

The Typical and Connotative Character of *Xeinoi* Situations across the *Apologue*:

Three Studies in Repetition

Hamish Williams/WLLHAM001

A dissertation submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Classics (SLL 6050W)

School of Languages and Literatures

Faculty of the Humanities

University of Cape Town

Submitted Monday the 28th of November 2016

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

Financial Acknowledgments

I hereby acknowledge the following financial assistance received for completion of this dissertation and degree: 1) The National Research Foundation: NRF Innovation Doctoral Scholarship (2013-2015), NRF Travel Grant (2013-2014). Disclaimer: “The financial assistance of the National Research Foundation (NRF) towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and not necessarily to be attributed to the NRF.” 2) The University of Cape Town: Doctoral Research Scholarship (2013-2015), UCT Travel Conference Grant (2014), UCT Scholarship for International Travel (2015). 3) The Classical Association of South Africa: The Ursula Vogel Trust Award (2013-2014). 4) The Oppenheimer Memorial Trust: OMT Scholarship (2015-2016).

Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	5
Chapter 1 <i>Introduction</i>	7
1.1 <i>Xeinoi Situations in the Apologue</i>	7
1.2 <i>Interpretations of Xeinoi Situations in the Apologue</i>	10
1.2.1 <i>The Apologue Entails Inversions of Normal Guest-Host Interactions in a Hospitality Scene</i>	11
1.2.2 <i>Xeinoi Situations in the Apologue Are Reflective of the Stranger's Stratagem</i>	17
1.2.3 <i>Xeinoi Situations in the Apologue Capture the Greek Traveller's or Colonist's Experience in Primitive Lands</i>	27
1.2.4 <i>Xeinoi Situations in the Apologue Entail Encounters with Feminized Inhabitants or in a Feminized Milieu</i>	36
1.2.5 <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	43
1.3 <i>Studying Repetitions and Their Connotations in the Homeric Poems</i>	44
Chapter 2 <i>Mountains and Isolation</i>	62
2.1 <i>Overview</i>	62
2.2 <i>Space in the Homeric Poems</i>	64
2.2.1 <i>Scholarship on Space in the Homeric Poems</i>	64
2.2.2 <i>Connoting Other Spatial Units in the Apologue</i>	72
2.3 <i>The Typicality of Mountains in the Apologue</i>	83
2.3.1 <i>Reference List for Mountains in the Apologue</i>	85

2.3.2	<i>Summary</i>	87
2.4	<i>A Connotative Interpretation of Mountains in the Apologue</i>	87
2.5	<i>Conclusions</i>	150
Chapter 3	<i>Eating and Danger</i>	152
3.1	<i>Overview</i>	152
3.2	<i>Eating in the Odyssey</i>	152
3.3	<i>The Typicality of Eating in the Apologue</i>	161
3.3.1	<i>Reference List for Eating in the Apologue</i>	164
3.3.2	<i>Summary</i>	166
3.4	<i>A Connotative Interpretation of Eating in the Apologue</i>	167
3.5	<i>Conclusions</i>	214
Chapter 4	<i>Tricks and Success</i>	216
4.1	<i>Overview</i>	216
4.2	<i>Trickery in the Odyssey</i>	216
4.3	<i>The Typicality of Tricks in the Apologue</i>	228
4.3.1	<i>Reference List for Tricks in the Apologue</i>	229
4.3.2	<i>Summary</i>	231
4.4	<i>A Connotative Interpretation of Tricks in the Apologue</i>	232
4.5	<i>Conclusions</i>	277
Chapter 5	<i>The Importance of the Apologue</i>	281
	<i>Reference, Format, and Name Guide</i>	288
	<i>List of References</i>	293

Abstract

This dissertation engages in a close reading and analysis of the *Apologue* of Homer's *Odyssey*; specifically, I am concerned with characterizing the nature of *xeinoi* situations or interactions in these books—that is, the relationship between the Ithacan travellers and the various inhabitants whom they encounter in these four books. There is a significant amount of scholarship on the nature of these encounters in the *Apologue*, and as my first chapter explores, many of these are often hinged upon certain polarities: hospitality versus inhospitality, civilized versus savage, masculine versus feminine. My study is greatly indebted to these; however, this dissertation explores new avenues of interpreting these encounters.

I have adopted an approach to the *Odyssey*, which is based upon the importance of repetitions and their connotations, what has been termed 'traditional referentiality'. The Homeric poems are defined by an aesthetic of repetition: certain 'units' (which may be isolated words, phrases, actions, scenes, etc.) are given prominence in the narrative through their frequency; when these units are examined with respect to their contexts, the particular units gain associative or 'connotative' meaning from their implementation.

In my second, third, and fourth chapters, I explore how the *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue* are pervaded by certain typical units—namely, (i) mountains, (ii) acts of eating, and (iii) acts of trickery—and then, importantly, how these units garner connotative senses of, respectively, (i) isolation, (ii) danger, and (iii) success, which characterize the relationships in these four books. While some of these typical units have received scholarly treatment in the *Odyssey* as a whole, their specific importance to the *Apologue* has not been studied extensively, nor have the connotative resonances of these repeated units been fully explored. The importance of these connotations is elaborated on in the conclusion, where I examine

how the meaning derived from these *xeinoi* encounters interplays with the surrounding story of the *Odyssey*.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 *Xeinoi* Situations in the Apologue

The *Apologue*, the secondary narrative of Odysseus from Books 9 to 12 of the *Odyssey*,¹ describes a number of different interactions between *xeinoi*—‘foreigners’, ‘strangers’, or ‘guests’ (*LfgrE* 2004: 464-469)—and the various local inhabitants whom they encounter at land and at sea during their wanderings. In almost all of these cases the *xeinoi* are Odysseus and his crew of Ithacan sailors, while the inhabitants they meet include the Cicones, the Lotus Eaters and Polyphemus in Book 9, Aeolus, the Laestrygonians, and Circe in Book 10, Teiresias and the various shades of the Underworld in Book 11, and the Sirens, Scylla, Charybdis, and Helios’ cattle in Book 12.

Each of these situations involving *xeinoi* and indigenous inhabitants (which I shall henceforth title *xeinoi* situations or *xeinoi* interactions in this dissertation) is in some respect unique. One can track these individual elements, for example, across the setting of the story, the orientation of characters, or the scale of treatment. Thus the setting of these interactions varies from primitive caves (*Od.* 9.182, 12.84), to more respectable *dōmata* (*Od.* 10.10, 210), to open landscapes without any marked domicile (in the case of the Lotus Eaters, the Sirens, and Helios’ Thrinacia), and even to the Underworld itself!²

¹ Under the designation of the *Apologue* I exclude a minor introduction to Odysseus’ narration by the primary narrator (*Od.* 9.1), and a brief interruption in Book 11 (lines 333-377) by his Phaeacian audience. The *Apologue*, depending on the scholar’s choice of nomenclature, can also be referred to as the *Apologoi* or the ‘Wanderings’.

² The Underworld might also be considered a ‘home’, the *domos* of Hades and Persephone (*Od.* 10.491, 512), a royal dwelling comparable to that of Menelaus and Helen, Alcinous and Arete, and Odysseus and Penelope (Bassi 1999: 418-419).

Secondly, with respect to the orientation of the native inhabitants, there are sharp distinctions to be viewed in their treatment of the *xeinoi*: while the most malevolent characters, such as Polyphemus and the Laestrygonians, turn the travellers into food (*Od.* 9.288-293, 10.116), there are some characters who seem to harbour no ill will to Odysseus and his men, such as the Lotus Eaters (*Od.* 9.92-93), and others who change from initial friendliness to outright hostility, in the case of Aeolus (cf. *Od.* 10.14-22, 67-69), or malevolence to friendliness, in the case of Circe, whose role in the story changes from that of a witch to a guide.

Thirdly, as to the scale of narrative treatment, it has been observed by critics that the episodes in the land of the Cyclopes and in Aeaëa are far more prominent than other scenes, and that the shorter episodes tend to act as prefaces to the major ones: the Cicones and the Lotus Eaters to Polyphemus (Book 9); Aeolus and the Laestrygonians to Circe (Book 10); the Sirens and Scylla to Thrinacia (Book 12) (Belmont 1962: 127, Most 1989b: 21, Redfield 1983: 236).

In contrast to the unique character of each *xeinoi* situation, this dissertation endeavours to locate points of tangency between these interactions—similar characteristics which can be found across the *Apologue* (cf. de Jong 2004a: 222-223, Niles 1978: 46-47). These similar characteristics will be identified on both a structural level (‘typicality’) and on the level of meaning (‘connotations’).

In this respect, my dissertation is indebted to a legion of scholars, who have provided insights into the structure and meaning of Odysseus’ wanderings. I do not view my analysis as antagonistic towards these earlier studies, although I shall provide a few points of criticism, but rather complementary and cumulative. It is my goal in this dissertation to build upon previous works of scholarship with fresh insights so as to enhance how we understand the various *xeinoi* interactions which pervade the *Apologue*.

The opening chapter of this dissertation has two purposes. In the first section, ‘*Interpretations of Xeinoi Situations in the Apologue*’ (1.2), I shall seek to identify, illustrate, and then criticize other major approaches of characterizing *xeinoi* situations in Odysseus’ wanderings. In the second section, ‘*Studying Repetitions and Their Connotations in the Homeric Poems*’ (1.3), I shall present the methodology which will be pursued in the ensuing three chapters. This methodology involves the recognition of typical units in the Homeric poems and then the evaluation of the connotations which these units garner, the meaning which they derive from their repeated contexts. Hence my dissertation explores the *Apologue* both in terms of typical character (what the repeated units are), as well as connotative character (what associative meaning these units garner from their repeated contexts).

In the second chapter, ‘*Mountains and Isolation*’, I commence by surveying the importance of space to the Homeric poems (2.2.1), a topic which has garnered greater scholarly attention in the last five to ten years. Having provided a review of this scholarship, as well as an illustration of connotative analyses of certain spatial units (2.2.2), I proceed to my particular identification of mountains in the *Apologue* as typical units (2.3). Of the three typical units assessed in this dissertation, mountains have received the least scholarly attention, and accordingly, this chapter has demanded greater exposition. In an analysis of the various contexts in which mountains are placed, I argue that they garner connotations of isolation, of which I enumerate three types—topographical, social, and temporal isolation (2.4).

In the third chapter, ‘*Eating and Danger*’, I have commenced with a review of scholarship on eating in the *Odyssey* (3.2), before identifying the typicality of acts of eating in the *Apologue* (3.3). I have argued in this chapter, that these units garner associations of danger, which may be divided into two groups, the danger of destruction and the danger of

delay; these connotations are also occasionally broken up by a more positive connotation where food is viewed as a respite or boon for weary travellers (3.4).

In the fourth chapter, '*Tricks and Success*', I have begun with a review of scholarship on *mētis* in the Homeric poems, alongside related discussions of *kleos* and *biē* (4.2). In my analysis of typicality, as with the third chapter, I am identifying units of action which reoccur throughout the *Apologue*—in particular here, I provide a reference list for all the acts of trickery which occur in these four books (4.3). In my connotative analysis, I contend that these tricks garner associative senses of success in the *Apologue*: that skill in trickery is the dominant fashion of ensuring superiority in the interactions, while a deficiency in trickery, whether through overreliance on *biē* or a lack of mental resources, leads to failure (4.4).

In the final chapter, '*The Importance of the Apologue*', I summarize the results of my three individual studies and also suggest areas where further research may be undertaken. The *Apologue* is of course just four books out of twenty-four, and the results of my study are evaluated here with respect to the rest of the epic poem. All the technical conventions employed in this dissertation are explained in the subsequent section, '*Reference, Format, and Name Guide*'.

1.2 *Interpretations of Xeinoi Situations in the Apologue*

In the following section, I review four prominent interpretations of *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue*. Each subsection is based upon an exemplary scholarly reading of the particular interpretation, over which related critical stances will be used both to substantiate the relevant perspective and to criticize its shortcomings. The four subsections have been described as follows: '*The Apologue Entails Inversions of Normal Guest-Host Interactions in a Hospitality Scene*' (1.2.1); '*Xeinoi Situations in the Apologue Are Reflective of the Stranger's*

Stratagem' (1.2.2); '*Xeinoi Situations in the Apologue Capture the Greek Traveller's or Colonist's Experience in Primitive Lands*' (1.2.3); '*Xeinoi Situations in the Apologue Entail Encounters with Feminized Inhabitants or in a Feminized Milieu*' (1.2.4).

1.2.1 *The Apologue Entails Inversions of Normal Guest-Host Interactions in a Hospitality Scene*

Steve Reece (1993: 123) conceives of the *Apologue* as being originally assembled by the Homeric poet(s) from a collection of inherited folktales and "deep-sea yarns" (123), which are different in subject matter and origin to the rest of the *Odyssey*;³ against these "fantastic elements" (123), however, he observes how Homer is at pains to humanize the supernatural, to consistently create human elements in the *Apologue* which are more recognizable for his Greek audience (cf. Glenn 1971: 180, Page 1973: 31, Scott 1974: 23-24). One such element for Reece (1993: 123) is the ritual of *xenia* or hospitality (cf. Glenn 1971: 158, Reinhardt 1996: 95).⁴

³ For scholarship which interprets the *Apologue* as being assembled from various folktales outside of the tradition of Greek heroic poetry, cf. Hölscher 1988, Page 1973, Reinhardt 1996, and as pertaining, in particular, to the Polyphemus sequence in Book 9, cf. Glenn 1971, Mondi 1983. The amalgamation of epic song and folktale material can be observed in several compositional oddities in the *Apologue*: for example, (i) the abrupt change in the number of ships from the large *Iliadic* fleet of twelve (*Od.* 9.159) to the single ship of the sailor's yarn (Reinhardt 1996: 69-77); (ii) the shortness of the Laestrygonian episode (*Od.* 10.80-134) when compared to the catastrophe which befalls the Ithacans there (Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989: 9, Page 1973: 31-32, Reinhardt 1996: 71); and (iii) the differences in character between the Cyclopes, taken from Greek mythology, and Polyphemus, adopted from European folklore (Mondi 1983: 23).

⁴ For further readings on hospitality or guest-friendship in the Homeric poems, cf. Belmont 1962, Donlan 1982, Edwards 1975, Thornton 1970: 38-46, Van Wees 1992.

Reece's critical engagement with *xenia* throughout his seminal work, *The stranger's welcome* (1993), is based upon studying repetition in "elements" (6) within scenes of hospitality, which render these scenes 'typical'. Reece's (6) recognition and analysis of the components of hospitality scenes is thorough, and he provides a list of 38 separate elements which reoccur in these scenes in the Homeric corpus. On the basis of this table of typical elements, he posits that there are twelve major hospitality scenes in the *Odyssey*, four of which are to be found in the *Apologue*: (i) Odysseus and Polyphemus, (ii) Odysseus and Aeolus, (iii) Odysseus and the Laestrygonians, and (iv) Odysseus and Circe (5).

Turning specifically to the *Apologue*, Reece conceptualizes these four books as entailing an inversion of benevolent representations of hospitality elsewhere in the poem,⁵ where any number of the typical elements he expects in these scenes are in some fashion distorted (cf. Belmont 1962: 124-125, de Jong 2004a: 223):

Every hospitality scene of the *Apologoi* is tainted by deviations from, and perversions of, the elements of the normal hospitality type scene (food, song, guest-gifts, bed, etc.)... In short, Odysseus' hosts are either blatantly hostile and violent, bringing death and destruction, or overzealous in their hospitality, jeopardizing his return home. There is no middle ground.

(Reece 1993: 124)

Reece's (1993: 125) subsequent analysis is focused entirely on the *Cyclopeia*, Odysseus' encounter with Polyphemus, precisely because it presents the most instances of a "parody of the theme of hospitality" (125; cf. Belmont 1962: 165-173). For example, in response to his

⁵ On Nestor and Menelaus as exemplary practitioners of hospitality, cf. Louden 2011a: 37, Most 1988: 24-25. Rose 1969: 389, 394, Webber 1989: 3.

guest's supplication (*Od.* 9.266-271) (#VI [Reece 1993: 6]), Polyphemus blatantly disregards the status of Zeus *xeinios*, as the avenger of suppliants and travellers (*Od.* 9.273-278) (Reece 1993: 133-134); instead of preparing food for his guests (#IX [Reece 1993: 7]), Polyphemus prepares his guests as food (*Od.* 9.288-293) (Reece 1993: 134-136); and Polyphemus' sardonic guest-gift, “ξενήϊον” (*Od.* 9.370) (#XX [Reece 1993: 7]), grants Odysseus the perverse honour of being consumed last of all his men (Reece 1993: 138-139). Reece's (1993: 126-130) analysis of hospitality motifs in the *Cyclopeia* is ultimately directed towards an evaluation of the innovative quality of the Homeric composer, in establishing how the folktale versions of the 'ogre tale', which runs through some two hundred different Indo-European traditions, are amended through the importance of *xenia* in the *Odyssey* version (cf. Podlecki 1961).

While my analysis is greatly indebted to the methodology of Reece in so far as repetitions are sought within *xeinoi* situations, there are several difficulties in his insistence that the *Apologue*, as a whole, is a narrative where hospitality or *xenia* is routinely distorted.

Firstly, Reece's criteria for typical hospitality scenes, his 38 elements, are not applicable to all the individual encounters in these four books. This can be seen in the numerical disparity between his excellent, but isolated, treatment of the singular episode of Polyphemus, which exhibits 19 out of his 38 typical elements (214-215), and two of the other hospitality scenes which he regards as representative: the Aeolian exhibits 9 out of 38 elements, the Laestrygonian a mere 5 (the Aeaean is a better fit with 18) (215-219). Moreover, none of the other *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue*, which Reece later specifically terms “hospitality scene[s]” (124), such as that of the Lotus Eaters or the Sirens, are even fitted into his rubric. The suspicion arises that, apart from the Polyphemus episode (and perhaps that of Circe [cf. Belmont 1962: 163-164, Edwards 1975: 67-69]), many of the other

xenoi interactions do not satisfy the typical elements of Reece's hospitality scene sufficiently (cf. Pucci 1998: 114).⁶

At the start of his monograph, Reece (1993: 5) does concede that the brevity of certain hospitality scenes in the Homeric poems renders them less important to his analysis. And it might therefore be argued that certain encounters in the *Apologue* are far too small in scale to incorporate an adequate number of the typical elements. But, as Belmont (1962: 118-119) illustrates, there are instances in the Homeric epics where a hospitality scene can be compressed into very few lines—half a dozen or less—and still, nevertheless, manage to contain a substantial number of typical elements (e.g. *Od.* 3.488-493). Why then do the minor 'hospitality' scenes in the *Apologue*, such as those between the Ithacans and the Lotus Eaters or the Sirens, not include a greater number of typical elements, or inversions thereof? In the case of the Lotus Eaters (*Od.* 9.83-104), I count 3 out of 38 typical elements (cf. #II, IIIb, IXb [Reece 1993: 6-7]); for the Sirens (*Od.* 12.165-205), I can find perhaps 4 (cf. #II, IIIa, IIIb, XIII [Reece 1993: 6-7]).

While I concur with the importance of the *xenia* theme in the *Cyclopeia*, a more convincing argument is needed for the inclusion of several other encounters as '(in)hospitality scenes', when they do not conform to the author's own structural rubric. It will be the pursuit of this dissertation to probe further into characteristics which are typified through several *xenoi* situations in the *Apologue*, and not confined to a single selected encounter, such as that of Polyphemus.

⁶ For Pucci the Cyclopes are the only people in the *Apologue* who demonstrate a marked opposition to the ideals of *xenia* and piety: "the other people he [Odysseus] describes are often judged in relation to their respect for hospitality and the gods—thus Aeolus is the perfect host, Circe an anti-host—but as gods and magicians they transcend the human scale and represent another level of alterity altogether from that of the savage man. Such an alterity also characterizes the world of the dead. Here man is no longer really human, and the rules of hospitality lose all force" (1998: 114).

Secondly, from a spatial perspective, Steve Reece's rubric makes it clear that a hospitality scene must take place around a house of some kind, seeing that several of his typical elements refer to a domicile, or parts thereof: "III.a. Description of the residence", "IV. Dog at the door", "V. Waiting at the Threshold", "VII.c. Host rises from his seat", "VIII. Seat", "XVII. Bed", and "XVIII. Bath" (1993: 6-7). In the *Apologue*, however, it seems problematic to talk about an interaction such as that between the Sirens and the Ithacan sailors as a 'hospitality scene', seeing that there is no physical threshold for the *xeinoi* to pass through, no home for them to enter. They are certainly *xeinoi* in the sense of 'wanderers' or 'strangers' passing near a foreign shore, but they cannot reasonably be considered *xeinoi* as 'guests' in this instance.

Similar problems would be faced when trying to term the encounters with the Cicones, Scylla, Charybdis, and with Helios' livestock as 'hospitality' or 'reception scenes'. In the case of the Cicones, the Ithacans constitute a raiding party, attacking a coastal town (they are not seeking entry into homes in Ismarus); Scylla is a cave-dwelling monster who attacks sailors (not guests) as their ships pass by on the sea; Charybdis is a massive whirlpool who threatens destruction to seafarers; and, in the case of Thrinacia, the island is only populated by animals and nymphs—there is no 'host' or 'home' to be found here at all. In all of these instances, the onus has to be on the critic to justify how any of these episodes, where there is no spatial reference to a home being entered, could reasonably be termed 'hospitality scenes', or *inhospitality* scenes (that is, parodies of hospitality scenes).

A third objection to Reece's critique of the *Apologue* is that it does not adequately allow for benevolent instances of hospitality in these books. Granted, there are affronts to Odysseus and his crew, but there are also hosts who go out of their way to help Odysseus. Thus further explanation is needed as to how Aeolus' kind reception of the travellers and his giving of a most useful *xeinēion*, a bag filled with unfavourable winds which ensures that the

wanderers are carried homeward to Ithaca (*Od.* 10.19-26), is anything but a proper instance of *xenia* (Reinhardt 1996: 88-89). Reece (1993: 124) suggests that the guest-gifts of Aeolus are a deviation from normal guest-gifts in that they drive Odysseus' fleet ultimately away from their home. But the reversal of fortune which Odysseus and his men experience is to be attributed to internal politics among Odysseus' crew rather than to an improper example of a guest-host reception (*Od.* 10.26-27). And although Circe initially acts as a mischievous witch, it is through her advice (*Od.* 12.21-27, 37-110), ultimately, that Odysseus manages to find the correct path home. In short, there are patterns of positive hosting throughout the *Apologue* which need to be accounted for in characterizations which seek to label these books as wholly 'inhospitable'.

In summary, there is certainly an ideal of *xenia* in the *Odyssey*, and it is a standard which characters frequently use to measure the propriety of a hosting situation (cf. *Od.* 6.121, 8.576, 9.176, 13.202); the ethics of this ideal are based in the divine status of Zeus *xeinios*, the protector of *xeinoi* and suppliants, who find themselves in a stranger's home (*Od.* 9.265-271).⁷ However, to regard *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue* as especially marked out by inhospitable interactions is to ignore certain problems: (i) many of the encounters really don't contain sufficient typical elements to constitute '(in)hospitality scenes', judging by Reece's own rubric; (ii) from a locative perspective, many of the episodes involve no manner of home at all, but play out across empty landscapes or over the sea; and (iii) there are at least two exemplary, hospitable hosts in the *Apologue*.

⁷ Recently, Loudon (2011a: 30-37) has endeavoured to show how the majority of guest-host situations in the *Odyssey* indicate traces, to varying degrees, of theoxenies—that is, scenes depicting a god arriving as a guest in disguise. The potential for any guest to be a divinity is what, according to Loudon (2011a: 32), gives Homeric *xenia* its sacred quality (cf. Kearns 1982).

1.2.2 *Xeinoi* Situations in the *Apologue* Are Reflective of the Stranger's Stratagem

Glenn Most's study, 'The structure and function of Odysseus' *Apologoi*' (1989b), analyses *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue* in tandem with the performance context of this secondary narrative, Odysseus' reception in the Phaeacian palace of King Alcinous and Queen Arete (15-17). Indeed, when one starts from the simple observation that the *Apologue* is both a speech about *xeinoi* and by a *xeinos*, it seems a natural route of critical enquiry to ask whether Odysseus' secondary narration is shaped in some respect by his on-going reception in Scheria (cf. Hopman 2012: 1-2, Krischer 1985: 11, Louden 2011a: 161). Glenn Most (1989b: 19) pursues this enquiry on the level of character motivation, exploring why Odysseus says what he says in the *Apologue*. He reads the *Apologue* as one in a number of stories in the *Odyssey*, and elsewhere in Greek literature (cf. Most 1989a: 114-133), which follow a pattern which he calls "the stranger's stratagem" (Most 1989b: 19):⁸

Those [stories] told in the guise of a stranger are uniformly tales of misfortune, in which Odysseus adopts a persona likely to meet (and almost invariably meeting) with the approval of his listeners, and all are aimed at the securing of practical ends.

(19)

Most's (20-21) argument that the *Apologue* presents a model of 'the stranger's stratagem' starts with a structural analysis of these four books. Employing a model which places the various episodes of the *Apologue* into a ring composition (for the diagram, cf. Most 1989b:

⁸ For other critical recognitions and explorations of a 'stranger's strategy' in the *Apologue*, cf. de Jong 1992: 11, 2001: 221, Doherty 2008: 63-76, Hopman 2012: 21-23, Larson 2000: 195-196, Newton 2008: 9-14, 22-29, Rose 1969: 387-406.

22; cf. Niles 1978: 47),⁹ he emphasizes how this structure places certain episodes in symmetrical alignment with one another and so tends to give weight to the thematic similarities of these episodes (cf. Most 1989b: 22-24); in particular, the structure is said to draw attention to the threat of a host delaying his guest for too long, and to a host who turns his guest into food (23; cf. Redfield 1983: 237-238). Like Steve Reece, Most (1989b: 24) follows an interpretation of the *Apologue* as a reversal of *xenia*, and he duly contrasts these types of negative behaviour to those which the ideal host should demonstrate—namely, feeding his guest and speeding him on his way:

The explanation for the arrangement of Odysseus' adventures is obvious: they confront him with the two extreme versions of bad hospitality, exaggerated to nightmarish proportions and repeated with hallucinatory obsessiveness.

(25)

Having established the patterns of behaviour which the *Apologue*'s structure emphasizes, Glenn Most turns to the function of such a presentation—its relationship to Odysseus' external situation in the Phaeacian court. According to Most, Odysseus' situation on Scheria

⁹ Other structural divisions have been suggested in the *Apologue*: (i) the four books can be divided into two parts, entailing two cycles of destruction: the first ending in the loss of the fleet after the Laestrygonian attack (*Od.* 9.2-10.134), and the second that of a single ship, after Thrinacia (*Od.* 10.135-12.453) (Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989: 8-9, Niles 1978: 48-49, Reinhardt 1996: 72); (ii) there has been a recognition that, at least in Books 9, 10, and 12, the adventures fall into bundles of three, the third of which is much longer and more challenging (Most 1989b: 21, Redfield 1983: 236); and (iii) with particular regard to the *Nekyia* in Book 11, it is either central to the structure of the four books (Nagler 1996: 143-145), or is an independent, free unit (Redfield 1983: 236). For further discussions on the structure of the episodes, cf. Bakker 2013: 25-27, Cook 1995: 65-69, 74-80, de Jong 2004a: 221-223.

is far from ideal. While conceding that the Phaeacians do ultimately present Odysseus with his desired *xeinēion*, Most (26-28) traces tokens of inhospitality throughout the Phaeacian sequence:¹⁰ this includes both Nausicaa's and Athena's warning to Odysseus of the xenophobic townspeople (*Od.* 6.273-284, 7.32-33) (Rose 1969: 388, 390-391),¹¹ the elevated power which Arete holds as queen (*Od.* 6.303-315, 7.53-77) and her initial reluctance to

¹⁰ For a summary of Phaeacian inhospitality, cf. Reece 1993: 105-106.

¹¹ In asserting that the Phaeacians are distrustful and hostile towards foreigners, there is a contradiction in their characterization elsewhere in the story (Fenik 1974: 126-127): for while Athena and Nausicaa warn us of the isolationism of the people, other parts of the Phaeacian sequence illustrate their sociable aspects, most notably their history of transporting travellers home (e.g. *Od.* 8.31-33) (cf. Austin 1975: 162, Reinhardt 1996: 128-129, Segal 1962: 21-22). Furthermore, Poseidon's threat against the Phaeacians, of isolating their realm, is levelled at them on account of their characteristic contact with nations overseas (*Od.* 8.564-571). How exactly one resolves these initial tokens of an isolationist, inhospitable attitude with the more welcoming depiction of the Phaeacians as benevolent ferrymen is just one of several internal inconsistencies which critics have faced in trying to arrive at a coherent characterization of these people (Reece 1993: 107). Scholars have attempted to explain this incongruity, between anti-social and social behaviour, through various arguments. (i) There could be an implied class distinction between an unfriendly proletariat and a benevolent nobility (Reece 1993: 107, Rose 1969: 388). (ii) The initial suggestions of inhospitality by Nausicaa and Athena might have been introduced at that point in the story for purely dramatic, plot-based reasons in order to heighten the jeopardy of the hero upon arriving in a foreign land, Scheria, and, secondly, to measure the profound change which Odysseus produces in his initially 'malevolent' hosts, and later, his audience (*Od.* 11.333-334) (Garvie 1994: 26, Pucci 1998: 122). (iii) With respect to Athena's warning specifically, the caution of an inhospitable people might simply constitute a necessary plot mechanism by the poet to motivate the goddess' actions for concealing Odysseus in a mist and helping him appear suddenly in the royal court (*Od.* 7.14-17, 139-143) (Pucci 1998: 122). And (iv) with respect to Nausicaa's warning, her description of her countrymen as being hostile to foreigners could also be construed as a young girl's typical anxieties of being denigrated by her people (*Od.* 6.285-288) (De Vries 1977: 115, Reece 1993: 104).

welcome Odysseus openly (Fenik 1974: 5-6, Rose 1969: 404, Whittaker 1999: 147),¹² Alcinous' violation of the etiquette of *xenia* (Rose 1969: 393-397),¹³ and the rudeness of Euryalus and Laodamas during the athletic games (*Od.* 8.131-164) (Louden 2011a: 157, Rose 1969: 402-403).

¹² Arete's role in Odysseus' reception, her importance to the hero's attainment of *xenia* from the Phaeacians, is also a subject of critical debate (Whittaker 1999: 141-142). If, for example, she is as prominent a figure in Scheria as both Nausicaa and Arete claim (cf. Bassi 1999: 420, Doherty 2008: 64-66, Lowenstam 1993: 177-178, Pantelia 1993: 499), then why does she play so minimal a role in Odysseus' opening entreaty to the royal family, and why, moreover, is the queen silent for so long a period (Fenik 1974: 6, 105, Garvie 1994: 22, Whittaker 1999: 141-142)? There have been various explanations for this narrative inconsistency. (i) A solution for the textual critic, rather than the literary, is to explore corruptions in the manuscript which have come down to us (Fenik 1974: 106). (ii) Other scholars have suggested a conflation in the Phaeacian narrative of an older folktale, in which Arete acts as an ogress, analogous to the wife of King Antiphates, or otherwise the head of a primitive matriarchal society (Fenik 1974: 111, Schewan 1919: 7). (iii) Arete's twin characterization, between her subservient role to Alcinous and her powerful status, might also be reflective of her liminal position in the narrative, between the dominant female characters of the *Apologue* and the more respectful women of Greek society in the *Telemachy* and the Return (Whittaker 1999: 146-149). (iv) Some critics point to a progression in her character from hostile to benevolent, from the initial warning of her power to Odysseus (*Od.* 6.303-315, 7.53-77), to her silent suspicion, her mute response when Odysseus first entreats her (*Od.* 7.146-152), to her blunt question to the hero when she finally speaks (*Od.* 7.237-239), to her offering of guest gifts at her husband's recommendation (*Od.* 8.438-445), and, finally, to her encomium of the hero (*Od.* 11.335-341) (Fenik 1974: 105-106). (v) Lastly, Fenik (1974: 126-129) views Arete's elevated status as central to all the other tokens of Phaeacian inhospitality and as relevant specifically to the 'sharp' question which the queen puts to Odysseus in Book 7 (lines 237-239), over which the success of Odysseus' reception hangs; the fact that Arete fades into insignificance in latter scenes, much like Nausicaa, is indicative of the fact that she has fulfilled her function in the Homeric type scene, irrespective of how inconsistent one might find this characterization.

¹³ For scholars who are opposed to labelling Alcinous an improper or inadequate host, cf. Austin 1975: 158, De Vries 1977: 116-118, Fenik 1974: 108, Reinhardt 1996: 124-125.

The token of Phaeacian abuse of greatest relevance to Glenn Most, though, is the constant delaying the Ithacan *xēinos* is subjected to at the hands of King Alcinous, the deferral of the *nostos* which Odysseus immediately requested from his hosts at 7.151-152 upon first entering the royal palace (cf. Most's (1989b: 28) commentary on the following sequence of passages: *Od.* 7.189-198, 222-225, 311-318, 331-333, 8.149-151, 154-157; cf. Lowenstam 1993: 150). According to Most (1989b: 28), Odysseus is made to wait an inordinate amount of time over the course of his reception in Scheria before he is finally bestowed the *xēinēion* he desires—his *nostos*. And, moreover, the threat of Alcinous' procrastination is further exacerbated by the possibility of a union between Odysseus and the king's daughter, Nausicaa, which could derail Odysseus' homecoming entirely (*Od.* 7.311-314) (Most 1989b: 27-28; cf. Pucci 1998: 145-146, Reinhardt 1996: 122-123).¹⁴

Although Most (1989b: 29) acknowledges that there is not a risk of an indefinite stay from the perspective of the primary narratees of the epic poem (the audience and we, the readers), since we have been told already that the Phaeacians will transport the hero back to Ithaca (*Od.* 5.36-42), Odysseus is not privy to this intelligence. Odysseus therefore has to make the case for his *nostos*. He achieves this argumentation primarily through the *Apologue*, where, as the ring structure demonstrates, great emphasis is given to hosts, such as the Lotus Eaters and Circe, who delay their guests against their will. The 'strategy of the stranger' or *xēinos* entails a persuasive, prohibitive exercise on the part of Odysseus, whereby "caricatures" (Most 1989b: 29) of bad types of hosting are presented to the Phaeacians in the

¹⁴ For further discussions of the initial 'erotic' encounter between Odysseus and Nausicaa, cf. Dougherty 2001: 130-134, Fenik 1974: 127-128, Glenn 1998: 107-116, Gross 1976: 311-317, Lowenstam 1993: 174-176, Murnaghan 1995: 66-67, Thornton 1970: 18-19. On the Phaeacian sequence as entailing a mixture of two original plots: of a guest demanding *nostos*, and of a nuptial narrative, cf. Louden 2011a: 137, Paton 1912: 215, Reece 1993: 109-113. On the mixing of a guest-based plot and a nuptial plot in the *Odyssey* as a whole, cf. Katz 1994: 58, Levy 1963: 145-153.

expectation that these people would be reluctant to adopt such utterly negative portrayals themselves, and would, accordingly, expedite Odysseus' *nostos* (29-30).¹⁵

Before I turn to the difficulties of Most's analysis, there are some points of tangency between this dissertation and his article. Firstly, methodologically, like Reece, he is searching for structural patterns and repetitions across the narrative of the *Apologue*, which can determine our understanding of the character of *xeinoi* situations in these four books; and, secondly, the twin dangers of delay and destruction for the Ithacan *xeinoi* will be taken up by my third chapter. The difficulties in Glenn Most's article do not lie so much in the structural part as in the functional—the stranger's stratagem. His argument can be attacked from numerous positions.

Firstly, more generally, the notion that Odysseus' *Apologue* entails a 'stranger's stratagem' rests on the assumption that the Phaeacians are, to a large extent, inhospitable towards the Ithacan hero throughout his stay, and, accordingly, that Odysseus is uncertain as to whether he will receive *xeinēion* in the form of a *nostos* and is thus compelled to engage in a persuasive exercise in the *Apologue*. But the question of Phaeacian inhospitality is a debatable subject in Homeric scholarship (Louden 2011a: 143), since for every token in the narrative which seems indicative of inhospitality, arguments can equally be levelled in the opposite direction, towards a conception of these people as favourable, even ideal hosts (e.g. Austin 1975: 157-159, De Vries 1977: 121, Fenik 1974: 8-9, Garvie 1994: 24-25, Segal 1962: 22; for further discussion on some of the specific problems, cf. fn. 11, 12, & 13).

Most's analysis, in particular, claims that the Phaeacian hosts are guilty of delaying Odysseus' *nostos*—but there are several objections to this assertion. In actual story time, as opposed to discourse time, the entire reception in Scheria is remarkably short—stretching to

¹⁵ "Nausicaa should not be like Circe and Calypso and her parents should let him [i.e. Odysseus] go home when he wants" (Most 1989b: 29).

only three days. This is not an overtly long delay when viewed in the context of other ‘benevolent’ reception scenes in the epic, such as Telemachus’ stay in the homes of Nestor and Menelaus. Recognizing this, Charles Segal (1962: 22) compliments the speed of the Phaeacian reception by contrasting it with the lengthy delays Odysseus experiences in the homes of Calypso and Circe (seven years and one year, respectively), who are the story’s two primary exemplars of delaying hosts. Furthermore, if the Phaeacians are delaying hosts, then it is all the more remarkable to observe, in contrast to this procrastination, the speed, lack of drama, and narrative brevity with which the Scherian sailors ultimately execute Odysseus’ *nostos* (*Od.* 13.70-125) (Segal 1962: 22, 38).¹⁶

A second objection to Glenn Most’s emphasis on a delay lies in the aesthetic arrangement of the Phaeacian sequence. Reinhardt (1996: 122-124) has argued that each day in the Phaeacian sequence has a specific thematic purpose in the story: Day One, which starts with the hero on the outskirts of Scheria, culminates in the reception scene in Alcinous’ palace; Day Two progresses towards a recognition scene, where Odysseus announces his heroic identity to his audience (cf. Garvie 1994: 28-29); and Day Three completes the Phaeacian sequence with a departure scene. For the Homeric composer(s) to have condensed the time, so as to match up with Alcinous’ original pledge of a return on the second day (*Od.* 7.317-318), would negate the aesthetic build-up of the respective scenes (Reinhardt 1996: 122-124): “A Homeric day has its own cycle of increasing tension, climax, and end” (122).

Thirdly, and perhaps most problematic for the stranger’s stratagem, one has to account for the fact that Odysseus’ delays in Scheria are caused as much by his own actions as those of his hosts (De Vries 1977: 121, Pucci 1998: 113-114, Reinhardt 1996: 124-125).

¹⁶ This short, successful return to Ithaca after the Phaeacian sequence contrasts with the narrative sequences which follow the hostings of Calypso and Circe, wherein Odysseus’ vessels are destroyed in storms (Fenik 1974: 165).

Most has forgotten about Odysseus' own enthusiasm for a lavish reception, and his desire to remain longer in Scheria and to receive more gifts (*Od.* 11.351-361, 13.200-206) (Redfield 1983: 227-230, 234, Van Wees 1992: 72-73, 104, 106, 233). Odysseus demonstrates two strategies as a guest in search of *xeinēion*: to win a *nostos* and to gain a substantial haul of treasure, the two of which are not necessarily conducive to each other. It seems harsh to criticize the Phaeacians for merely responding to their guest's somewhat conflicting needs.¹⁷

Nausicaa's feminine threat is also a major component in Most's (1989b: 28-30) argument of procrastinating Phaeacians, of a king who secretly wishes the powerful hero to remain in Scheria forever as his son-in-law (*Od.* 7.311-314). While erotic undertones may be felt in the initial encounter with the princess (cf. fn. 14), and while the athletic contest may have been part of an original narrative thread where suitors compete for the hand of the princess (cf. fn. 14), it requires a deft argument to insist that Odysseus still feels the threat of a potential marriage at the time of his narrating in Book 9, given the bathetic final encounter with Nausicaa in Book 8 (lines 461-462, 464-468) (de Jong 2004a: 212-213, de Vries 1977: 119, Fenik 1974: 127, Thornton 1970: 19). In this instance, there is no necessity for the *xeinós* to employ a stranger's stratagem in the *Apologue*, because the potential danger of a marriage with Nausicaa seems to have already passed.

And while we may characterize the Phaeacians as delaying hosts, the extent to which this delay constitutes an actual threat or an inhospitality of which Odysseus is greatly concerned at the exact time of his narrating (*Od.* 9.1) is debatable, since the hero has already

¹⁷ (i) For further readings on the economics and practical side of guest friendship, cf. Fenik 1974: 167-168, Pucci 1998: 115, 147, Roisman 1982: 36-38. Odysseus' economic motives are also shared by his wife, Penelope, cf. Hölscher 1996: 135-136. Against an interpretation of Odysseus' motives in Scheria as inspired by mercenary sentiments, cf. Segal 1962: 42, 54-56. (2) The tension between the hero's desire to return home and his tendency to procrastinate this homecoming can also be interpreted as a conflict between *nostos* and *kleos*, cf. Bassi 1999: 414-418, 421-422.

been assured of a homeward passage (Cf. *Od.* 8.544-545) (Fenik 1974: 129). Indeed, if we follow Gilbert Rose's (1969: 403-406) interpretation of Odysseus' stratagem as a guest, then most of the persuasive manipulation of his 'inhospitable' situation has been achieved prior to the *Apologue* in Books 7 and 8. In order to claim that the *Apologue* is a speech embodying a stranger's stratagem, one needs to prove that the supposed threats against the *xeinos* are still relevant at the time of narrating and have not yet been resolved.

The applicability of *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue* to the stranger's stratagem in Scheria becomes more problematic if one examines the interactions in Odysseus' wanderings not with an eye only to blaming improper 'hosts', but rather by analysing the behaviour of the travellers (Schein 1996: 30). Upon arriving at the shore of the Cicones, in the first encounter in the *Apologue*, Odysseus opts to carry out a raid, during which the town at Ismarus is sacked, the men killed, and the women seized as plunder (*Od.* 9.39-42). In the *Cyclopeia* it is not only the anthropophagous giant who violates *xenia* (*Od.* 9.273-280), but also Odysseus who acts contrary to proper hospitality by entering his host's home without permission (*Od.* 9.216-217) and by helping himself to the host's larders (*Od.* 9.231-233) (Austin 1983: 12-13, 15, Louden 2011a: 31, Pucci 1998: 116-117).¹⁸ Odysseus' men recognize at once that they are engaged in a raid, not a reception scene, since they recommend a quick flight from the cave before the monster returns (*Od.* 9.225-227). And in the reception in Aeaëa, Odysseus is reluctant to leave Circe's accommodation—he is enjoying a protracted reception; and it is his men who recommend the proper expedition of the *nostos*, and the termination of the year-long hospitality (*Od.* 10.472-474).

¹⁸ For further discussion on Odysseus' mistakes in this episode, cf. Byre 1994b: 364, Newton 1983: 140, Weinberg 1986: 24-25. Odysseus' impudence in the Polyphemus episode can be explained, from a compositional perspective, as being reflective of a stock character from folklore (Glenn 1971: 153-154).

If the *Apologue* is designed as a strategic, persuasive exercise by Odysseus to ensure that he is treated properly as a *xeinós*, then it is curious that the same story has provided numerous instances which could be employed by the Phaeacians as motivation against showing hospitality to Odysseus: city raids (the Cicones), an unwarranted entry into a host's home and eating of his victuals (Polyphemus), and a tendency to partake in overly long stays (Circe).

Ultimately, the difficulties in Most's analysis stem from the limitation of *xeinoi* situations to Odysseus' personal, subjective strategy, which Most (1989b: 17) separates from the narrative strategy of the primary narrator, 'Homer'.¹⁹ To claim that the *Apologue* is coloured by Odysseus' subjective experiences entails a structural and linguistic analysis and is largely uncontroversial (cf. de Jong 1992, Goldhill 1991, Griffin 1986); but when we turn to the task of arriving at some greater function or overall purpose behind this subjectivity, such as 'the stranger's stratagem', we are swimming in murky waters. Such an analysis requires a coherence to individual characterization and psychology, which is often undermined in the Homeric text by the semantic force of the typical scene and its constitutive repetitive elements (Fenik 1974: 13, 15, 162). Although this dissertation will illustrate typical and connotative characteristics which are prevalent in the Odyssean narrative, these will not be employed to indicate any distinct motivation on the part of the secondary narrator in the court of the Phaeacians.

¹⁹ For further discussion on Odysseus as a storyteller and the characteristics and function of his secondary narratives in the *Odyssey*, cf. Beck 2005: 213-227, Bergren 1983: 38-73, de Jong 1992: 1-11, 2001: 223-226, Pucci 1998: 131-142, Segal 1962: 23-24. On Odysseus' propensity to tell lies, and the truth of the *Apologue*, cf. Dougherty 2001: 73-77, Parry 1994: 1-20, Pucci 1998: 143-144, Schein 1996: 18. On Odysseus as a non-bardic performer, cf. de Jong 2004b: 13, Minton 1960: 307-309; as a bard, cf. Lowenstam 1993: 232, Musial 1968: 108-112.

1.2.3 *Xeinoi Situations in the Apologue Capture the Greek Traveller's or Colonist's Experience in Primitive Lands*

Carol Dougherty, in her study, *The raft of Odysseus: the ethnographic imagination of Homer's Odyssey* (2001), reads the Homeric poem firmly in the historical context of eighth century Greece (12), a period of heightened naval travel in the Mediterranean, when Greek communities began to expand their physical territories through colonization and their economies through trade (Redfield 1983: 223-224). Dougherty's (2001: 12-13) analysis is not concerned with plucking accurate historical information out of the *Odyssey* (sic Austin 1975: 140-141, Reinhardt 1996: 71-72, 103), but rather with reading the poem as a cultural history which plots an expanding world of travel, trade, and colonization in the Greek imagination.

In her analysis of the *Apologue*, Dougherty (2001: 95-96) understands Odysseus' wanderings from the perspective of a colonizer, moving away from civilization and culture towards primitiveness and nature:²⁰ thus, before the events of the *Iliad*, the hero departs from the civilized Greek world in Ithaca to the discord of war and a warring people (Troy and the Cicones [*Od.* 9.39-40]), and finally to the primitive, uncultured people and monsters whom he encounters in the *Apologue*. Indeed, Dougherty (96) interprets the sea itself as thematically important to this progression of the travellers away from civilization; it forms a "structural break" (96), marking the change from the Greek world to the strange 'New World' of Odysseus' wanderings (cf. Schein 1996: 15).

Starting with the Lotus Eaters, Dougherty (2001: 95-96) argues that these people are to be associated with vegetation, raw nature, by name and occupation (*Od.* 9.84), and, furthermore, she contends that their lifestyle threatens to push Odysseus' men farther away

²⁰ For further discussion on the opposition between nature and culture in the Homeric poems, cf. Kirk 1970: 162-171, Redfield 1994.

from civilization (Ithaca) by making them forget about their *nostos* (*Od.* 9.95) (cf. Vidal-Naquet 1996: 41).²¹ In the next encounter, the Cyclopes “are lacking in all the characteristics of a civilized life” (Dougherty 2001: 97): for example, their lack of agriculture (*Od.* 9.108-111) (cf. Vidal-Naquet 1996: 39-40), social institutions (*Od.* 9.112-115) (cf. Lowenstam 1993: 194), and contact with other people (*Od.* 9.125-130) (cf. Austin 1975: 145-148, Lowenstam 1993: 194). Their very land (*Od.* 9.113-114), as well as that of the neighbouring Island of the Goats (*Od.* 9.116-141) (cf. Bakker 2013: 60-62, Reinhardt 1996: 77), is described in “primitive and wild terms” (Dougherty 2001: 97).

Polyphemus himself can be considered an uncivilized savage in several respects. Firstly, before Odysseus actually confronts the ogre, the monster is specifically referred to as “ἄγριον” (*Od.* 9.215), a wild individual (*Lfgre* 1955: 96-97), and the very antithesis of the lawful man, “οὔτε δίκας εὔειδότα οὔτε θέμιστας” (*Od.* 9.215) (*Lfgre* 1955: 97) (Nestle 1942: 64-65, Schein 1970: 74).²² Secondly, Polyphemus eats his meat raw, breaking Greek custom by electing not to cook it (*Od.* 9.288-290) (Schein 1970: 74-75, Wilson 2002: 33).²³ Thirdly, the mountain lion simile which qualifies his anthropophagy conveys connotations of rage and savagery, especially employed in military contexts in the *Iliad* (*Od.* 9.292) (Schein

²¹ Likewise, Pierre Vidal-Naquet (1996: 39-41) shows the Lotus Eaters to be ‘non-human’ on the basis of their source of food, which his analysis contrasts to the agricultural cultivation characterizing human society; like Dougherty, also important for him is the Ithacans’ loss of “an essential facet of their humanity, memory” (41). For further discussion of the *Apologue* as a realm beyond the human world, cf. Thornton 1970: 20-21.

²² “In Verbindung mit entsprechenden Adjektiven hat die *Od.* abwertende Bed[eutung] etwa > *ruchlos* entwickelt, indem in dem wilden, ungebändigten Leben die barbarische... Unkenntnis oder Abkehr von Recht und Gesetz gesehen wurde... So besonders vom Kyklopen” (*Lfgre* 1955: 97). Cf. *Od.* 1.199, 6.120, 7.206, 9.175, 9.494, 13. 201 (*Lfgre* 1955: 97).

²³ This might be a pedantic point—the consumption of human flesh, whether properly roasted or eaten raw, would qualify as a savage act, either way.

1970: 75, Scott 1974: 58-62, Magrath 1982: 208-209). And, fourthly, the *pelōr* (*Od.* 9.187) does not respect the Greek custom of *xenia* (*Od.* 9.273-280) (Dougherty 2001: 97). Odysseus' final defeat of the one-eyed ogre has therefore often been viewed by Homerists as a triumph of the civilized human over the primitive, physical strength of nature,²⁴ as represented by Polyphemus (Austin 1983: 14, 20-22, Reinhardt 1996: 81-83, Schein 1970: 76-77, Segal 1962: 34).

Odysseus' next encounter with Aeolus is described briefly by Dougherty. She refers to the god's primitive associations with nature as being "king of the winds" (Dougherty 2001: 97), and, in line with such an interpretation, she later emphasizes the primitive aspect of Poseidon as the god of the seas (172-173). The power of the storms in the *Apologue*, a combination of wind and sea, indicates for Dougherty (95) a movement away from civilization.²⁵ The Laestrygonians are analogous in their primal savagery to Polyphemus (cf. Austin 1975: 143, Frame 1978: 57), while Circe creates a literal exemplum of the collapse of human civilization into animal savagery by transforming Odysseus' men into swine (*Od.* 10.237-243) (Dougherty 2001: 97; cf. Vidal-Naquet 1996: 38).²⁶ The Underworld is the destination which represents the furthest position from the human world, and from which Odysseus can commence his return voyage through the information which Teiresias and

²⁴ Weinberg (1986: 27) places importance in the natural elements symbolized by Polyphemus' parentage: Poseidon, watching over the earth and seas, and Thoosa, a divinity of tempestuous seas.

²⁵ The idea of storms as signifying a removal from civilization needs to account for the divine mechanism behind such storms, which in the case of the shipwreck after the Thrinacian reception has been instigated by Zeus (*Od.* 12.399-419) (Reinhardt 1996: 101). Zeus, as the protector of *xeinoi*, and thus the civilized order, can hardly be deemed an agent of the primitive world. For further discussion of the complexities and ambiguities of the characterization of Zeus, cf. fn. 118.

²⁶ Whether Circe later consumes the men whom she turns into pigs, as some suppose (e.g. Austin 1975: 153), is best left to the imagination of audience and reader alike.

Circe provide (Dougherty 2001: 97). The final threats Odysseus faces—the Sirens, Scylla and Charybdis—are symbolic of the dangers of the sea, in leading the traveller away from civilization (97).

Like Glenn Most's analysis, Carol Dougherty's also acknowledges the importance of Odysseus' storytelling being situated in Scheria. She does not, however, identify any subjective 'stranger's stratagem'; for in her interpretation, the hero's reception among the Phaeacians is characterized as entirely benevolent (Dougherty 2001: 98). Thus she notes the exemplary, generous hospitality which these people present to Odysseus—valuable gifts (*Od.* 8.387-445), a *nostos* (*Od.* 13.70-124), and the offer of a bride (*Od.* 7.311-316) (98). This munificent reception is in accordance with the existence of the Phaeacians, which she terms "utopian" (98). And Dougherty (98) remarks how the landscape and architecture of Scheria describes a country of Golden Age ease and prosperity, where the inhabitants live in plenty without recourse to labour (*Od.* 7.81-126).²⁷

The contrast created during Odysseus' stay in Scheria, between the primitivism of his *Apologue* (especially, in the *Cyclopeia*) and the hyper-civilized form which Phaeacian life demonstrates (123-127),²⁸ provides two extreme, competing visions of the colonist's imagination of what the New World could entail (100). For Dougherty (172-174), these two

²⁷ On the tension between Scheria as a characteristic Greek settlement in an age of colonization and its Golden Age aspect, cf. Vidal-Naquet 1996: 47-53.

²⁸ Several scholars have compared the hypo-civilized Cyclopes and the hyper-civilized Phaeacians, cf. Austin 1975: 153-158, 162, Hernández 2000: 345-346, Pucci 1998: 114-116, Redfield 1983: 239, 241-242, Segal 1962: 33-35. Pucci (1998: 114) takes this contrast even further by arguing for a 'stranger's stratagem' (of an opposite kind to Glenn Most's) in Odysseus' depiction of the Cyclopes; he suggests that Odysseus' juxtaposition of the savage and the civilized is a deliberate response to Alcinous' earlier anthropological question (*Od.* 8.572-576): "the guest plays his host a subtle compliment, seducing the story's listener with this *captatio benevolentiae*" (114).

paradigms—of locating primitive landscapes which could potentially be sites for a colony, and of imagining the ideal form which such a potential colony could take—are important steps leading up to Odysseus’ re-founding of Ithaca at the end of the poem, of achieving an actual colony through agricultural labour (cf. Austin 1975: 136, Vidal-Naquet 1996: 52-53).

For the purposes of my analysis, Dougherty’s work represents an important critical movement in re-evaluating *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue* through a broader characterization. In these books *xeinoi* are not merely guests, but they are foreigners, travellers, and strangers (*LfgrE* 2004: 464-469)—perhaps even, as Dougherty’s discussion recommends, ‘potential colonists’. Indeed, this characteristic of ‘foreignness’ is embedded in the very denotation of *xeinos* in the Homeric poem (Reece 1993: 108): while, in English there are two words to convey the cultural senses of ‘guest’ and ‘foreigner’, the presence of a single word to demarcate both in the Homeric narrative indicates that these two senses are not sharply divorced in the Greek poem.

In fact, when we examine actual (in)hospitality scenes across the *Odyssey*, we see that most of these social interactions are marked out by a distinction not only between a home owner and his visitor, but also between a local person or population and a foreign person or traveller (Van Wees 1992: 44-45, 169-171, 228-237): between Nestor and Telemachus, Pyliaean and Ithacan; Menelaus and Telemachus, Spartan and Ithacan; Calypso and Odysseus, Ogygiaean and Ithacan; the Phaeacians and Odysseus, Scherians and Ithacan; and Eumaeus and the disguised Odysseus, Ithacan and ‘Cretan’; moreover, the majority of the suitors, Telemachus’ irreverent guests, come not from Ithaca but the neighbouring islands (cf. *Od.* 16.241-257).

What renders the *Apologue* so singular is the cultural distance between the indigenous inhabitants and the Ithacan *xeinoi*, which is characterized, according to Dougherty, by a primitivism on the one hand, and a civilizing force on the other (nature versus culture). My

second chapter will build on this very notion of distance (from topographical, social, and temporal perspectives) by exploring a connotative character of isolation in *xeinoi* situations across these four books.

The particular contrast of primitive inhabitants of nature with civilized *xeinoi* of culture in the *Apologue*, however, fails to stand up to rigorous scrutiny throughout Odysseus' story. In the *Cyclopeia*, although one may classify the singular Polyphemus and his Cyclopean brethren together in character and conduct (cf. Austin 1975: 146, 1983: 19), one has also to account for an important difference between the solitary ogre and his Cyclopean brethren. When Polyphemus is asked by Odysseus to respect the sovereignty of Zeus *xeinios* and the Ithacans' status as suppliants and *xeinoi* (*Od.* 9.266-271), the ogre emphatically rejects the power of the chief Olympian (*Od.* 9.275-276); in contrast, when Polyphemus relates the injury done to him by Odysseus (or 'Outis'), the other Cyclopes immediately attribute his *nousos* to Zeus (*Od.* 9.411) (Vidal-Naquet 1996: 42)—what Geoffrey Kirk calls their "concession to culture" (1970: 167). By assuming that Polyphemus' ailment stems from Zeus, the Cyclopes are distanced in the story from Polyphemus' earlier antitheistic attitude; they align themselves closer to the moral authority of Zeus in the *Odyssey*, the avenger of suppliants and *xeinoi* (*Od.* 9.270-271). Such an ethics, in the context of the poem, could hardly be deemed an indicator of savageness or primitiveness on the part of the Cyclopes.²⁹

And even Polyphemus is not always the cold-hearted savage, the sheer antithesis of humanity and civilization which he is regarded to be (Kirk 1970: 166-167). One should not, in this regard, ignore the ogre's tender address to his favourite sheep after the scene of his

²⁹ Ruth Scodel (1999: 89) discusses the incongruity that a savage people like the Cyclopes could have enjoyed the services of a prophet (*Od.* 9.508-510), which is "an advanced skill, an odd one to find among the primitives" (89). For an illustration of the tension between nature/barbarism and culture/civilization in the *Cyclopeia*, cf. Kirk 1970: 169.

blinding (*Od.* 9.447-460) (Bowra 1952: 178, Glenn 1971: 169-171, 180-181, Hernández 2000: 354, Newton 1983: 137-142):³⁰

[Y]et even he [Polyphemus] is a double, at once a monstrosity of Nature and a gentle shepherd; on one hand a personification of Nature in its inhuman, bestial, and predatory aspects; on the other hand Nature as nurturing parent, not now raw Nature but Nature merely rude

(Austin 1983: 20)

In an earlier work, Austin (1975: 156) also observed that Polyphemus has *technē* in at least one art of civilization, since he demonstrates some skill in dairy farming (*Od.* 9.244-249); his deficiency, what characterizes him as ‘backwards’ in the universe of the poem, is his misuse of *technē*, in becoming a dairy farmer when he ought to make use of his island’s natural agriculture (*Od.* 9.109-111).

In Book 10, the hospitality scene in Aeolus’ palace is reminiscent of Odysseus’ stay among the super-civilized Phaeacians in Scheria (Cook 1995: 72): thus Aeolus’ home is analogous to that of Alcinous in being surrounded by a bronze wall (*Od.* 7.81-83, 86, 10.3-4) (Cook 1995: 73); the apparently incestuous relationship between Aeolus’ sons and daughters mirrors King Alcinous and Queen Arete’s own endogamous history (*Od.* 7.54-55, 10.5-7) (Cook 1995: 73, Reinhardt 1996: 88, Vidal-Naquet 1996: 51); and, like the Phaeacians in Book 8, Aeolus’ family are constantly occupied with feasting—consuming bountiful fare and listening to music in the manner of Homeric aristocrats (*Od.* 10.7-12) (Austin 1975: 99-100,

³⁰ The giant’s fixation with his livestock and his rather curious, corresponding vegetarianism has also, however, been interpreted as a marker of savagery, particularly a lack of concern with the gods, for whom animal sacrifice is prescribed (Bakker 2013: 57).

Reinhardt 1996: 88, Vidal-Naquet 1996: 51).³¹ Austin (1975: 133-134) has argued that Odysseus' stay in Aeolus' palace, while not necessarily connoting a primitive aspect, given the tokens of high society which feature in the reception, embodies the natural phenomenon of the wind in "the location and movement of the island, the behaviour of the king, his family organization, and their form of entertainment" (133). The fact that a host can represent at the same time facets of both civilization and the natural world undermines attempts to view the *Apologue* as entailing a linear contrast between the civilized culture hero, Odysseus,³² and his primitive hosts of nature. From the evidence of the poem itself, the critical rubrics are easily breached.

The next encounter of the travellers in Book 10 is with the Laestrygonians, and here one witnesses a manifest example of native inhabitants who offer both tokens of primitivism and civilization. For while the Laestrygonians, like Polyphemus, hunt down men by throwing rocks and then later devour them (*Od.* 9.481-482, 10.121) (Louden 2011a: 160), they are also said to have an agora as well as a king, Antiphates (*Od.* 10.114),³³ indicating some form of basic social cohesion (Lowenstam 1993: 195, Van Wees 1992: 25, 31-32, Vidal-Naquet 1996: 39). Dougherty's (2001: 140-141; cf. Cook 1995: 71) analysis of the episode is to view it as a grim parody of Odysseus' welcome into Scheria, seeing that in both sequences the protagonist(s) meets a young girl (*Od.* 6.139, 10.106), near a place of water (*Od.* 6.137,

³¹ For further correspondences, cf. Cook 1995: 72-73.

³² On the tension between Odysseus as a tamer of nature and as an ecological hero, on the complex relationship between civilizing the primitive and integrating the natural into culture, cf. Austin 1983: 20-22, Nagler 1996: 154-157. Pucci (1998: 116) suggests that Odysseus' behaviour mirrors his location, becoming himself more savage in this primitive world. On the savagery of Odysseus, to be contrasted with his civilizing role, the later parallels between the Ithacan hero and Polyphemus also need to be considered, cf. Bakker 2013: 72-73.

³³ For Louden (2011a: 158-159) the Laestrygonian scene provides a parallel with the Phaeacian through the figure of the hostile father-in-law, in the forms of King Antiphates and King Alcinous, respectively.

10.107), asks for or is given directions to her father's city (*Od.* 6.175-179, 10.109-110), first encounters a queen (*Od.* 7.141, 142-145, 10.112-113), and then a king (*Od.* 7.141, 159ff, 10.114).³⁴ The Laestrygonian scene soon perverts the parallelism with the hyper-civilized Phaeacians by reverting to Cyclopean savagery (140-141).

In the Aeaean episode, Dougherty (97) suggests that Circe's transformation of Odysseus' men into swine (*Od.* 10.237-243) is indicative of the powerful dehumanizing effect which the primitive 'New World' can have on civilized men. To state that the entire Aeaean sequence is governed by "the call of the wild (10.135-574)" (97) on account of one action, the men's transformation into hogs, is a deceptive *pars pro toto* analysis. The fact that Circe domesticates wild wolves and lions (*Od.* 10.212-219) could equally be interpreted as her being a taming, civilizing force (Pucci 1998: 159). And there are other notable markers of civilization in Circe's hosting, "showing herself as well acquainted with social forms as anyone else" (Austin 1975: 153): the witch's handmaids, who see to her household chores (*Od.* 10.348-359), remind the audience of Arete's servants, when we first hear of the queen through her daughter (*Od.* 6.307); and, adding further validity to this analogy, both women are described as being engaged in handicraft, spinning and weaving respectively, when they are first related to us (*Od.* 6.306, 10.222). Whether we are to regard the savage elements in Circe's reception as dominant over the civilized (Austin 1975: 153) or the civilized over the savage is a question for the proclivities of the individual audience members and readers of the poem, seeing that markers for both characterizations can be found in the poem.

In summary, Dougherty, much like Reece's analysis of the *Apologue*, has tended to base her assessment of *xeinoi* situations throughout these four books on the exemplary character of the Polyphemus episode. In Dougherty's defence, her treatment of colonial situations elsewhere in the *Odyssey*, particularly with regard to the Phaeacian reception, is

³⁴ On the parallels, cf. Lowenstam 1993: 195, Redfield 1983: 241, Vidal-Naquet 1996: 50.

more nuanced and she accounts for traces of both the inhospitable primitive and the hospitable civilized in the residents of Scheria (Dougherty 2001: 103-104, 126-127, 151; cf. Clay 1980: 263-264). It seems, however, that such a rich tension exists as well through the *Apologue* and to claim that the inhabitants of these four books are characterized by exemplary primitiveness, with Odysseus acting as a civilizing force, is an oversimplification of a complex relationship, where the tokens of nature and culture combine to varying degrees in both the *xeinoi* (cf. Cook 1995: 56) and the local inhabitants (cf. Austin 1975: 153, Pucci 1998: 118, 130, Vernant 1979: 244, 248).

1.2.4 *Xeinoi Situations in the Apologue Entail Encounters with Feminized Inhabitants or in a Feminized Milieu*

Seth Schein's chapter, 'Female representations and interpreting the *Odyssey*' (1995), is a good starting point for another popular interpretation of *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue*, namely that which characterizes the inhabitants of the various encounters as feminized, or, otherwise, the spaces within which these encounters occur as somehow feminine:

Odysseus represents his experiences with sea dangers as encounters with the feminine and repeatedly tells of escaping these dangers when the threatening females eventually befriend him, after he survives or overcomes them.

(19)

For Schein (1995: 19), this feminization is apparent not only in the inhabitants' physical gender, but also in their characteristic activities in the narrative, such as weaving (Circe) or

singing (Circe, the Sirens), in the form of a ‘womb-like’ cave (Polyphemus),³⁵ and in the danger which some of them present to the travelling Ithacans, that of literally swallowing the men up (Scylla, Charybdis). Further endorsement of this gendered perspective for Schein (1995: 20) is the emphasis which both the secondary narrator, Odysseus, and the primary narrator, ‘Homer’, place on the character of Calypso, who acts as a paradigm to the other inhabitants Odysseus encounters in his wanderings. Calypso’s importance, according to Schein (1995: 19-20), is indicated by her presence in the proem of the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 1.14),³⁶ by her being the first of Odysseus’ ‘hosts’ whom we witness after the *Telemachy*, in Book 5, and by being described by both major narrators, ‘Homer’ and Odysseus, in the poem.³⁷

A more recent structural analysis which identifies how *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue* are characterized by gendered encounters has been provided by Thomas Van Nortwick, in *The unknown Odysseus: alternate worlds in Homer’s Odyssey* (2009). Starting with the Polyphemus episode, Van Nortwick (50-51; cf. Austin 1983: 12) differs from those critics who view the monster purely as a savage or chaotic force of the primitive world; he observes the fastidious, almost pedantic care which the man-eating ogre demonstrates in organizing the objects of his spatial surroundings—kitchen appliances and utensils—and in looking after his flock of sheep (*Od.* 9.244-249) (cf. Austin 1975: 143-144),³⁸ so likening the domestic order he keeps to a form of “housekeeping” (Van Nortwick 2009: 52).

³⁵ For further discussion on the symbolism of caves, cf. Segal 1962: 48-49.

³⁶ For further discussion on the importance of the proem in the *Odyssey*, cf. Cook 1995: 15-32, de Jong 2004a: 5-8, Nagler 1990: 335-356, Pucci 1982: 39-62.

³⁷ For further discussion on the structural and symbolic importance of Calypso to Odysseus’ adventures, cf. Segal 1962: 20-21.

³⁸ Austin (1975: 144) understands this fastidiousness of the giant not as a particularly feminine characteristic, but rather as marking him out, against his primitive behaviour in other respects, as an ordered, systematic being—at least with respect to his *technē* in dairy farming.

Van Nortwick (52) identifies as well a rebirth symbolism³⁹ in the narrative sequence (cf. Austin 1983: 10-11, Dimock 1956: 56-57, Schein 1995: 19): thus, after Polyphemus has returned home, the entrance of the cave is shut off and Odysseus and his men are trapped within this ‘womb-like’ structure (*Od.* 9.240-243) (cf. Schein 1995: 19); under the hero’s instruction the men smooth, sharpen, and harden an olive branch (*Od.* 9.319-328), a phallic object, which is driven, to quote Van Nortwick, “into the round orifice on the monster’s face” (*Od.* 9.382-384) (2009: 52), thus mimicking the sexual act; and, finally, the hero is of course reborn from a Nobody, “Οὐτις” (*Od.* 9.366), to claim his identity as Odysseus (*Od.* 9.504), once he has left the cave and derides Polyphemus from afar (52).⁴⁰

This symbolic narrative, furthermore, is reinforced by the spatial environment of the episode: if the cave is a feminine locale, a womb no less, and Odysseus a reborn hero, it is particularly appropriate that the narrative space is filled with objects which hold milk, with animals which produce milk and with a shepherd whose chief occupation is in milking his flocks (Austin 1983: 10-11). Norman Austin (10) remarks how bizarre it is that Odysseus, in search of the kind of ‘masculine’ treasures which he plundered from the coastal Cicones (women and wine) (*Od.* 9.41, 196-201), covets a dairy product, cheese, as the prize from his encounter with the giant (*Od.* 9.232).

³⁹ For further discussion on rebirth in the *Odyssey*, cf. Bergren 2008: 64-72, Frame 1978: 65-66, Segal 1962: 23, 38.

⁴⁰ Odysseus’ announcement of his name, although perhaps entailing a symbolic rebirth, also enables Polyphemus to curse the hero, to bring down the wrath of his father, Poseidon, on the Ithacans (*Od.* 9.528-535); Odysseus’ reclaiming of his identity is therefore also a reaffirmation of the human pain, *odynē*, which his name bears etymologically (Segal 1962: 34-35). For further studies on Odysseus’ name, cf. Dimock 1956: 52-70, Pucci 1998: 128-129, 136, Sacks 1987: 8-9; in this dissertation, cf. p. 90, fn. 171, fn. 226, fn. 230.

Circe can be paired with Calypso⁴¹ as a goddess who offers the womanly threats of sexual seduction and a thus delay in the *nostos* of the *xeinoi*, and who is further feminized by her enchanting singing and skills at weaving⁴² (Van Nortwick 2009: 53-54). Van Nortwick (54), in addition, notes the significance of wolves and lions, in particular, being the animals which Circe's magic has tamed, since these two creatures are "most often associated through similes in Homeric epic with the raw masculine force of human warriors" (54; cf. Scott 1974: 58-62, 71). The whole *xeinoi* encounter in Aeaia is, according to Van Nortwick (54-55), a sexual power struggle: from Circe's attempt to turn Odysseus into a pig (*Od.* 10.314-320)—a transformation he considers allegorical for the lowly behaviour which masculine sexuality can assume (cf. Nagler 1996: 156)⁴³—to the hero's phallic presentation of his sword (*Od.* 10.321-322) (cf. Pucci 1998: 160), to, finally, the conquering of the female in the bedroom (*Od.* 10.347), after Circe has pledged not to emasculate Odysseus (*Od.* 10.345).

In Book 11, Van Nortwick (2009: 59), following the work of Karen Bassi (1999: 419-420), regards the Underworld as a domestic, feminine space. This is exemplified by the long catalogue of fourteen women (*Od.* 11.225-332), the appearance of Odysseus' own mother, Anticleia (*Od.* 11.152-224), and the treacherous hosting of Clytemnestra (*Od.* 11.405-434) (Bassi 1999: 419-421); on the other hand, Bassi (420-421) argues that those men who do appear in the underworld are deprived of those heroic traits which garnered them their masculine status while alive, which is noticeable, for example, in Agamemnon's pitiful reception as a guest in the home of Aegisthus.

⁴¹ On comparisons between Circe and Calypso, cf. Austin 1975: 152-153, Reinhardt 1996: 90-91, 93-99, 1997: 225-236, Nagler 1996: 141-161.

⁴² (i) On the connection between singing and weaving, cf. Nagler 1996: 149, 152. (ii) On the importance of weaving in the poem, cf. Felson-Rubin 1996: 167-168, Murnaghan 1995: 64, Schein 1996: 26-27.

⁴³ Reinhardt (1996: 92-93) believes pigs, rather than wolves or lions, have been chosen to create an antithesis with the heroic banquet in the form of the pigsty.

Van Nortwick (2009: 60) adds to Bassi's framing of the Underworld as a feminine space by positing the possible transgendered role which Teiresias, in some versions of his mythic persona, adopts. Taken all together, the progression of Odysseus from the 'feminine' home of the dead back to the lands of the living is suggestive of a kind of rebirth again (60-61); in fact Odysseus and his men are later referred to by Circe as "διθθανέες", 'twice-dead' (*Od.* 12.22) (*Lfgre* 1991: 316). Finally, in Book 12, Van Nortwick suggests that the female nymphs, who guard the flocks of Helios, and the cows themselves turn Thrinacia into "a female milieu" (61).

Structurally, then, several of the *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue* can be shown to entail a strongly gendered quality, between the feminized inhabitants—or, otherwise, a feminized milieu—and the masculine *xeinoi*. The importance of such a feminine milieu in the *Apologue* can be further augmented by studying the relationship of Odysseus' secondary narrative to his performance context in Scheria.

Thus in her monograph, *Siren Songs* (1995), Lillian Doherty (65-68) argues that the structure of the *Nekyia* (which is broken into two halves by an *intermezzo*) is arranged according to Odysseus' implicit recognition of gender and his consequent attempts to appease separately both female host, Queen Arete, and male host, King Alcinous (a type of 'stranger's stratagem', again). Thus the first part of the Underworld narrative is dominated by the catalogue of women, whereas the second contains the Iliadic heroes Agamemnon, Achilles, and Ajax (65-68). Accordingly, the first part elicits the praise of the female narratee,⁴⁴ and her offering of gifts to the singer (*Od.* 11.336-341), while the male narratee requests Odysseus to go into further detail of the heroes he met in the second part (*Od.* 11.370-372) (68).

⁴⁴ Rose (1969: 405) understands Arete's praise as resulting from Odysseus' magical skills as a storyteller (*Od.* 11.333-334), rather than an implicit approval of a gender-oriented narrative.

Whether or not such a stranger's stratagem functions throughout Odysseus' speech, there are further parallels in depictions of gender in Scheria and the *Apologue*. For example, the potential for Odysseus and Nausicaa to become betrothed, and for the hero to remain forever in the land of the Phaeacians as Alcinous' son-in-law (*Od.* 7.309-316), is picked up thematically by the seductive receptions in the homes of Calypso and Circe (*Od.* 9.29-33), while the daughter of Antiphates provides a grotesque parody of such a union, where the grooms are eaten. And on the status of Queen Arete, Hélène Whittaker (1999: 146-149) has argued that the liminal position of Scheria, between the fantastic realms in Odysseus' narration and the ordinary Greek world elsewhere in the epic (cf. Segal 1962: 17, 22-23, 27),⁴⁵ is mirrored in the depiction of gender there: thus the power the queen is said to wield in Scheria (*Od.* 7.66-77) corresponds to the interactions we witness in the *Apologue* where powerful feminized inhabitants pose a danger to the hero, while in other respects her subservient role reflects that of women in the Greek world of the *Odyssey*.

Finally, there are some objections to characterizing all the inhabitants and milieu of the *Apologue* as especially feminine. There seems to be an inversion or, otherwise, a fluctuation between feminine and masculine qualities in several of the inhabitants. Thus, while Polyphemus' cave might be symbolically conceived of as a womb, and the narrative sequence as entailing a rebirth, the ogre is in other respects characterized in strong masculine terms (Weinberg 1986: 30). Like many fine male heroes from the *Iliad*, is he given a strong bellicose simile of a mountain lion when Odysseus describes his anthropophagy (*Od.* 9.292) (Scott 1974: 58). Another simile, which is one of the first phrases used to describe him, adds to this masculine strength:

⁴⁵ For other remarks about Scheria as a liminal locale, cf. Fraser 1929: 159, Reinhardt 1996: 122, Vidal-Naquet 1996: 47-53. On distinguishing between the 'real-world' of the *Odyssey* and the fantasy or fairy-tale worlds, cf. Vidal-Naquet 1996: 37-39.

...οὐδὲ ἐφκει

ἀνδρί γε σιτοφάγῳ, ἀλλὰ ρίφῳ ὑλήεντι

ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων, ὃ τε φαίνεται οἷον ἀπ' ἄλλων.

(*Od.* 9.190-192)

He resembled rather some shaggy peak in a mountain-range, standing out clear, away from the rest

(Shewring 1980: 103)⁴⁶

If, like Van Nortwick, one applies the criteria of gendered symbolism throughout, then ‘ῥίφῳ’ (*Od.* 9.191) seems overtly phallic. And thirdly, when Polyphemus re-enters the ‘womb-cave’, his action in sealing the entrance-way is again fostered with a comparison which is indicative of immense masculine strength (*Od.* 9.240-243) (cf. *Il.* 12.445-449) (Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989: 27).

Prior to Polyphemus, Odysseus’ very first encounter in his travels is with the Cicones, a nation divided into two parts: the coastal dwellers, at whose city, Ismarus, Odysseus’ fleet lands (*Od.* 9.39-40), and the ‘mainlanders’ (*Od.* 9.49). While the more ‘effeminate’ coastal Cicones are easily subdued and pillaged by the Ithacans (*Od.* 9.39-42), their inland kin prove a much more formidable, bellicose enemy to the Greek travellers: they kill half a dozen men from each of Odysseus’ ships and force him and his *hetairoi* to flee the land (*Od.* 9.60-61); they are described in war-like terms, marked out for the strength and the size of their army (*Od.* 9.48), and for fighting on chariots (*Od.* 9.49-50). As the first inhabitants Odysseus

⁴⁶ For a quick guide to various translations of the *Odyssey*, cf. Griffin 2004: 38-43.

encounters in his *Apologue*, the Cicones are noteworthy for this contrast between effeminacy or softness and heroic, martial prowess.

In Book 10, while one may read feminine attributes into Aeolus' luxuriant dwelling and the decadent activities his family partakes in (*Od.* 10.1-13), the god's field of interests is limited to masculine endeavours: he questions Odysseus on Troy, the Greek ships, and the homeward journeys of the Greeks (*Od.* 10.14-16). As for the Laestrygonians, there is nothing 'soft' about their assault upon Odysseus' ships, where rocks are hurled down upon the crew (*Od.* 10.121-122); this action, furthermore, is qualified by a simile of fishing (*Od.* 10.124), which in the Homeric corpus is often employed in the contexts of warriors and enemies killing their victims (Scott 1974: 75).

Structurally, then, to classify the inhabitants whom Odysseus confronts in his journeys as being uniformly characterized by a feminine quality is an oversimplification of these episodes; there is certainly a gendered quality to these receptions, but this does not seem to be neatly divided into a rubric of feminine inhabitant, masculine *xeinoi*. Critics who identify *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue* as connoting encounters with the 'dangerous feminine' need to account also for encounters with the 'dangerous masculine' (the inland Cicones, Polyphemus, and the Laestrygonians).

1.2.5 Concluding Remarks

To sum up, I have surveyed four major approaches to understanding the nature of *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue*: (i) Steve Reece views these interactions as being defined primarily by inhospitable inhabitants, who in various ways demonstrate inversions of *xenia*; (ii) Glenn Most understands Odysseus' representations of these inhabitants as part of his strategy as a stranger, in order to exact the proper hospitality from his unwelcoming

Phaeacian hosts; (iii) Carol Dougherty plots an opposition between the primitive inhabitants of the *Apologue*, figures of nature, and the civilized *xeinoi*, figures of culture, the purpose of which lies ultimately in exploring the role of Odysseus as a potential colonizer; and finally, (iv) Thomas Van Nortwick illustrates how several of these encounters during Odysseus' wanderings have a gendered quality, with inhabitants who are strongly feminized, or, otherwise, a feminized environment.

In my second, third, and fourth chapters, I shall present three networks of repetitions in the *Apologue* which will be argued to connote certain distinctive characteristics throughout these *xeinoi* situations. All of these characteristics have been discussed, to varying degrees, by Homerists, but their concrete identification throughout the *Apologue* has not been fully realized. Before arriving at my individual studies, however, the methodological approach which this dissertation employs needs to be introduced and explained in the context of Homeric scholarship.

1.3 *Studying Repetitions and Their Connotations in the Homeric Poems*

Homeric scholarship throughout the nineteenth and much of the first half of the twentieth century was characterized by a division between two pugnacious armies: the Unitarians, whose task was to praise the singular genius of Homer by illustrating the coherent structure and unique, artistic design of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and the Analysts, who endeavoured to show how these two monumental epic poems are the result of a hotchpotch conflation of multiple original materials, composed by several hands, and which has led to several internal

inconsistencies in the current form of the text (Combella 1950: 337-342, Fowler 2004b: 220-221, Turner 1997: 125-138).⁴⁷

Modern scholarship in the Homeric poems has, with some exceptions,⁴⁸ moved on from this kind of debate, and for this we have Milman Parry and Albert Lord to thank (Fowler 2004b: 221, Russo 1968: 276-277). Parry's pioneering studies into the traditional quality of the Homeric compositions, captured most famously in his dissertation, *L'Épithète traditionnelle dans Homère; essai sur un problème de style homérique* ([1928] 1971), and Albert Lord's comparative work in contemporary Serbo-Croatian epic song, including *The singer of tales* ([1960] 1971), have been seminal in reorienting our approach to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* from purely literary approaches (Morris 2001: 60).⁴⁹

On the basis of their findings, we now know that the two Homeric poems, which we possess in a written, literary form, were in fact the products of an oral tradition, of a culture in ancient Greece which transmitted these 'texts'—or, better, 'songs'—by word of mouth from one generation to the next by bardic singers, or *aoidoi* (Foley 1997: 147). We know, moreover, that these songs were composed and performed simultaneously in a live context, to a listening audience by the singer (Hainsworth 1970: 90-92, Lord 1971: 13). And,

⁴⁷ Fowler (2004b) provides a concise summary of the main tenets of these scholarly movements. Turner (1997) tracks the development of the Analyst movement in the professionalization of philology during the late eighteenth century and its consolidation in the nineteenth century, while Unitarianism is shown to be the province of the amateurs and men of letters. Combella (1950) presents a summary of the situation in the first half of the twentieth century, when Unitarianism appeared to have the upper hand (cf. Combella 1955: 17-26).

⁴⁸ Adherents of the Analyst school, for example, can still be found in modern critics who are concerned with illustrating how parts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* have been shaped by textual emendations after the original transference of the oral poems to fixed written forms (Fowler 2004b: 221).

⁴⁹ For a succinct summary of Parry and Lord's research and contribution to Homeric scholarship, cf. Foley 1997: 146-151.

importantly, we know that transmitting and composing these songs in an oral medium, not to mention the performing demands and vagaries of the storytelling environment (Lord 1971: 14),⁵⁰ have resulted in a certain traditional quality—some scholars have referred to this as an “oral poetics” (Edwards 1997: 264, Lord 1968: 46) or as “an aesthetics of traditional style” (Parry 1971: 21)—within these poems. It is a quality which requires a different reception from modern critics, and readers, to that of purely literary texts (Lord 1968: 46); to approach these poems in the same manner in which we would any other contemporary poetry is to ignore the force which the tradition had on the Homeric epics, how it shaped the artefacts which we now possess (Lord 1968: 46).

With respect to this traditional quality, it is today a quite uncontroversial fact of Homeric scholarship that the ‘texts’⁵¹ of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are, compared to modern literary texts, greatly characterized by the phenomenon of repetition (Griffin 2004: 8, Thornton 1984: 73). In this regard, one should supply the observations of three prominent scholars in the field from the past fifty years:

Repetition is now understood to be one of the fundamental, intrinsic features of Homeric poetry, not haphazard or aimless, but organized and following certain definable, comprehensible laws.

(Fenik 1974: 135)

⁵⁰ It is important when analysing the oral tradition that we examine both the compositional side, from the perspective of the bards, and the performative, from that of the audience (Scodel 2009: 4). “When we realize that the performance is a moment of creation for the singer, we cannot but be amazed at the circumstances under which he creates. Since these circumstances influence oral form we must consider them” (Lord 1971: 14).

⁵¹ I employ the term ‘text[s]’ here and throughout so as to indicate the physical state in which the original oral performances have been handed down to us; there is no ‘literary’ biased intended in such a designation.

The most common feature in the Homeric poems is repetition. Not only are essential ideas often expressed by identical words or phrases, but similar scenes are usually depicted with the same details and patterns. Although the singers' penchant for ornamentation and the very flexibility of epic diction reduce to some degree this tendency to repeat, few would deny the great frequency of its occurrence.

(Lowenstam 1993: 1)

Interpretation should proceed from the realization that Homeric poetry is characterized on every level by an aesthetic of repetition, because it is constructed of a large but finite number of repeated units.

(Kelly 2007: 4)

Repetition has been observed by scholars through several different structures in the Homeric poems (Tsagalis 2008: 136): for example, (i) formulaic diction, (ii) the typical scene, (iii) the story pattern, (iv) character doublets, and (v) similes.

(i) The Homeric formula is, simply put, “an expression regularly used, under the same metrical conditions, to express an essential idea” (Parry 1971: 13). It has been most commonly cited by scholars through a repeated combination of a particular noun and its epithet in a fixed metrical, but it is also apparent in other kinds of duplicated phrasal combination in the metre, and even in the repetition of several whole lines of verse verbatim (Parry 1971: 8-16).⁵²

(ii) The typical scene,⁵³ sometimes also dubbed a ‘theme’ in the poems (Lord 1971: 68),⁵⁴ can be said to occur when actions in the narrative—such as those of arming (Armstrong

⁵² For a survey and summary of scholarship on formulae, cf. Edwards 1986: 171-174.

⁵³ For the seminal study of typical scenes, cf. Arend 1933.

1958), battle (Fenik 1968), or hospitality (Reece 1993)—tend to be characterized by a limited set of repeated constituent elements, which will, moreover, quite often be related in a fixed order within the scene, thus forming a repeated sequence or pattern in the scene (Edwards 1992: 287, 290; cf. Belmont 1962: 114-116, Lord 1971: 68-98, Minchin 2001: 32-72).⁵⁵

(iii) The story pattern—also at times referred to, somewhat confusingly, as a ‘theme’ or, otherwise, a ‘narrative pattern’ (Edwards 1975: 51-52, 1992: 286)—is a generic plot pattern which an entire tale adopts, such as a ‘return narrative’ in the *Odyssey* (cf. de Jong 2004a: 4, Griffin 1980: 46), and which is repeated across several songs in the repertoire of a tradition,⁵⁶ or even across multiple traditions (Foley 1999: 15).

(iv) Character doublets have received the most detailed treatment in Bernard Fenik’s *Studies in the Odyssey* (1974: 172-207).⁵⁷ Essentially, two characters are imbued with the features or actions of a single character, rather than being represented as two unique individuals (Fenik 1974: 172, Nickel 2002: 221-222). And, finally, there are (v) groups of similes, each comprising stock elements in their content, such that one can talk of ‘lion similes’, ‘fish similes’, ‘boar similes’, and so forth (Scott 1974: 56-82).⁵⁸

⁵⁴ This term is perhaps too broad to be synonymous with ‘the type scene’, cf. Edwards 1992: 285-287.

⁵⁵ For a complete summary of scholarship on type scenes, cf. Edwards 1992: 290-298.

⁵⁶ This is not easily proven in the tradition behind the Homeric poems, because of the paucity of surviving oral performances; however, the potency of the pattern of the Return can be observed through the internal evidence of the *Odyssey*, for example, in the parallels provided by Agamemnon and Menelaus (Bonifazi 2009: 486-488, Foley 1999: 117, 137-139). On the general relevance of Agamemnon’s story in the *Odyssey* to Odysseus, cf. D’Arms & Hulley 1946, Olson 1990.

⁵⁷ For further studies on character doublets in the Homeric poems, cf. Fenik 1968: 148-154, Nickel 2002: 221-231, Scully 1987: 401-417.

⁵⁸ Similes can be interpreted from both a traditional and an individual or specific basis, in that, while they employ repetition in subject matter (their traditional element), the form of each isolated simile in the Homeric corpus is almost always unique (Scott 1974: 83).

It should be noted here that I do not consider these five examples an exhaustive list of the possible forms which repetition can take in the Homeric poems; they have merely been supplied to give a sense of the pervasiveness of the phenomenon. Following the lead of Adrian Kelly, I shall refer to these structures of repetition in the Homeric poems as either “elements” (2007: 6) or “units” (15), in which class one may include formulas, type scenes, repeated similes, and others. The structuralist question of there being a coherent taxonomy of specific kinds or units of repetition, a limited syntax of repetition, in the Homeric poems will not be broached by this dissertation (14).

Of far greater relevance to this dissertation is the hermeneutic question of how these repetitions affect our determination of meaning in the Homeric poems; and, in this matter, the critical barometer has flickered from side to side since Parry first whet our interest in the force of Homeric repetition (cf. Foley 1991: xii, Lowenstam 1993: 1-3).⁵⁹ One possible model for arriving at meaning in the Greek epics tends to align repetition with redundancy in meaning and specificity with the transference of meaning. And this does appear on the surface to make sense to our modern, literate minds, which have been trained to pay homage to the altar of individuality and singular genius; repetition, conversely, reeks of artistic mediocrity, of a sameness which undermines the special meaning which we believe a literary work must carry (Foley 1991: 8, Finley 1954: 21, Thornton 1984: 73).⁶⁰

⁵⁹ “[S]ix decades of often sharp disagreement vividly testify that the impasse is real and demands attention; to put it plainly, as things now stand we cannot have both a fully analysed and an aesthetically pleasing oral poem” (Foley 1991: xii).

⁶⁰ “Sophisticated readers of printed books have often misunderstood the device of repetition as a mark of limited imagination and of the primitive state of the art of poetry. Thus French critics of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries placed Virgil above Homer precisely because the former did not repeat himself but always found a new phrasing and new combinations.” (Finley 1954: 21). On orality as entailing a primitive mentality, divorced from the intellectual expression found in literary texts, cf. Finnegan 1988: 64-69.

Perhaps it is such modern common sense which led Geoffrey Stephen Kirk to condemn the repetitive quality of the *Odyssey* in his *The songs of Homer* (1962):

The main fault of the *Odyssey* is that at many points the narrative content is drawn out to excessive length. At these points one feels that the monumental singer is consciously and almost painfully elaborating his material so as to make a great poem which will match the scale of the *Iliad*... the singer of the *Odyssey*... expanded his scenes either by free composition of an excessively leisurely kind or by sheer repetition

(357; cf. Griffin 1980: 47)

Kirk (1962: 357-362) goes on to give several examples in the *Odyssey* of such uncouth repetition, which he tracks in both formulaic language and in type scenes. The *Apologue* itself provides for Kirk (362) two broad structures of inappropriate repetition: firstly, in Book 12, Circe instructs Odysseus how to bypass the Sirens without loss to the crew (lines 39-54), Odysseus later instructs his crew in Circe's advice (lines 158-165), and the Ithacans do indeed manage to bypass the melodious voices of these women in the prescribed manner (lines 165-200); and, secondly, in Book 10, Circe instructs Odysseus in the ritual he must perform in Hades (lines 504-540), the descriptions of which follows in Book 11 when Odysseus and his men disembark at the land of the dead (lines 1-50).

The notion that repetition breeds redundancy in meaning, leading to excessive, superfluous material—and which a work of 'quality' ought to avoid—stems from a critical perspective of oral poetry which is fixed rather more on the generative side of things than the affective, on the mechanics of the *aoidoi*'s composition rather than the effect of their material on their audience or listeners (Foley 1999: 15). The singers, it is argued, made use of

repetition primarily as a means to aid in aspects of composition or performance, while the semantic value of these repeated units in the narrative context is of lesser or no importance to their employment.

A classic example of this is the so-called ‘economy’ of Homeric style, which Milman Parry introduced in his extensive study of noun-epithet phrases (Sacks 1987: 2):⁶¹

Generally speaking, whenever Homer has to express the same idea under the same metrical conditions, he has recourse to same words or the same groups of words

(Parry 1971: 22).

From Parry’s declaration, it follows that the determination of a ‘word unit’ or ‘word group’ was dictated by the metrical situation far more than any individual semantic nuances, which someone from a literate culture might endeavour to locate in this unit (Friedrich 2007: 10-12, Sacks 1987: 2).⁶² Thus when Homer sings, “πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς” (e.g. *Od.* 5.171, 354, 486, etc.), the essential idea is ‘Odysseus’; the adjectives ‘much-enduring’ and ‘god-like’ are quite redundant in sense (Parry 1971: 14). They are filler units whose sense is not important to the oral singer so much as their usefulness in helping him to complete an individual verse in the appropriate manner (Friedrich 2007: 13-14, Sacks 1987: 2). Such an interpretation, moreover, is endorsed by those contexts where the epithets (or, indeed, any other repeated units) are considered to be incoherent in their context (Kelly 2007: 3).

Parry’s economic noun-epithets can be extended to other examples of repeated language, such as the larger ‘word groups’ which can span from a single line to half a dozen

⁶¹ For a recent criticism on the applicability of such ‘economy’ in Homeric style, cf. Friedrich 2007.

⁶² “[T]he use of the fixed epithet... is entirely dependent on its convenience in versification” (Parry 1971: 22).

verses in the poem. Hence, the phrase “ἤμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως” (e.g. *Od.* 2.1, 3.404, 491, etc.) only denotes “when day broke” (Parry 1971: 13) to the listening audience; the sense of ‘rosy-fingers’ is redundant (13-14). The function of such ready verses is of practical use to the singer of these tales, in providing periods of reprieve from the demands of his storytelling; moreover, they possess a structural function in acting as bridges between sections of the story, ‘subject fillers’ between longer passages in the way that noun-epithets are metrical fillers. Thus the four verse passage “ὣς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἤμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα / ἤμεθα δαινόμενοι κρέα τ' ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἠδύ· / ἤμος δ' ἠέλιος κατέδν καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἤλθε, / δὴ τότε κοιμήθημεν ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης” (*Od.* 9.556-559, 10.183-186; with an abridged variation at *Od.* 10.476-479, 12.29-31) is a rather lengthy way of saying ‘They ate and drank all day and slept at night’. It fills out performance time and allows the *aidos* to prepare the next subject for the action of the ensuing day in his story.

Redundancy has not only been found by critics in verbal phrases or formulae, but also in type scenes:

Nevertheless, I hold that, just as much of the time the common formulae are used automatically, even if occasionally imperfect adjustment results in a metrical anomaly, so too the regularity of the common type scenes exert a compelling force on the poet which can sometimes be seen to result in awkward transitions.

(Edwards 1975: 71-72)

And with regard to other structural units of repetition, there have been doubts raised as to the semantic significance of similes with respect to their context. An older model has been for critics to view these comparative constructions as *hedysmata*, as sweeteners for the audience

to delight in,⁶³ which are removed from the immediacy of the narrative at hand, an aesthetic interlude or ecphrasis (Basset 1921: 132-147, Notopoulos 1957: 326), such that they are of little importance to the meaning of the story (Buxton 2004: 149).

In summary, there are strong compositional, and perhaps even performance-based, reasons which could motivate the bard's tendency to make use of repetitions. One should stop short, however, of declaring that certain structures in the poems are 'meaningless' or 'redundant' purely because the oral poet might have extra-narrative, 'economic' reasons for repeating these same structures (Austin 1975: 19-20, Lowenstam 1993: 2)—reasons, moreover, which this dissertation will not seek to refute.

In the last twenty to twenty five years, scholars have endeavoured to reconceptualise 'what is meant by meaning' in the Homeric poems, and, to this end, work in general reception studies has been most germane in steering us in the right direction (Foley 1991: 39-45).⁶⁴ Meaning, as the German literary critic Wolfgang Iser has suggested in *The Implied Reader* (1974), lies somewhere between the text,⁶⁵ as the compositional product of the author, and the reader (274-275); meaning lies in the complex interaction of the reader and the text, what Iser names a "virtual dimension" (279).

In this hermeneutical framework, both text and reader impinge upon one another in an equal manner in order for meaning to be realized (274-275). A text which is not read is an inert, inactivated, meaningless object; in order to garner meaning, it must invoke a reader and of course be read (274; cf. Foley 1991: 40).⁶⁶ But as soon as it is read, problems are created.

⁶³ Such arguments might fall in line with an interpretation of the similes as linguistically late (cf. Shipp 1972: 208-212). Scott (1974: 60, note 2), however, contends that while the formal phrasing of a simile might be recent, its subject matter might be traditional.

⁶⁴ For the movement away from generative to reception-based studies, cf. Clay 2011: 14-15.

⁶⁵ Iser's terminology is based upon a literary, not an oral, perspective (Foley 1991: 39).

⁶⁶ "The work is more than the text, for the text only takes on life when it is realized." (Iser 1974: 274)

The reader has to use his subjective, creative imagination to fill in the gaps (Iser 1974: 275, 280), which naturally ensue from the text's arousal of the reader's various expectations and its subsequent failure to resolve these expectations completely (278-280; cf. Foley 1991: 41).⁶⁷ At the same time, as much as this oblique quality of a text challenges the reader to set loose his imagination, it also places certain restrictions on him by providing him with keys, textual signals which he must decode (Iser 1974: 274-275, 282-284; cf. Foley 1991: 40, 42).⁶⁸

The reading process thus becomes an effort toward "consistency building," toward a realization of potentials that makes good aesthetic sense of the panoply of signals and gaps presented to the reader's imagination by the literary text.

(Foley 1991: 42)

Following the reception model of Wolfgang Iser, if we wish to garner meaning in traditional or oral poetics, our task is not only to be sensitive to the songs, the 'text', as it now confronts us, but to how an audience might have interpreted these songs (42-43).

At this point, it might be wondered why it is at all necessary to locate the original audience's means of arriving at meaning. Why not simply privilege the modern reader's analysis (cf. Gadamer 2011: 181)? Why not let the reader roam freely over the Homeric text? Such a 'post-modern' approach has indeed grown in popularity in classical scholarship over the past thirty years (cf. Peradotto 1997: 382). While, ultimately, nothing can stop a modern reader bent on unlimited freedom in garnering his or her own meaning, there are strong

⁶⁷ Foley defines these gaps as "those uncharted areas in the textual map where the reader is invited and indeed required to contribute an imaginative solution" (1991: 42).

⁶⁸ "Though this [the individual disposition of the reader] in turn is acted upon by the different patterns of the text" (Iser 1974: 274-275).

arguments to be made against such contemporary subjectivity, both on account of (i) how culture (in this case, traditional, oral-based societies) influences hermeneutics, and (ii) how the song-text itself has been shaped by its original reception.

(i) We cannot presume as readers that a modern reading applied to the textual artefacts of the oral poems is an accurate means of exacting meaning from the poems, since we cannot assert that we are as skilfully trained as oral listeners to decipher all the hidden codes in the textualized song. As Iser postulates, meaning lies between the text and the reader; the reader is truly a powerful figure in the production of meaning, but he still needs to recognize the patterns of the text at hand in order to arrive at the appropriate gamut of interpretations, he needs to respond, appropriately, to the clues of the text (Foley 1991: 41).⁶⁹ But what if these acts of recognition and response are vastly different between traditional/oral and modern/literate readers? What if we are trained to find meaning differently? (ii) And, if that is the case, would an audience, who receives meaning in a different way, not cause a bard, embedded in such a culture, to produce a song-text which adhered to these principles of meaning? In other words, the relationship between composition and reception is not a simple linear progression of egg to chicken, but a complicated, intertwining of cause and effect, composition and audience response.

This dissertation proceeds in the belief that meaning production was indeed quite distinct in an oral culture, such as that which produced the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, compared to modern, literary cultures, and that some reflection on original audience reception is therefore integral to our understanding of the textual artefact as we now possess it. And to this extent I am primarily indebted to the work of John Miles Foley, whose conceptualization of ‘traditional referentiality’, most significantly in *Immanent art* (1991) and *Homer’s*

⁶⁹ “The reader cannot afford to opt for solutions that controvert the explicit facts and strategies of the text” (Foley 1991: 41).

traditional art (1999), has been one of the more important developments in Homeric studies in the last two decades.

The key difference [from the interpretation of literary texts] lies in the nature of the tradition itself: structural elements are not simply compositionally useful, nor are they doomed to a “limited” area of designation; rather they command fields of reference much larger than the single line, passage, or even text in which they occur. Traditional elements reach out of the immediate instance in which they appear to the fecund totality of the entire tradition, defined synchronically and diachronically, and they bear meanings as wide and deep as the tradition they encode.

(Foley 1991: 7)

The ancient audience, attending a single performance of the Homeric songs, would not have simply ignored these traditional elements or units in the song as compositional fillers and looked for more creative, ‘unique’ elements in the work; far from it, these traditional elements were what connected that particular performance of song to all other performances and songs in the tradition (Nagy 1996: 82). On account of the audience’s great familiarity with the multiple contexts in which these traditional units were typically employed, throughout the repertoire of the tradition, there arose a kind of meaning, quite different from what we, in a literate culture, are accustomed to. It was a kind of meaning which was reliant far more on the contextual associations which arise out of the totality of the employments of the traditional units than the direct meaning of these units.

In the Homeric songs, there is, to follow the insights of Adrian Kelly (2007: 4, 6), to be witnessed a constant tension between the denotations of a ‘unit’ or ‘element’, that is, the direct meaning or sense of a word, phrase, action, scene (etc.), and the connotations of that

unit, that is, the associated meaning(s) which the unit garners on account of its repetition in multiple contexts. Repetition, in as much as it opens out identical units to different contexts, has the potential to expand the semantic associations of these units; and from this perspective, the pervasiveness of repetition in the Homeric texts is not semantically limiting, but, as Foley (1991: 7) describes it, “explosively connotative”.

In approaches to oral traditional poetry which prioritize the mechanics of bardic composition, repeated units are considered superfluous or redundant on account of the assumption that we should limit ourselves to a semantic perspective which is focused entirely on the denotative quality of a unit; when the units fail to justify their simple sense, they are deemed to have failed the task of meaning, and to be purely mechanical in employment. But if one takes into consideration the possibility that a unit might not have a single semantic meaning (its denotation), but can carry, through repetition in multiple contexts, a wide array of various meanings (connotations), then one can entertain the possibility that the repetition of an apparently ‘redundant’ unit, although being of minor denotative value, can still broaden the connotative understanding of a given unit when all its manifestations are assembled and analysed *in toto* (Scodel 2009: 12-13).⁷⁰

Denotations are, nevertheless, still important since they are the markers, the sign posts from which one forms the connotations; one cannot form these broader meanings without having first been led to their identification through their denotative sense. Following the lead of Adrian Kelly (2007: 14), my recognition of units of repetition will not be based upon compositional terms such as formulae, type scenes, similes and so forth, but rather through

⁷⁰ “Many formulae would surely be familiar to everyone, and many members of the audience would understand their significance beyond their denotative meaning. Listeners would be comfortable with those epithets so fossilized that their denotative meaning was lost” (Scodel 2009: 12-13).

repetition in sense—denotative sense—which the audience identifies before conceiving the extended sense from the contextual associations.

Lastly, there are several separate considerations which might complicate the claims of a traditional referentiality in the Homeric poems. (i) What of the vagaries of individual audience members? Was there such an ideal audience, or members of the audience, who perceived the totality of all cross-references? (Kelly 2007: 12-13) (ii) How can we know whether a particular reference is traditional or not? And, importantly, would it matter to the audience? (iii) Traditional referentiality was theorized for oral songs; does it account for the status of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as what Foley (1991: xii) calls “oral-derived texts”? Can meaning be found in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* outside of this system of connoted meaning?

(i) It would be naïve to claim that all the members of a bard’s audience would find equal connotative meaning in the singer’s tale. The Greek audience would have been composed of a wide range of individuals, of differing experience in the oral tradition on account of age, of different class and learning, and of differing natural abilities. It serves no purpose to transform every historical listener into a sublime receiver of traditional referentiality. In elucidating traditional referentiality, we are not declaring that all listeners were masterful practitioners, but rather that those, who embedded themselves in the tradition—just as we attempt to—would have had the potential to unlock as great a many references as their own natural proclivities and social circumstances allowed. It is such a potential, ideal listener whom we, as modern readers, try to assume, thereby unlocking all the hidden connotative resonances to be found from the repetitive clues.

It is possible that, in tackling the texts, we arrive at meanings which were, in fact, never garnered by the ancient audience, that we are reading too great a connotative depth into the song-text. This is the price we pay for our own cultural and historical distance from the

original artefacts. But, since no audience response has been left from the time when the Homeric epics were composed, one can never objectively gauge the accuracy of our deductions. In the absence of such data, the strength of the critic's argument must lean on the quantitative extent of his analysis, how prevalent the repetitions he demonstrates are, as an indicator of the likelihood that such connections were made.

(ii) Without the evidence of a great many other songs or even other versions of the same song in the tradition of Ancient Greek oral poetry, it becomes difficult to judge whether certain references are wholly traditional or, otherwise, specific. By specific referentiality, I refer to the possibility that some repetitions might have been particular to (a) all the performances of a certain song, such as the *Odyssey* (a hybrid of the traditional and the specific) (Tsagalis 2012: 156),⁷¹ (b) the range of performances of a particular bardic singer, part of his individual repertoire, or (c) a particular performance of a particular song. I see no necessity to separate the possibility of such specific referentiality from the traditional kind, since an audience who had been schooled in the hermeneutics of traditional referentiality would have been able to extend their skill in garnering connotative meaning to all forms of repetition in a particular performance of a song, so long as they, in the case of (a), had past

⁷¹ "At the same time, we would expect the oral tradition represented by our *Iliad* to have emphasized, highlighted, downplayed, and (re)shaped some of the typical features of any hero's experiential inventory, in order to make him abide by its particular presentation of the story-world. Odysseus, for example, has a generic epic persona, with certain fixed characteristics that can be seen in the entire epic tradition [cf. Scodel 1999: 83-84]. On the other hand, each song tradition, say the Iliadic, the Odyssean, or the Thesprotian-Telegonian, treats him in a way that suits its plotline and narrative aims" (Tsagalis 2012: 156). One such traditional resonance in the performance of the *Odyssey* might have been the importance of the marriage bed of Odysseus and Penelope, an object clearly relevant to the appreciation of the poem, but which is entirely unique in its description in the Greek tradition (Zeitlin 1995: 118-119); Tsagalis (2012: 156) argues that the positive presentation of Odysseus as a husband was unique to the Odyssean song tradition.

experience with other versions or performances of this song, or, in the case of (b), were regular followers of the work of a certain bard; in the case of (c), admittedly, this would only be possible in a listener of the greatest skill, who could build a system of relative meaning as the song progressed. In short, I follow in this dissertation a certain hybrid approach towards traditional referentiality, which allows an audience, steeped in this tradition, to find meaning both in the units which pervade the tradition, and in units which might be somewhat more specific, but the significance of which is enabled by the audience's essential familiarity with the cognitive process embedded in traditional referentiality.

(iii) Finally, it has to be conceded that the Homeric songs are not pure oral works or poems; they lie somewhere between orality and literacy, 'oral-derived texts' or 'post-oral texts' (Friedrich 2007: 142). It is not in the interests of this dissertation to enter into the debate as to where exactly the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* lie in the gamut of orality—literacy, to question how they were transferred from oral songs to written texts: whether by dictation (Janko 1998: 7-13, Lord 1953: 34-54) or whether through a semi-literate bard (Friedrich 2007: 141-142).⁷² While a substantial part of the meaning of the poems may be elucidated through an understanding of traditional referentiality, since they were clearly oral in genesis and in composition, it will be conceded that more modern literary approaches to meaning (involving the discussion of specific, non-repetitive material) may cast light on their quality in as much as the texts were altered by a literate mind-set at some point (cf. Friedrich 2007: 143), although this topic will not be broached by this dissertation, which is primarily concerned with repetitions, and how meaning is conveyed through them.

⁷² On the tendency for scholars to theorize pure forms of orality and literacy, rather than observing and analysing the more common advent of mixed oral and written forms, cf. Bakker 1999: 34-37, Finnegan 1988: 140-146.

In summary, this dissertation adopts a perspective of repetition which views it as creating typicality in the *Apologue*, a narrative which is characterized by reoccurring units, and, at the same time, as essential in opening out associated avenues of meanings through the implementation of these units in multiple contexts. In each of the three ensuing chapters I therefore analyse a particular unit of repetition, examining how this unit is pervasive across the *xeinoi* encounters in the *Apologue*, and, having outlined the typicality of each unit of repetition, I proceed to discussing its connotative meaning, its semantic value which is implied by examining the contexts of its employment.

For practical reasons of space, my analysis has been limited to a study of repetitions and their meaning in the *Apologue*. Following the precedent of Fenik (1968: 5) and Kelly (2007: 10), both of whom limit their analyses of repetitions to confined sections of the Homeric corpus, I consider the scope of my material broad enough to warrant this restriction— but for proof of this, the reader must wait until the conclusion of my analyses and judge accordingly (cf. Fenik: 5, Kelly: 14). In mitigation of this necessary limitation in textual coverage, at the start of each of the ensuing chapters I situate my analysis in the context of broader thematic discussions which cover both Homeric poems, examining, respectively, the importance of (i) space, (ii) eating, and (iii) trickery to the poems. Furthermore, in my concluding chapter, I discuss the possible extensions and relevance of my analysis of the *Apologue* to the rest of the *Odyssey*.

Chapter 2: Mountains and Isolation

2.1 Overview

This chapter investigates the repetition of mountains in *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue* and suggests that these repetitions, when analysed with respect to their contexts, come to connote a character of isolation in these interactions. This isolation is identified on three different levels: (i) the topographic isolation or remoteness of homes, as the physical sites of *xeinoi* encounters; (ii) the social isolation which characters demonstrate in their interactions; and (iii) the temporal isolation, the dislocation from the present, which is characteristic of certain episodes in these four books.

Occasionally, critics have singled out the isolated quality of the interactions in the *Apologue*—or, more generally, the entire world of Odysseus’ wanderings. Thus Steven Lowenstam, in discussing Odysseus’ reception with Calypso, summarizes the pervasiveness of isolation for the societies encountered during Odysseus’ wanderings:

Like all the other peoples visited, Kalypso is isolated; and in particular, like Cyclops, Circe, the Sirens, and Skylla, Kalypso does not live in a society with an agora.

(1993: 197)

In terms of temporal isolation, Charles Segal, in his article, ‘Divine justice in the *Odyssey*: Poseidon, Cyclops, and Helios’ (1992), distances the world of Odysseus’ wanderings on the basis of its “primitive” (490) ethics:

We are especially concerned with two devices by which Homer achieves his moral effect: juxtaposing gods of different levels of moral sensitivity (like Zeus and Poseidon) and bracketing less moral, more “primitive” divine behaviour in a well-demarcated section of the poem, the fabulous realm between Troy and Ithaca in Books 5-13.

(490)

And, lastly, Erwin Cook recognizes both a topographic and a temporal isolation in the wanderings of Odysseus:

The absence of the Olympians from the enchanted realm is explained by its physical remoteness from civilization... In such a world one might find Cyclopes, Laistrygones, and forbidden herds of cattle. Scylla and Charybdis illustrate the monsters thought to inhabit the world beyond the Greek cultural horizon—be that horizon geographic or temporal...

(1995: 54, 55)

Despite these observations, there is yet to be a decisive study which explores this characteristic of isolation on the multiple levels I have suggested, and across several episodes of the *Apologue*; nor, moreover, has the particular role of mountains in elucidating this quality been fully realized. This chapter is broken up into the following four sections: ‘*Space in the Homeric poems*’ (2.2); ‘*The Typicality of Mountains in the Apologue*’ (2.3); ‘*A Connotative Interpretation of Mountains in the Apologue*’ (2.4); and ‘*Conclusions*’ (2.5).

In the first part, I endeavour to place my analysis of mountains, as a type of topographical space, within the framework of contemporary scholarship on space in the

Homeric poems (2.2). In the subsequent section I provide an index of the repetitions of mountains in the *Apologue*, as an indicator of typicality in these four books (2.3). The bulk of my analysis is pursued in the ensuing section where I illustrate how mountains carry contextual or connotative associations of isolation within *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue* (2.4), the results of which are briefly summed up in the final section (2.5).

2.2 Space in the Homeric Poems

In this section, I firstly provide a brief review of important scholarship on space in the Homeric poems (2.2.1) before examining a number of specific spatial units in the *Apologue* which have attracted commentary from scholars as to their connotative or symbolic value (2.2.2); this leads aptly onto my own discussion of mountains as a particular spatial unit.

2.2.1 Scholarship on Space in the Homeric Poems

My selection of mountains as a significant unit of repetition in the *Apologue* stems both from my own close readings of the ‘text’ and from contemporary critical studies of ‘space’ in the Homeric poems, which try to find greater significance in the physical environment described in the epics. The word ‘space’ has a broad range of meanings in English, depending on the context of its employment, whether in astronomy, literary studies, phenomenology, physics, or purely colloquial usages (Tsagalis 2012: 3). I follow the designation of Classicist and narratologist Irene de Jong (2012b: 1), and understand by ‘space’ the physical world which a story represents, including both the location or setting, as well as the material objects within this locality.

Space has experienced a late blossoming in literary scholarship.⁷³ Fictional narratives have traditionally been examined through the analysis of the narratological features of narrator and time (e.g. Genette 1980: 228-244), while in contrast there has been, until quite recently, a comparative neglect of theory and critical analysis focusing on the aspect of space in literature (Bal 2009: 134, de Jong 2012b: 1, Zoran 1984: 310).⁷⁴ The bias has existed for well over a century and can be tracked to the comments of the influential nineteenth century German critic Gotthold Lessing, who considered literature a ‘temporal art’,⁷⁵ while painting and sculpture were, among others, to be regarded as ‘spatial arts’ (Clay 2011: 29-30, de Jong 2012b: 1; Tsagalis 2012: 1, Zoran 1984: 30). This simplified belief seems to have become ingrained in our popular approach towards literature, such that we tend to regard space as a kind of inert background setting to a story, like the painted backdrop to a theatrical stage, in front of which the ‘real narrative’ unfolds; in this way of thinking, space has no meaningful effect other than to create the immediate physical context in which the story may unfold, and is secondary to story aspects such as plot and character in the production of meaning (Bal 2009: 139, Byrne 1994: 2, de Jong 2012b: 1-2, 13).

Literary critics have slowly begun to appreciate the relevance of space to our understanding of a story, and how it is indeed an integral part of narrative art itself:

It was not until the late twentieth century that this disparity began to disappear, as scholars realized that space is a far more complicated concept, and that both

⁷³ For general discussions of what is meant by ‘space’ in literature, cf. Bal 2009: 133-145, Zoran 1984: 309-335.

⁷⁴ Thus Genette claims firmly that “the temporal determinations of the narrating instance are manifestly more important than its spatial determinations” (Genette 1980: 215). Linked to this theoretical movement is the belief that literary works have only recently begun to exploit the spatial dimension fully (de Jong 2012b: 17).

⁷⁵ “Literature is basically an art of time.” (Zoran 1984: 310).

background setting and more profound aspects of narrative space are of pivotal importance for understanding literature as a whole.

(de Jong 2012b: 1)

As late as discussions on space entered into discourses of literary theory in general, they have only begun to be acknowledged in Classics in the last five to ten years of critical study (Tsagalis 2012: 2). Of premium importance to analyses of the Homeric poems have been Jenny Strauss Clay's *Homer's Trojan theatre* (2011), Irene de Jong's chapters in the anthology, *Space in Ancient Greek literature* (2012a/b), and Christos Tsagalis' *Space in the Iliad* (2012).

Clay's (2011: ix, 12) study, which is limited to the so-called 'Battle Books' of the *Iliad*, identifies the significance of the visual domain, the sense of sight, for the listeners of the Homeric poem—that they were expected to pick up on and respond to visual-spatial signs. Evidence for such a visually-trained audience can be found in the Homeric texts themselves. (i) The frequent internal spectators in the *Iliad*, whether divine or human agents, who are shown to watch the action and events of the poem from a distance (3-11), “model the perspectives and reactions of the external audience” (3).⁷⁶ (ii) The listeners are invited to become viewers, and relegate auditory stimuli behind visual, in the proems of both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (and in the *Iliad*'s catalogue of ships), through the *aoidos*' professed relationship to the Muses, who provide a superior visual knowledge to the bards' employment of pure hearsay, and, under whose guidance, the stories are related to the listeners (14-17). (iii) And,

⁷⁶ “In sum, whether it is the passions of the sports fans in their grand-stands, the divine audience, both partisan and impartial at different proximities to the action, or the human actors in the Trojan drama from their various viewing perspectives, all constitute models that incite us to transform ourselves from listeners—or readers—to spectators and to transport ourselves to Homer's Trojan theater.” (Clay 2011: 12).

finally, there are several “enunciative strategies” (17) on display in the text, which the bard uses in order to convey to his audience strongly visual and vivid material, for example, direct speech (17) and similes (21). Apart from this internal evidence for a visually-oriented bard and audience, Clay (26-29, 110-115) also cites cognitive studies which have explored how traditional storytellers in other ‘living’ oral cultures make use of visual-based memory in constructing their tales.

Clay’s analysis of Books 12 to 17 of the *Iliad* goes on to illustrate how an ancient audience would perceive the story on visual terms, endeavouring to map out—at times quite literally (47, 50)—the theatre of war, both through significant landmarks in the landscape (102-105) and, most important to her analysis, through following the “deictic markers” (96) which are used by the narrator and characters to orient the audience in the spatial environment (96).

Clay’s study is thus concerned with justifying a spatial approach to the Homeric poem, and then providing a structural analysis of how a part of the *Iliadic* narrative attains a strong visual quality. Irene de Jong’s ‘Introduction’ (2012b), in the anthology *Space in Ancient Greek literature*, already assumes the importance of the visual domain to the study of all literature (14), and she assesses what functions space may have on a given narrative, of which she provides the following five roles: thematic, mirroring, symbolic, characterizing, and psychologizing (14-16). Of particular interest to the approach of this dissertation is her description of the symbolic function of space, which seems a recognition that the denotations of spatial units in a narrative might be expanded by certain connotations:

A third function of space is the symbolic one, when it becomes semantically charged and acquires an additional significance on top of its purely scene-setting function.⁷⁷ Notions, often oppositionally arranged, such as inside versus outside, city versus country, high versus low, become negatively or positively loaded, or are associated with cultural or ideological values. In the same way certain spatial features (rivers, hearths, stairs, roads, etc.) may represent certain ideas.

(15)

Turning to her discussion of space in the Homeric poems, de Jong (2012a: 21) starts by citing the apparent spatial shortcomings of the Greek epics, which have traditionally caused critics to downplay the importance of the physical world to the poems. This bias stems from modern literary expectations, wherein a novel will often provide a lengthy opening description of the setting before heading into the action and dialogue (21); the Homeric narratives, generally speaking,⁷⁸ only describe a material object or a location when it is relevant to the action (presented *in medias res*) or to the presentation of character (21; cf. Bowra 1952: 132-133, Tsagalis 2012: 450), or when this relevance is realized later for dramatic effect, a form of Chekhov's Gun (de Jong 2012a: 22).⁷⁹

De Jong (22) gives the example of Calypso's cave, which is only described to the audience at the exact time when the description is needed, when Hermes passes through the

⁷⁷ For further readings on the symbolic or connotative function of space in Homer, cf. Minchin 2001: 27, Thornton 1984: 151-160, Zeitlin 1995: 117.

⁷⁸ The *Odyssey* does provide more of such "descriptive set-pieces" (Byre 1994a: 1) than the *Iliad*; cf. Bowra 1952: 135.

⁷⁹ De Jong (2012a: 22-24), in contrast to Clay, who focuses her spatial investigations entirely on the *Iliad*, suggests that the *Odyssey* has a particularly rich supply of locations and material objects which are relevant to the narrative in which they are placed.

threshold (*Od.* 5.59-75). Occasionally, objects are introduced earlier in the narrative for dramatic effect later. Into this category de Jong (22) places Maron's wine, which is described in a long ecphrasis by the narrator Odysseus before the entrance of Polyphemus (*Od.* 9.196-211), and which will later fulfil an important function in the story, inebriating the ogre so that Odysseus and his men may get the better of him (*Od.* 9.353-374).

In both of these examples, the spatial units, location and prop, respectively, are understood through their denotative quality: a cave functions as a domestic area to be lived in; wine as an object to be drunk. The ability of space in the Homeric poems to "set the scene for actions to come" (de Jong 2012a: 33) is an important part of the story. While not denying that spaces perform a primary 'denotative' function of setting a scene and directly aiding in the fulfilment of plot, in this study of repetitions and connotations, I am more interested in exploring the associations which these spatial units can garner from their contextual employments.

To this end, in line with her earlier taxonomy of the functions of space (de Jong 2012b: 14-16), de Jong (2012a: 33) applies her category of symbolic functions to the Homeric narratives, wherein she locates several examples of spatial units which garner associated meanings beyond their basic sense. Thus, according to de Jong, in the *Iliad* the oak-tree close to the Scaean Gate connotes "safety for the Trojans" (2012a: 33), and the tomb of Ilus is to be associated with "the royal family" (34) of the Trojans, whereas in the *Odyssey* the hero's bow connotes "guest-friendship" (34; cf. Zeitlin 1995: 118), and mountains connote "places of danger" (34).⁸⁰

⁸⁰ My ensuing analysis of mountains (section 2.4) illustrates that mountains in themselves are not necessarily dangerous in the *Apologue*. One would have to explain, in this case, how Mount Neriton on Ithaca or the mountain on the Island of the Goats are as dangerous as the Cyclopes' mountains or those of the Laestrygonians. Rather, I show this danger to be a result of the social and temporal isolation which can characterize mountains.

Christos Tsagalis' *From listeners to viewers: space in the Iliad* (2012) continues de Jong's work on the significance of space beyond its basic scene-setting function (1). From his introduction, Tsagalis, by transposing a modern critical typology of space over the narrative of the *Iliad* (he lists fourteen distinct categories) (cf. 3-4), endeavours to illustrate how space has a greater functional value than mere background setting. I shall not summarize all of his examples, but his discussions of (i) 'historical space', (ii) 'political-social space', and (iii) 'topographical space' contribute to de Jong's scholarship on the symbolic quality of space.

Thus under the rubric of (i) 'historical space' (4-5), Tsagalis (5, 171) shows how certain geographic localities are closely related to the histories or origins of those individual heroes who hail from there, and thus garner associations beyond simple cartographic orientation. So, for example, Tsagalis (191) argues that the contexts in which Phthia is employed suggest that this place, as the home of Achilles, connotes a certain emotional opposition to Troy on his part, and indeed to the heroic code which pervades the entire war.

Phthia is particularly linked to the way Achilles... reconstructs an important part of his epic persona. He regularly brings up his fatherland in moments of emotional upheaval, over his quarrel with Agamemnon, his desire to leave Troy and return home, or recalling his aging father Peleus. These three interpretative ramifications of Phthia construct a poetics of nostalgia that is filtered by Achilles' idiosyncratic view of the heroic code.

(172)

At other times, however, mountains are simply topographically isolated: they connote faraway places, without any suggestion of danger, but simply a long distance in between the observer and the mountainous land.

In his identification of (ii) ‘political-social space’ (5-6), Tsagalis illustrates how segregation of location mimics the conflicts between two important Greeks in the invasion force:

In this respect, space does play an important role, as tensions between individuals are also mapped onto several spatial features of the inner organization of the Achaean camp. For example, the placement of Achilles’ hut at the far end of the camp—as far as possible from the headquarters of Agamemnon—symbolically underlines their different political viewpoints.

(6)

And for (iii) ‘topographic space’, Tsagalis (7-8) contends that features of the Iliadic landscape come to garner meaning beyond their simple physical denotations through their cultural associations in the context of the story. He later gives examples of some “topographical markers” (7) alongside their broader associations in the *Iliad*: thus the oak tree of Zeus connotes safety for the Trojans, although it foretells the demise of Hector (79-81), the fig tree is to be associated with danger for the Trojans (81-83), as is the river of Scamandros (83-86), while the tombstone of Ilos symbolizes the power of Troy’s past (86-90). In line with my own analysis, Tsagalis (79) views the contextual meaning derived from the repetition of these spatial features in the narrative from the perspective of John Miles Foley’s traditional referentiality:

[S]econd, they constitute lasting markers that function as memory cues to a reality standing beyond the limits of the poem and having a strong metonymic power.

(79)

Within the medium of traditional oral song, myth is by definition a strong means of transforming landscape markers, such as the oak and fig trees, into signs.

(82)

Following the scholarship of de Jong and Tsagalis into the importance of the symbolic or metonymic value of space in the Homeric narrative, this chapter investigates the repetition of a specific spatial unit in the *Apologue* in order to ascertain its broader connotative value to the story. Beyond the primary goal of this dissertation in delineating the character of *xeinoi* encounters, it is hoped that this chapter might also partially redress the balance in recent spatial analyses in the Homeric poems, where the lion's share of the focus has been on the Iliadic Trojan plain, towards a realization of the importance of the physical world to the *Odyssey* and, in particular, the hero's wanderings.

2.2.2 Connoting Other Spatial Units in the *Apologue*

Although there has not been a comprehensive study, in the manner of Tsagalis', which has been thematically aimed at 'space in the *Odyssey*', the physical world of Odysseus' voyages, Books 9 to 12, has attracted the attention of some critics and commentators. In particular, there are several features of the topography and objects therein which have elicited remarks as to their connotative value, including (i) the sea, (ii) caves, and (iii) olive trees or olive wood. In the case of all of these spatial units, one should ask, firstly, whether the unit is typical to the narrative (in other words, to what extent it is repeated), and then, secondly, whether this typicality breeds any associative meaning(s) in the story. In the ensuing discussion, I provide a brief review of the typicality and potential connotations for these three

spatial units, which leads aptly onto my own typical and connotative analysis of mountains in the *Apologue*.

(i) It is hard to argue against the typicality of the sea in Odysseus' narrative (Weinberg 1986: 32). Apart from the sheer repetition of words denoting its sense (cf. *LfgrE* 1991: 959-962, 2004: 1451-1456),⁸¹ the sea forms the central backdrop to many dramatic sequences in the *Apologue*. Furthermore, it also attains a certain structural importance to Odysseus' story, both framing and punctuating the episodes in Odysseus' narration. On the first point, the action of the *Apologue* commences with Odysseus' fleet sailing away from Troy to the land of the Cicones (*Od.* 9.39-40) and it concludes with the destruction of the very last ship of this fleet (*Od.* 12.403-419) and with Odysseus floating shipwrecked over the sea, on the way to Calypso's isle (*Od.* 12.447-453)—a neat ring structure. Secondly, the sea also acts as a bridge between many of the encounters in the four books, as a division between the various episodes (e.g. *Od.* 9.62-84, 104-105, 560-566, *etc.*).

It is not difficult to argue for the typicality of the sea as a spatial or locative unit in the *Apologue*. It is more challenging, however, to discover a single coherent connotative meaning for the sea, beyond its basic denotative value in the story—that is, as a locative means for transporting Odysseus' fleet, and later singular ship, from Point A to Point B, and thus advancing the plot from encounter to encounter.⁸²

In pursuit of such meaning, one might start with Carol Dougherty's (2001: 96) interpretation of Odysseus' voyage over the sea as leading towards unknown worlds. Dougherty (96) states that Odysseus' passage from 'the known' to 'the unknown', from familiar to strange, is marked by the boundaries of the sea:

⁸¹ *Thalassa* occurs 27 times in the *Apologue* (cf. *LfgrE* 1991: 959); *pontos* occurs 21 times (*LfgrE* 2004: 1451).

⁸² For connotations of the sea in the *Iliad*, cf. Tsagalis 2012:143-147.

[H]ere the ocean serves as a way to designate a structural break between the familiar world of Greece and the strange new worlds to which he travels

(96)

Thus from Ithaca and the familiarity of his own *oikos*, the sea shifts Odysseus to a war in a foreign country, Troy; then it moves him to a peripheral people, the Cicones, an ally of the Trojans, who mark the boundaries of the Greek world; and, finally, the sea transposes Odysseus and his men from the rim of the known world to the ‘fairy tale’ land of the Lotus Eaters (95-96). This three-part movement from known to unknown is then, according to Dougherty, marked by the active intervention of the sea: “he is driven farther and farther astray by the powers of the sea” (96).

The relationship between sea travel and the movement to the unknown is further validated by two other passages in the *Apologue*. In Book 10, after their failed second reception with Aeolus, Odysseus and his men sail for six consecutive days and nights until they arrive at the land of the Laestrygonians (*Od.* 10.80-81); the length of this nautical journey seems to have sent them to a country where the movement of the celestial bodies, and thus the passage between day and night, are radically different to the phenomena they are accustomed to (*Od.* 10.82-85). Later, in Book 11, the relationship between the sea and voyaging into the unknown is even more emphatic, where the Ithacans’ visit to the land of the dead, what Dougherty describes as “the ultimate expression of the other and the outer limits of Odysseus’ travels” (2001: 98), entails them traveling to the very edge of the Ocean (*Od.* 11.13).⁸³ The implication of both of these examples is that the time and distance spent travelling on the sea is directly proportional to the alterity of the cultures and peoples Odysseus visits.

⁸³ For the duality of *Ōkeanos* as both a river and an anthropomorphic entity, cf. Rudhardt 1971: 54-58.

But there are two interpretative difficulties with Dougherty's interpretation of the sea as a space which can trigger a symbolic movement from the known world to the unknown. Firstly, it is clear that Odysseus does eventually return from the absolute 'alterity' of the Underworld to 'known environments' via the sea: to Aeaia for a second time, which is no longer the mysterious island it originally was (cf. *Od.* 10.189-197) and thus is a 'known locality', later to Scheria, which, in society, lies manifestly closer to Greek culture than the domains of several monsters in the *Apologue*, and, ultimately, back home to the familiarity of Ithaca. The sea, in short, is more ambiguous than Dougherty allows for. It can both push one away from the familiar into a strange new world and it can also aid one in returning to the known.

This double-edged character is perfectly illustrated in Book 5, when Odysseus's voyage to Scheria is mediated by two sea gods: the more powerful Poseidon, who endeavours to make Odysseus' return home as difficult as possible (lines 282-296), and the goddess Leucothea, who gives Odysseus a veil to protect him from harm and help him arrive in Scheria (lines 333-353) (cf. Detienne & Vernant 1974: 204-205, 230). The ambiguous connotations of the sea, as a locality which can aid travellers in speedily returning home (to 'the familiar') and which can also retard and send travellers into strange, foreign territories, is encapsulated by the opposing roles these two divinities play here. Indeed, the *Apologue* itself provides several examples where the sea comes to the rescue of Odysseus and his crew removing them from inimical lands: allowing an escape from the hostility of the inland Cicones (*Od.* 9.62), the temptation of the Lotus Eaters (*Od.* 9.104), and Polyphemus' rock throwing (*Od.* 9.541-542).

Secondly, there is also a somewhat misleading generalization in Dougherty's (2001: 96) claim that "the powers of the sea" drive Odysseus off course in the episodes of the Cicones and the Lotus Eaters. In the first case, it is the wind, "ἄνεμος" (*Od.* 9.39), not the

sea, which steers the hero's fleet to the Cicones; in the second, the culprits in shifting the ships towards the Lotus Eaters are both the sea, in the form of a wave, “κῦμα” (*Od.* 9.80), and the current, “ῥόος” (*Od.* 9.80), as well as the North wind, “βορέης” (*Od.* 9.81). Moreover, as the subsequent line describes, the latter is the more powerful of the two forces in determining the fate of the Ithacans:

ἔνθεν δ' ἐννήμαρ φερόμην ὀλοοῖσ' ἀνέμοισι
πόντον ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντα· ἀτὰρ δεκάτη ἐπέβημεν
γαίης Λωτοφάγων...

(*Od.* 9.82-84)

Then for nine days I was carried by ruthless winds over teeming ocean. On the tenth day we reached the land of the Lotus-Eaters...

(Shewring 1980: 100-101)

In analysing the connotations of what Dougherty titles “the powers of the sea” in the *Apologue*, it might be necessary to explore those components—‘wind’ and ‘sea’ (and even ‘storms’)—individually for more nuanced meanings. Indeed, in a recent article, Alex Purves (2010b: 335) suggests that Odysseus’ circuitous journey home through the strange lands of the *Apologue* is due to the force of unfavourable winds and storms, which he must bear and, eventually, overcome. The importance of wind to hindering Odysseus’ journey home, and to sending him into unknown worlds, is exemplified by the Aeolus episode, for, when the hostile winds are tied up in the magical bag which has been bestowed unto Odysseus by the god (*Od.* 10.19-22), the Ithacans do indeed almost reach their homeland (*Od.* 10.28-30); in short, much of the jeopardy of Odysseus’ voyage has been removed when the power of the

winds are removed (Purves 2010b: 334). Indeed, the sea itself, without the unfavourable gales, is quite amicable and easy to navigate.

This is not to say that the sea does not, at least partially, provide for travellers like Odysseus a road to move away from the familiar; and this function is clear in the *Nekyia*, since the farthest distance the hero travels on the sea culminates in his furthest removal from humanity. This connotation of the sea, however, needs to be measured against the other quality of the sea, as helper or expediter, and also needs to be qualified by an examination of the connotations of other phenomena like winds and storms in the narrative.

Apart from connoting a movement towards the unknown, the sea has also often been viewed negatively as a hostile force, “a baneful entity” (Purves 2010a: 71) to the voyaging Ithacans (Cook 1995: 50); and this does seem a logical interpretation, given that the remainder of the crew die by drowning in Book 12 (lines 403-419) (72). Furthermore, the various antagonists whom Odysseus encounters in the final book of the *Apologue* have been understood by some critics as personifying the mortal threats of the sea:

He next encounters a series of female monsters—the Sirens, Scylla, Charybdis—who personify the risks of overseas travel. They threaten his seafaring progress as personifications of the dangers posed by the sea (deadening calm, jagged rocks, powerful whirlpools) just as they attempt to forestall his narrative momentum as well.

(Dougherty 2001: 98)

Water imagery plays an important part in all cosmogonic symbolism, where it functions as a powerful exemplar of the dark, threatening and formless medium in which savage monsters may prey upon the unwary.

(Hammond 2012: 53)

But while the sea might connote death and destruction for Odysseus' comrades, for the hero himself, its value is somewhat more positive. Odysseus' heroic identity in the *Odyssey* is shaped, at least partially, by the many sufferings he has endured on the seas (e.g. *Od.* 1.1-5, 2.343, 8.166-185, 9.12-15) (cf. Cook 1999, de Jong 2004a: 6, Nagler 1990: 337). And, indeed, his very name bears testament to these pains (cf. fn. 40). In short, the sea and the troubles Odysseus experiences on it give rise to much of his *kleos* in the *Odyssey*.

In summary, the sea connotes an ambiguous quality in the *Apologue*, a set of oppositions, between finding unknown worlds and returning home to the familiar, between the threat of dying and the possibility of heroic life, *kleos*. Indeed, one should hardly expect the sea to hold a single, concrete meaning for the audience of the Homeric poems, given the importance of the sea to Greek life, from the very geography of the lands, to the positioning of the cities along the coasts, to the colonization and expansion of its society, and even to the distribution of the heroic songs. Its pervasiveness and closeness to Greek life would infuse it with a complex of associations, which one should appreciate in total, without trying to resolve them into amenable rubrics:

The sea, true to its archetypal meaning, stands for life and its vicissitudes in which all men are "immersed". It is deceptive, treacherous, unpredictable, dangerous. It engulfs men if they are not strong, or if they do not find some sort of help: a haven, a ship to bear them up, or a rock to cling to.

(Weinberg 1986: 32)

(ii) The typicality of caves in the *Apologue* is prominent enough to warrant some critical discussion. Four inhabitants mentioned in these books are said to dwell in caves: Calypso

(*Od.* 9.30), the Cyclopes (*Od.* 9.114), Polyphemus (*Od.* 9.182), and Scylla (*Od.* 12.80); moreover, two further, apparently uninhabited, caves are described on the Island of the Goats (*Od.* 9.141) and on Helios' island (*Od.* 12.317). Regarding exact verbal repetitions of words denoting a 'cave', I include here "σπέος", occurring 18 times in the *Apologue* (*LfgrE* 2006: 178-180), and "ἄντρον", occurring 7 times (*LfgrE* 1955: 953-955).

Caves have been variously interpreted as connoting rebirth, a separation from society, a divine locale, or death. While a rebirth symbolism might be applicable to Odysseus' exit from Polyphemus' cave, in claiming back his heroic identity from being a literal 'Nobody' in this womb-like, milk-laden space (cf. section 1.2.4), as well as to the hero's departure from Calypso's cave (cf. Bergren 2008: 58), thus relinquishing the offer of immortality and being 'reborn' to the mortal world once more, the other 'minor' caves in the *Apologue* (e.g. *Od.* 9.141, *Od.* 12.317) provide no reasonable evidence of any rebirths for the hero or for his men so as to justify this broader connotative meaning for caves.

Accordingly, in her extensive study, *Caves and the ancient Greek mind: descending underground in the search for ultimate truth* (2009), Yulia Ustinova understands this focus on the womb-like structure of caves as a modern construction, and one, therefore, which one should be wary of extending too far, or, at least, pervasively, in the ancient world:

True, the metaphor of the cave as the womb of the earth and the connection of caves with fertility and chthonic cults are common. However, they are much less universal than thought formerly, and the notion of a primeval fertility goddess from whom all comes and all return, as well as the Freudian inclination to see every grotto as a uterine image or substitute for refuge in the maternal embrace, have been generally abandoned in recent research.

(3-4)

In the cases of the Island of the Goats and Thrinacia, caves seem to be connected primarily with Nymphs (*Od.* 9.154, 12.318). This connection might imply a separation or isolation from society, since in Greek mythology Nymphs were typically associated with raw nature, divorced from human contact (Bakker 2013: 61-62, Ustinova 2009: 55-58).⁸⁴ And, indeed, the Island of the Goats and that of Helios are both characterized by a picture of the natural world of animals untouched by the damaging hand of man: thus, on the former, innumerable wild goats run free (*Od.* 9.118-121), and, on the latter, a herd of many cattle and flocks of sheep roam (*Od.* 12.262-263), to be left unharmed because of their sacred status (*Od.* 11.104-113). Bowra (1952: 135-136) observes a similar social removal experienced by Odysseus in Calypso's cave, and in my own analysis I examine isolation with respect to the dwellings of Polyphemus and Scylla, both cave dwellers. This characteristic of social isolation therefore seems equally applicable to all the caves in the *Apologue*; but it is also, importantly, a character of a more pervasive spatial unit in the *Apologue*—mountains.

Two other connotations of caves in Ancient Greek culture may be touched on briefly here. One is their association with divine inspiration, assistance or prophecy, which can also be related to their being the typical residences of Nymphs (Ustinova 2009: 58-68). Ustinova declares in her introduction that in the Greek imagination “[caves] were always numinous” (1), but then some paragraphs later she takes a few steps back in indicating the selectivity of her study and its omission of caves such as that of Polyphemus (2). I cannot, on account of spatial considerations in this dissertation, attempt so broad a symbolic analysis of caves as Weinberg does across the Western literary canon, in her monograph *The cave: the evolution of a metaphoric field from Homer to Ariosto* (1986); but in the *Apologue*, to declare that ‘all

⁸⁴ “[Pan and the Nymphs] personify the idea of separation from human culture” (Ustinova 2009: 57).

caves are numinous' is open to immediate objection. For example, Scylla's cave is manifestly marked out in the story as a place beyond the intervention of divinities (cf. *Od.* 12.85-88).

Lastly, one may partner Polyphemus' abode with that of Scylla as localities connoting death (Graves 1955b: 366).⁸⁵ Weinberg (1986: 26-27), however, points out that the home of Polyphemus has not been described in a grim fashion—no emphasis is given to an impenetrable darkness, or creatures of the night lurking in hidden crevices, and so forth, which could contribute to such a function; instead Polyphemus' abode is filled with bleating lambs and kids, as well as various dairy products (9.218-223), a situation Weinberg describes as “burgeoning with life” (26).

(iii) The olive tree or stake of olive wood has been suggested to connote the presence and help of the goddess Athena, to whom the tree was traditionally sacred (Murnaghan 1995: 65, Weinberg 1986: 28-29).⁸⁶ Weinberg (28) points to the significance of the sequence of events in the Polyphemus episode, by which the hero first hopes for the assistance of Athena in conceiving an effective plan to get the better of Polyphemus (*Od.* 9.316-317), and subsequently discovers an olive spar immediately after his prayer (*Od.* 9.319-320) (cf. Vidal-Naquet 1996: 40). The presence of the olive stake becomes more emphatic if we compare the Polyphemus episode to other folktale versions of the one-eyed ogre motif, in most of which a form of spit is used to blind the ogre (Glenn 1971: 165-166, Schein 1970: 73); this implies that there might have been something intentional in the bard's employment of part of the olive tree here, beyond the mere facility of the stake in moving the plot forward, and blinding Polyphemus (Weinberg 1986: 28). Moreover, one might extrapolate the connotations of the

⁸⁵ On the comparison between Polyphemus and Scylla, cf. Hopman 2012: 2-3.

⁸⁶ For the mythic contest between Athena and Poseidon in being declared patron god of Athens, in which Athena's olive tree is considered more useful for the people of the city than Poseidon's offerings of a salt spring, cf. Graves 1955a: 59-60, Murnaghan 1995: 65.

olive tree a little further in this passage, as not being merely representative of Athena's aid to Odysseus but as also connoting a certain civilizing force over the savage Polyphemus, given the goddess' strong association in the *Odyssey*, and other myths, with civilization and order over barbarism and chaos (Murnaghan 1995: 62-65).⁸⁷

The suggested connotations of olive trees and wood, though, require greater substantiation in order for these spatial units to be deemed meaningful tokens of traditional (or even specific) referentiality in the *Apologue*, which an audience could duly pick up on. The units occur only five times in the *Apologue* (Lfgre 1991: 512-513),⁸⁸ and their contextual usages, apart from the solitary association spotted by Weinberg (1986: 28-29) (*Od.* 9.319-320),⁸⁹ do not point to a heavily-weighted association between the goddess Athena and the olive tree, or parts thereof.

Outside the *Apologue*, however, Seth Schein (1970: 75-76) has observed that the olive tree or olive wood comes to be associated with safety for Odysseus on no less than four occasions in the story: the handle of Calypso's axe, which Odysseus uses to build his raft, is made of olive (*Od.* 5.234-236) (cf. Vidal-Naquet 1996: 40); on the Scherian shore, Odysseus falls safely asleep among olive trees (*Od.* 5.477); similarly, in returning to his homeland, the Phaeacian sailors place the hero, and his goods, beside an olive tree (*Od.* 13.116-123); and

⁸⁷ “[T]he *Odyssey* represents another version of her [Athena's] ultimate victory over Poseidon. This victory is associated with civilization, as Odysseus both returns to civilization and restores civilized values on Ithaca, and with the cooperation of female figures in furthering the hero's goals.” (Murnaghan 1995: 65). Athena, like Zeus, is also an important figure in maintaining cosmic order, cf. Allan 2006: 20-21.

⁸⁸ References are from the noun, *elaiē*, and the adjective, *elaineos* (Lfgre 1991: 512-513).

⁸⁹ Weinberg (1986: 28) supposes that the “δαίμων” (*Od.* 9.381) who encourages the Ithacans to blind Polyphemus is Athena. However likely, this remains guesswork. For anonymous references to deities (including the *daimōn*) in the Homeric poems, cf. Tsagarakis 1977: 57-116.

Odysseus' knowledge that the foundation of his bed was constructed from an olive are crucial to the reunion of the hero with his wife (*Od.* 23.295-296).

2.3 *The Typicality of Mountains in the Apologue*

The ensuing list (2.3.1) illustrates that mountains are a typical spatial unit in the *Apologue*. By the English word 'mountain', I include here the following Greek words which denote a spatial image of 'mountainousness' to the audience: (i) various forms of the Greek noun, *oros*, denoting an entire mountain (*LfgrE* 2004: 806-811); (ii) adjectival compounds formed from *oros-*, denoting a quality related to mountains (*LfgrE* 2004: 764-767); (iii) proper nouns denoting actual mountains; and (iv) components of a mountain, including the following words, placed in alphabetical order, which denote a 'cliff', 'rocky peak' or 'summit': *akries* (*LfgrE* 1955: 434),⁹⁰ *koryphē* (*LfgrE* 1991: 1495-1496),⁹¹ *rion* (*LfgrE* 2006: 40),⁹² *skopelos* (*LfgrE* 2006: 153),⁹³ and *skopiē* (*LfgrE* 2006: 154).⁹⁴ This last category might be deemed too liberal in its allowances, but it must be recalled from my methodological section that, following the example of Adrian Kelly, I am examining repetition as based in semantics—that is to say, similarity in meaning, as occurring to the audience, not form:

The objects of the enquiry need not be formulaic, in the narrow sense(s) determined by previous scholarship, but rather of sufficient similarity and integrity in order to

⁹⁰ "Höhen, Bergspitzen" (*LfgrE* 1955: 434). The word is only found in the plural in Homer, and only in the *Odyssey* (*LfgrE* 1955: 434).

⁹¹ "Spitze d. Gebirges" (*LfgrE* 1991: 1496).

⁹² "Berg-, Felsvorsprung" (*LfgrE* 2006: 40).

⁹³ "Klippe" (*LfgrE* 2006: 153).

⁹⁴ "Ausschau, Warte" (*LfgrE* 2006: 154).

strike the impression of an audience during a performance. This may appear too subjective, too great a relaxation of schematic rigour, but it is unreasonable to expect an audience to differentiate between expressions on purely metrical grounds, for their impression of similarity will necessarily be more flexible than that of a researcher armed with a concordance, a written text, and the *TLG* search program. The Homeric *Kunst-sprache* is a living organism for its audience, and rigid structural categorizations merely describe the poetry from a compositional rather than a semantic perspective.

(2007: 14)

The singular number of Kelly's phrase "semantic perspective" (14) is, perhaps, too concise in explicating the manner in which an audience recalls units of "sufficient similarity" (14) in the Homeric poems; rather, one should talk in the plural about the 'semantic perspectives' which are employed in the system of traditional referentiality. For just how the audience's recognition is triggered is a complex process and requires some attention to the various forms of sensory perception (auditory, visual, etc.) which we experience in our primary world, and which, analogously, shape the cognitive (re)identification of units in a text (cf. Minchin 2001: 9-10, 25).⁹⁵ In short, different forms of perception influence different forms of memory. Thus Elizabeth Minchin, for example, lists four different types of recollection in the Homeric poems: "memory for typical scenes (that is... episodic memory), visual memory, spatial memory, and auditory memory" (30). In this chapter, the cognitive act of 'striking' which Kelly (2007: 14) describes, the mnemonic recall in a performance, will be understood on a visual-spatial level (cf. Minchin 2001: 25-28). I am concerned with how the pictureability of

⁹⁵ One must not here confuse the actual act of visual perception in the real world with the analogous act of mental imaging which occurs when an audience or reader listens to a story, cf. Minchin 2001: 25

mountains is denoted to the audience throughout the *Apologue*. To this end, I am interested in the spatial image of a mountain (in total or in part), as it recurs in the visual landscapes which the audience build in their minds, rather than a single formal word, such as *oros*.

2.3.1 Reference List for Mountains in the *Apologue*

N.B. All line references, indexed on the left, are from the *Odyssey*. For the sake of economy, I have included only each unit which conveys the mountainous quality here. The contexts of their employments will be discussed in section 2.4. All references have been located in consultation with the *Lexikon des frühgriechischen epos* (1955, 1991, 2004, 2006).

N.B.II. When components of a mountain occur alongside or in qualification with a whole mountain—in other words, a partitive construction—I have included and ‘counted’ them as a single unit here. For nouns in apposition which denote the same mountain, I have regarded them as a single unit. For adjectives derived from *oros*, I have included them with their noun.

9.21-22:	ὄρος... Νήριτον
9.113:	ὄρέων
9.121:	κορυφὰς ὄρέων
9.155:	αἴγας ὄρεσκώους
9.191-192:	ρίφ... ὄρέων
9.292:	λέων ὄρεσίτροφος
9.315:	πρὸς ὄρος
9.400:	ἄκριας
9.481:	κορυφὴν ὄρεος

10.97:	σκοπιήν
10.104:	ὄρέων
10.113:	ὄρεος κορυφήν
10.148:	σκοπιήν
10.194:	σκοπιήν
10.212:	ὄρέστεροι... λέοντες
10.281:	ἄκριας
10.307:	Ἵλυμπον
11.243:	οὐρεῖ
11.315:	Ἵσσαν
11.315:	Οὐλύμπω
11.315:	Ἵσση
11.316:	Πήλιον
11.574:	ὄρεσσι
12.73:	σκόπελοι
12.74:	κορυφῆ
12.76:	κορυφήν
12.80	σκοπέλω
12.95:	σκόπελον
12.101:	σκόπελον
12.108:	σκοπέλω
12.220:	σκοπέλου
12.239:	σκοπέλοισιν
12.430:	σκόπελον

2.3.2. Summary

In total, the above list cites 33 instances where a sense of ‘mountainousness’ is denoted in the narrative. Given (i) the recent critical focus on the meaning behind the spatial environment of the Homeric poems, and (ii) the relative typicality of the unit of mountains to the *Apologue* (cf. section 2.5), the following analysis is relevant to contemporary analysis in the Homeric poems.

2.4 A Connotative Interpretation of Mountains in the *Apologue*

This section illustrates and analyses how mountains tend to carry contextual associations of isolation within *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue*. The isolation in these situations will be viewed in several different respects: (i) topographical isolation, where homes or homelands are pushed to the edge of the map to geographical extremities; (ii) social isolation, where the agents in these interactions will act in an anti-social manner; and (iii) temporal isolation, where the *xeinoi* situations are distanced from the present.

Two qualifications are necessary here. Firstly, not every reference to mountains in the *Apologue* occurs in a *xeinoi* situation (e.g. 11.243). However, when the mountains do not occur in *xeinoi* situations, it will be observed that their connotations of isolation still hold true and thus reinforce the associations for when they occur in a *xeinoi* encounter. Secondly, not every reference I examine demonstrate the sense of isolation on the three levels I suggest, or even two, but all the references taken together provide a more complete picture of the different manifestations of isolation.

The following analysis is structured according to the relevant *xeinoi* encounters, positioned in the order in which they occur in the story, with each mountainous unit duly

examined in the order introduced in section 2.3.1, expect in cases where a later unit is introduced at an earlier time in order to substantiate a given claim. The force of the connoted meaning will gradually be established as the analysis progresses, so offering retrospection with earlier spatial units.

The first *xeinoi* situation to be related in the *Apologue* is not the tussle of Odysseus' men with the Cicones (*Od.* 9.39-61), although it is indeed the first in story-time (i.e. after the Greek departure from Troy [*Od.* 9.39]), but rather Odysseus' acknowledgement of his own current extra-narrative reception by King Alcinous and Queen Arete (*Od.* 9.2-11). The hero proceeds to announce his name and place of origin to his audience:

νῦν δ' ὄνομα πρῶτον μυθήσομαι, ὄφρα καὶ ὑμεῖς
εἶδετ', ἐγὼ δ' ἂν ἔπειτα φυγὼν ὑπο νηλεῆς ἥμαρ
ὑμῖν ξεῖνος ἔω καὶ ἀπόπροθι δώματα ναίων.
εἴμ' Ὀδυσσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν
ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καὶ μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει.
ναιετάω δ' Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον· ἐν δ' ὄρος αὐτῆ,
Νήριτον εἰνοσίφυλλον, ἀριπρεπές· ἀμφὶ δὲ νῆσοι
πολλαὶ ναιετάουσι μάλα σχεδὸν ἀλλήλησι,
Δουλίχιόν τε Σάμη τε καὶ ὑλήεσσα Ζάκυνθος.
αὐτὴ δὲ [χθαμαλή]⁹⁶ πανυπερτάτη εἰν ἀλὶ κεῖται

⁹⁶ I have excluded “χθαμαλή” (*Od.* 9.25) from my analysis, since all the possible solutions for its geographic denotation are irreconcilable with the remainder of the passage, and I am not able to provide a translation for this word without doing damage to more of the surrounding text (Stanford 1996: 349). “χθαμαλή” is not the only word which has been the subject of textual criticism in this passage (*Od.* 9.21-28): (i) “εὐδείελον” (*Od.* 9.21) has been given two possible meanings (cf. fn. 99); (ii) “πανυπερτάτη” (*Od.* 9.25) can mean either ‘highest

πρὸς ζόφον, αἶ δέ τ' ἄνευθε πρὸς ἠῶ τ' ἠέλιόν τε,
τρηχεῖ, ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ κουροτρόφος· οὐ τι ἐγὼ γε
ἦς γαίης δύναμαι γλυκερώτερον ἄλλο ιδέσθαι.

(*Od.* 9.16-28)

But first at least you shall have my name—then you will know it henceforth, and if I escape the day of evil I shall remain your guest-friend, although my own home is very far from here. I am Odysseus, son of Laertes; among all mankind I am known for subtleties, and the fame of me goes up to heaven. The place I live in is far-seen Ithaca; on it stands Mount Neriton, quivering with leafy coppices; round it are clustered other islands—Dulichium, Same, forested Zacynthus. Ithaca itself is [low-lying], farthest out in the sea westwards, and the other islands lie away from it, towards the rising sun. My land is rugged, but knows how to breed brave sons. A man can see no country more loveable than his own, and it is with myself and Ithaca.

(Shewring 1980: 99)

In the lines preceding the quoted text, Odysseus has already complimented his host for the singing ability of the Phaeacian bard, Demodocus (*Od.* 9.3-5), and the largesse of the

of all' or 'farthest out'; and (iii) “πρὸς ζόφον” (*Od.* 9.26) can mean either ‘west’ or ‘north-west’ (Stanford 1996: xxxviii). Of the four debated words, “χθαμαλή” causes the most headaches. The two most common translations of “χθαμαλή” have been “low-lying” or “close to the shore” (cf. Luce 1998: 167, *Lfgre* 2006: 1205-1206, Stanford 1996: 349), and these are equally problematic in the context. If the first holds true, then one has to question all references to lofty terrain on Ithaca; if the second holds true, then Ithaca’s western removal from the mainland and the other islands becomes troublesome. Moreover, in both cases, either definition of “πανυπερτάτη” is blatantly contradicted (Stanford 1996: 349). For further discussion on the sense of “χθαμαλή”, cf. Andrews 1962: 18, Luce 1998: 168, Rebert 1928: 377-387, Stanford 1996: 349.

Phaeacian feast (*Od.* 9.6-11), before he turns to announcing his identity (*Od.* 9.16-19). While the entertainment (#XIII [Reece 1993: 7]) and the feast (#IX [Reece 1993: 7]) are the responsibilities of a host, equally, in a typical hospitality scene in the *Odyssey*, a guest is expected at the very least to provide an account of who he is (#XI.b [Reece 1993: 7]; cf. Webber 1989: 2).⁹⁷

Bizarrely, against the customary conduct of a hospitality scene, Odysseus has withheld this information for a considerable period, from the start of Book 6 and his encounter with Nausicaa (*Od.* 6.127), or in story time, approximately one and a half days prior to his announcement (cf. Scodel 1999: 79-80 Webber 1989: 1). Whatever the rationale behind this deferral, and there have been several suggestions (cf. Fenik 1974: 5-60, Scodel 1999: 80-82, 84-93), the announcement of Odysseus' name and identity is intended to formally secure his guest friendship with the Phaeacians: he grants them his name in order to be their guest-friend, “ὄμῖν ξεῖνος ἔω” (*Od.* 9.18). Odysseus' prologue is thus an important component in the hospitality scene between the hero and the Phaeacians, seeing that it fulfils the guest's prerogative of providing his name to his hosts.

Of interest to this study of isolation in *xeinoi* situations is the concessive disclaimer which immediately follows Odysseus' wish to be the Phaeacians' guest-friend: “καὶ ἀπόπροθι δῶματα ναίων” (*Od.* 9.18). Odysseus creates a physical distance between himself and his hosts, declaring his own home to be far removed from them. In fact, his ensuing description of Ithaca⁹⁸ (*Od.* 9.21-27) serves to highlight the topographic isolation of his island and to push his home into a spatial periphery. This physical isolation and distancing is achieved in the following three respects: (i) certain epithets place Ithaca and Mount Neriton on the edge

⁹⁷ For further discussion on the ritual of name-giving in a hospitality sequence, cf. Webber 1989: 1-13.

⁹⁸ For the problems encountered in trying to reconcile the geography of Homer's fictional Ithaca (*Od.* 9.21-27) with a real-world equivalent, cf. Andrews 1962: 17-20, Bittlestone 2005: 34-39, Luce 1998: 165-189.

of the viewer's horizon, they are focalized from afar by the narrator; (ii) the contrasting of Ithaca with its three neighbouring islands serves to further alienate Odysseus' home; and (iii) the westwardness of Ithaca can, in the context of certain passages in the *Apologue*, be argued to connote an isolation or othering from human society. Lastly, the fact that the topographical isolation in this passage coincides with a spatial reference to a mountain (*Od.* 9.21-22) is not coincidental; indeed, as my analysis of ensuing *xeinoi* encounters demonstrates, in itself Mount Neriton is a powerful token of Ithaca's isolation.

(i) Firstly, Ithaca is “εὐδείελον” (*Od.* 9.21), a word which denotes a sense of ‘visual clarity’ (Luce 1998: 166-167)—“gut sichtbar” (*LfgrE* 1991: 769).⁹⁹ The spatial virtue of a landmark being “εὐδείελον” lies not in a focalizing subject's proximity to such a landmark, but rather his great distance; and, accordingly, outside of Homer, Greek lexicographers have occasionally rendered the word as “farseen” (Liddell & Scott 1940). In effect, Odysseus, as narrator, is visualizing Ithaca from an external position, from the sea (Farrington 1929: 299-300, Luce 1998: 184).¹⁰⁰ John Luce leaves open the possibility that “εὐδείελον” can denote this visual clarity from both an external and an internal perspective:

It [Ithaca] can be seen to be such [εὐδείελον] when one approaches it by sea, and particularly when one surveys it from higher ground within it.

(1998: 167)

⁹⁹ Two possible translations have been given for “εὐδείελον”: (a) ‘clear, distinct’ or (b) ‘fair in the afternoon’ (Stanford 1996: 349). “This passage [*Od.* 9.21-28] makes it virtually certain that *eudeielos* is not, as some ancient scholars supposed, a merely decorative epithet meaning “fair in the afternoon sunshine”; rather, it describes the essential nature of Ithaca as a distinctly apprehended island with clear water all around it.” (Luce 1998: 166).

¹⁰⁰ “Homer, as has often been suggested, most notably by Victor Bérard, is picturing Ithaca through the eyes of a seafarer (himself, in my view)” (Luce 1998: 184).

In the second case, Luce imagines a view of Ithaca ‘clearly seen’ from Mount Neriton. But there is one problem with this internal perspective of the island. In the next line, Odysseus describes the mountain itself as “ἀριπρεπές” (*Od.* 9.22), a virtual synonym for “εὐδείελον” (*LfgreE* 1955: 1277-1278). It is unlikely that the narrator is spatially positioning his Phaeacian listeners on top of Mount Neriton at line 9.21, and then, rather suddenly, away from it at line 9.22, in order to survey this ‘conspicuous mountain’.¹⁰¹

The next piece of spatial information the Phaeacian listeners receive of Ithaca is an aspect of topography, Ithaca has a mountain called Neriton (*Od.* 9.22), which is qualified with two adjectives, “εἰνοσίφυλλον” and “ἀριπρεπές” (*Od.* 9.22). Starting with the first of these descriptions, the visual image of a forested mountain is picked up by other depictions of mountains in the *Apologue*: Polyphemus is likened in a simile to a wooded peak, “ρίψ

¹⁰¹ The fact that “εὐδείελον” can connote a sense of distance between object and observer can be ascertained by examining some of its other contexts of use in the *Odyssey* (*LfgreE* 1991: 769-770). In Book 2 (lines 161-167), Halitherses cautions the people of Ithaca about the imminent return of Odysseus, and of the trouble which will befall the suitors and those who inhabit “Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον” (*Od.* 2.167). Ithaca here is not focalized from the internal perspective of Halitherses and his listeners, but rather from the external perspective of the returning, vengeful hero, whose removal from his homeland (*Od.* 2.163-164) is soon to come to an end. In Book 13, Odysseus still believes himself to be removed from Ithaca, “Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον” (line 212): ὦ πόποι, οὐκ ἄρα πάντα νοήμονες οὐδὲ δίκαιοι / ἦσαν Φαιήκων ἡγήτορες ἠδὲ μέδοντες, / οἳ μ' εἰς ἄλλην γαῖαν ἀπήγαγον· ἦ τέ μ' ἔφαντο / ἄξιεν εἰς Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον, οὐδ' ἐτέλεσσαν” (13.209-212). “After all, alas, those chiefs and rulers of the Phaeacians were not over-thoughtful or over-scrupulous; they promised to bring me to far-seen Ithaca, but they have not kept their word; they have brought me somewhere else instead” (Shewring 1980: 159). Ithaca, “far-seen” in Shewring’s translation, was indeed far-seen for Odysseus when the Phaeacians promised to return him when he was still a great distance away from his country in Scheria, and, mistakenly, he still believes the island to be far away, to be seen from afar, not knowing that he has returned now to his homeland. The same irony is at play in Odysseus’ later debate with Athena (*Od.* 13.325).

ὄληεντι” (*Od.* 9.191), in a mountain range; in the Laestrygonian land, we learn that the inhabitants bring back wood from the mountains in wagons (*Od.* 10.103-104); and Mount Pelion, in the mythological tale of Otus and Ephialtes, is also described as ‘εἰνοσίφυλλον’ (*Od.* 11.316).

The second adjective used to qualify Neriton, “ἀριπρεπές”, is remarkably similar to “εὐδείελον” in its denotations—that is, of an object which is ‘very clearly seen’ or ‘conspicuous’ (*Lfgre* 1955: 1277-1278).¹⁰² If we were to imagine Odysseus as a film-maker (cf. Minchin 2001: 25-26, Tsagalis 2012: 63, Winkler 2007: 50),¹⁰³ we can understand exactly why he is describing Mount Neriton, like Ithaca, as being ‘conspicuous’: for the simple fact that he is focusing in on the island from a long range, an external position, and that, naturally, the mountain is the most observable topographical feature on Ithaca, ‘viewed from afar’. But, interestingly, after Odysseus has offered his listeners a glance at his native land, he goes no closer. All we initially receive is a solitary mountain, clearly seen from a distance; there are no beaches, harbours, rivers, towns, houses, least of all, people! In fact, he briefly turns away from Ithaca to examine the other islands, Dulichium, Same, and Zacynthus (henceforth, titled ‘DSZ’) (*Od.* 9.24), which are closest to his homeland.

(ii) The shift to these other lands gives Odysseus a further opportunity to isolate Ithaca through a relative spatial contrasting, pushing his own island to the cartographic periphery and away from the nearest neighbouring habitations. Firstly, we are told that DSZ are extremely close to one another, “μάλα σχεδὸν ἀλλήλησι” (*Od.* 9.23). The great proximity

¹⁰² “[G]ut sichtbar, deutlich sich ab- oder heraushebend, durch besondere Qualität sich auszeichnend mit Übergang zu ausgezeichnet, vortrefflich” (*Lfgre* 1955: 1277). For other contexts of use, cf. *Od.* 8.176, 8.390, 8.424.

¹⁰³ “This almost cinematic character is not limited to battle scenes, but pervades Homeric epic as a whole. It allows the traditional storyteller to present the tale to his audience as a series of slides, which they are able to watch in their minds’ eye” (Tsagalis 2012: 63).

of these islands to each other, indicated by the superlative phrase, “μάλα σχεδόν”, creates a sharp contrast with the positioning of Ithaca relative to them. Odysseus’ island is described in the following terms: “αὐτὴ δὲ χθαμαλὴ πανυπερτάτη εἰν ἀλλὶ κεῖται / πρὸς ζόφον” (*Od.* 9.25-26), while DSZ are described in oppositional relation to Ithaca as: “αἶ δέ τ' ἄνευθε πρὸς ἦῶ τ' ἠέλιόν τε” (*Od.* 9.26).

There are three sets of contrasts in spatial orientation here: (a) DSZ are plainly described as being ‘away from’ Ithaca, “ἄνευθε” (*Lfgre* 1955: 820);¹⁰⁴ and this is to be directly contrasted with their extreme closeness to one another, “μάλα σχεδὸν ἀλλήλησι” (Andrews 1962: 18); (b) Ithaca lies to the west, “πρὸς ζόφον” (Andrews 1962: 18), whereas DSZ lie to the east, “πρὸς ἦῶ τ' ἠέλιόν τε”; and, lastly, (c) Ithaca lies farther out to the sea, “πανυπερτάτη εἰν ἀλλὶ κεῖται”, and, therefore, logically, the other three islands are closer to the mainland of Greece. All three of these relative spatial co-ordinates are designed to isolate Ithaca geographically from its closest neighbours through polarized oppositions: (a) farther to neighbouring islands (Ithaca) versus closer to neighbouring islands (DSZ), (b) west (Ithaca) versus east (DSZ), and (c) in the open sea (Ithaca) versus closer to the mainland (DSZ).

(iii) Furthermore, with regard to the second of these, the association between Ithaca’s westwardness and its topographic isolation is achieved through the lack of physical boundaries to the west of the island: in short, Ithaca is given only eastern parameters, the islands of DSZ and the mainland, it is afforded no borders or relative position to the west, apart from the open mass of the sea itself, “πανυπερτάτη εἰν ἀλλὶ κεῖται” (*Od.* 9.25). Ithaca is thus positioned on the very edge of Greek habitation, beyond which lies only the sea, and,

¹⁰⁴ “It lies at a distance from the rest... This again is the only Homeric sense of adverbial ἄνευθε” (Andrews 1962: 18). “ohne Gen. entfernt, in der Ferne, getrennt, beiseite.” (*Lfgre* 1955: 820). For contextual usages, cf. *Lfgre* 1955: 820-821.

ultimately, Oceanus (*Od.* 11.21). In line with my study, Norman Austin (1975: 97) observes a connection between Ithaca's 'westwardness', its 'rugged terrain', and its 'isolation'.

The association between westwardness and isolation in Ithaca becomes clearer upon examining other contexts of western travel in the *Apologue*.¹⁰⁵ The farthest west, “ὕπὸ ζόφον” (*Od.* 11.57), which Odysseus and his men travel is to the very edge of the Ocean, where the Cimmerians live; life among these people exemplifies the literal denotations of westward travel, ‘πρὸς ζόφον’, as ‘lying towards darkness’ (*Lfgre* 1991: 876):

ἦ δ' ἐς πείραθ' ἴκανε βαθυρρόου Ὠκεανοῖο.
ἔνθα δὲ Κιμμερίων ἀνδρῶν δῆμός τε πόλις τε,
ἠέρι καὶ νεφέλη κεκαλυμμένοι· οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτοὺς
Ἥλιος φαέθων καταδέρκεται ἀκτίνεσσιν,
οὔθ' ὀπὸτ' ἂν στείχησι πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα,
οὔθ' ὄτ' ἂν ἄψ ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν προτράπηται,
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ νύξ ὅλοη τέταται δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι.

(*Od.* 11.13-19)

The vessel came to the bounds of eddying Ocean, where lie the land and city of the Cimmerians, covered with mist and cloud. Never does the resplendent sun look on this people with his beams, neither when he climbs towards the stars of heaven nor when once more he comes earthward from the sky; dismal night overhangs these wretches always.

¹⁰⁵ For a general study of western travel in the Greek imagination, cf. Nesselrath 1970: 153-171. Nesselrath (156) tries to show that Odysseus' adventures frequently (apart from the adventure furthest east in Aeaea) take place in the “mysterious West”.

It is here that Odysseus, under Circe's instructions, confronts Teiresias and the various shades of the Underworld. Travel into the extreme west has removed Odysseus from the sphere of human life, into what Dougherty describes as the "ultimate expression of the other" (2001: 98), in the form of the Underworld. Similarly, westward travel, "πρὸς ζόφον" (*Od.* 12.80-81), also takes Odysseus to the cavernous home of Scylla, which entails a radical movement away from a known human environment (cf. pp. 146-149). Austin (1975: 97) emphasizes the fact that, like the Underworld (*Od.* 11.57), Scylla's realm is clouded over, "ἠεροειδέξ" (*Od.* 12.80), a place concealed from our gaze.

In summary, the first *xeinoi* encounter of the *Apologue*, the extra-narrative interaction between Odysseus and his Phaeacian hosts, is characterized by a topographical isolation on the part of the guest, who sets his own home in a geographic periphery. This is achieved (i) through Odysseus' explicit statement to the Phaeacians that his home is far removed (*Od.* 9.18), (ii) through Odysseus' focalization of Ithaca and Mount Neriton from a distance (*Od.* 9.21-22), (iii) through the relative positioning of DSZ (*Od.* 9.22-26), and (iv) through the connotations of Ithaca's 'westwardness' (*Od.* 9.26). The role of (v) the mountainous quality of Ithaca—the presence of Mount Neriton (*Od.* 9.21-22), not to mention the ruggedness of the countryside, "τρηχεῖ" (*Od.* 9.27)—in accentuating this isolation will only be able to be confirmed through subsequent repetition of mountains in the *Apologue*, in scrutiny with their contexts. It should suffice to note here that, apart from the relative positioning of Ithaca, the major quality of the geography which Odysseus describes in this passage is the mountainous aspect of the country.

After their encounters with the Cicones and the Lotus Eaters, the Ithacans sail to the land of the Cyclopes:

Κυκλώπων δ' ἐς γαῖαν ὑπερφιάλων ἀθεμίστων
ικόμεθ', οἳ ῥα θεοῖσι πεποιθότες¹⁰⁶ ἀθανάτοισιν
οὔτε φυτεύουσιν χερσὶν φυτὸν οὔτ' ἀρόωσιν,
ἀλλὰ τὰ γ' ἄσπαρτα καὶ ἀνήροτα πάντα φύονται,
πυροὶ καὶ κριθαὶ ἠδ' ἄμπελοι, αἳ τε φέρουσιν
οἶνον ἐριστάφυλον, καὶ σφιν Διὸς ὄμβρος ἀέξει.
τοῖσιν δ' οὔτ' ἀγοραὶ βουλευφόροι οὔτε θέμιστες,
ἀλλ' οἳ γ' ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ναίουσι κάρηνα
ἐν σπέεσι γλαφυροῖσι, θεμιστεύει δὲ ἕκαστος
παίδων ἠδ' ἀλόχων, οὐδ' ἀλλήλων ἀλέγουσι.

(*Od.* 9.106-115)

Thence we sailed on with downcast hearts. We came to the land of the Cyclops race, arrogant lawless beings who leave their livelihood to the deathless gods and never use their own hands to sow or plough; yet with no sowing and no ploughing, the crops all grow for them—wheat and barley and grapes that yield wine from ample clusters, swelled by the showers of Zeus. They have no assemblies to debate in, they have no ancestral ordinances; they live in arching caves on the tops of high hills, and the head of each family heeds no other, but makes his own ordinances for wife and children.

(Shewring 1980: 101)

¹⁰⁶ As Glenn (1972: 219) identifies, the apparent inconsistency in the Cyclopes' description at *Od.* 9.107 can be explained by the characterizing force of Odysseus as narrator; Odysseus is juxtaposing the Cyclopes' own irreverent attitude and the reality of their existence to indicate their hypocrisy: that, even though they are arrogant towards the Olympians, nevertheless they still benefit and are thus reliant on them.

The next reference to mountains in the *Apologue* occurs in Odysseus' ethnographic prelude to his encounter with the Cyclopes and, in particular, Polyphemus. Home for the anthropophagous ogres lies on the peaks of mountains, inside hollow caves (*Od.* 9.113-114). And whereas the isolation engendered in the description of Ithaca was primarily topographic, the isolation to be associated with the mountainous homes of the Cyclopes is social in effect.

The society of the Cyclopes is described as being without “ἀγοραὶ βουλευφόροι” and “θέμιστες” (*Od.* 9.112). The *agora* was a place of gathering in the Homeric world, a site of collective social interaction, where decisions could be made; thus the noun is partnered with the adjective “βουλευφόροι” (Lowenstam 1993: 146-147). In the *Apologue*, the formula, “καὶ τότ' ἐγὼν ἀγορῆν θέμενος μετὰ πᾶσιν ἔειπον” (*Od.* 9.171, 10.188, 12.319) is used three times for occasions when Odysseus summons his *hetairoi* and gives counsel as to what course of action to take (*Lfgre* 1955: 89). Lowenstam views Odysseus' *agora* at 9.171 as an indication of the “social conventions” (1993: 194) of the Ithacans, to be contrasted with the “isolation” (194) of the Cyclopes, who are without any place of assembly.¹⁰⁷

The fact that the Cyclopes are without “θέμιστες” is a repetition of their earlier characterization as “ἄθεμιστων” (*Od.* 9.106) (Belmont 1962: 166). This lack of *themis*¹⁰⁸ denotes here a general lack of law and order, appropriate for a people who do not have any *agorai*. And, indeed, at the end of the *Apologue*, in a splendid simile, we learn that the *agora* is the correct place where legal judgements are cast:

...ἐελδομένῳ δέ μοι ἦλθον,

¹⁰⁷ Lowenstam (1993: 193-200) contrasts the presence and employment of both the *agora*, the public space, and the *megaron*, the private space, throughout the *Apologue*.

¹⁰⁸ For further readings on *themis*, cf. Hirzel 1966, Rexine 1977: 1-6.

ὄψ' ἦμος δ' ἐπὶ δόρπον ἀνὴρ ἀγορήθεν ἀνέστη
κρίνων νείκεα πολλὰ δικάζομένων αἰζηῶν,

(*Od.* 12.438-440)

That time seemed long to my anxious hopes, but about the hour when a judge in court will hear no more claims from brisk young plaintiffs—when he stands up and goes home to dine...

(Shewring 1980: 153)

In short, the Cyclopes display a lack of social collectivity and order, what Segal terms “rudimentary social organization and isolated nuclear families” (1992: 495). Of interest to this chapter is the particular juxtaposition which lines 112 and 113 display. The negation of “ἀγοραί” and “θέμιστες” leads to an adversative clause, where the antithesis of such social collectivity and order is explained in terms of the natural topography: “ἀλλ' οἳ γ' ὕψηλῶν ὀρέων ναίουσι κάρηνα” (*Od.* 9.113). The Cyclopes do not have assemblies and laws, but rather live on the peaks of high mountains. That a life spent among the mountains leads to social isolation is then further qualified by the ensuing line, “θεμιστεύει δὲ ἕκαστος / παίδων ἠδ' ἀλόχων, οὐδ' ἀλλήλων ἀλέγουσι” (*Od.* 9.114-115). Each patriarch among the Cyclopes only cares for his immediate kin, and does not pay any heed to the rest of the tribe. It is clear that the social behaviour of the Cyclopes is intimately linked with their inhabited topography; thus Anthony Edwards writes, in his study, ‘Homer’s ethical geography: country and city in the *Odyssey*’ (1993):

[Their] lawlessness, violence, lack of communal spirit, and failure to worship the gods finds geographical expression in their isolated life outside the institutions of the πόλις (9.105-115, 187-92).

(33-34)

The first and third of the antisocial characteristics Edwards mentions—“lawlessness” and “lack of communal spirit”—are clearly juxtaposed to mountainous dwellings in the passage (*Od.* 9.112-113); that mountainous isolation also leads to ‘violence’ and to disrespect of the Olympian gods, will be uncovered in the Polyphemus encounter.

I regard the Island of the Goats¹⁰⁹ as essential in characterizing Odysseus’ encounter with the Cyclopes and, later, Polyphemus, in that it emphasizes a tension between the desire to create social order, on the one hand, and to remain isolated, on the other. That the island possesses mountainous terrain is revealed by the type of fauna, “αἴγας ὄρεσκόφους” (*Od.* 9.155), which the Ithacans find there. The only other reference to mountains in the episode, “κορυφὰς ὄρέων” (*Od.* 9.121), pertains to generic mountains outside this island, which hunters customarily frequent. The implication of this contrast is that the landscape of this island, which is teeming with mountain goats (*Od.* 9.118, 155), is strangely alienated from contact with human society, “οὐ μὲν γὰρ πάτος ἀνθρώπων ἀπερύκει” (*Od.* 9.119). Further distancing this island is the presence of the nymphs, who drive the mountain goats into the hands of the sailors (*Od.* 9.154-155).

¹⁰⁹ For a summary of scholarship on this island, cf. Bakker 2013: 60. (i) Reinhardt (1996: 77) views the island as a necessary plot mechanism to get rid of Odysseus’ fleet, although this does not account for the descriptive length of the episode (cf. Byre 1994b: 357). (ii) For Reece (1993: 127) the island provides a bridge between the original landlocked folktale of the ogre and the nautical wanderers of Odysseus’ tale. (iii) Clay (1980: 261-264) has suggested that the island might originally have been occupied by the Phaeacians, prior to their colonization of Scheria.

The isolation of the Island of the Goats, its historical removal from human contact, has an important function in the story; and herein it is important to compare and contrast the approach of (i) Odysseus and then (ii) the Cyclopes to this island (de Jong 2004a: 234). (i) The utter lack of human development on the Island of the Goats becomes a means for the colonist's eye to imagine the possibilities for human society in this land: "much of the description consists of comments about what the island is not, and about what it might be or could have been" (cf. *Od.* 9.119-135) (Byre 1994b: 358; cf. de Jong 2004a: 234, Edwards 1993: 28, Reinhardt 1996: 78; *contra* Louden 2011a: 181). (ii) Odysseus' 'plans' for the island are matched by the Cyclopean lack of interest in making use of this land (Kirk 1970: 165). These reclusive individuals are uninterested in expanding their 'society' so as to reach other lands and/or meet foreign communities. This isolated behaviour is all the more pertinent, considering the natural advantages which the island could hold for the giants:

Everything conspires to encourage the exploring interest [for the Cyclopes and Polyphemus]: the island is only a short distance off, it is unclaimed territory, it has besides its abundance of goats a good water supply, and, final irony, it has the absolutely ideal harbour where stern cables are never necessary... the paradise across the bay is not even a mystery to them.

(Austin 1975: 145)

Austin (1975: 144-145), in particular, contrasts the natural crop-based agriculture of the Cyclopean island (*Od.* 9.109-111) with the wilderness of the Island of the Goats, which is more suitable for a hunter-gatherer existence (*Od.* 9.120), or, otherwise the farming of livestock. Whereas Polyphemus and the Cyclopes have failed to take full advantage of the

crops on their own island,¹¹⁰ they have, conversely, ignored the potential of the nearby Island of the Goats, which would be far more suited to their characteristic skills in animal husbandry (Austin 1975: 144-146). For Austin (144-146) these are indications of the Cyclopes' characteristic lack of intellectual curiosity. But it is also indicative of their hermit-like existence, of their disinclination to explore new lands or societies, like Odysseus does, and their contentment to remain in their mountains.

Some critics have doubted the extent to which the Island of the Goats is meant to be contrasted with the land of the Cyclopes. Byre (1994b: 360) argues that the Cyclopean land is rich enough already (*Od.* 9.108-111), without the giants needing to consider alternative locales. Similarly, Mondì writes:

Why should the Cyclopes want to settle, or even visit the island?... While the island is the perfect place for habitation relative to the real world, the mainland life of the Cyclopes as described in 107-15 is something even better—an otherworldly paradise.

(1983: 27)

I have two answers to Mondì's question. Firstly, and concretely, as Austin (1983) recognizes, Polyphemus is obsessed with his flock of sheep and goats: his home is arranged with pedantic precision around his utensils for producing milk and cheese (*Od.* 9.218-223); he spends his days in the fields shepherding his flocks (*Od.* 9.187-188) (rather than, for example, indulging in the abundant crops which grow in this "paradise" [Mondì 1983: 27]); he even talks to his sheep, and the ogre's most tender, vulnerable moment is viewed in his, rather one-sided,

¹¹⁰ Although Zeus has provided them with wine-bearing grapes (*Od.* 9.110-111), their lack of *technē* results in a poor yield of wine (*Od.* 9.355-359) (Austin 1975: 145). Austin sees the Cyclopes' lack of "curiosity about cereal agriculture" (145) as critical in leading to Polyphemus' falling prey to the strong wine of Maron.

conversation with his favourite ram (*Od.* 9.447-460). To answer Mondī's question, I cannot imagine a more perfect paradise for a dairy farmer like Polyphemus than the Island of the Goats, where the flocks are 'innumerable' (*Od.* 9.118).

Secondly, and more rhetorically, Mondī's question seems focalized from the perspective of a Cyclops—it is just how a solitary Cyclops would phrase the topic of exploration, not the curious Odysseus (*Od.* 9.229) or the more cosmopolitan Phaeacians (*Od.* 8.557-563)—and this does rather prove Norman Austin's point. Whether the island has advantages for the Cyclopes, as Austin claims (and my analysis concurs), or whether it doesn't, as Mondī claims, can never be known by the Cyclopes, because they live such a solitary, confined existence. Mondī thus assumes the imaginary scenario whereby these giants would have knowledge, and could therefore exhibit a logical choice ("why should the Cyclopes *want*" [27]) about whether they want to inhabit the land. Their lack of utilization of the island is not indicative of a concerted choice, but is a consequence of their characteristic isolation.

The next *xeinoi* encounter is that between Odysseus and Polyphemus:

ἔνθα δ' ἀνήρ ἐνίαυε πελώριος, ὅς ῥα τὰ μῆλα
οἶος ποιμαίνεσκεν ἀπόπροθεν· οὐδὲ μετ' ἄλλους
πωλεῖτ', ἀλλ' ἀπάνευθεν ἐὼν ἀθεμίστια ἦδη.
καὶ γὰρ θαῦμ' ἐτέτυκτο πελώριον, οὐδὲ ἐώκει
ἀνδρὶ γε σιτοφάγῳ, ἀλλὰ ρίψ' ὑλήεντι
ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων, ὃ τε φαίνεται οἶον ἀπ' ἄλλων.

(*Od.* 9.187-192)

Here was the sleeping-place of a giant who used to pasture his flocks far afield, alone; it was not his way to visit the others of his tribe; he kept aloof, and his mind was set on unrighteousness. A monstrous ogre, unlike any man who had ever tasted bread, he resembled rather some shaggy peak in a mountain range, standing out clear, away from the rest.

(Shewring 1980: 103)

In this descriptive preamble to the encounter with the one-eyed ogre, Polyphemus is emphatically characterized as an isolated figure: he shepherds his flock alone, “οἶος”, and far away, “ἀπόπροθεν” (*Od.* 9.188; cf. 9.315); he has no contact with other people, “μετ' ἄλλους” (*Od.* 9.188); he is far away, “ἀπάνευθεν” (*Od.* 9.189); and like his Cyclopean brethren (*Od.* 9.106, 112), he is marked out for his lack of social order, “ἀθεμίστια” (*Od.* 9.189) (Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989: 25). In short, the context builds up his isolation, both geographic, shepherding his flock in a far removed territory, and social, alienated from contact with his fellows. In the context of this isolation, I deem it highly appropriate that the ogre is compared to a mountain in a simile. And, significantly, the simile itself extrapolates this sense of isolation from the context of the preceding passage: Polyphemus is likened to a solitary peak among high mountains, which appears apart from the rest (*Od.* 9.191-192) (Stanford 1996: 355).¹¹¹

Furthermore, there are points of contact in the language used to describe the earlier dwellings of the Cyclopes—“οἳ γ' ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ναίουσι κάρηνα” (*Od.* 9.113)—and the Polyphemus mountain simile—“ἀλλὰ ῥίω ὑλήεντι / ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων” (*Od.* 9.191-92). The two genitive plurals are identical and ‘κάρηνα’ (*Od.* 9.113) corresponds in sense to ‘ῥίω’ (*Od.* 9.191), as peaks of these mountains. There is in fact a progression in the isolated force of

¹¹¹ For another lonely mountain in the *Apologue*, cf. 11.574.

mountains between these two passages, which becomes more emphatic in the latter passage. While at line 113 there is a strong sense that the isolated topography of the land has shaped the social character of its inhabitants, in that mountains are the locative antithesis of the social space of the *agora* and accordingly turn mountain-dwellers into solitary recluses, remarkably at lines 191-192 one of these Cyclopes has, in a passage highlighting his antisocial habits, been figuratively transformed into an actual mountain.

The mountain simile connotes both topographic and social isolation. Firstly, topographic isolation occurs because the spatial image of the distant mountain peak reminds us that Polyphemus himself is a mountain-dweller, his home is in the ranges, like his fellow Cyclopes (cf. *Od.* 9.113, 315, 400, 481), and thus the landscape of geographical isolation in the metaphor can easily be transferred to Polyphemus' own literal dwelling by the audience—that is to say, the simile reminds us that he is not only like a solitary mountain, but that he lives in such a solitary mountain. And, secondly, the simile connotes social isolation through the force of the comparison in the context of Polyphemus' described removal from the other Cyclopes (*Od.* 9.187-189): just as the mountain peak is geographically removed from all others, so Polyphemus as an individual is alone from all others. In essence, through the simile, the land and its inhabitants have become fused: topographic (dwellings) and social isolation (individuals) combine. The relationship between the character of the land and its inhabitants in the Homeric world has been most eloquently phrased by Norman Austin:

Space is... invested with spiritual quality. External aspects of nature and the inner world of human experience function in indivisible harmony. Man's movement, his gesture even, is a declaration of that harmony between inner and outer.

(1975: 102; cf. Cook 1995: 54)

The isolation which characterizes Polyphemos plays an important role later in Book 9, in the giant's interactions with his fellow Cyclopes. The mountain simile foreshadows the later abandonment of Polyphemos by his neighbours. In the references to mountains which I have tackled thus far and will examine later, there is no such attempt to distinguish a part of a mountain from its whole in quite the manner of this simile (*Od.* 9.191-192): where the singular noun, “ῥίω” (*Od.* 9.191), is followed firstly by a partitive genitive, “ὕψηλῶν ὀρέων” (*Od.* 9.192), and then by a relative clause where another genitive, this time of separation, “ἀπ' ἄλλων”, distances itself from the singular, “οἶον”, peak (*Od.* 9.192). While the solitary peak in the simile is meant to characterize Polyphemos, the phrase “ὕψηλῶν ὀρέων... ἀπ' ἄλλων” (*Od.* 9.192) represents the other Cyclopes. One should consider, in this respect, the repetition of ἄλλος, between ‘ἄλλους’ in “οὐδὲ μετ' ἄλλους / πωλεῖτ’” (*Od.* 9.188-189), ‘the other [implied] Cyclopes’ and “ἀπ' ἄλλων” (*Od.* 9.192) in the simile, ‘the other mountains’. The surrounding mountains are similarly othered from Polyphemos’ peak, as he others himself from his neighbours, the Cyclopes, in his daily life.

This isolation of Polyphemos from his Cyclopean brethren reaches its plot fulfilment, the ‘pay-off’, in the scene of his blinding, where, when he cries for help from his neighbours (*Od.* 9.399-400), and informs them of ‘Nobody’s’ assault (*Od.* 9.408),¹¹² his countrymen proceed to distance themselves from him (Newton 2008: 1, Segal 1992: 495),¹¹³ diagnosing

¹¹² “His solitary nature prepares for the pathos of the ‘No One’ trick (which leaves him alone with his agony) and the address to his ram (the one living being he is attached to)” (de Jong 2004a: 236).

¹¹³ Segal also relates the attitude of the Cyclopes here (*Od.* 9.399-412) as indicative of their earlier characterization as anti-social beings, who hold no congress with each other (*Od.* 9.115): “Eager to get to sleep in their individual caves (*Od.* 9.401-404), they readily accept his story about “Nobody” as an excuse to dismiss his complaint.” (1992: 495). Against the interpretation of the Cyclopes and Polyphemos as isolated, cf. Newton 2008: 1-2, 7-9.

his characteristic isolation as a significant symptom in his malady and, conversely, spending very little time themselves in attending to his pains, a total of three lines of sympathy:

ἔει μὲν δὴ μή τις σε βιάζεται οἶον ἔόντα,
νοῦσόν γ' οὐ πως ἔστι Διὸς μεγάλου ἀλέασθαι,
ἀλλὰ σύ γ' εὖχεο πατρὶ Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι.'

(*Od.* 9.410-412)

If no man is doing you violence—if you are alone—then this is a malady sent by almighty Zeus from which there is no escape; you had best say a prayer to your father, Lord Poseidon.

(Shewring 1980: 109)

For the other Cyclopes the fact that nobody, “μή τις” (*Od.* 9.410), has harmed Polyphemos comes as no surprise, seeing that he is known to be so reclusive an individual, “οἶον ἔόντα” (*Od.* 9.410)—“οἶον” referring back to its earlier repetition (*Od.* 9.188, 192). There is no great expression of sympathy nor offering of assistance from them; instead, the solitary ogre is lectured in a few curt lines, before they walk off, as to the cause of his malady—the wrath of Zeus, “Διὸς μεγάλου” (*Od.* 9.411)—and he is instructed to pray to his father, Poseidon, “εὖχεο πατρὶ Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι” (*Od.* 9.412), and, by implication, not look to them for any help.

Polyphemos’ attitude to Zeus, the king of the gods, and Poseidon, his father, is an important component in the ogre’s being characterized as socially isolated, and must be interrogated further here. That Polyphemos is anti-Zeus and pro-Poseidon can be observed

without too great a difficulty in Book 9. After Odysseus has requested the ogre's hospitality (*Od.* 9.259-271), Polyphemus blatantly states:

νήπιός εἰς, ὦ ξεῖν', ἢ τηλόθεν εἰλήλουθας,
ὄς με θεοὺς κέλειαι ἢ δειδίμεν ἢ ἀλέασθαι.
οὐ γὰρ Κύκλωπες Διὸς αἰγιόχου ἀλέγουσιν
οὐδὲ θεῶν μακάρων, ἐπεὶ ἢ πολὺ φέρτεροί εἰμεν

(*Od.* 9.273-276)

Stranger, you must be a fool or have come from far afield if you tell me to fear the gods or beware of them. We of the Cyclops race care nothing for Zeus and for his aegis; we care for none of the gods in heaven, being much stronger ourselves than they are.

(Shewring 1980: 105)

Conversely, Polyphemus' love and trust in his father, Poseidon, can be observed at several points in the narrative. When Odysseus has taunted Polyphemus for his crimes and is endeavouring to sail away from his land (for the second time) with the latter's livestock (*Od.* 9.487-505), Polyphemus tries to tempt the Ithacan hero back to the island by offering the Greeks the assistance of Poseidon, in expediting their journey home (*Od.* 9.517-521). Odysseus naturally does not fall into the trap and reacts with not a little hybris himself to the ogre's request:

αἶ γὰρ δὴ ψυχῆς τε καὶ αἰῶνός σε δυναίμην
εὖνιν ποιήσας πέμψαι δόμον Ἄϊδος εἶσω,

ὥς οὐκ ὀφθαλμόν γ' ἰήσεται οὐδ' ἐνοσίχθων

(*Od.* 9.523-525)

Would that I were assured as firmly that I could rob you of life and being and send you down to Hades' house as I am assured that no one shall heal that eye of yours, not the Earthshaker himself.

(Shewring 1980: 111)

In turn, Polyphemus, distraught at his being defeated by the cunning of Odysseus, invokes his father in a prayer for the hero's destruction (*Od.* 9.528-535). The final rather ominous word we hear on this matter is that Poseidon gave heed to the prayer (*Od.* 9.536).

Of greater interest to this chapter, however, is what these divine allegiances connote in the *Apologue* in terms of the behaviour of the giant. Odysseus' exchange with Polyphemus, as Steve Reece (1993: 123-143) has shown, is an example of the ritual of *xenia* gone wrong—both on the part of Polyphemus and, as is frequently overlooked, Odysseus. When Odysseus has entered the cave of Polyphemus with his chosen comrades, he insists that they await their host, in the hope of garnering “ξείνια” (*Od.* 9.229), guest-gifts—this despite the hero's having already passed through the threshold of his host, without having been granted permission (*Od.* 9.216-217), and having helped himself to the giant's victuals (*Od.* 9.231-232). Later, when Polyphemus has returned home and, rather ominously, seals the entrance with a massive rock (*Od.* 9.240-243), Odysseus confirms his earlier desire by requesting that the giant offer them the gifts of the host, “ξεινήϊον” (*Od.* 9.267):

...ἡμεῖς δ' αὖτε κιχανόμενοι τὰ σὰ γούνα

ικόμεθ', εἴ τι πόροις ξεινήϊον ἦε καὶ ἄλλως

δοίης δωτίνην, ἥ τε ξείνων θέμις ἐστίν.
ἀλλ' αἰδεῖο, φέριστε, θεούς· ἰκέται δέ τοί εἰμεν.
Ζεὺς δ' ἐπιτιμήτωρ ἰκετάων τε ξείνων τε,
ξείνιος, ὃς ξείνοισιν ἄμ' αἰδοίοισιν ὀπηδεῖ.'

(*Od.* 9.266-271)

We have reached your presence, come to your knees in supplication, to receive, we hope, your friendly favour, to receive perhaps some such present as custom expects from host to guest. Sir, I beg you to reverence the gods. We are suppliants, and Zeus himself is the champion of suppliants and of guests; 'god of guests' is a name of his; guests are august, and Zeus goes with them."

(Shewring 1980: 105)

This passage illustrates, significantly, that *xenia* cannot simply be translated by the secular English rendering of 'hospitality'. The host-guest relationship has a religious and ethical element to it which Odysseus makes abundantly clear to Polyphemus. They are approaching his knees, "τὰ σὰ γοῦνα" (*Od.* 9.266), in the ritualistic manner of suppliants seeking religious sanctuary (Gould 1973: 76, Pedrick 1982: 126-127).¹¹⁴ Secondly, the act of receiving guests and bestowing gifts upon them is described by Odysseus as the "ξείνων θέμις" (*Od.* 9.268), the 'divine right of guests'; "θέμις" is often used in the Homeric corpus to refer to a universal moral law, often governed by a divine hand (Fuqua 1991: 53-54, Muellner 1996: 35-37). This is, moreover, proven in the context of this passage by the logic of the language: Odysseus declares "ξεινήϊον ἠὲ καὶ ἄλλως / δοίης δωτίνην, ἥ τε ξείνων θέμις ἐστίν" (*Od.* 9.268) and

¹¹⁴ For further discussions of supplication in the Homeric poems and Ancient Greek society, cf. Adkins 1972: 16-18, Roisman 1982: 35-36, Thornton 1984: 113-142, Wilson 2002: 28-29.

then two lines later, “Ζεὺς δ' ἐπιτιμήτωρ ἰκετάων τε ξείνων τε” (*Od.* 9.270). If guest-gifts are the *themis* of *xeinoi*, and *xeinoi* are protected by Zeus—then, logically, *themis* invokes a divine aspect in its denotation of the law. Thirdly, Odysseus explicitly refers to his men as suppliants, “ἰκέται δέ τοί εἰμεν” (*Od.* 9.269).¹¹⁵ And fourthly, Zeus is himself given the epithet, “ξείνιος” (*Od.* 9.271), and is charged with looking after the welfare of *xeinoi* and *hiketai*, and avenging them if wronged, “ἐπιτιμήτωρ” (*Od.* 9.270) (cf. *Il.* 13.624) (Tsagarakis 1977: 24-27).

So, in the context of the poem, *xenia* connotes more than simply receiving a guest. There is an ethical realization that this relationship between host and guest is not a mere social nicety, but is an old ritual ingrained with religious reverence, particularly to Zeus (Tsagarakis 1977: 25),¹¹⁶ the violation of which is considered a blasphemous crime, analogous to slaying a man who seeks sanctuary in a temple. Polyphemus’ defiant stance towards Zeus and the Olympians (*Od.* 9.273-276) is therefore indicative, in the context of this interaction, of a certain social orientation, or, better, antisocial orientation. To spurn Zeus is to spurn social reciprocity, as embedded, among other social acts (Tsagarakis 1977: 19-24), in the ritual of *xenia*.

On the basis of the evidence discussed above it would seem that Zeus punishes specific offences, those which posed to community life a greater danger than others; these must have been older and entered the field of religion when organized social and religious life began.

(Tsagarakis 1977: 25)

¹¹⁵ On the close relationship between *xeinoi* and suppliants, the acts of hospitality and supplication, cf. Gould 1973: 78-79, 90-94.

¹¹⁶ Cf. *Il.* 13.624-625, *Od.* 6.207-208, 14.402-406.

Polyphemus has no need for Zeus, and thus organized social structures, because he believes the Cyclopes to be “φέρτεροι” (*Od.* 9.276); they are physically strong enough to look after themselves, without any recourse to social reciprocity. Polyphemus is an isolated individual.¹¹⁷

The connotations of the ogre’s anti-Zeus sentiments are complemented by the connotations of his pro-Poseidon (pro-paternal) sentiments. Whereas in the *Odyssey* Zeus, among his various divine roles (cf. Tsagarakis 1977: 1-19, 27-33),¹¹⁸ is often motivated towards ensuring social justice among men, including punishing those who break oaths, who mistreat suppliants, and who abuse strangers (Tsagarakis 1977: 19-27), Poseidon seems to act in a more isolationist, “private” (Lloyd-Jones 1983: 29; cf. Friedrich 1991: 16), or alienating manner.¹¹⁹ On this point, I note that the *Odyssey* itself commences with the god of the seas in

¹¹⁷ Segal (1992: 501-502) has compared the social isolation of Polyphemus’ existence—his lonely dwelling and his spurning of Zeus and hospitality—to Maron, the priest of Apollo, who bestows Odysseus the wine which helps to defeat Polyphemus; Maron lives in a close-knitted human household, respects the gods, and engages in hospitality (*Od.* 9.196-207).

¹¹⁸ It is important not to oversimplify the complexity of each of the major gods in the Homeric poems (Allan 2006: 25, Fenik 1974: 211, Friedrich 1991: 19). For example, Tsagarakis’ characterization of the king of the Olympians demonstrates the multiple roles which were bestowed upon Zeus in the Homeric poems, including, being: (i) the mightiest of the gods (1977: 1-8), (ii) a helper of men (8-14), (iii) a bearer of pain (14-19) (cf. Fenik 1974: 222), (iv) a guardian against injustice (19-27), and (v) a co-operator with the other gods (27-33) (cf. Allan 2006: 19-20, 23). In the *Odyssey*, the combination of iii with iv and v is particularly vexing for those who desire a simplistic, benevolent portrayal of Zeus. On a notable problem in the characterization of Zeus in the *Apologue*, cf. fn. below, and p. 187.

¹¹⁹ As demonstrated in the previous footnote, problems can be encountered when trying to enforce too great a consistency in the characterization of a god in the *Odyssey*. (i) Thus one depiction of Poseidon which goes against his characterization as a solitary figure is his role in the mythic song of Demodocus (*Od.* 8.344-348),

topographical isolation from the rest of the gods, removed from the site of the council of the gods and dislocated in the far-removed territory of Ethiopia (*Od.* 1.22-26) (Cook 1995: 20-21):

There are really only two regions in Homeric space: the region of the sun and dawn and the opposite region of sunset and darkness. Only between these does Homer draw contrasts. The Ethiopians inhabit the two extremities of the earth, some living at the setting of the sun, the others at its rising (*Od.* 1.24)

where he is, to quote Segal, a “spokesman of flexibility and forgiveness” (1992: 499; cf. Allan 2006: 22). Segal (498-499), however, suggests that this idyllic characterization is limited to the secondary narration of the bard—a false depiction, the error of which the Phaeacians will later learn after they have dropped off Odysseus back in Ithaca. (ii) On the subject of Poseidon’s benevolence, one might also measure his isolationist persona in the *Odyssey* against his more amicable depiction in the *Iliad*, where he is a helper of the Greeks (in opposition to Zeus’ aid of the Trojans), and where his role as a god of the sea—alongside any associations with the primordial, savage dangers which the sea represents (cf. p. 77)—is somewhat less important, cf. Erbse 1986: 102-115. Thus Hartmut Erbse concludes that Poseidon’s characterization in the *Iliad* is marked out by “Menschlichkeit” (115) and “Liebenswürdigkeit” (115). Certainly, it would be difficult to characterize the god in so positive a manner in the *Odyssey*, seeing that even the Phaeacians, the most faithful supporters of Poseidon in the poem, eventually experience the wrath of their patron god (*Od.* 13.159-164) (cf. iv below). (iii) Any contrast between Zeus and Poseidon, and the type of behaviour they represent in the *Odyssey* (social justice for men versus personal wrath), needs to account for the bizarre behaviour of the king of the gods at *Od.* 9.550-555, namely “Zeus’ rejection of Odysseus’ thanksgiving sacrifice... and the implied sanctioning of Poseidon’s unfair persecution of the hero: why would Zeus, of all gods, go along so readily with the sea god’s primitive wrath at a mortal who acted who acted in self-defence against a brutal violator of Zeus’ own laws of hospitality?” (Friedrich 1991: 17). (cf. fn. 187) (iv) Another problem is Zeus’ condoning of Poseidon’s vengeance against the Phaeacians (*Od.* 13.125-158), whose crime was nothing more heinous than showing excessive hospitality to strangers, by offering them ferry rides home (Allan 2006: 18-19).

Secondly, Odysseus' isolation from Greek society during his wanderings is attributable on one memorable occasion to Poseidon's hostile vengeance, who tries to push the hero away from returning to the known Greek world (*Od.* 5.282-296). Poseidon's attitude is in this way far removed from that of the other Olympians. At the start of the epic we are informed of the great hatred he holds towards Odysseus, which is to be contrasted with the more benevolent, pitying stance adopted by the other gods (Segal 1992: 490-491; cf. Cook 1995: 20-23):

...θεοὶ δ' ἐλέαιρον ἅπαντες
νόσφι Ποσειδάωνος· ὁ δ' ἀσπερχὲς μενέαινε
ἀντιθέῳ Ὀδυσῆϊ πάρος ἦν γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι.

(*Od.* 1.19-21)

For though all the gods beside had compassion on him, Poseidon's anger was unabated against the hero until he returned to his own land.

(Shewring 1980: 1)

Isolated from the other gods, Poseidon is cast at once into the role of the "other," the blockading force or obstacle to Odysseus' return and to Zeus' will.

(Segal 1992: 491)

¹²⁰ For further discussion on the thematic and symbolic importance of the land of the Ethiopians, cf. Tsagalis 2012: 147-148.

The divine assembly is framed, not by Poseidon’s hatred for Odysseus, but by his isolation and opposition to the collective will of the other gods.

(Cook 1995: 23)

Segal (1992: 491, fn. 5) remarks further that Poseidon’s isolation from the will of the other gods is accentuated by the employment of “νόσφι” (Od. 1.20) at the start of a verse and in partnership with a proper noun, both of which are unique to the *Odyssey*. Moreover Cook (1995: 20) observes that “νόσφι” is typically employed to denote physical removal in the Homeric poems, and this is the only instance in the *Odyssey* in which it reflects a psychological distance; the resulting effect seems to be that Poseidon’s topographic and social (or, better, divine) isolation are closely linked in this passage (Cook 1995: 20).¹²¹

Thirdly, Poseidon, on account of his mythological paternal record, as the father of numerous primordial monsters who are hostile to the Olympian gods, can be associated with an older order, more primitive form of power (Segal 1992: 497); that is to say, Poseidon is temporally removed from the current state of affairs in the Greek world, the “here and now of Zeus’ reign” (Segal 1992: 498; *contra* Allan 2006: 15-27).

Fourthly, and of particular interest to this study of mountains and isolation, is Poseidon’s threat against the Phaeacians. Alcinous recounts Poseidon’s threat at the end of Book 8, right before Odysseus commences his narration:

ἀλλὰ τόδ' ὡς ποτε πατρὸς ἐγὼν εἰπόντος ἄκουσα
Ναυσιθόου, ὃς ἔφασκε Ποσειδάων' ἀγάσασθαι
ἡμῖν, οὐνεκα πομποὶ ἀπήμονές εἰμεν ἀπάντων·
φῆ ποτε Φαιήκων ἀνδρῶν περικαλλέα νῆα

¹²¹ (i) For the rivalry between Zeus and Poseidon in the *Iliad*, cf. Muellner 1996: 28-31.

ἐκ πομπῆς ἀνιοῦσαν ἐν ἡεροιδεῖι πόντῳ
ῥαϊσέμεναι, μέγα δ' ἤμιν ὄρος πόλει ἀμφικαλύψειν.

(*Od.* 8.564-569)

True, there is a certain tradition which I once heard from Nausithous my father. He said that Poseidon was angry with us because we took home all manner of men without coming to any harm; and hence, one day, when some nobly built ship of ours was returning from such an errand over the misty sea, Poseidon would shatter it and would block our town with a massy mountain.

(Shewring 1980: 98)

Poseidon, angry that the Scherians are rendering his tempestuous seas a little too easy to cross (undermining an important part of his identity as a sea god), threatens to put a stop to their easy-going movements across the seas by smashing a ship and through wrapping a great mountain around their city, “μέγα... ὄρος πόλει” (*Od.* 8.569). One should note the isolation implied by the verb, “ἀμφικαλύψειν” (*Od.* 8.569): Scheria, if this mountainous threat were to be carried out, would be geographically concealed from the rest of the world, ‘veiled all around’, removed from sight; furthermore, the characteristic sea-trade and voyaging of the Phaeacians, their fondness for visiting foreign shores (*Od.* 8.557-563), would also be hindered, and thus the mountain would entail social isolation for the residents of Scheria.

That Poseidon should use a mountain as a means to conceal and isolate is reflected in another passage in the *Apologue*, in the catalogue of heroines in Book 11. In love with the river god, Epineus, Tyro is taken to bed by Poseidon in the guise of her lover:

τῷ δ' ἄρα εἰσάμενος γαίηοχος ἐννοσίγαιος

ἐν προχοῆς ποταμοῦ παρελέξατο δινήεντος·
πορφύρεον δ' ἄρα κῦμα περιστάθη οὔρεϊ ἴσον,
κυρτωθέν, κρύψεν δὲ θεὸν θνητὴν τε γυναῖκα.

(*Od.* 11.241-244)

But in place of Epineus, and in his likeness, there came the god who sustains and shakes the earth. He lay with her at the mouth of the eddying river, and a surging wave, mountain-high, curled over them and concealed the god and the mortal girl.

(Shewring 1980: 133)

Just as Poseidon threatened to use a mountain to hide and isolate the Phaeacians, so here Tyro and the god himself are concealed (a form of the verb *kryptein* is again used) by a mountain-like wave, removed from the scrutiny of all potential passers-by. It might be argued here that ‘οὔρεϊ ἴσον’ (*Od.* 11.243)¹²² is the type of short formulaic simile which carries very little or no functional value to the storytelling: that it merely denotes a graphic image of a mountain, without any further connotations of ‘being isolated’ (Scott 1974: 81, 120-121). Still, connotations are constructed via repetition in similar contexts, and the reference to a mountain in this short anecdote, in tandem with a verb of concealment, complements the sense of isolation pursued in this chapter.

It is appropriate at this point to examine a more common critical connotation of mountains in the Homeric poems. Scott, in *The oral nature of the Homeric simile* (1974), classifies the above simile (*Od.* 11.243) under what he calls the “thematic context of measurement similes” (21); in other words, such a simile is useful in lending a sense of scale

¹²² Cf. *Od.* 3.290.

(here, 'height') to a character¹²³ or event but has no broader aesthetic effect on our appreciation of the narrative:

[A] modern critic requires many extended similes with adequate parallels [to make intratextual-type comments on the narrative effect of similes], both of which the *Odyssey* lacks, the number of similes being only about one-third that of the *Iliad*. Because the plots of the two poems are so different, the number of parallel instances which can be taken from the *Iliad* and applied to the *Odyssey* is slight. Second, sixty percent of the similes in the *Odyssey* are short, and for the most part it is impossible to ascertain the intent of the poet in singing a short simile. Waves as big as mountains or mountain-sized people do not lend any ascertainable atmospheric touch to the narrative but they merely express size...

(120-121)

I concur with Scott in that if I were to limit my analysis purely to similes in the *Odyssey*, I might, owing to their relative paucity, be lending a tendentious touch to my interpretation. In this chapter, however, I am examining word associations throughout the spatial world of the *Apologue*, and not isolating similes formally from the rest of the narrative space, which therefore provides a much broader scope for analysis. I agree with Scott that mountains do indicate scale, but if we examine the total contexts in which they occur, talking about mountains as connoting only an immense scale becomes problematic. For example, while it is appropriate that a mountain simile is used of Polyphemus (*Od.* 9.191-192), since he is a massive ogre (de Jong 2004a: 236), and while it is also apt that giants like the Cyclopes and Laestrygonians live in mountainous terrains (*Od.* 9.113, 10.104)—it is not clear that Mount

¹²³ Scott (1974:23) provides a similar explanation for the Polyphemus mountain simile.

Neriton on Ithaca (*Od.* 9.22), the implied mountain on the Island of the Goats, or the *skopiē* on Circe's island (*Od.* 10.148) are in any way indicative of the size of the inhabitants of these lands. In other words, topography does not reflect character in a purely scalar manner when it comes to mountains. Even if we limit ourselves to investigating only the similes, as Scott does, his reading of the Polyphemus simile ignores the context of isolation in which the simile occurs, and how this isolation carries over into the actual simile. The peak is emphasized for being removed from all others, not for being particularly taller than other mountains in the range.

Having established the connotations of Polyphemus' allegiance to Poseidon, I shall turn to two other references to mountainous space which occurs in this episode in Book 9 (*Od.* 9.292, 481). The connotations of the first of these is quite problematic to unravel. After the anthropophagous ogre has ripped apart two of Odysseus' men (*Od.* 9.288-291), the hero describes the giant as akin to a mountain lion, "ὥς τε λέων ὄρεσίτροφος" (*Od.* 9.292). Does a mountain lion connote a particularly solitary kind of animal? On the surface, it seems applicable that Polyphemus, a mountain dweller and one likened previously to a mountain himself, should be compared to such a beast; I would, however, be reluctant to push too far any associations of mountainous space in this noun-adjective phrase on two counts: (i) lions have their own set of contextual associations in the Homeric poems, and (ii) other references to mountain lions in the *Odyssey* occur in quite paradoxical contexts.

On the first count, lions have a strong association in the *Iliadic* text with martial contexts and are used to express the various emotions which warriors feel (Scott 1974: 58-62). In the violence of the present passage (*Od.* 9.288-293), the savagery and ferocity of Polyphemus is broadly applicable to the common bellicose connotations of lions in the poems (Scott 1974: 58-62). One would therefore have to ask to what extent 'the mountain lion' is differentiated from 'the non-mountain lion' in the *Odyssey*, so as to argue that the former has

a more specialized association of isolation. Here, unfortunately, one arrives at the second difficulty in unpacking this phrase, since the creature only occurs on two other occasions in the poem: firstly, when Odysseus, naked, confronts the group of Phaeacians girls, including Nausicaa, at the beach (*Od.* 6.130-136); and, secondly, when Eurylochus witnesses the wolves and mountain lions, “ὀρέστεροι ἢ δὲ λέοντες” (*Od.* 10.212), before Circe’s home. In both of these instances, the lions are acting unusually, quite differently to Polyphemus as fierce ‘mountain lion’: Odysseus’ ‘vulnerable’ state and his being surrounded by young maidens could hardly be said to be suitable to a violent context—in fact, the simile seems both erotic and parodic in effect (cf. Glenn 1998, Rutherford 2001: 139-140);¹²⁴ and the point of Circe’s lions is that they are domesticated because of her magic, and that their behaviour is quintessentially un-lion like.

Nevertheless, whether or not the mountain lion reference is relevant, in the present passage (*Od.* 9.288-293) Polyphemus’ dietary habits do entail a certain removal from the rest of society and movement towards solitary individualism. Important in this respect is the employment of eating as a measure of human interaction in the epic. When Polyphemus is first compared to a solitary mountain peak, it is framed in oppositional terms to a previous simile, “οὐδὲ ἐφκει / ἀνδρὶ γε σιτοφάγῳ” (9.190-191); while solitary behaviour is measured by a mountainous landscape (*Od.* 9.191-192), human society is defined by its eating habits, “σιτοφάγῳ”, ‘bread-eating’. When Polyphemus proves himself not to be a *sitophagos*, but *anthrōpophagos*, he is transformed at this time, appropriately, into a mountain dweller, a lion—in short, a creature who lives in topographical isolation is an apt *comparandum* for an ogre who shuns normal social interaction, eating people rather than bread.

¹²⁴ Although, according to Magrath, the lion in the simile at *Od.* 6.130-136 is “prone to violence, driven by maddening hunger, desperately in search of flesh-meat... the simile is immediately appropriate to Odysseus’ shipwrecked, famished condition.” (1982: 207).

The final reference to mountains in Book 9 occurs when Odysseus' ship endeavours to make its escape from Polyphemus, and the Ithacan hero proceeds to lecture the ogre in his failure to understand proper *xeinoi* relations:

ἽΚύκλωψ, οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες ἀνάλκιδος ἀνδρὸς ἑταίρους
ἔδμεναι ἐν σπηΐ γλαφυρῷ κρατερῆφι βίηφι.
καὶ λίην σέ γ' ἔμελλε κιχήσεσθαι κακὰ ἔργα,
σχέτλι', ἐπεὶ ξείνους οὐχ ἄζεο σῶ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ
ἐσθέμεναι· τῷ σε Ζεὺς τείσατο καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι·
ὣς ἐφάμην, ὁ δ' ἔπειτα χολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον·
ἦκε δ' ἀπορρήξας κορυφὴν ὄρεος μέγαλοιο,
κάδ δ' ἔβαλε προπάραιθε νεὸς κυανοπρώροιο

(*Od.* 9.475-482)

“Cyclops, your prisoner after all was to prove not quite defenceless—the man whose friends you devoured so brutally in your cave. No, your sins were to find you out. You felt no shame to devour your guests in your own home; hence this requital from Zeus and the other gods.” Rage rose up in him at my words. He wrenched away the top of a towering crag and hurled it in front of our dark-prowed ship.

(Shewring 1980: 110)

The literal employment of mountains, or parts thereof, for violent ends is repeated in two other contexts in the *Apologue*. Firstly, in Book 10, the Laestrygonians hurl rocks at

Odysseus' trapped fleet from the cliff-tops, "ἀπὸ πετράων" (*Od.* 10.121) (*Lfgre* 2004: 1198):¹²⁵

αὐτὰρ ὁ τεῦχε βοὴν διὰ ἄστεος· οἱ δ' αἴοντες
φοίτων ἴφθιμοι Λαιστρυγόνες ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος,
μυριοί, οὐκ ἄνδρεςσιν εἰκότες, ἀλλὰ Γίγασιν.
οἷ ῥ' ἀπὸ πετράων ἀνδραχθέσι χερμαδίοισι
βάλλον· ἄφαρ δὲ κακὸς κόναβος κατὰ νῆας ὀρώρει
ἀνδρῶν τ' ὄλλυμένων νηῶν θ' ἅμα ἀγνυμενάων·
ἰχθῦς δ' ὡς πείροντες ἀτερπέα δαῖτα φέροντο.

(*Od.* 10.118-124)

The king raised a hue and a cry through the town, and the other great Laestrygonians heard him; they came thronging up in multitudes, looking not like men but like the lawless¹²⁶ Giants, and from the cliffs began to hurl down great rocks that were each of them one man's burden. A hideous din rose amid my fleet as men were killed and vessels shattered. The Laestrygonians speared my men like fish and then carried home their monstrous meal.

(Shewring 1980: 116)

¹²⁵ While *petrē* normally denotes a rock; it can also denote "1c felsiges Gebirge, Felsmassiv" or "2b Felsvorsprung, Klippe" (*Lfgre* 2004: 1198). For further examples of these, cf. 5.156, 5.415, 5.428, 5.434, 7.279, 8.508, 9.284, 13.408, 24.11.

¹²⁶ Shewring (1980: 116) has here added an English adjective without any corresponding adjective from the Greek.

And, secondly, in Book 11, in the catalogue of heroines, Odysseus spots Iphimedeia, and provides a narrative ecphrasis in which he tells of her sons, Otus and Ephialtes:

τὴν δὲ μέτ' Ἴφιμέδειαν, Ἄλωῆος παράκοιτιν,
εἴσιδον, ἣ δὴ φάσκε Ποσειδάωνι μιγῆναι,
καὶ ῥ' ἔτεκεν δύο παῖδε, μινυνθαδίω δὲ γενέσθην,
ᾧ ὄτον τ' ἀντίθεον τηλεκλειτόν τ' Ἐφιάλτην,
οὓς δὴ μηκίστους θρέψε ζείδωρος ἄρουρα
καὶ πολὺ καλλίστους μετὰ γε κλυτὸν Ὠρίωνα·
ἐννέωροι γὰρ τοί γε καὶ ἐννεαπήχεες ἦσαν
εὖρος, ἀτὰρ μῆκός γε γενέσθην ἐννεόργυιοι.
οἳ ῥα καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀπειλήτην ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ
φυλόπιδα στήσειν πολυαῖκος πολέμοιο.
Ἔσσαν ἐπ' Οὐλύμπῳ μέμασαν θέμεν, αὐτὰρ ἐπ' Ἔσση
Πήλιον εἰνοσίφυλλον, ἔν' οὐρανὸς ἀμβατὸς εἶη.¹²⁷
καὶ νῦ κεν ἐξετέλεσσαν, εἰ ἦβης μέτρον ἴκοντο·
ἀλλ' ὄλεσεν Διὸς υἱός, ὃν ἠύκομος τέκε Λητώ,
ἀμφοτέρω, πρὶν σφωῖν ὑπὸ κροτάφοισιν ἰούλους
ἀνθῆσαι πυκάσαι τε γένυς εὐανθεῖ λάχνη.

(*Od.* 11.305-320)

After her I saw Aloeus' wife; she was Iphimedeia, whose boast it was to have lain beside Poseidon. She bore him two sons, though their life was short—Otus the peer of gods and far-famed Ephialtes; these were the tallest men, and the handsomest, that

¹²⁷ For textual criticism of lines 315-316, cf. Stanford 1996: 393.

ever the fertile earth has fostered, save only incomparable Orion; at nine years of age their breadth was nine cubits, their height nine fathoms. They threatened the Deathless Ones themselves—to embroil Olympus in all the fury and din of war. [*Lines 315-316 omitted*] And so indeed they might have done had they reached the full measure of their years, but the god that Zeus begot and lovely-haired Leto bore destroyed them both before the first down could show underneath their brows and overspread and adorn their cheeks.

(Shewring 1980: 135)

The *modus operandi* for Otus and Ephialtes in making war with the gods is the physical disruption of mountains and their employment for a violent purpose: Otus and Ephialtes desire to pile mountain upon mountain until they reach heaven itself, ‘ἴν’ οὐρανὸς ἀμβατὸς εἶη’ (*Od.* 11.316), and can defeat the gods; to be precise, they intended to place Mount Ossa, ‘Ὀσσαν’ (*Od.* 11.315), on top of Mount Olympus, ‘ἐπ’ Οὐλύμπω’ (*Od.* 11.315), and then Mount Pelion, ‘Πήλιον’ (*Od.* 11.316), on top of Ossa, ‘ἐπ’ Ὀσση’ (*Od.* 11.315). Shewring, in his translation, omits all mention of these specific mountains, most probably on account of a non-sequitur as to the home of the gods: for at line 313, it is said that the gods live on Mount Olympus, while later they live in the skies (*Od.* 11.316); the former makes little sense if Mount Olympus is one of the mountains which these two giants would employ in order to assail the home of the gods (Stanford 1996: 393).¹²⁸ The Homeric bard here seems to be caught between two different traditions as to the location of the divinities.

While previously I have examined mountains as stationary features of the landscape or as a figurative structure in a comparison, these three *xeinoi* encounters—between

¹²⁸ Mount Olympus in line 315 has, according to Stanford (1996: 393), no connotations of being related to heaven.

Odysseus and Polyphemus, Odysseus and the Laestrygonians, and Otus and Ephialtes and the Olympians—fashion mountains as instruments of war, as objects which can be torn apart or up-rooted for destructive purposes. In the case of Polyphemus, this almost results in the beaching of Odysseus' ship back onto the giant's shore (*Od.* 9.485-486); the Laestrygonians are far more successful in their anthropophagy than the Cyclops, annihilating the entire Ithacan fleet, barring a single ship (*Od.* 10.121-130); and the brothers Otus and Ephialtes are only stopped from attacking the home of the gods, and up-rooting the universal order, on account of their unripe youth (*Od.* 11.317).

I have shown that mountains in the *Apologue* connote topographical isolation as well as an isolation from social aspects (such as community, laws, Zeus-governed hospitality, normal eating habits, etc.), in the present three passages (*Od.* 9.475-482, 10.118-124, 11.305-230), however, I shall argue that the upheaval of mountains connotes a temporal isolation or removal: from the present state of Olympian autocracy in the *Odyssey*, where Zeus is in charge,¹²⁹ to a more distant, primitive time, which was characterized by a strong, violent opposition to the Olympians and, in particular, Zeus *xeinios*. Such an opposition is most manifest in the mythological portraits of the catalogue of heroines, where Otus and Ephialtes plan a mountain-based attack on the Olympian gods; and their desired course of action, moreover, mirrors that of other early hostile figures in Greek mythology, such as the Titans:

These precocious and aggressive adolescents closely resemble Hesiod's Silver Race (cf. 9.317f. and WD 132-36); but they also resemble the *Theogony's* Titans or monsters like Typhoeus in their attack on Olympus and also in their close connection with the earth (11.309).

¹²⁹ Segal (1992: 491) argues that the divine justice heralded by Zeus is more a work-in-progress than a *fait accompli* at the start of the *Odyssey*, and is consolidated in the course of the poem.

(Segal 1992: 497)

A similar temporal removal, to a prehistoric time before the story time of the *Odyssey*, is also apparent in the assault of the Laestrygonians upon Odysseus' men. In the very line before these cannibals rain rocks down from the cliff tops upon the Ithacan ships (*Od.* 10.121-122), they are described as: “μυρίοι, οὐκ ἄνδρεςσιν εἰκότες, ἀλλὰ Γίγασιν” (*Od.* 10.120). The comparison to Giants at this exact point in the narrative suggests that the subsequent mountain-breaking actions of the Laestrygonians belong to a more primitive and hostile order of interaction. Thus Charles Segal characterizes both the Cyclopes and the Phaeacians as belonging to a more primitive time on account of their respective associations with Giants :

By associating the Cyclopes and the Phaeacians with the Giants (7.59 and 206), Homer makes the two former peoples seem part of a more distant time, for the Giants generally belong to an older order. In Hesiod's *Theogony*, for example, the Giants are born from Gaia and the severed genitals of Ouranos and are coeval with the Erinyes and the Meliai (185-87). Hesiod's Cyclopes are the children of Gaia and Ouranos (*Theogony* 139).

(1992: 497)

It might be thought initially that the Giant simile fulfils a purely scalar function, like that which Scott (1974: 22) recommends for mountains; it is instructive, however, to observe to the contrary that, at least in post-Homeric artistic and poetic depictions, the mythical Giants were not marked out to such a degree for their physical scale, like their Titanic predecessors or Otus and Ephialtes, but rather for their hostile actions towards the Olympian gods—only in later classical representations did their physical size become both inflated and conflated with

that of the Titans (Delcourt & Rankin 1965: 211-213). Although it should be noted in passing that our knowledge of the Gigantomachy, the battle of the Giants with the Olympians, itself post-dates Homeric verse, and that there is no reference to this event in the poems, the characterization of Giants as being savage, lawless, beyond divine order, over-bearing, and even hubristic is still evident in the text, and does not need specific references to the battles with the gods to indicate this feature of their natures (Segal 1992: 497).

Thus Alcinous declares his people's kinship to the Giants, along with the Cyclopes, and refers to them as “ἄγρια” tribes (*Od.* 7.206), a word which in the *Odyssey* often denotes a wild people, who are outside the law—and also, importantly, a sense of godlessness (cf. *Lfgre* 1955: 97):

In der *Odyssee* sind ἄγριοι die Giganten... Skylla... endlich allgemein Männer, die in ihrem Übermut die Forderungen der Gerechtigkeit, Gottesfurcht, Gastfreundschaft verletzen... zu diesen gehört der Kyklop.

(Nestle 1942: 65)

When Athena provides a background for Odysseus to the royal house of the Phaeacians, she names Eurymedon, the king of the Giants, as the grandfather of Nausithous, father to Alcinous:

Ναυσίθοον μὲν πρῶτα Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων
γείνατο καὶ Περίβοια, γυναικῶν εἶδος ἀρίστη,
ὀπλοτάτη θυγάτηρ μεγάλητορος Εὐρυμέδοντος,
ὅς ποθ' ὑπερθύμοισι Γιγάντεσσιν βασίλευεν.
ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ὤλεσε λαὸν ἀτάσθαλον, ὤλετο δ' αὐτός·

(*Od.* 7.56-60)

First came Nausithous, son of Poseidon and lovely Periboea, the youngest daughter of bold Eurymedon, who once was king of the overbearing Giants, but then brought doom on his reckless people and on himself.

(Shewring 1980: 77)

The choice of adjectives to characterize the Giants is not positive. While “ὑπερθύμοισι” (*Od.* 7.59), literally translated as ‘high-hearted’ or ‘high-spirited’, can have positive connotations (*Lfgre* 2006: 739), its combination with “ἀτάσθαλον” (*Od.* 7.60), ‘reckless’, cannot be deemed to form an overall benevolent description. There is an explicit recognition in the narrative of their fall here, “ᾠλεσε” (*Od.* 7.60), that their lofty, reckless natures, “ὑπερθύμοισι... ἀτάσθαλον” have contributed partly towards their destruction (*Od.* 7.59-60); Polyphemus’ hubris (*Od.* 9.106, 275-280) led, similarly, to the loss of his eye (Thornton 1970: 39), and the youthful recklessness of Otus and Ephialtes to their destruction by Apollo (*Od.* 11.307-320) (Fuqua 1991: 51-52). It should be noted that ‘ἀτάσθαλον’ (*Od.* 7.60) does not have positive connotations elsewhere in the poem;¹³⁰ thus Bakker writes:

¹³⁰ Forms of the adjective *atasthalos* or the noun *atasthalīē* occur in the following lines: 1.7, 1.34, 3.207, 4.693, 8.166, 10.437, 12.300, 13.170, 13.370, 16.86, 16.93, 17.588, 18.139, 18.143, 21.146, 22.47, 22.314, 22.317, 22.416, 23.67, 24.352, 24.458 (*Lfgre* 1955: 1483-1488). On the differences between *atasthalīē* in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, cf. Muellner 1996: 43-44. For Michael Nagler, *atasthalīē* is a key concept linking the proem of the *Odyssey* to the *Apologue*: “[T]he setting of the *Odyssey* is divided roughly into two zones, the hero-and-now of Ithaca and what can be called the mantic space of the *Apologue*. Why we might use the term “mantic” rather than the traditional “exotic” will appear from consideration of the key ἀτασθαλία of the crew, which is cited in this portion of the proem [i.e. *Od.* 1.6-9]—namely, that they ate the cattle of the Sun, and particularly that they carried out a mock sacrifice, or more accurately a perverted sacrifice to do so” (1990: 339).

The contexts in which this term is used in the *Odyssey* favour a specialized sense of criminal behaviour due to human inability to deal with abundance

(2013: 114)¹³¹

The ethical orientation of the Giants is further consolidated by their familial relation to Poseidon (*Od.* 7.56). Poseidon is a common factor connecting several prehistoric, anti-Olympian entities, including Otus and Ephialtes and Polyphemus.

In short, the juxtaposition of the Laestrygonians' 'Gigantic nature' (cf. Cook 1995: 72)¹³² and their upheaval and tossing of rocks from the cliff tops (*Od.* 10.120-122) is reflective of their primitive, anti-social, anti-Olympian behaviour in this part of the narrative. And while the Laestrygonians may not be openly scornful of Zeus *xeinios*, like Polyphemus and brothers Otus and Ephialtes, their behaviour is certainly in contravention of the custom of *xenia*: they ignore the rights of their guests, and, instead of offering them food, they turn them into food (*Od.* 10.124).

Lastly, Polyphemus' tossing of the mountain peak at Odysseus' ship (*Od.* 9.481-482) occurs in the context of a direct rebuke from the Ithacan hero (*Od.* 9.475-479). Odysseus' speech is intended to lecture Polyphemus on his failure to recognize hospitality, and thus on the consequent punishment which he has earned from Zeus *xeinios* and the other Olympians. Polyphemus responds to the Ithacan hero's censure in the only way he knows how—through individual brute force (Segal 1992: 504),¹³³ the very quality which Odysseus has just

¹³¹ For examples of this connotation, cf. Bakker 2013: 114-116.

¹³² "By associating the Cyclopes and the Laestrygonians with the Giants, archetypal opponents of the Olympian order, Odysseus makes his encounters with these groups represent their hostility to the ethical norms of the Greeks and to the Olympian gods who validate these norms" (Cook 1995: 72).

¹³³ "[H]e is an unregenerate believer in brute force" (Segal 1992: 504).

condemned, “κρατερῆφι βίηφι” (*Od.* 9.476);¹³⁴ this individual physical force of Polyphemus is then to be contrasted with the appropriate behaviour which he ought to have displayed to his “ξείνους” as monitored by Zeus (*Od.* 9.478-479). Like the ‘Gigantic’ Laestrygonians and Otus and Ephialtes, Polyphemus’ actions, ripping a peak off a mountain, place him in a primitive category, in which the social order imposed by Zeus was not respected, but, rather, challenged through sheer physical might. It is of further interest to this characterization that when Polyphemus does recognize his own defeat by the crafty Ithacan, his response is to turn to his father, Poseidon (*Od.* 9.528-535): the god of the seas is representative of a more archaic form of divine power, governed by hostile vengeance rather than the justice of Zeus in the *Odyssey*.

As a *xεινοί* encounter, the interaction of the Ithacans with Polyphemus is characterized by isolation on three different levels: the ogre’s mountainous home, like that of his fellow Cyclopes, is topographically far removed; from a social perspective, he is a loner, ‘a solitary peak’ (*Od.* 9.191-192), who has little to do with his fellow countrymen, and whose disrespect of *xenia* and whose dietary habits set him apart from normal Greek society; and, lastly, his violent conduct is exemplary of a class of prehistoric, anti-Olympian entities and therefore removes him from the Zeus-governed order of the modern world in the *Odyssey*.

The dispersal of mountains in the Laestrygonian episode follows a similar pattern to that of the *Cyclopeia*: (i) as topographical markers in the land (e.g. *Od.* 9.113=10.104), (ii) as part of a simile (*Od.* 9.191-192=10.113), and (iii) as a means for a violent attack (*Od.* 9.481-482=10.121-122). (i) Thus mountains, cliffs, and other lofty locales first appear merely as characteristic features of the Laestrygonian landscape: the city of King Antiphates is initially described as ‘high-lying’, “αἰπὸ πτολίεθρον” (*Od.* 10.81) (*Lfgre* 1955: 335); the deceptively-

¹³⁴ Thus Polyphemus is shocked at the fulfilment of the prophecy which foretold his blinding, in that he expected to be bettered by a strong man, not some pipsqueak (*Od.* 9.513-516) (Segal 1992: 503-504).

peaceful harbour, which Odysseus' fleet enters, is surrounded by a high cliff, “πέτρα / ἠλίβατος” (*Od.* 10.87-88) on either side; Odysseus surveys the country from a hill-top, “σκοπιὴν ἐς παιπαλόεσσαν” (*Od.* 10.97); and, when his ambassadors venture into the land, they spot a road which is used by the residents to cart wood back to the city from the mountains, “ὕψηλῶν ὀρέων” (*Od.* 10.104). (ii) As with Polyphemus, the topography of the land comes to be used to characterize an individual: thus the wife of King Antiphates is compared to a mountain peak, “ὄσσην τ' ὄρεος κορυφήν” (*Od.* 10.113), when Odysseus' men confront her. (iii) And, lastly, the Laestrygonians use mountains as a destructive means of slaughtering the Ithacans by throwing boulders from the cliff tops (*Od.* 10.121-122).

Let me commence by examining the topographic isolation which accompanies some of these repetitions.

ἔξῃμαρ μὲν ὁμῶς πλέομεν νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμαρ·
 ἑβδομάτη δ' ἰκόμεσθα Λάμου αἰπὺ πτολίεθρον,
 Τηλέπυλον Λαιστρυγονίην, ὅθι ποιμένα ποιμὴν
 ἠπύει εἰσελάων, ὁ δὲ τ' ἐξελάων ὑπακούει.
 ἔνθα κ' ἄπνοος ἀνήρ δοιοῦς ἐξήρατο μισθούς,
 τὸν μὲν βουκολέων, τὸν δ' ἄργυφα μῆλα νομεύων·
 ἐγγὺς γὰρ νυκτός τε καὶ ἡματός εἰσι κέλευθοι.

(*Od.* 10.80-86)

For six days and through six nights we sailed on steadily; on the seventh day we came to Telepylus, the lofty town of the Laestrygonians whose king is Lamus. There one herdsman as he drives in his beasts will hail another driving his out and the second answers the first. In those parts a man who never slept could have earned wages twice

over, one wage for herding cattle and another for pasturing white sheep, because the pathways of day and night come close together there.

(Shewring 1980: 115)

After the disappointment of their near homecoming (*Od.* 10.29-30) and the subsequent rebuke of Aeolus (*Od.* 10.72-75), Odysseus and his sailors move towards the land of the Laestrygonians. And the only piece of direct topographical information we initially receive of the Laestrygonian territory, between lines 80 and 86, is that the city, “πτολίεθρον”, is “αἰπὺν” (*Od.* 10.81); this elevated quality of the terrain is extrapolated in the following verses, where we witness the tall cliffs and headlands on the coastal parts and the high mountains in the interior (*Od.* 10.87-88, 97, 104).

Importantly, just as in Odysseus’ opening description of Ithaca (*Od.* 9.21-28), the introduction to Laestrygonia (*Od.* 10.80-86) juxtaposes this mountainous quality with its extreme topographical isolation, its position on the very edge of the map (Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989: 48).¹³⁵ To this end, we are instructed, firstly, that it took a considerable amount of sailing time, six days and six nights worth, in order for the Ithacan fleet to arrive at this far-flung country from the isle of Aeolus (*Od.* 10.80). This distance, designated by a time duration, can be added to the distance between Aeolus’ isle and Ithaca, which was previously said to take nine days and nine nights (*Od.* 10.28). Nine, incidentally, might not be an insignificant numeral in the poem (Germain 1954: 8-11, 14, 34-35),¹³⁶ connoting, according to Albin Lesky (1947: 152-153), a “Grenze” (152) between the Greek world and the fairy

¹³⁵ “The lines convey a sense of the topographical strangeness of the legendary country in the far east” (Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989: 48).

¹³⁶ According to Germain’s (1954: 8-9) count, ‘9’ is the fourth most typical number in the *Odyssey*, with 24 occurrences, surpassed only by ‘12’ (26 occurrences), ‘20’ (27 occurrences), and ‘3’ (56 occurrences).

land of the *Apologue* (cf. 5.278-280, 9.81, 12.447). But, however we interpret the symbolic value of the numeral nine in the poem (cf. Germain 1954: 13-15, Hölscher 1988: 142),¹³⁷ the sum effect of these passages (*Od.* 10.28, *Od.* 10.80) is clear: in total at the start of Book 10, from Ithaca, then presumably west to Aeolus' isle (*Od.* 10.47-55) (Nesselrath 2005: 156), and then north to the Laestrygonians (cf. *paragraph below*), the sailors have journeyed fifteen days' worth of traveling¹³⁸ away from the known world of Greece, specifically Ithaca, in order to arrive at “Λάμου αιπὸ πτολίεθρον” (*Od.* 10.81).

Secondly, the land of the Laestrygonians is so distant—presumably, depending on one's interpretation of the critical phenomena, either so far to the east, towards the dawn (Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989: 48), or to the north (Austin 1975: 94, Bowra 1952: 135)—that the normal movement of the celestial bodies seems to have been altered, such that the country is characterized by a near perpetual light (Stanford 1996: 368),¹³⁹ a phenomenon which allows shepherds to potentially double their earnings by watching flocks around the clock (*Od.* 10.82-86).

That the mountainous, 'sheer' quality of Laestrygonia is articulated in a context of isolation is no accident; mountains connote a topographical isolation throughout this sequence of exploration in Book 10. Firstly, they create a sense of distance from the perspective of the Ithacans as they approach this land from the sea, and, secondly, they serve to create a distance between the Ithacan *xeinoi*, when they first arrive, and their ultimate destination, the *ptoliethron* of the Laestrygonians.

¹³⁷ “Le nombre 9 sert essentiellement à exprimer un temps, au terme duquel, le dixième jour ou la dixième année, arrivera un événement décisif” (Germain 1954: 13).

¹³⁸ “Fifteen days' worth of travelling”, because, with Aeolus' winds unleashed, the Ithacan fleet are transported over this lengthy distance in a much shorter time, although in terms of temporal measuring (the only means we are given for measuring nautical distance in the *Apologue*) the distance is still 15 days' worth.

¹³⁹ “[T]heir long northern day” (Bowra 1952: 135).

On the first point, the initial sheerness of the Laestrygonian city, “αἰπύ” (*Od.* 10.81), is an indication of a narrator view adopted from afar. To revise, I observed in my discussion of Mount Neriton in Ithaca that the singular focalization of a mountain and other rugged terrain in the narrator’s initial spatial description of Odysseus’ homeland is reflective of a view seen from afar, from outside the island rather than within. Equally, in the Laestrygonian passage, the visual perspective, of which the city’s ‘sheerness’ (*Od.* 10.81), like that of Ithaca, is our only major point of geographic reference at first, is oriented from an external position; our first glance of Laestrygonia is of a mass of land rising high, because we are looking on from a great distance and there is nothing else to be seen.

This is evidently true, since, as the narrator follows along with Odysseus’ fleet, other features of the landscape, other than a generic loftiness, become apparent. Firstly, we are made aware of the high cliffs and the jutting headlands which describe the external structure of the basin (*Od.* 10.87-89); not yet inside the harbour, our view sailing towards the land has to be of the rocky perimeter of this “λιμένα” (*Od.* 10.87): the headland which encloses it and the high walls on either side which wrap around it. In line with what I have been saying, it is appropriate that the tall, “ἡλίβατος” (*Od.* 10.88), rocky areas are spotted and narrated first, since they are seen easiest from a distance. Traveling with Odysseus’ fleet, we next encounter the narrow entrance, the “εἴσοδος” (*Od.* 10.90), which allows Odysseus’ fleet passage into the harbour. And once through this portal, we are provided with a description of the quality of the water (*Od.* 10.93-94). Odysseus, both as narrator and hero, exits the harbour (*Od.* 10.95-96), with a sense of danger learned from his experience with Polyphemus, before, finally, the narrator Odysseus turns our attention beyond the harbour towards the interior of the country (*Od.* 10.97-99).

Calvin Byre, in an article devoted to the cave of the Nymphs on Ithaca, has interpreted a similar landward movement in the descriptive narrative outlining Odysseus' return to his homeland in Book 13 (lines 96-101):

The spatial point of view adopted by the narrator contributes to this same effect of narrative movement: the description begins with the seaward side of the harbour and then proceeds inside it and then to its head and down into the cave near the shore, the details being so selected and arranged as to imply a moving point of view, the point of view of the narrator sailing in his imagination into the harbour, landing and descending into the cave. Thus the sequence of details in line 96-101 parallels and mirrors the movement of the Phaeacian ship into the harbour and to the shore.

(1994a: 7-8)

On the second point, the actual hometown of the Laestrygonians, the “δῶματα” (*Od.* 10.112)¹⁴⁰ and the “ἀγορῆς” (*Od.* 10.114) which we shall later hear about, is only to be witnessed after several references to mountains, or related precipitous objects, in the text; that is to say, the Laestrygonian countryside, which is described between the initial sighting of the coast and the arrival at the *ptoliethron* (*Od.* 10.87-112), is spatially oriented for the Ithacans primarily around their encounters with elevated terrain. Importantly, this mountainous space serves an isolationist function, either removing the countryside from the topography of the outside world, whence the Ithacans have arrived, or pushing the *ptoliethron*, the home of the Laestrygonian people, into the distance, away from the countryside. In short, mountains open

¹⁴⁰ On the sense of “δῶματα” (*Od.* 10.112) as meaning both ‘palace’ and ‘house’ in the Homeric poems, cf. Knox 1970: 117-120.

out a physical space between the *xeinoi* and their gigantic ‘hosts’, isolating the former from the latter.

Thus, firstly, Odysseus’ fleet confronts the high cliffs, “πέτρῃ / ἠλίβατος” (*Od.* 10.87-88), which divide the Laestrygonian harbour from the sea outside: we are told that there is only a narrow entrance which allows an escape from the harbour where the headlands jut out (*Od.* 10.89-91). Entry into this enclosed bay entails a physical isolation for the Ithacan fleet, a removal from the outer sea into the deceptively quiet calm (*Od.* 10.93-94) of the harbour waters; further on in the narrative this locational isolation will enable the giants to trap the Ithacan ships, throwing rocks down from the cliff tops—which, as I have said previously (cf. pp. 121-130), is emblematic of the temporal isolation of these ‘hosts’, of the primitive aspect of their behaviour. Odysseus himself seems aware of the danger of this topographic isolation, of being hemmed in by cliffs, and, accordingly, he anchors his ship outside the harbour (*Od.* 10.95-96).

Next, Odysseus climbs up a rugged peak, “σκοπιὴν ἐς παιπαλόεσσαν” (*Od.* 10.97), in order to get an idea of the lay of the land. The city of the Laestrygonians is, however, nowhere close:

ἔνθα μὲν οὔτε βοῶν οὔτ' ἀνδρῶν φαίνετο ἔργα,
καπνὸν δ' οἶον ὀρῶμεν ἀπὸ χθονὸς αἴσσοντα

(*Od.* 10.98-99)

From where we were no trace could be seen of men’s or oxen’s labours; we only discerned some smoke going up from the land below.

(Shewring 1980: 115)

The *skopiē* which Odysseus climbs pushes the *ptoliethron*, and the Laestrygonian homes, ahead into the distance. There is no sign of the Laestrygonian habitation other than a line of smoke, and a party is therefore selected to proceed farther inland in search of inhabitants (*Od.* 10.100-102). Then, as the embassy proceeds through the land, they mark out a road which runs down from the mountains:

οἱ δ' ἴσαν ἐκβάντες λείην ὁδόν, ἧ̃ περ ἄμαξαι
ἄστυδ' ἀφ' ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων καταγίνεον ὕλην.

(10.103-104)

Having left the ship, they took to a made road that was used by wagons for bringing timber into the town from the hills above.

(Shewring 1980: 115)

Again, the Laestrygonian town is not encountered at once by the travelling Ithacans but is oriented through the imposition of mountainous locales: the *ptoliethron* is to be found away, “ἀφ” (*Od.* 10.104), from the high mountains; mountains function as a means of distancing the city from the countryside, the non-city space, through which Odysseus’ embassy is travelling. And like in the previous example, where the prospectus from the hilltop gave clues as to the presence of a city (*Od.* 10.98-99), so the mountains show signs of a hometown—a road down which waggons run (*Od.* 10.103-104)—but require the Ithacans to wander farther if they wish to see the city itself, following the same road as the waggons, away from the mountains.

In summary, the topographic isolation which mountains connote in the exploration sequence of the Laestrygonian episode (*Od.* 10.87-111) is experienced by the Ithacan *xeinoi*

both with respect to their past locales—they are geographically alienated, and trapped once they pass into this territory—and also with respect to the Laestrygonian *ptoliethron*, which is positioned in the distance from the Ithacan scouts as they voyage through the countryside—a peripheral home, first viewed from a hilltop as a line of smoke, and later as the further end of a road running from the mountains.

While the physical landscape of the Laestrygonian countryside is characterized by a liminal, isolating space which creates a distance between the *xeinoi*'s first arrival and their ultimate discovery of the town, from a social perspective the Laestrygonians present a more complex melding of isolated and integrative behaviour (Lowenstam 1993: 195). There is a notable difference between the society of the Laestrygonians and the Cyclopes: whereas the latter live at the very tops of mountains (*Od.* 9.113), the former (or at least the royal family) live in *dōmata* (*Od.* 10.112), and display structures of developed social organization, such as an *agora* (*Od.* 10.114) and a king (*Od.* 10.114), which seem beyond the individualistic lifestyle of the Cyclopes (Cook 1995: 70). While the Laestrygonians undoubtedly demonstrate greater social cohesion within their society, acting as a unified collective which gathers at an *agora*, their reaction to *xeinoi* is no more sophisticated than that of Polyphemus (Cook 1995: 70, Lowenstam 1993: 195).¹⁴¹

The whole scene is, in fact, a parody and perverse inversion of a typical *xeinoi* reception, and the Laestrygonians show no inclination to interact with the *xeinoi*. One can start here by observing the complete absence of speech between the Laestrygonians and the Ithacans (cf. Hopman 2013: 43-44):¹⁴² there are no words of welcome from King Antiphates'

¹⁴¹ "The description of the Laestrygonians initially appears to reveal a society with the proper balance between *megaron* and *agora*. As the tale proceeds, however, we find that this agonistic people presents a sharp contrast to the hospitable Phaiakians" (Lowenstam 1993: 195).

¹⁴² "Throughout the poem, language is Odysseus' prime resource to overcome dangers and win his homecoming. His distinctive cunning is primarily based on speech" (Hopman 2013: 43).

wife (*Od.* 10.112-114), not even the uncouth demand which Polyphemos managed (e.g. *Od.* 9.252-255); similarly, and rather eerily, Antiphates' daughter did not bestow any speech on the ambassadors when they asked for directions to her city, but simply pointed in the direction of her father's house (*Od.* 10.105-111). This repetition of the 'girl at the well motif' (Reece 1993: 6, 12-13) is a parody of the polite, welcoming greeting which Odysseus receives from Nausicaa (*Od.* 6.187-197). In the absence of any appreciable intercourse with their guests, the Laestrygonian response is entirely self-contained, limited to their own internal arrangements: the wife calls the husband from the *agora* and Antiphates kills one of the ambassadors in his home (10.114-115):

αὐτίχ' ἕνα μάρψας ἐτάρων ὀπλίσσατο δεῖπνον.

(*Od.* 10.116)

He clutched one of my men at once and made a meal of him...

(Shewring 1980: 116)

The phrasing here recalls that of the *Cyclopeia*, after Polyphemos kills and consumes two of Odysseus' men (*Od.* 9.289, 291). The absence of dialogue on the part of the Laestrygonians, alongside their subsequent actions, is indicative of the relationship between them and the Ithacans: this is not an interaction between hosts and guests, but rather predators and prey. The Laestrygonians do not waste time talking to their 'guests' but proceed at once to preparations for a feast, “δαῖτα φέροντο” (*Od.* 10.124); appropriate here is the comparison of the trapped Ithacan fleet to fish, “ἰχθῦς δ' ὦς” (*Od.* 10.124), being hunted by the giants. Polyphemos, it will be recalled, devoured Odysseus' men like puppies (*Od.* 9.289). The anthropophagy of Polyphemos and the Laestrygonians animalizes the Ithacan travellers,

removing the possibility of any social interaction, of a scene of *xenia* between guests and hosts.

In the context of this parodic reception scene, where the native inhabitants shun any form of social interaction with their ‘guests’ (animals to be eaten, not people to be talked to), one should consider the mountain simile used to describe Antiphates’ wife:

οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ εἰσῆλθον κλυτὰ δώματα, τὴν δὲ γυναῖκα
εὖρον ὄσσην τ' ὄρεος κορυφήν, κατὰ δ' ἔστυγον αὐτήν.
ἢ δ' αἰψ' ἐξ ἀγορῆς ἐκάλει κλυτὸν Ἀντιφατῆα,
ὄν πόσιν, ὅς δὴ τοῖσιν ἐμήσατο λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον.

(*Od.* 10.112-115)

They entered the palace and found his wife there, but she stood mountain-high and they were aghast at the sight of her. She sent out forthwith to fetch King Antiphates her husband from the assembly-place, and his only thought was to kill them miserably.

(Shewring 1980: 115-116)

The simile does on the surface indicate physical scale, “ὄσσην” (*Od.* 10.113): she is a gigantic monster and she strikes loathing into the hearts of Odysseus’ men (Bowra 1952: 177, Scott 1974: 81); one should, however, consider this simile in light of other references to mountains in the Laestrygonian episode.¹⁴³ The Laestrygonian *ptoliethron* was framed topographically

¹⁴³ Bowra (1952: 135) observed the relationship between the mountainous topography and the mountainous inhabitants, although for him the characterization is indicative of the toughness of these people. Bowra does acknowledge the physical estrangement implied by the terrain: “[Odysseus] sees that this is a wild, forbidding

in oppositional terms to the mountainous terrain of the countryside: the Ithacans would find the town as they moved away from the high mountains (*Od.* 10.104); the landscape of the society—the *agora* and *dōmata* (*Od.* 10.112, 114)—is articulated spatially in terms of a distance from mountains. Ironically, then, when the travellers do arrive at the home of the chieftain of this land, they immediately encounter an individual who is compared to a mountain peak (*Od.* 10.113). While they are physically in a home, the figurative presence of a mountain suggests that the men are still removed from the home space they expected here.

This isolation must be understood in a social sense, rather than a topographical perspective, given the treatment which the *xeinoi* subsequently experience in the context of the passage (*Od.* 10.113-124). The *dōmata* of Antiphates is no ‘home’ at all: the Ithacans are not welcomed with any words, the mountainous wife of Antiphates ignores them entirely in search of her husband, and the king himself slaughters and eats one of the Ithacans. Her comparison to a mountain peak is employed in a context of her isolation from her guests, her removal from the normal behaviour of a host; like Polyphemus, who, at the moment of his anthropophagy was compared to a mountain lion (*Od.* 9.292), the behaviour of Antiphates’ wife at the time of the simile is removed from acceptable social conduct.

The combination of mountains first as topographic markers and then as a figurative device in the Laestrygonian sequence is mirrored by the *Cyclopeia*. Just as Polyphemus’ topographic isolation and his social isolation interplay with one another in the simile (*Od.* 9.191-192), so the Laestrygonians are distant both on account of their topography, dislocated by their elevated countryside, and their mountainous reception of Odysseus’ men, regarding them as food, not guests.

place and deftly sketches it in four lines, telling how the harbour has a narrow entrance enclosed by steep rocks.” (1952: 135); Bowra does not, however, transfer this connotation onto the mountainous people, as being ‘wild’, or removed from society.

Circe's island of Aeaea, like the lands of the Cyclopes and Laestrygonians, is characterized by high terrain: (i) Odysseus voyages up a “σκοπήν” (10.148), a journey which he repeats to his men later, “σκοπήν” (*Od.* 10.194); (ii) we are told that there are mountain lions, “ὀρέστεροι... λέοντες” (*Od.* 10.212) on the island; and, lastly, (iii) Odysseus meets Hermes on a mountain top, “ἄκριαζ” (*Od.* 10.281).

On the second count, it might immediately be objected that Circe's ‘pet’ mountain lions do not connote any kind of isolation at all in the narrative context: instead of being topographically isolated, high up in mountains or in the wild, these felines are nestled close to their mistress' home, nor do they display any kind of isolationist tendencies in their social behaviour—in fact, quite the opposite, they are compared to dogs which fawn on their masters when they return home from a meal (*Od.* 10.214-219). They are, in short, domesticated mountain lions. But this antithetical behaviour, defying connotations, is quite deliberate in this passage. They are not behaving in the manner we expect lions or mountain-dwellers to behave because they have been influenced, in some undisclosed manner, by the magic of Circe.

The first reference to a *skopiē* in the Aeaeian episode occurs within a repeated verse from the Laestrygonian sequence (10.98=10.148), and the context is much the same as the earlier: Odysseus has climbed a hilltop in order to get a better view of the country which he is in, and spots a line of smoke amidst the woodland ahead (*Od.* 10.148-150).

Our spatial orientation of Aeaea is initially divided according to three main theatres of action: (i) the coast or shoreline along which the ship is beached and the majority of the men wait (*Od.* 10.135-143, 172-188, 198-209, 244-250, 261-274); (ii) Circe's home (*Od.* 10.210-243, 251-260 [reported speech], 308-405); (iii) and the highlands between the shoreline and

the witch's *domos* (*Od.* 10.144-171, 189-197 [reported speech], 275-308). The *skopiē* lies in a middle ground between the shore and Circe's home:

μερμήριζα δ' ἔπειτα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν
ἐλθεῖν ἠδὲ πυθέσθαι, ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἴθοπα καπνόν.
ᾧδε δέ μοι φρονέοντι δοάσσατο κέρδιον εἶναι,
πρῶτ' ἐλθόντ' ἐπὶ νῆα θοὴν καὶ θῖνα θαλάσσης
δεῖπνον ἐταίροισιν δόμεναι προέμεν τε πυθέσθαι.

(*Od.* 10.151-155)

There were gleams of fire through the smoke, and at sight of this I wondered inwardly whether to go and look. But as I pondered, it seemed a wiser thing to return first to my vessel on the beach, give my men a meal and send them out to spy.

(Shewring 1980: 116)

The topographic isolation of this hilltop with respect to the two other spatial theatres in Aeaea breeds an uncertainty, “μερμήριζα” (*Od.* 10.151), in Odysseus. He has had a glimpse of what lies ahead in the island, “αἴθοπα καπνόν” (*Od.* 10.152), but he would need to advance farther in order to ascertain just who dwelt here; at the same time, while looking ahead on the hilltop, Odysseus turns his mind back to the shore, “θῖνα θαλάσσης” (*Od.* 10.154), and his compatriots, whose help he desires—this sense of physical isolation which the hill engenders is enhanced by Odysseus' own isolation from the rest of his crew, “μοῦνον ἔοντα” (*Od.* 10.157).

The contextual connotations of this hill as a site of physical dislocation is picked up later, when Odysseus narrates his earlier adventure to his shipmates:

ὦ φίλοι, οὐ γὰρ ἴδμεν ὄπη ζόφος οὐδ' ὄπη ἠώς,
οὐδ' ὄπη ἥελιος φαεσίμβροτος εἶς' ὑπὸ γαῖαν
οὐδ' ὄπη ἀννεῖται· ἀλλὰ φραζώμεθα θᾶσσον,
εἴ τις ἔτ' ἔσται μῆτις· ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ οἶομαι εἶναι.¹⁴⁴
εἶδον γὰρ σκοπιὴν ἐς παιπαλόεσσαν ἀνελθὼν
νῆσον, τὴν πέρι πόντος ἀπείριτος ἐστεφάνωται.
αὐτὴ δὲ [χθαμαλή]¹⁴⁵ κεῖται· καπνὸν δ' ἐνὶ μέσση
ἔδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι διὰ δρυμὰ πυκνὰ καὶ ὕλην.'

(*Od.* 10.190-197)

Comrades, as things now are, we do not know where the region of dawn or of darkness lies, in what quarter the radiant sun sinks below the earth or in what quarter he rises up. Let us ask ourselves quickly if some good plan may yet be found, though I fear there is none. When I climbed that commanding crag, I could see that we were in an island encircled by boundless ocean. The main part of the land lies low, and in the mid-point of it I saw smoke rising across thick undergrowth and woodland.”

(Shewring 1980: 117)

¹⁴⁴ For textual criticism of this line, considered spurious by some, cf. Apthorp 1975: 135-137.

¹⁴⁵ For the problems with deciphering the meaning of “χθαμαλή” (*Od.* 10.196), cf. fn. 96. The adjective describes Circe’s island (*Od.* 10.196), which is otherwise portrayed as a hilly landscape, containing a *skopiē* (*Od.* 10.148), an *akris* (*Od.* 10.281), and *oresteroi leontes* (*Od.* 10.212) (Rebert 1928: 377).

Instead of providing the Ithacan hero with some definite geographic bearings, his sojourn up the hill has instead filled him with a general sense of physical dislocation, destroying all sense of direction, east and west (Austin 1975: 93), and of isolation, since the island is bordered by a limitless expanse of sea, “πόντος ἀπείριτος” (*Od.* 10.195). The lookout spot, far from being a place which should convey certainty of one’s location, instead provokes doubt in the hero: “μερμήριζα” (10.151), “ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ οἶμαι εἶναι” (10.193).¹⁴⁶

A similar dislocation is recognized by the god Hermes when he appears before Odysseus on a hill top on Circe’s island:

ῥπῆ δὴ αὐτ', ὦ δύστηνε, δι' ἄκριας ἔρχεαι οἶος,
χώρου ἄϊδρις ἐών; ἔταροι δέ τοι οἶδ' ἐνὶ Κίρκης
ἔρχεται ὡς τε σύες πυκινὸς κευθμῶνας ἔχοντες.

(*Od.* 10.281-283)

Luckless man, why are you walking thus alone over these hills, in country you do not know? Your comrades are yonder in Circe’s grounds; they are turned to swine, lodged and safely penned in the sties.

(Shewring 1980: 120)

Just as Odysseus declared his locational bewilderment to his comrades upon descending the *skopiē*, so the messenger god confronts the hero on a mountain-top and identifies that

¹⁴⁶ Apthorp (1975: 135-137) suggests amending the latter line (*Od.* 10.193) from a negative statement to a statement of assuredness, seeing that Odysseus does at this point in the story have an immediate *mētis* (*Od.* 10.193): the hero is going to send his men ahead as spies to report back to him on the island (*Od.* 10.151-155).

Odysseus has no knowledge of this country, “χώρου ἄϊδρις ἐών” (*Od.* 10.282); Hermes then proceeds to point out the direction to Circe’s home (*Od.* 10.282-283).

Odysseus’ dislocations in the middle lands of Aeaea, between the shore and Circe’s home, reveal the mountains and hills on the island to be areas connoting topographical uncertainty, where the hero’s sense of direction is confused; and this, as in my discussion of the Laestrygonian countryside, serves to push Circe’s home, her “δῶματα” (*Od.* 10.210) into a spatial periphery, away from known lands. A further point which connotes the mountainous terrain on Circe’s island as geographically isolated from other human locales is the propensity for a god, like Hermes, to reveal himself on its peak, remembering that the Olympians themselves dwell on top a mountain, “ἀπέβη πρὸς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον” (*Od.* 10.307), which is inaccessible to humans (cf. Tsagalis 2012: 140-143).¹⁴⁷

Finally, in Book 12, cliffs and high peaks, *skopeloi* and *koryphai*, mark out the spaces where Scylla and Charybdis live. Circe first introduces these two opposing cliffs, “σκόπελοι” (*Od.* 12.73), before describing in detail the high peak, “κορυφῆ”, “κορυφὴν” (*Od.* 12.74, 76), of Scylla’s cliff; Scylla herself lives in a cave halfway up this cliff, “σκοπέλω” (*Od.* 12.80); and the multiple-headed monster searches around the “σκόπελον” (*Od.* 12.95) for prey. Circe then describes the “σκόπελον” (*Od.* 12.101) which lies near Charybdis whirlpool, but advises Odysseus against taking this route, and recommends, instead, going past Scylla’s cliff, “σκοπέλω” (*Od.* 12.108). After their encounter with the Sirens, Odysseus’ instructs his men to hug the cliff, “σκόπελου” (*Od.* 12.220), of Scylla, though he does not tell them of her existence, so as to avoid the menace of Charybdis, who tosses spray on the tops of both cliffs, “ἄκροισι σκοπέλοισιν ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέροισιν” (*Od.* 12.239). And, lastly, towards the end of the

¹⁴⁷ For further discussion on the spatial significance of Olympus, the home of the gods, beyond its characteristic isolation from human society, cf. Tsagalis 2012: 140-143.

Apologue, when Odysseus is washed back towards Scylla and Charybdis, after Zeus has destroyed his ship, he nears the “σκόπελον” (*Od.* 12.430) of Scylla once more.

Before discussing the connotations of the *skopeloi* and *koryphai* here, it must be restated that in searching for contextual meaning, I am not denying the force of the denotative or primary sense of a particular spatial unit. In the *xeinoi*'s encounters with Scylla and Charybdis, these tall spatial objects perform important plot functions: the one cliff concealing Scylla for her surprise attack and the other, later in the narrative, offering Odysseus a chance to escape the menace of Charybdis.

I have thus far examined how mountains are positioned in contexts of isolation—whether this isolation be (i) topographic, a creation of physical distance, or (ii) social, a distancing from expected social behaviour, or even (iii) temporal, wherein the manhandling of mountains takes us back into a more primitive past. In the case of Scylla and Charybdis, the high cliffs occur in contexts where the Ithacans are removed from ordinary human experience of the natural world; what they witness and experience is beyond the limits of human ken.¹⁴⁸ Thus the cliff peaks themselves are so very high that some parts are eternally concealed by clouds, such that the normal seasons have no place here (*Od.* 10.74-76); importantly, it is not within the realm of human capability to surpass this obstacle:

οὐδέ κεν ἀμβαίη βροτὸς ἀνὴρ οὐδ' ἐπιβαίη,
οὐδ' εἴ οἱ χεῖρες γε εἰκόσι καὶ πόδες εἶεν·

(*Od.* 12.77-78)

¹⁴⁸ Hopman (2012: 17-18) compares Scylla's abode in the *Apologue* to the infernal regions described in Hesiod's *Theogony*.

[N]or could any mortal man climb up it or get a foothold on it, not if he had twenty hands and feet.

(Shewring 1980: 144)

This is a realm which is beyond the limits of the “βροτός” (*Od.* 12.77) to transcend. The image of a mutated man, with dozens more appendages than a regular man (*Od.* 12.78), is indicative of this removal from the human into the unknown other; the dysmorphic picture is also, perhaps, a subtle foreshadowing to the many-armed creature whom they will soon encounter (*Od.* 12.89-92). A little further on in the narrative, another negation of a mortal endeavour serves to place us in a real beyond human reach, quite literally:

οὐδέ κεν ἐκ νηὸς γλαφυρῆς αἰζήϊος ἀνήρ
τόξῳ οἴστεύσας κοῖλον σπέος εἰσαφίκοιτο

(*Od.* 12.83-84)

A strong man’s arrow shot from a ship below would not reach the recesses of that cave.

(Shewring 1980: 144-145)

Scylla’s cave, half way up the mountain (*Od.* 12.80), is beyond the heroic, martial prowess of a Greek. While this mountain peak is outside the realm of human endeavours, so too its inhabitant, Scylla, is removed from human experience: not only her dysmorphic physical appearance (*Od.* 12.89-92), which is strange enough, but also her dietary habits, which seem to have no limit, place her on the opposite end of the spectrum of human behaviour.

αὐτοῦ δ' ἰχθυάα, σκόπελον περιμαιώωσα,
δελφῖνάς τε κύνας τε καὶ εἴ ποθι μεῖζον ἔλῃσι
κῆτος, ἃ μυρία βόσκει ἀγαστονος Ἀμφιτρίτη

(*Od.* 12.95-97)

[A]nd there, groping greedily round the rock, she fishes for dolphins and for sharks and whatever beast more huge than these she can seize upon from all the thousands that have their pasture from the queen of the seas.

(Shewring 1980: 145)

Anything, irrespective of size, within the vicinity of her *skopelos* (*Od.* 12.95) is acceptable prey for Scylla. Her hunger and greed is limitless. Her fishing prowess, moreover, will have a grim consequence for Odysseus' men whom the monster consumes in the manner of a fisherman (*Od.* 12.251-255), an act of anthropophagy similar to that of the Laestrygonians (*Od.* 10.124). And as in the case of the Cyclopes and the Laestrygonians, Scylla's character seems to be matched by the topography of her mountainous dwelling: that is to say, her behaviour, which is without limits and cannot be countered by human endeavour, although Odysseus does attempt to do so in heroic fashion (*Od.* 12.228-231), is akin to the insurmountable scale of her *skopelos*.

If Odysseus wishes to attempt to go past the other *skopelos* (*Od.* 12.101), leading past Charybdis, he will experience an equally indomitable foe: one who is beyond even the power of Poseidon to control (*Od.* 12.107), never mind a mortal such as Odysseus, and who, furthermore, can toss her spray so high that it can land on top of both her and Scylla's *skopeloi* (*Od.* 12.239)—no mean endeavour, considering how high Scylla's mountain extends.

2.5 Conclusions

In total, various references to mountains and related units occur 33 times in the *Apologue*. The relevance of this quantity can be realized through a quick statistical analysis of the occurrences of these spatial units outside the *Apologue*, in the remaining twenty books of the *Odyssey*:¹⁴⁹ (i) forms of *oros*, including adjectival compounds, occur 22 times (*LfgrE* 2004: 806-811);¹⁵⁰ (ii) *skopiē* occurs 5 times (*LfgrE* 2006: 154);¹⁵¹ (iii) *koryphē* occurs once,¹⁵² but has been counted with *oros* as a single unit (*LfgrE* 1991: 1495-1496); (iv) *akris* and *akron* occur 6 times (*LfgrE* 1955: 434),¹⁵³ (v) *pion* occurs once (*LfgrE* 2006: 40);¹⁵⁴ and (vi) *skopelos* does not occur.

In total, this amounts to 34 incidences of mountains and related spatial objects in the *Odyssey*, excluding the *Apologue* (i.e. Books 1 to 8 and 13 to 24). Thus out of a total of 67 occurrences in the entire poem, 51% occur outside the *Apologue*, and 49% within the *Apologue*.¹⁵⁵ This data needs to be put in perspective, the *Odyssey* totals 12 110 lines, of which the *Apologue* comprises 2140 lines,¹⁵⁶ or 18%. In other words, references to mountains in the *Apologue* are far more densely clustered than elsewhere in the *Odyssey*: 1 reference

¹⁴⁹ N.B. As in section 2.3.1, I have counted nouns in apposition and partitive constructions as single units.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. *Od.* 2.147, 3.287, 290, 4.514, 5.279, 283, 6.102, 123, 130, 7.268, 8.569, 13.152, 158, 177, 183, 351, 15.175, 19.205, 338, 431, 538, 22.303 (*LfgrE* 2004: 806-811).

¹⁵¹ Cf. *Od.* 4.524, 8.285 (considered suspect [cf. *LfgrE* 2006: 154]), 302, 14.261, 17.430 (*LfgrE* 2006: 154).

¹⁵² Cf. *Od.* 2.147 (*LfgrE* 1991: 1495-1496).

¹⁵³ Cf. *Od.* 3.278, 5.313, 8.507, 14.2, 16.365, 22.278 (*LfgrE* 1955: 434).

¹⁵⁴ Cf. *Od.* 3.295 (*LfgrE* 2006: 40).

¹⁵⁵ All fractions have been rounded off to the nearest whole number.

¹⁵⁶ Line numbers have been counted from the *TLG*.

occurs every 65 lines in the *Apologue*, compared to 1 every 293 lines elsewhere in the epic poem. In short, the *Apologue* is characterized by a relatively greater typicality of references to these spatial units.

Mountains are placed within several *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue*—including Odysseus' encounters with the (i) Phaeacians, (ii) Cyclopes (including the Island of the Goats), (iii) Polyphemus, (iv) the Laestrygonians, (v) Circe, and (vi) Scylla and Charybdis—and come to connote a sense of 'isolation' or 'distance'. Admittedly, my analysis has not included every single encounter in the *Apologue*, and further analysis would be needed to discover how this characterization might, or might not, be applied to the episodes of the Cicones, the Lotus Eaters, Aeolus (cf. Lowenstam 1993: 194-195), the *Nekyia*, the Sirens, and the Island of Helios, which, owing to spatial constraints, this dissertation cannot explore more fully.

To conclude then, mountains convey various senses of isolation in the *xeinoi* encounters in these four books: (i) topographic, where homes are pushed to peripheries, isolated dwellings, and where a sense of distance is created between *xeinoi* and local inhabitants; (ii) social, in which characters display strong anti-social tendencies, whether physically distancing themselves from communication with others, or deliberately subverting accepted social behaviour, often entailing an abuse of *xenia* through anthropophagy; (iii) temporal, whereby certain actions and associations with prehistoric figures characterize individuals as belonging to a more primitive era; and (iv) an isolation from the human world, by which I refer to the manner in which *xeinoi* encounters are placed beyond the physical limits of human agents.

Chapter 3: Eating and Danger

3.1 Overview

This chapter identifies acts of eating in *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue* as a typical feature of the story, and argues that these repeated units, when examined with respect to their contexts, come to connote danger for the Ithacan *xeinoi* during their travels. This danger will be shown to be of two varieties: (i) the danger of a delay in the pursuit and progress of the *nostos*, and (ii) the danger of destruction.

The importance of eating to the *Odyssey* has been recognized in several scholarly studies. In the first section of this chapter, ‘*Eating in the Odyssey*’ (3.2), I shall therefore provide a brief review of the relevant scholarship. The particular objective of this chapter will lie, firstly, in identifying ‘*The Typicality of Eating in the Apologue*’ (3.3), and then in exploring how this typical unit breeds connoted senses of danger for the Ithacan *xeinoi* in their travels (3.4). Finally, I shall summarize my findings in *Conclusions* (3.5).

The innovation of this study will be consist, firstly, in the clarification of the typicality of eating across several *xeinoi* encounters within the *Apologue*, (so analysis is not confined to selected episodes) and, secondly, in the demonstration that the contextual associations opened out by these repeated units pertain to the two sets of dangers which the Ithacan *xeinoi* experience during their wanderings.

3.2 *Eating in the Odyssey*

The most comprehensive recent monograph into the importance of eating in the *Odyssey* has been undertaken by Egbert Bakker, in *The meaning of meat and the structure of the Odyssey*

(2013). Bakker's study is oriented specifically towards exploring the consumption of meat in the heroic feast and the meaning behind such consumption. The significance of the ideal, successful Homeric feast or *dais*¹⁵⁷ for Bakker lies in a consolidation of social (particularly, aristocratic) and religious bonds which takes place during the consumption:

The *dais*, then, is an important occasion on which a community reaffirms its cohesion and maintains its relations with the gods. Successful *daites* are the typical manifestation of a healthy community.

(41)

Bakker's (38) interpretation stems from the connection of the noun *dais* with the verb *daiein*; this verb, alongside other verbal forms such as *daitreuein*, *dassasthai*, and *dateomai* in the Homeric poems, denotes a 'sharing' or 'dividing', whether it be of plunder, livestock, or, indeed, meat (cf. Saïd 1979: 15-17, Wecowski 2014: 198). Etymologically, the *dais*, or feast, while denoting on a simple level an occasion for the consumption of meat, is also a location for "the division of the slaughtered animal" (Bakker 2013: 38, cf. Bremmer 2007: 138), and where, on account of this division, social and religious bonds are reinforced (Howe 2008: 40, McInerney 2010: 60). The Homeric hero, while keeping the best part of the meat for himself as a form of honour or *geras* (Bremmer 2007: 138, Wecowski 2014: 212-213),¹⁵⁸ since meat and livestock were prestigious, valuable commodities in the Aegean (Bakker 2013: 48-50,

¹⁵⁷ "For Homer, *dais* is the generic term for 'feasting', and all other types of banquet can be subsumed under this category" (Wecowski 2014: 198).

¹⁵⁸ For example, Odysseus retains the best ram for himself in Book 9 (lines 549-551). On the notion of equal sharing in Homer, cf. Wecowski 2014: 198-199.

Haubold 2000: 18, Howe 2008: 39-40),¹⁵⁹ redistributes a share of the meat to the community, his fellow aristocrats (Bakker 2013: 37-38):

The distribution of animals in the form of gifts, or even as meat distributed at feasts, helped to maintain the complex reciprocal networks of elite society that were essential to the success of the aristocratic household

(Howe 2008: 40).

So too, the sacrifice of meat to the gods in a properly-conducted *dais* constitutes “an essential channel of communication between the two realms [i.e. human and divine]” (Bakker 2013: 41).¹⁶⁰

This ideal cultural situation of the successful feast—the equal sharing of meat and consolidation of a healthy society—becomes problematic in the *Odyssey*, where feasting is a more complex area, involving both good models (i.e. where the distribution of victuals is considered ‘equal’) and bad models (where the distribution is irregular or perverted in some manner) (Bakker 2013: 42). Moreover, Bakker concedes that even in the case of the benevolent models in the *Odyssey* feasting is never entirely without problems:

Even feasts that are in themselves beyond reproach can be problematic in the *Odyssey*. For the guest in whose honour the feasting takes place there is the risk of

¹⁵⁹ “The first thing to note is the importance of cattle farming in the world of epic. Odysseus wipes out a generation of Ithacans because they eat up his livestock” (Haubold 2000: 18). For further discussions and comments on the economic value and prestigious status of livestock in Homeric society, cf. Bremmer 2007: 133-134, Saïd 1979: 10-11.

¹⁶⁰ For further readings on sacrifice in early Greek society and the Homeric poems, cf. Bremmer 2007: 132-144, Detienne 1979: 7-35, Vidal-Naquet 1996: 33-53.

delay and being detained: his *nostos* may come to be jeopardized, the obverse of the hospitality that both Odysseus and his son enjoy. The traveller may also pose this risk himself, when his tale is too long to be told without significant loss of time.

(42)

Here Bakker touches on an important connotation of eating, upon which my analysis will elaborate further: namely, the danger of stagnation, for the act of eating to delay the *xeinoi* in the completion of their *nostos*. Moreover, in my study I shall explore further the simultaneity which Bakker identifies in these feasts, where eating can be both a risk (for example, of delay) and at the same time a benevolent boon, “beyond reproach” (42)—specifically, one which removes worries, cares, and griefs from the tired Ithacans. Incidentally, one criticism of Bakker’s decision to focus purely on the ‘feasting of meat’ as a typical unit in the story is that it negates instances of eating in the *Apologue*, such as that in the land of the Lotus Eaters, where a definite delay accompanies the eating, but where, importantly, this eating is not carnivorous in any respect.

As in my analysis, Bakker (42-43) combines the danger of a delay with a more immediate threat connoted by feasting; for him, the *dais* —in particular, the *dais* where the distribution of meat has gone wrong in some respect—opens out the possibility of strife, conflict, and, ultimately, of destruction. This relationship between eating and destruction is most evident in the case of the suitors, the principal antagonists of the epic. The suitors threaten Odysseus not simply by competing for the hand of Penelope in marriage, in the hero’s absence, but also in trying to supplant Odysseus as *basileus* in Ithaca, destroying the sovereignty of his *oikos* (43-48); Bakker (44-45) suggests that the latter crime is perhaps the more pertinent and underlying motive behind the suitors’ prolonged stay in the hero’s *oikos*

(cf. McInerney 2010: 86, Saïd 1979: 10).¹⁶¹ And, to this end, their primary means of destroying the absent king is to eat Odysseus (and his son, Telemachus) out of house and home (Bakker 2013: 45, Howe 2008: 40, Saïd 1979: 10, 24). The kind of excessive feasting in which the suitors indulge is, in truth, a gross perversion of the heroic *dais*, where the distribution of meat at feasts in a community has become the responsibility of only one *oikos*, depleting it to its ruin (Bakker 2013: 45-46):

Coupable de brouiller les partages, les prétendants sont surtout criminels en ce qu'ils refusent tout partage et bloquent complètement le processus d'échanges dans lequel s'inscrit le banquet et qu'il met lui-même en œuvre. Leur festins ne servent jamais à réaffirmer, par un partage ou un échange, les liens qui existent entre les membres de l'aristocratie locale

(Saïd 1979: 24)

The suitors' feasting is notable for its lack of reciprocity: they are content to consume the livestock of Telemachus entirely and not to share any meat of their own, nor are they willing to move their feast to another *oikos* in order to lessen the burden on Telemachus' herds (*Od.* 2.138-145) (Rundin 1996: 193-194); instead of being a place for consolidating social and religious ties within a community, the suitors' *dais* has instead become a place for the complete destruction of Odysseus' home and wealth. Bakker (2013: 45) notes, furthermore, that several verbs which denote forms of 'eating', 'devouring', or 'grazing' are used in order to characterize the suitors' aggressive, deleterious acts in diminishing Telemachus' inherited property and Odysseus' *oikos*; a notable employment occurs in the phrase, "οἱ τοι βίοντον

¹⁶¹ "Tous les crimes des prétendants se résument donc à un seul, la destruction de la maison d'Ulysse" (Saïd 1979: 10).

κατέδουσι” (e.g. *Od.* 11.116) (cf. Saïd 1979: 10).¹⁶² The suitors are ‘eating away’ at Odysseus’ “βίοντον”; this term, as Bakker notes (2013: 45), applies to the destruction of the hero’s ‘livelihood’, but it also implies the destruction of “his (and his son’s) physical life” (45) (cf. *Lfgre* 1991: 63).

Outside the context of meat distribution in a feast, eating has also been regarded as a typical element in Homeric hospitality scenes. To this end, Steve Reece provides a systematic breakdown of this activity. In his structural rubric of the various elements comprising a typical hospitality scene, Reece lists ‘the Feast’ as the ninth major element and provides the following three sub-categories into which it may be divided: “preparation”, “consumption”, and “conclusion” (1993: 7); furthermore, there is also the “departure meal” (7), twenty-first in Reece’s rubric, which is granted after the bestowing of guest-gifts by the host (7). Feasting is a typical, characteristic activity in Reece’s hospitality scene: (i) it occupies a fixed position in the possible range of actions in a scene of *xenia*; (ii) it is composed of three repeatable thematic sub-categories (7); and (iii) these subcategories demonstrate repetition in language through certain formulaic phrases in both Homeric epics (23-25).

Reece’s analysis is similar to my own in that he is seeking first to typify an action in the narrative and then to ‘read’ meaning into this typification. The value of placing ‘feasting’ within a set framework of *xenia* lies in our being able to assess how this activity characterizes specific *xeinoi* situations; we can track divergences in the representations of feasting across different hospitality scenes and interpret what these differences tell us about the quality of the respective hospitality scenes, and about guests and hosts.

One may, for instance, compare the initial feast in the home of Nestor to that in the home of Alcinous. Telemachus is immediately, without any reservation, granted his victuals as a *xeinos* upon arriving at Nestor’s abode in Pylos (*Od.* 3.31-42):

¹⁶² For other instances, cf. *Od.* 13.396, 428, 15.32; also for a similar phrase, cf. *Od.* 1.160, 14.377, 18.280.

In the ensuing feast the protocols of aristocratic *xenia* are followed exactly: the guests are greeted and feted without question. They are seated near Nestor, in places of honour, are given choice cuts, and receive the golden cut to pour libation... Only when the food has been eaten does Nestor even ask Telemachos who he is and what his business is.

(McInerny 2010: 87-88)

Odysseus' arrival at the Phaeacian feast—he arrives at the moment when the Scherian people are pouring their libations (*Od.* 7.136-138)—differs in several respects from the 'model reception' in Nestor's home: firstly, the hosts do not actively seat their guest at the table, but stare in silence at their guest (*Od.* 7.144-145) (Reece 1993: 105, Rose 1969: 394-395);¹⁶³ secondly, whereas Telemachus is not required to say anything before getting his meal, Odysseus has to entreat Arete for help (*Od.* 7.146-152); thirdly, Echeneus, one of the Phaeacian elders, reprimands Alcinous for his silence and recommends that food be given to Odysseus (*Od.* 7.159-166) (Reece 1993: 105, Rose 1969: 395-396); and, fourthly, when a meal is given to Odysseus, he is interrupted before completion of the meal by Alcinous' speech (*Od.* 7.179-181, 186-206), and he has to ask the king of the Phaeacians to be allowed to finish his meal (*Od.* 7.215) (Reece 1993: 105, Rose 1969: 396).

There are several pertinent reasons as to why the Phaeacian reception scene should be characterized by deviations from the ideal feast we witness in Nestor's home. (i) From a plot

¹⁶³ "What explanation is there for Arete's and Alcinous' failure to greet promptly the stranger, who for a long time (cf. ὀψέ 7.155) sits in a position of supplication in the ashes at the hearth, an indiscretion for which Echeneus must reprimand them (7.153-166)?" (Reece 1993: 105). On Alcinous' reception of Odysseus as entailing a quite exemplary display between suppliant and supplicated, cf. Gould 1973: 78-79.

perspective, it creates dramatic tension. For the best part of Book 6 and the start of Book 7, the narrative has been leading up to the reception in Alcinous' palace; it would therefore be anticlimactic if Odysseus were at once shown to his plate without any uncertainty. (ii) From the perspective of Odysseus' character, the possibility of an unfavourable, or somewhat lukewarm, reception allows the character the chance to reveal his heroic identity—both his great physical prowess, which he reveals in the athletics in Book 8, and his trials on the seas, the sufferings which are characteristic of Odysseus, part of his heroic *kleos* (Rose 1969: 398-406).¹⁶⁴ (iii) The relationship between Odysseus and the Phaeacians is between complete foreigners and complete strangers (unlike the meeting between Nestor and Telemachus, who are both Greeks and have heard of one another); it seems appropriate that there is a certain degree of hesitancy involved in the initial exchange (Reece 1993: 108). Along these lines, one should also acknowledge the fact that Odysseus has materialized before the Phaeacians without any warning, since he had been previously hidden by the machinations of Athena, and that, given his sudden appearance, some surprise, and a certain amount of delay, could reasonably be expected of his hosts (Thornton 1970: 40). (iv) From the perspective of the Phaeacians, they are characterized as somewhat aloof from human sufferings, as a people who live in hyper-civilized luxury, even dining with the Olympians upon occasion (Segal 1962: 27-28); the fact that they would not react with urgency to Odysseus' supplication is therefore apt.

In terms of the *Apologue*, Reece devotes an entire chapter to illustrate how the Polyphemus episode entails a perversion and parody of a typical hospitality sequence; and, to

¹⁶⁴ "Odysseus' major problem in Books 7 and 8, and thus the focus of interest, consists in replacing the suspicion and very incomplete hospitality he first encounters with admiration, warmth, and total acceptance on the part of the royal family. He accomplishes this in stages through his own extraordinary physical and especially mental prowess" (Rose 1969: 398).

this end, the depiction of feasting in this book is shown to be irregular. Contrary to Reece's rubric of the ideal hospitality scene, Polyphemus questions Odysseus on his identity before initiating a feast (*Od.* 9.252-255) (132-133), and when the ogre does indeed turn to the feast, it is perversely inverted feast: the guests are not offered any victuals but become the feast themselves (134-135). Polyphemus' crude response to the proper ritual of *xeinoi* interaction, exemplified by his irregular treatment of 'the Feast', characterizes him as a truly inhospitable figure in the context of Odyssean reception scenes.

Reece's rubric indicates the importance of eating specifically to hospitality scenes—i.e. scenes such as the receptions in Pylos and Scheria, which demonstrate a high proportion of the typical elements in Reece's list—such that we are able to project how certain deviations from the typical representations of eating (or, otherwise, exemplary models, such as in the home of Nestor) can characterize reception scenes. However, to frame all the various *xeinoi* interactions in the *Apologue* as forms of *xeinoi* interactions, or hospitality sequences, is problematic. Reece's rubric requires a number of typical criteria to occur in order for a scene to be considered an hospitality scene, but in my first chapter, I argued that his rubric was of limited value to the various interactions in the *Apologue*, and that to refer to the *Apologue* (rather than, singularly, the Polyphemus sequence, where I concur with his analysis) as a parody of hospitality scenes is not justified by the mere absence of these criteria, but, rather, by their marked presence and negation, as seen in the *Cyclopeia*.

What justification, for example, is there to describe the episode of the Lotus Eaters as a scene of hospitality? Employing Reece's list of thirty-eight individual ingredients, I detect the following three components: "II. Arrival at the destination" (*Od.* 9.83-84), "IIIb. Description of the person[s] sought" (i.e. they consume the Lotus plant [*Od.* 9.84]), and "IXb. Feast consumption" (*Od.* 9.91-97) (1993: 6-7). In this case, the consumption of food is really the singular activity which defines the episode. To label this episode a 'hospitality scene', or

a perversion of one, which Reece suggests (124), is to designate a scene of feasting as equivalent to a scene of hospitality. In fact, Reece himself concedes in his introduction that eating as an activity need not be restricted to hospitality scenes (6). Feasting, as Bakker (2013: 43) has identified, is also important in the episode of the Cicones, but this is certainly no hospitality scene—rather a scene of raiding by the Ithacans. It is equally challenging to argue for the encounter with Scylla (an encounter between predator and prey [cf. *Od.* 12.251-255]) and the Ithacans' stay in Thrinacia (where 'the host' is entirely absent) as 'hospitality scenes', although eating is an essential activity to both.

By restricting our analysis of eating to formal hospitality scenes, we are likely to miss out on several important references to eating throughout the *Apologue* which could contribute to our overall understanding of the meaning of this activity, or, otherwise, we are likely to read too much into certain scenes, always viewing them, unnecessarily, from an ethical perspective of good or bad hospitality or *xenia*.

3.3 *The Typicality of Eating in the Apologue*

The present section provides a complete list (3.3.1) for all acts of eating in *xeinoi* encounters in the *Apologue*. I include 'feasting' here under the general designation of 'acts of eating' for those instances where the consumption of food is not explicitly mentioned, but where the description of a feast renders the act of eating implicit in the story (e.g. *Od.* 9.45-46).

One of the problems encountered in formulating this section has been the formal representation of a 'unit of eating'. It will be observed that the unit of repetition in this chapter is somewhat different to the previous, in that the analysis is centered on a type of activity or event rather than a singular spatial object. Thus while the methodological basis for the identification of repetitions is still very much the same—i.e. the semantic recognition of a

unit of sufficient similarity—¹⁶⁵the formal parameters by which this unit is defined are different. In the case of mountains, repetition of the semantic unit was observed most often through a single noun or adjective (occasionally two words, as in partitive constructions or nouns in apposition); an activity or event in the narrative, however, will inevitably be denoted by a more complex unit—phrases, clauses, or even multiple lines.

Thus in designating each unit of ‘eating’ I could include all words which impart direct information concerning this activity: most importantly, (i) the actual process of consuming food should be given (or preparing food, in the case of a feast), which is conveyed by various verbs or noun-verb phrases (i.e. what action is being done); (ii) the subject of the eating might be provided (who does the eating); (iii) the object of the eating might be given (what food is eaten); and (iv) any further adverbial phrases which impart additional information as to the nature of the eating act (where, when, how (etc.) the eating takes place) might also be provided. In short, I understand the unit of eating as a typical action or event in the narrative which can stretch in scale from a short phrase to a clause to several lines, or parts thereof.

On account of the length of many of these action units and their high concentration in certain passages,¹⁶⁶ this section will apply the following measures for the sake of economy and clarity: (a) to cite merely the verse numbers in which the eating units can be located by the reader, rather than to give full quotations of the Homeric text here; (b) to group these units according to the *xeinoi* encounters in which they occur; and (c) to provide a brief, generalized descriptive summary of eating in each encounter.

¹⁶⁵ For further discussion on an audience’s recognition of typical actions and scenes, cf. Minchin 2001: 33-48.

¹⁶⁶ Thus, in the case of the Lotus Eaters, within a short space of some 20 lines, I could list line 9.84 (οἷ τ' ἄνθινον εἶδαρ ἔδουσιν), lines 86-87 (αἶψα δὲ δεῖπνον ἔλοντο θοῆς παρὰ νηυσὶν ἑταῖροι. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτιό τ' ἐπασσάμεθ'), lines 93-94 (ἀλλὰ σφι δόσαν λωτοῖο πάσασθαι / τῶν δ' ὅς τις λωτοῖο φάγοι μελιηδέα καρπὸν), line 97 (λωτὸν ἐρεπτόμενοι), and line 102 (λωτοῖο φαγῶν), as 5 separate ‘units of eating’.

N.B.1. This list does not include references to potential objects of consumption, e.g. livestock, when there is no explicit reference to an act of eating in the immediate narrative context, or when they are not part of a feast preparation; to clarify, the subject of this chapter is a typical activity, not a spatial or material object in the world of the story, as the previous chapter examined.

N.B.2. I have also not included isolated references to drinking, except when they occur alongside eating as part of a feast; the importance of drinking in the *Odyssey*—and, in particular, wine—demands separate discussion as to its significance (cf. Louden 1999: 38-40, Wecowski 2014: 214-248), which, for reasons of space, this dissertation cannot explore further.

N.B.3. Finally, this typical analysis is interested in eating as a physical event in the story—that is, the action of characters in having actual food prepared and consuming food—and thus it does not include mere verbal references to eating (for example, generic adjectival qualifiers like ‘bread-eating’ (*Od.* 9.191) or allusions to earlier eating acts within direct speech [*Od.* 9.478-479]),¹⁶⁷ when these references are not accompanied by an actual consumption or feasting in the immediate context of the story.

¹⁶⁷ For such references to eating, where no actual consumption occurs in the immediate narrative of the *Apologue*, cf. *Od.* 9.75, 190-191, 369-370, 475-476, 478-479, 10.200, 272, 290, 411, 11.116-117, 12.127-128, 282-283, 310, 439.

3.3.1 *Reference List for Eating in the Apologue*

(i) The Phaeacians: 9.8-9.

Odysseus praises the feast laid out by his hosts, the Phaeacians.

(ii) The Cicones: 9.45-46.

Odysseus' crew enjoy a feast by slaughtering the cattle of the coastal Cicones.

(iii) The Lotus Eaters: 9.86-87, 93-94, 97, 102.

The Ithacans take their rations upon reaching the land of the Lotus Eaters. Several of the crew, upon venturing inland, are offered the plant of these people and eat it.

(iv) The Island of the Goats: 9.154-155, 162, 557.

The nymphs on the Island of the Goats prepare a feast for the Ithacans, which the latter duly accept. Odysseus and his crew later return to the island, after their encounter with Polyphemus, and sacrifice a ram to Zeus.

(v) Polyphemus: 9.231-232, 244-249, 288-293, 296-297, 311-312, 344, 347.

The Ithacans eat some of Polyphemus' victuals in the absence of their host. Polyphemus returns and prepares his dairy-based supper. Polyphemus then kills and devours Odysseus' men on three separate occasions.

(vi) Aeolus: 10.8-9, 57-58, 60-61.

The Ithacans stay with the god Aeolus, whose family engages in perpetual feasting. Before the Ithacans visit him again, after their near homecoming, they take their rations.

(vii) The Laestrygonians: 10.116, 124.

The Laestrygonians kill and feast upon the Ithacans.

(viii) Circe: 10.143, 155, 182-184, 234-237, 241-243, 316-317, 354-357, 370-373, 375-376, 378-379, 383-384, 386, 426-427, 452, 460, 468, 477, 12.23, 30.

The Ithacans take their rations upon landing at Aeaea. Later at the beach they consume a stag, which Odysseus has hunted. Circe brews a porridge for Odysseus' ambassadors, who duly eat the concoction. Circe feeds the men, now transformed into swine, with acorns. Circe gives the same concoction to Odysseus, but it has no effect. A feast is prepared for Odysseus, but he will not eat until his companions are changed back into human form. Once he retrieves the remainder of his men from the beach, Odysseus and his companions enjoy the feasts on offer

in Circe's home. Upon returning to Aeaea from the Underworld, the Ithacans on the beach are brought a meal by Circe.

(ix) Agamemnon: 11.410-411.

Agamemnon is invited to a feast at the home of Aegisthus.

(x) Scylla: 12.256.

Scylla devours Odysseus' men.

(xi) Thrinacia: 12.307-308, 354-65, 397-398.

The Ithacans land on Thrinacia, having sworn to Odysseus that they will not slaughter the cattle of the Sun. After a month of inertia and scant victuals, the men, under the advice of Eurylochus, prepare a meal by sacrificing the best of Helios' cattle. They proceed to consume the cattle for six days, before departing on the seventh.

3.3.2 *Summary*

It is evident from this study of repeated units that eating is a typical activity throughout the *Apologue*, not only from the sheer number of incidences, but also on account of their presence in nearly all the *xeinoi* encounters in the *Apologue*. In the following analysis, the contextual meaning which becomes associated with these references will be further explored.

3.4 *A Connotative Interpretation of Eating in the Apologue*

“Ἄλκίνοε κρείων, πάντων ἀριδείκετε λαῶν,
ἦ τοι μὲν τόδε καλὸν ἀκουέμεν ἐστὶν ἀοιδοῦ
τοιοῦδ', οἷός ᾽δ' ἐστὶ, θεοῖσ' ἐναλίγκιος αὐδήν.
οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ γέ τί φημι τέλος χαριέστερον εἶναι
ἢ ὅτ' ἐϋφροσύνη μὲν ἔχη κάτα δῆμον ἅπαντα,
δαιτυμόνες δ' ἀνά δώματ' ἀκουάζονται ἀοιδοῦ
ἡμενοὶ ἐξείης, παρὰ δὲ πλήθωσι τράπεζαι
σίτου καὶ κρειῶν, μέθυ δ' ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσων
οἰνοχόος φορέησι καὶ ἐγχείῃ δεπάεσσι·
τοῦτό τί μοι κάλλιστον ἐνὶ φρεσὶν εἶδεται εἶναι.
σοὶ δ' ἐμὰ κήδεα θυμὸς ἐπετράπετο στονόεντα
εἴρεσθ', ὄφρ' ἔτι μᾶλλον ὀδυρόμενος στεναχίζω.
τί πρῶτόν τοι ἔπειτα, τί δ' ὑστάτιον καταλέξω;
κήδε' ἐπεὶ μοι πολλὰ δόσαν θεοὶ Οὐρανίωνες.

(*Od.* 9.2-15)

Alcinous, most illustrious lord, truly it is a happy thing to listen to such a bard as this, whose utterance is like a god's. Indeed I think life is at its best when a whole people is in festivity and banqueters in the hall sit next to each other listening to the bard, while the tables by them are laden with bread and meat, and the cupbearer draws wine from the mixing bowl and pours it into the cups. That, I think, is the happiest thing there is. But your mind is set on questioning me on the bitter sufferings I have borne, and for

me this means more lamentation and more unhappiness. Be it so; what shall I tell you first, what shall I leave for last? My griefs have been many—so heaven ordained.

(Shewring 1980: 99)

In an encomium to his extra-narrative situation, Odysseus commences his *Apologue* with a portrait of the flawless banquet with which the Phaeacians have provided him; indeed, the language of the Ithacan guest is laced with hyperbolic expressions and the highest of praise (Stanford 1996: 348).¹⁶⁸ Firstly, upon his host, Alcinous, is bestowed the epithet, “πάντων ἀριδείκετε λαῶν” (*Od.* 9.2), where the genitive adjective denotes an immeasurable quantity, and therefore the supreme reach of Alcinous’ ‘eminence among men’, “ἀριδείκετε λαῶν”; this, incidentally, is a title of honour which only the king of Scheria is granted in the *Odyssey* (cf. *Od.* 8.382, 401, 11.355, 378, 13.38) (*Lfgre* 1955: 1271-1272). Secondly, Odysseus likens the voice of the bard, Demodocus, to the divinities, “θεοῖσ' ἐναλίγκιος αὐδήν” (*Od.* 9.4), and describes the act of listening to the singer as “κάλόν” (*Od.* 9.3), an adjective which is later picked up and so reinforced by “κάλλιστον” (*Od.* 9.11) (de Jong 2004a: 227).¹⁶⁹ And, thirdly, Odysseus lauds the accomplishment, “τέλος” (*Od.* 9.5), of the bonhomie, “ἐὐφροσύνη” (*Od.* 9.6),¹⁷⁰ which arises from such a festive occasion—entailing music (*Od.* 9.7-8), eating (*Od.* 9.8-9), and drinking (*Od.* 9.9-10); this achievement of the Phaeacians is then qualified by two superlatives, “οὐ... χαριέστερον... / ἤ” (*Od.* 9.5-6) (the negative with the comparative adjective amounts to a virtual superlative in sense), and “κάλλιστον” (*Od.* 9.11).

¹⁶⁸ “In 3 ff. O’s introduction to his long speech is a model for after-dinner speakers. He begins with a felicitously worded praise of the pleasures of music and feasting, while deftly implying that he is something of a connoisseur and that Alcinous’ entertainment satisfies his high standards.” (Stanford 1996: 348).

¹⁶⁹ “The passage is marked off by ring composition” (de Jong 2004a: 227).

¹⁷⁰ On translating “τέλος” (*Od.* 9.5) and “ἐὐφροσύνη” (*Od.* 9.6), cf. Stanford 1996: 348.

Accordingly, the first reference to eating—or, to be more precise, the preparation of the table—in the *Apologue* appears an ideal model. The banquet, the occasion for feasting and drinking and listening to music and stories, seems to be the very pinnacle of human happiness (Pucci 1987: 184). The bliss of this flawless feast, however, is soon tempered by the harsh realism of Odysseus’ own experiences, which he relates to the Phaeacians in the ensuing lines (*Od.* 9.12-15). As idyllic as the present festivities of the Phaeacians are to Odysseus, they are equalled by the pain of recollecting his wanderings in reaching Scheria, which Alcinous has asked Odysseus to relate (*Od.* 8.572-586, 9.12-13) (de Jong 2004a: 227). Twice Odysseus uses forms of the word *kēdos* (*Od.* 9.12, 15) in order to emphasize the ‘grief’ which he has had to endure during his adventures; and, in order to further explicate his emotions, he twice uses words which denote physical groaning, “στονόεντα” (*Od.* 9.12) and “στεναχίζω” (*Od.* 9.13), the second of which is partnered with an adjective to denote his lamentation, “ὄδυρόμενος” (*Od.* 9.13).¹⁷¹ In truth, so troubled is Odysseus that even to relate his adventures to the Phaeacians is to suffer more (*Od.* 9.13) (Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989: 12, Stanford 1996: 348).

The Phaeacian feast, while ostensibly a place of supreme mirth and cheer (*Od.* 9.2-11), is soon transformed into a place of suffering for Odysseus (*Od.* 9.12-15), of *kēdos*, as he is compelled as a narrator to relive the hardships experienced during his various excursions into the mysterious lands whither he and his crew sailed. Uneasy associations therefore open up around the act of feasting in this introductory passage, juxtaposing the pleasure initially expressed by Odysseus, indicative of a space of present cheerfulness, and the subsequent

¹⁷¹ On the phonetic association of “ὄδυρόμενος” (*Od.* 9.13) with the name Odysseus, alongside other words which denote suffering, cf. de Jong 2004a: 14.

feeling of *kēdos* which Alcinous' questioning has triggered in his guest, turning the feast into a space for the recollection of the mournful past (cf. *Od.* 8.522) (Segal 1962: 27-28):¹⁷²

[I]t is, then, this opposition of 'grief'... and 'joy'... that introduces Odysseus' statement of his identity and his tale of the past.

(Segal 1962: 28)

And it is with the Phaeacian feast as an ever present background that Odysseus will indeed enumerate the numerous sufferings and losses which he experienced over the seas—sufferings, ironically enough, which are frequently intermingled, as I shall explore, with actions of feasting and eating.

The conflict arising in this passage (*Od.* 9.2-15), between the picture of idyllic Phaeacian festivities and Odysseus' subsequent articulation of his own sufferings, is, in fact, a continuation of a tension which has informed references to food and acts of eating in Books 7 and 8. For the Phaeacians, who enjoy a quasi-divine, hyper-civilized life, eating is nothing but a pleasurable activity. In Book 7, Odysseus pauses to gaze over the Phaeacian palace and beholds its unparalleled luxury—bronze walls, golden doors, and silver pillars (*Od.* 7.86-89)—and near this grand architecture, the audience of the poem is afforded a glance at the garden of Alcinous. Here there is a great variety of fruit-bearing trees—pears, pomegranates, apples, figs, and olives (*Od.* 7.115-116); and, moreover these plants are in rigorous health,

¹⁷² “The pain and loss of Odysseus in his post-Trojan adventures, his κήδεα, are similarly for Alcinous a fascinating, pleasurable tale to which he would gladly listen till dawn (11.375-376), while Odysseus would perhaps prefer to sleep (11.379ff.) and depart at dawn (see 7.222), rather than be delayed till the following sunset by another day of feasting and song (see 13.28ff)” (Segal 1962: 27). Reflecting this transition from present to past, one can observe the sudden shift in verb tense from the presents (*Od.* 9.3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11) to aorists (*Od.* 9.12, 15) in the passage.

remarkable for the quantity of food they bear, “τηλεθάοντα... τηλεθόωσαι” (*Od.* 7.114, 116). The fruit never rots, “οὐ ποτε καρπὸς ἀπόλλυται” (*Od.* 7.117), but is perennial, “ἐπετήσιος” (*Od.* 7.118): the next generation of fruit growing over the previous (*Od.* 7.120-121). This allows for multiple stages in the growth and cultivation of a single crop to occur simultaneously, without respect to changing seasons (the example of grapes is given in the narrative [*Od.* 7.122-126]).¹⁷³ This is a typical Golden Age landscape, a *locus amoenus* where the inhabitants can attain food in unlimited plenty and, moreover, without any work (de Jong 2004a: 176, Edwards 1993: 47-48).

What is most remarkable, perhaps, is that all this productive fertility is achieved with the conspicuous absence of labour... the entire passage contains only two verbs of cultivation... and they are both without an expressed subject... [the Phaeacians’] world and their life partake of a sensibility of ease, abundance, and closeness to the gods.

(Dougherty 2001: 88-89)

Abundant food for the Phaeacians is an effortless by-product of their paradise, and throughout Odysseus’ stay in Scheria eating—and, especially, eating plentifully—is a common activity for them (de Jong 2004a: 177). Thus not only does the royal garden yield an abundance of perennial plants, but livestock is also available in great quantities. In Book 8

¹⁷³ On the unusual preponderance of historic presents in this descriptive passage (*Od.* 7.103-130), which is entirely foreign to Homeric grammar, West (2000: 479-488) recommends retaining the passage, but inserting it into an earlier part of the Phaeacian sequence: Nausicaa’s speech to Odysseus, where the present tenses would be less problematic.

the promised feast of Alcinous takes place and the king himself slaughters a great number of sheep, swine, and cattle for his people:

τοῖσιν δ' Ἀλκίνοος δυοκαίδεκα μῆλ' ἰέρευσεν,
ὀκτὼ δ' ἀργιόδοντας ὕας, δύο δ' εἰλίποδας βοῦς·
τοὺς δέρον ἀμφί θ' ἔπον, τετύκοντό τε δαῖτ' ἐρατεινήν

(*Od.* 8.59-61)

For all these guests, Alcinous slaughtered a dozen sheep, eight boars, two oxen; these were flayed and made ready, and a meal was prepared that all would welcome.

(Shewring 1980: 86)

The abundance of the Phaeacian table can also be observed in Odysseus' initial arrival and reception at the palace in Book 7. Odysseus first catches sight of the Phaeacians in the closing stages of a feast—the Phaeacian banqueters have just finished their meal and are pouring drink offerings to Hermes (*Od.* 7.137) (de Jong 2004a: 177). Echeclus then recommends that the stranger be seated and be given food and drink (*Od.* 7.163-166), which he duly is and in good measure “εἶδατα πόλλ’” (*Od.* 7.176); and after Alcinous has stated that he will call for a great banquet the following day (*Od.* 7.189-191), the king provides Odysseus with further indications as to the customary lavishness and grandeur of their feasting, for we are told that the gods themselves come down to dine with the Phaeacians, “δαίνονται τε παρ' ἄμμι καθήμενοι ἔνθα περ ἡμεῖς” (*Od.* 7.203).

In response to the easy largesse of the Phaeacian table and the god-like magnificence of their feasting, however, Odysseus characterizes eating in rather less elevated, pleasurable

terms, when he asks Alcinous to be allowed to finish his meal, “δορπῆσαι ἐάσατε” (*Od.* 7.215):

ἀλλ' ἐμὲ μὲν δορπῆσαι ἐάσατε κηδόμενον περ·
οὐ γάρ τι στυγερῆ ἐπὶ γαστέρι κύντερον ἄλλο
ἔπλετο ἢ τ' ἐκέλευσεν ἔο μνήσασθαι ἀνάγκη
καὶ μάλα τειρόμενον καὶ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πένθος ἔχοντα,
ὡς καὶ ἐγὼ πένθος μὲν ἔχω φρεσίν, ἢ δὲ μάλα' αἰεὶ
ἐσθέμεναι κέλεται καὶ πινέμεν, ἐκ δέ με πάντων
ληθάνει, ὅσσο' ἔπαθον, καὶ ἐνιπλησθῆναι ἀνώγει.

(*Od.* 7.215-221)

But whatever my distress may be, I would ask you now to let me eat. There is nothing more devoid of shame than the accursed belly; it thrusts itself upon a man's mind in spite of his afflictions, in spite of his inward grief. That is true of me; my heart is sad, but my belly keeps urging me to have food and drink, tries to blot out all the past from me; it says imperiously: “Eat and be filled.”

(Shewring 1980: 81)

Irene de Jong identifies this passage as one in a number of the “accursed belly motif” (2004a: 182),¹⁷⁴ which runs throughout the *Odyssey* (6.133-134, 15.343-345, 17.286-289, 17.228, 17.473-474, 18.53-54, 18.364, 18.380). The majority of these references are in the latter half of the poem, where the hero makes his return to Ithaca in the raiment and persona of a beggar, and where the base need of the stomach therefore provides a fitting thematic

¹⁷⁴ For comprehensive discussions on the *gastēr* in Homer, cf. Bakker 2013: 135-156, Pucci 1987: 157-208.

juxtaposition to the excessive feasting and greed of the suitors (de Jong 2004a: 82, Segal 1962: 26-27, Worman 2002: 104-105). The Phaeacians, though, unlike the suitors, are not greedy in their consumption of their abundant produce: whereas the latter curse Odysseus and the suitor Antinous even throws a stool at the hungry beggar (*Od.* 17.462-463), the inhabitants of Scheria happily share their victuals with Odysseus, and without any hint of parsimony. Why then does Odysseus invoke the pangs of hunger which his stomach causes him here in their palace? As Charles Segal identifies, the Phaeacians are strangely aloof from ordinary human suffering; their existence is one of easy pleasure, out of touch with the hardships of life outside their paradise:

They are untouched by much of the suffering which Odysseus knows... They are totally removed too from war: the sufferings of Odysseus and the Greeks at Troy are for them a source of aesthetic pleasure in the songs of Demodocus... Their fondness for games reflects the same removal from real human pain... Odysseus' reluctance to identify himself to the Phaeacians... perhaps points up his foreignness and removal from them... Odysseus' brief sojourn among the Phaeacians thus represents a clash between involvement in human suffering and removal from it.

(1962: 27-28)

Odysseus' recognition of his hunger at 7.215-221 is an attempt to express to the Phaeacians their removal from human suffering. Whereas food for the Phaeacians is viewed in pleasurable abundance and through the absence of labour, a quasi-god-like state, Odysseus lets them know what it is like to be at the other end of the scale: where eating (i) arises not out of a pleasant utopia but is intermingled with a state of suffering and grief, *kēdos*, and where eating (ii) is compelled by the hungry stomach, and thereby becomes a matter of

almost animal necessity. On the first point, and very much like his introduction in his *Apologue* (*Od.* 9.2-15), which juxtaposes feasting with *kēdos*, Odysseus' speech (*Od.* 7.215-221) is noticeable for the number of words employed to convey notions of suffering, grief, and toil: “κηδόμενον... τειρόμενον... πένθος... πένθος... ἔπαθον” (*Od.* 7.215-221); and the way in which he shifts from the gnomic utterance of “ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πένθος ἔχοντα” (*Od.* 7.218) immediately to his own suffering “ἐγὼ πένθος μὲν ἔχω φρεσίν” (*Od.* 7.219)—one notes here the repetition in three words and the emphatic first person pronoun, “ἐγὼ” (*Od.* 7.219)—could not be a more dramatic indication of his plight. Eating for Odysseus is an activity which occurs in a context of suffering and grief.

On the second point—the lowly state of the stomach—the adjective “κύντερον” (*Od.* 7.216) doesn't only recall the abstract notion of ‘shame’ which is forced upon the hungry man, but quite graphically brings to mind the picture of the lowly dog, *kuōn* (Beck 1991: 164, Graver 1995: 44-45): an image which will be repeated in a simile in Book 10, where dogs fawn around their master for food (*Od.* 10.216-217) (*Lfgre* 1991: 1592-1593).¹⁷⁵ Furthermore, the idea that a stomach could somehow be “στυγερῆ” (*Od.* 7.216) would be equally foreign to the Phaeacians, for whom the belly, one imagines, would never be anything but content and full. The stomach is an accursed, “στυγερῆ” (*Od.* 7.216), thing for Odysseus, because it forces him to eat heedless of the suffering he has endured and to focus only on its base demands:

The *gastēr* is portrayed as a lower *thumos*, a vital principle that forces upon men its irresistible needs; it *lives* as an entity, let us say as a beast, inside man and needs to be taken care of, fed, and listened to. It forces upon man forgetfulness of his griefs and makes him mindful only of eating and drinking.

¹⁷⁵ For further discussion on dogs in the Homeric poems, cf. Beck 1991, Faust 1970, Graver 1995, Rose 1979.

The fact that eating, through the tyranny of the stomach, can also act as a removal of *kēdos*, a benevolent boon which causes man to forget his anxieties (*Od.* 7.220-221), will form an important part of my analysis in certain episodes in the *Apologue*; this benevolent feature, however, will be tempered by the dangers which eating still connotes in these instances.

In short, eating in the Phaeacian reception sequence has two opposing faces, one from the perspective of the hosts and the other from that of their guest. While Odysseus identifies the magnificence of the Phaeacian feasts (*Od.* 9.2-11), eating is a more troubling activity for the hero—both closely connected to his own *kēdos*, and also a necessity of the hungry stomach, which places him in a low, almost animal-like state. In my analysis of other interactions in the *Apologue*, the rationale behind this feeling of *kēdos* will become clearer as eating and feasting are frequently shown to be associated with destruction and losses for the *xeinoi*; moreover, the importance of the descent into a sub-human state during acts of eating will be viewed across several of the *xeinoi* encounters in these four books.

The first encounter of the Ithacans during their travels is with the Cicones:

Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσαν,
Ἴσμάρω· ἔνθα δ' ἐγὼ πόλιν ἔπραθον, ὤλεσα δ' αὐτούς.
ἐκ πόλιος δ' ἀλόχους καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ λαβόντες
δασσάμεθ', ὡς μή τις μοι ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης.
ἔνθ' ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ διερῶ ποδὶ φευγέμεν ἡμέας
ἠνώγεα, τοὶ δὲ μέγα νήπιοι οὐκ ἐπίθοντο.
ἔνθα δὲ πολλὸν μὲν μέθυ πίνετο, πολλὰ δὲ μῆλα
ἔσφαζον παρὰ θῖνα καὶ εἰλίποδας ἔλικας βοῦς.

τόφρα δ' ἄρ' οἰχόμενοι Κίκονες Κικόνεσσι γεγώνευν,
οἷ σφιν γείτονες ἦσαν, ἅμα πλέονες καὶ ἀρείους,
ἥπειρον ναίοντες, ἐπιστάμενοι μὲν ἀφ' ἵππων
ἀνδράσι μάρνασθαι καὶ ὅθι χρῆ πεζὸν ἔοντα.
ἦλθον ἔπειθ', ὅσα φύλλα καὶ ἄνθεα γίνεται ὥρη,
ἠέριοι· τότε δὴ ῥα κακὴ Διὸς αἴσα παρέστη
ἡμῖν αἰνομόροισιν, ἴν' ἄλγεα πολλὰ πάθοιμεν.

(*Od.* 9.39-53)

The wind behind me brought me from Ilium to Ismarus, the town of the Cicones. I sacked the town and I killed the men. As for the women and all the chattels that we took, we divided the, amongst us, so that none of my men, if I could help it, should depart without his fair share. Then I told the crews we must escape as fast as we could, but they in their folly would not listen. Instead there was much drinking of wine and much slaying of sheep and oxen down on the beach; and meanwhile such townsmen as had escaped made their way out and called to the other Cicones inland, who were more in number and stronger too, able to fight either from chariots or else on foot when that was needed. And these men came upon us in the morning, countless as leaves and flowers in spring, and evil fortune, sent from Zeus to afflict us all, overtook both me and my doomed comrades.

(Shewring 1980: 100)

Appropriate to its small size and its designation as one of the ‘minor episodes’ in the *Apologue*, the encounter of the Ithacans with the Cicones has by and large received only brief, passing commentary by scholars, and there are few studies which are directed entirely

at the episode. A brief review of critical works reveals several interpretations for the relevance of the Ciconian encounter to the rest of the *Apologue*.

(i) From a structural perspective, the episode forms a bridge between the ‘real world’ of Greece and Troy, “Ἰλιόθεν” (*Od.* 9.39) and the ‘fairy tale world’ of the Lotus Eaters, and the other inhabitants of the *Apologue* (de Jong 2004a: 229, Dougherty 2001: 96, Hölscher 1988: 142-143, Vidal-Naquet 1996: 37-38.). (ii) The encounter also introduces the audience to a major point of conflict in the story—the tension which develops between Odysseus and his crew (“τοὶ δὲ μέγα νήπιοι οὐκ ἐπίθοντο” [*Od.* 9.44]), which ultimately culminates in Eurylochus’ mutinous rebellion on Thrinacia (*Od.* 12.340-351) (Segal 1962: 35-36). (iii) There are, incidentally, other parallels to be observed with the Thrinacian episode, apart from the disobedience of the men towards their leader, such as the slaughtering of livestock (*Od.* 9.45-46, 12.352-365) and the subsequent involvement of Zeus in the punishment (*Od.* 9.52, 12.385-387) (de Jong 2004: 229, Frame 1978: 55-56, Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989: 8-9). And on account of these parallels, the episode of the Cicones can be considered to form the first part of a ring structure with the Thrinacian episode at the other end, thus framing all the adventures in the *Apologue*. (iv) The destruction of Odysseus’ crew by the continental Cicones has also been compared to the death of Elpenor in Book 10, in Circe’s *oikos*: in both cases, wine plays a decisive role in dulling the wits of the men (*Od.* 9.45, 10.555); the men are said to act foolishly (*Od.* 9.44, 10.557); an ‘evil destiny’, *kakē aisa*, is in some respect responsible for the catastrophe which ensues (*Od.* 9.52, 11.61); and, finally, in both episodes there is some posthumous respect paid to the deceased (*Od.* 9.60-66, 12.9-15) (Scully 1987: 410-411).

All of these approaches are germane to furthering our understanding of the Ciconian episode; in particular, (iii) and (v) are commensurate with my own method of locating points of tangency across the narrative of the *Apologue*. Both of these are, however, examples of

analyses which identify doublets (cf. Fenik 1974, Scully 1987), whereas my analysis explores a unit of typicality which is pervasive across multiple episodes. In examining the Ciconian episode for the particular relevance of eating, I shall suggest, in line with my opening hypothesis in this chapter, that in this encounter eating implies both the danger of destruction and, to a lesser extent, that of delay.

On the first point, one observes that the activity of feasting—that is to say, drinking wine and slaughtering livestock (*Od.* 9.45-46)—occupies a central position in the encounter, forming a transition between Greek dominance and the Ciconian retaliation. The principal action of the episode can be summarized thus: the Ithacans arrive (*Od.* 9.39-40), raid the town of the Cicones (*Od.* 9.40-42), and feast (*Od.* 9.45-46); the Cicones summon aid from their continental kin (*Od.* 9.47-50), who proceed to destroy many of the Greeks (*Od.* 9.51-61), with the remainder fleeing back over the ocean (*Od.* 9.61-63). In this sequence, it is the act of feasting which marks the structural divide and turning point between Greek dominance and Greek destruction (cf. Frame 1978: 55-56).

Indeed, the narrative directly following the feasting (*Od.* 9.45-46) has the clear purpose of preparing for, predicting, and then emphasizing the destruction of the Ithacan sailors—this is quite unusual for an Homeric raiding scene, which is typically focused on the material gains of the raid, not the losses (Pazdernik 1995: 351-352).¹⁷⁶ Thus firstly, the

¹⁷⁶ “*Odyssey* 9.39-42 relates an extremely abbreviated version of a raiding boast, a Homeric genre of speech-making represented more fully, for example, in Nestor’s story of his first cattle raid (*Il.* 11.670-705). Such an identification is easily made, yet it begs the question... of exactly why the account is as abbreviated as it is and stands in such disproportion to the dénouement of the episode. The characteristic form of a raiding boast is used in an uncharacteristic way. Here the hero is valorized not in virtue of his acquisition of vast stores of booty, all of which in a more typical example of the genre would be meticulously catalogued and assume perhaps the largest proportion of the space devoted to the account, as it does in Nestor’s boast; rather, it is paradoxically,

narrator draws attention to the superior martial prowess of the continental Cicones—greater in number, “πλέονες” (*Od.* 9.48), and stronger, “ἀρείους” (*Od.* 9.48) than their coastal cousins, as well as demonstrating military versatility (*Od.* 9.49-50). Then, when the actual fighting gets under way, the imminent destruction of the Ithacans is foretold by the narrator—the men are now ill-starred, “αἰνομόροισιν” (*Od.* 9.53), no longer enjoying a favourable destiny, “κακὴ Διὸς αἴσα” (*Od.* 9.52). And, thirdly, the actual casualties of the Ithacans are enumerated (*Od.* 9.60-61). That the entire episode of the Cicones (*Od.* 9.39-61) is centered on a theme of destruction can be ascertained from the ring structure which circumscribes the passage: the encounter starts with Odysseus’ men destroying the Cicones, “ᾠλεσα δ’ αὐτούς” (*Od.* 9.40), and ends with them being destroyed, “ἔυκνήμιδες ἑταῖροι / ᾠλονθ’” (*Od.* 9.60-61; cf. *Od.* 9.63).¹⁷⁷

For further proof of the correlation between feasting and destruction in this passage, I draw on Bakker’s understanding of excessive meat consumption (i.e. where equal distribution is not maintained) as leading to conflicts and, ultimately, destruction. Odysseus, after sacking the town of the Cicones, supervises the dispersal of captured wives and plunder, “ἀλόχους καὶ κτήματα” (*Od.* 9.41), so that every man receives his fair share, “ὥς μή τίς μοι ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης” (*Od.* 9.42). Odysseus’ men, however, in seeking out additional bounty by snatching wine and livestock, are reaching beyond this fair share, and one observes, to this end, how both the wine and livestock are consumed in vast quantities, “πολλὸν... πολλὰ” (*Od.* 9.45). It is the “undue *dais*” (Bakker 2013: 43) of the sailors, their distortion of ‘equal sharing’ so as to gain immeasurable amounts of meat for themselves, which is directly relevant to their destruction in this passage (cf. Cook 1995: 56). Their

and perhaps ironically, Odysseus’ dispossession and long-suffering endurance in the face of adversities beyond his control which valorize him” (Pazdernik 1995: 351).

¹⁷⁷ On the senses of the verb *ollymi*, conveying both ‘destruction’ and ‘loss’, cf. Pazdernik 1995: 355-358.

physical destruction at the hands of the Cicones becomes a necessary compensation in the ethics of the story for their subversion of a ‘healthy society’, the equal sharing of victuals which defines the aristocratic order in the poem.¹⁷⁸

Lastly, on the Ciconian encounter, feasting is also to be closely related to the danger of delay in the *nostos*. The decision by the Ithacan sailors to feast on livestock and to drink wine is a transgression against Odysseus’ command: “ἔνθ’ ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ διερχῶ ποδὶ φευγέμεν ἡμέας / ἠνώγεα” (*Od.* 9.43-44). Odysseus orders alacrity in escape, but their response is, in turn, one of inertia: to not move off, but instead to feast. This connection between eating/feasting and delays will be observed through several episodes of the *Apologue*, including the ensuing encounter with the Lotus Eaters:

...ἀτὰρ δεκάτη ἐπέβημεν
γαίης Λωτοφάγων, οἳ τ’ ἄνθινον εἶδαρ ἔδουσιν.
ἔνθα δ’ ἐπ’ ἠπείρου βῆμεν καὶ ἀφυσσάμεθ’ ὕδωρ,
αἶψα δὲ δεῖπνον ἔλοντο θοῆς παρὰ νηυσὶν ἑταῖροι.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτιό τ’ ἐπασσάμεθ’ ἠδὲ ποτῆτος,

¹⁷⁸ But it is not merely the ‘healthy aristocratic order’ which the men subvert, there is also a suggestion in the text that their excessive consumption of meat has had religious ramifications, leading to divine retribution against their actions. In this regard, one might pinpoint the verb, “ἔσφαζον” (*Od.* 9.46), which can denote the mere slaughter of livestock, but which, importantly, frequently denotes slaughter for the sake of sacrifice in the Homeric poems (*Lfgre* 2006: 266-267). If “ἔσφαζον” (*Od.* 9.46) carries a sense of sacrificial slaying in these two lines (*Od.* 9.45-46), then it is significant that Zeus himself has turned against the Ithacans directly after their sacrifice, not aiding them against the onslaught of the continental Cicones, “τότε δὴ ῥα κακῆ Διὸς αἴσα παρέστη” (*Od.* 9.52), and later, after the Greeks have fled from Ismarus, unleashing a storm against their ships (*Od.* 9.67-69). Rather than appeasing Zeus through sacrifice, improper feasting in the Ciconian encounter seems to have only provoked his ire and contributed to the destruction of the men.

δὴ τότε γόνων ἐτάρους προΐην πέυθεσθαι ἰόντας,
οἳ τινες ἀνέρες εἶεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ σῖτον ἔδοντες,
ἄνδρε δύο κρίνας, τρίτατον κήρυχ' ἄμ' ὀπάσσας.
οἱ δ' αἶψ' οἰχόμενοι μίγεν ἀνδράσι Λωτοφάγοισιν·
οὐδ' ἄρα Λωτοφάγοι μήδονθ' ἐτάροισιν ὄλεθρον
ἡμετέροισ', ἀλλά σφι δόσαν λωτοῖο πάσασθαι.
τῶν δ' ὅς τις λωτοῖο φάγοι μελιηδέα καρπὸν,
οὐκέτ' ἀπαγεῖλαι πάλιν ἤθελεν οὐδὲ νέεσθαι,
ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ βούλοντο μετ' ἀνδράσι Λωτοφάγοισι
λωτὸν ἐρεπτόμενοι μενέμεν νόστου τε λαθέσθαι.
τοὺς μὲν γόνων ἐπὶ νῆας ἄγον κλαίοντας ἀνάγκη,
νηυσὶ δ' ἐνὶ γλαφυρῆσιν ὑπὸ ζυγὰ δῆσα ἐρύσσας·
αὐτὰρ τοὺς ἄλλους κελόμην ἐρίηρας ἐταίρους
σπερχομένους νηῶν ἐπιβαινέμεν ὠκειάων,
μὴ πῶς τις λωτοῖο φαγὼν νόστοιο λάθηται.

(*Od.* 9.83-102)

On the tenth day we reached the land of the Lotus-Eaters, whose only fare is that fragrant fruit. We stepped ashore there and drew water, and without a delay my men and I took our meal by the ships. When we had had our portions of food and drink, I sent away some of my comrades to find what manner of human beings were those who lived here. They went at once, and soon were among the Lotus Eaters, who had no thoughts of making away with my companions, but gave them lotus to taste instead. Those of my men who ate the honey-sweet lotus fruit had no desire to retrace their steps and come back with news; their only wish was to linger there with the

Lotus-Eaters, to feed on the fruit and put aside all thought of a voyage home. These men I then forced back to the ships; they were shedding tears but I made them go. I dragged them down under the thwarts and left them bound there. The rest of my crews I despatched aboard with all speed, so that none of them should taste the lotus and then forget the voyage home.

(Shewring 1980: 100-101)

There should be little interpretative doubt that eating is the central activity in the Ithacans' interaction with the Lotus Eaters: the very name of these people attests to their defining dietary habit; and Odysseus' opening description of them is merely a tautologous expansion of their name, "οἳ τ' ἄνθινον εἶδαρ ἔδουσιν" (*Od.* 9.84).

While the Ithacans do renourish themselves beside their ships without any immediate drama (*Od.* 9.86-87), the welcome relief of this act of eating is quite short-lived in the context of the episode, for soon enough eating lands Odysseus' crew into trouble again (*Od.* 9.91-93). However, unlike some of the other anthropophagous inhabitants of the *Apologue* whom the Ithacans will later encounter, the Lotus Eaters are not bent on the physical destruction of the crew, "μήδονθ' ἐτάροισιν ὄλεθρον / ἡμετέροισ'" (*Od.* 9.92-93); instead, Odysseus' companions are freely offered some of the lotus plant, "δόσαν λωτοῖο πάσασθαι" (*Od.* 9.93). While food represents no physical danger of destruction here, the psychological dangers are manifest, for it eats away at their will to return home, "ἤθελεν οὐδὲ νέεσθαι" (*Od.* 9.95). All the men wish to do henceforth is to stay with the Lotus Eaters, "μετ' ἀνδράσι Λωτοφάγοισι... μενέμεν" (*Od.* 9.96-97), and to forget about their *nostos*, "νόστου τε λαθέσθαι" (*Od.* 9.97). Eating in the encounter with the Lotus Eaters presents the threat of delay in the *nostos* through forgetfulness (de Jong 2004a: 230-231, Most 1989b: 23).

Some further observations on the Lotus Eaters episode can be made with respect to the previous Ciconian encounter. There are several parallels in the two action sequences: (i) the *hetairoi* as a unit are separated from Odysseus in some respect—in the case of the Cicones, this separation was achieved through their collective disobedience, while, among the Lotus Eaters, this separation was geographic, as part of an envoy (*Od.* 9.44, 88-90); (ii) away from Odysseus, or no longer under his sway, the men partake in feasting or eating (*Od.* 9.45-46, 94); (iii) the eating has serious repercussions, leading to the physical destruction or delay, or both, of these men (*Od.* 9.60-61, 95-97); and (iv) a hasty retreat is necessary in order not to suffer any further harm in the hostile land (*Od.* 9.61-63, 98-102). Eating in both sequences marks the structural transition (*Od.* 9.45-46, 93-94), the turning point, from an initial foray into a new territory (*Od.* 9.39-44, 83-93) to the recognition of a particular danger and subsequent flight (*Od.* 9.47-61, 95-102). The major difference between the two episodes is, of course, that feasting among the Lotus Eaters does not entail the danger of destruction, but rather that of delay. Still, the fact that the absence of destruction is explicitly referenced in the encounter with the Lotus Eaters, “ὄλεθρον”, (*Od.* 9.92)—at the exact point in the story where food is offered and eaten, no less (*Od.* 9.93-94)—reinforces my study’s assertion that the two principal dangers to be associated with eating in the *Apologue* are destruction and delay.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁹ A further correlation between eating and delay in the *Apologue* may be suggested by a certain metaphor which occurs at several points in the story (*Od.* 9.75, 10.143). Between their encounters with the Cicones and the Lotus Eaters, Odysseus and his men are tossed over the seas by a Zeus-inspired storm, before briefly embarking on a nameless patch of land: “ἔνθα δὴ δύο νύκτας δύο τ' ἡμέματα συννεχὲς αἰεὶ / κείμεθ', ὁμοῦ καμάτῳ τε καὶ ἄλγεσι θυμὸν ἔδοντες.” (*Od.* 9.74-75). “On land, for two nights and two days together, we lay eating our hearts with weariness and misery” (Shewring 1980: 100). The inertia of the men, doing nothing for two whole days (*Od.* 9.74), is expressed through a metaphor of eating: their spirits are so consumed by their sufferings that they are rendered helplessly inactive for two entire days.

The next adventure of the Greeks is a brief foray onto an uninhabited island, which lies adjacent to the island of the Cyclopes. On this island, the Ithacans enjoy two feasts. The first (*Od.* 9.161-162) occurs before Odysseus' crew sails to the land of the Cyclopes, the second (*Od.* 9.556-557) after they have escaped from Polyphemus' rock throwing. In the first of these cases, eating connotes a welcome respite for the men, and I shall examine a similar such association with eating when the Ithacans first feast on the shores of Aeaea (cf. Bakker 2013: 76-77) (cf. pp. 203-210). The benevolence of this initial feast (*Od.* 9.161-162) is suggested by the divine assistance which precedes the meal. The Nymphs who reside on the island stir up the mountain goats, so that the exploring Ithacans can hunt them down (*Od.* 9.154-155), and when the Greeks are in the pursuit of their prey they are aided by an anonymous deity:

...αἴψα δὲ δῶκε θεὸς μενοεικέα θήρηγν.”

(*Od.* 9.158)

[A]nd it was not long before the god gave us game in plenty

(Shewring 1980: 102)

In contrast to the benevolence of this meal,¹⁸⁰ the feast which the men enjoy at the end of Book 9 (lines 556-557) is more problematic. For although the act of feasting is represented with identical formulae, earlier the men have divine assistance in providing them with their meal, whereas now Zeus specifically intends destruction against the Ithacans during this meal:

¹⁸⁰ For further description of the paradisiacal nature of the Ithacans' first venture onto this island, cf. Bakker 2013: 60-61.

ἀρνειὸν δ' ἐμοὶ οἴῳ εὐκνήμιδες ἑταῖροι
μήλων δαιομένων δόσαν ἔξοχα· τὸν δ' ἐπὶ θινὶ
Ζηνὶ κελαινεφέϊ Κρονίδῃ, ὃς πᾶσιν ἀνάσσει,
ῥέξας μηρί' ἕκαιον· ὁ δ' οὐκ ἐμπάζετο ἱρῶν,
ἀλλ' ὃ γε μερμήριζεν, ὅπως ἀπολοίατο πᾶσαι
νῆες εὖσσελμοι καὶ ἐμοὶ ἐρήρηες ἑταῖροι.
ὣς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἡέλιον καταδύντα
ἦμεθα δαινύμενοι κρέα τ' ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἠδύ·

(*Od.* 9.550-557)

Only to me did my comrades allot a special share when the beasts were portioned out, and this was my own ram. I sacrificed him upon the shore to Zeus of the thunderclouds, the all-ruler, and in his honour I burnt the thigh-bones. But the son of Cronos disregarded my offering there, pondering only how my decked ships and loyal comrades might be destroyed together. So all that day, till the sun set, we sat and feasted on meat in abundance and pleasant wine.

(Shewring 1980: 112)

This narrative connection between feasting and destruction was introduced in the Ciconian encounter, and will be seen in several other episodes in the *Apologue*, most notably in the encounter in Thrinacia, where, again, divine agency will play a role in the destruction after the consumption of Helios' cattle. It is noteworthy, then, that even when feasting is benevolent in an episode in the *Apologue*, as at 9.154-155, this needs to be tempered with the

dangerous connotations of eating as leading to destruction, represented later in this same episode (*Od.* 9.556-557).

It is not the task of this chapter to enquire into or, as some have done, to argue for a consistent ethical logic behind the connotations of eating in these episodes, so I shall not ask why the men are destroyed for their feasting in various parts of the narrative. I am predominantly concerned with locating consistent connotations (destruction) behind a typical unit (eating) in these four books—whether or not the particular destruction is at the hands of a god, on account of hostile foes, or because of the folly of the *hetairoi* themselves, or perhaps a combination of all of these.

Indeed, Zeus' destructive plans at 9.550-555 have given rise to much critical debate as to what, exactly, has fuelled the god's enmity at this point in the narrative. The god's punishment might be attributed, for example, to: (i) Odysseus' violation of hospitality, in that he helped himself to Polyphemus' victuals before the arrival of his host (Reece 1993: 143; *contra* Fenik 1974: 222); (ii) Odysseus' *hybris* when he overcomes Polyphemus (Friedrich 1991: 20-28); or (iii) the hero's improper treatment of Polyphemus' limited supply of livestock as if it were an immeasurable quantity (Bakker 2013: 68-69). Alternatively, the description may just be (iv) a generic characteristic of Zeus—the causer of human suffering (Fenik 1974: 216, 223, Tsagarakis 1977: 14-19); or, from a stylistic point of view, it could be (v) merely a thematic prelude, a doubling, to the destruction after Thrinacia, without any reference to any particular crime on the Island of the Goats (Fenik 1974: 209, Friedrich 1987: 376).

Sandwiched between the two feasts on the Island of the Goats is Odysseus' encounter with Polyphemus. Odysseus, upon arriving in the cave of Polyphemus, finds the dwelling uninhabited (*Od.* 9.216-217), apart from a bountiful supply of young livestock and cheese (*Od.* 9.217-223):

ἔνθ' ἐμὲ μὲν πρότισθ' ἔταροι λίσσοντ' ἐπέεσσι
τυρῶν αἰνυμένους ἰέναι πάλιν, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
καρπαλίμως ἐπὶ νῆα θοὴν ἐρίφους τε καὶ ἄρνας
σηκῶν ἐξελάσαντας ἐπιπλεῖν ἀλμυρὸν ὕδωρ·
ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην,—ἦ τ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν,—
ὄφρ' αὐτόν τε ἴδοιμι, καὶ εἴ μοι ξείνια δοίη.
οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλ' ἐτάροισι φανεῖς ἐρατεινὸς ἔσεσθαι.
ἔνθα δὲ πῦρ κήαντες ἐθύσαμεν ἠδὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ
τυρῶν αἰνύμενοι φάγομεν, μένομέν τέ μιν ἔνδον
ἦμενοι, εἶος ἐπῆλθε νέμων. φέρε δ' ὄβριμον ἄχθος
ὕλης ἀζαλέης, ἵνα οἱ ποτιδόρπιον εἴη.

(*Od.* 9.224-234)

My men's first thought was to ask my leave to take away some of the cheeses and depart, driving kids and lambs out of their pens and on to our rapid ship and then setting off again at once over the salt seas. I would not agree (better, much better, if I had!); but no, I was eager to see the cavern's master and hoped he would offer me the gifts of a guest, though as things fell out, it was no kind of host that my comrades were to meet. Then we lit a fire, and laying hands on some of the cheeses we first offered the gods their portion, then ate our own and sat in the cavern waiting for the owner. At length he returned, guiding his flocks and carrying with him a stout bundle of firewood to burn at supper...

(Shewring 1980: 104)

The sequence of events here forms a remarkably similar pattern to that which I examined in the Ciconian encounter, and, moreover, the act of eating has a corresponding structural importance in this sequence. Thus, firstly, in both episodes some consideration is given to raiding: while at Ismarus the Greeks engage in a successful raid of the city (*Od.* 9.40-41), in the cave of Polyphemus Odysseus' men are in favour of undertaking a raid of victuals and livestock, over and above awaiting the hospitality of the cave's owner (*Od.* 9.224-227). Secondly, a swift flight—"διερῶ ποδὶ φευγέμεν" (*Od.* 9.43), "καρπαλίμως ἐπὶ νῆα θοήν" (*Od.* 9.226)—is recommended from the location of the raid; this was instigated by Odysseus in the case of the Cicones, his men, in the case of Polyphemus. Thirdly, this good advice is emphatically ignored: "τοὶ δὲ μέγα νήπιοι οὐκ ἐπίθοντο" (*Od.* 9.44), "ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην" (*Od.* 9.228). Fourthly, instead of fleeing, the men turn to filling their stomachs (*Od.* 9.45-46, 231-232). And lastly, after eating, the antagonist(s) is immediately announced or enters the scene, be it the continental Cicones (*Od.* 9.47) or Polyphemus (*Od.* 9.233).

As in the Ciconian encounter, eating in the Polyphemus sequence is to be associated with a delay in the progress of the *nostos*. Odysseus' companions plead for a speedy departure from the land of the Cyclopes (*Od.* 9.226). Instead, the hero chooses to remain seated, "ἤμενοι" (*Od.* 9.233), in the cave, awaiting its owner, "μένομέν τέ μιν ἔνδον" (*Od.* 9.232), and partaking of the host's cheeses, "τυρῶν αἰνύμενοι φάγομεν" (*Od.* 9.232). A similar juxtaposition of eating alongside an 'action of inertia' occurs in the episode of the Lotus Eaters, when the men prefer to stay and eat the lotus plant rather than paying any thought to the return voyage: "λωτὸν ἐρεπτόμενοι μενέμεν νόστου τε λαθέσθαι" (*Od.* 9.97). In summary, in all three *xeinoi* encounters in Book 9, eating is an activity which occurs in contexts opposed to the speedy continuation of the *nostos*.

Secondly, eating not only connotes a certain delay in the Polyphemus encounter, but it is also to be closely associated with a growing danger of violence and destruction which the

men face in the ogre's cave. As in the encounter with the Cicones (cf. *Od.* 9.45-46), eating or feasting at 9.231-232 marks the turning point in the fortunes of Odysseus' men, from the expectation of a successful raid (or successful reception scene, from Odysseus' perspective), when they first sail to the Cyclopes' land (*Od.* 9.181-229), to their ensuing destruction.

Indeed, immediately after the feasting of Odysseus' men (*Od.* 9.231-232), the narrative starts to prepare us for the resulting carnage—the danger of destruction looms large. For just as the martial qualities of the continental Cicones were described in anticipation of battle (*Od.* 9.48-50), so too prior to the violence which he will unleash later, the imposing size and strength of Polyphemus are given emphasis. Thus upon entering his cave he carries a heavy stack of wood, “ὄβριμον ἄχθος / ὕλης ἀζαλέης” (*Od.* 9.233), which he hurls inside his home (*Od.* 9.235); and a few lines later the giant blocks the entranceway with a great boulder:

αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἐπέθηκε θυρεὸν μέγαν ὑψόσ' αἰείρας,
ὄβριμον· οὐκ ἂν τόν γε δύω καὶ εἴκοσ' ἄμαξαι
ἔσθλαι τετράκυκλοι ἀπ' οὐδεὸς ὀγλίσειαν·
τόσσην ἠλίβατον πέτρην ἐπέθηκε θύρησιν.

(*Od.* 9.240-243)

Then to fill the doorway he heaved up a huge heavy stone; two-and-twenty good four-wheeled wagons could not shift such a boulder from the ground, but the Cyclops did, and fitted it in its place—a massive towering piece of rock.

(Shewring 1980: 104)

Special emphasis is given here to the scale of the rock, which is qualified by three adjectives denoting its size, weight, and height—μέγαν, ὄβριμον, ἠλίβατον (*Od.* 9.240, 241, 244)—

while the act of lifting the boulder is accompanied by a simile indicating the immense strength of the ogre (*Od.* 9.241-242). Moreover, in the face of these physical tokens, the Ithacans twice anticipate the threat of Polyphemus' violence before he actually kills two of the men. When the ogre loudly tosses his pile of wood into his cave, the Greeks retreat further into the room in fear, “δείσαντες ἀπεσσύμεθ' ἐς μυχὸν ἄντρον” (*Od.* 9.236). Likewise, after he addresses them for the first time (*Od.* 9.252-255), the men are terrified by his voice and his size, “δεισάντων φθόγγον τε βαρὺν αὐτόν τε πέλωρον” (*Od.* 9.257). The danger of destruction in the ensuing narrative is further augmented by Polyphemus' fastidious concern for food preparation (*Od.* 9.244-249), a foreshadowing to his later consumption of the men, and also by the hostile exchange between the ogre and Odysseus, in which the monster refuses to recognize the law of hospitality and thus the strangers' status as his guests (*Od.* 9.273-280)—all of which culminates in the death of the first pair of unlucky Ithacans (*Od.* 9.288-293).

The destruction engendered by the next eating acts in the *Cyclopeia* is manifest and does not need too great an exposition. Polyphemus is anthropophagous, and consumes the Greeks on three separate occasions during the encounter (*Od.* 9.291-293, 311-312, 344, 347). Eating here patently results in the physical destruction of the Ithacans. What's more, though, during the first of these acts of cannibalism, the Ithacan *hetairoi* experience a metaphorical transition from humans to animals, becoming puppies, “σκύλακας” (*Od.* 9.289):

ἄλλ' ὃ γ' ἀναΐξας ἐτάροισ' ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἴαλλε,
σὺν δὲ δύο μάρψας ὥς τε σκύλακας ποτὶ γαίῃ
κόπτ'· ἐκ δ' ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέε, δεῦε δὲ γαῖαν.
τοὺς δὲ διὰ μελεῖστί ταμῶν ὀπλίσσατο δόρπον·
ἦσθιε δ' ὥς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος, οὐδ' ἀπέλειπεν,

ἔγκατά τε σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα μυελόεντα.

(*Od.* 9.288-293)

[H]e only sprang up, and stretching his hands towards my companions clutched two at once and battered them on the floor like puppies; their brains gushed out and soaked the ground. Then tearing limb from limb he made his supper of them. He began to eat like a mountain lion, leaving nothing, devouring flesh and entrails and bones and marrow.

(Shewring 1980: 106)

The particular transformation into whelps is worth exploring further, for what it implies about the state of Odysseus' men at the time of their destruction.

Forms of *skylax* occur on three occasions in the *Odyssey*, including the above reference (*LfgrE* 2006: 158-159). One of these usages is atypical and manifestly comic in effect: Scylla, Circe narrates, dwells within a high cave, and one can hear her on account of her bark, “λελακυῖα” (*Od.* 12.85). Circe compares the sound, “φωνή”, of Scylla's voice to that of a new-born puppy, “ὄση σκύλακος νεογιλλῆς” (*Od.* 12.86), a bizarre pitch and amplitude of voice for so monstrous a beast. With her twelve feet, six long necks, six heads, and given the terrible destruction which she does cause to Odysseus' crew, her diminutive vocal abilities come across as comically bathetic in the context. As Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989: 123) observe, the dog association is an etymological result—one might go so far as to say an etymological pun—on the name of the monster, “Σκύλλη” (*Od.* 12.85), as related to *skylax* (*LfgrE* 2006: 158-159).

The other instance of *skylax* occurs in Book 20 (line 14), also within a simile. Odysseus, in witnessing the reproachable, libidinous behaviour of his household maids in Ithaca is compared to a she-dog:

...κραδίη δέ οἱ ἔνδον ὑλάκτει.
ὥς δὲ κύων ἀμαλῆσι περὶ σκυλάκεσσι βεβῶσα
ἄνδρ' ἀγνοίησασ' ὑλάει μέμονέν τε μάχεσθαι,
ὥς ῥα τοῦ ἔνδον ὑλάκτει ἀγαιομένου κακὰ ἔργα.

(*Od.* 20.13-16)

His heart within him growled with anger. As a bitch with puppies, mounting guard over the strengthless creatures, spies a stranger and growls at him and prepares to fight, so Odysseus' heart growled within him as he saw these evil ways and loathed them.

(Shewring 1980: 243)

Puppies are characterized in this simile as helpless, passive, impotent creatures: (i) they are “ἀμαλῆσι” (*Od.* 20.14) or “weak” (Rose 1979: 228); (ii) they require protection by a fierce mother dog, “κύων... βεβῶσα” (*Od.* 20.14) (Rose 1979: 228);¹⁸¹ and (iii) they are threatened by a foreign individual, “ἄνδρ' ἀγνοίησασ’” (*Od.* 20.15). Importantly, the imagery of puppies in this simile (*Od.* 20.13-16) seems to recall the plight of Odysseus' men in Polyphemus'

¹⁸¹ “The rare word, ἀμαλός, “weak,” which occurs elsewhere in Homer only at *Il.* 22.310 (of a lamb), emphasizes the idea of the puppies' helplessness and consequent need for their mother. Further, her protectiveness is vividly realized in her stance, as she seems actually to be straddling her puppies” (Rose 1979: 228).

cave, for the hero, immediately after the dog comparison, recalls the anthropophagy in Book 9 (Rose 1979: 228):

“τέτλαθι δῆ, κραδίη· καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ' ἔτλης,
ἦματι τῶ, ὅτε μοι μένος ἄσχετος ἦσθιε Κύκλωψ
ἰφθίμους ἐτάρους· σὺ δ' ἐτόλμας, ὄφρα σε μήτις
ἐξάγαγ' ἐξ ἄντροιο οἰόμενον θανέεσθαι.”

(*Od.* 20.18-21)

‘Have patience, heart. Once you endured worse than this, on the day when the ruthless Cyclops devoured my hardy men; you held firm till your cunning rescued you from the cave in which you thought to die.’

(Shewring 1980: 243)

The explicit connection between the dog simile (*Od.* 20.13-16) and Odysseus’ self-riposte (*Od.* 20.18-21) is one of endurance and restraint—Odysseus is placating himself not to slaughter the licentious household maids, just as he did not try to attack Polyphemus right away, but to wait for a more opportune time (Bakker 2013: 54). The imagery of puppies, however, also aptly connects the simile (*Od.* 20.13-16) with the ensuing allusion to Polyphemus’ cannibalism (*Od.* 20.18-21), since it was at the time of anthropophagy that the men were compared to puppies (*Od.* 9.289).¹⁸²

Given the connotations which puppies hold in the passage in Book 20 (lines 13-16)—that of helplessness, passivity, and vulnerability to attack—and also given the close connection of this passage with the Polyphemus episode (*Od.* 20.18-21), the function of the

¹⁸² For further points of contrast between Polyphemus’ cave and Odysseus’ home, cf. Bakker 2013: 54.

puppy simile in the narrative of the Ithacan's destruction (*Od.* 9.288-293) should become all the more clear. The Ithacans are rendered entirely helpless and passive in the face of Polyphemus' anthropophagy—his assault on them is so thorough that they are rendered nothing more than puppies, unable to act, as their limbs are torn apart (*Od.* 9.291), and as every part of their bodies is consumed (*Od.* 9.292-293). Indeed, the completeness of the eating act, “οὐδ' ἀπέλειπεν” (*Od.* 9.292), their being wholly consumed, is indicative of the complete vulnerability and powerlessness of the ‘puppified’ men.

The transformation of Odysseus' men into these most meagre and helpless animals in the face of Polyphemus' destructive act is of course aptly matched by the ogre's own metamorphosis into a strong mountain lion (*Od.* 9.292), the connotations of which lend a sense of violence and wildness to his character (Scott 1974: 58-62). On the subject of Polyphemus' transition into a mountain lion, Suzanne Saïd has argued that this kind of animal imagery in a feast—with particular respect to Odysseus' being likened to a lion in the case of the suitors' death (*Od.* 22.402)—indicates the destruction of normal human relationships:

Ces présages, ces images et ces métaphores marquent également la rupture complète qui s'est établie entre Ulysse et les prétendants. Ils indiquent l'impossibilité radicale d'une relation proprement humaine entre eux par la métaphore de l'allélophagie... Avec les prétendants et par leur faute, le monde de l'animalité et du rapt a fait irruption dans le festin, c'est-à-dire dans le lieu même où la communauté s'affirme comme telle, où les hommes se reconnaissent mutuellement la qualité de sujets.

(1979: 26-27)

Equally, it is apparent in the case of the Ithacans being devoured by Polyphemus, that the ‘world of animality’ has entered into and broken down the world of normal human interaction, which is typically observable in a benevolent feast—“le lieu même où la communauté s'affirme comme telle” (27). In the process of being eaten, the Ithacans suffer not only a loss of life, from a literal perspective, but they also experience, by virtue of their metaphorical transition, the loss of their human identity and agency, since, as Saïd puts it, the feast is the place “où les hommes se reconnaissent mutuellement la qualité de sujets” (27). The men become analogous to helpless whelps in the face of Polyphemus’ violence. The figurative transition into animals—importantly, animals so radically opposed as puppies and lions—nullifies the possibility of mutual human exchange which is typical of a proper feast.

The transformation of the Ithacans into puppies is but one in a number of animal transformations which occur during scenes of eating or feasting in the *Apologue* (Cook 1995: 58). In the Laestrygonian episode, after devouring one of the Ithacan ambassadors (*Od.* 10.116), King Antiphates summons hordes of his fellow giants who pursue the Greeks to a sheltered bay, in which their ships are moored, and proceed to annihilate the Greeks:

ἰχθῦς δ' ὡς πείροντες ἀτερπέα δαῖτα φέροντο.

(*Od.* 10.124)

The Laestrygonians speared men like fish and then carried home their monstrous meal.

(Shewring 1980: 116)

Once again there is explicit reference to Odysseus’ men becoming the animalized object of eating, in the form of harpooned fish, fit to be carried away for a feast. This comparison is

taken up in the story of Scylla where the polymorphous monster eats up half a dozen of Odysseus' men at once:

ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἐπὶ προβόλῳ ἀλιεὺς περιμήκει ῥάβδῳ
ἰχθύσι τοῖς ὀλίγοισι δόλον κατὰ εἶδατα βάλλων
ἐς πόντον προΐησι βοὸς κέρας ἀγραύλοιο,
ἀσπαίροντα δ' ἔπειτα λαβὼν ἔρριψε θύραζε,
ὥς οἱ γ' ἀσπαίροντες ἀείροντο προτὶ πέτρας.
αὐτοῦ δ' εἰνὶ θύρησι κατήσθιε κεκλήγοντας,
χεῖρας ἐμοὶ ὀρέγοντας ἐν αἰνῇ δηϊοτήτι.

(*Od.* 12.251-257)

As when a fisherman on a promontory takes a long rod to snare little fishes with his bait and casts his ox-hair line down into the sea below, then seizes the creatures one by one and throws them ashore writhing; so Scylla swung my writhing companions up to the rocks, and there at the entrance began devouring them as they shrieked and held out their hands to me in their extreme of agony.

(Shewring 1980: 148)

In both these examples, the men are transformed into helpless animals—fish, either speared through or cast out of water—which are at the mercy of the violent antagonists. In the second of these examples, the feebleness and pathetic state of the men is most manifest (de Jong

2004a: 305, Sluiter 2014: 822-824).¹⁸³ Like Polyphemus’ puppies, they are diminutive creatures, “ἰχθύσι τοῖς ὀλίγοισι” (*Od.* 12.252); they are placed in a helpless situation, thrown out of the water, “θύραζε” (*Od.* 12.254) and moving in a manner which is reflective of their struggling “ἀσπαίροντα... ἀσπαίροντες” (*Od.* 12.254, 255); and they are crying in despair at their fate, “κεκλήγοντας” (*Od.* 12.256). As in the Polyphemus encounter, the particular animalization during the anthropophagy is indicative of the powerlessness of the men at the time of their destruction—how completely and utterly they are under Scylla’s control (cf. Hopman 2012: 9).

Although Book 11 is largely devoid of eating references, there is one noticeable instance where feasting is closely interwoven with notions of the destruction and animalization of men in the narrative. In the second part of the Underworld sequence, Odysseus encounters the shade of Agamemnon (*Od.* 11.387-388). The Ithacan, surprised that the leader of the Greek army in the Trojan War is now dead, asks how the king came to enter Hades (*Od.* 11.397-403). Agamemnon tells Odysseus of the treachery of his wife, Clytemnestra, and her lover, Aegisthus:

ἀλλά μοι Αἴγισθος τεύξας θάνατόν τε μόρον τε
 ἔκτα σὺν οὐλομένη ἀλόχῳ οἰκόνδε καλέσσας,
 δειπνίσσας, ὧς τίς τε κατέκτανε βοῦν ἐπὶ φάτνῃ.
 ὦς θάνον οἰκτίστῳ θανάτῳ·...

(*Od.* 11.409-412)

¹⁸³ Sluiter (2014: 822-824) notes that not only the companions, but Odysseus himself is characterized as helpless in this encounter. In comparing the fish similes at 12.251-254 and 22.384-388, Sluiter (822-824) observes a progression in Odysseus’ character from helpless observer to active hero in Ithaca.

It was Aegisthus and my accursed wife who plotted death and destruction for me; he invited me to his house and gave me a feast and killed me as a man kills an ox at a stall. Thus I died the most pitiful of deaths...

(Shewring 1980: 137)

Like several other *xeinoi* encounters in the *Apologue*, such as those of the Ithacans among the Cicones and in the cave of Polyphemus, Agamemnon's feasting at Aegithus' home, "οἰκόνδε καλέσσας, / δειπνίσσας" (*Od.* 11.410-411), occurs in a context of death and destruction.

Thus Odysseus commences his conversation with Agamemnon by asking him what manner of death he suffered, "κῆρ... τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο" (*Od.* 11.398), providing him with three possible options—death at sea through the machinations of Poseidon, death through the raiding of livestock, and death by fighting to win a city and its women (*Od.* 11.399-403). The shade of Agamemnon denies that he was defeated in these ways, "ἐδάμασσεν... ἐδηλήσαντ'" (*Od.* 11.406, 408), but instead points to the death and destruction, "θάνατόν τε μόρον τε" (*Od.* 11.409), prepared by Aegithus' feast. Agamemnon ascribes his murder to Aegisthus, "ἔκτα" (*Od.* 11.410), with the help of Clytemnestra, who is described as Agamemnon's "οὐλομένη" (*Od.* 11.410) wife—an adjective derived from *ollymi* (*LfgrE* 2004: 862). And before turning to the fate of his comrades, Agamemnon once more mourns his own death, "ὧς θάνον οἰκτίστῳ θανάτῳ" (*Od.* 11.412).

This destruction is further articulated through Agamemnon's metaphorical transformation into an ox, killed at a stall (*Od.* 11.411). Eating connotes not only a physical destruction of life in the *Apologue*, but frequently a collapse into a helpless, animal-like state—here the Greek general is changed into an ox which is primed for slaughter. Likewise, Agamemnon's companions suffer a similar figurative transfiguration from those feasting to swine being feasted upon at a banquet, when they are destroyed:

...περὶ δ' ἄλλοι ἑταῖροι
νωλεμέως κτείνοντο σύες ὡς ἀργιόδοντες,
οἳ ῥά τ' ἐν ἀφνειοῦ ἀνδρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο
ἦ γάμφῳ ἦ ἐράνῳ ἦ εἰλαπίνῃ τεθαλυῖη.

(*Od.* 11.412-415)

[A]nd my comrades too were killed around me mercilessly like white-tusked boars in the house of some rich and powerful man, at a wedding or feast or sumptuous banquet.

(Shewring 1980: 137)

Furthermore, in the *Apologue* the metamorphosis from human to animal during actions of eating is not merely a figurative transition—in the cases of Polyphemus, the Laestrygonians, Agamemnon, and Scylla—but, on one notable occasion, it also takes an alarmingly literal dimension, when Circe drugs Odysseus' companions and turns them into swine:

εἶσεν δ' εἰσαγαγοῦσα κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε,
ἐν δέ σφιν τυρόν τε καὶ ἄλφιτα καὶ μέλι χλωρόν
οἴνῳ Πραμνεῖῳ ἐκύκα· ἀνέμισγε δὲ σίτῳ
φάρμακα λύγρ', ἵνα πάγχυ λαθοῖατο πατρίδος αἴης.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δῶκέν τε καὶ ἔκπιον, αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα
ῥάβδῳ πεπληγυῖα κατὰ συφεοῖσιν ἐέργνυ.
οἱ δὲ συῶν μὲν ἔχον κεφαλὰς φωνήν τε τρίχας τε
καὶ δέμας, αὐτὰρ νοῦς ἦν ἔμπεδος ὡς τὸ πάρος περ.

ὥς οἱ μὲν κλαίοντες ἔεργατο· τοῖσι δὲ Κίρκη
παρ ἄκυλον βάλανόν τ' ἔβαλεν καρπὸν τε κρανεΐης
ἔδμεναι, οἷα σύες χαμαιευνάδες αἰὲν ἔδουσιν.

(*Od.* 10.233-243)¹⁸⁴

The goddess ushered them in, gave them all seats, high or low, and blended for them a dish of cheese and of barley-meal, of yellow honey and Pramnian wine, all together; but with these good things she mingled pernicious drugs as well, to make them forget their own country utterly. Having given them this and waited for them to have their fill, she struck them suddenly with her wand, then drove them into the sties where she kept her swine. And now the men had the form of swine—the snout and grunt and bristles; only their minds were left unchanged. They shed tears as they were shut in, while Circe threw down in front of them some acorns and mast and cornel—daily fare for swine whose lodging is on the ground.

(Shewring 1980: 118-119)

From starting out as participants in a feast, seated at the table and eating the food on offer, Odysseus' companions are soon transformed into livestock through the magic of Circe. After this, they are fed like animals not men (*Od.* 10.242-243). Eating connotes two distinct dangers in this passage. Firstly, the feast signifies a boundary at which both human identity and agency can be destroyed, that is to say the men have become literally disembodied as well as disempowered—transformed from active human subjects, willing participants in a feast, to powerless animals. This powerlessness is emphasized by the fact that the swine-men are (i) trapped in a pen (*Od.* 10.241), (ii) crying out in despair (*Od.* 10.241), and, tellingly,

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Circe's failed attempt to transform Odysseus also into a pig at *Od.* 10.311-320.

(iii) they can now only enjoy fodder which is fit for animals, and are thus excluded from human dining (*Od.* 10.242-243). Secondly, through Circe's pharmaceutical machinations, eating also challenges the successful completion of the *nostos*, causing Odysseus' men to forget about their homeland, “ἵνα πάγχυ λαθοῖατο πατρίδος αἴης” (*Od.* 10.236) and, potentially, to remain in Aeaea (de Jong 2004a: 258-259).¹⁸⁵

Aeolus and his family lead a blissful, hyper-civilized existence on their floating isle. In many respects they are the double of the Phaeacians since both they and the family of Aeolus enjoy a certain closeness or affinity to the gods (*Od.* 7.199-206, 10.2). Both have dwellings surrounded by bronze walls (*Od.* 7.86, 10.3-4), both royal families display incestuous relationships (*Od.* 7.54-68, 10.7), both enjoy the delights of music (*Od.* 8.246-255, 10.10), and, finally, there is bounteous feasting in both communities (*Od.* 8 [*passim*], 10.8-10). On the subject of eating, Aeolus' family is characterized as engaging in perpetual feasting in their palace, “αἰεὶ... δαίνονται” (*Od.* 10.8-9), and, in proof of this, when Odysseus later returns to the floating island after his trip home has been sabotaged at the eleventh hour by his men, he appropriately witnesses Aeolus and his family partaking in a characteristic feast (*Od.* 10.60-61). In addition to their eating being unrestricted by time, we are also told that the victuals of Aeolus' family are innumerable, “ὄνειατα μυρία” (*Od.* 10.9). And, lastly, Bakker (2013: 74) posits that these victuals consist of a substantial amount of meat, since the home is full of steam from sacrificial burning, “κνισῆεν” (*Od.* 10.10).

Eating, although a major component in an overtly benevolent reception or hospitality scene (“φίλει με καί” [*Od.* 10.14]), nevertheless still connotes the danger of a significant temporal delay in the pursuit of the *nostos*. The hosts, importantly, are characterized as partaking in the perpetual (*Od.* 10.8), all-day, “ἥματα” (*Od.* 10.11), feasting of innumerable

¹⁸⁵ Cook (1995: 58) also tracks a certain animalization of the *hetairoi* in the Thracian episode, wherein they gradually descend into beasts from civilized men.

victuals (*Od.* 10.8-9)—an activity which is only alleviated at night by the necessity of sleep (*Od.* 10.11-12), and which is, as far as we know, all the Family Aeolus ever gets up to in the way of recreational activities (cf. *Od.* 10.60-61); the guests, in turn, fall in line with the typical conduct of their hosts, spending an entire month, “μῆνα δὲ πάντα” (*Od.* 10.14), entertained by the festive hospitality of Aeolus (*Od.* 10.14-16). The combination of feasting and a substantial retardation in the *nostos* in the Aeolian encounter is a prelude to an even greater delay which occurs later in Book 10, in Circe’s home.

Odysseus’ encounter with Circe in Aeaëa illustrates better than any other *xeinoi* interaction in the *Apologue* the double-edged connotations which open up around the activity of eating in these four books: between, on the one hand, the necessity of food for survival and as a restorative, both physical and psychological, to the travel-worn men, and, on the other hand, the dangers which are to be associated with feasting. Of these dangers, I have already examined the threat of destruction to human identity and agency in the Aeaëan encounter (*Od.* 10.234-243), and I shall examine primarily the threat of delay to be associated with eating in this encounter.

Odysseus, having left his men at the seashore and having ventured inland to explore Aeaëa (*Od.* 10.144-152), decides, upon spotting signs of Circe’s dwelling, to head back to his companions and give them a meal (*Od.* 10.153-155). This the hero achieves to great effect, managing to hunt down and slay an enormous stag,¹⁸⁶ and to carry it back to his men at the beach (*Od.* 10.156-173). Odysseus addresses his men and the Ithacans duly prepare and enjoy their meal:

καὶ δ' ἔβαλον προπάροιθε νεός, ἀνέγειρα δ' ἑταίρους

¹⁸⁶ For further discussion on the meaning of the appearance of this stag, cf. Bakker 2013: 78. For a summary of scholarly interpretations of this episode, cf. Scodel 1994: 530.

μειλιχίοισ' ἐπέεσσι παρασταδὸν ἄνδρα ἕκαστον·
'ὦ φίλοι, οὐ γάρ πω καταδυσόμεθ', ἀχνύμενοι περ,
εἰς Αἴδαο δόμους, πρὶν μόρσιμον ἦμαρ ἐπέλθῃ·
ἀλλ' ἄγετ', ὄφρ' ἐν νηϊ̄ θοῆ βρωσὶς τε πόσις τε,
μνησόμεθα βρώμης μηδὲ τρυχώμεθα λιμῶ.'
ὣς ἐφάμην, οἱ δ' ὦκα ἐμοῖσ' ἐπέεσσι πίθοντο·
ἐκ δὲ καλυψάμενοι παρὰ θῖν' ἀλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο
θηήσαντ' ἔλαφον· μάλα γὰρ μέγα θηρίον ἦεν.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ὀρώμενοι ὀφθαλμοῖσι,
χεῖρας νιψάμενοι τεύχοντ' ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα.
ὣς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἡέλιον καταδύντα
ἦμεθα δαινύμενοι κρέα τ' ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἠδύ·

(*Od.* 10.172-184)

I threw it [the stag] down in front of the ship, went up to the men one by one and enlivened them with cheerful words: “Friends, whatever our plight may be, we shall not go down to Hades’ house before the appointed day is on us. Come then: while there is meat and drink in our ship, let us turn our thoughts to food and not starve to death.” So I spoke. They heeded my words at once, and there on the beach of the barren sea they uncovered the heads that they had muffled and wonderingly gazed at the stag, so huge a beast it was. Having satisfied their eyes with the sight, they washed their hands and prepared a noble meal. So all that day, till the sun set, we sat and feasted on plenteous meat and delicious wine.

(Shewring 1980: 117)

Eating in this passage represents a tremendous boon for the Ithacans, providing them with a welcome respite from sufferings they have endured to this point. Indeed, prior to landing in Aeaea, the Greeks have experienced the terrible destruction of the vast majority of their men, and all their ships but one, at the hands of Laestrygonians (*Od.* 10.121-124, 132). In fleeing Laestrygonia and reaching the open sea once more, the men are understandably devastated by the death of their comrades—“ἀκαχήμενοι ἦτορ... φίλους ὀλέσαντες ἑταίρους” (*Od.* 10.133-134); and when the Greeks reach Aeaea, they waste away two entire days in mourning at the shore, “δύο τ' ἡμέατα καὶ δύο νύκτας / κείμεθ', ὁμοῦ καμάτω τε καὶ ἄλγεσι θυμὸν ἔδοντες” (*Od.* 10.142-143) (cf. Tsagalis 2012: 100-102).¹⁸⁷ Odysseus, scouting out the island, spots smoke coming from what later turns out to be Circe’s house; instead of advancing to this new danger, however, or sending his men there right away, the hero first decides to feed his men at the shore (*Od.* 10.154-155).

Amidst the previous sufferings of the Ithacans and the danger of their future exploration in Aeaea, Odysseus’ bringing of the stag to his men and their subsequent consumption of the deer is framed in the narrative as a supreme respite for Odysseus and his Greek compatriots (Scodel 1994: 530). Firstly, the deer is said by the narrator to have been sent to the hero by some god, “τίς... θεῶν” (*Od.* 10.157)—it is a gift bestowed upon the hero by a pitying (cf. “ὀλοφύρατο” [*Od.* 10.157]) divinity (de Jong 2004a: 256).¹⁸⁸ Then, when Odysseus tosses the food before the men, he at once starts to buoy them up with encouragement, “ἀνέγειρα δ' ἑταίρους / μειλχιόισ' ἐπέεσσι” (*Od.* 10.172), and Odysseus’ speech itself extolls the great virtue of eating in keeping men alive (*Od.* 10.174-177), despite

¹⁸⁷ Tsagalis (2012: 100-102) understands the seashore in the *Iliad* as a place of lamentation, prayer, and isolation.

¹⁸⁸ “In effect, the stag was literally a godsend to Odysseus-hero, which he exploited to cheer up his despondent men, knowing that soon he would have to demand new exertions of them” (de Jong 2004a: 256).

all the sufferings they endure, “ἀχνύμενοι περ” (*Od.* 10.174). Odysseus’ gift of the food and his rousing speech have the desired effect on the men. They are removed from their sorrow, uncovering their faces, “ἐκ δὲ καλυψάμενοι” (*Od.* 10.179) (Stanford 1996: 370), and can rejoice, “τάρπησαν” (*Od.* 10.181), at the sight of the stag. Finally, of the formulaic lines—“ὥς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα / ἦμεθα δαινύμενοι κρέα τ’ ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἠδύ” (*Od.* 10.183-184)—Bakker (2013: 63) observes that they occur only six times in the *Odyssey*, all of which are in the *Apologue* (*Od.* 9.161-162, 556-557, 10.183-184, 467-468 [a slightly modified line], 476-477, and 12.29-30), and all of which occur in contexts of unlimited food supplies.

Irene de Jong comments on the strange benevolence of this act of eating on the shore of Aeaea:

They have a ‘splendid meal’, an unusual thing in the generally sober circumstances of their travels; the formula ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα [*Od.* 10.182] normally refers to a festive meal in civilized surroundings, e.g. 3.66; 13.26. The washing of hands before eating also suggests a return to civilized manners.

(2004a: 256-257)

It is worth pointing out, however, that an overtly benevolent feast (e.g. one which promises a respite in the men’s suffering and grief) is not incommensurate with danger in the story, specifically the danger of delay in the *Apologue*. Indeed, the narrative of the blissful feast on the seashore (*Od.* 10.178-186) is an apt prelude to the kind of feasting we witness in Circe’s home, where eating will connote both a great respite for the men, but also the possibility of indefinite delay.

After Odysseus has tamed Circe (*Od.* 10.321-347), there are two major feast scenes in the encounter.¹⁸⁹ The first (*Od.* 10.348-405) is actually a scene of non-eating, where Odysseus refuses to partake of the victuals which Circe has set out for him. The second (*Od.* 10.446-479) occurs after Odysseus has gone to the beach to fetch the remainder of his men and has returned to Circe's home. Irene de Jong (2004a: 262) divides the first scene (*Od.* 10.348-405) into the following sections: (i) the preparation of the meal, including the ordering of the furniture and the mixing of the wine (*Od.* 10.352-357), (ii) the serving of the bread, meat and wine (*Od.* 10.368-372), and (iii) the invitation to eat, followed by Odysseus' refusal, including his reasons for not wanting to eat (*Od.* 10.373-387).

Although it is technically a scene of non-eating, and thus does not fit into my study as a typical activity, the contextual associations of eating can still nonetheless be ascertained from the narrative. Eating connotes, as in the instance of the feast on the shore (*Od.* 10.178-186), a respite, an alleviation from worries and anxiety for the person who ingests the food. Odysseus, however, cannot eat at this point in the story because his mind is far too consumed by troubles to allow for such a respite:

ἐσθέμεναι δ' ἐκέλευεν· ἐμῶ δ' οὐχ ἦνδανε θυμῶ,
ἀλλ' ἦμην ἀλλοφρονέων, κακὰ δ' ὄσσετο θυμός

(*Od.* 10.373-374)

She bade me eat, but my heart was not on eating, and I sat with my thoughts elsewhere and my mind unquiet.

(Shewring 1980: 122)

¹⁸⁹ I omit the initial transfiguration feast scene (*Od.* 10.230-243), which I have already covered.

In particular, Odysseus does not eat because he is too concerned about his comrades, who are still in the form of pigs (*Od.* 10.383-387). To eat is to relax, to cast away anxieties—but, Odysseus interrogates, what righteous man, “ἐναΐσιμος” (*Od.* 10.383), could act in such a manner when his friends have their freedom taken away (*Od.* 10.383-385)? For her part, Circe identifies that it is indeed anxiety which is ‘eating away at Odysseus’, “θυμὸν ἔδων” (*Od.* 10.379),¹⁹⁰ and which is diminishing his appetite for food (*Od.* 10.379), although she misconstrues the cause of Odysseus’ anxiety, wrongly believing that he is fearful of treachery on her part (*Od.* 10.380-381).

When Odysseus’ companions have been transformed back into their human selves, the hero returns to the beach to bring the remainder of the men back to Circe’s home for the feast (*Od.* 10.426-427). Only Eurylochus objects, who suspects a similar destruction at the feast to what occurred earlier to his companions (*Od.* 10.431-437). Even he, however, is forced to relinquish his misgivings and to come to Circe’s home. When the group arrives there, they witness the rest of Odysseus’ men in a state of comfort, bathed, rubbed in oil, cloaked, and enjoying the fare of Circe’s table (*Od.* 10.450-452). The two companies reunite in an emotional exchange, weeping, crying, and groaning (*Od.* 10.454). Circe then addresses Odysseus’ men:

ἴδιογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ,
μηκέτι νῦν θαλερὸν γόον ὄρνυτε· οἶδα καὶ αὐτή,
ἤμὲν ὅσ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθετ' ἄλγεα ἰχθυόεντι,
ἦδ' ὅσ' ἀνάρσιοι ἄνδρες ἐδηλήσαντ' ἐπὶ χέρσου.
ἀλλ' ἄγετ' ἐσθίετε βρώμην καὶ πίνετε οἶνον,

¹⁹⁰ “[T]he metaphor ‘eating one’s heart out’ acquires an additional force in this context” (de Jong 2004a: 262).

Cf. Clarke 1999: 88, fn. 71.

εἰς ὃ κεν αὖτις θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι λάβητε,
οἷον ὅτε πρότιστον ἐλείπετε πατρίδα γαῖαν
τρηχέης Ἰθάκης· νῦν δ' ἀσκελέες καὶ ἄθυμοι,
αἰὲν ἄλλης χαλεπῆς μεμνημένοι· οὐδέ ποθ' ὕμιν
θυμὸς ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ, ἐπεὶ ἧ μάλα πολλὰ πέπασθε.

(*Od.* 10.456-465)

Son of Laertes, subtle Odysseus, you must all give over these loud laments that you are making. I myself well know what tribulations you have endured on the teeming sea and what injustices you have borne from barbarous men on land. But enough! Eat your food and drink your wine till you have regained the same spirit that you had when you first set sail from your own country, rocky Ithaca. You are listless now, you are spiritless, brooding for ever and ever on the calamities of your wanderings. Your hearts are never disposed to mirth, because you have suffered all too much.

(Shewring 1980: 124-125)

Circe's speech is centered on allaying the suffering of the Greek travellers: Circe demands the hero put a stop to the weeping of his men and professes to know, moreover, what pains they have suffered (*Od.* 10.457-459). As a remedy the witch suggests the Ithacans eat food and drink wine, “ἔσθίετε βρώμην καὶ πίνετε οἶνον” until they have regained their “θυμὸν” (*Od.* 10.460-461). At the moment, however, they seem to her to be exhausted and dispirited, “ἀσκελέες καὶ ἄθυμοι” and on account of their many sufferings, “πολλὰ πέπασθε”, their “θυμὸς” is without merriment (*Od.* 10.463-465).

What is noticeable in this passage is the thrice repeated employment of the *thymos*—a word which for the Homeric man, and somewhat confusingly for the modern reader, denotes

both a “*locus* of mental activity” (Clarke 1999: 35) as well as the “thoughts and emotions that are its products” (68).¹⁹¹ In Circe’s speech, it is twice utilized as a noun in the nominative (*Od.* 10.465) and accusative (*Od.* 10.461), and once as a negative adjective (*Od.* 10.463). Circe recommends her house as a spa to restore or reinvigorate the *thymoi* of the Ithacans, which she deems to be in a lowly state, “ἄθυμοι” (*Od.* 10.463). We might translate this lowly state of the *thymos*, like Shewring does, as “spiritless” (1980: 124), although such a modern separation of body and soul does not accurately reflect the Homeric notion of the *thymos* (cf. Clarke 1999: 37-60).

Indeed, the property of the *thymos* at 10.456-465, which is most intriguing to this particular study of eating in the *Apologue* is its physical presence in the narrative as a component of the body (Austin 1975: 106, Clarke 1999: 73-79, Russo & Simon 1968: 487, Snell 1953: 18-19). Thus at 10.456-465, in addition to being bestowed an actual location in the body, “θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι” (*Od.* 10.461), the lowly state of the *thymos* of the Ithacans is treated as a kind of physical malady by Circe through Odysseus’ men being offered a physical remedy as a restorative: ‘ἀλλ’ ἄγετ’ ἐσθίετε βρώμην καὶ πίνετε οἶνον’ (*Od.* 10.460). Eating (and drinking) becomes a physical means to reinvigorate the damaged *thymos* (Clarke 1999: 91-92, fn. 80).

While eating has largely positive connotations in this passage (*Od.* 10.456-465), in acting as a restorative for the *thymos* against suffering and grief, this is not to say that eating doesn’t connote a danger at the same time:

ἔνθα μὲν ἥματα πάντα τελεσφόρον εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν

¹⁹¹ (i) For further readings on the Homeric *thymos*, cf. Austin 1975: 106-115, Clarke 1999: 61-126, Snell 1953: 1-22. (ii) For a criticism of Snell’s original arguments on the *thymos*, cf. Williams 1993: 21-49. (iii) For a definitional diagram of related terms of mental activity, cf. Clarke 1999: 54.

ἤμεθα, δαινύμενοι κρέα τ' ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἠδύ·
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἐνιαυτὸς ἔην, περὶ δ' ἔτραπον ὄραι,
μηνῶν φθινόντων, περὶ δ' ἤματα μακρὰ τελέσθη,
καὶ τότε μ' ἐκκαλέσαντες ἔφαν ἐρήρηες ἐταῖροι·
'δαιμόνι', ἤδη νῦν μιμνήσκειο πατρίδος αἴης,
εἴ τοι θέσφατόν ἐστι σαωθῆναι καὶ ἰκέσθαι
οἶκον ἐϋκτίμενον καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.'
ὣς ἔφαν, αὐτὰρ ἐμοί γ' ἐπεπείθετο θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ.
ὣς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἤμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα
ἤμεθα, δαινύμενοι κρέα τ' ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἠδύ.

(*Od.* 10.467-477)

So every day, till the year's end, we sat there feasting on plenteous meat and delicious wine. When the year was out and the seasons had circled around, then my comrades called me apart and said: "Forgetful man, it is time now to call your own land to mind once more, if indeed heaven means you to come safe home to your lofty house and the country of your fathers." Such were their words, and my heart accepted them. So all that day, till sun set, we sat and feasted on plenteous meat and delicious wine.

(Shewring 1980: 125)

While in Circe's speech (*Od.* 10.456-465), feasting is presented as a necessary physical restorative for the troubled men, in this adjacent passage (*Od.* 10.467-477), feasting connotes a significant delay in the *nostos*. The extended time duration of Circe's feast is given emphasis in this passage (Bakker 2013: 88). The feasting encompasses an entire year, "εἰς ἐνιαυτόν" (a fact repeated at *Od.* 10.469)—every single day of this year no less, "ἤματα

πάντα” (*Od.* 10.467); it entails a complete cycle of the seasons, “περὶ δ’ ἔτραπον ὄραι” (*Od.* 10.469); and it is brought to a conclusion only after the wearing away of months, “μηνῶν φθινόντων” and after many long days, “ἡματα μακρά”, have come to an end (*Od.* 10.470). The stress given to the passing of time during this feast is remarkable, and time is signified by four different units—days, months, seasons and years. Two of these signifiers (days and years) are repeated for good measure. Furthermore, the festive days are described as both long, “μακρά” (*Od.* 10.470), and as stretching into one another, “ἡματα πάντα” (*Od.* 10.467).

The danger of feasting in connoting perpetual stagnation in Aeaea is also recognized by Odysseus’ men, since at this point they urge Odysseus to remember his homeland, “πατρίδος αἴης” (*Od.* 10.472). This same act of forgetfulness of home was triggered by the initial drugged food of Circe (*Od.* 10.236) (Bakker 2013: 89). Lastly, one final all-day feast is enjoyed in Aeaea (*Od.* 10.476-477), before Odysseus broaches the topic of his departure with Circe (*Od.* 10.483-486) (Bakker 2013: 89).

The connection between eating and danger in the *Apologue* culminates in the final episode of Odysseus’ wanderings, where the men land on the island of the sun god, Helios. Eating in the land of Helios connotes destruction for the Ithacans in two respects. On the one hand, if they consume the sacred cattle and sheep of Helios, they have been warned that they will be killed as a punishment; on the other not eating promises death by starvation to Odysseus’ men.

When they first land on Thrinacia the men behold herds of cows and flocks of sheep belonging to Helios. On several occasions during the story, prohibitions are made against the slaughter and consuming of these livestock, firstly by Teiresias to Odysseus in the Underworld (*Od.* 11.104-112), then by Circe to Odysseus (*Od.* 12.127-141). Both the prophet and the witch warn Odysseus that destruction will befall his ships and his men if the livestock are in any way hurt—“τότε τοι τεκμαίρομ’ ὄλεθρον / νηῖ τε καὶ ἐτάροισ’” (*Od.* 11.112-113,

12.139-140). Once off the coast of Thrinacia, Odysseus first warns the men about the dangers, “αἰνότατον κακόν” (*Od.* 12.275), of this island without any reference to the consumption of the livestock (*Od.* 12.271-276). Later, after Eurylochus has again stood up against their leader (*Od.* 12.279-293), Odysseus recommends that the men stick to the food Circe gave them and asks them to swear an oath against killing the livestock (*Od.* 12.297-302), which would be an act committed in “ἀτασθαλίησι κακῆσιν” (*Od.* 12.300). Once they have disembarked on Thrinacia, Odysseus again repeats his warning that they should abstain from eating Helios’ livestock (*Od.* 12.320-323), lest they suffer some misfortune, “μή τι πάθωμεν” (*Od.* 12.321).

In contrast to Odysseus’ Eurylochus’ speech (*Od.* 12.279-293) once again raises the ambiguous value of eating, which I examined in the Aeaeian encounter. Eating, for Odysseus’ lieutenant connotes a welcome respite from their laborious journeying. Eurylochus identifies the exhaustion of the rest of the men, “καμάτῳ ἀδηκότας ἠδὲ καὶ ὕπνῳ” (*Od.* 12.281), which he contrasts with the unceasing endurance of the hero (*Od.* 12.279-280). The lieutenant admonishes Odysseus’ lack of pity, “σχέτλιός” (*Od.* 12.279), for not allowing the weary men to refresh themselves by landing on Thrinacia and having a decent meal, “λαρὸν τετυκοίμεθα δόρπον” (*Od.* 12.283). Later he recommends that rather than face the tempestuous seas at night (*Od.* 12.284-292) they take their supper on the shore, “δόρπον θ’ ὀπλισόμεσθα θοῆ παρὰ νηὶ μένοντες” (*Od.* 12.292). Again, eating here connotes a respite from the destruction, “αἰπὸν ὄλεθρον,” (*Od.* 12.287), which the men might suffer at sea during the night.

In contrast to Eurylochus’ desire for a respite, actual instances of eating in Thrinacia are not at all welcome for the Ithacans. When the Ithacans do disembark on the island of Helios and prepare their meal (*Od.* 12.307-308), they are at once reminded of the last act of eating in the *Apologue*, Scylla’s horrible devouring of Odysseus’ men (*Od.* 12.309-310). For a whole month after the Greeks disembark, they are forced by unfavourable winds to remain

on Thrinacia (*Od.* 12.325-326), and during this time the supplies of food from the ship gradually run dry and the men are forced to eat fish and birds (*Od.* 12.327-331)—or whatever they can catch, “φίλας ὅ τι χεῖρας ἴκοιτο” (*Od.* 12.331)—because they are beset by hungry stomachs, “ἔτειρε δὲ γαστέρα λιμός” (*Od.* 12.332). The two forms of destruction awaiting the Ithacans are summed up by Eurylochus: either they suffer death by starvation (*Od.* 12.340-342) or, if Helios is displeased by their slaughter of his livestock, they suffer death at sea, by divine punishment (*Od.* 12.348-351). In both cases, the eating choices of the Ithacans implicate the fate they will suffer.

The conclusion to the Thrinacian episode is a simple progression of feasting followed by destruction. The Ithacans, inspired by Eurylochus’ persuasive words, decide to sacrifice and consume the cattle of Helios (*Od.* 12.352-365, 397-398) (cf. Nagler 1990: 339-340, Vernant 1979: 243-244). Upon learning of the slaughter, Helios demands that Zeus take hostile action against the offending Ithacans (*Od.* 12.378, 382) and the king of the gods promises Helios that the Greek ship will be sunk (*Od.* 12.385-388), which it duly is. All the men perish except Odysseus (*Od.* 12.399-419).¹⁹²

3.5 *Conclusions*

The typicality of eating in the *Apologue* should be manifest from this analysis. In many encounters, with the exception of several in the Underworld in Book 11 and the Sirens and Charybdis in Book 12, eating is a central activity. In Book 9 the Greeks feast on the livestock of the Cicones, they sample the intoxicating plant of the Lotus Eaters, and, in Polyphemus’ cave, they are both active subjects of a feast and later unfortunate objects of the ogre’s

¹⁹² On the parallel between the destruction of Odysseus’ companions in Thrinacia and the suitors in Ithaca, cf. Nagler 1990: 340-341.

feasting. In Book 10 Aeolus retains the Ithacans for a month in his palace, showing them exemplary hospitality, the Laestrygonians treat the Greeks as prey, and, in Circe's home, the men are transformed into swine in the first feast, while in the later feast, they stay for an entire year, indulging in food and drink. In Book 11, Agamemnon is the abused guest at Aegisthus' feast, rendered a figurative sacrificial ox to the slaughter. In Book 12, Scylla, like the Laestrygonians, treats herself to the Ithacans as though they were fish, and, finally, on Thrinacia, Odysseus' companions kill the cattle of Helios and suffer the consequences.

In the course of my analysis, I have explored the contextual associations which can be found alongside references to actions of eating or feasting in *xeinoi* situations. I have suggested in this chapter that eating connotes two particular types of danger in the *Apologue*. The first is that of destruction, which concerns the physical destruction the *xeinoi* experience in these books, often at the hands of monsters or inimical men, but also at times through punishment by divinities. This physical destruction, moreover, can be expressed also through the loss of human identity and agency, a descent into an animal-like state of powerlessness and helplessness in these encounters. The second danger connoted by eating in these four books is that of the delay in the *nostos*, a stagnation in the journey home. This is most marked in reception scenes which seem wholly benevolent, such as Circe's 'second' reception (after her taming, that is) or in the home of Aeolus, or even among the Lotus Eaters, who intend no harm to the crew. In the case of Circe especially, the connotations of eating as a danger to the *nostos* are compounded with the connotations of eating as a welcome respite for the travel-weary men.

Chapter 4: Tricks and Success

4.1 Overview

This chapter examines acts of trickery in *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue* as a typical feature of the story. I shall explore here how these repeated units, when viewed with respect to their contexts, tend to connote success for either the *xeinoi* or their ‘hosts’ in the respective encounters. By the term ‘success’, I refer variously to the manner in which the tricks are frequently to be associated in the *Apologue* with the achievement of an endeavour, victory over an opposition, or some manner of ascendancy or dominance in a particular *xeinos* encounter. This success will, in turn, often be contrasted in these four books with the corresponding failure, in the marked absence of tricks, of physical prowess, *biē*, in overcoming an obstacle or an opposition.

This chapter will follow a similar structure to the preceding two. Firstly, I shall provide a review of some of the major scholarship on trickery, in ‘*Trickery in the Odyssey*’ (4.2). I shall then provide a summary of all the employments of acts of trickery in the *Apologue* in the subsequent section, ‘*The Typicality of Tricks in the Apologue*’ (4.3). Following this, I shall pursue the connoted meanings behind these instances in the section, ‘*A Connotative Interpretation of Acts of Trickery in the Apologue*’ (4.4). Finally, I shall summarize my findings in *Conclusions* (4.5).

4.2 *Trickery in the Odyssey*

I commence this review of scholarship with Pietro Pucci’s study of Odysseus’ character in *Odysseus polutropos: intertextual readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad* (1987). Pucci

introduces three major, related terms which are of importance to Odysseus as a trickster-type figure:¹⁹³ (i) *mētis*, an abstract noun (also identifiable through the epithet most frequently attached to Odysseus' name, *polymētis* [Austin 1975: 25-30]),¹⁹⁴ which Pucci translates as “cunning” or “shrewdness” (1987: 16; cf. Detienne & Vernant 1974: 17-18); (ii) *polytropy*, an artificial noun Pucci contrives from the epithet *polytropos*, denoting a man “of many turns” (1987: 14);¹⁹⁵ and (iii) *doloi*, which Pucci translates as “tricks” (17). While Pucci regards (i) *mētis* and (ii) *polytropy* as “synonymous” (16), both denoting a mental quality which is conducive to and adept at employing acts of trickery, disguise, or illusion (16-17)—

¹⁹³ Pucci's (1987: 62) analysis contrasts two sides of Odysseus' character—the persona of the suffering hero, tossed over the seas and made to endure countless hardships before he returns home, and that of the trickster, the hero who, in later Greek literature, became defined for his versatility in all situations.

¹⁹⁴ For a summary of the different epithets which are applied to Odysseus in adjective-noun phrases, and their relative frequency, cf. Austin 1975: 25-36. Austin (29) argues against the meaningfulness of the epithet, *polymētis*, noting that it occurs primarily in the particular context of the introduction to a speech. “Can that most formulaic epithet, *polymētis*, be entirely ornamental when its association is with Odysseus as speaker? It might be better to translate the formula in that context as “thinking hard, Odysseus spoke,” or “while his mind ranged far, Odysseus spoke.” Such translations would remind us that when Odysseus speaks he is usually pleading a case, marshalling his most persuasive arguments” (39). Austin (40) also points out that Achilles might also attain the epithet *polymētis*, because his name is the metrical equivalent of Odysseus'—of course he never does. Other epithets which denote Odysseus' intellectual keenness, include *polyphrōn*, *poikilophrōn*, *polymechanos*, and *polykerdēs* (Clay 1983: 31).

¹⁹⁵ *Polytropos* is the first epithet which is bestowed upon Odysseus in the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 1.1). In the proemium, remarkably, Odysseus' name does not appear at first, but he is identified only through this adjective (Clay 1983: 26-29). On the ambiguous denotations of the epithet, *polytropos*, Clay writes: “[I]s one meant to think of turnings in space, and is the allusion therefore primarily to Odysseus' wanderings? Or are these mental turns which refer in some way to the hero's mental dexterity?” (1983: 29; cf. de Jong 2004a: 7). On the distinction between Odyssean epithets denoting mental ingenuity and those denoting his sufferings/wanderings, cf. Clay 1983: 31.

that is to say, “shrewdness” or “the turns and ruses of the mind” (16)¹⁹⁶—*doloi* are different, though of course still related, in usually referring to the actual acts of trickery and stratagems as they occur in practice (*Lfgre* 1991: 329-330).

On the subject of the denotations of these words and their utilization in contexts, however, it is necessary to caution that the Greek word *dolos* does not always occur in concrete instances where a particular artifice is actually being employed by the Ithacan hero (Pucci 1987: 61-62). Pucci observes that, while there are occasions where the word *dolos* is used to describe a specific act of trickery—for example, when Odysseus wrestles with Ajax in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 23.275), when he devises the wooden horse, itself called a *dolos*, to overcome the Trojans (*Od.* 8.494), or when he conceals his weeping from Penelope (*Od.* 19.212) (61-62)—there are equally other occasions when the Homeric poet(s) has chosen to employ terms designating mental ingenuity during these tricks, for example *mētis* (e.g. *Od.* 2.279, 9.414, 20.20), *poikilomētis*, and *polymētis* (62).¹⁹⁷ There are also occasions when the term *dolos* may be used outside of any particular trick, and is rather utilized to impart a general quality of trickery to the hero (e.g. *Il.* 3.202, *Od.* 3.119, 122, 9.19) (62).¹⁹⁸ These distinctions are relevant to my study, since I shall be exploring trickery as a repeated, typical activity or

¹⁹⁶ Pucci’s study rests, however, more on the particular resonances of polytropy: “If I choose to speak of Odysseus’ polytropy rather than of his *mētis* it is because “polytropy” has the felicitous advantage of describing not only his character but the thematic and rhetorical qualities of the text, for the turns and re-turn of his wanderings, the turns and ruses of his mind, are mirrored in the turns (*tropoi*, rhetoric and rhetorical figures) of the *Odyssey* itself” (1987: 16).

¹⁹⁷ “But in these other contexts another word is preferred, *mētis*, which indicates his intelligence and ruses” (Pucci 1987: 62).

¹⁹⁸ “When the text presents Odysseus in a formulaic sort of portrait, however, the *doloi* of the hero become his prominent characteristic; the word is used in the plural with *pantoioi* “of all sorts,” or *pantes*, “all,”” (Pucci 1987: 62). Podlecki (1961: 131) regards *dolos* and *mētis* as synonyms.

action in the story which the audience identifies on a semantic level, and not merely the formal repetition of words, such as *dolos*. In short, repetition of a single word does not necessarily indicate repetition of an action of trickery, though words such as *dolos*, *mētis*, and *polymētis* will be found in these contexts and give a strong indication that a trick is at hand.

Importantly, in terms of the connotative value which my study explores, Pucci regards all three terms—*mētis*, polytrophy, and *doloi*—as success-oriented phenomena (cf. Detienne & Vernant 1974: 17). To put it another way, their role in the *Odyssey* is to overcome potential obstacles, or what Pucci describes as the inhibiting forces of ‘necessity’:

The dominant presence of notions such as polytrophy, *mētis*, and *doloi*, “tricks,” implies that the empire of necessity is harsh and inevitable. What I call here, generally, the empire of necessity receives more precise determinations in the various situations staged in the *Odyssey*. Essentially this empire of necessity includes death, self-forgetfulness, dissemination (drifting away forever), and the loss of the self. As *mētis*, *doloi*, and polytrophy *succeed* [my italics] in controlling these threats, pleasure emerges for the character and for the reader as well. The text of the *Odyssey* applies endless variations to this same basic situation.

(1987: 17)

Such an interpretation does indeed lend a very positive character to the associated senses of these three terms, in that they are ‘notions’ which push against the dominant, obstructing forces of the poem. However, Pucci later concedes that the connotations of *dolos*, in particular, while generally positive and conveying success—“a trick is viewed as a weapon or a resource for self-protection from, or self-enhancement amid, enemies” (1987: 61)—can itself have a “derogatory meaning” (61). Pucci (61, fn. 21) cites the instance when Zeus gives

the epithet of *kakotechnos* (*Il.* 15.14) to Hera's act of *dolos* in deceiving him. This does not diminish the connotations of tricks as success-based activities, although it does make us question the ethics behind the victor's methods—put simply, both 'good' and 'bad' characters alike find *dolos* an effective means for achieving their desires or need.

Incidentally, when Pucci (1987: 23) talks about the success of *mētis*, *doloi*, and polytropy, he is not only referring to the implementation of these within the story, but also how the text itself plays with the reader, achieving a truly polytropic style.¹⁹⁹ Such an exercise, however, goes beyond the scope of this chapter, which limits itself to understanding how the audience derives meaning from the contextual usages of these units in the story. I shall not contend that the very act of reading the *Odyssey*—and, one should not forget, listening to it—is somehow intrinsically polytropic.

Furthermore, in substantiating the association of *mētis*, *doloi*, and polytropy with successful outcomes in the story, Pucci (1987: 22) points to their adoption by two divinities in the *Odyssey* who guide the hero in overcoming threats to his survival or to his *nostos*; thus Athena is both Odysseus' patron goddess, but also, like the hero, a master of *mētis*, attaining the epithet *polyboulos* in the Homeric poems (*Il.* 5.260, *Od.* 16.282), 'of many counsels' (Clay 1983: 32, Heatherington 1976: 227). In aiding Odysseus through disguise and illusion in the ultimate confrontation of the epic when he returns to his *oikos*, Athena's displays of *mētis* are quite ineluctable, "as the success of Odysseus' plan in his own house proves" (Pucci 1987: 16). Likewise, the god Hermes is portrayed as a master of *mētis* when he aids Odysseus in overcoming the machinations of the witch, Circe (Pucci 1987: 23-25). As divine

¹⁹⁹ "Textually speaking—that is, at the level of textual composition—Athena also stands for the polytropic style of the *Odyssey*, for its intriguing, baffling ironies, its playful allusiveness, its many facets and mirrors. An immense exercise of reading and misreading is couched in this polytropy" (Pucci 1987: 23). On Odysseus as a polytropic narrator, cf. Hopman 2012: 6-7.

practitioners of *mētis*, both Athena and Hermes present models of trickery which inevitably lead to overwhelming success for the hero.

Gregory Nagy's study, *The best of the Achaeans: concepts of the hero in Archaic Greek poetry* (1979), provides further insights into the significance of *mētis* in the Homeric poems, in particular as it is contrasted with *biē*. Before I arrive there, however, of first importance to Nagy's study is the Greek concept of *kleos* or 'glory' (16). Homeric poetry is, arguably, rooted in the very act of distributing *kleos*. The task of the Homeric bard is to convey to the audience the *kleos* which he hears from the Muses—the glory of the past heroes (*Il.* 2.485-486) (16; cf. Segal 1983: 23, 25).²⁰⁰ For Nagy (22-25), the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* come to respond to one another through the quarrel or *neikos*²⁰¹ of the two primary Greek protagonists in each epic, Achilles and Odysseus, each of whom strive to attain the greatest *kleos*, and thus to be dubbed the best of the Achaeans, *aristos Achaiōn*. Nagy argues that while Achilles lays claim to the title of *aristos Achaiōn* in the *Iliad* (26-35; cf. Clay 1983: 96-97), Odysseus achieves the honour of widest *kleos* in the *Odyssey* (35-40).²⁰²

Of relevance to this contrast is Odysseus' encounter with Achilles in the Underworld. Having addressed the shade of the dead hero as, “μέγα φέρτατ' Ἀχαιῶν” (*Od.* 11.478), “mightiest of the Achaeans” (Shewring 1980: 138), the Ithacan is surprisingly told by Achilles that he would rather perform the role of a serf, “θητευέμεν” (*Od.* 11.489) (*Lfgre* 1991: 1042-1043),²⁰³ than be king of the dead, “πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν” (*Od.* 11.491). This is a startling claim, given that death on the battlefield is a defining characteristic of the Iliadic hero, who values destruction and the accompanying *kleos* in

²⁰⁰ The word *kleos* does not only therefore refer to the fame of the great heroes, but is also a formal term to denote what the bards sang about (Segal 1983: 26).

²⁰¹ For the importance of boasting in asserting *kleos* in a *neikos*, cf. Nagy 1979: 45.

²⁰² For evidence of this competition in the proems of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, cf. Pucci 1982: 39-41.

²⁰³ “[A]ls Lohnarbeiter dienen” (*Lfgre* 1991: 1042).

heroic song over and above life itself, and the accompanying possibility of anonymity (Clay 1983: 108-109, Finkelberg 1995: 1).

The ‘best of the Achaeans’ from the *Iliad* is willing to give up his most valuable asset, his *kleos*, for the sake merely of being alive in the *Odyssey*. In fact, he would even elect the station of a lowly peasant—an ironic choice given Odysseus’ later transformation into a beggar (Nagy 1979: 35).²⁰⁴ Odysseus, as the ‘best of the Achaeans in the *Odyssey*, represents a different model of hero. He is in fact a doubly-successful hero, achieving both a *nostos* and *kleos*, unlike Achilles, who as the ‘best of the Achaeans’, manages only *kleos*, but dies before returning home (39-41). For Nagy (36-38), the exact *kleos* of Odysseus resides primarily in the Ithacan’s ability to win back Penelope from the clutches of the suitors, and take his revenge.

While both Odysseus and Achilles attain the status of ‘the best of the Greeks’ at certain points in the epics, just how they go about achieving their *kleos* is a traditional point of contrast in the Homeric poems, and indeed, a point of competition between the two heroes:

[T]he quarreling between Achilles and Odysseus as the “best of the Achaeans” [for example, at *Od.* 8.73-78]²⁰⁵ seems to be based on an epic tradition that contrasted the heroic worth of Odysseus with that of Achilles in terms of a contrast between *mētis* and *biē*. The contrast apparently took the form of a quarrel between the two heroes over whether Troy would be taken by might or artifice.

(Nagy 1979: 45)

²⁰⁴ “Achilles seems ready to trade places with Odysseus, whose safe homecoming will be marked by a painful transitional phase at the very lowest levels of the social order” (Nagy 1979: 35).

²⁰⁵ On Demodocus’ first song, and the *mētis/biē* contrast, cf. Olson 1989a: 136-137.

Although Nagy (1979: 46) concedes that this tradition, of a squabble between the two heroes as to whether Troy ought to be defeated by *mētis* or *biē*, is not explicitly mentioned in the surviving Homeric poems and is only referenced by the ancient scholia to certain passages (*Il.* 9.347, *Od.* 8.75, 77) (cf. Clay 1983: 102), he does cite examples in the *Iliad* where a contrast between ‘Odyssean artifice’ and ‘Achillean might’ seems deliberately intended (*contra* Wilson 2002: 140-141). At *Il.* 9.346-352, the Greek ships are under threat of fire and destruction from the Trojans. Achilles, in recommending a course of action in his own absence to the Ithacan hero, suggests that Odysseus, along with Agamemnon and the other kings, contrive a manner, “φραζέσθω” (*Il.* 9.347) (*Lfgre* 2006: 1007-1008), of overcoming the might of Hector, “σθένοϛ Ἔκτοροϛ” (*Il.* 9.351). As Nagy (1979: 46) argues, this is an ironic challenge by Achilles for the Achaeans to employ Odyssean wiles when they ought really to make use of Achillean might, so as to match that of Hector (cf. Dunkle 1987: 1).²⁰⁶

With regard to the connotative sense of success which my analysis investigates in the *Apologue*, Nagy (1979: 47) argues that *biē* is commonly associated with Achillean superiority in the *Iliad* (e.g. *Il.* 11.787) (cf. Dunkle 1987: 1), while *mētis* is a measure of Odyssean eminence in the *Odyssey* (cf. Cook 1999: 153). On the latter, he remarks that the epithets, *polymētis* and *poikilomētis* are only attributed to Odysseus in both Homeric epics (Nagy 1979: 47). To Nagy’s analysis of *mētis* as a measure of Odyssean superiority in the *Odyssey*, I would add the importance of *doloi*, the products of a mind which is strong in *mētis*, in characterizing the Ithacan thus (cf. Cook 1999: 153). It is, for example, given a prominent place in the hero’s introduction of his adventures to the Phaeacians. After praising the feast which the Phaeacians have laid out for him, and recounting his suffering, Odysseus announces his name:

²⁰⁶ Achilles’ disparagement of *mētis* is also shared by Agamemnon (cf. *Il.* 4.339) (Dunkle 1987: 1).

εἶμ' Ὀδυσσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν
ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καί μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει.

(*Od.* 9.19-20)

I am Odysseus, son of Laertes; among all mankind I am known for subtleties, and the fame of me goes up to heaven.

(Shewring 1980: 99)

The hero duly provides his name and patronymic before declaring what he is famous for, his *kleos*: he is known to all mankind for his displays of “δόλοισιν” (line 19).²⁰⁷ Odysseus’ pride at his skill in cunning and trickery, declaring it to be the reason for his fame, is matched by an earlier passage in Book 8, when the Ithacan recommends what Demodocus might choose to sing (Clay 1983: 107).²⁰⁸

ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ μετάβηθι καὶ ἵππου κόσμον ἄεισον
δουρατέου, τὸν Ἐπειὸς ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ,
ὅν ποτ' ἐς ἀκρόπολιν δόλον ἤγαγε δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
ἀνδρῶν ἐμπλήσας, οἳ Ἴλιον ἐξαλάπαξαν.

(*Od.* 8.492-495)

²⁰⁷ Charles Segal (1983: 26) comments on the unusual situation of Odysseus with respect to his *kleos*: he is both a distributor of *kleos* as a singer, and the subject of this song.

²⁰⁸ In fact, as Clay observes, Odysseus’ boast “forms the climax to Demodocus’ songs which presented the victory of Odyssean metis” (1983: 107; cf. Thornton 1970: 43-45).

Come, change now to a later theme—the wooden horse and its fashioning; Epeius made it, Athena helped him, noble Odysseus planned its cunning climb to the citadel; inside the horse he had housed his warriors, and the warriors achieved the sack of Troy.

(Shewring 1980: 96)

Just like at the start of his *Apologue*, Odysseus wishes his *kleos* to be associated with an act of *dolos*,²⁰⁹ for, as Nagy states, the bard is a powerful figure in the cycle of early Greek poetry since he is the distributor of *kleos*: “Poetry confers glory... The Achaean singer of tales is in control of the glory that may be yours” (1979: 16-17). Odysseus’ act of trickery ensures success for the Greeks since it is the means by which they sack Troy, “Ἴλιον ἐξάλαπαξαν” (*Od.* 8.495). The accomplishment of this deception is further augmented through the help of Athena (*Od.* 8.493), who is, of course, a master of *mētis*.

In summary, the act of trickery leads to the successful attainment of an endeavour (here, the sack of Troy), which in turns leads to *kleos* for the hero through heroic poetry. *Doloi* become a means of Odyssean superiority, and ultimately, fame.²¹⁰ Jenny Straus Clay

²⁰⁹ The response by Demodocus does not focus exclusively on *dolos*, however; in fact the subject matter of the recital is oriented far more towards traditional ‘Iliadic’ military prowess in the sacking of Troy (cf. *Od.* 8.514-520) (Olson 1989a: 137). The bard’s song, moreover, triggers a lament in Odysseus (*Od.* 8.521-531) (Olson 137). As Olson states: “Even if guile might in one sense be said to have conquered, the victory thus emerges as an oddly ambiguous one. It remains unclear whether cleverness really has one, and if it has, whether the triumph has been worthwhile” (137).

²¹⁰ I should add here, however, that this relationship between success and fame is not so straightforward in acts of trickery. Indeed, there are times when the *doloi* confer infamy or at least imply a certain disrepute, although they may still connote success. For further examples of Odysseus’ success and fame in *mētis* and *doloi*, cf. *Od.* 3.120-122, 13.291-299. Odysseus is also renowned as a trickster character by genealogy: his maternal

(1983: 101-102) suggests that the quarrel between Odyssean *mētis* and Achillean *biē* which was implied in Demodocus' first song is answered by the Phaeacian bard's third and final song which is prompted by Odysseus' request to sing of his *dolos*. This victory of *mētis* belongs, however, to the story of the *Odyssey*, for, as Nagy discerns (1979: 40-41), any reference to the trick of the wooden horse is conspicuously absent from the *Iliad* (cf. Rutherford 2001: 138-139).

To return to the opposition between *mētis* and *biē*, Nagy presents two further relevant passages. At *Il.* 23. 313-318, Nestor, a character, like Odysseus, who is known for artifice of thought rather than strength alone (cf. *Od.* 3.118-129) (cf. Dunkle 1987: 1-2), recommends to his son, who is about to compete in a chariot race, the virtues of *mētis* in the achievement of various endeavours—woodcutting, steering a ship, and indeed riding a chariot; in the case of the first activity, *mētis* is contrasted directly with *biē* (Nagy 1979: 47; cf. Dunkle 1987: 2):

μήτι τοι δρυτόμος μέγ' ἀμείνων ἢ ἐ βίηφι·

(*Il.* 23.315)

It is with *mētis* rather than *biē* that a woodcutter is better.

(Nagy 1979: 47)

Mētis, according to Nestor, confers success, helping a character attain prizes, “ἄεθλα” (*Il.* 23.314), over and above *biē*. In contrast to this, at *Il.* 9.423-426, Achilles finishes his speech by concluding that the *mētis* (*Il.* 9.423) which the Greeks have devised to check the Trojans, namely to build a wall, has not succeeded and that a better one is required. In fact, Odysseus

grandfather, Autolycus, who gave the young hero his name, is renowned as a cunning figure (Clay 1983: 68-89, Cook 1999: 152-153).

himself has argued for the need for the might of Achilles to end their difficulties (*Il.* 9.225-231) (Nagy 1979: 48). As Dunkle (1987: 3-4) points out, prior to the funeral games in Book 23 Nestor's wise advice, his characteristic demonstration of *mētis*, has not actually created any tangible advantages for the Greeks on the battlefield, quite the opposite in fact. Not only was the building of the ill-fated wall Nestor's plan (*Il.* 7.336-342), but so too was the embassy which was sent to Achilles (*Il.* 9.96-113) and did not achieve its end in convincing the hero to re-join the battle (*Il.* 9.308-429). In addition, Nestor's recommendation that Patroclus disguise himself in Book 11 does not end well for Achilles' friend (*Il.* 11.794-803). As Dunkle (1987: 5-7) has argued, Diomedes' triumph in the chariot race in Book 23 of the *Iliad* is to be ascribed primarily to *biē*, not his *mētis* which, though an important ingredient for a successful charioteer, is not the deciding factor (cf. Detienne & Vernant 1974: 18-31).

The lesson is clear: in the *Iliad*, *mētis* unsupported by adequate *biē* is doomed to failure.

(Dunkle 1987: 4)²¹¹

With respect to my own analysis, I shall further explore how the tension between acts of trickery (invoking *mētis*) and acts of might (*biē*), and the connotations of success and failure, are represented in the *Apologue*. By selecting Pucci's and Nagy's analyses as exemplary discussions of trickery in the Homeric poems (and these two scholars approach the epics from two quite different methodological standpoints), I am not implying that these are the most

²¹¹ For further analysis of the opposition between *mētis* and *biē* in the funeral games, cf. Dunkle 1987: 10-17. In some of the sports, particularly wrestling and the foot race, Dunkle argues for a superiority of brain over brawn. The greater role which *mētis* plays at the end of the *Iliad* is significant for Dunkle: "The effectiveness of *mētis* in the funeral games foreshadows the *mētis* which will eventually enable Odysseus to bring about the destruction of Troy and, moreover, to achieve his survival and homecoming" (1987: 17).

important dissections of the significance of tricks in the epics. They do, however, contribute to my analysis, in exploring the connotative value of tricks as being success-based in the *Apologue* (Pucci), and the tension which the Homeric epics open up between *mētis* and *biē* (Nagy).

4.3 *The Typicality of Tricks in the Apologue*

The present section provides a complete list of all acts of trickery in the *Apologue*. As with the previous chapter, I am studying the repetition of an action or activity, and not a particular word in isolation, and thus while these acts of trickery will often involve specific verbal references to *dolos*, *mētis*, or related epithets, repetition of a singular word is not essential if a trick is visible in the story and conveyed in different language. Still, if I preclude specific Greek words as units of typicality, it will be necessary to define just what exactly I consider an action of trickery to be.

My definition is quite broad and empirical. I regard a trick as having two defining properties: one from the perspective of the subject, the creator of the trick, the other from the object, the butt of the trick. Thus by a ‘trick’, I denote (i) a character’s implementation or practical demonstration of *mētis* or ‘guile’ (whether or not this mental facet is explicitly represented in the text). The implementation can be realized in the story in various ways, for example, as an act of disguise, illusion, crafty speech, alluring song, the clever utilization of some physical prop, and so forth (cf. Detienne & Vernant 1974: 17-18),²¹² all of which I include in the overarching category of ‘tricks’. (ii) Secondly, a trick is an action employed for

²¹² “En premier lieu, la capacité intelligente que désigne *mētis* s’exerce sur des plans très divers... multiples savoir-faire utiles à la vie, maîtrise de l’artisan dans son métier, tours magiques, usage des philtres et des herbes, ruses de guerre, tromperies, feintes, débrouillardises en tous genres” (Detienne & Vernant 1974: 17-18).

the purposes of defying the expectations of, or deceiving in some respect, another character(s).

As in the previous chapter, for the sake of economy I shall formally represent each act of trickery in the *Apologue* through the line references in which it may be located, categorized according to the particular *xeinoi* encounter, and accompanied by a descriptive summary.

4.3.1 *Reference List for Tricks in the Apologue*

(i) Polyphemus: 9.279-280, 283-286, 318-335, 347-361, 364-367, 375-388, 420-436.

Polyphemus tries to trick Odysseus into giving him the location of his ship; Odysseus realizes this and lies to the ogre. The hero devises the idea of using a wooden stake to blind the giant's eye when he falls asleep; the stake is duly fashioned and hidden. When the ogre returns, Odysseus tempts the monster into drinking the wine, a trap which he duly falls into. Odysseus answers the ogre's request for his name, but provides a fake appellation—'Noman'. When the giant passes out, the men heat up the stake and thrust it in Polyphemus' eye. Odysseus comes up with the plan of tying himself and his men to the stomachs' of the ogre's livestock in order to escape from the cave, which they do and wait for the giant to lead his flock out into the pastures.

(ii) Aeolus: 10.17-27.

Aeolus provides Odysseus with a special bag, filled with all the unfavourable winds, which would push Odysseus off course, ensuring that only the favourable west wind will blow the Ithacans homeward.

(iii) Circe: 10.212-219, 220-223, 233-240, 286-301, 312-320, 321-344.

On Aeaea, the Ithacan envoy first encounters Circe's magic through her tame 'pets', the wolves and lions which are outside the witch's home. The men are then transfixed by the beautiful voice of the goddess. Circe mixes a drug into the food which she gives the Ithacans, and proceeds to turn them into swine. Odysseus, upon learning about the mischief of Circe, travels to her home; on the way he is met by Hermes, who provides him with a means for defeating the witch: firstly, he will need a certain herb to counter Circe's magic; secondly, he will need to engage in a certain ritual when Circe tries herself to trick him. When Odysseus arrives at the home, the witch duly tries to trick him, but, following Hermes' advice, Odysseus manages to counter her doloι.

(iv) Agamemnon: 11.405-434

Clytemnestra devises a trap for her husband, Agamemnon and his men, a scene of murder disguised as a feast.

(v) The Sirens: 12.39-54, 173-200.

The Sirens employ a bewitching song to beguile their victims; Circe recommends that Odysseus' crew plug their ears with wax and to tie Odysseus to the mast, if the hero wishes to listen to what they have to say. They obey Circe's instructions when they approach the isle of the sirens.

(vi) Scylla: 12.245-255.

Scylla ambushes Odysseus' ship, surprising the men when they are focusing on Charybdis.

4.3.2 *Summary*

This analysis of typicality illustrates the pervasiveness of trickery in *xeinoi* encounters in the *Apologue*. Not only do they play a part in six different situations in these four books, but they also constitute substantial chunks of the narrative. In the overarching category of 'tricks', I have included, among other activities, acts of concealment (for example, the Ithacans hiding themselves under Polyphemus' sheep), of bewitchment (the song of the Sirens and of Circe), of verbal craft (Odysseus' name-game with the ogre), of evasion (Odysseus hiding outside the Laestrygonian harbour), and of outright magic (Circe's taming of wild animals). The following analysis will discuss the connotative resonances of these various acts of trickery.

4.4 A Connotative Interpretation of Tricks in the Apologue

Odysseus' encounter with Polyphemus can be interpreted as a battle between *mētis* and *biē*—in modern terms the idiom would be between 'brains and brawn'—with the former ultimately achieving success for the Ithacan hero through the various tricks he employs.

It is worth commenting on the various ways in which the narrative gives emphasis to Polyphemus' might, *biē*, from the outset. Firstly, the topography around the ogre's home has a characterizing function in drawing the audience's attention to the sheer physical scale of the resident giant (de Jong 2004a: 235-236). When the travellers first arrive at the land of the Cyclopes, they behold a tall cave, “σπέος... ὑψηλόν” (*Od.* 9.182-183) and around this cave, a 'high courtyard', “αὐλή... ὑψηλή” (*Od.* 9.184-185), has been fashioned with stones—'high' in the sense that the courtyard is surrounded by a high wall. The courtyard is further surrounded by tall pine trees, “μακρῆσιν... πίτυσιν”, and 'high-leaved' oaks, “δρυσὶν ὑψικόμοισιν”. All the surroundings, in short, give an emphasis to height, which aptly foreshadows the physical immensity of Polyphemus. I have analysed the mountain simile (*Od.* 9.191-192) in my second chapter, and argued that the imagery of a mountain, in the context of Polyphemus' isolation, is appropriate to several other references to mountains in the *Apologue*. In the context of the description of Polyphemus' home (*Od.* 9.182-186), however, the comparison of the ogre to a mountain, naturally the tallest feature in any topographic description, also adds to the sense of height which the surrounding landscape builds (de Jong 2004a: 235-236).

Secondly, Odysseus describes his premonition that he and his men would come across an individual in this cave, who was marked out by his savagery, and by his strength:

...αὐτίκα γάρ μοι ὄϊσατο θυμὸς ἀγῆνωρ

ἄνδρ' ἐπελεύσεσθαι μεγάλην ἐπειμένον ἀλκὴν,
ἄγριον, οὔτε δίκας εὔειδότα οὔτε θέμιστας.

(*Od.* 9.213-215)

[B]ecause from the first I had forebodings that the stranger who might face us now would wear brute strength like a garment round him, a savage whose heart had little knowledge of just laws or of ordinances.

(Shewring 1980: 103-104)

Polyphemus' lawlessness, “οὔτε δίκας... οὔτε θέμιστας” , and wildness, “ἄγριον” (*Od.* 9.215), are tokens of his isolation from civilized Greek society. His sheer physical strength, “μεγάλην... ἀλκὴν” (*Od.* 9.214), while representative too of the character of a solitary outsider, will also prove to be of importance in his confrontation with *polymētis* Odysseus. When Polyphemus does arrive, he displays his *biē* in several respects. He carries into the cave and throws down a heavy bundle of firewood, “ὄβριμον ἄχθος / ὕλης ἀζαλέης” (*Od.* 9.233-234), he closes the entrance of his dwelling with a great rock, which is given three descriptive epithets to emphasize its colossal proportions (*Od.* 9.240-241, 243); the act of moving the boulder is given further enormity through likening the monster's strength to a force greater than twenty-two wagons (*Od.* 9.241-242). Indeed, his *biē* seems to be transferred from his physique to his voice, “φθόγγον τε βαρύν” , which causes the Ithacans to shrink back in fear (*Od.* 9.257).

Most tellingly, when Odysseus asks Polyphemus to respect the laws of the gods and hospitality, the giant replies that the Cyclopes have no need to:

οὐ γὰρ Κύκλωπες Διὸς αἰγιόχου ἀλέγουσιν

οὐδὲ θεῶν μακάρων, ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτεροί εἰμεν·

(*Od.* 9.275-276)

We of the Cyclops race care nothing for Zeus and for his aegis; we care for none of the gods in heaven, being much stronger ourselves than they are.

(Shewring 1980: 105)

And Polyphemus soon gives the most patent indication of his apparently unmatchable *biē* when he kills and devours Odysseus' men (*Od.* 9.288-293). The disparity in power between the ogre and the men is analogous to that between a lion (*Od.* 9.292) and puppies (*Od.* 9.289).

In a battle of physical strength, Odysseus, along with his men, is grossly outmatched by Polyphemus; in a battle of wits, though, he gradually gains mastery over the man-eating giant in the course of the episode (Clay 1983: 113, Weinberg 1986: 27). The first trick in the *Apologue*, ironically enough, is instigated by the ogre, when he enquires of the whereabouts of Odysseus' ship:

ἀλλά μοι εἶφ', ὅπη ἔσχες ἰὼν εὐεργέα νῆα,

ἢ που ἐπ' ἐσχατιῆς ἦ καὶ σχεδόν, ὄφρα δαείω.

(*Od.* 9.279-280)

But tell me a thing I wish to know. When you came here, where did you moor your ship? Was it at some far point of the shore or was it near here?

(Shewring 1980: 105)

Polyphemus' interrogation is a kind of trick, a seemingly innocuous question which houses a concealed, ulterior motive—it is a crafty speech designed to pluck information out of Odysseus, which will be to the great detriment of the other Ithacans who are moored at the shore, as Polyphemus' anthropophagy soon reveals (Clay 1983: 118). The cunning behind Polyphemus' request is, nevertheless, at once recognized by Odysseus himself (*Od.* 9.281-282). The Ithacan supplies the ogre with the participle, “πειράζων” (*Od.* 9.281), indicating that his ‘host’ is in some respect ‘making a trial of’ the hero, or ‘putting him to the test’ (*Lfgre* 2004: 1103-1104), but, importantly, the trick does not at all deceive Odysseus (Clay 1983: 118):

...ἐμὲ δ' οὐ λάθην εἰδότα πολλά

(*Od.* 9.282)

[B]ut I knew the world and guessed what he was about.

(Shewring 1980: 105)

Odysseus, a master at *mētis*, declares that he has complete knowledge, “εἰδότα” (*Od.* 9.282), of many things, “πολλά” (*Od.* 9.282), and thus cannot be deceived, “οὐ λάθην” (*Od.* 9.282) (Schein 1970: 78). As I have illustrated in the passages leading up to the confrontation between Odysseus and Polyphemus (cf. pp. 232-234), the ogre is principally a character who relies on *biē* in going about his daily affairs. His initial attempt at an act of *dolos* to achieve success is inevitably weak and is thus immediately sussed out by Odysseus, a genius at *doloi*. Polyphemus' inability to make use of effective *doloi*, and his sole reliance on *biē*, will ultimately prove to be his undoing in the encounter.

Odysseus, in turn, fights *dolos* with *dolos*, and his superior *mētis* (Podlecki 1961: 131). He provides his own crafty speech, “δολίοισ' ἐπέεσσι” (*Od.* 9.282), a fabricated story, to match that of the giant (Clay 1983: 118):

ἴνεα μὲν μοι κατέαξε Ποσειδάων ἑνοσίχθων,
πρὸς πέτρῃσι βαλὼν ὑμῆς ἐπὶ πείρασι γαίης,
ἄκρη προσπελάσας· ἄνεμος δ' ἐκ πόντου ἔνεικεν·
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ σὺν τοῖσδε ὑπέκφυγον αἰπὸν ὄλεθρον.'

(*Od.* 9.283-286)

My ship was shattered by Poseidon, who drove it upon the rocks at the edge of this land of yours; a wind had carried it in from the open sea, and the Earthshaker dashed it against a headland. I myself and my comrades here escaped the precipice of destruction.

(Shewring 1980: 106)

Odysseus easily outfoxes Polyphemus. The giant naturally assumes the truth in what is a blatant lie. He makes no further verbal response to the hero (*Od.* 9.287) and, in fact, no further enquiries as to the presence of other men outside the cave, which illustrates his belief in the hero's lie. Polyphemus at once reverts to his characteristic *biē*, seizing and devouring two of the *xeinoi* (*Od.* 9.288-293).²¹³

²¹³ Weinberg (1986: 26) suggests that Polyphemus' action in seizing onto the two unlucky Ithacans is in some respect related to Odysseus' attributing the false shipwreck to Poseidon—that, in the ogre's mind this grants him permission to destroy the men, acting as his father. This is conjecture of course. One cannot guess what a character is thinking unless there is some indication in the text.

As an act of trickery, Odysseus' tall tale is, in two respects, an important component in the hero's ultimate triumph over the ogre. Firstly, his guile has achieved an initial (albeit minor) victory for the Ithacans in this encounter. It has ensured that Polyphemus is oblivious to the remainder of the sailors, so limiting the extent of his damage and preventing him from destroying their ship. This act of deception, moreover, will prove to be an important factor in Odysseus' successful escape from the giant. The ship will expedite the flight of the men away from the ogre's land (*Od.* 9.469-472), and when Polyphemus does try to destroy the vessel (*Od.* 9.481-490, 537-542), he is then too late to inflict the damage he might have, had he happened upon a moored ship—a destruction which, incidentally, occurs in the Laestrygonian episode when all but one of the ships are moored in the bay (*Od.* 10.91, 95). Secondly, Odysseus' crafty words also put an end to any attempts at *doloi* on the part of Polyphemus, and for the remainder of the episode the hero's *mētis* is met only by the *biē* of the giant.

Odysseus' subsequent tussle with Polyphemus involves no less than four major acts of trickery, which added together lead to the triumph of the hero over the monster. These include: (i) the implementation of a physical prop in the ogre's cave, a wooden stake, to blind the ogre; (ii) the use of a wine to lull Polyphemus into a sleep, a state which will enable the men to perform (i); (iii) Odysseus, in response to the giant's question, gives himself a false name, *Outis*, a trick which will ensure that Polyphemus receives no help from his kin (Schein 1970: 77-78);²¹⁴ and (iv) Odysseus will secure his men and himself to the undersides of the ogre's sheep, so enabling them to leave the cave when the blind giant leads his flock out to the pastures (Schein 1970: 78).

²¹⁴ The trick of the wine (ii) and the false name (iii) are, according to Schein (1970: 77), notable departures from the original folk tale of the ogre-figure, and have been specifically chosen by the bards/poet so as to emphasize the characteristic *mētis* of Odysseus.

(i) It might be considered that the action of blinding Polyphemus with a wooden stake is in fact a performance of *biē*, an act of physical might over an opposition.²¹⁵ Odysseus' use of this physical prop, however, actually stems from a realization that outright might will not in itself carry the day. After Polyphemus has slaughtered and devoured two of Odysseus' men, the hero considers slaying the monster through an act of *biē*.

τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ βούλευσα κατὰ μεγαλήτορα θυμὸν
ἄσσον ἰών, ξίφος ὄξυ ἐρυσσάμενος παρὰ μηροῦ,
οὐτάμεναι πρὸς στήθος, ὅθι φρένες ἦπαρ ἔχουσι,
χείρ' ἐπιμασσάμενος· ἕτερος δέ με θυμὸς ἔρυκεν.
αὐτοῦ γάρ κε καὶ ἄμμες ἀπωλόμεθ' αἰπὸν ὄλεθρον·
οὐ γάρ κεν δυνάμεσθα θυράων ὑψηλάων
χερσὶν ἀπώσασθαι λίθον ὄβριμον, ὃν προσέθηκεν.

(*Od.* 9.299-305)

Then with courage rising I thought at first to go up to him, to draw the keen sword from my side and to stab him in the chest, feeling with my hand for the spot where the midriff enfolds the liver; but second thoughts held me back, because we too should have perished irremediably; never could we with all our hands have pushed away from the lofty doorway the massy stone he had planted there.

(Shewring 1980: 106)

Odysseus' initial thoughts are to engage in an act of *biē*—inspired by courage, “μεγαλήτορα θυμόν” (*Od.* 9.299) (*Lfgre* 2004: 59-60), like a warrior he will draw his weapon (*Od.* 9.300),

²¹⁵ In fact, it is a collaborative effort of strength: several men are acting together to defeat a single entity.

and slay his enemy (*Od.* 9.301). But while Polyphemus himself might well be exterminated in this manner, so too would all the Ithacans, who would be stuck in the cave, without the ability to move the rock which blocks the entrance (*Od.* 9.303-305). Physical might does not guarantee success for the Ithacans here (Segal 1983: 27), it would consign them to an inevitable death, “ἀπωλόμεθ' αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον” (*Od.* 9.303), because they, unlike Polyphemus whose strength in lifting the boulder was greater than twenty-two waggons (*Od.* 9.240-243), do not possess the requisite force to match that of their opponent. According to Seth Schein (1970: 78), the very ability of Odysseus to recognize the futility of physical force, and to check his attacking impulse, is presented as a product of his mental prowess:

The expression “ἕτερος θυμός” is unparalleled in Homer, but is a catachresis of traditional language for the sake of describing Odysseus’ unique intelligence and resourcefulness.²¹⁶

It is in the context of this failure of outright *biē* that Odysseus turns to his cerebral faculties for help (Friedrich 1991: 22), devising the plan, “βουλή” (*Od.* 9.318), of using a wooden stake (Weinberg 1986: 29). As will be seen later in the story, this plan is a cunning employment of force (*mētis* mixed with *biē*), a trick which will render the ogre physically incapacitated (blind) such that he cannot harm any more of the Ithacans, but which will also keep him alive, so that the barrier to the cave can be removed by him. It might not be pure coincidence that, before Odysseus comes up with his actual plan, “βουλή” (*Od.* 9.318), he

²¹⁶ To be precise, as Cook (1999: 154) identifies, there are two *thymoi* at work in this passage (*Od.* 9.299-305): the first, “μεγαλήτορα θυμόν” (*Od.* 9.299), is an impulse towards anger, the violent behaviour of the warrior, the second, “ἕτερος θυμός” (*Od.* 9.302), is an impulse towards restraint, a trait of the trickster. In the present passage, the impulse of the trickster overcomes the impulse of the angry warrior (Cook 1999: 154). For further discussion on the mechanism and nuances of *thymos* in this passage, cf Barnouw 2004: 7-18.

ponders whether Athena, a divine practitioner of *mētis*, would grant his prayer and help him take vengeance upon Polyphemus (*Od.* 9.316-317) (Weinberg 1986: 28).²¹⁷ Moreover, one might also note the appropriate choice of wood for the stake.²¹⁸ The olive tree is associated with the goddess (*Od.* 9.320), and its utilization might therefore serve to implicate Athena in some respect (Weinberg 1986: 28).²¹⁹ Alternatively, according to Seth Schein (1970: 75-76), rather than signifying the specific aid of the Zeus' daughter, olive wood and the olive tree is more generally associated with the hero's salvation in the *Odyssey*.

Furthermore, in preparing for the assault, Odysseus also engages in the following acts of deception along the way. Firstly, he only attempts to fashion the stake into a weapon when Polyphemus is absent from the cave, shepherding his livestock in the fields (*Od.* 9.315-316). Secondly, Odysseus conceals his weapon in the dung in the cave, so that the ogre will not notice it when he returns (*Od.* 9.329-330). Thirdly, the hero needs to ensure that the giant is fast asleep before he attempts the assault (*Od.* 9.333)—a soporific state which will be induced by Polyphemus' ready acceptance of Odysseus' wine. In short, three different kinds of trickery are employed by Odysseus to render the later attack on Polyphemus successful: evasion, concealment, and temptation. Seth Schein (1970: 78) also considers the sharpening and heating of the olive stake to be indicative of Odysseus' mental prowess.

²¹⁷ "She inspires his questing intelligence with the right ideas for escape" (Weinberg 1986: 28).

²¹⁸ If one examines this encounter from a compositional perspective, the particular choice of an olive stake or club by Odysseus becomes more significant, since, in most other renditions of this ogre story, a metal spit which the monster uses for dinner is employed against the savage (Schein 1970: 75).

²¹⁹ "Odysseus must make a special mental effort to notice the spar, conceive a plan to use it, and put the plan into execution. All of this cerebration takes place after a prayer to Athena; the spar is of olive wood" (Weinberg 1986: 29).

(ii) As has been recognized by several critics, Odysseus displays his *mētis*²²⁰ very early on in his encounter with the giant by foreseeing the need to bring wine along to the cave when he and his men are exploring Polyphemus' land (*Od.* 9.212-215) (Clay 1983: 116, de Jong 2004a: 237). Furthermore, the extensive narrative digression in which Odysseus describes how the Ciconian priest Maron gave him this wine (*Od.* 9.196-211; cf. *Od.* 9.161-168, where it is first mentioned), lends the drink further weight in the story as an important spatial object (de Jong 2004a: 237-238, Schein 1970: 78). Maron's wine is described as extremely potent (Schein 1970: 78). It is given to Odysseus in an unmixed form, “ἀκηράσιον” and is described as a drink for the gods, “θεῖον ποτόν” (*Od.* 9.205). When Maron himself drinks it, one part of wine is, remarkably, diluted with twenty parts of water (*Od.* 9.209-210). Not only is it a strong drink, but it has an irresistible quality. Maron has to hide it, therefore, from the majority of his servants (*Od.* 9.205-207) and when the priest and his family pour it out for themselves, the temptation to indulge in the wine cannot be suppressed:

...ὄδμη δ' ἠδέϊα ἀπὸ κρητῆρος ὀδώδει,
θεσπεσίη· τότ' ἄν οὔ τοι ἀποσχέσθαι φίλον ἦεν.

(*Od.* 9.210-211)

[F]rom the mixing-bowl there would be wafted a fragrance beyond all words, and no one could find it in his heart to refrain.

(Shewring 1980: 103)

²²⁰ To be precise, Odysseus displays his *thymos* (*Od.* 9.213). “Sometimes, as here [i.e. *Od.* 9.213], it represents a kind of uncanny foresight which is not unconnected with *metis*; at other times, it suggests impulses whose consequences may be disastrous” (Clay 1983: 116; cf. Pelliccia 1995: 266-267).

It is the potency and irresistible quality of this wine which is the basis for Odysseus' next trick (de Jong 2004a: 238), and again, this *dolos* is in response to an act of outright *biē*—Polyphemus has once more snatched a pair of the Ithacan travellers and devoured them for his supper (*Od.* 9.343-344).

καὶ τότε ἔγὼ Κύκλωπα προσηύδων ἄγχι παραστάς,
κισσύβιον μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχων μέλανος οἴνοιο·
'Κύκλωψ, τῆ, πίε οἶνον, ἐπεὶ φάγες ἀνδρόμεα κρέα,
ᾧ φρ' εἰδῆς, οἶόν τι ποτὸν τόδε νηῦς ἐκεκεύθει
ἡμετέρη· σοὶ δ' αὖ λοιβὴν φέρον, εἴ μ' ἐλεήσας
οἴκαδε πέμψειας· σὺ δὲ μαίνεαι οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτῶς.
σχέτλιε, πῶς κέν τις σε καὶ ὕστερον ἄλλος ἴκοιτο
ἀνθρώπων πολέων; ἐπεὶ οὐ κατὰ μοῖραν ἔρεξας.'

(*Od.* 9.345-352)

And at that I came close to the Cyclops and spoke to him, while in my hands I held up an ivy-bowl brimmed with dark wine: “Cyclops, look! You have had your fill of man’s flesh. Now drain this bowl and judge what wine our ship had in it. I was bringing it for you as a libation, hoping you would take pity on me and would help to send me home. But your wild folly is past all bounds. Merciless one, who of all men in all the world will choose to visit you after this? In what you have done you defy whatever is good and right.”

(Shewring 1980: 107)

Odysseus' crafty speech disguises his real motive for tempting Polyphemus with the intoxicating wine—that is, to place the ogre in a helpless, drunken stupor through a beverage whose powerful effect Odysseus knows quite well—with a secondary, false narrative, which presents the wine as a potential object of appeasement to the monster, a gift to render him a favourable host to the Ithacans. Thus Odysseus' action in holding the cup with both hands is performed in the manner of a libation, an offering to soothe the monster (*Od.* 9.346), and this gesture is confirmed in his speech, when he directly refers to the drink as a libation, “λοιβῆν” (*Od.* 9.349). Secondly, by referring to the pity which he had wrongly expected from Polyphemus, “εἴ μ' ἐλέησας” (*Od.* 9.349), Odysseus implies that the libation was originally intended as part of the Ithacan's initial supplication towards the ogre (*Od.* 9.266-271), which failed to stir Polyphemus 'pitiless heart' (*Od.* 9.287) (cf. Most 2003: 54-55).²²¹ Thirdly, Odysseus also invokes the ogre's duty as a host in providing *xeinēion* in the form of a passage home, “οἴκαδε πέμψειας” (*Od.* 9.350), and Odysseus then vilifies Polyphemus as a host, declaring that he will no longer be chosen by any man as a potential host (*Od.* 9.351-352).

In short, Odysseus' speech (*Od.* 9.345-352) cleverly frames the wine as an object which was intended as a libation, for the purposes of supplication and ensuring his host's hospitality. That Odysseus' cunning speech has defeated Polyphemus is indicated by the ogre's immediate acceptance of the drink (*Od.* 9.353), his request for seconds (*Od.* 9.354), and his imbibing of the potent wine on several occasions (*Od.* 9.360-361)—he suspects no foul play in the hero's offering of the drink. Moreover, the ogre has so fully bought into

²²¹ “[M]ost of the episodes in the *Iliad* in which pity is invoked during battle scenes are ones in which a suppliant casts away his weapons, throws himself upon an enemy soldier's mercy, and asks that his life be spared in pity” (Most 2003: 54). For further discussion of pity in the Homeric poems, cf. Gagarin 1987: 300-303, Scott 1979: 1-14.

Odysseus' framing of the wine as an object of appeasement, that he decides to offer the Ithacan a rather macabre form of hospitality in exchange for the gift of wine (*Od.* 9.355-356), namely, that he will eat Odysseus last of all the Greeks in the cave (*Od.* 9.369-370). Finally, having been deceived by the hero's crafty speech into drinking the alcohol, Polyphemus is physically overcome by the effects of the wine, falling into a drunken stupor (*Od.* 9.371-373) and, further demonstrating his loss of control, vomiting out some of the flesh and wine in which he had indulged (*Od.* 9.373-374).²²²

The result of Odysseus' numerous acts of trickery and cunning deception—(a) fashioning the stake while the ogre was away from his cave, (b) concealing the stake in dung in the cave, (c) tempting Polyphemus with a wine which he knows to be both intoxicating and irrepressible in its effects upon the drinker, (d) and framing the beverage as a libatory offering meant for supplication and hospitality—ensures the success of the physical attack of the Ithacans upon the ogre. This physical attack is indeed an action which entails a certain amount of *biē* (cf. Cook 1999: 155)²²³ (measured *biē*, because Odysseus does not wish to slay the giant), but it has been enabled by Odysseus' *mētis*.

(iii) Odysseus has succeeded in blinding Polyphemus, and his achievement is memorably captured in two similes, one of a shipwright (*Od.* 9.384-386), the other of a metalworker (*Od.* 9.391-393), both of which convey the success of the knowledgeable,

²²² Weinberg (1986: 27-28) believes that the god Apollo has a hand in the intoxication of Polyphemus, since Maron is described as a priest of Apollo (*Od.* 9.288), and because there is a laurel tree, later associated with Apollo in Greek mythology, outside the ogre's cave (*Od.* 9.183).

²²³ “[H]is vengeance is the plan of the trickster... But the instrument of blinding is a shepherd's staff that Odysseus has transformed into a fire-hardened spear, and Odysseus describes the actual scene of blinding as a warrior's *aristeia*” (Cook 1999: 155).

civilized man over the ignorant savage (Bergren 1983: 47, Clay 1983: 113, 118-119).²²⁴ However, while Polyphemus has indeed been injured by Odysseus' wiles, the Ithacans are still far away from their goal of escaping from the land of the Cyclopes. Two further problems loom: firstly, Polyphemus could garner help from his countrymen, secondly, the *xeinoi* still need to get out of the cave.

The first threat is brilliantly dealt with again by a *dolos*, a verbal trick. After Polyphemus has asked Odysseus his name (*Od.* 9.355-356) the hero replies that his name is 'Nobody'—"Οὐτις ἐμοί γ' ὄνομα" (*Od.* 9.366).²²⁵ When the other Cyclopes hear their neighbour's shouting, they come to inquire after his welfare:

ῥίπτε τόσον, Πολύφημ', ἀρημένος ὧδ' ἐβόησας
νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίην καὶ ἀϋπνοὺς ἄμμε τίθησθα;
ἦ μή τις σευ μῆλα βροτῶν ἀέκοντος ἐλαύνει;
ἦ μή τις σ' αὐτὸν κτείνει δόλω ἠὲ βίηφι;
τοὺς δ' αὖτ' ἐξ ἄντρου προσέφη κρατερὸς Πολύφημος·
ῥῶ φίλοι, Οὐτίς με κτείνει δόλω οὐδὲ βίηφιν·
οἱ δ' ἀπαμειβόμενοι ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον·
ῥεῖ μὲν δὴ μή τις σε βιάζεται οἶον ἐόντα,
νοῦσόν γ' οὐ πῶς ἔστι Διὸς μεγάλου ἀλέασθαι,
ἀλλὰ σύ γ' εὐχθεο πατρὶ Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι·

(*Od.* 9.403-412)

²²⁴ "These striking similes point to the absence of such arts among the Cyclopes and to the fact that the *technai* are an important component of *metis*" (Clay 1983: 118-119).

²²⁵ The uniqueness of this trick can also be viewed through its absence in other version of the folktale, cf. Schein 1970: 79.

“Polyphemus, what dire affliction has come upon you to make you profane the night with clamour and rob us of our slumbers? Is some human creature driving away your flocks in defiance of you? Is someone threatening death to yourself by craft or violence?” From inside the cave the giant answered: “Friends, it is Noman’s craft and no violence that is threatening death to me.” Swiftly their words were borne back to him: “If no man is doing you violence—if you are alone—then this is a malady sent by almighty Zeus from which there is no escape; you had best say a prayer to your father, Lord Poseidon.

(Shewring 1980: 109)

Odysseus’ verbal trick works on two levels (Schein 1970: 79).²²⁶ On a simple level Polyphemus only understands *Outis* as the fake name which Odysseus gives to himself, he does not comprehend here the sense of ‘nobody’ (lowercase), which lies behind Odysseus’ construction. Thus when the other Cyclopes use the words, *mē tis*, a grammatically different form of *ou tis*, so as to ask their compatriot: ‘surely, nobody (*mē tis*) has driven off your livestock or is threatening you with trickery or force’, it is Polyphemus’ ignorance not to make the connection between *mē tis* and *ou tis*, but instead to regard *Outis* only as a proper name—‘Nobody’ has threatened him, which is of course understood by the neighbouring Cyclopes as answering directly to their enquiry of *mē tis* (Podlecki 1961: 130, Schein 1970: 80). Accordingly, the giants walk away and leave Polyphemus to himself, ensuring the

²²⁶ For further discussions of Odysseus’ ‘Outis’ trick: cf. Simpson (1972:22-25), who tracks a symmetry in the structural distribution of the terms *Outis/ou tis* and *mē tis* in the episode, and who later tracks the symbolic significance of this name—that Odysseus is indeed a Nobody in this encounter, faced with certain death, and, paradoxically, alleviates himself from this situation by announcing as much.

success of Odysseus' trick. As de Jong (2004a: 244) points out, Polyphemus' humorous misunderstanding of the hero's name carries on for a while after the Cyclopes depart (*Od.* 9.455, 460), until Odysseus finally announces his name to him (*Od.* 9.504-505) (cf. Podlecki 1961: 131).

The greater significance of the trick, however, lies behind the double sense of *mē tis* as 'nobody', and *mētis*, as 'cunning' or 'guile'. Given the prominence which *mētis* and *doloi*, tricks, have played in this encounter thus far, and its later announcement at 9.414 (Podlecki 1961: 130, Schein 1970: 80), one might be encouraged to substitute 'cunning' (*mētis*) for 'nobody' (*mē tis*) throughout this exchange (de Jong 2004a: 244, Schein 1970: 80). Thus when the Cyclopes question Polyphemus as to whether anybody (literally, 'nobody', *mē tis*) has driven away his sheep, “σευ μῆλα... ἐλάυνει” (*Od.* 9.405), it is ironic that it is through Odysseus' *mētis*, a shrewd trick, that the ogre's sheep are attached to the Ithacans and later transported to their ship—in short, 'cunning' has indeed driven his sheep away (cf. iv, *below*).

In the following line, the Cyclopes ask whether somebody (lit. 'nobody', *mē tis*) has killed Polyphemus through trickery or force, “κτείνει δόλω ἢ ἐ βίηφι” (*Od.* 9.406). Here, the neighbouring Cyclopes have inadvertently hit upon the primary struggle in the encounter, between Odyssean guile (*mētis/dolos*) and Cyclopean might (*biē*); replacing *mē tis* with *mētis* in line 406 points to the fact that it is certainly *mētis* and not *biē* which had led to Polyphemus' downfall, “σ' αὐτὸν κτείνει” (*Od.* 9.406) (Schein 1970: 80). Tellingly, Polyphemus himself says as much in the following line, declaring that he has been defeated by Odysseus' (or Nobody's) “δόλω” (*Od.* 9.408), and not by force, “οὐδὲ βίηφι” (*Od.* 9.408) (Cook 1999: 155, Schein 1970: 79).

Herein lies another great irony in this humorous exchange: Polyphemus' declaration that he has been the victim of assault by *dolos*, rather than *biē* (*Od.* 9.408), occurs in the very

line where he is once again the unwitting victim of the Ithacan's craft, thus reinforcing the dominance of trickery over might. Finally, when the Cyclopes reply to Polyphemus' statement, in reading *mē tis* with *mētis*, one can conclude that it is indeed shrewdness which has harmed the solitary ogre, “εἰ μὲν δὴ μή τις σε βιάζεται” (*Od.* 9.410), although naturally the Cyclopes themselves are not conscious of the layered meaning behind their words (Schein 1970: 80). As Schein (1970: 80) observes, there is a humorous paradox in the fact that it is intelligence, *mētis* (*Od.* 9.410), which is markedly portrayed as the agent of physical violence, “βιάζεται” (*Od.* 9.410) in this phrase (cf. Clay 1983: 120).²²⁷ And so appropriately, a few lines later, Odysseus directly attributes his victory to the triumph of his *mētis*:

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφρασαν ἀπιόντες, ἐμὸν δ' ἐγέλασσε φίλον κῆρ,
ὥς ὄνομα' ἐξάπατησεν ἐμὸν καὶ μῆτις ἀμύμων.

(*Od.* 9.413-414)

With these words they left him again, while my own heart laughed within me to think how the name I gave and my ready wit had snared him.

(Shewring 1980: 109)

De Jong (2004a: 244) points out, moreover, that when Odysseus does on some later occasions recollect the encounter with Polyphemus, it is twice with reference to the battle between his own wits and the brawn of the ogre (*Od.* 12.209-212, 20.19-20) (cf. Hopman 2012: 5-6).²²⁸

²²⁷ Schein (1970: 80) further regards Poseidon as a figure of *biē*, like his gigantic son, and Odysseus' final triumph over the god of the seas as an instance again of *mētis* defeating *biē* (cf. Cook 1995: 55-56).

²²⁸ Cook (1999: 155) reads greater importance into the amalgamation of the twin identities of Odysseus as a man of *mētis* and *Outis*; for him, in assuming the identity of trickster, Odysseus becomes a heroic nobody (cf. Friedrich 1991: 22, Hopman 2012: 4-5, Segal 1983: 34). Against this, some critics would argue that Odysseus'

(iv) Blinded (presumably hung-over) and abandoned by his compatriots, Polyphemus is all but conquered. He groans aloud, “στενάχων” (*Od.* 9.415), and is assailed by pains, “ὠδίνων ὀδύνησι” (*Od.* 9.415)—the latter phrase perhaps being a linguistic pun referring to Odysseus’ name, and the pain he has caused the ogre (Schein 1970: 83). Nevertheless, the monster resorts to *biē* one final time, a pitiful attempt to use bodily strength to stop the Ithacans from escaping from his cave. He gropes with his hands, “χερσὶ ψηλαφόων” (*Od.* 9.416), at the open entrance of the cave, expecting to catch some of the Ithacans as the sheep leave for the pastures. It might also be argued that Polyphemus is ‘trying his hands’ at a *dolos* again, using the open cave door (*Od.* 9.416) as a temptation for the Ithacans to recklessly flee his abode, and in so doing sacrificing their lives. But so crude a trick is this for Odysseus that the hero-narrator would have to be a total fool, “νήπιον” (*Od.* 9.419),²²⁹ in order to fall for it. On this adjective, a term of derision denoting intellectual inadequacy (*LfgreE* 2004: 369), Podlecki suggests that it is an important indicator of Polyphemus’ ultimate failure to comprehend the *mētis* of Odysseus in this encounter:

Blinded and in pain, the Cyclops sits in the cave entrance, hoping to catch the men as they try to escape, and expecting Odysseus to be “ἐνὶ φρεσὶ νήπιον εἶναι” (419). He had called him a fool earlier, “νήπιός εἰς” (273), and a few lines later the poet can claim that the term applies more appropriately to the Cyclops himself, “νήπιος οὐκ ἐνόησεν” (442), for not discovering the ruse of their escape under the bellies of the sheep and the ram. This is more than a neat about-face, for it reinforces the *mētis*-

intellectual abilities are an essential component of his heroic identity (Burrows 1965: 33). For a summary of Odysseus’ abnormal features as a hero, cf. Finkelberg 1995: 2; she enumerates several unusual features, including (i) the Ithacan’s occupation with food; (ii) his employment of the bow, rather than the spear; and (iii) his characteristic suffering and his endurance of humiliating experiences (cf. Pucci 1982: 41).

²²⁹ For a summary of the different contextual usages of *nēpios* in the *Odyssey*, cf. de Jong 2004a: 230.

theme: by a twist of circumstances, Odysseus, whom the Cyclops had called a fool, shows himself to be a crafty fellow and makes the Cyclops look a fool in the end.

(1961: 131)

So in response to the ‘folly’ (the pathetic attempt at a *dolos*) and the *biē* of the ogre, blindly snatching with his hands for a morsel, Odysseus, as Podlecki (131) observes, turns to planning, “βούλευον” (*Od.* 9.420), cunning, “μητιν”, and trickery, “δόλους” (*Od.* 9.422). The hero ties his men to the underside of the ogre’s sheep and clings himself onto the wool of Polyphemus’ favourite ram.

In summary, Odysseus’ triumph over the ogre is achieved by acts of trickery, implemented by means of his *mētis* and then by *bouloi* (cf. *Od.* 12.208-212). These tricks, taken together lead to the successful flight of the Ithacans from the monster’s cave and their survival. It is Odysseus’ *dolos*, (i) which prevents Polyphemus from locating the rest of his men outside the cave and destroying them, just as the Laestrygonians do later, (ii) which aids the hero in preparing the stake for the blinding of the ogre’s eye (this action itself being a mixture of cunning and force), (iii) which renders the giant inebriated thus ensuring the success of the assault, (iv) which ensures that Polyphemus receives no aid from his kin, and (v) which helps the *xeinoi* flee the cave. The victory engendered by tricks and *mētis* is contrasted with the failure garnered from acts of *biē*. Thus Odysseus chooses not to assault Polyphemus directly when the ogre eats his men, whereas Polyphemus, as a character defined by his recourse to physical might, finds himself only able to respond to the hero through brute force. While this secures him several meals, it does not ultimately prove to be an adequate reply to Odyssean *mētis*, as demonstrated by the decline in the ogre’s physical state: vomiting over the floor of his cave, blinded and tormented by pain, and, finally, groping about him pathetically and, abandoned by his countrymen, talking to the solitary sheep who is his

closest companion. As a contest between *mētis* and *biē*, Odysseus' tussle with Polyphemus certainly demonstrates the superiority of tricks in achieving a triumph for the Ithacan (Cook 1999: 156, Friedrich 1991: 22).²³⁰

After Odysseus is entertained for a month by Aeolus, the god of the winds provides Odysseus with a gift to help in the hero's quest to return to Ithaca:

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ ἐγὼν ὁδὸν ἤτεον ἠδ' ἐκέλευον
πεμπέμεν, οὐδέ τι κεῖνος ἀνήγατο, τεῦχε δὲ πομπήν.
δῶκε δέ μ' ἐκδείρας ἀσκὸν βοῶς ἐννεώροιο,
ἔνθα δὲ βυκτᾶων ἀνέμων κατέδησε κέλευθα·
κεῖνον γὰρ ταμίην ἀνέμων ποίησε Κρονίων,
ἠμὲν παυέμεναι ἠδ' ὀρνύμεν, ὄν κ' ἐθέλησι.
νηϊ δ' ἐνὶ γλαφυρῇ κατέδει μέρμιθι φαιειῇ
ἀργυρέῃ, ἵνα μή τι παραπνεύσει' ὀλίγον περ·
αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ πνοιὴν ζεφύρου προέηκεν ἀῆναι,

²³⁰ Odysseus' *mētis* does suffer a momentarily lapse at the end of the episode where he hubristically mocks Polyphemus and boastfully declares his real name to the ogre (*Od.* 9.502-505), with disastrous consequences, as Polyphemus elicits the help of his father, Poseidon (*Od.* 9.528-535) (Cook 1999: 155, Friedrich 1991: 23-24, Hopman 2012: 5, Segal 1983: 34). "In this passage [*Od.* 9.502-505] Odysseus assumes the heroic, warrior epithet, "sacker of cities", *πολιπόρθιον*. He thereby identifies himself with the Iliadic *kleos* of his leader in whose name he introduced himself to the Cyclops in IX, 265, *διέπερσε πόλιν*" (Segal 1983: 35). "Yet Odysseus does not consistently act as a man of *metis* either, and in fact his interaction with Polyphemus is framed by two strategic mistakes. Odysseus sparks off the whole adventure by insisting on meeting the Cyclopes and testing their hospitality (9.172-176), a mistake that he compounds by waiting for Polyphemus instead of going back to the ship as his companions recommend (9.224-230). Furthermore, after the escape from the cave, his taunting and disclosure of his name lead to Polyphemus' curse, the wrath of Poseidon, and other adventures that eventually cause the loss of the whole crew (1.68-73; 11.103 = 13.343)" (Hopman 2012: 5).

ὄφρα φέροι νῆάς τε καὶ αὐτούς· οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλεν
ἐκτελέειν· αὐτῶν γὰρ ἀπωλόμεθ' ἀφραδίησιν.

(*Od.* 10.17-27)

[T]hen in my turn I asked his leave to depart and begged him to help me on my way. Nor was he unwilling; he set about speeding my return. He gave me a bag made from the hide of a full-grown ox of his, and in the bag he had penned up every wind that blows, whatever its course might be; because Zeus had made him warden of all the winds, to bid each of them rise or fall at his own pleasure. He placed the bag in my own ship's hold, tied with a glittering silver cord so that through that fastening not even a breath could stray; to the west only he gave commission to blow for me, to carry onwards my ships and men. Yet he was not after all to accomplish his design, because our own folly ruined us.

(Shewring 1980: 113)

Aeolus collects all the unfavourable winds, then imprisons and hides them in a pouch which Odysseus is to keep in the hold of his ship, while the remaining favourable western wind pushes the Ithacans homeward (*Od.* 10.19-26). It might be a bit of a stretch to include Aeolus' entrapment and concealment of the winds as an instance of trickery in this study, since the device of the bag is given to the Ithacans without any intention of deception on the part of the god, unlike all the other tricks cited in this section. Nevertheless, this objection aside, the bag of the winds itself does ultimately deceive Odysseus' men, who falsely believe it to conceal rich guest-gifts for Odysseus.

It is certainly not unusual in the *Odyssey* for a god like Aeolus to opt for a cunning device rather than outright force, *biē*. The cuckolded Hephaistos, for example, employs a

trap, a net, to catch the adulterous Aphrodite and Ares (a god of *biē*, of course) when the smith pretends to be away from his home (*Od.* 8.272-299) (Detienne & Vernant 1974: 51, Olson 1989a: 137).²³¹ Thus rather than making use of the sheer force of the winds under his power to rocket Odysseus' ship homeward, Aeolus has exploited a cunning device whereby all the adverse winds are trapped and hidden in a meagre pouch. Nor, moreover, is this the first time that a bag of some kind has been involved in a trick in the *Apologue*. Maron's wine—like Aeolus' winds, a potent object—is also enclosed in an “ἄσκόν” (*Od.* 9.196).

That Aeolus' cunning device connotes success, or, better yet, the potential of success, for the *xεινοί* is indicated by the fact that through this device the *xεινοί* nearly arrive back home:

τῇ δεκάτῃ δ' ἤδη ἀνεφαίνετο πατρις ἄρουρα,
καὶ δὴ πυρπολέοντας ἐλεύσσομεν ἐγγυς ἐόντας.

(*Od.* 10.29-30)

[O]n the tenth day our own country began to heave in sight; we were near enough to see men tending their fires on shore.

(Shewring 1980: 113)

²³¹ (i) There are, incidentally, several points of tangency between Hephaistos—who is *polyphrōn* (*Il.* 21.355, 367) and *polymētis* (*Od.* 8.297, 327) in the Homeric poems (Clay 1983: 32)—and Odysseus as trickster figures in the two poems: “In each story, the hero returns from a journey to a distant land to find sexual disorder in his house. Despite serious disabilities, he emerges triumphant over his rival(s), by pitting his cleverness against their physical superiority” (Olson 1989a: 138). (ii) For the comparisons between Odysseus and Hephaistos as agents of trickery, in opposition to agents of physical force, and of its relevance to Odysseus' narrative situation in Book 8, cf. Olson 1989a: 137.

This, however, is the closest the men will ever get to Ithaca and to completing their *nostos*. The *dolos* of the wind-bag deceives Odysseus' men, they are fooled by this act of divine or supernatural concealment, for they wrongly believe the sack to contain rich gifts of hospitality from Aeolus to Odysseus, which the hero is hoarding selfishly for himself (*Od.* 10.34-45). They therefore open the bag and the winds, once unleashed, send them back to Aeolus' isle (*Od.* 10.46-55). Odysseus' men have, unwittingly, become the unintended butt of Aeolus' device and been defeated by it. Reminiscent of the folly which Polyphemus displays in the face of *doloi*,²³² it is the Ithacans' lack of understanding of this cunning device which has led to their failed homecoming. Thus the hero-narrator, in discussing this failure to attain their goal, mentions both their thoughtlessness, “ἀφραδίησιν” (*Od.* 10.27), and their bad planning, “βουλή... κακή” (*Od.* 10.46). The difference observed in this episode between Odysseus and his men in reacting to examples of *doloi* will become relevant in the Aeaean sequence, where the hero's success in confronting and overcoming the tricks of the witch, Circe, are matched by the inept, helpless responses of his companions.

It is perhaps such wily thinking on Odysseus' part which leads him to moor his ship outside the Laestrygonian harbour in the next encounter (*Od.* 10.95-96), while the rest of his men head into the perilous bay (Clay 1983: 114, Frame 1978: 58, Niles 1978: 49); *contra*, cf. Cook 1999: 160).²³³ As Cook (1999: 160) suggests, Odysseus' gesture of raising his sword—

²³² Similarly, earlier in the *Apologue* we witnessed another pouch which concealed a potent object—Odysseus' flask in which Maron's wine was kept; in both of these instances, the opening of the bag has dire consequences for the ones foolish enough to want to look inside.

²³³ “The outcome of the visit to Polyphemus has taught Odysseus to balance curiosity with caution” (Clay 1983: 114). Cook (1999: 160) considers the position of Odysseus' ship to be an aggressive manoeuvre, taking a “wing position” (160), similar to that which Achilles often adopts in the *Iliad*. But this ignores the fact that Odysseus did not intend the arrival at the Laestrygonian harbour as a raid—rather, he sends an embassy into the interior to

“ἐγὼ ξίφος ὄξυ ἐρυσσάμενος παρὰ μηροῦ” (*Od.* 10.126)—when his men are being skewered from above by the giants (*Od.* 10.121-124), is suggestive of an act of heroic *biē* in the midst of combat. However, Odysseus’ subsequent employment of his sword, to cut the ropes which are holding his ship to the land and to beat a hasty retreat over the seas is, ironically enough, a means of avoiding conflict. When faced with antagonists who are proficient in *biē*, hurling man-sized rocks, “ἀνδραχθέσι χερμαδίοισι / βάλλον” (*Od.* 10.121-122), down at the ships, Odysseus’ only hope for survival is flight and the avoidance of physical engagement. In this respect, the encounter closely parallels the *Cyclopeia* where Polyphemus, a character whom I have argued to be proficient in *biē*, and who also hurls boulders from a lofty summit (*Od.* 9.481-486, 537-542), cannot be beaten by an act of *biē*—a drawn sword (or, in this case, the impulse to draw a sword): “ξίφος ὄξυ ἐρυσσάμενος παρὰ μηροῦ” (*Od.* 9.300) (Cook 1999: 160).

The fact that Circe will employ artifice and tricks, *doloi*, in her encounter with the Ithacans is alluded to at the very start of the *Apologue*, when she is given the epithet, “δολόεσσα” (*Od.* 9.32):

ἦ μὲν μ' αὐτόθ' ἔρυκε Καλυψώ, δῖα θεάων,
ἐν σπέεσι γλαφυροῖσι, λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι·
ὥς δ' αὐτως Κίρκη κατερήτυεν ἐν μεγάροισιν
Αἰαίη δολόεσσα, λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι·
ἀλλ' ἐμὸν οὐ ποτε θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἔπειθεν.

(*Od.* 9.29-33)

discover what the inhabitants were like (*Od.* 10.100-102), just as he does in the case of the Lotus Eaters and Circe (*Od.* 9.88-90, 10.208-209).

There was a time when divine Calypso kept me within her arching caverns and would have had me to be her husband, and another time when subtle Aeaeian Circe confined me in her palace and would have had me for husband also. Yet neither of them could win the heart within me.

(Shewring 1980: 99)

Although this passage does not refer to a specific act of *dolos* (which is the focus of my study), there are indications that Circe's particular branch of trickery will involve both entrapment, “κατερήτυεν ἐν μεγάροισιν” (*Od.* 9.31), and seduction, “λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι” (*Od.* 9.32).

In Book 10, Odysseus sends an embassy to Circe's home, after he notices a line of smoke rising from the ground during his first foray into the island. In arriving at the witch's home, the *hetairoi* are confronted with four different acts of trickery and deception on the part of Circe: (i) the goddess possesses wolves and mountain lions, who have been rendered tame pets through her enchantment and her drugs—a trick which has occurred prior to the events of the story; (ii) she lures the travellers into her home by means of her charms, such as her singing and her voice; (iii) she conceals a drug in the food of the travellers which will make them forgetful of their homes; and (iv) she uses her wand to transform the men into swine, and then imprisons them in a pen. Her range of tricks is manifold and includes temptation (ii), concealment (iii), entrapment (iv), and transformational magic (i and iv).

Whereas Polyphemus was defeated by the trickery of his guest, in the initial encounter of the Ithacan ambassadors with Circe, it is the hostess who makes use of *doloi* to get the better of her guests. The *hetairoi* who are, importantly, not imbued with Odysseus' *mētis* are at a complete loss as to how to respond to the witch's cunning and to her acts of deception.

(i) Prior to the events in the story Circe enchanted, “κατέθελξεν”, the mountain lions and wolves which now live around her house, having given them ‘evil drugs’, “κακὰ φάρμακ’” (*Od.* 10.213). Accordingly, these creatures do not display the normal behaviour expected of wild animals—they do not make a charge at the ambassadors, “ὠρμήθησαν ἐπ’ ἀνδράσιν” (*Od.* 10.214), but, instead, wag their tails, an action which is likened to dogs receiving morsels from their master (*Od.* 10.215-219).

ὥς τοὺς ἀμφὶ λύκοι κρατερόνυχες ἠδὲ λέοντες
σαῖνον· τοὶ δ’ ἔδδαισαν, ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἰνὰ πέλωρα.

(*Od.* 10.218-219)

[S]o did these lions, these wolves with their powerful claws, circle fawningly round my comrades. The sight of the strange huge creatures dismayed my men

(Shewring 1980: 118)

Odysseus’ men, however, do not seem to perceive that some subtle trick, some witchcraft lies behind the strange behaviour of these animals, and their immediate reaction is one of fear, “ἔδδαισαν”, on account of the monsters, “πέλωρα” (*Od.* 10.218), which confront them. Their reaction is in anticipation of an act of customary *biē* from the wild animals—that these savage creatures would charge into them, “ὠρμήθησαν ἐπ’ ἀνδράσιν” (*Od.* 10.214). Such a fearful response is far more appropriate in the Polyphemus encounter, where the *hetairoi* meet a monstrous individual, “πελώριος” (*Od.* 9.187), who lives by might alone. Thus when the ogre hurls his huge stack of wood into his cave, and makes an awful noise, “ὄρουμαγδὸν ἔθηκεν” (*Od.* 9.235), the Ithacans’ response is naturally one of self-preservation:

ἡμεῖς δὲ δείσαντες ἀπεσσύμεθ' ἐς μυχὸν ἄντρου

(*Od.* 9.236)

[A]nd we in dismay shrank hastily back into a corner.

(Shewring 1980: 104)

Similarly, later in this episode, after Polyphemus speaks, the men are overcome by fear:

ὧς ἔφαθ', ἡμῖν δ' αὖτε κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ,
δεισάντων φθόγγον τε βαρὺν αὐτόν τε πέλωρον.

(*Od.* 9.256-257)

So he spoke, and our hearts all sank; his thundering voice and his monstrous presence cowed us.

(Shewring 1980: 105)

The fear which the Ithacans express, “δεισάντων”, in the presence of a monster, “πέλωρον” (*Od.* 9.257), is the same which they later reveal when they encounter Circe’s animals, “ἔδδειςαν... πέλωρα” (*Od.* 10.219); the difference here is, as the narrative reveals, they are not encountering vicious beasts, governed by *biē* but, instead, amiable pets. In short, the *hetairoi* have not appreciated the act of *dolos* which Circe’s magic has produced, transforming savage beasts into meek pets, but are responding to the animals in the expectation of physical violence, similar to that which Polyphemus produces.

(ii) Upon spying the Ithacans, Circe’s first act of trickery is to charm the travellers into entering her home. To this end, the ensuing narrator highlights the seductive qualities of

the hostess She is marked out by her physical beauty, described as a ‘goddess with beautiful locks’, “θεῆς καλλιπλοκάμοιο” (*Od.* 10.220), and the men hear her singing with her lovely voice, “ὀπι καλῆ” (*Od.* 10.221). Her skill at weaving is given great praise, as she produces fine and charming work, “λεπτά τε καὶ χαρίεντα καὶ ἀγλαὰ ἔργα (*Od.* 10.223). The second of these seductive qualities is given emphasis through the speech of Polites:

ὦ φίλοι, ἔνδον γάρ τις ἐποιχομένη μέγαν ἰστὸν
καλὸν ἀοιδιάει, δάπεδον δ' ἅπαν ἀμφιμέμυκεν,
ἦ θεὸς ἢ γυνή· ἀλλὰ φθεγγώμεθα θᾶσσον.’

(*Od.* 10.226-228)

“Friends, there is someone inside the house, a goddess or a woman, moving to a fro at her wide web and singing a lovely song that the whole floor re-echoes with. Come let us make ourselves heard at once.”

(Shewring 1980: 118)

The singing of Circe is “καλόν” and resounds throughout her dwelling (*Od.* 10.227), while the singer herself appears god-like (*Od.* 10.228). It is directly after this high praise that Polites recommends that they summon the goddess (*Od.* 10.228). His actions are motivated by pure desire since he is captured by Circe’s alluring voice. No time is wasted debating this point, moreover, and in the ensuing line the men at once summon the witch (*Od.* 10.229). The witch hears them, calls them inside, and all the men (apart from Eurylochus) follow her because of their “ἄϊδρείησιν” (*Od.* 10.231) or ‘ignorance’ (*Lfgre* 1955: 278). Similar to the Aeolian sequence, where terms of inadequate thinking were used—“ἄφραδίησιν” (*Od.* 10.27) and “βουλή... κακῆ” (*Od.* 10.46)—in the context of the Ithacans’ failure to appreciate

Aeolus' benevolent trick, so too here in the face of Circe's "δόλον" (*Od.* 10.232), the *hetairoi* are again guilty of insufficient thought, "ἄδρειψιν" (*Od.* 10.231). They have not displayed any *mētis* when confronted with Circe's *dolos*, but have instead acted without any proper thinking.

(iii, iv) After they are invited into the witch's home, the Ithacan *xeinoi* quickly fall victim to Circe's traps, drinking the porridge which she has given them (*Od.* 10.237), directly after she has slipped the drug into the food (*Od.* 10.235-236), and then being enclosed in the pig pens as soon as she has struck them with her wand (*Od.* 10.237-238), undergoing a transformation into swine in the process (*Od.* 10.239-240). Their only response to Circe's machinations is utter helplessness, weeping as they are locked in their sties, "οἱ μὲν κλαίοντες ἐέρχατο" (*Od.* 10.241) (cf. Segal 1983: 35-36).

It might be argued that Eurylochus fares better than his fellow explorers in at least not falling prey to Circe's *doloi*, since it is he who recognizes that the witch is setting a trap for the men (*Od.* 10.232), whereas the rest act anonymously together, "οἱ δ' ἅμα πάντες" (*Od.* 10.231). Certainly, he is one step ahead of his comrades in recognizing the danger of acquiescing to Circe's hospitality. However, Eurylochus' reaction is nothing more than a temporary evasion, and his subsequent 'performance' on the beach, once Odysseus suggests that they travel back to the witch's house and confront her (*Od.* 10.261-263), is indicative of his inability to deal with Circe's *doloi*. He can, in short, recognize *dolos*, but he has no suitable response to it. In his desperation he clutches the hero's knees, "λαβὼν ἐλλίσσεται γούνων" (*Od.* 10.264), in the manner of a destitute suppliant (cf. Gould 1973: 76), and his only real response is weeping, "ὄλοφυρόμενος" (*Od.* 10.265).

Before Odysseus arrives at the witch's home, he receives rather exceptional divine guidance from Hermes. The messenger god is a divinity renowned for his *mētis* and acts of trickery (Cook 1999: 161), rather like Athena, and he counsels Odysseus in the appropriate

ways of countering Circe's tricks. Before doing this, though, Hermes draws Odysseus' attention to the pitiful state of the hero's men, trapped in pig sties in the witch's home (*Od.* 10.282-283). This too will be Odysseus' lot, the god contends, if he attempts to rescue them (*Od.* 10.284-285). There is, once again, a recognition that the way in which the *hetairoi* approached the goddess was seriously inadequate and that a different approach is required of Odysseus in this encounter.

Hermes, however, will not allow the Ithacan to fall into the same predicament as his comrades, “σε κακῶν ἐκλύσομαι” (*Od.* 10.286). The god aids Odysseus by identifying each of the tricks, ‘the destructive arts’, “ὄλοφώϊα δήνεα” (*Od.* 10.289), which Circe will use to get the better of the hero, and then by recommending certain counter-tricks which the Ithacan hero should employ to defeat the goddess. Of Circe's many *doloi*, Hermes first informs Odysseus of the drug that the witch will conceal in his food (*Od.* 10.290). Appropriately, Hermes' trick is for the hero to meet Circe's deception of a concealed drug with another concealed drug, “φάρμακον” (*Od.* 10.287), of his own, a herb called “μῶλυ” (*Od.* 10.305) which Hermes plucks from the ground and gives to Odysseus (*Od.* 10.302-306). The consumption or utilization (the text is not clear)²³⁴ of this plant will, the god reveals, mitigate the magic of Circe's drug:

ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὧς θέλξαι σε δυνήσεται· οὐ γὰρ ἔασει
φάρμακον ἐσθλόν, ὃ τοι δώσω,

(*Od.* 10.291-292)

²³⁴ One assumes consumption, but perhaps its mere possession is sufficient—the narrative is not explicit on how Moly is to be employed.

Yet even so, she will not be able to enchant you; my gift of the magic herb will thwart her.

(Shewring 1980: 120)

And, indeed, when Odysseus later arrives at Circe's home and eats her drugged food, it has no effect on the hero, no enchantment, “οὐδέ μ' ἔθελεξε” (*Od.* 10.318). Hermes has helped Odysseus fight trickery with trickery—a malevolent magical drug, concealed in his food by Circe, is countered by a benevolent magical drug/herb which Odysseus conceals from Circe.

Circe's second trick, Hermes relates to the hero, is to strike Odysseus with her wand (*Od.* 10.293), just as she struck his men earlier (*Od.* 10.237-238). Hermes advises that Odysseus counters this attack with a direct assault of his own, charging upon the witch with his sword (*Od.* 10.294-295). This is not an instance of genuine *biē*, an attempt at real force, but it is feigned *biē*, a mere show of force. Thus Hermes provides the important conjunction, “ὥς” (*Od.* 10.295), in his instructions: Odysseus is to approach Circe, as if he wants to kill her, but not really—in short, it is an act of simulation and deception. And as with Hermes' previous counter-trick (drug versus drug), there are points of tangency with Circe's original trick. In both cases, what critics who study gender might deem ‘phallic’ instruments are used by the tricksters and in both cases the trick is conducted as a surprise attack—Circe strikes the *hetairoi* immediately after their meal, “αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα” (*Od.* 10.237), while Odysseus rushes at Circe with his sword, after she commands him to head to the pig sties. Indeed, the witch's surprise at Odysseus' sudden counter-trick is indicated by her panicked reaction:

ἦ δὲ μέγα ἰάχουσα ὑπέδραμε καὶ λάβε γούνων
καί μ' ὀλοφυρομένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·

(*Od.* 10.323-324)

She shrieked, she slipped underneath my weapon, she clasped my knee and spoke in rapid, appealing words.

(Shewring 1980: 121)

Like Odysseus' men, when they found themselves the victim of the witch's tricks (*Od.* 10.241), Circe responds to Odysseus' trickery with vocal distress, "ἰάχουσα", "ὄλοφρομένη" (*Od.* 10.323-324). Like Eurylochus, once he has returned to his captain and related his escape from the witch's trickery (*Od.* 10.264), Circe turns into a suppliant, putting herself at the mercy of Odysseus' assault and grabbing his knees (*Od.* 10.323). Circe's reactions to Odysseus' trick indicate his superiority over her in this encounter, just as the Ithacan *hetairoi* responded in like fashion to the witch's victory over them earlier in the narrative.

In summary, Odysseus has employed in these two instances counter-tricks which are similar to Circe's original tricks, but which, through Hermes' divine aid, help him in overcoming Circe (Austin 1975: 212).²³⁵ Odysseus' position as a superior trickster to Circe, a man of *mētis* and *doloi*, is acknowledged by the goddess herself:

σοὶ δέ τις ἐν στήθεσσι ἀκήλητος νόος ἐστίν.
ἦ σύ γ' Ὀδυσσεύς ἐσσι πολύτροπος, ὃν τέ μοι αἰεὶ
φάσκειν ἐλεύσεσθαι χρυσόρραπις Ἄργεΐφόντης,

(*Od.* 10.329-331)

²³⁵ "Odysseus' seduction of Kirke consists in matching her various forms of conquest with their mirror reflections" (Austin 1975: 212).

But you have an inner will that is proof against sorcery. You must surely be that man of wide-ranging spirit, Odysseus himself; the Radiant One of the golden wand has told me of you...

(Shewring 1980: 121)

Circe hails Odysseus' status as a "πολύτροπος" (*Od.* 10.330) hero, after his successful defeat of her tricks (Clay 1983: 30).²³⁶ In the same breath she mentions another polytropic²³⁷ individual, Hermes (Clay 1983: 31), as the one who warned her of the Ithacan's arrival (Clay 1983: 30-31).²³⁸ Whereas the *hetairoi* have been characterized by nouns indicating intellectual shortcomings (cf. *Od.* 10.27, 46, 231), Odysseus, according to Circe, has a mind, "νόος" (*Od.* 10.329) which is protected from the witch's magic, "ἀκήλητος" (*Od.* 10.329).

Hermes warns Odysseus of Circe's third and final form of trickery. Even after the goddess has submitted to the hero (*Od.* 10.323-324) and shown herself to be fearful (*Od.* 10.296), she might still try her hand at some form of deceit; namely, she will use her powers of seduction to compel Odysseus to go to bed with her, "εὐνηθῆναι" (*Od.* 10.296), and then possibly emasculate the hero (*Od.* 10.301). This third trick is to be countered by Odysseus insisting that Circe swear an oath against harming him or emasculating him (*Od.* 10.299), which she duly does in the actual encounter (*Od.* 10.345). Circe's trick of seduction is

²³⁶ The choice of epithet is deliberate; out of all the epithets which are given to Odysseus, *polytropos* occurs only twice (Clay 1983: 30).

²³⁷ Hermes is called *polytropos* in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (lines 13, 439) (*Lfgre* 2004: 1433).

²³⁸ "If *polytropos* is linked to the preceding line it must refer to some quality of mind. The explicit mention of Hermes in line 331 and the god's important role throughout the entire sequence is suggestive (Clay 1983: 30)". The ambiguity of the term *polytropos*, as referring both to Odysseus' spatial wanderings and his mental wanderings (Clay 1983: 29), a suffering hero and a trickster hero, is, according to Clay (1983:31) implied by 10.332, which presents Odysseus as seafarer returning from Troy.

derided by Odysseus when the hero wonders just how silly, “ἥπιον” (*Od.* 10.337), Circe thinks him to be. His friends have been turned into animals (*Od.* 10.338), and now the tricky woman, “δολοφρονέουσα” (*Od.* 10.339), commands him to go to her bedroom and to hop on her bed (*Od.* 10.340). The term “ἥπιον” (*Od.* 10.337) is employed by Odysseus, as a superior trickster, to deride the cunning of Circe to illustrate how he has risen above her tricks.

After a brief intermezzo in Book 11, Odysseus continues with the story of his journey through the Underworld by describing his encounter with Agamemnon. The leader of the Greek army replies to Odysseus’ query as to how he died:

οἰκτροτάτην δ' ἤκουσα ὄπα Πριάμοιο θυγατρὸς
Κασσάνδρης, τὴν κτεῖνε Κλυταμνήστρη δολόμητις
ἀμφ' ἐμοί· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ ποτὶ γαίῃ χεῖρας ἀείρων
βάλλον ἀποθνήσκων περὶ φασγάνῳ· ἡ δὲ κυνῶπις
νοσφίσατ' οὐδέ μοι ἔτλη, ἰόντι περ εἰς Ἀἴδαο,
χερσὶ κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐλέειν σὺν τε στόμ' ἐρεῖσαι.
ὦς οὐκ αἰνότερον καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο γυναικός,
ἢ τις δὴ τοιαῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶν ἔργα βάληται·
οἶον δὴ καὶ κείνη ἐμήσατο ἔργον ἀεικές,
κουριδίῳ τεύξασα πόσει φόνον. ἦ τοι ἔφην γε
ἀσπάσιος παίδεσσιν ἰδὲ δμώεσσιν ἐμοῖσιν
οἴκαδ' ἐλεύσεσθαι· ἡ δ' ἔξοχα λυγρὰ ἰδυῖα
οἷ τε κατ' αἴσχος ἔχευε καὶ ἐσσομένησιν ὀπίσσω
θηλυτέρησι γυναιξί, καὶ ἦ κ' εὐεργὸς ἔησιν.'

(*Od.* 11.421-434)

But most pitiful of all was the cry I heard from Priam's daughter Cassandra as treacherous Clytemnestra slaughtered her over me; and as I died with the sword thrust through me I raised my hands and beat upon the ground; but that shameless one turned away from me and even as I went down to Hades' house would not stretch out her hand to close my eyes and mouth. Truly nothing is deadlier and loathsomer than a woman when she sets her mind on deeds like these. Thus did my wife devise this abomination, contriving murder against her own wedded husband, when I had been thinking all the while how children and household would bid me welcome home. By her utter wickedness of will she has poured dishonour both on herself and on every woman that lives hereafter, even on one whose deeds are virtuous.

(Shewring 1980: 137)

That Clytemnestra is making exemplary use of plotting and trickery, *bouloi* and *doloi*, against her husband is quite manifest in this passage. She is given the epithet, “δολόμετις” (*Od.* 11.422) (*Lfgre* 1991: 328-329); Agamemnon lambastes the kind of plotting which lies behind her actions, “μετὰ φρεσὶν ἔργα βάλῃται” (*Od.* 11.428); and the actual act of deception is articulated by the dead general: specifically, Clytemnestra conceals a scene of murder as a scene of banqueting for her husband and then allows her love, Aegisthus, to ambush Agamemnon (*Od.* 11.410-411, 430-432). Odysseus, in response to Agamemnon's heated invective against all women, explicitly describes the actions of Clytemnestra as an act of trickery: “σοὶ δὲ Κλυταιμνήστρη δόλον ἤρτυε” (*Od.* 11.339). And according to Odysseus, both Helen and Clytemnestra brought ruin upon their husbands, brothers Menelaus and Agamemnon, on account of feminine plotting, “γυναικείας διὰ βουλάς” (*Od.* 11.437).

Clytemnestra's trickery utterly conquers Agamemnon, who can muster no suitable response to her machinations (Segal 1983: 31-32). The general's reaction to his wife's

scheming can also be compared to that of Eurylochus. In both cases, an equivalent helplessness and despondency can be detected in the face of feminine *doloi*: like Eurylochus, Agamemnon resorts to pitiful supplication, for all he can do, in opposition to his wife's deceit, is to plead to the Underworld for vengeance against her crime, “ποτὶ γαίῃ χεῖρας ἀείρων” (*Od.* 11.423) (Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989: 103). The failure of Agamemnon's particular brand of heroism, which achieves *kleos* through *biē* and lacks understanding of how to deal with, and himself make use of, *mētis* and *doloi*, is also evident in Book 9, when Odysseus identifies himself to Polyphemus through the fame of the leader of the Greeks (Segal 1983: 33):

λαοὶ δ' Ἀτρεΐδεω Ἀγαμέμνονος εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι,
τοῦ δὴ νῦν γε μέγιστον ὑπουράνιον κλέος ἐστί·
τόσσην γὰρ διέπερσε πόλιν καὶ ἀπώλεσε λαοὺς
πολλούς.

(*Od.* 9.263-266)

It is our claim that we are men of Agamemnon, that son of Atreus whose fame is paramount under heaven because of the mighty town he sacked and the multitudes of men he slew.

(Shewring 1980: 105)

Agamemnon's *kleos* (*Od.* 9.264) is built upon *biē*, sacking a town, “διέπερσε πόλιν”, and slaughtering his enemy, “ἀπώλεσε λαοὺς” (*Od.* 9.265) (Segal 1983: 33); Odysseus' boast, however, does not have the slightest effect on his 'host':

Far from Troy and Trojan heroism, however, this “μέγιστον ὑπουράνιον κλέος” has little meaning. It certainly makes little impression on the Cyclops, who “with pitiless spirit” dismisses his appeal for suppliant rights (IX, 272-80) Odysseus replies with δολίοισ' ἐπέεσσι (IX, 282): one may hark back proudly to martial deeds at Troy, but in this post-Trojan world the hero will have to achieve *kleos* by new means.

(Segal 1983: 33; cf. Griffin 1980: 56)

In short, Odysseus' associating himself with Agamemnon's fame does him little good, and the hero is forced to deal with Polyphemus in other, more cunning ways.

Clytemnestra's trick does raise the problem of the ethical ambiguity of *doloi*. Sometimes they are morally justified (Odysseus escaping Polyphemus' anthropophagy), and sometimes they are self-serving and malevolent. Accordingly, sometimes these acts lead to *kleos*, as Odysseus claims for himself (*Od.* 9.19-20), and sometimes they lead to infamy—in the case of Clytemnestra, the *aischos* or 'disgrace' which she has brought upon herself (*Od.* 11.432-434) (Segal 1983: 31). Regardless of how these acts are to be judged on an ethical level in the *Odyssey*—which is not the pursuit of this chapter—their pragmatic value in achieving favourable outcomes for the practitioners of the tricks, and the defeat they impose upon those who are unable to recognize and deal properly with tricks, is a characteristic of *xeinoi* situations in the *Apologue*.

The next *xeinoi* encounter to involve tricks is that between the Ithacans and the Sirens. The danger of the Sirens is first related to Odysseus by Circe, after he returns to Aeaea from the Underworld:

Σειρῆνας μὲν πρῶτον ἀφίξειςαι, αἶ ῥά τε πάντα
ἀνθρώπους θέλγουσιν, ὅτις σφεας εἰσαφίκεται.

ὅς τις ἀϊδρεΐη πελάση καὶ φθόγγον ἀκούση
Σειρήνων, τῷ δ' οὐ τι γυνὴ καὶ νήπια τέκνα
οἴκαδε νοστήσαντι παρίσταται οὐδὲ γάννυται,
ἀλλὰ τε Σειρήνες λιγυρῆ θέλγουσιν ἀοιδῆ,
ἤμεναι ἐν λειμῶνι· πολὺς δ' ἀμφ' ὀστεόφιν θίς
ἀνδρῶν πυθομένων, περὶ δὲ ῥινοὶ μινύθουσιν.
ἀλλὰ παρέξ ἐλάαν, ἐπὶ δ' οὔατ' ἀλειψαί εταίρων
κηρὸν δευήσας μελιιδέα, μή τις ἀκούση
τῶν ἄλλων· ἀτὰρ αὐτὸς ἀκουέμεν αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα,
δησάντων σ' ἐν νηὶ θοῆ χειράς τε πόδας τε
ὀρθὸν ἐν ἰστοπέδῃ, ἐκ δ' αὐτοῦ πείρατ' ἀνήφθω,
ὄφρα κε τερπόμενος ὄπ' ἀκούσης Σειρήνοϊν.
εἰ δέ κε λίσσῃαι ἐτάρους λῦσαί τε κελεύης,
οἱ δέ σ' ἔτι πλεόνεσσι τότε ἐν δεσμοῖσι διδέντων.

(*Od.* 12.39-54)

You will come to the Sirens first of all; they bewitch any mortal who approaches them. If a man in ignorance draws too close and catches their music, he will never return to find his wife and little children near him and to see their joy at his homecoming; the high clear tones of the Sirens will bewitch him. They sit in a meadow; men's corpses lie heaped up all round them, mouldering upon the bones as the skin decays. You must row past there; you must stop the ears of all your crew with sweet wax that you have kneaded, so that none of the rest may hear the song. But if you yourself are bent on hearing, then give them orders to bind you both hand and foot as you stand upright against the main-stay, with the rope-ends tied to the mast

itself; thus you may hear the two Sirens' voices and be enraptured. If you implore your crew and beg them to release you, then they must bind you fast with more bonds again.

(Shewring 1980: 144)

There are several parallels to be observed between Circe's exposition of the Sirens' trickery here in Book 12 and the witch's own previous machinations in Book 10. Firstly, just as Odysseus was fortunate enough to receive the good advice of Hermes in identifying the manner in which Circe would try to deceive him (I listed three distinct types of trickery), and in providing a way to get the better of the witch, especially through counter-tricks of his own, so likewise Circe now acts as a guide to Odysseus in identifying in advance the type of trickery which the Sirens will use to get the better of the *xeinoi*, and then in suggesting to the hero a cunning counter-trick by which the travellers can avoid being mastered by the Sirens, and continue unharmed with their *nostos*. Moreover, like Hermes, who acquires the epithet *polytropos* in Homeric Hymn to Hermes (lines 13, 439) which denotes his supreme ability with tricks and in cunning or *mētis*, so too Circe is given the descriptive epithets “δολόεσσα” (*Od.* 9.32) and “δολοφρονέουσα” (*Od.* 10.339) in the *Odyssey* (*Lfgre* 1991: 328, 330-331). In other words, in both of these passages Odysseus is aided by a supernatural master of trickery in overcoming a foe who is an accomplished trickster.

There are further points of tangency between the Sirens and Circe (in her earlier role as a witch [W], not as a guide [G]) in the manner in which they deceive their victims. The Sirens overcome their opponents through their vocal abilities: Circe (G) warns Odysseus of the danger for passing travellers of overhearing their voice, “φθόγγον ἀκούση” (*Od.* 12.41), and adds later that they conduct their seduction with a ‘clear singing-voice’, “λιγυρῆ...

ᾠοιδῆ” (*Od.* 12.44) (Segal 1983: 38).²³⁹ Moreover, their voice seems to contain a certain magical quality which is an essential ingredient in overcoming their victims. Thus Circe (G) mentions their ability to enchant men, “θέλγουσιν” (*Od.* 12.40) with their song (*Od.* 12.44), and this charm is so potent that no men can resist it, “πάντας / ἀνθρώπους” (*Od.* 12.39-40). Similarly, one of Circe’s (W) means of tricking the *hetairoi* is through her prowess as a songstress (10.221, 227), and this seems to have an overwhelming effect on the Ithacans so that all of them, with the exception of Eurylochus, enter her home as soon as she invites them inside (*Od.* 10.231). While Circe’s magical ability is not explicitly linked to her vocal seduction in the story, there are numerous references to her skill in enchantment throughout the encounter: “κατέθελξεν” (*Od.* 10.213), “θέλξαι” (*Od.* 10.291), “ἔθελξε” (*Od.* 10.318), and “ἔθέλχθης” (*Od.* 10.326) (Segal 1983: 38). In short, both the Sirens and Circe (W) engage in trickery through the seductive force of song, as well as through some manner of magical enchantment, in order to achieve mastery over their opponents.

That the trickery of the Sirens is highly successful is evident in Circe’s (G) warning as well. The enchantment of the Sirens is comprehensive, all men who hear it succumb to it (*Od.* 12.39-40)—just as, incidentally, all the Ithacans, barring Eurylochus, are overcome by Circe’s (W) singing (*Od.* 10.231-232). Secondly, the failure to comprehend and deal with a trick is, once more, explained in terms of a mindlessness or a witlessness. Circe refers to the ignorance, “ᾠδορείη” (*Od.* 12.41), of those travellers who come near to the Sirens and are overcome by their enchanted melodies (*Od.* 12.39-43). The exact same word is employed in Book 10, when the Ithacans at once head into Circe’s home at her behest (line 231), an ignorance which Eurylochus later repeats to Odysseus (*Od.* 10.257). Thirdly, the victory which the Sirens’ enchanted song wins over passing sailors is twofold: the victim of the magical voices of these creatures will forget about his homecoming, “οἴκαδε νοστήσαντι”

²³⁹ On comparisons between the Sirens and Homeric bards, cf. Segal 1983: 42-43.

(*Od.* 12.43), his wife, “γυνή” (*Od.* 12.42), and his children, “τέκνα” (*Od.* 12.42); and, furthermore, he will die in a horrible manner, as revealed by the grim remains of men on their island (*Od.* 12.45-46). In these two respects, yet again, one detects points of parallel with Circe’s (W) tricks: for the goddess threatened the Ithacan *hetairoi* with a forgetfulness of their *nostos* (*Od.* 10.236), as well as through a destruction of their human form, becoming pigs (*Od.* 10.239-243) (Segal 1983: 40).²⁴⁰

Circe (G), like Hermes, counters a trick with a trick, and so provides a way for Odysseus’ men to avoid the bewitchment of the Sirens. Circe’s trick is really two separate tricks, though. The first part ensures that the sailors are not overcome by Sirens’ singing by stopping their ears with wax (*Od.* 12.47-49), and the second part enables Odysseus alone to be bewitched, by tying him to the mast of the ship (*Od.* 12.49-52). Charles Segal (1983: 38) notes an interesting point of tangency between the Sirens’ trick of singing and Circe’s trick of the wax, in that both are in some respect ‘sweetened’—the honeyed-voice of the Sirens, “μελίγηρυν” (*Od.* 12.187), versus the honey-sweet wax of Circe, “μελιηδέα” (*Od.* 12.48); a sweetened trick requires a suitably sweetened trick as an antidote. Circe’s warning and instructions are duly heeded by the Ithacans when they actually approach the Sirens’ island (*Od.* 12.173-200). These creatures try to bewitch the sailors with their song (*Od.* 12.183-191) and the Ithacans resist it through Circe’s trick of the wax (*Od.* 12.173-177), whereas Odysseus himself, although he is overcome by their music, survives through Circe’s trick of having him tied up (*Od.* 12.178-179).

It is not only the voices of the Sirens and the enchantment with which they are imbued, but also the very subject matter of their song which provides a further temptation for Odysseus. The Sirens provide an Iliadic model of heroism to Odysseus. The promised content of their song is based on the sufferings of the Greeks and Trojans in Troy, and the divine

²⁴⁰ For parallels between the Lotus Eaters and the Sirens, cf. Segal 1983: 40.

caprice behind their toils (*Od.* 12.189-190) (Cook 1995: 59, Segal 1983: 38-39). Moreover, Odysseus himself is addressed as “μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν” (*Od.* 12.184), a title which is only bestowed upon Odysseus here in the entire *Odyssey* and only occurs on one other occasion in the epic poem (in connection with Nestor who, as Segal says, “more than any other Homeric character, lives in the past” [1983: 39]), and which is far more prevalent in the *Iliad* (Segal 1983: 39). Just as when Odysseus identifies himself to Polyphemus through the wartime feats of Agamemnon (*Od.* 9.259-266), so too here reversion to an ‘Iliadic model’ threatens Odysseus with failure in his quest to return home—the Sirens are in fact using guile to persuade Odysseus to become a hero of *biē*, one of the great Trojan warriors on the battlefield, but such a temptation leads only to ruin, as the rotten corpses on their island bear testament to (Segal 1983: 39-40). His present situation in the *Apologue* requires Odysseus to employ his brain and to engage in cunning and trickery. To become a hero of *biē*, a warrior at Troy, is to live in the stagnation of the past, represented by the fetid bodies which are decomposing on the isle of the Sirens (Segal 1983: 38-40).

The final act in the *Apologue* of relevance to this study of trickery is that between the Ithacans and Scylla, especially in as much as it draws attention to the *mētis/biē* antithesis once again. Scylla is primarily a character who employs *biē*, and, certainly, her slaughter of the Ithacan sailors must to a large extent be considered a result of her physical prowess, which Circe expounds upon before the Ithacans confront her (*Od.* 12.86-100). Indeed, one would not associate *doloi* and *mētis* with a character who is described as a monster, “πέλωρ κακόν” (*Od.* 12.87), seeing that both Polyphemus and Circe’s pets are referred to as *pelōra* (*Od.* 9.187, 10.219), and both are, incidentally, the victims of deceptions, on the part of Odysseus and Circe, respectively. Moreover, an ability to devour six men at once (*Od.* 12.110) and to pluck out huge beasts from the ocean (*Od.* 12.95-97) must indicate a character whose principal strength is her physical prowess. In this respect, she is similar to the man-

eating Polyphemos and Laestrygonians who rely on pure might in supplying themselves with meat.

It might be argued (although I would be hesitant to do so) that Scylla is also characterized partially as a *dolos* figure. At the point of her attack she is compared to a fisherman who throws down bait, “δόλον” (*Od.* 12.252),²⁴¹ in order to capture fish (*Od.* 12.251-254), which is reminiscent of a fish-catching simile applied to the crafty Odysseus later in the poem, after his trap against the suitors has paid off (*Od.* 22.383-389) (cf. Detienne & Vernant 1974: 53-54,²⁴² Sluiter 2014: 821-824). If Scylla were to employ ‘bait’ in her assault, she might indeed be considered a trickster figure—but the point of comparison in the simile does not lie in the throwing of bait by the agent (*Od.* 12.251-253), but, instead, the manner in which the captured men and fish are hauled out of the water/from the ship (Sluiter 2014: 822):

ἀσπαίροντα δ' ἔπειτα λαβῶν ἔρριψε θύραζε,
ὦς οἱ γ' ἀσπαίροντες ἀείροντο προτὶ πέτρας.

(12.254-255)

Then [the fisherman] seizes the creatures one by one and throws them ashore still writhing; so Scylla swung my writhing companions up to the rocks.

(Shewring 1980: 148)

²⁴¹ For the origin of the Greek vocabulary of *dolos* and *mētis* in physical acts of hunting and/or fishing, cf. Detienne & Vernant 1974: 54-56.

²⁴² “Quand Ulysse a refermé sur les prétendants le traquenard qu’il leur a tendu, il est le pêcheur tirant le filet où frétilent les poissons” (Detienne & Vernant 1974: 53).

There are two clear points of contact between the action of the fisherman in the simile, and that of Scylla in the actual story. The ‘writhing’ of the captured fish/men is manifestly compared through the repetition of “ἀσπαίροντα” (*Od.* 12.254) and “ἀσπαίροντες” (*Od.* 12.255), and whereas the fisherman throws the fish out of the water, “ἔρριψε θύραζε” (*Od.* 12.254), Odysseus’ men are raised from the sea and their ship onto the land/the rocks of Scylla’s home, “ἀείροντο προτὶ πέτρας” (*Od.* 12.255). There is, however, no obvious baiting employed by Scylla; her attack does not entail any actual lure.

While some fish similes in the Homeric poems, and in later Greek literature (cf. Detienne & Vernant 1974: 53-54), might be associated with an act of trickery (luring) or an employment of *mētis* in the context of a story, William Scott (1974: 75) shows that these similes in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* occur more frequently in contexts of violent slaying (or potential slaying), between a rampaging warrior, ‘the fisherman’, and his helpless victims, ‘the fish’ (cf. *Il.* 5.487, 16.406, 21.22, *Od.* 10.124).²⁴³ In short, these similes seem generally more appropriate to scenes of *biē* than scenes of *mētis*, wherein a character makes use of brute force to overwhelm and conquer his opponent(s) (cf. Hopman 2012: 16).²⁴⁴

Against Scylla’s *biē*, Odysseus—strangely for a hero who is usually defined by his *mētis*—becomes determined to confront the monster with *biē* himself. Thus, after Circe (G) has related the danger of both Scylla and Charybdis (*Od.* 12.86-107) and how Odysseus is to suffer the loss of six men while bypassing Scylla (*Od.* 12.108-110), the hero enquires whether he might make a defence, “ἀμυναίμην” (*Od.* 12.114), against her, so that he doesn’t lose any of his men (*Od.* 12.114):

²⁴³ For further discussion on fish in Homer, cf. Berdowski 2008.

²⁴⁴ “[T]he angler simile in *Odyssey* 12 belongs with and brings to a climax the martial paradigm underlying the passage. Not only does Odysseus fail to fight with Scylla, but the simile constructs her rather than him as a warrior performing his *aristeia*. In other words, Odysseus’ eagerness to fight culminates in a parodic duel where the monster, rather than the hero, occupies the triumphant position” (Hopman 2012: 16).

Together with its compounds (ἀπαμύνω, προσαμύνω, and ἐπαμύνω), ἀμύνω belongs to the vocabulary of fighting and occurs much more often in the *Iliad* (98 times) than in the *Odyssey* (19 times). Its use here stresses Odysseus' intention to face the monster as if it were an adversary on the battlefield.

(Hopman 2012: 13)

Circe at once censures Odysseus for considering the possibility of acting with *biē* against the *pelōr*. Thus she asks the Ithacan whether his mind is set on warfare, “πολεμήϊα ἔργα” (*Od.* 12.116)—a phrase which only occurs here in the *Odyssey* (Hopman 2012: 13-14). She describes Scylla as a creature who is not to be engaged in battle, “οὐδὲ μαχητόν” (*Od.* 12.119), and against whom physical strength is futile, “οὐδέ τις ἔστ' ἀλκή” (*Od.* 12. 120) and finally warns that the act of arming himself, “κορυσσόμενος” (*Od.* 12.121) for battle will only result in the death of even more of his sailors (*Od.* 12.122-123) (cf. Hopman 2012: 14).

Again, bizarrely, Odysseus on this single occasion forsakes the good advice of the *dolophroneousa* goddess, and, when his ship is approaching the hazards of Scylla and Charybdis, the hero chooses to arm himself:

Σκύλλην δ' οὐκέτ' ἐμυθεόμην, ἄπρηκτον ἀνίην,
μή πῶς μοι δείσαντες ἀπολλήξειαν ἑταῖροι
εἰρεσίης, ἐντὸς δὲ πυκάζοιεν σφέας αὐτούς.
καὶ τότε δὴ Κίρκης μὲν ἐφημοσύνης ἀλεγεινῆς
λανθανόμην, ἐπεὶ οὔ τί μ' ἀνώγει θωρήσσεσθαι·
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καταδὺς κλυτὰ τεύχεα καὶ δύο δοῦρε
μάκρ' ἐν χερσὶν ἔλων εἰς ἴκρια νηὸς ἔβαινον

πρώρης· ἔνθεν γάρ μιν ἐδέγμην πρῶτα φανεῖσθαι
Σκύλλην πετραίην, ἣ μοι φέρε πῆμ' ἐτάροισιν.

(*Od.* 10.12.223-231)

I had stopped short of mentioning Scylla, an inexorable horror; the crew in fear might have left their oars and have huddled down inside the hold. And here I let myself forget that irksome command of Circe's; she had told me not to arm at all, but I put my glorious armour on, took a long spear in either hand and strode up to the half-deck forward, since it was from there that I thought to catch the first glimpse of Scylla, that monster of the rock who was bringing doom to my companions.

(Shewring 1980: 148)

The arming sequence is elaborate, and distinctly Iliadic in the choice of vocabulary (Hopman 2012: 14-15). At no other time in the *Apologue* does Odysseus go to such lengths to prepare himself for battle. And yet this preparation has absolutely no effect on the outcome of his encounter with Scylla: the men are plucked from the ship with a sudden assault which catches Odysseus totally unawares (*Od.* 12.243-250). The armour and the weapons, as Circe predicted, have absolutely no use. Heroic *biē* fails to assist Odysseus to defend his men (Cook 1999: 161-162, Griffin 1980: 56-57, Segal 1983: 26-27).

4.5 *Conclusions*

Acts of trickery are typical of several of the *xeinoi* interactions in the *Apologue*. In the Polyphemus episode I examined how Odysseus' tussle with the man-eating ogre was characterized by a sequence of tricks, which included verbal trickery, the cunning use of a

prop, a wooden stake to blind the giant but not kill him, the intoxicating effect of a potent wine, and Odysseus' harnessing of himself and his men to the undersides of Polyphemus' sheep. The trickery employed in this episode is entirely due to the *mētis* of Odysseus. His men are mere passengers in the execution of the tricks. This disparity becomes more prevalent in the ensuing encounters.

In Book 10, in the case of Aeolus, an entirely benevolent act of deception, an apparatus which the god of the winds has designed so as to send the travellers back home, is misunderstood by the *hetairoi* and this has tragic consequences—sending them back to Aeolus' home, from where they are consigned to wandering over the seas once more. Secondly, in the case of Circe, the Ithacan sailors are rendered helpless in the face of Circe's acts of trickery.; As in the Polyphemus encounter, the tricks are manifold: the witch makes use of seduction, enchantment, imprisonment, concealment, and transformative magic. Only Odysseus, with the help of another trickster, Hermes, manages to overcome Circe's machinations by applying his own counter tricks. In Book 11, I examined how the deception of Clytemnestra led to the destruction of her husband. And in Book 12, I observed how the trickery of the Sirens and Odysseus' means of out-tricking them formed several parallels with Odysseus' earlier encounter in Book 10 with Circe (W). The last *xeinoi* interaction I analysed involved no actual tricks, but represented, instead, the failure of physical force in overcoming an inimical 'host'.

In all the episodes I have studied, the acts of trickery connote success or superiority for the practitioners of these tricks in the respective encounters: Odysseus defeats Polyphemus through a sequence of several deceits; Circe easily gets the better of Odysseus' men through her craft and natural wiles; Odysseus, in turn, with the help of Hermes, subdues Circe through counter-tricks; Clytemnestra overcomes Agamemnon; and Odysseus deals with the Sirens' trickery by employing two tricks which Circe has advised him to use. The

association between trickery and success in the *Apologue* becomes stronger when we examine the corresponding failure which characters experience in the absence of *mētis* and *doloi*. This absence is either expressed through an over-reliance on brawn, *biē*, or through a certain mindlessness.

In the case of the Polyphemus episode, there is a marked contrast between *mētis* and *biē*. The ogre's overreliance on physical might, to the neglect of mental cunning and trickery, is a key factor in Odysseus' being able to implement various tricks against the giant—it is a classic battle between brain and brawns. Bizarrely, *polymetis* Odysseus himself makes the error of relying on *biē* in his encounter with Scylla, without this attempt at physical strength having the slightest impact in this encounter. Indeed, in proof of the ineptitude of mere force, we are told that the six strongest of Odysseus' men, “οἱ χερσὶν τε βίηφί τε φέρτατοι ἦσαν” (*Od.* 12.246), were consumed. On the subject of Odysseus' men, in Book 10 the *hetairoi* are fooled by Circe's pets, expecting a savage attack, the use of *biē*, from these *pelōres*, when what they are in fact experiencing is the effect of Circe's enchantment upon the wild beasts. Apart from his faux pas with Scylla, Odysseus himself does not make the mistake of relying on pure *biē* to get the better of his foes. Thus although the wielding of the olive stake against Polyphemus is a physical endeavour which involves considerable courage, it has been undertaken because the hero explicitly recognises the failure of *biē* to aid the Ithacans in escaping the cave, and the physical act of blinding the ogre has, accordingly, been undertaken to ensure the survival of the monster so that the men can escape—in other words, it is an example of *biē* checked by *mētis*. In Book 10, when Odysseus makes a charge at Circe with his sword, this is again not an attempt at real *biē*, but a feigned attack, the simulation of *biē* so as to subdue Circe.

The failure to overcome obstacles or achieve a successful end in *xeinoi* encounters in the *Apologue* is also conveyed through descriptions which convey characters' deficiency in

mental resources when they are confronted with tricks: words such as “ἀφραδίησιν” (*Od.* 9.361) and “ἀϊδρείησιν” (*Od.* 10.231). Furthermore, the reaction of the defeated characters once tricked is often remarkably similar, and may involve gestures of helplessness or powerlessness in the form of supplicatory movements (cf. Gould 1973: 94, 96-97, Pedrick 1982: 128), as well as vocal lamentation.

Chapter 5: *The Importance of the Apologue*

This dissertation explored the character of the various interactions between the Ithacan *xeinoi* and the local inhabitants whom they encounter during their voyages as narrated in the *Apologue*. The rationale behind such an investigation lay in the belief that there were patterns of repetition and connotative meanings to be detected in the Odyssean narrative which had not previously been detected or, otherwise, fully exploited.

Accordingly, this dissertation reaches the following principal conclusions. Firstly, the *xeinoi* interactions in the *Apologue* are characterized by certain typical characteristics, repeated units, which can be traced across several episodes. In my studies, these included (i) the spatial unit of mountains, as well as the action units of (ii) eating and (iii) tricks. Secondly, these units garner certain associative meanings—connotations—because of their contextual employments in the story: these connotations were, respectively, (i) isolation, (ii) danger, and (iii) success.

Rather than recapping the results of my individual studies, which have been summarized in the concluding sections of each of the three studies, I should like here to explore some possibilities for the further extension of the findings of this dissertation.

In my first chapter, I examined Glenn Most's (1989b) assessment of the *Apologue* as a so-called 'stranger's stratagem', and other critics, including Irene de Jong, Lillian Doherty, and Pietro Pucci (cf. fn. 8, 28), have adopted a similar view of the role of Odysseus' speech in the context of its performance among the Phaeacians. While I am more hesitant to assert the possibility of a stranger's stratagem in Scheria, since it seems to involve an oversimplification of Odysseus' motives as guest and ignores the ambiguous characterization of the Phaeacians in the text, the notion that the *Apologue* reaches out beyond its borders to

the rest of the poem is worthy of further consideration. The *Apologue* contains both parallels and points of contrast with other parts of the *Odyssey*.

Isolation is a dominant characteristic of *xeinoi* interactions in the *Apologue*, and can be observed on a topographic, social, temporal, and human level. Homes are placed in geographic peripheries, pushed to the edge of the map; the inhabitants of these homes live in hermit-like solitude, shunning social institutions such as assemblies or the rite of hospitality; some of the inhabitants, such as Polyphemus and the Laestrygonians, engage in violent behaviour which seems to belong to a more primitive past, while others, like Scylla, appear so strange that they are removed from all human experience. The phenomenon of isolation is not only relevant to the *Apologue*, however, but is also to be found elsewhere in the poem.

In Book 5, the goddess Calypso is characterized as an isolated and isolating figure. Her very name points to her role as one who ‘conceals’ or ‘hides’ (*LfgrE* 1991: 1318), and she does indeed hide Odysseus on her island, Ogygia, for seven years, keeping the hero from returning home and reuniting with his family (*Od.* 1.11-15) (Thornton 1970: 32). From a locational perspective, she is a cave-dweller (*Od.* 1.15, 9.30), and this tends to connote a separation from civilization in the context of the poem (cf. section 2.2.2.ii). Moreover, her island of Ogygia is characterized by its physical distance from other lands (cf. *Od.* 5.100-102) (Cook 1995: 54), and it is described as “ὄμφαλός... θαλάσσης” (*Od.* 1.50) ‘the navel, the central point of the sea’ (*LfgrE* 2004: 703) (Thornton 1970: 27).²⁴⁵ Calypso’s desire to keep Odysseus to herself, removed from the rest of the world, is exemplified by her wish to make the hero an immortal like herself (*Od.* 5.135-136) (cf. Niles 1978: 50). But Calypso’s

²⁴⁵ Furthermore, this distancing is enacted not only on a spatial, but also a temporal level; thus, of the name ‘Ogygia’, Agathe Thornton writes: “The word does not occur elsewhere in Homer. It means ‘primeval’ or ‘primal’. Hesiod, for instance, uses it to describe the ‘imperishable water’ of Styx by which the gods swear an oath that binds even them under threat of terrible punishment. The name Ogygia denotes then the awesome ‘originality’ of this island” (1970: 27).

isolationism is, ultimately, countered by Hermes, who is sent at the behest of Zeus to ensure that Odysseus is returned to his homeland, to his family, and to the world of men (*Od.* 5.29-42)— in effect, he is reintegrated on a topographic, social, and human level.

A tension between isolation and a willingness to integrate is characteristic of the next people whom Odysseus encounters. The Phaeacians embody a strange mixture between isolationism and cosmopolitanism (cf. fn. 11). Tokens of the former can be traced in the speeches of both Nausicaa and Athena to Odysseus in Book 6 (lines 273-284) and Book 7 (lines 32-33), who warn Odysseus against the xenophobia of the Scherians. Also significant in this regard is the central place of honour afforded to Poseidon in the Phaeacian community (*Od.* 6.266-267), a god whose actions in the *Odyssey* are often motivated by private vengeance rather than any communal spirit (cf. pp. 112-119). Lastly, the hostility of the Phaeacians towards foreigners is demonstrated by the rudeness of both Euryalus and Laodamas, who act with impertinence towards Odysseus during the athletic competitions (*Od.* 8.131-164).²⁴⁶

On the other hand, Phaeacian isolation is matched by Phaeacian cosmopolitanism (Thornton 1970: 17). Although Poseidon is the dominant god among these people, and although he has warned them against ferrying men over the seas too often (*Od.* 8.564-569), this does not hinder the Phaeacians from helping Odysseus return to Ithaca, despite the punishment they might suffer for attempting this (*Od.* 13.159-164). Moreover, the threat of Poseidon is only relevant because the Phaeacians have been so helpful to wayfarers in the past (*Od.* 8.557-563). Another indication of Phaeacian cosmopolitanism is King Alcinous' desire for Odysseus to marry his daughter and become his son-in-law (*Od.* 7.311-316). This is hardly the behaviour of a purely isolationist people, concerned only with themselves.

²⁴⁶ For the possible topographic isolation of Scheria, cf. *Od.* 6.203-205, 7.321-323 (Cook 1995: 54).

The Phaeacians, as has frequently been recognized (cf. fn. 45), form a bridge between the world of Odysseus' wanderings and the Greek world elsewhere in the *Telemachy* and the Return. Specifically, in terms of my analysis, they represent a middle point between the isolation of the *Apologue* (and Ogygia) and the reintegration which Odysseus experiences from Book 13 onwards (cf. Thornton 1970: 19). They are a bridge in both a geographic sense, transporting Odysseus back to the known Greek world, Ithaca, from locatival aporia, but also in a social sense, demonstrating, as they do, some characteristics reminiscent of the inhabitants of the Märchen, as well as some of a civilized Greek society.

The Return narrative gradually moves away from the isolation encapsulated in Odysseus' wanderings from Books 5 to 12. From distant lands which are pushed to the edges of the world, Odysseus returns to the most topographically familiar locale of all—his own home, Ithaca; and after encountering inhabitants who demonstrate anti-social and lawless behaviour in the *Apologue*, on Ithaca Odysseus gradually assembles under his banner trustworthy countrymen, such as Eumaeus, as well as his family and household members so as to restore social order from the chaos he discovers in his own home.

Indeed, the final episode of the *Odyssey* is concerned with the victory of social order, the reestablishment of the community, over the threat of continued violence and chaos in Ithaca (Allan 2006: 25, Cook 1995: 14, 151-152). Thus Athena admonishes the battle lust of Odysseus who, having punished and slain the irreverent suitors, threatens to make further war upon the men of Ithaca, who have marched against him in retaliation for the death of the suitors (*Od.* 24.542-544). In its final lines (*Od.* 24.528-548),²⁴⁷ the *Odyssey* points its moral compass in the direction of social cohesion and cooperation, against the possibility of violent strife and disorder. Ultimately, the deviations from social order and social norms in the

²⁴⁷ On the question of where exactly the 'original version' of the *Odyssey* ended, and whether Book 24 is a later interpolation, cf. Bury 1922, Kirk 1962: 204-208, 244-252, Moulton 1974b, Page 1955: 101-136, Scott 1930.

Apologue, for example those which we witness among the Cyclopes and the Laestrygonians, provide a negative paradigm against which the ethical force of the poem strives.

As I have previously conceded (cf. fn. 118, 119), however, any attempt to argue for a coherent moral framework in the Homeric poem (i.e. the social justice of Zeus against the private vengefulness of Poseidon) faces stern challenges on account of incongruities which can be found in the poem. And likewise, any interpretation which views Odysseus as a kind of social or cultural champion needs to acknowledge the intrinsic individual superiority of the hero. Odysseus is the most successful character in the story, ‘the best of the Achaeans’. He triumphs not simply because he represents a moral high ground in the *Odyssey*—sometimes he does not (Allan 2006: 22, cf. p. 25, fn. 18)—but also because he is, quite simply, the best. Accordingly, the *Apologue* has the important function of solidifying Odysseus’ outstanding heroic quality: his practical intelligence or *mētis*, leading to his brilliant employment of tricks through which he outwits his various adversaries. And on those occasions when Odysseus foregoes *mētis* and relies on *biē* alone, such as in his encounter with Scylla, the hero fails to match the success which he achieves through *mētis*.

Odysseus’ prowess in trickery in the *Apologue* has broader relevance to the story of the Return. The hero’s successful vanquishing of the suitors from his home is, in several ways, a result of his trickery (Hopman 2012: 24). His disguise as a beggar affords him entry into his *oikos* without arousing the suspicions of the suitors. When Odysseus does finally shrug off this disguise and his true heroic identity is revealed to his competitors, it is far too late for them to avoid their bloody fate. Odysseus’ characteristic use of *mētis* is also apparent in other respects during the revenge story. For example, Odysseus advises Telemachus to stow away armour and the weapons so that the suitors cannot get their hands on them—and this act of concealment also involves the manufacturing of a lie to deceive the suitors (*Od.* 19.4-13). Later, the hero restrains himself from attacking the treacherous maids who have

been sleeping with the suitors (*Od.* 20.18-21), until he has devised a suitable plan for dealing with the suitors (*Od.* 20.22-30). Immediately prior to the attack on the suitors, Odysseus gets Eumaeus and Philoetius to ensure that all exits from his house are sealed, denying the suitors an escape from the hall (*Od.* 21.234-241). In short, in the build-up to the purging of the suitors, Odysseus' tricks include disguise, concealment, crafty speech, and entrapment.

Odysseus' trap does play out with a grotesque amount of violence, *biē*, and Odysseus, like the reckless Polyphemus earlier in the poem, is compared to a lion in his slaughter of the suitors (*Od.* 22.402) (Wilson 2002: 140-141).²⁴⁸ But just as in Odysseus' defeat of Polyphemus, it is not so much the absence of *biē* in an heroic endeavour but rather its partnering with *mētis* which ensures the success of an action (cf. Cook 1995: 32). Pure, reckless violence, "unrestrained *biē*" (Wilson 2002: 141), however, without any thought behind it cannot achieve victory in the *Odyssey*, and Odysseus is, accordingly, admonished by Athena at the end of the poem when the desire for heedless slaughter takes hold of him (*Od.* 24.537-538).

One further point on *mētis* and *doloi*: Odysseus' supreme ability in trickery is also a powerful way in which the poem unites husband and wife, Odysseus and Penelope. Penelope's own *kleos* as a woman, which lies in her characteristic fidelity (*Od.* 11.444-446), is solely dependent on her exhibition of *dolos*, particularly through her nightly deception of the suitors in weaving and un-weaving her loom so as to procrastinate the occasion on which she would have to commit to marrying one of these wooers (cf. *Od.* 19.136-137) (Segal 1983: 30-32).

In summary, my analysis of the *Apologue* does not only have relevance to our coherent understanding of these four books in themselves, but also to the rest of the *Odyssey*:

²⁴⁸ For the ruthless nature of Odysseus' and Athena's slaughter of the suitors, and the ethical problems raised by the violence of the hero's act, cf. Allan 2006: 23-25, Nagler 1990: 341-342.

(i) in identifying a movement from isolation to reintegration into the known Greek world and to the reestablishment of social order in the *oikos* and the Ithacan community, (ii) in consolidating the heroic prowess of Odysseus *polymētis*, a man of many tricks or *doloi*, the greatest of which will be played out against the suitors, and (iii) in reinforcing the *dais* as an area of contestation. On the last of these, the connotation of feasting as a dangerous activity in the *Apologue* is not foreign to the *Telemachy* or to the Return. In the case of the former, Telemachus feels the very real threat of having his home, and inheritance, being eaten away from him, because of the suitors' reckless consumption of his livestock (*Od.* 2.138-145; cf. 11.116) (Hopman 2012: 22-23); in the case of the latter, in the course of the suitors' destruction, they become, like Odysseus' *hetairoi* and Agamemnon in the *Apologue* (*Od.* 10.124, 11.411, 12.252), the metaphorical objects of a feast, fish hunted by fisherman (*Od.* 22.384-388) and then slaughtered cattle (*Od.* 22.403; cf. 22.299).

This dissertation has endeavoured to build on existing scholarship and to contribute fresh insights into the structure and meaning of the *Apologue*. Previous scholars have demonstrated that the *Apologue* is not merely a fantastic collection of tales in preternatural world, but that the interactions in these four books, between the travelling *xeinoi* and the local inhabitants, are bound by certain structural or thematic similarities. It is hoped that the results of this dissertation will both augment these readings, and, at the same time, provide the reader with new perspectives in interpreting the *Apologue*.

Reference, Format, and Name Guide

A) Referencing

A.1 For abbreviations of classical literature, cf. Hornblower & Spawforth 1998: xix-xxvii. In line references, *Od.* is used for the *Odyssey*, *Il.* for the *Iliad*. I have omitted abbreviations for Homer (Hom.) in line references. Book numbers for both epics have been given in integers (1, 2, 3... 24), not Roman numerals.

A.1.1 When Book numbers of the poems are stated in the text, the relevant line references are condensed in the citation. For example: “in Book 12 of the *Odyssey* (lines 300-304)...”

A.2 All journal abbreviations in the list of references are based on the standard conventions in *L'Année Philologique*: http://www.annee-philologique.com/files/sigles_fr.pdf. Those journal titles which do not appear in *L'Année Philologique*, such as non-Classics journals, have been given in full.

A.3 All Greek text is based on that of the standard online TLG edition at the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*® *Digital Library of Greek Literature*: <http://www.tlg.uci.edu>. Any text which is considered doubtful in this dissertation is marked with square parentheses or by a footnote.

A.4 When giving an in-text citation from the *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, a multi-authored reference work in four separate volumes, I have employed an abbreviation of the

title (*LfgrE*), followed by the year of publication and the page/column number (each page is divided into two numbered columns). For example: “ἄντρον” (*LfgrE* 1955: 953-955).

A.5 I have used the Harvard style of referencing throughout this dissertation. There are slight variations in the format of this style, depending on the institute or publisher. For further explanation of this style, cf. Pears & Shields 2010: 14-64. I have also consulted the referencing guide for the Harvard style on the UCT (the University of Cape Town) Libraries webpage: <http://www.lib.uct.ac.za/lib/referencing-help>. The following referencing conventions adopted by this dissertation should be observed:

A.5.1 *Publication date*. For reprints or translations of an original publication, the date of the reprint or translation, *and not that of the original publication*, is indicated in the in-text citation; however, both reprint and original publication date are given in the list of references. For example, in the case of my Cambridge edition of Irene de Jong’s commentary (from 2004, though it was originally published in 2001), an in-text citation might read: de Jong 2004: 223. In the list of references it reads: de Jong, I.J.F. [2001] 2004. *A narratological commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. In exceptional cases where a work is cited in my analysis with particular reference to its historical value in scholarship, I have included the original date in square parentheses in the in-text citation. For example, Milman Parry’s seminal dissertation is referenced ([1928] 1971) in-text.

A.5.2 *In-text citations*. In-text citations normally include author, date, and page number, and are placed at the end of a clause or sentence, or after a relevant

quotation. For example: *an Homeric hospitality scene is made up of a number of typical elements (Reece 1993: 7).*

A.5.2.1 If an author is mentioned in the main text, however, duplication of the name is always omitted in the citation, and the citation normally occurs earlier in the sentence, immediately after the author's name. For example: *As Reece (1993: 7) observes, an Homeric hospitality scene is made up of certain typical elements.*

A.5.2.2 *Exception to the above.* In the case of a quotation of scholarship, I have always placed the citation after the quotation, whether or not the author's name is given before. If the author's name is given before, only the date (if this has not also already been given) and page number is given after the quotation. For example: *Steve Reece concedes that a certain amount of variation is possible in a typical hospitality scene: "in practice Homer shows great flexibility in his narration of these scenes" (1993: 7).*

A.5.2.3 In a paragraph or a sequence of paragraphs which discuss a single scholarly work, after the first citation the scholar's name and date are omitted in subsequent citations, and only the page number is given. However, as soon as another scholarly work is cited or, otherwise, there is some ambiguity in the text, I revert back to the full citation of the original work in order to avoid confusion.

A.5.3 *Capitalization.* In titles of books, articles, etc., only the first letter of the first word as well as any subsequent proper nouns are capitalized. The first letter of a subtitle, after a colon, is not italicized. An exception is made here for German titles, where nouns are capitalized. Journal titles are always capitalized.

B) Formatting

B.1 For the sake of structural clarity, a sequence of points, arguments, etc., is often numbered in parentheses. The numbering of such a list is in lowercase Roman numerals: (i), (ii), (iii), etc. When another list occurs in the midst of or immediately sequential to such a list, the ensuing parentheses are then alphabetized in lowercase: (a), (b), (c), etc. Whole numbers in parentheses (1, 2, 3...), however, are used exclusively to denote page references from source material, and never indicate a list.

B.2 Square brackets are used (i) for parentheses within parentheses, (ii) around words or letters in a quotation which are not part of the original quotation, and (iii) in order to indicate the original date of a publication.

C) Naming

C.1 The following exception applies in C.2, C.3, etc.....: when quoting a scholar, I have kept the naming convention(s) he or she employs, in order to avoid misquoting material.

C.2 The Anglicised or Latinate forms of Greek proper nouns (and proper adjectives), including the names of individuals and places, have been employed throughout. For example: ‘Achilles’ is used instead of a transliterated Greek form, ‘Achilleus’; ‘Aeaea’ instead of ‘Aiaia’; ‘Ithaca’ instead of ‘Ithaka’, *etc.* This selection is based purely on my own force of habit, and no bias is indicated by this choice. Exceptions occur in those instances where the directly transliterated Greek form of a name is the customary usage in English translations: e.g. ‘Helios’, ‘Pylos’.

C.3 Transliteration of Greek words has been used throughout when terms are employed without reference to any one specific passage of text. When a word refers directly to a specific passage, the original Greek font is preferred, presented in quotation marks and cited. Three further notes on transliteration: (i) long vowels are indicated by macrons (\bar{o} for ω , \bar{e} for η); (ii) y for υ is used, except in diphthongs or diereses where u for υ is used; (iii) all transliterations have been italicized.

C.4 Some random naming conventions employed include: (i) ‘Lotus Eaters’ is used instead of ‘Lotus-eaters’ or ‘Lotus-Eaters’; (ii) ‘the Island of the Goats’ is used instead of ‘Goat Island’ or any appellation without proper nouns; (iii) ‘Giants’, capitalized, denotes the mythic race who fought the Olympians, while ‘giants’, without capitals, denotes any oversized individual.

C.5 The following names are used to refer to sections of the *Odyssey*: the *Telemachy* (Books 1 to 4), the Phaeacian sequence or narrative (Books 6 to 8), the *Apologue* (Books 9 to 12), the *Cyclopeia* (Book 9, lines 106-566), the *Nekyia* (Book 11), and the Return (Books 13-24). Words taken from Greek have been italicized.

List of References

Abbot, H.P. 2007. Story, plot, and narration. In *The Cambridge companion to narrative*. Edited by D. Herman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 39-51.

Abrahamson, E. 1956. The adventures of Odysseus. *CJ*. 51.7: 313-316.

Adkins, A.W.H. 1972. *Moral values and political behaviour in Ancient Greece*. Ann Arbor: Chatto and Windus.

Alden, M. 2000. *Homer beside himself: para-narratives in the Iliad*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alexander, C. 1991. A note on the stag: *Odyssey* 10.156-72. *CQ*. 41.2: 520-524.

Allan, W. 2006. Divine justice and cosmic order in early Greek epic. *JHS*. 126: 1-35.

Alwine, A.T. 2009. The non-Homeric Cyclops in the Homeric *Odyssey*. *GRBS*. 49.3: 323-333.

Anderson, W.D. 1957. Notes on the similes in Homer and his successors: I. Homer, Apollonius Rhodes, and Vergil. *CJ*. 53.2: 81-87.

Andrews, P.B.S. 1962. Was Corcyra the original Ithaca? *BICS*. 9: 17-20.

Apthorp, M.J. 1975. A note on "Odyssey" 10.189-97. *AClass.* 18: 135-137.

Arend, W. 1933. *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer.* Berlin: Weidmannische Buchhandlung.

Armstrong, J. 1958. The arming motif in the *Iliad.* *AJPh.* 79: 337-354.

Arterbury, A. 2005. *Entertaining angels: early Christian hospitality in its Mediterranean setting.* Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

Austin, N. 1975. *Archery at the dark of the moon: poetic problems in Homer's Odyssey.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Austin, N. 1983. Odysseus and the Cyclops: who is who? In *Approaches to Homer.* Edited by C.A. Rubino & C.W. Shelmerdine. Austin: University of Texas Press. 3-37.

Bakker, E.J. 1999. How oral is oral composition? In *Signs of orality: the oral tradition and its influence in the Greek and Roman world.* Edited by E.A. Mackay. Leiden: Brill. 29-47.

Bakker, E.J. 2013. *The meaning of meat and the structure of the Odyssey.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bal, M. 2009. *Narratology: introduction to the theory of narrative.* Third edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Barnouw, J. 2004. *Odysseus, hero of practical intelligence: deliberations and signs in Homer's Odyssey*. Lanham: University Press of America,® Inc.

Barthes, R. [1967] 2001. The death of the author. In *Modern literary theory: a reader*. Edited by P. Rice and P. Waugh. London: Arnold. 185-189.

Basset, S.E. 1921. The function of the Homeric simile. *TAPhA*. 52: 132-147.

Basset, S.E. 1933. The fate of the Phaeacians. *CPh*. 28.4: 305-307.

Bassi, K. 1999. *Nostos, domos, and the architecture of the ancient stage*. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*. 98.3: 415-449.

Beaulieu, M.A. 2008. *The sea as a two-way passage between life and death in Greek mythology*. PhD thesis. Austin: The University of Texas.

Beck, D. 1991. Dogs, dwellings, and masters: ensemble and symbol in the *Odyssey*. *Hermes*. 119: 158-167.

Beck, D. 2005. Odysseus: narrator, storyteller, poet? *CPh*. 100.3: 213-227.

Belmont, D.E. 1962. *Early Greek guest-friendship and its role in Homer's Odyssey*. PhD thesis. Princeton: Princeton University.

Ben-Porat, Z. 1992. Poetics of the Homeric simile and the theory of (poetic) simile. *Poetics Today*. 13.4: 737-769.

Berdowski, P. 2008. Heroes and fish in Homer. *Palamedes: A Journal of Ancient History*. 3: 75-91.

Bergren, A. 1983. Odyssean temporality: many (re)turns. In *Approaches to Homer*. Edited by C.A. Rubino & C.W. Shelmerdine. Austin: University of Texas Press. 38-73.

Bergren, A. 2008. *Weaving truth: essays on language and the female in Greek thought*. Washington D.C.: Harvard University Press.

Bittlestone, R. 2005. *Odysseus unbound: the search for Homer's Ithaca*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bonifazi, A. 2009. Inquiring into *nostos* and its cognates. *AJPh*. 130.4: 481-510.

Bowra, C.M. 1950. The comparative study of Homer. *AJA*. 54: 184-192.

Bowra, C.M. 1952. *Heroic poetry*. London: Macmillan & Co. LTD.

Boys-Stones, G.R. 2003. Introduction. In *Metaphor, allegory and the classical tradition: ancient thought and modern revisions*. Edited by G.R. Boys-Stones. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-5.

Bremmer, J.N. 2007. Greek normative animal sacrifice. In *A companion to Greek religion*. Edited by D. Ogden. Malden: Blackwell Publishing. 132-144.

Brown, C.G. 1996. In the Cyclops' cave: revenge and justice in "Odyssey" 9. *Mnemosyne* 49.1: 1-29.

Burgess, J.S. 2006. Neoanalysis, orality, and intertextuality: an examination of Homeric motif transference. *Oral Tradition*. 21.1: 148-189.

Burnett, A.P. 1970. Pentheus and Dionysus: host and guest. *CPh*. 65.1: 15-29.

Burrows, R.Z. 1965. Deception as a comic device in the "Odyssey". *CW*. 59.2: 33-36.

Bury, J.B. 1922. The end of the *Odyssey*. *JHS*. 42.1: 1-15.

Buxton, R. 2004. Similes and other likenesses. In *The Cambridge companion to Homer*. Edited by R. Fowler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 139-155.

Byre, C.S. 1994a. On the description of the harbor of Phorkys and the cave of the nymphs, *Odyssey* 13.96-112. *AJPh*. 115.1: 1-13.

Byre, C.S. 1994b. The rhetoric of description in "Odyssey" 9.116-41: Odysseus and Goat Island. *CJ*. 89.4: 357-367.

Cairns, D.L. 1993. *Aidōs: the psychology and ethics of honour and shame in Ancient Greek literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cairns, D.L. 1996. Hybris, dishonour, and thinking big. *JHS*. 116: 1-32.

Cairns, D.L. 2011. Ransom and revenge in the *Iliad*. In *Sociable man: essays on Ancient Greek social behaviour*. Edited by S.D. Lambert. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales. 87-116.

Calhoun, G.M. 1938. The poet and the Muses in Homer. *CPh*. 33.2: 157-166.

Candea, M & Da Col, G. 2012. The return to hospitality. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. 18.s1: S1-S19.

Cavallar, G. 2002. *The rights of strangers: theories of international hospitality, the global community, and political justice since Vitoria*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Chaintraine, P. 1953. *Grammaire homérique, vol. 2*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Chamberlain, D.F. 1990. *Narrative perspective in fiction: a phenomenological mediation of reader, text, and world*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Chiappe, D.L., Kennedy, J.M., & Chiappe, P. 2003. Aptness is more important than comprehensibility in preference for metaphors and similes. *Poetics*. 31.1: 51-68.

Christensen, J.P. 2012. Review of *Homer's Trojan theater: space, vision, and memory in the Iliad*, by Jenny Strauss Clay. *CR*. 62.1: 10-13.

Clarke, M. 1999. *Flesh and spirit in the songs of Homer: a study of words and myths*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Claviez, T. 2013. Introduction: "taking place"—conditional/unconditional hospitality. In *The conditions of hospitality: ethics, politics, and aesthetics on the threshold of the possible*. Edited by T. Claviez. 1-12.

Clay, J.S. 1980. Goat island: *Od.* 9.116-141. *CQ*. 30.2: 261-264.

Clay, J.S. 1983. *The wrath of Athena: gods and men in the Odyssey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Clay, J.S. 2011. *Homer's Trojan theater: space, vision, and memory in the Iliad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Coffey, M. 1957. The function of the Homeric simile. *AJPh*. 78.2: 113-132.

Cole, S.G. 2004. *Landscapes, gender, and ritual space: the ancient Greek experience*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Combella, F.M. 1950. Unitarians and Homeric originality. *AJPh*. 71.4: 337-364,

Combella, F.M. 1955. Contemporary Homeric scholarship: sound or fury? *CW*. 49.2: 17-26.

Combella, F.M. 1959. Milman Parry and Homeric artistry. *CompLit*. 11.3: 193-208.

Combella, F.M. 1965. Some formulary illogicalities in Homer. *TAPhA*. 96: 41-56.

Combella, F.M. 1974. Odysseus and Anticleia. *CPh*. 69.2: 121-123.

Combella, F.M. 1976. Homer the innovator. *CPh*. 71.1: 44-55.

Combella, F.M. 1982. Two blameless Homeric characters. *AJPh*. 103.4: 361-372.

Cook, A. 1984. Visual aspects of the Homeric simile in the Indo-European context. *QUCC*. 17.2: 39-59.

Cook, E.F. 1995. *The Odyssey in Athens: myths of cultural origins*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Cook, E.F. 1999. "Active" and "passive" heroics in the "Odyssey". *CW*. 93.2: 149-167.

Cook, E.F. 2003. Review of *The raft of Odysseus: the ethnographic imagination of Homer's Odyssey*, by Carol Dougherty. *CPh*. 98.2: 184-189.

Currie, G. 2010. *Narratives and narrators: a philosophy of stories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Currie, M. 1998. *Postmodern narrative theory*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Curtis, J.M. 1981. Spatial form in the context of modernist aesthetics. In *Spatial form in narrative*. Edited by J.R. Smitten & A. Daghistany. London: Cornell University Press. 161-178.

Dannenbergh, H.P. 2008. *Coincidence and counterfactuality: plotting space and time in narrative fiction*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

D'Arms, E.F. & Hulley, K.K. 1946. The Oresteia story in the *Odyssey*. *TAPhA*. 77: 207-213.

De Jong, I.J.F. 1992. The subjective style in Odysseus' wanderings. *CQ*. 42.1: 1-11.

De Jong, I.J.F. [2001] 2004a. *A narratological commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Jong, I.J.F. 2004b. Homer. In *Narrators, narratees, and narratives in Ancient Greek literature: studies in Ancient Greek narrative, volume 1*. Edited by I.J.F. de Jong, R. Nünlist, & A. Bowie. Leiden: Brill. 13-24.

De Jong, I.J.F. 2004c. Introduction. Narratological theory on narrators, narratees, and narratives. In *Narrators, narratees, and narratives in Ancient Greek literature: studies in*

Ancient Greek narrative, volume 1. Edited by I.J.F. de Jong, R. Nünlist, & A. Bowie. Leiden: Brill. 1-10.

De Jong, I.J.F. 2009. Review of *A referential commentary and lexicon to Homer, Iliad VIII*, by Adrian Kelly. *Mnemosyne*. 62: 478-480.

De Jong, I.J.F. 2012a. Homer. In *Space in Ancient Greek literature: studies in Ancient Greek narrative, volume 3*. Edited by I.J.F. de Jong. Leiden: Brill. 21-38.

De Jong, I.J.F. 2012b. Introduction. Narratological theory on space. In *Space in Ancient Greek literature: studies in Ancient Greek narrative, volume 3*. Edited by I.J.F. de Jong. Leiden: Brill. 1-18.

Delcourt, M & Rankin, R.L. 1965. The last giants. *HR*. 4.2: 209-242.

Derrida, J. 2000. *Of hospitality*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Detienne, M. 1979. Pratiques culinaires et esprit de sacrifice. In *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec*. Edited by M. Detienne & J.P. Vernant. Paris: Éditions Gallimard. 7-35.

Detienne, M & Vernant, J.P. 1974. *Les ruses de l'intelligence: la mètis des Grecs*. Paris: Flammarion.

De Vries, G.J. 1977. Phaeacian manners. *Mnemosyne*. 30.2: 113-121.

Dickie, M.W. 1978. Dike as a moral term in Homer and Hesiod. *CPh.* 73.2: 91-101.

Dietler, M. & Hayden, B. 2010. *Feasts: archaeological and ethnographic perspectives on food, politics, and power.* Tuscaloosa: University Alabama Press.

Dimock, G.E. 1956. The name of Odysseus. *The Hudson Review.* 9.1: 52-70.

Dodds, E.R. 1951. *The Greeks and the irrational.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Doherty, L.E. 1995. *Siren songs: gender, audiences, and narrators in the Odyssey.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Doherty, L.E. 2008. Nausikaa and Tyro: idylls of courtship in the Phaiakian episode of the *Odyssey* and the Hesiodic catalogue of women. *Phoenix.* 62.1/2: 63-76.

Donlan, W. 1982. Reciprocities in Homer. *CW.* 75.3: 137-175.

Dougherty, C. 2001. *The raft of Odysseus: the ethnographic imagination of Homer's Odyssey.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dowden, K. 1996. Homer's sense of text. *JHS.* 116: 47-61.

Dowden, K. 2004. The epic tradition in Greece. In *The Cambridge companion to Homer.* Edited by R. Fowler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 188-205.

Doyle, A. 2010. "Unhappily ever after?" The problem of Helen in *Odyssey* 4. *Akroterion*. 55: 1-18.

Duffy, W.S. 2011. *Legacies of an imaginary people: the Phaeacians after Homer*. PhD thesis. Buffalo: State University of New York.

Dunkle, R. 1987. Nestor, Odysseus, and the MÊTIS: BIÊ antithesis: the funeral games, *Iliad* 23. *CW*. 81.1: 1-17.

Dyck, A. 1981. The witch's bed but not her breakfast: an Odyssean paradox. *RhM*. 124: 196-198.

Edmunds, S.T. 1977. Summaries of dissertations for the degree of Ph.D. *HSPH*. 81: 299-306.

Edwards, A.T. 1993. Homer's ethical geography: country and city in the *Odyssey*. *TAPhA*. 123: 27-78.

Edwards, M.W. 1975. Type-scenes and Homeric hospitality. *TAPhA*. 105: 51-72.

Edwards, M.W. 1986. Homer and oral tradition: the formula, part I. *Oral Tradition*. 1/2: 171-230.

Edwards, M.W. 1992. Homer and oral tradition: the type scene. *Oral Tradition*. 7.2: 284-330.

Edwards, M.W. 1997. Homeric style and oral poetics. In *A new companion to Homer*. Edited by I. Morris & B. Powell. Leiden: Brill. 261-283.

Elliger, W. 1975. *Die Darstellung der Landschaft in der griechischen Dichtung*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Erbse, H. 1986. *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im homerischen Epos*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Farrington, B. 1929. More Ithaka problems. *CPh*. 24.3: 299-300.

Faust, M. 1970. Die künstlerische Verwendung von κύων 'Hund' in den homerischen Epen. *Glotta*. 48.1/2: 8-31.

Felson-Rubin, N. 1996. Penelope's perspective: character from plot. In *Reading the Odyssey: selected interpretative essays*. Edited by S.L. Schein. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 163-183.

Fenik, B. 1968. *Typical battle scenes in the Iliad*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.

Fenik, B. 1974. *Studies in the Odyssey*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.

Finkelberg, M. 1995. Odysseus and the genus 'hero'. *G&R*. 42.1: 1-14.

Finley, M.I. 1954. *The world of Odysseus*. New York: Viking Press.

Finnegan, R. 1988. *Literacy and orality: studies in the technology of communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Finnegan, R. 1990. What is oral literature anyway? Comments in the light of some African and other comparative material. In *Oral-formulaic theory: a folklore casebook*. Edited by J.M. Foley. New York: Garland Publishing. 243-282.

Flower, D. 2000. Epic in the middle of the wood: mise en abyme in the Nisus and Euryalus episode. In *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman textual relations*. Edited by A. Sharrock & H. Morales. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 89-113.

Fludernik, M. 2005. Histories of narrative theory (II): from structuralism to the present. In *A companion to narrative theory*. Edited by J. Phelan & P.J. Rabinowitz. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 36-59.

Foley, H.P. 1984. "Reverse similes" and sex roles in the *Odyssey*. In *Women in the ancient world: the Arethusa papers*. Edited by J. Peradotto and J.P. Sullivan. New York: State University of New York Press. 59-78.

Foley, J.M. 1986a. Introduction. In *Oral tradition in literature: interpretation in context*. Edited by J.M. Foley. Columbia: University of Missouri Press. 1-18.

Foley, J.M. 1986b. Tradition and the collective talent: oral epic, textual meaning, and receptionalist theory. *Cultural Anthropology*. 1.2: 203-222.

Foley, J.M. 1991. *Immanent art*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Foley, J.M. 1997. Oral tradition and its implications. In *A new companion to Homer*. Edited by I. Morris & B. Powell. Leiden: Brill. 146-173.

Foley, J.M. 1999. *Homer's traditional art*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Foley, J.M. 2010. "Reading" Homer through oral tradition. In *Approaches to Homer's Iliad and Odyssey*. Edited by K. Myrsiades. New York: Peter Lang Publishing. 15-42.

Forster, E.S. 1936. Trees and plants in Homer. *CR*. 50.3: 97-104.

Fowler, R. 2004a. Introduction. In *The Cambridge companion to Homer*. Edited by R. Fowler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-8.

Fowler, R. 2004b. The Homeric question. In *The Cambridge companion to Homer*. Edited by R. Fowler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 220-232.

Fränkel, H. [1921] 1997. Essence and nature of Homeric similes. In *Homer: German scholarship in translation*. Edited and Translated by G.M. Wright and P.V. Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 103-123.

Frame, D. 1978. *The myth of return in early Greek epic*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Franco, C. 2012. Women in Homer. In *A companion to women in the ancient world*. Edited by S. Dillon & S.L. James. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 54-65.

Frangoulidis, S.A. 1997. Intratextuality in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. *AC*. 66: 293-299.

Frank, J. 1981. Spatial form: thirty years after. In *Spatial form in narrative*. Edited by J.R. Smitten & A. Daghistany. London: Cornell University Press. 202-243.

Frank, J. 1991. *The idea of spatial form*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Fraser, A.D. 1929. Scheria and the Phaeacians. *TAPhA* 60: 155-178.

Fraser, J.A. 2014. Review of *Hospitality and treachery in Western literature*, by James Heffernan. *Modernism/modernity*. 21.4: 1044-1046.

Friedman, S.S. 2005. Spatial poetics and Arundhati Roy's *The god of small things*. In *A companion to narrative theory*. Edited by J. Phelan & P.J. Rabinowitz. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 192-205.

Friedrich, R. 1981. On the compositional use of similes in the *Odyssey*. *AJPh*. 102.2: 120-137.

Friedrich, R. 1987. Thrinakia and Zeus' ways to men in the *Odyssey*. *GRBS*. 28.4: 375-400.

- Friedrich, R. 1989. Zeus and the Phaeacians: Odyssey 13.158. *AJPh*. 110.3: 395-399.
- Friedrich, R. 1991. The hybris of Odysseus. *JHS*. 111: 16-28.
- Friedrich, R. 2007. *Formular economy in Homer: the poetics of the breaches*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Fuqua, C. 1991. Proper behavior in the *Odyssey*. *ICS*. 16.1/2: 49-58.
- Futch, M. 2008. *Leibniz's metaphysics of time and space*. New York: Springer.
- Gadamer, H.G. 2011. Aesthetics and hermeneutics. In *The continental aesthetics reader*. Edited by C. Cazeaux. London: Routledge. 181-186.
- Gagarin, M. 1987. Morality in Homer. *CPh*. 82.4: 285-306.
- Garcia, L.F. 2013. *Homeric durability: telling time in the "Iliad"*. Washington D.C.: Harvard University Press.
- Garnett, C.B. 1939. *The Kantian philosophy of space*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Garvie, A.F. 1994. *Homer: Odyssey. Books VI-VIII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Genette, G. 1980. *Narrative discourse: an essay in method*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Germain, G. 1954. *La mystique des nombres dans l'épopée homérique et sa préhistoire*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Glenn, J. 1971. The Polyphemus folktale and Homer's *Kyklôpeia*. *TAPhA*. 102: 133-181.

Glenn, J. 1972. Homer's "god-trusting" Cyclopes. *CW*. 65.7: 218-220.

Glenn, J. 1998. Odysseus confronts Nausicaa: the lion simile of *Odyssey* 6.130-36. *CW*. 92.2: 107-116.

Goldhill, S. 1991. *The poet's voice: essays on poetics and Greek literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, W.W. 1894. *A Greek grammar*. London: Macmillan.

Gottschall, J. 2001. Homer's human animal: ritual combat in the *Iliad*. *Philosophy and Literature*. 25.2: 278-294.

Gould, J. 1973. Hiketeia. *JHS*. 93: 74-103.

Graver, M. 1995. Dog-Helen and Homeric insult. *CIAnt*. 14.1: 41-61.

Graves, R. 1955a. *The Greek myths: volume one*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Graves, R. 1955b. *The Greek myths: volume two*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Gresseth, G.K. 1970. The Homeric sirens. *TAPhA*. 101: 203-218.

Griffin, J. 1977. The epic cycle and the uniqueness of Homer. *JHS*. 97: 39-53.

Griffin, J. 1980. *Homer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Griffin, J. 1986. Homeric words and speakers. *JHS*. 106: 36-57.

Griffin, J. [1987] 2004. *Homer: the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gross, N.P. 1976. Nausicaa: a feminine threat. *CW*. 69.5: 311-317.

Hainsworth, J.B. 1964. Structure and content in epic formulae. *CQ*. 58: 155-164.

Hainsworth, J. B. 1970. The criticism of an oral Homer. *JHS*. 90: 90-98.

Halliwell, S. 2008. *Greek laughter: a study of cultural psychology from Homer to early Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliwell, S. 2011. *Between ecstasy and truth: interpretations of Greek poetics from Homer to Longinus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hammond, R. 2012. *Islands in the sky: the four-dimensional journey of Odysseus through space and time*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Haubold, J. 2000. *Homer's people: epic poetry and social formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heal, F. 1990. *Hospitality in early modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Heatherington, M.E. 1976. Chaos, order, and cunning in the "Odyssey". *SPh*. 73.3: 225-238.

Heffernan, J.A.W. 2014. *Hospitality and treachery in Western literature*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Heitman, R. 2005. *Taking her seriously: Penelope and the plot of Homer's Odyssey*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Herbert, G.B. 1987. Hobbes' phenomenology of space. *JHI*. 48.4: 709-717.

Herman, D. 2005. Histories of narrative theory (I): a genealogy of early developments. In *A companion to narrative theory*. Edited by J. Phelan & P.J. Rabinowitz. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 19-35.

Hernández, P.N. 2000. Back in the cave of the Cyclops. *AJPh*. 121.3: 345-366.

Hesk, J. 2000. Intratext and irony in Aristophanes. In *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman textual relations*. Edited by A. Sharrock & H. Morales. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 227-261.

Heubeck, A & Hoekstra, A. 1989. *A commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume II: Books IX-XVI*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hirzel, R. [1907] 1966. *Themis, Dike, und Verwandtes*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.

Hobden, F. 2013. *The symposium in Ancient Greek society and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hölscher, U. 1988. *Die Odyssee: Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman*. München: Verlag C.H. Beck.

Hölscher, U. [1967] 1996. Penelope and the suitors. In *Reading the Odyssey: selected interpretative essays*. Edited by S.L. Schein. Translated by S. Richter. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 133-140.

Hogan, J.C. 1976. The temptation of Odysseus. *TAPhA*. 106: 187-210.

Holoka, J.P. 1979. Homer studies 1971-1977. *CW*. 73.2: 65-150.

Holoka, J.P. 1990a. Homer studies 1978-1983. Part I. *CW*. 83.5: 393-461.

Holoka, J.P. 1990b. Homer studies 1978-1983. Part II. *CW*. 84.2: 89-156.

Hooker, J.T. 1987. Homeric society: a shame culture? *G&R*. 34.2: 121-125.

Hopman, M. 2012. Narrative and rhetoric in Odysseus' tale to the Phaeacians. *AJPh*. 133.1: 1-30.

Hopman, M. 2013. *Scylla: myth, metaphor, paradox*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hornblower, S & Spawforth, A. 1998. *The Oxford companion to classical civilization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howe, T. 2008. *Pastoral politics: animals, agriculture and society in Ancient Greece*. Claremont: Regina Books.

Ingalls, W.B. 1979. Formular density in the similes of the Iliad. *TAPhA*. 109: 87-109.

Innes, D. 2003. Metaphor, simile, and allegory as ornaments of style. In *Metaphor, allegory and the classical tradition: ancient thought and modern revisions*. Edited by G.R. Boys-Stones. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 7-27.

Iser, W. 1974. *The implied reader: patterns of communication in prose fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Iser, W. [1976] 1978. *The act of reading: a theory of aesthetic response*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Issacharoff, M. 1976. *L'espace et la nouvelle*. Paris: Librairie José Corti.

Janko, R. 1998. The Homeric poems as oral dictated texts. *CQ*. 48.1: 1-13.

Jauss, H.R. 1982. *Toward an aesthetic of reception*. Translated by T. Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Jauss, H.R. 1988. Tradition, innovation, and aesthetic experience. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. 46.3: 375-388.

Kahane, A. 1994. Review of *The stranger's welcome: oral theory and the aesthetics of the Homeric hospitality scene*, by Steve Reece. *JHS*. 114: 181-182.

Katz, M.A. 1994. Homecoming and hospitality: recognition and the construction of identity in the *Odyssey*. In *Epic and epoch*. Edited by S.M. Oberhelman, V. Kelly, & R.J. Golsan. Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press. 49-75.

Kearns, E. 1982. The return of Odysseus: a Homeric theoxeny. *CQ*. 32.1: 2-8.

Kelly, A. 2007. *A referential commentary and lexicon to Homer, Iliad VIII*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kelly, A. 2012. The audience expects: Penelope and Odysseus. In *Orality, literacy and performance in the Ancient World: orality and literacy in the Ancient World, vol. 9*. Edited by E. Minchin. Leiden: Brill. 3-24.

Kelly, A. 2015. Review of *The meaning of meat and the structure of the Odyssey*, by Egbert Bakker. *Mnemosyne*. 68.4: 677-681.

Kestner, J. 1981. Secondary illusion: the novel and the spatial arts. In *Spatial form in narrative*. Edited by J.R. Smitten & A. Daghistany. London: Cornell University Press. 100-128.

Kirk, G.S. 1960. Homer and modern oral poetry. *CQ*. 10: 270-281.

Kirk, G.S. 1962. *The songs of Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirk, G.S. 1970. *Myth: its meaning and functions in ancient and other cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirk, G.S. 1976. *Homer and the oral tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klinkowitz, J. 1981. The novel as artefact: spatial form in contemporary fiction. In *Spatial form in narrative*. Edited by J.R. Smitten & A. Daghistany. London: Cornell University Press. 37-47.

Knox, M.O. 1970. 'House' and 'palace' in Homer. *JHS*. 90: 117-120.

Konstan, D. 2003. Shame in Ancient Greece. *Social Research*. 70.4: 1031-1060.

Krischer, T. 1985. Phäaken und Odyssee. *Hermes*. 113.1: 9-21.

Kullmann, W. 2012. Neoanalysis between orality and literacy: some remarks concerning the development of Greek myths including the legend of the capture of Troy. In *Homeric contexts: neoanalysis and the interpretation of oral poetry*. Edited by F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, & C. Tsagalis. 13-25.

Laird, A. 2000. Design and designation in Virgil's *Aeneid*, Tacitus' *Annals*, and Michelangelo's *Conversion of Saint Paul*. In *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman textual relations*. Edited by A. Sharrock & H. Morales. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 143-170.

L'Année Philologique. 2016. *Journal abbreviations in l'Année Philologique online*. Available at: http://www.annee-philologique.com/files/sigles_fr.pdf (Accessed 16 November 2016).

Larson, S. 2000. Boiotia, Athens, the Peisistratids, and the *Odyssey's* catalogue of heroines. *GRBS*. 41.3: 193-222.

Lattimore, R. 1970. Penrose Memorial Lecture: man and god in Homer. *PAPhS*. 114.6: 411-422.

Leask, W.K. 1888. The Homeric Phaeacians. *EHR*. 3.10: 292-294.

Lesky, A. 1947. *Thalatta: der Weg der Griechen zum Meer*. Wien: Rudolf M. Rohrer Verlag.

Levy, H.L. 1963. The Odyssean suitors and the host-guest relationship. *TAPhA*. 94: 145-153.

Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. 1955. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. 1991. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. 2004. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. 2006. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Liddell, H.G. & Scott, R. 1940. *A Greek-English lexicon*. 9th edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press. *Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.04.0057> (Accessed: 10 November 2016).

Lloyd-Jones, H. [1971] 1983. *The justice of Zeus*. Second edition. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lonsdale, S.H. 1990. Simile and ephrasis in Homer and Virgil: the poet as craftsman and choreographer. *Vergilius*. 36: 7-30.

Lord, A.B. 1951. Composition by theme in Homer and Southslavic Epos. *TAPhA*. 82: 71-80.

Lord, A.B. 1953. Homer's originality: oral-dictated texts. *TAPhA*. 84: 34-54.

Lord, A.B. 1968. Homer as oral poet. *HSPh*. 72: 1-46.

Lord, A.B. [1960] 1971. *The singer of tales*. New York: Athenaeum.

Louden, B. 1999. *The Odyssey: structure, narration, and meaning*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press

Louden, B. 2011a. *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Louden, B. 2011b. Review of *Homer's Trojan theatre: space, vision, and memory in the Iliad*, by Jenny Strauss Clay. *IJCT*. 18.4: 620-622.

Lowenstam, S. 1993. *The scepter and the spear: studies on forms of repetition in the Homeric poems*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Luce, J.V. 1998. *Celebrating Homer's landscapes*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Magrath, W.T. 1982. Progression of the lion simile in the "Odyssey". *CJ*. 77.3: 205-212.

Martin, R. 2000. Wrapping Homer up: cohesion, discourse and deviation in the *Iliad*. In *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman textual relations*. Edited by A. Sharrock & H. Morales. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 43-65.

McInerney, J. 2010. *The cattle of the Sun: cows and culture in the world of the Ancient Greeks*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

McNulty, T. 2007. *The hostess: hospitality, femininity, and the expropriation of identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. [1945] 1962. *Phenomenology of perception*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Merry, W.W. 1887. *Homer Odyssey, Books I-XII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Merry, W.W. & Riddell, J. 1886. *Homer's Odyssey*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Michelsen, D. 1981. Types of spatial structure in narrative. In *Spatial form in narrative*. Edited by J.R. Smitten & A. Daghistany. London: Cornell University Press. 63-78.

Minchin, E. 1995. The poet appeals to his Muse: Homeric invocations in the context of epic performance. *CJ*. 91.1: 25-33.

Minchin, E. 2001. *Homer and the resources of memory: some applications of cognitive theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Minton, W.W. 1960. Homer's invocations of the Muses: traditional patterns. *TAPhA*. 91: 292-309.

Mitchell, W.J.T. 1980. Spatial form in literature: toward a general theory. *Critical Inquiry*. 6.3: 539-567.

Mondi, R. 1983. The Homeric Cyclopes: folktale, tradition, and theme. *TAPhA*. 113: 17-38.

Moran, D. 2000. *Introduction to phenomenology*. London: Routledge.

Moretti, F. 1998. *Atlas of the European novel: 1800-1900*. London: Verso.

Morgan, K. 1991. *Odyssey* 23.218-24: adultery, shame, and marriage. *AJPh*. 112.1: 1-3.

Morris, D. 2004. *The sense of space*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Morris, I. 2001. The use and abuse of Homer. In *Oxford readings in Homer's Iliad*. Edited by D.L. Cairns. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 57-91.

Most, G.W. 1989a. The stranger's stratagem: self-disclosure and self-sufficiency in Greek culture. *JHS*. 109: 114-133.

Most, G.W. 1989b. The structure and function of Odysseus' *Apologoi*. *TAPhA*. 119: 15-30.

Most, G.W. 2003. Anger and pity in Homer's *Iliad*. In *Ancient anger: perspectives from Homer to Galen*. Edited by S. Braund & G.W. Most. New York: Cambridge University Press. 50-75.

Moulton, C. 1974a. Similes in the *Iliad*. *Hermes*. 102: 381-397.

Moulton, C. 1974b. The end of the *Odyssey*. *GRBS*. 15.2: 153-169.

Moulton, C. 1979. Homeric metaphor. *CPh*. 74.4: 279-293.

Muellner, L. 1996. *The anger of Achilles*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Murnaghan, S. 1995. The plan of Athena. In *The distaff side: representing the female in Homer's Odyssey*. Edited by B. Cohen. New York: Oxford University Press. 61-80.

Murray, P. 1981. Poetic inspiration in Early Greece. *JHS*. 101: 87-100.

Musial, T.J. 1968. The two heroes, two bards, and two worlds of the "Odyssey". *The Sewanee Review*. 76.1: 106-116.

Nagler, M.N. 1967. Towards a generative view of the oral formula. *TAPhA*. 98: 269-311.

Nagler, M.N. 1990. The proem and the problem. *ClAnt*. 9.2: 335-356.

Nagler, M.N. 1996. Dread goddess revisited. In *Reading the Odyssey: selected interpretative essays*. Edited by S.L. Schein. Translated by H.I. Flower. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 141-161.

Nagy, G. 1979. *The best of the Achaeans: concepts of the hero in Archaic Greek poetry*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Nagy, G. 1986. Ancient Greek epic and praise poetry: some typological considerations. In *Oral tradition in literature: interpretation in context*. Edited by J.M. Foley. Columbia: University of Missouri Press. 89-102.

Nagy, G. 1996. *Homeric questions*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Nagy, G. 2003. *Homeric responses*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Nagy, G. 2010. *Homer the preclassic*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nagy, J.F. 1981. The deceptive gift in Greek mythology. *Arethusa*. 14.2: 191-204.

Nesselrath, H. 2005. 'Where the Lord of the Sea grants passage to sailors through the deep-blue mere no more': the Greeks and the western seas. *G&R*. 52.2: 153-171.

Nestle, W. 1942. *Odyssee-Interpretationen I*. *Hermes*. 77: 46-77.

Newton, R.M. 1983. Poor Polyphemus: emotional ambivalence in "Odyssey" 9 and 17. *CW*. 76.3: 137-142.

Newton, R.M. 2008. Assembly and hospitality in the *Cyclopeia*. *College Literature*. 35.4: 1-44.

Nickel, R. 2002. Euphorbus and the death of Achilles. *Phoenix*. 56. 3/4: 215-233.

- Niles, J.D. 1978. Patterning in the wanderings of Odysseus. *Ramus*. 7.1: 46-60.
- Notopoulos, J.A. 1957. Homeric similes in the light of oral poetry. *CJ*. 52.7: 323-328.
- Olson, S.D. 1989a. Odysseus 8: Guile, force and the subversive poetics of desire. *Arethusa*. 22.2: 135-145.
- Olson, S.D. 1989b. The stories of Helen and Menelaus (*Odyssey* 4.240-289) and the return of Odysseus. *AJPh*. 110.3: 387-394.
- Olson, S.D. 1990. The stories of Agamemnon in Homer's *Odyssey*. *TAPhA*. 120: 57-71.
- Page, D. 1955. *The Homeric Odyssey*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Page, D. 1959. *History and the Homeric Iliad*. Berkeley: California University Press.
- Page, D. 1973. *Folktales in Homer's Odyssey*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Pantelia, M.C. 1993. Spinning and weaving: ideas of domestic order in Homer. *AJPh*. 114.4: 493-501.
- Parry, H. 1994. The *Apologos* of Odysseus: lies, all lies? *Phoenix*. 48.1: 1-20.
- Parry, M. [1928-1948] 1971. *The making of Homeric verse: the collected papers of Milman Parry*. Edited by A. Parry. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Paton, R.W. 1912. Book VIII of the *Odyssey*. *CR*. 26.7: 215-216.

Pazdernik, C.F. 1995. Odysseus and his audience: *Odyssey* 9.39-40 and its formulaic resonances. *AJPh*. 116.3: 347-369.

Pears, R. & Shields, G. [2004] 2010. *Cite them right: the essential referencing guide*. Eighth edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pease, A.S. 1943. The son of Neptune. *HSPH*. 54: 69-82.

Pedrick, V. 1982. Supplication in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. *TAPhA*. 112: 125-140.

Pelliccia, H. 1995. *Mind, body, and speech in Homer and Pindar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Peradotto, J. 1997. Modern theoretical approaches to Homer. In *A new companion to Homer*. Edited by I. Morris & B. Powell. Leiden: Brill. 380-395.

Podlecki, A.J. 1961. Guest-gifts and nobodies in "Odyssey 9". *Phoenix*. 15.3: 125-133.

Podlecki, A.J. 1967. Omens in the 'Odyssey'. *G&R*. 14.1: 12-23.

Podlecki, A.J. 1971. Some Odyssean similes. *G&R*. 18.1: 81-90.

- Porter, D.H. 1972. Violent juxtaposition in the similes of the "Iliad". *CJ*. 68.1: 11-21.
- Propp, V. 1984. *Theory and history of folklore*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Pucci, P. 1982. The proem of the *Odyssey*. *Arethusa*. 15.1: 39-62.
- Pucci, P. 1987. *Odysseus polutropos: intertextual readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Pucci, P. [1979] 1996. The song of the sirens. In *Reading the Odyssey: selective interpretative essays*. Edited by S.L. Schein. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 191-200.
- Pucci, P. 1998. *The song of the Sirens: essays on Homer*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC.
- Pucci, P. 2003. Review of *A narratological commentary on the Odyssey*, by Irene de Jong. *CPh*. 98.1: 81-87.
- Purkis, J. 1992. Reading Homer today. In *Homer: readings and images*. Edited by C. Emlyn-Jones, L. Hardwick, and J. Purkis. London: Duckworth in association with the Open University. 1-18.
- Purves, A.C. 2010a. *Space and time in Ancient Greek narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Purves, A.C. 2010b. Wind and time in Homeric epic. *TAPhA*. 140: 323-350.

Rabkin, E.S. 1981. Spatial form and plot. In *Spatial form in narrative*. Edited by J.R. Smitten & A. Daghistany. London: Cornell University Press. 79-99.

Rauber, D.F. 1969. Some “metaphysical” aspects of the Homeric simile. *CJ*. 65.3: 97-103.

Ready, J.L. 2011. *Character, narrator and simile in the Iliad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rebert, H. F. 1928. Χθαλαμός in Homer. *CPh*. 23.4. 377-387.

Redfield, J.M. 1983. The economic man. In *Approaches to Homer*. Edited by C.A. Rubino & C.W. Shelmerdine. Austin: University of Texas Press. 218-247.

Redfield, J.M. 1994. *Nature and culture in the Iliad: the tragedy of Hector*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Reece, S. 1993. *The stranger's welcome: oral theory and the aesthetics of the Homeric hospitality scene*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Reinhardt, K. [1960] 1996. The adventures in the *Odyssey*. In *Reading the Odyssey: selected interpretative essays*. Edited by S.L. Schein. Translated by H.I. Flower. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 63-132.

Reinhardt, K. [1948] 1997. Homer and the Telemachy, Circe and Calypso, the Phaeacians. In *Homer: german scholarship in translation*. Edited and Translated by G.M. Wright and P.V. Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 217-248.

Rexine, J.E. 1977. The nature and meaning of justice in Homer. *CB*. 54.1: 1-6.

Richards, I.A. 1936. *The philosophy of rhetoric*. London: Oxford University Press.

Richardson, S.D. 1990. *The Homeric narrator*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Richardson, S.D. 2006. The devious narrator of the “Odyssey”. *CJ*. 101.4: 337-359.

Robertson, H.G. 1955. The *hybristes* in Homer. *CJ*. 51.2: 81-83.

Roisman, J. 1982. *Some social conventions and deviations in Homeric society*. *AClass*. 25: 35-41.

Romm, J. 2003. Review of *The raft of Odysseus: the ethnographic imagination of Homer's Odyssey*, by Carol Dougherty. *Hermathena*. 175: 77-80.

Rood, N. 2006. Implied vengeance in the simile of grieving vultures (*Odyssey* 16.216-219). *CQ*. 56.1: 1-11.

Rose, G.P. 1969. The unfriendly Phaeacians. *TAPhA*. 100: 387-406.

Rose, G.P. 1979. Odysseus' barking heart. *TAPhA*. 109: 215-230.

Rowe, C.J. 1983. The nature of Homeric morality. In *Approaches to Homer*. Edited by C.A. Rubino & C.W. Shelmerdine. Austin: University of Texas Press. 248-275.

Rudhardt, J. 1971. *Le thème de l'eau primordiale dans la mythologie grecque*. Berne: Éditions Francke.

Rundin, J. 1996. A politics of eating: feasting in early Greek society. *AJPh*. 117.2: 179-215.

Rundle, B. 2009. *Time, space, and metaphysics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Russo, J.A. 1963. A closer look at the Homeric formulas. *TAPhA*. 94: 235-247.

Russo, J.A. 1968. Homer against his tradition. *Arion*. 7.2: 275-295.

Russo, J.A. & Simon, B. 1968. Homeric psychology and the oral epic tradition. *JHI*. 29.4: 483-498.

Rutherford, R.B. 2001. From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*. In *Oxford readings in Homer's Iliad*. Edited by D.L. Cairns. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 117-146.

Sacks, R. 1987. *The traditional phrase in Homer*. Leiden: Brill.

Saïd, S. 1979. Les crimes des prétendants, la maison d'Ulysse et les festins de l'Odyssee. In *Études de littérature ancienne*. Edited by S. Saïd, F. Desbordes, J. Bouffartigue, & A. Moreau. Paris: Presses de L'École Normale Supérieure. 9-50.

Schein, S. 1970. Odysseus and Polyphemus in the *Odyssey*. *GRBS*. 11.2: 73-83.

Schein, S. 1995. Female representations and interpreting the *Odyssey*. In *The distaff side: representing the female in Homer's Odyssey*. Edited by B. Cohen. New York: Oxford University Press. 17-27.

Schein, S. 1996. Introduction. In *Reading the Odyssey: selected interpretative essays*. Edited by S.L. Schein. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 3-31.

Schekeveld, D.M. 1970. Aristarchus and ΟΜΗΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΤΕΧΝΟΣ: some fundamental ideas of Aristarchus on Homer as a poet. *Mnemosyne*. 23: 162-178.

Schewan, A. 1919. The Scheria of the *Odyssey*. *CQ*. 13.1: 4-11.

Shelmerdine, C.W. 1969. The pattern of guest welcome in the "Odyssey". *CJ*. 65.3: 124.

Scodel, R. 1994. Odysseus and the stag. *CQ*. 44.2: 530-534.

Scodel, R. 1997. Pseudo-intimacy and the prior knowledge of the Homeric audience. *Arethusa*. 30.2: 201-219.

Scodel, R. 1999. Odysseus' evasiveness and the audience of the *Odyssey*. In *Signs of orality: the oral tradition and its influence in the Greek and Roman world*. Edited by E.A. Mackay. Leiden: Brill. 79-93.

Scodel, R. 2000. Review of *Homer's traditional art*, by John Miles Foley. *CR*. 50.2: 395-397.

Scodel, R. 2004. The story-teller and his audience. In *The Cambridge companion to Homer*. Edited by R. Fowler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 45-55.

Scodel, R. 2009. *Listening to Homer: tradition, narrative, and audience*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Scott, J.A. 1917-18. The journey made by Telemachus and its influence on the action of the *Odyssey*. *CJ*. 13: 420-428.

Scott, J.A. 1930. The "end" of the "Odyssey". *CJ*. 25.7: 547-548.

Scott, J.A. 1938. Odysseus and the gifts from the Phaeacians. *CJ*. 34.2: 102-103.

Scott, J.A. 1948. Dogs in Homer. *CW*. 41.15: 226-228.

Scott, M. 1979. Pity and pathos in Homer. *AClass*. 22: 1-14.

Scott, W.C. 1974. *The oral nature of the Homeric simile*. Leiden.

Scott, W.C. 2009. *The artistry of the Homeric simile*. Lebanon, NH.

Scully, S. 1987. Doubling in the tale of Odysseus. *CW*. 80.6: 401-417.

Segal, C. 1962. The Phaeacians and the symbolism of Odysseus' return. *Arion*. 1.4: 17-64.

Segal, C. 1983. *Kleos* and its ironies in the *Odyssey*. *AC*. 52: 22-47.

Segal, C. 1992. Divine justice in the *Odyssey*: Poseidon, Cyclops, and Helios. *AJPh*. 113.4: 489-518.

Sharrock, A. 2000. Intratextuality: texts, parts, and (w)holes in theory. In *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman textual relations*. Edited by A. Sharrock & H. Morales. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-39.

Shen, Y. 1992. Cognitive aspects of metaphor comprehension: an introduction. *Poetics Today*. 13.4: 567-574.

Shewring, W. 1980. *Homer: the Odyssey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shipp, G.P. 1972. *Studies in the language of Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shorey, P. 1922. The logic of the Homeric simile. *CPh*. 17.3: 240-259.

Silk, M.S. 1974. *Interaction in poetic imagery: with special reference to early Greek poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silk, M.S. [1987] 2004a. *Homer: the Iliad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silk, M.S. 2004b. The *Odyssey* and its explorations. In *The Cambridge companion to Homer*. Edited by R. Fowler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 31-44.

Simpson, M. 1972. "Odyssey 9": Symmetry and paradox in Outis. *CJ*. 68.1: 22-25.

Slatkin, L.M. 1991. *The power of Thetis: allusion and interpretation in the Iliad*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sluiter, I. 2014. Fish similes and converging story lines in the *Odyssey*. *CQ*. 64.2: 821-824.

Smitten, J.R. 1981. Introduction: spatial form and narrative theory. In *Spatial form in narrative*. Edited by J.R. Smitten & A. Daghistany. London: Cornell University Press. 15-34.

Snell, B. 1953. *The discovery of the mind: the Greek origins of European thought*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stanford, W.B. [1947] 1996. *Homer: Odyssey I-XII*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Steadman-Jones, R. 2013. Odysseus and the Sirens: archive, exile, voices. *Parallax*. 19.4: 20-35.

Stocking, D. 2010. Towards an ontology of the Homeric self. In *Approaches to Homer's Iliad and Odyssey*. Edited by K. Myrsiades. New York: Peter Lang Publishing. 43-71.

Thalman, W. 1998. *The swineherd and the bow: representations of class in the Odyssey*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae® Digital Library of Greek Literature. 2016. *TLG Browser*. Available at: <http://www.tlg.uci.edu> (accessed: from 15 January 2013 to 15 November 2016).

Thornton, A. 1970. *People and themes in Homer's Odyssey*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Thornton, A. 1984. *Homer's Iliad: its composition and the motif of supplication*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Tsagalis, C. 2008. *The oral palimpsest: exploring intertextuality in the Homeric epics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tsagalis, C. 2012. *From listeners to viewers: space in the Iliad*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tsagarakis, O. 1977 *Nature and background of major concepts of divine power in Homer*. Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner Publishing Co.

Turner, F.M. 1997. The Homeric question. In *A new companion to Homer*. Edited by I. Morris & B. Powell. Leiden: Brill. 123-145.

University of Cape Town. 2016. *UCT Libraries: Referencing help*. Available at: <http://www.lib.uct.ac.za/lib/referencing-help> (Accessed: 15 November 2016).

Ustinova, Y. 2009. *Caves and the ancient Greek mind: descending underground in the search for ultimate truth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Fraassen, B.C. 1970. *An introduction to the philosophy of time and space*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Van Nortwick, T. 2009. *The unknown Odysseus: alternate worlds in Homer's Odyssey*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Van Wees, H. 1992. *Status warriors: war, violence, and society in Homer and history*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.

Vernant, J.P. 1979. Manger aux pays du Soleil. In *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec*. Edited by M. Detienne & J.P. Vernant. Paris: Éditions Gallimard. 239-249.

Vernant, J.P. [1982] 1996. The refusal of Odysseus. In *Reading the Odyssey: selective interpretative essays*. Edited by S.L. Schein. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 185-189.

Vidal-Naquet, P. [1970] 1996. Land and sacrifice in the *Odyssey*. In *Reading the Odyssey: selected interpretative essays*. Edited by S.L. Schein. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 33-53.

Vidan, I. 1981. Time sequence in spatial fiction. In *Spatial form in narrative*. Edited by J.R. Smitten & A. Daghistany. London: Cornell University Press. 131-157.

Walcot, P. 1979. Cattle raiding, heroic tradition, and ritual: the Greek evidence. *HR*. 18.4: 326-351.

Webber, A. 1989. The hero tells his name: formula and variation in the Phaeacian episode of the *Odyssey*. *TAPhA*. 119: 1-13.

Webster, T.B.L. 1954. Personification as a mode of Greek thought. *JWI*. 17.1/2: 10-21.

Wecowski, M. 2014. *The rise of the Greek aristocratic banquet*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weinberg, F.M. 1986. *The cave: the evolution of a metaphoric field from Homer to Ariosto*. New York: Peter Lang.

West, M.L. 1997. *The east face of Helicon: west Asiatic elements in Greek poetry and myth*. New York: Oxford University Press.

West, M.L. 2000. The gardens of Alcinous and the oral dictated text theory. *AAntHung.* 40: 479-488.

West-Pavlov, R. 2010. *Spaces of fiction, fictions of space.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Whittaker, H. 1999. The status of Arete in the Phaeacian episode of the *Odyssey*. *SO.* 74:1: 140-150

Wilkins, E.G. 1920. A classification of the similes of Homer. *CW.* 13.19: 147-150.

Willcock, M.M. 1964. Mythological paradeigma in the *Iliad*. *CQ.* 14.2: 141-154.

Williams, B. 1993. *Shame and necessity.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wills, J. 1997. Homeric and Virgillian doublets: the case of *Aeneid* 6.901. *MD.* 38: 185-202.

Wilson, D.F. 2002. *Ransom, revenge, and heroic identity in the Iliad.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wimsatt, W.K. & Beardsley, M.C. 1946. The intentional fallacy. *The Sewanee Review.* 54.3: 468-488.

Winkler, M.M. 2007. The *Iliad* and the cinema. In *Troy: from Homer's Iliad to Hollywood epic.* Edited by M.M. Winkler. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons. 43-67.

Wittgenstein, L. 1953. *Philosophical investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Worman, N. 2002. Odysseus, ingestive rhetoric, and Euripides' *Cyclops*. *Helios*. 29.2: 101-125.

Zeitlin, F.I. 1995. Figuring fidelity in Homer's *Odyssey*. In *The distaff side: representing the female in Homer's Odyssey*. Edited by B. Cohen. New York: Oxford University Press. 117-152.

Zipfel, F. 2015. Narratorless narration? Some reflections on the arguments for and against the ubiquity of narrators in fictional narration. In *Author and narrator: transdisciplinary contributions to a narratological debate*. Edited by D. Birke and T. Köppe. Berlin: De Gruyter. 45-80.

Zoran, G. 1984. Towards a theory of space in narrative. *Poetics Today*. 5.2: 309-335.