7

Performance and Rivalry: Homer, Odysseus, and Hesiod*

Adrian Kelly

Among the several episodes at the end of the *Odyssey* to arouse the suspicious notice of scholarship,[1] the 'recapitulation' (23.310–43) has attracted its fair share of criticism. Odysseus' *précis* of his adventures to Penelope has been deemed (inter alia) unnecessary, cursory, selective, and even unique in summarizing his wanderings in *oratio obliqua*, for everywhere else those narratives are put into the mouth of the poem's main character.[2] Of these objections, the last is at least interesting, because it focuses on the poet's decision to narrate Odysseus' *précis* not in direct speech, but in his own, third-person voice. This article will argue that his decision should be understood within the broader context of the relationship between the poet and Odysseus.[3] Seen in this light, the recapitulation can reveal much about Homer's conception of his craft, and his attitude towards other (competing) *aoidoi*.

* This article is offered as an inevitably inadequate return to the Prof. in Boots for his unfailing humour, support, and instruction. I would like to thank Bill Allan, Bob Cowan, Sophie Gibson, Max Kramer, Martin Revermann, Peter Wilson, and audiences in Oxford and Exeter for their assistance on this piece and its material. All translations are mine.

[1] Cf. Kelly (2007*a*) for a recent treatment and bibliography.

[2] For summary details and references, cf. Heubeck (1989) ad loc., 346–7. Aristarkhos' athetesis of the passage (with which Σ Q V ad loc. already disagrees) proves no more than its attestation, while Aristotle's statement (*Rhet.* 1417[a]13–15) that the recapitulation consisted of 60 verses could either be evidence for a more extensive version (Heubeck), or simply imprecision; see Page (1955), 131 n. 11; cf. Erbse (1972) 175 n. 25. For criticism of the indirect speech here, cf. esp. Cauer (1921–3), 430–2; Schwartz (1924), 332; Theiler (1950), 107–8; Page (1955), 116; Kirk (1962), 249 (ambivalent); Suerbaum (1968), 170–1 and n. 42; Oswald (1993), 106–17; contra, e.g. Danek (1998), 460–1.

[3] The terms 'poet' and 'Homer' are used interchangeably in this article to refer to the author of the *Odyssey* and *Iliad* as we have them. I see no reason not to place their composition in the late 8th or early 7th centuries BC, though sufficient evidence (in type, quanitity and variety) for their emergence into wider Greek consciousness only begins to appear in the middle of the 6th century; cf. West (1995).

1. ODYSSEUS AND HOMER

Let us begin with the fact that the *Odyssey* habitually uses passages of indirect speech for the heroic songs of Phemios and Demodokos (1.325–7; 8.73–83, 499–521).[4] It would, thus, be far from inappropriate to use the same device for one of Odysseus' performances, particularly given how often and thoroughly he is drawn in specifically bardic or quasi-bardic terms.[5] Characters from Alkinoos (11.363–9) to Eumaios (17.518–21) remark on his true and false stories along precisely these lines, and the poet himself makes the link as Odysseus strings his bow (21.406–11), comparing that action with the bard stringing his *phorminx* ('lyre'). Furthermore, though he does not sing, Odysseus uses in the *Apologoi* good epic technique—catalogues (11.235–332, 568–632), *aporiai* (11.328–9; cf. *Il.* 2.484–92), similes (9.51–2, 190–2, etc.), storm scenes,[6] ring composition and doublets.[7] He opens his performance to the Phaeacians with a proem[8] conveying his identity (9.19–21; cf. *Theog.* 22–34; cf. *Hymn. Ap.* 169–76), containing a rhetorical question about the order and content of his story (9.14; cf. e.g. *Il.* 1.8, 2.484–92, 11.299–300, 16.112–13; *Hymn. Ap.* 19 = 207, 25–7)[9] and a topic statement at the beginning of the narrative followed by a transitional relative pronoun (9.37–8; cf. 1.326–7, 8.75–6; *Il.* 1.1–2; *Od.* 1.1; *Theog.* 1–2; *WD* 2–3; *Hymn. Ap.* 1–2; *Hymn. Dem.* 1–3; *Hymn. Aphr.* 1–2; *Theb.* F 1. 1 Bernabé; *Il. parv.* F. 1. 1 Bernabé). We even find the typical juncture between proem and narrative, that moment where archaic poets frequently provide a reinvocation or restatement of the topic (9.37–8; cf. *Il.* 1.6–7; *Od.* 1.10–11; *Theog.* 105–15).

The analogy between the recapitulator and the poem's professional *aoidoi* is, therefore, hardly a tremendous shock. Indeed, with the beginning of

[4] By 'indirect speech' I mean the poet's third-person narration of his characters' performances without quotation. I have, therefore, excluded the song of Ares and Aphrodite (8.266–367), because the poet includes direct quotation of the speeches delivered by the characters within the song (291–5, 305–21, 328–32, 334–43, 346–59), thus blurring the line between himself and Demodokos even further. Nonetheless, the same general principles still apply as for the first and third of the bard's songs, in that the narrative begins from a purported third-person perspective, and closes with the formular *ταῦτ᾽ ἄρ ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός* ('these things did the famous singer sing' 8. 367 = 83 = 521).

[5] A critical commonplace, though it has not to my knowledge been explored to the current purpose; cf. e.g. Fraenkel (1962), 11–15; Suerbaum (1968); Thalmann (1984), 170–3; Goldhill (1991), ch. 1; Segal (1994), 142–63; Clayton (2004), ch. 3; Beck (2005); Schlesier (2006); Minchin (2007), 21–3.

[6] Cf. Fenik (1974), 143–4; de Jong (2001), 594–5.

[7] For these last two, cf. e.g. Most (1989); Tracey (1997) 375–7.

[8] Cf. Lenz (1980), 57–9; de Jong (2001) ad *Od.* 9. 37–8, 229.

[9] Cf. Krischer (1971), 102–4.

Odysseus' *précis* (ἤρξατο 'he began' 23. 310), compare the start of Demodokos' Trojan horse story (ὃ δ᾽ ὁρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἤρχετο, φαῖνε δ᾽ ἀοιδήν 'and starting out from the god he began, and revealed the song' 8.499), as well as the way in which a progression from a starting point into the narrative is achieved (23.310; cf. 8.500), and the repetition of the verb of singing or speaking *within* the narrative to reveal Homer's guiding presence (23.321; cf. 8.514, 516). These similarities are above all a question of control; after allowing Odysseus to speak in his own voice throughout the *Apologoi* and the lying tales, Homer has decided to resume direct management of this most elusive and skilful of speakers. In doing so, he gives the external audience[10] an opportunity to compare this 'last telling' (δεύτατον ἔπος 23.432) with Odysseus' earlier performance to the Phaeacians.

Comparative strategies of this sort are typical of early epic poetry:[11] when, for example, Akhilleus tells Thetis of his quarrel with Agamemnon, he makes it seem that Agamemnon had not agreed to give up Khryseis until Akhilleus himself had suggested it (*Il.* 1.384–6):

> ἄμμι δὲ μάντις
> εὖ εἰδὼς ἀγόρευε θεοπροπίας ἑκάτοιο.
> αὐτίκ᾽ ἐγὼ πρῶτος κελόμην θεὸν ἱλάσκεσθαι
>
> and to us the seer
> knowing well spoke the prophecies of the far-shooter.
> Straightaway I first bade him propitiate the god

This is not, strictly speaking, what happened; after Kalkhas announced the reason for the god's anger (1.92–100), Agamemnon rose in a fury and abused him (101–20), but in the very same speech had conceded that he would have to return the girl to her father (1.117–18). Akhilleus' representation of the story, especially his emphasis on its temporal sequence (**αὐτίκ᾽ ἐγὼ πρῶτος** 'straightaway I first'), fiddles with the truth a little bit.

If Akhilleus can do this in 'his' poem, it is not surprising that Odysseus' version of his encounter with Nausikaa, told to Alkinoos and Arete (*Od.* 7.290–307), should also show this manipulative quality. Here he deflects the blame directed by Alkinoos towards his daughter for not conveying the *xeinos* straight to the palace by telling an outright lie (7.303–6):

[10] Reference from hereon in to 'audience' without further qualification denotes this external group. On the dynamics between the internal and external audiences, cf. Taplin (2001) esp. 33–6, but also 23: 'the internal audiences should not be treated as direct or "literal" evidence for the world of the external audiences—though that does not mean there is *no* relationship between them.' Indeed, as I shall attempt to demonstrate, there is considerable and deliberate crossover between these groups; cf. also below, n. 39.

[11] Cf. de Jong (1985) ~ (2001).

> *ἤρως, μή μοι τοὔνεκ᾽ ἀμύμονα νείκεε κούρην.*
> *ἣ μὲν γάρ μ᾽ ἐκέλευε σὺν ἀμφιπόλοισιν ἕπεσθαι,*
> *ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ οὐκ ἔθελον δείσας αἰσχυνόμενός τε,*
> *μή πως καὶ σοὶ θυμὸς ἐπισκύσσαιτο ἰδόντι*
>
> Hero, do not for my sake find fault with the blameless maid.
> For she bade me follow with her attendants,
> but I was not willing out of fear and shame,
> lest somehow even your *thumos* become angered on seeing

In the poet's narrative, however, it was Nausikaa's concern for public opinion which led to her rather embarrassed suggestion that he enter the palace separately (6.258–96). Comparisons of this sort are not confined to Homer, for when Persephone retells the pomegranate episode to Demeter in the latter's *Homeric Hymn*, her mother's rather pressing question has revealed that Hades' true purpose in offering the fruit was to keep her with him for a third of the year (398–400). Persephone's version therefore adds an element of force to Hades' action (*ἄκουσαν δὲ βίηι με προσηνάγκασσε πάσασθαι* 'but he compelled me against my will by force to eat' 413) which was conspicuously absent from the poet's own narrative (371–4).

The Analysts used to see variations of this sort as evidence for different authors or recensions, the Neoanalysts as evidence for sources.[12] There is, however, a poetic and rhetorical effect to the comparison, for it enables an external audience to see why a character would shape his or her tale in response to the requirements of the situation: Akhilleus is upset and attempting to enlist the aid of his mother, Odysseus is ingratiating himself with the Phaeacians in order to ensure his conveyance home, and Persephone has just realized, too late, the ramifications of her commensality—or whatever it was[13]—with Hades. One should not exclude other interpretations, for instance that Odysseus is motivated by kindly feelings towards Nausikaa, but the common element to all these cases is that they illustrate when and why speakers lie. Characters cannot be trusted, as they have reasons for the stories they tell, motives which may disrupt the direct transit of truth from Muse to mouth. In other words, the more we know of someone, the less reason we have to believe him. The Homeric poet, by contrast, gives his audience no such knowledge or details about himself. So a comparison between the poet's narrative and a character's version of it leads the audience into taking the

[12] For the Analysts, cf. e.g. Kirchhoff (1879), 210 (on Odysseus' falsehood to Alkinoos). Neoanalysts have directed less attention to the *Odyssey* than the *Iliad*, but the efforts of both groups are not confined to discrepancies of the current sort; cf. Fenik (1974), 105–30 for some examples, and Danek (1998), 23–8 for a review of recent scholarship.

[13] The pomegranate, and the significance of its eating, has been the subject of much discussion; cf. Richardson (1974) ad loc., 376; Faraone (1990); also Suter (2002), chs. 3 and 4.

former as the more believable one, and not only because they can compare the specifics of the tales in question. They do this *faute de mieux*, for the poet's is the less obviously biased version. It becomes, in effect, the default narrative.

The recapitulation is a slightly different case from those just discussed, for the audience is now comparing two (formally varied) versions of the same events delivered by the same character,[14] yet the effect is much the same. In general, the reperformance shows (yet again) Odysseus' abilities as a speaker, and his gift at shaping the tale to his audience, here Penelope. He omits any mention of the setback suffered against the Kikones, focusing solely on his initial victory (23.310). This presumably has something to do with the fact that he only brings in the *hetairoi* when absolutely necessary, as with the episode of Helios' cattle (23.329–32), so that the story becomes 'his personal tale of glory and woe,'[15] but some omission around Thrinakia might have been possible or desirable (cf. 12.450–3) simply because this is the second time he has told her this part of his story. During their encounter in book 19, he had pretended that he had heard from the Thesprotian king of Odysseus' mishap with Helios' cattle (19.270–8), which then led straight into his encounter with the Phaeacians (279 f.).[16] That earlier tale also reveals another side of Odysseus' rhetorical skill, for 'Aithon' had omitted Kalypso, the episode bridging the gap in the 'real' story between Thrinakia and the *Phaiakis*. Such sexual prudence may also be seen in the recapitulation, for he makes no mention of Nausikaa despite his promise to pray to her always (8.463–8),[17] and he only mentions Kirke's trickery and deviousness (23.321), not the fact that he had to be reminded by his men to think once more of his return after an entire year had passed in her company (10.469–75). It is therefore entirely in keeping with this quality that, though Kalypso is mentioned, it is only to make clear Odysseus' refusal to stay and be her husband (23.333–7). This does not contradict the situation depicted by the poet on the eve of Odysseus' departure from Ogygia (5.151–8), but the fact that 'the nymph no longer pleased him' (153) shows that his determination to get away was not always so

[14] The final element, the sojourn among the Phaeacians (23.338–41), is of course the compression of the poet's own narrative from the end of book 5 to the start of book 13. In that sense, it may also be rather fitting that the recapitulation finally fulfils the principle of *kata kosmon/moiran katalegein* ('in order/portion to recount').

[15] de Jong (2001), 563.

[16] Penelope is thus placed in a unique circumstance for an internal audience, one almost analogous to that of the external audience, in being able to contrast Odysseus' true and false narratives; cf. in general, Thornton (1970), ch. 10; Austin (1982), 200–38; Murnaghan (1987), ch. 4; Katz (1991); Felson-Rubin (1996); Clayton (2004).

[17] Cf. also Nausikaa's prior farewell (8.461–2), which elicited his promise.

singleminded.[18] In sum, the recapitulation is a combination of personal aggrandizement and strategic omission, a combination which aims to explain to Penelope the length of his absence, but also justifies her choice to wait faithfully for the return of such a worthy figure, who never lost sight of his *nostos* ('return').

The contingent nature of this narrative is brought out not only by its content, but also its position, for the 'lying tales' fall between the *Apologoi* and its recapitulation.[19] Thus the comparison between versions is only made after the poet has depicted a speaker uniquely able to adapt his own tales and experiences to the demands of his situation, and to do so in an explicitly false manner. It is as though Homer has prepared the audience for his resumption of control in the recapitulation by undermining Odysseus' status as a truthful teller of tales, and well before speaks to Penelope. But there is something more to this programme, for its scale has gone well beyond that of the usual comparisons (examined earlier).[20] In fact, its full extent and purpose can only be revealed by an examination of these intervening tales.

2. ODYSSEUS' REPERTOIRE I: THE WANDERING BEGGAR

When Odysseus or another character repeats or refashions a story, there are usually only one or two other versions to compare it with.[21] But with the lying tales we watch a performer develop his story over several tellings. The external audience is placed in a uniquely well-informed situation, one very like that of the scholar studying several performances of basically the same tale delivered by an oral poet over a period of time before several audiences.[22]

[18] Note that the poet *explicitly* connects his desire to return home with this fact (*οὐδέ ποτ᾽ ὄσσε | δακρυόφιν τέρσοντο, κατείβετο δὲ γλυκὺς αἰὼν | νόστον ὀδυρομένωι, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι ἥνδανε νύμφη* 'nor ever were his eyes | wiped dry from tears, but his sweet life flowed away | as he desired his return, since the nymph no longer pleased him' 151–3).

[19] There is an enormous bibliography on these tales; cf. e.g. de Jong (2001), 326–8 for a recent review——adding Clayton (2004), ch. 3; Schlesier (2006); Minchin (2007), 23–6. I have found particularly useful Clay (1983), 86–9; Haft (1984); Goldhill (1991), 36–56; Reece (1994).

[20] Cf. above, pp. 00–00.

[21] One exception is the famous story of the shroud, told by Antinoos at 2.87–110, Penelope herself at 19.129–61, and then Amphimedon at 24.131–7; cf. Heubeck (1989) ad 24.128–46, 274–5 for bibliography.

[22] The most interesting account of such a process remains Lord (1960), esp. ch. 5. The metapoetic function which I am about to suggest for these lying tales would complement very well the theory that the poet is also referring to previous or competing versions of Odysseus' wanderings; cf. e.g. Reece (1994); Danek (1998), 269, 285–6, 364–5 (though he is very cautious). By putting these 'versions' into the mouth of someone who is very like 'personalized' epic poets (below, pp. 00–00), and when he is explicitly lying, the Homeric poet asserts their inferiority to his own story.

Told on four occasions to different interlocutors in the second half of the poem, Odysseus' fake wandering tales revolve around a basic story designed to explain his presence on Ithaka (Table 7.1).[23] This is composed of recurring elements and, though none appears in every tale, the story as a whole is nonetheless recognizably the same from one telling to the next. Indeed, if one omits the third tale to Antinoos, which is the shortest by some way of all the examples, there are three universal elements: the Cretan identity, the presence of Idomeneus, and an involvement in the Trojan War.

We are, I think, justified in talking of three typical elements, despite their omission in the speech to Antinoos in book 17, as there are good reasons for that absence. First, the beggar is providing an admonitory paradigm in fairly short compass, and so requires only the detail that he was once important enough to have led an expedition to Egypt, where he suffered his setback. So, he implies, Antinoos should beware of the mutability of human fortunes, and act accordingly. Secondly, any more precise detail than this might be dangerous; though the elements of Cretan identity and the famous Idomeneus are well beyond the heroic experience to be expected in the young man (Athene) on the shore in book 13, Eumaios in book 14 or even Penelope in book 19,[24] they would be far from outré to the kind of knowledge possessed by someone like Antinoos. Remember that during his speech to the assembly (2.84–128) he gives a small catalogue of famous Greek women surpassed by Penelope (2.118–20), that he uses the paradigm of the Lapithai and Kentauroi (21.287–310),[25] and that has a personal reminiscence of Odysseus (21.93–5). By a member of basileutic society, wherein the telling and hearing of heroic tales is an essential part of social interaction and acculturation,[26] a Cretan identity and link with Idomeneus could be disproved, or at the very least questioned. A connection with Troy would be similarly dangerous, for this is a popular

[23] The table draws extensively on de Jong (2001), 596–7 (with minor additions). I exclude Odysseus' story of the cloak at Troy (14.459–506), which is obviously intended to be 'read' within the template as delivered to Eumaios, and I postpone discussion of the fifth tale to Laertes, which shows considerable divergence from this template; cf. below, pp. 00–00.

[24] I shall return to this Cretan theme later; cf. below, pp. 00–00. Penelope's reputation for intelligence is of course a fundamental theme in the *Odyssey* (above, n. 16), but her capacity to be deceived has already been foregrounded by Eumaios (14.122–32), who also speaks of his own deception by an Aitolian deploying the Cretan theme (14.378–85).

[25] That he doesn't use it well, i.e. not seeing that it is a story of inappropriate behaviour at a wedding feast where the wife is subject to seizure by those who have no right to her, is rather beside the point. Speakers who make use of mythical paradigms in Homer often fail to see the full range of their intimations, as e.g. Agamemnon in his reconciliation with Akhilleus (*Il.* 19.90–133). He does not recognize that his narrative, of a greater man (Herakles) subjected to a lesser man (Eurystheus), is obviously applicable to his own situation vis-à-vis Akhilleus; cf. in general, Alden (2000).

[26] Cf. Olson (1995), esp. chs. 1 and 4.

Table 7.1. Odysseus' lying tales (after de Jong (2001), 596–7)

	13. 253–86 (Athene)	**14. 192–359 (Eumaios)**	**17. 419–44 (Antinoos)**	**19. 165–299 (Penelope)**	**24. 244–97/303–14 (Laertes)**
Cretan identity (name)	256–7 (no name)	199–206 (no name)	— (no name)	172–80 Aithon	— Eperitos
Idomeneus	258–61 murdered son of	235–9 was leader with	—	180–5 is brother of	—
Troy	262–6 fought in	229/235–41 fought in	—	182–3 Idomeneus fought in	— —
Egypt	—	245–86 expedition to; defeated, stays with King	424–43 expedition to; defeated, sold to Kypros	—	—
Phoenicians	272–5 conveyed honourably	287–98 conveyed with intent to sell him as slave	—	—	—
Slavery	—	293–300 Phoenicians intend to sell him as a slave; storm intervenes (cf. below) 334–59 Thesprotians also try to sell him; but he escapes	442–4 Egyptians sell him to Kypros	—	—
Storm	276–86 driven off course to Ithaka	299–313 shipwrecked	—	—	306–7 driven off course to Ithaka

Thesprotia	—	291–2/334–59 reception by King; journey to Doulikhion where Thespr. sailors try to sell him (above)	—	270–92 reception by King; journey to Doulikhion	—
Odysseus	—	321–3 hears from Thesprotian King that Od. is in Dodona	—	185–202/225–48 entertained Od. on his way to Troy 270–99 hears from Thesprotian King of Od.'s adventures, and that Od. is in Dodona	266–79/309–14 entertained Od. in Sikania

Page 185

theme with the suitors (cf. 1.325–7), among whom Amphimedon was *xeinos* to Agamemnon himself (24.105–19), for it could also lead to suspicion about the identity of the aged beggar.[27]

Apart from the three basic elements, therefore, all the others are used twice across the four tales, and on several observable principles—all of which are drawn from, and well exampled in, the poet's own technique. The first is that of ***contiguity***: the Egyptian element is deployed in his second and third tales, the Phoenician in his first and second, the slavery in the second and the third, and the storm in the first and second.[28] Such deliberation on the part of the poet is a scholarly commonplace. Applied to Odysseus' performances, however, it is almost as though we get a picture of him practising elements within his repertoire. The Phoenician theme, for instance, is deployed for the first time for the young man on the beach, where their involvement has an entirely honourable slant which reinforces the traveller's status as someone worthy of their conveyance (13.272–86). But its most powerful deployment comes about when the Phoenicians become the evil slave traders in his second tale, to Eumaios, who had of course suffered this very fate when a child (15.415–84).[29] Odysseus cannot know when he uses the Phoenician theme for the first time that his most important use of the theme will come with his next audience, but the poet is allowing us to see from one tale to the next how Odysseus can use exactly the same theme in an almost completely different way.

Accumulative sequencing of this sort may be observed in Homer's use of hospitality scenes in the first half of the poem.[30] As Reece has observed, the reception of Odysseus on Skheria combines the two receptions of Telemakhos into one scene: for instance, Odysseus is met by the royal child Nausikaa on the beach in the morning and arrives at the palace of Alkinoos at night, whilst Telemakhos is met by Peisistratos on the beach in the morning and arrives at Menelaos' palace at night. The purpose of such contiguity may be defined both from the audience's perspective, viz. in permitting a series of connections and comparisons between father and son,[31] as well as from the poet's, in that it helps him to keep track of the narrative from scene to scene.

Odysseus does it again with the deployment of the Egyptian theme; in its

[27] Note Odysseus' caution in how to deal with Iros as the engagement begins, debating whether to kill him outright or just knock him senseless (18.90–4); he chooses the latter course 'lest the Akhaioi recognize him' (94). Behaviour too obviously heroic is to be avoided at all costs.

[28] Furthermore, the theme of entertaining Odysseus is deployed in the fourth and fifth (to Laertes).

[29] Though delivered after his own narrative, Odysseus obviously knew this story.

[30] Cf. Reece (1993), 192–6.

[31] In this case, undoubtedly magnifying the significance of the scene on Skheria and the capabilities and status of Odysseus.

first occurrence in the second tale (14.245–86), Odysseus shapes the element so that he becomes a figure first of sufficient *pathei mathos* to have supplicated the Egyptian king after being caught raiding his land, and secondly of such respect that he was protected by that king and then honoured by all the Egyptians until an evil Phoenician persuaded the beggar to sail with him. This makes a protreptic point in the circumstance—you should protect and honour me as the Egyptian king honoured Zeus *xeinios* (14.283–4) and protected even an enemy—but it also shows Odysseus as a formerly important and impressive man. Now when he uses this theme in his story to Antinoos, he mentions only the fact of the expedition and that he was then given by the Egyptians to the ruler of Kypros, Dmetor the son of Iason (17.441–3). It has already been suggested that the omission of the three basic elements in this third lying tale was motivated by the desire not to arouse Antinoos' suspicions. One may suspect the same motive in the use of the Egyptian element in this tale, for Odysseus does not wish to suggest to Antinoos that he was a figure of such enormous status to have warranted favourable treatment from both the Egyptian and then the Thesprotian kings, nor even the dubious honour of being thought worthy to kidnap, denude of material possessions, and then sell on for an 'enormous ransom' (*ἄσπετον ὦνον* 14.288–98).

Moreover, in these two tales Odysseus even uses the same thematic progression of (a) Egypt and (b) slavery, but in a different way each time, depending on the interlocutor and the circumstance. In his third tale Odysseus moves straight from the first to the second element, because he only wants to focus on the fact of reversal of fortune and his lowly status (or, more accurately, not suggesting a more important status). However, in the second tale he inserts several events between the two stages: the Phoenician element and attempt to sell him into slavery (14.287–98), a storm (299–313), reception by the Thesprotian king (314–34), then another attempt to make him a slave (334–43) which is only thwarted when he escapes from his kidnappers on Ithaka itself (344–59). Once more, one can observe contiguous developments shaped to the individual requirements of the performance: Odysseus plays up the slavery element in order to appeal to Eumaios' pity, because of the number of times people have planned this against him, and the similarity of their fortune; he plays down the intervening actions when speaking to Antinoos because he doesn't wish him to reflect on the possibility that he was once a noble.

The second principle is the ***progression*** in Odysseus' identity from tale to tale, as he becomes a more important figure across his performances. In the first tale, he is the leader of a separate group of Cretans (13.265–6) hostile to Idomeneus and his son Ortilokhos; in the second, he is the bastard son of Kastor (14.199–204), and was chosen by the people as joint leader with

Idomeneus of the Cretan contingent to Troy (237–9); in the fourth, he becomes Idomeneus' brother (19.181–4) left behind to take care of the island when he went off to Troy. So he moves from being a separate leader hostile to Idomeneus, to a separate leader friendly to Idomeneus, to a related leader friendly to Idomeneus. In other words, the closer Odysseus gets to regaining his identity, the greater the heroic legitimacy of his character through the false tales; as he moves further into his own household (from beggar to tolerated guest, then honoured guest, and finally husband), so his character moves further into Idomeneus' *oikos*.

For this type of progression in the poet's own hands, consider the three episodes in which the disguised beggar is struck by a suitor, first Antinoos (17.411–91), then Eurymakhos (18.349–411), and finally Ktesippos (20.291–319).[32] On every occasion a suitor becomes angry with the beggar and/or issues a threatening speech, hits or attempts to hit Odysseus with an item from the feast, the strike is ineffective, there is a negative reaction to the action, and then Telemakhos' reaction is described. Note the several progressions linking these three episodes. First, the striking instrument becomes both less impressive and effective: initially a throne is used (17.462), then a stool (18.394), and finally a cow's hoof (20.299–300); Odysseus is first hit but unmoved (17.463–4), then he's missed and the stool hits a wine pourer (18.396–8), then the hoof harmlessly hits the wall (20.300–2). Secondly, Odysseus requires progressively less effort to cope with the missile: initially he's hit and maintains his position, then he has to dodge the stool by sitting down rapidly, then he merely has to incline his head. Finally, note the change in Telemakhos' reactions: first he is silent (17.489–91), then he issues a vaguely threatening speech to the suitors (18.405–11), then he openly threatens Ktesippos (20.303–19). In short, as the strikes become less effective, and Odysseus less troubled by them, Telemakhos becomes bolder.

The third of our shared poetic principles in Odysseus' wandering tales is the ***mirroring*** between the second and fourth tales, those delivered to Eumaios and Penelope. By far the largest examples, these two are also the only stories directed at the faithful members of his household with a personal knowledge of Odysseus (the youth on the shore was unknown to him, and Antinoos is hardly a faithful character). The second and fourth are also the only tales in which the beggar actually speaks of Odysseus himself, and so draws out the strength of feeling from an interlocutor whose participation and assistance is, in varying ways, absolutely crucial to his success.

For such a deliberate allusion between two individual examples of an otherwise traditional sequence, compare the many ways in which Menelaos'

[32] Cf. Fenik (1974), 180–8.

Table 7.2. The nostoi of Menelaos and Odysseus

	Menelaos	**Odysseus**
1. Detained on an island	Pharos (4. 351–62)	Ogygia (5. 149 f.)/Thrinakia (12. 325–6)
2. Suffers from starvation	4. 363–9	12. 327–32
3. Assisted by water nymph	Eidotheia (4. 364–427)	Ino Leukotheia (5. 333–53)
3a. Advised by female	Eidotheia (4. 364–427)	Kirke (10. 487–540)
3b. To consult an oracular figure	Proteus	Teiresias
4. Journey to that figure	4. 428–459	10. 542—11. 22
5. Oracular consultation	4. 460–570	11. 90–151
5a. about the end of his life	Elysium (4. 561–9)	death from the sea (11. 134–7)
5b. told to go on another journey	Egypt (4. 471–80)	inland (11. 119–34)
5c. general conversation	Proteus (4. 485–537)	*plures personae* (11. 152–634)

nostos is built as a doublet to the return of Odysseus (Table 7.2).[33] As one can see, the similarities go well beyond the common inheritance of the basic *nostos* template,[34] creating a constructive dialogue between the patterns, in which Menelaos becomes a less important version of Odysseus, his wanderings briefer, less complex and involved, his achievements less impressive. In that regard, note how several elements in Odysseus' *nostos* are marked by an expansion of the parallel element in Menelaos' tale: Odysseus is detained twice (Ogygia, Thrinakia) and Menelaos once (Paros), while Menelaos' single water nymph and adviser (Eidotheia) becomes two figures in Odysseus' case (Ino Leukotheia, Kirke).

Furthermore, in the second and fourth tales we note that Odysseus ***doubles*** one of his elements, the fourth of our poetic principles, and once more in response to the requirements of the situation. When speaking to Eumaios he doubles the element of slavery, for both Phoenicians (14.287–98) and then Thesprotians (334–59) attempt to enslave him. The increased focus is clearly designed to win over Eumaios' sympathy, who had of course 'only' suffered the reversal once. Similarly, in the fourth tale he doubles the Odyssean element, for not only does he assert that he had entertained Odysseus on his way to

[33] Cf. Powell (1970). Of course, two internal narrators here mirror one another's stories, but the poet constructs the similarities between them in order to create a direct comparative dynamic between their events and their protagonists. For an example in the poet's own voice, one could examine the similarities between Odysseus' reception on Skheria and in his own house on Ithaka; cf. Reece (1993), ch. 5. In both places, the hero arrives in disguise, clashes with a group of young men led by a figure whose name is a compound of *Εὐρυ-* (Eurymakhos and Euryalos; cf. Louden (1999) ch. 1, whose pattern would include the *hetairoi* led by Eurylokhos), there is a latent/patent marriage contest (Nausikaa and Penelope) and the hero reveals himself to each group through a typical heroic achievement (athletic contests/storytelling and contest/storytelling/lethal violence).

[34] Cf. Foley (1999), ch. 5.

Table 7.3. Odysseus' final storm (Od.5. 297–355 | 356–87; after Fenik (1974) 143–4)

	First sequence	Second sequence
1. Monologue	5. 297–312	356–64
2. Wave shatters raft	313–23	365–70
3. Od. hangs onto the remnants	324–32	370–5
4. Female deity aids him	333–55 (Ino Leukotheia)	382–7 (Athene)

Troy (19.185–202 ~ 225–48), but also that he then heard of Odysseus' wanderings from the Thesprotian king (270–99). This time the increased focus is designed to elicit an emotional reaction from Penelope, whose affection for the absent figure is under the speaker's spotlight in this speech.

The poet's own use of doublets has been well documented,[35] as indeed has the fact that this is one way of increasing the importance and focus on the sequence so generated. Consider as merely one example the construction of Odysseus' final storm experience (5.297–387) (Table 7.3).[36] The duplication makes this example larger, more complex, and so more impressive, for it is the final time that Poseidon will be able to hamper Odysseus' *nostos*. When Odysseus survives this storm, a swift return to Ithaka is assured.

The relationship between the second and fourth false tales also leads nicely to the fifth poetic principle, ***omission***, the way in which the speaker chooses to leave out elements inappropriate to the interlocutor and the circumstance (again). Aside from the most blatant case, the missing three basic elements in the speech to Antinoos, consider the fact that Odysseus doesn't mention the slavery theme to Penelope, nor indeed any of the stories of plundering and pillage. To Penelope the slavery element would hardly serve the purpose it did with Eumaios, viz. eliciting sympathy because of the similarity in experience. Instead, he's talking now to a noblewoman whose sympathy is best gained by focusing on his own nobility.[37] Secondly, to a woman who has apparently lost her husband in a war of rape revenge, and is besieged by suitors in her household, it would hardly do to let slip his own history in plundering others' resources and women.

Again, it is not difficult to example omissions in Homer's voice, for a great deal of 'oral theory' scholarship has concerned itself largely with identifying

[35] Cf. Fenik (1974), 133–232.

[36] Cf. Fenik (1974), 142–4.

[37] This also helps to explain the particular form of the Odysseus element between the two speeches; in the fourth it is constructed around an actual *xeinos* relationship, bestowing an elevated status on the beggar more appropriate to that of his interlocutor, but comprises the more remote form of simply having heard of him when he speaks to Eumaios in the second tale. Incidentally, the *xeinos* form of the element is then repeated in his fifth false tale, to Laertes in book 24 (cf. below)—another example of contiguity.

narrative patterns and then showing how the poet varies them by, amongst others things, omission. Consider, for example, Patroklos' famous failure to take Peleus' ash spear in his arming scene (16.140–4; taken by Akhilleus at 19.387–91), though there the poet actually comments on his character's omission. A closer parallel would be the way in which Hektor invokes the 'wrath' pattern when speaking to Paris at home in the *Iliad* (6.325–42); according to this pattern, a quarrel within his own community must motivate the hero's withdrawal from the fighting.[38] Here in Troy, however, Hektor can only speak obliquely of Paris' *kotos* as the explanation for his absence from the fray (326), for there has been no *neikos* within the Trojan community to explain the withdrawal. In short, the inappropriateness of Paris' actions is pointed out by the omission of the initial element from the pattern.

In Odysseus' wandering beggar tales, therefore, we see something very much like an oral poet developing a fixed tale over several performances. This tale is composed of repeatable elements and constructed in typical ways, all to the end of generating the most appropriate, sympathetic and meaningful story for its audiences within the poem.[39] Furthermore, the structural principles by which Odysseus shapes his material are precisely those with which the Homeric poet works. So the bardic approximation goes beyond a couple of isolated compliments and the (relatively superficial) formal similarities outlined at the start of this article. Odysseus operates to all intents and purposes almost exactly like an oral poet recomposing in performance. Of course, though the analogy may not be exact in all its details (as we shall see below), any good teller must have more than one tale. He has to be able to respond to audience prompting, as Demodokos does to Odysseus's request for a particular story (*Od.* 8.492–5). Indeed, the possession of more than one story cycle is something to which Phemios appeals (22.347–8) as a sign of his particular favour from the Muses. And, like any good performer, Odysseus does have another story.

3. ODYSSEUS' REPERTOIRE II: THE TRAVELLING NOBLE

Odysseus' narrative to his father Laertes (24.220–362) has caused many a headache, with scholars particularly wondering why so many of the basic details from his previous story should have been discarded, and more often

[38] Cf. Lord (1960), 186–97; Nagler (1974), 131–66; Kelly (2007*b*), 97–8; contra Friedrich (2002), esp. 60–1, 61 n. 36. For a specific treatment of Paris' story as an example of wrathful withdrawal, cf. Collins (1988), 27–35.

[39] These audiences are internal for us, of course, but the direct recipients of Odysseus' performances, and so analogous to the poem's external audience; cf. above, n. 10.

than not concluding that the change is a sign of interpolation.[40] Though it is not my purpose to reopen here the famous case over the end of the *Odyssey*, the preceding analysis offers several good reasons as to why he should have a 'reserve' tale.

First, of course, he is no longer pretending to be a beggar, but a man of some stature. After all, he has just killed the suitors and regained at least some measure of control over his house. Secondly, his beggar story was based on a Cretan character, and it was suggested earlier that such a famous Trojan War element might well have been known to an Ithakan of status. If the risk of premature recognition was great when Odysseus was speaking to the relatively inexperienced Antinoos, then it becomes tremendous when addressing his own father, an older man of no small experience himself (cf. his capture of Nerikos at 24.377–8). In Homeric epic, older men know more, as Odysseus famously asserts to Akhilleus in the *Iliad* (19.216–19), and are therefore frequently seen as authoritative speakers.[41] One very important element in that authority is the knowledge of tales, for this is the kind of thing that mature heroes swap in one another's presence, as one can easily example in the *Odyssey* (e.g. Menelaos and Nestor to Telemakhos), but also in the *Iliad* (e.g. the Meleagros paradigm) and the *Kypria* (Nestor's stories to Menelaos; arg. 27–9 Bernabé). But the crucial parallel comes, perhaps unsurprisingly, from Nestor when he reminds his audience of Peleus' joy in such tales (*Il.* 7.125–8, esp. 128 *πάντων Ἀργείων ἐρέων γενεήν τε τόκον τε* 'telling the family and birth of all the Argives'). None of Odysseus' other interlocutors, potentially, have had the same exposure to epic knowledge.

The risks of revelation in this type of situation are made clear by Penelope herself, as she needs to use a ruse on her own husband to be sure of his identity because of her fear of precisely this sort of deception (23.215–17), yet she has not, according to Eumaios, always been so clever (14.122–32).[42] This leads nicely into the third (and most interesting) reason for dropping the earlier *persona*, as a Cretan connection seems to have been a somewhat

[40] Cf. e.g. West (1989). For passages in which the poet shows an interest in Laertes' situation and fate, cf. 1.188–93, 4.735–54, 11.187–96, 15.353–7, 16.137–53, 22.184–6; also Gainsford (2003) on the entire scene; also above, n. 1. I am concerned here only with the significance of this second story for our understanding of Odysseus in bardic terms, and not with providing a new defence of the passage.

[41] Cf. esp. Preisshoffen (1977); Alden (2000), 74–111; Roisman (2005).

[42] Of course, Odysseus is in no danger from his father (hence the oft-repeated criticism that the testing of Laertes is insufficiently motivated), but the episode is simply another instance of the pattern in which the returned hero tests the various members of his household. One might perhaps remember that there is no 'logical' reason for Odysseus to test his wife with a false tale in book 19, since he had already been told by Athene that she was faithful (13.379–81); cf. e.g. Murnaghan (1987), ch. 4.

well-worn theme for such wandering characters. Eumaios' story of the Aitolian man who deceived him by saying that he saw Odysseus in Krete with Idomeneus (14.378–85), from which the swineherd has learned not to trust people speaking of his master in this way, is delivered in response to Odysseus' rather similar deployment of the same themes (Cretan identity, link with Idomeneus, knowledge of Odysseus). More interestingly, the Aitolian also deploys another typical element in early epic, that of the *metanast* or 'migrant' who is forced to leave home because of a slaying or other trouble in his own community.[43] This will become important later on, but for now note that other figures were using the same type of elements as Odysseus himself, in much the same way—as well as some others. If even Eumaios, with his limited experience, can provide such a serious check on Odysseus' story, then all the more reason for him to be careful with this aspect of his self-presentation.

There are, then, several good reasons for Odysseus to abandon the wandering beggar *persona* before speaking to Laertes, and so the analogy between the poet of the *Odyssey* and his main character continues. Like the Aitolian, Odysseus has a false tale which deploys similar elements; unlike him, but (once more) like the bards of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus even has a second story to tell when his first loses its appeal, before a potentially difficult or sceptical audience. Odysseus *polytropos*, *polymêkhanos*, *polymêtis*—and now *polymuthos*.

4. POETIC CHARACTERS: ODYSSEUS AND HESIOD

Among all these examples of Odysseus—and possible rivals—deploying poetic techniques in false tales, there is one thing he does which Homer does not: he uses episodes from his personal experience.[44] In his third tale, for instance, he weaves into the Phoenician attempt to enslave him a description of the storm preventing the unhappy circumstance very like that which he encountered after leaving Thrinakia: no land but sea and sky appears (14.301^{b}–2 = 12.403^{b}–4); a dark cloud appears (14.303–4 = 12.405–6); Zeus thunders and destroys the ship (14.305–7 = 12.415–17); all the companions are killed (14.308–9 = 12.418–19); Odysseus is saved by hanging on to a piece of ship's equipment (*histos* 14.310–3 ~ *histos* and *tropis* lashed together

[43] Cf. Martin (1992); also below, pp. 00–00 and n. 61.

[44] Of course there's no telling whether the Homeric poet ever did this or not; the point is that he gives his audience no reason to believe that he is doing so.

(12.420–5).[45] Such personalization is perhaps unsurprising, because Odysseus' stories are told to explain his present circumstance, and he is always speaking about himself.

Yet we may add this to the several indications that, in spite of his skill with typical stories and their elements, Odysseus is *not* directly or totally analogous to a poet on the Homeric model. So, for instance, apart from the obvious difference between their first- and third-person narratives, Odysseus needs to resort to naming Kalypso as his source to explain how he knows of Helios' conversation with Zeus (12.374–90, esp. 389–90); Homer of course has no such need.[46] This is a function of his relationship with the Muses, and it is one very much like that enjoyed by both Phemios and Demodokos.[47] In the Homeric model of self-presentation or, more accurately, self-abnegation, the distance of the bard from the events of which he sings increases his reliance on the Muses for their accurate representation.[48] Demodokos in particular seems to enjoy the artistic benefits of that relationship, in that the truthful qualities of his first song are explicitly praised by someone who was there at the sack of Troy (8.487–91). Indeed, the whole performance is shaped as a test of the poet's accuracy, for Odysseus prompts him with a promise to spread his repute among men 'if you relate *to me* these things in order' (496). By confirming the veracity of Demodokos' performance, Odysseus confirms the Homeric poet's own strategy of third-person narrative for, like Demodokos, Homer sings things of which he can have no personal knowledge.[49]

[45] A less direct example is the way in which his arrival on Skheria (5.374–493) becomes his escape from the Thesprotians (14.350–9), for in both cases he swims to safety and is sheltered under some flora. Consider also how he deploys the theme of fruitlessly warning his men after an initial raiding success, first in the Kikonian episode (9.43–53) and then in the Egyptian theme in his tales to Eumaios and Antinoos (14.259–70 = 17.428–39).

[46] Cf. esp. Suerbaum (1968), 154–61; Lenz (1980), 110–19.

[47] The relationship between the Homeric poet and the Muse is obviously a large topic, and the following list is by no means exhaustive; cf. e.g. Minton (1960); Maehler (1963), chs. 1 and 2; Lenz (1980), 27–40; Murray (1981); Walsh (1984), ch. 1; Thalmann (1984), 78–56; de Jong (1987), 49–50; Finkelberg (1990); Bowie (1993), 8–20; Minchin (1995); Finkelberg (1998); Latacz (2003) ad *Il.* 2.484–93, 140–1.

[48] This need not suggest a fundamental difference between poet and Muse(s), as has been argued by Finkelberg (1998) in terms of a poetics of 'responsibility' and 'non-responsibility'. Instead, their relationship is precisely that which pertains for other figures in the epic world ('double determination'), which means that any action's causation can be explained simultaneously—and interconnectedly—on the mortal and divine planes. Notice how Odysseus' praise of Demodokos' accuracy combines the Muse and Apollo (488) with the idea of autopsy and source criticism (491) without apparently feeling a fundamental difference between the two. The same combination is to be found in Phemios' famous claim 'I am self-taught, but the god has put in my mind all sorts | of song paths' (22.347–8).

[49] The ancients would certainly agree that 'in einem Sänger wie Demodokos dürfen wir das Spiegelbild des Odyssee-Dichters erkennen' (Suerbaum (1968), 166); cf. Graziosi (2002), 138–63; Schuol (2006); also above, n. 5.

So we are left with a partial analogy between Odysseus and the bard. On the one hand, Odysseus is like an Homeric oral poet working through his repertoire of stories in a manner closely paralleled in the work of Homer himself: choosing which stories to tell; adjusting them to his audiences; picking and choosing from typical elements within those tales; and so on. On the other, Odysseus is unlike such a figure in all sorts of important ways: his narratives are told in the first person; they use details from experience in poetic form; he relies on 'real' sources for his knowledge. So is there any purpose to the approximation, if it is eventually to founder on these rocks? One might contend that this is simply a more extended or sophisticated version of the strategy discussed above with regard to Odysseus' story to Alkinoos.[50] Yet the picture is too detailed, complex and constant to be restricted in this way. In fact, the quasi-bardic qualities of Odysseus are so prominent that one must suspect another purpose to Homer's construction of his performances.

This motive, I suggest, has something to do with the fact that Odysseus' individualized *personae* are very similar in form and function to the Hesiodic strategy of constructing his own *persona* from a series of epic or, more appropriately, 'epicizing' details. Like Homer with Odysseus, Hesiod uses these details to give us a background next to which we can measure that authority, but this time they serve that purpose directly. Note that *he* met the Muses and was given the 'epic' staff to symbolize his gift of speech (*Theog.* 30–1);[51] that *he* competed and was victorious in a funeral contest (*WD* 650–9);[52] that *he* is involved in a *neikos* ('quarrel') with his brother for the family *dasmos* ('division') (*WD* 27–41);[53] and that *his* father was a metanast (*WD* 633–40).[54] All these are typical epic themes, but now applied to the figure of the poet himself, and not his characters. I hasten to add that I am not trying to reinvigorate an 'Entdeckung des Geistes' model of cultural development. Instead, as Griffith has noted, [55]

> … the techniques of self-reference in Hesiod belong to traditions much older than Homer himself and shared by other early Greek poets … Hesiod's personal and autobiographical remarks always serve a specific and necessary function within the

[50] Cf. above, pp. 00–00.

[51] Cf. West (1966) ad loc., 163–4. For the sceptre in heroic contexts, cf. e.g. *Il.* 1.234–7, 1.245–6, 2.100–9, 2.185–6, 18.505–6, 23.566–9; *Od.* 2.37–8, 2.80–1.

[52] Though this is of course a contest specifically in song. For athletic contests apart from the Funeral Games for Patroklos, cf. *Il.* 5.802–8, 23.629–43, 23.678–80; *Od.* 8.94–256, 24.85–92; *Kypria* arg. 22–4 Bernabé.

[53] For other *neikea* arising from the sharing out of goods or resources, apart from the quarrel between Akhilleus and Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1, cf. *Il.* 15.187–99, 23.540–65, 566–613; *Od.* 8.75–82, 11.543–64; 14.207–10; *Aithiopis* arg. 23–4 Bernabé; *Thebais* F 2. 9–10 Bernabé.

[54] Cf. below, n. 61.

[55] Griffith (1983), 37.

contexts in which they occur, and should be viewed in these terms rather than as gratuitous self-revelation and reminiscence.

All of the so-called 'personal' details help to form and strengthen Hesiod's qualifications as a source of wisdom and authority.[56] Odysseus could, of course, rely on his greater age and wisdom (cf. *Il.* 19.216–19),[57] but his authority also came from the usual heroic mixture of an ability 'to fulfil his word and action' (*Od.* 2.272). A large part of his conciliar ability depends on his *ethos* (broadly defined), for in early epic poetry what matters above all is who you are, and not necessarily what you say.[58] If you do not have the status to speak, you might as well shut up—or risk the kind of beating handed out to Thersites. In making his claim on an audience's trust, Hesiod taps directly into this 'ethical' source, and his reasons for doing so explain the *Theogony*'s famous lying Muses (*ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα, | ἴδμεν δ', εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι* 'we know how to speak many lies like truth, | and we know, when we wish, how to sing truth' *Theog.* 27–8).[59] Scholars have seen in this extraordinary statement Hesiodic self-criticism, or an expression of intertextuality with Homer (cf. *Od.* 19.203), but I suggest that it is a riposte to the Homeric model of poetic self-presentation, which works, as we saw, by deflecting the audience's attention from the poet and relying largely on the authority of the truth-speaking Muses.

By contrast, Hesiod proceeds on the basis that the Muses can lie. A mortal can never fully know the divine intention, and they are thus a risky

[56] Cf. Griffith (1983); Thalmann (1984), 152–3; Stein (1990), 8–12; Stoddard (2004), ch. 3.

[57] Cf. above, pp. 00–00.

[58] Status derived from birth is not an automatic source of conciliar authority or influence, for it must be reinforced by the individual's own achievements. Consider, for example, Diomedes' development as a speaker in the *Iliad*. He is first abused by Agamemnon in the *Epipolesis* for being good only in speech and not battle, unlike his father (4.364–400)—a comparison made again, though humorously, by Athene (5.799–813). Diomedes does not respond directly to this abuse, even silencing Sthenelos after the latter's angry retort (4.411–18), but he spends the next two days of battle as the most prominent of warriors, and his is the first voice rejecting the Trojans' offer of partial recompense (7.399–402) as well as rebuking Agamemnon's serious suggestion of retreat (9.31–49). In both of these cases, his exuberant response is only partially suitable to the circumstance (i.e. refusing the peace offer and reproving Agamemnon), and another speaker (Agamemnon and Nestor) addresses a practical response to the situation (accepting the truce, fixing their military reversal). When Diomedes next speaks in the council of book 14 (leaving aside the *Dolôneia*), the enthusiastic and angry response to another suggestion of retreat from Agamemnon is now delivered by Odysseus (82–102), whilst it is left to Diomedes to provide the practical measures required in the circumstance (109–32). From the youthful and abrasive speaker of books 7 and 9, he has become a practical advisor, but this is only possible because of his military exploits and the lessons learned from previous, and less successful, attempts at public speech.

[59] The bibliography on the lying Muses is predictably large; cf. e.g. Verdenius (1972); Stroh (1976); Pucci (1977), ch. 1; Thalmann (1984), 146–9; Nagy (1990), 44–7; Arrighetti (1996); Stein (1990); Stoddard (2004), ch. 3; Tsagalis (2006).

proposition as an unequivocal source of truth. He does not, of course, seek to replace the Muses; one can see from his invocation during the *Nautilia*, where he advises Perses on sailing despite his lack of personal experience (*WD* 618–94, esp. 660–2 *τόσσον τοι νηῶν γε πεπείρημαι πολυγόμφων·* | *ἀλλὰ καὶ ὣς ἐρέω Ζηνὸς νόον αἰγιόχοιο·* | *Μοῦσαι γάρ μ᾽ ἐδίδαξαν ἀθέσφατον ὕμνον ἀείδειν* 'so far is my experience of much-nailed ships; | but even so I will speak the mind of Zeus who holds the *aigis*; | for the Muses have taught me to sing divine song'), that they remain an essential part of his poetic authority. Yet they are now to be augmented. If one cannot trust divine inspiration alone, then the believability of any poetic narrative is up for grabs, and the audience will trust the character they find most trustworthy. So, Hesiod's sceptre suggests his authority and right to speak, as does his rather relevant triumph in the funeral games for Amphidamas. That he is involved in a *neikos* over a *dasmos* elevates his story, and of course his status, to that of an epic hero wrongfully deprived of his *timê* ('honour') or *geras* ('prize').[60] Finally, that his father was a metanast summons to the contest the conciliar authority so often possessed by these figures, and underlines the mutual dependence in, or closeness of, the relationship between Hesiod and Perses.[61] Yet again, these latter themes particularly make the protreptic of the *Works and Days* more powerful but, even in isolation, the *Theogony*'s *Dichterweihe* adds tremendously to Hesiod's claim to know the divine genealogies and the origin of the cosmos.

The further importance of *metanasteia* for my current purpose becomes

[60] Given the likelihood of withdrawal by the epic hero who suffers this kind of derogation (above, n. 37), Hesiod's continued attempts to persuade his brother back to the good side cast him as an even more sympathetic and authoritative speaker. In this, Hesiod also (suggests that he) avoids the particular loss usually suffered by the wrathful hero, due to his intransigence (e.g. Meleagros loses the *timê*, Akhilleus his friend), before his return to the community.

[61] Cf. Martin (1992). He rightly focuses on the metanast's conciliar authority, usually derived from the fact of their greater age (as e.g. Phoinix, Patroklos, Theoklymenos), yet attachment to another's household needs also to be viewed in terms of the relationship between the speakers. Phoinix's story of his departure from his father's house focuses on his bond with Akhilleus, and so increases the persuasive power of his advice, in that Phoinix can have no other motive than Akhilleus' benefit. He introduces his advice (*Il.* 9.496 f.) *only after* the long narrative of his subsequent attachment to Peleus' household (434–95), which is opened by a personal statement of dependence (434–8, esp. 437–8 'how then, dear child, could I be left alone from you') and closed by an admission of the purpose behind his careful tendance of the youthful Akhilleus (485–95, esp. 494–5 'but I considered you my son, Akhilleus, so that you ward dread destruction from me'). Similarly, Patroklos focuses on their close relationship in life as a paradigm for their relationship in death (*Il.* 23.82–92), as well as reason for Akhilleus to hurry his burial now (69–81). Finally, Theoklymenos' attachment to Telemakhos' household is uncertain until he proves his goodwill through the interpretation of the omen on Ithaka (*Od.* 15.529–38). Before that interpretation, Telemakhos had been prepared to send him to the house of Eurymakhos (518–24); after it, he entrusts him to the care of Peiraios (539–47), from whom he fetches him before even speaking at any length to his mother (17.52–6, 71–84). In all these cases, personal attachment is an integral part of the metanast's conciliar authority.

clear when we remember that the Aitolian wanderer had employed this theme when speaking to Eumaios, as the swineherd tells his disguised master (14.378–85). *Metanasteia* provides a strong motive for the establishment of a reciprocal link between the figures in question, in that protection of the fugitive is an index of the host's power and authority, while the metanast himself is a useful as well as sympathetic figure.[62] The Aitolian, one may surmise, had used the theme for precisely that purpose, i.e. to impose a favourable impression of himself on Eumaios and so increase the quality and quantity of his reception. Odysseus tries to do this, as we have already seen in his tales, but also in making explicit trial of his swineherd to get a cloak out of him (14.459–506, esp. 459–61).[63] Hesiod is not trying to get a cloak out of anyone, of course, but he is trying to impose an authoritative *persona* on Perses, the *basileis*, and his external audience, and the metanastic theme provides him with the perfect tool to do so, for such a figure connotes the wisdom, conciliar ability, and personal connection required to make his song persuasive. It is another of his *persona's* epicizing traits, and it underlines powerfully, once again, Hesiod's similarity with the lying speakers in the *Odyssey*.

The direction of the argument should be clear by now: Homer's Odysseus is constructed in bardic terms so thoroughly and in so many ways *precisely because* he is intended to reflect contemporary epic singers of the Hesiodic stamp. Odysseus (not to mention the Aitolian) is a portrait of the personalized poets with whom Homer himself was competing, poets whose strategies of self-presentation depended on the 'epic' qualities exemplified in the work of Hesiod. I do not suggest here a direct intertextual reference from Homer to Hesiod or *vice versa*, for by the time we encounter the first extant constructions of the poetic *persona* in Homer and Hesiod, their strategies are already fully and sophisticatedly worked out.[64] They are thus a part of the traditional inheritance.[65]

[62] Cf. last n.; also Tsagalis (2006), 110–13.

[63] Cf. also 15.304–24, where he makes another trial of Eumaios, this time to test the strength of his commitment to his new guest.

[64] Cf. Griffith (1983), 37 (above, p. 00). One should not preclude *a priori* the (largely Neoanalytical) suggestion of the possibility of direct intertextuality (viz. references to a specific version of a traditional story or theme rather than simply that story or theme itself) at the earliest stage in the visible history of Greek literature, but I am unconvinced by the existing attempts; cf. Kelly (2007*b*), 12 n. 41. More fruitful in this regard may prove a combination of traditional Neoanalytical method with an oralist perspective; cf. esp. Reece (1994) and Danek (1998), and more generally Burgess (2001).

[65] Another agonistic engagement of this traditional sort (which could be interpreted intertextually) is Hesiod's reference to the fact that 'beggar envies beggar and bard envies bard' (*καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῶι φθονέει καὶ ἀοιδὸς ἀοιδῶι WD* 26). Given that the disguised Odysseus and the Aitolian are both of reduced position, I suggest, firstly, that a disguise of this sort was a

Of course, Homer's agonism is not entirely or simply hostile, for Odysseus is a carefully and lovingly crafted creation. One could not imagine an early epic poem whose main character is someone with whom the audience is intended to have no sympathy, or for whom no admiration. So Homer is concerned not to damn entirely these alternative models of poetic authority, just to advertise and assert his own superiority in that regard.[66] Nor does the process only go one way. Hesiod's pointed reference to lying Muses makes most sense within a similarly agonistic engagement, and it is no coincidence that he has them mention their ability to make 'false things like true' in terms very close to those in which Odysseus deceives his wife in their meeting (*ἴσκε ψευδέα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα* 'he likened in his speaking many lies to truth' 19.203).[67] Again, this is not an intertextual reference, but a shared—if oppositional—participation in a traditional discourse of poetic presentation: Homer's Odysseus deploys the qualities and elements on which Hesiod's *persona* relies, while Hesiod appropriates that potentially deceptive skill and applies it instead to the Muses themselves.

CONCLUSION: HOMER'S ODYSSEUS

Going far beyond the usual poetic strategies of comparison, Homer decided to draw the hero *polytropos* not merely as a foil for his own truthful exercise in poetry, but also as a pointed and detailed allusion to his competitors and their

traditional *persona*, of the sort witnessed in Greek (and other) literature in the Archaic (Hipponax 24–5 Diehl = 32–4 West) and Hellenistic (Theokritos 16) periods, including the 'potter's song' preserved in the Herodotean life of Homer (433–61 Allen); cf. Merkelbach (1952). It is a consistent topos in these poems that 'die Muse des Vaganten nach Brot geht', which theme Segal (1994), 156–9 amply parallels in the Odyssean context. Therefore, *WD* 26 is another part of Hesiod's response to the (type of) criticism expressed by Homer, a response which associates the wandering beggar *persona* with the bard on equal terms; cf. Stein (1990), 28–9 for another interpretation. In this connection, Peter Wilson suggests to me that Eumaios' inclusion of the (perhaps wandering) bard among the 'workers for the people' (*δημιοεργοί Od.* 17.383) may be closer to the Hesiodic paradigm; though it strikes me that the swineherd's statement could apply to the Homeric model as well, it would be further evidence that Homer was familiar with this alternative strategy.

[66] Max Kramer suggests to me the analogy of Vergil's invocation of Gallus in his tenth *Eclogue*, viz. that Homer's poetry can embrace the entire spectrum of poetic engagement and self-presentation, much as Vergil's pastoral can recreate and appropriate the terms of Gallan love elegy; cf. Clausen (1994), 288–92. Though I find his approach too temporally predetermined, cf. also Tsagalis (2006), 124 (on the *Nautilia*): 'the Hesiodic tradition . . . does not "condemn" the Homeric tradition to silence but uses it as the necessary background against which it will "issue" its poetical *manifesto*.'

[67] Cf. above, p. 00.

methods. As Rutherford astutely remarks, 'what matters for the *Odyssey* is that the hero's persuasive falsehoods associate him with the art of the poet',[68] though the association between Homer and his hero is never absolute. It is certainly less thorough than Hesiod's self-characterization in heroic terms, and deliberately so. When the poet moves in the recapitulation to reassert control over Odysseus' narrative, it is the concluding stroke to the *Odyssey*'s suggestions of its superiority. The portrait of the hero as a rival has been on show long enough; it is time to put it back in the attic.

The 'metapoetic' quality of the *Odyssey* (and, to a lesser extent, the *Iliad*)[69] has long been noticed, and the recapitulation shows that it extends beyond musings about poetry and its delights to reveal Homer's immediate and palpable desire to outmatch his rivals. A similar imperative drives Hesiod, but Homer stakes his claim to truth and credibility by contrasting the ideal performances of Phemios and Demodokos with the equally, if not more, enjoyable stories of the *Odyssey*'s main character. Yet its poet goes to extraordinary lengths to show us that you can never trust a character; a good tale is not necessarily a truthful one, a good teller not for that reason to be trusted. By his performances shall ye know him.

REFERENCES

Alden, M. (2000), *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad*, Oxford.

Arrighetti, G. (1996), 'Hesiod et les Muses: Le don de la vérité et la conquête de la parole', *Athenaeum* 80: 45–63.

Austin, N. (1982), *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in the Odyssey*, Berkeley.

Beck, D. (2005), 'Odysseus: Narrator, Storyteller, Poet?', *CPh* 100: 213–27.

Bowie, E. (1993), 'Lies, Fiction and Slander in Early Greek Poetry', in C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter), 1–37.

Burgess, J. (2001), *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*, Baltimore.

Cauer, P. (1921–3), *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*, 3rd ed., Leipzig.

Clausen, W. (1994), *A Commentary on Virgil: Eclogues*, Oxford.

[68] Rutherford (1992) ad 19. 203, 165; cf. also the works cited above, n. 5.

[69] Cf., e.g. Taplin (1980) ~ (2001); Taplin (2003), 33–6, esp. 36: ' . . . there are still metapoetic assumptions that it seems safe to transfer as aspirations to the world of Homer and his audience—in fact it seems unreasonable not to: the beauty of poetry, its skilled musical accompaniment, its sweet delight, the way it charms its audience, they way it reduces them to spellbound silence; and the poet as someone who is held in special esteem, someone who conveys some special kind of wisdom as well as pleasure.'

Clay, J. S. (1983), *The Wrath of Athene: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*, Princeton.
—— (1989), *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*, Princeton.
Clayton, B. (2004), *A Penelopean Poetics: Reweaving the Feminine in Homer's* Odyssey, Lanham.
Collins, L. (1988), *Studies in Characterisation in the Iliad*, Frankfurt am Main.
Danek, G. (1998), *Epos und Zitat: Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee*,Vienna.
Erbse, H. (1972), *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee*, Berlin.
Faraone, C. A. (1990), 'Aphrodite's *ΚΕΣΤΟΣ* and Apples for Atalanta: Aphrodisiacs in Early Greek Myth and Ritual', *Phoenix* 44: 219–43.
Felson-Rubin, N. (1996), 'Penelope's Perspective: Character from Plot', in S. Schein (ed.), *Reading the Odyssey* (Princeton), 163–84.
Fenik, B. (1974), *Studies in the Odyssey*, Stuttgart.
Finkelberg, M. (1990), 'A Creative Oral Poet and the Muse', *AJPh* 111: 293–303.
—— (1998), *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece*, Oxford.
Foley, J. M. (1999), *Homer's Traditional Art*, Philadelphia.
Fraenkel, E. (1962), *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, Munich.
Friedrich, R. (2002), 'Oral Composition-by-Theme and Homeric Narrative', in F. Montanari and D. Ascheri (eds.), *Omero: Tremila anni dopo* (Rome), 41–71.
Gainsford, P. (2003), 'Formal Analysis of Recognition Scenes in the *Odyssey*', *JHS* 123: 41–49.
Goldhill, S. (1991), *The Poet's Voice*, Cambridge.
Graziosi, B. (2002), *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*, Cambridge.
Griffith, M. (1983), 'Personality in Hesiod', *CA* 2: 37–65.
Haft, A. (1984), 'Odysseus, Idomeneus and Meriones: The Cretan Lies of the *Odyssey*', *CJ* 79: 289–306.
Heubeck, A. (1989), in id. and A. Hoekstra, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey Volume II: Books IX–XVI*, Oxford.
Hölscher, U. (1989), *Die Odyssee: Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman*, Munich.
Jong, I. de (1985), '*Iliad* 1. 366–92: A Mirror Story' *Arethusa* 18: 1–22, reprinted with minor revisions in D. L. Cairns (2001) (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford), 478–95.
—— (1987), *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*, Amsterdam.
—— (2001), *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*, Cambridge.
Katz, M. (1991), *Penelope's Renown: Meaning and Indeterminacy in the Odyssey*, Princeton.
Kelly, A. (2007*a*), 'How to End an Orally-Derived Epic Poem', *TAPhA* 137: forthcoming.
—— (2007*b*), *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer Iliad VIII*, Oxford.
Kirchhoff, A. (1879), *Die homerische Odyssee und ihre Entstehung*, Berlin.
Kirk, G. S. (1962), *The Songs of Homer*, Cambridge.
Krischer, T. (1971), *Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epik*, Munich.

Latacz, J. (2003), *Homers Ilias, Gesamtkommentar: Band II: Zweiter Gesang (B)*, Munich.
Lenz, A. (1980), *Das Proöm des frühen griechischen Epos*, Bonn.
Lord, A. B. (1960), *The Singer of Tales*, Cambridge, Mass.
Louden, B. (1999), *The Odyssey: Structure, Narration, and Meaning*, Baltimore.
Maehler, H. (1963), *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars*, Göttingen.
Maronitis, D. N. (1981), 'Die erste Trugrede des Odysseus in der Odyssee: Vorbild und Variationen', in G. Kurz, D. Müller, and W. Nicolai (eds.), *Gnomosyne: Menschliches Denken und Handeln in der frühgriechischen Literatur* (Munich), 117–34.
Martin, R. (1992), 'Hesiod's Metanastic Poetics', *Ramus* 21: 11–33.
Merkelbach. R. (1952), 'Bettelgedichte', *RhM* 95: 312–27.
Minchin, E. (1995), 'The Poet Appeals to his Muse: Homeric Invocations in the Context of Epic Performance', *CJ* 91: 25–33.
—— (2007), 'Storytelling in Oral Traditional Epic', in C. Cooper (ed.), *Politics of Orality* (Leiden), 3–38.
Minton, W. W. (1960), 'Homer's Invocation of the Muses: Traditional Patterns', *TAPhA* 91: 292–309.
Most, G. W. (1989), 'The Structure and Function of Odysseus' *Apologoi*', *TAPhA* 119: 15–30.
Murnaghan, S. (1987), *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey*, Princeton.
Murray, P. (1981), 'Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece', *JHS* 101: 87–100.
Nagler, M. N. (1974), *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*, Berkeley.
Nagy, G. (1990), *Greek Mythology and Poetics*, Ithaca.
Olson, S. D. (1995), *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in the Odyssey*, Leiden.
Oswald, R. (1993), *Das Ende der Odyssee*, Graz.
Page, D. (1955), *The Homeric Odyssey*, Oxford.
Powell, B. (1970), 'A Narrative Pattern in the Homeric Tale of Menelaos', *TAPA* 101: 419–31.
Preisshofen, F. (1977), *Untersuchungen zur Darstellung des Greisenalters in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Wiesbaden.
Pucci, P. (1977), *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry*, Baltimore.
Reece, S. (1993), *The Stranger's Welcome*, Ann Arbor.
—— (1994), 'The Kretan Odyssey: A Lie Truer than Truth', *AJPh* 115: 157–74.
Richardson, N. J. (1974), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford.
Roisman, H. (2005), 'Nestor the Good Counsellor', *CQ* 55: 17–38.
Rutherford, R. (1992), *Homer: Odyssey XIX and XX*, Cambridge.
Schadewaldt, W. (1965), 'Die Gestalt des homerischen Sängers', in id., *Von Homers Welt und Werk*, 4th ed. (Stuttgart), 54–86.
Schlesier, R. (2006), 'Transgressionen des Odysseus', in A. Luther (ed.), *Geschichte und Fiktion in der Odyssee* (Munich), 107–16.
Schuol, M. (2006), 'Sänger und Gesang in der *Odyssee*', in A. Luther (ed.), *Geschichte und Fiktion in der Odyssee* (Munich), 139–62.

Schwartz, E. (1924), *Die Odyssee*, Munich.
Segal, C. (1994), *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey*, Ithaca.
Stein, E. (1990), *Autorbewußtsein in der frühen griechischen Literatur*, Tübingen.
Stoddard, K. (2004), *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod*, Leiden.
Stroh, W. (1976), 'Hesiods lügende Musen', in H. Gorgemanns and E. Schmidt (eds.), *Studien zum antiken Epos* (Meisenheim am Glan), 90–7.
Suerbaum, W. (1968), 'Die Ich-Erzählungen des Odysseus', *Poetica* 2: 150–77.
Suter, A. (2002), *The Narcissus and the Pomegranate*, Ann Arbor.
Taplin, O. (1980), 'The Shield of Achilles within the *Iliad*', *G&R* 27: 1–21, reprinted with minor revisions in D. L. Cairns (2001) (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford), 342–64).
—— (2003), 'The Spring of the Muses', in O. Taplin (ed.), *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (Oxford), 22–57.
Thalmann, W. (1984), *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, Baltimore.
Theiler, W. (1950), 'Vermutungen zur Odyssee' *MH* 7: 102–22.
Thiel, H. van (1991), *Homeri Odyssea*, Hildesheim.
Thornton, A. (1970), *People and Themes in Homer's Odyssey*, Dunedin.
Tracey, S. (1997), 'The Structure of the Odyssey' in I. Morris and B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden), 360–79.
Trahman, C. (1952), 'Odysseus' Lies', *Phoenix* 6: 31–43.
Tsagalis, C. (2006), 'Poet and Audience: from Homer to Hesiod', in F. Montanari and A. Rengakos (eds.), *La Poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d' un genre littéraire* (Geneva), 79–130.
Verdenius, W. J. (1972), 'Note on the Proem of *Hesiod's* Theogony', *Mnemosyne* 25: 225–60.
Walsh, G. (1984), *The Varieties of Enchantment*, Chapel Hill.
West, M. L. (1966), *Hesiod: Theogony*, Oxford.
—— (1995), 'The Date of the *Iliad*', *MH* 52: 203–19.
West, S. (1981), 'An Alternative Nostos for Odysseus', *LCM* 7: 169–75.
—— (1989), 'Laertes Revisited', *PCPhS* 35: 113–43.
Woodhouse, W. J. (1930), *The Composition of Homer's Odyssey*, Oxford.