

## EUMAIOS AND ALKINOOS: THE AUDIENCE AND THE *ODYSSEY*

BRUCE LOUDEN

The *Odyssey* has provoked many recent studies of its self-consciousness, how it is aware of itself as a poetic product.<sup>1</sup> As is increasingly recognized, the *Odyssey* is often concerned with what Doherty calls "the reflexive quality of the work—what might be called its attention to its own reception."<sup>2</sup> Such discussions note how Odysseus appropriates the language and gestures of the epic singer, functioning as an internal narrator within the greater narrative. There is thus a general awareness that the principal narrator identifies himself with Odysseus and vice versa. Necessarily, if an internal narrator, such as Odysseus, parallels certain tendencies of the principal narrator, so some of the internal audiences depicted in the poem suggest parallels and connections with an external audience, even ourselves.<sup>3</sup>

In the *Odyssey*, telling and hearing narratives are part of the reception of guests. The hospitable host provides both the environment as well as the specific impetus for most of the tale telling. The longest internal narratives are Odysseus' narration of his wanderings, delivered to the Phaiakians, the accounts Nestor and Menelaus give to Telemakhos, and those the disguised Odysseus and Eumaios exchange with each other. All of these contexts are extended treatments of hospitality, in which an exchange of narratives is an element in the type-scene.<sup>4</sup> The *Odyssey* offers many other internal narratives, from Phemios' first song, the songs of Demodokos, to Odysseus noting that he narrated his exploits to Aiolos, embedded within the *Apologos* itself.<sup>5</sup> For each internal narration there is also an internal audience. Among the many internal audiences figured in the *Odyssey*, Alkinoos and Eumaios stand out in their degree of interaction with Odysseus and in prompting narratives from him. Notwithstanding their manifold differences, I argue that Eumaios and Alkinoos serve the same essential role in their respective

I should like to thank Terry Bell, Richard Janko, John Miles Foley, Lillian Eileen Doherty, and the anonymous referees at *Phoenix* for their helpful comments and suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> Recent studies include Pratt 1993: 63–94; Walsh 1984: 3–21; Thalmann 1984: 170–184; Goldhill 1991: 111; Murnaghan 1987; Segal 1994: 85–109; Seidensticker 1978; Moulton 1977: 145–153; Rose 1975: 145–149; Stewart 1976: 146–195; Doherty 1995.

<sup>2</sup> Doherty 1991: 146.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Doherty 1995: 89: "By allowing the hero to take over . . . the narration of the poem . . . the epic narrator sets up an implied double comparison: on the one hand, a comparison between himself and Odysseus in the narrator's role; on the other hand, a complementary comparison between the Phaeacians as internal audience and implied audience of the epic as a whole." See below (96–97) on *implied* audience.

<sup>4</sup> Reece 1993, esp. 28, a discussion of item XII in his grid, "Entertainment."

<sup>5</sup> Odysseus himself serves as internal audience for Demodokos' three songs, while Penelope in an exchange less related to hospitality hears the last internal narrative in the poem (23.306–341).

sections of the poem.<sup>6</sup> Both characters are closely concerned with the act of narrative itself, serving to trigger lengthy narratives from Odysseus, and acting as internal audiences for those narratives. Even more specifically, both describe and comment on his powers of narration as do no other characters in the poem. Isolating the similar functions of Eumaios and Alkinoos clarifies how certain portions of the *Odyssey* interrelate and offers new perspectives on underlying Homeric compositional techniques. I argue further that it is Eumaios' role as internal audience which results in the narrator's frequent and, as far as the *Odyssey* is concerned, unique apostrophes to him.

The reciprocal relationship between guest and host has much in common with the necessary reciprocity between performer and audience. The audience, like the host, can interrogate the performer, and, because of its numbers and economic means, exerts considerable influence over the performance. We, the present audience of Homeric epic, are also its hosts. We welcome it into our lives, ask it where it came from, who its parents were, and the like. For a contemporary archaic audience listening to a performance, the possible parallels between the hospitable reception of a guest and the reception of a performance by its audience would have been more obvious. Though we must be utterly unlike any audience envisioned by the oral tradition, the parallelism, nevertheless, remains operative. Implicitly, Eumaios and Alkinoos, as both internal, critical audiences and hospitable hosts, suggest such a connection, and offer possible models of mediation between Homeric epic and (later) audiences.<sup>7</sup>

There is a considerable body of recent literature distinguishing between various audiences which the existence of a text presupposes: implied audience, actual historical and contemporary audience, later audience, ideal audience.<sup>8</sup> Doherty has written extensively on these issues in Homeric epic, in conjunction with analysis of some of the *Odyssey's* internal audiences. Iser defines implied reader as follows:

the implied reader . . . embodies all those predispositions necessary for a literary work to exercise its effect—predispositions laid down, not by an empirical outside reality, but by the text itself. Consequently, the implied reader as a concept has his roots firmly planted in the structure of the text; he is a construct in no way to be identified with any real reader . . . the concept of the implied reader is a transcendental model which makes it possible for the structured effects of literary texts to be described. It denotes the role of the reader, which is definable in terms of textual structure and structured acts.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> On multiforms, different instantiations of the same theme or character performing the same essential function, as a typical feature of oral/mythic narrative, see, e.g., Lord 1960: 120, 198–199, 221; Lord 1991: 102; cf. Nagy 1979: 3, 43, 205, 42, n. 3; Foley 1988: 10, 12, etc. Without taking orality into account, Propp 1968 presupposes the same tendency. Relevant recent Homeric studies include Lowenstam 1993; Reece 1993; Loudon 1993a.

<sup>7</sup> Doherty 1995 is centrally concerned with this topic.

<sup>8</sup> See especially Iser 1974.

<sup>9</sup> Iser 1978: 34–38. Though his textual models are more “literary” than oral, nonetheless, if we substitute audience for his reader, the model remains useful and applicable.

Whatever our conjectures may be as to the composition of an archaic epic audience, I suggest that the depictions of the internal audiences, Alkinoos and Eumaios, are closer to the concept of implied reader than they are to any actual historical audience, archaic or contemporary. Additionally, they are, in many ways, ideal audiences in their almost boundless appreciation of narrative and their acquaintance with epic conventions.

Eumaios has rarely been the focus of critical study.<sup>10</sup> Though he has been dismissed as insignificant or even a flaw in the poem,<sup>11</sup> the length of narrative which he occupies suggests that he is a character of some substance, if we agree with the view that the length of a narrative unit correlates with its importance in Homeric epic.<sup>12</sup> His function in the poem's greater structure deserves closer attention. In addition to his connection with the act of narrative he also serves to embody the distinct modality of the second half of the poem.<sup>13</sup> He is above all a figure of mediation on a number of levels, suggesting parallels not only with the audience but with Odysseus and the principal narrator.

# I

Before discussing how Eumaios and Alkinoos act as internal audiences, we should first consider the network of extensive, if subtle, parallels they share, which suggest that they are multiforms.<sup>14</sup> Many different structural schemes simultaneously inform the shape of the *Odyssey*.<sup>15</sup> The clearest such division is into halves: books 1–12 depict Odysseus absent from Ithaka, while books 13–24 chronicle events after he has returned. In such a bipartite scheme Alkinoos and Eumaios occupy ring-compositional positions. Alkinoos is Odysseus' last host before reaching Ithaka, Eumaios his first after returning. As such, each embodies the very different modalities of the two halves of the poem. Alkinoos is the last in a series of impressive, high-status hosts populating books 5–12, from Aiolos to Kirke, from Kalypso to the Phaiakians themselves. The second half of the *Odyssey*, however, shifts its focus decidedly, pausing at length in the humble cottage of a swineherd, and continuing to observe affairs through the eyes of what appears

<sup>10</sup> Exceptions include Hankey 1985; Roisman 1990; Ramming 1973: 146–150; and Segal 1994: 164–183. See also brief discussions by Farron 1979–80: 59–101; Edwards 1993: 60–70. For discussions of Eumaios' function as internal audience, see Thalmann 1984: 161; Goldhill 1991: 65–66; Walsh 1984: 5, 9, 19; Doherty 1995: 72, 84–85, 119, 148–150, 157–159, 171.

<sup>11</sup> E.g., Kirk (1962: 360) asserts that book 14 is "the least satisfactory . . . of any in either poem"; cf. Clarke 1967: 73: "the time and space given to the garrulous Eumaeus seem disproportionate, and the whole is not marked by any compensating rustic charm."

<sup>12</sup> Fenik 1968: 159; Edwards 1987b: 47–50.

<sup>13</sup> By "modality" I do not necessarily mean a strict interpretation in the manner of Northrop Frye (e.g., his "theory of modes," Frye 1966: 33–67), though his distinctions as to high mimetic, low mimetic, and so forth, do capture the distinctions I have in mind. The Ithakan sequence involving Eumaios is verisimilar and contemporary by contrast with the *Märchen* world in which Alkinoos is situated. I develop the issue in greater detail below, at 104–108.

<sup>14</sup> Segal (1994: 164–165) briefly notes a few correspondences between the characters.

<sup>15</sup> E.g., the poem neatly divides into six four book units (1–4, 5–8, etc.).

to be a wandering beggar. In this sense Eumaios embodies and foregrounds the modality of the second half of the poem in the same manner as Alkinoos does the first with its exotic, inaccessible locales, non-Greek peoples, and so on.

As hosts, both Eumaios and Alkinoos participate in that most productive of type-scenes in the *Odyssey*, the reception of a guest/stranger.<sup>16</sup> However, they share qualities that are absent from most of the other hosts depicted in the *Odyssey*.<sup>17</sup> I have argued recently that much of the poem is organized around the hero's parallel approaches to three powerful females, Circe, Arete and Penelope.<sup>18</sup> These three figures control access to the next phase of Odysseus' homecoming and he can proceed only after reaching agreement with each of them. In the sequences centered around Arete and Penelope, Alkinoos and Eumaios serve as initial hosts for Odysseus. The hero has extensive dealings with these male hosts before reaching agreement with the powerful females. Alkinoos and Eumaios thus function as intermediary figures, with whom Odysseus first establishes a relationship before forming contracts with the (structurally) more important females.<sup>19</sup> Both male hosts are closely attached to the powerful females: Alkinoos to Arete both by marriage and blood relation, Eumaios to Penelope by long service and by the fact that he was raised as a virtual member of Odysseus' family.<sup>20</sup> Hankey observes that, "Eumaios has a definite role in the action of the second half of the *Odyssey*: unknowingly he helps facilitate the meetings of Odysseus with both his son and wife, and also the entry of Odysseus into his palace."<sup>21</sup> The climax of this intermediary function occurs when Eumaios places the bow in Odysseus' hands.

Alkinoos serves a similar function.<sup>22</sup> Though Alkinoos is a king and Eumaios a swineherd, their original status is identical: both are royal by birth. Alkinoos

<sup>16</sup>The hospitality type-scene has been well studied since Arend 1933. For a summary and analysis of earlier work, see Reece 1993.

<sup>17</sup>Menelaos, in his reception of Telemakhos, shares many of the qualities found in Eumaios and Alkinoos, but does not act significantly as an audience to Telemakhos. Rather, he delivers his own extensive narrative to him.

<sup>18</sup>Louden 1993a.

<sup>19</sup>As Fenik (1974: 155–158) has shown, the structure of Odysseus' encounter with Eumaios in book 14 is closely related to his later encounter with Penelope. On Eumaios as intermediary between Odysseus and Penelope, see Ramming 1973: 149. Menelaos plays a similar role in introducing Telemakhos to Helen, though she exercises less control over his journey.

<sup>20</sup>Penelope is on close terms with Eumaios; e.g., 17.507–551.

<sup>21</sup>Hankey 1985: 27. In Eumaios' background sketch the narrator closely links him to Penelope (14.7–9).

<sup>22</sup>Though Alkinoos dominates the Phaiakian sequence, both Athene, the epic's most important deity, and Nausikaa declare Arete's importance (7.53–77, 6.305–315). Arete's true role is most evident in the *intermezzo* (11.335–345), on which see Doherty 1991; Louden 1993a: 15–17. This intermediate male host figure is absent in Kirke's case, partly to increase the isolation and otherworldliness of Kirke's abode, partly because Kirke already knows everything that has happened to Odysseus; furthermore, it would be redundant to have within Odysseus' extended internal narrative to the Phaiakians yet another layer to Kirke. Cf. Clay 1994: 45, noting the absence of internal narratives on Aiaia.

inherits the throne from his father (6.7–12, 7.63–66), while Eumaios' father, Ktesios, is a king (15.413), making Eumaios a prince by birth, and, presumably, inheritor of his father's throne. Their native lands are both paradises. While Skheria's paradisiacal qualities are well known, Syria, Eumaios' birthplace, is implicitly a paradise as well:

No hunger ever comes on these people, nor any other  
hateful sickness, of such as befall wretched humanity;  
but when the generations of men grow old in the city,  
Apollo of the silver bow, and Artemis with him,  
comes with a visitation of painless arrows, and kills them.

15.407–411<sup>23</sup>

The painless human existence, fruitfulness of the earth, and comfortable life free from disease, are typical *topoi* of paradise.<sup>24</sup> Though both are natives of paradise, Alkinoos remains in his, while Eumaios' life has been severely disrupted, suggesting a greater breadth of experience.<sup>25</sup>

Both figures establish almost familial ties with Odysseus. Alkinoos displaces his son, Laodamas, to offer Odysseus the honored seat at the banquet (7.170–171).<sup>26</sup> Shortly thereafter he offers his daughter Nausikaa in marriage to Odysseus (7.311 ff.). Eumaios regards himself as one of Odysseus' family.<sup>27</sup> After his abduction from Syria, Antikleia raised him together with Ktimene, Odysseus' sister. He was "only a little less favored" by her than Ktimene, and thus enjoyed a status as almost a younger brother of Odysseus (15.363–370).<sup>28</sup> The narrator later compares Eumaios' warm reception of Telemakhos to a father, absent for

<sup>23</sup> Quotations of the *Odyssey* are from Richmond Lattimore's translation (New York 1967).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Hes. *WD* 109–120. For attempted identifications of Syria see Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989: 257. I, however, assume no real location is intended, much as Skheria or Ogygia (though many have attempted identifications for these). Such locales are meant to be inaccessible for mortals. The *Odyssey* provides an aetiology as to why no one may now reach Skheria (13.125–187). On Syria's paradisiacal qualities, see Thalmann 1984: 231, n. 7; Edwards 1993: 48–49. For closer discussion and analysis of Skheria's paradisiacal qualities see Thalmann 1984: 97–106; Edwards 1993: 47; Dimock 1989: 83. For comparison of Skheria and Ogygis, see Austin 1975: 153–162. I do not argue that there are no distinctions between these paradises. Skheria is an elaborate utopia explored at some length, while Syria is only mentioned here, in passing.

<sup>25</sup> Note that Menelaos also has a connection with paradise in his prophesied future in the Elysian Fields: 4.563–568. On parallels between Menelaos and Alkinoos, see Reece 1993: 82–83 (with further references). I return below (107) to possible significance in the paradisaic origins of Alkinoos and Eumaios.

<sup>26</sup> However, Reece 1993: 21–22 notes that such displacement is a typical element of hospitality.

<sup>27</sup> See Hankey 1985: 29–31.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Powell 1977: 61–62; Murnaghan 1987: 41; Hankey 1985: 29; cf. Dimock 1989: 311 *ad* 14.138–143. Note also that Eumaios refers to his master as ἡθεῖος (14.147), explained by a scholiast as properly used by a younger brother of an older brother. See Stanford 1962: 222 *ad* 14.145–146. Cunliffe (1980: 179) lists four passages, *Il.* 6.518, 10.37, 22.229, 239, all of a brother to an elder brother, and *Il.* 23.94, Akhilleus to Patroklos (his senior). See also Hankey 1985: 29–30.

ten years, receiving a son (16.17–21).<sup>29</sup> Odysseus, when disclosing his identity to Eumaios and eliciting his aid against the suitors, declares that he will adopt him into his family, regarding him as Telemakhos' brother (21.213–216), a thematic parallel to Odysseus' own status as a potential son-in-law of Alkinoos. Again, Eumaios and Alkinoos are unique among Odysseus' hosts in this detail.<sup>30</sup>

Though each of their receptions of Odysseus begins with a *contretemps*, the two hosts' hospitality is nonetheless of a high caliber.<sup>31</sup> When Odysseus reaches Alkinoos' palace, he supplicates Arete, but an awkward silence follows. Only after Ekheneos admonishes Alkinoos (7.159–160) does the king respond and properly receive him. After this awkward start Alkinoos commits a few additional *faux pas*,<sup>32</sup> but on the whole he reveals himself as a sensitive host who goes to extravagant lengths to entertain his guest.<sup>33</sup>

Eumaios enters the narrative by rescuing Odysseus from the onset of his dogs, immediately interceding on the stranger's behalf (14.32–33).<sup>34</sup> Provoked into action, Eumaios does not pause embarrassingly as did Alkinoos. Having saved the stranger from harm, he prepares a meal for him, and continues to play the model host. Though he has far less to give, Eumaios outdoes Alkinoos, offering more exemplary hospitality.<sup>35</sup> Eumaios is unique in the poem in that he is a servant host. None of Odysseus' (or Telemakhos') other hosts are of such low status. His position as host thrusts Eumaios into a more important role in the poem than other servants such as Eurykleia or Philoitios, who, lacking such a role, do not serve as audiences.

## II

While serving as his hosts, both Alkinoos and Eumaios elicit lengthy narratives from Odysseus.<sup>36</sup> Each asks him to give an account of himself (8.548–586, 14.185–190), and Odysseus responds with lengthy accounts to both. In the *Apologos* his

<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, this simile is thought by many to be part of a series of interlocking family-centered similes (cf. 5.394–397; 23.233–240), on which see Moulton 1977: 128–132.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Menelaos' parallel offer of receiving Odysseus into the host's family in his offer to empty a city for Odysseus (4.174–180). Odysseus' offer extends to Philoitios as well, a partial doublet to Eumaios, though lacking his roles both as host and internal audience.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Race 1993: 82, "the treatment of a guest . . . is the touchstone of every character's *ἦθος* in the *Odyssey*."

<sup>32</sup> For a summary, see Reece 1993: 105–106.

<sup>33</sup> Commentators differ regarding the Phaiakians' hospitality. I side largely with Rose 1969. For opposing views see Reece 1993: 102–116 and the works cited there.

<sup>34</sup> His entrance is underscored by a typical Homeric narrative technique, the pivotal contrafactual. For discussion of the technique and of this passage, see Loudon 1993b.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Lowenstam 1993: 181, n. 95. Many see in Eumaios the influence of a Baukis and Philemon and/or *theoxeny* story operative throughout the second half of the poem: see Reece 1993: 47–57, 182–184; Petropoulou 1987.

<sup>36</sup> As opposed to such hosts as Polyphemos, Kirke, and Kalypso, who do not. Doherty 1995: 66–69, 148–150, and 157–159 offers the fullest discussion to date of Alkinoos and Eumaios as internal audiences.

two long speeches punctuated by an *intermezzo* (11.333–384) are the longest unbroken narratives in Homer, while his answer to Eumaios (14.192–359) is one of the longest speeches in the *Odyssey*.<sup>37</sup> Both accounts are ostensibly autobiographical: books nine through twelve describe the actual heroic deeds of Odysseus, while the account given Eumaios outlines the more mundane and realistic, but, ironically, fictional vicissitudes of a Cretan who also fought at Troy. The two narratives offer some parallels, both in content and context.<sup>38</sup>

Odysseus delivers both narratives with particular objectives in mind as to his immediate audience.<sup>39</sup> G. Most suggests that the separate episodes in the *Apologos* underscore the central point, “Let me go home now,”<sup>40</sup> arguing that the *Apologos* is intended to encourage the Phaiakians to send Odysseus home. Odysseus’ fictitious biographical narrative to Eumaios is best interpreted, however, as intended to win pity and forge common ground between guest and host.<sup>41</sup> To this end commentators have suggested that Odysseus patterns this story on his own prior knowledge of Eumaios’ biography.<sup>42</sup> Though Eumaios’ account is given later (15.403–484), it would already be known to Odysseus. Both narratives are thus designed to help secure Odysseus’ homecoming, the *Apologos* by convincing the Phaiakians that their guest does not want to stay, the fictive biography to Eumaios by securing Odysseus’ temporary status with the swineherd.<sup>43</sup>

Having served as audiences for his narratives, both hosts remark on Odysseus’ storytelling abilities. Alkinoos suggests his narrative powers inspire wonder in his audience (σὺ δέ μοι λέγε θέσκελα ἔργα, 11.374).<sup>44</sup> Eumaios also describes Odysseus’ narrative powers as charm-like (θέλγε, 14.387), repeating the depiction to Penelope (θέλγοντο, 17.514, ἔθειλγε, 17.521). More specifically, both hosts compare Odysseus to a singer. Eumaios does so in his report to Penelope:

But as when a man looks to a singer, who has been given  
from the gods the skill with which he sings for delight of mortals,

<sup>37</sup> At 168 lines it is longer than the description of Akhilleus’ shield (*Il.* 18.490–607), but four lines shorter than Phoinix’s speech (9.434–605). The only speech in the *Odyssey* longer is Menelaos’ narrative (4.333–592).

<sup>38</sup> See Dimock 1989: 194–196, on the similar range of experience; Finley 1978: 136, on the capping storm in each narrative; Fenik 1974: 167–171, on other similar elements; on the structure of Odysseus’ fictive biography, see Gaisser 1968: 27–31. Odysseus proclaims a fondness for arrows in the story to Eumaios (14.225), thematically part of a chain of references to his actual archery ability (e.g., 1.262, 8.215 ff., etc.): so Farron 1979–80: 60.

<sup>39</sup> Most evident in his second narrative to Eumaios, an escapade with Odysseus at Troy, recognized by Eumaios as told to elicit a cloak (14.462–506).

<sup>40</sup> Most 1989: 30; cf. Louden 1993a: 16.

<sup>41</sup> See Pratt 1993: 90.

<sup>42</sup> Tracy 1990: 87; cf. Finley 1978: 174–175; Thalmann 1984: 161; Hankey 1985: 29.

<sup>43</sup> Roisman (1990: 218) notes the “inner rapport and psychological sympathy” which develops in the episode.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. the principal narrator’s description, κληθμῶ δ’ ἔσχοντο, 11.334. As *Od.* 1.337 describes the content of Phemios’ songs as θελκτῆρια, both hosts’ comparable terms suggest reaction to his narratives as to those of a bard.

and they are impassioned and strain to hear it when he sings to them,  
so he enchanted me in the halls as he sat beside me. 17.518–521.<sup>45</sup>

In the *intermezzo* Alkinoos compares Odysseus' storytelling ability to that of a singer:

You have a grace upon your words and there is sound sense within them,  
and expertly, as a singer would do, you have told the story  
of the dismal sorrows befallen yourself and all of the Argives. 11.367–369<sup>46</sup>

Eumaios and Alkinoos are the only characters in Homer to make this comparison,<sup>47</sup> their observations underscoring their roles as internal audiences. Also suggesting Eumaios' capacity as audience are Odysseus' remarks on the environment for narrative performance:

I only wish there were food enough for the time, for us two,  
and sweet wine for us here inside the shelter, so that  
we could feast quietly while others tended the work. 14.193–195

Such a description contains generic elements of the setting for telling tales, but also suggests the circumstances and audience of the raconteur's previous outing on Skheria.<sup>48</sup> While these lines form a brief preamble to his extended narrative to Eumaios, so Odysseus' parallel comments at 9.5–11 serve as an introduction to the *Apologos* requested by Alkinoos:<sup>49</sup>

... for I think there is no occasion accomplished that is more pleasant  
than when festivity holds sway among all the populace,  
and the feasters up and down the houses are sitting in order  
and listening to the singer, and beside them the tables are loaded  
with bread and meats, and from the mixing bowl the wine steward  
draws the wine and carries it about and fills the cups. This  
seems to my own minds to be the best of occasions. 9.5–11

Both contexts thus offer not only the extended narratives, but also parallel introductory comments on the ideal settings for performance. That Odysseus himself utters both descriptions of the performance setting is yet another instance

<sup>45</sup> For a recent discussion of this passage, see Pratt 1993: 80–81.

<sup>46</sup> For discussion of this passage, see Pratt 1993: 67–70. "Sorrows" renders Greek λυγρὰ, which can also be seen as something of a technical term, as *Od.* 1.327 and 341 use it of song content.

<sup>47</sup> Though Odysseus implies such a comparison, at 17.418, as does the principal narrator, at 21.406–409. Odysseus further invites a comparison when he gives a gift to Demodokos (8.474–484), suggesting a reciprocal relationship.

<sup>48</sup> Thalmann (1984: 161) notes the similar contexts for storytelling, "And the recalling of the past with delight, which accompanies a meal, makes this scene the rustic analogue of the entertainments in aristocratic houses with their professional singers." For further evidence of generic elements, cf. descriptions in *Beowulf*, 87 ff., 494 ff., 1159 ff., etc.

<sup>49</sup> Both passages refer to feasting (9.7; 14.195), wine (9.10–11; 14.194), and the lack of work (9.6–10; 14.195).



of how he parallels the principal narrator in his knowledge of, and concern for, the requirements of narrative.

Alkinoos and Eumaios both use the same otherwise unique expression to note the large amount of time that Odysseus' narratives pleasantly occupy: νύξ ἀθέσφατος, "a night which has no limits."<sup>50</sup> In the *intermezzo*, as he coaxes his guest into saying more about the descent into Hades, Alkinoos notes, "Here is a night that is very long, it is endless" (νύξ δ' ἥδε μάλα μακρὴ ἀθέσφατος, 11.373). In response to Odysseus' request for his own story, Eumaios observes, "These nights are endless" (αἶδε δὲ νύκτες ἀθέσφατοι, 15.392). The two passages are the only instances in all of Homer and Hesiod where ἀθέσφατος modifies νύξ.<sup>51</sup> As Ford notes, ἀθέσφατος "refers to things that are beyond mortal articulation or exhaustive definition."<sup>52</sup> A night which has no limits is necessary to convey both the limitless range of experience in the narratives and the potential enjoyment of the audience.<sup>53</sup>

In the same contexts Alkinoos and Eumaios make parallel observations to the effect that there is a time for sleeping and there is a time for listening, the implication being that the exchange of narratives, on these occasions, takes priority over sleep.<sup>54</sup> Alkinoos again makes his remark during the *intermezzo*, "It is not time yet / to sleep in the palace. But go on telling your wonderful story. / I myself could hold out until the bright dawn . . ." (11.373–375). Eumaios makes a parallel observation as prelude to his own lengthy autobiographical narrative (15.403–483):

These nights are endless, and a man can sleep through them,  
or he can enjoy listening to stories, and you have no need  
to go to bed before it is time. Too much sleep is only a bore.

15.392–394

The comparisons underscore both hosts' pleasure in serving as audiences and, in Eumaios' case, in the exchange of narratives.

<sup>50</sup> On the meaning of ἀθέσφατος, see Ford 1992: 181–183, 189–190, though he does not comment on the parallels under discussion.

<sup>51</sup> Elsewhere in the *Odyssey* ἀθέσφατος modifies θάλασσαν (7.273), οἶνος (11.61), βόες (20.211); in the *Il.*, ἡμῖνος (3.4; 10.6); cf. Hes. *Th.* 830, *WD* 662, where it modifies ὄψ and ὕμνος respectively.

<sup>52</sup> Ford 1992: 183.

<sup>53</sup> Odysseus also suggests that a great deal of time is necessary for the narrative he will deliver to Eumaios, "easily I could go on for the whole of a year, and still not / finish the story of my heart's tribulations (14.196–197)," roughly paralleling such bardic statements as *Il.* 2.488–493. At 19.589–593 Penelope offers a variant of the *topos* but without νύξ ἀθέσφατος: οὐ κέ μοι ὕπνος ἐπὶ βλεφάροισι χυθεῖη. Cf. Athene lengthening the night to accommodate Odysseus and Penelope as they exchange narratives (23.241–246).

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Joyce's description (1959: 120) of the ideal reader for *Finnegan's Wake*, "that ideal reader suffering from an ideal insomnia," a passage that is also a touchstone in Eco's works (e.g., Eco 1990: 148–151).

Both hosts refer to Odysseus' narratives by the same term, "your sufferings," σὰ κήδεα (11.376, 14.185).<sup>55</sup> Alkinoos makes his remark already having heard much of the *Apologos*, while Eumaios anticipates that such will constitute his guest's story. The term suggests that both are sympathetic audiences.

To both audiences Odysseus implies that he deserves gifts for his narrative performance. On Skheria he does so through his own prior example. Hearing two songs by Demodokos, Odysseus rewards the bard with a choice cut of meat, while requesting the subject matter of his next song (8.474–398). As Odysseus himself will shortly be compared by his host to a talented singer, so he too will deserve conspicuous gifts.<sup>56</sup> However, Odysseus' narrative does not bring immediate results from Eumaios, who insists that some of it is a lie (14.363 ff.).<sup>57</sup> He does respond, however, to the range of experience in the tale, closely paralleling his own life story. In this sense the tale is part of the process of building a bond of camaraderie between the two men, evident in Eumaios' initial response, "O sorrowful stranger, truly you have troubled the spirit in me, / by telling me all these details, how you suffered and wandered" (14.361–362). After Odysseus' second, shorter tale about the cloak at Troy (14.468–502), Eumaios agrees to see to it that Telemakhos will give the stranger a new cloak. This story is part of a specific reciprocity between guest and host. On a higher narrative level, there is a similar reciprocity between Odysseus and the epic narrator. It is rather startling to note that in this story the protagonists are Odysseus' temporary beggar *persona* and the real Odysseus. For the duration of this performance Odysseus again closely resembles the principal narrator, who describes both the heroic Odysseus as well as Eumaios' beggar.

As a complement to delivering narratives, Odysseus also hears significant narratives in both settings. Before reciting his *Apologos*, he is part of the audience for Demodokos' three songs which occupy much of the eighth book. The fact that he observes the Phaiakians as audiences for the three songs helps establish them in his mind as a receptive audience, who thus might help to shape Odysseus' own narrative, inasmuch as he knows they are aware of his Trojan exploits. Further, Odysseus actively engages Demodokos in a dialogue on his art. As already noted, Odysseus hears Eumaios' autobiographical narrative, which closely parallels his own fictional biography in many ways.<sup>58</sup> As a swineherd, Eumaios lacks the luxury of having his own singer, but himself performs the role filled by

<sup>55</sup> At 7.242 Odysseus begins his brief narrative to Arete with the same phrase, as well as at 9.15, where he starts his great narration of the wanderings. See also the narrator's ὅσα κήδε[α] (23.306) of Odysseus' summary to Penelope. As suggested above in the case of λυγρά, κήδεα can be regarded as an aesthetic term.

<sup>56</sup> Doherty 1991: 147.

<sup>57</sup> See further below, 109–110. Note also that Alkinoos raises the issue of falsehood with regard to the *Apologos* (11.363–367). While not accusing his guest of lying, he emphasizes the possibility of lies in such narratives. Cf. Pratt 1993: 92–93; Thalmann 1984: 172–173.

<sup>58</sup> Many have commented on the parallels: e.g., Thalmann 1984: 161; Doherty 1995: 149–152.

Demodokos on Skheria, to serve before Odysseus as audience.<sup>59</sup> As Odysseus had commented on Demodokos' narratives, so he briefly remarks on Eumaios' storytelling, emphasizing Eumaios' ability to move his audience: "Eumaios, you have deeply stirred the spirit within me by telling me all these things, the sorrows your heart has suffered" (15.486–487).

Both sequences proceed at a leisurely pace, Odysseus staying longer than expected or necessary,<sup>60</sup> partly as a result of the embedded narratives. In fact, he spends roughly the same amount of time with both hosts.<sup>61</sup> Each host arranges for that which the guest most desires: to proceed to the next phase of his homecoming. Alkinoos arranges an escort by sea, while Eumaios personally escorts Odysseus to the palace. As noted above, each is a conduit to a powerful female, Arete and Penelope respectively, who are in turn more central to Odysseus' homecoming than are these hosts.<sup>62</sup> Eumaios speaks with Penelope concerning his guest, provoking her desire to interview him (17.507–550).

Against these similarities, however, Eumaios and Alkinoos differ to such an extent that it is sometimes difficult to recognize their many parallels. In addition to their different statuses, Alkinoos is hurt by his association with Odysseus: the escort ship and its crew are covered by a mountain on its return to Skheria. Eumaios, however, will prosper as a result. Odysseus promises him a wife, a house next to his own, and more (21.214–216). Such divergences underscore the differences between the two halves of the poem. Odysseus appears down and out to Eumaios, but is not. He is wearing rags, appears bald, older and run-down, while his fabulous gifts from the Phaiakians are safely hidden. On Skheria he does not appear down and out to Alkinoos, but he in fact is. Although he has nothing, he nonetheless wears palace clothing. Alkinoos is thus impressed by the appearance of a man who has nothing, whereas Eumaios is sceptical of a man with countless riches stowed nearby.

### III

How do we interpret the observed parallels and demonstrated differences between Eumaios and Alkinoos? Some of the broader parallels exist as generic components in hospitality type-scenes. However, several details relating to

<sup>59</sup> The content of Phemios' songs is effectively ignored other than in briefest synopsis, allowing more room for both Odysseus and Eumaios to take up a bardic role.

<sup>60</sup> Above, n. 10.

<sup>61</sup> On Skheria, Odysseus spends a night at the palace, a second day occupied by Demodokos' songs and the athletic games, capped by the *Apologos*, the Phaiakians sending him home on the third morning. On Ithaka, Odysseus spends two nights at Eumaios' hut, with Telemakhos arriving on the third morning. They spend one last night at Eumaios' hut before Odysseus proceeds to his palace on the fourth morning. If not for the meeting with Telemakhos, Odysseus would have headed to the palace on the third morning, replicating the sequence on Skheria.

<sup>62</sup> The *Odyssey* treats and develops the two females quite differently. While Penelope's importance is evident, for Arete, see above, n. 22.

narrative, the remarks about  $\nu\acute{\upsilon}\xi\ \acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\phi\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , the comparisons of Odysseus to a singer, the comments on listening to stories as being preferable to sleep, are absent from all other hospitality scenes. This figure of the host who provokes narratives may have some bearing on larger issues of performance and audience.

That Eumaios and Alkinoos function as audiences within hospitality scenes<sup>63</sup> suggests that the *Odyssey* associates the production and reception of narrative with hospitality. Our own word "reception" is appropriate both of an audience and of hospitality. That the reception of a guest can be a metaphorical equivalent of reception of a narrative is made clear in the *Odyssey* in the name of the Phaiakian singer, Δημόδοκος, a compound of  $\delta\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ , "received by the people."<sup>64</sup> Homeric Greek thus uses  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  to express both forms of reception.<sup>65</sup> The audience is the singer's host, then and now, and demands narrative from him, whether as listeners or readers.

I suggest that Eumaios and Alkinoos are contrasting models of an internal audience, and that, as such, they imply different connections with audiences external to the poem. We noted above that both Alkinoos and Eumaios have associations with paradise: Alkinoos in the general qualities of Skheria, Eumaios in the depiction of his birthplace, Syria. In the case of Alkinoos, commentators have noted many parallels between Skheria and the paradisaic afterlife, Elysium.<sup>66</sup>

Because of their paradisaic associations the Phaiakians function as a timeless, idealized audience. We first see this in Odysseus' experience as audience to Demodokos, hearing his own exploits made famous. As Murnaghan notes, Odysseus "experiences the reward that heroes die for but do not themselves normally experience: he witnesses and participates in the transmission of his own fame."<sup>67</sup> That Odysseus as audience is able to hear his heroic exploits being made immortal suggests an underworld or Elysian environment.<sup>68</sup>

Alkinoos and the Phaiakians are a privileged audience in many ways. For Alkinoos, whose inquiry prompts the *Apologos*, Odysseus can step off the canvas, so to speak, as a previously known epic entity, and deliver a privileged account. As no one else in the poem, except Penelope, the Phaiakians hear from the hero's own lips the central matter of the poem itself. Demodokos, the Phaiakian singer, gets privileged exposure to his craft. His own songs about Odysseus referred only to Trojan exploits. There is no suggestion that he (or Phemios) is already aware of any of the deeds Odysseus will relate in the *Apologos*. Odysseus' narration of his

<sup>63</sup> As do all of the *Odyssey*'s internal narratives other than that delivered to Athene in book 13.

<sup>64</sup> Kamptz 1982: 73, 190; cf. Nagy 1979: 17; Peradotto 1990: 111.

<sup>65</sup> For an instance of the root used to express guest reception, note Odysseus' first words to Eumaios:  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\chi\omicron$  (14.54).

<sup>66</sup> E.g., Cook (1992: 266) asserts that "the internal evidence of the *Odyssey* suggests that we should see Scheria as an otherworldly Paradise bordering on Elysium which it also resembles"; cf. earlier literature cited there.

<sup>67</sup> Murnaghan 1987: 153.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. the tendency in later epic for depictions of the underworld to include poetic performances: e.g., Virgil *Aeneid* 6.644–647, Milton, *Paradise Lost* 2.546–555.

exploits to an audience which includes a gifted singer thus depicts the tradition in action. That is, this is the only portrayal in the *Odyssey* of a singer being informed in his craft, hearing new instances of the subject matter of epic poetry. The motif of "the singer looks at his source," wherein a bard observes the epic protagonist at firsthand, also occurs in *Beowulf*,<sup>69</sup> and the *Odyssey* may implicitly offer a second instance of the motif in Odysseus' interview with Phemios (22.330–356). As the Phaiakians receive the fullest and most privileged account, they are closer to the hero himself and less like us than other internal audiences. Their privileged status is evident in other ways. Alkinoos notes their special relations with the gods (7.201–206), again suggestive of paradise or a golden age environment. Yet they will never again enjoy such intimate narrative interaction, since Poseidon prevents any further access to Skheria (13.125–165),<sup>70</sup> and Odysseus is never represented as giving a full scale reiteration of his exploits.<sup>71</sup>

Nagy and others have suggested that a central subject and goal of Archaic Greek epic is to ensure κλέος ἄφθιτον for the respective protagonist.<sup>72</sup> Imperishable fame requires a continuum of audience; the audience, too, must somehow be eternal if this goal is to be met. I suggest that Alkinoos' paradisaic associations depict him as an eternal, almost Platonic ideal of an epic audience; isolated, almost outside of the human time-continuum, yet eagerly appreciative of good narrative; indulgent and more than generous to a narrator.

Eumaios is also a native of a paradise, although he occupies a more mundane human habitat. S. West notes common elements in the description of Elysium, Alkinoos' gardens and Eumaios' Syria.<sup>73</sup> There is even an implicit connection with the underworld, or Elysium, in his father's name, Κτήσιος, a name with recognized underworld/afterlife associations.<sup>74</sup> But since Eumaios was abducted, his paradisaic associations and his connection with royalty are far less immediate.

Eumaios is a much more intimate audience than Alkinoos. He is not as easily representative of a people, the Ithakans, say, as king Alkinoos embodies the Phaiakians. Odysseus and Eumaios exchange their narratives face to face without the backdrop of a large royal entourage. As an audience of one for Odysseus' stories,<sup>75</sup> he is more like a modern individual reading audience than is the typical internal audience in its aristocratic *megaron* setting. He is also a more critical audience than Alkinoos. There is considerable irony in the fact that Alkinoos rather easily accepts the far more fantastic events of the *Apologos* than Eumaios

<sup>69</sup> See Creed 1962.

<sup>70</sup> Poseidon prevents the Phaiakians from ever again serving as escorts (see Loudon 1993a: 30 and n. 88), and, consequently, ever again entertaining guests. For a recent discussion of the passage, see Peradotto 1990: 77–82.

<sup>71</sup> The account given to Penelope (23.306–341) is partially truncated.

<sup>72</sup> E.g., Nagy 1974 and 1979.

<sup>73</sup> Heubeck, West, Hainsworth 1988: 227.

<sup>74</sup> Mühlestein 1987: 184.

<sup>75</sup> His four underling swineherds are absent from the hut until 14.410. At 15.395–398 Eumaios discounts them as an audience.

will accept as truth the disguised Odysseus' claim that Odysseus will soon return.<sup>76</sup> Though Alkinoos is the sophisticate, Eumaios shows considerable, if unexpected, sophistication.

Both Odysseus and the narrator treat Eumaios with special care.<sup>77</sup> Odysseus spends more time with him than his low status would lead us to expect; his almost familial relation with Odysseus has already been noted. While the protagonist exhibits such close ties to Eumaios, so does the principal narrator: Eumaios is the only figure in the *Odyssey* addressed through apostrophe.<sup>78</sup> Block has argued that the three main apostrophized figures in Homeric epic, Menelaos, Patroklos, and Eumaios, function as special characters, more sympathetic antitheses of Agamemnon, Akhilleus, and Odysseus, respectively.<sup>79</sup> I suggest that a further antithesis exists. As Odysseus is the principal internal narrator in the *Odyssey*, the use of apostrophe helps designate Eumaios as a significant internal audience.

Kahane has revealed significant patterns in the use and positioning of the name Eumaios. Only the narrator and members of Odysseus' immediate family address Eumaios by his proper name (Kahane 1994: 82, 111). Kahane argues that "this in itself creates an affinity between the narrator and those characters sympathetic to Eumaios" (111). Other characters address him generically as *σὺ βῶτα*. More importantly, in his study of proper-name vocatives, Kahane determines that the three metrical positions available, verse initial, terminal, and internal, carry different semantic values. Verse initial is a default mode, and semantically neutral (85). The terminal position "frequently coincides, and is thus to be associated with an address to the epic protagonists" (87). The internal position, that used for all thirteen apostrophes to Eumaios, is the mode "by which special attention to the addressee is revealed" (107).

Kahane notes (1994: 111) that the unelided form, *Εὐμαίε*, "is suitable for terminal positioning and can be adapted for initial positioning. However, it is in fact used internally in all 26 attestations." Such patterned avoidance of the other two possible positions argues for careful design in the deployment of the apostrophes to Eumaios. Kahane reiterates (113) that the internal proper-name vocatives, including all of the narrator's apostrophes to Eumaios, reflect "the narrator's sympathetic attitude towards particular characters." Concluding his argument, Kahane suggests (113) that "Homer pays due attention to characters that are closest in disposition to most of his audience/readers." Though Kahane does not touch on the issue of internal audiences, his findings offer support for

<sup>76</sup> On Alkinoos' impressionable character, see Doherty 1995: 123–124; Thalmann 1984: 172.

<sup>77</sup> For the narrator's comment about Eumaios at 15.556–557, see Griffin 1986: 47: "That openly laudatory comment departs widely from the normal reticence of the epic narrator."

<sup>78</sup> 14.55, 165, 360, 442, 507; 16.60, 135, 464; 17.272, 311, 380, 512, 579. For recent studies of apostrophe in Homer, see Parry 1972; Block 1982; Yamagata 1989; Kahane 1994: 80–113, 153–155. The use of apostrophe for Eumaios has been frequently criticized: e.g., Edwards 1987a: 37: "fossilized." In support of Eumaios' apostrophes see Hankey 1985: 32.

<sup>79</sup> Block 1982: 16; Kahane 1994: 113.

viewing Eumaios in this light. For an oral/listening audience, the apostrophes would have a considerably greater impact than for our reading audience. The bard would appear to address his listeners individually. I suggest that the bard's direct address to Eumaios embodies direct address to the external audience in performance.

The various interactions between Eumaios and Odysseus parallel other possible interactions between the bard and external audiences. This is especially evident in the mixture of fiction, non-fiction, credible, and incredible in the narratives Odysseus and Eumaios exchange. As commentators have noted, Eumaios appears to believe all of the lies in Odysseus' alleged autobiographical account (14.192–359), but not the one element of truth, the prediction that Odysseus will soon return.<sup>80</sup> Though many take this as a joke at Eumaios' expense,<sup>81</sup> a more complex interaction may be taking place. Odysseus' inability to convince the swineherd provides some subtle comedy at Odysseus' own expense, and even a bard poking fun at himself.

Contrary to a perhaps expected naïveté in the swineherd, Eumaios displays firm independence as he resists Odysseus' opening strategy. Building on Eumaios' expressed longing for him (14.144), Odysseus swears an oath that he will soon return. Not accepting a claim made under oath, Eumaios has good reasons for suspicion, as he relates how others have come by with similar tales later exposed as lies (14.378–389). Ironically, Odysseus' own ingenuity undoes him. He claims to have been a comrade-at-arms to Idomeneus, a detail assumed to be credible.<sup>82</sup> However, Eumaios notes that an earlier visitor had claimed a connection with Idomeneus (14.382), a story later found to be false, and thus for Eumaios a detail suggesting dishonesty.

Declaring that Eumaios is quite suspicious, Odysseus again attempts to maneuver him verbally, by a *ῥήτρη*, a verbal agreement or bargain, with his life as the stake. If his prediction of Odysseus' return proves false, Eumaios can throw him over a cliff (14.391–400). Eumaios, however, will not agree to the terms (14.402–406), outmaneuvering Odysseus; for if he were to fulfill them, he would clearly violate basic tenets of hospitality.<sup>83</sup> Recalling that Hermes endowed Autolykos in oaths (19.395–398),<sup>84</sup> and how easily Odysseus forces Kalypso into a binding oath (5.177–191), we might conclude that it is no easy thing to evade

<sup>80</sup> E.g., Thalmann 1992: 105.

<sup>81</sup> His refusal to believe, however, thematically parallels Telemakhos' conviction that Odysseus is dead, and is similarly expressed: see 14.133–136; 1.161–162.

<sup>82</sup> For Pratt (1993: 92), "his presence also adds weight and gives the mark of authenticity to Odysseus' fictions."

<sup>83</sup> Eumaios responds with considerable irony (14.402–406), a point noted by Dekker (1965: 178–180). This again belies his alleged rustic naïveté.

<sup>84</sup> Typically in Greek mythology one is emphatically the inheritor of family traits, though there are exceptions; e.g., Melanthis, gone over to the suitors' party, while his father, Dolios, is still loyal to Laertes and Odysseus.

Odysseus.<sup>85</sup> Nonetheless, Eumaios outwits Odysseus in just this matter. By so doing, he thematically parallels and foreshadows Penelope's initial incredulity and outwitting of her husband in her ruse of the bed (23.174–204).<sup>86</sup>

In his second story told to Eumaios, Odysseus meets with greater success, obtaining the promise of a cloak. Once again, however, Eumaios appears to be a step ahead of him. Recognizing the brief tale as an αἶνος (14.508), a narrative whose aim is to praise or be ingratiated toward a person,<sup>87</sup> and complimenting Odysseus on its formulation, Eumaios agrees that he should receive a cloak, but only when Telemakhos returns. As αἶνος occurs only here in the *Odyssey*,<sup>88</sup> and as Eumaios critiques each of Odysseus' narratives with what are almost technical terms (14.363: τὰ γ' οὐ κατὰ κόσμον, 14.509: οὐδέ τί πω παρὰ μοῖραν),<sup>89</sup> the composer appears to be painting Eumaios as a highly experienced and informed audience. Doherty notes of his comments to Penelope on Odysseus' bardic ability, that Eumaios "has obviously attended enough epic performances to make him something of a connoisseur."<sup>90</sup>

Eumaios, by his own admission, is entertained and moved by his guest's narratives, but in neither instance is Odysseus able to achieve his rather modest goals. As a traditional tale, much of the overall plot of *Odyssey* is predictable. Nonetheless, within specific episodes considerable room remains for unexpected outcomes. What Odysseus as narrator most expects to accomplish is Eumaios' agreement to his prediction, and the quick receipt of a cloak. As such, the situation suggests a performance dilemma facing a bard: his audience's response is not always as he expects; they may not accept what he assumes they will most easily accept. Such a narrative dilemma is elsewhere explored in the poem. When Polyphemos notes that "nobody is killing me by force or treachery" (9.408), his immediate audience does not understand his own intended meaning.

Eumaios, the more immediate audience, is more critical, his responses harder to predict than the less critical, but more timeless, Alkinoos. Though they differ, there is considerable overlap between the two as well. There are no apostrophes to Alkinoos, but there are eight proper name vocatives, perhaps the closest device. Significantly, Odysseus, the internal narrator, delivers six of these eight, three of them falling in and around the *Apologos*.<sup>91</sup> We suggested that by apostrophe the bard speaks not only to Eumaios, but through him to the external audience, whether an archaic, listening audience, or a twentieth-century, reading one. We, as Eumaios, are the present hosts of Odysseus. That Eumaios, as Alkinoos,

<sup>85</sup> For discussion of Autolykos' powers regarding oaths, see Dimock 1989: 256–257.

<sup>86</sup> On parallels in Odysseus' interviews with Eumaios and Penelope, see Fenik 1974: 155–158.

<sup>87</sup> On αἶνος as a specific form of discourse, see Nagy 1979: 235–241.

<sup>88</sup> For a recent discussion of Eumaios' use of αἶνος, see Pratt 1993: 89.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Odysseus' remarks to Demodokos: κατὰ κόσμον (8.489), κατὰ μοῖραν (8.496).

<sup>90</sup> Doherty 1995: 72.

<sup>91</sup> Odysseus: 7.208, 8.382, 9.2, 11.355, 11.378, 13.38; Ekheneos: 7.159; Euryalos: 8.401.



was once royalty, once in paradise, may serve as implicit praise of the external audience.

There are further ties between Eumaios, Odysseus and the narrator, some of a socio-economic nature. Within the class structure of the *Odyssey*, a singer and Eumaios have roughly the same status,<sup>92</sup> as does Odysseus, in some respects. The three are perceived as craftsmen. In his first scene Eumaios is fashioning himself a pair of sandals (14.23–24).<sup>93</sup> Odysseus is seen fashioning a raft (5.234–261), and known for construction of his marriage bed (23.188–201). The connection between metaphors for Greek poetry and various forms of construction is well known.<sup>94</sup> Consequently, as there is implicit identification between Homer and Odysseus, so may there be between Homer and Eumaios.

Eumaios further parallels Odysseus in being an only son.<sup>95</sup> Austin notes the rhythm, even *homophrosyne* that develop between swineherd and guest.<sup>96</sup> Farron suggests that Eumaios can be seen as Odysseus' *alter ego*.<sup>97</sup> In Eumaios' account the serving woman who delivers him into slavery describes him as κερδαλέον (15.451), a word closely associated with Odysseus.<sup>98</sup> As Eumaios straddles several worlds, from royal birth to rural servitude to reintegration into the palace, so does Odysseus.<sup>99</sup> Though king, he displays talents and occupations associated with the lower classes.<sup>100</sup>

We will never know the composition of the audience among and for which Homeric epic evolved. The importance of Eumaios as an internal audience suggests, however, that we may have too monolithic a conception of the aristocratic *megaron* setting as most typical of the performance arena of Homeric epic. The detailed descriptions of Alkinoos' palace on the one hand, and of Eumaios' circumstances and activities on the other, underline the tremendous class difference that separates the two most central internal audiences in the poem and the settings in which those narratives are performed. The poem as a whole, unless we restrict our view to the *Apologos* and the brief poetic performances noted in passing in books 1–4, includes among its own depictions of epic conventions, Eumaios, a type of audience that must also figure among the external audiences relevant to Archaic Greek epic. Despite his low economic status he is depicted as an audience

<sup>92</sup> Note Eumaios' comment at 17.381–391; for discussion, see Pratt 1993: 67–68.

<sup>93</sup> On the initial description of Eumaios as emphasizing his craftsmanship, see Austin 1975: 166–168; Edwards 1993: 60, 62.

<sup>94</sup> E.g., Scheid and Svenbro 1996: 111–130.

<sup>95</sup> Eumaios appears to be an only child, as no other children of Ktesios are mentioned, thus paralleling Odysseus' single line of descent (16.117–120.).

<sup>96</sup> Austin 1975: 7 and 203–204.

<sup>97</sup> Farron 1979–80: 89.

<sup>98</sup> E.g., 6.148, 8.548, cf. κερδοσύνη 4.251, 14.31, etc.

<sup>99</sup> The straddling is also evident in the application of heroic/aristocratic epithets to Eumaios. For a recent discussion, see Lowenstam 1993: 13–57.

<sup>100</sup> Farron (1979–80: 70–72) notes that the implicit parallels between Odysseus and Hephaistos in book 8 reinforce such a view.

having virtually a connoisseur's appreciation of epic conventions. He is singled out by the principal narrator as the sole recipient of apostrophe, a consequence of his function as internal audience. Both gestures indicate the inclusion of lower-class people among the intended audience of the poem.

One final passage exhibits all the tendencies we have noted in Eumaios. In his first words after escorting Odysseus to the palace, Eumaios denies Antinoos' charge that he invited the apparent beggar to the palace. He notes instead the type of ξείνοι (17.382) who are invited:

... one who works for the people, either  
a prophet, or a healer of sickness, or a skilled workman,  
or inspired singer, one who can give delight by his singing.

17.383–385

Eumaios, an internal audience, has escorted something of a singer to the palace, and duly gives him his due time and again, much as we, the present audience of the poem and its protagonist, do. As Eustathius suspects that Homer is *philodysseus*,<sup>101</sup> so, I suggest, is he *phileumaios*.

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO  
EL PASO, TEXAS 79968-5767  
U.S.A.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arend, W. 1933. *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*. Berlin.
- Austin, N. 1975. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's Odyssey*. Berkeley.
- Block, E. 1982. "The Narrator Speaks: Apostrophe in Homer and Vergil," *TAPA* 112: 7–22.
- Clarke, H. 1967. *The Art of the Odyssey*. Englewood Cliffs.
- Clay, J. S. 1983. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- 1994. "Sex, Drugs, and ... Poetry," in Steven M. Oberhelman, Van Kelly, and Richard J. Golsan (eds.), *Epic and Epoch*. Lubbock. 40–48.
- Cook, E. 1992. "Ferryman of Elysium and the Homeric Phaeacians," *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 20: 239–267.
- Creed, R. 1962. "The Singer Looks at His Sources," *Comparative Literature* 14: 44–52.
- Cunliffe, R. J. 1980. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*. Norman.
- Dekker, A. 1965. *Ironie in der Odyssee*. Leiden.
- Dimock, G. 1989. *The Unity of the Odyssey*. Amherst.
- Doherty, L. E. 1991. "The Internal and Implied Audience of *Odyssey* 11," *Arethusa* 24.2: 145–176.
- 1995. *Siren Songs: Gender, Audience and Narrators in the Odyssey*. Ann Arbor.

<sup>101</sup> For discussion of Eustathius' remark, see Clay 1983: 34–38.

- Eco, U. 1990. *The Limits of Interpretation*. Bloomington.
- Edwards, A. 1993. "Homer's Ethical Geography: Country and City in the *Odyssey*," *TAPA* 123: 27-78.
- Edwards, M. 1987a. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore.
- 1987b. "Topos and Transformation in Homer," in J. M. Bremer, I. J. F. de Jong, and J. Kalff (eds.), *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*. Amsterdam. 47-60.
- Farron, S. G. 1979-80. "The *Odyssey* as Anti-Aristocratic Statement," *Studies in Antiquity* 1: 59-101.
- Fenik, B. 1968. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad*. *Hermes Einzelschriften* 21. Wiesbaden.
- 1974. *Studies in the Odyssey*. *Hermes Einzelschriften* 30. Wiesbaden.
- Finley, J. H. Jr. 1978. *Homer's Odyssey*. Cambridge.
- Foley, J. M. 1988. *The Theory of Oral Composition: History and Methodology*. Bloomington.
- Ford, A. 1992. *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca.
- Frye, N. 1966. *Anatomy of Criticism*. New York.
- Gaisser, J. H. 1968. "A Structural Analysis of the Digressions in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*," *HSCP* 73: 1-43.
- Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet's Voice*. Cambridge.
- Griffin, J. 1986. "Homeric Words and Speakers," *JHS* 106: 36-57.
- Hankey, R. 1985. "Eumaeus and the Moral Design of the *Odyssey*," in R. Hankey and D. Little (eds.), *Essays in Honour of Agathe Thornton*. Otago. 26-34.
- Heubeck, A., S. W. West, and J. B. Hainsworth. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* 1. Oxford.
- Heubeck, A. and A. Hoekstra. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* 2. Oxford.
- Iser, W. 1974. *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore.
- 1978. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore.
- Joyce, J. 1959. *Finnegans Wake*. New York.
- Kahane, A. 1994. *The Interpretation of Order: A Study in the Poetics of Homeric Repetition*. Oxford.
- Kamptz, H. von 1982. *Homerische Personennamen*. Göttingen.
- Kirk, G. S. 1962. *The Songs of Homer*. Cambridge.
- Lord, A. B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. New York.
- 1991. "Homer as an Oral-Traditional Poet," in *idem*, *Epic Singers and Oral Tradition*. Ithaca. 72-103.
- Louden, B. 1993a. "Extended Narrative Pattern in the *Odyssey*," *GRBS* 34: 5-33.
- 1993b. "Pivotal Contrafactuals in Homeric Epic," *Classical Antiquity* 12: 21-38.
- Lowenstam, S. 1993. *The Scepter and the Spear: Studies on Forms of Repetition in the Homeric Poems*. Lanham.
- Most, G. W. 1989. "The Structure and Function of Odysseus' *Apologoi*," *TAPA* 119: 15-30.
- Moulton, C. 1977. *Similes in the Homeric Poems. Hypomnemata* 49. Göttingen.
- Mühlestein, H. 1987. *Homerische Namenstudien*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 183. Frankfurt.
- Murnaghan, S. 1987. *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Nagy, G. 1974. *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*. Cambridge.
- 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore.

- Parry, A. 1972. "Language and Characterization in Homer," *HSCP* 76: 1–22.
- Peradotto, J. 1990. *Man in the Middle Voice*. Princeton.
- Petropoulou, A. 1987. "The Sacrifice of Eumaeus Reconsidered," *GRBS* 28: 135–149.
- Powell, B. 1977. *Composition by Theme in the Odyssey*. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Pratt, L. 1993. *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar: Falsehood and Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics*. Ann Arbor.
- Propp, V. 1968. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Austin.
- Race, W. H. 1993. "First Appearances in the Odyssey," *TAPA* 123: 79–107.
- Ramming, G. 1973. *Die Dienerschaft in der Odyssee*. Erlangen.
- Reece, S. 1993. *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Ann Arbor.
- Roisman, H. M. 1990. "Eumaeus and Odysseus—Covert Recognition and Self-Revelation?," *Illinois Classical Studies* 15: 215–238.
- Rose, G. 1969. "The Unfriendly Phaeacians," *TAPA* 100: 387–406.
- Rose, P. 1975. "Class Ambivalence in the *Odyssey*," *Historia* 24: 129–49.
- Scheid, J. and J. Svenbro. 1996. *The Craft of Zeus: Myths of Weaving and Fabric*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Segal, C. S. 1994. *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey*. Ithaca.
- Seidensticker, B. 1978. "Archilochus and Odysseus," *GRBS* 19: 5–22.
- Stanford, W. B. 1964. *The Odyssey of Homer*. New York.
- Stewart, D. 1976. *The Disguised Guest*. Lewisburg.
- Thalmann, W. G. 1984. *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic*. Baltimore.
- 1992. *The Odyssey: An Epic of Return*. New York.
- Tracy, S. V. 1990. *The Story of the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Walsh, G. 1984. *The Varieties of Enchantment: Early Greek Views of the Nature and Function of Poetry*. Chapel Hill.
- Yamagata, N. 1989. "The Apostrophe in Homer as Part of the Oral Technique," *BICS* 36: 91–103.