Hofmeister, Timothy Paul

GENERATIONS OF MEN: THE IMPORT OF HOMERIC GENEALOGY

The Johns Hopkins University PH.D. 1984

Generations of Men:
The Import of Homeric Genealogy

by

Timothy P. Hofmeister

A dissertation submitted to The Johns Hopkins University in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Baltimore, Maryland

1984

Abstract

The creation of an heroic world which is for the most part three generations "deep" is central to Homeric fiction. The studies in this dissertation set out and evaluate the poetic depiction of a single heroic generation's attempts to distinguish itself through its own actions on the one hand, but on the other to reify its heritage from the acknowledged background of an heroic generation or generations.

The first chapter approaches the Homeric use of the past through two Iliadic heroes. In the case of Diomedes, the background of an heroic generation confronts him largely by the "report" of others, i.e., of Agamemnon, Athena, and to an extent Nestor. And so the struggle of Diomedes to assimilate this genealogical information is largely a narrative, characterizational matter. When Diomedes enters the forefront of the poem, we listen carefully for what he says, what is said to him; likewise this series of challenge and response culminates in book 14, and Diomedes claims a social role for himself accompanied by a final adaptation of the "traditional" material of his ancestry.

For Achilles, however, the matter is symbolic. The verbal lessons of the attachment to his father Peleus are suppressed, as are all spoken appeals to the angry Achilles in the first half of the poem. The objects inherited from Peleus, on the other hand, when placed in the context of the tragedy of book 16, surround Achilles with emblems of his own experience as an heroic mortal. This experience is articulated through the final books of the Iliad, as Achilles deals

with the genealogies and personal claims of other heroes, and with the ties to his own father at last in explicit terms.

The last three chapters show that the Odyssey also makes narrative and symbolic use of the past and of genealogical motifs. A digressive chapter on the genealogical background of the Phaeacian royal couple, Homeric women, and the suitors, leads to the attempt of Telemachos to construct for himself -- in Diomedes-fashion -- a workable relation to the heroic reputation of his absent father. Finally, the return of Odysseus himself is discussed in terms of his own re-assimilation to an Ithakan past which he partly inherited as an Arkeisian son, partly created through unique and individual heroic effort.

Preface

The translations which follow are my own. There are a number of imperfections in the text due to the limitations of the word-processing with which I composed this study -- not all of this the fault of the machine. I apologize especially to those Greek readers who are annoyed with the extensive transliterations. In general I transliterated any citations of one or two lines, so that the chore of pasting in Greek would remain a manageable one.

The bibliography at the end of the dissertation is arranged by sub-chapter and chapter. For any book or article used in more than one section, the citation will be acknowledged only under that section in which it first appears. Homeric passages cited in the dissertation are from the Iliad in chapter I, unless otherwise noted, and likewise from the Odyssey in II-IV.

Like anyone else associated with the Department of Classics at this University I owe much to the kindness and patience of Mrs. Joanna Schmidt. I would also like to thank Dr. Gilbert P. Rose, without whom I would never heve met a Greek Homer. In addition, Dr. Diskin Clay and Dr. Frank Romer have been my readers not, I think, for the year of this dissertation only, but for three challenging and enjoyable years beforehand. To my parents and my sister I give my deepest appreciation and thanks; and to Lisa, now as always, love and gratitude.

Contents

Introduction

When Thetis comes to the grieving Achilles in book 18, she does not come alone, but accompanied by no less than fifty daughters of the sea-god Nereus (18.37-67). The poet takes time out of his busy narrative to recite each sea-goddess by name. The passage represents a prodigious feat of poetic memory, whatever the conditions of composition and performance. Why would it have been important, though, for a poet to "know" these names? One answer comes from the Theogony of Hesiod. The Nereid passage appears in Hesiod's poem as well, the same hexameters nearly reproduced (240ff.). The poem of Hesiod recounts the daughters because it is a catalogic description of the gonos of the gods -- all their offspring. Since all the information pertains to the gods, it has intrinsic interest for that reason alone.

Another answer, however, resides in the Homeric poems themselves. The passage which constitutes the definitive statement of what the poet does not know, what he does know, and how he knows what he knows, is the so-called proem to the Catalogue of the Ships: Iliad 2.484-93. There the poet claims to know nothing, only the kleos which he has heard (486). The Muses on the other hand know everything, for they are immortal, and are thereby the direct witnesses to all things past, present, and future (485). What the poet needs to know from the Muses at this particular moment includes the identities of the leaders of the Achaean expedition, where they came from, and how many ships and men came with them. The Trojan forces are also reviewed following the Achaean catalogue. These are not gods, so knowledge of the competing

forces about Troy is not important in the same way that the list of the Nereids was. Still, these were the leaders of the forces about Troy, and their siege of this town constituted a highly significant event of the heroic age. Knowledge of the past -- specifically of the heroic past -- is as vital to the present day of the poet, somehow, as is reliable information on naming the gods.

This interest in the past is the spring of genealogy in Homeric poetry. The poet locates himself and his audience in what must have seemed a superior world: the men who lived then were bigger, more powerful physically, nearer and dearer to the gods. This special location is the aim of the epic poem. Without the "bard" there can be no access to the heroic time. Although the time of heroes is so elusive as this, it was not a narrowly ephemeral epoch. The heroic world existed for some time, and passed through a number of generations. Only at that point, after the death of the Achaean heroes who fought at Troy, and after the death of their sons, the heroic world ceased to be.

What we attempt to account for with this description is the feeling of depth which is one of the most striking characteristics of the Homeric poems. That is, the heroes whose deeds contribute the substance of the poetry are not only great men in their own right, but sons of great men. They had fathers who were also heroic, and these fathers were themselves sons of heroes. The heroic world was not an extraordinary event: extraordinary, but no "event". The heroic world had longevity. This longevity, or depth of generations, is telescoped in those poems which we have from the ancient Greek epic tradtion. The

focus of the poet rests on the generations who were alive around the time of the Trojan War. There is some conflict apparent among these generations: in book 4 of the Iliad between Sthenelos and Agamemnon, not to mention Agamemnon and Achilles! and between Antilochos and Menelaos in book 23. Also, in the Odyssey, there is conflict among the suitors and Telemachos and Odysseus, representatives of three different generations. But the contrast of these generations accounts for only part of this quality of "depth" in the epics. Even though it is multi-generational, still the heroic world of the Achaeans and Trojans is set off in contrast to the heroic generations which are not present, but whose accomplishments are the very measure of heroic accomplishment. And so, though the heroes around Troy are characterized as greater than the men of the poet's own time, the men who lived before the heroes around Troy are greater than there descendants.

The superiority of the past is only one aspect of the uses which the poet makes of references to former times. The poet has two basic ways of introducing the past within the narrative. One involves the creation of paradeigmata by a speaker inside the narrative. These speeches often repeat or emphasize a theme which has been prominent in the narrative itself, or soon will be. For example, when Tlepolemos and Sarpedon face one another in book 5.628ff., Tlepolemos prophesies a victory because his father Herakles already captured Troy once, and defeated its defenders, and with a smaller force. Therefore the defenders of Troy have no chance. Sarpedon responds that it was Laomedon's Troy which was taken. Laomedon had deserved this defeat,

for he had treated Herakles badly and had cheated him. He lost the favor of the gods through his own stupidity. These are the very themes which arose in the confrontation between Agamemnon and Sthenelos in 4.370-410. The questions associated with these themes are the same in the encounter here: by what means does one test one's favor with the gods? is their favor reliable? must each generation earn its own distinction, or can it inherit heroic power? Tlepolemos does not prove that the success of Herakles will automatically be his. He is killed, and therefore proves to be less than his father. Yet he is doomed in another facet of the scene which is part of the total dimensions of the genealogical interests of the poem. The combat between Tlepolemos and Sarpedon pits together a hyios and hyionos Dios: a son and grandson of Zeus. Tlepolemos has every reason to think that his heritage is significant both on account of what his father did and also who his father's father was. In this second respect nevertheless he is simply overpowered. Sarpedon himself is a son of Zeus. At the conclusion of the fight, the weapons of each of the warriors hit their targets. Only Sarpedon is not wounded fatally (662): patēr d' eti loigon amynen. The somewhat bare reference in patēr is to the father of gods and men, Zeus himself. His special relationship to the fighter who survives is intimated without excessive detail. The connection has been established, however, and will be reconnected in the scene of Sarpedon's death in book 16 to heighten the glory of that moment.

The second way that contact between the present world in the narrative and the past worlds of the poet is established is by the location of a scene in a particular landscape, surrounded with familiar

monuments, or by its "playing out" amidst significant objects. In a defense of the subjective interpretation of Homer, J. Griffin has written of the epic use
of such objects:

> I have been emphasizing the importance for Homeric poetry of scenes which have an emblematic quality, which define the actors in their essential natures and relationships, and also of the use of objects which carry an effective charge of symbolic significance ... (Griffin (1980) 24)

He writes later in the same book that scenes among characters and amidst objects "are not simple records of events; they stand for and make visible the whole relationship of the characters to each other. They also enable the audience to see the meaning of what happens as part of the whole pattern of human life and the world which contains men and also the gods (50)."

In the following studies, we will be trying to follow the poetic intelligence which uses such techniques as this, the depiction of "whole relationships of characters to each other", and the careful choice of setting and actors' props to create a vision of the human sphere overlaid with that of the divine. We will discover that this poet by employing such devices also occupies himself in constantly reflecting the past upon the present. In the first chapter, we contrast two heroic sons, who also represent the two most powerful Achaean heroes and the respective centers of narrative attention in the

Iliad. Diomedes protects and pursues an elusive image of his father; his part of the study forms an analysis of the effects of the genealogical paradigm, particularly that portion which relates father and son, on the conduct of a hero's activity. Achilles on the other hand does not have far at all to seek; he is surrounded with objects that his parents, who both have exceptional attachments to divinity, bestowed on him to help him maintain the same godly favor. The transformation which Achilles undergoes through the disasters of the poem leads him to a special point of vantage on the parental gifts, or at least offers the audience an opportunity to view the material heritage of Achilles in new and painful associations. In effect, Homer fashions a symbolic agorēsis of Achilles' experiences of death and loss through his manipulation of the weapons and the horses of Achilles, whose qualities he can undermine and transmute according to the contexts in which they are made to appear.

In the Odyssey on the other hand there is no death or loss -- connected with the main characters -- which cannot be rectified by the return of Odysseus to Ithaka. This difference between the two poems of Homer has drawn comment from the time of "Longinus". As far as the genealogical interests of the epic poet are concerned, especially the tendency to introduce into the narrative objects of symbolic importance, the Odyssey is a continuation of the work of the Iliad. Only, it is not many sons and fathers, or a plethora of heroic genē undergoing the test, but one single genos in the poem which must be restored in its native country. In the course of the struggle, the members of this line are forced to meditate on the meaning of their own

participation in the passage of heroic generations, and on the meanings which past acts transmit to a present time. Homeric genealogy compels its audience -- whether it is one that hears or reads -- to consider the same problems.

I. Heroic Genealogy in the *Iliad*

1. Son of Tydeus

Aside from the hero of the wrath, Achilles, Diomedes Tydeides (son of Tydeus) is the most important Greek hero in the *Iliad*. There is a concentration of his appearances in the "non-Achillean" half of the *Iliad*; these scenes of Diomedes reveal extensive development of some of the poem's important themes. Diomedes functions as a counter-weight to Achilles; it is not only a matter of Diomedes acting out the more obedient, passive side of the heroic personality. For a large part of the *Iliad* Diomedes is the prominent narrative alternative to Achilles. In the narrative line, his is the first *aristeia*. He is therefore first to distinguish himself in combat (if we discount Pandarus, whose distinction is dubious[1]); and so we witness the distinctive traits of the Homeric hero through Diomedes before any other.

Diomedes is the first to be moved directly by the gods (again, outside of the unlucky Pandaros). Athena directs him first of all toward the two mutual heroic goals - to be *ekdēlos meta pasin* ("highly visible among all the heroes") and to win *kleos esthlon*, an excellent or lasting renown (5.2-3). In return, Diomedes experiences the lessons of heroic contingency. Even before Book 5, however, his role has been

prepared in another way. In the epipolesis, or "Review of the Troops", Agamemnon creates another area of contingency for the Iliad's first hero. That is, by rebuking him as a shirker and reminding Diomedes of his heroic father through an uncomplimentary comparison, Agamemnon creates another extrinsic standard by which the hero's performance will be evaluated. Diomedes' struggle with the fighter-paradigm of his father is complicated by an embarrassing fact: he never knew his father (6.222f.; 14.125). Diomedes' interest to us in the present study should now be plain. As Oivind Andersen has pointed out, in the most recent and thorough study of the Diomedes-figure, Diomedes is portrayed in the light of two thematic complexes, which he designates as Frömmigkeitsproblematik and Generationsproblematik.[2] In the first complex, the hero makes his way on the battlefield, or in council, with the help of a god or gods. The gods do not offer this aid for nothing; they have certain objectives in mind, and the heroes are instrumental in bringing the divine will to pass. The gods also love heroes for themselves, which is even more problematical. For a hero cannot then afford to disappoint his patron deity.

In the second case, the generations of heroes are alluded to in the Iliad in basically three groups (the generation at Troy, the generation which fathered the present generation, and a generation which was active when the "father"-generation was young); these generations cannot help but reflect on one another. Various characters refer to the past, Nestor being of course the easiest example. Others, however, make similar references: Agamemnon in book 4, Athena in 5, and Phoinix in 9, for example. In doing so, these characters create a different set of

expectations for whomever they are addressing, and these expectations are, again, extrinsic to the achievements and personal desires of the one addressed (in the same way as the wishes of the gods are extrinsic to them). The extrinsic standard arises from the comparison of the hero with an ancestor, or many ancestors, or with the men of a previous generation. Diomedes offers a first example of this kind of characterization. Moreover, the themes inherent in Andersen's typology -- the hero versus the gods and the hero versus his counterpart(s) of another time -- will reappear, with some modification, in the process of Achilles' characterization as the son of Peleus.

Diomedes does not appear in the turbulent opening book of the Iliad, nor is he even mentioned during Book 3 and the stage-setting breach of the oath. He does not surface in the second book either, except as the captain of the Argive contingent in the Catalogue of Ships (2.563). From our perspective, the two mentions of his name within the space of five lines (563, 567) are inauspicious, since the reference is to boēn agathos Diomēdēs, without patronymic. His lieutenants carry genealogical information. Sthenelos is "very son of famous Kapaneos"; Euryalos has the honorific isotheos phōs, followed by an entire line: Mēkisteos hyios Talaonidao anaktos (566), which is repeated, with biographical expansion on Mekisteus, at 23.678. The two instances of Euryalos' genealogical formula are complementary. Only the shorter version is used in the Catalogue passage, to add dignity to the presentation. Diomedes is hereafter designated , more often than not, as simply Tydeides, although in this spot he does not carry the patronymic. The Catalogue mentions Diomedes in this bare way, because

here we are at an early stage in his characterization. We may even suggest that the poet refrains from a "standard" designation for Diomedes, because the Diomedes he is preparing to present must be in some sense tabula rasa. The poet will not employ the patronymic until Diomedes has appeared in the scenes which will lend significance to the appellation Tydeidēs.

His characterization begins at 4.365. Agamemnon begins the review of his forces, actually of their respective commanders, at line 4.250. He inspects first, and praises, Idomeneus, the Aiantes, and Nestor. Then Agamemnon's mood suddenly sours. He meets Odysseus and Menestheus, just moving into the battle-line, and accuses them of dallying. Odysseus objects to the criticism, and points out their active participation in marshalling the line. He identifies himself in the moment -- astonishingly -- as the "very father of Telemachos": astonishing, because no hero in the Iliad, while alive and strong, identifies himself by reference to his son.[3] Agamemnon relents and apologizes. The next and last rebuke is of a different sort, however.[4] In fact, Agamemnon's whole reproach of Diomedes is longer and both more precisely and more deliberately structured. It relies on genealogical information, unlike the rebuke directed at Odysseus, which was simple abuse. This genealogical material is used to present a more sophisticated challenge to Diomedes. The self-evaluation against this exterior fiction of the figure of Tydeus is not called up for the moment only; it persists throughout the books of the Iliad in which Diomedes is a leading character. The Epipolesis prepares the climax in the encounter of Agamemnon and Diomedes; and the paradigm with which

Agamemnon confronts Diomedes initiates a development, through the rest of Diomedes' share of the Iliad, of the themes on which that paradigm is based.[5]

The Epipolesis must be understood in its whole context, if we are to perceive it as leading to such a climax, closing with Diomedes' departure from the chariot (4.419f.). It had begun in the first place as a result of Menelaos' wound and the broken oath. As soon as he realizes Menelaos is wounded, Agamemnon is deeply affected (rhigēsen d' epeita -- "then he froze" -- 4.148). He delivers a long passionate speech, and promises the destruction of Troy (160-8). His tone grows morbid as he dwells on the insult some Trojan passing by the mound of his brother, Menelaos, will inflict on him. Menelaos interrupts him to say that his wound is not fatal. Machaon arrives, and tends Menelaos with the art of his divine father. As the Trojans begin to press their attack, Agamemnon has now worked himself into a rage: ouk brizdonta ... oude kataptōssont' - "not delaying or cringing" - (223-4). Out of this frenetic activity the epipolesis issues: Agamemnon storms up and down the battlefield to see to it that everyone is as overwrought as he is. He reiterates his former threat of doom to Troy in lines 235ff. (It will come again - sharper and more cruel - at 6.57-60.) These words spur on the eager; but the chief's manic intensity generates another message for those who are holding back; the neikos ("Rebuke") begins here. Nebroi ("cringing fawns") is Agamemnon's term of abuse. At 250, however, he comes to the koiranoi (leaders), and finds them initially to his liking. Unlike the "cringing fawns" he had just found, Idomeneus stands at the front: sui eikelos alkēn ("like a powerful boar").

Idomeneus is whetted for battle as sharply as the commander himself, for which Agamemnon is grateful. The epipolesis continues, without a hint of abusiveness, until Agamemnon reaches Odysseus and Menestheus, and finally Diomedes.

Agamemnon's neikos against Odysseus and against Diomedes are similar only at first; they begin alike with the question ti ptōsseis; ("why are you cowering?") then diverge. In insulting Odysseus, Agamemnon implies that Odysseus has broken the accepted sequence of geras, because he has shirked the obligation to fight, while expecting the honor of the banquet nonetheless.[6] Diomedes' rebuke, on the other hand, takes its effect from the example of his father. The keynote sounds already in 371-2: Tydeus did not like to shrink from battle (ptōskazdemen); he was always eager to fight for his friends (pro philōn hetarōn). The social virtue of Tydeus quickly passes to his ability to fight alone -- that is, without human allies (4.388). There is no contradiction here for the Homeric hero: he fights for his own glory, which is best highlighted when he strives without group support; yet, his efforts are recognized by the heroic group and further its cause. At his most glorious, however, the hero is not really alone, as Agamemnon notes at 390: "To such an extent did Athena stand by him as his guarantee." Agamemnon's paradigm entails two points then. The greatest hero is capable of anything because the gods love him and support him; second, he proves this divine support by taking on impossible challenges and succeeding at them.

The paradigmatic account of Tydeus is subject to one peculiar reservation, however (4.374-5):

ὡς φάσαν οἵ μιν ἴδοντο πονεύμενον· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
ἤυτησ' οὐδὲ ἴδον· περὶ δ' ἄλλων φασὶ γενέσθαι.

"So they say who actually saw him, for I never met him or knew him. They say he was superior, though."

Agamemnon admits no other authority for his portrayal than the purposefully vague subject of phasan -- "those who saw him". He has no direct proof for his account of Tydeus. On the other hand, he refers his audience to primary evidence. The decisive word in "epic" recollection occurs in the aorist forms of oida. (At Iliad 2.485-6, there is the poet's own apology for men of his time: The muses know (iste) everything, we today know (idmen) nothing.) Agamemnon does not appeal to the muses, but to a group whose speech represented for him their own direct experience of Tydeus' nature. Agamemnon tacitly adopts the conceit of Nestor, that the previous generation saw what was worthy and held it up to the coming generation. Therefore, this coming generation is beholden to the older for its wisdom. Sthenelos rejects this reasoning vigorously. The framework of Sthenelos' rebuttal of Agamemnon is generational, moreover, and works on the same points by which Agamemnon asserted the superiority of Tydeus over his son Diomedes. The new account deals not just with the former generation, leaving in an uncritical way the voice of the subsequent generation mute; the epigonoi ("those born after") are, in Sthenelos' view, stronger warriors and the true favorites of heaven (4.404-10):

"Son of Atreus, do not say so boldly what you know are lies! We can claim that we are better than our fathers. We took seven-gated Thebes,

although we led a smaller force against a stronger wall, because we trusted in the gods' portents and in the aid of Zeus. They perished for their own folly; don't give our fathers the same honor as us then." Agamemnon does not reply to Sthenelos' counter-claim; Diomedes speaks instead, and it is within his own generation that he levels the reply. Diomedes refuses to challenge or pass judgement on the role of the past in this discussion. Rather, he stresses the need for the obedience of the expedition to its commander. Agamemnon's clever close -- that Diomedes is less a warrior than his father but a greater speaker -- renders a verbal device unpalatable to Diomedes now. The young hero is therefore maneuvered into upholding the commander's prerogative: it is not just that he sees the reality behind Agamemnon's artful behavior. Agamemnon's words were an exercise in control -- Sthenelos attempted to repudiate that control, but he fails to persuade Diomedes'. Diomedes acknowledges the anankē of Agamemnon's leadership. The episode closes with a stock motif: Diomedes makes a swift jump from the chariot, and his bronze armor thunders on his chest (4.419-21). Diomedes has accepted the conditions under which he can become a great hero. The scene is finished, but the question remains: how could Agamemnon have responded to Sthenelos? What, in terms of the vision of the Iliad, is the resolution of their contradictory claims?

In proving himself -- that is, in acting out in battle the deeds whose myth-making qualities will make them remarkable and cause them to survive him -- Diomedes will have to work within limits imposed by his patrimony. However, Diomedes clearly sees his heritage -- unlike Sthenelos -- as an asset. For him, this insight is correct. Diomedes'

knowledge of who he is and whence his help comes guides him to the resource of the goddess Athena. In book 5, he draws his power from the goddess and finally encounters her directly, at which point the link to Tydeus is reinforced. Nor does Diomedes think at that moment to deny Athena's desire to see in himself the recapitulation of his father Tydeus. Sthenelos' objections retreat further from view. Diomedes' approach to the past is conservative, supportive of the standards by which he wishes to be evaluated. He is not concerned with failing the standards of the past; he is only concerned not to give them up. Agamemnon's own presentation of Tydeus avoided all uncomfortable aspects of the father's fortune. He refers to Diomedes' father at the end as Tydeus Aitolios (4.399) and thus connects him with his homeland. Tydeus in reality suffered exile, and Diomedes will eventually face the fact at 14.119f. Diomedes accepts for now the idea that the new generation is inferior in some sense to the old, and must adapt itself as best it can to its established patterns, preserved by one of those who preserve such stories.[7] Diomedes does not question the objective value of Agamemnon's paradigm; in other words, he does not himself question its quality, although we learn a perhaps compelling reason why he should: he never knew his father personally.

On the large scale, through the whole of Book 5, even through books 4-5 and 7-8, Athena moves in and out, up and down, fighting a strange combat indirectly against Apollo (and Zeus), with Aphrodite and Ares in the end her comic victims. What is her purpose in this book 5? To exalt a favorite mortal, as she did Tydeus before, in order to gain revenge on a hated people. In book 6 the Trojans pray to Athena to stop

Diomedes and break his spear-point; the goddess ignores their prayers and their despair. Diomedes is raised yet higher, and he becomes for the moment the most formidable hero before Troy. His kudos surpasses the Peleid's.

Athena begins Book 5 by setting Diomedes on the track of kleos and of being ekdēlos meta pasin ("conspicuous among all"). To this end she instills in him menos and tharsos. She then sets him ablaze, kindles him in the same way she kindles Achilles in 18.206 and 227. Diomedes then steps out and manages to kill one of a pair of twins. Other Trojan deaths follow - the heroes involved move in an ascending order of importance[8] - till Diomedes re-appears at 85. Raging like a storm-swollen river, Diomedes is nevertheless caught by Pandaros' arrow. The wound prompts Diomedes to look for help; he prays to Athena: "If you ever stood by my father in war, now be philos to me too" (5.116-117). The form of the question itself indicates the state of mind of the petitioner. "Ei pote ("if ever") ... then now ..." shows suppressed concern for the reliability of the stand on precedent. It reflects uncertainty to an extent, but also a challenge to the god, to prove the support to which Diomedes feels he holds a just claim. Athena appears and satisfies the request in Diomedes' terms. She refers to Tydeus in his positive heroic aspect (5.125); the power she puts into Diomedes is menos patrōion (126). Moreover, this menos is three times stronger than the courage which the gods normally offer a favorite (136). Diomedes apparently has not miscalculated in thinking that Athena would adhere to the Tydeus-paradigm.

Pandaros and Aineias approach Diomedes; Pandaros, at least, will

die. He must pay for the offence against the oath (his first shot) and for Diomedes' wound (his second shot). He should have left the bow at home as he himself realizes (5.205,209f.). Aineias has no fine sense of irony, however, and tells him to quit thinking of destroying his weapons (5.218). The approach of these two Trojans prompts an interesting exchange between Diomedes and Sthenelos. Sthenelos suddenly becomes susceptible to the claims of genealogy: he quickly recites the salient points of Pandaros' and Aineias' lineages and urges retreat in the face of such redoubtable adversaries. Diomedes refuses; his decision is based also on a genealogical consideration. There is much potential for kleos in the whole undertaking (5.260, 273). Diomedes recounts the genealogy of Aineias' horses, including Anchises' theft of the seed; he indicates the kleos-making power which the capture of these steeds would provide. Such a stance shows Diomedes' consistency: he honors the right of Agamemnon to persuade him by reference to Tydeus; likewise, he depends on others' acceptance of the fabulous story of Aineias' horses, when he will recount it to enhance his own accomplishments on this day.

Diomedes takes his revenge on Pandaros and also wins the horses. He then enters another encounter, one for which Athena had thought to prepare him. Aphrodite, for her own reasons, keeps Diomedes from capping his triumph by killing and despoiling an opponent with a very powerful genealogy. (Aineias' genealogy of course involves the goddess herself.) Diomedes remembers the injunction of his patroness and drives off Aphrodite. His words at this pass anticipate Athena's mockery of Aphrodite to Zeus (5.421f.): they are belittling to the goddess of love and keep within the tone of the entire scene; but they are also in

character for Diomedes -- full of menos, almost over-full, even though he is well within the limits allowed to him by his "own" goddess. Diomedes is in a position to finish off Aineias and take his armor. Diomedes sees at 433, however, that Apollo is now standing between him and the goal of Aineias' corpse and arms. The recognition itself is Athena's gift; but the daring to challenge Apollo steps beyond the limits she laid down.

A justification of this behavior can be found in a subsequent scene. Here Athena and Hera have just arrived from Olympos to counteract the onslaught of Hektor, which Sarpedon's taunt at 5.684f. had triggered. Hera rouses the entire Greek line; Athena goes directly and solely to Diomedes. The line heure de ton ge ... (5.794) echoes Agamemnon's "discovery" of Diomedes in the epipolesis. In fact, the mood of that scene returns here momentarily. Athena berates Diomedes, not only with his inferiority to Tydeus -- that is only her first gambit. She concludes the scolding by claiming that Diomedes is not at all the son of her former protege. Athena tells another anecdote resembling Agamemnon's[9]: how Tydeus once went to Thebes without any support or ally to dine among the Cadmeians. She had ordered him to, but had also told him not to cause any trouble. Nonetheless Tydeus challenged the young men of the Cadmeians, and won a resounding victory. Tydeus was on this occasion angelos, which gives ostensible cause of his being alone. Yet, perhaps he was alone because of a part of Athena's orders; the injunction to keep peace may have been a test of Tydeus' faith in Athena. Indeed, once Tydeus broke the peace, Athena came to his side without any reluctance. That is the main point of her story:

she stands by those whom she has chosen. The chosen require only knowledge of their dependence on the goddess. Diomedes, she implies, lacks both knowledge of this paternal resource -- the goddess -- and the resolution which stems from possession of that gift. Athena's reproof results in a strong denial (5.812-13):

οὐ σύ γ' ἔπειτα
Τυδέος ἔκγονός ἐσσι δαΐφρονος Οἰνεΐδαο."

"You are not the offspring of clever Tydeus Son-of-Oineus then." Not only is he not the son of clever Tydeus - he also cannot be the ekgonos of the Oineid Tydeus. The name of the father is joined with its patronymic to create a heavier blow -- whose weight lands on the member of the third generation. Diomedes is made to feel unworthy not because his actions disappoint expectations of his own, but expectations based on the reputation of the entire line.

Yet, the "fullness" of menos which Athena imputes to Tydeus is nowhere more evident than in Diomedes' assault on Aineias and Apollo only 400 lines before. Even after three rebuffs, Diomedes charges Apollo's defense of the helpless Aineias, and this fourth time finally Apollo utters the warning Diomedes must hear and obey.[10] His impetuosity leaves a deep impression even on the archer-god. Apollo summons Ares back to the fray; his main concern was prompted by Diomedes (459): autar epeit' autoi moi epessuto daimoni isos. ("But then he attacked me too, as if he were a god.") Apollo can scarcely believe Diomedes' mad attack. Diomedes' over-confidence arose in spite of his exalted vision - he recognized Apollo (433), but did not fear to

confront him; for Apollo stood in the way of kleos, by defending Aineias' body and arms. Athena's warning, on the other hand, did not persuade him. Only Apollo's divine force could bring Diomedes back to reality.[11]

Athena forgets (or ignores) that Diomedes did overstep her order and forsook reality -- fought like a daimōn -- to bring kleos to himself as her beneficiary and as son of a great hero. Perhaps because the motif of Tydeus' over-boldness points so clearly to the mighty assault on Apollo, Diomedes takes her condemnation calmly. He acted like his father after all, and Athena has in a strange and roundabout way acknowledged that. So Diomedes says (5.815): gignōskō se, thea. ("I recognize you, goddess.") He is not silent, as after Agamemnon's rebuke, but he is obedient. He confidently contends now that he only kept to Athena's orders by not fighting where he could see Ares (5.824): gignōskō gar Arēa. ("I know Ares when I see him.") Diomedes learned from his brush with Apollo that the goddess' warning was true, but that a great hero can also survive an occasional test of that warning. An increase in knowledge comes with the experience and the display of superhuman menos. Athena recognizes this and rewards Diomedes beyond any hero: he may fight with Ares, with any god (827), for as epitarrothos Athena stands by him as she did by his father. (Epitarrothos is an important term for a god's protection of a hero, especially through these books of the poem in which Diomedes is prominent. Cf. also 21.289.) Diomedes is so much the son of his father that for the moment at least the paradigm of Tydeus' life is superseded; Diomedes himself, like his father before, acts together with the goddess

in pursuit of kleos. As Andersen points out, this level is marked by the entry of Athena onto Diomedes' chariot: she pushes Sthenelos aside, and the car-axles creak beneath the eerie weight of the manifest goddess. Diomedes no longer fights with a mortal companion. In Diomedes (mounos implicitly in the same sense that Tydeus was), the days of hero and god fighting as partners -- all but legendary to the present generation -- have returned.

The excitement which arises in the co-ordinated attack of Diomedes and Athena on Ares peaks at the war-god's howling pain, and fades slowly through the course of his flight to Olympos, which parallels the retreat of Aphrodite earlier in Book 5. As Book 6 opens, however, the gods have departed from the Trojan plain. Diomedes initiates a cavalcade of successful Greek battle-encounters. This impels Helenos to send Hektor to Troy to order sacrifices which will re-establish divine favor for their cause. The trip back to the walls culminates in the poignant reunion of Hektor and Andromache. There comes an interlude after Hektor's departure from the side of Helenos, however, consisting of an encounter between two of the premier fighters on either side: Glaukos and Diomedes. Their meeting becomes something other than a typical battle-scene. Diomedes is included to round out the present phase of his education. The following confrontation between Diomedes and Glaukos, whom he does not recognize, leads to a lengthy sermon on genealogy and divine favor. The issue obviously has not been settled. Diomedes ignored the debate in book 4, refusing to acknowledge Sthenelos' claim that the present generation enjoyed the favor of the gods more than the previous one. Diomedes accepted Agamemnon's

estimation of the quality of the generations instead; in re-enacting his father's example, Diomedes puts himself in direct contact with his patrimonial divine-support. At that point, the debate, it would seem, has been resolved, and there is nothing to argue concerning the contrasting claims of a new and old generation. The dialogue in book 6 reveals the contrary.

Diomedes questions Glaukos' background to discover if he is mortal or divine. Diomedes is urgent to know whether this is a god he faces. He has lost those fine powers of discernment which Athena had for a time provided. Diomedes did not ask Axylos who or what he was. The mythos of his background was perhaps well-circulated enough, on account of his hospitality and wealth, for Diomedes to know that Axylos was only human. Or maybe Diomedes merely fit into the battle-sequence at that point due to his rising prominence, and in that limited context his caution over opponents is ignored. Now, however, he re-enters the forefront. We might repeat, his new hesitation may betray a hint of uncertainty deriving from a loss of preternatural powers as sudden as his acquisition of them. Diomedes reveals at the same time a fresh sophistication in the way he accompanies his question with a paradigm. After displaying his wisdom in this way, he regains confidence enough to re-assert his menos -- hence the imposing threat at 6.142-43.

Glaukos attempts in his reply to take some of the wind from Diomedes' sails. The question of descent, so vital to the aretalogical conceits of the hero-class, Glaukos initially disclaims. What are these generations of men, after all, short-lived as leaves? "Some the wind brings to the ground; others flourish so long as their season lasts.

Men live and die in generations that pass swiftly." (Cf. 6.147-9.) Glaukos first attacks the very basis on which Diomedes has built his claim to excellence. The passage from one generation to another is swift and inevitable; and what is more, it reveals the nature of man as surely as the hero wishes to conceal it by his arrogation of divine qualities. He then concedes to Diomedes the knowledge he has requested. He is amazed that Diomedes does not know his family already: it is so well-known[12].

Glaukos' genealogy is for the most part a celebration of one ancestor above the others. It does not have to do only with Homer's eagerness to tell the fascinating Bellerophon-saga, however. The figure of Bellerophon bridges the "original" location of the family and its new seat in Lycia. It is therefore on one level an aition. But, despite having undercut the hero's claim to deducing his own worth from the preserved accounts of his ancestors, Glaukos also attempts to show that his own particular line through Bellerophon obtained a special dispensation. The central motif of Bellerophon's saga is the reliance of the hero on divine favor. The motif is crucial to the genealogical impulse because, in spite of what Glaukos pretends, the coming and going of men has sometimes to do with natural processes, but more often with the intrusive hand of divinity. For a large part of his tale, Glaukos presents Bellerophon in the best light in this respect. Bellerophon obeyed Proitos in Argos because Zeus had established his kingship there (6.159). But in his first trial, sent against the hideous Chimera, he triumphs (183): theōn teraessi pithēsas. ("trusting the portents of the gods.") When no other trial subdued him, Proitos' son-in-law came

to a realization about Bellerophon (191): "But when he at last recognized in this hero the offspring of the gods ..." From this recognition came the position of kingly honor in Lycia (6.192-3). Interestingly enough, Glaukos' avoidance of certain of Bellerophon's more embarrassingly hybristic moments ends with the relation of a fall from divine favor[13]. The divine hatred which victimizes Bellerophon does not stay itself with the father alone. Ares kills Isander, one of the sons, in a war with the Solymoi; and Artemis kills the single daughter, Laodameia. That leaves Hippolochos. Hippolochos emerges as the only scion unscathed by divine anger; the excellence of the entire family devolves on one line. Glaukos infers a process of selection in what otherwise had been just a sorry accident. From the father, in a way the progenitor of this "new" line, Glaukos receives this injunction: (208-210) "to be pre-eminent and act nobly and not to shame the family", with which one might compare Peleus' reported words at 11.784. On the other hand, even here Glaukos does not depart from the opening tones of melancholy. The wish of his father will be fulfilled -- as best Glaukos can. As can be seen from Bellerophon's example, however, and Isander's, and so forth, the heroic ambition is not always sufficient to overcome the frailty of its connections to the gods, who provide the semblances of distinction and immortality. Glaukos confers on himself a unique and privileged status among men who are otherwise the same. With that arrogation, he also assumes a burden: to act like a hero, notwithstanding the likely loss of the gods' favor which may overturn human efforts at any instant.[14]

Diomedes' reaction does not rival or contest the claims Glaukos is

putting forward. Instead, Diomedes develops a response which is at one and the same time corroborative and competitive. He accepts Glaukos' Bellerophon-figure to explain why he and Glaukos should not fight. Their genealogical inheritances forbid it: they are xenoi patrōioi. Oineus entertained Bellerophon once for twenty days, who gave his host a gift when he left. Diomedes himself possesses the cup which was Bellerophon's present to grandfather Oineus. Tydeus never owned it, or at least he put it into Diomedes' patrimony before he left; thereafter Diomedes never saw him. The incident reveals Diomedes in a vulnerable position. He receives an heirloom from his paternal grandfather without mediation from the side of Tydeus. The absence of the father then draws Diomedes more solidly into the tradition of the oikos by a kind of over-compensation. The mythos of Oineus' reception of Bellerophon as a guest comes nearer to Diomedes under this perspective, and the cup that was a token of the old relationship entails an obligation on Diomedes. By this account he also manipulates the present scene between himself and Glaukos. Without disputing Glaukos' claims in theory, Diomedes shows that deeds in the past do not lose their importance as guides to present conduct simply because the original actors are dead. The claims of one generation upon another are more durable than that. Furthermore, Diomedes demonstrates that the gods may favor two heroes at one time, only one slightly more than the other. Zeus acknowledges Diomedes' cleverness, moreover, which is illustrated by his adroit use of genealogy to make friends of enemies, or at least to make enemies harmless.

In Book 14, Diomedes attempts to present at last a succinct account

of his own genealogy. The scene is the depressed situation of the Greek commanders, who are now at the nadir of their fortunes without Achilles. Agamemnon asks anyone of the chiefs to step forward with ameinona mētin (14.107). Diomedes arises and offers a simple recommendation, that everyone go to the battlefield, even the wounded. The others accept this resolution. The genealogical preface seems to have been unnecessary. On the other hand, the act of self-presentation which Diomedes goes through in depicting his own background to the assembled heroes is not unimportant; it also is positioned by the poet at the end of a series of speeches, at the climax of a debate scene occurring when the situation of the Achaean expedition is extremely serious.

Diomedes develops his account in stages: he first apologizes for his youth (14.110-12); he then asserts that his counsel should be heeded, since he is of a "good father" (113). The initial reservation is answered in the second point; this second point produces a difficulty as well, however, and thus Diomedes is compelled to discuss his father only after he has described a fuller genealogy. Diomedes begins with Portheus, his great-grandfather. Of the old man's three sons, Oineus the paternal grandfather excelled (14.118): "He was the outstanding one in regard to heroic excellence." Diomedes' version of the family concentrates its aretē in his line; Oineus, although the youngest, was the best. He then fathered Tydeus. Then an embarrassing detail appears (119-120):

> ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν αὐτόθι μεῖνε, πατὴρ δ' ἐμὸς Ἄργεϊ νάσθη
> πλαγχθείς· ὣς γάρ που Ζεὺς ἤθελε καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι.

"He [Oineus] stayed there, but my father went to Argos as a wanderer, since this was the will of Zeus and the other gods."
His own father not only was forced to leave the ancestral home; the gods, Zeus among them, willed it. Diomedes' version includes the negative-sounding plankthеis, moreover, in as low-key a fashion as possible; the entry of the gods' will as spur of Tydeus' departure almost makes him out to look pious rather than involved in atē, as if he were merely obeying an unprovoked divine-directive. Tydeus attained great wealth -- by marriage -- in land, produce, and cattle, the important commodities of the Homeric world. Tydeus also excelled as a warrior: kekasto de pantas Achaious/ engcheiē - "he surpassed all the Achaeans in spear-throwing" (14.123-4). This is expressed in a typical way. Nothing suits an heroic-mythos more than that its subject "excelled" all other mortals of his day in some tangible respect - feat, skill, or martial art. Yet, even with such a solid conclusion, Diomedes includes a note of hesitance (125): "This is what you are likely to hear, if it's true." The final line of the speech reverts to Diomedes' reservations over his audience's acceptance of the counsel. Diomedes has proven himself in battle, particularly in the spectacular episodes of book 5. He established himself as a hero by a self-conscious adoption of Tydeus' precedent. Only here does Diomedes have any difficulty with his father's paradigm. The suspicious absence of Tydeus in the presentation of Bellerophon's gift in book 6 now connects with Diomedes' revelation of the insecure knowledge he actually possesses of his father. What Diomedes knew of Tydeus before hearing the versions of Agamemnon and Athena he indicates in line 114. Tydeus is buried in

Thebes. Foreign burial is no disgrace in itself. But what the burial recalls , Diomedes wishes to avoid -- Tydeus' participation in a disastrous expedition. Sthenelos nearly brought the matter out openly, only Diomedes succeeded in silencing him. Now, Diomedes exorcises those aspects of Tydeus' past which are not beneficial or particularly proud; what is left is a projection of Tydeus as the heroic figure of accounts he has gleaned from others around Troy.

One more thing can be said for Oineus, however. He provided the excellence of the line which Diomedes claims for his own. Oineus excelled his brothers in aretē, despite the fact that he was tritatos. He was third, that is, last or youngest of three sons. The point may be coincidental that Diomedes feels he must apologize in 112 for being geneēphi neōtatos ... meth' humin ("youngest in age among you"). The request for advice had been couched in generous terms; Agamemnon had asked anyone of the company to stand up and offer help, whether old or young (107-8). The distinction of age enters there, and Diomedes significantly addresses himself to it in a self-effacing preamble.

Yet, the point is carried further when Diomedes represents Oineus as the best in his genealogy, and the one who stands directly behind the line which Diomedes wishes to represent. The association with Oineus in book 6, concerning the transmission of Bellerophon's gift, is implicitly repeated and strengthened here. The mention of Oineus' youth is important, moreover, when we realize that Diomedes' advice is not so bland after all. Diomedes' caps a series of five speeches. Agamemnon first addresses Nestor, asking him whether all is lost. Nestor answers that they must find a way out. Agamemnon then replies that the only way

out is to return home, at which point Odysseus speaks up to rebut Agamemnon's defeatism. Then Agamemnon asks those present for advice, and Diomedes takes the opportunity to make his presentation.

Nestor's main point was that the current lack of success in the front-line fighting called for a new tactic, which would be difficult to devise with so many of the premier fighters incapacitated (14.62-3): "I do not recommend that we fight; it is not possible for a wounded man to do battle."

The counsel which Diomedes gives, however, contradicts this opinion. At least, it reforms Nestor's concern for the wounded by recommending that the wounded heroes participate as much as possible, even if it mean only lending moral support (128-132). In this case, the young has given better counsel than the old, or has at least supplemented and refurbished the advice of the elder.[15]

Like Diomedes here, Oineus excelled while being the youngest. Diomedes has developed another paradigm on which to build his reputation. His Oineus-figure complements the Tydeus-figure. Despite Diomedes' search for the paternal exemplum and his dutiful respect for its use, nevertheless, what we finish with is a composite genealogy. All genealogies are composite of course; but usually the most important connection consists of the bond between father and son, since these two share some part of their lives. In Diomedes' case, Tydeus forfeited that role, however, and lost himself in a potentially disgraceful defeat.[16] For that reason, Diomedes' relation to the past is complicated. But this difficulty does not keep Diomedes from reconstituting the past to his own advantage.

Notes

1 For an explanation of "blameless" Pandaros, read Combellack (1982) 369-72.

2 Andersen (1974) develops the two complexes throughout his monograph; see especially pp. 36, 42, 86-7, 104-107.

3 See II.2 note 2 below.

4 In the case of Odysseus and Agamemnon, as Andersen says, "Die beiden verstehen einander und verkehren irgendwie auf gleicher Ebene."

5 Andersen 33 again provides a confirming insight: "Die ganze Epipolesis zielt auf Diomedes hin und bereitet seine grossartige Entfaltung im Folgenden vor."

6 The locus classicus of this notion is the first half of Sarpedon's speech at 12.310-21. On this passage, note Redfield's interpretations (99-103). M. Muellner (1978) 105-9 offers a far-reaching discussion of the entire speech.

7 For the affinity of Nestor and Agamemnon, one might inspect a number of passages, for example: 1.277-81; 2.20-22; 9.68-73, 96-102.

8 See Andersen 50.

9 Nagy 162 differentiates the two episodes, and writes that Athena's "challenge is both mental and physical", whereas Diomedes is "socially compelled to answer Agamemnon's taunt with action rather than words".

10 This pattern is repeated in connection with Diomedes; he receives a triple warning from Zeus, for example, in book 8. See notes 11 and 15 below.

11 The "naivete" of the Diomedes-figure allows for this safe lesson in those limitations which the gods put on men. Diomedes' entire career in the Iliad is safe in this way, and therefore critics have claimed that Diomedes is a hero insufficient for tragedy. (See especially Whitman (1958) 166-7, 169, 265.) Homer avoids involving Diomedes in a tragic fate; moreover, a large part of his characterization, as we are trying to demonstrate, revolves around his avoidance of the tragic flaw of his father Tydeus. Homer portrays a young hero selecting the useful information of his father's past to erect a scaffolding for his own climb toward recognition. Dramatic tension arises only where the dark underside of the Tydeus paradigm shows through - briefly in Sthenelos' speech in book 4 and curiously again in book 14. Otherwise Diomedes' arrangement functions so well that his "confrontations" with divinity never take him in over his head. As Andersen 72 points out, where Apollo says phrazeo ("think about it!") to Diomedes, the god says chazeo

("step back!") to Patroklos in the cognate scene. With Diomedes there is space and time for reflection, without ineluctably hard consequences. It is difficult to disagree with Whitman's statement (265) that "Diomedes' aristeia ... is a heroic comedy, which corresponds to the heroic tragedy of the aristeia of Achilles toward the end of the poem." The remark is apropos book 5, but characterizes Diomedes in the rest of the poem as well.

Diomedes is involved in strife with the gods in two other key instances; both times he remains unharmed. In the rescue of Nestor (book 8), Diomedes faces a decision whether to press a solitary assault on the divinely inspired Hektor or to retreat. He receives divine warning from Zeus himself to take the latter. The god strikes his chariot with a terrifying bolt of fire. Diomedes is still unconvinced: how can he live with the taunts which will surely follow if he relents? Nestor, a father-figure for Diomedes in this Book as well as in 9 and 10, teaches him new wisdom: a hero may retreat. This at least convinces Diomedes that retreat is a conceivable alternative. Hektor's taunting (161f.) nearly causes him to fight in any case, but Zeus thunders once for every turn of Diomedes' mental-tumblers (169-70). Diomedes is a lucky example of how the gods are sometimes unambiguous about their will.

The last brush with godhead comes in the chariot race of Book 23. In fact, others have remarked how the struggle among Diomedes-Athena-Apollo(-Eumelos) resembles the strife in Book 5. The relationship between Diomedes and Athena arises implicitly. Athena appears when Apollo snatches the whip from Diomedes' hand. The

appearance of his patroness at the crucial moment continues Diomedes' good luck in potentially threatening divine encounters. Diomedes' good standing is insured in this Book, and enhanced, in fact. He faces Aias in the deadly single combat; although both combatants are saved by Achilles' intervention, Diomedes is pronounced the superior fighter. This distinction should not come as a surprise, considering his family-origin, and his inherited and merited attachment to the goddess Athena.

12 This claim is conventional; it re-occurs in Aineias' genealogy in book 20, as well as in book 13 of the Odyssey, when Athena says of the landscape of Ithaka: polloi min isasi (many know it).

13 See Gaisser (1969) 172.

14 See both Griffin (1980) 72 and Gaisser 172, 174.

15 It is not surprising, then, that Diomedes makes his grandfather the youngest but still the best of his generation. In the same way, whenever Nestor retreats into the past to recall the activity of former, more illustrious men, he himself is active among these older ages and yet repeatedly portrays himself as the youngest of that time. (Consider 7.133-157 and 11.670-762; on the latter passage Vidal-Naquet (1981) 160 makes an interesting observation, terming it Nestor's "double initiation".) A further passage within the same context is 23.626ff., the games which Nestor recounts after Achilles' gratuitous award to the

old man: these games, as Nestor recollects them, have a generational setting, as they were given by the paides of Amaryngkeus at his funeral (630-1).) Nestor provides a framework -- built on the examples of bygone heroic generations -- within which he urges the present generation to develop itself, after the example of his own achievements in that era, even when he was the youngest.

A discussion of Nestor here would necessitate another dissertation. We ought to indicate, nevertheless, that the generational message of Nestor's self-presentation is often delivered in contexts within which Diomedes is a significant actor. Book 8 has been well dissected by Andersen 111ff. Another scene, the preliminaries to the Doloneia, provides interesting contrasts in Homer's association of Diomedes and Nestor.

Nestor comes round to wake the chiefs for a council; he comes on Diomedes first and rudely rouses him with a kick (158): lax podi kinēsas, otrune te neikese t' antēn. Nestor is in haste, therefore the rough awakening and the mildly abusive tone (158-60): "Are you going to sleep all night! Don't you realize how close the Trojans are?" Diomedes answers good-naturedly. On either end of his reply to Nestor, he calls him schetlios and amēchanos ("mercilessly tough" and "impossible"). Diomedes cannot believe the old man has taken it upon himself to run this errand of collecting the council.

(165) ou nu kai alloi easi neoteroi huies Achaion

"Aren't there other younger sons of Achaeans?"

The reference to "younger" men is interesting, but so is the use of what is admittedly a stock phrase "sons of Achaeans". The Achaeans' own

conception of themselves, displayed in the identification by patronymic, is as an extension of a "fathering" generation. They are derivative, and much in their vocabulary buttresses that feeling. Here, though, Nestor is doing what the extensions of his own generation ought to be doing. The dichotomy of the young doing and the old speaking is not being followed in this scene. After Diomedes' question, however, Nestor plays along. He asks Diomedes to carry on for him, to wake Aias and Meges, because he is younger and if he pities him (175-6). Nestor does not take advantage of the persuasive function of this facet of age-distinction. He has spoken; the dichotomy suggests that he should now sit back and watch everything happen. Instead, Nestor is back on the move: this time across the trench on the border of the camp to inspect the pickets! He addresses them, phila tekna, as he does elsewhere, e.g., Achilles in 23.626 - tekos. There is some literalness to the term in this instance. In book 9, he assembled and assigned the watch-duties to the kouroi (9.68); his son, Thrasymedes, led one detachment (9.81). So the sentries are his children in a biological and a social sense. He is an active heroic father (e.g., of Thrasymedes and Antilochos) and is active among the young men who are not yet fully defined warriors -- promachoi. Hence, Nestor, after being "relieved" by Diomedes of one task, embarks on another, to rouse the young men to vigilance:

(193) mē charma genōmetha dusmeneessin

In these words, Nestor speaks of physical security, but the notion of providing "joy" to one's enemies also encompasses the heroic sensitivty to personal honor. Nestor is no mere laudator temporis acti in this

scene. He is busy communicating to at least two distinct generations (Diomedes' and that of the kouroi) and making clear in both cases what the expectations are for them.

16 We ought to consider the possiblity at least that Diomedes attempts to surpass his father Tydeus. Perhaps, Diomedes all along means to replace the memory of Tydeus with his own. This necessitates first the acting out of an heroic career along the lines of the father's; then Diomedes can step beyond his father by avoiding whatever prideful defeat or error tarnished that earlier heroism. That is why Sthenelos' option must be rejected: because Diomedes has confidence that he can equal, and surpass, the heroic accomplishments of his father; Tydeus provides an indispensable stepping-stone. Diomedes has chosen not to rest on his Theban laurels, but to comply with the poet, as it were, and perform new klea to fill out books 5, 6, 8, and so on. In this way, Diomedes would embody the spirit of heroic genealogy as Bernard Schouler (1980) 6 describes it: "La noblesse de naissance est moins un critère dans l'évaluation des mérites d'un individu qu'un appel au dépassement, qu'une invitation à l'action."

2. Son of Peleus

Odysseus is referred to by patronymic nine times in the Iliad; these always include the hero's "given" name too:

(e.g., 4.358) diogenes Laertiadē, polymēchan' Odysseu.

"Zeus-born Son-of-Laertes, resourceful Odysseus."

(The epithet varies: e.g., polymētis as well.) The only time Odysseus receives a patronymic without his name and one of the epithets happens in book 19, as Odysseus tries to handle the rapprochement of Achilles and Agamemnon. Odysseus addresses Agamemnon:

(181) Atreidē, su d' epeita ... ("Son-of-Atreus")

So Agamemnon acknowledges his tact with a formal, dignified address:[1]

chairō seu, Laertiadē, ton mython akousas.

"I am gratified to hear what you say, Son-of-Laertes".

Nowhere is Laertes mentioned in the Iliad.[2] Odysseus' father does not impinge on his character in the Iliad. Likewise, Atreus, though his name comes up, plays no role in the Iliadic presentation of either son. There is the repetitive badge "son(s) of Atreus", which adheres to Agamemnon in the dream of book 2, and his aristeia of book 11 (2.23, 60; 11.131), and to Menelaos in books 3,4, and 6, as well as in the battle over Patroklos' body (3.37; 4.98, 115, 195; 6.36; 17.1, 79, 89, 553). The only independent appearance of Atreus' name is at 2.105-106. Atreus holds a pivotal position in the genealogy of the skēptron patrōion which betokens Agamemnon's authority: the sceptre comes to his family by way of the gods, and so does the right to rule.[3] Atreus

surfaces nowhere else in the poem, and this has only a little to do with the fact that he is known to be dead (so he passed on the sceptre to Thyestes); Tydeus is no less important to Diomedes for being invisible.

That is, Diomedes never saw much of his own father, nor does he have memories of his own remaining from any times they spent together while Diomedes was growing up as a young man. Instead Tydeus comes to exist in the present, but only in a shape the recollections of others have moulded. A major part of Diomedes' characterization consists in his reactions to the repeated challenges and the expectations of these others, e.g., Agamemnon, Athena, Nestor.[4] Diomedes'struggle with his own self-presentation, we hoped, would offer us perspective on the primary hero of the poem also. Analyses of Achilles' experience in the course of the poem have scrutinized his relations to Patroklos, the suppliant Achaeans, Hektor and Priam, and mother Thetis. But what is there to say of Achilles' relation to his father, Peleus? Certainly, Peleus is named more than Atreus; his presence -- and his pertinence -- in the poem, as we shall see, approaches more that of Tydeus, and surpasses it.

Of course, the tradition which centered on Achilles' activity has identified him as the son of a great father. His patronymic appears as often as his own name;[5] and the two are also employed together. He actually has a triple-set: Pēleidēs (52X), Pēleiōn (47X), and Pēlēiadēs (9X). Peleus is not named only in these patronymics nevertheless. The first reference to him in the Iliad is unconcerned with Achilles. In book 7, Hektor is inspired by Athena to offer single

combat. Menelaos accepts, to ward the shame of refusal from the group (7.96-7). Agamemnon stops him; he fears Hektor will kill Menelaos. Nestor arises, and addresses the point which had moved Menelaos in the first place. Nestor's speech is a neikos (like Menelaos' - cf. 7.95 and 7.161); to summarize: "There are no heroes anymore; it would make Peleus sick to death, if he found out about this. I wish I were young again, as when I fought a duel with Ereuthalion, who was wearing the armor of the great lord Areithoos. He challenged the Pylian warriors, but they were afraid: except me. I won with Athena's support. But you are all afraid." We need to consider with what embellishments Nestor delivers the simple message.[6]

First, the significance of Ereuthalion's challenge increases, once we learn how he came by his armor. The gear belonged to Areithoos, who was called "the Hammer" because of his prowess with that formidable tool. But, the arms were "stolen" from him by one Lykourgos, not through martial strength, but with stealth (despite the occasional epic countenance of Autolykan success, the point here has to be that the trick was ou themis) -- cf. 142. Lykoorgos met Areithoos in a narrow pass (143), where the Hammer's particular technique was inapt, and quickly exploited the situation to bring him down (144-45). Ereuthalion inherited the arms from this "thief". Nowhere is there explicit moral judgement; implicitly, the outrage of the loss of arms in a "maneuver" raises the expectations that one of the Pylians will rush to take up Ereuthalion's challenge. In their place, it is Nestor who comes forward and wins glory. When Nestor finishes, there is no hesitation in his audience: nine of the group jump up for the lottery

to determine Hektor's opponent. It is necessary now to fear shame more than death or injury.

Typically, this recollection of Nestor is suffused with the magical remoteness of his other narratives. There is Areithoos and his picturesque nom de guerre, the moving account of his unfair defeat, and of course the impressive response of Nestor himself on an "historic" occasion! The initial conceit of the speech, however, was the grief of Peleus. The shame of the Achaean conduct is outlined in its supposed effect on the absent Peleus. A penthos threatens the Achaiida gaian. It is this earth which Peleus still inhabits; he is in a way its representative. His non-participation in the expedition is not referred to at all here. Rather, the implications of his mention head in the opposite direction. Peleus' reproach is meaningful for the group for the very reason that Nestor's anecdote persuades. The shame which would compel Peleus to wish for death would imply a comparison between the "men now" and the "men then". The generation of heroes whose exploits Nestor can recreate so vividly are also the provenance of Peleus. As Nestor says, the last time they were together Peleus was entertaining him at home and

(128) panton Argeion ereon geneen te tokon te.

"... speaking of the race and progeny of all the Argives."

Not only will Peleus' disgust reveal the inferiority of the present generation over against a former generation; Peleus' knowledge is much more hauntingly specific: geneēn te tokon te. Each man of them could be measured by his own genealogy; everyone would be confronted by the example of his Tydeus, or his Kapeneus, and so forth, with the extent

of their present failure to live up to a well-recollected standard.

Peleus is a symbol of the importance of the past in gauging the accomplishment of the present generation. The worth of this group resides in its potential to survive in the way that the stories of Nestor retain attention. They invest in their own preservation by honoring those precedents which have been set, and which demonstrate a custom already in place to receive and foster heroic kleos. Nestor plays his part in this schema. He supports that position, moreover, in describing Peleus as the "outstanding counsellor and speaker of the Myrmidons". There is no aspersion shed on Peleus' lack of warlike strength; there is no need for Peleus to be warlike anymore, so long as the Nestorian-function remains intact -- that is, so long as the group maintains its interest in heroic aretē and its fulfillment in a future legacy.[7]

Nestor uses Peleus again in a long autobiographically related digression. His success at persuasion in book 11 triggers, as is well known, the double tragedy of the Iliad: Achilles' loss of Patroklos and then his savage revenge on Hektor. The initial 105 lines of Nestor's speech to Patroklos (11.656-761) describe the desperation of the crippled Greek contingent, but comprises thereafter a day-dream of Nestor, with the familiar theme: what he could do for the situation, were he young again. At 762, Nestor returns to Achilles, whom he mentioned in 656-7, asking Patroklos rhetorically why Achilles should now care at all about the difficulties of the Achaeans, since he has done so little to stave off this misery. Nestor warns Patroklos that Achilles will be very sorry if his stubbornness wrecks the expedition

(763-4). Then Nestor confronts Patroklos directly (765-6). Not only does he later review the instructions which Menoitios gave Patroklos on enlisting him with Agamemnon's expedition (786-9); Nestor first recalls in detail the scene which was played out in Phthia on Nestor's visit (765f.). When he and Odysseus arrived, on a mission to collect the Achaean forces, they found "hero Menoitios", with Patroklos and Achilles, in the home of Peleus. Nestor focuses first on Peleus, who was engaged in sacrifice; the "old hero" (gerōn hippēlata Pēleus - 11.772) sacrificed to Zeus. Then Nestor carefully distinguishes the participants in the work of the sacrifice (sphōi - 776) from himself and Odysseus (nōi - 776), who are standing in the antechamber as the portions are cut. Nestor makes his point in these three lines, which must be compared with three lines from the beginning of this scene:

(777-779)

στῆμεν ἐνὶ προθύροισι· ταφὼν δ' ἀνόρουσεν Ἀχιλλεύς,
ἐς δ' ἄγε χειρὸς ἑλών, κατὰ δ' ἑδριάασθαι ἄνωγε,
ξείνιά τ' εὖ παρέθηκεν, ἃ τε ξείνοις θέμις ἐστίν.

"Silently Achilles rose up, led us in by the hand, and bid us sit down. He provided for everything which guests are entitled to."

(645-7)

τὸν δὲ ἰδὼν ὁ γεραιὸς ἀπὸ θρόνου ὦρτο φαεινοῦ,
ἐς δ' ἄγε χειρὸς ἑλών, κατὰ δ' ἑδριάασθαι ἄνωγε.
Πάτροκλος δ' ἑτέρωθεν ἀναίνετο εἶπέ τε μῦθον·

"When the old man saw him, he arose from the shining chair, took him by the hand and bid him sit down. Patroklos held off from him and shook his head "no", explaining ..."

Achilles performs the proper ceremony of guest-reception in Nestor's

pointed remembrance, whereas the same efforts by Nestor just minutes earlier had been curtly declined by Patroklos.[8] Patroklos blamed his impolite haste on Achilles' severity (648f.), but this is more to Nestor's point. That Patroklos ought to be Achilles' better counsel is neatly re-emphasized in Nestor's implicit comparison of Achilles' civility then, and the rudeness of Patroklos just now, who has allowed himself to be drawn within the threatening self-centeredness of Achilles.[8]

Another point is raised at a more obvious level; the two injunctions of Peleus and Menoitios to their sons are stated side by side. Menoitios' has been unrealized, Nestor shows. But what about Peleus'?

(783-4) Πηλεὺς μὲν ᾧ παιδὶ γέρων ἐπέτελλ' Ἀχιλῆϊ·
αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων·

"Old man Peleus enjoined on his son, Achilles, always to act nobly and to be pre-eminent among others."

This is the typical tall order of the heroic father's expectations for his offspring (cf. 6.208). According to Nestor, Peleus and Menoitios were both extremely eager for their sons to participate in the Trojan expedition. Peleus enjoined Achilles "to be aristos and to be superior to others". This, it might be argued, is precisely what Achilles is fulfilling by his obduracy. The recent reversal has shown the inferiority of the Achaeans without Achilles, and he is thus demonstrating his superiority conspicuously. However, the phrase given to Peleus in 784 is conventional, and in fact implies in aristos a

social function and in hypeirochon a visibility among those others by whose recognition one's excellence is meaningfully recorded. So that Achilles does indeed ignore the wish that Nestor attributes to Peleus here. But, does that report faithfully Peleus' hopes for his son? More important, do those hopes confront Achilles anywhere else in the Iliad, in anything like the same guise, i.e., as significant exhortations of his father?

Odysseus attempts to persuade Achilles in the opening speech of the embassy in book 9 with the same claim of recollecting Peleus' wishes. Odysseus' message is more explicit than the generality which Nestor recalls; and, as one expects from the purposeful Odysseus, it is keyed to Achilles' recent behavior and the new directon toward which Odysseus hopes to urge him. Odysseus recalls Peleus' admonitions about Achilles' prideful nature, and the father's advocacy of philophrosynē. The last two lines quoted from Peleus embody the social philosophy which concerns Nestor also:

(9.257-8)

> *ληγέμεναι ὸ' ἔριδος κακομηχάνου, ὄφρα σε μᾶλλον*
> *τίωσ' 'Αργείων ἠμὲν νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες.'*

"Let go of ill-contriving strife, so that instead the Argives, both young and old, will award you with honor."

Timē is the goal which Peleus sets for Achilles. Yet, Achilles tries to protect his timē by withdrawing from the sphere controlled by the accursed Agamemnon, in which no one's share is truly secure. Achilles repudiates the gifts mentioned by Odysseus; in fact he rejects altogether the notion of reconciliation with anything remotely

connected with Agamemnon.

Odysseus' mention of Peleus seems to reverberate in Achilles' formulation of an alternative to remaining at Troy, however. In rejecting Agamemnon's offer of marriage to one of his daughters, Achilles asserts that Peleus will find him a good wife (394). Nor does he need the goods which come of making a match with the anax andrōn, or accompanying his expedition. He will enjoy, he asserts, a comfortable life with the estate Peleus has founded (400). Then, Achilles tells them the prophecy of his two fates, with the startling conclusion that he is fully willing to accept the alternative to staying in Troy: the loss of kleos (415). Nevertheless, this decision to leave despite the consequences soon is shown to have been composed in haste. The speeches which follow Achilles' frustrated rebuff of Odysseus circumvent the resolution to leave. Phoinix' speech recalls Peleus again, specifically his orders to make Achilles a warrior and a speaker (439-443). It has been objected, however, that Phoinix' speech, in its determination to persuade fully, distorts its own ends and makes a point which reflects badly on the effort of the embassy itself.[9] Meleager turned all entreaties away; that is how a hero acts. Unexpectedly, though, Phoinix' argument does seal the debate in Achilles' mind, where he had introduced for himself the notion of withdrawal in response to Odysseus' representations on the behalf of vile Agamemnon. What Phoinix recalls to Achilles -- indirectly -- is the nature of kleos, and its importance to the hero:

(524-5, 527-8) *οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν*
ἡρώων, ὅτε κέν τιν' ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἵκοι·
μέμνημαι τόδε ἔργον ἐγὼ πάλαι, οὔ τι νέον γε,
ὡς ἦν· ἐν δ' ὑμῖν ἐρέω πάντεσσι φίλοισι.

"Just so we have learned the deeds of kleos of men who lived before , and were heroes, even when swelling rage would come on one of them ... I recall a particular old-time event, it's not at all one from nowadays , how it was. I will tell it here since I care about all of you." . It does not come out well for Meleager in this story, from one perspective, But the outlines of the story shape the truer impression: Meleager withholds his strength from the city; he finally comes to its defense, yet too late for any reward. That loss is inconsequential. His greatness is re-inforced by the account of the dire need which his cholos created; the mythos is recounted because one man had such an impact on many others. Hence, Meleager's story rests in the stockpile of klea andrōn (524). It is well recognized that Achilles is engaged in something peculiar when the embassy arrives on the premises. He is delivering klea andrōn, accompanying himself on the lyre taken at Thebe (186-89). This scene echoes Peleus' entertainment of Nestor with accounts of the race and offspring of all the Argives. The same preoccupation shows in each case. Father and son are equally deeply involved in the heroic community, in its most fervent aspiration, the continued existence in song after physical death.

Achilles is caught up in his anger even in promising to leave the beachhead at Troy, and recommending the others come soon after. He cannot seriously embrace the choice of heroic extinction, as he explicitly identifies the choice of life renewed in Phthia with Peleus over against his impending doom at Troy. Achilles' knowledge of these

alternatives sharpens as he undergoes the tragic experience of the final two-thirds of the poem. The inevitability of the choice which we claim has been made by Achilles, at whatever stage of consciousness, in book 9, becomes more and more acceptable to him as he assimilates the loss of Patroklos. It is not simply a case of Achilles' seeing life as contemptible without the close friend Patroklos. His choice involves a deliberation on the aftermath of the events of book 16, and in this deliberation father Peleus exhibits some importance.

To appreciate the part Peleus plays in Achilles' suffering and learning, we must study the means by which the poet brings Achilles into contact with his absent father. There are certain things Achilles has by him at Troy which constitute an inheritance from Peleus. Three possessions surface in the action of books 16-22 - the great spear of Peleus, the divine horses given to Peleus by Poseidon, and the armor Patroklos loses to Hektor. In 21.184f., moreover, Achilles handles a further, though intangible "possession": the genealogy which Peleus and he share. Finally, Peleus' vow to Sperchios is re-directed by Achilles in light of new experience and a new determination of his personal destiny. At the point Achilles comes to evaluate his own relationship with his father Peleus, sitting in the tent with Priam, we must be equipped to evaluate what pains the poet has taken to depict Achilles' relation to his father, and the relevance of that character, who exists in the poem only by name, to the chief actor of the tragedy.

Achilles' spear and armor are inherited from Peleus. The spear shows up five times in the poem, always with the adjectival Pēlias (Ebeling, s.v.: "quae de Pelio monte est"), and all between the arming

of Patroklos and the death of Hektor, books 16 through 22. Peleus received it as a wedding gift from the gods.[10] The gods were present at the wedding of one of their number to the hero, Peleus. as Hera reminds them (24.62). The spear is reminiscent then of the special favor of the gods toward Peleus; this is Achilles' legacy from his father[11] (141-2):

> βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν· τὸ μὲν οὐ δύνατ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν
> πάλλειν, ἀλλά μιν οἷος ἐπίστατο πῆλαι Ἀχιλλεύς,

"No one of the Achaeans was able to wield it, but only Achilles was capable of using it." Pallō in the aorist-infinitive and the name of Peleus provide word-play, as Leaf notes, through paronomasia. By receiving such a distinguished present, Achilles is made distinct, since its use singles him out; and by its very use he recapitulates his father, who obviously was able to wield it, too, which the poet reinforces in Pēlai/Pēleus. Part of the connection between Peleus and Achilles is withheld from Patroklos, who cannot wield the spear which is Achilles'. Patroklos does take the paternal armor, and loses it, just as he himself is lost. We should keep in mind that this represents the deprivation of two paternal attachments, not one. Patroklos' reception with Peleus, like that of Phoinix and Epeigeus, reveals another aspect of the presence of Achilles' Pelean-past, which thus exerts its influence here and throughout the poem.

Thetis restores the loss of armor by importuning another god; she wins a favor from Hephaistos in much the same way she obtained the favor of the Dios boulē. The promise of Zeus did not entail Achilles' eventual abandonment of heroic action, however. Instead, it implied

the opposite, that Achilles would be given the supreme opportunity of showing his aretē. Zeus knew the sacrifice involved, but was not required to share all information with the hero he is "favoring". Both his parents -- the mortal one and the divine one -- provide support of his heroic activity. Achilles declines these prerogatives. In this way, Patroklos dies as a surrogate, since Achilles had allowed the special parental dispensations to lie unused. When he feels he must enter the sphere of heroic action again, he takes both the new armor from Thetis and the huge spear of Peleus. There never was any dichotomy in the direction he received from his parentage before Patroklos' death.

Achilles could not detect in the patrimony and the bequest of his mother any discrepancy, nor between the heroic fame of his father Peleus and the fact that his father is, after all, merely mortal. Achilles' complaint concerning the Achaeans was based only on the unreliability of the awards system (yet cf. 9.406-9). Patroklos' death, however, changes everything. Patroklos enters the combat surrounded by the parental objects of Achilles, those which were Peleus' own, or divine wedding-gifts, or the present of Thetis to her son. Patroklos' death applies a key, as it were, to these possessions to turn them toward their true meaning.[12] In the special circumstances of Patroklos' mission and his failure to survive it, the divine armor and the divine horses show up with unbearable certainty the disjunction of mortal and immortal, which Achilles had never confronted while all along it resided in the fundamental nature of his birth.

The Achaeans are winning as mid-day comes, on the day of Patroklos'

death (777-80), and he is likewise bringing massive destruction on the Trojans. At such a high point, Patroklos is daimoni isos (786). At precisely this time, he is ripe for the assault of Apollo. Patroklos loses everything in a mere thirteen lines. In 789-792, Apollo positions himself for the attack on Patroklos. The following passage describes the stripping of all defenses from Patroklos, i.e., the loss of the armor, from helmet (793-800) to spear and body shield (801-803) finally to the breast-plate (804). Clearly, the most significant part is the loss of the helmet. Apollo begins with the crucial defensive attribute, and with the most human and most vulnerable area of the body, then eliminates the remaining armor, leaving Patroklos gymnos, noted a few lines later (815). The chief effect registered in the passage however is Patroklos' disorientation and sudden lack of comprehension, given in 805: ton d' atē phrenas heile, lythen d' hypo phaidima gyia, /stē de taphōn. He is dumb-struck, paralyzed, and cannot cry out. Like Apollo's blows, the first weapon to draw blood arrives from behind (791=806). Patroklos is overcome, as the end of book 16 carefully develops, in a cruelly orchestrated rear-attack.

The helmet is struck from his head, and topples underneath the feet of the horses, where the horse-hair of the crest is "soiled with blood and dust". The spoiling of Achilles' helmet is called ou themis; so long as he wore it, it did not undergo such dishonor, for he is theios anēr. The helmet is the first item mentioned, and its loss is treated by the poet as the most horrendous detail of the action. The headgear marked divine power, never meant to mingle with blood or the elements -- blood which reeks from dying creatures and the dust which

covers them -- nor to undergo the human processes of defeat and debasement. Patroklos' significance is reflected in the abuse of the head-piece; the shock of his death transfers to the helmet's unseemly roll.[13]

The notion of ou themis permeates the passage of Patroklos' death. The idea is further impressed in the use of miainō[14] to intensify the description of the disfigurement of the horse-hair plume. The physical despoiling has another worse "metaphysical" disfigurement underlying it. Mortality has been introduced to things immortal. The motif returns in the middle of book 17. As the fight for the corpse quickens, the horses of Achilles are suddenly noted on the side of the battle. They are engaged in the first of those actions by which they are personified in this portion of the Iliad. The horses mourn because they have just now noticed that Patroklos is fallen. Automedon does his best to begin them moving, but they are "still as death": (17.434-436)

> ἀλλ' ὥς τε στήλη μένει ἔμπεδον, ἥ τ' ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
> ἀνέρος ἐστήκῃ τεθνηότος ἠὲ γυναικός,
> ὡς μένον ἀσφαλέως περικαλλέα δίφρον ἔχοντες,

"But as a grave-stele remains in place, which stands on the mound of a man or woman who is dead, so they remained and held the chariot back motionless."

As much as the image suits the tone of gathering gloom which shall break upon Achilles in the next book, it in no way is befitting these immortal animals. The outcome of their grief is tears, and these tears pour down from beneath their lids, for they desire their lost driver

(438-9): "Their manes were soiled (emaineto)." The manes of these immortal horses are soiled with tears. The juncture of mortal and immortal again produces the unseemly, despoiling tears and the disfigurement of grief.[15] The scene would remain one of elevated pathos, if it did not draw the comment of Zeus, who makes an explicit association:

(443-5)

" ἆ δειλώ, τί σφῶϊ δόμεν Πηλῆϊ ἄνακτι
θνητῷ, ὑμεῖς δ' ἐστὸν ἀγήρω τ' ἀθανάτω τε;
ἦ ἵνα δυστήνοισι μετ' ἀνδράσιν ἄλγε' ἔχητον;

"Wretched creatures , why did we give you to lord Peleus, a mortal, whereas you are unaging and undying? So you might share the griefs of men, whose lot is hard?"

Nothing immortal ought to be subjected to mortals, for mortality is suffering, which is inapprpriate to the immortal. Juxtapostion of deathless and the given-to-death eventually accentuates a chasm which emotional attachments forgetfully bridge over.

The horses have already emblemized the situation with Achilles and Patroklos in a previous sequence, moreover. At the end of the arming-sequence in book 16, Automedon yokes the team to the chariot. These are exceptional horses, noted at 2.770 and referred to by Achilles himself boastingly at 23.275f., and special interest is taken in their divine origin, of course (16.150-1). Something noteworthy intrudes at 152; an additional "trace-horse" is harnessed with the team, Pedasos

(153-4) *τόν ῥά ποτ' Ἱπποτίωνος ἑλὼν πόλιν ἦγαγ' Ἀχιλλεύς,*
ὃς καὶ θνητὸς ἐὼν ἕπετ' ἵπποις ἀθανάτοισι.

"... whom Achilles led off, when he sacked the city of Eetion; who, even though he was mortal, drove with the immortal horses." kai thnētos registers mild surprise that mortal is collocated with immortal. The fate of Pedasos is not wholly unexpected, then, with this foreshadowing. Like Nestor's in book 8, the only other Homeric trace-horse, this horse is killed -- here by Sarpedon's overthrown spear (467-9). The divine horses are stymied, not from any reaction on their part to the death of this yoke mate; the dead animal has simply fouled the contrivance. The yoke groans as the cart halts, and the reins snarl: ... epei dē keito pareoros en koniēsi ("since the trace-horse lay in the dust"). The death of the added mortal element (which, like many a hero in the poem, falls into the dust) produces an unseemly and paralytic effect on the fighting efficiency of the immortal team. Automedon dissolves the improper union, cutting the dead horse loose in a swift stroke (474).

This horse did not lack its own peculiar significance. The animal was part of the spoils taken at Thebe -- Eetion's town, once again. (More of the booty is mentioned at 9.188 (lyre) and 23.826f. (shot-put).) These possessions indicate the kleos Achilles has won for himself, and stand against those presents which Achilles bears from his parents: the spear, armor, and magical team from Peleus, and the chest from Thetis, out of which Achilles takes the unique cup for Zeus' offerings in 16.221f. The death of the trace-horse then creates more than an emblem of the separation of Achilles and Patroklos, since the symbolism includes Achilles' relation to his patrimony. Pedasos is

Achilles' own possession, a product of his own drive for kleos; the object is part of the insurance of his heroic immortality, yet ironically it intimates mortality by its function in the narrative. the innovation of the trace-horse in this scene reveals symbolically Patroklos' true relation to the whole enterprise. The armor does not protect Patroklos. It is taken from him by divinity; before the first blow is landed, Patroklos returns to his proper form;[16] though for his unconscious pretensions he must fall actually below his true form, and become naked in battle.[17] The divine gifts of Peleus preserve their essential integrity; the products of Achilles' kleos, on the other hand, are shown to be heavy with mortality. Side by side, the contrast of the paternal objects and Achilles' own in this case push Achilles' acceptance of the mortality for which kleos is payment.

The loss of these arms, however, leads to the acquisition of arms which are no less divine, but which are this time Achilles' own. Achilles puts the new handiwork of Hephaistos on in a second "arming sequence" which is the pointed correlative of Patroklos' arming early in book 16. Achilles seemingly enters a new stage, counterpointing in his movements those which culminated in the death of Patroklos. He has been given his own immortal arms, to replace those of his father. However, this arming-sequence ends in the yoking of the team, as did the previous one. These horses disarm Achilles, as it were, as the symbolism of the trace-horse prefigured Patroklos' death. Achilles first reproaches them for an imputed fault in his friend's death. Their answer, however, is truer than Achilles' accusations. They will save Achilles in this coming combat, for they are swift enough; but

just as Patroklos died by Apollo's determination, so Achilles is meant to die by the god. The lines with which Achilles turns away these unsuitable words are nearly those of Hektor to Patroklos at the end of book 16, when Hektor is told he will fall to Achilles. Whereas Hektor denies, Achilles says oude ti se chrē (420) "You are not the one [to tell me this]". Achilles has absorbed a lesson from the function of his paternal objects, that the means of heroic conduct elevate and bring low; which the last words of these horses need or not reiterate.

So far we have dealt with the poet's use of certain paternal objects of Achilles to supplement the narrative in the crucial books including and after Patroklos' death. In books 20 and 21, Achilles handles the genealogy directly, as a thing in itself, a concretion of mythoi about his ancestors dealing most specifically with himself and his father. We must first examine those passages in which Achilles manipulates this past, discover how and why he does so, then move through to the end of the poem in order to see what direction his feelings about his place in the Aeacid line and for his father have taken.

First, however, it is necessary to note how conditions have changed from those in the earlier books of the Iliad, i.e., those in which Diomedes tests and develops the matter of his own genealogy. Diomedes' efforts were directed at establishing his own identity as a hero for the others at Troy - for he willingly accepts a subservient role (4.370ff.), which Achilles rejects to begin with in the first book - and in relation to the gods. Such demarcations do not occupy Achilles; hence his inquiry pushes deeper. The others have already

acknowledged his superior status by desperate supplication; Achilles fears no enemy, as well. Achilles does not need to ponder which god to turn to, nor does he need the stand-by assistance which Athena gave Diomedes. When Achilles has challenged the river Xanthus, and is reeling in the river's surf, he prays immediately and directly to Zeus:[18]

(21.273-4)

> "Ζεῦ πάτερ, ὡς οὔ τίς με θεῶν ἐλεεινὸν ὑπέστη
> ἐκ ποταμοῖο σαῶσαι· ἔπειτα δὲ καί τι πάθοιμι.

"Father Zeus, now no god has promised to save my pitiful body from the river; I may die."

Poseidon responds with this assurance:

(288-90)

> "Πηλεΐδη, μήτ' ἄρ τι λίην τρέε μήτε τι τάρβει·
> τοίω γάρ τοι νῶϊ θεῶν ἐπιταρρόθω εἰμέν,
> Ζηνὸς ἐπαινήσαντος, ἐγὼ καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη·

"Son of Peleus, do not tremble so much, or be afraid; such are we, your support among the gods, I and Pallas Athena, with Zeus urging us."

Despite earlier attempts by Nestor (7.124f.; 11.769f.) and Odysseus (9.252f.) to craft a "Peleus-paradigm", and thus to gain influence over Achilles, he has a clear picture of who Peleus was and is, and no need to fashion a paradigm, or to criticize any presented to him, from the versions of many mouths. We shall see at the end that Achilles' assessment of his father, and of the divine favor of his line, will have been shaped not by others' recreations of Peleus, but by Achilles' own reflections upon him; these reflections grow from his experiences

in book 16 and beyond, which are partly conditioned too by handling the paternal objects.

At the start of 20, the gods take positions about Troy, precisely because Achilles poses such a threat; Zeus fears that Troy may fall "before its time" under Achilles' onslaught. But, the gods are soon opposed to one another around Troy: this is what eris makes of Zeus' plan for them to watch the goings-on in order to slow Achilles' progress.

Achilles is ready to kill Hektor. What he finds on the battle-field is not Hektor, but Aineias. Aineias has been impelled by Apollo, despite Aineias' sensible reservations over facing Achilles after their encounter at Lyrnessos and Pedasos. There, on Mt. Ida, Aineias fled Achilles, saved only by the quick sprint which Zeus enabled. Apollo overcomes this hesitance with genealogical encouragement:

"Hero, why don't you go ahead too and make a claim on the immortal gods! They also say that you are born of Aphrodite, daughter of Zeus, and that one (Achilles) is of a lesser goddess. Aphrodite is Zeus' daughter, but Thetis is from the old man of the sea. Take your durable bronze straight out there; do not let him fend you off with abusive talk and cursing."

Apollo has misrepresented the case to Aineias, as Poseidon later explains to the hero after the near-fatal encounter:(332-6) "Aineias, who of the gods orders you to act so foolishly and to fight the overbearing son of Peleus, who is both more powerful than you and dearer to the gods? Withdraw, whenever you come upon him, so that you

don't die too soon."

Despite all this, Aineias' genealogy was not irrelevant to what goes on here, nor was Apollo being insincere in urging him on. Indeed, Hera is very upset that Apollo and Aineias will overcome Achilles; she insists that Poseidon, Athena, and herself, go to Achilles, to reinforce within him the knowledge of his special auspices:

(127-131)

> ὕστερον αὖτε τὰ πείσεται ἄσσα οἱ Αἶσα
> γιγνομένῳ ἐπένησε λίνῳ, ὅτε μιν τέκε μήτηρ.
> εἰ δ' Ἀχιλεὺς οὐ ταῦτα θεῶν ἐκ πεύσεται ὀμφῆς,
> δείσετ' ἔπειθ', ὅτε κέν τις ἐναντίβιον θεὸς ἔλθῃ
> ἐν πολέμῳ· χαλεποὶ δὲ θεοὶ φαίνεσθαι ἐναργεῖς."

"Later he will believe what Fate assigned with her thread, when his mother bore him. If Achilles doesn't learn this now directly from the voice of the gods, he will panic whenever any god opposes him in battle."

Poseidon restrains her from direct interference, but recommends that they approach the field. In fact, Poseidon is forced to intervene, but not as Hera had anticipated. At 290, Achilles is about to unstring Aineias with his sword. Poseidon alerts the gods; Aineias, "persuaded like a fool by the arguments of Apollo" (295-6) is about to die at Achilles' hands. This cannot happen. Aineias' race is destined to supplant Priam's: more exactly, the race of Dardanos, Zeus' favorite son (303-4) must survive, and since Priam's line is out of favor (306), Aineias represents the sole surviving means to the divinely desired end. Aineias has just given us the whole picture, sketching

the history of the Dardanidai, from lines 215-240.[19] We are thus enabled to follow Poseidon's references.

Poseidon saves Aineias. Achilles' reaction follows from his ignorance of the true situation; he thinks Aineias has proven the favor of the gods. In a way, Aineias has proven his euchos, as Achilles had hoped he could not (348). Aineias' genealogizing is confirmed in Poseidon's rationale for direct divine intervention. Yet, the aim of kleos for both him and Achilles is obviated, at least in the narrow terms of the present encounter.

On both ends of the mythos on his race, Aineias denigrates such mythoi:

(20.200-202)

> *" Πηλεΐδη, μη δὴ ἐπέεσσί με νηπύτιον ὡς*
> *ἔλπεο δειδίξεσθαι, ἐπεὶ σάφα οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς*
> *ἠμὲν κερτομίας ἠδ' αἴσυλα μυθήσασθαι.*

"Son of Peleus, don't expect me to panic at what you say, like a childish little fool; for I myself know how to put together insults and threatening speeches."

(244-256)

> *ἀλλ' ἄγε μηκέτι ταῦτα λεγώμεθα νηπύτιοι ὥς,*
> *ἑσταότ' ἐν μέσσῃ ὑσμίνῃ δηϊοτῆτος.*
> *ἔστι γὰρ ἀμφοτέροισιν ὀνείδεα μυθήσασθαι*
> *πολλὰ μάλ', οὐδ' ἂν νηῦς ἑκατόζυγος ἄχθος ἄροιτο.*
> *στρεπτὴ δὲ γλῶσσ' ἐστὶ βροτῶν, πολέες δ' ἔνι μῦθοι*
> *παντοῖοι, ἐπέων δὲ πολὺς νομὸς ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα.*
> *ὁπποῖόν κ' εἴπῃσθα ἔπος, τοῖόν κ' ἐπακούσαις.*
> *ἀλλὰ τίη ἔριδας καὶ νείκεα νώϊν ἀνάγκῃ*
> *νεικεῖν ἀλλήλοισιν ἐναντίον, ὥς τε γυναῖκας,*
> *αἵ τε χολωσάμεναι ἔριδος πέρι θυμοβόροιο*
> *νεικεῦσ' ἀλλήλῃσι μέσην ἐς ἄγυιαν ἰοῦσαι,*
> *πόλλ' ἐτεά τε καὶ οὐκί· χόλος δέ τε καὶ τὰ κελεύει.*
> *ἀλκῆς δ' οὔ μ' ἐπέεσσιν ἀποτρέψεις μεμαῶτα*

"Come on, then, let's not speak like childish little fools any more, standing in the middle of the field of slaughter. We could both make up more than enough reproaches, more than a hundred-seat ship would hold. Men's tongues are versatile, and their stories are numerous enough, a great range of claims all around. Whatever claim you make, you might hear the same. But, why do we have to quarrel and be contentious, like women who get riled up over some passionate quarrel, and abuse each other right in the middle of the streets, truthfully and even with lies? Their anger gets the best of them. You won't keep me from fighting with any arguments ..."

(The first is echoed in Hektor's words at his first encounter with Achilles (431-33), and when he quiets the fear of Achilles in his troops (366-70).) Why the negation of "heroic" speechifying here? Actually, the refusal at the head of Aineias' speech (22.200-202) has one purpose, and the longer, developed image at the end -- with its pejorative tones -- another. In the first case, Aineias (or any warrior- as Hektor at 20.431-3) subverts the claims of the warrior confronting him, and cuts his opponent's speech off in order to make space for the proper effect of his own. The final belittling speech has a similar job of demarcation: it caps the foregoing mythos as complete, yet ready to be re-inflated once combat is complete, and the self-laudatory euchos can be implemented. The peroration at the end of Aineias' speech denigrates the use of mythoi, so that the time of

speaking and the time for fighting are sharply distinct;[20] also, after the brilliant simile of the women quarrelling, Achilles could not with any dignity hold off combat for a counter-attempt at speaking.[21]

The rhetorical engagements here in 20 are no less revealing of heroic psychology than we might expect. However, the action of the twentieth book is inconclusive for Achilles. He has gained nothing by fighting Aineias; Hektor has been held off from him as well. The gods are present, and supporting him, yet they retard his progress at the same time toward the revenge on Hektor.[22]

Book 21 is just as inconclusive regarding the revenge which Achilles desires. Yet, in his transformation from a warrior of gathering menos into a daimonic force, book twenty-one carries Achilles into that altered state in which he can kill Hektor and enact brutality on the helpless corpse. In book 20, Achilles' pursuit of combat is as "rational" as any combat in the rest of the poem. After the disappearance of Aineias, at line 354ff., Achilles urges on his army; his exhortation closes conventionally:(20.362-3). Hektor appears to urge on the other side, then backs off at Apollo's behest. Achilles attacks the line, killing Iphition, of whom Homer says:
(20.383-5)

> ἐσθλὸν Ὀτρυντείδην, πολέων ἡγήτορα λαῶν,
> ὃν νύμφη τέκε νηὶς Ὀτρυντῆϊ πτολιπόρθῳ
> Τμώλῳ ὕπο νιφόεντι, Ὕδης ἐν πίονι δήμῳ·

"The fine son of Otrynteus, leader of a numerous army, whom the naiad bore to Otrynteus, city-sacker, beneath snowy Tmolus, in the rich land of Hyda."

When Iphition falls, Achilles comes over the body, and creates an euchos:[23]

(389-92)

> "κεῖσαι, Ὀτρυντεῖδη, πάντων ἐκπαγλότατ' ἀνδρῶν·
> ἐνθάδε τοι θάνατος, γενεὴ δέ τοί ἐστ' ἐπὶ λίμνῃ
> Γυγαίῃ, ὅθι τοι τέμενος πατρώϊόν ἐστιν,
> Ὕλλῳ ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντι καὶ Ἕρμῳ δινήεντι."

"Lie here, son of Otrynteus, fiercest hero; here you die, although your race dwells on the Gygaean lake, where the ancestral land is, on the Hyllos, full of fish, and the Hermos, full of eddies."

What is unusual in this "euchos": nothing herein directly glorifies Achilles. The four lines of Achilles supplement the poet's with little redundance, which is the interesting part of this passage. Why such information as the location of the father's temenos, connected with Iphition's geneē? Patroios, of course, does not mean "of his father", nor does geneē simply mean "birthplace". The expressions deliver much more strongly the whole identity of the warrior whose contribution to his heroic genos has finished with death in this place, away from the nurturing homeland.[24] In one sense, this euchos shows Achilles' passion for control of the detail (biographical and historical) of heroic life, of the means to kleos, and in this he is the true son of Nestor's Peleus in book 8. Achilles is every bit the potential recorder of the significant data of his professional milieu; even now, with Hektor's pursuit an all-consuming passion, this penchant is not useless to him. Achilles enlarges upon his achievement by increasing the reputation -- through pathos[25] -- of the man who has just become

his victim. But, we might also reflect: the outlines of Iphition's fate match the predestiny of Achilles at Troy, as they match the loss of Patroklos. Achilles is absorbed in the distance imposed between birth and death, between generation and nurture (and their props), and the hard closure of "heroic" destiny. The change has begun in Achilles toward a passion for death, which Patroklos' prompted.

Hektor appears and disappears, and the frenzy of killing begins which continues into book 21, with the earth running dark with blood (20.494), then the stream of Skamander full of men and horses (21.15); Achilles forsakes spear and draws his sword for close work - the water ruddies with blood (21.21). As gory as are other scenes in the Iliad, the plunge into Skamander represents a new height of slaughter.[26] Achilles is daimoni isos (21.18); his murderous activity passes beyond bounds when he pursues the Paionian host (21.205), so that the river attempts to stop him. Nature is provoked to halt Achilles; he has upset a balance, Since these terms draw us away from the text of the Greek poem, however, let us be careful to produce a more precise description of what is taking place here.

After the twelve Trojan youths are captured alive from the river for sacrifice, Achilles meets Lykaon, a son of Priam; he had been captured before, sold by Achilles, and escaped. Achilles can hardly believe the sight when Lykaon comes before him:(21.55-56)

> *ἦ μάλα δὴ Τρῶες μεγαλήτορες, οὕς περ ἔπεφνον,*
> *αὖτις ἀναστήσονται ὑπὸ ζόφου ἠερόεντος,*

"Shall all the Trojans I've killed rise up again from the dark gloom?" As Redfield remarks, there is a macabre humor in Achilles'

reflections:[27]
(60-63)

> ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ καὶ δουρὸς ἀκωκῆς ἡμετέροιο
> γεύσεται, ὄφρα ἴδωμαι ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἠδὲ δαείω
> ἢ ἄρ' ὁμῶς καὶ κεῖθεν ἐλεύσεται, ἦ μιν ἐρύξει
> γῆ φυσίζοος, ἥ τε κατὰ κρατερόν περ ἐρύκει."

"No, let's have him taste my spear-point again, so I can see for myself and know for certain whether he will then come up from there again anyway, or the life-giving earth will hamper him, that earth which holds down a truly mighty one."

The brutality of combat is coyly termed 'tasting the spearpoint"; the experiment as to whether the man struck down will again reappear or earth will forever smother him is malicious mirth. (The humor barely veils Achilles' angry grief as the allusion to Patroklos (63) shows.) Lykaon recognizes the irony of his situation; he does not create any humor from the circumstances, but aims at pathos, calling his lot moir' oloē (83). Lykaon then tries to strengthen through genealogical information (21.85-9) the point that he and Hektor are not homogastrios; he may be passed over as insignificant and unessential in Achilles' designs for Hektor.

Lykaon misses Achilles' mood, nor understands the perplexity of emotions which cohere with Achilles' need to kill Patroklos' killer. Avenging Patroklos is but a secondary motive. Achilles has become aware of a larger complex of death and attainment, which has set his course by taking his companion and teaching him at the same time the unremovable prospect of his own end. Achilles has become an expert

dispenser of death, not simply in being its executioner, but its chief advocate in the case of each succeeding victim:(99-110)

"Fool, don't claim you can be ransomed -- don't even speak. Before Patroklos came upon his fatal day, I used to spare Trojans, and I took many alive to sell them. Now no one escapes, whomever the god here before Troy puts in my hands, any Trojan, but especially Priam's sons. So, my friend, you die too. Why must you cry like this? Even Patroklos is dead, who was much better than you. Don't you see how beautiful and strong I am? I am of a good father, and a divine-mother bore me. Even so, death and an overpowering fate are in store for me as well."

The death of Patroklos will be answered, especially by the offspring of Priam, but this makes only the first half of Lykaon's lesson.[28] The second comes in the jarringly intimate death-sentence:(21.106) So, my friend, you die too.

Patroklos died, says Achilles, who was better than you. And look at me: of a good father; a divine-mother bore me.

(21.110) Even so, death and an overpowering strict fate are in store for me as well.

To Lykaon's complaint moir' oloē Achilles suggests his own moira krataiē, withholding sympathy. Even he, Achilles, must die. After killing Lykaon, Achilles' euchos takes delight in the processes of decay which the fish shall speed on the corpse. Achilles then turns his speech to the other Trojan allies, whom he will pursue, and destroy, obliterating the efforts put forth in their sacrifices to the river. Now the delight is in instructing these men how death overturns

the normal expectations of life.

In the final scene preceding the confrontation of Achilles with the river, the foe is now Asteropaios, whom Homer identifies through genealogical narrative. Asteropaios is son of Pelegonos, himself son of the river Axios and of the oldest daughter of Akessamenos, Periboia. Asteropaios is infused with menos by Xanthos (21.145-6). This patronage is well-justified in the foregoing genealogical references concerning Asteropaios' river-origins.

Achilles comes up to Asteropaios, and suddenly shows a curiosity for his background. Asteropaios answers with little of the rhetorical trumpery we ascribed to Aineias in the preceding book. Simply, he is of the geneē of Axios, whose stream is most impressive on earth, who bore Pelegonos, who bore the hero himself. "Now let us fight, Achilles", says he. The fight then turns on a pathetic and revealing moment. Asteropaios, who is ambidextrous, hurls twice without killing Achilles. Achilles, brandishing the Pēlias meliē, overshoots Asteropaios, and the weapon sticks in the river bank . Three times Asteropaios struggles with the shaft; just as he about to pull it free or break it off, Achilles cuts him open at the navel with his sword, disembowelling him over the ground. Another euchos is spoken over the dead body to explain to the lifeless Asteropaios why Achilles killed him too, despite his powerful genealogy. The decisive difference, as Achilles sees it, arises from consideration of Achilles own genealogy, which Achilles relates succinctly, for a first and last time. He traces himself to Zeus, as his father was Peleus Aiakides, and Aiakos was son of Zeus. The point is that the descent from Zeus is more

potent than river-descent, even if water represents a mighty element. Achilles' assertion of the superiority of his background will be upheld in the outcome of the next scene: Hephaistos' rescue of Achilles in the fight with Xanthos.[29]

The situation in the final two books before Hektor's death is this: Achilles is presented with genealogical material from two central victims in 21, and from Aineias in 20. Aineias' predicament does not evoke any reflection from Achilles on his own family, though it does warn us that Priam's line is doomed, and so too Hektor -- as the one most responsible for the defense of Priam's prosperity and hegemony, hence too the one exposed to rapacious assaults on the wealthy town. Against the two in book 21, however, Achilles shows consistency toward the uses of genealogy in this way: the sort of expectations which they generate and seek to foster are wasted effort. Death is the outcome of heroic life. One either realizes that this alone is dependable, and forsakes the illusive reward of gifts,[30] for example; or one ignores it, and dies ignorantly. Thus, Achilles' taunting Lykaon with the hungry fish comes partly from exasperation with his wheedling pleas.

Achilles' exasperation also owes to the apparent realization that his own parentage -- unique as it is -- cannot save him from a mortal fate, from a swift one at that. Unlike Diomedes, who works conscientiously in the first half of the poem to build a respectable model of heroism from the scattered allusions to his father's career, as well as with what he had learned from grandfather Oineus, Achilles has everything at hand concerning his parental inheritance: Peleus had

sent him off with direct encouragements, which could only be manipulated to a small extent by others, and with much significantly storied equipment, i.e., the divine weapons which already have heroic associations. (Thetis makes personal appearances in the poem, moreover, and upholds her generosity to her son by the intercession with Zeus.) All this "inheritance" seems patent, until the disaster of Patroklos. At that moment, Achilles starts to understand the perversity of the union of Peleus and Thetis, which he never perceived before. Once Achilles is compelled to say to his mother "if only you lived with the gods of the sea, and Peleus had married a mortal!" (18.86-7), then clearly he must reconsider his whole relation to the heroic father Peleus -- in a much more meaningful way, perhaps, than Diomedes considered Tydeus. In book 23, the body of Patroklos is covered with the severed locks of the hetairoi, who carry him in the middle of the large procession to the pyre. Achilles, it is noted, stands aloof[31] (23.134-7). Again, at lines 140-1, Achilles acts outside the attention of the others around Patroklos' bier. He offers a lock, but the significance of this bit of hair is extremely personal,[32] touching on more than Achilles' considerable grief over Patroklos. The chaitēn (lock of hair) is tēlethoōsan (in bloom, luxuriant). The lock has prior significance, moreover: it was dedicated to the Sperchios by Peleus, to be given when Achilles arrived back from Troy. As Achilles is about to explain this dedication, he looks out over the sea: his aside is addressed, after all, to the far-away waters of Sperchios. In the same gesture, Achilles looks to Phthia. The speech to the home-land river concerns a pledge which

Peleus made to the god: that Achilles would give the lock of hair, and a special hekatomb, when he returned from the expedition (144-148). The river has failed somehow to fulfill Peleus'prayer (149), for Achilles will never return home (150). The lock of hair will be dedicated to Patroklos here at his funeral.

The point of this monologue is on the one hand Achilles' profound attachment to Patroklos. On the other, Achilles "pretended" orientation toward home has been finally reversed. Peleus' vow refers to a time when Peleus himself determined the shape of Achilles' Trojan experience, and the decisions of his going and coming home. Now for the first and only time in the poem, Peleus is conceived in this role, and the time described is long past. Peleus' expectations are brought up before Achilles, as we have already said, in book 9, and before Patroklos in book 11. In no case did it bother Achilles that Peleus had expectations of him; he did not chafe against the imperative of his father to be the hero among heroes. It was Agamemnon's impositions he could not tolerate; these initiated his discontent with the heroic effort at Troy. In response to Odysseus' appropriation of the authority of father Peleus, Achilles recreated Peleus' role in the decision of Achilles, namely, that Peleus would welcome back his son and support his choice to leave the Achaean enterprise. Nevertheless, even then Achilles showed himself aware of the contradictory pull of his mother's report of the prophecy, spelling out the terms of his fate. Achilles' Peleus allowed him to accept a non-glorious mortal solution to his discomfort as opposed to the more difficult, more elevated terms which his mother's prophecy indicated. Achilles accepts

the second choice, indeed without a complete grasp of its outcome. The outcome makes itself known through a symbolism of elements of Achilles' heroic patrimony, which now in this perspective one knows could not have been employed properly at home in Phthia, but only in the press of events about Troy. The gifts of Peleus provide Achilles with an aura of heroism, as well as divinity and immortality; this atmosphere is entered by Patroklos, and he disappears within it. Without understanding the process involved until too late, Achilles finally feels that the combinations of mortal and immortal in the greatest heroic fates demand him to follow after Patroklos toward the same promise of extinction.

The lesson of extinction, of mortality, is taught by the immortal team and the trace-horse, and by the once divine armor, which a mortal has lost, and which must be supplanted by another gift of divinity. These are lessons in the central discrepancy of heroic attainment: men are awarded fame everlasting for death-too-soon; and Peleus was given an undying woman, despite his own mortality, for his "heroism", which the gods loved. Achilles' ultimate knowledge of mortality comes back to the dilemma of his origins: he is caught in the heroic trap -- to act as if the heroes' rewards are sufficient, that the gods' care is attainable and consistent; but he is also the unique product of a union of the favorite hero of the gods and a divine mother, Peleus and Thetis. The illusions of heroism, which are its unreal expectations, fostered -- as Redfield would say -- to make it seem sensible to die, are compounded for Achilles; so is his eventual disappointment. How then does he recover from it?

When Priam supplicates Achilles in the last book of the Iliad, he asks for the body of his son. He begins with the injunction:

(24.486) "Remember your father, god-like Achilles."

Then a request of twenty lines follows, which does not, however, diminish the effectiveness of the appeal to Peleus:

(507) "Thus he spoke, and a need to cry out surged through Achilles, because of his father ..."

Both Achilles and Priam begin weeping, the latter over Hektor, and Achilles for his own father, and for Patroklos. Achilles' grief has been plentiful; now suddenly it no longer has its sole object in Patroklos, but primarily in Peleus. Achilles' speaks to Priam, and tries to convince him that the gods often put suffering on men. Even if a man is unusually fortunate, he cannot escape the inevitability of sorrow:

(534-542)

ὣς μὲν καὶ Πηλῆϊ θεοὶ δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα
ἐκ γενετῆς· πάντας γὰρ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἐκέκαστο
ὄλβῳ τε πλούτῳ τε, ἄνασσε δὲ Μυρμιδόνεσσι,
καί οἱ θνητῷ ἐόντι θεὰν ποίησαν ἄκοιτιν.
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ καὶ τῷ θῆκε θεὸς κακόν, ὅττι οἱ οὔ τι
παίδων ἐν μεγάροισι γονὴ γένετο κρειόντων,
ἀλλ' ἕνα παῖδα τέκεν παναώριον· οὐδέ νυ τόν γε
γηράσκοντα κομίζω, ἐπεὶ μάλα τηλόθι πάτρης
ἧμαι ἐνὶ Τροίῃ, σέ τε κήδων ἠδὲ σὰ τέκνα.

"Even so, the gods gave wonderful gifts to Peleus, as a birthright. He surpassed all men in good fortune and wealth, as ruler of the Myrmidons, and they married a goddess to him, even though he was just a mortal. Yet the gods sent bad luck, since there never came to be an

issue of mighty sons; all he bore was one son, short-lived. I will not be with him as he grows old, since I am here in Troy, far from my fatherland, making you grieve for your offspring."

Achilles knows the blessings of Peleus, has received and handled some part of the aglaa dōra himself; he has also experienced the power which emanates from his share of association with divinity. Yet, he knows now too the mortal part which haunts Peleus with ultimate failure. Achilles is so absorbed with the new awareness, his representations of it to Priam make himself into a very personification of the mortality from which Peleus cannot win his way. He is the failure of Peleus' gonē, in that he is a single male child, and not a long-lived one. The object of generation for every heroic father is to create another to bear the "things" accumulated, to represent and refine among the living the reputation of the father and of the others in their line. The passage of generations thus makes a semblance of immortality in replacing the perspective of one individual with the more continuous one of many generations (which makes Nestor, as Reinhardt calls him, Generationenwunder[33]). In this way men are not leaves, but through concatenation -- in our metaphor -- more like a whole, vital tree. The best in the line remain conspicuous to others yet to come. The existence of that line is ensured that much longer. Achilles never rejects the farsightedness of this vision, only an exclusive repose in its comforts. He holds together the tone of Glaukos' preamble in book six with the effort of heroic self-definition at which the rest of the speech aims, where Glaukos construed himself a significant member within the significant group. So Achilles most insistently joins

consciousness of heroic mortality with the better hopes of heroic mythoi.[34]

NOTES

1 See Benardete (1963) 15 for an insight into Agamemnon's choice of address.

2 Odysseus refers himself, however, to his son, Telemachos, at 2.260 and 4.354. Willcock's (1970) explanation is the same for both passages, and fairly bland: "Strong family attachment is one of the facets of this many-sided character, as may be seen in the Odyssey." (See p. 53,note on 2.260.) Leaf (1886) v. 1, pp.52-3, on the first citation, adduces anthroplogical testimony on the custom of bearing paedonymica; name-adoption by the parent from an eldest child provides "a polite description" rather than a "name", an honorific, that is. Leaf's comment on the second passage depends on the same analogy: "Here it is clearly impossible to give any appropriate reason for the introduction of Telemachos except as a title of honour."

Benardete (1963) presents Odysseus as an anomaly of heroic society, too old, too much an anthrōpos, to be quintessentially heroic, i.e., to die gloriously in battle while young and thus win glory evermore (see pp. 2, 4-5, 13-14). Evidence exists that the poem of the Iliad tolerates a contrary to this heroic ideal. Odysseus is unusual in that he identifies himself with his son. But, he is not dismissing his own greatness in that way; instead, he is supplementing his own achievements with the claim of having a superior-type son, i.e., one in

whom one would naturally take pride. Odysseus' intention with this unique claim is borne out in contextual analysis of the piece in book 4. Agamemnon "assaults" Menestheus and Odysseus for being slow to enter combat. He addresses Menestheus in dignified terms, despite the insult to come:(338) "O Son-of-Peteus the Zeus-fostered king", and Odysseus, with the opposite: "and you! surpassing in filthy tricks, greedy-bastard!" There is so much rudeness in the contrasted address to Odysseus, it seems that the entire rebuke is really spoken to him. Agamemnon is saying "You..." in the plural from 340 on, though; nevertheless, Odysseus is the one who responds, as his self-respect has been most obviously threatened. He does not respond with anything like: "You can't talk to me like that, you know who my father is?" Instead, he insists that Agamemnon will soon see him -- yes, the very father of Telemachos -- fighting in the fore-front, among the promachoisi.

He augments his claim to the heroic function with a reference to his son. Agamemnon then apologizes, addressing Odysseus with a full-line: two epithets + patronymic + personal name. Agamemnon takes Odysseus' lead, and validates the point as Odysseus wishes to make it. Odysseus celebrates himself through the accomplishemnt of siring an heroic son, just as Laertes' ability to produce another of heroic quality reflects well on him. Odysseus does not diminish his own glory referring to himself through his son, but increases its potential. (Nestor, who instructs Antilochos in horse-racing in 23, is a variation of the same theme.) This poses an alternative to the "singular heroism" of Sarpedon, and of Patroklos, and to an extent of Achilles -- who has no

son in the Iliad, yet asks after one in the Odyssey.

3 For the shifting significance of the sceptre in book 2, see Sale 1963, also Benardete 14-16. Nagy (1979) 179-80, 188-9, discusses the symbolism of Achilles and the skēptron in book 1. See also Griffin (1980) 9-12.

4 In his Childlike Achilles, W.T. MacCary launches a powerful argument for construing the character of Achilles in the narrowest light: i.e., as evidence of a recapitulation of certain infantile processes toward individuation, whose result he names "the Achilles complex". There is no space here for a discussion of the entire thesis. One corollary, however, strikes me as very much out of tune with the Homeric text. On "the poem's expressed attitude of the uselessness of old age and glory of death in youth" he states: ".. the linguistic aspect of this thematic structure is, of course, that young men act and old men talk. Achilles is notoriously better at the former than the latter and seems to prefer death in action to continued existence in language." First, to insist on the "uselessness of old age" in Homer is to do away with the ambivalence of the Nestor-figure altogether. There is no place then for his attempts to serve a normative function, in response to Achilles' challenge to Achaean "society"; of course, this interests MacCary not at all, since Achilles, by his design, has no true objective interests in any social norm, but in fact has developed pathologically through the very failure to invest anyone or anything external to himself with emotional importance. MacCary sees this abnormal ego-development in Achilles as due to an over-attention of his mother in the absence of father Peleus. MacCary can only sustain this

dimension of his analysis, therefore, by withholding the plentiful background treatment of Peleus in the Iliad, the significance of whom we are loathe to ignore. Furthermore, Achilles' being good at fighting, uninterested in speaking, must be either an empty cliche or simple carelessness. Aside from the discussion of this chapter, I would note a distinction made in the comments of Redfield (1975) 12-13. Although he terms Achilles a "great warrior, but less perfect in the arts of peace", he does not mean that Achilles is an imperfect speaker, or that he disdains rhetoric. Rather, Achilles suffers in a way from a unique clarity of vision, which is in fact the "source of his powerful rhetoric". The point is therefore that Acilles is an exceptional speaker, but on account of his passionate nature, no good as "a compromise politician". (Redfield, collaborating with P. Friedrich, has refined his notions of Achilles as speaker, in what has become a kind of sub-genre of Iliad-criticism: "the language of Achilles"; see Redfield and Friedrich in Language 54: 263-88 (1978), and a reply by G.M. Messing in Lang. 57: 888-900 (1981) for the latest controversy and a bibliography. Finally, Phoinix describes the attributes of the full-formed warrior in a well-known line: (9.443). The talent to fight, and to represent oneself as a fighter through language, must be learned by one generation largely from another elder. Achilles, though admittedly with a difference, is still no less involved in the relation and conflict of generations as it shows in the Iliad.

5 Benardete 12 remarks: "In Achilles' patronymic is summed part of his own greatness. He is partly the work of generations."

6 I agree with Nagy (1979) 330 that this passage in book seven is a

"fascinating narrative", but disagree that Nestor's biē is proven only if Ereuthalion is a man of biē, after the fashion of Areithoos, so to speak. Nagy's point of "the heroic attributes of wind and fire as conveyed by the themes of Areithoos and Ereuthalion respectively" is fitted with great linguistic talent and compositional skill within his argument on the incorporation of wind and fire in Achilles' biē in the Iliad. Such a reading of the passage in book seven does not impress me as the most accurate, however. (See the entire discussion at 328-333.)

7 As Griffin (1980) 97 implies, the interest of an Homeric hero in the typical Nestorian-narrative is like Homer's own inherent enjoyment of his own material, or (we assume) like his audience's enthrallment: "This status of being memorable and significant after death, the status which Homer's own characters have for him, is achieved by great deeds and great sufferings." Nestor's coup lies in his deft self-incorporation -- under the guise of a youthful persona -- within the stories he "preserves".

8 The ouk hedos-theme is discussed in its present role by Reinhardt (1961) 262. He compares Patroklos' refusal ("Das Loskommen wollen und nicht können.") with Hektor's to Helen (6.360). That scene is one of several refusals which make up Hektor's last day in Troy: cf. 6.264, also 6.486. A lighter application of the theme comes at 23.205f., with the refusal of delicate Iris.

9 Reinhardt (1961) 213 says, "In der Version des greisen Erziehers wird die Meleagersage der Situation der Presbeia fast bis zur Gefährdung ihres Sinnes angenähert." Ruth Scodel (1982) 128-136 offers a clever explanation of Phoinix' rhetorical aims in this speech,

specifically in his inclusion of an autobiographical section.

10 One must remember, the Wedding itself was a gift of the gods, the ultimate gift, no doubt.) According to 143-44, Cheiron "provided" it, having made it from an ash-tree on Mount Pelion. The reading tame is also recorded, however, for Cheiron's action, and a scholion provides a version of the incident (from the Kypria): Cheiron provided the raw material (the trunk or bough), Athena "finished" it, and Hephaistos affixed the bronze point. (See T.W. Allen, Homeri Opera V, pp. 118-19.)

11 Nagy (1979) 158-9, based on Shannon (1975), claims the spear is "an emblem of Achilles" which "re-affirms the hero's connection with his mortal father". Shannon's monograph includes an entire chapter on the Pēlias meliē, well worth reading, which stresses the equality of the gifts of Achilles' divine parent and mortal parent (i.e., that both the spear and the armor promote Achilles' "heroism");

The themes associated with the spear in the poem are summarized on pp. 84-5; one of the patterns to which these themes contribute is "ancestry ultimately derived from Zeus". The chapter also develops some interesting material on Indo-European mythological background for the ash-tree, connecting in Shannon's opinion with themes of generation and mortality.

12 Not only does Patroklos "take on" the paternal things in Achilles' place and offer a symbolic reflection of Achilles' own fate through his destruction in these particular trappings, but as D. Sinos (1980) 48 suggests, Patroklos in name and function "bodies forth" the compulsion of heroic ancestry within the poem: "His role enacts his name, and his

name is a key to the tradition which gives kleos to Achilles and marks the Iliad as the heroic present with an eternal past. Tradition is dependent on the continuation of ancestral values by their re-enactment in the present."

13 Griffin (1980) 136 calls this "great poetry", and says in addition: "The fall of the helmet in the dust is made almost more moving than Patroklos' death itself."

14 Miainō occurs two other times in the Iliad. Adjectives of the same root, miaros and miaiphonos, are witnessed in 24: Hermes assures Priam that Hektor's body has not suffered sēpos, rot or putrefaction (414). There is no mess of clotted blood, nothing miaros. This word seems to signify the effect of blood drying on the outside of the body, in this case blood seeped onto the skin of Hektor's corpse. (Miaiphonos designates Ares formulaically; miasma does not show anywhere in Homer.)

The first use of miainō is consistent with the use of miaros in 24. In Iliad 4, Menelaos is hit by Pandaros' arrow. The blood trickles down on his thighs, over his calves, and onto his ankles (146-7). This is the corresponding reality of a descriptive-simile; the bloody flow creates an appearance like that which a woman achieves who has stained an ivory-ornament with purple-dye. Miasma, then, for what is miaros, applies to the sight of an object streaked or soiled with any substance, particularly with a dark liquid like dye - or blood. The other use of miainō not directly linked to our passage reinforces this image of soiling. Odysseus and Aias are wrestling in the games Of book 23; they sweat profusely (715), and blood runs from deep welts on their shoulders and ribs (716-717). When they both fall

on the ground, after Odysseus tackles Aias, the dirt sticks to this moisture, and becomes grimy (731-2). In this context there is only the messy appearance conveyed in miainō, and nothing of "pollution" or any sort of moral repugnance.

15 Griffin 136 compares this with the disfigurement of Briseis later at 19.285f. MacCary's (1982) 204 interpretation of the image is interesting, if biased: "They are like a grave monument, motionless, their beauty unfading, since they are ageless and changeless, so that living they can symbolize the achievement Patroklos could make only in death, the glory which comes only to young men in battle."

16 Reinhardt 319 writes: ".. der unaufhaltsam Siegende, seither durch Achills Waffen Gefeite, auf einen Schlag entblösst, sein ungeheurer Sieg und Ruhm zunichte wie ein Traum; und gleichzeitig der Sieger erst recht in der Verhängnisvollen Blindheit, die darin gipfelt, dass er sich in Achills Rüstung hüllt."

17 Reinhardt 326 again observes: "Sichtbar wird aus ihm die Nacktheit, das vergebliche Fluchten, das wehrlose Preisgegebensein des Menschen vor dem Gott und vor des Gottes "leichter" Gebärde." On Patroklos' nakedness and "symbolic castration", see MacCary's provocative chapter, "Naked Men as Women", (1982) 152-162.

18 The close relation to Zeus singles out Achilles among the other Achaean warriors. Agamemnon comments on it (9.116-18). Likewise, Nagy 346 reveals how the Dios boulē validates the divine dimension of Achilles' nature.

19 A large number of the Trojan dead were related to Priam, or were even among his sons; Griffin 113n.20 offers bibliographical

information, and his own judgement, on this point. Clearly, the winnowing of his line is displayed throughout the poem, and not just in this prophecy of book 20. Priam's scolding of the sons at 24.252ff. is but the down-side of this motif. Redfield (1975) 115 writes, "Priam's line is being slowly exterminated; finally his inheritance will pass to Aineias in the collateral line (20.303). While Hektor lives, he is the hope of Ilium; as future king, he embodies the continuity of the state. As such he is also his father's hope for the maintenance of royal privileges within the family." The fate of the race presses on Hektor, broadening the impact of his death.

20 Patroklos insists on such a separation at 16.626f. when he rebukes Meriones. I would not agree with Benardete that Aeneas means the disgust with words he pretends here (see B. (1963) 2); his distinction between andres and anthrōpoi is an intriguing one, but an anēr ("he-man") must care for mythoi, as Benardete in fact admits.

21 As Nagy 274 evaluates this encounter, "... it reveals Aeneas himself as a master of poetic skills in the language of praise and blame."

22 Although Reinhardt 423 overly concerns himself with the primacy of the Flusskampf over the Götterschlacht in terms of compositional chronology, he makes some good points about their architecture, and that of their surroundings in the poem: "Die Spanne zwischen Achills Auszug in den Kampf und seiner Begegnung mit Hektor auszufüllen, dienen die Gesänge 20 und 21, "Götterschlacht" und "Kampf am Flusse" ... beide Handlungen werden ineinander geschoben, miteinander verwoben und bilden zusammen eine der grossen retardierenden Episoden." If Achilles had

encountered Hektor straightaway, he explains, ".. so wäre es dahin gekommen, wohin es im Epos niemals kommen darf: es wäre gekommen, wie es zu erwarten war." Finally, Achilles must pass through more than simply the final combat with Hektor, which he is destined to win with little difficulty: "Was wäre ein mythischer Held, der sein ihm vorbestimmtes Ziel erreichte, ohne dass es zuvor auf Tod und Leben ginge?"

23 Again, Reinhardt is worth consulting, in that he answers a question, and strikes beyond: "Man hat tadelnd gefragt, woher Achill das wisse .. Er weiss es, weil er redend Achill zu sein hat." MacCary downplays the existence of this "redend Achill".

24 "... Achills Nachruf schwelgt in der Antithese zwischen hier und dort, der Stätte des Todes und der Geburt." So Reinhardt 430.

25 Griffin 107-8 explains the <u>euchos</u> (in terms of a motif of "separation from home", use of which arouses pathos): it is "not simply a geographical or biographical excursus , but brings out the bitterness of death itself." In Griffin's view, Achilles insults Iphition hereby, employing the motif "to cause pain". F. Merz (1953) 9-10 wrote of this Homeric technique in anticipation of Griffin's formulations of biographical detail aiming at pathos: the technique is "eine Art Nekrolog"; at the moment of death, connections to life are stressed -- "Plötzlich bekommt das Geschehen tiefe." The leap is from heroic to "menschliche", by which the poet elicits from us pity, compassion, sympathy, and fear.

26 8.64-5 nearly compares, in nascent form. There Zeus is intent on coaxing his "plan" along (so 11.80-83); here Achilles acts out its

final stages.

27 He calls it "horrific playfulness"; (see Redfield 19).

28 Hekuba defines the pēma one way: 22.420f.; Achilles transfigures the curse of the Priamidai, after Priam has taken his hands in suppliancy: (24.547f.) "The war was the blow to Priam's fortunes."

29 Merz (1953) 65 remarks: "die Biographie des Asteropaios bedeutet eine raffinierte Stufe auf dem Weg zum Flusskampf." On Hephaistos' rescue of Achilles, Reinhardt 315 comments: "... darauf in ungeheurer Steigerung seine elementare Macht entfaltet wie zuvor seine Kunstfertigkeit."

30 As others have noted, Achilles has no taste for gifts -- or for food, sleep, or sex -- in the "reconciliation" scene of 19. By 23, however, Achilles has re-acquired his composure, so to speak, and can participate once again in the heroic barter of material goods/prizes qua status-objects. Interestingly, the prizes which Achilles distributes after each event of the games comprise a mixture of spoils from his 23 earlier sacks and from the spoils of books 16-22, including (as Shannon 76 points out) arms from Asteropaios.

31 See Nagy [325] on the isolation which united Achilles and Patroklos in life: 16.97-100; 23.77-78.

32 Redfield 181n.53 discusses the shearing of the lock in anthropological terms; Griffin 149 classifies the act as one of a type -- cult acts which "... are made into the vehicles of expressing psychology and emotion." But MacCary's (203) is the boldest: "The concept of ripeness for cutting -- Achilles cuts his hair tēlethoōsan -- persists into related contexts and is at the heart of the central

image in the poem for the human condition: men live and die like the leaves on a tree, i.e., in their season." This is taken from the chapter "He whom the Gods love dies young". MacCary has just alluded to the "destructive old age" of Peleus, and mentioned the etymological connection -- suggested by Nagy 185 -- between Peleus' home of Phthia and the verb phthi(n)ō, which denotes wasting away, "vegetal death". It is not extrapolating too much to say that MacCary presents Achilles' re-dedication of the lock as a negation of his attachment to Peleus. So he states on the last page of the chapter (216): "The son seems almost to pursue death in glorious action simply to escape the fate of the father, as though his attenuation into a speaking shadow were a negative paradeigma held up to him, the very figure of death." The notion of pursuing death in avoidance of death is not absurd: consider Achilles at 21.273ff. But, excessive denigration of the Peleus-figure threatens a mis-reading of Achilles' re-dedication of the lock, as well as of his whole experience here in the poem's closing movement. First, Peleus may live in Phthia-sounds-like-phthi(n)ō; yet, an interest in etymology would indentify him as closely with Mt. Pelion, as Reinhardt 328 intimates in a comment on the spear: "Die Esche gehort zu Achill, wie Peleus zum Gebirge des Pelion". The mountain was the source of Cheiron's gift, of the raw material (the shaft) which -- according to the scholia -- was worked upon by divinity. Peleus' name suggests a close association with the mountain, a symbol of robust natural endurance and persisting strength. (The kartistoi with whom Nestor's kartistoi -- the previous generation -- fight are phēres oreskōioi: "mountain-savages" (1.268), for what it is worth.) Moreover, Nagy 185

develops a contradiction which MacCary ignores: "If indeed the name of the homeland of Achilles is motivated by the theme of vegetal death as conveyed by the root phthi-, then the traditional epithet reserved for the place is all the more remarkable: Phthiē is botianeira "nourisher of men" (1.155). The combination seems to produce a coincidentia oppositorum, in that the place name conveys the death of plants while its epithet conveys the life of plants -- as it sustains the life of mortals ... thus the life and death of mortal men is based on the life and death of the plants that are grown for their nourishment: this is the message of the epithet botianeira in its application to the homeland of Achilles. Phthiē is the hero's local Earth, offering him the natural cycle of life and death as an alternative to his permanent existence within the cultural medium of epic." What MacCary does not appreciate in this point, I feel, is that Achilles does choose early death to a prolonged, fameless participation in the "cycle of life", yet maintains just the same its juxtaposition with the assured olbos of his repudiated homeland.

33 See Reinhardt 78.

34 In Griffin's view, Achilles' main interest to the poet and audience is the "successful" way in which he confronts his own -- i.e., heroic -- death: (cf. Griffin 94-5). So he writes (102): "The hero dies, not so much for his own glory, not even so much for his friends, as for the glory of song, which explains to a spell-bound audience the greatness and fragility of the life of man."

II. Genealogy and the Odyssey

1. Not Much Phaeacian History

There are glimpses of a Phaeacian past in a number of passages in the Phaiakis. At the opening of book 6.4f. and at 7.54f., we hear the foundation story of the Scherian settlement and a selective genealogy of Alkinoos and Arete. Alkinoos' repetitions of the prophecy of his father -- Od. 9.564-9 and 13.172-8 -- are gestures to the lore which belonged to the Phaeacians, more specifically, to Alkinoos, heir of the colonial leader Nausithoos. And, a chance remark of Alkinoos, at 7.205, reveals that the Phaeacians are "close to the gods" -- but in what respect?

The next line explains:

(7.206) hōs per kyklopes te kai agria phyla Gigantōn.

"As are also the Cyclopes and the savage tribe of the Giants."

The lineage given in book seven exhibits a similar connection: Eurymedon, Alkinoos' great-grandfather, was leader of a host of giants, along with whom Eurymedon himself at last perished, perhaps in a war against the Olympians:[1]

(7.60) all' ho men olese laon atasthalon, oleto d' autos.

"But he lost his fool-hardy army, and perished himself."

The adjective atasthalon along with the negative connotations of the verb ollymi imply that Eurymedon's career failed to achieve a favorable net balance in the accounting of olbos and kakia. The negative effect of this reference fits the speaker: the judgemental tone introduced in 7.60 can be

partly explained by Athena's Olympianism, for she is the narrator here.

The digressive recollection of the Phaeacian-founding is encapsulated by an "interrupted" description of Athena's advent in Phaeacia.[2]

(6.2-3) ... autar Athēnē
bē ...

(13) tou men ebē pros doma thea glaukōpis Athēnē.

(And so Athena 'made her way' ... to whose house the grey-eyed goddess 'made her way'.")

The digression strictly speaking begins as a relative clause, explaining Phaiēkōn andrōn in 6.3.[2] These Phaeacians were a people over-matched physically, who after some suffering (hoi spheas sineskonto - "they [Cyclopses] did them injury."), made a fateful and self-isolating move (hekas andrōn alphēstaōn - "far from men who eat grain") to establish their peaceable kingdom. Athena describes the "move" exclusively in the third-person singular: the participle anastēsas and verb age (6.7), as well as heisen ("he settled [them]") and the four verbs in a sequence of typical civilizing activity teichos elasse ... ktl. (9-10), are all singular, and have their subject in Nausithoos, the influential parent of Alkinoos. The narrator perpetuates the culture-heroism of this "founder". The fact is crucial to Alkinoos' position as "more equal" than the other basilēes among the Phaeacians, the potency of his father's memory justifies Alkinoos' status.

The lines which relate the transition from father to son are also suggestive.

(6.11-12) all' ho men ēdē kēri dameis Aidosde bebēkēi,
Alkinoos de tot' arche

"But he finally went to the house of Aides, overcome by death, and Alkinoos then ruled ..."

Line 11 appears as an exact replica of 3.410. There it refers to Neleus, who sat upon the very stone seat which is brought out for Nestor for an extraordinary feast after the epiphany of Athena.

(3.408-9) hois epi men prin
Nēleus hizdeske, theophin mēstor atalantos.

"On these Neleus used to sit, unequalled councillor of the gods."

The final two-and-a-half feet repeat the same phrase in 3.110, where Nestor so describes Patroklos, one of the aristoi who died at Troy. The recollection of Neleus is built up through the heroic epithet, and the words -- even in their formularity -- suggest an excellence, but also power in touch with the gods. The retrospective returns to Nestor after the stock-line telling Neleus' death:

(3.411) Nestor then sat on them too.

He is described as sceptre-bearing; and the context is amplified further by the entrance of Nestor's full panoply of sons: hyies aollees -- five sons in a space of two hexameters (413-14), then Peisistratos in 415. The scene begins with notable objects, the smooth stone-seats, recalls Neleus, and returns to the present: Nestor and his robust succeeding generation.

In this way, the preparation for our first impressions of Alkinoos' Phaeacia occur in the celebration of the arts by which its first founding was performed. Nausithoos is made the subject and "mover", as we have noted, of the flight en masse from the Phaeacians former home (6.7-10); then, just like with Neleus and Nestor, an orderly transition is described:

(6.12) Alkinoos de tot' arche, theōn apo mēdea eidōs.

"Alkinoos then ruled, who knows many shrewd things from the gods." Alkinoos receives an epithet-group like Neleus', which intimates divine favor, i.e., good fortune. There is good reason for the phrase by which the narrator describes Alkinoos. The Phaeacians are demonstrably religious. They give libation to Hermes every night before retiring (7.136f.). Moreover, in the narration of the wondrous material comfort of Phaeacia (7.133ff.), the gold and silver dogs at the palace gate are said to have been the design of Hephaistos; later, the surpassing skill of the women, comparable in its sphere to the men's marvelous skill at sea-faring, comes from Athena. The two gods who traditionally foster art and craft are patrons of the Phaeacian achievement. The gardens of Alkinoos are also supernaturally prolific, and the water-supply inexhaustible. "Such were the gifts of the gods to Alkinoos" (7.232).

Granted, the civilization of the Phaeacians depends mainly on their close ties to the Olympians. No wonder then that Athena talks of Eurymedon in pejorative terms; his story involves the Phaeacians in a non-Olympian past. We must take a closer look at the genealogy in book 7, to reconsider once more the long shadows which play on the backdrop of this Phaeacian scene. First, however, let us make a few preliminary remarks on Arete, since she is made the ostensible subject of the genealogy at 7.54, and on account of the fact that so much is made of her importance to Odysseus by Nausikaa and Athena.

Both Nausikaa and Athena emphasize the importance of Arete to Odysseus before he even comes near the palace. Nausikaa urges Odysseus to pass by her father Alkinoos, and to supplicate the queen mother, for if she be well-disposed, "then there is hope for your seeing your loved ones and going

home to your own land" (6.314-15). Athena's lines 7.75-77 then repeat Nausikaa's (6.313-15) verbatim. Why does the queen not dominate the scene in Phaeacia, then, once she is introduced? Fenik makes a major effort to solve the apparent contradiction of Arete's appearing in only a minor role after the supplication which these warnings prompted. As Fenik would have it, Arete does not fail in anything.[3] She does not immediately respond to Odysseus' clasping her knees. But, as this first encounter of Odysseus with the Phaeacians is played out, in the fullness of the dramatic narrative the hall clears, and Arete breaks her silence with these pithy questions: "Who are you, first of all, and who gave you these clothes here? Didn't you say you came here by sea?" (7.237-9). By stock technique -- Fenik calls it an "interruption"[4] -- the audience is forced to wait as Arete's powers of observation and her sense of timing make for a test of Odysseus. A lapse of narrative attention does not diminish the working of Arete in the text, but magnifies her impact.

Odysseus' reply to Arete is a model of tact and persuasion. As others have acknowledged, he not only clears himself of any suspicion, but also excuses Nausicaa to her parents, and impresses Alkinoos to such an extent that the king offers a marriage (7.311). Hereafter, Arete's appearances are limited: she bids the maids to send Odysseus to his bed at 7.335f., and in 8.433f., she has a bath prepared for him, and begins to collect part of the gift-booty he will bring back to Ithaka: all of this is at Alkinoos' bidding (8.424). She manages to re-assert herself, however, along the lines promised by Athena's report, later in the Phaeacian narrative.

The end of the eighth book leads to the climactic onset of Odysseus' self-disclosures about his identity and his recent difficulties. The first

break comes in book 11, after Odysseus' long narration. It is not without significance that the first to remark on his performance is Arete (11.336-41):

"What do you make of this man now, Phaeacians, his grace and his presence and his unfailing cleverness? he is my guest, and you share in him as well. Without constraining him send him off, and do not hold back your gifts to one needing them so. For thanks to the gods you all have plenty." Arete's final enthusiasm for Odysseus fulfills our expectations of her crucial protective role for the hero. The proof of that capability is her influence over the Phaeacians. Arete controls the response of Odysseus' audience to his words, reminding them of the hero's status as she has decided it, and engaging them furthermore in the insurance of his honor and safety.

As Odysseus departs from Phaeacia, he returns the favor with a warm blessing on Arete (13.59-62):

"May you have good fortune forever, great queen, until you finally grow old and die, as all must. I am leaving; may you be happy in this home of yours, with your children, your people, and king Alkinoos." Klaus Rüter wrote of this moment appropriately when he designated it as a final point in the contrast of Arete's perfect exercise of power within the scope of her role as a woman in the "royal" household, with Penelope's wish and inability to achieve the same success.

"Frei und in Übereinstimmung mit ihrem Wesen entfaltet sich das Leben Aretes, bedrängt und immer vom Untergang bedroht versucht Penelope mit Muhe, ihr eigenes Wesen zu bewahren".[6]

The significance of the genealogy which Athena gives at 7.54 is this: Arete

has the same high-birth as Alkinoos himself. Her nature is of the higher sort; Odysseus thenceforward depends on that bit of intelligence, using it shrewdly to insure the responses from Arete which will favor his cause. The first words he speaks to her are her name, and the rest of her honorific as "daughter of god-like Rhexenor" (7.146). In Arete's case, there is even some hint that her nature is slightly superior to Alkinoos', other than the surprising involvement in Phaeacian public affairs (see 7.69-74). She is born to Rhexenor, who was perhaps the elder brother of Alkinoos (7.63):

Nausithoos d' eteken Rhexenora t' Alkinoon te.

"Nausithoos sired Rhexenor and Alkinoos."

Being the first-born can provide pre-eminence, but admittedly does not always mean a higher nature (cf. Oineus Il. 14.114). There is something unsettling about Rhexenor's death, on the other hand, which dispatched him before he could create any sons. He died without male-issue (akouron), and too young (nymphion: precisely, "not long after he was married" -- cf. sch. V., also B.E.P.Q.T. on 7.65). This is hardly the mark of divine protection or good fortune. So, the union of Arete and Alkinoos, an attempt to re-coup their family's bad luck, and preserve these two blood-lines in the genos, recapitulates to some degree the effort of the Phaeacian founder himself to lead his people from the harm of the violent Cyclopes.

There is another explanation for all this background of giants in the accounts of Phaeacian genealogy and history. Gilbert P. Rose attributes these allusions to the poet's aim to create an uneasy atmosphere in the Phaiakis through which Odysseus must travel;[7] his stay in Phaeacia is no time of ease, but a test, and a more subtle reminder of the outright and brutal danger of the Cyclops, and the wrath of Poseidon in book 5.[7]

To summarize, the elements of this background-tension are: Alkinoos' father moved the Phaeacians to a point of isolation away from the rest of humanity, because they had been beset by violent Cyclopes. These creatures, and the race of Giants, are akin to the Phaeacians, on the other hand, since they are also "near the gods". Finally, the genealogy of the king and queen of this people reveals a progenitor who was himself a Giant, and apparently died on account of some violent form of hybris. Moreover, the grandfather of Alkinoos, great-grandfather of Arete, is Poseidon, father of Polyphemos, who not only persecutes Odysseus, but finally pays out ill-deserved vengeance on the Phaeacians for their unwitting generous hospitality.

Certainly all of this makes Odysseus play his part carefully in this not-so-Wonderland. There are surely many blessings in evidence in Alkinoos' land, the king's own fertile holdings, and the supernatural Phaeacian maritime, for example. But, on the other side, there is Echeneos' quickness to rebuke Alkinoos, which is not paralleled elsewhere in the Odyssey, but is shown for the embarrassment it is by its opposite number: Menelaos' chiding of Eteoneus in 4.31f. Then consider Nausikaa's fear of Phaeacian gossip. The trip to the river is motivated by Athena's dream insinuations that her mother has given birth to a "no-good" (methēmona 6.25). She needs to keep her appearance tidy, since she has the best of the kingdom for her suitors (34). It is this abundance of suitors that concerns Nausikaa -- everyone in town who sees her with a strange man will bring up her reluctance to marry, and spread rumors beside (6.274f.: these accusers are designated as hyperphialoi8). The rude behavior of Euryalos, after the teasing of Laodamas, pre-figures Ktesippos' rudeness before the slaughter of the

suitors -- though, in Phaeacia the conflict is mediated, Odysseus asserts himself through a peaceful agon, and an apology is accepted. Lastly, Odysseus' blessing to Arete is straightforward, but the last phrases of his blessing on Alkinoos voice a note of concern:

(13.45-6) theoi d' aretēn opaseian
pantoiēn, kai mē ti kakon metadēmion eiē.

"May the gods grant complete excellence and may there be no trouble of any sort here in your community."

This second clause may simply mean to avert any pestilence from the citizens and/or near-peers of Alkinoos. Or, it may refer to the very undercurrent of suspicion and potential violence which we have noted in the background in Phaeacia.

Arete feels obliged to provide Odysseus with a lock for the gifts he receives from them; he quickly accepts this safe-guard (7.447). Possibly his suspiciousness is due to his experiences of mutiny, which accumulate through the narrative of the adventures. Odysseus faces his companion and kinsman Eurylochos in an escalating sequence of confrontations (cf. 10.266, 431-448; 12.278f., 339ff.). At book 12.339ff., Eurylochos incites the final desperate rebellion from Odysseus' guidance (kakē boulē) which seals the doom of the entire company of hetairoi. Odysseus manages to save himself, perhaps with confidence in his own authority shaken, perhaps only the wiser;[9] in whichever case, the contradictions which haunt the Phaeacians Alkinoos and Arete must either assail his slim-remaining comfort in the old order or confirm his suspicions of the world -- anywhere -- after Troy, preparing him one more turn for the horrendous state of Ithakan affairs as

he is about to discover them.

Notes

1 See sch. P. on 7.60: hote emacheto meta tou Dios ētoi meta basileos tinos.

2 The historical "flash-back" is due to the divinely-inspired witness of the poet, as it is with the recall of Theoclymenos' genealogical background in 15.210. The muses are the poet's access to the past; it is not Athena who recalls these things in flight. Milton's technique in the description of Eden, first by the omniscient narrator (4.132-171), then through the eyes of Satan (205f.), does have an Homeric example (cf. 7.133, e.g.).

3 See Fenik (1974) 128-30.

4 See Fenik's chapter (1974) 61-104 on the variety of narrative "interruptions".

5 See Chapter 2b of this dissertation.

6 See K. Rüter (1969) 241.

7 Rose (1969) 391-2 writes: "As for the entire Phaeacian people, Homer makes a considerable effort to associate them both with Poseidon and with the giants, thereby providing Odysseus with additional cause for anxiety." And on Athena's account to Odysseus of Eurymedon in the royal family-tree: "The fact that Odysseus himself, not merely the audience, receives all this damaging information supports the assumption that he experiences more than the usual anxiety about a strange people ... these associations tend to maintain a tense atmosphere throughout Book 7 and an uncertainty which helps to account for Odysseus' long delay in revealing himself."

8 See Rose 390.

9 Fenik 161 cites Reinhardt Tradition und Geist (1960) 64ff. "for a fascinating analysis of the ironical disjuncture with which Odysseus must come to terms between the heroic world and the demesne of Circe, Polyphemos, Antiphates, etc." As Reinhardt and Fenik show, it is not only his difficulty with the companions, but the whole compass of the Adventures, which teaches Odysseus, in Fenik's words (161): " ... how little validity the norms of the life they left behind possess in the realm where they are now sailing." I am further suggesting that Odysseus' "value-shock" does not heal in Phaeacia, perhaps not even in Ithaka.

2. Homer's Daughters

With the reader's indulgence we might make a brief excursus to examine the way in which Homer characterizes women by some of the techniques with which he characterizes the heroes. Arete figured in the first analysis of this chapter, and we will soon be referring to her again; but she is not the only prominent female in the poem. Which perhaps justifies a short digression on the question: what characterizes the genealogies of heroic and other Homeric women?

Odysseus pauses in the narrative of his underworld trip just after he has finished his recital of the vision of well-familied women. This interlude shows for the first time the impact of Odysseus' storytelling on his Phaeacian audience (11.333-4): "So he spoke, and all were quiet; they were bound in a spell up and down the hall." These lines re-appear in 13.1-2,, at the close of the hero's "entrancing" recollections. The "intermezzo" therefore does not divide the Nekyia alone in two, but Odysseus' entire narration of the Adventures. The first half of the narrative consists of Polyphemos' cave, the two trips to Aeolus, and the encounter with Circe, as well as minor skirmishes. The second half concludes the tales with the elimination of the companions; the sorry end on Thrinakia comes after a series of hair-raising escapes in book 12 from the Sirens, Charybdis, and Scylla.

When he reaches our so-called 'axial' point, however, Odysseus is ready to stop the performance for good. He declares that his speaking should not encroach on bed-time (11.330-31). As he says in the

preceding lines (11.328-30):

> πάσας δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω
> ὅσσας ἡρώων ἀλόχους ἴδον ἠδὲ θύγατρας·
> πρὶν γάρ κεν καὶ νὺξ φθῖτ' ἄμβροτος. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥρη

"I could not possibly relate or name all the wives and daughters whom I came to know; night would sooner dwindle into daybreak."
Odysseus apparently feels he has spoken enough;[1] indeed, the vision of women which he beheld in Hades would take until morning to describe completely. Why would he be willing to stop before that vital moment of his story, the final isolation from his companions before his storm-tossed arrival in Phaeacia? Certainly, he is anxious for the trip home, so much that he suggests his passing the night in the ship with its crew; that escort, he emphatically reminds his host, is the job of the Phaeacians -- and the gods. As much as Odysseus nearly succeeds in moving the audience in this direction, he shows success in another quarter as well. The first to speak from the general enthrallment is Arete; in the interest of her own timē, she affirms her association with the newly manifest "hero". Her power to give and to elicit gifts from the others is displayed. So Odysseus has stopped at the proper moment, successfully drawing out Arete's final approval, likewise the unimpeachable promise of a swift and rich return home. Alkinoos however has determined to hear the story out. Odysseus reluctantly refuses to deny his host the tragic denouement, even though the complete narration involves oiktroter' (381): the more lamentable installment of the adventures must entail the "woes" of his comrades

(382).

Our concern, however, is not why Odysseus finishes the narration through; we must return instead to that point with which we began. One effect of Odysseus' stopping after the Catalogue of Women, and also a reason for his willingness to leave off entirely at the very spot, shows in Arete's reaction. As Buchner pointed out, the mention of these "fair women" aims straight at Arete's own pride, hopes, and pretensions.[2] As he explained, Arete stands in a peculiar position, chosen by the agency of natural disaster to marry an uncle -- to preserve the line of her father's haima. In this respect, the tales of women who all came first in a famous line generate a special interest for the powerful Phaeacian queen.[3] What more can we say on the Catalogue?[4] The Catalogue indeed speaks indirectly for Arete's state of mind at this stage in the Phaiakis; at the same time, we might examine the section on its own terms for internal clues to its significance to the rest of the poem. It is the natural place, after all, to investigate a particular branch of the Odyssey's genealogical poetics: the uses of genealogy in the characterization of Homeric -- that is, Odyssean -- women.

Obviously Homeric women had no place on the battlefield to win timē, nor were they allowed a place in the athletic contests. How then are these women in Hades noteworthy? Odysseus identifies for us their source of aretē at the start (11.227) and finish (11.328-9) of his description: they are the wives and daughters of heroes. In both cases, these women merit the kleos of Odysseus' special mention because they are wives and daughters of an aristos or hērōos. A woman's merit

depends on the male uppermost in her life, and in many cases on both father and husband, when both males maintain a solid reputation. Therefore, Tyro is recounted as daughter of Salmoneus and wife of Kretheus; Antiope "consorts" with Zeus and is daughter of Asopos, and the list goes on. Furthermore, a woman may also give birth to sons who will enter the cycle of competitions through which their fathers traveled. A woman can thereby be surrounded and engulfed by males -- progenitors, spouses, and progeny -- whose deeds of arete generously reflect on the reputation of her own circumscribed person.

The language of the Catalogue hints of an analogy to the assertions of aretē familiar from the male heroic-order; it is possible that Homeric women are not wholly passive in the matter of owning or not owning the means to kleos. The conceit of the entire account is of course that Odysseus asks each one of these women about her gonos; therefore, the first two lines of Tyro's history are transmitted as indirect discourse after two alternate imperfect forms of phēmi (11.236-7): "She asserted (phato) that she was the offspring of blameless Salmoneus, and she asserted (phē) she was the wife of Kretheus Aiolides." The device is extended to the second case: although the information of parentage is assumed -- Asōpoio thugatra (260) -- the information of Antiope's "wedlock" is imagined as indirectly quoting the heroine's shade (11.261-2):

> ἦ δὴ καὶ Διὸς εὔχετ' ἐν ἀγκοίνῃσιν ἰαῦσαι,
> καί ῥ' ἔτεκεν δύο παῖδ', Ἀμφίονά τε Ζήθόν τε,

"Who claimed to lie in the embrace of Zeus, and who bore two sons,

Amphion and Zethus." Euchomai is an important term of heroic rhetoric. As Adkins has demonstrated in a study of its uses, the verb euchomai in Homer embodies an act whereby the speaker lays claim to a status of respect and importance, vis-a-vis other men, enchanted animals, and even -- or especially -- the gods.[5] Antiope asserts a claim by which she presents herself as a mortal honored by Zeus, whose children possess semi-divinity therefore. Antiope has acted out an important step in acquiring kleos: she creates the potential for Amphion and Zethus to work the fame of their descent from Zeus into their own heroic reputations; by the same token, Antiope gains fulfillment and verification of her claim by their successes.

The rest of the women's "relations" are narrated without indirect discourse. Odysseus tells their personal histories as established fact - as the mythoi of the poet are often presented - a kind of divine knowledge which the Muses transmit through a poet, and which the mortal voice has nothing to add to or take from.[6] Only in Iphimedeia's narrative Odysseus returns to oratio obliqua, again with a suggestive verb: (11.305-7) "And after her I saw Iphimedeia, wife of Aloeus, who claimed (phaske) that she had combined with Poseidon, and she bore two children ..." We should not suggest that Odysseus means to cast suspicion on the claims through which these women create status-relationships; Homer is not Euripides. Those instances in which his "fair women" are reported to produce a claim to divine mates or semi-divine sons represent their legitimate efforts to certify special status. For Homer, that is the way women entitle themselves to the equivalent of 'excellent renown'.

In quick review, then, we have seen that a woman will do well to show herself productive of heroic sons -- the sort that come of a healthy heroic father, but even better if from the siring of the highest gods, Zeus or Poseidon. Also, a woman is "located" in heroic mythology by another essential attachment: who her father is, in other words what her own genealogy is. Divine intervention in the creation of mortal offspring, however, has already begun to decline; that is a palpable element of the epic atmosphere. The Iliadic aftermath, in which those last of the gods' sons die away, constitutes a twilight.[7] In this event, one must hold all the more steadfastly to a genealogy which can be traced back three generations or more to a divinity. Otherwise, noble fathers and noble husbands will do for the woman who desires honor in her lifetime and a serious reputation in the ears of generations-to-be.[8]

A survey of Odyssean women confirms these interests. Wherever a woman of any significance enters the narrative, her presence is enhanced through allusions to her connections with the male heroic-world. One might begin the survey with serving women. Eurynome makes several appearances in the poem, mostly in books 17 and 18 (4.366; 17.495,; 18.164, 169, 178), but never attains more than the stature of a faithful servant. Aktoris belongs to the Odyssean household also, although she is limited to one appearance (23.228). At that moment, Penelope is reminding Odysseus of the special properties of their olive-tree bed. Those who know its secret nature are themselves -- and one solitary serving-woman (23.227-8).
This maid Aktoris exemplifies a motif which arises in connection with

Eurykleia -- the motif of the single trusted servant (see 2.345-7; 9.207). She carries no patronymic, and given her circumstances she has no heroic husband. But she does recall Ikarios; she came with Penelope as part of a dowry, not intended to enrich Odysseus but to ease Penelope's new life. Eurymedousa follows a similar pattern in the Phaiakis. In book seven, she kindles a fire as part of beginning her day's chores in the royal household. The only detail given of her past is summed up in the epithet Apeiraiē, a place-name designation: she is a native of another town, but once upon a time was taken in a raid conducted by the Phaeacians, and consequently fell to the lot of Alkinoos to vouch for his timē among the people (7.9-11). Nor are Helen's servants, who make an appearance with her at her first entrance in book 4, identified through any male associations: Adreste, Alkippe, and Phylo (4.123-25, 133). All this lends indirect support to our observation that important female characterizations are accompanied by and enhanced through the use of genealogical detail; these female servants simply do not merit the consideration. (Compare, however, Iliad 9.664-68: Achilles and Patroklos retire to bed after the distressing scene with the embassy, with Diomede, daughter of Lesbian Phorbas, and with Iphis, daughter of Enyeus. The purpose of thus identifying the slave-women is to intrude into the narrative a glimpse of the spoils of Achilles previous heroic ventures; this detail of the seraglio of our Myrmidon prince probably reflects the poet's interest in reminding his audience of Achilles' past timē.[9])

The serving-woman who breaks through this sub-status is Eurykleia. Her first mention in the poem comes in the first book, and is handled

with considerable attention (1.429): Euryklei' Ōpos thygatēr Peisēnoridao ("Eurykleia, daughter of Ops Son-of-Peisenor"). Not only is her father mentioned in specifying her background, but he himself is named with his patronymic. Eurykleia's introduction continues beyond this line with a report that Laertes had bought her from home when she was still pre-adolescent, and had paid a price of twenty oxen (430-1). Eurykleia came to hold the same timē as Antikleia, although Laertes never slept with her - out of consideration for his wife (432-3). Laertes' desire to avoid the anger of his damar kouridiē adds a subtle twist to this passage on Eurykleia. The expanded portrait of her origins gives the audience a sense of her importance to the household, and the terms of her identification also give her an aura of dignity. (Laertes' reverence for her chastity on the other hand may indicate more the stature and authority of Antikleia within their marital arrangement.) The formulaic line which ties her to father and father's father Eurykleia carries along with her into the rest of the poem; it occurs in her appearances at lines 2.347 and 20.148. Moreover, after 19.357, Eurykleia is three times designated as periphrōn (19.491; 20.134; 21.381). Aside from Echeneus' compliment to Arete at 11.345, (basileia periphrōn), the only woman to whom the epithet applies is Penelope.

As one would expect, the women of Nestor's household receive due notice, which shows up in the language of their appellations. (His wife and daughters-in-law are on hand at the special feast of Athena, 3.430ff., for ololyzdein (450).) Nestor's wife, Eurydike, is aidoiē (451), due at least in part to her association with Gerenian Nestor.

But her status is equally assured by her positon as Klymenos' oldest daughter (452). Nestor's daughter, Polykaste, receives the honor of bathing (later of marrying!) Telemachos although she is the youngest, a consolation-prize for being excluded from the feast[10]; even though she is house-bound, she carries an honorific designation: "daughter of Neleid Nestor" (465).

The various goddesses who appear in minor roles through the poem are tagged just the same with some note of their lineage. A list demonstrates the point:

1. Calypso - Atlantos thugatēr oloophronos (1.52; 7.245)
2. Thoosa, mother of Polyphemos - Phorkynos thugatēr, halos atrugetoio medontos. (1.70)
3. Eidothea - Proteōs ipthimou thugatēr, halioio gerontos (4.365)
4. Ino/Leukothea - Kadmou thugatēr, kallisphyros Inō (5.333)

In the majority of cases, the line in which the "weighty" male relative is identified -- often the father -- expands into a description of that male, not the female in question. Likewise, Circe's epithet is autokasignētē oloophronos Aiētao. Like in Calypso's cases, and Ariadne's at 11.321, the epithet oloophrōn modifies the male kin; Thoosa's father Phorkys is characterized as the "ruler of the atrugetos sea", and in the last of her two-and-a-half line digression, she is consorting with Poseidon, on whose account in fact her mention was originally motivated (1.68ff.). Ino, it is true, fills out her identifying line by her self -- with a patently feminine epithet,

kallisphyros.

This treatment of women in the Odyssey and their enhancement through genealogical detail must bring us -- penultimately -- to Helen and to her sister Clytemnestra. Unlike most Homeric women, Helen engenders kleos for herself through her own actions. A serving girl Phylo carries in a silver serving basket while attending Helen's entrance in book 4, which basket touches off the memory of its donor: Alkandrē, Polyboio damar (4.126). Polybos was an Egyptian host, who entertained Menelaos, and sent him away with many more possessions than he had on arriving (128-9). In a separate act of xenia, Alkandre gave Helen guest-gifts, so establishing an 'heroic' bond empowered like the male variety to perpetuate the memory of giver and receiver for one another and for posterity, and to augment the status of each through the act itself. A second instance is the recollection stemming from a nepenthe that Helen administers later in this same book. The drug was given to her by Polydamna, wife of Thoon. This lady's apothecary knowledge was congenital: ē gar Paiēonos eisi genethlēs. Her whole people are offspring of Paieon. The information enhances this depiction of Polydamna, to be certain. She is first referred to through her husband; then the identification is enabled to pass on to a second stage: what is significant about this woman is her race's lore: pharmaka, polla men esthla memigmena, polla de lygra (4.230) "... drugs of all possible kinds, many that heal, but also many that destroy." Helen has entered into xenia with another female, whose prestige is secure in the mention of her husband, and in the further context of her descent from a mysterious and formidable scientific culture. Hereby,

Helen's own power is amplified as we only begin to know her in the poem.

Helen is also characterized by genealogical information, and as one might suspect her credentials could not be more impressive. She is styled alternately Dios ekgegauia and Dios thugatēr. Part of the fascination of her character in the Odyssey is the strength of personality Helen evinces, especially vis-a-vis Menelaos. That personal power is represented in part in the formulae which convey her divine ancestry. Her sister Clytemnestra, on the other hand, who functions in Agamemnon's recollections as an opposite to the virtuous Penelope, is not designated by Agamemnon as daughter of Tyndareus, but receives a naked negative-epithet, e.g., Klytaimnēstra dolomētis (11.422). Only in 24.199 does Agamemnon mention Clytemnestra in connection with her father: Tyndareou kourē; the line-segment is probably "automatic", since it is unlikely that Agamemnon betrays any wistfulness for the "virtuous bride" of his youth. (Nestor remembers, however, in lines 3.265-6.)

Helen on the other hand was not heroically fathered, but Zeus-born; this helps her overcome the stigma of her affair with Paris, nor is there any apparent interest in the poem to make her a foil for Penelope in the consistent way that Clytemnestra is so used. The ends of Helen's characterization appear in the speech which Proteus delivers to Menelaos in book 4 (4.561-4, 569):

> σοὶ δ' οὐ θέσφατόν ἐστι, διοτρεφὲς ὦ Μενέλαε,
> Ἄργει ἐν ἱπποβότῳ θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν,
> ἀλλά σ' ἐς Ἠλύσιον πεδίον καὶ πείρατα γαίης
> ἀθάνατοι πέμψουσιν . . .
> οὕνεκ' ἔχεις Ἑλένην καί σφιν γαμβρὸς Διός ἐσσι.

"Zeus-fostered Menelaos, it is not ordained that you die in horse-nourishing Argos and find your fate there, but the immortals will send you to the Elysian plain at the ends of the world ... because you have Helen and are the son-in-law of Zeus."

These are the final words of Proteus to Menelaos, before the god returns into the water. He has left Menelaos with a beatific vision of his own afterlife, yet this fated paradise is a grant due to the connection with the semi-divine Helen. He will not be buried in his paternal homeland; Menelaos will be settled in Elysium because he is related to Zeus through his wife. Finally, though she is named twenty times, second of females only to Penelope, with a number of epithets and designations (tanypeplos, Argeiê, dia gynaikŏn, Dios ekgegauia, ktl.), nowhere in the poem is Helen identified as anything like alochos Menelaou. If Helen is a partial exception to our rule, Penelope embodies the female who depends on the status of the male heroic-relatives by whom she is designated. Yet, our conclusion will wind up modifying the "rule", for Penelope does finally work outside and within the system in deciding her own timē and preparing her excellent renown.

There are two formulaic appellative lines for Penelope. One ties her to her father, Ikarios, and appears throughout the poem: kourē Ikarioio,

periphrōn Pēnelopeia. The narrator uses this designation at 1.329,

18.159, 20.388, and 21.2. Agamemnon is very fond of referring by the same formula to the faithful Penelope in both speeches in the Underworld: 11.446 and 24.195; and Eurykleia addresses her mistress with the very words at 19.375.

The suitors are equally insistent on this appellation. Antinoos speaks the line to Penelope at 18.285; Eurymachos three times, at 16.435, 18.245, and 21.321. It is in the suitors' interests to so designate Penelope. Making her the kourē Ikarioio puts back the clock, so to speak, and makes Penelope marriageable again. In that way Odysseus would seem dead, or as if he had never lived and wed Penelope.

Furthermore, though Ikarios' role in the Odyssey is relegated to the background, yet one detects in places a subtle pressure exerted by Penelope's father to relent in the Ithakan stalemate and marry one of her suitors. The first mention of Ikarios is made by Telemachos. He intends to portray the suitors as arrogant and deceitful; he therefore proposes that Ikarios has no interest in forcing Penelope's wedding, but that the suitors have even been too timid and devious to contract with him at all (2.52-4):

> οἳ πατρὸς μὲν ἐς οἶκον ἀπερρίγασι νέεσθαι
> Ἰκαρίου, ὥς κ' αὐτὸς ἐεδνώσαιτο θύγατρα,
> δοίη δ' ᾧ κ' ἐθέλοι καί οἱ κεχαρισμένος ἔλθοι.

"[the suitors] who shrink from going to the house of her father Ikarios, so that he could set the bride-price, and give her to whoever made the best impression."

This implies presumably that, if the suitors were not unwilling to

negotiate with an oikos whose leadership was intact, Ikarios would be entitled to renew Penelope's marriageability and give her away again. Antinoos' reply to Telemachos accepts and develops this implication (2.113-14):

> *μητέρα σὴν ἀπόπεμψον, ἄνωχθι δέ μιν γαμέεσθαι*
> *τῷ ὅτεῳ τε πατὴρ κέλεται καὶ ἀνδάνει αὐτῇ.*

"Send your mother away, and tell her to marry whomever her father wants and she is pleased with." Telemachos answers by re-trenching, as if it would not please Ikarios to have his daughter now forced into a decision (2.132-3):

> *ζώει ὅ γ' ἢ τέθνηκε· κακὸν δέ με πόλλ' ἀποτίνειν*
> *Ἰκαρίῳ, αἴ κ' αὐτὸς ἑκὼν ἀπὸ μητέρα πέμψω.*

"I would be in big trouble with Ikarios, if I sent my mother away on purpose." Cunliffe (s.v.) understands hekōn to be "used rather with reference to aekousan in 130 than as itself giving any distinct sense." But Cunliffe also cites examples, all Iliadic, in which the meaning of the adjective is construed as "on purpose, willingly, advisedly".[11] If that meaning be acceptable here, then Telemachos argues that Ikarios would be angry at his grandson for making a marriage without the elder's consent. That is no longer claiming that Ikarios opposes any new wedding.

The issue is submerged thereafter, as Telemachos appeals to Zeus; an omen appears, and Halitherses stands up to give an interpretation favorable to Telemachos, at which point the debate has completely changed direction. The problem re-appears obliquely in a later,

interesting scene. Penelope lies awake at the end of book 4, feverish with worry for Telemachos, whose departure had just been made known to her: keit' ar' asitos, apastos edētuos ēde potētos. ("She lay then without dinner, for she had tasted neither food nor drink"). Her anxious tossing-about resembles the frantic movement of an encircled beast (4.791f.). This physical condition is ripe for a significant dream. The dream appears in a form fashioned by Athena herself (4.796-8): in the form of Ipthime, daughter of Ikarios, and wife of Eumelos, also sister of Penelope. For pedantic satisfaction we may note that Iphthime is introduced by reference to father and husband; and Ikarios receives the epithet in 797, while Eumelos is subject of the clause and antecedent of the participial phrase in 798.

What does Iphthime tell Penelope? Her mission is to relieve Penelope's care for the absent Telemachos, and for that purpose Athena arranged this visit. Iphthime tells Penelope not to fear (825); Athena escorts Telemachos and pities Penelope, she says, having troubled to send this figment of the sister. Penelope's reaction to this is very interesting; she immediately turns from her latest anxiety to the old concern for Odysseus: "You are a god, then -- can you tell me about that one (kai keinon) too?" Penelope cannot even speak the name. But the opportunity of relieving her primary, unrelenting torment impels her to ask, with divinity so near. "Is he alive or dead?" Iphthime answers that she cannot say anything of "that one"(836-7), whether he is alive or dead: kakon d' anemōlia bazdein -- "it is bad to chatter foolishly" (837). With the same formula Odysseus dismisses Agamemnon's curiosity over the fate of his son, Orestes, as something he cannot

possibly know (11.464). This could not be the sense of Iphthime, since created by Athena and all she should have access to knowledge of Odysseus' fate. Iphthime leaves without offering any clue as to whether Odysseus is alive or dead: because Athena only wanted Penelope relieved from concern for Telemachos. Penelope cannot learn of Odysseus, probably for the sake of the dolos which Athena plans for his homecoming. Might we suggest, however, that another level of anxiety becomes apparent in this dream -- that Penelope's former household, represented by Iphthime, does not want to speak any longer of Odysseus, does not want to know of "that one" any more?

Such fears seem confirmed in Telemachos' waking vision of Athena in book 15. In this familiar scene Athena urges Telemachos to leave Sparta as soon as possible. Everyone (patēr te kasignētoi te: 15.16) is pushing Penelope to marry Eurymachos, who is spending his way into the forefront of the suitors. Perhaps Athena exaggerates the danger. But the fact of Ikarios' wanting a new attachment does not seem exaggerated in book 19. Penelope there tells the beggar how she is at her wits' end. She has resisted the suitors, but has no recourse left. Moreover, her parents are clamoring for a settlement (19.158-9). The suitors' insistence on calling Penelope kourē Ikarioio depends on a confidence that that association removes Penelope from the moorings of her previous status, which was dependent on Odysseus, and re-ties her to Ikarios, who is shown increasingly in the poem as a threat to end Penelope's resistance. Even Odysseus accepts the line of address -- provisionally. He speaks it as the beggar to Eumaios (17.562), but before he has had the crucial interview with his wife in book 19.

A counter-address can only begin to be used after the Return has gotten well under way. The man who introduces it is none other than Theoklymenos: o gynai aidoiē Laertiadeō Odysēos (17.152). He goes on to say all that Iphthime was obliged to withhold. Theoclymenos prophesies that Odysseus is already in his country, in the phrase Denys Page thought so foolish:[12] hēmenos e herpōn - "biding his time, or on the move." With this inroad, the appellation can gain momentum, so that in book 19 Odysseus in beggar-guise uses it no less than four times to address Penelope: 19.165, 262, 336, and 583. We have shown what it would mean to Odysseus' heroic identity, not to mention what it says of his existence, if Penelope came to be designated only as her father's daughter.

Yet, as much as Penelope's characterization is shaped by the contradictory claims of these two designations, she emerges nonetheless with something uniquely her own in terms of personality and personal fame. The poem of the Odyssey works at length to portray Penelope as an extra-ordinary character. To an extent, this occurs within the bounds set by the conventions of the "praise of women"[13]. For example, early in the poem, at 2.120, after Antinoos has advised Telemachos to have Penelope marry whomever she and her father find agreeable, he develops an alaborate praise of Penelope. He praises in particular her understanding, which extends to erga perikallea (2.117) -- as the gift of Athena, probably spinning or some other craft -- and Penelope's general good-sense and ability to "keep a good oikos". (kai phrenas esthlas/kerdea th' ... [epistasthai] 2.117-18). In these respects, she not only surpasses all women alive, but those who lived and achieved

fame before her (cf. 2.119-22). Aside from the excellence of her husband and her father, Penelope has distinguished herself in a various display of capabilities; these are typified as a reputation for noēmata. As Odysseus is said to excel all mortals boulē kai mythoisin (13.298), so Penelope has become known as the woman of solid sense. But Penelope even transcends this mere prudence in the broadest scope of her reputation. Antinoos is the first to refer to the famous shroud. Antinoos is telling Telemachos whose fault it is that the suitors are on Ithaka. That is, Penelope's dishonest deferral of their suit ended -- after three successful years -- in the current retaliatory wasting of the household goods. Penelope devised the ruse (it is called dolos here (2.193) and also in Amphinomos' version (cf. 24.128f.)) because peri kerdea oiden: "she was exceedingly crafty" (2.88). Penelope tells the beggar in book 19 of her dolos, for she calls it that herself. When she then expresses her despair that she is run out of defenses, she uses the words given above: oute tin' allēn/mētin eth' heuriskō (19.157-8). In the striving after mētis, she is surely the fit mate of wily Odysseus. Still, however much the two make a complementary pair should not predominate in our assessment of Penelope's achievement as an Homeric woman; her ingenuity is certainly very unusual in this category.

Through the last two books, in fact, where especially in 23 her character is shown in its full resilience and depth, Penelope is no longer designated either as kourē Ikarioio, or as gynē Laertiadeō Odysēos. Instead, the last half of the hexameter line combines with other syntax, and we have a simple, personal designation for the woman:

... periphrōn Pēnelopeia (cf. 23.5, 10, 58, 80, 104, 173, 256,285; 24.194, 198, [but 195! - Atreid atavism] 294, 404). Penelope has arrived at a unique identification. Perhaps this is due to the fact that her re-integration within the restored oikos of Odysseus has been fully appreciated by book 23, and so there is no point in tying her to one or the other "male-designator" anymore. Against this one might remember that the painful barriers between Penelope and her husband only break down toward the end of book 23, after Penelope has "tricked" Odysseus into giving up the secret of the olive-tree bed[14]. By that time Penelope is comfortably identified with her own special epithet, and no designations necessarily tied to father, spouse, or off-spring.

Penelope is in Homeric terms a "good woman" then, but also very much her own woman. The tales of famous women told to Arete compliment her sense of fulfilled womanhood, and enhance the world in which she excels.[15] Penelope excels in a similar world. Like Odysseus, though, she undergoes a tribulation, and shows the worth of her unusual nature by coping with intolerable circumstances for an interminable period. Thus Ruter wrote, as we mentioned in the previous section, that Arete is the happiness and the virtue of Penelope deferred. But Arete is only a partial mirror of Penelope's accomplishments; the Phaeacian queen simply does not have such an important place in the poem as does Penelope, hence nothing like the same challenges. And, although Penelope has not determined Odysseus' status and future kleos in the extreme negative way of Helen and Menelaos, she does help define -- far beyond the powers of a typical "famous" Homeric-female -- her husband's ultimate heroic standing and reputation through her own individual

aretē.

Notes

1 Heubeck discusses the resemblance of Odysseus' words here (11.328f.) and the proem of the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships (Il. 2.484f.). Through over-attention to the question of the priority of one passage over the other, however, he errs in saying: "...das ego in 11.328 ist zum mindesten überflussig, unmotiviert." There are no Muses in the Odyssean episode, it is true, over against which the narrative voice distinguishes itself. Yet, the deference of Odysseus to the magnitude of his vision, and the special claims it represents, is close kin to the poet's humility with his Muses in Iliad 2. Moreover, Heubeck has done very little with the dramatic context of the Nekyian Catalogue, for which the ego of 11.328 is not at all irrelevant, but a reminder of the consistent and controlling voice of these adventures. [see further at note 6]

2 "Das Besondere ... ist, dass wie in Hesiods Eoen immer eine Frau an der Spitze des Geschlechts steht. Das muss gerade bei Arete Interesse und Wohlgefallen erwecken. Nimmt doch auch sie eine ungewöhnliche Stellung ein infolge ihrer Blutsverwandschaft mit dem König - sie ist die Tochter seines Bruders - und durch ihre Klugheit (7.63ff.)." (W.Büchner (1937) 107)

3 "Diesem Gefühl der Verbundenheit entspricht es, wenn Odysseus an der erwähnten Stelle seiner Erzahlung die Heroinen der Vergangenheit vorführt: er will die anwesende Königin dadurch ehren und erfreuen. Dass er diesen Zweck erreicht, sieht man an ihren anschliessenden Worten deutlich genug." (Büchner 108) Büchner also makes a nice point here on Antikleia's effect in this scene with Arete.

4 The background issue of whence this passage comes is not pertinent to our purposes, but poses a fascinating question nevertheless. This Catalogue of Women has an obvious similarity to Hesiod's exercise in female genealogy in the so-called "ἠ hoiai". Since, in addition, the heroines of the piece in Odyssey 11 are connected in some respect with Boeotian legend, it has been suggested that this ensemble has found its way into the Nekyia after an original career in a stock Boeotian genealogical catalogue-poetry. In an older study, Thomson probably put the matter as it still must stand: "How far the Odyssean Catalogue may be drawn from or dependent on similar Catalogues in other poems, or the Eoiai in particular, is hardly determinable now." (Thomson (1914) 27) To accept his evaluation of the Catalogue's significance in the Odyssey, though, one would have to admit his entire thesis on the Boeotian history of the Odysseus-figure. "Properly understood, that episode [the meeting with "the Theban hero-prophet Teiresias"] is an essential part of the Odysseus legend, whereas the Catalogue of Women has a less organic connection with the rest of the Odyssey; it is, as we say, a mere episode." (p. 28) Perhaps it is, in the way the Contest of the Bow is a mere episode. In the heat of Quellenforschung, Thomson

also ignores the dramatic placement of the Catalogue. What is more, Fenik has suggested that the Boeotian connections of these women may be secondary; that is, the compositional principle behind the sequence in this Catalogue "operates independently of the Theban/Minyan or non-Theban/Minyan ancestry of the heroines." (see further Fenik 145-6). The "organizing principles", as he points out, are simple: "things like the number of children, the identity of the fathers, the length or brevity of the description each heroine receives." (p. 146) So that it becomes possible to distinguish the Homeric poetry from the Boeotian and Hesiodic varieties on other grounds than descent or chronological relation. Heubeck sums up well: "... die sachlich und formalen Beziehungen zwischen 11.225-332 ... und Eoien sind dabei besonders eng. Entscheidend jedoch, dass die Kataloge der grossen Epen nicht nur durch ihre funktion - als untergeordnete Glieder des Ganzen, als Mittel zu kleineren oder grösseren Zwecken - von den Hesiodischen Frauenkatalogen, die ja Selbstzweck sind, geschieden sind; die letzteren bilden doch anscheindend eine zwanglose Aneinanderreihung verschiedener Sagenelemente, die sich beliebig vermehren oder verkürzen lassen; in den Katalogen der Epen dagegen herrscht strenge Komposition nach den gesetzen der Symmetrie und des Parallelismus, die eine mutwillige Änderung des Umfangs ebenso ausschlösse wie einen Austausch der einzelnen Glieder." (Heubeck 35) Wherever it comes from in rudimentary form, this catalogue clearly bears the stamp of Homeric technique; we are free therefore to concentrate further critical energy on elucidation of the dramatic and thematic uses of the passage in its given context.

5 Among the various uses of euchomai in Homer, Adkins shows an underlying semantic connection, which he attributes to "the psychological resemblances of the situations [in which forms of euchomai occur.]": "... we distinguish situations in which a hero is boasting (when overstating his prowess), proclaiming his merits (when he is truthful), adverting to his ancestry, or uttering a victory-shout .. the Homeric hero ... in every case is asserting his existence, his value, and his claims ... to be of high lineage is to be of a lineage which is memorable and remembered (and so helps to rescue from oblivion); to be agathos is to be a valued member of society, one with privileges and again likely to be remembered; and to utter a victory-shout is to draw all the attention one can to one's existence and success. It is the claim, and one's psychological condition in making it, that is in the forefront ..." (W.H.A. Adkins (1969) 33). Adkins' claims are now qualified by L. Muellner 1976. Muellner's central concern is to distinguish more precisely among the several uses of euchomai, that is, to refrain from subordinating the use of this word in one context to its use in others. He identifies this usage (98) which we discuss as a sub-species of "secular euchomai" -- "an epic naming convention", and defines it (99): "say [proudly, accurately, contentiously]".

6 In Hesiod: (Theogony 27-29; 31-32)

ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
ἴδμεν δ', εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι."
ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδὴν
θέσπιν, ἵνα κλείοιμι τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα,

We know to speak many lies which seem true,
we knowhowever when we want to speak truth.

Then they breathed in me divine song, so that I
could give kleos to what will be and what is.

Compare with Homer's aforementioned disclaimer: (Il. 2.484-6):

Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι—
ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε, πάρεστέ τε, ἴστέ τε πάντα,
ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἷον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν—

Tell me now Muses who live in Olympos --
for you are goddesses, you are everywhere, and
you know all things -- we however hear only the fame
and we know nothing.

It is clear that the Muses know everything, a corollary of their immortality, and grant the human aoidos a version of what happened in the past. Yet consider Antikleia's injunction to her son, 11.223-4: tauta de panta/ isth', hina kai metopisthe teēi eipēistha gynaiki." This advice does not only cover what Antikleia just divulged on dikē brotōn ("the way it is for mortals [after death]"), but the ensuing spectacle of famous women, too, whose kleos Odysseus learns (characteristically) by an aristē boulē ("the best plan" - 11.230). His words at the finish of the account betray the distinctive methodology of Odysseus-aoidos:

(11.328-9) ouk an egō muthēsomai oud' onomēnō
hossas ... idon.

Our poet transcends the professed limitations of his art through the mediating figure of Odysseus, hero and more than mortal witness.

7 "Men of the present differ from the heroes not only in strength and

martial accomplishments, but also in their relations with the gods. The gods no longer join men in feasting nor do they beget children on mortals." (Cf. J.S. Clay 172; see also 171-6)

8 What is essential about the appellative system is the creation of status for each woman on the grounds of her relation to noteworthy males. Many of the women in this catalogue have both mortal and divine partners, however; this is an extraordinary feature of the system, indicating a high degree of attainment, in the scheme of things, for an Homeric woman. The favor of a god is a supplementary, not necessary, condition of a woman's holding timē. The example of Alkmene, as one finds it in the Hypothesis of the Aspis, reveals how perverse this surcharge can be: cf. lines 15-19 (Hesiodi Opera Oxford 1970).

9 One example shows continuity in the reminiscences of one episode in Achilles' pre-Iliadic exploits: Andromache recalls Achilles' devastation of her home-town and a large part of her family at Il. 6. 414f. A spoil of the same foray comes up in the games of book 23 -- a solos, "lump of iron" (a shot-put) -- which Achilles took from Eetion, along with all the rest of his wealth (23.826-9).

10 Just as Elektra worries that she cannot attend the festivities which the married women do (Euripides, Elektra, 311: anainomai gynaikas ousa parthenos [Denniston 1939]), Nestor's daughters apparently cannot attend the special feast for Athena: only Nestor's wife, sons, and daughters-in-law, are accounted for. The unmarried

girls must stay behind, as Polykaste does after she performs the favor for Telemachos.

11 Cf. Ebeling (s.v.) for the usage in this line: "prudens, consulto", i.e., 'on purpose'.

12 D. Page 86; Fenik 1974 differs. (See his excursus on Theoklymenos.)

13 See Nagy 2.13 and 14.5n1, n3, for comments directed specifically at the case of women within the traditions of praise and blame in greek poetry.

14 See D. Stewart 131ff. (especially 138-40).

3. The Negligible Suitors

How do the suitors "fit" into the Odyssey? Harry L. Levy quotes Cedric Whitman's comment on the "inconcinnity"[1] of the scene of the suitors' slaughter.[2] Levy agrees in part; he believes that the "destruction of immoderate quests" constituted a "little tradition" which Homer re-worked within his epic. The folk tale figures of wasteful guests are transformed into "those importunate suitors".[3] As Levy points out, the "little tradition" allows for a supernatural requital of the destruction of a host's substance. This primitively conceived motif of vengeance "was too deeply embedded in the story to be discarded"[4] - even by the sort of poet Levy and Whitman must imagine the Odyssey-poet to be. The battle of the suitors' outraged kin and the collected supporters of Odysseus, the last stage in the conflict between the Odyssean household and its assailants, is given this appraisal by Levy:

> Another traditional battle scene starts (Od. 24.413-530) - but what sort of peripety is this for the warrior and wanderer, battle-scarred and tempest-tossed, who has won his way back to the arms of a faithful wife. With the sang froid of a Euripides contriving a deus ex machina, our poet brings peace through the sudden intervention of Athena, and the epic as we have it ends.[5]

In the last chapter of this study we will show first that Odysseus is not the sole actor of the poem's dramatic peripety, but one of three important actors in the closing movement of book 24. Further, only a truly "Euripidean" critic could ignore the warming possibilities in the speeches of the three generations in that final scene of book 24 (perhaps the very one who easily wards off the drimy menos at Odysseus' put-off reunion with Laertes earlier in the book!). As Laertes comes very much to the forefront at the end of the poem, another point of discussion in our last chapter must be that the only discrete act of violence in this so-called "traditional battle-scene" is Laertes' spear-cast at Eupeithes. Traditional battle-scenes involve several or many personal confrontations between heroes or would-be heroes. Yet, Laertes and Eupeithes are the only antagonists in this case. Eupeithes is not picked out of the blue, to be sure. He has served a specific function in the poem, without having entered it at any time before the events in book 24. He was used in name only to identify Antinoos - through the epithet Eupeitheos huios.[6]

Which leads to a major exception to Levy's, and others', ideas of the suitors' role in the Odyssey. Analogues to folk-tale and the motifs of another story-telling tradition are interesting and entertaining, but also misleading. The suitors are not primarily wooers of Penelope, as their title makes them out to be, nor are they simply wasters-of-the-house, in the way Levy compares them to another folklore theme. As Agathe Thornton argues in a short but cogent paper, the suitors are in Odysseus' house for no reason more than to take

possession of it, and to have its wealth, its prestige, and therewith the capacity to engender a powerful new kleos of their own. Thornton writes:

> ... it is not primarily a story of princes competing for the hand of a beautiful and intelligent queen, but it is a tale from times in which power based on wealth and brute force was little hampered by law ... a tale, in fact, of greedy and ambitious aristocrats trying under a thin veneer of courtliness to seize the absent king's wife, wealth, and position.[7]

How far Homer has brought these "aristocrats" from obscure folk-story characterizations can be seen partly in the way the poet identifies them by particular genealogical notices, and by actions which then in one manner or another extrapolate from the significance of these genealogizing moments.[8]

There are two suitors of prime distinction. The suitors are, as a group, designated as hoi aristoi, and as the off-spring of tōn aristōn,[9] it is true. But, two stand out even at the head of such an excellent peerage: Eurymachos and Antinoos. Although Eurymachos and Antinoos seem to balance one another to a great extent, and often appear back to back in the books where the suitors are giving speeches, Antinoos nevertheless preponderates in the poem: his name arises fifty-six times as opposed to Eurymachos' thirty. Antinoos is the brasher, more outspoken of the two; therefore, he presents a more violent contrast with the offended household of Penelope and

Telemachos. Eurymachos offers no less of a menace, though his style is decidely less confrontational. The poet exposes his deviousness in the comment which follows Eurymachos' duplicitous consolation of Penelope, that no one of the suitors would harm Telemachos (16.448): Hōs phato, toi d' ērtuen autos olethron. ("He spoke in this way, yet was himself devising death for him [Telemachos]".)

Antinoos and Eurymachos share an orientation to eliminating the Odyssean household as it has existed into their lifetimes; they are dedicated to its absorption into one of the suitors' estates. They lead this effort because they are most confident, or determined, to make theirs the successful usurping claim. The last two chapters of this dissertation deal with the eventual exposure of the suitors' true aims. A final comment on their intent comes in book 22. Eurymachos has just watched Antinoos die by an arrow of Odysseus, who then reveals himself as the hero whose reputation they had not taken seriously, but had thought to arrogate to themselves through plunder of all its material attachments. Eurymachos characteristically backs off this purpose -- Odysseus with the bow is a fairly clear sign that his scheme is finished -- and just as congenially attempts to extricate himself from the whole affair: he claims that Antinoos wanted no marriage, but to be lord and master of the house, for which evil ambition Zeus smote him (22.50-3):

> οὔ τι γάμου τόσσον κεχρημένος οὐδὲ χατίζων,
> ἀλλ' ἄλλα φρονέων, τά οἱ οὐκ ἐτέλεσσε Κρονίων,
>
> ὄφρ' Ἰθάκης κατὰ δῆμον ἐϋκτιμένης βασιλεύοι
> αὐτός, ἀτὰρ σὸν παῖδα κατακτείνειε λοχήσας.

"... not needing or wanting the marriage so much, but thinking along other lines, which the Son-of-Kronos did not bring about for him, to become king himself here in Ithaka, likewise to kill your boy in an ambush."

Antinoos had essentially proposed at 16.383f. the very idea which Eurymachos alludes to, which in turn only reflected a more desperate version of the initial resolve to ambush Telemachos coming home from abroad. These open offers of murder prove Antinoos' brutally ambitious nature; Eurymachos' eleventh hour shifting-of-blame does not hide his complicity in the very purposes denied. Both die with full appropriateness, at the front of the group whose aims they spearheaded and controlled: Antinoos impulsively gulping wine, and Eurymachos seeking as usual to befog the truth by last-minute negotiations.

What does the background information which Homer attaches to them through the poem add to these characteristic directions? First of all, there is not much information offered on Antinoos or Eurymachos, especially of the genealogical type. However, there is some, so we may proceed so far as it takes us.

Antinoos is not only very poor in genealogical references, he does not even warrant any epithets. At 18.34, Antinoos is designated through the somewhat honorific periphrasis "hieron menos Antinooio"; and at 24.179, Amphimedon mentions him alone by name in narrating the horrors of the mnēsterophonia: bale d' Antinoon basilēa ("[Odysseus] hit lord Antinoos"). Otherwise, Antinoos receives no kudos by his appellation. He is throughout the poem "Antinoos", whether he is addressed by the narrator (33 times), or in the direct speech of

another character (9 times). There are, in addition, ten occasions in which Antinoos' name occurs with a special designation: Eupeitheos huios. Such times as these are limited to a single formulaic line (e.g., 21.140): toisin d' Antinoos metephē, Eupeitheos huios. "to them Antinoos spoke, son of Eupeithes."
The designation of paternality always occupies the final two-and-a-half feet, a verb of speaking the next-to-last position, preceded by Antinoos' name itself. In other words, this standard phrase testifies to a lack of interest in elaborate characterization for Antinoos through his family and fatherly background. Interestingly, Eupeithes himself steps into the foreground of the poem at 24.442 and thereafter. He moves the kin of the other murdered suitors to take an armed revenge. However, Eupeithes name is never in any of its four mentions (24.422,465,469,523) adorned with an epithet, family-designation, or patronymic. His death at the hands of Laertes represents the very treatment which Antinoos had intended for the Arkesiads: Eupeithes dies after his son, and neither can even make a statement on behalf of the future fame of their genos, since no word of Eupeithes' father, no hint of the lineage, adheres to them in the form of a developed designation.

Eurymachos fares only slightly better. At 4.628 and 21.186, the epithet theoeides is applied to him, a not completely automatic or pointless reference. His designation by father, however, runs in the same direction of triteness as Antinoos'; we might compare the last three occasions of Eurymachos' identification by his father to indicate its formularity (18.349 + 20.359): toisin d' Eurymachos, Polybou

pais, arch' agoreuein.

(21.320) tēn d' aut' Eurymachos, Polybou pais, antiōn ēuda.

In all other cases, too, one of the above two lines is used (1.399; 2.177; 16.345, 434). Once, however, an expansion occurs (15.518-20):

> ἀλλά τοι ἄλλον φῶτα πιφαύσκομαι ὅν κεν ἴκοιο,
> Εὐρύμαχον, Πολύβοιο δαίφρονος ἀγλαὸν υἱόν,
> τὸν νῦν ἴσα θεῷ Ἰθακήσιοι εἰσορόωσι·

"I will tell you another fellow to whom you might go, Eurymachos, the famous son of clever Polybos, whom the Ithakans treat like a god." It is not merely that Eurymachos' name comes at the head of the line, thereby displacing the usual formula and creating need of a different formulaic response. On one level, this explanation could prove correct. On the other hand, the added epithets to Polybos and Eurymachos increase the weight of the entire designation. Telemachos does render a certain honor to Eurymachos at this point, because he is yielding a xeinos in recognition of Eurymachos' surpassing power; Telemachos realizes that power for Eurymachos through a "genealogical"-type adornment which is otherwise denied the suitors. Telemachos reflects another strain which is heard in and out of the poem, but which Athena raises to a small peak at 15.16f. -- the bit on Eurymachos' being the nearest to marrying Penelope because he has made himself into the most impressive suitor. Eurymachos has nearly won, it seems; Telemachos even concedes to him the last prize -- kai Odyseos geras -- in the belief that Zeus has turned his back on the Arkesiad genos and has already fastened plans on another. An omen comes -- a kirkos, or hawk -- but not from Zeus: "the speedy messenger of

Apollo". Theoclymenos turns the tide and routs Telemachos' submissiveness. Theoclymenos performs his role as rising prophet of an Arkesiad resurgence; Eurymachos' glorious moment has ended before it really begins, as it was only a short-lived concession given by the youngest, unsurest Arkesiad.

This is not to say the suitors, especially Antinoos and Eurymachos, are without honor. There is, on the one hand, an ironic discrepancy between the excellence of their backgrounds and the impious, "immoral" uses to which they apply themselves - Eumaios rebukes Antinoos' abuse of the beggar by criticizing the disjunction of form and substance (17.381):[10]

Antino', ou men kala kai esthlos eōn agoreueis.

"Antinoos, however upper-crust you are you have hardly spoken like it." Furthermore, as we have pointed out, these excellent backgrounds are alluded to in just such curt instances, without significant expansion, because these suitors represent a wasted generation, the best product of an unquestioned aristocracy, but such a group as achieves nothing, tragically, to perpetuate its own good memory and add to or preserve the kleos of its families.

Yet Antinoos and Eurymachos do have an interest in kleos, which arises occasionally and in those moments contributes some depth to the tragedy which is overtaking them. Eurymachos bemoans, not the loss of Penelope, but the loss of kleos, when he cannot string the bow (21.253-55):

ἀλλ' εἰ δὴ τοσσόνδε βίης ἐπιδευέες εἰμὲν
ἀιτιθέου Ὀδυσῆος, ὅ τ' οὐ δυνάμεσθα τανύσσαι
τόξοιν· ἐλεγχείη δὲ καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι."

"If we so much less powerful than god-like Odysseus, in being unable to string the bow, it will be shame for us in the ears of all those yet to be born!"

Leodes had already swallowed that failure and suggested abandoning the trial (162), to which Antinoos targeted a reply which chides Leodes for an inferior nature (21.172-3): "Your mother did not bear you such that you would be a puller of the bow and arrows." The suitors are partially rehabilitated in another way, which in fact will more closely engage our interest in the genealogical aspects of characterization. One suitor, Amphinomos, is nearly spared out of the general slaughter. His moment comes before book 22; unfortunately, he allows it to pass by as he ignores Odysseus' warning.

Amphinomos is introduced in book 16: no more than by name at line 351. At 394, however, he is identified by an excursus on his father and father's father, his home, and his character (16.395-99):

> *Νίσου φαίδιμος υἱός, Ἀρητιάδαο ἄνακτος,*
> *ὅς ῥ' ἐκ Δουλιχίου πολυπύρου ποιήεντος*
> *ἡγεῖτο μνηστῆρσι, μάλιστα δὲ Πηνελοπείῃ*
> *ἥνδανε μύθοισι· φρεσὶ γὰρ κέχρητ' ἀγαθῇσιν·*
> *ὅ σφιν εὖφρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν·*

"[Amphinomos] famous son of Nisos, lord Son-of-Aretes, who from grassy wheat-rich Doulichion was a leader among the suitors and was extremely pleasing to Penelope in what he said; he was a prudent man. He spoke to them carefully ..."

As the son of Nisos, he receives the epithet phaidimos, and father Nisos receives a patronymic as well as the distinctive appositive anax. Amphinomos' sensibleness is the culminating point of the digression; but the point is nearly made before its explicit statement in Pēnelopeiēi hēndane mythoisi, for the expectations of good-sense and honor are suggested in whomever comes of such a noteable lineage. What Amphinomos goes on to say we shall treat harshly later on[11]- as temporizing, possibly cagey, ultimately dangerous to the prospects of the Arkesiads. There is ambivalence in Amphinomos' presentation, and it is perhaps the time to show this suitor in the best light. Amphinomos is called on in two more places to comment on, and thereby direct, the suitors' actions as a group. In both cases, the suitors are near to violence. At 18.414, he reproaches the whole group for abusive talk, and violent behavior, against strangers and servants in the house of Odysseus. He then suggests a last ritual round to be performed with the cups before they all leave (418-19); he is successful, and accomplishes the peace. Similarly, at 20.241f., the murder of Telemachos is being devised among the suitors. A bird comes to view from the left. Amphinomos takes this opportunity to put a stop to the plans of murder (20.245-6): "Friends (o philoi) let us forget this plan, the murder of Telemachos. Let us feast instead." He again addresses them as philoi; his ability to speak persuasively to them is contingent upon his closeness to the whole group. The proposal to quit planning Telemachos' murder, moreover, does not stem from remorse occasioned by the unfavorable divine-sign; instead, Amphinomos'

critique rests on a pragmatic approach: "the thing will not work!" Amphinoms may be defended by the fact that, given the circumstances, and the increasing volatility of the suitors' collective impulses, Amphinomos does the best he can to moderate the actions of the group.

Perhaps for some such reason, Odysseus makes his famous appeal - undercover and as the beggar - to Amphinomos, to quit the suitors and save himself. Odysseus is very flattering to his favorite suitor (18.125-28): "Amphinomos, you seem to me to be sensible: of such a father -- for I have even heard his excellent fame -- Nisos the Doulichion noble and rich. From whom they say you are, and you seem a decent man."

This genealogically-based praise is occasioned by Amphinomos' generosity at 119f.; the suitor brought bread to Odysseus and offered it to him with a warm-hearted blessing: chaire, patēr ō xeine. genoito toi es per opissō/ olbos. atar men nyn ge kakos echeai poleessi (18.122-23). Odysseus therefore establishes the claim that Amphinomos' goodness is explained in his famous lineage; it is part and parcel of a nature derived from excellent "stock". Why should this suitor be singled out, characterized by nobility with explicit reference to an heroic, noble race?[12] Why do the other suitors receive a negative sort of characterization, through lack of such "biological" support of their personalities?

Perhaps to show the opposition to Odysseus' household and the rule of the Arkesiads as a conglomerate of disfavored families, striving to make a more significant mark in the world, but failing in both the right time and place, failing likewise of the gods' approval and aid.

Amphinomos represents, by contrast, the solid fame of these families, even in Odysseus' own estimation, from which all are nevertheless finally precipitated in return for their wicked ambitions.

The passage which most explicitly involves the suitors in genealogical considerations comes in book 16. Upset when she hears that the suitors have now come so far as to plan Telemachos' murder, Penelope descends into their midst to confront them. She focuses her reproach at Antinoos; in this case, Antinoos stands for all the suitors, as Eurymachos' reply assumes (16.435-9). Penelope employs for the substance of her reproach the distance between the fair reputation of Antinoos' nature and his failure to equal that praise (418-20). She accuses him of plotting murder, also of failing to receive suppliants. The latter is necessary for the paradigmatic conclusion of her rebuke. She reminds Antinoos how his father came to Odysseus, after he had alienated the Thesprotians, so that they intended to kill him and rob his property (428-9). Odysseus at that time defended him, and held off his enemies (430). Penelope easily shows that Antinoos has failed to act in the same spirit toward Odysseus' oikos (431-2).

Eurymachos answers Penelope for Antinoos. He assures her of Telemachos' safety, the sincerity of which assurance is pointedly belied in 448. Eurymachos' promises are founded on the claim that Telemachos is his own favorite, from a fondness which he bases on the remembrance of how, as a child, he sat upon the knees of Odysseus, and the "city-sacker" himself fed him meat and wine (442-4). The memory is one with Phoinix' recollection of himself and the infant Achilles in Iliad 9. Eurymachos' reminiscence paints a scene in which we see

indications of a society wonderfully at home with itself, the borders of distinct families and different generations joining and being overstepped in a wholesome philia. Of course, Eurymachos' use of the old attachment to Odysseus, which his house evidently enjoyed as Antinoos', is a disgusting lie. These two suitors have certainly ignored the obligations which the past has lain upon them. Antinoos and Eurymachos have decided to alter the tradition in the present time, that is, to take whatever steps necessary to make a new genos basileion (for this term, see 16.401). Such an innovation must be conservative enough to assimilate the house of Odysseus, to acquire as much as possible of its capacities of preeminence, yet must also eradicate its hold on the memory of the region as the most favored race. In Odysseus' absence, the house is impaired, even as it continues to operate on one level -- on memory traces -- and on another -- in Telemachos' own efforts to re-embody that reputation. The resolution of disparate elements which finally occurs in book 24 is the very one the suitors were hoping all along to render impossible.

And so, the suitors are denied genealogy elsewhere, because -- here in 16.409f. so obviously -- they themselves have chosen to ignore the claims which the genealogical history of the area preserves , and to which the poet is ultimately committed as well. The least offensive suitors, who do receive genealogical characterization, recall the expectations which their inherited social position created for every one of them; but these genealogical references at the same time reemphasize the poor use to which the suitors have applied their natures.

Notes

1 Cf. Whitman 305-8.

2 Cf. Harry L. Levy (1963) 147.

3 See Levy 147.

4 See ibid.

5 See Levy 153.

6 See 1.383; 4.641, 660; 16.363; 17.477; 18.42, 284; 20.270; 21.140, 256.

7 Cf. Agathe F. Thornton (1963) 345.

8 In an appendix, P. Vivante (1982) 205-7 evaluates the epithets of the suitors in the poem. On 205 he makes an incredible claim for them: "We never see them doing any specific outrageous deeds as part of their normal behavior; such deeds are normally attributed to them by their opponents ..." true, the Odyssean side generates its own propaganda: Philoitios at 20.213f., e.g. But, Vivante can hardly mean that

Antinoos' attack at 17.462, Eurymachos' at 18.396, and Ktesippos' at 20.299, are merely responses to unusual provocation? The latter two scenes are prefaced with the same formulae (cf. 18.346-8), and expressedly lessen our respect for the suitors, even as they impel Odysseus further toward violent anger. Nor, I think, are the serving-women in 20.6-8 slandered by Odysseus' increasing bitterness only; this incident definitely represents the suitors' "normal behavior".

9 See, e.g., Telemachos(16.122); Agamemnon(24.107-8); Eupeithes(24.427-29).

10 The same idea is played on when Odysseus-in-disguise begs from Antinoos, testing him with cozening words (17.415-16): ou men moi dokeeis ho kakistos Achaiōn emmenai, all ōristos, epei basilēi eoikas. ("You don't seem to be the worst of the Achaeans to me, but the best, for you are the picture of a great lord.")
Telemachos, perhaps straightforwardly, also addresses Antinoos (and Eurymachos) in this way in the next book (18.64-65): "I receive my xenoi, and I want you lords (basilee) to respect that, Antinoos and Eurymachos, both of you intelligent enough (pepnymenō amphō)."

11 See chapter three (Telemachos Polymythos) of this dissertation.

12 Two other suitors could be mentioned as compatible with Amphinomos' role: Agelaos Damastoriades is conciliatory in his one appearance

before the slaughter: cf. 20.321ff. Amphimedon also bears a title paida philon Melaneos, agaklyton Amphimedonta (24.103), and must have held prestige and some promise, since he was xeinos of the powerful Agamemnon. Yet, he is reserved for the gloomy report in book 24, and therefore his moment comes - literally - in the shadows. Leokritos Euenorides has some pretensions as well, as he feels entitled to rebut Halitherses, Mentor, and Telemachos, in the agorē with sarcasm. Compare Ktessipos, at 20.288ff., who seems to be of the nouveau riche (289-90), and acts outrageously.

III. Telemachos Polymythos

Despite the misgivings of certain critics who see two distinct poems in the Odyssey -- the Telemacheia and The Return of Odysseus[1] - Athena's tutelage of the son of Odysseus begins early in Book 1, and does not diminish in significance through the rest of the poem. By 1.48, Athena has put Odysseus' case before the father of gods and men. Thereupon Zeus finally agrees that the cruelty of Poseidon will not endure, and that the gods will provide Odysseus' return. Athena then dispatches Hermes to rescue Odysseus from the island of Calypso;[2] Athena herself will go to Ithaka. It has been noticed that this "council" scene balances the similar climactic scene between Athena and Zeus in Book 24.[3] At this moment in the poem's performance, however, the boulē of Athena and Zeus introduces the Odyssey's essential bifurcation of plot. The hero's return is suspended, although his safety is assured; and the main interest devolves on the figure of the hero's son. Nevertheless, the announcement of the hero's imminent re-entry colors every corner of the landscape upon which the son moves.

In order to underscore the function of Telemachos in the Odyssey, we might digress on a possible Homeric analogue between this poem's beginning (the Telemachy) and the structure of the early portion of the Iliad. The Telemachy is analogous in at least two respects to the Diomedeia. Given the oral poet's difficulty in sustaining interest in

a single character, the introduction of a "rival for narrative attention" alleviates the tedium of a one-track story line; it affords, moreover, an opportunity of saying a great deal about the "main character", even in that character's absence, through expanding treatment of the foil character. Telemachos and Diomedes are representative of this technique. However, Diomedes' fully developed foil within the Iliad, Achilles, is not otherwise organically related to him; the two merely represent complementary, but discrete, opportunities of analyzing heroic arete. On the contrary, Telemachos is related inseparably to Odysseus as son to father, and cannot ignore his father as he works to develop himself.

Telemachos' role is like Diomedes' in the Iliad in another way. Both heroes are exhorted through appeals to a greater figure. For Telemachos this image is built on the history of his father, who happens to be the hero of the poem. On the other hand, Diomedes' paradigmatic father exists outside the poem of the Iliad.[4] In either case, it does not relieve their difficulties that in both cases these characters are created by an arbitrary authority - they are fictive paradigms and are challengeable, although Telemachos and Diomedes decline to challenge them. (We would say that Athena is a better authority than Agamemnon. But we recall that Athena appears, at least initially, in human guise; and thereby her mythos reflects her mortal impersonation in tone and so also in its fictional perspective. Moreover, gods cannot be trusted implicitly at any time: cf. Od. 13.221ff.) Like Diomedes, Telemachos is young and untried. (The Epigonid expedition to Thebes is suppressed for the most part by Homer

to make Diomedes the more anxious to achieve definitive kleos through his deeds at Troy.) Both young men encounter the goddess Athena, who enhances their powers and establishes herself as their patroness according to a right inherited from their fathers. Both are painfully unclear as well over who their fathers really were: this problem arises for Diomedes in two episodes of abuse, in the fourth and fifth books of the Iliad; and for Telemachos in his identity crisis in Od. 1.215-16, and in Athena's gentle challenge, 2.276f.

The crucial difference between these two emerges from the different destinies which their respective fathers are given in the poems. Diomedes' Tydeus operates only in the nether sphere of the digression and the potential allusion throughout each of Diomedes' appearances in the Iliad. Telemachos finds himself in a very different situation; he is arriving at maturity in Ithaka, and exhibits a serious curiosity for the Orestian-myth which starting with Athena's visit in Book 1 is passing about in certain circles. Before long, Telemachos embodies the incipient stage of Odysseus' eventual tisis.[5] That is, Telemachos is on the brink of a conscious decision, to make himself into a defender of his patrimonial property, therefore to grow up dependent on his father's image. Athena's visit spurs him along this path, and shows him where and how to look for more material from which he can devise a picture of his absent father as well as of himself. There has been little at hand for Telemachos to work with. Laertes has grown reticent in every way. Penelope can bear to hear little of the Greek woes at Troy (cf. her words to Phemios - 1.350f.), and finds fruitless comfort in the entertainment of one lying stranger after

another. The suitors, finally, have already begun to publish a mythos which is unhinged from the "true history" of Odysseus' relations with their fathers. Telemachos must go elsewhere then.

Telemachos' arousal to learn of his father and create his own character in light of that 'knowledge' forms the heart of this inquiry. In the next chapter, we will examine the role of Telemachos in the generational chain which centers on the missing hero Odysseus. Telemachos himself identifies the problem in Book 16; at the point Telemachos can relate the difficulties of his own position and that of the patrimony to the problem of monogeniture, it becomes clear that he has attained a degree of sophistication for which Homer had carefully prepared both him and us, the audience. Our present task will be to retrace the author's handling of that development, that is, especially in the Odysseus-less books 1-4 and 15. We will discuss in a while the scene which results from Athena's interruption of Telemachos' day-dreams. That scene provides our first glimpse of Telemachos; it establishes him as the heir of Odysseus' divine connection as well as the potential heir of everything else Odysseus has acquired. But, this relationship between Odysseus and Telemachos deepens as Telemachos grows in his own right. To appreciate this growth, it will be best to start with the scene (1.325-64) which immediately follows Athena's inspiration of Telemachos.

After Athena's wondrous departure, the scene opens to the megara, where the bard Phemios sings to the gathered suitors about the Achaeans' nostoi. Phemios' song brings Penelope down from her chambers because she is grieved at hearing of the expedition which took her husband away. Telemachos defends the bard's choice, however, against his mother's

preference. Poets cannot be blamed for the unhappiness they relate, he claims, for it all comes from Zeus. Men want to hear a song - good or bad - so long as it is the latest thing. He then instructs Penelope to go back upstairs and ignore what goes on in the men's quarters (1.358-9):

ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι· μῦθος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει
πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοί· τοῦ γὰρ κράτος ἔστ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ."

"Speech is the concern of every man, especially me, who is in charge here."

Telemachos means to define what is a "care to men", as opposed to what women need to worry over. Unfortunately for Penelope, she has provided Telemachos with an opportunity to send a message to the suitors; he does not really mean to upbraid his mother, though there is in the poem some tension between the two. Telemachos pretends that his mother has interfered with the management of what is said, spoken, or sung in the oikos. Over that medium he must be the master, but not just vis-a-vis his mother or any woman servant; Telemachos is beginning to assert his need to bring the mythoi of the house in line with his desire to dominate there. The mythos which he speaks to assert his will over mythoi in general shows progress toward that end: it amazes (thambēsasa ... bebēkèi) his mother, as she deferentially withdraws. But the suitors, his true target, are struck as well.

In his first speech to them Telemachos apprises the suitors that on the next day he will speak in the agora to expose the grievances which he has been suffering on their account. He decries what they do, and warns that he will sacrifice to Zeus for vengeance. Antinoos' answer shows shock at Telemachos' outspokenness. He chidingly claims

that the gods themselves have put the words into Telemachos' mouth; they could have come from nowhere else. This jibe has another edge, which is more prominent in Antinoos' closing remark (386-87):

> *μὴ σέ γ' ἐν ἀμφιάλῳ Ἰθάκῃ βασιλῆα Κρονίων*
> *ποιήσειεν, ὅ τοι γενεῇ πατρώϊόν ἐστιν."*

"The Son-of-Zeus might not make you king in sea-girt Ithaka, which is yours by an inherited custom."

Telemachos' threat to take control of local religious institutions to work his own aims has unsettling implications for the suitors.

Antinoos deals with it mockingly; facetious as he is, he replies at all only because he is sufficiently nervous over Telemachos' sudden determination. Antinoos' reference to Zeus is particularly revealing: supposedly, Telemachos' hopes of enlisting the aid of Zeus are fatuous, for even though his family-race is the kingly one in Ithaka, it has done him no good. Such needling abuse suddenly introduces a notion which had not appeared in the conversation beforehand. Antinoos' ambition to be 'king' appears in the open, as well as the fear that this aspiration is rendered unjust and also vulnerable by the existence of a more qualified rival. Telemachos, however, avoids a confrontation. He disarms the threatening insult by stubbornly holding to the idea that Zeus will ultimately determine his fate (390); if that means becoming "king", that is not so bad -- Telemachos erases Antinoos' putdown with a cleverly irrelevant dissertation on kingship. The contrivance soon reaches a point, however. "Many may want to be king -- many are -- in this area. Be this as it may, I want to rule here!", Telemachos says. Telemachos has re-appointed the line of

confrontation between himself and the suitors, including Antinoos. The object is no abstract kingship or right to rule, but ownership and control of the oikos of Odysseus, its treasure-rooms, land, and livestock. This is an inheritance which accrued to Odysseus through his warlike aretē (398):

"Likewise I will be master of our house and its servants, whom god-like Odysseus won on expeditions."

Telemachos does not want to give it up; nor is he motivated by simple materialism in this stance, as we shall see.

Eurymachos interrupts to diffuse the loaded implications of Telemachos' and Antinoos' abstractions. He piously asserts that these things are on the gods' knees, and just as insincerely assures Telemachos that he will always be lord here. Eurymachos' real interest is to learn the identity of Telemachos' recent xeinos. The answer is important. Telemachos tells Eurymachos that it does not matter whether the man carried any news of Odysseus; in all likelihood Odysseus is not in fact coming home. The visitor was patrōios xeinos, however, which entails on him an obligation; more importantly, it implies a reappraisal of Telemachos' status in the oikos and the power he will claim as its heir.[6] Telemachos' reception and recognition of the xeinos therefore involve an effort of self-definition. His task in his early share of the poem is to weld from various elements of his patrimony a persona to be acted out vis-a-vis the suitors. A significant portion of that persona constitutes his growing ability to manipulate words, to articulate his heritage, i.e., to summon it as something of his own creation as well as something within his own

control.

In the second book of the Odyssey, Telemachos keeps the promise he made in Book 1. He convokes the assembly at Ithaka. His opening address elicits the intended response at 81.[7] Antinoos repeats the formulaic tag he has fashioned for this new, threatening Telemachos: hypsagorē menos aschete (85). The point is, if Telemachos speaks at all, then from Antinoos' viewpoint he is hypsagorē.[8] Again, Antinoos expands on his ill-concealed anxiety. He witnesses Telemachos' growing power, which arises from a new awareness of his own nature and its place and potential within the heritage of his family and its inherited position on the island. Antinoos assumes a resentful air, objecting that the suitors are not to blame for the state of things which Telemachos deplores, but Penelope's devious obduracy. Telemachos' sidling argument was effective; Antinoos avoided attacking it directly, but resorted instead to blaming Penelope. Telemachos subverts this claim too, contradicting Antinoos' admonitions by piously foretelling the wrath of the mother's Erinnyes (135). Telemachos repeats his formula of supplication to Zeus, who does not merely remain limited to the conversation: the chief-god sends an omen. This omen is interpreted by one of the patrioi hetairoi: Halitherses Mastorides. His analysis is the best Telemachos could have wished for. Odysseus is alive and near coming home, says the old man. The quickened memory of Odysseus will do more for Telemachos at this point that his own personal appeal.

Halitherses' mythos also has a generationally conditioned direction. He frames the statement by reference to the expedition to

Troy, to the fate of Odysseus' companions, and to the full twenty-year cycle whose slow movement has brought Ithakan politics to this crisis. Eurymachos gives the suitors' reply to this pronouncement. He reminds the assembly that not all birds carry significant omens. He upbraids Halitherses for inciting the volatile young Telemachos, and promises that the suitors will continue seeking the marriage with Penelope, forsaking all others, until one of them is chosen by her for the match. They will not be diverted by Telemachos or by any prophecies. For they are not afraid of Telemachos (200): ... mala per polymython eonta. ("Even though he is full of talk.")

Telemachos has shown an ability to discern his own best interests, and not only to verbalize them, but also to put them forward in the cleverest, most efficient manner. Eurymachos surely regrets this; his epithet for Telemachos -- polymythos -- is a willful misrepresentation of Telemachos' rising capability. Eurymachos admonishes Halitherses, too, not to work up mythoi for the Odyssean side (201-2):

> *οὔτε θεοπροπίης ἐμπαζόμεθ', ἣν σύ, γεραιέ,*
> *μυθέαι ἀκράαντον, ἀπεχθάνεαι δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον.*

"We do not want any divination, old bird, which you work up into pointless talk, and you will be more unpopular still."

Eurymachos' assertion of the suitors' determination and lack of fear was provoked by the success of the assembly maneuver. Antinoos avoided attacking Telemachos directly by composing an accusation against Penelope; Eurymachos is threatening and abusive. Telemachos' closing of the debate signals a victory (210-11):

ταῦτα μὲν οὐχ ὑμέας ἔτι λίσσομαι οὐδ' ἀγορεύω·
ἤδη γὰρ τὰ ἴσασι θεοὶ καὶ πάντες Ἀχαιοί.

"I won't beg or speak further for these things which the gods acknowledge and all the Achaeans."

He knows he has unsettled the suitors, and won an audience in Ithaka.

The crucial scene in the sequence leading to Telemachos' departure occurs fifty lines later. Antinoos approaches him, grasps his hand warmly, and attempts to cajole him into relaxing his bitter opposition to the suitors. Antinoos advises him to join the feast and to put off worrying about the voyage for the meanwhile: the "Achaeans" will take care of your travel-arrangements in due time.[9] Telemachos refuses to lose the initiative. He swears off any fraternizing with the suitors. He has his own concerns (314-317):

νῦν δ' ὅτε δὴ μέγας εἰμὶ καὶ ἄλλων μῦθον ἀκούων
πυνθάνομαι, καὶ δή μοι ἀέξεται ἔνδοθι θυμός,
πειρήσω ὥς κ' ὔμμι κακὰς ἐπὶ κῆρας ἰήλω,
ἠὲ Πύλονδ' ἐλθών, ἢ αὐτοῦ τῷδ' ἐνὶ δήμῳ.

"But now that I am full-grown and can understand what others say, and have my wits about me, I will try to find a way to destroy you either by going to Pylos or even staying here."

This is a bold statement without artifice. It not only strips the suitors' prophasis of its plausibility, but reveals Telemachos' own implacable resolve to destroy them. Telemachos rips his hand from Antinoos' grasp, and leaves.

Two anonymous suitors interpret this heated scene. One simply recognizes the increasing danger which Telemachos now clearly offers them. The second apprehends the situation more optimistically. Telemachos, he feels, will surely be lost at sea on his voyage just

like Odysseus. In that event, the way will lie clear for all the suitors to divide up the house's goods, and to give up Penelope to one of the group for marrying. As in Leokrites' speech the aims of the suitors' are revealed without any pretense: their goal is the house of Odysseus and all that the house entails. What none of the suitors have access to, unfortunately, is the extent to which Telemachos is laying claim to these very things. As he prepares for the sea journey, Telemachos enters the inner chambers of the megara (337). He has penetrated the personal untouched treasure of the household. Silver and gold lie piled about; measures of unmixed wine, a potent symbol of fruitfulness as well as the token of hospitality, of the full vital life of the house, await Odysseus' return from hardship and threatened extinction. Eurykleia is the sole person to control and have access to these things.[10] Eurykleia is a vestige, Laertes' untouched purchase (1.433); and her figure is aidōs, and she invests the hidden stores of Odysseus with still more wonder than they possess in their own right. With it all, she is a link from the old generation to the fresh inheritor. By her help Telemachos outfits his ship with provisions. The ship itself Athena provides.

Telemachos' quest abroad has been interpreted from numerous perspectives; but from our perspective, the growth of Telemachos' character represented in these books of the Odyssey will lead toward a new control over the data of his family background, especially through knowledge of his father's aretē as it manifested itself through so many celebrated trials. Yet word of his father exists in Ithaka in a tenuous, disputed form. Telemachos must obtain a handle on the mythoi

of his lost father, in order to shape an image of his own identity over against the imposed interpretations of hostile manipulators. Therefore, he must escape the environment in which he has grown up, bereft of his father, and seek out surviving members of the generation with whom Odysseus fought and achieved his excellent renown.

Telemachos expresses the reservations of his youthful insecurity when he tells Athena his fear of beginning the interviews with this awesome company - at Nestor's Pylos especially (3.23-4):

> οὐδέ τί πω μύθοισι πεπείρημαι πυκινοῖσιν·
> αἰδὼς δ' αὖ νέον ἄνδρα γεραίτερον ἐξερέεσθαι."

"I have no experience with clever words. A young man should speak thoughtfully with an older one."

In the second line, andra is pillowed between two modifiers, serving in effect as subject and object of exereesthai. geraiteron then would signify first, according to the extended meaning, "older". But the basic meaning amplifies this transferred sense: Telemachos' hesitation arises not just from his painful modesty in addressing a much older man, but also from an intimation of Nestor's stature, his great experience and kleos. In contrast, Telemachos is "untried" (23) in just the area we are discussing: mythoisi pykinoisi. But Athena allays his doubt and encourages him with assurances of his own native abilities and a divinely auspiced descent and nurture (3.28): "I do not think that you have been born and nurtured without the notice of the gods." This is part exhortation, but it is also a first lesson in what Telemachos must be prepared to learn from those who can teach

him to speak in his own favor. The blessing that Athena assures Telemachos of is explained to him again in differing forms by his hosts in Pylos and in Sparta. Athena orients Telemachos in the assimilation of praise of birthrights, which in his case must be prior to any significant achievement in his own right.

When Telemachos arrives at Pylos, his way is eased by events. Nestor's son admits him into the hedria formed in the presence of his father. Thus, the diffidence of an extreme generation gap is eased by the tact of convention. Nestor sits among his sons and his sons-in-law; Telemachos momentarily becomes a part of that group - as he will report with appreciation later (17.108f.). After the rites of xenia have properly begun with food and wine, Nestor asks Telemachos to explain himself. Telemachos asks to hear anything of Odysseus which Nestor has either seen himself or picked up by another's account: ē allou mython akousas/ plazdomenou (93-95). Nestor's immediate reply is testy and difficult (113-114):

> ἄλλα τε πόλλ' ἐπὶ τοῖς πάθομεν κακά· τίς κεν ἐκεῖνα
> πάντα γε μυθήσαιτο καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων;

"We went through more than any have before -- who who is alive now could put these things into words?" That is, no one had better try. The heroes who took part in the affair of Troy alone may shape the mythos of that terrific event. A distance is created, therefore, between 'those times' and 'these', and between the sort of men who lived then as opposed to the sort who exist now. Nestor winds up in praise of Odysseus (lines 120-123) which is indeed complimentary to Telemachos, but also creates a distinction between father and son which

must make Telemachos squirm. This heroic world of his father's accomplishments grows more and more remote and inaccessible. Yet Nestor then begins to show signs of accepting this offshoot of the heroic Odysseus. The bond which Nestor describes between himself and Odysseus involved a similarity in judgement, a sympathy of counsel, and mutual respect. It is this homonoia which Telemachos must tap in order to establish rapport with Nestor and enlist his support. Nestor provides the opportunity (124-5):

> ἦ τοι γὰρ μῦθοί γε ἐοικότες, οὐδέ κε φαίης
> ἄνδρα νεώτερον ὧδε ἐοικότα μυθήσασθαι.

"Your speech is appropriate, and one would not expect a younger man to speak so appropriately."

Telemachos' power over mythoi, although nascent, has already been recognized; but it already begins to win friends who will foster the reputation of legitimate nobility.

To have Nestor on his side, however, Telemachos must learn patience. The old man has a message as well. By listening to the unfolding mythos of the old man, Telemachos receives a rhetorical lesson and the likelihood of Nestor's encouragement of his own mythoi. Nestor is bent on finishing his account of the end of the Trojan war and the return of the heroes; it becomes apparent that he has a personal interpretation to press upon events and to inculcate in his hearers. He tells the story of the departure of the fleet, and in such a way that Menelaos is victimized by his brother's atē. Despite the fact that Athena at line 136 seems to be angry with both Atreids, nevertheless Agamemnon is made a scapegoat. Nestor invents a mythos of

the "divided counsel" in order to dissociate the two brothers (3.150).[11] Agamemnon's orders bring ruin on the fleet. Of course, in due time Agamemnon pays more than a fair share for this error. For some reason, as if to ban the good memory of Agamemnon in the future, and to apologize for the surviving aristocrat Menelaos, to whom the fault of the war ultimately belongs, Nestor tells his tale. But the ending with Agamemnon dovetails nicely with his present need; Telemachos has already shown a fascination for Nestor's previous mentions of Orestes. Telemachos shows enthusiasm for Orestes' example, and expresses a desire for the same opportunity for kleos. Nestor finds this entirely appropriate, and offers a strong recommendation (218-224):

> *εἰ γάρ σ' ὡς ἐθέλοι φιλέειν γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη*
> *ὡς τότ' Ὀδυσσῆος περικήδετο κυδαλίμοιο*
> *δήμῳ ἔνι Τρώων, ὅθι πάσχομεν ἄλγε' Ἀχαιοί—*
>
> *οὐ γάρ πω τόδον ὧδε θεοὺς ἀναφανδὰ φιλεῦντας*
> *ὡς κείνῳ ἀναφανδὰ παρίστατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη—*
> *εἴ σ' οὕτως ἐθέλοι φιλέειν κήδοιτό τε θυμῷ,*
> *τῶ κέν τις κείνων γε καὶ ἐκλελάθοιτο γάμοιο."*

"If Athena is going to be your friend as she once cared for glorious Odysseus at Troy, when the Achaeans suffered so much grief -- no I never saw the gods so openly caring as in the way Athena stood by that one so clear -- if she is likely to be your friend and take pains for your life, then one of those [suitors] may lose out on a wedding." There is paradigmatic proof of Telemachos' hopes for divine aid, or so Nestor presents the case. He is very specific, naming Athena as the

father's patroness. Oddly enough, Telemachos rejects this comfort; his despondency may not be all that it appears, though.[12] His mind is bent elsewhere. Telemachos wants to hear of the circumstances of Agamemnon's return and murder. He is excited by Nestor's introduction of the analogy of Agamemnon and Orestes to his own domestic trials. Nestor then tells the story, finishing with Orestes revenge. Nestor warns Telemachos to keep his absence from Ithaka short, and he also bids him visit Menelaos who may know more of Odysseus. A certain amount of comic tension intrudes at this moment, as Nestor simultaneously urges Telemachos to be on his way and restrains him. Athena finally intervenes; she orders the necessary preparations. Then she departs miraculously: as a phēnē. The company is struck with amazement, and the epiphany impresses Nestor deeply. It becomes his honor, through Telemachos, that Athena saw fit to visit on his premises. He orders a special sacrifice; his support of Telemachos is galvanized in the excitement of the goddess' presence and by the solemnities which are generated from the extraordinary event.

The meeting of Nestor and Telemachos reveals much about the conflicts which the characterization of Telemachos itself is intended to embody. Telemachos' explorations in the retired heroic community mean a search for his father's kleos as it impinges on his own expectations; it also entails an encounter with a tired, if not moribund circle, representing the participants of a bygone, historic era. The paradox is that Odysseus both does and does not belong to this fading establishment. By his vanishing -- that is, through suffering - he has avoided the settling down which Nestor, as well as

Menelaos, accepts: a profound complacency which does nothing to work with the shape of the present but instead labors intensively to recreate and re-edit the past. So that, in a way, Telemachos intrudes into this world to rescue the still-living image of his father: which is neither dead and enshrined nor quick and visible. In this way, Telemachos' ability to find and refine the proper mythoi of his heritage is put to an extreme test.[13]

This test continues in Sparta. Telemachos encounters a similar nostalgia in Menelaos, who begins his part of the conversation with a mythos describing his close affection for Odysseus. At this description Telemachos is overcome with grief, and tries to hide his tears by pulling his cloak about his face. Menelaos is uncertain over how to proceed with his newly arrived guest, whether he should ask after the boy's father or leave him alone to speak himself when composed. Then Helen enters. She notices without any fumbling the likeness which Telemachos bears to Odysseus. Her acute perception and recollection dissolve the uneasiness of the situation. Telemachos, now identified properly, may talk freely of what he has come for. The pattern of this scene is replayed in the poem: at Telemachos' departure in Book 15. There, while an excessively zealous Menelaos awkwardly plays the host sending off his guest, an omen appears as two eagles fly in front of the assembled group. Peisistratos asks Menelaos to interpret this sign; the king ponders a suitable response. Helen cuts through this silence by giving her own quick, appropriate reply -- the very one Telemachos would have wished for.

Both Menelaos and Helen signal the predominant movement of Book 4

toward a proper recognition of Telemachos as the son of Odysseus. The atmosphere for this "recognition" is created from the opening lines, which describe the wedding festivities Menelaos is celebrating for his son and daughter. His daughter is marrying the son of Achilles. The match was arranged at Troy, presumably before the death of the great hero. The gods have seen to its fulfillment. The accomplishment of these arrangements symbolizes the preservation of the old world, a great deal of which perished at Troy, by a passage secured into the new. As it is repeatedly through the poem, the heroism of the Trojan war is recalled; in this case, the name of Achilles is called up in connection with his son. This son marries the only offspring of Menelaos and Helen, so that the event betokens as well Menelaos' partial victory, a hard-won concession from fate. Something from their union will escape the curse, and be fruitful, enjoying the completion of an action left unhindered bv the malicious intervention of the gods. The second half of the double wedding-party, the male half, which should lead to some sort of climax or heightening expectation, in fact reveals the meagerness of Menelaos' joy in this moment. The resolution of his fate and kingdom have been bitter. He found a bride for this son, not from another state, but from within his own capital, Spartēthēn. Alektor's young daughter it is, with no famous line or riches or heroic heritage. The gods made Helen barren after her first child, who fulfilled all expectations and grew up as beautiful as Aphrodite. But the union whose inner disharmony gave rise to a cataclysmic war was penalized by an end of fruitfulness. What was worse, the trouble came before the birth of a male child.[14] The son now to be wed was born ek doulēs. He is illegitimate, must marry

locally, in the shadows of the marriage of his sister to Neoptolemos, despite the fact that he is the male child. Suitably, the son's name is Megapenthes.[15]

Into this melancholy world steps Telemachos.[16] All the feasting seems to pass, out of sight; Menelaos devotes himself to his new guests without any apparent distractions from the other engagement he supposedly hosts. Helen appears very soon, too, to remain till dark. One would think that the weddings had never taken place. In addition to this contradictoriness, the episode achieves a feeling of removal in other ways. Many of the possessions of Menelaos and Helen, and the experiences they recall, are exotic and un-Greek, and -- naturally -- bygone. Yet, here Telemachos is recognized for his nobility, and told how much he is the son of Odysseus. Here, in a house that has lost its identity in losing the natural power to prolong itself, Telemachos must hear promises of the future of his own house and inheritance.

It begins with Etoneus announcing to Menelaos that guests have arrived (26-7):

"Ξείνω δή τινε τώδε, διοτρεφὲς ὦ Μενέλαε,
ἄνδρε δύω, γενεῇ δὲ Διὸς μεγάλοιο ἔϊκτον.

"A pair of strangers here, god-nurtured Menelaos, two men, and the look like the race of Zeus."

What first comes to Menelaos' attention is the appearance of Telemachos and Peisistratos, that they show by outward appearances the distinction of noble birth. Etoneus is not sure whether Menelaos wants to be interrupted, since the wedding is still going on. Should he direct the xeinoi to another house in the vicinity? Menelaos chides him; and

there seems to be no question that Menelaos will honor guests, whoever they are, before finishing the day at this wedding. They sit down to eat by the hero, and he offers a gracious compliment (62-64):

> ἀνδρῶν· οὐ γὰρ σφῷν γε γένος ἀπόλωλε τοκῆων,
> ἀλλ' ἀνδρῶν γένος ἐστὲ διοτρεφέων βασιλήων
> σκηπτούχων, ἐπεὶ οὔ κε κακοὶ τοιούσδε τέκοιεν."

"Your ancestors' race has not perished because of you; no indeed you are the race of Zeus-nurtured sceptre-bearing kings, since worthless men cannot produce such as you."

Again there is talk of their outward physis. For Menelaos, their stature and carriage bespeak basileuteron genos. The concern he expresses is ironic, however, coming from the father of a son whose wedding day is so negligible that the arrival of two complete strangers calls Menelaos away immediately. Even granted that xenia is a serious institution, but the two visitors could have been feasted without Menelaos' presence, if in fact it were necessary to detain them at all. But Menelaos is an eager host; he assures the two that their lines will survive without doubt

in the persons of such worthy offspring. One can see here how far Menelaos will go in this book, and in Book 15, in living vicariously through Telemachos and his search for the old comrade Odysseus.

As the group finishes supper, Menelaos catches an aside of Telemachos to Peisistratos. To the young man, the place looks like the hall of Olympos. Menelaos quickly corrects him, and explains that his wealth and opulence have come from travel and wandering abroad. All the while he was collecting his varied fortune, he continues, another

man killed his brother; another blow to Menelaos' posterity. He was nowhere to be found, when his own brother needed him (92-96):

ὡς οὔ τοι χαίρων τοῖσδε κτεάτεσσιν ἀνάσσω.
καὶ πατέρων τάδε μέλλετ' ἀκουέμεν, οἵ τινες ὑμῖν
εἰσάν, ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλὰ πάθον, καὶ ἀπώλεσα οἶκον
εὖ μάλα ναιετάοντα, κεχανδότα πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλά.

"So long as I wandered collecting great wealth in these things, another killed my brother in secret, by a plot, thanks to the trick of a cursed wife. That is why I cannot enjoy what I rule over. You will hear these very things of your fathers, whoever they are, since I suffered a great deal and destroyed a mighty house, squandering it all."
He cannot enjoy these riches; he destroyed a great house, emptying it of a good deal of booty. That was Troy, but it may as well have been his own city. Menelaos is wistful for the others upon whom his enormous misfortune descended. Weirdly enough, the spook of Odysseus floats from his mind. Menelaos does not know whether this close companion is alive or dead, whose memory haunts him. He finishes by saying that the man, Odysseus, haunts his own father as well, and his wife and son
(112): "... and Telemachos whom he left in the house when the child was young."

Telemachos must feel the tears heating his cheeks; he has not heard anyone else put his grief so succinctly, with such unpremeditated sympathy.

Menelaos is overjoyed to have with him the son of the man whom he so wanted to reward. Mention of Odysseus sends everyone to grieving again; Menelaos sees that they have all had too much of this anguish, and suggests that tomorrow morning they begin again. He alludes to the point of the whole visit, as we perceived it (214-215):

> *μῦθοι δὲ καὶ ἠῶθέν περ ἔσονται*
> *Τηλεμάχῳ καὶ ἐμοὶ διαειπέμεν ἀλλήλοισιν.*"

"Telemachos and I will go through the whole story together tomorrow morning."

On the next morning Menelaos and Telemachos hold their promised meeting to exchange information, that is, from Menelaos to the inquiring Telemachos. Menelaos asks Telemachos why he came, and Telemachos explains the troubles afflicting the <u>oikos</u>. Menelaos speaks first in a simile which underscores the <u>analkis</u> of the suitors. They are "fawns" (<u>nebroi</u>), who have taken to the dwelling of an absent lion (Odysseus). This simile is consistent with the terms of abuse which derive from animal comparisons, familiar from book 4 of the <u>Iliad</u>, for example, and also surviving in lyric poetry. More interesting is Menelaos' oath at 341f., which offers up a compelling <u>mythos</u> of Odysseus (341-45):

> *αἰ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἄπολλον,*
> *τοῖος ἐὼν οἷός ποτ' ἐϋκτιμένῃ ἐνὶ Λέσβῳ*
> *ἐξ ἔριδος Φιλομηλείδῃ ἐπάλαισεν ἀναστάς,*
> *κὰδ δ' ἔβαλε κρατερῶς, κεχάροντο δὲ πάντες Ἀχαιοί,*
> *τοῖος ἐὼν μνηστῆρσιν ὁμιλήσειεν Ὀδυσσεύς·*

"By father Zeus and Athena and Apollo, if only as he was in well-founded Lesbos, when he arose to wrestle Philomeleides after a quarrel, he threw him powerfully, and all the Achaeans were glad. Like this Odysseus could slaughter the suitors."

The aretē of Odysseus, as it manifested itself in a wrestling match with Philomeleides, is called up again. Heroic power was often put on display in such events - the chariot race in Iliad 23 is one such moment in which the contest becomes a highly serious event. Odysseus kills the suitors as an outgrowth of a contest which itself establishes his superiority over them. The athletic contest is an ersatz battlefield. It employed many of the same devices - javelin, stones and iron weights. It meant for one contestant praise and for another disgrace or at least embarrassment. (Death is not an element in the competition, although one might wish to re-read the single combat in Iliad 23 between Aias and Diomedes on this score.) The athletic trial in Book 8 grows into a sharper conflict, precisely because Euryalos calls Odysseus' aretē into question. Odysseus must then perform an act to show that he surpasses his new rivals; significantly, Odysseus thereupon supplements his deed with mythoi of other victories and of his generally surpassing ability (8.215ff.) (Although the art is primarily verbal, every good salesman must also be able to demonstrate the product.) Menelaos, therefore, celebrates Odysseus' physical power in an impressive mythos, and ties it firmly to a central notion of heroic aretē. What insures the lustre of the story, of course, is that Odysseus is not merely shown as a good wrestler - once or twice, or in

general - but at a palpable occasion, in Lesbos, against a noble opponent, old Philomeleides. The account makes a deep impression on Telemachos, who recalls it to Penelope in his summary of Menelaos' reception. Menelaos offers him a useful mythos of his father, just as Athena does at 1.264-5. From such lore Telemachos can learn to represent himself in terms of his father's nature and accomplishments, just as important as keeping Odysseus' memory alive for less selfish reasons.

By the time Menelaos has finished his long account of the meeting with Proteus, Telemachos is eager to return to Ithaka. He politely and astutely refuses a gift inappropriate to his native country - the chariot and the three-horse team. Menelaos approves Telemachos' good sense (611): "You are of good blood, my son, the way you speak." This approval is couched in eugenic terms; it thus suits the tone of the entire episode as we have described it. Menelaos improves on his first offer: he promises his most valuable possession (613-14), a beautifully wrought silver krater with gold cheilea. Telemachos' ability with mythoi, his growing tact and confidence, have thus begun to win him his own prizes. At the start of Book 15, we return to Sparta after a long detour through the memoirs of Odysseus voyageur. The scene has been "turned back", from the point at which we left Menelaos and his guests in Book 4. Telemachos and Peisistratos are in their beds; Athena appears before Telemachos, who had not yet fallen asleep. Athena fills his mind with urgency. She makes affairs out to be precarious, to the extent of being unfair to Penelope (cf. 15.20f.).

This belittling seems to take the place of criticism against Telemachos. We expect Athena to be a little tougher on the dalliance of Telemachos when we remember her treatment of Diomedes in Iliad 5. Telemachos does not need much pushing to excite his wish to leave. He gets up, and wakens Peisistratos with a rowdiness which indicates his increase in confidence (15.44-5), compared to the beginning of the journey in Pylos. Peisistratos agrees that departure is best for Telemachos' plans. He recommends that they wait for dawn; there will be more gifts that way (53-55)[18]!

When Menelaos and Helen arise, they find Telemachos ready to go. At least Helen recognizes this quickly and lets Menelaos on to it too (15.64-66). Menelaos marches into seven lines of short sententious maxims on why not to detain a guest; he never really explains why, but only repeats how awful a thing it is. He then makes a grandiferous offer to escort and guide Telemachos on a tour through the rest of the region and mainland Greece. Telemachos replies that he must go home. Menelaos agrees at once. Before a last meal Menelaos and Helen (and now Megapenthes) present the promised krater and other gifts in a brief ceremony. Menelaos relates the worthy details of his gift again, including a quick recollection of its first giver, Phaidimos. Helen gives Telemachos a peplos - one from the deepest reservoir of her linen-chest, the most beautiful and also the most impressive in size. The value of the gift is important, but to Helen this is only a subordinate part of the gift's purpose: its potency as a mythic device. The peplos shall stay with your mother, she tells Telemachos, to hold for your wedding. You will give it to your bride when the time comes. She wishes to build into the gift-giving a link with the

famous, steadfast and virtuous Penelope. Her gift is from one mother to another, then, and such an association favors her "rehabilitation". Besides, Helen has no son of her own, a fact which the presence of Megapenthes in this scene gently reminds us. Helen can enter the renewing power of Telemachos' eventual wedding-attachment by providing a provocatively beautiful and thus noteworthy gift. Telemachos and Peisistratos are about to depart; Menelaos comes running after them, to pour one last libation, utter one more word. He asks Peisistratos to remember him to Nestor. Peisistratos does not answer; Telemachos does instead. He promises to tell Odysseus of Menelaos' kind reception, if Telemachos should find his father at home. This wishful thinking is answered with a significant event. An eagle appears, carrying a wild goose in its talons. The appearance of the bird reflects favorably on what Telemachos has just said of his father. Peisistratos initiates the mythoi on this newest development. He asks Menelaos if this could be Telemachos' omen, or Menelaos' own. Menelaos is again caught in the trap of wondering how to say the right thing -- kata moiran; Helen anticipates - or rescues - him (171). She prophesies that as the bird (like the one in Penelope's dream: Book 19.538: elthōn ex oreos megas aietos angchylocheiles) seizes its prey, so Odysseus will take revenge when he returns (15.174-77):

> ὡς ὅδε χῆν' ἥρπαξ' ἀτιταλλομένην ἐνὶ οἴκῳ
> ἐλθὼν ἐξ ὄρεος, ὅθι οἱ γενεή τε τόκος τε,
> ὣς Ὀδυσεὺς κακὰ πολλὰ παθὼν καὶ πόλλ' ἐπαληθεὶς
> οἶκαδε νοστήσει καὶ τίσεται·

"As this [eagle] snatched here in the house the helpless goose,

the eagle from the mountain, where its race and birth are, so Odysseus although he has suffered much and has wandered far will return home and take vengeance."

Why is the simile with its descriptive information included? Perhaps Helen alludes once more to the powerful position which Telemachos holds by dint of succession in the Arkesiad line -- a role which nevertheless has been unrealized for and by him until now, although he and his race will not continue to be alienated from the polis and from the traditional seat of their power for much longer. Helen adds that Odysseus probably is already home. Her speech is a mixture of prophecy and clear sight. She tells Telemachos what he needs to hear, yet Homer gives her lines as well which boldly reach into the future. These are the last words Telemachos hears from the world of his father, in search of which he first set out. No words could have pointed a better bridge from that world to the new one Telemachos wishes to inhabit. Not only has Telemachos come to understand the place which was meant for him and to have confidence in his worthiness of that role; he also knows enough of himself and Odysseus as well to be in a position to have concrete expectations of his father once they have come face to face.

Notes

1 The most dedicated attempts at separation have come from the Homeric tradition in Germany: cf. Friedrich Eichhorn (1973), whose Unitarian

approach identifies two typical alternative viewpoints in Kirchhoff and Schadewalt. The former, according to Eichhorn, saw the Telemachy as a separate poem in the same tradition as the "Return of Odysseus", grafted on by the composer of the Odyssey; while the latter regarded the Telemachy as an original composition of a late redactor. Eichhorn's arguments for the integrality of the Telemachy within the Odyssey as a whole are as good as ignored in H. van Thiel (1979) 65-89, who posits a früh- and spätodyssee, on the basis of parallel variations of theme and diction within the 'Telemachian' and 'Odyssean' segments of the poem.

For a non-continental perspective, one may consult: D. Page (53-63) [contra the integration of Telemachy and 'Return']; and F.M. Combellack (1958) [pro integration], both cited in Gilbert P. Rose (1967) 391.

2 Hermes' dispatch is an act of inherited patronage in a way, even excluding the prompting of Athena. As J.S. Clay (69) points out, Odysseus represents in the poem of the Odyssey a worthy heir to Autolykos, and so "embodies the gifts of Hermes, the trickster god." Clear signs of this patronage are: (1) the rescue from Ogygia and Calypso the 'burier', a situation which W.S. Anderson (1963) 81-82 equates with Death; (2) Odysseus being kept from fatal danger again by the intervention of Hermes with the moly. It is interesting that Hermes here forsakes his normal psychagogic style and leads Odysseus from the dangers and seductions of an anonymous, otherworldly existence back towards his return to Ithaka.

3 See Stephen Bertman (1968) 115-123, especially 121 and 122.

4 For Diomedes' struggles with the memories of Tydeus, see I.1 above.

5 As Rose (1967) 398 states: "... Telemachos' voyage helps to establish him as something of an Odysseus, ...as a returning avenger in his own right and a secondary hero of the epic ..."

6 The guest-friends of Odysseus are an integral part of Telemachos' patrimony. The xenia-relation addressed itself to the notions of genealogy precisely to provide a continuity over the span of generations and to insure the quality of the relationship as well; in short, the xenia-relation built first on need, then extended and refined itself through mythoi-generating actions, which like the sons of the fathers had their own descent to place them in the traditions of a long relationship. Acts of hospitality and guest-gifts generate mythoi, or at least provide the material which each generation may work into a mythos.

Finley (1979[3]) 98 describes xenia in different terms, and for his own purposes, but I do not find his definitions contradictory to mine: "[gift-giving was] ... an act through which status relations were created, and what we should call political obligations ... the gift and the relationship between giver and recipient were inseparable."

7 For the intended response and Telemachos' rhetorical success at this

point (2.40-79), see H.A. Shapiro (1972) 57-8.

8 Rose's comment (1969) 390 on the suitors' designation of Telemachos as hyperphialos at 4.663 and 16.346 applies here and elsewhere: "... one of those instances in which the suitors acribe to others what in reality fits themselves."

9 Fenik (152) settles Page's objections to this scene.

10 One recalls in this connection the magical xenia-celebration of Book 9: the priest Maron gives Odysseus a portion of unearthly wine, which will eventually bring the Cyclops down; to the powerful wine, and to the rites of hospitality in the sacred grove only Maron's wife, and a single tamiē, have access.

11 Strangely enough, because he returned to Agamemnon's side before the final scattering of the fleet, Odysseus here is associated with the less favored Atreid, despite Nestor's initiatory eulogy of Odysseus. This discrepancy is discussed by J.S. Clay 47-49.

12 Even Athena - who is present, ironically, for this spiritless denial - cannot shake Telemachos' gloominess. His interest is fixed on the Orestes-story, and this new obsession shows that he is not overly discouraged. Furthermore, as N. Austin (1969) 59 writes on a later Telemachean utterance: "Frequently characters make utterances which are contrary to their true beliefs."

13 I cannot agree with the assessment of D. Stewart (1976) concerning Telemachos' trips to Pylos and Sparta: He rebuts (73) Whitman, who thinks that the Telemachy is meant "... to acquaint Telemachos with his heritage") "... since ... that heritage is so sterile, malevolent and dangerous. The purpose is rather to warn him of the extremely serious mistake he would be making if he were to assume that the old values and standards , by which his father also once lived, are any longer valid, or offer any hope of protecting his father and helping him reclaim his home. Telemachos -- or at least the reader -- is being informed that if Odysseus has not moved beyonhd these standards he is worse that dead, he is archaic as an example, even to his own son." Stewart's view of this part of the poem is conditioned by his thesis for the whole, that Odysseus must slough off the habit of accruing false personalities, by which he has survived the Adventures and the Return, in order to re-integrate fully in Books 23 and 24. Stewart sees the Odyssean-past as mainly paranoid self-deception, nor does he have any concern for the operation of genealogical imperatives in the Odyssey.

14 At 14.68f., Eumaios utters a curse on Helen's phylon, that it may be destroyed. The idea of destruction passed in subliminally through what Eumaios had just said in connection with the lost master Odysseus, all' oleth' . . . The curse which Eumaios then speaks has exposed a concern which he verbalizes again one-hundred lines later (180-2): "whom the suitors will ambush as he returns home, in order to destroy the race of god-like Arkeisios and make it meaningless in Ithaka."

The survival of the phylon is a precious matter - a vital interest of the Arkesiads, an inextinguishable remorse for Menelaos and Helen.

15 Anderson (74) takes a different line on this opening: "The poet chooses a particular occasion for Telemachos' arrival, for Sparta is celebrating the marriages of Menelaos' two children, Hermione and Megapenthes. This scene of festivity is enhanced by the resplendent appearance." He thereafter modifies this interpretation: "Even the festal occasion of the children's marriage becomes qualified with strains of sadness. Hermione, a girl who virtually grew up without a mother, now marries Neoptolemos and embarks upon her tragic experiences of love. Megapenthes' marriage in itself has little significance, but Homer tells us that he is not Helen's son; on this basis, we can immediately interpret the name as an expression of Menelaos' sorrow for his lost wife."

16 Anderson (cf. 74-77) has described the tense quality of Menelaos and Helen's relationship as well as anyone can (op. cit., pp.74-77); D. Stewart acknowledges following Anderson when he depicts the marriage of the Spartan pair alternately as "ferocious hostility" (46) and as a "neurotic and drugged immortality" (73).

17 Lines 11.444-46 reveal, however, that Odysseus' safety also derives from Penelope's unusual trustworthiness.

18 Telemachos must learn to compose his own self-serving mythoi, it is

true, but here it is important to remember that he has come abroad to win a reputation as well: his own kleos, which shall be spoken of in the mythoi of others sympathetic to him, and even of those unsympathetic to him. (There is some usefulness indeed in the suitors' publicly decrying his hypsagoria, for instance, for this is at least an active, formidable quality.)

IV. ODYSSEUS AND LAERTES

In the episode of Telemachos and Odysseus' reunion, Telemachos hesitates over his role in the suddenly imminent confrontation with the suitors. Despite his resolve to become heir to the household, Telemachos is taken by doubts at the very moment his father arrives to help him eliminate their common opponents. In freeing Telemachos of these doubts, Odysseus is compelled to formulate for both of them the nature of their claim on Ithaka. What Odysseus clarifies at this time, for the audience as well as for his son and himself, is a central issue of the heroic line of generations, particularly of this heroic line: even though it may be embattled and solitary among men, nevertheless, if the excellence of an heroic line remains intact, that line is divinely assured. Loneliness of human security is compensated through a special claim on the gods.

The physical reunion of the line of which we are speaking -- the Arkeisian line[1] -- starts in book 16, when Odysseus and Telemachos meet. Odysseus is disguised initially, and even after Eumaios leaves and Athena transforms Odysseus into a more youthful figure, the two cannot speak directly to one another, due to Telemachos' shock at the arrival of his father in such a miraculaous way. However, through the entire scene a continuity is established by Odysseus' need to test his son, to discover the degree to which he has made himself -- in his father's absence -- into a capable individual. Conversely then Odysseus must overcome the doubts which have also been uncovered within the scene, and show to Telemachos

that he can fulfill his own claims, and those which Nestor and Menelaos had made for him, to restore the security of the family's oikos.

When the beggar is first presented to Telemachos, the young man is upset. Here is another guest, and in the preceding book Telemachos displayed his anxieties that even one xenos was beyond his capacities at the moment. His frustration is overcome by his hospitable instincts, and he promises the stranger clothing, equipment, and safe passage. When Telemachos mentions the reason for his hesitance, the presence of the suitors in his house, Odysseus makes his move. His first speech to Telemachos demonstrates a passionate concern for the young man's predicament through a couple of exaggerated expressions. For one, he claims his heart is "devoured": (16.92) katadaptet' akouontos philon ētor -- "My heart is devoured as I listen..."

Then he conjectures the cause of the troubles: lines 16.95-6 are a repetition of Nestor's lines at 3.214-5. A comparison of the two contexts is interesting. Nestor in book 3 wonders if Odysseus will return alone and have revenge, or will need help (3.216-7):

> *τίς ὃ' οἶδ' εἴ κέ ποτέ σφι βίας ἀποτίσεται ἐλθών,*
> *ἦ ὅ γε μοῦνος ἐών, ἦ καὶ σύμπαντες Ἀχαιοί;*

"Who knows if sometime he himself will come back all alone to pay back their violence, or all the rest of the Achaeans?"

Nestor then recalls how Odysseus, more than anyone, had the help of the goddess Athena (3.219-22). If Telemachos had such help, he says , he would be able to end the hopes of the suitors (223-4). Telemachos respectfully disagrees: (227) liēn gar mega eipes. ("What you say is too enormous!")

Nestor's mention of Odysseus returning alone or with an army connects

with the last stage of Odysseus' own first speech to Telemachos in book 16. Again, Odysseus' assumed rhetorical pose adopts a passionate figure of speech: "May another man cut off my head, if I wouldn't cause them trouble, stepping into the house of Odysseus, Son-of-Laertes. Even if they with their mob (plēthyi) beat me, being all alone (mounon eonta), I would prefer dying in my hall to witnessing these perpetual outrages" (102-107). Odysseus has, for one thing, shifted out of the disguise, and spoken as if he were "young again, or the child of Odysseus, or Odysseus himself, come again" (99-101). The second possibility -- if he were Odysseus' son -- reproaches Telemachos. This notion we will pick up again later in the scene.

The immediate interest is Odysseus' reference to being alone -- mounon eonta. It is in that concept that Telemachos finds the means to explain the helplessness which the stranger intimates is essentially disgraceful (117-120):

"For in fact the Son-of-Kronos made our race singular. Arkeisios produced a single son, Laertes. Then as father he produced Odysseus alone. Likewise, Odysseus left me alone in the halls, after he had produced me, and he did not get any advantage from my birth."

When Telemachos had arrived at the hut that morning, it was Eumaios who greeted him with kisses, not Odysseus. The irony was exhibited through a simile. Eumaios was said to greet Telemachos "like a father would greet a son mounon tēlygeton (16.19). (The simile speaks very accurately of the situation, only its assignment of roles is indicative of the skewed relations of the group in the hut.) The mounos of Telemachos', genealogy stressed anaphorically, contrasts with the myrioi of the suitors in line

121. As far as Telemachos can see, fate has outweighed him in its assignment of resources. He does not realize that mounos -- like our word "singular" -- denotes a qualitative distinction, especially in the heroic context.

After Odysseus is stripped of the beggar-disguise, and Telemachos no longer fears that he is a god, Odysseus insists that he has returned to carry out the slaughter of the suitors, with Athena's support (16.233-4). He asks Telemachos for the number of the suitors; then he can decide whether to seek outside help (allous) or to make the attack mounō aneuth' allōn (238-9). Mounos is reintroduced into the discussion, but now in the dual![2] The "singularity" of the family is somewhat relieved now that father and son can combine in their solitariness!

The use of the adjective mounos to suggest an heroic distinction was apparent in its use in the Diomedes-portion
the Iliad. It provided a key nuance to the lesson of the Tydeus-paradigm. In both Agamemnon's and Athena's stories, Tydeus was alone (4.388: mounos eōn polesin meta Kadmēioisin/5.803-4: hote t' ēlythe nosphin Achaiōn/ angelos es Thēbas poleas meta Kadmeiōnas.) In both cases, despite his isolation, Tydeus won easily: because Athena was present as epitarrothos ("support-and-defender"). By isolating himself from the rest of humanity, the hero thus creates a focus of attention upon himself: in the gods' eyes, because the hero then appears unique and less mortal, and to other mortals because he suddenly seems elevated above them.[3]

Telemachos cannot embrace this heroic confidence. He articulates his doubt in the very same expression which he used to Nestor in the scene we quoted; (16.243=3.227) alla liēn mega eipes! His fear that Odysseus will

be insufficient to the task re-works Nestor's words at 3.215 -- ...sphi bias apotisetai elthōn: (16.255) mē polypikra kai aina bias apotisetai elthōn. Telemachos asks his father to consider where they may expect some help, so that they will not perish in the attempted revenge.

Odysseus tries to assuage the suspicions of his son by revealing to him the ground of their strength :(16.263-4)

"Just think whether Athena along with Zeus the father may be sufficient, or I should worry about another defender." Telemachos does not buckle under to the magnificence of Odysseus' claim. He points out instead how lofty, but also distant, those "defenders" are: hypsi per en nepheessi kathēmenō (16.263-4). Odysseus assures Telemachos that these will not be far away, once the shooting starts. However, Odysseus does not try any more to convince Telemachos that the gods follow him. Rather, he begins to give tactical instructions. this is no retreat on Odysseus' part nonetheless. What Telemachos must do is, upon a signal from Odysseus, when polyboulos Athena has directed his father (282-3), take up the arms in the hall, and carry them into the store-room out of the suitors' reach. To accomplish this, Telemachos will have to show the skill in speaking which Nestor had recognized in 3.124-5. If the suitors show suspicion, Telemachos must deflect them with disarming explanations (286 - malakois epeessi). Furthermore, if the suitors abuse Odysseus-in-disguise, at any time before the plan is carried out, Telemachos must bear it by trying to stop them with "gentle remonstrances" (279 meilichiois epeessi), even if they will not listen. Finally, Odysseus' presence must be kept secret from everyone,

even Laertes and Penelope. Odysseus challenges Telemachos to fulfill these as part of his role in the revenge-plot, especially the last; the challenge, however, is barbed (16.300): ei eteon g' emos essi kai haimatos hēmeteroio.

"If you really are mine and of our blood."

This insinuation of illegitimacy, which threatens everything that Telemachos has striven to assemble for himself from book 1 onward, does not unsettle Telemachos any more than Odysseus' challenge in 24.--. There, Odysseus exhorts him "not to shame the race", Telemachos assures him that he will make his father proud of him. In this case, on the other hand, Telemachos opposes Odysseus' insinuations more forcefully. Odysseus had suggested that, with his arrival and identity a secret, they might check the servants to discriminate loyal and disloyal. Telemachos however insists that such an opportunity will come, but only after the suitors have been destroyed. Then we may judge the servants, he says (320): ei eteon ge ti oistha Dios teras aigiochoio -- "If you really have recognized at all the sign of Zeus who carries the aigis."

The phrasing of Odysseus' reproach is thrown back at him. Telemachos' point is not clever banter, though. It is not, after all, that Telemachos cannot comprehend the shape of the heroic role, nor that he does not realize that such has been the birthright of his family. Like Sthenelos in Iliad 4, Telemachos is the sort of epigonos who is confident of his own capability, but realistic as well. Telemachos wants to know if Odysseus still has the favor of the gods, and if this favor is likely to persist. Telemachos in fact penetrates to the very core of heroic experience, questioning his father on an essential point: do you know the

indicating-sign of Zeus? This was the point indeed by which Sthenelos differentiated his generation from his father's. Telemachos' question to his father means: is your heroism still intact?

Odysseus' answer of course carries in it the gravest implications for the fate of the family's fortune. Its fate had hitherto been Odysseus', and so it is again. Likewise, Telemachos had reached a stage at which he was prepared to assimilate himself to the heroic example of his father, so far as he could discover it; now Odysseus is present to assume a role which his long absence from Ithaka had denied Telemachos. In this reunion the two characters have met, also confronted one another, and essential questions are raised of their respective places in the heroic line of the family. Odysseus asks Telemachos "are you worthy?" And Telemachos asks Odysseus in turn "can you assure this example of which you question me worthy?" Their mutual worthiness will be demonstrated in the twenty-fourth book, after one more reunion, of Odysseus with his father. Meanwhile, we must examine the intervening poetry for traces of that tradition of heroic authority which, we claim, belongs to this family of Odysseus, of the line of Arkeisios.

First, however, we need to digress shortly on a discussion of the aims of the suitors with regard to the house of Odysseus.

We have already established, on the basis of genealogical considerations, that their characterization is a negative one. Yet, their "suit" has an ostensibly legal aim, also a surreptitious one: to possess what by definition belongs to Telemachos: the patrōia panta, all his "ancestral goods".[4] At 4.660ff., Antinoos pushes through his leadership of an ambush which will catch Telemachos on the return from Pylos and Sparta. But here

and later in the book at 774 debate is limited, i.e., there is no progression of speeches among the chief suitors, as there often is, when for example Eurymachos offers a mildly corrective speech to Antinoos' at 16.433f., or Amphinomos a countervailing effort at 16.400f. Antinoos carries the day, as it were but more in the absence of significant participation of the chief suitors than in the support of any consensus. Antinoos' rhetoric is even conservative (4.667-8):

alla hoi autoi
zeus oleseie biēn, prin hēbēs metron hikesthai.

"But may Zeus destroy him, before he grows to maturity."

Zeus must be partner to the act. Moreover, the insistence on Telemachos' immaturity and pre-perfection as an adult renders the crime less horrible, a justifiable abortion. Antinoos wants to avoid saying explicitly what Telemachos' decisive move has in fact stated to all involved: the son of Odysseus is no longer a child; he is ready to show himself publicly as heir to the father's goods,[5] and now poses the only serious threat which the suitors' have faced outside of Penelope's reluctance. Still, the caution which Antinoos must exert in not mentioning the real object of Telemachos' assassination suggests that the suitors are divided in their aims. The most radical objective is the obliteration of the line of Arkeisios - more precisely, the line whose wealth and significance the most recent scion, Odysseus, has richly enhanced - and its replacement by a fresh, sanctified rival. When Antinoos returns in book 16 to announce the ambush's failure, he represents matters as having reached a crisis. Their attempted murder, he warns, will be used by Telemachos to inflame the Achaean laos to drive these suitors from the land (376-82). To prevent Telemachos, he again

urges his murder (16.384-6).

But he allows for the fact that some, even a majority, may shrink from the act of usurpation, and so he presents an alternative (387-8):

> εἰ δ' ὑμῖν ὅδε μῦθος ἀφαυδάνει, ἀλλὰ βόλεσθε
> αὐτόν τε ζώειν καὶ ἔχειν πατρώϊα πάντα,

"But if this idea please you, then let him live and hold on to his ancestral goods."

If Telemachos must live and be allowed to maintain unmolested the oikos, and his position among the Achaeans of Ithaka, then Antinoos suggests the suitors disperse to their homes and compete with bids for the hand of Penelope. The hinge of the decision is the patrōia panta; if Telemachos is allowed to assert his right over them, then the suitors may as well return home. Antinoos must hope that greed and the distasteful expense involved will swing the suitors' mood back to his callous perspective. He is for now disappointed.

Amphinomos rises to speak; his words betray the depth to which this issue penetrates (401-2): ... deinon de genos basileion esti kteinein. ("It is a terrible thing to murder a kingly race.") Here is a definite turning point in the evolution of the suitors' motives in the house of Odysseus. Antinoos, though momentarily deflected, has not been eliminated. Amphinomos' speech is temporizing, moreover, and not any condemnation of the program which Antinoos has to offer. Speaking what should be unspeakable, Amphinomos renders the extermination of the line conceivable. His characterisation is more "favorable" than either Antinoos' or Eurymachos' perhaps, only on the surface though. When he is warned by

Odysseus of the trouble which the suitors are courting, he somewhow misses the moment, and it is said that his destiny is anyhow death at Telemachos' hand, a prize granted from Athena. In this crucial spot, likewise, he is anything but a loyal supporter of the Arkesiad line. Rather, he wants the oracles consulted before an irretrievable step is taken. With Amphinomos what we have to discern is the distinction between caution and true conscience, saavy and sincerity. He is so thoroughly ambitious that he also considers the aftermath of aggression against the line, which heretofore has provided the basileus basileōn, even if only as a matter of custom, liable to change.[6]

Clearly the struggle which ends in the slaughter of book 22 quickens its momentum from the instant Antinoos and his ship return from the failed ambush. Within these last eight books the issue of the disputed inheritance is alluded to in a variety of ways, so that eventually it looms large over the conclusion of the poem itself. Telemachoas realizes that affairs are near a crisis in 17, when he orders Peiraios to hold his guest-gifts: he is aware of course that the catalytic agent of a crisis is now present on the island, his own father. That means that everything rests in place for the confrontation over what before his trip was undisputed (17.79-81):

> "Πείραι', οὐ γὰρ ἴομεν ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα.
> εἴ κεν ἐμὲ μνηστῆρες ἀγήνορες ἐν μεγάροισι
> λάθρῃ κτείναντες πατρώϊα πάντα δάσωνται,

"Peiraios, we do not know how these things will turn out. If the suitors catch me unawares in the hall and kill me, split up my ancestral property." Oddly enough, the arrival of his father initiates a dangerous crisis

regarding the paternal/ancestral goods. In book 20, Philoitios offers partisan confirmation of Telemachos' anxieties (20.215-6):

μεμάασι γὰρ ἤδη
κτήματα δάσσασθαι δὴν οἰχομένοιο ἄνακτος.

"They are eager to divide up the possessions of the lord who is away." The statement of their eventual aim is correct, even if one adds that this has been a gradual and also not a unanimous aspiration. (Note however that even as early as 2.367-8, Eurykleia indicates the basic meaning of the suitors' presence in the house, and the scope of their intentions.) Philoitios' assertion of the suitors' impiety, on the other hand, is biased. Certainly, a good many of the suitors would even handle the extinction of the race of Odysseus as piously as possible.

Furthermore, even at this late stage there are suitors who disavow the proposal of usurpation. Ktesippos is appointed later in book 20 to further goad Odysseus toward taking an unconditional retribution. His offensive violence is rebuked by Telemachos, who asserts himself as a prudent adult, and one who can now tell the difference between what he does and does not like. The suitor who replies to Telemachos' reply does not bait the young man; instead, Agelaos Damastorides delivers a conciliatory address to Telemachos. He insists on the impossibility of Odysseus' return. But this does not imply for him the desireability of eliminating the possible renewal of Odysseus' genos through Telemachos. He urges Telemachos to give up his mother so that the suitors may have what they came for and Telemachos may live in peace (20.336-7):

ὄφρα σὺ μὲν χαίρων πατρώϊα πάντα νέμηαι,
ἔσθων καὶ πίνων, ἡ δ' ἄλλου δῶμα κομίζῃ."

"... so that you do with all this inheritance what you wish, eat and drink it yourself, but she take care of another's house."
The tension increases in a vicious spiral since Telemachos has grown into the sole representative of the line which the suitors assail, and the suitors find themselves pushed to grow more consolidated and vigorous in achieving their goal of a redistribution of the Odyssean wealth.

The patrōia panta of Telemachos involve more than metals, cattle, weapons, slaves, and land. What it is that Telemachos must strive to grow into the master of, and upon what the reputation of his father is founded, can be examined in a less general way than by a discussion of a mere aggregate such as the words "all the ancestral goods" supplies. Homer instead does not withhold these "things" in the background, nor is the tradition of the oikos represented by "things" only. The poet brings forth a succession of people, places, and objects, which are significant in their relationship to the genos of Odysseus. Through them are revealed the poet's efforts to identify his hero with the authentic religious, social, and political life on Ithaka, where the claim of his genos resides.

When in the opening of book 2 Telemachos arrives for the assembly he had convoked in the previous book, even though many of the Ithakans are confused as well as curious about the cause of the assembly, nevertheless certain of them yield to the youth (2.13-14):

> τὸν δ' ἄρα πάντες λαοὶ ἐπερχόμενον θηεῦντο·
> ἕζετο δ' ἐν πατρὸς θώκῳ, εἶξαν δὲ γέροντες.

"The whole crowd gazed at him as he approached, and he sat in the seat of his father, for the elders yielded."

Telemachos assumes a seat his father once occupied. As he takes it, he does so through the deference, we assume, of men like Aigyptios and Halitherses Mastorides. The verb thēeomai in 13 reveals a lingering "popular" awe for the descendent and heir re-apparent of Odysseus; the crowd gapes as he approaches the speaking- ground. The reaction of the gerontes is another matter. There is every chance that no one will budge as Telemachos moves toward the thōkos which Odysseus had sat upon before. But in fact the old men make a place for Telemachos.[7]

The scene which complements and helps explicate this scene comes in book 17. In 17.61, Telemachos again approaches the assembly-place. The same line describes the awe-full attention he receives in making his way by the crowd. He by-passes the suitors, who are putting on their best faces this morning even though they feel collectively the greatest urge to see him dead (17.65-67). He takes a place instead where Mentor, Antiphos(see Stanford, vol.II, p.283), and Halitherses are seated:

(17.69) hoi te hoi ex archēs patrōioi ēsan hetairoi.

"For these were ancestral guest-friends of long ago."

Patrōioi hetairoi designates these men as Odysseus' companions, at least. It is also possible that family connections go back still farther in bringing these men into a relation of potential support with Telemachos. Yet, without Telemachos' adherence to the relationship there would be no patronage or support, no attachment on the part of Halitherses and company to the family of Odysseus. While he is interrogated by this group of elder comrades (70), his own hetairos, Peiraios, approaches him, in order to hand over the xenia-presents he had been safe-guarding , as well as to conduct Theoclymenos to Telemachos. This is a highly significant social act in

turn, and equally significant as an assertion that Telemachos is able to play out in full the role of an adult male who heads an important oikos. After Peiraios and the xeinos advance to Telemachos through the agora, the decisive result is stated simply (17.72-3): oud' ar' eti dēn Tēlemachos xeinoio hekas trapeto, alla parestē.

"Telemachos no longer turned away from the stranger, but stood by him." There is nothing more to this scene than the exchange between Peiraios and Telemachos concerning the guest-gifts from the trip and Telemachos' avowal of the suitors' aim to strip away his entire patrimony. At this point, Telemachos rises with Theoklymenos to go home for a bath and some dinner. The highlights are clear: the old citizens who once supported Odysseus now support Telemachos; they are interested in him and his progress, as well as hoping to find out for themselves the latest on the lost hero. The debility of the house is not so stark and insuperable as nature and accident at first brought about in collaboration. The house is again showing itself able to employ its powers, and is begininning to collect allies. All of this comes about, moreover, because of Telemachos' increasingly self-confident assertion as an adult.

Athena starts the process which will restore the house of Odysseus by impersonating Mentes, son of Anchialos; she visits Telemachos in this form, in order to spur his growth into a useful part of the plan. As Athena herself explains, when the time for introductions comes (1.187-9):

xeinoi d' allelōn patrōioi euchometh' einai
ex archēs, ei per te geront' eireai epelthōn

Laerten heroa ...

"We claim to be one another's guest-friends traditionally, if you could ask old hero Laertes."

Athena refers to Laertes for proof, perhaps because she knows he is present on Ithaka, if not in town at least on the island. (189f.) Beyond that, the appeal to Laertes' memory of the xenia bond between Mentes' Taphian family and the Arkesiads shows that the relationship does not originate with an act of Odyssean diplomacy, but has its roots deep in the past generations of both families. The phrase ex archēs, which we found in the description of the patrōïoi hetairoi of book 17 as well, aquires some definition now. The words do not designate any precise moment in the past. They suggest instead that, as far back as either family cares to remember, the two groups treated each other with respect and courtesy. Without xenia heroic society would fall into a state of unqualified incessant contention, which is something like the state of things on Ithaka now that the suitors have laid siege to the oikos of the departed hero. Xenia means to mediate among the numerous seekers-of-aretē. By means of the diverse institutions of hospitality -- visitation and common meals, gift-exchange, and as we learn through the fleeting allusions of this poem diplomatic and military assistance (cf. 16.424-30 and 21.13f.) -- aretē can be shared, and through such mutual recognition and alliance of purpose the heroic reputation of

reciprocating families can even be augmented.[8]

Athena's visit to Telemachos in the form of a family-friend thus shows him the meaning of such relationships in a vivid form. Telemachos is at first embarrassed to receive a guest; yet, despite the difficulties of being unexperienced as well as under the duress of the hostile suitors' presence, his "breeding" enables him to respond tactfully to the needs of the situation. A primer on etiquette is not more than the first step in Athena's intentions here, however. Her real aim with Telemachos, as we illustrated in the previous chapter, is to educate him in the mythoi of his heroic parent; to acquaint him with the typical vehicles of reputation in an heroic society, and so to enable him with a serviceable rhetoric to make use of the patrimonial material, thus to be enabled to asert control of his own oikos.

The generation of Odyssean stories out of the Mentes impersonation therefore creates history; the assimilation of this information, as we show, is a crucial facet of the development of Telemachos' character in the poem. Athena's first anecdote about Odysseus parallels Menelaos' later during Telemachos' stay in Sparta at 4.340f. Both utterances arise in indignation at the present affliction of the Odyssean household; the sentiment common to both is this: if Odysseus returned, he would smash the suitor; pikrogamoi they would be. Then, the confidence is corroborated by a bit of the past, a moment in which Odysseus displayed surpassing power and heroic aretē. In Menelaos' case, it is the wrestling-match with Philomeleides, springing out of strife, that shows Odysseus the perpetual, reliable victor. Athena's recollection is darker, more diabolical. By it she recounts the time when Odysseus came from Ephyra, from a visit to Ilos

Mermerides.[9] Ilos would not give Odysseus the poison he sought, for smearing on arrows, because he feared engaging the nemesis of the gods (1.263). But Mentes' father gives Odysseus the poison.

Some have decided that this is an unchivalrous story.[10] The foremost issue in this anecdote is the extent to which Odysseus inspired confidence in his associates. Overlooked as well is Athena's pre-amble. Menelaos' tale begins in simile form, then a pair of co-ordinating adjectives, as in both cases, toios eōn hoios ... Athena begins by saying that the suitors would be in trouble if Odysseus should come walking in the front door (1.256-7):

... echōn pēlēka kai aspida kai duo doure
toios eōn hoion ... (ta prōt'enoēsa).

"... holding a helmet and shield and two spears, being as he was when I first saw him."

The two spear-shafts are standard complement of the Homeric warrior, as Stanford notes. The pēlax, on the other hand, is a helmet; the word occurs here only in the Odyssey, not infrequently in the Iliad. In that case it is a martial touch, a tone of Iliadic bravado sounding in the evolving patterns of the Odyssey. This episode turns determinedly militaristic - even from the outset. Athena is intent on marshalling the potential for violence in both her proteges, father and son. No one should underestimate, then , the impact of this speech of Athena at 253ff. to Telemachos. The impression made on Telemachos by Menelaos' anecdote has been discussed in the previous chapter. It provides a bit of Odysseus which he happily retains, and repeats to Penelope, even after he has been secretly re-united with his father. He is aware, as is clear from 1.270-77, that his father had many "friends". To meet them, to learn what

they know and how that can be used in his behalf, is a mission we explored above, but which we also expand on here as part of the inheritance which links together Telemachos, the returning Odysseus, and the line which they both represent.

While there are characters who enter the narrative of the poem to address Telemachos, and to be addressed by him on behalf of Odysseus and their line, there are also physical tokens of genealogical interest for the descendants of Arkeisios. These objects are interspersed among the human actors; sometimes the recollections which these things prompt on the part of the "narrator" introduce new actors onto a secondary or background staging within the narrative. These objects, and the characters they 'recall', work with a common tendency: to build up in the audience certain expectations appropriate to the heroic family, whose reintegration we more and more eagerly accompany as the Odyssey unfolds. These expectations are thus genealogical; that is, they are at once created and reinforced by objects which store within them information on a genos of which Odysseus and Telemachos are the significant living members.

A first object for us to inspect appears in the important first council scene in book 2. Telemachos enters the assembly, and assumes his father's thōkos, in addition the deference of his father's old associates. We have already considered the manner in which this particular 'fatherly object' affects its immediate context. The next time an Ithakan scene reminds us of Odysseus comes at the end of the book. The instance is heralded by Telemachos' violent rejection of Antinoos' blandishments, as he snatches his hand away at 2.321. An anonymous suitor notes that the incident marks a change in Telemachos' attitude; the young man's resolve

will end in a sympathetic force from Pylos or Sparta, and their destruction. This is answered by another tis, who now sponsors the death of Telemachos:

(2.335-6) ktēmata gar ken panta dasaimetha, oikia d' aute
toutou mēteri doimen echein ēd' hos tis opuioi.

"Let's divide all the possessions, and give the household to his mother and to whoever marries her."

Even before Antinoos' urgency about the ambush, the notion of killing Telemachos and robbing the family's possessions circulates. The immediate reply to these words does not show up in the form of a speech by any Odyssean partisan; rather, this is joined to an important scene (337-9):

Ὣς φάν· ὁ δ' ὑψόροφον θάλαμον κατεβήσετο πατρός,
εὐρύν, ὅθι νητὸς χρυσὸς καὶ χαλκὸς ἔκειτο
ἐσθής τ' ἐν χηλοῖσιν ἅλις τ' εὐώδες ἔλαιον·

"He went down to the store-room of his father, wide, where gold and bronze lay heaped up, clothes in trunks and plenty of fragrant oil."

Just as the suitors begin to fear Telemachos enough to discuss his murder and broadcast their true ambitions, Telemachos goes down into the heart of the house, which is still inviolate. (The chamber with the high roof, the treasure- house, is his father's: (308) patros.) Gold and bronze, fine clothing and fragrant olive-oil all lie here in abundance; but the item which draws much more attention - four lines all of itself - and leads directly to thoughts of the lost home-coming of Odysseus is the store of wine. The wine is palaios, well-aged. Its condition of safe storage signifies that the suitors, although they abuse the house's hospitality, do not truly share in it. They are drinking only the inferior wine of the

house, and draw it off daily; but the house reserves this undiminished source of the ancient potency which wine can symbolize in several forms: release from toil and war; offerings to powerful gods; the geras of political leaders, the sacrament of the trapezda and of the rituals of hospitality. Wine is elsewhere a magical force in the Odyssey, nowhere more so than in book 9; for instance, Maron of Ismaros, priest of Apollo, offers Odysseus the potent wine which eventually will undo the Cyclops. That too is a powerful wine, and plenipotent gift. To the ceremony of Maron's presentation a curious detail is added:
(205-7)

οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν
ἠείδη δμώων οὐδ' ἀμφιπόλων ἐνὶ οἴκῳ,

"No one of the servants knew of it, nor any of the maids."
auton refers to the marvellous wine, which is protected from adulteration as it were by the personal secrecy which these lines communicate. The exclusivity of the ceremony guarantees the intimacy which the wine betokens, first for Maron in his own household, then as part of his rituals deep in the wood, between Odysseus and himself as guest and host. The casks of Odysseus' wine stand by the wall against the day of his homecoming, like Maron's watched by a single faithful tamiē, Eurykleia. The recital of laid-up items, which ends in the symbol of the unmixed wine, imparts the impression of time suspended. There is an expectancy which stirs within the room when Telemachos enters; at the same time the store-room reveals a stolid defiance of the troublesome suitors. The poet's description of Odysseus' intact wine-store is not casual; it creates

a new perspective on the suitors' failing effort. They cannot penetrate the core of the house's power. They are a corruption, but one abiding on the surface. The access of Telemachos to these things shows the opposite, points to his eventual success.[11] His entry into the treasure-chamber affords him a glimpse of the wealth he has inherited. The trip he plans has caused him to need some of these provisions. They are a measure of the powerful potential he owns as heir of Odysseus, but they are also the indicator that his future resides in becoming co-master of a wealth and tradition already established. He cannot stay ignorant of it and still hope to prosper.

Thus, in the early books especially, Telemachos is a divining-rod of the residual potency of Odysseus' accomplishment. As the poem progresses, Telemachos journeys off Ithaka; then too we finally meet Odysseus, and by the time we are done being entertained by his creativity, we are half-way through the work and just touching the shores of Ithaka again. The visible symbols of the heroic tradition of Odysseus' house have not come into view for ten books. However, as soon as we are on the island once more, these tokens reappear in the form of land-marks, people, and material objects. All are played out carefully inside their close context, but contribute too to a larger texture, which we are trying to describe as the establishment of the house of Arkeisias in genealogical terms.

When Odysseus first awakens on Ithaka in book 13, he cannot recognize the landscape as his native land. Athena poured a mist about him, so that Odyssues himself would not be over-eager to try to contact his family before deliberating with Athena. Athena appears to Odysseus in disguise, and they effectively circumvent one another in the first major "lying

scene" of the Odyssey. Athena is of course both pleased and reassured by Odysseus' deceit; she praises him as the best of mortals in that respect, just as she surpasses any god in mētis and kerdos (13.297-9). Odysseus does not immediately fall in with the goddess, however, even once she lifts the masquerade. He is angry still for what he considers her abandonment of him during the wreck of the Greek fleet after Troy. Athena answers this resentment with a promise that she always stands by Odysseus (331-2); she could not cut short the wanderings on account of the determined anger of Poseidon - patrokasignētos (342). So she excuses herself.

Athena then reveals the landscape of Ithaka to Odysseus. She begins with the harbor of Phorkys, the sea-god, grandfather of Polyphemos (!). Then she moves to a closer point: the olive-tree standing on a rise above the inlet. Near the tree is a cave; this cave is sacred to those nymphs which are called naiads (349-50):

touto de toi speos euru katērephes, entha su pollas
erdeskes numphēsi telēessas hekatom bas.

"This is the wide high-roofed cave, where you sacrificed plenty of perfect hekatombs to the nymphs."

The refresher tour concludes with the mountain which backdrops the whole scene (351): touto de Nēriton estin oros kataeimenon hulēi.

"This is Neritos clothed with woods."

As we have seen in other circumstances, the key element of this descriptive listing receives expansion; the cave of the nymphs takes four lines to narrate, the other items restricted to one line apiece. What is crucial to the expansion itself is the su of 349; it is toward the personal pronoun that the four lines are shaped. Odysseus is introduced into the

landscape, moreover, but not in a present tense. As a past actor, he is mentioned as the one who offered many sacrifices to the nymphs of the water.[12] The significance of this allusion is enhanced through Odysseus' reaction. The mist has lifted; Odysseus rejoices to see Ithaka, kisses its soil. Then Odysseus offers a prayer, not to the nearby patroness, but to those nymphs of twenty-years ago, abiding still. The end of the prayer ties past to future (358-360):

> *ἀτὰρ καὶ δῶρα διδώσομεν, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ,*
> *αἴ κεν ἐᾷ πρόφρων με Διὸς θυγάτηρ ἀγελείη*
> *αὐτόν τε ζώειν καί μοι φίλον υἱὸν ἀέξῃ."*

"But we will give gifts, just as before, if the daughter of Zeus, who grants spoils, if good to us and lets me live and raise my son."
The sacrifices will be resumed, if Athena assures success in myself and my son.

Odysseus' recollection of an Ithakan identity starts with this, a role determined in the past and expressed in geography and religious terms. The nymphs are a metaphor of geographical control; they symbolize the active relationship which Odysseus shared with the divinities of the land of Ithaka. The nymphs re-appear in book 14. Again, they do not appear alone. Eumaios serves his company and the beggar a meal. Portions are distributed, and two reserved:

(14.435) ... nymphēsi kai Hermēi, Maiados huiei.

"... to the nymphs and Hermes, son of Maia."

Here too the nymphs are part of a religious ritual, not the exclusive recipients of an offering, but instead close associates of an important patron of the group.[13] The association enhances this allusion to their

influence over local natural resources. In fact, in book 17 we find yet another reference. Eumaios and Odysseus approach the town, stopping at a spring which supplies most of the citizens' water. There is an altar on the spot, dedicated to the nymphs, and offering an opportunity for passers-by to improve their way with sacrifices to these local goddesses. The description of the vicinity is a prelude to the meeting with the nasty goat-herd Melanthios. Therefore, the peacefulness of the poet's description - cool waters, flowing from a high rock, and falling down to wet the whole green pasture in a wide circle - raises the potential contrast with the violent scene which follows. But there is another detail of the description which we cannot ignore (17.207):

[krēnēn]

tēn poiēs' Ithakos kai Nēritos ēde Polyktōr.

"the spring which Ithakos and Neritos and Polyktor made"

This detail is specific, where the rest of the passage is general, even conventional. Who were these three? One scholion (V.) cites Acusilaus, who thought Ithakos and Neritos were brothers (so also Eustathius:(1815.50) Pterelaou de paides houtoi.). It is conceivable that the names constitute a genealogy of three generations. Perhaps Neritos (as Stanford suggests (II.286), after Van Leeuwen) the mountain-god, begat Ithakos (eponymous hero of the island), who begat Polyktor. An important feature in the environs of the astu, the fountain is identified by what might be a genealogy, but by what is in any case a reference to the fairly distant past. The three who make up the "line" are a bit of static history: the places which keep their names do not seem to generate additional mythoi.

(There is a Polyktorides among the suitors, but he makes nothing of his ancestry, if indeed he has anything to do with the Polyktor of this ancient line, if indeed the three do represent a line.)

The living relation is soon brought forward, on the other hand. The abuse of the goat-herd Melanthios turns to confrontation; he passes Odysseus with a kick to the hip. The blow angers Odysseus, but does not budge him. Eumaios prays for vengeance (17.240-43):

> *"νύμφαι κρηναῖαι, κοῦραι Διός, εἴ ποτ' Ὀδυσσεὺς*
> *ὔμμ' ἐπὶ μηρία κῆε, καλύψας πίονι δημῷ,*
> *ἀρνῶν ἠδ' ἐρίφων, τόδε μοι κρηήνατ' ἐέλδωρ,*
> *ὡς ἔλθοι μὲν κεῖνος ἀνήρ, ἀγάγοι δέ ἑ δαίμων·*

"Nymphs of the fountains, daughters of Zeus, if Odysseus ever burnt thighs for you, hiding the bones in rich fat, fulfill this wish, that he might come, that man, and some god lead him."

In the same way as before, this prayer re-iterates the favored position which Odysseus has established by right. Of course, after his long absence the sentiment of the prayer really starts to look like an appeal to an endangered tradition. But this is precisely the crisis in which Odysseus and his entire group find themselves. They depend on, nurture, suffer with, a tradition which is near disappearing. The places of Ithaka, and the divinity which persist in them, remember Odysseus, or continue at least to provide some inspiration to the hopeful Eumaios, to continue speaking of the line which Odysseus has abandoned. But the Neritos which the poet recalls has no one living to foster his remembrance; he is a huge monument to the ossification threatening any tradition which has mythoi, but no warm blood to sustain its life.

Before proceeding to the most powerful item in the cumulative

symbolism of the significance of the Arkesiads in Ithaka, let us consider another character who brings life to the campaign for the preservation of the Odyssean oikos. Philoitios the cow-herd meets his master-in-disguise, and tells the man he thinks is a beggar his longing for the lord Odysseus. His remarks are cast largely in the style of personal recollection and reflection, but also contain several points of a discourse on kingship - at least, on the trials of being king (20.195-6):

alla theoi duoōsi polyplangktous anthropous,
hoppote kai basileusin epiklōsontai oizdun.

"But the gods make men wanderers whenever they spin out grief to kings."
It is not easy to be king. Even when one's line derives from Zeus, one cannot escape the father-god's generosity of mixed favors and misfortunes (201-3):

Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὔ τις σεῖο θεῶν ὀλοώτερος ἄλλος·
οὐκ ἐλεαίρεις ἄνδρας, ἐπὴν δὴ γείνεαι αὐτός,
μισγέμεναι κακότητι καὶ ἄλγεσι λευγαλέοισιν.

"Zeus, no god is more hateful than you! You do not pity men, even those you produce, but mix them trouble and hideous pains."
This assumes that Philoitios' Odysseus fits the pattern described, that he has been subjected to the worst ills that mortals can expect, even though he is kingly and descended from Zeus. Philoitios' lamentation is not empty of stratagem, or at the least a well-developed bias.

Philoitios cannot abide the new state of affairs. Although he is forced to service the needs of the new lords of the area, he does not submit in any way to altering his way of thinking, or speaking, to

accommodate the suitors' wishes for a transition of power. Philoitios does not lack illustrative material, either, to push his line of argument. He has symbolic embodiment handy in his daily work. The herd which Odysseus entrusted to him becomes first a mark of Odysseus' leadership in delegating responsibility; then, through Philoitios' special success with the herd, Philoitios vindicates that leadership, making himself in the meantime an indispensable element of its kleos. In fact, there is a good amount of vainglory in Philoitios' assertion (211-12):

> *νῦν δ' αἰ μὲν γίγνονται ἀθέσφατοι, οὐδέ κεν ἄλλως*
> *ἀνδρί γ' ὑποσταχύοιτο βοῶν γένος εὐρυμετώπων·*

"Now they increase incredibly, but this race of ox would not flourish under another man."

But Philoitios characterizes his success as measuring the benefit of Odysseus' rule. The reason why Odysseus' memory remains strong among such as he, Philoitios is saying, is that Odysseus is really the cause of prosperity in the first place. The immanent power of the good king is signalled here, which insures fertility and good yields, and which Odysseus himself indirectly recalls at 19.109ff. Philoitios' claim is that this power will descend to subordinates, also. The genos of cows increases through the magic which is transmitted from Odysseus to them through Philoitios. Where does the king acquire this power? From Zeus, Philoitios says, with the addition that still Zeus may even sometimes disfavor his own.

The matter of divine patronage comes up in the opening of this very book. Here Odysseus lies awake, wishing he could settle the score with his disloyal maidservants and their paramours among the suitors. Athena

appeases him, to still his turmoil, bubbling over as it is like stuffed entrails on a roasting spit. When Athena asks him why he is awake, Odysseus reveals that he is not so angry as apprehensive (20.38-40):

> ἀλλά τί μοι τόδε θυμὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερμηρίζει,
> ὅππως δὴ μνηστῆρσιν ἀναιδέσι χεῖρας ἐφήσω,
> μοῦνος ἐών· οἱ δ' αἰὲν ἀολλέες ἔνδον ἔασι.

"I am wondering how I can attack these suitors, since I am alone. They are so numerous."

The fears which he allayed in his son, he now admits to for himself. The basic worry is that he will be alone - mounos. Odysseus does not suddenly doubt the heroic distinction which we discussed earlier, in connection with the uses of mounos eōn. His worries of how to kill the suitors fade before another greater one: how to escape the consequences of the deed when it is done, the vengeance of the suitors' kin, that is.

Athena reassures him (20.45-48):

"Wretched one, a man might trust some worse companion, who was mortal and did not know anything very clever. But I am a god and will guard you faithfully in all your labors."

Odysseus' doubt is needless; she is an indubitable ally. Still, Odyseus is not wholly satisfied. He falls asleep, but awakens again to the sounds of Penelope's mourning. Odysseus gets up from his sleeping-place, sits in the megaron, and asks from Zeus himself a sign. Not only does the god thunder,

but a maid-servant confirms the teras with words of good-omen (20.112f.). The element of divine support again recalls the contexts of other Homeric genealogy which we have analyzed in this paper. In many cases, especially in the long discussion of Bellerophon's trials inside the family history related by Glaukos, a genealogy provides a means of locating where exactly the favor of the gods leaves and /or re-enters a mortal line. The remembrances of Tydeus with respect to the accomplishments of the Epigonoi turned on the same pivot: who had most clearly seen, and thus had benefitted by, the teras Dios. The matter upon which Odysseus' worries touch, Athena's visit, Zeus' thunder, the entire issue of the divine favor of a race of mortal men, is about to be worked out in a final confrontation between the representatives of the premier genos of Ithaka and the sons of other genẽ who wish to rearrange the old status arrangement.

Penelope's retrieval of the bow is itself transformed into a significant act through careful description of all her movements toward its resting place in the eschatos thalamos. Two lines dwell on the key to the chamber; two lines again describe the wealth of metals stored in the chamber. Then the bow appears. It was a token of xenia, aquired by Odysseus when he was out on a mission of state: to collect a penalty from the Messenians, who in a raiding party had stolen flocks and men from Ithaka. There are other interesting details, moreover. Odysseus undertook the mission despite his being very young; and he was encouraged to make the trip by his father and the elders of Ithaka (21.21). The task is redolent of the trip to Autolykos described in book 19. It represented a test for Odysseus, and a coming of age. The badge with which Odysseus returns this time is not a scar and many gifts, but (we assume) the success of his duty, and a

remarkable token of xenia, given by the son of a famous hero, Iphitos Eurytides.

A complication arises at this point. The relationship with Iphitos, as well as that hero's career, was cut short by an act of brutality, we are told. Herakles murdered him for the cattle he was driving when Odysseus had met him. Although Herakles is designated even here as Zeus' son (twice: 21.25; 36), still he commits the sacrilege of murdering a xeinos, and ignores the shame that should attend violation of the gods' regard.[14] This strange side-light on the bow reflects directly on the suitors' own ignorance of the proprieties of xenia; the bow which shall wipe out a crime against the hospitality of Odysseus' home itself carries the tale of a heinous offense against the sanctity of the xeinos-relation.

There may be room within this incident to move in other directions, taking a cue especially from the last four lines. There we are told that Odysseus never took the bow on expeditions, especially not to Troy. The bow was carried or shot only hēs epi gaiēs ("in his own country"). Most of the time, however, it remained at home -- mnēma xeinoio philoio -- "a reminder of precious guest-friendship" (40-41). The bow carries a great deal of history. It is not important as a weapon of war; it has not been taken from its resting place for a considerable time. What is more, its martial kleos, attaching to it while it was used by the hero Eurytos, has faded - at least, it is nowhere to be seen in this poem. Instead, the bow is a reminder of Odysseus' early career, and the mission he was performing when he met Iphitos. Along the lines of a familiar theme, the weapon displays a knack of Odysseus to keep on the healthy side of guest exchanges.

The original owner of the bow does not appear elsewhere in the poem. That is, if we only go so far back as Iphitos. But his father carried the bow before him, and Eurytos does show up elsewhere. Odysseus has just put the young Phaeácian nobles in their places after they had abused him. (He first rebukes their insolence (8.166f.), then outdoes their throwing-marks (8.186f).) His speech at 202ff., then, turns to a dissertation on Odysseus' own achievements and his excellence - within limits. He clearly avows his superiority within the present generation. But he assumes a humbleness in comparing his own power with that of former heroes - like Herakles and Eurytos at Oichalia. Eurytos is treated differently in this passage, as opposed to the treatment at 21.32-3. There he is simply megas Eurytos, and leaves the bow to his son on his death-bed. In the earlier story of book 8, though, there are complications.

In fact, Eurytos gets himself into serious trouble in the short anecdote of book 8. Both he and Herakles strove with the immortals through their archery. But Eurytos paid a price (8.226-28):

> τῷ ῥα καὶ αἶψ' ἔθανεν μέγας Εὔρυτος, οὐδ' ἐπὶ γῆρας
> ἵκετ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισι· χολωσάμενος γὰρ Ἀπόλλων
> ἔκτανεν, οὕνεκά μιν προκαλίζετο τοξάζεσθαι.

"Great Eurytos died suddenly and did not grow old at home. Apollo killed him in anger, because he had challenged the god in archery."
This version - that he did not die in his own home of old age - contradicts the later tale of book 21. Here Eurytos loses the benefit of his particular heroic aretē, because of his offense against Apollo. By overstepping proper boundaries, and provoking the god (prokalizdeto toxazdesthai [228]), he ruins himself. Why is this information not

included, but instead substantially deploded and re-created, for the narrative in 21 of the bow-gift from the Eurytid line? Perhaps, it would have been felt to detract from the image of Iphitos as an innocent and outraged victim, whose murder was unprovoked and remains unrequited. Requital will come, as a matter of fact, although obliquely in defence of another 's life and property.

We might wonder whether an audience taking in anything resembling the whole poem would bring any of the first Eurytos story to its appreciation of the second mention. It is difficult to trace connections between the narrative in the "Phaeacia" of book 8 and the "Return" of book 21. Nonetheless, it is curious that Eurytos challenges Apollo, the archer god, and is paid for such hubris with death. Likewise, the suitors' hubris is punished under the auspices of Apollo; Homer pointedly reiterates the coincidence of their appointed day and the Apollonian festival. The weapon which kills them is of course the self-same which Eurytos carried against the god. The bow bears implications that travel beyond the point which is the obvious climax of the immediate narration: The hinge of the passage of the bow is definitely the crime of Herakles. The bow is laden with other associations, though, through the mythoi adhering to the memory of the first owner. By contrast with the demise of Eurytos, it may be, Odysseus' closeness with the gods, his unshakable charter with Athena, his clear recognition of the teras Dios, the gift of revenge on Apollo's festival day, are all high-lighted by his coming to repossess the bow.

When Odysseus takes up this bow at the end of the book, it is likened to a musical instrument. The simile creates a symbol of the restored harmony of Odysseus and his possessions. The bow is the one with which

Odysseus will win back all the others; the allusion to the fine-tuned note with which the bow-string 'sings' re-inforces the integrity of man and object, especially in contrast to the suitors' failure to manage the weapon. In fact, the whole episode, which may be said to begin with the fetching of the bow and the relation of its heroic pedigree, reveals how thoroughly inferior the suitors are, how distant in the possession of arete and in the hopes of achieving a worthy kleos in the eyes of the opsigonoi. Before the stringing, however, Odysseus turns the bow in his hands, this way and that, examining it carefully:

(395) me kera ipes edoien apoichomenoio anaktos.

"... for fear that worms had eaten into the horn while the master was gone."

The literal-minded would attribute this to Odysseus' care not to have the bow break off in his hands at the moment of truth. But the inspection displays a moment of reintroduction to one's own. The bow is already identified as an invaluable piece in Odysseus' store; he long ago placed its practical value aside, keeping it apart from other weapons without its unique pedigree. Now, the reacquaintance with this piece serves as a reward of home-coming. Furthermore, another motif coheres in this concentrated moment, our attention on Odysseus fondling the bow before all hell breaks loose. The motif induced here involves the decay and decrepitude which has sapped the life of the oikos in Odysseus' absence. The possibility of the bow's decay is another, and will lead us further, to another weapon, and the conclusion of our interest in the reoccupation of the Arkesiads' rightful place.

After the first suitors have fallen, it becomes apparent that the trap

is nevertheless not air-tight. The surviving suitors start to receive arms. Apparently, Melanthios has found a way to get into the chamber where they had been stored. Odysseus orders Eumaios and Philoitios to apprehend him. They steal back into the chamber and hide in wait for Melanthios. When the goat-herd appears, he is carrying a helmet in one hand. In the other, he carries an interesting device (22.184-86):

> τῇ δ' ἑτέρῃ σάκος εὐρὺ γέρον, πεπαλαγμένον ἀζῇ,
> Λαέρτεω ἥρωος, ὃ κουρίζων φορέεσκε·
> δὴ τότε γ' ἤδη κεῖτο, ῥαφαὶ δ' ἐλέλυντο ἱμάντων·

"... in his other hand a broad old shield, spotted and soiled, belonging to the hero Laertes which he carried when he was a young man, but then it lay there a long time, and the stitching of the straps had raveled."

Melanthios carries a shield which Laertes himself once bore, when he was active and in his youth (kourizdōn). The age of the shield is visible in several details: for one, it is spattered with dry dirt. Azdē is a rare word, this being its single occurrence in Homer. The noun is formed of the same stem as the verb azdein: to dry or parch. According to the scholiast at Theocritos 5.109, the word signifies a dried residue of dirt, a sediment. Also disclosing the shield's age are the straps, whose stitching has begun to loosen. These ravelling shield-straps, and the dappled dried mud of a forgotten battle-field,[15] relate the shield of the young warrior Laertes to the Laertes whom we have seen in glimpses scattered throughout the poem. This characterization of Laertes as a withered old man, fading from significance on the island whose government he once stood foremost in, is corroborated in the decadence of the shield. The azdē on the shield is a temporary mold; the straps are worn, but can still support the bulwark's

enormous weight. Only through neglect this shield has ceased to speak truly of its own excellence and the history which it has witnessed. The shield even in its degenerate condition speaks of a time when Laertes was a great hero. That is important to the poet. Until now we had been given no reason to believe that Laertes had achieved anything particularly noteworthy, or that any of the power which Odysseus enjoyed while on Ithaka derived from his father. There are the patrōioi hetairoi which are well-disposed to Telemachos in books 2 and 16. Unless anyone should wonder if they date only from Odysseus' personal ascendence, we must recall that these attachments were probably due in significant numbers to Laertes. For Odysseus is sent on the mission to Messenia by his father alloi te gerontes -- "and the other elders" (21.21). Two points emerge, that Laertes is a moving force in the counsels of Ithaka and Odysseus receives preferment thereby, and that other of the island's influential men move in Laertes' direction as well.

These notices of Laertes are absent in the rest of the Odyssey. Elsewhere he is portrayed in the present, which is for him isolated, stricken, and pitiable. His state is not contrasted in detail with any former one, in which Laertes was capable and possessed aretē. That is not to say that the poet has no idea of depicting Laertes in any specific way, but only that he reserves the task until the most handsome opportunities. The new portrayal begins with the brief allusion in the send-off of Odysseus at the outset of the digression on the bow. Then Melanthios is caught carrying off the shield. Why would he have bothered lugging such obviously decrepit eq uipment to the fray? The incident is calculated, and leans to the symbolic. The thief and traitor of the oikos

has penetrated to a core-memory, threatening to despoil an important artefact of the family's past. He is cut down in the very act by which he comes closest to his aim - intended or not - to close out the account of the family in living history. However, Melanthios is stopped; the revelation of the shield makes for a bizarre finale in the goat-herd's soon-to-be-truncated career.

After the slaughter of the suitors is finished, there is a sort of winding-down, a short scene, in which certain house-members, who had been compromised only through the suitors' outright compulsion, emerge from various shelters to beg for their lives. Leodes, a diviner, is killed by Odysseus, since he went along with the suitors too willingly. Phemios is next, and his mind is split between two alternative chances at survival. He wonders whether to rush to the altar of Zeus Herkios, or simply to supplicate at Odysseus' knees. The altar carries this reminder (22.335-6):

enth' ara polla
Laertēs Odyseus te boōn epi mēri' ekēan.

"There Laertes and Odysseus burned many thigh-bones of oxen upon it." Both Laertes and Odysseus used to sacrifice on this altar. Laertes is included in the description- or the naming - of a central piece of furniture of the oikos, the altar to Zeus-in-the-enclosure; Laertes' name even precedes, raising the possibility at least that he began sacrificing there before Odysseus; or maybe he just had priority in the rituals. In any case, Laertes' inclusion in the "naming" of the altar associates him in a vital way with the religious life of the house.

After the slaughter of the suitors, the poem is not yet complete. A reunion remains to be accomplished between Odysseus and Penelope. This

reunion is achieved, again, through the poet's introduction of an object of deep significance to his two characters: the olive-tree bed which Odysseus made for Penelope and his marriage-bed. Fascinating as the manipulation of this device is, we must pass it by nevertheless, since we have limited the investigation to the significant traces of the struggle among the males, basically, of Odysseus' family to maintain control over local power. In the last book of the poem, another father and son are reunited: that is, not the first father and son of our concern, but the second pair - Odysseus and his father, Laertes. Three generations of the family then stand together to eliminate the last stirrings of a threat to their restored status.

A consistency in the poem-long depiction of Laertes resides in the isolation which he has practiced since Odysseus' failure to return from Troy. At the end of book 23, Odysseus announces that he must travel again, but only a short distance (23.359-60):

... polydendreon agron epeimi
opsomenos pater' esthlon, ho moi pukinos akachetai.

"I will go to the fertile field to see my father, who is sick with grief." When the book closes, Odysseus' small party is following the same initiative; Athena is their guide: exēge poleos (372). We return to their departure ek polios at 24.205, after the digression of the dialogue of the dead. They are headed for Laertes' agron ... kalon ... tetugmenon (206). The land which Laertes tends is not so fallow as he has become. Divorced from the city, as he is consistently represented, Laertes has lost his 'political' function. In this way, Laertes is divested of his aretē. Only a handful of objects have brought his heroism back into the present: the

shield, the common altar of himself and his hero son. The altar in fact comes to view after the victory over the suitors (22.335-6), so that Laertes' name is sounded in connection with a monument of the solid religious attachment of the oikos, that is, to the protection of Zeus.

There is one last vestige of the aretē which Laertes once possessed closer to the old man himself. The orchards surrounding the pitiful hut in which he spends his last days are still productive. The old man's condition contrasts markedly with the bloom of their fruit. Odysseus himself says so, when he at last encounters his father face to face (24.244-50):

> *"ὦ γέρον, οὐκ ἀδαημονίη σ' ἔχει ἀμφιπολεύειν*
> *ὄρχατον, ἀλλ' εὖ τοι κομιδὴ ἔχει, οὐδέ τι πάμπαν,*
> *οὐ φυτόν, οὐ συκέη, οὐκ ἄμπελος, οὐ μὲν ἐλαίη,*
> *οὐκ ὄγχνη, οὐ πρασιή τοι ἄνευ κομιδῆς κατὰ κῆπον.*
> *ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δὲ μὴ χόλον ἔνθεο θυμῷ·*
> *αὐτόν σ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κομιδὴ ἔχει, ἀλλ' ἅμα γῆρας*
> *λυγρὸν ἔχεις αὐχμεῖς τε κακῶς καὶ ἀεικέα ἕσσαι.*

"Old man, you are not ignorant of how to care for a garden; the whole is well-cultivated, for there is no shoot or fig or vine or olive, no bud that lacks care in the entire orchard. But do not be angry when I say one thing more: you are in a shambles, you are withered and old and your clothes are in tatters."

Odysseus speaks these lines to Laertes from behind the facade of another assumed identity. He himself is preparing another impersonation, in order to 'test' Laertes (240- kertomiois epeessi peirēthēnai). Critics are almost unanimously opposed to Odysseus' tactics in this final phase of his return;[16] in the opinion of the majority, his testing constitutes unnecessary cruelty. However cruel it is, there is evidence that the 'trick' is not an unreasoning one.

One interesting explanation likens the scene to a phenomenon which still persists in certain rural parts of modern Greece.[17] The seeming 'security' of some isolated and close-knit villages in fact spawns a powerful paranoia. Strangers represent potential enemies; neighbors, however, are indubitable adversaries. To strengthen the necessary defenses of those close to oneself, an institution of teasing and deceit arises: parents lie to children until these learn not to accept the words of others gullibly, and older children tease younger ones, to teach them to endure the ridicule of others. Odysseus' teasing of Laertes displays something of this spirit of punishing a perceived helplessness in one's close family. To many, this might seem the very opposite of a constructive endeavor. Yet, there is even another way in which Odysseus aims to be constructive.

Odysseus is not unaware that his father has suffered terribly because of his long absence (23.360). Why does he then prolong that absence by a postponed reunion? Not without reason.[18] The long, positive review which Odysseus gives of Laertes' orchards contrasts purposefully their good care with the pitiful appearance of the old man. This is a preliminary merely to the self-revision of Laertes' status which Odysseus means to incite (251-3):

> *οὐ μὲν ἀεργίης γε ἄναξ ἕνεκ' οὔ σε κομίζει,*
> *οὐδέ τί τοι δούλειον ἐπιπρέπει εἰσοράασθαι*
> *εἶδος καὶ μέγεθος· βασιλῆι γὰρ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικας.*

"Your master would not care for you if you were lazy, and to look at the size and shape of you there is nothing like a slave, for you seem more like a king."

Not only is Laertes in poor physical shape; there is distinction in his form and size, obscured not by poverty, which would be excusable, but by neglect. Odysseus is hinting that Laertes' condition constitutes an abuse, a crime against his given nature. He continues with the creation of a fictitious meeting at a former time with himself; by pretending to have met Laertes' son, Odysseus can then ask the most pointed questions of him, contrasting implicitly Laertes' present and past states. The key to the fiction which Odysseus perpetrates is that he does not know who Laertes is, and he feigns to take him for one of the estate's servants. The claim of Odysseus as one-time guest is then described (24.269-70):

> εὔχετο ὃ' ἐξ Ἰθάκης γένος ἔμμεναι, αὐτὰρ ἔφασκε
> Λαέρτην Ἀρκεισιάδην πατέρ' ἔμμεναι αὐτῷ.

"He claimed his race was Ithakan, likewise that his father was Laertes the son of Arkeisias."

The full Laertēn Arkēsiadēn must be meant to ring in the old man's ears, to call him back to a state of self-possession and restored consciousness. Odysseus' goal in all of this scene is to bring Laertes back to the sense of the apellation Arkēsiadēs, to rebuild the notion of aretē issuing from membership in a famous genos.

But Laertes does not respond immediately. The father of Odysseus is too full of the aimless present; Odysseus' fictive past cannot engender a new turn of heart. The whole effort breaks down when Laertes weeps at 315. The omens of good promise which Odysseus had received for his return -- so Odysseus "narrates" -- (311f.) are unconvincing, or bitter in their unfulfillment, and so bring a black cloud of grief on Laertes. At last, a fierce remorse overwhelms Odysseus, and he gives up his bluff to embrace

his father. But Laertes cannot believe Odysseus even as he casts away the masquerade. To bring the old man around, Odysseus once again reveals the scarred boar-wound, and recalls his heroic initiation on Parnassos with Autolykos and his sons. This memory pertains to the maternal side, however, and will not restore a sense of aretē to the bond of father and son, which is Odysseus' wish. Odysseus accomplishes this with a trip through the orchard, naming the trees and the numbers in which Laertes made them a present to his small son many years before. This is intimate knowledge, which at last convinces Laertes that his son has come home. Odysseus' enumeration in the tree-orchard is an inventory of that portion of the past which has persisted in bringing fruit. Hereby, a way to the present, in full and healthy reference to the past, now lies open.

After Odysseus and his father join the rest of the group inside Laertes' cottage, the old man is bathed and dressed; Athena completes the sprucing up (24.367-9):

> *ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρα χλαῖναν καλὴν βάλεν· αὐτὰρ 'Αθήνη*
> *ἄγχι παρισταμένη μέλε' ἤλδανε ποιμένι λαῶν,*
> *μείζονα δ' ἠὲ πάρος καὶ πάσσονα θῆκεν ἰδέσθαι.*

"Just the same Athena stood near and strengthened his limbs, made him taller and stouter to look on."

The enhancement is a typical mark of the charis of a divine patron. Odysseus finds the change in his father remarkable, and recognizes the activity of a god. The transformation highlights Laertes' incipient re-discovery of his own status. The gods abandoned him, or even he had abandoned the gods. Forgetfulness of one's heroic aretē is a failure of reciprocity. Laertes had forgotten the source and ground of his

excellence; he had ceased to believe in or desire the favored relationship to Athena. Athena likewise had left him to the fields. Odysseus' presence has reversed this process of alienation, and Laertes' physical change is the sign of a restored connection. Laertes' answer to the exclamation of Odysseus at 373-4 reveals how Laertes has been rejoined to his aretē, which must mean a re-attachment to greatness in the past. Laertes recalls an anecdote of the familiar type, which juxtaposes a past event with a present situation; thus, virtue is established in the former and in the latter an assumption is created that aretē must carry over and still be effective.

Laertes' heroic deed was a successful siege of Neritos. There he fought mightily. The transition to "I would have killed plenty of suitors myself, if I had been there ..." is the very function of the anecdote. The appeal to the past assumes the quality of direct evidence. There is no point in doubting Laertes' boast of rising strength, moreover; his telling of the anecdote reveals in itself a dramatic healing in his psychological state. He now wants to remember his heroic nature, his joy in success, his assurance in the gods and especially Athena.

With the new confidence of Laertes, the last link of the chain is forged. Telemachos was willing but, being young, lacked a sense of direction for finding his place in Ithaka or in the world outside. Only after Athena, in the guise of patrōios xenos, set him on the track of his father's reputation in the "old world", did Telemachos realize what his potential was. Odysseus himself returned to find the island of Ithaka retaining expectations of the revival of his power there; there were still traces of himself lodged in the meshes of local memory, which helped him also to reconstitute his identity. Both characters found themselves

engaged then in an examination of the past for present relevance. (For the same reasons, Penelope wisely uses the olive-tree bed.) Odysseus of course goes one better, and makes the past more precisely relevant through pure creation; but the culmination of Odysseus' "lying tales" in a final breakdown before his father Laertes shows that he can protect himself by mythic invention, but he will never truly progress. The "past" of his lies must yield at some point to an embrace of the more genuine past. Odysseus finds authenticity in the blooms of his father's trees.

This interest in the past is part of the genealogical urge. Genealogy is an impulse to retrospection in order to gain validation. That is exactly what the poet of the Odyssey achieves through his Arkeisian characters: he establishes the legitimacy of an embattled lineage in a small corner of the heroic world, by recalling the significance of that genos in the diverse levels of its past vitality -- its remembered social and political activity, its connection with the land and its indwelling divine forces, and its possession of certain unique, famous, costly, and heroic objects. By compelling his characters and his audience to experience all these various past levels of experience, Homer identifies us and them with the efforts of the Arkeisian race to restore that relation, and thus details through the entire Odyssey the richness of its struggle and the poverty of its detractors.

The clan of Arkesiads faces a final challenge at the end of book 24; for the first time they reflect among themselves on what has heretofore been their common but unspoken goal: to bring glory and continuing life to their race. The narrower concerns of individual suffering and self-preservation are now erased in the redrawing of guidelines; the

Arkesiads are developing a consciousness of their largest purpose. The gods, too, Athena most of all, make them the heaviest battalion, sealing the vindication of their aretē by direct aid.

At 506f., Odysseus turns to Telemachos, and reminds him that they are about to enter battle, hina te krinontai aristoi (507). Do not shame the paterōn genos (508), he says, (508-9):

... hoi te paros per
alkē t' ēnoreē te kekasmetha pasan ep' aian.

"We who surpassed in the old time with strength and manliness, anywhere we went."

The notion of surpassing strength, skill, or bravery, we well know, is quintessentially heroic; to be better than anyone else at anything is requisite of an effective heroic reputation. Hereby, Odysseus makes his first appeal to the genos ehich he and his son and father represent. The exhortation to Telemachos sounds like a challenge, but in fact it is meant to create the device by which the slaughter of opponents may be amplified and changed to everlasting fame and the claim to divine blessing.

Telemachos replies to Odysseus with a promise never to shame the race (teon genos- 512). This answer seems deferential, and yet it also reveals most of all how descent is treated as a gift from the father, as a possession originally belonging to him which the son later accepts with gratitude, as Iphitos aquired the bow from Eurytos, in one version, as the father expires in the megara. Laertes completes the generational triangle, when he rejoices that his son and grandson are striving over aretē (515). Athena appears as he speaks, and addresses him thus: ō Arkeisiadē. In a mere ten lines, the entire four generations of the Arkesiad line are

brought into play, not in a direct "boasting" speech in the style of, e.g., Iliad 20.200f., but within the context of a final coincidence of characterizations. Each of the three living members of the clan has come into a moment of definition as a member of the Arkesiad body; Laertes then receives the word of the goddess through an appellation which evokes the forefather of the line. The assembly of generations is no longer a triangle, but has been lent the maximum depth and resonance through this naming of the progenitor.

Laertes' last act, a spear-cast which is the only discrete act of violence in the battle, strikes down an appropriate victim. Eupeithes is the father of Antinoos; Eupeithes had whipped up the retaliatory force in the assembly, using a rhetoric and a penchant for abetting a crisis which his son had also displayed. The father himself, who had been mentioned before in connection with Antinoos through the locution Eupeitheos huios, now dies the last death of the poem. Odysseus and Telemachos fall on the front-line of the opposing force, but Athena halts a rout by demanding that no blood be drawn. Odysseus' war-cry at the backs of the fleeing enemy is compared to an eagle's scream -- hōs t' aietos hypsipetes (538). Odysseus is also elsewhere figured as an eagle -- in Helen's vision (book 15.160-1, 174-5), and Penelope's dream (book 19.543). He has arrived in reality now, coiled in potential violence, full of menos himself. But he is acquainted with the gods in a full knowledge. He obeys their will, and can make sense of Athena's words (24.543-44):

> "διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ,
> ἴσχεο, παῦε δὲ νεῖκος ὁμοιΐου πολέμοιο,
> μή πώς τοι Κρονίδης κεχολώσεται εὐρύοπα Ζεύς."

"Hold back! Cease the strife of leveling war, or else farsighted Zeus son

of Kronos will become enraged."

The generations that avoid the anger of Zeus enjoy their aretē intact; at such a peak, Homer leaves his account of Odysseus.

Notes

1 The progenitor of the line to which Odysseus and Telemachos (and Laertes) belong is a figure whose origins and personality we do not know. A story is preserved in a fragment of Aristotle's lost Constitution of the Ithakans (see Heracl. Pont. 38; Et. mag. 144, 22) that his mother was a bear. Eustathius also mentions this story, but includes it with a number of other conjectures combining the significance of his name with his possible origins (1961.15f.): "some say he was born of a bear, but others that he came from a horse or goat, still others from a she-wolf..." Elsewhere, however, Eustathius speculates the name of Arkeisios could have been derived from the verb arkeō -- "defend" (1516.63-4; 1756.53-4). That Arkeisios was the son of Zeus, we find in the scholion Q. on Od. 16.118, also in Eust. 1796.35: Arkeisios Eurydias kai Dios ("Arkeisios of Eurydia and Zeus").

R. Carpenter (1946) attempted to draw connections between cults of the "sleeping bear", and the Arkeisios-figure and his relation to Odysseus. (Cf. 112-156, especially 126-9. For a sharp critique of this study, see Peradotto 1973.) None of these possibilities are realized in Homer,

however. (There may be puns on the name of Arkeisios at 16.261 and 18.358, of which I hope to write in the future. Homer is indeed fond of punning in the Odyssey, for example on Odysseus' "given" name (cf. 19.406-9): consider 1.62; 5.340, 423.) As Carpenter (129) himself writes: "... the closest reading of the Odyssey gives not the slightest encouragement to any supposition that Homer even knew of these ursine associations."

Homer makes nothing of Arkeisios own personal history; his references to the progenitor of the line are relatively fixed.
Arkeisios is mentioned by Eurykleia at 4.755; that is, she claims that the genos, which is designated by the patronymic Arkeisiadēn, is not so out of favor with Zeus that it is due now to perish. Hence, the mention does not create an opportunity to discourse on the significant history of Arkeisios himself, but rather on the race. Furthermore, the race is referred to secondarily here, since the nurse's and penelope's concern is for Telemachos. Eurykleia draws significance from Telemachos' action specifically, when she loans it these implications for an entire line of generations. Telemachos, she implies, does not only act for himself now, but the whole race of his famous fore father. by thus juxtaposing Telemachos with the very founder of the line, Eurykleia provides a profound context into which Telemachos has entered.

Eumaios interprets the same movements of Telemachos in just this way; for Eumaios too, Telemachos' fate does not impinge on one simple destiny alone, but the fortune of a whole genos. Eumaios -- also like Eurykleia -- adds that wharever happens to this Arkeisiad will reveal the will of Zeus (14.183-4). Homer may or may not6 be assuming that his audience has in mind the Zeus-parentage of Arkeisios. The will and favor of Zeus is no

less important to the heroes of the Odyssey without that connection.

Telemachos names Arkeisios as Laertes' father in 16.118. He does not mention that Zeus fathered him, though he relates every act of generation in the line thereafter. Nothing is narrated of Arkeisios specifically then; he is simply the first through which Zeus make a single son of this genos. Finally, in 24.270 and 517, the patronymic Arkeisiades is applied to Laertes, once so that he might intimate the distance now grown between his present state and an old noble, heroic identity, then at last by Athena, to reaffirm the strong attachments of the genos, in the person of Laertes, to heroic aretē and the gods.

2 Mounos occurs in the plural as well, referring to Agamemnon and Locrian Aias at 4.496. The adjective (and its adverbial form mounax) and the related verb mounoō appear twenty-two times: nine times applied to Odysseus, by others and by himself (3.217; 10.157; 16.105, 239; 20.30, 40; 22.13, 107; 23.38); four times to Telemachos (2.365; 11.68; 16.19, 239). Of its remaining uses, mounax kteinomenōn kai eni kraterē hysminēi at 11.417 is used by the shade of Agamemnon to contrast with the death of those who fell in the battle around Troy. The use of the participle in 15.386 mounothenta par' oiesin e para bousin, where Odysseus guesses the circumstances in which Eumaios might have once been enslaved, reveals on the contrary the realistic, negative side of being alone in the world of the Odyssey. (Admittedly, Eumaios' would not have been an heroic situation; but that is precisely the predicament of the Odyssey. For a different kind of comparison, consider Il. 11.406, 417.

3 The dual, or the going of two heroes together, does not seem to encroach too much on one hero's glory or the other's. There is rather a feeling that one's powers are raised by the addition of a powerful companion. Achilles does order Patroklos to be careful of Achilles' kudos (16.19), and Athena pushes Sthenelos from the car (5.835); but in the first case, Patroklos is not entering battle with Achilles alongside, and the second instance is unique in the Iliad, and so atypical. Diomedes is in fact proof of the preference for two over one, when in book 10 he volunteers for the mission Nestor has urged. He specifically states that two are better:

> syn te du' erchomeno kai te pro ho tou enoese
> hoppos kerdos eei. mounos d' ei per te noese,
> alla te hoi brasson te noos, lepte de te metis.

In this passage, Diomedes admits to limitations. Some might call this unheroic. But Diomedes picks Odysseus, not for his own weakness, but for Odysseus' merits (244-7), especially the approval of Athena. It is interesting that Athena herself, when she looks to assure Odysseus of her support in Odyssey 20, speaks of their mutual combat at 20.49f. in terms of a warfare far different from the single-encounters which are taken as typically heroic. She uses the dual (nōi - 20.50), and acts as if nothing could be more handsome than for the two of them to fight off these ambushes together, and plunder some cattle and sheep. (Cf. Il. 11.671f., 18.509-40.)

4 The suitors want to marry Penelope. They seek her through gifts: 2.195-7; 15.17-18; 18.278-9. They have no "right", on the other hand, to take the oikos as part of her dowry. She will go to the house of whomever

she marries (cf. Lacey (1968) 41). Telemachos is the one to whom the property will pass. (Cf. Lacey 46: "... it is only in the event of his death that they will divide up the possessions and provisions and give his house to Penelope's new husband.") That this is the suitors' submerged intent shows at 2.334-6 and 16.383-6. In what sort of society this objectionable aim is conceivable, see note 6 below.

5 In 2.310ff., Telemachos warns Antinoos that he is no longer nēpios, that he can make distinctions which are impossible for a child, such as seeing the suitors for what they are (so he tells Ktesippos at 20.310). When Antinoos urges the other suitors in 4.668 to kill Telemachos before he reaches maturity (prin hēbēs metron hikesthai), he is distorting what he knows to be the truth: that Telemachos is now a cognizant adult.

The trip to Sparta and Pylos proves Telemachos' assertion. The quality of the following shows the maturation of his social position (see Lacey 38-9). A personal initiation occurs in the interviews with the older Nestor and Menelaos as well. The trip then is equivalent to Odysseus' voyage to Parnassos, which Autolykos had planned as a kind of initiation (hoppot' an hēbēsas ... ēlthe Parnēsond' -- 19.410-11). A good application of the data of anthropological investigations of initiation-rites is provided in C.W. Eckert (1963) 49-57.

Telemachos must further argue his maturity with Penelope, even after he returns from the voyage. She had emphasized his youth to the eidolon of her sister Iphthime (4.818); she reminds Telemachos of his immaturity at 18.215. Telemachos instructs her that he is grown up, and that she is in error (18.229). Perhaps he is at last successful. She indicates in the

next book to the beggar Odysseus that it is not so easy to keep off the suitors now that she cannot use the child Telemachos as an excuse; he is now a young adult (19.532).

6 The suitors, all worthy of the title basileus, in turn covet the distinction of being the wealthiest, most respected, and most feared basileus in the area. This depends on a notion of kingship in Homer, and in Greek history, which is highly controversial. R. Drews (1983) summarizes the theories of previous scholars, and provides a good review of the evidence for Greek kingship through the classical period. (For bibliography on Homeric kingship, see page 1 note 2.) In his conclusion (129) he writes: "The word basileus was indeed very commom in the epics of Homer and Hesiod. In this poetry, however, the word does not mean "king"; instead, it denotes a highborn leader who is regularly flanked by other highborn leaders."

This conclusion was anticipated by Finley (84): "...the oscillation btween basileus as king and basileus as chief ...
is duplicated elsewhere in the Homeric poems and by other early writers ... Behind the terminology can be felt the pressure of the aristocracy to reduce kingship to a minimum. Aristocracy was prior to kingship logically, historically, and socially. While recognizing monarchy, the nobles proposed to maintain the fundamental priority of their status, to keep the king on the level of a first among equals."

The power of each noble was based in his own oikos, not in any "community". Since the genos regulated the oikos, especially through the succession of generations, the replacement of a king meant the elimination

of a genos basileion. The struggle for political authority was a private affair, with public ramifications truly, but only indirectly. This is the view of S. Humphreys (1978) 201: "In the Homeric world a man's prestige is entirely bound up with his oikos: his ancestry, his wealth and the uses he makes of it in distribution to dependents or gift-exchange with equals, his personal alliances with other kings through marriage or guest-friendship. The suitors who covet Odysseus' kingdom seek it through exhausting his wealth and wooing his wife. Although Homeric nobles hold assemblies and dispense justice publicly to the demos, their own struggles for dominance tend to take place in the banqueting-hall rather than in the agora."

7 Aigyptios, mentioned only here in book 2, is typical of the gerontes who seem to incline to Telemachos. One of his sons, Antiphos, went with Odysseus on the expedition to Troy; another joins the suitors, Eurynomos; two work the farm (2.17-22). Aigyptios' offspring are thus split between the two worlds of the Odyssey: the heroic world, which is destroyed at Troy and in its aftermath, and the young world which the suitors embody, which is destroyed for its unworthiness. Telemachos' success on the other hand depends on the continuity which he represents among the generations. Compare Telemachos' actions in 17.61f., among Halitherses and the others, with Eurymachos' vicious denunciation of Halitherses at 2.178ff.

8 Cf. Finley (1979) 98-9.

9 Mermeros means "likely to cause care or pain", thus Ilos is Son-of-Baneful, or Son-of-the-Painmaker. The inclusion of Ilos, and the

unsuccessful trip to Ephyra, might have been included: 1)to increase the closeness of the tie Athena/Mentes wishes to illustrate between his family and Telemachos'; 2)to enrich the anecdote by the incidental mention of Ilos, complete with Ortsname and somewhat eerie patronymic. (Cf. also J. S. Clay 71ff.)

10 See G. Murray 129f.

11 Compare the careful description of Penelope's entrance to this inner-chamber, 21.7f., to fetch the bow.

12 The suitors feast continually, but do not concern themselves a great deal with sacrifice. In 20.248-56, for example, they take great pains over their dinner, but without any ceremony or offerings to the Olympians. The setting of the bow-contest during the Apollonian festival is also instructive. Antinoos threatens Telemachos at 20.271-4, after Telemachos had made an insulting reference to their presence in the hall. Following immediately on Antinoos' violent outburst are the lines in which the heralds are described going through the streets of the town, assembling the Achaeans for the festival in the "shady grove" of Apollo (20.276-8). The implication is clear: the suitors feast in the house, and constantly; the population celebrates the proper day of the god, in his hallowed precinct. The suitors might not have marked the festival-day at all, had Penelope not set the contest herself. Nevertheless, the aethlon then keeps the suitors from attending the festival, even if they had thought of it. The suitors do refer to Apollo, and to the other gods, for help in the contest

(21.362f.); but their alienation from divine protection has already been marked by Athena in the horrible pealing laughter of 20.345ff.

13 For the complex associations of Odysseus, Hermes, and Autolykos, see the discussion of J.S. Clay 68-89: "Odysseus and the Heritage of Autolykos".

14 J.S. Clay (89f.) examines the bow from a different perspective, in the way it suggests a contrast between two types of hero -- Heraklean and Odyssean.

15 According to Sch. H.Q., pepalagmenon azēi means memolygmenon tēi xērotēti. Sch. V. is unsure whether azēi is wet or dry, however: eurōti ē xērasia. Q. offers information: ephanismenon eurōti, ē melani kekrōmenon. eurōs de estin hē tois mydoisin epigignomenē leukotēs arachnē prospherēs. It is therefore hard to decide whether the store-room is a dank place or dry. The main idea seems to be that the shield lay in defilement, like Argos lying in the dung-pile; whether the mud on the shield is a molding remembrance of some past battlefield, or simply the dirt from the store-room which has soiled it in its uncared-for state, it is impossible to say.

16 In the opinion of R. Carpenter (142), Laertes is a "generic" character of the sort imported into heroic genealogies to supply links between generations whose representatives have full historically-attested personalities: "Since nothing characteristic or personal is recorded about

Laertes, he is without existence in his own right." Be this as it may, Homer tries mightily to create a sense of his past in a few concentrated points in the last four books of the Odyssey.

17 In the words of D. Page 112n.45, an "aimless and heartless guessing game". Other critics have attempted to find an aim or point to Odysseus' behavior. C. Moulton (1974) 163 refers to the scene as "a contrasting, harsh excess" to the "comically excessive lying tale at 13.256ff." Moulton also cites Singer of Tales 178, where Lord says of the typical recognition of the hero by one of his parents "omission of a lengthy deception would be unthinkable." D. Wender (1978) 57 also alludes to the "overdone" recognitions of Serbo-Croatian epic, yet feels too that Odysseus' lying in this scene is totally characteristic. In her estimation (60), "the scene is ... carefully contrived for emotional power." That is, Homer uses all his art to hold off the last and most powerful of three reunions to increase its dramatic impact upon the the audience. I agree with this, but also find suggestive her remark (52) on Laertes: "... his hibernation and hard physical labor ... reflect not his status in Ithaka but his state of mind." It is precisely with this degenerate state of mind that Odysseus must struggle, with what means appear cruel to us, but constitute a gradual, careful operation forcing Laertes at last to accept back an old conception of himself from which he has become dissociated.

18 P. Walcot (1977) has tried to link sociological evidence on a modern Greek teasing-phenomenon to the scene in book 24. The work on which he bases this part of his article, E. Friedl's Vasilika, is well worth

reading, especially the chapter on "Human Relations", pp. 75-91. Its application to the Odysseus-Laertes reunion is difficult, since lying and teasing are aspects of child-rearing as Friedl describes the modern Greek institution. However, a point in Friedl's observations which Walcot 19 emphasizes is that the mentally retarded, for example, never escape the teasing and mockery which is usually suspended for children after a certain age. Of course, the parents relent for the most part because the child eventually becomes less gullible, therefore will not submit to the routine of teasing: this progress is the aim of the custom. In the scene in the Odyssey, Laertes is teased like a child, in some sense; his proper relationship to his father is intentionally reversed by Odysseus, who pretends furthermore to mistake his father for a slave. (The Greek word for slave, pais, also means "boy, small child", and denies the dignity of adulthood.) So, Odysseus has momentarily turned the tables on his own parent, because that parent has fallen below the appropriate standard of behavior which his former status and personality set.

19 Sch. Q. offers a reasonable motivation for Odysseus' slow disclosure: hina me tēi aphnidiōi charai apopsyxēi ho gerōn, hōsper kai ho kyōn apoleto. ("So that the old man will not expire from sudden joy, like his dog [Argos] died after all.")

Conclusion

Genealogy is the ostensible topic of this dissertation . But it may be confessed now that the foregoing essays are concerned not just with genealogy in any narrow sense, but with the Homeric poet's disposition to the past. In claiming to have written about Homeric genealogy I am also claiming to have initiated a discussion of Homeric anthropology, for the genealogical interests of this poet entail not merely a record of blood-lines and descent, but the more fundamental observation that every new generation must develop itself conscious to some degree of what men have done before it.

Whatever was based on custom in heroic society -- meals, marriages, acknowledged stages of maturity, making war, dividing or sharing authority -- these social forms depended for their continuity on practices of an established generation remembered by a new succeeding one. The poet dramatizes this situation whenever a confrontation is enacted between two (or more) members of different generations: the older giving a precept or example and the younger respectfully accepting it helps articulate the norms of the society of the epic heroes; repudiation of the advice of the elder by the younger generation, however, or the accusation of misconduct against the younger brought by the elder, displays the difficulty with which any norms survive or remain in place.

We do not maintain that the heroic norms which the poet exposes in

this way all exist on one level. Some values are preserved with relatively small upset or change, such as the impulse to make sacrifices to the gods. (Although the suitors on the other hand are often inattentive to this cultural requisite, when they are not guided by one of their better sort, like Amphinomos.) By contrast, an inherited hegemony of one "king" (basileus) over many "lords" (basileis) can be the subject of fatal controversy. The poet does not set these struggles in motion in order to make recommendations to his own time. He returns to the past, as James Redfield (1975) writes, to create the heroic world as he composes the poetry. The conflict and competition which the poet exhibits through his characters function as the markers by which he retains an orientation in his fictional landscape. That is, strife delineates the essential characters of these heroes: they show themselves most clearly in trying to accomplish what they most passionately want.

Genealogy plays a part then by "placing" the figures of this art of characterization -- in time, first of all. But genealogy also offers a location in society, as we have revealed throughout, because one relates to the past in order to have bearings in the present, and yet others are navigating by the same technique, all of which produces conflict when any two versions of the past are close in content but at odds in interpretation. Further, genealogy lends to Homeric characters placement in a fictional geography -- for who but the poet creates the sacred beech outside the Skaean gate, or the sēma around which the chariots complete the final turn in the Funeral games of book 23, or in the Odyssey the Ithakan landscape as it is shown to the long absent

Odysseus by Athena. The poet creates every dimension of the heroic era, or recreates if you will -- what part(s) from reality we do not know.

In genealogy the poet possesses a versatile tool, which has its attachments so to speak and therefore can operate within a broad scale according to the intricacy of the effect which the poet desires to bring about at any moment in the performance. Hesiod handled the genealogical tool in its simplest form, though this may have come largely from his intentions not to create an heroic world wholesale, but to link elements of an heroic Greek past and of his contemporary world in a closer relation. If genealogy was ever an exercise in itself, like an arpeggio, which could be practiced for its own sake and therefore generate such artistic routines as the Ē hoiai represent, then the poet of Homeric epic was an utter virtuoso, and could modulate within this range of applications with dexterity and most importantly with invention.

The essays which comprise this dissertation represent an effort to track the range of this dexterity and invention. In the last three chapters we explored widely differing areas of the Odyssey. First, we discussed the ways in which the background of Alkinoos and Arete is promoted to set off dissonances in the seemingly peaceful Phaeacia of Odysseus' next-to-last "arrival". Their attachments to the past touched on details of fleeing from violence and the disfavor of the gods. The prophecy of these forebodings is fulfilled in Poseidon's punishment of the Phaeacians, and in fact a prophecy to the same effect is related explicitly when Alkinoos recalls Nausithoos' warnings of the wrath of Poseidon. The genos of Alkinoos and Arete, despite apparent blessings

in fact loses its privileges. Contrast with the Arkesiads is thereby revealed.

Second, we discussed the genealogical treatment of women in a digression. Whereas Homeric women in general are identified through their father or husband, we found that Penelope -- because of the ambiguity of Odysseus' status -- was caught between two identities, as daughter of Ikarios (which the suitors advocated) and as wife of Odysseus. Yet she becomes a true wife of Odysseus and nearly a moral cognate by assimilating to herself the intelligence and resourcefulness for which Odysseus is distinguished in both epics. Penelope transcends the standard system of references to heroic females when she is called in her last book of the poem simply periphrōn Penelope, without reference either to her father or to Odysseus.

The last two chapters follow the two heroes of the poem -- father and son -- as they discover their parts in the defense of the family's prestige. We noted with what keen interest the poet portrays their movements along this track. For Telemachos, the discovery of the breadth and wealth of his inheritance is the catalyst of a postponed and complicated passage to manhood. The poet then raises in Telemachos, in Odysseus, and in the audience too, an awareness of the relationship which Odysseus had built up between himself and Ithakan society and the in-dwelling gods of the land and of course within his house and with its subjects.

The resolution which Athena accomplishes on Ithaka through Odysseus naturally recalls her patronage in heroic poetry from the Iliad to the fragments of the Theban cycle (Tydeus) to the Aspis attributed to

Hesiod. But the reaffirmation of the Odyssean household, which is amplified throughout the poem in various ways as the victory of an entire genos, points in another direction. Lacey (cf. chapter 3 in The Family in Classical Greece) characterizes the period of synoikismos in Greek history as one in which the responsibilities of the individual to the genos and vice-versa were being transferred to an entirely different arena -- that of the polis. Since the Odyssey is in part a defense of Odysseus' household against rapacious and overweening aristocrats, numerous interpretations have made the poem out as an anti-aristocratic piece. But at least one alternative is evident. The poem does not suggest that the suitors should have deferred to Odysseus in order to keep their claims straight and avoid fighting among themselves. The suitors in truth behave among themselves with a kind of harmonious comradeship. They represent a group who share privileges fairly evenly, in which mutual aggrandizement does not seem to constitute a threat to anyone's portion. However, an immediate objection lies in the purpose which underlies the suitors' presence in Odysseus' house, and this purpose is dangerous enough to make strange bedfellows, as it were. There may be a balance of power that keeps peace among these Ithakan and Kephallenian lords, but that balance is disturbed by the prolonged absence of Odysseus, and in consequence the whole upper-level of society pounces upon one of its own. They fail the principle which they most ought to uphold: that every well-born man deserves to live within the terms of his birthright. Odysseus defends his birthright, not as if it were a monarchy in anything like the later sense of the word, certainly not like a tyranny even of the "benevolent" type -- only his birthright

and his own enhancement of it through heroic accomplishments. He is acting out a principle of duty to preserving and sustaining the genos. And because of the power and prestige of that race, the creation of his struggle makes such an excellent poem.

Bibliography

I.1

Andersen, Ø., Die Diomedesgestalt in der Ilias = Symbolae Osloenses Vol. Supplet. 25: 1978.

Combellack, F., "Two Blameless Homeric Characters", AJP 103 (1982) 361-72.

Gaisser, J.H., "Adaptation of Traditional Material in the Glaukos-Diomedes Scene", TAPA 100 (1969) 165-76.

Griffin, J., Homer on Life and Death (Oxford University Press, New York: 1980).

Muellner, M., "Knowledge and Delusion in the Iliad", in Essays on the Iliad, ed. J. Wright (Bloomington and London: 1978).

Nagy, G., Best of the Achaeans (Baltimore 1979).

Redfield, J., Nature and Culture in the Iliad (Chicago 1975).

Schouler, B., "Dépasser le Pere", REG 93 (1980) 1-24.

Vidal-Naquet, P., "The Black Hunter and the origin of the Athenian Ephebeia", repr. in Myth, Religion, and Society, ed. by R. L. Gordon (Cambridge 1981).

Whitman, C., Homer and the Heroic Tradition (Cambridge, Ma. 1958).

I.2

Allen, T.W., Homeri Opera, vol. V. (Oxford 1912).

Benardete, S., "Achilles and the Iliad", Hermes 91 (1963) 1-16.

Leaf, W., ed., Iliad, vol. I-II (Amsterdam 1960).

MacCary, W.T., Childlike Achilles (New York 1982).

Merz, Fritz, Die Heldenbiographie als Stilmittel Homers (diss. Zurich 1953).

Reinhardt, Karl, Die Ilias und Ihr Dichter, ed. U. Hölscher (Göttingen 1961).

Sale, W.M., "Achilles and Heroic Values", Arion 2 (1963) 86-100.

Scodel, R., "The Autobiography of Phoenix", AJP 103 (1982) 128-36.

Shannon, R.S., "The Arms of Achilles and Homeric Compositional Technique" = Mnem., Suppl. 36, Leiden 1975.

Sinos, D., Achilles, Patroklos, and the Meaning of Philos (Innsbruck 1980).

Willcock, M.M., A Commentary on Homer's Iliad: Books I-VI, London 1970.

II.1

Dindorf, G., Scholia in Homeri Odyssea (Amsterdam 1962).

Fenik, B., Studies in the Odyssey, 1974 = Hermes, Einzelschriften 30.

Rüter, K., Odysseeinterpretationen, Hypomnemata 19 (1969), ed. K. Mathiessen (Gottingen 1969).

Rose, G.P., "The Unfriendly Phaeacians", TAPA 100 (1969) 387-406.

II.2

Adkins, W.H.A., "Euchomai, Eucholē, and Euchos in Homer", CQ 19 (1969) 20-33.
Büchner, W., "Probleme der homerischen Nekyia", Hermes 72 (1937) 104-22.
Clay, J.S., The Wrath of Athena (Princeton, N.J. 1983).
Denniston, ed., Euripides' Electra (Oxford 1939).
Ebeling, H., Lexicon Homericum (Hildesheim 1963).
Heubeck, A., Der Odyssee-Dichter und die Ilias (Erlangen 1954).
Muellner, L., The Meaning of Homeric Euchomai Through it Formulas (Innsbruck 1976).
Page, D.L., The Homeric Odyssey (Oxford 1955).
Solmsen, F., ed., Hesiodi Opera (Oxford 1970).

II.3

Levy, H.L., "The Odyssean Suitors and the Host-Guest Relationship", TAPA 94 (1963) 145-53.
Thornton, Agathe, "Why do the Suitors Feast in the House4 of Odysseus?", AUMLA 20 (1963) 341-5.
Vivante, P., The Epithets in Homer (New Haven and London 1982).

III

Anderson, W.S., "Calypso and Elysium", CJ 54 (1958) 2-11, repr. in Essays on the Odyssey (Bloomington 1965).
Austin, N., "Telemachos Polymechanos", CSCA 2 (1969) 45-63.
Bertman, S., "Structural Symmetry at the end of the Odyssey", GRBS 9 (1968) 115-23.
Combellack, F., Gnomon 28 (1956) 412-16.
Eichhorn, F., Die Telemachie (Garmisch-Partenkirchen 1973).
Finley, M.I., The World of Odysseus (Pelican 1979^{3}).
Rose, G.P., "The Quest of Telemachos", TAPA 98 (1967) 391-8.
Shapiro, H.A., "Telemachos as Rhetorician", CB 48 (1972) 57-8.
van Thiel, H., "Telemachie und Odyssee", MH 36 (1979) 65-89.

IV

Carpenter, R., Folktale, Fiction, and Saga in the Homeric Epics (Sather Classical Lectures 1946).
Drews, R., Basileus (New Haven and London 1983).
Eckert, C.W., "Initiatory Motifs in the Story of Telemachos", CJ 59 (1963) 49-57.
Eustathius, Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam, vol.I-II.
Friedl, E., Vasilika (New York 1962).
Humphreys, S., Anthropology and the Greeks (London 1978).
Lacey, W.K., The Family in Classical Greece (Ithaca 1968).
Moulton, C. "The End of the Odyssey", GRBS 15 (1974) 153-69.
Murray, G., The Rise of the Greek Epic (Oxford 1934^{4}).
Peradotto, J., Classical Mythology: an annotated bibliographical survey (Urbana 1973).

Walcot, P., "Odysseus and the Art of Lying", AntSoc 8 (1977) 1-21.
Wender, D. The Last Scenes of the Odyssey = Mnem., Suppl. 52, Leiden 1978.

(Abbreviations)

AJP = American Journal of Philology
AntSoc = Ancient Society
AUMLA = Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association
CB = Classical Bulletin
CJ = Classical Journal
CQ = Classical Quarterly
CSCA = California Studies in Classical Antiquity
GRBS = Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies
MH = Museum Helveticum
Mnem. = Mnemosyne
REG = Revues des Etudes Grecques
TAPA = Transactions of the American Philological Association

Vita

Timothy Paul Hofmeister was born in Keene, N.H., on April 27, 1958. He graduated with High Honors in German from Swarthmore College in Swarthmore, Pennsylvania (B.A. 1980), also attending the Goethe Institut in Prien, West Germany, during the summer of 1979. While studying in the Department of Classics (1980-84) he has taught two courses for the Department as a teaching assistant (Etymology; Intermediate Greek), three courses for the adult-education program of the College of Notre Dame (Homer's Odyssey; Greek Tragedy; Virgil's Aeneid), for Friends School of Baltimore (Latin I-II), and for the Center for Talented Youth at The Johns Hopkins University (Etymology). During 1984-5 he will be the Taylor Lecturer in the Classics Department at Colby College in Waterville, Maine.