

SHORTER NOTES

HOMER, *ODYSSEY* 1.132–3

παρ δ' αὐτὸς κλισμὸν θέτο ποικίλον ἔκτοθεν ἄλλων
μνηστήρων, μὴ κείνος ἀνηθείς ὀρυμαγδῶ
δείπνῳ ἀδήσειεν

'Apart from the others, the suitors', as Stephanie West translates, adding, 'ἄλλος, as often, is followed by an epexegetic noun.'¹ So too Stanford and other commentators and translators. Of this usage there are, as far as I know, two certain instances in the two Homeric epics (*Od.* 8.368–9, 10.485).² Might we consider an alternative? Punctuate with a comma after ἄλλων (rather than after μνηστήρων) and take μνηστήρων with ὀρυμαγδῶ.³ This gives perfectly good sense and removes the unpleasantness of the two bare datives juxtaposed.⁴ Although to us, the readers of the *Odyssey*, the meaning of the sentence is ambiguous, Homer's audience would have known immediately from the bard's oral recitation how the words were to be connected.⁵

University of Illinois, Urbana

HOWARD JACOBSON

¹ S. West (ed.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* 1 (Oxford, 1988), 93 ad 1.132–3.

² A case could also be made at *Od.* 1.128, 2.412, 9.367, 15.449.

³ Eustathius ad loc. writes τὸν γοῦν ὑπὸ τῶν μνηστήρων γινόμενον ὄμαδον ὀρυμαγδὸν λέγει. This may suggest he read μνηστήρων with ὀρυμαγδῶ. The fact that the scholion ad loc. gives the lemma as ἔκτοθεν ἄλλων (not ἔκτοθεν ἄλλων μνηστήρων) may be significant (cf. e.g. the scholia at *Od.* 1.60 and 312, where the lemma overlaps the next line).

⁴ For the placement of μή, cf. e.g. *Il.* 5.24, 6.57, 9.522, 15.196, *Od.* 16.133, 18.20, 62, 24.174. A separation as great as μνηστήρων . . . ὀρυμαγδῶ is not common in Homer, but extreme examples can also be seen at *Il.* 11.242–3, 12.177–8, 23.339–40 and *Od.* 21.372–3.

⁵ I am indebted to Prof. David Sansone for a beneficial reading of an earlier version of this note.

AN EMENDATION TO THE SCHOLIA ON HOMER'S *NEKUIA*¹

The scholium TV at *Odyssey* 11.385 reads:²

ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Σίσυφος κέρδιτος ὦν διὰ τί κολάζεται;
τὸ κακὸ τροπὸν ὁ Γλαῦκος τοῦ προγόνου εἰς σύνεσιν
μετήνεγκεν. πῶς δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἐνταῦθα μένων
θεός; καὶ πῶς οἶόν τε τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι καὶ ἐν Αἰδοῦ
καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ; καὶ ἡ Ἥβη δὲ καθ' Ὀμηρον παρθένος,
ὄθεν καὶ οἶνοχοεῖ. ἀπίθανον δὲ αὐτὸν ἔχειν καὶ τὴν σκευήν.
μὴ πινὼν δὲ πῶς ὀμίλει; τὴν μὲν σκευὴν ἔχει κατὰ
φαντασίαν, τοὺς δὲ δύο στίχους καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀθετοῦμεν,
εἰδῶλον, καί, τέρπεται ἐν θαλίῃς. οὐ πάντες δὲ οὗτοι

¹ I would like to thank Richard Martin and the anonymous referee for their helpful comments on this piece.

² G. Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam* (Oxford, 1855), 511–12. All subsequent references to the scholia of the *Odyssey* are to this edition, which remains the most recent with the exception of A. Ludwich's *Scholia in Homeri Odysseas A 1–309 Auctoria et Emendatiora* (Hildesheim, 1966), which covers but a small portion of the whole.

ἐν τῷ τῶν ἀτάφων εἰσὶ χώρῳ, οἱ μὲν κολαζόμενοι,
οἱ δὲ κολάζοντες, ὡς ὁ Μίνως καὶ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς. οὗτοι
δὲ μὴ πεπωκότες τοῦ Λήθης ὕδατος καὶ φθέγγονται
χωρὶς τοῦ πιεῖν.

Something is clearly wrong with the scholium. Its first two lines apply to Sisyphus, while the remaining eight apply to Heracles. There is no close connection between the two groups of comments. Moreover, there is no connection between the note's comments on either Sisyphus or Heracles and the line to which they are attached, *Od.* 11.385. This line is at the beginning of the resumption of Odysseus' tale of Hades. Neither figure will appear for over 200 lines.

In a footnote to the lines, Dindorf acknowledges that there is a textual problem here. He cites Buttmann's analysis of the lines,³ which holds that, though attempts have been made to split the note up and move the lines on Sisyphus to *Od.* 11.593 and those on Heracles to 11.623, it is best to keep them where they are, 'ut iudicium de iis integrum esset'.

There is a compelling reason, however, to split up the note and reassign at the least that part of it which pertains to Heracles. The scholium HT at *Od.* 11.568 does not make complete sense either, and the comments on Heracles in TV at *Od.* 11.385 would render HT at *Od.* 11.568 intelligible if joined to it.

HT at 11.568 lists reasons for the athetization of everything in the *Nekuia* from Minos to the tortures of the damned to Heracles's encounter with Odysseus. Yet the scholium supplies only one reason, that of a narrative inconsistency in these scenes. The scenes imply that Odysseus has moved into Hades although there has been no mention of such a move. For the sake of clarity, I will quote the scholia in full:

νοθεύεται μέχρι τοῦ "ὡς εἰπὼν ὁ μὲν αὖθις ἔδω δόμον
Ἄιδος εἶσω." [11.627] καίτοι οὐκ ὄντες ἀγενεῖς περὶ τῇ
φράσει. ὑπὲρ δὲ τῆς ἀθετήσεως αὐτῶν λέγεται τοιάδε·
πῶς οἶδε τούτους ἢ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἔσω τῶν Ἄιδου πυλῶν
ὄντας καὶ τῶν ποταμῶν;

Now, while modern scholarship has turned away from this criticism,⁴ it seems to the scholia, at least, a very good point, so much so that they reiterate it regularly throughout the subsequent lines: HQT at *Od.* 11.570 (Minos), QT at 11.577 (Tityus), and QT at 11.593 (Sisyphus). But no scholia ever mention it again in connection with Heracles, and with good reason, because it is ridiculous from any point of view, whether ancient or modern, to apply the criticism to Heracles at all. *Od.* 11.627 concludes Heracles' appearance with, 'ὡς εἰπὼν ὁ [Heracles] μὲν αὖτις ἔβη δόμον Ἄιδος εἶσω', the same sense as the reading of the scholium. So there is no question as to whether Odysseus had to go into Hades to see Heracles. The note proposes to athetize all the lines from Minos' through Heracles' scene, yet gives a reason that cannot conceivably apply to the Heracles scene.

I propose that the scholium HT at 11.568 fails to make sense because it is truncated. The note abruptly ends just as soon as it begins to list the reasons for the athetization of *Od.* 11.568–627. The plural *τοιάδε*, in particular, makes one

³ P. Buttmann, *Scholia Antiqua in Homeri Odysseam* (Berlin, 1821).

⁴ See, for example, Heubeck's note on *Odyssey* 11.568–627 for an argument for the text's integrity based on structural similarities between it and the *Nekuia*'s catalogue of women. Heubeck also lists modern attempts to attack the lines, e.g. Wilamowitz's contention that they are an Orphic interpolation in *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1884), 109–206.

expect something more than the single *πῶς* question which follows it. At the very least, something which would explain the athetization of Heracles' scene has been left out.

The scholiastic comments on Heracles in TV at *Od.* 11.385 easily join the truncated list which *τοιιάδε* introduces in HT at 11.568. They continue to enumerate reasons for athetization in the form of a series of rhetorical questions beginning with *πῶς*. This conforms to a pattern in the Homeric scholia in which *πῶς* questions cluster around one another. A short example of this is also from the scholia on the *Nekuia*, HT at *Od.* 11.573, '*πῶς οὖν μήκιστοι οἱ προειρημένοι παῖδες Ἀλωῆος; ἢ πῶς ὁ κείμενος ἐξήλθεν; εἰ δὲ μὴ ἐξήλθε, πῶς ἑωρᾶτο;*' It is interesting to note that this addresses the text only five lines after the note we are looking at, and in quite similar fashion. Further such examples are in the scholium on the other Odyssean *Nekuia*, MV at 24.1, in which three *πῶς* questions are joined together to support the athetization of that part of the *Odyssey*. The Iliadic scholia partake of the pattern also, as can be seen in the scholium bT at 5.885–7.⁵ So moving the comments about Heracles from TV at *Od.* 11.385 to HT at 11.568 would not only make the plural *τοιιάδε* more intelligible, but also give the note a form found elsewhere in the scholia.

More importantly, the comments about Heracles in TV at 11.385 make the reference of HT at 11.568 to Heracles intelligible. The scholium's comments can now be understood as a general introduction to the athetization which begins at *Od.* 11.568 and continues until the end of Book 11. The note sums up the arguments for athetization, and so the reference to Heracles and the lists of reasons for athetization peculiar to his scene should come as no surprise at this point in the scholia.⁶ Such a change in the text is not insignificant. It dispels the impression otherwise created that the scholia suggest that the Heracles scene, like the descriptions of Minos and the damned, can be athetized simply because of a problem in the logic of the narrative. As such, it sets the Heracles scene apart as a separate, and much more complex, textual problem for the scholia than that provided by the descriptions of Minos and the damned.

Princeton University

EDWARD GUTTING
egutting@princeton.edu

⁵ H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* (Berlin, 1969).

⁶ The scholia's other criticisms of the Heracles scene follow shortly after 11.568, at lines 11.601, 602, 604, 616.

THE SEER TISAMENOS AND THE KLYTIADAI

At the battle of Plataia, 'Ἕλλησι μὲν Τισαμενὸς Ἀντιόχου ἦν ὁ θυόμενος· οὗτος γὰρ δὴ εἶπετο τῷ στρατεύματι τούτῳ μάντις· τὸν ἔοντα Ἥλειον καὶ γένεος τοῦ Ἰαμιδέων Κλυτιάδην Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐποιήσαντο λεωσφέτερον (Herodotos 9.33.1).

The Klytiadai, like the Iamidai, were an extended family of seers. They claimed descent from Melampous, by way of Klytios, grandson of Amphiaraios and son of Alkmaion.¹ Scholarly opinion is divided as to whether the name *Κλυτιάδην* should be secluded from the text of Herodotos as an intrusive gloss, or left where it is: if the Klytiadai and Iamidai were separate *genē*, then Tisamenos must belong to either

¹ Pausanias 6.17.6, where the line is given as: Amathaon-Melampous-Mantios-Oïkles-Amphiaraios-Alkmaion-Klytios (by a daughter of Phegeus of Arkadia).