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PREFACE

THIS volume is designed as a continuation of the commentary on the Odyssey which was begun, more than a quarter of a century ago, by the late Mr. Riddell of Balliol. As all scholars are aware, the first part of the projected work, comprising books i–xii, was completed by Dr. Merry and published in 1875. A second edition, with a good deal of new matter, appeared in 1885.

In the present state of scholarship an editor of Homer is almost obliged to form some opinion on the multifarious issues which make up the 'Homeric question.' I have therefore been led to add Appendices of somewhat unusual length, containing a statement of the views which seem to me on the whole the most in accordance with the existing evidence. In the course of this work I found it desirable to reproduce the substance (and occasionally the language) of two papers on the Epic Cycle which appeared in the Journal of Hellenic Studies (in the volumes for 1883 and 1884). I have to thank the Hellenic Society for permitting this, and also for allowing me to use the illustrations of the Homeric House which will be found on pp. 490, 491, 497.

A similar acknowledgement is due to Dr. Valtýr Guðmundsson for the sketch of a mediaeval Icelandic megaron on p. 218, and to Mr. W. A. Craigie of Oriel for directing my attention to the interesting parallel which it offers to the Mycenaean house. I have also had much help on this and other archaeological points from Mr. J. L. Myres of Christ Church and Mr. G. C. Richards of Oriel. Mr. Raper of Trinity has aided me by his opinion on many doubtful passages.

Oxford,
August 12, 1901.

D. B. MONRO.
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"Οδυσσέας ἀπόπλους παρὰ Φαιάκων καὶ ἀφίξει εἰς Ἰθάκην.

'Ως ἐφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοτο σιωπῆ, κηληθῶς δ' ἐσχοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκείβετα. τὸν δ' αὐτ' Ἀλκίνοος ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε· ἀὼ ὁ Ὀδυσσέας, ἕπει ἵκευ ἐμὲν ποτὲ χαλκοβατὲς δῶ, ὑπερφέρες, τῷ οὗ τι παλιμπάγχέταντα γ' ἄω ἂψ ἀπονοσθέσειν, εἰ καί μάλα πολλὰ πέσονθας, ὑμέων δ' ἀνδρὶ ἐκάστῳ ἐφιέμευος τάδε εἴρω, ὅσοι εἰνι μεγάροισι γεροῦσιν αἴθοπα οἶνον αἰεὶ πινετ' ἐμοίσιν, ἀκουάσεθε δ' ἀοιδοῦ. εἴματα μὲν δὴ ἰεληφ υἱαίστη ἐνὶ χηλῷ κεῖται καὶ χρυσὸς πολυδαιδὸς ἄλλα τε πάντα δώρ', δοσ Φαιήκων βουλησθοῦν ἐνθᾶθ' ἐνεικαν.

5 παλιμπάγχέταντα Άγν. vulg.: πάλιν πλαγχέτα P.S. See H.G. § 125, b.

5-6. The words here are taken from II. 1. 59 εὖ μὲν παλιμπάγχέτανται δῶ ἂψ ἀπονοσθέσειν εἰ καὶ βάσανοι γε φόνομεν, but with a change of application which has made them somewhat obscure. In the Iliad ἂψ ἀπονοσθέσειν refers to returning disappointed to Greece, and thus carries on the idea expressed by παλιμπάγχέταντα. Here a return home is not a disappointment, and cannot be described by such a phrase as παλιμπάγχέταντα. Some commentators meet the difficulty by confining the negative to that phrase: 'I think that, not having been driven from your course, you will return home.' But, apart from other objections, an interpretation by which ἂψ ἀπονοσθέσειν and παλιμπάγχέταντα are made to express contrasted things is surely excluded by II. 1. 59. The necessity for such an interpretation only arises from taking ἂψ ἀπονοσθέσειν of return to Ithaca. The meaning is simply that Ulysses will not return driven back from the house of Alcinous, but will have his desire. So Naegelsbach, Anmerk. zur Ilias (on II. 1. 59).

5. τῆ. There seems to be enough evidence in Homer for an adverbial τῆ, distinct from the dative τῇ.

9. ἀκουάσθε θεί 'please yourselves with listening' (II. 4. 343). Verbs of this formation have an ampliative and often unfavourable meaning: cp. μιμεῖον and μιμέασθε, μίγησι and μιγάσομαι, βίβω and βιβάζομαι, ἡρούμαι and ἡροᾶσθαι (17. 217), ἀθέρασθαι, ἀκαίριασθαι, ἀδοκόται, ἀκονοτάσθαι, οὐσωμάδες, κενοτάσθαι, μυστάσθαι.
13. ὍΔΣΕΙΑΣ Ν

ἀλλ’ ἄγε οἱ δόμεν τρίποδα μέγαν ἥδε λέβητα ἀνδρακᾶς· ἥμεις δ' αὐτε ἀγειρόμενοι κατὰ δὴμον τιμομεθ᾽ ἀργαλέων γὰρ ἔνα προῖκος χαρίσασθαι."

"Ὡς ἐφατ ‛Αλκίνοος, τοῖς δ' ἐπιθυμῶν μῦθος, οἱ μὲν κακκείοντες ἔβαν οἰκόνυδε ἐκαστος, ἤμοι δ’ ἠργόνεια φάνη βοδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς, νηᾶδ’ ἐπεσωπότο, φέρουν δ’ εὐήνορα χαλκὸν; καὶ τὰ μὲν εὖ κατέθηκ’ ἱερὸν μένος ‛Αλκίνοοι αὐτὸς ίδὼν διὰ νηᾶ κυπά, μή τίν’ ἐταύρων βλάπτοις ἐλαυνόντων, ὅπετε στρεφολατ’ ἐρεμοῖς ὦ δ’ εἰς ‛Αλκίνοοι κίον καὶ δαίτ’ ἀλέγνυν.

Τοῦτο δὲ βοῶν ἵερευ’ ἱερὸν μένος ‛Αλκίνοοι Ζηνὶ κελαινεφέει Κρονίδη, δι’ πάσιν ἀνάσσει. μὴρα δὲ κήαστε δαίνων’ ἐρικυθέα δνία τερπόμενοι: μετὰ δὲ σφίν ἐμέλπτετο θείος ἁοίδος, Ἀμόδοκος, λαοισὶ τετίμενοι: αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσέας πολλὰ πρὸς ἥλιον κεφαλὴν τρέπε παμφανδόντα, δῦναι ἐπεγύμνουν: δὴ γὰρ μενέαιντε νέσσαοι.

ὁς δ’ ὅτ’ ἀνήρ δόρπου λιλάε’αι, ὃ τε πανήμαρ νεῖοι ἀν’ ἐλκητὸν βὸε οἰνοπε πτερῶν ἀρτοῦν ἀσπασίων δ’ ἡρὰ τῷ κατέδου φαὸς ἤδεοιο.

13 Ἡδὲ ἐλ. Eust. who however found ἦδε in the better MSS. 14 ἀδρα καθ' ν. 1, known to Eust. 16 μῦθος θυμῷ P H S U. 19 ἱερὰ δ’ Ἀρ., F M: νη’ ἄρ’ valg. 22 ἐρεμοῖς] Perhaps ἐρεμοῖς, cp. ηθὴ (l. 78).

15. παισάθετα ’will repay ourselves.’ πρωίς ‘as a free gift,’ without such repayment; originally a partitive gen., ‘of his bounty’ (cp. χαρίμουθα χαρίσων), but used as an adverb, like the Attic προίκα = gratis, impune. The Homeric form is probably πρώις, πρωίς (or rather πρωίζω, since πρωίς is so accentuated on the analogy of monosyllabic nouns): so προληθής ‘a gift-man,’ ‘one who lives on doles,’ and the Ionic fut. καταπρόλυμα. The word is evidently a compound of πρωί. See also 17. 413.

18. Morning of the 34th day of the action of the poem.
21. ὣνδ’ ἦγα, with κατέθηκε.
30. οὖδὲν ἐπεγύμνους ‘in haste, eager for (his) setting.’
32. πηρτόν ‘put together,’ an epithet describing the workmanship of a plough. So παρτός of a house (13. 306), παρτός of a bed (19. 56), παρτός of a floor (17. 169), &c. We need not translate ‘well made,’ though that may be implied. The point is that the object (whatever it is) is a work of mechanical skill.
33. ἄνασαίοϊ. Cobet and Nauck would get rid of this adverb by substituting the adj. Here e.g. Cobet would read ἄνασαίω (cp. ἄμενω μοι ἄστιν), and Nauck ἄσσαίοιν, as ἄσσαίοιν in I. 35. But cp. II. 7. 118., 11. 327.
13. ΟΔΤΣΣΕΙΑΣ Ν

δόρπον ἐποίχεσθαι, βλάβεται δὲ τε γοῦνατ' ἵνα' ἄ' Ὀδυσσή' ἀποστῶν ἔδω φάος ἥλιον.
αἱγα δὲ Φαίηκεσσι φιληρέτμοισι μετήθοδα,
�示 Ἀλκίνῳ δὲ μάλιστα πυθαυκόμενος φάτο μύθον.
"'Ἀλκίνῳ κρείνων, πάντων ἀριθμείκετε λαῶν,
πέμπτε μὲ σπέσαντες ἀπήμονα, χαίρετε δ' αὐτόλ'.
ἡδη γάρ τετέλεσται α μοι ἐλεός ἤθελε θυμός,
πορτή καὶ φίλα δόρα, τά μοι θεός Οὐρανῶν
δῆμα ποίησειαν. ἀμύμονα δ' οἴκοι ἀκοίτῳ
νοσθήσας εὑρομί σὺν ἀρτεμέσσι φιλοιν.
ὑμεῖς δ' αὖθι μένοντες ἐφιάραιον τυναικάκα
κουρίδιας καὶ τέκνα: θεοὶ δ' ἄρεθή φάτον 
παντόην καὶ μή τι κακῶν μεταδήμοιν εἶν.
"Ως ἑφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἔπήνου ἢ' ἐκέλευν
πεπτέμεναι τὸν ξεινόν, ἐπεὶ κατὰ μοῖραν ἔπιπε.
καὶ τότε κήρυκα προσέφη μένος Ἀλκίνῳ:
"Ποινόνος, κρητήρα κερασάμενος μέθυ 

50

νάμ 

55

πάο 

55

άγαρον, δῷ εὐδέμην Διὶ πάτρι

τὸν ξεινὸν πέμπτομεν ἑν ἐν πατρίδα γαῖαν.

"Ως φάτο, Ποινόνος δὲ μελιφόραν οἶνον ἐκίρνα,


κόμησον δ' ἄρα πάοιν ἐπισταδόν' οὶ δὲ θεοῖν


ἐσπειράσου τοῦ ὀυρανοῦ εὐροὶ ἐχουσιν,


αὐτὸθεν εἴ ἐδρέων. ἀνά δ' ἱστᾶσα δὸς ὘δυσσεύς,


Ἀρήνθη δ' ἐν χειρὶ τίβε 


τέπας ἀμφικύππεων,


καὶ μιν φωνῆσας ἐπεα πτεράντα προσηῦδα:


"χαίρε μοι, ὅ βασιλεῖα, διαμπερές, εἰς 


δ' κε γῆρας


ἔλθῃ καὶ θάνατος, τά τ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις 


πέλουται.

34. βλάβεται.] For this anomalous present it is always possible to read βλάβετο, which would be the form of the aor, mid.; see H. G. § 30. 35 Ὀδύσση]. See on 5.398. 43 Folio may be restored by writing ἀμύμονα Φολεί (with epegegetic ἀσυνδετον). 53 ἐκίρνα] so 7.182, 10.356: but κῆρη in 14.78, 16.52. 56 ἐδώσων v. l. ap. Eust. 57 χαίρη vulg.: χρεία MU al.: cp. ll. 1, 585.

34. δόρπον ἐποίχεσθαι 'for going about his supper;' i.e. 'in that he can now go about his supper.'

35 ἄρεθη 'good' not limited, as in later Greek, to 'merit' or 'excellence.' Cp. 14.403 ἓκκληθε τ' ἄρεθή τε, and the verb ἀρεθῶ 'to prosper' (19.114); also 12.311, 14.312, 18.251.

45 ἄρεθη 'good': not unrestricted, as in later Greek, to 'merit' or 'excellence.' Cp. 14.403 ἓκκληθε τ' ἄρεθή τε, and the verb ἀρεθῶ 'to prosper' (19.114); also 12.311, 14.312, 18.251.

54 ἐπισταδόν: see 12.392, 18.425.

56. αὐτόθεν 'in their places;' 'even as they sat:' cp. ll. 19.77 αὐτόθεν εἰς ἔδρας οὐδ' ἐν μέσουσι διάματα.
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ νέομαι: σὺ δὲ τέρπεται τῷ ἐνὶ οἶκῳ παισὶ τε καὶ λαοῖσι καὶ Ἀλκινόφι βασιλῆι."

"Ως εἰπὼν ὑπὲρ οὐδὲν ἐβῆσετο δίος 'Οδυσσεύς.

τῷ δ’ ἀμα κήρυκα προεί μένος Ἀλκινόου,

ἡ γείτων ἔπι νήα θοήν καὶ θίνα βαλάσσον.

Ἀρήτη δ’ ἄρα οἱ δεμάς ἀμ ἔπεμπε γυναίκας,

τὴν μὲν φάρος ἔχουσαν ἐπιπλωλένῃ ἢ δὲ χιτώνα,

τὴν δ’ ἐπέρην χεῖλῃ πυκνὴν ἀμ’ ὑπάσσε κομίζειν.

ἡ δ’ ἄλη σίτιόν τ’ ἐφερεν καὶ οἴνον ἐρυθρών.

Αὐτάρ ἐπεῖρ’ ἐπὶ νήα κατήλυθον ἤδε θάλασσαν,

ἀλπα τά γ’ ἐν νητὶ γλαφυρῇ πομπῆς ἀγανοὶ

δεξάμενοι κατέθεντο, πῶς καὶ βρῶσιν ἁπασαν

καὶ δ’ ἄρ’ 'Οδυσσηί αὐτόσαβαν ῥήγας τε λίνων τε

νηδὸν ἔπι- λεκεφον γλαφυρῆς, ἤνα νήγρετον εὐδαι,

πρυμνῆς’ ἄν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐβῆσετο καὶ κατέλεκτο

σιγῆ; τοι δὲ καθεῖον ἐπὶ κλῆσιν ἐκαστοὶ

κόμῳφ, πεῖσμα δ’ ἔλυσαν ἀπὸ τρήτοιο λίθοιο.

ἐν’ οἱ ἀνακλινθέντες ἀνερπάτουν ἀλά πηδῆ,

καὶ τῷ νήδυμον ὑπὸς ἐπὶ βλεφάρωσιν ἐπιτε,

νήγρετος ἡδίστος, θανάτῳ ἀγχίστα ἐδοκῶ.

ἡ δ’ ὡς τ’ ἐν πεδίῳ τετράφοροι ἄρονεν ἵπποι,

πάντες ἀμ’ ὄρμηθέντες ὑπὸ πληγήσων ἴμασθελν,

ὑψὸς’ ἀειρόμενοι βίμφα πρήθουσοι κέλευθον,

ἀς ἄρα τῆς πρύμνης μὲν ἀείρετο, κῦμα δ’ ὀπισθὲ

61 οὐκετί χώρη ῾ΡΗ αὐτ.” από τον 'Αρσάτραχον

"νέομαι" ἐξε (Did.): σο Ἶι, ν. l. in X. 66 ὑναιματο _ἔμεις_ F P M Ευστ. ἧς

ὁδίστος, apart from the F of ἴδιος, is weak after νήδυμοι (i.e. ἴδιομοι). Read

perhaps ἴδιοτοι (or ἴδιοτοι) ‘most gentle,’ ‘feeblest’ (Π. 23. 531).

62. παράλ. The dat. is instrumental, with a partly ‘comitative’ sense: cp.

II. 21. 45, Od. 14. 244.

69. ἡ δ’ ἄλλῃ. The article marks contrast, ‘another again,’ H. G. § 260.

78. ἀνακλινθέντες ‘swinging back’: the aorist describing the movement,

H. G. § 77.

πηδᾷ, the sing. used distributively.

79. νήδυμοι, an early corruption of ἴδιομοι: see the note on Od. 4. 793.

81. ἡ δ’ κτλ. The sentence is taken up again in l. 84 ὡς ἄρα τῆς κτλ. The

harshness of the anacoluthon is softened by the nom. ὑποτις in the next clause: cp.


τετράφορος, contr. for τετρά-βορος: cp. σευ-βορος, παρ-βορος (ἅρπας of yoking

horses, cp. II. 10. 499., 15. 680).

84. For πράμως some read πρήφη, as giving a truer picture. But how could

πράμως have crept into the text?
πορφύρεον μέγα θεα πολυφλοβοσο θαλάσσης. 85
η δε μάλι άσφαλεως θεον ἐμπεδον ουδε κεν ίρης
κύρος ὁμαρτήσειν, ἐλαφρότατος πετρηνῶν.
δε η ρύμφα θεούσα θαλάσσης κύματ' ἑταμένην,
ἀνδρα φέρουσα θεοῖς ἐνάλγκια μήδε ἔχοντα,
δε πριν μὲν μάλα πολλὰ πάθ' ἄλγεα δν κατὰ θυμὸν
ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἀλεγεινα τε κύματα πελαρων,
δη τότε γ' ἀτρέμας εἶδε, λελασμένοι δοσ' ἐπεπυθεῖ.
Ευτ' αστήρ ὑπερέχει φαύντατος; δε τε μάλιστα
ἔρχεται ἀγγέλων φάσο 'Ἡώς ἱργενείς,
τήμος δη νήσῳ προσεπλνατο ποιοτόρος νήνις. 95
Φόρκυνος δε τίς ἐστι λιμὴν ἄλλω χέρωντος
ἐν δήμῳ 'Ἰνθήσις δοο δε προβλήτες ἐν αὐτῷ
ἀκαί ἀπορρώγες, λιμένοι ποτηστήριαι,
αἰ τ' ἀνέμων σκεπώωι δυσαχών μέγα κύμα
ἐκτοθεν ἐντοσθεν δε τ' ἄνευ δεσμοῦ μένουσι
νῆς εὐσελμοι, δη αν ἄρμων μέτρων ἱκνωται.
ἀυτὰρ ἐπὶ κρατός λιμένοι τανύφυλλος ἑλαίην,
ἀγχόθι δ' αὐτής ἀντρον ἐπήρατον ἡρεοιδίς,
ἱρὸν νυμφῶν αἰ νηιάδες καλέονται.
ἐν δε κρητήρεσ τε καὶ ἀμφιφορήσ ἐσαι
λαίνοιν ἐνθα δ' ἐπείτα τιθαιβάσαναι μέλισσαι. 100
ἐν δ' ἓστοι λίθοι περιμήκες, ἐνθα τε νύμφαι
φάρε' ύφαινουσιν ἀλπτόρφυρα, θαῦμα ἰδέοις.

88 ἐστιν Μ G M D A L: ἐστιν Μ F H U: ἐστιν Μ P X. 98 ἐποτηστήριαι F A L: ἐποτησθεν U A L: ἐποτησθεν vulg.: read perhaps ἐποτησθεν'.
86. ίρης κύρος. In combinations of this kind the second term is usually the specific one: cp. βούς ταῦρος, θεός πάσαρος,
διὸς δράκων (Herc. Theog. 321).
89. ἡ θεοῖς ἐνάλγκια, a brachylogy, ‘like the (counsels of the) gods’; cp. ll. 17, 51 κώμας Χαρῆτεσσιν ὕφωνι, Od. 2. 121., 4. 370.
91. πτολέμους καί κύματα carry on the construction of πολλὰ πάθ' ἄλγεια, while πτολέμων, ‘passing through them,’ belongs only to κύματα. Thus it is not properly an instance of zeugma.
93. ὑπερέχει is intrans., ‘rises.’ This is the dawn of the 35th day.
98. ποτηστήριαι lit. ‘crouching towards,’ ‘sinking down in front of the harbour,’ and so closing it in. with the gen. is used like πρός in 1. 110, of direction or aspect.
99. ἀνέμων κύμα ‘the waves raised
by the winds,’ cp. ll. 2. 396, 11. 305. ὑσαχών, by metrical licence, δυσαχῶν
being impossible in the hexameter.
101. έρμων μέτρων ‘the measure of
anchorage,’ i.e. the distance at which ships are fastened by a cable to the shore
(if fastening is needed).
ἐν δ' ὦδατ' ἄδωντα. δύω δὲ τε οἱ ὑθαίοι εἰσὶν,
αἱ μὲν πρὸς Βορέα καταβαταὶ ἀνθρώποισιν,
αὐτὸ δ' αὖ πρὸς Νότον εἰς θεότεραι. οὐδὲ τι κεῖνη
ἀνδρεῖς ἐσέρχονται, ἀλλ' ἀθανάτων ὀδὸς ἔστιν.

'Ενθ' οἱ γ' εἰσέλασαν πρὶν εἰδότες. ἡ μὲν ἐπείτα
ἡπείροι ἐπέκελσεν, δοσον τ' ἐπὶ ἡμιον πάσης,
σπερχομένη: τοιοῦ γὰρ ἐπέγευτο χέρον ἐρετάων'
οἱ δ' ἐκ νῦν βάντες εὐξύγου ἦπερφόλοι
πρῶτον 'Οδυσσῆα γλαφυρῆς ἐκ νῦν ἀειραν
ἀυτῷ σὺν τε λίψι καὶ ῥήγει σιγαλόντει,
καὶ δ' ἄρ' ἐπὶ ψαμάθωρ ὑσεῖαν δεδημημένον ὑποφ,
ἐκ δὲ κτῆματ' ἀειραν, ὁ Φαίηκες ἀγανοὶ
ὅπασαν οἵκαδ' ἱωτι διὰ μεγάθυμον 'Αθηνή.
καὶ τὰ μὲν οὖν παρὰ πνυμέν' ἑλαίας ἄθροα θῆκαν
ἐκτὸς ὀδοῦ, μὴ πῶς τες ὀδιτάων ἀνθρόπων,
πρὶν 'Οδυσῆη έγρεσθαι, ἐπελθὼν δηλήσαιον
αυτοὶ δ' αὖ οἴκονε τάλιν κλὼν οὖδ' ἐνοσίχων
λήβετ' ἀπελάων, τὰς ἀντιθέτω 'Οδυσῆη
πρώτον ἐπηπελήσε, Αἰδος δ' ἐξειρετο βουλήν.

"Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὐκέτ' ἔγωγε μετ' ἀθανάτωι θεοίς
τιμήεις ἐσομαι, δ' τε με βροτοὶ οὐ τε τίνος,
Φαίηκες, τοι πέρ τοι ἐμῆς εἰς εἰσι γενέθλης.
καὶ γὰρ νῦν 'Οδυσῆη ἑφάμην κακὰ πολλὰ παθόντα
οἰκαδ' ἐλεφθοῦσαί, νόστον δὲ οἱ ὁδοὶ ἀνὴρων
πάγχυ, ἑπεὶ σὺ πρῶτον ἐπέσχε Καὶ κατένευσας.
οἱ δ' εὐδοτ' εὖ νη θοῇ ἐπὶ πῦρτον ἁγώντες

120 κτήματ'] χρήματ' M al. This variation is frequent in the MSS.
123 μὴ τῶς G F H: μὴ τὼν Ar., P H X D S U: μὴ τοῦ M L W Eust. 125 αὖ
U: αὖν vulg. 129 δι' τούl vulg. 130 τοι πέρ τοι F: τοι πέρ τοι vulg.
111. θεότεραι, not 'more divine,' but 'divine in contrast to the human door:'
cp. 15. 422, H. G. § 122.
114. δοσον τ' ἐπὶ ἡμιον = ἐφ' δοσον τὸ
ἡμιον γίγνεται, 'to half its length.' Cp.
Il. 10. 351 δοσον τ' ἐπὶ οὐδα πέλλται, 31.
251 δοσον τ' ἐπὶ θοῦρδος ἱπη.
118. αὐτῷ σῷ τῶ λινῷ 'with the
linen cloth as it was.'
121. διὰ 'by the agency of.'
123. Ar. read μὴ τὼν 'that no one
yet, before Ulysses should wake, might
&c.' But this use of τῶ can hardly be
defended.
127. πρῶτον 'once,' as in l. 133.
129. δ' τω 'in respect that.'
130. 'Who after all (των) are sprung
from me.'
κάθεσαν εἰς Ἰθάκη, ἐδοσαν δὲ οἱ ἄσπετα δῶρα, χαλκόν τε χρυσόν τε ἀλις ἑσθητά θ' ὑφαντήν, πόλλ', δ' ἀν οὐδὲ ποτὲ Τροίης ἔξηρατ' Ὀδυσσεύς, εἰ περ ἀπήμων ἦλθε, λαχών ἀπὸ ληίδοι αἴταν."

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς:

"ὡς πότοι, ἐννοοῦντες εὐφυσθενεῖς, οὖν ἔειπες,
οὐ τί σ' ἀτιμάζουσι θεοί: χαλεπῶν δὲ κεν εἰς
πρεσβύτατον καὶ δριστῶν ἀτιμήσων ἱάλλειν.
ἀνδρῶν δ' εἰ πέρ τίς σε βίη καὶ κάρτει ἐκὼν
οὐ τί τεί, σοι δ' ἐστι καὶ ἔκοποι τίς αἰεὶ.
ἐρθον ὅτως ἐθέλεις καί τοι φίλων ἐπέλευς θυμῷ."

Τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' ἐπείτα Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίξθων.

"αἰγὰ κ' ἐγών ἔρξαμι, κελαινεῖς, ὡς ἄγορευες
ἀλλὰ οὖν αἰεὶ θυμὸν ὀπίζομαι θ' ἀλεείνω.

ὖν αὖ Φαιήκων ἐθέλω περικαλλέα νῆα
ἐκ πομπῆς ἀνυσώκων ἐν ἥροειδεί πόντῳ
βαίναι, ἣν ἰδέ σχόνται, ἀπολλῆξοι δὲ πομπῆς
ἀνδρῶν, μέγα δὲ σφιν δρόσι πόλει ἀμφικαλύψαι."

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς:

"ἢ πέποιν, ὡς μὲν ἐμφ' θυμῷ δοκεῖ εἶναι ἄριστα,
ὡς πέπηκεν δὴ πάντες ἐλαυνομένην προίδωται

λαοὶ ἀπὸ πτόλιος, θείαι λίθον ἐγγύθι γαῖας


135 ἄσπετα G F M D; ἄγλαδ P H S U al. 152 πόλιν P H J, ss M X.

142. ἄτιματοι καλλέω 'to fling into dishonour,' or (better) 'to fling at, assail, with acts of dishonour.' Elsewhere καλλέω is only found with an acc. of the thing thrown: but cp. βαλλω.

143. ἀλεείν 'giving way to,' 'allowing himself to be moved by': cp. τρ. 157., 22. 288.

144. There is a play of words between τίμα 'pays honour,' and τίμα 'payment,' in the sense of 'vengeance.'

152. ἀμφικαλύψω is rather far from the governing verb, ἱάλλων in l. 149. It seems from the scholia that there was an ancient variant, probably the fut. indic. ἀμφικαλύσω.

154-158. The infinitives θείαι and ἀμφικαλύπτει are construed as an epexegeisis of δοκεὶ εἶναι ἄριστα, so that there is no grammatical apodosis to ὡς μὲν: 'as seems best to me, viz. to turn their ship into stone, &c. (so I say).'

A small island near the entrance of the old harbour of Corfu is pointed out as the Phaeacian ship, and perhaps is sufficiently 'like a swift ship' to have give rise to the story (Plin. N. H. iv. 53). It is not, however, the only claimant. 'A rock outside the harbour of Trapani (in Sicily) is said to have been a Turkish war vessel, turned into stone by the Madonna' (Mr. A. Lang in Longmian's Magazine, Jan. 1898, quoting Mr. Butler's Authoress of the Odyssey).
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ἀνθρωποί, μέγα δε σφιν δρόσι πόλει αμφικαλύψαι.

Αὐτὰρ ἔπει τὸ γ' ἀκονε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσὶχθων,
βὴ β' ἢ μὲν ἐς Σχερίνην, θὰ Φαίηκες γεγάδαν.

ἐνθ' ἐμεν· ἡ δὲ μάλα σχεδὼν ἠλθε ποντοπόρος νῆς
διμφα διικομενή· τῆς δὲ σχεδὼν ἢλθ' ἐνοσὶχθων,
δὲ μν λᾶσαν ἑθηκε καὶ ἐριξωσεν ἐνερντο
χειρι καταπνηεὶ ἐλάσας· ὅ δε νῦν φιλε βεβήκει.

Οἱ δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔπεα πεπεζεντ' ἀγόρευον
Φαίηκες δολιχήρετμοι, ναυσκλυτοι ἀνδρες.

οδὲ δὲ τις εἴπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον
"α μοι, τίς δὴ νήα θοὴν ἐπέδησ' ἐνι πόντῳ
οἰκᾶθ' ἐλαυνομενήν· καὶ δὴ προφαίνετο πάσα."  

"Ως ἄρα τις εἴπεσκε· τὰ δ' οὐκ ἱσαν ὡς ἠτέτυκτο.

τοῖς 5. 'Ἀλκίνοος ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν
"ἀ πότοι, ἣ μάλα δὴ με παλαίφατα θέαφαθ' ἰκάνει
πατρὸς ἐνυο, δὲ ἐφασκε Ποσειδάων' ἀγάσασθαι
ἡμῖν, οὐνεκα πομποὶ ἀπήμονες εἴμεν ἀπάντων.

φὴ ποτε Φαιήκων ἀνδρῶν περικαλλεα νῆα

ἐκ πομπῆς ἀνιοσαν ἐν ἑρεοιδει πόντῳ
ραισέμεναι, μέγα δ' ἡμῖν δρόσι πόλει αμφικαλύψειν.

ἀς ἀγόρευ' ὁ γέρων· τὰ δὲ δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται.

ἀλλ' ἀγεθ', ὡς αν ἐγὼ εἰπα, πειδώμεθα πάντεσ' 

πομπῆς μὲν παυσάσθε βροτῶν, διε κτὶς ἱκηται

ἡμετερον προτὶ ἄστυν Ποσειδαώνι δε ταύρους

δάδεκα κεκριμένους λεπεύσωμεν, αἱ κ' ἐλεήσῃ,

173 ἀγάσασθαι. Ar. vulg.: ἀγάσασθαι G U. In the parallel 8.565 ἀγάσασθαι G, ἀγάσασθαι T. In 4.181 ἀγάσασθαι is given by F, but is excluded by the sense of μᾶλλον, viz. 'must have been jealous': H. G. § 238. 175 περικαλλα] ἐνεργεια M J U, cp. 8.567. 180 παυσάσθε vulg.: παυσάθε P H M.

180. For μέγα δὲ Ἀριστοφάνες read 

μῆθε, no doubt in view of the prayers of the Phaeacian elders (I. 183). But these need not affect what Zeus says now.

162. διικομενή· 'coursing along': cp. the phrase ἄρμα διαφέν.

13. ἀγάσασθαι 'had been surprised,' i.e. 'offended,' 'made jealous.' Notice the difference between ἐφασκε 'alleged,' and φῆ 'said.' The prophecy begins at

φῆ, and with it the necessity for a future inf. A few MSS. have ἀγάσασθαι, and this was probably an ancient variant. The present is perhaps the more suitable tense, as not implying that his jealousy had reached its height. The form ἀγάσασθαι, given in modern editions, has little support, external or otherwise.
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μην' ἥμιν περιμήκες ὄρος πάλει ἀμφικαλύψῃ.

"Ὡς ἐφαθ', οἱ δ' ἔδεισαν, ἐτοιμάσαντο δὲ ταύρους.

ὁδ οἱ μὲν β' εὐχότοι Ποσειδάων ἀνακτί

ἵμην Φαύκων ἕγητο αἰὲ μέδοντες,

ἔσσατες περὶ βαμῶν' ὁ δ' ἐγερεῖ διὸς 'Οδυσσέας

ἐδῶν ἐν γαῖῃ πατρωῇ, οὔδὲ μὲν ἔγνω,

ἥδι δὴν ἀπεών περὶ γὰρ θεὸς ἥρα χεῖν

Παλλάς 'Αθηναίη, κοῦρη Δίδο, οὕρα μὲν αὐτὸν

ἀγνωστόν τεύξειν ἕκαστα τε μυθήσατο,

μή μὲν πρὶν ἄλοχος γνοίη ἀστοί τε φίλοι τε,

πρὶν πᾶσαν μνησθήσασθα ὑπερβασίην ἀποτίσατε.

τοῦτον' ἃρ' ἄλλουδέ' ἐφαίνετο πάντα ἀνακτί,

ἀπάται τε δηνεκέεις λίμενε τε πάνορμοι

πέτραι τ' ἡλίβατοι καὶ δένδρα τηλεθάοντα.

στὴ δ' ἃρ' ἀναίζας καὶ β' εἰσιδε πατρίδα γαῖαν

φωνεῖν τ' ἃρ' ἐπείτα καὶ ὅ πεπλήγητο μηρὼ

χερὶ καταπρηνεῖο', ὄλοφυρόμενος δ' ἐπος ἠδα

"καὶ μοι ἐγώ, τέων αὕτε βροτῶν ἐς γαῖαν ἱκάνον;

190 αὐτὸν] Αρ. most MSS.: αὖτον Aristoph.

190 ἥδι δὴν δὲν ἄρτων belongs to ἐδῶν ἐν γαῖῃ πατρωῇ, while περὶ γὰρ κτλ. gives the reason of ὅδη μὲν ἔγνω. Cp. the relation of the clauses in 4. 191—192., 8. 477—478.

190. αὐτὸν 'himself,' i.e. his person: cp. l. 313 εἰ γὰρ αὐτῷ παρεῖ ἱσθοῖς.

191. ἀγνωστόν κτλ. The meaning is, not that the mist was to make Ulysses invisible, but that Athenæ wished to prepare him for the work before him by consultation, and by changing his appearance, as she does in ll. 419—438. Evidently ἀγνωστὸν τεύξειν here refers to the same process as ἀγνωστὸν τεύξιν in l. 397. If Athenæ had not taken these measures, Ulysses would have gone straight to his palace, and all would have been lost. Chronologically the conversation (ἕκαστα τε μυθήσατο) comes before the change: so that there is a prosthysteron, due to the tendency to put the more definite act first.

194. ἄλλουδε' ἐφαίνετο. The MSS. are divided pretty equally between ψαβέτῳ and φαύκετῳ. The latter involves scanning ἄλλουδε in three long syllables—which Buttman (L. c. θεοῦθη) rightly rejected—or else writing ἄλλουδε, a form which is against analogy. On the other hand, a metrical lengthening of the o in ἄλλουδε is not a greater licence than the poet admits when it is necessary (cp. δύσανον in I. 99, and instances given in H. G. § 386: see Knös, Dig. p. 121 note; Schulze, Quaest. Ep. p. 288). Again, the frequentative φαύκετῳ is out of place here, as Buttman observed. The history of the matter probably is that ἄλλουδε came to be scanned — — — , as would be the case in Attic, and then φαύκετῳ was adopted for the metre. The slight change of ψαβέτῳ to ἐφαίνετο does not need MS. support: it is called for by the need of a caesura.
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ἡ β' οἶ γ' υβρισταὶ τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι,
ἡς φιλόξεινοι καὶ σφιν νῦις ἐστὶ θεοῦδις;
πὴ δὴ χρῆματα πολλὰ φέρω τάδε; πὴ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς
πλάξομαι; αἰϑ' ὄφελον μεῖναι παρὰ Φαῖκεσσιν
αὐτὸν· ἐγὼ δὲ κεν ἄλλον ὑπέρμενεν βασιλῆς
ἐξικόμην, ις κέν μ' ἐφίλει καὶ ἐπέμπε νέεσθαι.

νῦν δ' οὖτ' ἄρ πη θέσθαι ἐπίσταμαι, οὐδὲ μὲν αὐτοῦ
καλλέστω, μὴ πῶς μοι ἔχωρ ἀλλοισί γένηται.

ὁ πότε, οὖκ ἄρα πάντα νόμμονε νοῦδε δίκαιοι
ἡς Φαῖκως ἄνιτρος ὑδέ μεδόντες,
οἱ μ' εἰς ἄλλην γαϊαν ἀπῆγαγον ἢ τὲ μ' ἐφαντο
ἀξειν εἰς Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον, οὐδ' ἐτελεσαν:

Zeus's sphere, its own territory, for in its place, so large
they cannot bear, as the others can.

ὁ θεός εἰς τὸν παράτο εἰς περικάλλεας ἢ δέ ἱερατικάς

τῶν μὲν ἄρ' οὐ τι πόθεν· ο ὅ' ἐδύρετο πατρίδα γαῖαν
ἐρτύζων παρὰ θύνα πολυφλοίσβου θαλάσσως,

πόλλ' ὀλοφυρόμενοι. σχεδόθεν δ' οἱ ἠλθεν 'Ἀθῆνη,
ἀνδρίς ἐκεῖα εἰκοῦν νέφη, ἐπιβιώτοι μῆλον,

παναπλαθών, οἵ τινες δ' ἐν ἀνάκτοι παῦει ἐςι,

διπτυχον ἀμφ' ὀμοιοῖν ἔχους εὐεργεία λάτπηνη

ποσεῖ δ' ὑπὸ λιταρώϊς πεδίλ' ἐχε, χερσὶ δ' ἀκοντα.

204 πλάξομαι F H M γρ. U2: πλάξωμαι vulg. 205 κεν] τιν' X D U: κεν
tin' U. 213 τὸντο Λτ.: τινάθω Ζεν. The imper. may have seemed improper ('πρέπει') applied to a deity. 216 οἴχονται F U: οἴχοινται vulg. 225 χειρὶ F U.

201—202. ἢ ... ἢς, a double question—"are they savage or hospitable?" So l. 234.

203. φέρω appears to be indicative, like πλάξομαι: 'where am I with all this wealth in my hands?' But possibly we should read πλάξωμαι or πλάζωμι,' and take both verbs as deliberative

subjunctives. 204. ὄφελον, sc. χρῆματα. 205. The reading τιν' for κεν is perhaps defensible, the aor. indic. carrying on the (unfulfilled) wish: cp. l. 6. 348 λεον με κυῖς ἀσφέρον. 209. οὖν ἀρὰ ἠλον 'they are not, as I thought they were.' 212. εὐδείελον, see l. 234. 216. μὴ οἴχονται 'to see whether they have not gone': cp. 24. 491 ἐξέλθων τις θεω μή δή σχεδον ὅποι.
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tην δ' Ὄδυσσεις γηθήσεν ἠδὼν καὶ ἐναντίος ἦλθε, καὶ μν ὁμώσας ἐπεα πτερώντα προσήδε 
"ὁ φῶλ ', ἐπει σε πρῶτα κιχάνω τῶν ἐν χῶρῳ, 
χαίρε τε καὶ μή μοι τι κακῶ νόμο ἀντιβολῆσαις, 
ἀλλὰ σᾶε μὲν τάττα, σάο δ' ἐμὲ' σοι γὰρ ἔγγυ 
εὐχόμαι ὡς τε θεῷ καὶ σευ φίλα γοῦναθ' ικάνον. 
καὶ μοι τοῦτ' ἀγάρευσον ἑτήμημον, ἰβρ' ἐν εἴδῳ 
τής γῆ, τίς δήμος, τίνες ἀνέρες ἐγγεγάσαιν; 
ἡ ποὺ τις νῆσον εὐδείελος, ἢ τις ἀκτῇ 
κεῖθ' ἀλη κεκλιμένη ἐριβώλακος ἤπειροιο";

Τὸν δ' αὐτὲ προσέειπε θεᾶ γλαυκώπης 'Αθήνη:

"κήπιδος εἰς, ὃ ξεῖν', ἡ τηλόθεν εἰλῆλουθας, 
ei δή τήνδε γε γαῖαν ἀνέρεαν. ὦδὲ τι λίν
οὐτω νάνυμος ἐστιν· ἱσασί δὲ μιν μᾶλα πολλοί,
ἡμὲν δοσι ναύουσι πρὸς ἥω τ' ἥλιον τε, 
ἡδ' δοσί μετοπισθε ποτὶ ζῶον ἠρῆντα.

ἡ τοῦ μὲν τρηχεία καὶ οὐχ ἱππήλατός ἐστιν, 
οὐδὲ λίνη λυπή, ἀτὰρ οὐδ' εὐρεία τέτυκται.
ἐν μὲν γὰρ οἱ σῖτοι ἀθέσφατοι, ἐν δὲ τε οἶνος
gίγνεται: αἰεὶ δ' ὅμβρος ἔχει τεθαλαία τ' ἐσοφή: 
αιγίβοτος δ' ἀγαθή καὶ βούβοτος· ἔστι μὲν ὅλα 
pαντοῖα, ἐν δ' ἀρδοὶ ἐπηεισοὺ παρέσαι.

τώ τοι, ξεῖν', 'Ἰθάκης γε καὶ ἐς Τροῖν δνομ' ἰκεῖ, 
τὴν περ τηλοῦ παιν' Ἀχαιόν ἔμεναι ἀῖσθαν.' 

"Ὡς φάτο, γηθήσεν δὲ πολυτλας δῖος Ὄδυσσεύς, 
χαῖρον ἥ γαϊν πατρώῃ, ὡς οἱ ξείπε 
Παλλάς 'Αθηναίη, κούρη Δίδις αἰγίδχιοι 

228 πρῶτον ἱλαρόν Μ. 
233 ἐγγέγασιν Ε. : ἐγγέγασιν vulg. 
238 τῆθε γε U: τῆθε X D L W : τῆθε το vulg. 
243 οὗ Α., F U : οὗ vulg. 

230. σῶμα, unless it is a mere mistake 
for σῶον (see Cobet, Misc. Crit. p. 293), 
points to a non-thematic contracted 
form: cp. ἱππόλαου. 
234. ὀδείσως 'shining': Hor. Od. 
1.14.19 'nitentes Cycladas.' 
235. ἀλλ' κακλημένη, cp. 4.608. Join 
ἀετῇ ἤπειροι. 

238. The vulg. τῆθε το is impossible; 
it is not supported by the similar form 
given by MSS. in 15.484. The reading 
τῆθε γα (if you ask about this land), 
is found in one of the best MSS. 
241. μετοπίσθα, i.e. westwards: the 
west being the end, as the east is the 
beginning, of the day.
καὶ μιν φωνῆσαι ἐπειτε πτερόειν προσῆκα: οὐδ' ὦ γ' ἀληθεὰ εἰπε, πάλιν δ' ὦ γε λάζετο μῦθον, 255
αἰεὶ εἰ ἐτῆθεσθη νῦν πολυκερδέα νωμῶν, "πυνθανοῦν 'Ἰθάκης γε καὶ ἐν Κρήτῃ εὐρείῃ,
τηλοῦ υπὲρ πῶντον νῦν δ' εἰδήλουθα καὶ αὐτὸς χρήματι σῶν τοῦτος εἰπε: λιπὼν δ' ἔτι παισὶ τοσαῦτα
φεῦγω, ἐπεὶ φίλον νῦτα κατέκτανον 'Ἰδομενῆς, 260
'Ορφιλοχον πόδας ὁκὼν, δς ἐν Κρήτῃ εὐρείῃ
ἀνέρας ἀλφηστὰς νίκα ταχέοιν πύρεσιν,
οὐνεκ' με στερέσαι τῆς ληίδος ἥθελε πάσης
Τρωίαδος, τῆς εἰκ' ἐγὼ πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῷ,
ἀνδρῶν τε πολέμους ἀλγεινατ κε κόματα πείρων,
οὐνεκ' ἄρ' οὐχ ὧ πατρι χαριζόμενος θεράπευνον 265
δήμῳ ἐν Τρώωι, ἀλλ' ἄλλων ἥρχον ἐταῖρων.
τὸν μὲν ἐγώ κατίκνα ταῦτα βάλον χαλκήρι δουρέ
ἀγράθεν, ἐγγοὺς ὦδοῖο λοχθάμενος σῶν ἐταῖρων
νῦὲ δὲ μάλα δνοφερῆ κάτεξ' οὐρανῶν, οὐδὲ τις ημέας
ἀνθρώπων ἐνόησε, λάθον δὲ ε ἥμων ἀπούρας. 270
αὐτὸς ἐπεὶ δὴ τὸν γε κατέκτανον ὃζει χαλκῷ,
αὐτ' ἐγὼν ἐπί νηα κιὼν Φοίνικας ἀγανώς
ἐλλισάμην, καὶ σφιν μενοεικά ληίδα δώκα' τοὺς μ' ἐκέλευσα Πύλονδε καταστήσαι καὶ ἐφέσαι
ἡ εἰς 'Ἡλίδα δίαν, δῆι κρατέουσιν Ἑπειολ. 275
ἀλλ' ἄρ τοις σφεας κείθεν ἀπόσατι ἰσ ἀνέμοι
πᾶλ' ἀεκαζομένους, οὐδ' ἥθελον ἐξαπατήσαι.
κείθεν δὲ πλαγχθέντες Ικάνομεν ἐνθάδε νυκτὸς. 276

256 Κρήτῃ] Τροίῃ Ρ. 273 ἷηα Aristoph.
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σπουδή δ' ἐσ λιμένα προερέσσαμεν, οὔτε τις ἤμιν δόρποι μνήμης ἔγιν, μάλα περ χατέουσιν ἑλέσθαι, ἀλλ' αἰτῶς ἀποβάντες ἐκείμεθα νήσος ἀπαντες. ἔνθ' ἐμὲ μὲν γλυκὸς ὅπον ἐπήλυθε κεκμήτα, οἱ δὲ χρήματ' ἐμὰς γλαφρῆς ἐκ νήσος ἐλύντες κάθεσαν, ἔνθα περ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ ψαμάθειοιν ἐκείμην. οἱ δ' ἐσ Σιδώνην εὗ ναιομένην ἀναβάντες

"Ως φάτο, μείδησεν δὲ θέα γλαυκώπις 'Αθηνη, χειρὶ τέ μιν κατέρεγεν δέμας δ' ἥκικο γυναίκι καλῆ τε μεγάλη τε καὶ ἀγάλα ἔργα ἰδιᾷ καὶ μιν φανήσαι ἐπεά περεόντα προστῆμα: "κερδαλέος κ' εἶη καὶ ἐπίκλοπος δς σε παρέλθοι ἐν πάντεσι δύλοις, καὶ εἰ θεὸς αὐτίασε. σχέτλιε, ποικιλομήτα, δόλων ἄτ', οὐκ ἄρ' ἐμελλες, οὖν ἐν σῇ περ ἕων γαῖῃ, λήξεις ἀπατάων μῦθων τε κλοπίων, οἱ τοι πεδόθεν φίλοι εἰσίν. ἀλλ' ἄγε, μηκέτι ταῦτα λεγόμεθα, εἰδὼς ἄμφω κέρδη, ἔπει σοὶ μὲν ἐσσὶ βρωτῶν ὁχ' ἄριστος ἀπάντων βούλῃ καὶ μῦθοιεν, ἐγὼ δ' ἐν πάσι θεοίς μήτι τοι κλέομαι καὶ κέρδεσιν οὔτε σοι γ' ἡγος Παλλᾶδ' 'Αθηνάιην, κόρην Δίως, ἢ τέ τοι αἰεὶ ἐν πάντεσι πῦοντι παράσταται ἡδ' φυλάσσο καὶ δε σε Φαϊήκεσσι φίλον πάντεσιν ἔθηκα. νῦν αὐ δεῦρ' ἰκόμην, ἵνα τοι σὴν μητὶ ὑφίνω

279 προερέσσαμεν Ar. (οὗτος αἰ πᾶσα Did., i.e. all the editions used by Ar.), G P H D: προερέσσαμεν F M X U al. 282 εἰπέλυθεν ἐπιλαβει vulg., sec 10. 31. 289 om. G P. 293 δέτ' better δατ'. 295 πεδόθεν P Eust.: πεδόθεν vulg.

281. αὐτως 'as we were,' without attempting more. 291. κερδαλέος 'crafty,' cp. πολυ- κορής in l. 255, and so κέρδη in l. 297, 299. 292. 'Even if a god presented himself,' 'even were it a god': cp. l. 312. 293. σχέτλια 'hard,' said in a friendly and admiring tone: cp. ll. 22. 41, 86. 295. πεδόθεν, cp. funditus: but probably the notion is that of constancy, as in ἐμένωδος. The variant πεδόθεν is easily explained by itacism. Schulze (Quaest. Ep. p. 86, n. 1) conjectures that the original word was παιδὸς. But the substitution in all MSS. of a modern equivalent for an archaic word like παιδὸς must have taken place, if at all, at a relatively early time—too early to produce the unmetrical παιδὸς.
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χρήματα τε κρύψω, ὅσα τοι Φαϊήκες ἀγανακτήσαν οἴκαδ’ ὅντι ἐμὴ βουλή τε νῦν τε, εἴπω θ’ ὅσα τοι ἀλα ὅμοι ἐνι ποιητοῖς κηδεῖ ἀνασχέσθαι: οὐ δὲ τετλάμεναι καὶ ἀνάγκῃ, μηδὲ τῷ ἐκφάσθαι μήτ’ ἀνδρῶν μήτε γυναικῶν, πάντων, οὐνεκ’ ἀρ’ ἥλθες ἄλομενος, ἀλλὰ σιωπὴν πάσχειν ἄλγεα πολλά, βιας ὑποδέγγυμενον ἄνδρῶν.”

Τὴν δ’ ἀπαμειβήμενος προσέφη πολέμητος Ὄδυσσεύς: “ἄργαλεόν σε, θεά, γνώριμοι βροτῷ ἀντίσαμμι, καὶ μᾶλ’ ἐπισταμένῳ σε γὰρ αὐτὴν παντὶ ἔσκεις. τοῦτο δ’ ἐγὼν εῦ σεῖ, δι’ ἐμαί πάρος ἡπὶ ἡσθα, ἦς ἐνὶ Τροίῃ πολεμίσθημεν ὑὲς Ἀχιῶν.

αὐτὰρ ἐπ’ Πριάμοιο πόλιν διεπέρσαμεν ἀλῆθιν, βῆμεν δ’ ἐν νήσσοι, θεῖς δ’ ἐκέδασσεν Ἀχιῶν, οὐ σέ γ’ ἐπείτα ἴδουν, κούρη Δίδος, ὀδή’ ἐνόσα νῦν ἐμὴν ἐπιβάζαιν, ὅπος τ’ ἐμοὶ ἄλγος ἄλλοκος, [ἄλλ’ αἰεὶ φρεσκόν ἦσιν ἔχων δεδαϊγμένον ἣτορ ἡλίμην, ἔμε μὲ θεοὶ κακότητος ἐλύσαν] πρὶν γ’ ὅτε Φαϊήκων ἄνδρῶν ἐν πόλιν δήμῳ θάρσουν τ’ ἐπέεσοι καὶ ἐσ πόλιν ἡγαγες αὐτή. νῦν δὲ σε πρὸς πατρὸς γουνάζομαι—οὐ γὰρ ὅπω ἦκεν εἰς Ἰθάκην εὐδεέλον, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀλλήν γαῖαν ἀναστρέφομαι σε δὲ κερτομεύοναν ὅπω ταύτ’ ἄγορευμεναι, ἐν’ ἐμᾶς φρένας ἡπεροπεύσῃς—

304 χρήματα G F D U al.: κήματα vulg. 305 οἰοδ’] qu. ἐνθάδ’. 307 ἀνασχέσθαι] ἀναληθοῦ M J Eust. 317 ἐκέδασσαν is given by good MSS. (G F U &c.) and may be right: Fick, Best. Beitr. xiv. 316. 325 ἡεῖν MSS.

309. ὁδέσκε ἰα ‘that,’ a meaning confined in Homer to the Odyssey.

320–323. These lines are generally condemned as spurious. As regards the first two there can be little doubt. The clause πρὶν γ’ ὅτα κτλ. does not fit ll. 320–321, but is construed with ὅπω σε γ’ ἐπείτα ἴδων (l. 318). Hence ll. 320–321 must be interpolated. A parenthesis such as they form is quite un-Homeric. The case against ll. 322–323 is not so clear. The ancients argued that Ulysses could not know of the presence of Athene in Phaeacia, since the goddess did not reveal herself to him there. The objection supposes a degree of accuracy that is hardly to be expected in a poem. But it may be admitted that ll. 322–323 have in some degree the air of an insertion intended to reconcile the present speech with the Phaeacian episode (esp. 7. 11–81). The four lines are rejected by Nitzsch, Sagenpoesie, p. 173. 326. κερτομεύοναν ‘seeking to vex.’
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εἰπὲ μοι εἶ ἐτέθη γε φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἱκάνω.

Τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' ἐπείτα θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθηνη
"αἰεὶ τοιούτῳ ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νόμμα:
τῷ σε καὶ οὔ δόναι προλιπεῖν δύστην ἐόντα,
οβεκ ἐπηθής ἐσσι καὶ ἀγχίνους καὶ ἐξέφρων
ἀσπάσιος γάρ κ' ἄλλος ἀνήρ ἀλλήλεμος ἐλθὼν
ιστ' ἐνι μεγάρους ἰδέειν παῖδας τ' ἀλοχόν τε
σοι δ' οὐ ποί φίλων ἔστι δαήμεναι οὕδε πυθεῖσθαι,
πρίν γὲ τὶ σῆς ἀλόχον πειρήσεα, ἢ τέ τοι αὗτος
χόσται ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν, δι' ὑπεραλ' δὲ οἰ αἰεὶ
φθόνουσιν νόκτες τε καὶ ἡματα δάκρυν χεύσῃ.
αὐτὰρ ἐγώ τὸ μὲν οὐ ποί ἀπίστευν, ἀλλ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ
ἐδὲ νοστήσεις ὀλέσας ἀπὸ πάντας ἑταῖρους.
ἀλλὰ τοι οὐκ ἔθελεσα Ποσειδᾶνι μάχεσθαι
πατροκασιγνήτῳ, δὲ τοι κότων ἐνθετο θυμῷ,
χαϊνεμοὶ δ' οὐ καὶ νῦν φίλον ἐξαλάσσας.
ἀλλ' ἀγε τοι δέξω Ἰθάκης ἔδος, ὅφρα πεποίθῃς.
Φόρκυνος μὲν δὴ ἐστὶ λειμὴν ἀλοιο γέροντος,
ἀλλ' δ' ἐπὶ κρατὸς λιμένων τανώφυλλος ἑλαίη.
[ἀγχίθι δ' αὐτῆς ἄντρον ἐπήρατον ἡρωεῖδε,
ἰρὸν νυμφάς αὐ νηύδες καλέσται']
τοῦτο δὲ τοι σπέσι ἐστὶ κατηρέψεις, ἔνθα σὺ πολλὰς
ἐρθεσκές νύμφας τεληέστας ἐκατόμβας.
τοῦτο δὲ Νῆριτὼν ἐστὶν ὅρος καταιμένον ἐλη.
"Ὡς εἰποῦσα θεὰ σκέδασ' ἡρα, εἰσατο δὲ χθόν
γυμνησεν τ' ἀρ' ἐπείτα πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
χαίρων ή γαῖ, κύσε δὲ ξείδωρον ἄρουραν.
αὐτίκα δὲ νύμφης ἠρήσατο χείρας ἀνασχύν·
"νυμφαὶ νηύδες, κοῦραι Διός, οὐ ποτ' ἐγωγε


335. πυθεῖσθαι, i.e. ‘observe for yourself’—not trusting to report (ὑπελεύσαι): while any other man would have made for his home without even enquiring.
347–348. Repeated wrongly in some MSS. from l. 103–104. The cave is first mentioned in l. 349, and with the deictic τοῦρα: ‘and there &c.’
δέσσει δήμη εφάμην νῦν δὲ εὐχωλής ἀγανήσι
χαίρετ'. ἀτὰρ καὶ δῶρα διδόσομεν, ὥσ τὸ πέρος περ,
αἰ κεν ἐξ πρόφρων μὲ Διὸς δυνάτηρ ἀγελείη
αὐτὸν τε ἔσειν καὶ μοι φῶν νῦν ἀέξη.

Τὸν δ' αὐτὲ προσεῖητε θεᾶ γλαικάνεσ 'Αθήνην·
"θάρσει, μή τοι ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ σῷςι μελόντων.
ἀλλὰ χρήματα μὲν μυχὸ ἄντρον θεσπεσίων
θέλομεν αὐτικὰ νῦν, ἵνα περ τάδε τοι σὰ μίμη
αὐτὸ δὲ φραζόμεθ' ὅπως ὥν άριστα γένηται."

"Ὡς εἰποῦσα θεᾶ δὴνε σπέος ἡροεὶδες,
μαιμομένη κευθμῶνας ἀνά σπέος' αὐτὰρ 'Οδυσσεῶς
ἀσσον πάντ' ἐφόρει, χρυσὸν καὶ ἄτειρεα χαλκῶν
eἰμιτὰ τ' εὐποίητα, τὰ οἱ Φαίηκες ἔδωκαν.
καὶ τὰ μὲν εὐ κατέθηκε, λίθον δ' ἐπέθηκε θύρησι
Παλλᾶς 'Αθναή, κούρη Δίως αἰγίχοιο.

Τὸ δὲ καθεξομένων λερῆν παρὰ πυθμέν ἐλαίης
φραζέθην μυστήριοι ὑπερφιάλουσιν ὀλέθρον.
τοῖς δὲ μύδων ἤρξε θεᾶ γλαικάνεσ 'Αθήνην·
"διογενὲς Δαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν 'Οδυσσεῦ,
φράζεν ὅπως μυστήριοι αναίδεις χείρας ἐφήσεις,
οι δὴ τοι τρίτες μέγαρον κάτα κουράνεψαν,
μυώμενοι ἀντίθεην ἀλοχον καὶ ἐδνα διδώτης
ἡ δὲ σὸν αἰεὶ νόστον ὄντρομενη κατὰ θυμὸν
πάντας μὲν β' ἐλπει καὶ ὑπάρχεται ἀνδρὶ ἐκάστῳ,

358 διδόσομεν] παρέξομεν Aristoph. 359 πρόφρων μὲ] The place of the μὲ is unusual (H. G. § 365): possibly the original reading was πρόφρωσα, the proper fem. of πρόφρων. The enclitic μὲ might be understood with αὐτῶν in the next line.
360 ὅπως ἐσταὶ τάδε ἐργα Ῥ. H. 361 τὸ τοί Φαίηκες ἔδωκαν] τὰ οἱ Φαίηκες ἄγανοι ἄμαςαι οἰκεῖ ὀντเทคนิค(365,111),(996,871)
375 φράζετ' ὅπως μυστήριοι αναίδεις χείρας ἐφήσεις,
οἱ δὲ τοι τρίτες μέγαρον κατά κουράνεψαν,
μυώμενοι ἀντίθεην ἀλοχον καὶ ἐδνα διδώτης
ἡ δὲ σὸν αἰεὶ νόστον ὄντρομενη κατὰ θυμὸν
πάντας μὲν β' ἐλπει καὶ ὑπάρχεται ἀνδρὶ ἐκάστῳ,

357. εὐχωλής 'with my prayers,'
'now that you again hear my prayers.'
χαίρετ' is hardly more than a form of
 greeting, but it is construed with the
gestive εὐχωλής as though it had the
literal meaning 'be gladdened.'
358. διδόσομεν. Ulysses associates
Telemachus with himself, as we see
from l. 360. For the form cp. 24. 314.
360. ἀέξη, an anacolouthon; cp. 16. 6.
364. ὅνα 'where,' = 'so that there —'
σᾶ. The form σᾶ is probably post-
Homeric, for σᾶ: see on 19. 300., 32.
28, and cp. the Attic neut. pl. σα, which
points to σᾶ.
377. κομπανέως, ironically, 'are
lording it.'
379. 'Lamenting about thy return,'
i.e. crying for it: cp. II. 2. 290 ὄντρομενη νοΊον ν insets.
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ἀγγελίας προϊέσα, νῦσ δὲ οἱ ἀλλα μενοιν̄.

Τὴν δ᾿ ἀπαμείβομεν προσέφη πολύμητις 'Οδυσεύς·

"ὁ πόται, ἥ μάλα δὴ ᾿Αγαμέμνονος ᾿Ατρέδαο

φῶσανεῖ κακῶν οἶτον ἐνι μεγάροις ἐμέλλον,

εἰ μὴ μοι σὺ ἔκαστα, θεά, κατὰ μοίραν ἐπίστε.

ἀλλ᾿ ἄγε μὴν ὕφηνον, ὅπως ἀποτίσομαι αὐτοῦς·

παρ ὑμοί σὺ οὐκ ἔστηθι, μένον πολυβαροῖς ἐνείσα,

οὖν ὅτε Ῥώης λύσων λιπαρά κρήδεμνα.

αἰ κέ μοι ὅσ μεμανεί παρασαίης, γλακυών,

καὶ τριθικοσιόν ἐγών ἀνδρεῖοι μαχούμην

σοις, πῦνα θεά, ὅτε μοι πρόφρασσο ἑπαρήγους.

Τὸν δ᾿ ἡμεῖς ἐπίετα θεᾶ γλακυών ἀθήνης·

"καὶ λίθῳ τοί ἐγώνε παρέσομαι, οὐδὲ με λήσεις,

ὀπίσω κεν δὴ ταύτα πενώμεθα· καὶ τινὶ ὁδὼ

ἀμαρτὶ τ᾿ ἐγκέφαλῳ τε παλαξέμεν ἄπτετον οὖδας

ἀνδρών μνηστήρων, οἴ τοι βίοντα κατέδωσιν·

ἀλλ᾿ ἄγε ὑπὸ ἀνακτών τεῦξω πάντεσι βροτοῖς·

κάρψῳ μὲν χρόα καλῶν ἐνι γναμπτοῖς μέλεσοι,

εὐανδρὶ ἐκ κεφαλῆς ὀλέσω τρίχας, ἀμφὶ δὲ λαῖφος

ἔσοσθε καὶ σταυράσσω ἴδων ἀνδροπον ἔχοντα,

κνυξίωσα δὲ τοι ὅσε πάροι περικαλλῆ ἔντε,

ἄν ἀν ζείλιον πάσι μνηστήρωι φανῆς

400 στυγήσων ἴδων ἀνθρώπων MSS.: στυγήσω τις ἴδων ἀνθρώπων v. i. ap. Eust.

381. ἀγγελίας 'messages.' No passage in Homer obliges us to assume the existence of a masc. ἀγγελίας: see Buttman, Lexil. s. v.

388. κρήδεμνα 'the diadem of towers': from P. 16. 100 ὄφρι οἴν Ῥώης λεφ ἀρματρία κρήδεμνα λύσων.

This picturesque phrase is a sort of refinement upon the more ordinary metaphor by which the battlements of a town are called its 'head': as in π. 2. 117 ὅτι δὴ τολῶν τολῶν κατέλυεν κάρυα.

400. The common reading is δ ἀν στυγήσων ἴδων ἀνθρώπων ἔχοντα 'which any man who should see thee wearing would loathe.' This is unsatisfactory, because (as was pointed out by Nitzsch, Sagenpoesie der Griechen, p. 176) ἀν-

θρώπων would not be used by Homer in the indefinite sense required, = 'any man,' τις. On the other hand the participle ἴδων may be = ἴδων τις 'any one that sees': cp. δουν τε γένοις βοῦσας 'as far as one is heard when he shouts,' and the other places quoted in H. G. § 243, 3, e. Hence it seems best to adopt ἀνθρώπων from the variant mentioned by Eustathius. Of course στυγήσω τις ἴδων, which Eustathius gives with ἀνθρώπων, is impossible, and is only due to the failure to see that ἴδων has the indefinite force required.

It is curious that the word ἀνθρώπων is very rare in Homer in the singular. This is the only place in the Odyssey in which it occurs.
όθε τ' ἀλόχω καὶ παιδί, τὸν ἐν μεγάροις ἐλειπές. 405
αὐτὸς δὲ πρώτοιστα συμβεβηκέσσαι,
δι' τοι ὄψων ἐπιούρος, ὅμως δὲ τοι ἡπτια οἴδε,
παιδά τε σὺν φιλεί τι ἐξήφρανα Ἰηνελάτει. 410
δεις τὸν γε σὔσσοι παρῆμενοι αἱ δὲ νέμοναι
πάρ Κόρακος πέτη ἐπὶ τε κρήνης Ἀρεθοῦσα,
ἐσθοῦσι βάλανον μενοείκεα καὶ μέλαν ὁδώρ
πίνουσιν, τὰ θ' δείσσο τρέφει τεθαλαμόν ἀλουφήν.
ἐνθα μένει καὶ πάντα παρῆμενοι ἑξερέσσαι,
ὅφρ' ἄν ἔγιν ἐλθὼν Σπάρτην ἐσ καλλιγύνακα
Τηλέμαχον καλέουσα, τεδυν ἄλων ὑόν, Ὀδυσσεύ
δ' τοι ἐσ εὐρύχορον Δακεδαίμονα πάρ Μενέλαον
φύτευεν πενήμενος μετὰ σὺν κλέος, εἴ τιν' ἑτῇ ἑην' 415
Τὴν δ' ἀπαμείβομενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς:
"τὶπτε τ' ἄρ' οὗ οἱ ἔλειπες, ἐνὶ φρέσι πάντα ἰδύα,
ἡ ἦνα ποι καὶ κεῖνος ἀλόμενος ἀλγεα πάσχη
πάντων ἐπὶ ἀτρύγετον, βιοτον δὲ οἱ ἄλλοι ἐδούσιν."
Τὸν δ' ἱμείβετ έπειτα θεὰ γλαυκάτησ 'Ἀθηνής:
"μή δ' οἱ κεῖνος γε λίνην ἐνθῆμοι εὐςω.
αὐτή μν πομπευον, ἡνα κλέος ἑσθολν ἀρτοῦ
κεῖν ἐλθὼν ἀταρ οὗ τιν' ἔχει πόνον, ἀλλὰ ἐκήδος
ἡσται ἐν Ἀτρείδαο δόμοις, παρὰ δ' ἀσπετα κεῖται.
ἡ μὲν μν λοχοψί νεόι σὺν νητ' μελανην. 420
414 ὑπ参股 Η U al.: πρὸς vulg. 415 έτ ᾗ U: ὑπ参股 Η H al. 417 τ' ἄρ'参股 Η Χ H al.:
γαρ参股 Ψ U al. 419 ἑδον参股 Μ Χ D Eust.

405 = 15. 39. The pronoun τοι is generally construed with ἡπτα οἴδε 'he is of friendly mind to thee.' With regard to ὅμως opinions differ. Ameis refers it to ἄν ἐπιούρος: Eumaeus was as much devoted to Ulysses himself as to his possessions, the swine. Others refer forwards to the words παῖδα τῆς κτῆλ. 'equally to thee' = 'even as he is towards thy son and Penelope.' This, however, will not suit 15. 39, where the line παῖδα τῆς κτῆλ. does not follow. It seems much too harsh to separate ὅμως τοι. The difficulty is really logical, arising from a certain blending of the ideas of friendship or loyalty, given in ἡπτα οἴδε, with that of agreement, expressed by ὅμως. Eumaeus was 'at one with Ulysses in the loyalty of his heart.' So ΙΙ. 4. 360 ὑπ参股 τοι θυματ... ἡπτα οἴδε τα γαρ φρονεῖς ἐτ' ἐγώ περ. And so in prose, Thuc. ΙΙΙ. 9 ἐστι τῇ γρήγορῃ διήντε καὶ ἐννον. In such passages we see the endeavour to express the complex notion of sympathy.

407. παρῆμενον 'abiding with;' as ΙΙ. 1. 421 ὑπ参股 παρῆμενον δεμπλοροιαν.

415. 'After thy story,' i.e. seeking what was told, what he could hear, of Ulysses. Bekker reads ἦντον: but ἦν is only used = 'it' in the disjunctive ἦν—ἦν.

419. ἑδον参股 'while others devour.'
ιέμενοι κτείναι, πρὶν πατρίδα γαίαν ἱκέσθαι
ἀλλὰ τά γ᾽ οὖν ὄνω πρὶν καὶ τινα γαία καθέξει
ἀνδρῶν μηστήραν, οἱ τοι βιότον κατέδουσιν.

"Ως ἀρα μιν φαμένη βάδθος ἐπεμάσσατ' Ἄθηνή.
κάρψε μὲν οἱ χρόνα καλῶν ἐνὶ γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσι, 430
ξανθᾶς δ' ἐκ κεφαλῆς διλέε τρίχας, ἀμβὶ δὲ δέρμα
πάντεσσιν μελέσσαν παλαιοῦ θῆκε γέρωντος,
κνύσσες δὲ οἱ δοσεῖ πάροι περικαλλὲς ένοντε.
ἀμβὶ δὲ μιν ράκος ἄλλο κακὸν βάλεν ἡδὲ χίτωνα,
βαγαλέα ῥυπόωντα, κακὸ μεμορυγμένα καπνῷ. 435
ἀμβὶ δὲ μιν μέγα δέρμα ταχείης ἐσσεř ἐλάφῳ
ψιλὸν δῶκε δὲ οἱ σκῆπτρον καὶ δεικέα πῆρην,
πυκνὰ ῥωγαλένην ἐν δὲ στρόφος ἔνεν ἀορτῆρ.
Τό γ' ὡς βουλεύσαντε διέτμαγεν· ἢ μὲν ἐπεῖτα
ἐς Δακεδαίμονα διαν ἐβη μετὰ παιδ' Ὀδυσσῆος. 440

428 om. H Eust. 430 μὲν οἱ MSS.: originally κάρψεν μὲν (Bekk.), or κάρψεν

431. Ulysses is here supposed to be 437. ψιλὸν 'bare,' the wool worn off.
καρδᾶς: but see 16. 176 (with the note), 440. The book ends in the middle of
also 6. 231. a sentence: ἢ μὲν... αὐτὰρ δὲ κτλ. 'she
434. ἄλλο 'other' (than his own). went to Sparta, while he &c.'
Ἀντάρ ὁ ἐκ λιμένος προσέβη τρηχεῖαν ἀταρπνχῶν ἀν ὑλήντα δι’ ἄκριας. ἦν Αἰθήνη πέφρατε δίον υφορβῶν, δ οἱ βιοτοι μάλιστα κηδετο οἰκήνον οὐς κτῆσατο δίοις Ὁδυσσεούς.

Τόν δ’ ἄρ’ ἐνι προδὴμῳ εὖρ’ ἦμον, ἐνθα οἱ αὐλῆ ὑψηλα δέμητο περισκέπτο ἑνὶ χώρῳ, καλῆ τε μεγάλῃ τε, περιβρομος. ἦν ρα συβάτης αὐτὸς δείμαθ’ ὑψιν ἀποιχομένοιν ἀνακτος, νῦσφιν δεσποίνης καὶ Λαέρταο γέρνοντος, ῥυτισιον λάβοσι καὶ ἔθργκοσεν ἀχέρδων

σταυροῦς δ’ ἐκτὸς ἔλασε διαμπεῖε ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα, πυκνοῦς καὶ θαμέας, τὸ μέλαν δρυὸς ἀμφικάσσας—ἐντοσθεν δ’ αὐλῆς συφεύς δυοκάιδεκα πολεὶ πλησιόν ἀλλήλων, εἴνας οὐσον’ ἐν δὲ ἐκάστῳ •

πεντήκοντα σὺς χαμαινάδες ἐρχατώντο, θῆλειαι τοκάδες: τοῦ δ’ ἄρσενε ἐκτὸς Ιανον, πολλὰν παυρότεροι: τοὺς γὰρ μινύθεσκον ἔδοντες


2. δ’ ἄκριας ‘through’ or ‘among the hill-tops.’
3. πεφραδε ‘showed’ (the way to): 15. 424.
7. περιβρομος ‘with an open space round it,’ serving as the glacis of the fortress, to guard against surprise.
10. ῥυτισιον, probably not ‘drawn,’ but ‘dug,’ ‘quarried.’ This sense, as Schulze points out (Quintil. Ep. p. 318), may be traced in ἐρυσίχων, and Lat. runo, eruo (rūta caesi—minerals and timber).
12. τὸ μέλαν ‘the dark part,’ viz. the heart of the oak.

ἀμφικάσσας ‘splitting off all round,’ i.e. splitting so as to separate the softer outside and leave the heart. The article is used (as with comparatives) to mark a contrast, here between the darker and the lighter wood: Η. Κ. § 260 (ε').

Aristarchus took τὸ μέλαν to be the bark (φλαός), and this view is adopted by Aemis and others. But the bark would hardly be called ‘the black part of the wood,’ and the process of stripping it off would not be splitting.

13-16. These lines are almost a parody of the description of Priam’s palace, II. 6. 244-249.
16. Ιανον ‘lay,’ passed the night: the word does not necessarily imply sleep, as appears e.g. from II. 9. 325 δέσνους νύκτας Ιανον.
14. **OΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ ξ**

αὐτόθει μηστήρες, ἐπεὶ προϊαλλε συμβάτης
αἰεί ἐτρεφέον σιᾶλων τὸν ἄριστον ἀπάντων
οἱ δὲ τρικάριοι τε καὶ ἐξήκοντα πέλοντο.

πάρ δὲ κώνες ὑθεσιν ἐκότες αἰεὶ λαυν
τέσσαρες, ὦδε ἐθρέψε συμβάτης ὄρχαμοι ἄνδρῶν.

αὐτὸς δὲ ἀμφὶ πόδεσιν ἔοις ἄραρισκε πέδιλα,
τάμνον δέρμα βθείοιν εὔχροες· οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι
ἀξόνιν ἄλλες ἄλλος ἀμφὶ ἀγρομένοισι σύσσειν,
οἱ τρεῖς· τὸν δὲ τέταρτον ἀποπροκειθεῖν πάλινδε
σὺν ἀγέμενοι μηστὴροι υπερφάλλοισιν ἀνάγκην,
ὅρῃ ἰεροῦαντες κρείων κορεσαίατο θυμὸν.

Ἐξαπίνης δ' Ὑδοὺηα ἰδὼν κὼνες ὑλακόμωραι.

οἱ μὲν κεκλήγωντες ἐπέδραμον· αὐτὰρ Ὁδούσεις
ἐξετο κερδοτην, σκήπτρον δὲ οἱ ἐκπεσε χειρός.

ἐνθά κεν δ' πάρ σταθήκοι διεκέλιον πάθει ἄλγος·
ἀλλὰ συμβάτης ὥκα σοὶ κραντοῦσιν μετασπὸν
ἐσοντ' ἀνὰ πρόβυρον, σκύτος δὲ οἱ ἐκπεσε χειρός.

τοὺς μὲν ὄμοκλησες σεθεν κώνας ἄλλες ἄλλον
πυκνήσεν λιθάδεσσιν· δὲ δρισεῖτεν ἀνακτα·

22 was suspected by Callistratus διὰ τὴν
ἐκατομάξιον τῶν κυνῶν καὶ τὸ δικαίεν (Schol. Ἡχ)
. The epithet ὄρχαμοι ἄνδρῶν
is not unusual; but it is singular that the number of the dogs should be the
same as that of the servants of Eamæus. Possibly l. 23 originally referred to
the ἄλλοι— a preceding line or lines, in which they were mentioned for the
first time, having been lost. As the text stands of ἄλλοι in l. 24 is obscure.

28 κρεῖαδ] For this form, in which the ι for ε is unexplained, we
can always substitute κρεῖα, a form preserved by the MSS, in H. Mec. 130.
30 κεκλή

35 ἄλλον Αρ. Δ. J U: ἁλη vulg.

26. τρεῖς 'three of them,' H. G.
§ 260 (σ).
29. ὑλακόμωρος is a kind of parody
of the heroic epithet ἄγαχομαρος,
τόμαρος. We cannot tell what precise
meaning (if any) was given by the latter
part of the word. See on ll. 2. 692.
30. κεκλήγωντες. In the history of
this participle we may trace (1) an
original (i. e. pre-Homeriκ) κεκλήγωντες,
the plur. of (Homeriκ) κεκληγόνος; (2) a
metaplastic κεκλήγωντες of the thematic
conjugation, probably the only Homeriκ
form of the plural; and (3) κεκλήγωντες,
a corruption due on the one hand to
κεκληγόνος, and on the other to such
plurals as εὐτεῦτες, πεθεῦτες, and the
like. The metaplastic pf. part. in -ων,
-ωτος is Aeolic; but whether κεκλή
γωντες in Homer has come from the
Aeolic dialect is a different question.
See H. G. App. F.
33. μετασπὼν 'taking in hand': ἔτω
in this use is probably from a root σεπ,
and therefore a different word from
ἐκομα σεμα (root σεπ): see Brugmann,
Grundr. II. 677, p. 1021.
34. πρόβυρον 'gateway,' sc. of the
ἄλη, σκύτος 'the leather,' viz. which
he was cutting into sandals (l. 24).
"δι γέρον, ἡ ὀλύγον σε κόνες διεδηλήσατο ἐξαπίνης, καὶ κέν μοι ἐλεγχεῖν κατέχεινα.
καὶ δὲ μοι ἀλλὰ θεοὶ δῶσαι ἀλγεά τε στοναχάς τε ἀντιθέου γὰρ ἀνακτὸς ὁδυρόμενοι καὶ ἄχειν
ἡμαι, ἀλλοισίν δὲ σῶσα σιάλους ἀτίταλλον ἐδρεύα τις ἀλλοθρών ἄνδρῶν δῆμον τε πόλιν τε,
εἰ πον ἐπι ἔξοι καὶ ὀρᾷ φῶς ἥξειον.
ἀλλʼ ἐπέσε, κλισίνην ἱμεν, γέρον, ὄφρα καὶ ἀυτὸς σῖτον καὶ ὄνυμον κορεσσάμενος κατὰ θυμὸν εἶναι ὑποθέθεν ἐσοὶ καὶ ὑπόσα κάθε ἀνέτλης."

"Ὡς εἰπὼν κλισίνην ἥγησατο δῖος ὑφορυδός,
εἰςεν δὲ εἰσαγαγόν, ῥώπας δ ὑπέχευε δασείας,
ἐστόρεσσεν δ εἰπ δέρμα ἱονβάδος ἄγριον αλγὸς,
ἀυτοῦ ἔνευναιον, μέγα καὶ δαυδ. χαίρε δε' Ὀδυσσεῦς
ὅτι μιν δ ὑπέδεκτο, ἤπεσι τε ἔφατ' ἐκ τ' ὄνυματε.
"Ζεῦς τοι δολῆ, ἔξειν, καὶ ἀδάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι
ὅτι μάλιστ' ἐθέλεις, ὄτι με πρὸφορὰν ὑπέδεξό."  

Τὸν δ ἀπαμείβόμενος προσέφθης, Ἐδύμαε συβοτα.
"ξείν, οὐ μοι θέμις ἑστ', οὐδ' εἰ κακίων σέβειν ἔλθοι,
ξείων ἀτιμήσας πρὸς γὰρ Διὸς εἰσώ ἀπάντες
ξείων τε πτοχοί τε. δῶσι δ ὀλγη γ τε φίλη τε
γίγνεται ἡμετέρης ὡς ἄρα δύσων δίκη ἐστὶν
αιε δείδησαν, δτ' ἐπικρατέσωι ἀνακτε
οἱ νεόι. ἡ γὰρ τοῦ γε θεοὶ κατὰ νῦστον ἐδῆσαν,
δς κεν εἰ' ἐνυκτέως ἐφίλει καὶ κτῆσιν ὑπασσεν,
60 ἑκατοτέτων ἐν ἘμπτἘστ."

41. ήμαι 'I hide,' cp. παρθένοιοι 13, 407. The metre is defective: perhaps the impf. ἠμαί should be read, as 'I have been sitting.' (H. C. § 73).
41. αὐτοῦ ἐνυπάλων 'his own very bed-covering': cp. l. 102.
55. κακίων 'one more miserable.'
57. πρὸς Δίαι, see on 6. 307.
58. Ενυμασ means simply ὀλγη, as the context shows: but he uses the set phrase ὀλγη γ τε φίλη γ as a euphemism, in order to soften what he wishes to say.
59. 'For that is the manner of bonds-
60. ἑκατοτέτων G F T Eust.
14. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΙΑΣ Ξ

οιά τε δ οικηή ἀναξ εὐθυμος ἐδωκεν,
ολκῶν τε κληρῶν τε πολυμνήστην τε γυναίκα,
δε οί πολλα κάμμης, θεός δ' ἐπι ἔργων ἀέγη,
ὡς καὶ έμοι τόδε ἔργων ἀεξεται, δ' ἐπιμιμω·
τω κέ με πολλ' ὄνησεν ἀναξ, ει αὐτόθ' ἐγήρα·
ἀλλ' ὁλεθ'—ὡς ὀφελλ' Ἐλένης ἀπό φολον ὀλέσθαι
πρόχυν, ἐπεὶ πολλῶν ἀνδρῶν ὑπό γούνατ' ἐλυσε·
καὶ γᾶρ κεῖνος ἔβη Αγαμέμνονος εἰνεκα τιμῆς
" Ἰλιον εἰς εὐπαλον, ἵνα Ἑράνθι μάχοιτο."

"Ως εἰπόν ζωστήρι θοῶς συνέργει χιτώνα,
βῆ δ' ίμεν ες συφεώς, δὴι ἐβνεα ἔρχατο χῷρων.
ἐνθὲν ἠλών δ' ἔνεικε καὶ ἀμφοτέρους ἔλευσεν,
εὔπετε τε μιστυλέν τε καὶ ἀμβ' ὀβελοίσιν ἔπειρεν.
οὐτῆς δ' ἄρα πάντα φέρων παρέθηκ' Ὀδυσσῇ
θέμ' αὐτοίς ὀβελοίσι· ὦ δ' ἀλφιτα λευκὰ πάλυνεν·
ἐν δ' ἄρα κυσσβίθρι κίρη μεληδέα ὀλιν,
αὐτὸς δ' ἀντίον Κεν, ἐποτρύνων δὲ προσπόδα·
" ἐσθίε νῦν, ὅν εἰςε να, τα τε δμαφεσί πάρεστι,
χοἰρε· ἀτὰρ σιάλους γε σύας μυστηρες ἐδουσιν,
οὐκ ὁπίδα φρονέοντες ἔνι φρεσίν ὀδ' ἐλητίν.
οὐ μὲν σχέτλια ἔργα θεοι μάκαρες φιλέουσιν,
ἀλλὰ δίκεν τίνου καὶ αἰσίμα ἐργ' ἀνθρώπων,
καὶ μὲν δυσμενεῖς καὶ ἀνάρσιοι, οἳ τ' ἐπὶ γαλης

67 Φίλοκο' conj. Van Leeuwen.

65. εἰς τε ἁέδχ 'makes to grow onwards': εἰς as in ἑιδος, &c.
69. πρόχυν, lit. 'on the knees,' used metaphorically of utter downfall (as II. 21.460 ἀπολογούτοι πρόχυν καπατ'), but here with a play on the literal sense: 'may the race of Helen fall and be brought to its knees, even as she has loosened the knees of many men.'
77. αὐτοίσ ὀβελοίσ 'with the spits as they were,' without drawing them out of the meat.
82. ἔδω. The word generally occurs in the phrase θεῶν ὡς 'the regard of the gods,' i.e. their watch kept on human transgression. Here and in 1.88 ὡς by itself has this special meaning, so that οὐκ ὁπίδα φρονέοντες is = θεῶν ὡς οὐς ἀλέγοντες (Il. 16. 388, the only place where θεῶν occurs in the Iliad): cp. Od. 20. 215 οὖν ὁπίδα τρομεούντι θεῶν, and 21. 28.
The constr. of the two accusatives ὁπίδα and ἐλητίν is somewhat different: 'not bethinking them of the judgment of the gods, nor (alive to) compassion.'
85. καὶ μὲν δυσμενές. This nom. has no verb, the sentence being taken up again in 1. 88 καὶ μὲν τοῖς κτλ. with a different construction. But the anacoluthon is softened by the nom. in the intervening clause of τ' ἐπὶ γαλης ἀλλοτρίης βασιν: cp. the note on 13. 81.
άλλοτρίης βῶσιν καὶ σφι Ζεὺς ληθὰ δοθ’,
πλησάμενοι δέ τε νήας ἔβαν οἰκόνδε νέεσθαί,
καὶ μὲν τοῖς ὁπίδοις κρατερῶν δέος ἓν φρειτι πίπτει.
οἴδε δὲ τοι ἰσαίς, θεοῦ δὲ τιν’ ἐκλυν οἰδήν,
κείνου λυγρὸν ὀλέθρον, δ’ τ’ οὐκ ἔθελονσι δικαίως
μνᾶσθαι οὐδὲ νέεσθαι ἐπὶ σφέτερ’, ἀλλὰ ἐκηλοὶ
κτήματα ἀραβάπτουσιν ὑπέρβιον, οὐδ’ ἐπὶ φειδώ.
δοσάι γὰρ νύκτες τε καὶ ἡμέραι ἐκ Δίας εἶσιν,
οὔ ποθ’ ἐν ἱεροῦ ἱερήν, οὐδὲ δό’ οἴω
οἴνον δέ φθινόουσιν ὑπέρβιον ἐξαφόντες.

ἡ γὰρ οἱ ζωή γ’ ἢν ἀσπετος: ο’ τινὶ τόσῃ
ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων, οὐτ’ ἤπειροιο μελανή
οὕτ’ αὐτῇς Ἴθάκες: οὐδὲ ἔννεκείσκοι φατῶν
ἐστ’ ἄφενος τοσσοῦτον: ἐγὼ δὲ κ’ τοι καταλέξω.
δάδεκ’ ἐν ἤπειρο ἀγέλαι: τόσα πώεα οἴων,
τόσα σοῦν συβότα, τό’ αἰσθαλα πλατέ’ αἰγῶν
βόσκουσι ξείνιον τε καὶ αὐτοῦ βάτορες ἄνδρες.
ἐνθάδε δ’ αἰσθαλα πλατέ’ αἰγῶν ἐνδέκα πάντα
ἐχατη βόσκουν, ἐπὶ δ’ ἄνερες ἔσολοι βρονταί.
τῶν αἰεί σφιν ἔκαστος ἐπὶ ἡματι μῆλον ἀγινεί,
ζατρεφέων αἰγῶν δς τις φαϊνηται ἄριστος.
αὐτάρ ἐγὼ σοὺς τάσσει φυλάσσοι τε ρύμαι τε,
καὶ σφι σῶν τὸν ἄριστον ἐν κρίνας ἀπόπεμπω’.

"Ως φάθ’, ὃ δ’ ἐνδυκέως κρέα τ’ ἤθειν πινέ τε οἴνον

89 δ’ τοι Μ.: δ’ τι vulg. 92 οὗτ’ εἰν vulg.: οὗτ’ ἔν: v.l. ap. Eust.
94 δο’ οὗ τ’ ὅλα MSS. 104 ἴσχατὶν Αr. The acc. with βόσκομαι occurs
in the hymn to Hermes (27, 72, 232, 559), not in Homer.

89. Join ἰσαίς κείνου λυγρὸν ὀλέθρον.
The common reading τι ἰσαίς gives a less satisfactory meaning, besides making
tι a long syllable.
90. τι τι ἐν respect that,’ as they show by the fact that —.
91. ἑκατον † untroubled,’ sans gén. 
95. ὑπέρθρον is adverbial, as in l. 92.
97. Gen. of the space within which.
101. συβότα. The 1 is counted as long by metrical licence, the word
being otherwise impossible in the hexa-
meter. So καταλοφάδια 10. 169. In
both cases the spelling -εια is against
all analogy (Schulze, Quast. Ep. 255).
102. αὐτοῦ ‘his own,’ cp. l. 51.
104. ἐπὶ βρονταί ‘are watchers (ὄροι,
τοιουροι) over them’: see on 3. 471,
II. 23. 112.
105. ἐπὶ ἠματι ‘for the day,’ 2. 284.,
12. 105. II. 10. 48.
109. ἐνδυκέως qualifies the whole
clause κρέα τ’ ἤθειν πινέ τε οἴνον, and is
further explained by the two adverbs
ἀφεαντόληος ἐστί. See on l. 62.
κρέα, see J. Schmidt, Pluralb. p. 338.
14. ὸΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ξ

ἀπαλέως ἄκεων, κακὰ δὲ μνηστήριοι φύτευεν. 110
αὐτὰρ ἔπει δείπνυσε καὶ ἥραρε θυμὸν ἐδώδη, καὶ οἱ πλησάμενοι δῶκε σκύφων, ὥσερ ἐπὶνεν, εἶναι ἐνέπλειον. ὁ δὲ ἐδεξατο, χαίρε δὲ θυμῷ, καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόετα προσήδεα:
"Ὁ φίλε, τίς γάρ σε πρίατο κτεάτεσσιν ἑώσιν, ὥσερ μαχαίρια καὶ καρτέρος ὡς ἄγορευες; φῆς δ' αὐτὸν φθόνοις Ἀγαμέμνονος εἰνεκα τίμησ. εἰπὲ μοι, αἷς ποτὶ γνώσι τοιούτου ἑόντα. Ζεῖς γάρ που τό γε οἶδε καὶ αὖθαναι θεοὶ άλλοι, εἰ κέ μιν ἀγγελαίμι ιῶν· ἐπὶ πολλαὶ δ' ἀλήθειν." 115
Τὸν δ' ἡμείσθε' ἐπείτα συβάσις, ὀρχαμος ἄνδρων:
"Ὃ γέρον, οὗ τὶς κείνους ἄνηρ ἀλαλήμενος ἔλθων ἀγγέλλων πείσεις γυναίκα τε καὶ φίλων υἱῶν, ἀλλ' ἀλλο τοῦμας κεχρημάνου ἄνδρες ἢλήται ψεύδοντ', οὕτ' ἐθέλουσεν ἢρθέα μυθήσασθαι. 120
ὅ δὲ κ' ἀλητέων 'Ἰθάκης ἐς δήμον ἱκηται, ἔλθων ἐς δεύτεραν ἑμὴν ἀπατήλια βάζει· ἡ δ' εὖ δεξαμενή φιλείς καὶ ἐκατά μεταλλά, καὶ οἱ ὀδυρομένης βλεφάρων ἀπο δάκρυα πίπτει, ἡ θείας ἐστὶ γυναίκος ἐπεί πόσις ἄλλοθ' ἢληται. 125
αὖ γα καὶ σῦ, γεραίς, ἐπος παρατείνοι, εἰ τίς τοις χλαίνας τε χιτῶνα τε εἶματα δοίης.
τοῦ δ' ἑδ' μέλλουσι κόνες ταχέες τ' οἴωνοι 
μινὸν ἀπ' ὀστειδίν ἐρύσασ, ψυχῇ δὲ λέλοιπεν

112 σικεχρέων Αἰ., σικεχρέων Aristoph. (Athen. xi. 498).

112. καὶ οὗ is the apodosis, 'then did
he (οἷς Eumaeus) fill &c.' The act
being necessarily that of the host, the
name of Eumaeus is not added.
118. αἰ κέ ποθε γενέω 'in case I shall
know,' i.e. 'find that I know.'
130. αἰ κέ μν ἀγγελαίμι ιῶν 'if I
may bring news of having seen him.'
123-132. The connexion of the speech
is: 'We cannot believe any of the wan-
derers who bring news of him; they
make up false tales in order to get
entertainment: you may be one of
them': i.e. 'There are so many false
tales brought by wanderers that we
must disbelieve you too.'
123. ἀφούς, opt. after ob, H. G.
§ 299 (f).
133. μέλλουσι with the aorist in-
means 'are like to have —,' 'must have
—,' cp. ll. 18. 162., 21. 83., 24. 46, Od.
4. 181 (ἀγάδεον οὖν G P D T).
14. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ε

η τον γ' εν πόντῳ φάγων ἔχοντες, ὡστεα δ' αὐτῷ κεῖται ἐπ' ἱππείρον ψαμάθῳ εἰλυμένα πολλῆ.
δις ο μὲν ἐνθ' ἀπόλολε, φίλοις δὲ κῆδε' ὀψίσω πάσιν, ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα, τετεύχονται οὐ γὰρ ἐτ' ἄλλον ἦπιον ὁδ' ἀνακτά κιχήσομαι, ὀππὸν' ἐπέλθω, οὐδ' εἴ κεν πατρὸς καὶ μητέρος αὐτίς ἰκομαί οἶκον, δι' ἐπί τότις γενόμην καὶ μ' ἐφερέν οὖτοι.
οὐδὲ νῦ τῶν ἔτι τόσον ὄντων, ἰμἐνόν περ ὀρβαλμοῖν ἴδεσθαί ἓν ἐν πατρίδι γαίη. ἀλλὰ μ' ὦδυσεῖος πόδος αἰτεῖται οὐχομένῳ.
τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν, ὦ ζεῖνε, καὶ οὐ παρεόαν' ὁμοίειν αἰδέομαι πέρι γάρ μ' ἐφίλει καὶ κῆδετο θυμὸν' ἀλλὰ μιν ἢθεῖν καλέω καὶ νόσφιν ἕνατα.

Τὸν δ' αὐτῷ προσέπη πολύτλας διὸς ὀδυσεύς;
"ἀ δ' ψαλμιντ.Entry πάμπαν ἅλωνεα, οὐδ' ἤτις ἤθορα
κεῖνον ἐλεψεσθαι, θυμὸς δέ τοι αἰέν ἀπιστος·
ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ὅπιτ' αὐτὸς μυθήσομαι, ἀλλὰ σὺν δρκφ,
οὐ νείται ὦδυσεύς' εὔαγγέλιον δὲ μοι ἔστω αὐτή̄ε' ἐπέλ κεν κεῖνοι ἓν τὰ δ ὀδάθ' ἱκηται:
[ἐσσαι με χλαίναν τε χιτώνα τε, εἰματα καλά]
πρὶν δὲ κε καὶ μάλα περ κεχρημένος, οὖ τι δεχόμην.
155
ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμός ἀλφαίο πύλη<
γίνεται, δς πενή εἴκων ἀπαθήλα βάξεά.

150

145-147. The meaning seems to be that the swineherd does not name Odysseus in speaking of him, but uses the word ἢθείος, which is properly a form of respectful address. Elsewhere we only find the voc. ἢθείς or (once) ἢθείς κεφάλη. The modern use of titles shows many instances of the same kind.

149, ἀνάλεως, properly 'refuse.' Cp. the use of μὴ in oaths and strong denial.
158-162. These five lines recur in 19. 503-507, and form the conclusion of the speech in which Ulysses assures Penelope of his speedy return. The last line, τοῦ μὲν φίλωντος μυρὸς τοῦ δ' λατρεύων, even fixes the day; for it describes the day called at Athens ἦν καὶ νέα, the last of one month and first of another, which was the very day following the dialogue with Penelope. The chronology is further emphasized by the fact that it was the feast-day of Apollo (20. 156, 276-278., 21. 258). Thus Ulysses ends his speech in the most effective way, promising his own return on the day then about to dawn.
162 om. P. 162–164. The Harleian MS. has the following scholium: 

_νοστήσατοι τοῖς τρεῖς ὑμέροιν πρὸς τὰ ἀρτὸν καὶ ὑμέροις καὶ ὑμέροις_ πέπλευ _γάρ_ ἀδιν ἔκκλησις τῶν πολεωμῶν; There is nothing in the MS. to show which three lines are referred to. Buttman assigned the scholium to 163–164. Dindorf adds in confirmation of this that in the Venetian MS. the five lines 160–164 are marked with asterisks: but this fact, if it has any value as evidence, surely tends rather to make it doubtful which three lines were suspected. Nor does the substance of the scholium clear up the doubt. The meaning seems to be that the stranger's words would be suspicious; for how could he know exactly when Ulysses would arrive in Ithaca? (For _οὐ_ _πολέω_ it is necessary to read _εὐδοκεῖ_.) This, however, only applies to 1. 162; and 19. 306–307 show that 161 and 162 stand or fall together. Probably, then, the three lines actually suspected were 160–162.

In this place the case is different. The speech does not end with τοῖς _μὲν_ _φιλικοῖς_ αὐτῷ, but we have a sort of second conclusion in 163–164 _οἶδα_ _νοστήσατοι_ αὐτῷ, which is something of an anti-climax. These last lines have accordingly been questioned (but see the critical notes). It seems to me more probable that the two lines 161–162—

that perhaps, as Kirchhoff held, the seven lines 158–164 that contain the oath—belong originally to the nineteenth book, and have been brought in wrongly here. This is a common form of corruption in Homer; whereas the interpolation of 163–164 would be difficult to account for. It is evident, too, on all principles of art, that in this place the prophecy about Ulysses ought to be general in its terms—_οἶδα_ _νοστήσατοι_ αὐτῷ _περίπτερον_—thus agreeing with the language of Helen to Telephus in 15. 177. More threatening words are naturally used by Ulysses himself a little later (18. 146 ff. _μάλα_ _δὲ_ _σχεδὸν_ αὐτῷ). But the precise and emphatic _τοῦ_ _αὐτοῦ_ _λυκάβαντος_ αὐτῷ, is best kept to heighten the interest at the last and most critical point in the story.

This view of 161–162 (in which I have been partly anticipated by Dr. Hayman) is strongly confirmed by the interpretation which it enables us to give of the word _λυκάβας_. The word is otherwise known only in Alexanderian and later authors, who doubtless took it from Homer. They explained it as meaning literally the 'path of light,' _i.e._ of the sun, and so as a poetical word for 'a year.' Admitting the etymology, we should rather expect it to mean 'a day,' or (more precisely) a _νυχθήμερον_, the period of time in which daylight goes and comes again. For _λυκάβας_ is the 'going of light,'—not of the sun (or moon). Further, this explanation of _λυκάβας_ gives a much better sense in the Odyssey. Critics have already noticed the absurdity of the announcement that Ulysses will come 'within this same year,' followed by a mention of the day, which happens to be the very next day (Buttmann on Schol. H. Od. 14. 162). In any case the words 'within this same year' must have sounded as a mockery to Penelope, who was literally on the eve of abandoning hope and consenting to accept one of the suitors. But if Ulysses said 'within a day' (in the sense of twenty-four hours), all is plain. The Slaying of the Suitors was on the day following the night of the dialogue with Penelope. Hence _λυκάβας_ is correct, and indeed the only correct word (_ἡμέρα_ being generally used of 'day' in contrast to night: _cp_. _ἡμείτι_ _τὰς_ in 20. 116 _after dawn_). On the other hand in the dialogue with Eumaeus here Ulysses could not say _τοῦ_ _αὐτοῦ_ _λυκάβαντος_, since it still wanted four days to the _μουστρατοφυῖα_.

The period of the _νυχθήμερον_ was probably reckoned from sunset to sunset: see II. 19. 141. So in counting days, Od. 14. 93 _δόσω_ _γὰρ_ _νυκτὶ_ _τε_ _καὶ_ _ἡμέραι_ _ἐν_ _Δίος_ _εἶναι_.

159. _τορίς_. In Homer the heath is
οίκάδε νοστήσει, καὶ τίσεται ὃς τις ἐκεῖνον ἐνθάδε ἀτιμάζει ἄλοχον καὶ φαίδιμον νῦν.

Τὸν δὲ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφης, Ἐδμαιε συβῶτα. 165
“ὁ γέρων, οὐτὶ ἄρ’ ἐγὼν εὐαγγέλιον τόδε τίσω, οὐτὶ Ὅδωρεὺς ἐτί οἴκοιν ἠλεύσεται ἀλλὰ ἐκηλὸν πίνε, καὶ ἄλλα παρεξ μεμνώμεθα, μηδὲ με τούτων μὴνας. ἥ γὰρ θυμὸς ἐνι στήθεσον ἐρῶσιν ἄχνυται, ὑπότε τις μνήσῃ κενὸν ἀνακτος. 170

ἀλ’ ἦ τοι δρκον μὲν ἔσομεν, αὐτὰρ Ὅδωρεὺς ἐλθοί ὅπως μιν ἔγαγα’ έθέλω καὶ Πηνελόπεια Δαέρτης θ’ ὁ γέρων καὶ Τηλέμαχος θεοειδῆς. 175

νῦν αὖ παιδὸς ἀλαστὸν ὅδρομαι, ὅν τεκ’ Ὅδωρεὺς, Τηλεμάχου τὸν ἁπεὶ θρέψαι θεοί ἔρευν ἰσων, καὶ μὲν ἐφην ἑσσεθαί ἐν ἀνδράσιν οὗ τι χέρεια πατρὸς εἰοίν φίλοιο, δέμας καὶ ἐίδος ἀγητῶν, τὸν δὲ τις ἀναντῶν βλάψῃ φρένας ἐνδὼν ἔισας ἥ τις ἀνθρώπων. δ’ ἐβη μετὰ πατρὸς ἁκοῦν ἐς Πύλον ἡγαθέν τὸν δὲ μνησθῆρε ἄγανο

οἰκαθ’ ἐωτα λοχῶσιν, ὅπως ἄπο φίλον δλαται νόμυμον ἐς Ἰθάκης Ἀρκεισίου ἀντιθείοι.

ἀλ’ ἦ τοι κείνων μὲν ἔσομεν, ἢ κεν ἀλῶῃ ἢ κεν φύγῃ καὶ κέν οἱ ὑπέρςχη χέρας Κρονιόν. 185

ἀλ’ ἄγε μοι σὺ, γεραιέ, τά σ’ αὐτόν κηδὲ ἐνίστε, καὶ μοι τοῦτ’ ἀγόρευσον ἐτήμων, ὁφ’ ἐν ἐλδά τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλεις ἢ δὲ τοκῆς; ὡς ποίημα τ’ ἐπὶ νῦς ἄφικεν. πῶς δὲ σε ναίται

162 νοστῆσας F Π Η Υ. 163-170 ψυμὸς ... ἄχρινον G Λ W: ψυμὸν ... ἄχρινον Π Η Χ Υ δ. 171 δρκον κείνων Zνερ. 172-174 οἰκεῖα M: perhaps because Ευμακεὺς could not know of the ambush. 176 χέρεια Α.: χερείων MSS. 177 δέμας L W, Eust.: φρένας vulg. 178 τὸν Α., Π Η: τοῦ Ἡ.Υ.αλ.

a sacred object, but is not a goddess, like the later Ἐσυρία. It only occurs in this form of oath; the ordinary word for ‘hearth’ in Homer is ἑκάρη.

The house of Eumaeus was not the ‘hearth of Ulysses.’ The words apply only to his own palace, cp. 17. 156, 19. 304.

171. Eumaeus declines the oath which Ulysses offered, but which (if 158 ff. are rejected) he had not actually taken.

177. ἄγγίητες, masc., in apposition to ὁ τι χέρεια. On χέρεια see H. C. § 121. 178. τὸν Ν. § 121, apodosis to ἑας (l. 175). 179. χερείων μετὰ πατρὸς ἁκοῦν, like μετὰ σῶν κλητ. 13. 415. 187-190, = 1. 170-173.
14. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ε

ηγαγὸν εἰς Ἰδάκην; τίνες ἐμεναι εὐχετῶντο;
οὐ μὲν γὰρ τί σε πεζὸν οἴομαι ἐνθάδε ἱκέσθαι.

Τὸν δ’ ἀπαμείβομενος προσέφη πολύμητι 'Οδυσσεύς:

"τοιγαρ ἐγὼ τῷ ταῦτα μᾶλ’ ἀπρεκέως ἀγορεύσω.
εἰς μὲν νῦν ναῦν ἐπὶ χρόνον ἥμεν ἐδωθή
ἡδὲ μέθυ γλυκέρων κλισίς ἔντοσθεν ἐσοφεί,
δαίνουσα άκέοντ’, ἄλλοι δ’ ἐπὶ ξέρων ἐποίειν

ῥηθῶς κεν ἐπείτα καὶ εἰς ἐναυτὸν ἀπαντα
οὐ τὶ διαπρήξαμι λέγων ἐμὰ κῆδεα θυμοῦ,
δόσα γε δὴ ἐξπαντα θεῶν ἱκριτὶ μῦγησα.

εἰ μὲν Κρητῶν γένος εὐχομαι εὐφρεῖαν,
ἀνέρος ἀφυεοὶ παῖς· πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι

υῖς ἐνι μεγάρῳ ἦμεν τράφεν ἢ ἐγένοντο

γνήσιοι ἐξ ἀλὸχου ἐμὲ δ’ ἀνετῇ τέκε μήτηρ

παλλάκις, ἀλλὰ με Ιδον Ιδαγενέσσιν ἔτιμα
Κάστωρ 'Τλακίδης, τοῦ ἐγὼ γένος εὐχομαι εὐναί·
δὲ τότ’ ἐνι Κρήτεσσε θεοὶ δὲ τίετο δὴμόφ

δάβα φε πλούτφ τε καὶ νιᾶδι κυδαλίμοιναν.

ἀλλ’ ἢ τοῦ τῶν κήρες ἔβαι θανάτοιο φέρουσαι
eis 'Αἰδαο δόμους· τοι δὲ γωνὶν ἐδάσαντο

παῖδες ὑπέρθυμοι καὶ ἐπὶ κλήρους ἐβάλοντο,

ἀυτὰ ἐμοὶ μᾶλα παύρα ὅσαν καὶ οἰκὶ ἔνειμαν.

ηγαγόντι δὲ γυναῖκα πολυκλήρων ἀνθρώπων


195. οἰνοποιός, inf. of consequence, 'wherewith to feast.'
196. ἐδώκει, with ἐναυτὸν, as in 15. 455: cp. the expression τετελεσθέντες εἰς ἐναυτῶν.
197. We expect a word meaning 'I could go on,' (διατετολογή μι or the like),
to which ὑπερθύμιμος is equivalent.
201. Better τράφον, see on II. 2. 661, 203. ίδαγενέσσις. The quantity of
the i is not certain. The i of the text
is supported by ίδαιμόνις (?) in II. 16. 586: but both passages can be amended,
as Fick proposed, by reading for here

and άδίφελον for άδειλαον in the Iliad.
209. 'Cast lots for it,' i.e. divided it
and assigned the shares by lot. The
order ἐδάσαντο καὶ ἐβάλοντο marks
the division as the main thing, of which
casting lots was a detail: cp. 13. 274.
210. ólala, sc. μάλα παιδί, repeated
from the preceding clause: cp. II. 16. 271 δὲ μὴ ἄριστο 1 Αργαῖαν παρὰ νησίων
καὶ ἀγχωμοι περατών (sc. οἱ ἄριστοι
εἰς). 211. ἀνθρώπων. The plur. stands for
the family or tribe of the wife: cp. II.
3. 49 ἀνδρῶν αἱματάσων.
14. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ε

einei' emis 'dretis, etei ouk apofiliaiou hα
oude phugospulemos' vnu d' hēi panta λελoivev-
all' emps kalāmen γe σ' otopiēi eisorofwnta
γyγwokewv' h γar me dojē χechi hliada poleasing.

h mēn dē tharros moı' hresis' t' exousan kai 'hthn
kai ῥηξuropoiv, ὅπτe κρύνεμi λόχude
anōras 'aristhēs, kaka dusanvēseiv phuteɔv
oδ potē moı' thαnatos prorīsato toumvds 'aghnavor,
alλα poul prōtisostos epallmeinev exchei elascon
anōdrōn dusumenev oδ tē moı' elgei pōdeisei.

tōīs 'e a̱n polēmpο' ἐργον δε μοι oφioun ἐσκεν
ouv' oikwfeλi, h te trēfei aglalā teκνa,
alλα moı' alei nēs ephepatoi φilai ἕσαν
kai pōleumoi kal akontes exhestoi kal dɔtstoi,

λυγρα, tα t' allousin γe katorigηla péléoueti.
anār eμoi τa φiλ' exke tα που thei en frēsi thēkev
[allos gαr t' allousin anhη epiterpetαι ἐργois.]
pri nēn γαρ Troihs ekthēmena 'ulas Ἀχaiovn
eivikis andrasiōn ἥρα kai ὀκυπροισι νεέsoin
anōras es allodapovoi, kai moı' mala týχaive pōllā.

222. ΕΑ ιν F X: ΕΑ ιν G (perhaps for ιν' ν): ιν' ιν P H (? ) Λ W: ιν' Η P. The
other examples of ΕΑ (II. 4. 321, 5. 887, Od. 14. 352) permit or require ιν.
Read therefore ιν (with synizesis), or ιν' (cp. II. 1. 277 Πηλεθν θελ' or 'θηλ'). It is
 tempting simply to omit ιν: but there is no instance of πολεμος used as a locative.

223. ἀρετῆς, used of any advantages,
not only prowess in war: see 13. 45.
ἀποφύλοι 'useless,' for ἀ-φυλ-οι (δρελ-οτ), with ω for ο σμετι γρατια
217. Editors generally put a colon after ῥηξuropoiv, taking ὅπτε κρίνομι
with the following clause oδ potē moı
κτλ. It is not Homerick, however, to
begin a sentence with a word like ὅπτε in
the middle of a line. But if ὅπτε κτλ is construed with the preceding
words, the clause oδ potē moı κτλ. has
still the character of an apodosis: ' (in
such a case) I never feared &c.' It is in
fact a repetition in a new form of Ἡ μὲν
dē tharros moı κτλ. (l. 216): hence the
asyneton. Cp. Ἐα 15. 317, 16. 466, 18. 278, and see Riddell's Digest, § 205 A.

224. ΕΑ ιν is here -ντες γιας or εις γιας,
contrary to the Homeric usage of the
article (H. G. 262). We expect ἦν χιοῦ.
ἀνίκα ποδεσθιν is obscure. The usual
renderings, 'whoever was inferior to me
in speed,' or 'whoever fled before me
with his feet,' give a poor sense. The
context is a boast of courage and prowess
rather than of speed, and does not
suggest the mere slaughter of a flying
enemy. Probably we should read (with
Bohte) δέ τε μὴ elgeis, 'whoever did not
save himself by speedy retreat.'

227. ΕΑ ιν κτλ. 'things which a
good made dear to me' (not being the
things that would naturally be so).
228. This gnomic line is doubtless of
later date. The form ἔργοις (for ἕρ-
γοις) is doubly post-Homeric.
τῶν ἐξαιρετικῶν μενοεικέα, πολλά δὲ ὁπίσω 
λάγχανον αἰνία δὲ οἰκος ὄφελετο, καὶ ίνα ἔπειτα 
δεινὸς τ' αἰδοίος τε μετὰ Κρήτεσσι τετύμην. 

άλυτο δὲ ὑδίν γε στυγερῆν ὄὁν έκφυσα Ζεδός 
ἐφράσατ' ἡ πολλῶν ἀνδρῶν ὅπδ γοιναρ' ἐλυσε, 
δὴ τότε ἔμενεν καὶ ἀγακυτόν 'Ἰδομενία 
νήσος' ἥγησασθαι ἐσ' 'Ἰλιὼν οὐδὲ τι μῆχος 
ζεν ἀνέμασθαι, χαλεπὴ δ' ἔχε δήμου φῆμις. 

ἐν δὲ μέν εἰνάτες πολεμίζομεν νῖες Ἀχαιῶν, 

τῷ δὲ κατοίκῳ δὲ πόλιν Πραμόμου πέρσαντες ἐβημεν 
οἰκάδε σὺν νῆσσι, θέους δ' ἐκέδασας Ἁχαιός. 

αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ δεῖλο κακά μηδετο μητέτα Ζεδός 
μήν γάρ οἶνον ἔμειναι τεταρπόμενος τεκέσσεσ 
κουμιδίτι τ' ἀλόχω καὶ κτήμασιν: αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα 

Ἀγυπτόνδε με θυμός ἀνώγη κατεπλήσαται, 

νήας ἐν στειλαντα, σὺν ἀντιθείσι εὐώρουσιν. 

ἐνεά νήας στειλα, θοῦος δ' ἐσαξείρετο λαός. 

ἐξήμαρ μὲν ἐπειτα ἐμοὶ ἐρήμες ἐταῖροι 

dαινυντ' αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν λερήμα πολλά παρεῖχον 

θεοίσιν τε βίεϊν αὐτοῖσι τε δαίτα πένεσθαι. 

ἐβδομάτη δ' ἀναβάντες ἀπὸ Κρήτης εὐρέη 

ἐπέλομεν Βορέης ἀνέμος ἄκραεῖ καλφ 

ρηθίδιος, ὡς εἰ τε κατὰ βρόν τευδε καί τιν 

νηών πημάνθη, ἀλλ' ἀνεκθέες καὶ ἄνουσον 

ημεθα, τάς δ' ἀνεμὸς τε κυβερνήτα τ' ἱδων 

πεπταίοι δ' Ἀγυπτοῦ εὐρρείτην ἱκύμεσθα, 

στῆσα δ' ἐν Ἀἰγύπτῳ ποταμῷ νέας ἀμφιελλοσας. 260
ἐνθ' ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ κελθὴν ἐρήμας ἐταῖρος
ἀυτοῦ πάρ νήσεσι μένειν καὶ νήσας ἔρυσθαι,
ὅπτηρας δὲ κατὰ σκοπίαι ἄτρυμα νέοσθαι:
oi δ' ἐβρεῖ εἴξαυτε, ἐπιπόθεμοι μὲνειν σφῶ,
ἀψα μᾶλ' Ἀἰγυπτίων ἄνδρῶν περικαλλέας ἁγρῶς
πόρθεν, ἐκ δὲ γυναῖκας ἄγον καὶ νήπια τέκνα,
ἀυτοὺς τ' ἐκτεινον τάχα δ' ἐς πόλειν ἵκετ' αὐτή.
oi δὲ βοής αἴνετε δ' ἦοι φαινομένηψιν
ἡλθον' πλέω δὲ πάντα πεδίον πεζῶν τε καὶ ἱππῶν
χαλκοῦ τε στεροπῆς' ἐν δὲ Ζεὺς τερπικέρανος
φύσεων ἐμοὶ ἐτάραυσί κακὴν βάλεν, οὐδὲ τις ἔτη
μεῖναι ἐναντίβιον' περὶ γὰρ κακὰ πάντοθεν ἔστη.
ἐνθ' ἡμέων πολλοὺς μὲν ἄπεκτανον ὄςφι χαλκῷ,
τοὺς δ' ἄναγων ξωοὺς, σφῶσιν ἐργάζεσθαι ἀνάγκη.
αὐτὰρ ἤμοι Ζεὺς αὐτὸς ἐνὶ φρέσιν δὲ νόθα
ποιήσα—ὡς ὀφελον θανεῖν καὶ δόμον ἐπιστεῖν
αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἀἰγύπτῳ ἔτι γὰρ νῦ με πῆμ' ὑπέδεκτο—
aὐτ' ἀπὸ κρατὸς κυνέην εὐτυκτὸν ἑθηκά
καὶ σάκος ὁμοῖοι, δόρυ δ' ἐκβαλον ἐπετείχε χείρος:
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ βασιλῆς ἐναντίον ἠλυθὸν ἱππῶν
καὶ κύσα γοῦναθ' ἐλῶν' ὁ δ' ἐρόσατο καὶ μ' ἐλέησεν,
ἐς δυφρόν δὲ μ' ἔσας ἄγεν οἴκαδε δακρύ χέντα. 280
ἡ μὲν μοὶ μάλα πολλοί ἐπιτίσσοσα μελέσεν,
ἰεμενοι κτείναι—δὴ γὰρ κεχολώσατο λῆπν—
ἀλλ' ἀπὸ κεῖνος ἔρυκε, Δίδας δ' ὀπίζητο μὴν
ξείνου, δς τε μάλιστα νεμεσσάται κακὰ ἔργα.
ἐνθα μὲν ἐπτάστες μένος αὐτόθι, πολλὰ δ' ἄγερα

262 σφῶ vulg. : σφῶν X D J al. 270 μείσας] The parallel passage 17.439 has
στῆσα, which may be right: see the note there. 272 ἄναγων] ἄγον F: ἄγαν
X D Z. The gloss ἀνέφω (Sch. V) points to ἄγαν. 279 μ' ἐλέησεν]

260. ἐρώθησα 'to cover', 'defend.'
272. ἄναγων 'took up,' i.e. inland.
Or perhaps 'into their hands'; cp. 18.
357 εἰ 'if' ἀνέκλημα 'if I took you into
my service.'
279. ἐρώτητο καὶ μ' ἐλέησεν is a
prothysteron of the common type; see
13. 274.
285. This chronology is not quite
arbitrary: the seven years in Egypt
take the place of the seven years that in the true history were spent in Cyzico's isle.

287. For δυθοὺς (- -) Dindorf reads δυθόμενος, with synizesis. The place of μοι after δυθοὺς (as has been pointed out by Mr. T. L. Agar in the *Journ. of Phil.* xxvi. 114) is accounted for by the emphasis on the numeral: so in II. 9. 474 ἀλλ' δέ διά διακή μοι ἔπιθομεν ὅλοι ἐπιθεμεθανής and the other instances which he quotes. The conjecture δυθόμενον, with the synizesis δὲ, may be supported by Od. i. 399 (= 15. 477) ἀλλ' δέ θρόνοις ἡπέθεν εὐλογείτο. It is difficult, however, to see why δυθόμενος should have been corrupted into the unmetrical δυθοὺς, and it still seems possible (as suggested in *H. G.* § 365) that we have here a trace of an older form δυθοὺς, Indog. okthy-o- (Brugmann, *Gr.* ii. 481), Lat. ostium.

289. τράχηντας. Barytone nouns in -τας seem often to have a hostile or contemptuous meaning: so διή, σιτης, αλήθης, πρόκλης, ἀνήρ. 'Gnawer' may suggest thieving vermin, mice, &c. ἄνθρωπος cannot well be a true dat. = 'to men,' since (as scholars have observed) the proper constr. is ἔρωμεν, om. ἄνθρωπους. The locative sense 'among men' is possible, but this sense of the dat. plur. is confined for the most part to certain idioms, such as the use with words expressing rule or pre-eminence: see *H. G.* § 145 (7). The reading of G, ἄνθρωπους ἔρωμεν, is supported by Hesychius s. v. ἔρωμεν, where the alphabetical order (as M. Schmidt notes a. l.) requires us to read ἔρωμεν ἐργά- σατο ἐνυποκείμενος. This ἐργάσατο points to an original ἐργάσατο (Dawes, *Misc. Crit.* 184).

290. ἦσεν φρεσίν 'by his wit,' or 'cunning': cp. ii. 1. 132 κλέπτεν νῦν.

291. ἱματιον goes with κενμα, but does not fit δουλος, either in sense or in construction (Zengma).

294. ἐπράξεως seems to mean, not 'came on' (as we speak of a time coming on), but 'came round,' 'passed by': cp. ἐπισωμόνων ἐτος (2. 287) and ἐπέρχομαι = 'to go round,' 'visit,' obiex, as 4. 268 πολλή ἐπεκάθισα γαῖρει, 16. 27 ὥσ. ἐργον ἐπέρχετο οὖθεν νομισάτο: ewi used as in ἐπέποιημαι, ἐπέσωλοι.

295. ἦσαν Λευκούν ἰεύοσατο, a pregnant use, 'put me on board (to take me) to Libya': cp. i. 240 ἦς ἐρρέων ἀνθρωπίαν.

296. ἱματιος has its local sense: 'that I should be his partner in taking a cargo there.'

297. The emphatic position of κεδα and the change from ἐνω to ἐνς serve to indicate that this further purpose was not avowed, but was the real purpose: 'but in such wise that when there he might &c.'
τῷ ἐπάμην ἐπὶ νῆσος διόμενός περ ἀνάγκη.
η δ’ θεεν Βορέη ἀνέμοι ἀκραῖει καλῆς,
μέσον ὑπὲρ Κρήτης. Ζεὺς δὲ σφίζει μῆδετ’ ὀλεθρον.
ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ Κρήτην μὲν ἔλεισθεν, οὐδὲ τε ἄλλη
φαίνετο γαῖῶν, ἄλλ’ ὦρανδός ἦδε θάλασσα,
δὴ τὸτε κυνάεν νεφέλην ἔστησε Κρονίων
νῆσο ὑπὲρ γλαφυρῆς, ἤχλυσε δὲ πόντος ὑπ’ αὐτῆς.
Ζεὺς δ’ ἀμωδὶς βρόντησε καὶ ἐμβαλε νῆι κεραυνῶν
ἡ δ’ ἑλείχθη πᾶσα Δίδ σπληγείσα κεραυνῷ,
ἐν δὲ θεεύο τοῦ πλήρ’ πέσον δ’ ἐκ νῆς ἁπαντες.
ὁ δὲ κορώνησον ἵκελοι περὶ νῆα μέλαιαν
κύμαιν ἐμφορέοντο. θεῖς δ’ ἀποίνυτο νῦστον.
αὐτὰρ ἔμοι Ζεὺς αὐτὸς, ἔχοντι περὶ ἄγγελα θυμὸς,
ἰστὸν ἀμαιμάκετον νῆος κυανοπρόρῳ
ἐν χελρεύου ἐθηκεν, ὅπως ἔτι πῆμα φύγομι.
τῷ μὲν περιπλεχθεὶς φερόμην ὀλοῖς ἀνέμοισιν.

300 ὅπερ] ὅπερ (sic) Ρ, i.e. ὅπερ, the κ having been lost before the initial κ of the next word.

300. μέσον is apparently to be construed as an adverb with θεεν, 'ran before the north wind (taking) the mid-sea course' (cp. 3. 174 πέλαγος μέσον εἰς Ἑββασι τέµενιν). What then is this 'mid-sea course' for a ship which, starting from Phoenicia, has made its way to the south-west corner of Asia Minor? It is further described as being ὅπερ Κρήτης, which words are generally taken as = 'beyond', 'far past Crete,' viz. to the south. This, however, is not a Homeric use of ὅπερ. It cannot be defended by such a phrase as ὅπερ πότεν 'across the sea' (said of Crete itself in 13. 257): land is seen 'over' sea, not conversely. Moreover, there is evidently a contrast intended between θεεν μέσον ὅπερ Κρήτης and the following line ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ Κρήτην μὲν ἔλεισθεν, so that the former clause must belong to the time before the ship was far on its way to Libya. More probably, therefore, ὅπερ is used like καθώρθηκε Χάρης in 3. 170, to denote the side on which they passed the island, viz. by the N.W. or windward side; and μέσον implies keeping off the lee shore of Crete.

The alternative was to follow the chain of islands—Cós, Rhodes, and Carpathus—and then run under the lee of Crete, i.e. along the southern coast. The latter was the course taken on St. Paul's voyage to Rome, which as far as Cnidus was the same as that described here: cp. Acts xxvii. 7 καὶ μὸς γενόμενος κατὰ τὴν Κνίδον, μὴ προσκύνησα ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἄνεμου, ὅπως ἐξεσείωμεν τὴν Κρήτην κατὰ Σηλέμπον (i.e. by the east). Here the fair N.E. wind made it possible to take the 'upper' or windward course.

311. ἀμαιμάκετον 'of vast length,' probably formed by intensive reduplication from the root μακ- (cp. δαίμαλος, καίμαλος, μαμίμος) with the suffix -έτος, as περι-μάκετος, πάκετος. The δ- is prothetic, as in ἀμαιμάκας, ἀμαίμας, ἀμαίσπ. The derivation from μακάσαω 'to rage, storm' (Ameis, &c.) is plausible, but the senses which it yields—'not to be regarded against,' 'invincible,' or (with prothetic δ-) 'raging,' 'furious'—hardly suit this passage. Such an epithet might however be applied to a mast in a spirit of burlesque, such as we occasionally trace in the Odyssey.
14. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ε

ἐννήμαρ φερόμην, δεκάτη δὲ με νυκτὶ μελαίνῃ
gαίῃ Θεσπρωτῶν πέλασεν μέγα κύμα κυλίνδου.

315 ἔθα με Θεσπρωτῶν βασιλέως ἱκομίσαςτατο Φείδων

ὁρεὶ ἀπράτητην τοῦ γὰρ φίλος ὦδε ἐπελθὼν

ἀλθος καὶ καμάτο δεδημένον ἤγεν ἐς ὅκον,

χειρὸς ανυστήσας, ὅφη ἶκετο δῶματα πατρῶς

ἀμφὶ δὲ με κλαίεις τε χιτώνα τε εἴματα ἐσεν.

320 ἔσθ' Ὀδυσσήσος ἐγὼ πυθόμην· κείνος γὰρ ἐφασκε

ζεινεῖα ὧδε φιλήσαι οἶντ' ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,

καὶ μοι κτήθεις ἐδείξεν δοσα ξυναγειράτ' Ὀδυσσείς,

χαλκὸν τε χρυσὸν τε πολύκμητον τε σίδηρον.

325 καὶ νῦ κεν ἐς δεκάτην γενεὴν ἐτερόν γ' ἐτι βύσκοι
tόσα οὐ ἐν μεγάρῳ κειμέλια κείτο ἀνακτος.

τὸν δ' ἐς Δωδώνην φάτο βημενα, ὅφρα θεοῖ

ἐκ δρυὸς ἕνυκτρῳ Δίδω βουλήν ἐπακοῦσα,

ἐπονοοῖο νοοθείει Ἰδάκης ἐς πόλον δήμον

ἢν δὴν ἀπ' ἐν, ἢ ἀμφαδὸν ἢ κρυφηδόν.

330 ὅμοιο δὲ πρὸς ἐμ' αὐτόν, ἀποστένων εὖν οἶκφ,

ἀνα κατειρύσθαι καὶ ἐπαρτέας ἐμμεν ἑταύροις,

οὶ δ' μν' πέμψουσι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.

ἀλλ' ἐμ' πρὶν ἀπέπεμψε· τύχησε γὰρ ἐρχομένη νήπιος

ἀνδρῶν Θεσπρωτῶν ἐς Δολίχιον πολύτυνον.

335 ἔνθ' δ' γέ μ' ἡ νάγει πέμψαι βασιλῆτ' Ἀκάστῳ

317 ἄργαδόν Rhiannus. 318 ἄθρος Zen. Aristoph. Ar.: λύθροι al. 325 νῦ


315. The wind must now have gone round from north-east to south or south-west. This change would come with a violent storm, such as is described. But from Crete to Thesprotia is the regular course of drift (independent of the wind), owing to the set of the main current of circulation in the Mediterranean. In the same way St. Paul is "driven about in Adria" (Acts xxvii. 27) for fourteen days, before getting to Malta (J. L. M.).

The story, however, is none the less improbable, considering the distance.

318. ἄθροι is a word only found here. It seems to mean exposure to the air: cp. the later ἄνωθρος, ἐν ἄνωθρος.

325. 'Would feed another (and so on) to the tenth generation,' i.e. one owner and then another to ten generations.

329. ἵπποκόντων νοοτρόπων 'how he should return—whether openly or secretly.'
14. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ἐ

ἐνδυκέως· τοῖς δὲ κακῇ φρεσκὶ ἤδαινε βουλὴ
ἀμφὲ ἐμοί, ὅφε ἐτὶ πάγχυν δόση ἐπὶ πήμα γενομὴν.
ἀλλ' ὅτε γαϊνὴς πολλὰν ἀπέπλυο ποντοπόρος νῆς,
αὐτικὰ δοῦλον ἦμαρ ἐμοὶ περιμῆχανῦντω.

ἐκ μὲν μὲ χλαίναν τε χιτῶνα τε εἰματ' ἐδυσαν,
ἀμφὶ δὲ μοι ράκος ἀλλο κακὸν βάλον ἥδε χιτῶνα,
μογαλέα, τὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ὀρθαλμοῖσιν ορθὶ,
ἐστεροίοι δ' 'Ἰδάκης εὐδείελον ἐργ' ἀφίκοντο.

ἐνθ' ἐμὲ μὲν κατέδησαν εὐσελμῷ ἐν νη
ὅπλῳ εὐστρεφεὶ στερεῶς, αὐτοὶ δ' ἀποβάντες
ἐσομένοις παρὰ δίνα θαλάσσῃς δόρπον ἔλαντο.
αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ δεσμῶν μὲν ἀνεγναμψάν θεοὶ αὐτοὶ
ῥήδιῶς· κεφαλὴ δὲ κατὰ ράκος ἀμφικαλύπασ
ξεστῶν ἐφόλκαυν καταβᾶς ἐπέλασσα θαλάσσῃ
στῆθος, ἐπειτὰ δὲ χεροὶ διήρεσαν' ἀμφιτέρρης
νηχόμενο, μᾶλα δ' ὅκα θύρηθ' ἔα ἀμφὶς ἐκεῖνων.

ἐνθ' ἀναβάς, δόθι τε δρόσι ἢς πολυανθέος όιης,
κείμην πεπτῆσο. οἶ δὲ μεγάλα στενάχοντες
φοίτων ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ σφιν ἐφαίνετο κέρδιον εἶναι
μαίεσθαι προτέρω, τοι μὲν πάλιν αὐτῖς ἐβαίναν
νὴς ἐπὶ γλαφυρῆς· ἐμὲ δ' ἐκρωψ' θεοὶ αὐτοὶ
ῥηδίως, καὶ με σταθμῷ ἐπέλασσαν ἀγοντες
ἀνδρῶς ἐπισταμένου ἔτη γάρ νῦ μοι αἰαν βιῶναι.

Τὸν δ' ἀπαρεῖβομενος προσέθης, Ἔδμαιε συβῶτα·

"ἀ δείλε ἐξεῖν, ή μοι μᾶλα θυμὸν ὅρινας."

338 δ' ἐπὶ πήμα γένηται Aristoph. 343 ἄργαλεως Rhianus. 349 κεφαλὴν Aristoph. 351 ἄργαλας vulg.

337. ἐνδυκέως 'with all kindness': in contrast to the κακὴ βουλὴ of the crew. See the note on l. 62.

338. ἐπὶ πήμα γενομὴν 'might be brought into sorrow,' regarded as a place reached: cp. κατευπήβασες, ll. 2, 234.

343. ὅρις, formed as from a present ὅριμα (like δίγημα). Many MSS. give ὅρις, which is the Doric form: cp. ὅρις, read by Zen. in ll. 11. 56, &c.

348. ἀνεγναμψαν 'bent back,' i.e. united: cp. 8. 359 δεσμῶν ὁπλὶα.
14. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Β.

146 ταῦτα ἔκαστα λέγων, δοσά δὴ πάθεσ ἢδ' ὅσ' ἀληθῆς.

147 ἀλλὰ τὰ γ' οὐ κατὰ κόσμον, ὁμοίαι, ὀμφῇ με πείσεις εἰσφεν ἀμφ' ὁδυση' τι σε χρή τοῖν ἐντά

148 μαγείας ψεύδεσθαι; ἐγὼ δ' εἴδε οἶδα καὶ αὐτός

149 νόστον ἐμοίω ἀνακτος, δ' ἰχθετο πάσι θεοῖσι

150 πάγχυ μάλ', ὅτι μιν οὗ τι μετὰ Τρόασιν δάμασαν

151 ἦν φιλῶν ἐν χεροῖν, ἐπεὶ πόλεμον τολύσεσεν.

152 τὸ κέν οἱ τόμβοι μὲν ἐποίησαν Παναχαῖοι,

153 ἡδὲ κε καὶ ὁ παιδὶ μέγα κλέος ἦρατ' ὀπλίσω.

154 ὑνὲ δὲ μιὰ ἀκλεῖωσ ἄρπαια ἀνηρείσαντο.

155 αὐτὰρ ἔγω παρ' ἔσσιν ἀπότρόπος οὐδὲ πόλυνδρος

156 ἕρχομαι, εἰ μὴ ποῦ τι περίφραξιν Πηνελόπεια

157 ἔλεμνεν ὑπρόνησα, δ' ἀγγελίη ποθὲν ἄλθη.

158 ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν τὰ ἐκαστὰ παρήμενοι ἐξερέσωσιν,

159 ἡμὲν οἱ ἀχνίηται δὴν οἰχομένου ἀνακτος,

160 ἡ δ' οἱ ταχροσίν βιοτον νόπων ἔδοντες

161 ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ οὐ φίλον ἐστὶ μεταλλησαί καὶ ἐρέσθαι,

162 εἰ οὐ δὴ μ' Ἀταλάς ἄνηρ ἕχοταφε μύθῳ,

163 δὲ ἄνδρα κτεινας, πολλὰν ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἄλθεις,

164 ἢθεν εἰμα πρὸς δόματι' ἐγὼ δὲ μιν ἀμφαιάπαζον.

165 φη δὲ μιν ἐν Κρήσεσι παρ' Ἰδομενη' ἰδέσθαι

166 νήσας ἀκείμενον, τὰς οἱ ἵππας αἰλλαί

167 καὶ φάζτ' ἐλέφθεσθαι ή ἐς θέρος ή ἐς ὅπωρην.


363. κατὰ κόσμον 'aright': supply εἰςεν by anticipation from oμφῇ με πείσεις εἰςεν. The poet meant to say ἐλεσ, but the subordinate and parenthetical oμφῇ με πείσεις, coming before ἐλεσ, changed it to εἰςεν. On this view Ἔλεσι: 'I suspect' is a parenthesis.

366. νόστον, acc. de quo: 'I know of his return that he has come to be hated,' i.e. that his return has been prevented by the hatred.

370. ἔρως is doubletless a false form, due to an old confusion between ἐρωτ and (without augment) ἐρωτ, the 2 aor. of ἔρως 'to win,' and ἐρωτ, the 1 aor. mid. of αἴρεω 'to lift.' The latter of these is post-Homeric, the Homeric form of the verb being αἴρεω. For ἔρως therefore we should restore ἔρως.

371. ἄρπαια the snatchers,' a word formed like ἄργων, ἄρνα, ἂρθα. The verb from which it comes is probably concealed in ἀνηρείσαντο, for which Fick (Odysse. p. 9) has happily proposed to read ἀνηρείσαντο, from ἀν-ἀρπάζω, 'to snatch up' (τρυπᾶ). Thus there is a play of language—'the snatchers have snatched up.' See 20. 77, 11. 20. 234.

For ἄρπαια Fick would read ἄρπαια (a form given in the Et. Mag.): but ἄρπαια is related to the supposed ἄρπα (or ἄρπα) as ἄργων to ἄργων.
14. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ε

πολλὰ χρήματ’ ἀγοντα, σὺν ἀντιθέως ἔταρσοι.
καὶ σὺ, γέρων πολυπενθές, ἐπεὶ σε μοι ἦγαγε δαίμων,
μήτε τί μοι ψεύδοσι χαρίζειο μήτε τι θέλεις
οὐ γάρ τοῦτο ἐγώ σ’ αἰδέσομαι οὐδὲ φιλίᾳ,
ἀλλὰ Δία ἔξιον δείσας αὐτῶν τ’ ἔλεαιρον.”

Τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις ‘Οδυσσεύς: 390

“ἡ μάλα τίς τοῦ θυμὸς ἐνι στήθεσιν ἀπιστος,
οὐδὲ οὐδ’ ὅμοιας περ ἐπήγαγον οὐδὲ σε πελώ.
ἀλλ’ ἄγε νῦν βραχὺν ποιησόμεθ’ αὐτἀρ δυσθε
μάρτυροι ἀμφοτέρως θεῶ, τοῦ Ὁλυμπον ἔχουσιν.
eἰ κεν νοσθήσειν ἄναξ τεὸς ἐς τὸν δόμα,
ἐστα χιλιάν τε χιτώνα τε εἰματα πέμψαι
Δουλοχίων’ ἑναί, δὴ μοι φιλὸν ἐπλετό θυμῷ.
eἰ δὲ κε μὴ ἔλθησιν ἄναξ τεὸς ὁς ἀγορεύω,
δυσαῖ εἰποσεῖς βαλέεις μεγάλης κατὰ πτέρρας,
ὁφρα καὶ ἄλλος πτωχός ἀλευταὶ ἥπερπονεῖν.”

Τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσεφόνει διὸς υφορβός: 395

“ξεῦφ’, οὖτω γάρ κέν μοι ξύκλει θ’ ἀρετή τε
ἐπὶ ἐπ’ ἀνθρῶπον ἀμα τ’ αὐτίκα καὶ μετέπειτα,
δὶ σ’ ἐπεὶ ἐστίν θλίψην ἄγαν καὶ ξεῖνια δῶκα
αὔτες δὲ κτείναμι φιλόν τ’ ἀπ’ θυμὸν ἐλοίμην
πρόφρον κεν δὴ ἑπειτα Δία Κρονώνα λιτοίμην.

νῦν δ’ ἀρχὴ δόρποι νάχεστα μοι ἐνδον ἐταῖροι
ἐλεν, ὦ ἐν κλίσιν λαρώ τετυκομέδα δόρπον.”


389. αὐτῶν ‘thyself.’
392. εἰς ‘seeing that in such wise.’
402 ff. The form of the sentence is that in which the speaker begins by giving the reason, and then goes on to announce what he will do: but here the latter part is left unexpressed, being sufficiently conveyed by the ironical tone of what has been already said.
404. ‘I should be fain thereupon to entreat Zeus’ (sc. Ζεὺς ξεῖνοις), i.e. to make my peace with him. The aor. must refer to some single prayer to be made. The usual rendering — with good heart, forsooth, would I pray ‘neglects the force of the tense. Moreover, πρόφρον implies eagerness to do something, not confidence in doing it. The reading ᾱλτωτομην ‘I should (thereby) sin’ is tempting, but gives a forced meaning to πρόφρον (= ἐθέλων γε), and to ἰησοῦ.
14. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ε

*Ως οἱ μὲν τοιαύτα πρὸς ἀλλῆλους ἀγρέυον, ἀγχήμολον δὲ σῶς τε καὶ ἀνέρες ἠλθον υφοβοί. Τὰς μὲν ἄρα ἔρξαν κατὰ ἥθεα κοµηθῆναι, κλαγγῇ δ' ἄσπετος ὠρτο σύνων αὐλιζομενάων· αὐτάρ δ' ὦς ἐτάρουσιν ἐκέκλετο διὸς υφοβοῖς· "ἀξεθ' ὦν τὸν ἄριστον, ἵνα ξειφὶ λειτεύω

τηλεδαιπ' πρὸς δ' αὐτοὶ ὄνημεθ', οἱ περ ὦγὸν δὴν ἔχομεν πάσχοντες ὦν ἔνεκ' ἁργιοδοτῶν, ἀλλοι δ' ἠμέτερον κάματον νήπιον ἔδουσιν."  

*Ως ἄρα φωνήσας κέασε ξύλα νηλεί χαλκῷ, οἱ δ' ὦν εἰσήγην μᾶλα πλονα πενταέπτρον.

τὸν μὲν ἔπειτ' ἔστησαν ἐπ' ἐσχάρῃ οὐδὲ συβάτης λήθετ' ἄρα ἀθανάτων φρεις γὰρ κέχρητ' ἀγαθήσων· ἀλ' δ' ἱ' ἀπαρχόμενος κεφαλῆς τρίχας ἐν πυρὶ βάλλει ἁργιδοντος ὄς, καὶ ἐπεύχετο πᾶσι θεοῖς νοστῆσαι Ὀδυσσήα πολύφρονα οὐδὲ δόμονδε.

κόψε δ' ἀνασχομένως σχίζῃ ὀρυσὶ, ἦν λίπε κελῶν· τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχή. τοι δ' ἐσφαξάν τε καὶ εὐθανον αἴσα δὲ μιν διέخεαι δ' ἢ ἁμοβετείτο συβάτης, πάντων ἀρχόμενων μελέων, ἐς πλονα δημον. καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐν πυρὶ βάλλε, παλύνας ἄλφιτον ἀκτή, μιστυλλόν τ' ἄρα τάλλα καὶ ἁμφ' ἑβελοίσων ἐπειραν, ἀπησάν τε περιφραδέως ἐρύσαντο τε πάντα, βάλλων δ' είν ἑλεοίσων ἀνάλλα· ἂν δὲ συβάτης ἰστατο δαιτρεύονος περὶ γὰρ φρεις ἀλίσαμα ᾧδή.

424 = 21. 204, where it is more in place. 428 πάντων Ατ.: πάντοθεν ΜΣ. 433 δαιτρεύον] δαιτρεύων ΑΤΡ, perhaps rightly.

419. Imitation (or parody?) of Π. 2. 402. The epithet 'five years old' is proper for beef, but not for pork (Fieriron ad.).
422. ἀπαρχόμενον = ἀστείονων ὅπ' ἄργα (l. 446). In this sense it governs τρίχας: cf. Π. 19. 254 κάπων ἄρο τρίχας δράμαμεν. See on Od. 3. 445-463.
425. ἀνασχομένως 'raising his hand aloft,' Π. 23. 600 τὰς μάλ' ἀνασχομένων.
438. δ' δημῶν, with ἀμβροσείτο. The swineherd cut pieces of raw meat as first offerings from each of the limbs and laid them in fat. This, properly speaking, represented the share of the gods in the sacrifice: but in the division among the guests one share was reserved for the host's especial patrons (l. 435), the nymphs and Hermes.
439. δ' ἐν συβάτης κτλ. 'In Greece this is still done with great ceremony, and beforehand. The host stands, and picks over the whole dish of bits, putting fair equivalents towards each of the guests, before helping on to the plates—a clear survival from the plateless stage' (J. L. M.).
καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐπταχα πάντα διεμοράτῳ δαίζων·

τὴν μὲν λαν νύμφῃ καὶ Ἑρμήν, Μαιάδος ὑλὲ,
θήκεν ἐπευξάμενος, τὰς δ' ἄλλας νεῖμεν ἐκάστῳ

νώτοισιν δ' Ὁδυσσήν διηνεκέεσσι γέραιρεν
ἀργυδόντος ὑπὲρ, κόδαιων δὲ θυμῶν ἄνακτος·
καὶ μιν φωνῆςας προσέφη πολύμητις Ὁδυσσέως·

"αἰθ' οὖτως, Ἐδμαίε, φίλοι Δίω πατρι γένοι

ὦς ἐμοί, ἵττι με τοῖον ἑπτ' ἀγαθοῖς γεραίρεις."

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμείβομενος προσέφης, Ἐδμαίε συβάτα·

"ἐστιν, δαιμόνιες ἔστων, καὶ τέρπει τοίῳ,

οὐ πάρεστιν. θεῖς δὲ τὸ μὲν δῶσει, τὸ δ' ἑάσει,

ὅτι κεν δ' θυμῷ ἐθέλῃ· δύναται γὰρ ἀπαντά." 445

"Ἡ ρα καὶ ἄργυρα τὰς θεῖς αἰειγενέτρις,

σπείρας δ' αἴθων ὡς Ὁδυσσήπτι πτολιχρόφ
ἐν χελρεσσεν ἐθήκεν· δ' ἐξετο ἥ παρά μοῦρη.

σῖτον δὲ σφιν ἐνεῖμε Μεσαύλιος, ὅω ρα συβάτης

αὐτὸς κτήσατο οἶος ἀποχομένου ἄνακτος,

νόσσφιν δεσποίνης καὶ Δαέρταο γέροντος·

πάρ δ' ᾠρα μὲν Ταφυν πρόατο κτέασσαν ὑέωσιν.

οὶ δ' ἐτ' ὀνείαθ' ἑτούμα προκείμενα χείρας ἱαλλον.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιοι καὶ ἐδήτως ἕξ ἔραν ἐντο,

σῖτον μὲν σφιν ἀφεῖλε Μεσαύλιος, οἴ δ' ἐπὶ κοῖτον

σῖτον καὶ κρείζων κεκορημένοι ἐσπενότο.

Νῦξ δ' ἄρ' ἐπήλθε κακῆς, σκοτοφήμιος· δὲ δ' ᾠρα Ζεῦς

πάννυχος, αὐτὰρ ἄρ Ζέφυρος μέγας αἰέν ἐφυδρος.

τοῖς δ' Ὁδυσσεῖας μετεείπε, συβάτως μεγα-περιτήκοιν,

εἴ πῶς οἱ ἐκδός χλαίμαν πόροι, ἢ τιν' ἔταιρον

ἄλλον ἐποτρύνειεν, ἐπεί ἐκ κόδετο λήνυ· 455

443 τοίῳ[· Read perhaps τοῖῳ, which makes a better antecedent to οἰα πάρεστι.

449 αφ' ἑπειρέμε G. 456 κρείμων] see on l. 28. 457 δ' ἀρ' (or δ' άρ')

G F U East.: γαρ P H X al. 460 ἡ πῶς F.

435. Ἐρμήν. The usual Homeric form of the name is Ἑρμειας; hence there must be some doubt of the genuineness of ll. 435-436. It may be noted that the giving of the chine as γῆρας would come before the division.

446. ἄργυρα 'the firstling pieces,' as described in l. 428.

457. σκοτωφήμιος 'in the dark (part of) the month,' i. e. when there was no moon. It was then four days to the new moon: see on ll. 158-162.
“κέκλυθι νῦν, Ἐδμαι καὶ ἄλλοι πάντες ἑταῖροι, εὐθαμενὸς τι ἐπος ἐρέων οἶνος γὰρ ἀνώγει ἥλεσι, δὲ τ’ ἐφέηκε πολύφρονα περ μᾶλ’ ἀείσαι καὶ θ’ ἀπαλῶν γελάσατε, καὶ τ’ ὀργήσασθαι ἁνήκε, καὶ τ’ ἐποτ προήκεν δ’ πέρ τ’ ἀρρητον ἀμείνον.

ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸ πρῶτον ἀνέκραγον, οὐκ ἐπικεύσω.

ἐὶδ’ ὃς ἠβδομεν, βίη τ’ εὔ μοι ἐμπεδός εἶν, ὡς δὲ ὅ περ Τροίην λόχον ἤγονον ἀμήςεις.

νῦν ἔσθε ὁ Οδυσσέας τε καὶ Ἀτρέιδας Μενέλαος, τοῖσι δ’ ἀμα τρέσος ἢρχον ἐγών, αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀνώγον.

ἀλλ’ ὅπε τ’ ἤβδομεσθα ποτὶ πτελὼν αὐτοῦ τε τῆχος, ἥμεις μὲν περὶ ἄστυ κατὰ βοιεθία ἵκνα, 

ἀν δόνακας καὶ ἔλος, ὑπ’ ἥθεσι πεπτησότες κείμεθα, νῦς δ’ ἰτ’ ἐπιλήθησα κακὴ Βορέαο πεσώτος, 

πηνυσί: αὐτῶρ ὑπ’ ἕλθε κακὴ Βορέαο πεσώτος, 

ψυχή, καὶ σακείους περίτριφετο κρύσταλλος.

ἐνθ’ ἄλλοι πάντες χλαίεις ἡγοῦν ὑδὲ χιτώνας, 

ἐβδόμος δ’ ἵκκηλοι, σάκειος ἐλιμένοι δύμως; 

αὐτῶρ ἐγώ χλαίεις μὲν ἴδων ἐπάροικον ἑλείον 

ἀφφάσις, ἐπεὶ οὖν ἔφασιν ἔργαζοτοι ἐμπροτ, 

ἀλλ’ ἐπάροικον σάκος οὐν ἡγοῦν καὶ ζωμά φαιεῦν,

ἀλλ’ ὅπε τ’ ἤβδομος ἄστρα βεβήκει,

466 προῆρῃν Ar. MSS. (cp. 20. 105) : παραφερεν Aristoph. (prob. understanding it in the sense of Attic παράστησις ‘put into his mind’).


474 περὶ Ar.: παρῄσκει ancient ν. 1.

463. εὔβαμον ἀρξεν ‘I will say with

464. ἠλέος ‘mad,’ as being the cause of madness. So Διὼντος is the ‘mad god,’ μαύρους (II. 6. 132).

467. τὸ πρῶτον ‘once.’ ἀνέκραγον ‘raised my voice,’ ‘spoke out’: the word has a colloquial stamp.

473. περὶ δαντε is used (with some vagueness) of besiegers: II. 8. 519., 24. 518.

475. παρῄσκεο τὸ ‘having fallen,’ i.e. ceased to blow: so 19. 303 Διονέκος νέος.

476. The emendation ἐτηλ λάχυ (Naber) is very plausible.

477. περὶπράτειτο ‘grew thick,’ ‘solid,’

478. ξυμποτ, i.e.even without a χλαίεις.

480. ξυμποτ, i.e. even without a χλαίεις.

482. He has on a χρίσο (1. 489); but that is always taken for granted. So in 11. 22. 124 Hector is γυμνός when he puts off his shield and helmet.

ξύλα, a leathern apron or kilt: note the absence of a δήμος, Reichel, p. 109.

483. τρίχα νισσει ‘the third part of the night,’ see on 12. 312.
καὶ τὸν ἔγων ὁデυθῇα προσημίδῳν ἐγγὺς ἐστὰ ἀγκὼν νόξας· ὦ δ' ἀρ' ἐμμαπέως ὑπάκουσε·
διογνησίαν Ἀλεξιάδη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῖ,
οὐ τοῦ ἔτι ζωοία μετέσσομαι, ἀλλὰ μὲ χεῖμα
δάμναται: ὦ γὰρ ἔχω χλαίναι· παρά μ' ἡπαφὲ δαίμων
οἰσκίτων ἐμενα· νῦν δ' οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλονται.
ἀς ἐφάμη, ὦ δ' ἔπειτα νῦν σχέθη τῶν' ἐνὶ θυμῷ,
οῖος κεῖνος ἐγνὶ βουλευέμεν ἥδε μάχεσθαι,
φθεγξάμενος δ' ὀλίγη ὁπ' μὲ πρὸς μῦθον ἐσπε·
'σίγα νῦν, μῆ τῆς σεν Ἀλχαῖων ἄλλος ἀκόσμη.'
 quam in tis. ὁὶ ἅμαμ ἐσπέ. ἀλλά τοι ἐτήν
ἐιπεῦν Ἀτρεύδη Ἀγαμέμνονι, ποιμένα λαῶν,
ἐπὶ πλέονα παρὰ ναβίν ἑποτρύνει νέοσθαι.'
ἀς ἐφαι', ἀρτο δ' ἔπειτα Θόδας, Ἀνδραῖμονος νῦς,
καρπαλίως, ἀπὸ δὲ χλαίναν θέτο φοινικάσαν,
βῆ δὲ θεεῖν ἐπὶ νῆσας· ἐγὼ δ' ἐνὶ εἰματι κεῖνον
κεῖμην ἄσπασιοι, φάε δὲ χρυσόθρονον Ἡώς.
ἀς νῦν ἡθομοί βῆ τέ μοι ἐμπεδὸς ἐτήν.
[δοῖκ κὲν τὶς χλαίναν ἐνὶ σταθμοῖς συφρίβων,
ἀμφότεροι, φιλότητι καὶ αἰδοὶ φωτὸς ἐρῆσιν,
νῦν δὲ μ' ἀτιμάζονι κακὰ χροῖ εἰματ' ἑκονταε.]
Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφης, Ἐδύμαις συβῶτα:
"ἀγερῶν, ἀνίως μὲν τοῖς ἀμύμων, ἐν κατέλεξα,

488 ἡλασε Callistatus. 489 ἵμαι Callistatus. 491 Βουλευέμεν ἤδε
μάχεσθαι] τελάον ἔργον τε ἔσω τε ν. l. ap. Eust. 494 σχέδει] θέτο F P H M X.
500 θέτο G D U al.: βάλε F P H X. 504-506 obel. M (καὶ δ' Ἀθηναέλη
προσβεῖν Schol. H).

490. τὸνδε 'this' (which follows),
viz. the device of sending Thoas.

495. This line is perhaps an interpo-
lation, as Aristarchus thought, from II. 2.
56. We expect to be told what this
dream was, what it said, &c. In any
case λῆν γὰρ κτλ. is the real beginning
of the speech, 'since we are so far &c.'
But a form of address, such as ἐλήνε
τη, cannot well be dispensed with.

504-506. These lines were rejected
by ancient critics. They are weak in them-
selves and spoil the preceding story, the
point of which is that it hints at the
need of a cloak without directly asking
for one.

508. αἰνος 'a tale; 'account. The
meanings 'fable' and 'praise' are not
clearly to be traced in Homer.
οὐδὲ τί πω παρὰ μοίραν ἔτος νηκρόθες ἔστετε—

τῶ σοὶ ἔσθήτος δενήσεις οὗτο τεν ἄλλου,

ὄν ἐπὲυξ' ἱκέτην ταλαπείριον ἀντιασαντα,

νῦν ἀτὰρ ἥθεν γε τὰ σὰ βάκεα δυσπαλεῖς.

οὐ γὰρ πολλὰ χλαῖναι ἐπημοίοβε τε χιτώνες

ἐνδάδε ἐννυσθαι, μιὰ δ' οἷα φωτι ἐκάστοτ.

[αὐτὸς ἐπὶ θροίνον Ὀδυσσήος φίλος νῦς,

αὐτὸς τοι χλαῖναν τε χιτώνα τε εἰματα δώσει,

πέμψει δ' ὑπη σε κράδη βυμός τε κελεύει.]

"Ως εἰπὼν ἀνδρουσ, τίθει δ' ἄρα οἱ πυρὸς ἐγγὺς

eῦν, ἐν δ' οἰῶν τε και αἰγῶν δέρματ' ἐβαλλεν.

ἐνθ 'Ὀδυσσεὺς κατέλεκτη'. ἐπὶ δὲ χλαῖναν βάλεν αὐτὸ

πυκνὴν καὶ μεγάλην, ἥ οἱ παρεκέκεκτ' ἀμοιβάς,

ἐννυσθαι δ' τι τές χειμῶν ἐκπαγῶς δροιτο.

"Ως ὁ μὲν ἐνθ 'Ὀδυσσεύς κοιμήσατο, τοι δὲ παρ' αὐτῶν

ἀνδρες κοιμήσαντο νενιά: οὐδὲ συβότη

ὑμᾶνεν αὐτόθι κοῖτος, ὅν ἀπὸ κοιμήθηναι,

525


510 oinos MSS. 521 μεγάλην] μαλακήν F M al. paraskein' Ar.: others (ἐν τοί Did.) paraskein'. MSS. are divided; paraskein' G: paraskein' P: paraskein' paraskein'. al. 523 ἐννυσθεῖ Aristoph. Rhianus: the true Ionic form, cp. εἴμων.

511. See on 6. 193.

512. ὑποπλεῖας has caused some difficulty. The meaning evidently is that Ulysses must wear his own rags again next day. In the Iliad the verb ὑποπλεῖας seems to mean 'to knock aside' or 'against.' So metaphorically a man may be said to knock about the clothes which he wears. The word is doubtless colloquial, like so much of the vocabulary of the Odyssey: cp. 14. 407, 15. 426, 445, 16. 63.

519. The gen. sing. and plur. of ὄς appear in our texts of Homer in the forms ὄς, ὄς and ὄς, ὄς. In a majority of the passages (eighteen out of twenty-eight) the disyllabic ὄς, ὄς are required by the metre. In the remaining instances (as here) the metre admits either form. The MSS. favour ὄς in ll. 9. 307, 15. 373 (but ὄς in H and others), Od. 4. 764: ὄς in ll. 3. 198, Od. 9. 167, 14. 519. 20. 3; ὄς in ll. 18. 539, Od. 9. 441, 443. The ancients were divided. Aristarchus wrote ὄς (see La Roche on ll. 3. 198), and presumably also ὄς. Others, represented by Herodian, preferred ὄς, ὄς. They argued from the nom., which in Homer is always ὄς (not ὄς, as in Attic:) so that the regular Ionic gen. would be ὄς-ς, ὄς-ς-ς. But ὄς and ὄς, as the accent shows, are not contracted from ὄς, ὄς, but come directly from ὄς, ὄς, ὄς, ὄς: from ὄς, ὄς, and similarly ὄς, ὄς, ὄς ὄς, ὄς, ὄς ὄς. Hence it is very probable that the forms ὄς, ὄς are fictitious: as are the gen. plur. ὄς, ὄς and the dative τῶν, μῆτρα, ὄς, etc. introduced by some modern grammarians.

521. ἐνελ' 'a change' = ἐπημοίοβε (14. 513).

525. ὄς 'the boars,' see l. 16 (supra).
ἀλλ’ δὲ γ’ ἄρ’ ἔξω ἰδὼν ὀπλίζετο· χαίρε δ’ ’Οδυσσεύς,
ὅτι μάθαί τοῦ περικήδετο νόσφιν ἑόντος.
πρὸτὸν μὲν ἔφος ὅξω περὶ στιβαροῖς βάλετ’ ὰμοισ,
ἀμφί δὲ χλαίναν ἑσσαν’ ἀλεξάνεμον, μᾶλα πυκνὴν,
ἀν δὲ νάκην ἐλετ’ αἰγὸς ἐὐτρεφεῖς μεγάλοιο,
εἴλετο δ’ ὅξων ἀκοντα, κυνῶν ἄλκτηρα καὶ ἀνθρῶν.
βὴ δ’ ἱμενεί κεῖαν δόθε περὶ στεῖς ἀργιδοῦντες
πέτρη ὑπὸ γλαφυρῆς ἐβδον, Βορέω ὑπ’ ἰωγῆ.

530 στιβαροὶ... ὰμοιος F, perhaps rightly, since the dat. plur. in -οις is probably not Homeric (H. C. § 102). But the true reading may be στιβαρῷ... ὰμῳ: as in the recurring πεπί ἔφος ὃκ τιν’ ὀμῳ (Od. 2. 3., 4. 308., 20. 125.).

536. ὀπλίζετο ‘furnished himself,’ ‘took what he needed for his bivouac.’
The going out (ἔξω ἰδὼν) properly comes after this furnishing, but is put first as being the main action: cp. 13. 274.

537. ἑόντος is a possessive gen. governed by βιδροῦ, instead of being construed with ὀλ. For other examples see H. C. § 243 (d).

532. κείαν, a fut. participle, always construed, as the Homeric rule requires (H. C. § 244), with a verb of motion: cp. 18. 428., 19. 48., 23. 292, Π. 14. 340, and the recurring μακειοῦτες ἔβαλαν αὐλ.; also Od. 7. 342 ὅτα κέιαν. In 18. 408 ἂλλ’ ἐδ' ἀκαλύμινον κατακείεσθαι ὀλίσθη λόπτης (= 7. 188) we have the corresponding indicative (not an imperative, see the note a. l.); and the infinitive in 8. 315 ὁδὸς μὲν σφέας ἐν' ἐνελα... κείμεν. The fut. may also be seen in κέιαν (19. 340) and μακειοῦμαι (18. 419); but in both these places Homeric usage points rather to the subj. of an aorist ἔσενa, of which Hesychius has preserved the inf. (μακείαν τομηθήσεται). For the formation cp. ἔσενa: also ἔτερον seemed, which is for ἔτερον. There is no good evidence in Homer of a pres. κέιαν or κέαν; hence the hypothesis of a Desiderative κέιαν (for κεῖ-γω) seems unnecessary (see however Schulte, Quaest. Ep. p. 246).

533. Βορέω λέγῃ ‘shelter from the north wind.’

A MEDITERRANEAN VESSEL, WITH LADING PLANK.
From a drawing by Mr. J. L. Myres.
Τηλεμάχου πρὸς Ἐθναίον ἄφιξις.

Η δ' εἰς εὐφόρονον Δακεδαιμόνα Παλλᾶς Ἀθηνή φέχετ', ὁδυσσήσας μεγαθύμων φαίδιμων ὑλὸν νόστου ὑπομνήσσαυσα καὶ ὀργυνέσσαν νέεσθαι.

εὐρέ δὲ Τηλεμάχου καὶ Νέστορος ἄγλαδον ὑλὸν εὔβουτ᾽ ἐν προδῆμῳ Μενελάου κυδαλίμοιο·

ἡ τοι Νεστορίδην μαλακῷ δεδημένων ὅπνοι,

Τηλεμάχου δ' σὺχ ὅπειρον ἔχε γλυκός, ἀλλ' ἐνι θυμῷ νῦκτα δὲ ἀμβροσίην μελεθήματα πατρὸς ἐγερεῖν.

ἀγχοῦ δ' ἵσταμεν προσέφη γλαυκώπις Ἀθηνήν·

"Τηλέμαχε, οὐκέτι καλὰ δόμων ἀπὸ τῆς ἀλάλησαι,

κτήματα τὲ προλιπῶν ἄνδρας τ' ἐν σοίς δόμαις ὀστῷ ὑπερφιάλους· μή τοι κατὰ πάντα φάγωσι

κτήματα δασαμένοι, σοὶ δὲ τησείν ὅδὸν ἔλθῃς.

ἀλλ' ὁπρε τάξιστα βοὴν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον

πεμπέμεν, δόρ' ἐτὶ οἰκοι ἁμύονα μητέρα τέμπης."

ὁδῆς γὰρ ρὰ πατήρ τε κασίγνητοι τε κέλουται

Εὐρυμάχῳ γῆμασθαι· ὅ γὰρ περιβάλλει ἀπαντᾷ

μυστηράς ὁδοίς καὶ ἐξωφέλλεν ἐδένα·

μὴ νῦ τι σεβ ἀέκητη δόμων ἐκ κτήμα φέρηται.

οἷσθα γὰρ οἶος θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσι γυναικὸς·

The scene changes to Sparta, whither we follow Athene (13. 440). As the last book ended with the coming on of night, the story must now begin with the next day, the 36th. The chronology is not quite clear: see I 7. 515.

4–7. There is an apparent contradiction: 'she found both sleeping. . . but Telemachus was not sleeping.' It may remind us of the famous contradiction about Zeus, between II. 1. 611 and 2. 2. In both places the difficulty lies in the epic style of narration.

8. μελεθήματα πατρός 'his anxious thoughts about his father.'

ἐγέρων 'roused,' 'kept him awake.'

10. τῆς is perhaps said with allusion to the name Τηλεμάχου.

19. φέρεται 'carry with her,' 'carry off.' Aristophanes is said to have rejected the line ἐνι ἄμμαρλογίᾳ, on account of the meanness to which it appeals. But it is necessary to the next sentence, οἷσθα γὰρ πτλ. The ancient critics were apt to judge Homeric sentiment from their own standard.
κείνου βούλεται ἄκων ὀφέλειν ὃς κεν ὅπως, παῖδων δὲ προτέρων καὶ κουριδίοιο φίλου οὐκέτι μέμνηται τεθνήτος οὖθε μεταλλά. ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ἐλθὼν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψειας ἐκαστα διμάζων ἢ τίς τοι ἀρίστη φαίνεται εἶναι, εἰς δ' κέ τοι φήνωσι θεοὶ κυβρήν παράκοιτην. ἀλλο δὲ τοι τι ἐπώς ἐρέω, σύ δὲ σύνθεσι θυμῷ. μνηστήρων σ' ἐπιτιθὲς ἀριστής λοχώσων ἐν πορθηθ' ἸΘάκης τε Σάμωι τε παιπαλέσσῃ, ἱέμενοι κτείναι, πρὶν πατρίδα γαίαν ἱέσθαι. ἀλλὰ τά γ' οὐκ ὅπως πρὶν καὶ τίνα γαία καθέξει αὐράσων μνηστήρων, οἰ τοι βίοτον κατέδουσιν. ἀλλὰ ἔκας νήσους ἀπέχειν ἐνεργέα νήα, νυκτὶ δ' ὁμός πλειεὶν πέμψει δὲ τοι οὖρον ὅπωσθεν ἀθανάτων δς τίς σε φυλάσσει τε μοῦτα τε. αὐτὰ ἐπῆν πρώτην ἀκτῆν ἸΘΑΚΗΣ ἀφικνάι, νηα μὲν ἐς πόλιν ὅτρων καὶ πάντας ἐτάφρος, αὐτὸς δὲ πρώτοτα συβωτὴν εἰσαφικέσθαι, δ' τοι ὅνως ἐπώρως, ὁμός δὲ τοι ἥπια οἴδεν. ἔνθα δὲ νύκτι ἄεσαι τὸν δ' ὅτρων πόλιν εἴσῳ ἀγγελὴν ἑρέοντα περίφρονι Πενελοπείρ, οὐνεκά οἱ σῶς ἔσοι καὶ ἐκ Πύλου ειλήλουθας." "Ἡ μεν δρ' δς εἰσοδ' ἀπέβη πρὸς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον, αὐτὰρ δ' Νεστορίδην ἔξ ἡδέος οὐνοῦ ἔγειρε

21 δς κεν vulg.: δς τις P. ὅπως MSS. 42 σώς, see on 19. 300., 22. 28.

21. The use of δς κεν in a gnomic sentence is unusual; but cp. 1. 55. It might be defended here on the ground that βούλεται ὀφέλειν is felt as a future. But it is of little use to discuss the syntax until the f of Fölken has been restored. In any case the subj. ὅπως is probably right: ὅπως comes from 2. 330., 16. 368. 22. κουριδίοιο, sc. ἀποθ.: cp. 19. 266., 24–26. These three lines were rejected by some ancient critics, on the ground that they do not lead to anything in the subsequent story. ἐπιτρέψειας, opt. as a polite form of imperative: 'I would have you entrust.' 28. ἐπιτρέψεια 'of set purpose.' 33. ἄκων νήσου, i.e. keeping close to the mainland. In νῆσου the reference must be especially to Cephallonia, as the suitors lay in wait between that island and Ithaca. But the phrase seems regularly to denote the three islands often mentioned with Ithaca—Δουλιτιών τε Σάμω τε καὶ ἱλίσσεσα Σάκωνδοι. These are described as lying πρὸς Ἡλίδος (21. 347), and had therefore to be passed by Telemachus. See on 15. 299–300. 34. δρώς, i.e. as well as by day: cp. the phrase δρὼς νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμαρ. 39. δράσι κτα. See on 13. 405.
15. ΟΔΣΣΕΙΑΣ Ω

λάξ ποδί κινήσας, καὶ μὲν πρὸς μὺθὸν ἔειπεν' 45
"ἔγρεω, Νεστορίδη Πεισίστρατε, μόνυχας ἱππος
ζεύζον ὑφ' ἄρματ' ἀγὼν, ὕφρα πρήσσωμεν ὄδῖον." 50

Τὸν δ' αὐτ' Νεστορίδης Πεισίστρατος ἀνύτιον ἤθαρν·
"Τηλέμαχ', οὗ πῶς ἔστιν ἑπειγομένοις περ ὄδῖον
νῦτα διὰ δνοφερῆ ἐλάναν τάχα δ' ἔστεται ἡώς.

ἐλλα ὑμ' εἰς δ' κε δῶρα φέρων ἐπιδίδρημα θῆν 60
ῥέω τ' Ἀτρείδης, δονοκλείτος Μενέλαος,
καὶ μῦθοι ἄγακοι παρανύσασ' ἀποπέμψη.

τοῦ γὰρ τε ξένως μυνησκεται ἡματα πάντα 65
ἄνδρος ἢπανδροκον, δὲ κεν φιλοτητα παράσχη.

"Ὡς ἔφατ', αὐτίκα δὲ χρυσόθρόνος ἤλθεν 'Ἡώς.
ἀγχυμάλον δὲ σφ' ἢλθε βοην ἄγαθος Μενέλαος,
ἀντάς εξ εὐνής, 'Ελένης πάρα καλλικόμοιο.

τὸν δ' ὡς οὖν ἐνόσην Ὀδυσσῆος φίλος νῖος,
σπερχῳμένος ῥα χιτώνα περὶ χροὶ σιγάλευτα 70
δύνει, καὶ μέγα φάρος ἐπὶ στιβαροῖς βάλετ' ὠμοις
ῥέως, βὴ δι' θύραζε, παριστάμενος ὑπὸ προσηύδα
[Τηλέμαχος, φίλος νῖος Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο·]

"Ἀτρείδη Μενέλαε διοτρεφάς, ὑγραμε λαῶν,' 80
ἐκν νῦν μ' ἀπόσπυε φήνη εἰς πατρίδα γαίαν
ἐκν γάρ μοι θυμὸς ἐλθεται οἶκαδ' ἱκέσθαι.

Τὸν δ' ἡμείσθε' ἑπείτα βοην ἄγαθος Μενέλαος· 85
"Τηλέμαχ', οὗ τ' ἐγγε ὑπὸν χροὶν ἐνθάδ' ἐρύξω
ἐμενον νόητοι περισσὸμαι δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι
ἀνδρὶ ἢπανδροκοφ, δὲ κ' ἐξοχα μὲν φιλεῖσιν,
ἐξοχα δ' ἐχθαίρησιν ἀμέλω δ' αἰσιμα πάντα.
ἰὸν τοι κακῶν ἐθ', δὲ τ' οὐκ ἐθέληντα νέεσθαι
ζεύον ἐποτρύνει καὶ δὲ ἐσοῦμεν κατερύκει.

61 στιβαροὶ ὑμοι] see 14. 538. 63 om. vulg. 66 ἔλθετοι (H. G. § 73).

45. Ar. and modern critics object to λάξ ποδί καλ. as absurd when the man
to be wakened was in a bed. But we
do not know the form of the bed. In
the parallel 11. 10. 158 this point is
equally undetermined.

70. The opposition expressed by ψι-
[χρῆ ἔεινον παρέντα φιλεῖν, ἑθέλοντα δὲ πέμπειν.]

ἀλλὰ μὲν ἐξ ἐκ δῶρα φέρων ἐπιδίφρα θείῳ
calá, σῷ δ' ὀφθαλμοῦσιν ἴδης, εἰπ' ὃ δὲ γυναῖξι
δεῖπνον ἐν μεγάροις τετυκεῖν ἄλισ ἐνδῶν ἐνυτόν.
ἀμφότερον κυδὸς τα καὶ ἀγαθία καὶ δυναρ
δειπνήσαντας ίμεν πολλὴν ἑρ' ἀπείρωνα γαῖαν.
ei δ' ἑθέλεις τραφῇναι ἄν' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἀργος, 80

74 ἐν πολλοῖς ὅπει ἠφέρετο Ariston.: see the note on l. 70. 76 δῆρα MSS.; δῆρον Ar. (as we gather from the scholia on II. 203, 3. 163, &c.). 78 was read by Zenodotus, and has most support in the manuscripts, especially in the Odyssey. Moreover the true Homeric form was δῆρα, which is not likely to have been contracted: H. G. § 378, 2, a. 78–85 were rejected by Ar. (obel. M).

78. ἀμφότεροι is adverbial. A feast is both an honour (κόθος καὶ ἀγαθή) and a benefit (δειπναρ).

80–85. This passage has been recently discussed by Mr. J. B. Bury in the Journal of Hellenic Studies, vol. xv. pp. 217–238, with especial reference to the words ἀν' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἀργος. These are generally understood as a poetical or traditional periphrasis for the whole of Greece,—Hellas (a part of Thessaly) representing the north and Argos the Peloponnesus. Mr. Bury points out that, if this is so, the offer here made to return home at once. How could Menelaus, who has himself been dwelling on the duty of SPEEDING the parting guest, suddenly propose to be his companion on so long a tour? In seeking for a solution of this difficulty, Mr. Bury is led to examine afresh the old question (Thuc. I. 3, &c.) of the different uses of the name Ἑλλάς and Ἐλλάριος. Among other results he arrives at the conclusion that, just as in the Iliad the names Ἑλλάς and Ἀχαιοὶ are closely associated in Thessaly, so the name Ἑλλάς at a somewhat later time was applied to the "Achaia" of history, the north coastland of the Peloponnesus. If then this is the sense of the term in the passage before us, Menelaus does not invite Telemachus to go with him all over Greece, but only to make a détour through Argolis and Achaia—countries then under the dominion of the Atridae.

It is impossible here to discuss Mr. Bury's history of the name Ἑλλάς: but a word may be said regarding its application to the Odyssey. In the first place, the difficulty with which he begins is surely not insuperable. Granting that Telemachus was not likely to accept the invitation, it may be that ancient manners required some such speech from the host—"the μέσον ἄγαφον promised by Pisistratus (l. 53). And the main purpose of Telemachus, the quest of news of his father, though not again mentioned here, must be supposed present to the minds of both. Moreover, the difficulty is not one that is very much diminished by Mr. Bury's interpretation. For surely it lies (poetically at least) not so much in the length of the proposed journey as in the fact of such an expedition being proposed at that moment. Again, the phrase ἄν' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἀργος is (or became) a piece of Epic common-place. In Od. 1. 344 (= 4. 726, 816) τοῦ ἁλίου εὐρ' καθ' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἀργος it seems to mean Greece generally. Moreover, it is plainly a variation of the line Ἀργος ἐς Ιπποδοτον καὶ Ἀχαιδὴν καλλυγύνουσι, which is also of a traditional type. The meaning of these phrases no doubt changed with time and circumstances; but it must always have been wide and conventional. It is hard to believe that Menelaus would force them to describe a route which he particularly wished to represent as a definite and limited one.

The phrase μέσον Ἀργος is not to be pressed: cp. II. 6. 224 Ἀργεῖτ μέσογ. There is nothing to connect it with a distinction between Argos in the narrower sense of the Argive plain and in the wider sense in which it includes a large part (if not the whole) of Peloponnesus.

80. The apodosis to ei δ' Ἐθέλεις
δόρα τοι αὐτός ἐσώμαι, ὑποζέβου ἐν τοι ἰπποσ, ἄστεα δ' ἀνθρώπων ἡγήσομαι· οὖδε τις ἡμᾶς αὐτῶς ἀπεύρηκε, δῶσει δὲ τι ἐν γε ἑρέσβαι, ἥν τινα τριπόδων ἔχαλκων ἥε λεβήτων, ἥν δ' ἡμῶν ἢς χρώσειον ἀλεισθαν."  

Τὸν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἄντιον ἠδα:  

"Ατρείδη Μενέλαες διστρέφες, δραχμε λάδιν, βουλομαι ἢδη νείσαι ἐφ' ἣμετέρ'· οὐ γὰρ ὀψιθεν οὐρὸν ἵνα κατέλειπον ἐπὶ κτείτεσσιν ἐμοίσιν· μὴ πατέρ' ἀντίθεουν διζήμενος αὐτός δλομαι, ἥ τι μοι ἐκ μεγάρων κειμήλιον ἐσθλὸν δληταί."  

Αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ τὸ γ' ἀκοοσε βοὴν ἀγάθος Μενέλαος, αὐτίκ' ἂρ' ἦ ἀλόξχο ἦδὲ δμήται κέλευσε δεῖτον ἐνι μεγάροις τετυκεῖν ἄλις ἔνδον ἑντων. ἀγχύμολον δε οἱ ἥλθε Βοσθοΐδης 'Ετεωνεύς, ἀνατάς ἐξ εὐνῆς, ἐπεὶ οὐ πολύ ναίν ἀν' αὐτοῦ τόν πῦρ κηαί ἄνογε βοὴν ἀγάθος Μενέλαος ὀπτήσαι τε κρεών' ὁ δ' ἂρ' οὐκ ἀπίθησεν ἀκοοσας. αὐτός δ' ἐς θάλαμον κατεβήσετο κηώντα, οὐκ οἶος, ἀμα τοῦ γ' 'Ελενή κίε καὶ Μεγαπένθης. ἄλλ' δε τὸ β' ἰκαν' ἓδι οἱ κειμήλια κείτο, 'Ατρείδης μὲν ἐπείτα δέπας λάβεν ἀμφικύπελλον, νῦν δὲ κρητῆρα σέρεν Μεγαπένθε' ἄνογεν ἀργυρευν' 'Ελενή δὲ παρίστατο φαραμοῖσιν, ἐνδὲ ἕσαν οἱ πέπλοι παμποίκιοι, οὐς κάμεν αὐτή.  

83 δὲ τι vulg.: δὲ τε Ρ ΙΥ: δὲ τοι conj. Voss; cp. 4. 589, 17. 11, 19. 559. 101 ἰκαν' ἓδι of Ρ ΙΥ: ἰκαν' ἓδι of Ρ ΙΥ: ἰκαν' ἓδι of Ρ ΙΥ: ἰκαν' ἓδι of Ρ ΙΥ: ἰκαν' ἓδι of Ἱερμ. Ορθ. 179. 105 ἤθος ἤθος τοι The most probable restoration is ἤθος 'ἡθος' theo, where 'ἡθος' is for 'ἡθος' with elision. But the pronoun is hardly needed.  

τραφθήνας is understood: 'if you wish to turn ... (do so),' cp. II. 6.150 εἴ τιθέμεν καὶ τοῦτα δαμείμαν, ἔρρα' ἑτίῃ, κτλ. (so 20. 313, 21. 887); also II. 7.375 αἰτεῖ τίθέμαι πανθεσσάτη ... ἐλ ἐκ κτλ., Od. 4. 388 (where δε κνίν τοι κτλ. cannot be the apodosis), 21. 360. These parallels show that it is erroneous to make the apodosis begin at δρατο (Ameis, &c.), or ὑποζέβου (Bury).  

81. αὐτοῦ, of Menelaus in contra-

II. distinction to Pisistratus, who would return to Pylus alone. The clause δου-

ζήσα τοι κτλ. is subordinate in sense to ἵππαμ: hence the prophysteron, cp. 13.  

274. 14. 200. 82. αὐτῶν 'as we came,' i.e. without any present.  

89. διορ 'watcher'; cp. the δοῖος left in charge by Agamemnon, 3. 367.  

91. Anciently rejected, cp. l. 19.  

98. Perhaps we should read ἄνθησα,
τῶν ἐν ἀδειρεμένη Ἔλενη φέρε, δία γυναικῶν, δὲ κάλλιστος ἦν ποικιλμασιν ἦς μέγιστος, ἀστήρ δ' ἄεικελαμπεν ἐκεῖν τὸ νειάτος ἄλλων. βὰν δ' ἰέναι προτέρῳ δια δόματα, ὡς ἰκοντο Τηλέμαχον τὸν δὲ προσέφη ξανθὸς Μενέλαιος· "Τηλέμαχ', ἥ τοι νύστον, ὅπως φρεσκή κητεῖ μενοινάς, ὡς τοι Ζεὺς τελέσειν, ἐργυδουσὶς πόσις Ἡρης. [δόρων δ', δοῦν ἐν ἐμῷ ὀίκῳ κειμήλια κεῖται, δῶσω δ' κάλλιστον καὶ τιμηστάτον ἐστι. δῶσω τοι κρητήρα τετυγμένων ἀργύρεος δὲ ἐστιν ἄπας, χρυσὸ δ' ἐπὶ κέλεα κεκράνται, ἔργων δ' Ἡφαίστοιο πόρεν δὲ ἐς Φαιδίμος ἥρως, Σιδώνιον βασιλεῦς, δὸς δόμος ἄμφεκάλυψε κεῖτο ἐμὲ νοστήσαντα· τέιν δ' ἐθέλω τόδ' ὑπάσσαι."

"Ως εἰπὼν ἐν χειρὶ τίθει δέπασ ἀμφικύπελλον ἥρως Ἀτρείδης' ὁ δ' ἀρα κρητήρα φαεινὼν θη' αὐτῷ προσπάραιθε φέρων κρατερὸς Μεγαπένθης ἀργύρεων· Ἐλένη δὲ παρίστατο καλλιτάρης πέπλον ἔχουσιν ἐν χειρότων, ἔτος τ' ἐφατ' ἐκ τ' ὀρβύματε· "δῶρον τοι καὶ ἐγώ, τέκνον φίλε, τοῦτο δίδωμι, μνήμη' Ἐλένης χειρῶν, πολυμαρτὼν ἐς γάμου ὄρην, σῇ ἀλόκω κορεέων τὸν δὲ φίλη παρὰ μπρι κείσαται ἐν μεγάρῳ. σὺ δὲ μοι χαίρων ἀφίκου ὀίκον ἐκτύτθενον καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν."

"Ως εἰπώσατ' ἐν χειρὶ τίθει, ὁ δ' ἐδεξατο χαίρων. καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐς πείρμαθα τίθει Πεισίστρατος ἥρως δεξάμενος, καὶ πάντα ἐφ' θησάτω θυμῷ· τοὺς δ' ἴχνε πρὸς δόμα κάρη ξανθὸς Μενέλαιος.

109 δόματα Eust.: δώματος MSS. 113 δόμον δ' G U al. 120 χειρὶ 7r. H. 113-119 (=4, 613-619) om. P H. 128 κείσατω Ar. G F: κείσατω vulg. kρέαδων 'wherewith to roast some of the flesh.' For κρέαδων see on 14, 28. 116. 'The lips are wrought above, or: finished, with gold.' 128. κείσατω. The inf. carries on the constr. of φορεῖν (inf. of consequence after δίδωμι). It illustrates the process by which the inf. comes to be used as an imperative. In this place the vulg. κείσατω has a peremptory tone which the inf. avoids. 132. 'Gazed upon them with his heart,' i.e. with all his thoughts centred upon them.
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εξόθην δ' ἀρ' ἑπείτα κατὰ κλισμόν τε θρόνους τε. 135
χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχρημένος ἐπέχεινε φέρουσα
calh χρυσείη, ύπερ ἀργυρόειο λέβητος,
νίψασαν παρ' δὲ ξεστήν ἐτάνυσε τράπεζαν.
σίτων δ' αἰδοίη ταμῇ παρέθηκε φέρουσα,
[εἴδατα πόλ' ἐπιθείσα, χαριζόμενη παρέδωνον']
pār δὲ Βοσθούδης κρέα δαιετο καὶ νέμε μολρας.
οἶνοχοι δ' υίδς Μενελαός κοδαλίματοι.
oi δ' ἐν' οὐνεῖαθ' ἐτοίμα προκειμένα χείρας ἵαλλον.
aὐτάρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητού εὔς ἐρεν ἐντο,
δὴ τότε Τηλέμαχος καὶ Νέστορος ἄγλαδος υίδς
ἵππους τε ξεῦγνυντ' ἀνα τ' ἄρματα ποικ' ἐβαίνον,
ἐκ δ' ἁλασαν προβορίου καὶ αἴδουσι ἐρίδουσι.
tους δ' μετ' Ἀτρείδης ἐκεὶ ξανθός Μενελαός,
oīνον ἐχον ἐν χείρι μελέφονα δεξιερόθεα
ev δεπαί χρυσέω, ὑφρα λειψάντε κιόσιν.
stή δ' ἱππων προπάροιε, δεδισκόμενοι δὲ προσηύδα.
"χαίρετον, ὃ κούρω, καὶ Νέστορι ποιμένι λαῶ
εἰπεν: ἢ γὰρ ἔμοιγε πάθη όι ἕπισεν Ἦπι
ὅσ εἴν τρόπη πολεμίζομεν νίες Ἀχαίων."

Τὸν δ' αὐ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀπόλοι ἑδα
"καὶ λίθην κείσω γε, διστρέφες, ὡς ἀγορεύεις,
pánta τάδ' ἐλθόντες καταλέξομεν αἱ γαρ ἐγὼν ὃς
νοστήοσα 'Ιθάκηνδε, κιχῶν Ὀδυσσῆν' ἐνι ὀικρ,

139 om. GPHXal.; see on 17. 95. 141 οἶνοχοι Ar. G: φίνοχοι vulg.
144 δῆ GU: καὶ vulg. 149 ἐν δείπαι χρυσείῳ G FU: χρυσείῳ ἐν δείπαι PXal.:
perhaps χρυσείῳ δείπαι (so Ar. in 3. 41).
152 κιχῶν GUal.: κιχων FPHII
al. Est. With κιχων it is necessary to take 'Οδυσσῆ' as 'Οδυσσῆ', or to read 'Οδυσσῆ'
as Ar., see Sch. H) or 'ΟΔΥΣΣΗ' (Eust.).

146. προθύρα, the gateway of the
eλών or court-yard.

αἰθωνη, the 'portico' or λογγία
across the gateway, which echoed to the
trump of the horses (τρωπος).

152. δείπνον (so Ar.), sc. χείρας.
155-158. αὐ γὰρ ἐγὼν ὃς . . . ὃς . . . ,
lit. 'would that I may tell it on returning
to Ithaca and finding Ulysses in
the house, even as I go on my way after re-
ceiving all hospitality from you,' i.e.
'my debt to you for hospitality is as
great and sure as my desire to see my
father again in Ithaca.' This is the only
interpretation consistent with the idi-
omatic use of ὃς—ὃς in wishes. The
commentators take the first ὃς as = 'as
surely as I shall tell it to Nestor,' and
ὃς παρά σεῖον κτλ. as an object clause, so
that the sense is 'would that I may be
equally sure of telling my father of your
hospitality.' But this does not lay due
stress on ὃς παρά κτλ., which is the main
assertion of the sentence. Cp. 3. 218,
18. 464.
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εἶποι', ὡς παρὰ σείο τυχῶν φίλητησος ἀπάσης ἔρχομαι, αὐτὰρ ἄγω κειμῆλια πολλὰ καὶ ἔσθλὰ.'

"Ὅς ἄρα οἱ εἰπότεν ἐπέπτατο δεξίοις ὄρνις, αἰετὸς ἄγρυν χήια φέρων ὀνύχεσι πέλαρον, ἥμερον ἐς αὐλῆς· οἱ δ' ἱόντες ἐποτο ἀνέρες ἡδὲ γυναῖκες· ὁ δὲ σφόνιν ἐγγύθεν ἐλθὼν δεξίοις ἥξε τρόπον ἕπον· οἱ δὲ ἱδίες γῆθησαν, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐνι φρεσὶ θυμὸς ἰάνθη.

τόσι δὲ Νεστόρης Πεισίστρατος ἡρχητο μύθων· "φράξεο δή, Μενέλαε διοτρέφες, δρχαμε λαών, ἥ νοϊν τόδ' ἐφυνε θεὸς τέρας ἡ σοι αὐτῷ."  

"Ὡς φατό, μερμήριζε δ' ἀρηφίλου Μενέλαου, ὅππος οἱ κατὰ μοῖραν ὑποκρίνατο νοῦς.

τὸν δ' Ἐλένη τανῦπεπλος υποφθαμένη φάτο μύθων· "κλύτε μεν, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μαντεύομαι, ὡς ἐνι θυμῷ ἀδάνατοι βάλλονται καὶ ὡς τελέοσθαι ὅιω. ὡς δὲ χήνη ἤπαξ' ἀτιταλλομένη ἐνὶ οἴκῳ ἐλθὼν ἐς ὄρεος, δῆι οἱ γενεά τε τόκοι τε,

175 ὁς 'Οδυσεὺς κακὰ πολλὰ παθῶν καὶ πῶλ' ἐπαληθεῖς οἰκάθε νοστήσει καὶ τίσται· ἢ καὶ ἢδη οἰκοί, ἄταρ μνηστήραι κακῶν πάντεσσι φυτεύει.

Τὴν δ' ἃδ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίλον ἠδόν·

159 ἔως vulg.: ἵνω XU: ἵεω P M. 167 δὴ] νῦν G X al.

158. ἅπασης, as we say, 'nothing but kindness.'

160. ἐπέπτατο 'slew by': ἐνι as in ἐπιληθεῖς (l. 176).

δεξίος 'to the right': equivalent to ἐνδίκια, and thus meaning 'from left to right.' So in l. 164 δεξίοις ἥξε πρόοθ' ἔπων means 'sped to the right in front of the chariot,' so as to cross its path in the lucky direction.

Note the order of the narrative: first a brief statement, in the words ἐπέπτατο δεξίοις ὄρνις (l. 160), then the incident in detail (ll. 161-165). Hence the main fact is told over again in l. 164 δεξίοις ἥξε κτλ. Cp. ll. 6. 158–168, where the story begins with the main fact of the banishment of Bellerophon (ἐς ρ' ἐν δημονο ἔλασθε), and then goes back to the cause—τῷ δὲ γυνὴ Προτεύτου ἐκμισματο κτλ.

170. ὑποκρίνατο 'should expound,' 'read the sign'; cp. 10. 535, 555.

172. αὐτὰρ marks the slight contrast between the listeners (κλύτε μεν) and the speaker: 'do you hear, and I &c.' Cp. ἀφρ., ll. 178, 197.

175. γενεά τε τόκοι τε is an example of the kind of hendiadys formed by two nearly synonymous words: e. g. κραδῆς θυμὼς τε, ἐβρίς τε βία τε, βουλή τε νόος τε, ἄνερεκα ἤδη μεταλλη, μάχη ἤδη πτολομοιο, Lat. more modoque, Germ. 'Art und Weise.' The two meanings are fused, as it were, into a single more complete conception.
15. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ο

"οὔτω νῦν Ζεύς θεῖ, ἐργάζουσα πόσις "Ἡρῆς·
τῷ κέν τοι καὶ κείθι θεῷ ὑπεροφήμην."

"Ἡ καὶ ἐφ' ἵππων μάστιν βάλεν· οἱ δὲ μάλ' ὀδα
ἡῖξαν πεδίον διὰ πτόλειος μεμαώτες.
οἱ δὲ πανημέριοι σείν· ἵγνων ἄμφις ἔχοντες,
δύσετο τ' ἑλλος σκιώτω τε πάσαι ἄγιαλ,
ἐς Ψηρὰς δ' ἱκόντο Διοκλῆς ποτὶ δῶμα,
νίεσ 'Ορτλῆχου, τῶν 'Αλφείδας τέκε παίδα.
ἐνθα δὲ νύκτ' ἄεσαν, ὃ δὲ τοῖς πάρ ἑιναὶ θήκεν.

"Ἡμος δ' ἑργίνεια φάνη ἱδωδάκτυλος 'Ηώς,
ἵππων τε ἡγόνυντ' ἀνὰ τ' θραμάτα ποικίλ ἔβαινον,
ἐκ δ' ἔλασαν προβόριον καὶ αἰθώνης ἐριδούπον
μάστιγεν δ' ἐλάνω, τὸ δ' οὐκ ἀπέκοντε πετέσθην.
ἀγα δ' ἐπειβ' ἱκόντο Πύλου αἰτὶ πτολεθρόν
καὶ τὸτε Τηλέμαχος προσεφώνει Νέστορος νῦν.
"Νεστορίδης, πῶς κέν μοι ὑποχόμενος τελεσίας
μῆθον ἐμὼν; ξείνοι δὲ διἀμπερές εὐχήμεθ' εἶναι
ἐκ πατέρους φιλότητος, ἀτὰρ καὶ ὀμήλικες εἰμεν,
ἡδε δ' ὥδε καὶ μᾶλλον ῥομφασύνην ἐκεῖσε.
μὴ μὲ παρέξ ἄγε νῆα, διοτρεφές, ἀλλὰ λίπ' αὐτοῦ,
μὴ μ' ὁ γέρων ἀεκοντα κατάλοχα δ' ἕνι οἶκῳ
ἰέμενος φιλέειν· ἐμὲ δὲ χρεώθ' θάσσον ἱκέσθαι."

"Ως φάτο, Νεστορίδης δ' ἄρ' ἐφ' συμφράσσεστο θυμῷ,

188 δ' ὡς τοῖς πάρ ἑιναὶ θήκεν]. In the parallel 3.490 most MSS. give the
smoother half-line δ' ἄρ' ξενὴν δῶσιν. The other may come from Od. 5.911,
9.517 ἵνα τοῖς πάρ ἑιναὶ θέω. 200 κατὰσχυν vulg.

181. τῶ κέν τοι. 'then to thee I &c.'
184-192. ὢν. The line δύσετο τ' ἑλλος κωτ. is obviously archaic
and conventional. It is always used when the poet wishes to say what
point, in a journey or process of some
kind, had been reached at sunset. The
form is noticeable as an instance of
primitive parataxis. Here (e.g.) there
are three statements virtually forming a
single sentence: 'the horses rattled
the yoke—the sun set—and they reached
Phereas'; i.e. 'they trotted along until,
at sunset, they reached Phereas.' The
connexion of the clauses is generally

obscured in our texts by the punctuation.
It is well seen in the shorter 6.321
δύσετο τ' ἑλλος καὶ τοι ἄλλους ἄδοι
ἰκότο (cp. 8.417). See also the note
on 15.206.

189. Morning of the 37th day.
190. Cr. II. 9.700 ἀγνοφέρον ἱερατική
'you have encouraged in haughtiness.'
191. This shows, as Strabo points out,
that the city of Pylos was some way
inland.

201. θέλει may be subject to τετελεσθα (as
in 210), 'needs must that I reach my end
quickly.' But χρέω (τοι νευτ) may take
an accusative: 1.225, II.9.75, 10.43.
15. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ω

"Οδηγεί εκείνοι τα πάντα τα έταιροι, πριν εμέ οίκαρ' ἰκέσθαι ἀπαγγείλαι τε γέροντι. ἦν γὰρ ἐγώ τὸ λαθα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν ὅσον κείνον θυμὸς ὑπέρβιος, οὐ δέ με θήσει, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς καλέων δεήρ' εἰσεται, οὐδὲ ἐ φημὶ ἄν ιέναι κενενό μάλα γὰρ κεχολῶσεται ἐμπησ.`

"Ως ἄρα φονίσσας ἐλασεν καλλιτριχας ἀκτος

"Ος ἐφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλῶν ἡ δ' ἐπίθοντο, αἰσθα δ' ἄρι ὑσβαινον καὶ ἐπὶ κλῆσι καθίζον. ὦ τοῦ ὁ μὲν τὰ ποιεῖστα καὶ εὐχετο, ὥθε δ' Ἀθηνὴ νητ' πάρα προμηθεὶς σχεδόθεν δὲ οἱ ἡλιθεν αὐτοὶ τηλεδαπόσ, φεύγοις ἐς "Ἀργεὸς ἄνδρα κατακτᾶς, μάντις: ἀτέρ γενεὰς γε Μελάμποδος ἐγώνοις ἦν, δι πρὶν μὲν ποτ' ἔναι Πύλω ἐνι, μητέρι μήλων, ἀνεφεια Πυλώνι μέγ' ἑξοχα δῶματα ναόν.

15. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ο

δὴ τὸτε γ' ἄλλων δήμον αἀκετο πατρίδα φεύγων
Νηλέα τε μεγάθυμον, ἀγανάκτατον ζωόντων,
ὁς οἱ χρήματα πολλὰ τελεαφόρον εἰς ἐναυτῶν
eἰκε θη. ὁ δὲ τέως μὲν ἐνὶ μεγάροις. Φυλάκοιο
δεσμῷ εἰν ἁργαλέω δέδετο, κρατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχων
eἰνεκα Νηλῆος κούρης ἄτης τε βαρείας,
τὴν οἱ ἐπὶ φρεσκὸ δῆκε θεᾶ δασπλήτης Ερμώς.

ἄλλ' ὁ μέν ἐκφυγε κήρα καὶ ἤλασε βοῦς ἐρμύκους
ἐς Πύλον εκ Φυλάκης καὶ ἐτίσσατο ἔργων ἀείκες
ἀντίθεεν Νηλῆα, κασιγνητὰ δὲ γυναῖκα
ηγάγετο πρὸς δάμαθ'. ὁ δ' ἄλλων ἵκετο δήμον,
'Ἀργός ἐς ἱππόβοτον τόθι γὰρ νῦ ὦ ὁ αἰσιμον ἦν
ναίμεναι πολλοῖσιν ἀνάσσουν' Ἀργείοισιν.

ἐνθα δ' ἐγγὺς γυναῖκα καὶ υφαρεφές θέτο δῶμα,
γείατο δ' Ἄντιφάτην καὶ Μάντιν, νῦε κραταιώ.
'Αντιφάτης μὲν ἐτίκτιν Ὀικήλα μεγάθυμον,
ἀυτὰρ Ὀικλείης λαοσοῦν Ἀμφίαραν,
ἐν περὶ κήρι φίλει Ζεὺς τ' αἴγιόχου καὶ 'Ἀπόλλων
παντολήν φιλὴτη'. οὖδ' ἵκετο γῆρας οὐδόν,
ἄλλ' ὦλετ' ἐν Θήβῃς γυναῖων εἰνέκα δῶρων.
τοῦ δ' νεῖς ἐγένετον 'Ἀλκμαῖον Ἀμφίλοχος τε.
Μάντιος αὐ τέκτον Πολυφείδα τε Κλείτον τε
ἄλλ' ἥ τοι Κλειτόν χρυσόβρονος ἠρπασεν Ὡδόσ
κάλλεος εἰνέκα οἴο, ἐν ἀθανατοίου μετεῖν
to" 228 ἄλλων G H U al.; ἄλλους F P X D (cp. 238).
originally doubtless τοῦ. 234 ἵκετο vulg.: ἓν F U. 244 Ἀμφιάραν Zen.
G F H U L W: probably the true Ionic form. 251 obel. Ar. (II. 20. 235).

μέγ' ἐξοχοι αἰσιόσισι, also 1. 70 πάτας
δοτὶ μεγαντὸν νὰίν Κυλλώνισσι, and
II. 2. 480 ἄγαλης μέγ' ἐξοχοι.
228. ἄλλων δήμον, sc. Ἀργός, as we
learn from 1. 238, where the words are
taken up again.
234. δασπλήτης 'smiter of houses':
cp. τειχεικλήτης. The first part of the
compound is probably from the same root
as δασ- in δασῶνς 'house-master.'
240. ἀνάσσουν, i.e. ἀνάσσοντα, acc.
with the subject of ναίμεναι.

246. The 'threshold' of old age is
not here thought of as the entrance
or beginning. The meaning is that he
never fairly set foot in old age: cp. II.
22. 60.

Some of the ancients (as Plutarch,
Consol. ad Apoll. c. 17) saw in this verse
a proof of the saying that those whom
the gods love die young. But no such
'pathetic fallacy' was in the poet's
mind.

247. γυναῖων δώρων, II. 521.
15. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ο

αὐτὰρ ὑπέρθυμον Πολυφείδεα μάντιν Ἀττάλλων
θῆκε βροτῶν δὴ ἀριστον, ἐπεὶ θάνεν Ἀμφιάραος
δὲ β’ 'Τηρησίνη' ἀπενάσατο πατρὶ χολωθεῖς,
ἐνθ’ δ’ γε ναυτάσων μαντεύετο πάση βροτοῖς. 255

Τού μὲν ἄρ’ υἱὸς ἐπήλθε, Θεοκλήμενος δ’ ἄνθρωπος ἦν,
δὲ τότε Τηλέμαχον πέλας ἱστατο· τόν δ’ ἐκίχανε
σπένδοντι εὐχέμενον τε θαῦμα παρὰ νη μελανῇς,
καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερύγεα προσηύδα: 260
“ὁ φίλ’, ἐπεὶ σε θύοντα κιγάνω τῷ’ ἐνι χάρῳ,
λύσοι’ ὑπὲρ θυέων καὶ δαίμονος, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
ς’ τ’ αὐτοῦ κεφαλῆς καὶ ἐτάρων, οἱ τοι ἐποντα,
εἰσέ μοι εἰρομένον νημερτέα μηδ’ ἐπικεύσῃς·
τὸς πόθεν εἰς ἄνδρῶν; ποθί τοι πολλὶς ἤδε τοκῆς;” 265

Τὸν δ’ αὐτὸ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἄντι τὸ ἀδάμα·
“τοιγάρ ἐγὼ τοι, ἐξεῖνε, μαλλ’ ἀτρέκεως ἀγορεύσω.
ἐξ Ἰθάκης γένος εἰμί, πατὴρ δὲ μοι ἐστιν Ὀδυσσεός,
ἐλ’ ποτ’ ἔννοι νῦν δ’ ἤδη ἀπεφθηρός λυγρόν ὁλέθρον.
τοῦκα νῦν ἐτάρως τοι λαβῶν καὶ νῦν μέλαιν
ἦλθον πεισθέντεον πατρὸς δὴν οἴκομένω.” 270

Τὸν δ’ αὐτὸ προσέειπε Θεοκλήμενος θεοείδης:
“οὖν τοι καὶ ἐγὼν ἐκ πατρίδος, ἄνθρωπος κατάκτας
ἐμφυλὸν πολλοὶ δὲ κασιγνητοὶ τε ἡταὶ τε
‘Αργος ἄν’ ἐπόβοτον, μέγα δὲ κρατέουσιν ‘Ἀχαίων.
τῶν ὑπαλευμένων θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν
φεῦγο, ἐπεὶ νῦ μοι αἰσα κατ’ ἄνδρονς ἀλάλησθαι. 275

268 λυγρὸν ὁλέθρων Ατ. (αἱ χαριστεραὶ Did.): λυγρὸ ὡλέθρῳ MSS.

256. τοῦ, viz. Polyphæides.
258. εἰ ποτ’ ἐν πο. This well-known formula is generally understood as a pathetic expression of doubt whether a former happiness ever really existed. It seems rather to be an aíssurance: ‘Ulysses was my father if he lived’ (as of course he did); i.e. ‘as surely as there was a Ulysses.’ So in II. 3. 180 δὴ ἔστω ἄμεσον... εἰ ποτ’ ἐν πο. ἐγὼ γα., ‘Agamemnon was my brother-in-law, as surely as he was at all’: and II. 11. 763.
272. ἐκ πατρίδος, sc. εἰμι.
275. πολλοὶ δὲ κτλ. carries on in paratactic form the description of ἄνθρωπος: ‘one who has many brothers and comrades.’
275. Editors generally construe τῶν θάνατον, ‘their death’ = ‘death at their hands,’ comparing 9. 411 νοῦν Διὸς μέγαλον. But the parallel does not hold: a ‘disease of Zeus’ is one that he only is known to send. More probably τῶν is governed by the οὖ ἄνω παρελευμένοι. With φεῦγω and similar verbs ἐν τὸ c. gen. is = ‘under stress of.’
15. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ω

ἐλλά μὲ νῦσ ἐφεσσαί, ἔπει σε φυγὼν ἱκέτευσα,
μᾶ μὲ κατακτείνωσοι διωκέμεναι γὰρ δία.

Τόν δ' αὐ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ἡδα:
"οὐ μὲν δὴ σ' ἐθέλοντα γ' ἀπόσω νῦσ ἐστιν,
ἀλλ' ἔπευν αὐτὰρ κείθι φιλήσει, οἶα κ' ἐχωμεν."

"Ως ἄρα φωνήσας οἱ ἐδέξατο χάλκεον ἔγχος,
καὶ το γ' ἐπὶ ικρίδιφι Τάνυσεν νέος ἀμφιελλός.

ἐν πρώμη δ' ἀρ' ἔπειτα καθέστο, πάρ δὲ οἱ αὐτῷ
εἰσε Θεοκλέμενον τοι δὲ πρωμής έλυσαν.

Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐτάρωσιν ἐποτρύνασ ἐκέλευσεν
ὅπλων ἀπεσθαί τοι δ' ἐσπυμένως ἐπίθυντο.

ιστὸν δ' εἰλάτινον κολῆς ἐντοσθε μεσόδημης
στήσαν αἰλάντες, κατὰ δὲ πρωτόνοισιν ἔθησαν,

ἐλκὼν δ' ἵστα λευκά εὔστρεπτοις βοέθες,

τοῖσιν δ' ἵκεμεν οὐρον ιεί γλαυκώπις Ἀθήνη,
λάβρων ἐπαιγίζοντα δ' αἰθέρος, ὅφα ταχιστα

νῦσ ἀνύσεις θέουσα δαλάσθης ἀλμυρῶν ὅδωρ.

δύσετο τ' ἧδιος σκιώντω τε πᾶσαι ἀγνιαίς.

ἡ δὲ Φειδ. ἐπέβαλλεν ἐπειγομένη Δίας οὔφρω,

[Βαβ δὲ παρὰ Κροωνοῦς καὶ Χαλκίδα καλλιρέθρων,

hound' Ἰλίδα διαί, δῆι κρατέουσον Ἑπείαν.

293 ἔφεσσα Aristoph.

295 is not in any MS. of the Odyssey, but is quoted by Strabo (viii. 26, p. 350). I have placed it after 297, for the reasons stated below. 297 Φείδις Αρ.: Φειδ. Ψ: Φειδ. νυγ. δααλλαμένη Strab. l.c.

277. ἔφεσσα 'put me on board,' cp. 13-274.

280. ἰδλοντα γε 'fain as thou art (to come).'

287-292. See on 2.430-436.

294. οἴδωρ is governed by ἀνύσεις, or perhaps rather by the phrase ἀνύσεις θέουσα, which is διαπρέπεις

295-298. These four lines are quoted by Strabo in his discussion of the voyage of Telemachus (viii. 26, p. 350). Line 295, now placed after 297, is not in any MS. of the Odyssey; but the three lines 295, 298, 297 (in this order) are found, with certain variations, in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, vv. 425-
to the Odyssey, or is an ancient inter-

1. It seems clear, in the first place,

2. The place of line 297 (ἡ δὲ Φεῦς

3. This last conclusion evidently

4. Therefore the original order of the

5. Hence the original order of the

line is—

15. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ο

ἐνθεν δ' αὐ ὑσοισιν ἐπιπροέκει θῷσιν,

ομαίνων ἢ κεν θάνατον φύοι ἢ κεν ἀλοίπ.

300 ἀλοίπ Βεν. 457: ἄλων, ἄλων, ἄλων vulg.

νὰπ Ἠλίδα διὼν. In Strabo, as in our texts of the Odyssey,

νὰπ Ἠλίδα διὼν has to be construed

with ἵππαλλεν, which is apparently a

nautical term meaning 'stood for' or

'tran for' (a point in view). There is

therefore a 'zeugma' of more than

ordinary harshness. In the Hymn the

construction of δὴ δὲ παρὰ Κρονοῖς...

ἥλιον Ἠλίδα is smooth and natural.

Moreover it finds a close parallel—

perhaps an imitation—in Od. 24. 11-13

πάρ δ' ἐνάνυ Πανενὸς τε ρῶν καὶ Λευκάδα

πέτρας, ἤδε πάρ' Ἁλκιός πολεμοὶ καὶ δῆμον

ἀνίκαμα.

The same conclusion follows with no

less certainty from the usage in regard
to the conventional line δοστέτ τ'] ἥλιον

κτλ. (as to which see the note on 184-186).

That line is always preceded by a

description, also usually in a

conventional formula, of a journey (or

process of some kind)—here τῶν δ' Λημνῶν

ὁδὸν ἵκεν κτλ.—and is followed by

a mention of the stage in the journey

then reached. Such a line as δὲν δὲ

παρὰ Κρονοῖς κτλ. would come very

well after δοστέτ τ'] ἥλιον, but not

before it. I have therefore no hesitation

in accepting 295 as genuine, and in

following the order of the Hymn so far

as to place it immediately before 298.

2. The place of line 297 (ἡ δὲ Φεῦς

κτλ.) is almost fixed by the geography.

Nearly all the MSS. of the Odyssey

give the form Φεῦς, and that is also

the word in the Hymn to Apollo: but

Aristarchus and Strabo read Φεῦς, which

we can hardly be wrong in adopting,

and identifying with the Φεῦς of II. 7.

135, a town on the Iardanus, and of

Thuc. 2. 25. A ship going northwards

from Pylus would steer for Phœa.

The headland near Phœa, the ancient Ichthys,

now Katakolo, must have been familiar

as a land-mark. On the other hand

there is no place of the name of Phœne

in this part of the Peloponnesus. But

Phœa, being to the south of Elis,
naturally comes before it in this narra-
tive. Hence the original order of the

lines is—

296. δοστέτ τ'] ἥλιον...

297. ἢ δὲ Φεῦς ἵππαλλεν...

295. βαῖν δὲ παρὰ Κρονοῖς καὶ Χαλκίδα...

298. ἢδε πρὸ Ἠλίδα διὼ κτλ.

On this point, then, we are led to

adopt the order of the Odyssey in

preference to that of the Hymn.

3. This last conclusion evidently

leads us to infer that the whole passage

belongs originally to the Odyssey: and

this again is strongly confirmed by the

words καὶ παρὰ Δύμηρ, which the Hymn

to Apollo gives in place of καλλιέρεθνον

at the end of 295. The town of Dyme,

in Achaea, is not on the course of Tele-

machus, and a fortiōri nowhere near

Κρονοῖς or Χαλκίδα. It is evidently

brought in with a view to the voyage

described in the Hymn, the voyage

from Crete to Delphi. Similarly it is

not improbable that the substitution of

Φεῦς for Φεῦς in 297 was suggested by

the Achaian town Φαραδ.

299-300. τῶν ὑσοισιν ἐπιπροέκει θῷσιν.

These enigmatical words describe the

course of Telemachus after passing Elis.

According to Strabo's view he obeyed

the injunction of Athene θεάς νήσουν διέ-

χεις εὐρύχειν νῆα (15. 33) by first steering
castwards towards the Echinades: the

νῆα θεοῦ being part of that group, and

so called from their 'sharp' or 'pointed'
form. Again shifting his course, Tele-

machus passed between Acarnania and

Ithaca, and landed on the further side

of the island: thus escaping the Suitors,

who lay in wait for him in the channel

between Ithaca and Cephalonia.

Plausible as this theory is, it fails

to explain the Homeric narrative. It

obliges us to suppose that the poet left

out the last part of the journey—a dis-

tinct stage in Strabo's account—viz.

from the Echinades home. We feel this

especially with the words δραμαῖνον ἢ

κεν θάνατον φύοι ἢ κεν ἀλοίπ, which
evidently apply best to the critical
moment when Telemachus was

approaching the shores of Ithaca. Again,

there is no independent ground for

Νῆος θεόι as a proper name denoting

some of the Echinades. This is a view

which has satisfied many scholars (see
Τὸ δὲ αὖτ' ἐν κλισίῃ Ὄδυσσεος καὶ δῖος ὕφορβὸς δορπείτην· παρὰ δὲ σφιν ἐδόρπεον ἀνέρες ἄλλοι.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδήτως ἕξ ἐρόν ἑντο, τοῖς δὲ Ὄδυσσεως μετέειπε συβάστικος πειρητίκων, ἢ μιν ἐτ' ἐνδυκεός φιλέοι μεῦναι τε κελεύοι

αὐτὸν ἐνι σταθμῷ, ἢ ὀτρύνει πῶλυνε·

“κέκλυθι νῦν, Εὐμεία, καὶ ἄλλοι πάντες ἐταίροι· ἢδεν προτὶ ἀπὸν λαλῶναι ἀπονεόθαι πτωχεύσων, ἵνα μὴ σε κατατρύχω καὶ ἐταίρους.

ἀλλὰ μοι εὗ ὑπόθεν καὶ ἀμ' ἡγεμόν' ἐσθλόν ὑπασσον, ὅσ' κε με κείσμ' ἀγάγη' κατὰ δὲ πτόλιν αὐτὸς ἀνάγκη 311

πλάγιομαι, αἴ κέν τις κοτύλην καὶ πῦρνον ὅρεξιν.

καὶ κ' ἔλθων πρὸς δόματ' Ὀδυσσῆος θεῶν ἀγγελῆς ἐποιμᾶ περίφορον Πηνελοπῆι,

καὶ κ' ὑποδήσων ὑπερφιάλοις μιγείν, 315

Buttmann’s Lex. a. n. θόα); but there is nothing to show that it is more than the ancient geographer’s hypothesis. It is true that on the other hand we are almost driven to some such hypothesis by the difficulty of explaining θόαν otherwise. The meaning ‘swiftness cannot be seriously thought of. The meaning ‘pointed’ is supposed to be established by the verb θόαν ‘to sharpen.’ This, however, is not certain. It may be that θόαν meant ‘to make quick’ or ‘active,’ and only acquired the sense of sharpening when applied to weapons and implements. It seems best, then, to leave θόαν unexplained.

Had it not been for the arguments based on θόαν the commentators would doubtless have taken the expression ‘the islands’ to denote the three that are so often associated with Ithaca: cp. 1. 245 ὅςον γὰρ ἑσοχήν ἐκπρατέσσων ἀριστοί, | ᾧ προέρχεται τὸ ἴδιον, τὰ δὲ βασιλείαν τῆς θαλάσσης Ἱπ. (= 16. 122., 19. 130.); and 11. 345 ὅςον ὁ δυστάκτης ἐκείνα πατρί οἰκονόμων, | ἂν ὁ δοῦλος νῆσοι πρὸς Ἡλίῳ Νικώδοτοι. The description ‘towards Elis’ applies very well to Zante, and partly to Cephalonia; in any case it shows that in the poet’s conception Telemachus in coming from Elis would pass ‘the islands’ more or less closely. So in the Hymn to Apollo, after Elis is passed, Ithaca and the other islands come in sight. The injunction ‘to keep his ship away from the islands’ (Ilias νῦν, 15. 33.) would be satisfied by giving them a moderately wide berth; for he trusts rather to darkness (ἀναβήσεται πλαίσεως), and to landing on Ithaca at a distance from the town.

On the whole it seems likely that ‘the islands’ here are the group associated with Ithaca, viz. Dulichium, Same, and Zacynthus. It is impossible to say what idea the poet had of their relative position: but the description of Ithaca in Od. 9. 25 as παντατραπάτη πρὸς ζώφον falls in with the view now taken.

301-495. The scene changes to the hut of Eumaeus. This digression serves a double purpose in the narrative: (1) it carries on the idyl of Ulysses in the swine-herd’s hut, and gives it artistic continuity; and (2) it fills up the otherwise blank space of the night voyage of Telemachus.

309. κατατρύχω, cp. Ηερ. Ὀρ. 305 (of drones) οἶτε πρὸς νῆσον πόλεως θάρσεως. 311. αὐτὸς, without the guide.
15. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ο

εἶ μοι δεῖπνον δοίεν ὅνειτα μυρί' ἔχοντες· ἀλάγα κεν εὗ δρόωμι μετὰ σφίσιν ἄσσο εὐέθειοι. ἐκ γάρ τοι ἐρέω, σοὶ δὲ σύνθεο καὶ μεν ἄκουσον· Ἐρμεῖον ἐκτῆς διακτήρου, ὡς ρά τε πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἔργοις χάριν καὶ κύδος ὅπαξεῖ, δρηστοσύνη οὐκ ἂν μοι ἐρίσσειε βροτός ἄλλος, πῦρ τ' εὗ νησάει διὰ τε ἐξαλα δανὰ κεάσσαι, δαιτρεῖσαι τε καὶ ὅπτησαι καὶ ὁνοχήσαι, οἷά τε τοῖς ἄγαθοῖς παραδρῶσωι χέρνες."

Τὸν δὲ μέγ' ὀψθένσας προσέφης, Ἐδμαιε συβῶτα: "ὁ μοι, ἔεινε, τίν τοι ἐνι φρεστι τοῦτο νῆμα ἔπλετο; Ἡ σο γε πάγχυ λιαίεαι αὐτὸν' ὀλέσθαι, εἰ δὴ μνηστήρων ἑθελεις καταδῦναι δμιλον, τῶν ἐβρίς τε βιὴ τε σιδιῄρου οὐρανὸν ἦκει. οἷ τοι σωίδ' εἰσθ' ὑποδρηστῆρες ἑκείνων,

ἀλλὰ νέοι, χλαίνας εὗ εἰμένου ἠδὲ χιτῶνας, αἰεὶ δὲ λιπαροὶ κεφαλάς καὶ καλὰ πρόσωπα, οἵ σφίν ὑποδρόσωσιν ἵθεστοι δὲ τράπεζαί σῖτον καὶ κρείων ἡδ' οἴνοι βεβρίθασιν.

ἀλλὰ μέν' οὖ γάρ τίς τοι ἀνιάται παρεῖντι, οὔτ' ἐγὼ οὔτε τις ἄλλος ἐταίρων, οἵ μοι ἐασιν. αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ ἐρήσιν 'Οδυσσῆος φίλος ἕθος,

κείσας σε χλαίναν τε χιτῶνα τε εἰματα ἔσσει, πέμψει δ' ὅππῃ σε κραδίθι θυμός τε κελεύει."

Τὸν δ' ἡμεῖσι' ἐπείτα πολύτλας δίος 'Οδυσσεύς."

317 ἄνεοι ἐθάλαιν Αρ.: the MSS. have ὅτι θέλομεν οὗτοι ἔθαλαιν. 321 ὑφη-

σώσσων Αθρέας: cp. h. Cep. 476. 322 δωδ' Φ Η Eust.: θωλάδ G X D U al.

317. ἀλάγα κεν κτλ. This is a kind of second apodosis to εἲ μοι δεῖπνον κτλ.: 'if they would', I would readily serve right well, &c.' Cp. 14. 217, and see Riddell, Digest, § 207 A.

322. νηθεῖσας and the other infinitives are to be construed with ἔρησεις, and thus form a sort of epexegeesis of ἐρησωσιν: ' no one would contend with me in respect of service, in piling up a fire, &c.' Cp. Ar. Pax 1133 ἐπίδια τῶν ἐξών ἄττ' ἂν ἣ δαύτατα κτλ.

324. τοῖς ἁγαθοῖς. The art. is used as with comparatives, see on 14. 12 τὸ μῦλαν, 14. 61 οἱ νέοι, 12. 253 ἐφώσι τοῖς ἄλγοις.

327. αὐτῶθ' ' on the spot,' without escape.

330. τοιοῦτοι ' as such as you.'

334. This spondaic line has been thought to express the notion of heaviness (βεβρίθαι). But probably the original was more dactylic: οἵτιν' οὐ κρεῖσον ἢδ' οἴνοι βεβρίθαι.
"αἰθ' ὠδώς, Ἐὔμαιε, φίλος Διὶ πατρὶ γένους
ὡς ἔμοι, ὅτι μ' ἐπαυγασά δῆλη καὶ διῶδος αἰνής.
πλαγκτοσύνης δ' οὐκ ἐστὶ κακώτερον ἄλλο βροτοῖσιν:
ἄλλ' ἔνεκ' οὐλομένης γαστρός κακὰ κήδε' ἔχουσιν
[ἀνέρες, δι' τιν' ἰκται δῆλη καὶ πῆμα καὶ ἀλγος.]
νῦν δ' ἐπεί ισχανάς μεῖναι τέ με κείνον ἄνωγας,
εἰσ' ἄγε μοι περὶ μητρὸς Ὀδυσσῆος θείοι
πατρὸς θ', δι' κατελειπεν ἰὼν ἐπὶ γῆρας οὐδῆ,
ἡ που ἐτί ζώουσιν ὑπ' αἰγάς ἑλλοιο,
ἡ ἥδη τεθναίει καὶ εἰν' 'Αἴδαο δόμοισιν."

Τὸν δ' αὕτε προσείπει συβωτῆς, δρχαμος ἀνδρῶν:
"τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ τοι, ξείνε, μᾶλ' ἀτρεκέως ἀγορεύσω.
Δαέρτης μὲν ἔτι ζώει, Διὶ δ' εὐχεταί αἰεὶ
θυμὸν ἀπὸ μελέων φθίσθαι οἷς ἐν μεγάροισιν
ἐκπάγλωσ γὰρ παιδὸς ὀδύρεται οἰχομένου
κουριδῆς τ' ἀλῶχοι δαιφρόνοις, ἢ ἐ μάλιστα
ῄκαχ' ἀποβιμένη καὶ ἐν ὁμῳ γηράι βῆκεν.
ἡ δ' ἄχει οὖ παιδὸς ἀπέφθητα κυδαλίμοιο,
λευγαλέῳ βανάτῳ, ὡς μηθανός δὲ τις ἐμοίγε
ἐνθάδε ναιετάων φίλος εἰπ καὶ φίλα ἐρδοί.

δόφη μὲν οὖν δὴ κείνη ἐγν, ἀχεύονα περ ἑμη,
τόφρα τ' μοι φίλον ἔσκε μεταλλησαι καὶ ἐρέσθαι,
οὔνεκα μ' αὐτὴ ἥθεψεν ἀμα Κτιμένη ταυτέπλωφ,
θυγατέρ' ἱφθικτη, τὴν ὀπλοτάτην τέκε παιδίων,
τῇ ὁμοῦ ἐτρεφόμην, ὀλγον δὲ τ' μ' ἥσον ἐτήμα.

αὐτάρ ἐπεί β' ἤβην πολυνήρατον ἠκόμηθ' ἀμφο,
τὴν μὲν ἐπείτα Σάμηνδ' ἐδοσαν καὶ μυρ' ἐλωνοτ,


344. οὐλομένη 'miserable.' The epithet in this context has a slightly mock-heroic effect.

The word οὐλομένης has been again discussed by Schulze (Quaest. Ep. 192-
301), who shows conclusively that it is the same as the aor. participle ἀλαθόμης, and not transitive in meaning
(≠ ὀλομος or ὀλήθος). It always means 'miserable,' 'accursed,' and has the
same relation to the part. ὀλος or ὀλοτο that ἀλήθος 'happy' has to the blessing
ὁμο. The ov for o in the first syllable is simply a metrical license, necessary in
hexameter verse.

357. ἀμφή 'unripe,' 'premature.' The meaning of ἀμφογή is curiously dif-
ferent (ll. 23, 791).

367. Σάμηνδ' ἐδοσαν, pregnant use, cp. 14.395 ἐς λιβόν ἐνιατο, II. 10.268

Digitized by Google
αὐτάρ ἐμὲ ἥλιανν τε χιτώνα τε εἰματα κείνη καλὰ μᾶλ" ἀμφίεσασα. ποσίν θ᾽ ὑποδήματα δοῦσα ἀγρόνδε προϊάλλε: φίλει δὲ μὲ κηρόθι μάλλον.  

370 νῦν δ᾽ ἣδη τοῦτον ἐπιδεώμαι ἀλλὰ μοι αὐτῷ ἔργον ἀέξουσιν μάκαρες θεοί δ᾽ ἐπιμεῖνὼν τῶν ἐφαγὼν τ᾽ ἐπίον τε καὶ αἰδοῖοισιν ἔδωκα. 

375 ἐκ δ᾽ ἄρα δεσποίνης οὐ μελίχων ἐστιν ἀκούσαι οὐτ᾽ ἔποσ οὕτε τι ἔργον, ἐπεὶ κακῶν ἐμπεσεν οἶκος, ἀνδρὲς ὑπερφίλαιοι. μέγα δὲ δμώες χατέουσιν ἀντία δεσποίνης φάσει καὶ ἐκαστα πυθέωσαι, καὶ φαγέμεν πέμεν τε, ἐπειτα δὲ καὶ τι φέρεσθαι ἀγρόνδ᾽, ὅλα τε θύμων ἀεὶ δμώεσοι λαίνειν."  

380 Τὸν δ᾽ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητος 'Οδυσσεύς.  

385 "ἀ πτοι, ὡς ἄρα τυθδος έῶν, Εὐμαίει συβότα, πολλάν ἀπεπλάγχθης σῆς πατρίδος ἦδε τοκῆσαν. ἀλλ᾽ ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπε καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξας, ἢ διεπράβετο πτόλης ἄνδρον ἐφυράγχα, ἢ ἐνι γαινάτασκε πατήρ καὶ πότνια μῆτρα, ἢ σὲ γε μονολὴν παρ᾽ οἴεσιν ἢ παρὰ βουσὶν ἄνδρες δυσμενὲς νησυὶν λάβον ἢ ἐπέρρασαν τοῦτο ἄνδρος πρὸς δόμαθ᾽, ὁ δ᾽ ἀξίων ἄνων ἔδωκε."  

390 Τὸν δ᾽ αὐτὲ προσέειτε συβότης, ὅρχαμος ἄνδρων "ζείν", ἐπεὶ ἄρ δὴ ταύτα μ᾽ ἀνείρει ἠδὲ μεταλλασ,  


366. έμε, with προϊάλλε (370).  

370. κηρόθι μάλλον, a fixed phrase, in which the comparative has no application to the present context. It properly means 'rather much (than little), then, by a litotes, 'right well': cp. διασφόνον="right quickly.' It does not mean 'more than before,' as Ameis takes it.  

373. τοὺς, neut. plur., denoting the things implied in ἔργον, viz. the different fruits of the work. The gen. is partitive.  

380. αἰδοῖοις, i.e. to those who have a claim on my regard (αἰδοῖς), as members of the family (αἰδοῖ παράκωσις, &c.); guests (9.271 ζείνοις, δὲ ζείνοιν ἀνβαλιοῖοιν ὑπόθεις), suppliants (7.165 λείτου ἀνβαλιοῖοις ὑπόθεις).  

375. Note that ἀκούσαι only suits ἔργον. But the zeugma is softened if we restore ou ἔργον οὐδε τὸ ἔργον.  

379. οὐτα ἐφεβει refers to all the preceding clauses, ἄνα ὑπόθεις, &c.  

386. οἰςαν, for ὑπνο μετρι γρατία.  

387. ἐπιράσασιν πρὸς δόματα, a pregnant use, "brought to the house and there sold", cp. 387 (supra).
15. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΔΑΣ 0

σιγην νυν ἐνεκει καὶ τέρπεο, πινε τε οἰνον ἡμενος. αἰδε δὲ νόκτες ἄθεσφατοι ἔστι μὲν ευδειν, ἔστι δὲ τερπομένοιοι ἀκοῦειν οὐδὲ τι σε χρή, πρὶν ὄρη, καταλέχαι τὴν καὶ πολὺς ὕπνος. τῶν δ’ ἀλλων δτινα κραδή καὶ θυμὸς ἄνγη εὐδέτω ἐξελθῶν ἄμα δ’ ἦν φαινομένη, δειπνήσας, ἀμ’ ἔσοσιν ἀνακτορίζοις ἑπέσθω. νοϊ δ’ ἐνί κλισίη πίνοντε τε δαίνυμένοι τε κηδεῖν αλλήλων τερπάμεθα λευγαλέοις μνωμένων μετὰ γάρ τε καὶ ἀλγεις τέρπεται ἄνήρ, δε τις δέ μέλα πολλὰ πάθη καὶ πόλλ’ ἐπαληθῇ. τοῦτο δέ τοι ἐρέω δ’ μ’ ἀνείρει ἣδε μεταλῆς.

Νησός τις Συρίη κικλήσκεται, εἰ που ἀκούεις, Ὀρτυγής καθύπερθεν, δὴ τροπαὶ ἥλιοιο, οὒ τι περιπληθῆς λίθν τόσον, ἄλλ’ ἀγαθὴ μὲν, εὐβοτος εὐμυλος, οἰνοπληθῆς πολύπυρος. πείνη δ’ οὔ ποτε δῆμον ἐσέρχεται, οὔδε τις ἄλλη νοῦσος ἐπὶ στυγερη πέλεται δειλοῖς βρυτοίσιν ἄλλ’ ὅτε γηρᾶσκοι πόλιν κάτα φιλ’ ἀνθρώπων, ἐλθὼν ἀργυρότροφος Ἀπόλλων Ἀρτέμιδι ξῦν οἰς ἀγανοίσι βέλεσιν ἐποιχόμενος κατέφειν. ἐνθα δῶν πόλεις, δίχα δὲ σφοι σάντα δέδασται τηῶν δ’ ἀμφοτέρροις πατὴρ ἐμὸς ἐμβαλείες, Κτήσιος Ὀμενιδῆς, ἐπιείκελος ἀθανάτους.

"Ἐνθα δὲ Φῶτικες ναυσικλιτοὶ ἤλυθον ἄνδρες, 395 ακούοντι Ατ.: ἰμεν MSS. βελέσιν τυλ.

394. πρὶν ᾗρη, sc. ἐρ. 400. μνωμένω, from μνῶμαι ‘call to mind.’

μετὰ ‘in turn,’ cp. 460.

403. The islands Συρίη and Ὀρτυγή have a mythical character, as the ‘turning points’ of the sun (so the island of Circe has the house of the dawn and the rising of the sun, 12.4), and also in respect of the superhuman felicity of the inhabitants. We need not seek to identify them with real places, such as the islands Syra and Delos.

404. ἄλην τόσον. The force of τόσον here is analogous to that of τοῖον in βάμα τοῖον, sc. (see on 1.451), i.e. it insists on the preceding word as not too much: cp. 4.371 ὑμίοις εἰς, ὃ ἐκεῖν, λίθν τόσον ‘you are really λίθν νήσοις.’

Here the meaning is that the island is large, but not quite to be called very large. Similarly in Latin, tantum = ‘just so much,’ procul tantum = ‘apart but no more’ (Virg. Ecl. 6.16).

407. ἄλην νοῦσος ‘disease as well,’ according to the familiar idiom.
τρόκται, μωρὶ ἄγοντες ἀδύρματα νηῇ μελαῖνῃ. ἐσκε δὲ πατρὸς ἐμοῦ γυνὴ Φωίνισσα ἐνὶ οἶκῳ, καλὴ τε μεγάλῃ τε καὶ ἄγλα ἔργα ἰδιὰ· τὴν δὲ ἄρα Φωίνικες πολυταπαλοὶ ἦπερσενον. πλυνοῦσθ οἵ πρῶτα μίγη κολῆ παρὰ νηῇ εὐνηὶ καὶ φιλότητι, τὰ τε φρένας ἦπερσενετε θηλυτέρᾳ γυναιξί, καὶ ἦ κ᾽ εὐεργὸς ἔργων. ιερῶτα δὴ ἐπείτα τὸς εἶν καὶ πόθεν ἐλθούν. ἡ δὲ μᾶλ αὐτίκα πατρὸς ἐπέφραξεν ὑψερφέρες δῶ.; 'ἐκ μὲν Σιδόωνος πολυχάλκου εὑχομαι εἶναι, κοῦρη δ᾽ εἰ π. 'Ἀροβαντὸς ἔγω ῥῳδὸν ἀφνειούν ἀλλὰ μ᾽ ἀνήρπαξαν Τάφοι λῃστορεῖ άνδρεῖς ἀγρόθεν ἐχομένην, πέρασαν δὲ με δεύρ᾽ ἀγανάκτησεν τοῦτ᾽ ἀνδρὸς πρὸς δόμαθ᾽. δ᾽ αἶξον ὄνων ἐδοκε." Τὴν δ᾽ αὐτὴ προσέειπεν ἄνηρ, δε ἐμίσγετο λάθρη; ἡ δὲ κε νῦν πάλιν αὐτίς ἄμ ἡμῖν οἶκαθ᾽ ἔποιο, ὅρα ἤδη πατρὸς καὶ μητέρος ὑψερφέρες δῶ. αὐτοῦ τ᾽; ἡ γὰρ ἤτ᾽ εἰσὶ καὶ ἀφνειοὶ καλέονται." Τὸν δ᾽ αὐτὴ προσέειπε γυνὴ καὶ ἀμεῖβετο μύθῳ; 'ἐλη κεν καὶ τούτ᾽, εἰ μοι ἑθελοίτε γε, ναῦται, δροφὶ πιστωθήναι ἀπημονὰ μ᾽ οἶκαθ᾽ ἀπάξειν.

432 ἦ κ᾽ εἰ G F Eust. 433 ἦδη vulg.: ἦδη Ar. (1), P H M. See the note on 15. 76. 436 μ᾽ om. X D Z Eust.: ἀπημονὰ δ᾽ F: ἀπημονα εὖ (sic) P. The pronoun should probably be omitted.

416. τρόκται, see on 14. 289.
417. πατρὸς, with οἶκῳ, not γυνῆ (as Ameis takes it).
422. θηλυτέρος does not mean 'more θηλικὸς,' but 'θηλικὸς in contrast to ἄρση;': cp. θηλυτέρος 'divine' (13. 111), ἄγρόθερος 'of the country,' &c.
424. πατρὸς must surely mean 'my father,' as M. Pierron and Dr. Hayman explain it, not 'her father,' as it is generally taken. ἐπέφραξεν, said of a house, means 'pointed out,' 'showed the way to,' cp. Od. 7. 49., 10. 111. Here the woman naturally pointed out the 'lofty roof' of the house that she belonged to, and went on to relate that she had been brought from her home in Sidon τοῦτον ἄνδρος πρὸς δόματα, where τοῦτον = 'this that I am showing you.'

The use of πατρὸς = πατρὸς ἐμοῦ is easier on account of πατρὸς ἐμοῖ in 1. 417. The repetition of ὑψερφέξης δὸ in 1. 433 with a different reference is probably intentional. The Phoenician seems to say, '-You have shown us the "great house" where you are kept in slavery: will you return to the "great house" of your father and mother?'

436. ποῦδεν 'in a stream'; 'one to whom riches came in a flood'-an appropriate word for a trader's wealth. It sounds like a piece of mercantile argot. 'Ἀρράβα seems to be a Phoenician name—perhaps Hasdrubal.
433. καλωτοί 'are reputed,' 'have the credit of being.' This also looks like a trader's way of speaking.
435. τούτο, ἵστη, 'what you say.'
15. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΛΑΣ Ο

"Νυσ ἐσφαθ', οἷς ἀρα πάντες ἐπώμυνον ὡς ἐκέλευσεν· ἀυτάρ ἕπει β' δυσάν τε τελευτήσαν τε τῶν ὁρκῶν, τοῖς δ' αὐτίς μετέειπε γυνὴ καὶ ἀμέβετο μύθος· σιγὴ νῦν, μὴ τίς με προσανάτω ἐπέσεσυν ὑμετέρων ἐτάρων, ἐμβλήμανος ἢ ἐν ἀγνῇ· ἤ ποι ἐπὶ κρήνην· μὴ τις ποτὶ δῶμα γέροντι ἔλθων ἐξείπη, ὡς τ' ὄσιάνοις κατάθησιν
dισμὺ ἐν ἀργαλέω, ὑμῖν δ' ἐπιφράσσετ' ἀλεθρόν. ἀλλ' ἔχετ' ἐν φρεσι βύθον, ἐπείγετε δ' ὄνων ὀδαίων. ἀλλ' διδ τε κεν δὴ νῦσ πλείυ βιότου γένεται ἀγγελία μοι ἐπείτα θοῶς ἐσ δώµαθ' ἱκέσθων
οίῳ γὰρ καὶ χρυσῶν, δότις χ' ὑποχείριοι ἐλθῆν· καὶ δ' κεν ἀλλ' ἐπίβαθρον ἔγων ἐθέλουσα γε δοίην. παίδα γὰρ ἄνδρος ἔθος ἐνι μεγάρωι ἀτίτάλω, κερδαλέων δὴ τοίον, ἀμα τροχώντα τούτος τεν κεν ἄγοιμ' ἐπὶ νηός, ὡς τ' ὑμῖν µυρίον ὄνων ἀλφοι, ὅπη περάσατε κατ' ἀλλυράδυος ἄνδρανους';

'Ἡ µὲν ἄρ τὸς εἰπότοι' ἀπέβη πρὸς δῶμα καλά· ὦ δ' ἐναυτὸν ἄπαντα παρ' ἡµῖν αὐθί µένοντες

437 ἐπώμυνον Ar. vulg. : ἐπώµυνον G F X al. 444 δισόμενος F P H M U al., and so in Apoll. Rhod. &c. (Schulze, Quastet. Æp. p. 354: Veitch s.v.).
451 τροχώντα] τροχώντα Schol. V: cp. τρόχων (Od. 6. 318) and τραχώι (II. 22. 163). But these are doubtless from original τρόχων, τραχώι, H. G. § 55. 9. 453 περάσατε] περάσατε, the reading of the MSS., is post-Homeric both in form and in syntax (H. G. §§ 82, 298): cp. 14. 297, where the opt. has been preserved in two MSS. only. κατ' Γ Χ: πρὸς F P H U.

445. ὄνων δηλαῖων 'the buying (lit. the price) of your freight' (δῆλοι, hence cargo taken in on the way, return cargo: see on 8. 163.

ἀλλ', always means 'price paid', is 'hurry on with the price' must be a (slightly colloquial) way of saying 'make haste with your bargaining'.

449. ἐπίβαθρον 'passage money'.

451. τοῖον is best taken as an adjective, as ἐβληθησαν μᾶλα τοῖον (1. 125, 23. 282), and so whenever it follows an adj., as μέγα τοῖον (3. 321), σαρῆδαν μᾶλα τοῖον (5. 302). After an adverb it is of course adverbial, as θάμα τοῖον (1. 209), σιγῆ τοῖον, &c. The meaning is not, as usually given, 'so very —', but 'quite, 'just' : κερδαλέον δὴ τοῖον of a child means that it may properly be called κερδαλέον. So in the only instance of the phrase in the Iliad, 23. 246 οὐ μᾶλα παλλόν, ἀλλ' ἐπείκεια τοῖον, 'but just a befitting one.' Compare the corresponding use of τοῖον (1. 405 supra) : also the common use of ὄνω of after an adv. with the sense of 'quite, as in μὴ ὄνω (II. 2. 120). Attic εἰφέων ὄνωι, &c. The modern use of 'so much' in the sense of 'very much' is not Greek. The supposition that τοῖον may have a deictic force (=τοῖοδε) is also untenable.

453. περάσατε, see the critical note.


en νητ γλαφυρή βίοτον πολύν ἐμπόλυντον.

ἄλλ' ὅτε δὴ κολὴ νηθὸς ἤχθετο τοίοι νέεσθαι,
καὶ τῶν ἀρ ἄγγελον ἦκαν, ὃς ἄγγελειε γυναῖκι.
ἡλυθ' ἀνήρ πολύηδρος ἐμοὶ πρὸς δόματα πατρὸς
χρύσεον ὁμον ἔχων, μετὰ δ' ἠλέκτροσιν ἔρετο.
τῶν μὲν ἀρ' ἐν μεγάρῳ διμφαὶ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ
χερσὶ τ' ἀμφάδωστο καὶ ὄβθαλμοίν ὁρῶντο,
όνον ὑποχέμεναι· οὐ δὲ τῇ κατένευσε σιωπῇ.

ἡ τοι ἡ καννέωσας κολῆν ἐπὶ ἰη βεβήκει,
ἡ δ' ἐμὲ χειρὸς ἠλούσα δῶμαν ἔχηγε θύρας.

εὗρε δ' ἐν προδόμῳ ἑκέν δέπα ἕδε τραπέζας
ἀνδρῶν δαίμων, οἱ μὲν πατέρ' ἄμφεποντο.
οἱ μὲν ἀρ' ἐς θώκον πρόμυλον δήμωι τε φήμιν,
ἡ δ' αἰγά τρ' ἀλείσα καταιρύψα' ὑπὸ κόλπῳ
ἐκφέρεν· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπύμην ἀεισφοροῦς.

δύσετο τ' ἥλιον σκιώδυντι τε πάσαι άγνια;

ἡμεῖς δ' ἐς λιμένα κλιτόν ἠθόμεν ὦκα κιόντες
ἐνθ' ἀρα Φοινίκων ἀνδρῶν ἡν ὁκύαλος νηθὼς.
οἱ μὲν ἐπειτ' ἀναβάντες ἐπέπλεον ὑγρὰ κέλευμα,

νὰ ἀναβησάμενοι· ἐπὶ δὲ Ζεώς οὐδον ἴλλεν.


460. The ὄρνος was a chain which passed round the neck and hung down on the breast: cp. H. Ven. 88 ὄρνος δ' ἀμφ' ἀναλη δείρη περίπαλλες ἥσσον καλὸν χρυσίους παμποίλιον· οὐ δὲ σελήνη στήθεις ἀμφ' ἀπαλῶν ἤλαμπτο: also H. vi. 10 ἐκεῖρ δ' ἀμφ' ἀναλη καὶ στήθεις ἀργοκοσίων δρομαι χρυσίουν ἰκάμονς. It was therefore of some length (ἐνέκαλπαι, H. Apoll. 104).

'μετ' 'in turn,' 'at intervals.'

ἄλεξτρον 'with pieces of amber.'

It appears that the ancients distinguished between neut. ἄλεξτρον 'amber' and masc. ἄλεξτρον, the metal so called, an alloy of gold and silver. The plural would not suit a metal, but it would naturally be used of a substance that is always found in lumps. See Helbig, Hom. Pros, p. 268.

463 ὑποχέμεναι 'tendering,' i.e. making offers for it, chaffering.

460. προδόμῳ. After the feast the serving-maids carried off the remains, with the tables and drinking-cups (19. 61-62). From this place we may infer that they were taken into the πρόνωμον or entrance hall of the μέγαρον.

467. ἀμφεποντον, viz. as γέφυρες or counsellors, like the twelve elders in Phaeacia.

468. πρόμυλον 'had gone forth': πρό as in προβαθειι, προφαυσι, προκαλει, &c. (not of time).

θώκος is the 'sitting-place' or tribunal: φύσις, which elsewhere means the 'talk' of the people, is here (= διψοφ) the place of talking.

470. ἀείφορον must here mean 'in childish thoughtlessness.' The derivation is obscure: see the note on ἀείφορον (21. 302).
εξήμαρ μὲν ὄμος πλέομεν νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμαρ·
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἐβδομὼν ἡμαρ ἐπὶ Ζεῦς θήκε Κροίων,
τὴν μὲν ἐπειτα γυναῖκα βαλ' Ἀρτέμις ἱοχέαρα,
ἀντλοὶ δὲ ἐνδούπῃσε πεσοῦτ' ὡς εἰναλίη κῆς.
καὶ τὴν μὲν φόρκησι καὶ ἱχθύσι κόρμα γενέσθαι
ἐκβαλον· αὐτὰρ ἔγω λιτόμην ἀκαχήμενος ἠτρο·
τοὺς δὲ Ἰθάκη ἐπέλασε φέρων ἄνεμος τε καὶ ὤμω,
ἐνθα με Δερήτης πρῶτο κτεάτεσθιν ἐνσίν.
οὕτω τὴν γε γαῖαν ἔγων ἰδὼν ὀφθαλμοῖς.

"Εὔμαι', ἣ μάλα δὴ μοι ἐνι φρέσι τυμον δρινας
ταῦτα ἔκαστα λέγων, δος δὴ πάθες ἀλγεα ὑμὴν.
ἀλλ' ἢ τοι σοι μὲν πάρα καὶ κακῷ ἐσθλὸν ἔθηκε
Ζεῦς, ἔπει ἀνδρός δώμαι' ἀφίκοι πολλὰ μογύσας
ἡπίου, ὡς δὴ τοι παρέχει βρῶσιν τε πόσιν τε
ἐνδυκέωι, 'ὅπεις δ' ἀγάθων βλον' αὐτὰρ ἐγουε
πολλὰ βρισκὼν ἐπὶ ἄστε' ἄλομενος ἐνθαδ' ἰκάνων."

"Ποι ὁ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἄλληλονς ἄγχρομων,
καδρατένην δ' οὐ πολλὸν ἐπὶ χρώνον, ἄλλα μνημα·
αἴσα γὰρ Ἡδώς ἠλθεν ἐθρόνος. οἱ δ' ἐπὶ χέρσου
Τηλεμάχου ἐταροι λόου ἱστα, κἀδ' ἐλον ἱστον
cαρπαλίμως, τὴν δ' εἰς ὅρμον προέρεσαν ἐρετμοῖς.
ἐκ δ' εὐνά ἐβαλον, κατὰ δὲ πρυμνῆσι' ἐδησαν·
ἐκ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ βάινον ἐπὶ βηγμίνι δαλάσης,
δείπνον τ' ἐντύνοντο κερῶντι τε αἴθσα αἰνον."

484 τήνδε γε Βοθέ: τήνδε τε MSS.: see 13. 238.
487 ἄλγεα ϑυμῷ] ἦν' ὡ'
ὁλὴτοι F M, cp. 14. 362. 497 ἵπ λυμένα G X al. προερεσαν Ατ.: προφέρεσαν
MSS., see II. i. 435. ἐρετμοῖς, see 13. 22.

479. ἐνδούπῃσε πεσοῦτα, an adaptation, perhaps a parody, of the conventional δώμαις δι πεσών of the Iliad.
487. ἄλγεα properly belongs to the antecedent clause, ἄλγεα δοι δ' πάθες. Cp. 18. 37.
488. καὶ goes with ἔσθλον, and κακῷ is placed between them in order to bring the contrasted κακῷ ἔσθλον together: cp. 17. 285 μετα καὶ τόδε τούτως γενέσθω.
491. ἐνδυκέω, see on 14. 63.

495. Dawn of the 38th day. Change of scene, to the landing of Telemachus on the neighbouring coast.
ἐπὶ χέρσου means that they had now reached land, not that they had landed. The mast is taken down before the ship is run aground (l. 497).
499. ἐπὶ βηγμίνι, cp. 4. 430. The word seems always to mean the 'broken water' or 'surf' (χέρσον βηγμίνων), not the beach on which it breaks.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἑδητός ἐξ ἔρων ἐντο, τοῖς δὲ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἤρχετο μόθων· ἡμεῖς μὲν νῦν ἄστυδ' ἐλαύνετε νῆα μέλαιναν, αὐτὰρ ἐγών ἀγρόφη ἐπειδομαί ἦδε βοσῆρας· ἐπτέριος δ' εἰς ἄστυ ἴδων ἐμα ἐργά κάτειμι.

ἡδεῖν δὲ κεν ὦμμιν ὀδοιπόροι παραθείμην, δαιὶ ἀγαθὴν κρεῖων τε καὶ οἶνου ἡδυπτάοιο."  

Τὸν δ' αὔτα προσεῖπε Θεοκλύμενος θεοειδῆς·

"πὴ γὰρ ἐγὼ, φίλε τέκνου, ἰο; τε μῶμαθ' ἱκώμαι ἀνθρῶν οἱ κρανάθην 'Ιθάκην κατά κοιρανέοιν; ἤ ἴδος σῆς μητρός ἰο; καὶ σοί σῶμα δόμω."  

Τὸν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντὶν ἡδα·

"ἀλλος μὲν σ' ἀν ἔγωγε καὶ ἡμετέρονθ' κελοῦμην ἔρχεσθ'. οὐ γὰρ τι ξενίων ποθή· ἀλλὰ σοι αὐτῷ χείρον, ἐπεὶ τοι ἐγὼ μὲν ἀπέσομαι, οὐδὲ σε μήτηρ ὅφεται· οὐ μὲν γὰρ τι θαμά μηνστήρ' ἐν οἴκῳ φαίνεται, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῶν υπερωφ' ἅτιον υφαίνει· ἀλλὰ τοι ἀλλον φῶτα πιφαύσκομαι δν κεν ἴκοιο, Εὐρυμάχον, Πολύβοιο δαίφρονος ἀγλαῶν ἴον, τὸν νῦν ἵσα θεῷ 'Ιθακήσιοι εἰσορῶσιν·

καὶ γὰρ πολλὸν ἄριστος ἀνήρ μέμονεν τε μάλιστα μητῆρ' ἐμὴν γαμεῖεν καὶ 'Οδυσσῆος γέρας ξενίων· ἀλλά τὰ γε Ζεῦς οἶδεν 'Ολύμπιοι, αἰθέρι ναον,


505. ἐπτέριος. Telemachus does not in fact return till next day.

511. ἀν ἰο,' circumflexed because it is put as the second member of a disjunctive question, the first being in form a simple question: cp. Η. G. § 340.

513. ἀλλος 'were it otherwise.'

517. ἄνδρ' τῶν 'away from them.'

This use of the article—as an unemphatic pronoun of the third person (= anaphorich of ol)—is hardly found except with prepositions: see Η. G. § 257, 5.

519. The introduction of the name of Eurymachus seems at first sight to have no sufficient motive, and to lead to nothing in the sequel. Probably it is merely intended to give occasion for the prophecy of Theoclymenus, one of the steps which prepare us for the final denouement. Here Telemachus confesses that he cannot receive a stranger in his house, and advises Theoclymenus to go to Eurymachus, who seems likely to be the future lord of Ithaca. But on seeing the omen, Theoclymenus proclaims that the line of Ulysses will continue to be the 'most kingly.' In consequence of this prophecy the resort to Eurymachus is tacitly given up, and Telemachus promises ample hospitality.
15. ΟΔΤΣΣΕΙΑΣ Ο 69

ει κε σφι προ γάμοιο τελευτησει κακών ήμαρ.

"Οσ άρα οι ειποντι έπεπτατο δεξιδος ώρης,
κύρκος, Απάλλωνος ταχύς άγγελος· εν δε πόδασσι
τιλλε πέλειαν έχων, κατά δε πτερά χεδεν έραζε
μεσηγιας νης τε και αυτου Τηλεμάχουσ.
τον δε θεοκλύμενος έτάρων άπονδοφι καλέσσα
εν τ' άρα οι φυ χερί έποσ τ' έφατ εκ τ' άνόμαζε'
"Τηλέμαχ' ου τοι άνευ θεού έπεπτατο δεξιδος ορνι
έγων μιν έσάντα ίδων οιωνον ένότα.
μετέρουν δ' ουκ έστι γένοις βασιλεύτερον άλλο
εν δήμω 'Ιθακης, άλλ' ύμεις καρπεροι αιει'

Τον δ' αυ Τηλέμαχοι πεπνυμένοις άντιον ηόδα
"αι γάρ τοντο, ξείνη, έπος τετελεμένον ειη
τω κε τάχα γνοίνης φιλοτήτα τε πολλά τε δώρα
έξ εμε, όσ αν τις σε συναντόμενοι μακαρίζοι.

'Η καλ Πειραίους προσεφόνει, πιστο δε έταρον
"Πειραίες Κλυτίδη, σι δε μοι τα περ άλλα μάλιστα
πεθη έμων έτάρων, οι μοι Πύλων εις αμ' έποντο
και νόν μοι τον ξείνων δαγων εν δώμασι σοιαν
ενδυκεώς φιλεών και τιέμεν, εις δ' κεν έλθω.

Τον δ' αυ Πειραίους δουρικλυτός άντιον ηόδα
"Τηλέμαχ', ει γάρ κεν σι πολυν χρόνον ένθάδε μιμοι,
τόνδε δ' έγω κομίω, ξελίων δε οι ου ποθη έσται.

531 [έστατο] βλεπε G X U al. 533 γάνων H2 corr.: γάνων vulg.: γάνων G M.
The contraction of gen. -οs is extremely rare in Homer. 536 τετελεσμένων ειη
τελέσα λος Κρονίων G, as in 4.699, 20.236. 546 τόνδε δ' Herodian, G: τόν δε τ'
vulg.: τόνδε τ' Wolf, Ludw.: τόνδε τ' U.
ξειλων G F P; see on 14.389.

524. αι κε... τελευτήσα. This is the only instance in Homer of αι κε with the future in an object clause. We should probably read τελευτήσα. Cp. the similar question as to κε κε, 16.261, 18.265.
525. έπεπτατο δεξιδος έρης, see the note on l. 160.
532. έχονων, aor. of what happens in the moment of speaking; H. G. § 78, 1.
olóuvon, from δελ- (Lat. avi-z) 'a bird.' The suffix is rare: cp. υλόνος 'grand-
son.' It apparently has an amplitative meaning.
534. καρπερο 'powerful.' The word is generally used of physical strength; but cp. the common use of κρατέω in the sense of 'bear rule.'
537. φιλοτήτα τε πολλά τε δώρα, perhaps a hendiadys, = δώρα φιλοτήσια, hospitality as shown in many gifts.
545. αι γάρ κεν 'why, if &c.' On γάρ in this use—serving as a kind of interjection—see H. G. § 348, 4: and on αι κεν with the opt., § 313.
ενθάδα 'here': Telemachus has landed at a point not far from the homestead of Eumaeus.
15. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ο

"Νος εἰπὼν ἐπὶ νησὶ ἔβη, ἔκλευσε δ' ἐταίρους αὐτοὺς τ' ἀμβαίνειν ἀνὰ τε πρυμνήσια λύσαι. οἱ δ' ἀλής εἰσβαίνουν καὶ ἐπὶ κλησίς καθίσον· Τηλέμαχος δ' ὑπὸ ποσσὶν ἐδήματο καλὰ πέδιλα, εἴλετο δ' ἀλκίμον ἔγχος, ἀκαχμένον δὲι ἀλκῆ, νησὶ ἀπ' ἱκρίβις τοι δὲ πρυμνήσει ἔλυσαν. οἱ μὲν ἀνάσαντες πλεών ἐς πόλιν, ὡς ἔκλευσε Τηλέμαχος, φίλος νῦν Ὠδυσσήος θείων· τὸν δ' ἅκα προβιβάσει πόδες φέρον, ὡφρ' ἵκετ' αἰλήν, 555 ἐνθα οἱ ἦσαν ὑπὲρ μᾶλα μυρία, ἤδε συβάνης ἐσθλὸς ἐών ἐνλαιεν, ἀνάκτεσιν ἡπὰ εἴδος.


547. εϊτε νησι ζητ. sc. Πελοπόννησος, who now takes the command of the ship, and proceeds to carry out the directions of Telemachus (l. 503 ὄμης μὲν κτλ.). 548. Prohysteron, since they must not have unfastened the cables before embarking. The embarkation is put first as being the main action: cp. 13. 374.

551. The reference is not to the spear of Theoclymenus (l. 283), as Ameis supposes. The spear usually carried by Telemachus himself (2. 10) would also be in the hero.

553. ἀνάκτεσις 'pushing off': ἀνά = 'out to sea'—not of the direction of the voyage.

555. The question between the participles βιβάζω and βιβάζων is left unsettled by La Roche (H. T. 215): and both forms are admitted by Ludwig (βιβάζω in Od. 9. 450., 17. 27, βιβάζων in 11. 539, προβιβάσαντα here). The MSS. are overwhelmingly in favour of the nom. masc. βιβάζω, while they give fem. βιβάζων in Od. 11. 539, and βιβάζων, &c. in ll. 3. 22., 13. 307., 16. 609, Od. 15. 555, but βιβαίων in ll. 13. 371. About the reading of Aristarchus there is an apparent contradiction. On ll. 15. 307 both the 'marginal' and the 'text' scholia of Α tell us that he read βιβαίων (βιβαίων πάσαν οὖν Α' Ἀριστάρχος Βιβαίων Α',—both from Didymus). The Townley scholia have: βιβαίων οὖν τινά, ιδεῖ καὶ ὅρι Βιβαίων (13. 371) φησίν: ἄλλοι δὲ βιβαίων γράφουσι καὶ περικρούον. On the other hand, on ll. 7. 213 Α has οὖν τοῖς Ἀριστάρχος βιβάζω (from Did.): and on ll. 13. 371 we find in Α and Τ the statement, probably coming from Herodias (see Ludwig), that he wrote βιβαίων as διαμεντα καὶ λεπτάντα. It seems to me certain that in the scholia Α and Α', on ll. 15. 307 βιβάζω should be written for βιβαίων. The agreement of scholia Α and Α', does not prove (as La Roche seems to think) that βιβαίων must be right. Α and Α' are taken from a common source, the comparatively late 'epitome.' Against this evidence we have the testimony of Didymus himself on ll. 7. 213, and of Herodias on ll. 13. 371, ascribing βιβάζω and βιβαίων to Aristarchus. Moreover, Schol. Τ on ll. 15. 307 is practically conclusive in the same direction. In a Townley scholium of the form οὖν τινάς, ἄλλοι δὲ—, the word τινάς almost certainly includes Aristarchus (see examples in Ludwig, Α. H. T. p. 188). This is strongly confirmed by the reference to βιβαίων in 13. 371, since we know that that form was expressly adopted there by Aristarchus. On the whole, then, we may take it that in his view the Homeric declension was βιβάζω, gen. βιβαΐωτος, &c. And considering that the MSS. are practically unanimous for βιβάζω, while they are not unanimous against βιβαίων, &c., and further that the declension βιβάζω, gen. βιβαΐωτος, &c. is improbable, we infer that βιβαίων, βιβαίωτος, &c. may be banished from Homer.
Τηλεμάχου ἀναγνωρισμὸς Ὁδυσσέως.

Τῶ δ᾿ αὖτ᾿ ἐν κλίσει Ὁδυσσέως καὶ δίος ὑφορβός ἐντύνοντι ἄριστον ἄμε ἡ深化改革, κηρύμενῳ πῦρ, ἐκπεμψάν τε νομήᾳ ἄμε ἀγρομένοισι σύνεσι.

Τηλέμαχον δὲ περίσσαισιν κύων ὕλακόλωμοι, οὐδ᾿ ὑλαιον προσιώτα. νόησε δὲ δίος Ὁδυσσέως σαλωντάς τε κύων, περὶ τα κτήσις ἥλθε ποδοῦν. αὖρᾳ δ᾿ ἄρ Εὐμαῖον ἔπει ππερίστενα προςἴδανα: "Εὐμαῖα, ἢ μᾶλα τὸς ἔλευθεται ἐνθάδ᾿ ἐταίρος, ἢ καὶ γνώριμος ὄλλος, ἐπεὶ κύων ὑχ ὑλάουνιν,

3 ὑποτύνων; G F P X D East. ἄριστον with ἄ, the original Homeric form probably being δύριστον; cp. Il. 24.214. 8 ἐταίρος G.

The scene changes again, but without a sensible break in the narrative. The transition is made by means of the movements of Telemachus, whom we follow from the landing place, where he parted from his companions, to the hut of Eumaeus. A further link is formed by the mention of dawn (L. 1), which takes us back to the coming of dawn mentioned in 15.405.

2. ἄριστον ἄμε ἡ深化改革. There may be an intentional play of language here; the original doubtless was δύριστον δύριστον δύριστον δύριστον. The stem δύριστον, older ames (seen in ἀριστερὸς ἐν τῷ δύριστον ἐν τῷ δύριστον ἐν τῷ δύριστον, to-morrow, Lat. aurora) is a parallel form to δύριστον, older ames, dawn. We may conjecture that δύριστον came from δύριστον through a verb δύριστον to take a morning (meal). The suffix -is is regularly used of time or season; so in δυριστοσ, δυριστοσ, δυριστοσ, the time of unyoking, δυριστοσ, plough-time, δυριστοσ, reaping, τρυγησον, vintage. Note that δυριστοσ may be a compound; the second part containing the root ἴσ- to eat (lengthened under the general rule as to compounds whose second part begins with a vowel, H.G. § 123, 8). So ἴσος-τος: but not ἴσος-τος, which is properly ἴσος τοῦ ἴσος-τος. For ἴσος-τος to breakfast, cp. δειλάδω το παρά (17.599). Similarly ἴσος-τος to do summer-work, i.e. to reap, ἴσος-τος to gather in fruit: also ἴσος-τος to blossom, ἴσος-τος to rise early (Luke xxi. 38). See Curt. Stud. 11. 175.

4. ὑλακόλωμος, see on 14.29.

6. The two clauses of this line are parallel in sense: Ulysses perceived at once the fawning of the dogs and the sound of feet. The governing word νόησε is strictly appropriate to σαινοφαίνειν κύων only: hence the poet was naturally led into the slight anacoluthon involved in the use of the indic. ἥλθος instead of a participle. Cp. II. 3.80 (ἐπετοξόμειον Ἱαπύν τε τιτυκνύσιν ἵμηρον ἓπαλλιν. περὶ is often used of sound heard: cp. 17.261 περὶ δὴ σφιχα ἰδιόν ἤλθε φόρμυγγος. So ἰδιός, as 1.352 ἰδιόν-τεσσαρες νεωτάτη ἄμφιβλητα.
16. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Π

ἀλλὰ περισσαίνωσιν: ποδῶν δ' ὑπὸ δούπον ἄκωκον.

Οδὼν πάν ἐληρητὸ ἔπος, ὅτε ὁ φίλος ὑδάτη ἐστὶν ἐκ προθύρου. ταφῶν δ' ἀνόρουσε συβάτης, ἐκ δ' ἀρα ὁ χειρών πέσον ἄγγεα, τοῖς ἐπονεῖτο κοινὰς ἀθόπα οἴνων. ὅ δ' ἀντίος ἔλθεν ἄνακτος, κύσε δὲ μιν κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλά, χείρας ἴ ἀμφοτέρας· θαλερὸν δὲ ὁ ἐκπεσε δάκρυ, ὡς δὲ πατήρ ὑπὸ παῖδα φιλα φρονέων ἄγαπάζῃ ἐλθὼν· ἐξ ἀπῆς γαίης δεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ, μοῦνον τηλύγετον, τῷ ἐπὶ ἄλγεα πολλὰ μογὺ, ὡς τῷ Θηλέμαχῳ θεοεἴδεα δίοις ὑφορβὸς πάντα κύσεν περιφύς, ὡς ἐκ θανάτου φαινήτα καὶ β' ὀλυφρόμενος ἔσπει ἐπεὶ ἰσφεύτη προσήδην·


10. ποδῶν δ' ὑπὸ δούπον ἄκωκον. The constr. must be ὑπὸ ποδῶν: cp. II. 2. 405 ὑπὸ χειρῶν σμερδαλίων κοινά δοῦνο. So Hes. Theog. 70 ἐρατος δὶ ποδῶν ὑπὸ δούπον ὕδρας (cp. Hes. fr. 70). This constr. is confined in general to verbs expressing motion, or sound made (as in the passages quoted). In this place we must suppose a construction ad sensum, δοῦνον ἄκωκον being = δοῦνος ἄγγεα. The force of ὑπὸ is half-way between the literal sense of 'under' and the derived sense of 'caused by.'

12. προθύρους, 'the door-way,' sc. of the οἰλή; properly the spaces round the door, see on τὸ 220.

15. φαεών, with δ' bymetrical lengthening (Schulze, Quaest. Ep. p. 206).

18. ἐξ ἀπῆς γαίης 'from a far-off land.' This must be the meaning here and in 7. 25 (see the note). From Aristonicus (Schol. A. on II. 1. 270) we learn that ὁ νέατος, i.e. post-Homeric authors, understood it as a name for the Peloponnesus. This is possible in the Iliad (1. 270, 3. 49). If it is so, we must suppose that in the time of the Odyssey the word ἄνακτος survived, though its proper meaning was forgotten, and that it was then connected with ἄνατο by a kind of 'popular etymology.' The true derivation may be, as Curtius conjectured (Grunds., 2. 469), from a root ἄφ 'water,' whence Μεσσό-ἀνατο, &c. Or, if the root is ἄφ, it may be connected with Latin aqua, Goth. ahæ 'river.'

19. τηλύγετον. As Buttmann showed (Lex. s.v.), this word probably meant 'beloved,' 'favourite.' No probable derivation has been proposed. It may be worth suggesting that it comes from θλός 'soft,' 'delicate,' through a verb θληκόω, and thus originally meant 'made tender, 'caressed.' For the initial τ cp. τηλέμων from δόλλω, δόλλων. So Τηλύγετος is probably from ταῖς 'great' (ταῖς μεγάλως Hesych.). The γ is doubtless a formative element, and has nothing to do with the root ἄφ.

21. πάντα. This is one of several places where πάντα may be either a masc. sing, or a neut. plur. used adverbially (= 'in all parts'). Here the neut. plur. would refer to the head and hands (l. 15). So in 17. 480 ἀπὸδεξώμην δὲ πάντα, 19. 475 πάντα ἄνακτα ἐνρω ἄμφωσαςβάθι, II. 22. 354 κατά πάντα ἑαυτον, 24. 20 περὶ δ' αἰγίθη πάντα κάλυπτε. The adverbial use is clear in II. 22. 491 πάντα δ' ὑπερσείνωμεν, Od. 4. 654 τ' ἀτίφ πάντα ἐρίκα (so 24. 446, II. 5. 181, 11. 613, 21. 600, 23. 66), perhaps in Od. 6. 227, ἐκ δ' πάντα λοεσάου (viz. back, shoulders, and head): cp. also 18. 167. It seems to give the best construction in all the passages quoted.
16. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΛΑΣ ΙΙ

"ξηθες, Τηλέμαχε, γλυκερὰν φάσον' οδ' σ' ετ' ἔγωγε
δυσῆθαι ἐφάμην, ἔπει τὸ θέλον νηπί Πύλονδε.

ἀλλ' ἀγε νῦν εἰσέλθη, φιλὸν τέκος, ὥρα σε θυμῷ
τέρψιμαν εἰσορῶν νέον ἄλλοθεν ἐνδον ἔντα.

οὐ μὲν γάρ τι θάτ' ἄγρων ἐπέρχειαν οὐδὲ νομῆσαι,
ἀλλ' ἐπιδημεύεις ως γάρ νῦ τοι ἑδαθ' θυμῷ,
ἄνδρῶν μνηστήρων ἑσοράν ἄδηλον ὄμιλον."

Τὸν δ' αὐ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένοις ἀντίων ἡδα:

"ἔστησεν οὖτως, ἀπτα' σέθην δ' ἔνεκ' ἐνθάδ' ἰκάνω,
ὄρα σε τ' ὀφθαλμοίνων ὑδω καὶ μύθον ἀκούσα,
ἡ μοι ἦν ἐν μεγάροισ μήτηρ μένει, ἥ τις ἢδ
ἀνδρῶν ἄλλος ἔγνεν, Ὁδύσσηος δὲ που εὕνη
χήτει ἐνεναίον καθ' ἀράχνα κεῖται ἔχουσα."

Τὸν δ' αὔτε προσείτης συβώτης, ὄρχαμος ἄνδρῶν:

"καὶ λίπθην κεῖνη γε μένει τετελήτι θυμῷ
σοίνων ἐνὶ μεγάροισινδ' οἰκουρᾶ, δεὶ οἱ αἰεὶ
φθινούσιν νῦκτες τε καὶ ἡματα δάκρυ χεῖονῃ."  

"Ὅς ἄρα φωνήσας οἱ εἰδέξατο χάλκεον ἐγχος
αὔταρ δ' ἡ εἴσα τε καὶ ὑπέρθη λάινων οὐδῶν.

τῷ δ' ἔδρας ἐπίστην πατήρ ὑπεδείξεν Ὁδύσσεος:
Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἐρήμην φώνησεν τε."

"Ἱσόο, ἤείν. ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ ἄλλοθι δήμουν ἔδραν


31. ἢσος, from ἤσος in the sense of 'town'—probably the original sense.

33-35. It has been thought strange that Telemachus should ask this question after an absence of a month. It is no doubt designed to remind us of the inevitable crisis in the fortunes of Penelope and her son was rapidly drawing near. Ulysses, as we shall see, returned just in time.

35. ἐνέναλον may be masc., 'sleepers in the bed,' or neut., 'bed-trappings.' The latter sense is supported by 14. 51 ἐνέναλον (sc. ἀθρομμ); but it does not suit this context nearly so well. The reading χήτει ἐνέναλος, attributed by Eust. to 'the ancients' (viz. Aristarchus?), might mean 'from want within the bed.' But the phrase is more like Aeschylus than Homer. For καὶ τοιαύτα cp. κατάθηκει in I. 45. 41. For the prohysteron cp. 13. 274. 42. ἔδρας, with ὑπεδείξεν, not ἐπάνων. 44. ἦσος ... ἡμεῖς. Telemachus takes care to associate the others, especially Eumaeus, in the reception of the stranger, and the ownership of the
σταθμὸ ἐν ἡμετέρῳ πάρα δ’ ἀνήρ δὲ καταθήσει.” 45
"Ὡς φαθ’, ὁ δ’ αὐτὸς ἰδὼν κατ’ ἄρ’ ἔξετο· τῷ δὲ συζώτης
χεῖρι ὑπὸ χλωράς βάπας καὶ κώας ὑπέρθεν· ἔνθα καθέξερ’ ἐπείτα Ὁδυσσήος φίλος ὑδός.
τοῖς δὲ κρείοις πίνακας παρέθηκε συζώτης
ὀπταλέων, α μὰ τῇ προτέρῃ ὑπέλειπον ἐδοντες,
σύτων δ’ ἐσσυμένοις παρενήγεεν εν κανοίοις,
ἐν δ’ ἀρα κισυβίφρῳ κίρη μεληλέα οἶνον
αὐτὸς δ’ ἀντίον ἤζεν Ὁδυσσήος θείου.
οὶ δ’ ἐπ’ ὄνειαθ’ ἐτοίμα προκελέμενα χεῖρας ιαλλον.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιοι καὶ ἐδητύοις ἐς ἐρόν ἐντο,
δὴ τότε Τηλέμαχος προσεφώνεε διὸν όφορθών·
"ἄττα, πόθεν τοι ξείνοι δ’ ἵκετο; πῶς δὲ ἐ ναύται
ἄγαγον εἰς Ἰθάκην; τίνες ἐμμενει εὐχετῶντο;
οὐ μὲν γάρ τι ἐ πεζὸν διομεν ἐνθάδ’ ἱκόθαι.”
Τὸν δ’ ἀπαμείβομενος προσέφης, Εὔμαιος συβότας·
"τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ τοι, τέκνον, ἀλήθεα πάντ’ ἀγορεύος.
ἐκ μὲν Κρητάων γένους εὐχεται εὐρεῖοι,
φησι δὲ πολλα βροτῶν ἐπ’ ἀστεα δινηθήται
πλαζόμενοι· ὡς γάρ οἱ ἐπέκλωσεν τὰ γε δαίμων.

47 κώδεα καλά G. 49 δὲ κρείον πίνακας F X D Eust.: δ’ αὐτὸς κρείον vulg.
50 om. X1 D Z K. 51 παρενήγεεν P. Knight, perhaps rightly. 52 κώρα G.

Homestead. The use of the plural 'we' as a mere variety for the singular is not Homeric: see however 16. 442., 19. 344.,
II. 13. 257., 15. 224.
45. καταθήκη, sc. ἐβρυή, cp. II. 3. 425 δίφορος . . . κατάθεκε φίρουσα.
49. πίνακας, lit. 'boards' or 'panels,' here wooden 'platters,' 'trenchers.' The meaning 'slices of meat' (so Ameis on 1.141) is evidently less natural. The platters of meat are mentioned, as are also the baskets in which the bread was brought, and the κισυβία in which the wine was mixed (ll. 51, 52). According to Athenaeus (vi. 228 d') Aristophanes the grammarian said that the practice of serving meat on πίνακες was later than Homer. Whether he rejected Od.
1. 141-142 (= 4. 57-58), where the word occurs in a similar passage, or took it there in the sense of 'slices,' does not appear.
51. παρενήγεεν 'heaped up and served': παρά as in παράθηκε (l. 49).
The form πηνίων is given by the MSS. here and in Od. 1. 147, II. 7. 428, 431: also by Eust. in II. 23. 139, and by one MS. in II. 24. 276. But it is improbable that there should have been two forms, πηνίων and πηνίων, identical in meaning.
53. κισυβίον on 9. 346.
51. ἀλήθεια πάντα 'nothing but the truth': cp. 15. 158.
53. κισυβίον, lit. 'whirled,' 'whelded about,' but here 'wandered about': so 9. 153 πῆλον θυαμάζοντες ἐδειδαμοσθα κατ’ αὐτήν, also 19. 67 δειδαμος κατὰ ἄλων. This derivative sense is probably colloquial. It can hardly be traced in the Iliad (except doubtfully in 4. 541).
16. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Π

νῦν αὖ Θεσπρωτῶν ἄνδρῶν παρὰ νῆς ἀποδρᾶς

ηλθ' ἐμὸν πρὸς σταθμὸν, ἐγὼ δὲ τοι ἐγγυαλίζω

ἐρξόν ὅπως ἔθελες· ἱκέτης δὲ τοι εὐχεταί εἶναι.”

Τὸν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίλα ἤδη:

"Ἐδμαί, ἢ μᾶλα τοῦτο ἐπος θυμαλγές ἔσπεσ-

πῶς γὰρ δὴ τὸν ἤειν ἐγὼ ὑποδέξομαι οἶκφ; αὐ-

τὸς μὲν νέος εἰμὶ καὶ οὗ πω χερὶ πέποιθα

ἄνδρ' ἀπαμύνασθαι, διτοι τοι πρῶτος χαλεπήνη-

μητρὶ· δ' ἐμὴ δίξα θυμὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερηρίζει,

ἡ αὐτὸν παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ μένη καὶ δῶμα κομίζη,

εὐνὴν τ' αἰδομένη πόσιον ὁμοίῳ τε φήμιν,

ἡ ξῆ οἷς ἐπηταὶ Δαίμον δὲ τις ἀριστος

μνᾶς ἐνὶ μεγάρους ἀνὴρ καὶ πλείστα πόρησιν.

ἀλλ' ἡ τοι τὸν ἤειν, ἐπεὶ τεδν ἤκετο δῶμα,

ἐσοὸ μὲν χαλαῖν τε χιτῶνα τε εἶματα καλά,

δόσῳ δὲ ἔμεις ἀμφηκας καὶ ποσὶν πέδιλα,

πέμψῳ δ' ὑπῆρ μὲν κράδιθ θυμὸς τε κελεύει.

εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις, σὺ κόμισον εἰνι σταθμοίων ἐρβας-

ἐϊματα δ' ἐνθάδ' ἐγὼ πέμψω καὶ σίτων ἀπαντα

ἐδμεναι, ὥς ἂν μὴ σε κατατρυχή καὶ ἑταίρους.

κεῖσο δ' ἂν ὁδὸ μὲν ἐγὼ γε μετὰ μυστήρας ἔφυμι

ἐρχοῦσαί· λίπη γὰρ ἀτάσθαλον ὑβριν ἔκουσι·

μὴ μὲν κερτομέων, ἐμοὶ δ' ἀχος ἐσσεται αἰνὸν.

πρῆξαι δ' ἀργαλέων τι μετὰ πλεῦσεον ἑντα

ἄνδρα καὶ ἕθιμον, ἐπεὶ ἡ πολὺ σφέτεροι εἰσι.”

Τὸν δ' αὐτὲ προσέειπε πολύτλας δῖος 'Οδυσσεύς·

65 παρὰ vulg.: ᾳ F D: ἀδὶ U. 70 ἐγὼν] ἔμφ M. The F may perhaps be restored by reading τὸν γὰρ δὴ ἤειν (a stranger) ὑποδέξομαι ἀμφι. If the ἐμφ became ἔμφ the rest of the corruption would easily follow. 73 δ' ἐμοὶ (δὲ μοι) G M U. 79 ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀ Lr. and most MSS.: ἐσαὶ μὲν F. Cr. 17. 550, where μὲν is impossible. 85 λάσσω F H M al.

72. χαλαπτὴν 'does violently.'

75. αἰδομένη 'out of respect for' suits εὐνὴν πόσιοι and δῆμοι φήμιν with hardly a variation of meaning.

79. μὲν, resuming τὸν ἤειν. This use of the enclitic pronoun is hardly Homeric; but the reading μὲν is supported by the other places where the line occurs, viz. 17. 550 and 21. 330. 80. This line looks like an abbreviation of the two lines 21. 340–341 δῶμα δ' ἤειν ἄκορτα, κυνὼν ἀλτήματα καὶ ἄνδρων, καὶ ἔμεις δαιμονεῖς, δῶμα δ' ὧδε ποσὶ πέδιλα.

84. κατατρυχή, cr. 15. 309.
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"ο φίλ', ἐπεὶ θήν μοι καὶ ἀμετψαθαι θέμις ἐστίν, ἤ μάλα μεν καταδάπτερ' ἀκούοντος φίλον ἦτορ, ὦν φατε μνηστήρας ἀτάσθαλα μηχανάσθαι ἐν μεγάροις, ἀείς τε δέθεν τοιοῦτον ἔντος.

εἰπὲ μοι ἡ ἔκων ὑποδάμνασαι, ἦ σὲ γε λαοί ἐχθαίρον' ἀνά δήμον, ἐπισπάμενοι θεού ὁμφή, ἦ τι κασιγνῆτοις ἐπιμέμφει, οὐκεί περ ἄνηρ μαραμένουσι πέποιθε, καὶ εἴ μέγα νείκος ὥρηται.

αἰ γὰρ ἔγων οὐτον νέοις εἰςν ὑπὸ ἐπὶ θύμω, ἦ παῖς εἰς Ὅδυσῆος ἀμύμονος ἢ καὶ αὐτός [ἐλθοι ἀλητεύων ἐπὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐλπίδος αἰσία], αὐτήν ἔπειτ' ἀπ' ἐμείο κάρη τάμοι ἀλλότριος φῶς,

εἰ μὴ ἔγω κελνοσι κακὸν πάντεσσι γενομήν ἔλθον εἰς μέγαρον Λαστιάδεω Ὅδυσῆος.

ἐς δ' αὖ μὲ πληνδί δαμασάλατο μοῦνῳ ἐνότα, 105


96. θεοῦ ὁμφή, not probably an actual "oracle":—rather the Homeric mode of conceiving what we now should call a wave of unreasoning popular sentiment. See the excellent note on 3. 215.

97. ἐπιμέμφεας 'complain of': 'is it that you have brothers who do not stand by you as they ought?'

99. οὖντο νίος 'so young' (as I had need to be for the purpose), 'young enough for that.'

ἐκλ 'with': 'would that I had the youthful strength, as I have the spirit, to act.' Cp. 17. 308 ἐκλ εἰδε τῆς.

101. If this line is genuine, we must suppose an anacolouthon: 'would that I were young enough, either being the son of Ulysses, or would that he might come himself.' That is to say, instead of ἐκεῖ καὶ άφιδός ἔρθων (subordinate to νίος εἶπ), the second alternative takes the form of an independent clause of wish. This is an irregularity of a type common enough in Greek (cp. H. G. § 272): but here there is a real anacoluthon or change of meaning; since the second clause—the wish that Ulysses himself would come—does not fit ἐκεῖ εἶπω.

Thus the line interferes with the main point of the sentence—the duty incumbent on Telemachus of resisting the Suitors at all hazards. Moreover, the half-line ἔτσι γὰρ καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀναρ 'hope has its share,' i.e. a claim to its place, a raison d'être.

104. The objection that the ancient critics made to this line probably was that it interferes with the play of suggestion which characterises the speech. It implies that the speaker is only a stranger offering help. But Ulysses is now supposing himself to be Ulysses (cp. 1. 106). His aim is to lead rapidly up to the point at which he reveals himself to his son (l. 188). On the other hand the introduction of the name Λαστιάδης Ὅδυσσεας has some rhetorical value.
16. ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ Π

βουλοίην κ’ εν ἐμοίσι κατακάμενος μεγάροισι
tεθνάμεν ἦ τάδε γ’ αἰλν ἀεικέα ἐργ’ ὀράσασθαι,
ξείνως τε στυφελιζομένους δημόσ τε γυναίκας
μυστάζοντας ἀεικελίος κατὰ δώματα καλά,
καὶ οἶνον διαφύσομενον, καὶ οῖτον ἔδωντας
μᾶψ ἄστως ἄτελεστον, ἀνήνυστρ ἐπὶ ἐργῇ.

Τὸν δ’ αἰ τῇ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένοις ἀντίων ἠδαί
"τοιγάρ ἤγῳ τοι, ξείνω, μᾶλ’ ἄτρηκεως ἀγορέυσω.
οὔτε τί μοι πᾶς δῆμος ἀπεκθάνοντος χαλεπαίνει,
oὔτε κασιγνήτως ἐπιμέμφομαι, οἷοι περ ἀνήρ
μαραμενώσι τέσσερε, καὶ εἰ μέγα νείκος δρηταί.
αὖδε γὰρ ἡμετέρην γενεὴν μοῦνος Κρονίων
μοῦνον Δαέρτην 'Αρκελάου νῦν ἐτίκτε,
μοῦνον δ’ αὐτ’ Ὀδυσσῆα πατήρ τεκέν’ αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς
μοῦνον ἔμ’ ἐν μεγάροισι τεκὼν λίπεν οὐδ’ ἀπόντησ.
τώ νῦν δυσμενέοις μάλα μυρίοι εἰσ’ ἐν ὅικρ.
ὁσοι γὰρ νῦσσοισιν ἐπικρατέουσιν ἄριστοι,
Δούλειαν τε Σάμη τε καὶ ὅληντι Σάκυνθου,
’νδ’ ὅσοι κραναλ’ Ἰθάκην κατὰ κοιμανέοις,
τόσοι μητέρ’ ἐμὴν μνώνται, τρόχους δὲ οἶκουν.

η δ’ οὔτ’ ἀρνεῖται στυγερὸν γάμον οὔτε τελευτὴν
ποίησι δόναται τοι δὲ φθινόθουσιν ἔδωντες


108–110 are three successive lines without a caesura in the middle. The rhythm is probably intended to mark the rising passion of the speaker. Throughout this speech Ulysses is on the verge of using language only suited to his own character.

109. μυστάζοντας, used substantively, = μυστάζοντας τιμᾶς: and so ἔδωντας in the next line. For this use of the participle cp. 13. 400. The force of -αω is frequentative or ampliative, 'dragging about': see on 13. 9.

111. ἄτελεστον is an adv., explained in the phrase ἄνυστρον ἐπὶ ἐργῇ 'with no end to the business.' For examples of this kind of exegesis see on 1. 300. For ἐπὶ = 'with,' 'in presence of,' cp. 11. 548 τοῖς ἐπὶ ἀδέλφη, 16. 99 τῶ[σ] ἐπὶ θυμῷ, also II. 4. 175, 258.

114. ἀπεχθάνοντο 'having become your enemy,' cp. l. 95 σ’ ἐν λαόλ ἄχαιροι. ἀπεχθάνον is generally passive, 'came to be hated': but here it applies to both sides of the supposed quarrel, expressing simply the fact of enmity between them. So probably in 19. 407 ὁδυσσάμενος, which is generally 'having been angered,' is used in the more comprehensive sense of 'having quarreled.'

115. τρόχους, cp. 15. 309.
οἶκον ἐμὸν· τάχα δὴ με διαρράθοντι καὶ αὐτὸν. ἄλλῳ ἦ τοι μὲν ταῦτα θεῶν ἐν γούσασι κείται· 
ἀττα, οὐ δὲ ἐρχείσθαι ἐμφανίσθη ἐφι' ὅτι οἱ σῶς εἰμὶ καὶ ἐκ Πύλου εἰληφθεῖα. 
αὐτάρ ἐγὼν αὐτοῦ μενέω, οὐ δὲ δειθρὸ νέεσθαι 
οἴη ἀπαγγέλαις· τῶν δ' ἄλλων μὴ τις 'Ἄχαιων 
πενθέσθω πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐμοὶ κακὰ μηχανῶνται." 

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφης, Εὐμαιος συβότα· 
"γεγυνάκω, φρονέω· τά γε δὴ νοεντί κελεύεις. 
ἄλλῳ ἀγεῖ μοι τόδε εἰπὲ καὶ ἀτρεκεῖος κατάλεξον, 
εἰ καὶ Δαέρτῃ αὐτῶν ὅδων ἄγγελος ἐλθὼ 
δυνάμων, δὲ τόσος μὲν 'Οδυσσήος μέγ' ἄχειν 
ἐργα τ' ἔσπερονεκε μετὰ δμῶν τ' ἐνὶ ἵππῳ 
πίνε καὶ ἴπθ', ὅτε θυμός ἐνὶ στήθεσιν ἀνώγοι· 
αὐτάρ νῦν, ἐξ' οὗ γε ἄχεος νητ' Πύλονδε, 
οὗ πώ μὲν φαίνειν φαγέμεν καὶ πιέμεν αὐτῶς, 
οὗτ' ἐπὶ ἐργα ἰδεῖν, ἄλλα στοναχῇ τε γάρ, τε 
ἵσται ὀδυρόμενος, φιναῦθε δ' ἄμφ' ὀστεόφι χρώσ." 

Τὸν δ' ἀδ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀπόνοι ἡθα· 
"Ἀλγιον, ἄλλῃ ἐμπρος μν ἐκεῖομεν ἀχανυμενοι περ' 
ἐλ γάρ ποις εἰς αὐτάγρητα πάντα βροτούσι, 
πρώτῳ κεν τοῦ πατρὸς ἐλομέθα νῦστιμον ἡμαρ."
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ἀλλὰ σὺ γ’ ἀγγελάς ὑπὸ κίε, μηδὲ κατ’ ἄγροις πλάζεσθαι μετ’ ἐκείνων ἀτὰρ πρὸς μητέρα εἰπείν ἀμφότερον ταῦτα ὑπεμένειν ὅτι τάχιστα κρύβην κείνη γὰρ κεῖν ἀπαγγέλσει γέρωντι.

"Ἡ βα καὶ ἄρον συφωβίων ὃ δ’ εἰλετο χερσὶ πέδιλα, δησάμενος δ’ ὑπὸ ποσὶν πῶλιν τευ. οὐδ’ αὖ Ἀθηνὴν λήθεν ἀπὸ σταθμοῦ κιών Εὔμαιος υφορός, ἀλλ’ ἡ γε σχεδοῦ ἦλθε δέμας δ’ ἵκτο γυναικὶ καλὴ τε μεγάλῃ τε καὶ ἁγιὰ ἑργὰ ἱδυρ. στῇ δὲ κατ’ ἀντίθετον κλίσης Ὀδυσσῆι φανείσα· οὖδ’ ἀρὰ Τηλέμαχος ίδεν ἀντίλον οὖθ’ ἐνόσεν, οὗ γὰρ ποὺ πάντεσσι θεοὶ φαίνονται ἐναργεῖς, ἀλλ’ Ὁδυσσῆς τε κύνες τε ἰδον, καὶ β’ οὐχ ὑλάντο, κυνήθῆμα ὃ ετέρωσε διὰ σταθμοῦ φόβηθεν.

/ioi 6. δ’ ἀὖ ἐπ’ ὄφρως νεῦσε· νόησε δὲ δίος Ὀδυσσεύς, ἐκ δ’ ἦλθεν μεγάριον παρεκ μέγα τεῖχον αὐλῆς, στῇ δὲ πάροιδ’ αὐτῆς· τὸν δὲ προσέειπεν Ἀθηνή. "διογενῆς Λαερτίαδη, πολυμήχαν’ Ὀδυσσεύθ, ἦν νῦν σῷ παιδὶ ἔπος φάστ’ μη’ ἐπίκευθε, ὡς ἄν μηντήρων θάνατον καὶ κηρ’ ἀραφόντε ἐρχησθον προτὶ ἄστυ περικλυτὸν’ οὐδ’ ἐγὼ αὐτὴ δηρὸν ἀπὸ σφῶν ἔσωμαι μεμανι μάχεσθαι.

"Ἡ καὶ χρυσάτη βάσιδο επεμάσσατ’ Ἀθηνή, φάρος μὲν οἱ πρῶτον εὐπλυνές ἢ ὑπὸ χιτῶνα θῆκ’ ἀμφὶ στῆθεσι, δέμας δ’ ὁφέλλε καὶ ἤβην.

153–153 rejected by Ar. 161 was G F X U al. Eust.: was P H al.

Third person only, and that the extension to the First and Second persons, though ancient, was on the whole post-Homeric.

152. We hear no more of this message to Laertes.

159. ἀντίθετον seems to be the space just outside the doorway of the αὐλή or courtyard. Odysseus sees Athene from the μέγαρον, passes out beyond the wall (τεῖχος) of the αὐλή, and is then somewhere in (ṣvrat) the adjoining ἀντίθετον. In 343–344 (infra) the Suitors go out, as here, παρὲ μέγα τεῖχον αὐλῆς, and are then προτάρωθε θυράνων.

162–163. An instance of the sympathy with the dog which is so noticeable in the Odyssey: cp. 14. 29., 16. 5, and (above all) 17. 291–327.

165. τεῖχος, of the wall of the courtyard: τεῖχος being used of a city wall or fortification.

174. δέμας δ’ ὁφέλλε καὶ ἤβην, a slight zeugma: 'she glorified his form and (granted him increase of) youthful strength.'
175. τάνωσθαι 'were filled out,' were no longer shrunken.

176. κανέσι must mean 'dark.' The poet forgets that Ulysses had 'yellow' hair before: see Od. 13. 399, 431.

An interesting parallel to this contradiction has been pointed out to me by a friend. In the first edition of Scott’s Heart of Midlothian, vol. I. ch. iv (p. 119), Effie Deans is described as ‘a modest-looking black-haired girl.’ In ch. ix of the same volume (p. 240) it is said that ‘her Grecian-shaped head was profusely rich in waving ringlets of brown hair.’ Finally, in vol. II. ch. x (p. 231) in the account of the trial special mention is made of her beautiful and abundant tresses of long fair hair.

In later editions the inconsistency was removed by altering ‘black-haired’ in the first of these places into ‘fair-haired.’ But the necessity for such a correction was probably not felt before the ages when ‘second editions’ and the like made revision possible.

181. ἔος, viz. when Telemachus saw him. Telemachus was not now looking towards Ulysses.

185. τετυγμένα, cp. 13. 32.

189. ἡμέρας, a plural like δρασθαλία, ἠποσφονα, &c.; cp. the Latin laudes = ‘glorious deeds.’

191. πόρος δ’ ἐξε νολεμέρις αἰεὶ, parataxis, ‘though up to that time he had borne up firmly.’
οὐ γὰρ πως ἂν θυντὸς ἀνήρ τάδε μηχανόπτο
ὅτι αὐτοῦ γε νῦν, διε μὴ θεῖς αὐτὸς ἐπελθὼν
ῥηθεῖσι εὐθέλων θείᾳ νέον ἢδὲ γέροντα.

ἡ γὰρ τοι νέον ἦσαν γέρον καὶ δεικέα ἐσούν νῦν δὲ θεοῖσιν ὑκακα, οὐσον εὐρὺν ἔχονει."
16. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Π

φήναι ἢ ἀγυπτοὶ γαμψώνυκες, οἵοι τε τέκνα ἀγρόται ἐξελοῦσθε πάρος πετενά γενέσθαι ὅσ' ἄρα τοῖς γ' ἠλευνυν ὅπ' ὄρφοι δόκρυν εἶβον. καὶ νῦ κ' ὄδυρομένωσιν ἔδω φάος ἠλίῳ,

εἰ μὴ Τηλέμαχος προσεφώνεν δ' πατέρ' αἰλία: "πολὺ γάρ νῦν δεθρό, πάτερ φίλε, νὴι σε ναῦται ἡγαγον εἰς 'Ἰθάκην; τίνες ἔμμεναι εὐχετῶντο; οὐ μὲν γὰρ τί σε πεζον διομαί ἐνθάδ' ἱκέσθαι." 225

Τὸν δ' ἀφεῖ προσέειπε πολύτλας δίοις 'Ὅδυσεῦς

"τοιγάρ ἔγω τοι, τέκνον, ἀληθείνα καταλέγω.

Φαίηκες μ' ἡγαγον ναυσκλιτοί, οἶ τε καὶ Ἀλλος ἀνθρώπους πέμπουσιν, ὅτις σφεάς εἰςαφλεκταί

καὶ μ' εἴδουν' ἐν νηθ' θοῇ ἐκτ' πόντων ἐγνοτες
cάθεσαν εἰς 'Ἰθάκην, ἔπορον δὲ μοι ἄγλαδ δώρα,

χαλκών τε χρυσῶν τε ἄλις ἐσθήτα θ' ὄφαντην.


Lex. s. v.). The former is supported by one good manuscript, viz. F. This ἢντα or ἢντε is evidently to be identified with ἢντε 'like as.' The dissyllabic form is found with the meaning 'as' or 'like' in two places in the Iliad, viz. 3. 10 εὐτ', ὅρεσιν κοροφηκεν κτλ. (ancient variants ἢντ', ὅρεσιν, and ἔντ' ὅρεσιν). and 19. 360 τὸ ῥ' ἢντε πτερὰ γέγενεν κτλ. (v. l. ἢντε and ἢντε). In the latter place ἢντε is possible: cp. the variation of ἢν', ἢν', and ἢν.

There remains the question,—what is the force of the comparative followed by ἢντε? Buttmann and other modern scholars have taken ἢντε as equivalent to 'than,' comparing the use of as in provincial English, and of als and wie in German. The difficulty, however, is not the use of a word with the double sense of 'like as' and 'than,' but the improbability that such a use, if it existed in the language, should occur so very rarely. It must be said, too, that the phrase 'blacker than pitch' is an exaggeration, such as Homer does not resort to in his descriptions of nature. In the ancient view, put forward or at least maintained by Aristarchus, the comparative was used as a positive (ἡ δική δ' ἐγκροτα τῷ συνεργατικῷ ἀντὶ ἀπλοῦ Aristonicus, στιχέων μετὰ τοῦ μελάντερον Nicanor). That is to say, melánτερον does not express a degree of blackness, but blackness instead of its opposite. Bekker (I. 2. 1. 312) quotes as instances άνδρόθερος (Od. 8. 169), κομβόθερος (8. 201), comparing Lucian (Philopatr. 4) Ἀἰδηφα συμβαί μελαντέρος καὶ τὴν δόξαν κορωμάνον. The meaning 'dark and pitch like' seems sufficiently Homeric. So here ἀπεικώνω, of a cry that comes fast, like the cry of certain birds, cp. ἰπασούτερον. A good parallel to the form of the sentence is to be found in Herodotus (3. 33) ἐπὶ κρήνην σφι θήσασθαι, ἀπ' ἓν λουκέοντο λεπαροῦνῳ ἔγνωτο, κατάπερ εἰς ἔλασον εἰς, where the meaning is not that they became more shining than if it were a fountain of oil, but that it shone with oil.

219. ἔλεουν, adv. 'piteously.'

222. The γὰρ marks the suddenness (αἰφα) of the speech.

230. καθέσαν ἐν 'Ἰθάκῃ, pregnant construction, 'brought to and set down in Ithaca': cp. 13. 274.

Digitized by Google
καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐν στῆσει θεών ἱότητι κέονται
νῦν αὖ δειρ’ ἱκμὴν ὑποθημοσύνην Ἀθήνης,
ὅρα κε δυσμενέσσι φώνα πέρι βουλεύομεν.
ἀλλ’ ἄγε μοι μυντήρας ἀρίστημας καταλέξων,
ὄριον ἄδεω δοσοὶ τε καὶ οἱ τινες ἄνερες εἰσι·
καὶ κεν ἱμὸν κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονα μερηρίζας
φράσομαι, ἡ κεν νοὶ δυσμηνεῖ άντιφέρεσθαι
μοῦνον ἀνευθ’ ἄλλων, ἢ καὶ διζησώμεθ’ ἄλλως.”

Τὸν δ’ αὖ Θηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίοις ἡδα: 240
“ἀδ πάτερ, ἡ τοι σειὸν μέγα κλέος αἰεὶν ἄκονον,
χειρᾶς τ’ αἰχμητὴν ἔμεναι καὶ ἐπιφόρνα βούλην,
ἀλλὰ λίθον μέγα ἔπεσ· ἠγὴ μ’ ἐχει’ ὁδὸν κεν εἰη
ἀνδρε δύο πολλοὶ και ἱβιμοιοι μάχεσθαι.
μυστήριων δ’ οὖτ’ ὁ δεκάς ἀτρεκές οὔ τε δυ’ οἶαι,
ἀλλὰ πολὺ πλέονες τάχα δ’ εἰσεῖ αὐτὸς ἀριθμὸν.
ἐκ μὲν δοῦλιοι δύο καὶ πεντηκόντα 245

234. βουλεύομεν] better βουλεύωμεν, see H. G. § 82. 238 ἢ H : et vulg.
240 τάχα ἔσεαι (with asyndeton) would be idiomatic; cp. 13. 42. aoríst G P X U
as 2. 40., 24. 506. : etv’d vulg.

232. στήσασθαι may stand for στεί-εσασθαι, or may simply be a metrical licence for the regular στήσασθαι, which cannot come into the hexameter.

πόνται is an isolated thematic form, for the Homeric πόλατα; see however Schulze, Quaest. Ep. p. 426.

238. δυσμηνεῖ is doubtless a subj.: see on 1. 261. So δυσμηνεῖα in the next line, although the ind. δυσμηνεῖα is not found.

242. βούλην is generally taken as an acc. of limitation—wise in counsel.’ But if we compare 3. 118 νῦν καὶ ἐπίφοροι βούλην, and 19. 326 νῦν καὶ ἐπίφοροι μίτην, it becomes more probable that ἐπίφοροι is an epithet of βούλην,—the constr. being χειρᾶς τ赎回 καὶ βούλην ‘in strength of hands and wise counsel.’ For ‘wise in counsel’ we should expect rather ἐπίφοροι βούλη (cp. ἐπιστήριων βούλῃ in 1. 374).

245. ἀτρεκές, adv. ‘exactly’: i.e., ‘it is not a simple ten, or two tens only.’

247–251. It would seem from this enumeration that the recurring line
κοραι κεκριμένοι, ἕξ ἔδρασέρες ἔπονται.
ἐκ ἐκ Σάμης πλυρέσ τε καὶ εἰκοσὶ φότες ἔσαν,
ἐκ ἐκ Ζακύνθου ἔσαν ἔλκουσι κοροὶ Ἀχαϊῶν,
ἐκ δέ αὐτῆς Ἰθάκης δυοκαλικα πάντες ἄρωτοι,
καὶ σφυν ἄμ' ἄφτετι Μέδουν κήρυξ καὶ θεῖος δοῦδος
καὶ δουλο θεράποντε, δάμων δαιτροσυνάω.
τῶν εἰ κεν πάντων ἀντίσωμεν ἐνδον ἐντον,
μὴ πολύπικρα καὶ άλα βίας ἀποτίσεαι ἐλθόν.
ἀλλὰ σύ γ', εἴ δώσασι τι' ἀμύντωρα μερμήριξαι,
φράσεν, δέ κεν τις νοῦν ἀμύνον πρόφορον θυμ.'
Τὸν δ' αὖτε προσείπει πολύτλας διὸς 'Οδυσσεύς:
"τοιγάρ ἐγὼν ἔρεω, σῦ δὲ σύνθεο καὶ μεν ἀκοινον-
καὶ φράσαι ή κεν νοῦν Ἀθήνη σὺν Δι βατρί
ἄρκεσι, ἦ τι' ἄλλον ἀμύντωρα μερμήριξω."
Τὸν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ηύθαι:
"ἐσθλώ τοι τούτω γ' ἐπαμώντορε, τοὺς ἀγορεύεις,

250 κοραι... φότες G X al. 257 φράς' H: φράς J: φράσεν vulg.: see the note.
261 ἄρωτεν, see the note.

(15. 361 f.), the messengers go and return immediately. So too in 2. 51 they are described as τῶν ἄρωτον φίλοι υἱες ἐκ ἐνθάδε γ' (i.e. in Ithaca) εἰπὼν ἄρωτοι. The contradiction, such as it is, seems undeniable. Moreover, it is not one which can easily be explained by a difference of authorship. Rather, like other contradictions or unenvelopes in works of fiction, it arises partly from the limitation of human memory, partly from our ignorance of circumstances which the contemporaries of the poet would have been able to supply. If the three other islands are apt to be ignored (so in 1. 394 in reference to the 'kingdom' of Ulysses), that is because Ithaca was the dominant island, to which the others stood in the relation of περιοι. The chiefs of the dependent communities doubtless had their πρέσβειο in the capital. In any case, every hearer of the Homeric poems would know how to meet the difficulty of carrying on his suit in a neighbouring town. (See Kern, Ὑπὸ τὰ Φρεῖρε τὴν Οδύσσει, Ulm, 1861.)

255. 'See that you do not in right bitter and terrible fashion take your vengeance,' i.e. 'I fear that instead of taking vengeance you will suffer a terrible fate.' The expression is a kind of oxymoron: cp. 17. 448 με νύχα πικρὴν Ἀγαμήνων καὶ Κυκέρως ληπη, i.e. 'something bitter instead of Egypt and Crete.'

257. φράσεν 'think of.' But as δ (the art.) is not generally used — δι with an indefinite reference, perhaps we should read φράς δέ κεν τις 'tell me of one who —'

261. ἄρωτον. The fut. after κεν is very doubtful, see on 15. 534. We should probably read ἄρωπον.

263—264. The point of this passage has generally been missed. Ulysses having named Zeus and Athene as the helpers to be looked for, Telemachus answers ironically that Zeus and Athene are good champions, no doubt—sitting aloft in the clouds (instead of helping). Hence the reply of Ulysses: 'yet will these two not long hold aloft from the combat.' Note the significant change from ρῶσιν γς, ἵτι, 'those, forsooth,' to ρῶσιν γς, ἵτι.
16. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Π

δῆ τε καὶ ἄλλοις ἀνδράσι τε κρατέουσι καὶ ἀθανάτους θείους." 265

Τὸν δὲ αὐτὲ προσέειτε πολύτλας δῖος ὁ Ὁδυσσεύς·

"οὐ μὲν τοι κεῖνῳ γε πολυν χρόνον ἄμφις ἔσεσθον

φιλόπιδος κρατερῆς, ὅπερ μὴν τή τρήσασθον ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν ἕξ ἐκαθεὶ, καὶ μυστήριοιν ὑπερφύλαυσιν ὁμλεῖν

αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ πρὸς ἀστὴν συβάτης ἄστερον ἀξεῖ, πτωχὸς λευγαλέρ ἐναλλυγικον ἥδε γέροντι.

εἰ δὲ μὲν ἀτιμήσουσι δύον κάτα, σὺν δὲ φιλον κῆρ

πετλάτῳ ἐν σπήθεσιν κακῶς πάσχοντος ἐμεῖο, 275

ἡν περ καὶ διὰ δώμα ποδῶν ἐλκοῦσι θύρας

ἡ βέλεσιν βάλλοντι: σὺ δὲ εἰσορθῶν ἀνέχεσθαι.

ἀλλὰ ἡ τοι παῖςθαι ἀνωγέμεν ἄφροσυνάω, 280

μειλχίους ἐπέσει παραυδῶν οὐ δέ τοι οὐ τι

πείσονται δὴ γὰρ σφι παρίζεταται αἰσίων ἡμαρ.

ἄλλο δὲ τοι ἐρωσ, σὺ δὲ ἔνθε φρεσι βάλλει σήσιν,

ὑπάντε κεν πολύβουλους ἐνθε φρεσι θῆσιν Ἀθηνῆ, 285

νεύσω μέν τοι ἐγὼ κεφαλῆ, σὺ δὲ ἐπείτα νοῆςας

ὅσα τοι ἐν μεγάροιν ἅρηια τεῦξεα κεῖται

ἐς μυχῶν ὑψηλοῦ βαλάμου καταθεῖναι ἄείρας

πάντα μάλι· αὐτὰρ μυστήρας μαλακοῖς ἐπέσεισι

παράβαινα, δότε κὲν σὲ μεταλλώσιν ποθέντες·
16. ΟΔΗΣΕΙΑΣ Π

'ἐκ καπνοῦ κατέθηκ', ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι τοιῶν ἐφεκι
οὐά ποτε Τροίην καὶ κατέλειπεν 'Οδυσσεύς,
ἀλλὰ κατῆκιστα, δόσον πυρὸς ἤκει ἀύτμη.
πρὸς δ' ἐστι καὶ τόδε μείζον ἐν ἤρεσι βῆκε Κρονίων,
μή τῶς οἰνωβέντες, ἐριν στήσαντες ἐν ὕμιν,
ἀλλήλους τρώσατε κατασχόντες τε δεῖτα
καὶ μυστηρίου αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος.
νοῦν δ' οἰοίσιν δῶν φάσοντα καὶ δώδεκα
καλλιτείνω καὶ δοιά βοὸν χρησίν ἐλέσθαι,
ὡς ἄν ἐπιθύσαντες ἐλοιμεθα· τούτο δὲ κ' ἐπεῖτα
Παλάς Ἀθηναίη θέλει καὶ μητίες Ζεὺς·
ἀλλ' δ' τοι ἔρεα, σο δ' ἐν ἤρει βάλλει σῆμα·
ei'έτεον γ' ἐμὸς ἔσσι καὶ αἰματος ἡμετέρου,
μή τις ἐπεὶτ 'Οδυσσός άκουσάτω ἐνδον ἐόντως,
μήτ' οὖν Δαέρτης ἵστω τό γε μήτε συβαύτης
μήτε τις οἴκησιν μήτ' αὕτη Πηνελόπεια,
ἀλλ' οἴοι σοῦ τ' ἔγω το γυναικῶν γνώμοναν ἱθῶν·
kai κέ τεο δμῶν ἄνδρῶν ἔτι πειρηθεῖμεν,
ἡμὲν ὅποι τὸς νόοι τιε καὶ δελθε βημαβ,
ἡδ' οὔτι οὐκ ἄλεγει, σε δ' ἀτίμᾳ τοιῶν ἐόντα·

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμείβομενος προσεφώνει φαλίμοι νύός:·
"ὁ πάτερ, ἥ τοι ἐμὸν βωμόν καὶ ἐπείτα γ', ὅιω,

290 κατῆκιστα] Read κατηκίστα τι (note).
293 τρώγατε] Read τρώγατε οὐ τρώσατε
300 ὅτι] ὅτι
306 ὅπως ὅπως vulg.
388. ἐφέκε, in past time with reference
to κατηκίσα: = 'I found them no longer
like'.
390. κατηκίσα τι is not a good epic
form, since δεικὴς and δεικὺς are always
uncontracted (ἀδείκεις). It is easy to
substitute κατηκίσα δοῦν (or perhaps
κατακίστα, like ἐφέκε)—unless we prefer
to regard the passage as a com-
paratively late insertion.
391. Θήκε Κρονίων. In 19. 10 ἐμβαλε
βαίμων.
393. τρώγατε. The subj. after the
aor. θήκε may be defended, on the ground
that the event which is referred to is
still future. But the η of τρώγατε is not
Homerinc. It is open to us (subject to
the remark made on l. 290) to read
either τρώντε (cp. τρώει, Od. 21. 293),
or τρώσατε and κατασχόντα. Cp.
369 (infra).
394. αὐτὰς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρᾳ
σίδηρος. Cp. Tac. Hist. 1. 80 et visa
inter temulentos arma cupidinum ini
moveres. Regarding this mention of iron
as the ordinary material of arms, see on
19. 13.
395. This injunction is not borne in
mind when the arms are removed (19.
31 ff.): cp. 22. 101.
397. έκ-θύσαστε 'making a rush for
them' (not ἔκ-θύσατε).
301. Notice the aor. imper. άκουσάτω
with μή: H. G. § 328.
306. ὅπως, viz. in the various ἔργα,
see 314.
16. ὍΔΗΣΕΙΑΣ II

γνώσεαι: οὐ μὲν γάρ τι χαλιφροσύναι γέ μεν ἔχουσιν: 310 ἄλλ' οὗ τῷ τόδε κέρδος ἦγον ἔσεσθαι διὸν ἣμῖν ἀμφότεροισιν: σὲ δὲ φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα.

δὴ δ' γάρ αὕτως εἴη ἐκάστοις πειρητικῶν, ἑγγα μετερχόμενοι· τοι δ' ἐν μεγάροις ἐκεῖ διὸ

χρήματα διαρκάσαντοι ὑπέρβησιν, οὐδ' ἐπὶ φειδώ. 315 ἄλλ' ἦ τοι σε γυναῖκας ἐγά σεδώκασθαί ἄνωγα, 

αἰ τ' ἀτιμάζοναι καὶ αἱ νηλείτιδες εἰσιν: 

ἀνδρῶν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἔγωγε κατὰ σταθμοὺς ἑθέλομι 

ἡμέας περιάζειν, ἄλλ' ὡστερα ταῦτα πένεσθαι, 

εἰ ἔτην γέ τι οἶδα Αἴδις τέρας αἰγιλήκου." 320

'Ὡς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἄλληλοις ἄγορευν,

ἡ δ' ἄρ' ἐπειτ' 'Ἰδάκηνδε κατήγετο νῆποι ἵστερης,

ἡ φέρε Τηλέμαχον Πυλήθεν καὶ πάντας ἐταῖρους. 325

οἱ δ' διὸ πάντως πολυβενθέοι ἐντὸς ἱκοντο,

νήμα μεν οἱ γε μέλαιναν ἐντ' ἡπείρῳ ἔρυσαν,

τεῦχεα δὲ σὺ ἀπένεικαν ὑπέρθυμοι θεράποντες,

αὐτίκα δ' ἐς Κλυτίον φέρον περικαλλέα δῶρα.

αὐτὰρ κήρυκα πρόησαν ὅμων εἰς 'Ὀδυσσίος,

ἀγγελῖνη ἐρέωντα περίφρανεν Πηνελόπην,


(of the various forms offered to our choice, here and in the two other places where this line appears (see the crit. note), the two which have most external support are νηλείτις and νηλείτες. If however, as seems probable, the word meant 'unoffending,' from διηνήθει, the second syllable should be written with ει (not ι): cp. διηνήθη 'offender,' rightly so written by Aristarchus, also the 'ablation' form διηνήθεις (Lycophr. 136).

Evidently νηλείτης is related to διηνήθεις as ημερήτης to ἀμερήτες. Further, we have sufficient authority for preferring the uncontracted ending -εις, to the advantage of the metre. The final question, therefore, lies between νηλείτις and νηλείτες. Both forms doubtless existed, and may well have existed together in the language of which this line is an archaic fragment; but in the present context the feminine form has a good deal of point. It should be observed, however, that a fem. νηλείτης does not answer regularly to νηλείτης (gen. -οτης), but rather to a masc. of the First Declension (possibly νηλείτης, negative of διηνήθη). Cp. the fem. forms ἄργατις, ληθης, δασυλητις, χρεητης, &c., which answer to bartone masc. forms in -ης.

322. 'Ἰδάκηνδε. Here the town is meant.

326. τεῦχεα ἀρμάς,’ see 15. 318.
οὖνεκα Τηλέμαχος μὲν ἐπ’ ἀγροῦ, νῆα δ’ ἀνώγει
ἀστυν’ ἀποπλείειν, ἵνα μὴ δεισάσα’ ἐνὶ θυμῷ
ἰφθίμη βασιλεία τέρεν κατὰ δάκρυνον ἔβοι.
τὸ δὲ συναντήσων κῆρυξ καὶ δῖος οὐρβόδος
τῆς αὐτῆς ἕνεκ’ ἀγγελίης, ἔρεον τε γυναικὶ.
ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ β’ ἵκοντο, δύμων θείου βασιλῆς,
κῆρυξ μὲν ὡς μέσησι μετά διμφάσιν ἔειπεν.
“ὦ θά, βασιλεία, φίλος πάϊς εἰδήλουσθε.”
Πηνελόπει ὦ ἐπε συβάτης ἄγχι παραστὰσ
πάντ’ ὧσα οἱ φίλοι υἱὸς ἀνώγει μυθήσασθαι.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάνων ἐφημοσύνην ἀπείπει,
βῆ β’ ἵμεναι μεθ’ δας, λίπε δ’ ἔρκα τε μέγαρον τε.
Μνηστήρες δ’ ἀκάχωντο κατήφορον τ’ ἐνὶ θυμῷ,
ἐκ δ’ ἰλθον μεγάρων παρέκ μέγα τειχῶν αὐλῆς,
αὐτοῦ δὲ προπαρόθει θυράων ἐδριδώντο.
τοῖσιν δ’ Εὐρώμαχος, Πολύβου παῖς, ἥρξ’ ἀγορεύειν
“ὦ φίλοι, ἡ μέγα ἔργον ὑπερφιάλω τετέλεσται
Τηλεμάχῳ ὄδης ἤδε φάμεν δὲ ὦ τελέσθαι.
ἀλλ’ ἀγα νῆα μέλαιναν ἐρύσομεν, ἢ τὸς ἀριστή,
ἐς δ’ ἐρέτας αἵλης ἁγελρμεν, ὦ κε τάχιστα
κείνοις ἁγγείλωσι θοὼς ὀικονε νέεσθαι.”

Οὐ πο τάν εἰρηθ’, δο’ ἄρ’ Ἀμφίνομοι ὑδέ νῆα

335 Βασιλῆς] Ἰασιηθοί G, v. i. in M. P H X U al. 343 τοῖσιν δ’ Εὐρώμαχος, Πολύβου παῖς, ἥρξ’ ἀγορεύειν
335 εἰαλὴλούσθε G F D: ὅς Πόλου ἤκέθεν
344 αὐτοῦ] δίχοι G F al. 346 τετέλεσθη G F X al.

331. δεισάσα ‘taking alarm,’ viz. by the ship arriving without Telemachus.
333. συναντήσων is one of the curious group of forms, chiefly duals and in
334. finitives in -μεναι of verbs in -αω and -αιω, which have ἃ instead of ἃ (from αἴ) or
335. αἰ (from εἶ) ἁπλήνθην, σφοκτήνην, ἄρθρην, γοημέναι, πιεύ-
336. μεναι: ἄπειρητην, ὑματικήν, καλήμεναι, πεποθμέναι, φρονήμεναι, καλήμεναι, ποθή-
337. μεναι, ἰλατμόνως, βραυ (14. 343).
338. Whether these are originally non-
339. thematic, as Brugmann holds (M. U. 1. 86, Grundr. II. 953. 963), or arise
340. from pre-Hellenic contraction of αἴε, εἴσ (as Wackernagel, Χ. Ζ. xxvii. 84-88),
can hardly be determined. In any case there seems to be no reason for regarding
341. them as derived from Aeolic: especially
342. as in that dialect the dual was lost at an
343. early period.
344. ἐκάρκα is properly the whole en-
345. closure, μέγαν ς the chief hall of the
346. palace.
347. κατήφισαν ‘were downcast’: from κατηφί σῃ (34. 433): cp. κατηφεῖ
348. τ’rebuke, disgrace.’
350. ἐκάρκα ‘those others,’ viz. those
351. who lay in wait for Telemachus.
στρεφθείς ἐκ χώρης, λιμένος πολυβενθεός ἐντὸς, ἵστατα το τεσσάρων ἐρετμα τε χερσὶν ἔχοντας. ἤδη δ' αἵ διγγυλάσας μετεφώνειν οἷς ἐτάροισιν:

"μὴ τιν' ἐτ' ἀγγελίην θρόνωμεν οἴδε γὰρ ἐνδον", ἢ τις σφιν τόθ' έκειν ϑεόν, ἢ εἰσιδον αὐτοὶ νῦν παρερχομένην, τὴν δ' οὐκ ἐδώντακτο κιχήναι."

"Ως ἐφαθ", οἱ δ' ἀνατάντες ἐβαν ἐπὶ θίνα βαλάσσης, αἴγα δὲ νῦν μέλαιναν ἐπὶ ἄπειροι ἐρυσαν,

teúdo τέ δ' ἀπενεκαίν ὑπέρθυμοι θεράποντες,
aὐτοὶ δ' εἰς ἀγορὴν κίον αἴροι, οὐδὲ τὴν ἀλλον εἰσαν οὔτε νέον μεταίχευν οὔτε γερόντων.

τούτον δ' Ἀντίνου μετέφη, Εὐπείδειος υἱὸς:

"ἀ δῶσο, ὡς τόνθ' ἀνδρά θεοί κακότητος ἔλυσαν.

ἡματα μὲν σκοποί ζῶν ἐν' ἀκρίας ἤμεοκές

αἰὲν ἐπασπαστροι ἑβα δ' ἡλίῳ καταδύται

οὐ πο' ἐπὶ ἄπειρον νῦκτ' ἀσαμεν, ἄλλ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ

ὑπ' ὑπ' πλεονεύτων ἐλμύομεν Ἡὼ διαν,

Τὴνέμαχον λοχώντες, ἵνα φίλασαμεν ἑλώντες

αὐτόν τόν δ' ἄρα τῆς ἄπηγαγεν οὐκαὶ δαίμων,

358 θεὶ G X D. 367 δασαμεν vulg.: δασαμεν F X: δασαμεν D. The form δασαμεν (for δασαμεν) is not elsewhere found: read perhaps ἐν ἄπειρο δασαμεν (Wackenagel, K. Z. xxx. 270).

369 φίλασαμεν Hermann: φίλασαμεν MSS. The opt. is required by form and syntax. 370 τῆς θεράς vulg.: τῆς μὲν F U.
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ημείς δ' ἐνθάδε οἱ φραζόμεθα λυγρῶν ὄλεθρον Τηλεμάχῳ, μηδ' ἥμας ὑπεκφύγοι· οὐ γὰρ δίω τούτον γε ζῴωντος ἀνύσσεσθαι τάδε ἔργα.

αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἐπιστήμων βουλή τε νῦν τε,

λαοὶ δ' οὐκετί πάμπαν ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἡρα φέρουσιν.

ἀλλ' ἀγετε, πρὶν κεῖνον ὄμηνυρισθαι Ἀχαιὸς
eἰς ἄγορὴν—οὐ γὰρ τι μεθοθεμέναι μιν ὄφει,

ἀλλ' ἀπομυνίσει, ἑρείει δ' ἐν πᾶσιν ἀναστάς

οὐνέκα οἱ φόνον αἰτπομεν οὐδ' ἐκίχηκεν

οἱ δ' οὐκ αἰνήσουσιν ἀκόωντες κακὰ ἔργα:

μὴ τι κακῶν ρέξωσι καὶ ἡμέας ἐξέλάσσωσι

gαίης ἡμετέρης, ἀλλαὶ δ' ἀφικόμεθα δημον'

ἀλλὰ φθέωμεν ἔλοντες ἐπ' ἄγροι βόσφοι πόλης

ἡ ἐν ὀδῷ βλεπόν δ' αὐτοὶ καὶ κτήματ' ἔχομεν,

δασσάμενοι κατὰ μοῖραν ἐφ' ἡμέας, οἴκοι δ' αὐτὲ

κεῖνον μητέρι δοίμεν ἔχειν ἥδ' ὡς τις οὖνοι.

εἰ δ' ὑμῖν δδε μῦθοι ἀφανίδανε, ἀλλὰ βλεπεθε

αὐτὸν τε ξύεμι καὶ ἔχειν πατρώια πάντα,

μὴ οἱ χρήματ' ἕπεται ἐλιθς θυμιδ' ἔδωμεν

ἐνθάδ' ἀγειρόμενοι, ἀλλ' ἐκ μεγάρου ἐκαστος.

372 ἡμα] a form only found here: read ἀμμε. 387 βόλοθε Π U*: βολόθε vulg. 389 θυμιρ' Bekker: but θυµχαρ' would be more Homeric. The form θυμιθε must be later: in Homer it would be θυμοβαθεθε.

αὐτῶν οἱ δάσινων μεγαλυμμ. Π. 11. 141

αθῆς καταστηΐναι μηδ' ἐξέμεν δὴ ἐς Ἀχαιός, κ.λ. For the combination αὐτῶν ἔλοντες cp. Od. 18. 51 ἀθην εἶταν ἀεὶν καὶ 'even as he falls.'

375. οὐκετὶ πάμπαν, = 'do not now at all.' So in Attic οὐ πάντα 'not at all.' This idiom is originally a litototes, like our ironical 'hardly,' 'rather,' &c.: see Riddell's Digest, § 139.

On the phrase ἐν ἡρα φέρων see the note on 3. 164.

376. ἀλλ' ἀγετε κτλ. The sentence is taken up again in 383 ἀλλὰ φθέωμεν κτλ.

380. οὐκ αἰνήσουσιν, a litototes, = 'will resist.'

385. ἐφ' ἡμῖν 'among us': ἐν nearly as in l. 365.

386. δοιμον is concessive, i.e. it expresses, not a direct purpose (like ἐξαι-


mes), but a part of the plan to be acquiesced in.

387. áphódono cannot be áph-áphódono: in Homer, since áphánw has the F. The form áphódáno, proposed by Dr. Hay-

man, is against analogy, the prefix á-

not being used with verbs (for áthi in Theogn. 611 is a word coined for the nonce). Is it possible that áph-

ódáno contains the preposition at, Sanscr. átsa, Lat. an (in ausfere, ausfigo) i See Delbrück, Grundriss III. 670.

βόλοθε is perhaps an aor.: cp. 1. 234 ὥν δ' ἐκτρών ἐβλάστησε θεοί, where an aor. is required by the sense.

390. ἐκ μεγάρου ἐκαστός 'each from his own hall.' ἐκ μεγάρου goes with μεῖκοι ἐβλάστων, words that imply sending ἐννα, or at least offers of ἐννα, from the several houses. Cp. 19. 256 ἐγὼ νόμον ἐν θαλάμουν.
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μνάσθω έδένοισιν διήμενοις; ἢ δὲ κ’ ἐπειτα γῆμαθ’ ὅς κε πλείοντα πόροι καὶ μόροιμος ἔλθοι." 395

"Ως ἐφαθ’, οἱ δ’ ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῆ. τοῖς δ’ Ἀμφύνομος ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε, Νίσσου φαίμισις νός, Ἀρητιάδαο ἀνακτος, ὅς ρ’ ἐκ Δουλιχίου πολυπόροι ποιήμασι ἡγετὸν μνησθῆροι, μάλιστα δὲ. Πηνελόπεις ἑνδανε μύθουσιν. φρεσι γάρ κέχρητ’ ἀγαθῆσιν ὁ σφιν έὑφρονέαν ἁγορήσατο καὶ μετεειπεν ο’ ὁ φίλοι, οὐκ ἀν ἐγαγε κατακτείνειν ἐθέλουμι 400 Τηλέμαχον δεινὸν δὲ γένος βασιλῆιν ἐστι κτείνειν. ἄλλα πρώτα θεῶν εἰρόμεθα βουλᾶς. εἰ μὲν κ’ αἰνήσασιν Διὸς μεγάλοι θέματες, αὐτὸς τε κτενέω τούς τ’ ἄλλους πάντας αὐτώς εἰ δὲ κ’ ἀποτροπάωσι θεοί, παύσασθαι ἀνώγα." 405

"Ως ἐφαθ’ Ἀμφύνομος, τοῖς δ’ ἐπικτυδενε μύθους. αὐτὰκ ἐπειτ’ ἀναστάντες ἔβαν δόμον εἰς Ὀδυσσήος, ἐλθόντες δὲ καθίζον ἐπὶ ξεστοῖς θρόνοισιν. Ἡ δ’ αὐτ’ ἀλλ’ ἐνόησε περὶφρον Πηνελόπεια, μνησθῆρεσι φανήναι ὑπέρβιον ὦβριν ἔχουσιν πεύθετο γὰρ οὗ παιδὸς ἐνι μεγάροισι διεβρον κήρυξ γὰρ οἱ ἐείπε Μέδων, δε σεύθετο ὑπολάς. βῆ δ’ ἕναν μεγαρώοντε σὸν ἀμφιτόλοισι γυναιξιν. ἀλλ’ ὅτε Ἰ ἡ μνηστήρας ἄφικεν δία γυναικῶν, στῇ μα παρὰ σταθμὸν τέγεος πῦκα ποιητοί, ἀνά παρειάων σχοινέων λιπαρά κρήδεμα, 410


401. γένος is doubtless nominal. to ἐστι, the construction being personal: so 17. 15 φίλ’ ἅληθε αμφιτόλοισι, 17. 347. 403. θέματες ‘sentences,’ ‘oracles’ in the sense of answers to the question what ought to be done.

For θέματες there was an ancient v. l. τόμοις, preserved by Strabo. The word denoted the priests of Zeus at Dodona. It was doubtless brought into the Homeric text by some learned grammarian. 414-416. Repeated from 1. 332-334. The σταθμὸς τέγεος is generally taken to be the door-post of the μέγαρον: see the Appendix on the Homeric house.
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'Αντίνοον δ' ἐνένιπεν ἐπος τ' ἐφατ' ἐκ τ' ὄνομαζεν·
"'Αντίνο', ὁβριν ἔχων, κακομήχανε, καὶ δὲ σε φασίν
ἐν δήμῳ Ἰθάκης μεθ' ὁμήλικας ἔμμεν ἄριστον
βουλῆ καὶ μύθοισ' σὺ δ' οὐκ ἄρα τοῖς ἐσθα. μάργη, τὴ δὲ σύ Τηλεμάχῳ θάνατον τε μόρον τε
ῥάπτεις, οὐδ' ἱκέτας ἐμπάζεις, οἷον ἄρα Ζεὺς
μάρτυρος, οὐδ' ὁσὶν κακὰ ῥάπτειν ἀλλήλοισιν;
ἡ οὐκ ὁλὸς' δέ, δεύρο πατήρ τεῦς ἱκετο φεῦγων,
ὅπερ καθελόσατο λίνην, οἰ δ' ἡμῖν ἃρμοι ἤσαν.
τὸν Ῥ ἢθελὸν φθάσαι καὶ ἀπορράθαις φλὸν ἤτορ
ηδὲ κατὰ τὴν φαγεῖν μενοείκεα πολλὰ.'

428 φθάσαν vulg.: κτείναι X D U al.

417. ἐνένιπεν appears to be a form of the type of ἄνωγε, πέληγων, ἐγγύων, &c.; the p. stem with thematic endings (H. G. p. 307).
419. ἀρθμήλικας. The acc. with μετ' ἀμοιβας is rare except with verbs of motion. Possibly the convenience of ἀμοιβας for the metre had something to do with this extension of use.
422. ἱκέτας ἀμφάκεια. This cannot be applied to Telemachus, who was in no sense a 'suppliant' to the Suitors. It must refer to the story which Penelope proceeds to tell, about the father of Antinous coming as a suppliant (ἰεροῦ φίδων) to Ulysses, and receiving his protection; in consequence of which Antinous was bound by a sacred tie (ὁλὴ) to the house of Ulysses. Thus the sense is not 'you neglect (certain persons who are) suppliants,' but, more generally, 'you disregard the order or class of suppliants,'—the relation of suppliant and protector. Elsewhere ἄμφακεια takes a gen. of the person or thing that is cared for, as 19. 134 ὃς ἱκέτας ἄμφακειος ὡς ἱεράων. Possibly the use of the acc. marks this difference of meaning; as with ὀδὴ and μέμνημαι the acc. is used when the existence of a person or thing constitutes the fact known or remembered (H. G. § 140 (3), § 151 d). The ancients, who saw that Antinous, as representing his father, was the suppliant, met the difficulty by holding that ἱκέτας was a word of double meaning, and might denote the protector of the suppliant (viz. Ulysses or Telemachus), just as ἐξίνοις means 'host' as well as 'guest.' Of this, however, there is no other evidence.
423. It is best to put a comma only after μάρτυρος, since the sense is continuous: 'to whom Zeus is witness, and for whom it is impious to devise evil to one another,'—'who in the sight of Zeus ἱεράων are bound to be at peace with each other.'
428. ἀπορράθαις 'to smite away,' i.e. to take away with violence. The word is formed like ἀφαίρεω, ἀφαίρεσιν, ἀφαίρεσις (H. G. § 224); cp. 1. 404 κτῆμα ἀπορράθαις. Mr. T. L. Agar (Journ. of Phil. xxvi. 116) would restore ἀφεβίας, ἀφεφίν, supposing the words to be first sorites formed from the root which we have in ἀσφάλω, part. ἀσφαλέως, and perhaps also in the fut. ἀσφαλεῖσθαι in II. 32. 489—if we follow the reading and analysis suggested by Buttmann and adopted by Bekker and Curtius. The proposed tense, it is evident, would yield a very suitable sense in the context. On the other hand, there are considerable difficulties in regard to the form of the word. The point is, what is the root? If, as G. Meyer holds (G. G.
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ἀλλ' 'Οδυσσεύς κατέρμα καὶ ἔσχεθεν ἑμένους περ. τοῦ νῦν οἰκον ἄτιμον ἔδεις, μνάρα δὲ γυναῖκα
παῖδα τ' ἀποκτενέας, ἐμὲ δὲ μεγάλοις ἀκακίςεις-
ἀλλὰ σε παύσασθαι κέλομαι καὶ ἀνώγεμεν ἄλλους.'

Τὴν δ' αὐτ' Εὐρύμαχος, Πολύβον πάις, ἀντίον ἑδο-
"κοὐρη 'Ικαρίοιο, περὶφρον Πηνελόπεια,
θάρσει, μὴ τοι ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ σῆσοι μελῶντοι.
οὐκ ἔσθ' οὗτος ἄνηρ οὖδ' ἔσσεται οὖδὲ γένηται,
δὲ κεν Τηλεμάχο σὺ νεῖ ξεῖρας ἐποίει
ζώοντός γ' ἔμεθεν καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ δερκομένοιο.
ὁδε γὰρ ἔξερεν, καὶ μὴν τετελεσμένον ἔσται:
αὐξὴ οἱ αἴρα κελαίνων ἐρωθεὶ σερὶ δουρὶ
ἡμετέρῳ, ἐπεὶ ἦ καὶ ἐμὲ πτολίπορθος 'Οδυσσεύς
πολλάκις γοῦνεν οἷον ἑφεσάμενος κρέας ὑπὸν
ἐν χείρεσιν ἐθηκεν, ἐπέσχε τε οἷον ἐρυθρῷν.
τὸ μοι Τηλεμάχος πάντων πολὺ φιλτάτῳ ἔστων
ἀνδρῶν, οὐδὲ τί μιν θάνατον τρομεῖσθαι ἄνωγα
ἐκ γε μνηστήρων θεδθὲν δ' οὖκ ἔστ' ἀλέασθαι.'

"Ως φάτο θαρσύνων, τῷ δ' ἤρτεν αὐτὸς ἀλέθρον.
ἡ μὲν ἄρ' εἰσαναβασὸν ὑπερφεἰα συγαλεῖντα
κλαῖεν ἐπεὶ 'Οδυσσῆα, φιλον πόσιν, ὅφρα οἱ ὅπιοι
ἐδ yönetimπ' ἔμπορόσι βάλε γλαυκότης 'Αθήνη.
'Εσπερίου δ' 'Οδυσσῆι καὶ νεῖι δίοις υφόρμος
ἐλυθεν' οἱ δ' ἄρα δόρπον ἐπισταθὼν ὑπλίζοντο,
σὺν ἑρέμουσας ἐνιαύσιοι: αὐτὰρ Ἀθήνη

432 ἤρει θ' Γ: ἤρει τε ΠΗΧαλ., Ευστ. 433 παύσασθαι ΓΡΗ. 434 Πολύβον
παῖς] ποιητικός ΓΥαλ.
ἀγχίπαρισταμένη Δαυερίναθη Ὀδυσσῆ 
ράβδῳ πεπληγνοῦσα πάλιν ποίησε γέροντα,
λυγρά δὲ εἰμάτα ἔσσε περὶ χροῖ, μῆ ἐ σύβατης
γυνῆ ἐσάντα ἵδων καὶ ἐχέφροι. Πηνελοπέη
ἔλθει ἀπαγγέλλων μηδὲ φρεσίν εἰρύσσατο.

Τὸν καὶ Τηλέμαχος πρότερος πρὸς μῦθον ἔστα
"ἦλθες, δι' Ἑδμαίε. τῇ δ' κλέος ἔστι' ἀνά ὄστο; 
ἡ ρ' ἡ δ' μνηστῆρες ἀγνόρες ἵδων ἔσσιν
ἐκ λόχου, ἡ ἐτὶ μ' αὐθ' εἰρύσσατι οἴκαδ' ἵντα;
" 
Τὸν δ' ἀπαμέμβομεν προσέφης, Ἑδμαίε συμβοτα:
"οὐκ ἐμελέν μοι ταύτα μεταλλήσαι καὶ ἐρέσθαι
ἀστὺ καταβλέσκοντα τάχιστα με ὑμῖν ἀνέγει
ἀγγελὴν εἰπώντα πάλιν δεῦρ' ἀπονεέσθαι.
ἀμήρησε δὲ μοι παρ' ἐταράν ἀγγελός ὁκός,
κῆρυξ, δὴ δ' πρῶτος ἔστος σῇ μητρὶ ἔστεπι.
ἀλλο δὲ τοῖς τόδε οἶδα: τὸ γὰρ ἵδων ὀφθαλμοῖς
ἡδ' ὑπὲρ πολίος, δὴθ' ὦ ᾿Ερμαίος λόφος ἐστών,
ἁ κιών, δὲτη νῆα θοῦν ἱδόμην κατιοῦσαν
ἐς λιμέν' ἠμέτρον πολλοὶ δ' ἔσαν ἄνδρες ἐν αὐτῇ,
βεβρίθη δὲ σάκεσι καὶ ἐγχεσιν ἀμφιγύοισιν.

461 δι' Ἑδμαίε G U P: δ', Ἑδμαίε vulg. 462 ἐμ' vulg. editors generally write δ' but the disjunctive δ—δ' seems in place here. 463 ἐμ' vulg.: ἐμ' G F U al. εἰπόνταν: perhaps ἐιπόντο 'were they guarding (when you heard)?' οἴκαδ' ἱδώσι: ἵδων ἱδώσι ν. 466 ἄναγεi G al.: ἄναγεν vulg. 470 τόδε vulg.: τὸ γε Ἡ ᾿J al.

459. εἰπόνταν 'keep safe': the aorist because 'keeping silence' is thought of as a single act or exercise of will.
463. ἐμ' 'in the same place,' 'as before' (not 'yonder,' as some commentators translate). The reading ἐμ' (i.e. ἐμ' 'on the other hand,' 'instead') is not so pointed.
εἰπόταν 'keep in guard!': the word is properly used of protection, but here ironically of men watching with hostile purpose.
The reading ἵδων ἱδώτα is plausible: but after ἵδων ἱδώτα in the preceding line it is somewhat too epigrammatic for Homer.

466. καταβλέσκοντα 'as I went down through.' The acc., notwithstanding μοι, to show that it goes with the infinitives μεταλλήσαι καὶ ἐχέρθαι: H. C. § 240.
τάχιστα μα κτλ. The asyndeton is expository, the clause being put as a re-state-ment: 'I did not care to ask about this:—my desire was &c.' See on 14. 217., 15. 317., 18. 278.
ἀνάγεν, plpf.: a past tense is required to correspond with ἐμελέν.
470. τόδε 'this' (which I am going to tell): the reading τὸ γε is less appropriate.
474. ἀμφιγύοισι. It is uncertain, according to Helbig (Das hom. Epis'.
καὶ σφέας ὀάσθην τοὺς ἐμμεναι, οὐδὲ τι ὤδα.” 475

"Ὡς φάτο, μείδησεν δ' ἱερὴ ἢς Τηλεμάχου ἐς πατέρ' ὀρθαλμοῖσιν ἰδὼν, ἀλέεινε δ' ύφορβᾶν.

Οὐ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν παύσαντο πόλυν τετῦκοντο τε δαιτα, δαίνυντ', οὐδὲ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἐίσης. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἐντο, 480

κοίτου τε μνήσαντο καὶ θυμὸν δῷρον ἐλοντο.

p. 245), whether this epithet means that the spears were sharp at the butt end as well as the point, or that the spear heads were sharp on both sides (like the blade of a two-edged sword). Mr. Myres decides in favour of the second alternative. 'There are some specimens of the Mycenaean σαυροτήρ, but they are rare, and not the least like the head of the lance. Nor do the monuments show Mycenaean spears as double-ended, but rather with a butt. On the other hand the Mycenaean (and especially the late Mycenaean and Iron Age) lance-head is decidedly two-edged, with two 'hollow-ground' cutting blades and a tubular mid-rib' (see Tsountas and Manatt, fig. 90). It may be noticed also that in Homer the word σαυροτήρ only occurs in the Doloneia.

From a vase, probably of the seventh century, in the Capitoline Museum at Rome.
Δυσιππονί “Ερμαίοι πάλιν πολεισθενείν τόμον τιμότε θεὸν ἡμῖν, καὶ τιμήσατε τὸν θεόν καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους πάντα ἁγιάζοντες ἆποιεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς ἐνεπληκτεῖτε. Τόν καὶ τῆς ἐνεπληκτείς πρὸς μοῦ ἕστη λέγεις, γενέσθαι τὰ ἁγιά παράθεται. Ἐκ τῆς ἀνάλογης θυσίας ἐκπροσώπων “οὐκ ἐμελέτης ὠδήν μοι τάστικα μεταλλήσαι καὶ ἑρεθθαί ἀστυ καταβλάσοκοντας· τάχιστα μεθευμένος ἐγείρεται ἀνώγει ἀνώγειν ἐπίφορτα πάλιν δεύρ’ ἀπονέεσθαι. ἀμήρητα δὲ μοι παρ’ ἑταίρων ἄγγελος ὄνος, κίρυς, ὅποι δὴ πρῶτος ἐποίησεν σὴν μητρὶ θείον ἐξέδοσε. ἀλλο τὸ πάντων ὠδήν ὑπὸ τὸ γὰρ ἱδιὸν ὀρθολογοῦν· ἡ ἡνυπὸ πόλιος, ὡς ἂν ἦν ἡ ἑσότερον καταδικάζων ἐκ λιμενὶ ἡμετέρον πολλοὶ δ’ ἐσαν ἀνδρεὶς ἐν αὐτῇ, βεβριέθη δὲ σάκεισι καὶ ἐγχεισιν ἀμφιγόησιν.

461 δὴ Ἐδμαίε G U P: δή, Ἐδμαίε vulg. 462 ἡ β’ editors generally write ἡ β’; but the disjunctive ἡ—ἡ seems in place here. 463 ἁδ’ vulg.: ἁδ’ G F U al. εἴπαται] perhaps ἐφέρατο ‘were they guarding (when you heard)?’ βαλλεῖν ἰώστα] ἵδιν οὖσα καὶ. 466 ἡν ἔγειρεν G al.; οὖσα vulg. 470 τοῦ τῆς Ἡ Ἡ al.
The text is not legible due to the quality of the image. It appears to be a page from a book or a document, but the content cannot be accurately transcribed.
Τηλεμάχου ἐπάνοδος εἰς Ἰθακήν.

Ἱμος δ' ἠργύεισα φάνη ἰδοδάκτυλος Ἰνας,
ὅτα τὸν ἔπειθ᾽ ὑπὸ ποσεῖν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα
Τηλεμάχος, φίλος νῦν Ὀδυσσής θεῖος,
εἰπετο δ' ἀλκίμων ἔγχος, δ' οἱ παλάμηθιν ἀρήμει,
ἀστυδε ἱέμενος, καὶ ἐὰν προσεῖπε συβώτην·
"ἀπ', ἢ τοι μὲν ἐγὼν εἰμ' ἐς πόλιν, ὅφρα με μήτηρ
δῆσαι· οὐ γὰρ μιν πρόσθεν παύσεσθαι ὁ διὸ
κλαυθμὸς τε στυγεροῖο γύδοι τε δακρυδέντος,
πρὶν γ' αὐτῷ με ἔθηται· ἀτὰρ σοι γ' ἂδ' ἐπιτέλλω.
τὸν ξείνον δύστηνν αὖ' ἐς πόλιν, ὅφρα αὐτῷ ἐκεῖθε
δαίτα πτωχεύῃ· δῶσε αὐτῷ εἰς κ' ἐθέλησε
ποῦρον καὶ κούλην· ἐμὲ δ' οὖ πὼς ἔστιν ἀπαντας
ἀνθρώπους ἀνέχεσθαι, ἔχοντά περ ἀλγεα βυθοῦ.
ὁ ξείνος δ' εἶ περ μᾶλα μνηνεί, ἀλγουν αὐτῷ
δῆσεται· ἢ γὰρ ἐμοὶ φίλ' ἀληθεϊα μνησίσσαθαι."
17. ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ Ρ

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσέως·

"ἀ φίλος, οὐδὲ τοι αὐτὸς ἐρίκεσθαι μενεαίνων·

πτωχὸ βέλτερον ἐστὶ κατὰ πτόλιν ἡ κατ' ἀγροὺς
dαιτα πτωχεύειν· δῶσει δὲ μοι δς κ' ἐθέλουσιν.

οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ σταθμοῖς μενεῖν ἐτὶ τηλίκως εἰμὶ,

ὡς τε ἐπιτειλαμένῳ σημάντορι πάντα πιθέσθαι

ἀλλ' ἐρχεῖν ἐμὲ δ' ἄξει ἀνήρ δὲ, τὸν σφ κελεύεις,

αὐτίκ' ἐπεί κε πυρὸς θερέω ἀλή τε γένηται.

αἰώνας γὰρ τάδε εἰμιν' ἔχω κακά· μή με δαμάσῃ

στήξῃ ὑποήθη ἐκαθὲν δὲ τε ἄστου φᾶτ' εἶναι."

Ὡς φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ διὰ σταθμοῦ βεβήκει,

κρατινὰ ποσὶ προβιβᾶς, κακὰ δὲ μνηστήρισι φότευν.

αὐτὰρ ἔπει β' ἦκαν δόμους εὐ ναετάντος,

ἐγγος μὲν β' ἐστησε φέρον πρὸς κίονα μακρήν,

αὐτὸς δ' εἶσαι λεγ. κἀν ὑπέρβη λαίνων οὐδῶν.

Τὸν δὲ πολὺ πρώτη εἰδε τροφὸς Εὐρύκλεια,

κάκεα καστορνύσα θρόνωι εἰς δαιδαλίωι,

δακρύσασα δ' ἔπει τ' ὁδοί κίεν ἀμφε δ' ἄρ' ἄλλα

διμφαὶ Ὀδυσσός ταλασίρουνς ἠγερέθοντο,

καὶ κύνεον ἀγαπάζομενα κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ὅμους.

'Ἡ δ' εἶν ἐκ βαλάμου περίφρον Πηνελόπεια,

17 οὐδὲ τοι αὐτός Φ Χ έλ., Ευστ.: οὐδ' αὐτός τοι vulg. 25 ἡ κανύλη ἐπηθη

Sch. H.: see on 16. 195. 26 δὲι δὲι G U al. 29 ἐγγος μὲν στήσε πρὸς

κίονα μακρόν δρέιας G al.: ἐγγος μὲν β' ἐστησε φέρον πρὸς κίονα μακρόν δρέιας X,

doubtless from 8. 66, 473. The reading of G was probably a correction of this

unmetrical line.

21. ἃν τ'...πιθέσθαι. This is not

properly an instance of the Attic use of

ὅτε with an inf., since πιθέσθαι carries

on the construction of μὲνειν (inf. of

consequence after τῆλικος). Similarly in

Π. 9. 42 ἐκτίσσαται δὲ τε νίσθαι the inf.

is governed by ἐκτίσσαται. But these

instances show how the later Attic con-

struction must have originated.

23. θέρεω is regarded by Curtius

(Verb. ii. 334) as the subj. of a pass.

στ. θέρημαι. But from θέρεω (θέρεωσι,

θέρεοι) the regular form would be θερεῖο.

Perhaps there was a present θέρεω (like

πέλεω, &c.), with intrans. meaning.

اتفاق is said to mean 'the sun's

warmth,' i.e. the heat of the day. It is

doubtless connected with ἀφθαρσία, but not (surely) with σέλαια or Lat. sol.

29. This line may be taken as showing

that the δωροδόσης or receptacle for

spears was outside the μάγαρον. So in

16. 40 Telemachus gives his spear to

Eumaeus and then crosses the threshold:

cp. i. 128. The column used for this

purpose was doubtless one of those

which formed the πρόδρομος.

35. κύνων. The metrical lengthening

of -ον,-ον (3 plur.) is not found in

the Iliad except in the Catalogue. For

the Odyssey cp. 7. 341., 9. 413., 16. 350.,

Δρέμιδι ἴκελη ἡ χρυσὴ Ἀφροδίτη,
ἀμφὶ δὲ παιδὶ φίλῳ βάλε πῆχες δακρύσασα,
κύσσε δὲ μιν κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλά,
καὶ β' ὄλοφυρομένη ἦταν πτερύγεια προσηνύμα

"ἡλθες, Τηλέμαχε, γλυκερὸν φῶς. οὔ σ' ἐτ' ἔγγυε
ὄψονται ἐφάμην, ἐπεὶ φίλοι νη Πόλυνδε
λάθρη, ἐμὲν ἀέκτη, φίλου μετὰ πατρὸς ἁκοῦν.
ἀλλ' ἄγα μιν κατάλεξον δῶς ἡπιος ὑπόπτης."

Τὴν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίς ὑδά

"μὴ ἄρ ἡμὶ, μὴ μιν γόνω δραίης μηδὲ μοι ἦτορ
ἐν στήθισιν ὅρινε φυγότι περ αἰτὴν ὀλεθρόν
ἀλλ' ὀδηγημένη, καθάρα χροὶ ἐμαθ' ἐλὔσα,
[εἰς ὑπέρφ' ἀναβάσα σὺν ἀμφιπόλουσι γυναῖξιν]
ἐβέθη πάσι θεοῖς τελέσασα ἐκατόμβαθα
ἐξεῖν, αἱ κέ πολεί Ζεός ἀντίτη ἔργα τελέσῃ.
αὐτὰρ ἔγων ἀγορηθῆ ἐλεύσομαι, δόρα καλέσω
ζεῖνον, διὸς μιν κείθεν ἀμ' ἐσπερτὸ διὸρο κῶντι.
τὸν μὲν ἔγω προὔπεμψα σὺν ἀντιθέους ἐτάρουσι,
Πείραιον δὲ μιν ἡμῶνα προτί ὀδίκον ἀγνοτα

44. 'How thou hast gained sight of
him,' i.e. Ε. F. H. X. U. al.; see (sic) P. 46 μὴ του Ευστ., 49 om.
vulg.: cp. 4. 751. 42 ἀγορηθῆ ἐλεύσομαι Aristophanes: ἀγορηθῆ ἐλεύσομαι F: ἀγορηθῆ ἐλεύσομαι Ar., J H'; ἀγορηθῆ ἔσπλατ- G H U. al.; ἀγορηθῆ ἔσπλατ- P. Thus ἀγορηθῆ has the strongest ancient support, while the variety in the MSS. points to the simple ἐλεύσομαι. Cp. Od. 1. 88, II. 6. 365.

45. ἡ G Eust. al.; ἡ F H X U al.; ἡ F H X U al.; see (sic) P. 46 μὴ του Ευστ., 49 om.

46-56. Ameis justly directs attention to the dramatic truth and propriety of this speech. Telemachus is still under the influence of the recognition scene, and is oppressed by the great secret of his father's presence in Ithaca. Consequently his reply to Penelope is brief and troubled. As she afterwards complains (II. 104-106), he does not answer her question, or even tell her whether he has news of Ulysses or not. He bids her make vows to the immortals, and offer hecatombs if Zeus will grant retribution. This is like the answer of Hector when he was met at the Scaean gate by the Trojan women, who asked about their husbands and brothers (II. 6. 240 δ' ἐνήπτα θεοὶ ἐναντα ἄνεγες πᾶσας ζεῖσιν). It was perhaps a recognized formula for refusing to say anything. Telemachus then pleads that he must hasten to the ἀγορᾶ. It is only on his return, and when he has had time to collect himself, that he is ready to give Penelope a connected story of his journey.

47. φυγοῦντι περ 'even when I have escaped': see on I. 13 (supra).

53. άτα is used, instead of ὅς, of the comparatively unknown stranger: 'one that followed' (whoever he was).

55. μὲν is governed by ἄγοντα φίλειν.

It is placed early in the sentence according to the general rule; as to which see H. C. § 365.
17. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ρ

ένδυκεώς φιλέειν καὶ τιέμεν, εἰς δ' κεν ἐλθῶ.

"Ως ἀρ’ ἐφώνησεν, τῇ δ’ ἀπερόσ ἐπλετό μύθος.
ἡ δ’ ὤδημαμένη, καθαρὰ χροῖ εἰμαθ’ ἐλύσα,
ἐκχέτο πάσι θεοίσει τελεσσασ ἐκατέμβα
μέξειν, α’ κε ποθε Ζεδ’ ἀντίτα ἔργα τελεσσαί.

Τηλέμαχος δ’ ἀρ’ ἐπείτα διέκ μεγάροι βεβήκει
ἐγχός ἔχον, ἀμα τῷ γε δῶ ἑνὸς ἄργοι ἐπόντο.
θεσπείην δ’ ἄρα τῷ γε χάριν κατέχεις ’Αθηνη-
τόν δ’ ἅρα πάντες λαὸ ἐπερχόμενον θηνύτε.
ἀμφι δὲ μνηστηρες ἀγήνορες ἢγερέσουν
ἔσθλ’ ἀγορένοντες, κακὰ δὲ φρεσί θυσοδόμενον.

αὐτὰρ ὁ τῶν μὲν ἐπείτα ἀλεύτατο πουλῶν ὅμιλον,
ἀλλ’ ἵνα Μέντωρ ἤστο καὶ "Ἀντιφος ἢ’ Ἀλιβέρσης,
οἱ τε οἱ ἐμ ἄρχης πατρῶι ἡς ἐκάτοροι,
ἐνθα καθεζε’ λῶν τοι δ’ ἐξερείειν έκαστα.

τοῖσι δὲ Πειραιοὶ δουρικλῦτος ἐγγύθεν ἡλθε
ζεύγον ἄγον ἀγορήνδε διὰ πτόλυν’ οὐδ’ ἀρ’ ἐτὶ δὴν

60 τελεσσαί: Hermann Op. 1. 287: τελέσσῃ MSS.

62 δῶν κῦσε ἄργοι U: πῦνε σῶδα ἄργοι vulg. See 2.11.

56. ᾧθο, subj. notwithstanding the past tense ἴψα, because the action is future at the time of speaking. But in l. 60 Hermann’s τελεσσαί, for the τελεσσαί of the MSS., is necessary.

57. τῇ δ’ ἀπερόσ ἐπλετό μύθος is generally taken to mean that the speech stayed in the mind, was not forgotten or neglected. But ἵνα πτερόντα, the Epic phrase upon which this one is evidently founded, means words uttered, not words that fly away and are lost; and similarly ἀπερόσ μύθος must be an unspoken word. Hence ‘her speech took not wings’ means simply that she heard in silence. Cp. 12. 254 πάλιν δ’ γε λάθετο μύθον ‘he took back his (unspoken) word,’ i.e. did not utter what he thought; and the common phrases ἔχειν in ἄργοι μύθοι, ἔχειν στηγ’ μύθον, &c.

62-64. = 2.11-13, a description of Telemachus going from his house to the ἀγών. Hence ἔχον ἔχον is not to be pressed as implying that he had his spear within the µέγαρον: cp. the note on l. 29.

66. βυσσοδόμενον, the indic. instead of a participle, by a species of parataxis; cp. 1. 162., 16. 6, 10.1., 19. 368, II. 3. 80.

67. πουλῶν is a very doubtful form: the lengthening is only definable metri gratia, viz. only in such words as πουλῶ-

68. πουλῶδος, πουλοβοῖτηρα, which cannot otherwise be scanned. πουλῶν and πουλῶν occur in nine places in Homer. Schulze (Quaest. Ἐπ. p. 447) has pointed out the curious facts (1) that in five of these places the word is feminine, and (2) that the neut. πουλῶ is only found in one place, Od. 19. 387, and there only in a few MSS.; whereas in later epic poets it is quite common. Hence he infers that the masc. πουλών and πουλῶν are corrupted from πολλῶν, πολλῶν.

72. οὐδ’ ἀρ’ ἐπὶ δὴν κτλ. is a litotes, meaning that he did not turn away at all: cp. II. 16. 736 οὐδ’ δὴν χάζετο φωτὸς ‘it did not long give way from,’ = ‘was quick in reaching the man.’

H 2


16. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Π

Ημεῖς δ’ ἐνθάδε οἱ φραζόμεθα λυγρῶν ὀλέθρων Τηλεμάχῳ, μηδ’ ἡμᾶς ὑπεκφύγοιοι οὐ γὰρ ὅπως τοῦτο γε ζῶντος ἀνύσσεθαι τάδε ἔργα. αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἐπιστήμων βουλῇ τε νῦν, λαόν δ’ οὐκέτι πάμπαν ἐφ’ ἡμῖν ἦρα φέρουσιν. ἀλλ’ ἀγετε, πρὶν κεῖνον ὁμηγυρίσασθαι Ἀχαίοις εἰς ἀγορῆ—οὐ γὰρ τι μεθεσμέναλ μην ὅτω, ἀλλὰ ἀπομηνίζει, ἐρέει δ’ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀναστάσις οὐκεκα οἱ φόνοι αὐτῶν ἐράπτομεν οὐδ’ ἐκίχημεν· οἱ δ’ οὐκ αἰνησοῦσιν ἀκοῦντες κακὰ ἔργα· μὴ τι κακῶν βέβους καὶ ἡμέας ἐξελάσσοι γαλής ἡμετέρης, ἀλλὰν δ’ ἀφικόμεθα δημον· ἀλλὰ φθέωμεν ἐλύντες ἐπ’ ἀγροῦ νόσφα πάλης ἢ ἐν ὀξύν· βίοτον δ’ αὐτοὶ καὶ κτήματ’ ἐξωμεν, δασσάμενοι κατὰ μοίραν ἐφ’ ἡμέας, οἰκία δ’ αὐτὲ

κεῖνον μητέρι βοίμεν ἔχειν ἢ δ’ ὑπὶ τις ὀπικοὶ. εἰ δ’ ὑμῖν δὲ μῦθος ἄφανδαι, ἀλλὰ βόλεσθε αὐτῶν τε ἔσειν καὶ ἔχειν πατρώια πάντα, μὴ οἱ χρήματ’ ἐπειτα ἄλισ θυμῆδε’ ἐδωμεν ἐνθάδε’ ἀγειρόμενοι, ἀλλ’ ἐκ μεγάρου ἐκαστος

372 ἡμαὶ] a form only found here; read ἀμμε. 387 βόλεσθε G U*: βόλεσθε vulg. 389 θυμῆδε Bekker: but θυμαρ’ would be more Homeric. The form θυμῆδος must be later: in Homer it would be θυμοφαθής.

αὐτῶν οἱ θανάτων μερίσσωμαι. Π. 11. 141 ἀδη καταστείλαι μὴ’ ἐξέμεν δὴ ἐς Ἀχαίοις, &c. For the combination αὐτῶν ἔλαντες cp. Od. 18. 91 ἀδη’ ἐλλόντα ‘even as he falls.’

375. οὐκέτι πάμπαν,—‘do not now at all.’ So in Attic οὐ πάνι—‘not at all.’ This idiom is originally a litotes, like our ironical ‘hardly,’ ‘rather,’ &c.; see Riddell’s Digest, § 139.

On the phrase ἐπ’ ἡμαὶ φέρουν see the note on 3. 164.

376. ἀλλ’ ἀγετε κτλ. The sentence is taken up again in 383 ἀλλὰ φθέωμεν κτλ.

380. οὐκ αἰνησοῦσιν, a litotes, = ‘will resent.’

385. ἐφ’ ἡμαὶ ‘among us’: ἐπ’ nearly as in 1. 365.

386. θοίμεν is concessive, i.e. it expresses, not a direct purpose (like ἐξωμεν), but a part of the plan to be acquired in. 387. ἄφανδαι cannot be ἄφανδαι in Homer, since ἄφαντα has the F. The form ἄφανδαι, proposed by Dr. Hay- man, is against analogy, the prefix ἄ- not being used with verbs (for ἄντει in Theogn. 611 is a word coined for the nonce). Is it possible that ἄφανδαι contains the preposition ἄ, Sanscr. ᾧ, Lat. ad (in af, of, afo)? See Delbrück, Grundriß III. 670. Βόλεσθε is perhaps an aor.: cp. 1. 234 νῦν δ’ ἐπτερῷ ἐβλάστα τειλ, where an aor. is required by the sense.

390. ἐκ μεγάρου ἐκαστος ‘each from his own hall.’ ἐκ μεγάρου goes with μετὰ ἄνδον, words that imply sending ἓνα, or at least offers of ἓνα, from the several houses. Cp. 19. 256 ἐκ τοῦ πόρου] ἐκ θαλάμου.
οι 'Αμφίνομος ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν,
Νίκου φαιδίμοι νῦν, Ἀρητιάδαο ἄνακτος,
δ' ἐκ Δουλικίων πολυπύρου ποιήσατο
ἥγεσσι τοιγίν ἄχην ἐγένοντο σιωπῆ.
τοῖς δ' ἀρν ἔμεθα, ὥσπερ γὰρ θάρρη', ἀγαθοῖς
ὅ σφιν ἐφοροῦεν ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν
"οἱ φίλοι, οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ γατάκτεινειν ἐθέλομι
Τηλέμαχον δειμων δὲ γένος βασιλῆιὸν ἐστι
cτεινειν ἀλλ' πρῶτα ἕως εἰρομενα βουλᾶς.
εἰ μὲν κ' αὐτῆσοι Δίὸς μεγάλοιο θέμαστε,
αὐτοὶ τε κτενεὸς τοὺ' τ' ἄλλους πάντας ἀνάβο
ἐκ δὲ ἀποτρωπάσωι θεοί, παῦσασθαι ἄνωγα.
"Ομ έφατ' 'Αμφίνομος, τοίς δ' ἐπιθήναι μῦθοις.
αὐτικ' ἔπειτα ἀντάλλατες ἔβαν ὅμων εἰς Ὀδύσσος,
ἐλθόντες δὲ καβύζον ἐπὶ ξέστοιοι θρόνοισιν.
'Η δ' αὐτ' ἄλλ' ἐνόσει περὶφραον Πηνελόπεια,
μνημόσυνοι φανήναι ὑπέρβιον ὅμηρον ἔχουσιν
πεῦθετο γὰρ οὐ παιδὸς ἐνι μεγάροις ὄλεθρον
κηρὺς γὰρ οὐ ἔστε Μέδων, ὦ ἐπεθύτητο βουλᾶς.
βῆ δ' ἵναι μέγαρόνδε σὺν ἄμφιπλοιοι γυναιξιν.
ἄλλα δὲ ὅτε μνηστήρας ἀφέκετο δία γυναικῶν,
στῇ ρα παρὰ σταθμῶν τέγεος πύκα ποιητοῖο,
ἀντα παρειάων σχομένη λιπαρὰ κρήδεμνα,

392 διεῇ] δὲ τις G U al. (cp. 21, 162).
393 δεινόν] χαλεπάν G. 403 δέματε]
tόμου ροι τινές (Strab. vii. p. 328).
405 ἀποτρωπᾶσοι vulg.: ἀποτρωπῶσι M,
perhaps rightly, the verb being ῥοπᾶ, not ῥοπᾶ.
408 θρόνοισιν F D U
Kust.: λίθοιοι G P H al.

401. γένος is doubtless nom. to ἔστιν,
the construction being personal: so 17. 15 φίλ' ἄλθεα μυθήσατι, 17. 347.
403. δέματε 'sentences,' 'oracles'
in the sense of answers to the question
what ought to be done.
For δέματε there was an ancient
v. l. Τόμουροι, preserved by Strabo.

The word denoted the priests of Zeus
at Dodona. It was doubtless brought
into the Homeric text by some learned
grammarian.
The σταθμῶν τέγεος is generally taken
to be the door-post of the μέγαρον: see
the Appendix on the Homeric house.
16. ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ Π

'Αντίνοον δ' ἐνενίπτεν ἐποσ τ' ἐφατ' ἐκ τ' ὄντωμας.

"'Αντίνοον, ὦ θεί, ἔχων, κακομήχανε, καὶ δὲ σὲ φαείν ἐν δήμῳ Ἰθάκης μεθ' ὀμήλικας ἔμενε ἄριστον βουλῇ καὶ μύδοισι: σὺ δ' ὦκ ἄρα τοῖσ ἐξοῦς. 420

μᾶργε, τί θὰ σὺ Τηλεμάχῳ θάνατον τε μόρον τε ράπτεις, οὐδ' ἰκέτας ἐμπάζεις, οὐδὶ αὐξα Ζεὺς μάρτυρος, οὐδ' ὅση κακὰ ράπτειν ἀλλήλουσίν;

ἡ οὐκ ὃσθ' θεί, δεῦρο πατήρ τεδ' ἰκετε φεύγων, δήμον ὑποδέιας; δή γὰρ κεχολάτο λήνη, 425

οβενκα ληστήριαν ἐπιστόμενος Ταφλίων ἥκαξε Θεοπροτοῦς, οἰ δ' ἡμῖν ἄρβαιοι ἤγαν. τὸν β' ἐθελον φθεῖαι καὶ ἀπορρᾶαι φίλον ἦτορ ὡδὲ κατὰ ζωῆν φαγέειν μενοεἰκέα πολλήν·

428 φθείαι vulg.: κτείναι X D U al.

417. ἐνενίπτεν appears to be a form of the type of ἄνωγε, πένθερον, ἐγκύσω, &c., &c. a pf. stem with thematic endings (H. G. p. 397).

419. μηθ' ὀμήλικας. The acc. with μετὰ 'among' is rare except with verbs of motion. Possibly the convenience of ὀμήλικας for the metre had something to do with this extension of use.

422. ἰκέτας ἤμπτεσσα. This cannot be applied to Telemachus, who was in no sense a 'suppliant' to the Suitors. It must refer to the story which Penelope proceeds to tell, about the father of Antinous coming as a suppliant (ἰετορ ἠγεύτων) to Ulysses, and receiving his protection; in consequence of which Antinous was bound by a sacred tie (ὁδῆν) to the house of Ulysses. Thus the sense is not 'you neglect (certain persons who are) suppliants,' but, more generally, 'you disregard the order or class of suppliants,'—the relation of suppliant and protector. Elsewhere ἤμπτεσσας takes a gen. of the person or thing that is cared for, as 19. 134 οτε ἐξενοῦ ἄνωθεν ἤμπτεσσας. Possibly the use of the acc. marks this difference of meaning; as with οδῆν and μελωμας the acc. is used when the existence of a person or thing constitutes the fact known or remembered (H. G. § 140 (3), § 151 d). The ancients, who saw that Antinous, as representing his father, was the suppliant, met the difficulty by holding that ἰκέτας was a word of double meaning, and might denote the protector of the suppliant (viz. Ulysses or Telemachus), just as ἐξενοῦ meant 'host' as well as 'guest.' Of this, however, there is no other evidence.

423. It is best to put a comma only after μάρτυρος, since the sense is continuous: 'to whom Zeus is witness, and for whom it is impious to devise evil to one another,'—'who in the sight of Zeus ἱερεύνοισι are bound to be at peace with each other.'

428. ἀπορρᾶαι 'to smile away,' i.e. to take away with violence. The word is formed like ἀποδόσα, ἀπορρῆσιν, ἀνοφανήτως (H. G. § 234); cp. I. 404 καθμας ἀπορρᾶσιν. Mr. T. L. Agar (Journ. of Phil. xxvi. 116) would restore ἀποφῆσαι, ἀποφήσεις, supposing the words to be first aorists formed from the root which we have in ἀναφές, ἀναφές, and perhaps also in the fut. ἀναφήσοντως in ii. 32. 489—if we follow the reading and analysis suggested by Buttmann and adopted by Bekker and Curtius. The proposed tense, it is evident, would yield a very suitable sense in the context. On the other hand there are considerable difficulties in regard to the form of the word. The point is, what is the root? If, as G. Meyer holds (G. G.)
τοῦν νῦν οἷκον ἄτιμον ἐδείς, μνάρα δὲ γυναῖκα παῖδα τ' ἀποκτενεῖς, ἔμε δὲ μεγάλως ἄκαχίζεις· ἀλλά σε παύσασθαι κέλομαι καὶ ἀνωγέμεν ἄλλους."  

Τὴν δ' αὐτ' Εὐφράμαχος, Πολέβου πάις, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡδα: "κοβρή Ἰκαρίοιο, περίφρον Πηνελόπεια, θάρσει: μὴ τοι ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ σῇς μελόντων. οὐκ ἔστοι οὖτος ἄνηρ οὖθ' ἐσσται οὐδὲ γένηται, ὥσ' κεν Τηλέμαχο φῶνει· χεῖρας ἐποίησεν ὀφντός γ' ἐμέθεν καὶ εἶπ· χθονὶ δερκομένου. οἴδι γὰρ ἐξερέω, καὶ μὴν τετελεσμένον ἔσται· αἰγαὶ οἱ αἷμα κελαίδον ἐρωθεὶ περὶ δωρὶ ημετέρῳ, ἔπει δ' καὶ ἐμὲ πτολίπορος ὦθυσεν εὐθὺς ἀκαʔίζεις ἐξίτους ἐνεχθήσας εὐθέσει τε οἷον ἐρυθρῶν.

τὰ μοι Τηλέμαχο πάντων πολὺ φιλητός ἔστιν ἀνδρῶν, οὐδὲ τέ μιν ἄνατον τρομεσθεῖαν ἀνώγα ἐκ γε μνηστήρων· θέσθεν δ' οὖκ ἔστι· ἀλέασθαι."  

"Ως φάτο θαρσύνων, τῷ δ' ἡρτυν οὖτος ὀλέθρον. ἡ μὲν ἄρ' εἰςαναβάς ὑπερφαί συγκαλέντα κλαίειν ἐπειτ' ὄνομα, φίλων πόσις, ὅφρα οἱ ὕπνων ἡδίν ἐπὶ βλεφάρετοι βάλε γλαυκάπες Ἀθηνή. Ὑπόνοσ δ' ὄνομα· καὶ νεῖτ' διὸς υφορὸς ἠλθεν· οὐ δ' ἀρα δόρων ἐπιστατῶν ὀπλίζοντο, σὺν ἐρεύναντες ἐναισθιον. αὐτὰρ Ἀθηνή

16. ΟΔΗΣΕΙΑΣ Π

άγχη παρισταμένη Δαερητάδν Οδυσσήα 455
ράβδῳ πεπληγνιᾳ πάλιν ποίησε γέρωντα,
λυγρά δὲ εἴματα ἔσσε περὶ χροῦ, μὴ ε ὕποβαθη
gνοῆ ἐσάντα ἱδὼν καὶ ἑκέφροιν Πνευμοπείγε
ἔλθοι ἀπαγγέλλων μηδὲ φρεσοὶ είρυσσατο.

Τὸν καὶ Τηλέμαχος πρὸτερος πρὸς μίθον έειπεν 460
"ξίλεσ, δι' Εἴμαιε. τί δὴ κλέος ἐστ' ἀνδ ἄστυ;
ἡ ἡ' ἡδ' μνημήτερες αγήνορες ἱδὼν ἔασιν
ἐκ λόχου, ἡ ἐτὶ μ' αὐθ' εἰρύσται οἴκαδ' ἱόντα;"

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμείβομενος προσέφησ, Εἴμαιε συβοτα·
"οὐκ εἴμελέν μοι ταύτα μεταλλήσαι καὶ ἔρεσθαι 465
ἀστι καταβλάσκοντα τάχιστα με τυμὸς ἀνώγει
ἀγγελιν εἰπόντα πάλιν δεῦρ' ἀπονέεσθαι.
ἀμήρησε δὲ μοι παρ' ἐταύροιν ἀγγελος ἀκός,
κῆρυξ· δὴ πρότος ἔποσ σὺ μήτρι εἰπεν.
ἐκλε δὲ τοι τόδε οἶδα· τὸ γαρ ἱδὼν ὀφθαλμοίσων·
ἡδ' ύπὲρ πόλιος, δοθ' θ' "Εἴμαιες λόφος ἑστίν,
ἕκα κιόν, ὅτε νὴα θοὴν ἱδόμην κατίποιαν
ἐς λιμέν' ἁμέτερον πολλοὶ δ' ἔσαν ἄνδρες ἐν αὐτῇ,
βεβριθεὶ δὲ σάκεσαι καὶ ἐγχεσων ἀμφιγύοισιν;

461 δι' Εἴμαιες G U P²: δη, Εἴμαιε vulg. 462 δη δη vulg.: editors generally write δη δη: but the disjunctive — δη seems in place here.
463 πρός vulg.: αἴσθη G F U al. εἴρωνατα] perhaps εἴρων το ᾦ were they guarding (when you heard)?
οἴκαδ' ἱόντα] ἱδὼν ἱόντα n. 466 ἄνωγες G al.: ἄνωγεν vulg. 470 τὸδε vulg.: τὸ γε Ἠ J al.

459. εἴρωνατα 'keep safe': the aorist because 'keeping silence' is thought of as a single act or exercise of will.
463. αἴσθη 'in the same place,' 'as before' (not 'yonder,' as some commentators translate). The reading αἴσθη (i.e. αἴσθη 'on the other hand,' 'instead') is not so pointed.
εἴρωνατα 'keep in guard'; the word is properly used of protection, but here ironically of men watching with hostile purpose.
The reading ἱδὼν ἱόντα is plausible: but after ἱδὼν ἵκες: in the preceding line it is somewhat too epigrammatic for Homer.

466. καταβλάσκοντα 'as I went down through.' The acc., notwithstanding μοι, to show that it goes with the infinitives μεταλλήσαι καί ἱρόθαι: H. G. § 240.

τάχιστα με πτλ. The asyndeton is epegegetic, the clause being put as a restatement: 'I did not care to ask about this:—my desire was &c.' See on 14. 217., 15. 317., 18. 278.
ἀνώγες, plp.: a past tense is required to correspond with εἴρων.
470. τὸδε 'this' (which I am going to tell): the reading τὸ γε is less appropriate.
474. ἀμφιγύοισιν. It is uncertain, according to Helbig (Das hom. Epos),
καὶ σφέας ὁίσθην τοὺς ἐμμεναι, οὐδὲ τι οἶδα." 475

"Ὡς φάτο, μείδησεν δ' ἱερὴ ἢς Τηλεμάχου
eῖ πατέρ' ὄφθαλμοισιν ἰδὼν, ἀλέειν δ' ύφορβῆν.

Οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν παυσάντω πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαίτα,
δαίνυτ', οὖδὲ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιώς εἰσης.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιοι καὶ ἐδητὸς εἶ ἐρῶν ἐντο,
kοίτου τε μυῆσαντο καὶ ὑπνοῦ δῷρον ἐλοῦτο.

481 κοίτου τε μυῆσαντο] δη τότε κομήσαντο F, Est.

p. 245), whether this epithet means that the spears were sharp at the butt end as well as the point, or that the spear heads were sharp on both sides (like the blade of a two-edged sword). Mr. Myres decides in favour of the second alternative. 'There are some specimens of the Mycenaean σαυρωτῆς, but they are rare, and not the least like the head of the lance. Nor do the monuments show Mycenaean spears as double-ended, but rather with a butt. On the other hand the Mycenaean (and especially the late Mycenaean and Iron Age) lance-head is decidedly two-edged, with two "hollow-ground" cutting blades and a tubular mid-rib' (see Tsountas and Manatt, fig. 90). It may be noticed also that in Homer the word σαυρωτῆς only occurs in the Dolomeia.

From a vase, probably of the seventh century, in the Capitoline Museum at Rome.
Τηλεμάχου ἐπάνοδος εἰς Ἰθάκην.

Ἡμος δ' ἤργενεια φάνη βοθοδάκτυλος Ἡνός, δὴ τὸν ἐπείθ᾽ ὑπὸ ποσσίν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα Τηλέμαχος, φίλος νῦν Ὁδυσσήος θείοι, εἰλετο δ' ἀλκιμὸν ἤγχος, δ' οἱ παλάμηνιν ἀρῆει, ἀστυδε ἰέμενος, καὶ ἕων προσέειπε συβώτην·

"ἄττ', ἢ τοὶ μὲν ἐγὼν εἰμ' ἐς πῶλιν, ὅφρα με μήτηρ ὑγετάς: οὐ γάρ μιν πρόσθεν παύσονται δίω κλαυθμοῦ τε στυγροῖο γόβιο τε δακρύσεως, πρίν γ' αὐτὸν με ἠθηταί· ἀτάρ σοι γ' δ' ἐπιτέλλω. τὸν ξείνον βόστην ἄγ' ἐς πόλιν, ὅφρα δ' ἐκεῖθε δαίτα πτωχεῦῃ· δώσει δὲ οἱ δὴ κ' ἐθέλῃ πῦρνον καὶ κοτύλην· ἐμὲ δ' οὐ πως ἔστιν ἄπαντας ἄνθρώπους ἀνέχεσθαι, ἔχουτα περ ἀλγεα θυμῷ. ὁ ξείνος δ' ἐλ περ μᾶλα μνησι, ἀλγιον αὐτῷ ἔσταται· ἢ γάρ ἐμοὶ φιλ' ἀληθέα μυθίσασται."

10 ὁ δὲρ' ἄν ἐκεῖθε] Better ὅφρα με καίθε, cp. 2.124 ὅφρα με καίθ. The form ἐκεῖθε is not found.

1. Here the 39th day of the action begins. The story of the day extends to 20. 90.

The three main threads of the narrative—the fortunes of Ulysses himself, of Penelope, and of Telemachus—are now drawn together, and the climax of the poem is speedily reached.

4. παλάμηνιν is an instrumental dative with ἀρῇε, while ὁ is dat. comm. : 'fitted his hands.'

13. ἀνέχεσθαι 'to hold up against,' 'tolerate': cp. 7. 32 οὐ γάρ ξεῖνοι ἀν- ἐχονται, 19. 27 ἄργουν ἀνέχομαι.

14. ὁ ξείνος δ' κτλ. The inversion of the usual order gives emphasis to ὁ ξείνος: cp. 8. 408 ὅς δ' εἶ πέρ τι βε- βαστήσαη δαίσιν, 11. 113 αὐτὸς δ' εἶ πέρ κεν ἀλυγη, 13. 143 ἄνθρωπον δ' εἶ πέρ τι σε κτλ., 11. 10. 225 μοῦν δ' εἶ πέρ τε νοθη. The article is not deictic—'this stranger'—but probably gives a con- temptuous tone: so in 1. 10 τὸν ξείνον βόστην.
17. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ρ

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις 'Οδυσσεύς:

"α' φιλος, ουδέ τοι αὐτὸς ἐρύκεσθαι μενεαίνω
πτωχῷ βελτερὸν ἐστὶ κατὰ πτόλιν ἥ κατ' ἀγροῦν
dαιτα πτωχεύνει· δώσει δὲ μοι δς κ' έθέλησιν.

οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ σταθμοῖς μένειν ἐτι τηλίκος εἰμὶ,
ὡς τ' ἐπειτειμανέοι σημάντορι πάντα πιθέσειαν.

ἀλλ' ἔρχεν ἐμὲ δ' ἄξει ἀνὴρ ὅδε, τὸν οὐ κελεύεις,
αὐτίκ' ἐπεί κε πυρὸς θερέω ἀλή τε γένηται.

αἰνῶς γὰρ τάδε εἶμαι' ἔχω κακά: μή με διαμάσῃ
στιβὴ ὑποῦν ἐκαθε' δὲ τ' ἀστυ φατ' εἶναι.'

"Πεῖ φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ διὰ σταθμοῦ βεβήκει,
κραίνα ποσὶ προβιβάς, κακὰ δὲ μνηστὴρσι φύτευεν.

αὐτάρ ἐπεί β' ἰκανε δόμους εὐ ναιετάοντας,
ἔγχος μὲν β' ἐστησε φέρων πρὸς κίονα μακρῆν,
αὐτὸς δ' εἶσω λεω καὶ ὑπέρβα λάινον οὐδόν.

Τὸν δὲ πολὺ πρώτη εἴδε τροφὸς Εὐρύκλεια,
κῶα κατστρονύσα τρόνοις ἐν δαιδαλεόσι,
δακρύνασα δ' ἐπειτ' ἱδὺς κίεν' ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ἄλλαι
δμαζι 'Οδυσσηος ταλασίφρονος ἡγερέθωντο,
καὶ κόνιον ἀγαπαζόμεναι κεφαλῆν τε καὶ δόμους.

'Ἡ δ' λεω ἐκ ταλαμώδιον περίφορον Πηνελόπεια,

17 οὐδὲ τοι αὐτὸς G F X al., Eust. : οὐδ' αὐτὸς τοι vulg. 15 5 ἐνεκλειῇ ἐπηοὴ
Sch. H : see on 16. 195. 16 διὰ διὰ G U al. 20 ἔγχος μὲν στήσε πρὸς
πῖονα μακρὸν ἔρεισα G al. : ἔγχος μὲν β' ἐστησε φέρων πρὸς κίονα μακρὸν ἔρεισα X,
doubtless from 8. 66, 473. The reading of G was probably a correction of this
unmetrical line.

21. δι τ' ... πιθέσεια. This is not
properly an instance of the Attic use of
δι τε with an inf., since πιθέσεια carries
on the construction of μένειν (inf. of
sequence after τήλος). Similarly in
Π. 9. 42 ἐκόσσαι δι τε νικόβα the inf.
governed by ἐκόσσαι. But these
instances show how the later Attic con
struction must have originated.

23. θερόω is regarded by Curtius
(Verb. il. 334) as the subj. of a pass.
act. θερήσα. But from θερά'- (θέραμος,
θέρας) the regular form would be θερεῖν.
Perhaps there was a present θεράω (like
τιλεύω, &c.), with intrans. meaning.

Δέλη is said to mean 'the sun's
warmth,' i.e. the heat of the day. It is
doubtless connected with ἀλη 'warmth';
but not (surely) with σιλας or Lat. sol.

29. This line may be taken as show
ning that the δουροβοκή or receptacle for
spear was outside the μέγαρον. So in
16. 40 Telemachus gives his spear to
Eumaeus and then crosses the threshold;
cp. 1. 128. The column used for this
purpose was doubtless one of those
which formed the πρώορον.

35. κόνιον. The metrical lengthening
of -ον, -αν (3 plur.) is not found in
the IIiad except in the Catalogue. For
the Odyssey cp. 7. 344., 9. 413., 16. 358.,
17. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ P

Ἀρτέμιδι ἵκελῃ ἢ χρυσῇ Ἁφροδίτη, ἄμφὶ δὲ παιδὶ φίλῳ βάλε πῆχες δακρύσασα, κόσοε δὲ μιν κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλά, καὶ β’ ὀλοφυρομένῃ ἦπα τεπεβετα τροπήδω: ἡ λεθε, Τηλέμαχε, γυλεκρόν φῶς. οὐ σ’ ἔτ’ ἔγγυγε ὑψσθαι ἐφάμην, ἐπεὶ ᾧ θεόν τε Πῶλονδε λάθηρ, ἐμεῦ ἀέκτι, φίλου μετὰ πατρὸς ἀκούνῃν. ἀλλ’ ἂγε μοι κατάλεξον ὅπως ἡμησας ὦπωπῆς.

Τὴν δ’ αὐ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίων ἤδη: μὴ ἐκεῖ, μὴ μοι γῦνο ὀρνυῦ μηδὲ μοι ἦτ’ ἐν στήθῃςιν δρίνε. φυγνί τερ περ αἰτῶν ὀλεθρῶν ἀλλ’ ὑδρημαρμένη, καθαρὰ χροί εἴμαθ’ ἐλθοσά, ἐὰν ὑπερφ’ ἀναβάσα σὺν ἀμφιπόλουσι γυναιξέν.] εὐχεὶ πάσι θεοὶ τελέσσασα ἐκατέμβας ῥέοιν, αἱ κε πολί Ζεὺς ἀντίτα ἔργα τελέσσῃ. αὐτὰ ἐγὼν ἀγορήνθη ἐλεύσομαι, ὅφρα καλέσσῳ ἔσθεν, ὡς μοι κεῖθεν ἄμ’ ἐσπετο δεῦρο κύκτι. τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ προσπεψά σὺν ἀντιθείσι ἐτάρουσι, Πειραιὸν δὲ μιν ἠώγεα προτεί ὄικον ἄγαντα

37 η τε G Eust. al.; ἤδη F H X U al.; κε (sic) P. 46 μὴ τοι Eust. 49 om. vulg.: cp. 4. 751. 52 ἀγορὴνθῇ ἐλεύσομαι Aristophanes: ἀγορήνθῃ ἐλεύσομαι F: ἀγορηθῇ ἐλεύσομαι Ar., J H*: ἀγορηθῇ ἐσειλεύσομαι G H U al.: ἀγορηθῇ ἐσειλ- Ρ. Thus ἀγορηθῇ has the strongest ancient support, while the variety in the MSS. points to the simple ἐλεύσομαι. Cp. Od. i. 88, II. 6. 365.

44. 'How thou hast gained sight of him, i.e. εἶ ποι δυσας ὄρθολογοι τεοῖν ἢ ἄλλου μίθον ἄκουσας (3.93). Strictly of course ὑπώπη applies only to the former alternative.

46-56. Ameis justly directs attention to the dramatic truth and propriety of this speech. Telemachus is still under the influence of the recognition scene, and is oppressed by the great secret of his father's presence in Ithaca. Consequently his reply to Penelope is brief and troubled. As she afterwards complains (II. 104-106), he does not answer her question, or even tell her whether he has news of Ulysses or not. He bids her make vows to the immortals, and offer hecatombs if Zeus will grant retribution. This is like the answer of Hector when he was met at the Scaean gate by the Trojan women, who asked about their husbands and brothers (Π. 6. 240 ὃ δε ἀπετίθεν θεοῖ εὐχέσθη αὐτῶν πᾶσας ἡμῖν). It was perhaps a recognized formula for refusing to say anything. Telemachus then pleads that he must hasten to the ἀγορᾶ. It is only on his return, and when he has had time to collect himself, that he is ready to give Penelope a connected story of his journey.

47. φυγνί τερ 'even when I have escaped'; see on l. 13 (supra).

52. ἢς is used, instead of δι, of the comparatively unknown stranger: 'one that followed' (whoever he was).

55. μιν is governed by ἄγαντα φίλους. It is placed early in the sentence according to the general rule; as to which see H. G. § 365.
ένδυκεως φιλέειν καὶ τίμειν, εἰς δὲ κεν ἔλθω.”

“Ὡς ἄρ’ ἐφώνησεν, τῇ δ’ ἀπερός ἐπλετοῦ μῦθος. ἡ δ’ ὀδρυμαζένη, καθαρὰ χρυσὸ ἐίμαι’ ἐλοῦσα, ἐσχετο πάσι θεοίσι τελησάσας ἐκατομβας ἰδεῖν, αἱ κέ ποτε Ζεὺς ἀντίτα ἔργα τελείσαι.

Τηλέμαχος δ’ ἄρ’ ἐπείτα διεκ μεγάρῳ διεβήκει ἐγχος ἠχον, ἀμα τῷ γε δῶ κοινὲς ἄργοι ἐποντό. θεσπεσίνι θ’ ἀρα τῷ γε χάριν κατέχευν Ἄθηνας τῷ δ’ ἀρα πάντες λαοὶ ἐπερχόμενον σηδεῦσω. ἀμφὶ δὲ μιν μοιστῆρες ἀθύσορες ἑγερέθουσαν ἐσθλ’ ἀγορένειτε, κακὰ δὲ πρεσι βυσσοδέμενον. αὐτὰρ ὁ τῶν μὲν ἐπείτα ἀλεύατο πουλὼν ἤμιλον, ἀλλ’ ἣν Μένταρ ἤστο καὶ Ἀντίφος ἡ’ Ἀλιθέρας, οἱ τὲ εἴς ἄρχεις πατρώτοι ἤσαν ἐκατορ, ἐνα διαπερ’ λῶν’ τοί δ’ ἐξερεύνον έκαστα.

τοῖς δὲ Πειραιοὶ δουρκλυτοὶ ἐγγυθεν ήλθε ξεῖνον ἄγων ἀγορίθω διὰ πτόλει’ οὐδ’ ἄρ’ ἐτι δὴν


62 δῶ κοινὲς ἄργοι U: πὸσες ὁδὸς ἄργοι vulg. See 2.11.

56. ἔλθω, subj. notwithstanding the past tense ἔφωνε, because the action is future at the time of speaking. But in l. 60 Hermann’s τελείσαι, for the τελείσῃ of the MSS., is necessary.

57. τῇ δ’ ἀπερός ἐπλετοῦ μῦθος is generally taken to mean that the speech stayed in the mind, was not forgotten or neglected. But ἐνα πτερόντα, the Epic phrase upon which this one is evidently founded, means words uttered, not words that fly away and are lost; and similarly ἀπερός μῦθος must be an unspoken word. Hence ‘her speech took not wings’ means simply that she heard in silence.

Cp. 15. 254 πάλιν δ’ γε λόγετο μῦθον ‘he took back his (unspoken) word,’ i.e. did not utter what he thought; and the common phrases ἐχεῖν ἐν φρεσί μῦθον, ἐχεῖν στῇ μῦθον, &c.

63–64. 2. 11–13, a description of Telemachus going from his house to the αὐγάδα. Hence ἐγχος ἠχον is not to be pressed as implying that he had his spear within the μέγαρον: cp. the note on l. 29.

66. βυσσοδέμενον, the indic. instead of a participle, by a species of parataxis; cp. 1. 162., 16. 6, 101., 19. 368, II. 3. 80.

67. πουλὼν is a very doubtful form: the lengthening is only defensible metri gratia, viz. only in such words as πουλῶσο, πουλοβύτερα, which cannot otherwise be scanned. πουλὼν and πουλὼν occur in nine places in Homer. Schulze (Quaest. Ep. p. 447) has pointed out the curious facts (1) that in five of these places the word is feminine, and (2) that the neut. πουλὼ is only found in one place, Od. 19. 387, and there only in a few MSS.; whereas in later epic poets it is quite common. Hence he infers that the masc. πουλὼν and πουλὼν are corrupted from πολλός, πολλός.

71. οὐδ’ ἄρ’ ἐτι δὴν κατ. is a litotes, meaning that he did not turn away at all: cp. II. 16. 736 οὐδέ δὴν χέετο φατός ‘it did not long give way from,’ = ‘was quick in reaching the man.’

H 2
Τηλέμαχος ξείνοι εκάς τράπετ', ἄλλα παρέστη. τὸν καὶ Πειραιός πρὸς τοὺς μῦθον ἔφη:

"Τηλέμαχ', αἰήστρου ἐμὸν ποτὶ δῶμα γυναῖκας, ὃς τοι δῷρ ἀποστῆμῃ, ὃ τοι Μενέλαος ἔδωκε." 75

Τὸν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίποι ἦδα: "Πειραί', οὐ γάρ τ' ἵδεν ὅπως ἐσταί τάδε ἐργα, εἰ κεν ἐμὲ μνηστήρες ἀγήνορες ἐν μεγάροις λάθη κτείναντες πατρώια πάντα δᾶσονται, 80

ἀυτὸν ἔχοντα σὲ βούλοι ἐπαυρέμεν ἢ τίνα τῶν δε' ἔδει τ' ἑγώ τούτοις φῶνον καὶ θήρα φυτεύο, δὴ τότε μοι χαίροντι φέρειν πρὸς δόματα χαλρών."

"Ως εἴπον ξείνον ταλαπείριον ἥγεν εἰς ὁλον. 85

αὐτὰρ ἐπει ἑκὼντο δόμους εἴ ναιετάντας,
χλαίνας μὲν κατέθεντο κατὰ κλισμοῦ καὶ θρόνους τέ, 88
ἐς δ' ἀσαμίκθου βάντες ἐξέτασα λοῦσαντο.

τὸν δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δομαί λουσαν καὶ χρύσαν ἐλάαρ, ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρα χλαίνας οἴλας βάλον ἢ δὲ χιτώνας, 90
ἐκ δ' ἀσαμίκθου βάντες ἐπὶ κλισμοῦ καθίζον.

χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχόρ ἐπέχευε φέρουσα 95
καλὴ κρυσεῖς, ὑπὲρ ἀγρυρεῖον λέβητος,
νῦψασαν παρὰ δὲ ἑστήν ἐτάννυσε τράπεζαν.

ὁτὸν δ' αἰδοίᾳ ταμή παρέθηκε φέρουσα, 100
eἶδατα πόλ' ἐπιθείτα, χαριζομένη παρέβντων.

84 ἥγεν ἐς ὁλον] Originally perhaps ἥγετο φῶκον. 90 ἀσαμίκθους U: -θον vulg.

78. οὖ γάρ τ' κτλ. 'inasmuch as we do not know': cp. 1. 337 (note).
81. σε. The orthotone form seems required by the sense. The editors generally write ξοντά σε.
95. This conventional line is found in Od. 1. 140, 4. 56, 7. 176, and (in some MSS.) in 10. 372, 15. 139. It was explained by Aristarchus (see the comment of Aristonicus on Od. 4. 54-56) as applying to the cases in which hasty preparation is made for an unexpected guest. On that ground, apparently, he rejected 1. 140 (or possibly did not find it in his sources). In his view—if we may judge of it from the argument in Athenaeus (V. p. 193 b)—the εἰδατα of this line are pieces of meat, the remnants of a former feast, which the ταμή has in her store: consequently they are superfluous when meat is otherwise provided in the usual way. This theory is surely open to much objection. There is no reason for confining the word εἰδατα to meat (see Brosin, De Comnis Homerici, p. 55). In the style of Homer the participial phrase εἰδατα πόλλ' ἐπιθείτα after ὁτὸν παρέθηκε would naturally be taken as a simple exep- egesis. And εἰδατα may well denote
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μήτηρ δ' ἀντίον. ζε παρὰ σταθμὸν μεγάρῳ
cλεισμὸν κεκλιμένη, λέπτ' ἡλάκτα στροφῶσα.
οί δ' ἐπ' ὄνειαθ' ἐτοίμα προκείμενα χείρας ἱαλλον.
avτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδήτιος ἐξ ἐρων ἐντο,
τοιοὶ δὲ μύθων ἄρχει περίφρον Πηνελόπεια.
"Τηλέμαχ', ᾧ τοι ἑγὼν ὑπεραύον εἰς αναβάσα
λέξομαι εἰς εὐνήν, ὧ μοι στονδέσσα τέτυκται,
αιε δάκρυον ἐμοίης πεφυρμένη, ἔκ ὦ 'Οδυσσεύς
φίλε' ᾧ 'Ατρείδησιν ἐσ "Ἰλιον' οὔδέ μοι ἐλή
πρίν ἐνθεῦ μνηστῆρας ἀγάνφορας ἐσ τόδε δῶμα,
nόστον σοῦ πατρὸς σάφα εἰπέμεν, εἰ ποὺ ἄκουσας."

Τὴν δ' αὐ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ἡδα:
"τοιγάρ ἐγώ τοι, μήτερ, ἄληθενι καταλέξω.
φίλε' ἐς τε Πόλον καὶ Νέστορα, πομενα λαὸν
θεάτας δέ με κεῖνον ἐν ὑψηλοῖς δόμοισι

νοῦτον οὐ πατρὸς σάφα εἰπέμεν, εἰ ποὺ ἄκουσαι,

111 νῦν vulg. : νῦν X D al. The scholium found in H X (σῶσας 'Ἀρίσταρχος'

καὶ Σωκράτους ἐκομμένοι θύλησεν εἰς τε πατρὸς ἐναντίον) does not decide whether

ηδι. wrote νῦν or νῦν. The reading ascribed to Zeno. is evidently corrupt. As

Dindorf suggests, he probably ended the line like Il. 9.481 ὡς εἰ τε πατρὸς ἐν

πατρὶ φυλής (simply omitting ἕφθασκε).


the various 'bake meats' that the ταμή would bring in her basket (like Pharaoh's

chief baker, Gen. xl. 17). In general, the bread and the wine are in the keep-
ing of the ταμή (cp II. 19. 44 ταμία στομα δοτήται); but the meat is freshly

killed, roasted on the spot, and taken in hand at once by the δαττόμεν, who
gives the portions. It is only in the humble household of Eumaeus that we

hear of remnants from a former meal (Od. 16. 50). It does not seem at all

likely that a stately formula, like the line in question, should have been

framed for such a case.

96. σταυρίνων, see the Appendix.

97. στροφῆσα, perhaps an early cor-
rupution from στροφᾶσα, see H. C.

§ 55, 9. The forms with o can be easily

restored everywhere except in II. 13.

557, where στροφᾶρ' begins the line.

And στροφᾶσα may there be defended

on metrical grounds (Schulze, Quaest. 


104. οὔδε μοι έληπτε κτλ. This

clause really qualifies the preceding

sentence: Encelpeia complains that she

will have to return to her chamber

before Telemachus has consented to give

his report.

106. νόστος is acc. de quo; the mean-

ing is 'to tell whether you have heard of

the return.'

115. ζωοῦ οἴδαι θανάτος 'of his being

alive, nor yet of his death.' The second

is the more important point, Telemachus
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άλλα μ’ ἐσ 'Ατρείδην, δουρικλείταν Μενέλαον, ἵπποισι προδηπεμψε καὶ ἀρμασι κολλητοῖσιν. ἐνθ’ ἱδον 'Αργείην Ἐλέενην, ἢς εἶνεκα πόλλα 'Αργείου Τρώως τε θεῶν ἠτηθι μόχησαν.

εἴρετο δ’ αὐτίκ’ ἐπείτα βοὴν ἀγάθος Μενέλαος ὅτεν χρηίζων ἱκύρην Δακεδαίμονα διάν- αὐτὰρ ἤγῳ τῷ πάσαν ἀληθείαν κατέλεξα· καὶ τὸτε δὴ μ’ ἐπέεσσοι ἀμεβόμενοι προσέειτεν· ὃ πότοι, ἢ μᾶλα δὴ κρατερόφρονος ἄνδρος ἐν εὐνῇ ἥθελον εὐνηθῆναι, ἀνάλκιδες αὐτὸι ἐόντες. ὃς δ’ ὅποι’ ἐν ξυλόχρο ἐλαφος κρατεροί λέοντος νεβροῦν κοιμήσασα νεγυνεάς γαλαθνυόν

κυνηγοῦν ἐξερέῃσι καὶ ἀγκαὶ ποιήτητα βοσκομένη, δ’ ἐπείτα ἐνι εἰσῆλθεν εὐνήν, ἀμφοτέροις δὲ τοίσιν αἰεικα πότιον ἐφήκεν, ὃς 'Οδυσσεὺς κείνοισιν αἰεικα πότιον ἐφήσει.

αἱ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ 'Ἀθηναίη καὶ 'Ἀπόλλων, τοίοις ἐὼν ὅλος ποι’ ἕυκτιμένη ἐνὶ Δέσβῳ ἐξ ἐρίδος Φιλομηλείδῃ ἐπάλασεν ἀναστάς,

κἀδ’ ἐβάλε κρατερώς, κεχάροντο δὲ πάντες Ἀχαῖοι, τοίοις ἐὼν μνηστήρισιν ὁμιλήσειεν Ὁδυσσεύς· πάντες ἱ’ ὁκύμοροι τε γενοίατο πικρόγαμοι τε. ταῦτα δ’ ἔμετρας καὶ λίσσας, οὐκ ἂν ἔγωγε ἀλλα παρεῖς ἐποίμι παρακλίδων, οὔτ’ ἀπαθής, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μοι ἐείπε γέρων ἄλοις νημερτῆς,

τὸν οὐδὲν τοι ἤγῳ κρύψω ἐποί οὕτ’ ἐπικεύσων,

118–119 πολλά ... μύησαν F P H (?): D: πολλοὶ ... δάμησαν G U L W Z. 120 δ’ ἐπείτα] δ’ ἔτ’ ἐπείτα G X D U. 130 ἐφήκεν] ἐφῆκε H K (i.e. ἐφεί). wishing to make it clear that Nestor’s account was at least not unfavourable. The commentators who take οὖντα θα- νόστα as a mere exepogesis of θανόω— ‘living, not dead’—lose sight of this. 124–141. Repeated from 4. 333–350. So 142–146 = 4. 556–560, and 148–149 = 4. 585–586. 135. ἀμφοτέρος, i.e. both the hind and her fawns.

134. ἔς ἐρίδος. For the force of ἔς cp. 18. 38 ἐνείνος τε καὶ Ἴρος ἄριστον ἀλλήλων χαράς μαχέσσασθαι. The dis- pute (ἐρίς) leads up to a challenge to fight.

137. πικρόγαμος, an oxymoron, cp. 1. 448: ‘bitter marriage’ means no marriage—άριστο instead of γάμος.

140 (= 4. 349). For the use of the article cp. Il. 1. 125.
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"ὅς φάτο, τῇ δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἐνι στήθεσιν ὅρινεν τοῖς δὲ καὶ μετέειπε Θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής: ὡς γύναι αἰδοίλα Δαερτάδεω 'Οδυσσός, ή τοι δ' γ' οὔ σάφα οἴδεν, ἔμειο δὲ σύνθεο μῦθον ἀτρεκέως γάρ τοι μαντεύσομαι οὐδ' ἐπικεύσω. ἴστω νῦν Ζεὺς πρῶτα θεῶν ἔσει τε τράπεζα ἱστίη τ' 'Οδυσσός ἀμύμωνος, ἢν ἀφίκαν, ὡς ή τοι 'Οδυσσέως ἠδη ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ, ἡμενος ἢ ἔρπων, τάδε πευθόμενοι κακὰ ἔργα, ἐστιν, ἀτὰρ μυστήριοι κακῶν πάντεσσι φυτεύει: οἶον ἐγὼν οἴον ἕισσάμου ἐπὶ νης ἡμενος ἐφρασάμην καὶ Τηλεμάχῳ ἐγεγόνειν."

150-165 ἀδετοῦντα Schol. II; but according to Schol. Q X (as emended by Huttmann, see his note a. l.) only the two lines 160-161 were rejected in tois χαριστέροις, while in tois εἰκονιστέροις (or κοινότεροις) the condemnation extended to 150-165. The meaning of this statement is obscure. Elsewhere we usually hear of χαριστέραι and εἰκονιστέραι. αἰν. for Schol. II, 15. 50., 18. 100., 20. 255., 384.) for the reference in either case being to editions or copies made use of, or at least referred to, by Aristarchus. The term ἀθετεῖν, however, expresses the judgement of a critic, not the reading of a manuscript. Hence the meaning of the scholiast probably is that Aristarchus found that the 'common' texts favoured the rejection of 150-165 (which may have been προθεσμίνοι, obelized by Zenodotus or Aristophanes), but was led by his own better sources to confine the athelesis to 160-161. 155 δ' y vulg.: δ' F.

143. ἢ μὲν ἀνάγεις ἱσεῖ, δ' οὗ δύνα- 
tαι θα. Note the change to στειο ῥετα: Telemachus is still quoting Menelaus, whose speech ends with l. 146.

148. ταῦτα τελευτήσας. Telemachus does not give an account of all that he did, but only of what he heard regarding Ulysses.

153. As δ' γ' is not used as a deictic pronoun, it can only refer here to Menelaus, who has just been mentioned. On the other hand the context points rather to Telemachus. Perhaps we should read δ', with one of the oldest manuscripts. 161. ἐγεγόνειν 'declared aloud, made known': a word of the use that is common in later poets, e.g. Aeschylus. The evidence for a form γεγονότοι is very slight: e.g. for ἐγεγόνειν we can always read ἐγόνον (9 47., 12. 370). The line is doubted on other grounds: see the crit. note.
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Τὸν δ’ αὖτε προσέπισε περὶφρων Πηνελόπεια: "αἰ γὰρ τοῦτο, Ἲειν, ἐπος τετελεσμένον εἰσὶν τῷ κε τὰχα γνοίης φιλοτητὰ τε πολλὰ τε δώρα εἰς ἔμεθ, ὡς ἂν τίς σε συναντήμενοι μακαρίζει."  

"Ως οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγρόναμον μνηστήρες δὲ πάροιθεν Ὁδυσσήος μεγάρων δίσκουσιν τέρποντο και αἰγανέσις εἴνες, ἐν τυκτῷ δαπέδῳ, δὴ περὶ πάρος, ὁβριν ἔχοντες. ἀλλ’ δεῖ δὴ δειπνηστος ἦν καὶ ἐπήλυθε μήλα πάντοθεν εἰς ἀγρόν, οἱ δ’ ἠγγαν οἱ τὸ πάρος περ, καὶ τότε δὴ σφιν ἔστη Μέδων, ὅσ γὰρ μαλίστα ἦν δαμασκήνης και σφιν παρεγύγυνε δαιτῇ: "κοῦροι, ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντες ἐπερφυτεῖ φρεν’, ἀέθλοις, ἔχεσθε πρὸς δάμαθ’, ἵν’ ἐντυνόμεθα δαιτὰ: οὐ μὲν γὰρ τι χέρειον ἐν ὁρῷ δείπνον ἐλεύθαι.”  

"Ως ἔσβαθ’, οἱ δ’ ἀνιστάντες ἔβαν πείθοντο το μῦθῳ. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ β’ ἱκοντο δόμους εὑρετάντας, χλαίνας μὲν κατήεντο κατὰ κλησμοὺς τε θρόνους τε, οἱ δ’ ἱέρευον δῖς μεγάλους καὶ πλονας αἴγας, ἱέρευον δὲ σύνας σιάλους καὶ βοῦν ἄγελαιν, δαιτ’ ἐντυνόμενοι. τοι δ’ εἰς ἀγροῖ πόλινδε ἀντρύνων Ὁδυσσέος τ’ ἴλαι καὶ δίος ὑφορὸβος. τοῖς δὲ μύθων ἠρχες συβάτης, ὀρχαμος ἄνδρων: "ἐξεῖν’, ἐπεὶ ἀρ δὴ ἐπείτα πόλινδ’ ἴλαι μενεάνεις σήμερον, ὃς ἐπετελείν ἀνὰξ ἐμοί, — ἢ σ’ ἂν ἔγωγε

169 ἔχοντες Αρ. G U Eust.: ἔχοντο vulg. 170 Herodian distinguishes διείνους καὶ δειπνηστος ‘the time of δειπνου’; and similarly with ἄρητος, &c. See on 16. 3, also Spitzner on Π. 19. 223. 174 δὲ λαον, a v. l. in the edition of Stephanus, perhaps preserves the original reading. The gen. is used with τίρσα meaning ‘to satisfy.’ 177 πείθοντο το μῦθῳ] ἐξάψας ἐκαστος F: ποιλ Ὀλυμπ. Ἐκαστος F H al.—phrases elsewhere used of returning home. 181. Obelized by Aristoph. (and Ar. I see Ludw.).

169. δὴ περ πάρος does not qualify ὁβριν ἔχοντες, but the whole description. The poet wishes to insist on the daily repetition of the scene: cp. l. 171 οι δ’ ἠγαγον οἱ τὸ πάρος περ. 176. οἱ χρίσαν ‘not a bad kind of thing.’ The comparative does not mean ‘worse’ (as Ameis takes it), but ‘bad rather than good’: cp. 15. 370., 16. 216. 185. ἐπί κτλ. The apodosis is in l. 190 ἀλλ’ ἀγαν νῦν ἑμοῖ. 186. The words ἢ σ’ ἂν ἔγωγε κτλ. are a parenthetical ‘though for my part I would rather &c.’: see on Π. 3. 215. Note the use of δὲν ‘else,’ ‘otherwise,’ where καὶ would be less pointed.
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αὐτοῦ βουλοῦμαι σταθμῶν ἕνεται λιπέσθαι.

ἀλλὰ τὸν αἴδεομαι καὶ δείδαι, μή μοι ὑπὸσσον
νείκεσί: χαλεπά δὲ τ’ ἀνάκτων εἰσὶν ὁμοκλαί.
ἀλλ’ ἀγνόν ὦμεν· δὴ γὰρ μέμβλοκε μάλιστα
ἡμαρ, ἀτὰρ τάχα τοι ποτὶ ἐστερα βίγιον ἐσται.

Τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενον προσέφη πολύμητις ’Οδυσσεύς.

"γιγνώσκω, φρονέω· τὰ γε δὴ νοεόντι κελεύεις.
ἀλλ’ ἤμεν, σοῦ δ’ ἐπειτὰ διαμπερὲς ἤγεμόνευε.
δός δὲ μοι, εἰ ποθὶ τοι βράκαλον τετμημένον ἐστὶ,
σκηρίπτεσθ’, ἐπεὶ δὴ φατ’ ἀρισφαλε’ ἐμμεναι οὐδὲν."

‘Ἡ ρα καὶ ἀμφ’ ἁμοίοισιν ἄεικεα βάλλετο πήρην,
πυκνά μοιάλεν· ἐν δὲ στράφος ἦν ἄορτη.
Εὐμαίος δ’ ἀρα οἱ σκῆπτρον θυμαρές ἐδωκε.

τῷ βῆτῃ, σταθμῶν δὲ κύνες καὶ βάτορες ἀνδρεῖς

ἐμπεθ’ ὑποσθε μένοντες· ὥδε εἰς πόλιν ἤγεν ἀνακτὰ
πτωχὸ λεγαλέα ἐναλλαγῶν ἥδε γέροντι,
σκηπτόμενον· τὰ δὲ λυγρὰ περὶ χρόν εἰματα ἐστο.

’Αλλ’ δὲ γνωρίζοντες ὠδὸν κάτια παιπάλβεσαν

ἀστέος ἐγγὺς ἐσαν καὶ ἐπὶ κρήνην ἀφίκοντο

τυκτὴν καλλίροον, δὲν ύδρεύσατο πολίταιν.

τὴν πολίς’ Ἰθακος καὶ Νέριτος ἥδε Πολύκτωρ·

ἀμφ’ δ’ ἀρ’ αἰγείρων υδατοτρέφειν ἥν ἄλσος,

187 λεισθαὶ G P H U: γενίσθα Ἴ X al. East. (from 223, where it is the vulg.).
191 βίγιον] ἄλγων F. 193 φοινίκτῳ M, cp. 281. 199 θυμαρές F al.
The distinction made by Herodian between θυμάρης and θυμηρῆς cannot be well
founded. Doubtless θυμηρής is Ionic, θυμάρης either Old Attic or Aeolic: H. G.
p. 391.

187. ἁμοίοισιν ‘as keeper’: cp. βόστο
(l. 201, &c.).
191. ἁσώρα ‘the evening time,’ a
collective plural of ἱσώρα.
196. It is impossible to explain οὐδὲν
as the Ionic form, only found here, of
ὅδε. In all similar cases (κῷσος and
ὁσός, ἐκόσιν and ἐκόσιν, &c.) the long
form is the regular Homeric form. The
word must surely be the same as οὐδἐν
‘threshold.’ Probably, when applied
to a road, it had the meaning ‘road-
way,’ 'agger viae.' See however Schulze,

206. τυκτήν, that is, with a basin of
wrought stone.
207. According to Acusilaus, the
three brothers Ithacus, Neritus and
Polyctor were founders, first of Cephal-
lenia, and afterwards of Ithaca. As
they are evidently local names, and not
connected by tradition with the family
of Ulysses, this seems to be one of
the instances in which the ruling families
of the Trojan War have partially sup-
planted an earlier group of heroes. See
the English Historical Review, vol. I.
pp. 43-52.
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πάντοσε κυκλοτέρες, κατὰ δὲ ψυχρὸν μὲν ἔδωρ
υψόθεν ἐκ πέτρης· βωμὸς δ᾿ ἐφύπερθε τέτυκτο
ἐφιμφάων, δόλων πάντες ἐπίρρεξακον ὀδηγαὶ·
ἐνθὰ σφας ἐκίθανεν νῖος Δολίου Μελανθεῦσ
αἰγας ἄγων, αἱ πάσι μετέπρεπον αἰτολῶισεν,
δείπνον μυστήρεσσι· δῦν δ᾿ ἀμη ἐπιστὲν νομής
tοὺς δὲ ἱδᾶν νεῖκουσεν ἔπος τ᾿ ἐφαστ᾿ ἐκ τ᾿ ὑναμαζεν
ἐκπαγόν καὶ ἄδεικς: ὅμως δὲ κηρ Ὅδυσσος·
"νῦν μὲν δὴ μάλα πάγχυν κακῶς κακὸν ἡγηλάζει·
ως αἰεὶ τὸν ὁμοίον ἀγεί θεὸς ὡς τὸν ὁμοίον.
πὴ δὴ τῶν μοιοβρῶν ἂγεις, ἀμέγαρτε συβωτα,
πταχὸν ἀνίηρῶν, δαίτων ἀπολυμαντήρα·
δὲ πολλῆς φλιτσί παραστᾶς θλίψεται ὁμοὺς,
αἰτίων ἀκόλουθοι, οὐκ ἄρα γ᾿ οὐδὲ λέβθας·

217 ἡγηλάζει (not -[eus] Aristoph. Ar. MSS.; cp. 16. 105. 218 ὁ δὲ τὸν] ὡς τὸν
Read perhaps ὡς πολλὰ: or πολλῆς (omitting δέ). θλίψεται vulg.: (φλιτσί) H X U al., v. l. ap. Eust. The two readings were discussed by Zen. and Ar., but the
scholia are too fragmentary to enable us to say more. In Schol. Q V we should
doubtless read φλιτσί (ο) λοικώς ἀντὶ τοῦ θλιβησα (φ for θ being Aeolic).
With this reading there is probably an intentional play in φλιτσί φλιτσί. 222 ἀρα
γ᾿ Π ὡς: ἄρα vulg. The form ἄρα is noticed in the Scholia, and by Eust.

212. Μελανθεὺς, so called in 20. 255.,
21. 176, 22. 153, 159, but more com-
monly Μελανθῖος. These (and also
the female name Μελανθώ) are abbrevia-
tions; cp. Πάτροκλους from Πάτρο-κλῆς.
The full form may have been Μελα-
ανθης (Fick, Personennamen. p. 54).
213. Cp. 14. 105–106. We are to
imagine these parties with their tributes
of sheep or goats coming in from all parts
of the island (170 ἔνθα καὶ μῆλα πολλα
ἐν ἄγρῳ), and occasionally meeting, as
now.

217. ἡγηλάζει. ‘plays fugleman to.’
The form implies an adj. ἡγηλός ‘apt
to lead,’ and doubtless has an ironical
or contemptuous force: cp. the note on
dιονεύσωμαι, 13. 9.
218. ὡς . . . ὡς are correlative: ‘as
heaven brings one (like), so it ever
brings his like.’ This was first pointed
out by Mr. Ridgeway (Journ. of Phil.
xxvii. 113). The commentators take the
second ὡς to be the Attic preposition
ὅως, = εἰς or επός. Such a solitary use is
evidently most improbable.

219. The only clue to the meaning of
μοιοβρῶς is the statement that μοιο-
βρων denoted the young of the wild
swine (Aelian, N. H. vii. 47). This at
least is a meaning which suits the use of
the word here and in 18. 26. As we
find ἄρισκαλα and ἐβίμα used in nearly
the same sense we may gather that
μοιοβρῶς is a compound; but the
derivation of μοιοβρῶς (Curt. Gr. 370)
must be very doubtful. The explana-
tion ought to include various other
words; μόλος (Hesych.), μύλωρος, μο-
λοών, and the proper names Μολόρχους,
Μολάτας, Μολίων, Μύλων, &c. In any
case the derivation of μοιοβρῶς need
not affect the sense which it bears in
the context. If it means a kind of pig,
it is not likely that the first syllable is
a mere general epithet, such as ‘dirty.’
220. δαίτων, from δαίς: unless we
read δαιτῶν, gen. plur. of δαῖρη.
222. ἄρα γ᾿. The common reading
ἄρα is open to the objections (1) that
the noun ἄρα is only known as a neuter,
and (2) that scansion of the first α as
17. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΔΑΣ Ρ

τὸν γ' εἰ μοι δοῦσι σταθμῶν μνήμα γενέσθαι σηκοκόρον τ' ἐμεναι θαλλὼν τ' ἐφίοισε φορήναι, καὶ κεν ὄρην πίσων μεγάλην ἐπιγυνίδα θεῖο. 225
ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δὴ ἔργα κάκ' ἐμμαθεν, οὐκ ἐθελήσει ἔργον ἐποίησθαι, ἀλλὰ πτῶσον κατὰ δῆμον βουλείται αἰτίζων βοσκεῖν ἥν γαστέρα ἀνάλοι.
ἀλλ' ἐκ τοι ἐρέω, τὸ δὲ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται: αἱ κ' ἐλη πρὸς δάμας Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο, 230
πολλὰ οἱ ἄμφι κάρη σφέλα ἀνδρῶν ἐκ παλαμῶν πλευραὶ ἀποτρίφουσι δῆμον κατὰ βαλλομένοιο.

"Ως φάτο, καὶ παριστά μοι ἐνδορευ ἀφραδίςιν ἴσχορι οὔδε μὲν ἐκτὸς ἀταρπίτου ἐστηφέλειν, ἀλλ' ἐμε' ἀφαλέως: ὅ δὲ μερμηρίζεσ' Ὀδυσσείς 235
ἡ μετάλεια βοσάλω ἐκ θυμὸν ἠλοίτο, ἥ πρὸς γῆν ἐλάσσει κάρη ἄμφοιδες ἀείρας.
ἀλλ' ἐπέστολμησε, φρεαί δ' ἔσχετο· τὸν δὲ συβάτης νεκείτα ἔσταντα ἰδὼν, μέγα δ' ἐδέκατο χείρας ἀνασιχῶν, 240
"νῦμφαι κρηναίαι, κούραι Δίδος, εἰ ποτ' Ὀδυσσείς ὁμί' ἐπὶ μηρή ἔγις, καλύψας πίσιν δημῷ,

223 λιποῖοι Ρ. Η.  After 223 ἔλεγεν ἱσσυμένος μεγάλην σφόνην ἀνήκενος ὖσ. 237 ἄμφιοδες Ηέρο διαν. Ε' Κ. Η. : ἄμφι οἴδας Φ Υ Άλ. ἀείρας] ἤρλισας Μ. Απολλ. Σοφ. 29, 30. 241 πνεα θήμων θ' ἄργα θημῆ Φ Μ Άλ.

long is a metrical licence only allowable in forms like ὄρης and ὄρα, which cannot otherwise be used in the hexameter (Schulze, Quaest. Ep. p. 207). Some would read ὄρα, with hiatus in the Bacolic diacresis: but the γε seems in place here. 225. θείοτα 'would make,' 'would get himself.'
228. ἀνάλοι, for ἀνάλος, which again is for ἀν-αλός, 'not to be filled out': ἀλλ' as in ἀλλά-that and ἀλλά-θεον. This derivation (given by Van Leeuwen) seems more probable than that from ἀλ-: Lat. al-ere), which is not found as a root in Greek. 231-232. 'His ribs will wear out many a foot-stool (flung at him) on both sides of his head': a piece of exaggeration or inversion of the natural statement, suited to the rough humour of the speech. The difficulty is to ex-
plain ἄμφι κάρη, especially to connect it with πλευραί. The meaning cannot be that some foot-stools will be flung at his head, some at his ribs. This sense may be obtained by reading πλευρά τι (as Bothe proposed): 'his head on both sides and his ribs will wear out &c.' Or perhaps better (taking σφέλα as the nom.), 'many a foot-stool will bang him about the head and ribs.' Cp. 18. 335 ἄμφι κάρη κενοπώς χεραί στυβάρης.
237. The exact sense of ἄμφοιδες is unknown; but it evidently implies lifting by the middle. Ameis quotes Ter. Adelph. ill. 2. 18 Sublimem medium arriperem et capite in terram statuerem, ut cerebro dispergat viam. Probably it is an adverb in -&c., and has nothing to do with οἴδας or οἴδας.
238. φρεαί δ' ἔσχετο 'refrained in his heart,' mastered his impulse.
ἀρνῶν ἦδ’ ἐρίφων, τὸδε μοι κρηναῖ  ἐέλθωρ, ἡς ἔλθοι μὲν κεῖνος ἁνήρ, ἀγάγοι δὲ ἐ δαίμων
tῶ κέ τοι ἀγλαίας γε διασκεδάσειν ἀπάσας, τὰς νῦν ὑβρίζων φορεῖς, ἀλαλήμενοι αἰεὶ
ἀστυ κατ’ αὐτὰρ μῆλα κακοὶ φθείρουσι νομῆς.”

Τὸν δ’ αὐτὲ προσεῖει περὶ Μελάνθιος, αἰτῆλος αἰγῶν.
“ὅ ποτε, οἶνον ἐπιπτε κύων ὀλοφώια εἰδός,
tὸν ποτ’ ἑγὼ ἐπὶ νῆδ’ ἐισεῖλμοι μελαίνης
ἀξω τῆ’ Ἰθάκης, ἵνα μοι βιότον πολὺν ἄλφοι.
αἱ γὰρ Τηλέμαχον βάλοι ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων
σήμερον ἐν μεγάροις, ἢ ὅπο μυστήριοι δαμείης,
ὡς Ὅδυσσῆς γε τηλοῦ ἀπόλευτο νόστιμον ἦμαρ.”

“Ὡς εἰπὼν τοὺς μὲν λίπεν αὐτὸθ’ ἤκα κιόντας,
αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ, μάλα δ’ ὅκα δόμως ἱκανον ἀνακτός.
αὐτῖκα δ’ εἰςω ἱεν, μετὰ δὲ μυστήριοι καθίζειν,
ἀντίον Εὐρυμάχον τὸν γὰρ φιλέσκε μάλιστα.
tῷ πάρα μὲν κρείων μοίραν θέσαν οἱ πονέντω,
σίτον δ’ αἰδοὶς ταμίς παρέθηκε φέρουσα
ἐδμεναι. ἀγχιμολον δ’ Ὅδυσσεὺς καὶ δίος ὑφορβᾶς
στῆτην ἑρχομένω, περὶ δ’ σφεας ἕλυθ’ ἵοι
φόρμιγγος γλαφυρής’ ἀνὰ γὰρ σφις βάλλετ’ ἀείδειν
Φήμιος. αὐτὰρ ὁ χειρὸς ἑλὼν προσεῖει συβατνήν
“Εὔμαι’, ἢ μάλα δὴ τάδε δώματα κάλ’ Ὅδυσσῆς,
ῥεῖα δ’ ἀργύρωτ’ ἐστὶ καὶ ἐν παλλοῦσιν ἱδέσθαι.
ἐξ εὐτέρων ἐτερ’ ἐστίν, ἐπήκοηται δὲ οἱ αὐλῆς

247 Μελανθίους. G. 250 ἄλφοι MSS.: but the true reading is probably ἄλφη,
249 ἑρχομένοι, cp. P H X al.
251 ἐλαφοί, αὐτὸθ’ ἤκα κιόντας,
252 ἐξ εὐτέρων ἐτερ’ ἐστίν, ἐπήκοηται δὲ οἱ αὐλῆς.
253 ἔλαβεν...ἀδελφοί...ἀνὰ...βάλλετ’, ἀείδειν ἔλαβεν.
254 ἀνὰ βάλλετ’, ἀαθότου...ἐπήκοηται δὲ οἱ αὐλῆς.
255 ἐξ εὐτέρων...ἐστίν, ἐπήκοηται δὲ οἱ αὐλῆς.
256 ἐξ εὐτέρων...ἐστίν, ἐπήκοηται δὲ οἱ αὐλῆς.
17. ΟΑΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ρ

τοίχῳ καὶ δριγυκοίῳ, θύραι δ' εὑρέκες εἰσὶν
dικλίδες· οὐκ ἄν τίς μιν ἀνήρ ὑπεροπλίσατο.
γιγνόσκω δ' ὅτι πολλοὶ ἐν αὐτῷ δαιτά τίθενται
ἀνδρεῖς, ἐπεὶ κνήσῃ μὲν ἐνήνθεν, ἐν δὲ τε φόρμιγγε
ἥπει, ἣν ἀρα δαιτί θεοὶ ποίησαν ἐταῖρην." 270
Τὸν δ' ἀπαμείβομενος προσέφης, Ἐδύμητε συβότα:
"μεί ἕγγος, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ τά τ' ἀλλα πέρ ἐσσ' ἀνοήμων.
ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ φραζόμεθ' ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα.
ἡ' σον πράτος ἐσελθε δόμους εἰ ναιετάντας, 275
δύσεο δὲ μυστήρας, ἐγώ δ' ὑπολείψομαι αὐτοῦ·
ei δ' εἴθελες, ἐπίμεινον, ἐγώ δ' ἐμί προπάροιθε
μηδὲ σοὶ δηθίνειν, μή τίς σ' ἐκτοσθε νοῆςας
ἡ βάλη ἡ ἐλάσῃ· τά δὲ σε φράζοσθαι ἄνωγα." 280
Τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' ἐπεται πολύτλας δίος 'Οδυσσεύς:
"γιγνόσκω, φρονέω· τά γε δὴ νοέοντι κελεύεις.
ἀλλ' ἀρχεῖ προπάροιθεν, ἐγώ δ' ὑπολείψομαι αὐτοῦ.
οὐ γάρ τι πληγέων ἀδάμημων οὐδὲ βολάων.
τομήης εἰς ὁμοίος, ἐπεπαύσα τολλά πέπονθα
κύμασι καὶ πολύμων μετὰ καὶ τόδε τοιῷ γενέσθω.
285
gαστέρα δ' οὐ ποὺς ἐστιν ἀποκρύψαι μεμαίναι,

Did.) uilg. 276 δόσαι (δοῦς) P H M. 281 φρονεῖστι M K. 284 κακώ
πολλά MJ.

268. ὑπεροπλίσατο 'would show
himself able to spurn it.' From ἐπέρω-
πλων 'haughty,' 'masterful,' comes the
verb ὑπερωπλικόμασι 'to play the supe-
rior,' in the sorist 'to do some act of
superiority,' to spurn or the like.
270. ἐνήνθεν is the reading of Aris-
tarchus, but the MSS. generally have
ἀνήνθεν. It is difficult to believe that
these are distinct words, as Buttmann
and most scholars have held. The form
ἀνήνθεν can be explained as the regular
perfect from the root ἄνεθ-, ἄν-, which
means 'to rise or spring from,' 'appear
on the surface'; and this meaning suits
all the Homeric uses. But no similar
account of ἐνήνθεν can be given. So
far, therefore, ἐνήνθεν has the better
claim to a place in the Homeric text.
The supposed connexion with ἄνα or
ἴνα takes us into extremely speculative
ground.
273. The τα in the phrase τά τ' ἄλλα
περ is probably a survival from the full
form τά τ' ἄλλα — καὶ τών —. Cp. 5. 29
οὔ γὰρ αὖτε τά τ' ἄλλα περ ἀγαλμάτι
ίσιον.
275-277. Ulysses and Eumaeus affect
to be unknown to each other, in order
to avoid exciting the suspicions of the
Suitors.
284. τομήης 'full of hardihood.'
285. The contrasted words τόδε τοιῷ
are brought together for effect: so in
15. 488 παρὰ καὶ κακῷ ἑθόλον ἔθηκε,
5. 155 παρ' οὐδῶν ἑθελοῦσιν.
286. ἀποκρύψα μι 'to hide away,'
'make a secret of.'
οὐλομένην, ἡ πολλὰ καὶ ἀνθρώποις δίδωσι, τὴς ἕνεκεν καὶ νῆς ἱδύνυοι ὁπλίζονται πάντων ἐπὶ ἀτρύγετον, κακὰ δυσμενέσσι φέρουσαι."

"Ὡς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγάλμους,
ἀν δὲ κύων κεφαλῆν τε καὶ οὕτα κείμενοι ἔσχεν,
'Ἀργος, ὦ Ὀδυσσής ταλασίφρονος, ὃν ἐκ ποτ' αὐτὸς
θρέψε μὲν, οὖν ἀπόνητο, πάρος ὃς εἰς Ἰλιὸν ἱρὴν
φίκτε. τὸν δὲ πάροιθεν ἀγίνεκον νεόι ἄνδρες
ἀγος ἐπὶ ἀγοτέρας ἢδὲ πρόκας ἢδὲ λαγωούς,
ὅτι τότε κεῖτ' ἀπόθεστος ἀποιχομένου ἄνακτος,
ἐν πολλῇ κόπρῳ, ἥ ὁ προπάροιθε θυρῶν
ἡμόνων τε βῶν τε ἀλίς κέχυτ', δφρ' ἄν ἄγοιεν
δῦνε Ὀδυσσής τέμενος μέγα κοπρῆσοντες'
ἔνθα κύων κεῖτ' Ἀργος, ἑνίπλειος κυνοραίτεόνιν.
ὅτι τότε γ', ὡς ἐνόησεν Ὀδυσσή' ἐγγὺς ἑντα,
οὐρὴ μὲν ὑ' ῥ' ἐςῃ καὶ οὕτα καββαλεν ἀμφώ,
ἀσον δ' ὀουκέτ' ἐπείγ' δυνήσατο οἰο ἄνακτος
ἐλθέμεν' αὐτάρ δ' νόσφιν ἱδὼν ἀπομάξιατο δάκρυ,
μεία λαθὼν Ἐδμαιον, ἄφαρ δ' ερείεντο μῦθον:
"Εὐμαί', ἥ μάλα θαύμα κύων δδέ κεῖτ' ἐνι κόπρῳ.
καλὸς μὲν δέμας ἐστίν, ἀτάρ τόδε γ' οὐ σάφα οίδα,
εἰ δὲ καὶ ταχὺς ἐσκε βszę εἶπι εἶδει τόδε,
ἥ αὐτῶς οἶδ' τε τραπεξῆς κόνες ἄνδρῶν
γίγνστ', ἄγαλης δ' ἕνεκεν κομέουσιν ἄνακτες."

290 ἄνακτος] Ὀδυσσής G F P H M U. 301 'Οδυσσή' G: 'Όδυσσα vulg. (a form not elsewhere found in Homer).

296 ἀπόθεστος 'cast aside': probably from a root meaning 'to desire, pray for.' This root is probably not ὑθ-, as Curtius supposed, but ὑθ-
(whence θεσαυρόν for θε-σαυρό, θεστώρ for θε-τόρ, &c.), Indo-germanic *ghedh: whence also τόδ-οι for φόδ-οι (related to θε- as φῶνος to θεν- in θεόν). See Brugmann, Grundr. l. 320, 366.
298 δφρ' ἄν ἄγοιεν ' (waiting) till they should take it away.'
306 The wonder that Ulysses affects to feel is that so fine looking a dog
should be allowed to lie on the dung-hill.
308 ἐνί] Ἡ with this beauty of form,' cp. l. 454.
309 τραπεξῆς 'fed from the table,' II. 22. 69., 23. 173.
310 ἄγαλης δ' κτλ. This clause is logically dependent, = οὕτως δ' κομέουσιν ἄνακτε: but as usual the relative is not repeated. It is incorrect to re-
gard this as a specially Homeric kind of parataxis (Kühner, II. § 799).
17. ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ Ρ

Τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφης, Ἐδμαίει συβῶτα:
"καὶ λίθν ἄνδρος γε κόσω δδε τῇλε θανόντος·
εἰ τοιοῦδ’, εἶ ἡμέν δέμας ἢδε καὶ ἔργα,
οἶν μιν Τροίνδε κιὸν κατέλειτεν Ὅδυσσεύς,
ἀλγὰ κε θηήσαι ἰδὼν ταχυτῆτα καὶ ἄλκην.
οὐ μὲν γάρ τι φύγεσκε βαθείςς βένθεσιν ὅλης
κνάδαλον, ὅτι δύοτο καὶ ἰχνείς γὰρ περιήδη
νῦν δ’ ἔχεται κακοττη, ἄναξ δὲ οἱ ἄλλοθι πάτρης
ἄλετο, τὸν δὲ γυναικὲς ἀκηδείς οὐ κομέωσι.
δὲ δέ με, εὐτ’ ἄν μηκέτ’ εἰπικρατέωσιν ἀνακτε,
οὐκέτ’ ἐπειτ’ ἐθέλουσιν ἐναίσιμα ἐργάζεσθαι.
ἡμιο νῦρ τ’ ἄρετής ἀποίηνυται εὐρότοπα Ζεῦς
ἄνεροι, εὐτ’ ἄν μιν κατὰ δούλων ἦμαρ ἠλησιν.
"Ὡς εἴπον εἰσῆλθε δόμους εὖ ναιετάντας,
βῆ δ’ ιῆς μεγάριοι μετὰ μνηστήρας ἀγανοίς.
"Ἀργὸν δ’ αὖ κατὰ μοῖρ’ ἔλαβεν μέλανος βανάτοιο,
αὐτίκ’ ιδόνι Ὅδυσσει ἐκεικότω ἐναντῷ.
Τὸν δὲ πολὺ πρῶτος ἰδὲ Τηλέμαχος θεοείδης
ἐρχόμενον κατὰ δόμα συβῶτην, ὅκα δ’ ἐπείτα

318 πάτρης] γαῖς Μ. 322–323 are quoted by Plato (Legg. vi. p. 777 a) in the form ἰμεων γάρ τε νόου ἀπαμειβεται εὑρότοπα Ζεῦς ἄνδρον οὗ τα ἀν θανόντως δούλω ἦμαρ. This version appears in Eust., who follows it in commenting on 14. 434 with reference to ἀπαμειβεται, and only notices the variation between ἀρετής and νῦν. When he comes to the present passage, however, he quotes the vulgar and does not refer to any difference of reading: ἀπαμειβεται is recognized in the Et. Mag., and occurs in Hesiod (Op. 578 ἔργοι τρίτων ἀπαμειβεται ἄλος, also Th. 801). The meaning ‘takes away a portion’ is not inappropriate here, with ἰμεων (ср. τρίτων ἄλος in Hesiod): but νοῦν and ἀνδρόν obei τα περὶ are evidently less Homeric than ἄρετής and ἄνεροι εὐρ’ αὖ μιν. 327 Perhaps οἶδ’ ‘on the spot when he saw’ (Bekker, H. B. i. 275).

312. It seems best to put a stop at the end of this line, rather than to treat 312–315 as one sentence. Eumæus explains at once what seemed to surprise Ulysses: the dog belonged to one who had died far from his home—hence his neglected condition. καὶ λίθν = ‘you may well see that,’ it is indeed because’ (Lat. immo).
317. διὰ διοντ’ ‘whatever one he chased.’ 318. ἄλοθι πάτρης must here be ‘away from his country,’ a use of ἄλοθι not elsewhere found. The Venetian MS. (M) has γαῖς (as in Od. 2. 131). The vulgate here may have arisen by contamination of ἄλοθι γαῖς with τηλόθι πάτρης (2. 365).
322. ἀρετή appears here to have its later meaning (see 13. 45). But probably the sense is very general: ‘Zeus takes out half the good of a man, when &c.’
νεῦσ' ἐπὶ οὐ καλέσασ' ὃ δὲ παπτῆνας ἔλε διήφρον κείμενον, ἔνθα τε δαιτρὸς ἐφίζεσθε κρέα πολλὰ δαιόμενος μνηστήριον δόμον κατά δαιμυνόμενης τὸν κατέθηκε βέρων πρὸς Τηλέμαχοι τράπεζαν ἀντίον, ἔνθα δ' ἄρ' αὐτὸς ἐφίζετο τῷ δ' ἄρα κῆρυξ μοίραν ἔλλον ἔτιθει κανέον τ' ἐκ σιτον ἄειρας. Ἀγχίμολον δὲ μετ' αὐτὸν ἐδύσετο δώματ' Ὀδυσσεύς, πτωχὸς λεγαλέος ἐναλληγίου ἢδὲ γέροντες, σκηπτέμενος τὰ δὲ λυγρὰ περὶ χροὶ ἔμματα ἔστο. ἧς δ' ἐπὶ μελίνου οὐδοῦ ἐντοσθε θυρῶν, κλινάμενος σταθμῷ κυπαρισσῶν, ὃν ποτε τέκτων ἔδεσσεν ἐπιταμείνως καὶ ἐπὶ στάθμην ἰθὺν. Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐπὶ οὐ καλέσασ προσέπιεσε συβάτην, ἄρτον τ' οὐλὸν ἔλλον περικαλλέος ἐκ κανέοιο καὶ κρέας, ὅς οἱ χεῖρες ἐγκάνδαλον ἀμφιβαλλόντι "δὸς τῷ ἕδην ταῦτα βέρων αὐτοῦ τε κέλευς αἰτίζειν μάλα πάντας ἐποιχόμενον μνηστήρας' αἰῶς δ' οὐκ ἄγαθη κεχρημένῳ ἀνδρὶ παρεῖναι." Ὅς φάτο, βῆ δὲ συφορβός, ἐπεὶ τὸν μιθὸν ἄκουσεν, ἀγχοῦ δ' ἱσταμένος ἔπεα πετρέντ' ἀγρεύεις: "Τηλέμαχος τοι, ἥεινε, διδοὶ τάδε, καὶ σε κελευει αἰτίζειν μάλα πάντας ἐποιχόμενον μνηστήρας αἰῶδ' οὐκ ἄγαθήν φης' ἐμμεναι ἄνδρι προίκτη." 334 ἔνθα δ' ἄρ'] ἔνθα περ Ρ Η α λ. 344 κρήνα Υ. 347 κεχρημένῳ ἀνδρὶ παρεῖναι] κεχρημένον ἀνδρα κομίζειν Π. 349] προικτη] προσηθεὶς Φ Χ Υ α λ. 

330. νεῦσα καλέσα. The aor. part. is used as a description of an act, 'made a sign to call him': H. C. § 77.
331. κείμενον 'placed,' 'set': cp. κατ-τίθησε, l. 333.
332. ἐφίζεσθε 'used to sit in attendance': ἔστι as in ἐστινος, &c.
333. Notice the play of words, δαιόμενος ... δαιμυνόμεναι: cp. 13. 24, &c.
334. τά, with ἔμματα (H. C. § 259. a), λυγρὰ being a predicate; cp. l. 573.
335. μελίνου. On the relation of this threshold to the λάϊνος οὐδός of l. 30 see the Appendix on the Homeric House.
336. οὗτος καλέσας. Elsewhere the word is always μελίνως.
337. ἵσταμη is properly 'a weight,' then a plumb line, a line with a weight attached.
338. αὐτόν, with αἰτίζειν, 'to beg in person.'
339. οὐκ ἄγαθήν παρεῖναι 'is not good to be with,' a personal constr. for 'it is not a good thing that it should attend on': cp. Π. I. 1. 107, &c.
340. προίκτη, from προί, or rather προιξ, see on 13. 15.
τὸν δὲ ἀπαμείβομενος προσέφη πολύμητις 'Οδυσσεύς.
"Ζεῦ ἄνα, Τηλέμαχον μοι ἐν ἀνθράκιν ἀλβίον εἶναι,
καὶ οἱ πάντα γένοιτο σοι φρεσὶν ἵππι μενοῖνα." 355

"Η ρὰ καὶ ἀμφοτέρῃσιν ἱδέξατο καὶ κατεθήκεν
αὐτὶ ποδῶν προπάροισιν, ἀδικελίῃς ἐπὶ πῆρας,
ῄσθε δὲ ἡσοί αὐτὸς ἐνὶ μεγάροις αἰείδεν
εὐθὺς ὁ δεδεπνηκέν, ὁ δὲ ἔπαιντε ἄθεος αὐτὸς,
μνηστήρας δὲ ὄμαθθαν ἀνὰ μέγαρ᾽ αὐτὸρ 'Αθηνή
ἀγχὶ παρισταμένη Δαερτιάδην 'Οδυσσῆα
ἀφημ᾽, ὡς ἀν πύρνα κατὰ μνηστήρας ἀγέλεροι,
γνοὶ δὲ οἱ τινες εἶχεν ἐναίσιμοι οἱ τ᾽ ἀδέμιστοι,
ἀλλ᾽ οὖν ἡ των ἐμέλλ᾽ ἀπαλεξῆσεις κακῶτητος.

βῆ δὲ ἱμὲν αἰτήσον ἐνδέξατα φῶτα ἔκατον,
πάντοσε χεῖρ ὀρέγων, ὡς εἶ πτωχός πάλαι εἰς
οἱ δὲ ἐλειεροντες δίδοσαν, καὶ ἐβάμβουεν αὐτὸν,
ἀλλὰς τοῦ ἐν τοῖς εἰς καὶ πᾶσαν ἔλθοι
τοῖς δὲ καὶ μετέπεσε Μελάνθιος, αἵπτοις αὐγῶν:
"κέκλυτε μεν, μνηστήρας ἀγκλείης βασιλείς,
τοῦτε περὶ ξείνους ἡ γάρ μν πρόσθεν ὀπώσα.

ὃ τοι μὲν οἱ δύφορο συνβάτης ἤγεμονεν
αὐτὸν δὲ οὐ σάφα οἴδα, πᾶσαν γένος ἐχεται εἰναι.

"Ως ἐφατ᾽, 'Αντίνοος δ᾽ ἐπεσιν νείκεσσε συβάτην
"ἀργύνωτε συβάτα, τὴν δὲ σεύ τόνδε πάλινδε

"καὶ ἤγαγες; ἡ οὖν ἀλισ ἢμιν ἀλήμονες εἰς καὶ ἄλλοι,


358. The readings ὅς ὅς (or ὅς) and ὅς ὅς are excluded by the sense, and are in fact merely successive corruptions of ὅς, for which the metre requires - ὅς. The original is doubtless ὅς or ὅς.

359. The apodosis is the aor. ὁμάθθαν, rather than the imperf. ἔπαιντο, which is logically subordinate: 'when he had eaten, with the pausing of the singer the noise of the Suitors began.' For the succession of tenses compare II. 1.
πτωχοὶ ἀνιηροὶ, δαιτῶν ἄπολυμαντήρες; ἡ δυσαι δι τοι βίοτον κατέδουσιν ἄνακτος ἐνθάδ᾿ ἀγερίμυκοι, ς δὲ καὶ προτὶ τὸν ἐκάλεσσας;

Τὸν δ᾿ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφης, Ἐδραίε συβῶτα· 380

"Ἀντίνο", οὐ μὲν καλὰ καὶ ἐσθλὸς ἐών ἀγορευές· τίς γὰρ δὴ ἔσευν καλεὶ ἄλλους αὐτὸς ἐπελθὼν ἄλλου γ’, εἰ μὴ τῶν οἱ δημοοργοὶ ἔσαι, μάντιν ἡ ἕστηρα κακῶν ἢ τέκτονα δότας, ἡ καὶ θέστων ἁμοίων, δὲ κεν τέρπησιν ἁμείων; 385

οὔτω γὰρ κλητοὶ γε βροτῶν ἐπ’ ἀπείραν γαῖαν—πτωχῶν δ’ οὐκ ἂν τις καλεί τρύγοντα ἐ αὐτῶν. ἀλλ’ αἰεὶ χαλεπῶς περὶ πάντων εἰς μνησθῆραν ὁμοίων Ὄδυσσηος, περὶ δ’ αὐτ’ ἐμι· αὐτὰρ ἐγγυε ὅτι δὲ ἄλλοι ἥσοι μοι ἐξέφρας Πηνελοπεια

ζωε ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ καὶ Τηλέμαχος θεοειδῆς;" 390

Τὸν δ᾿ αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίνον ἔδα: "σίγα, μὴ μοι τοῦτον ἀμεβεῖ σὺλλ ἐπέσσων Ἀντίνοος δ’ ἑλθει κακῶς ἐρεθιζόμεν αἰεὶ

379 προτὶ Ρ.Η.: σωτὶ Μ. E. F. Χ. Υ. Α.ν. 389 πέμ Υ., Ευκ.: περὶ


377. δαιτῶν, see l. 220.

378. δωσαί 'are you dissatisfied?' i.e., 'do not you think it (bad) enough!' Cp. the ironical sense of paenitet in Latin comedy: e.g. Ter. Eun. 3, 6, 12 an paenitetbat flagitit te austore quod facisset adolescents?

383. δημοοργοῖ 'workers for the common weal,' in contrast to husbandmen or merchants, who deal only with their own or their master's property.

386. ἐν ἀπεῖραν γαῖαν 'all the world over': ἐν of extent, without a verb of motion—a use chiefly found in the Odyssey (H. G. § 199, 4).

387. τρύγοντα ἐ αὐτῶν, cp. for the metre Il. 17, 551 πυκάσσα ἐ αὐτής. We get rid of one hiatus by writing either ἐ σὲ αὐτῶν or ἐ σὲ αὐτῶν, but we cannot account in this way for both. The anomaly is probably due to causes similar to those which produced the Attic σεαρτόν and λαυτόν as alternatives with σαρτόν and αὐτῶν. Ahrens and Brugmann (Griech. Gr. § 133) suppose that the genitives σὲ αὐτῶν, ἐ σὲ αὐτῶν, passing into σεαρτόν, λαυτόν, were the model on which other cases were formed. This view is strongly supported by the form feantrén (gen.) found in the Cyprian dialect. Wackernagel (K. Z. xxvii. 279) finds the solution in the double forms τεν, τεν and σεν, σεν. Thus he treats λαυτόν and αὐτῶν as ἐ τὲ αὐτῶν and ἐ τὲ αὐτῶν respectively. The two explanations are not wholly incompatible, since ἐ τὲ αὐτῶν and 'feantrén may have both existed, and after the loss of ἐ would both become λαυτόν. In Homer, however, the hiatus of ἐ τὲ αὐτῶν is easily accounted for by the analogy of ἐ τὲ αὐτῶν and of αὐτῶ. We may compare ἐ τὲ αὐτῶν αἰεὶ in Il. 13, 22, due to the recurring ἐ τὲ αὐτῶν αἰεὶ: αἰεὶ μεταν δεσδροῦ. (Il. 18, 288), due to μεταν δεσδροῦ, &c. But ἐ τὲ αὐτῶ may be recognized in Il. 14, 152 ἐ τὲ ἱπποφανός ἐ αὐτής.
17. ΟΔΤΣΞΕΙΑΣ Ρ

μύθοισιν χαλέποισιν, ἐποτρύνει δὲ καὶ Ἀλλοις." 395

*Ἡ ρα καὶ Ἀντίνοον ἐπεια πτερόεντα προσηύδα: "Ἀντίνο, ἢ μεν καλὰ πατὴρ δς κηδεαυνίο, δς τὸν ξεύον ἀναγκας ἀπὸ μεγάρου διεσθαί μύθον ἀναγκαίως μη τοῦτο θεδις τελέσειε. δὸς οἱ ξέλων οδ τοι φθονέω κέλαιμα γάρ ἐγαγε. 400

μητι οὖν μητέρι ἐμὴν ἄξεν τὸ γε μήτε τιν' Ἀλλον δράμων, οἱ κατὰ δώματ' Ὀδυσσηὸς θελοι. ἀλλ' οὔ τοι τοιοῦτον ἐνι στήθεσι νόημα: αὐτὸς γὰρ φαγέμεν πολὺ βούλεαι ἢ δῶμεν ἄλλω." 405

Τὸν δ' αὐτ' Ἀντίνοος ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέειπε: "Τηλέμαχ' ὕψαγόρη, μένος ἄσχετε, ποίον ἔειπες. εἰ οἱ τῶσιον πάντες ὄρεξείαν μυστῆρεσ, καὶ κέν μιν τρεῖς μήνας ἀπόπροδι οἴκος ἐρύκοι." 410

*Ὡς δρ' ἐφή, καὶ θρήνιν ξέλων ὑπέφηνε τραπέγης κείμενον, δ' ἐπεχεὶ λιπαροῦς πόδας εἰλαπνάζον. οἱ δ' Ἀλλοι πάντες δίδοσαν, πλήσαν δ' ἄρα πήρην σέτου καὶ κρειῶν τάχα δὴ καὶ ἐμελλέν 'Οδυσσείδις αὐτίς ἐπ' ὀβδῶν ἰῶν προικὸς γεῦσοσθαί Ἀχαίοιν. στῇ δὲ παρ' Ἀντίνοον, καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε: "δὸς, φίλος' οὐ μέν μοι δοκεῖεις δ' κάκιστος Ἀχαίοιν 415


399. Cp. 7. 316 μὴ τευτόν φίλος Διτ πατρὶ γένοτο. 401. τὸ γε 'ί to that point,' i.e. so as to refuse to give away what belongs to her. 407. ὄρεξαν. The word is chosen to cover the sort of dole that Antinous thought of. 408. 'The house would keep him aloof for quite three months.' The words are intentionally ambiguous; they might mean that the beggar would have food enough for three months. 409. ὑπέφηνε 'showed from under,' 'made to peep from under the table.' 410. κείμενον, cp. 1. 531 (supra). 413. προικὸς γεῦσοσθαί Ἀχαίοιν is generally translated 'to taste the present of the Achaean,' i.e. to eat the food which he has just collected from them. But (1) προικὸς is only known as an adverb, = gratia (see 13. 15); and (2) the verb γεῦσομαι in other Homeric passages always has the metaphorical sense 'to make trial of': Il. 20. 258 γεύσομαι ἀλληλοις ὑπαίθριαν νυφανὰς ἐγκέφαλον, and so γ. χειρῶν (Od. 20. 181), δέστοι (Od. 21. 98), δουρὸς ἀναπήρτη (Il. 21. 61). Hence the meaning more probably is, he was going to try (his fortune with) the Achaean without paying for it,' i.e. his bold experiment on the good nature of the Suitors was like to be made with impunity. 415. There is much to be said for reading δ' φίλος, οὐ γάρ μοι στ. The
έμεναι, ἀλλ' ἄριστος, ἔπει βασιλῆι ἔσκας.
τῷ σε χρῆ δομέναι καὶ λαῖον ἥ περ ἄλλοι
σίνου ἔγω δὲ κὲ σε κλείον κατ' ἀπελρονα γαίαν.
καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ποτὲ οἶκον ἐν ἄνθρωποις ἐναιον
όλβιος ἀφνεῖον καὶ πολλάκις δόσκων ἀλῆτη,
tοῦρ ὅπως ἔοι καὶ δὲν κεχρημένοις ἔθοι.
عجز ἄν δὲ δύος μᾶλα μυρίοι ἄλλα τε πολλά
οίςν τ' εἰ ὄρωσι καὶ ἀφνεῖοι καλέονται.

αὐλλὰ Ζεῦς ἀλάπαξε Κρονίων—ἣδελε γὰρ ποιν—
d' μ' ἀμα ληστήροι πολυπάγκτους ἀνήκεν
Ἀγυπτόνδι' ἵναι, δολιχὴν ὄδων, δρφ' ἀπολοίην.
στήσα δ' ἐν Ἀγύπτῳ ποταμῷ νέας ἀμφιελώσασ.
ἐνθ' ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγώ κελῆμην ἐρήμασ ταῖρους
ἀυτὸς πάρ νήσου μένειν καὶ νήσας ἐρυσθαί,
ὀπτήρας δὲ κατὰ σκοπίας ὄρωνα νέσαβαι.

ο' δεθρεί εξαντες, ἐπισπόμενοι μένει σφῆ,
ἀγά μαλ' Ἀγυπτίων ἄνδρων περικαλλέας ἄγροις
πόθεν, ἐκ δ' γυναῖκας ἄγον καὶ νήπια τέκνα,
ἀυτοὺς τ' ἐκτείνων τάχα δ' ἐσ πόλιν ἱκετ' αὐθή.

ο' δε βοήσα ἄνοντες ἄμ' ἥτοι φαινομένην


421 δὲν [Perhaps δῆς: see 19. 77.

441 ἄναγον] see 14. 272.

sentence would then consist of a clause
with γὰρ with the main clause follow-
ing it and introduced by τῷ: "since
you are the best of the Achaeans, there-
fore you should give me most." The
only objection is that this form of sen-
tence is confined to the Iliad (H. G.
§ 382.2).

418. σίνου, a partitive gen., as in
1. 457.

κλέω may be either a subj. (Cobet, 
Misc. Crit. 315), or a fut. (Schulze,
Quaest. Ep. p. 281). In either case the
original Homeric form is κλέων, from
κλέων: cp. τελέω, &c.

423. ἐφ' t' κτλ. 'because of which
men live well.'

425. ἥ, with causal force, 'in respect
that he &c.'


439. στήσα makes an awkward jingle
with ἐπτη. In the parallel 14. 370 most
MSS. have μεναν.

441. ἄναγον, see on 14. 272.
αυτάρ εἰς ἘΚ튼ον ξείνη δόσαν ἀντιάσαντι, 445
Δμήτριον Ιασίδη, δε Κύπρον ἵππο ἀνασεν
ἐχθέν δὴ νῦν δείρο τὸ ἱκα πῆματα πάσχων·

Τὸν δὲ ἀδίκον ἀπαμείβετο φανήσεν τε· 446
"τίς δαίμον τόδε πῆμα προσήγαγε, δαιτὸς ἀνίην;
στήθ' οὖν ἐς μέσον, ἐμῆς ἀπάνευθε τραπέζης,
μὴ τάχα πικρὴν Αἰγυπτον καὶ Κύπρον ἱκτηι
ὅς τις θαρσάλεος καὶ ἀναιδὴς ἑσσὶ προκῆς.

ἐξῆς πάντεσσι παρῆσασα σ᾽ ὑπὲρ διδοῦσι
μαγίδιοιν, ἐτεὶ ὁ τις ἐπισχεῖσι οὖν ἐληκτὸς
ἀλλοτρίων χαρίσασαί, ἐτεὶ πάρα πολλὰ ἐκάστῳ.

Τὸν δὲ ἀναχωρῆσας προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς· 450
"ἀ ροχοὶ, οὐκ ἄρα σοι ὑπὸ εἶδε ili καὶ φρένες ἠσαν
οὐ σὺ γὰρ ἦς οὐκ ἐπιστάτης οὐδὲ ἄλλης,
ὅς τι νῦν ἀλλοτρίως παρόμοιον ὑπὸ τι μοι ἐτήλη
οἰων ἀποπροελών δῶμαι· τὰ δὲ πολλὰ πάρεστιν·

"Ως ἦς τινε, Ἀντίνοος δὲ ἐχολῶσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον,
καὶ μην ὑπὸ δρα ἰδὼν ἑπει πτερώματα προσήδα·
"νῦν δὴ σ' οὐκέτι καλὰ διέκ μεγάροι γ' ὑπὸ
ἀναχωρῆσειν, δὴ δὴ καὶ ὑνείδεια βάζεις.

"Ως ἄρ' ἠφη, καὶ θρήνων ἑλών βάλε δεξιῶν ὑμῶν

450–452 obel. Ατ. (ὑπεροίσων Ariston.).

447. οὕτως, not properly an adverb of place, but used to emphasize the words ἐς μέσον, to the middle, as I tell you': cp. the use in the phrase μῖκρος ὀὖν (II. 2. 130), lit. 'vainly—just so,' = 'quite vainly,' and similar phrases in Attic (συναφὸς οὖν], &c.); also the idiomatic use of τόσον (15. 405) and τοίον (15. 453), and of ὑπὸ in I. 544 (infra). In these uses it is generally unnecessary to suppose any explanatory gesture.

448. A typical example of oxymoron: 'a sad kind of Egypt,' meaning something quite different from Egypt. Cp. πυρόγαροι, l. 137 (supra).

454. οὖν ἄρα ἄγον 'are not as we thought.'

ἐς εἶδε 'with a fair outside,' cp. 308 (supra).

455. ἐπιστάτη generally taken to mean a 'suppliant' or 'almsman,' one that comes and takes his stand to beg. But perhaps the notion is rather that of 'standing by' as follower or dependant. As the patron is προστάτης, 'standing in front,' the client might be described as standing 'with' or 'behind.' Similarly προστάτης in Attic military language meant 'front rank man,' and ἐπιστάτης 'rear rank man.' We may compare the Latin applicatio denoting a mode of creating client-ship (Cic. de Orat. 39. 177 s. se ad aliquem quasi patronum applicavisset).

456. δὲ has a causal force, = 'seeing that you had not the heart': cp. 425 (supra). ἀλλοτρίως, neut.: so 18. 18.

458. καὶ δὲ ὑπὸ 'right heartily,' see 15. 370.
πρυμνότατον κατὰ νῦτον: ὁ δ' ἐστάθη ἥτετε πέτρη ἐξεδον, οὐδ' ἄρα μιν σφῆλεν. Ἑλος 'Ἀντινοοι, ἀλλ' ἀκείων κίνησε κάρη, κακά βυσσοδομέας. 465 ἄφ δ' ἃ γ' ἐπ' οὖδ' οὖν κατ' ἄρ' ἔετο, καδ' δ' ἄρα πήρην θηκεν εὐπλείην, μετὰ δὲ μυστήριν ἐπείτε
'κέκλυτε μεν, μυστηρίπας ἀγακλειτής βασιλείης, δόρ' εἰπὼ τά με θυμός εἰνι σηθήσει κελεύει. οὐ μᾶν οὐ' ἄχος ἐστὶ μετά φρεσὶν οὔτε τι πένθος, ὄποτ' ἀνὴρ περὶ οἷς μαχείμενοι κτεάτεσσα
βλήται, ἢ περὶ βουσών ἢ ἄργενηὶς οἴεσσαι αὐτὰρ ἔμ' Ἀντίνους βάλε γαστέρος εἶκενα λυγρῆς, οἰλομένης, ἢ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώπωι δίδωσον. 470 ἀλλ' εἶ ποι πτωκῶν γε θεοὶ καὶ ἐρινύες εἰσίν, Ἀντίνουν πρὸ γάμου τέλος βαντότοι κιηῆτ." Τὸν δ' αὐτ' Ἀντίνους προσέφη, Ἐυπείδεοι νίος: "ἐσθί' ἐκπλω, ἤειν, καθήμενος, ἢ ἀπιθ' ἀλλ', μή σε νέοι διὰ δομά ἐρώσσωσ', οἱ ἀγορεύεις, ἢ ποδός ἢ καλ' χειρός, ἀποθυρύσωσι δὲ πάντα." 475 "Ὡς ἐφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ὑπερμᾶλως νεμέσσαν ὁδε δὲ τις ἐπεσκε νέων ὑπερηνορεῖντων:
'Ἀντίνο, οὐ μὲν κάλ' ἐβαλε δύστην ναλῆν" 466 ἄφ δ' ἃ γ' F P al.: ἄφ δ' ἃ γ' H: ἄφ δ' ἃρ G X al.: ἄφ ἄρ U. 475-480 obliterated by Ar. 478 ἐσθι' ἐκπλω\) Originally perhaps ἐσθι' ἐκπλω. 479 δομα G M: δομά: U: ἄδμα: vulg. 463. πρυμνότατον goes with ἄμοιν, as in l. 504: 'the shoulder at its very base,' which is then explained by κατὰ νῦτον, = 'where it joins the back.' Ameis and others take πρυμνότατον with νῦτον, and explain it of the upper part of the back. It is difficult to say what πρυμνόν νῦτον would mean. The word is regularly used of the hindmost or undermost part of a thing (the base, root, &c.), and in the case of a limb denotes the end next the body. Here the point is that the blow was from behind, and also that it struck Ulysses full in the back—not so as to glance off. 465. Βυσσοδομέας, see on l. 66. 471. μαχείμενοι, metrical lengthening for μαχείμενοι: cp. μαχεύμενοι (II. 403, 34. 113). 480. τώτο, probably a neut. plur.: see 16. 21. 483 ff. It is usual to punctuate as though the clause εἶ ἐν ὑπό οἷς αὐτα, were construed with the preceding line. But the vocative οἷς (wretched man!) makes a break which obliges us to take it as the beginning of a new sentence. This sentence will then consist of a protasis—'if now perchance he is some god'—with no apodosis expressed, but followed by a parenthesis, καὶ τε θεοὶ αὐτα, which suggests the proper apodosis (viz., 'it will go hard with us,' or the like). This apodosis is especially indicated by the last words of the parenthesis (ἐορθέν, ἀφετέρων).
οὐλόμεν', εἰ δὴ ποῦ τις ἐπουράνιος θεὸς ἔστι,—
καὶ τε θεὸι ξενοῦσιν ἐοικῶτες ἀλλοιοποιοῦσιν,
παντοίοι τελεθοῦντες, ἐπιστρεφόμενοι πῶλησας,
ἀνθρώπων ύβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίαν ἐφοροῦντες."

"Ως δ᾿ ἔφαν μνηστήρες, ὡς οὖκ ἔμπαξετο μοῦθων.
Τηλεμάχος δ᾿ ἐν μὲν κραδίῃ μέγα πένθος ἐξες
βλημένου, οὖδ᾿ ἀρὰ δάκαρ χαμαῖ βάλεν ἐκ βλεφάροιων, 490
ἀλλ᾿ ἀκέον κίνησε κάρη, κακὰ βυσσόδομενων.
Τοῦ δ᾿ ὡς οὖν ἤκουσε περιφρῶν Πινελόπεια
βλημένου ἐν μεγάρῳ, μετ᾿ ἄρα δρφήσιν ἔισεν·
"αἰῶν οὐντοί αὐτὸν σε βάλοι κλυτότοξον 'Απόλλων." 495
τὴν δ᾿ αὐτ᾿ Εὐρυνόμη ταμίῇ πρὸς μύθον ἔισεν·
"εἰ γὰρ ἐπὶ ἀρβίσιν τέλος ἡμετέρησε γένοιτο
οὐκ ἄν τίς τούτων γε ἔθρονον Ἡώ ἴκοιτο."

Τὴν δ᾿ αὐτὴ προσέειτο περιφρῶν Πινελόπεια·
"μαί", ἐχθρὸι μὲν πάντες, ἐπεὶ κακὰ μηχανώνται
Ἀντίνως δὲ μάλιστα μελαινὴ κηρὶ ἑοίκε. 500
ζεινός τις δ᾽ ὁστηνος ἀλητεύει κατὰ δῶμα
ἀνέρας αἰτίζον· ἀχρηστοῖς γὰρ ἄνωγεν·
ἐνθά δὲ ἄλοι μὲν πάντες ἀνέλπησαν τ᾽ ἔσοράν τε,
οὗτος δὲ θρήνου πρυμνον βάλε δεξιῶν ὁμον."

"Ἡ μὲν ἄρ᾿ ὡς ἄγρευε μετὰ δρφησὶ γυναιξὶν,
ἡμένη ἐν τάλαμον· ὃ δ᾿ ἔδειτε δίοις 'Οδυσσείς. 505


Thus the structure of the sentence is like Π. II. 580 εἰ περ γὰρ εἰ ἡθελοῦν ᾧθήσονται... στυφέλεια, ὡ γὰρ τὸλυ τὸν ἐθρατοῦν ἡμα: cp. Π. II. 21. 567, Od. 21. 260.

486. τελεθοῦντες 'turning,' i.e. 'becoming.' ἐπιστρεφομένοι, see l. 97.

489. δέξα 'cherished,' 'allowed to swell,' cp. Π. II. 17. 139 μέγα πένθος ἐν ἀσθενείαν ἄλοι.

490. βλημένον, gen. of the object, 'sorrow for him thus struck,' or rather (since the emphasis is on the fact) 'for that he had been struck.'

494. οὕτως 'in like manner,' 'as you have done to him.'

499-504. It is difficult to see how Penelope is supposed to have gained the knowledge which she here shows of what has been passing in the μέγαρον.

She appears to assume that Eurynome and the maids know nothing; see Seek, Quellen, p. 29. Possibly the 'lady's bower' in the Homeric palace was furnished with some window or opening by which she could see the company in the hall. So she hears Telemachus sneeze (l. 542), and the song of Phemius (l. 328); and Ulysses hears her voice (20. 92).

501. The asyndeton is epexegetical: Penelope is explaining the words μελαβην ηρι δωει.

504. πρυμνον, see l. 463.
17. ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ Ρ

"η δ' ἐπὶ οἷος καλέσασα προσήδα διὸν ὑφορβιν
"ἐρχεο, δι' Ἐδμαιε, κιὼν τὸν ξείνον ἀνωθῆ
ἐλθέμεν, ὅφει τι μὴν προσπτύζομαι ἥδ' ἔσωμαι
εἰ που Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασσήργων ἥ πεπυσται
η ἰδεν ὀφθαλμοῖ. πολυπλάγητα γὰρ ἔικε."

Τὴν δ' ἀπακειβύμενος προσέφης, Ἐδμαιε συβάτα:
"εἰ γάρ τοι, βασίλεια, σωπήσειεν Ἀχαιοῖ:
οἱ δ' γε μυθείται, θέλγοιτό κέ τοι φίλων ἦτορ.
τρεῖς γάρ δὴ μὲν νυκτας ἔχον, τρία δ' ἤματ' ἐρυξα
ἐν κλισή: πρῶτον γάρ ἤμ' ἵκετο νὴς ἀποδράς,
ἀλλ' οὐ ποι κακότητα διήνυσεν ἢν ἄγορευσαν.
ὡς δ' ὅτ' αὐδῶν ἀνήρ ποτιδέρκεται, δε τε θεῶν εἰς
ἀείθη δεδαύς ἐπε' ἰμέρεντα βροτοῦ,
τοῦ δ' ἀμοιν μεμᾶσιν ἄκουμεν, ὅπτοτ' ἀείθη
ὡς ἐμὲ κεῖνος ἐθέλυε παρήμενος ἐν μεγάροισι.
φησι δ' Ὀδυσσήος ξείνοις πατρώοις εἶναι,
Κρητή ναετάν, δὴ Μίνωος γένος εἰσὶν.
ἐνθεν δὴ νῦν δέθρο τὸδ' ἵκετο πήματα πάσχον;

514. ὅσα is causal: ‘with such things
as he tells.’

515. νυκτας. The night is regularly
put first, as in the phrase νυκτας τε καὶ
ἡμαρ, and the later νυγήμερον.

The chronology is open to some
doubt. If the homeward journey of
Telemaeus did not begin till the
morning after Ulysses landed in Ithaca
(as we have assumed, see the note on
15.1), Ulysses must have spent four
nights in the hut of Eumaeus, viz. (1)
the night after his landing; (2) the
night which Telemaeus passed at
Phaeae, 15.188; (3) the night of the
voyage from Pylos; and (4) the night
after the return of Telemaeus. This
is the reckoning of Kirchoff, who ob-
serves that ‘in this and similar things
it is advisable not to demand too
scrupulous an exactness from the poet’
(De Homerische Odyssen, p. 516). The
ancients got rid of the discrepancy by
making Telemaeus start on his journey
on the same day as that on which his
father reached Ithaca. On this view
(if a prosaic accuracy is insisted on)
Athene reached Sparta before she left
Ulysses in Ithaca (so Dr. Hayman, vol.
III. app. H 2). And in any case, when
one book ends with the end of a day
(14.533 ff.), and the next begins with
an early morning scene (15.1-55), the
days are surely meant to be successive.
On the other hand, the miscalculation—
if such a word may be applied to it—
becomes intelligible when we consider
that only three evenings in the hut of
Eumaeus are actually described—one
in each of the three books 14-16.
The rest of the time spent there—the second
and early part of the third day—is
a blank in respect of incident, and
naturally passed even from the poet's
own mind.

522. This is quite different from the
account given by Ulysses himself to
Eumaeus (14.321 ff.); but it agrees
with the story which he tells to Penelope
19. 272 ff. A discrepancy of this
kind, in a story supposed to be the
invention of the moment, does not
seem to have as much significance as
modern critics are apt to give it.
προπροκυλινδόμενος: στεντά δ' 'Οδυσσής ἀκοῦσαι 
ἀγχοῦ, Θεσπρωτῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐν πλοίῳ δήμῳ, 
ξωθοὶ πολλὰ δ' ἀγεί κειμήλια δυνὴ δύσουνδε.'

Τὸν δ' αὐτὲ προσείπει περίφρον Πηνελόπεια: 
"ἐρχεσ, δεύρο κάλεσον, ὥν' ἄντιον αὐτὸς ἐνισση. 
οὖτοι δ' ἡ βύρησι καθήμενοι ἑσπιάσθων 
ἡ αὐτοῦ κατὰ δόματ', ἐπεί σφησι θυμὸς ἑσφροκ. 
αὐτῶν μὲν γὰρ κτήματ' ἀκήρατα κεῖτ' ἐνὶ ὀίκῳ, 
σίτος καὶ μέθυ ἢδυ· τὰ μὲν τ' οἰκήσες ἑδονίνιν, 
οὶ δ' εἰς ἡμετέρου πωλεύμενοι ἡματα πάντα, 
βοῦς ἱερεύνοντες καὶ δῖς καὶ πλονας αἰγας,
εἰλαπινάζουσι πινούσι τε αἴδοπα ὀίνον
μαψίδων· τὰ δὲ πολλὰ κατάνεται· οὐ γὰρ ἐν' ἄνρη, 
οῖς 'Οδυσσεὺς ἔσκεν, ἄρην ἀπὸ οἶκου ἀμώναι.
εἰ δ' 'Οδυσσεὺς ἐλθοὶ καὶ ἱκοῖ' ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν, 
.aliὰ κε σὺν ὑπὸ παιδί βίας ἀποτίσεται ἀνδρῶν.

"Ως φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ μεγ' ἐπτάρεν, ἀμφὶ δὲ δῶμα
συμβαλέοις κονάβησε̇ γέλασον δὲ Πηνελόπεια,
αἰγὰ δ' ἄρ' Ἐδμον ἐπέα περάστην προσηῦδαν
"ἐρχεσ μοι, τὸν ξεινὸν ἐναντίον ὁδε κάλεσσον.
οὐχ ὀρᾶσ  ὢ μοι νidi ἐπέπατα ράσιν ἐπέσας;
τῶ κε καὶ οὐκ ἀτελης ἡνατός μνηστήριοι γένοιτο

534 ἡμετέρων G F P H: ἡμετέρων vulg. The gen. ἡμετέρων cannot well be 
explained by ellipse, like εἰς πατρός, εἰς διδασκέων, &c., 
but may be due to the 
analogy of these phrases. It is supported by the 
commentators, who probably followed 
Ar., and is the reading of most MSS. in 
Od. 2. 55., 7. 301. See also H. Merc. 370

525. στεντά literally means 'presses 
up' or 'forwards' (as 11. 58. στιφῶντος δε δῆλον); here with an aer. infr. 'he 
insists,' is positive that he has heard.' 
530. The verb ἐπάμαι means 'to 
indulge in play, to jest.' It implies 
a noun ἐσι, from a root ἐσι̣, Indog. ἐσι̣, seen in Lat. 
joces. Verbs in -ωαυ seem 
often to have a frequentative meaning, 
or at least to express some form of 
continuous action: cp. μεδωσ (beside 
μεδαι), μηδαμαι, ἄθαμαι (16. 344), 
δεραμαι (18. 33), μητιαν, οδαιαι, ουλαι, 
πελατιαν, φυαιν, δειειαν (17. 599); 
also (of play of colour, &c.) γλαυκαι, 
ἀκροκλαυειαν, ραβραιαν.
534-538. Repeated from 2. 55-59.
542. συμβαλέοις is an adv., qualifying 
κονάβησε. The use of such a word to 
describe a sneeze is mock-heroic: see 
on 18. 5, also on 11. 499-504.
544. ὦδα qualifies ἐναντίον: cp. 1. 447 
ὁμοίως εἰς μοσον; 18. 324 ἡμοίων ὦδα: 
21. 106.
546. οὐκ ἀτελῆς θάνατος seems to be 
a variation of the phrase τῆλος θανάτου.
πάσι μάλιστα, ουδέ κέ τις θάνατον καὶ θέρας ἀλάξαι. ἄλλο δέ τοι ἔρεω, οὐ δ’ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλει σήσοιν· αἰ κ’ αὐτὸν γνῶσι νημέρτεα πάντ’ ἐνέποντα, ἐσσώ μιν χαλαινάν τε χιτώνα τε, ἔλματα καλά.

"Ὡς φάτο, βῆ δὲ συφόρβος, ἔπει τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσέν, ἄγχοι δ’ ἱστάμενοι ἔστε πετρύετα προσήθοτα· ἔξων πάτερ, καλέει σε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια, μήτηρ Τηλέμαχοι: μεταλλήσατι τί ε ὑμὸς ἀμφὶ πόσει κέλεται, καὶ κηδεά περ πεπαθύνῃ. εἰ δέ κε σε γνώσι νημέρτεα πάντ’ ἐνέποντα, ἐσσώι σε χαλαινὰν τε χιτώναν τε, τῶν οὐ μάλιστα χρησίεις· σίτον δε καὶ αἰτίζων κατὰ δήμων γαστέρα βοσκήσεις· ὅσει δέ τοι δ’ κ’ ἐθέλησιν.

Τὸν δ’ αὐτὲ προσέειπε πολύτλας διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς· Ἔσσω, αἰσγὰ κ’ ἐγὼ νημέρτεα πάντ’ ἐνέρξομαι κόρῃ Ἡκατείριον, περίφρων Πηνελόπεια· οἶδα γὰρ εὖ περὶ κεῖσαι, ὁμῆν δ’ ἀνεδύγεμεθ’ ὄπισθον. ἀλλὰ μηκέτηρα χαλεπῶν ὑποδείκνυμι δομίλον, τῶν ὑβρίς τε βίη τε σείδρευν οὐράνον ἴκει. καὶ γὰρ νῦν, ὅτε μ’ οὗτὸς ἀνήρ κατὰ δῶμα κεῖται ὅτι κακὸν ῥέγαντα βαλῶν ὄντισαν ἐδωκεν, οὔτε τι Τηλέμαχος τὸ γ’ ἐπήρκεσεν οὔτε τις ἄλλος.

τῷ νῦν Πηνελόπειαν ἐνὶ μεγάροις ἀναχθέν


547. The aor. opt. ἀλέξας has not much support in the MSS., but it is most according to Homeric usage, and suits γίνομαι in the preceding clause.

549. αὐτόν, in contrast to the report of Eumaeus, ‘with his own lips.’

555. παθήσης. The dat. is construed with θυμὸς κέλεται, on the analogy of such constructions as 16. 73 μητρὶ δ’ ἔμη δίκαι θυμὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερηρήσει, 18. 75.

Schol. Q has the note δεῖ τοῦ πενελο- πειας, from which Buttmann inferred a v.l. πενελὀπειας. It is surely more probable that the scholiast is corrupt: read δεῖ τοῦ πενελοπειας, or πενελοπειας. If the latter reading is right, the original word must have been παθόνθης, a gen. to be construed with θυμός: cp. 6. 155-157 μᾶλθα τοῦ σοφι τιμῶς...λαβεται... λευκώτορας, and H. G. § 243, 3, d.

561 ff. Regarding this answer see the Appendix on the Homeric House.

564. ὀποδείκνυα. The prep. τοῦ indicates the quasi-passive meaning of the verb: so ὑμαῖνον. It does not mean ‘I am a little afraid.’ Cp. Soph. Aj. 691 μέγαν ἅγιαν ὄποδεικνύαμα, of birds cowering beneath a bird of prey.
17. ΟΔΤΣΞΕΙΑΣ Ρ

μείναι, ἐπειγομένην περ, ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα:
καὶ τότε μ’ εἰρέσω πόσιον πέρι νόστιμον ἦμαρ,
ἀσσότερον καθίσασα παραὶ πυρὶ ἐίματα γάρ τοι
 λύγρ’ ἔχω οἶσθα καὶ αὐτῆς, ἐπεὶ σε πρῶθ’ ἰκέτευσα.”

“Ὡς φάτο, βή δὲ συνφροβός, ἔπει τὸν μύθον ἄκουσε.
τὸν δ’ ὑπὲρ οὐδοῦ βάντα προσήθα Πηνελόπεια:"

“οὐ σὺ γ’ ἄγεις, Ἐδμαίε; τί τοι’ ἐνῆσθαι ἀλήτης;
ἥ τινα που δεῖσας ἐξάλοιπον ἢ καὶ ἄλλοις
αἰθεῖται κατὰ δόμα; κακὸς δ’ αἰδοίος ἀλήτης.”

Τὴν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφης, Ἐδμαίε συβύτα:

“μυθεῖται κατὰ μοῖραν, ἀ πέρ κ’ οὐκετό καὶ ἄλλος,
ὑριν ἄλυπταξον ἀνδρῶν ὑπερηνοφέςτων.

ἀλλά σε μείναι ἄνωγεν ἐς ἥλιον καταδύνα.
καὶ δε σοι δ’ αὐτῇ πολῦ κάλλιον, δ’ βασιλεία,
οἶν πρὸς ξείνον φάσθαι ἐκεῖ ήδ’ ἐπακοῦσκαί.”

Τὸν δ’ αὐτὸ προσεέπι περὶ φρώνων Πηνελόπεια:

“οὐκ ἀφρών ὁ ξείνος: ὁίτατ, ὁ σε περ ἀν εἰς,
οὐ γάρ ποῦ τινες δοῦ καταθνητῶν ἀνδρῶν
ἀνέρε ὑδρεύοντες ἀτάσθαλα μηχανόταται.”

‘Ἡ μὲν ἂρ’ ὅς ἀγρίνευν, ὁ δ’ ἄγιτο δῖος υφορβὸς

μηστήρων ἐς δμιλον, ἐπεὶ διεσφράβη πάντα.

αἰσχὶ δὲ Τηλέμαχών ἐπεα πτερῶντα προσήθα,

ἄγχι σχόν κεφάλην, ἣν μὴ πενθολαθ’ οἱ ἄλλοι:

“ὁ φιλ’, ἐγὼ μὲν ἄμεινα, σύνας καὶ κείνα φυλάξαν,

573 οἶσθα καὶ αὐτὸς] Originally perhaps αὐτὸς οἴσθα. 577 After this line F
575 Πηνελόπεια has ἄλυπταξως (sic) ἀδρῶν ὑπερηφανοτών (from 581).
578 ἄλυπταξως

571. εἰρέσω... ἦμαρ. The acc. is
572. because the sense is ‘let her ask
573. which is the day of return.’ So with
574. ὁς, μέμνημα, πνεύματα, &c.: H. G.
575. § 140, 3. a.
576. κακῶς is predicate, with personal
577. constr.; the meaning being ‘it is a bad
578. thing for an ἀλήτης to be ἄλοιπος’ (cp.
579. l. 347). It is hardly likely that there
580. is an allusion to the sense in which
581. Ulysses is really ἄλοιπος (as Ameis
582. suggests).

586. It seems necessary to put a stop
587. at πέρα: ‘the stranger is no fool,—he
divines &c.’ The construction ἀφρών
588. ὁίτατ ‘he thinks foolishly,’ required
589. with the usual punctuation of the line,
590. is hardly Homeric.

586 ὁς ὁς ἂν ἢ ὁ δ’ ‘how it may be’: cp.
587. 19. 312 ὁίτατ ὁ δ’ δένταν πέρ. The read-
588. ing ὁς πέρ is indefensible; it cannot
589. mean ‘whoever he may be’ (ὁς τις ἂν
590. ἄρ’).
σὺν καὶ ἐμὸν βλέπον· σοὶ δ’ ἐνθάδε πάντα μελόντων.
αὐτὸν μὲν σε πρῶτα σάω, καὶ φράζεο θυμῷ
μὴ τι πάθησι· πολλοὶ δὲ κακὰ φρονέωσιν Ἀχαιῶν,
tous Zεδς ἐξολέσει πρὶν ἡμῖν πῆμα γενέσθαι.”

Τὸν δ’ αὐ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένοις αὐτῶν ἄδοι:
“ἐσοτερίσαι οὕτως, ἀττα· σὺ δ’ ἔρχεο δειελήσας·
ἡδεν δ’ ἵναι καὶ ἁγείν λερήθα καλά·
αὐτῷ ἐμοὶ τάδε πάντα καὶ ἀθανάτωςι μελήσει.”

“Ὡς φάθ’, ὁ δ’ αὐτίς ἄρ’ ἔζετ’ ἐυξέστον ἐπὶ δίφρον,
πλησάμενος δ’ ἄρα θυμὸν ἐδητύς ἢδε ποτήτος
βῇ ρ’ ἵμεναι μεθ’ ῃασ, λίπε δ’ ἔρκεα τε μέγαρον τε
πλεῖον δαιμυόνων· οἱ δ’ ὄρχηστι καὶ ἀοίδῃ
τέρποντ’. ἡδὴ γὰρ καὶ ἐπήλυθε δείελον ἡμᾶρ.

596 Ἀχαιῶν G F U: Ἀχαιῶν P H X al. 602 ἐυξέστον ἐπὶ δίφρον G F (ἔνας
Did.): ἐυξέστον ἐπὶ δίφρον U: ἐπὶ θρόον ἐνθαθ’ ἀκολῆθη P H J. 603 After this
line U has αὐτῷ ἐπὶ δειενήσας καὶ ἡμᾶρα θυμὸν ἱδωθή (from 5.95, 14.111).

599. δειενήσας. The verb δειελάω properly means ‘to evening,’ ‘to act as
befits the evening,’ here apparently ‘to
sup.’ So ἀρστοῖν is from a verb ἀρρίζω
‘to do the early,’ sc. breakfast: cp.
the note on 16. 2.

606. The impf. τέρποντο is to be
connected with the aor. ἡλθε at the
beginning of the next book: ‘they
were pleasing themselves with dance
and song, when there came the beggar
Irus.’

Penelope at her loom, with Telemachus.
(From a vase in the Museum at Chiusi.)
'Οδυσσέως καὶ Ἰρον πυγμῆ.

"Ηλθε δ' ἐπὶ πτωχὸς πανθήμος, διὰ κατὰ ἄστυ πτωχεύσειν Ιθάκης, μετὰ δ' ἐπρεπές γαστήρι μάργη δέχεται φαγεμέν καὶ πείμεν οὐδὲ ὦν ἢ ἢ οὐδὲ βίη, εἶδος δὲ μάλα μέγας ἥν ὁδάσσαται. Ἀρναῖος δ' ὅνου ἐσκέ τὸ γὰρ θέτο πῦρνια μὴν ἑκ γενεθής. Ἰρον δὲ νέοι κύκλησκοι ἀπαντές, οὐκ' ἀπαγγέλλαςκε κιών, ὡς πού τις ἀνάγοι: ὃς ἢ ἐλθὼν Ὀδυσσῆα διάκετο οἷο δόμωι, καὶ μιν νεικεὼν ἐπεα πτερόβεντα προσήδοτα: "ἔικε, γέρουν, προθύρου, μὴ δὴ τάχα καὶ ποθὸς ἐλκη. οὐκ ἀεις δι' ὃ δοὺς ἐπιλληθοῦσιν ἀπαντες, ἐκλίνεναι δὲ κέλουται; ἐγὼ δ' αἰσχύνομαι ἔμπης. ἀλλ' ἄνα, μὴ τάχα νοῖν ἐρις καὶ χερσο γένηται." Τῶν δ' ἀρ ὑπὸῦρα ἱδὼν προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς.

1. πανθήμος is explained by the following clause διὰ κατὰ ἄστυ κτλ. On δέμος cp. 16. 28.
2. ἀκρίς is usually explained as ἀκρίς: but the lengthening of υχ- to υχ- is against all analogy. The form points to a noun *τηχος, from a verbal stem τηχ-; If the χ is formative (as in τηχ-χει, τηχ-χει, &c.), the root would be της, Indog. gē, gē (Sanscr. jyā), 'to be strong,' 'to live.' Possibly ἀ-τηχος is, with copulative ἀ-, means 'with one life,' that is, 'with uniform, unbroken vigour.' Cp. ἄλφος ἁλη of a wood that is 'all trees.'
3. ίη is not meant to be distinguished from ἰη. The two words are used for the sake of emphasis, by a kind of hendiadys: see 15. 176.
5. πῦρνια. The epithet is here mock-heroic. But the ancient reading τὸ γὰρ θέτο of πῦρνια is plausible.
6. Ἰρος. The name is evidently formed by turning Ἰροι into the corresponding masculine.
8. διάκετο, impf. de conatu.
10. προθύρου, here the gateway of the μέγαρον: cp. 15. 146.
11. ἐλκη, for ἐλπη, a rare contraction in Homer. Read perhaps μὴ τις . . . ἐλπη.
"δαιμόνι, οὕτω τι σε μέξω κακῶν οὕτω ἀγορεύω, οὕτω τινά φθονεῖα δέμεναι καὶ πόλλα ἀνελύντα. οὐδὲς δ' ἀμφοτέρους διδεῖ χεισταί, οὕτω τι σε χρῆ ἀλλοτρίων φθονεῖς· δοκεῖς δὲ μου εἶναι ἀλήθης ὡς περ ἐγών, ἄλβουν δὲ θεοὶ μέλλουσιν ὑπάξειν.

χερσὶ δὲ μὴ τι λήνη προκαλίζει, μὴ με χολόσης, μὴ σε γέρον περ ἑών στῆθος καὶ χείλεα φύροσι αἵματος· ήσυχία δ' ἂν ἔμοι καὶ μᾶλλον ἔτ' εἰπ' ἄφθοιν ὡς μὲν γάρ τι σ' ὑποστρέψεσθαι δῶ ἐδέστων ἐς μέγαρον Δαερτιάδεω 'Οδυσσήος."

Τὸν δὲ χολοσάμενον προσεφάνεεν Ἱρος ἀλήθης· "αὐτός, ὅς ὁ μολοβρὸς ἐπιτροχάδην ἀγορεύει, γρηγορόν τιμοῦν ἵσοι· ὡς ἂν κακὰ μητισαίην κόστων ἀμφοτέρησι, χαμαι δὲ κε πάντας ὀδόντας γναθῶν ἐξέλάσαιμι συός ὃς ληπτοτέρης.

ὁσαί νῦν, ὅνα πάντες ἐπηγνώσασι καὶ οἴδε μαρναμένους· πῶς δ' ἂν σὺ νεωτέρος ἄνδρι μάχοιο;"

"Ὡς οἱ μὲν προπάροιθε θυράνων ὑψηλῶν οὐδεὶς ἐπὶ ξεστοῦ πανθυμαδὸν οἰκρώντο.

τοῖς δὲ ξυνήξῃ ἠρχον μὲνοσ 'Αντινοοί, ἤδη δ' ἄρ' εκγελάσασι· μετεφώνει μενοσθήρεσιν· "αὕτῳ φίλοι, οὐ μὲν πώ τι πάροι τοιούτων ἐπόχθη, οἰην τερπωλή θεοὶ ἤγαγαν ἐς τόδε δῶμα.

ὁ ξείων τε καὶ Ἱρος ἐρίζετον ἄλληλοιών

χερσὶ μαχεσσαθαι· ἀλλὰ ξυνελάσσομεν δικα."

34. τοῖς, gen. as often with verbs meaning to hear or learn.
36. 27. τοιούτων οἰην τερπωλῆν is put for τοιοῦτον τερπωλή οἰην; as we say 'nothing like the pleasure which,' instead of 'no pleasure like that which.'
Cp. the note on 15. 487. The word τερπωλή does not occur elsewhere in Homer.
38. ἐρίζετον 'are provoking,' 'challenging.'
18. ΟΔΣΣΕΙΑΣ Σ

'Ως ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀνήξαν γελάωντες, ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρα πτωχοὺς κακοεῖμονας ἠγερέθοντο. τοῖς δ' Ἀντίνωος μετέφη, Εὐσπείθος ύστερος καθεύθεμα κύσης τε καὶ αἵματος ἐμπλήσατε. ἀπτέρεις δὲ κε νυκήσῃ κρείσσον τε γέννηται, ταύον ἴνα κ' ἑθήσῃς ἀναστὰς αὑτὸς ἐλέησον αἰεὶ δ' αὖθις ἡμῖν μεταδαστεί, οὐδὲ τιν' ἄλλον πτωχὸν ἐσο εἰςγεσθαί ἔσοιμεν αὐτήσοντα.

'Ὡς ἔφατ' Ἀντίνωος, τοῖς δ' ἐπιήνιδε κυβός. τοῖς δὲ δολοφρονεῖν μετεφή πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεὺς. δ' φίλοι, οὐ ποιεῖ νέοτέρο ἀνδρὶ μάχεσθαι ἄνδρα γέροντα, δὴ ἄρημένων ἀλλὰ με γαστὴρ ὄρονει κακοεργός, ἵνα πληγῇσι δαμείω.

ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν μοι πάντες ὄμοσατε καρπερδὸν ὄρκον, μὴ τίς ἐπὶ 'Ἰρῷ ἢρα φέρον ἐμὲ χειρὶ βαρείᾳ πλῆξῃ ἀτασθάλλων, τοῦτῳ δὲ μὲ ἤφι δαμασόμη.

'Ὡς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπόμνην ὡς ἐκέλευεν. αὐτὰρ ἔπειρ Ὀμοσάν τε τελεύτησαν τε τῶν ὄρκον, τοῖς αὐτὸς μετέεθη λερῆ ἵνα Τηλεμάχων

"ζεϊν', ἐλ' ὄρονει κραδία καὶ θυμὸς ἁγίνωρ τοῦτον ἀλέξοσαι, τῶν δ' ἄλλων μὴ τίν' Ἀχαϊῶν δείδο', ἐπεὶ πλεύνεσσι μαχὴσται δς κέ σε θείνῃ.

44 τὰς ΤΕΥΞΥΝΟΥΝ: τὰς δ' ΦΗΧΑΛ. 51 προορίζει ΤΕΥΞΥΝΟΥΝ ΤΕΥΞΥΝΟΥΝ
GΗΡΗΧΑΛ.: ἀντίθετο F ΧΕΥΣΑΛ. 58 ἄμαν ΤΕΥΞΥΝΟΥΝ: τὰς δ' ΦΗΧΑΛ. GΗΡΗΧΑΛ.: ΤΕΥΞΥΝΟΥΝ
51 ΦΗΧΑΛ.: ἀντίθετο F ΧΕΥΣΑΛ. 59 ομ. F ΕΥΣΤ. 60 τοῖς GΗΡΗΧΑΛ.: τοῖς δ' ΦΗΧΑΛ.
62 δ' om. G.

46. ἀπτέρεις δὲ κε νυκήσῃ κρείσσον τε γέννηται, a formula repeated from 11. 3. 71,—doubtless in the spirit of parody.
53. δαρημένος seems rightly explained as = βασιλαμένως 'impaired, broken down.' It is doubtless derived from δρόμος 'harm' (ἀπὸ ἀκούσιον βλάπτο). Hesych.). The δ' is a difficulty: it must represent a reduplication: but the temporal reduplication (there is no evidence of initial f or σ) would give ἴμμενα. Possibly the true form is δαιμημένοι, like δαλαλήμενου, δαχχημένου (properly δαλαλημένου, δαχχημένου).
58. The weight of authority is for ἐπώμνουν (against ἰψ-) here and in 15. 437: Elsewhere in the Odyssey (2. 377, 10. 345, 381, 12. 302) ἐπώμνου is used of swearing not to do a thing. For ἰψ- with ἴμμα denoting a negatius oath, see 11. 9. 139, 274., 10. 332, 21. 373, 23. 42.
ξεινοδόκος μὲν ἐγών, ἔπι δ' ἀλειτον βασιλεὶς,
Ἀντίνοος τε καὶ Ἑφρύμαχος, πεπνυμένοι ἀμφῶ." 65

"Λει ἀφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπὶ κενον, αὐτὰρ 'Οδυσσέας
ζώσατο μὲν ράκεσιν περὶ μῆθεα, φαίνε δὲ μπροδ 
καλοῦσ τε μεγάλους τε, φάνεν δὲ οἱ εὐρεῖς ἄμοι 
στήθεα τε στιβαροὶ τε βραχίόνες' αὐτὰρ 'Ἀθηνὴ 
ἀγχία παρισταμένη μέλε' ἠλλαν ποιμένι λαῶν.
μητῆρες δ' ἄρα πάντες ὑπερφαίλον ἀγάσαντο
οδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδῶν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον.

"Ἡ τάξα 'Ἰρὸς 'Αἱρὸς ἐπίσταστον κακὸν ἤξει,
οἶν ἐκ ρακέων ὁ ἕρων ἐπιγονίδα φαίει." 70

"Λει ἄρ' ἔφαν, 'Ἰρὸ δὲ κακῶς ἀφίνετο θυμὸς.
ἀλλὰ καὶ ὃς δρηστήρες ἄγων ἱσταντες ἀνάγκη
dειδίβας σάρκες δὲ περιτροπμένον μέλεσον.
Ἀντίνοος δ' ἐνέφευσεν ἐποσ τ' ἐφαν' ἐκ τ' ὀνόματε.

"νῦν μὲν μήτ' εἶν, βουγαίε, μητ' γένοιο,

64 Βασιλῆς Αγ.: -ης MSS. 65 'Ἀντίνοος τε καὶ Ἑφρύμαχος G X D Eust.: Ἐθ. τε καὶ Ἀντ. F P H U L W. 75 σακίδι F X al.

65. This line is an echo (or parody) of II. 3.148 Οὐκαλέγων τε καὶ Ἀντήνωρ, πενεμένων ἄφεων.
71. ὑπερφαίλον 'beyond measure.' This is perhaps an example of the original sense of ὑπερφαίλον, viz. 'overflowing the φάλην or pan.' That derivation has been rejected by modern scholars, but no other at all probable has been put forward. We may compare ὑπερφασαλος 'with excess of tackle,' 'over-rigged.' Words of this kind begin by being colloquial metaphors; when they have made their way into general use the original metaphor is apt to be more or less forgotten.
73. 'Αἱρὸς 'Ιρὸ no more, no longer fit to be our messenger.
74. ἐπισταστῶν 'drawn upon himself.'
76. δικαῖος, with causal force, = διτα τοῖς.
79. μήτ' εἶν εἴς κτλ., in form a wish, really an impassioned way of saying 'What is the use of your existence!'
So II. 2.330 ἐν πυρὶ δὲ γνωστοὶ = 'might as well be thrown into the fire,' 6.164 τεθώρητος 'you might as well be dead.'
Cp. also Ἰδ. vii. 11 μῆ σιν ἐκ Δαριῶν

. . . μῆς τιμωρητάμενος κτλ., 'to what purpose am I the son of Darius, if I do not punish thee.'

Βουγὰς. In II. 13.814 this word is addressed by Hector to Ajax, and evidently carries with it the notion of stupidity or clumsiness. Here the application is somewhat different; Iris is accused of sheer cowardice. Perhaps there is meant to be a sarcastic allusion to the use in the Iliad: as though Iris claimed to be the Ajax of his class. The meaning 'braggart' (L. and S.) is not especially appropriate in either passage.

As to the derivation, the most hopeful material is the gloss of Hesychius, γαῖος ὁ ἱμαίσθης βούς καὶ ὁ ἀνάχαιμος ἀνεμος. This at least proves that there was a word γαῖος (or γαίος), and that ἀνάχαιμος γαῖα was 'a land breeze,' βούς γαῖα 'a plough ox.' Hence βούς γαῖα or βουγαίοι might mean ἀνάχαιμος παῖδος καὶ ἀνακαλείητο (Eust.). The notice in Eust. that among the people of Dylchium and Samos οἱ γαλακτοφάγοι γαῖαι καὶ μῆδεν ἰσχυροὶ were called Βουγαίοι may point to the same etymology.
18. ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ Σ

ei δὴ τούτον γε τρομεῖς καὶ δείδιας αἰνός,
ἄνδρα γέροντα, δύσα ἀρπήμενον, ἢ μὲν ἰκάνει.

ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ ἐρέω, τὸ δὲ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται
αὐτόν σ’ οὕτως νικήσῃ κρέσσων τε γένηται,
πέμψω σ’ ἥπειρόνδε, βαλῶν ἐν νητὶ μελαίνῃ,
εἰς "Εὐκέτων βασιλῆ, βροτῶν δηλήμμαν πάντων,
δὲ κ’ ἄπτο μίνα τάμπησι καὶ ὀβάτα νηλεῖ χαλκῷ,
μήδει τ’ ἐξερήσας δόῃ κυνίν ἀμὰ δάσασθαι”

"Ως φάτο, τῷ δ’ ἔτι μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τρόμον ἐλλαβε γυνία.

ἐς μέσον δ’ ἀναγν’ τῷ δ’ ἀμφοτερχεῖς ἀνέσχων.

δὴ τότε μερμήριζε πολύτλας δίος Ἅνδυσσες

ἡ ἕλασε’ ὃς μὲν ψυχή λίποι αδῆ πεσόντα,

ἡ μὲν ἥκ’ ἕλασεε τανύσσειν τ’ ἐπὶ γαλή.

δὲ δὲ οἱ φρονέοντι δοάσαστο κέρδιον εἶναι,

ἥ’ ἕλασε, ἵνα μὴ μὲν ἐπιφρασσάλατ’ Ἀχαιοι,

δὴ τῷ ἀνασχόμενῳ ὁ μὲν ἦλασε δεξιῶν ὄμων

"Ιρος, ὁ δ’ αἰχέν’ ἔλασεν ὑπ’ οἰκισμὸς, ὅστεα δ’ εἰσώ ἔθλασεν.

αὐτίκα δ’ ἦλε κατὰ στήμα φοίνικον αἰμα,

καὶ δ’ ἐπεσ’ ἐν κοινῆς μακάων, σοῦ δ’ ἦλασ’ ὀδόντα

λακτίζων ποιλ γαϊά’ ἀτὰρ μηστῆρες ἄγανοι

χείρας ἀνασχόμενοι γέλοι ἐκθανον. ἀτὰρ Ἅνδυσσες


85. "Εὐκέτων is doubtless purely imaginary, the ‘Croquemitaine’ of the Odyssey. See on 20.383.

94. ἐπιφρασσάλατο 'should take note of him,' begin to wonder who he was.


98. μακάω 'with a cry': a word properly used of the bleating of sheep.

100. γέλοι ἐκθανον. The common rendering is 'were ready to die with laughter.' But this sense can hardly be extracted from the aor. of ἐκθανατεῖν (if that compound was known to Homer, of which there is no other evidence). Possibly the word should be ἐκθανασκόν ἥκε, opened their mouths in laughter.'

II. K

It is conceivable also that ἐκθανασκόν is grammatically the aor. of the verb ἐκθανατεῖν, and means properly 'struck out,' i.e. 'burst' or 'broke out.' Cp. προτότω in 24.319 δρομὸ μένος προτύφε. It is true that ἐκθανατεῖν and ἐκθανασκόν are now supposed to be from the same root (γχειν) as θανατεῖν, ἐκφεύειν, Lat. fendo, etc. (Brugmann, Grundr. I. p. 320). Possibly ἐκθανασκόν represents an older use of the root, before θανασκέω acquired the sense of dying. This hypothesis would explain Attic ἐκθασκαῖον meaning 'I faint' (not 'I die'). But the later use was doubtless influenced by this passage: cp. Antiphanes Πλωτ. 1.7 γελώτες ἐκθασκακεῖν ἔπι τοὺς πράγματα, Menand. Κολ. 2 γέλαστε ἐκθασκακεῖνοι.
Δικε διεκ προβρόποι λαβόν ποδός, δηρ' ἵκετι αὐλην αἰθοῦντις τε θύρας καὶ μιν ποτὶ ἔρκον αὐλῆς ἐλευν ἀνακλίνας, σκῆπτρον δέ ὦ ἐμβάλε χειρὶ, καὶ μιν φονῆςα ἔσεα πτερέντα προσηῦδα· "ἔντωθεν νῦν ἥσοσ σῶς τε κύνας τ' ἀπερίκαν, μηθὲ σύ γε ξείνων καὶ πτωχῶν κοίρανος ἐσόνοι λυγρὸς ἐὼν, μὴ πού τι κακῶν καὶ μείζων ἐπαύρρης." Ἡρα καὶ ἀμφὶ ὀμοιον αἰείκα βάλλετο πῆρήν, πυκνὰ βωγάλενη· ἐν δὲ στράφος ἦν ἀρτήρη. ἄψ δ' δ' γ' ἐπ' οἴουν ἰὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο· τοι δ' ἱσαν ἐσὼ ἥδο γελώσωνε καὶ δεικανόντι ἐπέεσσον· "Ζεὺς τοι δοῖνε, ξείνε, καὶ ἀδάπατοι θεοὶ ἄλοι ὡτὶ μάλιστ' ἐθέλει καὶ τοι φλὸν ἐπλέτο θυμῷ, δὲ τοῦτον τὸν ἀναλτὸν ἀλητεῖν ἀπέπαινας ἐν δῆμῳ τάχα γάρ μιν ἀνάξομεν ἰπειρόνυκε εἰς "Ἐξητόν βασιλῆς, βροτῶν δηλήματα πάντων." Ἡμῖν δρ' ἐφαν, χαίρεν δὲ κληθοῦν διὸς Ὄδυσσεύς. 'Αντίνοος δ' ἄρα οἱ μεγάλην παρὰ γαστέρα θῆκεν.

105 εἶκος τε σῶς τ' Τ, G F U. 107 ἐπαύρρης F: ἐπαύρρης vulg. 110 δ' γ' F M Σ: ἁρ G P H U al. (cr. 17. 466). 111 γελώσωνες, cp. 20. 347. After 111 G and others have the line δοὺς δὲ τοι ἐλέεσεν τῶν ἱπνοροφῶντων (2. 324, &c.). 115-116 obel. by Ar., as a repetition of 84-85.

103. θύρα, the gate of the αὐλή or courtyard: called 'gate of the αἰθώνα' because the αἰθώνα or 'portico' was across the gateway, cp. 15. 146. 105. ἐντώθεν νῦν καίσο μετ' ἱγῆσών. 107. ἐπαύρρης (or ἐπαύρη, as nearly all the MSS. read) means 'take,' 'incur,' ἐπαύρησε, literally 'to touch,' 'graze;' acquires (especially in the mid., but sometimes also in the act.) the sense of deriving from contact, 'gaining from.' In this sense it is construed with a neut. adj. or pronoun in the accusative, expressing the good or harm taken or 'gained': e.g. Theogn. 111 τὸ μέγιστον ἐπαύρησον, Aesch. Prom. 38 τούθ' ἐπήρω τοῦ φιλαρθρῶν τρόπου, Andoc. 20. 2 ἄγνοθ᾽ ἵμω ἐπαύρησα. Of the two readings ἐπαύρης is not satisfactory as 2 sing. subj. mid., the proper Homeric form of which is ἐπαύρρης (II. 15. 17). Hence we should read ἐπαύρρης (with Buttmann, &c.). Some take ἐπαύρης as 3 sing. act., and ἔσω as nom. to it; as though the evil were a weapon that is to 'touch' the beggar. This however is a metaphor at variance with the σισσος logoi, in which the good or evil is always treated as the thing gained by touch.

111. γελώσωνες, see the note on 20. 347. 114. τὸν ἀναλτόν. The article expresses contempt: Ὕ. C. § 261, 2. 117. A κληθοῦν, or φήμη (so in 2. 35., 20. 105), is a word which conveys a truth unknown to the person who utters it. Such is evidently the prayer that the stranger may have his desire fulfilled.
18. ΟΔΕΣΕΙΛΑΣ Σ

ἐμπλείην κυβης τε καὶ αἵματος. Ἀμφίνομος δὲ ἀρτοὺς ἐκ κανέων δῶο παρέθηκεν αἵματος
καὶ δέπαι χρυσέρ δειδίσκετο φάνησέν τε.
"χαίρε, πάτερ ὦ δέεινε γένοιτο τοι ἐς πέρ ὁπλίσω
δήμος ἀταρ μὲν νῦν γε κακοίς ἔχεις πολέεσσιν."

Τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενον προσέρη πολύμητος Ὀδυσσέως:
"Ἀμφίνοι, ἢ μάλα μοι δοκεῖς πεπνυμένος εἶναι
τοῖον γὰρ καὶ πατρός, ἔπει κλέως ἐσθλὸν ἄκονον,
Νίσιον θυληχίᾳ ἑών τ’ ἐμεν ἀφνεῖν τε
tου σ’ ἐκ φασί γενέσθαι, ἐπητῇ δ’ ἀνδρὶ ἔκικας.
tοθέκα τοῖ τέρω, ὥσ δ’ σύνθεο καὶ μεν ἄκονον
οὐδὲν ἀκιννότερον γαῖα τρέψει ἀνδρόσοι

πάντων δοσα τὲ γαίαν ἐπι πνεείτε τε καὶ ἔρπες.
οὐ μὲν γὰρ ποτὲ φησὶ κακὸν πείσεσθαι ὁπίσω,
ὅρο ἀρετὴν παρέχωσι θεοὶ καὶ γούναι ὁρόρη.
ἀλ’ ὅτε δὴ καὶ λυγρὰ θεοὶ μάκαρες τελέσωσι,
καὶ τὰ φέρει ἀδελφόμενος τετληνθεὶ θυμῷ.

τοῖος γὰρ νῦν ἔστιν ἐπιθυμοῦν ἀνθρώπων
οἶν ἐπὶ ἡμαρ ἄγγει πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.
καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ποτ’ ἐμελλὼν ἐν ἀνθράσιν ἄλβιοι εἶναι,
πολλὰ δ’ ἀτάσθαλ’ ἐρεξα-βλή καὶ κάρτει ἔκων,
πατρὶ τ’ ἐμῷ πίσωνοι καὶ ἐμοὶς κασιγνήτουις.

τὸ μὴ τίς ποτὲ πάμπαν ἀνὴρ ἀθέματιος εἶη,
ἀλ’ δ’ ἔγερε δῶρα θεῶν ἔχοι, ὅτι διδοῖν
σ’ ὀρόω μηστηρίας ἀτάσθαλα μηχανώντας,
κτῆμα κείροντας καὶ κτιμάζοντας ἄκοιτων

102 ἐς περ] ὅς περ G F X U al.
103 τελέσωσι D H U²: τελέσωι vulg.
106 τοιοῦ ‘of such a kind (as to account for your good qualities).’
107 δρότην ‘prosperity,’ cp. 13. 45.
107 ἐς ἡμαρ ἄγγει ‘brings round the day,’ ἔτι as in ἐπικλέοντος ἐτός.
The two lines are imitated by Archilochus, fr. 70 τοῖον ἀνθρώπων θυμὸς,
πλαύην λεπτίνων πάξ, γέγονεν δυντοῖς
διήν Ζεὺς ἐν ἀμφεθρῳ ἄγγ.
108 ἐμελλὼν, not ‘I was destined’
—which would require a fut. inf.—
but ‘I was like to be,’ i.e. it seemed
that I ought to be ἄλβος. Cp. 1. 19.
109 βλή καὶ κάρτει ἔκων, 13. 143.
141. The opt. is a softened imperative: ‘I would have no one be lawless,
but’ &c.
143. ὁμ is causal: = ‘I say so, considering what outrages I see &c.’: cp.
16. 93, 17. 479, 514.

K 2
ἀνδρός, ἦν οὐκέτι φημὶ φίλων καὶ πατρίδος αὑτῆς 
δηρὸν ἀπέστεφθαι· μάλα δὲ σχέδων· ἄλλα σε δαίμων
οἰκαθ᾽ ὑπεξαγάγοι, μηδὲ ἀντιάσειας ἐκεῖνοι,
ὑπηρέτε νοστήσειε φιλήν ἐς πατρίδα γαϊάν·
οὐ γὰρ ἀναίματι γε διακρίνεοι βίω
μνηστήρας καὶ κείνων, ἐπεὶ κε μέλαθρον ὑπέλθη.

"Ὡς φάτο, καὶ σπείσας ἔπιεν μελιτέδεα οἶνον,
ἄψ ὧν ἐν χερσίν ἑθηκε ἑπάσας κοσμητορὶ λαῶν.
αὐτὰρ ὃ βῆ διὰ δῶμα φίλων τετιμένον ἦτορ,
νευστάξων κεφαλῆ· δὴ γὰρ κακὸν δοσετὸ θυμῇ.
ἀλλ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ὅς φύγε κῆρα πέδησε δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἁθῆνη
Τηλεμάχοι ὑπὸ χερσὶ καὶ ἐγχεί ἵπτι δαμὴν.
ἄψ ὧν ἀπὸς κατ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἐξεῖ ἐπὶ θρόνον ἐνθὲν ἀνέστη.
Τῇ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἐπὶ φρειὸ πήκε θέηκε θεᾶ γυλακώπης Ἁθῆνη,

152 κοσμήτορι λαῶν, viz. Amphi-

154. Cp. 10. 374 καὶ δ᾽ ὑπέστ θυμοῦ,

158-303. The scene which now fol-

158 ὁμφ. vulg.: θυμὸς FM.
18. ΟΔΩΣΕΙΑΣ Χ

κοῦρ Ἦκαρίου, περίφρονι Πηνελοπεῖ, 

μουθήρεσι φανήναι, ὡς πετάσει μάλιστα 

θυμὸν μουθήρον ἱδὲ τιμῆσα γένοιτο 

μᾶλλον πρὸς πώσις τε καὶ νίεις ἢ πάρος ἦν. 

ἀχρείον δ’ ἐγκέλαθεν ἔπος τ’ ἐφατ’ ἐκ τ’ ὀνύμαξεν. 

"Εὐρυνόμη, θυμὸς μοι ἐέλθεται, οὐ τι πάρος γε, 

μουθήρεσι φανήναι, ἀπεθομένων περ’ ἐμψυ. 

παϊδὶ δὲ κεν ἐποιμὴ ἔπος, τὸ κε κέρδιον εἶη, 

μὴ πάντα μουθήροιν ὑπερφιδλοῦσιν ὄμιλεῖν, 

οὐ τ’ εὖ μὲν βαζόσου, κακῶς δ’ ὀπίθεν φρόνεσοι." 

Τὴν δ’ αὖτ’ Εὐρυνόμη ταμή πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε. 

"ναι δὴ ταῦτα γε πάντα, τέκος, κατὰ μοίραν ἔειπες."


(170–176), which must have conveyed more than finds expression in the present 
text. Penelope, as we see, does not merely appear to the Suitors in order to 
gain their admiration and their gifts. She announces the end of her long re-
fusal of their advances, and puts this on the ground that Telemachus has now 
reached man’s estate (269 ἐν τῷ δὲ παιδὶ 

gενεσθάναι ἢμα). Now this is pre-
cisely what Eurynome had said (176). 
Hence Eurynome must have meant to 
urge Penelope to make the declaration 
that she consented to marriage. 
The lines in which she did so are wanting: 
hence, they were cut out in the process of 'working up' the Odyssey. 
The advice to adorn herself must have been 
merely a consequence. The 'word to 
Telemachus,' again, cannot have been 
the trivial warning of 1. 167, but the 
announcement that he would thenceforth 
be master in the house.

The reasons now adduced, and espe-
cially the comparison of 1. 176 and 
1. 269, make it probable that Seeck's 
interpretation of the speech of Eurynome 
is the true one. The question, then, is 
whether the desired meaning is to be 
gathered from the present text. Surely 
this may be done without too much 
forcing, or reading between the lines. 
Eurynome, it may be understood, could 
not venture to advise her mistress in so 
many words to accept one of the Suitors. 
But when Penelope declared her inten-
tion to show herself to them, she took 
this as meaning all that (as we see from 
the sequel) it did mean. She did not 
use the word marriage (any more than 
Nausicaa did to her father, 6. 66), but 
merely said: 'Do so, my child: but 
adorn yourself, lay aside your mourning; 
your son, who has been your care till 
now, is a bearded man.'

On the whole it seems not improbable 
that the passage in question is an inter-
polation as regards the context in which 
we now find it. There are some traces 
of post-Homeric language: as χρῶμα 
(172, 179), τέκος (190), ὀμαίατο (191), 
πλέονες scanned πλυνθεὶς (247), ἀνέοι 
(265), μᾶλλον = 'a cosmetic' (193). 
Cp. also the scanning ἐδρίουν (173).

160. πετάσει 'might flutter.' The 
metaphor is obscure. The notion may 
be that the minds of the Suitors would 
be excited or 'elated' as a sail is 
filled by the wind: cp. the phrase ἀῤῥ' 
ὦ ιωτία λαυεὶ πετάσοι, and the later 
uses of διδύλλαι. See also l. 327. 

163. ἀχρείον ἐγκέλαθεν 'laughed a 
needless,' i.e. a pointless, forced laugh: 
cp. ἀξιοκέλεος of untimely laughter, in 
Cratinus (incert. 51). 

164. οὐ τι πάρος γε, sc. ἐδέλθειν, 'it 
has by no means so desired before.' 
πάρος γε means 'before' in opposition 
to 'now': πάρος περ = 'even before,' 
'before as well as now' (H. G. § 354). 

168. ἐπείδη 'afterwards,' καίδε 
φρονέως 'have evil purposes.'
18. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Σ

ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ σφ' παιδὶ ἔτος φάος μηθ' ἐπίκευε, χρῶτ' ἀπονισμένη καὶ ἐπιχρύσασα παρειάς· μηθ' οὖτω δακρόουσι πεφυρμένη ἀμφί πρώσωτα ἔρχεν, ἐπεί κάκιν πενθῆμεναι ἄκριτοι αἰεῖ. ἡδὴ μὲν γὰρ τοι παῖς τηλίκος, δν σο μάλιστα ἦρος ἀθανάτουι γενεισάματα ἰδέαθαι.

Τὴν δ' αὐτὴ προσέειπε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια:

"Εὐνοώμη, μὴ ταῦτα παραβά διδομένη περ, χρῶτ' ἀποπνίπτεσθαι καὶ ἐπιχρύσασθαι ἀλοιφή· ἁγλαῖνη γὰρ ἐροιγε θεό, τοι "Οὐλυμπὸν ἔχουσων, ὀλέσαν, ἕξ οὐ κεῖνος ἐβη κολῆς ἐν νησίν. ἀλλά μοι Ἀὔτονὴν τε καὶ Ἰπποδάμειαν ἄνωχθε ἐλθέμεν, δήρα κ' μοι παραθέτεν ἐν μεγάροισιν οὐδ' οὐκ εἴσεμι μετ' ἀνέρας· αἴθομαι γάρ."

"Νο ἄρ' ἐφη, γρηγορ' δὲ διεκ μεγάριον βεβήκει ἀγγελέουσα γυναιξί καὶ ὀπτερνύουσα νέεσθαι.

"Ενθ' αὐτ' ἄλλ' ἐνόησε θεά γλαυκώπις Ἀθήνη· κόρη Ἰκαρίου κατὰ γλυκῶν ὄπων ἔχειν, εἴδε δ' ἀνακλυνθείσα, λύθεν δὲ οἱ ἄγεα πάντα αὐτὸ ἐν κλαυτήρι· τέως δ' ἄρα διὰ θεῶν ἀμβροσία δώρα δίδουν, ίνα μιν θησαλίτ' Ἀχαιοί.

κάλλει μὲν οἱ πρώτα προσώπατα καλὰ κάθηρεν

173 δὰκρυσὶν Π Η ἀλ. 178 κηδομένη MSS. : κηδομένη was an ancient variant, cp. Π. 22. 416 καὶ μ' οὖν κοῦσα κηδομένοι περ καλ., where κηδομένη is the reading of Ar., but the best MSS. have κηδομένον. Here the scholia are corrupt, see Ludwizch a. l., who makes it probable that Ar. preferred the nom. in both places. 179 ἀπονίσασθαι G. 184 οὐκ εἴσεμι vulg. : οὐ κεῖν' εἰς μ Hdn. Π Η Η al. 190 διὰ θεῶν δ' 'Αφροδίτῃ Ζεν. The scholium has been wrongly referred to l. 197, see Ludwizch a. l. 191 θησαλότερο hard is a possibly form in Homer: read ἄναθος αὐτά'

172. χρώτα (here and l. 179) is post-

10. 575. Homerian; for χρώτα : so χρῶτος in II.

173. The shortening of the α in δα-

12. κρώσια may be defended by metrical necessity; but cp. δάκρυσιν. 19. 122. The form δάκρυσιν, suggested by Nauck, is not Homerian: for δέκυσιν &c. see on 22. 401.

174. κάποιον 'it is ill' (not well) : the compar. as in Ι. 370., 17. 176.

175. τηλίκοι ' of the age' (to lead you to do so) : cp. τοίου in l. 126.

190. κλαυτήρι. The word only occurs here in Homer. If the passage were certainly genuine we should be tempted to read κλαυσί (or κλαυρο)/ τέος δ' ἄρα κτλ.

192. κάλλει δ' αμβροσία appears to be used in a concrete sense, for some kind of paint or ointment.


18. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Σ

ἀμβροσία, οὔτε περὶ εὐστέφανος Κυθέρεια
χρίται, εὔτ' ἀν ἦν Χαρίτων χορὸν ἱμερῶντας·
[καὶ μιν μακροτήρην καὶ πάσονα θῆκεν ἱδέοθαῖ.] 195
λευκότερην δ' ἀρα μιν θῆκε πριστοῦ ἐλέφαντος.
ἡ μὲν ἄρ' ὡς ἔρρα' ἀπεβήσετο δια θεῶν,
ἡλθον δ' ἀμφίπολοι λευκώλενοι ἐκ μεγάροιο
φθόγγον ἐπερχόμεναι τὴν δὲ γλυκὸς ἔτινος ἄνηκε,
καὶ ῥ' ἀποδρέχασι χεριν παρεῖς φώνησεν τε·
"ἡ με μάλ' αἰνοπαθῆ μαλακόν περὶ κἀρ' ἐκάλυψεν.
αἰθέ μοι δ' μαλακῶν θάνατον πόροι Ἀρτεμίς ἄγνω
αὐτικὰ νῦν, ὥν μηκέτ' ὑδρομένη κατὰ θυμὸν
ἀιὼν φθεῖσθα, πόσιον ποθένοσα φίλοι
παντοτὴν ἀρετὴν, ἐπεὶ ἔξοχος ἦς Ἀθηναῖων."

205
"Ως φαμένη κατέβαυν ὑπερῴα σηγαλέντα,
οὐκ οὖθ', ἄμα τῇ γε καὶ ἀμφίπολοι δ' ἐποντα.
ἡ δ' δὲ δή μηνισθέρας ἀφίκετο διὰ γυναικῶν,
στῇ μα παρὰ σταθμὸν τέγεσε πῦκα ποιητοῦ
ἀντα παρεῖδω σχομένη λιπαρὰ κρήδεμα·
ἀμφίπολος δ' ἀρα οἱ κεδυν ἐκατερθε παρέστη.
τῶν δ' αὐτοῦ λύτο γούνατ', ἔρρ' ἀρα θυμὸν ἔθελξαν,
πάντες δ' ἠρήσαντο παρὰ λεχέσσι κλῆθναι.
ἡ δ' αὖ Ἡλέμαχον προσεφώνεεν, ἰν φίλον υἱὸν.

210

197 ἀφθή γλυκᾶπος Ἀθηνὴ P.
212 ἔθελξαν G P al.

195 (=8.20) is out of place here, as Kirchhoff notices (Odyssey, p. 520). The ivory complexion follows as the effect (ἐρα) of the cosmetic. Observe also the needless repetition of θῆκε.

206. κατέβαυν ὑπερῴα must mean 'came down from the upper chambers,' a use only found here and in 23.85. Elsewhere in the Odyssey καταβαίνω with the acc. means 'to come down to' or 'by' (a ladder, &c.). The constr. is not found in the Iliad.

207-211 = 1.331-335, and 213 = 1.366.

214-243. These lines are almost certainly an interpolation, as has been shown by Wilamowitz (Hom. Unt. p. 30). The Suitors are described as struck with admiration of the beauty of Penelope (212-213), and their admiration is expressed in glowing language by Eurymachus (244 ff.). It is evident that the speech of Eurymachus was intended to follow immediately on the statement in ll. 212-213. Furthermore, the dialogue which thus breaks in upon the thread of the narrative is irrelevant to the context, as it has nothing to do with the appearance of Penelope in the μήγαρον. Moreover, it is a dialogue which must have been intended to be secret: yet it is carried on in the presence of the Suitors, with every circumstance that could tend to arrest their attention. The interpolation was no doubt suggested by Penelope's words in l. 166, though the 'word
“Τηλέμαχος”, ουκέτι τοι φρένες ἐμπεδοὶ οὐδὲ νόημα·
παῖς ἐτ’ ἔως καὶ μᾶλλον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ κέρδεν ἐνώμας·
νῦν δ’ ὅτε δὴ μέγας ἐσσι καὶ ἤβης μέτρον ἱκάνεις,
καὶ κέν τις φαίη γίνον ἐξεμενα ἄλβων ἀνδρόβς,
ἐς μέγεθος καὶ κάλλος ὀρόμενος, ἀλλότριος φός,
οὐκέτι τοι φρένες εἰσιν ἐνάλισμοι οὐδὲ νόημα,
οἶον δὴ τὸ δέ εὗρον ἐνὶ μεγάροις ἐτόχθη,
ὅτ’ ὁνοὶ ξείνων ἔκασσε ἀεικοσθημέναι οὕτως.

πῶς νῦν, εἰ τι ξείνος ἐν ἡμετέρουι δομοίσιν ἡμενος ὁδε πάθοι μυστακιός εξ ἀλεγενὶς;
οὐ χ’ αἰσχος λάβη τε μετ’ ἀνθρώπουι πέλοτοι.”

Την δ’ αὐ τῇ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντὶον ἁθή·
“μύτερ ἐμῆ, τὸ μὲν οὐ σε νεμεσσώμαι κεκολωσθαι·
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ θυμῷ νοέω καὶ οἴδα ἐκαστα,
ἐσθλά τε καὶ τὰ χέρεων πάροι δ’ ἐτι νῆπιος ἥ.

ἀλλά τοι οὐ δύναμαι πεπνυμένα πάντα νοῆσαι·
ἐκ γάρ με πλῆσοντοι παρήμενοι ἀλλοθεν ἄλλος
οἴδε κακὰ φρονέοντες, ἔμοι δ’ οὐκ εἰσιν ἁρωγοι.
οὐ μὲν τοι ξείνων γε καὶ Ἰρον μᾶλλος ἐτόχθη
μυστηριῶν ἱστη, βή δ’ δ’ γε φέρτερος ἤν.

223 τι Αν. vulg.: τις G F al.: τοι M al. 225 πέλοτο] γένοιο Φ. 229
obel. by Aristoph. and Aristarchus. 234 βίθ Φ.

to Telemachus' there indicated is quite different from what she now says. See also the note on 244-245.
216. καρδια 'clever thoughts,' cp. κερδια.
217. ἤβης μέτρον, i.e. the point from which ἤβη is measured, is considered to begin: cp. ἄρημον μέτρον (13. 101) 'the distance for anchorage.'
219. ἀλλότριος, who therefore would have no other knowledge of him.
221-222. οἶον κτλ. and ὅτε κτλ. are both causal, and do not go together quite smoothly, especially as δ’ must refer back to τοι in 1. 320.
224. ἡμενος δδα, cp. 17. 447, 544. The adv. re-affirms ἡμενο: 'while sitting, as he does,'—as much as to say 'while he sits here quietly.'
229. τὰ χέρια. The art. is regular with comparatives, but there is also an express contrast here: H. G. § 259.
231. παρήμενον 'keeping by my side': as II. 9. 311 ὅς μὴ μου τριξῆς παρήμενον ἄλλους ἄλλος, cp. II. 24. 652.
234. μυστηρίων ἱστη 'at the will of the Suitors,' as they wished (so the Schol.). This hardly agrees with the story as told. The Suitors are quite impartial: indeed, Antinous affects a sympathy for Ulysses (79-81) which does not belong to his usual character. Moreover, ἱστη in Homer means not 'in accordance with the wish,' but 'by the will,' i.e. the command or instigation. So δεὸν ἱστη (often in the Odyssey) = 'by divine providence,' and II. 15. 41 μὴ δ’ ἐπίθη ἱστη = 'it is not my doing that.' Hence the sense here should be that the combat with Irus was
αἱ γὰρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναὶ καὶ Ἀπόλλων,
obtω νῦν μηντηρές ἐν ἡμετέρωι δόμοισι
νεῦσειν κεφαλᾶς δεδημένοι, ὦι μὲν ἐν αὐλῇ,
oi δὲ ἐν τὸ δήμοι, λελύτῳ δὲ γυῖα ἐκάστων,
ὡς νῦν Ἰρος κεῖνος ἐπ' αὐλεῖσθη θύρην
ἵσται νευστάξων κεφαλῆς, μεθοῦντι ἀσκώς,
oúdo ὀρθὸς στῆναι δύναται ποσὶν οὐδὲ νέεσθαι
οὐκαί, ὅπῃ οἱ νόστοι, ἐπεὶ φίλα γυῖα λέλυται."  

"Ὡς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἄγρευον
Εὐρύμαχος δὲ ἐπέσεσε προσῳδὰ Πηνελόπειαν:
κούρη Ἰκαρίου, περίφρων Πηνελόπεια,
ei πάντες σε ἱδονέι σὲ Ἰασω Ἀργος Ἀχαιοί,
πλέουντες κε μηντηρές ἐν υμετέρωι δόμοισιν
ἵστεν δαινύσας, ἐπεὶ περὶ σε γυναικῶν
εἰδός τε μέγεθος τε ἱδὲ φρένας ἐνδον ἐσάς."  

Τὸν δὲ ἡμεῖσι ἐπείτα περίφρων Πηνελόπειαν:
"Εὐρύμαχ' ὡς τοὺς ἐμὺν ἄρετὴν εἰδός τε δέμας τε
ἀλέσαν ἀδάνατοι, ὅτε Ἰλιὸν ἐλαστειν
Ἀργείων, μετὰ τοῖς δὲ ἔμοι πόσις ἦν Ὀδυσσεύς.
ei κείνος γ' ἐλθὼν τὸν ἐμὸν βίον ἀμφιπολεῖοι,

238 ὁ δὲ καὶ ἐκταθεὶς μεγάρων εὐ ναυτάρτων G. ἑλότῳ Hdn. G P H al.;
242 ἐλευθές Baunack (Statud. i. 6) would restore the old
247 Παλαιαντα -ev- 5. would restore the old
252 εἰς Aristoph. Ar., vulg. : ēν G P U al.

not however does not fit the next words δὴ
5 7 ἔτη φάρσος ἦν. Thus we are driven
to regard the use of λέγοντας as one of the
indications of the post-Homeric charac-
ter of the scene (158-303).
238. ἑλότῳ, p.f. opt., for ἑλότῳ-το.
243 So in l. 248 δανύσατο for δανύσα-τάτο.
244-245. The repetition of the name
Πηνελόπεια is a little awkward. When
the interpolated lines 241-243 are cut
out the name is not wanted in 244. It
would certainly be an improvement in
that case to read Εὐρύμαχος δὲ ἐνεισθη
προσῳδά μελικίων.
246. Ἰασων Ἀργος, a phrase which
only occurs here, must denote the whole
of the Peloponnesus, if not all the
Greece of the time (cp. 15. 80). It is
one of the old geographical names that
survive in poetical tradition, sometimes
after their original application is for-
gotten. It is quoted by E. Curtius as a
proof of the wide diffusion of Ionian
settlements in the earliest period of
Greek history. He combines it with
the statement of Pausanias (ii. 37, 3)
that before the Dorian invasion the
people of Argos spoke the same dialect
as the Athenians (Curtius. Die Ionier,
p. 3). On the other hand it is difficult
to understand why the Peloponnesus
should be called 'Ionian' when it was
mainly occupied by an Achaean popula-
tion. And the formation of the word
Ἰασων, in the sense of ἴασων (or ἴαυον),
is not according to any obvious analogy.
251. ἄρετῆς, cp. 13. 45.
18. ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ Σ

μείζων κε κλέος εἰή ἐμὸν καὶ κάλλιον οὐτως.


νῦν δ’ ἄχομαι· τόσα γάρ μοι ἐπέσυνεν κακὰ δαίμων.


ἡ μὲν δὴ δετι τ’ ἦν λιπῶν κατὰ πατρίδα γαίαν,


δειτέρων ἐπὶ καρπῷ ἄλων ἐμὲ χείρα προσφύγα·


ἀ’ γυναι, οὐ γάρ ὁδὸ ἑκνημίδαι Ἀξιοὺς


ἐκ Τροίης εὐ πάντας ἀτύμωνας ἀπονεώσαι·


καὶ γάρ Τροάς φαςι μαχητὰς ἐξεμενει ἄνδρας,


ἡμὲν ἀκοντιστὰς ἢδὲ ρυτῆρας διστῶν


ἵππων τ’ ὀκυπόδων ἐπιβήτορας, οἱ κε τάξιστα


ἐκρίναν μέγα νεῖκος ὁμοίου πτολέμου.


τὸ οὐκ οἴδ’ ἢ κὼ μ’ ἀνέσει θεῖς, ἢ κεν ἄλω


αὐτῶι ἐν Γροῖς· σοι δ’ ἐνθάδε πάντα μελάνων.


μεμνήσθαι πατρὸς καὶ μητέρος ἐν μεγάροισιν


ὁς νῦν, ἢ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐμέδ ἀπονυμφίν ἐῶτος·


ἀυτὰρ ἐπὶν δὴ ποίᾳ γενειν̄ατα λῦναι,


γῆμαθ’ ὁ κ’ ἐθέλησα, τειν κατὰ δώμα λυτοῦσα.


265 ἢπειλοῦσεν Ἂς (cp. 19. 129).


263 τάξιστα] μάλιστα Μ. Ι. 264 πτολέ-


μοῦ F P al.: πολέμου vulg. 265 ἂς] el MSS.


ἀνέσει, better ἄνέση, see the


note. 269 ἠπεὶ δὴ] ἠπειδή F: read probably ἠπεὶ κεν.


263. οἱ κε τάξιστα ἐκρίναν. These words can hardly be made to yield a satisfactory sense. They can only mean 'who would have decided' (in a case which has not happened). If the sorist is gnostic, as is generally supposed, it cannot take κε. We may however read οἱ τε, which gives the gnostic sense required. The change is supported by a parody (as it seems to be) in the Comic poet Metagenes, Αὔρ. Ι αὐτηριδαι οἱ τε τάξιστα ἀνδρών φορτηγών ὑπὸ γοῦν


κατα μοῦνον ἤλωσαν.


264. πτολέμου, for πολέμου, which is given in a few MSS., is doubtless a survival of the original Epic formula ὁμοίῳ πτολέμῳ. Similarly the ττ—has been preserved in 24. 543, Π. 9. 440, 13. 258, 635, 15. 670, 18. 348, 21. 204. In the Iliad the weight of MS. authority in its favour is greater than is shown in La Roche’s edition.


265. ἀνέσει is said by the commentators to be shortened from ἀνέσηι (fut. of ἄνεσι), and to mean 'will let me return home.' Such a licence, however, is quite inadmissible. If any part of the verb ἀνέσῃ is required here we must read ἄνή (with hiatus after με), or else ἄνεσῃ, as Thiersch conjectured (Gr. § 226, comparing ἀνή in Π. 16. 590). But it is a further question whether ἀνέσῃ can have the sense of 'sending home.' It seems much more probable that the word is from the root σαδ, whence sor. ἔσα (inf. ἔσα, ἔσα). It is true that the fut. ἔσαω or ἔσω is only found in one doubtful instance (viz. Π. 9. 455 ἔσασατο, with v. l. ἐσασσατο), the true fut. being probably preserved in the Attic καλ-καθοῦμαι. And the use of the fut. after ἢ κεν (with the subj. ἄλων in the other clause) is very doubtful. These difficulties, however, may be met by the easy correction ἄνεσῃ. The meaning 'seat again,' 'restore to my place,' seems possible enough: the examples are confined to the literal sense, e. g. Π. 3. 310 ἢκαὶ Χρυσίστα ἐλέειν ἄνη, Π. 13. 667 ἢκαὶ καὶ ἄνεσῃς, Π. 14. 209 εἴς εἰςον ἀνὲσαμ (the two last wrongly referred by L. and S. to ἄνεσι).
18. OΔΤΣΣΕΙΑΣ Σ

κείνος τῶς ἀγρευεῖ: τὰ δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται

νῦς δ' ἐσται δι' ἑκείνου γάμος ἀντιβολήσει
οὐλομένης ἐμέθεν, τῆς τε Ζεὺς ὁ θεὸς ἀπήρα.

アルバム ἡ ἄρα ἄξος κραδήν καὶ θυμὸν ἰκάνει,

μηνιτήρων οὖς ἢ δική τοῦ πάροιν τέτυκε,

οἱ τ' ἀγαθὴν τε γυναικα καὶ ἀφετήριοι θύγατρα

μυστείων ἔθελον καὶ ἀλλ' ἐράσωσιν

αὐτοῦ τοῖς γ' ἀπάγουσι βδας καὶ ἰδία μῆλα,

κόρης δαίτα φίλοις, καὶ ἀγιαλα δῶρα διδοῦσιν

ἀλλ' οὖς ἀλληλοιρίοι βίοτον νήποιν ἐδοσιν' οὐσίν.

"Ως φατο, γῆθησεν δὲ πολύτλας δίος 'Οδυσσεός,

ονεκα τῶν μὲν δῶρα παρέλκετο, βέλγε δὲ θυμὸν

μελικίων εὔπεσαν, νόος δὲ οἱ ἀλλὰ μενοῖνα.

Τὴν δ' αὐτ' Ἀντίνοος προσέφη, Εὐπελθεος νῖβας·

κορη 'Ικαρίων, περίφρον Πηνελπεία,

δῶρα μὲν δὲ κ' ἐθέλησιν 'Ἀχαιῶν ἐνθάδ' εὔνεικα,

271 τὸν Ἀρ. (Η. 2. 530) : θ' ὁ Ηερόδιαν, G F H αl.: τὸσ' U. 275 τέτυκαί P,

perhaps rightly.

272. νῦς ἐσται, perhaps said with

conscious allusion to the formula ἐστιν

ἡμερ ἐν' ἐν κτλ.

275. Most editors put a colon or full

stop at τέτυκεν, which gives rather an

abrupt effect to the next sentence. On

the other hand the asyndeton after

ἵμας (1. 277) is regular, since αὐτοῦ
tοι γ' ἀπάγουσι κτλ. is a restatement,

in an affirmative form, of μηνιτήρων οὖς

ἦν δική κτλ. Other examples of this

epegegetic asyndeton are 14. 216-219,

15. 318., 16. 466.

282. παρέλκετο 'drew off to herself':

παρά implies something irregular or

wrong, as in παρατέλων (20. 346), παρα-

ειλθεῖν (5. 104), and frequently in

Attic. See also on 21. 111.

The customs governing the giving

and receiving of presents evidently had

a serious importance in Homeric times,

as they still have in the East, and in

uncivilised countries generally. We have

several indications in the Odyssey of

the richness of the parting gifts (ευρήξια)

which a hero such as Ulysses or Menelaus


82-86., 19. 278.

It has been asked how Ulysses can

be supposed to know that Penelope is

only deceiving her suitors, and is still

faithful to himself (Seeck, Quellen der

Odyssee, p. 55). The accounts which

he has had from Athene (13. 336,

379), confirmed, as we may assume, by

Euamenes and Telemaeus, surely go a

long way to account for his trust.

We may note that the actual words

νόος δὲ οἱ ἄλλα μενοῖνα (1. 283) recall

13. 381, where they are said to him by

Athene. His knowledge of Penelope's

character would do the rest. The in-

cident, therefore, gives no support to

the theory of an Odyssey in which the

recognition by Penelope came earlier

in the story. Indeed we may hold that

the confidence shown by Ulysses is true

to nature, and adds to the poetical value

of the passage.

286. κ' ἄλαρσιν. The antecedent

is understood: 'receive from him who,'

&c.: H. G. § 267, 2, a.
δέξασθον οὐ γὰρ καλὸν ἀνήφασθαι δόσων ἐστίν· ἡμεῖς δὲ σοὶ ἐπὶ ἔργα πάρος γ' ἵμεν οὖτε τῇ ἄλλῃ, πρὸν γέ σε τῷ γῆμασθαι Ἀχαίων δ' τις ἄριστος." 290

'Ωσ ἐφαί 'Αντίνοος, τοῖσιν δ' ἐπιήνυαν μῆθος, δῶρα δ' ἀρ' οἰσέμεναι πρόεσαι κήρυκα ἐκαστος. Ἀντινόφ μὲν ἔνεικε μέγαν περικάλλεα πέπλον, ποικλον· ἐν δ' ἀρ' ἐσαν περναὶ δυσκαιδεκα πᾶσαι χρύσεια, κλησιν εὐγνάμποις ἄραρωια.

300 ὃμοι δ' Ἑυρυμάχῳ πολυδαίδαλον αὐτικ' ἔνεικε, χρύσεων, ἥλεκτρων ἅμεμον, ἥλιον ὁς. ἔρματα δ' Ἑυρυδαμάντι δῶοι θεράπωτες ἐνεικαν τρίγυλνα μορέντα· χάρις δ' ἀπελάμπετο πολλή. ἐκ δ' ἁρα Πεισάνδροι Πολυκτορίδαο ἄνακτος ἑσθμιον ἕνεικεν θεράπων, περικάλλες ἄγαλμα.

305 ἄλλο δ' ἀρ' ἄλλος δῶρον Ἀχαίων καλὸν ἔνεικεν. ἣ μὲν ἔτειτ' ἀνέβαιν ὑπερφιώ διὰ γυναικῶν, τῇ δ' ἀρ' ἀμφίστολοι ἑφέρον περικάλλεα δῶρα.

Οἱ δ' εἰς ὀρχητῶν τε καὶ ἦμερόσαν αἰώδην τρεψάμενοι τέρποντο, μένον δ' ἐπὶ ἐσπερον ἐλθεῖν. 310

305 ὑπερφίω συγαλόντα V (16. 449).

287. δέξασθο, inf.—a softened imperative, expressing what Penelope will naturally do as her part: 'If the Suitors bring gifts, it is for you to take them at their hands.'

288. ἀνήφασθαι δόσων 'to refuse (to give) a gift': so 4.651 χαλεπῶν κεν ἀνήφασθαι δόσων ἐνη. This may be taken to be a formula for unwilling consent. The next words limit this consent to the gifts: 'yes, but we will not leave the house.'

291. οἰονίμων is aor. inf.: cp. the imper. οἶοι (22.106,481), οἰονίων (8.255), &c.

294. The 'keys' of a περόνη or brooch are the metal sheaths into which the pins were passed. They were curved in form, hence θυγναμπτοι. See Helbig, p. 275 (ed. 3).

295. For the δρόμος, with its ornaments consisting of pieces of amber (ἐλκυτρα), see the passages quoted on 15.460.

297. ἔρματα 'ear-rings': cp. II. 14. 182.

299. τρίγυλνα 'of three drops' or 'beads': γλάφη is properly a 'bead,' hence applied to the pupil of the eye. Cp. the Attic τριστής, also τριστής, the name of a 'three-eyed' brooch. As to μορόντα the most probable suggestion is that it means 'clustering' (μορόν being a mulberry). But as the word only occurs in this obviously conventional verse, it may be an archaism—one of the words that kept their place in Epic poetry after their meaning was more or less forgotten.

305. τερπάμενοι τέρποντο, apparently an intentional play of language: cp. 13.144, &c.

μένον... ἐλθεῖν, cp. Simonides fr. 1, 7 οἱ μέ ν ἥμερον μένουσιν ἐλθείν.
18. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Χ

τοίς δὲ τερπομένοις μέλας ἐπὶ ἔσπερος ἥλθεν. αὐτίκα λαμπτήρας τρεῖς ἱστασαν ἐν μεγάροισιν, ὄφρα φαεῖνον· περὶ δὲ ἔναλα κάγκανα θῆκαν, αὖν πάλαι περὶκήλα, νέον κεκεαμένα χαλκῷ, καὶ δαίδας μετέμιχον ἄμοιβηδίς δ' ἀνέφαινον δμφαὶ Ὀδυσσήος ταλασίφρονος· αὐτάρ ὁ τῆςιν αὐτός διογενὴς μετέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεῖς· δμφαὶ Ὀδυσσήος, δὴν οἰχομένου ἄνακτος, ἔρχεσθε πρὸς δόμαθ', ἵνα αἴδοιη βασιλεία· τῇ δὲ παρ' ἡλάκατα στροφαλίζετε, τέρπετε δ' αὐτὴν ἤμεναι ἐν μεγάρῳ, ἢ εἰρία πεῖκετε χειρὶ· αὐτάρ ἐγὼ τούτοις φαῖς πάντεσσι παρέξω. εἶ περ γὰρ κ' ἐθέλοισιν ἔθωρον Ὁ ὑψίων, οὕτως μὲν, ὡς με νυκήσουσιν πολυτλήμαν δὲ μάλ' εἰμὶ."  

"Εϊς ἔφαθ' ἀλ' δ' ἐγέλασαν, ἐς ἄλληλας δὲ ἱδοντο. τὸν δ' αἰσχρός ἐνέπιπε Μελανθώ καλλιπάρρος, τὴν Δολίας μὲν ἔτικτε, κόμισε δὲ Πηνελοπεία, παίδα δὲ δι' ἀτίταλλε, δίδου δ' ἀπ' ἀθυρματα θυμοῦ· ἅλλ' οὖθ' δος ἔχε πένθος εἰπ' φρεσι Πηνελοπείας, ἅλλ' γ' Εὐρυμάχῳ μισώσκετο καὶ φιλέσκεν.

328 ἱστασαν G U: other MSS. have ἱστασαν or ἱστασαν. 308 πρεῖ] ἐπὶ R H M 310 ἄφωνοι] πάθων G. 314 δῶμα F, perhaps rightly. 318 οἴ] σκέθη F U M.

7. λαμπτήρας are 'brassiers,' cp. 19.63. 8. πρεῖ δὲ ἔναλα κτλ. These words seem to describe the making of the fire in the brassiers (not the mere placing of fuel with which to seed it): cp. the re-plenishing of the fire in 19.63 ἄλλα δ' ἐκ αὐτῶν νῆσσον ἔναλα πολλὰ φῶς ἐμὸν ἂν θῆραισαν. 310. δακτος μετέμιχον, i. e. besides the λαμπτήρας, and in the spaces between them, there were torches held by attendants. These relieved each other in this service (ἐμειβοίς ἀνέφαινον). Cp. the figures holding torches in the palace of Alcinous, φαίνοντες νυῖνας (7. 100-101). Some commentators take δακτος here in the sense of 'slips of pine wood,' which were mixed with the ἔναλα (of which, therefore, they were merely a variety), and ἀνέφαινον as = 'kept up the fire,' sc. of the λαμπτήρας. But on this view the service of the δακτος is not very noticeable, and we lose the striking picture of Ulysses acting himself as the unwearied torch-bearer. 316. πεῖκετε is probably only a metrical lengthening of πεῖκε (Schulze, Quaesit. Ἐρ. p. 223): cp. II. 14. 176. 323. The MSS. are divided pretty equally between δυμοῦ and θυμοῦ. The dat. would be construed with διδοῦ, 'gave to please her mind': the gen. would go with ἄθωρμα, cp. οἰκήματα δυμοῦ (Od. 10. 317). The latter is more Homeric. 324. Ἐπαθάσασι, objective gen., 'sorrow for Penelope.'
18. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΔΗΣ Σ

"Εξείνε τάλαν, σύ γέ τίς φρένας ἐκπεπταγμένος ἦστι, ὦ φήλεις εἴδειν χαλκήν ές δόμον ἠλόν, ἧν που ἦς λέσχην, ἀλλ' ἐνθάδε πάλιν ἄγορεύεις [θερσαλέως πολλοίσι μετ' ἀνδράσιν, οὐδὲ τι θυμὸν ταρβείς; ἡ γά σε οἴνον ἔχει φρένας, ἡ νῦ τοι αἰεὶ τοιούτος νόος ἰστὶν, ὦ καὶ μεταμάνια βάζεις.]

ἡ ἀλώος ὅτι Ἰρών ἐκκήσας τόν ἄλητην;
μὴ τίς τοι τάχα Ἰρών ἀμείνουν ἄλλος ἀναστῇ,
δὲ τίς σ' ἀμφί κάρη κεκοπῶς χεροὶ στιβαρθῆσι
dώματος ἐκπέμψῃ φορύδας αἴματι πολλῷ.

Την ὅ ἥρ ὑπόθερα ἱδὼν προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
"ἡ τάχα Τηλεμάχῳ ἐρέω, κύον, οἱ ἄγορεύεις,
κείν' ἠλόν, ἵνα σ' ἀδεὶ διὰ μελείστη τάμησιν.

"Ως εἴπων ἐπέεσσα διεπτοίησε γυναίκας.

βὰν ὅ ἢμεν διὰ δόμα, λόθεν ὅ ὑπὸ γυνὰ ἐκάστης
tαρβοῦνῃ: φάν γὰρ μεν ἄληθεν μυθήσασθαι,
αὐτάρ ὅ παρ λαμπτῆριοι φαείνων αἰθομένων ἐστίκειν ἐς πάντας ὀρφόνεοι· ἄλλα δὲ οἱ κήρ
dραμαινε φρεσίν ἤσιν, ὅ οὖκ ἀτελεστα γένοντο.

327. ἐκπεπτασμένος L. W. 332. μεταμάλαια F H M U al. 336. ἐκτίμησις G. 343. αὐτάρ ὁ λαμπτήριος G. 344. ἐστίκεις G U al.: -ανι H K: see Lud-
wich on II. 14. 412.

327. φρένας ἐκπεπταγμένος is a somewhat difficult phrase. The word περάσω is used of the beating of the heart from fear (II. 7. 216., 13. 282) or excitement (II. 23. 370): hence the meaning might be 'frightened out of his wits,' or else 'stirred to madness.' Two MSS. have ἐκπεπτασμένος, and perhaps a better sense, or at least more one suitable to the context, may be obtained by connecting this word with the obscure περάσει of I. 160. If πετάνωμ said of the mind means 'to set agog' or 'intoxicate,' the participle would express the restless excitement that Melantho complains of.

328. χαλκήν δόμον 'house of the χαλκήν,' cp. l. 353.
329. This is the only mention in Homer of the λέον, afterwards a familiar institution in Greece.

330-332. These lines, which recur in 390-392, were rejected by Aristarchus. They certainly fit the later context, and are superfluous here. And the repetition πολλά ... πολλοῖς is awkward.

332. ὥς ἑκάτερον, 'which is the reason that.' Cp. 4. 206 τοῖσιν γὰρ καλ 
πατροὶ, ὅ καὶ πεπνυμένα βάζεις: H. G. § 269, 1.
338. οἱ ἄγορεύουσα, not 'what things you say,' but with causal force, 'since you say such things': cp. 389, &c.
344. ἄλλα 'other' than he seemed to be attending to.
Μνηστήρας δ' ου πάμπαν αγνήνοπας ελα Ἀθηνή
λάβης Ἰσχεσθαί θυμαλγέος, δαφ' ἐτι μᾶλλον
δὴ ἄχω κραδήν Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσσῆος.
τοισὶν δ' Ἐὐρώμαχος, Πολύβου παῖς, ἤρχ' ἄγορεειν,
κερτομέων Ὀδυσσῆα, γέλω δ' ἐτάροιοιν ἐτευχε'.
"κέκλυτε μεν, μνηστήρες ἀγακλείης βασιλείης,
δαφ' εἴπο τὸ με θυμὸς ἔνι στήθεσσι κελέει.
οὐκ ἀθεεί δδ' ἄνηρ Ὀδυσσῆοιν ἐς δόμον ἤκει·
ἐμην μοι δοκεί δαλών σελας ἐμμεναι αὐτοθ
κὰς κεφαλῆς, ἐπει οὐ τὶς ὁδ' ἡβαιαί." 350

"Ἡ ρ' ἀρα τε προσέειτον Ὀδυσσῆα πτολίποροθν·
"ἔειν', ἡ δρ κ' ἐθέλως θητενεμεν, εἰ ὅ' ἁνελοῖμην,
ἀγροὶ ἐπ' ἐςχατής—μυσθὸς δὲ τοι ἄρκτος ἐσται—
αλμασίας τε λέων καὶ δένδρα μακρὰ φυτεύων;
ἐνθα κ' ἐγὼ σῖτων μὲν ἐπηταινὸν παρέχομι,
ἐίματα δ' ἀμφίσαμαι ποσὶν θ' ὑποδήματα δοθνεν. 360
ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δὴ ἔργα κὰς ἐμμαθες, οὐκ ἠθελήσεις
ἐργον ἐποχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ πτῶσειν κατὰ δῆμον
βούλεαι, δαφ' ἄν ἔχεις βόσκειν σὴν γαστέρ' ἀναλτον."

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβομενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσευς. 365

348 Λαερτιάδην Ὀδυσσῆα Γ Υ : σφ. 20, 286. 350 γέλων vulg. (σφ. 20, 8).
3' ἐτάροιοιν' δ' ἑρα τοισὶν Ρ Η ΜΙ αλ. ἐτευχὲ Ρ Η ΜΙ αλ. 355 καλ' Barnes: καὶ
MSS. 366 πτολίποροθν' μεγάθιμον Υ.

346. οὐ πάμπαν 'not at all,' = Attic οὐ πάντων.
348. ὑπην is opt., for δη-η.
354. ἔεινε 'after all,' 'really now,' said in a deprecating tone before an-
nouncing a prodigy: cp. 19. 37 ἔεινε μοι τοῦχοι ετᾶ. Eurymachus pretends to
think that Ulysses with his torches is a source of light that can only be
ascribed to the presence of a divine
being (19. 40 ὡς μᾶλα τις θεὸς ἐνθοῦς.
355. κἀς κεφαλῆς 'down from his
very own head.' The gen. with κατά
is generally found with verbs of motion:
here δοκεί δαλᾶς ἐμμεναί = 'light seems
to come.' The joke about Ulysses as
a self-luminous body is now improved
upon by the remark that the light must
come from himself, since he has no hair
which could help to produce it. The
MS. reading καὶ κεφαλῆς involves the
hardly possible constr. ἐμμεναι κεφαλῆς
'to be on, or come from, the head.'
357. ἀνελοίμην, of taking into service:
cp. 14. 272, also 19. 22 ἐμφροσύνας
ἀλιλουο τ' Ταγρέον, of 'taking thought.'
359. αλμασίας 'a wall,' as 24. 224
αλμασίας λίθος ὁλῆς ἐμμεναι ἔρως.
It is apparently a dry wall, as Herodotus
speaks of lizards living in such a wall
(2. 69 κροκόφθωλοι τοισὶ ἐν τήσι αλμα-
σίαις). Ἀλγων must here mean 'laying':
cp. αλμασίαλογεϊν in Theopompos Com.
(incert. 11).
"Εὐρύμαχ’, εἰ γὰρ νῷϊν ἐρίς ἔργῳ γένοιτο ὀρη ἐν εἱλαρίνῃ, ὅτε τ’ ἥματα μακρὰ πέλονται, ἐν πολι, ὄρπανον μὲν ἔγών εὐκαμπτες ἔχομι, καὶ δὲ σὺ τοιὸν ἔχοις, ἵνα πειρησάμεθα ἔργου νῆστιες ἄχρι μάλα κνέφαος, ποιή δὲ παρείη.

εἰ δ’ αὐ καὶ βῆς εἰς ἐλαυνέμεν, οἱ περ ἄριστοι, αἴθωνες μεγάλοι, ἄμφω κεκορηθὲ ποίης, ἰλικει ἵσοφοροι, τῶν τε σθένοις οὐκ ἀλατάδνων, τετράγωνον δ’ εἰ, εἰκοι δ’ ὑπ’ βῶλος ἀρτόρω τὸ κέ μ’ ἰδοις, εἰ ἄλκα διηνεκεά προταμοίμην. εἰ δ’ αὐ καὶ πόλεμον ποθὲν ὀρμήσει Κρονίων σήμερον, αὐτὰρ ἐμοι σάκος εἰ καὶ δύο δοῦρε καὶ κυνή πάγχαλκος, ἐπὶ κροτάδοις ἄραρια, τῶ κέ μ’ ἰδοις πρότοισιν ἐνι προμάχοισι μιγέντα, οὐδ’ ἀν μοι τὴν γαστήρ’ ὅνειδιζων ἄγορεοίσι.

ἀλλὰ μᾶλ’ ἀβρέξεις καὶ τοι νόος ἑστὶν ἀπηνῆν, καὶ ποῦ τις δοκεῖσι μέγας ἐμεναι ἡ δὲ κραταιός, οὐνεκα πάρ παιροισι καὶ οὐτίδανοισι όμιλεῖς. εἰ δ’ Ὀδυσεύς ἔλυοι καὶ ἱκοι’ ἐσ πατρίδα γαῖαν, ἀλφα κέ τι τὰ θύρετρα, καὶ εὐρεά περ μάλ’ ἐντα, 385 φεύγομε στείνοιτο διὲκ προβόρου θόραζε.

'Ἰω ἐφατ’, Εὐρύμαχος δ’ ἐχολόσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον, καὶ μιν ὑπὸδρα ἱδον ἐπεα πτερόεντα προσήδα: ἀ ἄειλι, ἡ τάχα τοι τελεό κακόν, οἰ ἄγορεοίσι

370 κνέφαος G άι. 371 εἰ δὲ περ ἄριστον G. Probably the dudal should be restored in the two next lines also: thus αἴθωνες μεγάλοι... ἱλικεὶ ἵσοφοροι. 379 καὶ ἰδοις P, τ. c. originally καὶ ἰδοις, and so in 375. In 379 the pronoun με can be understood from the context. 383 οὐτίδανοισιν G U: οὐκ ἀγαθοίσιν valg. 386 προβόρου τοι. G F P H U: μεγάρου Khianus, X D άι.

366. ἕρας 'rivalry', as 6.92 θοδὸς ἐράδα προφροζεζ. 367. πέλοντας 'come round,' cp. εἰπελόμανον ἔτος. 377. Note the absence of the ὅρης: so in 14.482. 380. The art. with μοι has the force of a possessive adj. (μοι τὴν γαστὴρ = τὴν ἐρήμη γ.) : see on 13.262, and H. G. § 261, 3, b.

381. ἀπήνης 'averse, ungentle': cp. πρόσην 'favouring, kind': prob. from a word ἰσος (or ἱσος) 'mouth' or 'face' (Sanscr. anika, anana). Hence also ἵν’ ἔρη 'beard.' 383. οὐτιδανοίσιν, conjectured by Barnes in place of the proseic οὐκ ἀγαθοίσιν, is now found in two good MSS.
θαρσαλέως πολλοίς μετ’ ἀνδράσιν, οδὲ τί θυμῷ ταρβείς· ἦ ὅσι σε οἶνον ἔχει φρένας, ὡς νῦ τοι αἰεὶ τοιοῦτος νῦσος ἦσαν· ἐν καὶ μεταμόνια βάζεις.

[ἢ ἀλητεῖς, ὅτι Ἰρών ἐνίατον τῶν ἀλητῶν;]"

"Ὡς ἄρα φωνῆςα σφέλας ἔλλαβεν· αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσέως Ἀμφίνομον πρὸς γοῦνα καθέξετο Δουλιχίδος,

Εὐφράμαχον δείχσας· ὁ δ’ ἄρ’ οἶνοχῶν βάλε χεῖρα δεξιερήν πρόχος δὲ χαμαι βδῆμης πεσοῦσα, αὐτὰρ δ’ γ’ οἰμώξας πέσεν ὅπτιος εἰς κονίησι.

μυστήρες δ’ ὄμαδήσαν ἀνὰ μέγαρα σκιδεντα, ὡς δ’ εἰς εἰπεσκεν ἱδὼν εἰς πλησίον ἄλλον·

"αἰθ’ οὐφελλ’ ὁ ξείνους ἀλάμονος ἄλλοθ’ ὀλέθσαι πρίν ἐλθεῖν τῷ κ’ ὁδ’ τό τόσον κέλαδον μετέθηκεν·

δὲ περὶ πτωχῶν ἐριδαλνομεν, οδὲ τί δαίρεις εἰσθήσει ἔσσεταί ἥδος, ἐπεὶ τὰ χερείων νικά.""

Τοίοι δὲ καὶ μετέειφ’ λεηρὶ ἢς Τηλεμάχου·

"δαιμόνιοι, μαίνεσθε καὶ οὐκέτι κεύθετε θυμῷ βραχών οὐδὲ ποτήτα· θεῶν νῦ τις ὁμίρ’ ὄρθονεν.

ἀλ’ εὖ δαισάμενοι κατακελευτε οἰκαδ’ ἵοντες,

ὀπτῶς θυμὸς ἁνγεῖ· διάκωκ’ δ’ οὐ τιν’ ἐγαγε.""

"Ὡς ἐφαθ’, οἱ δ’ ἄρα πάντες οὐδὲ εἰς χελεσί φώντες

Τηλεμάχον θαύμαζον, ὁ θαρσαλεός ἀγάρευε.

τοίοι δ’ Ἄμφινομος ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε

392 μετάμφετα Φ. al. 393 om. G F X U al. 402 τόσον] κολὼν G F. μετάθεται Ar.: μεθῆκε MSS. (μεθήκα τύπισε)."
[Νῦνον φαιδίμου ὑός, Ἀρητάδαο ἀνακτόσ].

“(...) φιλοί, ὅσι ὁ μή τις ἐπὶ ῥηθεῖντι δικαίω

ἀντίβοις ἐπέεσσι καθαπτόμενος χαλεπάνῳ

μήτε τι τὸν ξείνου στυφελῆτε μήτε τιν’ ἄλλον

διόν, οἱ κατὰ δόματ’ Ὀδνοφός θείοι.

ἄλλ’ ἄγετ’, οἰνοχόσ μὲν ἐπαρράθωσ δεσπέσσων,

ὅφη σπείσατες κατακέλομεν οἰκαβ’ ἵνατε
tὸν ξείνου δὲ ἱκώμεν ἐνι μεγάροις Ὀοὺσθος

Τῆλεμάχῳ μελέμεν τοῦ γὰρ φιλον ἱκετοῦ δώμα.

“(...) φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ἑαὐτὰ μόνον ἐεπεῖ.

τοῖσι δὲ κρήτηρα κεράσσατο Μοῦλλος ἱρως,

κήρυξ Δουλιχέας· θεράπων δ’ ἦν Ἀμφινύμοιο

νόμησεν δ’ ἄρα πᾶσιν ἐπισταῦδον· οἱ δὲ θεοὶ

λειψάντες μακάρεσσι πλοῖο μελιθέα οἶνον.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπείσαν τ’ ἐπὶν θ’ δοὺν ἥθελεν θυμός,

βάν β’ ἤμενι κείοντες ἐδ’ πρὸς δόμαθ’ ἐκαστος.


418 ἄγετ’ D X Z, perhaps rightly, if we

restore the f of οἰνοχόσ.

419 κατακέλομεν] Perhaps καταστάλεστε, as in 408 (cp.

στυφελῆτε in 410).

420 μεγάρων ἐπηλὼν Rhamnus, who may have thought

μεγάρων Ὀδουθίνο not consistent with τοῦ γὰρ ... ἱκέμα in the next line.

425 λειψάντες G F X U a l.: σπείσατες vulg.

428 βάν ἰ F H X a l.

414. οἱ ῥηθεῖντι δικάλαρ ‘after the

right word has been spoken.’

418. ἐπαρράθωσ. This word denotes

the pouring in of the first drop, which

was then immediately poured out in libra-

tion (σπείσαντες), and the full draught

poured in by the οἰνοχόσ. The pre-

position ἐν has the force of going

‘round’ the company: see on 14. 294.

419. κατακέλομεν, cp. l. 408. For

ὅφη with fut. indic. see H. G. § 326, 3.

425. ἐπισταῦδον means ‘stopping at

each in succession.’ The οἰνοχόσ waited

for the libation to be made by the

guest, and then passed to the next.

The preposition has the same force as

ἐπήρξασθαί (418). On the whole

passage see the note on 3. 340.

Mycenaean Crater Found in Cyprus.
Oδησσέως καὶ Πινελόπης ὑμίλια: ἀναγνωρίσθη ὑπὸ Εὐρυκλείας.

Αὐτὰρ ὅ ἐν μεγάρῳ ὑπελείπτερο δίος Ὀδυσσέως, μνηστήρας φόνον σὺν Ἀθήνη μεριπρίζων· αἴσχα δὲ Τηλέμαχον ἐπεα περάντα προσήδεα· "Τηλέμαχε, χρῆ τείχεν ἅρμια κατόθημα ἐσω πάντα μᾶλ', αὐτὰρ μνηστήρας μαλακῶς ἐπέεσσι

1–50. The removal of the arms from the μέγαρον to an inner θάλαμος has already been mentioned in 16. 281–298. The two passages are to some extent identical, the nine lines 19. 5–13 being a repetition of 16. 286–294. Ancient and modern critics are generally agreed in regarding 16. 281–298 as an interpolation, founded upon the present passage, and intended to lead up to it. They argue that Ulysses would not be likely to think of the arms in the μέγαρον until he came to the palace himself: that exact directions, such as he gives for an answer to the Suitors, are more appropriate at the later stage: that the phrase μαλακῶς ἐπέεσσι παραφάσσα (16. 286) comes awkwardly after μελυκτοὶ ἐπεα παραφάσσα in 16. 279: and that the injunction to keep two sets of arms for himself and Telemachus, which does not recur in the 19th book, is inconsistent with the subsequent story. It has also been pointed out that the words in 16. 283 νεόσων ετὸς refer to a signal to be given by Ulysses to Telemachus while the Suitors are in the hall, whereas the removal of the arms could only be carried out while they were absent. Finally, the repetition of the formula ἄλλο δὲ τοῦ ἐρέων ετὸς (16. 281, 299) is strongly suggestive of insertion.

On the other hand it is maintained by Kirchhoff (Odyssées, p. 560) that the passage in the 16th book is genuine, and is the source from which the passage before us was derived. His arguments turn upon minute points of comparison between the language of the two places. Thus in 19. 10 the unusual construction ἐπὶ φρεάτει ἐμβάλει is best accounted for by supposing that the vague phrase ἐμβάλει δαίμον was substituted for θῆμεν ἐρείον, which is the reading in 16. 297. Again, 19. 4 gives in one line the substance of the two lines 16. 284–285, and has probably been abbreviated from them. The speech of Ulysses in 19. 4 ff. begins abruptly, and is not clear by itself: e.g. the words κατάθημα εἶναι are only intelligible if they recall 16. 285 ἐς μυγω τηλτῷ θαλάμων καταθεῖναι. And χρῆ κατάθημα is not so Homeric as the use of the infinitives κατατεῖναι and παραφάσσαω as imperatives.

These considerations, if not all equally decisive, show at least that we cannot be content simply to bracket 16. 281–298. But other reasons lead rather to
the conclusion that both passages are additions to the original context.

(1) If the repetition of ἀλλο δὲ τοι ἐρώτητα κτλ. is suspicious, the same may be said with still greater force of 19. 1-2 and 51-52. And it may be noticed that αὐτὰρ ὅ ἐν μέγαρον ἐπεληκτόν δοὺς ὅδοις Ὀδυσσέας is more correct in l. 51, when Ulysses is left quite alone, than in l. 1, when Telemachus is still with him.

(2) The speech which Telemachus is to make to the Suitors (16. 286-294 = 19. 6-13) does not fall in with the course of events. He is here furnished with the answer to be given to them when they notice the absence of the arms. This leads us to expect that the Suitors, when they come to the palace next day, will at once ask about the arms, and receive the preconcerted answer, repeated in the Epic manner. But no such incident takes place.

(3) One of the reasons which Tele- machus is to give is that arms tempt men to use them. This assumes that the Suitors were otherwise unarmed: whereas (as we presently find) every one had his sword by his side. It would seem, then, that this argument was suggested in an age when the habit of wearing arms no longer prevailed.

(4) The proverb ἤθελεν στίπς... is a similar anachronism. It belongs to a period when iron was the chief or only metal of which weapons were made. But although the use of iron was well known in the time of the Odyssey, it was evidently still rare in comparison with bronze. Not only do we never hear of iron spears or swords, but the word χαλας is often used of weapons generally, like στίπς here: cp. ὄδ. 4. 226, 700, 743, 11. 120, 519, 535, 13. 271, 14. 271, 17. 440, 8c.

(5) The vocabulary in the two passages in question has a post-Homeric stamp. This applies to κατακήρυκτο (for κατακήρυκτος), τάφος (for τάφος), χρόνος as a spondee, ἀχρόνος. See also the note on l. 48.

There are however two passages in the 12nd book, and one in the 24th, which seem to imply that the arms had been removed from the μύχοις.

(1) 22. 23-25, where the μύστηρος... begins by the slaying of Antinous, and the others start up in excitement κατάρτισαι κατακήρυκτος ἀδιάβροχον προς τοῖς, οδῆς τὴν ἄτοι ἡν ὁδῆς ἀλμύρων ἑξῆς ἐλᾶθαν. These words however, as Kirchhoff has happily shown, do not suit the context. They imply that the Suitors looked for arms for their combat with Ulysses. But the Suitors did not yet expect any combat. They thought that the stranger had killed Antinous by accident, and did not dream of the fate that was hanging over them. Hence these lines are an interpolation, and prove nothing about the removal of the arms.

(2) 22. 140-141 ἐκ βαλάμως ἐνθον γὰρ, ἄλοιμα, ὁδῆς τὴν ἄλλη τεύχεα κατακήρυκτη Ὀδυσσέας καὶ βαλάμως νῦν. These words are generally taken to mean that Melanthius would bring arms from the βαλάμως, since it was there, and nowhere else, that Ulysses and Telemachus had put them. But as Kirchhoff points out, that cannot be the true sense. The word ἐνθον does not mean 'there,' but 'within' (opposed to 'without'), hence 'at home,' 'in their place.' What Melanthius wishes to say is that the arms will be found in their proper place, the βαλάμως — that Ulysses and Telemachus have not put them anywhere else (which they might have done as a precaution). The passage therefore is really a confirmation of the view that the whole incident of the removal of the arms is a later addition.

We may go further, and conjecture that it was the misunderstanding of this passage that gave the incident its place in the existing narrative.

(3) The removal of the arms is also mentioned in 24. 164-166. The fact may rank with other indications of the later date of that book. It is worth while noticing that the words ἄλλ' ἄλλῳ δὴ μὲν ἐνεέργει Δῖος νῦν (24. 164) recall 16. 291 ἐν ἀγέρι αἰθέρι βρών (16. 291), and ἄλλος in 24. 165 must come from 16. 285. Possibly the author of the 24th book knew 16. 281-298, but not 19. 1-50.
19. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Τ

... κατηκισται, δεσον πυρὸς ίκετ' αὐτήν. πρὸς δ' ἐτι καὶ τὸδε μεῖζων ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἐμβάλε δαιμών, μὴ πως οἰνωϑέντες, ἤριν στῆσαντες ἐν υἱίον, ἀλλὰ δους τρώοντε καταισχύνητε τε δαίτα καὶ μηνιστῶν· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος."

"διε σάτο, Τηλέμαχοι δὲ φιλω ἐπιπεθηκεντο πατρί, ἐκ δὲ καλεσάμονος προσέφη τροφὸν Εὐρύκλειαν. "μαῖ, ἄγε δὴ μοι ἰρμον ἐνὶ μεγάροις γυναίκας, ὄρεν κεν ἐς θάλαμον καταθεματί ἐντεα πατρὸς καλά, τὰ μοι κατὰ ὁλον ἀκηδεα κατιδες ἀμέρει πατρὸς ἀποιχομένου· ἐγώ δ' ἐτι νήπιων ἡ.

νῦν δ' ἐθέλω καταθέαθαι, ἐν οὐ πυρὸς ἱετ' αὐτήν."  

Τὸν δ' αὐτὸ προσείπετε φιλη τροφὸς Εὐρύκλεια: "αἱ γὰρ δὴ ποτε, τέκνον, ἐπιφροσύνας ἀνέλοιο ὁλον κήδεσθαι καὶ κτήματα πάντα φιλάσσειν. ἀλλ' ἄγε, τίς τοι ἐπείτα μετοιχομένη φαος οἴσει; διμφάς δ' οὐκ εἶλας προβλασκέμεν, αἱ κεν ἐφαίνον."  

Τὴν δ' αὐτὴ Τηλέμαχοι πεπνυμένοις αὐτίων ἡθα: "ζείνοις δ'· οὐ γὰρ ἀεργῶν ἀνέβομαι δς κεν ἐμης γε ὀνυκος αὐτής, καὶ τηλθεοι εἰληθούνας."  

"με δρ' ἐφώνησεν, τῇ δ' ἅπερος ἐπλετο μύθος. κληθέν δὲ θώρας μεγάρον εν ναεταντων. τῇ δ' αὐτίναμαν' ὁδουσίς καὶ φαθώμοι νῦ dishonest kóρυθασ τε καὶ ἄσπιδας δύμαλοεύσας ἐγχεια τ' ἐξουθετα. πάρωθε δὲ Παλλᾶς Ἀθηνή, κρόσου λόχων ἔχουσα, φαος περικαλλες ἐποτεί."

9 κατήκοιτα, see 16. 290. 10 ἐμβάλε δαιμών] δῆλης Κρονίων (16. 291) should perhaps be read here, to avoid the tautology ἐν φρεσὶν ἐμβάλε. 12 τρώοντε, see on 16. 292. 31 ἀνάβατο δε πατρί F.

16. ἐν μεγάρον 'indoors': the plural μέγαρα is used of the house or palace generally. It is not likely that the women's apartments are here meant, as some think.

24. μετοιχομην, not 'going after you,' but 'going off to fetch' (the light): cp. 8. 47 ἄριθμος δὲ μετεθεϊτο θεῖον διδώσω. 25. οὐκ εἶλας = 'you forbade.'

28. χρόσου διατητα 'lays hold of a ration of meal.' χρόσου is used like κασλῆς καὶ φρένω (15. 312., 17. 12). But the phrase seems colloquial.

29. ἅπερος κτλ. See the note on 17. 57.

34. λόχων is post-Homeric, both word and thing. The synizesis in the word χρόσου is not Homeric.
δὴ τὸτε Τηλέμαχος προσεύχοντας θυσίαν πατέρι αἰλή.
“ο δ' πάτερ, ἥ μέγα θαύμα τὸδ’ ὀφθαλμοίσιν ὁρῶμαι. ἔμμης μοι τοῖχοι μεγάρων καλὰ γε μεσόδμαι εἰλάτινα τε δοκοὶ καὶ κίονες ὑψὸς ἵχοντες φαίνοντε ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅς εἰ πυρὸς αἰθομένῳ.
ἡ μάλα τις θεὸς ἐνδον, οὐ οὐρανὸν εὐφον ἵχουσι.”

Τὸν δ’ ἀπαμείβωνες προσεύχη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσέας.
“σύγα καὶ κατὰ σὸν νόον ἵσχανε μηθ’ ἐρέεινεν: αὐτὴ τοι δίκη ἐστί θεῶν, οὐ "Ολυμπον ἵχουσιν.
ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν κατάλεξει, ἐγὼ δ’ ὑπολείψομαι αὐτὸν, ὅφρα κ’ ἔτι ὅμοιος καὶ μητέρα σὴν ἐρεβίζω.
ἡ δέ μ’ ὂδυρμένη εἰρήσεται ἄμφις ἐκαστα.”

"Ὡς φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ δίδεκ μεγάρων ἄβηκεν.
κεῖον ἐν θαλάμων δαίδων ὑπὸ λαμπρομενῶν,
ἐνθα πάρος κοιμᾶτ’ ὅτε μιν γλυκὸς ὕππος ἱκάνοι,
ἐνθ’ ὅρα καὶ τότ’ ἐλεκτο καὶ Ἡώ διὰν ἐμμεν.
αὐτὸρ δ’ ἐν μεγάρῳ ὑπελείπετο διὸς Ὀδυσσέας,
μυστήρεσι βούλον σὺν Ἀθήνη μεμηριζόν.
’Η δ’ ἔνεκ θαλάμων περὶ πῆλος Πηνελόπεια,
’Αρτέμιδι ἱκέλη ἦ’ χρυσῆ Ἀφροδίτην.

37 μεγάρων] μεγάλου G.

37. έμμης. See on 18. 354.
The μεσόδμα are of a house, according to Aristarchus, were the spaces between the columns (τὰ μεσόστοιλα): according to others, the interval between the beams (τὰ μεσαῖὰ τῶν δοκῶν διαστήματα). When used of a ship the word meant a sort of box in which the mast was set (καλάς ἄγεος μεσόδμα, see note on 2. 424). It does not seem likely that the same word would denote two things so different. Moreover, a phrase like καλὰ μεσόδμα, used as it is in this context, would naturally be applied to a prominent part of the building, or at least to something of importance for the decoration. Possibly the μεσόδμα are the stone bases or pedestals on which the wooden columns stood. In the palace at Tityns thirty-one stone bases are still in situ (Tsountas and Manatt, p. 53). The resemblance between the base of a pillar and the box in which the mast was set is sufficiently obvious.
39. ὅς εἰ πυρὸς αἰθομένων ‘as though with a fire blazing,’ i.e. as if in the light of a bright fire.
42 κατὰ ἵσχανε ‘keep in check.’
48. δαίδων ὅρα ‘by the light of torches.’ The poet does not explain who held these torches. Apparently the maidservants came back with or after Penelope (60).
The θαλάμος of Telemachus was probably a building that opened on the αἰλή: cp. 11. 9. 475-476 καὶ τότ’ ἐγὼ θαλάμῳ βίρας τινὰς αἴρεις ρηχὰς ἐξέβλοι, καὶ ὑπερθορον ἐρεῖον αὐλῆς (of the escape of Phoenix).
19. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Τ

τῇ παρὰ μὲν κλωσήν πυρὶ κάθεσαν, ἐν' ἀρ' ἐφίζε, δινοτήν ἐλέφανται καὶ ἀργύρφ. ἦν ποτὲ τέκτων ποιήσῃ 'Ἰκμάλιος, καὶ ὑπὸ θρήνου ποσὶν ἦκε προσφυε' εἰς αὐτῆς, δ' ἐπὶ μέγα βάλλετο κῶς. ἔθα καθέζετ' ἐπειτὰ περίφρον Πηνελόπεια. ἥλθον δὲ διμφαί λευκάλενοι ἐκ μεγάρου.

ἀλ 8' ἀπὸ μὲν σῶτον πολὺν ἤρεον ἢ ὅτε τραπέζας καὶ δέτα, ἐνθὲν ἄρ' ἀνδρεὶς ὑπερμενέοντες ἐπὶνον· πῦρ δ' ἀπὸ λαμπτήρων χαμάδις βάλον, ἄλλα δ' ῥετ' αὐτῶν νήσαν ξύλα πολλὰ, φῶς ἔμεν ἢ ἄρ' θέρεσθαι. ἡ δ' Ὀδυσσή' ἐνέπιπτε Μελανθῶν διούτερον αὐτὲς· "ἐξίη", ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐνθάδ' ἀνιήσεις διὰ νύκτα διενεών κατὰ οἶκον, ὁπιστεῦεις δὲ γνώικας; ἡλί έξειδε δύραξε, τάλαν, καὶ δαιτὸς ὤνησο· ητά καὶ δαλὸ βεβλημένοις εἰσθα δύραξε.

Τὴν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἠδὼν προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς· "δαιμονίη, τί μοι ὁδ' ἐπέχεις κεκοτητοὶ θυμῷ; 

η δ' δὴ ὑπόδρα, κακὰ δὲ χρυσὸ εἴματα εἴραι, πτωχεῦο δ' ἀνὰ δήμον; ἀναγκαίη γὰρ ἐπελεγεί. τοιοῦτο πτωχοὶ καὶ ἄλημανες ἄνδρες ἔσαι. καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ποτὲ οἶκον ἐν ἀνθρώπωσιν ἐναιων 

διβίοις ἀφενεῖν καὶ πολλάκις δόσκοιν ἀλλήλη 

tοῦ, ὅποιος ἐκαὶ δὲν κεχρημένους ἔλθοι.

19. OΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Τ

ψαν δε δμως μέλα μυρίω, ἀλλα τε πολλὰ οἰσίν τ' εὐ γώινας καὶ ἀφνειον καλέονται.

ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἀλάπαξ Κρονὸς ἦθελε γὰρ ποιν.

τὸ νῦν μή ποτε καὶ σύ, γυναί, ἀπὸ πάσαν ἀλέσσης ἀγλαῖν, τῇ νῦν γε μετὰ δμοθοι κέκασαι: μή πώς τοι δέσποινα κοτεσσαμένη χαλεπῆν, ἢ 'Οδυσέως ἄλθη· έτι γὰρ καὶ ἐπιθώς άλος.

εἰ δ' ὁ μὲν δὲ ἀπόλλων καὶ οὐκέτι νόστιμος ἔστιν, ἀλλ' ἣδη παῖς τοῖς 'Απόλλωνδες γε ἐκεῖν,

Τηλέμαχος· τὸν δ' οὗ τις ἐνι μεγάροισι γνυαίκων λήθει ἀτασθάλλουσ', ἐπει οὐκέτι τηλίκοι ἔστιν.

"Ως φάτο, τοῦ δ' ἤκουσε περίφρον Πηνελόπεια, ἀμφίπολον δ' ἐνέπιπτεν ἔπος τ' ἦφατ' ἐκ τ' ὄνοματι.

"πάντως, θαρσαλῆ, κών ἀδείς, οὐ τί με λήθεις ἔρωτα μέγα ἔργον, οὐ σῇ κεφαλῇ ἀναμάξεις; πάντα γὰρ εὖ ἡθεόθ, ἐπει εξ' ἐμεθ ἐκλευσ αὐτής, ὅσ τὸν ξεῖνον ἐμελλον ἐνι μεγάροισιν ἐμοῖς ἀμφι πάσιε εἰρεθεῖσ, ἐπει πυκνῶς ἀκάχημαι."  

"Ἡ ρα καὶ Ἔυρινόμην ταμῆν πρὸς μῶθον ἔειπεν:

"Εὐρινόμη, φέρε δὴ δίφρον καὶ κώς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, δόμα καθεξόμενος εἰπη ἔπος ἥδ' ἐπακούσῃ ὁ ξεῖνος ἐμέθεν· εἴθελω δὲ μιν ἱδορεθεῖσαι."
19. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Τ

"Να έφαθ', ή δὲ μᾶλ' ὄτραλέως κατέθηκε φέρουσα δίφροιν ἐδέξετον καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ κώας ἔβαλλεν· ἐνθα καθέκτη ἔπειτα πολύτατος δεῖον Ὀδυσσεῦς. τοῖα δὲ μύθων ἤρξε περέφρασιν Πηνελόπεια.

"ζείνε, τὸ μὲν σε πρῶτον ἐγὼν εἰρήσομαι αὐτῷ τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλει ἢδὲ τοκῆς;"

Τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητος Ὀδυσσεύς·

"总产值, οὐκ ἂν τίς σε βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρων γαίαιν νεκεῖν. ἦ γάρ σου κλέος σοφανδ' εὐρύν ἱκανεί,

ὡς τε εὖ βασιλῆσ' ἀμύμονοι, δὲ τε θεοῦδη

ἀνδράσιν ἐν πολλοῖς καὶ ἱθυμούσιν ἄνασσον

εὐδικίας ἀνέχομαι, φέρροι δὲ γαία μέλαινα πυρὸς καὶ κριβᾶς, βριθήσοι δὲ δένδρα καρπῷ,

τίκτη δ' ἐμπέδα μῆλα, θάλασσα δὲ παρέχῃ ἱχθύς

ἐξ ἐνέγερσης, ἀρετῶι δὲ λαοὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

τῷ ἐμὲ νῦν τὰ μὲν ἄλλα μετάλα σφ' ἐνι ὁλοφ.,

115


109-114. These lines are not quite in place here. The general words of 1. 108 form a sufficient introduction to the speech of Ulysses. And, as Friedländer has pointed out (Analeuca Hom. p. 462), 1. 115 τὸ ἡμιν νῦν καλ. implies that a reason has been given why Penelope should not ask who the stranger is—a reason which the lines in question cannot be thought to supply. In substance and in style they are Hesiodic: see the very similar passage Hes. Op. 235-237. The mention of fishing as an important source of wealth points to a post-Homeric state of things. The scanning γραφή is perhaps to be defended by σύγχρος in 9. 74, but is at least unusual. Probably we have here one of the instances of a fragment of early gnomic poetry finding its way into epic narrative.

109. δὲ τὸ τῶν ἥ. With this reading δὲ is an affirmative or emphasizing particle, as in τιν' (or τὶ ἥ), ἡταν ἥ. The vulgar reading δὲ is usually supported by the parallel 3. 348 ὅτι τὸ τῶν ἥ παρὰ πάντων ἀνείμονοι ἢ πεινηροῦ. But, as Bekker showed (Hom. Bl. ii. 200), the disjunctive δὲ is out of place there, and we must read δὲ—ὁποῖα. So in ll. 2. 289 we should probably read (with Amelius) δὲ τὸ γάρ ἢ χώροι νεμοῖο χρὴσαι τὸ γνωρίαν.

θεοῦδη, properly θεοῦδης, 'god-fearing.'

111-112. φέρροι, βριθήσοι. The subj. is used as if in the construction with the relative were carried on: the sense being 'and under whom the earth bears &c.'

113. τίκτη ἐμπέδα 'bring forth unfallingly.' So in Hesiod (I. c.) τιτνουσιν δὲ γνωσίμοις κτλ.

114. εξ ἐνέγερσης 'from his good leading': the word only occurs here. The use of ἤ with an abstract word is hardly Homeric: H. G. § 239, 5. The other reading εὐφηγεῖσις gives us a word that is otherwise known; but the sense is less satisfactory. Toup's conjecture εὐφηγεῖσις 'good sport' is not more than plausible.

ἀρέτου 'prosper,' see on 13. 45.
μηδ' ἐμὸν ἐξερεύνει γένος καὶ πατρίδα γαῖαν, μὴ μοι μᾶλλον υμὸν ἐνπλήσης ὦνων, μνησαμένος μᾶλα δ' εἰμὶ πολύστονος, οὐδὲ τί με χρῆ ὁλὲ ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ γοβώντα τε μυρμήνην τε ἡσθαί, ἑπεὶ κάκιον πενθήμεναι ἄκριτον αἰεὶ.

Τὸν δ' ἠμείθητ' ἐπειτα περίφρον Πηνελόπεια: "ζείν', ἥ τοι μὲν ἐμὴν ἀρετὴν εἰδὼς τε δέμας τε ὠλεσαν ἀθάνατοι, ὅτε Ἰλιὸν εἰςανέβαινον Ἀργείων, μετὰ τοῦτο δ' ἐμὸς πᾶσις ἦν Ὀδυσσεύς. εἰ κεῖνος γ' ἐλθὼν τὸν ἐμὸν βίον ἀμφιπολεῖνοι, μεῖζον κε κλέος εἶν ἐμὸν καὶ κάλλιον ὅτω. νῦν δ' ἔχομαι τόσα γάρ μοι ἐπέσεσεν κακὰ δαιμόνων. [δοσοὶ γὰρ νήσοις ἐπικρατέσαν ἀριστοι, 

ἀνωτέρω τὸ Σάμη τε καὶ ὑπῆκεν Ζακύνθῳ, 

ὁ τ' αὐτὴν Ἰθάκην εἰδεῖσσον ἀμφινέμονται, 

ὁ μ' ἀκαζομένην μνῶται, τρύχουσι δὲ ὁλεῖν.] 

τῷ ὅστε ξέλον ἐπιτάξομαι οὖθ᾽ ἱκτάεσθα 

ὅστε τι κηρύκων, ὁ δημιουργὸς ἔσωσιν. 

ἄλλ᾽ Ὀδυσσὴν ποθέουσα φιλῶν κατατήκομαι ἕτορ. 

ὁ δὲ γάμον στείδουσιν ἔγω δὲ δόλοις τολυμεῦω. 

φάρος μὲν μοι πρῶτον ἐνέπνευσε φρεσὶ δαιμῶν στησαμένη μέγαν ἐςτιν ἐν μεγάροις υφαῖνεν, 

λεπτὸν καὶ περίμετρον ἀφρὸς δ' αὐτοῖς μετέειπον. 

116 μηδ' ἐμὸν vulg.: μηδ' μοι Ατ.: μηδ' ἐμοὶ G. 122 om. G U: καὶ μ' φησιν 

120 δάκρυ πλάσων βεβαρμένον ὄφρον Arist. Probl. 30. 1, from which we may perhaps restore καὶ τί με φη βακρυπλάσων βεβαρμένα ὄφρον. The vulgate cannot be a genuine Homeric verse. 129 ἐκπολέμεν] ἐκπολέσαν G F (cp. 18. 256).

130-133 obelized by Ατ. (1. 245., 16. 129). 134 Ὀδυσσῆ οὔδεσσα Ατ.: 'Ὀδυσσῆ οὐδεσσα οὐδεσσα G F H U M αι.: ἄλλα τόσιν οὐδεσσα Fick. 135 φρείοι] 

139 υφαίνειν Ατ., F: ὑφαίνων G F H X U αι.

120. πάσιν 'not well,' kαρὸν rather than not. On this comparative see 15. 370.

122. Βακρυπλάσων 'to be mandrill.' The second part of the word is derived from the root πλασμεν, in the sense which it has in Lat. placere 'to rain.' For the application to tears cp. πλασματοε. 124. ἀφητηρ, cp. 13. 45.

135. δημιουργοὶ 'in the public service,' in contrast with the ἐρημοὺς who belong to individual chiefs.
'κόβροι, ἐμοὶ μηνητῆρες, ἔπει θάνε δῖος 'Οδυσσεύς, μὴ μεντ' ἐπειγήμενοι τῶν ἐμὼν γάμων, εἰς δ' κε φῖρος ἐκτελέσω, μὴ μοι μεταμάνια νήματ' θληται, Δαέρτη ήροι ταφῆιν, εἰς δ' κεν μιν μοιρ' ὀλὴ καθέλησαι ταυγεγέος θανάτων
μὴ τίς μοι κατὰ δήμουν 'Αχαίαδων νεμεσηγη, αἰ' κεν ἄτερ σπείρων κεῖται πολλὰ κτεώσοσας.'
δ' ἐφάμην, τοῖσιν δ' ἐπεεἴθετο θυμός ἀγήνωρ.
ἐνθα καὶ ἡμοῖν μὲν ὀφαίνεσκον μέγαν ισόνιν,
νύκτας δ' ἀλλεσκον, ἔπει δάιδας παραθελήμην.
δ' τρεῖτες μὲν ἐλεσον ἐγὼ καὶ ἐπείδουν 'Αχαϊος,
ἀλλ' ἐπετρατόν ἤλθεν ὠτὸς καὶ ἐπήλυθον ὁραν,
[μηνῶν φυλωτῶν, περὶ δ' ἡματα πάλλ' ἐσελέθην,]
καὶ τότε δὴ με διὰ διμφας, κύνας οὐκ ἀλεγοῦσας,
εἴλον ἐτεθάντες καὶ ὀμοκλήσαν ἐτέσσοιν.
δ' τὸ μὲν ἐκτέλεσα καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλους' ὑπ' ἀνάγκης,
νὸν δ' οὕτ' ἐκφυγείν δύναμι γάμων οὕτε τιν' ἀλλὴν
μήτιν ἐθ' εὕροικων μάλα δ' ὀτρύνοισι τοκῆς
γῆμασθ', ἀσχαλάς δὲ παῖς βιοτὸν κατεδαντων,
γιγνώσκων. ἤδη γὰρ ἄνηρ οἷς τε μᾶλια
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19. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Τ

οῦ γὰρ ἀπὸ δρᾶς ἑσοὶ παλαιφάτον οὐδ’ ἀπὸ πέτρης.

Τὴν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεῖς·

“δ’ γόναι αἰδοία Δαερτίαδε ο’Οδυσσός,

οὐκ’ ἀπολλίξεις τὸν ἐμὸν γόνον ἐξερέουσα,

ἀλ’ ἐκ τοῦ ἐρέως ἡ μὲν μ’ ἀχέεσοι γε δώσεις

πλεοσιν ἡ ἑχομαι· ἡ γὰρ δίκη, ὅποτε πάτης

ἡς ἀπέρσων ἀνή τόσον χρόνον δοσον ἐγὼ νῦν,

πολλά βροτῶν ἐπὶ ἄτες’ ἄλομνος, ἄλγεα πάγχων.

ἀλλ’ καὶ ὁ ἐρέω δ’ ἀνείρεις ἱδὲ μεταλλάζῃς.

Κρήτης τις γα’ ἔστι, μεσφ’ ἐνὶ οἴνου πόντῳ,

καλὴ καὶ πλέιρα, περίρμυτος· ἐν δ’ ἀνθρώποι

πολλοί, ἀπειρέσιοι, καὶ ἐνήγκουτα πλῆθες—

ἀλλ’ δ’ ἄλλους γλώσσα μεμιγμένη ἐν μὲν ’Αχαιοί, 175

174 ἐννεαοῦντα ι: ἐπεισοδία vulg.

163. ‘For you are not come of some old-world stock or stone.’ The phrase is evidently an echo from older poetry; and, as usually happens in such cases, the original application had been more or less forgotten. In II. 22. 126 ὁ ποτ’ ἐστιν ἀνδρὸς οὐδ’ ἀνδρὸς πέτρης τὰς ἀπορίζειν seems to mean ‘you cannot converse with him just as you like,’ in casual fashion; and so Hes. Theog. 35 τὴν μοι ταύτα περὶ ἄρθρων ἡ περὶ πέτρης; (περὶ τὰς γνωστὰ.) A different turn is given to the phrase by Plato, Apol. 34 οὗ οὐδ’ ἐρέω ἀνδρὸς οὐδ’ ἀνδρὸς πέτρης πέφυκα, ἀλλ’ ἐς ἀνθρώπων. Similarly here it appears to be—οὗ τοῦ γνωστοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ‘you are not a terra incognita—a mere nobody in birth.’ The attempts to connect the phrase with myths of the origin of mankind are surely quite in the wrong direction.

175-177. The form of the sentence ἐν μὲν ’Αχαιοί, ἐν δὲ πάλι seems intended to make a distinction between the ’Αχαιοί and the four other nations. As this distinction is expressly founded upon language (Ἀλής δ’ ἄλλως γλώσσα), it is practically the later contrast of ‘Hellenic’ and ‘barbarian.’

The name Εὐβοϊς—‘true’ or ‘native’ Cretans—shows that they were commonly recognised as the original population of the island, like the Sicani and Siculi in Sicily. In historical times they are found in the eastern end of Crete, near Mount Dicte, the seat of the primitive worship of the Dictaean Zeus. Their city was Praesaeus (Πραισεος in Strabo, x. 4. 6, but Πραισος on the inscriptions: see Pashley, 1. p. 290). From an inscription discovered at Praesaeus some years ago it appears that they retained their ancient non-Hellenic language down to a comparatively late period. See Kretschmer, Einl. in die Gesch. der griech. Sprache, p. 407; Evans, Cretean Pictographs, pp. 85-86: Journal of Hellenic Studies, xiv. 354.

The Κόρινθοι were probably Semitic, either Carian or Phoenician. They are described in Od. 3. 292 as living ‘about the streams of the ἀνθρώπος’ or ‘Jordan’ (see Burian, Geogr. von Griechenland, ii. 534).

The name Δαμόδας presents great difficulty. It is hard to believe that these were the Dorians of history, of whom as yet there is no trace in the Peloponnesus. They are represented here as speaking a different language from the ’Αχαιοί, whereas even in later times the divergence between Doric and Achaean Greek was unimportant. The name Δαμόδας means simply ‘people of Δαμός,’ and as there was a Δαμός in Messenia (as well as in Doris itself), there may have been one among the non-Achaean cities of Crete. The name
ἐν δὲ Ἑτέκρηταις μεγαλότερος, ἐν δὲ Κόδωνε, Δωρίες τε τριγάκες διὸ τε Πελαγοῦ—
τῇ δὲ ἐν Κωσσᾶς, μεγάλη πόλις, ἐνθα τε Μίνως
ἐννέαρος βασιλεὺς ἄνδρος ἡμερῶν, πατρὸς ἐμοίον πατήρ, μεγαβύμον Δευκάλιον.

180

Δευκάλιον δ' ἐμέ τίκτε καὶ Ἰδομενην ἀνακα-
ἀλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν νήσοις κορωνίσω "Ἰλίων εἶσσω
φεῖ' ἀμ' Ἀτρείδεσσαν, ἐμοὶ δ' ὅσοι κλυτῶν Αἴθων,
ὀπλήτερος γενεώ. ὁ δ' ἄρα πρότερος καὶ ἄρειων.
ἐνθ' Ὀδυσσάς ἐύων ἰδομην καὶ ἐλείνα δόκα

185

178 τοῖς: M. X. D. Est. al.  
184 ἄρα] ἡμα U (cp. II. 2. 707).

180 ἐμοίο Ar. valg.: ἐμοίο Zen. F al.

'Tάξιδων also occurs both in Triphilia
and in Crete. On the other hand it
may be said that the Dorian colonization
of Rhodes is referred to in the Catalogue
(II. 2. 653 ff.), and that their settlements
in Crete are not likely to have been
later. But if so, we should expect to
find the Catalogue making some distinc-
tion, such as the Odyssey makes here,
between the Achaean and the
Dorian element in Crete.

The epithet τραχεῖας must be
derived from θίξις and ἄλοιπος, and com-
pared in respect of form with κορυφάζου
σταλεμένη (II. 22. 132) and πολυδίκη
(epithet of ἀνάμαρτος); in meaning with
κορυφάζω, καρφίζω, κραφίζω, κραφίζω,
and the like. It is a picturesque
word, descriptive of the dashing move-
ment of long-haired warriors. In time
however it suffered a kind of popular
eytymology, and came to be connected
with τράχος and the threefold division
which was characteristically Dorian.
Thus we find quoted from Hesiod
(fr. 178) πάντες δ' τραχεῖς μακρίων,
ὀφεῖν τραχίων γαῖας ἔλημεν ἡπάτῳ
ἀρτοῦ. Modern attempts to clothe this
derivation in a scientific form have not
been satisfactory (Fick in Ges. Beitr.
111-168).

The Πελαγοῦ appear in the Iliad
(2. 800, 10. 429) among the allies of
the Trojans, and are therefore non-
Achaean, and presumably Βαρβαρώφωνοι.
This agrees with the statement in Hdt.
1. 57 about the historical Pelasgians
speaking a 'barbarous' language (Grote,
Pt. II. ch. ii). In Homeric times their
chief seat was Larissa (II. 2. 841),—
probably the city of that name in Aetolia,
to the south of the Troad. There are also
Homerical traces of Pelasgiants in Thessaly
—the name Πελαγικῶν 'Ἀργος, and
Πελαγικὸς as an epithet of Zeus at
Dodona.

On various traces of affinity between
Crete and Asia Minor, see
Grote, Pt. I. ch. xii.

178. τῆς δ' ἐν 'among them,' viz.
the ninety cities.

179. ἄνευσας probably means 'in the
ninth season,' and so 'nine years old.'
Sometimes however nine seems to be
used as a vague or round number; so
that the word would mean 'of full
age.' Plato (Legg. 634) takes it here
with κορασίν (ὑεὶ Μινώος φαντάζων πρὸς
τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἱεράτως ἐννοεῖν 
ἵνα ἐκεῖνον). It is more natural to
join ἄνευσας βασίλευς, the adjective
having an adverbial force: 'was king'
(i. e. came down from his converse with
Zeus and ruled his people) 'after nine
years,' or, with the vaguer sense, 'in the
fulness of the seasons.' Some translate
ἄνευσας 'at nine years old,' others
'during nine years.' The former render-
ing gives us a marvel of a somewhat
pointless kind; the latter is against
the usage of adjectives of time (e.g.
δευτερωρίον 'on the second day').

184. ἐπιλτέρως, nom. by attraction
to Ἀιθών; the dat. would be more
logical, since the word qualifies ἐμοῖ
(183).
καὶ γὰρ τὸν Κρήτην δε κατῆγαγεν ἵς ἀνέμοιο, ἱέμενον Τροίης, παραπλάγγασα Μαλεωνότι, στῆσε δ' ἐν Ἀμυσθὶ, ὅπι τε οτὲς Ἐλευθηρίας, ἐν λιμέσιν χαλεποῖσι, μόνισ δ' ὑπάλληλον ἀδέλλας.

αὐτίκα δ' Ἰδομενῆ μετάλλα δοστοῦ ἀνελθὼν· 

ζείνον γὰρ οἱ ἐφασκε χὶλον τ' ἀμεν αἰδοϊν τε. 

tοῦ δ' ἡ δεκάτη ἢ ἐνδεκάτη πέλεν ὡς ἵξεϊμεν ἄγον νημοῦ κορονώσαν "Ἰλιόν εἶνα.

tὸν μὲν ἐγώ πρὸς δὰματ' ἄγων ἐδ ἐξεϊμίσα, ἐνυκεῖος χὶλον, πολλὰν κατὰ οἰκὸν ἐκεῖνον· 

καὶ οἱ τοῖς ἀλλοις ἐτάροις, οἱ δ' αὐτῷ ἐποντο, 

δημὸθεν δώκη δωκα καὶ αἴθοπα ὁνον ἄγειρας καὶ βους ἰρεύσασαι, ἦν πλησίατο θυμόν. 

ἐνθα δυσδεκα μὲν μὲνον ἡματα διὸν Ἀχαιοἰ· 

eile γὰρ Βορείως ἀνέμος μέγας ὁδὸν ἐπὶ γαλα 

ἐλα ἵστασαι, χαλεῖς δ' τις ἄρῳ ἄρμον· 

τῇ τρικαιδεκάτῃ δ' ἀνέμος πέσε, τοι δ' ἀνάγοντο." 

"Ἰσκε χείδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοιον ὁμοία· 

τῆς δ' ἄρ' ἀκουοῦσης βᾷ δάκρυα, τῇ κετο ὅρασ. 

ὁς δὲ χιὼν κατάτηκεν ἐν ἄκροπλοιοιν ὀξεσίν, 

حاد τοῦ Εὐρος κατέτηκεν, ἐπὶ Ζέφυρος καταχεῖνγ

189 μέγας F: μᾶλαν ναλγ. 192 πέλεν'] γένετ' G. 197 ἄγειρας F αλ.: 

delph G F H U. 200 γαλῆς G.

188. στῆσε, sc. ἕπος, cp. 14. 258. 

Ἀμενᾶς was the ancient harbour of the city of Cnossus (Burnian, l. 560).

195. πολλὰν, gen. of material, 'of the great store that was within.'

197. δημὸθεν goes with δώκη and ἄγειρας: 'I gave from the public store, making a collection' (ἀγείρομεν κατὰ δῶμον, 13. 14). 

200. 'Did not allow them even to stand up on land'—much less therefore to put to sea.

203. ἵστα ὅ 'he made like,' i.e. 

'feigned,' 'imitated': as 4. 379 φαύνῃ Ἰκουνοῦ ἀλαγοῦσι. See also on 32. 31. 

ψοῦδα, with λέγων, as in Hes. Theog. 27 τὸμεν ψοῦδα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοιον ὁμοία.

204-208. Note the difference in the sense of τῆκα, first (in 204) 'to moisten' but in the simile 'to melt.'

206. In this line the parts which we expect to be assigned to the two winds Eurus and Zephyrus are reversed. Elsewhere Zephyrus is represented as stormy and wet (ὥφος, see 14. 458), but not as bringing frost or snow. It ripens the fruits in the garden of Alcinous (7. 118), and blows constantly in the Elysian fields (4. 567). On the other hand Eurus is a cold and snowy wind in the Mediterranean lands. It is true that Boreas and Zephyrus are sometimes associated, as in II. 9. 5 Bορεύς καὶ Ζέφυρος, τὰ τε ὑπηρέτην ἄγων, and in II. 23. 195: but this does not make
19. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Τ

τηκομένης δ' ἄρα τῆς ποταμοὶ πλῆθουσι ρέοντες· ὡς τῆς τήκετο καλὰ παρρία δάκρυ χεούσης, κλαιούσης ἐνν ἀνδρα παρήμενον. αὐτάρ 'Οδυσσεΐς θυμοῦ μὲν γούσαν ἐγν ἐλέαρε γυναικα, ὀφαλμοὶ δ' ὡς εἰ κέρα έτασαν ἢ σίθορος ἀτρέμας ἐν βλεφάροις. δόλῳ δ' ὁ γε δάκρυα κεύθεν.

η δ' ἐπει οὐν τάρφη δολυβακρότου γόνοι, ἐξαιτό νῦν ἐπεσον ἀμεβιμένῃ προσέειπε· "νῦν δὴ σεῖο, ζείνε, ὅδω πειρήσεσθαι, εἰς ταῖσ' ἐν δῷ κεῖθι σὺν ἀντιβέοις ἐτάροις 

ζείνεσας ἐν μεγάροις ἐμὸν πόσιν, ὡς ἄγορευεις. εἰπέ μοι ὡποὶ ἀσσα περὶ χροὶ εἰματα ἑστο, αὐτὸς θ' οἶος ἐγν, καὶ ἑταῖρος, οἰ οῖον ἁπτομον." 215

Τὴν δ' ἀπαμεβομένος προσέφη πολύμητις 'Οδυσσεύς· "δ' γνωί, ἀργαλέον τόσον χρόνον ἀμφις ἑντα εἴπέμειν. ἠδ' γάρ οἱ έεκουσόν ἑτος ἑστιν 

ἐξ οὐ κεῖθεν ἐβη καὶ ἐμής ἀπελήλυθε πάτρης· αὐτάρ τοι ἐρῶ ως μοι ἱναλλαται ήτορ. 

χλαίναν πορφυρένην σφιν έχε δίος 'Οδυσσεύς, 225 

διηλήν αὐτάρ οὶ περόνης χρυσοῦ τέτυκτο


it likely that Zephyrus was a cold wind.

Mr. Myres suggests that the two names should be interchanged: ἢν Ζέφυρος κατάτηχεν, ἐτο π' έκρος κατατέχεν. 207. τηκομένης δ' ἄρα τῆς. This inversion of the natural order throws a stress on τηκομένης, to show that it refers to κατέτηχεν in the preceding line.

215. νῦν δὴ σεῖο. This, which is the reading of the editio princeps, seems better than the vulg. νῦν μὲν δὴ σεῖο.

The MSS. give εἴξει γ', but the use of γε or any similar particle with a voc. is unknown in Homer. H. G. § 164.

221. τόσον χρόνον ἀμφις ἑντα has a double meaning, since it may be understood by the hearer (though not by Penelope) of the absence of Ulysses from his own home. 224. δὲ μοι ἱναλλαται ήτορ. The sense required evidently is, 'as his figure remains in my mind;' but there is no satisfactory construction. We cannot take ήτορ as an acc. of the part affected, or as a dat. (so e.g. Döderlein, Hom. Gloss. 414). If the reading is right, ήτορ must be the nom., and ἱναλλαται = 'imagines, pictures to itself': cp. δικαίω meaning 'I think,' as well as 'I seem,' also δείκει in 19. 312. The easiest emendation is ἱναλλαται έσαι (Nauck).

225. οὐδ' 'thick,' 'woolly,' from the same root as Lat. vellus, also làna (for vlā-na). Whether it is akin to ἐλπὸς, ἐρα (Lat. servex) is more than doubtful.
19. ὍΔΣΣΕΙΑΣ Ῥ

αὐλοῦσιν διδύμοις: πάροισε δὲ δαδαλὸν ἦν· ἐν πρατέροις πόδεσι κῶν ἔχε πούκλων ἄλλων, ἀσπαίρωτα λάσιν· τὸ δέ θαμαζέακον ἀπαντεῖς, ὡς οἱ χρύσοις ἐπότες ὁ μὲν λάει νεβρῶν ἀπάγχον, αὐτὰρ ὁ έκφυγεῖς μεμάδως ἡσαΐρε πόδεσι. τὸν δὲ χιτῶν ἔνορα περὶ χρυτὶς σιγαλβετα, οἴδων τε κρομόμοι λοπίν κατὰ ἱσχαλέωι τῶς μὲν ἔνη μαλακῶς, λαμβρός δὲ ἡν ἥλιος ὅς—

ὁ μὲν πολλαὶ γ' αὐτῶν ἐθησαντο γυναῖκες. ἀλλὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐρέω, οὗτ' ἐνι φρεσκό βάλλεω σήμενιν οὐκ οἶδ' ἡ τάδε ἐστο περὶ χρύτις οἴκοθ 'Οδυσσεύς, η τοῖς ἐταίρων δόκει θοῆς ἐπὶ νηὸς ίότι, ἡ τοῖς ποι καὶ χεῖνος, ἐπεὶ πολλοῖσιν 'Οδυσσεύς ἐσκε φλοίο παύρου γὰρ Ἀχαῖων ἦσαν ὰμοίοι. καὶ οἱ έγὼ χάλκεοιν ἄφρο καὶ δίπλακα δῶκαν καλὴν πορφυρὴν καὶ τερμίδεντα χίτωνα αἴδοιών δ' άπέπεμπον εὐσσέλμον ἐπὶ νηὸς. καὶ μὲν οἱ κηρυξ οἴλγον προγενέστεροι αὐτῶ

239 τίς τοι] τω τε Γ.

227. αὐλοῦσιν. These are the tubes or sheaths into which the two pins are passed, answering to the 'keys' of the brooches described in 18. 193–4. πάροισε 'in front,' i.e. at the heads of the pins, where the ornament was placed: see Helbig, p. 188.

229, 230. The verb λῶ must be a technical term for a dog 'gripping' or 'pinning' an animal. The sense of 'gazing at' or 'watching,' which occurs in H. Merc. 360 σκέτεις λῶ, might apply to a dog with something between its paws, but hardly to one that holds a struggling animal by the throat (ἀπάγχον).

230. χρύσοις ένοτες, cp. II. 18. 549 χρυσίη τοῖς λούσα, τὸ δὲ περὶ θεώμα τέμνω. The marvel was that inanimate gold should have the effect of life and movement.

233. οἴδων τε κρομόμοι λόσων κατὰ ἱσχαλέωι. With this reading the sense must be 'like as (it glistens) over the skin of a dried onion.' That is, the tunic glistened all over like the surface of a dried onion. Or, reading κατά, and taking οἶδων τε λόσων κατὰ λόσων, 'as is the peel over (covering) a dried onion': κατά with a gen. as 18. 355. The explanation of λόσων κατὰ κατὰ is 'after the fashion of peel' is surely untenable. Several MSS., however, read καταχαλέου, which is free from difficulty. The prep. may be used as in καταργῆλος, κατηρεφής, &c.

The passage is referred to in a fragment of the Comic poet Theopomnus (Mein. ii. 806) χιτώνα μοι φίλον δίδωσι δυτικόν διατεκμομί διὰ χεισσρ ἀρχότ 'Ομηρός κρομμάντι λευκείς. 'The χιτών or shirt, a cut and sewn linen garment which fits like an onion peel, in sharp contrast with the mere web of woolen girt about the loins as an apron or thrown over the shoulders like a cloak' (Tsountas and Manatt, p. 161).

243. τερμίδεντα 'with a τέρμα, i.e. a fringe: cp. II. 16. 803.
εἰπετο· καὶ τὸν τοι μυθήσομαι, ὥσος ἦν περ.

245 γνωρις ἐν ἁμοισιν, μελανύχρους, οὐλοκάρηνος,

Εὐρυβάτης δ’ ὄνομ’ ἔσκε· τίνες δὲ μω ἐξοχον ἄλλων

ἀν ἐτάρων Ὅδυσσεός, δτι οἱ φρεσίν ἁρτια Ἰδὴν’

"Ὡς φάτο, τῇ δ’ ἔτι μᾶλλον υφ’ ἵμερον ὄρας γόοιο,

250 σήματ’ ἀναγνώσῃ τάς οἱ ἐμπεδα πέφραβ’ Ὅδυσσεός.

καὶ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὐν τάρβῃ πολυδακρύτους γόοιο,

καὶ τότε μω μόοις ἀμειβομένη προσέειπε·

"νῦν μὲν δ’ μή μου, ξέινε, πάρος περ ἐδῶ ἐλεεινός,

ἐν μεγάρωι ἐμοίοι φίλοι τ’ ἐσθ’ αἰδοῖος τε·

255 αὐτή γὰρ τάδε εἰματ’ ἐγὼ πόροιν, ο’ ἄγορευες,

πτύσας’ ἐκ θαλάμου, περόνην τ’ ἐπέθεκα φαεινήν

κεῖνον ἄγαλμ’ ἔμεναι· τὸν δ’ οὐχ ὑποδέξομαι αυτὸς

οἰκάδε νοστῆσαντα φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.

260 τῶ μα κακῆ αἰσθι κολλῆς ἐπ’ ἦδος Ὅδυσσεός

ἀφετ’ ἐποψόμενος Κακολίους οὐκ ὁνομαστήν.”

Τὴν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέτη ρολύμητις Ὅδυσσεός·

"ὅ γάρνα αἰδοῖ αἰαρτιάδεω Ὅδυσσῆος,

μηκέτι νῦν χρόνα καλὸν ἐναίρεο μηδε τι θυμῶν
tήκε πόσιν γοῦσα· νεμεστώμαι γε μὲν οὐθέν
cαι γάρ τις τ’ ἄλλοις ὀδύτεραι ἄνδρ’ ὀλέασα
cουριδὼν, τῷ τέκνα τέκνη φιλότητι μυγείσα,

265 Ὅδυσσῆ’, δι’ φασι θεός ἐναλίγκιοι εἶναι.

266 γνωρις ἑν τοῖς ἁμοίων Ηροδιαν, who must also have read μελάγχροος, with

Aphthon. in Rhet. Gr. 1. 104, 1.
άλλα γόνον μὲν παύσαι, ἕμειο δὲ· σύνθεοι μύθοιν· νημερτέως γάρ τοι μυθήσομαι οὐδ’ ἐπικεύσων· ὡς ἥδη 'Οδυσσῆς ἐγώ περὶ νόσου ἀκουσάν· ἀγχοῦ, Θεσπρωτῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐν πλοὶ δήμῳ, ξωθ’ αὐτάρ ἄγει κειμήλια πολλὰ καὶ ἑσθλὰ αἰτίζων ἀνὰ δήμον· ἄταρ ἐρήπας ἐταῖρους ἀλεσε καὶ νῆα γλαφρὴν ἐνι οἴνοπι πόντφω, Θρινακίης ἀπο νῆσον ἐνοῦ· ὀδύσαντο γὰρ αὐτῷ· Ζεύς τε καὶ 'Ἡλίος τοῦ γὰρ βᾶς ἔκταν ἑταῖροι· οἱ μὲν πάντες θλοῦντο πολυκλύστοι ἐνὶ πλοῖν τῶν δ’ ἀρ’ ἐπὶ τρόπιον νεῖς ἐκβάλε κϒή ἐπὶ χέρους, Φαῖηκον ἐς γαίαν, οἱ άγχίθησεν γεγάγων, οἱ δ’ ἐκ μεν περὶ κῆρι θεῶν ὅς τιμήσαντο καὶ οἱ πολλὰ δόσαν πέμπειν τὸ μὲν ἴδελον αὐτοῖ· οἰκάν ἀπήματον, καὶ κεν πάλαι εὐθάδ’ 'Οδυσσεὺς ἡν’ ἄλλ’ ἄρα οἱ τὸ γε κέρδιον εἰσάτω θυμῷ, χρήματ’ ἀγυρτάζειν πολλὴν ἐπὶ γαίαν ἰὼν τ’ ὄς περὶ κέρδεα πολλὰ καταβητῶν ἀνθρώπων· οὗ ὁ 'Οδυσσεύς, οὐδ’ ἀν τὶς ἐρίσειει βροτὸς ἄλλος· ὁς μοι Θεσπρωτῶν βασιλεὺς μυθήσατo Φεῖδων· ὁμιᾶς δὲ πρὸς ἐμ’ αὐτόν, ἀποσπᾶνδων ἐνὶ οἴκῳ, νῆα κατειρύσαι καὶ ἑπαρτέας ἔμενε ἑταῖρος, 275 272 πολλὰ δ’ ἀγιος κειμήλια ὅκεν δόμωθεν ὕπα (17. 523). 275-277 om. F, U. 278 νεῖς ἐκβάλε D U: νεῖς ἐκβάλε H al.: νεῖς ἐκβάλε F P: νεῖς βάλε G (Ludw.). 283 ἡν’ vulg.: ηεν’ P H al.: ηεν’ eras. U: ηεν, which is a v.1. on the margin of Barnes’ ed., is plausible: but ηεν is probably right. 285 τὸ γε δεῖσατο κέρδιον ὕπα γως Cobet. 270. 'Οδυσσῆς must surely be taken with νόσον, notwithstanding the construction 'Οδυσσῆς ἵκουσαι in 17. 114, 325. Cp. 1. 287 el μὲν κεν παρὰ διατόν καὶ νόσον ἰκουσῆς, also 2. 215, 218, 264, &c. 271. ἐπὶ with the gen. after verbs meaning to speak, hear, &c., is occasionally found in the Odyssey, but not in the Iliad. 272. ζωοῦ, = ὥσι ζωός ἔστι. After a verb of hearing, &c., an adj. or part. expresses the fact heard: as 16. 301 'Οδυσσῆς ἰκονίσατο νόσου ἰκονίς, II. 4. 357 ὅτα γνω χειρώνα. 278 ff. Ulysses here omits the long episode of the island of Calypso. It is the landing on that island to which the incident of the keel belongs, see 12. 424 ff. 283. For ηεν see on 23. 316. 285. Construe ἐπὶ ἀνθρωπῶν 'beyond all men.’ 288-299. These lines are repeated from 14. 323, 325-335, with some change of order.
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οι δή μν πέμψοντι φίλην ἣς πατρίδα γαϊάν. 290
ἀλλ' ἐμὲ πρὸν ἀπέστειρ' τόχος σάρ ἐρχομένη νῦν
ἀνδρῶν Θεσπρωτῶν ἐς Δαυλίχαιον πολύπουρον,
καὶ μοι κτήματ' ἐδείξειν, ὅσα ξυναγείρατ' Ὀδυσσεύς.
καὶ νῦ κεν ἐς δεκάτην γενέθη ἑτέρον γ' ἐτί βόσκου:
τόσα οὐ μεγάροις κειμέλια κεῖτο ἄνακτος.

τῶν δ' ἐς Δωδώνην φάτο βήμεναι, ὀφρα θεοῦ
ἐκ ὕμνος ὑπερίκειοι Δίὸς βουλὴν ἐπακούσαι,
ὅπως νοσθῆσει φίλην ἣς πατρίδα γαϊάν
ἡδη δὴν ἀπεὼν ἢ ἀμφαδόν ἢ κρυφῆδον.

ὅς ο μὲν οὖτως ἔστι σῶς καὶ ἐλεύσεται ἡδη
ἀγχι μαλ', οὖθ' ἐτὶ τήλε φιλῶν καὶ πατρίδος αἰτῆ
δηρδὸν ἀπεσεῖται. εἰπης δὲ τοι ὅρκ' ἄδεω.

ἰστον νῦν Ζεὺς πρῶτα, θεῶν ὑπατος καὶ ἄριστος,
ἰστίν τ' Ὀδυσσεύς ἄμμονοι, ἵνα ἀφικάνω
ἡ μὲν τοι τάδε πάντα τελείεται ὁς ἀγορεύω.

τοῦτ' αὐτὸν λυκάβαντος ἐλεύσεται ἐνθὰδ' Ὀδυσσεύς,

τοῦ μὲν ὕβιννος μνημό, τοῦ δ' ἵσταμένου." 300

297 ἐπακούσαι G F U: ἐπακούῃ vulg.: ἐπακούῃ P.

300. σῶς. The original form of this
adj. is σῶς, preserved in σώτερος (II. 1. 31), σαφερὼν, and the verb σῶσ. The
form σῶος is given as an ancient variant
in II. 16. 252, where Aristarchus read
σώον (this appears from the use made of
II. 16. 252 in the notes of Didymus on
II. 1. 117 and 9. 681). It is also found
in a quotation of II. 1. 117 in Apollonius de conji. (Bekker's Anecdota, p. 489, 16). A trace of σόως also remains
in the rare Attic neut. plur. σά (for σῶν,
see on Od. 13. 264).

The form σῶσ, acc. σῶν, arose from
the contraction of σῶν. Aristarchus read
σών and σῶν wherever the metre
admits a long monosyllable. The MSS.
are inconsistent: they read nom. σῶν
wherever it is metrically possible, but
always acc. σῶον, except in II. 17. 367,
where one important family of MSS.
(Mr. Allen's b) has σῶν.

The form σῶος (σῶος, σῶν, σῆ, σᾶ) must have arisen by the process which
produced φῶος for φῶς, ὄφος for ὄφω, &c. That is to say, where the metre
forbade the usual form σῶν, an approxi-
mation to it was made in the shape of
σῶος (H. G. § 55, 10). Thus σῶος is
a conventional form not drawn from
any living dialect, and is necessarily
later than the contraction of σῶος to
σῶς. Nevertheless it was adopted by
Aristarchus where the metre required a
dissyllable.

Out of nine instances of σῶος and σῶν
there is only one (II. 32, 333) that does
not admit σῶος, σῶον. It can hardly be
assumed, however, that σῶς is a post-
Homeric contraction. The forms σῶος
and σῶος may have subsisted together,
like ἄδ and ἄδ, νῦς and νεῖς.

302. ἡμέρα 'nay even,' immo: i.e.
whether my story is enough for you or
not, 'anyhow I will go on to confirm it
with an oath.'

303-307 = 14. 158-163: see the notes
on that passage.
164
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Τὸν δ' αὐτὲ προσέειπε περίφραν Πηνελόπειαν·
"αἰ γὰρ τούτο, ξείνε, ἔσος τετελεσμένον εἰῆ
tῷ κε τάχα γνώνης φιλήτητά τε πολλά τε δῶρα
εἴ ἐμεῖ, ὡς ἄν τίς σε συναντόμενος μακαρίζω.
ἀλλὰ μοι ὁδ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν ὅτεται, ὡς ἐστείλα τερ
οῦτ 'Οδυσσέας ἐτι ὁικὸν ἐλεύσεται, οὔτε σοῦ πομῆς
τεῦξε', ἵπτε οὐ τοὺς συμάντορές εἰσ' ἐνι ὁικῷ
ὁς 'Οδυσσέας ἔσκε μετ' ἀνδρᾶσιν, εἰ ποῖ' ἦν γε,
ξείνους αἰδοῖσον ἀποπεμπτέμεν ἡδὲ δέχεσθαι.
ἀλλὰ μιν, ἀμφιπολοί, ἀπονύσατε, κάθετε δ' εὐνήν,
δέμνια καὶ χλαῖνας καὶ ρήγεα σιγαλδέντα,
ὡς κ' εὗ θαλπίοιδον χρυσόφρονον 'Ἡῶ ἱκηται.

ἡθεῖν δὲ μάλ' ἦρι λοέσαστι τε χρῖσαι τε,
ὡς κ' ἐνδον παρὰ Τηλεμάχῳ δείπνοιο μέδηται
ἡμενος ἐν μεγάροι τῷ δ' ἄλγιον δς κεν ἐκεῖνων
τοῦτον ἀνάξ ϑυμοφθόρος· οὐδὲ τι ἔργον
ἐνθάδ' ἐτι πρήξει, μάλα περ κεχολομένος αἰνῶς.

πώς γὰρ ἐμεῖ σοῦ, ξείνε, δαὔςασε εἰ τι γνυικῶν
ἀλλῶν περέυμι νόν καὶ ἐπίφρονα μὴν,
εἰ κεν αὐσταλέος κακὰ εἰμένος ἐν μεγάροισι
δαινή; ἀνθρωποὶ δὲ μινυνδάδιοι τελέοςων.

δς μὲν ἀπενῆς αὐτὸς ἐη καὶ ἀπνεά εἰδῆ,

FX: read perhaps ἀμεῖο (cp. 215).
319 κ' εὗ] κ' ἔργον G P M. 325 αὐτῶν οὖν om.
326 ἧχοφρόνα G Eust. al. μὴν

312. ὅτεται. This is the only instance of ὅτεται used impersonally. Ἀκt conj.
ὑπὸ θυμός ὅτεται (Conj. Hom. p. 34).
315. εὗ τὸν· ἦν γε, see on 15. 298.
316. ἀπομεμπτέμεν ἡδὲ δέχεσθαι, an
apparent prothrones, but it is a χονη
that is in question, and ἡδὲ δέχεσθαι is
merely added to cover all the duties of
a host.
323. ϑυμοφθόρος 'corrupting the
mind,' 'heart-breaking;' i.e. vexing be-
yond endurance. So in 4. 716 ἄχος
ϑυμοφθόρος, of the 'crushing grief' of
Penelope on hearing of the departure of

Telemachus: and II. 6. 169 ὁμοφθόρα
ὁμαθανοῦ of the letter which was to poison
the mind of the King of Lycia against
Bellerophon. Cr. ὁμομοιάς μοῦνος (8.
185), also ὁμοφθόρος (of ἔργο, δ. c.).
323-324. 'He will bring nothing to
an issue in this house, however furiously
wrathful he may be,' i.e. 'he will have
no success in his wooing, and I will not
care how he may storm.'
325. The omission of σο in three
MSS. suggests reading ἣμα, ξείνῃ.
329. ἀπενῆς, ἀπνεᾶ, see on 18.
381.
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τῷ δὲ καταρώνται πάντες βροτοὶ αὐλγὲ ὑπίσων
ζωφ, ἀτὰρ τεθνεῖτι γ' ἐφεψιδόνται ἄπαντες·
δό δ' ἄν ἀμύμων αὐτὸς ἤη καὶ ἀμύμωνα εἰδή,
τοῦ μὲν τε κλέος εὔρυ διὰ ξείνιο φορέουσι
πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, πολλοί τε μίν ἐσθλῶν ἔεισον.

Τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὄδυσσεύς·
"δ' γύναι αἰδοίη Δαερτάδωο Ὅδυσσεος,
ἡ τοι ἐμοὶ χλαίναι καὶ βήγεα σιγαλέντα
ἡχάθο', ὦτε πρῶτον Κρήτης δρεα νιφάεται
νοσφισμὴν ἐπὶ νηὸς ἰδὼ δολίχηρτεμοι,
κελο δ' ὡς τὸ πάρος περ ἀὕπνους νῦκτας ἰαυνο-
πολλὰς γὰρ δὴ νῦκτας ἀεικελίῳ ἕνι κοίτῃ
ἀεσα καὶ τ' ἁνεμείνα εὔθρονον Ἡῶ διαν.
οὐδέ τί μοι ποδανίπτερα ποδῶν ἐπιήρανα θυμῷ
γίγνεται· οὐδέ γυνῇ ποδὸς ἄψεται ἡμετέρῳ
τάνω αὐ τοὶ δῶμα κἀτα δρήστειρα ἔσαυν,
ἐι μῆ τις γρῆνις ἐστὶ παλαιή, κεβδα ἰδειά,

334. ἐσθλὸν is masc., 'call him ἐσ-
θλὸς,' say of him 'a true man.'
338. ἡχάθο, aor. 'have become hate-
ful.'
340. κελο, see on 18. 408.
344. ἡμετέρῳ. The plural of the
First Person is not used in Homer as a
mure variety for the singular. Here
the intention may be to lessen the self-
assertion of the speech: as though
Ulysses spoke for others as well as him-
self. Cpi. the notes on 16. 44, 442.
346-348. These three lines were re-
jected by ancient critics on the ground
that Ulysses could not choose to be
washed by one who would recognize
the scar. But (1) the poet makes the
very natural supposition that he has not
yet remembered about the scar (cp.
l. 390); and (2) in the praise which
Penelope gives him in her answer she
is evidently moved by his preference for
the aged nurse.

Some recent writers have been led to
another solution of the difficulty. They
see in the incident a trace of a differen-
t version of the story. Ulysses, they say,
must have asked for the services of

Eurycleia in order to be recognized by
her,—desiring in this way to bring about
his recognition by Penelope, which in
our Odyssey follows the slaying of the
Suitors. There was therefore an Odys-
sey in which Penelope recognized Ulysses at
this point, and acted in concert with
him in the ὑφὼ δῶς and other events of
the 20th and 21st books. And this
version is supported by Od. 14. 167-
169 atâρ ὄντα ἄνω Λοχοῦ πολυπερδειάν
ἀναγε τόιγα πολ. (Nieae, Hom. Poesie,
p. 55: Seeck, Quellen, p. 4).
It will be admitted, in the first place,
that the recognition of Ulysses as told
in the Odyssey is an admirable speci-
om of a common type of incident. In
almost every tale or romance there is a point at
which the author allows the fortunes of
his hero to be brought to the verge of
ruin by the intervention of an unforeseen
agency. In the highly wrought
story of the Odyssey the recognition by
the nurse is just such a critical moment,
and has probably heightened the interest
of every hearer or reader of the poem.
It is, in short, an incident which any
poet who knew of it, or was capable of inventing it, would desire to weave into his narrative.

The only difculty, then, is the way in which it is introduced. Why make Ulysses ask to be washed by Eurykleia? Why does not Penelope simply tell Eurykleia to wash ‘the compeer of her master’? The answer is probably to be sought in the code of manners which governed the Homeric age. We may gather from the words of Ulysses in 344 ff. (οδδε γενη ποδος δεμνι νηπια), and of Eurykleia in 373 ff. (τιθην ρα... δακρυων οι δυο καη νικηρα), that in the ordinary course the washing would have been done by one of the younger maidservants. Cp. the washing of Telemachus at Pylos (3. 464) by a daughter of the house.

If this is so, the poet had to contrive some reason why Ulysses was to be washed by the old nurse. And he has done so in a way that serves also to bring out the modesty and wisdom of his hero. It is the invariable discretion (πεντυμβα παντα) of Ulysses that leads him to refuse the services of the maids. In the same spirit soon afterwards (20. 140 ff.) he declined himself to be too miserable an outcast to sleep in the couch offered to him by the order of Penelope.

As to 24. 167 it is probably enough to point out that it does not directly contradict 19. 570-587. The difference is accounted for by the later date of the 24th book.

350-352. The sense is, ‘no one that has come to the house has been so wise as you are’: ἄλλα—ἄλλα as in 380-381.

Hence φιλων is out of place; it must have crept in from 24. 268 ὁ τειν... ξεινων τηλεδαπων φιλων εμω λεητο δωμα. The original half-line here may have been εμω λεητο χαλυβασθε δω, or κλω-των λεητο δωμη' Οδυσσεοι: see 13. 4. The comparative φιλων is doubtless one of the post-Homeric words of the 24th book.

363. Ὑ μοι... σαο, gen. as 20. 209 Ὑ μοι ειτεί' Οδυσσεοι. For the phrase Ὑ
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άνθρώπων ἁχθεὶς θεοῦδε θυμὸν ἔχοντα.

όυ γάρ πώ τις τόσα βροτῶν Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ
πίνα μηρί ἐκή οὖδ’ ἐξαίτους ἐκατόμβας,
όσα σο τῷ ἐδίδους, ἀρόμενος ἥς ἰκου
γήρας τε λιπαρὸν θρέψαι τε φαίδιον νῦν·

ήν δε τοι ὁφ' πάμπαν ἀφέλετο νόστιμον ἥμαρ.

οὕτω ποῦ καὶ κείνῳ ἐφεσιόωντο γυναῖκες
ξείνων τηλεδαπῶν, δτε τευ κλυτὰ δώμαθ' ἱκοιτο,

ὑπὲρ των νῦν λάβην τε καὶ ἀλόχεα πόλλ’ ἀλεεινον·

οὐκ ἔσας νέοιν· ἑμὲ δ’ οὖν ἀέκοιτν ἄνωγε

κούρῃ Ἴκαρίου, περίφορον Πηνελόπεια.

τῷ σε πόδας νέγω ἀμά τ’ αὐτής Πηνελόπειας
καὶ σέθεν εἰνεκ’, ἑπεῖ μοι ὄρφεται ἐνδοθ’ θυμὸς

κήδεσιν. ἀλλ’ ἁγε νῦν ἔννει ἐποῖς, δττε κεν ἐπ’

πολλοί δὴ ξείνοι ταλαπερίοι ἐνθάδ’ ἱκοντο,

ἀλλ’ οὗ πὼ τινὰ φημὶ ἐνικάτα δδε ἱδέσθαι

ὡς σε δέμας φωνὴν τε πόδας τ’ Ἄθανατη ἐοικας.”

Τὴν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσέους.

“ὁ γρηγ., οὕτω φασίν δος όδον ὀφθαλμοῖς

ἡμέας ἀμφισβέρους, μάλα εἰκέλω ἀλλήλοιον

ἐμμεναι, ὡς σε περ αὐτὴ ἐπιφρονείονα ἀγορεύεις.”

:"Ως δρ’ ἐφή, γρηγὸς δ’ λέβηθ’ δὲ παμφανδοντα,

366 οὔδ’ ἢ θ’ G: read perhaps ὄδειν θ’ (note).


καὶ ἐν ἀμήκανος εἰς 3. 399 ὥς μοι ἐγὼ
δειλικός, also II. 18. 544, 24. 255. Else-
where in Homer ἀμήκανος means ‘not
to be managed,’ ‘with whom no con-
trivance avails;’ but here it must be
= ‘helpless.’

366. For the more rhythmical reading ὄδειν θ’ it may be noticed that ὀδε
after a negative (instead of οὔδε) seems
to be allowed when the things denied constitute in effect a single notion. So
21. 233 οὔτα ἄδουσσιν ἤτοι δέομαι βαϊν

ὦν ἑορτήν, II. 9. 133 ( = 275) μὴ μονε

τῆς εὐσής εὐφιλήμενοι ἢδ’ μεγήσθαι, 11.

355 οὔδ’ ὃ ἐν ἄκληγε μάχην ἢδ’ πτολέμου.

In these cases there is a kind of hen-
diadys.

368. The place of the first τε is due
to a slight anacoluthon, the sentence
beginning as if έκαστο were the governing
word of both clauses. Cp. II. 3. 80
λοίδων τε τετυπαμένων λάέσοι τ’ ἐβαλλον.

372. αὔτῃ G: the art. of aversion or
contempt: H. G. § 261. 2.

374. The form ἀπεφες may be a pf. or
an impf. (as from a thematic ἐπεφες). Here the pf. agrees better with the pres.
ἔστιν.
τοῦ πῶδας ἔξαπένως, ὦδαρ δ' ἐνεχεύσατο πολλῶν
ψυχῶν, ἐπείτα δὲ θερμὸν ἐπίφυσαν. αὐτάρ 'Οδυσσέας
ζεν ἀπ' ἑσχαρφῆν, ποτὲ δὲ σκότον ἔτραπεί αἵηα-
αὐτίκα γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ὄσιατο, μὴ ἐλαβοῦσα
οὐλὴν ἀμβράσσατο καὶ ἀμφαδὰ ἔργα γένητο.
νῦξε δ' ἄρ' ἀσσόν ἰώσαν ἀναχθ' ἐδν. αὐτίκα δ' ἐγὼ
οὐλὴν, τὴν ποτὲ μν ὅλασε λεικῷ ὀδότι
Παρνησοῦν' ἔλθητα μετ' Αὐτόλυκον τε καὶ νίας,
μπρὸς ἐς πατέρ' ἐσθλὸν, ὅς ἀνθράκοις ἐκέκαστο
κλεπτοσύνηθ' ὁρκὶ τε. θείς δὲ οἳ αὐτῶς ἐδακέν
Ἐρμείας: τῷ γὰρ κεχαρισμένα μιρὰ καίεν
ἀρνόν ἢδ' ἐρίζων. ὁ δὲ οἱ πρόφρον ἀμ' ὑπῆδει.
Αὐτόλυκος δ' ἔλθην Ἰθάκης ὥς πίνα δήμον
παίδα νέον γεγαώτα κιχήσατο θυγατέρος ἦν
τῶν ρᾷ οἱ Εὐρύκλεια φίλοι ἐπὶ γούνασθα θῆκε
παμομένῳ δόρποι, ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἐκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν.
"Αὐτόλυκ', αὐτῶς νῦν ὄνομ' εὔρεο ὅτι κε θῆαι

παιδὸς πάλι καὶ και ρήμα πολυάρητου τε τοι ἐστιν.

Τὸν ἄυτον Ἀὐτόλυκος ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε.

"γαμβρός ἐμὸς θυγάτηρ τε, τίθεσθ' ὄνομ' ὅτι κεν εἶπον πολλοῖς γὰρ ἐγανεί ὀδυσσάμενος τὸδ' ἰκάνος, ἀνδράσιν ἤδε γυναιξίν ἀνά χθόνα πολυβότειραν τῷ δ' Ὀδυσσέως ὄνομ' ἐστι ἐπώνυμον. ἀυτάρ ἐγαγε, ὅπερ' ἂν ἥβησας μητρώιον ἐς μέγα δῶμα ἔλη Παρνησίνδον', βὴ τοῦ μοι κτήματ' ἐσαι, τῶν οἰ ἐγὼ δῶσω καὶ μιν χαίροντ' ἀποσπάσμα.

Τὸν ἑνὲκ' Ἴλθ' Ὀδυσσέας, ἵνα οἱ πόροι ἀγλαδ' δῶρα.

τὸν μὲν ἄρ' Ἀὐτόλυκος τε καὶ νιέες Ἀὐτόλυκοιο χερσίν τ' ἡσπάζοντο ἐτεσσάρες τε μειλίχιοι.

μήτηρ δ' Ἀμφιθέη μητρὸς περὶφός 'Ὀδυσσῆι κύσο' ἄρα μὲν κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ἀμφοῖ φάεα καλά.

Ἀὐτόλυκος δ' ὕλοσιν ἐκέκλετο κυδαλίμοις δείτην ἐφοπλισάς· τοι δ' ὅτρωντος ἄκουσαν, ἀυτίκα δ' ἐσάγαγον βοῦν ἄρενα πεντάετηρον τὸν δέρον ἄμφι θ' ἐγεν' καὶ μιν δείχεναι ἄπαντα, μετελλάξα τ' ἄρ' ἐπισταμένως πειράμαν τ' ὀβελοῦσι, ἀπετήσαν τ' περιφραδζεῖς δᾶσσαντι τ' μοῖρας.

the imperative ἔφεσον than ἔνθα, which most MSS. have. The middle is properly used of the parenth giving the name: but Autolycus is to be regarded as acting for them.

406. θυγάτηρ τε. The nom. is required here by the rule that the voc. is never used with a conjunction such as τε or δέ. So in Sanscrit, and doubtless in the original language, the voc. cannot be part of a sentence in any respect: H. G. § 164.

407. γὰρ introduces the reason: 'inasmuch as I have come to you here as one that has been angered with many,' as a man of many quarrels. Some take ὀδυσσάμενος to be = 'having been the object of anger'; but there is no support for this sense of ὀδυσσάμενος.

410. ὄνομα ἐπώνυμον 'a name to be named by.'

410. μητρώιον probably means, not strictly 'maternal,' but 'belonging to the μητρώιος, the mother's kindred. It is true that μητρώιος in Homer means simply 'belonging to a father'; but it is not unlikely that it was originally used in a more limited sense, as the adj. of πάτρως.

421. ἄμφι θ' ἐστιν 'dealt with,' the most general word for doing whatever was necessary.
ὁς τότε μὲν πρόσαν ἡμαρ ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα
daiunv', oudè tì thumòs édeúeto daitos étisgi'.
<dim>425</dim>
<dim>ἡμος δ' ἥλιον κατέδυ καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἱλθε,
dè tòte koimíasanto kal úpouo dàron élono.
<dim>19. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Τ</dim>

'Ἡμος δ' ἱριγένεια φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος 'Ηώς,
βάν ἡ ἤμεν ἐς θήρην, ἤμεν κόνες ἢδ' καὶ αὐτοὶ
vìées Διτολύκου- μετὰ τοῖς δὲ δίοι 'Οδυσσεύς
<dim>430</dim>
<dim>ἡι'ν' αἰπὺ δ' ὅρος προσέβαλλεν καταιμένου ὅλη
Παρνησοῦ, τάχα δ' ἴκανον πτόχαι ἤμισθέασας.
'Ἡλίος μὲν ἐπείτα νέον προσέβαλλεν ἀροῦρας
εἰς ἀκαλαρρεία βαθυρρήθ' Ἑκανοῦ,
oi δ' ἐς βῆσαν ἴκανον ἐπακτῆρες· πρὸ δ' ἄρ' αὐτῶν
<dim>435</dim>
<dim>ἰχνὶ' ἐρευνάντες κόνες ἕιναν, αὐτὰρ ὅπισθεν
vìées Διτολύκου- μετὰ τοῖς δὲ δίοι 'Οδυσσεύς
<dim>ἡι'ν' ἄχι χωνών, κραδάων δολιχόσκιον ἐγχος.
ἐνθα δ' ἄρ' ἐν λόχημ πυκνῇ κατέκειτο μέγας σος·
τὴν μὲν ἄρ' οὐ' ἀνέμων διὰν μένος ὤγρον ἀντων,
oste μιν 'Ἡλίος φαέθων ἀκτίσων ἔβαλλεν,
oste 'ὁμήρος περάσασε διαμπερές· ὅς ἀρα πυκνὴ
<dim>440</dim>
<dim>ἡι'ν, ἀτὰρ φύλλων ἐνέπνυ χύσις ἥλια πολλή.
τὸν δ' ἀνδρῶν τε χωνῶν τε περὶ κτύποις ἤλθε ποδοῦν,
ὁς ἐπάγωντες ἑφήσαν· ὁ δ' ἀντίος εκ ξυλόχοιο,
<dim>445</dim>
<dim>φρίζας εὖ λοφιῆν, πῦρ δ' ὁφθαλμοῖ δεδορκώς,
στή β' αὐτῶν σχεδόθεν· ὁ δ' ἁρα πρῶτιστος 'Οδυσσεύς
ἐσούτ' ἀναχώμενοι δολιχόν δῆρα χειρὶ παχείη,
οὐτάμεναι μεμάως· ὅ δέ μιν φθάμενος ἐλαεν σὺς
γυνῶν ὑπὲρ, πολλῶν δὲ διήφυσε σαρκὸς ὁδόντι
<dim>450</dim>

429 αὐτο[ ] ὁδός G. 431 ἐπέβαιν F M X. ἕλην G F. 436 ἰχνὲν
F U. 440 δαίμ G U: δαίμ vulg.

440–443, repeated from 5. 478 ff.
<dim>444</dim> ποδοῦν, dual used in a distributive sense: cp. 20. 348, II. 23. 362.
<dim>445</dim> ἐπάγωντες 'driving on' (sc. the game), cp. έπαντήρες (I. 435).
<dim>446</dim> Cp. Ar. Ran. 822 φρίζας δ' αὐτο-
κόρων λοφιάρ λασοαθέμα χαίταις—evidently a reminiscence of Homer.
<dim>450</dim> πολλῶν is adverbial, = 'a long way,' 'far,' and σαρκὸς is a partitive gen., akin to the gen. of the space within which something moves; cp. II. 20. 178 ὡρίλων πολλῶν ἐσελθών.
<dim>451</dim> διήφυσε 'drained,' laid open so as to draw off the life: II. 13. 507 δὲ δ' ἐντερα χαλάς ἰχνον, also 14. 517.
οδημένη 'Οδυσσέας, οὐδ' ὀστέου ἱκετο φωτός.


However this may be, the reading ἡμῶν ἐς πατρίδ' ἔστωμαι, given by the Laurentian (F) and other MSS., is free from objection, and has been adopted by Ludwig. The reading ἡμῶν ἱππούρες separates ἡμῶν too far from the substantive ('Ἰδάκην') which it qualifies.

464. ὡσὶν is acc. de quo, 'asked about the wound, what befell him,' i.e. asked for the story of the wound.

470. Εὖλη, sc. ἅλκας, 'the vessel was turned over.'
πρὶν ἔγινον, πρὶν πάντα ἀνάκτο ἐμὸν ἀμφαφάσσαθαι." 475

"Ἡ καὶ Πηνελόπειαν ἐσθέρακεν ὀφθαλμοῖς, πεφραδείειν ἐθέλουσα φίλον πόσιν ἐνδον ἐδόντα. 480
η δ’ οὖτ’ ἄθρησαι δύνατ’ ἀντίθ εὐτε νοήσαι:
τῇ γὰρ Ἀθηναὶ νῦν ἔτραπεν’ αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
χεῖρ’ ἐπιμασσάμενος φάρυγος λάβε δεξιερῆφι,
τῇ δ’ ἐτέρῃ ἔθεν ἄσον ἐρύσσατο φάνησέν τε:
"μαία, τίς μ’ ἐθέλεις οἷάσαι; σὺ δέ μ’ ἔτρεφες αὐτῆ
tῷ σῷ ἐπὶ μαζῷ νῦν δ’ ἄλγεα πολλὰ μογῆσας
ἤλθον ἔεικοστῷ ἐστὶ ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν.

ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ ἐφράσθης καὶ τοι θεος ἐμβαλε θυμῷ,
σίγα, μή τίς τ’ ἄλλος ἐνὶ μεγάροις πῦθησαι.
δδε γὰρ ἐξερέω, καὶ μὴν τετελεσμένον ἑσται:
εὶ χ’ ὑπ’ ἔμοιγε θεὸς δαμάσῃ μνηστήρας ἀγανοῦ,
οὐδε τροφοῦ οὕτος σεῦ ἀφέξομαι, ὅπποι’ ἂν ἄλλας
δημόφας ἐν μεγάροιν ἐμοὶ κτείνωμι γυναῖκας."

Τὸν δ’ αὐτὸ προσέειπε περὶφραν Εὐρύκλεια:
"τέκνον ἔμοι, ποῖον σε ἐπος φόγεν ἐρκος ἀδύνων.
οῃθα μὲν οἶνον ἐμὸν μένους ἐμπεδων, οὐκ ἐπεικτὸν,
ἐξω δ’ ὡς ὅτε τις στερεὶ λίθος ἥ σίθησον.
ἀλλο δὲ τοι ἐρεῖν, σὺ δ’ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεισ σῆσιν:
ἐι χ’ ὑπ’ σοὶ γε θεὸς δαμάσῃ μνηστήρας ἀγανοῦ,
ὅτε τότε καταλέξω ἐνὶ μεγάροις γυναῖκας,
αῖ τέ σ’ ἀτιμάζοι καὶ αἴ νηλείτεις εἰς." 490

Τὴν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεὺς:
"μαία, τίς δὲ συ τὰς μυθήσεαι; σὺδὲ τί σε χρῆ.
ἐν νῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ φράσαμαι καὶ ἐσομ’ ἐκάστη
ἀλλ’ ἔχε σιγῆ μιθῶν, ἐπίτρεψον δὲ θεοῖς." 500


475. πάντα, see on 16. 21.
480. οὔσα. This is not the Homeric form; but no good emendation of the line has been proposed.

494. ἐξω, intrans., as with adverbs.
498. νηλείτεις, cp. 16. 317.
502. ἐπίπρεψον δὲ θεοῖν 'leave the matter to the gods,' a formula for de-
19. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Τ

"Ως ἄρ' ἔφη, γρηγος δὲ διέκ μεγάρου βεβηκει ὁσιομένη ποδάνιπτα: τὰ γὰρ πρῶτερ' ἐκχυτο πάντα. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ νίψεν τε καὶ ἥλεψεν λίπ' ἐλαφρ., αὐτὶς ἄρ' ἀσοτέρω πυρὸς ἔλκετο δίφορον 'Οδυσείας θερόμενος, οὐλὴν δὲ κατὰ βαθέσσα καλυψε. τοσὶ δὲ μύθων ἦρχε περίφρων Πινελπεία: "ζείνε, τό μὲν σ' ἔτι τυθῶν ἔγων εἰρήσομαι αὐτῇ· καὶ γὰρ δὴ κοίτων τάχα ἥδεος ἔσασται ὄρη, ὁν τινά γ' ὑπὸς ἐλη γλυκερός, καὶ κηδόμενον περ. αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ καὶ πένθος ἀμέτρητον πόρε δαιμών· ἠματα μὲν γὰρ τέρπομ' ὅδυρμενη, γόωσα, ἐς τ' ἐμὰ ἐργ' ὅρψοσα καὶ ἀμφιπτόλων ἐνὶ ὅικρ. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ νῦς ἔλθη, ἔλησι τε κοίτως ἅπαντας, κείμαι ἐνὶ λέκτρω, πυκναί δὲ μοι ἄμφ' ἀδινὸν κήρ. ὀς δ' ἒτε Πανδάρειον κούρη, χλωρήτις ἀθάνον,


precating further action. Cp. 22. 288 ἄλλα θεοῖς μέθαν ἦπερχαι (in contrast to μέσα ἐσείσ). also of the contest with the bow, 21. 279 γὰρ μὲν πιάνει τόγον, ἀντιγράφει δὲ θεοῖς. Here, as Ameis points out, and in 21. 270 it has a double meaning. To the person addressed it is a mere formula = 'say no more': to the hearer, who knows the course of events, it is significant of the fate that the gods have in store.

505. The final α of λίγα is always elided in Homer, but the form is proved by Thuc. 1. 6. 5. It is doubtless one of the adverbs in -ά (like λίγα, ποώα, κάρτα, &c.), which are generally regarded as survivals of the instrumental case (Brugmann, M. U. ii. 158). Possibly the phrase λιν' ἐλαφρ. represents an ancient instrm. λίγα ἐλαιό 'with oil olive.'

507. θαυμόμενοι, fut. part. 509. τυθών is adverbial.

511. ὑπή, the subj. suits the context best: the effect of the opt. ἔσαστα would be to avoid assuming that any one will sleep: H. G. § 305 (2).

512. καὶ strengthens ἀμέτρητον.

513. τέρπομαι goes with ὅδυρμενη γοώσαιa (not with the next line, as some take it). Cp. 4. 194 τέρπομα' ὅδυρμεναι, also 4. 103 γὰρ φρύτα τέρπομαι. The sense is that Penelope mourns both by day, when she has other occupation, and by night, when she is sleepless with grief. The sense is much the same in 20. 83-87.

515. ἐνι, which is more in accordance with Homeric syntax than ἐνιν (H. G. § 352), is here preserved by the Harleian MS.

518. χλωρήτις cannot be explained of the colour of the nightingale, which is in the main a dull brown, the throat and breast only being greenish. Moreover, the form of the word is against taking it as simply χλωρός, and favours the interpretation of the Schol. ἐν χλωρίοις διαπέβασα. Cp. νηρὶ and νηρῆς of the nymphs that live in springs (ῥῶμ) and water (if Modern Greek νερό points to an ancient νηρῶν): also δρυίς, δρυάς, &c. The epithet χλωράγχη given to the bird by Simonides (fr. 73) may have been suggested by misunderstand-
καλὸν ἀείθησιν ἔαρος νέον ἵσταμένοιο, 520 δευδρέων ἐν πετάλοις καθεξομένη πυκνοῦσιν,
η τε θαμα τρωπῶσα χέει πολυηχέα φωνήν,
παϊδ’ ὄλοφυμομένη Ἱτυλοῦ φίλον, διν ποτε χαλκῷ
κτείνε δι’ ἀφραδίας, καθὼς Ζήθουο άνακτος,
ὡς καὶ ἐμοὶ δίχα θυμὸς ὁρώτεται ένθα καὶ ένθα,
η μένω παρὰ παιδὶ καὶ ἐμπεδα πάντα φιλάσω,
κτήσιν ἐμήν, ἱματός τε καὶ ύψερεβές μέγα δόμα,
εὔην τ’ αλομομένη πόσιος δήμοι τε φήμην,
η ἠθή ἀμ’ ἐπωμαι Ἀχαιῶν ὡς τις ἀριστος
μνατά εἰνι μεγάροις, πορῶν ἀπερείσι ἔδα,
pαις δ’ ἐμός ἑος ἐν ἐτι νήπιος ἄθε χαλληφρών,
γήμασθ’ ο’ μ’ εὰν πόσιος κατὰ δῶμα λισθοῦσιν
νῦν δ’ ὧτε δὴ μέγας ἐστὶ καὶ ἤθης μέτρων ἱκάνει,
καὶ δὴ μ’ ἀρατή πάλιν ἐλθέμεν ἐκ μεγάρου,
κτήσιοι ἀσχαλῶν, τὴν οί κατέδουσιν Ἀχαιῶ
αλλ’ ἄγε μοι τὸν ὀνειρον ὑπόκριναι καὶ ἄκουσον.
530 χήνες μοι κατὰ ὀλοκν ἱείσκου πυρῶν ἔδουσιν
ἐξ ὑδατός, καὶ τὴ σφυν λαίνοι πείσμωσα·
ἐλπὼν δ’ ἐξ ὑδρεος μέγας αἰετὸς ἀγκυλοχείλης

522 Ἱτυλοῦ seems to be a name formed in imitation of the nightingale’s
note.
523 μνατά, subj. It has been proposed to read ναντας’ ἐν, but needlessly.
524 τὸν ὄνειρον. The article seems to have a possessive force, μοι τὸν = τὸν
ὄνειρο. H. G. § 261.
525 νοερός καὶ δίκωσον, a prothetoronic arising from the important word being
put first: cp. 13. 274.
537 ἔξ ὑδατος. Two explanations are given in the scholia: ὑδατος τῶν
βεβρεμένων ἔδατο ἔντον, ὑδατος τῶν ὑδατός ἐνα διατρίβωσιν B.P. ἦν καὶ
χωρὶς ὑδατος V. The second seems the more probable. The geese come from
the water, which is their usual abode;—
just as the eagle has come from the mountain (ἐξ ὑδρος, cp. the preceding
line). They are fed on grain from a
trough or box (νεκρος). The picture
which the commentators draw of a flock
of geese eating grain that had been
thrown into a water trough does not
rest on any evidence.
538 ἀγκυλοχείλης. The true form is probably ἀγκυλοχηλῆς ‘with crooked
claw’; cp. Ar. Eq. 205, where the
epithet is said to be given ἔξ ὑδατος
τῶν χεροῖν ἀπαθῶν φόρεσι.
πάσι κατ’ αὐχέν’ ἐξέθε καὶ ἔκτανεν ὁ δ’ ἐκέχυντο ἀνθρώποι ἐν μεγάροις, ὁ δ’ ἦς αἰθέρα διὰν ἀέρθη. 540
αὐτάρ ἐγὼ κλαίον καὶ ἐκάκυνον ἐν περ ὅνειρο, ἀμφὶ δὲ μ’ ἠγερέθηντο ἐὕπλοκαμίδες Ἀχαιοῖ. οἷκε τ’ ὀλοφυρομένῃ δ’ οὐκ ἄλλοις ἔκτανεν χῆνας. 
ἀὖθ᾽ ἐλθὼν κατ’ ἄρ’ ἔξετ’ ἐπὶ προσκόμντε μελάθρφι, φωνῇ δὲ βροτήν κατερήθη σφώνησέν τε· 545
θάρσει, Ἰκαρίου κούρῃ τηλεκλειτοί. οὐκ δὲναρ, ἀλλ’ ὑπάρ ἔσθλον, δ’ τοι τετελεσμένον ἔσται.
χῆνας μὲν μνηστήρες, ἐγὼ δὲ τοι αἰετός ὅρνει ἡ πάρος, νῦν αὐτῇ τεῖσ τόσοι εἰλῆλαυθα, δὲ παύς μνηστήρων ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφῆσαν.’ 550
δὲ ἐφατ’, αὐτάρ ἐμὲ μελισθῆν ὅπως ἀνήκε· πατήρασα δὲ χῆνας ἐνι μεγάροις νόησα πυρὸν ἔρεπομένου παρά πύελον, ἤχε πάρος περ.”

θεν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
“ἀ δ’ γύναι, οὐ πῶς ἔστων ὑποκρίνασθαί δνειρον 555
ἄλλη ἀποκλίναντι, ἐπεὶ θ’ πά τοι αὐτῶς Ὀδυσσεύς
πέφραδ’ ὅπως τελέει· μνηστήρου δὲ φαίνετ’ ἔλθρος
παύσι μᾶλ’, οὐδὲ κ’ τις δάνατον καὶ κήρας ἀλύβ.’

Τῶν δ’ αὐτὲ προσείπετο περίφρων Πηνελόπεια·
“ζεῦν’, δ’ τοι μὲν δνειροῖς ἀμήχανοι ἀκριτόμυθοι 560
γλνύντ’, οὐδὲ τι πάντα τελείεται ἀνθρώποις.
δοια γάρ τε πῦλαι ἀμενηνῶν ἐνοῦ δνειρῶν’
αλ μὲν γὰρ κεράσος τετεῦχαται, αἴ δ’ ἐλέφαντι
τῶν οὗ μὲν κ’ ἐλθοῦσι διὰ πριστοῦ ἐλέφαντος,


544. ἐπι προσκόμντε μελάθρφ ‘on a projecting roof-beam.’
552. πατήρασα ‘peering,’ ‘looking about for’: χῆνα is to be construed with πατήρασα as well as νόησα, cp. II. 4. 200 πατήρασαν ἠκροὶ Μαχαώα’ τῶν ἐνθότον κτλ.
556. αὑτὸς Ὀδυσσεύς has a fuller meaning to the hearer than to Penelope — ‘the real Ulysses,’ not merely the Ulysses of her dream.
557. τελέει, sc. ‘Οδυσσεύς.
558. ἀλύβ’. The subj. after οὐδὲ κεῖν is more Homeric than the fut.
560. ἀκριτόμυθο θερ. II. 2. 796 μῦθοι ἀκριτῶν.
562. ἀμενηνῶν ‘shadowy,’ ‘bodiless.
564-567. There is a play of language on ἔλθος and ἐλεφάντος, and doubtless also on κῆρας and κραῖνος.
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οἱ β’ ἐλεφαίρονται, ἐπε’ ἀκράαντα φέροντες.  
οἱ δὲ διὰ ξεστῶν κεράων ἠλθοσί θύραζε,  
oi β’ ἔνυμα κραίνοντι, βροτῶν διὸ κέν τις ἰδητί.  
ἀλλ’ ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἐντεθεὶν δίομαι αὐτῶν ὅνειρον  
ἐλθέμεν· ἥ κ’ ἀσπαστὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ παιδὶ γένοιτο.  
ἀλλ’ δὲ τοι ἑρέω, σὺ δ’ ἐνὶ φρεαὶ βάλλεις σημῖν·  
ἢ δὲ ἦνοι ἐνὶ δυσώνυμοι, ἥ ὁ Ὀδυσσέας  
oiκὸν ἀποσχῆσθι· νῦν γὰρ καταθήσως ἄεθλον


Fig. A.

Fig. B.

Fig. C.

565. ἐλεφαίροντας 'deceive': cp. ἀλοφώια (17. 248, with the note).
572–578. The latest and most adequate commentary on this much vexed passage will be found in Helbig's work, Das homerische Epos, ed. z., pp. 348–353. This discussion is the basis of the following notes.

The δρόχων to which the axes are compared in l. 574 are stays or trestles on which the keel of a ship rested while it was being built (στριγματα τῆς πηγνυμὴς νέον Σιδ. ; ἔωλα ἱφ' ἐν ἡ τρόπις ἴσηται Ευτ.). Hence the phrase ἐς δρόχων = 'from the laying down of the keel.' Others (as Ameis) understand the word of the ribs of the ship. In any case we are to imagine a straight line of upright pieces of timber.

In what sense, then, could it be said that Ulysses 'used to shoot an arrow through' διαρρήπτασεν διοίτων all the twelve axes? In 21. 421–422 we are told that he 'did not miss the foremost point of the haft' of any of them (see the note there on the phrase πῶτη στειλή). Evidently we must suppose that at the end of the haft, i.e. at or in the head of the axe, there was a hole or opening of some sort, and that the axes could be so placed that the twelve openings were in line, and formed a kind of tube, through which a very expert archer could send an arrow.

Two forms of axe satisfying these conditions are given by Helbig. One of these is a double axe or ὀπεννις, in which the two blades are separated by circular openings, above and below the end of the shaft (fig. A). This form is chiefly known from post-Alexandrian representations, but Helbig finds traces of it in early times. In the other, which is known from the figure of an Amazon on one of the metopes of Selinunte, the two sides are different. One side is a fragmentary blade (or, as Mr. Myres thinks, an adze seen edge-ways); the other is rounded, and perforated by a crescent-shaped opening (fig. B). To these alternatives—between which Helbig does not decide—a third has now been added by an axe found in the famous 'Mycenean' tomb at Vaphio (fig. C, from Tsountas and Manatt. p. 307). In this axe the blade is shaped
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tοῦς πελέκεας, τοὺς κεῖνος ἐνι μεγάρουσιν ἐσοίν ἱστασχ' ἐξείς, δρυόχους ὡς, δάδεκα πάντας. ὥστε δ' ὡς πολλῶν ἀνένθε διαρρήπτασκεν οὐστών. 575


νῦν δὲ μηνισμέσοιν δεθλον τοῦτον ἐφῆσον. ὡς δὲ κε ἔπιτατ' ἐντανύσῃ βίον ἐν παλάμησι
καὶ διοιστεύσῃ πελέκεας δυνατότερα πάντων,
tῷ κεν δρ' ἐσπολίμην, νοσφισσαμένη τόδε δώμα κουρίδιον, μάλα καλὸν, ἐνύπλειον βιότοιο,
tοῦ ποτε μεμνήσοναι δόμαι ἐν περ ὀνείρρφ.

Τὴν δ' ἀπαρεξεῖονος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς:

"ὁ γύναι αἰθήθη Δαερτίαδει Οδυσσής,


μηκέτι νῦν ἀνάβαλλε δόμοις ἐν τοῦτον δεθλόνν


πρὶν γάρ τοι πολύμητις ἐλέυσται ἐνθάδ' Ὀδυσσεύς,


πρὶν τούτους τόδε τόξον εὔξον ἀμφαφάστα


νευρῆν τ' ἐντανύσαι διοιστεύσα τα σιδήρου.

Τὸν δ' αὐτὸ προσέειπε περίφραν Πηνελόπεια:

"εἰ κ' θεόλοις μοι, ἔειναι, παρῆμενος ἐν μεγάρωσι
tέρπειν, οὗς κ' μοι ὑπὸς ἐπὶ βλεφάρωι χυβεὶν. 590


ἀλλ' οὗ γάρ πως ἐστιν ἀύπνους ἐμμεναί αἰλὲν ἀνθρόπους. ἐπὶ γάρ τοι ἐκάστῳ μοῖραν ἔθηκαν


ἀθάνατοι θνητοίσιν ἐπὶ σείδωρον ἄρωναν.

ἀλλ' ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγὼν ὑπερώϊον ἐσαναβάσα


579 δρ' ἐσπολίμην] Better δμα στολής, Η. G. § 36, 6 note. 586 ἀμφαφάστας


G F: δωνας vulg. 589 εἰ κ'] The εἰ is doubtful: to what condition can it refer? Read perhaps εὶ γ' (Η. G. § 313).

like an arch, with two large holes instead of the single opening in the second form.

If we had merely to consider which of these forms answers best to the story as told in the Odyssey, it might be difficult to arrive at a conclusion. But as a question of archaeological evidence there is no doubt that the Vaphio axe has the advantage. We possess the actual implement (or weapon); and we know that it belongs, in time and in place, to the Homeric world.

572. δεθλον is acc. masc., as in 576 and 584, meaning a 'contest' or 'competition' (later ἄγων). The axes were to be made 'the contest,' in the sense that they were the material of it: cp. 21. 3-4 τόξον μηνισμέσοιν δίμεν πολλῶν τε σιδήρου εἰ μεγάρας Ὀδυσσής ἀθλία καὶ φόνων ἄρχην.

591-593 are perhaps interpolated: the repetition of ἀλλά in 594 is suspicious.

592. ἐκαστως, apparently neut.: 'to each thing the gods have assigned a share for mortals,' i.e. sleep, like other things, has its place among men. See on 20. 171 οδ' ἐνδοι αἰδέσθη μοῖραν ἔχωνιν, also ἠλιθίοις ἀσά (19. 84).

II. N
λέσομαι εἰς εὐνήν, ἥ μοι στονέσσα τέτυκται, 595
αἰεὶ δάκρυον ἐμοίσι πεφυρμένη, ἐξ οὗ Ὄδυσσεώς
φχεῖ' ἐποψάμενος Κακοῖλιον οὐκ ὀνομασθήν.
ἐνθα κε λεξαίμην· σοὶ δὲ λέξω τῷ ἔνι οἴκῳ,
ἡ χαμάδις στορέσας ἢ τοι κατὰ δέμνια θέντων."

"Ὡς εἰποῦ&' ἀνέβαιν ὑπερώια σιγαλόντα, 600
οὐκ οἶη, ἁμα τῇ γε καὶ ἀμφύδωι κίον ἀλλα.
ἐς δ' ὑπερῴα ἀναβάσα σοι νὰμπύδωιοι γυναῖκι
κλαίειν ἐπειτ Ὅδυσσῆα, φίλον πόσιν, ὀφρα οἱ ὑπνον
ἡδῶν ἐπὶ βλεφάροις βάλε γλαυκώπις Ἀθήνην·

599. There is a slight anacoluthon: after ἥ χαμάδις στορέσας we expect another participle, to be construed (like στορέσας) with the verb λέγω. Instead of this we have an independent imperative ὀδυσσεῖν: cp. l. 368.

EURYCLEIA WASHING ULYSSES.
(From a vase in the Museum at Chiusi.)
Σατείς τὸ πρὸ τῆς μνηστηροφονίας.

Διδότα ὦ ἐν προδόμῳ εὐνάξετο δίος 'Οδυσσεύς·
καὶ μὲν ἀδέψητον βοήν στόρεις', αὔτὰρ ὑπερθε
κώεα πόλλ' οἶον, τοὺς ἱερέσεικον Ἁχαίοι.
Εὐφρνήμη δ' ἄρ' ἐπὶ χλαίναν βάλε κοιμηθέντι.
ἐνὸ 'Οδυσσεύς μνηστήριοι κακὰ φρονέων ἐνὶ θυμῷ
κεῖτ' ἐγρηγορῶν· ταλ' δ' ἐκ μεγάρου γυναίκες
PerPixel ηὐςαν, αὐ μνηστήρων ἐμισγέσκοντο πάροι περ,
ἀλλήλης γέλω τε καὶ εὐφροσύνην παρέχουσαι.
τού δ' ἀρίνετο θυμὸς ἐνὶ στῆθεσι φλοιοῖς ἀπὸ
πολλά δὲ μεριμήριε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν,
ἢ μετὰξας θάνατον τεῦξειν ἐκάστη,
ἣ ἐν ἐφ' μνηστήροιν ὑπερϊμαλοισί μιγὴν
ὃτατα καὶ πῦματα, κραδή δὲ οἱ ἐνδον ὑλάκτει.
ὥς δὲ κῶν ἀμαλήκει περὶ σκυλάκεσσι βεβόσα
ἄνθρ' ἄγνονθασα' ὑλαῖ τεῦξοντες μέμοντες τε 
PerPixel ὑλάκτει, ὥς μα τοῦ ἐνδον ὑλάκτει ἀγαιομένου κακὰ ἔργα
στήδος δὲ πληξίας κραδήν ἣνοπε μῦθοι

1. αὖταρ κτλ. This clause should be read with the last sentence of the preceding book.
6. ἐκ μεγάρου, and so past the entrance-hall where 'Ulysses was, on their way to the houses of the Suitors (Ames). See however the Appendix on the Homeric house.
14. περὶ βεβόσα 'standing over.' The comparison is imitated by Simonides of Amorgos, fr. 7. 15 λάθοιν ἥν καὶ μιμοδ' ἀλφάσσων ὑεῖ, 7. 33 ἤσσερ ἀμφ' εὐερτοισιν κῦϊν.
15. ἄγνονθασα. The force of the aor. must be 'having failed to recognize,' 'having heard and not known.'
"τέσπλαθη δή, κραδίθη καὶ κύττερον ἄλλο ποτ' ἔτης, ἢματι τῷ δ' ὅτε μοι μένος ἄσχετος ἢσθιε Κύκλωψ ἰφθίμους ἑτάρους· σὺ δ' ἐπάλλας, ὕφρα σε μῆτις ἐξάγαγ' ἐξ ἄντρου οἴδεμνον θανέεσθαι." 20

"Ιδε ἐφατ', ἐν στήθεσι καθαπτόμενος φίλων ἢτορ· τῷ δε μάλ' ἐν πείσῃ κραδίθη μὲνε τετέλεια νουλεμέως· ἀτὰρ αὐτὸς ἐλίσσετο ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα. ὅς δ' ὅτε γαστέρι ἀνὰρ πολέως πυρὸς αἰθομένου, ἐμπλείην κνίσης τε καὶ αἴματος, ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα αἰόλη, μάλα δ' ὅκα λιλαίεται ὅπτηθήναι, ὅς ἀρ' δ' γ' ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα ἐλίσσετο μερμηρίζων ὅππος δὴ μνηστήριν ἀναίδεσι χειρας ἔφησει μοῦνος ἐδών πολέσι. σχεδόθεν δὲ οἱ ἤλθεν Ἀθηνη

οὐρανόθεν καταβάσα· δείμας δ' ἥκτο γυναικι·

στῇ δ' ἀρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καὶ μὲν πρὸς μῦθον ἔσπει· "τίπτ' αὐτ' ἐγρήγορες, πάντων περὶ κάμμορε φωτῶν; οἰκὸς μὲν τοι δ' ἐστὶ, γυνὴ δὲ τοι ἥ' ἐν ὁκρ καὶ πάις, οὖν ποῦ τίς ἐξέδεται ἐμμεναι νίαι." 35

Τὴν δ' ἀπαμιμήμενος προσείφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς· "ναὶ δὴ ταυτά γε πάντα, θεά, κατὰ μοίραν ἐσπές· ἀλλὰ τί μοι τόδε θυμὸς ἐνι φρέσοι μερμηρίζει, ὅππος δὴ μνηστήριν ἀναίδεσι χειρας ἐφῆσω μοῦνος ἐδών· οἱ δ' αἰὲν ἀδολλέες ἐνθὸν ἔσπι· 40

18 ὁμ. F H X al. 19 μοι τοι F X M al. 34 ὅδ'] ὅδ' G F.

18. Cp. the imitation in Archilochus, fr. 66 θυμι, θωμι' ἀμηχάνοις κόκκινων κυκάμενοι, ἀνεχεο.

19. For μοι some good MSS. have τοι, which agrees with οὗ and σε in the next line. But, though slightly illogical, μοι seems more likely to be right.

23. ἐν πείσῃ, ἐν δείσῳ (Schol.). The word πείσῃ only occurs here. It is probably akin to πείσμα 'a cable' (root πρή-) 'to bind'.

25. πυρὸς might be a gen. absolute, but it is better to take it as a local gen. with ἄνθ' καί ἄνθ', 'this way and that in the blaze of the great fire': cp. II. 6. 2 ἄνθ' καί ἄνθ' ἵκνει Μάχη πέλαιον. 27. αἰόλη 'tosses, 'makes it dance': from αἰόλος, in the sense which it has in κορῳδίαλος, &c.—a sense in which the notions of light and movement seem to pass into each other.

29. ἐφῆσα. With δῶσι or a similar adv., after a past tense in the governing clause, Homeric usage almost requires the opt.: see Hermann, Op. ii. 26. The only real parallel to this fut. is II. 12. 55 πείσῃ δ' ἐν μεσοίς αἰ τελεύσων. In I. 386 some MSS. have ὅππος... ἐφῆσα, whence we may read ἐφάνε here also. The form ἐφῆσα may have crept in from I. 39 ὅππος δὴ... ἐφῆσα: cp. also 13. 376 φραζέεν ὅποι... ἐφῆσες.
πρὸς δ' ἐτι καὶ τόδε μείζον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερμηρῖζων;
εἰ περ γὰρ κτείναι Αἰδώς τε σέθεν τε ἔκπτη,
πῇ κεν ὑπεκπροφύγοιμι; τὰ σε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα.”

Τὸν δ' αὐτὲ προσέειπε θεὰ γλαυκώπης 'Αθηνη·
“σχέτλιε, καὶ μὲν τίς τε χερεῖον πείθει ἐταίρῳ,
δ' ἕπερ θυτός τ' ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ τόσα μῆδεα οἴδεν·
αὐτάρ ἐγὼ θεὸς εἰμι, διαμέρεσ ἢ σε φυλάσσω
ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοις. ἐρέo δ' τοι ἐξαναφανθένει
eἰ περ πεινηκοιτα λόχοι μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
νοὶ περισταίεν, κτείναι μεμαἰτες "Ἀρηί,
καὶ κεν τῶν ἐλάσαιο βδῶς καὶ ἱφα μῆλα.
ἀλλ' ἐλέτω σε καὶ ὑπνος· ἄνη καὶ τὸ φυλάσσειν
πάνυν χον ἐγρήσουντα, κακῶν δ' ὑποδύεσθαι ἦδη.”

"Ως φάτο, καὶ ρά οἱ ὑπνον ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἔχευν,
αὐτὴ δ' ἄψ ἐς "Ολυμπὸν ἀφίκετο δία θεᾶν.
εὔρῃ τὸν ὑπνον ἐμαρττε, λύσαν μελεθήματα θυμοῦ,
λυσιμῆς· ἄλοχος δ' ἀρ' ἐπέγυρε κεδυλία ἰδυία,
κλαίε δ' ἀρ' ἐν λέκτροις καθεξεμένη μαλακοῖς.
αὐτάρ ἐπει κλαίονα κορέσατο δι' ἐκατὰ θυμοῦ,
Ἀρτεμίδι πρόσθησαν ἐπεῦξατο δία γυναικῶν·
“Ἀρτεμί, πότινα θεά, θυγατερ Δίας, αἴθε μοι ἡδη
ἰδν ἐνι στὴθεσι βαλοῦ' ἐκ θυμοῦ ἐλοίο
αὐτίκα νῦν, ἢ ἐπειτά μ' ἀναρπαξάσα θύελλα
ὁχίον προφέρουσα κατ' ἡράθεντα κέλευθα,

43 τά σε vulg.: τό δὲ F: τόδε σε M: τό σε Barnes. 55 ἄφ] αὖτ' G.
éν προχοθή δέ βάλοι ἀφαρδόν 'Ωκεανοῖ. 65
ὡς δ' ὦτε Πανδαρέων κούρας ἀνέλοντο θύελλαι,
tῆσι τοκῆς μὲν φθίσαν θεοὶ, αἱ δ' ἐλπιστὸν ὀρφαναί ἐν μεγάροις, κύμασε δὲ δι' Ἀφροδίτη
τυρφό καὶ μέλατι γλυκερό καὶ ἢδει οὖνπρ:
"Ἡρη δ' αὐτήσιν περὶ πασέων δώκε γυναικῶν 70
eῖδος καὶ πλυτῆν, μήκος δ' ἔπορ "Ἀρτέμις ἀγνή,
ἐργα δ' Ἀδηναίη δέδω σε κλυτα ἐργάζεσθαι.
eὐτ' Ἀφροδίτη δία προσέστιχε μακρὸν "Ολυμπῶν,
κούρης αἰτήσουσα τέλος θαλεροῦ γάμου,
ἐσ Δία τερπικέραυνον—ὁ γάρ τ' εἰς οἴδεν ἀπαντά,
μοιράν τ' ἀμμορίης τε καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων— 75
tόφρα δέ τὰς κούρας ἄρπυια ἄνηρεψαντο
καὶ β' ἔδοσαν στυγερῆσιν ἐρυνόνι ἀμφιπολέοντι
ἀσέ εἰ' αἰωτάσειαν 'Ολυμπία δώματ' ἔχοντες,
ἥε μ' ἑπλύκαμοι βάλοι Ἀρτέμις, δῷρ 'Οδυσσήα
νουμερένη καὶ γαίαν ὑπο στυγερὴν ἀφίκομην,
μηδὲ τι χείρονος ἀνδρὸς εὐφραινομε νόημα.
ἀλλὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἀνεκτὸν ἅχει κακῶν, ὀππότε κέν τι 80

65 προχοθή G (cp. II. 242).

66. This story of the 'daughters of Pandora's' does not directly clash with the story told of Aeson 'daughter of Pandarens' in 19.518-523: but the two passages have the air of belonging to different myths, as Bekker observed (H. Bl. I. 125).

74. τίλος γάμω. The word τίλος, in phrases like this, means the 'coming to pass,' hence the crisis or 'supreme moment': so τίλος θανάτου (often), also νόστου τίλοι (Od. 22.323), μοθοῦ τίλοι (II. 21.450) 'the actual payment of the wage.'

77. ἄνηρεψαντο, see on 14.371. It should have been noticed there that the correction ἄνηρεψαντο was suggested by Döderlein (Hom. Gloss. 2325), and supported by the Hesychian gloss ἄνηρεψαντο: ἀναρέψαντες, and by some MSS. in Hesiod Theog. 990 (ἀναρέψασθε Υ, ἀναρέψασθη Αλд. 1.).

78. ἓρμυσθε should rather be ἓρμυσθο,' cp. ἑκάστοι, &cc. (better perhaps νέκτοι, &cc.; Brugmann, Gr. Gr. § 90).

79. αμφιπολέοντι 'to attend to,' a euphemism.

81. ἀντομή 'looking for Ulysses,' 'with his image before my mind,' cp. I. 1.115 ἀντομήν πατέρ' ἀνθίζων ἐνί φρεσκίν,
ἐν νόπιν ἐλάσον κτλ. See also the note on I. 93 (infra).

82. νόημα 'thought, mind': cp. Hesiod, fr. 189 γνώ ἕρμυσθι νόημα.

83-87. The general sense is the same as in Penelope's speech, 19.512-517. She weeps by day, and even at night her dreams are full of sorrow.

83. ἀνεκτὸν ἥχη κακῶν 'has in it (brings with it, involves) an endurable ill.' So Faesi and the older commentators, rightly. Amois objects that ἥχη cannot be shown to have this meaning. Accordingly he takes τὸ as an acc., and supplies τί as nom. from the following clause ὄπτετε κὲν τί κτλ.: 'a man
20. ΟΔΣΕΙΑΣ Τ

ηματα μὲν κλαίει, πυκνῶς ἀκαχάμενος ἠτορ, 

νῦκτας δ’ ὑπὸν ἔχουσι—δ γὰρ τ’ ἐπέλεησεν ἀπάντων, 85 

ἐσθλῶν ἢδὲ κακῶν, ἐπεὶ ἄρῃ βλέφαρ’ ἀμφίκαλυψη— 

αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ καὶ ὑνειρατ’ ἐπέσουσεν κακὰ δαίμον. 

τῇδε γὰρ αὖ μοι νυκτὶ παρέδρασεν εἰκέλους αὐτοῦ, 

τοῖς ἔων οἶος ήμὲν ἀμα στρατῷ αὐτὰρ ἐμὼν κῆρ 

χαίρ’, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐφάμην ὑπαρ ἔμμεναι, ἀλλ’ ὑπαρ ἠδὴ.” 90 

· Ὡς ἐφατ’, αὐτικὰ δὲ χρυσόβρονος ἠλυθεν ’Ηόσ. 

τῆς δ’ ἄρα κλαίοντος ὅπα σύνθετο διὸς ’Οδυσσεύς: 

μερημὶζε δ’ ἐπείτα, δόκησε δὲ ὦ κατὰ θυμὸν 

ἡδη γυνώσκουσα παρεστάμεναι κεφαλῆς. 95 

χλαίας μὲν συνελὼν καὶ κάεα, τοῖς ἐνεδεῖ, 

ἐς μέγαρον κατέθηκεν ἐπὶ βρόντον, ἐκ δὲ βοεῖν 

θήκε θύραζε φέρων, Δι’ δ’ εὔετο χεῖρας ἀναστολ. 

“Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἐὰν μ’ ἑθέλοντες ἐπὶ τραφερῆν τε καὶ ὑγρήν 

ἠγετ’ ἐμὴν ἐς γαίαν, ἐπεὶ μ’ ἐκακόσατε λίθην, 

φήμην τῆς μοι φάσθων ἐγειρομένων ἀνθρώπων 

ἔνδοθεν, ἐκτεθέν ὑπὲρ δ’ ἄις τέρας ἀλλ’ ἰανίται.” 100 

· Ὡς ἐφατ’ εὐχάμενος· τοῦ δ’ ἐκλυε μὴτετα Ζεὺς,

85 ἀπάντων] ἀστας Ρ. 101 φανήται Ρ.

suffers an endurable evil when he ’ &c. But this is too artificial, and is against 

the Homeric usage of the correlatives τὸ—τοι (e.g. II. 15. 207 ἄτητα καὶ τὸ 

τίτωτα τὸ ἄγγελον αὐτομα ἀδη;) in 

which τὸ means the whole fact or state 

of things described by the clause with 

τοι. Here (e.g.) τὸ—ὁράσει καὶ τὸ 

κλαίει would be in later prose (ἀνεκτὸν 

ἐχει καλὸν τὸ κλαίει τυπα. As to τοῖς 

the only question is whether the phrase 

ἐχει καλὸν, which is said of a person 

suffering evil, may be said of a state of 

things. We may compare the Attic 

phrases such as ἄνεκτων ἐχει, κατά 

μεμερὰμ ἐχει (Thuc.), ταῦτ’ ἀπατιῶν ἐχει, 

ταῦτ’ ὑγρῆν ἐχει (Demosth.). Some 

take καλὸν as a nom., and ἐχει—ἐχει 

τυπα: but this absolute use of ἐχει is 

doubtful. Possibly, however, ἐχει is an 

old corruption for ἐκατον, as in 12. 209 ὑ 

μὲν δὴ τὸ ὡς μείκων ἐπὶ καλὸν (so Ameis, 

La Roche: vulg. ἐν καλὸν). In that 

place, it is worth noting, Zen. read ἐκατον.

91. Dawn of the 40th day—that which 

ends at 23. 345. 

93. δέκαρτέλ ὤ δι οὐτα. These words 

describe a vivid waking impression: the 

recognition to which Úlysses is looking 

forward seems turned into a present 

reality by the sound of her voice. The 

Odyssey is rich in words expressing 

strong imagination, such as δοσσαμα, 

δοσσαμα, ἠνάλλαμοι. 

98. ἑθέλοντες, plur. because he de 

sires to include the action of the gods’ 

generally, ἑθέλω is used (not ἐθέλως) 

to express the will of the gods. 

99. ἤγετα is used like an aor.: H. G. 

§ 72, 2, note 2. 

100. A φήμη, called also κλαίον (4. 317, 18. 117, 20. 130), is a speech 

that serves as an omen: see on 18. 117. 

Neither word occurs in the Iliad. 

101. τέρας ἀλλ’ α σ ign besides.”
20. ὌΔΣΣΕΙΑΣ Τ

αὐτίκα δ' ἐβρόντησεν ἀπ' αἰγλήντος Ὀλύμπου, ὑψόθεν ἐκ νεφέων· γῆθησε δὲ δίος Ὁδύσσεως.

φήμην δ' ἐξ οἴκου γυνῆ προείκεν ἀλετρίς πλησίον, ἐνθ' ἄρα οἱ μῦλαι ἦτο ποιμένι λαῶν,

τῆσιν δάδεκα πᾶσαι ἐπερράωντο γυναῖκες ἄλφιτα τεῦχονσαι καὶ ἄλειατα, μυελὸν ἀνδρῶν.

αἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἄλλαι εὐδόν, ἐπεὶ κατὰ πυρὸν ἄλεσαν, ἡ δὲ μί' οὖ πο ψαυτ', ἀφαυροτάτη δ' ἐτέκτο.

ἡ μᾶλλιν στήσασα ἔπος φάτο, σήμα ἀνακτικά· "Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὐ τι θεοί καὶ ἀνθρώποις ἀνάσσεις,

ἡ μεγάλ' ἐβρόντησαν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστερεθεντος,

108 ἄλειατα] ἄλειφατα F P H.

103. Ὀλύμπου, here simply = 'sky': in the Iliad, as Aristarchus observed, Ὀλύμπος is always a mountain.

104. The words ἐκ νεφέων destroy the significance of the thunder as an omen—the point being that it came from a clear sky (I. 113 ἀστερέωντος, oúde νοθε νέφοι ἐστι). Probably therefore the line is spurious: the latter part of it anticipates 120-121.

105. οἴκοι, not the μέγαρα, but one of the detached buildings or minor ἄλεωμοι, opening on the αἰθή. These were inhabited by slaves or used for household operations, and would be within earshot of Ulysses, who is in the πρόδομοι (J. L. M.).

106. ἢματο 'were set down.' This is the only place where ἢματο is used of inanimate objects. The mills 'sat,' i.e. (probably) 'lay flat.' Presumably, like the hand-mills still used in Greece, they were too heavy to be placed on any support, such as a table.

107. ἐπερράωντο 'sped on, plied their task at.' (the mills). μοιχον seems to express continuous movement, e.g. the 'rippling' of hair (Π. 1. 529). For the ἕπι cp. 7. 104 ἀλεμενοι μᾶλλος ἐς μέλαν κορίν.

108. ἄλειατα, the later ἄλειφα, 'wheaten flour,' ἄλειφα being of barley: cp. Plat. Rep. 372 B κε μὲν τῶν κρατῶν ἄλειφα σκευασμένον, κε δὲ τῶν τυρών ἄλειφα: also Arist. Probl. 1. 36, where it is said to be an argument for πτώτης of wheat as compared with barley water δι' ἀλθ' ἐκρούστεροι οἱ περὶ τὴν τῶν ἄλεφρων ἐγγάζομαι ἢ τὴν τῶν ἄλφιτων. In this case, however, the grain was all wheat (I. 109): while ἄλειφα is much commoner than ἄλειατα (only mentioned here in Homer). Probably the original distinction was one between meal (ἄλειφα) and flour (ἄλειατα, as being more ground): but practically the 'meal' was usually of barley, and the 'flour' of wheat.

The form ἄλειατα is a metrical lengthening of ἄλεια (Schulze, Quest. Er. p. 236).

109. To avoid the hiatus Fick reads ἄλλας τ' εὐδόν, supposing that the woman who presently spoke had got up before the rest. But this does not agree with οὖ πο ψαυτ' in the next line. Apparently the work of grinding was done at or before dawn, so that the meal should be fresh and ready for the day's use, and the workers were allowed to sleep when their task was done.

110. ἢ δ' μία 'but one,' cr. 14. 26.

111. μᾶλλιν στήσασα, apparently 'stopping the mill': otherwise he could not have heard what she said. The Greek women at the present day sing while the mill is going, and always stop when you speak to them. Hence the place given to the circumstance in the account of the φήμη. It is a 'sound-note,' like the step on the threshold (J. L. M.).
οὐδὲ ποιή νέφος ἑστὶ· τέρας νῦ τερ τὸδε φαλνεῖς.
κρήνων νῦν καὶ ἐμοὶ δείλῃ ἔπος, ἵττι κεν ἐπὶ

μνηστήρες πύματον τε καὶ ὠστατον ἤματε τὸδε
ἐν μεγάροις Ὁδυσσῆος ἐλοιατο δαίτ' ἐρατείνην,
οἱ δῆ μοι καμάτῳ θυμαλγεῖ γοῦνατ' ἐλυσαν

ἀλφατα τευχοῦση νῦν ὠστατα δειπνήσεσιν.'

'Ως ἀρ' ἐφη, χαίρεν δὲ κληδόνι δῖος Ὁδυσσῆος
Ζηνὸς τε βροντῇ· φάτο γὰρ τίσεσθαι ἀλεῖτας.

Αἰ ὁ άλλαι δημαί κατὰ δόματα καλ' Ὁδυσσῆος

ἐγρομέναι ἀνέκαιν οπ' ἐσχάρῃ ἀκάματον πῦρ.
Τηλέμαχος δ' ευν浔θεν ἀνίστατο, ἱσόθεοι φῶς,

εἰμάτα ἐσσάμενος· περὶ δὲ χίφος οὐδ' θέτ' ὕμφα

ποσοί δ' ὑπὸ λιπαροίσιν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα,
εἴλετο δ' ἀλκίμον ἔχχος, ἀκαχμένον οὐκεὶ χαλκῷ

στῇ δ' ἀρ' ἐπ' οὐδῶν ἰὼν, πρὸς δ' Ἐυρώκλειαιν ἐφειστῆς

"μαία φιλή, πῶς ξείνον ἑτιμήθοσθ' ἐνι οἴκῳ

εὐνὴ καὶ σῖτῳ, ἡ αὐτῶς κεῖται ἀκηδής;

τοιαύτῃ γὰρ ἐμὴ μήτηρ, πινυτῇ περ ἑοῦσαν

ἐμπλήγησθ' ἑτερον γε τεῖ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων

χείρονα, τὸν δὲ τ' ἀρείουν ἑτιμήθαν αὐτοπέμπει.'

Τὸν δ' αὐτέσ προςειτε περίφρων Ἐυρώκλειαιν

"οὐκ ἂν μιν νῦν, τέκνων, ἀναῖτιον αἰτίοφοι.

οἶνον μὲν γὰρ πίνεν καθήμενοι, ὅφ' ἐθέλ' αὐτῶς,

οἶνον δ' οὐκέτ' ἐθη πευνήμεναι· εἶρετο γὰρ μιν.

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κοίτοι καὶ ὑπνον μιμήσκοντο,

115 κρήνων F P H al. This, the Homeric form, may be restored, omitting νῦν (Bothe).
116 τίσεσθαι, ep. II. 3. 28: τίσεσθαι Ven. 457: τίσεσθαι MSS.
117 ἔγγορμαν G U: ἔγγορμαν vulg.
118 ἐκπλήγητον Ar., vulg.: ἐκπλήγητον F M al.
119 μιμήσκοντο U: μιμήσκετο G: μιμήσκοντο vulg.

123. ἄγγορμαν 'waking' seems much more in point than the vulg. ἄγγορμαν

'assembling.' Conversely ἄγρετο has probably taken the place of ἄγρετο (or ἄγρετο) in II. 7. 434., 24. 780.

132. ἐκπλήγητον 'mightily,' lit. 'in striking fashion': the reading ἐκπλήγη

τιν 'in maddening fashion,' 'astoundingly' is not impossible, but err by

being somewhat too emphatic.

135. οὐκ ἂν αὐτώφοι is a polite form of saying 'do not blame': ep. II. 2. 250., 14. 126.

138. μιμήσκοντο, sc. Penelope and her guest. The opt., which is the vulg.

reading, would have an iterative force, which is inapplicable in this context

(L. and O.).
ἡ μὲν δὲμεν Ἀναγεν ὑποστρέφαι διμήφησιν,
 αὐτὰρ δ' γ', ὅς τε τίς πάμπαν δύναρθς καὶ ἀποτμοσ,
 οὐκ ἔθελ· ἐν λεκτροσια καὶ ἐν ρήγασι παθεῦνειν,
 ἀλλ' ἐν ἀδεψήτω βοή καὶ κόσμου ὁλῶν
 ἑδραθ' ἐνι προδήμοι. χλαῖναι δ' ἐπείσασαν ἡμεῖς."  

"Ὡς φάτο, Θηλέμαχος δὲ διέκ μεγάρου βεβήκει
 ἐγχος ἔχων ἀμα τῇ γε δοὺς κόνες ἅργοι ἐποντο.
 βῆ δ' ἵμεν εἰς ἀγορῆς μετ' ἐὐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιών.
 ἡ δ' αὐτή διμήφησιν ἐκεῖκετο διὰ γυναικῶν,
 Εὐρυκλεί, Ὡπος θυγάτηρ Πεισηνορίδαο·
 "ἀγρείθ', αἱ μὲν δάμα κορήσατε ποτνύσασαι,
 πάσατε γ' ἐν τε θρόνοισ εὐποντοίσι τάπηται
 βάλλετε πορφύρεσι: αἱ δ' σπαγγονισ τραπέζας
 πάσας ἀμφιμάσας, καθήρατε δὲ κρήτηρας
 καὶ δέπα ἀμφικύπελλα τετυγμενα. ταὶ δὲ μεθ' ὀδὸ
 ἐρχόμενη κρήνηνε, καὶ οἶσετε θάσσον ἱόηοι.
 οὐ γὰρ δὴν μηντήρεσ ἀπέσονται μεγάροι,
 ἀλλὰ μὰλ' ἢρ νέονται, ἐτεὶ καὶ πάσιν ἐορτήν."  

"Ὡς ἐφαθ', αἱ δ' ἀρὰ τῆς μάλα μὲν κλύνον ἥ' ἐπίθοντο.
 αἱ μὲν ἐλκοσι βῆσαν ἐπὶ κρήνης μελάνυδον,
 αἱ δ' αὐτοῖς κατὰ δόματ' ἐπισταμένους πονέοντο.
 ἐς δ' ἠλθον δρηστήρες ἀγήμορες· οἱ μὲν ἐπείτα
 εὖ καὶ ἐπισταμένως κέασαν ξύλα, ταὶ δὲ γυναικὲς
 ἠλθον ἀπὸ κρήνης· ἐπὶ δὲ σφισιν ἥθε υπεφώσις

145 δοὺς κόνες Bekker, cp. 2. 11., 17. 62: κόνες πόδας MSS.  150 δάμα F P.
160 ἐς G F U : ἐς Π Ἑ Ἀ L.  δρηστήρεσ P H U A L : μηντήρεσ G F.

139. Ἀναγεν with the dat. (διμήφησιν) is not found elsewhere in Homer.
140. Cp. the note on 19. 346–348. It is part of the character assumed by
Ulysses to refuse all luxury.
153. τετυγμένα, cp. 13. 33.
156. ἐορτή, viz. the νουμηρία, 'day of
new moon': see on 14. 162. 'It is
a high-day for them all' may be in-
tended to bear a double significance.
According to the Herodotean life of
Homer the νουμηρία was kept as a
festival of Apollo in the island of
Samos. This is implied in the story
that Homer went about there on the
day of new moon to the richest houses,
led by children and singing the short
poem called εἰρετιῶν: 'whence (adds
the writer) these verses were sung for
a long time afterwards by the children
in Samos when they went round begging
at the festival of Apollo' (ὑ' δειάρον
ἐν τῇ ἐορτῇ τοῦ 'Ἀπόλλωνος'). See
E. Meyer in Hermes, xxvi. 376.
158. αἱ ἐλκοσι 'twenty of them,' cp.
20. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Τ

τρεῖς σιάλους κατάγων, οί ἔσαν μετὰ πᾶσιν ᾠριστοὶ.
καὶ τοὺς μὲν ῥ’ εἶλεν καθ’ ἐρῆμα καλὰ νέμεσθαι,
ἀυτὸς δ’ αὐὴ 'Οδυσῆα προσηύδα μειλιχίοισι' 165
"ξεῖνι, ἥ ἄρ τι σε μᾶλλον Ἀχαῖοι εἰσορώσων,
ἥς σ’ ἀτιμάζουσι κατὰ μέγαρ’ ὅσ τὸ πάρος περ’

Τὸν δ’ ἀπαλείβομεν προσέφη πολύμητις 'Οδυσσεύς:
"αἱ γὰρ δή, Ἑὔμαι, θεοί τισαίατο λῶβην,
ἣν οὐδ’ ὑβρίζοντες ἀτάσθαλα μηχανώνται 170
οἶκον ἐν ἄλλοτρῷ, οὐδ’ αἰθῶς μοῖραν ἔχουσιν."

"Ός οἱ μὲν τισαία πρὸς ἄλληλοις ἀγάγον,
ἀγχώμουν δὲ σφ’ Ἰλής Μελάνθιος, αἰτόλος αἰγῶν,
ἀγας ἄγων αἰ πάσι μετέπρεπον αἰτολίωσι,
δεῖνον μηστῆρεσι: δῶς δ’ ἐμ’ ἐποντὸ νομῆσε.
καὶ τὰς μὲν κατέδησεν ὑπ’ αἰθουσῇ ἐρίδοσφοι,
ἀυτὸς δ’ αὐτ’ 'Οδυσῆα προσηύδα κερτομίσθω." 175

"ξεῖνι, ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐνθάδ’ ἀνήσεως κατὰ δῶμα
ἀνέρας αἰτίζοι, ἀτάρ οὐκ ἐξεσθάν θύραξ;
πάντως οὖκετε νοὶ διακρίνεσθαι δῶς
πρὶν χειρῶν γεύσασθαι, ἐπεὶ σύ περ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον
αἰτίζεσι οἰσίν δὲ καὶ ἄλλα δαῖτες Ἀχαῖῶν." 180

"Ως φάτο, τὸν δ’ οὗ τῷ προσέφη πολύμητις 'Οδυσσεύς,
ἀλ’ ἀκένω κίνησε κάρη, κακὰ βουσιδομενών.

Τοῦτος δ’ ἐπὶ τρίτος Ἰλῆς Φιλοτίος, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν,
βοῦν στείραν μηστῆροι ἄγων καὶ πίνας αἰγας. 186

πορράμησι δ’ ἄρα τοὺς γε διῆγαγον, οἱ τε καὶ ἄλλους


171. οὐδ’ αἰθῶς μοῦραν ἔχουσιν.
The notion is that there is a certain place or share in the mind to which
aithos is entitled, and which the Suitors do not assign to it. So in 19.593 it is
said that each thing—and therefore asleep
—has its moiara or claim upon men.
Cp. also δληθός αἰηα (16.101., 19.84)
'the place to be given to hope'; and the
later phrase μοῖραν νῦμαν 'to respect,
value.'

178. Cobet would read στ for στα, making πάντως κατα the apodosis. But
στα is supported by 19.66, where the
same words are put into the mouth of
Melantho. And πάντως usually begins
a fresh sentence, like our 'really now':
cp. 19.91, Il. 8.450.
187. For the flocks on the mainland
see 14.100 ff.
ανθρώπωσεν πέμπουσιν, διὸς φεύγας ἐλευθερία
καὶ τὰ μὲν εὖ κατέδησεν ὅτι αἰθώσῃ ἐριδοῦσθη,
καὶ τὸς ἄνθρωπον πρὸς δῶμα; τέων ἔς εὑχεται εἶναι ἀνθρώπων; οἴπ' ἄνθρωποι δὲ ἄνθρωποι, ἦν τε ἐσοὐε δέμας βασιλεῖς ἀνακτή
ἄλλα θεῖα δυνάωσι πολυπλάγκτους ανθρώπως;
�πτήτε καὶ βασιλεῦσιν ἐπικλώσωσιν διὸν ὡς
"Ἡ καὶ δεξιοτῆθε δεξιότεροι χειρὶ παρασίτας,
καὶ μιν φωνήσαι ἔσεῃ πεπράγεντα προσηδῶ.
χαιρει πάτερ ὁ Ξεῖνος γένοιτο τοι ἐσε περ ὀσοῦ
βάθος άταρ μὲν νῦν γε κακοῖς ἔχει αὐτός, πολέσσι
θυν νησει αὐτὸς, μοιγμέναι κακῆτη τοι καὶ ἰμείει λευγέοισιν.
οἰκισε, ὃς ἐνός, δεδήξωσι λέοντας δὲ μοι δοσε
μησσαμένον ᾽Οδυσῆος, ἐπεὶ καὶ καῖνον διὸ
τοιάδε λαίφε ἔσχοντα κατ' ανθρώπωσεν ἀλάλοσθαι,
εἰ ποὺ ἔτι ζοῖει καὶ ὄρη φῶς ἥλιον,
εἰ δ' ἥδη τέθηκε καὶ εἶν Ὀιδαὶ δόξοισιν,
δὲ μοι ἐπειτ' ᾽Οδυσῆος ἀμύμονος, δὲ μ' ἐπὶ βουνόν


189. τὰ μὲν εὗ κατακλήσα. The neut. is used of sheep, &c., when they are spoken of collectively; see H. G. § 171. It is especially suitable when animals of different kinds are intended.

190. The words καὶ βασιλεύσιν belong logically to the principal clause: the sense is that 'the gods mar the form of much-wandering men, even of kings, whenever they ordain sorrow for them.' The effect of the postponement of the words is that they come in as an afterthought: 'whenever they ordain sorrow, even to kings, the lot of sorrow.'

A different explanation was given by Ernesti: 'sensus est; sed intelligi potest quam proclives diarr et ad homines miseris mergendos, cum etiam regibus decernant atque immittunt miserationem.' If 'cum decernant' he means 'since they decree,' these words cannot be accepted as the translation of ἐπικλώσως with a subj. 'In to bring into, make acquainted with.' The inf. is construed as with a verb of private meaning, 'pity in regard to mixing' = 'pity so as not to mix.' Cp. II. 7. 408 κατακλήσαν ὡς τι μεγαλῶν ὡς γὰρ τις φθαῖνω ... μελησίμασιν: Soph. Aj. 632 ὁλοκληρῶν ὃν κήρων παρ' ἐξωθῷ παῖδα τ' ὀρφανών λωτεί.
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210. Κεφαλλήνας as a national or tribal name is applied in the Catalogue (Π. 2. 631 ff.) to all the subjects of Ulysses. Here the mainland, where the herds of cattle were (14.100), must be intended. There is nothing in the Odyssey to connect the name with the island afterwards called Κεφαλλήνια. Possibly it was then still confined to a district of Epirus.

211. ‘Cattle could not thrive in other fashion’ means, not merely that they could not do better, but that they thrive uniced, in the one right way, ‘like nothing else.’ Cp. 8. 176.

212. ἀνδρὶ γε ‘for a man’ (not a god): cp. 5. 199., 9. 191.


216. ἐπιθύμησα ‘turns over,’ cp. 16. 63 ἐπὶ δάση δινθήναι. Here also ἐπὶ = ‘over’ or ‘round,’ cp. 16. 365.

219. αὐτήσι βέβαιοι ‘my cattle all alive with me,’ ‘cowherd and cows.’ The phrase has a curiously different meaning in Π. 7. 474 ἄλλοι δὲ μνύεται, ἄλλοι δ’ αὐτήσι βέβαιοι, i.e. with the whole animals.

221. ἀλλοτριότης, because now given over to the use of the Suitors,—the ἄλλοι of l. 213.

224. τὸν δύστηνον is an acc. de quo; that is to say, δύστην would not take an acc. of the person unless such a clause as εἰ συνεχεῖν κτλ. followed to express the thing expected.

230-231 = 14. 158-159 (where see the note).
ιστή τ’ Ὀδυσσῆος ἀμύλωνος. ἢν ἀφικάνων
ἡ σέθεν εὖθαν’ ἑωτος ἐλεύθεται οἶκαδ’ Ὀδυσσῆος,
σοῖν δ’ ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ἐπόθεει, αἰ’ κ’ ἐθέλησα, κτιωμένους μυστηρός, οἱ ἑνθάδε κοιρανέων.”

Τὸν δ’ αὐτὸ προσέειπε βοών ἐπίβουκόλος ἀνήρ
“αἱ γὰρ τούτοι, ξείνε, ἔπος τελέσειε Κρονίων
γυναῖς ἃ οἱ ἐμὴ δύναμι καὶ χεῖρες ἐποντα.”

“Οὕς δ’ αὐτῶς Εὔμαιος ἐπεύξατο πᾶσι θεοῖς
νοστῆσαι Ὀδυσσῆα πολύφρονα δόνε δόμοντε.”

“Οὕς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγρέων,
μυστηρές δ’ ἄρα Τηλεμάχῳ βάπτατο τε μύον τε
ήρτων αὐτὰρ δ’ τοῖς δριστερὰς ἠλθέθεν ὄρνις,
αιτῶν ὑψιπέτης, ἔχε δὲ τρήρωνα πέλειαν.
τοῖσι δ’ Ὄμφυνομος ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν
“ὅ φιλο, οὐχ ἡμῖν συνθεύεσθαι ἴδε γε βουλή,
Τηλεμάχῳ φόνοις: ἀλλὰ μνησόμεθα δαιτός.”

“Οὕς ἐφατ Ὅμφυνομος, τοῖσι δ’ ἐπίθυναν μύθοι.
ἐλθόντες δ’ ἐσ’ δῶμαι Ὀδυσσῆος θεόιο
χαίνας μὲν κατέθεντο κατὰ κλίμασιν τε θρόνους τε,
οἱ δ’ ἱερεύνον δῖς μεγάλους καὶ πίονας ἀγγας,
ἱερεύν δὲ σῶς σιάλους καὶ βοῶν ἀγελαίνην
σπλάγχνα δ’ ὁ προκήσαστε εὔμοιον, ἐν δ’ ἄρα οἶνον
κρητίτα τερwoord’ κόπελλα δὲ νείμε συβῶτης.”
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σήτων δέ σφ' ἐπένειμε Φιλοίτιος, ὅρχαμος ἄνδρων, καλοῖς ἐν κανέοισιν, ἐφισχεὶ δὲ Μελανθέως. 255
οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ ὠναλαθ' ἐτοίμα προκείμενα χειρας ἑαλλοῦ.

Τηλέμαχος δ' Ὁδυσῆα καθάρως, κέρδεα νομῆν, ἐντὸς ἐώσταθέντος μεγάρου, παρὰ λαῖνου οὐδόν, δίφρον ἀεικέλιον καταθεὶς ὁλγην τε τράπεζαν. 260 ὄρθ' ἐτίθει σπλάγχνων μοῖρας, ἐν δ' οἶνον ἔχειν, ἐν δέπαιχρος, καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἐξείπεν ἐν τούτοις νῦν ἴσον μετ' ἀνδράσιν οὐνοματάξθησαν. κερτομιᾶς δὲ τοι αὐτῶς ἐγὼ καὶ χειρας ἀφεξὼ πάντων μνησθῆραν, ἔτει οὐ τοῦ δήμου ἐστιν ὅικος δή, ἀλλ' Ὁδυσῆος, ἐμοὶ δ' ἐκτήσατο κεῖνος. 265 ὑμείς δὲ, μνησθῆρε, ἐπισχεῖε θυμὸν ἐνιπῆς καὶ χειρῶν, ἰνα μή τις ἔρις καὶ νείκος ὑβρισται.

"Ὡς ἐφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ὀδὰς ἐν χείλεσι φύντες Τηλέμαχοι θαύμαζον, δ' θαρσαλέως ἀγάρεως. τοῖσιν δ' Ἀντίνοος μετέφη, Εὐπειθεὺς νιός. 270 καὶ χαλεπῶν περ ἑώτα δεχόμεθα μῦθον, Ἀχαιοι, Τηλεμάχου μάλα δ' ἥμιν ἀπειλήσας ἀγορεύει. οὐ γὰρ Ζεὺς εἰσαγεῖ Κρονίων τῷ κέ μιν ἥδη παύσαμεν ἐν μεγάροις, λιγῶν περ ἑώτερ' ἄγορητην." 275 "Ὡς ἐφαθ' Ἀντίνοος' δ' ἄρ' οὐκ ἐμπάζετο μῦθων. κήρυκες δ' ἀνα ἄστυ θεῶν λεφην ἐκατοβηθην" 275

259 καταβείς ΣΤ.: καθείς G.: παραβείς F Π. H. al. (perhaps from γὰρ δ' ἐτιθεί in 260). 261 Read perhaps χρυσαῖα δειλαί, as Ar. in 3.41: cp. 15.149, ι. 24.285.

257. ξάραρα λειτοῦν seems to imply that Telemachus knew of the stratagem of the bow. Or the reference may be vague: he did the proper thing, and so fell in with his father's plan.

258. λαῖνου οὐδόν, here (as always) the threshold at the entrance: cp. 17.30.

262. ἔπαθος, cp. 18.105.

273. οὐ γὰρ Ζεὺς ἔσται 'Zeus did not suffer it. The sentence is elliptical; what it was that Zeus did not suffer is not expressed, but is implied in the following clause τούτων μεταφην αὐλ. It is commoner after a καταθέων,

276-278. As to this feast of Apollo see on 14.148 ff. The mention of it is rather abrupt. It serves to remind us that the eventful day had now come,
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280 ἡγον τοὶ δ' ἀγέροντο κάρη κομώντες Ἀχαιοὶ ἄλοις ὧπο σκιερὸν ἐκατηβάλου Ἀπόλλωνος.
Οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ ὁπτὴσαν κρὴ ὑπέρτερα καὶ ἐρύσαντο, μοῖρας δασσάμενοι δαίνων' ἐρικυδέα δαίτα: 285 πάρ δ' ἄρ᾽ Ὀδυσσῆι μοῖραν βέσαν οἱ πυνέντο ἴςν, ὡσ αὐτὸν περ ἔλαγχανον ὡς γὰρ ἀνύγει Τηλέμαχος, φίλος υἱὸς Ὀδυσσῆος θείων.

Μηστήρας δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἄγνορας εἷς Ἀθηνή 

λάβῃς ἰσχεσθαι θυμαλγέως, ὡφ' ἐτι μᾶλλον ἡθε ἄχος κράδην Ἀαρδιάδεων Ὀδυσσῆος, ἦν δὲ τις ἐν μηστήρας ἀνὴρ ἀθεμίστια εἰδώς, Κτήσιππος δ' ὄνομι ἔσκε, Σάμη δ' ἐν οἰκίᾳ ναίεν ὃς δὴ τοῖς κταίστεσσι πεποίθως θεσπεσοίοις μνάσκετ' Ὀδυσσῆος δὴν οἰχομένου δάμαρτα.
290 ὃς βα τότε μηστήρας ὑπερφιδίοις μετηθεὶς
"κέκλυτέ μεν, μηστήρας ἄγνορας, ὡφρα τι εἰπὼν μοίραν μὲν δὴ ξείνοις ἐχει πάλαι, ὡς ἐπέοικεν, ἴςν' ὃς γὰρ καλὸν ἀτέμβειν οὐδὲ δίκαιον ξείνοις Τηλέμαξοι, δὲ κεν τάδε δόμαθ' ἐκταίρες.

ἀλλ' ἄγε οἱ καὶ ἐγὼ δῶ ξείνοιν, ὡφρα καὶ αὐτὸς ἡ λασπρόχερ δῶ γέρας ἡ τῷ ἀλλῷ δύμων, οὐ κατὰ δόματ' Ὀδυσσῆος θείων."

"Ὡς εἰπὼν ἔρριψε βοῦς πόδα χείρι παχείη, κεῖμενον ἐκ κανέων λαβῶν' δ' ὁ ἄλειπατ' Ὀδυσσεῦς 300 ἱκα παρακλίνας κεφαλῆν, μείδησε δὲ θυμὸν

286 Ἀαρδιάδεων Ὀδυσσῆος G: Ἀαρδιάδη Ὀδυσσῆα νυλγ., but cp. 18. 348. 289 θεσπεσοίς G X U Eust.: παρὸς ιοῖο F P H al.


279. κρὴ ὑπέρτερα, i.e. the flesh on the carcasse (not the ἔγκατα), cp. 3. 65.

280. δασσάμενοι δαίνων, a play of language: cp. 13. 24.


286. δόμη, opt., cp. 18. 348.

297. λασπρόχαι, apparently a 'bath attendant,' one who made ready the hot water. It is a δῶς εἰρμένων as a substantive, but it is applied elsewhere (8. 435, II. 18. 346) as an adj. to the tripod which served to carry the kettle of hot water.

301. θυμὸν is naturally used with verbs of feeling or thought, hardly with a word like μείθος, denoting an act or outward sign of feeling. Cp. however 8. 450 ὃ δ' ἄρ᾽ ἄπαντις θεῷ τῷ θυμῷ, and the phrase θυσία τῷ θυμῷ (15. 132, &c.) 'gazed (and admired) at heart.'
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σαρδάνον μέλα τοίον ὃ δ' εὐδημητὸν βάλε τοίχων. Κτήσιππον δὲ ἀρα Τηλέμαχος ἱντπατε μοῦθη.

"Κτήσιππ', ἢ μέλα τοῦ τάδε κέρδιον ἐπελευ θυμῷ οὐκ ἔσαλε τῶν ξεινῶν. ἀλεάτο γάρ βέλως αὐτῶς. 305

ἡ γάρ κεν σὲ μέσον βάλον ἐγχεῖ δευθέντι, καὶ κέ τοι ἀντὶ γάμωι πατήρ τάφον ἀφεπονεῖ το ἐναθῇ. τὸ μῆ τίς μοι ἄεικες ἐνι οἰκῷ

Φαινέτων ἢ δὴ γὰρ νοεῖ καὶ ὑδα ἔκαστα, ἐσθλᾶ τε καὶ τὰ χέρεια. πάρος δὲ ἐτὶ νῆπιος ἡ. 310

ἀλλ' ἔμητης τάδε μὲν καὶ τέτλαμεν εἰς ὁμόεντες, μῆλον σφαζομένων οὐκοί τε πινομένου καὶ σίτων χαλεπῶν γάρ ἐρυκακεῖν ἐνα παλλοῦς. 315

ἀλλ' ἄγε μηκέτι μοι κακὰ βέβετε δυσμενέοντες, εἰ δὴ μῆ μ' αὐτῶν κτείναι μενεαθιες χαλκῷ καὶ κέ τὸ βουλοίμην καὶ κέν πολὴ κέρδιον εἶ

τεθναμέν καὶ τάδε γ' αἰὲν ἀείκεν ἐργ' όρασθαι, ξεινὸς τε στυφελιζομένους διμάς τε γυναικᾶς


302. σαρδάνον μέλα τοίον 'surely a smile of quite Sardanic bitterness.' 303. σαρδάνον or σαρδάνων—the former spelling has rather the better claim to antiquity—must come from some proper name which had passed into a proverb, or else from some foreign word—perhaps Egyptian or Phoenician. The notion that it meant 'Sardinian,' and referred to a certain bitter herb found in that island, is doubtless later than Homer.

304. θυμῷ is even more difficult here than in 301. The clause looks like a contamination of the common phrase φίλον ἐπελευο θυμῷ and 19. 283 τὸ γε ἐνδύον εἰσατο θυμῷ. But we may translate 'this has been a wiser thought in thy heart,' 'you show discretion in not hitting the stranger.' The compliment is ironical, as Telemachus shows by immediately adding that it was the stranger himself who avoided the missile.

Notice the parasitic structure, with anadeton, = ἐκβαλον ἐκεῖν ὅτι σὺ ἔβαλες, or τὸ μῆ βαλεῖν: cp. 4. 655 ἄλλα τὸ θανμαξ' ὅπων κτλ.

The recurrence of θυμῷ at the end of ll. 301, 304 is suspicious, especially as it does not give a perfectly-smooth sense in either place.

315. εἰ δὴ μῆ μ'. With this reading, which has the best support in the MSS., there should be only a comma at δυσμενέοντες, but a colon at χαλκῷ: the sense being, 'do not go on doing mischief to me,—unless you desire to play me : and indeed I would rather die than &c.' This gives a more natural train of thought than the usual reading εἰ δὴ δὴ μ', with the chief stop at δυσμενέοντες.

317-319. = 16. 107-109. The lines are perhaps wrongly repeated here. They are superfluous in the construction, and do not agree with 311-313, which express a similar complaint, but in a somewhat different tone. Notice too the awkward repetition εἰς ὁμόεντες (l. 311), ὁράσθαι (l. 317).
μυσταζόντας δεικείτως κατά δόματα καλά." 320
οἷς έφαβ', οἱ δ' αρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένετο στατη.

οὖς δὲ δὴ μετέπειται Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος.
"δ' φίλοι, οὐκ ἀν δὴ τις ἐπὶ βρέθηντη δικαιρ
ἀντιβοις ἐπέσεσι καθαπτόμενον χαλεπαίνων.
μήτε τι τὸν βεῦνον στυφελίζετε μήτε τιν' ἄλλον
δημόν, οὐ κατὰ δόματ' Ὀδυσσῆος θείοι.

Τηλεμάχος δὲ κε μθόν ἐγὼ καὶ μητέρι φαίνη
ήπιον, οἱ σφαῖρι κραδῆ ἄδων ἀμφοτέρων.
δόρα μὲν ὑμῖν θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσιν εἴλπει
νοστῆσων Ὀδυσσῆα πολύφρονα δωδε δομώνα,
τόφῳ οὗ τις νέμεσις μενεμένι τ' ἢν λαχείρατο
ταῦτα κατὰ δόματ', ἔπει τὸδε κέρδιον ἦν,
εἰ νοστηGreg 330
θοῦ Ὀδυσσήας καὶ ὑπότροπος ἐκεῖτο ἀρμα-
μνήτηρας κατὰ δόματ', ἔπει τὸδε κέρδιον ἦν,
εἰ νοστηGreg 335
θοῦ Ὀδυσσήας καὶ ὑπότροπος ἐκεῖτο δόμα-
μνήτηρας κατὰ δόματ', ἔπει τὸδε κέρδιον ἦν,
εἰ νοστηGreg 330
θοῦ Ὀδυσσήας καὶ ὑπότροπος ἐκεῖτο ἀρμα-
μνήτηρας κατὰ δόματ', ἔπει τὸδε κέρδιον ἦν,
εἰ νοστηGreg 335
θοῦ Ὀδυσσήας καὶ ὑπότροπος ἐκεῖτο δόμα-
μνήτηρας κατὰ δόματ', ἔπει τὸδε κέρδιον ἦν,
εἰ νοστηGreg 330
θοῦ Ὀδυσσήας καὶ ὑπότροπος ἐκεῖτο ἀρμα-

Τὸν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίνον ἡδα:
"οὐ μὴ Ζήν', Ἀγέλαε, καὶ ἀλγειο πατρὸς ἐμοίο,
δἐ πον τῆλ' ἸΘάκης ἢ ἐφθιται ἢ ἀλαληται,
οὐ τε διατρίβει μητρὸς γάμον, ἀλλ' κελεύω
γήμασθ' φ' κ' ἑθελη, ποτὶ δ' ἀσπετα δώρα δίδωμι.
U al. 337 δώματ' ἔγχρα Eυστ. 339 ἐμοίου ἤμερο G Ρ X.
αἰδέομαι δ’ ἄκουσαν ἀπ’ μεγάρου δέοσθαι μόνον ἀναγκαίον μὴ τοῦτο θεὸς τελέσειν.’

Πε φάτο Τήλεμαχος μνηστήριν δὲ Παλλᾶς Ἀθηνᾶς ἀδεστον γέλω ὄρσε, παρέπλαγξεν δὲ νόημα.

οἱ δ’ ἔδει γναθοὶ γελοσιῶν ἀλλωριῶν, αἰμοφόρουτα δὲ δὴ κρέα ἱσθιον δεσμὸ δ’ ἔρα σφέων δακρυόν πιπιλαντο, γυνὸν δ’ ἄκτο όμοιο.

τοῖς δὲ καὶ μετέειπε Θεοκλάμενος θεοειδῆς.

“ἀ δειλοὶ, τι κακὸν τόδε πάσχετε; νυκτὶ μὲν ὑμῶν εἶλθαι κατε νεκρῶν τα νεκρῶν, οἰμώῃ δὲ δέξῃς, δεδακρυνται δὲ παρειαλ, αἴματι δ´ ἠρράδαι τοῖς καλαί τε μεσόμας εἰδῶλων δὲ πλέων πρόθυρον, πλείη δὲ καὶ αὐλή.”

345 γέλων Ρ Χ Υ: γέλων Μ Υ: γέλων Γ Αλ.: γέλων Φ).

γελεῖν vulg. 351 ἄ δειλοὶ δακρύλιες Plat. Ion 539 A.

γυνὴ ibid. 355 γελεῖν γελεῖν Π Φ Υ Αλ.
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a subj. to be construed as if it were καὶ δὲ αἰδέομαι. But on this view nisi ἄδεια ‘and besides’ would have no reference. Note the conative use of δέοιμι ‘offer,’ as of διατίμιοι in l. 341: cp. 16. 432., 18. 8.

347. The impi. γελοσιῶν or γελῶν, and the participle variously written γελοσιῶτες, γελοσιώτες, γελόσιῶτες (18. 112. 20. 390) cannot come from γελῶν. We must assume a derivative verb γελοιάω (or γελάω), meaning ‘to deal with, indulge in laughter’ (γελῶν or γελῶν). The form γελόσιων is supported by H. Ven. 49 ὅδε γελοσιώναι, and by East.: the MSS. of Homer generally have γελοῖον, &c. For the formation cp. ξαλκαὶ (22. 312), δακρύλιες (18. 33), ἥμαρας (17. 530, see the note), ἀράξιοι, φωτωνίοι, &c.

Δακρύλιοιας ‘not their own,’ not answering to their real feeling. The phrase ἄγεροι γελάσατο (18. 163) expresses much the same thing.

348. ‘They even (ἤδη) were eating meat bedabbled with blood,’ i.e. the meat seems to be bleeding as they ate. So in a passage of the Icelandic Njals saga (quoted in the notes to Butler and Lang’s translation of the Odyssey): ‘It seems as though the gable wall were thrown down, but the whole board and the meat on it is one gore of blood.’

349. = 10. 248 (where see the note). γυνὸν ἄκτομος ‘was full of the thought of lamentation.’ It impelled them to lamentation, while outwardly they were laughing.

351 ff. Theoclymenus by his gift of divination or ‘second sight’ has the future scene before him as if it were already present,—the darkness of death on the heads of the Suitors, the loosing of knees, the wailing cries that burst forth, the tears, the blood bespattering the walls, the shades of the slain passing to Hades.

The shroud of mist covering the feet and knees is found in Celtic belief as a sign of approaching death. If it reaches (as here) to the head it shows that the death is very near. The bespattering of the walls with blood occurs as a portent in the oracle in Hdt. 7. 140 (ἲριδος) ὅποιον ἰδὼν μακροῦν 

353. δίδυμα, lit. ‘is lighted up’: cp. II. 2. 93 μετὰ διέλθη ὁσσαν ‘Ooso δεδηί, also II. 12. 35 μάχη ἐνοχὴ τε δεδηί.
"Ερεβόση άπό ζηφόν: ήλιος δὲ
οὐρανοῦ ἔκατος καθ' ἐπὶ ἐπιδήδρομεν ἄχλος."

"Ως ἔσορθ', οἷ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπί αὐτῷ ἤδη γέλασαν.
τοῖσιν δ' Ἐβρώμαχοσ, Πολύβων πώς ἤρξ' ἀγορεύειν
"ἀφραίνει ξείνοι νέον ἄλλοθεν ἐκλιποῦσώ.
ἀλλά μὲν ἄλφα, νέοι, δόμον ἐκπέμψασθε θύραζ' ἐς ἄγορην ἔρχεσθαι, ἐπεὶ τάδε νυκτὶ ἔσκει.

Τὸν δ' αὐτῇ προσεΐσε Ἀσκλῆμενος θεοειδὴς.
"Εβρώμαχ', οὗ τί σ' ἄνωγα ἐμοὶ πομπὴν ὑπάρειν' ἐκεὶ μοι ὀφθαλμῷ τε καὶ οἴκατα καὶ πόδες ἀμφὸ
καὶ νόος εἰς στήθησιν τετυγμένος οὐδέν ἀεικής.
τοῖς ἥξειμι θύραζ', ἐπεὶ νοεῖ καθὼς ὁμίμων ἔρχομενον, τὸ κεν οὗ τις ὑπεκφύγων οἷ' ἀλέατω μυγνηθρῶν, οὗ δῶμα κἀ' ἀντιθέου ὁδοῦ ἀνέρας ὑμφίοντες ἀτάσθαλα μηχανάσσαθ' "

"Ως εἰσών ἔξηλθε δόμοι εὖ ναιεταῖντο, ἐκεῖο δ' ἐς Περίαον, δ' μιν πρόθρον υπεδέκτο.
μυγνηθρὲς δ' ἀρα πάντες ἐς ἀλλήλους ὑρὔοντες 
Τηλέμαχον ἑρέθιζον, ἐπὶ ξείνως γελώοντες.
ἀκερεὶ δὲ τις εἰσπετό χέαν ὑπερνοεοῦντον.

"Τηλέμαχ', οὗ τις σεὶ κακομείνωτερος ἀλλο-
οῖον μὲν τινα τούτων ξείνες ἐπίμαστον ἀλήτην,


357. We do not hear of any actual darkness on the day of the μυγγνηθροφοια. Although it was new moon, we can hardly suppose that an eclipse is intended by the words καὶ ὁ ἐπιδήδρομεν ἄχλος. Rather, the darkness or 'night' is that of death: cp. II. 13. 425 ἡβενηθ' μνείς καλόβαι = 'to slay,' and phrases such as βαθύτατο μέλαν γέφος, κατα δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κλίνειν ἄχλος, &c.
362. ξείνει is transitive, 'thinks like.'
365-367. The structure is paratactic: 'I have eyes &c., with them I will go out,' = 'I will go out guided by the eyes &c. that I have.'

366. Cobet would omit this line, so that τοὺς ξείσαμι may be taken closely with τοῖς in l. 365. But τοῖς has a 'comitative' sense, which may apply to eyes and ears as well as feet : cp. II. 18. 506 τοῖς θύετο 'with these (sceptres) they started up.'
374. ξείνες, see on l. 383.
377. ἐπίμαστον, apparently from ἑμαυλομα 'I feel after, seek out,' cp. ἄπειροματον 'untouched' (II. 19. 263). The exact meaning is difficult to determine. Probably the vagrant is 'sought out' in the sense that he did not come unasked, but was brought by Εμαυλομα.
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σίτου καὶ ὁλν’ κεχρημένων, οὐδέ τι ἑργὼν ἐμπαῖνον οὐδὲ βής, ἀλλ’ αὐτῶς ἀχθος ἀροῦρης.

ἀλλ’ εἰ μοι τι πίθου, τὸ κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἶν’

τόσος ξένων ἐν νη’ πολυκλῆιδι βαλόντες

ἐς Σικελίων πέμπομεν, οθεν κε τοι ἄξιον ἄλφοι.'

"Ὡς ἔφασαν μπιστήρες· ὃ δ’ οὐκ ἐμπάξετο μῦθαι.

ἀλλ’ ἀκαίν πατέρα προσεδέκτε, δέγμενος αἰεὶ

οπιστε δὴ μπιστήρος ἀναδέςει χείρας ἐφήσει.

Ἡ δὲ κατ’ ἄντησιν θεμένη περικαλλά δίφρον

κούρη Ἰκαρίου, περίφρον Πηνελόπεια,

ἀνδρῶν ἐν μεγάροις ἐκάκτου μῦθον ἀκοῦε.


Cp. ἰδευσαντον βασίν (18. 73) of an evil which a man brings on himself (so Döderlein, Hom. Gloss.).

379. ἀλλ' αὐτος 'experienced,' cp. 21. 400. The scansion of the diphthong as as a short syllable is without parallel in Homer, but αἰ is similarly treated in οἶνος. The derivation of ἰδευσαν is not ascertained: it may be connected with the Doric φιόμα 'I possess,' and thus with ἱμεν, ψαμέρη, and the Attic ψαλευεια 'full possession' (Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 548).

383. Σικελίων. The earliest Greek contact in the south of Italy came in contact with a people of this name, apparently the same as the Siculi of history. In the time of the Odyssey these Italian Σικελίων may have been known to the Greeks as slave-dealers: cp. the γερα Σικελῆ among the servants of Laertes (24. 211).

A different view was suggested by Niebuhr (Philological Museum, I. 174). The scholia on Od. 18. 85 tell us that the king Ξένου there mentioned was said to have been 'tyrant of the Ξενολογ.' As other indications place him in Epirus, Niebuhr inferred that the Ξενολογ of the Odyssey were to be found in that country. But, though Ξενολογ may have been the name of a real people, it is most probable that Ξένου was purely mythical. The notice connecting him

with the Ξενολογ looks like the guess of an ancient commentator.

ὅθεν καὶ ταὐτ’ ἄξιον ἄλφοι. The difficulty here is to find a nominative for ἄλφοι. It is extremely hard to understand 'the thing done,' viz. 'the sale,' as subject (as proposed by Nauck). Bentley conjectured ἄθεν καὶ ταῦ οὖ, which seems to meet the case. As Dr. Hayman observes, the word ἄλφοι must be understood of the man who is sold: so that ταὐ would be τῶν ἔξινων τις. There is some plausibility in Dünzer's conjecture τῶν ἔξινων, for τῶν ἔξινων in 1. 382. If it is adopted (or if I. 382 is struck out, with Bergk), we should also read ἔξινω for ἔξινωs in 1. 374 (ἔξινω F Z). The subject will then be the νῦν ἔξινωs. Theoclymenus, with only a parenthetical reference in 377-379 to ῾Ολυμπας. Failure to perceive this would easily lead to the plurals ἔξινωs and τῶν ἔξινων. Bekker's proposal (in H. B. I. 113) to read ἄλφον as a 3rd plur. is quite inadmissible.

387. κατ’ ἄντησιν seems to mean 'opposite,' like κατ’ ἀνατολῖν. The supposed ἄντησιν may be compared in formation with the nouns implied in the words ἄρχητοντι and πρωμοντότι —both used of relative position (21. 230). Regarding the place of Penelope, see on 17. 452, 542 and the appendix on the Homeric House.
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δείπνον μὲν γὰρ τοῖς γε γελοιώτατες τετύκοντο
ἠδύ τε καὶ μενοεικές, ἐπεὶ μᾶλα πάλλ᾽ ιέρευσαν
δόρπου δ᾽ οὐκ ἄν πως ἀχαριστέροι άλλο γένοιτο,
οἴον δὴ τάχ᾽ ἐμελλε θεᾶ καὶ καρπερὸς ἄνηρ
θησάμεναι: πρότεροι γὰρ άεικέα μηχανῆωςτο.

390. On the form γελοιώτατες see the note on l. 347.

392. οὖν ἄν γένοιτο 'there could not have been,' — οὖν ἄν ἐγένετο.

HARPIES
(From a Lebes in the Museum of Berlin.)
Τή δ’ ἄρ’ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θήκε θεὰ γλαυκώπις Ἀθηνη, κοῦρ’ Ἰκαρίω, περίφρονι Πηνελοπείας, ἰδρόν μησητήρεσι θέμεν πολίν πεπερ σιδήρον ἐν μεγάροις Ὀδυσσέου ἄθλημα καὶ φῶνον ἄρχην. κλιμάκα δ’ ψηλήν προσεβήσετο οὐκ ὀδοίῳ, εἰλετο δὲ κληθ’ εὐκαμπταί χειρὶ παχνῆ καὶ χαλκεῖν κότη δ’ ἐλέφαντος ἐπην. βὴ δ’ ἵμναμεν θάλαμοντος σὺν ἀμφιπόλαις γναυίζων ἐσχατον’ ἔνθα δὲ οἱ κειμήλια κείτο ἀνατος, χαλκὸς τε χρυσὸς τε πολύκηπτος τε σίδηρος. ἔνθ’ ἐν δὲ ιδρόν κείτο παλίντον ἡδὲ φαρέτρη λοῖκος, πολλοὶ δ’ ἔνσαν στοιχεῖον διότῳ, δῶρα τά οἱ ξεῖοι Λακεδαιόμου δῶκε τυχήσας Ἰφιτος Εὐρώτηθης, ἐπιεῖκεσ δανάτοις. τοῦ δ’ ἐν Μεσσήνῃ ἐμβλήτην ἀλλήλοιπον

7 ἑωρείαν F.P.H. al.

3. σίδηρον, viz. the axes which were brought with the bow, cp. 61, 81, 97.
4. ἄθλημα ‘a contest,’ i.e. the material of a contest, cp. 10. 572–573.
5. προσεβήσετο ‘set foot upon,’ ‘began to descend.’
9. ἐσχατον, a distant store-room, not in common use: cp. l. 48.
11. παλίντον. It is difficult to decide whether this is a general epithet — ‘springing back,’ as a bow does when drawn—, or denotes a particular kind of bow, as in Herodotus (7. 69). In the latter case it may imply that the middle part of the bow is curved ‘backwards,’ i.e. is convex towards the archer: cp. ll. 8. 366.
12. στοιχεῖον ‘charged with groaning.’ The groans which the arrow may cause are regarded as something that is inherent in it.
15. Perhaps the only line in Homer that consists wholly of spondees. In some others (as 15. 334, 33. 333, 11.
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οίκος ἐν Ὤρτιλχοιο δαφρόνοι. ἦ τοῦ 'Οδυσσεὺς ἥλθε μετὰ χρεῖος, τὸ ρά οἱ πᾶς δὴμος δῆμος, δρέση μῆλα γὰρ ἐξ Ἰθάκης Μεσσήνιοι ἄνδρες δειράν νυμαί πολυκλῆσι τριηκό η δὲ νυμαί.

tὸν ἕκατον χειρὶ παλλὴν ὄδον ἠλθὲν 'Οδυσσεὺς παιδῶς ἑώς πρὸ γὰρ ἤκε πάθηρ ἀλλοι τε γέροντες.

'Ἰφιτος αὖθ' ἐποὺς διζήμενος, αἱ οἱ ὑλοτοῦ δώδεκα θῆλεια, ὑπὸ δὲ ἡμοῦ ταλανγοῦ,

αἱ δὲ οἱ καὶ ἐπεὶτα φῶνας καὶ μοῖρα γένοντο,

ἐπεὶ δὲ Δίδος ἔνδο αἴκετο καρπέρομυθον,

φῶθ' Ἡρακλῆα, μεγάλων ἑπιστορά ἐργαν,

ὅτι μὲν ἐνεῖον ἐντά κακέταν ὡς ἐν οἴκοις,

ἂν τὸν αἰδὼν ἔξεσται ἔνδο τράπεζαν,

τὴν ἦν οἱ παρέθηκεν ἐξείτα δὲ πέφυ ναι αὐτὸν,

ἐποὺς δ' αὐτὸς ἔχει κρατερώνχας ἐν μεγάροις.

τὰς ἔρεων 'Οδυσσηίς συνήντετο, δὸκε δὲ τὸ βοῦν,

τὸ πρὶν μὲν β' ἐφόρει μέγας Ἐδρυτος, αὐτὰρ ὥ παιδὶ καλλιοτείτο σοφοῦντων ἐν δῶμασιν ὑψηλῶν,

τῷ δ' 'Οδυσσεὺς ἐξέθες ὥς καὶ ἀλλιοῦν ἐγχος ἐδώκειν,
21. ΟΔΗΣΕΙΑΣ Φ

35 ἀρχὴν ξεινοσύνης προσκήδεως οὖν τραπέζῳ
gνάτην ἀλλήλων πρὶν γὰρ Δία σῶς ἐπεφευρ
"Ιφιτὸν Ἑὐρυτίδην, ἐπείκελον ἄθανάτοις,
ὅτε οἰ τόξον ἔδωκε. τὸ δὲ ποτὲ δίος Ὀδυσσεὺς
ἐρχόμενος πτέλεμόνδε μελαινῶν ἐπὶ ηθῶν
ἡμείς, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν μὴμα ξεινοίο φιλοί
kέσκετ' ἐνι μεγάροις, φόρει δὲ μὴν ἦσεν γαϊής.

Ἡ δὲ θεᾶς τάλαμον τὸν ἀφίκετο διὰ γυναικῶν,
οὖν τε ὁ ἀντίκαι τούτο προσέβαλε, τὸν ποτὲ τέκτων
ξέσενεν ἐπισταρίεσι καὶ ἐπὶ στάθην θύουν,
ἐν δὲ σταθμὸς ἄρσε, ὥρας δ' ἐπέδηκε φαινόμεν.
αὐτίκα δὲ γ' ἢμάντα θους ἀπέλυεν κορώνης,
ἐν δὲ κλῆσθ' ἤκε, θυρεάν δ' ἀνέκατεν ὁχήμα
ἀντα τιτυσκομένης: τὰ δ' ἀνέβαξεν ἥτε ταύρος
βοσκόμενος λεμών: τὸν' ἔβραξε καλὰ òφεῖτα
πληγέντα κληθ', ἐπάθησαι δὲ ολὸς ὅκαι.

ἡ δ' ἐφ' ὡς ὑψηλὴς σκείλος βι' ἐνθ' ἐιθα δε χηλοί

35 παμπτήσεις P: εἰσηγήσεις U. 36 ἀλλήλων G al.: ἀλλήλων vulg., ep. 23. 109. 41 θυρεάτ' G F al. 42 τῶν om. F P: ἐν U, v.l. in K. 46 κορώνη G P, v.l. ap. Μακε. 42. τὸν 'that' chamber, viz. the one described in l. 8. But this use of the article is hardly defensible. The reading ἄρσε is attractive, but has little MS. support. The omission of τῶν in two good MSS, suggests the conjecture ἀντίκαι ἀριστερὰ (so Nanck). 43. ὀξὺθερμὸς is perhaps used here in the general sense of 'wooden.' οξὺθερ is etymologically the same word as 'tree,' and originally had an equally wide meaning. 46-48. The bar or bolt (ὀξὺθερμοῦ), which was on the inside of the door, was drawn from the outside by means of a thong (ἰμίας) passing through a hole or slit in the door. Cp. 4. 802, where the vision came into the chamber παρὰ κληρον ἱμίας. After the door was bolted the thong was fastened to a knob or handle (κορώνης) on the outside. The 'key' (κλῆς) was a curved instrument with a handle (ll. 6-7). When the door was opened from without the key was passed through the aperture (which of course fitted in size and shape), and was so directed or 'aimed' (ἐνα ἁμαρτουμένη) as to thrust back (ἀμαρτουμένη) the bolts. Before this was done it was necessary to unfasten the thong from the knob. It does not appear why the thong was so fastened: it could not add much to the security of the door. But it would serve to prevent the door being opened from within. The κορώνη was also used as a handle to pull the door to (1. 441 ὁρείμα ἐκάρμος σωμάτων ἄργυρη). On other points, especially the double sense of κλῆς, see the note on 1. 441-442. Cp. also l. 241 (infra). 48. τά, neut. in anticipation of καλὰ θύρας, the words ήτα... ἔβραξε being of the nature of a parenthesis. The breaking of the lock reminds us that it has not been opened for a long time. 49. τῶν, adv. 'so loud.' 51. σκείλος, generally explained as a dais or stage on which the chests were
placed, to raise them above the earthen floor of the room. Mr. Myres thinks it probable that the room, being upstairs, had a wooden floor, and that the word σαλία 'boarding' refers to this floor. The mention of it, he thinks, is a 'sound-note': the ring of Penelope's steps as she reaches the boarding forms a characteristic touch in the description.

61. ἵγιον is ἰγαθικὸν: it is said by the ancients to be a box for holding ἰγιάς, i.e. barbs for arrowheads. The explanation seems improbable, and is evidently a mere inference from this passage. Perhaps, as Döderlein suggested (Isthm. Glass. 2999), it is from the root ἰγειν- 'to carry;' and means a box or 'tray' for carrying things.

62. ἀφέλλα, as in 1. 4. It does not mean that the iron and bronze (i.e. the axes &c.) had been won as prizes.

63-66, = 1. 332-335: see on 16. 414.

69. ἀρχαίος 'have set on, assembled'; cp. π. 21. 369 ἦσον βὸν ἱερα κυρίαν, ἀρχαίος is an inf. of purpose (cp. π. 24. 212 τοῦ ἐγενέσθαι δὴ ἱερά ἱερα ἱερα lówmen, and governs δόμα, 'have set on to eat up this house.

71. μάθειν ἵμαχος ὅτι 'the offering, putting forward, of a word,' i.e. a plea in defence of their conduct. Cp. Ηδί. 6. 133 τοῦτο μὲν δὴ ἐνώπιον λάχου δόμα (λάχης = Homeric μάθει).
21. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Φ

ἀλλ' ἀγετε, μνηστήρες, ἐπεὶ τὸδε φαίνετ' ἔθελον
θῆσον γὰρ μέγα τὸξον 'Οδυσσής θείου
δὲ δὲ κε ρήτατι ἐντανώθη βιῶν ἐν παλάμησι
καὶ διοίστεθη επελέκεις δυοκαίδεκα πάντων,
τῷ κεν ἄµε ἐποίησε, νοσφοσαμένη τόδε δῶμα
κοῦριδιν, μᾶλα καλὸν, ἐνόσλειον βιότοιο,
tοῦ ποτε μεμήνεσθαι δώμαι ἐν περ ὀνείρῳ.

"Ως φάτο, καὶ δ' Ἐδμαιον ἄναγει, διὸν ὄφορθην,
τὸξον μνησάθρευς βέμεν πολιὸν τε πίθηρον.
δακρύσας δ' Ἐδμαιον ἐδέξατο καὶ κατέθηκε:
κλαῖε δὲ βουκόλου ἄλλοθ', ἐπεὶ θεὶ τὸξον ἀνακτος.
'Αντίνωσο δ' ἐνείμην ἔκος τ' ἐφατ' ἐκ τ' ὅψιμας:
"νήπιοι ἀγροῦμαται, ἐφ' ἡμέρα φρονέωντες,
ἀ δεῖλα, τι νῦ δάκρυ κατεβητον ὅδε γυναῖκι
θυμῶν ἐνι στήθεσιν ὀρίνετον; ἢ τε καὶ ἄλλος
κεῖται ἐν ἀλγείς θυμός, ἐπεὶ φίλον ἄλλος ἄκοτὴν.
ἀλλ' ἀκένων δαίμους καθέμενοι, ἢ ἥθεραξ
κλαῖον ἐξελόντε, κατ' αὐτόθι τόξα λισόντε,
μνηστήρεις ἔθελον ἀδατον οὐ γὰρ ὄδο
ρηθὶδας τὸδε τὸξον ὀξόν ἐντανύσωσθαι.
οὐ γὰρ τις μέτα τοῖσ ἀνὴρ ἐν τολοθεῖ πάσιν
οὸς 'Οδυσσεὺς ἐσκεν ἐγὼ δὲ μὴν αὐτός ὑποπα,
καὶ γὰρ μνήμων εὔας, παῖς δ' ἔτι νήπιος ἡ.

"Ως φάτο, τῷ δ' ἄρα θυμῶν ἐνι στήθεσιν ἐώπει
νευρὴν ἐντανών διοίστεσθεν τε σιδῆρου.

ἡ τοι ὅπτοι γε πρῶτος γεύσεσθαι ἔμελλεν

82 ἄλλοθ' G: ἄλος F P H al. (toιοθέτει) F X U al.
73. ἐσάι πτλ. The apodosis is left
to be understood. 'Since this prize is
open to you—for I will offer the bow
&c.—(come and join in the contest).'
See the note on 15. 80.
74. Ἐθέλαν 'prize,' viz. the hand of Pene-
lope, as she proceeds to explain: cp. 106-107 Ἐθέλαν, αθ οὐν (ἐκ θετικοῦ).
78-79. = 19. 577-578.
85. This line is an exclamatory like
the Virgilian O fortunatos &c. The
speech addressed to Eumaeus and the
ox-herd begins with & διαλέο, in the
next line.
89. ἀκάθων. The indeclinable use of
this word has seemingly not been ex-
plained. East mentions the variant
ἄλλα καὶ ἅ, which is plausible.
91. ἀκαθόρασ, from ἀκάθορ (Homeric
form of ἀθρο), with irregular ἀ- for ἀν-
ἐκ χειρῶν Ὀνυθὸς ἀμύμονος, δι τὸν ἄτιμα
ημενος ἐν μεγάροις, ἐπί θ' ἀρνυν πάντας ἐταίρους.
τοις δὲ καὶ μετείχει περὶ Ἡ τηλεμάχου.
"α δίκαιοι, ἡ μάλα με Ζεὺς ἀφρόνα θήκε Κρονίων
μήτηρ μέν μοι φησί φίλη, πινυτή περ ἔσορα,
ἀλλ' ἂμ' ἐψεσθαι νοσφησαμενή τοῦ τάβρα
αὐτῷ ἐγώ γελῶ καὶ τέρπομαι ἀφρόνι θυμόν.
ἀλλ' ἄγετε, μοντῆρες, ἐπεὶ τὸδε φανεί ἀέθλουν,
οἶν νῦν οὐκ ἔστι γυνὴ κατ' Ἀχαιῶν γαῖαν,
οὔτε Πύλου λερῆς οὔτε 'Ἀργείως οὔτε Μυκῆνης
[οὔτ'] αὐτῆς 'Ἰθάκης οὔτ' ἡπείρου μελανής']
καὶ δ' αὐτοὶ τὸ γε ὅστε· τί με χρή μὴτέρος ἄινον;
ἀλλ' ἄγε μὴ μύνῃς· παρέλκετε μηδ' ἐτ' τὸδου
δηρὸν ἀποτραπάσθε ταυτότων, ὀφρα θ' θαμεν.
καὶ δ' κεν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τοῦ τὸδου πειρησαμὴν·
ei δε κεν εντανὸν διώτατον τε σιδήρου,
οδ' κε μοι ἄχνυμεν τάδε δῶματα πότνια μήτηρ
λεπτοὶ ἂμ' ἀλλ' ἰδον', δ' ἐγὼ κατοπίσθε λυπολήν
οἶδ' τ' ἡδη πατρὸς δέθλια κάλ' ἀνελέοσθαι·
"Η καί ἄπ' ἄμοιν χαίαν ἥθεν φοινικέσαν
όρθος ἀναίξας, ἀπὸ δὲ ἑίφων ἀξὶ δέτ' ἄινον.
προτὸν μὲν πελέκεας στῆσεν, διὰ τόφον ὄρβεας

99 δ' σον' P Eust. 105 ἐγὼ γελῶ vulg.: ἕγω γ' ἢσω F: ἕγω ἢσω M.
109 om. Ῥ ὜ M U. 110 τοῦ γε 1 (Vind. 5): τοῦς F U: τοῦ γ' G P H al.

privative; hence 'not admitting ἄτμο, '
'to be done mischief to, 'un-
impeachable' or 'decisive': cp. 22. 5,
Il. 14. 271. See Buttmann, Lexil. s. v.
100. For ἡμενος Wilamowitz con-
jectures ἡμον, comparing l. 424 ob æ' o' ἐφοιν ἐπὶ μεγαροιν ἀλλῆγε ἡμενος.
106-107. 'Since there is offered this
prize, namely a woman, whose like is
not in the Achaean land.'

111. μύνη appears to mean 'with
excuses, pretext.' If μύνη is connected
with δ-μύνω it may mean 'a defence,'
a way of parrying or evading. It is not
otherwise known.

παράδεισε 'play false,' 'trick': cp.
18. 382 παράδεισον—'gained by a trick.'
The meaning is mainly given by the
preposition, as in Attic παρακροσώμει,
παρακοκτονεί, &c.

112. ἀντοποπάθθε, better ἀντοπο-
pάθθε, a frequentative: cp. 16. 405.,
19. 521.
115. ob κε μοι ἄχνυμεν can only
mean 'I should not be vexed if &c.'
This interpretation is confirmed by the
clause δ' ἐγὼ κατατ. 'if I were left
behind (i. e. seeing that I should remain
here) able to take up my father's con-
test.'

120 ff. It has been a matter of
doubt whether the row of axes was set
21. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Φ

πάσι μίαν μακρὴν, καὶ ἐπὶ στάθμην ἠθυνέν, ἀμφὶ δὲ γαίαν ἐναξε· τάφος δ' ἦλε πάντας ἱδότας, ὡς εὐκόσιμος στῆσε· πάρος δ' ὑπὸ πῶς ποτ' ὡπάσει. στῆ δ' ἀρ' ἐπὶ οὐδὲν Ἰὼν καὶ τέξου πειρήτιζε.

τρίς μὲν μῖν πυλέμιζεν ἐρώσεοταὶ μενείαν, τρίς δὲ μεθηκε βῆς, ἐπιελπὰμενος τὸ γε θυμῷ, νευρὴν ἐνταῦθας διαστεόσεως τε σιδήρου.

καὶ νῦ κε δὴ β' ἐπάνωσε βῆς τὸ τέταρτον ἀνέλκων, ἀλλ' Ὅδυσεν ἀνέφευ καὶ ἔσχεθαν ἕμεθεν περ.

τοῖς δ' αὐτίς μετέειπ' ἑρῆ ὡς Τηλεμάχου-

"ἀ δέ πόποι, ἣ καὶ ἑπείτα κακὸς τ' ἐσομαι καὶ ἄκις, ἦν νεατονίς εἰμὶ καὶ ὑπὸ τω χεροὶ πέποιθα

ἀνδρ' ἀπαύγασθαί, διὸ τις πρότερος χαλεπῆν.

ἀλλ' ἀγεθ', οἱ περ ἐμεῖα βῆς προφερέστεροι ἐστε, τέξου πειρήσασθε, καὶ ἐπεκλέωμεν ἄεθλον."

"Πο ψεύτων τέξον μὲν ἀπὸ ὑδὴ καραῖοκε, κλίνας κολλητήσιν ἐξετοτις σανίδεσιν, αὐτοὶ δ' ὑπὸ βέλος καλὴ προσέκλινε κορώνη, ἀψ δ' αὐτίς κατ' ἀρ' ἐζετ' ἐπὶ πόλιν ἐνθὲν ἀνέστη.

τοῖς δ' Ἀντίνοος μετέφη, Εὐπείδθεος νῦσ-

"δρυνοθ' ἔξεις ἐπὶδέξαμεν τάντας ἢταῖροι, ἀρέμαυνος τοῦ χάρου δθεν τ' ἐπιοικοδομεῖν."

"Ως έφαι' Ἀντίνοος, τοῖς δ' ἐπιήνυον μῦθοι."

132 ἠθύνον] Ἀχαίων Ἐ.Μ., αἰ.: cp. 3.372 ἄρμιθος δ' ἐνο πάντας ἱδότας ('Ἀχαίων Ἐ.Μ.), and 24.441 ἄρμιθος ἰσιντον οὐκτας ἱδότας Ἀχαίων Λ. 

133 διεισς εἰς θείος 

134 τ' ἐπιοικοδομεῖν (-ει) F X U J: τὸ περ οἰκοδομεῖν vulg.

up within the μέγαρον, or outside in the σῶλ. The question is surely settled in favour of the former alternative by the procedure described, and especially by the repeated formula ὅπ' αὐτίς κτλ. (l. 139, 166). The Suitors were to try in turn, according to the order in which they sat, counting from left to right. Each was to go to the threshold, make his effort with the bow, and return to his seat. Moreover, it is while this is proceeding that Ulysses goes out and reveals himself to Eumaeus and the near-herd, unseen by any of the company in the μέγαρον (l. 239). And when Antinous proposes to leave the axes standing till the next day, it is because no one will come to the μέγαρον and take them up (l. 262).

The floor of the μέγαρον was not paved or boarded, but was of earth trodden hard (γαῖαν ἐναξε, l. 122): cp. 22.455.

125. = Il. 21. 176, where πυλέμιζεν is used of the effort of pulling out a spear that has been stuck in the ground. Here the word does not seem to be quite so appropriate.
Δεινόθες δὲ πρῶτος ἀνίστατο, ὦνομος υἱός, ὁ σφί θυσσεῖος ἐσκε, παρὰ κρητῆρα δὲ καλὸν ἰτε μιχαλτατος αἰέν' ἀτασθαλίαν δὲ οἱ ὀφρ' ἔχθραι ἔσαν, πάσιν δὲ νεμέοσα μνηστήρεσσιν δὲ βα τότε πρῶτος τόξον λάβε καὶ βέλος ἄκα. στὴ δ' ἄρ' ἐν' ὀδὴν ἱδὼν καὶ τόξον πειρήτθεν, οὐδὲ μιν ἐντάνυσε· πρὶν γὰρ κάμε χειρὰς ἄνελκων ἀτριπτοὺς ἀπαλάς· μετὰ δὲ μνηστήριον ἔπιπεν· "ἀ φίλοι, οὐ μὲν ἐγὼ ταῦτα, λαβέτω δὲ καὶ ἄλλοις. πολλοὺς γὰρ τόδε τόξον ἀριστήςας κεκαθῆσει θυμοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς, ἐπεὶ ἡ πολὺ φέρτερον ἐστὶ τεθάμεν ἡ ζωντας ἀμαρτείν, οὖθ' ἐνεκ' αἰεὶ ἐνθάδε ὀμιλέομεν, ποτιδέγμενοι ἡμᾶς πάντα. νῦν μὲν τις καὶ ἔπετ' ἐνὶ φρεσκὶ ἡδὲ μενούμι γῆμαι Πηνελόπειαν, Ὁδυσσείας παράκοιτων. αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν τόξου πειρήσεται ἡδὲ ἑιδηταί, ἀλλοι δὴ τιν' ἐπείτα Ἀχαιάδων εὐπέπλων μνάσθω εἴδουσιν διξήμενος· ἡ δὲ κ' ἐπείτα γῆμαιθ' δὲ κε πλεῖστα πόροι καὶ μόρσιμος ἔλθοι." "οι δ' ἐφώνησεν καὶ ἀπὸ ἐν τόξον ἐθηκε, κλίνας κολλητῆσας εὐξέστης σανίδεσθαι, αὐτὸν δ' ὀκύ βέλος καλῇ προσέκλινε κορώνη, ἀν' δ' αὐτὸς καὶ ἄρ' ἔγετε· ἐπὶ ὄρνου ἐνθαν ἄνεσθη. 'Ἀντίνοος δ' ἐνένιπτεν ἐπος τ' ἔφατ' ἐκ τ' ὀνυμάζει· "Δειῶδες, ποῖον σε ἐπος φύγειν ἐρκὸς ὀδόντων, δεινὸν τ' ἄργαλεόν τε,—νεμεσοῦμαι· δε τ' ἀκούων,— εἰ δὴ τοῦτο γε τόξον ἀριστῆςας κεκαθῆσει ὑμοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς, ἐπεὶ οὐ δύνασαι σὺ ταῦτασαι. οὐ γὰρ τοι σὲ γε τοῖον ἐγείνατο πότινα μῆτηρ

144 ὁμοιὸς Ὕψος ἔγκειται ὁ ἔλθοι εἰς Φ Μ al. 162 δι κο] δι τὸς Ἐ Υ χ Φ al. (ε.π. 16.392). 163 ἀπειρί λευκή Φ Μ al. 165 προσελπεῖ σπίτιντειν metri causa.

153. The prediction here put into the mouth of Leides is to be fulfilled in a manner which was very far from his thoughts. For other examples of this dramatic effect see 17.355. Here it is especially in place, since Leides was a θυσσεῖος, and as such had the gift of prophecy.
οὖν τε μυηρά βιοῦ τ' ἥμεναι καὶ δοτῶν δὲ ἀλλ' ἀλλοι τανύουσι τάχα μνηστήρες ἄγανοι."

"Ως φάτο, καὶ β' ἐκέλευσε Μελάνθιον, ἀιτώλων αἰγῶν·

"ἀγρει δή, πῦρ κῆν ἐνὶ μεγάροις, Μελανθῆθ, πὶ δὲ τίθει δίφρον τε μέγαν καὶ κῶς ἐπ' αὐτῶ, ἐκ δὲ στέατος ἔνεικε μέγαν τροχὸν ἐνδόν ἐόντος, ὑφυρε νέου βαλλοντες, ἐπιχριστεὶς ἀλουφῆ, τὸν ἐπιρόμεσεν καὶ ἐκτελέσεμεν ἑδολ." 180

"Ως φάθ', δ' αἱ' ανέκαιε Μελάνθιος ἀκάματον πῦρ,

πὶ δὲ φέραν δίφρον θήκεν καὶ κῶς ἐπ' αὐτῶ, ἐκ δὲ στέατος ἔνεικε μέγαν τροχὸν ἐνδόν ἐόντος

τῷ ὑφυρε νέου βαλλοντες ἐπερῴετ' οὖν ἐδόκαντο ἐνταύσαι, πολλὸν δὲ βής ἐπιδεικεὶς ἦσαν. 185

'Αντίνοος δ' ἐτ' ἐπείχε καὶ Εὐρομάχος θεοείδης,

ἀρχολ μνηστήρων ἀρετῆς δ' ἔσαν ἔχον' ἀριστοῖ.

τῷ δ' ἐξ οἴκων βήκαν ὁμαρτήσαντες αἱ' ἀμφοὶ

βουκόλος ἦδεν συνφορβὸς 'Οδυσσῆος θελοῦ

ἐκ δ' αὐτῶς μετὰ τῶν δύμων ἠλυθε διὸς 'Οδυσσεύς. 190

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ β' ἐκτός θυρέων ἔσαν ἦδεν καὶ αὐλῆς,

φθεγξάμενος σφ' ἐπέσεσα προπυθία μελιχαίοις' 195

"βουκόλε καὶ σύ, συνφορβέ, ἐπος τί κε μυθησάμην,

ἡ αὐτος κεῦβο; φᾶσθαι δὲ με θυμὸς ανέγει.

ποιοὶ κ' εἶ. 'Οδυσσῆ' ἀμνέμεν, εἰ ποθὲν ἔλθοι

181 φάθ', δ' αἱ' Γ Χ Υ: φάτο, αἵρα δ' Φ Η Μ al. 188 ἀμαρτήσαντες] ἀμ- F U al.: ἀμ- Ar. G Η H. Ar. probably wrote ἀμ- (La Roche, H. T. 189).


173. οὖν τε... ἐμαυα. For the use of ἐος with an inf. cp. 19. 160; and see H. G. § 235.

178. Either στώτος is scanned as a dissyllable (ἐν synizesis), or the vowel before στ- is allowed to be short, as in the case of Ἀκάμαρθος, Ζώανθος, &c.

186. The fresh paragraph should begin here, not with l. 188: for the meaning is that while Antinous and Eurymachus were still busy with the bow, Ulysses took the opportunity to steal out and make himself known to the two faithful servants. Hence the impf. ἐνέχει followed by the sor. βήκαν. ὁμαρτήσαντες "held on," "persisted": as we say, "kept at it." This interpretation, given in Ebeling's Lexicon, suits the context best. Most commentators take it to mean "waited," "restrained" from trying. But when ἐνέχει has this sense it is generally more clear what is the process or action that is stopped.
όδε μάλ’ ἐξαπλύση καὶ τις θεὸς αὐτὸν ἐνεικαί;
ἡ θεοτήτισσαν ἀμύνοντ’ ἡ Ὀδυσσὴ;
eἰπάθ’ διὸς ὑμᾶς κραδή θυμὸς τε κελεύει.”

Τὸν δ’ αὐτὸ προσέεις βοῶν ἐπιστολῆς ἀνήρ;
“Ζεῦ πάτερ, αἷ γαρ τούτῳ τελευτήσεις έέλθωρ,
ός ἐλθοί μὲν κείσων ἀνήρ, ἀγάγοι δέ εἰ δαίμονις
γνωθις χ’ οὖν ἐμὴ δύναμις καὶ χεῖρες ἐστονται.”

“Ὡς δ’ αὕτως Εδμαίος ἐπεύχετο παῖς θεοῦς
νοστῆσαι Ὀδυσσῆα πολύφρονα διδὲ δύσμαι.
αὐτῷ ἐπεῖ δὴ τῶν γε νῦν νημερτε’ ἀνέγου,
ἐξαίτις σφ’ ἐπέέσεσιν ἀμείβομενος προσέειπεν.
“ἐνδον μὲν δὴ δὴ αὐτὸς ἐγώ, κακὰ πολλὰ μογῆςας
ἥλθον ἑκικόστη ἐτεί ἐσ πατρίδα γαίαν.
γιγνώσκω δ’ ὡς σφαῖν ἐπελθομένοισιν ἱκάνω
οἰοι διόμων τῶν δ’ ἄλλων οὖ τεν ἄκουσι
ἐφαμένου εμὲ αὐτὶς ὑπότροπον ὅκαδ’ ἱκέσθαι.
σφαῖν δ’, ὡς ἐστεῖ περ, ἀληθείας καταλέξω.
eἰ χ’ ὑπ’ ἔμοιγε θεὸς δαμάση μυστήρας αγανοῦ,
ἀξομαί ἀμφότεροι ἀλόχους καὶ κτήματ’ ἐπέσω
οἰκία τ’ ἐγγύς ἐμείο τετυγμένα καὶ μοι ἐσεῖτα.

Τηλεμάχουν ἐτάρον τε καστιγνήτω τε ἑσεῖσθώ.
eἰ δ’ ἄγε δὴ καὶ σήμα ἀμφράδες ἄλλο τε δείξω,
ὄφρα μ’ ἐν γνώτον πιστωθῆτον τ’ ἐνι θυμῷ,
οὐλήν, τὴν ποτὲ με σὺς ἤλασε λευκῷ ὀξύτι
Παρνησσόνθ’ ἐλθόντα σὺν νιάσιν Ἀιτωλίκου.”

“Ὡς εἰπόν πάκεα μεγάλης ἀπόεργαθέν οὐλῆς.
τὸ δ’ ἐπεῖ εἰσιδεῖτυ εἰ τ’ ἐφράσαστο ἐκαστα
κλαῖον ἄρ’ ἀμφ’ Ὀδυσσῆι δαίφρον χείρε βαλέντε,

203 ἐπεύχετο G al. 206 μὴν εὐσείσον F M. 208 Ὕλον εὐσεβότις M : ἀλόχον
eὐσεβότις vulg.: see on 16. 206. 211 εἰ ποικὰ ὑπότροπον αὐτὶς λατεσθεὶς Fick.
213 αἰ G F P H U al. 219 μὲ] μοι G al. 220 μὲ’ (is G) Ἀιτωλίκου η
cαὶ ὡς Ἐστι Ευστ. 222 ἐκαστα] ἐκαστα L W, v. 1. in M. 223 Ὀδυσσῆ
δαίφρον G Eust.

196, 136 μάλ’ ἡσαίνη ‘just sudd-
denly,’ see on 17. 447, 544. 201, = 17. 243.
202—204, = 20. 237—239.
καὶ κόνεον ἀγαπαζόμενοι κεφαλήν τε καὶ ὅμοιος.

δός δ᾽ αὐτῶς Ὀδυσσέας κεφαλᾶς καὶ χείρας ἐκυσσε. 225
καὶ νῦ κ᾽ ὀδυρομένωσιν ἐδώ φάος ἰέλλοιο, εἰ μὴ Ὀδυσσέας αὐτὸς ἐρύκακε φώνησέν τε: "παύεσθον κλαυθμοῖο γύοιο τε, μή τις ἴδητι ἐξελθὼν μεγάρωι, ἀτὰρ εἴπησι καὶ εἶσο.

αλλὰ προμηντινοί ἐσέλθετε, μηδ᾽ ἀμα πάντες, 230 πρῶτος ἐγὼ, μετὰ δ᾽ ὅμμες· ἀτὰρ τόδε σήμα τετῦχων. ἀλλοί μὲν γὰρ πάντες, δοσὶ μυστήρες ἀγανοί, οὐκ ἔλασσον ἐμοὶ δόμηνα βιών ἢ δὲ φαρέτρην. ἀλλὰ σύ, δι᾽ Ἐὔμαι, φέρων ἀνὰ δόματα τόξον ἐν χείρεσιν ἐμοὶ δέμεναι, εἰπεῖν τε γυναῖκι 235 κληρίςει μεγάρωι θύρας πυκνῶς ἀραγιᾶς, ἢν δὲ τις ἡ στοναχῆς ἡ κτύπων ἐνδον ἀκοῦσῃ ἀνθρῶπος ἠμετέρωσιν ἐν ἐρκεσί, μή τι θύραξ προβλάσκειν, ἀλλ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐκήν ἐμεναι παρὰ ἐργῳ. σοὶ δέ, Φιλότει δие, θύρας ἐπιτελλομαι αὐλῆς 240 κληρίςει κληρίςει, θώς δ᾽ ἐπὶ δεσμὸν ἤλιαι." "Ως εἰπὼν εἰσῆλθε δόμους εἰ ναιετάοντας· ἔτερ᾽ ἐπεῖτ᾽ ἐπὶ δέφρον ὅδων ἐνθὲν περ ἀνέστη. εὲ δ᾽ ἄρα καὶ τὸ δρῶς ἤσθην θείου 'Ὀδυσσέας.

Εὐρώμαχος δ᾽ ἕδη τόξον μετὰ χερσὶν ἑνώμα, 245 βάλτωσιν ἐνθα καὶ ἑνθα σέλα πυρὸς. ἀλλὰ μιν οὐδ᾽ ἀς ἑνταύνουσι δύνατο, μέγα δ᾽ ἐστενε κυνάλμων κηρ. ὀχυράς δ᾽ ἄρα εἰπεῖν ἐποὺς τ᾽ ἐφατ᾽ ἐκ τ᾽ ὀνόματεν'

224 χειρός τε καὶ ὅμοιος Μα.: κεφαλῆς τε χέρας τε Χ. 229 εἰσὼν] ἄλλως Α. G, cp. 22, 373. 233 οὗ μοι ἐδάσωσιν Ρ. Knight. 244 διῳδες ἤσθην Ρ: διῳδες Η. D al. 248 εἴπε πρὸς ἐν μεγαλήτορα δωμῶν Τ Ψ Η al.

230. προμηντίνοι 'one after another' (11.323): the opposite of ἄγχυστοι "close together." The two words are formed as if from abstract nouns, viz. προμηντίνοι and ἄγχυστοι: cp. ἄντησις (20.387).

231. The sense is: 'Let this be made the sign, namely (γάρ) the refusal of the Suitors to allow the bow to be given to me.' When this took place (285-358) Eumaeus was to bring the bow and give it to Ulysses (so 369 ff.).

236. μεγάρωι. If this means the great hall, we must suppose a second door, opposite to the main entrance, and leading to the women's quarters. Otherwise the μέγαρον of the women is meant. See the Appendix on the Homeric house.

243. δέφρον, the same as the δέφρον - δεκάλιοι which Ulysses placed by the door (20.259).

II. P
210 ΟΔΣΣΕΙΑΣ Φ

"... ὁ τόπος, ἢ μοι ἄχος περὶ τ' αὐτοῦ καὶ περὶ πάντων
οὗ τι γάμου τοσσοῦτον ὀδύρομαι, ἄχνυμενὸς περ'...
εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ Ἀχαϊδες, αἱ μὲν ἐν αὐτῇ ἀμφιάλῳ Ἰθάκῃ, αἱ δ' ἀλλὰς πολλέσσιν.
ἄλλ' εἰ δὴ τοσσοῦν βής ἐπιδεύεσθε εἴμεν ἀντίθεου Ὀδυσσῆος, δ' τ' οὐ δυνάμεσθα τανύσσαι
τόξου ἐλεγχεῖν δὲ καὶ ἑσσομένοις πυθέσθαι." 255

Τὸν δ' αὐτ' Ἀντίνοος προσέφη, Ἐὔπειθεος νῦσσ.
"Εὐρύμαχ', οὐχ οὐτως ἔσται νοεῖς δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς.

νῦν μὲν γὰρ κατὰ δήμον ἐρτῇ τοῖο θεόο
ἀγνή' τις δὲ κε τόξα τιταίνει', ἄλλα ἔκχει
κάθετε'. ἀτὰρ πελέκεις γε καὶ εἰ κ' εἴῳμεν ἄπαντας 260
ἐστάμεν οὐ μὲν γὰρ τιν' ἀναίρῃσθαι δῶ, ἐλθόντι εἰς μέγαρον Δαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσσῆος.

ἄλλ' ἄγετ', οὐνοχὸς μὲν ἐπαρξάσθω δεπάσσων,


260 εἴῳμεν] originally ἐκώμεν: εἰ- is only correct in augmented forms.
263 ἄγετ'] originally ἄγε, as in 1. 281.
274 τοῖσι δὲ D L W: τοῖσι U3.

258. ἐρτῇ, viz. the 'new moon,' see on 14. 162., 20. 156.
260. ἐρτῇ, sc. Apollo (20. 276-278).
260. εἰ κ' εἴῳμεν. The apodosis is not expressed, but is suggested by ἐστάμεν: 'if we leave them to stand (they will)' The form of the sentence is like 15. 80 εἰ δ' ἑόλαῖς τραφήγαι (see the note): see also on 4. 388 (where the first of the two explanations given is the better one), and 17. 483.
263. See on 18. 418.
267-268. ἐπαρξάσθω is used here with meaning. The sacrifice to Apollo, god of the bow, will properly come before a contest with the bow.
270-272. = 3. 338-340. See the note on ἐπαρξάσθων (3. 340).
21. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΛΑΣ Φ

"κεκλυτέ μεν, μνηστήρες ἀγακλειτῆς βασιλεῖς: [δῆρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνί στήθεσοι κελεύει]
Εὐφράμαχον δὲ μάλιστα καὶ Ἀντίνου θεοειδέα λίσσομ', ἐπεὶ καὶ τόσο ἐπος κατὰ μοίραν ἐείπε, νῦν μὲν παῦσαι τὸβον, ἐπιτρέψαι δὲ θεοσίων ἡθένει δὲ θεός δώσει κράτος δ' κ' ἐθέλησιν.
αλλ' ἄγε ἔμοι δότε τὸβον ἔδουσ' δφρα μεθ' ὑμῖν χειρῶν καὶ σθένος πειρήσομαι, ἡ μοι ἐτ' ἐστὶν ἵς, οἰν' πάρος ἐσκεν ἐνὶ γναμπτοῦσι μέλεσσιν, ἡ ἥμη μοι δέωσεν ἀλη τ' ἀκομιστή τε." 285

"Ως ἠφαθ', οί δ' ἄρα πάντες ὑπερφιάλως νεμέσθησαν, δείσαντες μὴ τὸβον ἔδουσ' ἐνταυψειεν. 'Ἀντίνους δ' ἑνείπετεν ἐπος τ' ἠφαθ' ἐκ τ' ὑσομαχεν: "ἀ δειλέ ἕξειν, ἐνὶ τοι φρένες οὐδ' ἡβαίαι: οὐκ ἀγαπῆς δ' ἐκηλος ὑπερφιάλοισι μεθ' ὑμῖν δαινυσαι, οὗδε τι δαινὸς ἀμέρδεαι, αὐτὰρ ἀκοῦεις μῦθον ἡμετέρων καὶ βήσιος; οὐδὲ τις ἄλλος ἡμετέρων μῦθον ξείνοις καὶ πτώχος ἀκοῦει. οἶνος σε τρώει μελιθής, δς τε καὶ ἄλλους βλάπτει, δς ἄν μιν χανθὸν ἔλη μηδ' ἀλίμα πίνη. οἶνος καὶ Κένταιρον, ἀγακλυτῶν Ἑὐρυτίωνα, δαος' ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ μεγαθύμου Πειρηθοιο, ἐς Δαπίθασ ἐλθονθ'. δ' δ' ἐπεὶ φρένας δασεν οἰνφ, μαύνυμενοι κακ' ἑρεξε δῆμον κατὰ Πειρηθοιο. ἡρωσας δ' ἄχος εἴλε, δικ προθύρου δὲ θύρας ἐλκον ἀναίζαντες, ἀπ' ὀβατα νηλεί χαλκῷ.

286 is wanting in the MSS. It is found in the old editions (Flor. Rom. &c.).
289 σ] δ' F: ὁ δ' P. 296 δασεν εἰν] δασεν F Z.

281. ἄγα, sing. notwithstanding the plur. δόντι: the form ἄλλοις ἄγες having become a mere interjection: cp. 16. 248, 18. 55., 20. 314., 21. 111. 285. ὑπερφιάλως 'beyond measure,' see 18. 71. νεμέσθησαν 'affected indignation': their real feeling was fear.
294. χανθὸν 'open-mouthed' (χαίνω).

296. δασε 'did harm to,' 'impaired.' The word is especially used of mental injury or aberration, as in ll. 297, 301. Hence the middle δασάμεν and passive δασήν 'I was stricken in mind,' = 'I did a senseless thing.' And so ἄγα means originally the mental 'harm' that causes acts of folly.

P 2
21. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Φ

βίναι τ' ἀμήσαντες· ὀ δὲ φρεσὶν ὃσιν ἀσθεῖς
ἥιεν ἦν ἀτὴν ὁχέων ἀετίφροιν θυμῷ.
ἐξ οὖν Κενταύρωι καὶ ἀνδράσι νεῖκος ἐτύχθη,
οἱ δ' αὐτῷ πρότυχε κακὸν εὕρετο οἰνοβαρεῖον.
ἀς καὶ σοὶ μέγα πῆμα πιφαύσκομαι, αἱς κε τὸ τόξον
ἐντανύσῃ· οὐ γὰρ τευ ἐπητῦς ἀντιβολῆσεις
ημετέρῳ ἐνὶ δήμῳ, ἀφαί δὲ σε νηὶ μελανῇ
εἰς "Ἐχεῖν βασιλῆα, βροτῶν δηλήμονα πάντων,
πέμψομεν εὖθεν δ' οὐ τι σαβέσαι· ἄλλα ἐκχέον
πινε τε, μηδ' ἔρπαινε μετ' ἄνδρας κουροτέραιν." 305

Τὸν δ' αὐτὲ προσειπει περίφροιν Πηνελόπεια·
"'Αντίνοι, οὐ μὲν καλὸν ἀτέμβειν οὐδὲ δίκαιον
ξείνους Τηλεμάχου, ὅσ' κεν τάδε ὅμαθ' ἤκηται.
ἐπεικει, αἱς χ' ὅ ξείνος Ἄδυσσησος μέγα τόξον
ἐντανύσῃ χερῶν τε βίηψι τε ἥψι πιθήσας,
οἴκαδε μ' ἄξεσθαι καὶ ἐγὼ θὴσησθαι ἄκοιτιν;
οὐδ' αὐτὸς ποιοῦτό γ' ἐνι στηθέσων ἐσλαπεν
μηδέ τις ῥεῖλων τοῦ γ' οἴνεικα θυμὸν ὁχεῖν
ἐνθάδε δαινύσθω, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδὲ ἔοικεν." 310

Τὴν δ' αὐτῇ Εὐφύμαχος, Πολύθου παῖς, ἀντίνον ἤθην·
"κοῦρη Ἰκαρλείο, περίφροιν Πηνελόπεια,
οὐ τί σε τόδε ἄξιον οἰκεῖν· οὐδὲ ἐοικεν·
ἀλλ' αἰσχυνόμενοι φαῖν ἄνδρῶν ἣδε γυναικῶν,
μὴ ποτὲ τίς ἐπητοι κακώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαϊῶν.
'ἡ πολυ χεῖρον ἄνδρες ἀμύνον ἄνθρω ἄκοιτιν
μνώνται, οὐδὲ τί τόξον ἐσχον ἐντανύον· 315

326 μνώνται δ' F P H U X: μνώνται δ D L W: the original reading was probably μνώντιν.

302. ἀετίφροιν. We expect the form
dαιμοῖροιν, from δαίμων, cp. ταῦτα-μοῖροιν. But δαιμοῖροι may be due to the analogy of
tαμασίχρωσ, ἀλατι-καρπος, ἀλατί-εισοδος, ἀλεγί-πεπλος, &c.
306. ἐπητοιν 'gentleness,' 'courteous treatment': the abstract noun that answers to ἐπητὴς (13. 331, &c.).
312-313, = 20. 294-295.

318. θυμὸν ἄχειν is the logical predicate, the sense being 'let no one of you that feast here vex his soul on that account.'
323. αἰσχυνόμενοι is construed ad.
324. σεσίεσσε; οὐ τι διήμεθα = οὐ τι πράττομεν

313. διήμεθον, 'we do not do so because we think' &c.
21. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Φ

ἀλλ’ ἄλλος τις πτωχὸς ἄνηρ ἀλαλήμενος ἐλθὼν βηθὶδος ἑτάνυσε βιών, διὰ δ’ ἦκε σιδήρου.’
δ’ ἐρέων, ἡμῖν δ’ ἀν ἑλέγχεια ταῦτα γένοιτο.’

Τὸν δ’ αὖτε προσεῖπε περίφροιν Πηνελόπεια:
“Εὐρύμαχ’, οὗ ποις ἐστὶν ἐκκλείας κατὰ δήμουν ἔμμεναι, οἱ δ’ ὅλοιν ἀτιμάζοντες ἔδουσιν ἀνδρὸς ἀριστῆσι: τί δ’ ἑλέγχεια ταῦτα τίθεσθε;
οὕτος δὲ ξείνοις μᾶλα μὲν μέγας ἦδ’ εὐπηγής, πατρὸς δ’ ε’ ἀγαθοῦ γένους εὐχεταὶ ἔμμεναι νῦὸς. ἀλλ’ ἄγε οἱ δότε τόξον ἐνδεικνύον, ὁφρα ἰδομέν.
οὔδε γὰρ ἐνερέω, τὸ δ’ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἐσταὶ εἰ κ’ μὲν ἑντυνόση, δόῃ δ’ οἱ εὐχὸς Ἀπόλλων,
ἐξεῖσα μὲν χλαίναν τε χιτώνα τε, εἰματα καλά,
δῶσι δ’ ἐξ’ ἀκοῦτα, κυνῶν ἀλτήρα καὶ ἀνδρῶν,
καὶ ξίφος ἀμφήκες. δῶσι δ’ ὑπὸ ποσοὶ πέδαλα,
πέμψω δ’ ὅππη μὲν κραδίη θυμὸς τε κελεύει.”

Τὴν δ’ αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένοις ἀντίον ἔθηκα:
“μὴτερ ἐμή, τόξον μὲν Ἀχαῖων οὗ τις ἐμεῖον
κρείσσων, δ’ κ’ ἐθέλω, δῷμεναϊ τε καὶ ἀρνήσασθαι,
οὖθ’ δ’ δοσὶ κραναλή Ἰθάκην κατά κοιρανέουσιν,
οὐθ’ δ’ δοσὶν ἴσοιοι πρὸς Ἐλιδος ἰπποθότῳ,
τῶν οὖ τίς μ’ ἀκοῦτα βιῆσαι αὖ κ’ ἐθέλων
καὶ καθάπαξ εἰνοῦ δῷμενα τάδε τόξα φέρεσθαι.”

335 πατρὸς] ἀνδρὸς F M U Est.
214 21. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Φ

ἀλλ᾽ εἰς οἶκον ἱσθα σὰ τὰ σ᾽ αὐτῆς ἔργα κόμεσε,
λοτόν τ᾽ ἡλικάτην τε, καὶ ἀμφιπόλοις κέλευε ἔργον ἐποίησασι: τόξον δ᾽ ἀνδρεσι μελημεῖ πάσι, μάλιστα δ᾽ ἔμοι τοῦ γὰρ κράτος ἐστ᾽ ἐνι οἶκῷ.

Ἡ μὲν θαμβήσασα πάλιν οἰκόνθε βεβήκει: παιδὸς γὰρ μῦθον πεπνυμένον ἐνθετο θυμόν.

ἐς δ᾽ ὑπὲρφ᾽ ἀναβάσα σὺν ἀμφιπόλοις γυναιξὶ κλαιείν ἐπείτ᾽ Ὀδυσσά, φίλον πόσιν, δόρα οἱ ὑπόν ἢδον ἐπὶ βλεφάροις βάλε γλαυκώπις Ἀθήνα.

Αὐτάρ ὁ τόξα λαβὼν φέρε καμπύλα διὸς ὑφορβός

μυπτήρες δ᾽ ἁρὰ πάντες ὅμκλεον ἐν μεγάροισιν

ἀδε δὲ τις εἵπεσκε νέον ὑπερηνορέοντων.

ππ η δὴ καμπύλα τόξα φέρεις, ἀμέγαρτε συμβάτα, πλαγκτε; τάχ᾽ αὖ σ᾽ ἐφ᾽ ἑσοὶ κῶνες ταχεῖς κατέδονται οἶνον ἀπ᾽ ἀνδρόπων, οὐς ἑτρήσε, εἰ κεν Ἀπόλλων ἦμιν ἱλήπησι καὶ ἀδάνατοι θεοὶ ἀλλοῦ.

Ὡς φάσαν, αὐτάρ ὁ θήκε φέρον αὐτή ἐνι χώρη,

δεῖσας, οὐνέκα πολλοὶ ὅμκλεον ἐν μεγάροισι.

Τῆλεμαχος δ᾽ ἐτέραθεν ἀπειλήσας ἐγεγώνει:

"ἀττα, πρόσω φέρε τόξα: τάχ᾽ οὐκ εἰ πάσι πιθήσεις."
21. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Φ

μή σε καὶ ὀπλητέρως περ ἐδών ἀγρόνθε δίωμαι,
βάλλων χερμαδίους: βίηφή δὲ φέρτερός εἰμι.
αἱ γὰρ πάντων τόσον, δοὺς κατὰ δῶματ' ἐσαι,
μυστήρων χερσίν τε βίηφί τε φέρτερος εἶνη
τῷ κε τάχα στυγερῶς τιν' ἐγὼ πέμψαμι νέεσθαι
ἡμετέρου ἐξ οἶκου, ἐπεὶ κακὰ μηχανώνται.

"Ὤς ἐφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἥδι γέλασαν
μυστήρες, καὶ δὴ μέθιεν χαλεποῦ χόλοιο
Τῃλεμάχῳ τὰ δὲ τόξα φέρων ἀνὰ δώμα συβότης
ἐν χείρεσι' Ὀδυσσῆι δαίφρονι βήκε παραστάς.
ἐκ δὲ καλεσάμενος προσέφη τροφόν Εὐρύκλειαν
"Τῃλέμαχος κέλεται σε, περίφρων Εὐρύκλεια,
κλῆσαι μεγάροι τὸς πυκνῶς ἀραπίζα,
ἡν δὲ τις η στοναχῆς ἢ κτύπου ἐνδον ἀκούσῃ
ἀνδρῶν ἡμετέρους ἐν ἐρκεσι, μὴ τι θύρας
προβλώσκειν, ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς ἀκήν ἐμενα παρὰ ἐργῷ." 385

"Ὡς ἀρ' ἐφόνησεν, τῇ δ' ἄπτερος ἐπλετο μίθος,
κλῆσεν δὲ θύρας μεγάρων εὐν ναεταῦντων.
Σιγὴ δ' εξ οἴκοιο Φιλοτίος ἅλτο θύρας,
κλῆσθαι δἐ ἀρ' ἐπειτα θύρας εὐερκεῶς αὐλῆς.

381 om. F P U Z.

374. The use of πίνα, 'some one,' 'one or another,' really meaning 'every one,' is a sarcastic litote: cp. 13. 394, 427., 22. 67.
377. μιθαιν χόλω 'they let go,' 'relaxed the violence of their anger': the gen. is partitive, as in 11. 21. 177 μεθαίνει βίης. But the acc. is used in the closely similar 11. 1. 283 Ἀχνήνει μιθαιν χόλω τὸν Διὸ, in which the gen. is locative.
382-385. repetition of 236-239.
382. μεγάροι τὸς. This must mean the door of, i.e. leading into, the μέγαρον of the women's apartments. The passage has been thought to favour the view that the μέγαρον of the women was immediately behind the men's hall, and that the door now intended was one at the upper end of the hall, by which the two rooms communicated. Eumaeus, it is argued, was in the hall: if he 'called forth' Eurycleia, he must have done so through such a door. But Eumaeus was with Ulysses at the lower end of the hall, near the main entrance, and could hardly have given his order to Eurycleia from that point without exciting the suspicion of the Suitors. It was much easier for him to go out (as Philoctetus did), and go to the door by which the women's μέγαρον was entered from the οἰλή. On this view there is no argument either for or against the existence of a second door at the upper end of the hall.
388. ἐξ οἴκου 'from an οἶκος,'—probably not the μέγαρον, but one of the buildings that opened into the οἰλή: cp. l. 354. Philoctetus went out σιγῆ, so that the Suitors should not hear him: which would have been useless if they had seen him leave the μέγαρον. But from his οἶκος he could see Ulysses standing in the door-way.
κεῖτο δ’ ὑπ’ αἰλοῦσα ὅπλον νεὸς ἀμφελίσσης.
βύβλιων, δ’ ἐπέδησε θύρας, ἐδ’ ἥγεν αὐτὸς·
ἐζεῖ ἐπεῖτ’ ἐπὶ διόροι λῶν, ἐνθεν περ ἀνέστη,
εἰσορών Ὀδυσσα. δ’ ἥδη τόξων ἑνόμα
πάντη ἀνατροφών, πειρόμενος ἕνα καὶ ἑνά, 
μὴ κέρα ἱπερ ἔδωεν ἀποιχομένου ἀνακτος.

δε δε τις εἰπεσκεν ἱδὼν ἐς πλησίον Ἀλλον—
“ἡ τις θητήρ καὶ ἐπίκλησος ἐπλετο τόξων.
ἡ μά νο πον τοιαῦτα καὶ αὐτῷ οἴκοθε κεῖται,
ἡ δ’ γ’ ἐφορμάται ποιῆσεμεν, ὡς ἐνὶ χερι
νωμα ἐνα καὶ ἑνα κακόν ἐμπαιος ἀλίτειρι”

“Ἀλλοι δ’ αὐτ’ εἰπεσκε νέων ἑπηρένων—
“αἱ γὰρ δὴ τοιοῦτον ὑνησίοις ἀνθιάσεις
ὡς οὐτὸς ποτε τοῦτο δυνηταίεται ἐντανύσα.

‘Ὡς ἄρ’ ἔφαν μνηστήρες ἀτὰρ πολύτερα Ὀδυσσεύς,
αὐτίκ’ ἐπεὶ μέγα τόξων ἐβάστασε καὶ
ὅς δ’ ἀνὴρ φόρμιγγος ἐπιστάμενος καὶ ἄδος,
ῥηθίως ἐτάνυσε νέο περὶ κόλλωτι χροδήν;”

393 διὸ θερ. G. 397 θητήρ] θητήρ X D αl. 400 νωμάν’ F. 407 περὶ
G X U J : ἐνὶ F H al.

390. αἰλοῦσα, sc. over the door-way of the αἰλός, cp. 15. 146.
391. ἐπεὶ ἡμᾶς ‘made fast,’ from ἐπιθ. The preposition ἐπὶ is used of
shutting, as in ἐπιθεῖν (13. 370, II. 5. 751, &c.), ἐπικεκλήμενα σαβίδα (II.
12. 131).
394. ἀνατροφών, see on 17. 97.
395. θεοὶν ‘should eat,’ i.e. should be found eating (or having eaten).
397. θητήρ ‘an admirer,’ ‘fancier’; from θητήμα: in the sense which it has
(c. g.) in the recurring line αὐτόρ εἰνὶ δὴ
πάντα ἡθοσαθια θυμ.
398. ἐπίκλησον ‘cunning about,’ ‘knowing the tricks of the thing,’ cp. II. 22. 281.
The word is used in a good or at least an
indulgent sense: cp. ἀλεπτοσύνη in
19. 396.
399. τοιαύτης: cp. 18. 382 καὶ νῦ τις δοκεῖς
μέγας έμμεναι κτλ.

398. ‘Either he has such bows at
home’ (and therefore is interested in
comparing this one) ‘or he is bent
upon making’ (bows). We need not
suppose (with Aemis) that the Suitors
suspect him of intending to steal the
bow.

400. ξυπάτων seems to mean ‘an
expert in,’ ‘having the command of’: cp.
20. 379. The whole speech is finely
‘ironical’: the Suitors are made to
express suspicions and apprehensions,
but have no idea how much ground
there is for these.

403-403. This again is a piece of
poetical irony. ‘Would that the fellow
(οὗτος) may benefit by it in proportion
as he is sure of being able to string this
bow.’ The speaker means ‘not at all,’
but his wish is fulfilled in the opposite
sense to that which is in his mind.
Note that οὗτος properly belongs to
the former of the two clauses, but is post-
pended in order to bring οὗτος and τοῦτο

398. ‘Either he has such bows at
21. ὌΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Φ

ἀψα ἄμφοτέρωθεν ἑυστρεφές ἐντερον οἶδα,
διὸ σ᾿ ἄρα ἀτερ σπουδὴς τάνυσεν μέγα τόδεν 'Οδυσσεύς:

δεξιτερὴθ' δ᾿ ἄρα χείρι λαβὼν πειρήσατο νευρῆς·

ἡ δ᾿ ὑπὸ καλὸν δεισςε, χειλιδόνι εἰκέλη αὐθὴν.

μνηστηριασθ᾽ δ᾿ ἁρχὸς γένετο μέγα, πᾶσι δ᾿ ἄρα χρῶς
ἐτράπητο. Ζεῦς δὲ μεγάλ᾽ ἐκτυπε, σήματα φαίνον
γῆθησέν τ᾿ ἂρ᾽ ἐπείτα πολύτλας διὸς 'Οδυσσεύς,

ὅτι βὰ οἱ τέρας ἦκε Κρόνου παῖς ἄγκυλομῆτεν·

ἐκεῖτο δ᾿ ὥκον διότειν, δ οἱ παρέκειτο τραπέζῃ

γυμνόν· τοῖ δ᾿ ἄλλοι κολῆς ἐντοσθὲ φαρέτρῃς

κεῖτο, τῶν ταχιὸν ἐμελλον Ἀχαιοὶ πειρήσεσθαι.

τὸν β′ ἔπι πῆς ἐλευ ζευγν ἐλκεν νευρὴν γλυφίδας τε,

αὐτθένεν ἐκ διόρθιος καθήμενος, ἦκε δ᾿ ὅστῳ

ἀντα τυνακόμενος, πελέκεων δ᾿ οὐκ ἡμβροτε πάντων

πρώτης στελεθή, διὰ δ᾿ ἀμπερὲς ἴλθε θώραζε

ἴδος χαλκοβαρέως ὠλὲς Θηλέμαχον προσέειπε·

"Τηλέμαχε," οὐκ ὃ ξεῖνος εἶνι μεγάροις ἐλέγχει

 HttpServletResponse, οὐδὲν τοῦ σκοποῦ ἡμβροτον οὐδὲ τὸ τόδον

δὴν ἔκαμον ταῦνον· ἔτι μοι μένοι ἐμπεδὸν ἔστιν,

οὐχ ὃς με μνηστήρες ἀτιμάζοντες ὄνονται.

νῦν δ᾿ ἀρη καὶ δόρπον Ἀχαίοιν τετυκέσθαι

ἐν φάει, αὐτὰρ ἐπεῖτα καὶ ἄλλος ἐψιάσθαι

412 ὧρα] ὕποι G. 414 δ᾿ ὧρα G. 415 ἄγκυλομῆτεν G. 419 ἵππες Ar. X: ἱππαι vulgar. The reading of Ar. is supported in II. 4. 213 by most of his manuscripts (cf. πλειον Did., see Sch. A).

411. ὧρα 'in answer to his touch': ὑπὸ as in ἐν-σαίνοι, ὑποκρίνομαι, &c.

413. ἄτράπατο 'changed colour.'

414. τρέφομαι is an adverb with ἐκτυπε, cp. 20.113 μεγάλε ἔφροντοσ.

415. The reading ἄγκυλομῆτες was first proposed by Nauck, Miianges Gr.-Rom. IV. 132. Being supported here by G (one of the oldest MSS.), it should now perhaps be adopted.

416. ἄρα σίγεν θῶν, taking (and placing) on the πίθυς or 'elbow,' i.e. on the middle part which joined the two 'horns,' as the elbow joins the two parts of the arm. For the brachylogy or 'pregnant' use of ἔλων cp. 15. 206 ὥς δ᾿ ἔντει πρώιμη ἐξαίτου κάλλια δόρα, also 13. 274 (note).

417. πρώτης στελεθή 'the top of the handle': to be construed with ἡμβροτε, 'did not miss the stελεθή of any of the axes.'

418. θώραξ 'out, forth,' viz. from the axle-heads; the word has no reference to a door, cp. 11. 5. 694 ἐκ μυρώ θώραξ, 16. 408, &c.

419. ἰππος, an oxymoron, a suppur in daylight being a contradiction. The 'supper' really meant is of course the μνηστήροφωλα.
μολυσε και φόρμιγγι τα γαρ τι αναθήματα δαίτος."

430

'Η και ἔπό δύτοι νεῦσεν· δ' ἀμφέθετο εἶφος ὅτι Τηλέμαχος, φίλος υἱὸς Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο,
ἀμφι δὲ χείρα φίλην βάλεν ἐγχεί, ἄγχι δ' ἄρ᾽ αὐτοῦ πάρ θρόνον ἐστήκει κεκορυθμένος ἀλθοὶ χαλκῷ.

The Great Hall (Stofa) of an Icelandic House (circa 1000 A.D.).

From Den islandske Bolig i Fristats-Tiden, by Dr. Valtýr Guðmundsson (Copenhagen, 1894).
ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Χ

Μνησητηροφνία.

Αὐτὰρ ὁ γυμνόθη βακέων πολύμητος Ὄδυσσεύς,
ἀλτὸ δ' ἐπὶ μέγαν οὐδόν, ἔχων βιδῶν ἢ δὲ φαρέτρην
λῶν ἐμπλείνην, ταχέαις δ' ἐκχεβάτ᾽ ὀἰκτοῦσι
ἀυτοῦ πρὸςθε ποδῶν, μετὰ δὲ μνηστήραιν ἔιεπεν.

"Οὐκὼς μὲν δὴ ἄεθλος ἄατος ἐκτετέλεσται·

νῦν αὖτε σκοπῶν ἄλλον, δὲν οὐ πώ τις βάλεν ἄνηρ,
εἴσομαι αἰ κε τόχωμι, πόρη δὲ μοι εὐχος Ἀπόλλων." 5

"Ἡ καὶ ἐπὶ Ἅλκινόφ ἵθυνετο πικρὸν διστόν.

ἡ τοι ὁ καλὸν ἀλεισῦν ἀναίρησθεθαί ἐμελλε,

χρύσεαν ἄμφωσιν, καὶ δὴ μετὰ χεραίν ἐνώμα,

δραπ ποι οὖν φῶνος ἄρα ὦ ὀϊκ ἐνὶ δυμοῖ

méμβλητον τίς οἷοτο μετὰ ἀνδράς δαίστημον

μοῦνον ἐνὶ πλεύσεις, καὶ εἰ μάλα καρτερός εἰ,

εἰπείν F.

3 εἴπείν. F.

2. μέγαν οὐδόν, the threshold at the entrance of the μέγαρον. The object of Ulysses was to prevent the escape of the Σιώτοι (I. 171 μνησήρας ἁγανός σχήσομεν ἑτοοθεν μεγάλων): their only chance was to force him from the doorway, and pass out into the town (I. 76 εἰ μὲν οὐδόν ἀπώσουμεν ἕδθε δυράων, ἐλθόμεν οὗ ἀνά ἄστιν, κτλ.).

5. δάσταρον. Ulysses takes up the phrase of Antinous (31. 91), who had announced that the contest would be "decisive," and was now to find it so to his own cost.

6. σκοπών, with εἴσομαι αἰ κε τόχωμι as an accusativus de quo, "as to an-

other mark I will know if I shall hit it": cp. 14. 366, also II. 8. 535 ἔμπρον ἢν ἀρετήν διαίεισται εἰ κέ ἐμὸν ἐχος μείνη.

Some take εἴσομαι in the sense of a fut. of εἴμι, viz. 'I will go at'; cp. εἴσαγαρ in 15. 313, ἐσπερομαι (II. 11. 367., 20. 454), and ἐσαρον or ἐλευσόρων in 8. 295., 22. 89 and often in the Iliad. But this εἴσομαι would surely take a gen. of the object aimed at: cp. l. 89.

12. μέμβλητο, plupl. mid. of μέλα, 'was matter of care': cp. μέμβληται (II. 19. 343). The word is probably to be regarded as a thematic form of the perfect (Brugmann, Gründr. ii. p. 1334).
220 22. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ X

οὐ τεῦξειν δάνατον τε κακὸν καὶ κήρα μέλαιναν;
τὸν δ’ Ὁδυσσέας κατὰ λαμινὸν ἐπισχέμενον βάλεν ἰῷ,
ἀντικρύ δ’ ἀπαλοίο δ’ αὐχένοις ἡλυθ’ ἀκωκῇ.
ἐκλύνῃ δ’ ἐτέρωσε, δέπασ δ’ ἐκέπεσε χειρὸς
βλημένον, αὐτίκα δ’ αὐλὸς ἀνὰ βίνας παχῦς ἥλθεν
αἵματος ἀνδρομέοις. θώος δ’ ἀπὸ ἐκ τράπεζαν
ἀδεὶς ποὶ πλῆξας, ἀπὸ δ’ εἶδατα χειρῶν ἔραξε.
σίτῳς τε κρέα τ’ ὄπτα φορύνετο, τοι δ’ ὄμαδον
μνηστέρας κατὰ δώμαθ’, ὅπως ίδου ἀνδρα πεσόντα,
ἐκ δὲ βρόνων ἀνθρωπος ὁρισθεντες κατὰ δῶμα,
pάντοσε παπαύνουσε εὐδήμῃσοι ποτὶ τοῖχους.
οὐδέ πη ἀσπίδης ἐκὸν ὁλκιμὸν ἐγχος ἔλεσθαι,

14. οἱ τεῦξεοι κτλ. "would make
for himself an evil death and black
fate," i.e. would do what could only
mean his own death. All the commen-
tators refer ol to the τίς of l. 12: "who
would think that in the midst of a
banquet one man amongst so many,
even were he very strong, would bring
death upon him?" But the pronoun
ol must have a strictly reflexive sense
(ἐλαυτή), referring to the subject of
τεῦξεων. And this agrees with the
general sense required, which is not to
ask who would say "he is going to
kill me," but whether any one would
expect him to fight with all the company at once.
15. κατὰ λαμῖναν, to be taken with
βάλεν ἰῷ.
ἐν-σχέμενοι "holding it (the arrow)
to or at" (the object aimed at). So
ἐνέχω in l. 75 ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πάντες ἔχωμεν.
The aorist participle is descriptive of
330 (H. G. § 77).
17. ἐτέρωσε "to one side," cp. II. 8.

306-308 μῆκος δ’ ὃς ἐτερώσε κάρη βάλεν
. . . . ὃς ἐτερώσε ἡμῶν κάρη κτλ. It does
not mean 'to the other side' or 'back'
as Amels, &c.), but only that he did
not remain upright. So in ὢδ’ ἐτέρωσε
(or ὄδετερωσε) = 'not to either side.'
18. βρόντη, gen., notwithstanding
the possible constr. with ol: H. G.
§ 243. 3, d.

αὐλός, a ‘jet’ or ‘column,’ so called
from its likeness in shape to a tube.
21. φορύνετο 'were bedabbled,' the
floor being of earth.
24-25. It is probable that these lines
(and perhaps also l. 23) are spurious:
see on 19, 1-50. The Suitors, as was
pointed out by Kirchhoff (Die homerische
Odysse, p. 581), do not yet suppose
themselves to be in any danger. It is
quite premature for them to be looking
for shields or spears.
31. ἵσκων 'so guessed,' 'so imagined';
cp. 19, 203. The indicative of the verb
ἵσκω only survives in this idiomatic use
of ἵσκω (with asyndeton) = ἔστω ἵσκω.


22. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ X

άνδρα κατακτεῖναι τὸ δὲ νῆπιοι οὖκ ἐνήσαν, 
ὡς δὴ σφιν καὶ πάσιν ὀλέθρου πείρατ' ἐφήπτο.

tous ὁ ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη πολύμητις 'Οδυσσεύς·
"κἂν κυνε, οὐ μ᾽ ἐμ' ἐφάσκεθ' ὑπέτροπον οἰκαδ᾽ ἱέσθαι
δήμον ἀπὸ Τρῶων, ὅτι μοι κατεκέρτησε ὄλκον,
δυσφήσοι δὲ γυναιξὶ παρευνάσσεθε βιας,
αὕτου τε ἔφορος ὑπεμνάσσεθε γυναῖκα,
οὕτε θεοὺς δείσαντες, οἱ οὐρανῶν εὐρών ἔχουσιν,
οὕτε τιν' ἀνθρώπων νέμεσιν κατόπισθεν ἔσεθαν,

νῦν ὁμίλοι καὶ πάσιν ὀλέθρου πείρατ' ἐφήπταν."

"Ὡς φάτο, τοὺς ὁ ἄρα πάντας ὑπὸ χλωρῶν δέος ἐίλε·
[πάντης δὲ ἐκαστὸς ὁπῃ φύγοι αἰτῶν ὀλέθρον·]
Εὐρύμαχος δὲ μιν οἶον ἀμείβομεν προσέπειεν·
"ἐὶ μὲν δὴ 'Οδυσσεύς Ἰθακήσιος εἰλήλουθας,
ταῦτα μὲν ἄσιμα ἔπας, δοκα μέσεσκον Ἀχαιοὶ,
πολλὰ μὲν ἐν μεγάροις ἀτάσθαλα, πολλὰ δὴ ἐπὶ ἀγροῦ.
ἀλλ᾽ ὁ μὲν ἱδὴ κεῖται ὅσιοι ἐπλετο πάντων,
Ἀντίνοος· οὕτοι γὰρ ἐπίπλεν τάδε ἔργα,
οὐ γὰρ τόσον κεχρημάτοις οὐδὲ χατίζων,
ἀλλ᾽ ἄλλα φρονέων, τά οὐκ ἐτέλεσσε Κρονίων,
ὅφρ᾽ Ἰθακής κατὰ δήμον ἐυκτιμένης βασιλεῖς
ἀυτοῦ, ἀτὰρ σὺν παιδα κατακτεῖει λοχήςας.

νῦν δὲ ὁ μὲν ἐν μοῖρῃ πέφαται, οὐ δὲ φείδει λαῶν

---

35 πᾶς τι μ᾽ G. 37, 38 transposed in F P H al. (not in G X U Eust.).
40 ἔσεθαι Ἐσθάνα M X Ι Eust.: ἔσεθα L W. 43 om. in most MSS.; cp. ΙΙ. 14. 507., 16. 283. 49 τάδε πάντα G P.

33. πείρατ' ἐφήπτο, II. 7. 402., 12.
79. There is a play of language between πεῖρα in the literal sense of the end of a rope and in the metaphorical sense of 'completion,' 'consummation.'
36. ἐπὶ 'insomuch that,' 'as you show by the fact that,' cp. ΙΙΙ. 14. 367., 18.
392: Ἡ. G. § 369, 2.
38. ὑπεμνασάθαι. The sense of ὅτι is to imply that the wooing is something that exists along with and thus is in conflict with the rights of the husband: as in ὅτι-ἀντιδίως.

40. νέμεσιν is governed by δείσαντες.
The epexegetical inf. ἔσεθαι is an example of the uses out of which the construction of the acc. c. inf. originally grew: H. G. § 237.
46. τάδε κατά. 'These things you have said justly about all that the Achaeans have been doing.'
54. ἐν μοῖρῃ 'in his due portion,' nearly = κατὰ μοῖραν, 'duly.'
σών· ἀτὰρ ἄμμες ὁπωθὲν ἄρεσσάμενοι κατὰ δήμον, δόσα τοι ἐκπέπεσαι καὶ ἐθήδαται ἐν μεγάροις, τιμὴν ἄμφις ἀγοντες ἔκικοσάβοιον ἔκαστος, χαλκὸν τε χρυσὸν τ' ἀποδώσομεν, εἰς δ' κε σὸν κῆρ ἰανθῆ· πρὶν δ' οū τι νεμεσθήτων κεχολῶσαται.'

Τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπὸδρα ἴδων προσέφη πολύμητις 'Οδυσσέας· "Εὐρύμαχ', οὖθ' ε' μοι πατρώια πάντ' ἀποδοίητε, δόσα τε νῦν ὃμι' ἔστι καὶ ε' ποθεν ἄλλ' ἐπιθείτε, οὔδε κεν ὃς ἐτὶ χεῖρας ἐμᾶς λήξαιμι φῶνοι πρὶν πάσαν μυστήρας ὑπερβᾶς ἀποτίηται. νῦν ὅμιν παράκειται ἐναντίον ἢ μάχεσθαι ἥ φεύγειν, δ' κεν θάνατον καὶ κῆρας ἀλλή; ἀλλὰ τιν' οὔ φεύξεσθαι οἴσομαι αἰτῶν ὀλεθρον.'

"Ὡς φάτο, τῶν δ' αὐτῶν λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλων ἦτορ.

τοῖνα δ' Εὐρύμαχος μετεφώνε τεύτεραν αἰτίας· "ἀ φίλοι, οὔ γὰρ σχῆσει ἀνήρ δὲ χεῖρας ἀδίπτοις, ἄλλ' ἐπεὶ ἔλλαβες τόξον ἵππον ἤδε φαρέτρην οὐδοῦ ἀπὸ ἑστοῦ τοξαστεί, εἰς δ' κε πάντας ἄμμε κατακτείς· ἀλλὰ μνησώμεθα χάρμης· φάσγανα τε ὑπάσσασθε καὶ ἀντίσεθε τραπέζας


55. ἄρεσσάμενοι 'making it good.' κατὰ δήμον, i.e. by a contribution levied on the δήμοι or community: cp. 13.14.

56. ἐθήδαται, the reading of Aristarchus, is the regular third person plural of ἐθήδα, which is the only Homeric perfect of ἔθω. The plural is very harsh, however, after the sing. ἔκπεπτα. The form ἐθήδατα, which Herod. gives as the 3rd sing., may be compared with ὄρφεται (19. 377, 524), and with the Attic ἐθῆδαναι, in which the σ may not be original. ἐθή-

δονα, the reading of all the MSS., can only be explained in connexion with non-Homeric forms, viz. ἐθηδοᾶ (Attic) or ἐθῆδοα (on a Laconian inscription, C. I. G. 15). Hence it is probably not Homeric.

57. ἄμφις 'apart,' i.e. each severally. ἔκικοσάβων. We should perhaps read ἔκικοσάβω (with Bekker), as in 1. 431, where the word is used as a substantive, 'the value of twenty oxen.' Here it would be in apposition to τιμήν.

63. ἄνθαμμι, properly intrans., χεῖραs being an acc. of the 'part affected.'

67. τῶν properly means 'some one' (indifferently), 'this or that one.' Here it is virtually = 'every one,' by an ironical litotes: so in 13. 394, 427, 21. 374., 22. 323.

70. The clause with γάρ is put first (see on 1. 337., 14. 402): the principal clause being ἀλλὰ μνησώμεθα κτλ.

74. The syndeton serves to show that φάσγανα τε κτλ. is epexegetic of μνησώμεθα χάρμης.
22. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Χ 223

ιόν ὀκυμάτων· ἐπὶ δ' αὐτὸ πάντες ἤχωμεν
ἀθρόι, εἴ κε μιν οὐδοῦ ἀπώσομεν ἧδε θυράων,
ἐλθομεν δ' ἁνδ' ἀστυ, βοή δ' ἀκιστα γένοιτο·
tω κε τάχ' οὖτος ἁνὴρ νῦν ὅστατα τοξάσατο.

"Ως ἀρα φωνήσας εἰρύσσατο φάσγανον ὄξυ,
χάλκεον, ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἀκαχμένον, ἀλτο δ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ
σμερδαλέα λάχων· ὃ δ' ἀμαρτή δίος Ὄδυσσεὺς
ἰδὼν ἀποπροεί, βάλε δὲ στήθος παρὰ μαζῶν,
ἐν δὲ οἱ ἦπατι πῆξε θυὸν βέλος· ἐκ δ' ἀρα χειρὸς
φάσγανον ἤκε χαμάζε, περιρρηθής δὲ τραπέζη
κάππεσαν ἴδωθείς, ἀπὸ δ' εἴδατα χείνε εὔραξ
καὶ δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον· ὃ δ' χθῶνα τύπτε μετάπῳ
θυμῷ ἄνιαζων, ποσὶ δὲ θρόνον ἀμφοτέρουσι
λικτίζων εὔνασε· κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν δ' ἐχύτ' ἄχλυς.

'Αμφίνομι δ' Ὅδυσσης εἰείσατο κυδαλίμοιο
ἀντίος αἴξας, εἴρυτο δὲ φάσγανον ὄξυ,
εἰ πώς οἱ εἰξει θυράων. ἀλλ' ἀρα μιν φθή

77 γένοιτο] γένυται F X al. 80 εἰ' αὐτῶν F X. 81 ἀμαρτή G X Eust.:
-τεί F J. 82 ἀποπροέι M X J: ἀποπροέλ ος G F P H al. 85 ἴδωθείς X U:
δινωθείς U al. : δινωθείς G F P H al.

75. ὀκυμάτων. The epithet applies properly to those who are slain by
the arrows. The shortness of life which
the arrows cause is poetically treated as
a quality inherent in them: cp. 21. 12
στονότες ἐστολ.

77. ἰδωμεν... γένοιτο. The optative
in the last clause indicates that the
clause refers to something that is not
directly the act of the Suitors, but may
be expected to follow on their action:
cp. 16. 386.

84. περιρρήθης is perhaps to be ex-
plained (as Curtius suggested) from a
root βάδ- (for βαδ-?), in the strong
form βάδ-, with the sense of 'bending'
or 'waving': whence βαδόνιον 'pliable'
and βαδάλας (v.l. for βοδάνιον in 11. 18.
576 παρά βοδάνων δοκάσα). On this
view περιρρήθης might be explained as
= 'sprawling over' or 'doubled round'
(the table). There is also a root βάδ-
(for β-α-?) 'scatter,' 'sprinkle' (cp.
βάδονατε, ἰππάνατα): but this does not
yield so good a sense.

85. ἰδωθείς 'curled up,' cp. ll. 2.
266 (of Thersites struck by the sceptre),
13. 618 ἰδωθή 31 πᾶσων. A different
attitude is expressed by ἰδωθείς ιδώσων
(0d. 8. 375, ll. 12. 205). The other
reading δινωθείς would mean 'whirling'
or 'spinning about': see the note on
16. 63.

89. ἔσωτα. Regarding this form the
most plausible suggestion is still that of
Wackernagel (Bess. Beitr. iv. 269), viz.
that it answers to Sanscr. ग्राहान, sig-
nmatic aor. from the root यā (Indog. य). The
corresponding Greek form would be
ἔσωσα, but the change from η to α
may be due to the influence of ἐμμ, &c.
It should, however, be noticed that the
meaning is not simply 'went,' but 'went
at,' 'took a course towards': cp. 8.
283 ἐσορ' ἐμεν 'directed his going to.'
On this ground we are tempted to com-
pare the sense of ἵθος 'aim,' 'direction,'
and suppose a root ἱδω- or ἱδ-. But
this would not explain the syllabic
augment.
Τηλέμαχος κατόπισθε βαλὼν χαλκήρει δουρί
όμων μεσογύς, διὰ δὲ στήθεσφιν ἑλασσε.
δούπησεν δὲ πεσὼν, χθόνα δ' ἥλασε παντὶ μετάπφο.
Τηλέμαχος δ' ἀπόρουσε, λιπὼν δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος
αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἀμφινήμορ περὶ γὰρ δὲ μὴ τις Ἀχαιῶν
ἔγχος ἀνεκλόμενον δολιχόσκιον ἦ ἐλάσσει
φασγάνῳ ἄξιος ἦ προσπηνέα τύφας.
βὴ δὲ θέειν, μάλα δ' ὁκιά φίλον πατέρ' εἰσαφίκανεν,
ἀγχὸς δ' ἱστάμενος ἔσεα περέβεντα προσηύδα:
"ἀ δ' πάτερ, ἢδη τοι σάκος οἰσῶ καὶ δύο δοῦρε
καὶ κυνήν πάγχαλκον, ἐπὶ κροτάφων ἀραμίνας,
αὐτὸς τ' ἀμφιβαλέειμαι ἰῶν, δῶσω δὲ συμβήγ
καὶ τῷ βουκόλῳ ἀλλ' τετευχήσθαι γάρ ἄμεινον."
Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς,
"οἰνεί θέου, ἥς μοι ἀμύνεσθαι πάρ' ὅστοι,
μή μ' ἀποκνίσῃσιν θυράνω μοῦναν ἑντα.
"Ως φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ φίλορ ἐπεεἰθετο πατρί,
βὴ δ' ἱμεναι τάλαμων', δόθι οἱ κλυτά τεύχεα κεῖτο.
ἐνθὲν τέσσαρα μὲν σάκε ἐξελε, δυσράτα δ' ὁκτῶ
καὶ πίσσαρα κυνέας χαλκήρεας ἱπποδασείας.
βὴ δ' φέρων, μάλα δ' ὁκιά φίλον πατέρ' εἰσαφίκανεν,
αὐτὸς δὲ πρότιστα περὶ χροὶ δύσετο χαλκῶν
δος δ' αὕτως τῷ ὄμως διέσβθην τεύχεα καλά,

98 ἐπιστρεπτα D.L.W.; ἐπιστρεπτα vulg.
τύφαι Bekk. 102 εὐχαλκον F. 110 ἐξελε X; ἐλέεο vulg.; cp. 144.

97. ἀνεκλόμενον 'as he was drawing out.'
ἡ ὕλος κτλ. The alternatives are not quite clear. In either case, however, the danger was from the sword of one of the Suitors, as they had no other weapons. Hence φασγάνῳ belongs to both the clauses. The meaning probably is that a Suitor might make a dash (ἄξιος) at Telemachus as he advanced, or reserve his blow for the moment when he had to stoop forward (προσφηγὲς τύφαι). The reading τύφαι does not make much difference, since there is no contrast of meaning between τύφαι and ἐλασσόω. The reading προσφηγὲι can hardly be defended; the epithet must describe the attitude of a combatant, not of a weapon.

104. τετευχήθατο 'to be armed.'
The formation is not quite regular, since the stem is τευχ-. We expect τετευχεθα (formed as τετελεσθα), or τετευχεθα (τευχθα like τειχθα).

109. Telemachus now goes round the outside of the μέγαρον, and so to the ἄλαμος. He could do this without being seen by the Suitors.

114. δυσβάσθην. The change to the impf. in this line marks the action as subordinate to that of 1. 113: H. G. § 71, 1.
22. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ X

εσταν δ' ἀμφ' Ὀδυςηα δαιφρόνα ποικιλοτήτην. 115

Αὐτὰρ δ' γ', ἀφρα μὲν αὐτῷ ἀμύνεσθαι ἦσαν λοι, 
τῷ γραμμήτων ἕνα γ' αἰεί δ' ἐν οἴκῳ 
βάλλει τιτυκόδεμεν τοι δ' ἄγχιστεοι ἐπιπτον. 
αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ λίθοιν λοι διοιτεύον ἄνακτα, 
τόξων μὲν πρὸς σταθμὸν ἐνσταθεός μεγάρῳ 
ἐκλιν' ἑστάμεναι, πρὸς ἐκσύναμα παμφάνωντα, 
αὐτὸς δ' ἀμφ' ἀμοιοί σάκος θέτο τετραθέλιμον, 
κρατὶ δ' ἐν ἰφυμην κυνήῃ ἐντυκτον ἑθηκεν, 
ἐπιπορίαν, δεινὸν δὲ λόφος καθόπερθεν ἐνευκ 
ἐιλετο δ' ὅλιμα δισφε δόξω κυκοβολέμενα χαλκά. 120

'Ὁροσθήρη δὲ τις ἔσκεν ἐῳρημέρῃ ἐν τοῖς, 
ἀκρότατον δὲ παρ' οὐδὸν ἐνσταθεός μεγάρῳ 
ἀν ὄδος ἐς λαβρήν, σωλήθει β' ἔχον εἰδ' ἀραμωι.

119 διοιτεύονα Ῥ. 125 ἐκ δ' ἔλεγ' Χ. 128 εἰ ἀραμωι] ἔκτος ἐκὼν Χ. U.

118. ἄγχιστης 'close together;' 'in closed order;' opposed to ὁμωμετοῦ (31. 230). The formation of the words is evidently parallel, and therefore ἄγχιστης is not to be derived from the superl. ἄγχιστος, but (like ἄχυτης in Soph.) from ἄχυς, through a hypothetical verb ἄχυζων.

121. ἁμαρτία ὑπήκοος, cp. 4. 42, where the chariots of the Visitors are set up leaning against them (so Π. 8. 436). Hence they are probably the wall-spaces on each side of the entrance of the μεγαρὸν, facing the αλήθ. As this wall looked to the south the epithet παμφάνωντα is fully justified, especially in contrast to the μεγαρὸν σπάδετα within.

122. τετραθελίμον 'of four layers of hide.'

126. ὄροσθηρή 'a raised door': the stem ὄρο- occurs also in ταλίς-ὅρος 'starting back.' The etymology would suggest a door that opens by being raised (like a trap-door): but the supposition that it means a door (or window) above the level of the floor is borne out by the phrase δ' ὄροσθηρήν ἀκαλλαθεῖ (l. 134).

127-128. Through the ὄροσθηρή there was a way into a Λαβρῆ 'passage—doubtless one of the narrow passages that must be numerous in a house made up of several distinct buildings. So much seems clear: but the words ὄροσθηρήν τοις ὄδοις have not been satisfactorily explained. If the ὄδος is the sill of the ὄροσθηρή, It seems needless to say that the way out of the ὄροσθηρή was over or 'past' the top of the sill. We expect rather to be told how the ὄδος reached the Λαβρῆ. Possibly the meaning is that the way to the Λαβρῆ passed along the outside of the ὄροσθηρή at the full height of the sill. This would imply that the level of the passage outside was somewhat higher than the floor of the μεγαρὸν. It would be worth mentioning in order to show that the ὄροσθηρή was easily approached from the Λαβρῆ.

The phrase ὄδος μεγαρὸν may be applied, as Protodicos observes (Περί τῆς μήτης ''Ομορφον οἰκής, p. 50), to the sill or threshold of any entrance to the μεγαρὸν: cp. οὔδος ἀλήθ. (7. 130), οὔδος θαλάμου (4. 718), &c.

The σωλήθει seem to be those of the ὄροσθηρή. The mention of them is intelligible as a descriptive touch, though it does not affect the story, since the door must have been open at the time (cp. l. 155). Some take σωλήθει of a door in the Λαβρῆ (l. 137): but no such door has as yet been mentioned.
226. OΔΣΕΙΔΑΣ X

thn de 'Odysevs phraeseboi ánôgen diean evforbìn
éstadd' ágyi auti's. Mia de' ois gladniet evforh.

Tois de 'Agelaios metēinei, eis po pántessai pífrasokon:
"oí filoi, óuk òn dé tis év órysothyn anabhai
kal eípoI lavoioi, boi' ódiketa gënoi;
tò ke táx' oítos ánþf vûn ùstata tojásostaiot."  

Tòn de autè prosëepei Melánthios, aittile oïgyovn

"oû paras étet, 'Agelaios diotrefés' ágyi xhár aîwâs
aîlìs kalà thôrêta kale árgaléon stôma laôrfis
kal x' eis pántas érûkoi anýr, ois t' 

all' ágyeth, ómuì teîxe ëneikô woîrhxhína
ìk thalámos' évndon xhár, ópomoi, òoudé ëpì all' teîxea 
katasthèn 'Odysevis kal faiðmos vilà."  

"Ois eîpòv anëbaivne Melánthios, aittile aîgwn,
ìs thalámos 'Odysohos ãva rôgas megáriaon.

131 'Agelaios F al.: 'Agelaios G. 140 évdon] évdon F.

129. thn seems to mean the òrhoðhyn, 
not the laôrfi. Ennausen was to watch 
the òrhoðhyn, and he naturally did so 
with a view to preventing escape by the 
laôrfi.

137. aîlìs kalà thôrêta must be 
the same as thôru aîlìs (21.389) or 
thôru aîlìa (18.339, &c.), viz. the gate of 
the court-yard. It was 'terribly near'
Ulysses, õ.e. within bow-shot of him. 
And 'the mouth of the laôrfi was diffi-
cult': it was so narrow that one man 
could bar the passage into the coun-
yard. The Suitors would emerge from 
it one by one, and then would have to 
cross the aîlìs and unfasten the gate 
within range of the arrows.

Some understand aîlìs thôrêta of 
a door at the end of the laôrfi, where 
it debouches into the aîlìs. But 
seme laôrfi would then be a mere 
description of aîlìs thôrêta, which the 
form of the sentence seems to forbid.

139 all' ágyel' õkaI. It now occurs 
to Melanthius that the òrhoðhyn, though 
it is not a good means of escape, may 
be useful in another way. Seeing that 
Ulysses and his companions are armed, 
hhe guesses that the arms have been 
brought from the store in the thalámos 
(l. 109); and he remembers that the 
way to the thalámos through the òrhoðhyn 
is still open.

140. ëndon, sc. isti: 'the arms are 
in their place: Ulysses and his son have 
not put them elsewhere.' Commentators 
generally take ëndon with katasthèn: 
"Ulysses and his son have put the arms 
therein and nowhere else" (referring to 
19.1-50). But, as Kirchhoff shows 
(Odysseis, p. 581), ëndon would not be 
pot for òrhoðhyn. It means 'inside' (not 
outside), 'at home,' 'in their regular 
place.' Hence there need be no re-
ference to 19.1-50: indeed the removal 
of the arms there described (cp. 16. 
281-298) is probably an interpolation 
due to the present passage.

143. ãva rôgas megáriaon. As to 
the meaning of this phrase nothing can be 
said to be known. It has been suggested 
by Protodicos (Peri tìn evall 'Omevov 
olados, p. 58) that the word ñas 
is the same as the Modern Greek rôga, 
meaning 'a narrow passage.' But rôga 
seems to be the Latin râga, which in 
Low Latin means a 'passage' or 'street' 
(whence the Modern French rue, &c.). 
The context requires that it should 
designate a way of mounting to the
22. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Χ

ένθεν δάδεκα μὲν σάκε έξελε, τόσα δὲ δοῦρα
cal tóssas kúνεας χαλκήρεας ἱπποδασείσ.

βη δ’ ἱμεναί, μάλα δ’ ἀπά φέρων μυστήριον έδωκε.
cal tóri 'Οδυσσῆος λόγο γούνατα καὶ φλων ἔτορ,
ὡς περιβαλλομένοις ἐθεῖ σχεραὶ τε δοῦρα
μακρὰ τινάσσοντ᾽ μέγα δ’ αὐτὴ φαλετο ἔργον.

αιγα δὲ Τηλέμαχον ἔπεα πετρύνα τροσθάδα:

"Τηλέμαχ," ἡ μάλα δ’ τις ἐνι μεγάροισι γυναικῶν

τῶν ἐπρόεχες πόλεμον κακὸν ἦ Μελανθεύς.

Τὸν δ’ αὐ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον πάθα:

"ὁ πάτερ, αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τόδε γ’ ἱμβροτον—οὐδὲ τὶς ἄλλος
αἰτίας—δὲ βαλάμιον θύρῃς πυκνῶς ἀραμίαν
κάλλιτον ἄγκλας: τῶν δὲ σκοπὸς ἦν ἀμείλιον.

144 ἑβδομάδα F Al.

θάλαμος, and (we may add) an ordinary
and convenient way, by which a man
could bring twelve shields, as many
spears, and the like number of helmets
(Π. 144–145). It is not expressly said
that his way lay through the ὄρσοφη
but this appears to be implied. Indeed
the ὄρσοφη has no place in the story
unless it leads up to and explains the
action of Melanthius.

Assuming that βη is connected with
ἐπιγώμι, we may perhaps suppose that
βέγας was used of a flight of steps,
termed ‘break’ in contrast to the un-
broken surface of an ordinary path.
Cp. μεγάλος (Π. 23. 430) of broken
ground. It is true that on this view we
have still to determine the place of these
‘steps of the μέγαρον’ especially with
reference to the ὄρσοφη. It may lessen
the difficulty of this problem if we re-
member that μέγαρον, though properly
meaning the great hall of a palace, is
often used loosely for the palace as a
whole.

149. μέγα δ’ αὐτὴ φαλετο ἔργον

‘the work,’ i.e. the conflict before him,
‘seemed to him a great one,’ a serious

151. It appears that Ulysses and
Telemachus could not see Melanthius
for the arms: they could only see
the Suits putting them on. We may
suppose of course that Melanthius did
not come back himself to the μέγαρον,
but passed in the arms through the
ὄρσοφη.

A further difficulty lies in the doubt
whether it was Melanthius or one of the
women who was bringing arms. How
could it be one of the women, who were
shut up with Euryclea (21. 387)? The
most obvious answer is that the women
were only shut off from the μέγαρον,
and consequently perhaps from the οἰκή
and its gate. They may still have
been able to go to the buildings behind
the μέγαρον.

155. δὲ is causal, ‘in that I &c.’

θᾶλάμῳ θύρῃς, the door leading
into the θάλαμος (from the λασμή).

156. ἄγκλινω ‘opening it’: cp. 11.
8. 395 ἰὼν ἀνακλίνω πυκνῶν νίφος ἢ έντεινω.

τῶν is probably masc., ‘their sentry
was the better man’: the gen. being
used as in Τῆλων σκεύος (Π. 2. 792),
σκεύως ‘Στερνὸς (of Dolon in Π. 10. 546).
The words need not be taken literally,
so as to imply that the Suits had
actually set any sentry or watch.
Some commentators take τῶν as a partitive
gen., ‘one of them was a better watch-
man’: others as a neut. plur., ‘of this
there was a better watchman.’ Tele-
machus means ‘better’ than he himself,
had proved. As a matter of fact it was
Eumaeus who had failed as a σκεύος:
but Telemachus is now taking the blame
to himself.

Q 2
αλλ' έι, δι' Ευμήνει, θάρην επίθες θαλάμωιο,
καὶ φράσαι ή τις ἐρ' ἐστὶ γυναίκῶν ἡ τάξις ῥεῖται,
ἡ ύπὸ Δοῦλοι Μελανθείς, τὸν περ δίω.

"Ὡς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἄγρευον,
βὴ δ' αὐτὶς θάλαμῳθει Μελάνθιος, αὐτὸλος αὐγὸν,
οίσων τεύχεα καλὰ. νόησε δὲ δίος ὥρφωβι,
αἰγὰ δ' Ὀδυσσῆα προσεφάνεν ἤγεις ἑντα,
"διογενῆ Δασερίδη, πολυμῆχαν Ὀδυσσῆα,
κεῖνος δὴ αὐτ' ἀδίθηλος ἀνήρ, ὃν δίδμεθ' αὐτόι,
ἔρχεται ἐς θαλαμον 'σε δὲ μοι νημερτὴς ἐνίστησε,
ἣ μὲν ἀποκτεῖνα, αἴ λέ πρείσθην γε γένωμαι,
καὶ τοι ἐνδαὶ ἄγω, ἵν' ὑπερβαῖναι ἀποτομὴ
pολλάς, δοσας οἴτως ἐμήσατο σῷ ἐνι ὅικρ.

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητος Ὀδυσσέως·
"ἡ τοι ἐγὼ καὶ Τηλέμαχοι μνητήρας ἄγανος
σχήσομεν ἐντοσθὲν μεγάρων, μάλα περ μεμάκτας,
σφῶι δ' ἀποπεράντα πόδας καὶ χείρας ὅπερθεν
ἐς θαλάμον βαλέειν, σανίδας δ' ἐκδῆσαι ὅπωθε,
σειρῇ δὲ πλεκτῇν ἕξ αὐτοῦ πειρήνατε
κίον' ἀν' υψηλὴν ἐρύσαι πελάσαι τε δοκοῖν,
ὅς κεν δηθὰ ξωδὸς ἐνὸς χαλέπ' ἀλαεα πάσχῃ.

"Ὡς ἐφαθ', οἴ δ' ἔρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλόουν ἥ' ἐπίθουτο,

162. Eumaeus, having been put on
his guard, is now a 'better watch,' and
sees Melanthe going to the thalamos.
Probably the λαβρη was so straight that
Eumaeus could do this by posting him-
self at or opposite the στέρα λαβρη.
In this position he would be only a
few paces—half the breadth of the
μαλαβρο—from Ulysses and Telemachus.

172. Ἐπερήθιν belongs to χείρας, in
contrast with πόδας, cp. 8. 135., 12. 248.,
22. 406.

174. σανίδις δ' ἐκδῆσαι διασθε. The
best commentary on these words is that
of Döderlein, in his Homeric Glossary,
§ 994. He shows that the punishment
intended here was a form of crucifixion.

It is evidently much the same as that
which was inflicted as the penalty of
sacrilege on Artayctes, Hdt. 9. 130
πρὸς σανίδα προσπασαλέσσατε ἐνερ-
κρίμασαι (cp. Hdt. 7. 33). In this case
the feet and hands of Melantheus were
made fast behind him (cp. Il. 21. 30 ὅποια
δ' ὑποκτείνα χείρας), and were bound to
the board (or boards), not nailed. Similarly
the σανίς of Ar. Thesm. 931, 940 was
a board or plank to which offenders
were bound. The punishment of
Melantheus is referred to (not very
accurately) by Aristophanes, Plut. 309—
313 ὅποιον σφ... λαβὼντες ἀπὸ φθολίας
tὸν ναυτία μεμφήμενα τὴν ἐρχομὲν
κρυμβάνει.

175. δὲ αὐτοῦ 'from his body.'
22. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ X 229

βάν ὦ ἴμεν ἐς θαλάμων, λαβέτην δὲ μιν ἐνδον ἔντας.

ἡ τοι ὦ μὲν θαλάμῳ μυχᾶν κατὰ τεῦχε ἐρεύνα,

τοῖς δ᾽ ἐστάν ἐκατέρθε παρὰ σταθμοὶ μένοντε,

εὕς ὑπὲρ σῶδον ἢμανεν Μελανθίους, αἰπόλος αἰγῶν,

τῇ ἔτερῃ μὲν χειρὶ θέρων καλὰς τριφάλειαιν,

τῇ δ᾽ ἔτερῃ σάκος εὐφρ. γέρον, πεπαλαγμένον ἄξιον,

Δαέρτων ἔρως, ὦ κουρίκης φορέσκε.

δὴ τάτε γ᾽ ἤδη κεῖτο, μαθάλθ οὔτ᾽ ἐλένυτο ἱμάντων

τοῖς δ᾽ ἵππαις ἐκέλετο ἐλέτην, ἔρισαν τε μιν εἰσον

κουρίξ, ἐν δαπέδῳ δὲ χαμάλ βάλον ἄχνομενων κηρ,

οὖν δὲ πόδας χειρᾶς τε δέον θυμαλγεῖ δεσμῷ

εὔ μαλὰ ἀποστρέψαντε διαμπερεῖ, δὲ ἔκλεισεν

[νῦν Δαέρταο, πολύτλας δῖος Ἐδωνοσεύς]

σειρήν δὲ πλεκτὴν εἰς αὐτοῦ πειρήναντε

κλόν ἀν ἵπτιλην ἔρωσαν πέλασαν τε δοκοῦσι.

τὸν δ᾽ ἐπικερτόμενον προσέφης, Ἐβμαε συβέτα:

"νῦν μὲν δὴ μάλα πάγχυ, Μελανθίε, νῦκτα φιλάξεις, εὖν ἐνι μαλακή καταλέγμενος, ἦσε σε ἐσκενοῦντε σὲ γ᾽ ἥριγενεια παρ᾽ Ὡκεανοῦ μιᾷν

λήσει ἐπερχόμενη χρυσόθρονος, ἦνε ἀγίνεις

αἵματι μνηστήρεις δῆμον κατὰ δαίτα πένεσθαι."

"Ως δὲ μὲν ἄαθε κλέειπτο, ταθεὶς δελοφ εἰς δεσμῷ

τοῖς δ᾽ ἐς τεῦχα δῶντε, δόμην ἐκτιθέντε φαινήν,

βήτην εἰς Ὁδουσῆα δαίφρονα ποικιλομηθήνην.

179 δόντε conj. Classen. 184 εὔφρ. γέρον H U al.; εὐφρ. γέρον P: εὐφρότερον


181. παρά σταθμοίτερ 'by the doorposts,' but outside of the chamber (so that he could not see them); cp. 187 ἔρως τὲ μιν εἶναι.

184. γέρον, here a neut. adj., 'old,' 'used up.' This is the only place where it is applied to a thing.

185. κουρίξ 'when he was a κούρος,' i. e. a young warrior.

186. καῖτε apparently means 'was laid aside.'

188. κούρε 'by the hair.'

197 f. The irony of the speech is continued: 'the coming of dawn will not fail to call you (from that soft bed), at the time when you fetch the goats': an allusion, in the spirit of parody, to II. 24. 12–13 ὥδε μὲν ὢδας φαινώμενα λήθουσαν ὑπὲρ ὑλεία τὸ ἥδεον τε. Possibly we should read ἥδεος, impf. as ἥδεον (200). The word ἥδεον is not found elsewhere in Homer (Sittel, op. cit., p. 53).

201. ἐς τεῦχα δῶντε. They had taken off their armour before the affair with Melanthius.

θύρων ἐπιθέντα, cp. l. 157.
ἔνθα μένος πνεύματες ἠφέστασαν, οἱ μὲν ἐπ' οὕτῳ τέσσαρες, οἱ δ' ἐνυσθήκαν δόμοι πολέες τε καὶ ἐσθλοῖ.

τοῖς δ' ἐκ ἀγχῇς μολὼν θυγάτηρ Δίδημος ἢλθεν Ἀθηνή, 205
Μέντορι εἰδομένη ἤμεν δέμας ἢδε καὶ αὐθήν.

τὴν δ' 'Οδυσσεύς γῆθησεν ἵδον καὶ μίθων ἐξετῃ:

"Μέντορ, ἄμμον ἄρην, μὴνοι οὐ' ἐτάροιο φίλοιο, 210
δὲ σ' ἀγαθὰ βέσακον" ὄμηλικὴ δὲ μοι ἔσσι.

'Ως φάτ', οἴδημεν λαοσδόν ἐμμεν Ἀθηνήν.

μνηστήρες δ' ἐτέρωθεν ὁμβλεφέν ἐν μεγάροις.

πρῶτος τὴν γ' ἐνενίπτε Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος:

"Μέντορ, μὴ σ' ἐπέσσι παραπτετῆσιν 'Οδυσσεύς

μνηστήρεσι μάχεσθαι, ἀμυνέμεναι δὲ οἱ αὐτῷ.

άδε γὰρ ἡμέτερον γε νῦν τελέσσαθι διὰ

ὀπτῆτε κεν τούτων κτεώμεν, πατέρ' ἢδε καὶ νῦν,

ἐν δὲ σο τοίς ἐπείτα περὶσσα, οἷα μενονικὲς

ἐράνων ἐν μεγάροις ὁφ' δ' αὐτοῦ κράτατι τίσεις.

αὐτὰρ ἐκείνη υἱόπω γε βλας ἀφελώμεθα χαλκῷ,

κτήμαθ' ὑπόσα τοῦ ἐστι, τὰ τ' ἐνδοθε καὶ τὰ θύρηφι,

220
tοῖς 'Οδυσσῆοι μεταμίζεμεν οὐδὲ τοι ὑπάλλ
ζώες ἐν μεγάροιν ἐάσσομεν οὐδὲ θύγατρας,

οὖθ' ἀλοχον κεδνήν 'Ἰδάκης κατὰ ἐστιν πολέειν."

'Ως φάτ', Ἀθηναίη δὲ χολώσατο κηράθι μᾶλλον,

νείκεσσεν δ' 'Οδυσσῆα χαλωτοῖσιν ἐπέσσιν
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"οὔκετί σοι γ', 'Οδυσσῆ, μένος ἐμπεθεν οὐδὲ τύς ἀλή,

οῃ ὃτ' ἀμφ' 'Ελένη λευκωλένε εὐπατέρη

230
tὶς οἴδὸν G F al. 204 δόμου G. 211 ἐκ μεγάρων G X. 216 κτεώμεν]
22. ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ Χ

εἰνάτεσ Τρόμησιν ἐμάρναυ νολεμέας αἰεί,
pολλοὺς δ' ἀνδρας ἐπεφηνέ ἐν αἰνῇ δησίτητι,
σὺ δ' ἦλω βουλή Πριάμου πόλει ἑυρώναγια.
pῶς δή νῦν, ὅτε σὺν γε δήμων καὶ κτήμαθ' ἰκάνεις,
ἀντα μνηστήρων ὀλοφόρει ἀλκιμος εἶναι;
ἀλλ' ἔγε δεύρο, πέπον, παρ' ἐμ' ἱστασο καὶ ἰδε ἐργον,
ὁφ' εἴδης οἷς τοι ἐν ἀνδράσι δυσμενέσσοι
Μέντωρ 'Ἀλκιμίδης εὐεργεσίας ἀποτύνειν.'

Ἡ ρα, καὶ οὗ ποι πάγχυ δίδον ἑπεραλκέα νίκην,
ἀλλ' ἐγ' ἁρα σθενέσ τε καὶ ἄλκης πειρητίζεν
ἡμὲν ὄδυσσην ἥδ' ἐνοῦ κυδαλίμοιο.
ἀυτῆ δ' αἰθαλέους ἀνὰ μεγάροι μέλαθρον
ἐξε' ἀναίσασα, χελιδών εἰκέλη ἀντήν.

Μνηστήρας δ' ὁτρυνυ Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος
Ἐὐρώνυμος τε καὶ Ἀμφιμέδων Ἁμποπόλεμός τε
Πεισανδρός τε Πολυκορίδης Πόλυβος τε δαίφρων
οἱ γαρ μνηστήρων ἀρετὴ ἔσαν ἐξοχ' ἀριστοι,
ὅσοι εἰ' ἐξων περὶ τε ψυχέων ἐμάγουντο.
τοὺς δ' ἢδ' ἐφάμασσε βίδο καὶ ταρφέις λοι.

τοῖς δ' Ἀγέλαος μετέειπεν, ἐσο πάντεσοι τιφάοδοκοι,
"ὤ φίλοι, ἡδ' σχῆσει ἀνήρ ὅδε χεῖρας ἀάπτουν·
καὶ δ' οἱ Μέντωρ μὲν ἐβῆ κενὰ εὔγματα εἰπὼν,
οἱ δ' οἱ λειποῦται ἐπὶ πρότης θύρῃς·

233 Ἡσταο Η. 235 εὐφροσύνῃς Ρ. 247 'Αγέλαος H. al., cp. 131. 249 σεβάδ
P: hence perhaps we should restore σεβάς.

233. ἀλφόφορει ἀλκιμος εἶναι. The
inf. is construed as though ἀλφόφορει
'you bewail' were a strong equivalent
for ὁδ μέμνον or ὁδ τῆλημα, 'you do
not endure.' Thus the meaning is the
opposite of that given by a similar
construction in II. 2. 290 ἀλλάξως
ἄφοροι οἰκίνευς νίκισα.

233. παρ' ἐμ' Ἡσταο, an epic phrase,
not quite appropriate here (Sittl, p. 43).

235. 'Ἀλκιμίδης, a name chosen with
a view to the context, especially to
ἄλκιμος in l. 232.

236. ἑπεραλκέα νίκην, a phrase taken
from the Iliad, where it probably means
'victory by other strength,' i.e. by an
accession of strength (see II. 7. 26). This
suits the present passage. Athenae
did not yet give 'other' ἄληθ, i.e. her
own help, but still made trial of the
ἄληθ of Ulysses and his son.

240. ἀντήν, lit. 'facing,' strengthens
ἄληθι: she was 'like a swallow if set
opposite to one.' This seems to imply
that Athenae now took the shape of
a swallow,—not merely (as some think)
that she flew up to the roof like one.

244. οἷς γὰρ. The pronoun may be
either the article or the relative (οἷς):
 cp. 24. 255.
τῷ νῦν μὴ ἄμα πάντες ἐφετε δοῦρα τοιαύτα μακρά, ἀλλ' ἀγεθ' οἱ ἐξ πρῶτον ἀκοντίσαν, αἱ κέ πολι Ζεὺς δῷ Ὁδοσοῦτα βλήσθαι καὶ κύδος ἄρθαμα. 

τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὖ κῆδος, ἔπει χ' οὔτω γε πέτρων.

"Ωσ ἐφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκοντίσαν ὡς ἐκέλευς, ἱμενον τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐσόρα θέκεν Ἀθήνη.

τῶν ἁλλὸς μὲν σταθμῶν εὐστάθεσις μεγάρῳ βεβλήκει, ἁλλὸς δὲ θύρῃ πυκνοῦς ἀραμάων ἁλλὸν δ' ἐν τοίχῳ μελίνοι πέτε χαλκοβάρβαι, αὐτ' ἐπει δὴ δούρατ' ἀλευνάτῳ μυστήρων, τοῖς δ' ἀμά μηθών ἥρχε πολύτλας δῖος Ὅδοσοῦτος. "δ' φιλοι, ἥδη μὲν κεν ἑγών ἐπετοι καὶ ἄμμι μυστήρεως ἐς διμον ἀκοντίσαι, οἱ μεμάζων ἡμεῖς ἐξενερέξας ἐς προτέρους κακοῖς.

"Ωσ ἐφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκοντίσαν ὡς ἐκέλευς 265 ἀντα τιτυκόμενοι: Ἁμοπτέλεμον μὲν Ὅδοσοῦτος, Ἕμυσθν' δ' ἀρα Τηλέμαχος, Ἐλατον δὲ συβάις, Πεισάνδρον δ' ἀρ' ἐκεφυράν βοών ἐπιβακάκισκες ἀνήρ. οἱ μὲν ἐπεθ' ἀμα πάντες ἐδαξ' ἐλων ἀπετοι νὐδας, μυστήρες δ' ἀνεχώρησαν μεγάρωι μυχώδει: 270 τοι δ' ἀρ' ἐπέθειαν, νεκτῶν δ' ἐς ἠγχε' ἐλοντο.

Ἀδήσι δὲ μυστήρες ἀκοντίσαν ὡς ἐκέλευς δοῦρα ἱμενον: τὰ δὲ πολλά ἐτάσια θέκεν Ἀθήνη.

254 ἐπὶ χ' F: ἐς τῷ vulg. 265 ἐς τῷ χαλκῷ P: ἐς ἐκέλευς J. 270 μεγάρῳ]

θεάμαινο U.

252. οἱ ὡς 'six of the number': H. V. § 260, c.

253. ἄρεσθα. The change of subject with the infinitive is characteristic of Homer: Ὅδοσοῦτα βλήσθαι καὶ [ἦμι] ἄρεσθα. It is a survival from the original Infinitive, which was an abstract noun. Cr. 2. 237, II. 9. 230.

254. οὗ καθά 'there is no caring about them.' The seeming play of language with καθά and καθά can hardly be intended: but see 13. 144., 17. 252., 18. 305.

258. θύρῃ, sing. because of course one only of the folding doors was struck: so in 275.

270. μέγαρωι μυχώδε 'to the innermost part of the μέγαρον.' Cr. θαλάμῳ μυχός (180). We need not suppose that any distinct part of the room was intended by the word μυχός.

273. τὰ δὲ πολλά καθ' 'and they, many as they were, &c.' We must not take τὰ πολλὰ together in the sense of 'most of them,' as in later Greek. Cr. 17. 537 τὰ δὲ πολλὰ καθαντευα. Note however that καθα is not used here (as it is in 1. 256), because two of the spears were not wholly without effect.
22. ΟΔΑΣΕΙΔΑΣ X

τῶν ἄλλων μὲν σταθμὸν ἑσταθέος μεγάρου βεβλήκει, ἄλλοι δὲ θύρην πυκνῶς ἀραρίαν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἐν τοίχῳ μελῆ πέσε χαλκοβάρεια.

'Αμφιμέδων δ' ἄρα Τηλέμαχον βάλε ἵππον ἐπὶ καρπῆς λύγδην, ἄκορν δὲ μουν δηλήσατο χαλέβα.

Κτήσιππος δ' Ἐυμαιον υπὲρ σάκος ἐγχεὶ μακρῆς ὅμοι ἑγέγραψεν τὸ δ' ὑπέρπετο, πίπτε δ' ἔραξεν. τοι δ' αὐτ' ἀμφ' Ὀδυσσεία δαϊφρονα ποικιλομήτην μνηστήριον ἐς δαμον ἀκόμησαν δέεα δούρα.

ἐνθ' αὐτ' Ἐυμηδαμαντα βάλε πτολίπορος Ὀδυσσείος, Ἀμφιμέδωντα δ' Τηλέμαχος, Ἐυμιθον δὲ συβάτης Κτήσιππον δ' ἀπ' ἑπείτα βοῶν ἐπιβουκόλος ἀνήρ βεβλήκει πρὸς στήθος, ἐπευχόμενος δ' προσηύδα: "δ' Πολυθεσίδη φιλοκέρτομε, μή ποτὲ πάμποι πείκων ἀφραδθὲς μέγα εἰσίν, ἀλλὰ θεώσι μύθοιν εἰπτεύσαι, ἐπεὶ ἡ πολύ φέρτερο εἶσιν.

τοῦτο τοι αὐτ' ποθὲν ξεινήλον, ὡν ποτ' ἂνθεκας ἀντιθέω 'Ὁδυσσε' δόμον κατ' ἀλητεύοντι.'

'Ἡ ρα βοῶν ἀλίκων ἐπιβουκόλος· αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσείδος οὕτα Δαμαστορίδην αὐτοχεδῶν ἐγχεὶ μακρῆς Τηλέμαχος δ' Ἐυνορίδης Λειάκρων οὕτα δουρὶ μέσον κενάωνα, διαστῷ δὲ χαλκοῦ ὧλαςεν κηρεὶ δ' πρανῆς, χόωνα δ' ἀλασε παντὶ μετέπορθ' δὴ τοῦ Ἀθηναίη φθισίμβροτον ἀγθῆ ἀνέσχεν

294 Λειάκρων F U al. 295 χαλεδις F.

278. ἀγθὴν 'grazing it.'
279. μύθοιν ἐπιτέρψας 'commit to the gods the μύθος,' i.e. the thing that you would say. The meaning is not 'leave it to the gods to speak,' but (with a slightly illogical extension of the sense of μύθος) 'leave it to the gods to deal with the matter (instead of your speaking about it).'
282. οὕτα, see the note on 1. 92.
284. Λειάκρων. The names written in our texts Λειάκρων (οι Λειάκρων) and Λειάθης are probably derived from an Old Ionic form λῆθ (for λῆθος). They must have been originally written Λειάκρωτος and Λειάθης (cf. Λειάθης). The form λῆθ was preserved in Ionic; Hipponax (88) λῆθ ἀδρέων is quoted by the grammarians. Similarly the stem of Θάρσος (the later Θάρως) is preserved in the proper names Θερέτης, Ἀλέθρης, and Πολυθερείδης (1. 287). It is incorrect to regard these forms as Aeolic. Similar forms are common in proper names of all the dialects.
297. The interference of Athene, fore-
22. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ X

υψόθεν ἐξ ὀροφῆς τῶν δὲ φρένες ἐπτοίθηνεν.
oi δ' ἑφέβουτο κατὰ μέγαρον βδες ὡς ἀγελαίαι,
tὰς μὲν τ' αἰδόσοι οἴστρος ἐφορμηθεὶς ἐδόνησεν
ἀργὴ ἐν εἰαρνῇ, ὁτε τ' ἡματα μακρὰ πέλουται:
oi δ' ὡς τ' αἰγυπτοὶ γαμφώνυχες ἀγκυλοχεῖλαι
ἐξ ὀρέων ἐλθόντας εἵν' ὀρνίθεσαι θῶροσι' ταὶ μὲν τ' ἐν πεδίῳ νέφα πτάσουσαν ἠνεταί,
oi δὲ τὰς ἀλεκουσιν ἐπάλμενοι, οὐδὲ τις ἄλκῃ
gίγνεται οὐδὲ φυγῇ χαλροσι δὲ τ' ἀνέρες ἀγρῇ.
ὡς ἄρα τοι μνηστήρας ἐπεσύμενοι κατὰ δώμα
τόπτων ἐπιστροφήν τῶν δὲ στόνον ὄρνυτ' ἀεικῆς
κράτων τυπτομένων, δάπεδον δ' ἀπαν ἀλματι θῆνε.

Δειώδης δ' 'Οδυσσός ἐπεσύμενος λάβε χοῦνων,
καὶ μνι λισσόμενο ἔτεα πτερόετα προσηόδα:
"γανούμαι σ', 'Οδυσσέω τ' ὅπὲ μ' αἰδεο καὶ μ' ἐλέγσον
οὐ γάρ τῷ τινά φημι γυναικῶν ἐν μεγάροις
εἰπείν οὐδὲ τί βέξαι ἀτάσθαλον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλους
παύσεικαν μνηστήρας, δτις τοιαῦτα γε βέξαι.

ἀλλὰ μοι οὐ πεθόντο κακῶν ἀπ' χείρας ἔχεσθαι:
tο καὶ ἀτάσθαλίσιν ἀεικά πτόμον ἐπέσον.

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μετὰ τοῖς θυσικὸς οὐδὲν ἑοργῶς
κείσομαι, ὡς οὐκ ἔστι χάρις μετόπισθ' εὐεργέων."

Τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόπδρα Ἰδῶν προσέφη πολύμητος 'Οδυσσέως:
"εἰ μὲν δὴ μετὰ τοίς θυσικὸς εὔχεαι εἶναι,

---

shadowed in 16. 260, and again in this book (l. 236), now begins. She takes her own form, of which the terror-
striking αἰδος was a chief attribute. 300. αἰδος 'darting,' 'dancing about,'
ἐδόθησεν 'swept along': δανίω is especially used of the wind. 301. οὐ δὲ κτλ., taken up again in
l. 307 δὲ ἄρα τοι κτλ.

304. νέφα πτάσουσα 'shrinking from the region of the clouds,' i.e. flying
as low as possible. 305. ἠνεταί 'are urged along,' the passive
of ἐνέω, probably a different word from ἔμασι 'I aim at, desire.'

308-309., = Il. 10. 483-484., 21. 30-
21. τῶν is masc., as in the Iliad.

310. κείσομαι 'shall be laid low,'
'shall fall': cp. Soph. El. 244 eι γὰρ
ὁ μὲν θανόν γὰ τε καὶ οὐδὲν ἐν κατάστη
τάλας.
22. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Χ

πολλάκι ποι μέλλεις ἀρέμεναι ἐν μεγάροισι
tηλῷ ἐμοὶ νόστῳ τέλος γλυκεροῖο γενέσθαι,
σοὶ δ’ ἀλοχὸν τε φθινόντι σπέσεαι καὶ τέκνα τεκέσθαι
tῷ οὐκ ἂν θάνατον γε δυσπέσει προφύγοισθα.”

“Ως ἄρα φωνήσας εἴφος εἰλετό χειρὶ παχεῖν
κείμενον, δ’ ἤ' Ἀγέας αἰτύροικὰ χαμάξε
κτεινόμενος τῷ τόν γε κατ’ αἰχένα μέσον ἔλασσεν
φθεγγομένου δ’ ἄρα τοῦ γε κάρη κονίσα μεῖκην.
Τερπιάθαι δ’ ἐσ’ οἴοις ἀλύσκαι κήρα μέλαιναι,
Φήμιος, δε δ’ ἠκίδε μετὰ μυστήριον ἄνάγκην.

έστι δ’ εἰς χεῖρεσσιν ἔχων φόρμιγγα λύγειαν
ἄγχι παρ’ ὄρσοδήρῳ δοκάς δὲ φρεσὶ μερμήριζεν,
ἡ ἔκδύς μεγάρῳ Δίδς μεγάλου ποτὶ βομβὸν
ἐρκεῖον ἐξωτε τετυγμένον, ἐνθ’ ἄρα πολλὰ
Λαέρτης 'Οδυσεύς τε βοῶν ἐπὶ μηρί έκηκαν,
ἡ γούνων λύσσοιτο προσαίζεσ 'Οδυσσὴ.

όδε δέ οἱ φρονοῦντι δοσᾶσθαι κέρδοις εἶναι,
γούνων ἀφανοῖ Δαερτιάδεω 'Οδυσσὸς.

ἡ τοι ὁ φόρμιγγα γλαφυρὴν κατέθηκε χαμάξε
μεσσηγὸς κρήτηρος ἰδεθ ὑμνὸν ἀγγυρούλου,
αὐτὸς δ’ αὐτ’ 'Οδυσσὴ προσαίζες λάβει γούνων,
καὶ μὲν λισθόμενος ἐπεκα πτερόειτα προοῦσθα.

“γούνωμι σ’ ὁ Ὀδυσσὸς’ οὐ δὲ μ’ αἰθεὶ καὶ μ’ ἐλέησον
αὐτῷ τοι μετόπισθ’ ἄχοι ἐσσεται, εἰ κεν αἰοίδιν

322 του Φ ΧΖ: μου Γ Ρ Η Η αι.
φιέρστιν Α. 333 οροθόρη (sic) Π.

322. μέλλεις ἀρέμεναι 'you are like to
have prayed;' 'it must be that you
prayed:' μέλλεις with the present or
aorist inf. has this force: see on 14. 133.
333. ταῦτα, a litotes, since the real
meaning is 'prayed that I might never
return at all.'

333. δίχα δὲ κτλ. The alternatives
were (1) to slip out of the μῆγαρον by
the δρόσοθρη, and seat himself as a
surplus at the altar of Zeus in the
ἀίθη, or (2) at once to throw himself on
the mercy of Ulysses.

323 ίμοι Ρ Η Κ. 327 χαμάξε
335 ίοιο Γ Ρ Η Η αι.: ιοιον vulg.

335. ιοιον. The aor. is the more
appropriate tense here, the meaning
being 'should seat himself.'

341. κρήτηρος. The mixing bowl was
in the μυχὸν or innermost part of the
μῆγαρον, cp. 21. 145 πάρα κρήτηρι δὲ
καλὸν ἤμεν καταμαθότας αὐτὸν. Further, it
was within reach of the δρόσοθρη, near
which Phemius was (l. 333). Hence
we must place the δρόσοθρη as near
as possible to the upper end of the
μῆγαρον,—either in the end wall or
(more probably) in the side wall.
πέφυς, δι τε θεοί καὶ ἀνθρώπωσιν ἄείδω. αὐτοδίδακτος δ' εἰμὶ, θεὸς δὲ μοι ἐν φρεσίν οἷμαι παντολας ἐνέφυσεν ἑώκα ὅτι τοῖς παραειδέοι ως τε τη' τῷ μή με λιλαεό διεροτομῆσαι. καὶ κεν Τηλέμαχος τάδε γ' εἶποι, ὅσο φίλος ὦδος, ὡς ἐγὼ ὅτι τι ἐκάνες ἐς τοῦ δέμον σωθ' χατίζων παλεύσης μυστηρίων ἀδειόμενος μετὰ δαίμον, ἀλλὰ πολὺ πλέονες καὶ κρέσοσθεν ἤγον ἀνάγκη."  

"Αλς φάτο, τοῦ δ' ἤκουσε ἱερή ἵς Τηλεμάχου, αἰφα δ' ἐν πατέρα προσεφώνεσσεν εὐγνό ἔννοιαν: "Ιδοχεο μὴ δ' τοῦτον ἀναίτιον οὔταε χαλκῷ καὶ κήρυκα Μέδοντα σαώσομεν, ὅτι τε μεν αἰεὶ ὁλοκ ἐν ἡμετέρῳ κηδέσκετο παῖδες ἔννοιαν, εἰ δὴ μή μιν ἔπεφευς Φιλοκτεν ἢ συβάτης, ἢ σοι ἀντεβθήσῃς ὑμνομένῳ κατὰ δώμα." 360

"Αλς φάτο, τοῦ δ' ἤκουσε μεδόν πενυμένα εἰδώς πεπτηός γὰρ ἐκεῖτο ὑπὸ θρόνον, ἀμφὲ δὲ δέρμα ἐστο βοῦδε νεάδατον, ἀλύσκων κήρα μελαιναν. αἰφα δ' ὑπὸ θρόνον ἀρτιο, βοῦδε δ' ἀπέδυνε βοϊν, Τηλέμαχον δ' ἄρ' ἐπειτα προσαιάζας λάβε γοβέων, 365 καὶ μιν λισόμενον ἐπει περβίνα προσιήδα: 


347. αὐτοδίδακτος is a word which implies that the art of the ἀδών was becoming, or had become, a regular profession, in which teaching might take the place of inspiration.

οἷμαι 'λαγά,' 'poema.' Cp. 8. 74 οἷμη τῆς τοῦ ἄρα ἀλὸς οἰδὰν ἐφ' αὑν λεια, λεια Ὑδοὺςεῖο καὶ Πηλεῖον Ἀχιλῆος 'a song whose fame then rose to heaven, namely the strife of Ulysses and Achilles' (as the Iliad might be called the strife of Agamemnon and Achilles). The word οἷμα may mean 'going, course,' cp. οἷμος and οἷμα, also the fine imitation in Tennyson's Ode on the death of the Duke of Wellington, 'and ever-ringing avenues of song.' 348. ηοίκα δ' τοι παραειδέον 'I am fit to sing before you,' a personal construction, nearly = 'it is fit that I should sing.' This use of ηοίκα is not common, except in the participle ηοίκας. Some take it to mean 'I seem, in singing to you, to be singing to a god.' This is harsh, and moreover is not the sense required by the context. It is not the glory of Ulysses, but the especial worthiness of Phemius, that is insisted on.

352. μέρα δαύας 'among their feasts,' i.e. in the company at their feasts. The acc. is due to the verb of motion παλεύσης, with which μέρα δαύας is to be construed.
"ἐὰν γὰρ μὲν ὄβεστέ, εἰπε δὲ πατρὶ μὴ με περισσεύον μὴ διλήσεται ὁμίχλη, ἀνδρῶν μνηστήριον κεχολαμμένος, οὐ οἱ ἐκείρων κτήματ' ἐνε μεγάρῳ, δὲ νῦντίοι οὔδεν ἔτιον." 370

Τὸν δ' ἐπιμελήσας προσέφη πολύμητι 'Οδυσσεύς: 373

"Θάρσει, ἐπεὶ δὴ ὦ οὖν ἐρώσατο καὶ ἐσάωσεν, δόρα γνώρι κατὰ θυμόν, ἀτὰρ εἰπησθα καὶ ἄλλορ, ὥς κακοφυῆς εὐθρησκῆ μεγ' ἀμείβων.

ἀλλ' ἐξελθόντες μεγάρων ἔσθεθε θύρας ἐκ φόνου εἰς αὐλήν, σὺ τε καὶ πολύφημος ἀοιδὸς, δόρ' ἀν ἐγὼ κατὰ δόμα πονησσομαι δρεὶν μὲ χρή;"

"Ως φάτο, τὸ δ' ἔσω βήτην μεγάρων κοινῆ, ἐξεσθῆν δ' ἄρα τὸ γε Αἰδώς μεγάλον ποτι βωμόν, πάντοτε παπταίνοντε, φόνον πυτιδεγμένον αἰεί. 380

Πάπτηνεν δ' Ἅδους καθ' ἐναὶ δόμαν, εἰ τις ἐτ' ἀνδρῶν ἐκεῖστον, ἀλοκότης κῆρα μέιλαιν. 385
tοὺς δὲ ἢν μαλα πάντας ἐν αἵματι καὶ κοινῆς πεπτεόντας πολλοὺς, ὡς τ' ἱγθα, ὅσοι θ' ἀλίθες κούλον ἐς αἰγιαλὸν πολιής ἑκτοσθε θαλάσσης
dικτύον ἐξέρυσαν πολυπνῷ οἱ δὲ τε πάντες κυριά' ἄλας ποθέοντες ἔπει παμάθουσι κήρυκται
tῶν μὲν τ' ἱέλιος φαέθων ἐξελείτο θυμόν-

δὸς τὸν δ' ἄρα μυστήρες ἐπ' ἄλληλοι κήρυκται
dὴ τὸν Τηλέμαχον προσέφη πολύμητι 'Οδυσσεύς: 390
"Τηλέμαχ', εἰ δ' ἀγε μοι κάλεσον τροφὸν Εὔρυκλειαν,

ἀλλ' ἐποῖο εἰπομή τὸ μοι καταθύμιον εἶτιν.

"Ως φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ φίλος ἐπεείθετο πατρὶ,

κνήσας δὲ θύρης προσέφη τροφὸν Εὔρυκλειαν.

367 ὑ' G FR Z. 392 ἐκείνου vulg.

382. ἑπρολεξώθετον 'were concealing himself.' 583, where Oeneus stands on the threshold κατὰ πολλῆς σωσίας, γυναικέας
385. κοῦλον 'curving': the fishermen drew their nets into a bay. νῦν, Virgil, the Aeneid, 1. 88. 394. κνήσας δὲ θύρης κτλ. Tele-

machus throws the door to call the men stand on the threshold ἐρωτῶν κατὰ πολλῆς σωσίας, γυναικέας νῦν, Virgil, the Aeneid, 1. 88. 394. κνήσας δὲ θύρης κτλ. Tele-
machus throws the door to call the attention of Eurykleia. Cp. II. 9. 581-

583, where Oeneus stands on the threshold κατὰ πολλῆς σωσίας, γυναικέας νῦν, Virgil, the Aeneid, 1. 88. 394. κνήσας δὲ θύρης κτλ. Tele-

machus throws the door to call the attention of Eurykleia. Cp. II. 9. 581-
"δεύρο δὴ ὅρσο, γρηγοραγενές, ἢ τε γυναικῶν δημιουρόν σκοπός ἐσσι κατὰ μέγαρ' ἡμετέρας ἐρχεοί· κικλήσκει σε πατήρ ἐμὸς, ὄφρα τι εἶπην." 395

"Ὡς δὲ ἐφόνησεν, τῇ δ' ἀπερός ἐπετεύ μῦθος, διέπνευ δὲ θύρας μεγάρων εὐ ναιετάβαν, βὴ δ' ἤμεν· αὐτὰρ Τηλέμαχος πρόσθ' ἥγεμονευν. εὐρεν ἐπειτ' Ὀδυσσῆα μετὰ κταμένοις νέκυσοι, αἴματι καὶ λόθρον πεπαλαγμένον ὄς τε λέοντα, ὅς βά τε βεβρακωδὸς βοῦς ἐρχεται ἀγραύλων. 400

πάν δ' ἅρα οἱ στήθος τε παρῆκα τ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν αἰματάθνα τέλει, δεινὸς δ' εἰς ἀπα ἰδέοταν·

"Ὡς Ὀδυσσείς πεπάλακτο πῦθας καὶ χείρας ὑπερβεβ' ὧ δ' ὃς οὖν νέκυα τε καὶ ἀστετον εἰσιδεν αἴμα,

Ἰθυσέν' β' ἀλολούφας, ἐπεὶ μέγα ἐλισεὶν ἕργον,

ἀλλ' Ὀδυσσείς κατέρυκε καὶ ἐσχεθεν λεμένην περ,

καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἑπεκ περήβεντα προσῆθα· "ἐν θυμῷ, γρηγορ, χαίρε καὶ ἵππου μηθ' ἀλιθὺς·

οὐχ ὅση κταμένοις ἐν' ἀνδράσιν εὐχετάσθαι,

τοὺς δὴ μοῦ ἑδάμασσε θεῶν καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα

οὗ τινα γὰρ τέσκον ἐπιχειδονέν ἄνθρώπων,

οὐ κακὸν οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλόν, δὺς σφέας ἐνσαφείκοιτο·

τῷ καὶ ἀταθαλήσαν ἀεικέα πτὸμον ἐπέστων. 410

413 τῶν δὲ F: τῶν δὲ G P: τοῦδε δὲ vulg.

doors only was actually shaken: cp. 22. 258, 275. For the question as to the position of this door see the Appendix on the Homeric House.

398. For τῇ δ' ἀπερός cp. see the note on 17. 57.

408. ἐθνόεν 'set herself to,' 'prepared.'

ἀλολούφα 'to cry aloud.' The ἀλολούφα was a joyful cry, uttered by women, especially at the moment of the consummation of a sacrifice: see the note on 3. 450. According to Herodotus (4. 189) the ritual use originated with the women of Libya, and they excelled in the performance of it.

ἀλολούφα is a little awkward after the same word in 1. 407: perhaps we should read ἀλολούφα (falsaro), and thus get rid of the hiatus at the same time.

415. οὐ κακὸν οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλόν. Of the two opposites here denied it is the second which is logically important. There is no point in the assertion—taken by itself—that the Suitors did not honour the unworthy (μικρό): but the addition of οὐ κακὸν leads up to and gives effect to οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλόν. 'They honoured 'neither bad nor good' is a rhetorical way of saying that they honoured good no more than bad (and therefore not at all). An example of this illogical or at least pleonastic form of expression may be found in Soph. El. 305 τάς ὀθονας τε μου καὶ τάς ἄταθας ἀλλατα δεσδορευ.
22. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Χ

άλλ' ἄγε μοι σὺ γυναῖκας ἐνὶ μεγάροις κατάλεγον, αἰ τέ μ' ἀτιμάζουσι καὶ αἰ νηλικίδες εἰσιν."

Τὸν δ' αὐτὲ προσεύχειτο φίλη τρόφος Εὐρυκλεία: "τοιγάρ ἐγώ τοι, τέκνην, ἄληθείνα καταλέγω. 420
πεντήκοντα τοι ἐνὶ ἐνὶ μεγάροις γυναῖκες δῷς, τὰς μὲν τ' ἑργα διδάξαμεν ἑργαζεσθαί,
ἐξιά τε ξαίνειν καὶ δουλοσύνην ἄνεχεσθαι:
τῶν δάδεκα πᾶσαι ἀναδείξεις ἐπείβησαν,
οὗτ' ἐμε τίλουσαι οὕτ' αὐτὴν Πηνελόπειαν.
Τηλέμαχος δὲ νέον μὲν ἄδεξε, οὐδὲ ἐ μῆτηρ
σημαίνειν τὴν εἰσακίνῃ ἐπὶ διμφῆσι γυναίκης.
ἄλλ' ἀγ' ἐγὼν ἀναβάσα' ὑπεραίνῃ συγκαλυπτα
ἐπιο σή ἀλήχρι, τῇ τις θεῖς ὑπ' οὖν ἐπώρεσιν."

Τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσεύχη πολύμνης 'Οδυσσέως:
"μὴ πω τήν γ' ἐπέγειρε; ώτ δ' ἐνθάδε εἰπὲ γυναίκης 431
ἐλθέμεν, αἰ πὲρ πρὸςθεν ἄκικα μηχανῶντο." "Ως δρ' ἔφη, γηῆς δὲ διὲκ μεγάροιο βεβήκει
ἀγγελέουσα γυναίκι καὶ ὅρμηνουσα νέοςαι.
αὐτὰρ ὁ Τηλέμαχος καὶ βουκόλον ἢδε συβάτην
εἰς καλεσάμενος ἔπεα περέσταντα προστῆδα:
"ἀρχέτε νῦν νέκυας φορέως καὶ ἀναχθε γυναίκας:
αὐτὰρ ἐπειτα θρόνους περικαλλέας ἢδε τραπέζας
θάται καὶ στόχευοι πολυτρήτους καθαίρειν.
αὐτὰρ ἐπῆν δὴ πάντα δόμων κατακομμὴσεθε, 440
διμφᾶς ἐξαγαγότες ἐυσταθεῖος μεγάροιο,
μεσογύς τὸ θόλου καὶ ἐμύνοιοι ἐρκεος αὐλής,

418 νηλικίδες, ssc 19. 498. 419 φίλη τρόφος] πειρήφων G. 420 δουλοσύνην
432. ημιχανόων 'have been working,' impi. as in 28. 456. 437. φορέω 'to carry away,' cp. l. 440. The word is to be supplied again
Od. 23. 13. 52. with ἀνοίξει. 442. θόλου, a dome-shaped building,
425. νέον ἄλκετο 'was but lately
424. δώδεκα πᾶσαι 'twelve in all.'
426. νέον ἄλκετο 'was but lately
growing to man's estate.'
θειέμεναι είφρεσιν ταυτήκεσιν, εἰς ὅ, κε πασέων ψυχὰς ἐξαφέλησθε, καὶ ἐκλελάθων τ’ Ἀφροδίτης, τὴν ἅρ’ ὑπὸ μυστηρίων ἔχον μισοῦστο τε λάβρη." 445

"Ως ἐφαθ’, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ὀλλέες ἥλθον ἀπασαὶ, αἰν’ ὀλοφυρμέναι, θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χένυσαί. πρῶτα μὲν οὖν νέκυας φόρεου κατατεθμότας, καὶ δ’ ἅρ’ ὑπ’ αἰθοῦσῃ τίθεναν εὐεργεῖος αὐλῆς, ἀλλήλους ἐρείδουσαν· σήμαινε δ’ Ὑδυσσέως αὐτὸς ἐπισπέρχον ταῖς ἅρ’ ἐκφέρον καὶ ἄναγης. αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα ἄρον ναύς περικαλέαι ἥδ’ τραπέζας ὑδατι καὶ σπόγγους πολυπρήτους καθαροὺν.

αὐτὰρ Τηλέμαχος καὶ βουκόλος ἡδ’ συβάτης λέστροισιν δάπεδον πῦκα ποιητοῖ δόμου 450

ζυόν ταῖς ἅρ’ ἐκφέρον δμφαί, τίθεναν δὲ θώρακε. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τὰς μέγας ὁμισορρήσας, δμψᾶ δ’ ἐξάγαγωςτις εὐσταθείος μεγάρου, μεσηγός τε θόλου καὶ ἀμύνονος ἐρκες αὐλῆς, εἴλετο ἐν στείλει, δὴν ὅ τοι ἦν ἀλώβαι.

tοῦτι δὲ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἧρξ’ ἀγορεύοιν· "μή μὲν δὴ καθαρφ’ θανάτῳ ἐπὶ θυμὸν ἐλοίμην τάνων, αἱ δὴ ἐμὴ κεφάλῃ κατ’ ὀνείδεα χεῖναν μνημέρι θ’ ἡμετέρη παρά τε μυστηρίων ἱανων.” 460

"Ως ἅρ’ ἐφη, καὶ πείσεια νεὰς κυανοπρόφοιο κλωνος ἐξάγας μεγάλης περίβαλλε θόλου, υψὸς’ ἐπεντανύσα, μή τις τεσθιν οὔδας ἱκουτο.

444. ἐκλελάθων’ Hermann: ἐκλελάθων’ MSS. 450 ἀλλήλοις M: ἀλλή-


449. ὅμ’ αἰθοῦσῃ αὐλῆς ‘under the portico of the court-yard.’ This was close to the entrance of the αὐλῆς, as is shown by the description in 23. 49 ἡ’ αἰσθητοῖ δόρρων δάκρων.

450. ἀλλήλους ἐρείδουσαν ‘pilling them against each other;’ i.e. setting them in a row leaning against each other and the wall of the αἰσθώνα.

456. ἐκφέρον ‘carried away’ (the scrapings). 462. μὴ ἀλώμην, an emphatic negative, putting away the idea of doing a thing; cp. 7. 316: H. G. § 299(e).

464. ἡμετέρη, plur. because Tele-

machus speaks as a member of a family. 466. κλωνος, doubtless one of the columns of the αἰσθώνα, and accordingly on the line of the ἐφρος αὐλῆς (443). περίβαλλε ‘threw (the loose end) round’ the top of the θόλος, and then drew the rope tight.
22. ΟΔΗΣΕΙΑΣ Χ

ός δ’ ὑ’ ἄν ἡ κίχλαι ταπαύνετοι ἦ τέλειαι
ἐξεῖ κηνπλῆξον, τὸ δ’ ἐστὴκη ἐνι θάμνῳ,
ἀλλιν ἐσείμεναι, στυγερὸς δ’ ὑπεδέκατο κοῖτος,
δι αἰ’ ἐξεῖὶς κεφαλᾶς ἔχον, ἀμφὶ δ’ πᾶσαις
δειρῆσι βρόχοι ἤσαν, ὅποι σοκτίτα θάνοιεν.

ἐποιαρον δὲ κτέος μίνυνθα περ, οὗ τι μάλα δὴν.

Ἐκ δὲ Μελάνθιον ἤγον ἀνὰ πρόθυρον τε καὶ αὐλῆν.

τοῦ δ’ ἀπὸ μὲν ρίνας τε καὶ σάτα νηλεὶ χαλκὸ
τάμνων, μῆθεά τ’ ἐξέρυσαν, κυσὶν ἀμα δάσσοισαι,
χεῖρας τ’ ἂδε πόδας κόπτον κεκοτητὶ θυμῆ.

Οὶ μὲν ἐπειτ’ ἀπονιγάμενοι χεῖρας τε πόδας τε
ἐλι’ Ὀδυσσήα δόμων κιόν, τετέλεστο δὲ ἑργον,
ἀυτάρ κ’ ὑ’ προσεέπει φίλην τροφὸν Ἑυρώκλειαν
“οἴςε θείους, γρηγὺ, κακῶν ἄκος, οἶςε δὲ μοι πῦρ,
δόμας θεοῦς μέγαρον” σοῦ δὲ Πηνελόπειαν
ἐλθεὶν ἐνθάδ’ ἀναχτὶ σοῦν ἀμφιπόλους γνωσίε
πᾶσας δ’ ὑτρυνων δόμας κατὰ δῶμα νέεσθαι.”

Τὸν δ’ αὕτη προσεέπει φίλη τροφὸν Ἑυρώκλειαν
“ναὶ δ’ ταῦτα γε, τέκνον ἐμὸν, κατὰ μοίραν ἔειπες.
ἀλλ’ ἄγε τοι χλαίναν τε χιτῶνα τε εἴματ’ ἐνείκω,
μη’ ὀπτῶ δάκσειν πεπικασμένον εὐρέας ὁμος
ἐσταθ’ ἐνι μεγάρουι νεμεσσισθῶ δὲ κεν εἰ.”

Τὴν δ’ ἀπαμείβδμενος προσέφη πολύμνης Ὀδυσσεῖος
“πῦρ νῦν μοι πρότιτον ἐνι μεγάρουι γενέσθα.”

“Ως ἐφατ’, οὗ’ ἀπίθησε φίλη τροφὸς Ἑυρώκλεια,
ηνικεν δ’ ἄρα πῦρ καὶ θέιον’ αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεῖος


470. στυγερὸς κοῖτος, an oxymoron, the meaning being that instead of a κοῖτος they found something hateful: so 17. 448 μ’ τάχα πανεῖν Αἶγαντον καὶ Κύραν θεά, Π. 10. 496 κακὸν ὄναρ (of Diomede killing Rhesus in his sleep).

474. ἀνὰ πρόθυρον τε καὶ αὐλῆν, i.e. from the θάλαμος and so through the doorway of the μέγαρον.

484. κατὰ δῶμα ‘through the hall (the μέγαρον) inwards’; whereas κατὰ δῶμα implies movement outwards. For this force of κατὰ cp. 20. 122., 22. 299, 307: for κατὰ 21. 234, 378 (J. L. M.).

493. θέιον is a strange variety for θέιον. Possibly we should read πῦρ τὰ θεῖάν τ’, and in the next line εὔ θεῖον.
εὖ διεθέψεον μέγαρον καὶ δόμα καὶ αὐλὴν.

Γρηγὸς δ' ἀντ' ἀπέβη διὰ δώματα καὶ 'Οδυσής δ' ἀγγελέωσα γυναιξι' καὶ ὀρφεύσα νέεσθαι.

αὐτὸν ἕκεν ἐκ μεγάρῳ δάος μετὰ χειρῶν ἔχουσαι

αὐτὸν δὲ ἀμφεξένοντο καὶ ἠσταζόντ' ὁ Ὀδυσῆς, καὶ κόνεν ἀγαπαζόμεναι κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ἀμων χεῖρας τὴν αἰνόμεναι τὸν δὲ γλυκὸς ἵμερος ἥρει κλαυθοῦ μαία στοναχῆς, γέγνωσκε δ' άρα φρεσκ' πάσαι.

495 ἀνήθη G. F.

494. μέγαρον καὶ δόμα καὶ αὐλήν is difficult, since δόμα usually = μέγαρον. Possibly the original reading here was θέλαμον καὶ δόμα καὶ αὐλήν—a conventional phrase for the whole palace (cf. Il. 6, 316). μέγαρον may have been substituted from recollection of 1, 493, 497. ἐκ μέγαρον. Here μέγαρον must mean the women's apartment.
'Οδυσσέως ὑπὸ Πινελόπης ἀναγγειλμένος.

Γρηγὸς ὦ εἰς ὑπερφανεῖς ἀνεβηκέρτο καγχαλίσεως, διεσπάρτη ἐρέουσα φιλον πῶσιν ἐνδόω ἐόντα.
γούννατο ὦ ἣροςαντο, πόδες ὦ ὑπερίκτανωντο, στὴ ὦ ὄρη' ὑπὲρ κεφαλής καὶ μιν πρὸς μύθον ἐκεῖνον
"ἐγρεῖν, Πινελόπεια, ἡεῖαν τέκοι, ὅφρα ἰδηι εἰ διδλιομοῖσι τεωσί τὰ τ' ἐλθεῖη ήματα πάντα.
ηθ' Ὀδυσσέως καὶ ὥλικον ἵκανεται, ὑψε περ ἔλθων.
μυστήρας ὦ ἐκτελεῖν ἀγήνωρας, οἷ' ὦ ἐν ὥλικον
κηδεσκον καὶ κτῆματ' ἐδον βιβαντὸ τε παῖδα.'

Ἦν ὦ αἰτε προσῆτε περίφρων Πινελόπειαν
"μαία φηλη, μάργην σε θεοί θέσαν, οἷ' τε δύνανται
ἄφρωνα ποιήσαι καὶ ἐπίφρωνα περ μάλ' ἐόντα,
καὶ τε καλιφρονέαντα σαφροσύνης ἐπέβησαν
οἷ' σε περ ἤβλαψαν πρὶν δὲ φρένας αἰσίμη ἠθα.
τίπτε με λαβεῖες πολυπενθέα θυμὸν ἐχοῦσαν

3. ἤρωοντο 'sped along': the word is used of a continuous or rhythmical movement, cp. 20.107, 24.69.
4. ἦαραντο is surely a compound of ἦδο, as Aristarchus held (τὸ κάθερον ἐκεῖνο ἀριστάρχου ἦρωαντον Απόλλ. Lec. s. v.). ἦδο is often used of the lower limbs (γούννα, γυνα, &c.). The sense of ἦρωαντο can only be guessed at from this context: it may mean 'bustled' or 'trotted along.—Gradum studio celebrabat anili (Aen. 4.641).
One ancient grammarian connected the word with ἥρωασ (ἕρω-εϊ), explaining it by ἄπολαμελελώτο 'were broken down under her.' This is tenable as regards
the form, but the meaning is unsatisfactory.
9. κηδεσκον 'have been vexing,' an impf. of the kind noticed in H. G. § 73.
Cp. 22.46, 209, 432.
14. οἷ' σῃ περ ἤβλαψαν is a second relative clause, after οἷ' τε δύνανται κῦλ.
It is 'not uncommon in Homer to find a general statement introduced by δς τς, followed by a particular example introduced by δς: see H. G. § 372.
σῃ περ 'even thee.'
πρὶν δὲ... ἠθα is logically sub-ordinate: 'that was so sound of mind before.'
ταῦτα παρὲξ ἐρέουσα, καὶ ἐξ ὑπνοῦ μ’ ἀνεγείρεις ἡδέος, δό μ’ ἐπέδησε φίλα βλέφαρ’ ἀμφικαλύψας; οὐ γάρ παῖ τοῦνδε κατέδραθον, ἐξ οὗ ὙΟὐσείς ἐχεῖς ἐπογράμμενος Κακότιλων οὐκ ὄνομασθήν. ἀλλ’ ἄγε νῦν κατάβηθι καὶ ἄψ ἔρχει μέγαρῳ. 20

εἰ γάρ τίς μ’ ἄλλη γε γυναῖκών, αἱ μοι ἔσαι, ταῦτ’ ἐλθοῦσ’ ἤγγειλε καὶ ἐξ ὑπνοῦ ἀνέγειρε, τῷ κε τάχα στυγερώς μιν ἔγιν ἀπέπεμψα νέοθα αὕτης ἕσω μέγαρους σε δε ταύτῳ γε γῆς ὦν οὖσι.”

Τὴν δ’ αὕτη προσεῖπε φίλη τροφὸς Ἑὐρύκλεια: 25

“οὐ τί σε λαβεῖν, τέκνον φίλον, ἀλλ’ ἐγκμόν τοι ἡλι’ ὙΟὐσείς καὶ ὅλων ικάνεται, ὅς ἀγορεύω, ἐξέσως, τῶν πάντων ἀτέρκων ἐν μεγάροις.

Τηλέμαχος δ’ ἄρα μιν πάλαι ἤδειν ἐνδον ἐννοτα, ἀλλὰ σαφροφύση λομάτα πατρὸς ἐκεύθι, ὃφον ἀνδρῶν τίσατο βιῆν ὑπερηφανεῖς.” 30

“ὁμ έφαθ’, ἡ δ’ ἔχαρη καὶ ἄπδε λέκτροι θοροῦσα γρή περιπλέχθη, βλεφάρων δ’ ἀπὸ δάκρυνον ᾔκε, καὶ μιν φονήσαμεν ἔπεε πτερόντα προσηῦμα: 35

“εἰ δ’ ἄγε δὴ μοι, μαία φίλη, νημερτές ἐνόπιες, εἰ ἐπέμεν δὴ ὅλον ικάνεται, ὅς ἀγορεύεις, διππώσ δὴ μνησθήσων ἀναδείξει κεφαλ’ ἐφήκε μνῖον ἔσων, οἱ δ’ αἰεὶ ἀλλάξεις ἐνδον ἔμμοι.”

Τὴν δ’ αὕτη προσεῖπε φίλη τροφὸς Ἑὐρύκλεια: 40

“οὐκ ἔδω, οὐ πυθόμην, ἀλλὰ στόνον οὐκ ἄκουσα.”

---

16. ἐφέσωσα is a fut. part., hence we must take λαβεῖς as equivalent to a verb of motion—‘maltreat in order to tell.’ The clause καὶ ἐξ ὑπνοῦ ἀνεγεῖρεις is an explanation of λαβεῖς: so that the whole sentence means ‘why do you do me the hurt of waking me out of sleep only to tell me this false news?’ For ἐφέσωσα cp. 12. 213.

20. The μέγαρον of the women, cp. l. 24, also 22. 497.

21. μ’, for μοι, see on 1. 60.

22. A prothysteron: ἕγγαλος is the main assertion: ἐνέγας subordinate, =‘thereby waking me’; cp. 13. 374, with the passages quoted there.

24. τοῦτο, adverbial acc., ‘will do you this benefit.’

31. ἀνάρχων ὑπερηφανεῖς, perhaps an intentional play of language, as often in the Odyssey: see on 13. 24.

37. διττῷ καλ., is an object clause to ἔφηωσα; ‘if he has come, tell me how &c.’
κτεινομένων ἡμεῖς δὲ μυχῶν θαλάμων εὐπήκτων ἡμεῖς ἀνυώμεναι, σανίδες δ’ ἔχον εἰδ’ ἄρα ρώμαι, πρῶς γ’ ὅτε δὴ μὲ σῶς ὑλὴ ἀπὸ μεγάρου κάλλησεν Τηλέμαχος τὸν γάρ τ’ ἀνατρέψοις καλέσας. Εὐθρόν ἐπετεῖ 'Οδυσσήα μετὰ κταμένους νεκροὺς ἐσταθή: οἱ δὲ μὲν ἀμφι κρατατάδενον οὐδ’ ἐχοντες κεῖαι ἐπ’ ἀλλήλοισιν ιδιοθά κε θυμὸν ἦν οὐκ ἦν ἵνατι καὶ λόθροι πεπαλαγμένοι δ’ τ’ ἑλότα. νῦν δ’ οἱ μὲν δὴ πάντες ἐπ’ αὐλείληις θύρην ἄθροι, αὐτὰρ ὅ δ’ θάμα θεευόταν περικαλλές, πῦρ μέγα κτάμενος σὲ δὲ μὲ πρόηκε καλέσας. ἀλλ’ ἐπευ, όφρᾳ σφαῖν εὐφροσύνης ἐπιβίητον ἀμφιτέρων φίλων ἢτορ, ἐπεὶ κακά πολλά πέπασθε. νῦν δ’ ἦδη τὸδε μακρὸν ἑλδαρ ἐκτετελεσται· ἡλθε μὲν αὐτὸς ἀκούει εὐφροσύνης, εἴρε δὲ καὶ σὲ καὶ παῖδ’ ἐν μεγάρους κακῶς δ’ οἱ πέρ μὲν ἔρευν μνηστήρες, τοὺς πάντας ἐτίσατο δ’ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ."

Τὴν δ’ αὐτῇ προσεείπε περίφρον Πηνελόπεια: "μαῖα φίλη, μή πω μέγ’ ἐπεύχθε Καγχαλώσα. οἶδα γάρ ὡς κ’ ἀσπαστὸς ἐνὶ μεγάρους φανεῖ πᾶσι, μαλιστα δ’ ἐμοὶ τε καὶ υἱὲ, τὸν τεκῶμεθα· ἀλλ’ οὔκ ἐσθ’ δεὶ μοῦς ἑτήμους, ὡς ἀγορεύεις, ἀλλὰ τὶς ἀθανάτων κτείνε μνηστήρας ἀγαυός, δῆμιν ἀγασάμενος θυμαλγέα καὶ κακὰ ἔργα. οὐ τίνα γάρ πλεκὼν ἐπιχθυνίων ἀνθρώπων, ὡς κακῶν οὐδὲ μὲν ἔσθλων, ὡς φέεις εἰςαφίκτοι· τὸ δ’ ἀπαθαλίας ἐπαθὼν κακῶν αὐτὰρ 'Οδυσσέας

48 ομ. Γ Φ Η Ψ. 52 ἐπιφροσύνης Γ.

42. σανίδες, viz. of the door leading to the women’s room, cp. 21.382 and 23.390.
45. νεκροὺς should perhaps be νεῖκους: see the note on 20.78.
46. ἐγγερνεῖς ‘occupying,’ ‘covering.’
48. This line (22.402) is clearly out of place here. The object to ὠδόσα should be left vague.

52. σφαῖν can hardly be taken as a dat. We must either suppose it to be nom., comparing ὠδόν in II. 16.99, or read σφαῖ (or σφαῖ γ’).
53. φίλων ἢτορ, constr. ad sensum, since ἐπιφροσύνης ἐπιβίητον = ἐφραίνε-σθεν. For ἢτοι ἢτον in this use cp. 22.424 and the places there quoted.
όλεσε τηλοῦ νόστον Ἀχαῖδος, ἀλετοὶ δὴ αὐτῶς.

Τὴν δ' ἤμειβε· ἔπειτα φιλὴ τροφὸς Εὐρώκλεια·

"τέκνον ἔμον, ποίδον σε ἔπος φίγεν ἔρκος ὄδωταν,

ἡ πόσιν ἕδων ἔντα παρ' ἐσχάρῃ ὄδε ποι' ἐφησὰ

οὐκάθ' ἐλεύσεσθαι θυμὸς δὲ τοι αἰνεῖστοσ.

ἀλλ' ἤγε τοι καὶ σήμα ἀμφιβάλοι τι εἰπὼν

οὐλὴν, τὴν ποτὲ μὲν σὺς ἦλασε λευκὴ ὄδωτι,

τὴν ἀπολύσουσα φρασάμην, ἔθελον δὲ σοι αὐτῇ

ἐπιμενεὶ· ἀλλὰ με κείνον ἐλῶν ἐπὶ μάστακα χερσὶν

οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐπιμενεὶ πολυκερδήσῃ νοῦσο.

ἀλλ' ἤπειρ ἀστάρ ἐγὼν ἐμεῖνεν περιδόσομαι αὐτῆς,

αἱ κέν σε ἔξαπάφω, κτείναι μ' ὀκτίστορ ὀλέθρως."

Τὴν δ' ἤμειβε· ἔπειτα περίφρον Πηνελόπεια·

"μαία φλη, χαλεπῶν σε θεῶν ἀλειγενετῶν

δὴ δένει γροῦθα, μᾶλλα περι πολύθρων ὕσταν·

ἀλλ' ἔμπετ ὅμοια μετὰ παιδ' ἔμοι, δύρᾳ ἠθωμαι

ἀνάθαις μνηστήρας τεθνήτας, ἥ δ' ἐπεφένη." 85

"ὁς φαμίνη κατέβαιν ὑπερβάλλει πολλὰ δὲ οἱ κήρ

ἐρμαιν', ἢ ἀπάνευθε φλιν πόσιν ἐξερεύνων,

ἡ παρατάσα κάσιε κάρη καὶ χείρ λαβοῦσα.

ἡ δ' ἤπει εἰσηλθεν καὶ ὑπέρβη λάινον οὐδόν,

᾽Επ' ἔπειτ' 'Οδύσης ἐναντίη, ἐν πυρὸς αὐγῆ,

τοῖχον τοῦ ἐτέρου' ὁ δ' ἀρὰ πρὸς κλώνα μακρῆν

87 χείρα λαβοῦσα] χείρας ἀλατοὺς G.

68. Ἀχαίδος to be taken either with νόστον or with τηλοῦ. The former is supported by 5.344 ἐπωλεο νόστον γαῖς Φαξίμων, and is favored by the order of the words. For the other constr. Ameis quotes 13.249 τὴν περ τηλοῦ φαζῶν Ἀχαίδος ἐμμενεί αἰγῆ. But ἀλλαγὴ νόστον is too vague without Ἀχαίδος following to define it.

76. ἦτο μάστακα ‘by the throat’: the prep. expresses the direction of the act of seizing or laying hold, as in the phrases ἦτο στόμα, ἦτο γούνα, ἦτο στήθος.

78. περιδόσομαι ‘I will stake’: with a gen. of the stake, as 11.23.485 πρινδοῦ περιδόσομεθν ἦλ ἔλθητος.

82. δήμα ἐρυθυω ‘to be in possession of, comprehend, the thoughts.’ The verb has various shades of meaning, derived from the notion of covering, keeping safe. The nearest parallel to this use seems to be II.1.239 (θέμους) πρὸς δῶς ἐρύσαται keep in mind, know and are ready to apply.

88. λάινον. For this epithet see on 16.41, 17.30.

90. τοῖχον τοῦ ἐτέρου ‘by the wall at one side’: gen. of place, cp. II.9.219, 24.593. πρὸς κλώνα. This was doubtless one of the pillars which surrounded the fireplace and carried the lourve over it.
23. ΟΔΣΧΕΙΑΣ Ψ

διότι κάτω ὄρων, ποτιδέγγεμον εἰ τι μιν εἴποι ἱθῆμι παράκοσις, ἐπεὶ οἶδαν ὄφθαλμοισιν.

ἡ δ' ἄνεω δὴν ἡστο, τάφος δὲ οἱ ἦτορ ἱκανοί,

οὐ εἰ ἀλλοτε μὲν μιν ἐνοπαθίω ἱσόδεσκεν,

ἀλλοτε δ' ἄν γνώσασθε κακὰ χροὶ εἴματ' ἔχοντα.

Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐνείπειν ἔπος τ' ἐφατ' ἐκ τ' ὧν ὁμαζε'.

"μὴτερ ἐμή, δύσμητερ, ἀπηνεά θυμὸν ἔχουσα,

τίθην οὕτω πατρὸς νοσφέξεαι, οὐδὲ παρ' αὐτὸν ἐξομένη μύθοισιν ἀνέβρεαι οὐδὲ μεταλλὰς;

οὗ μὲν κ' ἄλλῃ γ' ὅδε γυνὴ τετληθῆτο θυμῷ

ἀνδρὸς ἀφεστάλῃ, δὲ οἱ κακὰ πολλὰ μογῆςας

ἐλθοί εἰκοστῷ ἐτεί ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν

σοὶ δ' αἰεὶ κραδής στερεωτῆρη ἐστὶ λίθων."

Τὸν δ' αὐτὸ προσέκειτε περίφροιν Πηνελόπεια:

"τέκνον ἔμοι, θυμὸς μοι ἐνὶ στήθεσι σεπηπεν,

οὐδὲ τι προσφάσαθαι δύναμαι ἔπος οὐδ' ἔρεσθαι οὐδ' εἰς ὅπα ἠδεσθαι ἐναντίον.

εἰ δ' ἔτειν δὴ ἔστ' Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ οἶκον ἱκάνεται, ἡ μάλα νῦν γνωσόμεθα' ἀλλήλων καὶ λάοιν ἔστι γὰρ ἥμιν σήμαθ', ἢ δὴ καὶ νῦι κεκρυμμένα ἑμεῖν ἀπ' ἄλλων."

"Με φάτο, μειδησεν δε πολύτλας διος Ὀδυσσεὺς,

αἰσθανε τὲ Τηλέμαχον ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηδέθα.

"Τηλέμαξ', ἢ τοι μητέρ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔστεν

πειράζουν ἐμέθεν' ταχὰ δὲ φράσεται καὶ ἄρειον.

νῦν δ' ὅτι ρυπόω, κακὰ δὲ χροὶ εἴματα εἴμαι,

τοθνεκ' ἀτιμαζεί με καὶ οὐ πτὸ φησί τὸν εἶναι

ἡμεῖς δὲ φραζόμεθ' ὅπως δ' ἀριστα γένηται.

καὶ γάρ τίς θ' ἐνα φῶτα κατακτεῖνας ἐνὶ δήμῳ,

101 ἀνοσταίη Γ Χ Ψ al. 117 ὅποις ἰσταί ταῦτα ἔργα Ρ. 118 δήμω] οἷον Ρ.

94. δέμα 'with her eyes' (since she was speechless).

95. ἀνοσταίη, contr. from ἀνοσή-σασθε, a frequentative formed from the sor., = 'she continually failed to recognize,' i.e. showed by some gesture that she did not recognize: cp. 30. 15.

110. The neglect of position in κεκρυμμένα is highly anomalous. We should perhaps read νῃ. Hartmann would omit καί; but the emphatic καί νυῖ is appropriate here.

ἀπ' ἄλλων, with κεκρυμμένα.

118. καί emphasizes ἐνα.
ϕ μὴ πολλοὶ ἔσοιν ἀοσσητήρες ὀπίσσων, 120
φεύγει πηοῦς τε προλιπών καὶ πατρίδα γαῖαν
ήμεις τοῦ ἔρμα πάλης ἀπέκταμεν, οὐ μέγ' ἄριστοι
κοῦραν εἰν Ίθάκη τὰ ὅπερ φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα.”
Τὸν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντιλο ηζῆς:
“αὖτος ταῦτα γε λέοσε, πάτερ φίλε, σὴν γαῖρ ἄριστην
μὴν ἐπί ἀνθρώποις φάσ' ἐμμεναι, οὔτε κ' τίς τοι
ἄλλος ἂνρ ἐρίσει καταθνητῶν ἄνθρωπων.
[ήμεις τοῦ ἐμμεμαύτος ἡμί ἐψφηνοθ', οὔτε τί φημι
ἀλκής δευησθαι, δή δημαῖς γε πάρεστιν.]”
Τὸν δ' ἀπαμεθήμονος προσέφη πολύμμητε 'Οδυσσεύς:
“τοιγάρ ἐγὼν ἔρεω ὃς μοι δοκεὶ εἶναι ἄριστα.
πρῶτα μὲν ἄρ λούσασθε καὶ ἀμφιέσασθε χιτῶνας,
διὰ μᾶς τοῦ ἐν μεγάρους ἄνωγετε ἐμμαθ' ἔλεοσθαι:
ἀρτὰρ θεῖος ἀοίδος ἔχων φόρμιγγα λύειν
ήμιν ἡγείσω φιλοπαγμονὸς ὀρχηθρόιοι,
οὐ κέν τις φαίδ γάμον ἔμμεναι ἐκτός ἄκοιων,
ή ἡμ' ὁδόν στείχον τί οileaks διὸν περιπαιτάσουν.
μὴ πρὸσβε σκλοὺς εὐρὸ φῶνον κατὰ ἀστυ γένηται
ἀνδρῶν μηστήρων, πρός γ' ἡμέας ἐλθέμεν εὖξω
ἀγριὸν ἐς ἡμέτερον πολυλέθρεον, ἐνθα δ' ἐπείτα
φρασσομεθ' ὅτι κείροσον 'Ολυμπίους ἐγγυαλίζεσθ.’
140
"Ὡς ἐφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλών ἂν ἐπίθοντο.
πρῶτα μὲν οὖν λοῦσαντο καὶ ἀμφιέσαντο χιτῶνας,
σπλισθεὶς δὲ γυναῖκες· δ' ἰδεῖ θείος ἀοίδος
φόρμιγγα γλαφυρήν, ἐν δὲ σφίσσω ἵμερον ὅροις
μολῆτις τε γιλκερῆς καὶ ἀμύμονος ὀρχηθρόιοι.
τοῖσιν δὲ μέγα δῶμα περιστεναχάζετο ποισίν
ἀνδρῶν παιδόντων καλλιζώνων τε γυναικῶν.


137-138. These two lines are in place in the description of a battle (II. 13.785-786), but are unsuitable here.
139. ἔρμα, used here in the sense of 'a farm': so res in Latin.
140. κέραδος 'device,' cp. 14.31.
143. διπλωθην 'were arrayed': a use which points to the originally wide meaning of the word διπλω.'
146. τοὺς 'for them,' 'at their will.'
23. OΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ψ  249

"ὅ μᾶλα ὅ τις ἔγγειρε πολυμνῆσθην βασιλείαν
σχετλὴς, οὐδ' ἐτέλε πόσιος οὐ κουριδίοι
ἐλυσθαί μέγα δῶμα διαμπερέ, ἵπτο Ἰκοιτ.

"Ὅς ἄρα τις εἰπεσκε, τά δ' οὐκ ἦσαν ὃς ἐτέτυκτο.
αιτάρ 'Οδυσσήα μεγαλητρα φ' ἐνί οἰκόφ
Εὐρυνίβη ταμῆ λουθεν καὶ χρῖσεν ἐλαφ,
ἀμφ' δέ μιν φάρος καλῶν βάλεν ἥδε χιτῶνα:
αιτάρ κάκ κεφαλῆς χεῦεν πολὺ κάλλος Ἀθήνη
[μελθόνα τ' εἰσιδεῖαν καὶ πάσσονα] καὶ δὲ κάρητος
ὁλας ἢκ κόμας, δακτυθῦνον ἄνθει ὑμᾶς]
δέ δ' ὅτε τις χρυσὸν περιχεῖται ἀργὺρα ἄνθρ
ὶδρε, ἐν Ἡφαιστόσ δέδεαν καὶ Παλλᾶς Ἀθήνη
tέχνην παντοῖν, χαρίεντα δὲ ἔργα τελείει,
ἀς μὲν τῷ περίχευε χάριν κεφαλὴ τε καὶ ὁμοις.
ἐκ δ' ἀσαμίνου βη δέμας ἄδαιστοις ὑμοῖς,
ἄψ δ' αὐτὸς κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετ' ἐπὶ θρόνου ἐνθεν ἀνέστη,
ἀντίον ή τάλαξον, καὶ μιν πρὸς μοῦ θείητε:
"δαιμονίη, περὶ σοὶ γε γυναικῶν θηλυτεράω
κήρ ἀτέραμον ἔθηκαν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
οὐ μὲν κ' ἄλλῃ γ' ὅδι γυνῆ τετλητότι θυμῷ
ἀνδρὸς ἀφεστὰ, ὡς οἱ κακὰ πολλὰ μογῆς
ἔλθοι εἰκοστῷ ἐτεῖ ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.

151 ἢσος ἦν Χ Εαστ.: δῆρ' ἀν vulg. 157 καὶ δὲ κάρητος] θήκαν ἰδέοθαι: G.
162 κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ὁμοιοῦ M. 169 ἀφεστὴν U Εαστ.: ἰδουε- vulg.; cp. 101.
150. σχετλή means 'unfeeling,' not moved by sentiment or affection: cp. Od. 13. 293, also II. 9. 630 σχέλιον, οὐδέ μεταφάντασεν φαλούς ἐσταρώ. 151. εἰρθαύνω 'to hold to': see I. 82. 153 ff. The incident of the bath, as Kirchhoff has shown (Odyssey, p. 155), makes an awkward break in the scene with Penelope, and is ignored in the sequel. Penelope has failed to recognize Ulysses in his beggar's rags (I. 95 ἐκαὶ χρωτ εἰμα' ἵξονα. cp. 115 τῷ δ' ἐττ' ἐπειδ' ἐπτακατη). He now returns from the bath resplendent in beauty: but the change is quite unnoticed. Yet the same change had profoundly moved Tele- machus (16. 378 ff.). Observe also the weak repetition, 100-103 = 168-170. For these reasons Kirchhoff is probably right in rejecting 111-176 or 117-170. 157-162, = 6. 230-235. The first two of these lines (= 6. 230-231) must be wrongly inserted here, since μελθόνα has no construction, and καὶ δὲ κάρητος is a very awkward tautology after κακὸς κεφαλής in the preceding line. Ameis would reject also 159-162 (= 6. 232-235). But this does not seem necessary. 159. χρυσὸν περιχεῖται ἀργὺροι. This describes a process of enamel of which there are fine examples among the objects found at Mycenae.
Δ' ἀγε μοι, μαία, στόβεσσιν λέχος, βφφα καὶ αὐτὸς
λέξομαι: ἥ γὰρ τῇ γε σιδήρεων ἐν φρεσίν ἡτορ.

Τὸν δ' αὐτῷ προσέειπε περίφρον Πυνελπεία:
"δαιμόνι, οὔτ' ἂρ τι μεγαλίζοιμαι οὔτ' ἀθερίζω
οὔτε λίθν ἀγαμαί, μάλα δ' εὖ οἴος ἔησα
ἐξ Ἱθάκης ἐπὶ νῆδος ἦν ὁλιχρήτυμοι.

ἄλλ' ἀγε οἱ στόβεσσιν πυκνῶν λέχος, Εὐρυκλεια,
ἐκτὸς ἐιστάθεσο θαλάμος, τὸν β' αὐτος ἐπολεί
ἐνθα οἱ ἐκθείαν πυκνῶν λέχος ἐμβάλετ' εὐνήν,
κάσα καὶ χλαίας καὶ βήγας σιγάλβεναν."

"Με ἄρ' ἐφ' ποσίος πειραμένης αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς
ὀξῆσας ἀλοχοῦν προσεφώνεε κενὰ ἰδώνα
"ο γώναι, ἡ μάλα τοῦτο ἐπος θυμαλγῆς ἔειπε.
τὶς δὲ μοι ἀλλοσε θήκε λέχος; χαλεπῶν δὲ κεν εἶ
καὶ μαλ' ἐπισταμένα, ὅτε μή θέος αὐτὸς ἐπελθὼν
ῥηθὸς εἴθελων θεὶς ἄλλη ἐνι χόρῃ.

ἀνδρῶν δ' οὗ κὲν τις ζωός βρωτός, οὐδὲ μᾶλ' ἡβῶν,
μεία μετοχλίασιεν, ἐπεὶ μέγα σήμα τέικται
ἐν λέχει ἀσκητῷ τὸ β' ἐγώ κάρον ὁδὲ τις ἀλλος.

θάμνοις ἐφ' ταυφυφίλλους ἑλαίας ἐρκεσ ἐντός,
ἀκμηνὸς θαλέθων' πάχετος δ' ἂν ἤδε κλῶν.

τῷ δ' ἐγώ ἀμφιβαλῶν θάλαμον δέμον, ὑφρ' ἐτελεσα,
πυκνὴν λιθάδεσσιν, καὶ εὖ καθόπερθεν ἐρεψα,
καλλητὰς δ' ἐπέθηκα θόραν, πυκνὸν ἀρανώλας.
καὶ τοῦτ' ἐπειτ' ἀπέκοψα κόμην ταυφυφίλλον ἑλαίας,

174 οὐ τὰρ Ρ.Χ. 178 θαλάμου] μεγάρου Γ.Ρ. 177 οὖδε γεωσιῶν
G F M X U. 193 λιθάδεσσι Γ F J: λιθάδεσσι Ρ Η U.

171. αὐτὸς 'alone.'
174 ff. The connexion of the thought is somewhat obscured by Penelope's desire to try Ulysses. She means to say 'I am not naughty or indifferent or offended, nor have I forgotten: but if you are Ulysses you will see the meaning of the order which I now give,' viz. to put the bedstead outside the chamber that be himself made.
186. ῥηθοὶ θάλαμον, see 16. 198.
188. μέγα σήμα τέικται 'there is a great token contrived,' i.e. there is in the making of the bedstead a secret that will serve for a token or pass-word.
190. ταυφυφίλλος. Voss would read ταυφυφίλλον. The epithet certainly goes better with ἑλαίας, as in 1. 195, also 13. 102.
191. ἀκμηνὸς is usually derived from ἀκμή, and explained as 'flourishing,' 'in its prime.' Aristarchus distinguished it by accent from ἄκμηνος 'without food.'
κορμῶν δ' ἐκ μίζης προταμῶν ἀμφέξεσα χαλκῷ
ev καὶ ἐπισταμένως, καὶ ἐπὶ στάθμην ἂνα, ἔρμων ἀσκήσας, τέτρηνα δὲ πάντα τερέτραν. 
ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ἀρχιμενος λέχος ἔξεων, ὅφε' ἐτέλεσα, 
διαδάλλων χρυσῷ τε καὶ ἀργυρῷ ἢ δ' ἐλέφαντι. 200
ἐν δ' ἱεράνου ιμάντα βοδᾶς φοίνικι φαενον.
οδια τοῦ τόδε σήμα πιθανοκομαι οὔδε τι οὐδα, 
μη μι ἐξ ἐμπεδὼν ἑστι, γόνα, λέχος, ἢ τις ἢ δὴ 
ἀνθρῶν ἄλλος θήκε, ταμᾶν ὑπὸ πυθμέν ἠλάθης."

"οὐς φάτο, τής δ' αὐτοῦ λύτω γοώνατα καὶ φιλον ἦτορ, 
σήματ' ἁγιανοῦσα τά οἱ ἐμπεδα πέφραζ 'Οδυσσεύς. 206
δακρύσας δ' ἑπει' ίδὸς δράμεν, ἀμφι δὲ χειρᾶς 
δείχῃ βάλλ 'Οδυσσῆ, κάρη δ' ἐξοῦ ἢ δὲ προσηάδα; "μη μι, 'Οδυσσεύ, σκότειν, ἑπεῖ τά περ ἀλλα μάλιστα 
ἀνθρώπων πέννυσο' θεοὶ δ' ἄπαξον ὀξίζων, 210
οἰ νῷν ἀγάσαντο παρ' ἀλλήλους μένοντε 
κύης ταρθήναι καὶ γήρας οὐδὸν ἱκέσθαι.
αὐτὰρ μη νὼν μοι τόδε χάος μηδὲ νεμέσα, 
ουκεκά σ' οὐ τό πρότων, ἑπεὶ ἰδὼν, δ' ἀγάπησηα. 
αἰεὶ γὰρ μοι θυμὸς ἐνι στήθεσσι φιλοιν 
ἐρρίγει μη τίς με βροτῶν ἀπάφοιτ' ἐπέεσσιν ἐλθῶν 
πολλοῖ γὰρ κακὰ κέρδεα βουλεύουσιν."

201 ἐν G X U Eust.: ἐν F P H al. 202 ἦ 
H D: εἰ vulg. 204 ἐνδ G F X U Eust.: ἄν P H al. 205 τῆς τῇ P. 
206 ἀγιανοῦσα F U: ἁγιανοῦσα vulg. 207 δράμεν F X U: ἂν G P H M D: 
both given by Eust.

206. ἁγιανοῦσα, gen. as in 24. 345-6 
τοῦ δ'. . . σήματ' ἁγιανοῦντος έτη. Most 
MSS. have the dat. ἁγιανοῦση, which 
it is hardly possible after the gen. τῆς. 
It cannot be justified by the instances 
of a part. in the gen. following an 
exiibisc pronoun in the dat.: see H. G. 
§ 243, 3, d. It is possible, however, 
that we should read τῆς . . . ἁγιανοῦση 
as in 10. 249-250 τῆς δ' ἐκ μάλλων δη' 
μερον ἄρητο γωνία, σήματ' ἁγιανοῦση, 
where the dative is necessary for the 
construction.
211. ἁγάσαντο 'thought it too much,'
23. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ψ

[οὐδὲ κεν Ἀργείη Ἑλένῃ, Δίδις ἐγγεγαυκα, ἀνδρὶ παρ’ ἀλλοδαπῷ ἐμιγὴ φιλήτητι καὶ εὐν., εἰ ἡδη δ’ μν αὐτῆς ἄρησοι ὑλὶς Ἄχαϊῶν ἄξεμεναι οἴκουντε νῆσε εἰς πατρὶδ’, ἐμελλὼν.

τὴν δ’ ἡ τοι βέβαι θεῶς ὀροεῖν ἐργὸν ἀεικές τὴν δ’ ἐπὶ οὐ πρόσθεν ἐξ ἐγκάθετο θυμῷ λυγῆν, εἰ δ’ πρῶτα καὶ ἡμέας ἰκέτω πένθως.]

218–224 δεστούται ὁ ἐκτά στίχοι αὐτοὶ ὀς αὐτάζοτες κατὰ τὸν νῦν Vind. 133.

218–224. These seven lines were rejected by Aristarchus, and have been generally condemned, mainly on the ground that they do not fit the context. The case of Helen, it is argued, is not really parallel to that of Penelope, and the excuse which is made for her—that she acted under the compulsion of Aphrodite—is especially out of place, since it makes her incapable of being deterred by the consequences of her acts. Moreover the close connexion of l. 215 ἀλεί γὰρ μοι θυμὸς ἀπειράκη with l. 225 τὸν δ’ ἐκεὶ αὐτὰ. (‘I was always in fear—but now &c.’) is seriously interrupted by so long a parenthesis. Recently, however, an ingenious defence of the passage has been put forward by Mr. Platt (Class. Rev. xiii. 383). He pleads the absence of any motive for the interpolation, and insists upon the beauty of the lines themselves, especially l. 224. In his view the aim of the poet was to bring out once more, almost at the end of his story, the noble prudence and faithfulness of Penelope, by contrasting her with the opposite type of character seen in Helen. Such a contrast, Mr. Platt shows, is quite in the manner of the Odyssey, and has been already made between Penelope and Clytemnestra (Od. 11. 433ff., cp. 24. 198ff.). And the finishing touch is added to the picture by the words in which Penelope makes an excuse—the only possible excuse—for the enemy whose 'blind folly' had wrought so much woe.

The explanation is attractive, but somewhat fanciful, as Mr. Platt is ready to admit, and it supposes an obscurity in the thought which is not at all like Homer. It may be doubted whether Penelope's readiness to forgive an enemy would have appealed to hearers in primitive times. The excuse, too, is hardly one that would have been accepted in an age when almost every human thought and feeling was ascribed to the gods. And what is it that the example of Helen is cited to prove? The points dwelt upon are (1) that she would not have gone with Paris if she had known what would follow: but (2) that she was not a free agent. The lesson taught would seem to be that men do wrongly from their ignorance of the future, and because they are led astray by higher powers. But this is not applicable in any way to Penelope. Probably therefore it belongs originally to a different context.

The argument from style is difficult to estimate, since it depends almost entirely upon individual judgment. But it must be evident that the manner as well as the matter of the verses is didactic rather than epic (in the strict sense). With the possible exception of l. 224, they do not rise above the level of similar passages in Hesiod. They may have been suggested by the passage in Od. 3. 265 ff., where it is related that Clytaemnestra at first would not listen to the suggestions of Aegisthus—φροσι γάρ εἰχερηγα ἀγαθοί—till the decree of the gods obliged her to give way. If a conjecture may be ventured, the most obvious source is the post-Homeric epic known as the Cypria, the main subject of which is the unfaithfulness of Helen, brought about and directed by the agency of Aphrodite. The poem is one in which the progress of moral reflexion in early post-Homeric times may be very plainly traced. It need hardly be added that the interpolation of didactic passages is not uncommon (see Od. 14. 228., 15. 74., 19. 109 ff.).


234. πρῶτα 'as a beginning,' that made the beginning of sorrows for us.
νῦν δ', ἐπεὶ ἢδη σήματ' ἀριφράδεα κατέλεξα
εὐνὴς ἢμετέρης, τὴν οὖ βροτὸς ἄλλος ὁπάπει,
ἀλλ' οἷοι σοὶ τ' ἐγὼ τε καὶ ἀμφίπολος μὲν μοῦνη, 225
'Ἁκτορίς, ἂν μοι δῶκε πατὴρ ἔτι δεύτερος ἱώσῃ,
ἡ νῦν εἴρυτο θόρας πυκνοῦ ταλάμου,
πεῖθες δὴ μεν θυμόν, ἀπηνέα περ μᾶλ' ἐόντα.'

'Ως φάτο, τῷ δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον ὅφ' ἵμερον ὁδεῖ γύδοι
κλαῖε δ' ἔχον ἀλοχον θυμαρέα, κεδὼ ἱδών.
ὡς δ' ἄν ἀσπάσιοι γῆ νυχμοιέναι φανήτη,
ὅτε τοῖς Ποσειδώνων ἐνεργείᾳ γῆ' ἐνί πόντῳ
βαίνῃ, ἑπειγομένην ἀνέμφω καὶ κύματι πηγῆς
παῦροι δ' ἔξεφυγον πολιής ἀλὸς ἦπερφυνδε
νυχμοιενοι, πολλὴ δὲ περὶ χρὸν τέρπον ἄλμη,
ἀσπάσιοι δ' ἐπέβαν γαίης, κακότητα φυγάντες·
ἂς ἄρα τῇ ἀσπασίῳ πέντε εἰσοροσθή,
δειρῆς δ' οὖ πω πάμπαν ἄφιετο πῆχεε λευκός.

καὶ νῦ κ' ὄνωρομένοι φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ἄλλ' ἐνύπηθε θεά γλαυκώτης Ἀθηνή.
νύκτα μὲν ἐν περάτη δολιχὴν σχέθες· Ἡώδ' αὐτὲ
ρόσατ' ἐπ' Ὀκεανῶ χρυσόθρονον, οὔτ' ἐν ἱπτοῦσ
ζεύγνισθ' ἀκύποδας, φαὸς ἀνθρώποις φέροντας,

226 ἦν Ὁ Γ Φ Μ Υ: ὅνι. 231 ἔτι Ψ Φ Χ Υ: ἄρα Ρ Η ἀν. 233 ἀσπάσιοι
Μ Π: ἀσπασίους υψ. 237 τέρπον] θερμομέν Ψ Υ. 241 ἔβαν φαὸς ἑλλοῦ Ρ.
245 [ἐσέκαθ] Μ Π.

239. ἐργατο 'guarded,' 'was sentry at.'
232. γῆ is much less common in Homer than γώιν, but need not therefore be
condemned. In a formula such as Γῇ τε καὶ Ἡλίος (II. 3. 104., 19. 289)
it is probably ancient. Note that γώιν and γῆ are distinct formations (not
phonetic varieties): cp. 'Ἀθηναίαν and
Ἀθηνή.
243. ἐν περάτῃ. This word was sup-
posed by Alexandrian scholars to mean
'farthest,' Acts 1281, Calim. Del. 169: but there does not
seem to be any good ground for this
interpretation. Ameis and others con-
nect it with πάσας 'end,' so that it is
= 'the bounds' of earth and sky, the
horizon (cp. πάσας γαίης). But πάσας
is a later form: in the Homeric word
πάσας and its derivatives the first syllable
is long. A more defensible etymology is
from περάτη 'to pass.' As barytone
nouns in -τῇ from verbs usually have
(or acquire) a concrete sense— as ἥλιο-τή
'an oar,' ἄη (for ἄρα-τή) 'harm done,
ὅλι-τη, κολ-τη, μαλ-τη, ἱλακ-τη, &c.—
we should expect περάτη to denote 'the
passage' of night, i.e. the space which
the darkness traverses in the course of
one night. Cp. λακάβας as explained in
the note on 14. 161.

244. βυότατο 'kept safe': cp. I. 229.
Δάμπων καὶ Φαέθων’, οί τ’ Ἡώ πῶλοι ἄγονοι.
καὶ τότ’ ἄρ’ ἤν ἄλοχον προσέφης πολύμητις 'Οδυσσεύς.
"ἀ γόναι, οὖ γάρ πὼ πάντων ἐπὶ πεῖρατ’ ἄθλων
ήλθομεν, ἀλλ’ ἐτ’ ὅπειραν ἀμέτρητος πόνον ἔσται,
pολλὸς καὶ χαλεπός, τὸν ἔμε χρή πάντα τελέσαι.
ἀς γάρ μοι ψυχή μαντεύσατο Τειρεσίαο
ἠματι τῷ δε τῇ κατέβην δήμον "Ἄϊδος εἶσον,
νόστον ἐταρατείνα διήμενός ἡ’ ἐμοί αὐτῆ.
ἀλ’ ἔρχειν, λέκτρον’ ἱμένε, γόναι, ὄφρα καὶ ἰδῇ
ὑπόπ πρὸ γλυκερῆ ταπράμεθα κοιμηθέντε."  

Τὸν δ’ αὐτὴ προσέπιτε περίφροις Πηνελόπεια.
"ἐνυθ’ μὲν δὴ σοι γε τότ’ ἐσεται ὑππότε θυμῷ
σφ’ ἔθελης, ἐπεὶ ἄρ’ σε θεοὶ πολῆσαν ἱκέσθαι
οἶκον ἐκτίμενον καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.
ἀλ’ ἐπεὶ ἐφράσθης καὶ τοι θεῖς ἐμβαλε θυμῷ;
ἐλ’ ἀγε μοι τὸν ἄθλον, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὅπειραν, δῶ.

πεῦσομαι, αὐτίκα δ’ ἔστι δαῆμοιν οὐ τι χέρεων."

Τὴν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφης πολύμητις 'Οδυσσεύς.
"δαιμονίῃ, τί τ’ ἄρ’ αὐ’ με μᾶλ’ ὑπρόνοσα κελεύεις
ἐπίμεν; αὐτάρ’ ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ’ ἐπικεῦσι.

οὐ μὲν τοι θυμὸς κεχαρῆσται: οὐδὲ γάρ αὐτὸς
χαίρω, ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλὰ βροτῶν ἐπὶ ἄγετε ἄνωγεν
ἐλθεῖν, ἐν χείρεσιν ἐχοιτ’ εὕπερα ἑρεμῶν,

246 ἄγουν, ἠσει Ρ. 249 ἴσται ἦστι Π. 251 Μ 252 Ξ 254 Π
264 ὑπρόνοσα U: ὑπρόνονοι vulg. 266 θύμῳ κεχαρῆσαι Π Δ Κ.

248. οὐ γάρ τιον κτλ. The apodosis is I. 254 αλλ’ ἔρχεται κτλ. The argument being that since (γάρ) there are many troubles still to come, it will be well to enjoy the present.

256. ἔτεκεν σε θεοὶ πολῆσαν ἱκέσθαι.
This use of πολῆς has no exact parallel in Homer: the nearest is Π. 13. 55 σφένθ’ ἦν ὅτι Θεῶν τις ἐν φρείσι πολῆσειν 

260. ἔφρασεν. ‘has bethought thee of’; ‘remembered’: viz. the ἅθλος—the trial that is still to come.

268-284. These lines are repeated from Π. 11. 121-137 (see the note in vol. I), with a few variations due to the change to οραία ὁλίγνα. They are designed apparently to give us a glimpse of the fortunes of Ulysses beyond the point at which the narrative of the Odyssey ends. He is to kill the Suitors, and forthwith to set out again (ἐρχεσθαὶ δὴ ἔπειτα, 11. 121) to wander ‘through the cities of men.’ His long and painful wandering (ἀμέτρητοι τόνοι . . . πολλὸς καὶ χαλεπός) is to come to an end with the incident of the oar mistaken for a winnowing-shovel; when he will return to Ithaca, reign happily, and at length die by a ‘gentle death.’ Such is the prospect
which Ulysses and Penelope have put before them at the moment when their long endurance has been crowned with triumph.

The narrative of the 24th book is quite different. According to it the blood-fend between Ulysses and the kin of the slain man was appeased by agreement, and Ulysses became undisputed master of his kingdom. It seems clear that this was meant to be the closing scene, not merely of the Odyssey, but of the adventures of Ulysses. It leaves no room for the perspective disclosed by Tiresias. Unfortunately, however, this circumstance is indecisive, because (as we shall see) the 24th book itself is probably a later addition.

In the Cyclic epic Telemeias we have a sequel to the Odyssey, which (if we may judge from the brief abstract of Proclus) was at variance with the prophecy of Tiresias, yet showed traces of acquaintance with it. In this version Ulysses goes first to visit Elissa. On his return to Ithaca he 'performs the sacrifices directed by Tiresias' (Procl.). Then comes a fresh series of adventures, chiefly in Thesprotia. Once more he comes home to Ithaca, but has hardly landed in the island when it is invaded, in ignorance, by his son Telemonus. Father and son meet, not knowing each other, and Ulysses is slain. In this story it hard to find a place for the incident of the ear, or for the happy reign and 'gentle death' of the prophecy. Yet the injunctions of Tiresias were expressly recognized; and possibly the death at the hands of an invader from the sea was meant as a fulfilment of the mysterious ἕδη ἄλος (1. 281).

It is needless to discuss the forms which the story assumed in later times—for example, in the ' Ordering ἀκανθοπλής of Sophocles. The fragments show, as we should expect, that Sophocles closely followed the indications which the prophecy of Tiresias furnished.

The evidence now set forth can hardly be thought to prove much for or against the genuineness of the passage before us. It is certainly a piece of very ancient poetry. The chief argument against it is the difficulty of supposing that the poet would bring his hero to a triumphant issue from his troubles only to tell us that next day they must begin afresh.

269. Iσαπα ἀλλαζον 'know of the sea,' know that there is such a thing. To 'know the sea' in the ordinary sense would be γνωκαίνω. So in 1. 271 Iσαπα νίκα.

270. ἀνέρες, nom. by attraction of of ὅλος Iσαπα, which is nearer than the principal clause.

Ἀλλαξον. In Homeric times it appears that the sea was the only source from which salt was obtained.

273. σύμεν ινα κατοικεῖν. These words are appropriate as said by Tiresias to Ulysses, but not in the present context.

275. ἄνερ φαιδήμων ἄμφω. Hence Soph. 'Ὁδυσσεύς ἀκανθοπλής Br. 403 ἄδημαν τὸ δώρον ἄμφω φαιδήμως ἄμφως ἄμφως.

277. Ποσειδών. Some have found the meaning of the whole prophecy in the reconciliation with Poseidon. This does not appear in the language of the passage. A sea-faring man in such
ἀρνειν ταθρόν τε συών τ' ἐπιβήτορα κάπρον, ὁκαδ' ἀποστείχειν, ἔρδειν θ' ἱεράς ἐκατομβας ἀδανάτους θεοί, τοι οὐκαίρων οὐρὼν ἔχουσι, πᾶσι μᾶλ' ἐξεισθ' θάνατος δὲ μοι εξ ἄλσος αὐτῷ ἀβληχρός μάλα τοῖς ἐλεύθεροι, δε κε με πέφη γνῆρα ὅπου λιπαρῶν ἀρημένων ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ ἰδίοι ἔσονται τὰ δὲ μοι φάτο πάντα τελεσθαι." Τὸν δ' αὐτὸ προσέειπε περὶ φεροῦν Πηνελόπεια: "εἰ μὲν δὴ γῆρας γε θεοί τελεούσιν ἄριστον, ἐλπορθ' τοι ἐπειτα κακῶν ὑπάλυγιν ἐσεσθαι.

"Αὐτὸ οἱ μὲν τοιαύτα πρὸς ἄλλην ἀγάλμαν τόφα τ' ἅρ' Ἐυρυνύμη τε ἰδὲ τροφός ἐγνήν εὐνήν ἑσθήτος μαλακῆς, δαιδὼν ὅπου λαμπτομενῶν. αὐτῷ ἐπη στόρεσαν πυκνῶν λέχων ἔγκονέωσαν, γρηθὺς μὲν κελοῦσα πάλιν οἰκόνθε βεβήκει, τοῖς δ' Ἐυρυνύμης θαλαμηπίδος ἱερομνευν ἐρχομένουι λέχωσε, δάος μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχουσα: εἰς δαλαμὸν δ' ἀγαγοῦσα πάλιν κλέευ. οἱ μὲν ἐπειτα δισάνοι λέκτρου παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ικνοῖν.

286 ἄρειον] ὀκίνοις G. 289 ἐγνήν] ἐγνήν G F X: ἐγνήν (for ἐγνήν;) P.

a case would naturally turn to Poseidon as his especial patron. If the poet had meant to lay stress on such a reconciliation as is supposed, he would have told us that Poseidon was appealed by the sacrifice.

278. The sacrifice here prescribed answers to the Roman superstition.

281. εἰ ἄλος, with ἆλοστειαν, can only mean 'will come from the sea.' Cp. 24. 47 μήτηρ δ' ἐξ ἄλος ἄλος. In what shape was it to come from the sea is left undetermined, after the manner of prophecy. The meaning 'away from,' 'at a distance from,' is not found with a verb of motion. It is possible, however, that there was a word ἔκαλος, formed (perhaps as a nonce-word) on the analogy of ἔκαλος, and meaning "away from the sea." The point then would be that Ulysses, who had gone through many dangers by sea, was to die on land.

αὐτός is opposed to λαοῖ (283): 'you yourself will die &c., while your people &c.'

282. ἀβληχρός μᾶλα τοῖς 'one quite gentle': meaning doubtless a death by old age or by the ἰδάρα βίαις of Apollo. For this use of τοῖς in the Odyssey cp. 15. 451.

283. ἀρημένον 'stricken,' cp. 18. 537. 288. ἄρειον 'better,' i.e. good rather than the reverse, cp. 13. 111. The word is a rare one, and is perhaps used here for the sake of the play of language which it makes with γνῆρα ἀρημένον.

292. κελοῦσα, see on 14. 533.

295. ἔρθεις is a word which does not occur elsewhere in Homer. It seems here to have the sense of 'place,' 'situation': cp. the later words ἐνὶ and ἐνὶ.

This verse, we are told in the scholia, was pronounced by Aristophanes and Aristarchus 'the end of the Odyssey.'
We also know that Aristarchus obelized two passages which come later, viz. 23. 310–343 and 24. 1–304. The question at once arises: how could he reject these parts of a text when he had already rejected the whole of it? Doubtless if we had the commentary of Aristarchus, the difficulty would be explained. The most obvious solution is that he distinguished (1) a continuation of the Odyssey by some later poet, extending from 23. 297 to the end of the 24th book and (2) two still later interpolations, viz. the two passages said to be obelized. This view, simple as it is to the modern scholar, was one which the obelus could not express. Accordingly it would seem that the condemnation of the text from 23. 297 onwards did not take the form of ἀβέβαιος, in the strict sense of the term viz. the affixing of an obelus to the verses condemned. This was reserved for the later interpolations.

The question whether the continuation was needed in order to bring the story of the Odyssey to a satisfactory close is one that can hardly be settled by discussion. The issue depends rather upon the evidence afforded by language and metre: see the notes on 23. 300, 316, 361, 34. 235 ff., 237, 249, 341, 345, 248, 286, 288, 332, 343, 360, 394, 398, 465, 497, 534, 535. Other points are noticed on 307, 368, 469, 472, 526.

300 ἑταρπών. Augmented forms of the dual are rare in Homer, especially in the Odyssey (see Mr. Platt in the *Journ. of Phil.*, xxxii. 305).


310–343. This strangely prosaic summary is doubtless interpolated by a later hand,—later than the author of the continuation. It is referred to by Aristotle (Rhet. iii. 16. 8), who gives the number of lines as nearly twice the true number. The discrepancy shows that some at least of the ancient writers quoted from memory, and did not take pains to be correct in unimportant particulars.

312. ἀπολλωνεος, sc. Ὄδυσσεος, 'made him pay.'
258 23. ΟΔΗΣΕΙΑΣ Ψ

ηδ' ὁς Αἰολον ἱκεθ', ὡς μνείρον ὑπὲδεκτο
cαὶ πέμπ', οὐδὲ πω ἀλὸν ἓς πατρίδ' ἱκέσθαι
ην, ἀλλ' ὁς αὐτὸς ἀναρπάξασα ὀθηλλα
πάντων ἐπ' ἱχνωδετά φέρεν βαρέα στενάχοντα·
ηδ' ὁς Τηλέπυλον Ἀἰστρυγονίνην ἀφλακεν,
οἱ νῆς ὅ' δ' ὀδεσαν καὶ ἐκκλημιδα ἐταῖροι
[πάντας. 'Οδυσσειος δ' οἶος ὑπέκφυγε νητ' μελανη].
καὶ Κήρης κατέλεξε δόλων πολυμηχανίν τε,
ηδ' ὁς ἔις Αἰδεω δόμων ἱλυθεν εὑρίσκετα,
ψυχὴ χρησάμενος Θηβαίων Τειρεσίαο,
νητ' πολυκληδί, καὶ εἶσοδε πάντας ἐταῖρους
μητέρα θ', ὡς μνείρε καὶ ἔτρεφε τυσθόν ἓντα·
ηδ' ὃς Σειρήνων ἀδυνάων φθόγγον ἀκοινον,
ὡς θ' ἱκετο Πλαγκτᾶς πέτρας δεινήν τε Χάρυβδι
Σκύλλην θ', ἡν ο' πά πορ' ἀκρίροι ἀνδρες δυναν
ηδ' ὃς 'Ηλείων βδος κατέφευν ἐταῖροι.
ηδ' ὅς νήα θοῦν ἔβαλε ψολόμενοι κεραυνοφ
Ζεῦς ὑψιβρεμέτης; ἀπ' δ' ἐφθινεν ἐσθολο ἐταῖροι
πάντες ὃμως, αὐτὸς δ' κακός ὑπὸ κῆρας δυνεν
ὡς θ' ἱκετ' Ἡμυγίην νήσον νύμφην τε Καλυψώ,
η δ' μνείρε κατέρυκε λυμαιρένη πόσιν ἔναι
ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροίς, καὶ ἔτρεφεν ἤδε ἐφασκε
θύσεων ἄδανατον καὶ ἄγχρως ἡματα πάντα·
ἀλλα τοῦ ὅδε ποτε θυμον ἐνι στήθεσιν ἐπειθεν
ηδ' ὅς ἐς Φαῖηκας ἀφκέτο πολλὰ μογησα,

316 ἤνιν vulg.: εἰς Υ: εἰς F al.: αἰς (for ἤνιν Υ). 317 barla G F M X
al.: μεγάλος F: μεγάλα H U al. 320 is omitted in nearly all MSS. It must
be unknown to Aristarchus, who counts the passage 310–343 as thirty-
three verses. 335 Perhaps ἤδι 'φ.' ἐφασκε.

316. ἤνιν. This form occurs four
times in our text of Homer, viz. in ll.
11. 808 (where we can read ἤνιν), Od.
19. 283 (read εἰς or εἰς), and twice in
the continuation of the Odyssey, viz.
here and in 34. 343. It is clearly not
Homerian.

326. ἄδους, an epithet to be under-
stood in reference to the voices of the
Sirens, 'thick-coming,' 'with ever re-
sounding song.' So of the blesting of
calves, 10. 413 ἄδους μυαλμένου, the cry
of birds, 10. 216 ἄδουρες η ρ' όλωρ, &c. But the application of the adj.
to the Sirens themselves is not justified by
these instances. The author probably
had in his mind the passage ll. 2. 469
τὸ ἁμες μυαλὸν ἄδους, ετλ., and may have
understood the word there of the cease-
less humming of the flies.
οὐ δὴ μὲν περὶ κήρυ θεὸν ὁμοίαντο
καὶ πέμψαν σὺν νητὶ φίλην ἐστὶ πατρίδα γαίαν,
χαλκὸν τε χρυσὸν τε ἄλισ ἐσθήτα τε δόντες.
τούτῳ ἰρα δεῦταν εἰπεν ἔπος, ὅτε οἱ γλυκῶς ὕπνος
λυσιμέλης ἐπάροσε, λύσων μελεθήματα θυμὸν.

为抓 τὸν ἐνεῖσθε θεὰ γλαυκώπις Ἀθηνή.
οπίσω δὴ τοῦ ὄντων ἐξέπετο ὅν κατὰ θυράν
εὐνής ὅς ἀλάχως ταρπήμενεν ὅδε καὶ ὕπνος,
αὐτίκ' ἀπ' Ὀλκεανοῦ χρυσόθρονον ἦργιγείειαν
ἀρσεν, ἵνα ἀνθράποις φῶς φέροι· ὅρτο δὲ Ὅντωσεν
εὐνής ἐκ μαλακῆς, ἀλάχωρ δ' ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλεν·
"οὐ γυναί, ἥδη μὲν πολέων κεκορήμεθα ἀέθλων
ἀμφότερος, σὺ μὲν ἐναθά' ἔμοι πολυκηδέα νόστων
κλαίσων· αὐτὰρ ἔμε Ζεὺς ἄλγεσι καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι
λέμενοι πεπάσκουν ἐμής ἀπὸ πατρίδος αἰτής.

νῦν δ' ἐπει ἀμφότερος πολυνήρατον ἰκόμεθ᾽ εὐνής,
κτήματα μὲν τὰ μοι ἐστὶ κομίζεμεν ἐν μεγάροις,
μῆλα δ' α μοι μηνοτήρες ὑπερφάλαιοι κατέκειραν,
πολλὰ μὲν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ λησσομαι, ἄλλα δ' Ἀχαιοὶ
dοῦσιν', ἐλλιας τοι αἰ στα ἐπιπλήσσων ἐπαύλους.

ἀλλ' ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ πολυδένδρον ἀγρὸν ἔπειμι,
ὄψόμενος πατέρ' ἔσθλον, α μοι πυκνῶς ἀκάχηται·

σοι δέ, γύναι, τάδ' ἐπιτέλω πινυτῆ περ ἐυσφή
 αὐτίκα γαρ φάτις εἰσιν ἀμ' ἣλιῷ ἀνίοντι
ἀνδρῶν μνηστήριον, οὐς ἔκτανον ἐν μεγάροις

ἐλα ὑπερφ' ἀναβάσα σὺν ἀμφιπόλοις γυναιξιν

348 ὕπνοι] φῶς UZ.
354 ἀμφότερος U: ἀμφότερος vulg.
355 ἐπιμελής, see on 30. 57.
359 ἔπειμι U East.: ἔπειμι P H al.
343. ἡμισεισμία, see on 30. 57.
355. ὅλος ἦν νεότατος, 'was satisfied.'
356. ἢ ἡμισεισμία, see on 30. 57.
357. The use of the epithet ἄργινα (without Ἀθην.) = Dawn is not found in
Homer.
355. κομίζεμεν 'take in charge.'
358. ἐπαύλους 'stalls,' stabula.
356. ἐπιτέλω. This scansion is in-
defensible by Homeric rules.
352. φάτις ... ἀνδρῶν μνηστήριον
't story about the Suitors.' Usually the
phrase means 'the talk of men.'
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'Ἡ βα καὶ ἀμφ' ὀμοιων ἐδύσετο τεῦχεα καλά,
ἀφεὶ δὲ Τηλέμαχον καὶ βουκόλου ἣδε συβάτην,
pάντας δ' ἐνε' ἀνωγεν ἀρήια χερσίν ἐλέσθαι.
oὶ δὲ οὐκ ἀπιθῆσαν, ἐθαρρήσοντο δὲ χαλκῷ,
ἀιξαν δὲ ὁδρας, ἐκ δ' ἤιν ἤρχε δ' 'Οδυσσεὺς.

''Ἡδη μὲν φάος ἦν ἐπὶ χώνα, τοὺς δ' ἄρ' Ἀθηνὴ
νυκτὶ κατακρύψασα θῶς εἴηγε πόλησιν.''

371–372. These two lines introduce the passage 24.1–204, as to which see the note at the beginning of the 24th book. It will be evident that the division between the books has been made in the middle of a sentence: cp. 13.440, also 3.497 (as explained in the note on 15.290).

Ulysses with the Oar.
From an engraved gem ('Inghirami, Galleria Omerica, vol. iii. 55).
ΟΔΤΞΕΙΑΣ Ω

Σπονδαί.

'Ερμῆς δὲ ψυχὰς Κυλλῆνος ἐξεκαλεῖτο ἀνδρῶν μυστήρων. ἔχε δὲ ράβδουν μετὰ χερός καλὴν χρυσείν, τῇ τ’ ἀνδρῶν ὄμματα θέλγει ὃν ἐθέλει, τοὺς δ’ αὐτὲ καὶ ὑπνώοντας έγειρεν τῇ ρ’ ἔγε κινήσας, ταῖ δὲ τρίζουσι ἐποντὸ.

4. Here one or two MSS. insert the line τῶν μετὰ χερόν ἑκὼν πάτετο κρατὺς Ἀργοκόρης (II. 24, 345).

1-204. This passage, which contains the Second Νέα of the Odyssey, was rejected by Aristarchus. His objections, together with the replies to them which satisfied later grammarians, are preserved by the scholiasts, in a summary of remarkable brevity (see Sch. M.V.). The replies are often successful in showing that particular arguments are inconclusive: but the cumulative effect of the reasoning can hardly be resisted. Moreover, it is reinforced by other considerations. The most obvious is that in an epic poem such as the Odyssey the introduction of a second 'descent into Hades' must be, poetically speaking, a failure. The scholiasts argue that the eleventh book describes a piece of 'soothsaying by means of the dead,' while the present passage is in the full sense a 'visit to the dead' (καὶ Νεκυομαντεῖαν μὲν ἀν τις ἐλεύθερος τῷ Αἰνῷ, Νέας δὲ ταύτῃ). But the dialogues in the two books are similar to a degree that renders the second a frigid repetition of motifs already exhausted. We may add that the language shows clear traces of a later period. The objections made by Aristarchus are noticed in the notes on II. 1, 2, 11 ff., 23, 50, 60, 63, 150; for other traces of spuriousness see II. 1 (Ἐρμῆς), 19, 28 (ἐρωτεύεται), 30, 52, 57, 79, 88-89, 128, 155, 158, 166, 198.

1. Ἐρμῆς. This contraction is doubtless post-Homeric (cp. 14.435). The Homeric form appears in I. 10, in the phrase Ἐρμῆς δανέσα. The use of Ἐρμῆς in that archaic phrase is no reason for attempting to correct the first line (ψυχὰς δ’ Ἐρμῆς Βαν Λεουwel). The old form subsists as a poetical archaism along with the new one.

Κυλλῆνος, as Aristarchus observed, is a post-Homeric epithet of Hermes. It is common in the Homeric Hymns (H. Mec. 318, &c., xvii. 1., xviii. 31). The word occurs in II. 15, 518, not in reference to Hermes or Mount Cyllene, but as the adj. from Κυλλῆν, a town in Elis.

2. Aristarchus argues with great force that the function here attributed to Hermes—that of conducting souls to Hades (ψυχομυστέραι)—is nowhere else mentioned in Homer. The passing away of life is so often described in the Iliad and Odyssey that this argument is as strong as any argument ex silentio can be. Compare also the contradiction pointed out in the note on 11-13.
24. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ω

ὁς δ' ὅτε νυκτερίδες μυχω ἄντρων θεοπεσίου
tρίζονται ποτένται, ἐπεὶ κέ τις ἀποπέσησιν
ὁμαθοῦ ἐκ πέτρης, ἀνά τ' ἀλλήλων ἔχονται,
δέ αἱ τετραυίαι ἀρ' ἠξίον ἥρχε δ' ἄρα σφιν
'Ἐρμελες ἀκάκητα κατ' εἰρώτειτα κέλευθα.

πάρ δ' ἵσαν 'Ὀκεανοῦ τε ῥόδα καὶ Δευκάδα πέτρην,

8 ἀντ' ἕμα τ' Ἄ. Μ. [ἔχοντα] ἔχοντα Μ.

7. φοτίουτα. This form (found also in Il. 19.357) is originally the same as the contracted φοτών 'sit about' (Il. 2.462), from φοτάω. It does not follow, however, that we should read φοτάω here. The form φοτών is Ionic, like μενέάων, ὑπόκλεων, ἰτέον, τραύς. The question as to the relative antiquity of this group of forms depends on the general question of the original dialect of Homer.

8. ὀμαθόθεν, with ἀποφλέομεν, 'drops off the chain,' sc. of bats that are clinging together. ἐκ πέτρης 'from the rock,' so as to lose hold on the rock, to which the cluster of bats was attached.

ἀνά τ' ἀλλήλων ἔχονται is a para
tactic addition to the picture given by ὀμαθόθεν: '(the cluster), in which they cling to one another.'

9. τετραύια 'squeaking,' of the peculiar shrill note of the bat. The perfect is used of sustained sounds: cf. μεμένικα, ἀλληλες, μεμέλικα, καλελιγμένα.

11-13. In this account of the way to Hades Aristarchus noticed that no heed is given to the fact that the slain Suitors were still unburied (cp. I. 187). In Il. 23.72-73 the shade of Patroclus asks for burial, because 'the souls of the dead will not suffer him to join their company across the river.' So too Elpenor, the companion left unburied in the Island of Circe, is met at the entrance of Hades, and entreats Ulysses to grant him funeral rites, without which, as we may gather—though it is not expressly said—he will not be able to pass the gates of Hades. The contradiction is plain, and, considering that the direct agency of Hermes ἄγοσιν ἀνάξιον is hardly consistent with stories like that of Elpenor, it clearly shows that the representation in the Second Νίκαιa is inconsistent with the beliefs elsewhere to be traced in Homer.

Moreover, the localities mentioned in Il. 11.1-12 do not accord with other Homeric accounts, except perhaps in regard to the river 'Ὀκεανός.' The notion that that river had to be passed appears in the former Νίκαιa, Od. 11.157-159. In these lines—which however were rejected by Aristarchus—the mother of Ulysses says it is hard for living men to see these regions; 'for between are great rivers and fearsome streams, Oceanus first, which no man can pass on foot, but must have a good ship.' In Il. 23.73 we hear of a river to be passed. In the Iliad generally, however, the souls go down, without delay or incident, beneath the earth. So Elpenor reaches at least the entrance of Hades quickly, Od. 11.58 ἑφθανεν πεσον τον ἀθανασιν ἐπὶ μιαν. And nothing is said of his having still to pass the Oceanus, or any river. Commentators have attempted to reconcile these passages by supposing two ways to Hades: but they are better left unreconciled. It may be worth noticing, however, that a possible trace of two such ways is to be found in the Frgs. of Aristophanes, where Dionysus crosses the 'lake' in Charon's boat, while Xanthias goes round by land (κωπία).

The White Rock is only mentioned here; unless (as Van Leeuwen suggests) it appears in the Frgs., l. 194 ἐκαὶ τοῦ Ἀδαιοῦ λίθου.

The Gates of the Sun doubtless belong to the conception of Hades which places it in the darkness of the extreme west (ἔφοβος, ἐρεῖδος). The gates are those which the sun enters at his setting, whereupon the veil of night hides him from the world.

The Land of Dreams is known from this place only. The notion which the phrase suggests is not inconsistent with the account in Od. 19.562 ff. of the two gates out of which dreams issue.
24. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ω

ηδε παρ' 'Ηελλοιον πίλας καὶ δήμον ὁνειρῶν ἠσαν' ἀλφά 8' ἰκοντο καὶ ἀσφοδέλων λειμώνα, ἐνθα τε ναλοῦσι ψυχαί, εἴδωλα καμάιτων.

Εὐδρον δὲ ψυχὴν Πηλιάδεω Ἀχιλῆος καὶ Πατροκλῆος καὶ ἀμύμωνος Ἀντιλόχου Ἀλεκτώς θ’, δὲ ἀριστος ἔν ἔδεσ τε δέμας τε τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ’ ἀμύμωνα Πηλείωνα. δὲ οἱ μὲν περὶ κεῖνον ὅμλεον· ἄγχημαλον δὲ ἤλυθ’ ἐπί ψυχὴ Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρέιδο" ἀρνινεν’ περὶ δ’ ἄλλαι ἀγνηραθ’, δοσαὶ ἄρ’ αὐτῷ οἰκε ἐν Αλεξάθου θάνων καὶ πόθμον ἐπέστον. τὸν προτέρη ψυχὴ προσεφώνει Πηλείωνος· "Ἀτρέιδη, περὶ μὲν σ’ ἐφαμέν Διὶ τερπικεραύφνῳ ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων φίλον ἔμμεναι ἡματα πάντα, σνεκα πολλοῖν τε καὶ ἰβδόμοιν ἀνάσσες δήμων ἐν Τρώων, διὶ πάσχομεν ἐλγε’ Ἀχαἰοι.

At the same time there is no reason to combine the two pictures.

The land of the Cimmerians, described in Od. 11.14-19, does not re-appear in this πίεμα.

It has been already remarked, in the notes on Od. 15.295-298, that lines 11-12 closely resemble two lines in that passage. This is probably the result of imitation. Or there may have been a conventional formula for the land-marks passed on a voyage.

13. καὶ ἀσφοδέλων λειμῶνα. There was a common plant called ἀσφοδέλος (Hes. Op. 41 ὁθ’ δημον ἐν μαλάχῳ τε καὶ ἀσφοδέλῳ μυγ’ δεινων), our King's spear, and from this name, according to the grammarians, was derived an adj. (generally made an oxytone) ἀσφοδέλως "full of asphodel." Hence the 'mead of asphodel' which has become a familiar image in modern poetry. It must be pointed out, however, that the rules for the formation of nouns in Greek do not allow us to make an adj. ἀσφοδελός = 'full of ἀσφοδέλως.'

It is evidently much more probable that the adjectival use is the original one, and that the plant was so called because it had the quality (or absence of a quality) which the adj. expresses. What that quality was we are left to conjecture. In the so-called σχολή Didymi we find the note δικαίως φυτὸν ὁ ἀσφοδέλος. This may be a mere guess, but it suggests an explanation which has some plausibility. The 'meadow without fruit,' i.e. where there is no sowing or reaping, would not be out of place in the infernal regions. On the other hand the same word might be applied to a plant which was 'without fruit' (or was imagined to be so). We do not know that the asphodel could be so described: but it is worth noting that the root was the part which was eaten (Theophr. H. P. 1. 10. 7).

19. ἐν οἷς μὲν κτλ. These words come in strangely after the preceding lines. The reference of καὶν is not sufficiently clear. And the words imply that there has been a δμιλ— a conversation or 'consorting together'—in which Achilles was the principal figure.

23 ff. The dialogue that follows is certainly, as Aristarchus said, διαγος. It has nothing to do with the main story, and the newly arrived souls of the Suitors have to wait till it is done (l. 98). Moreover it is strange that Agamemnon should now hold such a dialogue with Achilles. It would be appropriate only if Agamemnon were himself one of the new-comers.
24. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΑΣ Ω

ἡ τ᾿ ἀρα καὶ σοι πραίτ παραστήσεσθαι ἐμελλεῖ
μοῖρ᾽ ὅλῃ, τὴν οὗ τις ἀλευτεῖ δὲ κε γένηται.
ὡς ὄφελες τιμῆς ἀπονήμενος, ἦς περ ἀνασφει,
δήμῳ ἐνὶ Τρώων θάνατον καὶ πότιον ἐπιστείν-
tῶ κέν τοι τόμβων μὲν ἐποίησαν Παναχαιῳ,
ἡδὲ κε καὶ σφὶ παιδὶ μέγα κλέος ἡρὰ ὀπίσω

υόν δ᾿ ἀρα ὁ οἰκτιστὸ τοῖ ἐμαρτο ἀλῶναι.

Τὸν δ᾿ αὐτή ψυχὴ προσεφώνει Ἀτρείδας·
״δίβης Πηλέοις οὐέ, θεοῖς ὑπείκει καὶ Αχιλλεύ,
δὲ θάνες ἐν Τροίῃ ἐκδό Ἁργείου· ἀμφὶ δὲ σφὶ ἄλλοι
κτείνοντο Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ὑλὲς ἀριστοί,
μαρνάμενοι περὶ σεῖον σφὶ ἐν στροφάλυγγι κοινὴς
κεῖσο μέγας μεγαλωστὶ, λεπασμένοι ἀποσυνάων.

ἡμεῖς δὲ πρὸπαν ἦμαρ ἐμαρνάμεθ᾽· οὐδὲ κε πάσμπαν
πανσάμβατα πολέμου, εἶ μὴ Ζεὺς λαλαπεν παθεν.
αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ σφὶ ἐνίνα ἐνέλκαμεν εκ πολέμου,
κάθθεμεν ἐν λεγέσσι, καθήμαντες χρῶν καλῶν
οδατὶ τε λιαρφ καὶ ἀλεφάτει· πολλὰ δὲ σφὶ ἀμφὶ
dάκρυα θερμὰ χένον δαναιοί κέραντο τε χαῖτας.

μήτηρ δ᾽ εὑρὸς ἤλθε σφὲν ἄδανάτης ἄληρον
ἀγγελῆς ἄλλους. βοὴ δ᾽ ἐπὶ πόντον ὅραμε
θεοπεσιν, ὅποὶ δὲ τρόμος ἐλαβε πάντας Ἀχαιῶν·
καὶ νῦ κ᾽ ἀνατεινὲς ἔβαν κολάς ἐπὶ νῆας,
εἰ μὴ ἀνὴρ κατέρυκε παλαία τε πολλὰ τε εἰδῶς,

28 πραίτι προτά GPH. 30 ἀ G1. 39 G᾽ ἐν FXU: ἀ GPH al. 46 κείραντο vulg.: κείραντο U Eust. 49 ἐπὶ GFMU: ἐπὶ P H al. ἐλαβε H al.: ἔλαβε GFMJ.

28. πραίτ occurs in the Iliad in the formula πράτι δ᾽ ὑποιοί σὺν τεῦχεις θωριχθέντες, meaning simply ‘early.’ Here it is = ‘too early,’ like ὑπερφ in Attic. The reading προτὰ has good MS. support, but would not yield this sense.

29. ἀλευτεῖ is probably aor. subj., used after ὅποι σοι in ὅποι γένηται.

30. ἦς περ ἀνασφεί of which you were master." This use of ἀνασφει occurs also in II. 20. 180 ἀλακμὸν Τρώων ἀνάζειν ἰποδάμους τιμῆς τῆς Πράμου," where it seems to imply wrongful ‘mastery’ of what belongs to another.

39-40, = II. 16. 775-776; where ἀλα-

ακμὸν ἰποδάμους is said—more appropriately—of the chariot-driver (Sittl). 50. ἔβαν κολάς ἐπὶ νῆας. Aristarchus objected that the Greeks were already

at the ships, where they had brought the body of Achilles (I. 43 ἔνι νῆας). The answer seems to be that in the panic now described the Greeks rushed to

their ships with the view of flight (σέβομαι, l. 57): cp. II. 2. 150 νῆα ἐν ἀσεβῶστῳ.
Νέστωρ, οὖ καὶ πρόσθεν ἄριστη φαίνεται βουλή·
δ' σφιν ἔφρονεν ἀγοράσατο καὶ μετέειπεν·
ἲσχεσθ', Ἀργεῖοι, μὴ φεύγετε, κοσμεῖ Αχαιόων·
μήτηρ εἰ ἄλος ἢδε σὺν ἀδανάτης ἄλησθιν
ἐρχεται, οὖ παῦσις τεθηντος ἀντίδωσα·
δὲ ἔφατ', οἷς δ' ἐσχοντο φόβου μεγάθυμοι Ἀχαιοί·
ἀμφὶ δὲ σ' ἐστησαν κοσμεῖ ἄλοιο γέροντος
ὄκτρ' ὀλοφυρόμεναι, περὶ δ' ἀμβροτα εἴματα ἔσσαν.
Μοῦσα δ' ἐνεια πᾶσαι ἀμεβδήμεναι ὡλὶ καλῇ
θρήνουν ἐναὶ κεν οὖ τι' ἀδάκρυτον γ' ἐνοῆς
Ἀργεῖων· τοῖς γὰρ ὑπόροις Μοῦσα λύγεια.
ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ δέκα μὲν σε ὄμος νῦκτας τε καὶ ἱμαρ
κλαομένα ἀδανατοί τε θεοὶ θυντοὶ τ' ἀνθρωποί·
ὀκτωκαιδεκάτη δ' ἔδομεν πυρί, πολλὰ δὲ σ' ἀμφὶ
μῆλα κατεκτάνομεν μάλα πιόνα καὶ ξικας βοῦς.
καλεῖ δ' ἐν τῇ ἐσθρήσι θεῶν καὶ δηλοῦσα τολλῷ
καὶ μελίτι γλυκέρῳ· πολλοὶ δ' ἥρωες Ἀχαιοί
τεχέσιν ἐφρώσαντο πυρὶν πέρι καιομένου,
πεζοὶ δ' ἵππησ· τε· πολὺς δ' ὀρυμαγδὸς ὀρφεί·
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σε φιλὸς ἦνουσεν Ἡφαίστου,

52 ὁ καὶ πρόσθεν κτλ. This formula is hardly appropriate here; Nestor has given no 'former counsel.'
57. It is perhaps not a mere accident that this is the only place in the Odyssey in which the word φόδος occurs.
60. On this line Aristarchus observed that it is the only Homeric passage in which the number of the Muses is given.
62. ὄψωρος 'stirred their hearts': the preposition is especially used of feeling, as in the phrase ὑπὸ τῷ μετρον ὄρως γόον.
63. Aristarchus asked how the body of Achilles was kept for so many days. The scholiast plausibly says that it was by the agency of Thetis, as in the case of Patroclus. But would Homer have left this to be understood?
68. The use of honey appears to be a trace of the practice of embalming the dead; see Helbig, Hom. Epist., p. 53.
69. ἐφρώσαντο, see on 23. 3. So in honour of Patroclus, II. 23. 13 ὀλὶ δὲ τρίς
περὶ περευδό ἐνθρίχας ἤλασαν ἵππους μυρῷ-
μενοι.
266 24. ΟΔῲΣΕΙΑΣ Ω

ηὸδεν δὴ τοι λέγομεν λευκ' ὅστε', Ἀχίλλε, οὐν τέ ἀκρότητι καὶ ἀλείφατι δῶκε δὲ μήτηρ χρύσεων ἀμφιφορήα· Διονύσοιο δὲ δώρον φάσκ' ἔμεναι, ἔργον δὲ περικλυτοῦ Ἡφαῖστου· ἐν τῷ τοι κεῖται λευκ' ὅστεα, φαϊδρ' Ἀχίλλε, μύγα δὲ Πατρόκλου Μενοιτάδαο θανύτος, χωρὶς δ' Ἀντιλόχου, τὸν ἔσχα τεῖς ἀπάντων τῶν ἄλλων ἐτάρων μετὰ Πάτροκλον γε θανύτα.

ἀμφ' αὐτοῖς δ' ἐπείτα μέγαν καὶ ἀμύμωνα τύμβου χεδαμεν Ἀργείων λερός στρατὸς αἰχμητῶν ἀκτη ἐπὶ προὐχοῦσιν, ἐπὶ πλατεί Εὐλησιόντη, ὡς κεν τηλεφανῆ ἐκ ποντόφων ἄνδραίν εἰς τοῖς οὐ νῦν γεγάδοι καὶ οἱ μετόπισθεν ἔσονται.

μήτηρ δ' αἰτήσασα θεοῦς περικάλλε' ἄεθλα θήκε μέσῳ ἐν ἄγωνι ἀριστήσασιν Ἀχιλλών.

ἡδ' μὲν πολέων τάφος ἄνδρῶν ἀντεβόλησας ἥρων, δοτ' κέν πολ' ἀποφιμέμων βασιλῆς ζώνιται τε νέοι καὶ ἐπεντύνονται ἄεθλα-ἀλλα κε κείμα μάλιστα ἰδὼν θησαυροῦ, οἶ ἐπὶ σοὶ κατέθηκε θεά περικάλλε' ἄεδελα ἀργυρόπετα Θέτεις· μᾶλα γὰρ φίλος ἡσάθα θεοῖς.

ὡς οὖ κοι οὐδὲ θανών ὦνοι ἠλέσας, ἄλλα τοι άλει

74. ἀμφιφορήα, the urn in which the ashes of Patroclus were placed at his entreaty; II. 23. 92 χρύσεων ἀμφιφορείαν, τῶν τα ναρα πόταμ μήτηρ. It is also called a φάνη, see II. 23. 243, 253.

77. Cp. the injunctions of Patroclus in II. 23. 83.

79. The term 'τραύρος of Achilles' is not strictly applicable to Antilochus.

80. αὐτοῖς, see on 241, 282. In later times these three heroes had separate mounds on the Hellespont.

81. λερός στρατός, perhaps a trace of the original sense of λερός, viz. 'strong.' The theories as to this word put forward by W. Schultze (Quaest. Ep. p. 207 ff.) and Mr. Mulvany (Journ. of Philology, xli. 131) are somewhat too elaborate.


82 ἐν Homer ὅτα κεν usually refers to a particular future event: but there are some exceptions to the rule, see H. G. § 289, 2. In any case, however, δεῖ κεν must take the subjunctive. The form ζώνιται has sometimes been explained as a subj. (as by Curtius, Verb. l. 67); but this is against all analogy. The proper subj. would be ζώνισθαι, and possibly that form should be read here. The synizesis is violent (cp. the usual scanning of Θενοῖς αὐραήφωρτος): but the fact that the form ζώνισθαι cannot otherwise be brought into the hexameter is a partial excuse.
πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων κλέος ἐσεται ἐσθλῶν. Ἀχιλλεὺς
ἀυτὰρ ἔμοι τί τὸδ' ἱδος, ἐπεὶ πόλεμον τολμύευσα;
ἐν νόστῳ γὰρ μοι Ζεὺς μῆκοτο λυγρὸν ὀξέθρον
Ἀγλάσθου ὑπὸ χερσὶ καὶ οὐλομένης ἀλόχους."

"Ως οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἄλληλος ἄγρευνον,
ἀγχύμολον δὲ σφ' ἦλθε διάκτοροι ἀργείφορης,
ψυχὰς μυστηρῶν κατάγων 'Οδυσσῆς δαμέντων.
τῶ δ' ἄρα ταμβύσαντ' ἵθει κλών, ὑσ' ἐσιδέσθην.
ἔγνω δὲ ψυχὴ Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρέιδαο
παῖδα φιλον Μελανῆος, ἀγακλητῶν Ἀμφιμέδουτα.
ζείνος γὰρ οἱ ἐν 'Ἰθάκῃ ἐνι οἰκίᾳ ναλών.
τῶν προτέρη ψυχὴ προσεφώνειν Ἀτρέιδαο

"Ἀμφιμέδου, τί παθόντες ἐρεμήν γαῖαν ἐπιτε
πάντες κεκριμένοι καὶ ὅμηλικε; οὐδὲ κεν ἄλλως
κρυμάμενος λέξαιτο κατὰ πτόλει ἄνδρας ἀράτους.
ἡ ὁμῇ ἐν νήσεσι Ποσειδίδων ἐδάμασεν,
ὅρας ἀργαλέους ἀνέμους καὶ κύματα μακρὰ;
ἡ ποι ἀνάρσιοι ἄνδρες ἐδηλίσαντ' ἐπὶ χέρουν
βοῶς περιταμνομένους ἣ' οἰόν πέφη καλά,
ἡ περὶ πτόλεος μαχεύμενοι ἢδε γυναικῶν;
ἐπεῖ μοι εἰρομένῳ ἐρείνος δὲ τοι εὐχομαι εἰναι.
ἡ οὐ μέση ὅτε κείει κατηλυθον ὑμέτερον δώ,
ὀρνέαν 'Οδυσσῆα σὺν ἀντιδείς Μενελάφ
"Ἰλιον εἰς ἀμ' ἐπεσθαί ἐνσέλμαν ἐπὶ νῆων;

95 τὸν Ἱταλ. G. 112 καὶ δίς καὶ πιονας αὔγας Π.

95. τί τὸδ' ἱδος 'how is it now (τῶδε)
a pleasure?' Cp. II. 18, 80 ἀλλὰ τί μοι
tῶν ἱδος; Possibly the original phrase
was τί τὸ ἱδος;
97. It is only here and in the eleventh
book (410, 453) that Clytaemnestra is
said to have taken part in the murder.
Elsewhere in Homer it is ascribed to
Aegle thus alone.
101. τὸ 'the two' who had spoken,
viz. Achilles and Agamemnon.
104. Ἰθάκη Ἔν. Amphimedon was
host 'in Ithaca, his home,' and Aga-
memnon similarly in Mycenae: cp. II.
6. 224 αἰὲ μὲν ἐγὼ ἐρείνος φίλος Ἀργιλ
μέσῃ εἰμ' ὡς ὀν Λυκίη ὅτε κεν τῶν
δήμων ἱκουμαι.
106. τί παθόντες, to be understood
literally, not in the later colloquial use
of τί παθόντα κτλ.
108. κρυμάμενος, for κρυμαμένος τις:
see the note on 13. 400.
109--113. = II. 399--403.
112. περιταμνομένους, i.e. raiding.
113. μαχεύμενοι, to be explained as
merely μετρὶ gratia for the impossible
ῥαξεύμενοι. The change to the nom.
is also required by the metre.
μήν δ' ἰδ' ὀλοθρὼν πάντα περήσαμεν εὐρέα πάντων, σπουδὴ παρτεπιθέντας Ἡδονήματα πτολύτορθον.

Τὸν δ' αὐτὸν ψυχήν προσεφάνεν Ἀμφίμεθον. ὡς ἰδότηθα, ἀναξ ἄνδρων Ἁγάμεμνον, μέμνησαι τάδε πάντα, διοισχέσθη, ὡς ἀγορευείσαλο δ' ἐνω εὐ μᾶλα πάντα καὶ ἀνεκέκτω καταλέξω, ἡμετέρου θανάτου κακὸν τέλος, οὖν ἐτόχη.

μνάμεθ' Ὑδονήματα δὴν οἰχομένου δάμαρτα· ἡ δ' οὐτ' ἤρνειτο στυγερῶν γάμων οὖν ἐτελεῦτα, ἡμῖν φραξάμενη θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μελαναν, ἀλλὰ δόλων τὸν ἄλλον εἰς φρεσὶ μεμηρίζεστα, στηρσάμενη μέγαν ἵστον εἰς μεγαροτινά ῥαθεὶς, λεπτὸν καὶ περίμετρον ἀφαρ δ' ἡμῖν μετέειστε· ὡς χορ蕊, ἐμοὶ μνητῆρες, ἐπεις θάνε δίοι Ὑδονήματα, μίμητ' ἐπειγόμενοι τὸν ἐμὸν γάμον, εἰς δ' κε φαρὸς ἐκτελέσω, μὴ μοι μεταμόλυνα νὴματι δηται, Δαέρη τῃς ταφήνων, εἰς δ' κεν μιν μοὶς ὀλοθρὼν καθέλησι ταπηλεγέος θανάτοιο, μὴ τίς μοι κατὰ δήμουν Ἀχαίιδων νεμεσήσῃ, αὰ κεν ἄτερ σπέιρον κεῖται πολλὰ κτετίητοις· δ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν δ' αὐτ' ἐπείπεθε θυμός ἀγήνωρ. ἕνθα καὶ ἡματία μὲν ύφαινεσθεν μέγαν ἱστον, νῦκτας δ' ἀλλύσεκεν, ἐπεὶ δαίδας παραθεῖτο. δ' τρεῖτος μὲν ὠλὴ δόλῳ καὶ ἐπείθεν Ἀχαιών· ἀλλ' ὀτε τέταταν ἠλθεὶν ἔτος καὶ ἠπήλυθον δραί, [μηνῶν φθινότων, περὶ δ' ἡματα πόλλ' ἐτελέσῃ,] καὶ τότε δὴ τίς ἐξειπε γυναικῶν, ἡ σάφα ἑδή, —

118 ᾧρ οὐδ' ὂλοθρՍ in a whole month': i. e. it took just a good month.
121. This line is doubtless spurious. The address contained in the word διοισθέσθη is sufficient.
128-156, = 2. 93-110. The passage is also put into the mouth of Penelope in 19. 139-156.
128. ἄλλως has no clear meaning here, as no ἄλλος has been spoken of. In 2. 93 it refers to the preceding sentence, viz. 2. 91-92 ὑπέδεικνυα δήμῳ διάδοχος ἐγγελικος προεῖσιον, so that it means 'other than false promises.' Hence the present passage is shown to have been borrowed from the other: which again is probably an interpolation from the 19th book: see Sittl, p. 86.
καὶ τὴν γ' ἀλλόουςαν ἐφεύρομεν ἀγλαδὸν ἱστῶν.

ἀς τὸ μὲν ἐξετέλεσε καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλουσ' ὅπ' ἀνάγκης.

ἐκὼ ἦ φάρος ἐθείξετο, ὑφήνασα μέγαν ἱστῶν,

πλύνας', ἤλιῳ ἐναλύκιον ἐς σελήνην,'

καὶ τότε δὴ ἢ Ὄδυσσηα κακὸς ποθὲν ἴγαγε δαίμων ἀγροῦ ἐπ' ἐσχατής, ὃθι δόματα ναιε συβότης.

ἐκὼ ἦδεν φίλος υἱὸς Ὁδυσσῆος θεῖοι,

ἐκ Πύλου ἡμαθητὸς ὅπ' σὺν νηὶ μελανη.

τὸ δὲ μνητήριον βάσανον κακὸς ἁρτόναντε

Ικνοτο προτὶ ἀτυ περικλωτόν, ἦ τοι Ὅδυσσει

δότερος, αὐτάρ Τηλέμαχος πρὸςθ' ἤγεμόνευς.

τὸν δὲ συβότης ἑγε κακὰ χροτ εἰματ' ἐχοντα,

πτωχοὶ λευγάλεφ ἐναλύκιον ἑδὲ γέροντι

σκηπτόμενον τὸ δὲ λυγάρι περὶ χροτ εἰματα ἐστο

οδός τις ἡμέλων δῦνατο γνώναι τὸν ἐντα

ἐξαπίνεσ φραγάνερ', οὐδ' οἱ προγενέστεροι ἠσαν,

ἀλλ' ἐπεσαν τῇ κακοίνῃ ἐνίσσομεν ἑδὲ βολήνιν.

αὐτὰρ δὴ τέος μὲν ἑκόλμα ἑνὶ μεγάροις ἑοὶ

βαλλόμενοι καὶ ἐνισσόμενοι τετηροί θυμῷ.

ἀλλ' δὲ τῇ μὴμ ἐγειρε Δίος νόδος αἰγίδχοιο,

οὸν μὲν Τῆλεμάχος περικαλλέα τεβχε' ἀείρας.

147 ἐκὼ vulg.: ἐκὼ Ρ.

147-149. The incident referred to in these lines is one for which it is hard to find a place in the preceding story. Penelope, we are told, showed the finished φάρος to the Suitors, and we gather from the context that she at the same time confessed that she could no longer delay her marriage with one of them. Thereupon Ulysses came, and she was saved. This is not exactly the course of events in the Odyssey as we have it. Was there then a version in which the incident here referred to had a place—perhaps as the opening scene? The conjecture is as plausible as many that have been put forward. But the sounder conclusion surely is that discrepancies of this kind between the 24th book and the rest of the Odyssey do not call for special explanation.

150 ff. Aristarchus objected here that Amphinomedon could not know about the meeting of Ulysses and Telemachus in the house of Eumaeus. The difficulty is hardly one that the ordinary hearer of the Odyssey would feel. The real objection to the passage is that it repeats what the hearer knows already.

155. ἡγεμόνεις should mean 'led the way,' not merely 'went first (in time),' as it must do here.

158. περὶ χροτ εἰματα ἱστο is a repetition, in un-Homeric style, of the latter half of l. 156. λυγάρι is awkward after λευγαλαῖν in l. 157.

161. βολήν, sc. ἐβάλλομεν, to be supplied from ἐνισσόμενοι by zeugma: cp. L. 163 βαλλόμενος καὶ ἐσασσόμενος.

165-166. Regarding this incident see the notes on 19. 1-50.
ἐσ θάλαμον κατέθηκε καὶ ἐκλήθησεν δύχας,
αὐτὰρ ὃ ἦν ἄλοχον πολυκερδήσων ἀνώγε
τόξον μυστήρησεν θέμεν πολιόν τε σιδηρον,
ἡμῖν αὐνομόροις ἀεθία καὶ φόνον ἄρχην.
οὐδὲ τις ἡμεῖς δόνατο κρατεροῖς βιοίο
νευρὴν ἐντανύσαι, πολλὰς δ’ ἐπιδειεῖτε ἦμεν.
ἄλλ’ ὁτε χεῖρας ἵκανεν Ἄδυνσέης μέγα τόξον,
ἐνθ’ ἡμεῖς μὲν πάντες ὁμοκλέομεν ἐπέσει
tόξον μὴ δόμεναι, μηδ’ εἰ μᾶλα πόλλα ἄγορευοι.
Τηλέμαχος δὲ μιν οἷον ἔποτρύνων ἐκέλευσεν.
αὐτὰρ ὁ δεξατο χειρὶ πολύτλας δίος Ὄδυσσέως,
ῥηθήσοσ δ’ ἐπάνυσον βιῶν, διὰ δ’ ἦκε σιδήρον,
στὴ δ’ ἀρ’ ἐπ’ οὐδόν ἰών, ταχέας δ’ ἐκχεινιάτ’ ὅιστοις
δεινὸν παπταῖνον, βάλε δ’ Ἄλτυνον βασιλῆα.
αὐτὰρ ἔρειν’ ἀλλ’ ἐφει βέλεα στονέβατα,
ἄντα τιτυσκόμενον’ τοι δ’ ἀγχοτινοι ἐπιτοῦν.
γνωτῶν δ’ ἦν δ’ ἐνὶ τὰς σφι θεῶν ἐπιτάρροθος ἦν,
αὐτικα γάρ κατ’ δώματ’ ἐπιστάμονοι μενεὶ σφι
κτείνον ἐπιστροφάδουν, τῶν δ’ ἐκ νότοις ὄρνου ἄεικ’
κράτων τυπομένων, δάπεδου δ’ ἀπαν αἴματι θεῶν.
δε ἡμεῖς, Ἀγάμεμνον, ἀπωλόμεθ’, δῶν ἑτ’ καὶ νῦν
σῶματ’ ἀκηδέα κεῖται ἐνι μεγάροις Ὅδυνσέως,
οῦ γάρ πω ἱσαι φίλοι κατ’ δώμαθ’ ἐκάστοι,
ο’ κ’ ἀπονιγάντες μέλανα βρότων ἐξ ἀτελέων
κατθέμενοι γοαίοιν’ ὁ γάρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων.”

Τὸν δ’ αὐτὲ ψυχὴ προσεσφώνεν Ἀτρέιδαο̣.

180 ἐφει] ἐφει Φ Μ J.
181 δτ’ βα σφι P, perhaps rightly, since τις is not
182 δτ’ βα σφι P, perhaps rightly, since τις is not
183 σφι] σφων Φ Υ αλ

166. ἀκλήτης would naturally mean ‘shut the door of the θάλαμος.’
But it may be due to imperfect recollection of 10.30 ἀκλήτης δὲ δύνας
μεγάροις, —words which refer to the closing of the door on the women
servants.
167-169. This is a slightly inaccurate or at least incomplete version. Penelope
first proposed the τόξων θέσιν (19. 572),
and Ulysses urged her to carry it out.
The discrepancy has been much insisted upon by modern scholars, as pointing
to the existence of a different form of the story: but surely it is not one upon
which any conclusion can be founded.
Cp. the note on 147-149.
181-184, = 21. 308-309.
190. κατθέμενοι ‘placing on biers,’
‘laying out.’
“οὔτε δέ Αδέρτας πᾶι, πολυμήχαν’ Ὄνυστεθ, ἡ ἄρα σὺν μεγάλῃ ἀρετῇ ἐκτῆσθαι ἀκούσαι ἄγαθαι φρένες ἕσαν ἀμύουν Πηνελόπει, κούρη ‘Ικαρίων, ὅσ εὐ μέμνη’ Ὅνυστεθ, ἀνδρὸς κουριδίου. τῷ οἷς κλεός σὺ πατ’ ὀλεῖται ἕς ἀρετῆς, τεῦξονι δ’ ἐπιχομοίωσιν ἄοιδὴν ἀδὰνατον χαρίσθησαν ἐχέφρων Πηνελόπει, ὅς ὃς Τυνδάρεων κούρη κακὴ μῆσατο ἔργα, κουριδίων κτείνασα πόσιν, στυγερῇ δὲ τ’ ἄοιδῇ ἔσεστ’ εἰς ἀνδρῶπους, χαλεπῆν δὲ τε φήμιν ὑπάσσει θηλυτέρῃς γυναιξί, καὶ ἦ εὐεργῆς ἔροις.”

“Ὡς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἄγρευον, ἐστατὶ εἰς Ἅδωα δόμοις, ὑπὸ κεῦθεις γάλης: οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐκ πόλιος κατέβαν, τάχα δ’ ἀγρὸν ἱκοντο καλῶν Δαέρτα τετυγμένον, δὴ τὰ ποτ’ αὐτὸς Δαέρτης κτείσασεν, ἐπεὶ μάλα πόλλ’ ἐμόγγησεν. ἐνθα οἱ όικος ἔην, περὶ δὲ κλίσιον θέε πάντη, ἐν τῷ σιτέκοντο καὶ Ἰανοῦ ἤδε Ιανοῦ δμῶς ἀναγκαῖοι, τοι οἱ φίλα ἐργάζοντο.

194 ἀμύουν] ἐχέφρων F U.

193. σὺν μεγάλῃ ἀρετῇ ‘with a dower of noble gifts.’ The ἀρετῆ of Penelope includes all her qualities of character and person: cp. l. 197, also such phrases as 2. 206 ἐνέκει τῆς ἀρετῆς ἱματίζομεν. Here the especial meaning of the word appears in the next clause ὅπως ἄγαθαι φρένες εταλ. (ὡς being ὡς οὕτως). Note that σὺν is especially used of an accompaniment or attendant circumstance: σὺν ἔτσι, σὺν τετώμοι καὶ ὑθεισοι, σὺν ὑθεισοι (Π. 6. 270), ἐδέφων σὺν λάβασεν (Οδ. 12. 408), &c.

198. Πηνελόπει, with τεῦξονι, ‘will make for, in honour of, Penelope.’ Both proposed to read ἐχέφρων Πη- νελόπεια, so that δαιθὴ would be = ‘matter of song,’ as δαιθή in l. 200, and in 8. 580 ἀκα τι καὶ ἐκομίσκοναι δαιθῆ. But the succession of accusatives—χαρίσαν ἐχέφρων Πηνελόπεια—would be very harsh.

χαρίσαν ‘pleasing,’ the opposite of στυγερῇ δαιθῇ (l. 200). The place of the word in the sentence is not quite Homeric. If an epithet is added in the following line it regularly begins the line.

205. οἱ δὲ, viz. Ulysses, &c. The story is continued from 23. 370.

207. μάλα πόλλ’ ἐμόγγησεν ‘had toiled much,’ viz. in making the farm,—bringing the land into cultivation, building, &c. So in l. 388 Dolius and his sons return ἐκ ἐργῶν μαγέουσες. The land, having thus been won from the waste (the γῆ διαλέποι τε καὶ δειτῶς of H. Ven. 123), was a τέμνος or separate possession of Laertes: hence κτέτισεν (see a paper by Mr. Ridgeway, J. H. S. vi. 310 ff.).

208. οἴκος, the chief room, answering to the μέγαρον of a palace: while the ἅλατον, ‘a shed’ or ‘cottage,’ took the place of the series of θάλαμοι,
ἐν δὲ γυνὴ Σικελία γρηγορότερον καὶ ἡ σφικτερότερον ἔγερθος, μάλιστα ἀγροῦ, κῦσφι πολῆςος. ἐνθ’ ὁ Ὀδυσσέας ἐμέσος καὶ νεκρὸς μὲν ἐλθεῖν τὴν οἰκίαν ὁμηροῦν ὑπὸν ἔσω, δεῖτον δ’ ἀνάγονα υἱοῦ λειτουργεῖται τὰς ἀρσενικὰς ἀρτικάς ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ.

215 ὁ δὲ ἐπέτειος δύναμις θρόνοι πατρὸς, ἀνάγεται τὸν Ὀδυσσέας ἀσσον οὐκ ἐνορκίστε τόπος ἀράδος πειρήματος.

220 οὔτε ἐδρέων Δολίων, μέγαν δραχοῦν ἐκπαιδευτέρων, οὔτε τινα ὁμοιῶν οὔτε υἱῶν ἄλλα ἄρα τοῦ γε 

αἰμασίας λειτουργεῖς ἀράδος ἐμενείτο ἐρκος 

φράσοι, καὶ τοῖς γέροις ὁδῷ ἕγετονεν. 

225 τὸν 8’ οὐκ ἐδρέων ἐκτείνοντ' ἐν τῆς ἀράδος, λιστρεύοντα φυλάκων ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ 

βαπτῶν αἰκίληος, περὶ δὲ κυρίειαν ὁδείας 

κυρίδος δαπάνας δέδετο, γραπτοῦ ἀλλείπον, 

χειρίδας τ’ ἐπὶ χερσὶ πάτους ἐνεκ’. καὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσέας ἡγέτας 

ἀνέφερεν ἑξωσμίαν κυρίαν ἑχει, πένθος ἀξίαν. 

230 τὸν δ’ ὅτι οὖν ἐνόπλας πολύτιμος δίδοοι Ὀδυσσέας 

γῆρας τείματος, μέγις δὲ φρέσιν πένθος ἐχοντα, 

στόι ἀπ’ ὑπὸ βλασφημίαν δρακόντων κατὰ δάκρυων εἶπε. 


220 225 227 μετείχαν Φ. 221 ἐνεπειράτα Ψ. 

211. Σικελία. We have already heard of the Σικελίοι as buyers of slaves (20. 383). 

215. δεῖτον, predicative, ‘for our dinner.’ 

219. τεύχει ἐδοκιμάσι ‘gave the arms,’ which he had put on (23. 366). The servants were to take them into the house. 

221. περιήθριον ‘in his inquiries,’ cp. l. 216 στράτευσε περιήθριον. 

224. αἰμασίας αἰκιάτως, see on 18. 359. 

225. γέρων, sc. Dolius. 

227. λιστρεύοντα ‘digging about,’ from λίστρην (22. 455); cp. also l. 242 ἀνεφεσας. 

229. κυρίδος ‘greaves’ or ‘gauntlets.’ The greaves worn as armour were not materially different, and served chiefly to protect the shins against the edge of the great shield. 

230. χειρίδος, from χειρ, apparently on the analogy of κυρίδος. 

231. πενθος ἀξίωμα ‘cherishing his sorrow’; said to explain the rudeness of his attire.
24. OΔΣΣΕΙΛΑΣ Ω

μερμήρηζε δ' ἔπειτα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν
cóσσαι καὶ περιφύναι ἐδώ πατέρ', ὡδὲ ἔκαστα
ἐπείν, ὡς ξεῖθοι καὶ ικοτ' ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν,
ἡ πρώτ' ἐξερεύνη ἐκαστά τε πειρήσατο.

２３５—２４０. This passage is evidently
modelled on 10. 151-154. Note (1)
the conventional lines 235 = 10. 151
and 239 = 10. 153, (2) the constr. of
μερμήρηζε with the inf. in place of the
usual δῆ—ἡ and an opt., and (3) πρώτον
in 1. 240 answering to πρώτα in 10.
154. There is the difference that in
this place a second alternative is in-
serted, introduced by ἡ and the opt.,
thus giving the extremely harsh form
μερμήρηζε... κόσσαι καὶ περιφύναι...
ἡ ἐξερεύνη for 'debated whether he
should kiss and embrace, or should
ask.'

２３７. ἦν ξένοι κτλ. The opt. in
στατίσιον ὀλίγα is a post-Homeric con-
struction.

２４０. ἐπιόσαυν. This is the only
instance in the Odyssey of τοῦ ἐπ. forming
position in the fourth thesis of the
hexameter. It is also the only real
exception to the rule that a short vowel
cannot be lengthened by position in
that part of the line. See the discus-
sion in the Class. Rev. xi. 28, 29, 151-
154.

２４１. αὐτοῦ. The use of the oblique
cases of αὐτὸς where no emphasis is
intended seems to be post-Homeric:
ep. l. 80 and l. 282.

２４５. ἐν ἔξει. The only instance in
Homer of this phrase, afterwards so
common.

２４７. The synizesis is hardly to be
paralleled in Homer.

２４８. An adaptation—almost a parody
—of the conventional ἄλλο δὲ τοι ἐρω
σὺν ὃ ἐν ἐκεί βόλλες σῆμα.

２５２. Σοῦλακα, evidently an adjective,
used as a predicate with ἐστιν—
'shows like a slave.' Thus the whole
sentence means that the form and
stature of Laertes did not strike the
beholder as at all answering to his
slave-like dress and employment.
εὐθέμεναι μαλακῶς· ἢ γὰρ δίκη ἐστὶ γερόντων. 255
αλλ᾽ ἀγε μοι τὸδε εἰπεῖ καὶ ἀρτεκέως κατάλεξον,
tεῦ δμῶς εἰς ἄνδρῶν; τεῦ δ᾽ ὥρχατον ἀμφιπόλευσι;
καὶ μοι τοῦτ᾽ ἁγγείους ἐπίκους, ὅρη ἐν εἰδῶ,
eἰ ἔτεν γ᾽ Ἰδάκην τὴν ἲκμεθ᾽, ὃς μοι ἐξηπεν
οὔτος ἀνήρ νῦν ἢ ἀμβλήμενος ἐνθάδ᾽ ἰδώνι,
o ὅ μαλ᾽ ἀρτίφρον, ἐπεὶ οὐ τὸμησεῖν ἐκαστα
ἐπεῖν ἢ δ᾽ ἐπακούσαι ἐμὸν ἐπος, ὅσ ἐρρεῖνον
ἀμφὶ ἥξιντο ἐμῷ, ἢ ποὺ ἥξει τε καὶ ἑστὶν,
ἢ ἡδη τὴνηκε καὶ εἰν Ἀἴδαο δὴμοισιν. 260
ἐκ γὰρ τοι ἔριζ, σοὶ δὲ σύνθεο καὶ μεν ἄκουσον
ἄνδρα ποτ᾽ ἐξελίσσοσα φίλη ἐν πατρίδι γαῖ
ἡμέτερῳ ἀνίθοντα, καὶ οὐ πό τις βροτός ἄλλος
ξείνων τηλεπαῖν φίλων ἐμὸν ἱκτο δώμα
εὐχετο δ᾽ ἐς Ἰδάκην γένος ἐμμεκαί, αὐτὰρ ἐφασκε
Δαέρτην Ἀρκειοιδὴν πατέρ ἐμμεκαί αὐτῷ. 265
τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ πρὸς δῶματ᾽ ἄγων ἐν ἐξελίσσοσα,
ἐνδύκεως φίλων, πολλῶν κατὰ οἴκον ἑωτον,
καὶ οἱ δῶρα πόρον βεσείεα, ολα ἐφκει.
χρυσοῦ μὲν οἱ δῶκ᾽ ἐνεργός ἐπτά τάλαντα,
δῶκα δὲ οἱ κρητηρία πανάργυρον ἀνθεμβέντα, 270
δῶδεκά δ᾽ ἀπλοίδας χλαίνας, τόσους δὲ τάπητας,
τόσα δὲ φάρεα καλά, τόσους δ᾽ ἐπὶ τοιῇ χίτονας,
χωρὶς δ᾽ αὐτὲ γνωνίας ἀμύνονα ἐργα ἱδας
τέσσαρας εἰδαλίμα, ὃσ ἠθέλεν αὐτὸς ἐλέοσθαί.”
Τὸν δ᾽ ἥμειβε σειτα πατήρ κατὰ δάκρυον ἐβεβοῦν.
“ἐξεῖν, ἢ τοι μὲν γαῖαν ἴκανες ἢν ἐρεῖενες,
263 ἢ πολύ τοῦ MSS. 266 ἢ F D U: ἢν F M al. 270 ἀμύνονας
F D U al.

255. εὐθέμεναι, inf. after τωούνη 
one qualified to &c.

ἡ may be either the article or the 
relative pronoun (ἡ); cp. L. 190 ἡ γὰρ
γέρα ἄτι διατόνων.

διαρχεὶ combines the notions of custom 
and right—notions not distinguished in 
primitive law and morals.

260. οὔτος is deictic: it denotes an 
imaginary man of whom he affects to 
have made inquiry.

261. τὸ καραμένω, ‘took heart of grace’: 
cp. L. 1. 5. 434 τοκετάρας εὑρίσκειν ἄνως.

268. See the note on 19. 351.
24. ὍΤΣΕΙΔΩ Ω

οἱ δρισταὶ ἰ ἀυτὴν καὶ ἀτασθαλοὶ ἄνδρες ἔχουσιν. ἀφάνε ἰ ἔτωσια ταῦτα χαρῆς, μυρὶ ὀπάζωνεν γάρ μοι τινὶ ἐκέχεις Ἰθάκης ἐνὶ δήμῳ, τῶ κέν ἐν δόροισιν ἀμεινήσανον ἀπέπεμψε καὶ ἐγὼ ἀγαθῇ ἰ γὰρ θέμι, ὅς τῶ ὑπάρξῃ. ἀλλὰ ἄγε μοι τὸ δὴ εἰπὲ καὶ ἀτρέκειοι καταλέξουν, πώσον δὴ ἔτος ἐστίν, ὅτε ξείνισας ἐκείνον σων ξείνων θύσινον, ἔμων παιδί, ἐπὶ ποι ἐν γε, δύσμορον; ἐν ποι τῇ ἐκλογήν καὶ παρθῶν αἷσσ

285 ἧ ποῖν ἐν πόλιν φάγουν ἔχουσε, ἢ ἐπὶ χέρσουν θηροὶ καὶ οἰκονόμων ἐλούρ γένετ' ὑπὲρ ὑπὲρ κλασεν περιστερῆσα πατήρ θ', ὦ μὲν τεκόμεσσα, ὦ δὲ ἀλοχος πολύφωρος, ἐκέφρων Πηνελοπεία, κάκωτ' ἐν λεχέσσων ἐδώ πάσιν, ὡς ἐπεφείρει, 290 ὀφθαλμοὺς καθελοῦσα τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανάτων. καὶ τοῦτ' ἄγρευσον ἑτήτουν, δὺρ' ἐν εἰδὼ

tὸ πόλεος εἰς ἄνδρῶν; πῶθι τοι πῶλος ἠδὲ τοκῆς; τοῦ δαὶ υἱὸν ἐστήκη ἰ θοὺς, ὅ ὁ ἢγαγε διὸ

295 ἀντίθεους ὦ ἐτάρους; ὢ ἐμπορὸς εἰλήπτουσα νῦν ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ, ὦ δ' ἐκβήσαντες ἐβησαν;

Τὸν ὃ ἀπαμειβάμενος προσέφη πολύμετρος Ὀδυσσεύς;

"τοιγαρ ἐγώ τοι πάντα μᾶλ τρέκειοι καταλέξω. εἰμὶ μὲν ἐξ Ἀλόβαντος, δυὶ κλυτά δῶματα ναῶ, ὕπος Ἀφείδαντος Πολυπημονίδαιο ἀνακτος;

300 ἔραν' ἐν γῆ γε, ἐν σφάλματοι ἐσείερο τοι πάντα μᾶλτ' ἀτρέκειοι καταλέξω. εἰμὶ μὲν ἐξ Ἀλόβαντος, δοὶ κλυτά δῶματα ναῶ, ὕπος Ἀφείδαντος Πολυπημονίδαιο ἀνακτος;

305

284 τῇ, see on 1. 241.
286. ἐκέχει used as a substantive is only found in this book, here and in 1. 314. For the quantity of the first syllable see on 1. 359 (crit. note).

287 κατάλεξων] ἀγρευσον H. al. 289 ἐδώ]

288. ἀδραχα is rare in Homer, but common in this book (cp. 312, 437).

289. ἐλ ποτ' ἐν γη, see on 15. 268.
293. περιστεράς 'dressing up' (in the funeral robes).


295. ἔραν' ἐν γῆ γε, see on 15. 268.

300. On this particle see the critical note on 1. 255.

304—305. Of these fictitious names Πολυπημονίδαιος may refer to Laertes and Ulysses as 'much-suffering' heroes. Or it may be suggested by their ancestral riches (from πολυμαχός, with hyper-

305 Iconic ἔ for ἔ): cp. 'Ἀφείδας = 'un-

sparingly.' Ἐπικράτος, from ἐπι, is perhaps an allusion to the meaning of the name Ὀδυσσεύς (see 19. 407 ff.).
αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ γ' δνομ' ἔστιν Ἐπτήριτος' ἀλλὰ μὲ δαίμων πλάγιος' ἀπὸ Σικανίας δεῦρ' ἔλθεμεν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα·


ηῶς δὲ μοι ἢ' ἔστηκεν ἐκ' ἀγροῦ νόσῳ πῦλος.


αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσῆι τοῦδε δὴ πέμπτον ἄτος ἔστιν,


ἐξ ὦ κείθεν ἔβη καὶ ἔμης ἄπελάυθυε πάτρης,


δόσμορος· ἢ τε οἱ ἐσθολοὶ ἔσαν ὅρμας ἱντι,


dεξιῶ, οἱ χαῖρων μὲν ἔγιν ἀπέπεμπτον ἐκεῖνον,


χαῖρε δὲ κεῖνοι ἱῶν· θυμὸς δ' ἔτι νῦν ἐκάλετε


μῆδεσθαι ἕως ἢ' ἀγλαὶ ὁδὸν ἑδόμεναν·


"Ὡς φάτο, τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα·


ἀμφότεροι δὲ χερῶν ἐλῶν κώνιν αἰθαλδεσάν


χεῦτο κὰκ κεφαλῆς πολίης, ἀδινὰ στεναχίσων.


tὸ δ' ὀρίνετο θυμὸς, ἀνα βίνας δὲ οἱ ἤδη


δριμὸ μένος προστύπηε φίλοι πατέρ' εἰσοροήτηε·


κύστε δὲ μιν περίοθα ἐπιαλμένοι ἢδ' προσηύδα·


"κεῖνος μὲν τοι δ' αὐτὸς ἐγώ, πάτερ, δν σφ μετάλλας·


ἄλθων ἕκκοστῷ ἔτει ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν·


ἀλλ' ἵσχεο κλαυθμόιο γόσοι τε δακρυβεντος.


eκ γὰρ τοι ἑρέω μάλα δὲ χρὴ σπευδέμεν ἐμπῆς·


μνητήρας κοστόπεφον ἐν ἡμετέροις· ὅμοιοι,


λάβην τινῶμενος θυμαλγεά καὶ κακὰ ἔργα."


Τὸν δ' αὖ Δαέρητος ἀπαμείβετο φωνησέν τε·


"εἴ μὲν δὴ Ὀδυσσάοις γε ἐμός πᾶς ἐνδαὶ' ἱκάνεις,


σήμα τί μοι νῦν εἰπὲ χρυσαδές, ὦ φρα πεπολθών."


Τὸν δ' ἀπαμείβεμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσάοις·


"οὐλὴν μὲν πρῶτον τόνδε φράσας ὀφθαλμοὶ,


τὴν ἐν Παρυσοφι' μ' ἠλασεν σφ λυκῇ ὀδυότι


οἰχόμενον, οὐ δὲ με προῖες καὶ πόλνια μὴνπρ


322 ἄλθων ἕκκοστῷ U: ἄλθων ἕκκοστῷ vulg., see on 16. 266.


307. Σικανία is nowhere else mentioned in Homer.

314. μῆλον κτλ. 'that we would meet again as host and guest, and give (each other) splendid gifts.' According to ancient manners the host in each case would be the giver.

319. μένει 'passion,' in this case strong affection and pity.

335. μένος 'dashed forward,' cp. the similar metaphor, 11. 291 προδέομουν ἄλθεια μαθήσονται.

335. μ' is misplaced: so μοι in l. 335, so in l. 337, so in l. 247.
ες πατέρι Αὐτόλυκον μητρὸς φίλον, ὃφ' ἀνελοίμην δόρα, τά δεύτερο μολὼν μοι ὑπέσχετο καὶ κατένευσεν. 335
εἰ δ' ἄγε τοι καὶ δενδρεί ἐκτειμένην καὶ ἀλῳν εἴπο, ἀ μοι ποτ' ἄδωκας, ἐγώ δ' ἔτειν σε ἐκαστα παῖδος ἐὼν, κατὰ κῆπον ἐπισώμενον· διὰ δ' αὐτῶν ἴκνευμεθα, σω δ' ὀμφασας καὶ ἔστης ἐκαστα.
δρακνα μοι δάκα τρισκαίδεκα καὶ δέκα μηλέας, συκέας τεσσαράκοιν· ὁρχοὺς δὲ μοι ἀδ' ὀμφάμας δώσειν πεντήκοντα, διατρύγιος δὲ ἐκαστος ἦν· ἔνθα δ' ἀνα σταφυλὶ παντοίας ἑαυτιν, ὅπως δέ Δίδω δραί ἐπιβρίσειαν ὑπερθην—

"Ὡς φάτο, τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ, σήματ' ἀναγνώστος τά οἴ ἐμπέδα πέφραδ' Ὄδυσσεύς· 346
ἀμφὶ δὲ παιδί φιλῷ βάλε πήχει· τόν δὲ ποτὶ οἱ ἐλεον ἀποψάχοντα πολύτλας διὸς Ὅδυσσεύς.
αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ β' ἐμπνευστὶ καὶ οὗρα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη, ἐξατίς μύθωσιν ἀμεβήμενος προσέπετε·
"Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἢ β' ἐπ' ἐστε θεοὶ κατὰ μακρὸν "Ὅλυμπον,
εἰ ἐστεν μνηστηρὲς ἀτάσθαλον θῆμιν ἐτίσαν.
νῦν δ' αἰῶνως δείδοικα κατὰ φρένα μὴ τάχα πάντες ἐνθὰ' ἐπέλθωσιν Ἰδακῆςι τοῖς δὲ πάντῃ ἐπιτρύμωσει Κεφαλῆνας πολλοῖς.
355
Τὸν δ' ἀπαμεβήμενος προσέφη πολύμνης Ὅδυσσεύς·
"θάρσει, μὴ τοι ταῦτα μετὰ φρέσι οὐδὲ μελόντων.
ἀλλ' ἱππον προτὶ δόκου, δὲ δρσατὸν ἐγγύθι κεῖται.

334 δορ' ἀνελοίμην P al.; δορ' ἀν ἰλόμην vulg.
334 ἄμφτο τοῦ vulg. See Sch. A on Il. 22. 475. 335 δοθ' Ὅδυσσεύς: δοθ' Ὅδυσσεύς Am. (5. 458).
334 δορ' ἀνελοίμην P al.; δορ' ἀν ἰλόμην vulg.
334 358 δοθ' F U: δοθ' F H M al.
334. ἄνελοίμην. The verb is used of carrying off anything as a prize: 21. 117 ἄλοχα καὶ ἄνελεσθοι, Il. 23. 823.
341. δἐς 'just,' 'as I tell you,' see on 17. 447, 544.
341. άδωκας 'did promise.'
343. ηγ'ν, see the note on 23. 316.
344. ἐπιβρίσειαν. The opt. cannot be explained, unless we can look upon it as connecting the clause with the past tenses of the narrative, δῶκας, ὀμφάμας, &c.
If so, the words ἐνθά... ἑαυτὶ are parenthetical. On this view, however, the arrangement of the clauses is very unsatisfactory.
348. ἔλευ. Hartmann's conjecture ἔλευ (or ἔλευ) is not improbable:
24. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ω

ἐνθα δὲ Τηλέμαχον καὶ βουκόλων ἢ δὲ συβάτην
προσπεμψ', ὡς ἄν δείπνων ἐφοπλισσος τάχιστα." 360

"Ὡς ἄρα φωνήσαντε βάτην πρὸς δόματα καλά.
οἱ δ' άτε δὴ β' ἱκοντο δόμους εὖ ναιείτοντας,
εὐρον Τηλέμαχον καὶ βουκόλων ἢ δὲ συβάτην
ταμνομένους κράε πολλὰ κερώντας τ' αἴθοσα ὄνον.

Τόφρα δὲ Λαέρτην μεγαλήτορα φ' ἐνί ὀίκρον
ἀμφίπολος Σικελὴ λούθεν καὶ χρίσεν ἔλαιον,
ἀμφ' ἄρα χλαῖναν καλὴν βάλειν αὐτάρ Ἀθήνη
ἀγχι παριστάμενη μέλε' ἠλθανε ποιμένι λαῶν,
μείζονα δ' ἦ πάρος καὶ πάσσονα θήκεν ἰδέσθαι.
ἐκ δ' ἀσαμίθου βηθ' θαύμαζε δε μιν φῖλος νός,
ὡς ἰδεν ἀθανάτοις θεοῖς ἐναληγκιόν ἄντεν
καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἐπεα πτερίνετα προσηύδα:
"ἄ πάτερ, ἡ μάλα τῆς σε θεῶν αἰειγενετῶν
εἶδος τε μέγεθός τε ἁμείνονα θήκεν ἰδέσθαι." 370

Τὸν δ' αὐτ Ἀδερτήν πεπνυμένος ἀντίων ηδά:
"αἰ γάρ, Ζεὺς τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηνάη καὶ Ἀπόλλων,
οἷς Νῆρικον εἶλον, εὐκτίμενον πτολεβρον,
ἀκτην ἤπειροι, Κεφαλλήνους ἄνασσαν,
τοῖς εἀν τοι χθισός ἐν ἡμετέροισι δόμοιοι,
τεῦχε' ἕχων ὁμοίους, ἐφεστάμεναι καὶ ἄμυνες
ἄνδρας μνηστήρας· τῷ κε σφέων γούναν ἐλυσα
πολλῶν ἐν μεγάροις, σο δ' φρένας ἔνδον ἐγήθεις." 380

"Ὡς οἱ μὲν τοιάτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρινον.
οἱ δ' έπει οὖν παύσαντο πῦνον τετύκοντο τε δαίτα,
ἐξείης ἐξοντο κατὰ κλίμοντες θρόνους τε." 385

370 ἐν δ'] ἐν β' vulg. 382 ἐγήθεις] ἔδωκεν East.

360. προσπεμψα, the only Homeric instance of a compound of πρό in which
we cannot write the uncontracted form
προε.-
368. This transfiguration of Laertes is
an awkward imitation of the similar
changes wrought on Ulysses in the
course of the story: cp. 18. 70.
378. Κεφαλλήνους, cp. 1. 355. So
in the Catalogue (II. 2. 631) Ulysses is
the leader of the Κεφαλλήνες.
380. ἐφεστάμεναι καὶ ἄμυνες. The
infinitive of with is found here and in
7. 311. It is allied to the use of the
inf. as an imperative.
ένθ' οἱ μὲν δείπνω ἐπεξέλθον ἄγχίμολον δὲ ἤλθ' ὁ γέρων Δολλίος, σὺν δ' οὐεὶς τοῖο γέροντος, εἴ τε ἐργον μογέντως, ἐπεὶ προμολοῦσα κάλεσε μήτηρ, γρηγὸς Σικελῆ, ἡ σφας τρέφε καὶ βα γέροντα ἐνυδέκεως κομεέσκεν, ἐπεὶ κατὰ γῆρας ἔμαρφεν. 390
οὐ δ' ὦς οὖν 'Ὀδυσσήα ἰδον φράσαι τὸ τυμῷ, ἐσταν ἐνι μεγάροις τεθηπτείς· αὐτάρ 'Ὀδυσσεὺς μειλιχίως ἐπέεσσα καθαπτίμους προσέειπεν· "ὡ γέρων, ἦς ἐπὶ δείπνων, ἀπεκλελάθησε δὲ θάμβεσι· δηρόν γὰρ στίφος ἐπιχειρήσεις μεμαῦτες 395
μίμουμεν ἐν μεγάροις, ὡμέας ποιτείμους αἰεί." "Ὡς δρ' ἐφη, Δολλίος δ' ἰδος κε χείρε πετάσας ἄμφωτορας, 'Ὀδυσσεὺς δὲ λαβὼν κόστε χείρ' ἐπὶ καρπῷ, καὶ μιν φονήσας ἐπεκα πτερώντα προσηῦδα· "ὡ φιλ', ἐπεὶ νόστησας ἐκδομένους μάλ' ἦμιν 400
οὐδ' ἐτ' διομένους, θεοὶ δὲ σε ἡγαγον αὐτοῖ, οὐδὲ τε καὶ μάλα χαίρε, θεοὶ δὲ τοι ὀλίβα δοῖεν. καὶ μοι τοῦτ' ἀγρέυσον ἐπτήμουν, δφρ' ἐν εἴδω, ἢ ἤθη σάφα οἶδε περὶφρον Πηνελόπεια νοστήσαντά σε δειρ', ἢ ἄγγελον ὄτρυμομεν." 405
Τὸν δ' ἀπαμείβομενος προσέϕη πολύμητις 'Ὀδυσσεύς· "ὡ γέρων, ἤθη οἴδε· τί σε χρή ταῦτα πένεσθαι;"' "Ὡς φάθ', δ' ἄτις ἀρ' ἐξετ' εὐξεῦστον ἐπὶ δίφρον. 402
οὐ δ' ἄτισε ψάδες Δολλίων κλωτὸν ἄμφ' 'Ὀδυσσήα δεικαόνως' ἐπέεσσα καὶ ἐν χείρεσσι φύστο, 410

402 μάλα F U al., cp. μάλα χαίρε in Od. 8.413, Ἡμ. Ὀ. C. 225: μέγα P H M, cp. Ὀ. Ἀρ. 466 οὐλ' τε καὶ μέγα χαίρε. The two forms are evidently both very ancient.

386. ἐνθέλεσαν: 'set hands to,' cp. 1. 395: the word does not occur elsewhere in Homer.
389. γέροντα, apparently: Laertes: cp. l. 211 ἐν δὲ γωνῇ Σικελῆ γρηγὸς πέλεν, ἢ βα γέροντα ἐνυδέκεως κομεέσκεν. The editors generally take the word of Dolinus, as in l. 387. But the poet seems to be repeating here his description of the γρηγὸς Σικελῆ, given in 211–212.
394. θάμβεσι. This contraction is not Homeric: see Ὀ. C. § 105, 3.
398. Ὀδυσσεύς, for 'Ὀδυσσήα, is certainly not a Homeric form.
χείρ' ἐν καρπῷ is a phrase that is hardly in place here.
402. οὐλ' is probably imper. of a verb οὐλ' of which a trace remains in Strabo, p. 635 τὸ γὰρ οὐλ' ὄγαλεν ὑπαίτυν. 410. φύστο, used in imitation of the Homeric formula ἐν δ' ἀρα οἱ φύ χείρι κτλ.
24. ΟΔΤΣΕΙΔΑΣ Ω

ἐξεῖης δ' ἐξοντο παραὶ Δολίων, πατέρα σφόν.
"Ως οἱ μὲν περὶ δειπνου ἐνι μεγάροιι πένοντο:
"Οσσα δ' ἀρ' ἄγγελος ὅκα κατὰ πτέλιν φυτετο πάντη,
μνηστήρων στυγερῶν θάνατον καὶ κηρ' ἐνεύσουσα.
οἱ δ' ἀρ' ὁμοὶ αἰῶνες ἐφοίτων ἀλλοθεν ἀλλος
μυχαὶ τε στοναχὶ τε δόμων προπάροιθ' Ὥδωσος,
ἐκ δὲ νέκυς οἰκων φόρεων καὶ βάπτων ἔκαστοι,
τοὺς δ' ἐξ ἀλλάδων πολίων οἰκόνθε ἐκαστὸν
πέμπουν ἄγειν ἀλευσὶ θοῆς ἐπὶ νησὺ τιθέντες.
αὐτοὶ δ' εἰς ἄγορην κίον ἄθροι, ἀχνύμενοι κηρ.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ρ' ἰγερθέν δρυγερεῖς τ' ἐγένοτο,
τοῖς δ' Ἔνπειθής ἀνὰ θ' ἑστατο καὶ μετέειπε
παῖδος γάρ οἱ ἐκαστὸν ἐνὶ φρέσι πένθος ἔκειτο,
Ἀντινόου, τὸν πρῶτον ἐνήρατο διὸς Ὥδωσευς.
τοῦ δ' γε δάκρυ χέων ἄγορησατο καὶ μετέειπεν
"δ' φίλοι, ἡ μέγα ἐργον ἀνήρ ὅθε μῆθ' Ἀχαιοὺς
toûs μὲν σὺν νήσεσιν ἄγων πολέας τε καὶ ἐσθλοὺς
ἄλεσε μὲν νήσας γλαφυράς, ἀπὸ δ' ἄλεσε λαοὺς,
toûs δ' ἐλθὼν ἐκείνη τ' Κεφαλήνων ὁχ' ἄριστοιν.
ἀλλ' ἄγετε, πρὶν τούτων ἡ ἐς Πύλων ὅκα ικέσθαι
καὶ ἐς "Ἡλίδα διαν, ὅθε κρατέουσιν Ἐπειολ,
ἀλμεν' ἢ καὶ ἑπεῖτα κατηφέες ἐσομέθ' αἰει-
λοβη γὰρ τάδε γ' ἐστι καὶ ἐσομένουισι πυθέσθαι,
eὶ δὴ μὴ παῖδων τε καστιγνήτων τε φονῆς
τισομεθ'. οὐκ ἄν ἔμοιγε μετὰ φρέσιν ἢδ' γένοιτο
ζωέμεν, ἀλλὰ τάχιστα θανῶν φθειόμενοι μετείπιν.
ἀλλ' ἱμαν, μὴ φθέοις περαιωθέντες ἐκεῖνοι."
Οι φάτο δάκρυ χέων, οκτός δ' ἔλε πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς.
ἀγχισμολον δὲ σφ' ἥλθε Μέδων καὶ θείος δοίδος
ἐκ μεγάρων Ὀδυσσός, ἐπεὶ σφεάς ὑπνὸς ἀνήκεν,
ἐσταν δ' ἐν μέσοις: τάφος δ' ἔλεν ἄνδρα ἐκαστον.
τοις δὲ καὶ μετεείπε Μέδων πεπνυμένα εἰδῶς:
"κέκλυτε δὴ νῦν μεν, Ἰθακήσιοι· οὐ γὰρ Ὀδυσσέας
ἀθανάτων ἀδέκτι θεῶν τάδε μήσατο ἔργα:
αὐτὸς ἔγων ἐλθὼν θεῶν ἀμβροτον, δὲ β' Ὀδυσσός
ἐγγύθεν ἐστήκει καὶ Μέντορι πάντα ἐφεκί.
ἀθανάτος δὲ θεὸς τοτὲ μὲν προπάροιθ' Ὀδυσσός
φαίνετο ταρσύνων, τοτὲ δὲ μυηστήρας ὄρισων
θὰνεν κατὰ μέγαρων τοι δ' ἀγχιστίνοι ἐπιτούονν."
24. ΟΔΤΣΣΕΙΑΣ Ω

πείθοντι· αἶγα δ' ἔπειτ' ἐπὶ τέυχεα ἐσσεύοντο.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεῖ β' ἐσσαντό περὶ χροὶ νάροπα χαλκόν,
ἄρθροι ἠγερέθοντο πρὸ ἄστεοι εὐρυχόριοι.
τοιῶν δ' Ἐναπείθης ἐγήσατο νηπίεςοι·
φη δ' γε τίσεσθαι παιδός φόνον, οὖσ' ἀρ' ἤμελλεν
ἄψ ἀπονοστῆσειν, ἀλλ' αὐτῶι πότμον ἐφέσειν.
αὐτὰρ Ἀθηναιή Ζήνα Κρονίωνα προσῆθα·
"δ' πάτερ ἡμέτερε, Κρονίδη, ὑπατε κρεώντων,
εἰπὲ μοι εἰρομένη, τί νῦ τοι νόος ἐνδοθι κεύθει;
ἡ προτέροι πολεμῶν τε κακῶν καὶ φίλους αἰνῆ
τεῦξεις, ἡ φιλότητα μετ' ἀμφότεροι τίθησα;"

Την δ' ἀπαμειβόμενοι προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς·
"τέκνον ἐμόν, τί με ταῦτα διείρει ἡδὲ μεταλλάξ;
οὐ γάρ δὴ τότων μὲν ἐξισλευσασ νοῦς αὐτῆ,
ὡς τοι κείνους 'Οδυσσέως ἀποτίσεται ἐλθῶν;
ἐρξον δῦνος ἐθέλεις· ἐρέω δὲ τοι ὡς ἐπέοικεν.
ἐπεῖ δὴ μνηστήρας ἑτίσατο δίος 'Οδυσσέως,
ὅρκια πιστὰ ταμὼτε δὲ μὲν βασιλευέτω αἰεὶ,
ἡμεῖς δ' αὖ παιδῶν τε κασιγνήτων τε φόνοιο
ἐκλησιν θέωμεν τοι δ' ἀλλήλους φιλέοντων
ὡς τὸ πάρος, πλοῦτος δὲ καὶ εἰρήνη ἀλίς ἔστω."

"Ὡς εἰπὼν ὄτρυνε πάροι μεμαίνειν 'Αθηνήν,
βή δὲ κατ' Οὐλώμπιοι καρήνων ἀίξασα.

Οι δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν στίοι μελίφρονες ἐξ ἐρον ἐντο,
τοῖς ἀρὰ μύθων ἥρα τούτως δίοις 'Οδυσσεύς;
"ἐξελαθὼν τε ἰδοι μὴ δὴ σχέδων ὡσι κιόντες."

469. The poet omits to tell us how
they knew where to find Ulysses and
his friends.

472. The scene here changes to
Olympus, with an abruptness which
would hardly be possible with Homer.

478 ff. Zeus replies in effect: 'you
brought about the slaying of the Suitors,
and it is for you to meet the danger
from the consequent blood-feud. But
I propose that you make a treaty of
peace between Ulysses and his subjects,
with an amnesty for the blood that has
been shed.'

479-480 = 5. 23-24, where the sense
is simpler: 'you made the plan, and it
is for you to carry it out.'

483. After δ' μὲν we expect oi δ' or
some other nom. denoting the Ἐθάνθισον.
The form of the sentence is changed: cp.
12. 73 ff.

485. ἐκλησιν 'a forgetting;' i.e., 'an
amnesty.'

491. μὴ . . . δοκεῖ, 'whether they are
not;' cp. ll. 10. 100 ὃδε τί ἰδοι μὴ
πώς . . . μενοικήσοισι.
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ὁς ἔφετε· ἐκ δ' ὑδὸς Δολλίου κλεν, ὡς ἐκέλευε,
στῇ δ' ἀρ' ἐπ' οὐδ' ἱών, τους δὲ σχεδὸν ἐπίσεις πάντας.
αἷψα δ' Ὄδυσσῆς ἐπεισ πτερέντα προσηύδα·
"οἴδε δὲ ἔγγυς ἐκεί· ἀλλ' ὀπλιζόμεθα θάσσον." 495
ὁς ἔφαθε, οἱ δ' ὄρνυντο καὶ ἐν τεῦχεσι δύντο,
tέσσαρες ἁμφ' Ὄδυσσῆ, εἰ δ' ὑφείς οἱ Δολλίου
ἐν δ' ἄρα Δαέρτης Δολίος τ' ἐν τεῦχε' ἐδυνον,
cαὶ πολιοῖ περὶ ἑντες, ἀναγκαῖοι πολεμοῦται.
αὐτὰρ ἔπει δ' ἐσσαντο περὶ χροτ ὁρώσα το παλάκον,
διέκisations ἤθηα, ἐκ δ' ἦιων, ἱρχει δ' Ὄδυσσεως.
Τοιοὶ δ' ἐν' ἀγχϊμολον θυγατήρ Δίος ἦλθεν Ἀθῆνη,
Μέντοιρ εἰσθοῦμεν ἡμὲν δέμας ἥδε καὶ αἰῶν.
τὴν μὲν ιδὼν γῆθησε πολύτλας δίος Ὄδυσσεος·
aἰπ' Ἰηλέμαξον προσεφώνενον ὁ γιον ὑλόν·
"Ἰηλέμαξ', ἢδε μὲν τὸ γε εἰσεῖ αὐτῶς ἐπελθὼν,
ἀνδρῶν μαρναμένων ἵνα τε κρίνονται θρίστοι,
μὴ τι κατασχύνειν πατέρων γένος, οἱ τὸ πάρον περ
ἀλκή τ' ἡμορέη τε κεκάσμεθα πᾶσαν ἐν' αἰῶν." 500
Τὸν δ' αὖ Ιηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἄντιον ἤδη·
"ἀνθεία, αἰ' κ' ἐθελησθα, πάτερ φίλε, τῷδ' ἐπὶ θυμῷ
οὔ τι κατασχύνοντα τεσ πάντως, ὡς ἀγορεύεις.
"Ὄως φάτο, Δαέρτης δ' ἔχαρη καὶ μόθον ἔειπε·
"τὰς νῦ μοι ἡμέρῃ ἢδε, θεοί φίλοι; ἦ μάλα χαίρον
ὐῖός θ' νυμοὶ τ' ἀρετῆς περὶ δήϊν ἔχουσιν." 510
Τὸν δὲ παραταμένῃ προσέφη γλαυκώπεις Ἀθῆνη·
"ἄρ' Ἀρκεισίδη, πάντων πολὺ φιλταβ' ἐταίρων,
eὐξέμενος κοῦρη γλαυκόπιδι καὶ Δίι πατρὶ,

505 ὁ γίον ὑλόν | ἤγκτε ἱέπτα λ. W. 506 τὸ γε' | τὸ γ' Μ. L W: τὸς Β. Vind.
50: τὸς γ' νυλγ. 511 ἦτο | ἦτο MSS., cp. 16. 99. 512 ὁ | ὁ L W Z Eust. 515

495. ὀπλιζόμεθα 'let us array ourselves.' We need not understand the word in the later sense, in which it is
confined to arms: cp. 1. 360 βίουν ἐφολίζωσιν, also 23. 143.
497. οἱ Δολλίου. This is a post-Homeric use of the article: see how-
ever 11. 20. 181., 23. 348, 376 (H. G. § 260, g).
508. κατασχύνων, with αἰτεῖα, 'you will know how not to disgrace.' The
exhortation seems out of place after the battle with the Suitors.
512. ὡς ἀγορεύεις 'as you thus speak,'
i. e. after such an exhortation as this of yours: ὡς ἐνδειδε ὁδοὺς.
αἱσα μαλ' ἀμπεπαλῶν προεὶ δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος.

"Ως φάτο, καὶ β' ἐμπνευσέ μένος μέγα Παλλᾶς Ἀθηνῆ.

εὐδέμενος δ' ἄρ' ἐσείτα Διὸς κοῦρη μεγάλου, 521

αἰσα μαλ' ἀμπεπαλῶν προεὶ δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος,

καὶ βάλεν Ἐὔπειθεα κόρυφος διὰ χαλκοπαρήν.

ἡ δ' οὐκ ἔγχος ἔρυχο, διαπρὸ δὲ εἰσατό χαλκός:

doπησέν δὲ πεσών, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε ἐν αὐτῷ. 525

ἐν δ' ἐπεσον προμάχοις 'Οδυσσεος καὶ φαλδίμος υῖος,

τῦτον δὲ ξίφεσίν τε καὶ ἔγχεσιν ἀμφιγύοιοι.

καὶ νῦ κε δὴ πάντας δλεσαι καὶ ἔθηκαν ἀνδρότων,

εἰ μή 'Αθηνή, κοῦρη Διὸς αἰγιχόλοιο,

ἡπελν φωνῆ, κατὰ δ' ἔσχεθε λαὸν ἀπαντα: 530

"Ισχεσία πτολέμου, Ἰδακήσιοι, ἀργαλέοι,

δ' κεν ἀναμωσία γε διακρινθητε τάξις.

"Ως φάτ' Ἀθηνή, τοὺς δὲ χλώρων δέος ἑλετῶν δ' ἀρα δεισάντων ἐκ χειρῶν ἐπτατο τεύχεα,

πάντα δ' ἐπὶ χονι πίπτε, θεάς ὅπα φανησάςης

πρὸς δὲ πόλιν τροπῶντο λυλαιδέμενοι βιοῦν

σμερδαλέων δ' ἐβόησε πολύτλας δίος 'Οδυσσεος,

ομησεν δὲ ἄλεις ὅς τ' αἰείδος ὑψιπεθεῖς.

καὶ τότε δὴ Κρονίδης ἄφει ψολδεντα κεραυνῶν,

καὶ δ' ἐπεσε πρόσθε γλαυκόπτιδος ὀβριμοπάτρης. 540

δὴ τότ' 'Οδυσσέα προσέφη γλαυκόπις 'Αθηνή:

"διογνεὶς Δαερτίαθη, πολυμῆχαι 'Οδυσσεὺ,

ἴσχεο, παθὲ δὲ νείκος ὀμοίου πτολέμου,


ἔστατο χειρῶν J. 543 πτολέμων F H al.: πτολέμου vulg., cp. 18. 264.

536 ff. This easy victory is full of improbabilities, which the poet does not attempt to soften or disguise, as Homer would assuredly have done.

534. The line is taken from 12. 203, τῶν δ' ἀρα δεισάντων ἐν χειρῶν ἐπτατ' ἔρωτα: It is open to the objection that the use of a form like τεύχεα as the final spondee is not Homeric. One MS. avoids this (see the critical notes): but the change which it makes in the order of the words seems the emendation of a scribe.

535-6. must here be construed as a connective acc. with φανησάςης. It is not so in the formal lines on which this one is modelled, such as Il. 2. 182 ὅ δὲ ξίφεσίν θεᾶς ὅπα φανησάςης (so Il. 10. 512., 50. 780).
μή πώς τοι Κρονίδης κεχολώσεται εύρύσσα Ζεύς." "Ως φάτ' Αθηναίη, ὃ θεότητο, χαίρε δὲ θυμῷ. δρκια δ' αὖ κατόπισθε μετ' ἀμφοτέρους ἔθηκε Παλλᾶς Ἀθηναίη, κόρη Δίως αἰγιάλου. Μέντορι εἰδομένη ἡμὲν δέμας ἢδὲ καὶ αὐθὴν.

**FIGURE OF A RHAPSODIST RECITING**

δι' ἑορ' ἐν Τερυθί.

From a vase (*Monimenti dell' Istituto, 1849*).
ADDITIONAL NOTES AND CORRECTIONS.

13. 15. πρωκός. The adverbial use of the gen. πρωκός is found in Attic inscriptions: also the dat. πρωκί = 'for a free gift,' i.e. 'as dowry' (Meisterhans', p. 210).

13. 75. The accentuation of πρωμή is a matter of difficulty. There is an adj. πρωμός, found chiefly in poetry, and a substantive πρόμη, common in Attic prose. But we also find πρωμή, sc. ραίς; that is to say, πρωμή is used as a substantive because the substantive ραίς is understood. In this case the word should properly be oxytone.

13. 194. The strangeness of Ithaca as Ulysses sees it after his long absence may be only the exaggeration of a natural effect. There is a parallel (as a friend has pointed out to me) in Wordsworth's poem The Brothers:

    But, as he gazed, there grew
    Such a confusion in his memory
    That he began to doubt.
    . . . . He had lost his path,
    As up the vale, that afternoon, he walked
    Through fields which once had been well known to him.
    . . . . He lifted up his eyes
    And, looking round, imagined that he saw
    Strange alteration wrought on every side
    Among the woods and fields, and that the rocks
    And everlasting hills themselves were changed.

13. 386. δόσως ἀποτελομέα αὐτοῖς. The pronoun is perhaps emphatic, 'Now I shall take vengeance on the men in their turn (who sought to kill me).'


14. 69. πρόχνυν. Brugmann thinks that πρόχνυν here and in II. 21. 460 is from the root of χνοῦν 'gnaw,' 'rub away,' so that the meaning was originally 'rubbed away,' and so 'utterly.' The use in the phrase πρόχνυν καθεσίμηνι, in which it seems to mean 'on the knees,' may have arisen, he thinks, by confusion with a form πρόχνυν 'kneeling forward.' On this view πρόχνυν is an adverb of similar formation to πάχυν, all-pouringly,' δέσω in δεσύτεροι, &c. (Brugmann, Gr. Gr. ed. 2. p. 571).

14. 368-371 = 1. 238-241. Here a double interpolation has taken place. The two lines—

    τῷ κεῖν οἱ τύμβοι μὲν ἐσοφανείς Παραξενοι,
    ἢδειος οἱ παῦλ οἱ μέγα κλέος ἢρατ' ἀπειρα

are wanting here in most good MSS., and therefore probably come from 1. 239-240. On the other hand the line τῷ φιλαν ἐν χερσῶν τ.τ.λ. cannot stand with those lines, since they refer to death before Troy: hence it is an interpolation in 1. 238, from 14. 368. Thus the only repetition is 14. 371 = 1. 241—probably an epic commonplace.

14. 371 (= 10. 77). For the form ἄφισσω see also the vase-painting figured on p. 198.

14. 425. ἦν λαβεν κελον. It has been happily suggested by Mr. Tyrrell (Hermathena xxvi. 103) that κελον here has the usual sense of 'going to bed': as to which see the note on 14. 532. The chief difficulty is that the participle
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**κτισμ is only used with a verb of motion:** but perhaps *κτισ* sufficiently implies motion.

14. 464. δε τ' ἑφέση πολύφρονά τιν μᾶλλ' ἀδελφός. From II. 18. 108 καὶ χαῖς δε τ' ἑφέση πολύφρονά τιν χαλάρωσιν, which gives a better sense—since singing at a feast is hardly a sign of madness. Note also the otiote μᾶλα.

14. 468. ἐφόβῳ ἄν ἔκφωμα ἄρτοι. This formula is less appropriate here, where the story turns upon cunning rather than prowess.

15. 161. See the Appendix, p. 327.

15. 295. This line is not wanting in all MSS., as stated in the crit. note: it is given in the Cod. Mori.

16. 23. γιακερείν φόνος. Mr. T. L. Agar has recently pointed out (Journal of Philology, xxvii., 1911, &c.), that *φόνος* here is not a vocative, as the commentators have assumed (comparing such phrases as Latin *mea lux*). The word when used metaphorically in Homer always means ‘success,’ ‘salvation,’ or the like. Mr. Agar takes it as an ‘accusative of apposition.’ This is a well-known Homeric idiom (cp. II. 3. 50-51., 24. 735, &c.). But the nearest parallels that he quotes are II. 17. 615 καὶ τῷ μὲν φόνοις ἥθε 'he came as a rescuer,' II. 8. 282 αἰτί 

16. 323. The word *κινοῦσα* is properly a subjunctive, and may have been used as a future (like ἴδου, &c., H. G. § 80). It may be so taken in II. 22. 510 ἄνδρα 

17. 212. Add in the app. crit. ἵκαναν Hdn. G P: ἵκαν' Ἡ Ὁ U: ἵκαν' F M.

17. 218. The interpretation here given of the particles ὡς... ὡς was proposed by Nietzsche, Sagenespie der Griechen, p. 176.

17. 495 ff. See the Appendix on the Homeric House.

18. 359. ἀλκοοσαί λέγει means ‘building walls of (unhewn) stone’; probably, however, it is incorrect to say that λέγει here means ‘laying.’ Literally it is = ‘choosing,’ and is used because the stones were picked to fit each other; hence the brachylogy to pick walls = to pick stones for building of walls,’ and so simply ‘to build.’ Cp. the later λειβολόγος = ‘builder.’


19. 219. For αὐτῆς ἥ La Roche conj. αὐτοῦ ὅ, which is almost necessitated by ἵππανος.

19. 576. ἄδηλον τούτον ἵφθανσε violates the rule against a naturally short syllable lengthened by position in the second half of the fourth foot: hence Wernicke, who pointed out the rule (Tryphiod. p. 174), conj. ἵφθαντον τούτον ἄδηλον (cp. 1. 584). See the note on 24. 240.

20. 49. λόγοι μερόπων ἄνθρωπων. An echo of II. 9. 340 ἄλογοι μερόπων ἄνθρωποι: the archaic epithet μερόπως is peculiarly meaningless here.
ADDITIONAL NOTES AND CORRECTIONS.

13. 15. ὑμανάας. The adverbial use of the gen. ὑμανάας is found in Attic inscriptions: also the dat. ὑμανάας = 'for a free gift,' i.e. 'as dowry' (Meisterhans, p. 312).

13. 175. The accentuation of ὑμανάας is a matter of difficulty. There is an adj. ὑμανάας, found chiefly in poetry, and a substantive ὑμανάας, common in Attic prose. But we also find ὑμανάας, ὑμανάας; that is to say, ὑμανάας is used as a substantive because the substantive ὑμανάας is understood. In this case the word should properly be corynute.

13. 194. The strangeness of Ithaca as Ulysses sees it after his long absence may be only the exaggeration of a natural effect. There is a parallel (as a friend has pointed out to me) in Wordsworth's poem The Brothers:

But, as he gazed, there grew
Such a confusion in his memory
That he began to doubt.

. . . . . . . He had lost his path,
As up the vale, that afternoon, he walked
Through fields which once had been well known to him.

. . . . . . He lifted up his eyes
And, looking round, imagined that he saw
Strange alteration wrought on every side
Among the woods and fields, and that the rocks
And everlasting hills themselves were changed.

13. 386. ἀνανάας ἀνηνάας ἀνήναας. The pronoun is perhaps emphatic, 'Now I shall take vengeance on the men in their turn (who sought to kill me).'


14. 69. πρόχνυ. Brugmann thinks that πρόχνυ here and in II. 21. 460 is from the root χνᾶω 'gnaw,' 'rub away,' so that the meaning was originally 'rubbed away,' and so 'utterly.' The use in the phrase πρόχνυ καθεκέμενοι, in which it seems to mean 'on the knees,' may have arisen, he thinks, by confusion with a form πρόχνυ 'kneeling forward.' On this view πρόχνυ is an adverb of similar formation to πάγχνυ, all-pouringly; άσσον in δισύνερας, &c. (Brugmann, Gr. Gr. ed. 2. p. 571).

14. 368–371, = I. 238–241. Here a double interpolation has taken place. The two lines—

τῷ κιν ἐν τῷ βοῦ μᾶν ἔποιές γε Παναχαιοι,
ἡδὲ κε κατὰ καὶ παιδὶ μέγας κλέος ἡρατ' ὀπίσω
are wanting here in most good MSS., and therefore probably come.

On the other hand the line ἦ τοί φίλων ἐν χεροῖν κ.τ.λ. cannot be, since they refer to death before Troy: hence it is an insertion.

14. 368. Thus the only repetition is 14. 371 = I. 241–

place.

14. 371 (= 20. 77). For the form ἄπειρα see

p. 109.

14. 415. ὢν άνω κειρων. It has been (ad. 1. 426. 103) that κεῖρων

as to which see the note on
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κείων is only used with a verb of motion: but perhaps λίθος sufficiently implies motion.

14. 464. ί το ι δέ άφένσα πολύφρονα περ μάλι' δέσσαν. From II. 18. 108 καὶ χόλος δι το ι δέ άφένσα πολύφρονα περ χαλιτήρα, which gives a better sense—since singing at a feast is hardly a sign of madness. Note also the otiose μάλια.

14. 468. ί τοίς δέ άφένσι κ.τ.λ. This formula is less appropriate here, where the story turns upon cunning rather than prowess.

15. 161. See the Appendix, p. 327.

15. 295. This line is not wanting in all MSS., as stated in the crit. note: it is given in the Cod. Mori.

16. 23. γλυκερόν φόες. Mr. T. L. Agar has recently pointed out (Journal of Philology, xvii. 194) that φόες here is not a vocative, as the commentators have assumed (comparing such phrases as Latin mea lux). The word when used metaphorically in Homer always means ‘success,’ ‘salvation,’ or the like. Mr. Agar takes it as an ‘accusative of apposition.’ This is a well-known Homeric idiom (cp. II. 3. 50-51., 24. 735, &c.). But the nearest parallels that he quotes are II. 17. 615 καὶ τοίς μίν φόες ἤλθε ἵνα εἴη τοὺς τινας τοιούτους φόεις δαναοῖς γίνεται (= II. 797), 18. 102 Πατρώλης γενέμην φόες. In these passages it is evidently a nominative, and so probably in the present case.

16. 114. In this note for ‘your enemy’ read ‘my enemy.’

16. 232. The form κτόντας is properly a subjunctive, and may have been used as a future (like δωρεαν, &c., H. G. § 80). It may be so taken in II. 22. 510 οἵπερ τοι οἵματι οἵν μεγάλως κτόντας: cp. δωρεαν in the preceding line. In the Odyssey δέων λόγης κτόντας is a formula (= II. 341), which may have continued to be used after the original future meaning had been forgotten.

16. 306. For δέων τε we should perhaps read δεῖς τού.

16. 441 = II. 1. 303. In this place the want of a protaosis makes the sense rather less clear.

17. 212. Add in the app. crit. ιακεροφ Hdn. G P: ιακεροφ H D U: ιακεροφ F M.

17. 218. The interpretation here given of the particles ὥς . . . ὥς was proposed by Nitzsch, Sagenpoesie der Griechen, p. 176.

17. 499 ff. See the Appendix on the Homeric House.

18. 359. αἰμασάδι τὸν γένος τεκτονών τεκτόνων, building walls of (unhewn) stone; probably, however, it is incorrect to say that λέγον here means ‘laying.’ Literally it is—‘choosing,’ and it is possible that the stones were picked to fit each other; hence the brachylastic lines ‘to pick stones for building of walls,’ and so simply ‘to build, to construct,’ i.e. γένος = builder.

18. 418. For this use of an indeclinable word or interjection, where the connotation is general, cp. 13., 13., 16. 348, 18. 55-

20. 296, 314-


21. 200, 230,

16. 73. ὅ, which is almost necessitated by the rule against a naturally short-syllable of the fourth foot: hence θεοματικοὶ τεκτόνων. ἐπιθέσις τεκτονων (= 21. 230. 3).

16. 83. An echo of II. 5. 6. 350. αὐτὰ, not peculiarly necessary.
20. 149. For ἀγρεῖα there are the curious variants ἀγρεῖθο Iaonn. Alex. 36, 37, An. Οχ. i. 71, 29, where it is said that Antimachus read ἀγρεῖτε), and ἀγρεῖo P. Possibly ἀγρεῖ was used without reference to number, like ἀλλ' ἄγα (see on 18, 418 supra).

21. 100. ἰμανος may have the force of 'staying,' 'keeping on,' as in Il. 2. 255 ἵμαν ὀμηθίζον, 24. 542 ἰμαν ἐν Τροισ, Od. 14. 40 ἰμανόμενος καὶ ἰμήν ἰμαν.

21. 113. Telemachus wishes the Suitors to understand that his success in stringing the bow will not affect the issue as regards them. Similarly in 21. 314 ff. Penelope soothes the alarm of the Suitors by explaining that the supposed beggar is not a claimant for her hand. If he succeeds he shall be dismissed with a fitting gift. In all this there is a vein of poetical 'irony.'

21. 153-155. These despairing words of Lefodes may be illustrated by a story told in Pausanias (6. 8. 4) of the athlete Timanthes of Cleoneia, who after he retired from public contests used every day to test his strength by stringing a great bow that he had; until once, having been absent for a short time, he found on returning that he could not perform the feat: upon which he lighted a pyre and threw himself alive into the flames.

21. 234. άνα δάματα. See the Appendix on the Homeric House.

21. 407. ἑπιδίωκεν ἱκάνως νῦν περὶ κόλπως χρῆμα. For νῦν Mr. Tyrrell (ibid.) plausibly suggests reading ἐν.

22. 140. ἵδον is derived by Brugmann (Gr. Gr. p. 239) from the Indo-germanic root-noun dom or dem 'house,' of which we have the original Nom. dom in Homeric δώ, the Gen. dems in δεσπόρη (for dems-potis), the Locative (without suffix) in dom, whence Greek ἵδοδ in δέ-δον. The association of ἵδον with the adverbs in-δον would aid the retention of the form as an adverb.


22. 408. A curious piece of ritual has been observed in Galicia, which may be a trace of the ancient heathen δαλαγή. It is described in a book of travel entitled Across the Carpathians (Macmillan, 1862), which was the work of two ladies, Miss Maith Mackenzie and Miss Irby. Writing of the church in the town of Zakopane, in Austrian Poland, they say (p. 199): ‘A practice said to be peculiar to this part of the world is the shouting of the women when the wafer is lifted up. Like other Roman Catholics, they fall down at the sound of the bell, but, besides this, they hail the host with loud cries and wild gestures of affection and worship.’


23. 198. For ἔρημον Schol. V gives the v. 1. ἔρημν, explaining that the bed-post was sometimes wrought into a figure of Hermes, as the god who was ὀνειρωτάτος, a sender of good dreams.
APPENDIX

I. THE COMPOSITION OF THE ODYSSEY.

§ 1. Sources of the Homeric narrative.

The student who seeks to analyse the complex narrative of the Odyssey, and to disengage the various threads that enter into its texture, will do well to begin, not by looking for discrepancies or marks of imperfection in detail, but by endeavouring to form some estimate of the general character of the stories and incidents with which he has to deal. In doing so he cannot fail to be struck by the difference, from this point of view, between the Odyssey and the Iliad. The Iliad, as he must soon recognize, is based on a mass of tradition or legend—Saga, if we may borrow the Norse word—that is historical in form. It may or may not be trustworthy as a record of fact. We may be unable to say whether the events related in the Iliad, or any of them, actually took place—whether the chief dramatis personae were real persons or imaginary. But in any case they are events and persons of high and serious interest, such as worthily make up the history of a national life. And the whole narrative of the Iliad is marked by a verisimilitude, a truth to nature and natural laws, that must be taken to prove the advanced stage of intelligence—we may almost say, of education—attained at the time, if not by the Greek people, at least by the class for whom the poem was intended. In the Odyssey, on the contrary, most of

1 The Iliad contains one almost perfect example of a märchen, viz. the story of Bellerophon (II. 6. 152–211). But it is told of a hero who belongs to a former generation and has no direct connexion with the Trojan story. It is therefore eminently an exception that proves the rule. The war of the Pygmies and the Cretans is a piece of folklore which still more decidedly lies outside the narrative of the poem. The only real instance of the type is the incident of the horses of Achilles speaking with human voice and prophesying his death (II. 19. 404–418). The account of Poseidon and Apollo turning the rivers of the Troad on to the Greek fortification, so as to sweep away all traces of it (II. 12. 10–34), is certainly märchenhaft: but it is probably an interpolation. The word
the narrative belongs to the realm of pure fancy. It is obviously akin to the class of stories denoted in German by the word *Märchen*, which we (rather inadequately) translate ‘fairy tale’ or ‘popular tale.’ That is to say, it is full of marvellous incidents, the work of supernatural or imaginary beings, and it is generally devoid of local or national interest. As Wilhelm Grimm quaintly expressed it, ‘the *Märchen* stands apart from the world, in a place fenced round and untroubled, beyond which it looks out no farther on the world, and therefore knows neither names and places nor a fixed home.’ It is, in short, neither historical nor quasi-historical.

It is true that this description does not apply in the strict sense to Ulysses, who is not nameless, like the heroes of the *Märchen* proper, but has a great place in the national tradition of the Trojan war. And of that tradition the return of the several ‘kings’ or leaders to their homes in Greece formed an integral part. Hence the main subject of the *Odyssey*, the return of Ulysses to Ithaca, belongs essentially to the same cycle of historical legend as the *Iliad*. Hence, too, along with Ulysses himself we have pictures of other actors in the heroic story—of Nestor and his sons, of Menelaus and Helen, even of Agamemnon and Ajax. It could not be otherwise, while the *Iliad* still held its place in the ears of men. But a large part—and the most characteristic part—of the *Odyssey* is of a very different stamp, and has been derived, directly or ultimately, from different sources. It is made up of adventures and incidents that are unmistakeably *märchenhaft*—akin to those of which Grimm’s *Household Stories* and the French tales of Perrault are among the best known examples. The difference, moreover, is not merely seen in the incidents related. It is almost as strikingly shown by a marked falling-off in the character of the chief actor. It has often been remarked that the Ulysses of Attic tragedy does not answer to the representation of him that we find in Homer. His wisdom tends towards mere cunning or deceit, and he becomes cruel as well as unscrupulous. This change—which we may regard as due for the most part to the exigencies of the stage—finds a certain analogy in the partial degeneracy to be observed in the same character when we compare the *Iliad* with some passages of the *Odyssey*. The Ulysses of the...
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Trojan story, the leader in war and in counsel, meets us again as the Ulysses of the cave of Polyphemus and the palace of Circe: but quantum mutatus ab illo. The leader who thrusts himself, against the advice of his wiser companions, into the monster's cave, who tricks and then provokes him by useless and foolhardy threats,—who gets the better of Circe by a magical herb,—who escapes the spell of the Sirens,—this Ulysses has counterparts in Grimm and the contes bleus, as well as in the folklore tales of numberless tribes all over the world. But with the Ulysses of the Iliad he has little in common but the name. What, then, is the meaning of this strange alteration? The answer is not far to seek. In the Iliad Ulysses is a leading actor in the Trojan war, and one of the greatest figures in the historical (or quasi-historical) tradition of Greece. In the Odyssey most of the stories told of him are märchenhaft. That is to say, they are folklore stories, told in the first instance without names of persons or places,—of kings and magicians au temps jadis, of countries with 'neither history nor geography,'—which gathered by a sort of attraction round the name of Ulysses. This process, by which a great national hero became the central figure in a series of more or less childish fables, is one for which it is not difficult to find parallels. One of the most conspicuous instances is that of Charlemagne, whose historic greatness was almost eclipsed by the place which he came to hold in the Carolingian cycle of legend. A somewhat different but not less instructive example is the mediaeval representation of Virgil as a mighty sorcerer. In the case of Ulysses we have not the advantage of knowing the basis of fact—if such there were—on which the mythical superstructure was erected. It may be taken for granted, however, that the marvellous tales of the Odyssey were not told originally of Ulysses, and that they were first told of him when he was already famous as a warrior and tribal chief.

It may be asked why tales of adventure, such as fill so much of the Odyssey, should have gathered round the figure of Ulysses, to the exclusion of the other Greek chiefs. The reason doubtless is that the political qualities of Ulysses, the wisdom and eloquence by which he is distinguished in the Iliad, passed by an easy transition into the cleverness of a hero of adventure: and then that such an ideal appealed more than any other to the imagination of the Greeks. The process may be seen, not only in the Odyssey, but also to some extent in the Dolomeia, which is undoubtedly later than the rest of the Iliad. The Dolomeia is not märchenhaft or marvellous, like the

* See W. Grimm, Die Sage von Polyphem, p. 19.
"Ως φάτο, καὶ ρ' ἐμπνευσε μένος μέγα Παλλάς Ἀθηνὴν. εὐδέμονες δ' ἄρ' ἐπείτα Δῖος κοῦρη μεγάλου, αἰγά μάλ' ἀμφεπάλῳ προεὶ δολικόσκιον ἔχχος, καὶ βάλεν Εὐπέθεια κόρυθος διὰ χαλκοπαρῆν. ἢ δ' οὐκ ἔχχος ἔρωτο, διαπρὸ δὲ εἰσάτῳ χαλκὸς· δοῦσθην ἕως πεσών, ἀράβησε δὲ τεῦχε ἐπ' αὐτῷ. ἐν δ' ἔπεσον πρωμάχοις Ὀδυσσέας καὶ φαλήμοσ υἱός, τύπτον δὲ ἐξεῖσι τε καὶ ἔχχεισιν ἀμφίγωισιν. καὶ νῦ ἄρα πάντας δλέσαν καὶ ἠθηκαν ἀνδρόσους, εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίην, κοῦρη Δῖος αἰγίδχοιο, ἤσσεν φωνῇ, κατὰ δ' ἐσχεθε λαὸν ἀπαντα· ἰσχεσθε πτολέμου, Ἰθακησσίοι, ἀργαλέοι, ὃς κεν ἀναματί γε διακρινθητε τάχιστα." "Ως φάτ' Ἀθηναίη, τοὺς δὲ χλώριν δόει εἴλε· τῶν δ' ἄρα δεισάτων ἐκ χειρῶν ἔπετασ τεῦχα, πάντα δ' ἐπὶ χθονὶ πᾶπτε, θεᾶς ὅπα φωνησάσης· πρὸς δὲ τόλιν τρωπῶντα λιλαιδμον βιότοι σμεραλέων δ' ἐβάθησε πολύτας δίος Ὀδυσσέας, οὕμησεν δὲ ἄλεις ὡς τ' αἰετὸς ψυψεθεῖς. καὶ τότε δὴ Κρονίδης αἴφει ψολδεντα κεραυνῆν, καὶ δ' ἔπεσε πρὸςβο δελακαπίδος ὑβρισματρής. δὴ τὸ Ὀδυσσῆσα προσέφη γλαυκότης Ἀθήνη· "διογινὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμῆχαν Ὀδυσσεῖ, ἰσχε, παῦ ὑπὲ τὸ γόμοι τοπλέμοιο," 530-532 om. F H. 536 φαλήμοσ υἱός] δίος ἅφοβός U. 534 ἐπί τεῦχα ἐπτατο χειρῶν J. 543 πτολέμου F H al.: πτολέμου vulg., cp. 18. 364. 536 ff. This easy victory is full of improbabilities, which the poet does not attempt to soften or disguise, as Homer would assuredly have done. 534. The line is taken from 12. 203 τῶν δ' ἄρα δεισάτων ἐκ χειρῶν ἔπετας ἔργα. It is open to the objection that the use of a form like τεῦχα as the final spondee is not Homeric. One MS. avoids this (see the critical notes): but the change which it makes in the order of the words seems the emendation of a scribe. 535. δὲ must here be construed as a cognate acc. with φωνῆσας. It is not so in the formal lines on which this one is modelled, such as Il. 2. 182 δὲ ἐμπνεὺς θεᾶς ὅπα φωνῆσας (so Il. 10. 512, 20. 380).
24. ΟΔΥΣΕΙΑΣ Ω

μή πάσ τοι Κρονίδης κεχολώσται ευρόσπα Ζεύς.

'Ως φάτ Ἀθηναῖ, ὁ δ' ἐπείθετο, χαίρε δὲ θυμῷ.

ορκία δ' αὖ καταψισθε μετ' ἀμφοτέρουσιν έθηκε
Παλλᾶς Ἀθηναίη, κούρη Δίδ σαλιέχου,
Μέντορι εἰδομένη Ἡμὲν δέμας ἠδὲ καὶ αὐθὴν.

Figure of a Rhapsodist Reciting

Σόλονες τοι' ἐν Τίρυνθ

From a vase (Monimenti dell' Istituto, 1849).
ADDITIONAL NOTES AND CORRECTIONS.

13. 15. προασ. The adverbial use of the gen. προασ is found in Attic inscriptions: also the dat. προασι 'for a free gift,' i.e. 'as dowry' (Meisterhans, p. 210).

13. 75. The accentuation of προμή is a matter of difficulty. There is an adj. προμήν, found chiefly in poetry, and a substantive προμήν, common in Attic prose. But we also find προμή, sc. προι; that is to say, προμή is used as a substantive because the substantive προι is understood. In this case the word should properly be oxytone.

13. 194. The strangeness of Ithaca as Ulysses sees it after his long absence may be only the exaggeration of a natural effect. There is a parallel (as a friend has pointed out to me) in Wordsworth's poem The Brothers:

But, as he gazed, there grew
Such a confusion in his memory
That he began to doubt.

. . . . . . He had lost his path,
As up the vale, that afternoon, he walked
Through fields which once had been well known to him.

. . . . . . He lifted up his eyes
And, looking round, imagined that he saw
Strange alteration wrought on every side
Among the woods and fields, and that the rocks
And everlasting hills themselves were changed.

13. 386. δέλων δέσποινος. The pronoun is perhaps emphatic, 'Now I shall take vengeance on the men in their turn (who sought to kill me).'


14. 49. πρόχνυ. Brugmann thinks that πρόχνυ is here and in π. 21. 460 is from the root of χριν 'gnaw,' 'rub away,' so that the meaning was originally 'rubbed away,' and so 'utterly.' The use in the phrase πρόχνυρ καθεζομένοιν, in which it seems to mean 'on the knees,' may have arisen, he thinks, by confusion with a form πρόχνυ 'kneeling forward.' On this view πρό-χνυ is an adverb of similar formation to πάνχνυ, all-pouringly, δανον in δανύτερον, &c. (Brugmann, Gr. Gr. ed. 2 p. 571).

14. 368-371. = 1. 238-241. Here a double interpolation has taken place. The two lines—

τὸ καὶ οἱ τύμβοι μὲν ἐποίησαν Πασαγμοῦ,

ἡδὲ καὶ ἕπω κάποι μέγα κλέον ἡραν ἀπάθω

are wanting here in most good MSS., and therefore probably come from 1. 239-240. On the other hand the line ἢδὲ φίλαον ἐν χερινί εὐτ. cannot stand with those lines, since they refer to death before Troy: hence it is an interpolation in 1. 238, from 1. 368. Thus the only repetition is 14. 371 = 1. 241—probably an epic common-place.

14. 371 (= 20. 77). For the form ἄρσιμι see also the vase-painting figured on p. 198.

14. 425. ἦν λαβε κελον. It has been happily suggested by Mr. Tyrrell (Hermathena xxvi. 153) that κελον here has the usual sense of 'going to bed': as to which see the note on 14. 532. The chief difficulty is that the participle
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κέινω is only used with a verb of motion; but perhaps λέει sufficiently implies motion.

14. 464. τ' ἐφακρα πολύφρονα περ μάλλ' ἄντων. From II. 18. 108 καὶ χόλον δε τ' ἐφακρα πολύφρονα περ χαλεπήνων, which gives a better sense—since singing at a feast is hardly a sign of madness. Note also the otiose μάλλ'.

14. 468. εἰς ἥπερ μητέρα. This formula is less appropriate here, where the story turns upon cunning rather than prowess.

15. 161. See the Appendix, p. 327.

15. 295. This line is not wanting in all MSS., as stated in the crit. note: it is given in the Cod. Mori.

16. 23. γλαυκόριφ φῶς. Mr. T. L. Agar has recently pointed out (Journal of Philology, xxvii. 194) that φῶς here is not a vocative, as the commentators have assumed (comparing such phrases as Latin mea lux). The word when used metaphorically in Homer always means 'success,' 'salvation,' or the like. Mr. Agar takes it as an 'accusative of apposition.' This is a well-known Homeric idiom (cp. II. 3. 50-51, 24. 735, &c.). But the nearest parallels that he quotes are II. 17. 615 καὶ τῷ μὲν φῶς ἡ λευχ' he came as a rescue,' II. 8. 282 αἱ καὶ τι φῶς Δαναοῖς γέλη (= 11. 797), 18. 102 Πατρόκλῳ γενέμπιν φῶς. In these passages it is evidently a nominative, and so probably in the present case.

16. 114. In this note for 'your enemy' read 'my enemy,'

16. 232. The form κόσμα is properly a subjunctive, and may have been used as a future (like δοκούμα, &c., H. G. § 80). It may be so taken in II. 32. 510 ἄνθρωπος ἂν εἴπατ' ἐκ μεγάρων κόσμα: cp. δοκούμα in the preceding line. In the Odyssey θέωσιν ὠργήν κόσμα is a formula (= 11. 341), which may have continued to be used after the original future meaning had been forgotten.

16. 306. For διονυσία we should perhaps read διονυσίω.

16. 441 = II. 1. 303. In this place the want of a protasis makes the sense rather less clear.

17. 212. Add in the app. crit. ἑυχάνον Hdn. G P: ἑυχάνον H D U: ἑυχάνον F M.

17. 218. The interpretation here given of the particles ὡς... ὡς was proposed by Nietzsche, Sagenpoesie der Griechen, p. 176.

17. 490 ff. See the Appendix on the Homeric House.

18. 359. ἀναμάθεσα λέγω means 'building walls of (unhewn) stone'; probably, however, it is incorrect to say that λέγω here means 'laying.' Literally it is 'choosing,' and is used because the stones were picked to fit each other; hence the brachylogy 'to pick walls' = 'to pick stones for building of walls,' and so simply 'to build.' Cp. the later λιθολόγος = 'builder.'

18. 418. For the use of ἀλλ' ἄγα as a kind of indeclinable word or interjection, where the context requires a verb in the plural, cp. 13. 13, 16. 348, 18. 55, 20. 296, 314, 21. 111, 263, 281, 336.


19. 219. For αὐτός ἦν La Roche conj. αὑτόν ἦν, which is almost necessitated by ἐκπληθεῖν.

19. 576. ἄθλον τοῦτον ἐφήμων violates the rule against a naturally short syllable lengthened by position in the second half of the fourth foot: hence Wernicke, who pointed out the rule (Tryphiod. p. 174), conj. ἐφήμων τοῦτον ἄθλον (cp. 1. 584). See the note on 24. 240.

the narrative belongs to the realm of pure fancy. It is obviously akin to the class of stories denoted in German by the word Märchen, which we (rather inadequately) translate 'fairy tale' or 'popular tale.' That is to say, it is full of marvellous incidents, the work of supernatural or imaginary beings, and it is generally devoid of local or national interest. As Wilhelm Grimm quaintly expressed it, 'the Märchen stands apart from the world, in a place fenced round and untroubled, beyond which it looks out no farther on the world, and therefore knows neither names and places nor a fixed home.' It is, in short, neither historical nor quasi-historical.

It is true that this description does not apply in the strict sense to Ulysses, who is not nameless, like the heroes of the Märchen proper, but has a great place in the national tradition of the Trojan war. And of that tradition the return of the several 'kings' or leaders to their homes in Greece formed an integral part. Hence the main subject of the Odyssey, the return of Ulysses to Ithaca, belongs essentially to the same cycle of historical legend as the Iliad. Hence, too, along with Ulysses himself we have pictures of other actors in the heroic story—of Nestor and his sons, of Menelaus and Helen, even of Agamemnon and Ajax. It could not be otherwise, while the Iliad still held its place in the ears of men. But a large part—and the most characteristic part—of the Odyssey is of a very different stamp, and has been derived, directly or ultimately, from different sources. It is made up of adventures and incidents that are unmistakeably märchenhaft—akin to those of which Grimm's Household Stories and the French tales of Perrault are among the best known examples. The difference, moreover, is not merely seen in the incidents related. It is almost as strikingly shown by a marked falling-off in the character of the chief actor. It has often been remarked that the Ulysses of Attic tragedy does not answer to the representation of him that we find in Homer. His wisdom tends towards mere cunning or deceit, and he becomes cruel as well as unscrupulous. This change—which we may regard as due for the most part to the exigencies of the stage—finds a certain analogy in the partial degeneracy to be observed in the same character when we compare the Iliad with some passages of the Odyssey. The Ulysses of the

* * *

† Das Märchen aber steht abseits der Welt in einem umfriedeten ungestörten Platz, über welchen es hinaus in jene nicht weiter schaut. Darum kennt es weder Namen und Orte, noch eine bestimmte Heimath (Über das Wesen der Märchen, in W. Grimm's Kleinere Schriften, i. p. 333).
Trojan story, the leader in war and in counsel, meets us again as the Ulysses of the cave of Polyphemus and the palace of Circe: but quantum mutatus ab illo. The leader who thrusts himself, against the advice of his wiser companions, into the monster's cave, who tricks and then provokes him by useless and foolhardy threats,—who gets the better of Circe by a magical herb,—who escapes the spell of the Sirens,—this Ulysses has counterparts in Grimm and the contes bleus, as well as in the folklore tales of numberless tribes all over the world. But with the Ulysses of the Iliad he has little in common but the name². What, then, is the meaning of this strange alteration? The answer is not far to seek. In the Iliad Ulysses is a leading actor in the Trojan war, and one of the greatest figures in the historical (or quasi-historical) tradition of Greece. In the Odyssey most of the stories told of him are märchenhaft. That is to say, they are folklore stories, told in the first instance without names of persons or places,—of kings and magicians au temps jadis, of countries with 'neither history nor geography,'—which gathered by a sort of attraction round the name of Ulysses. This process, by which a great national hero became the central figure in a series of more or less childish fables, is one for which it is not difficult to find parallels. One of the most conspicuous instances is that of Charlemagne, whose historic greatness was almost eclipsed by the place which he came to hold in the Carolingian cycle of legend. A somewhat different but not less instructive example is the mediaeval representation of Virgil as a mighty sorcerer. In the case of Ulysses we have not the advantage of knowing the basis of fact—if such there were,—on which the mythical superstructure was erected. It may be taken for granted, however, that the marvellous tales of the Odyssey were not told originally of Ulysses, and that they were first told of him when he was already famous as a warrior and tribal chief.

It may be asked why tales of adventure, such as fill so much of the Odyssey, should have gathered round the figure of Ulysses, to the exclusion of the other Greek chiefs. The reason doubtless is that the political qualities of Ulysses, the wisdom and eloquence by which he is distinguished in the Iliad, passed by an easy transition into the cleverness of a hero of adventure: and then that such an ideal appealed more than any other to the imagination of the Greeks. The process may be seen, not only in the Odyssey, but also to some extent in the Dolomeia, which is undoubtedly later than the rest of the Iliad. The Dolomeia is not märchenhaft or marvellous, like the
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Odyssey: but it falls in with the Odyssey as an indication of the advance of Ulysses in popular favour, and of the disposition to see in him the type of adventurous boldness and resource.

§ 2. Folklore Tales (Märchen) in the Odyssey.

If it is admitted that the narrative of the Odyssey has been formed by the admixture of folklore tales with a portion of the Greek heroic tradition, the next step is to attempt to determine the extent to which each of these elements is to be recognized. How much of the Odyssey has its source in the common stock of local or national story, from which the subject of the Iliad and doubtless many other epics was derived? How much comes from tales that belong, as far as we can judge, to the childhood of the human race? Where, in short, does Saga end and Märchen begin?

Of the latter class—that of Märchen—the story of the Cyclops is the most striking instance. It has been found in many versions all over the world, sometimes in countries too remote or too primitive to admit of any theory of borrowing 4. But much the same may be said of the other adventures related by Ulysses in the Ἀλκίστων ἀκάλυφος of the ninth, tenth and twelfth books. The witchcraft of Circe, who changes men into animals for her pleasure, but yields to the more potent magic of Ulysses and then aids him in his enterprise, has parallels in Grimm, and in the Indian fables 5. So too the enchanted

4 See the dissertation of Wilhelm Grimm, Die Sage von Polyphem, a summary of which is given in the first volume of this edition of the Odyssey, Appendix II.

5 In Somadeva’s collection there is a story of a young merchant who travels about the world in quest of a Vidyâdhâr, or fairy, who has appeared to him. On the way he meets with four pilgrims. They continue their journey together, and one evening they all come to a wood where, as they are warned, there is a Yaksînî or demon, who changes the travellers whom she finds into animals, and then devours them. Accordingly at midnight the Yaksînî is heard approaching, blowing a flute made of a human bone. She recites a spell, whereupon a horn grows on to the head of one of the pilgrims: he throws himself, maddened, into the fire, and the Yaksînî roasts and devours him. The same happens to the second and third pilgrim. But when it is the turn of the fourth she accidentally lays her flute on the ground: the merchant seizes it, blows it, and recites the magic spell which he has heard her use. She loses all power, falls at his feet, and offers to fulfil his wishes and guide him to the dwelling of the Vidyâdhâr (G. Gerland, Altgriechische Märchen in der Odyssee, Magdeburg, 1869).

There is a somewhat similar incident (as Gerland points out) in Grimm’s story of the ‘Two Brothers’ (Kinder- und Hausmärchen, 66). One of the brothers and the animals that follow him are lost in a wood, where an old witch with her magical twig turns them into stones. The other brother afterwards comes to the same place, but is on his guard against the old woman’s spells, and forces her to turn his brother back into his proper form, ‘as well as many merchants, workpeople, and shepherds, who, delighted with their freedom, returned home.’
isle of Calypso, in which the hero is hidden away, like Tannhäuser in the Venusberg—the πλαγγέλων or Moving Rocks—a bag of Aeolus—the Laestrygonian giants—all these marvels, which the poet of the Odyssey places in unexplored corners of the Mediterranean, belong evidently to an imaginary place and time. The Phaeacian episode, too, is distinctly märchenhaft, as was shown long ago by Gerland, though the genius of the poet has given it a human interest which rises far above that level.

§ 3. Heroic Saga—treatment of it by the Singers.

In the latter half of the Odyssey the separation of the different sources is much more difficult. From the thirteenth book onwards the character of the narrative perceptibly changes. The folklore element, as we shall be able to show, is still present: but it is held in solution, so to speak, in the mass of heroic mythology. Like Ulysses after his landing in Ithaca, when Athene removed the mist from his eyes, we find ourselves in a familiar world—the world of the Trojan story. Some part of that story the poet of the Odyssey had desired to take as his theme, even as other singers have done before him. So

* Dr. Tylor in his book on Primitive Culture (vol. i. pp. 313-315, ed. 1871) mentions three forms of this myth, all based upon the notion of a passage from the upper to the under world. (1) The Karens of Birma say that in the west there are two massive strata of rocks which are continually opening and shutting, and between these strata the sun descends at sunset. (2) Among the Algonquins there is a tale of a chasm to be passed on the way to the land of the Sun and Moon, where the sky comes down with violence on the earth, and rises again slowly and gradually. (3) In the funeral ritual of the Aztecs the dead man receives a passport by which he is to pass 'between the two mountains that smite one against the other.'

Another curious parallel in the Polynesian mythology is given by Mr. Gill in his Myths and Songs of the South Pacific (p. 53). The hero of the story is Mani, the Prometheus who discovers the secret of fire and brings it up from the lower world. He descends for that purpose in the body of a red pigeon, passing through a rock that opened in obedience to certain magical words. The rock however closed again so quickly that the pigeon's tail was cut off. We may compare Od. 12. 62 τῷ μὲν τ' οὖν ποταμῷ παρ' χειμερίνον ἔδει πέλειαι κτα.

* In the dissertation quoted above (p. 292, note 5) Gerland draws out the parallel between this part of the Odyssey and an Indian tale in the collection of Somadeva. The hero of the tale, a Brahman named Sak tidera, is saved from a great whirlpool, like Ulysses, by climbing into the branches of a fig-tree which overhangs it. He is then carried through the air to the Golden City and is there entertained by the Vidyādharī (or fairy) queen who is destined to have a mortal for her husband. 'Many as are the noble Vidyādharīs that my father has proposed to me, I have refused them all, and am still a maiden' (like Nausicaa, ἢ γὰρ τοῦτον γὰρ ἀνδρὰς ἂν ἀδίκημα μακρὸν ἡμῖν ἔπιπτε, τοῖς μὲν μόνοις κυρίοις τε καὶ ἵλοις, Od. 6. 284). But before a marriage can be arranged Saktidera is suddenly conveyed back to his father's house, and marries his original love, the princess Kanaka rekha. I may refer to a review of Gerland's dissertation in the Academy of 23 Oct. 1870.
APPENDIX

much he has told us at the outset. It is under this aspect, viz. as a portion of the heroic tradition, that we have now to consider the poem.

Regarding the poems that dealt with the different quasi-historical or heroic myths we may learn a good deal from the Odyssey itself. The 'singers' or 'minstrels' (δασόι) of whom it gives a vivid and evidently sympathetic picture—Phemius in the palace of Ulysses, Demodocus at the Phaeacian court—are represented as taking all their subjects, by choice or by compulsion, from the Trojan cycle of legend. The song of Demodocus about Ares and Aphrodite (Od. 8. 266–369) is an apparent exception, but one that proves the rule: for it is shown by the evidence of language to be an interpolation of post-Homeric times. In the Iliad it is otherwise: the few digressions, such as the stories told of Bellerophon (II. 6. 152–211), of Meleager (II. 9. 527–599), of Tydeus (II. 4. 372–400), belong to non-Trojan cycles of legend. Moreover, the various false stories told by Ulysses all turn upon events and characters in the Trojan war. Even the song of the Sirens is chiefly occupied with the same inexhaustible theme: cp. Od. 12. 189–191:

"ομον γὰρ τῳ πάσῳ δο’ ἐν Τροίᾳ ἐφορεῖγ
Ἀργείων Τρῶϊς τε θεῶν ἴσητι μόγησιν,
ομον δ’ δοσα γινηται ἐν χαιρὶ πουλυβοτειρη.

In one or two instances we are allowed to see how the singers set to work to transform portions of the traditional narrative into 'lays' or songs of the right shape and compass. Demodocus, we are told (Od. 8. 73–82), was inspired by the music to sing a lay, then of wide-reaching fame, the Quarrel of Achilles and Ulysses,—how it had been predicted by Apollo, and how Agamemnon secretly rejoiced, because it foreshadowed the issue of the war. Another time he sang of the taking of Troy by the stratagem of the Wooden Horse (Od. 8. 499 ff.), the subject afterwards treated by the cyclic poets, Arctinus of Miletus and the author of the Little Iliad. The singer, it is related, took up the story from the point where (ἐν δὲν δὲν ὡς κτλ.) the Greeks made their feigned retreat: and he brought it down to the recovery of Helen from the house of Deiphobus. Similarly in the opening scene of the Odyssey in the palace of Ulysses the minstrel Phemius is represented as singing of the Return of the Greeks—the song which latest

¹ Od. 1. 10 ὁν ἄλοον γὰ, θεᾶ δἐγατερ Διός, οὐδὲ καὶ ἡμῖν.
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sounded in the ears of the listeners' (Od. 1. 352), even as the events themselves were the most recent. This subject also, as we know, had a place in the epic cycle.

It has been maintained by no less an authority than Welcker that these passages refer to actual poems, known to the poet of the Odyssey and his hearers. Welcker has even discussed the question whether the two songs of Demodocus, the Quarrel and the Wooden Horse, are meant to be represented as distinct poems or merely as two parts, 'syttes' or ἡφυδίας, taken from a single great poem on the capture of Troy. Adopting the latter view, he finds in the Odyssey a record of two pre-Homeric epics—the Ἰλίων πόροι of Demodocus and the Νόστοι of Phemius.

The hypothesis of a poem which included the two songs of Demodocus does not find any support in the language of the passages in question. The words in 8. 500 ἵθεν δῶν (sc. ἱστῆρ) ὡς οἱ μὲν κτλ. naturally mean 'taking the subject of his song from the point in the story at which' &c. They do not suggest beginning somewhere in the middle of a poem. So it is in the formula at the beginning of the Odyssey itself (1. 10 τῶν ἄμωδεν γα... εἰς τα ἢμών), and so we must understand the opening lines of the Πιαδ (μήνων ἀλίτω... ἵντα δή τα πρῶτα διαστήμων κτλ.). The epic singer begins by announcing his subject: and in doing this he has only to tell his hearers what point he has chosen in the story which they all already know. It seems probable, therefore, that the song of the Wooden Horse was complete in itself, and began at the point indicated by the words ἵθεν δῶν κτλ. If so, the Quarrel and the Return were doubtless also distinct poems.

Had these poems, then, a real existence, or were they imaginary? The latter is surely much more probable, and much more in harmony with all that we know of the artistic and poetical method of the Odyssey. It cannot be supposed that Demodocus was a real person, any more than the rest of the characters in the Phaeacian episode. And if the singer was a creature of the imagination, it follows that his songs were imaginary also. It is most unlikely that the poet of the Odyssey—a poet in whose heart 'the Muse had implanted all manner of songs'—would be at a loss for typical subjects of his art.

10 F. W. Welcker, Der epische Cycleus, I, pp. 268 ff. (Drey früh untergangene Homerische Gedichte).
11 In Od. 8. 74 omēs τῆς τότ' ὅτα κλλος εἰπόντα εἴρον ἵππεν, νείκος κτλ. It is not quite clear whether omēs is partitive (ἀπὸ τῆς omēs εἰς ἵππη Schol. H.), or attracted into the genitive by the relatival clause. But in either case the Quarrel is the omē which Demodocus sang. It is not merely the part of that omē with which he began his song.
This conclusion is strengthened when we observe the difficulty that later poets and critics evidently experienced in finding a place for a quarrel such as Demodocus could be supposed to have sung. In the Cypria there is a quarrel at a feast in Tenedos, but it is one between Achilles and Agamemnon, brought on by the omission of Agamemnon to invite Achilles. It is true that in the 'Aχιλλεως Συλλογος of Sophocles,—a play which was apparently founded on this incident,—Ulysses takes a part in the affair, and makes a violent attack upon Achilles, attributing his conduct to sheer cowardice in the face of the enemy. But this is a quarrel between Achilles and the Greeks: it is not the sort of quarrel between two subordinate chiefs that the passage in the Odyssey suggests. On the other hand, the grammarians explain the passage of a dispute which arose between the two leaders after the death of Hector, on the question whether Troy could be most surely taken by courage or by guile. As may be supposed, no ancient poet is quoted for this academic debate. Indeed, the limits of time between which it is placed, the death of Hector and the death of Achilles, do not offer any space in which it could be inserted. It may serve, however, to show that the dispute which is described as furnishing a subject for Demodocus had no existence in the heroic tradition. It is a trait in the picture that the poet of the Odyssey draws of an imaginary singer. The type to which it belongs is familiar enough, being represented by the quarrel of Achilles and Agamemnon in the Iliad, of Ulysses and Ajax in the Aethiopis, of Agamemnon and Menelaus in the Nosti.

We may go a step further, and conjecture that the author of the Odyssey intended a direct allusion to his great predecessor. Such an allusion would certainly not be alien to the spirit of imitation or even parody which we can trace in his poem.

13 Σαλατεῖας ουτέρος κληθέεις διαφέρεται πρὸς 'Αγαμέμνωνα Procl. (after the incident of Philoctetes and before the landing in the Troad). This agrees with the reference in Aristotle, Rhet. ii. 26 διὰ γὰρ τὸ μὴ κληθεῖν τοῦ 'Αχιλλείας ἤμετρον τοῦ 'Αχιλλείας τοῦ Τενεδυ. 15 It may be that the part given to Ulysses in the 'Aχιλλεως Συλλογος was suggested by the song of Demodocus. The language put into his mouth (see fragm. 152a) is hardly less violent than that of Thersites in the Iliad. Perhaps this is accounted for by the licence of the satyrical drama, in which Homeric subjects, treated in a spirit of caricature, were not infrequent. The Σαλατεῖας, generally identified with the 'Aχιλλεως Συλλογος, contained at least one obvious parody of the Odyssey, viz. in the lines preserved by Athenaeus (p. 17 d'), who quotes similar passages from the Ουσιδίας of Aeschylus (p. 17 c, p. 667 c). Among the plays founded on the story of the Iliad and Odyssey many are satyrical—the Cyclops of Euripides, Εἰρην, Προφυλακτης, 'Ουσιδίας of Aeschylus.

14 The story goes back to Aristarchus: see Schol. A on Il. 9. 347. 18 As Niese has pointed out (op. cit. p. 49), the words Διὸς μεγάλου διὰ βουλὴς in the account of the song of Demodocus (Od. 8. 82) remind us of the Διὸς Βουλή.
§ 4. **Unity of action in the early epics—the Iliad.**

Our study of the minstrelsies of Demodocus leads us to two conclusions that are of interest in themselves, and are borne out by the extant Homeric poems. The first is that the epic singer in Homeric and pre-Homeric times ordinarily took his subject from a common stock of traditional narrative—including (it might be) events within his own memory. In working out the details we may be sure that his powers of invention—the powers in which he himself recognized the inspiration of the Muse—had free play: but in the main lines he had to conform to the national memory or belief. In the second place, the subject chosen was some single incident, or at most a group of connected incidents lying within narrow limits of time. The artistic sense of the Greeks, which afterwards showed itself in the strict unities of the Attic drama, seems at one time to have been almost as exacting in regard to the plan of an epic poem.

It will be seen at once that these observations apply in the fullest sense to the *Iliad*. As Aristotle pointed out in his *Poetics*¹⁸, in a criticism which no modern advance of knowledge can improve upon, the divine excellence of the *Iliad* as an epic poem is that the main action or story is short and simple. It has the organic unity of a work of plastic art (*τι δισερ έφων εν διον ποιή την οίκειαν ἡθοήν*), and it is neither too much to be embraced in a single mental picture (οικειοστος) nor too rich in detail (κατασκευημένον τη ποιμία). Along with this unity, which is remarkable and indeed unique in a poem so long as the *Iliad*, and which it owes to this characteristic singleness of the main subject, we have to admire the skill with which the subordinate events, and even the great battles that go on during the 'wrath of Achilles,' are compressed within the space of a few days. This triumph of poetical construction must be due, like other masterpieces

in the opening of the *Iliad*. Similarly the combat over the body of Achilles (Od. 5. 308) was doubtless suggested by the combat over Patroclus (Il. 17. 738 ff.) and the styxoria or adventure of Ulysses entering Troy in disguise (Od. 4. 240 ff.) may be an imitation of the Dolonía. See also the examples of parody, &c. quoted in the notes on 14. 13 ff. These instances are the more convincing when we observe that the poet of the *Odyssey* never repeats what has been told in the *Iliad*. He consciously aims at novelty in the substance as well as the form of his narrative.

¹⁸ Arist. *Poet.* c. 23 (p. 1459 a 30) διά δισερ εἴρομεν ἡθο καὶ ταύτη ἑκάστοις τον φανερον παρά τοὺς ἀλλοὺς, τῷ μηδὲ τοῖς πόλεμον καὶ τῷ ἰσοτέρῳ δράξιν καὶ τίλον ἐπικεφαλέα τοιούτῳ διὸ εἰς τὸν μέγαν καὶ τοῖς εὐθύνοστοι ἔρμολεν ὑπερεῖ, τῷ μεγαθεὶς μεταφούσα κατασκευημένον τῇ ποιμίᾳ. τόν τ' ἐν μέρος ἀναλαβὼν ἐσπευσίας ἐκχρηματίζει αὐτὸν ἀλλοι, οἷον νεὼν καταλληκτὰ καὶ ἀλλοι ἐσπευσίαις διαλαμβάνει τῇ ποίησιν.
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of Hellenic art, not merely to individual genius, but also to the guiding
and restraining force of an artistic tradition.

§ 5. The plan of the Odyssey—admixtcheck of Märchen.

The canons that govern the epic songs of ideal singers in the
Odyssey are also observed, but in a somewhat different way, in the
structure of that poem itself. We have seen how large is the admixture
in it of an element foreign to Greek historical or quasi-historical
tradition,—foreign also to the Iliad and perhaps to the earlier epic
poetry in general. The presence of this element did not merely alter
the tone and quality of the narrative by making it fanciful and unreal.
It also increased considerably the difficulty of maintaining the unity of
the action, and keeping the various incidents within the conventional
limits of time. The series of unconnected adventures that had
gathered round the name of Ulysses did not offer material fitted for
the true Greek epic. Probably these adventures were not at first told
of his return from the Trojan war, or indeed of any part of his history
as a national hero. As soon as it was felt to be necessary to find
room for them in that history, the return from Troy was the obvious
vacant place. There remained however the difficulty of constructing
a poem which should satisfy the rules of the epic art, and at the same
time be an adequate picture of ten years of wandering on every border
of the known world.

How the poet solved this problem is familiar to every reader of
Homer. The device of putting part of the narrative into the mouth
of one of the actors is not unknown in the Iliad. It was natural to
a poet who always sought to make his heroes tell their story rather
than to speak in his own person 17. Thus the story told by Achilles
to Thetis (II. 1. 366 ff.) helps to give a clear notion of the events that
immediately preceded the Iliad. The same end is attained for other
parts of the previous story by the speech of Ulysses in the second book
(II. 2. 301–330), and by the νευςοςοτια, especially the speech of
Antenor (II. 3. 205–224). Such instances, however, are hardly enough
even to have suggested the ολησεων εσωλογογος. The story there told is
not a mere prologue or mise-en-scène: it is an integral part of the

17 A. R. Πετ. c. 24, p. 1480 a 5 Ὑμηρος δὲ ἐλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ δέος ἐπηρεάτοθαι, καὶ δὴ
καὶ δὲ μὲν ἄλλοι παραγόντες ἑρενῖκαὶ δὲ δὲν ποτέ αὐτὸν. αὐτὸν γὰρ δὲ τὸν ποιητὴν
ἐλάχιστον λέγον εἰς γὰρ ἐπὶ εἰς κατὰ ταύτα μιμητὴ. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐλλὰ αὐτὸ μὲν ἐς
ἀναγέννησθαι, μιμοῦται δὲ ὅληγα καὶ ὅληγας ἐς δὲ ὅληγα φρομμασκέμενος εἴδος
εἰς ἀρχή ἡ γενεσία πτα.
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subject, which is the return of Ulysses from Troy. The change of form is the poet's heroic but on the whole eminently happy way of dealing with the task which he had set himself, viz. that of bringing the longest and most eventful of all the 'returns' within the legitimate compass of a single epic poem.

While it may be assumed that the immediate aim of the poet in adopting this form of narrative was to shorten the time of the action, it cannot be doubted that the work gained in other ways. The use of the first person creates a kind of dramatic interest in the figure of Ulysses,—the hero whose character appealed most directly to average Greek sentiment. Further, it permits some freedom in the order of the story. In particular, it makes possible the stroke of art by which Ulysses begins with the last stage of his wanderings, viz. the voyage from Calypso's island to Phaeacia (Od. 7. 240-297), which he relates in such a way that it serves as a prologue to the full story. But perhaps the chief advantage, poetically speaking, of making Ulysses tell his own tale lay in the character of the tale itself. The incidents, as has been already said, are not such as originally or properly belonged to epic poetry. A poet would naturally have shrunken from treating them as so much heroic story. But in the mouth of Ulysses, and amid the ἀναθήματα δαυραί of the Phaeacian fairy-land, this dissonance is much softened. We do not of course put the wonders of these four books in the same category with the deliberately false stories afterwards told in Ithaca. Yet the interposition of a narrator, and that narrator the master of fair-seeming falsehood, gives a certain sense of remoteness which is in harmony with the substance of the tale.

The contrivance by which this is managed has been happily explained by G. Schmidt in his dissertation Über Kirchhoff's Odysseus-Studien (Kempten 1879). He points out that in answer to the formula τις τώθεν εἷς θρήνω, if it had stood alone, Ulysses could not have avoided giving his name and country. But Aretē, who asks the question, has noticed the garments which Ulysses had received from Nausicaa, and which he is now wearing: they were in fact the work of her own hands (ἐγὼ γὰρ φάρος τε κτλ.). Hence she adds the more directly interesting enquiry, τις τοι τάδε εἰμαρ' ἔσσωεν; In answer Ulysses has first to tell the story of his shipwreck and landing in Phaeacia. When he has done so (ending καὶ μοι τάδε εἰμαρ' ἔσσωεν), the other question is forgotten. The poet is able to reserve it for the moment when the revelation can be made with the fullest effect (9. 19 εἰμ' Ὁμέρον κτλ.).

A similar remark applies to the story told by Menelaus in Od. 4. 351-502, especially in regard to the essentially märchenhaft incidents of the prophecy of Proteus.
§ 6. The transformations of Ulysses.

In the latter half of the Odyssey, the scene of which is laid in the island of Ithaca, the story is by no means in the fanciful vein which characterizes most of the earlier books. The natural inference is that it no longer comes in the main from the same source, viz. the fairy tales of primitive Greece, but either from the 'national' quasi-historical tradition, or from the invention of the poet himself. In drawing this distinction, however, we must not omit to notice, in the first place, that there are features in the story which cannot well be either traditional or invented, and, in the second place, that the original improbabilities may have been softened or removed by the poet. No one, we may be sure, would know better how much his narrative gained by being true to life and human experience.

Among the incidents which may be thought to be of the fairly-tale order we must place the repeated changes of form that Ulysses undergoes at the hands of Athene. The first of these belongs to the Phaeacian episode (6. 229 ff.). Ulysses presents himself to Nausicaa, fresh from the bath and arrayed in the garments that she has given him: Athene at the same moment makes him taller and more beautiful, even as a skilful artificer adorns silver by inlaying it with gold. Again, on his landing in Ithaca she turns him into a withered old beggar, so that he may not be recognized (13. 429 ff.). When he reveals himself to Telemachus she restores him for the time to his proper form (16. 172 ff., 454 ff.). Finally, before the recognition by Penelope, she endows him once more with youthful beauty (23. 153–163). The question arises in regard to each of these occasions whether the exercise of divine power goes beyond that general interference of the gods in human affairs which every epic poet, and indeed every pious Greek, would freely admit. In the first of these instances this cannot be said. The poet attributes to divine agency a passing enhancement of the beauty of Achilles, or rather of its effect on the mind of the spectator. Athene does much the same for Telemachus whenever he goes to the agora (Od. 2. 10., 17. 63). Such a phenomenon need not be supernatural, any more than the sleep of Penelope (1. 363, &c.), or the favourable winds granted to Telemachus (2. 420., 15. 292). The like may be said of the transformation in 23. 156 ff., which indeed is a mere repetition of the account in 6. 229 ff. The case of the landing in Ithaca (13. 429–438) is somewhat different. There, as Kirchhoff has rightly insisted, the change wrought is a magical one,—not a mere
illusion, or the exaggeration of a natural effect. Similarly when Ulysses is revealed to his son (16. 172 ff.), he is really himself again. In these two passages, therefore, we have an incident that is marvellous, not merely because we see the hand of deity in it, but essentially and in its own nature.

§ 7. The wooing of Penelope and the return of Ulysses.

Let us now go on to the further question indicated above, and ask whether in the other incidents or features of the narrative—those which have no distinctly marked supernatural character—we can find traces of derivation from 'popular tales' or Märchen.

A little reflexion can hardly fail to suggest the answer that the whole story of the wooing of Penelope and the return of Ulysses in time to prevent her marriage is originally of this class. As told in the Odyssey it is comparatively free from supernatural admixture. The

20 Kirchhoff, Die homerische Odyssee, p. 538. It is impossible here to do more than indicate in the briefest words the nature of the theory which this observation has suggested to Kirchhoff. In his view there is a profound difference between the two halves of the Odyssey in the representation which they give of the hero. The Ulysses of the wanderings—of Calypso's isle and the Phaeacian court—is still in the prime of life: the Ulysses of Ithaca is a man who bears the marks of his many years of war and hardship. The two pictures, he holds, belong to originally distinct poems, and the magical transformation of 13. 429 ff. was inserted to smooth over the passage from the one to the other. In later recognition scenes, in particular the recognition by Eurykleia (19. 407), and by Eumaeus and Philoetius (21. 188), perhaps even in the scene with Penelope (see the note on 23. 153), he is not transformed, but only disguised by his beggar's rags (cp. 23. 95, 113).

The difference that Kirchhoff finds between the Ulysses of the Phaeacian episode and the Ulysses of Ithaca is not borne out by the language of the poem. When a Phaeacian observes that he is not like one skilled in athletic contests (8. 159-160), Ulysses replies that he was so once, but now has suffered too much toil and hardship (8. 183 νόης ήξομαι κατοπτης, cp. 8. 231 λείη γαρ δειπνίων ἑκατόν κημιστὶν ἐν σαλαίοι). At the same time we cannot suppose him to be so altered by age and wandering that he was under no risk of being recognized in Ithaca. But if there was that risk, then the transformation, or some equivalent means of concealment, becomes a poetical necessity. Similarly in the Philoctetes of Euripides the opening speech of Ulysses related how Athene had promised to change him so that he should not be recognized by Philoctetes. The real difficulty pointed out by Kirchhoff lies in the passages which imply only such a disguise as the beggar's rags would provide, instead of the complete transformation described in 13. 429 ff.

But this inconsistency surely admits of an easy explanation. It is in fact an example of the practical difficulty of dealing with supernatural machinery in a logical and consistent way. The poet has made a somewhat excessive use of the marvellous, and afterwards returns unconsciously to a more natural point of view.

It need hardly be said that the recognition of Ulysses by means of the scar on his thigh does not show that he was unchanged. He even retains a measure of likeness to his former self, which does not escape the observation of the old nurse (Od. 19. 380). Penelope is represented as struck by his aged appearance, even for a companion of Ulysses: note the remark in 19. 360 ἀθα νὰ γὰρ ἐν κακογείτη βροτοί καταγγίχουσιν.
aid of Athene, even in the final battle, is given less freely than in corresponding situations in the Iliad, and only 'after full trial of the valour of Ulysses and his son.' But in its main outlines the story is fanciful and improbable. It may have been in accordance with the manners of the time that various claimants should appear for the hand of Penelope. But we cannot imagine a suit carried on for upwards

81 Od. 22. 236–238.
82 On this point some important suggestions have been made by Mr. W. Crooke in his article on 'the Wooing of Penelope' in Folklore (June 1898). 'I venture to think' (he says) 'that what we are told about the Suitors is not inconsistent with the theory that in the more primitive version of the tale they may have been regarded as the family or tribal council, like the Hindu Panchāyat, and that their presence in Ithaca, after the assumed death of Odysseus, may have been based on the generally recognised right inherent in the kinsfolk of arranging and enforcing the marriage of Penelope with one or other of their number according to the current tribal law of the age.' Hence he would explain the continued feasting of the Suitors, the subordinate chiefs having a right 'to entertainment when they assembled for tribal business,' and this right being occasionally used as a mode of pressure. So in India (he adds), 'when a family refuse to accept the decree of the Panchāyat, the meeting is adjourned time after time. The parties concerned have on each occasion to provide a dinner for the councillors, and the pressure of this tax sooner or later forces them to accept the verdict or arrange the matter by compromise' (p. 118). This right of entertainment—to take the last point first—may have existed, if not in the Homeric age, at least in the earlier times when the story of Penelope first took shape. What we find in Homer is that the council or Βουλή γεροθείας (not to be confused with the δορυφορία of Ithaca) was regularly feasted by the king when it met for business. When Nestor proposes to Agamemnon the holding of a council he says, 'give a feast to the councillors: you shall then follow him who advises best' (II. 9. 70–75 δεινόν δαίμων γεροθείας... τολλίν έ άροσάντος υπ άνδρεωι ή και δέ όσιει Βουλής Βουλεθος). This is not the same thing as a right to be entertained by the family whose business is concerned: but the latter right probably existed where (as in the most typical Indian communities) there was no king or general assembly, and the council or Panchāyat was therefore the only source of authority (see Malin, Village Communities, pp. 123–125).

The question, then, is whether it is probable that the Suitors were originally, or in an earlier version of the story, the body to whom it belonged by tribal law to dispose of the hand of Penelope. 'The kinmen (Mr. Crooke thinks) for the purpose of dramatic effect are turned into a body of audacious ruffians, and the right of entertainment at the table of the prince and the habitual licence during an interregnum converted into those scenes of insolent revelry' (p. 119). The chief difficulty in the way of this theory seems to me to lie in the position of Telemachus. It is surely clear that in the view of the Odyssey the right of giving Penelope in marriage rested entirely with him. The Levirate is not in question, because, as the poet is careful to tell us, neither Ulysses himself nor his father Laertes had any brother (Od. 16. 117–119). Telemachus may refuse to exercise the right, but he claims it (cp. Od. 2. 215 καὶ ἄνδρα μητέρα δοσίς, also 20. 343–344), and the Suitors admit it (cp. Od. 2. 113 μητέρα στὶν ἄνδραμοι, ἄνωθεν δέ μη γαμήσης). On the other hand a version of the tale without a Telemachus is improbable, not only because Telemachus occurs in the Iliad (see p. 300), but also because, as Wilamowitz pointed out (Hom. Unters. p. 56), without Telemachus as the rightful heir Penelope would have no legal footing in the palace of Ulysses. The δραματικός would step in and divide the property of the dead. On the whole it seems doubtful whether much can be made of the suggestion that the Suitors were in fact these δραματικοί. If the Suitors are not unjust and insolent, they are no longer dangerous to Ulysses, or proper objects of his vengeance. Where then is the story of the Odyssey?

A parallel instance in Greek history may be seen in the wooing of Agariste,
of three years by more than a hundred of the young nobles of Ithaca and the adjoining islands. Hence we are not surprised to find that this is one of a group of stories with the same 'root' idea or *motif* —the king who is brought back to his home in a sudden and marvellous fashion, and who arrives at the last moment at which he can prevent the loss of his queen or bride. These 'return stories' (*Heimkehrsagen*) appear to be especially common in the Norse and Teutonic cycles of legend.

Moreover it is not to be supposed that the arrogant and unscrupulous Suitors represented by such men as Antinous and Eurymachus would allow themselves to be put off so long by Penelope's plea of the unfinished web. That famous device, it need hardly be said, is akin to the tricks by which giants and trolls are outwitted in all the fairy tales. Looking to the imperious temper of the Suitors and the craft shown in their speeches, we may feel sure that the web is a survival from a more fabulous world, in which it was

daughter of Cleisthenes of Sicyon (Hdt. 6. 126–130), on which occasion the Suitors, fourteen in number, were entertained by Cleisthenes for a year. This account points to the survival of some ancient rule by which Suitors as such were entitled to hospitality.

Many examples are given in Dr. Schnorf's dissertation, *Der mythische Hintergrund im Gudrunslied und in der Odyssee* (Zurich 1879). It is usual (he observes) for the heroes to be suddenly carried through the air from a distant country, by the miraculous help of a god, an angel, or it may be the devil, and so brought to their house, 'where their presence is urgently needed—a marriage being imminent which threatens to deprive them of bride or wife.' A good example is the story of the return of Charles the Great from Hungary, as given in Wilhelm Grimm's *Kleinere Schriften* (i. 577). In leaving Rome he had said to his queen that if he stayed away more than ten years, she might surely count him as dead. Now when nine years had passed there arose much plundering and devastation at Aix and throughout the empire. Then the great men went to the queen and said, 'We suffer much because we have no lord [cp. *θιλγάρ* *κυρία* αθηνός, *οὗτος ὁ θεός της ἀνθρώπων*]: therefore we pray you, noble lady, to take as husband a prince that can protect the country. Our lord is surely dead.' The queen would not listen to them, but they pressed their suit, and at length she consented to do their will. A great wedding was ordained, and a mighty king chosen for her. After the third day she was to be married: but God would not permit it to be, and therefore sent his angel to warn King Charles, who was then in Hungary. The king asked how he was to get back to his kingdom in three days, and the angel gave him directions, how he was to find a horse that would take him in one day to Rab, and on the next day to Passau on the Danube, where he was to buy a foal that would carry him back to Aix in time to hinder the wedding. All this duty came to pass, and the story ends with a recognition scene in the cathedral church of Aix.

Some other features of the *Odyssey* are to be seen in the German 'return story' of Count Udalrich (Schnorf, p. 31). He returns from a long imprisonment in Hungary, and presents himself in beggar's rags among those to whom his wife Wendilgard was in the habit of giving alms. He seizes her hand, calls to the warriors present that he is their lord, and is recognized by them. But Wendilgard felt herself outraged: 'now indeed do I feel that my Udalrich is dead when I have to suffer such violence.' Thereupon he shows her the scar of an old wound on his hand, and is at once recognized.
employed against beings of a less human type than the young Achaeans of the *Odyssey*.  

The account of the insults offered to Ulysses may gain some light from this point of view. On three successive occasions one of the Suitors throws something at him, with no effect beyond proving his strength and patience. First Antinous throws his foot-stool (*θηρίον*, Od. 17. 462 ff.); then Eurymachus also throws a foot-stool (*οφθαλμ*, 18. 394 ff.): finally Ctesippus throws an ox's foot (20. 299). The repetition has been felt to be a weakness in the story, and theories have been formed to account for it, based in general on the assumption that originally there was only one incident of the kind. But nothing is more familiar in popular tales than the occurrence of an incident three times, each time with some more or less trivial change of form. An example may be seen in the *Iliad* itself, in the story of Bellerophon (II. 6. 179–186). The hero there has three tasks set him, (1) to kill the Chimaera, (2) to fight against the Solymi, and (3) to slay the Amazons. In the three insults described in the *Odyssey* a difficulty has been felt in the circumstance that there is no *climax*—they do not increase in violence. But it may be that throwing an ox-foot was regarded as the supreme indignity of a feast.

§ 8. The Slaying of the Suitors.

It remains to consider the scene which forms the *dénouement* of the *Odyssey*—the slaying of the Suitors by Ulysses, with the aid of Telemachus and the two faithful servants.

In this famous combat we distinguish two successive stages.

24 Regarding the web Mr. Crooke (p. 122 ff.) puts forward a theory suggested to him by Mr. Sidney Hartland. The chief difficulty which Mr. Crooke feels is that there is no direct evidence within the Greek area that it would be the duty of the nearest female relative of an old man to prepare his winding-sheet in anticipation of his decease. The solution which he gives as the suggestion of Mr. Hartland is that in its original form the weaving was not that of the shroud of Laertes, but the wedding dress of Penelope. He cites many examples to show the importance attached to the wedding dress, and the obligation which lay upon the bride to make it, or at least to assist in its making.

This is not the place for a discussion of these interesting questions of folklore: but two remarks may be made. In the first place, the *Odyssey* is itself good evidence both of the need of a shroud for Laertes, and of the duty imposed upon Penelope in regard to it. We can hardly expect to find more decisive references in early Greek literature. In the second place, the distinctive circumstance calling for an explanation is the nightly unravelling of the web. No parallel or illustration of this singular feature in the story seems to have been observed.

25 Mr. Crooke quotes an instance from the Highland tales. A man is flung under the table, 'and there was not one of the company but cast bone upon him as he lay' (Campbell, *Popular Tales of the Highlands*, vol. II. p. 490).
THE COMPOSITION OF THE ODYSSEY

Ulysses leaps on to the threshold of the hall, and from that post of vantage, with the bow in his hands and the arrows on the ground before him, he shoots one after another of the Suitors. These have only their swords, and when one of them makes a rush at Ulysses, he is stopped by an arrow, or is slain by the spear of Telemachus. But the arrows, as Ulysses soon finds, are not sufficient for the work. Before they are exhausted Telemachus goes to the ἅλαμος where the arms are, and brings shields, spears, and helmets enough for the four men. Meanwhile Melanthius, who is with the Suitors at the end of the hall, bethinks him of the arms, and is able to reach them without being observed by Ulysses, and so to arm twelve of the Suitors. The bow is then laid aside, and the rest of the fighting is carried on with spear and shield.

The representation of Ulysses as a great archer is confined to the Odyssey, and almost to the scene that we are now concerned with. In the Iliad the heroes of the highest rank are not archers. Their weapons are the spear, the shield, and the sword, and they look upon the bow with some degree of contempt (Il. 11. 385 τοξότα, λαβηθήρ κτλ.). In the Catalogue (Il. 2.718) Philoctetes is said to have been 'well skilled in the bow,' and the same praise is given to the men that he commanded. In the rest of the Iliad we only hear of two individual marksmen—Teucer on the Greek side, and Pandarus among the Trojans. We do not hear of bodies of archers,—of arrows darkening the air, as in the descriptions of oriental warfare. On the other hand, the bow has a great place in Greek tradition. It was the distinctive weapon of Heracles, whose shade was seen by Ulysses γυμνῶν τοξῶν ἱκών καὶ ἐπὶ πυρῆσιν διύτεν (Od. 11.607). It is only in later art that the club takes its place. Ulysses himself, speaking of his own prowess as an archer (in language that is perhaps intended to prepare the reader for the μυστηροφοβία), claims to be second to Philoctetes alone among living men: but he will not contend with the great archers of past generations, such as were Heracles and Eurytus of Oechalia (Od. 8.215 ff.). From all this it may be gathered that archery had formerly been a much more important thing than it was in the battles of Homeric times. This earlier importance, however, survived in the field of tradition and romance: and thus the Ulysses of the Odyssey gained a character as an archer which the Ulysses of the Iliad never had. The process is the same in principle as that by which (as we have already seen) he became the Ulysses of the Polyphemus tale. In both instances the purer tradition of the Iliad was contaminated by admixture from another body of mythology.

II. X
These considerations make it probable that the first stage of the μυστηρειον— the slaying of the Suitors by the bow of Ulysses—did not assume the form in which we know it till after the time of the Ιλιό. No doubt it was already told, at least in germ, of some (perhaps nameless) hero, but not yet of Ulysses. In the Οἰδυσσευ it became an essential part of the story, and indeed has all the appearance of being the nucleus round which the story was constructed. The whole incident of the τῶξον βίος is evidently a device for the purpose of letting Ulysses gain possession of his weapon. And the τῶξον βίος again is foreshadowed in the conversation between Ulysses and Penelope which occupies the nineteenth book. Thus everything in the last books of the Οἰδυσσευ leads up to the combat with the bow. But in the second part of the μυστηρειον this is not the case. The fight has begun, and the stock of arrows is like to fall short of the need, when Telemachus offers to go and fetch arms from the chamber. After he has done so, a like thought occurs to Melanthius. In this unexpected fashion both sides are armed with spear and shield, and the combat is thenceforth carried on in the manner familiar to us from the battles of the Ιλιό.

It is hardly possible to read the twenty-second book of the Οἰδυσσευ without being convinced that this second phase of the great combat was not founded on either heroic legend or popular tales, but was designed by the poet as a sequel to the first part. We see the work of a poet in the constructive ingenuity with which the two parts are welded together, and in the dramatic effect obtained by an unlooked-for danger: while the incidents which follow are mere epic commonplace. We conclude (1) that the material which the poet found to his hand was a tale in which Ulysses (or the great archer who was confused with him) regained his bow by a stratagem, and with it slew a whole band of enemies, and (2) that he developed this tale in his own fashion, and in accordance with the manners of his time.68

The motives which may have led the poet to add a combat with spear and shield to the combat with the bow are not far to seek. In the earlier story the hero, armed only with bow and arrows, slays

68 A combat with spear and shield is anticipated in the words of Athene,

1. 255–256:

εἰ γὰρ νῦν ἀλάδων δόμου ἐν πρώτῃ βίοισιν,

σταυρῷ, ἔχων πῆλημα καὶ σωθέα καὶ δόο δοῦρο.

In fact Ulysses appeared at his door armed only with bow and arrows. But here Athene (speaking in the shape of Mentor) is not uttering a prophecy, but putting a hypothetical case. In doing this she naturally mentions the weapons that were in use at the time.
a hundred or more Suitors, each of whom, according to the custom of the time, has his sword by his side. An exploit of this kind does not surprise us in a fairy tale. But so glaring an improbability must have offended the artistic sense of the Greeks, even in Homeric times. Any poet who took it for his theme would be almost obliged to give it a more rational colour. He would at the same time be tempted to add fresh incidents, to relieve the monotony of the original tale: and any such incidents would reflect the circumstances of his own day, or (in such matters as the arms and mode of fighting) would be influenced by the battle scenes of the Iliad.

§ 9. Summary of the original tale.

It is perhaps worth while here to put together what, according to these suggestions, the Odyssey may be supposed to have derived from ancient popular mythology. The tale will have run in some such fashion as this:

The king of one of the many islands of Greece—we do not know when he was first thought to be Ulysses of Ithaca—went with the warriors of his people to a distant war. On his way home he was driven out of his course into strange lands, where he met with wonderful adventures of all kinds—adventures in the cave of the monster Polyphemus, with the Laestrygonian giants, in the palace of the enchantress Circe, and many more—till at length, after losing his ship and all his companions, he was thrown ashore on the magical island of Calypso. There he remained, lost to friends and country, for seven long years: after which he was allowed by the gods to return to the world. The first land that he reached was the mysterious country of the Phaeacians, who entertained him splendidly, and sent him home to his own island in one of their magical ships. Meanwhile his palace was occupied by a horde of men (or perhaps of trolls or giants), the suitors of his faithful wife. She put them off for three years by pleading that a certain web which she was then weaving must first be finished: but they discovered that every night she undid the work of the day. Thus she had to finish her web, and to fix the time when she must consent to choose one of them as a husband. The king could not make himself known, since he would have been at once killed by the violent men who hoped to supplant him. He was accordingly changed by his protecting goddess Athene (or possibly by some magical means) into a withered old man, and in this form
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and under the disguise of a beggar found his way into the palace. There he was the object of three successive insults from the chief of the Suitors. Thus the fatal day approached. But among the treasures of the palace was a bow of marvellous strength, which only the king himself could bend. This bow the queen, at the suggestion of the disguised king (or perhaps by the direct inspiration of the goddess), resolved to use for the trial of the Suitors, offering to accept the one who should string it and send an arrow through twelve axe-heads placed in a row. After all had failed, the supposed old beggar had the bow put in his hands, and at once performed the task. Thereupon, planting himself at the door, so that none could escape him, he shot down the whole number. He then recovered his own form, and was recognized by his queen.

§ 10. The supposed Telemachia.

Some such outline as this may have been anterior to the growth of the heroic tradition into which it was eventually absorbed, and may have passed through various stages before reaching the perfect form that lies before us in Homer. What these stages were, and at what point in the process each of the subordinate characters was introduced into the story, it would be vain to inquire. In some of them—such as Nausicaa, Eumaeus, Eurykleia—there is no reason to see anything but the invention of a great poet. There is one leading character, however, of whom this cannot be said, and whose place in the structure of the Odyssey has been the subject of much discussion, viz. Telemachus.

Many scholars have maintained that the part of the Odyssey that is taken up with the adventures and deeds of Telemachus originally formed a distinct poem, a Telemachia. The common opinion now seems to be that the ‘Telemachia’ is the work of a different author, who, however, composed it, not as an independent poem, but with a view to the place which it holds in the complete Odyssey. There are further questions regarding the amount of matter to be assigned to the Telemachia. It has usually been taken to include—roughly speaking—the first four books with the earlier part of the fifteenth. Kirchhoff and those who follow him regard the first book as a still later addition. Others (as Wilamowitz) extend it so as to take in much that passes in the palace of Ulysses. Let us begin by considering the probable origin of the episode in question.
THE TELEMACHIA

By a fortunate accident the name of Telemachus occurs more than once in the Iliad (2.260., 4.354), and in the mouth of Ulysses himself. 'May I be no longer called the father of Telemachus if &c.' is the form of adjuration with which he threatens Thersites. 'You will see the father of Telemachus in the front of the battle' is his boast, addressed to Agamemnon. It is therefore an integral part of the Trojan legend that Ulysses had a son so named, too young to go with his father to the war. It follows that Telemachus must have played a part in any possible version of the return of Ulysses. Twenty years having passed before the return, he could no longer be a child. He must be old enough to stand by his father's side in the combat with the Suitors. On the other hand, if he had come to man's estate, what was his position? Two pressing tasks lay before him—to drive away the Suitors, and to seek for his father. How long had these remained unfulfilled? Such was the problem presented to any storyteller or singer who took the fortunes of Ulysses for the subject of his art. The only possible solution, as it seems, is that which we find in the Odyssey. Telemachus must have reached manhood, and begun to think and act for himself, just before Ulysses set foot in Ithaca. This is a point which the poet of the Odyssey constantly keeps in view, and brings before his hearers in every form—in the exhortation of Athene (1.296 ὁδὲ τι σε χρὴ νηπίας ἄξιειν, ἐπὶ οὐκάτι τοῖκος ἐσοι), the surprise of Penelope (1.361., 18.217., 21.354), the confession of Telemachus himself (2.313 ἐγὼ δ' ἔτι νῆπιος ἦν, cp. 18.229., 20.310., 21.132). Moreover, if this was so, Telemachus was bound to give some proof of his manhood by taking the action required by the circumstances. Hence the Agora of the second book and the journeys to Pylos and Sparta are really indispensable to the plan of the poem. If they were left out, it would be necessary to put some equivalent action of Telemachus in their place. He is by tradition an actor in the drama, and must have a rôle assigned to him.

If a Telemachia of some kind was a necessary episode in any Odyssey, it can hardly be said that the Telemachia which we have—the Ithacan assembly and the journey to Pylos and Sparta—is disproportionate in length or irrelevant to the main theme. There is hardly a line in it which does not bear upon the fortunes and character of Ulysses himself. On the other hand there is nothing in these books that raises Telemachus to the place of hero of an epic poem. The interest with which we follow his movements and listen to the speeches for which he gives occasion, is an interest reflected from the figure of the real hero. Telemachus is on the stage for the purpose of giving
more effect to the entrance of Ulysses. The so-called Telemachia does for the Odyssey what the earlier battles of the Iliad do for the 'Achilleis.' It secures that gradual heightening of interest which is the chief secret of dramatic art. At the same time it fulfils the subsidiary purpose of giving us a wide outlook over the Greek world as it was after the great war. We may almost adopt the phrase which Grote has made familiar by his theory of the Iliad, and say that by the story of Telemachus the 'Odyssey' was enlarged into a comprehensive Néstor that included the 'Returns' of all the Greek heroes.

The case for the later date of the Telemachia—meaning by that word the first four books of the existing Odyssey—has been stated with much force by Sittl (p. 74). He relies in the first place on the argument furnished by the old difficulty of the two Olympian assemblies (1.26-95 and 5.1-42), and then on the allegation that all the subsequent references to the 'Telemachia' can be cut out without injuring the context. This last point will be dealt with a little later (see § 13). As to the two assemblies or councils of the gods, there is not much to be said that is not already familiar. In the first of these councils it is proposed by Athene that Hermes be sent to convey to Calypso the will of the gods that Ulysses shall now return, while she herself goes to Ithaca and urges Telemachus to hold an assembly of the people and 'speak out' to the Suitors. She sets out on this mission; but nothing more is said about Hermes or the message to Calypso. In the second Olympian assembly, held when Telemachus is on his journey (5.18-20), Athene repeats her complaint of the neglect of Ulysses by the gods. Zeus affects to be surprised (ποιόν σε ἔσο τοὺς φύγεν;) and forthwith sends Hermes on his way. Comparing these accounts we must admit that there is some inconsistency. If the gods agreed in the first assembly to the sending of Hermes, no second debate was needed. In any case the speech of Athene in the fifth book is partly a repetition of what she had said before (cp. 5.13-17 with 1.48-59). It is to be observed, however, that there is no actual contradiction between the passages. Indeed, the dialogue in the fifth book presupposes the earlier one. When Athene again sets forth the griefs of her favourite, Zeus reminds her of what had passed. 'Did you not yourself counsel this?' he asks—meaning apparently that everything she wished had been already resolved upon. So, too, the mention of Poseidon returning from the Aethiopians (5.282) refers to the passage

This was remarked by the ancients: τὸν Τελεμαχὸν ξεθεύν τοιεὶ ὅτως ἐν τῶν Ἰλιακῶν ἐν παρουσίᾳ πολλά λέγειν (Schol. on Od. 1.284, cp. 4.187, 245). I take this reference from Sittl, Die Wiederholungen in der Odyssee, p. 166.
in the first book (i. 22) which tells us that he had gone there. The real difficulty is that the first book gives us the proposal of Athene to send Hermes to Ogygia, but without telling us what became of it. This, however, is a difficulty of that passage—not a discrepancy. It is not explained by any theory of authorship. The true explanation surely is that the poet first stated the two proposals made by Athene, and then proceeded to say how they were carried out; that he naturally began with the second—the visit of Athene to Ithaca, with the consequent meeting of the Ithacan people and the journey of Telemachus: that all this occupied four books; and that then he had to return to the other thread of the story, and relate the deliverance of Ulysses from Calypso. A prose writer would find this transition easy enough. He would only have to say 'we now return to the other proposal agreed to by the Olympian council, in accordance with which Hermes was to be sent by Zeus' &c. But a Greek poet could not put back the clock in this fashion. The epic narrative is a single continuous one. The poet could shift the scene of his story back to the halls of Zeus, but not to a point of time in the irrevocable past. He met the difficulty, therefore, by the device of a second Olympian debate, held like the other in the absence of Poseidon, and finally setting in motion the course of events in the poem.

Some stress has also been laid on the chronology of the 'Telemachia.' The visit of Telemachus to Pylos and Sparta is always represented as a hurried one. He certainly takes leave of Menelaus in language that implies this (Od. 4. 594 ff.). Yet when we compare the account of his journey with the simultaneous movements of Ulysses, we find that he must have spent twenty days in Sparta, viz. the time which his father took between leaving Ogygia and reaching Ithaca (Od. 5. 278., 6. 48., 8. 1., 13. 18). The answer surely is that the epic poet does not aim at accuracy of this kind. If an error is one that can only be detected by a calculation which his hearer is not able to make, or which nothing in the story leads him to make, he takes no pains to avoid it. A similar instance of chronological licence or error may be found in 17. 515 (see the note).

But the chief argument (or series of arguments) that Sittü urges in favour of the later date of the Telemachia is found in a comparison of parallel passages. He maintains that in the numerous instances in

"A similar case has been pointed out by Kirchhoff in the Phaeacian episode. The queen Arête asks Ulysses in the usual form τις πώσαν τις ἄνθρωπον; In answer he tells some of his story, but keeps back his name: see p. 299, n. 18.

"For other examples of this rule, see p. 316."
which one or more lines occur in the Telemachia, and also in an undoubtedly genuine part of the Odyssey, it is generally possible to show that the author of the Telemachia has borrowed from an older poem. This is a method which Sittl has applied with success in other cases, especially in determining the relation in time between the Odyssey and the Iliad (see p. 325), and in proving the comparative lateness of the present end of the Odyssey (as to which see on 24. 1).

In regard to the Telemachia his demonstration—for such it professes to be—is much less convincing. When we have made due allowance for the parallels that can be otherwise explained—either (1) as epic commonplace, or (3) by interpolation (the cases for which Aristarchus used the obelos with an asterisk), or (3) by borrowing from a common source in some lost poem—it will surely be found that the residuum is not sufficient for any large conclusion 80.

80 The following are the chief instances which Sittl regards as proving that the author of the 'Telemachia' has borrowed from the original Odyssey:

1. 1. 320 μελητ' τ' ἀρχαστός τε... τα γὰρ τ' ἀνέβασμα δαιτός, cp. 21. 430 μελητ' καὶ φόρμα γ' τα κτλ. This seems rather a case of interpolation: ἀρχαστός is irrelevant, since the Suitors wished for the song of Pheius. In 1. 151 ἄλας is to be compared with ἄλας ἱφάσασθαι in 21. 429. Possibly II. 152–152 are both interpolated.

2. 154 (= 22, 331) ὑμηλ', δε' ἀυτοὶ παρά μενοτήρους ἀνάγει. This no doubt is especially to the point in the later place, where it excuses Pheius; but, as Sittl himself admits, the poet may have wished to prepare us here for the incident in the μεγαλοφοβία.

3. 1. 157 (= 4. 70, 17. 592) δύτις σχόν κεφαλής, κτλ., is not superficial: though Telemachus was apart from the Suitors, he may well have been within hearing of them.

4. 1. 171–173 (= 14. 188–190, 16. 59, 224) are probably interpolated here: οἰκειθεν ταῦτα ἐκτι Εύμαιος ἐν λεγομένῳ, διὸ ἐν τοῖς οὐα φήσασθαι Schol. H. Q. This cannot mean, as Sittl supposes, that the lines were wanting in certain copies because they were condemned by Alexandrian critics. Rather διὸ ὅτι 'which accounts for the fact that' (they were wanting).

5. 238–241 = 14. 368–371. Here 1. 238 is interpolated from 14. 368 (since τῷ κτλ. κτλ. can only refer to 1. 237). Conversely 14. 369–370 come from 1. 339–340: they are wanting in some MSS. Thus the only repetition is 1. 341 = 14. 371. 1. 356–359 and 21. 350–353 come (as Sittl might have observed) from a common source, viz. II. 6. 490–493, and therefore neither need have been borrowed from the other.


7. 415 δι' οἷον διαλαμφος περικαλλός αὐλή βραγᾶ διάμετρο περισσαῖτε ἐν χύρρῃ, cp. 14. 5–6 ἐνεχ' τε αὐλή βραγῆ κτλ.

8. 122 (= 7. 299) ἄρα μεν τοῦτο γ' ἐναλαμάνοιν οὐκ ἐνέργειν.

In these three instances no definite reason can be given for regarding the passage in the 'Telemachia' as later than the other.

9. 1. 323 σιβας μ' ἔχει εἰσοροβῶσαι is epic commonplace: and the same may be said of 3. 333 οἰκειος τ' ἀκίνητοι καὶ νόστων ἴμαρ ἱδέσθαι. In such cases it is only a flagrantly inapposite use that can furnish any argument.

10. 288 (= 14. 335) συνεργῶν δὲν εὐρόσωπος δεῖν ἐφάσασθαι applies rather better to the Trojan war than to the voyage of Menelaus. But it applies so well to both that there is no valid argument.

11. 471 (= 14. 104) ἵπτε στὶς ἀμέλειας δροταί is epic commonplace, as the archaic word δροταί shows.
§ 11. The first book.

In dealing with the question whether the first book is or is not an integral part of the Telemachia, Sittl has gone back to suggestions which were first made by Hermann, and which seem to meet the requirements of the case. Kirchhoff had maintained, with the assent of many scholars, that the first book belongs to the latest ' stratum' of the Odyssey, being the work of the 'arranger' or 'worker-up' (Ordnervor Bearbeiter), who is so important a personage in this field of criticism. The proof of this was found in the extensive but maladroite use which the supposed author seemed to make of the second book. In the assembly of Ithacan citizens described in that book Antinous and Eurymachus, speaking for the Suitors, bids Telemachus send his mother back to her father, who will then give her in marriage in the usual way (2.113-114, 195-197). Telemachus entirely refuses (2.130 ff.), but eventually proposes to wait for a year, and meanwhile to go in search of his father (2.214 ff.). But in the first book Athene advises Telemachus to use nearly the language afterwards put into the mouth of Eurymachus (1.275-278):

4.354 (=9.116) νῇσας ἔπειτα κτλ. If ἔπειτα is properly used, as Sittl says, of the goat island as following the preceding description of the land of the Cyclops, the adverb is equally correct when applied in 4.354 to Pharos, after the mention of Egypt.

4.636-637 δώδεκα θήλεια, ὅπος δ' ἡμέρας ταλαεργός, ἀδύνας, τῶν κείν τινι διαεσάξων διασκαλίην (4.636=21.23). If the foals were fit for work, Sittl argues that they could no longer be 'under' their mothers, hence that ὅπος in 4.636 can only mean 'accompanying.' It is not likely that ὅπος as applied to mares and their foals ever bore more than one meaning. If 4.636 is wrong, the mistake is one of practical knowledge, and would not prove a different authorship from 21.23. But perhaps ἀδύνας refers to the mares.

4.796 ἔπειτα δ' ἴδε τοῦ γιον αὐτοῦ. Sittl has not noticed that this half-line occurs in a passage (4.787-841) which he treats as an interpolation: see p. 101 of his book.

15.181 (=8.467) τῶν κείν του καὶ καθ' θεῷ δὲ τούτων ἵππων. It may be that, as Sittl contends, Ulysses owed more to Nausicaa than Telemachus owed to Helen; but an expression of devotion such as this is not to be taken too literally.

16.437 οὐκ ἤκου οὖσας ἄνθροπος ἄνευ ἀπεσταλμένου ἄγνωστου, cp. 6.301 οὐκ ἤκου οὖσας ἄνθροπος κτλ. Sittl holds that ἀπεσταλμένοι was put in place of ἄνθρωπος κτλ. at a time when that phrase was no longer understood. But probably, like many other archaisms, it was not understood at all in Homeric times.

However this may be, οὐκ ἄγνωστοι ἄνθρωποι is not a tautology: cp. the prose equivalent, e.g. Plat. Rep. 493 Ε ὄπιστα γὰρ γέγοναν οἵτινες ὅλη ἀπεσταλμένοι κτλ. We should add that 16.437 is in a passage (16.342-451) which Sittl afterwards treats as an interpolation (p. 103). Similarly his next instance 17.101-103 is in the supposed interpolation 17.31-166.
These lines, however, can be struck out without disturbing the context, and this circumstance, taken with the harsh anacoluthon μητέρα... ἄψ ἔτω, and the ambiguity of οἱ δὲ, justifies Sittl in regarding them as an interpolation. If this is so, they do not prove anything as to the relation of the first book to the second. Again, a few lines further on Athene urges Telemachus to take action against the Suitors (1.293 ff.). But she has just told him that if he hears of his father’s death he is to give his mother in marriage (1.292 ἀνὴρ μητέρα δοῦναι)—a step which would at once get rid of the Suitors. It is very probable, however, that 1.292 is interpolated from the parallel 2.223, and, if so, Kirchhoff’s argument fails. Again, in the speech of Telemachus to the Suitors we find seven lines (1.374–380), which he again addresses to them in the assembly (2.139–145). The repetition is evidently weak, and the effective line ἔξω μου μεγάρων Ἀλεξ οἱ ἀλεγόνεται δαίταις (2.139) is quite spoiled in the form ἔξων μεγάρων κτλ., which it assumes in order to fit the earlier context. Here also interpolation is highly probable.

It is possible that we should go further in striking out lines in the first book which recur in the second, or are otherwise superfluous: but the excisions proposed by Sittl are sufficient to save the book from the suspicion of being a piece of comparatively modern patchwork. In this way he not only repels the attack on the first book, but does much to defend the unity of the Odyssey as a whole. Kirchhoff, and other scholars who hold that it was formed by a combination of several shorter poems, cannot dispense with an ‘arranger.’ And since the first book has the character of an introduction to the completed Odyssey, it is to the arranger of the poem that that book is naturally assigned. But if with Sittl we reject the hypothesis of an ‘arranger,’ it becomes necessary to look elsewhere for the source of that unity of structure for which the Odyssey has been so long admired.

§ 12. Later references to a Telemachia.

Before we leave the subject of the Telemachia it will be well to follow Sittl in examining the passages in the second half of the Odyssey which refer to, or at least presuppose, the expedition of
THE TELEMACHIA

Telemachus. Such are—the return of Telemachus and his companions to Ithaca (15. 1–300), the landing of Telemachus (15. 495–557), his message to Penelope (16. 129 ff.), the return of his companions, and the proceedings of the Suitors on the failure of their ambush (16. 322–451), his meeting with Penelope (17. 31–166). These passages carry on the story of the ‘Telemachia’ and interweave it with the subsequent course of events. If the ‘Telemachia’ is an addition to the original Odyssey, they must have been inserted either by the author of that addition or by a still later hand. The second alternative—that which treats them as interpolations—is adopted by Sittl: but he admits that the evidence furnished by his method of comparing parallel verses does not go far to settle the question. Let us apply a different test.

It has been already remarked (p. 311) that in the Homeric poems the narrative is always approximately consecutive. The poet does not allow himself the licence of the modern historian or novelist, who often relates in successive chapters events that are supposed to have taken place at the same time. Moreover, it is a general rule in Homer that the narrative is also continuous. The incidents follow each without an appreciable interval. They fill the time of the poem, just as in a good picture the figures and other objects fill the space of the canvas. If there is an unavoidable pause in the main action, our attention is called away from it by a digression or subordinate episode. These rules, it will be seen, are especially significant, because especially difficult to observe, when the poet is really carrying on more than one thread of narrative. In the earlier part of the Odyssey, for example, there are in fact three parallel stories. From the second to the

81 The following are instances put forward by Sittl of repetition of the ‘Telemachia’ in the ‘Telemachian interpolations’:

Od. 15. 11–13 = 3. 314–316. It is urged that the journey of Telemachus cannot be γνώμη, if that word means ‘vain,’ after the account which he has had from Menelaus. But Menelaus has only given him hopos of the return of Ulysses.

16. 130–131 = 15. 41–42: see the remarks in the text, p. 316.
17. 44 δεν δύναται δωρία. These words, it is objected, are used here to include hearsay. But this is so also in the parallels, 3. 97, 4. 327: see the notes on these places.

17. 63–64 = 2. 11–13. The only defect here is that we are not told that Telemachus was going to the agora. Possibly a line has fallen out. If for 17. 62 we substitute the two lines 2. 16–11 the difficulty disappears.

It is surely an objection, at least from Sittl’s point of view, that these interpolations are scarcely possible unless we suppose an Ordoner or Bearbeiter. The task of continuing the Telemachia and fitting the continuation into a series of places in the later story is surely one that could not be left to fortuitous concurrence.
sixteenth book we follow the several fortunes of Ulysses on his return
from Calypso's island, of Telemachus on his way to Pylos and Sparta,
and of Penelope in Ithaca. Is the narrative in these books consecutive
and continuous? And if so, how is that result affected by the supposed
'Telemachian' interpolations?

Od. 15. 1–300. The fourteenth book ends at nightfall, with the long
dialogue between Ulysses and the faithful Eumaeus. The passage in
question begins before dawn (15. 56), and relates the return of Tele-
machus. It ends as Telemachus is approaching Ithaca, and then we are
taken back to the house of Eumaeus, where it is now supper-time. Thus
between 15. 1 and 15. 301 there is a gap of one or more days in the
story of Ulysses, which is filled up by the story of Telemachus. With
the passage which describes the return of Telemachus the narrative is
smooth and connected: without it there is a sensible hiatus in the
course of events.

Od. 15. 495–557. The landing of Telemachus takes place next
morning at dawn, and he reaches the house of Eumaeus immediately
after breakfast. Here it cannot be said that the passage fills a per-
ceptible blank. At the same time it is so managed as not to interrupt
the main action. And if (as Sittl holds) the original Odyssey made
Telemachus come from the city on a visit to his faithful servant, we
must suppose that a passage, or series of passages, describing the
occasion and circumstances of that visit has been skilfully excised.

Od. 16. 129 ff. According to Sittl (p. 102) the message addressed
to Eumaeus comes in abruptly at the end of Telemachus' speech.
It is difficult to assent to this criticism: the line ἀλλ' ἦ τοι μὲν ταῦτα
κτλ. surely forms a sufficient transition. On the other hand the
message cannot be struck out unless we also omit several passages
that refer to it, viz. 16. 138 (ἦ καὶ Λαύρη τῇ ἔνθα ὁδὼν ἀγγείλας Ἐλθεῖν),
16. 150 (ὑπερ οὐ γὰρ ἀγγείλας ἐπίθετο κτλ.), 16. 467 (ἀγγείλας εἰπότα κτλ.).
Moreover, the recognition scene which immediately follows between
Ulysses and his son implies the absence of Eumaeus: cp. 16. 155
οὐδ' ἐρ' Ἀθηνὴν ληθεῖν ἀπὸ σταθμοῦ κεῖν Ἐμαίως ἐφορβός. With these
difficulties it is not surprising that Sittl has not made it clear where
he would place the inferior limit of the interpolation.

Od. 16. 321–451. The events related in these lines serve to fill up
the time between the departure of Eumaeus in the morning (16. 155)
and his return in the evening to his house (16. 452). If they are left
out there is nothing to occupy the day except the recognition of
Ulysses by his son, which takes place immediately after Eumaeus
leaves them.
THE COMPOSITION OF THE ODYSSEY

Od. 17. 31-166. The earlier part of the next day is occupied by the return of Telemachus to the palace and his meeting with Penelope. The omission of the meeting would certainly tend to break the continuity of the story.

The result of our examination seems to be to show that these five passages, which form the natural sequel to the expedition of Telemachus, cannot be treated as interpolations without impairing and indeed destroying the structure of the narrative in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth books. But if these passages must stand, it follows a fortiori that the earlier books which relate that expedition are part of the original Odyssey. Moreover, besides the incidents which directly presuppose the 'Telemachia,' there are references and allusions that are not less conclusive. Thus Eumaeus receives Telemachus ὡς ἐκ βανδόου φυγόντα (16. 21), and speaks of his going to Pylos (16. 24). His absence is implied in the questions which he asks about his mother (16. 33-35). The ambush of the Suitors is mentioned in the short dialogue between Telemachus and Eumaeus (16. 460-477). Again, the recent danger of Telemachus is not only referred to in his meeting with Penelope, but is indicated earlier in the seventeenth book by her excessive anxiety about him: cp. 17. 7-9 οὐ γὰρ μεν πρῶτον παύσωσθαι ὑπὲ... πρὶν γ' αὐτῶν με θηρασ. Indeed the only important passage in this part of the Odyssey which is not more or less 'Telemachian' is the recognition scene between Ulysses and Telemachus. It will be difficult to reconstruct a 'primitive Odyssey' with that scene better placed than in the existing context.

§ 13. Books V-XII.

The eight books which follow the 'Telemachia' are taken up with the wanderings of Ulysses over the seas and shores of the Outer Geography. The chief heresy—if we may venture so to call it—about the composition of this part of the poem is that of Kirchhoff, who sees in it the work of two different periods. In his view the books from the fifth to the ninth (inclusive) form an older stratum, the older Νέατος or Return of Ulysses; while the tenth and twelfth represent a later Νέατος, in which some of the motifs of earlier stories are repeated. Thus Circe is a double of Calypso, and some features

22 To this list should be added the speech put into the mouth of Theoclymenus, with the reply of the Suitors (20. 345-394). He is a figure in the Telemachia.
belong originally to the tale of the Argonautic expedition. The fountain Αρτακις, which is common to the Odyssey (10. 108) and the Argonautica, belongs historically to the latter, being in fact a spring in the neighbourhood of Cyzicus. The Πλαιαρταί of Homer are the same as the Symplegades, the Laestrygones are the Doliones, and Medea is another Circe. It is not difficult to show the weakness of reasoning based on coincidences of this kind. The word Αρτακις, which is the only name common to the two cycles of legend, may have had a meaning that made it applicable to any fountain. The other resemblances are only such as may be traced in any two sets of popular stories. Kirchhoff finds support for his theory in certain indications which seem to him to prove that the story of the tenth and twelfth books was originally told of Ulysses (in the third person), whereas the ninth book was composed originally as a story told by him. These indications he sees in passages which relate things that Ulysses could not be supposed to know, e.g. the doings of his crew while he was asleep (10. 1-76., 12. 339-365), or in his absence (10. 210-243). It is unlikely, however, that an ancient poet would feel the necessity of this kind of verisimilitude—especially if autobiographical narrative was a new form of epic art.


We can have little hesitation in recognizing one or two short interpolations in the Phaeacian episode. Chief of these is the song of Demodocus (8. 266-369), the so-called 'comedy of the gods.' The whole tone and style of this piece is unworthy of Homer, and indeed is below the level of serious epic poetry. Moreover the language is clearly post-Homeric: in particular the later forms Ἡλιος (for ἵλιος, 8. 271), 'Αρεί (at the end of line 8. 276), 'Ερμην (for 'Ερμειαν, 8. 334): also some words and forms borrowed from the Πιαδ, as ἐκαρβδος, ἀλασκοπη, τὸ = for which reason.

In the description of the palace and gardens of Alcinous in the seventh book a considerable interpolation was first pointed out by L. Friedländer. That description, it will be noticed, is introduced into the story at the point where Ulysses is about to enter the palace, and is given as an account of what he then saw. It is therefore in

---

83 For an excellent criticism of Kirchhoff's theory see Georg Schmidt, Uber Kirchhoff's Odysseestudien, Kempten 1879.

84 Philologus, 1851, pp. 669 ff.
the past tense, the verbs being imperfects or pluperfects; as ὢς τε γὰρ ἥκισον αὐγή πέλευ (l. 84), and so down to l. 102. But from l. 103 the verbs are in the ‘principal’ tenses: ἀληθείουσι (l. 104), ὑφόωσι, στρεψόμεν (l. 105), ἀληθεία (l. 113), πεφυκασί (l. 114), &c., and this form is kept up till l. 131, where the parenthetical ὅπως ὑπεριώντω πολίται somewhat abruptly returns to the imperfect. The main thread of the narrative is then taken up in the same tense: τοῖς ἄρ' ἐν Ἀλκιβιάδου θεῶν ἴσων ἄγλα ἄρα. There can be no doubt that the use of the present in ll. 103–131 is contrary to Homeric usage, and is especially inadmissible after the past tenses of ll. 84–102. Moreover, the reference of the pronoun ὅλ in l. 103 (νερῶντο μὲν ὅλων κτλ.) and 122 (ἐνα βαν ὅλων κτλ.) is not sufficiently clear. And the account of the garden, with orchard and vineyard, placed at the gate of the αἰλή, in the middle of the town, does not agree very well with the words of Nausicaa, 6. 293–294 ἐνα βαν ὅλων τόμων τεβαλυά τ' ἀλω, ἔναν ὅλως ἐπὶ ὅλως ὅς τοι γήγων βοήσει.

The chief remaining difficulty in regard to the Phaeacian episode is caused by the repetition of an incident in the story. After the feast given by Alcinous in honour of the arrival of Ulysses the minstrel Demodocus is introduced, and sings of a famous quarrel between Ulysses and Achilles. Thereat Ulysses covers his head with his robe, and weeps silently: Alcinous alone observes him, and brings the singing to an end (8. 93–103). After supper the same thing happens. Demodocus, at the request of Ulysses himself, sings of the Wooden Horse. Ulysses again weeps; Alcinous again notices it and interferes —this time inviting Ulysses to tell them who he is (8. 521 ff.). Is there any repetition here which an ancient epic poet would seek to avoid? The object of the passage evidently is to lead up to the story of the wanderings. Alcinous is to be convinced that the unknown stranger is one of the heroes of the war, and so to be led to ask for his name. For that purpose the repetition is proper and natural. The first time that Alcinous notices his guest’s emotion he says nothing about it to the others. The second time he feels that he may ask for an explanation. Nitzsch, who sees no difficulty in the fact of a repetition, is struck by the number of events compressed into a single day. After the agora of the morning comes the δείπνον given to the chiefs, then the song of Demodocus, then the games of various kinds (in some of which Ulysses takes a part); after these the δόρπον, the second song of Demodocus, and finally the story which fills the next four books. In this there is no doubt a degree of improbability. But it is not the kind of improbability that would
be readily felt in oral recitation. The Greek listener was doubtless quick to perceive a want of smoothness or continuity in a tale or poem. It does not follow that he would be able or inclined to measure the time that a given series of events would occupy. Nevertheless, the poet does make a sort of apology for the length of the story.

§ 15. The ἀνάμνεσις.

The eleventh book of the Odyssey relates the ἀνάμνεσις or (more strictly) ἐπιμνηματική, in which Ulysses called to him the spirits of the dead, and had converse with them. The book stands very much apart from the other adventures, and scholars have been disposed to regard it as a later addition. In any case it has suffered considerable interpolation, by which indeed the character of the episode has been materially affected. The voyage to the region of the dead is undertaken at the bidding of Circe, in order that an oracle may be obtained from the spirit of the soothsayer Tiresias. Ulysses is to go to a place on the shore of the river Oceanus, and there perform sacrifices and incantations which will draw the multitudes of the dead to him. This he does, and as each ghost is allowed to drink of the blood of the sacrifice, it is enabled to speak to him. In this way he consults Tiresias, then speaks with his own mother, and many other famous women of past generations, finally with Agamemnon, Achilles, and Ajax. Ajax refuses to speak, and returns, like the rest, to the darkness (l. 564). At this point there is a break: Ulysses desires to see more of the heroes of the past. He does so, but in a different way. The ghosts no longer come at his bidding: he sees them in their places, carrying on, in a shadowy way, the occupations of life—Minos judging, Orion hunting, Heracles shooting with the bow. Others, again, are expiating the crimes of their life-time: such are Tantalus, Sisyphus, &c. This part (ll. 565–627) must be an interpolation, belonging to the age when the notion of future retribution had gained a place in Greek theology.

33 The improbability is at least as great in Virgil's imitation of this scene. The story told by Aeneas in the second and third books of the Aeneid is supposed to begin after midnight, when 'night is past the meridian, and the sinking stars invite to sleep' (Aen. 2, 8–9). See the remarks of Wilamowitz, Hom. Unters. p. 117 (note).
34 See Od. 11, 330 ἀλλὰ καὶ δρῆ ἐδεικνύ, and the reply of Alcinous in 11, 373 τις ἡδε μᾶλα μακρὰς ἀδιάφορος, ὀβδέ τω δρήν εἴδειν ἐν μεγάφρ.
§ 16. *The Continuation* (Od. 23. 297 ff.).

According to Aristarchus and other ancient critics the *Odyssey* originally ended with the line 23. 296—

αστάιοι λίτριοι πολαιοὶ θεμένι Νέμω.

The remainder of the existing text, in their view, was a later addition, designed to satisfy the Greek hearer or reader, who naturally desired to know how the blood-feud created by the slaying of the Suitors was appeased, and how Ulysses was finally established in his kingdom. It is evident that that object is satisfactorily attained by the narrative of Od. 23. 197 ff., in which also a place is found for one more 'recognition'—the meeting of Ulysses with his father Laertes.

In this narrative, again,—which we may call the 'continuation'—there are two passages which, in the opinion of Aristarchus, were still later interpolations, viz.—(1) a brief summary, hardly more than a versified table of contents, of the adventures of Ulysses (23. 310—343); and (2) the Second Νέμων (24. 1—204), or account of the descent into Hades of the ghosts of the Suitors.

The reasons for accepting the judgment of the ancient critics as to the 'continuation' of the *Odyssey* are to be found partly in the general character of the story, and partly in the many traces of post-Homeric language and ideas. The battle in which Ulysses with the aid of Telemachus and a few servants meets and vanquishes the united forces of Ithaca, is ill-conceived and improbable in the highest degree. After the great combat of the twenty-second book, which forms the real dénouement of the poem, a further scene of the same character could not be anything but an anti-climax. It has been urgent that the relatives of the Suitors were under the obligation, which no ancient poet could ignore, of avenging the death of their kinsmen. It may surely be replied that the author of the *Odyssey*, if he had felt the necessity of saving his hero from this difficulty, would have found a better way of doing so.

In the μετατροπή, as we have seen, nothing is more worthy of notice than the efforts which the poet makes to bring the incidents within the bounds of probability. He represents his hero as facing fearful odds, but he takes care at the same time to lay stress on the various circumstances that lessen or at least disguise the strangeness of the result. The Suitors are taken by surprise, they are unarmed,
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they are crowded together in a disadvantageous position, &c. But in
the ‘continuation’ no such attempt is made to give the story an air of
credibility. The consequence is that the concluding incidents are
unnatural in themselves, and that they caricature the most important
part of the poem. We pass from the crowning moment in the
fortunes of Ulysses to the state of mind described by Horace in the
words *quodcunque ostendis mihi sic incredulus odi.*

Most of the other traces of post-Homeric workmanship in the
passage now in question have been noticed in the commentary: but
it may be useful to add a brief summary of them here. They fall
under the following heads:—

(1) Non-Homeric or doubtful forms: ἦν (23. 316., 24. 343),
ἐξεῖνος (24. 288, 312, 437); the contractions προθυμψα (24. 360),

(2) Grammar: the Optative in *oratio obliqua* (24. 237), the unem-
phatic use of *αὐτὸν* (24. 241, 282), enclitics misplaced (24. 247, 332,
335, 337), the later use of the article (24. 497).

(3) Metre: ἑπικλας (23. 361): the synizesis in *ἐ β γ χ ε ὦ* πράσιν (24. 247),
the lengthening by position in *ἐ νέεσσιν* (24. 240).

(4) Vocabulary: Ἡρωίνεα (ἐ Ὕσε, 23. 347): ἐ Ὡ ξα (24. 245),
ζειν (24. 286), ὑπαρχω (ibid.), ἐπικεφαλέω (24. 386).

(5) Geography: the mention of Σικανία (24. 307).

(6) Imitation of Homer: see the notes on 24. 235–240, 248, 368,
534, 535.

In the ‘continuation,’ again, is inserted the passage known as the
Second *Νίκωα.* The *junctura* is shown by the lines which form the
transition to the *Νίκωα* (23. 371–372), and back to the ‘continuation’
(24. 203–204). The words in 24. 205 ὁ δ’ ἔναι ἐκ πόλεως κατέβαιν refer
back to 23. 370. The internal evidence for a post-Homeric date is
not less strong than in the case of the ‘continuation,’ but it is of
a somewhat different kind, turning not so much upon the forms of
the language as upon traces of later ideas and beliefs. Thus the form
Ἐρμης is probably later; but the same may be said still more
decidedly of the epithet Κυλλήνιος and the attribute ψυχωτορμώς, as
well as of the admission to Hades of the souls of men who were
unburied (24. 187), and indeed of the whole conception of the way
to the under-world (see the note on 24. 11–12). The traces of
borrowing or imitation of Homeric passages are frequent. The
dialogue between Achilles and Agamemnon (24. 23–100) can hardly
be uninfluenced by the scenes of the eleventh book, and (as Aristarchus
observed) is not in place here. The speech of Amphimedon repeats
the passage about Penelope’s web, which has already occurred twice (24.128–146: see the note on 24.128), as well as other incidents already familiar to the hearer (24.150 ff.). Imitation of the *Iliad* may be seen in the use of πρῶ (24.28), διάσω (24.30), φόβος (24.57), ἰγνωμενία (24.155), and the phrases λευσμένοι ἵππονύμην (24.40) and οὐ καὶ πρὸς θνήμα τοιοῦτο βουλή (24.52). The mention of Clytemnestra as taking part in the murder of Agamemnon indicates a post-Homeric version of the event: but it is found also in the former *hexa* (11.410, 453). The ‘nine Muses’ (24.60) are not elsewhere heard of in Homer, who uses either the singular, as in the invocations at the beginning of the two great poems, or a vague plural. In this passage there is an abrupt change to the singular (24.62 Μοῖσιν λέγει). It will be seen that the arguments for the later date of these passages are overwhelming. The same may be said of the Song of Demodocus (8.266–369), and of the incident of the gifts extorted from the Suitors by Penelope (see the notes on Od. 18.158 ff.). These examples may serve to show the difficulty of making an interpolation or continuation of one of the Homeric poems without betraying the difference of date and authorship.

The general conclusion in these matters has never been better expressed than by Wolf himself, in the Preface to his Homer (Halis 1794), p. xxii:

‘Quoties abucto ab historicis argumentis animo redeo ad continentem Homeri lectionem et interpretationem, ... atque ita penitus immergor in illum veluti prono et liquido alveo decurrentem tenorem actionum et narrationum: quoties animadvertus ac reputo mecum, quam in universum aestimanti unus his Carminibus insit color, aut certe quam egregie Carmini utrique suus color constet, quam apta ubique tempora rebus, res temporibus, aliquot loci adeo sibi alludentes congruant et constant, quam denique equabiliter in primariis personis eadem lineamenta servetur et ingeniorems et animorum: vix mihi quisquam irascri et succensere gravius poterit quam ipse facio mihi, &c.’

And a little further on—

‘Odyssea, ut dixi, longe admirabilior est virtutibus illis compositionis, atque numeris huius artis omnibus absolution. Imprimis operis illius integritas tanta est, quantam vix ullum aliud epos habet.’

Y 2
APPENDIX

II. RELATION OF THE ODYSSEY TO THE ILIAD.

§ 1. Influence of the Iliad on the narrative of the Odyssey.

A brief sentence in the Poetics of Aristotle contains the germ of much of the thought that has been directed in ancient and modern times to the comparison of the two Homeric poems. ‘The Iliad,’ says Aristotle, ‘is simple and pathetic, the Odyssey is complex, dealing throughout in recognitions, and ethical.’ That is to say, the Iliad is a straightforward story, the essentials of which are the wrong done to the hero, and the grief suffered by him through the loss of his friend: the Odyssey is a story with a developed plot, in which the interest turns upon the play of character and the final triumph of right over wrong. Yet notwithstanding the difference in artistic aim and method implied by this pregnant criticism, it does not appear that Aristotle felt the least doubt of the Iliad and Odyssey being the work of the same great poet. The first trace of any such doubt among Greek scholars belongs (so far as is known) to the Alexandrian age.

In later times, when the heresy of the χωρίζοντες, or ‘separators’ of Iliad and Odyssey, had been confuted by Aristarchus, and no longer troubled the republic of letters, the critics and rhetoricians must have felt the need of a theory of some kind to account for the common authorship of the two poems. A specimen of such a theory may be seen in a celebrated passage of Longinus, in which it is maintained that Homer wrote the Iliad in the prime of his life, the Odyssey in his declining years—when, like the setting sun, he had lost the intensity

---

1 Arist. Poet. 1459 b 13 καὶ τῶν ποιημάτων ἐκάτερον συνέστηκεν ἢ μὲν Ἰλιάδος ἀπελεύσατο καὶ παθητικόν, ἢ δὲ Ὀδύσσεια πενελεγμένον (ἀναγράφει τις περὶ δίολον) καὶ ἱστορικόν.
2 In the treatise πρὸς τὸ Εἰνονος παράδοσον.
3 Longinus, De Subl. c. 9 δείκνυσις δὲ ἀκατακαταρτητέον τῆς Ὀδύσσειας (καὶ δὲ ταύτα πολλάν ἔνεκα προσενεκτηρίσθεν), διὸ μεγάλη φύσεως ὑποφερομένης ἢ ἂν ἦτον ἐστών ἐν γὰρ τοῦ φιλομούχου, δήλως γὰρ ἐν πολλάν τοῦ ὄλλου συνεθετικοῦ ταύτῃ διάτηρερ κατὰ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, ἀντὶ δὲ κατὰ τὸν λείπον τῶν Ἰλιακῶν παθητικῶν διὰ τῆς Ὀδύσσειας, ὥστε οἰσισίδα τινα τῶν Τραγικοῦ πολλοῖς, προσενεκτηρίσθεν. οὐ γὰρ ἄλλο ἢ τῆς Ἰλιάδος ἔπισθεν ἢ Ὀδύσσειαν.
4 ἦι δὲ μὲν Αἴας κατὰ ἀρχήν, ἦπα ὧν Ἡχέλλεως, ἦπα δὲ Πάτροκλος θεόφιλος μὴστωρ ἀτάλατος, ἦπα δὲ ἡμὸς φίλος ὑλός.
5 ἀν δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς αἰτίας, οὕτω, τῆς μὲν Ἰλιάδος γραφομένης ἐν ἀκκύρω πνεύματος, ἔλην τοῦ συμμάτου δραματικοῦ ἐπεστηθάτο καὶ ἐναγομένην. τῆς δὲ Ὀδύσσειας τὸ πνεῦμα διηγηματικόν, ἄλλω ἦν γὰρ ὑπό. οὕτων ἐν τῇ Ὀδύσσειᾳ παρείληπα τε ἐν καταδυνάμει τῶν Ὀμηροῦ ἦλιον, οὐ δέχα τῆς σφαδέτητος παραμένει τὸ μέγεθος.
of his power, but not his greatness. We may be unable to accept this as a full explanation of the distinctive qualities of each of the two poems; but it is worthy of notice as a recognition of the critical problem which they present. And some at least of the considerations urged by Longinus are still valid as arguments for the later date of the Odyssey. There is much truth in the remark that the Odyssey serves up the broken fragments of the feast that was spread before us in the Trojan story. For most of the great figures of that war—Achilles and Patroclus, Ajax, Hector, Agamemnon—have passed away; and others, like Nestor and Menelaus, are ending their days in peace. In the Odyssey, along with the fortunes of the last Trojan hero, we have much gathering up of incidents or episodes, now only memories of past deeds; and generally a spirit of retrospect, such as befits the epilogue (as Longinus calls it) of the whole drama. Such a poem, it is evident, could not come into existence until the Trojan war had been celebrated, and that in song as well as in story.

The view of the Odyssey set forth in this passage will show that the ancients, who were guided by a poetical instinct rather than by definite reasons, were led some way in the direction of a 'separatist' theory of the two Homeric poems. It will also give an idea of the more or less fanciful speculation which enabled them to acquiesce in the traditional belief.

Among the modern scholars who have pursued a similar vein of inquiry, with the object of framing a theory of the relation of the Odyssey to the Iliad, one of the most suggestive is the German writer already quoted. He has been especially successful in pointing out the peculiar tacit recognition of the Iliad which may be traced in the later poem. The Odyssey, he shows, is full of references to the story of the Trojan war—indeed it virtually ignores all the other cycles of legend—yet it never repeats or refers to any incident related in the Iliad. The incidents to which it does refer are in the style of the Iliad: they turn upon the same characters and motifs, but these characters and motifs are presented in new combinations. Thus, to take those in which Ulysses is an actor—

The πολεμία, or visit of Ulysses in disguise, related by Helen in Od. 4. 240–264, is an adventure much in the manner of the Doloneia.

The story of the Wooden Horse, as told by Menelaus (Od. 4. 265 ff.), is meant to bring out another side of the character of Ulysses, viz. his firmness.

4 B. Niese, Die Entwicklung der homerischen Poesie, pp. 43–45.
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The wrestling match in Lesbos (Od. 4. 342 ff., 17. 133 ff.) is or may be suggested by the mention of Lesbos in Il. 9. 129, 271.

The combat over the body of Achilles, referred to in Od. 5. 309–310, is evidently parallel to the combat over Patroclus in Il. 17. 717 ff. (see p. 358).

The quarrels that occupy so much space as motifs in the story—of Ulysses and Achilles (Od. 8. 75), of Ulysses and Ajax (Od. 11. 543 ff.), of Agamemnon and Menelaus (Od. 3. 136)—are apparently reflexions of the great quarrel of Achilles with Agamemnon.

In other instances we recognize the desire to carry on the story beyond the point at which the Iliad left it, and in doing so to make use of any hint that the Iliad supplies. To this class of incident we may assign the story of the death of Achilles, of which the Iliad offers vague prophecies (Il. 21. 277, 22. 359): the coming of Thetis to lament her son: the contest for the arms of Achilles: the part played by Neoptolemus, who is only once mentioned in the Iliad (19. 327): the death of Antilochus: the murder of Agamemnon, and all the misfortunes of the return from Troy. Finally the actual capture of Troy forms a necessary complement to the siege described in the Iliad; though the story of the Wooden Horse is hardly one that we can suppose the author of the Iliad to have known or accepted in an epic narrative.

These examples seem to show that the influence of the Iliad upon the story and incidents of the Odyssey was of much the same kind as that which was exercised by the two Homeric poems upon the early post-Homeric epics. The remark applies especially to the earliest of the 'cyclic poets,' viz. Arctinus. In the works of that successor and 'disciple' of Homer, as will be pointed out*, there is not much direct borrowing from the master. His aim was rather to imitate and carry further the epic story which he found in the Iliad and Odyssey: even as the poet of the Odyssey seems himself to have dealt with the Iliad, and doubtless also with the other early epic poets of whom he has given us pictures in his Phemius and Demodocus.

Among the arguments which go to show the comparative lateness of the Odyssey these pictures certainly deserve a place. The Iliad, indeed, mentions κλέα ἀγῶνων, 'stories of heroes' sung to the lyre (Il. 9. 189); and the adjective δοίγων, 'matter of song,' is used in a way that implies narrative poetry (Il. 6. 358). But it is in the

* Regarding the first-mentioned quarrel see the remarks on p. 296.

* See the remarks on pp. 355, 377.
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Odyssey that we first meet with the professional epic 'singer' (ἀγανακτής), occupying a clearly recognized place in the social system. This is a difference that can hardly be accounted for except as the result of a movement partly literary and partly social, which must have taken a considerable time. It was in fact the growth of a new calling.

§ 2. Passages of the Iliad borrowed or imitated in the Odyssey.

Among the characteristic features of Greek epic poetry nothing is more marked than the freedom with which it allows the repetition of language already used. Favourite epithets or phrases, lines or half-lines, and even long descriptive passages, recur as often as the poet has occasion for them. Sometimes we almost feel that the Homeric singer is not using a language of his own, but is ringing the changes on a stock of traditional verbiage, some of which has even ceased to convey a clear meaning*. If this were so it would be impossible, generally speaking, to draw conclusions regarding the comparative originality, and hence the earlier or later date, of identical passages. All would be equally derived from a conventional storehouse, accumulated in pre-Homeric times.

An examination of the numerous repetitions in the Iliad and Odyssey soon shows that they are not all of the same nature*. In many instances, no doubt, they arise from the epic use of conventional words and phrases, or conventional bits of description—a sacrifice, the arming of a warrior, his fall in battle, the landing from a ship, the setting forth of a god or goddess on a journey*⁰. A few cases are due to the rule that a message is first given to the messenger, and is then repeated word for word to the person for whom it is intended.

The nearest approach to such a character in the Iliad is the singer Thamyris, who, however, is only mentioned in the Catalogue (Il. 4. 595). The ἄδεξε of the twenty-fourth book (Il. 24. 720) are not poets or reciters, but mourners employed to perform the lamentations (θρήνου) that are in vogue in oriental countries. The ἄδεξε who appears in modern texts of Il. 18. 604 has been foisted in against all the MSS.

It may be noticed that the calling of the λαρσός seems to have undergone a similar development in the time between the Iliad and the Odyssey: see Od. 4. 231.

* This feeling is expressed in an epigram of Pollinius, Anthol. xi. 130:


They even go the length (the epigrammatist goes on to say) of 'conveying' μὴν ἀνεῖλῃ θεά.

⁰ The chief monograph on the subject has been already referred to (p. 310), viz. the excellent work of Karl Sittl, Die Wiederholungen in der Odyssee (München 1883).
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Others, again, are spurious instances, arising from the interpolation of lines that belong to a different context. But many passages remain in which we have to recognize borrowing, or at least close imitation—passages, that is to say, in which the poet imitates a predecessor—even as Virgil imitates Homer and Lucretius, or as Persius imitates Horace. If, after rejecting repetitions that fall under other categories, we are able to point to a sufficient number of passages tending to show that the author of the Odyssey imitates the Iliad, and if no considerable instances can be produced of the converse, we obtain strong confirmation of the view taken above regarding the relative age of the poems.

In choosing examples from the long list in Sittl's book (pp. 10–61) it will be convenient to take no notice for the present of those parts of the Iliad and Odyssey which are generally regarded as later than the rest of the poem. Such are—in the Iliad, the Catalogue, the 'Doloneia,' the story of Nestor in ii. 670–762, the last book: in the Odyssey, the song of Demodocus (8.266–369), the Néusa, the 'continuation' (23.297 ff.).

(1) Od. i. 358–359 μῦθος ὁ ἄνδρεσι μελήσει | πᾶσι, μάλιστα ὁ ἐμι, τοῦ γὰρ κράτος ἵτο ἐν ὅλῃ. Also in Od. ii. 352–353, with τὸ ὀφν in place of μῦθος.

The original of both passages is evidently II. 6. 492–493 πῶλεμος ὁ ἄνδρεσι μελήσει πᾶσι, ἐμι δὲ μάλιστα, τοῦ 'Δημ. ἔγγυμαν. These clear and impressive words doubtless passed into a sort of proverb: the substitution of μῦθος or ὀφν for πῶλεμος is just such an adaptation as proverbial words are apt to suffer. See the note on Od. ii. 352.

(2) Od. i. 398 καὶ δὲ μόνον ὅσο μοι λήσαντο διὰς 'Οδυσσεὺς.

Cp. II. 18. 28 δὲ μόνον ὅ ὀσ 'Αχιλλεις λήσαντο, where the phrase implies that capture in war was the chief or only mode of obtaining slaves. This may be true for the Iliad, but is certainly not true for the Odyssey (1. 430, 14. 450).

(3) Od. iii. 245 τὰς γὰρ δὴ μὲν φασιν ἀναχασθαν γενε' ἄνδρεσ. This seems to come from II. i. 250–252, where it is said that Nestor lived for three generations, and was a king in the third—a not very improbable statement, of which the line in the Odyssey is an obvious exaggeration.

(4) Od. iii. 291 ἐνὶ διαμῆχας τῶν μὲν Κρήτη ἐπιλασθεῖ (of ships).

In ii. 21. 3 ἐνὶ διαμῆχας τῶν μὲν πτλ., applied to the cutting off of troops in the field, is more natural than when used of the scattering of ships in a storm. And, as Sittl observes, the reference of τὰ to ηὐσο, four lines back, is somewhat harsh.
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(5) Od. 4.527 μήσαντο δὲ διόρδος διήζη.
This is almost a fixed formula in the Iliad, imitated or borrowed in
the Odyssey.

(6) Od. 4.829 δὲ νῦν μὲ προεὶς τεῦ τάδε μυθοσάθως.
The use of τάδε where we expect τοῦτα is suspicious: in the parallel
II. 11. 201 τάδε refers to what follows.

(7) Od. 7.197 πείσται ἄσοοι οὐ αὖρα κατὰ Κλαθές τε (v. i. Κατακλαθές τε)
βαρίσα | γυνομένῳ νήσαστο λίμπῃ, ὅτε μν τίκε μήτηρ.
Cp. II. 20.127 τά πείσται ἄσοοι οὐ αὖρα γυνομένῳ ἐπένεε κτλ.
The addition of the Κλαθές (or Κατακλαθές) to the simple ἄσω of the
Iliad is surely later. It brings us within sight of Κλαθές and her sister
Fates in Hesiod.

(8) Od. 8.258 ἐντελεῖ πάντες ἀκίς (=II. 7.161).
That there were nine champions of the Greeks is part of the story
in the Iliad (7.161, 8.266): but for the Phaeacian judges the number
is arbitrary.

(9) Od. 9.350 σὺ δὲ μαθεῖν ὀκεῖν' ἀκτένι.
In II. 8.355 δὲ μαθέται ὀκεῖν' ἀκτένες is said of the furious career of
a warrior in the field. It does not apply to the Cyclops.

(10) Od. 10.162 τὸ δὲ ἀτυχῶ ὑπὸ κάλλεων ἐκπέρησε.
In II. 16.346 these words describe a spear passing through the neck
of an antagonist. Sending a spear through the back of a stag would
be an improbable feat.

(11) Od. 13.5 τῷ Ὠ' ὄ τι παλμπηλαγγέβατα γ' διώ | δῆλ ἀπονουστήσων.
These words are hardly intelligible except as an imitation of II. 1.59
νῦν ἄμμε παλμπηλαγγέβατα διώ κτλ.

(12) Od. 14.156 ἐχθρὸς γὰρ μοι κεῖνος ὑμῶν 'Αἴδαυ πύλης | γήγεται.
In II. 9.312 the verb is left unexpressed—to the advantage of the
sense. In the Odyssey γῆγεται is a weak addition.

(13) Od. 14.419 οι δ' ἐν εἰλεγμῷ μᾶλα πίονα πενταέρηθον.
From II. 2.402 αὐτὸ ὅ βοῶν ἐρευσιν . . . πίονα πενταέρηθον. ‘Five
years old’ is right for an ox, but does not apply in the case of
a pig, which at that age is too old for use.

11 In regard to the two readings in Od. 7.197 it may be observed that (1)
the tmesis involved in taking κατα τε with νῆσαστο in the next line is extremely harsh;
(2) the root-nouns of the form Κλαθές are rare, but are not infrequent in composition,
especially with prepositions: e. g. ἀπορρόφε, παρακλάθης, ἐκ φαλῆς, σύζης,
κατατρύ (7), also the adverbial θεῦδα, ἐπικεφ, ἐπιμελ., &c.: (3) the name Κλαθές,
being in form a shortened name (Kesenames), is more likely to be derived from
a compound such as Κατα-κλαθές than from the simple Κλαθές.
12 ‘Le boeuf immolé par Agamemnon a cinq ans: rien de mieux: mais un porc
de cinq ans a depuis longtemps acquis toute sa taille, et n'a plus qu'une chair dure
et coriace. On mange les porcs même dès avant la fin de la première année;
et ils ne sont guère bons que jusqu'à trois ans’ (Pierro, a. l.).
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(14) Od. 15. 161 αἰτέοι ἀργῷ χίρα φίλων ἀνύξεσι πελάθοι.
This is an abbreviated imitation of Il. 12. 201–202 αἰτέοι . . . φωνήνα δρακοντα φίλων ἀνύξεσι πελάθοι. The adjective πελάθοι is appropriate to a serpent, but the application of it to a goose gives a certain mock-heroic effect.

(15) Od. 15. 479 ἀνθλή δ' ἐνδούπησε πεσοῦς ὡς κτλ.
This seems an adaptation of the conventional δαιπύτευν δε πετών.

(16) Od. 17. 541 μέγ' ἑπαρεν, ἀμφὶ δὲ δῶμα | σμερδιλέων καμβῆσκε.
The phrase is used in the Iliad of the shout of an army (Il. 2. 334, 16. 277), of its tread (Il. 2. 466), of the rattle of armour (Il. 13. 498, 15. 648, 21. 255, 593). Applied, as here, to the sound of a sneeze it has the effect of a parody.

(17) Od. 21. 125 τρίς μέν μιν πελίμβην ἑρνάσεσθαι μεμαίνων.
These words are used here of the effort to string a bow, but in Il. 21. 176 of tugging at a spear to pull it out of the ground. It can hardly be doubted that this latter use gives a better sense to πελίμβην 'shook' and ἑρνάσεσθαι 'to pull to himself.'

(18) Od. 21. 335 παρὸς δ' ἐξ ἄγαθοι γένος ἑξεταὶ ἐμενα ὑλός.
The origin of this pleonastic sentence is, to be found in Il. 14. 113 παρὸς δ' ἐξ ἄγαθοι καὶ ἐγὼ γένος ἐκχώμαι ἐώι. The words καὶ ἐγὼ had to be omitted, and ὑλός was put in to fill the place in the verse.

(19) Od. 22. 73 ἄλλα μαχαῖμεθα χάρμης.
The phrase occurs in Il. 15. 477, 19. 148. The word χάρμη is quite common in the Iliad, but does not occur in any other place in the Odyssey. It is evidently a reminiscence of the Iliad.

(20) Od. 22. 233 παρ' ἵμ' ἵστασο.
This phrase, which is almost conventional in the Iliad (Il. 314, 17. 179), would imply that Ulysses was to leave his place and go to Athene: whereas the reverse is the case.

(21) Od. 22. 296 ἥμητι δὲ προνήσε.
This is also taken from a battle in the Iliad (5. 58), and is incorrect. Leiochirus, being struck in front, would not fall forwards. In the Iliad, as Siti shows, the rule is that those who are wounded in front fall backwards, and vice versa: except in Il. 12. 396 ff., where Sarpedon draws the spear from the wound, and the man falls with it.

(22) Od. 22. 308–309 τῶν ἐνπροσφάδες τῶν δὲ στῶν ἄρντ' ἀμφὶς | κράτων τυπομένων, δακτόδων δ' ἄπαν ἄμας στὺν.
This couplet occurs in Il. 21. 20–21, with the difference that in place of κράτων τυπομένων we find δομιθεωμένων—doubtless the original formula, altered because in the slaughter of the Suitors Ulysses was

not armed with a sword. The substitution is not quite successful: πράσων πυθμόνων has not a clear construction; and ἐπιστροφέω does not suit a battle fought with the spear only.

(23) Od. 22. 494 μέγαρον καὶ δῶμα καὶ αὐλήν.

In Il. 6. 316 θέλαμον καὶ δῶμα καὶ αὐλήν expresses the three parts of a complete dwelling. Probably μέγαρον was substituted here, because that part especially needed purification: but the phrase thus became tautologous, since δῶμα is properly = μέγαρον.

(24) Od. 17. 57 (=19. 29, 21. 386, 22. 398) τῇ ἄτερπῳ ἐπιτερμὸν.

This half-line must have been formed as an allusion to the ἐνεα περβοτα of the Iliad. It is not intelligible on any other supposition.

In some other cases the spirit of parody is shown by the use of a lofty epic formula where the subject is unworthy of it. Thus the sties in the farm-yard of Eumaeus (14. 13–15) imitate the palace of Priam (Il. 6. 244 ff.: note πεντήκοιτα and πληθίων ἀλλήλων). The epithet of the dogs, ὀλυκόμοι (14. 29), is a parody of the epic ἐγχισόμοι. Again, in the story of Irus, the language of the Iliad is borrowed or parodied: e.g. in 18. 5 πότινα μήτηρ (of the mother of Irus); 18. 46 ὀπτότερος δὲ κε μεήγη κτλ. (from the duel of Paris and Menelaus, = Il. 3. 92): 18. 65 Ἀρνιόδει τε καὶ Εὐρόμαχος πεντυμένο ἄμφω (from the τεὐχοσκοπία, = Il. 3. 148): 18. 105 ἐναυθοὶ νῦν ἤσο (from Il. 21. 122 ἐναυθοὶ νῦν κεῖσο).

§ 3. Comparison of the Iliad and Odyssey in respect of grammar.

If the Iliad and Odyssey are the work of different authors, separated from each other by a considerable interval of time, they will in all probability be found to present a corresponding divergence in respect of dialect—that is to say, in grammatical forms, in syntax, and in vocabulary. Hence, if such a divergence can be pointed out between the two poems, it will serve to strengthen the conclusions as to authorship and date which have been arrived at on other grounds.

Those who are acquainted with the thorny questions relating to the Homeric dialect will interpose here with one or two prior questions. The original language of Homer, they will say, is not the same as that of the traditional text. It has certainly undergone a process of modernising, the extent of which cannot now be exactly measured. In any case the loss of the f or labial spirant is only one change out of many. A long series of scholars, beginning with Bentley, have used their best endeavours to restore the primitive forms, and have
arrived at various results. Even on the question whether the language was Ionic or Aeolic they are not at one. How then can we compare the language of one Homeric poem with another, both being unknown quantities? These are questions to which we shall have to return when we come to deal with the history of the Homeric text. Meanwhile it may be answered that while the main features of the dialect are the same, so far as our limited knowledge extends, in the two poems—and indeed in all Greek epic poetry—there are many minute differences of syntax that can be traced back with certainty to the Homeric period. These are all the more valuable as evidence of authorship, inasmuch as they are not matters in which one poet would be likely to imitate another. Moreover, the argument to be derived from differences of vocabulary is not affected by the degree of uncertainty which attaches to the sounds and inflexions of the dialect.

The chief points in which the grammar of the Odyssey differs from that of the Iliad seem to fall under the following heads. In general it will be seen that the Odyssey makes some approach to the later Greek usage.

1. Uses of Prepositions.

ἀκραῖ with the Dative is common in Homer to express the object over which there is a contest or debate. In the Odyssey it is also found with verbs meaning to speak, think, ask, &c., about something. The construction of ἐπί with the Genitive undergoes a like extension; i.e. it is used in the Iliad when a contest is implied, in the Odyssey (as in later Greek) without that restriction.

ἐνι with the Accusative is used of motion over, and in the Odyssey of extent (without a verb of motion). On the other hand the sense of motion towards a person is almost confined to the Iliad.

ἐξ in the derivative sense in consequence of is found in the Odyssey (and in II. 9. 566).

2. Uses of Pronouns and Relatival Adverbs.

The defining Article is much more frequent in the Odyssey—ὁ ἥκωσιν, τὸ τοῖχον, ἤ νύσσος, &c. On the other hand the use to express a contrast (II. 2. 217 τὸ δὲ οὐ δύναται ἐτὸς) is commoner in the Iliad.

The use of τοῖς = for which reason belongs to the Iliad: in Od. 8. 332 τὸ καὶ μοιχύρι τῆς ἐφέλει (in the song of Demodocus), it is doubtless an imitation.

The full correlative τὸ—ὁ—(whence, by omission of τοῖς, the

adverbial use of ἀ) survives in a few places of the Iliad only. The development by which ἀι, ἀε, ὁμικος came to mean in respect that, because, and then simply that, may be traced in the two Homeric poems. Of the last stage of that development, viz. the use of these words = that after verbs of saying, there are two instances in the Iliad, fourteen in the Odyssey. The use of ὁμικος after verbs of saying, knowing and the like appears first in the Odyssey.

The attraction seen, e.g. in Od. 10. 113 τὴν δὲ γυναικα ἐδρον δοσιν τῇ κορωφη (= δοσὶ ἐστὶ κορωφη) belongs to the Odyssey: cp. 9. 322, 325, 10. 167, 517, 11. 25, 19. 233.

The reflexive use of ἵ, ἵ, ἵ is much less common in the Odyssey, and is chiefly found in fixed combinations, such as ἄνδ ἵ, προτί ἵ.

The form τὸν is only found in the Iliad.

3. Uses of the Moods.

The Homeric use of the Optative with κεν of an unfulfilled condition (where in Attic we find the past indicative with δι) is chiefly found in the Iliad.

The concessive use of the First Person of the Optative with κεν or ἄν is found in the Odyssey, in such instances as Od. 15. 506 ἀνθεὶ δὲ κεν διμιουδοτροπον παραξενημ (I may furnish, = I am willing to furnish), Od. 2. 219 ἂν τρυφερῶς πέρ ἐν θληθν ἐναντίον.

The use of ἵ and the Optative after verbs of telling, thinking, &c. (as Od. 1. 115 δοσιμοενος παρεῖ ἐσθλόν ἐν φρεσὶ ἵ ποθεν ... θεί) is characteristic of the Odyssey. It is evidently an extension of the use of ἵ-clauses as final and object clauses (H. G. § 314).

4. Particles.

The forms μαῦ and μαῦ are found in the Iliad (μαῦ twenty-two times, μαῦ ten times), but are very rare in the Odyssey. The form μαῦ ὁμ belongs to the Odyssey.

5. Metre.

The neglect of lengthening by Position is perceptibly commoner in the Odyssey. In this respect the versification of the Odyssey is nearer to that of Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, and the fragments of the Cyclic poets (H. G. § 370).

Hiatus is somewhat commoner in the Odyssey, especially the 'legitimate hiatus' in the so-called bucolic diaeresis. This may seem to be an exception to the general tendency to get rid of hiatus by elision or crisis. Possibly it may be due to the incipient loss of the f. The examples of hiatus produced by that loss would re-act on the metrical sense of the poets, and lead them to admit combinations which would otherwise seemed intolerable.
§ 4. Vocabulary.

The vocabulary of a poem depends so much upon its subject-matter, the nature of the story, the scenery, &c., that we cannot be surprised to find many differences in this respect between the two Homeric poems. The Iliad, it is evident, could not do without such words as ἀγός, φαλαγξ, ἐπίκουρος, ἰππυς, ἰπποστήν, ἥλιος, δύνας, προλέες, στίχος, φαλός, αἰχμή, ἔστος, καμίς, ζωστήρ. It was sure to be rich in terms for fighting and its various incidents: such as ὑσμής, φίλος, χάρμη, δαίς, μόθος, μῶλος, κυδομός, κλώνος, λογις, φόβος (always meaning flight), γέφυρα (in the phrase πτολέμων γ.), with the verbs φίβομαι, χάζομαι, χωρέω, συλλάμ, μαμάω, μαρμαίρω, παμφαιώ (of arms), ἔρεισ (of a falling warrior), βήγαμοι (of breaking ranks). The same words are naturally rare or wanting in the Odyssey. In like manner the special vocabulary of the Odyssey is largely made up of (1) words for sea, ships, islands, &c., and (2) words for objects of use or luxury under the conditions of peaceful life. Such are θυμή, ἄλμωρ (ὄδωρ): ἀμφίλος, ἀμβροσία: εὐθέιος (of islands): ἀκρίς (of wind): πτελάμω, κέλλω and ἐπικέλα: ὑφορθία, συβόλα: and again ἰσχρή, ἱκτή, κοῖτος, δέμανα, κόας, ρήγας, ἄσθις, ἱππός, ἀπός, ἀρομή, ἀσάμοθος, χέρνη.

These and similar words, though not without significance, are insufficient to prove difference of date or authorship.

But among the remaining instances of words peculiar to one or other of the poems there are two noteworthy groups:

(1) The language of the Homeric poems contains, as is well known, a large number of old poetical words, mostly preserved in certain fixed or traditional phrases, and often (as far as we can judge) only half understood by the poet himself. Of these words much the greater part are confined to the Iliad. Such are the epithets of Zeus, ἀστεροπητής, ἀργιέραυες, ὑψίγγας, Δωδώναιος, Πελαικυλός: of Apollo, ἐκβόλω, ἐκάτος, ἐκάρης, Σαμβεούς: of Ares, θυμής, ἰναλίως, ἀνδρεφώτης, μαμάν, τάλαυρος: of Here, βωτεύς: of Aphrodite, Κύπρης: of horses, μάρτυρες, ἑραύκτης, ἐνίγμη: also the epithets δήσις, ἀγχέμαχος, ἀγχεμαχής, τάθετος, ἑρεβινθος, ὑμητής, ἱανός, λαυρός, μέρεμψος, λόγιος, ἰλίκες (Ἀκαιλοι), ἔλκωπαι (κούρην), πευκάλως, πευκεδασός, ἑρπευκής, πηνήχος, πηνύτος, κυδάνερα, ταχύπωλος, φιλοπτόλεμος, μενεδής, μενεχώρμης, ποδάκης.

13 On this subject see the dissertation of L. Friedländer, De vocabulis Homericis quae in alterius carmine non inveniuntur (Regimonti, 1858–59).

16 Of these δήσις, βῆγαι, κόας, ἀσάμοθος are found in the Iliad, but only in books ix, x, xxiv.
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weakness of Agamemnon and Achilles, or of the moral superiority of Hector. In the Odyssey, on the contrary, the plot of the poem is a contest between right and wrong. The triumph of right in Ulysses, of virtue and patience in Penelope, makes the interest of the story.

Olympus in the Iliad (as Aristarchus observed) is a mountain in Thessaly. In the Odyssey it is a supra-mundane abode of the gods, described in the well-known passage (Od. 6. 42–45) as never shaken by winds or wetted by rain or covered with snow. We hear no more of Iris as the messenger of Zeus: the agent of his will is now Hermes, as also in the twenty-fourth book of the Iliad. Another difference is that in the Iliad the wife of Hephaestus is one of the Naiads: in the Odyssey she is Aphrodite. The trident is the weapon of Poseidon in the Odyssey and in II. 12. 27 (a spurious passage).

It may be accidental that the worship of Apollo in the Iliad is mainly local, confined to the Troad and adjoining island of Tenedos. In the ninth book we are told of his sanctuary at Πυθώ, i.e. Delphi. In the Odyssey he appears in his sacred island of Delos (Od. 6. 152), and we hear for the first time of the Delphian oracle (Od. 8. 80). Indeed the resort to local oracles is distinctive of the Odyssey: other examples are the oracle of Zeus at Dodona (Od. 14. 327, 19. 296), and the Μενακάστεια of Tiresias (Od. 10. 492, &c.). Hence the use of the word βηματες, in the sense of 'oracles,' is found in the Odyssey (16. 453), as in the Hymn to Apollo 17.

§ 6. History, Geography, &c.

In turning from the Iliad to the Odyssey we leave a great and far-reaching war for a condition of profound peace. The change, doubtless, has some foundation in the political history of early Greece. Whoever the people may have been whose greatness is recorded or (perhaps we should say) reflected in the poetical shape of the empire of Agamemnon, we can well believe that their triumph would mean the establishment of a pax Mycenaen in the Mediterranean lands, for at least one or two generations. In such a period of peace the favouring conditions would be found for the material prosperity of which there are plain traces in the Homeric poems, and especially in the Odyssey. In the Iliad, indeed, we hear of the gold of Mycenaen, of golden vessels such as the cup of Nestor, and (if the ninth book is Homeric) of the riches of Orchomenus and Egyptian Thebes.

17 Hom. H. Apoll. 394 θήματας Φοίβου Ἀπόλλωνος χρυσαόρου, ὅτι κεν εἶναι.
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But it is when we turn to the Odyssey that we are struck by the signs of an active Phoenician commerce, and can admire the splendour shown in the palaces of Alcinous and Menelaus, and even (in its way) in the homestead of Eumaeus. The account of these things there given—confirmed as it is by remains of buildings and objects of art discovered in recent years—testifies to the existence of a ‘golden age’ of pre-historic Greece 18, to which the term ‘Mycenean’ may fitly be applied.

The geographical knowledge shown in the Odyssey goes beyond that of the Iliad in more than one direction, but especially in regard to Egypt and Sicily. In the ninth book of the Iliad there is a mention of Egyptian Thebes, but hardly anything to show that the poet knew more than the name. In the Odyssey the voyage to Egypt is described more than once 19, and with a fair approach to correctness. Sicily, again, is quite unknown to the Iliad: in the Odyssey, if we cannot say that the island is referred to 20, we at least hear of the Siculi as a people to whom men might be sold into slavery (Od. 20. 383). In the twenty-fourth book we again find the Siculi, and along with them the name Sicania, which is brought into the fictitious story told by Ulysses (24. 307). The name Thesprotia is also met with for the first time in the Odyssey. That country is important as lying on the westward route from Greece.

On the other hand there is no extension of knowledge eastward, towards the Propontis and the Euxine, such as we should expect to find in the age of Ionian colonisation. The acquaintance that the Iliad shows with the Troad, and with the peoples of Asia Minor—Phrygians, Maeonians, Mysians, Carians—is no longer to be traced. On the contrary, the geography of these lands has fallen back into the mythical stage. As the island of Circe is the abode of the Dawn, and the place of the sun’s rising 21, it must lie to the east; consequently the Πλαγκταί or ‘meeting rocks,’ which the poet of the Odyssey places somewhere beyond that island, are to be sought in the same quarter. They are evidently the same as the Symplegades, which in the Argonautic story form the entrance to the Euxine.

18 See Mr. Gardner’s New Chapters in Greek History, ch. v. His main view is that ‘the art familiar to the authors of the Iliad and Odyssey is in many respects like the art revealed at Mycenae, but distinctly later, and showing clear evidence of comparative poverty and degradation’ (p. 118). So far as the language of Homer is concerned, I cannot think that there is much evidence of decline in art.
19 Od. 3. 300, 4. 351, 14. 257, 17. 426.
20 There does not seem to be any reason for connecting Θρυμνή with the name Trinacria, or for localising the Cyclops, or Scylla and Charybdis, in Sicily.
21 Od. 12. 3 ὁδῷ τ’ Ἡμῶν ἑρμαφρηνείας οἰκίας καὶ χορόν έλεγόμενον καὶ ὁμοσαντιναν ἥλιον.
A geographical indication of date may perhaps be found in the use of the name Hellas. In Homer, as Thucydides observed, it is regularly applied to a part of Thessaly. In the ninth book of the Iliad this is still the case, though there is some discrepancy as to the boundaries of the district so called: see the notes on ll. 2. 683, 9. 447. But the phrase that is a commonplace of the Odyssey, καθ Ἐλλάδα καὶ μισον Ἀργος (Od. 1. 344, 4. 726, 816, 15. 80), seems to imply a less restricted use of the name.

An examination of the land system of Homeric times has been made to yield some further evidence of difference in date between the two poems. In the Iliad, as has been shown by Mr. Ridgeway 28, there are clear references to the so-called Common Field system: and there is no trace of the existence of individual wealth in land. All words implying riches, possession, and the like 29 apply to chattels, not to landed property. But in the Odyssey the case is somewhat altered. The word κλήρος lot, which in the Iliad 30 means only the right to an allotment in the common fields, has come to mean a portion of land bestowed by a master on a deserving slave: cp. Od. 14. 63-64:

οἶδα τε ὧν οικεῖ ἀναξ ἐθνυμοι ἑδωκεν,
οἴδαν τε κληρὸν τε πολυμνήστην τε γυναικα.

Such a portion must have been cut out of a demesne or 'garth' belonging to the master: for he cannot have been able to give away rights in the common land. Moreover the word πολυκληρος, which occurs in Od. 14. 211, implies an inequality in the matter of land that can only have arisen when it was often held in sevillany. Finally, in the twenty-fourth book (Od. 24. 207) the use of the verb κτεσιζω, in reference to the farm of Laertes, shows that the notion of property in land had then become familiar.

The plants and animals of Homer afford some little confirmation of the view now taken as to the later date of the Odyssey. Among the plants that are mentioned there, and not in the Iliad, are the fig (σύκον, συκία), which was indigenous in Palestine and Syria 31; the laurel (δάφνη), which appears to have entered Greece by way of Thessaly—coming, as Hehn conjectured, from Asia Minor 32—and the date-palm (φοῖνιξ), which was quite an exotic on the northern

28 See his article on the Homeric land system, in the Journal of Hellenic Studies, vi. 319 ff.
29 Viz. κτήματα, κτήσεις, κτήρας, κτάρας.
30 e.g. in ll. 15. 498, where it goes with οἶκος as the possession of each warrior.
31 See Hehn, Culturfliessen und Hausthiere 3, p. 84.
32 Hehn, op. cit. pp. 195, 197.
shores of the Mediterranean. The introduction of the fig is perhaps not as early as the *Odyssey*, since the word only occurs in the description of the gardens of Alcinous (Od. 7. 116, 121), in the latter part of the *Nestor* (Od. 11. 590), and in the 'continuation' (Od. 24. 341). On the other hand the wild fig-tree (*στριγωτός*) is found in both poems. The cypress (*κυμάρεσσος*, the Semitic *gopher*) appears in the *Odyssey* (5. 64, 17. 340), and in two names of places in the Catalogue (*Κυμάρεσσος* in II. 2. 519, *Κυμάρισμα* in II. 2. 593): the cedar (*σείδρος*) in the *Odyssey* (5. 60) and in the twenty-fourth book of the *Iliad*.

The wild beasts of prey known to Homer are the lion (*λιον*, *λίς*), the wolf (*λύκος*), the panther (*πάρδαλις*), and the jackal (*θώρ*); and all these occur repeatedly in the *Iliad*. In the *Odyssey* the lion and the wolf are much less common, the panther occurs once (Od. 4. 457), the jackal not at all. In the interval between the two poems the progress of cultivation had doubtless made these animals much less familiar in Greek life.

It is probable that in the same period some progress was made in the use of the metals. In Homer, as is well known, *iron* (*σίδηρος*) is rarely mentioned in comparison with bronze (*μελανός*): but the proportion is greater in the *Odyssey* (25: 80) than in the *Iliad* (23: 279). The difference is still more marked if we leave out the two last books of the *Iliad*, in which iron is mentioned seven times. Moreover, some of the passages in the *Iliad* may be interpolations: e.g. II. 4. 123, 6. 48, 8. 15, 9. 366, 11. 133, 18. 34—all of them lines that can be omitted without detriment to the sense. It is worth notice, too, as evidence of longer familiarity with iron objects, that the metaphorical use of the adjective *σιδηρός* in the sense of 'hard, cruel' is nearly confined to the *Odyssey* and books xxiii—xxiv of the *Iliad*. It is found in II. 22. 357, 23. 177, 24. 205, 521, Od. 4. 293, 5. 191, 12. 280, 23. 172. A similar latitude of use is observable in the phrases *σιδηρα δίσματα* (Od. 1. 204), *σιδηρα ἄρανδα* (Od. 15. 329, 17. 565). If we could argue from the proverb *δίφυλλα τακτα* ἄρα σιδηρος (Od. 16. 294, 19. 13), it would be necessary to assign the *Odyssey* definitely to the Iron age. It seems probable, however, for the reasons stated in the note on 19. 1, that that passage is of later date.

It may be a mere accident that *τίς* (*καστερές*) is only mentioned in the *Iliad*. It comes into descriptions of armour, such as do not occur in the *Odyssey*.

---

77 Hehn, op. cit. p. 231.
78 Beloch, *Rivista di Filologia*, vol. ii (1874).
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III. Homer and the Cyclic Poets.

§ 1. The Epic Cycle.

In the various discussions of Homeric subjects that have appeared of late years, it may have been observed that the 'Epic Cycle' has fallen rather into the background. It is not difficult, perhaps, to understand why this should be so. The recent study of Homer has been influenced by remarkable discoveries of Hellenic and pre-Hellenic monuments, and by the no less remarkable progress of linguistic science. Hence an investigation such as that of Welcker, which reaches Homer through the scanty remains of later and less illustrious poets, has lost much of its interest, even for scholars. Yet it may fairly be maintained that some of the most considerable steps towards a right understanding of the 'Homeric question' have been gained through this study. The difficulty of the question is certainly due in great measure to the obscurity which has been the lot of the 'cyclic' poets. It is an effect of the surpassing splendour of the Iliad and Odyssey that they are followed by a long period of darkness—a period which seems to throw them back into an inaccessible foretime, out of relation to the subsequent course of Greek literature. To fill up this blank—to restore the lost outlines of post-Homeric poetry, to trace in it the development of poetical form, the growth of legend, the widening of knowledge, the movement of thought and sentiment, the invasion and spread of foreign superstitions—such was the aim that Welcker set before himself in his great book. It will be worth while to dwell for a few pages on the subject of the Epic Cycle, were it only for the purpose of directing attention afresh to a work which,


The questions connected with the Epic Cycle were discussed by Casaubon on Athenaeus, vii. 4 (p. 277), and by Heyne in an excursus on the second book of the Aeneid: also in separate treatises by F. Wüllner, *De cyclo epico poetico cyclicitis* (Monasterii 1825), and C. W. Müller, *De cyclo Graecorum epicii et poetis cycllicitis* (Lipsiae 1829). But the chief writer before Welcker was G. W. Nitsch, who made it the main subject of successive works: *De Historia Homer* (Hannoverae 1830—37, Kiiiae 1837—39), *Die Sagepoesie der Griechen* (Braunschweig 1852), *Beiträge zur Geschichte der epischen Poesie der Griechen* (Leipzig 1862).
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in its combination of learning and artistic feeling, is one of the most signa...
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The Cypria; the authorship of which is reserved by Proclus for separate discussion.

The Iliad of Homer.
The Aethiopis, by Arctinus of Miletus.
The Little Iliad, by Lesches of Mitylene.
The Sack of Ilium (Ἡλίου πέρασι), by Arctinus.
The Nosti or 'Returns,' by Agias of Troezen.
The Odyssey of Homer.
The Telegonia, by Eugammon of Cyrene.

§ 3. The poems of the Epic Cycle.

The statement (quoted from Proclus) that these poems were chosen with a view to the mythical history contained in them (διὰ τὴν ἀκολουθιῶν τῶν ἐν αἵτὶ πραγμάτων) brings us to a much-debated question. Were these poems taken into the Epic Cycle in their original form? In other words, was the 'sequence of events' of which Photius speaks attained by simply arranging the ancient epics in a certain order, or was there any process of removing parallel versions, smoothing away inconsistencies, filling up lacunae, and the like?

If we could argue from the silence of Proclus, we should be led to assume that 'the poems of the Epic Cycle' were the works of the ancient epic poets, retained in their primitive integrity. He nowhere gives any hint of omission or curtailment. The inference, however, would not be a safe one. Proclus may have dealt with the topic in a part of the chrestomathy now lost, or not sufficiently represented in the scanty notice of Photius 3. Or it may be that Proclus only knew the poems in the Epic Cycle, not in their independent shape. On the other hand, it is unlikely that the continuity on which Proclus seems to have laid so much stress could have been brought about spontaneously, or by happy accident.

It is needless, however, to dwell upon arguments of this order if

3 The natural place for Proclus to notice any changes made in the poems in order to fit them for a place in the Epic Cycle would be the passage in which he explained that they were 'preserved and valued not for their merit so much as διὰ τὴν ἀκολουθιῶν τῶν ἐν αἵτὶ πραγμάτων.' It seems very possible that he there discussed the rejection of books or parts of poems, not merely of entire poems. Note that the sequence of events, according to Photius, was in the Epic Cycle (ἐν αἵτί), not in the poems which were chosen to form it.

It may be worth while noticing also that the form used by Proclus in introducing the several poems does not always expressly assert that the whole poem was before him, e.g. μὴ ἶν φθείρων Μιθρίδας ἑπιτίθεσθαι τάθες: and so of the Little Iliad and Iliopersis—the books, not the poem, are said to comprise so much matter.
there is enough independent testimony as to the contents of the several poems to furnish a basis for comparison with the abstract of Proclus. In one instance the evidence of this kind is abundant. The *Little Iliad* is discussed by Aristotle in the *Poetics*; several incidents in it are referred to by Pausanias in his account of a picture by Polygnotus: and a considerable number of fragments has been preserved. From all these sources it is easy to show that the poem which Proclus found under that title in the Epic Cycle had been very much shortened from the *Little Iliad* known to Aristotle and Pausanias.

The proof is as follows:

In speaking of the unity which should characterize an epic poem, and of the great superiority of Homer in this respect, Aristotle notices that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* supply far the fewest subjects for the stage. The reason is, according to him, that in poems of less perfect structure the successive parts of the action can be turned into so many tragedies: whereas in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* there is a single main action, the parts of which have no independent interest, and are consequently not suitable for dramatic treatment. To illustrate this criticism he points to the number of tragic subjects taken from the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad*. The latter, he says, furnished more than eight tragedies: and he enumerates ten, viz. (1) the *Judgment of the Arms*, (2) the *Philoctetes*, (3) the *Neopolemos*, (4) the *Euryymylus*, (5) the *Begging* (Ulysses entering Troy in beggar’s disguise), (6) the *Laconian women* (probably turning on the theft of the Palladium): (7) the *Sack of Ilion*, (8) the *Departure* (of the Greek army), (9) the *Simon*, (10) the *Troades*. Now the first six of these subjects follow closely the abstract in Proclus, but there the agreement ends. The subsequent history, to which the last four subjects belong, is not given by Proclus under the *Little Iliad*, but under the *Iliupersis* of Arctinus. It follows with something like mathematical certainty that in the Epic Cycle the conclusion of the *Little Iliad*—including the sack of the city and the departure of the Greeks—had been left out; the compilers preferring the version which Arctinus gave of this part of the story in his *Iliupersis*.

4 Arist. *Poet.* 14:59 a 30 καὶ ταῦτα θεσπίζως ἀν νανημοροποιάτει τοῦ ἄλλου τὸ μέρος τῶν πόλεμων, καίεται ἐχοντα ἐρχόμενος καὶ τέλος, ἐπηκερίσθησαν τοιών ἄλλων λαον γάρ ἰδίως καὶ οὐκ εὐφύστοτος ἐμμελέως διασώσας ἢ τῷ μεγάλῳ μεταρεῖσα ταπεινελεγμένον τῇ ποιήσας . . . οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι περὶ ἦν ποιήσας καὶ περὶ ἦν χρόνον καὶ μίαν πράξιν πολυμερήν, οὖν δ’ εἰ τὰ Κύπρων πολεύσας καὶ τὴν μεν Ἰλίδας τογοιράτων εἰ μὲν Ἰλίδας καὶ Ὀδυσσείας μία τραγωδία ποιήσας ἐκατέρθαι ἢ δυο μόναι, εἰ δὲ Κυπριαν πολλαν, καὶ τῆς μικρᾶς Ἰλίδας πλέον ὡστὸ, οὖν ὡς Ἐκλαυ κρίσις, Φιλοπάτης, Νεο-πόλεμος, Εὐρύπυλος, Πτωχεία, Λάκαιαι, Ἰλίου πίεσις, καὶ Ἀσάλειοι, καὶ Σινών καὶ Τρεβίδες.
This inference is confirmed by the description which Pausanias gives (10. 25–27) of a picture by Polygnotus, representing the taking of Troy. The details of this picture, as Pausanias shows from a large number of instances, were taken from the narrative of Leschae. It is true that he does not mention the *Little Iliad*; the only reference to a particular work of Leschae being in the words εις δε εις θεομερειαν δια της Μηδειας και Αιοκυλίνου Πορραίων εν θλιον περατι ϊ τοις (Paus. 10. 25. 5). From this passage it has been supposed that there was an *Iliauperseis* by Leschae distinct from the *Little Iliad*. But this is not at all probable. The phrase εν θλιоν περατι may equally well refer to part of a work, meaning simply 'in his account of the sack of Ilium'; as Herodotus says εν Διομέδεω αριστείρα (2. 116), Thucydides εν τοι ουρλιαρην τη παραδοσεων (1. 9). Now we know from Aristotle (l. c.) that the *Little Iliad* included the sack of Ilium, and it is therefore most unlikely that Leschae wrote a distinct epic on the subject.

Two quotations may be mentioned which support the same conclusion. The scholiast on Aristophanes (Lys. 155), says that the story of Menelaus letting fall his sword at the sight of Helen was told by Leschae in the *Little Iliad*. And Tszetzes (ed Lycophr. 1363) quotes from the *Little Iliad* five lines which describe Neoptolemus taking away Andromache as his captive, and throwing the child Astyanax from a tower. These events, being subsequent to the capture of Troy, prove that the original *Little Iliad* contained an θλιον περατι.

Again, a passage of Pausanias (10. 28. 7), mentions, as the poems which contain descriptions of the infernal regions, the *Odyssey*, the *Minyas*, and the *Nostis*. As the abstract of the *Nostis* in Proclus says nothing of a descent into the infernal regions, the probability is that this episode was left out in the Epic Cycle—doubtless as superfluous, after the *minau* in the eleventh book of the *Odyssey*.

Again, it is argued by Herodotus that the *Cypria* cannot be the work of Homer (as appears to have been commonly supposed in his time), because it contradicts the *Iliad* in an important particular. The *Iliad*, according to Herodotus, represented Paris as returning from Sparta by way of Sidon, whence he brought the Sidonian women mentioned in the sixth book (l. 290); whereas in the *Cypria* he returned in three days, with a fair wind and smooth sea. But according to the abstract of the *Cypria* in Proclus, a storm is sent by Here, Paris is driven out of his course, lands at Sidon, and takes the city—in perfect agreement with the construction put by Herodotus on the passage of the *Iliad*. Nothing can be plainer than that the
Cypria of the Epic Cycle had been altered. The voyage to Sidon was inserted, in consequence of the criticism of Herodotus, to harmonise the story with the account implied (or supposed to be implied) in the Iliad.

These conclusions, it is right to add, are opposed to the view of the Epic Cycle held by the scholar to whom this subject owes most of its interest. According to Welcker, the poems of the Epic Cycle were preserved in their original form; it is the information of Proclus that is defective. The object of Proclus, he maintains, was not to describe the poems which he found in the Epic Cycle, but to give a summary of the mythical history which they furnished: accordingly it is Proclus, and not the compiler of the Epic Cycle, who is responsible for the omissions on which we have been insisting. It seems difficult to uphold this view in face of the language of Proclus himself. His formula is that a poem succeeds or 'joins on' (ἐνθέβολλει, συνάπτεται) to the preceding one, and that there are so many books, comprising such and such matter. This manner of speaking can hardly be reconciled with the theory that he passed over large portions of the contents—that, for instance, he omitted from the Little Iliad of Lesches an amount of narrative equal to the whole Liupersis of Arctinus, and sufficient to furnish four tragedies. Moreover, the abstract of Proclus is not merely silent about parts of the original poems: in one case at least it introduces new matter, viz. the voyage of Paris to Sidon in the Cypria. Apt as the framer of an abstract may be to leave out incidents, we can hardly suppose that he would give this story as an episode of the Cypria if he had not found it in the Epic Cycle.

The settlement of this point, however, does not very much affect the value of Proclus as the chief source of knowledge regarding the post-Homeric poets. In any case we have to reckon with the possibility that the abstracts or 'arguments' as given by Proclus are incomplete, if not erroneous—that they have been tampered with in the interest of historical teaching. Still less is it necessary for our present purpose to determine the questions relating to the date of the Epic Cycle, and the different meanings of the word κύκλος and its derivatives—κύκλος, ἕκκυκλος, κυκλικός. These questions have an important place in the history of Greek learning and education. From that point of view we should be glad to know whether the idea of a selection of epic poems, forming a continuous chronicle of the early age of the world, originated in the Athens of the Sophists, or in the Alexandria of Zenodotus, as Welcker maintained, or among the grammarians of the Roman empire, as seems much more probable. It would also be interesting to ascertain when the word κύκλος was
first applied to any such compilation, and who or what exactly is intended by Callimachus when he declares his hatred of 'the cyclic poem' (§χαλριν το ποιημα το κυκλικω), and by Horace when he contrasts the scripae cyclicus with Homer. But with the view of gaining light on the Homeric question our aim must be to study the individual poets that were most nearly contemporaneous with Homer. To these accordingly we now proceed.

On these points it may be permitted to refer the reader to an article which appeared in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (1883), on 'the fragments of Proclus' abstract of the Epic Cycle contained in the *Codex Venetus* of the Iliad. The evidence seems to justify the following conclusions:

1. The opinion of Welcker that the Epic Cycle was the work of Zenodotus rests on no good ground. The scholiwm of Tzetzes on which Welcker relied ascribes to Zenodotus the arrangement and recension (σβεβοιμ) of Homer and the other epic poets. It has been made clear by Ritschl (Oeconomia, i. p. 158) that this refers simply to what Zenodotus did as an editor of Homer, and as the first head of the Alexandrian Library.

2. The use of κυκλος in the Alexandrian age is indicated by the κυκλος ιστορικως of Dionysius of Samos, which was a body of mythical history, written in prose, but founded largely upon the poets. It appears also from the κυκλος of Phyllus, given by Aristotle (Rhet. p. 1417 a 15) as an example of a rapid summary of events.

In the same period the adj. κυκλικως meant 'returning in a circle,' 'common-place.' It was applied to the recurring formulas of epic poetry, and perhaps generally to anything trite and conventional. In a celebrated epigram it was employed by Callimachus as a literary catch-word, and was aimed at a rival school—that which sought to keep up the traditions of epic poetry—and in particular at Apollonius Rhodius. The same sense appears in the *scripae cyclicus* of Horace (Ep. ad Pis. 156), probably also in his *niiis palatinius orbis* (ibid. 132). It goes far to show that the use of the word for an epic 'cycle' or collection of early 'cyclical' poets had not then arisen. See Cout, *La Poésie Alexandrine* (p. 502).

3. In the two places in the Organon of Aristotle, *Post. Anal.* p. 77 b 32, *Soph. El.* p. 171 a 10, where κυκλος is given as an example of ambiguous Middle Term, I still think that the words το ιπων and ο Ισθρονος must mean a particular poem ascribed to Homer, and probably mean the famous ἡμερη τιμη των ουρανων αληθους. That in the lifetime of Aristotle there was a collection of poems like those of the Epic Cycle, and all passing under the name of Homer, seems quite incredible.

4. The phrase εκεινο κυκλος does not occur before the (probable) time of Proclus. It is used by Athenaeus (p. 277 ε), apparently as a collective term for the early epic poets. The word κυκλος seems to be used in certain scholia as εκεινος κυκλος; so in Schol. H on Od. 1. 190. 4. 248, 285, 11. 547, and the Schol. on Ar. *Eq.* 1051 and Eur. *Or.* 1392, also in a scholium on Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 30. But there is no trace of this in the scholia which come from Aristarchus and other Alexandrian scholars. And so in all writers of that period, and indeed down to the second century A.D.—including (*e.g.*) Strabo and Pananius—the *Cypria, Little Iliad, &c.*, are not quoted as parts of a cycle, but as separate poems.

5. The tendencies which led to the formation of an Epic Cycle—chief of which was the desire to make the study of poetry the basis of a comprehensive scheme of knowledge (τιγκλικος σαλβελα)—were shown also in the class of monuments of which the *Tabula Iliaca* of the Capitol is the best example. That work of art represents scenes from the Trojan war, with references to the poems from which they were taken. They were evidently intended as instruments of education, and belong to the early years of the Roman empire. See Wilmowits, *Hom. Unterr.* (p. 332).
§ 4. The Cypria.

The first of the poems which composed the Trojan part of the Epic Cycle was the Cypria. It was in eleven books, and was generally attributed to Stasinus of Cyprus, sometimes to Hegesias, or Hegesinus, of Salamis in Cyprus. The argument as given by Proclus is as follows:—

Zeus having consulted with Themis as to the lightening of the earth from the burden of its increasing multitudes, and being advised to bring about a great war, sends Discord to the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, and by means of the golden apple causes a quarrel between the three goddesses, Here, Athene, and Aphrodite. The quarrel is settled on Mount Ida by the 'Judgment of Paris.' Thereupon Aphrodite instigates Paris to build ships, and to set forth on the voyage to Sparta; in which he is accompanied by Aeneas, the son of Aphrodite. The voyage is undertaken in spite of prophetic warnings from Helenus and Cassandra. Paris is hospitably received on landing by the Dioscuri (Διόσκουροι), and again in Sparta by Menelaus. He takes advantage of the absence of Menelaus in Crete, and returns to Troy, carrying off Helen and much treasure. On the return journey, according to Proclus' abstract, a storm was sent by Here, and Paris was driven out of his course as far as Sidon, which he took; but in the original poem, as we know from Herodotus (2.117), he reached Troy in three days, with a fair wind and smooth sea. The story then returned to Sparta, and related the war of the Dioscuri with the Messenian twins, Idas and Lynceus, the death of Castor, and the alternate immortality granted by Zeus to Castor and Pollux. Then come the preparations for the war—Iris having been sent to tell Menelaus of the wrong done to his house. Menelaus goes for advice to Agamemnon, and then to Nestor, who relates the stories of Epopeus and the daughter of Lycus, of Oedipus, of the madness of Hercules, and of Theseus and Ariadne. They then make a circuit of Greece, and assemble the chiefs for the expedition against Troy. Ulysses, feigning madness to avoid serving, is detected by Palamedes. The fleet is mustered at Aulis in Boeotia, where the incident of the sparrows takes place, with the prophecy of Calchas founded upon it (Il. 2.300ff.). The Greeks then set sail, but land by mistake in Teuthrania, where they encounter the Mysians under Telephus. In this combat Telephus kills a certain Thersander, and is himself wounded by Achilles. On leaving Teuthrania the fleet is scattered by a storm, and Achilles is cast on the island of Scyros, where he
marries the daughter of Lycomedes. Telephus, on the advice of an oracle, comes to Argos, is cured of his wound by Achilles, and undertakes to serve as guide to the Greeks. The fleet is again assembled at Aulis, and this time we have the story of Iphigenia—ending, however, not with her death, but as in the version of the Iphigenia in Tauris. On the way to Troy Philoctetes is wounded by the serpent, and left behind on the island of Lemnos. Achilles quarrels with Agamemnon on a question of precedence at the banquet. On the Greeks landing in the Troad there is a battle in which Protesilaeus is killed by Hector; then Achilles puts the Trojans to flight and slays Ceycus, son of Poseidon. Then follows the embassy mentioned in II. 3. 205 ff.: then an attack on the walls of Troy (τειχωπαχία): after which the Greeks ravage the Troad and take the smaller towns. Achilles desires to see Helen, and the meeting is brought about by Aphrodite and Thetis. He restrains the Greeks from returning home, and performs various exploits mentioned or implied in the Iliad—the raid on the cattle of Aeneas, the sack of Lynnessus and Pedasus, the slaying of Troilus, the capture of Lycaon—ending with the division of spoil in which he obtains Briseis as his prize. Next comes the death of Palamedes, and the resolve of Zeus to aid the Trojans by withdrawing Achilles from the Greek side. Finally there is a catalogue of the Trojan allies.

The number of fragments given in Kinkel's edition is twenty-two (besides three doubtful references). About half of them are quotations, amounting in all to more than forty lines. The fragments add something to our knowledge of the details of the poem, and they serve (with the important exception of the passage of Herodotus mentioned above) to confirm the outline given by Proclus. Thus the opening lines (fr. 1 Kinkel) describe the 'counsel of Zeus' for the relief of the too populous earth: several fragments (5, 7, 9, 14) belong to the episode of the Dioscuri: from one of them we learn that Lynceus was endowed with superhuman powers of sight, so that he could see from Mount Taygetus over the whole Peloponnesus, and through the trunk of the oak in which the Dioscuri were hiding. Fr. 11 refers to the son born to Achilles in Scyros, and tells us that the name 'Pyrrhus,' which does not occur in Homer, was given by Lycomedes, the name 'Neoptolemus' by Phoenix. In fr. 16 we have the account given by the Cypria to explain how it happened that Chryseis, being a native of Chryse, was taken by Achilles in the sack of Thebe (II. 1. 369). Regarding the death of Palamedes fr. 18 related that he was drowned, while fishing, by Diomede and Ulysses.
CYCLIC POETS—THE CYPRIA

There are also references in the fragments to the spear given by the gods to Peleus (fr. 2), the quarrel of Achilles and Agamemnon (fr. 13)*, the slaying of Protesilaus (fr. 14). There is also a notice (fr. 17) of a curious piece of mythology which does not appear at all in the argument of Proclus, viz. the story of Anius of Delos and his three daughters, called Οἰώ, Ζηρεμώ, and Έλαις. These names were given to them on account of their magical power of producing an infinite quantity of wine, seed (i.e. corn), and oil; so that once when the Greek army was threatened with famine, Agamemnon (on the advice of Palamedes) sent for them, and they came accordingly to Rhoeoteum and fed the Greek army. Two fragments (3 and 4) in Athenaeus probably describe Aphrodite arraying herself for the Judgment of Paris. Another in the same author (fr. 6) relates how Nemesis, the mother of Helen, was pursued by Zeus, and changed herself into many and various shapes to avoid him.

Of the plan and structure of the Cypria we learn something from the Poetics of Aristotle, where it is given as an example of the poems that have 'one hero, one time, and one action, consisting of many parts' (περὶ ἕνα καὶ περὶ ἕνα χρόνον καὶ μίαν πράξεων πολυμερή). The hero is evidently Paris; the main action is the carrying away of Helen ('Ελευθέρω δραστηρίζη). The 'one time' is more difficult to understand, in a poem which begins with the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, and comes down to a late period in the Trojan war. Probably it means no more than that the action was continuous in respect of time. A further element of unity, however, is furnished by the agency of Aphrodite, which has very much the same prevailing influence over the course of events in the Cypria that the agency of Athene has in the Odyssey. This may be seen even in minor incidents, such as the visit of Achilles to Helen, and in the prominence given to Aeneas by associating him with Paris in the fateful expedition. The hero, accordingly, is the favourite of Aphrodite, just as Ulysses in the Odyssey is the favourite of Athene. We may gather, therefore, that the poem was characterized by a distinct ethos, or vein of moral feeling. On the other hand, it is proved by the testimony of Aristotle that the Cypria had much less unity of plan than the Iliad and Odyssey. It was not indeed one of the poems in which all the adventures of a hero are strung together, as in the later Thesiads and Heracleids of which Aristotle speaks in another place (Poet.


† Arist. Poet. 1489 b 1: see p. 343, note 4.
But the several parts of the action had an independent interest and artistic value, such as we do not find in the Homeric poems: they were not so completely subordinated to the main action as to be lost in it. In support of this criticism Aristotle points to the fact (noticed above, p. 343) that the story of the Cypria yielded a great many subjects for tragedies, whereas the Iliad and Odyssey did not lend themselves to this mode of treatment. Other reasons may have contributed to this result; it may be urged, for instance, that the battles and debates of Homer were beyond the resources of Greek stage machinery, and that most of the adventures of Ulysses are without interest of a tragic kind. But this need not affect the conclusion which Aristotle wishes to enforce, viz. the difference, in respect of unity of structure, between the Cypria and the Homeric poems. On such a matter his judgment can hardly be disputed. Moreover, it is confirmed by the argument of Proclus, and the fragments. The events which we there find in outline cover a space of several years, and are enacted in many places—the scene changing from Thessaly to Mt. Ida and Troy, then to Sparta, and back (with Paris and Helen) to Troy; then to Messenia, then over Greece with the chiefs who collected the Greek forces, and so to the meeting-place at Aulis; then to Mysia, Scyros, Argos, Aulis again, and so once more to the Troad. As regards the external unities of space and time, it is clear that the Cypria was formed on a different model from either of the Homeric poems.

Turning from the plan and structure of the Cypria to consider the details, we find, in the first place, that there is clear evidence, in the fragments as well as in the abstract given by Proclus, that the poem was composed with direct reference to the Iliad, to which it was to serve as an introduction. Thus the account of the βουλη δίκη at the outset (fr. 1), as has been observed, is evidently founded upon the Homeric δίκη δ' ἐτέλεσα βουλη (Il. 1. 5), to which it gives a meaning which was certainly not intended by the poet of the Iliad. The story that when Thebe was taken by the Greeks Chryse's had come thither for a sacrifice to Artemis (fr. 16) is clearly a device to explain why she was not in her own city, Chryse, and so to reconcile an apparent contradiction in the first book of the Iliad. So the raid on the cattle of Aeneas and the taking of Lynnessus and Pedasus (fr. 15) is suggested by II. 2. 690, 20. 92; the giving of a spear to Peleus at his marriage (fr. 2) by II. 16. 140; the presence of the gods at that marriage by II. 24. 62; the ship-building of Paris, and the warnings of Helenus and Cassandra, by II. 5. 62–64; the embassy to Troy by II. 3. 205;
the portents seen at Aulis by II. 2. 301 ff.; and the τεξώμαχα by II. 6. 435. We might add the slaying of Protesilaus (fr. 14), the landing of Achilles in Scyros, and birth of Neoptolemus (fr. 11), and the incident of Philoctetes; but in these cases it is possible that the poet took his story directly from a legend which survived independently of Homer. The catalogue of the Trojan allies, however, must have been intended to supplement the list given in II. 2. 816 ff., which is so much briefer than the catalogue of the Greek army. Such an enlarged roll would be the natural fruit of increased acquaintance with the non-Hellenic races of Asia Minor.

Besides these direct references there are some instances in which the author of the Cypria imitates the Iliad, or borrows motifs from it. Such are, the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon (cp. also the quarrel of Ulysses and Achilles in Od. 8. 75), the stories told by Nestor, the association of Ulysses and Diomede (also in the Little Iliad), the incident of Achilles restraining the Greeks from returning home, and the parts played by Aphrodite and Thetis.

On the other hand, it is no less apparent that a large proportion of the incidents of the Cypria belong to groups of legend unknown to Homer.

1. The train of events with which the poem opens—the purpose of depopulating the earth, the Apple of Discord, &c.—seems to be a post-Homeric creation. The only incident in the series to which there is an allusion in Homer is the Judgment of Paris, of whom it is said in II. 24. 29, 30—

δε μείκοσε θεάς ὅτε οἱ μέσαυλον ἱκώτο,

τὴν ὥθησε ή οἱ πάρε μαχλοῦνη ἄλγωνήν.

Aristarchus obelized the passage on the ground (among others) that μείκοσε is inappropriate, since it does not mean 'decided against,' but 'scolded,' 'flouted.' This, however, would rather show that the lines refer to a different version of the incident; and the same thing is suggested by οἱ μέσαυλον ἱκώτο, and πάρε μαχλοῦνη. These phrases lead us to imagine a story of Paris visited in his shepherd's hut by the three goddesses, spurning the two first and welcoming Aphrodite. This, we may reasonably conjecture, was the local form of the legend. It is parallel in some respects to the legend of Anchises (given in the Homeric hymn to Aphrodite), and to other stories, told especially in Asia Minor, of 'gods coming down in the likeness of men.' It is evident that the ordinary version of the Judgment of Paris is less simple, and might be created by the wish to fit it
into the main narrative of the Trojan war. In any case there is no hint in Homer that the action of Paris towards the goddesses had any connexion with his expedition to Sparta. Everything, in short, tends to show that the story was recast in post-Homeric times, with the view of enhancing the importance of Aphrodite in the Trojan story.

2. The episode of the Dioscuri appears to be a piece of local Spartan or perhaps Messenian legend. The Messenian Twin Brethren, Idas and Lyceus, are unknown to Homer. The apotheosis of the Dioscuri is inconsistent with the language of the Iliad (3.243 τοις δ' ἐν τύχῃς φυσικοῖς αἰτεῖοι), and belongs to a distinctly post-Homeric order of ideas.

3. The landing in Mysia, with the story of Telephus, has all the appearance of a graft upon the original story, probably derived from local Mysian tradition. The awkward expedient of a second muster of the fleet at Aulis was evidently made necessary by this interpolation. The miraculous healing of Telephus by Achilles is not in the manner of Homer, and the account that makes him the guide of the Greeks on their way to the Troad is at variance with the Iliad, which assigns this service to Calchas.

4. The story of Iphigenia is non-Homeric. The daughters of Agamemnon, according to Homer (II. 9.145), are—

Χρυσόθεμος καὶ Λαοδίκη καὶ Ἰφίάμασσα.

Some later authorities supposed Iphigenia to be another name for Iphianassa, but the author of the Cypria, as we learn from the scholiast on Sophocles (EL. 157), distinguished them, thus making four in all. This may be regarded as an attempt to reconcile the account of Homer with the legend of the sacrifice of Iphigenia.

The version given in the Cypria (if we may trust the argument of Proclus) was that of the Iphigenia in Tauris of Euripides, according to which Iphigenia was not put to death, but was carried off by Artemis to be the priestess of her Taurian altar, and as such to be immortal. This form of the story is necessarily later than the Greek settlements on the northern coasts of the Euxine,

5. Cyrcus, the ‘Swan-hero,’ son of Poseidon, is a non-Homeric figure. In later accounts he is invulnerable, and can only be

---

* The lines about the Dioscuri in the Nema (Od. II. 298-304) must be interpolated.

* This must be the meaning of the words of the scholiast if ὅ ἐστιν Ὀξύμηκος ἀνέστη τὰς τάφους φανά, ἐναγάγετι καὶ Ἰφιάμασσαν, i.e. ‘counting Iphigenia and Iphianassa.’ With this punctuation it is unnecessary to emend as Elmsley proposed (reading ὅ as διαφόρους, instead of the numeral τῆς τάφους).
dispached by being forced to leap into the sea. According to another version he is changed into a swan, like the Schwanritter of German legend. As the argument of Proclus merely says that he was killed by Achilles, we cannot tell how much of this marvellous character belongs to him in the Cypria. In any case he is a being of a fantastic kind, such as we might meet with in the adventures of Ulysses, but certainly not among the warriors who fought in the battles of the Iliad.

6. Palamedes is an important addition to the Homeric group of dramatis personae. In the Cypria he detects the feigned madness of Ulysses, and so forces him to join the Trojan expedition (Procl.). He is drowned while fishing by Ulysses and Diomede (fr. 18). In later writers he appears as a hero of a new type, one of those who have benefited mankind by their inventions; and his fate thus acquires something of the interest of a martyrdom. As the enemy of Ulysses he represents the higher kind of intelligence, in contrast to mere selfish cunning; he is solertior isto, sed sibi inutilior, in the words which Ovid puts into the mouth of Ajax (Metam. 13. 37). It is impossible to say how far this view of the character of Palamedes was brought out in the ancient epic poem. The story of his death certainly assumed a much more highly wrought and pathetic form, familiar to us from the reference to him in Virgil (Aen. 2. 81 ff.)—

quem falsa sub proditione Pelasgi
Insontem infando indicio, quia bella vetabat,
Demisere neci; nunc cassum lumine lugent.

But the germ of all this, the contrast between the wisdom of Palamedes and the wisdom of Ulysses, with the consequent lowering of the character of Ulysses, is fairly to be traced to the Cypria. We must feel that the murder of Palamedes by Ulysses and Diomede would be as impossible in Homer as it is in harmony with some later representations.

7. The prophecies in the Cypria deserve some notice. When Paris builds ships for his expedition, the consequences are foretold by Helenus. Again, before he sails he is warned by Cassandra, whose gift of prophecy is unknown to Homer. Telephus comes to Argos to be cured suandam mantriam. Finally, as Welcker pointed out, the prophecy of Nereus in Horace (Od. 1. 15) probably comes from the Cypria. The words—

Ingrato celeres obruit otio
Ventos

II.
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agree with the 'fair wind and smooth sea' of the quotation in Herodotus (2.117). The passage from which this quotation came is omitted (as we have seen) in the argument of Proclus; hence we need not be surprised if the prophecy of Nereus is also unmentioned there.

8. The statement that Helen was the daughter of Nemesis is peculiar to the Cypria. It may be connected, as Welcker thought, with the local worship of Nemesis in Attica. It is to be observed, however, that the author of the Cypria is fond of treating personifications of this kind as agents: compare the consultation of Themis, and the sending of Discord with the apple. Such figures occur in Homer, but are much more shadowy and impalpable. The notion of a 'purpose of Zeus' as the ground-work of the whole action shows the same tendency to put moral abstractions in the place of the simpler Homeric agencies.

The Protean changes of Nemesis when pursued by Zeus belong to a category already noticed as characteristic of the Cypria. Other examples are, the Apple of Discord, the healing of Telephus, the marvellous sight of Lynceus, the supernatural powers of the daughters of Anius. The notion of magical efficacy residing in certain persons or objects is one which in Homer is confined to the 'outer geography' of the Odyssey.

The attempt which has now been made to ascertain the relation between the Cypria and the Homeric poems has turned almost entirely upon points of agreement and difference between the Cypria and the Iliad. This, however, is only what was to be expected, since the Cypria and the Odyssey lie too far apart in respect of matter to furnish many points of comparison. Subject to this reservation the result seems to be to show, with cumulative and irresistible force, that between the time of Homer and the time of the Cypria great additions had been made to the body of legends and traditions available for the purposes of epic poetry; that that increase was due, in a large measure at least, to the opening up of new local sources of legend; that concurrently with it a marked change had come over the tone and spirit of the stories; and finally, that all this change and development had taken place in spite of the fact that the author of the Cypria wrote under the direct influence of Homer, and with the view of furnishing an introduction to the events of the Iliad.
§ 5. The Aethiopis of Arctinus.

As the Iliad was introduced by the Cypria, so it was continued in the Aethiopis of Arctinus of Miletus, a poem in five books, of which Proclus gives the following argument:—

The Amazon queen Penthesilea, daughter of Ares, comes as an ally of Troy. After performing great deeds she is killed by Achilles, and duly buried by the Trojans. There was a rumour that Achilles in the moment of victory had been seized by a passion for the fallen Amazon, and on this ground he is assailed in the Greek assembly by Thersites. He kills Thersites, and the deed provokes a quarrel in the army; thereupon Achilles sails to Lesbos, and having duly sacrificed to Apollo, Artemis, and Leto, is purified from the homicide by Ulysses. Then Memnon, son of Eos, arrives to aid the Trojans, with a panoply made by Hephaestus, and Thetis reveals to her son what the fortune of this new ally will be. Memnon slays Antilochus, and is slain by Achilles; thereupon Eos obtains for him the gift of immortality. In the rout of the Trojans which ensues, Achilles enters the city after them, and is killed in the Scaean gate by Paris and Apollo. His body is brought back after a stubborn fight by Ajax, who carries it to the ships, whilst Ulysses keeps off the Trojans. Then follows the burial of Antilochus, and Thetis, with the Muses and the Nereids, performs a lamentation for her son. When he has been placed on the funeral pyre she carries him off to the island Leuce. The Greeks having raised the sepulchral mound hold funeral games, and a quarrel arises between Ajax and Ulysses for the succession to the arms of Achilles.

The tablet known as the Tabula Veronensis 10 (now in the Louvre) gives the following brief summary of the Aethiopis:—Πεθεσίλεα Ἀμαζών παρογίζεται. Ἀχιλλέους Πεθεσίλην ἀποκτείνει. Μέμων Ἀντιλόχου ἀποκτείνει. Ἀχιλλέους Μέμωνα ἀποκτείνει. Ἐν ταῖς Θηράους πώλαις Ἀχιλλέους ἐπὶ Πάρδος ἀμαρτείνα. It seems very probable that these five sentences answer to the five books into which we know that the poem was divided. If so, the argument may be distributed somewhat as follows:—

I. Arrival of Penthesilea—her ἄρσεια.

II. Slaying of Penthesilea—interval of truce, occupied on the Trojan side by her burial, on the Greek side by the Thersites-scene and the withdrawal of Achilles.

III. Arrival and ἄρσεια of Memnon—he slays Antilochus.

10 Welcker, Ep. Cycl. ii. p. 524; Jahn, Bilderchroniken, Tab. iii. D'.
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IV. Achilles returns to the field, slays Memnon, and puts the Trojans to flight.

V. Death of Achilles in the gate—battle for the recovery of his body—θρήνος and apotheosis of Achilles—funeral games and contest for his arms.

From the statement of the scholiast on Pindar (Isth. 3. 53), that according to the Aethiopis Ajax killed himself about dawn, it would appear that the story was brought down a little further than Proclus gives it. The reason for the omission would be that the contest for the arms and the death of Ajax fell within the story of the Little Iliad

The Townley scholia on the Iliad contain the statement that in the place of the line which ends the poem in all MSS.,

δε οί γ’ διμφέτου ράφων Ἐκτορος Ἰπποδήμου

some copies had the two lines,

δε οι γ’ διμφέτου ράφων Ἐκτορος, ἡλθε δ’ Άμαξιν

"Ἀρης δύναται μεγαλύτερος ἂν δροσόφονοι."

These lines are evidently meant to introduce the story of the Aethiopis, and were believed by Welcker to be the opening words of the poem itself (Ep. Cycl. 18. p. 199). Others, as Bernhardy, have thought that they were framed for the purpose of connecting the two poems in a collection or compilation, such as the Epic Cycle. The latter view is probably nearer the truth. There is a very similar passage of four lines at the end of the Theogony of Hesiod :

ἀναί πένθος τατ’ ἀνθρώπων εὐπρεπεία

ἀβάναι γείνατε θεία ἐπικελά τέκνα

νὺν δ’ γυναικῶν φύλον αἰείσθε, ἡμυπείαν

Μόναι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Δίων ἀλέεσθε.

These lines are in the form of a transition from the Theogony to the Hesiodic Kataklymos Γυναικῶν, and accordingly have been thought by some commentators to be in fact the first four lines of that poem. Two MSS., however, omit them altogether, and several others omit the last two of the four, thus leaving the clause αναί πένθος without an apodosis. Comparing these facts with the case of the two lines at the end of the Iliad, we see that the circumstances are almost exactly parallel. The single line which stands in our copies is incomplete. Like all the sentences in Homer that begin with δε ο’ γε, and the like, it is the first half of a formula of transition. The Townley scholia

11 The quotation of eight lines assigned by Kinkel to the Aethiopis (fr. 3 in his edition), seems to me to belong to the Ηλων πάρας; see p. 372.
have preserved the original form of the couplet. What then was the source of these lines? What is their date? We may be sure at least that they cannot have been the opening of the ancient 'Cyclic' Aethiopis. Apart from the silence of the scholia, and the difficulty of understanding why the lines should ever have appeared in manuscripts of the Iliad, it is impossible to suppose that the Aethiopis began with words which would be meaningless unless the hearer remembered the end of the Iliad. This would be something quite different from the general knowledge of and subordination to Homer which we trace in the 'Cyclic' poets. Both in the Iliad and in the Theogony the lines in dispute have the appearance of a sort of catchword added to prepare the reader for the next poem, as in printed books the heading of a chapter used to be placed at the foot of the preceding page. Such catchwords imply of course that the poems were read in a recognized order. The habit of inserting them may have begun in the Alexandrine age, when the chief works in each branch of literature were collected and arranged in a 'canon' or accepted list. After the formula had been confused with the text of the author, it was an easy further step to leave out the latter part of it, as being wholly irrelevant to the subject of the poem.

In passing from the Cypria to the Aethiopis we are struck at once with the greater simplicity and unity of the poem. The action falls within nearly the same limits of space and time as that of the Iliad. There are two days of battle, separated by an interval which need not be supposed to be a long one. The second battle is quickly followed by the funeral games, with which the concluding events are immediately connected. The hero of the poem is Achilles; the main event is his death, and to this the rest of the action, as far as we can judge, is kept in due subordination.

The proportion of incidents that can be regarded as directly founded upon passages in Homer is comparatively small. The death of Achilles takes place as foreshadowed in the prophecy of Hector (II. 22. 359–360):

\[
\text{ءارضي الْفُصَّلَةُ مِنْ نَبِيَّةَ الْأَرْدُنِيَّةَ}
\text{يَأْتِيّنَ لَهُمْ هَلْسُ وَهُمْ يَؤْتِيُّهُمْ نَبَلَةً}
\text{ءاَنِبُرُمُ مِنْ نَبْيِ مُحَمَّدٍ}
\]

This, however, is a circumstance which may well have been part of the ancient saga, anterior to the Iliad itself. The Odyssey refers to the beauty of Memnon (11. 522), and to the death of Antilochus at his hands (4. 187); but there is nothing in Homer to connect Memnon with the Aethiopians. The Amazons, again, are mentioned in the
Iliad, but (like the Aethiopians of the Odyssey) they belong to a distant and fanciful region. The funeral games held in honour of Achilles, and the lament for him performed by Thetis and the attendant Muses and Nereids, are described in the last book of the Odyssey (24. 36–97). The burning of the body, mentioned in the same passage of the Odyssey (24. 71–79), was replaced in the Aethiopis by a species of apotheosis in harmony with later religious and national feeling. The representation in the Aethiopis—and also, as we shall see, in the Little Iliad—of Ajax carrying the dead body of Achilles, while Ulysses protected the retreat, is clearly taken from II. 17. 715 ff., where, however, it is Ajax with his Locrian namesake who keeps the Trojans at bay. Aristarchus, who pointed out the imitation (see Schol. A on II. 17. 719), added the remark that if Homer had related the death of Achilles he would not have made Ajax carry the body, as the later poets did. Another account actually exchanged the parts played by the two heroes: for on Od. 5. 310, where Ulysses speaks of this exploit—

\[ \textit{καὶ μετα τῷ ὅτε μοι πλεῖστοι χαλόρεα δοῦρα} \]

\[ \textit{Τρῶς ἐπίρρησαν περὶ Πηλείων θανόντι}, \]

the scholiasts add that Ulysses and Ajax fought for the body of Achilles, and that 'the one (Ulysses) carried it, and Ajax protected it with his shield, as also in the case of Patroclus.' This variant, however, was evidently unknown to Aristarchus.

18 It will be remembered here that the twenty-fourth book of the Odyssey is later than the bulk of the poem. But the discrepancy noticed in the text seems to show that it is at least older than the Aethiopis.

19 ("Η ἂνελά") ἐν ἱνεῖοι τὸν ναύτερον ὅ βασταζόμενος ἄχιλλης ἦν Ἀλεπτο, ἐναρεύον ἐν τὸ Οὔτωσεν παρῆκεν. ἐν δὲ Ὀμηρὸς ἔγραφε τὸν ἄχιλλην δαματο, ὅπε ἐν ἐντολὴ τὸν νεκρὸν ἦν Ἀλεπτο βασταζόμενος, ὡς ὁ ναύτερο (Schol. A on II. 17. 719).

ἔτι ἑπερεμάχησαν τοῦ ναύματος ἄχιλλης ὁ Οὔτωσεν καὶ Αλας, καὶ δὲ μὲν ἱδέατασεν, ὅ δὲ Ἀλα ὑπερήπασεν, ὡς καὶ ἔιν Πατρόκλῳ (Schol. B P Q on Od. 5. 310). Cp. the speech of Ulysses in Ovid, Metam. xiii. 282: 

nec me lacrimae luctuose timorve
tardarunt quin corpus humo sublime referrem.

In this latter version Ajax remains true to his Homeric character as the chief hero of defence, wielding 'a shield like a tower,' and it is easy to suspect that it was the original account of Arctinus, although in the argument of Proclus the Aethiopis is made to agree with the current story of the Little Iliad. It is clear, however, that Aristarchus knew nothing of any such variant. Either therefore we must suppose that Aristarchus was unacquainted with the poems of Arctinus—and it is curious that we have no trace showing that he did know them—or we must explain the statement of the scholia on Od. 5. 310 as a mere mistake. The remark of Aristarchus that Homer would have told the story in a certain way may have been twisted into a statement that that was the true account.
Regarding the 'judgment of the arms,' which perhaps fell within the range of the Aethiopis (p. 356), two stories were told. According to the Little Iliad, as we shall see, the issue was made to depend upon the part taken by each hero in rescuing the body of Achilles. The Greeks sent spies to listen under the walls of Troy, and when these reported that in the opinion of the Trojan maidens Ulysses, who repelled the Trojan attack, did a greater service than Ajax, who carried the body of Achilles back to the camp, they awarded the arms to Ulysses. But the scholia on the Odyssey (11. 543 ff.) tell us that in the line in the Νέκυια—

παιδες δὲ Τρόων δίκαιων καὶ Πολλᾶς Ἀθηνᾶ

the reference is to the Trojan prisoners, who served at the trial as a jury. The question put to them being whether Ajax or Ulysses had done them most harm, they gave their verdict for Ulysses. Apparently Athene herself acted as a dicast—as she did in the equally famous trial-scene of the Eumenides. This form of the story does not connect the 'judgment of the arms' in any especial manner with the combat over the body of Achilles, and so far it is simpler and more reasonable than the other. Also, it gives a better meaning to the passage of the Νέκυια, especially to the word δίκαιων. Regarding its source we are only told that it comes from the 'cyclic' history (ἡ ιορταλα ἐκ τῶν κυκλικῶν Schol. H). The most obvious conjecture is that it was the version of Arctinus. It should be noticed that the line παιδες δὲ Τρόων κυλ. was rejected by Aristarchus, who apparently regarded both the current versions of the trial-scene as post-Homeric.  

These are perhaps the only cases in which Arctinus can be thought to have directly borrowed the matter of the Aethiopis from Homer. Nevertheless the whole course of the events on which the poem is founded is closely parallel to the story of the Iliad. The hero is the same, and he again quarrels with the Greeks and leaves them for a time. Thetis has the same part as in the Iliad—that of consoling her son and warning him of the future. Antilochus apparently takes the place of Patroclus as the friend of Achilles. Like Patroclus, he is the warrior whose fate comes next to that of Achilles in tragic interest, whose death at the hands of the Trojan champion is immediately

14 The scene is especially suggested by Il. 2. 220 ἐχθρῶν δ᾽ Ἀχιλῆς μάλιστ᾽ ἂν ἱμὴ Ὄδυσσης, τῷ γὰρ νεκρισαί. As the Iliad shows Thersites in relation to Agamemnon and Ulysses, it was left to the Aethiopis to bring him on the stage with Achilles.

15 The prophecy about Memnon seems suggested by Il. 11. 795 (= 16. 37, 51) καὶ τινὲς ὁ πάρ Ζηρός ἐκφέρατε πότνια μῆτηρ.
APPENDIX

avenged by Achilles himself. Achilles, again, when he has pursued the Trojans into the city, is killed by Apollo and Paris; as Patroclus, drawn too far in a like victorious course, was killed by Apollo and Hector. The contest which follows for the recovery of the body of Achilles is a repetition of the contest in the seventeenth book over Patroclus. There is also a scene with Thersites, as in the Iliad, but it has a more tragic issue. The armour of Achilles has its counterpart in the armour of Memnon, which is equally the work of Hephaestus. Achilles gives up the body of Penthesilea, as he gave up Hector to Priam. The battles of the poem are wound up by a ὕπνος, a funeral, and funeral games.

In these points, as in the plan of the poem, we have to recognize not so much borrowing as imitation, that is to say, a close adherence to the motifs and artistic forms of the Iliad. The ancient tradition that Arctinus was a disciple of Homer (Ομήρου μαθητή Συῖδ) is fully borne out by what we know thus far of his work.

It may be objected here that the correspondences now insisted upon between the Aethiopis and the Iliad go to show that the two works belong to the same age or school, but do not prove that the Iliad is the original, of which the other is an imitation. This proof may be supplied by an examination of the various post-Homeric elements in the Aethiopis:

1. The part which the Amazons take in the defence of Troy is evidently unknown to Homer. The Aethiopians of the Odyssey are far too remote from the known world of Homer to have taken part in the Trojan war. Both the Amazons and the Aethiopians are nations of a fabulous type that we do not meet with in the Iliad at all. Their appearance in the Aethiopis is evidently due to an inclination towards the romantic and marvellous, of which several examples have been already noticed in the Cypria.

3. The carrying away of Achilles to the island of Leuce is an incident which reminds us of the death of Sarpedon in the Iliad (16. 450, 667), but it is at variance with the account given in the last book of the Odyssey (24. 71–79), according to which his body was burned and the ashes placed in an urn, along with those of Patroclus. It is connected with the custom of hero-worship, the absence of which is so distinctive a mark of the Homeric age. For the choice of Leuce

18 Strabo (xii. 24, p. 553) speaks as if it were an established fact that the Amazons took no part in the Trojan war. He was probably unacquainted with the poems of Arctinus: see the remarks on p. 378.
as the abode of Achilles is significant. It was an island in the Euxine opposite the mouth of the Danube, and in historical times we find the worship of Achilles widely spread on the neighbouring coasts. Thus Alcaeus addresses him as presiding hero of Scythia 17, and Herodotus (4. 55) describes the strip of land called 'Αχιλληίος δρόμος near the mouth of the Borysthenes. This diffusion of Greek traditions and Greek religious ideas must have been mainly brought about by the numerous colonies of Miletus, which occupied the coasts of the Euxine in the early prosperous times of Ionia; it is therefore no accidental coincidence that a poet of Miletus should be the earliest witness of the fact. It has been doubted, indeed, whether the Leuce of the poet is the real island afterwards so called. According to the received chronology the period of Milesian colonisation is rather later than Arctinus. The original Leuce may have been purely mythical, the ‘island of Light,’ like the Elysian plain in the Odyssey. The name would naturally be attached in course of time to a real place, especially a place in the centre of a region over which the worship of the new hero extended. If we accept this view, which however is only necessary on the assumption that Arctinus is anterior to the Milesian settlements, the evidence of the Aethiopis is still good for Miletus itself. It will then serve at least to connect the Aethiopis with the time when the Ionian trading cities, of which Miletus was chief, had begun to adopt the new religious practices that grew up, after the Homeric age, in honour of the national heroes.

4. The immortality granted to Memnon is a further exemplification of the new ideas. It is true that two similar instances are found in our text of the Odyssey, viz. the immortality of Menelaus in the Elysian plain (Od. 4. 563), and the apotheosis of Heracles (Od. 11. 601). The latter, however, is almost certainly spurious, since it is inconsistent with all that is said of Heracles elsewhere in Homer. The passage about Menelaus may also be an interpolation; in any case it stands alone, and the Iliad (as we see especially from the case of Sarpedon) shows no trace of the notion 18.

5. Another incident of a post-Homeric kind is the purification of Achilles from the guilt of homicide, after sacrifice to Apollo, Artemis, and Leto. There are references in Homer to compensation paid to the relatives of the slain man, but never to any purification by means

17 Αχιλλεύς δ τοὺς ξανθίας νίμις (Alc. fr. 49).
18 Hesiod (Op. 156 ff.) speaks as though many of the heroes of Troy had obtained this immortality:

τὸς δὲ δίχ' ἄνθρωπων βιοῦν καὶ ἰὼν ὑδάτας καλλιεργεῖται ηὐλ.

Another instance is Phaethon son of Eos (Hes. Theog. 987 ff.).
of ritual, nor is Apollo ever represented as deliverer from guilt (καθάπερα), which afterwards became one of his most prominent characters. The whole idea of pollution as a consequence of wrongdoing is foreign to Homer 19.

It seems to follow from these considerations that the *Aethiopis* of Arctinus, like the *Cypria*, was a work of considerably later date than the *Iliad*. Probably also it was later than any part of the *Odyssey* (see the note on p. 358): but as to this the evidence, in the nature of the case, is less conclusive. And while it is apparent that the *Aethiopis* was materially different from the *Cypria* in point of artistic structure, and probably in style and spirit, we cannot but see on the one hand that it was influenced in the same degree by the example and authority of Homer, on the other hand that it showed equally decisive traces of change and progress, both in external circumstances and in moral and religious ideas.

§ 6. The Little *Iliad*.

The abstract of the *Little Iliad* given by Proclus represents it as a poem in four books, which related the events of the Trojan war from the award of the arms of Achilles to the bringing of the Wooden Horse into the city. The original poem, as has been shown (p. 343), brought the story down to the departure of the Greeks, and thus came into competition with the *Διόν πέρας* (*Sack of Troy*) of Arctinus. Proclus accordingly passes over the latter part of the *Little Iliad*—either because it was not taken into the Epic Cycle, or (on Welcker's view) because his object was to give the series of events rather than the contents of the different poems. The want is supplied in great measure by the statement of Aristotle (quoted above, p. 343) about the tragedies taken from the *Little Iliad*, and still more by the passage in Pausanias (10. 25–27) describing the celebrated paintings by Polygnotus in the *lesche* at Delphi. These paintings represented scenes from the capture of Troy, and we are expressly told by Pausanias that in them Polygnotus followed the account of the *Little Iliad*. From this source we learn more of the details of the poem than is known of any other part of the Epic Cycle.

The *Little Iliad* was generally ascribed to Lesches of Mitylene (or Pyrrha), but by some to Thesiorides of Phocaea, by others (among

19 This was observed by the ancients: cp. Schol. T on II. 11. 690 ὑπ' Ὄμηρον ὅσιν ὑδάμεν ἄρτας καθάπερα, ἀλλ' ἀντίστι ηθος ἄρτης φυγαδεύκοντι. The most famous example is in the story of Adrametus and Croesus (Hdt. i. 35), from which Grote infers that the rites came to Greece from Lydia.
whom was the historian Hellanicus of Lesbos) to Cinaethon of Sparta, by others to Diodorus of Erythrae. There was also a story (like the one told of Stasinus and the Cypria) that Homer was himself the author, and gave it to Thestorides of Phocaea in return for lodging and maintenance (Ps. Hdt. Vit. Hom., § 15 ff.).

Of the ten tragedies said by Aristotle to be founded upon episodes of the Little Iliad, the first six cover the same ground as Proclus' abstract of the poem. The account of Proclus, therefore, is verified by the high authority of Aristotle, down to the point at which Proclus—or the compiler of the Epic Cycle—deserted the Little Iliad for the Iliupersis of Arctinus. The agreement is so close that the titles in the Aristotelian list will serve very well as headings under which the argument of Proclus may be arranged. The incidents, then, were as follows:—

(1) The Judgment of the Arms (ερήμα δαλών). The arms of Achilles, by the influence of Athene, were adjudged to Ulysses; the madness and suicide of Ajax follow.

(2) The Philoctetes. Ulysses having taken Helenus prisoner, and obtained from him an oracle about the capture of Troy, Philoctetes is brought from Lemnos by Diomede, is healed by Machaon, and kills Paris in single combat. The dead body of Paris is treated with indignity by Menelaus, then given up to the Trojans and buried. Deiphobus becomes the husband of Helen.

(3) The Neoptolemus. Ulysses brings Neoptolemus from Scyros and gives him the arms of Achilles. The shade of Achilles appears to him.

(4) The Euryalus. Euryalus, the son of Telephus, now comes as a fresh ally of the Trojans. After doing great deeds he is slain by Neoptolemus.

The Trojans are now closely besieged, and the Wooden Horse is made by Epeius, under the guidance of Athene.

(5) The πρώτεια. Ulysses maltreats himself, and enters Troy in beggar's disguise. He is recognised by Helen, with whom he confers regarding the capture of the city, and fights his way back to the camp.

(6) The Αδραιωμ. The Palladium of Troy is carried off by Ulysses and Diomede.

C. Robert (Bild und Lied, p. 226) points out that the authority of Hellanicus tells strongly against Lesches. Had there been an old tradition of the Lesbian origin of the Little Iliad, Hellanicus as a Lesbian would probably have given it his support. It is worth notice that the poem is ascribed to authors belonging to all the great divisions of the Hellenic race.

We have no express statement as to the subject of the Αδραιωμ, but there
(7) The Sack of Troy (Πλοῦ πέρας).

The Greeks then man the Wooden Horse with the chief warriors and make their feigned retreat; the Wooden Horse is taken into the city, and great rejoicings are held by the Trojans over their fancied deliverance.

At this point the argument in Proclus breaks off.

The remaining plays mentioned by Aristotle are:—

(8) The Departure of the Greeks (ἀπόβασις), which is also the last incident in the Iliupersis of Arctinus.

(9) The Sinon—doubtless founded on the same story as is given in the argument of the Iliupersis, and with full detail in the Aeneid.

(10) The Troades, in all probability the extant play of the name, which turns upon events that immediately followed the capture.

It is worthy of notice that the two last plays are out of their chronological order, since they turn upon subordinate incidents belonging to the subject of the seventh, the Sack of Troy. This is not the only indication that they stand on a different footing from the rest—that they are of the nature of an after-thought. Aristotle begins by saying that there were ‘more than eight’ plays taken from the Little Iliad. We may gather that he had eight in his mind that were clearly taken from the poem, besides others that had been more or less altered in the process of fitting them for the stage.

About twenty lines of the Little Iliad survive, besides numerous references. The opening lines were—

"Πλοῦ ἀπίδω καὶ Δαρδανής ἐσπελαυν,

ἐς πέρα πολλὰ πάθον Δαναοὶ θεραπέουσι Λευκῆς."

It was therefore an Iliad in the proper sense of the term. The subject was the fall of Troy, and the various episodes were necessary steps towards that end.

The next in the series of quotations (fr. 2) has the interest of being referred to by the poet Aristophanes, in a passage of the Knights (1056). It comes from the first part of the poem, the Judgment of the Arms. According to the Little Iliad the Greeks, on the advice of Nestor, sent spies to listen under the walls of Troy for some saying that would enable them to decide the quarrel. The spies heard the Trojan maidens disputing on the question at issue. One said that Ajax was by far the bravest—

is no room for doubt. The play is evidently named from the chorus, which consisted of the Spartan maidens in the service of Helen.
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Διὰς μὲν γὰρ ἀπερε καὶ ἐκεῖρα δοξουμένος
ημι Πηλεῖν, οὐδ' ἔθιελε διὸς 'Οδυσσεύς.

To which another answered, by the inspiration of Athene—

πῶς ἐπεσουσθεί; πῶς οὗ καὶ κύριον ἑκείνη;
καὶ κε γυνὴ φέροι ἄχθος, ετεί κεν ἄνη̣ρ ἑπιθείη.

These words were reported to the Greek assembly, and the decision
given accordingly in favour of Ulysses. The last line is actually
quoted in the text of Aristophanes; the rest comes from the scholiast.
It is interesting to compare this form of the story with the version
given above (p. 359) as probably that of the Aethiopis of Arctinus.
The two versions agree in finding a meaning for the παιδες Τρώων of
Od. ii. 547. The notion of a jury of Trojan prisoners deciding on
the merits of Greek heroes is not without dramatic effect, though it
fails in dignity and verisimilitude. But the substitution of Trojan
maidens overheard disputing about the question turns the whole into
an absurdity. We can only suppose that it originated as a deliberate
parody of the older and simpler story.

The Little Iliad is also quoted (fr. 3) for the statement that owing
to the anger of Agamemnon the body of Ajax was placed in the coffin
without being duly burned.

Two lines (fr. 4) relate how Achilles was driven by a storm to the
island of Scyros. This is evidently to introduce the bringing of
Neoptolemus. The words describing the spear of Achilles (fr. 5)
may belong to the same part of the story.

Four lines (fr. 6) are quoted from the history of a famous golden
vine, which the author of the Little Iliad—differing somewhat from
Homer—represented as having been given by Zeus to Laomedon by
way of compensation for the loss of his son Ganymede:

ἀμφόλων, ὡς Κρονίδης ἔποιεὶ οἷ παιδες ἄνωθι,
χρυσίτης φυλλωσίν ἀγαθών κομίωσιν
βότρυνι θ' ὁ δε Ἡφαιστός ἐπασκήνωσ Αἰε πατρὶ
δῶχ', ὡς τοι Λαομίδως τόρεν Γανυμήθεως ἀντί.

These four lines probably come from the episode of Eurypylus. The
vine appears to be referred to in the Odyssey (ix. 521 ff.), where Ulysses
relates how Eurypylus son of Telephus fell, ‘and many Ceteians were
slain around him, all because of a woman’s gift’ (γυναιὸν εἰκέα δώρεν).

The bringing of Neoptolemus was probably directed by the oracle of Helenus
(Milani, Milo di Filette, p. 22). As to this, however, there may have been
more than one account: see Philostr. Imag. p. 865 λεγον δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἑλληνας
ἐμπλεόντος ἐκ οἴνων ἔλλη τού ἄλωτος ἵππου τῇ Τροίᾳ πλὴρ τοῖς Αλαίδως.
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The scholiasts on this passage tell us, on the authority of the ancient historian Acusilaus, that Priam sent a golden vine to Astyoche the mother of Euryppylus, and thus persuaded her to send her son to the aid of the Trojans. This explanation is borne out by Od. 15. 247, where the same thing is said of Amphiaraus—

διὰ δειν ἐν Θέσιοι γυναιών ἕνεκα δώρων,

that is to say, he was forced to take part in the war of Thebes, in which he fell, because of the necklace given to his wife Eriphyle. If then the golden vine given to Astyoche was the same as that which Laomedon received from Zeus, it becomes easy to understand how the four lines in question came into the episode of Euryppylus. The poet of the Little Iliad had to relate the story of Priam sending the ornament as a bribe to Astyoche, and was naturally led to give its history in a short digression (after the manner of the ἀκτητήν παράχον of II. 2. 101—108). On this view we can almost complete the fragment. The next line would be something like—

οὗτος Λαόμεδων Πρίαμῳ λίτρ.

and the apodosis (which is required by the grammatical form of the passage) must have said, 'this vine, then, Priam now gave to Astyoche, mother of Euryppylus.' The poetical value of a parenthesis of this kind is evident. It must have heightened the pathetic effect of the story to represent Priam, in the extremity of his need, giving away one of the great heirlooms of the royal house to buy the alliance of the Mysian king.

Among the deeds of Euryppylus not noticed in the argument was the slaying of Machaon (fr. 7). Other details to be added to this part of the narrative are, the wounding of Ulysses by Thoas (fr. 8), the name Antilus in the list of the warriors who were in the Wooden Horse (fr. 10), and the full moon (fr. 11)—

νυσ τοῦ μήσου, λαμπρὴ δὲ ἐπήλευ ὀτέρη.

The line comes from the description of Sinon giving the preconcerted signal to the Greek army. It was of great use to the scholars who sought to determine the exact date of the capture.

The remaining fragments (12—19) relate to the final battle and the division of the spoil. The picturesque incident of Menelaus letting fall his sword at the sight of Helen, referred to by Aristophanes (Lysistr. 155), came from this part of the Little Iliad (fr. 16). A quotation of five lines (fr. 18) relates that Neoptolemus obtained Andromache as his prize, and killed the young Astyanax by throwing him from the wall of Troy. Pausanias adds that Aeneas also was
given to Neoptolemus, and that the death of Astyanax was the act of Neoptolemus alone, not authorised by the decree of the army. Other incidents of more or less interest are derived from the chapters of Pausanias already mentioned (10.25–27). From this source we learn that according to the *Little Iliad* (fr. 15), King Priam was not killed by Neoptolemus as he clung to the altar of his palace (as the story is told in Virgil), but at the door. Helicaon, son of Antenor, when wounded in the night battle was recognised by Ulysses, and his life was saved (fr. 13). Aethra, the mother of Theseus, who was one of the attendants of Helen, made her way to the Greek camp, and was recognised by her grandsons Demophon and Acamas; into whose hands Agamemnon, having first obtained the consent of Helen, delivered her free from her long bondage (fr. 17). Ajax, son of Oileus, was represented as taking an oath to purge himself of the sacrilege which he had committed in tearing Cassandra from the altar of Athene so that the image of the goddess was dragged after her (Paus. 10.26.1). Besides these there are various details, such as form the staple of the minor Homeric battles. Meges is wounded by Admetus, Lycomedes by Agenor (fr. 12); Admetus is slain by Philoctetes, Coroebus by Diomede, Axion by Eurypylus (fr. 15); Astynous is struck down by Neoptolemus (fr. 14), and Eioneus and Agenor also fall to him (fr. 15). In the *Little Iliad* the wife of Aeneas is named Eurydice (as also in the *Cypria*)—not Creusa.

Such, then, were the multifarious events and personages of which the story of the *Little Iliad* was composed. For the plan of the poem and the degree of artistic unity which it possessed we must recur to the piece of Aristotelian criticism already quoted in reference to the *Cypria*. The *Little Iliad*, like the *Cypria*, is said by Aristotle to be about one person (περὶ ἕνα), one time, and one action consisting of many parts (περὶ μιᾶν πρᾶξιν πολυμερῆ). The 'one action' is evidently the taking of Troy. The 'parts' of which it consists are the subordinate events, such as the arrival of Neoptolemus, the healing and return of Philoctetes, the theft of the Palladium. Each of these parts is necessary to the main action, but is also a story with an interest of its own, capable of furnishing the subject of an independent work; whereas in Homer the different episodes have not this independent character; their interest lies in their relation to the whole, and is lost when they are detached from it. The 'one hero' of the *Little Iliad*
is somewhat less obvious; but a review of the chief incidents leaves no doubt that Ulysses holds that place. The poem begins with his victory over Ajax, which meant that he was then acknowledged by the Greeks as their greatest warrior; and he is the chief actor, or at least the chief adviser, in most of the other affairs. His character (as in Homer) is that of the champion of stratagem and adventure; and as such he is contrasted with warriors of the type of Achilles and Ajax. With a hero of this stamp we should naturally assume that the poem was of a comparatively light and cheerful cast; and this impression is amply confirmed by the details, so far as they are known. Such scenes as the debate of the Trojan maidens on the wall (in the ὀκλῶν ἐπὶ τάκα), or Menelaus letting fall his sword at the sight of Helen, have an unmistakeable air of comedy. This will be brought out still further when we come to compare the Little Iliad with the treatment of the same narrative by Arctinus.

The Little Iliad is distinguished among the Cyclic poems by the large proportion of matter which may be regarded as derived from Homer, either directly or through earlier poems of the Homeric school. Thus, to take the episodes in Aristotle's list—

1. The Judgment of the Arms is described in Od. 11. 543–562. It has been noticed above (in speaking of the Aethiopis) that the representation of Ajax carrying the body of Achilles, while Ulysses covered the retreat, is apparently taken from the battle over Patroclus in the seventeenth book of the Iliad: compare especially vv. 717–719, where Ajax says, addressing Menelaus—

Δέλλα σύ μὲν καὶ Μηνίδης ὑποδύει μᾶλ’ ἵκα
νεκρὸν ἀλώσας φέρετ’ ἐκ πόνων αὐτὸρ διψάθεν
τοῖς μαχηθόμεθα Τροώσιν τε καὶ Ἐκτορὶ διφ.

The rescue of Achilles and the part which Ulysses played in it is referred to in the Odyssey (5. 309–310):—

Ηματε τῷ δε μοι πλείστοι χαλκόρεα δώρα
Τρώος ἐπέρρεψαν πέρι Πηλέως δακρώτει.

The fanciful story of the spies overhearing the words of the Trojan maidens seems to be contrived to give a meaning to Od. 11. 547—

παῖδες δὲ Τρώων δίκαιων καὶ Παλλᾶς Ἀθην.,

a line of which other explanations were current (see p. 359).

2. The bringing of Philoctetes from Lemnos is alluded to in Il. 2. 718, and his presence with the army is implied in Od. 8. 219.

3. Neoptolemus is mentioned in Il. 19. 326, as being then in
Scyros: his coming to Troy under the charge of Ulysses in Od. 11. 506 ff.

4) His victory over *Euryffylius* in Od. 11. 518 ff.

5) The *πιξία*, with the meeting between Ulysses and Helen, is sketched in Od. 4. 240-264.

6) The theft of the Palladium is unknown to Homer. The adventure is in the manner of the tenth book of the *Iliad*, and may even be an imitation of it.

7) The capture of Troy by means of the Wooden Horse was told in the song of Demodocus, Od. 8. 492 ff. Anticlus as the name of one of the heroes in the Wooden Horse (fr. 10) occurs in the story told in Od. 4. 285. That Deiphobus became the husband of Helen, and that he was killed by Menelaus, seems to be implied in Od. 4. 276., 8. 517 (cp. 4. 276). The recognition of Helicaon son of Antenor by Ulysses (fr. 13) is suggested by II. 3. 207 ff., where Antenor is said to have entertained Ulysses and Menelaus. It is an example of *εὐία*, like the meeting of Diomede and Glaucus. Coroebus coming as a suitor for the hand of Cassandra (fr. 16) seems to be a repetition of Othryoneus (II. 13. 364)—

δὲ μὰ νέων πολέμων μετὰ κλέος εὐπλοῦσας,

ηὐτεὶ δὲ Πριὰμων θυγατέρας ἕδει ἀριστήν

Κασσάνδρην.

8) The death of Astyanax, as it is related in fr. 18—

παιδὰ δ' ἐλῶν ἐκ κόλπου εὐπλοκέμοι τυῆνης

μίψει ποδὸς τεταγὼν ἀπὶ πύργου,

is suggested by the words of Andromache in II. 24. 734—

ἡ τε Ἀχαίων

μίψει χαῖρες ἐλῶν ἀπὸ πύργου, λυγρὸν ἀθληθῶν.

The sacrifice of Ajax son of Oileus may have been suggested by Od. 4. 502, where his death is connected with the hatred of Athene: cp. the reference to the anger of Athene as the cause of the disasters of the return, Od. 3. 135.

Of the additions made by the *Little Iliad* to the Homeric narrative the following are of interest:—

1) The Palladium of Troy is unknown to Homer, but was mentioned by Arctinus. It has been already observed more than once that objects endowed with magical virtue are not Homeric.

2) So of the arrows of Philoctetes: it would be unlike Homer to make the fate of a city depend upon anything of the kind.
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(3) Sinon is not one of the Homeric *dramatis personae*, if we may argue from the silence of the *Odyssey*. He was a character in the *Iliupersis*.

(4) Aethra, the mother of Theseus, was said to have been carried off by the Dioscuri in their invasion of Attica. Accordingly in the *Little Iliad* she is in bondage to Helen, and is set free by her grandsons Demophon and Acamas, as is related in the passage of Pausanias quoted above (fr. 17). The only apparent trace of this in Homer is in II. 3. 144, where the two attendants of Helen are—

_Αἴθρη Πιθήκος θυγάτηρ, Κλωμέντις βοώνιας._

It is impossible, however, to suppose that the poet of the *Iliad* knew the story of Aethra. There is no trace in Homer of acquaintance with the group of legend to which the story belongs. The two sons of Theseus are not among the warriors of the *Iliad*, and the few references to Theseus himself are probably interpolations. Even supposing Theseus to be known to Homer, he belongs to an earlier generation than the heroes of the *Iliad*, and the chronological difficulty of bringing his mother into the story of Troy is manifest. Hence, as Aristarchus pointed out, we have to choose between two suppositions. Either the line is an interpolation, inserted to suit the story of Aethra; or it is genuine, and the coincidence of name is accidental. Considering the freedom with which Homer introduces unimportant proper names into his descriptions, the latter seems the more probable alternative. It might seem, indeed, that the whole story of Aethra was based on the line of Homer: but Aethra, as the name of the mother of Theseus, more probably belongs to the local tradition. Naturally the later poets who found the name in Homer took advantage of it in order to find a place for the Attic heroes in the main body of epic narrative. Thus the story, as told in the *Little Iliad* (and also, as we shall see, in the *Iliupersis* of Arctinus), is an attempt to connect the Trojan war with the local Attic mythology—a mythology which was singularly late in finding its way into literature.

Besides these we find only a few such matters as the slaying of Machaon by Eurypylus (fr. 7), the slaying of Priam (fr. 15), the division of the spoil, in which Andromache and Aeneas fall to Neoptolemus (fr. 18), the name Eurydice for the wife of Aeneas (fr. 19), the meeting of Menelaus and Helen (fr. 16), with the minor incidents of the night-battle.

* In the bronze figure of the Trojan Horse on the Acropolis of Athens, the heroes represented as peeping out of it were Menestheus, Teucer (who expresses the Athenian claim to Salamis), and the two sons of Theseus (Paus. 1. 23. 10).
In style and character the *Little Iliad* followed the *Odyssey* rather than the *Iliad*. The spirit of adventure which runs through it, especially in the earlier part, is clearly inspired by the picture of Ulysses in the *Odyssey*. In the *Iliad*, indeed (with the marked exception of the Doloneia), this side of his character is not brought out. He is wise and eloquent, but hardly adventurous. On the other hand it is the most prominent feature in the Doloneia (which is certainly later than the rest of the *Iliad*): and so doubtless in the προεῖα, the theft of the Palladium, and other parts of the *Little Iliad*. On the whole it would seem that if we imagine the *Little Iliad* as a poem of no great length—there were only four books according to Proclus—consisting of episodes in the manner of the Doloneia, we shall not be far from the truth.

§ 7. The *Iliupersis* of Arctinus.

According to Proclus the *Iliupersis* or 'Sack of Ilium' in the Epic Cycle was a poem in two books, the work of Arctinus of Miletus. The contents were as follows:—

The Trojans surround the Wooden Horse, and hold anxious debate. Some are for throwing it from the height of the city-wall, or burning it up: others say that it must be consecrated as an offering to Athene, and this opinion at length prevails. They then give themselves up to rejoicing over their deliverance. At this point two serpents appear, and kill Laocoön and one of his two sons. Alarmed by this portent, Aeneas and his followers withdraw to Mount Ida. Then Sinon lights the signal-fires, as agreed with the Greeks. They return from Tenedos, the warriors sally from the Wooden Horse, and the city is taken. Neoptolemus kills Priam in his house, on the altar of Zeus ἐπαξίος. Menelaus takes Helen to the camp, killing her husband Deiphobus. Ajax son of Oileus, in attempting to drag Cassandra from the altar of Athene, drags away the image of the goddess; upon which the Greeks are ready to stone him, and he escapes by taking refuge himself at the altar. By this act of sacrilege Athene is incensed against the Greeks, and prepares disaster for them on their return. Before they sail Ulysses kills Astyanax; Neoptolemus obtains Andromache as his prize; Demophon and Acamas find Aethra and take her with them. Finally the Greeks burn the city, and Polyxena is sacrificed at the tomb of Achilles.

This argument represents the *Iliupersis* as taking up the story of the siege nearly at the point where the argument of the *Little Iliad* left
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it, viz. the bringing of the Wooden Horse into the city. But as the Little Iliad is known to have included the later events, down to the departure of the Greeks, so it is possible that the poem of Arctinus began at an earlier point than the account of Proclus would lead us to suppose. Unfortunately the references to the Iliupersis are extremely few; but they go far to show that it gave some account of the events between the death of Ajax and the making of the Wooden Horse.

The scholia on the Iliad (11. 515) tell us that according to some critics the two Homeric larpol, Machaon and Podaleirius, followed the two branches of the healing art—Machaon dealing with wounds, Podaleirius with disease. In support of this they quote a remarkable fragment from Arctinus' Sack of Ilium (ἐν 'Ηλίου πορφύρου), which runs as follows:—

αὐτὸς γὰρ σφυν ἤδωκε πατήρ . . 'Εννοσίγαμος
· μοθοφέροις, ἐπιτοῦ ὦ ἐπέρου κυδίου ἦθη
tῷ μὲν κουφοτέρας χείρας πόρνη, ἵπ τε βίλειμα
σαρᾶς θλίν, τῦμβαί τε καὶ ἰλκα πάντ' ἀκίσσαθαι.
tῷ ὦ ἀκριβία πάντα ἐπι στήθεσιν ἦθηκεν
ἀκοπά τε γνώμαι καὶ ἀνάλθα ἁγισσάθαι:
δὲ ἵπ καὶ Λαυρό σπώτος μάθε χαμόκινο
δραμετά τ' ἀστράπτετα βερυφόμενον τ' νόημα.

It has been generally supposed, from the reference to Ajax, that these lines come from the Aethiopis, the scholiast having confused the two poems of Arctinus. This, however, is not in itself probable, and does not suit the wording of the passage. The two lines about Ajax are in form a parenthesis. The poet has been describing the surgery of Machaon and the medical skill of Podaleirius, and adds, by way of illustration, that Podaleirius was 'also' the first to perceive the symptoms of madness in Ajax (δὲ ἵπ καὶ Λαυρό σπώτος μάθε κτλ.). Hence the main subject of the passage was not the case of Ajax, but some later part of the history in which the Asclepiadæ were concerned. This later occasion must surely have been the healing of Philoctetes—which therefore must have been told in the Iliupersis of Arctinus.

It is worth noticing that the style of the lines is that of a speech rather than of a story told by the poet in his own person. The speaker seems to be arguing or explaining. He may be giving the reasons

30 On this subject see the exhaustive monograph of L. A. Milani, Il mito di Filotete (Firenze, 1879), and Sir Richard Jebb's introduction to his edition of the Philoctetes.
why Podaleirius was charged with the healing of Philoctetes, either alone or in addition to Machaon.

Regarding the form which the episode of Philoctetes assumed in the *Iliupersis* there is no direct evidence. The circumstance that Podaleirius had to do with the healing would be a point of difference from the *Little Iliad*, where Machaon only is heard of. It agrees with the account in the *Posthomerica* of Quintus Smyrnaeus, who gives the work to Podaleirius. Again, according to Quintus the oracle which leads the Greeks to send for Philoctetes is not given by Helenus, but by Calchas. It seems not unlikely that the incident of Ulysses taking Helenus prisoner, &c., was an addition to the original story, due to the desire to exalt the importance of Ulysses. If so, the older and simpler form of the story probably came from the *Iliupersis*. It may be also that in the *Iliupersis*, as in the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles and most later sources, the return of Philoctetes was placed after the coming of Neoptolemus from Scyros. But it is at least equally probable that Sophocles himself made the change in the order of events, and that he did so merely because he wished to make use of Neoptolemus as one of the characters in his play.

It seems not unlikely, especially if the *Iliupersis* represented the recovery of Philoctetes as one of the exploits of Neoptolemus, that the poem began with the coming of Neoptolemus himself from Scyros. This would explain the mention of the *Scyria pubes* in Virgil (*Aen.* 2. 477). On this view the poem would embrace the whole career of Neoptolemus πτολεορθὸς—the real captor of Troy.

---

28 Sophocles speaks of the Asclepiadai (*Phil.* 1333), and even of Asclepius himself being sent to perform the cure (*Phil.* 1437).
27 Quintus Smyrm. ix. 325 ff.
26 The story was taken as the subject of a tragedy by all the three great dramatists of Athens, and something is known of the mode of treatment adopted in each case. In the *Little Iliad*, as we have seen, the return of Philoctetes was effected by Diomedes, at the instigation of Ulysses. In the *Philoctetes* of Aeschylus Ulysses himself took the chief part in the exploit. Euripides, whose play comes next in the order of time, brought back Diomedes, but as a *tritagonistes*, in subordination to Ulysses. He made other changes, especially the introduction of a Trojan embassy. It would be an error to look for the source of these variations in the ancient epic poems. The story in which Diomedes was the actor was evidently a simple narrative, with no dénouement giving room for force or fraud. Aeschylus must have felt the want of dramatic interest, and supplied it by the conflict which he created between the obstinate resentment of Philoctetes and the craft and eloquence of Ulysses. Such a part as that of Ulysses was now a necessity. It was skilfully developed by Euripides, in whose hands the *Philoctetes* became a fine example of the drama of intrigue and adventure. In the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles the introduction of the character of Neoptolemus was used to give an entirely new turn to the play. The interest was shifted from the contrivances of Ulysses—which were therefore doomed to failure—to the conflict of feelings and motives in the mind of the hero.
Dionysius of Halicarnassus tells us that according to Arctinus the Palladium carried off by the Greeks was only a copy. The true Palladium was in Troy to the time of the capture, kept in a secret place, while the copy was exposed to view. Hence it appears that the theft of the Palladium was related, or at least mentioned, in the Iliupersis (as well as in the Little Iliad). We also learn from Dionysius that Virgil followed Arctinus in the description of the Sack of Troy in the second book of the Aeneid. Thus the slaying of Priam at the altar of Ζέες Ἐρείπεως recurs in the Aeneid (2. 663)—

Natum ante ora patris, patrem qui obrunca ad aras,
whereas in the Little Iliad (fr. 15) Priam is killed at the door of his palace. Hence it may be assumed that the Iliupersis is the source of Virgil’s account of the fate of Creusa, in Aen. 2. 785–788:

Non ego Myrmidonum sedes Dolopumve superbas
Aspiciam, aut Grais servitum matribus ibo
Dardanis et divae Veneris nurus:
Sed me magna deum genetrix his detinet oris.

This is confirmed by a statement of Pausanias (10. 26. 1), to the effect that Creusa was delivered from slavery by Aphrodite and the Mother of the gods. As Pausanias adds that according to the Little Iliad and the Cypria the wife of Aeneas was named Eurydice, we can hardly be wrong in assigning the story of Creusa to the Iliupersis.

Pausanias also tells us (10. 25. 9) that according to the Little Iliad Astyanax was thrown from a tower by Neoptolemus, ‘but not in pursuance of a decision of the Greeks’ (οὐ μὴν ἠπολύθη διὰ μαρτυρίως τῶν Ἑλλήνων). This seems to imply that in another account—presumably that of the Iliupersis—there was such a decision, carried out by Ulysses and doubtless also advised by him, on the ground that νῖμιος δὲ πατίρα κρίνας παῖδας καταλείνω.

It appears, then, that the story of the Iliupersis is to be reconstructed somewhat as follows. Neoptolemus, who is the destined conqueror in the Trojan war, is brought from Scyros to the Greek camp before Troy. He succeeds to the arms of Achilles, and kills the new Trojan champion, Eurypylus. Thus the important steps towards the capture

---

Pausanias never mentions Arctinus, and seems not to have known of either the Aethiopis or the Iliupersis. He refers to Arctinus’ version of the death of Priam, and of Astyanax (10. 25. 9), simply as the account from which Lesches differed. Similarly, when Pausanias (10. 27. 1) says that Coroebus was killed ὅποι δὲ παιδαν λόγοι by Neoptolemus, but according to Lesches by Diomedes, the ‘common account’ doubtless is that of the Iliupersis, of which Neoptolemus was the hero.
of Troy are due to him—the Palladium having been a deception. He takes the leading part in the Wooden Horse, and again in the Sack; which ends with the slaying of Priam in the central and most sacred spot of the city. In the division of the spoil he receives the chief ypæas, the possession of Andromache. He is evidently, therefore, the hero of the poem. His character, as we should expect from the poet of the Aethiopis, is in many points a repetition of the character of Achilles. He is a triumphant Achilles—πατρὸς εὐτυχότερος, τὰ ἄλλα ἄμιοι. As in the Theban story the older ‘Seven against Thebes’ fail and the ‘Epigoni,’ though less glorious, succeed, so Neoptolemus is an Achilles who succeeds. The Iliupersis stands to the Aethiopis, poetically speaking, as the Epigoni to the Thebaid.

With the fortunes of Neoptolemus for the main interest of the Iliupersis, we find, as a kind of underplot, the story of the flight of Aeneas. The death of Laocoon is not, as in Virgil, a warning to those who would destroy the Wooden Horse, but a sign of the approaching fall of Troy. The escape of one of the two sons—a trait peculiar to this version—was doubtless meant to signify that one branch of the Trojan royal house—that represented by Aeneas—might still survive the fall of the city and the extinction of the family of Priam. Thus the prophecy of Poseidon was to be fulfilled (Ili. 20. 307-308),

\[\nu\nu\ \\delta\ \\delta\ \ Αἰνεία\ \ Βίη \ Τράγεσσιν \ άνάξει,
καὶ \παιδὸν \παιδες \τοι \και \μεθένει\ \γίνονται,\]

—a prophecy which has long been recognised as a piece of local or family legend, connecting the later inhabitants of the Troad with Aeneas. The divine agents in these events were probably Aphrodite (who is also associated with Aeneas in the Cypria), and Cybele, the Idaean Mother, to whose sacred mountain the fugitives betook themselves. A trace of this remains in the story of Creusa, who evidently serves as a link of connexion between the Aeneas-legend and the local worship of Cybele. In that worship Creusa was doubtless a subordinate figure—taken into the service of the goddess as Ganymede by Zeus, or Iphigenia by Artemis. Another indication of local influence may be seen in the assertion of Arctinus that the Palladium taken by Ulysses and Diomed was a copy. The real Palladium was

\[\footnote{C. Robert, Bild und Lied, p. 193.}
\[\footnote{Arctinus certainly mentioned the true Palladium, probably in connexion with the flight of Aeneas; but the rest of the notice may possibly be due, as in some instances given by C. Robert (Bild und Lied, p. 231), not to the poet himself, but to commentators who sought to harmonise his account with the Little Iliad.}\]
doubtless believed to have been carried off by Aeneas, and to have remained in the possession of the royal house that claimed descent from him.

Among the subordinate characters the chief place was probably given to Ulysses. As in the Iliad, he is the wise counsellor of the Greek host. His advice leads to the return of Philoctetes, and prevails in the question of Astyanax. He evidently served as a contrast, bringing into relief the heroic figure of Neoptolemus.

Although the Iliupersis ended with the victory of the hero and the success of his cause, it had a distinctly tragic character. The Nemesis of good fortune made itself felt. When the Greeks set sail Athene had withdrawn her favour, and had resolved to send disaster upon them in the course of their voyage (φθορὰν αὐρῴς καὶ τὸ πέλαγος μηχανῆς, Procl.). The misfortunes of the return were therefore indicated at the close of the poem. The thought that 'satiety breeds insolence' evidently coloured the representation of Arctinus, and gave the key-note to the treatment of the subject in later Greek literature.

As to the plan and structure of the Iliupersis it is difficult to form a satisfactory judgment. If we are right in the conjecture that it began with the arrival of Neoptolemus, the poet can hardly have given it the almost Homeric unity which he attained in the Aethiopis. Possibly he imitated the plan of the Odyssey, and put the story of the earlier adventures into the mouth of one of the dramatis personae. This is suggested by the fact pointed out above (p. 372) that the fragment about Machaon and Podalirius has the appearance of belonging to some such ἀπόλογος. The shortness of the Iliupersis is a circumstance pointing in the same direction. A speaker in Homer—and therefore presumably in an epic of the school of Homer—can omit or abridge with a freedom that is not allowable in the poet's own narrative.

The incidents of the Iliupersis which appear to be taken from Homer—the Wooden Horse, the death of Deiphobus, the sacriilege of Ajax, the death of Astyanax, the disasters of the return to Greece—have been already noticed in speaking of the Little Iliad (see p. 369). Of the new or post-Homeric matter some portions are common to the two poems, viz. the treachery of Sinon, the slaying of Priam by Neoptolemus, and the story of Aethra. On the other hand the most important addition to the Homeric account, the story of the flight of Aeneas and his followers—of which the story of Laocoon is an integral part—is peculiar to Arctinus. According to
the *Little Iliad* Aeneas fell to the share of Neoptolemus, and was carried into slavery by him. The sacrifice of Polyxena, if we may argue from the silence of our authorities, was related in the *Iliupersis* only. It is one of the indications of the hero-worship of Achilles.

The points now enumerated will furnish data for comparing the *Iliupersis*, not only with Homer, but also with the *Aethiopis*, as a work of the same poet, and with the *Little Iliad*, as a different and (as is generally supposed) later treatment of the same subject.

In the *Iliupersis*, as in the *Aethiopis*, we have recognized the addition to the Trojan story of a considerable amount of legendary matter. Two main sources of new legend may be discerned. It was doubtless in the native traditions of Asia Minor that Arctinus found the figures of Penthesilea and Memnon, as well as the legend of Aeneas and the Trojan settlement on Mount Ida. In these matters we trace the influence upon the Greek colonists of the races with which they were brought into contact. And though this influence is perceptible in other ‘cyclic’ poems—e.g. in the story of Telephus in the *Cyприa*, of Euryypylus in the *Little Iliad*, and (as we shall see) of Calchas in the *Nosti*—the most striking examples seem to be those which we find in the *Aethiopis* and the *Iliupersis*. Other post-Homeric elements in Arctinus receive light from the circumstances of the Ionian colonies, and from their religious ideas and practices, especially the practice of hero-worship. Under this head fall such things as the immortality of Memnon, of Achilles, of Creusa—the purification of Achilles from the guilt of homicide—his removal after death to Leuce, in the region of the Milesian settlements—and the sacrifice of Polyxena at his tomb. In the hands of Arctinus, in short, epic poetry has become more Asiatic. The centre of interest is no longer Mycenae or Thessaly or Boeotia. It has been carried eastward with the stream of Aegean colonisation.

In the *Little Iliad*, on the other hand, there is less of the spirit and method of the *Iliad*, but more dependence on Homer as an authority. The circle of legends which supplied material for epic poetry has become more restricted and more Hellenic. The later date given in our sources for the poet of the *Little Iliad* is born out, therefore, by the probabilities of the case. It apparently belongs to an age when the Homeric poems had gained the position in the Greek world which is reflected in such writers as Xenophanes, Heraclitus, and Simonides.

It appears, then, as the result of our examination that the poems of Arctinus were composed in the tragic style of the *Iliad*, combined
with a vein of romance which belonged to the soil of Asia Minor: while the Little Iliad treated the same series of events in the lighter epic style, largely tempered by the romantic and adventurous element which is represented by the Odyssey, and within the Iliad by the 'Doloneia.' Thus the Little Iliad carried the Ulysses of the Odyssey, so to speak, back into the Trojan war: the Aethiopis and Iliupersis gave the chief place to Achilles and the heroes who were akin to him, Ajax and Neoptolemus. Finally, while Arctinus admitted much new matter, the growth of Ionian history, the author of the Little Iliad confined himself in general to the Homeric circle of myths, and sought rather for novelty in his manner of treatment and in the details of his narrative.

The Aethiopis and the Iliupersis are almost the only epics never attributed to Homer, and Miletus is almost the only important city which never claimed him. Perhaps the reason is simply that Arctinus was not sufficiently popular to give rise to a legend of the kind. His poems are not mentioned by any writer earlier than Dionysius of Halicarnassus; apparently they were unknown to Strabo (p. 360), to Pausanias (p. 374), perhaps even to the great Alexandrian critics (p. 358). Probably the name of Arctinus would not have survived at all if he had not been the earliest poet who related the escape of Aeneas from the destruction of Troy. Thus he became a witness to the Roman national legend, and the Iliupersis gained a species of immortality in the second book of the Aeneid.

§ 8. The Nosti.

The poem called the Nosti, or 'Returns' of the heroes from Troy, was in five books, and was generally ascribed to Agias of Troezen. The contents as given by Proclus were these:—

Athene having stirred up a quarrel between Agamemnon and Menelaus on the subject of the voyage home, Agamemnon delays his departure in order to propitiate the goddess, Diomedes and Nestor are the first to start, and return safely: Menelaus follows them, but

Eustathius (p. 1796, 53) quotes 'the author of the νὸστος, a Colophonian,' for the statement that in the end Telemachus married Circe, and Telegonus Penelope. It has been thought that this refers to another poem on the subject of the 'Returns,' by a Colophonian poet. There is so much about Colophon, however, in the cyclic Nosti that it seems more natural to suppose that the author was thought by some authorities to be a Colophonian. It is in the style of Eustathius to give the city of an author without his name: cp. δὲ τῷ Τηλεμάχῳ γράφας Κυρηναίος.
encounters a storm which drives him to Egypt with five only of his ships. Calchas with Leonteus and Polypoetes goes by land to Colophon, where he dies and is buried. As Agamemnon is preparing to start with his followers, the shade of Achilles appears and warns him of the future. The fate of the Locrian Ajax is then described. Neoptolemus, on the advice of Thetis, goes home by land through Thrace, meeting Ulysses in Maroneia; Phoenix dies on the way and is buried: Neoptolemus reaches the Molossian country, and is recognised by Peleus. Finally, the death of Agamemnon at the hands of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra is avenged by Orestes and Pylades, and Menelaus returns to Sparta.

According to Pausanias (ιό. 28. 7) the Νόστι contained a νικωνα, or descent into Hades, of which Proclus says nothing. Several of the references to the Νόστι seem to belong to this part of the poem, especially a version of the story of Tantalus, quoted by Athenaeus (ι. 10), and three lines about Medea restoring Aeson (ι. 6); perhaps also the genealogical notices about Clymene (ι. 4), and Maera (ι. 6). Eustathius (p. 1796, 53), says that the author of the Νόστι made Telemachus eventually marry Circe, and Telegonus, son of Circe, marry Penelope. This piece of eschatology lies beyond the period covered by the story of the poem, and probably Eustathius made a confusion between the Νόστι and the Τελεγονία, see p. 382.

The death of Calchas at Colophon was the subject of a story told by Hesiod, and also by the logographer Pherecydes (Strabo xiv. p. 643). It had been foretold that he would die when he should meet with a mightier seer than himself, and such a seer was found in Mopsus, grandson of Tiresias, who presided over the oracle of the Clarrian Apollo. It may be gathered that some form of this legend was adopted by the author of the Νόστι.

The subject of the Νόστι, according to the reference in Athenaeus (vii. p. 281 δ), is the ‘return of the Atridae’ (δ γονὸν τὴν τῶν Ἀτριδῶν ποιῶν κάθοδον), and this phrase is evidently a correct description of the main argument. The poem opened with the separation of Agamemnon and Menelaus, and ended with the return of Menelaus, just as his brother’s murder had been avenged by Orestes. Thus the plan of the poem seems to have resembled that of the Οδyssey,


The MS. gives Τειρείαν ἐνταθα τελευτήσαντα θάντω, where Τειρείαν must be a false reading for Κάλχαντα. The mistake may be accounted for if we suppose that the name Τειρείαν occurred in the poem, and was wrongly put for Calchas in this place—perhaps by the grammarian who made the summary in Proclus. The Calchas story was known to Herodotus (7. 91).
in which the adventures of Ulysses and of Telemachus are carried on independently until they meet in Ithaca. The Nosti, however, must have been more complicated. It contained two chief threads of narrative—the diverse fortunes of the two Atridae—which are brought together at the close. In subordination to these there are two land journeys in opposite directions: Calchas going to Colophon, and Neoptolemus to Thrace and so to Epirus. Room is found also for the fate of Ajax the Locrian, who accompanies Agamemnon, and the uneventful return of Nestor and Diomedes. The arrangement of these episodes is worth notice; it follows the Homeric rule of filling up pauses or intervals of time by a subordinate piece of narrative, so as to avoid any sensible break in the action of the poem. Thus the pause made by the quarrel of Agamemnon and Menelaus is taken advantage of to introduce the return of Nestor and Diomedes. Again, the sailing of Menelaus to Egypt is immediately followed by the journey of Calchas, and the sailing of Agamemnon by the journey of Neoptolemus, because without such a change of scene a long voyage would have the effect of a blank space in the picture. So (e.g.) in the third book of the Iliad, when heralds are sent from the armies into Troy (l. 116), the scene changes to the walls, and the time during which they are on the way is filled by the τὰ χοροστοια (ll. 121–244). By these contrivances the narrative of the Nosti doubtless attained a degree of continuity not inferior to that of the Homeric poems. The crisis is evidently the murder of Agamemnon, which is speedily followed by the vengeance of Orestes.

The moving force in the poem seems to have been the anger of Athene; as her favour and the anger of Poseidon are the moving forces in the action of the Odyssey. This is indicated, as we have seen, in the closing scenes of the Iliupersis; the general tone and character of the Nosti was evidently in keeping with this motif. The main events were essentially disastrous, and the playful and fanciful elements associated with the figure of Ulysses were wanting. Thus we may regard the Nosti as a tragic Odyssey—an Odyssey which marks the transition from Homer to the Agamemnon of Aeschylus.

Of the incidents of the Nosti a large proportion appear to be taken directly from Homer. Such are:—The quarrel caused by the anger of Athene between Agamemnon and Menelaus (Od. 3. 135 ff.); the return of Diomedes and Nestor (Od. 3. 166, 182); the voyage of Menelaus and his arrival in Egypt with five ships (Od. 3. 299 ἐκ τοῦ νῆος . . . Ἀληώτης ἐνελασαί); the fate of the Locrian Ajax (Od. 4. 499 ff.); the story of Agamemnon and Orestes. In one or two
cases we can trace the growth of new detail from Homeric suggestions:

(1) Megapenthes is said in the *Odyssey* (4. 12) to be the son of Menelaus by a slave (ἐξ δούλης); in the *Nosti* (fr. 2) the name of the slave was given.

(2) The meeting of Neoptolemus with Ulysses in Maroneia is suggested by Od. 9. 39, 197 ff., where Ulysses is said to have been in that part of Thrace.

The chief additions to the Homeric account are the journeys of Calchas and Neoptolemus; the former of these is essentially post-Homeric in its character. The city of Colophon, like all the cities founded or occupied by the Ionian colonists, is quite unknown to Homer. The oracle of the Clarian Apollo belongs to the time when the Greek settlers in Asia Minor had adopted to some extent the religious ideas and practices of the native tribes: as a local oracle too, it is an institution of a post-Homeric kind. Its seer, Mopsus, claimed descent from Teiresias—just as the kings of the Ionian cities are found to claim descent from Homeric heroes, such as Agamemnon and Nestor. In this part of the *Nosti*, therefore, we trace the same relation to the history of Colophon which we found to subsist between the *Aethiopis* and the history of Miletus, and again between the *Iliupersis* and the later settlements in the Troad.

In the story of Neoptolemus we may recognise a post-Homeric element in the ethnical name of the Μολοσσοί, which implies some extension of geographical knowledge. It is the first indication of the claim of the kings of Epirus to the honour of descent from Achilles.

It does not appear that the *Nosti* added materially to the story of Orestes as told in the *Odyssey*. There is nothing to show for example that Clytemnestra was prominent in it (as later in the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus), or that Electra was introduced.

Of the remaining names the most important is that of Medea, whose magical powers were set forth (fr. 6). The notices in Pausanias (fr. 4, 5) and Apollodorus (fr. 1) refer to genealogical details which it is not easy to connect with the story of the poem. The mention of

---

35 It has been shown by C. Robert (*Bild und Lied*, 163 ff.) that the later version comes mainly from the *Oresteia* of Stesichorus, which again was said to be taken from Xanthus (Athen. xiii. 513). According to Aelian (*V. H.* iv. 2–6) it was Xanthus who first mentioned Electra in the story. Thus the dream of Clytemnestra in the *Choephoroi* comes from Stesichorus (*fr. 42 τῷ δὲ δωμαν ἰδέαμος μολεῖν πτλ.*); also the recognition scene, which must be older than Aeschylus, since it is found on an archaic relief of Melos, and the golden bow given to Orestes by Apollo (*Eur. Or.* 268), from which we may gather that the whole story of Apollo instigating Orestes to avenge his father comes from the same source.
the mother of Megapenthes (fr. 2) is a fact of the same kind. It may be inferred that the author of the *Nosti* was one of the poets who made it their business to furnish the genealogies connecting the Homeric heroes with each other, and with the leading families of later times.

The prophetic warning given by the shade of Achilles is an incident of a post-Homeric type; we may compare the appearance of Achilles to Neoptolemus in the *Little Iliad*. The immortality of Telemachus and Telegeonus follows the precedent of Achilles and Memnon in the *Aethiopis*, the Dioscuri and Iphigenia in the *Cypria*.


The *Telegonia* was a poem in two books only, by Eugammon of Cyrene, the last of the ‘cyclic’ poets. It was evidently composed as a sequel to the *Odyssey*, and conclusion of the heroic story. The argument in Proclus is as follows:—

After the burial of the suitors Ulysses sacrifices to the nymphs and then goes to visit his herds in Elis, where he is entertained by Polyxenus. The stories of Trophonius, Agamede and Augeas are related. After returning to Ithaca to perform the sacrifices prescribed by Tiresias, Ulysses goes to the country of the Thesprotians, marries their queen Callidice, and leads them in a war against the Brygi, in which Ares takes part on behalf of the Brygi, and Athene for Ulysses, while Apollo intervenes as a mediator. On the death of Callidice, Polypoetes, son of Ulysses, becomes king, and Ulysses returns to Ithaca; then Telegeonus son of Ulysses by Circe, who has been seeking for his father, makes a descent upon Ithaca. Ulysses comes to repel the attack and is killed by his own son. Telegeonus finds too late what he has done, and takes his father’s body, with Telemachus and Penelope, to his mother Circe, who makes them immortal. Finally, Telemachus marries Circe, and Telegeonus Penelope.

It is evident that this story was framed partly to satisfy curiosity as to the fate of the chief characters of the *Odyssey*, and partly to find a place for the genealogies of various families that claimed descent from Ulysses. The Thesprotian episode is clearly due to the latter of these motives.

The story of the cave of Trophonius is given by the scholiast on Aristophanes (*NuB.* 500). It is a variant of the Rhampsinitus story. The incident of the death of Ulysses at the hands of his son is equally
familiar from the story of Sohrab and Rustum. In these stories we have fresh instances of the kind of attraction by which a dominant group of legend, such as the *Troïca*, draws in materials from other circles of popular mythology.

The burial of the Suitors, with which the argument of Proclus begins, has already been mentioned in the *Odyssey* (24. 417): but we cannot infer (as Kirchhoff seems to do, *op. cit.*, p. 340) that the 'continuation' of the *Odyssey* was unknown to the author of the *Telegonia*. The sacrifice to the nymphs may have been suggested by Od. 13. 358, where Ulysses promises to make them gifts. But the chief Homeric passage that bears on the closing scenes of the epic story is the prophecy of Tiresias (Od. 11. 119–137, 23. 267–284). The sacrifice to be offered to Poseidon is there expressly mentioned. The death of Ulysses at the hands of Telegonus, who has come 'from the sea' to make a descent upon Ithaca, is probably intended to satisfy the words of the prophecy δι τοι ἐξ ἄλλη αἰνή κτλ.

§ 10. *Other cyclic poems.*

Of the other ancient epics little is known that can throw light upon Homer. It will be enough to notice those which were sufficiently Homeric in character to be ascribed at one time or another to the poet himself. These were: the *Thebaid*,—also known as the 'expedition of Amphiaraus'—the *Epigoni*, the *Taking of Oechalia*, and the *Phocais*.

The *Thebaid* related the enterprise of the 'Seven against Thebes,' and seems to have been the poem that, next to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, had the best claim to be the work of Homer. The story was continued in the *Epigoni*, which accordingly began with the words νῦν ἄθι ὅπλοιρων ἄνδρων ἀρχώμεθα, ἂν οὖν. It is referred to by Herodotus (4. 32), who indicates doubt as to the Homeric authorship. There was also an *Oedipodeia*, attributed to Cinaethon of Lacedaemon, which was never attributed to Homer, and perhaps was a poem of the Hesiodic school.

It is impossible with the scanty materials at our disposal to reconstruct the plan of either of these poems, or to compare them in detail with Homer. In the *Thebaid* the leading figure was Amphiaraus, who stood to the Argive king Adrastus somewhat as Achilles to Agamemnon. Like Achilles, he fought in a cause

*Pausanias, 9. 9. 3.*
not his own, and with full consciousness of impending fate. In other respects he is a hero of a new and very different type, one in which valour was united with prophetic wisdom. He occurs in the Odyssey (15. 244, 253), but not in the Iliad. His death is connected with the foundation of an oracle—one of those local oracles that are unknown in the Iliad, and rare in the Odyssey, but were rapidly multiplied in post-Homeric times. Similarly in the Epigoni it was related that after Thebes had fallen Manto, daughter of Tiresias, was sent as part of the spoil to Delphi, from which place she passed over to Colophon, and there founded the oracle of the Clarian Apollo. We may compare the story told of that oracle in the Nosti (p. 381). Another post-Homeric incident that is perhaps to be traced to the Thebaid is the institution of the Nemean games. In Homer we hear of funeral games, but not of periodical athletic contests forming part of a great religious festival. The mention of Hyperboreans in the Epigoni (Hdt. l. c.) may also be regarded as an indication of lateness. Possibly they are akin to the Abii and Hippomolgi of Homer (II. 13. 5); but the name is new.

The 'Taking of Oechalia' (Οἰχαλίας ἄλωνας) was a poem of the Heracles cycle, relating the expedition of Heracles against Eurytus king of Oechalia. It was generally ascribed to Creophylus; but there was a legend according to which it was given to him by Homer. It was the story of a single expedition, and doubtless was distinguished by a certain epic unity of treatment from such poems as the Heraclia of Pisander,—which related all the Labours of Heracles,—or the later Heracleids of which Aristotle speaks in the Poetics (c. 8).

The Phocais was a poem attributed to Thistorides of Phocaea, with the usual suspicion that Homer himself was somehow the real author. Regarding the subject of the poem we are left to conjecture. According to Welcker it was the same with the Minyas, and dealt with the conquest of Orchomenos by Heracles. Of the Minyas we know that it contained a viara, in which Charon—who is a post-Homeric figure—had a place.

Pind. Ol. 6. 15. πόθεν στρατεύασα δεδουλήμη ἤρας, ἐμφότερον μάτιν γ' ἀγαθω αὖ μετὰ μέμρασθαι. These words of Adrastus in praise of Amphiaraurus are said by the schol. to have come from the Thebaid.

Schol. Laur. ad Apoll. Rhod. 1. 308.
IV. HISTORY OF THE HOMERIC POEMS.

§ 1. Sources.

The literary history of the poems which we are accustomed to associate with the name of "Homer" is necessarily based, partly on data furnished by the testimony of ancient writers, partly on the internal evidence of the poems themselves. Under the latter head are to be included, not only the dialect in which the poems are composed, and the poetical structure that they exhibit, but also the whole historical setting in which we find them—the heroes and peoples that they celebrate, the literature that they can be shown to have influenced, the ideas and sentiments that they express, the civilisation of which they are the product, and therefore the mirror. Some of these matters we have already touched upon; others remain to be noticed. But before entering on this wider field it will be proper to attempt to ascertain how much is to be learned from the notices of "Homer" scattered through the writings of ancient scholars and historians. As might be expected in the case of so commanding a personality, the number of these notices is very great, while their critical value is often extremely doubtful. They may be roughly classified somewhat as follows:

(1) Statements and allusions bearing upon the life of Homer—his date and birthplace, and the places where his poems were first produced.

(2) Statements regarding the agency by which his poems were brought from the place of origin—usually supposed to be in Ionia—and were made known in the mother country of Greece.

(3) Statements as to the recitation of the poems, and the contests of reciters (δασφαδοί).

(4) Notices of the Homeridae of Chios.

(5) Stories of the confusion introduced into the poems, and of the collection and arrangement of them by Pisistratus.

(6) Notices of recensions or corrected texts, and generally of the work of ancient critics, down to the time of the Alexandrian grammarians.

§ 2. Life of Homer.

The earliest notices of Homeric poetry undoubtedly point to the cities of Ionia. The elegiac poet Callinus of Ephesus, who cannot be II.  
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later than the first half of the seventh century B.C., mentioned the
Thebaid, and ascribed it to Homer¹. In the next century Xenophanes
of Colophon condemned the mythological teaching of Homer and
Hesiod, and especially deplored the use of Homer in education ².
Pythagoras of Samos and Heraclitus of Ephesus joined in this censure,
though they quoted Homer (i.e. the Iliad and Odyssey) in a way
that shows the ascendency which his poetry then held in the Greek
world ³. Indeed the adoption of the hexameter by Xenophanes and
other philosophers was simply carrying on the literary tradition estab-
lished by the Homeric epic and continued in the didactic school of
Hesiod.

It remains, however, to consider what weight can be attached to
this testimony, if such it is, in favour of an Ionian origin of Homer.
We may begin with a simple observation. It is highly significant
that so many of the notices now in question are in a hostile vein.
Here, as Heraclitus might have said, Strife has been a saving force.
But for the ‘ancient quarrel’ of poetry and philosophy—that is to
say, between the traditional fables of Homeric and Hesiodic poets and
the higher morality which was the fruit of advancing reflection,—but
for this old and growing discord we should have been almost without
evidence of the importance of Homer in pre-historic Greece. The
strife was a consequence of progress, and therefore a sign of life.
Even as a measure of time the observation is of value. How long
was it, we may fairly ask, from the age that produced the Homeric
poems to the age of their condemnation by all the foremost thinkers?
Long enough, surely, for great movements, such as those which mark
the beginning of Greek history—the Dorian conquest of Peloponnesus,
the Ionian colonisation:—long enough, in any case, to make it very
hazardous to argue from the state of things in the time of Xenophanes

¹ Paus. 9. 9. 5 ἵππηθε δὲ ἵππ θέλητον τίποτον καὶ ἵππ Θηβαίς. τὰ δὲ ἵππ ἵππητα
Κάλλινος, ἀπὸ κάλλινος αὐτῶν ἐλευθερῴων ἦσαν ὁμορρούν τὸν πατρίαν εἶναι. Καλ-
λίνος δὲ πολλοὶ τε καὶ δέκα λόγων καὶ ταῦτα ἠρρωκαν. Τῶν δὲ τῶν τάφων τῶν τῶν
μετὰ τὰς Ἰλίδας καὶ τὰ ἵππα τὰ ἵππα Θῆβαι ἐπανειπά ἡμῖν κληρονομεῖν.
² Xenophanes ap. Sext. Empir. ix. 193—

³ Thus Pythagoras, in connexion with the belief in the transmigration of souls,
claimed to be Euphorbus, who was killed by Menelaus (II. 17. 51 ff.). He also
quoted Od. 10. 239—

οἷς οὐκ ἔχων καὶ καλὸν φωνήν τὴν τρίας τε
καὶ δίω, αἰτήτος οὐ θεὸς ἤ γεισομένος, ὡς τὰ πάροι τοῦρ.

Again, in II. 1. 46 ἐλαχιστῶς ἐφ᾽ ἐστιν κατὰ λήθα, he identified the sound of the arrows
of Apollo with the sound made by the sun in its course.
back to the conditions under which Homeric poetry was first heard in Greek lands.

If we are forbidden to place Homer in the Ionia of the early philosophers, it is still more incumbent on us to be on our guard in dealing with the series of definite statements made by writers of the fifth and succeeding centuries B.C. regarding the birthplace of Homer and the circumstances of his life.

Seven cities, according to the epigram⁴, contended for the honour of having given birth to Homer. The actual number of claimants mentioned by our authorities is somewhat greater. When we add that no one city gained the general assent of ancient scholars, or produced evidence of a kind that we should regard as convincing, it may be thought that enough has been said—that the conflict was one, not of evidence, but of patriotic assertion. Nevertheless it will be well to glance at the claims made. So many of the contending cities are Ionian colonies that the list has been held to favour the cause of Asiatic Ionia as a whole, if not of any one city. Aeolis, too, is represented in it, and the issue between these two divisions of the Hellenic nation still has its place among Homeric controversies. Moreover, some of the claims, if they do not prove anything about the Iliad or Odyssey, are not without bearing on the history of other poems once connected with the name of 'Homer.'

The claim of Chios has perhaps the greatest number of voices in its support. Simonides of Ceos, in the earliest known quotation from Homer, calls him Xios ἄνηρ⁶. Pindar divided his testimony between Chios and Smyrna. Anaximenes the philosopher said that Homer was a Chian. Of the logographers Acusilaus and Hellanicus connected him with a Chian family or gens (γένος) of Homeridae: Damastes also made him a Chian. Finally, in the Hymn to the Delian Apollo⁶, which is quoted by Thucydides as the work of Homer, the author describes himself as 'the blind old man of Scio's rocky isle' (τυφλὸς ἄνηρ, ἄλοι περὶ Χίου τῆς συνταλαισίας).

Next to Chios we cannot be wrong in ranking Smyrna. Pindar, as has been said, made Homer both a Smyrnaean and a Chian—perhaps distinguishing between his place of birth and his dwelling. The

⁴ Anthol. Planud. 4. 297:

ἐντὸ ἀφθαρσίᾳ πόλεις διὰ μάζαν Ὀμήρου,
Κῦκυς, Σμύρνα, Χίος, Καλοφόρον, Πύλος, ἅρρος, Ἀθήναι.

Ibid. 298:

ἐντὸ πόλεις μάρτυρες σωφῆν διὰ μάζαν Ὀμήρου,
Σμύρνα, Χίος, Καλοφόρον, Ιάικη, Πύλος, ἅρρος, Ἀθήναι.

⁵ Simonides fr. 85 Bergk.
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logographer Eugaeon of Samos said that Homer's true father was the Meles, the river of Smyrna. And one of the earliest professed students of Homer, Stesimbrotus of Thasos (a contemporary of Cimon and Pericles), made him a native of Smyrna, where he had a shrine, and was worshipped as a demigod.

The strength of the popular belief about Smyrna appears also in the so-called Epigrams, which are brief poems, of a folklore type, such as are found in most countries as 'popular rhymes.' The fourth epigram contains the complaint of a blind poet, in whose person the Muses desired to glorify that city—

Αλτίδα Ζύμηνη Αλεγείτον ποιητήνατον,
ης τε δι' άγλαον είσιν άνδρι ιερόι Μήλητος.

But the citizens rejected the sacred voice, and the poet became a wanderer. He does not however name himself, and there is nothing to show when he was first identified with 'Homer.' Verses of this kind may have been current in Ionia and Aeolis long before they were drawn within the orbit of the Smyrnaean Homer legend.

The poet Bacchylides witnessed to the claim of Ios, and in the lost work of Aristotle περὶ ποιητῶν a story was related of the death of Homer in that island. Apparently his tomb was shown there.

A claim on behalf of Colophon was made by the scholar-poet Antimachus (pupil of Stesimbrotus and contemporary of Socrates); also by a certain Nicander of Colophon, who wrote περὶ τῶν ἐκ Κολοφῶν ποιητῶν. The mock-epic Margites, which even Aristotle regarded as the work of Homer, had a Colophonian poet as hero. The first line was—

ἠθί τις εἰς Κολοφῶνα γέρων καὶ θείος ὀιδῶς.

The historian Ephorus of Cyme (in the end of the fifth century) maintained that Homer was a Cymeaean. The same opinion was held by the Homeric scholar Hippias of Thasos. This claim, like that of Smyrna, doubtless found support in the Epigrams. The first addresses Neonteichos as 'daughter of Cyme,' and begs for hospitality: the second announces the return of the poet: the fourth implies at least some stay in Cyme. In this case also Homer may have taken the place of an originally nameless bard.

A certain Callicles is said to have maintained that Homer was

---

2 Arist. Eth. Nic. vi. 7 ἄπαντες Ὀμηρός θεαῖς ἐν τῷ Μαργίτῃ.
a native of Salamis in Cyprus. The ground for his contention may be found in the Hymns, three of which are addressed to Aphrodite in her character as Κύρης (cp. H. Ven. 292 Κύρης οικτιμένης μεδέουσα, H. vi. 2 ἦ πάσης Κυρῆς κρήδεμα λόγιον, and especially H. x. 4 χαίρε θεά, Σαλαμώνος οικτιμένης μεδέουσα). It may perhaps rest also on the poem called the Cypria (Κύπρια ἑτή), sometimes ascribed to Homer, which (as we have seen in ch. iii) chiefly turned upon the baleful influence of Aphrodite on the fortunes of Troy.

In the third century B.C. the historian Philochorus⁸ maintained that Homer was of Argos. Perhaps, like Cleisthenes of Sicyon, he was moved by the circumstance that Homer 'is for the most part about Argos and the Argives' (Hdt. 5. 67). It may well be that he took account of the Thebaid and Epigoni as Homeric, although these poems cannot have retained much vogue in his time.

Omitting one or two less well attested matters—such as the connexion with Phocaea, of which there are traces in a Thesprotides, who shares with Homer the attribution of the Little Iliad and the Phocais¹⁰, or such as the Roman or the Egyptian Homer of some late authorities "—we come to the name of Athens. The advocate in this case is no less than Aristarchus, and his opinion is based on the most scientific of tests, viz. that of language. It is unfortunately impossible to guess how he would have met the obvious objection that Athens and the Attic heroes are hardly mentioned in Homer except in doubtful or more than doubtful passages. If Homer had been an Athenian who, like the Smyrnaean poet of the Epigrams, had shaken off the dust of his native city, he could not have been more silent.

The preceding review seems to point to the conclusion that most of the places in Greece or its colonies that boasted of Homer's presence could appeal to the internal evidence of poems then generally accounted Homeric. The mythical biographies, when rationalised, assume the guise of a bibliography. The Iliad and Odyssey are so impersonal that they furnish no data for this purpose. Perhaps it was so also with the Thebaid and the Epigoni. But the Hymn to Apollo contained a clear announcement that Chios was the home of its author. An ancient objector could at most raise a doubt whether Homer was born in Chios, or only dwelt there. Again, the Hymns went far to connect Homer with Cyprus, especially with Salamis, and probably the Cypria

⁸ Philochorus fr. 54 c (Müller).
¹¹ Vii. Hom. 6 Ἀριστόδημος δ' ὁ Νυσαῖς Ἀρμαῖον αὐτὸν ἀποδείκνυτι ἐκ τιναν θέσιν Ἀρμαίων, ἄλλος δ' Ἀλκιππίνον.
strengthened the case. Again, the *Margites* seemed to be the work of a native of Colophon, and therefore to connect Homer with that place. The *Nosti* was also a poem of Colophonian authorship, and was ascribed at one time to Homer. The short hymn to Artemis (ix), which connects her with the Clarian Apollo, doubtless contributed. Similarly the *Little Iliad* and the *Phocais* were made the ground of a visit of Homer to Phocaea. Finally the *Epigrams* brought a nameless poet, identified in time with Homer, to Smyrna, to Cyme, to Neonteichos: and these cities—none of them known to the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*—gained a place in the Homer legend.

There is one remarkable exception, or *instantia negativa*, which does much to confirm the rule that the other instances suggest. Miletus never claimed to be the birthplace of Homer: it does not occur in any version of his life. And no work of a Milesian was ever ascribed to Homer. Yet Miletus has a great epic poet, Arctinus, and was a chief centre of civilisation in Ionia. This instance makes it probable that it was not simply the diffusion of epic poetry that led to stories of the birthplace of Homer. It was the diffusion (so to speak) of the name of Homer—the tendency to attribute all epic poems or fragments of poetry to him. At Miletus this tendency was met by a well-established local tradition, through which the name of Arctinus retained sole possession of the ground.

It is worth while to notice here that the *Aeolian* Smyrna is the city mentioned in the *Epigrams*. This helps to fix, roughly at least, the date of the verses in question. Smyrna was Aeolian, according to the account of Herodotus, down to the year 688 B.C., when certain Colophonian exiles who had been admitted into the city took possession of it by treachery. From that time it belonged to the Ionia confederacy, but was taken and destroyed by Alyattes about 627 B.C. It seems unlikely therefore that it was known as 'Aeolian Smyrna' after the seventh century B.C.

Besides disputing about Homer's birthplace, the early logographers concerned themselves with his date and genealogy. Pherecydes, Hellanicus and Damastes agreed in making him a descendant of Orpheus. According to Damastes he was also tenth in descent from Musaeus. A similar genealogy was framed for Hesiod, who (as Hellanicus asserted) was a cousin of Homer. In these matters the

---

14 Hdt. 1. 16, 150: *Paus.* 7. 5. 1., 9. 29. 2.
15 Hellanicus (*Vit. Hom.* 8).
most interesting thing is the attitude of Herodotus. He does not condescend to notice the mythical figures of Orpheus, Linus, Musaeus and the like, beyond expressing his belief that the poets who are said to have been earlier than Homer and Hesiod were really later. At the same time he thinks that these two poets were not more than 400 years older than himself. Apparently it was the fashion to ascribe to them a considerably higher antiquity. It is strange to find even Herodotus speaking of 400 years as a short time (σώφην τε καὶ χθεῖς is his phrase). But Herodotus looked back upon a period which did not record or measure time. He had no means of forming a conception of the rate at which events take place. His testimony in this case is almost purely negative; but it has the great value of proving that there was then no other evidence bearing on the points at issue.

§ 3. The poems brought from Ionia.

If, then, the ancients imagined Homer as a wandering minstrel who went about among the Ionian cities, how and when could they suppose that his poems became known on the western side of the Aegean? They had to explain (e.g.) the favour which Homer enjoyed with the partly Dorian and partly Achaean population of Sicyon in the time of the elder Cleisthenes, and to understand how it came to pass that the Spartan envoy to Hiero of Syracuse expressed his indignation in words borrowed from the Iliad—in words, too, which implied that Sparta had succeeded to all the rights of the empire of Agamemnon 16.

The first answer, so far as we know, was given about the end of the fifth century by Ephorus, who related that the Spartan legislator Lycurgus, in the course of his travels, met with Homer in the island of Chios, and obtained from him a copy of his poems 16. In a version of this story preserved by Dio Chrysostom (ii. p. 87) the poems were brought by Lycurgus 'from Crete or Ionia.' According to another version, which goes back to Heraclides Ponticus (fourth century B.C.), Lycurgus found the poems in the possession of the descendants of

13 Hdt. 7. 159 ἐν μεγηθεῖς ὁ Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων πυθόμενος κτλ. On the same occasion the Athenian appealed to the passage about Menestheus (Il. 2. 553). As to Sicyon see p. 397.
16 Strabo x. p. 482 (quoting from Ephorus) ἰππηξάτα δ' ἐν φασί τινες καὶ Ὀμήρου ἱστράλβοντες ἔν Χίῳ. A trace of this story, or at least of the anachronism which it involves, is to be found in Cicero, Tusq. 5. 3. § 7 Lycurgum cuius temporibus Homerum etiamuisse ante hanc urbem conditam traditur.
Creophylus in one of the islands—variously given as Samos, Chios or Ios—and brought them back to Sparta. The historian Timaeus thought that there were two statesmen of the name of Lycurgus, the elder of whom was contemporary with Homer. The name of Creophylus was familiar at that time, as we see from the Republic of Plato, where he is mentioned as a sort of companion poet. The explanation of all this is not far to seek. The oldest version told of a meeting between the two greatest men of early Greece. In it we have exactly the type of literary anecdote in which ancient historians delighted. Then came the reflexion that Homer was not later than the Dorian invasion, and therefore long anterior to the Spartan reformer. The difficulty was met by bringing in the Creophylus legend, which (like the Lycurgus story) was current in the fourth century B.C. The discrepancy as to the place where the poems were obtained arose in the most natural way. Chios appears in the original story, because it was known to have been the abode of Homer. Samos came in as the home of Creophylus. And if Homer's death took place in Ios, it was there that men would expect to find his treasures.

One late writer, Aelian (V. H. xiii. 14), relates that the poems of Homer were dispersed (διηρρύθησαν), and that it was Lycurgus who first brought them in a collected form to Greece (ἀθρόω πρῶτος εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα κομίσας τὴν Ὀμῆρου ποίησιν). This is of course the story that afterwards gained so much vogue when told of Pisistratus. At first sight we are tempted to suppose that it originally belongs to Lycurgus, and was transferred to Pisistratus at a later time. On this view, however, it would be hard to see why this part of the Lycurgus anecdotes should have been unknown to writers such as Ephorus and Heraclides Ponticus, and yet have come to the knowledge of Aelian. More probably, therefore, it is an example of contamination. The comparatively late Pisistratus story was drawn into the group of anecdotes that had clustered round the greater name of the Spartan lawgiver.

17 Heraclid. Pont. Pol. 2 Λυκόμεσος ἐν Ζάμιοι ἔτελεύτησε, καὶ τὴν Ὀμῆρου ποίησιν πρῶτον ἐποίησεν Κρεοφύλου λαβὼν πρῶτος διεκόμασεν εἰς Πελοπόννησον. So Plutarch (Lyc. 4), who adds an echo of the Pisistratus story, to the effect that in the time of Lycurgus the poems were already known in Greece, but only in parts and στορμάτων to not many persons. For Chios and Ios see n. 19.
18 Plut. Lyc. 2 (Timaeus thinks that there were two Spartans of the name of Lycurgus) καὶ τῶν ἑκατέρων οὐ πόρρω τῶν Ὀμῆρου γεγονέναι χρόνων, ἔτει δὲ καὶ καὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐντυχεῖ εἰς Ομῆρον.
19 Plato Rep. p. 600; cp. Strab. xiv. p. 638 Ζάμιος ἐν Κρεοφύλῳ, ὃς φανερῶς ζωγράφων φυλή πολὺ Ὀμῆρου αὐτ. In the scholia on the Republic (i.e.) he is called a Chian; while according to Proclus (Vit. Hom.) it was in Ios that Homer was hospitably entertained by him.
In the pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Hipparchus*, which is usually supposed to be not later than the second century B.C., it is said that Hipparchus son of Pisistratus first brought the poems of Homer to Attica, and that he obliged the rhapsodists at the Panathenaic festival to recite consecutively, so that the people might hear entire poems, and not merely passages chosen at the will of the reciter. This regulation, as we shall see (§ 4), is also attributed to Solon. It undoubtedly existed, but we cannot tell to whom it was due. This is one of the points on which late writers make positive statements, while those whose testimony would have real weight are silent. But the assertion that there were no copies of the Homeric poems at Athens before the time of Hipparchus is a strange one. The Lycurgus story, though evidently unhistorical, was at least in harmony with other conditions. The explanation is doubtless to be sought in the character and aim of the *Hipparchus*, as a not very successful imitation of Plato. The author evidently desired to illustrate his theme by a myth in the Platonic manner. He adopted the historical type of myth seen in the *Political* and *Timaeus*, and chose for his period the government of the Pisistratidae. In this he was strongly influenced by the disposition among the literary men of the time to take a favourable view of 'tyrants,' and to see in them collectors of books and patrons of learning, like the Ptolemies and the Attalid princes. Accordingly he fixed upon Hipparchus, and gave an idealised description of him which perhaps had the effect of a paradox. He transferred to Hipparchus and Attica the story that Ephorus and others had told of Lycurgus and the Peloponnesus. It is worth noting that the *Hipparchus* falls into all the errors regarding the Pisistratidae that are pointed out by Thucydides. The writer either blindly accepted floating tradition, or deliberately preferred an unhistorical version, in a case where he doubtless assumed that the literal truth was not called for. Our attitude towards his testimony must be based upon this appreciation. We cannot say, as Wolf said of the Pisistratus story, *historia loquitur*. But he shows us by example the sort of stories that were in the air.


21 Thuc. 6. 54-59.
not his own, and with full consciousness of impending fate. In other respects he is a hero of a new and very different type, one in which valour was united with prophetic wisdom. He occurs in the *Odyssey* (15. 244, 253), but not in the *Iliad*. His death is connected with the foundation of an oracle—one of those local oracles that are unknown in the *Iliad*, and rare in the *Odyssey*, but were rapidly multiplied in post-Homeric times. Similarly in the *Epigoni* it was related that after Thebes had fallen Manto, daughter of Tiresias, was sent as part of the spoil to Delphi, from which place she passed over to Colophon, and there founded the oracle of the Clarian Apollo. We may compare the story told of that oracle in the *Nosti* (p. 381). Another post-Homeric incident that is perhaps to be traced to the *Theaid* is the institution of the Nemean games. In Homer we hear of funeral games, but not of periodical athletic contests forming part of a great religious festival. The mention of Hyperboreans in the *Epigoni* (Hdt. l.c.) may also be regarded as an indication of lateness. Possibly they are akin to the Abii and Hippemolgi of Homer (*Il*. 13. 5); but the name is new.

The ‘Taking of Oechalia’ (Οχαλίας ἀλωνος) was a poem of the Heracles cycle, relating the expedition of Heracles against Eurytus king of Oechalia. It was generally ascribed to Creophylus; but there was a legend according to which it was given to him by Homer. It was the story of a single expedition, and doubtless was distinguished by a certain epic unity of treatment from such poems as the *Heraclea* of Pisander,—which related all the Labours of Heracles,—or the later Heracleids of which Aristotle speaks in the *Poetics* (c. 8).

The *Phocais* was a poem attributed to Thedorides of Phocaea, with the usual suspicion that Homer himself was somehow the real author. Regarding the subject of the poem we are left to conjecture. According to Welcker it was the same with the *Minyas*, and dealt with the conquest of Orchomenos by Heracles. Of the *Minyas* we know that it contained a νίεων, in which Charon—who is a post-Homeric figure—had a place.

---

27 Pind. *Ol*. 6. 15 τοῦτοι στρατιὰς ἄφθολμοι εἶναι, ἀμφότεροι μὴν τ’ ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουλὶ μυρωθέν. These words of Adrastus in praise of Amphiaraus are said by the schol. to have come from the *Theaid*.

28 Schol. Laur. ad Apoll. Rhod. l. 308.
IV. HISTORY OF THE HOMERIC POEMS.

§ 1. Sources.

The literary history of the poems which we are accustomed to associate with the name of 'Homer' is necessarily based, partly on data furnished by the testimony of ancient writers, partly on the internal evidence of the poems themselves. Under the latter head are to be included, not only the dialect in which the poems are composed, and the poetical structure that they exhibit, but also the whole historical setting in which we find them—the heroes and peoples that they celebrate, the literature that they can be shown to have influenced, the ideas and sentiments that they express, the civilisation of which they are the product, and therefore the mirror. Some of these matters we have already touched upon; others remain to be noticed. But before entering on this wider field it will be proper to attempt to ascertain how much is to be learned from the notices of 'Homer' scattered through the writings of ancient scholars and historians. As might be expected in the case of so commanding a personality, the number of these notices is very great, while their critical value is often extremely doubtful. They may be roughly classified somewhat as follows:

1. Statements and allusions bearing upon the life of Homer—his date and birthplace, and the places where his poems were first produced.

2. Statements regarding the agency by which his poems were brought from the place of origin—usually supposed to be in Ionia—and were made known in the mother country of Greece.

3. Statements as to the recitation of the poems, and the contests of reciters (μνημοσύνες).


5. Stories of the confusion introduced into the poems, and of the collection and arrangement of them by Pisistratus.

6. Notices of recensions or corrected texts, and generally of the work of ancient critics, down to the time of the Alexandrian grammarians.

§ 2. Life of Homer.

The earliest notices of Homeric poetry undoubtedly point to the cities of Ionia. The elegiac poet Callinus of Ephesus, who cannot be
later than the first half of the seventh century B.C., mentioned the
Thebaid, and ascribed it to Homer. In the next century Xenophanes
of Colophon condemned the mythological teaching of Homer and
Hesiod, and especially deplored the use of Homer in education.
Pythagoras of Samos and Heraclitus of Ephesus joined in this censure,
though they quoted Homer (i.e. the Iliad and Odyssey) in a way that
shows the ascendancy which his poetry then held in the Greek
world. Indeed the adoption of the hexameter by Xenophanes and
other philosophers was simply carrying on the literary tradition estab-
lished by the Homeric epic and continued in the didactic school of
Hesiod.

It remains, however, to consider what weight can be attached to
this testimony, if such it is, in favour of an Ionian origin of Homer.
We may begin with a simple observation. It is highly significant
that so many of the notices now in question are in a hostile vein.
Here, as Heraclitus might have said, Strife has been a saving force.
But for the 'ancient quarrel' of poetry and philosophy—that is to
say, between the traditional fables of Homeric and Hesiodic poets and
the higher morality which was the fruit of advancing reflection,—but
for this old and growing discord we should have been almost without
evidence of the importance of Homer in pre-historic Greece. The
strife was a consequence of progress, and therefore a sign of life.
Even as a measure of time the observation is of value. How long
was it, we may fairly ask, from the age that produced the Homeric
poems to the age of their condemnation by all the foremost thinkers?
Long enough, surely, for great movements, such as those which mark
the beginning of Greek history—the Dorian conquest of Peloponnesus,
the Ionian colonisation:—long enough, in any case, to make it very
hazardous to argue from the course of things in the time of Xenophanes

1 Paus. q. q. 5 ἔσχηθη δὲ ἐς τῶν πόλεμων τοῖσον καὶ ἐς Ἡθαι. ταῦτα ἔτη ταῦτα
Καλλίστον, ἀφόρμονοι αὔτῶν εἰς μνήμην, ἔφησαν· Ὑμνον τὸν ποιητὰν εἶναι· Ἐκα-
λίνη δὲ πολλοὶ τοῖς καὶ αἷσιν λόγοι κατὰ ταῦτα ἔφησαν. Ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν τούχην τοῖσο
μετὰ τε Ἡλίαδα καὶ τὰ ἔτη ταῦτα ἐν Ὀδυσσεᾶ ἐπισκόπως μάλιστα.

Xenophanes ap. Sext. Empir. i. 193—
πάντα θεοῖς διάθεαν Ὑμνον καὶ Ἡθαιδος τε
δοσαν τοις ἀθραπτοσιν ὑπελεκα καὶ ψυχος δοτιν.
And ap. Herodian. ii. 16, 20 (Lenz)—
ἐκ δραχαι εἰς Ὑμνον ἐτελ μεμαθήκαι πάντες.

Thus Pythagoras, in connexion with the belief in the transmigration of souls,
claimed to be Euphorbus, who was killed by Menelaus (II. 17. 51 ff.). He also
quoted Od. 10. 239—
οὐ δὲ σωμα μην ἕχων κεφαλᾶς φωνήν τε τρίχας τε
καὶ ἑμσ, αὐτὸρ τούς ἔχων δείξεις, ὅτι τὸ πάροι περ.
Again, in II. 1. 46 ἐκλατγήνε δ᾽ ἐρ᾽ ἄστιν πτερ. he identified the sound of the arrows
of Apollo with the sound made by the sun in its course.
back to the conditions under which Homeric poetry was first heard in Greek lands.

If we are forbidden to place Homer in the Ionia of the early philosophers, it is still more incumbent on us to be on our guard in dealing with the series of definite statements made by writers of the fifth and succeeding centuries B.C. regarding the birthplace of Homer and the circumstances of his life.

Seven cities, according to the epigram 4, contended for the honour of having given birth to Homer. The actual number of claimants mentioned by our authorities is somewhat greater. When we add that no one city gained the general assent of ancient scholars, or produced evidence of a kind that we should regard as convincing, it may be thought that enough has been said—that the conflict was one, not of evidence, but of patriotic assertion. Nevertheless it will be well to glance at the claims made. So many of the contending cities are Ionian colonies that the list has been held to favour the cause of Asiatic Ionia as a whole, if not of any one city. Aeolis, too, is represented in it, and the issue between these two divisions of the Hellenic nation still has its place among Homeric controversies. Moreover, some of the claims, if they do not prove anything about the Iliad or Odyssey, are not without bearing on the history of other poems once connected with the name of 'Homer.'

The claim of Chios has perhaps the greatest number of voices in its support. Simonides of Ceos, in the earliest known quotation from Homer, calls him Χῖος ἄνδρος. 5 Pindar divided his testimony between Chios and Smyrna. Anaximenes the philosopher said that Homer was a Chian. Of the logographers Acusilaus and Hellanicus connected him with a Chian family or gens (γένος) of Homeridae: Damastes also made him a Chian. Finally, in the Hymn to the Delian Apollo 6, which is quoted by Thucydides as the work of Homer, the author describes himself as 'the blind old man of Scio's rocky isle' (τωφλῶς ἄνηρ, ολείς δὲ Χίω ἐν παυσάλωσιν).

Next to Chios we cannot be wrong in ranking Smyrna. Pindar, as has been said, made Homer both a Smyrnaean and a Chian—perhaps distinguishing between his place of birth and his dwelling. The

4 Anthol. Planud. 4. 397:

ἐντὸλθεὶςἐνδώτιοιπόλειςκαιμέγεθε'Ομήρου,
Κύμα,Σμύρνα,Χῖος,Καλοφῶν,Πύλος,Ἀργος,Ἀθῆναι.

Ibid. 298:

ἐντὸλθεὶςπόλειςμάραθνοσοφῆνκαιμέγεθε'Ομήρου,
Σμύρνα,Χῖος,Καλοφῶν,Πάλαμα,Πύλος,Ἀργος,Ἀθῆναι.

5 Simonides fr. 85 Bergk.

logographer Eugaeon of Samos said that Homer's true father was the Meles, the river of Smyrna. And one of the earliest professed students of Homer, Stesimbratus of Thasos (a contemporary of Cimon and Pericles), made him a native of Smyrna, where he had a shrine, and was worshipped as a demigod.

The strength of the popular belief about Smyrna appears also in the so-called Epigrams, which are brief poems, of a folklore type, such as are found in most countries as 'popular rhymes.' The fourth epigram contains the complaint of a blind poet, in whose person the Muses desired to glorify that city—

Λιόλιθα Σμύρνην ἄλγειτον ποιητικάτον,
ἡν τε δὲ ἀγλαῶν εἶδον ὂδηρ λεών Μῆλητος.

But the citizens rejected the sacred voice, and the poet became a wanderer. He does not however name himself, and there is nothing to show when he was first identified with 'Homer.' Verses of this kind may have been current in Ionia and Aeolis long before they were drawn within the orbit of the Smyrnaean Homer legend.

The poet Bacchylides witnessed to the claim of Ios, and in the lost work of Aristotle περὶ ποιητῶν a story was related of the death of Homer in that island.Apparently his tomb was shown there.

A claim on behalf of Colophon was made by the scholar-poet Antimachus (pupil of Stesimbratus and contemporary of Socrates); also by a certain Nicander of Colophon, who wrote περὶ τῶν ἐκ Κολοφωνος ποιητῶν. The mock-epic Margines, which even Aristotle regarded as the work of Homer⁷, had a Colophonian poet as hero. The first line was—

ἡθε τις εἰς Κολοφώνα γίρων καὶ θείος ἄλειπος.

The historian Ephorus of Cyme (in the end of the fifth century) maintained that Homer was a Cymaeian. The same opinion was held by the Homeric scholar Hippias of Thasos. This claim, like that of Smyrna, doubtless found support in the Epigrams. The first addresses Neonteichos as 'daughter of Cyme,' and begs for hospitality: the second announces the return of the poet: the fourth implies at least some stay in Cyme. In this case also Homer may have taken the place of an originally nameless bard.

A certain Callicles is said to have maintained that Homer was

---


a native of Salamis in Cyprus. The ground for his contention may be found in the Hymns, three of which are addressed to Aphrodite in her character as Küpris (cp. H. Ven. 292 Kúpris eikímēnes medéousa, H. vi. 2 ἡ πάσης Κύπρου κρήθεμα λέογχη, and especially H. x. 4 χωρε θεά, Σαλαμίνος έικίμην μεδέουσα). It may perhaps rest also on the poem called the Cypria (Kúpria Γυναίκα), sometimes ascribed to Homer, which (as we have seen in ch. iii) chiefly turned upon the baleful influence of Aphrodite on the fortunes of Troy.

In the third century B.C. the historian Philochorus\(^8\) maintained that Homer was of Argos. Perhaps, like Cleisthenes of Sicyon, he was moved by the circumstance that Homer 'is for the most part about Argos and the Argives' (Hdt. 5. 67). It may well be that he took account of the Thebaid and Epigoni as Homeric, although these poems cannot have retained much vogue in his time.

Omitting one or two less well attested matters—such as the connexion with Phocaea, of which there are traces in a Thestorides, who shares with Homer the attribution of the Little Iliad and the Phocais\(^9\), or such as the Roman or the Egyptian Homer of some late authorities\(^10\)—we come to the name of Athen. The advocate in this case is no less than Aristarchus, and his opinion is based on the most scientific of tests, viz. that of language. It is unfortunately impossible to guess how he would have met the obvious objection that Athens and the Attic heroes are hardly mentioned in Homer except in doubtful or more than doubtful passages. If Homer had been an Athenian who, like the Smyrnaean poet of the Epigrams, had shaken off the dust of his native city, he could not have been more silent.

The preceding review seems to point to the conclusion that most of the places in Greece or its colonies that boasted of Homer's presence could appeal to the internal evidence of poems then generally accounted Homeric. The mythical biographies, when rationalised, assume the guise of a bibliography. The Iliad and Odyssey are so impersonal that they furnish no data for this purpose. Perhaps it was so also with the Thebaid and the Epigoni. But the Hymn to Apollo contained a clear announcement that Chios was the home of its author. An ancient objector could at most raise a doubt whether Homer was born in Chios, or only dwelt there. Again, the Hymns went far to connect Homer with Cyprus, especially with Salamis, and probably the Cypria

---

\(^8\) Philochorus fr. 54 c (Müller).


\(^11\) Vit. Hom. 6 'Αριστοδόμος δ' ὁ Νυσαῖν Ῥωμαίοι αὐτὸν ἀποδείκνυσιν ἐν τινιν Ἰθαῖων Ῥωμαίων, ἄλλοι δ' Ἀγαθίνων.
strengthened the case. Again, the Margites seemed to be the work of a native of Colophon, and therefore to connect Homer with that place. The Nosti was also a poem of Colophonian authorship, and was ascribed at one time to Homer. The short hymn to Artemis (ix), which connects her with the Clarian Apollo, doubtless contributed. Similarly the Little Iliad and the Phocais were made the ground of a visit of Homer to Phocaea. Finally the Epigrams brought a nameless poet, identified in time with Homer, to Smyrna, to Cyme, to Neonteichos: and these cities—none of them known to the Iliad or Odyssey—gained a place in the Homer legend.

There is one remarkable exception, or instanta negativa, which does much to confirm the rule that the other instances suggest. Miletus never claimed to be the birthplace of Homer: it does not occur in any version of his life. And no work of a Milesian was ever ascribed to Homer. Yet Miletus has a great epic poet, Arctinus, and was a chief centre of civilisation in Ionia. This instance makes it probable that it was not simply the diffusion of epic poetry that led to stories of the birthplace of Homer. It was the diffusion (so to speak) of the name of Homer—the tendency to attribute all epic poems or fragments of poetry to him. At Miletus this tendency was met by a well-established local tradition, through which the name of Arctinus retained sole possession of the ground.

It is worth while to notice here that the Aeolian Smyrna is the city mentioned in the Epigrams. This helps to fix, roughly at least, the date of the verses in question. Smyrna was Aeolian, according to the account of Herodotus, down to the year 688 B.C., when certain Colophonian exiles who had been admitted into the city took possession of it by treachery. From that time it belonged to the Ionic confederacy, but was taken and destroyed by Alyattes about 627 B.C. It seems unlikely therefore that it was known as 'Aeolian Smyrna' after the seventh century B.C.

Besides disputing about Homer's birthplace, the early logographers concerned themselves with his date and genealogy. Pherecydes, Hellanicus and Damastes agreed in making him a descendant of Orpheus. According to Damastes he was also tenth in descent from Musaeus. A similar genealogy was framed for Hesiod, who (as Hellanicus asserted) was a cousin of Homer. 14. In these matters the

14 Hdt. 1. 16, 15o : Paus. 7. 5. 1., 9. 29. 2.
14 Hellanicus (Vit. Hom. 8).
HOMER IN IONIA, ETC.

The most interesting thing is the attitude of Herodotus. He does not condescend to notice the mythical figures of Orpheus, Linus, Musaeus and the like, beyond expressing his belief that the poets who are said to have been earlier than Homer and Hesiod were really later. At the same time he thinks that these two poets were not more than 400 years older than himself. Apparently it was the fashion to ascribe to them a considerably higher antiquity. It is strange to find even Herodotus speaking of 400 years as a short time (πρόφητα τῳ καὶ χῖς is his phrase). But Herodotus looked back upon a period which did not record or measure time. He had no means of forming a conception of the rate at which events take place. His testimony in this case is almost purely negative; but it has the great value of proving that there was then no other evidence bearing on the points at issue.

§ 3. The poems brought from Ionia.

If, then, the ancients imagined Homer as a wandering minstrel who went about among the Ionian cities, how and when could they suppose that his poems became known on the western side of the Aegean? They had to explain (e.g.) the favour which Homer enjoyed with the partly Dorian and partly Achaean population of Sicily in the time of the elder Cleisthenes, and to understand how it came to pass that the Spartan envoy to Hiero of Syracuse expressed his indignation in words borrowed from the Iliad—in words, too, which implied that Sparta had succeeded to all the rights of the empire of Agamemnon.

The first answer, so far as we know, was given about the end of the fifth century by Ephorus, who related that the Spartan legislator Lycurgus, in the course of his travels, met with Homer in the island of Chios, and obtained from him a copy of his poems. In a version of this story preserved by Dio Chrysostom (ii. p. 87) the poems were brought by Lycurgus 'from Crete or Ionia.' According to another version, which goes back to Heraclides Ponticus (fourth century a. c.), Lycurgus found the poems in the possession of the descendants of

15 Hdt. 7. 159 ἡ εἰ μὲν οἶκεια τῆς Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμήλων, καὶ οὐδὲνος κτλ. On the same occasion the Athenian appealed to the passage about Menestheus (II. 2. 553). As to Sicily see p. 397.
16 Strabo x. p. 482 (quoting from Ephorus) ἦταν θυατεροὶ καὶ οἷς ἐνεργοὶ διατηρήσων ἐν Χίῳ. A trace of this story, or at least of the anachronism which it involves, is to be found in Cicero, Tusc. 5. 3. § 7 Lycurgum cuius temporibus Homerus etiam fuisse ante hanc urbem conditam traditur.
Creophylus in one of the islands—variously given as Samos, Chios or Ios—and brought them back to Sparta. The historian Timaeus thought that there were two statesmen of the name of Lycurgus, the elder of whom was contemporary with Homer. The name of Creophylus was familiar at that time, as we see from the Republic of Plato, where he is mentioned as a sort of companion poet. The explanation of all this is not far to seek. The oldest version told of a meeting between the two greatest men of early Greece. In it we have exactly the type of literary anecdote in which ancient historians delighted. Then came the reflexion that Homer was not later than the Dorian invasion, and therefore long anterior to the Spartan reformer. The difficulty was met by bringing in the Creophylus legend, which (like the Lycurgus story) was current in the fourth century B.C. The discrepancy as to the place where the poems were obtained arose in the most natural way. Chios appears in the original story, because it was known to have been the abode of Homer. Samos came in as the home of Creophylus. And if Homer’s death took place in Ios, it was there that men would expect to find his treasures.

One late writer, Aelian (V. H. xiii. 14), relates that the poems of Homer were dispersed (ἄφρομια), and that it was Lycurgus who first brought them in a collected form to Greece (ἄρδον πρώτος εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα κοιμεῖα τὴν Ὀμήρου ποίησιν). This is of course the story that afterwards gained so much vogue when told of Pisistratus. At first sight we are tempted to suppose that it originally belongs to Lycurgus, and was transferred to Pisistratus at a later time. On this view, however, it would be hard to see why this part of the Lycurgus anecdotes should have been unknown to writers such as Ephorus and Heraclides Ponticus, and yet have come to the knowledge of Aelian. More probably, therefore, it is an example of contamination. The comparatively late Pisistratus story was drawn into the group of anecdotes that had clustered round the greater name of the Spartan lawgiver.

17 Heraclid. Pont. Pol. 2 Αμαχίστης εἰς Ἑλλάδα ἴτελεύτητα, καὶ τὴν Ὀμήρου ποίησιν παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων Κρεσφέλου λαβὼν πρώτος διεκμένει εἰς Πελοπόννησον. So Plutarch (Lyc. 4), who adds an echo of the Pisistratus story, to the effect that in the time of Lycurgus the poems were already known in Greece, but only in parts and ἀφρόμια to not many persons. For Chios and Ios see n. 19.

18 Plut. Lyc. 1 (Timaeus thinks that there were two Spartans of the name of Lycurgus) καὶ τῶν ἡ προσωπίτευρον ἀπὸ τῶν Ὀμήρου γεγονότων χρήσεως, ἵνα δὲ καὶ κατ’ ὅραν ἑρμηνευθῇ Ὀμήρου.

19 Plato Rep. p. 600: cp. Strab. xiv. p. 638 Χάμος ή ἢν καὶ Κρεσφέλου, καὶ φαίνεται ἐξομίλησεν ποτὲ Ὀμήρου κτλ. In the scholia on the Republic (l.c.) he is called a Chian; while according to Proclus (Vit. Hom.) it was in Ios that Homer was hospitably entertained by him.
In the pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Hipparchus*, which is usually supposed to be not later than the second century B.C., it is said that Hipparchus son of Pisistratus first brought the poems of Homer to Attica, and that he obliged the rhapsodists at the Panathenaic festival to recite consecutively, so that the people might hear entire poems, and not merely passages chosen at the will of the reciter. This regulation, as we shall see (§ 4), is also attributed to Solon. It undoubtedly existed, but we cannot tell to whom it was due. This is one of the points on which late writers make positive statements, while those whose testimony would have real weight are silent. But the assertion that there were no copies of the Homeric poems at Athens before the time of Hipparchus is a strange one. The Lycurgus story, though evidently unhistorical, was at least in harmony with other conditions. The explanation is doubtless to be sought in the character and aim of the *Hipparchus*, as a not very successful imitation of Plato. The author evidently desired to illustrate his theme by a myth in the Platonic manner. He adopted the historical type of myth seen in the *Politicus* and *Timaeus*, and chose for his period the government of the Pisistratidae. In this he was strongly influenced by the disposition among the literary men of the time to take a favourable view of ‘tyrants,’ and to see in them collectors of books and patrons of learning, like the Ptolemies and the Attalid princes. Accordingly he fixed upon Hipparchus, and gave an idealised description of him which perhaps had the effect of a paradox. He transferred to Hipparchus and Attica the story that Ephorus and others had told of Lycurgus and the Peloponnesus. It is worth noting that the *Hipparchus* falls into all the errors regarding the Pisistratidae that are pointed out by Thucydides. The writer either blindly accepted floating tradition, or deliberately preferred an unhistorical version, in a case where he doubtless assumed that the literal truth was not called for. Our attitude towards his testimony must be based upon this appreciation. We cannot say, as Wolf said of the Pisistratus story, *historia loquitur*. But he shows us by example the sort of stories that were in the air.

---

30 Ps. Plat. *Hipparc. p. 228 B* τα 'Ομηρου ἰη τρῶν ἱκώμων ἐι τῷ γῆν ταυτην, καὶ ἱνά άθα νας τοῦ βασιλέως Παναθηναίου εἰ ἐπολύμενος ἱκώμης αὐτῷ διηνεμήσε, ἔσοσο υῖν ἵνα οἶδε τοιώδειαν.

And so of Solon, Diog. Laert. 1. 57 τα τε 'Ομηρου ἰη τε ἐπολύμενος γέγραφη βασιλέως, οἷον οὖν δ' πρῶτος ἠλθείς ἄρχεσθαι τῶν ἱκώμων. See n. 24.

31 Thuc. 6. 54–59.
§ 4. Recitation of Homer.

In a striking passage of Wolf’s Prolegomena, it is pointed out that there must always be some relation or correspondence between the form of a literary work and the methods or channels by means of which it is brought before the public—the hearers, or readers, or spectators—to whom it is addressed. Thus in an age of oral literature, he goes on to argue, an epic poem like the Iliad or the Odyssey would be as much out of place as a great ship built on ground from which it could not be launched. The notices that we have of the recitation or rhapsodising (ῥαψῳδία) of Homer, if they do not prove that the poems were impossible under such conditions, at least show that his contention is one of which it is very necessary to take account.

The term ῥαψῳδία was applied in classical times to men who made it their business to recite epic poetry, especially that of Homer. Why they were called ῥαψῳδοί, ‘stitchers of song,’ is a question that need not delay us here. They are described as going about to the great religious festivals of Greece, and contending for the prizes offered for this species of performance. At Athens there was a law that Homer should be recited at every quinquennial celebration of the Panathenaea. As has been mentioned, the rhapsodists were there obliged to follow the order of the text, so that the poems should be produced in their

23 Wolf, Proleg. xxvi. Quid? quod si forte ... unus in saeculo suo Iliada et Odysseam hoc tenore pertexisset, in ceterarum opportunitatum penuria similes illae fuisse genti navi, quod quis in prima ruditate navigatoris fabricatus in loco mediterraneo, machinis et phalangetis ad protrudendum, atque adeo mari careret, in quo experimentum suaes artis caperet. ... Eodem pacto si Homero lectores dearent, plane non assequor quid tandem eum impellere potuisse in consilium et cogitationem tam longorum et continuo partium nexus consortorum Carminum.

The derivation of the word ῥαψῳδία which makes it = ‘stitcher of song’ (from ῥαψῳδος, from the word that they carried). But what did the expression ‘stitcher of song’ originally mean? Attempts have been made to explain it, in accordance with modern theories, of some process of arranging or ‘stringing together’ short ‘lays’ so as to form connected poems. But it is surely more probable that ‘stitching’ was simply a colloquial variation for composing or making, as in the lines quoted by the scholiast on Pind. Nem. 2:1 as from Hesiod (fr. 231 Goettling):

ἐν Δήλυν τότε πρώτων ἔγινεν καὶ θείος Ὀμήρος
μᾶλλον ἐν νεοφόροι δύοντες βάφαρας δαιμόνιος.

If so, ῥαψῳδος meant ‘poet,’ and only acquired the sense of ‘reciter’ when recitation took the place of original poetry in the poetical contests of Greece. Naturally, when the word became the symbol of the competing rhapsodist the accidental likeness of ῥαψῳδος and ῥαψῳδία led to a popular etymology by which they were associated. Of this Heraclitus took advantage when he said that Homer deserved to be cast out from the contests and beaten (ἡμικέφαλοι instead of ῥαψῳδοι).
entirety. Elsewhere it would seem that they were more free, each one being allowed to choose a passage suited to the display of his powers. As 'rhapsody' was only one of several kinds of entertainment, the time allotted to each rhapsodist can hardly ever have been enough for the due appreciation of a poem of moderate length. Even the regulation said to have been enforced at the Panathenaeae cannot have entirely remedied this evil. Moreover, the unfortunate conditions of the rhapsodic art reacted on the artists. We find a highly contemptuous estimate of them in the Symposium of Xenophon. The picture of a typical rhapsodist drawn for us in the Ion of Plato is hardly more flattering. The feature most dwelt upon is the highly theatrical style of the recitation, and the strong feeling that overmastered the performer as well as his audience. As Plato doubtless recognized, this effect was alien to the true character of Homeric narrative. Even the text of Homer suffered at their hands. If we are to believe the scholiast on Pindar (Nem. 2. 1) they mangled the poems sadly, and inserted many verses of their own.

Here an obvious question arises. If recitation by professional rhapsodists was so imperfect and unsuitable as a means of knowing and enjoying the poetry of Homer, how was it tolerated at all? Does it not bring out precisely that want of harmony between the work of art and its production upon which Wolf insisted? Does it not show that the original poems must have been, not epics like the Iliad and Odyssey, but 'lays' such as the rhapsodists would have found within the compass of their art?

The answer to this question is found in the profound difference—one that implies a very considerable interval of time—between the manner and circumstances of recitation in historical times and those

---

24 The expression ἵππος (ἵπποδιασθα) has given rise to much controversy. At first it seems to answer to ἴππως, the phrase used in the Hipparchus, which clearly means 'taking up, i.e. going on where the last man left off, or (in the words of Diogenes Laertius) ἰππος ὅ πρῶτος ἔληθεν ἐνείθεσα τῶν ἰχθύων. But this is inconsistent with the use of ἰππόμελλω and its derivatives, which have the sense of 'suggesting,' 'supplying' (with ideas or words), 'prompting' or 'dictating.' Hence the meaning in the passage in question is that each rhapsodist was 'given his cue,' and that this was done (presumably by the agonothetae) so that the recitations should follow the order of the text. The words ἰππος ὅ πρῶτος κτλ. are not exegetical of ἵππος, but express the practical result of the ἰππόμελλω, i.e. of the direction to which the rhapsodists at the Panathenaeae were subject.

25 Xen. Symm. 3. 6 οίσχα τι οὖν ἔνθα, ἤρη, ἥλιοντερον μαφαθῶν; οὐ μᾶ τὴν Δι, ἤρη ὅ Νικηράτος, οὔκουν ἐμοίνε δοκει.
which obtained in the Homeric age. To understand the full extent of this difference we have only to turn again to the 'singer' of the *Odyssey*. We find him attached to a great house, the palace of one of the 'kings' or *seigneurs* of the quasi-feudal period of Greece. He sings at the feast in the hall, day after day, to amuse the leisure of the 'king' and his guests and retainers. His song is accompanied by the *φόρμυκτ*—the Homeric instrument answering to the lyre of later times. The rhapsodists, on the other hand, went about to the various festivals, and competed for prizes, reciting passages in turn before the assembled crowd. Their performance was not musical, but was highly dramatic and sensational. Instead of the lyre they bore a wand (*φάδως*); as in Homer a speaker in the assembly holds a *σειμπρων*. Their recital did not produce the sense of charm (*κηληθμός*) that followed a well-told tale in Homeric days. Rather it roused the feelings of the vast audience to a species of madness.

This difference in the outward conditions of epic poetry is only part of the social and political changes that were brought about in the period now in question. The Greece of Homer, with its hereditary chiefs living in fortified palaces like those of Tiryns or Mycenae, had become more or less democratic. The occupation of a post like the rock of Tiryns was now tantamount to an attempt to overthrow the law and establish a 'tyranny.' The palaces were deserted: the acropolis was reserved for the temples of the gods. The amusements of the people underwent a corresponding change. New kinds of music and poetry—the Aeolian choric music, the Dorian tragedy, the Attic drama, shared in succession the vogue once confined to the epic. Great festivals arose, such as the *πανήγυρις* of Delos, and drew crowds from many cities. The minstrel's song, which was chief among the *αινήμαρα δανός* in the olden time, no longer met the need. It is surely a proof of the vitality of the Homeric poems, and the hold they had gained over the people of Greece, that they still continued, though under different conditions, to form a large part of the entertainment at such gatherings.

It is worth while to compare the failure of 'rhapsody' as a vehicle for Homeric poetry with the objections taken to the poems themselves by the early Ionian philosophers. In both cases the poems suffered from a gradual change in their environment. As the quarrel of poetry and philosophy was due to the advance of moral and religious thought, so the inadequacy of the rhapsodists was due to the passing away of the society for which the poems were originally composed. In both cases we obtain something like a time-
measure—a process of development for which we have to find room in our chronology.

It would be interesting, in view of the considerations now put forward, if we could trace the rise of professional rhapsodising, or determine the time at which it first became popular in Greece. According to Aristotle it was comparatively late. It was, however, an established institution early in the sixth century B.C., if it is true that Cleisthenes of Sicyon (unlike the enlightened tyrants of learned imagining) put down the contests of rhapsodists in Sicyon 'on account of the poetry of Homer, because it is all about Argos and the Argives'. At Athens in the same century (if we may trust our information), a law was made prescribing and regulating the recitation of Homer as part of the Panathenaic festival. It is attributed by Diogenes Laertius to Solon, and by the writer of the pseudo-Platonic Hipparchus to Hipparchus son of Pisistratus. It is also referred to by the orators Lycurgus and Isocrates, but without mention of the statesman to whom it was due. As the laws of Solon are generally quoted with his name, it may be suspected that the author of this regulation was unknown. It was however a thing of long standing in the time of Isocrates; and the contests which it was designed to regulate were doubtless still older. Another probably ancient seat of Homeric 'rhapsody' was the Brauronia, a festival held at Brauron in Attica, where we are told that the Iliad was recited. There is also a notice of rhapsodic contests at the Dionysia: but we are not told which festival of that name is intended.

Rhapsodists are referred to in two passages of Pindar, viz. in Nem. 2.1–3 'ομηρίδας βασιλέως ἐπίων αἰῳν, and in Isthm. 3.56 καθ' ῥάβδον ἄφραστος θεοπαίων ἐπίων (said of Homer celebrating the prowess

37 Arist. Rhet. iii. 1.3 (p. 1403 b) τρέτον δὲ τουτόν, οὐ δέναμεν μὲν ἕχει μεγίστην, οὕτως δὲ ἑπεκεχείρηται, τα περὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν καὶ γὰρ εἰς τὴν τραγῳδίαν καὶ βασφόδιον όφει παρῆλθεν. Cp. Max. Turg. 23.5 οὐ δὲ μὲν γὰρ ἡ ξυνάρτῃ ἑπαφθεί, οὐδὲ δὲ ἡ ἱβήρη.
38 Hdt. 5.67 βασφόδιον ἰσαταν ἐν Ξενοφώνι, ἀγαφιζόμεθα τῶν Ὀμηρίων ἐπίων ἑσεκα, ὅτι Ἀργοῦ τε καὶ Ἀργος τὰ πολλὰ τάτα ἱμάτατα.
39 Diog. Laer. 1.57 (see note 30).
41 Isocr. Paneg. p. 74 οἴμαι δὲ καὶ τὴν Ὀμηρὸν ποιήσει μείζω λαθῶν δόγμα, διamente πολεμήσαται τοὺς βασιλέας ἐνεκρίθησα, καὶ διὰ τούτων βουληθήσεται τὸς προβολὴν λαθῶν ἐντείνειν, εὐκράτειν τὸν τέχνην ἐν τε τῷ μεγαλῷ ἄλλοι καὶ τῷ παρασχεθέν τῶν κατεχόντων.
42 Hesych. Βραυροῦνι, τῇ Ἰλίδεα βασιλεία βασφόδιον ἐν Βραυροίνῃ τῇ Ἀττικῇ.
43 Athen. vii. p. 275 δ (from the account of a certain ῥαφθοτ by Clearchus, scholar of Aristotle) ἰέλεμε δὲ αὐτή, καθάπερ ἡ τῶν βασφόδων, ὥς ἑλον κατὰ τὴν τῶν Διονυσίων ἐν τῇ παρέστην ἰκανοῦ τῷ θεῷ οἷον τιμήν ἀντίλοχον τὴν βασφόδια.
of Ajax). The allusion to the word ἤραβαλός is marked, and all the more so since the poet seems to shrink from using it himself. Perhaps it was a new expression, or too colloquial, and not sanctioned by poetical usage. According to the scholiast on the former of these two passages one of the earliest of the rhapsodists was Cynaethus of Chios, who recited Homer for the first time at Syracuse in the sixty-ninth Olympiad. The evidence for poetical contests goes back somewhat farther. They are clearly implied in the boast of Thamyris ‘that he can conquer even the Muses in song’ (Il. 2.597). That passage is, however, in the Catalogue, and therefore of doubtful antiquity. The author of the Hymn to Apollo describes himself as taking part in the great Ionic παριγμος in the island of Delos, and as begging the Delian maidens to declare his songs to be the best 22. Another Homeric hymn ends with the formula δος ή έν όγδοος νικην τε θεός φιμυηθαι, ἐπει δε έντυσον αὐτής 23. In some at least of these cases the contest was apparently not one of rhapsody in the technical sense, but the competitors were poets who recited their own verses. It may be that contests of this kind formed the transition between the Homeric minstrel ‘in whose heart the Muse had put many songs,’ and the unintelligent rhapsodist of the age of Plato.

§ 5. The Homeridae.

It has often been supposed that the preservation of the Homeric poems before the time when writing was in general use and written copies began to be multiplied may be accounted for by the services of a family or gens (γένος) settled in Chios and calling themselves Ομηρίδαι. Such a family, if it existed, might well have carried on the recitation of Homer as a hereditary craft, even as the Asclepiadae carried on the profession of medicine, or as the Daedalidae seem to have kept up the art of making certain mechanical contrivances. It is therefore necessary to examine the evidence that there is for the existence of the Homeridae, and for their connexion with the recitation of Homer in early times.

The earliest mention of Homeridae is in Pindar, who applies the word to the rhapsodists, in Nem. 2.1–3:

διὸν περ καὶ ὁμηρίδαι
βασιῶν ἐπὶν τὰ πολλά δοῦλοι
ἀρχουται δος ἐκ προομίου κτλ.

23 Hom. H. v. 30 : cp. x. 5., xxiii. 5.
HOMERIDAЕ

whence the sons of Homer, the singers of stitched song, mostly take their prelude, from Zeus.' This, however, need not mean that the rhapsodists of Pindar's time belonged in a literal sense to a family of Homeridae. On the contrary, the real subject of the sentence is the word which the poet wraps up in a periphrasis, viz. ἀρτοφθολ, and ὀμνηθίδαι is a descriptive epithet, to be understood metaphorically. Such a manner of speaking is most natural in Greek. Homer himself speaks of 'the race of singers' (φιλαν ἀνδών), and of physicians as 'the brood of the god of healing' (ἕ γὰρ Πασχωνε ἐστι γενέθλιον, Od. 4.232). Hereditary occupation was so familiar that the family or gens became a form under which any group of the kind could be imagined and spoken of. We may compare the modern use of the term 'school,' which is extended to a group that must have been formed by common teaching. There is no difficulty in supposing that Pindar applied the phrase 'kindred of Homer' to the rhapsodists of his day in this indefinite sense.

This interpretation of Pindar's ὀμνηθίδαι is borne out by the Attic use of the same word. It is found in three passages of Plato and one of Isocrates, in all of which it can have nothing to do with recitation, but must mean 'students of Homer,' 'Homer worshippers,' or the like 44. In these writers it is still somewhat esoteric or poetical, answering to the more prosaic ὀμηθωκl of Aristotle 45. This use, it is hardly necessary to remark, is inconsistent with the survival of a family of Homeridae known as rhapsodists. Indeed if the term Homeridae had ever been generally used as an equivalent for 'rhapsodists,' it is unlikely that it would have acquired so different a meaning. In the time of Plato and Isocrates the true 'children of Homer' were not the reciters but the students of the poet.

Further, this view is supported by an ancient commentary on the passage of Pindar. The following are the scholia in question:

(1) ὀμηθίδαι ἔλεγον τό μέν ἀρχαῖον τοὺς ἀπὶ τοῦ Ὀμηθῶν γένους, οἱ καὶ τὴν ποίησιν αὐτῶν ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἔδωκεν μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ οἱ ραφθοῖ, οὐκέτι τὸ γένος εἰς Ὀμηθῶν ἀνάγοντες ἐπιφανεῖς δὲ ἐγένετο οἱ περὶ Κύκλων, οἵς φασὶ πολλά τῶν ἐπῶν ποίησαντας ἐρμαιλεῖς εἰς τὴν Ὀμηθῶν ποίησιν. ἦν δὲ ὁ

44 Isocr. Hel. § 65 ἔλεγον δὲ τινες καὶ τῶν Ὀμηθῶν ὅτι ἐκστάσατε πιστῶς Ὀμηθῶν προστάζει τοιοῦτος Ὀμήθρων ἐν τοις στρατευσάμοις ἐνει Τροίων.

Plato, Rep. p. 599 E (Homer is not known as a legislator) οἱκεῖον ἄλλῳ γε ὁσιτα τὸ Ὀμηθῶν ἐν τοῖς στρατευσάμοις ἐνει Τροίων.

APPENDIX

Κύναιδος Χίος, δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐπιγραφομένων Ὀμήρου ποιημάτων τῶν εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα γεγραμμένων ὑμνον λέγεται πιστοκείναι. ὅποτε οὖν ὁ Κύναιδος πρῶτος ἐν Συρακούσαις ἔρρωσθη τὰ Ὀμήρου ἔργα κατὰ τὴν ἔξοχοτήν ἐνάτην Ὀλυμπιάδα, ὥστε Ἰπποστρατέω φησιν.

(2) Then follows a scholiwm on the etymology of ἐπιγράφω: then—

(3) ἄλλως: Ὀμηρίδαια πρῶτον μὲν οἱ Ὀμῆρου παίδες, διόστερον δὲ οἱ περὶ Κύναιδον ῥαβδόδοι οὕτω γὰρ τὴν Ὀμῆρου ποίησιν σκεδασθείσαν ἔμμηδον καὶ ἐπήγγελλον ἐλιμάναντο δὲ αὐτὸν πάνω.

'Originally,' the scholiast says, 'the name Homeridae denoted the actual descendants of Homer, who sang his poems in hereditary succession: but afterwards the rhapsodists who were not descended from him. Chief among these were Cynaethus and his followers (οἱ περὶ Κύναιδον), who, they say, foisted many verses of their own making into the poetry of Homer. Now Cynaethus was a Chian, who is said to have been the author of the hymn to Apollo that is ascribed to Homer. This Cynaethus was the first who recited the poems of Homer at Syracuse, in the 69th Olympiad, as Hippostratus says 28.' As Cynaethus was older than Pindar, this statement implies that the rhapsodists of Pindar's time were no longer of the family of Homer,—so that they could only be Homeridae in a poetical sense.

It may be urged here that the scholiast does not confine himself to the negative statement that the rhapsodist Cynaethus and his like were not of the Homerid gens. He says that anciently—in the times before Cynaethus—the descendants of the poet sang his verses. On this point, however, it is difficult to believe that he had any evidence going back so far. He gives us no information about the supposed gens. He does not even seem to know that they were of Chios,—which is the more remarkable since he says that Cynaethus was a Chian. It seems much more likely that his assertion is merely an inference from the patronymic form of the word. He had some information about the career of Cynaethus which probably did not justify his saying more than that the word Homeridae, if it once implied descent from Homer, had ceased to do so in the time of Cynaethus, and a fortiori in the time of Pindar.

So far we have had to do with Pindar and his scholiasts, and with statements as to the claim of rhapsodists to the name Homeridae.

28 Hippostratus is quoted by the scholiast on Pindar (Pyth. 6. 4) as ὡς τὰ περὶ Ἑλλήνων γενεαλογίας. Hence his notice of the rhapsodising of Cynaethus at Syracuse probably comes from a local source. On the other hand it is unlikely that Cynaethus, if he recited Homer so late as the 69th Olympiad, was the real author of the Hymn to Apollo. Cp. also the scholia on Pind. Ol. 2. 8, 16 and Theocr. 6. 40.
HOMERIDAE

We have now to turn to notices about a family that certainly bore the name of Homeridae, and to ask what right they had to claim kindred with the poet.

The *locus classicus* is the article Ὠμηρίδαι in the *Lexicon* of Harpocrates, which is as follows:

‘Ὀμηρίδαι: Ἰσοκράτης Ἑλέης ὦ ὸμηρίδαι γένος ἐν Χίω, διπλα Ἀκουσίλαος ἐν γῇ, Ἐκλέκτος ἐν τῇ Ἀτλαντίδα ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ φιλοῦ ἀνομάθητος Σέλευκος δὲ ἐν Βηθίαν ἄφθασαν φησὶ Κράτης. μοιχώτα ἐν ταῖς θροποιαῖς ὸμηρίδαι ἄπογόνοις εἶναι τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἀνομάθητος γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν ὃμηρων, ἐπεὶ αἱ γυναῖκες ποτὲ τῶν Χίων ἐν Διονυσίους παραφρόσυνα εἰς μάχην ἠλθοῦν τοῖς ἀνδράσι, καὶ δόστει ἀλλήλοις ἑμια ἑμφόρους καὶ νύμφας ἐπαύσαντο, δυνατὸν τοὺς ἄπογόνοις Ὀμηρίδαις λέγουσιν. (So, but with abridgments, Photius *Lex.*, Timaeus *Lex. Ptol.*, Suidas.)

From this article, then, it appears that there was a family called ὸμηρίδαι in the island of Chios, and that two conflicting accounts were current regarding their origin. One, which was given by the logographers, Acusilaus and Hellanicus, derived them from the poet. This view was also adopted by Crates in a work on sacrifices (*ἐν ταῖς θροποιαῖς* is clearly a reference to the title of a book) 

The other, which was maintained against Crates by Seleucus (probably the Homeric critic of the first century B.C.), derived them from the hostages (ἁμαρτα) exchanged after a war which once took place between the men and women of Chios. It was told that on the occasion of a Dionysiac festival the women were seized with madness, and fought with the men: then that, when they made peace, they gave each other as hostages certain bridegrooms and brides, whose descendants thenceforth were called Homeridae. This singular legend, it may be conjectured, was devised to explain some ritual usages of the local Dionysia, in which the Homeridae had a traditional part to play. However this may be, the existence of the legend shows that the connexion of the Homeridae with Homer was not accepted as a matter of course. If there had been any evidence of it—if the Homeridae had been reciters of Homer, or had performed sacred rites to him as their ancestor—the claim would hardly have been doubted. As it is, all that we can be said to know is that there was a family bearing that name in Chios. The derivation from Homer is only one of many possible sources of the word.

The sceptical view is borne out by indications showing that the

---

27 This may be the grammarian Crates of Mallos, the celebrated rival of Aristarchus. But there was another Crates who wrote περὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, which may be the same as the work on *θροποια* now in question.
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Homeridae of Chios were unknown to various writers who might be presumed to be well informed on such a matter. It has already been noticed that the scholiast on Pindar, who tells us a good deal about Cynaethus of Chios and the rhapsodists, evidently did not know that there were Homeridae in Chios. Moreover, the existence of descendants of Homer is ignored in the stories about Creophylus—stories that are alluded to as matter of common knowledge in the Republic of Plato. According to the usual account, which comes from the fourth century B.C.,^28 Lycurgus got the Homeric poems from the descendants of Creophylus in Samos. This obviously implies that Homer had no descendants of his own.

On the whole it appears that the series of notices that has been thought to prove the existence of a family of Homeridae, claiming Homer as their eponymous ancestor and reciting his poems, is really a combination or ‘conflation’ from two sources, neither of which bears out any such hypothesis. These sources are:

1) The scholiast on Pindar, who gives us some information, derived from Hippostratus, about Cynaethus of Chios, but knows nothing of the Homeridae. What he says of them is arrived at by taking Pindar’s poetical use of the word in a literal sense.

2) The lexicon of Harpocration, which brings together notices of the Chian Homeridae, but tells us nothing of their recitation of Homer. In this case also the claim to Homeric descent seems to be a mere inference from the patronymic form of the name.

Our conclusion then must be that the only use of the word ‘Ομηρίδαι known to Attic usage is as a half-poetical term meaning ‘students of Homer’.

§ 6. The rhapsodists and the text—Pististratus.

The rhapsodists, as we have just learned, are charged with having done much to corrupt the text of Homer. One scholium on Pindar Nem. 2. 1 speaks of Cynaethus and his followers (οἱ περὶ Κύουδον) as eminent rhapsodists, ‘who, they say, made many of the verses and put them into the poetry of Homer.’ Another says of the same rhapsodists, ‘they kept in memory and made known the poetry of Homer when dispersed: but they greatly mangled it’^29. It appears, then, that they did mischief in two ways. They broke up the text into

^29 Cp. also Bekker, Anecd. l. i. p. 766 οἱ γὰρ μὲν ‘Ομηρον... περιερχόμενοι καὶ διδάσκει τὰ οὕτω οὐκ ἐφεξῆς, οὐ κἂν τοι οἱ στίχοι, οὕτω ἔλεγον ἀπολύουσιν ἀνεκάκριτον, ἀλλ’ ἐνεμίθεν κἀκεῖθεν.
fragments (presumably ῥαυστὰ, or portions suited for recitation at festivals); and they introduced many interpolations.

The known conditions under which the art of the rhapsodists was exercised render these accusations intrinsically probable. Moreover, they are borne out by the law that regulated the public recitations at Athens, and also, as will be seen, by the later history of the text. It is not necessary to suppose that Homer at one time only survived in a fragmentary state, or in much interpolated copies. The continuous recitation insisted upon at Athens implies the possession of a complete text. Whether the Athenian authorities were equally on the watch against spurious additions (except such as tended to the glory of the city) does not now appear. In any case the regulation of the rhapsodists by public officials shows that there was risk of abuse, and also that steps were taken to guard the purity of the Homeric tradition.

So much may be regarded as resting on the ground of historical fact, namely the law for which we have the testimony, not merely of late compilers like Diogenes Laertius, but of the Attic orators, Lycurgus and Isocrates, besides the more shadowy author of the Hipparchus. But besides these we have to deal with a series of statements, of a circumstantial and occasionally marvellous character, describing much more considerable services as having been rendered to Homer by the Athenian 'tyrant' Pisistratus.

The earliest of these meets us in an unexpected author, namely Cicero, who (in a passage of his treatise De oratore, iii. 34. § 137) dilates on the learning of Pisistratus, 'qui primus Homeri libros confusos anteac sic disposuisse dictur ut nunc habemus.' The earliest Greek writer who refers to this story is Pausanias (7. 26. 6)⁴⁰, who says that when Pisistratus collected the poems of Homer, then known only in fragments scattered about in various places, he (Pisistratus) or one of his companions in ignorance changed the name Δωρίδεσσαν in Il. 2. 573 into Γονίδεσσαν. Who these 'companions' were is a question to be considered presently. The story is told in an epigram said (contrary to all historical probability) to have been inscribed on the base of a statue of Pisistratus at Athens. In it he is made to speak of himself as—

τὸν μέγαν ἐν βουλαίς Πεισίστρατον, ὃς τὸν Ὀμηρόν
ἀθροίσα, ὑποτάξατο πρὸς ἀεὶδόμενον.

⁴⁰ Paus. 7. 26. 6 Πεισίστρατον δὲ ἴδια ὑπὸ τὸ Ὀμηρὸν ἔκτισσάτω τὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἀλλαγαὶ μητροανέλαι ἠθροίζε, τότε αὐτὸν Πεισίστρατον ὃ τῶν τίνα ἱπτάρων μετα-
ποίησαν τὸ ἱερόν ἑκὸ δήμος.
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It is a probable conjecture, though unsupported by external evidence, that this epigram is the source, directly or indirectly, of all the other versions 41.

So far the authorities only speak of Pistratus and certain ‘companions.’ In Byzantine times we are surprised to find credence given to the story that the work of restoring the integrity of Homer was carried out under the direction of Pistratus by a body of seventy-two grammarians, the chief of whom were Aristarchus and Zenodotus. This account is quoted from Heliodorus the grammarian by Tzetzes, who had himself formerly accepted it as true (Prolegomena περὶ Καμηφίας), also from Diomedes 42, and is given by Eustathius, except that he does not specify the number of the grammarians employed. Speaking of the division of the Iliad into ραψίδια or books, Eustathius says—

οί δὲ συνθέμικα ταύτην κατ' ἑπταθήν δὲ φασι Πιστράταυτον τοῦ τῶν Ἀθηναίων γυμνάνον γραμματικόν καὶ διορθῶσαμον κατὰ τὸ ἑκάντον ἀρέσκου, δι' ἱκυρφαίον Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ μετ' ἑκάντον Ζενοδότος κτλ. (Eust. p. 5. 31).

An interesting notice—apparently the earliest reference to this version of the story—is to be found in the poet Ausonius (Epist. 18. 27), who said in praise of a certain grammarian of his time that he was one—

Quem sibi conferret Varro, priorque Crates,  
Quique sacri lacerum collegit corpus Homeri,  
Quique notas spuriis versibus apposuit.

The two unnamed grammarians are Zenodotus and Aristarchus 43: and it is Zenodotus who is said to have ‘collected the torn body of sacred Homer.’ The words are obviously inapplicable to the real work of Zenodotus, but answer exactly to the language of the Pistratus story 44. Hence, although Ausonius does not name Pistratus, he must be regarded as one of the witnesses to the Homeric services of which Pistratus had the credit, and to the association with him of the two great Alexandrian scholars.

A curious variant of the story as regards the assistants or ‘companions’ of Pistratus rests upon the single authority of Tzetzes, and

41 Nutzhorn, Die Entstehungsweise der homerischen Gedichte, p. 40.
43 Cp. Ausonius, Sept. sap. præf. 11 Censor Aristarchus, normaque Zenodoti: also Prof. 15. 3 esset Aristarchi tibi gloria Zenodotique, Graiorum antiquus si sequeretur honos.
44 It is needless to discuss Welcker’s opinion that Zenodotus was here proclaimed as the compiler of the Epic Cycle. It is impossible to admit that Ausonius meant by ‘Homer’ anything but the poems that we have now.
has met with an amount of attention on the part of scholars to which that grammarian was hardly entitled. It was first discovered in Latin, in the document well known as the *Scholium Plautinum* ⁴⁶, and is to the effect that Pisistratus was aided by four persons, Onomacritus, Zopyrus of Heraclea, Orpheus of Croton, and a fourth, whose name was written as Conculus. Then similar comments were found in Greek manuscripts, and at length the original treatise of Tzetzes was found and published ⁴⁸. It will be enough to quote a few words in which he explains his error and the correction:

εἶτον συνθείναι τῶν Ὀμηρῶν ἐπὶ Πεισιστράτου ἐβδομήκοντα δύο σοφοῖς, διὰ ἐβδομῆκοντα δύο εἶδος καὶ τῶν Ζηνόδοτον καὶ Ἀριστάρχου καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνδρῶν ἐπὶ Πεισιστράτου συνθέτων τῶν Ὀμηρῶν, ὁμοίας εἶσιν ὑπὸ ἐπικόγυλος (sic), ὁ Οινομάκριτος Ἀθηναῖος, Ζώνυρος Ἦρακλείτης καὶ Ὀρφεὺς Κρατεριάτης.

He goes on to reproach Heliodorus with having led him into the gross anachronism of making Zenodotus and Aristarchus contemporaries of Pisistratus. Regarding the corrupt ἐπικόγυλος, which conceals one of the four names given by Tzetzes, the most probable suggestion is that of Comparetti ⁴⁷, who has restored the name of the Pythagorean philosopher Ocellus Lucanus. Apparently the corruption extended to all existing manuscripts of Tzetzes, for it is found in the few subsequent notices that refer to him. Thus one grammarian ⁴⁸, after saying that Zenodotus and Aristarchus arranged and corrected (διορθώσαντες) the poetical books of the Alexandrian library, goes on to say:

καὶ τὰς Ὀμηρικὰς ἐβδομήκοντα δύο γραμματικὸν ἐπὶ Πεισιστράτου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων τυράννων διεθήκασιν οὐσιῶν στοράδην ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτον ἐπεκρίθησαν δὲ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν ἑκάστων τῶν καρυοῦ ἔτη Ἀριστάρχου καὶ Ζηνόδοτον, ἄλλων ὄντων τούτων ἕπειροι διορθωσάντων. οἱ δὲ τέσσαρες ταῦτα ἐπὶ Πεισιστράτου διόρθωσιν ἀναφέρουσιν, Ὅρφεὺς Κρατεριάτης, Ζώνυρος Ἦρακλείτης, Ὅμομάκριτος Ἀθηναῖος, καὶ καθ ἐπὶ κογκυλὼν (sic).

This scholion puts the history of the matter into a nutshell. First there is a statement of the real service that the great Alexandrian librarians and scholars did for Homer—Zenodotus the first and Aristarchus the greatest διορθωτής. Then their work is distorted, exaggerated, and thrown back into the half-mythical times of Pisis-

---

⁴⁶ Ritschl, *Die Alexandrinischen Bibliotheken* (Opuscula Philologica I. 4).
tratus. Then a reconciliation is attempted: Pisistratus was assisted, not by the Alexandrian Zenodotus and Aristarchus, but by two scholars bearing the same names. Finally it is added that 'some' (viz. Tzetzes) refer the earlier recension to a commission formed of four Pythagorean philosophers.

The last statement surely has very little claim on our belief. It is entirely unheard of before Tzetzes, that is to say, for fifteen centuries: and it seems to have been forgotten again in the time of Eustathius. Tzetzes does not give his authority, and it can scarcely be imagined that he had access to sources unknown to the generality of Byzantine scholars. Everything points to the conclusion that the statement is a mere fabrication. The materials were doubtless at hand in the literature of Pythagoreanism—a school in which legend and tradition always had a large place.

Apart from fabulous details and rationalized versions, is the story of Pisistratus in its main outlines worthy of belief? This question still divides scholars, and affects their judgment, not perhaps of the Wolfian theory, of which it was once the mainstay, but in regard to the history and fortunes of the Homeric text.

It is admitted that there is no hint of the story in any of the tolerably full accounts that we have of Pisistratus. It is unknown to Herodotus, to Thucydides, and to Aristotle (including the author of the 'Ἀθηναίων μαστία). It is excluded by the account adopted in the pseudo-Platonic Hipparchus, which does not leave room for any collection of Homeric verses. It is never referred to in the scholia of the codex Venetus, and may be shown to be unknown to the Alexandrian grammarians. For example, take the line about Ajax, II. 2. 558:

οτΗος δ' ἀγώ ἐν 'Αθηναίων ἱστατό φάλλῃς.

Aristotle (Rhet. i. 15) simply says that the Athenians quoted it to prove their title to Salamis. Aristarchus condemned the line because he observed that in the narrative of the Iliad (3. 230., 4. 251) Ajax is placed with Idomeneus, not with the Athenians: but he says nothing of a supposed author of the interpolation. In Strabo (ix. p. 394) it is said that some ascribed it to Pisistratus, some to Solon (so Diog. Laert. i. 48). Again, the three lines describing Menestheus (II. 2. 553-555), which were appealed to by the Athenians on the question of the supreme command against Persia (Hdt. 7. 159), were rejected by Zenodotus. They are discussed by Aristarchus without any hint of the possible agency of Pisistratus. Again, the line Od. xi. 631 (Εἰσαὶ Πειριδοῦ τε βίων ἐρωτεία τίμων) was said by Hereas of Megara to have
been interpolated by Pisistratus: and the same historian accused Pisistratus of having left out the verse in Hesiod (fr. 123 Goettl)—

δεινος γάρ μὲν ἔτηρεν ὅρος Παντοπᾶδος Ἀγλης,

as being a reproach to Theseus. But this information comes from Plutarch, not from the scholia. Once more, the Harleian scholium on Od. i. 604 says that that verse was interpolated by Onomacritus. It comes from Hes. Theog. 952, and has no specially Athenian interest. In these places, if anywhere, we expect the scholia that represent the teaching of Aristarchus to make some reference to so important a matter as the collection of the poems by Pisistratus. In fact they do not even go so far as to hint at the probability that interpolations relating to heroes like Theseus and Menestheus may have been due to Athenian influence.

One important piece of evidence still remains to be considered, viz. the well known passage of Diogenes Laertius (i. 57), who says of Solon:

τά τε Ὠμήρου έξ ἵσσιβα εἰς γέγραπται μαθήματα, οἷον ὅσοι ὅ πρῶτος ἔλεγεν ἀρχέσθαι τόν ἱστόμον. μᾶλλον οὖν Σιλων Ὁμήρου ἐφώτισεν ἡ Πεισιάτρατος, ὃς ἂν Πεισιάτρατος ἤν πέμπτος Μεγαρικών, ἦν δὲ μάλιστα τά ἐπὶ ταύτην ὕπο τ' ἀρ' Ἀθηνας εἶχον καὶ τά ἐξῆς.

In this passage there is evidently a lacuna. The sentence ἦν δὲ μάλιστα κτλ. clearly implies that something has just been said about verses of Homer. And considering the subject of the lines referred to (Il. 2. 546 ff.), and the mention of a Megarian writer, we cannot doubt that the missing words contained something to the effect that according to Dieuchidas of Megara certain verses tending to the glory of Athens were foisted into Homer by an Athenian statesman. We may compare the similar charge made by Hereas of Megara in regard to Od. i. 631; also the notices in Strabo about Il. 2. 558, and in Pausanias about II. 2. 573 (cp. p. 403). So far, be it observed, we have only to do with one of the charges of interpolation that were freely made against rhapsodists as well as statesmen. There is no necessary reference to a collection of the Homeric poems by Pisistratus, or even to a recension made by his order. But Diogenes Laertius doubtless knew the Pisistratus story, and if so he must have referred to it in this context. On these grounds, then, Ritschl* filled up the lacuna as follows:

μᾶλλον οὖν Σιλων Ὁμήρου ἐφώτισεν ἡ Πεισιάτρατος, ὃς ἂν πυλεῖς τὰ 'Ὀμήρου ἄναπόστεν τὰ τὰ τὴν Ἀθηναίων χάριν', ὅς θειν διακλίδαι κτλ.

* Ritschl, op. cit. i. 54.
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But can we rest satisfied with a restoration yielding a sense such as this: 'By the continuous recitation instituted at the Panathenaea Solon did more to spread abroad the fame of Homer than Pisistratus did by inserting verses to the glory of Athens'? Notwithstanding the opinion of Lehrs we can hardly think that Diogenes Laertius (or the author from whom he borrowed) had no better argument to found on the law of Solon. His reasoning, surely, was directed against the claim made on behalf of Pisistratus to the credit of collecting and arranging 'Homer.' The strongest point must have been that Solon's law implied the existence of complete copies of the Homeric poems, and therefore cut the ground from under any such claim. This said, he apparently went on to notice a charge of interpolating the text of Homer, and quoted the historian Dieuchidas of Megara in reference to it. This was to the point, since interpolation is a process that postulates a text in which the additional verses can be inserted. It is not a means of diffusing knowledge of Homer, but of turning to use the fame and authority that Homer already enjoyed.

Owing to the lacuna, however, it is not quite certain that the charge was made against Pisistratus. Elsewhere Solon is made the object of similar suspicions. It will be evident that if Solon made interpolations—taking advantage of his control over the rhapsodists—the Pisistratus story becomes a fortiori impossible.

If these suggestions are accepted, the question of the date of Dieuchidas, which has been argued with his usual acuteness by Wilamowitz, is comparatively unimportant. The chief interest will lie in determining whether the lines in the Catalogue of the Ships that bear upon Athens are interpolated there, or are not rather part of the proof that the whole Catalogue is post-Homeric. In the former case they are probably due to the unbidden action of Attic rhapsodists rather than to any stroke of state-craft.

The preceding lines were in type before the writer had the advantage of seeing Mr. Leaf's discussion of the matter in the Prolegomena to his new edition of II. i-xii. It is a satisfaction to find that he agrees in rejecting the supplement proposed by Ritschl. He himself proposes to complete the passage somewhat as follows:

μᾶλλον αὖν Σόλων ὁ Ὀμηρον ἐφότισεν καὶ Πισίστρατος ἐν ἐκείνοις γὰρ ἢ γὰρ τὰ ἔπη εἰς τὸν Καταλόγον ἐμπούσας, καὶ οἱ Πεισίστρατος ἐς φησι διευκόλυνα αὐτὸν.

This restoration appears to supply at least the most important part of the words which have fallen out, and also to furnish a probable

Lehrs, De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis, p. 446.
cause of the lacuna, viz. the repetition of the word Ἡσαίοςπαρασ. But does the passage as so restored prove that Dieuchidas had any knowledge of the collection of scattered Homeric poems said to have been made by Pisistratus? His testimony refers to the interpolation that has just been mentioned, and need not extend further back. On the contrary, the natural sense of the completed words is something like this: 'It was this law of Solon that made Homer known, rather than any (alleged) collection of his poems by Pisistratus: and so too it was Solon who interpolated the lines in the Catalogue supporting the Athenian claims against Megara,—not Pisistratus, as the Megarian Dieuchidas pretends.'

To sum up: the evidence in this and similar cases seems to belong to three tolerably well marked periods:

(1) Alexandrian; in which verses are questioned as spurious, and are discussed by critics on the ground of internal consistency, &c., but without reference to political or other motives.

(2) Early post-Alexandrian; when allegations begin to be made about Solon, Pisistratus, Onomacritus, and the like.

(3) Roman and Byzantine; when the full-blown Pisistratus myth makes its appearance,—οἵρῳν ἑτήρισε κάρη καὶ ἕν καὶ χθονι βαινει.

If the result of the foregoing inquiry is to show that there is no good evidence for the story told of Pisistratus, it only remains to consider whether there is a reasonable αἰτία τοῦ ψέφων—whether, that is to say, there was anything to suggest such a story, and to give it currency among the learned of Roman and Byzantine times.

The elements and motifs of the story lie open to our view. They seem to be these:

(1) The great critical work of the Alexandrians, especially of Zenodotus and Aristarchus, to which later scholars looked back with veneration, but not always with much knowledge.

(2) The existence of much textual corruption, especially interpolation. The evidence for this has always been considerable, and has been augmented in quite recent years. The services of the great Alexandrians in dealing with it were magnified, or rather were distorted and turned into senseless marvels, by ignorant γραμματικοί.

(3) The influence of Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries as a literary centre; including, in particular, such institutions as the regular and complete recitation of Homer. This no doubt helped to attract to Attica the stories about the preservation and diffusion of Homer which were originally told of other parts of Greece.
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(4) The desire to think well of 'tyrants' and monarchs generally, as friends of letters. This led to the prominence of Pisistratus, where an earlier age would have rather looked to Solon.

Such were the causes and conditions through which the age of the Ptolemies came to be reflected in the myth—for so we must call it—of Pisistratus and his grammarians, 'of whom Zenodotus and Aristarchus were the chief.' Let us understand it as a myth, and not think, by leaving out the anachronisms and the marvels, to turn it into history.

§ 7. Ancient criticism—the fifth century B.C.

The systematic study of Homer can be traced back to the beginning of prose writing in Greece. The 'ancient quarrel' with philosophy—that is to say, with the advancing reason and morality of the nation—came to a height in the attacks of Xenophanes and Pythagoras. Following closely on these—towards the end of the sixth century B.C.—attempts at reconciliation began to be made. The first of these, so far as we know, was the allegorical explanation put forward by Theagenes of Rhegium, who lived in the time of Cambyses, king of Persia—which was also (roughly speaking) the time of the earliest logographers. Theagenes, it is said, was the first who 'wrote about Homer.' With him began ἡ νεωτίρα γραμματική, the New Grammar, that which studied the language and narrative of Homer, and did not confine itself to reading and writing. Whether he rendered any service to the purity of the text does not appear. He is quoted on one place, viz. II. 1. 381 ἐκεῖ μᾶλλα οἴ φίλος ἢ, where he is said to have read ἐκεῖ μᾶ ὑ ὦ οἴ (with the Cyprian and Cretan editions). The statement, however, seems doubtful. The chief passage quoted from him is the explanation of the θεομάχια in the Iliad, given by Schol. B on II. 20. 67. It is to the effect that the different gods stand for elements or powers of nature or man: Apollo is the sun, Hephaestus fire, Poseidon and Scamander water, Artemis the moon, Here air, Athene wisdom, Ares folly, Aphrodite desire, Hermes λύγας.

88 It does not seem likely that a writer of the period of Theagenes would be quoted for the difference between ἐκεῖ μᾶλλα and ἐκεῖ μᾶ ὑ. Perhaps the name was that of some much later grammmarian. If so, προφήτευτα may have the meaning ἡρατέρχεσθαι, as sometimes in the scholia.

89 At this point I have ventured to make a correction. According to the MS. 'Ἀνάλλων,' Ελιών, and Ἐφαστος stand for fire. But Ελιὼν is not one of the actors in the story. And if Artemis is the moon, Apollo is naturally the sun. Hence for τὸ μὲν τῷ Ἀνάλλων καὶ Ἐλιὼν καὶ Ἐφαστος τῆν τὸ μὲν γιόν Ἐφαστος τὸν διὰ Ἡλιόν Ἀνάλλων.
THE FIFTH CENTURY

The philosopher Democritus of Abdera (unlike his rival Heraclitus) was on the side of Homer in the great conflict. Among other treatises on poetry and music he wrote περὶ Ὄμηρου ἡ δροθεσινὶς καὶ γλωσσιῶν, and seems to have dealt especially with the Homeric meanings of words—perhaps anticipating Aristarchus in that field—and the various senses that the same word may have (τὸν ὁμοιοῦν τῶν πολυσθένων λίγων). These few indications point to the beginning of a really scientific treatment of Homeric language.

The allegorical system of interpretation was carried farther by the philosophers of the age of Pericles. Anaxagoras is said to have been the first to explain Homer as moral allegory; while his friend and follower Metrodorus of Lampsacus sought rather for physical explanations. But a more important name in this period is that of Stesimbrotus of Thasos, who lived about the time of Cimon and Pericles. He is mentioned by Xenophon (Συμπ. 3. 6) as one of those who could explain the hidden meanings (τὰς ὑποωνας) of Homer; also in the Ion of Plato (p. 530) as an author of interpretations (ὑποωνας). He is associated in the latter passage with Metrodorus, whence it has been inferred that he was one of the allegorising school. This, however, is not borne out by the specimens of his method that have been preserved in the scholia. He is quoted (with Crates) about the division of the universe between the three sons of Krônos, especially about the line γαία δ’ ἐπὶ ξυνή πάνων καὶ μακρός “Ολυμπός: but the scholium is corrupt. II. ii. 637 Νίστορ δ’ ὁ γέρων ἄργιθη ἄμφερεν, he pointed out, was put in simply to account for Nestor’s long life. On II. 21. 76 πάρ γὰρ σοὶ πρῶτῳ παιδὸς Δημήτριος ἀκτίν he accounted for πρῶτῳ on the ground that barbarians only ate barley, so that Lycaon had really eaten wheat for the first time with Achilles. Stesimbrotus also wrote περὶ τελετῶν, probably on the Mysteries of the neighbouring Samothrace. References are quoted from it to the Idaean Δίκτυος, the Cabiri and the Corybantes, the name Δίκτυος, &c. A third work was historical, viz. ‘on Themistocles, Thucydides, and Pericles.’

The island of Thasos boasts of two other Homeric students of the fifth century, viz. Hippias, two of whose emendations are mentioned in the Poetics of Aristotle (c. 25), and Hegemon, who first ventured to parody Homer. Other Ὅμηροι of the same brilliant period are

84 Diog. Laert. ii. 11 (of Anaxagoras) δοκεῖ δὲ πρῶτος (καθ’ ἄνθρωπον ἡ Παναθήναι Ἡσορί), τὸν Ὅμηρον ποιήσαν ἀφορμῆσθαι εἶναι περὶ ἄρτης καὶ ὑποκρίτους ἐκ τελειῶν δὲ προστίθη τοῦ λόγου Μεντρόδωρο τοῦ Λαμπσυκτήνων, ἄριστην δέτα αὐτοῦ, διὰ καὶ πρῶτον στουδάσα τοῦ συμποτο γε τὴν φυσικὴν πραγματείαν.
Anaximander (coupled with Stesimbrotus in Xen. *Symp.* 3. 6), Glaucón (similarly mentioned among Homeric scholars by Plato, *Ion*, p. 530, and probably the same as the Glaucón of Arist. *Rhet.* iii. 1. 3, *Poet.* 25), and Hippias of Elis, the celebrated sophist, introduced in the Platonic dialogue *Hippias minor*. It is needless to add the names of those who dealt indirectly with Homer: such, for instance, as Gorgias of Leontini and other rhetoricians (many of them his pupils), who took Homeric subjects as themes for declamation. These rhetorical exercises—of which we have a good specimen in the *encomium Helenae* of Isocrates—do not belong to the history of serious Homeric studies; but (like the imitations and allusions in the poets) they serve to complete the picture of the supremacy of Homer in Greek literature and thought.

Among the philosophers who drew their inspiration from Socrates the chief writer on Homeric subjects appears to have been Antisthenes the Cynic. In the list of his works we find many names taken from the *Odyssey*: περὶ ὀνυσθείας, Ἀθηνᾶ ἡ περὶ Τηλεμάχου, περὶ Ἐλένης καὶ Πηνελόπης, περὶ Πρωτίας, περὶ μέθης ἡ περὶ τοῦ Κόκλωτος, περὶ Κίρης, and the like. The *Iliad* is represented by a treatise περὶ Καλχατος, and perhaps a few others. These titles, however, do not lead us to infer that Antisthenes was an authority on the criticism or interpretation of the poet. They point rather to treatises in which Homeric personages were taken as types of character, or used as pegs on which to hang the discussion of moral and political questions. Thus the Cyclops evidently served as an example of the vice of drunkenness: and the treatise on Helen and Penelope must have dwelt on the striking moral contrast suggested by these two names. This is a mode of treatment which does not imply minute study of the text of Homer, and indeed is not very different from the use of Homeric subjects in the *encomia* and other rhetorical exercises of the early sophists. It would seem, however, that Antisthenes was one of the earliest writers who made it their business to account for the apparent contradictions to be found in the Homeric poems, and that his key was the familiar antithesis of 'truth' and 'seeming' (ὅτι τὰ μὲν δὲν τὰ δὲ διὰ τὸ ἐκφράσθη πρὸς τὴν ἡμᾶς). According to Dio Chrysostom this distinction was largely employed afterwards by Zeno to explain contradictions, but he adds that it was first put forward by Antisthenes. In this point, then, as in others, the Stoics carried on the ideas and methods of the earlier Cynic school.

Hitherto the authors with whom we have had to do have been either philosophers, concerned with the speculative truth or falsehood.
that they discovered in Homer, or else historians, who dealt with the scanty records of his life. A new type appears about the end of the fifth century in Antimachus of Colophon, a pupil of Stesimbrotus, and nearly contemporary with Socrates. Antimachus was an ‘editor’ or διορθώτης of Homer, and also himself an epic poet of the first rank. He was thus the prototype of the learned poets so numerous in Alexandria under the Ptolemies, and formed a link between them and the great poets of earlier times. His chief work was a Thébaïd, said to be referred to by Horace in the line—

Nec reeditum Diomedis ab interitu Meleagri.

A poem beginning with the death of Meleager and consequent flight of Tydeus to Argos, and coming down to the return of Diomede from the war of the Epigoni, was certainly not Homeric in structure, however valuable as a storehouse of mythical history. It was to poems of this learned character that the epithet κυκλοφόρος came to be applied in Alexandrian times, and indeed Antimachus (if we may believe the scholiast already quoted) was himself known as δ κυκλοφόρος par excellence. It was apparently also of this Thébaïd that Callimachus uttered the celebrated saying μέγα βιβλιον μέγα κακήν.

The edition of Antimachus is referred to about twelve times in the Iliad, and once in the Odyssæy (1. 85, where he read 'Ογυνήν for 'Ογυνήν). Several of his readings represent a good tradition: such as μαχησομαι (I. 298), κατὰ δαίτα (II. 1. 424, so Aristarchus), οἶνοχος (I. 598), κακοπόν (I. 13. 60), Τρόπος (II. 5. 461). It also appears from the fragments of his own poems that he read ἰδωμοι (for ἰδήμοι), ἐπίπηρα (not ἐπι ἡρα), φη (II. 2. 144, 14. 499), διὰ στπιδος (II. 7. 54), ἀδόροις (Od. 2. 354, for δοροῖς). On the other hand he seems to have made or adopted some arbitrary emendations: II. 21. 607 πῦλαi δ ἐμπληρο ἀλήτων (for πῦλαι δ ἐμπληρο): 22. 336 ἀληθονεν κακάς (for ἀλκών): 24. 71 ἐληψαι μὲν ἀμήχασον (for ἐλάσομεν—not seeing that ἐλω means omit, give up).

There was a tradition, which has reached us in very late sources, that a recension of Homer was made by Euripides—not the tragic poet, but perhaps a contemporary (Suid. s.v. Εὖριπίδης, Eust. on II. 2. 865). If such an edition existed, it had no place, so far as we know, in the critical apparatus of the Alexandrian scholars.

Before leaving the fifth century we may notice some writers who

---

84 The 'canon' of epic poetry consisted of the five names, Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Panyasis, Antimachus.
85 See the scholia on Hor. Ep. ad Pis. 146.
86 Athen. iii. p. 72 a.
were not professedly Homeric students, but whose references to Homer are none the less worthy of attention.

Herodotus and Thucydides are almost alone among historians in expressing no opinion about Homer's birthplace or genealogy. Even as regards his date Herodotus merely protests against the excessive antiquity which some claimed for him (Hdt. 2. 53). The most interesting notices are those which show that the early epic poems, in particular the Cypria (Hdt. 2. 116) and Epigoni (4. 32), were still commonly assigned to 'Homer.' Thucydides refers several times to the Iliad and Odyssey, and quotes the Hymn to Apollo as Homeric, but does not allude to any 'cyclic' poem. It is probable, therefore, that in his time the Homeric canon was nearly what it ultimately became. He makes the important remark that in Homer Greece was not called ΕΛΛΑΣ, and similarly that non-Greeks were not yet brought under the general designation βάρβαρος. He also observed that piracy was regarded as honourable (referring to Od. 3. 71, &c.). Generally his tone in regard to Homer is sceptical. Thus he gives the size of the Greek armament before Troy as οὕτως τούτῳ δεδόθησα, οἵ τε λεγότα τεκμηρίωσα. Sicily, he says, was originally inhabited by Κύκλωνες καὶ Δαυστριγόνες, about whom he declines to say anything himself (6. 2). The notice of Corinth as ἄφηνεν, ὡς καὶ τοὺς παλαιοὺς ποιητὰς δεδήλωσε, refers to II. 2. 570 ἄφηνεν τῷ Κόρινθῳ. Thus his attitude was one of protest against the undue authority which Homer exerted, and which the limitation to the Iliad and Odyssey doubtless made more sensible.

Direct references to Homer in the later poets must necessarily be rare. Difference of literary form and treatment forbids imitation such as we find (e.g.) in Apollonius Rhodius and Virgil. Nevertheless Homer is mentioned by name in three or four passages of the Epinician Odes of Pindar. In Pyth. 4. 277 ἄγγελον ἐσόζει ἢφα τιμῶν μεγίστων πράγματι παντὶ φύσεωι we must surely recognise a poetical quotation of II. 15. 207 ἵσθησεν καὶ τὸ τέφναται ὅτι ἄγγελος αὐτῷ εἶδε. So in Isthm. 4. 37 there is a clear reference to the speech of Ajax in II. 7. 198-199. In Nem. 7. 20 Pindar speaks of the Homeric stories of Ulysses and his exploits in language that is almost in the sceptical vein of Thucydides.

In tragedy, for obvious reasons, direct references to Homer cannot occur. Yet ancient scholars were impressed with the profound

48 The speech of Ajax is in fact addressed to the Greeks, not to Hector, as Pindar's language would imply. This, however, is due to a mere lapse of memory, and proves nothing about Pindar's knowledge of the Homeric text. See Mr. Bury's note ad loc., also the Classical Review, vol. vi. p. 3.
influence exercised by Homer on the great tragic poets. Aeschylus was believed to have spoken of his plays as 'slices (τεμάχια) from the great repasts of Homer' (Athen. viii. c. 39). Sophocles was called φαλόμπρος (Eust. 440. 38), μαθητής ὁμήρου (Vit. Soph. i. 97), and was said to have taken the subjects of many dramas from Homer, especially from the Odyssey. There may be some exaggeration in this: Aristotle, as we have seen (p. 339), was struck rather with the farness of the plays that it had been possible to take from the two great poems. It should be noticed, however, that the subjects of Satyric dramas are not uncommonly Homeric. We know of the Κηρα and Πρατεύος of Aeschylus, the Κριός and 'Ελεύθης γάμος of Sophocles, the Cyclops of Euripides. Evidently the attraction of these plays lay in the familiarity of the audience with the poems of which they were virtually parodies.

The element of parody or burlesque held a large place in Greek comedy, especially in its earlier periods. Accordingly we are not surprised to find that many of the subjects are connected with the story of the Trojan war; and of these a considerable proportion must have been taken from the Iliad and Odyssey. Thus we find—

Epicharmus: Σειρήνες, Ὡδυσσείας ναυαγός, Τρίκλες, Χείρων, Φαλοκτήτας.
Cratinus: Ὡδυσσείς.
Theopompos: Ὡδυσσείας, Πηνελόπη, Σειρήνες.
Philyllus: Πρωτεύος ἡ Ναυσικά.
Callias and Dioecles: Κύκλεψ.
Plato: Μενέλαος.

These examples belong to the period of the Old Comedy, and in nearly every case the subjects come from the Odyssey—the poem which leant itself more readily to treatment in a playful vein. In the Middle Comedy freer use seems to be made of the Iliad: we meet with the titles 'Ελένη, 'Αχιλλειος, Πάυδαρος, Ολύμπιος, Μελέαγρος, Βελλεροφόντης, 'Αντία, 'Αμφίσης, as well as Ὡδυσσείας, Κύκλεψ, Ναυσικά, Κηρα, Καλυψώ. With the introduction of the New Comedy came a change of fashion, and Homeric subjects thenceforth were very rare.

The influence of Homer may be traced, not merely in the choice of subjects, but also in allusions and reminiscences of all kinds. Here also there is a curious difference of usage or fashion between the different periods in question. In the Old Comedy these Homeric...

34 Vit. Soph. i. 90 τῶν μέθος φέρει κατ' ἑκάτον τοῦ ποιητοῦ καὶ τὴν Ὡδύσσειαν 8' ἐν πολλοῖς δράμαις ἀναγράφεται.
35 Parody of Homer is said to have begun with Hipponax, in the sixth century B.C.: see Athenaeus (p. 698 b).
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reminiscences are frequent: in the Middle Comedy they become comparatively few: in the New Comedy they practically disappear. Cratinus, for example, who is perhaps the most representative poet of the Old Comedy, was the author of a play, the Οδύσσης, which was simply a burlesque of the Οδύσσεις (dissyrios τῆς Όμηρου Οδυσσείας Platonius p. xxxv). It contained such adaptations as—

ἐν' ἀριστερ' ἀεὶ τῇν Ἀρκτον ἡχων λάμπουσιν ἦν ἀν ἑφύρησιν,
from Od. 5. 276—277 τῷ (sc. "Ἀρκτον")... ἐν' ἀριστερ' χειρὸς ἡχουσα.

τῇ νῦν τέδε πυθε λαβὼν ἤδη, καὶ τοθναμά μ' εἰθύνε ἐρώτα,
from Od. 9. 347 Κύλλων, τῇ πεί ὄνου, and 1. 355 καὶ μοι τῶν οὖνομα εἰσὶ. So in the Λύκωνες of Cratinus—

φοβηρῶν αὐθρόπως τόδ' αὖ
κταρίσσει ἐν' ἀλίβοις καυκάσσως μέγα (Od. 22. 412):

and in the Πυλαία fr. 2 ἀδεινῶς ἐπαιδευσεν ἔθνευτε τε δημοσίως χρήμασιν
εἰς ἠφην ἦν αὐτὰ ποτὲ λογίου ἀμφιβολοῦ, from II. 9. 495 (παίδα) ποιήσασθον ἦνα
μοι ποτ' ἀκκαία λογίου ἀμφίης. Cp. also the imitation in the Κείρων of Pherecrates, fr. 8—

δώσει δὲ σοι γυναίκας ἔπει δεσδιδᾶς (II. 9. 270):

and in the Δήμοι of Eupolis, fr. 15. 6—

εἰς ὀστρεῖ θεοίσων ηὐχήμεσθα (II. 22. 394, &c.).

Pure parody is seen in Metagenes (incert. 2)—

εἰς οἰκίαν ἅριστος ἀμίνεσθαι περὶ δήσουν
as in Άρ. Λυσ. 538 πόλεμος δὲ γυναῖκα μελήσει. When however we turn
to the fragments of the Middle Comedy, allusions of this kind are no
ger longer to be found 41. The change is one which it is not easy to account
for. The knowledge of Homer possessed by an average Attic audience
in the period of Middle Comedy cannot have been less than it was
in the time of Cratinus. Possibly the cause is to be seen in a general
advance of refinement. The popular taste may have turned against
parodies of the almost sacred poetry of Homer, just as it discarded
the coarseness and personalities of the Aristophanic stage.


The progress of Homeric studies in the fourth century shows itself
in several different directions. The students and admirers of Homer
now form a recognised class or sect, the Ομηρίδαι or 'clan of Homer'

41 W. Scherrans, De poetarum comicorum Atticorum studiis Homericis (Regi-
monti, 1893), pp. 46—50.
spoken of in the passages of Plato and Isocrates already quoted (p. 399). They are doubtless the same with the ὄμηρωί of whom Aristotle says that they see the small differences and fail to see (παρορθωί) the great ones. But apart from this inner circle of devotees, it is evident that the poems of Homer—not the mass of epics once connected with his name, but definitely the Iliad and Odyssey—had become one of the chief factors in the intellectual life of Greece. They had been familiar for some time as the staple of education: they now shared in the general awakening of the scientific spirit. Theories and opinions on the interpretation of Homer, on the condition of the text—of which there were many new recensions—, on the historical authority of the poems, and similar topics, now found their way into the common stock of knowledge.

Plato is not one of the writers on Homer: but he is full of Homeric quotations and allusions, and he contributes in several ways to our knowledge of the Homeric movement of his time. In the Ion he draws a picture of the manner in which Homer was listened to and enjoyed by his countrymen. In the Cratylus he gives us specimens of the grammatical and linguistic speculation that was growing out of the Homeric studies of the philosophers. The Republic furnishes a measure of the importance of Homer as a moral influence in Greece. And the same dialogue, in the curious reference to Homer’s friend or alter ego Creophylus, witnesses to the fresh crop of mythical anecdotes that had then sprung up. As we have already seen (p. 391), the notices that come from historians of the fourth century—such as Ephorus, Timaeus, Heraclides Ponticus—tell us much of Lycurgus and Creophylus: even as the logographers told of Smyrna and the Meles, and as later informants tell of Pisistratus and Zenodotus.

From Plato it seems an easy step to Aristotle: yet the difference is hardly to be measured. For the scientific treatment of poetry it means the transition from infancy to mature knowledge. The moral difficulties that stood in the way of a just estimate of Homer, the allegorising fancies that obscured his meaning, are now brushed aside. They are phantasms that have no place in the dry light of Aristotelian thought. In the few pages given to Homer in the Poetics the study of epic poetry as a form of literature stands on the highest level

---

* Arist. Met. 1093 a 27. Cp. also the passage from the Comic poet Strato (quoted in Athenaeus), describing the cook who was ὄμηρως and constantly used Homeric γλῶσσαι (Meineke, Fragm. Com. iv. 545).

* Cp. the saying attributed to Timon: φασὶ δὲ καὶ Ἀρατὸν πεθάνων αὐτοῦ τῶν ὀμηρῶν τοίνυν ἀσφαλῶς κτῆσαι· τὸν δὲ εἶπεν, εἰ τοῖς ἄριστοι ἀντιγράφοις ἐκτυχεῖ, καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἴδη διαφωτισθέντως (Diog. Laert. ix. 113).
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ever attained. On such matters as the structure of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (*Poet.* c. 8, c. 23), or the essential characteristics that distinguish the two poems (c. 24), we feel that a final verdict has been pronounced. Great scholars have sometimes failed to understand the teaching of Aristotle: none have surpassed his critical insight. Moreover, Aristotle was in a position from which he could survey not only the Homeric poems but the whole of Greek epic literature. He could compare Homer with the early Ionian poetry that had once been regarded as all more or less Homeric, and again with the comparatively recent writers, such as Antimachus and Choerilus. With these advantages a modern scholar could do infinitely more for linguistic and historical science. But in the field of pure literary criticism Aristotle was doubtless able to make the fullest use of his materials, and his results may be accepted by us as ascertained truth.

There is a story in Plutarch 44 of a recension of Homer made by Aristotle for the use of Alexander the Great. The volume, he says, was kept in a certain casket, from which it was called ἦ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ ἵπποιδος. In Strabo 45, however, the story is told of a copy revised by Alexander himself. In any case it can hardly be true of the great philosopher. Such a work must have been quite unsuited to his powers. His own quotations from Homer, as we shall see (p. 429), are exceptionally inaccurate. It is certain that Alexander was strongly influenced by the poetry of Homer, and that he looked upon the heroic career of Achilles—not without reason—as in some sense a forecast of his own genius and fortunes. But the *Iliad of the Casket* may safely be dismissed as a picturesque legend.


In an inquiry into the history of the Homeric text the first great fact that meets the student is the existence of the *vulgate.* The conditions that favour the creation of a vulgate or testus receptus of an author are perhaps never wholly absent: but they vary with the popularity of the author and the importance of the market for his works. In the case of Homer these causes operated with peculiar force. If we compare the editions of the *Iliad* before that of Wolf (1794), from the Florentine *editio princeps* to the great work of Heyne, we find hardly any difference. And similarly in the numerous manuscripts of Homer the most striking feature is their uniformity. As

44 Plutarch *Vit. Alexandri* 8: Strabo xiii. 594.
Mr. Leaf has said, 'almost any extant manuscript is nearly good enough: at any rate a collation of almost any two will give us a readable text.' The tendencies that lead to error and consequent divergence are balanced and kept in check by those which make for agreement.

Several questions are suggested by this phenomenon. How far back can the existence of this vulgate be traced? Is it lineally descended from a text, or group of texts, current in antiquity? Was such a text formed, or in the way of being formed, in the fourth century B.C., when Athens was the centre of the Greek book-trade? Does our vulgate represent the 'old copies' spoken of in the saying of Timon of Athens (p. 417), or the 'corrected editions' that he regarded with distrust? In what relation does it stand to the manuscripts collected in the Alexandrian library, and to the texts formed by the great Alexandrian scholars?

The answers to these and similar questions are to be sought in more than one direction. We turn, in the first place, to the work of the ancient critics. The scholia, especially those of the Codex Venetus, have preserved a large number of the readings of Aristarchus, and they not infrequently allow us to know something of the materials on which his conclusions were based. In the next place, through the discoveries of recent years we are in possession of fragments of text, some of which go back to the earliest days of Alexandrian Hellenism. And, lastly, there are the numerous quotations from Homer in the prose writers of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. From these three quite independent sources it is possible to form some estimate of the condition in which the Alexandrian grammarians found the text of Homer, and also of the influence exerted by them on its later fortunes.

§ 10. Early forms of textual corruption.

It will be readily granted that some forms of textual corruption must have been commoner in antiquity than in the period from which our manuscripts generally date. The mistakes to which copyists are liable are not the mistakes of oral transmission: and mistakes of the latter kind would be apt to creep even into written copies so long as it was by hearing rather than by reading that poetry was known and enjoyed. While the Greek of Homer, notwithstanding the archaic grammar and vocabulary, was still felt by the people as a living
language, and continued to be the conventional dialect of poetry, there were possibilities of divergence that ceased when it was confined to a professional class. Many examples may be given of the type of ‘various reading’ produced under the older conditions. One of the first and most obvious is in II. 1.91, where our MSS. have ἄριστος ἐνὶ στρατῷ εὑρέται εἶσαι, but Aristarchus (following the editions of Zenodotus, Sosigenes, and Aristophanes) reads ἄριστος Ἀχαῖων. It is plain that no scribe could mistake Ἀχαῖων for ἐνὶ στρατῷ, or vice versa: the originator of the false reading either took it from some other passage, or is responsible for the authorship of it himself. The same observation applies to II. 1.97, where we have to choose between Δαμαών διεκέρα λογιὰν ἀπόσυνε (Ar. following the Massiliensis and Rhianus) and λαμών βαρείας χεῖρας ἀφέσει (Zen. and the MSS.): and to the reading in II. 2.15 δίδομεν δὲ οἱ εὐχος ἀρέσει, quoted by Aristotle (Poet. 25), instead of Τρώωσοι δὲ κύδει ἐφήσαι. So generally it may be assumed that it is the reciter rather than the copyist to whom we have to attribute the numberless cases of ‘contamination,’ that is to say, of the process by which words or phrases are transferred from one context to another. This is especially frequent with epic commonplace: e.g. in II. 1.73 δς μν ἀμεθύματοι ἐντὰ περίοντα προσόνθα was read by Zen., for the vulgate δ σφυν ἐφφοιτεῖν ἀγροῆσατο καὶ μετίεσαν: in II. 2.484 Ὡλυμπιάδες βαθύκολου (Zen. for Ὡλυμπία δέματ’ ἐκοινοῦτο): and so ἄνακτος for γέροντος in II. 2.793 τύμβῳ ἐς ἀροτάτῳ λισυνήτω γέροντος.

§ 11. Interpolation in early texts.

Of the various forms of textual corruption that belong especially to the pre-Alexandrian age the most important, from every point of view, is interpolation. On this part of the subject it will be worth while to go into some detail, so as to distinguish the several branches of evidence, and to show the cumulative nature of the reasoning upon which our final conclusions are based.

1. It appears from the ancient commentators, in particular from some passages in the scholia on Pindar (quoted above, p. 402), that the rhapsodists were accused of spoiling the poetry of Homer by inserting verses of their own. The accusation may be just or not; the fact that it was made serves to prove that in some at least of the current texts of Homer there was a considerable admixture of verses generally regarded as spurious.

2. Several instances were mentioned above (p. 406) of verses said
to have been interpolated for political ends by Athenian statesmen. It is true that charges of this kind cannot be traced far back. They are ignored in the Venetian scholia, and apparently were made in the first instance by certain Megarian historians, from jealousy of Athens. But they would probably not have been made if the idea of interpolation in Homer had not been already more or less familiar to the learned world.

3. In the Homeric criticism of the Alexandrians nothing is more characteristic than the prominence given to the detection of spurious verses. The obelus seems to have been the earliest of the critical marks, as in form it is the simplest. It was apparently used by Zenodotus, perhaps was devised by him. In antiquity it was generally regarded as especially the weapon of Aristarchus. In the first three books of the Iliad, for example, the number of verses obelized by Aristarchus (if we may trust the Codex Venetus) is 120, or about six per cent. How many more he absolutely rejected we cannot tell, since there is no corresponding record of them. The scholia, however, furnish some significant instances of lines rejected by Aristarchus notwithstanding that they appeared in some of the texts that he had before him. Thus on II. 9.159 Aristarchus noted that some added the line—

οὐ νε' ἐπεὶ κα λάζομαι πῶλορ ἵκει οὐδ' ἄνησι.

And on II. 8.168 he seems to have noted that 'they subjoin' (ὑποτάσσουσι) the line—

ἡ μὴν στρέφαι μὴν ἀνίβου μαχεῖσαι.

Similar additions are mentioned by the Venetian scholia on II. 9.140, 12.328., 22.158., 23.538., 24.205. In the Townley scholia the notices of such verses are still more numerous. Thus after II. 2.848 it is said that some added the line—

Πηλεῦνος θ' υἱὸς περιδέξος Ἀστεροπαῖος, δὲ καὶ ἐν πολλαῖς τῶν Ἦλιος φέροντα, i.e. which was to be found in many of the texts habitually quoted by Aristarchus. So on II. 8.131 the Townley scholia give two lines as found ἐν τυχὶ τῶν πολλῶν, i.e. in certain Alexandrian texts. So after II. 8.131, according to the

---

44 According to the grammatical fragment in the Codex Venetus (fol. 8) Aristarchus took it from Zenodotus (τὸν δὲ ὁμιλῶν ἔλαβεν ἐκ τῆς Ζηροδοτοῦ διορθώσεως).

45 So in Ansonius (Epist. 18. 29) Aristarchus is indicated in a list of eminent grammarians by the description quique notas spuriis versibus apposuit. Cp. the dictum of Cicero (Fam. 3. 11) Aristarchus Homeri versum negat quem non probat.

46 A list of about thirty is given by Ludwich, Homervulgata, p. 25.
Townley scholia, there were two lines found εν τινι των παλαιων, which
completed the sentence as follows:

και νυ κε σηκεσθεν κατα "Αλιον ηνε άρρες
Τρισι υπ' Ἀργείων, Ελιπον δε κεν "Εκτορα διω
χαλκε βιώντα, δάμασε δε μην Διομήνης,
eι μη κτλ.

Again, II. 5. 808, which was read by Zenodotus and is in almost
all the manuscripts, was omitted by Aristarchus. And II. 16. 613,
which is in all the manuscripts, was omitted in the earlier recension
of Aristarchus: but in the second he allowed it to stand with the
obelus.

It appears also that the edition of Zenodotus gave several lines that
are not in our texts, and probably were wanting in that of Aristarchus.
Such are the lines mentioned in the scholia as coming after II. 3. 338.,
13. 808., 14. 136., 17. 456 **. On the other hand there are about
thirty lines not read by Zenodotus (δ ἐν Ζενοδότος ωδὲ γραφε), but
admitted, usually with the obelus, into the text of Aristarchus. Besides
these instances, which have found their way into the scholia because
they were the subject of controversy between Zenodotus and Aristarchus,
there were doubtless many more that the two great scholars agreed
in condemning—of which consequently there is no record.

The large use that Aristarchus made of the obelus is in itself
a ground for believing that interpolation was frequent. Why should
he have been so ready to suspect the genuineness of lines, and to
resort to athetesis whenever he was met by a difficulty? Evidently
he had some good reason for regarding interpolation as a vera causa,
that is to say, as a cause which was known aliunde to be operative
in the Homeric text, and could therefore be supposed in any particular
case without antecedent improbability. But such an attitude on the
part of the great critic is hardly defensible unless the evidence of
interpolation was stronger than appears in the scholia.

§ 12. Interpolation in papyrus fragments.

The foregoing arguments, if somewhat indirect, are at least sufficient
to raise a presumption in favour of the view that besides the many
verses that Aristarchus was content to 'obelize' there were many
more that he simply rejected and left to oblivion. But independent

testimony to the same effect is furnished from the sources of evidence with which we have still to deal.

One of the earliest and most surprising results of the work of Mr. Flinders Petrie in Egypt was the discovery, at Gurob in 1890, of a fragment of papyrus roll containing parts of thirty-nine verses, viz. the last few letters of twenty verses, and the first few letters of nineteen more. These were soon identified by Mr. Bury as II. 11. 502–537, but with some remarkable differences from the existing text. One line is wanting (there being only room for one in place of 529–530): and there are no less than four additional lines, viz. one after l. 504, about which we only know that it ended with -νον περ: one after l. 509, the two lines, with the supplement proposed by Robert, probably being—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{μὴ πῶς μὲν πολέμου μετακληθέντες (sic) Ἑλοῦν} \\
\text{[Τρώες ὑπέρθυμοι καὶ ἀπὸ κυντᾶ σεύχη] Ἑλοὺτο}
\end{align*}
\]

and one after each of the two lines 513 and 514. When these last are restored in the most probable way (as by Robert and Menrad) they complete the passage somewhat as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἀγρεῖ, σῶν ὡχὶν ἐπιθήσοτα, πάρ δὲ Μαχᾶων} \\
\text{βαινεῖ, ἵνα δὲ τάχιστ' ἀγε μάρτυρα ἔπειτα,} \\
\text{[νόσον ἀπὸ Τρώων τὲ καὶ Ἐκτορος ἀνδροφόλῳ] ἔμετρον} \\
\text{ῃπτρὸς γὰρ ἄνὴρ πολλῶν ἀντάξιος ἄλλων} \\
\text{[... ... ἐσάκω καὶ] ἄλλοις} \\
\text{ἰὼν τε ἔκταμνων ἐτὶ τε ἡπα φάρμακα πάσσων.}
\end{align*}
\]

It is hardly necessary to point out that these additional lines cannot be genuine. The form Ἑλοῦτο (for Ἑλοῖα) is not Homeric, and the juxtaposition of Ἑλοῦν and Ἑλοῦτο is intolerable. The same may be said of the two lines ending with ἄλλων and ἄλλοις. On the whole it is plain that the additional lines only weaken the passage.

The fragment was found in the wrappings of a mummy along with documents belonging to the reigns of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285–247 B.C.) and Ptolemy Euergetes (247–221 B.C.). In all probability therefore it is not later than the third century B.C., and it may be earlier. That is to say, it is at least a century before the time of Aristarchus, but may be contemporary with the earliest Alexandrians, Zenodotus and Rhianus.

Mr. Flinders Petrie's discovery was followed not long afterwards

\[n\] Published by the Royal Irish Academy, 'Cunningham Memoirs,' No. viii. (July, 1891): On the Flinders Petrie papyri, by Rev. John P. Mahaffy, D.D.

by another of the same kind. Among the papyrus fragments in the library of Geneva, published by M. Nicole, there is one which contains II. 11. 788–12. 9, with at least nine additional verses. The fragment is important from its length (seventy lines), and also from the fact that in part of the passage (11. 810–834) complete or nearly complete verses are preserved. Line 11. 827 and the three additional verses that follow it ran thus:

χειρον ὑπὸ Τρώων τοῦ δὲ σβίνως ἄνθρωπος (sic) 827
"Εκτορος οὗ τἀχα νῆσα ἐνσπλήσει πυρὶ κηλέφ
ηῶσας Δικαιοῦσ παρὰ θῶς ἄλος αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλείους
ἔσθις ἕως Δαναῶν οὐ κηθεταὶ οὐθεὶς ἀλειρεῖ.

With 11. 795 and two additional verses (restored by Nicole from 1. 538., 16. 239 and similar places) we have—

καὶ τινὰ οἷς ἐπίψφραθε πότνα μήτηρ,
[ἀργυρόπετα Θεῖς θυγάτηρ ἄλοι] γέρωνος,
[αὐτὸς μὲν μιντόι νηῶν ἐν ἄγ]ιῶν θοῶν.

Again, for 804–808 (with the supplements of Nicole and Diels) we read the eight lines—

ἐς φάετο, τῷ δ' ἄρα θυμόν ἐνὶ στήθεσιν ὀρείς,
[τεῖρα γὰρ αἰὼν ἄχος κραδίνην ἁ]κίχεσο δὲ θυμόν
βῆ δὲ θεῖων παρὰ νῆσα ἐν' Ἀλκηϊδῆ Ἀχιλῆ
[ἀγγελινή ἔρως, αὐτῖς δ'] ἐδύναι φαλάγγας
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κατὰ νῆσα Ὀδυσσῆος θεῖων.

ἐς θεῶν Πάτρων, ἵνα σφ' ἀγορὴ τε θέμις τε
[. . . .] προπάροιθη νηῶν ὄρθοκαιρών
ἡν, τῇ δὴ καὶ σφ' θεῶν ἑτετέχατο βωμοὶ.

There was also a line added after 11. 838, and perhaps four more between 11. 834 and 11. 837: but these have entirely perished.

The general character of the additional verses is evidently the same as in the Flinders Petrie fragment already described. Most of them occur elsewhere in the Iliad, in passages where they fit the context better. In the two fragments, as Ludwigh well points out, the proportion of additional matter is nearly the same; the various readings and inaccuracies of spelling &c. are similar; and both are independent of the Alexandrian recensions. The date of the second is not fixed by external evidence: but the best judges assign it to the second century B.C. 73.

72 Mr. Kenyon thinks it clear that it belongs to the second century B.C. (Palaeography of Greek Papyri, p. 68).
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The next great contribution to our knowledge of early Egyptian texts of Homer was made by Mr. Grenfell and Mr. Hunt, who in 1897 published a considerable number of newly discovered papyrus fragments 74, including eighty verses of the Iliad. A few of these verses are from book viii, the remainder from books xxi–xxiii. They are assigned by the editors to the third century B.C.

As regards the insertion of verses the Oxford fragments tend generally to confirm what we gather from the Dublin and Geneva publications. With the eight verses 8. 217–219, 249–253 we find three added. After 8. 216 comes the formula εἶνα κε λογγὸς ἐτη καὶ ἀμήκανα ἔργα γε]; after 8. 252 (with Van Leeuwen's supplements)—

Ζεὺς δὲ πατὴρ ἄρτυν φзданиеν Τρώους ἐγάφως
εἶζαν δὲ Τρώες τυθθὸν Δαναῶν ἀπὸ τάφρων

Other new readings in these lines are: in 8. 217 νῆς Ἀχαίων for νῆς ἐδωσ: in 8. 219 πάρνιον for Ἀχαιῶν: in 8. 251 ἵδοντο Διὸς τίρας αἰγάκου for εἴδους δὲ ὧν Διὸς ἠλθεν ὀρμε. The nature of these variants is tolerably plain: they are failures of memory rather than of transcription.

The passages from books xxi and xxii do not contain any quite certain instances of interpolation. On the other hand the three fragments 23. 159–166, 195–200, 223–229 contain six added verses. The first of them, with some suggested restorations, is as follows:

οἰλεσθεὶς τάδε δ' ἀμήκαινον ὀμεθ' οἷα μάλιστα
[εἴθες εἴ] τι νέκους π[αρὰ δ' ἢμῖν αδεθ μενόντων] (ἔ) 159
[νεκροῦ κηρίμονος] σκηδᾶ[άσαι δ'] ἀπὸ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν. 160
αὐτὰρ ἐπει τό γ' ἡκουσεν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων, 161
αὐτίκα λαὸν μὴν σκίδασεν κατὰ νῆς ἐδωσ,
[κόσμῳ] τοι κατὰ κλεισίας κ[αὶ διάτονον ἕλοντο] 162
κηδεμόνες δὲ κατ' α ALPHA μένον καὶ νῆσον ἄλην,
ποίησαν δὲ πυρήν ἐκατόμπευον ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα' 163
ἐν δὲ πυρὴ ὑπάτη νεκρῶν θέαν αὐξήμενοι κῆρ, 164
[καὶ κοσμήν κ]αὶ τὰ χεράν ἀμήκαν[ῖτο σφετέρωσι] (ἔ) 165

In the second fragment there is one addition, viz. after 23. 195 a line ending NE KATAPHN, of which no very plausible restoration has been proposed. In the third there are two lines before 23. 224, taken from 17. 36–37, viz.—

χρῆσατεν δὲ γυναῖκα κυρὶ ϑαλάμου νέων
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The second of these lines is quoted by Plutarch (Consol. ad Apoll. 30) after 23.222–223 (omitting therefore χόροιν εκλ.).

The addition after 23.160 is evidently made on the principle that what was done in obedience to Achilles must all have been expressly asked for by him. Hence κεφαλάια from l. 163 (in spite of the equivalent ὁ δὲ μάλιστα κηδεῖας ἔστι νίππες), and σκίδασι (or σκίδασον) from l. 162, although it is tautologous after σκίδιασον in l. 158. It seems very probable, as Grenfell and Hunt observe, that in l. 160 ὡς τ' ἄγιοι (or ὡς ταγολ) is not the original reading.

The chief further variants in these passages are: 21.396 Τοῦδείσθ 

The Oxford fragments, it will be seen, tend on the whole to confirm the conclusions already indicated. It is true that the added lines are not so uniformly distributed as in the other passages. Indeed no certain example of interpolation is found in the fragments from the twenty-first and twenty-second book. This however may be accidental. Grenfell and Hunt quote the acute remark of Ed. Meyer that new lines are much more frequent in passages where the texture of the narrative is loose. This is what we should expect in the case of interpolation—a process to which some parts of the Homeric poems lend themselves much more than others.

§ 13. Quotations from Homer.

It remains for us to test these conclusions by the passages quoted from Homer by writers of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. The materials for doing so have been brought together by Ludwich with a completeness that makes it needless to do much more than record the results arrived at by him.

According to Ludwich's computation the quotations made by pre-Alexandrian authors comprise about 480 verses. The passages in which additional verses occur are the following:

(1) II. 23.77–92, quoted by the orator Aeschines, with two new verses, one verse transposed, and some minor differences. Thus for lines 81–84 we find—

75 Hermes xvii. p. 368.
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It is to be noticed however that, as Volkmann has pointed out, the lines were not recited by the orator himself, but were read at his bidding by the grammateus of the court, as was done with laws, decrees, depositions, &c. Such documents were not usually set out in the original copies of speeches; consequently we have no security that these Homeric quotations come from Aeschines himself.

There is a well-known passage in which Aeschines (§ 141) says that the words φήμη δ' εις στρατόν ἔδω are often used in the Iliad when something is going to happen. In fact the word φήμη does not occur in the Iliad at all, and in the Odyssey only in the sense of an utterance which serves as an omen. It has sometimes been assumed that the half-line comes from some 'cyclic' poem, or that the 'Iliad' intended is the Little Iliad. It is much more likely that it was suggested to Aeschines by the picturesque story of the report that came to the Greeks before the battle of Mycale (Hdt. 9. 100 λοῦσε δὲ σφι φήμη τε ἀσέπτατο εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον κτλ.), which in his memory was confused with Homeric phrases like ὁσα δεδηκε (Π. 2. 93, cp. Od. 24. 413 ὁσα δ' ἀτελεῖα δὲκα κατὰ πτῶλιν κτλ.).

(2) II. 2. 391–393, quoted by Aristotle (Pol. iii. 14) with the addition of the half-line τὰρ γὰρ ἦσαν θάνατος. Possibly however these words were meant as a fresh quotation.

(3) II. 9. 539 ὅπερ ὃι χλοῦνη σὺν ἄγρων ἀργύρῳσσα, amplified by Aristotle (Hist. Anim. vi. 28) into two lines—

the second line being, as Ludwig points out, the result of contamination with Od. 9. 190–191, where the phrase (only with ἀνθρό for θηρί) is applied to the Cyclops.

(4) II. 11. 542, quoted by Aristotle (Rhet. ii. 9) with the addition—

This can only mean 'Zeus used to be angry with him whenever
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language, and continued to be the conventional dialect of poetry, there were possibilities of divergence that ceased when it was confined to a professional class. Many examples may be given of the type of 'various reading' produced under the older conditions. One of the first and most obvious is in II. 1. 91, where our MSS. have ἄριστος ἐνι οὐρανῷ ἐβαθεῖα ἑβαθεία, but Aristarchus (following the editions of Zenodotus, Sosigenes, and Aristophanes) reads ἄριστος Ἀχαϊών. It is plain that no scribe could mistake Ἀχαϊών for ἐνὶ οὕραν, or vice versa: the originator of the false reading either took it from some other passage, or is responsible for the authorship of it himself. The same observation applies to II. 1. 97, where we have to choose between Δαναοίσιον ἀκιδὴ λογικὴν ἀπώσει (Ar. following the Massiliensis and Rhianus) and λοιμαῖο βαρείας χεῖρας ἐβίβεις (Zen. and the MSS.): and to the reading in II. 2. 15 δίδομεν δι' ὅιον ἀφάνθατο, quoted by Aristotle (Poet. 25), instead of Τρώομεν δι' ηθοῖς ἐφημετα. So generally it may be assumed that it is the reciter rather than the copyist to whom we have to attribute the numberless cases of 'contamination,' that is to say, of the process by which words or phrases are transferred from one context to another. This is especially frequent with epic commonplace: e.g. in II. 1. 73 δο μμυρισίων ἐπιεικέια παράδοσα was read by Zen. for the vulgate ἐν ὅροις ἔφημεν ἀφήματι καὶ μετέπειτα: in II. 2. 484 Ὄλυμπιάδες βανδύκιον (Zen. for Ὄλυμπια δώρατ' ἐχθουσα): and so ἀνακτῶς for γέροντος in II. 2. 793 τύμβῳ ἐπὶ ἀκροτάτῳ Λιονήτου γέροντος.

§ 11. Interpolation in early texts.

Of the various forms of textual corruption that belong especially to the pre-Alexandrian age the most important, from every point of view, is interpolation. On this part of the subject it will be worth while to go into some detail, so as to distinguish the several branches of evidence, and to show the cumulative nature of the reasoning upon which our final conclusions are based.

1. It appears from the ancient commentators, in particular from some passages in the scholia on Pindar (quoted above, p. 402), that the rhapsodists were accused of spoiling the poetry of Homer by inserting verses of their own. The accusation may be just or not; the fact that it was made serves to prove that in some at least of the current texts of Homer there was a considerable admixture of verses generally regarded as spurious.

2. Several instances were mentioned above (p. 406) of verses said
to have been interpolated for political ends by Athenian statesmen. It is true that charges of this kind cannot be traced far back. They are ignored in the Venetian scholia, and apparently were made in the first instance by certain Megarian historians, from jealousy of Athens. But they would probably not have been made if the idea of interpolation in Homer had not been already more or less familiar to the learned world.

3. In the Homeric criticism of the Alexandrians nothing is more characteristic than the prominence given to the detection of spurious verses. The obelus seems to have been the earliest of the critical marks, as in form it is the simplest. It was apparently used by Zenodotus, perhaps was devised by him. In antiquity it was generally regarded as especially the weapon of Aristarchus. In the first three books of the Iliad, for example, the number of verses obelized by Aristarchus (if we may trust the Codex Venetus) is 120, or about six per cent. How many more he absolutely rejected we cannot tell, since there is no corresponding record of them. The scholia, however, furnish some significant instances of lines rejected by Aristarchus notwithstanding that they appeared in some of the texts that he had before him. Thus on Il. 9. 159 Aristarchus noted that some added the line—

οὐνίκε ἐπὶ κα λάβῃ πελαρ ἔχει οὐδ' ἀνίσι.

And on Il. 8. 168 he seems to have noted that ‘they subjoin’ (ὑποναόσουν) the line—

ἡ μὴν στρίψαι μὴν ἀντίθεν μαχίσωσαι.

Similar additions are mentioned by the Venetian scholia on Il. 9. 140., 12. 328., 22. 158., 23. 538., 24. 205. In the Townley scholia the notices of such verses are still more numerous. Thus after Il. 2. 848 it is said that some added the line—

Πηλεγόνος ἔνιος περιβέβησε Ἀστεροπαῖος,

ἐν καὶ ἐν πολλαῖς τῶν Ἰλιάδων θέρασθαι, i.e. which was to be found in many of the texts habitually quoted by Aristarchus. So on Il. 8. 131 the Townley scholia give two lines as found ἐν τοῖς πολλαῖς, i.e. in certain Alexandrian texts. So after Il. 8. 131, according to the

* According to the grammatical fragment in the Codex Venetus (fol. 8) Aristarchus took it from Zenodotus (τὸν ἤδη ἐβεβηκαί ἐν τῇ Ζενοδότου διηθήσεως).

* So in Auseonius (Epist. 18. 29) Aristarchus is indicated in a list of eminent grammarians by the description quique notas spuriis versibus apposuit. Cp. the dictum of Cicerò (Fam. 3. 11) Aristarchus Homeri versus negat quem non probat.

* A list of about thirty is given by Ludwich, Homervulgata, p. 25.
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Townley scholia, there were two lines found in τις τῶν παλαιῶν, which completed the sentence as follows:

καὶ νῦν καὶ σήκασθεν κατὰ Ἡλιοῦ ἠνέ τὸν ἄρμας 131
Τρεῖς ἐν 'Αργείᾳ, Ἡλιοῦ δὲ καὶ Ἐκτόρα δίον
χαλκῷ δημόσια, δάρασον δὲ μυν Διομήδης,
εἰ μὴ κτλ. 132

Again, II. 5. 808, which was read by Zenodotus and is in almost all the manuscripts, was omitted by Aristarchus. And II. 16. 613, which is in all the manuscripts, was omitted in the earlier recension of Aristarchus: but in the second he allowed it to stand with the obelus.

It appears also that the edition of Zenodotus gave several lines that are not in our texts, and probably were wanting in that of Aristarchus. Such are the lines mentioned in the scholia as coming after II. 3. 338., 13. 808., 14. 136., 17. 456. On the other hand there are about thirty lines not read by Zenodotus (δι Ζηνόδωτος οδὴ γραφέ), but admitted, usually with the obelus, into the text of Aristarchus. Besides these instances, which have found their way into the scholia because they were the subject of controversy between Zenodotus and Aristarchus, there were doubtless many more that the two great scholars agreed in condemning—of which consequently there is no record.

The large use that Aristarchus made of the obelus is in itself a ground for believing that interpolation was frequent. Why should he have been so ready to suspect the genuineness of lines, and to resort to *athetesis* whenever he was met by a difficulty? Evidently he had some good reason for regarding interpolation as a *vera causa*, that is to say, as a cause which was known *aliunde* to be operative in the Homeric text, and could therefore be supposed in any particular case without antecedent improbability. But such an attitude on the part of the great critic is hardly defensible unless the evidence of interpolation was stronger than appears in the scholia.

§ 12. Interpolation in papyrus fragments.

The foregoing arguments, if somewhat indirect, are at least sufficient to raise a presumption in favour of the view that besides the many verses that Aristarchus was content to 'obelize' there were many more that he simply rejected and left to oblivion. But independent

* Ludwich *op. cit.* pp. 11-13.
testimony to the same effect is furnished from the sources of evidence with which we have still to deal.

One of the earliest and most surprising results of the work of Mr. Flinders Petrie in Egypt was the discovery, at Gurob in 1890, of a fragment of papyrus roll containing parts of thirty-nine verses, viz. the last few letters of twenty verses, and the first few letters of nineteen more⁷⁹. These were soon identified by Mr. Bury as II. 11. 502–537, but with some remarkable differences from the existing text. One line is wanting (there being only room for one in place of 529–530): and there are no less than four additional lines, viz. one after l. 504, about which we only know that it ended with -νιν περ: one after l. 509, the two lines, with the supplement proposed by Robert⁷¹, probably being—

\[ \text{μὴ πῶς μεν πολέμως μετακαλυθέντες (sic) Πλων} \]

\[ [\text{Τρῶς ὑπέρθυμοι καὶ ἀπὸ κλευτ' τεῦχ}] \text{ή Πλωτο} \]

and one after each of the two lines 513 and 514. When these last are restored in the most probable way (as by Robert and Menrad) they complete the passage somewhat as follows:

\[ \text{ἀγριε, σὺν ὄχέων ἐπιβῆσε, παρ ἔσο} \]
\[ \text{βαινέσ, ἑκ πῆς ἐς τὰ χοτή αὐτὲς μνήμας ἰππους,} \]
\[ [\text{τόσου ἀπὸ Τρῶς ὑ ὑπὸ Εὐτορος ἀνδροφόλου}.} \]
\[ \text{ηπρὸς γὰρ ἀνὴρ πολλῶν ἀπαξίως ἄλως} \]
\[ [. . . . . ἐσάωσε καὶ] \text{ἄλως} \]
\[ \text{λοῦς τ' ἐκτάμων ἐ ντι τ' ἑπά μακα παύσων.} \]

514

515

It is hardly necessary to point out that these additional lines cannot be genuine. The form Πλωτο (for Πλωίστο) is not Homeric, and the juxtaposition of Πλων and Πλωτο is intolerable. The same may be said of the two lines ending with ἄλως and ἄλως. On the whole it is plain that the additional lines only weaken the passage.

The fragment was found in the wrappings of a mummy along with documents belonging to the reigns of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285–247 B.C.) and Ptolemy Euergetes (247–221 B.C.). In all probability therefore it is not later than the third century B.C., and it may be earlier. That is to say, it is at least a century before the time of Aristarchus, but may be contemporary with the earliest Alexandrians, Zenodotus and Rhianus.

Mr. Flinders Petrie's discovery was followed not long afterwards

⁷⁹ Published by the Royal Irish Academy, 'Cunningham Memoirs,' No. viii. (July, 1891): On the Flinders Petrie papyri, by Rev. John P. Mahaffy, D.D.
by another of the same kind. Among the papyrus fragments in the library of Geneva, published by M. Nicole, there is one which contains II. 11. 788-12. 9, with at least nine additional verses. The fragment is important from its length (seventy lines), and also from the fact that in part of the passage (11. 810-834) complete or nearly complete verses are preserved. Line 11. 827 and the three additional verses that follow it ran thus:

χερσὶν ὑπὸ Τρωῶν τοῦ δὲ θείον κάιν ἵππα (sic) 827
'Εκτορος δὲ τάχα γῆς εὐπλήθης πυρὶ κηλέφ
δημῶσα Δαμαῶν παρὰ θῦν ἄλος αὐτῷ 'Αχιλλεύς
ἀσθάνε ἐνὶ Δαμαῶν οὐ κηδεται οὔτε ἔλαβει.

With 11. 795 and two additional verses (restored by Nicole from 1. 538, 16. 239 and similar places) we have—

καὶ τυά οἱ πάρ Ζηνὸς ἐπέφραζε πότιμα μήτηρ, 795
[ἀργυρίον σε θείος θυγάτηρ ἀλλο[...] γέροντος,
[αὐτὸς μὲν μενέτω νηών ἐν ἄφῳθων θεῶν.

Again, for 804-808 (with the supplements of Nicole and Diels) we read the eight lines—

δὲ φάτο, τῆς ᾧ ἀρα θυμὸν ἐνι στήθεσαιν ὁμι, 804
[τεῖρε γὰρ αἰῶν ἄχοις κραδίῃς δ]άξησιν δὲ θυμῶν
βῆ δὲ θίον παρὰ νῆς ἐν' Ἀλκιδᾶν 'Αχιλῆς 805
[ἀγγελίην ἐρίων, αὐτίς δ'] ἐνδυνος φαλάγγας
ἄλλ' ἄτε δὴ κατὰ νῆς 'Οδυσσέου θείον 806
[ζε θεῶν Πάτροκλος, ἵνα σφ' ἄγορη τε θύμε τε 807
 [. . . . οπρόπαιρθε νηών ὅφ]οικαρίαν
ην, τῇ δὴ καὶ σφι θεῶν ἐστείλακατο βωμοί. 808

There was also a line added after 11. 838, and perhaps four more between 11. 834 and 11. 837: but these have entirely perished.

The general character of the additional verses is evidently the same as in the Flinders Petrie fragment already described. Most of them occur elsewhere in the Iliad, in passages where they fit the context better. In the two fragments, as Ludwich well points out, the proportion of additional matter is nearly the same; the various readings and inaccuracies of spelling &c. are similar; and both are independent of the Alexandrian recensions. The date of the second is not fixed by external evidence: but the best judges assign it to the second century B.C. 72.

72 Mr. Kenyon thinks it clear that it belongs to the second century B.C. (Palaeography of Greek Papyri, p. 68).
The next great contribution to our knowledge of early Egyptian texts of Homer was made by Mr. Grenfell and Mr. Hunt, who in 1897 published a considerable number of newly discovered papyrus fragments \(^{11}\), including eighty verses of the \textit{Iliad}. A few of these verses are from book viii, the remainder from books xxi–xxiii. They are assigned by the editors to the third century B.C.

As regards the insertion of verses the Oxford fragments tend generally to confirm what we gather from the Dublin and Geneva publications. With the eight verses 8. 217–219, 249–253 we find three added. After 8. 216 comes the formula ἵθα καὶ λογίος ἐν καὶ ἀμήχασα ἔργα γε\(\)νορ\(\)το: after 8. 252 (with Van Leeuwen’s supplements)—

\[Ze\(\)s δὲ πατὴρ ὀτρυνη φ[\(\)δβον Τρώεσσον ἐνόρσας]\]
\[ἐλ\(\)ξαν δὲ Τρώες τυρσθόν Δα[καίων ἀπὸ τάφρον’]\]

Other new readings in these lines are: in 8. 217 ἵθας Ἀχαιῶν for ἵθας ἔσας; in 8. 219 ἀτρούς for Ἀχαιῶς; in 8. 251 ἐδώρτα Διὸς τήρας αἰγώνχαυ for ἐίδουθ’ ὅτ’ ἀρ’ ἐκ Διὸς ἑλυθέν ὀρνεῖ. The nature of these variants is tolerably plain: they are failures of memory rather than of transcription.

The passages from books xxi and xxii do not contain any quite certain instances of interpolation. On the other hand the three fragments 23. 159–166, 195–200, 223–229 contain six added verses. The first of them, with some suggested restorations, is as follows:

\[ἐπλεθαυ’ τάδε δ’ ἀμφιποσὸσθεν οἰοί μάλατα 159\]
\[κεῖδος ἵτα]τι νίκον π[\(\)μα δ’ ἡμῖν αδθὶ μενότω](?)] \(160\)
\[νεκρῷ κηδ[\(\)μῶν]’ σχεδ[\(\)δοι δ’ ἀπο λαδ其次是 Ἀχαιῶν].\]
\[αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τὸ γ’ ἀκουσ’ αὐτ’ ἀδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων, 161\]
\[αὐτικα λαδὸν μὲν σκέδασεν κατὰ ήθας ἑισας, 162\]
\[κάτμνσι]ν τε κατὰ κλισιάς κ[\(\)αί δείπνων δλοντοť’\]
\[κηδιμὼν δὲ κατ’ αδθὶ μένον καὶ χίειον ὅλη, 163\]
\[ποίησαν δὲ πυρῆν ἑκάτουμεν ἵθας καὶ ἐνδα’ 164\]
\[ἐν δὲ πυρῆ ὑπάτη νεκρῶν θέσαν δαχνύμευν τῷ, 165\]
\[καὶ κοινήν κ’ αὐτὰ χερσὶν ἀμήχασα[ς α]το σφετέρισον (]?\]

In the second fragment there is one addition, viz. after 23. 195 a line ending \textit{NE KATAPHN}, of which no very plausible restoration has been proposed. In the third there are two lines before 23. 224, taken from 17. 36–37, viz.—

\[χῖρεσθεν δ’ ἐρ γυναῖκα μνημὴ θαλάμου ἱεῖον]\]
\[ἀρ[\(\)το]’ δὲ τ’[\(\)οκέσσι γόνι καὶ πένθος ἔθηκε].\]

APPENDIX

The second of these lines is quoted by Plutarch (Consol. ad Apoll. 30) after 23. 222–223 (omitting therefore χρήστευν κτλ.).

The addition after 23. 160 is evidently made on the principle that what was done in obedience to Achilles must all have been expressly asked for by him. Hence καθ' αὑτός from l. 163 (in spite of the equivalent ὁδεις μάλιστα θείον ἐστι νέκων), and καθαίρεσι (or καθαίρεσιν) from l. 162, although it is tautologous after καθαίρεσιν in l. 158. It seems very probable, as Grenfell and Hunt observe, that in l. 160 εἰ ὁ ἄγω (or εἰ ταγω) is not the original reading.

The chief further variants in these passages are: 21. 396 Τυθείας Διαμήδει ἄνεκας (for Τυθείης Διαμήδει ἄνεκας): 21. 397 ἰσημόστροφον (as a correction of πανόψιον): 21. 398 ἵπτε (for δια): 21. 609 ὅκε κε (for ὅκε τε): 22. 154 τιθε (for δθε): 23. 163 κατ' ἀιθι (for παρ' ἀπθ): 23. 198 ἄκο δ' ἱπτε (for ἄκο δ' ἵπτε). The last is especially interesting, since it is a better reading than the vulgate.

The Oxford fragments, it will be seen, tend on the whole to confirm the conclusions already indicated. It is true that the added lines are not so uniformly distributed as in the other passages. Indeed no certain example of interpolation is found in the fragments from the twenty-first and twenty-second book. This however may be accidental. Grenfell and Hunt quote the acute remark of Ed. Meyer that new lines are much more frequent in passages where the texture of the narrative is loose. This is what we should expect in the case of interpolation—a process to which some parts of the Homeric poems lend themselves much more than others.

§ 13. Quotations from Homer.

It remains for us to test these conclusions by the passages quoted from Homer by writers of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. The materials for doing so have been brought together by Ludwig with a completeness that makes it needless to do much more than record the results arrived at by him.

According to Ludwig's computation the quotations made by pre-Alexandrian authors comprise about 480 verses. The passages in which additional verses occur are the following:

(1) II. 23. 77–92, quoted by the orator Aeschines, with two new verses, one verse transposed, and some minor differences. Thus for lines 81–84 we find—

75 Hermes xvii. p. 368.
It is to be noticed however that, as Volkmann has pointed out, the lines were not recited by the orator himself, but were read at his bidding by the grammatai of the court, as was done with laws, decrees, depositions, &c. Such documents were not usually set out in the original copies of speeches; consequently we have no security that these Homeric quotations come from Aeschines himself.

There is a well-known passage in which Aeschines (§ 141) says that the words φήμη δ' ἐστὶ στρατὸν ἤλθε are often used in the Iliad when something is going to happen. In fact the word φήμη does not occur in the Iliad at all, and in the Odyssey only in the sense of an utterance which serves as an omen. It has sometimes been assumed that the half-line comes from some 'cyclic' poem, or that the 'Iliad' intended is the Little Iliad. It is much more likely that it was suggested to Aeschines by the picturesque story of the report that came to the Greeks before the battle of Mycale (Hdt. 9. 100 λούσε δ' σφι φήμη τε ἐσώτερο εἰ γε στρατόπεδον κτλ.), which in his memory was confused with Homeric phrases like ὁσσα δεδήμ (Il. 2. 93, cp. Od. 24. 413 ὁσσα δ' ἄγγελος διὰ κατὰ πτόλιν κτλ.).

(2) Il. 2. 391–393, quoted by Aristotle (Pol. iii. 14) with the addition of the half-line τάρ γὰρ ἐμνθέας. Possibly however these words were meant as a fresh quotation.

(3) Il. 9. 539 ἀφεν ἔτι χοίλουσι σὺν ἄγροιν ἀργῶδον, amplified by Aristotle (Hist. Anim. vi. 28) into two lines—

θρόψελ ὑπὶ χοίλουσι σὺν ἄγροιν, οὐδὲ ἐφεσι

θηρὶ γε σιτοφάγῳ, ἀλλὰ βίῳ ὑλήντι,

the second line being, as Ludwig points out, the result of contamination with Od. 9. 190–191, where the phrase (only with ἄνδρι for θηρὶ) is applied to the Cyclops.

(4) Il. II. 543, quoted by Aristotle (Rhet. ii. 9) with the addition—

Ζεὺς γὰρ ολημάτισσαχ' δε' ἀμείνου φανερὰ μάχατο

This can only mean 'Zeus used to be angry with him whenever

he fought with a better man,' which does not suit the context. The line is printed in modern editions with the variant μεσάθ, found in a later quotation (Plut. De aud. poët. 24c, 36a, also Pseudo-Plut. VII. Hom.). It will be evident that if μεσάθ refers to the particular occasion the use of δε (or δ τι) μάκαρο is indefensible.

(5) Od. 17. 382–385, referred to by Aristotle (Pol. viii. 3), who quotes the line—

ἀλλ' οὖν μὲν ἐστι καλεῖν ἐπὶ δαίμων τάλαυν.

Apparently however it is meant to take the place of l. 383. In any case it is probably a mere misquotation.

(6) Il. 8. 548–552, quoted in the pseudo-Platonic dialogue Alcibiades II:

ἐρδον δ' ἄδακτοις τελεύσασθα ἔκατομφια,
κατημόρε δ' ἐκ πεδίων άνεμοι φίρων οὐρανον τοιούτω ἡξισαν τῆς δ' οὖν τι θεοι μάκαρες δικέστω
οὐδ' ἱδίων μᾶλα γάρ σφαν ἀπῆξθεν "ίλιον ίρή,
καὶ Πρεόμος καὶ λαδε ἐσμελλὼν Πριάμου.

Of these five lines the second is the only one found in the manuscripts of Homer. The last three are clearly spurious. They do not fit the story of the Iliad, in which there is no sign of any such agreement among the Olympian gods. Nevertheless they have been accepted by modern editors and placed in the text.

(7) Il. 10. 387 (=343), quoted by Diogenes of Sinope with a new half-line prefixed:

τίττε σὺ ὅνε, φέριςτε;

δ' τιμά συλήσων μείκων κατατεθητόντων;

The half-line in sense reproduces the two lines 385–386 ηδ' οὖν κλ., but in form it is modelled on such lines as Il. 6. 123 τίς δὲ σὺ ἐστι, φέριςτε κλ. Thus it is a contamination—if it is not rather to be reckoned among the parodies for which Diogenes was famous.

(8) Il. 9. 119 ἀλλ' ἐστὶ διασάμανας φρεσκευαλίθης πιθήσας, said to have been quoted by Dioscurides, a pupil of Isocrates, with the addition—

δ' οὖν μεθύουν δ' μ' ἤθικαν θεοὶ αὐτοὶ.

This line can hardly have been intended as a serious quotation.

The result of this examination is to show that the number of additional lines in the texts of the pre-Alexandrian age was relatively small. Out of a total of 480 verses not more than twelve can be traced, and several of these are more than doubtful. If the proportion had been as high as in the papyrus fragments we should have had
about sixty. It is especially significant that Plato, the author who quotes Homer most frequently and most correctly, is free from them. Of the 209 verses enumerated by Ludwich the only exceptions are in a spurious dialogue. This fact serves to prove that, whatever interpolated texts of Homer were then current, the copy from which Plato quoted was not one of them. And hence we are led to the further inference that in the case of Aristotle, whose poetical quotations are especially incorrect, some of the additional lines are likely to be due to mere failure of memory. The same arguments may be applied to the passages, relatively few in number, quoted by Herodotus (twelve lines), by Xenophon (fourteen lines), by Heraclides Ponticus (twenty-one lines), and the rest. The quotations, in short, prove that there was a pre-Alexandrian vulgate agreeing much more closely with the modern vulgate than with any text of which the papyrus fragments can be specimens.

It must be admitted that interpolation of the kind now in question is also found in post-Alexandrian writers, and even in our manuscripts. Thus the new line—

\[ \text{ἀργών ἐὰν τοικών γόνω καὶ πόνθος ἑκένερ} \]

which is found in the Oxford fragment after II. 23.223, is quoted by Plutarch (Consol. ad Apoll. 30), who subjoins the line \[ \muούνος τηλύγετος πολλοίων εἰκε πτατέουσι (II. 9.482) \]. Plutarch also, as we have seen (p. 427), follows Aristotle in quoting the line now usually printed as ll. 11.543; and he is the source of the four lines II. 9.458-461 (De aud. poet. 8). Longinus (De Subl. 9.8) quotes II. 13.18 and adds the line \[ καὶ κορφαὶ Τρώων τε πόλις καὶ νῆσος Ἀχαιῶν, \] from II. 20.60. Strabo has preserved several geographical additions: after II. 2.855 the lines—

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Καίκωμος ὁ αὐτῷ ἦγε Πολυκλέος ὑπὸ ἀμύμαν,} \\
\text{οἵ περὶ Παρθενίου ποταμῶν κλυτὰ δόματ' ἔναιον,}
\end{align*} \]

The subject of the Homeric quotations in Aristotle has been fully treated by Ad. Roemer in his dissertation Die Homercitate und die Homerischen Fragen des Aristoteles (in the transactions of the Munich Academy, 1884), and he has shown that the numerous differences between Aristotle and the vulgate are much more due to Aristotle himself than to any defects in his copy of Homer.

In Plato the only important divergence from the vulgate is in a quotation in the Republic (p. 379d), where for II. 24.518 δρόμων οἷα διδωσί, κατὰ, εἴρη τοι ἰδὼν we find—

\[ \text{κήρων ἐμφαλοῦ, δὲ μὴ θολῶν, αὐτὰρ ὃ δειλῶν.} \]

This is evidently not an addition to the vulgate, but a corruption due to such passages as II. 9.411 διάθαλας κήρας φέρεμεν βαλάντων τέλοσθε. It is to be observed that in Homer there are no κήρες θεσθαι: also that δειλῶν in the Platonic quotation suits neither metre nor sense.
and so after Il. 2. 692, 783, 866. From Surabo also comes Od. 15. 295 
βὰρ δὲ παρὰ Κρονούς καὶ Χαλκίδα καλλιρέθρω (as to which see the 
note a. l.).

Many more such additions might be collected from the scholia 
and the manuscripts (see the instances given on p. 421): but these will 
suffice to show that interpolation did not entirely cease with the rise 
of the Alexandrian school of criticism. On the other hand it is clear 
that it did not seriously affect the purity of the current or vulgate text. 
How that result was attained it will be for us to consider hereafter.

§ 14. The apparatus criticus of Aristarchus.

The course of the argument has brought us to two conclusions, 
viz. (1) that the text of Homer, in the period before the rise of the 
Alexandrian school, had suffered much from interpolation, but (2) that 
in the same period there were in existence copies of Homer which 
did not greatly differ from the present vulgate. These conclusions, 
it is obvious, can only be reconciled by the hypothesis that there were 
manuscripts of different classes—some much interpolated, some 
tolerably free from interpolation. And in the process of verifying 
this hypothesis we are led at once to the question of the apparatus 
criticus at the disposal of the Alexandrian scholars, and the place 
in it of the texts revealed to us by the papyrus fragments.

The view generally taken in regard to these fragments by the first 
editors and critics was that they might be regarded as fair specimens 
of the condition into which the text of Homer had been brought— 
chiefly, it was assumed, by the action of the rhapsodists: that the 
work of removing interpolations, and generally of restoring it to the 
original purity, was taken in hand by the Alexandrian grammarians: 
and that the existing vulgate is in the main the result of their labours, 
and is especially due to Aristarchus himself. In opposition to this 
view it is maintained by Ludwich that the vulgate of the manuscripts 
is substantially pre-Alexandrian: that is to say, that there is a standard 
text or 'vulgate' of Homer which has subsisted with little change 
from the earliest times known to us—for this purpose we may say 
from the fifth century—down to the present day, and that the pre-
Alexandrian copies which departed from that standard were driven 
out not so much by the agency of the Alexandrian grammarians as by 
their inability to compete with the more correct and recognised texts. 
The main proof of this thesis is found by Ludwich in the quotations: 
and on that ground, as we have seen, his case is an exceedingly strong
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one. It will be interesting however to see how far it is confirmed by
the glimpses which the scholia allow us of the manuscript materials
that Aristarchus and the other grammarians had at their command.

Aristarchus, as we learn from this source, had before him the
‘editions’ (ἐκδόσεις) or ‘recensions’ (διορθώσεις) 78 made by certain
of his predecessors in Homeric criticism, and also a number of texts
of which we only know that they were mostly called after various
cities or parts of the Greek world. Of the former class (αἱ καὶ ἄνδρα)
were the editions of Antimachus (see p. 413), and of Zenodotus and
his successors—Rhianus, Philemon, Sosigenes, and Aristophanes.
The latter (αἱ κατὰ τῶν πόλεων οἷς καὶ πολιτείαι) included
those of Massilia, Chios, Argolis, Cyprus, Sinope and (perhaps) Crete
and Aeolis. 79 The scholia also quote readings of Philetas of Cos,
who lived in the fourth century b.c., and of Callistratus (a pupil of
Aristophanes), but it is not certain that these scholars made complete
editions. Much the same may be said of Crates, the great rival of
Aristarchus, whose διορθώσεις Ἡλίδος καὶ ὶθυστείας was a work in nine
books, not an edition or running commentary. The scholia also
mention texts or editions called ἡ πολιτείας, ἡ κυκλική, and ἡ ἐκ
μονακίου. 80 From other sources we hear of editions by Euripides
(not the great tragic poet), and by Aristotle (see p. 418), also of an
edition of the Odyssey ascribed to the poet Aratus: but there is
nothing to show that Aristarchus made use of them. On the other
hand the list may be far from complete. Some of these names occur
very seldom. In fact the whole number of references to earlier texts
of the Iliad or Odyssey, other than those of Zenodotus and Aristophanes,
is barely a hundred.

The editions or manuscripts mentioned by name in the scholia are
all earlier than Aristarchus, and are always cited with a reference,

78 The full expression seems to be ἐκδοσις τῆς διορθώσεως ‘edition of the recen-
sion’ or corrected text.
79 The Aeolic edition, ἡ Ἀολίς or Ἀολική, is only mentioned in the scholia on
the Odyssey (14. 280, 331, 18. 98).
It has sometimes been imagined that the ‘city editions’ were public or official
copies of Homer belonging to the different places, and serving to control the
recitation at festivals, &c. More probably, as Wolf thought (Prosl. p. clxxviii),
they were simply manuscripts so called from the place where they had been pur-
blished by the Egyptian king or his agent.
80 It has been suggested that the text ἡ πολιτείας contained the additional
interpolated lines, and that ἡ κυκλική was connected with the Epic Cycle: but
there is no foundation for these conjectures. The word κυκλικόν meant ‘common,
ordinary.’ If a number of manuscripts in the Alexandrian museum had to be
distinguished, it was natural to give them names, and to choose these names from
such circumstances as chance offered. This method was in some ways better than
the modern one of giving mere numbers.
express or clearly implied, to his readings. Hence it may be regarded as certain that the notices of them come directly or mediatly from him. The form of reference may be seen in one or two specimens:

II. i. 91 Ἄρισταρχος, οὖς ἐνὶ στρατῷ, αἱ "Ἀριστάρχου" ὁμοίως καὶ Ἡ σωστίγους καὶ Ἡ "Ἀριστοφάνους καὶ Ἡ Σηρόδωτον.

II. i. 298 μαχησόμαι οὖν διὰ τοῦ η, οὗ διὰ τοῦ εσ, καὶ Ἡ Μασσαλιωτική καὶ Ἡ Ἀργολική καὶ Ἡ Σιθοπηγή καὶ Ἡ Ἀντιμάχου καὶ Ἡ "Ἀριστοφάνους.

When later critics are quoted in the scholia, they come in by way of an addition to the notices of manuscripts: e.g.—

II. i. 423 λέεις "Ἀριστάρχου ἐκ τοῦ α' τῆς Ἰλιδίου ὑπομνήματος... οὖν δὲ εὑρομεν καὶ ἐν τῇ Μασσαλιωτικῇ καὶ Σιθοπηγῇ καὶ Κυπρίᾳ καὶ Ἀντιμαχείᾳ καὶ Ἀριστοφανείᾳ. Καλλιστρατος δὲ ἐν τῷ πρὸς τὰς ἀδενήσεις ὁμοίως, καὶ ὁ Σιδώνος καὶ ὁ Ιξίων ἐν τῷ ζ' πρὸς τὰς ἐγγύσεις.

Here the words down to Ἀριστοφανείᾳ are taken verbatim from the commentary (ὑπομνήμα) of Aristarchus himself. Then the scholiast (i.e. Didymus) quotes Callistratus, a contemporary of Aristarchus, and (like him) a pupil of Aristophanes: then follow two grammarians of the next generation, viz. Dionysius of Sidon, a pupil of Aristarchus, and Demetrius Ixion, who was a follower of his great rival Crates of Pergamus. So on II. 2. 192 καὶ ἁ πλείους ἀνασένται οὖν εἴχαι, καὶ Ἡ "Ἀριστοφάνεις" καὶ ὁ Σιδώνος δὲ καὶ ὁ Ιξίων οὖτως γράφομεν (so also on 3. 18).

§ 15. πάσαι, αἱ πλείους, ἦτη in the scholia.

The critical annotations which refer by name to these earlier texts of Homer are few in number, but suffice to give us the key to many scholia in which they are cited under summary phrases, such as ‘all editions,’ ‘the majority,’ ‘some’ and the like: e.g.—

II. 13. 485 οὖτως αἱ Ἀριστάρχου διὰ τοῦ π εἰλὶ θηματικοῦ καὶ πάσαι οὖτως εἴχαι.
II. 11. 439 αἱ Ἀριστάρχου οὖτως τῶν, καὶ αὐθεντικά ἄπασαι.
II. 4. 213 Ἀριστάρχος λακών ἄκιντον, καὶ αἱ πλείους.
II. 19. 124 καὶ ἐνίας τῶν ἐκδότων ἀναφέρων.

Regarding the expression πάσαι two views have recently been maintained. La Roche, observing that it does not seem to include the text (or texts) formed by Aristarchus—or at least not as part of the list of sources—and yet that it regularly occurs in connexion with his readings, took it to mean ‘all the copies of the edition of Aristarchus.’ But it is impossible to interpret it differently from the similar phrases αἱ πλείους, ἦτη, and the rest, which La Roche himself
understands of the earlier editions. On the other hand Ludwig explains \( \pi\acute{a}v\)\( \alpha\)\( \varsigma\) to mean 'the editions of Aristarchus and all those with which he agreed in the given case,' 'the majority of the old editions, those of Aristarchus himself included.' But this account of the matter must also be pronounced unsatisfactory. The word \( \pi\acute{a}v\)\( \alpha\)\( \varsigma\) surely means 'all' the manuscripts to which it refers, not merely a majority, or a part determined by agreement with Aristarchus. It must mean something more than \( \alpha\iota \nu\acute{e}i\acute{o}\varsigma\iota\varsigma\iota\) or \( \alpha\iota \nu\acute{e}i\acute{o}\varsigma\iota\varsigma\iota\acute{e}o\varsigma\varsigma\). Moreover, as La Roche saw, the formula most commonly used ('\( \Lambda\rho\acute{r}\iota\sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\chi\tilde{o}\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma \kappa\acute{a}i \pi\acute{a}v\)\( \alpha\)\( \varsigma\)') points to a distinction between \( \pi\acute{a}v\)\( \alpha\)\( \varsigma\) and the Aristarchean text.

The true explanation becomes apparent when we consider that all these notices, which reach us through the work of Didymus, come ultimately from Aristarchus himself. In his mouth they naturally refer, not to his own text, but to the critical apparatus on which it rested. That is to say, the word \( \pi\acute{a}v\)\( \alpha\)\( \varsigma\) (or \( \nu\acute{e}i\acute{o}\varsigma\iota\varsigma\iota\) or \( \iota\varsigma\iota\varsigma\iota\) \&c.) denotes all (or most or some \&c.) of the editions adduced by Aristarchus on a given passage. Briefly, '\( \Lambda\rho\acute{r}\iota\sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\chi\tilde{o}\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma \kappa\acute{a}i \pi\acute{a}v\)\( \alpha\)\( \varsigma\)' means 'Aristarchus and all his manuscripts.'

It is to be observed that 'all the editions' from the point of view of Aristarchus is by no means equivalent to the codices omnes or MSS. of a modern critical commentary. It does not include all the existing manuscripts.

Besides the texts that are mentioned in the scholia, and that must have been regularly quoted by name in the commentary of Aristarchus, it appears that he was acquainted with others of obviously inferior value. These are spoken of as the 'common' texts (\( \alpha\iota \kappa\omega\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma \) or \( \alpha\iota \kappa\omega\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma \) \&c.), the 'popular' (\( \delta\mu\acute{a}\dot{\iota}\varsigma\iota\varsigm
unanimity, and there would be nothing to comment upon. It is also shown in some cases by the form of the annotation: e.g.—

II. 12. 382 οὕτως αἱ Ἀριστάρχου καὶ αἱ πλείους χείρας διψοτέρησιν ἐν δὲ ταῖς κοινωνίαις χειρὶ γε τῇ ἑτέρῃ (Schol. A).
II. 13. 499 αἱ πᾶσαι ξύοχοι οὐ δὲ ξύοχοι (Schol. T).
II. 19. 95 οὕτως ἐν ἄπασι Ζεδὸς ἄσατο· καὶ ἔστι ποιητικότερον ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἑκαστήριων Ζήνν ἄσατο.
II. 2. 53 αἱ πλείους καὶ χαριστάται δῖξα τοῦ ν βουλῆς· καὶ ἡ Ἀριστοφάνεως ἐν δὲ ταῖς κοινωνίαις καὶ τῇ Ζηροδότειρ βουλῆν.

A phrase of this kind, in short, is an abbreviation or siglum by which Didymus or a later epitomator replaced the list of sources originally quoted by Aristarchus. We sometimes see the abbreviating process going on: e.g.—

II. 1. 598 οὕτως οἰνοχεία Ἀριστάρχου λακῶν· καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀργολὶ καὶ Μασσαλίωνι καὶ Ἀρειακὶ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ζηροδότου καὶ Ἀριστοφάνου (Schol. A), οἰνοχεία λακῶν πᾶσαι (Schol. T).
II. 2. 196 οὕτως ἐκεῖς ἀνασκάλεται Ἀριστάρχου· ... εἶχον δὲ καὶ αἱ χαριστάται οὕτως ἄνω τῆς Ζηροδότου (Schol. A).
οὕτως αἱ πᾶσαι πλὴν τῆς Ζηροδότου (Schol. T).

It is true that in two places in the scholia the word πᾶσαι is so used as apparently to exclude the most important previous texts, those of Zenodotus and Aristophanes:

II. 14. 259 οὕτως ἐν πᾶσαις δύναται· Ἀριστοφάνης καὶ Ζηροδότου μὴ τείρα.
II. 15. 307 βιβλίων πᾶσαι εἶχον, Ζηροδότου βοῦν.

But both these places are suspicious: the first on account of the strange word μὴ τείρα, the second because elsewhere Aristarchus is said to have read βιβλία (see the note on Od. 15. 555). And in any case it is necessary to allow for the chance of error, especially in scholia which are the result of successive abridgment. Thus on II. 1. 522, where Schol. A gives οὐχὶ μὴ σα ἀλλὰ μὴ τι αἱ Ἀριστάρχου καὶ αἱ ἀλλαὶ σχέδων πᾶσαι διπλώσεις, this becomes in Schol. T the brief αἱ πᾶσαι μὴ τι. Similarly in the two passages now in question πᾶσαι may have been put carelessly for αἱ ἀλλαὶ πᾶσαι or σχέδων πᾶσαι.

It appears, then, that there were certain approved manuscripts which Aristarchus was in the habit of using as his apparatus criticus; while the others—the ‘common’ or ‘inferior copies’—were little regarded by him. On what grounds the choice was made cannot now be ascertained. Practically, we may conjecture, his list was that of
the copies of Hómer in the Alexandrian library, and consisted of purchases made on the authority of a succession of famous librarians. But in forming his own estimate of the comparative value of manuscripts Aristarchus was doubtless guided in some measure by their age. Indications of this are pointed out by Ludwich (op. cit. p. 46) in the scholia on II. 9. 657 (ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐτέρᾳ τῶν Ἀριστάρχου καὶ ἐν πολλαῖς τῶν ἀρχαίων) and II. 6. 4 (ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαιοῖς ἐγγύτατο κτλ.). In several places, again, Aristarchus noted that certain readings were found in the 'city editions,' or in some of them (αἱ καὶ πόλεις, ἡναι ορ τώς τῶν κατὰ πόλεις, &c.). These must have been ancient variants which were unknown to, or did not find favour with, the authors of the earlier recensions. Aristarchus is not known to have adopted any of these readings—a fact which makes his careful record of them all the more characteristic. In about half of the instances the variant is given as that of 'some' only of the copies in question, and in no case is it said to be the reading of all. The circumstance that notices of this kind are preserved only in books xix—xxiv is doubtless accidental, and we may assume that they were to be met with everywhere in the Aristarchean commentaries. The few that we have—thirteen in the scholia of the Venetus, and three in the Townleianus—do not add much to our knowledge, but they help to show that Aristarchus took account, not merely of the number, but still more of the quality and provenance of his manuscripts.

It is worth observing, further, that the proportion of instances in which Aristarchus cites 'all' or 'nearly all' his manuscripts is significantly large. Considering the number of these manuscripts, and the variety and independence of the sources from which they appear to have been derived, their agreement, even in a few crucial passages, would be very notable. In fact the number of instances in which a reading is supported by the πᾶσαι or σχεδὸν πᾶσαι of the scholia is about forty: while the places in which the testimony of the same source is more divided (αἱ πλεοῦς, ἡναι, τῶς, &c.) do not exceed fifty or sixty. These figures point decisively to the existence of a textus receptus or vulgate, of which the manuscripts of Aristarchus must have been generally good examples.

Zenodotus of Ephesus was contemporary with the two kings, Ptolemaeus Soter, founder of the Alexandrian library, and Ptolemæus Philadelphus, who employed him to correct and arrange the works of Homer and the other poets. Hence he is sometimes called ὁ πρῶτος τῶν Ὄμηρων διορθωτής (Suid.). The title belongs properly, as we have seen, to Antimachus: but in Roman and Byzantine times the name of Zenodotus was associated with the very beginnings of criticism 88.

The references in the scholia to the readings of Zenodotus are numerous: in the first book of the Iliad alone there are about fifty. Yet nothing is more difficult than to judge of the character and value of his critical work. Our knowledge of it comes mainly, if not entirely, through Aristarchus, who seems to have had a copy of the recension made by Zenodotus, with the critical marks which he employed, but with no apparatus of various readings or commentary. Hence we know nothing of the manuscripts or earlier recensions used by Zenodotus, and have no external evidence to show whether his peculiar readings are due to tradition or to conjecture. A single example will illustrate this. On II. 1. 63 ἴ καὶ ὀνειροπόλος κυλ. Aristarchus noted that the line was condemned by Zenodotus, 'perhaps' because he took ὀνειροπόλος to mean an interpreter of dreams 89. Aristarchus therefore appears to have found the line marked with the obelus: but he could only guess at the reason which had led Zenodotus to affix it.

Under such conditions as these it is evident that isolated statements about readings of Zenodotus will not tell us much of his critical methods. The chief case in which we find a general view or principle involved is that of the Pronoun ἓς or ὃς. In Homer, according to Aristarchus, ἓς was always a Possessive of the Third Person Singular (his, her): whereas in the text of Zenodotus it was not infrequently used as a Reflexive of the First and Second Persons: e.g. in II. 1. 393 ἀλλὰ σὺ, εἰ δύνασαι γε, περισχεῖς παύεις ἐϊό (Ἀγ. ἤνου): or II. 11.142 ὥς μὲν δὴ ὃς παρῆρε ἀκμία νείπτει λάβῃ (Ἀγ. τοῦ). Some modern scholars have taken the side of Zenodotus in this question. They find evidence

which they regard as showing that the stem ste (Sanskrit sva, Greek συ) originally had what may be termed a ‘general reflexive’ sense, i.e. that it referred to the subject of the sentence, which might be of any Number or Person. This use, they hold, was preserved by Zenodotus in the passages in question; while Aristarchus sought to banish it from Homer by a series of more or less violent alterations of the traditional text.  

44 The Homeric use of the Possessive ὅς, ὅς has been examined afresh by Mr. Leaf in an Appendix to the new edition of his Iliad (Vol. I. Appendix A). He agrees with Brugmann and other scholars in accepting, as relics of the oldest Homeric text, the readings attributed to Zenodotus, such as—


But he takes a different view of the process by which these readings disappeared from the great majority of the manuscripts. Hitherto it has generally been assumed that the issue lay between the authority of Zenodotus (or of ἀμαλ Zōp̄ōdorov) and the more powerful authority of Aristarchus. Mr. Leaf does not think it possible that Aristarchus should have exercised any such influence over the manuscript tradition. Agreeing with him as to this, I cannot but think that the case for Brugmann’s theory is materially weakened by the admission.

Comparing the readings of Aristarchus with those of Zenodotus in the passages now in question, we find a series of changes which are apparently animated by a common principle. They are such changes as are made by a modern scholar who has discovered a rule generally observed by his author, and sets to work to correct the instances which do not conform to it. It is very different when changes are made fortuitously, or by an unconscious process. The result is not then to create (or restore) uniformity of usage, but the contrary. Can we suppose, for example, that the frequent substitution of ἦς for ἦς was fortuitous? Brugmann holds that Aristarchus found certain uses of ἦς which he wrongly thought illegitimate, and got rid of them by importing the obscure word ἦς. Aristarchus himself considered ἦς as a corruption of ἦς. Either of these views is prima facie tenable. But is it likely that ἦς was re-discovered and replaced in the text by a series of undesigned coincidences?

If, then, the influence of Aristarchus was not equal to so great a change in the ancient vulgate, we are driven to suppose that the readings favoured by him were already those of the best sources, or at least of those from which the later text was mainly derived.

It may be objected that we have still to explain the genesis of the readings attributed to Zenodotus. But the steps which have to be supposed—the corruption of ἦς into ἦς, of τοῦ into οὗ, of φρειδ σφειν into φρειδ ἦς, and a few others of the kind—are not very difficult; the reading ἅλυς ἦς in II. 1. 393 may well be due to ἅλυς ἦς in II. 14. 266.; 18. 71—aided by παρός ἦς in II. 2. 662.; 14. 11.; 19. 390.; 23. 360.; 402 : the reading ἦς παρός in II. 11. 142 to ἦς παρός in II. 11. 404; Od. 7. 3, aided by ἦς παρός in II. 6. 466.; 9. 633.; 16. 522; Od. 15. 358.; 16. 411.; 24. 56.

Mr. Leaf points to the general reflexive use of ὅς (ὁς) found in Callimachus and Apollonius Rhodius, and argues that ‘if ὅς never meant anything but his in Homer (as I never means anything but him), it would be an amazing step for an imitator, against all the usage of his own day, to make it = my’. The answer is two-fold. In the first place, there was nothing more than a false archaism—a thing to which imitative poets are always liable. In the second place, the supposed misuse is exactly parallel to the late Attic and Hellenistic use of ἦς with reference to the First and Second Persons: e.g. in Matth. xxvi. 9 ἐγὼ δέ μοι έαυτόν buy for yourselves, 1 Cor. xi. 31 ει έαυτόν δικαίωμεν if we discern ourselves (see
Another difference between the two great critics turned upon the use of the Dual Number. While Aristarchus held that the Dual was used in Homer (as in Attic) only when two persons or things were spoken of, the text of Zenodotus exhibited several Dual forms indistinguishable in sense from Plurals. Such are II. 1. 567 ὠντε (sc. οἱ θεοὶ), 3. 459 ἀποίνες (of the Trojans), 6. 112 ἀπεὶσεν ἄντει λάβην, 8. 503., 13. 627., 15. 347., 18. 287., 23. 753 (cp. 2. 297., 3. 279).64

There can be no doubt that these readings are wrong. No one would now maintain, as even Buttmann did, that they are relics of a primitive usage of the Dual. It is equally evident that the source of the error lies in the fact that the Dual Number, which had survived in Attic much longer than in any other literary dialect of Greece, disappeared from the Hellenistic or κοινή διάλεκτος. Consequently the Dual forms in Homer came to be regarded, even by grammarians like Zenodotus and Crates, as mere poetical or old-fashioned varieties of the Plural. As such, moreover, they were imitated by post-Homeric poets, e.g. the author of the Hymn to Apollo (ll. 456, 487, 501); also Aratus (968, 1023), Oppian, &c. Under these circumstances the wonder is, not that false Dual forms should have been allowed to stand in the Alexandrian copies of Homer, but that none of them found their way into the existing manuscripts.65 If, as we have been led to conclude (p. 430), there was an ancient vulgate, dating as far back as the fifth century, from which the modern vulgate is descended, the examples from Xenophon, Plato, &c. in Kühner-Blass, § 455, 7, b). This use, which had evidently grown up in the colloquial Attic of the fourth century, would smooth the way for a similar extension of the Homeric reflexive pronoun.

The argument from a supposed primitive use of the stem ταῦτα cannot be pressed. It turns upon questions that are 'glottogonic,' and beyond the reach of science. We know that in many languages there is a Reflexive of the kind in question. But we do not know how these Reflexives came to be so used. Several of the uses are as obviously late as the Hellenistic use of ταῦτα. Brugmann himself notices the Scandinavian formation of the Middle in -ske, which was at first restricted to the Third Person: also the misuse of sich in German dialects. There is no proof, therefore, that the use of ταῦτα for all three Persons is 'primitive,' if by that is meant Indo-germanic. The restriction to the Third Person in Latin servus is more likely to be original.66

Besides Zenodotus we hear of Eratosthenes and Crates as οἱ θεοὶσεν τῷ διάλογῳ 'Ομήρου (Sch. A on ll. 24. 282). Hence it seems to have been one of the points at issue between Aristarchus and the school of Crates.

64 Besides Zenodotus we hear of Eratosthenes and Crates as οἱ θεοὶσεν τῷ διάλογῳ 'Ομήρου (Sch. A on ll. 24. 282). Hence it seems to have been one of the points at issue between Aristarchus and the school of Crates.

65 So far as I know there is only one place where a Dual form ascribed to Zenodotus can be traced in any other source, viz. in ll. 23. 753—

δρυσθ' οἱ καὶ τοῦτον δίλων περιήθεος.

In this formula, which occurs three times in the account of the Funeral Games (ll. 707, 753, 831), περιήθεος is given by most manuscripts in one place, viz. in l. 707, and is there right, since the invitation is to a wrestling-match. In l. 753 περιήθεος is found in an Oxyrhynchus fragment (l. p. 46), and in one of Mr. Leaf's manuscripts (Paris grec. 2682)—readings which are evidently due to contamination with l. 707.
it follows that that ancient vulgate must be represented in the matter of the Dual, not by Zenodotus, but by Aristarchus. And this argument, it will be evident, is independent of any view which may be taken of Aristarchus as a critic, or of the share that he had in determining the subsequent history of the text.

The remaining notices of Zenodotus, numerous as they are, do not throw much light on his methods. On the whole they tend to confirm the conclusion just stated. They prove that his text was much more influenced by the συνήθεια, i.e. by the language, whether literary or colloquial, of his own age, than his great successor. He shows an evident readiness to make Homer easier—to remove small difficulties by prosaic changes, and to replace archaic and poetical forms by words taken from the vocabulary of the time. A few examples will serve to make this clear:

Il. 1. 299 ἐνεί μ’ ἀφελεσθαί γε δόντες. Zen. read ἐνεί τ’ ἐθέλεις ἀφελεσθαί, doubtless because it was only Agammenon who took away Briseis—not the Greeks, who had given her to him.

Il. 6. 511 βίμφα τ’ γοῦνα φέρει. Zen. got rid of the bold anacoluthon by reading βίμφ’ ἐν γόυνα φέρει.

Il. 10. 10 τρομίσατο δ’ οἱ φρένες ἐντόσ. Zen. read φοβέσατο, contrary to the invariable Homeric use of φόβος—‘flight’ (not ‘fear’). Cp. Il. 18. 247 πάντας γὰρ ἔχε τρόμος (Zen. φόβος); also 19. 14.

Il. 11. 123 νεός Ἀντιμάχου δαίφρονος. Zen. read κακόφρονος, doubtless because δαίφρων is elsewhere an epithet of praise, and therefore inappropriate to Antimachus.

Il. 11. 439 δ’ οἱ οὔ τ’ τέλος κατακάιρων ἢλεῖν. For the difficult but clearly Homeric τέλος Zen. read βῆλος.

Il. 15. 207 οὐ ἄγγελος ἀληθεία εἱδή (Zen. εἰπῇ). Here a distinctively Homeric idiom is lost by the change.

Il. 18. 34 μὴ λαμὼ ἀκαμήσουι σιδήρῳ (Zen. ἀπομήνῃ). Here again the reading of Zen. is simply the translation of the Homeric word into prose.

Od. 5. 132 (= 7. 250) Ζεῦς ἀλῶς ἐκέλασε. For ἀλόσας Zen. substituted the familiar form ἀλῶσας.

§ 17. Aristarchus.—The sources.

The place of Aristarchus in philological criticism can only be compared with that which Aristotle holds in the general history of

* See Ad. Römer, Ueber die Homerrecension des Zenodot (München, 1885).
science. In both men we recognise the transition from mere beginnings to a sudden maturity. Both were distinguished by their many-sided grasp of scientific problems, by their encyclopedic attainments, and by their freedom from all that is fanciful or superstitious. The work of Aristarchus, like that of Aristotle, gathered into itself the most valuable fruits of earlier study, and formed the basis of nearly all subsequent advance.

A minor point of resemblance may be found in the difficulty of determining exactly what came from the master himself and what from disciples and followers. In the case of Aristarchus the difficulty is aggravated by the nature of the subject-matter. The writings of grammarians have not the literary form or interest which secures their preservation. In ancient times, as now, they were excerpted, abridged, incorporated with new matter, till the original was lost altogether. But though only a few lines are left of the actual words of Aristarchus, a good deal is known of the substance of his criticism. The Codex Venetus gives us the critical marks affixed by him: and the Scholia of the same manuscript have preserved numerous extracts from two sources of capital importance, dating from the first century B.C., viz. the work of Aristonicus on the critical marks, and that of Didymus on the Aristarchean recension. These two grammarians seem to have had access to the writings of Aristarchus, and doubtless also to most of the traditions of his school. Their information is supplemented by notices derived from Herodian and Nicanor—scholars of a somewhat later date, but still within reach of the stores of Alexandrian learning.

The Homeric learning of Aristarchus was embodied in works of three kinds, viz. 'editions' of his correction of the text (ἐκδόσεις τῆς διορθώσεως, or simply αἱ ἐκδόσεις), 'commentaries' (ἐπομήνματα) on the text, and certain 'treatises' (συγγράμματα) which dealt with particular questions.

1. It would appear from the language of the scholia that Aristarchus published two editions of his recension, which is therefore usually referred to in the plural (αἱ ἐκδόσεις or αἱ Ἀριστάρχου, whereas we only find Ἡ Ζηνοδότου, Ἡ Ἀριστοφάνου). Hence such expressions as διάλλασσα ἰ Ἀριστάρχου (14. 427), Ἦ ἄνεια 'one of the two recensions,' and frequently διὰ τρίς Ἀριστάρχου. So on II. 6. 4 Didymus tells us that the old reading, which the 'commentaries' show to have been that of Aristarchus, was—

μεσοθύς ποταμοῦ Σηκαμώνδου καὶ στομαλίμης,
but afterwards he found and adopted the reading—

μεσσηγής Σιμώνιτος λεί Ζάνθου ημών.

And on II. 16. 613 we are told that the line was wanting in one of the two editions, and was obelized in the second (ἐν τῇ ἕτερᾳ τῶν Ἀριστάρχου οὖν ἐφήμετο καθάπαξ; ἐν δὲ τῇ δεύτερᾳ ὄβελος αὐτῷ παρ- ἐκείνῳ). There is one piece of evidence, however, which throws some doubt on these two editions.

This is the statement, made by Didymus on II. 10. 397–399, to the effect that Ammonius, one of the pupils of Aristarchus, and his immediate successor in the school, was the author of a treatise περὶ τοῦ μὴ γεγονόναι πλεῖονες ἐκδοσεῖς τῆς Ἀριστάρχειας διορθώσεως. The same treatise is probably meant in another passage (II. 19. 365), where Ammonius is said to have written περὶ τῆς ἐπεκδοθείσης διορθώσεως 88. But what is intended by the contention that there were not ‘more editions’ of the recension of Aristarchus? Villoison and Wolf took it to mean that there was only one such edition 99. Aristarchus, they thought, may have left materials, in one form or another, from which a revised text, or a series of corrections of the text, was drawn up; and this may have led to the belief in a second edition published by him. Recent scholars have generally followed Lehrs in taking πλεῖονες here as = πλεῖονες τῶν δύο 100. Such an interpretation, in the absence of any context to suggest it, is certainly strained. And if we are right in looking upon the words περὶ τῆς ἐπεκδοθείσης διορθώσεως as an alternative description, the work so described must surely have discussed the question whether something which passed for a second recension was so in reality or not. The discussion which Lehrs supposes περὶ τοῦ μὴ γεγονόναι κτλ. would not be ‘about the second recension,’ but would take that recension for granted.

88 It has been supposed that these two descriptions refer to different works of Ammonius, viz, one ‘on the second edition of the recension’ (quoted on II. 19. 365), and one ‘on the question whether there were more editions than these two’ (on II. 10. 398). This is improbable in view of the fact that the point for which Ammonius is referred to is of the same nature in both places. The lines II. 10. 397–399 were first marked by Aristarchus as doubtful, and afterwards left out altogether. II. 19. 365–368 were obelized, and afterwards the obeloi were removed. Thus the point lay in the change of mind shown in the treatment of a passage. This agreement in respect of subject points to a single treatise.


100 De Arist. Stud. Hom. 3. p. 23. It will be seen that Lehrs rests his case mainly on the other notice about the treatise of Ammonius. ‘Quidnisi opponam eundem Ammonium scripsisse περὶ τῆς ἐπεκδοθείσης διορθώσεως (sc. Ἀριστάρχου), de qua non poterat scribere si nulla erat.’ But we do not know that this title was given to the work by Ammonius himself. More probably it is the description of it by Didymus, who undoubtedly regarded Aristarchus as the author of a ‘second recension.’
However this may be, it is highly significant that the number of editions of the Aristarchean text was a matter of dispute among his immediate successors at Alexandria.

2. The scholia, especially those that come from Didymus, frequently refer to certain ὑπομνήματα, ‘memoranda’ or ‘commentaries’ (in the Latin sense), which they quote as sources for the readings and opinions of Aristarchus. Thus on II.10.398 it is noted that the reason why certain verses were obelized is not to be found ‘in the Aristarchean commentaries’ (διὰ τῶν Ἀρισταρχείων ὑπομνήματων): cp. the scholia on II.1.423, 2.125, 20.471, 23.870. It is not quite clear, however, in what sense or to what extent they are to be regarded as his. Apparently they were numerous (schol. II.23.169 τὰ πολλὰ τῶν ὑπομνήματων), and differed considerably in value and authority. Thus on II.2.111 Didymus introduces a quotation of the actual words of Aristarchus in the following terms:—

καὶ ταῖς λιταῖς ἔγγονυμοις αὐτῶν ἔπειτα Ἀλας τὰ μέγας (II.9.169) ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἡμεροθεμένων ὑπομνήματων γράφει ταῦτα κατὰ λέξιν.

The ‘commentaries’ generally support the ‘recensions’: as on II.2.192 καὶ ἐν ταῖς διορθώσεις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν οὕτως ἐγέργατο, 2.355 οὕτως Ἀρισταρχεῖς καὶ τὰ ὑπομνήματα, II.40, &c. But occasionally we hear that some at least gave different readings; as on II.4.3 καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήματοι ἐννοούσαι φέρεται: οἱ δὲ φαιν Ζηροδάτεως εἶναι τὸν γραφήν· ἐν μένῳ ταῖς ἐκδόσεις χωρίς τοῦ ν εὑραμέν (so on 7.452, 14.382). In such cases it would seem that the writer of the ὑπόμνημα cannot have had the recension of Aristarchus before him. On the other hand there is evidence that the ὑπομνήμαta gave, not only the readings of Aristarchus, but also the grounds on which they were adopted by him. Two examples from Didymus will show this:

II.3.57 ἴσον δὲ τῶν δύο οἱ εἰχόν αἱ Ἀρισταρχέως καὶ οὐ μένον ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν εἶχον οὕτως, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν οἷος λόγος ὑπέκειτο, ὅτι εὐλ.

II.2.397 ὁ ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνήματος λόγος ὑπέκειτο εἰχὸν τῆδε, ἐντ.

Thus the ὑπομνήμαta must be the original source of much that has reached us through works like those of Didymus and Aristonicus. The Aristarchean marks gave little information themselves. The diplē hardly ever indicated more than that Aristarchus had something to say on a verse. And it is not uncommon to find that the meaning of a diplē was unknown to the immediate pupils of Aristarchus, or at least that it was disputed among them. Thus—

II.8.221 πρὸς τὸ ἵχων ἐν χωρί, τί ποτε σημαίνει, ῥ.ε. the diplē was to call attention to the interpretation. The rival opinions of Apollodorus and Dionysius—both pupils of Aristarchus—are then given.
ARISTARCHUS.—THE SOURCES.

II. 17. 24 τὸ σημεῖον Διονύσιος διὰ τὸν Ὑπερήφανον φήσαν.

II. 17. 125 οδί Διονύσιος τὸ σημεῖον φήσαν δὴ ἡλκαται πτῶσις, ἰ.ε. Dionysius understood the diplê to refer, not to an apparent contradiction, but to a point of grammar (Lehrs de Arist. stud. Hom. p. 15 note).

Thus the critical marks, in conjunction with the ἵππομήματα and other writings of the Aristarcheans, formed the nearest Alexandrian equivalent to the text and commentary of a modern editor. The marks served as sign-posts directing the reader to search in the traditional stores of learning—oral or written, accessible or not.

3. The important scholium of Didymus on II. 2. 111 refers to another group of Aristarchean works, the συγγράμματα or ‘treatises.’ According to Didymus these were more authoritative than the ἵππομήματα, doubtless because they were known to be in the fullest sense the work of the great critic himself. They are much less frequently quoted: probably they were less numerous, and were concerned with particular subjects, which did not often involve questions of reading. We hear of a treatise πρὸς τὸ Ζένωνος παράδειγμα, i.e. against the Chorizontes or ‘Separators’ of the Iliad and Odyssey: of τὰ περὶ τοῦ μαστάμου, on the arrangement of the different nationalities in the Greek camp, with a plan (τὸ τοῦ στρατοπέδου διάγραμμα): also of controversial writings (τὰ πρὸς Φιλητᾶν, τὰ πρὸς Κυμαθῶν).

Notwithstanding these different sources of knowledge it is clear that the information which ancient scholars had about the criticism of Aristarchus, and in particular about the readings that he adopted in his recension of Homer, was much less exact than we should have expected to find it. As a crucial instance it may be worth while to quote the scholium on II. 2. 111, which line is usually written—

Zeus μὲ μέγα Κρονίδης ἄτη ἐνίδησε Βαρέην.

Here Didymus tells us that the reading μέγα, by what he calls a σχολικὸν ἄγγελμα, a piece of ignorance belonging to the school11, was attributed to Aristarchus, while Zenodotus was supposed to have read μέγας. The mistake, he says, was due to Dionysius Thrax, a pupil of Aristarchus. Against him Didymus cites Ammonius and Dionysodorus, both pupils of Aristarchus, and Callistratus, who was a contemporary and wrote περὶ Ἰλιάδος. The reading μέγα, he admits, is found in some of the ἵππομήματα, but on the other side he argues that μέγας is given as Aristarchean in the much more

11 The word σχολικός here may have a contemptuous sense: cp. Longin. § 10 οὐδὲν φλοιώδες ἢ ἀσέμνον ἢ σχολικὸν ἡγεσατάττοντες.
decisive σύγγραμμα πρὸς Φιλητᾶν, and also in ‘one of the carefully written commentaries’ (ἐν τινὶ τῶν ἡκριβωμένων ὑπομνήματος). Finally he says that Ptolemaeus Epithetes—so called as the especial ‘assailant’ of Aristarchus—in setting out the readings of Zenodotus did not reckon μέγας in this place as one of them. Notwithstanding this array of authorities we find that Aristonicus assigns μέγας to Zenodotus: and on the whole it seems probable that he was right.

Other references to pupils of Aristarchus as witnesses to his readings are—

II. 6. 76 Ἀμμώνιος, ὡς Ἀριστάρχου προφέρεται καὶ ταύτην τὴν γραφήν.
II. 8. 513 Παρμενίδος ἐν τῷ α’ πρὸς Κράτητα ὡς Ἀριστάρχου γραφήν προφέρεται κεῖνη.

And, what is still more significant, the word προφέρεται by itself is used ὡς Ἀριστάρχου γραφήν: e.g. on II. 7. 7 Ἀμμώνιος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἀθηνακλέα τοῖ προφέρεται πληθυντικάς: on II. 9. 197 Παρμενίδος ἐν προφέρεται ἡμέτερονα. In these and many more instances we see that the question anciently debated was, not whether Aristarchus was right or wrong in regard to a reading, but what the reading was which he preferred.

Sometimes the doubt is whether a reading was only mentioned in passing by Aristarchus, or was discussed and adopted. Instances of this are—

II. 13. 2 παρὰ τῷ Ἶδιοι] Ζηνόδοτος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης καὶ τῇ μένῃ μένῃ οἷς διψῶν. Here Aristarchus gave the reading of Zenodotus and Aristophanes, and perhaps therefore left the issue undecided between it and some other.

II. 21. 130 μὴπετει δένδοι καὶ ὁ Ἀριστάρχος δυνατικότερος τῇ ἀδείᾳ, μὴ δὲιν ἀντιπάλοι τῷ Ἀριστοφάνη. Here Aristarchus had mentioned that six verses were obelized by Aristophanes: but he did not make any reply to the objection taken. Hence the question, what is to be inferred from his silence?

§ 18. Aristarchus as a textual critic.

We know something of the resources that Aristarchus had at his disposal—manuscripts of Homer brought from far and near, and copies of all the most famous recensions, from that of Antimachus down to his own immediate predecessors in the Museum (p. 431). What do we know of his use of them? Can we assume that his
text was the best that they were fitted to yield? On this question there has been some controversy in quite recent times. Scholars have been found to maintain that Aristarchus altered the text of Homer by numerous arbitrary conjectures, designed to bring it into accordance with certain rules that he imagined himself to have discovered. It must be admitted that the scholia, even those which come from Aristarchus, often give some colour to this idea. The criticism which they contain is generally much more 'subjective' than modern methods would allow. The reasoning appears to be based too much upon internal evidence—upon such matters as the poetical effect of a reading, or its agreement with other passages, or the lesson which it teaches—to the comparative neglect of manuscript sources. This impression, however, is in great measure removed by further study. We have to consider that the interest taken by ancient grammarians in purely textual problems was a constantly diminishing quantity. Such critical data as we possess are almost confined to the Venetian scholia: while the later collections (the Townley scholia, Eustathius, &c.) are mainly exegetical. But the process had gone on from the first. In the Venetian scholia themselves the proportion of critical apparatus must be very much less than in the original Alexandrian commentaries. We cannot therefore lay much stress on the silence of the scholia.

On the other hand there are many indications that Aristarchus was noted in antiquity for his faithfulness to the manuscript tradition. The scholia have preserved a striking instance of this in the comment of Aristarchus on Il. 9. 222—

\[ \text{ἀντών ἐπεὶ πάσος καὶ ἐδητύς ἢς ἐρον ἐντό.} \]

He observed that the envoys, of whom this is said, had already supposed, and therefore that the poet would have done better to write \[ \text{ἀντών ἐπεὶ πάσος καὶ ἐδητύς ἅψ ἐπάσαντο, ὥς ἂν ἐπάσαντο;} \] but he

---

23 Thus in reference to the reading δαῖρα for θᾶσοι in Il. 1. 5 Nauck writes as follows (Melanges Gr.-Rom. iv. 463): 'ich meine, dass wie an dieser so an zahllosen anderen Stellen durch willkührliche und verfehlte Conjecturen des Aristarch die ursprünglichen Lesarten verdrängt worden sind: ich meine, dass das Schwören auf die Worte des Aristarch, wie es in Alexandria herrschend war, dem Homerischen Text den empfindlichsten, niemals wieder gut zu machenden Schaden gebracht hat.' Cp. Ludwich, op. cit. vol. ii. p. 78 ff.

24 The Cod. Ven. has ἢ ἅψ ἐπάσαντο, which (as Cobet noticed) points to ἅψ ἐπάσαντο. Ludwich rejects the words as a mere dittoography. But the context seems to require ἅψ. 'It would have been better,' according to Aristarchus, 'if the poet had described the envoys as only tasting, out of courtesy to Achilles, and not eating and drinking to satiety' (ἐδοχεν χαίροντας τῷ ἄχιλλῃ γεθοῦσαι μόνον καὶ μη εἰς κόρον καθεῖν καὶ πίνων λαγωματι). This, he seems to have thought, might be expressed by ἅψ ἐπάσαντο: set hastily.
was too cautious to make any change against the weight of the manuscripts (ινδο περιττής εὐλαβείας οἴδιν μετέθηκε, ἐν πολλαῖς οὖν εὐρώς φερομένην τὴν γραφὴν). It is characteristic of the later scholia (Townley, &c.) that in the face of this notice they say Ἀρισταρχος γράφει δὲ ἐπάσατα. Again, in II. 2.665 Aristarchus retained (οὐ μετέθηκε) the reading βὴ φέωγων, although he observed that Homeric usage was in favour of βῆ φέωγεν. In II. 3.262 he preferred (προκρίνει) the form βήσετο, but kept βήσατο. On II. 7.114 he noted the harshness of the words ἰ περ σῖον πολλὸν ἄμελος as said to Menelaus, and observed that it would have been less reproachful (ἵτων ἀνειδιστικῶς) if the poet had said ἰ περ μέγα φήσατο ἑτε: but he did not alter the text. Similar examples will be found on II. 16.636., 22.468., 23.857; and doubtless there were many more. Indeed it seems very possible that some of the readings now ascribed to Aristarchus come from remarks of this kind, and were never intended to appear in his text of Homer.

A further argument in favour of Aristarchus may be based upon his citations of the earlier manuscripts πάσαι, al πλείους, &c. His reading in no instance differs from the reading of 'all' or even of 'nearly all' his manuscripts, and very seldom differs from that of the majority.

§ 19. Aristarchus and the modern vulgate.

When the discovery of the Venetian scholia first revealed the stores of Alexandrian criticism, it was natural to imagine that the ancient recensions, and especially the recension of Aristarchus, had at once exercised a determining influence on the Homeric text. Thus Wolf, whose Prolegomena appeared a few years after the publication of Villoison (1788), assumes that the 'reading of Aristarchus' became thenceforth the 'tradition' or 'vulgate,' and the basis of all subsequent changes:

Etenim ex quo Aristarchea ἄδικως facta est vulgatissima (vulgata lectio, vulgatus textus dici solet, et satis commode), id quod maturo factum videtur, ad illam potissimum novae emendationes et notationes annexae et compositae sunt (p. cccxii).

This view had been already expressed by Giphanius:

Si de universa facie et habitu Carminum quaerimus, non est dubium quin recte divinarit Giphanius, vulgatum nostram recensionem esse ipsam Aristarcheam (p. cclvii).
The scholars who have accepted this estimate of the supremacy of Aristarchus do not take sufficient account of the difference between ancient and modern conditions. They suppose that a new text of Homer, produced by the critic of highest authority in the most important centre of learning, would at once become known throughout Greece, and would drive out all previous texts. A revolution of that kind is possible only with the aid of printing. Without some such means an 'edition,' in the modern sense of the word, can hardly be said to exist. So far was the recension of Aristarchus from taking the Greek world by storm, that his readings, as we have seen, were very imperfectly known in the following century, and even in the circle of his immediate disciples. And, apart from general considerations of this kind, the facts are irreconcilable with any such view. For—

(1) Many readings in the modern vulgate cannot be explained by derivation from the text of Aristarchus. Such a theory might explain many variants: e.g. ἄγνις κα for ἄγνις κα (II. 1. 168) or φύγα τοῖς for οὐκοχοί (II. 1. 598). But it evidently fails with ἐν ὴστατῳ for Ἀχαιῶν (II. 1. 91), λαμπὼν βαρείας φεραίς ἀφέξει for Δαναοίων ἀεικία λογίων ἀπόσει (II. 1. 97), &c. And it would not account for the existence in the manuscripts of verses which Aristarchus left out altogether.

(2) The variety of reading in our manuscripts is often to be traced back to the texts that Aristarchus himself made use of. Thus on II. 1. 91 Aristarchus quoted Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Sosigenes for Ἀχαιῶν. It follows that ἐν ὴστατῳ, the reading of nearly all our manuscripts, was derived from other pre-Aristarchean sources. In this case, then, and in the many similar cases, the authority of Aristarchus did not prevent the reading which he and other leading grammarians condemned from gaining a place in the vulgate.

(3) It has been shown from the Homeric quotations of the fifth and fourth centuries that the text was then well established, and did not very greatly differ from that of the modern manuscripts (p. 426). This being so, the hypothesis of a great Homeric restoration carried out at Alexandria has no raison d'être. If there were interpolated and otherwise 'eccentric' copies, such as are being found in the papyrus rolls of Egypt, these were not got rid of by the obelus of the critics, but by the superiority which better and 'nicer' copies (χαρίστατερα) had in the struggle for existence.

(4) There are many instances in which the recension of Aristarchus preserved the earlier and more correct form of a word, while the present vulgate shows the form which he rejected. Thus he read θῆς (II. 6. 432), δεμής (II. 3. 436), σανίς (II. 19. 27), φανίς (II. 22. 73), not
theις, δαμεῖς, σακεῖ, φαμεῖ— the epic grammar in these places requiring the Subjunctive. So he read τεθησά (passim), περιοτίωσι (II. 17. 95), καθήσαται (II. 24. 473), not τεθησά, περιοτίωσι, καθήσαται: νεμεστηθείσαις (II. 24. 53), not -όμεν: οἰνοχότεις (II. 1. 598), not φρονήσεις: εἴλει (II. 4. 213), not εἴλει: ηθοῦσα, ἐδυστε (in most places, cp. however Didymus on II. 3. 262): ἐθιλωμι and other Subjunctives in -ομι, not the corresponding Optatives in -ομι: the Second Person Dual in -των, not in -την: καὶ κείμεν &c., not κακείσις: the plural verb with a neuter plural; the compounds with νερ, πανενδή, ἀντακαίν, &c., not πανενδή, ἀντακαίν, &c. In these and similar cases it appears from the independent evidence of linguistic that Aristarchus was nearly always right in his choice. We may infer—since he had no other source of knowledge in this field—that these more correct forms were to be found in the better manuscripts which he used. Yet the other readings prevailed, and found their way into the vulgate.

(5) This inferiority of the existing vulgate in the details of spelling and inflexion is in effect the inferiority of a multitude of copyists to a single great critic. The work of Aristarchus was based upon the use of many sources, and his strength lay first and foremost in the classification of these sources. The scribes had not access to the treasures of the Alexandrian Museum; and they were more liable to be influenced by the grammar and phonetics of their own age. Hence the text that they have transmitted to us, although in the main it is the ancient vulgate, is a less exact reproduction of that vulgate than we should have had if Aristarchus had wielded the despotic powers often attributed to him.

The manuscripts of Homer, then, are descended, not from the critical recensions of the Alexandrian school, but from the ancient pre-Alexandrian vulgate—a vulgate which goes back, not indeed to "Homer," but at least to the great period of Greek literature. Their comparative freedom from the disfigurements of the papyrus fragments is accordingly due rather to the collective agency that we speak of as the Homeric παράδοσεις or tradition than to individual scholars. The texts to which these fragments belong, so far as they came under the notice of the great grammarians, were doubtless included in the class of κοινων. The interpolations which form the most charac-

[44] The words κοινων and ἐκκοινων should not lead us to imagine that the texts so described were in any sense a "vulgate." The word "common" does not mean that certain readings were common to, or commonly found in, the copies in question, but that these copies were in use among common people. There is nothing to show that they generally agreed among themselves. Such references as ἐν τίσι τῶν κοινῶν, or ἐν τίσι τῶν κεκοινων, which are not infrequent, imply the
teristic feature of them explain a good deal in the aims and methods of the Alexandrians (pp. 420 ff.). But if they had really made good their footing in the Homeric textus receptus, they would hardly have been dispossessed, as they seem to have been, in the course of the next century.

It follows from what has now been said that the task of the modern Homeric critic is in the first place to restore the pre-Alexandrian vulgate: and that the way to that restoration lies through the apparatus criticus of Aristarchus. When the testimony of the Aristarchean or pre-Aristarchean sources is divided we can sometimes fall back on the evidence of linguistic. But that evidence must be used with caution. We may know that one sound or one grammatical form is later in the development of language than another: but we may not be able to tell when the change took place. It is certain (e.g.) that ὁμοχός is older than φισχός, because it is nearer the original ἄρωχος. But this does not suffice to tell us whether ὁμοχός or φισχός was the reading of the ancient vulgate. That can only be determined by positive evidence, such as Aristarchus furnishes. What in such cases the primitive Homeric form was is another and usually a more difficult question.

§ 20. Aristarchus as an interpreter of Homer.

The greatness of Aristarchus as a textual critic, and especially his success in dealing with interpolations, has perhaps somewhat obscured his services in other departments. A complete account of these services does not fall within the plan of this book: but it may be well to notice a few of the many points in which we can test for ourselves the soundness of his judgment. In many more, owing to the imperfection of the record, we only know the conclusions at which he arrived, not the facts and observations on which they were based.

1. In the great work of Lehrs on the Homeric studies of Aristarchus the largest space is given to the chapter on the Aristarchean interpretation of Homeric words. It will generally be agreed that this is the field in which Aristarchus did most to advance the boundaries of reverse. It is true that their readings are usually mentioned when they differ from those of Aristarchus. But all these references come through Aristarchus, and he would seldom quote the 'common' manuscripts except when they presented a different reading from that of his own.

K. Lehrs, De Aristarchi studiis Homericis: Diss. II. De Aristarchea vocabulorum Homericorum interpretatione (pp. 35–169).

II. "G"
philological science. It is certainly in this field that his pre-eminence in scientific method and insight is most evident and demonstrable. He was the first scholar who saw that the language of Homer was an organic whole, to be understood and interpreted from itself. The earlier Homeric students—from the fifth to the third century B.C.—had busied themselves with explanations of the obsolete words or γλώσσα, which naturally were the chief difficulty of the ordinary reader. Their aim was in each of the passages concerned to replace unfamiliar words by equivalent familiar ones. Lists of such words, with the accepted explanations, were soon drawn up; the authors of them were known as the 'glossographers' (oi γλωσσογράφοι). Even Aristotle treats the diction of Homer in the main from this point of view. Aristarchus did much to correct the errors which seem to have become more or less traditional with the glossographers. Thus he noted on II. 3. 44 that πράμα does not mean 'a king,' but is πράμαχος: on II. 4. 318 that φωιος (in phrases like γάρ φωιος φωιοσ) does not mean κακός: on II. 9. 324 that μάναγε does not mean 'a locust': on 9. 540 that θνων is wrongly glossed by βλαστων: on 16. 822 that the glossographers took δωπησια as simply equivalent to δομοσια, whereas it implied falling in battle. In these and similar cases (cp. 10. 56, 17. 151, 18. 378, 540, 23. 16, 661, 24. 164, 367) we learn that his diplé was προς τον γλωσσογράφον. But he also observed, what was not so obvious, that a large proportion of the commonest words had changed their meaning in the interval between Homer and the Attic age. He discovered, for example, that in Homer φόβος meant 'flight,' not 'fear': that τρείω meant 'to run away,' 'bolt,' not 'to tremble': that πόνος meant 'labour,' not 'sorrow': that δεδε never meant 'here' (as in Hellenistic Greek): that πέλεω did not mean 'a second time,' but only 'backwards': that σχεδεω did not mean 'nearly,' but only 'near, at hand': that τάγα did not mean 'perhaps': that βάλλω and βέλος were used of missiles, στάχω of weapons held in the hand: that μέλεω with an infinitive meant 'to be likely to,' not 'to be about to': that φάνεω meant to 'show,' not to 'say': that ἔρως was applied to warriors generally, not only to the 'kings.' In short,

The word goes back to Aristophanes Δεισιδακτής fr. 1:

προς τάξα συ λέγων 'Ομηροίς γλώσσας, τι καλοῦσι σάρματα;

and again τι καλοῦσ: 'διηνέρα κόρη; There were also γλώσσας in the laws of Solon, e.g. τι καλοῦσι ιδιων:

E.g. in the Poetics, c. 35 τα δὲ προς την λέγων δραματα διε διαλέγων, εδων γλώσσα σάρμαται μεν πρώτος ἴσως γορο αὐτοι τοις γλώσσαις λέγει, ἀλλα τοις φοίλασι τινὶ τῆς Δολοσιας: δη δή του εἴδος μὲν ἥν παύοι, αὐτο τὸ σώμα ἀτύμμετρον, ἀλλα τὸ πρώτων σημειῶν το γνῷ εἰσίνει τι Κριτίτες εἰπέρον αι λαοίν. Cp. the remarks in c. 33 on the effect of changing poetical into ordinary language.
it was Aristarchus who realised for the first time that the language of Homer was not a mere literary Greek, in which distinction of style was gained by the use of an archaic or conventional vocabulary, but that it was in its whole texture the genuine speech of a different period.

2. The number of scholia that refer to the inflexions of the Homeric dialect is comparatively small; probably because that part of grammar did not leave much room for controversy. We may mention the notes on the pronouns σφις (II. i. 8), σφοί (II. i. 336), σφωτρόσ (II. i. 216): on the aorists οδημε, ἐκσαθε, and the reduplicated aorists (II. i. 100): on the omission of the augment (laiκέ): on the forms of the subjunctive with short vowel (as in II. i. 141 ἔρφοσομεν, &c.).

3. On the other hand there are hundreds of annotations bearing on the meaning and usage of the grammatical forms. Every use of a Case that does not conform to Attic practice is duly noted. The force of the aorist is observed in the infinitive and participle: e.g. on II. 9. 578 διὶ συντελεῖκας τὸ δίσθαι, 3. 295 ἄφυσομεν διὰ τοῦ ο παρατάτικα, 6. 87 (εὐνόγοος) διὶ ὁ χρόνος ἠλάσκει ἀντὶ τοῦ ξωμεγγοῦσα. So of such uses of the Moods as are peculiar to Homer—the subjunctive with οὐ = οὐ μη, and generally the use of the subjunctive as a kind of future (τό εἰπον ἀντὶ τοῦ εἶρον ἀν, &c.): the future indicative with ἄν and κεν: the optative with ἄν or κεν of an unfilled condition: the infinitive for the imperative. So too we find references to the uses of the prepositions, the adverbial use of neuter adjectives and pronouns, the construction of the neuter plural with a plural verb. And all this fine observation of usage was accomplished before the days of systematic grammar. It is true that the first steps had been taken by the Stoics. The Cases had been enumerated, and perhaps also the Tenses (as may be inferred from the technical terms παρατάτικας and συντελεῖκας). But no theory of the Moods had been attempted: their names (ἀμετακι, &c.) do not occur in the Aristarchean scholia. It was in the next generation, among the pupils of Aristarchus, that these rich stores were made to yield the material for the first complete τέχνη γραμματεία.

4. The subject of accentuation, which occupies fifty-five pages in Lehrc**, is one that cannot be said to have yielded many results of value to the Homeric scholar. The materials are abundant, and for the Greek language as it was in the Alexandrian period they
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are almost complete. But when the ancient grammarians had to deal with Homeric and other obsolete words and forms it is evident that they were generally much at a loss. It is true that they had the tradition (παράδοσε) of the rhapsodists, and of readers of Homer generally. But that tradition could not have the force or persistence of living usage. Accordingly it failed to prevent such departures from legitimate accent as ἀνέω (adverb from ἀνέωτα), δόλεα (fem. of *δολύς), ἵγρεσθα, ἵγρεσθα, πίφον (participle of ἔπιθον), ἄκακήμενος, ἀλλήλους.

5. Turning now from the language of Homer to the story of the poems and the historical environment in which they are placed, we still derive our best guidance from the learning of Aristarchus, and even more from his supremely rational spirit.

In dealing with the Cyclic poems we often had occasion to notice the growth of the heroic mythology by the introduction of new characters and incidents. This process of development is constantly recognized by Aristarchus, who notes every indication of change, and never omits to tell us how much was known to Homer, how much added by post-Homeric poets (οἱ νεωτέροι). His observations refer not only to large episodes—the Judgment of Paris (see on Il. 24. 25), the sacrifice of Iphigenia (9. 145), the landing in Mysea (1. 59), the story of Troilus (24. 257), &c., but also to such things as the name Ξθηνία for "Ἄντεα (6. 160), the name Ἰεράνθης (6. 170), the localisation of Oechalia (2. 596), the confusion of Troy and Phrygia (2. 862), of Argos and Mycenae (11. 46), the island in which Philoctetes was landed (2. 722); and mythological points like the immortality of Heracles (18. 117), the divinity of Dionysus (6. 131), the identification of Apollo and Παῖες (5. 898), of Ares and Ἐρυμαλος (17. 211), the function of Hermes as ψυχωαμβύλος (Od. 24. 1). In his handling of these and many similar matters Aristarchus did not treat Homer as an ultimate omniscient authority, nor did he regard the heroic mythology as a body of doctrine, a kind of ἐπικὸς κύκλος, to be filled up from the various poets (συμπληροϊμένος ἐκ διαφόρων.

The uncertainty of Homeric accent may be further seen in two small groups of words:

(1) The Nominatives in -α (derived from Vocatives) are regularly accented like the forms in -ος: so ἤτοιο, αἰχμάτῳ, θύετα, ἀναρχάια. But the three isolated forms εὐρόμα, μετίετα, διάματα are proparoxytone. The reason is that in the absence of analogy they readily fell under the general 'regressive' accent.

(2) The names of the towns Πλοῖος (II. 2. 504), Ἀθηναίος (II. 2. 647); and Ἰέρω, and of the river Κάρθας (II. 12. 20) were so accented by Aristarchus, who followed the literary tradition. But the local forms, as we are told, were Πλοῖος (?), Ἀθηναῖος, Ἰέρω, Κάρθας. It can hardly be doubted that the local mode of pronunciation was generally right.
ποιητῶν), as a theology is constructed from texts. On the contrary it is evident that his point of view is that of the most critical of modern historians. He studied the forms and conceptions of literature, and especially of the epic, in the same spirit of scientific detachment with which Aristotle analysed the morals and politics of Greece. It need hardly be added here that he gave no countenance to the allegorical methods of interpretation.

6. Of the numerous observations and discoveries of Aristarchus which do not fall under any of the preceding heads the most considerable are those which relate to the history, geography, and antiquities of the Homeric age.

Aristarchus wrote a separate treatise (σύγγραμμα) on the Greek camp before Troy (περὶ τῶν Ναυστάθμων), in which he discussed the topography and the arrangement of the different contingents: in particular the assertion in the doubtful line II. 2. 558 of the Athenian claim to Salamis. In other writings we find him noticing the wide sense of the Homeric "Ἀργος, in contrast to the limited use of Ἑλλῆνες and the absence of such important names as ‘Peloponnesus’ and ‘Thessaly’: besides sundry local names mentioned in the Catalogue and elsewhere. In this connexion we may place the recurring scholiwm ὅτι ἄρος ὁ Ὀλύμπως, i.e. that ‘Olympus’ in the Iliad has all the characteristics of a mountain, being in fact the real mountain of that name which rises from the plain of Thessaly into the upper aether, the abode of the heavenly gods. Regarding the Odyssey, however, the rational view was first attained, doubtless from the scientific rather than the literary side of the question, by Eratosthenes, who pointed out that Homer’s knowledge of geography was really very limited—that he was ignorant of the rivers and nations of the Euxine, the mouths of the Nile, &c.—consequently that the wanderings of Ulysses must be imaginary. In this view he was followed, as we might expect, by Aristarchus: while the opposite opinion was maintained by Crates and his school. The question is so far of interest that the supposed Homeric localities show the direction that Greek trade and colonisation were taking when the identifications were made.

7. It remains to notice the service rendered by Aristarchus in pointing out the manifold difference between Homeric and later Greece in all the arts and observances of life. The list of topics as given by Lehrs is a long one: but perhaps he is right in thinking that they are only a small part of the observations made. It will be enough to mention a few of the points referred to in the scholia:
Homer's ignorance of writing—σημεῖα are 'signs,' not 'letters,' and γράφω means only to 'scratch,' not yet to 'write' (see the Schol. on II. 6. 169, 176, 7. 175, 187).

The use of two-horse (not four-horse) chariots in war (8. 185); the non-use of cavalry—riding being only heard of as a show performance (κελητιζεσ, 15. 679).

The restriction of athletic contests to funeral games (the only ἀγώνες then known): also the character of the prizes, and the fact that they were given to all the competitors (22. 164, 23. 659, 707).

The use of the sceptre in all public speaking (18. 505).

The rare occurrence of wind instruments—the ἀθλός only in the Doloneia and the Shield of Achilles (10. 13, 18. 495), the σύρφης only in 10. 13, the σάλπηρfts not used in war (18. 219).

The armour—the size of the shield (6. 117), the use of the τελακάω, the order of putting on arms (3. 324, 11. 32, 19. 380): the question of the δώρης (4. 133, 135, 187).

Meals and cooking—the Homeric διννόν a midday meal (the later ἄρεννον), while 'supper' in Homer was δόρπος (18. 560): the exclusive use of roasted meat, though boiling was known (21. 362 describes boiling water): the eating of fish, which according to the Chorizontes distinguished the Odyssey from the Iliad (16. 747).

The casting (not drawing) of lots (7. 182).

The use of barter in default of coined money (7. 473).

Marriage customs: the ἀνα not a dowry, but the price of the bride (9. 146, &c.).

The ritual of sacrifice: the cutting of 'raw meat' from each part (1. 461): the burning of the thighs (1. 464): the dragging backwards of the victim (2. 422): the mixing of wine in making a treaty (3. 270).

The non-use of crowns (13. 736).
V. THE TIME AND PLACE OF HOMER.


It appears from the preceding chapters that there is a considerable body of testimony carrying back our knowledge of the text of Homer almost to the time of the earliest Greek prose writers, or (roughly speaking) to the fifth century B.C. On the one hand we have the apparatus criticus of Aristarchus, which included the oldest recensions; on the other hand we have the quotations, from Herodotus onwards. There is therefore, as has been said, an ancient vulgate, which can be reached by external and on the whole trustworthy evidence. But somewhere about the fifth century the stream of direct evidence runs dry. The poems of Homer, we know, are much more ancient. They are anterior to the long series of Cyclic poems; and these begin with the poetry that flourished at Miletus in the eighth century. They are anterior to Hesiod and his school—a school which followed Homer as prose elsewhere comes after verse. They are older than the great festivals, at some of which they came to be recited. And they are doubtless much older than the schools of Ionian philosophy, which saw in them a danger to public morals. There is therefore a long period during which the history of the Homeric text can no longer be followed in manuscripts or even in quotations. During that period two processes must have gone on, not quite independently. In the first place, the language was changing, as every language does, and the result was an ever-widening difference between the dialect of the poems and the spoken dialects of Greece. In the second place, the spoken dialects re-acted on the poems. Sounds which had been modified or lost in the living speech were not preserved by the rhapsodists or in the written copies. And both grammatical forms and syntax were more or less consistently modernised.

The argument for the antiquity of the Homeric dialect cannot be stated briefly, since it depends on the cumulative effect of a number of minute differences of form or usage. It will be enough here to mention a few of the most convincing:

1) The second aorists show a remarkable diminution. Those of the common thematic form (such as ἔβαλον) number about eighty in
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Homer, reduced to thirty in Attic prose. Two smaller groups, viz. the non-thematic middle forms (ἰβλητῷ, ἰφθῖτῳ, χῦτῳ, λεῖτῳ, ἀλτῷ, &c.), and the reduplicated aorists (δίδασκεῖν, ληλαβόσθαι, &c.) disappear altogether.

The forms of the present tense in -ημι and -νμι are almost confined to Homer.

(2) The variation between 'strong' and 'weak' grades of roots, of which Attic retains only a few survivals: (φαινεῖν, ἴημεν, &c.), is still almost regular in the Homeric perfect (ἐπέκτιβεν, Πηκὼν, πέφοιτε, γέγημεν, μέγατε, ἀραφῶ, μεμακοῦ, &c.).

(3) The subjunctive of all non-thematic Tenses is still formed regularly with a short vowel, as ι-ομέν, φθι-έται, ηδ-ομέν, ἄλασσο-όμεν, &c.

(4) The free use of prepositions as adverbs, or separated from the verbs to which they belong (Tmesis), is common in Homer, and practically unknown afterwards.

Among the Homeric constructions with prepositions may be noted the dative with σῶς, μετά, ἀνά, περί, ἀμφί.

(5) The use of the article is essentially post-Homeric.

(6) The uses of the Moods, as was observed by Aristarchus (see p. 451), are in several respects quite distinct.

(7) The Particles show many differences: cp. Homeric καί (for ἦσ), ἀντὶ and ἀντὶ, ὅσα, ὧν, περὶ, θν, &c.: and post-Homeric καίτων, τοῖς, ἄλλα (either), καίτης.

(8) Inflectional forms are somewhat less decisive, since they may be imitated or borrowed. But no such account can be given of the numberless forms which we find in Homer: e.g. the third plural in -ν for -σων, and in -αται, -ατο (Attic -αται, -ατο), the aorists in -σα, the thematic aorists (ἐβοῦλον, &c.), the forms without augment, the subjunctive in -ωμι, -γων, the infinitives in -μετα and -μεν, the masc. nouns in -τα, the dative plural in -σων, the instrumental in φης, the genitives in -ων, -ἀν, -ἀνν, &c. Cp. also the post-Homeric τεβίσσαι, διδόσαι, τεβίναι, διδόναι, ἱστάναι, &c.

These facts are enough to show that we have to do with two forms of Greek that are not merely different dialects, but belong to stages or periods of the language separated by a long development. The length of the interval cannot be exactly determined, because the rate of change is as uncertain in the field of linguistic as in that of geology; but it must be measured by centuries.

Moreover, the force of the argument is not seriously impaired by the circumstance,—of which however we are bound to take account,—that the language of Homer was a poetical dialect, differing more or less from the spoken language of the time. It is evident in many
ways that this was so. Much of the vocabulary is made up of epithets appropriated as titles of honour to particular deities or heroes. Thus Zeus is εὐρίσκως, αἰγλόκος, ἀρχικαρπός: Athene is γλακέπης, τριγυνέα: Apollo is ἵματος, Ἴδως, παύων, ἐμυθεὺς: Hephaestus is ἀμφώθης, κυλλοποδίως: Eos is ἄργυρεια: Ares is ἐναλικός: Persephone is ἐπαυμῆ: a hero is ἄμμων, δίαφρος, ἐμμαλητῆς—all of these being unfamiliar words, and hardly understood, as far as we can judge, by the poet himself. The same may be said of the epithets νόδωμος (which is in reality a νος πιθή], Ἰμμος ὀδός, δαλυχόστος (γγχος), and of sundry fixed phrases—πτολέμαι γέφυραν, μερόπαι Ἀθηράπων, νυκτός ἀμολγη, ὁμοίου πτολέμου, ἀβανοπην καὶ ἔβαν, also the sacrificial terms μῆρα, αἰερύων, ἀμαβτήσταν. Again, it may be seen that some of the characteristic inflexions of the Homeric dialect are in fact pre-Homeric. A good instance of this may be seen in the genitives in -οιο, -οο (for -οο), -οι. These three forms are successive phonetic stages, which cannot have co-existed in a genuine spoken dialect. When the stage -ωι had been reached, therefore, the others could only survive as archaism. The facts are entirely in agreement with this inference. The regular form is -οι, for which the poet frequently uses the poetical -οι: while the intermediate -οο was confined to a few phrases. Accordingly -οιο is especially used in the words upon which the poetical effect depends: e.g. in the first hundred lines of the Iliad, στίμμα θεοῦ, πολυφλοκβνο, χωμίνοι, ἄργυροι βιοί, ἐπὶ χθεὶ δερκομινο. On the other hand the form in -οιο is comparatively rare in the declension of pronouns. Thus we have τοῦτον ten times, τοῦτο sixteen times, οῦ (relative) twelve times, δο (rel.) twice; but never the corresponding forms in -οιο. Probably also the genitives in -αιο and in -αιοω were archaic. Those in -αιο are mostly proper names; which are peculiarly apt to retain old-fashioned forms. Similarly it is probable that instrumental forms in -φι(ν) were no longer used in living speech. They are chiefly found in conventional phrases. The same considerations should perhaps be applied whenever a contracted and an uncontracted form of the same word subsist together: e.g. φιλεύ and φιλιτι. They certainly hold of the

1 Two cases have to be distinguished:

(1) When a contraction is established it becomes the ordinary or prose form of the word: e.g. the form προσηύδεα is so constantly used at the end of the line, and in fixed phrases (like εἰς περικτη προσηύδα), that the προσηύδα introduced by some modern editors is a mere falsification.

(2) Vowels which have not coalesced so as to form a diphthong may occasionally be so pronounced together as to form one syllable for the metre. So in Homer ού, οῦ, οῦ, and so in the Attic scansion of θείς, πόλειως, &c. This however is evidently of the nature of a metrical licence, and does not represent the ordinary pronunciation. It seems probable that in Homeric Greek οῦ, οῦ, οῦ were never contracted. So in Latin deinde is poetically a trochee, but is not one in prose.
often discussed group of verbs in –αι, since ὑπὲ, ὑπὲς, &c. are quite as frequent as the resolved or 'distracted' forms ὑπέω, ὑπές, &c. Of the latter indeed it may be said, not only that they are peculiar to the poetical dialect, but that they arose in that dialect, and never existed in any other.

It will be seen that, when all due allowance has been made for archaic or pre-Homeric elements, the relation in which the Homeric language stands to later Greek is not materially affected. The distinctive features of a poetical or literary dialect lie very much on the surface. They consist in the use of a number of borrowed or imitated words, with a few survivals of the most familiar inflexions. The differences between Homeric and later Greek are not confined to vocabulary or inflexions, but affect the whole structure of the language.

§ 2. Restoration of the original form of Homer.

It appears then that between the earliest date to which we can assign the existing text of Homer and the age in which the poems themselves were composed there is an interval for which we have no external evidence. Can this want be supplied in any measure by the internal evidence of the poems themselves? Briefly, can we argue back from the ancient vulgate to the original Homer?

1. The first attempts in this direction were suggested by the discovery of the digamma. Much progress has been made in 'restoring the digamma,' i.e. in emending the passages in which it cannot be at once replaced. Even now, however, it is not quite certain that the sound in question (v or y) was still heard in the period of the Iliad and Odyssey. Some scholars hold that it was treated like the French h aspiré, which is no longer pronounced, but in certain words has the force of a real consonant. However this may be—whether there was loss of a sound, or only neglect of a traditional hiatus—there is no doubt that a number of small changes were made in the text in consequence.

2. Another important change affecting the sounds of the Homeric dialect was first pointed out by P. Kretschmer. He observed that the Ionic change of ā to η necessarily took place, not only in Greek

---

2 For Wackernagel's theory of these forms see his discussion in Bess. Beitr. iv. 259 ff. (H. G. § 55).
3 In Kuhn's Zeitschrift, xxxi. 285 ff.
words, but also in foreign words adopted by the Ionians. The reason
why it is not made in such words as Δαρείος or Μιθρεῖος is that they
did not become known to the Ionians till the period of change from ά
to η had passed. Now the Medes were originally Μάδος, as they are
on the monument of Idalium: consequently the change of ά to η
must have taken place after they became known to the Ionian Greeks.
It follows a fortiori that in Homeric times the ά was still heard. The
same argument applies to Μιλεῖος, the Carian Μλατεύς: the η in that
name must be later than the first acquaintance of the Ionians with the
coast of Asia Minor.

3. If the original Homeric ά became η, it would follow that the
changes which produced ά in certain Ionic words are also later than
Homer. As is well known, the reason that ά in τάε, πάοσ, &c. did not
become η is that when that phonetic process took place the words
were still τάε, πάοσ, &c. These then are to be regarded as the true
Homeric forms. And if ούο had not then passed into οο, we must
suppose that οο and οο were still heard in τούς, τοθέν, and similar
words, especially as these forms are found in some dialects (Argolic,
Cretan, Cyprian).

4. The Homeric forms of the subjunctive show a want of symmetry
which cannot be regarded as the original state of the text. The non-
thematic tenses (including the perfect and first aorist) form the sub-
jective with a short vowel, ε or ο, in all cases in which the quantity
of the vowel is secured by the metre; but with a long vowel, η or ο, 
whenever the metre is not affected. Thus we find σημειε, σήσε, but
σημε, σήσσι; and so σημομαι and σήστατα, but σησομάθε, σήσωστα.
It is evident that originally the inflexions were regular, σημ, σήσες, &c. :
then the analogy of the thematic conjugation (λέει, λέγει, &c.) brought
in the long vowel whenever it was metrically possible.

5. The forms of the dative plural in -ος and -ης or -ος appear to
be post-Homeric, since in the great majority of instances the metre
allows elision (-οι', -ηι'). Where this is not so it is generally possible
to correct the text so as to restore the original -οι, -ηι.

6. The forms η γ (from εί ἐγ) and ἐπιγ (from ἐωι ἐγ) are in all
probability post-Homeric. With ει and εια Homeric usage some-
times requires ει or κει, sometimes not: hence, as has been pointed
out elsewhere, it is highly significant to find that in cases of the
former kind ἐπιγ is followed by a vowel, so that we can read ἐοι α',

* Cp. the Cretan Μιλεῖος (Cauer, Delectus Inscript. 193 121).
* Monro, Homeric Grammar, § 361 (ed. 2).
while in those of the latter kind the next word begins with a consonant and ἑνί can stand.

7. The adverbs ὅς and τῶς appear in Homer with a trochaic scansion, which is explained by the fact that they were originally ᾳφος, ἀφος. In this case the remarkable point is that the Attic form held possession of the text although it involved a glaring violation of metre.

These examples—which could easily be multiplied—will show the nature of the reasoning by which it is possible to recover some of the characteristic features of the older Homeric language. The process, as will be seen, is one of analysis and induction, chiefly from the facts of Homeric metre. Accordingly it is essentially imperfect. It may succeed if there are metrical phenomena from which to argue: it generally fails where these phenomena are wanting. This being so, it follows that no re-construction of the primitive Homeric text can be adequate or scientific. It must consist of a mixture, in unknown proportions, of forms which have been restored with more or less probability by the methods now in question, and forms to which these methods cannot be applied.

§ 3. Relation of epic to other dialects.

The ancient grammarians, who studied the several dialects employed in literature, but who probably had little acquaintance with local varieties of speech, described the language of Homer as 'epic' and 'Ionic,'—epic as being the vehicle of epic poetry, Ionic because it most nearly resembled the dialect of the Ionian historians, medical writers and philosophers. For such Homeric forms as were not Ionic they had recourse to other dialects, from which they supposed Homer to have borrowed. Thus the genitives in -ον were said to be Thessalian (Schol. A on II. 11. 35) or Boeotian (Eust. p. 140, 41); those in -αιο were accounted Boeotian (Schol. A on II. 11. 306), those in -αιο Aeolic or Boeotian (Schol. T on II. 19. 1), the datives in -ου Αeolic (Schol. T on II. 1. 4). Of the pronouns, the forms ἰαμος, ἰαμος(ο), ἰιμος, ἰμος, ἰμος(ο), ἰμο were recognised as Aeolic, and therefore had the Aeolic accent and breathing. The same account was given of the accent of ἄλλος and ἄμος, also of ἰπανθοςα, ἰπανθοςος, ἰλαπενος, ἰλαπενος, ἰπανθοςα, and sundry other words. These words, the grammarians held, were taken by Homer from Aeolic and other
dialects in order to give elevation and poetical colour to his verse. In this way it was thought that the epic dialect was formed—a dialect based upon that of Ionia, with a considerable admixture from the neighbouring Aeolis, and a few words from more distant parts of Greece. It need hardly be said that no poetical dialect has ever been created in such a fashion as this.

The first attempt to treat this subject in a scientific manner was made a few years ago by Aug. Fick, in his work on the Odyssey. His view, briefly stated, is that the original home of Homeric poetry was Smyrna, which was an Aeolian settlement down to about 700 B.C. When it became Ionian, the poems, he believes, were brought to Chios, and there—probably as late as 540 B.C.—were translated into Ionic, so far as the vocabulary and metre of the two dialects allowed this to be done. The proof of this theory he finds partly in the digamma, which was lost in Ionic Greek at a comparatively early time, and partly in the circumstance that the Aeolisms of Homer are mostly words which have no exact metrical equivalents in Ionic: e.g. ἄστρειθα, Ion. ἄστρεῖθα: λάδε, Ion. λαές: κόνεσσι, Ion. κοισί: νυμφα, Ion. νυμφη: δόμαναι and δόμεν, Ion. δομίνα: ομηρίς, Ion. ομηρής: ἀμμεν(ν), Ion. ἀμών: κε(ν), Ion. ἀρ. In such cases, translation being impossible, the original Aeolic was retained.

Fick's views are professedly determined in great part by quasi-historical data,—the stories of Homer's birth at Smyrna, with the notices about the Homeridae in Chios, and the recitation of the poems by Cynaethus. We have seen how worthless all the evidence of this kind is (pp. 398-402). On the other side must be set the inherent improbability of such a translation or rifacimento as Fick imagines. Nothing is more marked in Greek literature than the intimate association between literary form and dialect, and the fidelity with which a dialect once employed is adhered to by subsequent authors in the same genre. It may be admitted that a poetical dialect does not remain quite unchanged—that it is liable to be gradually modified by the influence of the ever-changing colloquial speech. And in the early times, when writing was little used, this influence would be especially operative. But that a great body of Aeolic poetry, famous as such down to the sixth century B.C., should then have been deliberately re-cast in an Ionic dress is most unlikely. If Homer was so dealt with, why not Sappho and Alcaeus?

Nor is the linguistic evidence really decisive. Fick's conclusion depends upon the premises (1) that New Ionic forms are adopted whenever the metre admits them, and (2) that the older forms pre-
served by the metre are Aeolic. Neither contention is quite borne out by the facts. The text has ἄρω, &c., not Ionic ἄρεῖο, ἄτογα, not Ionic ἄτογα: πᾶς, πότε, &c., not κὰς, κίνε, &c.: ἄμμω, ἄμμω, as well as Ionic ἄμμω, ἄμμω: Aeolic ἐνοοῖγμοι, but Ionic εἰνοοῖφυλλοι. Again, if the metre preserved Aeolic Ἀτρείδαι, μοναδώ, λῶς and the like, it also preserved the Old Ionic νῆσος, ἄδησ, ἄδησ, δῆμος, κλης, ἄμμος, ἄμμος, instead of the equivalent Aeolic νῆσος (or νῶς), ἄδησ, &c. And if it preserved πτωκός and ἄπτωκός, why did it not preserve μετάμαρτιος, ἰδίαςωτες, ἤδικοι, μαμάκωσι;?

If however the supposed change of dialect is not placed in the sixth century B.C. or in the Ionian colonies, the problem becomes a very different one. Mr. Leaf assumes as a probable hypothesis that a body of Epic poetry, originally composed in an Aeolic dialect, was carried to Asia and there passed through 'an Ionian development,' which lasted perhaps from the ninth to the seventh century B.C. This is a view which is free from the most obvious improbability of Fick's theory, viz. the sudden change of dialect. But it sweeps away most of the linguistic evidence upon which Fick relied. Instead of comparing an Aeolic supposed to be akin to that of Alcaeus and Sappho with the Ionic of the sixth century, we have now to compare what we know or can guess of an Aeolic and an Ionic anterior to the Aeolian and Ionian colonisation. For the problem is this: having reconstructed the primitive dialect of the Iliad and Odyssey, to determine the group of dialects to which it most akin, and the part of Greece in which it was spoken.

A few examples will show how much of the linguistic argument suffers by this way of stating the question. Fick's main point was that the digamma is wanting in the earliest known Ionic: but this proves nothing for the Ionic of the age of Homer. He contended that the Homeric dialect must have been an ἄ-dialect, i.e. one in which ἄ did not change to η: but the Ionic of Homeric times, as we have seen, was an ἄ-dialect. He showed that the endings -αο, -αω, which the metre protected from alteration, were in fact Boeotian and Thessalian: but the Ionic -εω, -εω presuppose -αο, -αω, or some metrical equivalent. Again, the pronouns ἄμμω and ἄμμω are Lesbian, the Ionic forms being ἰμας, ἰμας: but we may substitute ἰμε, ἰμε, which are justified by the Homeric ἰμες, ἰμες, and moreover are Doric and Boeotian. When-
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6 Kretschmer has shown (K. Z. xxxi. p. 205) that in Attic the loss of F, even in the combination of ρF, was later than the change of η to η. For the η of κόρη, διή points to κόρή, διή: cp. κόρη from κόρη. So κοντέρος, στενότερος (instead of -στερος) point to κοντέρος, στενότερος.
ever, in short, the Homeric forms are found to belong to the original stock of the language, it is at least possible that they survived in Ionic, without such a change as would affect the metre, down to the time of Homer. Consequently there is no good ground for assigning them to Aeolic.

There are however one or two of Fick's arguments to which the foregoing remarks do not apply.

1. The forms of the dative plural in -eos (εύν-εσι, ἄνδρεσι, &c.) were apparently formed on the analogy of ἔσσι, βέλεσι, &c. They are obviously due to the desire or tendency to keep the same stem in all case-forms: e.g. πάντ-εσι is preferred to πάνι because it is more like πάντ-ες, πάντ-ευ, &c. In Homer they are nearly as numerous as those in -ας, and accordingly there are very many doubles like κατι and κόινις, ἀνδρας and ἄνδρεσι, both evidently belonging to the colloquial speech of the time. Thus Homer holds a middle place between Ionic, which does not admit -εσι except under Homeric influence, and the Aeolic dialects—Lesbian and Boeotian—which rarely use the older forms in -ας. On the other hand the Arcado-Cyprian or 'South Achaean' dialect has -ας, which is also the regular ending in Doric. These facts evidently do not determine the affinities of the Homeric dialect. At most they suggest that in the matter of the use of -εσι the Homeric dialect tends in the direction of Aeolic, or at least not in that of Ionic.

2. A similar indication may be drawn from the forms of the perfect participle with the endings -ως, -οντος, of which there are one or two examples in Homer (viz. κελήγοντες, κεκόπωσ). The change from -ες, -ότος was universal in Lesbian and Boeotian, also in Syracusean Doric. Fick would extend it in Homer to all the forms now written with -ωτος: thus he would write γεγόντες, μεμόρισες. But this cannot be carried far in Homer. It can only produce a few anomalies; and these merely illustrate the general tendency to substitute thematic for non-thematic inflexion.

3. The apocope of prepositions, i.e. the use of the forms ἄν, κατ, παρ, ἄν, &c. is a feature of Homeric Greek in which it agrees with all the dialects except Ionic. It is not carried so far in Homer as (e.g.) in Lesbian, where the full form κατα is not found in use. Similarly προτι and προτε are non-Ionic.

4. The Homeric infinitive endings -μαλα, -μα, -αι (for -φης), -εις, -ειν are all apparently primitive, and are variously distributed among the later Greek dialects. Thus we find Lesbian -μαλα in non-thematic tenses, and -η (Ion. -ειν) in thematic tenses: Boeotian
and Thessalian -μευ: Arcado-Cyprian and Homeric -φεμα (non-
thetic); Arcadian and Doric -ν. New developments are seen in
Ionic -να (διδώμα, &c.), Lesbian -ν (for -να in μεθύσθην, γεγίσθη, &c.).
Among these should be reckoned Homeric -ερωμα, i.e. the extension
of -μενα to thematic forms; also Homeric, Thessalian and Boeotian
-εμευ. This extension—not found in Lesbian or Doric—departs from
the original type of noun formation. In such forms as τρυπέ-μεσ-κα or
φυπέ-μεν the thematic vowel does not come from an actual or possible
noun-stem (with suffix -men), but from the analogy of the verb. Thus
the evidence of these infinitive forms goes to show that in this point
Lesbian is more primitive than Homer. The development of -ερωμα
in the Homeric dialect and -εμευ in Thessalian and Boeotian were
probably independent.

5. The Homeric language possesses two particles, ἕ and κε(ν),
which, as has been shown elsewhere ¹, differ slightly in meaning.
They are both employed with the freedom and accuracy characteristic
of the use of such words in living speech. In the later dialects they
are separated: ἕ only is found in Attic and Ionic, κε(ν) only in the
three north Aeolic dialects. Fick indeed contends that ἕ is not
originally Homeric, and proposes a series of excisions and corrections
to get rid of it. But, apart from the probability that it is identical
with the an of Latin and Gothic, and therefore in any case proto-
Hellenic ², there is a strong argument for it in the fact that it is the
usual conditional particle in the Arcadian dialect, where there are also
traces of the use of κε(ν). This suggests that both ἕ and κε(ν) are
proto-Hellenic, and that while ἕ was lost in the Aeolic of northern
Greece (as also in Doric), κε(ν) died out in the Peloponnesus, as well
as in Attica and Ionia. However this may be, ἕ and κε(ν) cannot
serve as a shibboleth to distinguish Ionic from non-Ionic Greek. The
appearance of both in Homer points not to later intermixture, but
to the antiquity and independence of the dialect.

6. The primitive ἦς (3 Sing. Impf. of εἶπε) is found in Arcado-
Cyprian and Boeotian, as well as in Doric: but the original Homeric
forms are ἦς and ἦς. ³ As these are later than ἦς we may count this
as an instance in which Homer does not present the oldest Greek.
The metre excludes the possibility of exchange of forms.

A similar case may be seen in the Thessalian and Arcadian τός for

¹ Monro, Homeric Grammar, § 361.
² See Leo Meyer, 'AN im Griechischen, Latinischen und Gotischen, Berlin
³ Leo Meyer in Kuhn's Zeitschrift ix. 386: Nauck, Mélanges grécoc-rom. iii. 290.
FICK'S THEORY

τος, which was doubtless originally a sentence-doublet, τος standing before vowels and τος before consonants. So too the infinitive in -ει is Arcadian as well as Doric.

7. Examples of agreement between Homeric and Ionic may perhaps be found in the iterative tenses in -ενομ, the adverbs in -δον (πρεπενωτικον, διαφθόν, ἔμπολον, &c. in Hdt.), the particle μέν = the Attic µέν. In all these cases the form is guaranteed by the metre.

These facts do not carry us far in the endeavour to localise the ancient epic language. They indicate, indeed, that it was closely akin to several members of the group called Aeolic by Strabo (viii. 513), which included not only the three dialects universally recognized as such, but also Arcadian. But they do not identify it with any one dialect of the group.

Moreover, it cannot be said that the Attic-Ionic dialects are separated by any sound linguistic criterion from the group in question. Their most salient points are the loss of f and the change of α to η; but both these changes have been shown to be post-Homeric. The same may be said a fortiori of such Aeolic peculiarities as the loss of the dual (supposed by Fick to have taken place between the ninth and the seventh century), the extension of the verbs in -ει (φιλειμ, δοκειμ, &c.), the barytone accentuation (which is attributed only to Lesbian), the loss of the rough breathing and of ν θυλευστικον. In the last two points the innovation is common to Lesbian and New Ionic—just as θυ for συ is common to Boeotian and Attic. On the other hand the retention of the dative plural in -οι and of the particle ἂν are points which do much to connect Ionic and Arcado-Cyprian.


The linguistic phenomena seem to point, by faint but definite indications, to a chain of kindred dialects extending from Thessaly—or (after the Aeolian colonisation) from Lesbos—to the Peloponnesus, if not to Crete and Cyprus, and probably including the Ionic of Attica and Euboea. How does this agree with such data as we can glean from Homer on the one hand, and the monuments of pre-historic Greece on the other?

The testimony of Homer is clear on one great issue. He describes an expedition in which every town and district of Greece bore a part, from the Argos which was afterwards Thessaly to the Argos which

II. H h
became Peloponnesus, from Ithaca in the west to Euboea in the east. To the army so formed was opposed an army of Trojans and their allies. And the chief difference between them is described in the Iliad with the vividness as of one who was there, and heard if he did not see the meeting of the hosts. It lay in this, that the Greeks, who spoke a single language, advanced in silence, while on the Trojan side was a babel of many tongues (Il. 4. 437-438):

οὐ γὰρ πάνων ἦν ὅμος θρόος οὔτ' ἐν γῷρυσ,
ἐλλὰ γάλασσον ὕμιμυκτο, πολύλαθος δ' ἕσων ἄθρας.

So in the Odyssey, in the well-known passage about the five peoples of the island of Crete, the 'Achaeanas' (Ἀχαιοὶ) are contrasted on the ground of difference of language with the other four (Od. 19. 175 ff.):

ἐλθεὶ δ' ἐλιού γάλασσα μεμεγήν ὑπὸ μὲν Ἀχαιοί,
ἐν δ' Ἔπειρησας κτλ.

What then was the language of these Homeric 'Achaeanas'? Of what civilisation, of what literature, was it the organ?

These are questions that have acquired a new significance from the discoveries of the last twenty-five years. It may be regarded as certain that, whatever amount of historical truth there is in the story of the Trojan war, the Homeric poems are a mirror of the age to which they belong, and reflect, not only the arts and industries, the institutions and beliefs of that age, but also the political condition of the then Greek world. The picture drawn in the Iliad of an array of contingents from all parts of Greece united under the military command of an 'emperor' or Bretwalda, to whom the many tribal 'kings' are in a species of feudal vassalage, must have answered to a real state of things. This inference is amply confirmed by the wonderful series of monuments unearthed by Schliemann and those who are carrying on his work. The Homeric empire of Agamemnon—a king of Mycene 'ruling over many isles and all Argos'—has

10 'The Iliad speaks of A great king of Mykēnē as warring on the coast of Asia. To one who knew Greece only from Herodotus and Thucydides the story would seem absurd. In their pages Mykēnē appears utterly insignificant... But go to the place itself, look at the wonderful remains of early magnificence which are still there, and the difficulty at once vanishes. Legend and archaeology between them have kept alive a truth which history has lost. We may fairly set down the Pelopid dynasty as a real dynasty' (Freeman, Historical Essays, II. p. 61). These words were written long before Schliemann's discoveries, but fully apply to them. They may be extended to other places celebrated in Homer, especially Orchomenos (II. 9. 381):

'The King of Mykēnē who reigned over many islands and all Argos was as it were the Bretwalda of Hellas, Basileus in the later as well as in the earlier sense' (Freeman, Comparative Politics, p. 304).
found its historical antitype in the 'Mycenaean' civilisation. In the period occupied by that civilisation it is easy to place a drama like that of the Iliad, of which the often-renewed strife of East and West furnishes the back-ground. In the Odyssey, too, as has been already noticed (p. 336), there are all the signs of a condition of tranquillity which implies the presence of some central power controlling the chivalrous and restless tribes of Greece. That this Homeric polity is essentially 'Mycenaean'—that is to say, that it is not separated by any long interval or serious breach of continuity from the period of the Mycenaean remains—appears now to be the general opinion of archaeologists and historians. It cannot be accidental that hitherto these remains have been chiefly found in the countries most prominent in Homer—Argolis, Laconia, Attica, Boeotia, Thessaly, Crete. It is also clear that the Mycenaean civilisation is contrasted at every point with that of Dorian Greece: and accordingly we find that in the period depicted by Homer the Dorians had not entered or even seriously threatened the Peloponnesus. Eventually this pre-Dorian Homeric empire was over-mastered and destroyed by the descent of the northern tribes, the

---

11 The chief facts on which this judgement is based are given by Mr. Percy Gardner (see p. 337, n. 18), and by Busolt, Griech. Gesch. 1, pp. 53–126. Busolt regards the Homeric civilisation as later than the Mycenaean,—as simpler, at a lower stage of technical development, but also less under oriental influence. In some matters—funeral customs, dress, armour—he notes marked differences, but along with these he finds manifold links and transitional features connecting the two periods (op. cit. p. 113). Both writers recognize that the Mycenaean culture was Hellenic, and that it was that of the pre-Dorian inhabitants, the ancestors of the Aeolians and Ionians.

More recently the question has been discussed by Paul Cauer, in his book Grundfragen der Homerkritik. He notices, as evidence of post-Mycenaean or late Mycenaean date, (1) the sitting image of Athene mentioned in II. 6, 273, (2) the σιμάρα λυγαδα in the story of Bellerophon, which imply some form of writing, (3) the use of iron, (4) the custom of burning the dead, and (5) the more restricted use of chariots in war (we do not hear of squadrons of chariots). In his view, however, the Homeric culture is not to be treated as that of a single uniform period. He seeks rather to show how far observations of such things may serve to distinguish earlier from later strata in the composition of the poems, applying the method to (1) the use of iron, (2) ὅθωα—as to which he proves in an interesting discussion that the Homeric period was one of transition: and (3) the temples mentioned in Homer, of which the chief instances are in II. v–vii.

Since this was written the whole subject has been fully treated by Mr. Ridgeway in his new book on The Early Age of Greece, vol. 1: see p. 484 (infra).

12 The flight of Tydeus from Aetolia to Argos may be interpreted as a symptom that in the time of Homer the Aetolian invaders were pressing upon north-western Greece, occupying places like Calydon and Pleuron, which were associated with famous events in heroic Greece. Another trace may be seen in the name of the Eleans (II. 11, 671), which occurs only once in Homer, in a long and probably spurious speech of Nestor. The Dorians, if we may argue from the mention in the Odyssey (19, 177), reached Crete before they were able to enter the Peloponnesus. They are described as non-Achaean in respect of language.
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Dorians and Aetolians, who drove out the inhabitants—the Homeric Αχαιοί or Αργείοι—from the greater part of the Peloponnesus.

If the Homeric poems, and the early Greek culture which they bring before us so fully and vividly, are to be identified as Mycenaean (in the archaeological sense), it becomes more than probable that the language of Homer was the dominant language of the same great period. That there was a language of government may be taken for granted: and if so it is not likely that the language of poetry was materially different. The Dorian conquest, like the barbarian invasions of the Roman empire, had the effect of breaking down the ascendancy of the official and literary language, and giving independent importance to a number of local varieties, such as grow up when a single language is spoken over a wide area. Thus instead of the one Homeric or (as we may call it) ‘Old Achaean’ tongue, we find several dialects, of which some were brought by the invaders, and some were the forms assumed by the ‘Old Achaean’ in the different provinces. It is surely a confirmation of this view of the epic language that the area covered by these pre-Dorian dialects is almost exactly the same as the area over which the traces of Mycenaean civilisation have now been discovered. In the Mycenaean period the parent Achaean was doubtless spoken over a continuous territory, extending from Thessaly to the Peloponnesus,—not as in historical times dislocated and interrupted by the invaders from the north and the west.

If these conclusions are accepted, the main division of the Greek dialects is into Dorian and non-Dorian. The Ionians in early times occupied much of the Peloponnesus, and their affinity with the Peloponnesian Achaeans is expressed in the ancient genealogy which made Ion and Achaean the sons of Xuthus, while Xuthus, Aeolus, and Dorus were the sons of Hellen. This genealogy goes back to the Hesiodic Ἐτών (fr. 25 Kinkel):

Εὔνωμος δ' ἐγένετο θεομαχόλος Βασιλεὺς
Διόρος τε Εὐθύς τε καὶ Ἀεολος ἤρεχθότεν.

The name of Αχαιοί, son of Xuthus and brother of Ion, refers doubtless to the Achaeans of north Peloponnesus, where they were mythically associated with the Ionians. It is all the more significant since in later times the Achaean dialect seems to have been a northern Dorian—one of those which became important for a time through the influence of the Achaean and Aetolian leagues. The name, however, may fairly be extended to denote the dialects of pre-Dorian Peloponnesus, as well as those of which the Achaeans of Phthiotis are the remnant. Hence the classification made by Hoffmann into North Achaean—sc. the three Aeolic dialects,— and South Achaean, sc. Arcadian and Cyprian: the latter being colonists, not presumably of the Arcadians, but of some kindred population on the coast of the Peloponnesus (Busolt, Gr. Gesch. I. p. 114, n. 3). It is worth notice that various
Phthiotis was of the same linguistic group, only diverging from the
rest with time and distance. To this group, then, the Homeric
language must have originally belonged, emerging from it as the
great languages of the world have emerged from local dialects,—as
the Italian language, for example, was formed from the popular
speech of Tuscany. On the other hand, the Dorians and the
ancestors of other northern tribes—Aetolians, Eleans, Thessalians,
perhaps Boeotians—lay outside the limits of the 'Mycenaean' empire,
or at least on its more distant confines. They may have been to
Homer Greece what Macedonia and Illyria were to the Hellenism
of later times, or what the descendants of Esau were to the children
of Israel,—half acknowledged as kindred, yet despised as semi-
barbarian. The parallel with Macedonia may be carried a good
deal further. The northern and western tribes descended upon
Mycenaean Greece, and broke up the earlier political system: but
at the same time they suffered themselves to be conquered by the
art and literature which they found in their new seats. They listened
to the recitation of Homer, and they adopted the Homeric chiefs—
notably the 'Pelopid' Agamemnon and his son Orestes—as their own
national heroes. They even looked upon their leaders as heroes
returning to a land of which they had long been wrongfully dis-
possessed. And the claim to Hellenic ancestry made by such princes
as Philip of Macedon and Pyrrhus of Epirus is evidently the counter-
part of the Spartan king's boast that he was not a Dorian but an
Achaean.

Homeric words re-appear in this Cyprian descendant of the ancient speech: e.g., ἄνευ 'but,' ὅ δ' 'and,' ἄγαν 'farther,' βλάστωμα (βλαστωματος), ἀγαν 'alone,' ἀγαμε 'am
astonished,' ἀλόγο 'blind,' ἀνίκη 'command,' ἀφι 'prayer,' ἀκροά 'field,' γάτης 'beawail,' ἄρος 'meadow,' εὐωδία 'vow,' εὔναξ 'prince,' ἀκόλου 'swept forth,
ὑπερ 'did,' ὑπάρχε 'watcher;' ὑπο 'rain,' ἑβάσα 'little,' ἑνέρ 'healer,' ἐκ 'seated,' εὐαγγελτο 'brother,' ἐραμο 'prison,' λαοῦ 'last,' ἐμφαν 'seized,'
ἐμάσιν 'to embroider,' νόμος 'husband,' πολίτης 'war-dance,' πύρος 'cave,' ναὸς 'leader,' φάτερον 'sword' (Hoffmann, Die griech. Dialekte, I. § 240). An
interesting trace of this South Achaean dialect has been pointed out in the
Laconian Ποιδίωος (Poseidon), since this cannot be the Doric Ποιδίων, but must
be the Laconian pronunciation of Ποιδίων, the Arcado-Cyprian form.

When we turn to the Dorian dialects, we find many evidences of their alien
character. The most striking perhaps is the ancient -μες of the First Person
Plural, which in all Ionic-Aeolic dialects has been replaced by -μα. No equally
significant difference is found in the case of any other group of dialects. In
the formation of the tenses the Doric is pointedly distinguished by the Future in -σου
(σου), and the Futures and Aorists in -σεος and -σα. It is also the only dialect
that always retains the forms τολ, τιλ in the declension of the Article. Phonetically
it is peculiar in contracting τα into η. And it is the most primitive in respect of
accentuation—as the Lesbian Aeolic is the most degenerate.

the story about the bones of Orestes (Hdt. 1. 68). 12 Hdt. 5. 72 δ' γόνα, ἄλλ' ἐφ' ἄνθρωπον ἐμ, ἄλλ' Ἀχαϊς.
The ascendancy of the epic or Homeric dialect was such that it was the language of all poetry—that is, of all literature—from Homer to the lyric poets of the seventh century B.C. After that time it continued to be exclusively used in epos and elegy, as well as in the hexameter verse of the early philosophers, and even in the answers of the Delphian oracle. The nationality of the poet made no sensible difference. Hesiod was by birth an Aeolian of Cyme, and lived at Ascle in Boeotia. His poetry was so un-Homeric that he might well have adhered to his native dialect. Yet we find him boasting of a prize won at the funeral games of a prince of the Ionian Chalcis. Tyrtaeus was said to have been an Athenian, and his verses were addressed to the Spartans. Theognis was a Megarian. Among the reputed authors of cyclic poems there are several that are not Ionic: Stasinus of Cyprus, Lesches of Mytilene, Agias of Troezen, Eugammon of Cyrene: and so among the Hesiodic or genealogical poets, Eumelus of Corinth, Cinaethon of Lacedaemon, &c. It is true that the dialect was not retained in its original purity. When the supremacy in literature, as in art and commerce, passed to Ionia, the language of poetry was insensibly modified under the influence of the colloquial Ionic. The digamma after a time was no longer heard: the long ā became η: ῥῆς, ῥῆς, &c. became ρῇς, ρῇς, &c. But apart from these phonetic changes, and others to which we shall have to return, the distinctive character of the dialect was maintained. We do not know how long it remained in use as the language of government, or as the lingua franca of commerce. The law codes, which seem to have been among the earliest prose writings, were in the vulgar tongue, if we may argue from the Dorian instance of Gortyn. But in the realm of poetry it held undisputed sway, until the popular songs of Lesbos took artistic form in the hands of Alcaeus and Sappho.

The nature of this supremacy of epic Greek may fitly be illustrated by the account which Dante has given of the Italian of his own time. There were then, as always in Italy, very many local dialects, differing from each other (if we may judge from the specimens) as widely as any Greek dialects known to us. Along with these there was one form of speech which was universally understood, and was independent of local influences. This he calls the 'illustrious vulgar tongue' (vulgare illustre). It was the dialect of every city, and yet belonged to none. It was the standard by

17 Dante, De vulgari eloqio, I. cc. 16–19.
which the other spoken dialects (*inferiora* or *municipalia vulgaria*) were judged, the hinge on which they turned: hence it was properly called *cardinale*. Further, it was the dialect of palaces and courts, hence *aulicum* and *curiale*,—though Italy had then no visible *aula* or *curia*. Finally, it was the common dialect of the poets who had written in the vulgar tongue, from Sicily to Lombardy. It need hardly be added that this 'illustrious' tongue was not so unconnected with local varieties of speech as Dante imagined. It was simply one of the popular dialects of Tuscany, raised to an exceptional position by the ascendancy, literary and political, of those who spoke it.

§ 5. Theory of an Aeolian epos.

In what part then of the Mycenaean or Old Achaean (pre-Dorian) realm is the origin of the epic language to be sought? This is a question that has occupied much of the attention of scholars in late years, indeed ever since Fick put forward his theory and supported it by striking arguments, derived partly from his unsurpassed knowledge of the Greek dialects, and partly from historical and geographical considerations. That theory, of which an outline has already been given (p. 461), has not been generally accepted in its entirety: but it has gone far to do away with the old notion of an Ionian Homer; *i.e.* of a Homer whose language was simply an early form of Ionic Greek, with occasional words or inflexions borrowed from the neighbouring Aeolis. 'The epos,' Wilamowitz has observed, 'is more than anything else the living expression of Ionian supremacy, and yet it bears plain marks, 'in form and content, of having sprung from an Aeolian root: but the Ionian genius gave it a new birth.' More recently Busolt has expressed the opinion that Fick goes too far in maintaining that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were actually translated from the Aeolic dialect into Ionic: but he considers him to have proved that the Aeolic element in Homer is much more important than was formerly assumed,—that it can only be explained

---

18 *Ibid.* c. 16 *inter quae nunc potest discerni vulgare quod superiorius venabamur, quod in qualibet redolet civitate, nec cubat in utra . . . quo municipalia vulgaria omnia Latinorum mensurantur, ponderantur et comparantur.


20 *Herakles,* I. p. 66 (ed. 1889).

on the supposition that the Aeolians cultivated epic poetry before the Ionians, and that when the practice of the art passed to the latter they took over with it a store of conventional words and turns of phrase. And in addition to the argument from the Aeolisms thus accounted for, it is pointed out that the hero of the *Iliad* is a prince of Thessaly, the mother country of Aeolis—that his father is a hero connected with the Thessalian mountain Pelion—that the Trojan expedition sailed from Aulis, not from Nauplia (the natural port for Mycene)—that the religious associations of Homer are with mount Olympus, the Zeus of Dodona, the Muses of Pieria—that the folklore figures are mostly Thessalian, viz. the Lapithae and Centaurs (with their Aeolic name *Φιάρες*), and the Aloeidae, who sought to pile Ossa on Olympus, and Pelion on Ossa—that the scene of the *Iliad* is laid in Aeolis, and the poet shows acquaintance with Aeolic localities, Tenedos and Cilla.

The theory according to which the epic dialect was the *vulgare illustre* or national language of pre-Dorian Greece is not inconsistent, logically speaking, with an Aeolic (*i.e.* Lesbian or Thessalian) origin. It may be that in respect of language Thessaly was the Tuscany of early Greece. If that was so, the 'illustrious' dialect was doubtless carried by Thessalian settlers to their new seats in Asiatic Aeolis: where epic song may have arisen and flourished, and whence it may have been passed on in time to Ionia. But this chain of hypotheses is open to some objections which have hardly been sufficiently considered.

1. The supposed Aeolian stage in the history of the Greek *epos* is not at all necessary. What is the problem? It is to explain how a national epic such as the *Iliad*, interesting to all parts of Greece, and composed in a common national language, came to be regarded as in a special sense Ionian, and to be recited in the Ionic dialect. But if the Ionians or their ancestors formed part of the early Achaean nation—if they were included in the *Παναχαιοί*—they had by birthright a share in Homer. Why should the poems have come round to them by way of Thessaly and Aeolis?

2. It is true that Thessaly is in some ways what may be called a 'cradle-land' of early Greece. It is perhaps the part of Greece which was the first to be occupied by a Hellenic population; accordingly it is the seat of some of the oldest traditions, and in particular of the most venerable religious memories. But these traditions and memories are much older than Homer. The question for us turns upon the period of the *Iliad*—a period in which Argolis
and Lacedaemon were at least as much in the minds of men as Boeotia and Thessaly.

3. The scene of the Trojan war is laid in Asiatic Aeolis. But can the story be a reflection of the conquest of Aeolis? Is it such a tale as would be told by Aeolian colonists about their mythical ancestors? This is surely more than doubtful. The poet of the Iliad knows something of the Trojan topography. He mentions the coast towns and rivers (all the rivers, if we admit the testimony of Il. 12. 19 ff.), and he refers to such local features as the mounds that marked the burial places of the Greek heroes, and the distant peaks of Ida and Samothrace. But, as Ed. Meyer has pointed out, he does not seem to know the interior—Gergis, Cebren, Scepsis. And he betrays no acquaintance with the subsequent history of the Troad. He drops no hint that it was destined to be occupied by his countrymen. On the contrary, he introduces a prophecy (Il. 20. 307) that the Trojans would thereafter be ruled by a line of native princes descended from Aeneas. This prophecy, which is put into the mouth of Poseidon, proves that at the time of the Iliad the country of Troy, if not the city itself, was still in the possession of a people that called themselves Trojans. If, as seems likely, the passage is a later insertion, the argument from it is so much the stronger. Again, if the Iliad was inspired by the Aeolian conquest, why is it not a tale of conquest? There is nothing in the poem to make it certain that Troy was eventually taken. It was not to be taken by the hero of the poem,—so much the Iliad tells us. The Odyssey supplies the want, in its own märchenhaft fashion: but that is only the natural development of the story. And in the Odyssey the chief theme is not the victory of the Greeks, but their lamentable return (μοντες Ἀχαιῶν λυγρά). Much has been made of the foundation legends which connect the Aeolian and Ionian colonies with the heroes of the Trojan war. But such legends only prove that these heroes had become or were becoming the national heroes of Greece. It might as well be argued that because the Dorian invasion was supposed to be the Return of the Heraclidae it is the real source and explanation of the mythical adventures of Heracles.

4. The notion of early epic songs, arising in Aeolis and afterwards spreading to Ionia, does not fall in very well with what is otherwise known, on the one hand of Ionian poetry—epic, elegiac and iambic—and on the other hand of the Aeolian choric songs. In the seventh

24 Ibid. p. 65.
25 See especially Duncker, History of Greece, Bk. II. c. xii.
century B.C., when the outlines of a history of Greek literature begin to be discernible, the ancient supremacy of the epic style, with its consecrated language and metre, was challenged, apparently for the first time, by the rise of a new species of poetry, one that employed a vernacular dialect and various new forms of verse, and was distinguished especially by the fresh and passionate expression which it gave to individual feeling. This form of literature made its appearance in the island of Lesbos, then colonised chiefly by settlers from Thessaly. It was of the nature of a reaction or revolt from the epic—an escape from the traditional classicism of Homer and his successors to colloquial speech and natural sentiment. The lyrical type may have been much more ancient. It was doubtless created and handed down in local and popular songs (such as the rispetti and stornelli of Tuscany), long before it was made ‘illustrious’ by the genius of Alcaeus and Sappho. Thenceforth the Aeolic dialect—the local speech of Lesbos and the adjacent Asiatic coast—became one of the leading dialects of Hellenic literature. For all subsequent lyric poets it was what the epic dialect had been for poetry in general.

Now in all this course of development it is not easy to find a place for an early Aeolian (pre-Ionian) school of epic song. Can it be that there was such a school in Aeolis, capable of giving the first impulse to the Ionian epos, and yet so obscure that no record of it remains? And was the profound and characteristic distinction—we may almost say, the antagonism—between ‘epic’ and ‘lyric’ merely a distinction between one form of Aeolic popular poetry and another? It is surely much more likely that the two styles are the products of two different branches of the Hellenic race, speaking kindred dialects, but singularly opposite in temperament, and in the specific quality of their genius.

5. Though the origin of the ethnical name Αἰολικός is not known, it is at least worth mention that the word is post-Homeric. It is first met with in Hesiod, himself an Aeolian.


Are we then to return to the prevailing belief of antiquity, and look for Homer among the Ionian colonies—in Smyrna or Chios or Colophon? Was he a son of the Meles? Or was he, as Aristarchus thought, an Athenian who took part in the new settlement on that river?

THEORY OF AN IONIAN EPOS

1. If the local knowledge shown in the Iliad is not enough to convince us that it was produced in Asiatic Aeolis, still less can we find grounds for connecting it with any of the Ionian settlements. In respect of them the Homeric map, from Lesbos southwards, is practically a blank. Chios occurs in the Odyssey, but merely as a landmark. Delos in the same poem is only a name. Miletus, the home of the earliest cyclic poems, those of Arctinus, occurs in the Catalogue, but is still Carian. Of the twelve cities that celebrated the Panonia at Mycale, of the isles of Greece from which (as we learn from the Hymn to Apollo) the Ionians gathered to the Delian festival,—of Samos, Naxos, Ios, Paros, and many more,—Homer to all appearance knows nothing.

2. The name 'Idomene or 'Iomnes is in all probability non-Homeric. It does not appear in the Catalogue, but occurs once (II. 13. 685) apparently = 'Aphnyios, in a passage which bears marks of being an interpolation. As Herodotus observed, it was a name which was not generally used except in Asiatic Ionia. In that country it must have come into vogue at an early time, since it was the term universally applied to the Greeks, without distinction of race, by their oriental neighbours—just as at the present day the term 'Frank' is applied in the Levant to all Europeans. The forms which it assumes in eastern languages (Hebrew Jadybn, Indian Favanas) go back to the time when the digamma was still sounded and the long a had not passed into η in Ionic (cp. p. 458). It could hardly be unknown to an early Ionian poet.

3. While Homer's local knowledge of Aeolis and Ionia is defective, on the other hand he displays an acquaintance with European Greece which would hardly be possible to an Ionian. At several points, as has been pointed out elsewhere, the Iliad shows traces of a distinction between the leaders in the Trojan war, with the Pelopid dynasty at their head, and the ancient local chiefs and heroes. Thus the kingdom of Agamemnon included Sicyon, 'where Adrastus used to be the king' (II. 2. 572), and Ephyre, where Preetus ruled over the Argives (II. 6. 159). In Sparta, if Helen is the sister of the native heroes, the Dioscuri, Menelaus must be an intruder. In Argos Diomedes is confessedly a stranger: the native legends go back to

---

* Hdt. i. 143. The meaning of Herodotus, as Ed. Meyer has shown, is not that the Athenians were ashamed of being Ionians, but that they used the name as little as if they were ashamed of it. The commentators have generally missed the point of this half-playful expression.

* This argument is stated more fully in an article in the English Historical Review, vol. I. pp. 43-52.
Perseus. Even in Attica we find Menestheus taking the place due to the sons of Theseus, who accordingly figure in the cyclic poems (p. 370). And in Ithaca there is at least a trace of local heroes older than the house of Laertes (see the note on Od. 17. 207). These things prove familiarity, not merely with the outward aspects of the country, but with its cherished legends and memories. Moreover, they are widely diffused, especially in the Peloponnesus, where the rule of the Pelopidae would be most felt. That these various pieces of tradition should have survived the fall of the Mycenaean empire and the migration to Ionia seems hardly credible.

The truth is, surely, that Homer is Ionian in the earliest centuries of which we have any historical knowledge, mainly because during these centuries Ionia was the centre of Greek civilisation—the most educated and most enterprising part of Greece. Homer is Ionian—that is to say, was taught, recited, imitated in Ionia—for the reasons that made Ionic Greek the language of the first philosophers and the first historians.


The dialect which we find in the vulgate text of Homer is a mixed or artificial one. It cannot have existed as a living variety of speech, or even as a genuine poetical dialect (such as the Italian of Dante). No poet, we may be sure, would make the free use that is made in it of such phonetically inconsistent forms as Aeolic ἄμφε, Doric ἄμφε, Ionic and Attic ἠμέρεσ, or Aeolic and Old Attic λάδη, Ionic νῆς, Attic ἰς. Even Fick's theory is open to objection on this score: for it is impossible to imagine an Ionian singer or rhapsodist adopting a series of Aeolisms solely on the ground that they had no exact metrical equivalents in Ionic. The most that can be attributed to the action of a poet is the use, under appropriate conditions, of archaic words and inflexions, and perhaps of an occasional borrowed word (like Φῆς for the Centaurs). Anything further must be the result of gradual and unconscious change in the text of the poems. The mixture of dialects, in short, was not in the original Homeric poems, but supervened as a corruption, brought about by the circumstances under which they were transmitted. It is simply an example, on a peculiarly large scale, of the modernising process which no literary masterpiece can quite escape if it is to retain its hold on a people.
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Three dialects at least have left their mark in different ways upon the Homeric text, viz. Ionic, Aeolic, and Attic.

a. Ionic.

The influence of the Ionic dialect on the form of the Homeric text is too obvious to call for much comment. The characteristic change from ἁ to η must have taken place, like all such changes, gradually and unconsciously. An Ionian rhapsodist would use the sound η, just as an English actor of Shakespeare uses the modern and not the Elizabethan pronunciation of the vowels. Similarly the digamma was forgotten, and Ionic poets ceased to recognize its former existence—except in the case of the forms ἄο of ἄ, which continued to be treated as words beginning with a consonant. If the combination νσ was still tolerated in the original language, as seems probable (see p. 459), the forms which contained it were now modernised: τῶς, τῶς became τῶς, τῶς, &c. Other proto-Hellenic forms may have gone through the like process: e.g. ἀρμᾶ and ἀρμᾶ (Dor. ἀρμᾶ, ἀμᾶ, Aeol. ἀμᾶ, ἀμᾶ); Ἐςμμ (Att. Ἐςςμμ, Ion. Ἐςςμμ); ἦςμ (Ion. ἦςμ).

In the declension of nouns we have to notice the Ionic genitives in -ἐω and -ἐων (for older -ἀ, -ἀν). These genitives are too numerous to be ruled out as post-Homeric corruptions. All that we can say is that in the language of Homer the original endings -ἀ, -ἀν had passed into forms of the metrical value of -ἐω, -ἐων (capable of being scanned as ἐ — or as —). Possibly these were -ἀν, -ἀν, which in Ionic would become -ἐω, -ἐων (cp. -ας for -ας, ὧρω for ὧρω, &c.). In the polysyllabic nouns in -ι, usually declined as παῖς, Gen. παῖος, Dat. παῖ, Nom. Pl. παῖες, Gen. Pl. παίδες, it seems possible that Ionicising has taken place. The Attic dialect was the only one which preserved the somewhat less symmetrical but more ancient Gen. παῖος, Dat. παί, Nom. Pl. παῖες, Gen. Pl. παίδες. The Dat. in -ι, which is demonstrably Homeric, is not contracted from -ις, but is an ancient (Indo-germanic) Instrumental 28.

The Ionic change from αο to εο appears in the forms μερότευν (cp. μεροσκευα), πούτενες (cp. ἑρφυτευταῖο), τρόπεον, ἱπειον, ἐσχίον, ἐμύλεον, ἐμελεῖον: not however in all similar cases (not e.g. in ὧρω).

Ionic influence is also to be seen in ἤν and ἐπήν, which have taken the place of ει or (before a vowel) ει ει, and ἐπει or ἐπει ει. As has been already noticed (p. 459) the contraction in ἤν and ἐπήν can hardly be Homeric; and they are used in the vulgate text without 28 Brugmann, Grundr. II. § 266, p. 620.
regard to the syntactical distinction observed in Homer between the 'pure' Subjunctive and the Subjunctive with ἄν or καν. It may be that under Ionic influence ἄν has often taken the place of καν: but it is impossible to banish ἄν altogether from the original language of the poems.

The loss of the spiritus asper is characteristic of Asiatic Ionic, and also of Lesbian Aeolic. It is apparently Ionic in ὁδὸς 'boundary,' ὁδὸς 'watcher,' ὁδὸς 'whole,' ὁδὸς 'threshold,' and perhaps in other words that Fick gives as Aeolic—ἄλο (or ἄλο), ἄμακ, ἄμαρ, ἄμοις. In other cases the smooth breathing is original: e.g. in ἰπνος ἐγκεφαλος, ἀμοινή (ἡμαρον, &c.).

**Β. Aeolic.**

It is impossible to doubt that the dialect of the Lesbian lyric poets, called Aeolic by the grammarians, exercised a perceptible influence upon the text of Homer. The most conspicuous instances are to be seen in the pronouns of the First and Second Person Plural, ἄμμες, ἄμμιν(υ), ἄμμε and ἄμμες, ἄμμιν(υ), ἄμμε, which are trebly Aeolic, viz. in respect of the accent, the smooth breathing and the double μ. How then was this influence exercised? Regarding ἄμμες &c. Fick himself is our guide. 'The smooth breathing,' he says, 'may have been inferred from the Aeolic dialect.' That is to say, the Ionian rhapsodists (and after them the grammarians) pronounced ἄμμες &c., contrary to the usage of their own dialect, because they only knew the word as an Aeolic form. But if this explanation holds for ἄμμες &c., it is equally good for ἄμμες &c. And if it explains the breathing, why not also the accent and the double nasal? Accordingly the history of these pronominal forms may be re-constructed somewhat as follows. The original stems ἄγμε, ἄγμε became Old Ionic ἄμε ὑμε, Boeotian ἄμε ὑμε, Lesbian ἄμμε ὑμε. Along with these, which were used without any case-ending as accusatives, there were the nominatives ἄμες ὑμες, Lesb. ἄμμες ὑμες, and the dative ἄμε ὑμε, ἄμμε ὑμε. In Homer these ancient forms, especially the accusatives, are beginning to be superseded by new forms modelled on the nouns in -νης, gen. -νος: hence (with Ionic η) ἄμες ὑμες &c. The variety of forms in the existing text is very great; but they may be accounted for, as has been shown by Van Leeuwen (Enchiridium Dictionum Epicae, pp. 251-257), by supposing an original declension ἄμε (better ἄμε)
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died out as a source of epic archaisms. Under these circumstances it was natural for the rhapsodists, whether of Ionian birth or not, to assimilate the older epic pronouns to the living Aeolic declension, with which they were doubtless familiar. Hence instead of ἵμες ἵμις &c.,—forms that should have appeared in Ionic—we find the confessedly Aeolic ἵμια ὑμέα &c.

It is remarkable that the corresponding Possessives ὑμός and ὑμός have retained their original Homeric form, instead of passing into Lesbian ἵμια ὑμέα. The fact serves to show the accidental and sporadic character of the influence that Aeolic forms exercised on the text of Homer.

A similar account may be given of the μέ in the infinitives ὑμενα ὑμεν, which are formed in the Aeolic manner from ὅ-μενα ὅ-μεν. In Ionic we might have had ὑμενα ὑμεν: but these forms being unknown in the Ionic vernacular the Aeolic forms took their place. It is to be observed however that Homer has also the forms ὑμενα ὑμεν. These are not Aeolic, and cannot have come from ὅ-μενα ὅ-μεν: they must have been formed on the analogy of ὑμενα and the like as.

Aeolic ὅ may be recognized in ὅρηνα, ὅρεσινα, ὅταν ὅταν (ὑ-τός for ὑ-τός): cp. Ionic ὅρηνα, ὅτε, ὅτε. They are evidently words that belong to the poetical style, and have little root in popular usage. Hence they serve chiefly to show how easily such words are affected by the influence of another literary dialect. So perhaps ἰνοιγμα is Aeolic, ἰνοιξτικλα το Ionic: but ἰνοιξτικλα shows that the lengthening

φίμε &c., and a new formation in -ες -εν -εα. For the new forms φίμε and the like we can very often restore φίμε &c.: but there are at least twelve places in Homer in which φίμε with the scansion -οι is guaranteed by the metre. The others of the same type, φίμα (or φιμας) φιμα &c., are less decidedly supported, but are doubtless Homeric. The view of some scholars (including Van Leeuwen) that φίμε and φίμα are duals seems untenable. It is most unlikely that they would be used as well as φιλοι and φιλοι. They are to be classified with φιλε, φιλε, as stems without a case-ending. The want of an ending, however, came to be felt, and in this way we can understand why φίμα φιμα are better attested in Homer than the rest of the new formation. That formation doubtless began with the accusative (Joh. Schmidt, Κ. Ζ. xxvii. 299).

It is possible that ὑμενα ὑμεν are also products of analogy. It is difficult to see why ὑμενα and ὑμεν should have been formed if the regular ὑμενα ὑμεν were already in use. On the other hand ὑμενα may have been produced afresh from the stem ὅ-, just as Attic ὅμεν took the place of Ionic ὅμεν. If so, the final change from ὅμενα to ὑμενα may have been comparatively late, and independent of Aeolic influence. Cp. the account of the νν of ἁνηνε, πελαντοντες, &c. (Brugmann, Grundr. Ψ. p. 1011).

The form ἵμαρα, generally regarded as an Aeolic perfect, notwithstanding the corresponding Middle form ἵμαρα, is perhaps better taken as an aorist. It occurs in ιτ. 376 ὅποινοι ἵμαρα τιμήν 'never gained a share'; in ιτ. 1589, where we should read ἵμαρα, ἵμαρα τιμή (cp. ἱλακων in the next line); and in Od. 5. 535 and 11. 338 where the same phrase recurs. The Aeolic infinitive μεροθημα τιμησε points to a Π. Act. μεροθεσα: cp. ἵμαρα φιλοντες and ἤμαρα.
is merely metrical \( ^{34} \). And we find Aeolic \( ὕρ ρον \) instead of \( ὕρ ρα \) (for Indo-germ. *g*) in \( ἱμβρόσων, πόρδαλες, ἀμαβροκίν. \) Whether Homer exhibits Aeolic \( αὐ ὠ ὠ ὠ \) for \( αὐ ὡ ὡ ὡ \) is very doubtful. Of the instances given by Fick (*Odysseus*, p. 18) the most plausible are \( ἀλαῖρως \) (said to be for \( ἀν-φέρως \)), \( αὐλαχοῦ, ταλαῖρως, καλαίρων, εὐδαί, εὐληρα, ἀναιρα, ἀποιρας \)—which again are conventional or poetical words \( ^{35} \). The same may be said with confidence of the form \( πῖσσως \) \( 'four', \) which is doubtless to be identified with the Aeolic \( πῖσσως. \) If the Homeric language used a second numeral, in addition to the regular \( πῖσσως, \) it was probably of the nature of a borrowed word, used in some special connexion,—as we talk of a ‘dozen’ or a ‘quartet.’ In the *Iliad* it is applied only to horses, and perhaps came in when four-horse chariots were first introduced.

It is needless to resort to Aeolic to account for words or forms that are proto-Hellenic. Thus \( πλιὸς πλας (= πλιῶνες πλάνιναι) \) are found not only in Aeolic, but also in Cretan Doric (\( πλιὸς πλιᾶς πλιᾶς \)). And the same principle applies to changes due to causes that are always present. Thus \( καλήγων \) for \( καληγώς \) is not necessarily Aeolic because in that dialect every perfect participle is treated in this way. It is one of many examples of the tendency to put thematic in place of non-thematic forms. The reverse change produced the Aeolic verbs in \( -μύ (καλήμυ \text{ and the like}), \) of which there are a few instances in Homer. These also are not necessarily intrusions from Aeolic. *E.g.* the infinitive \( φορήμενα \) need not be taken from Lesbian, any more than \( φορῆμα \) is taken from Cyprian.

\( γ. \text{ Attic.} \)

The ascendancy of the Ionians in the realm of literature was not long maintained after their loss of political and commercial greatness. Indeed the comparative obscurity of the cyclic poets seems to show that the prestige of the Ionian epos outlived the poetical movement to which it was originally due. The literary centre was shifted to European Hellas. The poems of Homer were brought back from their long exile, and although they retained their Ionic form, as Greek literary feeling required, they were no longer directly or mainly under Ionian influence. Those who now recited them, those who listened to or read them, were men who spoke various local dialects, of which the most important was Attic.

\( ^{34} \) Schulze, *Quaestiones Epicæ*, p. 160.

\( ^{35} \) As to the other instances—\( δεύμαι, χεῖδαι, ἀλεύναται, ἀγάλης, άταρα—\) see Schulze, *loc. cit.* pp. 54-55.
INFLUENCE OF DIALECTS ON THE HOMERIC TEXT

The effect of this Attic cultivation of Homer may be traced in a certain number of differences, generally rather minute, between Homeric and Ionic forms. Our text of Homer has ὀν: all dialects except Attic have ἀν. Homer has τισινας, ἄροςν, not τισινας, ἄροςν: μεῖζον, κρίψινα, not μεῖζον, κρίψινα: πῶς, πώς, &c., not κῶς, κότα, &c.: τίρας τίρας, γέρας γέρας, not τίρας γέρας. Homer retains the ι ἐφελκνυτυκόν and the spiritus asper, which are lost in New Ionic (as also in Lesbian Aeolic)44. Besides these, there are two groups of forms in which Attic influence is less directly obvious:

1. In the conjugation of certain verbs in -ος the combinations ἀς and ἂς (or ἄς) are changed into ὄς (or ὄς) and ὄς, and ας into ας: hence the forms ορᾶν, ἡβούνται, μυθόμενοι, ὄρος, ορᾶσμεν: μύκασθε, μενούσα, ὄρας &c.: also φῶς for φῶς, φανθη for φανθη, and some others. They were explained by J. Wackernagel as the result of a double change, first the regular contraction, then a restoration of the metre by ‘distraction.’ E.g. ἄνδρι ὄραβ first became ἄνδρω ὄραβ, then metri gratia ἄνδρω ὄραβ. Recently Brugmann has gone back to the view of G. Curtius, viz. that these forms represent an intermediate stage in the process of contraction,—that in which two vowels are assimilated to each other, but are not yet fused into a single long syllable. The difficulty of this hypothesis is that it is not verified. There is no trace of these or similar forms in any living dialect. Moreover, if the change is a phonetic one, we expect it to take effect with something like uniformity: whereas exceptions are frequent,—e.g. ναυτάονται, τηλεθάνοτα, πεντάοι, διψάοι, κραδάοι, αἰσθάμανται, δοξάζοι, ὀμοστιγάει. Indeed the examples of the change seem to be limited to instances in which the contracted form also is in common use: ὄρω ὄρας &c. beside ὄρω ὄρας, but ναυτάοντας in the absence of ναυτάονται &c. These facts point to the operation of analogy. In the Homeric language there were apparently two sets of forms, the uncontracted ὄρω ὄρας &c., retained (like the genitives in -ος) by the poetical tradition and the metre, and the contracted ὄρω ὄρας &c., which were the only forms in colloquial use. The intermediate ὄρω ὄρας &c. were produced by assimilating the archaic to the living forms as far as metre permitted. Probably too the process was influenced by the similar treatment of the verbs in -ος. Pairs such as ὄρωσι and ὄρωσι, μυθόμεναι and μυθόμεναι, are closely analogous to τελεί and τελεί, τελείωται and τελείωται.

There is nothing to show when or where the changes now in question

44 These may be added to the instances in which agreement in points of dialect goes with local proximity. See Collitz, Verwantschaftsverhältnisse.

II.

I i
were brought about. The occasional variation in the manuscripts between such forms as ναυδώνα, ναυδώνα, ναυδώνα suggests that they may have been of no great antiquity. In any case they were due to the existence of the Attic forms ὄφω ὄφαι &c.

2. There remains a group of Homeric words in which we find α instead of the Ionic η. These are:—the genitives of the First Declension in ᾠο and ἀω: the nouns λαός, λίαν (gen. λιῶς, λιῶν), Νάος, οἶκος, οἰκομένη, with the participles πεινάων and διψάων, and numerous proper names, Λαομήδων, Λαοδίκη, Μενίλαος, Πρωτεσίλαος, 'Αμφάραος, 'Ιάον, Ποσιδίαον, Μαγάων, &c.; also θεός, θεόν, Δάνα, Ναυσικά, Λευκάδα, Ἕρμης, Ἀγγελα: the possessive διής: and one or two isolated verb-forms, ἑάω (fut. of ἑαω), ἡγά, ἡγίζων.

In this case, again, a phonetic explanation is excluded by the irregularity of the phenomena. It will be seen that in most of the instances α is retained before ο or ω. But against these we have to set the Ionic η appearing in ἡδό ‘temple,’ ἡδός and ἡδῶν (gen. of ἡδύν), ἡδος ‘kinsman,’ παῦν ‘paean’ and Παῦν (epithet of Apollo). So from original δφος, ρφος we find ἵως or ἱως, τίως or τείως, from which with the help of the metre we can restore ἂος ἂος. Further, although λαός is the form of the word in Homer and in most of the Ionic poets (Callinus, Tyrtaeus, Xenophanes), the true Ionic ληδός is quoted from Hipponax, and has left its mark on some Homeric proper names, as Λήδης (cp. the Ionic λήδόν = Attic προπεπεῖον), Λήδερος, Ληθής (written Ληθώρεος, Ληθάθη). As the names Θερσίης, &c. tend to show that the change from βέρος to βάρος is post-Homeric, so these names point to a time when the form ληδός was in general use. Finally, it may be conjectured that in the participles πεινάων and διψάων the ending αων stands for an Ionic -ηων. It can hardly be an accident that these verbs are among the few that contract as to η (πεινής, πεινή, &c.).

The α of this group of words might be explained, like the accent and the μμ of ἄμμος and τίμημ, by the influence of Aeolic. We may suppose (e. g.) that when ληδός passed into λαός in spoken Ionic, as it did before the time of Herodotus, the poetical ληδός reverted under the attraction of the Aeolic dialect to λαός.

There is another quarter, however, in which the same phenomenon presents itself, viz. in the so-called Old Attic—the dialect of the Tragic poets and Thucydides. In that dialect the combination ἀο ἀω, answering to Ionic νο νο, is almost invariable: e. g. λαός, φαύς ‘temple,’ ταύς ταῦτα.

37 In this list we do not include words in which α arises phonetically, as in δὰρ for δαῖρη, δαόνα for αἵρον, or by contraction of ας, as in λάρος, ἀρτιόν, or compensatory length, as θάνατος, χάνω for φαῦσα, λαῦος. Still less should we count instances of metrical license, as ἀδέμας, ἀδέματος, ἀνδρείων.
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(gen. of ραΐς), with the adj. ῥαῖς: δαίος or δαίος, παῖς "kinsman," συμάρος, παράμος, τιμάρος, ὀπαῖς, also the proper names Τάως, Μεσσαρός, Τελαος, &c. The issue is complicated by the doubt regarding the nature of the dialect itself. The ancient notion of Old, Middle and New Attic as successive stages of the language spoken at Athens in the classical period is no longer tenable. It is proved from inscriptions that New Attic, though first known to us from Aristophanes, was the genuine colloquial speech of Attica from the earliest times of which there is any record: while Old Attic, as we find it in the dialogue of Greek tragedy, was not a living or colloquial, but only a literary dialect. From what sources, then, was this Old Attic formed, and how did it gain that position? The question has been discussed at length by Mr. Rutherford in the introduction to his New Phrynichus (pp. 3–31), and his conclusion is that "the basis of the language of Tragedy is the Attic of the time when Tragedy sprang into life," that is to say, of the time of Thespis and Pisistratus. The proof of this conclusion he finds chiefly in the number of words common to Ionic and the dialogue of Tragedy, but unknown to Comedy and to Attic prose. More recently it has been disputed by Mr. Schulhof, principally on the ground that Old Attic is not a form of speech from which New Attic can have directly descended. For example, New Attic πραττω cannot have been reached by a phonetic change from Old Attic πράσσω, or New Attic ἔν "if" from Old Attic ἔν. The true source of Old Attic, according to Mr. Schulhof, is the literary Ionic of the iambic poets, such as Archilochus and Hipponax. Both these views seem to contain a proportion of truth. The Tragic poets doubtless wrote under the literary influence of Ionic, especially of the Ionic poets who had invented and perfected the iambic metre. At the same time they must have adopted some at least of the peculiar Attic sounds. In πράσσω, for instance, if the σω was Ionic, the α was native, and indeed was the result of the Attic change of η to α after ρ.

How then are we to regard the Old Attic αο and αω in λάδε νάδε and the like? It cannot be due to epic influence, since it is consistent, which the epic usage is not (e.g. λάδε but νάδε). Nor can we suppose the sound to be borrowed from Aeolic or Doric: for why should these words be borrowed rather than others? The only alternative is to attribute them to a phonetic law or tendency, of the same order as that which turned -η -η into -α -α. By the operation of this law,

28 J. M. Schulhof, "Attic" "Ionic" and "Tragic" (Cambridge, s. a.). The pamphlet contains suggestions that deserve to be worked out in greater detail.

29 It seems probable that there was a double change, first pan-Ionic, from α to η, then Attic, from η back to α after ε or η (Brugmann, Grundr. § 104, p. 98).
then, the Ionic change which produced λάθες μαθες &c. must have been reversed, and original λαθες μαθες &c. restored. In this way two specifically Attic groups were created, viz. that of ὅδε ἔργους &c. and that of λαθες μαθες &c. Hence when the period of Attic ascendancy arrived, and Athens became a meeting-place of rhapsodists and ὄμποωι, both these groups had their share of influence on the text.

Why this Attic influence appears in some words and not in others—why, for instance, λαθες is Homeric but not μαθες—can only be matter of conjecture. It is worth observing however that in some cases the issue between α and η was not absolutely determined even in the texts of the Alexandrians. Zenodotus, who was himself an Ionian (of Ephesus), read Ἀμφιάρας, Ἀμφίδην, βουγής, κρατός (ll. 1. 530): and Aristarchus read Βυθόρα (ll. 11. 92) and Πέιας (ll. 14. 203), where the manuscripts have Βυθώρα, "Πέιας."

§ 8. Mr. Ridgeway's Theory.

It is impossible to leave this subject without some notice of a theory recently put forward by Professor Ridgeway of Cambridge, first in a paper in the Journal of Hellenic Studies, and again in his work on The Early Age in Greece, the first volume of which has appeared since the preceding pages were in type.

According to this theory the civilisation reflected in the poems of Homer—to which we may fitly apply the Homeric national name 'Achaean'—is separated from that of the Mycenaean monuments by important points of difference. Foremost among these is the Homeric custom of burning the dead, which stands in marked contrast to the peculiar Mycenaean manner of burial. Again, the Mycenaean objects belong to the age of Bronze, when 'black iron was not'; whereas in Homer there is evidence of the use of iron for cutting instruments of various kinds. The armour, too, is materially different. Mr. Ridgeway still maintains, against the view put forward by W. Reichel, that the Homeric heroes wore helmets, greaves, and breastplates of bronze—things unknown in the Mycenaean finds. He sees traces in Homer of the use of round shields, as well as the figure-of-eight shields which were the sole defensive armour of the Mycenaean

40 Doric influence may be admitted in some cases, as in συμοργας and χορωργας, since, as Mr. Rutherford observes, hunting with dogs and choral singing were things in which the Dorians were masters (New Phrynicus, p. 496).
41 vol. xvi. pp. 77-119, 'What people produced the objects called Mycenaean?"
warrior: also of the comparative disuse of the bow. In dress the Achaeans period is characterised by the close-fitting chiton, and the cloak (χαῖνα or φάρος) fastened by a brooch: also by the practice of wearing long hair (καρυκακίας) instead of the species of top-knot (κραύμβιλος) seen on the Mycenaean. It is further noted that Homer says nothing of signet gems, which were much used in the Mycenaean period.

The existence of this Homeric or Achaean form of culture is attributed by Mr. Ridgeway to an ethnical movement analogous in some respects to the Dorian invasion and conquest of Peloponnesus. The Achaeans, he believes, were a Celtic people, settled, for a time at least, in Epirus, who descended upon southern Greece and established the order of things represented in epic poetry by the empire of Pelops and Agamemnon. From them the Peloponnesus was called Ἀχαιαῖοι Ἀγρός. Another detachment crossed the Pindus and carried the Achaean name into Thessaly—a district which in the Iliad is next in importance to Argolis itself. Two countries—Attica and Arcadia—were not reached by the wave of invasion, and accordingly play a very subordinate part in the Trojan war. The Achaeans were fair-haired—this is expressly said (e.g.) of Menelaus and Achilles—but in time were absorbed into the Greek population, which (then as now) was dark-haired and dark-eyed. They took over the culture that they found, retaining however some of their own usages, and especially the improvements in armour, &c., which they had brought with them, and to which they doubtless owed their success. Moreover, as usually happens when a successful invasion leads to a military aristocracy, they adopted the language of the conquered. In this way Mr. Ridgeway accounts for the fact that the Homeric dialect does not greatly differ from those of the Aeolic and Ionic groups—which he rightly regards as closely allied—and that in vocabulary it shows a remarkable coincidence with Arcadian and Cyprian. Finally, he searches among the traditions and ethnical names for an answer to the question which formed the title of his paper five years ago, viz. what people produced the objects called Mycenaean? As might be

42 This point is somewhat exaggerated by Mr. Ridgeway when he says, p. 301, that no Achaean warrior employs the bow for war. He surely forgets Teucer. But it is clear that in the time represented by the Iliad the bow had lost much of its former importance. Cp. p. 305 (infra).

43 As to Achilles see II. 23. 141 ἄργως ἀκατάθρον σταυρός. Regarding Ulysses the statements are contradictory: see the note on Od. 16. 176. Fair hair is attributed also to Meleager (II. 2. 642), and to Agamemnon (II. 11. 740).

44 It was so (e.g.) with the Norman conquest of England, and the Frankish conquest of Gaul.
expected, he finds that the name most widely diffused in pre-historic Greece, especially in the 'Mycenaean' districts—Arcadia, Attica, Thessaly—is that of the Pelasgians.

It will be apparent from this brief outline that on some important points Mr. Ridgeway is at one with the scholars whose opinions have been quoted above (p. 467). He agrees with them in regarding the Mycenaean culture and the Achaean dominion as both pre-Dorian; also in believing the objects found on Mycenaean sites to be generally earlier than the corresponding objects described in Homer. That being so, the question whether the Homeric age falls within the Mycenaean age, or is to be treated as a distinct archaeological period, is a question of detail. The main issue is not whether certain changes had taken place within a time to be styled Homeric, but whether they were brought about, as Mr. Ridgeway holds, by the agency of a people of different race, which formed an intermediate stage between pre-historic Mycenaean and historical Dorians.

What then is the evidence for the supposed Achaean-Celtic conquest of Pelasgian Greece?

Some of the passages that Mr. Ridgeway quotes from the ancient historians will hardly be thought convincing. Few scholars would think that much is proved by the statement that Achaeus was the son of Xuthus, and that Dorus, Aeolus and Xuthus were the sons of Hellen 46. The names evidently stand for the Hellenic nation and the chief dialects of historical Greece. The myth, therefore, is much later than Homer and the Homeric Achaeans. Another myth, or learned invention in the form of a myth, tells us of the three brothers Achaeus, Phthious and Pelasgus 46—obviously eponymous heroes of equally post-Homeric sub-divisions of Thessaly. So too of the various stories that bring an Achaeus or his sons from Thessaly to Peloponnesus, or vice versa; they simply mean that the name 'Achaeoi was met with in both countries. In Homeric times the Achaeans were everywhere: afterwards the name survived in certain localities, isolated by the intrusion of new races; and men began to wonder what was the connexion between the localities.

Greater weight is to be attached to some indications in Homer. It has already been noticed 47, as a proof of the European origin of the Homeric poems, that Agamemnon and the other leaders in the Trojan war are curiously distinct from the older local heroes—from such figures as Perseus of Argos, Adrastus of Sicyon, the Aeolidae

46 Paus. vii. 1. 7. 46 Dionys. Hal. i. 17. 47 On p. 475 (supra).
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of Corinth, the Dioscuri in Lacedaemon, Theseus at Athens. They do not derive a mythical title from these older heroes; on the contrary, they appear in the character of intruders or usurpers. Hence the suggestion that the empire of Agamemnon and his peers was in fact the result of a successful inroad is not without a certain plausibility.

It is not very easy to follow the argument which Mr. Ridgeway bases upon 'labialisation' in Greek. The term may be used of at least three sets of phenomena, which he does not keep sufficiently distinct, viz. (1) the labial affection of an original velar, exemplified in Latin qu; (2) the pan-Hellenic change from this labialised sound when followed by the vowel o to a labial, as in Greek wo- for Latin quo- (whereas Latin gui-, que- answer to Greek τύ-, τε-): and (3) the labial which appears in Aeolic where Doric and Ionic exhibit a dental, as in πέταπες for τέταπες, φῆδορ for θῆρο. Mr. Ridgeway's description of the phenomenon in question as 'traces of labialism superimposed upon a general tendency to preserve the κ' (p. 673) does not properly apply to any one of these groups of instances. The retention in Greek of the gutturals κ γ χ depends upon conditions that have not been completely ascertained: but in any case it is clearly not sporadic, or due to foreign influence of an accidental kind. When the original sound is palatal (e.g. κ in ἱκαρών, = Sanscr. ḷ), it is never labialised in Greek. When the original is velar (Sanscr. ḷ, ḳ), the appearance of κ γ χ in Greek is exceptional: but it may be accounted for by some other law. Thus κ remains in λίκος under the rule that labialisation does not take place after a w-sound 48.

The weak point of Mr. Ridgeway's argument, taken as a whole, is the want of evidence in Homer of a racial difference between the 'Achaeans' and the bulk of the population. The common language, upon which the poet himself lays so much stress, may perhaps be accounted for by the supposition that the conquerors, being a small minority, learned the language of their subjects. But surely we should have found other distinctions. What traces are there of grades of any kind—of difference of legal status or social condition or religious usage? The men who fought before Troy are called Achaean, without any exception. If the 'Achaeans' were a military

48 Mr. Ridgeway founds another linguistic argument on the fact that the names of some of the Achaean chiefs are not easily explained as Hellenic. Such are Achilles, Odysseus, Aeacus, Ajax, Laertes, Peleus. But on the other hand Agamemnon and Menelaus are quite Hellenic. And the same etymological difficulty appears in many of the older names of heroes—Perseus, Theseus, Proetus, Aeolus—and generally in those of deities.
aristocracy, the whole army must have belonged to it. The only difference of rank, either in the Agora or in war, is between the λαοὶ or rank and file and the few great chiefs who formed Agamemnon's council. There is nothing at all answering to the Dorian gradation of Spartans, Perioeci and Helots, or the racial distinctions which obtained under similar circumstances in Thessaly.

Again, if the Achaeans were only a ruling caste, we should expect to find some name for the rest of the population. The word Ἀργείοι, being derived from the name of the country, might have served in such a use. But Ἀργείοι is exactly synonymous with Ἀχαιοί. And all such words as λαὸς or δῆμος evidently include the Achaeans.

In place of the hypothesis of an Achaean conquest it seems possible to make two suppositions of a less violent kind. These are, (1) that advances in culture—the use of iron, of bronze armour, of cremation, &c.—reached Greece gradually and by pacific intercourse: and (2) that the empire of Agamemnon was the work of a dynasty under which Mycenae became for a time, through causes no longer discoverable by us, the political centre of continental Greece and some of the islands. The former of these suggestions must be left to the judgement of experts. It is for archaeologists to determine the nature and degree of the connexion (if there is one) between the arts and usages described in Homer and the culture which may be thought to have been brought down the eastern shore of the Adriatic. It is for the historian to speculate on the political conditions under which any such intercourse may have subsisted. The second problem is also historical, but deals with matters that are even more beyond our reach. For what divination can recover for us the series of causes through which a supremacy such as that of the Pelopidae was gained in 'Mycenaean' Greece?
V. The Homeric House.

§ 1. The opposing theories.

In the discussion of the Homeric House, as in other parts of the field of Homeric archaeology, the main question has come to be whether the data furnished by the poems agree on the whole with the type revealed in the remains of the 'Mycenaean' period, or belong to a distinctly later stage of culture. We naturally form for ourselves some mental picture of the palace of Priam on the Trojan acropolis, of the splendid palaces of Alcinous and Menelaus, above all of the banqueting-hall which was the scene of the 'Vengeance of Ulysses.' How far are we aided in forming this picture by the great palaces of which the ground-plan can still be traced on the rocks of Tiryns and Mycenae? Are we to imagine the action of the latter books of the Odyssey as taking place in a building like these palaces, or must we suppose something more resembling the Hellenic house of the fifth and following centuries?

The former of these alternatives is supported by the high authority of Dr. Wilhelm Dörpfeld, who adopted it in the chapters which he contributed to Schliemann's book on Tiryns. Soon after the publication of that book the relation of the Tiryns palace to the Homeric descriptions was examined afresh by Sir Richard Jebb, who came to the conclusion that the points of agreement had been greatly exaggerated, and that the house of the Odyssey answered in its most characteristic features to the Hellenic mansion of historical times. In particular he held that the Homeric μέγαρον, like the later ἀνδρών, had two entrances, viz. the front entrance from the courtyard (αὐλή), and a back entrance, leading from the women's apartments and store chambers; whereas in Dörpfeld's view these other apartments did not lie behind the men's hall, but were separate buildings, entering directly from the courtyard. This view has now been taken up and defended in detail by Mr. J. L. Myres, in a paper published (like Sir Richard Jebb's) in the Journal of Hellenic Studies.

1 Tiryns: the Pre-historic Palace of the Kings of Tiryns, by Dr. Henry Schliemann (London, 1886).
§ 2. The Fire-place.

There is at least one point on which the palaces of Tiryns and Mycenae have undoubtedly thrown fresh and interesting light, viz. the position and structure of the fire-place (τοχάρη). It will be seen from the ground plan of the Tiryns palace (part of which is given in fig. 1), that in the centre of the Great Hall (μεγαρόν) there are the bases of four columns still in situ, with traces of a fire-place within the square thus formed. These four columns were doubtless employed, as Dörpfeld has conjectured 4; to support a louvre or lantern somewhat higher than the roof of the building, and serving partly to give light to the room and partly as an escape

4 Tiryns, p. 218. It would answer much better to cover the square included by the pillars, after the manner of a basilica, with a higher roof: in the vertical walls of the upper structure (clere-story) smaller or larger apertures could be introduced, through which not only light would enter into the megaron, but also the smoke from the hearth would find an easy escape.
for the smoke. A section showing the possible construction of this lantern is given by Mr. Middleton in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (vii. 165): see fig. 2. A similar construction was usual in the hall of a mediaeval castle, with the difference that the lantern was not placed on columns rising from the floor, but rested on the framework of the roof. A much closer parallel to the Mycenaean hearth is to be found in the Icelandic houses of the *Saga* period, the plan of which has been recovered by recent investigations. As may be seen from the sketch reproduced on p. 218 (with the section given in fig. 3), the *stofa* or chief room—answering to the Homeric *μέγαρον*—is a large square hall, with a roof supported by four rows of columns. The two inner rows (*instafir*) are larger and higher than the others, and between them, in the middle of the hall, is the fire-place, with the seats of honour for the host and his principal guest or guests. Thus the chief place was not, as in a mediaeval hall, at the top of the room—with a dais and 'high table'—, but as nearly as possible in the middle, within the central columns of the building. So too in the Homeric *μέγαρον* it is now clear that the hearth was in the middle, surrounded by a group of columns. It is there that queen Arete sits working 'in the light of the fire,

---

*Fig. 2. Restoration of the Hall at Tiryns: transverse section (Mr. Middleton in *J. H. S.*, vii. 165).*

---

6 Dr. Valtýr Guðmundsson, *Privat-boligen på Island i Saga-Tiden* (Copenhagen, 1885); *Den islandske Bolig i Kristiats-Tiden* (Copenhagen, 1894).
and 'leaning against a pillar,' with her maids behind her, i.e. outside the place of honour (Od. 6. 305-307). It is there also that Penelope sits in the light of the fire,' while Ulysses, as the honoured guest, sits on the opposite side 'against a tall pillar' (Od. 23. 89-90). So the singer Demodocus was placed 'in the midst of the banqueters, resting against a tall pillar' (Od. 8. 66). This was therefore the place from which Penelope addressed the Suitors, according to the recurring formula—

οτη βα παρά σταθὼ τίγυς πίκα πουρούο,

and from which Nausicaa gazed at Ulysses, and then spoke to him (Od. 8. 458). It is evident that the words are more appropriate to

![Diagram of Icelandic stafa](image)

**FIG. 3.** ICELANDIC stafa: tranverse section showing the four rows of columns (Grundr. d. german. Philologie, xii. p. 479).

columns that formed the main support of the roof than to the posts of the door-way (see Od. 16. 415, with the note). The lantern overhead was doubtless the opening through which Athene flew in the shape of a bird (ἔρις δὲ αὐρωπία διέστερε Od. 1. 320).

At Mycenae the fire-place is better preserved than at Tiryns, and the four bases of columns are still visible. The same construction is found in the 'Palace of Erechtheus' on the Acropolis of Athens. We may infer that this feature was universal in the Mycenaean period. The other Mycenaean sites—Gha in Boeotia, the sixth stratum at Troy, &c.—do not seem to furnish direct evidence on the point.

4 Tsountas and Manatt, Mycenaean Age, p. 57.
5 J. H. S. xx. p. 130: cp. Mr. Middleton's Plans and Drawings of Athenian Buildings (J. H. S. Suppl. no. 3), esp. Pl. i. 67, 74, Pl. viii. no. xii.
§ 3. The μέγαρον of the women.

The word μέγαρον is generally understood as denoting the ‘men’s hall’—the room in which the chief and his followers were accustomed to pass their leisure time. It is to be observed, however, that it is used in the Odyssey of some part at least of the women’s apartments—probably of their chief room, in which the mistress of the house and her handmaidens carried on the spinning or weaving or embroidery that formed their usual employment. This appears most clearly from Od. 18.316:

\[\text{Tρικεθε πρὸς δῶμαθ ἐν' αἰδοὶς βασίλεια,}
\[\text{τῇ δὲ παρ' ἡλώσια στροφαλίζετε, τίρπετε δ' αὐτήν,}
\[\text{ἡμικυκλώ ἐν μεγάρῳ.}\]

So in Od. 22.497 the women are called forth ἐκ μεγάρου, i.e. from the apartments to which they have been strictly confined during the slaying of the Suitors, and are sent to cleanse the men’s hall. And in Od. 18.185–198 Penelope, who is in an upper chamber (cp. 18.206 κατέβας ὑπερώια), sends Eurycleia to bring two of her attendants. Eurycleia goes διὰ μεγάρου (l. 185), and the attendants come ἐκ μεγάρου, and escort Penelope to the hall where the Suitors are. The μέγαρον here must be a room in which women servants would ordinarily be. So in Od. 23.20, 24 the μέγαρον to which Penelope talks of sending back the old nurse must be the women’s room. And so, therefore, in 20.6, where Ulysses as he lies awake in the πρόθομος hears the women passing ἐκ μεγάρου, it must mean ‘from their μέγαρον’ (not as given in the note a. l.).

The plural μέγαρα is also used of the women’s apartments (Od. 17.569., 19.16, 30). Properly speaking the singular μέγαρον is applied to a particular room, the plural to the group of which that room forms the chief part (cp. ρόξα = ‘bow and arrows,’ λέπια = ‘a bed and its furniture,’ &c.). But this is a difference that in the nature of things is not always perceptible. In general it will be found that μέγαρα is a vaguer word, which may be put for μέγαρον when the definite sense of ‘room’ or ‘hall’ is not required.

§ 4. The θάλαμος.

Any room except the μέγαρον may be called a θάλαμος or ‘chamber.’ When it is said that the Trojans made for Ἑκτὸς θάλαμοι καὶ δῶμα καὶ αὐλὴν (II. 6.316), we may put δῶμα = μέγαρον, and thus obtain the three component parts of a great house. As to the place of the
θάλαμος or θάλαμοι the indications are most diverse. The chamber of Penelope was in an upper storey, reached by a stair. The chamber of Ulysses, in which the bed was made of a living olive-tree, was certainly on the ground. The store-chamber where the bow lay was some way from the chamber of Penelope (Od. 21.5-42). Again, in the vast palace of Priam there were fifty chambers for his sons, and opposite these, also within the αὐλή, there were twelve chambers for his married daughters. These, it will be evident, were separate buildings, opening into a spacious courtyard. So Phoenix, when he had been watched for nine days by his kinsmen and his comrades (II. 9.473-476), escaped by breaking the door of the θάλαμος in which he slept and leaping over the wall of the αὐλή. Hence, too, the need of torchlight to show the way at night from the μέγαρον to the θάλαμος—the two fires kindled by the watchers of Phoenix being an exceptional precaution. The ordinary case is that of Telemachus, who sleeps in a θάλαμος built in a conspicuous part of the court, and is lighted to it by the old nurse Eurykleia (Od. 1.425-428):

Τηλεμάχος ήδη οί θάλαμοι περικαλλέων αὐλῆς
υψηλός δίδυμο περικέπτει ἐν χάρφ,
ἐνθ’ ἠβή εἰς εὐνύμπολλα φρεσκὶ μερμηρίζων.
τῷ δ’ ἀπ’ ἐμ’ αἰθομέναι θάνατος φόρει κτλ.

So too Eurynome guides Ulysses and Penelope to their θάλαμος, 'holding a torch in her hands' (Od. 23.294). These passages give us the notion of a group of distinct buildings—a μέγαρον, perhaps a second μέγαρον for the women, and θάλαμοι of various kinds—all opening on to a courtyard or αὐλή, which was accordingly the chief or only means of communication between them. And this is confirmed by the occasional use of such words as oίκος and δωματία for the several apartments of the palace (for oίκος cp. Od. 1.356, 20.105, 21.350, 354, 358: for δωματία Od. 1.330, 21.5).

At this point, again, it is interesting to compare the descriptions which we have of the domestic architecture of mediaeval Iceland.

A farmhouse, it appears from the Sagas, consisted of at least three or four distinct houses (háus, herbergi), besides barns, cowhouses, &c. These 'houses' usually were (1) the men's hall (stofa), (2) the sleeping-room, (3) the kitchen, (4) the eating-room. They were

1 See the article by Kr. Kälund and Valtýr Guðmundsson in the Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, xii. p. 429. I am indebted for this reference to Mr. W. A. Craigie.
not rooms in the modern sense, parts of a single large house, but separate buildings, each of which contained a single room.

§ 5. The position of the women's quarters.

It will be clear from the passages now quoted that the word θάλαμος usually denoted a separate structure, composed of a single room, and opening off the αὐλή. It did not imply anything as to the situation of the room so called. Is there then any evidence as to the relative position of the θάλαμος (or θάλαμοι) of Penelope and her attendants? Were her apartments placed, like the Hellenic γυναικονωτής, at the back of the men's hall? And were they approached from that hall? On this subject the indications in the Odyssey are few, but perhaps sufficient.

1. In Od. 20. 92 Ulysses hears the voice of Penelope weeping in her θάλαμος, having himself just wakened from sleep in the vestibule (πρόδομος) of the μύραον. He is still in the πρόδομος, or has approached the altar of Zeus in the αὐλή, when he hears some words uttered by a woman who is grinding corn in a ‘house’ (οἶκος) near him. He must therefore have been within hearing distance of Penelope's sleeping chamber, and also near the rooms in which the women were doing their work. He can hardly have been at the opposite end of the palace from them, as would have been the case if the women's quarters were behind the Great Hall.

2. Antinous throws his stool at Ulysses (Od. 17. 462 ff.); Penelope hears the blow, and knows who has dealt it. She is then ‘sitting in her chamber’ (ὁμία τῷ θαλάμῳ), surrounded by her maidservants: Ulysses has returned from his round of begging (ἀνευρήσας 17. 453, 461), and directly afterwards takes his seat again on the threshold.

* The men's hall with its central fire-place, surrounded by huts serving as sleeping-places, may still be found in Greece and Turkey. ‘Je me rappelle surtout, dans la montagne de Samarie, un village où nous avons passé la nuit. Les maisons où couchaient les paysans n'étaient que des huttes de terre, fort basses : mais il y avait au milieu du bourg un grand bâtiment fait d'une pièce unique, très vaste, que recouvrait un toit en coupole. C'était ce qu'on appelait la “maison des hôtes” (medhâfa). Pendant que les femmes travaillaient aux champs, les chefs de famille passaient là de longues heures à fumer, à prendre du café et à causer. Nous les trouvâmes réunis à la tombée du jour dans leur migaron : ils nous firent au premier moment un aussi mauvais accueil que jadis les prétendants à Ulysse. Il nous fallut parler haut et payer d'audace pour loger nos bêtes de somme et nos bagages dans un coin de la grande salle et pour obtenir, mouillés comme nous l'étions par une pluie torrentielle, notre place au foyer. Celui-ci était formé par de grosses pierres, rangées en cercle, vers le centre du vaisseau. Il est permis de croire que, dans le palais d'Alkinoos et dans celui d'Ulysse, l’être avait une apparence moins rustique’ (Georges Perrot, Hist. de l'Art dans l'Antiquité, Tom. vii. La Grèce de l'Épopée, p. 89).
(17. 466). Hence he could not well have been seen or heard from an upper room at the back of the μέγαρον. Penelope and her attendants must be placed somewhere within reach of the front entrance.

3. Penelope calls Eumaeus to her (Od. 17. 507), and gives him a message to Ulysses, which he delivers. It would evidently be easier for Penelope to communicate with Eumaeus outside the μέγαρον—to hail him from across the αὐλή, as Mr. Myres suggests,—than to bring him into an inner θάλαμος which he could not enter without being observed by all the Suitors.

4. In a later passage (Od. 20. 387) Penelope places her seat κατ' ἀντίστασιν, and there hears the talk of the Suitors, who are feasting in the μέγαρον. Mr. Myres takes the phrase κατ' ἀντίστασιν as equivalent to κατ' ἐπίθεσιν (Od. 16. 159), which appears to mean at the space at the further side of the αὐλή, facing the door of the μέγαρον. Unless ἀντίστασις has some other sense not now discernible, this seems the most probable account.

There is one feature of the incident of Od. 17. 507 ff. which seems at first sight to show that the way to Penelope’s room lay through the μέγαρον. Penelope, as we saw, sends Eumaeus to Ulysses, who was then in his place by the threshold of the μέγαρον, to ask him to go to her. He answers that he fears to do so because of the Suitors, by whom he has been ill-treated when he was going among them and doing them no wrong. He therefore begs her to wait till night, when the Suitors will be gone. But the argument may be, as Mr. Myres suggests, that the Suitors will object to an unknown stranger having access to Penelope in the women’s quarters; and this argument is equally valid wherever Penelope is supposed to be. It must be remembered too that the poetical value of an incident may be much more obvious than the matter of fact requirements of the story. In this instance the message of Penelope and the reply of Ulysses have a double artistic purpose. The poet wishes to bring out the mysterious attraction that leads Penelope to notice and favour the seeming beggar, notwithstanding her general incredulity; and he also wishes to lead up to the great scene between Ulysses and Penelope in the nineteenth book. It was however a necessary part of the incident that Ulysses should give a reason—not the true one—for his refusal of Penelope’s request. Under the circumstances we cannot expect his reason to be quite above criticism from the prosaic and logical point of view.

It may be asked here whether on any of the ancient sites there are traces of buildings that might have been women’s quarters, and are within reach of the main entrance of the μέγαρον. The answer as
regards the palace of Tiryns is somewhat doubtful, as a glance at the ground-plan, with its supposed women's μέγαρον, will show. But there can be no difficulty about the buildings at Mycenae (fig. 4). There, as Mr. Myres observes 10, 'a similar smaller group of rooms (which this time is furnished with an upper story approached by a corridor and staircase) lies κατὰ δαυρών on the further side of the courtyard, and

**FIG. 4. PALACE AT MYCENAE.** Women's quarters (?) opposite the main entrance (Mr. Myres in *J. H. S*. vol. xx. p. 131).

exactly opposite the πρόθυρον of the Great Hall. Penelope's δόμοι or οἶκοι, with its μέγαρον, βαλαμοί, κλίμακες and ἐπιφάνεια, is thus repeated in every essential detail: and the whole story of the *Odyssey*, so far as it concerns the heroine, could have been rehearsed without a hitch in the palace of the ἄναξ ἄνδρων of Mykenai.'

§ 6. The door, or doors, of the μέγαρον.

It is time to consider the question of the women's quarters from a different side. If the way to them lay through the μέγαρον (as has been supposed), that room must have had at least two main doors, viz. the front entrance from the πρόθυρον, and a back entrance at the top of the room. There is no trace of any such second doorway at Tiryns or Mycenae. Is there any evidence of its existence to be found in the story of the *Odyssey*?

If we could argue from silence—that is to say, from the absence of any express mention of the second door—the matter would be simple. In no passage is it said or implied that the μέγαρον had two doors. When a door is spoken of there is no trace of a desire or endeavour to show which door is meant. The question turns entirely upon what may be called circumstantial evidence. We have already noticed the argument founded upon the unwillingness of Ulysses to be seen going to Penelope while the Suitors are in the μέγαρο. It is an argument

---

which depends for its validity on the purpose and meaning of the action of Ulysses. Again, there are two doors which before the final trial of the bow Ulysses takes care to have closed, viz. the door of the women's apartment, and the gate of the αὐλή. He bids Eumaeus tell the women—

κλείσαι μεγάρωνθύρας πυκνώς ἁρπαγίας.

In this line (as was shown in the note on 21. 382) the μέγαρον intended is that of the women—the injunction to them is to shut the door of their μεγαρον. Had the poet said 'the door of the men's hall,' that would naturally mean the main entrance, which was certainly not closed 11. What, then, is there to show that the door into the women's μεγαρον was at the upper end of the men's hall? The probabilities are surely on the other side. The closing of the two doors, a measure intended to bar the chance of any aid coming to the Suitors, was necessarily carried out without their knowledge. Ulysses gives his instructions secretly to Eumaeus and Philoetius (21. 228–231): they avoid even being seen together (προμαρτυροῦσα ἐσίθετε μηδ' ἄμα πάντες): and Philoetius goes out 'in silence' to perform his part (21. 388). It was clearly impossible to close a door in the μέγαρον while the Suitors were there. The ἄφωνθυρον, as presently appears, was left open, and Eumaeus was told off to guard it (Od. 22. 129). It would doubtless have been closed if that could have been done without exciting suspicion.

§ 7. The threshold, or thresholds.

The chief argument for a second door in the Homeric μέγαρον is derived from the mention of two thresholds. One was of stone, the λαῖνος οἰῶς of Od. 17. 30., 20. 258., 23. 88: the other was of ash, and is mentioned in Od. 17. 338. But it is not difficult to show that both these 'thresholds' or door-sills were at the entrance of the men's hall. In 17. 30 Telemachus crossed the λαῖνος οἰῶς, and was seen and welcomed by Eurykleia and the maidservants: thereupon Penelope came from her chamber and welcomed him. Consequently the οἰῶς that he had just crossed was not that of his mother's room. The other two passages are indecisive, since they can be reconciled with any view of the place of the threshold. Elsewhere the λαῖνος οἰῶς of a house evidently belongs to the main entrance, as in the house of

11 This is clear from 22. 76: the only chance of the Suitors there is to drive Ulysses from the door. Nothing is said of unfastening or opening it. It appears also from the movements of Telemachus, who brings arms for himself and the others, evidently passing freely through it.
Eumaeus (Od. 16. 41), and the temple at Pytho (Il. 9. 404, Od. 8. 80). On the other hand the μίλινος οἴδος was no less clearly at the entrance of the hall. Ulysses in his character as an aged beggar comes and sits upon it (Od. 17. 339 ἐπὶ μιλίνου οἴδοι)—not beside it, as is said of the λαϊνος οἴδος. The solution of the difficulty is given by Mr. Myres. It is simply that the two thresholds belong to the same doorway, viz. that of the Great Hall. Every doorway on the ground floor had its λαϊνος οἴδος, a massive stone threshold of considerable breadth—the ξεντός οἴδος where Ulysses fought with Irus, the μέγας οἴδος from which he sent his arrows among the Suitors. But at Tiryns, if there was a door at the entrance of the μέγαρον, there must have been a second threshold of another material. The stone sill of this doorway has no sockets for hinges: consequently, if it had a door (as the Homeric μέγαρον had), that door must have been fitted with a four-sided frame, and the sill of this frame—which it would be natural to call the μιλίνος οἴδος—would rest upon the stone threshold which still survives. It would be a place upon which a man might sit, and indeed (as Mr. Myres tells us) a threshold of this kind furnishes the beggar’s seat in every café in the Levant. As to the material it is to be observed that there was a δρύινος οἴδος of the upstairs chamber where the bow lay (Od. 21. 43). Perhaps the χαλκος οἴδος of which we hear in the palace of Alcinous (Od. 7. 83), and also in Tartarus (II. 8. 15), takes the place of the usual wooden sill, not of the stone threshold. It may have been in fact of wood covered with bronze plating.

With the opposition between the λαϊνος οἴδος and the μιλίνος οἴδος disappears the last shred of evidence for a door at the upper end of the μέγαρον. At the same time we get rid of all difficulty about the place of Ulysses at the successive points in the story. At his first coming he seated himself on the μιλίνος οἴδος of the μέγαρον (17. 339). He and Irus fought on the ξεντός οἴδος—evidently the broad stone threshold. Next day Telemachus artfully (κύρδεα νομάν) places him within the μέγαρον, giving him however only a humble stool and a small table (20. 257). While the trial of the bow is going on he slips out with the two faithful servants Eumaeus and Philoctetus, and reveals himself to them; after which he returns to his seat. When he asks to be allowed to try the bow, and Penelope and Telemachus support him in this, Eumaeus brings the bow from the fire-place and places it in his hands. He then proceeds to string the bow, and to shoot from his seat (αὐτοθεν ἐκ διόρωα καθῆμενος, 21. 420). Presently at his signal Telemachus armed himself and took his stand near his father (21. 431), who immediately sprang on...
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to the 'great threshold' of the hall; and the slaying of the Suitors began. All this time Ulysses has been at or near the entrance of the μέγαρον, except when he made his round of begging.

§ 8. The use of ἄνω and κατά.

This account of the matter is strongly confirmed by an observation which Mr. Myres has made on the force of the prepositions ἄνω and κατά in relation to a house. It may be described shortly by saying that the ideas of 'up' and 'down' are the same as if we were speaking of a cave or a well. To enter a house is to go down into it (cp. the phrase ἐβόησεν ἐπὶ τὸ δόμα and the like): to leave it is to come up out of it. Hence κατὰ δόμα (μέγαρον, ὥσον, δόμον, &c.) implies motion from the door to the interior of the house or room: ἄνω δόμα, &c. motion towards the entrance. This distinction Mr. Myres establishes by a convincing array of examples. It aids in the interpretation of several passages:

(1) In 17. 531 κατὰ δῶμα is said by Penelope of the place of the Suitors—showing that she was outside of the hall when she spoke (not within or behind it).

(2) In 17. 566 Ulysses goes on his round of begging κατὰ δῶμα, i.e. he proceeded from the entrance, where he had been sitting.

(3) In 22. 23, 99, 307 the Suitors are driven κατὰ δῶμα, or κατὰ μέγαρον, by Ulysses, who is on the threshold (cp. 22. 270 μηροτέμες ὧν ἀνεχόμεναι μεγάρον μυχάδε). So 22. 381 πάντως ὦ Ὀδυσσέα καθ’ ἐκεῖ δύναται.

And e contrario:

(4) In 21. 234 Ulysses tells Eumaeus to bring the bow to him ἄνω δῶμα, from the middle of the room to the place where he was, viz. beside the λαῦνοι συνήθες. Accordingly Eumaeus brought the bow φέρων ἄνω δῶμα (21. 378); and from that moment the escape of the Suitors was barred.

Apart from these passages, which the proper distinction thus made between ἄνω and κατά converts into so many arguments, the mere existence of such a distinction goes a long way to establish the correctness of the view now taken. As Mr. Myres well argues, the difference between 'from the door' and 'to the door' is hardly conceivable with two doors exactly opposite each other. It could only arise or be maintained if the μέγαρον, as a rule, had one door.
§ 9. The ὀροθύρῃ, &c.

A discussion of the Homeric House, as Mr. Myres justly says, can hardly be complete without dealing in some detail with the narrative of Od. 22. 126–146. Some of the difficulties of that passage have been touched upon in the commentary; and unfortunately they are difficulties upon which the ground plans of Mycenaean buildings do not throw any new light. It will be enough here to state very briefly the chief conclusions arrived at.

The ὀροθύρῃ seems from its name to have been a 'rising door,' i.e. a trap-door of some kind; or possibly a 'raised door,' an opening or window above the level of the floor. In any case the way through it lay in an upward direction, as appears from the phrase ἀν ὀροθύρῃ ὑποβαίνει (22. 132)—unless indeed any way out of the hall could be spoken of as a way 'up.' The place of the ὀροθύρῃ is approximately fixed by the incident of Od. 22. 332–341, where Phemius is described as close to it, and also near the mixing-bowl, which was in the innermost part of the hall (21. 145). It was therefore, as we should expect, as far as possible from where Ulysses stood. There is nothing to show whether it was in the wall opposite the main entrance, or in one of the side-walls: but on the latter supposition it is easier to understand how Eumaeus could watch it from the outside, and still be within reach of his friends. Apparently it was through the ὀροθύρῃ that Melanthius fetched arms for the Suitors (see the note on 22. 143).

As he did so without being seen from the threshold, we must suppose some contrivance by which the ὀροθύρῃ was screened from view—unless we are to understand that Melanthius was outside the ὀροθύρῃ all the time, and only passed in the arms through it. The Suitors might have got out by it themselves, as Phemius afterwards thought of doing (22. 332 ff.): but they could only reach the courtyard by a λαύρῃ, a narrow corridor or gallery 13, where one man would have been a match for them all.

Regarding the phrases ἀκρότατον τερ' ὀδὸν (22. 127) and ἄλλα μέρας μεγάλοι (22. 143) the existing purely literary evidence does not enable us to advance beyond more or less probable conjecture.

13 Mr. Myres compares the mining galleries from which Laúrium (Λαύρειον) was so called.
View of Ithaca, looking northwards
Taken by permission from a photograph belonging to the German Archaeological Institute of Athens.
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Smyrna App. 387, 390.
Solon App. 397.
Stasinus App. 347.
Stesimbrotus App. 388, 411.
Strabo quoted App. 406, 429.
Symplegades App. 318, 337.
Syra 15.403.
Syracuse App. 400.
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Thebaid App. 383, 386.
Thebes, Egyptian App. 337.
Theseus (Little Iliad) App. 370.
Thesprotia App. 337.
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ULYSSES PLANTING THE OAK
From an engraved gem (Inghirami, Galleria Omerica, vol. iii. 55).
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<td>Aetna</td>
<td>A critical recension of the Text, based on a new examination of MSS., with Prolegomena, Translation, Textual and Exegetical Commentary, Excerpts, and complete Index of the words. By Robinson Ellis, M.A., LL.D.</td>
<td>Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avianus</td>
<td>The Fables. Edited, with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Commentary, &amp;c., by Robinson Ellis, M.A., LL.D.</td>
<td>8vo. 8s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>De Bello Gallico. Books I-VII. According to the Text of Emanuel Hofmann (Vienna, 1890). Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by St. George Stock.</td>
<td>Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catulli Veronensis Liber</td>
<td>Iterum recognit, Apparatum Criticium Prolegomena Appendices addidit, R. Ellis, A.M.</td>
<td>8vo. 16s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catullus</td>
<td>a Commentary on.</td>
<td>By Robinson Ellis, M.A.</td>
<td>Second Edition. 8vo. 18s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Pro Milone. Edited by A. C. Clark, M.A. 8vo. 8s. 6d.</td>
<td>Select Letters. With English Introductions, Notes, and Appendices. By Albert Watson, M.A. Fourth Edition. 8vo. 18s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry</td>
<td>Selected Fragments of Roman Poetry. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by W. W. Merry, D.D. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ovid. P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibis. Ex Novis Codicibus edidit, Scholia Vetera Commentarius cum Prolegomenis Appendice Indiciis addidit, R. Ellis, A.M. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
—— P. Ovidii Nasonis Tristium Libri V. Recensuit S. G. Owen, A.M. 8vo. 16s.


Plautus. Rudens. Edited, with Critical and Explanatory Notes, by E. A. Sonnenschein, M.A. 8vo. 8s. 6d.
—— The Codex Turnebei of Plautus. By W. M. Lindsay, M.A. 8vo, 21s. net.

Quintilian. Institutiones Oratoriae Liber Decimus. A Revised Text, with Introductory Essays, Critical Notes, &c. By W. Peterson, M.A., LL.D. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Rushforth. Latin Historical Inscriptions, illustrating the History of the Early Empire. By G. McN. Rushforth, M.A. 8vo. 10s. net.

King and Cookson. The Principles of Sound and Inflexion, as Illustrated in the Greek and Latin Languages. By J. E. King, M.A., and Christopher Cookson, M.A. 8vo. 18s.
—— An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

Lindsay. The Latin Language. An Historical Account of Latin Sounds, Stems and Flexions. By W. M. Lindsay, M.A. Demy 8vo. 21s.

Nettleship. Lectures and Essays on Subjects connected with Latin Scholarship and Literature.
—— Second Series. Edited by F. J. Haverfield, with Memoir by Mrs. Nettleship. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.


Tacitus. De Germania. By the same Editor. 8vo. 6s. 6d.
—— Vita Agricola. By the same Editor. 8vo. 6s. 6d.
—— Dialogus de Oratoribus. A Revised Text, with Introductory Essays, and Critical and Explanatory Notes. By W. Peterson, M.A., LL.D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Velleius Paterculus ad M. Viniciurn Libri Duo. Ex Americhevi praeceptus Apographo edidit et emendavit R. Ellis, Literarum Latinorum Professor publicus apud Oxonienses. Crown 8vo, paper boards. 6s.

Also sold in parts, as follows—
Bucolics and Georgics, 2s. 6d.
Aeneid, in 4 parts, 2s. each.

Nettleship. Contributions to Latin Lexicography. 8vo. 21s.

II. Horace and the Elegiac Poets. With a Memoir of the Author by Andrew Lang, M.A. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

2. STANDARD GREEK WORKS.


Farnell. *The Cults of the Greek States. With Plates*. By L. R. Farnell, M. A.

Vols. I and II. 8vo. 32s. net.

Volume III in Preparation.

Grenfell. *An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment and other Greek Papyri, chiefly Ptolemaic*. Edited by B. P. Grenfell, M. A. Sm. 4to. 8s. 6d. net.


--- Menander's *Féwpróç.*

A Revised Text of the Geneva Fragment. With a Translation and Notes by the same Editors. 8vo, stiff covers, 12s. 6d.


A Description of the Stage and Theatre of the Athenians, and of the Dramatic Performances at Athens. By A. E. Haigh, M. A. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

--- The Tragic Drama of the Greeks. With Illustrations. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Aeschylus. *In Single Plays.*


I. *Agamemnon*. II. *Choephoroi*. III. *Eumenides.*


Aristophanes. *In Single Plays.*

Edited, with English Notes, Introductions, &c., by W. W. Merry, D. D. Extra fcp. 8vo.


The Birds. Third Edition, 32. 6d.


The Peace. 32. 6d.

The Wasps. 32. 6d.

Aristotle. *Ex recensione.*

Im. Bekker. Accedent Indices Sylburgiani. Tomi XI. 8vo. 21. 10s.

The volumes (except I and IX) may be had separately, price 5s. 6d. each.
Aristotle. *Ethica Nicomachea*, recognovit brevique Adnotatione criticà instruxit I. Bywater. 8vo. 6s. Also in crown 8vo, paper covers, 3s. 6d.

— Contributions to the Textual Criticism of the Nicomachean Ethics. By I. Bywater. 2z. 6d.

— Notes on the Nicomachean Ethics. By J. A. Stewart, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

— *Selecta ex Organò Aristotelis Capitula*. In usum Scholarum Academiarum. Crown 8vo, stiff covers. 3s. 6d.

— *De Arte Poética Liber*. Recognovit Brevique Adnotatione Criticà Instruxit I. Bywater, Litterarum Graecarum Professor Regius. Post 8vo, stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

— *The Politics*, with Introductions, Notes, &c., by W. L. Newman, M.A. Vols. i and II. Medium 8vo. 28s.

Vols. III and IV. [Immediately.]

— *The Politics*, translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices, by B. Jowett, M.A. Medium 8vo. 2 vols. 21s.

— *Physics*. Book VII. Collation of various ms.; with Introduction by R. Shute, M.A. (Anecdota Oxoni.) Small 4to. 2s.


Vol. I. Philippic I. Olympiæae I–III. Extra feap. 8vo. 3s.

Vol. II. De Pace, Philippic II. De Chersoneso, Philippic III. Extra feap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.


Heracliti *Epheii Religivae*. Recensuit I. Bywater, M.A. Appendicis loco additae sunt Diogenis Laertii Vita Heracliti, Particulæ Hippocratei De Dieta Lib. I., Epistole Heracliti. 8vo. 6s.


Homer. *A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey and Hymns of Homer*; to which is added a Concordance to the Parallel Passages in the Iliad, Odyssey, and Hymns. By Henry Dunbar, M.D. 4to. 21s.


— *Ilias*, ex rec. Gul. Dindorfi. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

— *Scholia Graeca in Iliadem*. Edited by W. Dindorf, after a new collation of the Venetian ms. by D. B. Monro, M.A. 4 vols. 8vo. 50s.

— *Scholia Graeca in Iliadem Tumuleyana*. Recensuit Ernestus Maass. 2 vols. 8vo. 36s.

— *Odyssey*, ex rec. G. Dindorfi. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

— *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam*. Edidit Gul. Dindorfius. Tomi II. 8vo. 15s. 6d.


   Also in various leather bindings.

Plato. Apology, with a revised Text and English Notes, and a Digest of Platonic Idioms, by James Riddell, M.A. 8vo. 8s. 6d.
   Philebus, with a revised Text and English Notes, by Edward Poste, M.A. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
   Sophistes and Politicus, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
   Theaetetus, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
   The Dialogues, translated into English, with Analyses and Introductions, by B. Jowett, M.A. Third Edition. 5 vols. Medium 8vo. Cloth, 84s.; half-morocco, 100s.
   The Republic, translated into English, with Analysis and Introduction, by B. Jowett, M.A. Third Edition. Medium 8vo. 12s. 6d.; half-roan, 14s.
   I. The Apology, 2s. 6d.
   II. Crito, 2s. III. Meno, 2s. 6d.


Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. With English Notes and Introductions, by Lewis Campbell, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s. each.

Sophocles. Tragoediae et Fragmenta cum Annotationibus Guili. Dindorfi. Tomi II. 8vo. 10s.
   The Text, Vol. I. 5s. 6d.
   The Notes, Vol. II. 4s. 6d.


Thucydides. Translated into English, to which is prefixed an Essay on Inscriptions and a Note on the Geography of Thucydides. By B. Jowett, M.A. Second Edition, Revised. 2 vols., 8vo, cloth, 15s.
   Vol. I. Essay on Inscriptions and Books I-III
   Vol. II. Books IV-VIII and Historical Index.

Xenophon. A Commentary, with Introduction and Appendices, on the Hellenica of Xenophon. By G. E. Underhill, M.A. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.
3. OXFORD CLASSICAL TEXTS.

GREEK.

AESCHYLI TRAGOEDIAE. CUM FRAGMENTIS. A. SIDGWICK. Paper covers, 3s.; limp cloth, 3s. 6d.; India Paper, 4s. 6d.

APOLLONII RHODII ARGONAUTICA. R. C. SEATON. Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; limp cloth, 3s.

ARISTOPHANIS COMOEDIAE CUM FRAGMENTIS. F. W. HALL and W. M. GELDART. Tom. I. Paper covers, 3s.; limp cloth, 3s. 6d. Tom. II. Paper covers, 3s.; limp cloth, 3s. 6d. Complete, on India Paper, 8s. 6d.


THUCYDIDIS HISTORIAE. H. STUART JONES. Tom. I (Libri I-IV). Paper covers, 3s.; limp cloth, 3s. 6d. Tom. II (Libri V-VIII). Paper covers, 3s.; limp cloth, 3s. 6d. Complete, on India Paper, 8s. 6d.

XENOPHONTIS OPERA. E. C. MARCHANT. Tom. I (Historia Graeca). Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; limp cloth, 3s. Tom. II (Libri Socratici). Paper covers, 3s.; limp cloth, 3s. 6d.

LATIN.

CAESARIIS COMMENTARII. R. L. A. DU PONTET. De Bello Gallico. Paper covers, 2s.; limp cloth, 2s. 6d. De Bello Civili, Cum Libris Incertorum Auctorum. Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; limp cloth, 3s. Complete, on India Paper, 7s.

CICERONIS ORATIONES PRO MILONE, CAESARIANAEC, PHILIPPICAE I-XIV. A. C. CLARK. Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; limp cloth, 3s.

CICERONIS EPISTULARAE AD FAMILIARES. L. C. PURSER. Paper covers, 5s.; limp cloth, 6s.

HORATI OPERA. E. C. WICKHAM. Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; limp cloth, 3s.; India Paper, 4s. 6d.

LUCRETI CARI DE RERUM NATURA. C. BAILEY. Paper covers, 2s. 6d. limp cloth, 3s.; India Paper, 4s.

SEXTI PROPERTI CARMINA. J. S. PHILLIMORE. Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; limp cloth, 3s.

CORNELI TACITI OPERA MINORA. H. FURNEAUX. Paper covers, 1s. 6d.; limp cloth, 2s.

VERGILI OPERA. F. A. HIRTZEL. Paper covers, 3s.; limp cloth, 3s. 6d.; India Paper, 4s. 6d.
4. MISCELLANEOUS

Arbuthnot. The Life and Works of John Arbuthnot. By George A. Aitken. 8vo, cloth extra, with Portrait, 16s.

Bacon. The Essays. Edited, with Introduction and Illustrative Notes, by S. H. Reynolds, M.A. 8vo, half-bound, 12s. 6d.


Finlay. A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the present time, B.C. 146 to A.D. 1864. By George Finlay, LL.D. A new Edition, revised throughout, and in part re-written, with considerable additions, by the Author, and edited by H. F. Tozer, M.A. 7 vols. 8vo. 70s.

Greenidge. The Legal Procedure in Cicero’s Time. By A. H. J. Greenidge. 8vo. 21s.


Kyd. The Works of Thomas Kyd. Edited from the original Texts, with Introduction, Notes, and Facsimiles, by Frederick S. Boas, M.A. 8vo. 15s. 6d.

STANDARD WORKS.


Morris. The Welsh Wars of Edward the First. A Contribution to Medieval Military History, based on original documents. By John E. Morris, M.A. With a Map and Pedigrees. 8vo. 9s. 6d. net.


Pattison. Essays by the late Mark Pattison, sometime Rector of Lincoln College. Collected and Arranged by Henry Nettleship, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.


Ralegh. Sir Walter Ralegh. A Biography. By W. Stebbing. Re-issue. Small Post 8vo. 6s. net. * * Also in Half-parchment, with List of Authorities separately, post 8vo, 10s. 6d.


Rhys. Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx. By John Rhys, M.A., D.Litt. 2 vols. 8vo, 21s. — Studies in the Arthurian Legend. 8vo, 12s. 6d.


London: HENRY FROWDE, Amen Corner, E.C.
5 STANDARD THEOLOGICAL WORKS, &c.


The Book of Ennoch. Translated from Dillmann’s Ethiopic Text (emended and revised), and Edited by R. H. Charles, M.A. 8vo. 16s.


Ecclesiasticius (xxxix. 15—xlxi. 11). The Original Hebrew, with Early Versions and English Translations, &c. Edited by A. Cowley, M.A., and Ad. Neubauer, M.A. 4to. 10s. 6d. net.

Ecclesiasticius. Faceimiles of the Fragments hitherto recovered of the Book of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew. 60 leaves, collotype, in a Cloth Box, price 21s. net. (Published jointly by the Oxford and Cambridge University Presses.)


—— Supplement, Fasc. I. Containing a Concordance to the Proper Names occurring in the Septuagint, by H. A. Redpath, M.A. Imperial 4to. 16s.


Turner. Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Turci Antiquissima: Canonum et Conciliorum Graecorum Interpretationes Latinae. Edidit Cuthbertus Hamilton Turner, A.M. Fasc. I. para. 1. 4to, stiff covers, 10s. 6d.
