

CONTENTS

List of Illustrations ix

1	Introduction	1
2	The Telemachy: Tales of the Father	31
3	From Listener to Narrator: Odysseus at the Phaeacian Court	75
4	Polyphemus: Narrative, Art and History	109
5	Homecoming, Recognition and Narrative	150
6	Ethics and Narrative	195
7	Narrating the Ending	235
8	Epilogue: Reflexivity and Experience	262

Bibliography 275

Index Locorum 291

Index 299

1

Introduction

‘I AM ODYSSEUS son of Laertes, known before all men / for the study of crafty designs, and my fame goes up to the heavens’ (*Od.* 9.19–20).¹ These are the words with which Odysseus introduces himself to the Phaeacians. The assertion seems to have lost none of its validity—his fame indeed reverberates throughout modern literature. James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, a key twentieth-century novel with its stream of consciousness narration, is merely one well-known example of the wide-ranging reception of Homer’s *Odyssey*. Those who would rather not delve into the 33,333 verses of Nikos Kazantzakis’s *Odyssey: A Modern Sequel* might like to try Franz Kafka’s short story ‘The Silence of the Sirens’, or *The Penelopiad* by Margaret Atwood. Echoes of Odysseus can also be found in poetry, by poets as diverse as Paul Celan and Gabriele d’Annunzio, Ernst Jandl and Durs Grünbein. And on stage, Odysseus is not just a figure of ancient tragedy—he also appears in modern plays: by Jean Giradoux and Botho Strauß, for instance.

Additionally, Odysseus is a frequent motif in the visual arts. In a picture painted by Max Beckmann during his Amsterdam exile, Odysseus, embraced by Calypso, directs his gaze at the far horizon, arms folded behind his head (Fig. 1). While Picasso depicts him on the high seas surrounded by the Sirens (Fig. 2), Giorgio de Chirico’s Odysseus rows across a sea that is a mere carpet in a living room (Fig. 3). Abstract

1. English translations of both the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* in this volume are by Richmond Lattimore (with some slight modifications): see Lattimore (1975); Lattimore (1961 [1951]).



FIG. 2. Pablo Picasso (1881–1973), *Ulysse et les sirènes*, 1947, Ripolin paint and graphite on three eternit panels, 360 × 250 cm, Musée Picasso, Antibes. Photo: akg-images. © Succession Picasso/VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn 2023.



FIG. 3. Giorgio de Chirico (1888–1978), *Il ritorno di Ulisse*, 1968, oil on canvas, 59.5 × 80 cm, Casa Museo di Giorgio de Chirico, Rome. Photo: Luisa Ricciarini/Bridgeman Images. © VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn 2023.

artists, too, were inspired by the *Odyssey*. A painting by Willem de Kooning, which is over two metres high and dominated by pastel shades, bears a title that includes a Homeric expression: *Rosy-Fingered Dawn at Louse Point*. Romare Bearden, in turn, merges the ancient myth with the Afro-American tradition. In his collages, the heroes of the *Odyssey* are represented as African tribal members and the savannah, along with other African landscapes, forms the background. Circe, for example, is a black sorceress who, adorned with heavy amulets, bends over a skull while a snake coils itself around her arm and a lion bares its teeth in the background (Fig. 4).

The title of one of the most famous films of the twentieth century, Stanley Kubrick's *Space Odyssey* (2001), refers to the Homeric epic, while



FIG. 4. Romare Bearden (1911–1988), *Circe*, 1977, collage on paper mounted to fibreboard, 38 × 24 cm, Chazen Museum of Art, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Colonel Rex W. and Maxine Schuster Radsch Endowment Fund purchase 2014.1. © Romare Bearden Foundation/VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn 2023.

the Coen Brothers' comedy *O Brother, Where Art Thou* (2000) is loosely based on the *Odyssey*. It depicts a Mississippi odyssey in the shape of convict Ulysses Everett McGill and his cronies' escape from prison. Many of their adventures, like the encounter with a one-eyed Bible salesman, treat the Homeric motifs in a satirical manner and Everett eventually returns to his wife, aptly named Penny, after numerous trials and tribulations. By contrast, the film *Ulysses' Gaze*, which won the Grand Jury Prize in Cannes in 1995, offers a serious treatment of the subject. Greek director Theo Angelopoulos presents a contemporary odyssey through the crisis-ridden Balkans where only melancholy testifies to a great past.

Odysseus reverberates not only through the arts—he also permeates intellectual history. Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno interpret the *Odyssey* as an illustration of the dialectic of the Enlightenment and ultimately, as the culmination of the Enlightenment in National Socialist barbarism. For them, Odysseus is an example showing how the attempt to overcome myth leads to new dependencies, and finally back to mythologies: 'no work bears more eloquent witness to the intertwinement of the Enlightenment and myth than that of Homer, the basic text of European civilization.'² The price which Odysseus pays for prevailing against primitive monsters is self-denial: 'the nimble-witted man survives only at the cost of his own dream, which he forfeits by disintegrating his own magic along with that of the powers outside him.'³ And it is not only Odysseus who pays dearly for overcoming natural powers—he subjugates his companions and anticipates the oppression of the proletariat. While he listens to the Sirens' singing, or in other words, surrenders to culture, his companions are not permitted to do likewise. Instead, they have to row with all their might. Behind the supposed liberation, new dependencies lurk, and the Enlightenment reverts to myth.

While for critical theory, Odysseus stands for the bourgeois who, moreover, can quickly turn into a fascist, Peter Sloterdijk invokes him as the predecessor of a positive Enlightenment. For Sloterdijk, Odysseus is not only a proto-sophist; his cunning also represents the virtue that can

2. Horkheimer and Adorno (1969 [1947]): 37.

3. *Ibid.*: 45.

potentially shake modern Europeans awake before complacency causes them to slip into some self-inflicted, terminal ineptness until they are finally transformed into ‘a nation of lotus eaters [. . .]’. The great homecoming hero remains an indispensable, paradigmatic, absolutely exhilarating ally, the versatile teacher of how to not be helpless.⁴ Like Horkheimer and Adorno, Sloterdijk refers to Odysseus in his critique of civilization, but whereas the former see instrumental reason and the dawn of barbarism, Sloterdijk perceives *furbizia*, a kind of shrewdness that knows how to turn every deficiency into a challenge, every plight into a project.

The enduring presence of the *Odyssey* is evident not least from the fact that its title has become synonymous with the notion of prolonged wandering, ultimately with a favourable outcome. A flight from a despotic regime is referred to as an odyssey, for instance, as is the foreigner’s arduous route to a railway station that is found only with great difficulty. Homer’s epic is not usually thought of when the term is used on such occasions, which shows just how deeply it has entered our imaginations and everyday language. And yet, just as a forgotten metaphor can be revived, so the Homeric origin of the term ‘odyssey’ can be made to resonate afresh. This is seen in *The New Odyssey: The Story of the European Refugee Crisis* (2016), in which Patrick Kingsley analyses the refugee crisis using the fate of a Syrian man as an example. The text is preceded by an epigraph that quotes from the *Odyssey*: ‘If any god has marked me out again for shipwreck, my tough heart can undergo it. What hardships have I not long since endured at sea, in battle! Let the trial come.’ Many politicians and journalists also speak of the ‘odyssey of the refugees’, albeit without making any reference to Homer. Kingsley’s quote draws attention to the origin of the term in order to emphasize the dignity, or even heroic status, of refugees, and to claim a place in Europe for them.

Even though the literary canon has been questioned, Odysseus remains an integral part of our shared imagination. He moves effortlessly through the various media of art, is at home in paintings and films as much as in literature and has found a new home in comics and computer games. He can be the main or a secondary character, a hero or charlatan,

4. Sloterdijk (2018): 177.

warrior or enlightener. As versatile and omnipresent as he is, Odysseus comes from an epic that originated in ancient Greece—the Homeric *Odyssey*. It was written in a language that was artificial even then, and is told in a style that is quite strange to us today. It is the aim of this book to make it accessible to today's audience in a new way, but without detracting from the strangeness of the Homeric epic. Reading the *Odyssey* is both an intellectual challenge and an aesthetic pleasure. Homer's narrative is not only brilliant—it also stimulates reflection, not least about narrative itself and its multilayered relationship to experience. Before embarking on an interpretation of the Homeric epic, however, some introduction to its special features will be required. The content and structure of the *Odyssey* and the history of its reception will be briefly recalled; the *quaestio Homerica*—the question of the genesis of the Homeric epics—will be examined and the liveliness of the epic narrative explored through important formal elements, such as formulaic language and typical scenes. All these aspects will serve to establish the perspective from which the *Odyssey* is interpreted in the chapters that follow.

Structure and Content

The *Odyssey* comprises over twelve thousand verses, which have been divided into twenty-four books since the Hellenistic editions. The three main parts are the Telemachy, Escape to the Phaeacians with the Apologoi, and the Mnesterophony, or Murder of the Suitors. The Telemachy occupies the first four books. At the outset, the gods decide that Odysseus, who is being kept prisoner by the nymph Calypso, should at last be allowed to return home. But the reader must read four books before finally meeting the hero of the epic. As the term 'Telemachy' suggests, it is Odysseus's son Telemachus who is at the centre of this initial narrative. When Odysseus had departed to join the Trojan War, he left behind his wife and their infant son. Now, twenty years later, the son has matured into a youth on the threshold of manhood, but finds himself in a difficult situation: his father's estate on the island of Ithaca has been taken over by a horde of a hundred and eight young men who are all courting his mother, Penelope. And not only do the suitors enjoy

themselves at the expense of the house; they also threaten Telemachus's position. If Penelope were to remarry, he would lose his status as heir to any children from the second marriage. Penelope has so far succeeded in stalling the suitors by a ruse—she refuses to remarry until she has completed the shroud for her father-in-law, Laertes.

For several years, she has unravelled at night what she had woven during the day. But her maidservants betray the ruse to the suitors. Additionally, doubts have grown about Odysseus's survival and threaten to dash any hopes of his ultimate return—Penelope's new marriage seems inevitable. This is the situation when the goddess Athena, alternately hidden in the figures of Mentos and Mentor, approaches Telemachus and advises him to set off and seek news of his father. Is Odysseus still roaming in this tenth year since the fall of Troy, or has he died ignominiously at sea and been eaten by the fishes? Should Telemachus resist the suitors or permit his mother to be married to the best among them? After calling a people's assembly, which makes him the laughing stock of the suitors, Telemachus secretly boards a ship during the night and sails to Pylos in order to consult the aged Nestor. While Nestor is able to tell him about the return of many of the Greek warriors, he knows nothing of Odysseus's whereabouts. On Nestor's recommendation and accompanied by Nestor's son Peisistratus, Telemachus continues his journey to seek Menelaus, who had been the last of the warriors to return home. He meets him and his wife Helen in Sparta and listens to stories about the Trojan War and Menelaus's own valiant return. But all he learns of his father is that he had been seen with the nymph Calypso.

It is in the fifth book that the hero of the epic finally appears. A second meeting of the gods sends Hermes to Calypso to order her to let Odysseus go, and after seven years on the Ogygian island he finally sets out on a raft. He sails for seventeen days before Poseidon churns up the sea into a violent storm. For two days Odysseus is a plaything of the waves; it is not until the third day that he succeeds, with the last of his strength and more dead than alive, to reach the shore of the Phaeacian island of Scheria. On the beach he meets the king's daughter, Nausicaa, who falls in love with him in spite of his pitiful condition. With her help he reaches the king's palace, where Alcinous welcomes him. Without

revealing his identity, Odysseus feasts, listens to bard Demodocus's songs and even competes with the Phaeacian nobility in an *agōn*. When he hears the bard sing about the Trojan War for the second time, however, Odysseus, as before, cannot hold back his tears, and now reveals his identity.

Most of this second part of the *Odyssey*, Escape to the Phaeacians—the story of Odysseus's stay on the Phaeacian island of Scheria—is taken up with the *Apologoi*, consisting of the hero's own account of his exploits and tribulations. In Books 9 to 12, he tells the Phaeacians of his adventures after the fall of Troy. He initially came to Ismarus in the land of the Cicones with twelve ships. The Greeks sacked the city but were surprised by other Cicones while celebrating their victory. They managed to flee but incurred great losses. A storm then drove the Greeks to the lotus eaters. Two men who tasted the lotus had to be forcibly returned to the ships. Almost the entire ninth book is taken up with their encounter with the cyclops Polyphemus, who imprisons Odysseus and his reconnaissance troop of twelve men in his cave. It is only after Polyphemus has devoured six companions that Odysseus succeeds in blinding him and escaping with the remaining men. Nevertheless, the episode proves disastrous—Polyphemus curses Odysseus and implores his father Poseidon to make his return home, if not doomed to failure, as difficult and painful as possible.

Initially, everything seems to work out well for Odysseus. He receives a hose that banishes unfavourable winds from Aeolus, Lord of the Winds. But, with Ithaca already in sight, Odysseus's envious companions open Aeolus's gift as he sleeps. The winds escape and drive the ship far off course. In a battle with the Laestrygonians, huge cannibals, Odysseus loses eleven ships and their crews. On the sole remaining ship, he reaches the island of Aeaëa. There, Circe turns half of his companions into pigs. Only when Odysseus defeats her with the help of Hermes does she restore them to their human form. He becomes Circe's lover and, together with his companions, stays on Aeaëa for a year. Then Circe sends him to the underworld, where he asks the seer Teiresias about his journey home and meets the ghosts of the dead, including Achilles and Agamemnon.

Odysseus returns to Circe and, following her instructions, continues his journey, first to sail past the Sirens, whose beguiling song he hears while lashed to the ship's mast, then to sail through a strait, with Scylla, a monster with six heads and three rows of teeth on one side of it, and Charybdis, who swallows the sea three times a day, on the other. The ship finally docks at Thrinacia, where the windless air holds up the voyage. Driven by hunger, the companions devour cattle dedicated to the sun god Helios, without Odysseus's knowledge and in spite of Circe's warning. Shortly after the ship can finally weigh anchor, it is caught in a terrible storm. Only Odysseus survives and, clinging to the mast, he has to pass Scylla and Charybdis again. After nine days, he arrives on Ogygia badly battered. There, Calypso takes him in and makes him her lover. He stays with her for seven years until the gods decide that he should be allowed to return home.

In the *Apologoi*, Odysseus tells of his wanderings up to the point where the plot begins in the fifth book. Homer thus allows his hero to tell a large part of his experiences himself; the spectacular adventures associated with the name Odysseus are therefore told from a first-person perspective. In the thirteenth book, the Homeric narrator takes over once more and recounts in this extensive third part, the entire second half of the work, how Odysseus reconquers his position on Ithaca, first with cunning, then by force. The Phaeacians, famous for their nautical skill, accompany him to his native island. Once there, he meets Athena, who gives him instructions and promises him her support. She transforms him into an old beggar so that he can prepare his return incognito. Odysseus first goes to his faithful swineherd Eumaeus, where he also sees Telemachus, who has just returned from his own voyage after having survived an attack by the suitors with Athena's help. In the first recognition scene, Odysseus reveals his identity to Telemachus and initiates him into his plans.

When Odysseus sets foot on his farm for the first time in twenty years in disguise, only his old dog, who lies neglected on a dung heap recognizes him, and, as if he had been waiting for him all that time, dies. The farm is full of suitors partying, loafing about, playing and dancing as if they owned the estate. They taunt the newly arrived beggar and

only permit him to stay when he wins a combat with another beggar. When Odysseus is granted an audience with Penelope and tells her that her husband's return is imminent, she does not believe him. She sets up a challenge for the suitors—whoever can draw Odysseus's old bow and hit the target through twelve axes will become her husband.

None of the suitors succeeds. When the beggar is given the bow, he draws it effortlessly and hits the target. Then he aims again and shoots the second arrow into the throat of Antinous, one of the suitors' ring-leaders. The suitors are shocked and seized by fear when the beggar is revealed as Odysseus. A bloodbath ensues. Together with two faithful shepherds who had been initiated into the plan beforehand, Odysseus and Telemachus slaughter all the suitors, who have been locked up in the hall. When the suitors succeed in obtaining weapons, Athena intervenes and helps Odysseus to complete his work. He forces the unfaithful servants to carry out the corpses and clean the bloodstained house, then has them executed. But even after Athena reverses his transformation and rejuvenates him, Penelope still does not recognize her husband. It is only when he tells her how he had himself built their marriage bed, which still stands immovably in the bedroom, that she falls into his arms. With Athena holding back the dawn chariot and thus delaying daybreak, Odysseus and Penelope reunite and tell each other of their experiences. The next day, Odysseus visits his father Laertes, who lives in seclusion in the country, and, together with him, Telemachus and his followers, meets the suitors' relatives, who are bent on revenge. The gods ultimately stop the fight and bring peace; Ithaca returns to order and the plot has come to an end.

Both the subject matter and narrative techniques of the *Odyssey* have had a lasting influence on storytelling in the Western tradition.⁵ New Comedy, handed down primarily in Menander's fragments but also visible in Roman reception through Plautus and Terence, repeatedly returns to the motif of the separation and reunion of a couple. It follows the teleological plot structure of the *Odyssey*, which builds up tension

5. Lowe (2002) provides a thought-provoking analysis of the *Odyssey's* plot and its reception history.

over the narrative trajectory, which then, at its *telos*, or culmination, is dispelled—after all their trials and tribulations, Odysseus and Penelope finally renew their marriage. It is no coincidence that the scenes of deception and recognition that are so popular in New Comedy resemble the second half of the *Odyssey*. And the *Odyssey* does not necessarily need to have served as a direct model; it may also have influenced Menander and other authors of New Comedy via tragedy: works such as Euripides's *Ion* and *Helen*, for example.

Apart from its influence on New Comedy, in the post-Christian era the impact of the *Odyssey* has been felt particularly in the novel. Any notion of a definitive Greek novel is misleading—it is difficult to establish any common denominator to the five works by Chariton, Xenophon, Longus, Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus, not to mention other surviving novel fragments that indicate an even broader spectrum. Nevertheless, the continuity of motifs and narrative techniques found in both the *Odyssey* and New Comedy is unmistakable—most novels feature a couple who are torn apart, finally to be reunited. In many cases, this union is also linked to the return to a place of origin, which takes up the Odyssean motif of returning home, the so-called 'nostos'. The great economy of plot, and above all, the happy ending continue the narrative tradition of the *Odyssey* and New Comedy.

The *Aethiopica*, probably the most complex of the Greek novels to have survived to this day, narrates the love story of Theagenes, a descendant of Achilles, and the beautiful Ethiopian princess Charicleia, and includes a substantial examination of the *Odyssey*. Its author, Heliodorus, repeatedly quotes from the *Odyssey* and makes explicit comparisons between the central character Kalasiris and Odysseus. He even introduces an etymology of the name Homer into his characters' dialogue—Homer is said to owe his name to the hairy leg (*meros*) he was born with. Additionally, Heliodorus begins the story *in medias res* and blends in the backstory as a long internal narrative. Just as the second half of the *Odyssey* begins with the conclusion of the Apologoi, the end of Kalasiris's story marks the middle of the *Aethiopica*. Heliodorus's novel, as a culmination of ancient narrative art, is inconceivable without the *Odyssey* as a foundation.

The major theories of the novel only began with modernity and tend to view it as an expression of a specifically modern state of mind. Lukács, for instance, offers an analysis of the metaphysical homelessness which the contemporary self is subject to. Bakhtin does at least make reference to Menippean satire, named after its originator, Menippus of Gadara (third century BCE), as a source for the modern novel, but he generally contrasts the modern novel with the ancient epic.⁶ Specialist studies, however, have demonstrated the profound influence which the ancient novel had on the development of the early modern novel.⁷ The claim of the great humanist Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484–1558) reflects the spirit of the times: “This particularly brilliant method of structuring is encountered in Heliodorus’s *Aethiopica*. I believe that any epicist must read this book with great care and keep it in mind as a perfect example.”⁸ After the *Aethiopica* had been translated into European languages in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, many authors did follow Heliiodorus’s example and imitated the *in medias res* opening. While most of the Baroque writers are now forgotten and their often lengthy novels are only known to experts today, Heliiodorus’s influence can also be seen in Cervantes, especially in *Persiles*, which he considered to be his main work and far more important than *Don Quixote*.

Many works of modern and postmodern literature deliberately undermine the conventions of the classical plot; they play with those of its elements without plot relevance, or may deny the reader a rounded ending. And yet, the distinctive teleology found in the *Odyssey*, in New Comedy and the ancient novel are by no means extinct. It continues to be found in what literary scholars are frequently too quick to dismiss as popular literature. The road movie takes up the nostos motif, adventure novels use the idea of prolonged wanderings, and romantic novels incorporate the *Odyssey*’s love story. The fact that very few popular novels borrow directly from the *Odyssey* serves to underline the rich fruit which the epic has borne. The story of a man who roams the world,

6. Lukács (1971 [1916]); Bakhtin (1981); Doody (1996). Pavel (2003), who considers the importance of ancient Greece for the modern novel, is an exception.

7. See the literature in Sandy (1982): 95–124.

8. Scaliger (1964 [1561]): 144.

finally to return home to his wife, and its narrative techniques—suspense, recognition scenes and internal narratives—have all contributed to the fact that the *Odyssey* has influenced Western literary history more than any other work.

The Homeric Question

People were puzzled by Homer even in ancient times. Two Hellenistic epigrams name seven cities that claim to have been Homer's birthplace (AP 16.297–98) and during the Imperial period, several more candidates were added. There was also disagreement about Homer's lifetime; some ancient authors considered him an eyewitness to the Trojan War, while others placed him centuries later. Further epics were attributed to Homer in addition to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and at the same time there were philologists who claimed that the *Odyssey* and *Iliad* had different authors. The fantasies that abounded about Homer's life can still be admired today in ancient biographies. One finds, for instance, that Homer was the son of Phemius, who is a singer in the *Odyssey*, and that he died of depression after he failed to solve a riddle posed by a young fisherman. . . .⁹

For the most part, the Homeric epics were accessible to the Middle Ages only through scant Latin summaries, but they quickly gained in importance after the Renaissance, when translations into European languages appeared in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The 'Homeric question' of the origin of the epics is generally thought to have started with Friedrich August Wolff and the publication of *Prolegomena ad Homerum* in 1795. Wolff developed the thesis that the Homeric poems had been handed down orally over several centuries, subject to constant change in the process, before they were finally written down, at which point they became fixed. Therefore, it is not a single poet named Homer, but rather a multitude of singers who are to be regarded as the authors of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Wolff's originality should not be overestimated here. The Abbé d'Aubignac, Richard Bentley and

9. See Graziosi (2002).

Giambattista Vico had all doubted in their time that a single poet named Homer had written down these texts and lecture notes show that Wolff had developed his ideas from his lecturer Heyne in Göttingen. Nevertheless, it is Wolff's *Prolegomena* that uprooted the myth of the ingenious poet and gave a decisive impetus for modern Homer research.

In the nineteenth century and even at the beginning of the twentieth, philologists endeavoured to identify various stages of development in the texts of the Homeric epics. Where they perceived breaks in the text, they meticulously separated what they supposed were later additions in an effort to arrive at an original version. The *Redaktor* or 'editor' theory, which assumes that a poet had combined several poems into a single text eventually prevailed in research on the *Odyssey*. One of the most important analysts, Adolf Kirchhoff, tried to show that a poem about Odysseus's wanderings is the oldest core of the *Odyssey*. Accordingly, he thought that the revenge on the suitors was written as a continuation of this original text, and, like the *Telemachy*, was added later. Kirchhoff and other analysts used great ingenuity and ploughed through the narrative verse by verse in search of inconsistencies. Wherever they thought they had discovered any, they postulated more or less artfully blended poems.

In the first half of the twentieth century, this kind of analysis lost its primacy in Homer research. Two developments were decisive here—the increasing prominence of the unitarians and of the oralists. There had already been philologists, such as Gregor Wilhelm Nitzsch and Carl Rothe in the nineteenth century, who emphasized the unity of Homeric epics. Even if the epics did refer to earlier material, these scholars felt that both the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* are unmistakably composed as a whole. But it was not until the twentieth century that the unitarians gained the upper hand. Their analysis discredited proponents of the editor theory, not least by highlighting that there was no agreement between them; indeed, there were almost as many models of origin as there were analysts. Many of the inconsistencies on which these proponents had based their theses proved to rest on questionable assumptions. While the unitarians mercilessly exposed the weaknesses and contradictions of these theses, their arguments also conceal a wider

paradigm shift: preoccupation with the origin of epics was being replaced by an interest in the interpretation of the texts. Tensions which the earlier analysts had tried to explain in terms of genesis were interpretative challenges for the unitarians. The origin question was by no means solved, but people became more interested in the way the text was presented, in its effects and meanings.

It is appropriate to speak of a paradigm shift, since similar developments can also be observed in other fields of classical philology, albeit not necessarily concurrently. Until the middle of the twentieth century, for instance, scholars endeavoured to work out the stages of Herodotus's development in the *Histories*: he had first been a geographer and ethnographer and, after becoming a historian, had integrated his earlier studies into his historical work. Similarly to Homeric research, the idea of unity underlying such analyses was questioned. Historians of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries may have been irritated by the breadth of material presented in the *Histories*, but their standards are by no means relevant to Herodotus, especially since he could not fall back on any prior concept of 'historiography', let alone genre conventions. While the analysts discovered discontinuities and explained them genetically, unitarians showed a clear compositional structure, with a succession of great empires as the mainstream of the narrative, from which ethnographic and geographical tributaries branch off whenever new peoples enter the plot.¹⁰

While in German-language Homeric philology the analysts ceded their ground to the unitarians, in Anglophone research they were almost entirely supplanted by the oralists. In 1928, at the age of twenty-six, Milman Parry submitted his dissertation, written in French, to the Sorbonne and laid the foundation for the thesis that the Homeric poems were not only based on oral poems, but had actually been composed orally. Together with his student Albert Lord, Parry went on to pursue field studies in the former Kingdom of Yugoslavia, where he used the

10. Jacoby (1913) and Fritz (1967) are examples of Herodotus analysis; Immerwahr (1966) and Cobet (1971) represent the unitarian position, which is already found in Regenbogen (1930).

example of an existing recitation culture to examine how epics are created and circulated without ever being fixed in written form. The epic formula, defined by Parry as ‘a group of words regularly used under the same metrical conditions to express a specific and essential idea’,¹¹ is fundamental to the oralists’ thesis. According to Parry, formulaic language, which is particularly evident in recurring links between nouns and epithets—‘the rosy-fingered dawn’, ‘the long-enduring Odysseus’—is an example of oral poetry in which singers use a traditional system of formulae to compose and memorize their songs. While both analysts and unitarians assume that the epics made use of oral poems but were in fact written down, Parry, Lord and their followers are convinced that they were composed entirely in oral recital.

The Homeric question does not stir up emotions today like it did fifty years ago, but it does remain controversial. Although analysis no longer plays a major role, it is still pursued by individual scholars, some of whom are well known.¹² Beyond that, German-speaking philologists tend towards unitarian positions, and their English-speaking colleagues towards oralist positions. The unitarians focus on the complex structure of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and on recurring resonances within each epic, which, according to them, would be inconceivable without the use of writing. However, they wrestle with the question of how the epics might have been written down in archaic Greece. They must deal with difficult technical questions, such as in what medium such long texts are supposed to have been recorded. For example, there are no surviving papyri or parchment strips from archaic Greece. The naïve inscriptions on vases also contribute to doubts that several thousand verses could have been written down at that point, while the question of why an oral culture should write down poetry that was exclusively circulated through recitation is even more challenging.

Conversely, while oralists can rely on the oral tradition of archaic society, despite all attempts to find parallels from other epic traditions, it remains difficult for many philologists to imagine how such extensive

11. Parry (1971): 272.

12. See, for instance, West (2011); (2014).

and complex works could have been created in oral poetry. We cannot date the Homeric epics precisely, but linguistic and historical findings suggest that they were composed in the seventh, and perhaps as early as the eighth century BCE. What kind of institutional framework would have been able to ensure that they took a fixed form, to be reliably handed down for centuries? Oral traditions are only stable in exceptional cases; as a rule, they are adapted to the horizons of any given contemporary world. There is some evidence that singing guilds performed the Homeric epics at festivals such as the Panathenaia, but this is from a later time and should not be too much relied upon.

Although the Homeric question will probably remain a mystery and continue to cause headaches, we can conclude that like the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, contains formal elements of oral poetry, which distinguish it from later literature. However, these peculiarities do not make it impossible to interpret the Homeric epics, and the unresolved problem of genesis does not relieve us of the necessity of interpretation. It will therefore be useful to look at the most striking characteristics of oral poetry in early Greek epic and ask what role they play in interpretation.

Formulaic Language and Typical Scenes

Formulaic language conveys both the oral origins of the Homeric epics and, if we follow Parry and his followers, their oral composition. Fixed, recurring combinations of words form the building blocks from which the rhapsodists composed their songs. The formulaic combination of names with epithets, such as ‘stony Ithaca’ or ‘wise Penelope’ are those that initially stand out, but formulae can also take up an entire verse, or even several verses. Daybreak, for instance, is portrayed by the formula ‘when rosy-fingered dawn appeared’. At banquets we often find the verse, ‘When they had roasted the outer flesh and taken it from the spits, they divided the portions out and began the glorious feast.’¹³

13. Since the flood of publications on Homeric formulaic language subsided after the 1970s, the two survey articles by Edwards, (1986) and (1988) are still helpful. See also Russo (1997) and more recently, Bakker (2013): 157–69.

On another level, formulae continue in so-called ‘typical scenes.’¹⁴ In order to depict recurring actions, such as a sacrifice, assembly or bath, Homer makes use of fixed blocks of words, some of which consist of formulae. He reproduces the individual steps of an action in a specific sequence but varies the degree of detail. For example, the *Iliad* features four armouring scenes. The order in which the hero equips himself is identical in all of them—greaves, breastplate, sword, shield, helmet, spears and lance. But while Homer uses eleven verses to describe Paris’s armouring, Agamemnon’s occupies thirty-two. Detailed descriptions of the breastplate and shield prolong the scene and prepare for Agamemnon’s *aristeia*, his distinction in battle. Similarly, the scene in which Achilles dons his armour in the nineteenth book is expanded, since it marks a turning point in the plot.

Many books and countless essays have been devoted to Homeric formulaic language and in many ways, they have changed Parry’s somewhat rigid conception of formulae. As difficult as it may be to determine whether some phrases are formulae or not, it has become clear that the proportion of formulaic language in the epic is smaller than had been assumed by the pioneers of the orality thesis. While generic scenes such as the banquet do make extensive use of formulae, non-formulaic language predominates in many passages that are vital to the plot.¹⁵ Parry’s thesis that it was the constraints of metre that led to the formation of formulaic language has even been reversed. Gregory Nagy, for example, asserts that it was the formula which produced the metre, rather than the other way around.¹⁶

Above all, it has been recognized that formulae are not only a means of composition and aid to memory, but can in fact create meaning through repetition.¹⁷ In Parry’s eyes, many epithets were merely ornamental, metrically conditioned additions without any semantic value. When Achilles, sitting by the campfire, is described as ‘swift-footed’, this view seems confirmed. Isn’t such a characterization contradictory? Not

14. See especially Arend (1933), and for a research overview, Edwards (1992).

15. Finkelberg (1990).

16. Nagy (1976).

17. Bakker (2013): 157–69 offers a balanced discussion.

necessarily—after all, the epithet designates a characteristic of Achilles regardless of any specific situation. Thus the formula ‘swift-footed Achilles’ engenders its own meaning beyond the context. By resorting to a formula, Homer invokes an image of the hero which is firmly established in tradition. It’s not just any Achilles who appears, but a specific character who is also referred to as swift-footed in other epics, and in this way the poet firmly embeds his work in the epic tradition.¹⁸

And even without referring to the epic tradition, formulaic language and typical scenes can be significant. An example from the *Iliad* serves to illustrate this point.¹⁹ In Book 22, Andromache prepares a bath for her husband, but Hector is already dead. Achilles has just killed him at the gates of Troy after a long chase. Andromache, who is closest to Hector, is the last to hear of his death. In this scene, Homer plays with the two functions which the bath has in the *Iliad*: on the one hand, it refreshes the warrior returning from battle; on the other, it cleanses the corpse of the fallen. Hector’s death turns the refreshing bath which Andromache has prepared into a bath for cleansing the dead. But not even this is granted to Hector while Achilles refuses to hand over his body.

Formulae and formulaic language underline the irony (*Il.* 22.442–46):

She called out through the house to her lovely-haired
handmaidens
to set a great cauldron on the fire, so that there would be
hot water for Hector’s bath as he came back from the fighting;
poor, innocent, nor knew how, far from waters for bathing,
Pallas Athene had cut him down at the hands of Achilles.

The formula ‘when he came back home from the fighting’ always denotes a hero doomed to die; in a prediction made by Zeus it even refers to the death of Hector (*Il.* 17.206–8):

Still for the present I will invest you with great strength
to make up for it that you will not come home out of the fighting,
nor Andromache take from your hands the glorious arms of
Achilles.

18. Foley (1991).

19. For a more detailed discussion, see Grethlein (2007).

The example of ‘come home from the fighting’ shows that formulae do more than serve as building blocks that enable the composition of hexametric verses to aid memorization. They are also repeated to establish comparisons across set scenes and create specific meanings in this way. Through its usage elsewhere in the epic, this formula connotes a hero who will, in fact, die in battle rather than returning home. By using it in the twenty-second book, Homer cryptically and subtly underlines the futility of Andromache’s action.

The phrase ‘to set a great cauldron across the fire’ is found in the eighteenth book of the *Iliad*, when Achilles instructs his companions to wash Patroclus’s corpse (18.344). This repetition, likewise, not only serves as a compositional technique but is charged with meaning. Just like the formula ‘come home from the fighting’, the phrase intimates that Hector will no longer be able to enjoy a bath while alive, but will be ritually washed after his death, just as Patroclus was. Moreover, the repetition underlines the causal connection between their respective deaths—Achilles kills Hector in revenge for Hector killing his close friend Patroclus.

The formulaic half-verse ‘setting tripod and cauldron on the fire’ appears for the third and last time in the twenty-third book. The Greeks urge Achilles to take a bath, but he refuses. The renewed echo of the bath for Patroclus indicates that Achilles is now himself in the shadow of death. Just as Hector is bathed as a corpse, Achilles, as described in the *Odyssey* (24.43–45), will be ritually purified after his death. The formulaic repetition underscores the parallel between killer and victim: both suffer a premature death. Far from merely being a compositional device, the language reflects the dynamics of the plot. It crystallizes the chain of murders that underlies the action in the final third of the *Iliad*. Hector kills Patroclus and in turn is killed by Achilles, who, as he is aware from a prophecy, forfeits his own life in the process.

In the Homeric epic, whose formulaic language is shaped by poetry in recitation, not every repetition is as significant as in Hellenistic and Augustan poetry, which are firmly anchored in a book culture. Nevertheless, contrary to the original assumptions of the orality theorists, it has been shown that repetitions of formulaic language can be significant. Similar rules but different standards apply when compared to allusions that appear elsewhere in literature: the less frequent the repetition and the more

specific the context, the more plausible it is to speak of an allusion. The phrase ‘the rosy-fingered dawn appeared’, repeated dozens of times in very different contexts, cannot be said to be an allusion. But when a half-verse such as ‘setting tripod and cauldron on the fire’ is used just three times in the *Iliad* and each time refers to the bath of a hero who has already died or is about to die, the repetition obviously carries significance. In interpreting the *Odyssey*, other instances will be encountered where formulaic language is used specifically to juxtapose individual scenes.

Homer’s Language and Style

Even though we are examining the *Odyssey* in translation, it is useful to take a brief look at Homer’s language and style beyond formulaic expressions. The Homeric epic was not only distinguished from everyday Greek by its hexametric verse form, but was also written in an artificial style that was not spoken anywhere at any point in time. Homer mixes different dialects—the basis is Ionic, but occasionally, Aeolic and Doric elements appear. In addition, different levels of language are amalgamated. Overall, Homeric language corresponds to the Greek of the eighth and seventh centuries BCE, but the epics also contain earlier forms and elements. In some cases, for instance, the metre presupposes the letter digamma, a ‘w’-sound, which had already disappeared from Ionic by Homer’s time. An example of this is *anax*, the word for lord or ruler, which for metrical reasons must often be read as ‘wanax.’ It has been known since the deciphering of the Linear B tablets that *wanax* was already documented in Mycenaean.

Homer’s stylized language creates its own cosmos, which was already removed from the contemporaneous audience’s everyday world. Old forms and words no longer in use lent the epic a patina and formally expressed the gulf that separated the heroes from the present. The following verses (*Il.* 20.285–87) present a succinct image of this:

But Aeneas now in his hand caught
up a stone, a huge thing which no two men could carry
such as men are now, but by himself he lightly hefted it.

The impression which the Homeric language made on the Greeks can be gleaned from the fact that right up to the Imperial epoch, poets as well as prose writers incorporated Homeric words into their texts whenever they aspired to eminence or wanted to portray something as venerable.

Homer's language and style are not only monumental, but also extremely vibrant. Even in antiquity, audiences praised the *enargeia*, or vividness, of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*—the narrative was so rich that they felt as though they were seeing the action at first hand. Similarly, modern Homer scholars often emphasize how intensely these epics appeal to the imagination. But they are faced with a paradox: the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* contain only a few, brief descriptions. Homer does not waste words on the spaces in which his heroes move. For example, on the basis of the descriptions provided, it would be impossible to draw a picture of Odysseus's court. A philologist put the question succinctly: 'So, how—to formulate the paradox—does Homer conjure up images without giving any descriptions?'²⁰

Recent work in cognitive science provides some insights.²¹ Psychologists and philosophers have rejected an assumption, widespread until the 1990s, which held that sensory impressions are condensed into a photographic or pictorial representations of what we consciously perceive. This pictorialist model has been replaced by an action-based model. Numerous experiments have shown that the environment is instead perceived selectively. People do not retain a picture of what they perceive within them, but focus their attention on aspects that are, or could become, relevant for their actions. If, for instance, we search for a tool to hang a picture on the wall and see a hammer, we may not perceive whether the shaft is brown or black, but rather, concentrate on those properties that determine the tool's suitability, such as whether

20. Radke-Uhlmann (2009): 12. There are more detailed descriptions of localities in the *Odyssey*, such as the island of Calypso and the palace of Alcinous, than in the *Iliad*; but even so, Radke-Uhlmann's question remains valid.

21. The cognitive approaches of scholars such as Noë, Gallagher and Damasio are here referred to as action-related, 'enactive' or 'embodied'. For a detailed account of these approaches in respect of the *Iliad*, see Grethlein and Huitink (2017).

the shaft is ergonomic or whether the head is the right size to drive the nail into the wall. If in spite of this we have the impression that we are fully aware of our surroundings, it is because we can potentially direct our attention beyond the immediately relevant aspects at any point.

The imagination seems to resemble perception. It too focuses on aspects related to the possibilities of interaction. For example, if we imagine stroking a cat, we do not necessarily visualize whether the cat has white paws or not. Yet it would be wrong to assume that the imagination is incomplete: it focuses on what is pertinent, such as whether the fur is soft or shaggy. If a roomful of people were asked to imagine a man running across a bridge and were then asked if the man wore glasses, most would reply that they didn't know. Like perception, the imagination does not work photographically, but in relation to action.

This is why descriptions that are very detailed can be felt to be tedious, rather than inspiring. A passage from Theodor Fontane's *On Tangled Paths (Irrungen, Wirrungen)* may serve to illustrate this:

At the point where the Kurfürstendamm intersects the Kurfürstenstraße, diagonally across from the Zoological Gardens, there was still, in the mid-eighteen-seventies, a large market garden running back to the open fields behind; and in it stood a small, three-windowed house with its own little front garden, set back about a hundred paces from the road that went by and clearly visible from there despite being so small and secluded. However, the other building in the market garden, indeed without doubt its main feature, was concealed by this little house as if by the wings of a stage set, and only a red- and green-painted wooden turret with the remains of a clock face (no trace of an actual clock) under its pointed roof suggested that there was something hidden in the wings, a suggestion confirmed by a flock of pigeons fluttering up round the turret from time to time and, even more, by the occasional barking of a dog. The whereabouts of this dog eluded the viewer, although the front door on the far left stood open all day long, affording a glimpse of the yard.²²

22. Fontane (2013): 7.

Fontane's description is exemplary in terms of its precision and richness of detail. If most readers nevertheless find it difficult to imagine the setting, it is because the narrative, which strives for photographic completeness, does not correspond to the way in which reality is perceived. It is not easy to determine, however, what kind of narrative style is 'cognitively realistic'. Literary scholars have only just started to draw on cognitive approaches in their studies. Yet some criteria are becoming apparent: texts that focus on actions, and which describe simple, purposeful physical movements, for instance, seem to be particularly vibrant. Vivid texts, moreover, describe objects and spaces insofar as they refer to potential interactions, and descriptions are provided when they are relevant to action. Generally speaking, descriptions that are embedded in action are more captivating than those which are detached from it. The reader's imagination seems to be stimulated when the narrative lasts for a similar length of time to the event being described.

Returning to Homer, a passage considered particularly 'vivid' in antiquity may be cited in this regard. A text from the early Imperial period, which is ascribed to an author named (Pseudo-)Demetrius, discusses vividness (*enargeia*) as an aspect of a simple style. The author mentions the example of a chariot race in the twenty-third book of the *Iliad*. He refers to the three verses in italics below, here reproduced with some additional lines for context. Eumelus's mares are at the head of the field:

Out in front was the swift-stepping team of the son of Pheres,
Eumelus, and after him the stallions of Diomedes,
the Trojan horses, not far behind at all, but close on him,
*for they seemed forever on the point of climbing his chariot
and the wind of them was hot on the back and on the broad shoulders
of Eumelus. They lowered their heads and flew close after him.*
(*Il.* 23.376–81)

Ps.-Demetrius praises the depiction as 'vivid owing to the fact that no detail which usually occurs and then occurred is omitted' (4.210).²³ His focus on action rather than on the surroundings corresponds to the

23. Translation by William Rhys Roberts: see Roberts (2010 [1902]): 166–67.

above-mentioned criteria concerning vividness. Indeed, unlike Fontane, Homer does not provide any separate description of where the race takes place; he only refers to what is significant to the plot. A narrowing of the track becomes apparent when Antilochus uses it for a daring overtaking manoeuvre. The verses chosen by Ps.-Demetrius are also pertinent—instead of explicitly referring to the short distance between Diomedes and Eumelus, Homer uses simple action verbs; Diomedes's horses seem to mount the chariot in front of them. The passage captures their movements and makes the events almost tangible for the readers. Further, the narrator assumes the perspective of an eyewitness as he adds a tactile dimension: Eumelus feels the hot breath of the horses in his back.

Cognitive approaches to descriptive narrative are still in their infancy. Nevertheless, they can help to solve an apparent paradox in Homer research: the lack of detailed descriptions does not diminish the vividness that has been attributed to Homer since antiquity. By concentrating on the action in terms of simple and purposeful movements, and by limiting descriptions to aspects that are relevant to the action, Homer fulfils an important condition that seems to apply to enthralling narratives. Yet it is important to remember that not all aspects of the Homeric style contribute equally to the narrative's vividness. Homer also characterizes persons and objects with epithets that are not relevant to the plot and incorporates words the meaning of which was already obscure to ancient audiences. In this way, he creates a patina of venerability over the epic world. It is this venerable style coupled with vivid descriptions that has captivated ancient and modern audiences alike.

Narrative and Experience in the Epic

Having outlined the structure, content, *quaestio Homerica* and the formulaic and artistic language and style of the epic, we now have a background against which to view the *Odyssey*. The question that arises next is how to approach this text. At first glance, a thematic approach looks tempting: depending on temperament and inclination, the focus could be on narrative technique, Homeric society, the role of women or other aspects of the epic, in individual chapters. Any such approach, however,

runs the risk of detracting from a crucial aspect of the work, or indeed of any narrative—its sequentiality. We read word by word, paragraph by paragraph and chapter by chapter. Literary scholars familiarize themselves with texts through multiple readings, or at least pretend to, and often interpret passages regardless of their place in the narrative flow. Such a de-temporalizing approach is legitimate, since it is often the only way to identify fundamental structures that are not apparent on first reading. Yet it also means that temporal dynamics that characterize the reading process can come to be ignored.²⁴

When we read a narrative, we wonder about what has been concealed, are surprised by the unexpected, and above all are curious about how the plot will develop. We enter a flow of time that is categorically different from lived experience yet at the same time structurally analogous to it. The plot does not affect us directly; the reading experience is directed towards the experiences of the fictional characters—it's a second-hand experience. And yet, analogously to real life, the narrative either fulfils or disappoints expectations. Even though reading takes place within an 'as if' framework—being enthralled by Odysseus's travels does not mean that we entirely forget we are sitting on a garden bench holding a book in our hands—the reading experience can often be particularly intense. An artfully crafted plot can create a tension rarely experienced in daily life.

In order to do justice to this temporal dynamic or experiential character of the narrative, the *Odyssey's* storyline will be essential to the interpretation that follows. This does not mean ignoring structural observations or aspects beyond a specific passage; such analysis should, anyway, be embedded in a sequential reading. Rather, interpretation is brought in line with the reading process—while reading, the plot is followed sequentially, and at the same time, the whole is kept in mind.

24. For a detailed discussion of the experiential character of reading, see Grethlein (2010c); also Grethlein (2015b): 276–79 on the difference between the phenomenological understanding of experience and 'experientiality', which Fludernik introduced into narrative research: Fludernik (1996).

There will be two points at which to investigate related areas and consider the *Odyssey* as a whole. The Polyphemus adventure affords an opportunity to consider the relationship of the Homeric epic to history. As will be seen, the *Odyssey* deals with the Greeks' experiences as they struck out into the wider world of the Mediterranean. The blinding of the cyclops also happens to be the first Homeric motif in vase painting. The illustrations which will be examined display a reflexivity that is not usually ascribed to archaic vases. Then, after this excursion into history and art history, the murder of the suitors will provide an occasion to examine ethics in the *Odyssey*. The justice of the gods and morality of the hero will here serve as the focal points.

To avoid the danger of retelling while exploring the *Odyssey*, this study will adopt a perspective which, it is hoped, will reveal the text anew to today's readers and show why the study of Homer continues to be worthwhile. A remark about the *Odyssey* in a text entitled *On the Sublime*, probably written in the first century CE and handed down under the name of Longinus, points in the right direction: the author remarks that the *Iliad*, composed at the height of Homer's creative powers, is dramatic and full of conflict, while 'most of the *Odyssey* is storytelling, as befits old age' (9.13). He goes on to declare that in the *Odyssey*, Homer is like the setting sun, which still has its radiance but no longer its previous intensity. While the comparison with the *Iliad* and comparatively negative judgement of the *Odyssey* may be disputed, the approach of the author of *On the Sublime* does draw attention to a central feature of the latter epic. The *Odyssey* is not only narrative in the sense that it fabulates. It also itself contains a multitude of narratives—bards appear on both Scheria and Ithaca; Helen and other characters recount the Trojan War; Odysseus himself describes his voyages at the court of the Phaeacians and on Ithaca deceives his interlocutors with tall tales.

Without neglecting other aspects such as Odysseus's ambivalent heroism, the role of the gods or the importance of the gaze, this book focuses on narration in the *Odyssey*.²⁵ It is particularly concerned with

25. See Goldhill (1991): 1–68; Segal (1994): 113–83; Olson (1995); Mackie (1997); Scodel (1998), who offer different perspectives and emphases on the narratives and songs contained in the *Odyssey*.

the forms and functions of narrative. The epic is not, of course, a philosophical treatise—Homer is not Aristotle—yet the many internal narratives in the *Odyssey* show how, why and to what end we tell stories. This gives the poem a meta-narrative dimension; it engages with the forms and functions that narrative can encompass. In other words, the *Odyssey* is a narrative about narrating.

In recent decades, the importance of storytelling has been examined from various perspectives. Psychologists describe how people establish their identity by narrating their lives, while the philosopher Paul Ricœur interprets narration as engagement with time. Historians and sociologists examine narratives that bind communities, or conversely, call them into question.²⁶ These debates on narrative theory not only enable new perspectives on the *Odyssey*, but in turn appear in a new light themselves, refracted through the prism of the poem. The narrative engagement with storytelling has a depth that remains unavailable to the distanced gaze of the theorist.

Above all, Homer is not a modern narrative theorist *avant la lettre*. The popular game of discovering supposedly (post)modern phenomena in the epic detracts from its hermeneutic richness as well as its strangeness. The *Odyssey* is far more complex than its position at the beginning of European literature would suggest, and, although its influence continues to be felt today, it resists all attempts at appropriation. Time and again, Homer frustrates our expectations and instead draws our attention to aspects that distinguish the Homeric epic, and perhaps ancient narratives in general, from the modern novel.

In a much-cited essay, Uvo Hölscher describes antiquity as our ‘nearest other’ (das nächste Fremde).²⁷ The appeal of Greco-Roman culture is that while it is the foundation of our own civilization on the one hand, it also provides a counterpoint to the present day. But today, the proximity of antiquity is perhaps no longer assumed in the same way as it was in 1962. In a world which sociologists describe as increasingly globalized and mobile, the spatially distant may be felt to be closer than the temporally

26. See, for instance, Bruner (1986); (1990); Ricœur (1984–88 [1983–85]); Anderson (1983); Smith (1999). For a broad overview of narrative, see Koschorke (2012).

27. Hölscher (1965): 81 (first given as a lecture in 1962).

past; present-day China may seem a nearer stranger than does ancient Greece.²⁸ If, as Hölscher claims for antiquity, the *Odyssey* allows the modern reader ‘to think creatively of possibilities, to gain distance from the constraints of the taken-for-granted, the common consensus, the contemporary’,²⁹ this is due not only to perceived distance, but also to the contemplation of the epic itself. It is the combination of reflexivity, strangeness and familiarity that makes reading the *Odyssey*, or the conversation with Homer, as rewarding as it is appealing.

28. Grethlein (2018).

29. Hölscher (1965): 81.

INDEX LOCORUM

- Antiphanes
fr. 189
13–17 PCG, 246n17
- AP (*Anthologia Palatina*)
16.297–98, 14
- Apollonius Rhodius
Argonautica
4.1755–81, 253
- Arrian
Anabasis
1.12.1, 129
7.14.4, 129
- Athenaeus
Deipnosophistae
5.19 Kaibel, 81
12.511 b/c, 80n5
- Clemens Alexandrinus
Protrepticus
12.118.4, 99n31
- Ps.-Demetrius
On Style
4.210, 25
- Democritus
B 21, 83n10
- Dio Chrysostom
Orationes
11.34, 96n24
- Euripides
Medea
1021–80, 71
- Eustathius
*Commentary on the
Odyssey*
1493.10–15, 58
1675.30–35, 250n23
1878.47, 196
1948.49–1949.2, 252
ad *Od.* 8.267, 80n5
ad *Od.* 8.335, 80n5
- Heliodorus
Aethiopica
2.35.5, 34–35
4.4.3, 259
- Heraclitus
DK A22, 191
- Herodotus
Histories
1.5.4, 233
1.32.1, 233
1.34.1, 233
1.86, 233
1.207.2, 233
2.120.5, 230
3.40.2, 233
3.125.2, 233
4.205, 232
6.21, 45
7.133–37, 232
7.159, 129
- Hesiod
Nautilia
erg. 648–49, 251n27

Hesiod (<i>continued</i>)	23.85–90, 210n21
<i>Theogony</i>	23.326–32, 243
26–28, 189	23.376–81, 25
1011–18, 125	24.39–43, 215
<i>Works and Days</i>	24.480–83, 210n21
117–18, 117	24.507–12, 53
276–80, 117	24.527–33, 222
Himerius	<i>Odyssey</i>
<i>Orationes</i>	1.1–2, 38, 195
16.1–2, 57	1.3–4, 187
Hippolytus	1.3–5, 195
<i>Elenchos</i>	1.4, 38, 187
7.13.2.3, 99n31	1.6–9, 195
Homer	1.7–9, 97
<i>Iliad</i>	1.20–21, 223
1.188–92, 202	1.22–95, 244
2.485–86, 192	1.32–34, 46
2.488–90, 55	1.32–39, 196, 219
2.661–67, 210n21	1.35–36, 205
3.351–54, 230	1.35–43, 40n9
6.146–49, 179	1.46–47, 205
6.402–3, 50	1.47, 196–97
6.490–93, 64	1.48–62, 198–99
7.84–91, 242	1.68–71, 97, 223
9.379–80, 205n10	1.95, 62
11.414, 140	1.114–17, 61–62
11.479, 207n14	1.160, 207n16
12.233, 166n20	1.163–65, 154
13.620–27, 229	1.188–93, 238n5
13.636–37, 259n38	1.196–205, 41
13.694–97, 210n21	1.200–201, 41
15.335–36, 210n21	1.255–66, 41–42
15.430–32, 210n21	1.266, 63
16.384–88, 229	1.281–83, 37
16.570–76, 210n21	1.287, 207n16
17.206–8, 20	1.296–97, 66
17.446–47, 222	1.298–302, 40n9
18.344, 21	1.325–26, 43
19.301–3, 53	1.326–27, 42
19.338–39, 53	1.327, 45
20.285–87, 22	1.336–44, 254
22.346–47, 215	1.337–38, 42
22.442–46, 20	1.340–41, 45

1.341-42, 47	4.422-26, 59
1.346-47, 43	4.475-76, 154
1.346-49, 221	4.502, 46
1.351-52, 47	4.512-49, 40n9
1.353-55, 48	4.521, 155
1.356-59, 64	4.597-98, 44
1.374-80, 208	4.611, 62
1.378-79, 221	4.735-54, 238n5
1.420-21, 45	5.41-42, 154
2.1-259, 244	5.108-9, 46
2.14, 65	5.114-15, 154
2.17-20, 201	5.154-58, 75
2.19-20, 97	5.220, 155
2.21-22, 204	5.228-61, 81
2.139-45, 208	5.279-387, 203
2.162-69, 206-7	6.127-315, 187
2.180-82, 33	6.130-36, 215
2.218, 207n16	6.187-90, 220
2.312-16, 66	6.244-45, 126
3.103-4, 86	6.311, 155
3.120-22, 49	7.192-96, 100
3.124-25, 62	7.224-25, 155
3.193-200, 40n9	7.226-27, 100
3.199-200, 62-63	7.311-15, 126
3.232-35, 40n9	7.317-18, 100
3.233, 155	8.30-36, 100
3.254-316, 40n9	8.63-65, 77
3.316, 207n13	8.81-82, 78
4.71-75, 50	8.83-92, 254
4.81, 38	8.115, 80
4.91-92, 40n9	8.164, 80
4.122, 51	8.169-77, 80-81
4.148-50, 62	8.176, 80
4.181-82, 51	8.178-79, 83
4.186-89, 52	8.215-22, 166
4.193-94, 52	8.230-33, 81
4.236-37, 220n35	8.275, 176
4.240-41, 55	8.326-27, 79
4.275, 54	8.329, 81
4.291-95, 59	8.340-42, 81-82
4.333-40, 215	8.367-69, 87
4.341-46, 41	8.410, 154
4.346, 63	8.447-48, 97

Homer (<i>continued</i>)	9.288–93, 111
8.466, 155	9.290–91, 213
8.487–98, 82	9.291–93, 216
8.489, 82n9	9.297, 213
8.496–98, 86, 88	9.308–9, 118
8.513, 79–80	9.314, 213
8.519, 80	9.321–24, 116
8.521–31, 254	9.339, 102n37
8.522–23, 84–85	9.341–42, 118
8.523–32, 85	9.347, 213
9.11, 93	9.357–58, 117
9.12–13, 101	9.369–70, 111
9.19–20, 1, 76, 173	9.373–74, 112
9.20, 243	9.374, 213
9.29–32, 90	9.381, 102n37
9.39–66, 187	9.383–86, 116
9.43–44, 103, 200	9.391, 81
9.52, 102n37	9.405–6, 113
9.62, 90	9.408, 112
9.67, 102n37	9.410–12, 113
9.84, 102	9.413–24, 113
9.105, 90	9.428, 94
9.107–11, 117	9.442–44, 214
9.112–15, 105	9.452–55, 114
9.116–48, 103	9.458–59, 213
9.122–24, 123	9.479, 225
9.124, 127	9.502–5, 115
9.125–30, 123	9.517–19, 115
9.131–33, 122	9.525, 225
9.136–39, 123	9.528–35, 115, 203
9.142, 102n37	9.532–33, 154
9.142–43, 123	9.534, 106
9.146–48, 112	9.565, 90
9.158, 102n37	10.25–27, 103
9.174–76, 110–11, 124	10.28–30, 155
9.189, 105	10.34–35, 102
9.190–92, 116–17	10.46, 91
9.213–15, 104, 200–201	10.77, 90
9.219–24, 118	10.121–24, 170
9.224–29, 200	10.133, 90
9.228–30, 103	10.141, 102n37
9.229, 104, 111	10.157, 102n37
9.259–66, 111	10.210–43, 102

10.213, 43	12.339–51, 102
10.251–60, 102	12.340–51, 227
10.291, 43	12.371–72, 102n37
10.318, 43	12.374–90, 102
10.431–37, 201	12.378–83, 228
10.438–42, 202	12.389–90, 227
11.100–137, 188	12.403–25, 187
11.101–3, 106	12.445, 102n37
11.110–13, 104	12.448, 102n37
11.116, 207n16	13.1, 43
11.120, 188	13.90–91, 187
11.161–62, 154	13.128–30, 226
11.187–96, 238n5	13.149–52, 226
11.210–12, 44	13.259, 210
11.333, 43	13.263–64, 187
11.352–53, 64	13.291, 172
11.363–66, 98	13.291–98, 96
11.366–68, 190	13.291–99, 186, 199
11.366–69, 84	13.383–85, 40n9
11.373–76, 76	13.394–96, 213
11.375–76, 260	13.396, 207n16
11.409–56, 40n9	13.396–402, 151
11.605–8, 166	13.417–19, 62
12.40, 43	13.428, 207n16
12.44, 43	13.434–35, 178
12.87, 94	14.92, 207n14
12.137–40, 104	14.122–27, 184
12.169, 102n37	14.156–57, 184
12.188, 84	14.175, 179
12.209–10, 94, 108, 109	14.259–72, 187
12.228–29, 167–68	14.288, 185
12.230–33, 168	14.296, 185
12.251–55, 94	14.303–15, 187
12.251–56, 169	14.317–20, 187
12.256–57, 168	14.327–30, 188
12.258–59, 94–95, 168, 195	14.330, 188
12.271–76, 227	14.361, 193
12.295, 102n37	14.361–68, 84
12.300–301, 227	14.364–65, 84
12.313, 102n37	14.377, 207n16
12.332, 227	14.380, 210
12.337, 102n37	14.387–88, 193
12.339, 91	14.444–45, 220

Homer (<i>continued</i>)	19.273–82, 187
15.13, 207n13	19.358–59, 157
15.32, 207n16	19.379–81, 157
15.224, 210	19.392–466, 140, 171
15.280–81, 63	19.395–96, 172
15.353–57, 238n5	19.462–66, 174
15.398–400, 101	19.467–68, 157
15.398–401, 58–59	19.474–75, 157
15.400–401, 105, 255	19.476–79, 158
16.137–53, 238n5	19.589–93, 255
16.207–10, 156	20.18–20, 109
16.220–21, 256	20.18–21, 69, 97, 212
16.267–307, 35	20.20–21, 113
16.315, 207n14	20.41–43, 238n6
16.351–57, 211	20.81–83, 158
16.394–405, 211	20.201–3, 220n35
17.124–31, 215	20.244–46, 211
17.132–37, 41	20.310, 66
17.307–10, 156	20.392–94, 208
17.415–16, 156	21.11–38, 180
17.424, 220n35	21.128–30, 67
17.444–49, 151	21.146–67, 212
17.458–65, 164	21.226–27, 256
17.514, 43	21.397, 166
17.518–21, 84, 190	21.404–11, 88
17.521, 43, 193	21.406–9, 190, 209
18.3–4, 156	21.428–29, 208
18.14, 164	21.430, 209
18.119–23, 211	22.18–19, 213
18.130–37, 221	22.32–33, 214
18.138–40, 222	22.34, 165
18.229, 66	22.37–38, 209
18.280, 207n16	22.42–43, 165
18.337, 164	22.48–55, 211
18.343–45, 163	22.54–55, 210
18.387–98, 164	22.55–59, 205
18.412–21, 211	22.60, 165
19.19, 66	22.61–62, 205n10
19.33–40, 163	22.61–64, 205
19.70, 164	22.184–86, 238n5
19.170, 187	22.312–15, 211
19.203, 185, 189n52	22.320, 165
19.226–31, 162	22.320–29, 165

- 22.330, 44
22.383–89, 170
22.401–6, 214
22.412–16, 216
22.465–73, 165
23.5–7, 159
23.48, 214n28
23.90–95, 160
23.94, 160n11
23.107–10, 160
23.109–10, 175–76
23.118–22, 210
23.118–52, 238n6
23.159–62, 175
23.188, 176
23.190–91, 175
23.190–200, 177
23.204, 176
23.206, 176
23.241–46, 256
23.248–50, 250
23.267–84, 247–48
23.286–87, 250n22
23.296, 251, 252, 253n33
23.300–301, 101, 258–59
23.310–43, 252
23.342–43, 255
23.343, 253n33
23.362–63, 238n6
24.1–204, 252
24.30–34, 241
24.36, 241
24.43–45, 21
24.83–84, 241
24.93–94, 241
24.95–97, 40n9
24.106–13, 211
24.114, 210
24.167–69, 158
24.178–79, 166
24.191–202, 40n9
24.192, 241
24.196–202, 242
24.227–30, 178
24.249–53, 178
24.329, 178
24.336–44, 179
24.351–52, 220
24.353–55, 238n6
24.420–71, 244
24.426–28, 203–4
24.429, 204
24.432–36, 239
24.443–49, 239
24.454–62, 239
24.456–60, 244
24.472–88, 244
24.482–86, 238, 247
24.485, 246
24.515, 238
Homeric Hymns
3 (To Delian Apollo)
162–64, 55–56
4 (To Hermes)
360, 163n14
Juvenal
Satires
15.13–26, 97n27
Longinus
On the Sublime
9.13, 28
9.13–14, 96n24
Lucian
A True Story
1.3, 97
Maximus Turinus
Homiliae
49, 99n31
ML (R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC*)
no. 7, 185

- Ovid
Metamorphoses
5.198–99, 142
5.206, 142
5.226–99, 142
- Parmenides
B 8, 83n10
B 52, 83n10
- Pindar
fragments
fr. 194.2–3 Snell–Maehler, 83n10
Nemean Odes
7.20–23, 96, 191
7.22, 96n25
Pythian Odes
9.5, 127
9.51–58, 127
- Plutarch
Quaestiones convivales
614c, 57
- Polybius
Histories
1.1.2, 48
34.2, 96n24
- Porphyry
*Quaestionum homerocarum ad Odysseam
pertinentium reliquae*
1284, 72n44
- Sappho
fr. 1, 253n32
fr. 2, 253n32
- fr. 16, 253n32
fr. 23, 253n32
fr. 26, 253n32
fr. 31, 253n32
- Scholia on Homer
ad *Od.* 1.34 DHJM,
219
ad *Od.* 8.267, 80n5
ad *Od.* 8.272, 80n5
ad *Od.* 23.188, 176
bT ad *Il.* 15.56, 35
EQV ad *Od.* 1.261, 42
- Solon
fr. 1 W, 83n10
fr. 2, 83n10
- Strabo
Geographica
1.9–19, 96n24
1.27, 96n24
1.36–37, 96n24
- Thucydides
*History of the Peloponnesian
War*
1.3.1–3, 133
1.21.1, 84
- Timocles
Dionysiazousai
fr. 1 KA, 48
- Xenophon
Memorabilia
2.6.35, 206

INDEX

- Achilles: Alexander the Great modelled himself on, 129; allegorical interpretation of, 57–58; anticipation of death in *Iliad*, 231–32; on arbitrariness of gods, 222; armouring scene in *Iliad* and, 19; bath scenes in *Iliad* and, 20–21; compared to lion, 215; emotional impact of shared lament and, 53; epithet ‘swift-footed’ for, 19–20; fate compared to those of Agamemnon and Odysseus, 241–43; *Iliad* emphasizes mortality of, 21, 231–32; met by Odysseus in underworld, 9; parallels between Odysseus and, 202, 205, 212, 215–16; in Pindar’s seventh Nemean Ode, 96; represents *Iliad* in comparisons with Odysseus, 79–80, 242–43; in songs of Demodocus, 76, 78–80, 254
- Achilles Tatius, 12, 71, 147–48
- Adorno, Theodor, 5–6, 271
- Aeaea, 9, 163, 201
- Aegisthus: incurs divine retribution, 219–20, 225, 228; Orestes’s revenge on, 49; parallels between Odysseus’s companions and, 196, 228; parallels between suitors and, 39, 196–97, 205, 209, 216, 228; warned by gods, 219, 225
- Aeneas, 22, 126
- Aeolia, 89, 91, 103, 107
- Aeolus: gives Odysseus bag of winds his companions open, 9, 89, 103, 155; refuses further help after Odysseus’s companions open bag of winds, 89; in structure of Apologoi, 91–93, 103, 107; violates norms of Greek civilization, 93
- Aeschylus, 34, 125, 245–46
- Agamemnon: allegorical interpretation of, 57–58; armouring scene in *Iliad*, 19; as Bronze Age aristocrat, 121; compared to Odysseus, 39, 241–42; compares Achilles to Odysseus, 241–43; fate compared to those of Achilles and Odysseus, 241–42; later Spartan historical claim traced back to, 129; met by Odysseus in underworld, 9; on murder of suitors, 210–11; parallels between his homecoming and Odysseus’s, 38–40, 155, 197, 205, 255; in songs of Demodocus, 78–79
- Aigyptios, 65, 201, 204, 244
- Ajax, 35, 38–39, 96, 210
- Ajax the Lesser, 47, 49
- Alcinous: parallel between promise of help to Odysseus and Telemachus’s rebuke of Penelope, 64; possibility of association between Greek colonists and indigenous populations and, 125–26; reaction to Odysseus’s Apologoi, 76, 84, 98, 190, 260; welcomes and assists Odysseus, 8, 76, 99–100
- Alexander the Great, 129
- Allan, William, 230
- American Pie*, 67
- Amphimedon, 158, 166, 210–11, 240–41, 245
- Amphinomus, 211–12, 221–22
- anagnorisis. *See* recognition
- Andromache, 20–21

- Angelopoulos, Theo, 5
- anger: Achilles's at Agamemnon, 202, 212;
Athena's at Greek warriors, 46–47;
expressed by gaze, 164; Helios's at Odysseus's companions, 223, 228; *Iliad* dedicated to Achilles's, 242; meaning of Odysseus's name and, 173; Odysseus's at Euryalus, 83; Odysseus's at Eurylochus, 202; Odysseus's at maidservants, 109; parallels between Achilles's and Odysseus's, 212; parallels between Polyphemus's and Odysseus's, 216; Poseidon's at Odysseus, 75, 106, 133, 187, 203, 223–26, 237, 250–51; Poseidon's at Phaeacians, 126; Zeus's at injustice, 229; Zeus's at Odysseus's companions, 187
- animals: Achilles compared to lion, 215; battlefield encounters described through parables about, 139; Circe transforms Odysseus's companions into, 9, 43, 89, 91, 95, 131, 201; dogs' sensitivity to identity behind disguise, 10, 56, 155, 162; fishing analogies, 169–70; food-related norms separate humans from, 92, 117, 124; Odysseus compared to boar, 139–40; Odysseus compared to dog, 69, 162–63; Odysseus compared to lion, 139–40, 214–16; Odysseus's scar from encounter with boar, 140, 171, 174; Polyphemus compared to lion, 111, 116, 216; Primo Levi's efforts to draw boundary between humans and, 270; suitors associated with scavengers, 207; vase paintings of blinding of Polyphemus and, 137–40
- Anticlus, 54, 56
- Antilochus, 26, 52, 243
- Antinous: blamed by Eurymachus for suitors' actions, 165, 205, 210; contrast between appearance and reality of, 156, 161; death of, 11, 152, 165–66, 213–14; defends suitors in people's assembly, 244; father offers critical view of Odysseus's deeds, 203–4, 244; mistreats Odysseus disguised as beggar, 151, 164–65; most sacrilegious of suitors, 156, 161; Odysseus tells tall tale to, 182–84, 188, 192–93; rejects Telemachus's demand that suitors leave, 65
- Antiphous, 201, 244
- Aphrodite, 76, 78–79, 81–82, 87, 176–77
- Apollo, 34, 82, 112, 127, 215, 245
- Apollonius Rhodius, 253
- Apologoi: confrontational gaze in, 162, 167–69; events referred to by *Odyssey's* narrator, 97, 201; fabulous creatures in, 93, 185; first-person perspective, 102–3, 203, 227; food in, 91–93; function of, 99–108, 263; hospitality in, 99–100; interpretations of, 99; momentum of, 93–95; newness of, 47; non-civilized adversaries in, 93; non-first-person details in, 102; Odysseus processes his experiences through, 77, 88, 101–8, 194, 263; Odysseus's reliability as narrator of, 77, 88, 95–98, 200; Odysseus's retrospective control of narrative, 102–8; Odysseus's shift from active to passive heroism in, 93–95, 169; order of narration, 95; parallels between Odysseus's tall tales and, 187–88; parallels between stories told in Telemachy and, 37–40; plot in, 106; prophecy in, 103–4; schematization of adventures in, 105–6; structure of, 77, 88–95, 102–4; in structure of *Odyssey*, 7, 9–10, 12, 76, 107, 150, 263; suspense in, 103; transition from Iliadic world to return to Ithaca, 91
- appearance and reality: in Antinous, 156, 161; in Argos's recognition of Odysseus, 56, 155–56; in Athena's transformations of Odysseus, 156, 161; in Euryalus, 80–81; in Helen's and Menelaus's accounts of Odysseus in Troy, 56–57; in Iros, 56, 156, 161; in Laertes's recognition of Odysseus, 178–79; Odysseus's among the Phaeacians, 56, 80–81; in Sirens, 56; in Telemachus's recognition of Odysseus, 156
- Ares, 76, 78–81, 176–77

- Argos (dog), 56, 155–56, 238
Argos (place), 51, 63, 132, 136, 210
Aristarchus, 251–53
Aristonothos krater, 134–37
Aristophanes, 251–53
Aristotle, 45–46, 53, 71, 87
armouring scenes, 19, 168
assembly, people's: after murder of suitors, 238–39, 243–44; called by Telemachus, 8, 33, 65, 201, 204, 243–44; cyclopes do not hold, 116; institutionalization of polis and, 121; in *Odyssey's* structure, 243–44; parallels between two Ithacan assemblies, 243–44; Phaeacians', 76, 100
Athena: account of Odysseus to Telemachus, 41–42; in Aeschylus's *Eumenides*, 245; assists Odysseus's homecoming, 10, 150–53, 155, 158, 163; assured by Zeus of Odysseus's homecoming, 33; conversations with Zeus in *Odyssey's* structure, 244; disguise as Mentos, 8, 39, 41–42, 61, 63–65; disguise as Mentor, 8, 39, 62, 67, 152, 154–55, 239, 244; in François Fénelon's *Les aventures de Télémaque, fils d'Ulysse*, 67; helps Telemachus survive attack by suitors, 10, 151; holds back the dawn for Odysseus and Penelope's reunion, 11, 255–57; holds up Orestes as model for Telemachus, 39, 64; insists that gods allow Odysseus's homecoming, 75, 196–99, 244; intervenes to prevent violence by Achilles, 202; intervenes to reconcile Odysseus and suitors' relatives, 153, 238, 246–47; on justice of Aegisthus's death, 196–97, 205; makes return journeys difficult for Greek warriors, 42–43, 46–47; meeting as Mentos with Telemachus, 61–66; motivated by personal sympathy for Odysseus, 198–99, 222; moves Telemachus to action, 61–66, 72; Odysseus tells tall tale to, 181, 183, 210; participates in murder of suitors, 11, 152, 213; physically transforms Odysseus, 10–11, 150–52, 156, 160–61, 175, 178; praises Odysseus's skill in deception, 96, 114, 186, 199; in song of Phemius, 42–43; in songs of Demodocus, 78, 82; urges Telemachus's journey, 8, 31, 37, 62–64, 72; warns suitors as Mentor, 239, 244
Athenaeus, 81
Atwood, Margaret, 1
Aubignac, abbé d'. *See* Hédelin, François, abbé d'Aubignac
Auerbach, Erich, 171–72
Austen, Jane, 74
Auster, Paul, 74
Autolycus, 171–74, 178
Bakhtin, Mikhail, 13
barbarism: cyclopes and, 118, 135–36, 268; formation of Greek idea of, 124–25, 136; in later Greek interpretation of Trojan War, 130, 134
bard: beauty and truth in songs of, 84, 192; ethics in songs of, 83; fame spread by songs of, 88, 243; inspired by Muses, 78, 192; Odysseus compared to, 88, 190–92, 208–9; role in *Odyssey*, 192. *See also* Demodocus; Phemius
Baricco, Alessandro, 67
Bearden, Romare, 3–4
Beckmann, Max, 1
bed: Hephaestus's, 79, 176; Odysseus's, 11, 152, 160–61, 175–78, 180
Benjamin, Walter, 236
Bentley, Richard, 14
Bildungsroman, 60–74
Bond, James, 36–37, 72
bow: compared to lyre, 88, 190, 209; gaze and, 166–67; less heroic than other weapons, 42; in murder of suitors, 11, 41–42, 152, 166–67, 190, 212; narrative evoked by, 180; not associated with Odysseus in *Iliad*, 166; Telemachus's attempt to draw Odysseus's, 66–67; trial by, 11, 42, 66–67, 152, 158–59, 175, 190

- Briseis, 53, 202
- Brooks, Peter, 235, 260–61
- Calypso: imprisonment of Odysseus
known to audience before known to
Telemachus, 37, 41; informs Odysseus
about conversation between Zeus and
Helios, 102; less richly described than
Circe, 95; in Max Beckmann's *Odysseus
and Calypso*, 1; Odysseus's account to
Penelope of, 98; ordered by gods to let
Odysseus go, 7–8, 75; parallels between
Circe and, 90; in structure of Apologoi,
91–92, 95; takes Odysseus in after his
arrival on Ogygia, 10
- cannibalism: colonial violence and, 124,
128–29; by cyclopes, 117–18; in Eurip-
ides's satyr play, 118–19; by Laestrygo-
nians, 9, 92–93; murder of suitors and,
213–14, 216; by Polyphemus, 92, 111,
117–18, 124, 128–29, 213–14, 216, 268; and
violation of Greek civilizational norms,
92, 117–19, 124
- Cassandra, 47
- catharsis, 40, 45–46, 53, 58–60, 87
- cattle of the sun god: Apologoi account
confirmed by mention in main narrative,
97; blinding of Polyphemus compared to
slaughter of, 227; Circe and Teiresias
warn about, 10, 89, 104, 227; Eurylochus's
role in slaughter of, 201–2; gods' re-
sponse to slaughter of, 102, 226–28;
Odysseus's companions' responsibility
for slaughter of, 10, 89, 91–93, 106, 203,
226–27, 234; Odysseus's knowledge in
account of, 102; in Odysseus's tall tales,
182, 187, 194; in *Odyssey's* Proem, 97,
195–96, 226; parallel between lack of
winds to leave Thrinacia and lack of
winds for Menelaus to leave Pharos,
38–39; in structure of Apologoi, 91–93
- Celan, Paul, 1
- Cervantes, Miguel de, 13
- Chandler, Raymond, 159
- Chardin, Jean Siméon, 141–42
- Chariton, 12
- Charybdis, 10, 89, 91–94, 108–9, 150
- Chirico, Giorgio de, 1, 3
- Christian readings of *Odyssey*, 99,
265
- Cicones, 9, 89, 91–92, 187, 194, 200,
210
- Circe: Apologoi account confirmed by
mention in main narrative, 97; Etruscan
rulers' claim of descent from Odysseus
and, 125, 129; in Eugammon of Cyrene's
Telegony, 248; gives Odysseus instruc-
tions for journey, 10, 89, 103–4, 167–68,
227; in Hesiod's *Theogony*, 125; informs
Odysseus about conversation between
Zeus and Helios, 227; more richly de-
picted than Calypso, 95; Odysseus's ac-
count to Penelope of, 98; Odysseus's
knowledge in account of, 102; parallels
between Calypso and, 90; parallels be-
tween Eidothea and, 39; in Romare
Bearden's *Circe*, 3–4; sends Odysseus to
underworld, 9, 39, 89; in structure of
Apologoi, 91–92, 95; turns Odysseus's
companions into animals, 9, 43, 89, 91, 95,
131, 201; in vase painting, 131; warns about
Scylla, 167–68; warns about Sirens, 10,
89; warns about sun god's cattle, 10, 89,
104, 227
- Clytemnestra, 39, 50, 81, 205, 209, 225,
241–42
- Coen Brothers, 5
- cognitive science, 23–26, 44, 108
- colonization, ancient Greek: blinding of
Polyphemus and, 28, 110, 119–30, 133–37;
cannibalism and, 124; causes of, 122; dis-
tinguished from early modern coloniza-
tion, 121–22, 124–25, 128; marriage and,
126–30; Odysseus's homage to Poseidon
and, 250; settlement legends, 123, 126–28;
vase painting and, 133–37

- companions of Odysseus: cursed by Polyphemus, 106, 115, 202–3; devoured by Polyphemus, 9, 69, 89, 93–94, 105, 109, 111, 200–202; devoured by Scylla, 94–95, 168–70; in Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno's interpretation of *Odyssey*, 5; Odysseus's responsibility for deaths of, 200–204, 217, 220, 223–25, 239, 244, 270; in *Odyssey*'s Proem, 195–97, 204, 216, 220, 226; open Aeolus's bag of winds, 9, 89, 103, 155; parallels between Aegisthus and, 196, 228; parallels between suitors and, 203–4, 212–16, 228; refuse to heed Odysseus's warnings after conquest of Ismarus, 103, 200; responsibility for slaughter of sun god's cattle, 10, 89, 91–93, 106, 203, 226–27, 234; succumb to lotus, 93; transformed into animals by Circe, 9, 43, 89, 91, 95, 131, 201; violate food-related norms in Apologoi, 91–93, 95; warn Odysseus about Polyphemus, 103–4, 111, 167, 200, 225
- composition, theories of *Odyssey*'s: analytical, 15–17, 31, 158, 232–33, 240, 248, 251–52; editor theory, 15; oralist, 14–21, 232, 248; unitarian, 15–17
- Crete, 67, 97, 181–84, 186, 194, 210
- cunning: in blinding of Polyphemus, 110–15, 213; as defining character trait of Odysseus, 38, 265; Helen's, 56; in Menelaus's and Helen's accounts of Odysseus in Troy, 49, 54; paired with violence in Odysseus's return to Ithaca, 10, 42, 213; Penelope's, 56, 240; in Peter Sloterdijk's interpretation of *Odyssey*, 5–6; in songs of Demodocus, 78–80; source of Odysseus's fame, 186; Telemachus's, 64–65; wordplay on, 112–14
- cyclopes: blacksmiths in alternate tradition, 116; cannibalism by, 117–18; colonization and, 122–24; contrasted to Phaeacians, 125–26; contrasting other to Greek civilization, 93, 116–19; Golden Age and, 117–18; in structure of Apologoi, 92–93.
See also Polyphemus
- Cyprus, 50, 67, 151, 182–83
- d'Annunzio, Gabriele, 1
- Dante Alighieri, 265, 268–72
- Deiphobus, 54, 80
- Democritus, 83
- Demodocus: beauty and truth in songs of, 82–84; blindness of, 77–78; cunning in songs of, 78–80; *kosmos* in songs of, 82–83, 86, 101; Odysseus's reaction to songs of, 9, 59, 76–77, 82–88, 254–55, 261; Odysseus takes over role of, 88, 101; *Odyssey*'s structure and songs of, 77, 80–82, 176, 192; parallels between Homer and, 77–78, 83; Phaeacians' reaction to songs of, 77, 84, 86–87; vividness in songs of, 83, 85–86, 262
- Derrida, Jacques, 272
- Diderot, Denis, 141–42
- Diomedes, 25–26, 49, 268
- disguise: Athena's as Mentos or Mentor, 39, 41, 61; Athena's as shepherd, 181; Helen's in Menelaus's Trojan account, 54, 56; Laertes's apparent, 178; Odysseus's as beggar, 10–11, 56, 69, 98, 151, 158, 162, 172; Odysseus's in Helen's Trojan account, 54; Telemachus takes Odysseus for god in, 156
- Dougherty, Carol, 128
- Droysen, Johann Gustav, 120–21
- drug, Helen's, 54, 57–60
- Egypt, 49–50, 57, 67, 151, 181–83, 185, 187, 193–94
- Eidothea, 39
- Eleusis amphora, 137–44, 146
- Eliot, George, 70
- empathy, 45–46, 53, 87
- enargeia*. *See* vividness
- enchantment: Circe's, 43; of narrative, 40, 43–44, 58, 190, 193, 257; of the Sirens' song, 43

- ending: Amphimedon's alternative account in *Odyssey's*, 240–41; battle with suitors' relatives in *Odyssey's*, 237–39; contingencies in *Odyssey's*, 236–37; critical dissatisfaction with *Odyssey's*, 237; elements undermining *Odyssey's*, 240–41, 245–51; in epic tradition, 253; establishment of new political order in *Odyssey's*, 239, 245–47; *Iliad's* open, 244; Laertes's recognition of Odysseus in *Odyssey's*, 237–38; lament in *Iliad's*, 53; narrative artificiality of, 251; narrative significance of, 235–36; *Odyssey's* as establishment of new political order, 245–46; *Odyssey's* closed, 237–45, 251; Penelope and Odysseus's reunion in *Odyssey's*, 12, 237, 251–61, 263; second Nekyia in *Odyssey's*, 237, 239–42; Teiresias's prophecy in *Odyssey's*, 247–51; whether *Odyssey* originally ended in book 23, 251–52
- Enlightenment, 5–6, 270–71
- Escape to the Phaeacians, 7–10, 77, 88
- ethics: conceptions of personality and, 73–74; fate of Odysseus's companions and, 200–204, 216–17; gods' behaviour and, 28, 195–99, 218–34, 246; in Herodotus's *Histories*, 232–34; *Iliad* as moral lesson, 230; *kosmos* and, 82–83; murder normally followed by exile in Homeric world, 210; murder of suitors and, 28, 199–200, 204–18, 239; narrative and, 217–18, 232–34, 263–64; Odysseus's actions and, 28, 197–98, 200–218; in *Odyssey's* Proem, 195–98, 200, 204, 216, 220, 226; revenge and, 206; Trojan War as example of divine justice, 229–30
- Ethiopia, 12, 35, 50, 185
- Etruria, 132, 135–36
- Etruscans, 122, 125, 129, 135–36
- Eugammon of Cyrene, 126, 248
- Eumaeus: background of, 183; on beauty and truth of narrative, 84; on cathartic function of narrative, 58–59, 101; on divine arbitrariness, 220; on enchantment of narrative, 43, 190, 193; hosts Odysseus, 10, 188, 220; on narrator's retrospective control of narrative, 105, 254–55; Odysseus's recognition of, 157; Odysseus tells tall tale to, 181–85, 187–88, 190, 192–93; participates in murder of suitors, 152–53; recognizes Odysseus, 157; on reliability of narrative, 184–85
- Eupeithes, 203–4, 239, 244
- Euripides, 12, 34, 36, 71, 118–19
- Euryalus, 76, 80–81, 83, 176
- Eurycleia: asked Autolycus to name Odysseus, 172, 174; forbidden by Odysseus to rejoice over suitors' death, 216; prevented from informing others about recognition of Odysseus, 56, 152, 158; recognizes Odysseus, 56, 152, 154, 157, 170–74, 177–78, 180, 266; significance of name, 56; urges Penelope to recognize Odysseus, 159, 175
- Eurylochus, 201–2, 225, 227
- Eurymachus, 33, 64, 152, 163–65, 205, 209–11
- Eustathius, 58, 196, 250, 252
- fame: achieved through Telemachus's journey, 62–63; Achilles's, 231, 241–43; Agamemnon's, 111, 255; bard's role in, 62, 88, 101, 241–43, 254; burial mounds and, 242–43; homecoming in Odysseus's, 56, 241–42, 255; meaning of *kleos*, 62; Odysseus's proclamation of his own, 1, 76, 88; *Odyssey* as guarantee of Odysseus's, 242–43; Orestes's, 64; Trojan horse in Odysseus's, 186
- fear: in catharsis, 45–46; cyclopes and Greek colonizers', 124, 128–29, 137; pleasure of narrative and, 44
- Fénelon, François, 67–68
- Feuchtwanger, Lion, 71
- fictionality: in Athena's account of Odysseus to Telemachus, 41; Greek invention of, 192; in Lucian's *A True Story*, 97; in Odysseus's tall tales, 41, 186–88, 192–93

- Flaubert, Gustave, 68
- Fleming, Ian, 36–37, 72
- folklore and fairy tales: blinding of Polyphemus and, 109–10, 131; Teiresias's prophecy and, 249
- Fontane, Theodor, 24–26
- food: civilization defined through practices related to, 92–93, 117–19, 124; feasts associated with song and narrative, 9, 40, 49–50, 91–93, 208–9, 253–54; feasts represent harmony and order, 93; in Greek anthropology, 92; murder of suitors compared to feast, 208–9, 213–14; Odysseus's companions' violation of norms related to, 91–93, 95, 226–27; in Primo Levi's use of *Odyssey*, 268–70; in structure of Apologoi, 91–93; suitors' violation of norms related to, 207, 209
- Fränkel, Hermann, 69
- Fried, Michael, 140–41
- Galatea, 119
- gaze: admiration and, 162–63; aggression and, 162–70; from below (*hypodra idōn*), 164–65; in blinding of Polyphemus, 167–68; bow and, 166–67; in encounter with Scylla, 167–68; in literary texts, 147–48; in Odysseus's homecoming, 154–62; in Odysseus's shift from passive to active heroism, 168–70; in Pompeian wall paintings, 147; reflexivity of pictorial representations of, 140–42; in vase painting, 140–47
- genealogy, 125, 129, 180, 238
- Gill, Christopher, 73
- Giradoux, Jean, 1
- glory. *See* fame
- gods: arbitrariness of, 197–200, 218, 220–28, 230–34; decide to allow Odysseus's homecoming, 7–8, 10, 33, 75, 198–200, 239, 244; defence of own honour by, 225–28; Greek assimilation of foreign, 125; gulf between humans and, 81–82, 87, 176–77; in Herodotus's *Histories*, 230, 232–34; in *Iliad* and *Odyssey* compared, 197–200, 218, 222, 228–32; impose peace on Ithaca, 11, 246; justice and, 41–42, 46–47, 49, 114, 196–200, 218–34, 246; Odysseus's knowledge of, 102, 203; put heroes to sleep, 227; responsibility for human suffering and, 46–47, 197, 219; responsibility for slaughter of sun god's cattle and, 226–27, 234; sacrifice situates humans between animals and, 92–93; send winds, 227
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 67
- gorgons, 137–38, 140, 142–43
- Greuze, Jean-Baptiste, 141
- Grünbein, Durs, 1
- Halitherses, 33–34, 206–7, 239, 244
- Hector, 20–21, 50, 53, 64, 119, 215, 242–44
- Hédelin, François, abbé d'Aubignac, 14
- Helen: account of Odysseus in Troy, 28, 37–38, 49, 54–60; allegorical interpretation of, 58; auditory disguise of, 54–56; divine justice and abduction of, 230; drug of, 54, 57–60; in Herodotus's *Histories*, 230; marriage to Deiphobus, 54–55; marriage to Menelaus, 8, 54–55; in Menelaus's account of Odysseus in Troy, 54–55; parallels between Penelope and, 56, 81; parallels between Sirens and, 56; reaction to Menelaus's lament, 52–53; recognized by Odysseus in Troy, 54; recognizes Odysseus in Troy, 54, 56; recognizes Telemachus, 51
- Heliiodorus, 12–13, 34–36, 71, 259–61
- Helios: Odysseus's knowledge of conversation between Zeus and, 102, 227; personal resentment in response to slaughter of his cattle, 218, 223, 228. *See also* cattle of the sun god
- Hemingway, Ernest, 159
- Hephaestus, 79, 81, 126, 175–76
- Heracles, 166, 180

- Heraclitus, 191
- Hermes: on Aphrodite's infidelity, 81–82; in Apologoi, 89; favours Autolycus, 173; helps Odysseus to defeat Circe, 9, 89, 95; informs Calypso about conversation between Zeus and Helios, 102; marvels at fauna on Calypso's island, 162; sent to order Calypso to release Odysseus, 8, 75; sent to warn Aegisthus, 196, 219, 225
- Hermione, 49–50
- Herodotus: on catharsis, 45–46; composition of *Histories*, 16, 233; on genealogical connections, 129; on gods, 230, 232–34; on Persians, 125; on Trojan War, 230, 232
- heroism: bow less heroic than other weapons, 42; futile in encounter with Polyphemus, 110–12, 114–15, 200, 225; futile in encounter with Scylla, 94–95, 168; Odysseus and Achilles represent different types of, 79, 231–32, 241–43; Odysseus's cunning and, 42; Odysseus's scar and, 174; Odysseus's shift from active to passive heroism in Apologoi, 93–95; Odysseus's shift from passive to active heroism in homecoming, 88, 154, 168–70, 213, 263; public events and, 253; Telemachus's status and, 62–64, 67; unheroic character of suitors, 207, 209
- Hesiod, 117, 125, 189–92
- Hesse, Hermann, 273
- Heyne, Christian Gottlob, 15
- Himerius, 57
- history: Greek colonization and blinding of Polyphemus, 28, 110, 119–30, 133; Greek use of Homeric epic to process their own experiences, 129–30; Homeric epics not direct historical sources, 119, 128; Homeric epics witnesses to culture and society, 120–21, 128
- Hofmannsthal, Hugo von, 258
- Hölscher, Tonio, 133
- Hölscher, Uvo, 29–30, 66
- homecoming: Athena assists Odysseus's, 10, 150–53, 155, 158, 163; connections between Greeks and others forged by songs of, 125; fame and Odysseus's, 56, 241–42, 255; gaze in Odysseus's, 154–62, 170; gods decide to allow Odysseus's, 7–8, 10, 33, 75, 198–200, 239, 244; in Greek novel, 12; newness in songs of, 47; Odysseus reclaims identity in, 107, 154, 180, 238; Odysseus's shift from passive to active heroism in, 88, 154, 168–70, 213, 263; parallels between Agamemnon's and Odysseus's, 38–40, 155, 197, 205, 255; parallels between Menelaus's and Odysseus's, 38–39; in Phemius's song, 42, 45–49, 86; in Primo Levi's use of *Odyssey*, 266–67; restoration of political order in Odysseus's, 239; in road movies, 13; Telemachus's stories of, 38–40, 42–49, 262; visual semantics of, 154–55, 161–62, 170; in Xenophon, 130
- Homer: birthplace, 14; blindness, 77–78; date of Homeric epics, 14, 18; Homeric Question, 7, 14–18, 31; language, 22–23; life, 14; parallels between Demodocus and, 77–78; parallels between Odysseus and, 191–92; *philodyseus*, 196, 204; significance of name, 12; style, 23–26; works, 14
- Homeric Hymns*, 55–56
- honour: later influence of Homeric code, 129; motivates gods' response to slaughter of sun god's cattle, 226–27; motivates Helios's response to slaughter of his cattle, 228; motivates Odysseus in encounter with Polyphemus, 111, 200; motivates Poseidon's response to blinding of Polyphemus, 225–26, 228; Odysseus's cunning pushes at limits of, 42; revenge and, 206
- Horkheimer, Max, 5–6, 271
- hospitality: in Apologoi, 99–100; blinding of Polyphemus and, 110–12, 115, 132, 166, 212; fall of Troy as divine punishment for Paris's breach of, 229; murder of suitors

- and, 166, 207, 212; narratives associated with host gifts, 175, 180; Phaeacians', 99–100, 150, 187, 226; Telemachus's knowledge of conventions of, 63
- hubris, 206, 225, 233
- Hulme, Peter, 124
- identity: Greek, 124–25, 133–37; narrative and, 29, 107, 154, 170–81, 184, 189, 193, 262–63; reclaimed by Odysseus in homecoming, 107, 154, 180, 238; recognition and, 170, 174, 177, 180, 184, 189, 193, 238
- Idomeneus, 67, 181–83, 188, 210
- Iliad*: aggressive gaze (*hypodra idōn*) in, 164; analogy of leaves in, 179; armouring scenes in, 19; bath scenes in, 20–22; bow not associated with Odysseus in, 166; commemoration of heroes and, 242–43; different type of heroic epic from *Odyssey*, 79, 218, 231–32; futility of Iliadic heroism in encounter with Scylla, 94, 168; gods in, 197–98, 218, 222–23, 228–32; lament in ending of, 53; Longinus compares to *Odyssey*, 28; as moral lesson, 230; open ending of, 244; pan-Hellenism and, 133; parallels between Odysseus's anger in *Odyssey* and Achilles's anger in, 202, 205, 215; personality in, 69; represented by Achilles in comparisons with Odysseus, 79–80, 242–43; songs of Demodocus's use of motifs and formulae from, 79; vividness in, 23–26
- Iliupersis* (*The Destruction of Troy*), 46–47
- Iphitus, 180, 212
- Iros, 56, 151, 156, 161, 164–65
- Ismarus, 9, 89, 91, 103–4, 112
- James, Henry, 36–37, 72
- Jandl, Ernst, 1
- Jason, 71
- Jonas, Hans, 142
- Joyce, James, 1
- Kafka, Franz, 1
- Kazantzakis, Nikos, 1
- Keller, Gottfried, 67
- King, Stephen, 72
- Kingsley, Patrick, 6
- Kirchhoff, Adolf, 15
- kleos*. See fame
- Kooning, Willem de, 3
- Korfmann, Manfred, 119
- kosmos*, 82–83, 86, 101
- Kracht, Christian, 67
- Kubrick, Stanley, 3
- Laertes: confronts suitors' relatives, 11, 152–53; on divine justice and murder of suitors, 220; lives in rural seclusion, 11, 32, 152; neglected state of, 152, 178–80, 238; Odysseus's identity as son of, 1, 76, 115, 154, 172–73, 241; Odysseus tells tall tale to, 182–84, 192–93; Penelope weaving shroud for, 8, 158; recognizes Odysseus, 157, 170, 172, 178–80, 237–38; represents Ithaca's decline, 238
- Laestrygonians, 9, 89, 91–93, 104, 170, 195
- lament: consolation of, 44, 58, 101, 256; in *Iliad*'s ending, 53; Menelaus's for Odysseus, 41, 49–53; presence of Odysseus in Telemachy and, 37; shared and individual elements, 53; in underworld, 44, 241, 250
- language: formulaic, 17–22, 79, 90, 155, 164–65, 187, 189, 194, 207, 214, 241; mixture of dialects and level in Homeric epics, 22–23; 'odyssey' as common term in, 6, 264; and relationship to life, 272–73; wordplay on 'no one' in blinding of Polyphemus, 112–14; wordplay on 'truth' in Eumaeus's encounter with Odysseus, 112–14
- Latacz, Joachim, 119
- Lavinia, 126
- Leodes, 164–65, 206, 211–12
- Levi, Primo, 265–72
- Linklater, Richard, 67

- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh, 197
- Longus, 12
- Lord, Albert, 16–17
- lotus eaters, 6, 9, 89, 91–93, 95
- Lucian of Samosata, 97
- Lukács, György, 13, 68
- Macrobius, 57
- Man, Paul de, 272
- Mann, Thomas, 67
- Maron, 104, 112, 166, 212
- Medea, 71
- Medon, 66, 212, 239, 244
- Megapenthes, 49–50
- Melanthius, 151
- Melantho, 152, 163–65
- Menander, 11–12
- Menelaus: account of Odysseus in Troy, 37, 44, 54–60, 80; compares Odysseus to a lion, 215; in Euripides's *Orestes*, 34; on gods in *Iliad*, 229–30; lament for Odysseus, 41, 49–53; in Odysseus's tall tales, 188; parallels between his homecoming and Odysseus's, 38–39; in songs of Demodocus, 80; Telemachus's visit to, 8, 49–60, 62–64, 262
- Mentes. *See* Athena
- Mentor. *See* Athena
- Meriones, 180
- Mnesterophony: aggressive gaze in, 162–63, 167; blinding of Polyphemus and, 213–14; justice and, 204–6, 209–12, 239–41; Odysseus's shift to aggression in, 169; *Odyssey*'s ending and summary of, 240–41; in *Odyssey*'s structure, 7, 15; Telemachus's journey and, 72
- Most, Glenn, 99–101
- Muses, 55, 77–78, 82, 189, 192, 195, 223, 241
- Nagy, Gregory, 19
- names, significance of: Anticlus, 56; in blinding of Polyphemus, 112–15, 202–3, 267; Eurycleia, 56; in Heliodorus's *Aethiopia*, 35; Homer, 12; Megapenthes, 50; Odysseus, 173; Phemius, 42; Scamandrius, 50; Telemachus, 50; Terpias, 44
- narrative: adapted to recipient, 183, 185, 189; appeal of newness, 47; audience's relationship to protagonists and, 44–46, 52–53; balance between character and plot, 70–74; cathartic effect of, 58–60; consolation of, 47–48, 52–53, 86–87, 101; contemporary theories of, 29; enchantment of, 40, 43–44, 58, 190, 193, 257; endings in, 235–36, 251; enrapturing effect of, 43–44, 49, 101, 254, 260, 262; erotic desire and, 258–61; ethics and, 217–18, 232–34, 263–64; identity and, 29, 107, 154, 170–81, 184, 189, 193, 262–63; influences audience's actions, 188–89; joy in recounting suffering overcome, 253–55; limits of, 250–51, 271–72; more than representation, 273; narrator's retrospective control of, 102–8; objects and, 180; *Odyssey* itself constructs meaning through, 264–72; patterns and, 194; personality and, 61; physical impact of, 86; processing of experience through, 101–8, 129–30, 174, 193–94, 267, 271–74; recognition and, 154, 170–80, 189, 193, 262–63; relationship between form and content, 82–84; shaped by narrator's perspective and interests, 54–55; suspense and, 61, 70, 72; thematic and narrative approaches to *Odyssey*, 26–29; time and, 107, 235–36, 255–58; trustworthiness of narrator, 54–56; truth and falsehood of, 154, 193; used to manipulate, 154
- National Socialism, 5, 271
- Nausicaa: on divine arbitrariness, 220; Odysseus compared to hungry lion upon approach to, 215; parallels in Odysseus's tall tales, 187; potential marriage of Odysseus to, 126, 129–30; warns about Phaeacians' xenophobia, 76; welcomes Odysseus, 8, 76

- Nekyia. *See* underworld
- Neoplatonism, 38, 57, 72, 99
- Neoptolemus, 49–50
- Nestor, 8, 37–39, 49, 52, 62–64, 86, 243, 262
- New Comedy, 11–13
- New Realism, 272–73
- New Romanticism, 272–73
- Nitzsch, Gregor Wilhelm, 15
- nostos. *See* homecoming
- novel: Greek, 12–13, 34–35, 70–71, 74, 231; modern, 13, 36–37, 67–68, 70–72, 74, 159, 231, 236, 260
- Ogygia, 8, 10, 34, 38, 75–77, 81, 89, 95, 197
- Omina, 206
- One Thousand and One Nights*, 258–59
- Orestes, 34, 39, 49, 62–64, 74, 205–6, 245
- orientalism, 124–25
- Ovid, 142
- Pandarus, 230
- Paris, 19, 54, 229–30
- Parmenides, 83
- Parry, Milman, 16–19
- Patroclus, 21, 53, 129, 212, 215–16, 231
- Peisander, 229
- Peisistratus, 8, 49–54, 60, 68
- Penelope: Amphimedon's account of, 158, 240; Athena instructs Odysseus to test, 150; blamed by Antinous for suitors' presence, 65, 244; cunning of, 56, 240; epithet 'wise' applied to, 18; initiates bow trial, 11, 152, 158–59; Odysseus's account of Calypso and Circe to, 98; Odysseus tells tall tale to, 182–84, 187–88, 192–93; orders Eurycleia to wash disguised Odysseus's feet, 152, 171; parallels between Aphrodite and, 81–82, 87, 176–77; parallels between Clytemnestra and, 39–40, 81, 209, 241–42; parallels between Helen and, 56, 81; parallels between serving women and, 209; possibility of remarriage creates narrative suspense, 32–33, 37; in Primo Levi's use of *Odyssey*, 266; reaction to Phemius's song, 42–48, 52–53, 60, 86, 254–55; rebuked by Telemachus, 42–45, 47–48, 52, 64, 160, 221; recognizes Odysseus, 11, 152, 157–62, 170, 175–78, 238, 256; reunion with Odysseus in *Odyssey*'s ending, 12, 237, 251–61, 263; supposed to remarry when Telemachus reaches adulthood, 32, 152; tests Odysseus, 11, 160, 177; urged to recognize Odysseus by Eurycleia, 159, 175; virtue of, 39, 241–42; weaving shroud for Laertes, 8, 32, 158
- Perseus, 137–38, 140
- Persian Wars, 46, 125, 129–30, 134
- personality: ancient objective-participatory view, 73–74; Cartesian subjective view, 73–74; coming-of-age narrative and, 68, 72–73; development of, 61; emphasis on plot or character and, 70–74, 159; ethics and, 73–74; inner life of Homeric heroes, 68–69; Odysseus's scar and, 174; in Primo Levi's use of *Odyssey*, 266; suspense and, 32, 61, 70
- Phaeacians: contrasted to cyclopes, 125–26; as descendants of Poseidon, 125, 226; as expert seafarers, 10, 87, 126; hospitality and, 99–100, 226; Odysseus's self-introduction to, 1, 76, 172–73; in Odysseus's tall tales, 182, 187; Odysseus's time with marks transition to life on Ithaca, 91, 107, 263; Odysseus tells Apologoi to, 9, 28, 76–77, 88, 96–102, 107, 169, 200, 255, 262–63; people's assembly of, 76, 100; Poseidon's anger at, 226; in Primo Levi's use of *Odyssey*, 266–67; reaction to Demodocus's songs, 77, 84–87; reaction to Odysseus's Apologoi, 76; in structure of Apologoi, 91–92; welcome and assist Odysseus, 8–10, 75–77, 99–100, 150. *See also* Scheria

- Phemius: Homer said to be son of, 14;
Penelope's reaction to song of, 42–48,
52–53, 60, 86, 254–55; significance of
name, 42, 44; song of, 41–49, 52, 55, 64,
254; spared in murder of suitors, 66, 212;
suitors' reaction to song of, 43–46, 48,
86; Telemachus rebukes Penelope's reac-
tion to song of, 42–45, 47–48, 52, 64, 221;
Telemachus's reaction to song of, 42–44,
46–48, 52, 221
- Philoetius, 152, 157
- Philostratus, 148
- Philoxenus, 119
- Phoenicia, 50, 67, 128, 181, 185, 194
- Phrynichus, 45–46
- Picasso, Pablo, 1–2
- Pindar, 83, 96–97, 127, 191, 265
- Plato, 57
- Plautus, 11
- plot: in Apologoi, 106; coming-of-age
type, 67–68, 70; conceptions of person-
ality and, 70–74, 159; emphasized over
character in ancient literature, 70–74,
159; formulaic language and, 19, 21, 26;
of Herodotus's *Histories*, 16; *Iliad*'s tragic
epic, 231–32; influence of *Odyssey*'s on
later literature, 11–14, 231; *Odyssey*'s
adventure story, 231–32; *Odyssey*'s teleo-
logical, 11–14; parallels between *Odys-
sey*'s and *Oresteia*, 205–6; portrayal of
gods in *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and, 198, 218,
231–32; romance type, 253; significance
of ending in, 235–36; suspense and,
33–38, 70, 159, 260–61; temporal experi-
ence of narrative and, 27, 44, 70, 235–36,
257–61
- Plutarch, 57, 74
- poetry: formulaic language in Hellenistic
and Augustan, 21; Polyphemos in Hel-
lenistic, 119; reception of *Odyssey* in, 1, 23;
romantic love in archaic lyric, 253; sub-
jectivity in archaic lyric, 69
- Polybius, 48
- Polyphemos: Apologoi account confirmed
by mention in main narrative, 97, 201;
blinded by Odysseus, 9, 75, 89, 106, 112,
114–15, 133, 225; blinding compared to
slaughter of sun god's cattle, 227; blinding
enabled by Greek technical skills, 116;
cannibalism by, 92, 111, 117–18, 124,
128–29, 213–14, 216, 268; compared to
lion, 111, 116, 216; compared to Scylla, 94;
contrasting other to Greek civilization,
92, 104–5, 111, 116–19, 124, 133–37; curses
Odysseus, 9, 115, 202–3; devours *Odys-
sey*'s companions, 9, 89, 93–94, 111, 223,
226, 244; fairy-tale motif, 109–10, 131;
gaze in depictions of, 140–49; gaze
in encounter with, 167–69; Greek coloni-
zation and, 28, 110, 119–30, 133; in Hellenis-
tic poetry, 119; heroism futile in encounter
with, 110–12, 114–15, 200, 225; hospitality in
encounter with, 110–12, 115, 132, 166, 212;
natural images in description of, 116–17;
Odysseus's cunning in encounter with, 94,
104–5, 110–15, 200–201; *Odysseus*'s re-
sponsibility for companions' deaths in
encounter with, 105, 124, 200–203, 223–27;
Odysseus's retrospective narration of
encounter with, 104–5, 113, 195, 200–201;
parallels between gorgons' pursuit of Per-
seus and blinding of, 140; parallels be-
tween murder of suitors and blinding of,
166, 169, 212–16; in Primo Levi's use of
Odyssey, 267–68; son of Poseidon, 9, 75,
106, 113, 115, 203, 223–26; as standard by
which *Odysseus* measures other adven-
tures, 109–10; in structure of Apologoi,
91–94; in structure of *Odyssey*, 9, 133; vase
painting and, 110, 130–49
- Porphyry, 72–73
- Poseidon: anger at *Odysseus* motivated by
honour, 223–26, 228; anger at Phaeacians,
226; causes storm off Scheria, 8, 75, 203,
223; father of Polyphemos, 9, 75, 106, 113,
115, 203, 223–26; in *Odysseus*'s tall tales,

- 187; Phaeacians descended from, 125, 226;
responsible for Odysseus's wanderings,
33, 106, 133, 203, 223–26, 237; in songs of
Demodocus, 79; in Teiresias's prophecy,
247–51; theodicy and, 218
- post-structuralism, 272–73
- Priam, 53, 230
- Proclus, 38, 248
- prophecy: Achilles's death and, 21, 231;
Circe and Teiresias predict dangers Od-
ysseus will face, 103–4, 168, 188, 227; for-
mulaic language and, 20–21, 247; Halith-
erses predicts Odysseus's return, 33–34;
Mentes predicts Odysseus's return, 41;
narrows gap between experience and
retrospective narration, 103–4; Pythia
predicts quarrel between Odysseus and
Achilles, 78; suspense and, 33–34; Teire-
sias instructs Odysseus on appeasing
Poseidon, 247–51, 255, 261
- Proust, Marcel, 67, 256–57
- Psammetichos II of Egypt, 185
- Pylos, 8, 31, 37, 61–63, 65, 68, 93, 181
- Ramses II of Egypt, 185
- rapture (*terpsis*), 43–44, 49, 101, 254, 260,
262
- reception of *Odyssey*: in cinema, 3, 5; in
intellectual history, 5; in literature, 1,
11–14, 23, 118–19, 231, 265–73; and Odys-
seus as suffering and cunning, 265; and
'odyssey' as common term, 6, 264; in
visual arts, 1–3, 110, 130–49
- recognition: Argos's of Odysseus, 10, 56,
155–56; Eumaeus's of Odysseus, 157, 256;
Eurycleia's of Odysseus, 56, 152, 157,
170–74, 266; Helen's of Odysseus in Troy,
54, 56; Helen's of Telemachus, 51; identity
and, 170, 174, 177, 180, 184, 189, 193, 238;
Laertes's of Odysseus, 157, 170, 172, 178–80,
237–38; limited role of sight in, 154–62,
170–71, 174; narrative and, 154, 170–80,
189, 193, 262–63; in New Comedy, 12;
Odysseus's of Eumaeus, 157; Odysseus's
of Helen in Troy, 54; Odysseus's of Philo-
etius, 157; Odysseus's scar and, 152, 157,
171–75, 177–80, 266; Penelope's of Odys-
seus, 11, 152, 157–62, 170, 175–78, 238, 256;
Philoetius's of Odysseus, 157, 256
- recusatio*, 55
- reflexivity, 28, 30, 140–49, 189, 264, 272–74
- Reiner, Rob, 67
- Reinhardt, Karl, 95, 103–4
- Ricœur, Paul, 29, 107
- rite of passage: Odysseus's Apologoi, 99;
Odysseus's visit to Autolycus, 173–74;
Telemachus's journey, 68
- Rothe, Carl, 15
- sacrilege (*atasthalia*): Aegisthus's, 39, 196–
97, 216; Antinous most sacrilegious of
suitors, 156, 161; divine punishment of,
39, 196–97, 216, 220, 226; Eurylochus
accuses Odysseus of, 201–2, 225; Odys-
seus's in Dante's *Divine Comedy*, 270;
slaughter of the sun god's cattle, 97, 187,
195–96, 202, 216, 226–27; suitors', 39, 196–
97, 202, 204, 209, 216, 220
- Said, Edward, 124–25
- Sappho, 253
- Scaliger, Julius Caesar, 13
- scar, Odysseus's, 140, 152, 157, 171–75, 177–80,
266
- scenes, typical, 19–22, 168, 194
- Scheria: contrasted to cyclopes' island,
125–26; games on, 9, 76, 81; harmony and
order represented by banquet on, 93;
Odysseus compared to hungry lion upon
arrival on, 215; Odysseus recounts Apolo-
goi on, 9, 76–77, 98, 107, 153, 190, 262;
Odysseus welcomed on, 8–9, 75–77, 100;
people's assembly on, 121; as place of tran-
sition before Odysseus's return to Ithaca,
107, 153; Poseidon causes shipwreck off, 8,
75–76, 203, 223; songs of Demodocus on,
28, 76, 80, 262. *See also* Phaeacians

- Schliemann, Heinrich, 119
- Schmitt, Carl, 245
- scholia on Homer, 35, 42, 176, 219, 251–52
- Schopenhauer, Arthur, 85
- Scylla: Circe warns Odysseus about, 10, 89, 167–68; compared to fisherman, 94–95, 169–70; compared to Polyphemus, 94, 108–9, 168; gaze in Odysseus's encounter with, 94, 167–68; Iliadic heroism futile in Odysseus's encounter with, 94–95, 168; Odysseus remembers as most pitiful scene, 94–95, 168, 195; in structure of Apologoi, 91–93; in vase painting, 131
- singer. *See* bard
- Sirens: beauty and truth in song of, 84; in Christian interpretations of *Odyssey*, 99, 265; Circe warns Odysseus about, 10, 89; enchantment of, 43, 261; Helen and, 56; in Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno's interpretation of *Odyssey*, 5; in Pablo Picasso's *Ulysse et les sirènes*, 1–2; in structure of Apologoi, 91–93; in vase painting, 131
- Sloterdijk, Peter, 5–6
- Snell, Bruno, 68–69
- Solon, 83
- Sophocles, 130, 265
- Sparta: harmony and order represented by banquet in, 93; Helen's flight from, 54; in Herodotus's *Histories*, 129, 232; later claim traced back to Agamemnon, 129; Menelaus's return to, 50; Telemachus's visit to, 8, 31, 37, 49, 61–63, 65, 68, 80; tensions in, 55
- Stoicism, 265
- Strauß, Botho, 1
- structure: of Apologoi, 77, 88–95, 102–4; Apologoi in *Odyssey's*, 7, 9–10, 12, 76, 107, 150, 263; blinding of Polyphemus in *Odyssey's*, 9, 133; conversations between Athena and Zeus in *Odyssey's*, 244; double ring in *Odyssey's*, 243–44; Mnesterophony in *Odyssey's*, 7, 15; of Odysseus's tall tales, 183–84; of *Odyssey's* conclusion, 243–44; people's assemblies in *Odyssey's*, 243–44; songs of Demodocus in *Odyssey's*, 77, 80–82, 176, 192; Telemachy in *Odyssey's*, 7–8, 31–40, 77, 87
- suffering: account of others' may provide consolation for one's own, 48; account of others' reawakens one's own, 52–53, 60, 86; catharsis and, 45–46; characterizes Menelaus, 38; characterizes Odysseus, 38, 195, 198, 265; in Christian interpretations of *Odyssey*, 99, 265; divine or human responsibility for, 46–47, 197, 218–19, 226, 228, 232–34; in epic as genre, 231, 251; Helen's drug and, 54; in Herodotus's *Histories*, 232–34; narrator's retrospective control of, 59, 101–2, 105, 254–55; not moral justification for divine assistance, 199; Odysseus's heroism and, 154, 169–70; in Odysseus's tall tales, 187; in Primo Levi's use of *Odyssey*, 265–67, 270–71; processed through narrative, 86–87
- suitors: abuse of disguised Odysseus by, 10–11, 151–52, 164; aggressive gaze and, 162–67; Antinous most sacrilegious of, 156, 161; associated with scavengers, 207; backgrounds of, 210; blinding of Polyphemus and murder of, 212–16; bow trial and, 11, 42, 66, 152, 158–59, 166–67, 175, 240; cannibalism and murder of, 213–14, 216; compared to fawns, 162–63; consume Odysseus's substance or life, 92, 207–8; critical views of murder of, 198, 200, 204, 209–17, 239; disregard warnings, 206–7; distinctions among, 211–12, 216; ethics and murder of, 28, 199–200, 204–18, 239; exploit maidservants, 69, 209; fail to understand events, 240; feasting and murder of, 208–9; fishing analogy for murder of, 170; gods and murder of, 150, 196–97, 213, 220–22, 238–39, 246–47; hospitality and murder of, 212; justice and murder of, 39, 198–200, 206–9, 216, 220–21, 239, 244; murder of, 11,

- 42, 151–52; negative descriptions of, 206; Odysseus's tall tales and, 188; offences of, 204–9, 216; parallels between adulterous Ares and, 81, 176–77; parallels between Aegisthus and, 39–40, 196–97, 205–6, 209, 216, 228; Penelope's ruse to stall, 8, 32, 158; at people's assembly, 8, 33, 65; reaction to Phemius's song, 43–46, 48, 86; relatives of, 11, 153, 203–4, 237–39, 244, 246–47; revenge and murder of, 206, 216; sacrilege by, 39, 196–97, 202, 204, 209, 216, 220; threat to Telemachus, 7–8, 10, 32–33, 61–66, 151, 204; in underworld, 158, 166, 210–11, 237, 239–41
sun god. *See* Helios
- suspense: in ancient narratives, 32–36, 61; ancient view of personality and, 61, 70; in Apologoi, 103; in contemporary narratives, 36–37; erotics of narrative and, 260–61; in modern popular literature and films, 72; in Telemachy, 32–34, 37–38, 40, 70
- tales, Odysseus's tall: adapted to audience, 183, 185, 193; told to Antinous, 182–84, 188; told to Athena in disguise, 181, 183, 186, 188–89, 199; compared to bard's songs, 190; compared to *Odyssey* itself, 189–94; deceive audience, 28, 98, 181, 184–89, 192–93; enchantment of, 193, 262; to Eumaeus, 181–85, 187–88; influence audience's actions, 188–89; to Laertes, 182–84; mixture of fact and fiction in, 41, 154, 181, 186–89, 192–93; parallels between Odysseus's adventures and, 187–88, 193–94; to Penelope, 182–84, 187–88; pragmatic goals of, 188–89, 192, 263; process Odysseus's experiences, 193–94; realism of, 185; reflect Greek mobility, 122, 185; reveal Odysseus's nature, 188–89; structure of, 183–84
- Tchekhov, Anton, 35–36
- Teiresias: Circe sends Odysseus to, 9, 39, 89; in Eugammon of Cyrene's *Telegony*, 248–49; identifies Poseidon's anger as cause of Odysseus's wanderings, 203; instructs Odysseus on appeasing Poseidon, 247–51, 255, 261; predicts Odysseus's future, 9, 89, 103–4, 187–88; warns about sun god's cattle, 89, 104, 227
- Telemachus: attempts to draw Odysseus's bow, 66–67; calls people's assembly, 8, 65; cunning of, 64–65; development of, 43, 60–68, 72–74; draws audience into plot, 37–38; fame of, 62–63; in François Fénelon's *Les aventures de Télémaque, fils d'Ulysse*, 67–68; on gods' arbitrariness and justice, 221; journey of, 8, 31, 37, 49–63, 68, 72–73, 262; meeting with Athena/Mentes, 8, 37, 41–42, 61–66; Odysseus reveals identity to, 10, 151, 154, 156, 256; Orestes as role model for, 39–40, 62–64, 74; parallels between Alcinous and Hector and, 64; parallels between Menelaus and, 215; participates in murder of suitors, 11, 151–52, 163; reaction to Menelaus's account of Odysseus in Troy, 44, 59–60; reaction to Menelaus's lament, 50–53; reaction to Phemius's song, 42–44, 46–48, 52, 221; rebukes Penelope's reaction to Phemius's song, 42–45, 47–48, 52, 64, 221; rebukes Penelope's slowness in recognizing Odysseus, 160; recognized by Helen, 51; resemblance to Odysseus, 51, 62–63; significance of name, 50; suitors' hostility to, 7–8, 10, 33, 64–65, 151, 204, 208
- Telemachy: homecoming stories in, 38–40, 42–49; may have originated separately, 15, 31; in *Odyssey*'s structure, 7–8, 31–40, 77, 87; parallels between other parts of *Odyssey* and, 38–40; suspense in, 32–34, 37–38, 40, 70; tales of the father in, 37–38, 40–42, 49–60; whether a *Bildungsroman*, 60–74
- Terence, 11
- terpsis*. *See* rapture
- Theoclymenos, 63, 206, 210

- Theocritus, 119
- theodicy, 197, 218–19, 226, 271
- Thesprotia, 126, 182, 187, 248
- Thrinacia. *See* cattle of the sun god
- Thucydides, 84, 133
- Timocles, 48
- tragedy: catharsis in, 45–46; consolation and, 48; *Iliad* as tragic epic, 231–32; *Odyssey* in, 12, 130; psychological conflict in, 71; suspense in, 34, 40
- truth and deception: in Apologoi, 77, 88, 95–98, 200; in Athena’s account of Odysseus to Telemachus, 41; beauty and, 82–84, 192; in contemporary rural Greece, 186; Eumaeus on, 184–85; in Homeric world, 186, 191, 199; narrative and, 154, 193, 263; Odysseus praised for skill in deception, 96, 114, 186, 199; in Odysseus’s tall tales, 28, 98, 154, 181, 184–94, 263; in *Odyssey*, 56, 181, 189–94; wordplay on, 112–14
- underworld: Circe sends Odysseus to, 9, 39, 89; Odysseus encounters Heracles in, 166; Odysseus’s adaptation of account to audience, 98; Odysseus’s fate compared to Agamemnon’s in, 39, 241–42; Odysseus’s lament for his mother in, 44; in *Odyssey*’s ending, 39, 237, 239–43; in structure of Apologoi, 76, 91–92, 94, 103; suitors in, 158, 166, 210–11, 237, 239–41; Teiresias’s instructions to Odysseus in, 247–48, 250
- vase painting: Aristonothos krater, 134–37; blinding of Polyphemus in, 28, 110, 130–46; chronology of motifs, 28, 110, 130–31; colonization and, 133–37; Eleusis amphora, 137–44, 146; eye and gaze in, 140–49; gorgons in, 142; reflexivity in, 28, 142–49
- Vico, Giambattista, 15
- Virgil, 126, 268
- virtue (*arete*): in education of Telemachus, 73; Odysseus not described as morally virtuous, 198–99; Penelope’s, 39, 241–42
- vividness (*enargeia*), 23–26, 83, 85–86
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Ulrich von, 61, 119
- Wolff, August Friedrich, 14–15
- Woolf, Virginia, 72
- Xenophon, 12, 130, 206
- Zeus: angered by slaughter of sun god’s cattle, 187; comments on Polyphemus, 97, 223; connects Aegisthus and Odysseus’s companions, 196; connects Aegisthus and suitors, 39, 205, 220; conversations with Athena in *Odyssey*’s structure, 244; divine arbitrariness and, 220–22; divine punishment of injustice and, 46–47, 114, 167, 196–99, 218–20, 225–31; divine responsibility for suffering and, 46–47, 197, 219; enables Odysseus’s homecoming, 33, 75, 244; intervenes to reconcile Odysseus and suitors’ relatives, 238–39, 246–47; Odysseus claims that Polyphemus’s blinding is punishment from, 114, 225; Odysseus’s knowledge of, 102, 227; predicts Hector’s death, 20; sends winds that trap Odysseus and companions on sun god’s island, 226–27