

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

HOMERIC STITCHINGS:  
A NEW TEXT AND INTERPRETATION  
OF THE HOMERIC CENTOS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

BY

M. D. USHER

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JUNE 1997

**UMI Number: 9729876**

---

**UMI Microform 9729876**  
**Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized  
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

---

**UMI**  
**300 North Zeeb Road**  
**Ann Arbor, MI 48103**



**Copyright © 1997 by M. D. Usher**

**All rights reserved**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
NOTE ON CITATION STYLE.....	v
<b>PART I: INTERPRETATION</b>	
INTRODUCTION.....	2
I. EUDOCIA: READER-RHAPSODE.....	18
II. ACCOMMODATIONS.....	35
III. ENJAMBEMENT.....	67
IV. CENTO SEMIOTICS AND AESTHETICS.....	91
V. "COMPOSITION BY THEME".....	118
VI. THEMES FROM THE <i>ODYSSEY</i> .....	132
VII. THEMES FROM THE <i>ILIAD</i> .....	154
APPENDIX I: LIST OF HALF-LINES.....	174
APPENDIX II: LIST OF LINES WITH NO EXACT EQUIVALENT IN HOMER.....	175
WORKS CITED.....	176
<b>PART II: GREEK TEXT</b>	
NOTE ON THE GREEK TEXT.....	195
EUDOCIA'S PROLOGUE .....	196
τὰ Ὀμηρόκεντρα .....	198

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Some debts are a pleasure to pay. My heaviest and most pleasant one is to Laura Slatkin—Μέντορι εἰδομένη ἡμῶν δέμας ἠδὲ καὶ αὐδῆν—for inspiration, insight, and constant support; to my other readers, Bob Kaster, Chris Faraone, and Michael Roberts of Wesleyan University, for their generous contribution of time, counsel and energy; to Elizabeth Asmis for the research opportunity that led to my discovery of this fascinating poem; to Bob Allison of Bates College for his role in my obtaining access to the manuscript of the Homeric Centos on which this study is based; to Robert Lamberton of Washington University, Mark Edwards of Stanford, and Gregory Nagy of Harvard, for carefully reading and commenting on various parts of this project. I owe a great deal to all my teachers at Chicago, and to Jeffrey Rydberg-Cox, Paul Holloway, and Peter Struck for being such good friends and colleagues for the past four years. I am especially grateful to the Whiting Foundation and the Division of Humanities at the University of Chicago for a dissertation fellowship for 1996-97.

Above all, I would like to thank my wife, Caroline, and my children, Isaiah, Estlin, and Gawain, for making the life of the mind a life of the heart as well.

## NOTE ON CITATION STYLE

I have kept footnotes to a minimum and borrowed my style of citation and reference from the journal *Oral Tradition*. Full bibliographic information (including volume numbers for multi-volume works) for all sources cited in the text will be found under Works Cited. For older books and essays which have been reprinted or translated from another language into English at a later date I have given the author's name and (when known) the original year of publication in the body of the text, and the year of the standard or most accessible modern edition or English translation under Works Cited. For example:

Wood 1775            R. Wood. *An Essay on the Original Genius and Writings of Homer*. New York: Garland (1971).

An ancient author is sometimes cited according to the modern editor's date and pagination, when that edition is standard. I have only translated Homeric passages when the sense is at issue; passages which illustrate aspects of Homeric prosody have been left untranslated. All translations are my own, though for biblical passages I have occasionally fallen into the cadences of King James.

Reading nourisheth the wit; and when it is wearied with studie, it refresheth it, yet not without studie. Neyther onely ought wee to write, or onely to read, the one of these things will wearie and consume the strength; I speak of writing: the other will dissolve and dissipate it. Interchangeably this is to be exchanged with that, and the one is to bee moderated with the other; so that whatsoever is gathered together by reading, the Pen may reduce into a bodie. Wee ought (as they say) to imitate the Bees, which wander up and downe, and picke fit Flowers to make Honey: then whatsoever they have brought they dispose and place through their Combes; and to separate what things soever wee have heaped up together from divers readings; for distinct things are the better remembered. And afterwards, having digested the whole by our selves, according to the care and abilitie of our understanding, to make a good broth of these divers sauces in such sort: that although it shall appeare whence it was taken, yet may it appeare to be some other thing, then that whence it was taken.

—Seneca *Epistle* 3 in the translation of Thomas Lodge (1620)

**PART I**  
**INTERPRETATION**

## INTRODUCTION

A *cento* is a patchwork quilt. This Latin loan-word, derived from the Greek κέντρον—"goad," "prick," "needle," hence by metonymy "a piece of needlework"—is first used as a metaphor for verbal activity by Plautus (*Epidicus* 455) in the proverbial phrase *centones sarcire*,<sup>1</sup> which Erasmus glosses in his *Adagia* as *sermo mendaciis explere*, roughly our English "to spin a yarn" (Delepiere 1875:7; Crusius 1899:1930; Duckworth 1940:329). The word is first used to designate a literary pastiche by Ausonius who says he inherited the term from the anonymous inventors of the form (Green 1991:132; 519).

As the quilting metaphor suggests, a centonist collects disparate scraps and strands from a source text and stitches them into a new artistic whole. "Cento is not a generic term but an *écriture*—such as parody, travesty...and pastiche—which can be realized in a lyric and an epic form as well as in the prose of political treatises and the literary essay, even in dramatic form" (Verweyen and Witting 1991:172). In fact, dozens of ancient and modern centos exist, some pious, some political, some obscene, which have been patched together from the works of Euripides, Vergil, Ovid, Cicero, Petrarch, Shakespeare, Goethe and Emily Dickinson.

---

<sup>1</sup>Alluded to by Tertullian: *Homerocentones...de carminibus Homeri propria opera more centonario ex multis hinc inde compositis in unum sarciunt corpus* (*Praescr. haer.* 39.5; cf. Isidore of Seville *Etym.* 1.39.25).

The *Homeric Centos*, the topic of the present study, originated with a Christian bishop named Patricius in the fourth century CE, and were later expanded by Eudocia Athenais, wife of the emperor Theodosius II, in the early fifth. Eudocia's Centos (τὰ Ὀμηρόκεντρα—hence the capitalized plural) are made up entirely of verses lifted verbatim, or with only slight modification, from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. They comprise a single, continuous twenty-four-hundred-line poem on a biblical theme which recounts the creation of the world, the temptation and fall of man, and the birth, life, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ.

\*

"Understanding art by means of its reception," writes Constance Perin, "implies understanding culture itself.

For what people find meaningful determines what will make them curious and pleased, anxious and fearful, distant and hostile. The reception of new, unusual, and difficult art—in all the arts—depends on interpreters who will speak as much to the culture as to the work of art" (Perin 1994:193).

The Homeric Centos are new, unusual, and sometimes difficult. They have not been well received, in either ancient or more modern times. I speak as much to the culture as to the work of art when I say that, in spite of their reception hitherto, the Homeric Centos are intrinsically fascinating and important. Given the poem's poor reception, however, the burden of this Introduction is, as it were, to justify Eudocia's ways to men, and to explain



my aims and methods in studying them here.

An aesthetic maxim of Oscar Wilde holds that "Art is at once Surface and Symbol" (Wilde 1891:236). Following Wilde, I have endeavored in this study to scan the one and sound the depths of the other—the Symbol perhaps (as Wilde cautions) at my own peril, but nonetheless with eyes and ears open to appreciate the art of the Homeric Centos.

The Centos' poetic surface is the topic of Chapters II and III, where I offer a systematic description of the linguistic techniques and devices used in the composition of this poem. The symbol is a central concern in Chapters IV-VII where I attempt to place the Centos in their larger semiotic environment, namely the textual domains of Homer and the Bible, and their place in the world of late antiquity. These chapters are the necessary complement to the poetics offered in Chapters II and III, for without a semiotic orientation,

The theorist of art will always be inclined to regard the work of art as a purely formal structure or, on the other hand, as a direct reflection of the psychological...states of its creator or a direct reflection of the ideological, economic, social or cultural situation of the milieu in question. This train of thought will lead the theorist either to treat the evolution of art as a series of formal transformations or to deny evolution completely...or, finally, to conceive of it as passive commentary on an evolution exterior to art. Only the semiotic point of view allows theorists to recognize the autonomous existence and essential dynamism of artistic structure and to understand evolution of art as an immanent process but one in constant dialectical relationship with the evolution of other domains of culture (Mukarovsky 1936:8).

This classic statement on the semiotics of art reflects my objectives

exactly. I am interested in both the "autonomous existence and essential dynamism" of the Centos' artistic structure and the "constant dialectical relationship" they have "with the evolution of other domains of culture," including—indirectly—our own. Before we can discuss either surface or symbol, however, some background information about the text and its author is necessary. This is the purpose of Chapter I, which places the Centos in their cultural and literary contexts.

\*

In 1979 Kurt Smolak called for a new edition of the Homeric Centos in no uncertain terms, emphasizing the poem's great "heuristic potential as a special form of Homer-reception," adding, however, that the recognition of this potential has been impeded by "the censorship of a *klassizistischen Ästhetik*" (Smolak 1979:49). The responsibility for this situation lies primarily with an otherwise eminent Homerist, Arthur Ludwich, whose Teubner edition of 1897 (until now the only edition of the Centos currently available) is based on a single, only partially-edited manuscript, which, as Ludwich himself was well aware, is a non-Eudocian eclogue of Homeric centos compiled by several hands.<sup>2</sup>

Ludwich performed limply as editor because, he confesses, "books of this kind, only a few of which still lie hidden in libraries, are not worth the careful attention of anyone today." "I leave this sterile field," he adds

---

<sup>2</sup> Ludwich 1897:87; the textual situation is discussed in detail by Usher 1997.

elsewhere, "to others more patient than myself to plow" (Ludwich 1897:87-8). More patient than Ludwich, I have given my neck to the yoke, and have produced a new edition of the Centos (Part II of this dissertation). It is based on that edition that I offer here an explanation and radical re-evaluation of the Cento aesthetic.

The Homeric Centos, I argue, are a creative reception of and response to Homeric poetry in which poetic sound and poetic memory are the distinguishing features. Eudocia's poem has much to contribute to the ongoing debate about the effects of orality and textuality in verbal art forms, and much to teach us about the aural and performative aspects of ancient reading, the processes of human memory, and the reception of Homeric poetry as oral poetry in later antiquity. The aural and mnemonic aspects of Eudocia's poem were admired by Petrus Candidus, the Centos' very first editor, who described them in the Aldine edition of 1502 as a "model of mnemonic capacity" (τὰ τῆς μνήμης δείγματα), "a poem which proceeds eurythmically—almost seamlessly—from the poetry of Homer" (ποίημα...ἐκ τῆς Ὀμήρου προελθὸν εὐρυθμὸν καὶ γλαφυρόν). The present study is a sustained explanation and vindication of these claims.

It is my contention that the Homeric Centos stand in relation to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as *parole* does to *langue*: In this familiar linguistic model, courtesy of Ferdinand de Saussure and the Prague Circle, *parole* ("speech" or "*langue*-realization") corresponds to the activity of verbal combination, visualized as taking place on a "horizontal" axis. *Langue*, meaning "language-as-a-complete-system" or "*parole*-potential,"

corresponds to the process of verbal selection from a "vertical" axis. An individual's *langue*-awareness is, following Noam Chomsky, referred to as his "competence," and his *langue*-realization as verbal "performance" or "generation."<sup>3</sup> To apply the model to the Homeric Centos: Eudocia's competence in the text of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, her *langue*, is the basis for the generation of her cento poem.

Because she is a cento poet (and I emphasize both elements in that description of her), Eudocia's *langue*-competence is much more specific than the kind of familiarity with the Homeric *Kunstsprache* and the habits or techniques associated with it (e.g. localization and colometric structure) that we see in Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, the Alexandrian hexameter poets, or even Nonnus. Unlike them, Eudocia has no choice whether or not she will "imitate" Homer stylistically in a given line. As she scans the *langue*-axis of selection the question is not "whether," but "which" line she will use. That is, the field open for selection is limited, because she is working from within a closed system (the actual Homeric texts); and on the verbal level that system is mostly unaffected by historical change. Leonard

---

<sup>3</sup> For a succinct expression of Chomsky's notion of linguistic competence and performance, terms first used in *Aspects of a Theory of Syntax* (1965), see Chomsky 1985:7. On Chomsky's relationship to de Saussure see Dresselhaus 1979. There is an excellent discussion of literary competence in a *parole-langue* system in Culler 1975:6-10; 113-30. The notion of linguistic competence in a traditional, formulaic language is well expressed by Cassidy and Ringler, who in discussing *langue* acquisition by the Anglo-Saxon *scop* note that "Language itself supplies a useful parallel. The child learns his language by abstracting recurrent patterns out of the apparent chaos he hears in the speech of adults. He learns how to substitute within grammatical "frames"—substitute one noun for another, etc. The frames themselves remain constant. The oral poet learns, in a similar way, the grammar of formulaic substitution—and will ultimately be as flexible and spontaneous at oral poetical composition as we are at speaking our native language" (Cassidy and Ringler 1971:270-1).

Muellner puts this beautifully: the Homeric *Kunstsprache*, he writes, "has an extension in time and place beyond that of natural languages, [and] comes with expressiveness and consistency built in and refined over generations of audience-performer interaction" (Muellner 1990:98).

Eudocia's own competence in the *Kunstsprache*, as one expects of *parole* in general, generates some idiosyncracies, that is, solecisms within this closed system, and we will pay close attention to them in our analysis. But on the whole, she is fluent in the Homeric *langue*.

Eudocia's use of Homeric lines to express biblical themes also generates fascinating semiotic problems. Verweyen and Witting rightly note that the cento, more so than other literary forms, "can serve two opposite purposes: on the one hand the constitution/ formation and confirmation/endorsement of norms" (by its use of canonical texts and authors), and "on the other hand their violation" (by the deconstruction and selective reassembly of those texts) (Verweyen and Witting 1991:173). In the Homeric Centos the form serves both purposes at once: on the one hand Eudocia's use of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to express biblical and biblically-derived themes affirms the cultural prestige of both Homer and the Bible in the world of late antiquity; and yet, because of the clash of two very different sign systems in the Centos, her poem inevitably compromises the integrity and hence the authority of both. This explains why the poem has got such bad reviews; it is also, I think, the reason the poem is so attractive.

The cento aesthetic clearly infuriated Irenaeus and Jerome, two early critics of the cento form. Jerome says that cento poets "fit to their own

private meaning passages that have nothing to do with that meaning, as if it were some great feat (and not a depraved method of exposition) to have an author's intention violated, and to make scripture conform to their own will, though in fact that same scripture flies in their face."<sup>4</sup> Irenaeus, in a discussion of the teachings of Valentinus, insists that cento-writing is a gnostic art. In taking over material from authoritative source texts, he argues, cento poets disregard the immediate context of the originals. As he puts it, "They collect words and phrases lying about here and there in a text and transpose them from their natural context to an unnatural one."<sup>5</sup>

There is no defense against these charges. Eudocia *does* violate the intentions of authors, making her poem an extended exercise in wilful misreading. But there is a logic to her use of Homeric verses to express biblical themes. To quote Sir James Frazer's definition of magic, the logic of the Cento aesthetic "is nothing but...[an] application of the very simplest and most elementary processes of the mind, namely the association of ideas by virtue of resemblance or contiguity" (Frazer 1906:52).<sup>6</sup> The semiotic

---

<sup>4</sup>*Ad sensum suum incongruè aptant testimonia, quasi grande sit et non vitiosissimum docendi genus, depravare sententias, et ad voluntatem suam Scripturam habere re pugnantem* (Jerome *Ep.* 53.7 in Labourt 1953:15-16).

<sup>5</sup>Ἀλέξεις καὶ ὀνόματα σποράδην κείμενα συλλέγοντες μεταφέρουσι...ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν εἰς τὸ παρὰ φύσιν (Iren. *apud* Epiph. *Pan.* [Migne PG 41:532]).

<sup>6</sup>Compare C. A. Faraone's observations on the appropriation of Homeric verses in late antique magical spells: "a single line cited in a magical recipe may be shorthand for citing a short passage... [where] the original context of the verse or verses in the Homeric poem usually dictates its power or usefulness in a magical ritual. Thus, for example, verses excerpted from an Homeric speech—used in epic to calm someone's anger or to assure the temporarily blinded Diomedes that the mist has been lifted from his eyes—could similarly be used to calm the anger or heal the eyesight of someone in day-to-day life" (Faraone 1996:85).

magic at work in this poem is pervasive, for beneath the apparent mismatch of material on the Cento surface, the two source texts are strongly bound by theme and structure. As stories of quest, cunning, suffering, recognition and return, the tales of Christ and Odysseus are compatible, as we shall see, and their literary *Nachleben* attests to the adaptability of these two polytropic heroes.

Borges once remarked that "the generations of men, throughout recorded time, have always told and retold two stories— that of a lost ship which searches the Mediterranean seas for a dearly loved island, and that of a god who is crucified on Golgotha" (Borges 1972:19). In the Homeric Centos these two stories, the fabric of the western imagination, are read one in terms of the other. Eudocia's poetic syncretism of Homer and the Bible presents us with a unique comparative reading of those two texts. This "reading"—the *parole* re-generation of Homer's oral poetry—commands our attention as a feat of human memory, interpretation, and imagination; it also makes the Centos a case study in "intertextuality" (see Chapter 4), and in what playwright Bertolt Brecht dubbed *Verfremdungseffekt* ("V-Effekt"), the aesthetic of "defamiliarization" (cf. Hunger 1978:99). *Verfremdung*, Brecht writes, aims "to deprive an event or character of any self-evident, familiar, or obvious quality, and to produce instead astonishment or curiosity about it." "*Verfremdung* brings about heightened understanding."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> "Einen Vorgang oder einen Charakter verfremden heisst zunächst einfach, dem Vorgang oder dem Charakter das Selbstverständliche, Bekannte, Einleuchtende zu nehmen und über ihn Staunen und Neugierde zu erzeugen" (Brecht 1933-41:301). Cf.

Consider briefly Eudocia's handling of Man's first disobedience (84-87) where it is said of Eve:<sup>8</sup>

	ἡ μεγά ἔργον ἔρεξεν ἀδρείησι νόοιο	o 11.272
85	οὐλομένη, ἡ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἔθηκε' πολλάς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν πάσι δ' ἔθηκε πόνον, πολλοῖσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφήκεν.	o 17.287 † i 1.3 i 21.524

She unknowingly did a monstrous deed,  
and, destructive, she wrought many evils for men;  
she cast many strong souls to Hades' abode,  
wrought hardship for all, caused trouble for many.

This short passage contains all the elements that make the Centos an art form to be reckoned with.

First, in terms of the generation of the verse, we see how the appropriated Homeric lines are linked together by key words (ἔθηκε, πολλ-), a mnemonic aid frequently used in the composition of this poem, and with Homeric precedent (see Chapter 5). In line 85, taken from *Odyssey* 17.287 (= 17.484), Eudocia substitutes the verb ἔθηκε for the Homeric reading δίδωσι at the end of the line. This and many other Cento substitutions, some accidental, others intentional, are often suggested to the poet by Homeric habits of word-collocation and word-localization (see Chapter 2). Here the substitution is due to the influence, by association, of the first word of *Od.* 17.287, an enjambed οὐλομένη (see Chapter 3), whose *locus classicus* is of

---

Brecht 1935-41:364: "Die classische Verfremdung erzeugt erhöhtes Verständnis." On Brecht's theory and practice of V-Effekt see further Knopf 1986:102-6 and Brooker 1994:191-5.

<sup>8</sup> An explanation of the sigla used here is given in Chapter II.



course the second line of the *Iliad*: *οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκεν*. *Iliad* 1.2, although unexpressed, suggests, on the principle of contiguity, *Iliad* 1.3 (used in Cento line 86), which in turn suggests a thematically related line (*Il.* 21.524), containing the verb *ἔθηκε* and the adjective *πόλλα*, for line 87.

Under close inspection, the Cento text thus reveals the author's manner of composition. The text also contains its own interpretation. The word *οὐλομένη* ("destructive") in line 85 (= *Od.* 17.287), for example, refers in Homer to the stomach (*γαστέρα*). Eudocia predicates the word here of Eve, implicitly equating her with a stomach, which is to say a womb. For an audience steeped in Christian discourse, the Homeric referent (the unexpressed *γαστέρα*) suggests the curse of pain in childbearing mentioned in the Book of Genesis (3:16), and the adverse effects of "Original Sin" on the womb which produced Cain, the world's first of many murderers (Gen. 4:1). An audience steeped in the Homeric poems—and in late antiquity this could be the same audience, as Irenaeus shows by his ready identification of the Homeric context and speaker for each verse in the ten-line cento he cites (Wilken 1967:32)—might appreciate the additional nuance that Homer himself uses *οὐλομένη* elsewhere in the *Odyssey* (though in a different metrical position) to describe Clytemnestra, the "destructive" wife of Agamemnon, party to the "fall" of the House of Atreus (*Od.* 4.92; 11.410; 24.97). In fact, earlier in this passage (77-79) Eudocia explicitly links Eve to Clytemnestra with these dire lines from *Odyssey* Book 24:

κουρίδιον κτείνασα πόσιν, στυγερὴ δέ τ' αἰοιδῆ	ο 24.200
ἔσσειτ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, χαλεπήν δέ τε φῆμιν ὄπασσεν	ο 24.201

θηλυτέρησι γυναιξί, καὶ ἢ κ' εὐεργὸς ἔησιν.

ο 24.202

**She destroyed her lawfully-wedded husband, and the song  
of it  
will make men shudder; she has also given women  
a bad reputation, even the woman who does what is right.**

Of course the word οὐλομένη in line 85, especially with ἔθηκε substituted for δίδωσι and followed by *Iliad* 1.3 in line 86, also evokes the wrath of Achilles, the catalyst which sets the whole story of the *Iliad* in motion, just as Eve's unwitting role in the fall of man from Paradise is the initial crisis in the biblical story. Here too Eudocia had precedent in the Homeric *langue*. At a crucial point in his narrative the *Iliad* poet himself evokes this "initial crisis" when in Agamemnon's apology he qualifies "Ατη ("Folly") with an enjambed οὐλομένη in initial position: πρέσβα Διὸς θυγάτηρ "Ατη, ἢ πάντας ἀᾶται / οὐλομένη (*Il.* 19.91-2).<sup>9</sup>

Centō line 84 (= *Od.* 11.272), like οὐλομένη used of the womb and of Clytemnestra, also evokes images of fateful marriage and curse. This Homeric line is taken from the parade of nefarious women Odysseus meets in Hades and refers to Epikaste (Sophocles' Iokaste), the mother and unwitting spouse of her son, Oedipus. The appropriation of this line here implies for the reader who knows Homer and Greek myth that Eve's sin was not just destructive, but incestuous as well. Here we feel the full effects of defamiliarization: to assimilate the "Mother of All the Living" with the mother of Oedipus is somehow pleasantly disconcerting.

---

<sup>9</sup> On the "deictic" potential of localized words and runovers in Homer see the study of Kahane (1994).

Whether or not Eudocia intended to produce V-Effekt in this or in any given Cento passage is difficult to gauge, as was recognized by Mikhail Bakhtin in reference to centonic, parodic and macaronic treatments of Christian themes in the Middle Ages (Bakhtin 1981:68-9). We do not have statements from Eudocia as clear or explicit as the one from German poet Erich Weinert, for example, who in his cento poem "Einheitsvolkslied" (published in 1924) stitches together popular verses from Germanic folklore and *Lieder* in order to deconstruct those texts which he felt articulated the identity of certain social classes.<sup>10</sup>

All the evidence suggests the Empress was a pious Christian, so I doubt that Eudocia intended to undermine Christian belief and doctrine.<sup>11</sup> We must therefore respect the likelihood that she meant no irreverence, and treat the defamiliarization aesthetic in the Homeric Centos as an *attendant* effect, the result of Cento intertextuality, dependent upon, or activated by, a third-party reader's knowledge of Homer. This is not to say that inconcinnity is irreverence, or that Eudocia was incapable of irony, humor or even intentional V-Effekt. In fact, ambiguity is Eudocia's strong suit, showing, as we shall see in due course, all seven of William Empson's

---

<sup>10</sup> "When I saw the bourgeoisie and petite-bourgeoisie with whom I had contact in my day-to-day affairs rise up in all their cowardly arrogance and lies," Weinert tells us in his autobiography, "I reacted with spite. I felt the urge to yank down the shorts of these patriots in top coat and tails—stained with the blood of the workers—and expose their warts to the world. My intent in this poem was to make them look ridiculous" (Quoted in Verweyen and Witting 1991:173, my translation).

<sup>11</sup> "Für Eudokia war der christliche Glaube keineswegs ein blosses Lippenbekenntnis. Er formte vielmehr ihr Leben und Denken und war die wichtigste Inspiration ihrer Dichtung" is Martin West's accurate assessment (West 1978:110; cf. Haffner 1996:223 and the studies of Cameron 1982 and Holum 1982).

types.<sup>12</sup>

It is evident from her treatment of the Fall that Eudocia was not slavishly producing a flat paraphrase of biblical myth with Homeric tags but drew deeply from the repository of Homeric poetry to tease meanings out of Homer and the Bible which she as a reader found there. The exhilarating mixture of narrative ambiguity and logic exhibited in this Cento vignette is characteristic of the whole poem, and speaks volumes for its inherent worth.

Decades before Brecht, the Russian Formalists had argued that "defamiliarization," which they termed *ostranenie*, constitutes the very "literariness" of literature,<sup>13</sup> a proposition revived recently by Harold Bloom (a very different sort of critic), who finds "strangeness" the common thread that runs through the Western literary canon (Bloom 1994:3). The Centos are indeed strange. They are not, however, a high work of fine art, but of folk art. That is part of their appeal. The mismatch of Homeric and biblical text-worlds conjures up for me the magnificently naive painting of Morris Hirshfield, Howard Finster and Oscar de Mejo, whose flat surfaces teem

---

<sup>12</sup> Listed in *Seven Types of Ambiguity* as follows: (1) "a detail is effective in several ways at once, e.g. by comparison with several points of likeness, antitheses with several points of difference;" (2) "two or more meanings are fully resolved into one;" (3) "two apparently unconnected meanings are given simultaneously" (as in puns); (4) "alternative meanings combine to make clear a complicated state of mind in the author;" (5) "fortunate confusion[s], as when the author is discovering his idea in the act of writing;" (6) "what is said is contradictory or irrelevant and the reader is forced to invent interpretations;" (7) "full contradiction, marking a division in the author's mind" (Empson 1966:v-vi).

<sup>13</sup> On the Formalist conception of "literariness" (*literaturnost*) see Erlich 1965:172; Todorov 1973:70 and Steiner 1984:212-13. On *ostranenie* see Birnbaum 1985:148-50 and Fowler 1987:101.

with visual contradictions: stunted limbs, disproportionately elaborate costumes, biblical mixed with secular iconography. Finster's work in particular smacks of the Cento aesthetic: "Finster's episodic and multi-panel paintings...read like medieval narratives in their parataxis which, rather than unfold in a sequential ordering of events, abruptly joins them side by side in a manner that is filmic or televisionistic as images shift from panel to panel" (J. Murray 1980:161).

Like Finster and his ilk, Eudocia created a work of what art historians call "Outsider Art" (Cardinal 1994:21-43). Artist Outsiders have certain traits in common: they are largely self-taught; they often reuse discarded materials; their work stands outside established canons of taste; the artists themselves are often marginalized socially. In terms of their reception, the Centos qualify as Outsider Art on all counts. Even their author can be constructed as somewhat of an Artist Outsider: Eudocia, history's "first writing empress" (van Deun 1993:273), composed this work while in exile in Jerusalem on charges of adultery (Holum 1982:193-4). As Mrs. Browning described her fellow poet's lot in her *Essay on the Greek Christian Poets* (1842),

She was the third fair woman accused of sacrificing the world for an apple, having moved her husband to wrath, by giving away his imperial gift of a large one to her philosophic friend Paulinus; and being unhappily more learned than her two predecessors in the sin, in the course of her exile to Jerusalem, she took ghostly comfort, by separating Homer's εἶδωλον from his φρένες. There she sat among the ruins of the holy city, addressing herself most unholily, with whatever good intentions and delicate fingers, to pulling Homer's gold to pieces bit by bit.

The story of Eudocia's affair with Theodosius' most trusted advisor and the emperor's discovery of it through an erotic "apple of discord" is legendary—at once biblical and Homeric. Behind the legend, however, lies the truth, that in Eudocia the fantasies of critics like Samuel Butler and Harold Bloom find perfect historical expression. Butler and Bloom sought, and found, a woman in the author of western literature's two greatest works: Butler for Homer in his *Authoress of the Odyssey* (1897), and Bloom for the biblical Genesis in his *Book of J* (1990). My own fantasy is that the Empress sits enthroned between both critics like a πότνια θηρών as she mediates between Homeric text and biblical theme. That mediation, and not Eudocia herself, is my primary concern in this study. My Eudocia is a Homeric reader of the Bible. Anything else she is is for anyone else to discover.

## CHAPTER I

### EUDOCIA: READER-RHAPSODE

Τί οὖν ποτε τὸ αἴτιον, ὦ Σώκρατες, ὅτι ἐγὼ, ὅταν μὲν τις περὶ ἄλλου τοῦ ποιητοῦ διαλέγηται, οὔτε προσέχω τὸν νοῦν ἀδυνατῶ τε καὶ ὅτι οὖν συμβαλέσθαι λόγου ἄξιον, ἀλλ' ἀτεχνῶς νυστάζω, ἐπειδὴν δέ τις περὶ Ὀμήρου μνησθῆ, εὐθύς τε ἐγρήγορα καὶ προσέχω τὸν νοῦν καὶ εὐπορῶ ὅτι λέγω;

—Plato *Ion* 532b8-c4

The Homeric Centos are the product of a manuscript culture and thus share with the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the books of the Bible problems relating to date, authorship, and the transmission of the text. The particular situation we face is also similar to the problems encountered in establishing the texts of early print culture, including some of the finest Renaissance poetry, for example the works of Donne, Wotton and Sir Philip Sidney. As a recent editor describes it (Norbrook 1993:xxxv),

The concept of an accurate, correct text representing what an author had finally decided on was...an unfamiliar one in the Renaissance. Once in circulation, a poem could easily change its form, being adapted for different purposes at different times by different people. The whole notion of authors' control over, or ownership of, their texts was a relative one.

This is precisely what has happened to the Homeric Centos. As we learn from Eudocia's Prologue to the poem, an otherwise unknown bishop named Patricius composed the work in the latter third of the fourth century CE but

left it, in Eudocia's judgement, "half-finished" (ἡμιτέλεστον). The Empress subsequently edited and greatly expanded Patricius' poem during her exile in Jerusalem, sometime after 443 CE (Holum 1982:220). The Cento text on which this study is based, the "Ivion recension" (Part II of this dissertation), represents Eudocia's expanded edition.<sup>1</sup>

As suggested in the Introduction, Eudocia's Centos effectively prove that Homer continued to be appreciated aurally as an oral poet in late antiquity and, more importantly, could be reproduced as such. Obviously, in making this statement I do not deny that actual texts were involved in the process of composition. Indeed, Eudocia speaks of Patricius' poem as his "columns" (σελίδες), his "writing tablet" (δέλτον) and "book" (βιβλον), and of course she knew her Homer from manuscript copies of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. However, the information we have about the origin and context of the cento form and the nature of Eudocia's editorial work on Patricius' poem as revealed in her Prologue indicate that oral/aural factors played a large role in the composition and transmission of this poem. These two areas of evidence suggest that Eudocia, a late antique *reader* of Homer, is heir to the ancient tradition of rhapsodic *performance* as well.

In her Prologue (5-8), Eudocia says that the reason for undertaking her revision of Patricius's poem was that her predecessor "did not declare (ἀγόρευσεν) everything accurately... nor in singing (ἀείδων) did he remember (ἐμνήσατο) the actual verses that Homer uttered" (εἶπεν). Eudocia's

---

<sup>1</sup>The manuscript in question is *Ivion* 4464 (Mt. Athos), catalogued and described by Lambros (1900:92), and collated by me against Stephanus' 1578 edition of the poem. For details see Usher 1997.



description here emphasizes the vocal, aural and mnemonic aspects of Patricius' cento. The same qualities are stressed in her assessment of another predecessor in the art of composing Homeric centos, the praetorian prefect of the East under Theodosius I, Flavius Eutolmius Tatianus<sup>2</sup>

(Prologue 19-27):

And if anyone listens to (εἰσαίων) the formal beauty (μορφήν<sup>3</sup>) of wise Tatian the poet (ὑμνοπόλοιο), and if he likes what he hears (τέρπειεν ἀκουήν), it was on account of the "double" that Tatian composed his epic poem (ᾠοιδήν) out of Homeric song, using verses of his own composition as well.<sup>4</sup> It is a wicked song that sings (ἐνέπουσαν αὐτήν) of warlike Trojans, about how the sons of Achaians destroyed the city of Priam, Troy itself holding out against them; it sings of gods and men raging in the terrible din of battle, the same ones Homer once sang with his voice of bronze (χαλκεόφωνος...αὐτήσεν Ὀμηρος).

Eudocia's synaesthetic metaphors of sight and sound, text and voice, remind us that the usual practice of reading aloud in antiquity blurs any sharp distinction between spoken word and written text (Gamble 1995:204; 321). In the fourth and fifth centuries CE this aspect of Greco-Roman culture is perhaps appreciated most by scholars of Christian prose literature where it is often difficult to determine which texts were originally sermons actually delivered to a congregation and which are treatises

---

<sup>2</sup>PRLE I 876-8 ("Tatianus 5"); see Usher 1997.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the Homeric μορφή ἐπέων (*Od.* 11.367).

<sup>4</sup> "Doubles" (δοιάδες) are passages taken over from Homer in sequences of two or more lines. According to the so-called rules of cento composition laid down by Ausonius in the preface to his *Cento nuptialis* such doubles were to be avoided. Tatian avoided them by interspersing lines of his own composition. Eudocia does not avoid them and thus "apologizes" for them in her Prologue. See further Usher 1997:313-15 and Chapter II below.

intended primarily for a reading public (Dihle 1994:521).

Picking up on Paul Zumthor's notion of *vocalité* in medieval poetry, Doane and Pasternack (1991) describe this close relationship between orality and textuality in later antiquity and the Middle Ages with the apt phrase *vox intexta*, "sound sewn into text" (cf. Gamble 1995:203-4). In the next chapter I demonstrate in detail how many features of the orally-derived poetry of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*— the sound sown into text—actually facilitated the composition of the Homeric Centos. The question I put here is: In the *parole-langue* system of verse generation proposed earlier, what would be the nature and significance of Eudocia's revisions of Patricius? The answer is to be found in line 6 of the Prologue, which states that Patricius "did not preserve the harmony of the verses" (οὐδὲ μὲν ἀρμονίην ἐπέων ἐφύλαξε), and in line 14 where Eudocia says she therefore conferred it upon them (ἀρμονίην ἱερὴν ἐπέεσσιν ἔδωκα).

It is clear from the Prologue that Eudocia performed her "harmonizing" on the actual Homeric verses (ἔπη), and that this somehow involved correcting them. The need for such corrections arose, we recall, because Patricius "did not declare all his verses accurately" (οὐ πάνπαν ἐτήτυμα πάντ' ἀγόρευσεν), "nor in singing did he remember only those verses sung by the brazen heart of blameless Homer" (οὐδὲ μόνων ἐπέων ἐμνήσατο κείνος αἰείδων / ὅπποσα χάλκεον ἦτορ ἀμεμφῆος εἶπεν Ὀμήρου). Her response was "to draw out what was not in order" (ὅσσα μὲν ἐν βίβλοισιν ἔπη πέλεν οὐ κατὰ κόσμον / πάντ' ἄμυδις κείνοιο σοφῆς ἐξείρυσσα βίβλου), "and to add what he left out" (ὅσσα δ' ἐκεῖνος ἔλειπεν, ἐγὼ πάλιν ἐν σελίδεσσι / γράψα).

As described here, Eudocia's editorial work would fall into the category of *emendatio*, which according to Quintilian (*Instit.* 10.4.1) entails "addition, excision, and alteration" (*adiicere, detrahere, mutare*). Eudocia, we have just seen, claims to have performed all three tasks. I have demonstrated elsewhere that she is responsible for nearly three-quarters of the poem's twenty-four-hundred lines (Usher 1997). These are her additions. The character of her excisions and alterations is bound up in the notion of *ἀρμονία*, the very quality of Homer's poetry that Patricius did not preserve. It is here that we can detect the aural dimension in her revisions, for *ἀρμονία* is a speech-sound phenomenon particularly connected with proper accentuation in the oral performance of texts (Arist. *Rhet.* 1403b with Allen 1987:116).

For Dionysius Thrax *ἀρμονία* consists in the act and art of reading (*ἀνάγνωσις*) and hence recitation, which he defines as the "unfaltering pronunciation" (*ἀδιάπτωτος προφορά*) of poetry or prose (Uhlig 1883:6). By reading "with an ear for accentuation" (*κατὰ προσφθίαν*), he suggests, we apprehend a poet's art or skill (*τέχνη*), which according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus is what produces *ἀρμονία* (*De comp. verb.* 3). For this Dionysius the aural quality *ἀρμονία* is the desired object of "composition" (*σύνθεσις*), the effective combination and arrangement of syllables, words and clauses; this includes the harmonious arrangement of *μέλος*, *ῥυθμοί*, *μέτρα*, and of various speech-sound phenomena involving "slurring" (*συναλοιφή*) (*De comp. verb.* 6; with Rutherford 1905:158 n. 2; 164 n. 14). Reading or reciting *κατὰ προσφθίαν*, then, preserves the *ἀρμονία* of a poetic composition.

Two of Dionysius' principal examples of ἀρμονία come from Homer, and his analysis sheds some light on Eudocia's use of the word in the Prologue. To prove that σύνθεσις is more important than word-selection (ἐκλογή), Dionysius cites the homely description of Odysseus' breakfast in his swineherd's hut (*Od.* 16.1-16), the beauty of which, he says, consists not in the use of figurative language, but in the composition (σύνθεσις), specifically in the meter (*De comp. verb.* 3). "If the meter were broken up," he writes, "the very same lines would appear cheap (φάδλα) and unworthy of our emulation (ἄζηλα)."

*Iliad* 12.433-5 is offered as another example of ἀρμονία. To demonstrate the same point he made with *Odyssey* 16.1-16 Dionysius performs some experiments upon these lines, changing the word order several times to create several different "heroic" rhythms (*De comp. verb.* 4). He concludes that such rearrangements spoil the original: "While the choice of words remains the same and only the σύνθεσις is altered, the rhythm and meter changes along with it, as well as the structure, complexion, character, and emotion—indeed, the whole meaning—of the verses."<sup>5</sup>

As an aesthetic principle ἀρμονία, the sound-quality of a verbal composition, is paramount: it affects the poetic meaning of an entire passage. Dionysius does not transpose whole Homeric lines in his verbal experiments, only the words within them, so what he would have made of the cento poet's stichic rearrangements one can only guess. His

---

<sup>5</sup> Τῆς μὲν ἐκλογῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων τῆς αὐτῆς μενούσης, τῆς δὲ συνθέσεως μόνης μεταπεσούσης τὰ τε μέτρα μεταρρυθμίζεσθαι καὶ συμμεταπίπτειν αὐτοῖς τὰ σχήματα, τὰ χρώματα, τὰ ἦθη, τὰ πάθη, τὴν ὅλην τῶν ποιημάτων ἀξίωσιν.

identification of Homeric ἀρμονία with Homeric μέτρα, however, is surely a clue to understanding the nature of Patricius' cento-poetic flaws.

Good composition, according to Dionysius, has a "beauty" or "order" consisting of ἀρμονία (κόσμον ἀρμονίας *De comp. verb.* 3). Patricius, according to Eudocia, lacked both qualities because he did not declare Homer accurately. In fact she says much of his poem was οὐ κατὰ κόσμον. Patricius' σύνθεσις was somehow faulty. Perhaps his original cento—at least as it had been transmitted to her—contained non-Homeric forms, displaced words, and/or poorly-joined half-lines—flaws perhaps attributable to phonological changes in the Greek language and the incipient shift from accentuation based on pitch to accentuation based on stress in the fourth and fifth centuries (Allen 1987:130-1; Browning 1983:24-6). Traces of his work may perhaps remain in the few non-Homeric lines left in Eudocia's recension (see Appendix II), and in the occasional metrical fault. By and large, however, Eudocia successfully took it upon herself to restore the proper (i.e. Homeric) ἀρμονία of such lines and expanded Patricius' poem on the same principle, keeping as close as possible to Homeric wording (cf. Alan Cameron 1982:284).

Eudocia's editorial work, then, was not unlike the work involved in the production of the διορθώσεις of the Homeric text undertaken by Aristotle and the Hellenistic critics, Zenodotus, Aristophanes and Aristarchus. In fact the verb διορθόω is the word used in the testimonia and manuscript epigraphs to describe her activity, just as συντίθημι is used of Patricius' original composition (Usher 1997:310). As Gregory Nagy has recently

reminded us, the production of the Hellenistic corrected editions or copies of Homer essentially involved two things: (a) the correct accentuation and thus pronunciation of Homeric verse (Nagy 1996a:118-27),<sup>6</sup> and (b) the athetesis of lines and passages judged to be interpolations. In each type of correction Nagy argues persuasively that both the variants (including the so-called concordance interpolations) and the Hellenistic critics' notions of correctness and authenticity (e.g. proper pronunciation marked by diacritics; the *numerus versuum* of each poem) were established by the performance tradition of rhapsodes. Consequently, many textual variants in the papyri and medieval manuscripts, Nagy argues, should be regarded as "authentic" variants stemming from those living performance traditions (Nagy 1996a:146-7).

Of course, in comparing Eudocia's concern for ἀκρόασις with the Hellenistic critics' methods of textual criticism, I do not mean to suggest that she is a critic of that caliber or stripe, much less that we should use her *Centos* as a *textual* witness for Homer. Although this has been the direction of recent work on the poem (e.g. Alfieri 1987; 1989), it is not the most rewarding path to follow, for in the *Centos* we are dealing not with a "reperformed composer," to borrow Nagy's phrase, but rather with a "recomposed performer" (Nagy 1996a:60), whose text is in effect a "recomposition-in-performance" (Nagy 1996a:78). Indeed, I suggest that Eudocia's *Centos* have their own peculiar place in the rhapsodic tradition of "authentic"

---

<sup>6</sup> Aristotle is reported to have made notes on diacritics in the margin of the text (παράσημον), while Aristarchus confined such remarks to his commentaries (ὑπομνήματα) (Nagy 1996a:135).

variation and creative manipulation of the Homeric repertoire, a proposition supported by our sources.

Eustathius, for example, citing Pindar *Nemean* 2.2 on the Homeridae ('Ομηρίδαι / ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων τὰ πόλλα αἰδοί), explicitly compares the Homeric cento poet to the ancient rhapsode. In his discussion of the use of the term ῥαψοδία to designate the books of the *Iliad*, Eustathius notes that the Homeric Centos are "a clear example of this kind of stitching" (τῆς δὲ τοιαύτης ῥάψεως παράδειγμα σαφὲς καὶ οἱ κέντρωνες, τουτέστι τὰ λεγόμενα Ὀμηρόκεντρα), and that centonism, like ῥαψοδία is "song stitched together from either of the two poems of Homer in a manner appropriate to the business at hand, be it a wedding or a festival" (καὶ ῥαψοδία δὲ ἢ ἐξ ἑκατέρων τῶν Ὀμηρικῶν ποιήσεων συρραφεῖα ᾧδὴ ἀναλόγως τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ πράγματι, γάμῳ τυχόν ἢ ἑορτῇ Van der Valk 1971:I.10.18-29).

Heliodorus, a seventh-century commentator on Dionysius Thrax, questions this derivation of ῥαψοδία from the verb ῥάπτειν (preferring instead the popular—and incorrect—derivation from ῥαβδός, "staff") by citing a short seven-line Homeric cento about Echo and Pan, arguing as follows (Hilgard 1901:480-1):

Some say that rhapsody is song stitched together out of different Homeric passages (τόποι). However, if this were true, then this little passage [the short cento about Echo and Pan] would be called rhapsody, even though these verses are no longer in their proper Homeric order. Actually, such compositions are called centos; just as a cento is said to be a coverlet made out of various swatches of fabric, so too the themes (νοήματα) which have been composed out of various epic

poems are called centos.<sup>7</sup>

In surveying the many textile metaphors for poetic composition in classical antiquity (Latin *texo*, Greek *ράπτω*, *ύφαίνω*) Nagy concludes that in *ραψοδία* "many and various fabrics of song, each one already made (that is, each one already woven), become remade into a unity, a single new continuous fabric, by being sewn together" (Nagy 1996b:86). This is a fitting description of the centonsim of Eudocia, who too took a fabric of song, already made, and remade it into a "single new continuous fabric" by sewing it together. When we review the ancient evidence, however, we see that the centonist and rhapsode share more than a metaphor drawn from the fabrication of textiles, regardless of whether the verses in Homeric centos remain in their proper order or not.

We know that the first stitchers of Homeric verse, the archaic rhapsodes, recited Homer and other texts from memory—both at public festivals and in more private settings—and were believed to have borrowed lines or passages from other poems, or other places in the same poem, and to have patched them onto the texts they (or their competitors) recited.<sup>8</sup> The disciples of the rhapsode Kynaithos of Chios, for example, the reputed

---

<sup>7</sup> 'Ραψοδίαν δὲ εἶναι λέγουσι τὴν ἐκ διαφόρων τόπων Ὀμηρικῶν ἐρραμμένην ᾠδὴν...ἀλλ' εἰ τοῦτο ἦν ἀληθές, αὐτὰ ἂν μόνον ἐκαλεῖτο ραψοδία, καὶ οὐκέτι τὰ κατὰ τάξιν Ὀμήρου· εἶρηται δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα κέντρωνες καλοῦνται· καὶ ὡς περ κέντρων λέγεται περιβόλαιον τὸ ἐκ διαφόρων ῥακῶν συγκείμενον, οὕτω καὶ τὰ ἐκ διαφόρων ἐπῶν συγκείμενα νοήματα κέντρωνες καλοῦνται.

<sup>8</sup> For the ancient testimonia see Herington (1985:167-76). Andrew Ford (1988:300-7) points out that the word *ραψοδία* as used in antiquity extends beyond the genre of epic to any type of recited or chanted poetry which was unaccompanied by music.



author of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (with its notable suture of Delphic and Delian material), were even believed to have "inserted many verses of their own composition" into the Homeric poems.<sup>9</sup>

Such elasticity in the Homeric repertoire during the archaic period is underscored by Aelian's remark that for ancient rhapsodes what we now possess as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were not thought of as continuous poems but as discrete episodes: "The Doloneia, The Aristeia of Agamemnon, The Catalogue of Ships...The Ransom...What Happened in Pylos...The Cyclopeia, The Nekuia."<sup>10</sup> Similarly, Dionysius Thrax, in the same portion of his treatise in which he discusses reading (ἀνάγνωσις), defines ῥαψῳδία as "the part of a poem that contains the major 'theme' or 'main subject' (ὑπόθεσις) in a given book of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* (Uhlig 1883:8). An ancient commentator on Dionysius, Melampos, explains (Hilgard 1901:28):

The poem is the whole book—for example, the whole *Iliad* or *Odyssey*—whereas the sections of these poems are called ῥαψῳδία. Dionysius is correct to say each part contains its own ὑπόθεσις, and this ὑπόθεσις isn't contained in the other parts. For example, *Iliad* Book 1 contains the "The Battle between Achilles and Agamemnon," Book 2 "The Dream Sent to Agamemnon from Zeus," Book 3 "The Single Combat between Alexander and Menelaus," and so forth. Each of these "comprises" (in Dionysius's words), or rather, "contains," its

---

<sup>9</sup> Οἱ ῥαψῳδοὶ οὐκέτι τὸ γένος εἰς Ὀμηρον ἀνάγοντες, ἐπιφανεῖς δὲ ἐγένοντο οἱ περὶ Κύναιθον, οὓς φασὶ πολλὰ τῶν ἐπῶν ποιήσαντες ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου ποίησιν (schol. Pind. *Nem.* ii); cf. Eustathius: οἱ περὶ τὸν Κύναιθον καὶ πολλὰ τῶν ἐπῶν αὐτοὶ ποιήσαντες παρενέβαλον (Van der Valk 1971:I.11.40).

<sup>10</sup> Τὰ Ὀμήρου ἔπη πρότερον διηρημένα ἦδον οἱ παλαιοί. οἷον ἔλεγον τὴν...Δολώνειάν τινα καὶ Ἀριστείαν Ἀγαμέμνονος καὶ Νεῶν κατάλογον καὶ...Λύτρα καὶ...Τὰ ἐν Πύλῳ καὶ...Κυκλώπειαν καὶ Νέκυϊαν (*Var. Hist.* 13.14; cf. Nagy 1996b:78 following Sealey 1957).

own *ὑπόθεσις*, which is a part of the poem as a whole.<sup>11</sup>

Eudocia's poem also unfolds as a chain of episodes: "Adam, Eve and the Serpent's Trick" (Περὶ τοῦ Ἀδάμ καὶ τῆς Εὐας καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀπάτης τοῦ ὄφρατος)... "The Annunciation" (Περὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελισμοῦ)... "The Betrayal" (Περὶ τῆς προδοσίας), and so forth. That the Centos were actually composed by "theme" (*ὑπόθεσις*—on which more below) is the topic of Chapters IV-VII. The important point here, *a propos* Eudocia, is the connection Dionysius makes between reading and *ῥαψωδία*.

In a revealing comment, Melampos traces Dionysius' flow of thought from reading to rhapsody, reasoning that "when children begin to read, they latch onto the Homeric poems before all other books" (οἱ ἀρχόμενοι ἀναγίνωσκουν παῖδες πρὸ πάντων τῶν βιβλίων ἄπτονται τῶν Ὀμηρικῶν); thus "[Dionysius] wants to teach them what the word *ῥαψωδία* means" (βούλεται διδάξαι καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτὸ τοῦτο, τί ἐστὶ *ῥαψωδία* Hilgard 1901:28; cf. Pecorella 1962:94). We have evidence from Asia Minor and Chios dating to the first century BCE that rhapsodic exercises were actually practiced in the schools. In Teos, for example, competitions took place in which secondary level students read Homer aloud, "each competitor taking up the text at the

---

<sup>11</sup> Ποίημα μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ ὅλον βιβλίον, ὡς ἡ Ἰλιάς καὶ ἡ Ὀδύσσεια, τὰ δὲ τμήματα αὐτῶν *ῥαψωδία* καλοῦνται· καλῶς οὖν εἶπε μέρος περιέχει τινὰ ἰδικὴν *ὑπόθεσιν* μὴ ἐμφορομένην ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις μέρεσιν, ὡς τὸ μὲν Α περιέχει τὴν μάχην τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως καὶ Ἀγαμέμνονος, τὸ δὲ Β τὸν ὄνειρον τὸν πεμθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς πρὸς Ἀγαμέμνονα, τὸ δὲ Γ τὴν μονομαχίαν τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Μενελάου, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. ἕκαστον οὖν τούτων ἐμπεριείληφε, τοὔτεστι περιέχει, ἰδικὴν τινὰ *ὑπόθεσιν*, ὃ μέρος ἐστὶ τοῦ ὅλου ποιήματος.

point where his predecessor had left off" (Marrou 1956:166).<sup>12</sup>

In the sixth century BCE, Hipparchus, son of the Athenian tyrant Pisistratus, enacted the so-called Panathenaic rule, whereby "the episodes of Homeric story-telling were arranged in a constant order for rhapsodes to follow" (Sealey 1957:349). As H. A. Shapiro argues, the rule of Hipparchus was also an attempt to limit the performances of epic poetry (which earlier had probably included episodes from the Epic Cycle as well) to the material in our *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, an action which constituted "a narrowing of the repertoire... with no freedom to 'stitch together' episodes in different ways" (Shapiro 1993:104).<sup>13</sup> In a sense, centonism represents an innovative return to that lost freedom.<sup>14</sup> The Homeric cento, which perhaps originated as a spoof on rhapsodic exercises in the schools, becomes, in Eudocia's hands, a serious poetic medium. In their rhapsodic treatment of non-Homeric themes Eudocia's Centos mark a significant chapter in the cultural and literary history of the Roman empire.

Inscriptional evidence indicates that rhapsodic performances of Homer continued at games and festivals until at least as late the third-

---

<sup>12</sup> I mention in this context an Attic red-figure kyathos of the fifth-century BCE which portrays a seated youth peering into a book, flanked by two other youths holding what appear to be  $\rho\alpha\beta\delta\omicron\iota$  (Berlin 2322 in Beazley 1963:239.134; 1645).

<sup>13</sup> Nagy, adducing evidence and terminology from the study of contemporary Indian performance traditions, sees the Panathenaic rule as the culmination of a process of "even" or "equalized" weighting of individual episodes, "a communalization of repertoire" (Nagy 1996b:76-82).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Fabricius (1790:552): *verisimile sane videtur, centones eiusmodi Homericos decantatos fuisse a Rhapsodis, antequam de vero ordine carminum Homericorum constaret, nec Pisistrati cum opus Poetae utrumque digessisset.*

century CE (West 1981:114)—the period to which our first centos date—and it is possible that professional rhapsodes or *Homeristai* in the Roman empire were also cento poets. A short Homeric cento graffito found inscribed on the leg of a statue of Memnon in Egypt, for example, was composed by a man who appears to have been a professional poet working in the age of Hadrian, one "Areios, the Homeric poet from the Museum" in Alexandria (Αρείου Ὀμηρικοῦ ποιητοῦ ἐκ Μουσείου Bernard 1960:111-13; cf. Bowie 1990:65).

Whether this Areios was a rhapsode or not, our two earliest sources of information about Homeric centos give us a clear picture of the cento poet as a performance artist. "They set themselves subjects at random and then try to declaim them extemporaneously in lines from Homer," writes the church father Irenaeus (τοῖς ὑποθέσεις τὰς τυχούσας αὐτοῖς προβαλλομένοις, ἔπειτα πειρωμένοις ἐκ τῶν Ὀμήρου ποιημάτων μελετᾶν αὐτὰς (Iren. *apud* Epiph.*Pan.* II, 29.9). Or, as the author of the *Life and Writings of Homer* describes the activity, cento poets "propose non-Homeric themes (ὑποθέσεις) and fit Homeric verses to them, transposing them and stringing them together" (ἐτέρας ὑποθέσεις προθέμενοι ἀρμόζουσιν ἐπ' αὐτὰς τὰ ἔπη μετατιθέντες καὶ συνείροντες Keaney and Lamberton 1996:310-11).

Both references place this art-form squarely in the ancient rhetorical tradition of declamation, where μελετάω, the verb used by Irenaeus, is a technical term meaning "to declaim," or, to reduce that Latin word to its etymological base, "to raise one's voice aloud" (= Greek ἀναφώνησις), while ὑπόθεσις, used by both authors, is a technical term for the specific "theme"

declaimed (Russell 1983:141; Heath 1995:17-18).<sup>15</sup> A memorable description of an accomplished practitioner of this art, Isaeus, is given by the Younger Pliny (*Ep.* 2.3). "He always speaks extempore," Pliny writes to a friend:

He lets his audience choose the topic, and often the side he is to argue. He gets up, wraps himself in a cloak and begins. Almost instantly every sort of word comes readily to this learned man's mind—just the right words. In these spontaneous performances his wide reading and experience in composing shines forth. His memory is unbelievable. He can repeat what he has just spoken extempore without missing a word.<sup>16</sup>

If the Homeric cento poet is a successor to the ancient rhapsode, then declamation, I suggest, is their historical intermediary, and Homeric centos are best viewed as a rhapsodic expression of it, requiring of their practitioners the same great mnemonic capacity and technical expertise (cf. P. Murray 1996:98). Long after Homer and his primary oral culture had passed away, declaimers, both schoolboys and professionals, practiced a form of oral composition in their improvised speech-performances. In fact, Greek declamation, like Eudocia's brand of centonism, is a generative system dependent upon a speaker's *langue*-competence for verbal

---

<sup>15</sup> Wilken (1967:30), who is concerned primarily with Irenaeus's theological attack on the Valentinian Gnostics, translates the word ὑπόθεσις in this passage as "system." This is true enough to the meaning of the word in Christian theological discourse (Lampe 1961 s.v. "ὑπόθεσις" 3. a. and b.), but it fails to recognize the analogy Irenaeus is drawing between the Valentinians' haphazard concatenation of unrelated proof texts from Scripture and the *impromptu* performances cento-declainers of Homer.

<sup>16</sup> *Dicit semper ex tempore...electionem auditoribus permittit, saepe etiam partes; surgit amicitur incipit; statim omnia ac paene pariter ad manum, sensus reconditi occurrant, verba—sed qualia!—quaesita et exulta. Multa lectio in subitis, multa scriptio elucet...Incredibilis memoria: repetit altius quae dixit ex tempore, ne verbo quidem labitur.*

realization: "Typically, a speaker will aim to generate a superabundance from which to select an effective combination of mutually supporting material," writes Malcolm Heath in his recent study of Hermogenes' treatise on declamation, *On Issues*. "To make a selection the speaker must already have an eye on the way the material will be organized" (Heath 1995:7).

This, as we shall see in subsequent chapters, is an apt characterization of Eudocia's method. A crucial difference between Eudocia's cento poetry and declamation, however, lies in the fact that Eudocia does not handle her themes according to the rules of rhetoric, with its five step process of *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *memoria* and *pronuntiatio* (Quint. *Inst.* 3.3.1-10), but rather "according to Homer;" that is, according to the Parryan principles of economy and extension, and guided further by the semiotic principles of resemblance and contiguity.

The centonists of Eustathius' day were encomiasts (Van der Valk 1971:IV.758.1-4). Eudocia too was adept in this art. In the year 438, on her way to Jerusalem where she would eventually compose the Centos, the Empress visited Antioch, delivered an encomium on the city before the Senate, and brought the house down (ἐκραξαν αὐτῇ οἱ τῆς πόλεως) with a pastiche from Homer (Ludwich 1897:12-13; cf. Holum 1982:117; 186). Eudocia's use of the cento form as encomium suggests that her Centos may actually have been composed with performance in mind, perhaps even during performance. However, like the performances of Homer and the recitations of rhapsodes these are forever lost to us with the living culture

that produced them.

This much, however, is certain: like Xenophon's friend Niceratus before her, Michael Psellus after her, and in our time, Mr. Steven Powelson, "a retired C.P.A. and amateur Homeric rhapsode," Eudocia knew Homer by heart.<sup>17</sup> Mnemosyne presides over every aspect of Cento poetics and aesthetics, suggesting appropriate Homeric verses to express her biblical themes from the *langue*-axis of selection, and harmonious adjustments to a given line to make it fit its new environment on the *parole*-axis of verbal combination: as Pliny says of Isaeus, Eudocia's "wide reading and experience in composing shines forth." On that note, ἀρχομ' αἰεῖδεν.

---

<sup>17</sup> For Niceratus see Xen. *Symp.* 3.5-6 (Herington 1985:169); for Psellus's claim to have memorized the whole *Iliad* (*Ep.* 1.14) see Marrou (1956:341); for Powelson see his advertisement in the *American Philological Association Newsletter* (October 1993:7 [obituary: October 1995:14]). Cf. Ausonius who knew first-hand that cento composition is "a task for the memory only" (*solae memoriae negotium* Green 1991:132).

## CHAPTER II

### ACCOMMODATIONS

I cannot greatly honor minuteness in details, so long as there is no hint to explain the relation between things and thoughts.

—Ralph Waldo Emerson

"Every poetics," it is true, "must...be based, either explicitly or implicitly, on a theory of language and, behind that, on a theory of mind, mind being the maker of language" (Preminger and Brogan 1993:932). Obviously, I am not purveying theories of mind or language here *per se*. However, the observations that emerge from the following discussion of Eudocia's practice of Cento composition will necessarily verge in those directions, for as I. A. Richards once remarked, "nearly all the topics of psychology are raised at one point or another by criticism" (Richards 1928:2).

In offering in the next two chapters a systematic description of Cento poetic techniques I am aiming at a generative model, or as Todorov defines poetics, at "the establishment of general laws of which this particular text is the product" (Todorov 1973:6). To establish a generative model of Homeric Cento verse-composition we must look in detail at two features of the poetic surface: (1) the



relationship of the elements in the individual Cento line to the elements in the Homeric line, and (2) the various relationships Cento verses have to one another compared to the relationships verses have to one another in Homer. The first set of relationships are discussed in this chapter. The second set of relationships receive full treatment in the next chapter under the heading *Enjambement*.<sup>1</sup> In both her accommodations and her use of enjambement Eudocia proves to be fully conversant with important conventions of Homer's oral style, yet she brings to that style the peculiar verve of a cento poet.

\*

Adaptation of the source text is a necessary part of the process of cento composition. I follow Stephanus in calling such adaptations *accommodations* (Stephanus 1578:Praefatio). Accommodation takes several forms in the Homeric Centos, but most often it is a response to the syntax set up by a verse the poet has already chosen to appropriate as she moves from one verse to another. In many cases the reader "will be unsure," as Stephanus himself observed in the preface to his edition of 1578, "whether the variation is done on

---

<sup>1</sup> Homeric lines appropriated in couplets and blocks (e.g. similes) will not be discussed as such here, either under *Accommodations* or *Enjambement*. Although couplets and blocks of lines show accommodation and (naturally) contain enjambements, they do not in and of themselves reflect the stitching techniques involved in Cento composition as the poet moves from one line to the next. What couplets and blocks *do* suggest is that Eudocia was thinking of their particular context when she took the lines over. In this capacity they will receive due attention in Chapters V-VII.

purpose or is due to a mistake."<sup>2</sup> Such cases usually involve a semantic change and must be judged on a case-by-case basis. However, categories can be drawn up and some generalizations made from Eudocia's practice.<sup>3</sup>

There are two basic types of accommodation used by Eudocia to make Homeric verses fit together in their new context: the grammatical and the semantic (cf. Alfieri 1988:140-1). The two are distinguished by various sigla in the Cento text I will be citing here and elsewhere from Part II. As these sigla appear frequently in the following discussion where knowledge of them is presumed I give here a brief overview and explanation of my system of annotation.

Most Cento verses have undergone no change. These are identified simply by an *i* (*Iliad*) or an *o* (*Odyssey*) with the book and line numbers printed in Arabic numerals. A reference given in *italics* indicates that the line or a close variant of the line occurs elsewhere in the Homeric poems. Italicized lines are usually formulaic verses, which are often repeated verbatim by Homer in

---

<sup>2</sup> *Alicubi vero ea est diversitas quae an ex errore sit, an consulto mutatio illa facta fuerit, dubites.*

<sup>3</sup> Anna Maria Alfieri, revising the early work of Sattler (1904), has discussed Eudocia's accommodations in some detail (Alfieri 1987; 1988; 1989). However, because her work is based on Ludwich's edition, her observations about Eudocia's technique have limited application here. Rocco Schembra (1993; 1994) has added further observations based on his own inspection of two short unpublished Cento manuscripts. However, his and Alfieri's attempt to understand Eudocia's craft in terms of the so-called "rules" of Cento composition provided by Ausonius in the preface to his *Cento nuptialis* is mistaken (see below). The capital defect in both studies, however, is that neither author ventures far beyond the prospect of using the Centos as a textual witness for Homer, that is, neither attempts a poetics of Cento composition.

similar contexts, for example speech introductions and type-scenes (cf. Alfieri 1988:140), or they are lines repeated only once elsewhere in the same Homeric book, a common phenomenon distinct from type-scene repetition known as "clustering" (Hainsworth 1993:27-8). It is reasonable to suppose that the centonist had any one of several similar Homeric verses in mind and that she chose the precise wording of the one that fit her syntax. Thus, in order to represent the full range of possible Homeric resonances for a given Cento line, I have given the other references for lines occurring five or fewer times in Homer in the apparatus at the bottom of the page.

An asterisk (\*) placed after the reference indicates that there has been a change in grammatical form. This is the most common type of accommodation in the Centos and affects one or more of the following elements in a verse: (1) the number, case or gender of nouns and pronouns, (2) the person, tense and mood of verbs, and (3) participles when they are substituted for finite verbs and vice versa. In the interest of keeping the text as uncluttered as possible, I do not provide the Homeric readings for verses marked with an asterisk, but leave the reader to look up the reference or not at his discretion.

I have used the sigla ' ' to indicate a semantic change. These sigla enclose semantic or lexical variants of one or more than one word. In each instance the Homeric reading is given in the apparatus. Additionally, a dagger (†) is placed after the reference in the margin to conveniently alert the reader of the change. Semantic

deviation from the Homeric text usually involves either (1) the substitution of one noun, verb or adjective for another, or (2) variation in the use of a conjunction, particle or particle chain. I have also used raised brackets ( ' ') when a non-semantic change (\*) requires the addition or deletion of other words in a verse (usually particles) for the sake of the meter. Here too I give the Homeric reading in the apparatus. Where the Cento reading is itself attested somewhere in the textual tradition of Homer but not printed in the standard text of Monro-Allen (e.g. ἔρδεσκεν for ἔρπεξεν at line 36 = *Il.* 22.380), I enclose the word or words in raised brackets ( ' '), put the sign @ next to the reference, and give Monro-Allen's reading in the apparatus.

A line with two references, e.g. i 23.536 + 107, indicates that the verse is made up of two half-lines. References given as cf. i 1.149 mean that there is no or only an approximate match in Homer. These two varieties are rare, yet such confections of Homeric phraseology are to be expected of a "recomposition-in-performance," and, since they too reveal the processes involved in Cento verse generation, each will be discussed in some detail below.

Grammatical accommodation (\*) involves the least change to the Homeric line. It is in principle always intentional, motivated by the need to maintain syntactical coherence. Although central to the centonist's technique, it is not peculiar to the Centos. Grammatical accommodation often occurs within Homer when the words of one protagonist are reported to another. *Iliad* 2.11-15, a well-known

example, is repeated verbatim at 2.28-32 and 65-69, except for the minor adjustment of the third-person  $\acute{\epsilon}$  to second-person  $\sigma\epsilon$  (or  $\sigma'$ ), and the corresponding adjustments to the verb. Fortunately, the identical metrical shape of short words and inflected endings in Homeric Greek allowed the cento poet great flexibility in this regard. It is important to emphasize this flexibility and Eudocia's free use of grammatical accommodation, for although it involves minimal change to the Homeric line, it is in some respects the most important type. As will be argued in more detail in Chapter IV, the easy change of number, person, even gender of nouns and pronouns makes the Homeric Centos what I believe they essentially are: a comparative reading of Homer and the Bible, a reading in which the *function* of a character serves as the stable, constant element in the respective narrative, "independent of how and by whom it is fulfilled" (Propp 1928:21).

Semantic substitution (†) is a more complicated affair. When semantic accommodation occurs it is by no means certain whether it is intentional or not. I would like to make my own agnosticism clear on this matter.

Sometimes the motive for semantic accommodation seems obvious, as at the Baptism scene (446 = *Od.* 5.230) where the word  $\nu\mu\phi\eta$  (the subject of the Homeric sentence) is replaced by the adjective  $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$  agreeing with the object,  $\phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ , in the same line. Simply in terms of the story, the Homeric  $\nu\mu\phi\eta$  is inappropriate to a scene requiring the

presence of John the Baptist (however, at 450 a *πάρθενος ἀδμής* hands Christ a cloak). Other semantic accommodations seem to have been influenced by dogmatic concerns (cf. Alfieri 1988:141 n. 11; 154; Schembra 1994:320-7), as was often the case in the Christian appropriation of the Classics.<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, for example, in a manner characteristic of the Cento technique, alters a passage from Plato's *Phaedo* (114c3) to make it suit his purposes (*Praep. Evang.* 13.16.10): where Plato had said that the souls of those who have purified themselves sufficiently through philosophy will live forever "without bodies," that is, without being reincarnated (*ἄνευ σωμάτων*), Eusebius says they will do so *ἄνευ κομμάτων* "without trouble," altering the reading so as not to violate the Christian doctrine of bodily resurrection (cf. Wilson 1983:17). In the Centos, accommodation on dogmatic grounds may be present, for example, in the Crucifixion scene (1889 = *Od.* 11.584) where the Homeric verb *εἶχεν* in the phrase *πέειν δ' οὐκ εἶχεν ἐλέσθαι* is changed to *ἦθελ'*. *Εἶχεν*, "could not," may have been thought inappropriate for a god revered by Christians as Pantokrator, and was therefore intentionally softened to *ἦθελ'*, "did not will it."

Obviously, moral and religious considerations played an

---

<sup>4</sup> And it was, of course, not only the Christians. The archaic poet Tyrtaios (Frag. 12.3 West) changes one word in a half-line from *Il.* 16.262 to make a common "woe" into a public "good." Aristarchus and Zenodotus, on the Hellenistic critical principle of *τὸ πρέπον*, athetized and sometimes omitted passages in Homer, famously the reference to Phoenix's intent to kill his father at *Il.* 9.458-61 (on these lines see Janko 1992:27-9; on athetesis see Apthorp 1980:xv). Philosophers especially, like Plutarch, positively recommended adjusting or "glossing" Homer where necessary (*Mor.* 22 B, F).

important role in Cento composition—indeed the Centos invite further study with such considerations in mind. However, I will bracket such questions here, for as Todorov notes, the fact that "the relation of poetics and interpretation is one of complementarity par excellence," both being "'secondary'... must not keep us from distinguishing, in the abstract, the goals of the one attitude from those of the other" (Todorov 1973:7-8). Moreover, as will be argued in Chapter Four, the appropriation of *Od.* 5.230 to the Baptism scene already suggests *ipso facto* a comparison of the Baptist with the nymph, Kalypso, a comparison which invites its own set of speculations in light of a passage like John 3:29 where Jesus describes himself as a bridegroom (ὁ ἔχων τὴν νύμφην νυμφίος ἐστίν) and the Baptist as his "best man (ὁ φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου).

Even in the one case where the Cento text itself seems to explain an accommodation we cannot be certain of the motivation: this involves the substitution of the verb *μυθέομαι* for *μαντεύομαι* at lines 396 (= *Od.* 15.172), 469 (= *Od.* 2.170) and 1678 (= *Il.* 1.107), which follows logically from Christ's statement at 472 (= *Od.* 1.202) that he is "not a μάντις or an augur (οἰωνῶν σάφα εἰδώς) / but the son of the great god." However, some manuscripts of Homer actually read *μυθήσομαι* for *μαντεύομαι* at *Od.* 15.172, and it is entirely possible that the other instances of this particular reading in the Centos arose by analogy, since *μυθήσομαι* regularly occurs in this *sedes* in Homer.

Before we look closely at semantic accommodation of Homer in

the Centos it is important to emphasize that the same phenomenon appears also in Plato, where the motive for the variation from the received text of Homer poses similar problems. In the *Ion*, for example (538d1-3), Plato cites Homer's description of Iris' descent from Olympus at *Iliad* 24.80-2,

ἡ δὲ μολψβοαίνῃ ἰκέλη ἐς βυσσὸν ἵκανε,ν,  
 ἢ τε κατ' ἀγραύλοιο βοῶς κέρας ἐμμεμαυῖα  
 ἔρχεται ἀμηστῆσι μετ' ἰχθύσι πῆμα φέρουσα.

and shows the same kinds of accommodation found in the Centos: the verb ἵκανεν substituted for ὄρουσεν, the participle ἐμμεμαυῖα for ἐμβεβαυῖα at line-end; the preposition μετὰ substituted for ἐπὶ, and the noun πῆμα for κῆρα. As Jules Labarbe concludes in his study of Plato's use of Homer, such variation is due to many factors, ranging from grammatical necessity, mnemonic imprecision, and "rhapsodic" habits of word- and phrase-association, to deliberate revisionism and even parody (Labarbe 1949:108-20). We must allow for the same range of explanations of accommodation in the Centos.

Frequently semantic substitution in the Centos seems to occur simply in order to avoid repetition with a previous line,<sup>5</sup> or to fit the new syntax a line may acquire in the Centos. This is analogous to the use of synonymns in Homeric formulas for stylistic *variatio* in order

---

<sup>5</sup> Just as often, however, such repetition is not avoided (e.g. at 890-891) and lines are strung together catena-style, bound by key-words. This Cento poetic technique, a mnemonic device, is discussed in Chapter V.



to "avoid the repetition of a noun in the same or adjacent sentences." (Hainsworth 1993:15; 25). At line 6, for example, ὡς is substituted for ὄφρ' in a purpose clause so as not to repeat the (temporal) ὄφρ' in the previous line. Other times the close proximity of a word or phrase in an adjacent line seems to have brought to mind a similar line involving that word or phrase and then that line, once used, required accommodation.<sup>6</sup> An example of this is lines 229-231 (the angel's speech at the Annunciation):

χαῖρε μοι, ὦ βασίλεια, διαμπερὲς, εἰς ὃ κεν ἔλθοι'	ο 13.59 *
ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ γυναῖξιν ἐπὶ χθόνα πουλοβότειραν	ο 19.408 †
ἡῆρας καὶ θάνατος, τὰ τ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισιν πέλονται.	ο 13.60 †

Here Eudocia accommodates a line well-suited to the Gospel setting (cf. Lk 1:28 χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη), changing the γῆρας of *Od.* 13.59 to ἔλθοι. The resulting end-line phrase is analogous to several *Iliad* end-line formulas, e.g. εἰς ὃ κεν ἔλθῃ / νυξ (*Il.* 14.77), and εἰς ὃ κεν ἔλθῃ / δειλος ὄψε δύων (*Il.* 21.231). In fact, as we shall see in a moment, the words εἰς ὃ κεν of *Od.* 13.59 probably brought ἔλθοι to the poet's mind. As for the optative form at line-end, though not used in the particular verse she accommodates, it is worth noting that this is perfectly consistent with Homeric practice elsewhere: twenty-four of thirty-four total

---

<sup>6</sup> Compare Parry's observations on the enjambement at *Il.* 8.74-5—πολλῶν δ' ἀγρομένων τῷ πείσεια ὅς κεν ἀρίστην / βουλὴν βουλεύση: "Homer, putting together his traditional phrases, remembered first such common expressions falling at the end of the verse as ὅς μέγ' ἄριστος, ὅς τις ἄριστος, and then such expressions used at the beginning of the verse as βουλάς βουλεύει (K 415), βουλας βουλεύειν (K 147,327I ζ 61), βουλάς βουλεύουσι (Ω 652), and their joining made the enjambement of I 74-75" (Parry 1929:264-5).

occurrences of the optative form ἔλθοι appear at line-end.

Hypothetically, having committed herself to the *Odyssey* line and the accommodation, Eudocia could supply any nominative expression to finish the thought, i.e. "there shall come to that place (point in time) / X, Y or Z." However, she expands the thought, inserting a line containing datives, then perhaps remembers γῆρας, or associates it with θάνατος owing to the frequent Homeric collocation ἀθανατ- καὶ ἀγήρ- which always occurs in the first half of the line (11x *Il.* and *Od.*). In any event, once γῆρας becomes the first word of the line (a normal *sedes*, 4x in Homer), Eudocia completes the line with the rest of *Od.* 13.60, καὶ θάνατος...κτλ.

A related phenomenon may be observed at line 299 (= *Od.* 4.526), where Mary "receives with wonder two talents of gold" from the Magi and "keeps them in her home" (φύλασσε δὲ ταῦτ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ). The substitution of the phrase δὲ ταῦτ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ for the Homeric δ' ὁ γ' εἰς ἐνιαυτόν ("...for/towards the year") does not seem to be motivated by a need to make the text agree with some biblical or apocryphal detail, but rather by a desire to avoid the masculine deictic pronoun ὁ by substituting a neuter plural to agree with τάλαντα. But it is interesting to note that the word ἐνιαυτόν, omitted in Eudocia's accommodation, occurs in the first line of the next scene: ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἐνιαυτὸς ἔην, περὶ δ' ἔτραπον ὄραι (*Od.* 10.469). Once again, it is likely that the unexpressed (in the Centos) ἐνιαυτόν of *Od.* 4.526 actually brought *Od.* 10.469 to mind. This is certainly the case with line 794 (= *Il.* 24.181) where Eudocia

substitutes the word θυμῶ for τάρβος at line-end, and then continues in 795 with a line from the *Odyssey* (7.51) which begins with τάρβει.

Compare also Cento lines 42-43 where Eudocia takes a verse closest to *Il.* 7.28 (ἀλλ' εἰ μοί τι πίθοιο, τό κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἶη) apparently accommodating the particle chain in the first half of the line to ἦ ῥά νύ μοί τι πίθοιο...κτλ. She continues with *Il.* 14.191, ἦέ κεν ἀρνήσαιο, κοτεσσαμένη τό γε θυμῶ, which in Homer is directly preceded by a verse, the first half of which—ἦ ῥά νύ μοί τι πίθοιο—is identical to the first half of the "accommodated" Cento line 42. *Il.* 14.191 here provides the second limb of the disjunctive sentence set up by the poet's accommodation and that particular line came to mind because of her association of it with ἦ ῥά νύ μοί...κτλ. We will have more to say about this phenomenon momentarily.

While each instance of semantic accommodation must be evaluated with various criteria in mind, we can be sure that semantic accommodation involving proper names is always intentional (cf. Schembra 1994:323-4). Onomastics was a potentially difficult problem for the cento poet to overcome since names and naming are such a large and integral part of the Homeric style (von Kamptz 1982; Higbie 1995). While some names are allowed to stand as personifications, e.g. Ἀμφιτρίτη (17), Ὀρίων (11, 13), Χάριτες (753), Δημήτηρ (323, 666) and Ἡφαίστος (559), as a rule Eudocia tends to avoid lines which contain personal names. Thus, semantic accommodation of Homeric names does not occur very often.

Still, though she needs to avoid names, the poet must nonetheless specify who's who in her own story. This she does either by periphrasis, the use of an Homeric "significant name," or by the misuse of some other Homeric word. Some of the substitutions used in semantic name-accommodation are non-Homeric in that either (1) the word substituted in is not a Homeric word (e.g. ὑποκουσσαμένη for ῥ' Ἡρακλῆα at 275; Συκείμων for Φαιήκων at 1122<sup>7</sup>), and/or (2) an Homeric word is placed in a position where it never occurs in Homer (e.g. βίη for Δίη at 1524; ἦρωι for Ἄρει at 1792).

At line 273 we find μώνυχες for Διομήδεος in the phrase μώνυχες ἵπποι. Μώνυχες ἵπποι is a common Homeric formula (25x in this *sedes* in the acc.; 7x in the nom.), whereas Διομήδεος ἵπποι, the particular version of that formula in the line she adapts from *Iliad* Book10 (568), occurs in Homer only there, and—unless some word or words have been lost—we must scan the word as μῶνῦχες to fit the meter. However, in Homer too adaptations of metrically sound formulas sometimes result in faulty derivations, for example μερόπων ἀνθρώπων becomes μέροπες ἄνθρωποι. As Martial complained and Ahuvia Kahane has recently emphasized, Homer himself is not hidebound with regard to word localization and metrical quantity. In the well-known line Ἄρες Ἄρες βροτολοιγέ, μαιφόνε, τειχεσιπλήτα (*Il.* 5.31, 455) and elsewhere, the poet

---

<sup>7</sup> Συκείμων is a Septuagint word for the inhabitants of the biblical town Συχάρ or Συχέμ (= Shechem). The same form of the name is found in the biblical paraphrase of Theodotus, a Hellenistic Jew who paraphrased the biblical story of Shechem in the Book of Genesis (Harris 1898:10-11; on Sychar see Brown 1966:169).

"wilfully adapts" the position and hence the metrical quantity of word, here a proper name (a relatively inflexible metrical unit), in composition (cf. Kahane 1994:9).

However, most of Eudocia's substitutions are consistent with Homeric practice, and this consistency applies to all types of accommodation, semantic (†) and/or grammatical (\*), whether intentional or not. For example, the phrase δ' ἄρα πάντες substituted for δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι at 921 and 981 (= *Il.* 24.484) is in perfect keeping with Homeric practice: δ' ἄρα πάντες is localized to this position forty-five out of the forty-seven times the phrase occurs in Homer, once in a line rather close in sense to ours (μνηστῆρες δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐς ἀλλήλους ὀρώωντες *Od.* 20.373), and lines containing the phrase occur four other times in the *Centos*. Eudocia was clearly familiar with this formula and could easily slip into it here. Her substitution νεκύεσσι for Δαναοῖσι in line 1991 (*Il.* 8.227), in spite of the fact that the word occurs in this position only at *Od.* 12.383, is truly in the Homeric manner. Line 1991 is an *Iliad* formula used by Homer six times, always reproduced verbatim except for *Il.* 12.439 and 13.149 where Homer, like Eudocia, substitutes a dative plural, Τρώεσσι, for Δαναοῖσι to suit *his* context. The name substitution of ἔξοχα πάντων for Πάλλας Ἰθάκη at end-line in 1763 is also perfectly Homeric (5x in this *sedes*). It is interesting to observe that at *Il.* 5.61 the words ἔξοχα and Πάλλας Ἰθάκη occur in the same line. As will emerge again and again the closer we look at Eudocia's method of composition, the association of ἔξοχα and Πάλλας Ἰθάκη at *Il.*

5.61, reinforced by the effects of localization, may in fact have suggested this substitution. Such word association is clearly at work in 1285 (‘πάντας’ δὲ τρόμος αἰνὸς ὑπήλυθε γυῖα ἐκάστου = *Il.* 7.215): while the change from Τρῶας to πάντας has no exact Homeric precedent, πάντας (in a different *sedes*) is often associated with τρόμος, occurring in the same line four times in Homer (*Il.* 14.506; 18.247; 19.14; *Od.* 24.49), and in the Centos themselves (1978), where Eudocia makes the same substitution, once in a distinctly different line from the *Odyssey* (2015 = *Od.* 20.44).

A distinct type of Cento name-accommodations involves imperatives and vocatives. Here too Eudocia works in the Homeric manner. While the phrase ὦ φίλε substituted for Τηλέμοαχ’ at 691 (*Od.* 2.303) occurs exactly so only at *Od.* 14.115, the related phrase ὦ φίλοι occurs forty-two times in initial position. So too with the *Odyssey* phrase ὦ ξείν’ substituted for Δημόδοκ’ at 1112 (= *Od.* 8.469; also at 891 and 1408). This phrase is always localized to the same pre-caesural position in Homer (10x). However we find the plural ὦ ξείνοι in initial position at *Od.* 3.71 and 9.252. Like Homer himself we see Eudocia here displacing formulas (Hainsworth 1968:45-57) and composing by analogy.

Periphrasis serves to identify characters beyond the mere use of a demonstrative (e.g. ὅ, ὅδε, or ἐκεῖνος). In the Centos periphrases are employed like formulas; in some instances they *are* formulas lifted from Homer, and employed in exactly the same way. Examples:

Jesus is designated by *Il.* 12.242 as ὁς πᾶσι θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσει (73, 91, 270, 428, 1537, 1998, 2240); Judas by *Il.* 22.380, ὅς κακὰ πολλ' ἔρδεσκεν ὅσ' οὐ σύμπαντες οἱ ἄλλοι (1423, 1613 etc.), and *Il.* 9.313, ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθη ἐνὶ φρεσὶν, ἄλλο δὲ εἶπη (1411). The Virgin Mary is referred to by *Od.* 23.325 as μήτηρ θ' ἣ μιν ἔτικτε καὶ ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἐόντα (290, 298, 354, 2040, 2169, 2328); Peter is ὅς οἱ κήδιστος ἐτάρων ἦν κεδνότατός τε (= *Od.* 10.225; at lines 529, 772, 1758); the other disciples are, in the words of *Il.* 9.586, ἄλλους θ', οἳ οἱ κεδνότατοι καὶ φίλτατοι ἦσαν (1303, 1436). As in Homer, the comments of anonymous spectators are regularly introduced by *Od.* 2.324 (etc.), ὦδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκε νέων ὑπερηνορέοντων (1742, 1891, 1939, 2087), or the related formula ὦδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον (722, 983, 1287, 1912, 1995, 2233). Once, at a particularly poignant moment during the Crucifixion (1956), the poet uses Homer's apt modification of his own formula: ὡς ἄρα τις εἶπεσκε, καὶ οὐτήσασκε παραστάς (*Il.* 22.375).

Another way to refer to individuals in the Gospel story is by using an Homeric "significant name" as an adjective. Some significant names in Homer do in fact occur as ordinary adjectives. For example the Trojan counselor Ἀγήνωρ gets his name from the adjective ἀγήνωρ, "manly," which at *Il.* 12.300 modifies the noun θυμός. In the Centos this feature of Homeric poetry has a broader application: Christ is the god-fearing prophet of Ithaca, Θεοκλύμενος (13x), "he who hears from God" (cf. Eust. 1780.20 [Stallbaum

1825:II.97]);<sup>8</sup> elsewhere he is the healing divinity Ἴητρος (1127) or Παιήων (1128); the Baptist is the herald Πεισήνωρ, "a persuasive man" (224, 258, 362).

Conversely, Ἔχετος, the personal name of a wicked king in the *Odyssey* (18.116), becomes a common adjective meaning "powerful" (1827). Ἀλιθέρης, Odysseus' close friend from Ithaca and counsel to Telemachus, is used as an adjective to describe the "old man" Peter, and means either "sweaty," if we follow Eustathius' suggestion (1439.40-41 [Stallbaum 1825:I.90]): παρὰ τὸ ἐν ἀλὶ θέρεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου, or "daring in wit" if we connect -θέρης with θάρσος—either meaning is well-suited to the context of Peter's denial of Jesus under pressure (1757 = cf. *Od.* 2.57). Place names too receive such treatment: the spring Ἀρτακίη at 1054 (= *Od.* 10.108), if from ἄρτα + κίεν, is "close-moving;" the plain Ἀλήϊον at 929 (= *Il.* 6.201), if from ἀλάσθαι, means "for wandering" or, if an α-privative of λήϊον, means "without wheat or booty," i.e. "desert" (cf. Eust. 636.49 [Van der Valk:II.290.10-14]). A mirror image of this onomastic technique is seen at 771 (= *Il.* 16.734) where the common noun πέτρον is used for "Peter."

Akin to this use, or rather misuse, of Homeric words is the frequent exchange of δρήστηρ and μνήστηρ. The word μνήστηρ ("suitor") was not in itself objectionable since it is regularly used in a positive way (13x) to describe the disciple-suitors of Christ, as at e.g. 467 (= *Od.*

---

<sup>8</sup> However von Kamptz is probably right to derive -κλύμενος from κλυτός and to take the name to mean "God-renowned" (1982:203).



18.351). However, δρήστηρ ("manservant"), is sometimes substituted for μνήστηρ where the context requires a villain or villain's accomplice and seems to verge on the meaning "perpetrator" (note especially 1862 = *Od.* 22.211, and 2029 = *Od.* 22.270).

To various degrees all these examples of semantic name accommodation involve the use of the rhetorical figure known as *catachresis* (κατάχρησις = Latin *abusio*), which is defined by Tryphon the grammarian in *De tropis* as λέξις μετενηνεγμένη ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου κατονομασθέντος κυρίως τε καὶ ἐτύμως ἐφ' ἕτερον ἀκατονόμαστον, κατὰ τὸ οἰκείον. Tryphon gives the expressions γόνυ καλάμου, ὄφθαλμὸς ἀμπέλου and χεῖλος κεραμίου as characteristic examples (Walz 1835:182). The author of the *Essay on the Life and Writings of Homer* gives an example specifically from Homer, αἰγείην κυνέην, noting that a helmet (περικεφαλαία) is called κυνέη ("of or pertaining to a dog") by the poet because helmets were traditionally made out of dog-skin, though this particular helmet, modified by the adjective αἰγεία, was made out of goat-skin (Keaney and Lamberton 1996:84-5; so too Apion in Neitzel 1977:246). As we see by pseudo-Plutarch's example, *catachresis* does not involve word substitution, but "abuses" or stretches a given word's ordinary or apparent meaning.

A fine example of *catachresis* is Cento line 1378 (= *Il.* 22.255) where the Homeric words ἐπίσκοποι ("observers") and μάρτυροι ("witnesses") clearly have their Christian connotation, "bishops and martyrs." Similarly, *Od.* 5.194—ἴξεν γ' ἐς σπεῖος γαλφυρὸν θεὸς ἠδὲ καὶ

ἀνὴρ—which describes two persons in Homer (Kalypso and Odysseus), is used in the Raising of Lazarus scene (line 1270) as a hendiadys to describe the god-man, Jesus. In the Feeding of the Five Thousand scene (line 1222 = *Il.* 23.58) the Homeric word κλισίη ("shanty" or "cabin") is used catachrestically to represent the biblical word κλισία, found in the plural in the Gospel of Luke (9:14), where it describes the "companies" into which the disciples have divided the crowd. As Quintilian puts it in his discussion of catachresis, the trope "non ad nomen, sed ad vim significandi refertur, nec auditu, sed intellectu perpendenda est" (*Inst.* 8.2.6). "Non verbum pro verbo ponitur," he notes elsewhere, "sed res pro re" (*Inst.* 8.6.36).<sup>9</sup>

Catachresis, then, extends a word's ordinary meaning without resorting to substitution. However, sometimes even when semantic accommodation does involve word substitution it does not greatly affect the sense: for example, αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' for αἴψα δ' ἐπειθ' in 774 (= *Il.* 6.370 etc.), or ἔθηκε for δίδωσι at 85 (= *Od.* 17.287). Sometimes the substitution is simply an antonym, as is especially the case with prepositions (ἀνά for κατά in 320; ἀπό for εἰς in 346; also 136, 1365 and 2081). Often the accommodation involves particles and particle chains. The prevailing opinion is that variants like τι for τοι, δε and τε for γε, etc. are mnemonic errors on the part of Eudocia, or,

---

<sup>9</sup> For the phrases κυρίως and καταχρηστικῶς λεγόμενα in Greek scholia see further Rutherford 1905:209-11. Porphyry frequently uses these terms in his "Aristarchan" work, *Homeric Questions* (Sodano 1970:index). On Stoic views of katachresis see Barwick 1957:88-97.

alternatively, scribal errors in the transmission of the text of a kind commonly found in the textual tradition of Homer (Salinitro 1987:233; Alfieri 1988:142 n.12; 154). In her non-Cento poetry Eudocia was in fact rather indiscriminate in her use of such particles, for example in her hexameter paraphrase of the life of St. Cyprian, "where she does not seem to be aware of the essential meaning of these particles...They have become stop gaps...to give her poems a Homeric touch," notes Van Duen (1993:280; cf. Cameron 1982:279; Ludwich 1882:206-25). C. J. Ruijgh, however, suggests that some of the confusion goes much further back, and that archaic rhapsodes introduced  $\tau\epsilon$  in many instances of what was originally  $\gamma\epsilon$ , e.g. at *Od.* 13.238 and 15.484, for the sake of euphony (Ruijgh 1971:839) In fact, many variants involving  $\gamma\epsilon$ ,  $\tau\epsilon$  and  $\delta\epsilon$  are attributable to the rhapsodic performance and transmission of the epics (Ruijgh 1971:118-22). Eudocia herself—in her own way—stands in this tradition.

While it is sometimes difficult to decide which is at fault, the poet or the textual tradition, I will proceed on the premise that if a substitution does not appear as a variant somewhere in the manuscript tradition or papyri of Homer, it may fairly be counted as a mnemonic variation (I refrain from calling them errors). But this, even if it is a sound assumption, is not enough. It is important for Cento poetics to try to account for how and why such mnemonic variation—and, in some cases, innovation—arises. I offer a few observations in this regard which have a wider application and

significance for the Cento technique.

In the example of Homer's use of grammatical accommodation from *Iliad* Book 2 we saw that the difference between verse 11 and verses 28 and 65 was minimal: θωρήξαι ἐ κέλευε versus θωρήξαι σε κέλευσε. While technically a grammatical change has taken place involving the pronoun and the verb, the phrases are metrically identical and nearly homophonous. Homophony is by definition a speech sound phenomenon, not limited to single words, and sometimes dependent on the pace of speech for its effect, as in the pronunciation of the French *à votre tour* and *à votre retour* (Jakobson and Waugh 1979:7-8).

That homophony plays an important role in the oral poet's technique has been argued for Homer by Michael Nagler. Nagler expanded Milman Parry's notion of *calembour* ("punning"), or the sound correspondance between elements in variations of the same Homeric formula, to include words that are not semantically related (Nagler 1967:274; 296).<sup>10</sup> For example, in Homer the word ἀϋτή and ἀϋτή both occur with ἀμφήλυθε; πῖονι δημῶ and the homonym πῖονι δῆμῶ always occur in the final colon of the line, though they are semantically different and appear in a wide variety of grammatical and syntactical combinations.

---

<sup>10</sup> Stanford (1939:7-8; 26-34) is careful to note that homophones (same sound, different form, different meaning) and homonyms (same sound, same form, different meaning) are distinct phenomena, yet that in oral speech homophones are effectively homonyms, and both are covered by the ancient (Aristotelian) term ὁμωνυμία. Cf. also Rutherford 1905:223 n. 51

Nagler argues, *contra* Parry's definition of a formula, that while the "overwhelming similarity of rhythm and phonetic sound among these phrases is formulaic...they do not express one 'given essential idea'" (Nagler 1967:275). Such phrases he calls "allomorphs of a single [mental] template."<sup>11</sup> Bryan Hainsworth (1993:15) cites other similar substitutions in Homer, e.g. δηλήμονες for ζηλήμονες in the phrase σχέτλιοι έστε, θεοί, ζηλήμονες, and γερόντων for θανόντων in τὸ γὰρ γέρας έστὶ θανόντων, and notes that *calembour* is "striking evidence for the basic orality of the Homeric style." However, while *calembour* may be "atypical" of the Homeric style, we cannot deny it, as Hainsworth is too ready to do, "a place among the resources of αἰοδή." Nor does Hainsworth's implicit criticism of Nagler's mental template—"A pleasing sound is a perhaps a reason for keeping an expression rather than a template for its creation" (1993:10)—do justice to Nagler's theory, which is based on homophony, not euphony. Indeed, an example of an Homeric formula cited by Hainsworth himself, ἄγχι παραστάς (4x *Il.*; 3x *Od.*), shows homophonic reflexes, or "conjugations" of a type identical to Cento accommodations: ἄγχι παρέστη, ἄγχι παρίστατο, ἄγχι παρισταμένη and even ἄγχι δ' ἄρα στάς, accommodated to take the connective (Hainsworth 1993:16).

Clearly, if not a primary resource to the ancient αἰοδός, *calembour* was an appreciable feature of Homeric verse, and was

---

<sup>11</sup> Hoekstra (1965), observing the same phenomenon from a slightly different angle, had previously referred to them as "conjugations" of a formula.

exploited as such by the poet of the Homeric Centos (cf. Alfieri 1988:143), where homophony and allomorphy play a large role in the generation of the verse. Both phenomena account for many grammatical accommodations since this type often involves conjugated verb forms or the declension of nouns which are themselves allomorphs of a word stem. The slight phonetic difference at 1064 (= *Od.* 23.101) between πόλλ' ἐμόγησε and the Homeric πόλλα μογήσας is a good example, as are ἰών κε for the Homeric dual ἴοντε (1515 = *Il.* 10.468), τάρβησάν τε for ταρβήσαντε (1437 = *Il.* 1.331), οὐκ ἄν for οὐ κεν (1964 = *Od.* 4.223), δάκρυ χέουσα for δακρύσασα (2055 = *Od.* 17.38), ἠδὲ τιθήσι for ἠδ' ἐπιθήσει (1016 = *Il.* 4.190), μάκαρ ἐκτελέησι for μάκαρες τελέσωσι (1187 = *Od.* 18.134), or even θεῶ ἰδὲ for θεοῖσι δὲ (1214 = *Il.* 7.177).

The poet's choice of a particular word for semantic accommodation is also often facilitated by homophony: the frequent substitution or confusion of γάρ for ἄρ and vice versa (777, 788, 1010, 1341, 1689), the intentional name accommodation βίη for Δί at 1524, μιν for μέν (824), με for τε (883), and θεοῦ for θ' ἐόν (1151) to cite but a few. Some semantic substitutions show considerable ingenuity. Out of Homer's ὤριστος (crasis for ὁ ἄριστος) in the chariot-race scene at *Il.* 23.536 (= Cento line 33), Eudocia makes the verb-form ὤριστο ("was traced out"), which she uses to describe the creation of the "last" (λοῖσθος—meaning, of course, the "first") man, Adam.

Σώματα substituted for δάματα in the phrase κατὰ σώματα is used to describe the physical strength of the villain Judas at 1696 (= *Od.*

21.372); ἤρνήσατο for ἤρήσατο at 1796 (= *Il.* 17.568) makes Peter "deny" in the Garden of Gethsemane with a Homeric that describes Menelaus "praying" to Athena on the battlefield. In order to avoid the name Ἄντινοον at 2283 (= *Od.* 17.414) the phrase ἀντὸν ἰών is used; at 294 (= *Od.* 8.419) in order to avoid Ἄλκιννοῖο the poet coins the word ἀγνωτόκοιο. Εἰ for ἦ at 1951 (= *Il.* 11.433) makes what is in Homer a disjunctive sentence into an indirect question. Λῆς for τις at 1529 (= *Od.* 4.535) lends additional force to a rather weak Homeric simile.

The conformity with Homeric practice in homophonous semantic accommodation varies. Ἄγνωτόκοιο at 294, for example, is a Homeric formation, but not a Homeric, or even epic word. However, most substitutions involve common Homeric words, and are consistent with Homeric practice. For example, γὰρ for δ' ἄρ at line 777 (= *Od.* 15.134) is a variant reading found in the textual tradition of Homer at *Od.* 15.495. The Centos' semantic accommodation of δρηστῆρ- as μνηστῆρ- mentioned above is a variant also found in the Homeric textual tradition. Cento line 425 (= *Il.* 1.79) contains the semi-homophonous substitution ἀνθρώπων for Ἄργείων in semantic name-accommodation at the beginning of the line, a non-Homeric substitution in that ἀνθρώπων is regularly localized at end-line. However the end-line substitution ἅπαντες for Ἄχαιοί in the same verse—ἀνθρώπων κρατέει καὶ οἱ πείθονται ἅπαντες—is clearly patterned after the phrase πειθόμεθα πάντες, a formula occurring ten times in Homer, always at line-end. The phonetic difference between πειθόμεθα πάντες

and *πείθονται ἅπαντες* is slim indeed. In one instance in Homer (*Od.* 22.269) we find this homophonous "allomorph of a single template" relocated to the beginning half of the line: οἱ μὲν ἔπειθ' ἅμα πάντες ὁδᾶξ ἔλον ἄσπετον οὐδας.

Another aspect of homophony and allomorphy in the Centos is metathesis (cf. Jakobson and Waugh 1979:3-4), seen in the substitution at 1829 (= *Il.* 6.167), *μυθῶ* for *θυμῶ*, which involves a metathesis of consonants, as does 616 (= *Od.* 12.440), *κίρνων* for *κρίνων*, the ingenious (or unintentional?) *σῶζοντες* for *ζῶσοντες* at 945 (= *Od.* 18.76; cf. *σῶσον* for *ζῶσαι* at 1950 = *Od.* 18.30), and *λαομέδοντα* for *λαοδάμαντα* at 92 (= *Od.* 7.170). The regular confusion of *ἐνοσίμοσ* and (the non-Homeric, unmetrical) *αἰνέσιμος* in the Iviron manuscript involves a metathesis of vowels of a type frequent in Homer, e.g. *ἀτραπιτός* for *ἀταρπιτός*, *οἱ κράπιστος* for *κάρπιστος*, which itself occurs at Cento line 172 (= *Od.* 8.17), and in the manuscript tradition of Homer.

A related phenomenon is the transposition of words that go together: *πάτηρ τε μήτηρ τε* for *μήτηρ τε πάτηρ τε* at 1098 (= *Od.* 8.550); *ἔπος δειλῆ* for *δειλῆ ἔπος* at 1007 (= *Od.* 20.115); *πέλεναῖγλη* for *αἶγληπέλεν* 2191 (= *Od.* 7.84); *δόμου ἔσαν* for *ἔσαν δόμου* 2269 (= *Od.* 1.126); *τοῖς εὖ* for *εὖ τοῖς* 1592 (= *Il.* 12.369); *φίλα τέκνα* for *τέκνα φίλα* at 605 (= *Od.* 3.418), and *ὡς βοῦς* for *βόες ὡς* 2019 (= *Od.* 22.299). One example of word transposition in the Centos, *Ζέφυρος νέφεα* for *νέφεα Ζέφυρος* at 1155 (= *Il.* 11.305), is found so written in papyri, three manuscript families of Homer, and Strabo. As with this example, it is possible that the other word metatheses



were part of some vulgate with which Eudocia worked. However, τέκνα φίλα occurs thus only at *Od.* 3.413 (and once in the singular at *Od.* 23.26), whereas Eudocia's φίλα τέκνα is the order used at *Il.* 2.313 (but at line-end) and *Il.* 10.192. As for ὡς βοῦς, while this phrase does not occur in Homer, βοῦς is often localized in this *sedes*, and twice is juxtaposed with ἀγελαίας (*Il.* 23.846 and *Od.* 10.410) as it is in the Cento line. As we see again here, association and analogy play an important role in Cento composition.

A small number of Cento lines are made up of half-lines. Half-lines are far fewer in the Homeric Centos than in the Vergilian Centos of Proba. This is because Homeric and Vergilian lines are not organized internally in the same way. The Homeric poet, composing during performance, does not strive to attain literary effects like chiasmus or the adjective-noun displacements (often organized around an articulating caesura) that characterize any given line in Vergil.<sup>12</sup> In spite of these differences between the Latin and the Homeric hexameter, Alfieri (1988) asserts that Eudocia's use of half-lines is in keeping with the so-called "rules" of Cento composition as outlined by Ausonius in the preface to his *Cento nuptialis*. Yet when we look at Ausonius' rules and Eudocia's practice we find only the most superficial relationship and so many striking differences that I

---

<sup>12</sup> Alfieri notes this difference between the Vergilian and Homeric Centos but attributes it, not to orality or performance, but to the "depersonalized" (*spersonalizzato*) nature of the Homeric style (1988:140), apparently meaning by that term Homer's so-called "objective" (as opposed to Vergil's "subjective") narrative style.

believe any comparison of the compositional techniques of the Homeric Centos with Vergilian Centos of Ausonius, "Pomponius," or Proba is misguided and must be abandoned.

Most obvious among the discrepancies between the two methods is Eudocia's complete disregard for Ausonius' aesthetic ideal that the cento poet should avoid reproducing whole lines from his source in blocks. To use two lines in a row, according to Ausonius, is *ineptum* ; three or more in a row are *merae nugae* (Green 1991:133). Yet thirty-five percent (35%) of Cento lines (821/2348) come in blocks, ranging from two to six successive lines to consecutive runs of blocks from different places in Homer as long as twelve lines (see Usher 1997:314-15). Though Ausonius himself occasionally falls into ineptitude by using two successive lines from Vergil, his practice is for the most part as he describes it (Green 1991:133):

Diffiduntur autem per caesuras omnes, quas recepit versus heroicus, convenire ut possit aut penthemimeres cum reliquo anapestico chorico aut <lacuna> post dactylum atque semipedem quicquid restat hexametro.

It is worth emphasizing that there is nothing particularly "technical" or surprising about Ausonius' practice. Eudocia too joins Homeric half-lines at the caesuras (Where else would she join hemistichs?). Eleven of her thirty-one half-lines are joined at the weak penthemimeral caesura (see Appendix I a). Seven more lines

are joined at the strong penthemimeral caesura, one of which (line 214) requires lengthening a short vowel in thesis before the break (see Appendix I b). However, unlike Ausonius, we find in Eudocia one three-colon line,<sup>13</sup> and divisions at other metrical breaks: at the second-foot diaeresis,<sup>14</sup> and at the bucolic.<sup>15</sup>

Further evidence of Eudocia's disregard for Ausonian "rules" is the presence of what I shall call conflated lines. Conflated lines are to be distinguished from half lines proper. Conflation occurs when two successive Homeric lines, or lines in close physical or contextual proximity to each other, are compressed into one Cento line.<sup>16</sup> As we have already seen, elements from two or more very similar Homeric lines are often mixed and matched in the Centos, as in line 1: κέκλυτε, μυρία φύλα περικτιόνων ἀνθρώπων. The phrase in the second half of this line, if from *Il.* 17.220, substitutes ἀνθρώπων for ἐπικούρων; if from *Il.* 2.804, where the collocation is πολυσπερέων ἀνθρώπων, we have an adjectival substitution. Either way, two different but

---

<sup>13</sup> Ἀλλὰ τοκῆε δύω | προτέρω ἄγε· | ἐγγύθι δὲ στάς (801 = *Od.* 8.554 + 4.36 + 1.120).

<sup>14</sup> 1389 = *Il.* 21.32 + 23.235: δῶκε δ' ἑταίροις | καὶ 'σφείας' πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν.

<sup>15</sup> 1410 = *Od.* 1.33 + *Il.* 10.378 : ἐξ 'ὕμέων' γὰρ φασὶ κάκ' ἔμμενα. | ἔστι γὰρ ἔνδον, 1869 = *Od.* 22.189 + 477: σὺν δὲ πόδας χεῖράς τε δέον | κεκοτητόι θυμῷ, 685 = *Il.* 15.262 + 572: ὧς εἰπὼν, ἔμπνευσε μένος μέγα. | τὸν δ' ὀρόθουνεν·

<sup>16</sup> The scholia to Venetus A, which preserves several examples of this kind of line conflation (e.g. at *Il.* 1.219-20, 1.446-7; 4.88-9), attributes them to the ancient Homeric critic, Zenodotus of Ephesus (see Bird 1994:43-4). For a similar conflation of lines from *Iliad* Book 11—with accommodation—at Plato *Ion* 538c2-3 see Labarbe 1949:101-8, who concludes: "La ressemblance des éléments...a déterminé l'association psychologique."

related genitive phrases which comprise the latter half of the line have been conflated, and, as Alfieri remarks, this probably happens spontaneously because of the similarity of the two lines (Alfieri 1988:144).

Conflation involving half-lines occurs several times in the Centos and comes in several different varieties. Lines 657 (from the healing of a paralytic) and 1008 (the woman with a flow of blood) are perfect specimens, both of which conflate two successive lines from the *Iliad* (657: σοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα διαμπερὲς ἤματα πάντα [= *Il.* 16.498 + 499]; 1008: ἔλκος μὲν γὰρ ἔχω τόδε καρτερόν. οὐδέ μοι αἷμα [= *Il.* 16.517 + 518]). Line 103 involves conflation with line-transposition: οὐχ ὀράας ὅτι δ' αὐτε βροτοὶ ἐπ' ἀπίρονα γαῖαν (= *Il.* 7.448 + 446). Analogous to the examples of grammatical and semantic accommodation discussed above, conflation is caused by the close proximity of familiar material, as if today one were to misrecite e. e. cummings' familiar dactylic poem as "what if a much of a which of a wind / bloodied with dizzying leaves the sun," skipping the part about giving truth to summer's lie. Conflation, then, is the result of a mind thoroughly acquainted with Homeric verse and Homeric technique thinking too quickly ahead.

As in semantic accommodation, the association of words and phrases contribute to the generation of Cento half-lines too, though they be comprised of Homeric hemistichs which lay hundreds of lines, books, even poems apart. Take for example line 1863 (ἴθυσαν δὲ ἄλυκοισιν' εἰοικότες ὀμοφάγοισιν), which is comprised of *Il.* 17.725 and *Il.*

5.782. This Cento line is in effect a "mixed simile" in which two Homeric similes of similar phrasing have been assimilated by Eudocia and Homer's datives—*κύνεσσιν* at 17.725, *λέουσιν* at 5.782—accommodated with *λύκοισιν*, to suit a Gospel saying (Mt. 7:15, Lk. 10:3, Jn. 10:12 etc.).<sup>17</sup> Note also line 717: *βῆ δ' ἴμεν ὡς ἔπερ λίς* ὄρεσίτροφος ἀλκί πεποιθώς (= *Il.* 12.299 + 17.61). Although the Homeric reading in the first half-line is *τε λεῶν*, the Centos' *λίς* occurs in a closely related simile at *Il.* 17.109. So too line 2141: *ἠδὲ γυναικας ἐυζώνους* | *καὶ νήπια τέκνα* (= *Il.* 23.261 + 22.63). No exact equivalent is to be found in Homer, though women and children co-occur in a variety of formulas (cf. *Od.* 14.264).

Such overlap between elements is common to all types of Cento half-lines. The conflated line 1869—*σὺν δὲ πόδας χεῖράς τε δέον κεκοτηότι θυμῷ*—is composed of two similar lines from the *Odyssey*, 22.189 (*σὺν δὲ πόδας χεῖράς τε δέον θυμαλγεί δεσμῷ*) and 22.477 (*χεῖράς τ' ἠδὲ πόδας κόπτον κεκοτηότι θυμῷ*), both of which mention "hands and feet." Compare the conflated line at 1969—*αὐτίκα δ' ἐβρόντησεν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστεροέντος*—which is made up of *Od.* 20.103 (*αὐτίκα δ' ἐβρόντησεν ἀπ' αἰγλήεντος Ὀλυμποῦ*) and *Od.* 20.113 (*ἠὲ μεγάλ' ἐβρόντησας ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστεροέντος*).<sup>18</sup> In each instance the poet has collapsed two related lines based their shared lexical and

---

<sup>17</sup> For wolves in Homeric similes cf. *Il.* 16.156. For the substitution of one animal for another in otherwise identical Homeric similes (e.g. "boar" for "lion") see Scott 1974:58-60 and Muellner 1990:63.

<sup>18</sup> Other examples include lines 1548 (= *Od.* 23.117 + *Od.* 17.274) and 1840 (= *Il.* 7.264 + *Il.* 5.34).

structural elements.

There are a small number of lines in the Centos for which an exact Homeric equivalent is lacking (see Appendix II a), and one (1918: ἴσχεο, μηδὲ περισθενόων δηλήσειο τούσδε) which is a conflation of line-fragments with no exact half-line matches, but closely resembling *Od.* 22.367 + 368. In lieu of an analysis of each of these lines, let me make two general observations.<sup>19</sup> First, the source for most of these lines is readily apparent, either because of their context in the Centos (i.e. they are followed by or preceded by lines from the same Homeric book), or by other verbal features which limit the possibilities for their source in Homer (e.g. the name Πεισῆνωρ occurs only at *Od.* 2.38). Secondly, it is important to note that roughly half of these lines are made up of speech introductory material adapted to fit the particular Cento speaker or context, and one of them (667) is repeated elsewhere in the Centos; another (599) involves little more than the displacement of one word. Both features suggest that these lines result from a combination of mnemonic variation and/or *impromptu* composition using Homeric diction.

Add to the foregoing lists a few halves of half-lines which have no exact equivalent in Homer (see Appendix II b). The presence of

---

<sup>19</sup> Using Ludwich's text, Alfieri analysed sixteen such lines whose source in Homer eluded Sattler (Alfieri 1988:147-53). However, of those sixteen lines, eight are not in the Stephanus-Ivion text. Five others are in Stephanus-Ivion, but match (or nearly do) the Homeric wording, and their Homeric source is easily found, without appeal to hemistichs. Of the other three (lines 144, 295, 371 of my text), only 144 and 295 involve a multiple or unknown source. Both lines receive excellent treatment in Alfieri's study (to which the interested reader is referred).

such lines coupled with the presence of conflated lines underscores a basic and fundamental difference between the mechanical Ausonian model of cento versification (which was followed by Proba) and the more organic poetics of Eudocia in the Homeric Centos. This difference will be brought into higher relief when we look at Cento enjambement.

## CHAPTER III

### ENJAMBEMENT

...as that of Homer in Greek...the sense variously drawn out from one verse into another.

— John Milton

It is a mark of Eudocia's skill as a poet and seamstress that lines taken from different places in the Homeric poems occur as successive, enjambed lines in the Centos, often without alterations. Homeric enjambement has received due attention in recent years and our understanding of it increased. Carolyn Higbie has thoroughly surveyed and slightly revised earlier categories of Homeric enjambement proposed by Milman Parry (1929) and G. S. Kirk (1966; 1985:17-34), and has, for the first time in Homeric studies, tabulated statistics based on the entire *Iliad* (Higbie 1990). Though I disagree with the rationale behind some of her distinctions, which I think result in the overclassification of Homeric enjambement types, I offer Higbie's basic categories here as a control so as to demonstrate Eudocia's command of Homeric oral technique, and her divergences from it, in terms familiar to the modern student of Homer.

Homeric enjambement is described by Higbie as either "adding," "clausal," "necessary" or "violent." The Centos show the full range of these types, and they occur with about the same relative frequency as they do in



Homer.<sup>1</sup> I will treat them here, with exception of the "clausal" type, roughly in reverse order, according to their frequency.<sup>2</sup>

So-called "violent" enjambement is caused by the separation of a clause's introductory material from the clause itself (Higbie 1990:51). Higbie restricts this category of enjambement to particle chains and "adverbs that are sentence adverbs, that color the meaning of an entire clause rather than modify only the verb, an adjective, or another adverb" (Higbie 1990:53). According to this definition, violent enjambement occurs two times in the Centos.

(1) 361-362 (John the Baptist's recognition of Jesus):

ἰξέν γ' ἐς πεδίον πυρηφόρον· ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτα	ο 3.495 *
κῆρυξ πεισίνωρ πεπνυμένα μῆδεα εἰδῶς	ο 2.38

(2) 1457-1458 (at the Last Supper):

---

<sup>1</sup>In the *Iliad*, end-stopped lines are just slightly more common than "adding" enjambement (39% : 36%), "necessary" enjambement accounts for 19%, "clausal" for 5%, and the rare "violent" type of enjambement for 0.5% (Higbie 1990:29; 82).

<sup>2</sup> I note here that adding enjambement is subdivided by Higbie into "internal" and "external" varieties "depending on whether the addition expands a clause already present [internal]...or adds another clause to a complete thought [external]." Adding-external enjambement occurs whenever a verse is followed by a coordinate or dependent verse-clause (Higbie 1990:32-3). For my part, I do not think that either type of verse-clause, though "adding" and grammatically "external" to the preceding verse, should be counted as enjambement at all unless the clause that the verse contains runs over into the next verse. In many instances Higbie's adding-external could be, and often is, punctuated with a semicolon or full stop (especially before compound sentence-verses beginning with καί). If there is no other enjambement type involved in the relationship between two given verses, such verses are functionally stichic units. The same is true of lines said to be in "clausal" enjambement, which Higbie distinguishes from adding-external in places where the dependent clause *precedes* the independent (Higbie 1990:41). Here again, if the dependent or independent clause is not itself enjambed, I do not count this as enjambement. Thus, though Higbie's adding-external and clausal types occur frequently in the Centos, I do not find them useful categories and do not cite examples.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δῶκέν τε καὶ ἔκπιον. αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα	ο 10.237
μύθοισιν τέρποντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐνέποντες.	i 11.643

There are three other examples that come very close to qualifying as violent.

(1) 674-675 (Christ speaking to a healed paralytic):

ὄρσοο κυλλοπόδιον, ἐμόν τέκος. ἄντα σέθεν γάρ	i 21.331
οὗ τις ἀνὴρ προπάρριθε μακάριταος, οὐτ' ἄρ' ὀπίσσω	ο 11.483

(2) 1681-1682 (Jesus to Judas, in the garden of Gethsemane):

ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω πάντα πεπείρανται· σὺ 'δὲ αἴψα'	ο 12.37 †
'ρέξον' ὃ τι φρονέεις, τελέσαι δέ σε θυμὸς ἀνάγει.	ο 5.89 * †

(3) 2081-2084 (the burial of Christ by the disciples):

ὧς οἱ γ' ἐμμεμαῶτε νέκυν φέρον· αὐτὰρ ὑπερθεν'	i 17.746 †
χερσὶ μέγαν λίθον ἀείραντές τε προσέθηκαν,	cf. ο 9.240

The second major type, "necessary" enjambement, is more common. In this type any one or two of three essential elements of a clause—subject, verb, or object—is separated by verse end. In 129-131 (God in heaven speaking to the pre-existent Christ about the human condition), the verb is enjambed:

130	ἥερι καὶ νεφέλη κεκαλυμμένοι· οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτοὺς	ο 11.15
	εἶα ἴστασθαι, χαλεπὸς δέ τις ἄρορε δαίμων	ο 19.201
	δαίμοσιν ἀρήσασθαι, ὑποσχέσθαι δ' ἑκατόμβας.	i 6.115

In 202-203 (the Annunciation), it is the object:

καὶ πότε ἄγγελον ἦκεν, ὃς ἀγγεῖλειε γυναῖκα	ο 15.458 *
βουλήν, ἣ ῥα 'τότε σφιν' ἐφήνδανε μητιόωσιν.	ι 7.45 †

Note that Eudocia often enjambes lines that Homer does not, as with *Od.*

19.201 in the first example and *Od.* 15.458 in the second.

Examples of "adding" (Parry's "unperiodic") enjambement, the most common type in Homer, abound in the Centos as well. Adding enjambement often involves a runover adjective or participle in agreement with, or a noun in apposition to, some element in the previous line, or a runover adverb or adverbial phrase. The verse is then extended to line-end usually by (1) a relative clause, or (2) a new sentence connected to the preceding one by δέ or, if negative, οὐδέ. An example of (1) are Cento lines 474-476 (Christ's teaching about God the Father):

	πατὴρ δ' εἶμ' ἀγαθοῖο θεὸς δέ μ' ἐγείνατο 'πατήρ',	ι 21.109 * †
475	ἦπιος, ὃς δὴ τοι παρέχει βρώσιν τε πόσιν τε	ο 15.490 *
	ξεῖνιος, ὃς τε μάλιστα νεμεσσάτα κακὰ ἔργα.	ο 14.284 *

Examples of (2) include lines 1733-1734 (Christ on the way to the cross)

	ἐν δ' αὐτὸς κίεν ἦσι προθυμίησι πεποιθῶς	ι 2.588
	καρπαλίμως κατὰ ἄστυ. φίλοι δ' ἅμα πάντες ἔποντο,	ι 24.327

the description of the wine at the Last Supper (1450-1451)

1450	νίψατο δ' αὐτὸς χεῖρας, ἀφύσσατο δ' αἶθοπα οἶνον,	ι 16.230
	ἠδὸν ἀκηράσιον, θεῖον ποτόν. οὐδέ τις αὐτόν	ο 9.205

and 1805-1807 (Peter's denial):

1805	ἦ ῥ ὁ γέρων. πολιὰς δ' ἄρ' ἀνά τρίχας ἔλκετο χερσὶ,	i 22.77
	· αὐλῆς ἐκτὸς ἐών. οἱ δ' ἔνδοθι μῆτιν ὕφαινον	o 4.678
	νωλεμέως· ἀτὰρ αὐτὸς ἐλίσσετο ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα	o 20.24

Another type of adding enjambement occurs when a sentence fragment which takes up a whole verse is placed in apposition to a word in the previous line. This characteristically Homeric technique is very useful to the centonist for it "allows the poet simply to add items without affecting the grammatical construction" (Higbie 1990:33). Take for example the Centos' hymn-like proem which recounts the creation of the world: after the verb ἔτευξ' in line 8 there follow twenty lines of things created in the accusative case, bound here and there by relative clauses. As in Homer, the pattern is usually noun (and/or adjective) + τε καὶ, or + τε...τε καί, or + τε...ιδέ...ἠδέ, as in lines 21-24 where flowers are catalogued in the accusative case after νεοθηλέα ποιήν, or lines 26-28, where varieties of trees are enumerated in the nominative case after δένδρεα ὑψιπέτηλα. In the Wedding at Cana scene this type of adding enjambement is used to tally the guests, their activities and their pleasures (e.g. 623-625). It is not surprising that both the creation and Cana scenes are populated with lines taken from Homer's description of Achilles' shield where the same cataloging style is used.

Often in Homer adding enjambement follows pronominal adjectives (e.g. ἕτερος, ἕκαστος, οὐδείς, μηδείς and πᾶς), and the deictic pronouns ὅ, ἡ, τό, both

of which the poet uses in a quasi-substantival way. This Homeric peculiarity also proves convenient for the cento poet who can simply end-stop such lines, or enjamb them *ad libitum*. For example *πάσι* in *Od.* 10.38—ὦ πόποι, ὡς ὄδε πάσι φίλος καὶ τίμιος ἐστὶν—at line 984 is endstopped, whereas in Homer it is enjambéd, being glossed with *ἀνθρώποις...* in 10.39.<sup>3</sup> So too with the deictic pronoun *οἱ* we find *Od.* 9.334 endstopped in the Centos (1349-1350), followed by an explanatory *γάρ* verse-clause from the *Iliad*:

	οἱ δ' ἔλαχον τοὺς ἀν κε καὶ ἤθελεν αὐτὸς ἐλέσθαι.	o 9.334
1350	οἱ γὰρ οἱ εἴσαντο διακριδὸν εἶναι ἄριστοι.	i 12.103

In Homer *Od.* 9.334 is enjambéd with the runover *τέσσαρες* in the following line.

Higbie's otherwise comprehensive study does not attempt to explain how the rest of a line which begins with enjambement from the previous verse is related to the runover word. This is the subject of a short study by Matthew Clark (1994), who insists that "in order to understand the condition and function of runovers...we must examine not only what precedes the enjambement, but also what follows." When dealing, as in the Centos, with essentially stichic units, this becomes even more important.

Clark uses the term "binding" to refer to the probability that two words will occur together and borrows terminology from the analysis of musical fugues to describe the two limbs involved in enjambement: the *dux* is the preceding whole-verse or, if punctuated, verse-fragment before the

---

<sup>3</sup> *Od.* 10.38-39 occur as a couplet at 1337-1338.

runover; the *comes* is what follows, either to line end or to some point of punctuation in the line that contains the enjambement. Runovers themselves can be *free*, *pendant*, *embedded* or *orphan*.

An example of a free runover is an adjective like *νήπιος*, which, while often followed by *οὐδέ* or a relative clause, shows great variety in the *dux* and *comes*. A pendant runover is associated with a particular *dux*, but not with a particular *comes* (Clark 1994:96). The term "orphan" refers to runovers that are *not* associated with a particular *dux* but are associated with a specific *comes*. An example is *γυμνόν* in the line *γυμνόν· αὐτὰρ τά γε τεύχε' ἔχει κορυθαίολος* "Ἐκτωρ (*Il.* 17.122 = 693; 18.21) where "the runover and the *comes* are in different clauses, and have no grammatical relationship; nonetheless they co-occur. Lines of this sort," Clark observes, "are in effect whole line formulas, [even though] the boundaries of the line do not coincide with the boundaries of the grammar" (Clark 1994:101). Homer's free, pendant, and especially orphan runovers are of tremendous importance to the Centos. On the one hand, Eudocia adheres to the principles involved in each type; but she also diverges from Homeric practice and creates thereby some ingenious, disconcerting effects.

An example of an orphan runover occurs in 904-906 (Christ speaking to the man born blind):

	ἦ μὲν σ' ἐνδυκέως ἀποπέμπομα, ὄφρ' ἂν ἴκηαι	ο 10.65 *
905	χαίρων καρπαλίμως, εἰ καὶ μάλα τηλόθεν ἐσσί,	ο 7.194 *
	πατρίδα σὴν καὶ δῶμα, καὶ εἴ που τοι φίλον εἴη.	ο 10.66

The enjambement of *χαίρων καρπαλίμως* in line 905 with the *comes* *εἰ καὶ μάλα τηλόθεν ἔσσι* is found only twice in Homer, at *Od.* 6.312 and *Od.* 7.194, two closely-related, context-bound passages. In both it is preceded by a different *dux*. *Od.* 6.312:

τὸν παραμειψόμενος μητρὸς ποτὶ γούνασι χεῖρας  
βάλλειν ἡμετέρης, ἵνα νοστιμον ἡμῶν ἴδηαι  
χαίρων καρπαλίμως, εἰ καὶ μάλα τηλόθεν ἔσσι,

In the second example, *Od.* 7.194, Alcinous recommends that the Phaeacians speed Odysseus on his way so that

πομπῇ ἐφ' ἡμετέρῃ ἦν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἵκηται  
χαίρων καρπαλίμως, εἰ καὶ μάλα τηλόθεν ἔσσι,

We note that although the first part of the *dux* in *Od.* 10.65 is different from *Od.* 7.193 (both however contain the verbal idea in *πέμπ-*), Eudocia preserves the end-line/beginning-line collocation, *ἵκη(τ)αι / χαίρων...* of 7.193. To supply the destination (*πατρίδα*) she adds *Od.* 10.66 in the next line. In Homer the verb *ἴδηαι* at 6.311, a virtual homonym and allomorph of *ἵκη(τ)αι* and sometimes found as a variant of that word in Homer (e.g. at *Od.* 17.448), may have brought to the oral poet's mind *χαίρων καρπαλίμως* etc.

We have seen this type of word association already as a factor in Cento accommodation. Clark makes a similar observation about the oral poet's repeated association of words and phrases in his discussion of *semantic trigger* which sets off a formulaic molecule in the poet's mind. The Homeric phrase *βριθὺ μέγα σιβαρόν*, for example, which occurs six times

in the epics, always as a runover and in various environments, does so regularly in close proximity to ἔγχος (Clark 1994:107). Semantic triggers clearly fire off rounds of word and phrase association in Eudocia's mind, and thus are, more broadly defined, crucial to the Cento technique. Take for example the formula ὄφρ' εἶπω τὰ με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει in Cento line 5:

	κέκλυτε, μυρία φύλα περικτιόνων ἄνθρώπων,	i 17.220 †
	ὄσσοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσὶν ἐπὶ χθονὶ σῖτον ἔδοντες	o 8.222
	ἤμεν ὄσσοι ναίουσι πρὸς ἠῶ τ' ἠέλιόν τε	o 13.240
	ἠδ' ὄσσοι μετόπισθε ποτὶ ζόφον ἠερόντα	o 13.241
5	ὄφρ' εἶπω τὰ με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει	i 8.6
	ἄς' εὖ γινώσκητ' ἤμεν θεὸν ἠδὲ καὶ ἄνδρα	i 5.128 * †

This line would be in Higbie's categories an example of adding-external enjambement (see note 2 above). It occurs four times total in the *Iliad* (8.6; 7.369; 7.349; 7.68), notably all with κέκλυτε preceding. Similarly, a little further on in the same passage,

	ἰχθῦς ὄρνιθὰς τε φίλας ὅ τι χεῖρας ἴκοιτο	o 12.331 *
15	εἰναλίων τοῖσιν τε θαλάσσια ἔργα μέμηλεν	o 5.67 *
	δελφῖνάς τε κύνας τε καὶ εἴ ποθι μείζον ἔνεστι	o 12.96 †
	κῆτος ἃ μυρία βόσκει ἀγάστονος Ἀμφιτρίτη,	o 12.97

line 15 (*Od.* 5.67) with adding-internal enjambement is preceded in Homer by two lines (*Od.* 5.65-6) which, like Cento line 14 (*Od.* 12.331), mention birds (ὄρνιθες, ἴρηκες, κορώναι). At Cento lines 238 and 239

	τοῦ δὴ νῦν γε μέγιστον ὑπουράνιον κλέος ἐστὶ	o 9.264
	πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, καὶ οἱ δόσις ἔσσεται ἐσθλή.	i 10.213



the phrase ὑπουράνιον κλέος in *Od.* 9.264 brings *Il.* 10.213 to the poet's mind because of the unexpressed *Il.* 10.212, the only other place in both poems where the phrase occurs. Eudocia's use of theme words will be discussed in more detail in Chapter V. We see clearly enough here, however, that key words and semantic clusters bring associations with them recalling various lines from similar contexts.

Oftentimes the semantic trigger helps Eudocia with an enjambement, as at 355-356 (the return from the Flight into Egypt):

355	καὶ γὰρ θαῦμ' ἐτέτυκτο πελώριον. οὐ γὰρ ἐφκει ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ πάϊς ἔμμενα, ἀλλὰ θεοῖο.	ο 9.190 i 24.259
-----	--	---------------------

In this example *Od.* 9.190 is followed in Homer by ἀνδρὶ in line 191, but with a different *comes* (ἀνδρὶ γε σιτοφάγῳ, ἀλλὰ ρίφ ὑλήεντι); conversely *Il.* 24.259 is preceded by οὐδὲ ἐφκει at end-line in 24.258 with a different *dux* ("Ἐκτορά θ' ὄς θεὸς ἔσκε μετ' ἀνδράσιν, οὐδ' ἐφκει). Eudocia takes a little liberty with the personal construction of ἐφκει, but it may be that the non-semantic structure of the inappropriate verse *Od.* 9.190 suggested to her *Il.* 24.259, a verse of almost identical sentence structure (ἀνδρός γε...ἀλλα...) that *did* fit the context.

Another example is 2031-2032 (the burial of Christ):

2030	'τόνδ' ἄρ' ἔπειθ' ὑποδύντε δύω ἐρίηρες ἑταῖροι, κάτθεσαν ἐν λεχέεσσι· φίλοι δ' ἀμφέσταν ἑταῖροι μυρόμενοι· θαλερὸν δὲ κατεΐβετο δάκρυ παρειῶν. ἀμφὶ δὲ μιν φᾶρος καλὸν βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνα.	i 8.332 † i 18.233 i 24.794 i 24.588
------	---	---

The μυρόμενοι... here from *Il.* 24.794 is preceded in Homer by ἑταροὶ τε at the

end of 24.793 (with a completely different *dux*) and *ἐταῖροι* at end-line at *Il.* 18.233 is followed by a line beginning with an enjambed *μύρομενοι*, but with an entirely different *comes*. There are dozens of similar examples. I note here only two more,<sup>4</sup> each of which shows the fascinating effects of semantic trigger on Eudocia's movement from one line to the next.

(1) 910-11:

910	ἀχλὺν δ' αὖ τοι ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἔλεν ἢ πρὶν ἐπῆεν, θεσπεσίην. ὁ δ' ἔπειτα μέγ' ἔξιδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι	i 5.127 * i 20.342
-----	--	-----------------------

In Homer, the lines used here by Eudocia to describe a blind man involve the displacement of a formula where *ἀχλὺν* with *ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν* occupies verse-initial position at *Il.* 5.127 rather than the more frequent end-line position. Nonetheless Eudocia enjambes *θεσπεσίην* in agreement with it (though there is no such enjambement in Homer), no doubt because she freely associates it with the *ἀχλὺν / θεσπεσίην* collocation, which appears for example at *Il.* 20.341.

(2) 1008-1009 (the description of the Woman with a Flow of Blood):

ἔλκος μὲν γὰρ ἔχω τόδε καρτερόν. οὐδέ μοι αἷμα 'τέρσεται', ἀλλὰ μάλ' ὄκα κατειβόμενον κελαρύζει.	i 16.517+518 i 21.261
---	--------------------------

This example involves the conflation of two successive lines from a type-scene in the *Iliad*. The semantic trigger *αἷμα* sets off *τέρσεται*, although at *Il.*

---

<sup>4</sup> Other examples include lines 285-286 (= *Od.* 13.93 + *Il.* 5.6), 829-830 (*Il.* 23.75 + *Od.* 14.139), 941-942 (= *Od.* 18.99 + *Il.* 15.369), and 1183-1184 (= *Il.* 17.446 followed by a series of lines from *Odyssey* Book 18 [*Od.* 18.131 = *Il.* 17.447, cited through to the caesura of *Od.* 18.137]).

21.261 the enjambed word is not that but *ὄχλευνται*. Eudocia slips into the enjambement quite naturally because she remembers, or is prompted by, *τερσηῖναι* at *Il.* 16.519.

According to Clark, runover in type-scenes is due to the fact that "Similar scenes naturally call forth similar phrasings which may then produce or protect embedded and orphan runovers" (Clark 1994:101). The question arises: "When we have repeated runover words in such cases, 'which unit is the unit of repetition—the runover, or the context in which the runover occurs?'" With Clark I would conclude it is the context.<sup>5</sup> Eudocia's "thinking in context" will be the topic of Chapters IV-VII, an investigation of the morphological and semiotic reasons she chose the particular lines she did. But as we see here context certainly played a role in the actual process of stitching the lines together.

A final example gives us a glimpse of how, before Eudocia, archaic rhapsodes (or a later interpolator) could work in the Homeric manner of whole-line formulas. At Cento lines 578-581 (The Wedding at Cana), Eudocia uses an orphan runover cited by Clark: *τερπόμενοι· μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδὸς / φορμίζων*. This line occurs twice in the *Odyssey*, at 4.17 *verbatim*, and 13.27 with *Δημόδοκος* as the runover instead of *φορμίζων*. The enjambed line also occurs in the vulgate text of *Il.* 18. 603-5, although Allen brackets it in the Oxford text on the authority of Aristarchus. However, we find the orphan in Eudocia, followed by four more lines from *Iliad* Book 18 which

---

<sup>5</sup> Clark (1994:105) also notes that "the process of composing in molecules increases the statistical occurrence of runovers without increasing the difficulty of composing in performance."

precede the *dux*—*Il.* 18.603—in Cento line 578 (The Wedding at Cana):

	πολλος δ' ἱμερόεντα χορὸν περίσταθ' ὄμιλος	i 18.603
	τερπόμενοι· μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδὸς	o 4.17
580	φορμίζων· δοιῶ δὲ κυβιστητῆρε κατ' αὐτοὺς	o 4.18
	μολπῆς ἐξάρχοντες ἐδίνεον κατὰ μέσσους.	o 4.19
	ἔνθα μὲν ἦῖθεοι καὶ παρθένοι ἀλφεισίβοια	i 18.593
	ᾠρχεῦντ', ἀλλήλων ἐπὶ καρπῷ χεῖρας ἔχοντες.	i 18.594
	τῶν δ' αἱ μὲν λεπτάς ὀθόνας ἔχον, οἱ δὲ χιτῶνας	i 18.595
585	εἶατ' ἐϋννήτους ἦκα στίλβοντας ἐλαίῳ.	i 18.596

It may be that in Eudocia's text of Homer that's where the lines stood. Or it may be that she transposed two blocks of lines, *Il.* 18.603-6 and 18.593-6, omitting lines 597-602 (which describe a sword-dance inappropriate to the context). Be that as it may, what Clark says of the appearance of this orphan runover in the *Iliad* applies exactly to Eudocia: "If it is in fact an interpolation, the interpolator was completely conversant with Homeric technique."

However, in many other places Eudocia diverges from Homeric practice in that she often separates an end-line/beginning-line collocation. Compare again 475-476 (cited above):

	πατρός δ' εἴμ' ἀγαθοῖο· θεὸς δέ μ' ἐγείνατο 'πατήρ',	i 21.109 * †
475	ἦπιος, ὃς δὴ τοι παρέχει βρῶσιν τε πόσιν τε	o 15.490 *
	ξείνιος, ὃς τε μάλιστα νεμεσσᾶται κακὰ ἔργα.	o 14.284 *

In Homer there are only two occurrences of the genitive ξεινί(ο) in adding enjambement, one of which is *Od.* 14.284, the verse in grammatical accommodation (\*) here (the other is at *Il.* 13.625). Both times ξεινίου refers

(of course) to Zeus, but as in the *Odyssey* examples just discussed, the wording of the *dux* (and *comes*) in each passage is rather different:

Ζηνός ἐριβρεμέτεω χαλεπήν ἐδείσατε μῆνιν  
 ξεινίου, ὅς τέ ποτ' ὕμμι διαφύσει πόλιν αἰπυήν·  
 (*Il.* 13.624-5)

ἀλλ' ἀπό κείνος ἔρυκε, Διὸς δ' ὠπίζετο μῆνιν  
 ξεινίου, ὅς τε μάλιστα νεμεσσᾶται κακὰ ἔργα.  
 (*Od.* 14.283-4)

The end-line / beginning-line collocation μῆνιν / ξεινίου in both Homeric passages is broken up by Eudocia with *Od.* 15.490, where ἠπίο(υ) is used by Odysseus of a guest-friend from Eumaeus' past and, interestingly, in a line which begins with an enjambed Ζεύς.

As is well known, many lines in Homer come in "clusters," and "couplets" (cf. Lord 1960:58; 1991:75), what Clark calls "formulaic molecules" (1994:99). Runovers within such molecules are said to be *embedded*. An example is the enjambed line at *Cento* lines 212 and 249—ἀδμήτην, ἦν οὖ πω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἦγαγεν ἀνήρ— which occurs in Homer only in couplet form and only at *Il.* 10.293 and *Od.* 3.383:

σοί δ' αὖ ἐγὼ ρέξω βοῦν ἦνιν εὐρυμέτωπον  
 ἀδμήτην, ἦν οὖ πω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἦγαγεν ἀνήρ

In Homer ἀδμήτην refers to a cow. This line is used twice by Eudocia in the *Annunciation* scene to describe the Virgin Mary (evoking, I would add, strange images of Io given the context):

## (1) 211-13:

	βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἐς θάλαμον πολυδαίδαλον, φ' ἔνι κούρη	o 6.15
210	ἔζετ' ἐνὶ κλισμῷ· ὑπὸ δὲ θρήνης ποσὶν ἦεν, ἠλάκατα στρωφῶσ' ἀλιπόρφυρα, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι	o 4.136 † o 6.306
	ἀδμήτη, τὴν οὐπω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἤγαγεν ἀντήρ.	i 10.293 *

## (2) 247-48:

	"ὦ φίλ' ἐπεὶ ἴδῃ μοι καὶ ἀμείψασθαι θέμις ἐστὶ,	o 16.91 * †
	τίπτέ με κείνος ἄνωγε μέγας θεός; αἰδέομαι δὲ	i 24.90
	ἀδμήτη, ἣν οὐπω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἤγαγεν ἀντήρ.	i 10.293

## Compare Cento lines 1473-1474 (describing Judas at the betrayal):

	κλίμακα δ' ὑψηλὴν κατεβήσατο τοιοῦτο δόμοιο,	i 1.330 *
	ἄχόμενος· μένεος δὲ μέγα φρένες ἀμφιμέλαινα	i 1.103 †
	πίμπλαντ'· ὅσσε δὲ οἱ πυρὶ λαμπετόωντι εἴκτην.	i 1.104

In Homer the orphan runaway ἀχνόμενος occurs with its embedded partner πίμπλαντ' etc. (see Clark 1994:103). Here it is changed by Eudocia to the stronger χωόμενος. This is either a slip of the poet's memory, or a creative substitution on Eudocia's part to keep out any resonances of "grief" in the word ἀχνόμενος. Perhaps she felt χωόμενος, "full of rage," (which frequently occurs in this position in Homer) better captured the villainy of Judas.

Though she freely departs from strict adherence to Homeric usage, Eudocia is nonetheless an expert seamstress whose stitchings reveal a poetic mind well-versed in the Homeric and biblical texts. Take this example of a brilliant but unhomeric use of enjambement in the Crucifixion scene (1872-1877):

	ἤμος δ' ἥλιος μέσον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβεβήκει,	i 8.68
	δεξάμενοι δ' ἄρα τοί γε, διαστάντες τανύουσι	i 17.391
	σταυροῖσιν ἔπυκνινοῖσι' διαμπερὲς ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα	o 14.11 †
1875	γυμνὸν (ἀτάρ τοι εἶματ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισι κέοντο)	i 22.510 *
	ὄρθον ἐν ἱστοπέδῃ. ἐκ δ' αὐτοῦ πείρατ' ἀνήψαν	o 12.179 *
	ὑψι μάλα μεγάλως. ἐπὶ δ' ἴαχε λαὸς ὄπισθε.	i 17.723

As it is construed here the adjective γυμνόν in 1875, referring to Jesus, is the direct object of the verb τανύουσι in line 1873. Γυμνόν in enjambement (separated from its verb by a whole line) is further qualified by the adjective ὄρθον in 1876 in apposition to it. In Homer γύμνον refers to Hector's corpse. The direct object of τανύουσι at *Il.* 17.391 is a bull's hide, in a simile that compares the struggle over the body of Patroklos to a procedure in the tanning of leather. Ὀρθόν at *Od.* 12.179 refers to Odysseus who has been tied to the mast in order to hear the song of the Sirens. Though Eudocia's syntax is "unhomeric" in that no expressed referent exists for γύμνον and ὄρθον, she skilfully organizes four consecutive enjambements (using lines taken from scenes of death) around an episode from the *Odyssey* which for early Christians was pregnant with Crucifixion symbolism (Pépin 1982).

Another example. At lines 1236-1239, where Jesus learns from Martha and Mary of his friend Lazarus' death, we read

	πεύσεαι ἀγγελίης, ἢ μὴ ὄφελλε γενέσθαι,	i 18.19
	λυγρῆς ἀγγελίης, ὅτι σοι φίλος ὄλεθ' ἑταῖρος,	i 17.642
	λυγρῆς, ἢ τέ μοι αἰὲν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλον κῆρ	o 1.341
	τείρει, ἐπεὶ με μάλιστα καθίκετο πένθος ἄλαστον.	o 1.342

In this (unhomerically) example of hyperenjambement (with the genitive λυγρῆς

twice repeated anaphorically in apposition) the poet lingers on what are two of the most grievous reports in Homer: the news of Patroclus' death, and Phemius' song about the *nostoi*, which for Penelope and Telemachos is tantamount to the death of a beloved husband and father (cf. *Od.* 1.354-5). Similarly, in the description of King Herod's Slaughter of the Innocents (307-312), Eudocia enjambes the word *νήπιος* twice in a row, playing with the Homeric word's literal and figurative meanings, "fool" and "infant" respectively:

	πολλα δ' ἀτάσθαλ' ἔρεξε βίη καὶ κάρτει εἴκων,	ο 18.139
	πάντων μὲν κρατέειν ἐθέλων πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν.	ι 1.288 *
	νήπιος· ἦ τε πόλεσσιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ θυμὸν ἀπηύρα	ι 17.236 *
310	νηπιάχοις· ξυνὸν δὲ κακὸν πολέεσσιν ἔθηκε'	ι 16.262 †
	κτείνας ἐπιστροφάδην· τῶν δὲ στόνος ὄρνυτ' ἀεικῆς	ι 10.483
	ἄορι θεινομένων· ἐρυθθαίνετο δ' αἵματι γαῖα.	ι 10.484

\*

In his book on formal, but non-formulaic patterns of repetition in Homer Ahuvia Kahane observes of Homeric poetics that "The study of patterns is, to a point, an investigation of *usage*. It emphasizes reception and response rather than composition" (Kahane 1994:16). Such are the limitations faced by all modern Homerists seeking to describe the making of Homeric verse: the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are the culmination and refinement of a long poetic tradition that originated in an oral milieu, yet, because they exist only as written texts, the origin and generation of the poems in that



milieu is accessible to us, if at all, only through a textual medium (Griffin 1980:xiii; cf. Nagy 1990:206). Thus, on this view, we can go no farther back in our investigations into the oral tradition of Greek epic poetry than the reception of and response to it in the works of Homer.

Analogously, but at a secondary level, reception and response is what the Homeric Centos represent (cf. Smolak 1979:49; Stehlíková 1987). However, with Eudocia, unlike "Homer" himself, we can observe the poet interacting with her repertoire and get that much closer to the moment and manner of verse composition. In the Centos the processes of reading Homeric poetry (reception) and composing with it (response) are complementary, even symbiotic, and this, I believe, is what makes them so intriguing.

In Chapters I and II I gave reasons for thinking that the Centos were composed in a mode that presupposes a high degree of what Walter Ong calls "residual orality," by which he means that a "manuscript culture...[is] always marginally oral" (Ong 1982:157). To establish whether or not some degree of orality is present in a given text we must ask a basic question: "How can one distinguish an oral-traditional text from one of written literature?" (Lord 1991:25). To answer it the late Albert Lord offered some sound advice based on a lifetime of field work.

First, "one must know what the specific characteristics of a given tradition are in order to tell whether they are present or not in the text

---

<sup>6</sup> However, I register Nagy's criticism of textualists who neglect or undervalue comparative evidence from non-Greek traditional societies for reconstructing the performance context of Homeric poetry (Nagy 1996b:134).

under consideration" (cf. Miller 1982:26; Foley 1991:43). This has been my aim in writing a Cento poetics. Obviously, because the Centos are comprised entirely of Homeric lines and phrases, they would qualify as an oral-traditional text by virtue of that fact alone.<sup>7</sup> But we have also seen that the *process* of Cento composition has many features in common with the processes used by the oral poet(s) or proto-poets of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. In all types of Cento accommodation and enjambement we see the large part played by homophony, allomorphy and the spontaneous association of words and phrases. I have suggested that in many instances Eudocia, like an ancient bard, composed by analogy, adapting Homeric formulas in her word and phrase substitutions. Her frequent use of all types of enjambement is especially impressive given her self-imposed handicap of reproducing Homeric lines as accurately as possible. In sum, Eudocia proves to be fluent in Homer and the Homeric style.

Once the specific characteristics of a given tradition have been established, Lord suggests that a text be scrutinized using Milman Parry's three criteria for determining whether or not a text is oral-traditional: (1) Does it contain formulas? (2) Does it make use of "themes?" (3) Is there frequent "unperiodic enjambement?" The Centos in fact satisfy all three criteria. We have dealt only with the use of formulas and enjambement so far. Themes, also fundamental to Cento composition, will be discussed fully in the next four chapters.

---

<sup>7</sup> Although Stanley (1992:268-79) offers notable objections to Ong's criteria for orality and their applicability to Homer, I am still sympathetic to Ong's basic premises.

As to the criterion of formulas, Russo (1966), following Notopoulos (1962), has advanced the useful concept of the "structural formula," a nuanced development of Parry's notion of a "formula-system" that allows "any and all the members of a phrase to be variable and still count the phrase as formulaic, so long as it continue[s] to share similarities of rhythm, parts of speech, syntactic relationship, and...localization within the hexameter verse, with a series of other phrases that could be related to the same 'system'" (Russo 1976:32).

In an attempt at clarity and differentiation in this flexible approach to Homeric formularity Russo has graded Homeric formulas into five basic levels according to how far removed a phrase is from exact repetition. From most concrete to most abstract these are: (1) exact repetition, allowing for simple inflection of the elements, (2) formulas with only one variable element, (3) formulas with two or more variables, (4) the "single-term structural formula" (e.g. middle-passive participles at verse-initial position), and (5) the purely rhythmic formula, not corresponding to actual words at all, but to metrical *sedes* and the patterns of colometry in the Homeric line (Russo 1976:35-7).

In principle, Eudocia operates at each of these levels. In her very use of Homeric lines, line-formulas and grammatical accommodation (\*) she operates at level 1. In her substitutions in semantic accommodation (†), her conflated and half-lines she works at levels 2-5. Seen thus, Eudocia's use of Homer and the formula system is, in a modified form, an expression of the Parryan principles of economy and extension (on which see Hainsworth

1993:23-6). Extension, understood in terms of Cento poetics, is the hypothetical set of Homeric lines capable of appropriation (mostly those that do not contain proper names). Economy is at work in the particular use of those lines: for example in the use of periphrasis to identify the *dramatis personae*, in the repetition of other whole-line formulas, and in the semantic accommodations (intentional or otherwise) where she is consistent with Homeric practice elsewhere.

If Homeric Cento poetry is a *parole*-re-generation of Homeric verse, then it must be, like the original generation of the verse by the bard of old, a line-by-line transaction of *thought* along the axes of selection and combination. This is a crucial point for a proper understanding of Homeric and Homeric Cento enjambement, and I would like to dwell on it briefly here, for I believe Eudocia's practice in this regard quickens our understanding of audience expectation and reader response, adding much to that understanding—by way of clarification—of how a Homeric poet's thought proceeds from line to line.

According to Higbie, the difference between Homeric enjambement types is "the degree of expectation of or grammatical need for what follows the verse end" (Higbie 1990:29). In her analysis, however, it turns out that "expectation" for Higbie is grammatical.<sup>8</sup> This misses what is best in the

---

<sup>8</sup> I cite only one of several examples of this tendency, her discussion of *Il.* 5.144-47 in which line 145 is classed as "clausal-external" enjambement (see note 2 above) because the verb *πληξ'* in line 147 constitutes the previous two lines as a clause (Higbie 1990:30). But surely, based on any definition of "expectation," lines 145 and 146 are also "adding-internal" in that they are explicative of the double object of the verb *ἔλεν* in line 144. Put another way, the sentence could happily end at 146 and *πληξ'* in 147, though technically in "necessary" enjambement, is superfluous.

Parry-Lord tradition. In a seminal article on enjambement published in 1929 Parry noted how often in Homer's style "several *ideas* [are] added to one another...which could not be foreseen, were not even looked for, until each one was told" (emphasis added). Parry rightly understood that for a true poetics of enjambement and an accurate appraisal of Homer's oral style the expectation of the audience during performance and the generation of the verse by the poet must be seen as a phrase-by-phrase, line-by-line transaction of *thought*.<sup>9</sup> However, on the level of the expression of thought in words, Parry's own notion of expectation also becomes problematic.

Parry had argued that the audience or reader gradually acquired "*a sense for the formula*. Meeting over and over the same group of words expressing the same idea, he comes to look on this group of words as a whole which has a fixed end." In short, "He reads by formulas." Thus, according to Parry, the auditor's response to the enjambed line at *Iliad* 5.16—Τυδείδεω δ' ὑπὲρ ὄμιον ἀριστερόν ἦλυθ' ἀκωκή / ἔρχεος—would be conditioned by his memory of the more usual and generic endstopped versions of this formula, *Il.* 17.49 and *Il.* 22.327: ἀντικρὺ δ' ἀπαλοῖο δι' αὐχένος ἦλυθε ἀκωκή (Parry 1929:258). However, since the *Iliad* was composed during performance, the

---

<sup>9</sup> Bakker's 1990 analysis of the hexameter line by "idea units" as opposed to grammatical units—that is "from the point of view of the cognitive processes of the narrator, not from the point of view of the standards applied by a [modern] reader"—is truer to Parry's early insights on the question. Bakker's model of Homeric enjambement based on the "left and right dislocation," of elements in the Homeric sentence reveals that the varieties of Homeric enjambement involving the separation of verb, subject and/or object from the rest of their sentence by verse-end (so-called "necessary enjambement") are not *categorically* different because the grammatical need is greater, as Higbie believes, but rather occupy a place on a manageable spectrum of oral discourse familiar to the poet and his audience.

original Homeric audience could not, strictly speaking, hone their expectations for Book 5 on Books 17 and 22 since those parts of the performance had yet to be realized. While I am in full agreement with Nagy that any "cross-reference that we admire in our two-dimensional text did not just happen one time in one performance," and that "the resonances of Homeric cross-referencing must be appreciated within the larger context of a long history of repeated performances" (Nagy 1996b:82<sup>10</sup>), it is difficult, if not impossible, to prove which version of a given formula was the standard wherefrom the audience acquired its "sense."

So far as enjambement is concerned, however, by measuring Eudocia's practice against Homer's we get a glimpse of what *her* expectations as an Homeric reader and poet were: we have already seen that she enjambes lines that are end-stopped in Homer and vice versa *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. Parry's notion of expectation actually better suits the centonist Eudocia—a literate poet fully conversant in the Homeric *langue*, who composed in a culture still marked by oral residue— than it does the oral bard of primary orality.

But what does formularity, if present, really tell us about a text? While recognizing that formularity is characteristic of the Homeric style, Russo, John Miles Foley, D. Gary Miller and others have rightly questioned the logic in the assumption that the presence of formulas in a text is automatically a guarantor of oral composition. In 1976, noting the

---

<sup>10</sup> *Pace* Ong whose characterization of the spoken word in a primary oral culture as an "ephemeral event" runs the risk of undervaluing a long-standing, conventional poetic tradition (Ong 1982:31-2).

limitations of Parry and Lord's comparative evidence from Yugoslavia and citing studies of national poetries in the Celtic languages which have yielded very different conclusions, Russo called for "an extended interpretation of the 'poetics' of composition in a style that may or may not be oral but that *is* very distinctly formulaic and traditional" (Russo 1976:49). I believe that the Centos are such a text, and important, because as Russo points out, "history has hidden Homer's methods of poetic creation from us...All we have is his style; and all that can be put to the proof is our own capacity to respond to it." "The fundamental quality of such a style," he writes, "is that it is one shaped by the ear."

It is laden at every level with the devices that facilitate this process: the level of rhythmical metric [and] the level of "structural" patterning of language in formulaic moulds that may be filled in a variety of ways, and as such may be called "aural" formulas but not "oral" ones...It is a style, and a poetry, organized at every level, from the acoustic to the sociolinguistic, to serve the needs of *rapport* and *communication* between the poet and his audience.

Eudocia, we have seen, responded to this aural style by reproducing it—twelve-hundred years later in a very different milieu—and used Homer's poetry as a vehicle for communicating the Christian story. Fluent in the texts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, her poetic idiom, Eudocia manipulated the inner workings of the Homeric system to stitch together a new ἀοιδή out of Homer.

## CHAPTER IV

### CENTO SEMIOTICS AND AESTHETICS

You can write down the word "star," but that does not make you the creator of the word, nor if you erase it have you destroyed the word. The word lives in the minds of those who use it. Even if they all are asleep, it exists in their memory.

—C. S. Peirce

In or about the year 400 CE a bishop in northern Asia Minor named Asterius commented on the high fashion of his day: "The more religious among rich men and women," he complained before his congregation, "have carded through the Gospel story and handed it over to the weavers." In the streets of fifth-century Constantinople, Antioch or Alexandria, Asterius informs us, you could find "Christ and his disciples" woven into the fine garments of these religious rich, "and each of the miracles, as the story goes (ὡς ἡ διήγησις ἔχει): the wedding in Galilee with the water jars; the paralytic carrying his bed on his back; the blind man healed with clay; the woman with the flow of blood seizing the hem of Jesus' cloak; the sinful woman falling at his feet; Lazarus coming back to life from the grave" (Migne *PG* 40:168; Mango 1972:51; cf. Maguire 1995:52-9).

It is no surprise that Eudocia embroidered these same biblical scenes into her verbal textile. Christ's miracles were favorite themes for all arts and crafts in late antiquity. They are commonly found on Christian



sarcophagoi, diptychs, wall-paintings and mosaics, often presented paratactically in successive registers (Matthews 1993:54-91). Eudocia's choice and treatment of her subject matter shows her general sympathy with the tastes of the period, much as Homer's treatment of his themes can be fruitfully compared Geometric pottery and the "Dipylon Style" (Whitman 1958:87-101; Hurwit 1985:93-106). Of course, unlike "Homer," Eudocia knew her themes from texts, or from lectionary readings and sermons based on those texts. And yet Eudocia's choice and treatment of her themes, like her selection and combination of Homeric verses, reveals that she was not directly dependent upon texts, much less any single text, in composing the Centos.

Of the scenes mentioned by Asterius, for example, the Wedding at Cana (Cento lines 528-627) and the raising of Lazarus (1228-1299) are story-traditions unique to the Gospel of John. The Annunciation (203-268) appears only in Luke; the Visit of the Magi (294-300) only in Matthew. The story of Christ's descent to Hades (Cento lines 2105-2148), on the other hand, is not told in the canonical Gospels. That episode, perhaps implied in a few New Testament passages and mentioned briefly in early patristic writings, is first narrated only in the fourth-century *Gospel of Nicodemus* (Schneemelcher 1991:I.501-36; Ferguson 1990:411-12). The heavenly conversation between Christ and "God the Father" (88-201), so far as I know, has no narrative source at all, but is a purely imaginative dialogue modeled, it seems, after the familiar Homeric council-of-gods scene (Smolak 1979:32), and based on theological speculation about Christ's pre-

existence— speculation which stretches back to the earliest Messianic and Christological interpretations of biblical passages like Psalm 110:1 ("The LORD says to my Lord...") and Genesis 1:26 ("Let *us* make man in our image").

As we see from the diverse nature of her "sources," Eudocia does not approach her theme material like a biblical metaphrast, whose primary objective is to turn the prose text of a "stylistically simple original" into poetry that "typically involve[s] a great deal of rhetorical embellishment" (Roberts 1985:58). Like her contemporary Nonnus, who wrote an hexameter poem of this sort based on the Gospel of John, Eudocia was certainly capable of the rhetorical paraphrase, as can be seen from her own hexameter version of the prose *Life of St. Cyprian*. Photius in fact praises Eudocia (notoriously, the only poet he discusses at all in the *Bibliotheca*) for being particularly good at sticking close to the text of the original in her lost paraphrases of the Octoteach and Daniel (*Bibl. Codd.* 183-84). In composing the Centos, however, Eudocia's task was different: she was not working with a fixed *text*, but rather with a *story* that had been spun over time from various themes, themes drawn from various spheres of Christian discourse—narrative, theological, even iconographic.<sup>1</sup>

"The study of themes," and their relationship to narrative structures and cultural discourse, "is hardly an easy approach that is...ideal for dissertations," but rather, "a minefield without an adequate map" (Sollers

---

<sup>1</sup> On the role of story in early Christian culture see Sykes 1987, Averil Cameron 1991:13, and Robbins 1996.

1993:xxiii). Our minefield here is particularly treacherous, for to deal with themes in the Homeric Centos we must go below the surface of Cento poetics and venture into the areas of context, referentiality and meaning. At this semantic level of the text, the Homeric verses used by the poet must constantly be related to the biblical or biblically-derived theme material. Todorov calls this a relationship *in absentia*: "A certain signifier *signifies* a certain signified, a certain phenomenon *evokes* another, a certain episode *symbolizes* an idea, another *illustrates* a psychology" (Todorov 1973:14). In the Centos we face the additional complication that at this semantic level the signs of one system have been appropriated to express the signifieds of another. Consequently, in discussing the use and function of themes in the Homeric Centos we face the whole question of intertextuality and its aesthetic effects.

Clearly, no one map will take us through, and I have had to use several here. My overarching thesis, however, is simple and straightforward. As was stated for Homer by Bernard Fenik in his landmark study of Homeric battle type-scenes, I am convinced that Cento "verse-building and action narrative...represent two aspects of basically the same compositional technique" (Fenik 1968:Summary); that is, I argue that themes, like the free association of words and phrases in all types of accommodation and enjambement, play a major role in the Cento poet's cognitive processes of selection and combination, and thus contribute to the generation of the poem.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an explanatory model for

both the generative and aesthetic dimensions of Eudocia's use of themes. "Aesthetics," as I understand the word here, is not the study of beauty per se, but of perception, and it is primarily the eye of the beholder that fixes my attention throughout. While Eudocia's generation of Cento verse may have been facilitated by thematic structures built into and shared between the Homeric and biblical narratives, her choice and handling of this material was also a reader's response, that is, an aesthetic judgement. Our task, in other words, is twofold: first, to state what that choice entailed. This I do by demonstrating how Eudocia, taking her cues from Homer, composed her poem by theme. Secondly, I state what her choice of material implies, semantically and artistically. This I do through a semiotic analysis and interpretation of Cento intertextuality.

Before we delve into Eudocia's use of Homeric themes and type-scenes, however, let me clarify what I mean by these terms. The Homeric "type-scene," a phrase coined by Walter Arend in 1933, is a recurrent block of narrative in either the *Iliad* or, especially, the *Odyssey*, whose elements consistently appear in the same order. Type-scenes express the customary, everyday activities and etiquettes of the Homeric age (departing, arriving, eating, entertaining, sleeping, sailing, holding assembly etc.), and thus, by their frequency and regularity, reflect and preserve fundamental Homeric values (cf. Foley 1991:34-5).

In a recent overview of the subject, Mark Edwards proposes five descriptive categories into which all Homeric type-scenes fall: battle, social intercourse, travel, ritual, and speech and deliberation, each of which has

various subspecies (Edwards 1992). To construct a given episode Homer draws from several of these categories at once (cf. Arend 1933:35). The hospitality scene, or *xenia*, for example, crucial to the composition of the Centos, utilizes type-scenes belonging to the spheres of social intercourse, ritual and speech/deliberation (cf. Reece 1992:5-39). On the larger level, as has been demonstrated elsewhere by Edwards for *Iliad* Book 1 (Edwards 1980), "the whole of Homeric narrative can be analyzed into type-scenes" and typical motifs (Edwards 1992:287; cf. Edwards 1991:11-12; Kirk 1990:16-18).

Inevitably, every Cento episode draws on Homeric type-scenes or other recurrent motifs. In fact, each of Edwards' categories is represented. Lines from Homeric scenes of feasting and sacrifice, for example, abound in the Wedding at Cana episode (528-627), the Feeding of the Five Thousand (1153ff.), and the Last Supper (1385ff.). Homeric lines describing the wounding of warriors are used repeatedly to describe the blind, sick, bleeding, crippled and lame persons healed by Christ (628-1045). The healings themselves use various lines describing the divine enabling of Homeric heroes. At Christ's burial (2030-2086) lines taken from Homeric burial and mourning scenes flow freely.

"Theme" is Albert Lord's term for these recurrent blocks of narrative in oral poetry, which, as he defines it in *Singer of Tales*, "is not any fixed set of words but a grouping of ideas" (Lord 1960:69; 1938:73).<sup>2</sup> V. V. Radlov, a

---

<sup>2</sup> When I use Lord's now standard phrase "composition by theme" (Lord 1951) I have this definition in mind. As Edwards notes (1992:286), however, Lord's later definition of theme and its character in Serbo-Croatian poetry as "a repeated passage

pioneer in the study of themes in oral poetry, used the apt term *Bildtheile*, "idea-parts," to describe the phenomenon (Foley 1988:12). Taking a given theme as a whole (e.g. "hospitality") the type-scene (e.g. "sacrifice") is the smaller narrative unit. But whether Homer elaborates a type-scene, as in the case of Nestor's sacrifice at *Od.* 3.418-76, or uses type-scene shorthand as at *Od.* 13.26 the notion of "sacrifice" is common to both treatments. A theme, then, as I use the word here, is what any typical recurrent passage in Homer "is about." "The theme (what is being said in a work) unites the separate elements of the work. The work as a whole has a theme, and its individual parts also have themes" (Tomashevsky in Lemon and Reis 1965:63).

Themes and type-scenes are the building blocks of Homeric narrative. An oral poet, as Lord observed of the Serbo-Croatian *guslari*, knows the whole song by theme before he sings it. However, "when he reaches key points in the performance of the song, he finds that he is drawn in one direction or another by the similarities with related groups [of songs] at those points" (Lord 1960:123). In the act of composition, in other words, there is always "an explicit awareness...of the existence of the possibilities that could become other songs" (Slatkin 1996:228). Eudocia realized these "possibilities" in an extreme fashion by using Homeric verses to express a completely different "song" from a completely different tradition. She was drawn in that direction, as we shall see, by perceived similarities between

---

rather than a repeated subject" (Lord 1991:27) is not well suited to the greater verbal and structural variety found in the Homeric type-scene.

the Homeric and biblical stories as she moved from one verse to the next.

Although Eudocia was composing in a literate society, the *Centos*, like the Homeric poems, presuppose, even depend upon, a thematic knowledge of "the story" on the part of both poet and audience. Eudocia's re-generation of Homeric verse therefore entails what Egbert Bakker describes as theme "activation and preservation" (Bakker 1993). Bakker suggests that in order to understand the place of Homeric poetry in its oral or residually oral tradition we must move away from the modern idea that the primary function of texts and language in society is to transmit information, *new* information in particular. With special reference to the interdependence of text and performance Bakker argues that the ancient Greek poet and/or writer of texts

is concerned not with the transmission of messages to readers (the text being a container for these contents), but with the fixation, and thereby the *preservation*, of what binds container and content together into an indissoluble whole, that is, speech. Similarly, "reading" a text that is meant to represent...speech is nothing other than the *re-enactment* of it, or better its reactivation.

Following the work of Jesper Svenbro (1993) and a hint provided by the Greek verb "to read," ἀναγιγνώσκω, Bakker suggests that

If speaking is a matter of cognition, of the activation of ideas in one's consciousness...then reading is a matter of the "*re-cognition*" and reactivation of these same ideas, both in the reader's and the listeners' consciousness. Writing and reading, in short, are related to each other as performance and re-performance (Bakker 1993:16).

This notion of theme activation and preservation which sees content and

container as an "indissoluble whole" representing original speech is especially important for us as it accounts for both the orality of "Homer's" original performance and the aural dimension of texts like the Centos which were composed by a literate poet in a residually oral culture.

Although Eudocia activates her themes with Homeric lines, the themes themselves, of course, are not Homeric but biblical. "Composition by theme" for Eudocia, then, as we have said, involves applying the Homeric sign system and the conventions and compositional techniques associated with it to themes taken from a completely different system. Thus, as a concatenation of Homeric verses expressing biblical themes, the Homeric Centos are a perfect specimen of "intertextuality."

As I understand it in this study, intertextuality means simply the condition or quality of being poised between texts. This definition embraces not only the intertext in question, but the poet and audience as well. Indeed, in our case the poet, as reader, is a member of the audience. To cast this mutual relationship in terms of Cento theme activation in a generative system, in the words of Gregory Nagy, "Each occurrence of a theme (on the level of content) or of a formula (on the level of form) in a given composition-in-performance refers not only to its immediate context but also to...other analogous contexts remembered by the performer or by any member of the audience" (Nagy 1996a:50).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Paul Zumthor justly describes this phenomenon as "intervocality." In speaking of texts and "intertextuality" in a generative system we must keep in mind that "Chaque texte enregistré par l'écriture, tel que nous le lisons, occupa néanmoins un lieu précis dans un ensemble de relations mobiles et dans une série de productions multiples, au sein d'un concert d'échos réciproques: d'une intervocalité, comme l'



"Intertexts," according to a semiotic formulation by Heinrich Plett, "consist of signs. Signs are part of codes. Codes have two components: signs and rules. The signs represent the material, the rules the structural aspect of the code" (Plett 1991:13). Plett distinguishes between "material" and "structural" intertextualities, and recognizes an intertextuality based on a combination of the two. Material intertextuality corresponds to the quotation, the repetition of signs. Structural intertextuality consists in the repetition of narrative rules. Both types are fully operative in the Homeric Centos, which use the repetition of signs (Homeric verses) to reproduce biblical narrative according to narrative rules that both codes share. Although the signs of the Homeric and biblical codes are often at variance, the two texts can be assimilated in the reader's response because on the narrative plane their signifieds, or themes, share structural, that is, morphological elements. Themes, in this sense, serve as the biblical and Homeric narratives' common denominator.

What are the rules of narrative? The seminal work on this topic is still Propp's *Morphology of the Folktale*. The importance of Propp's work for a proper understanding of Cento intertextuality is immense. In the *Morphology* Propp rejected the classification of tales by subject matter and along with it the view (espoused in the English-speaking world by Stith

---

'intertextualité' dont on parle tat depuis quelques années, et que je considère ici sous son aspect d'échange de paroles et de connivence sonore; polyphonie perçue par les destinataires d'une poésie qui leur est communiquée—quelles qu'en soient les modalités et le style performancier— exclusivement par la voix. Ces relations intervocales, dans l'univers des contacts personnels et des sensations, tiennent de celles qui s'instaurent (avec moins de chaleur!) dans notre pratique moderne entre le texte original et son commentaire ou sa traduction" (Zumthor 1987:161).

Thompson) that each simple sentence of a tale comprises a motif, as in "a dragon kidnaps the tsar's daughter," and that this motif is the basic narrative unit. Propp showed to the contrary that this and most sentence-motifs are in fact divisible into four component parts, "each of which in its own right can vary." The dragon, for instance, is often replaced by a whirlwind, a devil, falcon or magician; abduction can be effected by vampirism or some other method resulting in disappearance; the daughter may become a sister, bride, wife or mother, and the tsar a prince, priest, or peasant (Propp 1928:12-13; cf. Bremond 1993:51).

Given these variables, Propp saw the need to isolate the stable elements in a narrative. He did so by maintaining that the function of a character is the stable, constant element in the tale, "independent of how and by whom it is fulfilled." Although "the actual means of the realization of functions can vary," he notes, "the function as such is a constant" (Propp 1928:21). Propp further observed that the sequence of functions in the Russian fairy tale is also constant (1928:22), and that although "all tales do not contain all functions, the absence of certain functions does not affect the sequence of the rest": "the number of functions is extremely small, whereas the number of personages is extremely large" (Propp 1928:20), a factor which explains "the two-fold quality of tale: its amazing multiformity, picturesqueness, and color; and on the other hand, its no less striking uniformity, its repetition" (Propp 1928:20-1).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> These two claims have generated the most criticism, much of which is based, I think, on misunderstandings (e.g. Nathhorst 1968:16-29; Lévi-Strauss 1960). Propp's claim about the limited number of functions is not important here, though he made it

Independently of Propp, Walter Arend, the father of Homeric type-scene scholarship, established the importance of sequence for the Homeric type-scene.<sup>5</sup> As to the "two-fold quality of the tale, its amazing multiformity, picturesqueness, and color; and...its no less striking uniformity [and] repetition," this has long been recognized as a defining characteristic of Homeric poetry, attributable to its origin in a pre-literate culture. Again, as Arend observed in reference to the Homeric type-scene:

All variation...preserves the fixed form. Such is the source of the peculiar and unique quality of Homeric art—the interplay between the fixed form and the various embellishments, between what is formally required and what arises serendipitously, between the typical and the particular, between repetition and variation.<sup>6</sup>

Propp's emphasis on the narrative function of a character, irrespective of his attributes, is his great contribution to narratology.<sup>7</sup>

---

only for the limited body of material he studied (Propp 1928:23-4), and primarily for the purposes of classification.

<sup>5</sup> A glance at his charts conveys this best (Arend 1933; see especially Plate 5, Chart 9, "Landung," with discussion on 79-81).

<sup>6</sup> "Alle Variation... hat die feste Form nicht aufgelöst. So entsteht das Eigenartige und Einzigartige der homerischen Kunst, der Wechsel von fester Form und verschiedener Ausschmückung, von Notwendigem und Zufälligem, von Typischem und Individuellem, von Wiederholung und Variation" (Arend 1933:27).

<sup>7</sup> Propp's many successors in the morphological approach to narrative have adapted his work to accommodate other modes of structuralist thought. Notable among these is A. J. Greimas, who took the concept of the binary opposition of phonemes developed in the work of Saussure and Jakobson and applied it to Propp's morphology with the result that Propp's seven general spheres of character action are resolved into three pairs of opposed "actants" (Greimas 1966:197-207; Hawkes 1977:87-95). At first sight this is a simplification of Propp, but Greimas' nuanced scheme adds more terminology than substance and is too complicated to be useful here. Moreover, as Propp himself realized (completely independently of Greimas' work), binarily opposed functions are performed by different characters in the story, and are fulfilled at different points in the narrative sequence, "Therefore, in the study of composition, that is, of the sequence of functions, reduction of the binary elements to a single one will not reveal the laws that

Given the clash of sign-systems in the Homeric Centos, the distinction between function and attribute is especially important. As we have seen already in Chapter II, the cento poet's use of grammatical accommodation (\*) often makes such attributes as the person, number and gender of a character a matter of indifference. A character's other attributes, too, though they be uncongenial to the corresponding biblical character's, are also often ignored, or seemingly so.

Consider the Centos' version of the Annunciation (202-268):

	καὶ πότε ἄγγελον ἦκεν, ὃς ἀγγεῖλειε γυναίκε	o 15.458 *
	βουλήν, ἣ ῥα τότε σφιν' ἐφήνδανε μητιώσιν.	i 7.45 †
	αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ· μέγα γάρ ῥα θεοῦ ὄτρυνεν ἐφετιμή,	i 21.299 *
205	ἀντία δεσποίνης φάσθαι καὶ ἕκαστα πυθέσθαι.	o 15.377
	καρπαλίμως δ' ἦιξεν ἐπὶ χθόνα πουλυβότειραν	i 11.118+619
	οὐρανόθεν καταβάς δι' αἰθέρος ἀτρυγέτιοι,	i 11.184+17.425
	νύμφη εὐπλοκάμφειπὶν νημερτέα βουλήν.	o 5.30
	βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἐς θάλαμον πολυδαίδαλον, φ' ἐνὶ κούρη	o 6.15
210	ἔζετ' ἐνὶ κλισίῳ ὑπὸ δὲ θρήνυς ποσὶν ἦεν,	o 4.136 †
	ἠλάκατα στρωφῶσ' ἀλιπόρφυρα, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι	o 6.306
	ἀδμήτη, τὴν οὐπω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἦγαγεν ἀνήρ.	i 10.293 *
	τήνδε τότε ἐν μεγάροισι πάτηρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ	i 9.561
	ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ ἔπορον· ὁ δέ μιν πρόφρων ὑπέδεκτο	i 14.504+9.480 *
215	οὔτ' εὐνήσιν πρόφασιν κεχημένος, οὔτε τευ ἄλλου,	i 19.262
	ἀλλ' ἔμεν' ἀπροτίμαστος ἐνὶ κλισίῃσιν ἐῆσιν,	i 19.263
	οὐ τι γάμου τόσσον κεχημένος οὐδὲ χατίζων,	o 22.50
	ἀλλ' ἄλλα φρονέων, τά οἱ οὐκ ἀτέλεστα γέγοντο'.	o 22.51 †
	ἦ τι οἰσάμενός γ' ἦ καὶ θεὸς ὡς ἐκελεύσει,	o 9.339
220	μή ποτε τῆς εὐνήσιν ἐπιβήμεναι ἠδὲ μιγῆναι	i 9.133
	ἦ θέμις ἀνθρώπων πέλει ἀνδρῶν ἠδὲ γυναιξῶν.	i 9.134
	δέσποιναν μὲν πρῶτα κιχήσατο ἐν μεγάροισι.	o 7.53 *

---

govern the development of the plot" (Propp 1966:75). Peradotto (1990:34-58) applies Claude Bremond's modification of Propp's method to the *Odyssey*, though I think he somewhat misrepresents Propp himself in the process.

	στη δ' αὐτῆς προπάροιθεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνομαζε	i 14.297
	κήρυξ πεισίνωρ, πεπνυμένα μῆδεα εἰδώς,	o 2.38
225	τυτθὸν φθεγξάμενος· τὴν δὲ τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα.	i 24.170 *
	"θάρσει ὧ γύναι χαρίεσσα, ἠ μηδέ τι τάρβει·	i 24.171 †
	νῦν ὄδ' ἐμέθεν ξύνες ὦκα· θεοῦ δέ τοι ἄγγελος εἰμί,	i 24.133 †
	ὄς κέν με προέηκε τείν τάδε μυθήσασθαι.	i 11.201 †
	χαῖρε μοι, ὦ βασίλεια, διαμπερές, εἰς ὃ κεν ἔλθοι'	o 13.59 †
230	ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ γυνοαξὶν ἐπὶ χθόνα πουλοβότειραν	o 19.408 †
	ἠγῆρας καὶ θάνατος, τά τ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισιν πέλονται.	o 13.60 †
	σὸν δ' ἦτοι κλέος ἔσται ὅσον τ' ἐπικίδνεται ἠὼς	i 7.458
	τοῖς οἷ νῦν γεγάασι καὶ οἷ μετόπισθεν ἔσονται.	o 24.84
	χαῖρε, γύναι χαρίεσσα· περιπλομένου δ' ἐνιαυτοῦ	o 11.148 †
235	ἐκφανεῖ ὄς πάντεσσι περικτιόνεσσιν ἀνάσσει	i 19.104 *
	τῶν ἀνδρῶν οἷ σῆς ἐξ αἵματος εἰσὶ γενέθλης.	i 19.111
	νημετερές γάρ τοι μυθήσομα, οὐδ' ἐπικεύσω,	o 19.269 *
	τοῦ δὴ ἠνὺν γε μέγιστον ὑπουράνιον κλέος ἐστὶ'	o 9.264 †
	πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, καὶ οἷ δόσις ἔσσεται ἐσθλή."	i 10.213
240	ὣς φάτο· τῆς δ' αὐτοῦ λῦτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ.	o 4.703
	ἠ δ' οὐτ' ἀθρήσασα δύνατ' ἀντίη, οὐτε νοῆσασα,	o 19.478
	καὶ ῥ' ἀκέουσα καθῆστο, ἐπιγνάμψασα φίλον κῆρ.	i 1.569
	τὴν δ' ἄμα χάρμα καὶ ἄλγος ἔλε φρένα, τῷ δέ οἷ ὄσσε	o 19.471
	δακρύοφιν πλῆσθεν, θαλερῆ δέ οἷ ἔσχατο φωνή.	o 4.705
245	ὀρθὰ δὲ τρίχες ἔσταν ἐνὶ γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσσιν.	i 24.359
	ὀψὲ δὲ δὴ μιν ἔπεσσιν ἀμειβομένη προσέειπεν,	o 4.706
	"ὦ φίλ' ἐπεὶ δὴ μοι καὶ ἀμείψασθαι θέμις ἐστὶ,	o 16.91 * †
	τίπτέ με κείνος ἄνωγε μέγας θεός; αἰδέομαι δὲ	i 24.90
	ἀδμήτη, ἦν οὐπω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἦγαγεν ἀνήρ.	i 10.293
250	ἀλλὰ τί κεν ῥέξαιμα; θεὸς διὰ πάντα τελευτᾷ,	i 19.90
	ὄππως κεν ἐθέλησιν· ὃ γὰρ κάρτιστος ἀπάντων.	i 20.243
	τοῦτο μὲν οὕτω δὴ ἔστω ἔπος ὡς εἶρηκας',	o 11.348 * †
	αὐτὰρ ἠμὲν νῦν μοι τόδε χῶεο μηδὲ νεμέσσα	o 23.213
	οὔνεκα σ' οὐ τὸ πρῶτον ἐπεὶ ἴδον ὦδ' ἀγάπησα.	o 23.214
255	αἰεὶ γάρ μοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν	o 23.215
	ἔρριγει, μὴ τις μὲ βροτῶν ἀπάφοιτ' ἐπέεσσιν	o 23.216
	ἔλθῶν. πολλοὶ γὰρ κακὰ κήδεα βουλευόνται."	o 23.217 †
	τῆνδ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη κήρυξ πεισίνωρ,	cf. o 2.38
	"καὶ δέ σοι ὦδ' αὐτῆ πολὺ κάλλιον ὦ βασίλεια,	o 17.583

260	οἷν πρὸς ξεῖνον φάσθαι ἔπος, ἡδ' ἑπακοῦσα. θάρσει 'μοι'· ἐπεὶ οὐ 'τι' ἄνευ θεοῦ ἦδέ γε βουλή. σίγα, καὶ κατὰ σὸν νόον ἴσχανε, μηδ' ἐρέεινε, ἀλλ' ἔχε σιγῇ μῦθον, ἐπίτρεπον δὲ 'θεῶ περ'.	o 17.584 o 2.372 † o 19.42 o 19.502 *
265	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν νέομαι, σὺ δὲ τέρπεο τῶδ' ἐνὶ 'χώρῳ'. εἶμι μὲν, οὐδ' ἄλιον ἔπος ἔσσεται ὅτι κεν εἶπη. ἀργαλέον, βασίλεια, διηνεκέως ἀγορευσα." αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πᾶσαν ἐφημοσύνην ἀπέειπε, χάλκεον οὐρανὸν ἴκε δι' αἰθέρος ἀτρυγέτοιο.	o 13.61 † i 24.92 o 7.241 o 16.340 * i 17.425

Eventually he sent a herald to inform the woman  
of the plan, since it pleased them who devised it.  
He went, for God's great authority moved him  
to speak before the queen and make several requests.  
He shot swiftly over the nourishing earth,  
descending from heaven through fallow air  
to tell the fair-haired bride about the sure plan.  
He entered an elaborate room—there was the girl,  
Sitting on a couch, a footstool supporting her feet  
as she spun yarn into thread, a wonder to see.  
She was unwed; a man had not brought her under his yoke;  
this girl once lived in the house of a noble mother and father;  
they had given her to a dear husband, who took her in good  
faith,  
neither using her for his bed, nor for anything else;  
she remained untouched, uncared in his tents.  
He did not enjoy the stuff of marriage, he had no desire to,  
For he had other things on his mind which for him did not go  
unfulfilled.  
Either it was his own idea, or God himself gave the command  
that he not make her mount that bed or mingle in love,  
though such is proper for human husbands and wives.  
The queen was the first person the herald met in the house.  
He stood before her, named her and spoke,  
Persuasive this herald, inspired with knowledge,  
Softly intoning. Nonetheless, fear seized her limbs.  
"Courage, woman of grace, do not be afraid.  
Hear me now: I am God's messenger  
He sent me to you to with the following message:  
'Hail to you queen, for all time, until there comes  
upon the women and men of the nourishing earth  
old age and death, which things are their lot.  
Indeed your fame will spread as far as dawn scatters its dew

on men living today and on those born tomorrow.  
 Hail, woman of grace! and when the time is come round  
 there will appear a man to rule those who dwell upon earth,  
 Over all men who are of your race and your blood.  
 What I will say is true. I shall not mislead you.  
 His fame now will be greatest of all under heaven;  
 he will be over all mankind, and noble his gift."

Those were his words, and her knees and heart sank.  
 She was unable to look at him straight, nor could she think,  
 but sat down in silence, bending her heart to his will.  
 Then pain mixed with joy snatched her breath away, and her  
 eyes

Flooded with tears, her lovely voice stuck in her throat;  
 the hair on her shapely arms stood on end,  
 and she answered him back with these words:

"Friend—since indeed it is right that I answer you back—  
 Why me? what is this that God the almighty commands? I am  
 shamefast,

Unwed; a man has not brought me under his yoke.  
 But what can I do? God brings all to completion  
 however he wants. For he is the strongest of all.  
 Let your word be as you say.

But do not be angry at me over this, nor find fault  
 Because I did not welcome you the instant I saw you.  
 For the spirit in my breast is always afraid  
 that some mortal man will come and seduce me with words.  
 As you know there are many men with evil intent."

In reply the persuasive herald addressed her:

"Surely, my queen, it is much better for you to speak  
 as you did with a stranger in private and to hear him out.  
 Courage! this plan is not without God's approval.  
 Quiet now, check your thoughts, ask no more questions,  
 Don't tell a soul, but turn your thoughts toward God.  
 As for me, I am going away. You enjoy yourself here.  
 I'm off. The story he tells is not meant to trick you.  
 Continual talk, queen, is difficult work."

And when he had conveyed the whole message,  
 he passed through fallow air to a heaven of bronze.

The Virgin Mary is equated in this scene—by means of direct quotation of Homeric lines (i.e. material intertextuality)—with a motley crew of Homeric characters. Among them are: a Sidonian slave girl (202), Kalypso (208), Nausicaa (209), Helen (210), Arete (211, 222, 229), Briseis (213, 220-221), Priam

(225-226, 245), Tyro (234), Penelope (240, 241, 243, 244, 246, 253-257, 259-260), Hera (242), Thetis (248) and Eurycleia (261, 262, 263).

Obviously, Mary has attributes in common with many of these characters, even where they do not consistently share the same attributes with one another. Like Nausicaa she is a young virgin; like Penelope and Arete a mother and queen (the latter through a theological development which by Eudocia's time was well established; Graef 1963:133-8 with Plate 2); like the Sidonian girl, Eurycleia and Briseis she is a servant (cf. Lk 1:38 and 48). But what of King Priam?

It could be argued that Mary shares with Priam, if not gender, the attribute of bereavement, for she, like him, loses a son to a violent, ignominious death. The assimilation of Mary and Priam at this early juncture of the narrative would then "foreshadow" the event described at Cento lines 2030ff., comprised largely of material drawn from *Iliad* Books 22 and 24, where Christ is represented as the dead and dying Hector. A detail from Eudocia's biblical theme may have suggested the comparison with Priam, for according to the Gospel of Luke Jesus's death is foreshadowed in his infancy in the Presentation in the Temple scene, where the prophet Simeon warns Mary that the boy will be "a sign that shall be spoken against," adding, in reference to her son's eventual death: "Yea, a sword will pierce through your own soul also" (Lk. 2:34). Such *intra*-Cento referentiality, if that is what this represents, is just one of the many intricacies of Cento intertextuality. But there is something much more basic at stake in this passage.



Stripped of all attributes, the biblical theme in the Annunciation scene consists of the reception of a visitor (the angel Gabriel sent by God). In the Homeric *langue* visitation is realized as a type-scene. Thus, although the Homeric lines Eudocia uses refer to distinct epic characters, they come to mind because all these lines are taken from Homeric type-scenes involving the arrival and reception of a stranger or herald (Arend 1933:28-63; Edwards 1992:304-6; 308-9; Reece 1992:5-46). Mary is equated with these several Homeric characters—just as the angel, the other *dramatis persona* in this episode, is equated with Hermes, Athena and other human heralds (lines 202, 204, 206, 207, 209, 224, 237 etc.)—because their function in their respective contexts in Homer corresponds to her function in the biblical story. The two narratives here are linked by structural intertextuality.

To begin to understand Cento intertextuality we must analyze Cento episodes, as Propp did for the Russian material, "by structural, interior features, and not by features which are external and changeable." This does not mean that external or attributive features are not important. Certainly the virginity of Nausicaa, the compassionate motherhood of Thetis, and the queenly stature of Penelope and Arete apply to Mary. Perhaps too the bereavement of Priam. These are attributes she possesses in Christian discourse. However, other characters in this scene possess attributes that generate ambiguities I cannot imagine the poet intended—but nonetheless demand resolution if we are to comprehend this poem in all its facets.

For example, in Homer, the Sidonian slave girl to whom Cento line 202 refers (in a tale told by Eumaeus) is seduced by a Phoenician trader, and makes love to him in the hollow of his ship (μίγη κοίλη παρὰ νηΐ, εὐνή καὶ φιλότητι). Her pleasure and complicity in this sexual encounter are perfectly *unambiguous*: τὰ τε φρένας ἠπεροπεύει / θηλυτέρησι γυναιξί (*Od.* 15.420-2).

Obviously, if attribute is the point of comparison here, it plays havoc with the Christian doctrine of the Virgin Birth, effectively undoing four-hundred years of Mariology, and implicitly turns God into a philandering Phoenician pirate. This case confirms Propp's view and our proposition that the Homeric characters' narrative *function* (in this case as receivers of guests) takes priority in the process of verse generation.

The semiotic impasse in line 202 is precipitated by the fact that, unavoidably, lines appropriated from Homer in the Homeric Centos always resonate with their original Homeric context, even if this is in conflict with the biblical or theological context. On the level of meaning as opposed to morphology—of *product* as opposed to *process*—such appropriation inevitably compromises the integrity of all parties involved, Homeric and biblical, leading to *Verfremdung*. And yet we also find many instances in the Centos where function and attribute seem to coincide; that is, a biblical character happens to share both narrative function and character attribute with his Homeric counterpart, as we saw in Mary's relationship in the Annunciation scene to e.g. Thetis and Nausicaa. Furthermore, many other Cento character assimilations based on attributes do not involve the damaging associations brought on by Homer's Sidonian slave girl; these

assimilations are based on something other than simple narrative function and must be taken into account. Cento line 242, where Mary reacts to God's plan as Hera does to the βουλή of Zeus in *Iliad* 1.569, provides a good example.

The Homeric context of this line does not involve the herald-theme as do most of the lines in the Annunciation, but the line *does* capture Mary's biblical response to the events surrounding the birth of Jesus with Homeric imagination. In Luke's Gospel Mary "kept all the things the angel told her and pondered them in her heart" (πάντα συνετήρει τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα συμβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς Lk 2:19); whereas Hera, rebuked in front of all the gods by Zeus, "took her seat in silence, bending her heart to his will" (καί ῥ' ἀκέουσα καθῆστο, ἐπιγνάμψασα φίλον κῆρ). Read in light of Homer there is slight V-Effekt in the appropriation of this line, which suggests that the Centos' Mary is not unequivocally St. Luke's obedient "handmaid of the Lord," but also, like Homer's Hera, the recalcitrant bride of an Almighty. The scenes, however, *are* linked—not by function, but by the attributive word/idea "heart" (Homer ἐπιγναμψασα κῆρ; Luke συμβάλλουσα ἐν καρδίᾳ). Both characters' hearts figure prominently in their response to divine injunction.

Clearly, then, both function *and* attribute—in that order—are important in the generation and appreciation of Homeric Cento verse. Whether there is a satisfying congruence or a startling discrepancy, characters' attributes nuance every Cento episode. They are, as it were, adjectival elements in the narrative syntax; as such they are telling of the reader's aesthetic response to both texts, and cannot be neglected.

The logic of Eudocia's handling of character attribute in the intertextual ties between biblical themes and Homeric signs is, we have said, particularly susceptible to semiotic analysis. The semiotic model of thought propounded by C. S. Peirce provides the basic tools and terminology for understanding such relationships. I give only the necessary details here.<sup>8</sup>

Peirce saw all thought as a semiotic process involving three essential elements: an *object*, a *sign*, and an *interpretant*. In the processes of thought and signification a sign always stands for something (an object) to something else (its interpretant) (Peirce 1955:99). To apply Peirce's model to the Centos (speaking in the broadest terms) the *object* is the biblical, or biblically-derived theme or themes, the *sign* is the Homeric verse or verses used to convey it, and the *interpretant* is the poet, or to put it more abstractly, a "second thought" which interprets a first thought initiated by the sign. This abstract notion of the interpretant is preferable to simply equating it with the poet since, as Peirce is careful to point out, "throughout this process, *introspection* is not resorted to. Nothing is assumed respecting the subjective elements of consciousness which cannot be securely inferred from the objective elements" (Peirce 1867:26). For our analysis of Cento intertextuality as a generative system the interpretant is the most important element of the semiotic triad. How it mediates between sign and object is of primary concern.

---

<sup>8</sup> For a summary of Peirce's thought, terminology and relationship to other semiotic systems see Nöth 1990:39-47; 115-21, with ample bibliography, and recently Deledalle 1995.

In making comparisons (as between a Homeric and biblical character or episode) the interpretant, according to Peirce, "cannot comprehend an agreement of two things, except as an agreement in some respect" (Peirce 1867:27). The respect in which two things are related by the interpretant is called by Peirce its *ground*. Of the three types of ground identified by Peirce two are relevant to our analysis here: the *iconic* and the *symbolic* grounds.

In iconic relations object and sign participate in some quality or characteristic. Icons are in some way like their objects—representationally, like a painting; relationally, as a diagram or algebraic equation is to a logical or mathematical proposition; or analogically, as is the case when "I surmise that zebras are likely to be obstinate, or otherwise disagreeable animals, because they seem to have a general resemblance to donkeys, and donkeys are self-willed" (Peirce 1955:106).

In symbolic relations, unlike iconic relations, "the sign would lose the character which renders it a sign if there were no interpretant. Such is any utterance of speech which signifies what it does only by virtue of its being understood to have that signification." In other words, a symbol is "a conventional sign, or one depending upon habit (acquired or inborn)" (Peirce 1955:104; 113). In Cento intertextuality a symbol's full significance, unlike an iconic sign, demands that we import information from outside of the two texts or passages at hand; the symbolic relationship between sign and object is conventional or (less accurately) arbitrary, and at the level of meaning, is independent of shared qualities or characteristics.

From the "objective elements" of the signifying process, by which I mean (1) the morphological relationships between biblical and Homeric themes, and (2) the iconic and symbolic grounds that connect particular characters or events, we can identify with some confidence the one or more interpretants behind any instance of Cento intertextuality. I think we can even distinguish between the interpretant that was foremost "in Eudocia's mind," and the interpretant that may be present in the thoughts of a third-party reader. Of course it is not impossible that both thoughts occurred to the poet herself, one in composition and one, as it were, as an afterthought, and I would like to keep that possibility in play throughout this discussion. In either case, it is important to emphasize here that, as an object of analysis, Peirce's interpretant, or "second thought," yields information about *signification*. An author's intention is of course embedded in this process, but need not be invoked in our analysis. I offer the customary apologies now if in what follows I occasionally attribute a particular meaning to "Eudocia."

\*

In 1697 Marius D'Assigny, an English clergyman and scholar of French Huguenot extraction, published a short treatise for aspiring preachers entitled *The Art of Memory*.<sup>9</sup> In it he offers six "Rules to be

---

<sup>9</sup> Much of D'Assigny's work is an abridgement of Gulielmus Gratarolus' *De Memoria Reparanda* (1553) (DePorte 1985:v). Francis Yates, in her work on artificial memory systems in the Middle Ages and Renaissance (1966), cites neither study. On

observed to help our Remembrance of things that we desire to preserve in Mind." D'Assigny's Rules epitomize Propp's morphology and Peirce's semiotic with an elegance the latter both lack. To the extent that the cento is connected to the art of declamation, especially in the need to internalize the laws of a generative system, I think these Rules convey something of the cognitive and aesthetic dynamics involved in Cento composition. Trusting the reader to the heuristic power of conceits, I offer D'Assigny's mnemonic Rules here, prefatory to the following chapters, for I believe they show a keen awareness of character attribute and character function as separate, but related grounds for intertextuality, Cento or otherwise. The Rules are (D'Assigny 1697:78-80):

(1) Mind the Order in which those things were first entered into our Memories; for things that precede will oblige us to think upon those that followed and the Consequences of things will refresh in our Fancies that which went before. It becomes us therefore to record them in order with a Connexion and a mutual Dependence.

(2) For the better remembering of things, we ought to compare them with those things with which we are familiar or best acquainted, and that have a Resemblance with them, either in Syllables, in Quantity, in Office, Employment &c. for this Similitude will certainly imprint the Thing or Person so in our Mind.

(3) We may imprint in our Minds, and fix Things in Memory, by thinking upon their Contraries or Opposites; and we may by the same means better remember Things that are almost blotted out of our Imagination. For Example, he that remembers an *Hector*, cannot forget *Achilles*; he that thinks upon a *Goliah*, will also mind a *David*.

(4) If we desire to mind Things of Importance, we ought to

---

ancient and medieval mnemonics generally see Carruthers 1990.

imprint all the Circumstances in our Memories of Time, Place, Persons, Causes, &c. because these Circumstances being always in our Fancy, will also keep there the things that we intend to preserve from Oblivion.

(5) We may think upon Things, and remember them by their Properties, and Qualifications. For Example; if we desire to remember a gross and fat Man, we may think upon King Dionysius, of whom an Author tells us, that he grew so fat that he could scarce see, and that at last his Eyes were closed up with Fat.

(6) If we desire to remember any thing, let us mind that Circumstance that is belonging to it, most admirable, remarkable, or sutable [sic] to our Genius, Temper, or Interest; for this will fix it in our Memories in such a manner that it will not easily be forgotten.

D'Assigny's Rule 1 may be understood as Propp's rule of sequence, Rule 4 as that of morphological function. Rules 2, 3 and 5 represent three varieties of Peirce's iconic ground.<sup>10</sup> Rules 3 and 5 are a binarily opposed pair.<sup>11</sup> Rule 5 makes a positive comparison. Rule 3 is dependent on Rule 5 in so far as it presupposes that an identity or assimilation has already been

---

<sup>10</sup> In choosing which Homeric lines to use to express her biblical themes Eudocia is always motivated by an icon. As Peirce himself observed, "Anything whatever, be it quality, existent individual, or law, is an Icon of anything in so far as it is like that thing and used as a sign of it" (Peirce 1955:102). Thus, the Proppian Rules of function and sequence (1 and 4) are iconic to the extent that intertextuality based on either Rule is based on a perceived similarity between texts or stories at the level of narrative structure. Symbolic relationships between biblical theme and Homeric sign (Rule 6) are intelligibile primarily because symbols themselves participate in iconicity. The capaciousness of the icon has prompted some, particularly Eco, to criticise its utility. The problem is stated well by W. J. T. Mitchell: "Everything in the world is similar to everything else in some respects, if we look hard enough" (Mitchell 1986:56-7). In using D'Assigny's Rules I have intentionally limited the application of the term icon here.

<sup>11</sup> Peirce himself recognized that iconic similarity between object and sign requires that iconic difference or contrast be a ground for an interpretant as well: "if a drunken man is exhibited in order to show, by contrast, the excellence of temperance, this is certainly an icon, but whether it is a likeness or not may be doubted" (Peirce 1955:107).



established (based on Rule 5), which, once remembered, sets off contrasting associations of character and/or quality. This is what the words "Contraries" and "Opposites" in D'Assigny's seventeenth-century English mean, as his example shows. "He that remembers an *Hector*, cannot forget Achilles:" only one sign needs to be present in order to evoke the other. In Cento intertextuality the antagonist of Rule 3—not necessarily an adversary—is present *in absentia* via the Homeric context of a given line or passage.

Rule 2 I take to refer to the linguistic devices discussed in the previous chapters which help the poet link one line to another; this Rule also applies to verbal or semantic resemblances between Homeric and biblical signs (as opposed to codes). These iconic devices, for example the κῆρ-καρδίη connection between Mary and Hera in the Annunciation scene, also serve as mnemonic aids in the generation of the verse.

Rule 6, which I relate to Peirce's symbolic ground, is by definition the most subjective of the six criteria ("sutable to [one's] own Genius, Temper, or Interest"), and consequently the most fascinating, yet difficult, of the criteria to apply in our analysis, for it often involves a gross misreading of the Homeric (and biblical) text. However, assimilations based on this ground can and will be explained and defended with reference to late antique discourse and culture at large, for "Interpretants are the testable and describable correspondents associated by public agreement to another sign" (Eco 1976:1471). Aware that "public agreement" is difficult to establish, for any period of history, I have (proportionate to my knowledge of

the period) offered as evidence only what strikes me as uncontroversial in late antique Christian doctrine and belief, privileging pertinent information culled from canonical texts and Christian sermons.

## CHAPTER V

### "COMPOSITION BY THEME"

Οὔτε γὰρ μέτρον οὔτε τρόπος οὔτε λέξεως ὄγκος οὔτ' εὐκαιρία μεταφορᾶς οὔθ'  
ἀρμονία καὶ σύνθεσις ἔχει τοσοῦτον αἰμιλίας καὶ χάριτος ὅσον εὖ πεπλεγμένη διάθεσις  
μυθολογίας.

—Plutarch *How to Study Poetry* (Mor. 16 B)

The tale's the thing.

—A. B. Lord

Having established a generative and aesthetic model that can account for the intertextual role of both function and attribute, let us look closely at some particular realizations of composition by theme in the Centos. In order to give the reader maximum exposure to this unfamiliar poem and the many issues at stake in its interpretation and appreciation my analysis is divided over three chapters.

This chapter contains an introductory discussion of the character, scope, and techniques of composition by theme in the Centos, and its basis in Homer. In Chapter VI I discuss Eudocia's realization of the Homeric hospitality type-scene, a theme particularly associated with the *Odyssey*. In Chapter VII I turn my attention to the realization of themes typical of the *Iliad* through an analysis of Eudocia's use of Homeric similes. This is not

an exhaustive treatment. I have sought to provide enough evidence, however, to illustrate most aspects of Cento intertextuality and the general utility of my approach. Every episode in the Homeric Centos deserves the close attention I give select passages in Chapters VI and VII. I would be gratified if my efforts here reveal the need for further research on this amazing poem and spur the reader on to seek greater clarification.

Because of the nature of Cento intertextuality and the interdependence of form and content in a generative system, it is difficult to discuss structural elements and compositional techniques without calling attention to the iconic and symbolic grounds upon which the realization of those elements are simultaneously based. All of D'Assigny's Rules, in other words, work together toward the realization of a Cento episode, even if one Rule is dominant in a given assimilation. Moreover, as we have seen, Homeric characters may share both function and attribute with their biblical counterpart. Conscious of this, I nevertheless confine my remarks here to observations relating to the Proppian rules of sequence and function, and to the intertextual law of verbal resemblance (D'Assigny's Rules 1, 2 and 4). The semiotics of Cento intertextuality come into full play in the next two chapters.

The Feeding of the Five Thousand episode (1153-1227) illustrates several features characteristic of Eudocia's handling of themes and type-scenes. Morphologically, this biblical scene is realized as a combination of an Homeric assembly and meal type-scene. The basic narrative sequence in the Gospels is (*a*) a great crowd gathers on the shore where Jesus and

the disciples have landed (Mk. 6:30-34); (b) Jesus teaches them (v. 34), (c) performs the miracle with loaves and fishes (vv. 35-44), and (d) dismisses the crowd (v. 45). The same basic sequence applies to the doublet of this scene at Mark 8:1-10, and in the other Gospel accounts as well (Mt. 14:13-21; Lk. 9:10-17; Jn. 6:1-13)—an example of structural intertextuality among the Gospels.

Items (a), (b) and (d) correspond to the Homeric assembly scene; item (c) to the meal scene. As realized in the *Centos*, the sequence of elements in each section corresponds to the proper Homeric sequence. For the assembly scene this is *assembly* (1153-1174), *speech* (1176-1204), *dismissal* (1222-1223); for the meal: *preparation*, including prayer and hand-washing (1211-1216), *consumption* of food and drink (1217-1221), *satiety* (1226-1227) and after-dinner *entertainment* (1224) (Edwards 1992:311).

Eudocia's duplication of narrative function and sequence here preserves conventions of the Homeric type-scene even when this introduces elements not present in the Gospels. Jesus' speech, for example, mentioned only in passing in the Gospels, is a major intrusion, added no doubt because no Homeric assembly scene is complete without one. In the meal preparation, which begins with a shorter version of an assembly scene (1206-1209), elements such as hand-washing (1216), the mention of beverages (1220) and a dance-propitiation of the god (1224 = *Il.* 1.472) are intruded for the same reasons.

Eudocia's realization of the Wedding at Cana episode as a feast type-scene goes equally far beyond the biblical details. Lines from Homeric feast-

scenes at Ithaca, Pylos, Sparta, Scheria, and from the description of Achilles' shield dominate the scene. Eudocia "reads into" the biblical passage full contingents of dancing *κοῦροι* and *νύμφαι*, bachelors and maidens (582), a minstrel (548-549), acrobats (580), and large-scale animal sacrifices (550-551; 556-559), none of which is present in the Gospel, each of which is attributable to the pressure exerted by the conventions of the Homeric type-scene. One senses that conventional elements of contemporary wedding feasts are also intruding themselves.

Several structural features in the assembly portion of the Feeding episode call for comment (1153-1174):

	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἐκίχανε πολὺν καθ' ὄμιλον ὀπάζων,	i 5.334
	βῆ ῥ' ἄν ὁδὸν μεμαώς. τὸν δ' ἐφράσατο προσίοντα	i 10.339
1155	πληθὺς ὡς ὅποτε 'Ζέφυρος νέφεα' στυφελίξῃ,	i 11.305 @
	ὄσσαι ἀριστήων ἄλοχοι ἔσαν ἠδὲ θύγατρεις,	o 11.227
	νύμφαι τ' ἠΐθεοί τε πολύτλητοί τε γέροντες	o 11.38
	χολοί τε ῥυσσοί τε παραβλώπεις τ' ὀφθαλμῶν.	i 9.503
	ἀλλ' οὐ πῶ τοιόνδε τοσόνδε τε λαὸν ὄπωπα.	i 2.799
1160	λίην γὰρ φύλλοισιν εἰοικότες ἢ ψαμάθοισιν,	i 2.800
	ἠϊόνος προπάροιθε βαθείης ἐστιχόωντο	i 2.92
	ἠχῆ, ὡς ὅτε κύμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης	i 2.209
	αἰγιαλῷ μεγάλῳ βρέμεται, σμαραγεῖ δέ τε πόντος.	i 2.210
	οὐτ' ἄρ πάντων ἦεν ὁμῶς θρόος, οὐδ' ἴα γῆρυς,	i 4.437
1165	ἀλλὰ γλῶσσα μέμικτο· πολύκλητοι δ' ἔσαν ἄνδρες,	i 4.438
	τῶν δ' ἄλλων τίς κεν ἦσι φρεσὶν οὐνόματ' εἶπη;	i 17.260 * †
	ὡς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ μέγα στεναχίζετο γαῖα	i 2.784
	ἐρχομένων, μάλα δ' ὄκα διέπρησσον πεδίοιο,	i 2.785
	ἠύτε ἔθνεα εἶσι μελισσάων ἀδινάων	i 2.87
1170	πέτρης ἐκ γλαφυρῆς αἰεὶ νέον ἐρχομενάων·	i 2.88
	βοτρυδὸν τε πέτονται ἐπ' ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσιν,	i 2.89
	αἱ μὲν τ' ἔνθα ἄλις πεποτήγεται, αἱ δέ τε ἔνθα,	i 2.90
	ὡς τῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων	i 2.91

ἤϊόνος προπάροιθε βαθείης ἐστὶ χόωντο.

i 2.92

And when he reached the crowd, leading them in train,  
he eagerly took to the road. As he approached, the mob  
pointed him out; as when Zephyros pummels the clouds,  
that's how many people there were: the wives and daughters  
of nobles,

bachelors, maidens, old experienced men,  
the lame, the shrivelled, the blind.

To this day I have not seen an army of people of that size or  
type.

Like so many leaves, or as the sands  
facing the widening shore they fell into line.

And the noise of it was as when the waves of the sonorous sea  
roar against the vast strand and the waters crash.

Everyone's language was not the same; they were not of  
identical speech,

but tongues were confused, for they were called from many a  
land.

Who with all his heart could mention the names of the rest?

Oh, how the earth groaned under their feet

as they advanced, and made their way swiftly over the plain:

they travel like tribes of swarming bees

darting constantly out from the crevices found in a rock,

in clusters they hover over spring flowers,

in a group some fly persistently here, and some there—

just so those tribes piled out from the cabins and ships, and

facing the widening shore, they fell into line.

The considerable V-Effekt of this passage aside, notice how Eudocia frames her type-scene here by repeating line 1161 (= *Il.* 2.92) at 1174. Such framing techniques occur frequently in the Centos. In Christ's conversation with the blind man, for example, line 887 (= *Od.* 13.332) is repeated at 898 to close one thought before the speaker moves on to another. A more pervasive framing technique, however, is the intercalation of thematically related material. Eudocia frequently takes a line or a block of lines from one place in Homer, continues with another line or lines from

somewhere else, and then returns to the Homeric passage with which she began. Among dozens of examples of this Cento phenomenon compare

(1) 538-543 (= *Il.* 18.492-3 + *Od.* 23.147 + 146 + *Il.* 18.494-5):

	νύμφας δ' ἐκ θαλάμων, δαΐδων ὑπο λαμπομενάων,	i 18.492
	ἠγίνεον ἀνά ἄστῳ, πολὺς δὲ ὕμναιος ὀρώρει.	i 18.493
540	ἀνδρῶν παιζόντων καλλιζώνων τε γυναικῶν	o 23.147
	τοῖσιν δὲ μέγα δῶμα περιστεναχίζετο ποσσὶ.	o 23.146
	κοῦροι δ' ὀρχηστήρες ἐδίνεον, ἐν δ' ἄρα τοῖσιν	i 18.494
	αὐλοὶ φορμίγγες τε βοήν ἔχον· αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες	i 18.495

(2) 331-337 (= *Il.* 5.406-8 + two miscellaneous lines + *Il.* 5.687-8):

	νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδε κατὰ φρένα 'καὶ κατὰ θυμόν',	i 5.406 †
	ὄττι μάλ' οὐ δηναῖος ὄς 'ἀθανάτω γε' μάχοιτο,	i 5.407 * †
	οὐδέ τί μιν παῖδες ποτὶ γούνασι παππάζουσι.	i 5.408
	τοῦ δὲ γυναικὸς μὲν ἀμφίδρυφοὶ εἰσὶ παρειαί.	i 11.393
335	'οὐδὲ γάρ' οὐδέ ἐ φημί πόδεσσί τε οἴσι κίοντα,	i 17.27 †
	νοστήσαντ' οἶκόν δε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,	i 5.687
	εὐφρανέειν ἄλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νήπια τέκνα,	i 5.688

(3) 500-506 (= *Od.* 19.332-4 + 329 + *Il.* 512 + *Od.* 19.330-1):

500	ὄς 'μὲν' ἀμύμων αὐτὸς ἔη, καὶ ἀμύμονα εἶδη,	o 19.332 †
	τοῦ μὲν τε κλέος εὐρὺ διὰ ξεῖνοι φορέουσι	o 19.333
	πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους. πολλοὶ τε μιν ἐσθλὸν ἔειπον.	o 19.334
	ὄς 'δ' ἀπηνῆς αὐτὸς ἔη καὶ ἀπηνέα εἶδη	o 19.329 †
	τῷ ἄτην ἄμ' ἔπεσθα, ἵνα βλαφθεῖς ἀποτίση.	i 9.512
505	τῷ δε καταρῶνται πάντες βροτοὶ ἄλγε' ὀπίσσω	o 19.330
	ζωῶ, ἀτὰρ τεθνεῶσσι γ' ἐφειλόωνται ἅπαντες.	o 19.331

Lines 1154-1159 of the Feeding scene also serve as an excellent example of how theme-based repetition within the Centos combines with



semantic trigger to help Eudocia with enjambement: at line 741 the first word of the Homeric reading, *μύριοι*, is changed by Eudocia to *πληθὺς* in the line '*πληθὺς*,' ὅσσά τε φύλλα καὶ ἄνθεα γίνεται ὥρη (*Il.* 2.468); at 1155 a different line beginning with *πληθὺς* without accommodation (*Il.* 11.305) is bound to the same line, *Il.* 10.339, in a similar context. Contrast line 1268 where *Il.* 2.468, referring to the crowd that has gathered to watch the raising of Lazarus, is repeated unchanged (bound to *Il.* 12.251). As is the case with Homer, realizing the same scene several times in the poem/performance produces slight variations in organization and diction (cf. Edwards 1991:13).

The Feeding episode further shows how within the Centos themselves Eudocia repeats lines in similar contexts. The cluster of lines at 1154-1159, and line 1179, for example, are repeated from 740-744, which describe a different crowd gathered to witness the Healing of the Centurion's Daughter (728-816). Many of these same lines, or formula lines close to them thematically, also occur in the description of the crowd following Jesus at the beginning of his ministry (512-527). All told, ninety-nine (99) out of one-thousand two-hundred and twenty-three (1223) whole-lines from the *Odyssey* and eighty-seven (87) of one-thousand and seventy (1070) from the *Iliad*, roughly ten percent (10%), are repeated one or more times elsewhere in the Centos. Many such lines are taken from Homeric type-scenes. Most of the repeated lines not from type-scenes are gnomic or, as noted in Chapter II, periphrases for biblical characters' names, or one-line formulas introducing speeches.

Here are some typical examples of intra-Cento repetition: suppliants

in two different healing scenes use the line *εἰ μὲν δὴ θεὸς ἔσσι θεοῖό τ' ἔκλυες αὐδῆς* (*Od.* 4.831 at 704 and 860) in their address to Jesus, both expressing their initial doubts about his divine status. At 1894 the same line is spoken by the mocking thief on the cross; at 1946 by a heckling bystander, both at the Crucifixion scene. Similarly, *Od.* 21.327—*ἄλλος δ' αὐτὶς πτωχὸς ἀνὴρ ἀλαλημένος ἐλθὼν*—is repeated at 852 and 924, both in healing scenes introducing a cripple. *Odyssey* 7.135—*καρκαλίμως ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἐβήσετο δώματος εἴσω*—is used three times to describe a character entering a house (534, 775, 1301); *Odyssey* 8.16—*καρκαλίμως δ' ἔπληντο βροτῶν ἀγοραὶ τε καὶ ἔδραι*—describes a gathering crowd at 374, 1146, and 1206. *Iliad* 15.369—*χεῖρας ἀνίσχοντες μεγάλ' εὐχετόωντο ἕκαστος*—is used in prayer scenes at 694 and 942. And, a final example, *Il.* 17.466—*οὔδαι ἐνισκίμπαντε καρῆατα· δάκρυα δέ σφι* (the line describing the weeping horses of Achilles)—is used of the Samaritan woman's penitent supplication (1072), and of two disciples mourning over the body of Jesus (2103).<sup>1</sup>

Such repetition is strong evidence that Eudocia, taking her cue from Homer, was actually *composing* by theme, that is, that she was re-using lines in typical scenes under similar narrative conditions. However, such thematic economy is not limited to the verbatim repetition of Homeric verses. Another help in verse-generation is the use of thematic key-words, which serve to link related material in the poet's mind as she scans the

---

<sup>1</sup> For other repetitions involving type-scene or related formula lines compare, from the *Odyssey*: 5.450 (842, 1246), 8.551 (517, 1099), 10.105 (39, 1052), 17.343 (1211, 1387), 23.20 (1904, 1949), 24.320 (437, 1665), 24.441 (1283, 1747); from the *Iliad*: 7.108 (668, 2303).

axis of selection. This is one of Eudocia's favorite tricks.<sup>2</sup>

Marcel Jousse, an early and careful observer of the "mnemotechnics" of the oral style, recognized that "the prior knowledge of just one single word of an oral recitative has [the] power to conjure up an entire block" for the performing poet or cantor (Jousse 1925:211-25). With copious examples, many drawn from Homer and the biblical and rabbinic traditions, Jousse demonstrated that such words can appear anywhere in a stich or strophe. In the Centos we find combinations of key-words at the beginning-, middle- and end-line positions, as in the Visit of the Magi episode, a gift-giving scene, where the key-words are δῶρα and δεξάμεν-:

	<u>δεξάμενοι</u> δ' ἄρα παῖδες ἀμύμονες ἄγνωτόκοιο	o 8.419 †
295	<u>δῶρα</u> , τά οἱ φέρον ἀστέρα δερκόμενοι ἀντολίηθεν, μητρὶ παρ' ἀδοίῃ ἔθεσαν περικαλλέα <u>δῶρα</u> .	o 8.418 o 8.420
	τέρπετο δ' ἐν χείρεσσιν ἔχουσα περ' ἀγλαὰ <u>δῶρα</u> μήτηρ, ἣ μιν ἔτικτε καὶ ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἐόντα	i 19.18 * † o 23.325 *
	χρυσοῦ δοιὰ τάλαντα· φύλασσε δὲ ταῦτ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ	o 4.526 †
300	<u>δεξαμένη</u> , καὶ πάντα ἐφ' θήησατο θυμῷ.	o 15.132

Similarly, a vignette from the Wedding at Cana episode is replete with lines containing the words δαν- /δατ- taken from Homeric feast and sacrifice scenes:

---

<sup>2</sup> The use of key-words to link related material is a compositional technique also used in *catena* commentaries, a literary form originating in late antiquity and probably invented by Eudocia's near contemporary and fellow Homer enthusiast, Procopius of Gaza (Wilson 1983:32-3). Japanese renga poetry of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries operates on similar principles, where a given stanza is linked semantically to the preceding and successive stanza (Miner 1979:ix). Key-word techniques are characteristic of the troubadours' *sestina* form as well (Preminger and Brogan 1993:1146-7).

	<u>δαίνυτ'</u> · οὐδέ τι θυμός ἐδεύετο <u>δαίτος</u> εἴσης.	i 1.468 *
	<u>δαιτυμόνες</u> δ' ἀνά δάματ' ἀκούζοντες αἰοιδῶν,	o 9.7 *
	πίνοντες καὶ ἔδοντες ἐπηετανὸν γὰρ ἔχεσκον	o 7.99
575	<u>δαίνυνθ</u> ἐζόμενοι· ἐπὰ δ' ἀνέρες ἐσθλοὶ ὄροντο	o 3.471
	οἶνον οἰνοχοεῦντες ἐνὶ χρυσεῖσις δεπάεσσιν.	o 3.472
	ὥς οἱ μὲν <u>δαίνυντο</u> καθ' ὑπερεφές μέγα δῶμα.	o 4.15

Compare further this string of lines linked by the words παιδ- and τέκνον at 2042-2058:

	ἐκπάγλως γὰρ <u>παιδός</u> ὀδύρετο οἰχομένοιο.	o 15.355 *
	ὄξυ δὲ κωκύσασα κάρη λάβε <u>παιδός</u> ἐοῖο.	i 18.71
2045	ἀμβρόσια δ' ἄρα χαῖται ἐπερράσαντο ἀνακτος.	i 1.529
	τὴν δὲ κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἐρεβεννὴ νύξ ἐκάλυπεν.	i 22.466
	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἄμπνυτο, καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμός ἀγέρθη,	o 5.458
	καὶ ῥ' ὀλοφυρομένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα,	i 18.72
	" <u>τέκνον</u> ἐμόν, πῶς ἦλθες ὑπὸ ζόφον ἠερόεντα	o 11.155
2050	ζωὸς ἐών; χαλεπὸν δὲ τόδε ζωῖσιν ὀράσθαι.	o 11.156
	οἴμοι <u>τέκνον</u> ἐμόν, πέρι πάντων κάμμορε φωτῶν,	o 11.157
	πῶς ἂν ἔπειτ' ἄπο σεῖο, φίλον <u>τέκος</u> , αὐθι λιποίμην;	i 9.437
	πῆ γὰρ ἐγώ, φίλε <u>τέκνον</u> , ἴω; τεῦ δάμαθ' ἴκαμαι;	o 15.509
	πῶς ἔτλης Ἄϊδόσδε κατελθέμεν, ἐνθά τε νεκροί;"	o 11.475
2055	ἀμφὶ δὲ <u>παιδί</u> φίλω βάλε πῆγχε δάκρυ χέουσα·	o 17.38 †
	κύσσε δὲ μιν κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλὰ,	o 17.39
	χεῖρας τ' ἀμφοτέρας· θαλερόν δέ οἱ ἔκπεσε δάκρυ.	o 16.16
	" <u>τέκνον</u> · ἐμοί γε μάλιστα λελείπεται ἄλγεα λυγρὰ	i 24.742 †

The Woman with a Flow of Blood scene (993-1029) is organized around lines containing the key-words ἔλκος and αἷμα:

	ἦτις τοι νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμέρας συνεχὲς αἰεὶ	cf. o 9.74
	θυμὸν ἀποπνείουσ', ὥς τε σκάλῃς ἐπὶ γαίῃ	i 13.654 *
	κεῖτο ταθεῖσ'· ἐκ δ' <u>αἷμα</u> μέλαν ῥέε, δεῦε δὲ γαῖαν.	i 13.655 *

1000	εἰρώτα δὴ ἔπειτα τίς εἶη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι· ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ γίγνωσκε θεοῦ γόνον ἔγγυς ἑόντα καρπαλίμως· ὁ δὲ ἔπειτα μετ' ἵχνια βαῖνε θεοῖο. δάκρυα δ' ἔκβαλε θερμά, ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυδνὸν ἔειπε "κέκλυθι νῦν καὶ ἐμεῖο· μάλιστα γὰρ ἄλγος ἰκάνει.	o 15.423 i 6.191 † o 2.406 o 19.362 i 3.97 *
1005	οὐ γὰρ πω μύσαν ὄσσε ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἐμοῖσιν, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ στενάχω καὶ κήδεα μυρία πέσσω κρήνον νῦν καὶ ἐμοὶ ἔπος δειλῆ', ὅτι κεν εἶπω. ἔλκος μὲν γὰρ ἔχω τόδε καρτερόν, οὐδέ μοι αἶμα τέρσεται, ἀλλὰ μάλ' ὄκα κατειβόμενον κελαρύζει.	i 24.637 † i 24.639 o 20.115 † i 16.517 + 518 i 21.261 †
1010	πολλοῖσιν δ' ἄρ' ἐγὼ δὴ ὀδυσσαμένη τόδ' ἰκάνω ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ γυναῖξιν ἀνὰ χθόνα βωπιάνειραν'. ὥς μ' ὄφελ' ἦματι τῷ ὅτε με πρῶτον τέκε μήτηρ, εἰς ὄρος ἢ εἰς κύμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης οἴχεσθαι προφέρουσα κακὴ ἀνέμοιο θύελλα.	o 19.407 † @ o 19.408 @ i 6.345 i 6.347 i 6.346
1015	ἔνθά με κῦμ' ἀπώερσε πάρος τάδε ἔργα γενέσθαι. ἔλκος δ' ἰητῆρ ἐπιμάσσεται, ἠδὲ τίθησι' φάρμαχ' ἅ κεν παύσησι μελανάων ὀδυνάων. πολλάκις ἐν μεγάροισι καθημένη ἡμετέροισιν, ἄλλοτε μὲν τε γόφ φρένα τέρπομαι, ἄλλοτε δ' αὐτε	i 6.348 i 4.190 † i 4.191 o 4.101 * o 4.102
1020	παύομαι· αἰψηρὸς δὲ κόρος κρυεροῖο γόοιο. ἀλλὰ σὺ πέρ μοι, ἄναξ, τόδε καρτερόν ἔλκος ἄκεσσα. ἔρξον ὅπως ἐθέλεις· ἰκέτης δέ σοι εὐχομαι εἶναι. ὥς σε, ἄναξ', ἄγαμαί τε τέθηπά τε δεῖδιά τ' αἰνώως γούνων ἄψασθα· χαλεπὸν δέ με πένθος ἰκάνει."	o 4.103 i 16.523 o 16.67 * o 6.168 † o 6.169
1025	αὐτῷ δ' οὐ πω φαίνεται ἐναντίη· αἶδετο γὰρ ῥα· χειρὶ δὲ νεκταρέου ἑανοῦ ἐτίναξε λαβοῦσα. αὐτίκα παῦσ' ὀδύνας, ἀπὸ δ' ἔλκος ἀργαλέοιο αἶμα μέλαν τέρσηνε, μένος δέ οἱ ἔμβαλε θυμῷ.	o 6.329 i 3.385 i 16.528 i 16.529

Finally, consider this clever concatenation of lines which describe the healing of the lame man with a withered hand; "feet," "hands," and "knees" are made suddenly strong as the cripple gambols off like a colt:

	κλύθι ἄναξ', ἀγαθός μοι ἐπίρροθος ἔλθε <u>ποδοῖν</u> .	i 23.770 * †
	οὐ μὲν γὰρ μείζον κλέος ἀνέρος ὄφρα κεν ἦσιν,	o 8.147
845	ἢ ὃ τι <u>ποσσίν</u> τε βέξει καὶ <u>χερσίν</u> ἐῆσιν.	o 8.148
	ὥς φάτο· τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε μέγας θεὸς εὐξαμένοιο.	cf. i 1.453
	ἄλθετο <u>χεῖρ</u> , ὀδύνας δὲ κατηπιόωντο βαρεῖαι.	i 5.417
	<u>γούνατα</u> δ' ἐρρώσαντο, <u>πόδες</u> δ' ὑπερικταίνοντο.	o 23.3
	ὥς 'δ' ἄρ' ὃ κεν' λαιψηρὰ <u>πόδας</u> καὶ <u>γούνατ'</u> ἐνώμα,	i 15.269 †
850	ὥς ὅτε τίς στατὸς ἵππος ἀποστήσας ἐπὶ φάτνη,	i 15.263
	ἦῖξεν πεδίοιο <u>ποσὶ</u> κραιπνοῖσι πέτεσθαι.	i 21.247

The Centos are full of similar repetitions at close intervals on a smaller scale (e.g. θάρσει at 225 and 261, 890 and 891, and 1253 and 1256, ὄ γύνα at 1250 and 1251, εἰπέ at 1104 and 1105, σπείος at 1270 and 1271, etc.). As D. Gary Miller notes "repetition within short spaces"—found in Homer at both the thematic and formulaic levels—"is a fact of cognitive operation. Use of a motif, formula, or unusual word restores it to active memory and any subsequent elaboration is apt to contain one or more recurrences of it" (Miller 1982:45). Eudocia's concatenation of theme-words is not limited to the repetition of the same word. Often it involves synonyms or synonymous expressions, e.g. 926 (φωνή), 928 (αὐταί). Eudocia's thematic use of key-words is similar to the cues provided by semantic trigger to join verses together in enjambement. The theme-word even seems to suggest semantic accommodations in cases where the poet must avoid inappropriate material, for example, an Homeric name in direct address (e.g. lines 1112, 1113, 1073, 1078, 1086, 2258 etc).

Like semantic trigger, thematic key-words play a role in *Homeric* verse generation as well. Compare the *Odyssey* poet's treatment of a gift-

giving scene (15.113-5), which uses key-words related to each other by *figura etymologica* (Fehling 1969:153-62; cf. Louden 1995:28-9):

δώρων δ' ὅσσ' ἐν ἐμῷ οἴκῳ κειμήλια κείται,  
δώσω δὲ κάλλιστον καὶ τιμηέστατόν ἐστι.  
δώσω τοι κρητήρα τετυγμένον.

In Homer the technique is particularly associated with gnomic lines. Ahrens cites several examples of such "gnomic chains," where key-words, often in anaphora, bind successive lines together thematically (Ahrens 1937:54, citing e.g. *Il.* 14. 394-9 and 23.315-8). Compare the gnomic chain bound by the key-word "stranger" at *Odyssey* 14.56-8:

Ξεῖν', οὗ μοι θέμις ἔστ' οὐδ' εἰ κακίων σέθεν ἔλθοι,  
Ξεῖνον ἀτιμήσοι· πρὸς γὰρ Διὸς εἰσιν ἅπαντες  
Ξεῖνοί τε πτωχοί τε·

Correspondingly in the Centos we find in the Samaritan woman's speech a famous proverbial line from *Odyssey* 19.163 expanded by three thematically-related gnomic lines from *Odyssey* 8 (cf. Ahrens 1937:64) with anaphoric repetition of οὐ:

<u>οὐ</u> γὰρ ἀπὸ δρυός ἐσσι παλαιφάτου, οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης	ο 19.163
<u>οὐ</u> μὲν γὰρ τις πάμπαν ἀνώνυμος ἔστ' ἀνθρώπων,	ο 8.552
<u>οὐ</u> κακός, οὐδέ μὲν ἔσθλος, ἐπὶν τὰ πρῶτα γένηται,	ο 8.553
<u>ἀλλ'</u> ἐπὶ πᾶσι τίθενται ἐπεὶ κε τέκωσι τοκῆς.	ο 8.554

The result of this mnemonic technique in the Centos is the heaping up of lines that express virtually the same idea. Such redundancy, already

characteristic of Homer's oral style (cf. Fehling 1969:164), is even more pervasive in the Centos. For example, at lines 1137-1138 a line from *Odyssey* 16 follows immediately upon a synonymous one from 6.201:

οὐκ ἔσθ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ διερὸς βροτῶς, οὐδὲ γένηται.	ο 6.201
οὐ γάρ πως ἄμ θνητὸς ἀνὴρ τάδε μηχανόφθο	ο 16.196

Tautologies like this abound in the Centos, as for example at 1093 (ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπὲ, καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον = *Il.* 10.384), where the same thought is reiterated with no appreciable difference in sense at 1095 (καὶ μοι τοῦτ' ἀγόρευσον ἐτήτυμον, ὄφρ' ἐὺ εἰδῶ = *Od.* 1.174).

In all these examples Eudocia utilizes and builds upon features already present in the Homeric *langue*: she combines type-scenes to construct a larger episode; she structures scenes internally by the intercalation of thematically related material; she repeats lines or blocks elsewhere in the poem under similar narrative conditions; she stitches lines together with keywords. The cumulative force of these techniques is a glossomatic "redundancy" typical of Homer's adding style. Each item enumerated here is a characteristic feature of oral poetry. Because she is working from within a closed system consisting of the orally-derived texts of Homer, Eudocia's intertextual activation of biblical themes and her re-generation of Homeric verse are two aspects of the same phenomenon. Cento form and content work together in an indissoluble whole. It remains now to look closely at the content.



## **CHAPTER VI**

### **THEMES FROM THE *ODYSSEY***

πάντων δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω (*Od.* 1.3 = Cento line 387)

As a rule Eudocia tends to draw heavily from certain Homeric books, or a certain episode within a given book, to construct a given Cento scene. We may take such favoritism as an indicator of Eudocia's intercontextual thinking (if I may use that word), and from her tendencies to associate a particular Homeric scene or scenes with a given biblical episode, we may—by assessing the morphological and semiotic links between the passages in question— establish the motivation or ground behind a given comparison.

In the Samaritan Woman at the Well scene (1046-1152), for example, lines from the *Odyssey* predominate (87%). Lines from Books 6, 8, 17, and 23 comprise sixty (60) of one-hundred and six (106) total lines (57%). Lines from these books are favored in this scene because their themes are particularly compatible—at several levels—with the narrative structure and details of the biblical episode.

The biblical scene begins with Christ's and his disciples' encounter with the woman who is drawing water at Jacob's well (Jn. 4:6-7). The

Homeric lines used to express this encounter in the Centos are taken from the description of Eumaeus' and Odysseus' meeting with Melanthius near the spring in Ithaca (*Od.* 17.204-9 = 1047-1051), and the Companions' encounter with the Laestrygonian king's daughter at the spring Artakia (*Od.* 10.105; 107-8 = 1052-1054):

	ἤμος δ' ἥελιος μέσον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβεβήκει,	i 8.68
	ἔκαστος δὲ στείχοντες ὁδὸν κατὰ παιπαλόεσσαν	o 17.204 †
	ἄστεος ἔγγυς ἔσαν καὶ ἐπὶ κρήνην τ' ἀφίκοντο,	o 17.205
	τυκτὴν, καλλίροον, ὅθεν ὑδρεύοντο πολῖται.	o 17.206
1050	ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρα αἰγείρων ὑδατοτρεφέων ἦν ἄλσος,	o 17.208
	πάντοσε κυκλοτερές, κατὰ δὲ ψυχρὸν ῥέεν ὕδωρ·	o 17.209
	κούρη δὲ ξύμβλητο πρὸ ἄστεος ὑδευούση.	o 10.105 *
	ἢ μὲν ἄρ' ἐς κρήνην κατεβήσατο καλλιρέεθρον	o 10.107
	Ἄρτακίην· ἔνθεν γὰρ ὕδωρ προτὶ ἄστει φέρεσκεν.	o 10.108

When the sun had made its way 'round to mid-heaven,  
they were walking along the rocky road  
and eventually came near to the town and its spring—  
built up as a well, beautifully flowing—from which the citizens  
drew water.

And what a grove of watered poplars surrounded it!  
forming a circle on all sides, and fresh water trickled down.  
They met a girl drawing water in front of the town.  
She was headed toward to the fine-flowing spring  
the one called Close-moving; it is from there that she usually  
brought the water to the city.

Eight times in the *Odyssey* a stranger meets with either a maiden drawing water at a well, fountain or river, or with a youth by the roadside before being directed to his destination in town. This motif, when present, is always the first element in the Homeric hospitality scene (Reece 1993:12). So

it is here. As it happens, the Bible shares with Homer this universal motif; but the sequence of elements continues to follow the Homeric norm throughout this scene, for the Cento treatment of the first element also dispenses with the next two elements of a *xenia* scene, the *arrival* at the destination (II) and the *description* of the surroundings and the activities of the person sought (III).<sup>1</sup> Element VI, *supplication*, occurs at line 1072:

οὔδαι ἐνισκίμψασα καρῆατα· αἶδετο γὰρ ἄμιν'.                    i 17.437 \* + o 6.329 †

She placed her head in the dirt, for she respected him.

Elements VII and IX, *reception* and *feast*, are implied in the woman's speech:

	ἄστῳ δέ τοι δείξω, ἐρέω δέ τοι οὖνομα λαῶν.	o 6.194
	εἴμ' ἵνα θαρσύνω ἐτάρους, εἶπω τε ἕκαστα.	o 3.361
	ἔρχεο· ἴσον γάρ σε θεῶ τίσουσιν ἄπαντες',	i 9.603 †
	ξείν', ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀχάριστα μεθ' ἡμῖν ταῦτ' ἀγορεύεις,	o 8.236
1085	ἀλλ' ἐθέλεις ἀρετὴν σὴν φαινέμεν, ἢ τοι ὀπηδεῖ.	o 8.237
	ἔξιν', ἐπεὶ ἡμετέραν τε πόλιν καὶ γαῖαν ἰκάνεις,	o 6.191 †
	οὔτ' οὖν βρώσιος' δευήσεα, οὔτε ποτῆτος'.	o 6.192 †
	ἐν δ' ἄνδρες ναίουσι πολύρρηνες πολυβοῦται,	i 9.154
	οἳ κέ σε δατίνησι θεὸν ᾧς τιμήσουσι.	i 9.155

I shall show you the city and tell the name of its people.  
I am going to encourage my comrades and tell them  
everything.

Come with me, for they will honor you as the equal of a god,  
Stranger, since you speak pleasingly in our midst,  
and are ready to display the skill which attends you.  
Stranger, when you come to our land and town

---

<sup>1</sup> In enumerating the conventions of Homeric *xenia* here I follow the numbering and headings of Reece 1993:6-39.

you will lack neither food nor drink.  
 Many strong men, rich in cattle, live there  
 and they will honor you with gifts like a god.

Next comes Element XI, *identification*:

	ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπὲ, καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον	<i>i</i> 10.384
	ξείν', ἐπεὶ οὔτε κακῶ, οὔτ' ἄφροني φωτὶ ἔοικας.	o 6.187
1095	καὶ μοι τοῦτ' ἀγόρευσον ἐτίτυμον, ὄφρ' ἐὺ εἰδῶ	o 1.174
	τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες.	o 1.170
	τρὶς μάκαρες μὲν σοί γε πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ.	o 6.154
	εἶπ' ὄνομ' ὅτι σε κείθι, κάλειον 'μήτηρ τε πατήρ τε'	o 8.550 †

But come now, tell me this and tell truly  
 Stranger, since you don't seem to be a mean or foolish man.  
 Tell me this truly, so that I may be sure:  
 What kind of man are you? where is your city and parents?  
 Thrice blessed indeed are your father and noble mother.  
 Tell me the name your mother and father call you by where  
 you're from.

There follows Element XII, an *exchange of information* in which the woman introduces Jesus to her people as the offspring of Paieon (1128 = *Od.* 4.232), the physician of the gods (cf. *Il.* 5.401; 899), an immortal who has disguised himself so as to seem a man:

	αὐτὸν δ' οὐ σάφα οἶδα, πόθεν γένος εὐχεται εἶναι.	o 17.373
	νῦν 'δέ γε' κάλλιόν ἐστι μεταλλῆσαι καὶ ἔρυσθαι	o 3.69 †
1135	ὀππόθεν οὔτος ἀνὴρ, ποίης δ' ἐξ εὐχεται εἶναι	o 1.406
	γαίης, ποῦ δέ νυ οἱ γενεὴ καὶ πατρὶς ἄρουρα.	o 1.407
	οὐκ ἔσθ' οὔτος ἀνὴρ διερός βροτῶς, οὐδὲ γένηται.	o 6.201
	οὐ γάρ πως ἄμ θνητῶς ἀνὴρ τάδε μηχανόφθο	o 16.196
	ᾧ αὐτοῦ 'γε νόφ', ὅτε μὴ θεὸς αὐτὸς ἐπελθῶν,	o 16.197 †
1140	ῥηϊδίως ἐθέλων θεῖη νέον ἠδὲ γέροντα.	o 16.198
	ᾧς τέ μοι ἀθάνατός γ' ἰνδάλλεται εἰσοράασθαι·	o 3.246
	ἄλλω δ' αὐτὸν φωτὶ κατακρύπτων ἦϊσκε.	o 4.247

ἀλλὰ ἴδεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀνασταδόν. οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε                   i 23.469  
 εὖ διαγιγνώσκω, δοκέει δέ μοι ἔμμενα ἀνὴρ."                   i 23.470

I do not know him well, or his origin.  
 But it is surely better to inquire and ask  
 where this man is from, from what land he claims to come,  
 the source of his family and his fatherland.  
 For he is not your ordinary man, nor could he be,  
 for no mortal could devise these things  
 by his own intelligence except a god himself come upon him,  
 who, when he wishes, easily makes him a young or old man.  
 He looks like an immortal to me.  
 Cryptically he has likened himself to your average mortal.  
 But stand forth and see for yourselves, for I am  
 far from certain. He looks to me like a man.

The scene closes with throngs of Shechemites rushing from their porches, calling their neighbors, to welcome the woman and her strange god-like guest (1145-1152).

This Cento episode is typical of Eudocia's construction of Cento episodes in general, and of her treatment of Homeric type-scenes in particular. We note first that the majority of lines used to construct this episode is taken from Homeric hospitality scenes, and that most elements of the typical Homeric *xenia* scene are present, with only three "out of place":<sup>2</sup> (1) the seating of the visitor (Element VIII), which in the Centos comes immediately upon arrival (1055), reflecting a biblical detail (Jn. 4:6: ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς... ἐκαθέζετο... ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ); (2) the giving of guest-gifts (Element XX), which is mentioned at 1089, after reference to feasting; and (3) the host's taking the

---

<sup>2</sup> "Out of place" is perhaps the wrong phrase here, for as Edwards concludes in his comparison of Homer's treatment of funeral type-scenes: "Not only does he change the order of the elements of the type-scene...he uses regular elements and themes with greatly enhanced emotional significance" (Edwards 1986:90).

visitor by the hand (Element VIIIf) which occurs at 1148. Eudocia's basic repetition of the narrative rules of the Homeric type-scene, however, is obvious, and accords with the principle of structural intertextuality and with the Rules of function and sequence.

Secondly, we notice that two Homeric episodes in particular are favored in this scene's construction: (1) Odysseus' encounter with Nausicaa on the beach and his subsequent stay at Scheria (from *Odyssey* Books 6 and 8); and (2) Odysseus' two pre-recognition encounters with Penelope in Ithaca (from *Odyssey* Books 17 and 23). Like the biblical episode, each of these Homeric books contains a private interview between a man and a woman. In each Homeric scene, moreover, Odysseus is a stranger (ξείνος) to his host—to Nausicaa by virtue of his having washed up on shore in Scheria, and to Penelope because of his beggar's disguise. This iconic trait is reinforced at the verbal level by Eudocia's repeated use of the key-word ξείν- which occurs anaphorically in the initial colon of the line 9 times in this scene (1073, 1084, 1086, 1092, 1094, 1108, 1112, 1114, 1129), 4 times with semantic accommodation.

In terms of morphology, the scene involving Jesus and the Woman at the Well is a Cento version of the *xenia* theme. However, non-structural elements have also influenced Eudocia's preference for lines from *Odyssey* Books 6, 8, 17, 23, and the interviews and stranger-motif they contain. While the biblical theme and Homeric signs are functionally compatible, lines spoken by Odysseus are not simply assigned to Jesus, nor lines spoken by Nausicaa/Penelope to the Samaritan woman. Moreover, at both functional

and attributival levels Homeric roles are reversed, and biblical details are contravened or elaborated. Such is the result of the complicated interaction of iconic and symbolic grounds in Cento intertextuality, to which we must now turn.

First, at the morphological level, there is the reversal of roles. This confirms Propp's dictum that "an action cannot be defined apart from its place in the course of narration." Consequently, we find that according to a morphological description of narrative "identical acts can have different meanings, and vice versa."<sup>3</sup> Thus, at line 1072 it is the host who supplicates the visitor (with an *Iliad* line describing the weeping horses of Achilles), and though gifts are promised by the woman (1088-1090), they are actually given by Jesus in the form of a ransom (ζωάγρια) at 1109, where the verb ὀφέλλεις, which in the *Odyssey* passage means "you owe," is used somewhat catachrestically to mean "you provide." That this is the proper translation here is clear from line 1111 where the woman utters to Jesus the words of Odysseus to Nausicaa, and a clever grammatical accommodation of Homer's vocative to an accusative in apposition to the pronoun με makes the woman the beneficiary (as opposed to Homer where it is Odysseus who "owes" Nausicaa "the ransom" of his life). The Cento passage runs thus:

	χαῖρε ξεῖν', ἵνα καὶ ποτ' ἐὼν ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ,	ο 8.461
	μνήσῃ ἐμεῖ', ὅτι μοι πρώτη ζωάγρι' ὀφέλλεις.	ο 8.462
1110	τῷ κέν τοι καὶ κείθι θεῶ ὣς εὐχετοώμην	ο 15.181
	αἰεὶ ἤματα πάντα· σύ γάρ μ' ἐβίωσας κούρην.	ο 8.468 *

---

<sup>3</sup> Hence Propp's formal definition: "*Function is an act of character, defined from the point of view of its significance for the course of the action*" (Propp 1928:21).

Farewell, stranger. Be sure to remember me when you reach  
Your father's land. I was, after all, the first woman you  
ransomed.

That's why I'll pray to you there as a god  
All the days of my life. For you have given this girl life.

The intense V-Effekt of this and other role-reversals in this scene is not softened by the coherent structural intertextuality of the larger episode, as the following analysis of the semiotic dynamics of the whole dialogue will show.

The conversation begins with Jesus' words at 1057-1065, which consist of lines spoken by three different characters in Homer:

(1) by Telemachus to Penelope

τίφθ' οὕτω ἄνδρὸς' νοσφίζεαι, οὐδέ παρ' αὐτὸν	ο 23.98 †
ἔζομένη μύθοισιν ἀνείρεαι ἠδὲ μεταλλάς;	ο 23.99
.....	
οὐ μὲν κ' ἄλλη ᾧδε γυνὴ τετληότι θυμῷ	ο 23.100
ἄνδρὸς ἀποσταίη, ὅς τοι κακὰ πόλλ' ἐμόγησε.	ο 23.101 *
σοὶ δ' αἰεὶ κραδίη στερεωτέρη ἐστὶ λίθοιο.	ο 23.103

(2) by Nausicaa to herself

καὶ δ' ἄλλην νεμεσῶ ἢ τις τοιαυτὰ γε ῥέζοι·	ο 6.286
1060 ἦ τ' ἀέκητι φίλων πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς ἐόντων,	ο 6.287
ἀνδράσι μίσγηται, πρὶν γ' ἀμφάδιον γάμον ἐλθεῖν.	ο 6.288

and (3) by the suitor Amphimedon about Penelope

1065 ἦ δ' οὐτ' ἠρνείτο στυγερὸν γάμον, οὔτε τελεύτα.	ο 24.126
--	----------

These Homeric lines are used by Eudocia to express Jesus'



disapproval of the woman's improper relationship to her husband. In (1) Telemachus reproaches his mother Penelope for her slowness in recognizing her husband: "Why are you keeping yourself in this way from your husband? You refuse to sit near him or engage him in conversation...No other woman of steadfast heart would keep aloof as you do from her husband when he has suffered so much." In (3) Amphimedon faults her stalling duplicity in courtship: "She says neither 'no' nor 'yes'." Of special note in Jesus' speech is (2), *Od.* 6.286-8 = 1059-1061, which in Homer expresses the self-doubts of Nausicaa about her sexual attraction to Odysseus: "I (would) find fault with any other woman who would have intercourse with men against her parents' will, before she was lawfully wed." These Homeric lines convey the information in Jn. 4:16-18:

Jesus said to her, "Go, call your husband and come here." The woman answered him, "I have no husband." Jesus said to her, "You are right in saying 'I have no husband'; for you have had five husbands, and he whom you have now is not your husband; this you said truly.

Christ's intuition provokes a series of responses in the woman. First there is embarrassment: In words used to describe Nausicaa's reaction to her father's teasing her about marriage (*Od.* 6.66-7 = 1066-1067) the woman "felt ashamed at the mention of lovely marriage before her husband" (αἶδετο γὰρ θαλερὸν γάμον ἐξονομῆναι / ἄνδρῖ φίλω). Then, taken aback by the stranger's knowledge of her situation, her next response is wonder and trepidation, this time conveyed in Homer's memorable words describing Penelope's response to Odysseus during the couple's recognition interview:

- ἡ δ' ἄνεω δὴν ἦστο, τάφος δέ οἱ ἦτορ ἴκανεν. ο 23.93  
 1070 ὄψει δ' ἄλλοτε μὲν μιν ἐνωπαδίως ἐσίδεσκε. ο 23.94

**She sat speechless, amazed; but now and again  
 With a glance she would look him straight in the face.**

The Samaritan woman then elaborates on her reaction at 1073-1075 with lines from the same Homeric scene, but spoken this time by Penelope to Telemachus:

- ἔξεινε, ἐπεὶ θυμός μοι ἐνὶ στήθεσσι τέθηπεν, ο 23.105 †  
 οὔτέ τι προσφάσθαι δύναμαι ἔπος οὐδ' ἐρέεσθαι ο 23.106  
 1075 οὐδ' εἰς ὄπα ιδέσθαι ἐναντίον· αἰδέομαι γάρ'. ο 23.107 †

**Stranger, the heart in my chest is struck with wonder.  
 I can neither address, nor question you,  
 Nor look you in the eyes. I feel ashamed.**

At 1086-1089, as we have seen, the woman finally responds to Christ's request at 1068 for a drink and an escort to town with the words of Nausicaa, assuring him of the gifts and entertainment he will receive from her people, then adds, *in the words of Odysseus*:

- 1090 κείνος δ' αὖ περὶ κῆρι μακάρτατος ἔξοχον ἄλλων, ο 6.158  
 ὃς κέ 'σε ἔδνοισι' βρίσας οἰκόνδ' ἀγάγηται. ο 6.159 @

**Blessed beyond compare is the man  
 Who loads you up with bridal gifts and takes you home to wed.**

The V-Effekt here is particularly strong. While the use of marital imagery to describe the Christian's relationship to Christ is a topos in Christian discourse (originating from New Testament passages like Mt. 25:1-13, Mk.

2:19, Jn. 3:29, 2 Cor. 11:2, Eph. 5:23-32. See Cameron 1991:68), usually it is the church or individual devotee who is the bride and Christ the bridegroom. Here however the woman's use of Odysseus' words to Nausicaa makes Christ, as it were, the woman's bride, for ἑδνα, "bridal gifts," are presented by a suitor to the bride's father, as if to purchase her, what anthropologists call a bride price.<sup>4</sup>

The appropriation of all these *Odyssey* lines precipitates the same kinds of attributival conflicts that we have seen already with the Sidonian slave girl and Mary. Although they each involve some degree of V-Effekt, all the lines used in the exchange are nonetheless related to each other in that they are situated in a larger Homeric context where marriage (real or imagined) is somehow at stake. And yet, marital imagery is not developed in the biblical Woman at the Well scene beyond Jesus' short mention of the woman's adultery, even if we concede that sexual tension (arising from Jesus' and the woman's disregard for the social mores of ancient Palestine) colors the whole scene. Conversely, Jesus' lectures in the Gospel about possessing "living water" and "food ye know not of"—what are clearly the theological focal points of the Johannine scene—are completely elided in Eudocia's treatment. What, we might ask, was she thinking?

A proper understanding and appreciation of the exchange between the woman and Jesus—indeed the interpretation of the entire

---

<sup>4</sup> The V Scholion on this line glosses ἑδνοισι thus: τοῖς πρὸ γάμου δάρους, μνήστρους (Dindorf 1855:I,307). We have seen this same reversal of marriage roles elsewhere in the Centos in the repeated use of lines from the *Odyssey* which describe the disciples as "suitors of Christ."

episode—requires that we understand the iconic and symbolic relationships between signs and their various objects. From the Gospel of John the basic information that Eudocia represents in this scene is (a) that the Samaritan woman is improperly related to her husband, Jesus' knowledge of which she takes as a sign of his prophetic skills (cf. Jn. 4:19), and relatedly, (b) her recognition of Jesus as a god (cf. Jn. 4:25-26; 39-42). Both (a) and (b) are key ingredients in the biblical scene, but they are realized quite differently in the *Centos*.

As noted above, (a) is realized primarily with the words of Telemachus to his mother Penelope regarding her reluctance to recognize Odysseus, her husband. The recognition of Jesus' godhood, (b), is realized within the conventions of the *xenia* scene with a farrago of lines (most of them in the woman's speech), taken from both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, which compare mortals to immortals.<sup>5</sup> Two of these passages stand out in that they are themselves taken from Homeric recognition scenes. In the first (1138-1140 = *Od.* 16.196-8), Telemachus is slow to recognize that it is truly his father behind the beggar's disguise. As he explains:

οὐ γάρ πως ἄμ θνητὸς ἀνὴρ τάδε μηχανόφτο  
 ᾧ αὐτοῦ 'γε νόφ', ὅτε μὴ θεὸς αὐτὸς ἐπελθών,  
 ῥηϊδίως ἐθέλων θεῖη νέον ἢδὲ γέροντα.

No mortal could devise these things [i.e. a change of  
 appearance]  
 by his own intelligence except a god himself come upon him,  
 who, when he wishes, easily makes him a young or old man.

---

<sup>5</sup> 1083 = *Il.* 9.603; 1088-1089 = *Il.* 9.154-5; 1094 = *Od.* 6.187; 1106-1107 = *Od.* 6.160-1; 1120 = *Od.* 1.323; 1137 = *Od.* 6.201; 1138-1140 = *Od.* 16.196-8.

These words are uttered by the woman to her Samaritan neighbors (though the *τάδε* in the Centos refers not only to Jesus' appearance but to his foreknowledge of her past activities as well; cf. 1131-1132). The second instance (1120 = *Od.* 1.323), also spoken by the woman to her neighbors, is a single line from a scene in the *Odyssey* which evokes its larger Homeric context, namely Athena's visit to Telemachus in Ithaca disguised as Mentos (*Od.* 1.319-23):

ἡ μὲν ἄρ' ὡς εἶπous' ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις' Αθήνη  
 ὄρνις δ' ὡς ἀνοπαῖα διέπτατο· τῷ δ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ  
 θῆκε μένος καὶ θάρσος, ὑπέμνησέν τέ ἐ πατρός  
 μᾶλλον ἔτ' ἢ τὸ πάροιθεν. ὁ δὲ φρεσὶν ἦσι νοήσας  
 θάμβησεν κατὰ θυμόν. οἴσατο γὰρ θεὸν εἶναι.

Grey-eyed Athena spoke and departed.  
 Like a bird she soared high in the air. In Telemachus' heart  
 she planted courage and strength, and he remembered his  
 father—more now than before. So he stood there amazed,  
 pierced to the heart by the realization, for he knew it was a god.

An interpretation of this Cento episode inheres in both the iconic qualities of the Homeric material itself, specifically in the Homeric recognition scenes where marriage is at issue, and in the symbolic relationship that obtains between Homeric sign and biblical theme in Christian discourse. In no uncertain terms: *the "husband" Jesus asks the woman not to draw back from, but recognize, is himself.* Through a semiotic chain of images, referents, signs, themes, symbolic and iconic grounds, Eudocia's Woman at the Well episode, realized morphologically in

the Homeric *langue* as a *xenia* scene, emerges in the end as a recognition scene—symbolically between husband and wife. This interpretation can be established in several ways, beginning with the Homeric material.

The referent of the Homeric sign in Telemachus' reproach (changed by Eudocia from "father," πατήρ, to "husband," ἀνδρός) is Odysseus. As a stranger in the Homeric scenes in question, he shares an iconic bond to Jesus in the biblical scene. At 1063 the "husband who has suffered so much" is also Odysseus. Suffering is an iconic quality both characters share as well. Given that Odysseus is the referent of the ἀνδρός at 1057, 1063 can also be taken as a reference to Jesus, a man of sorrows in his own right; in fact, in Homer, Telemachus' lines (= *Od.* 23.100-1) are repeated *verbatim* by Odysseus himself (*Od.* 23.168-9). Two other details confirm this: the metaphor at 1109, where the woman refers to the ransom (ζωάγια) provided her by Jesus, referring proleptically to his own death, and the grammatical accomodation of the third-person pronoun οἱ to the second-person form τοι in 1063.

The "ransom theory of redemption" (ἀπολύτρωσις, λύτρον) was a *topos* among Christian teachers and theologians. Origen speaks of Jesus making an exchange of his own life with the Devil for the souls of men and women, a bargain which the Devil was unable to enforce (Kelly 1977:185-6). In explaining why the Devil would agree to such a deal in the first place Gregory of Nyssa puts his finger on the symbolism of recognition and disguise in the Cento scene. As J. N. D. Kelly paraphrases Gregory's argument (Kelly 1977:382):

Since the Fall placed man in the power of the Devil...the Devil had a right to adequate compensation if he were to surrender him, and for God to have exercised *force majeure* would have been unfair and tyrannical. So He offered him the man Jesus as a ransom. When Satan saw Him, born as He was of a virgin and renowned as a worker of miracles, he decided that the exchange was to his advantage. What he failed to realize was that the outward covering of human flesh concealed the immortal Godhead.<sup>6</sup>

Like the appropriation of the line spoken by the suitor Amphimedon, these assimilations of Jesus to Odysseus on these particular grounds cast the woman momentarily in the part of Penelope. The biblical woman does not have an iconic connection with Penelope (as the wedded wife of the protagonist). Rather, the woman's relationship to Christ is grounded symbolically, and depends upon the topos in Christian discourse that joins Christian and Christ in a conjugal bond (though, as noted, Eudocia's symbolic realization of the topos stretches the metaphor considerably by reversing the roles). This symbolic link is in turn reinforced by Odysseus' iconic attributes in Homer as husband (ἀνὴρ) and stranger (ξείνος).<sup>7</sup>

Homeric commentators have called attention to the peculiar use of the word ξείνος to describe the beggar Odysseus in the later books of the *Odyssey*, where it means "stranger" or "outsider" rather than possessing "its more favorable meaning of an artisocratic 'guest' whose rank would

---

<sup>6</sup> The Greek of the last bit runs: ἀλλὰ μὴν ἀμήχανον ἦν γυμνῇ προσβλεψαί τῃ τοῦ θεοῦ φαντασίᾳ, μὴ σαρκὸς τινα μοῖραν ἐν αὐτῷ θεωρήσαντα, ἦν ἤδη διὰ τῆς ἀρματίας κεχείρωτο. διὰ τοῦτο περικεκάλυπται τῇ σαρκὶ ἡ θεότης (Migne PG 45:60-4).

<sup>7</sup> Note especially Eurycleia's appeal to Penelope to recognize her husband at *Od.* 23.28, where Odysseus is still (for Penelope) ὁ ξείνος, "that stranger."

entitle him to guest-gifts" (Russo 1992:4). In the Cento scene, as surely in Homer also, there is ambiguity in the repeated use of this word: Jesus, as a Jew, is a stranger to the Samaritan woman, but paradoxically he is, as a god, also a guest of status, supplicated as such by the woman and offered gifts. Eudocia seems to have been aware of this paradox, for she exploits it in this scene, especially in the morphological inversion of the roles of supplication and gift-giving.

One can easily find in Christian discourse statements that attribute to Jesus himself the iconicity of a beggar- ξείνος. "Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man has nowhere to lay his head," is Jesus' answer in the Gospels to a rich young ruler eager to enter the religious life (Mt. 8:20 and pars.). With reference to this biblical passage, a sermon attributed to Epiphanius of Salamis on the humility of Joseph of Arimathea emphasizes these same qualities: "Give me the corpse of Jesus of Nazareth," the preacher imagines Joseph to say to Pilate,

the man you condemned, Jesus the beggar (ὁ πτωχός), the homeless (ὁ ἄοικος)...the naked (ὁ γυμνός)... the stranger (ὁ ξένος)...  
Yes, give me this stranger. For he came from a distant land to save strangers like himself... Give me this man who had nowhere to lay his head" (Migne PG 43:445).

The Christian doctrine of Christ's κένωσις or "emptying" of himself at the Incarnation to take a lowly human form strengthened this topos, and served as a paradigm for Christian behavior:

Have this mind among yourselves which is yours in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not count



equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant (μορφὴν δούλου λαβών), being born in the likeness (ὁμοιώματι) of men, and found in human form" (σχῆματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος) (Phil. 2:5-7).

With such thoughts in mind, John Chrysostom explains our Samaritan woman's willingness to entertain Christ, whom she (as a Samaritan and a woman) had every reason not to greet, as attributable to Jesus' "disguise": "Christ took upon himself an appearance (σχῆμα) so plain and ordinary," John notes in a sermon on this episode, "that even Samaritan women, harlots and publicans had the confidence to approach him with boldness and engage him in conversation."<sup>8</sup> In Eudocia's treatment of the scene, however, the σχῆμα of Christ, like the disguise of Odysseus, makes identification and full recognition difficult. In this she follows the *Odyssey* more closely than the Bible. To the typical questions about identity posed by a host to his or her guest—τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν, πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆς *Od.* 1.170 = 1096; εἰπ' ὄνομ' ὅτι σε κείθι κάλεον μήτηρ τε πατήρ τε *Od.* 8.550 = 1098; εἰπέ δέ μοι γαῖάν τε τεῖν δῆμον τε πόλιν τε *Od.* 8.555 = 1104—Jesus gives no answer in the Centos, quite unlike in the Gospel of John where he responds to the Samaritan woman's suggestion that he is the Messiah with an emphatic ἐγώ εἰμι (Jn. 4:26). Mysterious already in the Gospel, Christ is more so in the Centos.

Who is this man? For the woman who receives him he is a healing god who looks like a man or perhaps a man with god-like abilities (cf. 1143-

---

<sup>8</sup> Οὕτω γὰρ εὐτελής περιέκειτο σχῆμα καὶ κοινὸν ἅπασιν ὁ Χριστὸς, ὡς καὶ Σαμαρείτιδας γυναικῶν καὶ πόρνων, καὶ τελῶνας μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀδείας θαρρῆν αὐτῷ προσιέναι καὶ διαλέγεσθαι (Migne PG 59:89).

1144 = *Il.* 23.469-70). Behind this ambivalence lurk larger theological themes current in the Christological controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries, the dominant discourse of Eudocia's age. Such debates over the nature and status of Christ gave rise to the Christological paradoxes of the Ecumenical Councils, for example Chalcedon's (451) where Christ is professed as "truly god and truly man" (θεὸς ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἀληθῶς, Schaff 1919:62). Homeric hospitality and recognition scenes, as realized within the parameters of Cento intertextuality, stand to Eudocia as icons and symbols for the intellectual and cultural property of her own time.

I noted at the outset of this analysis that the Woman at the Well episode is paradigmatic of Cento intertextuality in general. All six of D'Assigny's Rules work toward the generation and interpretation of this scene. Homeric *xenia* scenes (and their symbolic transformations into recognition scenes) play a role in the generation of many other Cento episodes, for the arrival and reception of Christ in various places under various circumstances with varying results is the narrative backbone of the Gospel story, especially as Eudocia read it. It is tempting, in fact, to read the entire poem as a theoxeny ("the hospitality shown to a god"). This theme, present already in the *Odyssey*, is even more conspicuous in the Homeric Hymns, for example, those to Demeter and Dionysus, where reception and recognition of the god by mortals is a central theme. As the Gospel of John puts it, Christ "came unto his own and his own knew him not. But to those who received him...he gave power to become children of God" (Jn. 1:11-12).

In the Gospel according to Eudocia, steeped as she is in the Homeric

*langue*, this theological and narrative theme takes on a distinctively Homeric quality. One consequence of the Fall, for example, in Athena's words of warning to Odysseus about the Phaeacians, is that "these people do not much tolerate strangers" (115 = *Od.* 7.32: οὐ γὰρ ξείνους οἶδε μάλ' ἀνθρώπους ἀνέχοντα). This lack of *philoxenia* is part of God's rationale (βουλή 203; cf. 195, 199) for sending his son from heaven, to cure this social malaise. That hospitality is the "will of God" in the Centos, and not just a template for Cento intertextuality, is clear from Christ's teaching at lines 475-476 (= *Od.* 15.490 + *Od.* 14.284) about the nature of his Father: "He is gentle, and provides you with food and with drink." Like Zeus, he is "a patron of strangers, who is sure to avenge misdeeds" (ἦπιος, ὃς δὴ τοι παρέχει βρώσιν τε πόσιν τε / ξείνιος, ὃς τε μάλιστα νεμεσσᾶται κακὰ ἔργα).

Christ's sermon at 1176-1204 is emphatic about the treatment of strangers. This speech, which follows immediately upon the Woman at the Well episode, is delivered to a gathering of people from diverse social backgrounds—"wives, mothers, maidens, bachelors, old men, the lame, the crippled, the blind" (1156-1158)—who have assembled for a feeding miracle:

	ὕμῶν ἀνδρὶ ἐκάστω ἐφιέμενος τάδε εἶρω,	ο 13.7
	ὥς αἶ καὶ τιμὴν μεγάλην καὶ κῦδος ἄρησθε,	i 16.84
	τιμὴν, ἢ τ' ἄλλων περ ἐπιγνάμπει νόον ἐσθλῶν·	i 9.514
	πολλοὶ δὴ ξεῖνοι ταλαπείριοι ἐνθάδ' ἴκοντο,	ο 19.379
1180	καὶ μάλα τειρόμενοί περ· ἀναγκαίη γὰρ ἐπείγει .	i 6.85
	τοὺς νῦν χρὴ κομέειν. πρὸς γὰρ 'θεοῦ' εἰσὶν ἅπαντες	ο 6.207 †
	ξεῖνοί τε πτώχοί τε· δόσις δ' ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε.	ο 6.208
	οὐ μὲν γὰρ τι που ἐστὶν οἷζυρότερον ἀνδρὸς,	i 17.446
	πάντων ὅσσα τε γαῖαν ἐπὶ πνεῖει τε καὶ ἔρπει.	ο 18.131
1185	οὐ μὲν γὰρ ποτέ φησὶ κακὸν πείσεσθα ὀπίσσω,	ο 18.132

	ὄφρ' ἀρετὴν παρέχῃσι θεὸς, καὶ γούνατ' ὀρώρη·	o 18.133 *
	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ λυγρὰ θεὸς μάκαρ ἐτελέησι,	o 18.134 *
	καὶ τὰ φέρει ἀεκαζόμενος τετληότι θυμῷ.	o 18.135
	τοῖος γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων,	o 18.136
1190	οἶον ἐπ' ἡμᾶρ ἄγησι θεὸς πάντεσσιν ἀνάσσων.	o 18.137+cf. i 1.288
	πάντες μὲν στυγεροὶ θάνατοι δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι,	o 12.341
	λιμῷ δ' οἴκτιστον θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν.	o 12.342
	οὐδὲν ἀκιδνότερον γαῖα τρέφει ἀνθρώποιο.	o 12.343
	αἴψα γὰρ ἐν κακότητι βροτοὶ καταγηράσκουσιν.	o 19.360
1195	οἷη περ φύλλων γενεῆ, τοιῆ δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.	i 6.146
	χρητὴ <u>ξεῖνον</u> παρέοντα φιλεῖν, ἐθέλοντα δὲ πέμπειν.	o 15.74
	τοῦ γὰρ τε <u>ξεῖνος</u> μιμνήσκεται ἡμᾶτα πάντα	o 15.54
	ἀνδρὸς <u>ξεινοδόκου</u> , ὃς κεν φιλότητα παράσχη.	o 15.55
	ἴσόν τοι κακὸν ἐσθ' ὃς τ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντα νέεσθαι	o 15.72
1200	<u>ξεῖνον</u> ἐποτρύνῃ, καὶ ὃς ἐσσύμενον κατερύκη.	o 15.73
	ἀλλ' ἄγεθ', ὡς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω, πειθώμεθα πάντες,	i 2.139
	μοίρας δασσάμενοι δαίνυσθ' ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα.	o 3.66
	δήμῳ καὶ κε τότε ἀντήσασατο δεῦρο μολόντες·	cf. o 3.44
	μειζόν κε κλέος εἶη ἐμὸν καὶ κάλλιον οὕτως	o 18.255

I give the following commands to each man among you  
if you would gain great honor and glory,  
an honor which influences the mind of other important men.  
Many wretched strangers have come here  
and they are very tired, for necessity compels them.  
You must look after these, for in the presence of God all  
are strangers and beggars. Even a small gift is precious.  
There is nothing more pitiful than man—  
of all the creatures that breathe and creep on the earth.  
For he says he will never experience harm  
So long as God gives him skill and his knees are strong.  
And when blessed God brings dire fortune his way,  
this too he endures, reluctantly, but with a patient heart.  
Such is the mindset of men who inhabit the earth.  
God, the ruler of all, drives them to a day such as this.  
All deaths are despicable to sorry mortals.  
To die of hunger and to meet one's fate is the sorriest thing of  
all.  
The earth rears nothing more worthless than man.  
For mortals grow old in wickedness.  
As the race of leaves, such is the race of men.

You should treat a stranger kindly when he's with you, but  
 send him on his way when he wants to go.  
 A stranger will remember all of his days  
 the host who offers him kindness.  
 Of course you know it is just as bad to dismiss  
 one who doesn't want to leave, as it is to detain one who is  
 eager to depart.  
 But come now, let us all believe what I say,  
 Divide up the portions and dine upon a lavish meal.  
 Then they would come here and meet in the country.  
 In this way my reputation may become greater and more  
 excellent still.

We find here in Christ's discourse on *xenia* the same iconic grounds of comparison that we saw in the Woman at the Well scene. Lines 1196-1200, bound together by the appropriate theme-word, are the words of the swineherd Eumaeus to his ξείνος, Odysseus. Likewise, the gnomic lines 1184-1190, from Odysseus' speech to the suitor Amphinomos in Book 18 (*Od.* 18.131-7), are spoken by the beggar-hero himself, after he has overcome the rival beggar, Iros, in a beggars' duel. Eudocia's intercontextual thinking—her composition by "idea-parts"—can be seen at Cento line 1184 (= *Od.* 18.131), the first of seven consecutive lines from this *Odyssey* scene. *Od.* 18.131 is identical to *Il.* 17.447, which in Homer follows *Il.* 17.446, Cento line 1183. *Od.* 18.130, the line in the series from the Iros scene that the poet suppresses (using the thematically similar line from *Il.* 17.446) actually surfaces at line 1193.

Pagans and Christians alike knew that the gods were hard to recognize (cf. *Od.* 16.161: οὐ γὰρ πως πάντεσσι θεοὶ φαίνονται ἐναργεῖς; *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 111: χαλεποὶ δὲ θεοὶ θνητοῖσιν ὀρᾶσθαι), and that it was better to err on the

side of caution than mistreat a stranger.<sup>9</sup> The author of the New Testament Epistle to the Hebrews, drawing on a rich Old Testament tradition of angelic visitations, encourages his readers "not to forget about hospitality to strangers (τῆς φιλοξενίας), for thereby some have entertained (ξετίσαντες) angels unawares" (Heb. 13:1). Eudocia's realization of Jesus' encounter with the Woman and the Well as a *xenia* scene—in all its facets—shows that Homer never ceased to be a Bible for Greek-speaking Christians.

---

<sup>9</sup> Robin Lane Fox fruitfully compares Ovid's story of Baucis and Philemon (*Met.* 8.625ff.), where Zeus and Hermes come down to earth as mortals, to that of Paul and Barnabas at Acts 14:8ff., where the apostles are received and worshipped as Zeus and Hermes come down from heaven (Lane Fox 1989:99-101; and on late antique theoxeny and divine epiphany in general 102-67).

## CHAPTER VII

### THEMES FROM THE *ILIAD*

*ἑπέων δὲ πολλὸς νομὸς ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα (Iliad 20.249)*

There is a great range of epics from place to place (Nagy 1990:24)

It is well known that a fundamental difference between the narrative strategies of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is seen in each poem's use of similes. In the *Iliad* the simile is the chief means of expanding and embellishing the narrative (Edwards 1987:109). The "outstanding characteristic of the similes in the *Iliad* is their concentration in battle contexts. Over three-fourths of the developed comparisons occur in scenes of fighting" (Moulton 1977:50).

By my count, the Centos contain twelve Homeric similes of the "long," pre-positioned *Wie-stück-So-stück* type (Fränkel 1921:4; Edwards 1991:26-8). Eleven of these come in the final scenes of the poem, which recount the betrayal, death, burial and resurrection of Jesus. Nine of these eleven are taken from the *Iliad*. It is not incidental that the distribution and concentration of Homeric similes in the Centos correspond to the increasingly violent themes toward the end of the poem. The Centos' concentration of Homeric similes in the "Iliadic" second-half of the poem is

an example of structural intertextuality vaguely reminiscent of Vergil's treatment of Homeric themes in the *Aeneid*. This intertextual pattern in the Centos is based on iconicity at the broadest level: as the theme becomes violent, the poet scans the axis of selection for the appropriate signs, and finds them most readily in the *Iliad*. Such intertextuality is also a factor on a smaller scale in several other episodes. In the Slaughter of the Innocents (301-339), for example, with its violent, even martial theme, thirty-two of thirty-nine total lines come from the *Iliad*.

In this Chapter I use Cento similes as a platform for discussing Eudocia's realization of Iliadic themes and the iconic and symbolic grounds on which those realizations are based. The simile presents an interesting case, for it is iconic by definition: it makes a comparison between two or more objects or situations based on a perceived similarity. The use of Homeric similes in the Centos adds as a third point of comparison the Homeric context in which the simile occurs. That context contains the object of comparison. The Homeric context with its object stand together (at one remove) as an icon to Eudocia and can serve as an intertextual ground for a symbol. Thus, the Homeric similes in the Centos contain within them the grounds for their appropriation *from* Homer and, *in absentia*, their points of reference *in* Homer. The semiotic process thickens. Consider these examples:

(1) At 1519-1521 Judas enters the upper room for the Last Supper and is indirectly compared to Sarpedon storming the Achaean wall:



	βῆ δ' ἴμεν ὡς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος, ὅς τ' ἐπαδευῆς	i 12.299
1520	δηρὸν ἔη κρειῶν, κέλεται δέ ἐ θυμὸς ἀγῆνωρ	i 12.300
	μήλων πειρήσοντα καὶ ἐς πυκινὸν δόμον ἐλθεῖν.	i 12.301

**He came on like a mountain lion when he's gone  
without meat for a spell and his strong heart compells  
him to make an attempt on the sheep and go for the sheepfold.**

**(2) Judas is indirectly compared to Hector standing his ground  
against Achilles at Jesus' arrest in the Garden of Gethemane (1643-1646):**

	ὡς δὲ δράκων ἐπὶ χειρὶ ὀρέστερος ἄνδρα μένησι,	i 22.93
	βεβρωκῶς κακὰ φάρμακ', ἔδν δέ τε μιν χόλος αἰνός,	i 22.94
1645	σμερδαλέον δὲ δέδορκεν ἐλισσόμενος περὶ χειρῆ·	i 22.95
	ὡς ἄρ' ὁ γ' ἄσβεστόν περ ἔχων μένος οὐχ ὑπεχώρει.	i 22.96 †

**You've seen a snake from the mountains wait for a man near  
his hole,  
glutted with poison, who, when fury comes dreadful upon him,  
stares at you horribly, coiling himself around his lair:  
just so, with inexhaustable nerve, he held firm to his ground.**

**(3) At Jesus' arrest Judas is further compared to Ajax in his rush  
against the Trojans to retrieve the body of Patroclus (1658-1660):**

	ἴθυσεν δὲ διὰ προμάχων, σὺι εἵκελος ἀλκῆν	i 17.281
	καπρίῳ, ὅς τ' ἐν ὄρεσσι κύνας θαλερούς τ' αἰζηνοὺς	i 17.282
1660	ῥηϊδίως ἐκέδασσεν, ἄλυξάμενος' διὰ βήσσης.	i 17.283 †

**He shot through the front lines, like a wild boar  
in his strength, who scatters sleek, vigorous dogs  
with no trouble at all, and escapes through the ravines.**

**In using these similes to describe the villain Judas, Eudocia disregards the  
fact that in their original context the comparisons serve to enoble brave,  
heroic actions. In her disregard, she is no respecter of persons, but**

predicates the martial fury of both Achaeans and Trojans to the traitor Judas without partiality.

Iconically, these similes are related to each other: each occurs in a scene of violence, and makes a comparison between man and beast. The wild animals with which the Homeric heroes are compared—lion, snake and boar—carry largely negative symbolic connotations in Christian discourse. The Devil "prowls about like a roaring lion" (1 Peter 5:8) and deceives the first man and woman in the form of a serpent (Gen. 3:1). Pigs are fit only for demonic possession (cf. Mark 5:11-13; Cento lines 960-972). Thus, the identification of Judas with these animals implies that his behavior is demonic. That this is Eudocia's interpretant here is suggested by Cento line 36 (from the Fall of Adam and Eve episode) where the Devil himself, the δράκων of *Il.* 2.308 (= line 34), is identified with a Cento periphrasis used elsewhere only of Judas: ὅς κακὰ πόλλ' ἔρδεσκεν ὅσ' οὐ σύμπαντες οἱ ἄλλοι (*Il.* 22.380). The biblical theme provided grounds of its own, for the Gospel of Luke explicitly states that Satan "entered" Judas at the Last Supper (Lk. 22.3). In these Cento similes we see the interpretant processing Homeric icons (i.e. similes) as symbols for something larger than the similes themselves. As Peirce was well aware "Symbols grow. They come into being by development out of other signs, particularly from icons, or from mixed signs partaking of the nature of icons and symbols" (Peirce 1955:115).

Eudocia's symbolic use of animal similes extends once to Christ. At the Crucifixion—predictably—Jesus is compared to a ram (ἀρνειός) with a

two-line simile spoken by Priam of Odysseus in the *Teichoscopia* (for Christ as an ἀμνός see e.g. Jn. 1:29 and 36, as ἄρνιον see the Book of Revelation *passim*). Those lines are followed, with considerable V-Effekt, by a line from *Odyssey* Book 9 describing the Cyclops' favorite sheep (under which, suggestively, Odysseus is hid). These three lines come straight on the heels of a short simile comparing the Roman soldiers to wolves:

	ἄρνηστές δ' ἐτέρωθεν ὁμόκλειον ἐν μεγάροισι.	ο 22.211 †
	ἴθυσαν δὲ ἰλύκοισιν ἑοικότες ἰμοφάγοισιν.	ι 17.725+5.782 †
	ἀρνειῷ μιν ἐγὼ γε εἶσκω πηγεσιμάλῳ	ι 3.197
1865	ὅς τ' οἴων μέγα πῶϋ διέρχεται ἀργεννάων	ι 3.198
	ἀρνειὸς γὰρ ἔην μήλων ὄχ' ἄριστος ἀπάντων.	ο 9.432

On both sides of the palace, the perpetrators urged themselves  
on.

They sprang forth like carnivorous wolves.  
And so I would liken him to a fleecy ram,  
who passes through a large flock of white sheep;  
he was, after all, by far the finest ram in the flock.

In accordance with D'Assigny's Rule 3, the semantic accommodation of *Il.* 17.725 from "dogs" to "wolves" suggests its "Contrary" or "Opposite," the lamb; that in turn stands to the interpretant as a symbol for Christ, the paschal Lamb of God in Christian discourse.

In contrast to these examples of animal similes used as symbols, other Cento similes, although transformed by their new context, retain their original iconic qualities. For example,

(1) As they seize Jesus and whip him, Roman soldiers are compared to the Myrmidons joining the fray (1820-1823):

1820	αὐτίκα δὲ σφήκεσσιν ἐοικότες ἐξεχέοντο	i 16.259
	εἰνοδίοις, οὓς παῖδες ἐριδμαίνωσιν ἔθοντες.	i 16.260 *
	αἰεὶ κερτομέοντες, ὁδῶ ἐπὶ οἰκί' ἔχοντες,	i 16.261
	νηπίαχοι. ξυνὸν δὲ κακὸν πολέεσσι τιθείσι.	i 16.262

**Suddenly they poured out like hornets  
At the wayside, which children enrage, as children do,  
Constantly provoking them in their roadway nest,  
The fools, causing a public nuisance for many.**

(2) At 2154-2160 the soldiers guarding the tomb wake from sleep before dawn with a simile describing the Achaean sentries in the *Doloneia*:

	ὡς δὲ κύνες περὶ μῆλα δυσωρήσωνται ἐν αὐλήῃ	i 10.183
	θηρὸς ἀκούσαντες κρατερόφρονος, ὅς τε καθ' ὕλην	i 10.184
	ἔρχηται δι' ὄρεσφι· πολὺς δ' ὄρυμαγδὸς ἐπ' αὐτῶ	i 10.185
	ἀνδρῶν ἠδὲ κυνῶν, ἀπὸ τέ σφισιν ὕπνος ὄλωλεν.	i 10.186
2160	ὡς τῶν νήδυμος ὕπνος ἀπὸ βλεφάροϊν ὀλώλει.	i 10.187

**As dogs keep a hard watch over sheep in the yard  
When they hear a dangerous beast clamber through the woods  
And mountains, and there's a loud noise  
Of both dogs and men over it, and their sleep is ruined—  
That's how sweet sleep died in their eyes.**

(3) In a piquant simile from the *Odyssey*, Peter is compared to Odysseus camped out on the porch of his palace in Ithaca (1807-1811).

These lines describe Peter's remorse over his denial of Christ:

	ὡς δ' ὅτε γαστέρ' ἀνὴρ πολέος πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο	o 20.25
	ἐμπλείην κνίσσης τε καὶ αἵματος ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα	o 20.26
1810	αἰόλλη, μάλα δ' ὄκα λιλαίεται ὀπτηθῆναι,	o 20.27
	ὡς ἄρ' ὄγ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ἐλίσσετο μερμηρίζων.	o 20.28

**You know how a man rotates a haggis,  
Stuffed with blood and with fat, over a blazing bonfire  
Back and forth, anxious for it to be roasted quickly:**

That's how he tossed, turning things over in his mind.

In Homer the comparison of Myrmidon troops to hornets (exhibit 1 above) conveys the quality of their movement and demeanor as they disembark from their ships. "This image of angry wasps makes an impact on almost every level of the senses—audible, visual, tactile, and kinesthetic" (Hofmeister 1995:311). Although here, as in Homer, the simile is predicated of soldiers, the quality of the comparison has changed, acquiring its significance from its new context: the hornets' "sting" is suggestive of the pain of flogging that Jesus is enduring in this scene at the hands of the swarming soldiers (1825 = *Il.* 23.363; cf. Mk. 15:17-19; Lk. 22:63-65); the children who have provoked them suggests a reference by analogy to the mob and their jeering condemnation of Jesus (cf. Lk. 23:23; Mt. 27:24).

In exhibit 2 the guards the Pharisees have had stationed at Christ's tomb (Mt. 27:63-66) are positively compared to vigilant dogs. The point of this simile appears to be to dispel rumors recorded in the Gospel of Matthew that the "elders and chief priests," upon learning that Christ's body was missing, bribed the soldiers to say that his disciples had stolen the corpse while they had fallen asleep on the watch (Mt. 28:11-13; explicitly stated at Cento lines 2088-2099 = *Il.* 24.71 + *Il.* 24. 436). They were not in fact sleeping (οὐδὲ γὰρ εὐδοντες φυλάκων ἡγήτορες ἔσσαν 2154 = *Il.* 10.181), the simile informs us, but were wide awake, when Jesus "easily escaped their notice" (ῥεῖα λαθῶν φύλακάς τ' ἄνδρας δμῶας τε ἅπαντας 2153 = *Il.* 9.477).

Underlying this apparently polemical intent, however, is a keen

iconic awareness of context and detail. The simile is introduced in the Centos by *Il.* 9.477 which describes Phoenix's pre-dawn escape from the house of his father Amyntor, where he was kept under guard (φύλακας ἔχον) by his kinsmen for nine nights after a quarrel over his father's mistress (*Il.* 9.470-1). Like Phoenix, Christ too is held captive by guards (φύλακες) for a set period of time ("two days and two nights" 2163-2164 = *Od.* 9.74 + *Il.* 16.414). The noise of wild beast, men and dogs in the simile suggests by analogy the great earthquake attending the Resurrection (*Mt.* 28:2).

In using *Od.* 20.25-8 (exhibit 3) to describe Peter's remorse Eudocia displays a deep Homeric awareness of human psychology. In Homer these lines describe Odysseus' rage at the disloyalty of his serving women who go out nightly to sleep with the suitors. In the simile he is both the haggis and the man who roasts it as he wrestles with whether he should kill them on the spot, or keep to his comprehensive plan for revenge (*Od.* 20.10-13). "Disloyalty" is also the point of the biblical theme—of which the protagonist himself is guilty; thus, instead of indignant rage we have remorse. The simile is used in the Centos as an icon for the nausea associated with remorse: the churning and burning of a stomach (γαστέρα) "filled with blood and with fat."

As in (2), other iconic details link this biblical theme and the Homeric context: the presence of serving women (a παιδίσκη interrogates Peter at *Lk.* 22:56), the time (after dark), and the setting (both scenes take place on the porch or forecourt of a palace: ἐν προδόμῳ *Od.* 20.1; *Jn.* 18:16 πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ ἔξω; *Lk.* 22:55 ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς). Place, occasion, physiological symptom: not only

is Peter's remorse "like" a sizzling haggis and the man who impatiently waits to see it done with (i.e. "cooked"), his larger situation is "like" the one Odysseus faces in Ithaca. In fact, the whole Cento scene is introduced by the opening verses of *Odyssey* Book 20 (verses 6-7, 9, 10 and 13 at Cento lines 1768-1770 and 1789-1790). As recent empirical studies of the role of context in memory-recall attest, "what is remembered is not a word, but an experience" (Baddeley 1990:285). For Eudocia this is the experience of reading; the fruit of her experience here is a brilliant transformation of an already ingenious simile.

At Christ's death and burial the use of similes is more involved:

(1) The soldiers presiding over the Crucifixion are compared to a mass of Achaeans who crowd over Sarpedon's body as the Trojans try to recover it (1936-1938):

οἱ δ' αἰεὶ περὶ νεκρὸν ὁμίλειον, ὡς ὅτε μυῖαι	i 16.641
σταθμῶ' ἐπὶ βρομέωσι περιγλαγέας κατὰ πέλλας,	i 16.642 †
ᾠρη ἐν εἰαρινῇ, ὅτε γλάγος ἄγγεα δεύει.	i 16.643

They were gathered around the corpse like flies  
In a barn, buzzing over the milk pails  
In springtime, when the milk splashes in buckets.

(2) In bringing the body of Jesus to burial, the disciples are compared to the Danaans carrying the body of Patroclus away from the battle line (2077-2081):

οἱ δ' ὥς θ' ἡμίονοι κρατερὸν μένος ἀμφιβαλόντες	i 17.742
ἔλκωσ' ἐξ ὄρεος κατὰ παιπαλόεσσιν ἀταρπὸν,	i 17.743
ἢ δοκὸν ἢ δόρυ μέγα νήϊον ἐν δέ τε θυμὸς	i 17.744

2080 τείρεθ' ὁμοῦ καμάτῳ τε καὶ ἰδρῶ σπευδόντεσσιν· i 17.745  
 ὡς οἱ γ' ἔμμεμαῶτε νέκυν φέρον· αὐτὰρ ὕπερθεν i 17.746 †

**As mules clothed in their full strength  
 Haul a beam or a huge plank for a ship  
 Down a rugged mountain path, and their hearts  
 Fail as they hasten with the toil and sweat of the work,  
 So did the two of them strain to carry the corpse.**

Here, unlike the animal similes discussed above, the context is respected. The first simile equates Jesus with Sarpedon—in spite of the fact that Judas had just been compared to him at 1519-1521. The context and perspective, however, have changed and with it the character's iconic potential: Sarpedon is now noble in death where he once was (symbolically) a demon in life. The dead Sarpedon has other iconic qualities to recommend him as well: the beloved of Zeus, over whom he weeps tears of blood (*Il.* 16.459), Sarpedon is saved from the shame of death (though not actual death) and whisked away to Lycia for an honorable burial (*Il.* 16.667-83). In fact, when Zeus sees that the warrior's fate is near in his duel with Patroclus, he is tempted to save him, like Jesus, from death altogether, though Hera dissuades him from this unprecedented course of action (*Il.* 16.440-58).

The simile involving Patroclus (exhibit 2) brings the scene of Christ's death and burial (2030-2086) to a close, yet like a hypertext link, opens up other windows connected by images of death. This vignette of Homeric *Pietà* deserves our closest attention.

The episode begins with three lines describing how two disciples haul



Jesus' body from the cross like a fallen soldier from battle (2030 of Teucer;  
2031 of Patroclus):

2030	‘τόνδ’ ἄρ’ ἔπειθ’ ὑποδύντε δύω ἐρίηρες ἑταῖροι, κάτθεσαν ἐν λεχέεσσι· φίλοι δ’ ἀμφέσταν ἑταῖροι μυρόμενοι· θαλερόν δὲ κατείβετο δάκρυ παρειῶν.	i 8.332 † i 18.233 i 24.794
------	--	-----------------------------------

And then, supporting him, two faithful companions  
placed him on the bier, while his companions, his friends,  
stood around  
grieving; and a fresh tear fell from their cheeks.

Structurally this episode unfolds as a Homeric burial type-scene (Edwards 1986:84). Eudocia's book- and episode-favoritism points specifically to the deaths and burials of Patroclus and Hector, where the intertextual connections between Homeric sign and biblical theme are particularly strong. A series of fitting verses are taken from *Iliad* Books 18, 19 and 24 (2030-2039) which describe the preparation of the bodies of Hector and Patroclus for burial and their magical preservation from the rot of worms and flies:

	ἀμφὶ δὲ μιν φᾶρος καλὸν βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνα. ἐν λεχέεσσι δὲ θέντες ἕανῶ λιτὴ κάλυψαν	i 24.588 i 18.352
2035	ἔς πόδας ἐκ κεφαλῆς· καθύπερθε δὲ φάρεϊ λευκῶ. ἐν δ’ ὠτειλάς πλησαν ἀλείφατος ἐννεάροιο. ‘ἀλλὰ γὰρ’ οὐδέ τι οἱ χρώς σήπετο, οὐδέ μιν εὐλαὶ ἔσθουσ’, αἶ ῥά τε φῶτας ἀρηιφάτους κατέδουσιν. αἰεὶ τῷδ’ ἔσται χρώς ἔμπεδον ἢ καὶ ἄρειον.	i 18.353 i 18.351 i 24.414 * † i 24.415 i 19.33 *

And they tossed a fine cloak and tunic around him,  
set him out on a bier, and covered him with soft linen  
from head to foot, with a clean cloak underneath.  
Then they stopped the wounds with an oil aged for nine years.  
His flesh, however, saw no decay, nor did the worms

consume it, who are otherwise wont to devour men slain in  
battle.  
This man's flesh will always be intact—even firmer than  
before.

Like Sarpedon, Hector is a Judas in actual battle, but becomes a powerful icon for Jesus in death: his feet are pierced (*Il.* 22. 396-7) and his corpse is stabbed with spears (*Il.* 22.371; cf. Jn. 19:34 and Cento lines 1951-1955 = *Il.* 21.60-3). The connection between the two characters is explicit at 1930-1931 where Christ gives up the ghost in lines describing the death of Hector, the breaker of horses (*Il.* 22.361-2). Both tragic heroes die naked (1875 = *Il.* 22.510) and taunted to the last (1956 = *Il.* 22.375).

In Homer the bodies of Hector and Patroclus are miraculously preserved, by Hermes and Thetis respectively. In Eudocia's activation of this theme, lines referring to both Homeric scenes come to mind, one after the other (2037-2039). At one level, the lines are used here as an icon for the "natural" consequence and intended purpose of the wraps, herbs, perfumes and oils used by the women in the preparation of Jesus' body (Lk. 24:1; Jn. 19:39-40; Mk. 16:1). However, given the praeternatural quality of their preservation in Homer and the interpretant's grounding in Christian discourse, there is surely also a symbolic reference to the belief that Jesus' body did not decay, in fulfillment of several Old Testament prophecies, for example, LXX Psalm 16:110, quoted as a Christian prooftext at Acts 2:27 and 13:35: "For thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades, nor let thy Holy One see corruption (διαφθοράν)." In the Centos this theme foreshadows the Resurrection, as the retention of the future tense ἔσται at 2039 suggests.

Mary's lament over her dead son (2040ff.) continues the structural intertextuality of the larger scene, and builds on the comparison of Christ with Hector and Patroclus in accordance with D'Assigny's Rule of Contraries and Opposites: she embraces and addresses him as Briseis does Patroclus (2041-2042; 2064), weeps for him as Thetis for Achilles (2044, 2048), faints, recovers and pronounces a moving elegy like Andromache at Hector's funeral (2046; 2058-2061; 2065-2067), and mourns her son's trip to Hades as Anticleia does Odysseus' (2049-2051; 2062-2063). The passage runs thus:

2040	μήτηρ δ' ἢ μιν ἔτικτε καὶ ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἐόντα, ἀμφ' αὐτῷ χυμένη λίγ' ἀνεκώκυε, χερσὶ δ' ἄμυσσε στήθεά τ' ἠδ' ἀπαλήν δειρήν ἰδὲ καλὰ πρόσωπα. ἐκπάγλως γὰρ παιδὸς ὀδύρετο οἰχομένοιο. ὄξυ δὲ κωκύσασα κάρη λάβε παιδὸς ἐοῖο.	ο 23.325 i 19.284 i 19.285 ο 15.355 *
2045	ἀμβρόσιαι δ' ἄρα χαῖται ἐπερρώσαντο ἄνακτος. τήν δὲ κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἐρεβεννὴ νύξ ἐκάλυπεν. ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἄμπνυτο, καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη, καὶ ῥ' ὀλοφυρομένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, "τέκνον ἐμόν, πῶς ἦλθες ὑπὸ ζόφον ἠερόεντα	i 1.529 i 22.466 ο 5.458 i 18.72 ο 11.155
2050	ζωὸς ἐών; χαλεπὸν δὲ τόδε ζωοῖσιν ὀραῖσθαι. οἴμοι τέκνον ἐμόν, πέρι πάντων κάμμορε φωτῶν, πῶς ἂν ἔπειτ' ἄπο σεῖο, φίλον τέκος, αὐθι λιποίμην; πῆ γὰρ ἐγὼ, φίλε τέκνον, ἴω; τεῦ δάμαθ' ἴκωμαι; πῶς ἔτλης "Αἰδόσδε κατελθέμεν, ἐνθά τε νεκροί;"	ο 11.156 ο 11.157 i 9.437 ο 15.509 ο 11.475
2055	ἀμφὶ δὲ παιδι φίλω βάλε πήχεε 'δάκρυ χέουσα' κύσσε δὲ μιν κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλὰ, χεῖρας τ' ἀμφοτέρας; θαλερὸν δὲ οἱ ἔκπεσε δάκρυ. "τέκνον', ἐμοί γε μάλιστα λελείπεται ἄλγεα λυγρὰ. οὐ γάρ μοι θνήσκων λεχέων ἐκ χεῖρας ὄρεξας.	ο 17.38 † ο 17.39 ο 16.16 i 24.742 † i 24.743
2060	οὐδέ τι μοι εἶπες πυκινὸν ἔπος, οὐ τέ κεν αἰεὶ μεμνήμην νύκτας τε καὶ ἡματα δάκρυ χέουσα.	i 24.744 i 24.745

	ἀλλὰ με σός τε πόθος σά τε μήδεα, (φαίδιμε υἱέ),	o 11.202 †
	σή τ' ἀγανοφροσύνη μελίηδέα θυμὸν ἀπηύρα.	o 11.203
	τῶ σ' ἄμοτον κλαίω τεθνηότα μείλιχον αἰεί.	i 19.300
2065	νῦν δὲ σὺ μὲν ῥ' Ἄϊδαο δόμους ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης	i 22.482
	ἔρχεαι, αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ στυγερῶ ἔνι πένθει λείπεις."	i 22.483

The mother who bore him and nursed him when he was young,  
pouring all over him, raised a sharp cry of lament, and with her hands she tore at her breast, her supple neck and lovely face, for she was struck with grief over her departed son. She wailed bitterly as she took hold of her son's head, while the ambrosial locks of the Lord flowed down. A night as dark as Erebus covered her eyes— but once she regained consciousness, and her spirit returned to her chest, she uttered winged words, afflicted with grief:  
"O my child, how can you have gone down to the nether gloom and still be alive? This is a difficult thing for the living to see. Oh my child! more fated than all mortal men. How can I possibly remain, separated from you? Where will I go, my dear child? to whose home? How have you dared go down to Hades, where the corpses are?"  
She threw her arms around her dear son, weeping, and kissed his head, the area around his handsome eyes, and his two hands. A fresh tear fell:  
"Child, for me grievous woe remains. For in death you do not reach out to me from the bier. You did not utter a pithy saying that I could always remember, as I weep night and day. But my longing for you, your counsels, shining son, and your gentle manner has begun to steal my sweet life away. I mourn you, motionless, dead and forever mild. But now to Hades' home, in the recesses of earth, you go and leave me here in awful pain."

The comparison of Mary with Briseis and Andromache follows from the initial comparisons of Christ with Patroclus and Hector. With Thetis and Anticleia Mary shares the additional attribute "mother" and the iconic

quality "grief." The former comparison implies "child" or "son," and this in turn generates several miscellaneous lines with that icon: 2043 = *Od.* 15.355 (of Laertes grief over his son Odysseus), 2052 = *Il.* 9.437 (Phoenix pleading with Achilles), 2057 = *Od.* 16.16 (Eumaeus embracing Telemachus "as a father does a son"), 2071 = *Od.* 16.220 (describing the joy of Odysseus and Telemachus as they are united as father and son). All these appropriations depend upon the Rule of Contraries and Opposites, and, as seen in an earlier chapter, are linked together by the key-words τέκνον and παῖς.<sup>1</sup>

Cento similes reveal Eudocia's intercontextual thinking as it processes signs from the *Iliad en bloc*. However, her use of *Iliad* lines is by no means limited to similes. Many scenes are realized with individual lines or series of lines from the poem of force. Cento healing episodes especially are populated with lines taken from Homeric battle type-scenes. The sick are described as wounded heroes; Christ and his patients are consistently compared to warriors locked in battle. In Jesus' encounter with the the demoniac of Gerasa, to cite but one example, the possessed man is portrayed with lines describing the furious fighting of Ajax (926; 935-937), Athena's entry into battle (927-928), Bellerophontes' mad wandering (929-930), Hector foaming at the mouth (932), and Achilles ignited to fury by the sight of his new armour (933). This depiction of demonic possession reflects biblical details (foaming at the mouth;

---

<sup>1</sup> On Mary's lament over Jesus in late antique and early Byzantine literature see Alexiou 1974:62-78.

unusual gait) and clearly has been influenced by accounts of possession from other sources as well (e.g. wild hair; fiery eyes; sweating; heavy breathing) (cf. Makris 1995):

	φοῖτα δὲ μακρὰ βιβὰς, φωνὴ δὲ οἱ αἰθέρ' ἰκάνεν.	i 15.686
	στάς δ' ὅτε μὲν παρὰ τάφρον ὄρυκτὴν τείχεος ἔκτός,	i 20.49
	ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἀκτάων ἐριδούπων μακρὸν αὐτεῖ.	i 20.50
	ἦτοι ὁ καπ πεδίον τὸ ἀλήϊον οἶος ἀλάτο,	i 6.201
930	ὄν θυμὸν κατέδων, πάτον ἀνθρώπων ἀλεείνων,	i 6.202
	δηρὸν τηκόμενος· στυγερὸς δὲ οἱ ἔχραε δαίμων.	o 5.396
	ἀφλοισιμὸς δὲ περὶ στόμα γίνετο· τῷ δὲ οἱ ὄσσε	i 15.607
	δεινὸν ὑπὸ βλεφάρων ὡς εἰ σέλας ἐξεφάνθεν.	i 19.17
	χαῖται δ' ἐρρώνοντο μετὰ πνοίης ἀνέμοιο.	i 23.367
935	αἰεὶ δ' ἀργαλέῳ ἔχετ' ἄσθματι· καδ δὲ οἱ ἰδρῶς	i 16.109
	πάντοθεν ἐκ μελέων πολὺς ἔρρεεν, οὐδέ πη εἶχεν	i 16.110
	ἀμπνεῦσαι· πάντη δὲ κακὸν κακῶ ἐστήρικτο.	i 16.111

And he came on with huge strides; his voice reached to the sky.  
Taking his stand near the pomerium, outside the wall,  
He shouts now and again a long distance along the roaring  
shore.

He wanders alone over the wandering plain  
eating his heart out, avoiding the beaten path of men,  
and has been wasting away for a long time. The heinous  
demon attacked him,  
and started to foam at the mouth. His eyes blazed  
wickedly under his brow, like lightning.  
And his hair tossed about with a gust of wind.  
He kept panting terribly, and sweated profusely  
all over all of his body: he couldn't catch  
his breath. Evil through and through.

Christ meets this opponent, cast as a raging Homeric warrior, with vaunts typical of the Homeric hero. He boasts like Achilles over the doomed Asteropaios (948-949), provokes his enemy as Ajax does Hector (950) and threatens him as Menelaus does Euphorbus (954-956):

	τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν ὁ μευ ἔτλης ἀντίον ἐλθεῖν;	i 21.150
	δυστήνων δέ τε παῖδες ἐμῷ μένει ἀντιόωσι.	i 21.151
950	δαιμόνιε, σχεδὸν ἐλθέ· τίη δειδίσσεα 'οὔτως';	i 13.810 @
	δαιμόνιε, φθίσει σὲ τὸ σὸν μένος· οὐδ' ἐλεαίρεις	i 6.407
	ἄνδρα γέροντα δύη ἀρήμενον, ἧ μιν ἰκάνει,	o 18.81
	καὶ μάλα τειρόμενον, καὶ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πένθος ἔχοντα;	o 7.218
	ᾧς θην καὶ σὸν ἐγὼ λύσω μένος, εἰ κέ μευ ἄντα	i 17.29
955	στήης, ἀλλά σ' ἔγωγ' ἀναχωρήσαντα κελεύω	i 17.30
	ἔς πληθὺν ἰέναι· μηδ' ἀντίος ἴστασ' ἐμεῖο.	i 17.31

"Where are you from, you who dare to engage me?  
 I assure you, only the children of unfortunate men encounter  
 my strength.  
 Demon, come close; what are you afraid of?  
 Your own strength, demon, will destroy you; have you no pity  
 for an old man worn out with the misery that came his way,  
 completely tired, with grief in his heart?  
 Yes indeed, I will undo your strength, if you would stand before  
 me; but I command you to return to the crowd. Do not stand in  
 my presence."

Appropriate to their context in Homer, the appropriated lines are linked together by the key-word μένος "strength." The word δαιμόνιε at 950-951, a characteristic Homeric form of impolite or coarse address, is used catachrestically by the poet here, as elsewhere in the Centos, for "demon;" this verbal icon is the basis for the generation of two successive lines, and is reinforced symbolically in that the identification of the Homeric gods and heroes with biblical δαίμονες (based on the lexical match) was a topos in Christian apologetic.<sup>2</sup>

These are only a few of many *Iliad* appropriations. What is clear

---

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Clement of Alexandria *Protrep.* 4.55.4-5 (citing *Il.* 1.22); Justin *Apol.* 1 5,9; *Apol.* 2 5; Athenagoras *Leg.* 23-27 as cited in MacDonald 1994:20; 29.

from these examples, however, is that Eudocia's assimilations are not based on a simple evaluative formula: X is "good," Y is "bad." As we see from Christ's response to the demoniac, the referents in Cento appropriations are not stable, nor the grounds for comparison consistent: Judas, the demoniac, and Jesus are all compared to Ajax; both Christ and the demoniac are compared to Achilles; in the earlier examples both Christ and Judas were compared to Hector. The referent alone is no reliable guide to interpretation, because in Cento intertextuality there is no one-to-one correspondence between Homeric and biblical characters. The grounds for comparison are variously tied to attribute and function. Sometimes the context suggests or reinforces one or more grounds; other times the ground itself overrides context, leading to V-Effekt.

Eudocia's activation of themes in her *parole* re-generation of Homeric verse throws the intertextual and semiotic aspects of Cento composition into high relief, and calls attention to itself as a powerfully comparative reading of Homer and the Bible unique to late antiquity. Eudocia's assimilations are not allegories, not even her realizations based on symbolic grounds. They do not, in Northrop Frye's definition of allegory, "smooth out the discrepancies in a metaphorical structure by making it conform to a conceptual standard" (Frye 1982:10). It is *not* the case in the Centos, as it was for pagan and Christian allegorical readers of Homer, that "The 'secondary' level of meaning is obtrusive and takes on a greater importance than the action itself, which has lost all claim even to a coherent 'surface' meaning" (Lamberton 1986:146). In the Centos the



surface meaning is not obliterated; discrepancies are allowed to stand; indeed, they are fostered by the very act of appropriation, sometimes multiplied, as we have seen, by accommodation.

Eudocia is essentially a comparatist—a careful reader with an excellent memory who delights in the workings of plot and character. Her *Centos* are an act of Homeric and biblical interpretation in which surface and symbol possess equal validity. Her art "is at once Surface and Symbol," the product, we might say, of an "anagogical" reading of Homer, in the sense defined by Dante (*Convivio* 2.1), whose validation of both surface and symbolic meanings stands in a tradition of poetic theory stretching back at least as far as the philosopher Proclus, Eudocia's younger contemporary (Liebescheutz 1995:196-7; Sheppard 1980:162-202).

Like the *Cantos* Eudocia's *Centos* are at times "mannered, allusive, enigmatic, esoteric;" yet like Dante, Eudocia "clearly invites the reader to come at their ultimate meaning through a surface that is, within the limits of a very conventionalized mode of representing reality, real" (Damon 1961:334). As Dante himself declares of his own work, the sense of poetry, though "real," "is not simple, but may rather be called polysemous, that is, of many senses. For the sense that is gathered by the letter is one, and the sense that is gathered by the things signified by the letter another" (Dante in Wicksteed 1903:66). Roman Jakobson explains that this is so because "The poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination." "Similarity superimposed on contiguity imparts to poetry its thoroughgoing symbolic, multiplex,

polysemantic essence." In the generation of poetry, to quote Jakobson's well-known slogan, "everything sequent is a simile" (Jakobson 1958:358; 370).

*That*, I suggest, is the poetry of the Homeric Centos, a rhapsodic, *parole* re-generation of Homer within the larger context of late antique aesthetics, where, in the words of Michael Roberts, "Fragments of earlier poets, invested with brilliance and color by their original context, are manipulated and juxtaposed in striking new combinations, often exploiting the contrast with the previous text in sense, situation, or setting" (Roberts 1989:56).

The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are a Bible of human experience. Somehow they contained all Eudocia needed to tell the Gospel story. Whenever and wherever Eudocia needed to express greatness, pain, truthfulness, deceit, beauty, suffering, mourning, recognition, understanding, fear, or astonishment there was an apt Homeric line or passage ready in her memory to be recalled. As Robert Wood concluded in his great *Essay on the Original Genius and Writing of Homer*,

The more we consider the Poet's age, country, and travels, the more we discover that he took his scenery and landscape from nature, his manners and characters from life, his persons and facts (whether fabulous or historical) from tradition, and his passions and sentiments from experience of the operations of the human mind in others, compared with, and corrected by his own feelings (Wood 1775:294).

That poet was also Eudocia.

## APPENDIX I

### LIST OF HALF-LINES

#### a. Half-lines joined at the weak penthemimeral caesura:

33	λοῖσθος ἀνήρ ὄριστος·   ἔϊκτο δὲ θέσκελον αὐτῷ.	i 23.536+107
121	πάντες δ' εὐχετόωντο   κελαινεφεῖ Κρονίωνι,	i 11.761+1.397
384	κέκλυτε μευ πάντες μῦθόν τ' εὖ γνῶτε ἕκαστος.	i 19.101+84
1274	"ὄρνυθι', μηδ' ἔτι κείσο."   σέβας δ' ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας	i 18.178+o3.123 *†
1392	'καδ' δὲ δέπας περικαλλῆς   ὃ οἱ παλάμηφιν ἀρήρει,	i 11.632+3.338
1548	ἡμεῖς δὲ φραζώμεθ'   ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα,	o 23.117+17.274
1739	ὥς ἄρα τίς εἶπεσκεν,   ὃ δ' οὐκ ἐμπάζετο μύθων,	i 4.85+o17.488
1796	χερσὶ καταπρηνέσσι.   δάκρυα δὲ ἔκβαλε θερμὰ,	i 15.144 +o 19.362
1840	ἀλλ' ἀναχασσώμεσθα,   θεοῦ δ' ἀλεώμεθα μῆνιν.	i 7.264+5.34 *
1597	'καὶ τότ' ἄρ' ἄγγελος ἦλθεν   ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος	i 2.786+19.130
206	καρπαλίμως δ' ἦϊξεν   ἐπὶ χθόνα πουλυβότειραν	i 11.118+619

#### b. Half-lines joined at the strong penthemimeral caesura:

207	οὐρανόθεν καταβάς   διὰ αἰθέρος ἀτρυγέτοιο,	i 11.184+17.425
214	ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ ἔπορον·   ὃ δὲ μιν πρόφρων ὑπέδεκτο	i 14.504+9.480 * †
648	νειόθεν ἐκ κραδίης,   οὐδ' ἐν μέσσοισιν ἀναστάς.	i 10.10+ i.19.77
805	ἔξετο δ' ὀρθωθείς·   ὃ δ' ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν αὐσας,	i 23.235 +6.66
1203	δήμῳ καὶ 'σάρκεσσ'   ἦντησατο δεῦρο μολόντες·	i 8.380+ o 3.44 *
1388	χερσὶ διακλάσσας,   μεγάλ' εὐχετο χεῖρας 'ὄρεγνύς'	i 5.216+ 1.450
1412	μισθῷ ἐπὶ ῥητῷ.   τὸ δὲ ῥίγιον, αἶ κεν ἀλώη.	i 21.445+11.405 *

**APPENDIX II**  
**LIST OF LINES WITH NO EXACT**  
**EQUIVALENT IN HOMER**

**a. Cento lines with no exact equivalent in Homer:**

258	τήνδ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη κήρυξ πεισήνωρ,	cf. o 2.38
449	ἦμος δ' ἄρ' ὃ γ' ἐλούσατο ἐν ποταμῷ βαθυδίνη,	cf. o 6.210
473	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μεγάλου θεοῦ εὐχομαι ἔμμεναι υἱὸς.	cf. i 21.87
599	ὣς φάτο. τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέειπεν ἔπεσσι,	cf. o 16.193
667(= 846)	ὣς φάτο· τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε μέγας θεὸς εὐξομένοιο.	cf. i 1.453
970	χοίρων τ' ὄλλυμένων ἀγγελῶν τε σκιδνομενάων.	cf. o 10.123
1397	ἀθάνατοι δ' εἶεν καὶ ἀγήραοι ἦματα πάντα.	cf. o 23.336
1757	αὐτὰρ ὄγ' ἐν προδόμοισι καθῆστο γέρων ἀλιθέρης	cf. o 2.157
1898	ἔρξον ὃ περ δὴ τοι νόος ὀτρύνει καὶ ἀνάγει.	cf. i 15.148
1926	ἴσχεο, μηδὲ βίην τίσσαις ὑπερνηροέοντων	cf. o 23.31
2082	χερσὶ μέγαν λίθον ἀείραντές τε προσέθηκαν,	cf. o 9.240
2136	ὣς ἄρα μιν προσέειπεν ἄναξ ἐνέρων Ἀἰδωνεὺς,	cf. i 20.61
2320	ὣς ἄρα φωνήσαντες ἀπέστασαν ἀλλήλοισιν.	cf. i 13.708

**b. Hemistichs with no exact equivalent in Homer:**

771	βῆ δ' ἵμεναι προτέρως. ἐτέρηφι δὲ λάζετο Πέτρον,	cf. o 2.298+i 16.734
841	ἦ δθηθὰ στρεύεσθαι δύη ἀρημένος αἰνῆ.	o 12.351+ cf. 18.51
119	οἶον ἐπ' ἦμαρ ἄγῃσι θεὸς πάντεσσιν ἀνάσσω.	o 18.137+cf. i 1.288
1918	ἴσχεο, μηδὲ περισθενόων δηλήσειο τούσδε,	cf. o 22.367+368
2232	δὴν δ' ἀνέφω καὶ ἄναυδοι ἐφέστασαν ἀλλήλοισιν.	cf. i 9.30+i13.133 *

## WORKS CITED

- Ahrens 1937 E. Ahrens. *Gnomen in griechischer Dichtung*. Halle: Triltsch.
- Alexiou 1974 M. Alexiou. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alfieri 1989 A. M. Alfieri. "Note testuali al Eudocia, Homero-centones." *Sileno*, 15:137-39.
- Alfieri 1988 \_\_\_\_\_. "La tecnica compositiva nel centone di Eudocia Augusta." *Sileno*, 14:137-56.
- Alfieri 1987 \_\_\_\_\_. "Eudocia e il testo Omerico." *Sileno*, 13:197-218.
- Allen 1987 W. S. Allen. *Vox Graeca: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Apthorp 1980 M. J. Apthorp. *The Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Arend 1933 W. Arend. *Die typische Szenen bei Homer*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Baddeley 1990 A. Baddeley. *Human Memory: Theory and Practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bakhtin 1981 M. M. Bakhtin. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakker 1990 E. J. Bakker. "Homeric Discourse and Enjambement: A Cognitive Approach." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 120:1-21.

- Bakker 1993 \_\_\_\_\_ . "Activation and Preservation: The Interdependence of Text and Performance in an Oral Tradition." *Oral Tradition*, 8:5-20.
- Bannert 1987 H. Bannert. "Versammlungsszenen bei Homer." In *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*. Ed. by J. M. Bremer, I. J. F. de Jong, and J. Kalff. Amsterdam: Grüner. pp. 15-30.
- Barwick 1957 K. Barwick. *Probleme der stoischen Sprachlehre und Rhetorik*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Beazley 1963 J. D. Beazley. *Attic Red-figure Vase-painters*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Bird 1994 G. D. Bird. "The Textual Criticism of an Oral Homer." In *Nile, Ilissos and Tiber: Essays in Honor of Walter Kirkpatrick Lacey*. Ed. by V. J. Gray. *Prudentia* 26.1:35-52.
- Birnbaum 1985 H. Birnbaum. "Familiarization and its Semiotic Matrix." In *Russian Formalism: A Retrospective Glance*. Ed. by R. L. Jackson and S. Rudy. New Haven: Yale Center for International and Area Studies. pp. 148-56.
- Bloom 1994 H. Bloom. *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Bloom and Rosenberg 1990 \_\_\_\_\_, and D. Rosenberg. *The Book of J*. New York: Grove Weidenfeld.
- Borges 1972 J. L. Borges. "The Gospel According to Mark." In *Doctor Brodie's Report*. Trans. by N. T. Giovanni and J. L. Borges. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc.
- Bowie 1990 E. L. Bowie. "Greek Poetry in the Antonine Age." In *Antonine Literature*. Ed. by D. A. Russell. Oxford: Clarendon. pp. 53-90.
- Brecht 1933-41 B. Brecht. "Über eine nichtaristotelische Dramatik." In *Bertolt Brecht Gesammelte Werke*. Vol. 15. Ed. by W. Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp (1967).

- Brecht 1935-41      B. Brecht. "Neue Technik der Schauspielkunst." In *Bertolt Brecht Gesammelte Werke*. Vol. 15. Ed. by W. Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp (1967).
- Bremond 1993      C. Bremond. "Concept and Theme." Trans. by A. D. Pratt. In *Sollers* 1993:46-59.
- Brooker 1994      P. Brooker. "Key Words in Brecht's Theory and Practice." In *The Cambridge Companion to Brecht*. Ed. by P. Thompson and G. Sacks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 185-200.
- Brown 1966      R. E. Brown. *The Gospel According to John (i-xii): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Vol 1. New York: Doubleday.
- Browning 1983      R. Browning. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Butler 1897      S. Butler. *The Authoress of the Odyssey*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1967).
- Alan Cameron 1982      Alan Cameron. "The Empress and the Poet." *Yale Classical Studies*, 27:217-89.
- Averil Cameron 1991      Averil Cameron. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cardinal 1994      R. Cardinal. "Toward an Outsider Aesthetic." In *The Artist Outsider: Creativity and the Boundaries of Culture*. Ed. by M. D. Hall and E. W. Metcalf. Washington D. C.: Smithsonian Press. pp. 20-43
- Carruthers 1990      M. Carruthers. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cassidy and Ringler 1971      F. G. Cassidy and R. N. Ringler, edd. *Bright's Old English Grammar and Reader*. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Chomsky 1985 N. Chomsky. *The Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clark 1994 M. Clark. "Enjambment and Binding in Homeric Hexameter." *Phoenix*, 48:95-114.
- Crusius 1899 O. Crusius. "Centō." In *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Alterumswissenschaft*. Ed. by G. Wissowa. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.
- Culler 1975 J. Culler. *Structuralist Poetics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Damon 1961 P. Damon. "Modes of Analogy in Ancient and Medieval Verse." *University of California Publications in Classical Philology*, 15.6:261-334.
- D'Assigny 1697 M. D'Assigny. *The Art of Memory: A Treatise Useful for Such as Are to Speak in Publick*. New York: AMS Press (1985).
- Deledalle 1995 G. Deledalle. "Introduction to Peirce's Semiotic." *Semiosis: Internationale Zeitschrift für Semiotik und Ästhetik*, 79/80:5-31.
- Delepierre 1875 O. Delepierre. *Tableau de la Litterature du Centon chez les Anciens et chez les Moderns*. 2 vols. London: Trübner.
- DePorte 1985 M. V. DePorte. "Introduction to the AMS Edition." In D'Assigny 1697. pp. iii-xiv.
- Dindorf 1855 G. Dindorf, ed. *Scholia graeca in Homeri Odysseam*. 2 Vols. Oxford.
- Doane and Pasternack 1991 A. N. Doane and C. B. Pasternack. *Vox Intexta: Orality and Textuality in the Middle Ages*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Dresselhaus 1979 G. Dresselhaus. *Langue / Parole und Kompetenz / Performanz: zur Klärung der Begriffspaare bei Saussure und Chomsky*. Frankfurt: Verlag Peter D. Lang.
- Duckworth 1940 G. E. Duckworth. *T. Macci Plauti Epidicus*.



- Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Eco 1976 U. Eco. "Peirce's Notion of Interpretant." *Modern Language Notes*, 91:1457-72.
- Edwards 1986 \_\_\_\_\_. "The Conventions of an Homeric Funeral." In *Studies in Honor of T.B.L. Webster* Ed. by J. H. Betts, J. T. Hooker, and J. R. Green. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press. pp. 84-92.
- Edwards 1987 \_\_\_\_\_. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Edwards 1991 \_\_\_\_\_. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume V: Books 17-20*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards 1992 \_\_\_\_\_. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type Scene." *Oral Tradition*, 7:284-330.
- Empson 1966 W. Empson. *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. New York: New Directions.
- Erlich 1965 V. Erlich. *Russian Formalism: History-Doctrine*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Faraone 1996 C. A. Faraone. "Taking the 'Nestor's Cup Inscription' Seriously: Erotic Magic and Conditional Curses in the Earliest Inscribed Hexameters." *Classical Antiquity*, 15.1:77-112.
- Fehling 1969 D. Fehling. *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Fenik 1968 B. C. Fenik. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Technique of Homeric Battle Descriptions*. Hermes Einzelschriften 21. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Ferguson 1990 E. Ferguson, ed. *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. New York: Garland.
- Foley 1988 J. M. Foley. *The Theory of Oral Composition: History and Methodology*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

- Foley 1991 \_\_\_\_\_ "Orality, Textuality, and Interpretation." In Doane and Pasternack 1991:34-45.
- Ford 1988 A. Ford. "The Classical Definition of ΠΑΨΩΔΙΑ." *Classical Philology*, 83:300-7.
- Fowler 1987 R. Fowler. *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms*. London: Routledge.
- Fränkel 1921 H. Fränkel. *Die homerischen Gleichnisse*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Frazer 1906 J. G. Frazer. *The Golden Bough*. Ed. by R. Fraser. Oxford: Oxford University Press (1994).
- Frye 1982 N. Frye. *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Gamble 1995 H. Y. Gamble. *Books and Readers in the Early Church*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Graef 1963 H. Graef. *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion*. Vol. 1. New York: Sheed and Ward.
- Green 1991 R. P. H. Green. *Ausonius: Opera Omnia*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Green 1995 \_\_\_\_\_ "Proba's Cento: Its Date, Purpose, and Reception." *Classical Quarterly*, 45:551-63.
- Greimas 1966. A. J. Greimas. *Structural Semantics: An Attempt at a Method*. Trans. by D. McDowell, R. Schleifer and A. Velie. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press (1983).
- Griffin 1980 J. Griffin. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Haffner 1996 M. Haffner. "Die Kaiserin Eudokia als Repräsentantin des Kulturchristentums." *Gymnasium*, 103:216-28.
- Hainsworth 1993 \_\_\_\_\_ *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume III: Books 9-12*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hainsworth 1968 J. B. Hainsworth. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Harris 1898 J. R. Harris. *The Homeric Centos and the Acts of Pilate*. London: J. S. Clay & Sons.
- Hawkes 1977 T. Hawkes. *Structuralism and Semiotics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Heath 1995 M. Heath. *Hermogenes On Issues: Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Herington 1985 J. Herington. *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Higbie 1990 C. Higbie. *Measure and Music: Enjambement and Sentence Structure in the Iliad*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Higbie 1995 \_\_\_\_\_. *Heroes' Names, Homeric Identities*. New York: Garland.
- Hilgard 1901 A. Hilgard, ed. *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis artem grammaticam*. In *Grammatici Graeci*. Part I, Vol II. Hildesheim: Georg Olms (1979).
- Hofmeister 1995 T. P. Hofmeister. "'Rest in Violence': Composition and Characterization in *Iliad* 16.155-277." *Classical Antiquity*, 14.2:289-316.
- Holum 1982 K. G. Holum. *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Domination in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hunger 1978 H. Hunger. "Der Cento und verschiedene Versspielereien." In *Die Hochsprachliche Profane Literatur der Byzantiner*. Vol 2. Munich: Beck. pp. 98-107.
- Hurwit 1985 J. M. Hurwit. *The Art and Culture of Early Greece 1100-480 B.C.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Jakobson 1958. R. Jakobson. "Closing Statement." In *Style in Language*. Ed. by T. A. Sebeok. Cambridge,

- Mass.: M.I.T Press. pp. 350-77.
- Jakobson and Waugh 1979  
\_\_\_\_\_, and L. Waugh. *The Sound Shape of Language*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Janko 1992  
R. Janko. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume IV: Books 13-16*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jousse 1925  
M. M. Jousse. *The Oral Style*. Trans. by E. Sienaert and R. Whitaker. New York: Garland (1990).
- Kahane 1994  
A. Kahane. *The Interpretation of Order: A Study in the Poetics of Homeric Repetition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keaney and Lamberton 1996  
J. J. Keaney and R. Lamberton, edd. *[Plutarch] On the Life and Writings of Homer*. American Philological Association American Classical Studies 40. Scholars Press: Atlanta.
- Kelly 1977  
J. N. D. Kelly. *Early Christian Doctrine*. 5th edition. London: A & C Black.
- Kirk 1985  
G. S. Kirk. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume I: Books 1-4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirk 1966  
\_\_\_\_\_. "Studies in Some Technical Aspects of Homeric Style." *Yale Classical Studies*, 20:75-152.
- Kirk 1990  
G. S. Kirk. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume II: Books 5-8*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knopf 1986  
J. Knopf. "Verfremdung." In *Brecht's Theorie des Theaters*. Ed. by W. Hecht. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. pp. 93-141.
- Labarbe 1949  
J. Labarbe. *L'Homère de Platon*. Paris: Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres.
- Labourt 1953  
J. Labourt. *Saint Jérôme, Lettres*. Vol. 3. Paris:

- Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres.
- Lamberton 1986 R. Lamberton. *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lambros 1900 S. P. Lambros. *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lampe 1961 G. W. H. Lampe. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lane Fox 1989 R. Lane Fox. *Pagans and Christians*. New York: Albert A. Knopf.
- Liebescheutz 1995. W. Liebescheutz. "Pagan Mythology in the Christian Empire." *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 2.2:193-208.
- Lemon and Reis 1965 L. T. Lemon and M. J. Reis. *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Lévi-Strauss 1960 C. Lévi-Strauss. "Structure and Form: Reflections on a work by Vladimir Propp." In *Theory and History of Folklore*. Ed. by A. Lieberman. Trans. by M. Layton. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press (1984). pp. 167-88.
- Lord 1991 A. B. Lord. *Epic Singers and Oral Tradition*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lord 1960 \_\_\_\_\_. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Lord 1951 \_\_\_\_\_. "Composition by Theme in Homer and Southslavic Epos." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 82:71-80.
- Louden 1995 B. Louden. "Categories of Homeric Wordplay." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 125:27-46.
- Ludwich 1897 A. Ludwich. *Eudociae Augustae, Procli Lycii, Claudiani Carminum Graecorum Reliquae*.

- Leipzig: Teubner.
- Ludwich 1882                    \_\_\_\_\_. "Eudocia, die Gattin des Kaisers Theodosius II als Dichterin." *Rheinisches Museum*, 37:206-25.
- MacDonald 1994                D. R. MacDonald. *Christianizing Homer: The Odyssey, Plato and The Acts of Andrew*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maguire 1995                    H. Maguire. "Magic and the Christian Image." In *Byzantine Magic*. Ed. by H. Maguire. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks. pp. 51-72.
- Makris 1995                     G. Makris. "Zur Epilepsie in Byzanz." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 88.2:363-404.
- Mango 1972                     C. Mango. *Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Marrou 1956                     H. I. Marrou. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Trans. by G. Lamb. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Matthews 1993                 T. F. Matthews. *The Clash of Gods: A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Migne PG                        J-P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*. Paris: Migne.
- Miller 1982                     D. G. Miller. *Improvisation, Typology, Culture, and the 'The New Orthodoxy': How Oral is Homer?* Washington D.C.: University Press of America.
- Miner 1979                     E. Minor. *Japanese Linked Poetry: An Account with Translations of Renga and Haikai Sequences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mitchell 1986                 W. J. T. Mitchell. *Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moulton 1977                 C. Moulton. *Similes in the Homeric Poems*. Hypomnemata 49. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Muellner 1990                 L. Muellner. "The Simile of the Cranes and

- Pygmies: A Study of Homeric Metaphor." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 93:59-101.
- Mukarovsky 1936 J. Mukarovsky. "Art as a Semiotic Fact." In *Semiotics of Art*. Trans. by I. R. Titunik. Cambridge, Mass.: M. I. T. Press (1976). pp. 3-9.
- J. Murray 1980 J. Murray. "Reverend Howard Finster: Man of Vision." *Arts Magazine*, 55.2:161-64.
- P. Murray 1996 P. Murray. *Plato on Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nagler 1967 M. Nagler. "Towards a Generative View of the Oral Formula." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 98:269-311.
- Nagy 1990 G. Nagy. "Formula and Meter." In *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. pp. 18-35.
- Nagy 1996a \_\_\_\_\_. *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nagy 1996b \_\_\_\_\_. *Homeric Questions*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Nathhorst 1970 B. Nathhorst. *Formal or Structural Studies of Traditional Tales: The Usefulness of Some Methodological Proposals Advanced by Vladimir Propp, Alan Dundes, Claude Lévi-Strauss and Edmond Leach*. 2nd ed. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Soner.
- Neitzel 1977 S. Neitzel. "Ἀπίους Γλώσσαι Ὀμηρικαί." In *Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker*. Vol III. Ed. by K. Alpers, H. Erbse and A. Kleinlogel. Berlin: de Gruyter. pp. 185-328.
- Norbrook 1993 D. Norbrook. "Introduction." *Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse 1509-1659*. Ed. by D. Norbrook and H. R. Woudhuysen. London and New York: Penguin.
- Nöth 1990 W. Nöth. *Handbook of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Notopoulos 1964 "Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 68:1-77.
- Ong 1982 W. Ong. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London and New York: Methuen.
- O'Neill 1942 E. G. O'Neill, Jr. "The Localization of Metrical Wordtypes in the Greek Hexameter." *Yale Classical Studies*, 8:105-178.
- Parry 1929 M. Parry. "The Distinctive Character of Enjambement in Homeric Verse." In *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. by A. Parry. Oxford: Clarendon (1987). pp. 251-65.
- Parry 1933 \_\_\_\_\_. "The Traditional Metaphor in Homer." In *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. by A. Parry. Oxford: Clarendon (1987). pp. 365-75.
- Pecorella G. B. Pecorella, ed. *Dionisio Trace TEXNH ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙΚΗ. Testo critico e commento*. Bologna: Cappelli.
- Peirce 1867 C. S. Peirce. "On a New List of Categories." In *Peirce on Signs*. Ed. by J. Hoopes. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press (1991). pp. 23-33.
- Peirce 1955 \_\_\_\_\_. "Logic as Semiotic: The Theory of Signs." In *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*. Ed. by J. Buchler. New York: Dover (1955). pp. 98-119.
- Pépin 1982 J. Pépin. "The Platonic and Christian Ulyssus." In *Neoplatonism and Christian Thought*. Ed. by D. J. O'Meara. Norfolk, Virg.: International Society for Neoplatonic Studies. pp. 3-18.
- Peradotto 1990 J. Peradotto. *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Perin 1994 C. Perin. "The Reception of New, Unusual, and Difficult Art." In *The Artist Outsider: Creativity and the Boundaries of Culture*. Ed. by M. D. Hall and E. W. Metcalf. Washington D. C.:



- Smithsonian Press.
- Plett 1991 H. Plett. *Intertextuality*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
- Preminger and Brogan 1993 A. Preminger and T. V. F. Brogan, edd. *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Propp 1928 V. Propp. *The Morphology of the Folktale*. Trans. by L. Scott and L. Wagner. Austin: University of Texas Press (1968).
- Propp 1966 \_\_\_\_\_. "The Structural and Historical Study of the Wondertale." In *Theory and History of Folklore*. Ed. by A. Lieberman. Trans. by A. Y. and R. P. Martin. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press (1984). pp. 67-81.
- Reece 1993 S. Reece. *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Richards 1928 I. A. Richards. *Principles of Literary Criticism*. 3rd ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Roberts 1985 M. Roberts. *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity*. Liverpool: Francis Cairns.
- Roberts 1989 \_\_\_\_\_. *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Ruijgh 1971 C. J. Ruijgh. *Autour de 'æ epique': Etudes sur la syntaxe grecque*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Russell 1983 D. A. Russell. *Greek Declamation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Russo 1976 \_\_\_\_\_. "Is 'Oral' or 'Aural' Composition the Cause of Formulaic Style?" In *Oral Literature and the Formula*. Ed. by R. S. Shannon and B. A. Stolz. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. pp. 31-71.
- Rutherford 1905 W. G. Rutherford. *A Chapter in the History of*

- Annotation. Scholia Aristophanica* Vol. 3.  
London: Macmillan & Co.
- Salanitro 1987 \_\_\_\_\_ "Omero, Virgilio e i Centoni." *Sileno*, 13:231-40.
- Sattler 1904 G. Sattler. *De Eudociae Augustae centonibus*, Bayreuth: L. Ellwanger.
- Schaff 1919 P. Schaff. *The Creeds of Christendom*. Vol. 2. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Schembra 1993 R. Schembra. "La 'Quarta' Redazione degli *Homerocentones*." *Sileno*, 19:277-95.
- Schembra 1994 \_\_\_\_\_ "Varianti di christianizzazione e δοιάδες nella 'quarta' redazione degli *Homerocentones*." *Sileno*, 20:317-32.
- Schneemelcher 1991 W. Schneemelcher. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Vol. 1. Ed. by R. McL. Wilson. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Scott 1974 W. C. Scott. *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile*. Leiden: Brill.
- Sealey 1957 R. Sealey. "From Phemios to Ion." *Revue des études grecques*, 70:312-55.
- Shapiro 1993 H. A. Shapiro. "Hipparchos and the Rhapsodes." In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*. Ed. by C. Dougherty and L. Kurke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 92-107.
- Sheppard 1980 A. D. R. Sheppard. *Studies on the 5th and 6th Essays of Proclus' Commentary on the Republic*. Hypomnemata 61. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Slatkin 1996 L. M. Slatkin. "Composition by Theme and the Mêtis of the *Odyssey*." In *Reading the Odyssey: Selected Interpretive Essays*. Ed. by S. L. Schein. Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp. 223-37.
- Smolak 1979 K. Smolak. "Beobachtungen zur Darstellungsweise in den Homerzentonen."

- Jahrbuch der Osterreichischen Byzantistik*, 28:29-49.
- Sodano 1970            A. R. Sodano, ed. *Porpyrii Quaestionum Homericarum Liber I*. Naples: Giannini.
- Sollers 1993            W. Sollers, ed. *The Return of Thematic Criticism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Stallbaum 1825        J. G. Stallbaum, ed. *Eustathii commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*. Hildesheim: G. Olms (1970).
- Stanford 1939        W. B. Stanford. *Ambiguity in Greek Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stanley 1992        K. Stanley. *The Shield of Homer*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Stehlíková 1987     E. Stehlíková. "Centones Christiani as a Means of Reception." *Listy Filologicke*, 110:11-15.
- Steiner 1984        P. Steiner. *Russian Formalism: A Metapoetics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Svenbro 1993        J. Svenbro. *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*. Trans. by Janet Lloyd. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Sykes 1987        S. W. Sykes. "The Role of Story in the Christian Religion: An Hypothesis." *Journal of Literature and Theology*, 1:19-26.
- Thomas 1992        R. Thomas. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Todorov 1973        Tz. Todorov. *Introduction to Poetics*. Trans. by Richard Howard. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Uhlig 1883        G. Uhlig, ed. *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica*. In *Grammatici Graeci*. Part 1, Vol. 2. Hildesheim: G. Olms (1979).
- Usher 1997        M. D. Usher. "Prolegomenon to the Homeric Centos." *American Journal of Philology*, 118.2:305-321.

- van Deun 1993 P. van Deun. "The Poetical Writings of the Empress Eudocia: An Evaluation." In *Early Christian Poetry: A Collection of Essays*. Ed. by J. den Boeft and A. Hilhorst. Leiden: Brill. pp. 273-82
- Verweyen and Witting 1991 T. Verweyen and G. Witting. "The Cento: A Form of Intertextuality from Montage to Parody." In *Plett* 1991:165-78.
- von Kamptz 1982 H. von Kamptz. *Homerische Personennamen: sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Walz 1835 C. Walz, ed. *Rhetores Graeci*. Vol. 8. Stuttgart and Tübingen: J. G. Cotta.
- West 1978 M. L. West. "Die griechischen Dichterinnen der Kaiserzeit." In *Kyklos: griechisches und byzantinisches* (Festschrift Rudolf Keydell). Ed. by H. G. Beck, A. Kambylis and P. Moraux. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter. pp. 101-15.
- West 1981 \_\_\_\_\_. "The Singing of Homer and the Early Modes of Greek Music." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 101:113-29.
- Whitman 1958 C. H. Whitman. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Wicksteed 1903 P. H. Wicksteed. *The Convivio of Dante Alighieri*. London: Aldine House.
- Wilde 1891 O. Wilde. "Preface to *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." In *The Artist as Critic: The Critical Writings of Oscar Wilde*. Ed. by R. Ellmann. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1982).
- Wilken 1967 R. L. Wilken. "The Homeric Cento in Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* I, 9, 4." *Vigiliae Christianae*, 21:25-33.
- Wilson 1983 N. G. Wilson. *The Scholars of Byzantium*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wood 1775

R. Wood. *An Essay on the Original Genius and Writings of Homer*. New York: Garland (1971).

Zumthor 1987

P. Zumthor. *La lettre et la voix: De la "littérature" médiévale*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.

**PART II**  
**GREEK TEXT**

**Die Zentonen als spezielle Form der spätantiken  
Homerrezeption erwiesen sich als der Interpretation ihrer oft  
nicht anerkannten dichterischen Möglichkeiten durchaus  
zugänglich—dann sind sie doch wohl auch eine Edition wert!  
Denn die frühbyzantinische Bibeldichtung kann dem  
Theologen, Komparatisten und sich auch dem Philologen ein  
wenig bebautes Arbeitsfeld eröffnen—sofern dieser sich nicht  
als Zensor im Namen einer klassizistischen Ästhetik versteht.  
(Smolak 1979:49)**

## **NOTE ON THE GREEK TEXT**

The basis for this new edition of Eudocia's Homeric Centos is set out in detail in Usher 1997, where the reader will find a history of the text and a list of the principal manuscripts and editions. Essentially, I transcribed the Greek text of the poem and Eudocia's Prologue from Mt. Athos manuscript *Iviron 4464*, and collated it against a copy of Stephanus' 1578 edition of the poem.

The sigla and apparatus used here are described and explained in Part I, Chapter II of this dissertation.



## EUDOCIA'S PROLOGUE

Ταῦτα νῦν τὰ ὀμηρόκεντρα, συνετέθη μὲν ὑπὸ Πατρικίου ἐπισκόπου, διορθώθη δὲ ὑπὸ  
Εὐδοκίας ἧς καὶ ὁ παρῶν ἐστὶ δι' ἠρώων πρόλογος.

- ἦδε μὲν ἱστορίη θεοτερπέος ἐστὶν ἀοιδῆς.  
Πατρικίος δ', ὃς τῆνδε σοφῶς ἀνεγράψατο βίβλον,  
ἔστι μὲν ἀθανάτιο διαμπερὲς ἄξιος αἴνου,  
οὔνεκα δὴ πάμπρωτος ἐμήσατο κύδιμον ἔργον.  
5 ἄλλ' ἔμπης οὐ πάμπαν ἐτήτυμα πάντ' ἀγόρευσεν·  
οὐδὲ μὲν ἀρμονίην ἐπέων ἐφύλαξε ἀπάσων,  
οὐδὲ μόνων ἐπέων ἐμήσατο κείνος αἰείδων,  
ὀππόσα χάλκεον ἦτορ ἀμεμφὲος εἶπεν Ὀμήρου.  
ἄλλ' ἐγὼ ἡμιτέλεστον ἀγκακλεὲς ὡς εἶδον ἔργον  
10 Πατρικίου, σελίδας ἱεράς μετὰ χειρας λαβοῦσα,  
ὄσσα μὲν ἐν βίβλοισιν ἔπη πέλεν οὐ κατὰ κόσμον,  
πάντ' ἄμυδις κείνοιο σοφῆς ἐξείρυσσα βίβλου·  
ὄσσα δ' ἐκεῖνος ἔλειπεν, ἐγὼ πάλιν ἐν σελίδεσσι  
γράψα καὶ ἀρμονίην ἱερὴν ἐπέεσσιν ἔδωκα.  
15 εἰ δέ τις αἰτιόωτο καὶ ἡμέας ἐς ψόγον ἔλκοι,  
δοιάδες οὔνεκα πολλὰ ἀρίζηλον κατὰ βίβλον  
εἰσὶν Ὀμηρείων ἐπέων θ' ὅπερ οὐ θέμις ἐστίν,  
ἴστω τοῦθ', ὅτι πάντες ὑποδρηστήρες ἀνάγκης.  
εἰ δέ τις ὕμνοπόλοιο σαόφρονος Ταπιανοῖο  
20 μορφήν εἰσαῖων σφετέρην τέρψειεν ἀκουήν,  
δοιάδος οὔνεκα κείνος Ὀμηρείης ἀπὸ μολπῆς  
κείνων τ' ἐξ ἐπέων σφετέρων ποίησεν ἀοιδὴν,  
Τρώων ἀρείων τε κακὰ ἐνέπουσαν αὐτήν,  
ὥς τε πόλιν Πριάμοιο διέπραθον υἱὲς Ἀχαιῶν,  
25 αὐτήν Τροίαν ἔχουσαν, ἐν ἀργαλέῳ δὲ κυδοιμῷ  
μαρναμένους αὐτούς τε θεοῦς, αὐτούς τε καὶ ἄνδρας,  
οὓς ποτε χαλκεόφωνος ἀνήρ αὐτήσεν Ὀμηρος.

30 Πατρικός δ', ὅς τῆνδε σοφὴν ἀνεγράψατο δέλτον,  
ἀντὶ μὲν Ἀργείων στρατιῆς γένος εἶπεν Ἑβραίων,  
ἀντὶ δὲ δαμονίης τε καὶ ἀντιθέοιο φάλαγγος  
ἀθανάτου ἦυσε καὶ υἷα καὶ γενετῆρα.  
ἀλλ' ἔμπης ξυνὸς μὲν ἔφνυ πόνος ἀμφοτέροισι,  
Πατρικίῳ καὶ ἐμοί καὶ θηλυτέρῃ περ ἐούσῃ·  
κεῖνος δ' ἦρατο μόνος ἐν ἀνθρώποις μέγα κῦδος.

## τὰ Ὀμηρόκεντρα

	Κέκλυτε, μυρία φύλα περικτιόνων ἄνθρώπων,	i 17.220 †
	ὅσσοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ σῖτον ἔδοντες	o 8.222
	ἡμὲν ὅσσοι ναίουσι πρὸς ἠῶ τ' ἠέλιόν τε	o 13.240
	ἡδ' ὅσσοι μετόπισθε ποτὶ ζῶφον ἠερόεντα	o 13.241
5	ὄφρ' εἶπω τὰ με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει	i 8.6
	ἄς) εὖ γινώσκητ' ἡμὲν θεὸν ἡδὲ καὶ ἄνδρα	i 5.128 * †
	ὅς πάσι θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανατοῖσιν ἀνάσσων.	i 12.242 *
	ἐν μὲν γαῖαν ἔτευξ', ἐν δ' οὐρανὸν, ἐν δὲ θάλασσαν	i 18.483
	ἠέλιόν τ' ἀκάμαντα σελήνην τε πλήθουσιν	i 18.484
10	ἐν δὲ τὰ πείρεα πάντα τὰ τ' οὐρανὸς ἐστεφάνωται	i 18.485
	Πληϊάδας θ' Ὑάδας τε τό τε σθένος Ὀρίωνος	i 18.486
	Ἄρκτον θ' ἦν καὶ ἄμαξαν ἐπὶ κλησὶν καλέουσιν	i 18.487
	ἡ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται καὶ τ' Ὀρίωνα δοκεύει,	i 18.488
	ἰχθύς ὄρνιθὰς τε φίλας ὅ τι χεῖρας ἴκοιτο	o 12.331 *
15	εἰναλίῳν τοῖσιν τε θαλάσσια ἔργα μέμηλεν	o 5.67 *
	δελφινὰς τε κύνας τε καὶ εἴ ποθι μείζον ἔνεστι	o 12.96 †
	κῆτος ἃ μυρία βόσκει ἀγαστόνος Ἀμφιτρίτη,	o 12.97
	ἵππους θ' ἡμίονους τε βοῶν τ' ἴφθιμα καρῆνα	i 23.260
	ἄρκτους τ' ἀγροτέρους τε σύας χαροπούς τε λέοντας,	o 11.611 *
20	ἄπαντα κεν' ὅσσα τε γαῖαν ἔπι πνεῖει τε καὶ ἔρπει,	i 17.447 *
	τοῖσιν δ' ὑπὸ χθῶν δια φύεν νεοθηλέα ποίην	i 14.347 *
	λατόν θ' ἐρσήεντα ἰδὲ κρόκον ἡδ' ὑάκινθον,	i 14.448
	ἀμφὶ δὲ λειμώνας μαλακοὺς ἴου ἡδὲ σελίνου	o 5.72 *
	πυρούς τε ζειάς τε ἰδ' εὐρυφυῆς κρῖ λευκόν,	o 4.604 *
25	γίνετο δ' ὕγρον ὕδωρ καὶ δένδρεα ὑψηπέτηλα,	o 4.458 *
	ὄγγυα καὶ ροιὰ καὶ μηλέαι ἀγλαόκαρποι	o 7.115
	συκέαι τε γλυκεραὶ καὶ ἐλαῖαι τηλεθώσσαι	o 7.116

---

1 ἐπικούρων 6 ὄφρ' 16 ἔλησι 20 παντῶν



	ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ζεφύροιο λιγὸν πνείνοντος ἄηται'	ο 4.567 * @
50	παντοίην εὐπρηστον ἀντιμὴν ἐξανειῖσιν. οὔτε φυτεύουσιν χερσὶν φυτὸν οὔτ' ἀρόωσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ γ' ἀσπάρτα καὶ ἀνήροτα πάντα φύονται. πέινη δ' οὔ ποτε δῆμον ἐσέρχεται, οὐδέ τις ἄλλη νοῦσος ἐπὶ στυγερῇ πέλεται δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν.	i 18.471 * ο 9.108 ο 9.109 ο 15.407 ο 15.408
55	ἐνθά δὲ δένδρεα 'καλὰ πεφύκει' τηλεθώντα συκέαι τε γλυκεραὶ καὶ ἐλαῖαι τηλεθώσασα, ἄλλα τε πόλλ' ἐπὶ 'τοῖσι' σὺ δ' ἴλιον ἔνθεο θυμόν. τάων οὔ ποτε καρπὸς ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ἀπολείπει. τῶν εἴ πως σὺ δύναιο λοχησαμένη 'γε λαβέσθαι'	ο 7.114 @ ο 7.116 i 9.639 * @ ο 7.117 ο 4.388 * @
60	πρῶτον, ἔπειτα δὲ καυτὴ ὀνήσειαι, αἶ κε 'φάγησθα' θήσει τ' ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀγήραον' ἦματα πάντα ἄνδρα τε καὶ οἶκον καὶ ὁμοφροσύνην ὅπασειεν ἐσθλὴν· οὐ μὲν γάρ 'τοῦδε' κρεῖσσον καὶ ἄρειον ἢ ὅθ' ὁμοφρονέοντε νοήμασιν οἶκον ἔχητον	i 6.260 * † ο 5.136 * @ ο 6.181 * ο 6.182 † ο 6.183
65	ἀνὴρ ἠδὲ γυνή, πόλλ' ἄλγεα δυσμενέεσσι, χάρματα δ' εὐμενέτησι·ς μάλιστα δὲ τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ." ὧς εἰπὼν 'παρέπεισεν', ἐπεὶ διαεπέφραδε πάντα.	ο 6.184 ο 6.185 * i 20.340 †
<i>περὶ τῆς παρακοῆς</i>		
	οἶσθα γὰρ οἶος θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι γυναικός. τήν δ' ἄτην οὐ πρόσθεν ἐφ' ἐγκάτθετο θυμῷ.	ο 15.20 ο 23.223
69a	λυγρὴν· ἐξ ἧς πρῶτα καὶ ἡμέας ἴκετο πένθος	ο 23.224
69b	ἢ λάθει· ἢ οὐκ ἐνοησεν· ἀάσατο δὲ μέγα θυμῷ	i 9.537
70	αὐτίκα δ' ἢ γε ἔπεσσι πόσιν ἐρέεινεν ἕκαστα	ο 4.137

---

55 μακρὰ πεφύκασι 57 τῆσι 59 λελαβέσθαι 60 πήσθα 61 ἀγήρων 63 τοῦ γε 67  
λίπεν αὐτόθ' 69a et 69b om. Steph

	λισσομένη δειπνήσαι· ὁ δ' ἤρνειτο στεναχίζων·	i 19.304 *
	ἀλλ' ἔτι 'που' μέμνητο ἐφετμέων, ὅς ἐπέτελλεν,	i 5.818 * †
	ὅς πᾶσι θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσει.	i 12.242
	ἢ δ' αἰεὶ ἄμαλακοῖσι καὶ αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισι	o 1.56 †
75	πολλῆσιν τ' ἄτησι πάρεκ νόον ἦγαγεν ἄνδρός·	i 10.391 * †
	μεμνήσθαι πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ὅτι τάχιστα·	i 19.231 †
	κουρίδιον κτείνασα πόσιν, στυγερὴ δέ τ' αἰοιδῆ	o 24.200
	ἔσσετ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, χαλεπὴν δέ τε φῆμιν ὄπασσεν	o 24.201
	θηλυτέρησι γυναίξιν, καὶ ἦ κ' εὐεργὸς ἔησιν.	o 24.202
80	τῶν αἰὶ νῦν γεγάασι, καὶ αἰὶ μετόπισθεν ἔσοντα.	o 24.84 *
	ὡς οὐκ αἰνότερον καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο γυναικὸς	o 11.427
	ἢ τις δὴ τοιαῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ ἔργα βάλῃται.	o 11.428
	οἶον δὴ καὶ κείνη ἐμήσατο ἔργον αἰεκέας,	o 11.429
	ἢ μεγὰ ἔργον ἔρεξεν αἰδρεῖησι νόοιο	o 11.272
85	οὐλομένη, ἢ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἔθηκε·	o 17.287 †
	πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν	i 1.3
	πᾶσι δ' ἔθηκε πόνον, πολλοῖσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφήκεν.	i 21.524
<i>περὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίας</i>		
	ἀλλὰ (γε) οὐ τις τῶν γε τότ' ἦρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον·	i 6.16 †
	αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίησιν ὄλοντο.	o 1.7
90	ἀλλ' αὐτός γ' ἐσάωσε καὶ ἐφράσαντο μέγ' ὄνειαρ	o 4.444 *
	ὅς πᾶσι θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισι ἀνάσσει,	i 12.242
	υῖον ἀναστήσας ἀγαπήνορα ἄλαομέδοντα·	o 7.170 †
	ὅς ἤδη τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρὸ τ' ἐόντα	i 1.70

---

72 σεῶν 74 αἰεὶ δὲ 75 Ἔκτωρ 76 ὄφρ' ἔτι μᾶλλον 85 δίδωσι 88 οἱ 92 Λαοδάμαντα

	πατρός ἐοῖο φίλοιο, 'φρένας' τε καὶ εἶδος 'ὁμοῖος'	ο 14.177 @ †
95	ὄς οἱ πλησίον ἴζε, μάλιστα δέ μιν φίλεσκεν ἀμφογαπαζόμενος ὡς εἰ θ' ἔδον υἷον ἔοντα	ο 7.171 i 16.192
	<i>περὶ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς συμβουλίας</i>	
	καὶ μιν φωνήσας, ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα	i 1.201
	ἢ ῥά νύ μοι τι πίθοιο, φίλον τέκος, ὅτι κεν εἶπω;	i 14.190
	οὐ γάρ τις νόον 'ἄλλον' ἀμείνονα τοῦδε νοήσει,	i 9.104 @
100	οἷον ἐγὼ νοέω ἡμὲν πάλα ἠδ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν. οἶδα γὰρ ὡς τοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν ἦπα δήνεα οἶδε· τὰ γὰρ φρονέεις ἅ τ' ἐγὼ περ.	i 9.105 i 4.360 i 4.361
102a	τῷ τοι προφρονέας ἐρέω ἔπος οὐδ' ἐπικέυσω· οὐχ ὀράας ὅτι δ' αὐτε βροτοὶ ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν ἡμέας ὑβρίζοντες, ἀτάσθαλα μηχανώνονται,	i 5.816 i 7.448 + 446 * i 11.695 *
105	βοῦς ἱερεύοντες καὶ οἷς καὶ πίονας αἰγας; οὐκέτ' ἐπειτ' ἐθέλουσιν 'ἐναίσιμα' ἐργάζεσθαι. οὐ γὰρ 'τοι' γλυκύθυμος ἀνὴρ ἦν οὐδ' ἀγανόφρων. 'οὔ' τις ἔτι πρόφρων ἀγανὸς καὶ ἦπιος ἐστίν σκηπτοῦχος βασιλεύς, 'οὐδὲ' φρεσὶν αἴσιμα εἰδώς,	ο 2.56 ο 17.321 † i 20.467 † ο 2.230 * † ο 2.231 †
110	ἀλλ' αἰεὶ χαλεπὸς τ' εἶη, καὶ αἴσυλα ῥέζοι. λαοὶ δ' οὐκέτι πάμπαν ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἦρα φέρουσιν. ψεύδοντ', οὐδ' ἐθέλουσιν ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι. οὔ τινα γὰρ τίεσκον ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων, οὐ κακὸν οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλὸν, ὅτις σφέας εἰσαφίκοιτο.	ο 2.232 ο 16.375 ο 14.125 ο 22.414 ο 22.415

---

94 δέμας...ἀγητόν (sine τε) 99 ἄλλος 102a om. Steph 106 ἐναίσιμα Steph, Hom :  
αἰνέσιμα Iv 107 τί 108 μή 109 μηδὲ

115	οὐ γὰρ ξείνους οἶδε μάλ' ἀνθρώπους ἀνέχονται. ἐκ γάρ τοι τούτων φάτις ἀνθρώπους ἀναβαίνοι ἐσθλή, χαίρουσιν δὲ πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ. οὐδ' ἀγαπαζόμενοι φιλέουσ,' ὅς κ' ἄλλοθεν ἔλθῃ. αἰεὶ 'τοῖσιν' δαίς τε φίλη κίθαρίς τε χοροὶ τε,	ο 7.32 ο 6.29 * ο 6.30 ο 7.33 ο 8.248 *
120	εἴματά τ' ἐξημοιβὰ λοετρά τε θερμὰ καὶ εὐναί. πάντες δ' εὐχετόωντο κελαινεφεῖ Κρονίωνι, τοῖς θ' ὑποταρταρίοις, οἳ Τιτῆνες καλέονται 'σχέτλιοι', οὔτε δίκας εὖ εἰδότες οὔτε θέμιστας. ἄνδρας μὲν κτείνουσι, πόλιν δέ τε πῦρ ἀμαθύνει	ο 8.249 i 11.761 + 1.397 i 14.279 * ο 9.215 *† i 9.593
125	τέκνα δέ τ' ἄλλοι ἄγουσι βαθυζώνους τε γυναῖκας, ἄρνων ἠδ' ἐρίφων ἐπιδήμιοι ἀρπακτῆρες. τοῖσιν δ' οὔτ' ἀγοραὶ βουλευφόροι οὔτε θέμιστες. οὐδέ τι ἴσασιν θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν, ἠέρι καὶ νεφέλῃ κεκαλυμμένοι· οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτοῦς	i 9.594 i 24.262 ο 9.112 ο 2.283 ο 11.15
130	εἶα ἴστασθα. χαλεπὸς δέ τις ὥρορε δαίμων δαίμοσιν ἀρήσασθα, ὑποσχέσθα δ' ἑκατόμβας. ἦ δὴ λoίγια ἔργα τάδ' ἔσσετα, οὐδ' ἔτ' ἀνεκτά. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὣς ἐθέλω καὶ ἐέλδομαι ἦματα πάντα πάντων ἀνθρώπων ῥύσθαι γενεήν τε τόκον τε,	ο 19.201 i 6.115 i 1.573 ο 5.219 i 15.141
135	ὄφρα μὴ ἄσπερμος γενεὴ καὶ ἄφαντος ὄληται. ἀλλ' ἴθι νῦν 'μετὰ' λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν, μηδ' ἔτ' ἐρώει οὐρανόθεν καταβὰς 'ἔξ' αἰθέρος ἀτρυγέτιο. 'σοῖς δ' ἀγανοῖς ἐπέεσσιν ἐρήτυε φῶτα ἕκαστον. καὶ δὲ σοὶ αὐτῷ θυμὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἴλαος ἔστω.	i 20.303 i 2.179 @ i 11.184+17.425 i 2.164 @ i 19.178
140	ὡς ἄν μοι τιμὴν μεγάλην καὶ κῦδος ἄρῃαι, ἦ τε καὶ ἐσσομένοισι μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέληται.	i 16.84 i 3.287

---

123 ἄγριον 136 κατὰ 137 δι' 138 σοῖς



	σοὶ δὲ αὐτῷ μελέτω, καὶ ἐμῶν ἐμπάζω μύθων.	o 1.305
	ἔϊ' δέ τοι αὐτίκ' ἰόντι κακὰ φράσσονται ὀπίσσω	o 2.367 †
	ἴεμενοι κτεῖναι, καὶ ἀπὸ κλυτὸν εὐχος ἀμέρσαι.	o 4.823 + cf. i 5.435
145	ἀλλὰ σὺ τούς γ' ἐπέεσσι παραιφάμενος κατέρυκες	i 24.771 *
	σῆ τ' ἀγανοφροσύνη καὶ σοῖς ἀγανοῖς ἐπέεσσι.	i 24.772
	φθέγγεο δ' ἦ κεν ἴησθα, καὶ ἐγρήγορθαι ἄνωχθι	i 10.67
	πάντας κυδαίνων· μὴ δὲ μεγαλίζω θυμῷ.	i 10.69
	ὥς μὴ πάντες ὄλωνται ὀδυσσαμένοιο τεοῖο.	i 8.37
150	δῆθα γὰρ αὐτως εἴσῃ ἐκάστου πειρητίζων.	o 16.313
	γνοίης δ' οἷ τινές εἰσιν ἑναίσιμοι' οἷ τ' ἀθέμιστοι,	o 17.363 * †
	ἦε φιλόξεينوι, καὶ σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής.	o 6.121
	ἦ ρ' οἷ γ' ὑβρισταὶ τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι	o 6.120
	ἤμην ὅπου τις νῶϊ τίει καὶ δεΐδιε θυμῷ,	o 16.306
155	ἦ δ' ὅτις οὐκ ἀλέγει, σὲ δ' ἀτιμᾶ τοῖον ἐόντα.	o 16.307
	ἐν δὲ σὺ τοῖσιν ἔπειτα πεφήσεαι οἷα μενοιναῖς.	o 22.217
	καὶ κ' αἰδοιότερος καὶ φίλτερος ἀνδράσιν εἴης	o 11.360 *
	αἷ κε θάνης, καὶ ἑμοῖραν' ἀναπλήσης βιότοιο	i 4.170 *
	ὦδε γὰρ ἡμέτερόν γε νόον τελέεσθαι οἷω.	o 22.215
160	ὅς δ' ἂν ἀμύμων αὐτὸς ἔη καὶ ἀμύμονα εἶδη,	o 19.332
	αἶψα μεταστρέψει νόον μετὰ σὸν καὶ ἐμὸν κῆρ.	i 15.52
	καὶ οἷ πάντα γένοιτο ὅσα φρεσὶν ἦσι μενοιναῖς.	o 17.355
	ὅς δὲ κ' ἀνήνηται καὶ τε στερεῶς ἀποείπη	i 9.510
	ἡμέας ἀμφοτέρους, μάλα εἰκέλω ἀλλήλοισιν	o 19.384
165	ἴστω τοῦθ' ὅτι νῶϊν ἀνήκεστος χόλος ἔσται.	i 15.217
	αἰεὶ τοι τούτῳ γε πόνος καὶ κήδε' ὀπίσσω	i 22.488
	ἔσονται· ἄλλοι γὰρ οἷ ἀπουρήσουσιν' ἀρούρας.	i 22.489 @

---

143 οἷ 151 ἑναίσιμοι Steph, Hom: αἰνέσιμοι Iv

	ἦμαρ δ' ὀρφανικὸν παναφήλικα παῖδα τίθησι.	i 22.490
	ἀνδρῶν δ' εἶ πέρ τις σε βίη καὶ κάρτει εἴκων	o 13.143
170	οὐ τι τίει, σοὶ δ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἐξοπίσω τίσις αἰεὶ.	o 13.144
	ἔκ τε καὶ ὄψε τελείῃ, σὺν τε μεγάλῃ ἀποτίσεις.	i 4.161 *
	γνώσετ' ἔπειθ' ὅσον εἰμὶ θεὸς 'κάρτιστος' ἀπάντων,	i 8.17 * †
	ὑβριν ἀγασσάμενος θυμαλγέα καὶ κακὰ ἔργα,	o 23.64
	τῆσδ' ἀπάτης κοτέων· τὰ μὲν ἔσσεται οὐκ ἀτέλεστα.	i 4.168
<i>περὶ τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ ὑπακοῆς</i>		
175	τόνδ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσεφώνεε φαίδιμος υἱός,	o 14.401
	"οὐκ ἐσσ' οὐδὲ ἔοικε τεὸν ἔπος ἀρνήσασθαι.	i 14.212 *
	τοῖος ἔω οἴός ἐσσι. τὰ 'γάρ' φρονεῖς ἅ τε ἐγὼ περ.	o 7.312 * †
	νῦν δ' ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον νοέω φρεσὶ τιμήσασθαι.	i 22.235
	ὡς δὲ πατήρ ὄν παῖδα φίλα φρονέων ἀγαπάζῃ.	o 16.17
180	γινώσκω φρονέω τά γε δὴ νοέοντι κελεύεις.	o 16.136 *
	'πάτερ, σὺ' μὲν ταῦτα φίλα φρονέων ἀγορεύεις	o 1.307 †
	ὡς τε πατήρ φ' παιδί, καὶ οὐ ποτε λήσομαι σὺτῶν.	o 1.308
	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ θυμῷ νοέω καὶ οἶδα ἕκαστα.	o 18.228
	'ὦ πάτερ', οὐτ' ἄρ τι μεγαλίζομαι οὐτ' ἀθερίζω	o 23.174 †
185	οὔτε λίην ἄγαμαι, μάλα δ' εὖ οἶδ' οἴος ἔησθα.	o 23.175
	ἀλλὰ μάλ' εὐκηλος τὰ φράζεαι ἄσσα θέλησθα.	i 1.554
	οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητον ἔπος ἔσσεται, ὅττι κεν εἴπῃς.	i 2.361 *
	ἡμῖν δ' οὐ τις τοῦδε νόος καὶ μῆτις ἀμείνων.	i 15.509
	καὶ κε τὸ βουλοίμην, καὶ κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη'	i 3.41 *
190	τεθνάμεν ἢ τάδε γ' αἰὲν ἀεικέα ἔργ' ὀράσθαι,	o 16.107

172 κάρτιστος Steph, Hom: κράτιστος Iv 175 o 16.308 177 τε 181 ξεῖν' ἢ τοι 184  
δαίμονι' 189 ἦεν

	ἔϊπερ μοι καὶ ἴ μοῖρα θανεῖν, καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν	i 7.52 †
	πάντα μάλ' ἐκτελέω, καὶ πείσομαι ὡς σὺ κελεύεις	i 23.96
	αὐτὸς ᾧ θυμῷ, εἰδῶσι δὲ πάντες ἄλαιοι	o 2.112 * †
	ὡς ἐμὸς οὐ ποτε θυμὸς ὑπερφίαιλος καὶ ἀπηνής.	i 23.611
195	βουλοίμην δ' ἂν ἔγω γε καὶ ἄλγεα πολλὰ μογήσας,	o 3.232
	πάντων ἀνθρώπων ῥύσθαι γενειήν τε τόκον τε.	i 15.141
	καὶ γὰρ ἐμοὶ νόσος ἐστὶν ἑναίσιμος· οὐδέ μοι αὐτῷ	o 5.190 * †
	θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι σιδήρεος, ἀλλ' ἐλεήμων.	o 5.191
	βουλοίμ' ἐγὼ λαὸν ἑσόν' ἔμμενα ἢ ἀπολέσθαι,	i 1.117 @
200	πάσχειν τ' ἄλγεα πόλλα, βίας ὑποδεγμένος ἀνδρῶν.	o 16.189 *
	μείζον κε κλέος εἴη ἐμὸν καὶ κάλλιον οὕτω."	o 19.128
201a	ὡς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλοισ' ἀγορευον	o 4.620
201b	ἀλλήλων ἰότητι, ἄχριν δ' ἀνδρεσσι φέροντες	i 5.874 @

*περὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελισμοῦ*

	καὶ τότε ἄρ' ἄγγελον ἦκεν, ὅς ἀγγείλειε γυναικὶ	o 15.458
	βουλήν, ἣ ῥα τότε σφιν' ἐφήνδανε μητιόωσι.	i 7.45 †
	αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ, μέγα γὰρ ῥα θεοῦ ὄτρυνεν ἐφετιμή,	i 21.299 *
205	ἀντία δεσποίνης φάσθαι καὶ ἕκαστα πυθέσθαι.	o 15.377
	καρπαλίμως δ' ἦϊξεν ἐπὶ χθόνα πολυβότειραν	i 11.118 + 619
	οὐρανόθεν καταβάς διὰ αἰθέρος ἀτρυγέταιο,	i 11.184 + 17.425
	νύμφη εὐπλοκάμῳ εἰπεῖν νημερτέα βουλήν.	o 5.30
	βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἐς θάλαμιον πολυδαίδαλον, ᾧ ἔνι κούρη	o 6.15
210	ἔζετο ἐνὶ κλισίῳ ὑπὸ δὲ θρηῆνυς ποσὶν ἦεν,	o 4.136 †
	ἠλάκατα στρωφῶσ' ἀλιπόρφυρα, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι	o 6.306

---

191 οὐ γὰρ πῶ τοι 193 Ἀχαιοί 197 ἑναίσιμος Steph, Hom: αἰνέσιμος Iv 199 σῶν  
201a et 201b om. Steph 201b ἄχριν 203 θεοῖσιν 210 ἔζετο δ' ἐν

	ἀδμήτη, τὴν οὖ πω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἦγαγεν ἀνὴρ.	i 10.293 *
	τῆνδε τότε ἔν μεγάροισι πάτηρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ	i 9.561
	ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ ἔπορον· ὁ δέ μιν πρόφρων ὑπέδεκτο	i 14.504 + 9.480 *
215	οὐτ' εὐνήσ προφασιν κεχρημένος, οὐτέ τευ ἄλλου,	i 19.262
	ἀλλ' ἔμεν' ἀπροτίμαστος ἐνὶ κλισίησιν ἔησιν.	i 19.263
	οὐ τι γάμου τόσσον κεχρημένος οὐδὲ χατίζων,	o 22.50
	ἀλλ' ἄλλα φρονέων, τά οἱ οὐκ ἀτέλεστα γέροντο'.	o 22.51 †
	ἦ τι οἴσασάμενός γ' ἦ καὶ θεὸς ὧς ἐκελεύσεν,	o 9.339
220	μή ποτε τῆς εὐνήσ ἐπιβήμενα ἠδὲ μιγῆναι,	i 9.133
	ἦ θέμις ἀνθρώπων πέλει, ἀνδρῶν ἠδὲ γυναικῶν.	i 9.134
	δέσποιναν μὲν πρῶτα κιχήσατο ἔν μεγάροισιν.	o 7.53 *
	στῆ δ' αὐτῆς προπάρειθεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνομαζεν	i 14.297
	κήρυξ πεισίνωρ, πεπνυμένα μήδεα εἰδῶς,	o 2.38
225	τυτθὸν φθειγζάμενος· τὴν δὲ τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα.	i 24.170 *
	"θάρσει ὧ γύναι χαρίεσσα, μηδέ τι τάρβει·	i 24.171 †
	νῦν ὄδ' ἐμέθεν ξύνες ὄκα· θεοῦ δέ τοι ἄγγελος εἰμί,	i 24.133 †
	ὄς κέν με προέηκε τειν τάδε μυθήσασθαι.	i 11.201 †
	χαῖρε μοι, ὧ βασίλεια, διαμπερές, εἰς ὃ κεν ἔλθοι'	o 13.59 †
230	ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ γυναιξὶν ἐπὶ χθόνα πουλυβότειραν	o 19.408 †
	ἄγῃρας καὶ θάνατος, τά τ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλονται.	o 13.60 †
	σὸν δ' ἦτοι κλέος ἔσται ὅσον τ' ἐπακίδναται ἠώς.	i 7.458
	τοῖς οἱ νῦν γεγάσι καὶ οἱ μετόπισθεν ἔσσονται.	o 24.84
	χαῖρε, γύναι ἄχαρίεσσα· περιπλομένου δ' ἐνιαυτοῦ	o 11.248 †
235	ἐκφανεῖ, ὃς πάντεσσι περικτιόνεσσιν ἀνάσσει	i 19.104 *
	τῶν ἀνδρῶν οἱ σῆς ἐξ αἵματός εἰσι γενέθλης.	i 19.111

218 ἐτέλεσσε Κρονίων 226 Δαρδανίδα Πρίαμει, φρεσί 227 δ' Steph, Hom: ἀλλ' Iv /  
Διός 228 Ζεὺς με πάτηρ 229 γῆρας 231 ἔλθη 234 φιλότητι

	[νημετερές γάρ τοι μυθήσομαι, οὐδ' ἐπικεύσω,]	ο 19.269 *
	τοῦ δὴ νῦν γε μέγιστον ὑπουράνιον κλέος ἐστὶ	ο 9.264
	πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, καὶ οἱ δόσις ἔσσετα ἐσθλή."	ι 10.213
240	ὣς φάτο· τῆς δ' αὐτοῦ λῦτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ.	ο 4.703
	ἢ δ' οὐτ' ἀθρήσασα δύνατ' ἀντίη οὔτε νοῆσαι,	ο 19.478
	καὶ ῥ' ἀκέουσα καθῆστο, ἐπιγνάμψασα φίλον κῆρ.	ι 1.569
	τῆν δ' ἄμα χάρμα καὶ ἄλγος ἔλε φρένα, τῷ δέ οἱ ὄσσε	ο 19.471
	δακρύοφι πλήσθεν, θαλερῆ δέ οἱ ἔσχατο φωνή.	ο 4.705
245	ὀρθαὶ δὲ τρίχες ἔσταν ἐνὶ γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσσι.	ι 24.359
	ὄψε δὲ δὴ μιν ἔπεσιν ἀμειβομένη προσέειπε·	ο 4.706
	"ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ 'δὴ' μοι καὶ ἀμείψασθα θέμις ἐστὶ,	ο 16.91 @
	τίπτε με κείνος ἄνωγε μέγας θεός; αἰδέομαι δὲ	ι 24.90
	ἀδμήτη, ἦν οὐ πω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἦγαγεν ἀνὴρ.	ι 10.293 *
250	ἀλλὰ τί κεν ῥέξομαι; θεὸς διὰ πάντα τελευτᾷ,	ι 19.90
	ὄπως κεν ἐθέλησιν· ὃ γὰρ κάρτιστος ἀπάντων.	ι 20.243
	τοῦτο μὲν οὕτω δὴ ἔστω ἔπος, 'ὡς εἴρηκας',	ο 11.348 * †
	αὐτὰρ 'μὲν' νῦν μοι τόδε χῶεο μηδὲ νεμέσσα	ο 23.213
	οὔνεκά σ' οὐ τὸ πρῶτον, ἐπεὶ ἴδον, ὦδ' ἀγάπησα.	ο 23.214
255	αἰεὶ γὰρ μοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν	ο 23.215
	ἔρριγει, μὴ τίς με βροτῶν ἀπάφοιτ' ἐπέεσιν	ο 23.216
	ἐλθῶν. πολλοὶ γὰρ κακὰ 'κήδεα' βουλευόντα'."	ο 23.217 † *
	τῆνδ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη κήρυξ πεισήνωρ,	cf. ο 2.38
	"καὶ δέ σοι ὦδ' αὐτῇ πολὺ κάλλιον, ὦ βασίλεια,	ο 17.583
260	οἴην πρὸς ξεῖνον φάσθαι ἔπος ἠδ' ἐπακοῦσαι.	ο 17.584
	θάρσει 'μοι'· ἐπεὶ οὐ 'τι' ἄνευ θεοῦ ἦδε γε βουλή.	ο 2.372 †

---

237 om. Iv 247 θήν 252 αἰ κε ἐγώ γε 257 κέρδεα βουλεύσουσιν 261 μαῖα'...τοι

	σίγα καὶ κατὰ σὸν νόον ἴσχανε μηδ' ἐρέεινε·	ο 19.42
	ἀλλ' ἔχε σιγῇ μῦθον, ἐπίτρεψον δὲ 'θεῶ περ'.	ο 19.502 *
	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ νέομαι· σὺ δὲ τέρπεο τῷδ' ἐνὶ 'χώρῳ'.	ο 13.61 †
265	εἶμι μὲν, οὐδ' ἄλιον ἔπος ἔσσεται, ὅττι κεν εἶπη.	ι 24.92
	ἀργαλέον, βασιλεια, διηνεκέως ἀγορεύσαι."	ο 7.241
	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πᾶσαν ἐφημοσύνην ἀπέειπε,	ο 16.340 *
	χάλκεον οὐρανὸν ἴκε δι' αἰθέρος ἀτρυγέτοιο.	ι 17.425

*περὶ τῆς συλλήψεως καὶ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τόκου*

	αὐτὰρ ὃ αὐτίς ἰὼν πάϊς ὧς ὑπὸ μητέρα δύσκεν,	ι 8.271
270	ὃς πᾶσι θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσει.	ι 12.242
	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μῆνές τε καὶ ἡμέραι ἐξετελεῦντο,	ο 14.293
	αὐτίκ' ἄρ' εἰς εὐρὺ σπέος ἤλυθε 'παρθένος ἀγνή'	ο 5.77 †
	φάτνη ἐφ' ἱπτεΐη, ὅθι περ 'μώνυχες' ἵπποι	ι 10.568 †
	ἔστασαν ὠκύποδες μελιῖθ' ἀπὸ πυρὸν ἔδοντες.	ι 10.569
275	ἢ δ' 'ὑποκουσαμένη' κρατερόφρονα γείνατο παῖδα.	ι 14.324 †
	ἐξάγαγ' ἐν 'τε' φώσδε καὶ ἡελίου ἴδεν ἀνγᾶς.	ι 16.188 †
	τῷ δ' οὐ πῶ τις ὁμοῖος ἐπιχθόνιος γένετ' ἀνήρ.	ι 2.553
	καλὸν δ' οὕτω ἐγὼν οὐ πῶ ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν,	ι 3.169
	οὐδ' οὕτω γεραρόν. βασιλῆϊ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικε	ι 3.170
280	παναπάλφ, οἰοί τε ἀνάκτων παῖδες ἔασι.	ο 13.223
	τῶς μὲν ἔην μαλακός, λαμπρός δ' ἦν ἡέλιος ὧς.	ο 19.234

*περὶ τοῦ ἀστέρος*

	ἀστήρ δ' ὧς ἀπέλαμπεν· ἔκειτο δὲ νεῖατος ἄλλων,	ο 15.108
--	---	----------

---

263 θεοῖσιν 264 οἴκῳ 272 οὐδέ μιν ἄντην 273 Διομήδεος 275 ῥ' Ἡρακλῆα 276 πρὸ

	‘κάλλει’ παμφαίνων ὡς τ’ ἠλέκτωρ Ὑπερίων.	i 19.398 †
	αἴγλη δ’ οὐρανὸν ἶκε, γέλασσε δὲ πᾶσα περὶ χθῶν.	i 19.362
285	εὐτ’ ἀστήρ ὑπερέσχε φαάντατος, ὅς τε μάλιστα λαμπρὸν παμφαίνησι λελουμένος Ὠκεανοῖο	o 13.93 i 5.6
	δεικνύς σῆμα βροτοῖσιν· ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαί. τὸν μὲν ἀρίζηλον θῆκεν θεός, ὅς περ ἔφηνε	i 13.244 i 2.318
	παῖδ’ ἐόν· ἢ δ’ ἄρα μιν κηῶδει δέξατο κόλπῳ	i 6.483
290	μήτηρ, ἧ μιν ἔτικτε καὶ ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἐόντα, εἴματά τε ἀμφιέσατο θυάδεα καὶ λούσατο·	o 23.325 * o 5.264 *
	‘οἱ καὶ ἐθήησαντο’ φυτὴν καὶ εἶδος ἀγητόν.	i 22.370 *
	τὸν δ’ ὁ γέρον ἐφύλασσε· καὶ ἔτρεφεν ἠδ’ ἀτίταλλεν.	i 16.191 †

*περὶ τῶν προσενεχθέντων τῶν δῶρων παρὰ τῶν μάγων*

	δεξάμενοι δ’ ἄρα παῖδες ἀμύμονες ‘ἀγνοτόκοιο’	o 8.419 †
295	δῶρα, τὰ οἱ φέρον ἀστέρα δερκόμενοι ἀντολίηθεν, μητρὶ παρ’ ἀδοίῃ ἔθεσαν περικαλλέα δῶρα.	? o 8.420
	τέρπετο δ’ ἐν χείρεσσιν ἔχουσά περ’ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα	i 19.18 * †
	μήτηρ, ἧ μιν ἔτικτε καὶ ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἐόντα	o 23.325 *
	χρυσοῦ δοιὰ τάλαντα· φύλασσε ‘δὲ ταῦτ’ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ’	o 4.526 †
300	δεξαμένη, καὶ πάντα ἐφ’ ἔθησατο θυμῷ.	o 15.132 *

*περὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἡρώδου βρεφοκτονίας*

	ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ ῥ’ ἐνιαυτὸς ἔην, περὶ δ’ ἔτραπον ὦραι,	o 10.469
	ἄσσα δ’ ἄρ’ ἄγγελος ὤκα κατὰ πτόλιν ‘ἄχετο’ πάντη,	o 24.413 @

---

283 τεύχεσι 292 οἱ καὶ ἐθήησαντο *correcti*: ἧ καὶ ἐθήησατο Iv/Steph 293 Φύλας  
294 Ἀλκίνοοιο 297 ἐχὼν θεοῦ 299 δ’ ὁ γ’ εἰς ἐνιαυτόν

	ἴδη τότε τόν γε ἄνακτα χόλος λάβεν οἶον ἄκουσε.	i 6.166 †
	καὶ ῥα τότε αἰνοτάτην ἔριδα πτολέμοιο ἴτάνυσσεν	i 14.389 † @
305	νηπιάχοις, οἷς οὐ τι μέλει πολεμήϊα ἔργα.	i 2.338
	θήσειν γὰρ ἔτ' ἔμελλεν ἐπ' ἄλγεά τε στοναχάς τε.	i 2.39
	πολλὰ δ' ἀτάσθαλ' ἔρεξε βίη καὶ κάρτει εἴκων,	o 18.139
	πάντων μὲν κρατέειν ἐθέλων, πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν.	i 1.288 *
	νήπιος· ἦ τε πολέσσιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ θυμὸν ἀπηύρα	i 17.236 *
310	νηπιάχοις· ξυνὸν δὲ κακὸν πολέεσσιν ἔθηκε	i 16.262 * †
	κτεῖνας ἐπιστροφάδην· τῶν δὲ στόνος ὄρνυτ' ἀεικῆς	i 10.483 *
	ἄορι θεινομένων, ἐρυθθαίνετο δ' αἷματι γαῖα.	i 10.484
	ἴτῳ κέν πως λαοὶ μὲν ὀδύρονται κατὰ ἄστυ,	i 24.740 †
	ἀρητὸν δὲ τοκεῦσι γόνον καὶ πένθος ἔθηκεν.	i 24.741 *
315	ἔνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὕστατον ἐξενάριξε	i 16.692 *
	σχέτλιος, ὀβριμοεργός, ὃς οὐκ ὄθετ' αἴσυλα ῥέζων;	i 5.403
	ὃς ῥ' ἔθελε κτεῖναι καὶ ἀπορροῖσα φίλον ἦτορ,	o 16.428 * @
	αὐτὸς θνητὸς ἐὼν θεὸν ἄμβροτον. οὐδέ νυ πῶ μιν	i 22.9 *
	ἔγνω ὡς θεὸς ἐστίν. ὁ δ' ἀσπερχὲς μενέαινε,	i 22.10 *
320	τὰ φρονέων ἀνά θυμὸν ἄ ῥ' οὐ τελέεσθαι ἔμελλεν	i 2.36 * @
	αὐτίς, ἐπεὶ ῥα τοι ὦδε κακὸς χόλος ἔμπεσε θυμῷ.	i 16.206
	ἀργαλέος γὰρ τ' ἐστὶ θεὸς βροτῷ ἀνδρὶ δαμῆναι,	o 4.397
	ὃς θνητὸς τ' εἶη καὶ ἔδοι Δημήτερος ἀκτῆν.	i 13.322
	τὸν δὲ τότε ἐν μεγάροισι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ	i 9.561 *
325	νυκτὶ κατακρύψασα θοῶς ἐξήγε πόλῃος,	o 23.372
	ὀρμαίνουσ' ἦ οἱ θάνατον φύγοι υἱὸς ἀμύμων.	o 4.789
	δείδιδε γὰρ μὴ λοιμὸν ἀποτιμήξειε σιδήρω	i 18.34 @
	δεινὸς ἀνήρ. τάχα κεν καὶ ἀνάτιον αἰτίοφτο.	i 11.654

---

303 ὡς φάτο...δέ 304 δὴ 310 τιθεῖσι 313 τῷ καὶ μιν 317 φθεῖσθαι



- τῷ οὐτ' ἄρ φρένες ἦσαν ἐναίσιμοι οὔτε νόημα  
 330 γναμπτόν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι, λέων δ' ὡς ἄγρια οἶδεν. i 24.40 \*  
 νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδε κατὰ φρένα 'καὶ κατὰ θυμόν', i 24.41  
 ὅτι μάλ' οὐ δηναὸς ὄς 'ἀθανάτω γε' 'μάχοιτο', i 5.406 †  
 οὐδέ τί μιν παῖδες ποτὶ γούνασι παπάζουσιν. i 5.407 \* @  
 τοῦ δὲ γυναικὸς μὲν τ' ἀμφίδρυφοί εἰσι παρειαί. i 5.408  
 335 'οὐδὲ γάρ' οὐδέ ἐ φημὶ πόδεσσί γε οἴσι κίοντα, i 11.393  
 νοστήσαντ' οἰκόνδε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν, i 17.27 †  
 εὐφρανέειν ἄλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νήπια τέκνα, i 5.687  
 ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τε 'θεοῦ' κρείσσων νόος ἢ ἐ περ 'ἀνδρός'. i 5.688 \*  
 ὅς τε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἄνδρα φοβεῖ καὶ ἀφείλετο νίκην. i 16.688 \* @  
 i 17.177

*περὶ τῆς εἰς Αἴγυπτον φυγῆς*

- 340 ἦδέ δέ οἱ κατὰ θυμόν ἀρίστη φαίνετο βουλή i 2.5  
 Αἴγυπτιόνδ' ἰέναι, δολιχὴν ὁδὸν ἀργαλέην τε. o 4.483  
 πεμπταῖοι δ' Αἴγυπτον ἐϋρρείτην 'ἀφίκοντο' o 14.257 \*  
 δειδιότες· κρατερός γάρ ἔχε τρόμος ἀνδρὸς ὁμοκλή. i 6.137 \*

*περὶ τῆς ἐξ Αἴγυπτου ἐπανόδου*

- 345 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἔβη δόμον Ἄϊδος εἴσω, cf. o 11.150  
 ὄς ῥ' ἔθελε 'κτεῖναι' καὶ ἀπορροᾶσαι φίλον ἦτορ, o 16.428 @  
 ἄψ δ' 'ἄρ ἀπ' Αἰγύπτιο, διιπετέος ποταμοῖο, o 4.581 †  
 οἶκον ἐς ὑψόροφον καὶ ἔην ἐς παρίδα γαῖαν o 5.42  
 ἔπλεον, ἐστόρεσεν δὲ θεὸς μεγακῆτα πόντον. o 3.158  
 αὐτὰρ ὁ θυμόν ἔχων ὄν καρτερόν, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ, i 5.806

---

331 Τυδέος υἱὸς 332 ἀθανατοῖσι 335 ἔμμεναι 338 Διὸς 342 ἰκόμεσθα 346 εἰς

350	εὐδασκ' ἐν λέκροισιν, ἐν ἀγκαλίδεσσι τιθήνης, εὐνή ἐνι μαλακῇ, θαλέων ἐμπλησάμενος κῆρ, ἔσθων καὶ πίνων, οἷα βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ἔδουσιν, κάλλει καὶ χάρισι στίλβων. θηεῖτο δὲ κούρη, μήτηρ, ἧ μιν ἔτικτε καὶ ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἑόντα.	i 22.503 i 22.504 o 5.197 * o 6.237 o 23.325 *
355	καὶ γὰρ θαυμ' ἐτέτυκτο πελώριον. οὐ 'γὰρ' ἐφκει ἄνδρὸς γε θνητοῦ πάϊς ἔμμεναι, ἀλλὰ θεοῖο. οὐ γὰρ πω 'τοιούτον ἶδε βροτὸν' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν, οὐτ' ἄνδρ', οὐτε γυναικα· σέβας 'δ' ἔχεν' εἰσορόωσαν.	o 9.190 † i 24.259 o 6.160 @ o 6.161 *
<i>περὶ τοῦ προδρόμου</i>		
360	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἦβης ἐρικυδέος ἵκετο μέτρον, μηνῶν φθινόντων, περὶ δ' ἦματα πόλλ' ἐτελέσθη, ἱξέν γ' ἐς πεδίον πυρηφόρον, ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτα κῆρυξ πεισίνωρ, πεπνυμένα μήδεα εἰδῶς, πρόσθε μὲν ἐσθλὸς ἔφευγε, δίωκε δὲ μιν μεγ' ἀμείνων, ἀμφοτέρων κῦδός τε καὶ ἀγλαΐη καὶ ὄνειαρ.	i 11.225 o 19.153 o 3.495 * o 2.38 i 22.158 o 15.78
365	τῇ ῥα παρεδραμέτην, φεύγων, ὁ δ' ὄπισθε διώκων ὀπλότερος γενεῆ, 'ἀλλὰ' πρότερος καὶ ἀρείων. καὶ μὲν οἱ κῆρυξ ὀλίγον προγενέστερος αὐτοῦ, ὃς δὴ κάλλιστος γένετο θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων, τοῦ 'γὰρ' ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδῆ,	i 22.157 o 19.184 † o 19.244 i 20.233 i 1.249 †
370	ὃς τις ἐπίστατο ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἄρτια βάζειν. κηρύσσων 'βοάασκε' λιγύς περ ἑὼν ἀγορητής. βῆ δ' ἵμεν εἰς ἀγορὴν, ἅμα δ' ἔσπετο πουλὺς ὄμιλος. 'πάντας' δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω.	i 14.92 * i 17.325 †+i 2.246 o 8.109 * i 2.488 †

---

355 δὲ 358 μ' ἔχει 366 ὁ δ' ἅμα 369 καὶ 371 γήρασκε / i 19.82 373 πληθὺν

	καρπαλίμως δ' ἔμπληντο βροτῶν ἀγοραὶ τε καὶ ἔδρα.	o 8.16
375	τετρήχει δ' ἀγορῆ, ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαῖα. οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὀμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο. στῆ ῥα' μέση ἀγορῆ, σκῆπτρον δὲ οἱ ἔμβαλε χειρί. στὰς δ' ἐν μέσσοισιν ᾿προσεφώνεεν ἠπύτα κήρυξ. ἔσταότος μὲν καλὸν ᾿ακουέμεν, οὐδὲ ἔοικεν	i 2.95 i 1.57 o 2.37 † i 7.384 † i 19.79 @
380	ὑββάλλειν χαλεπὸν γὰρ ᾿επιστάμενόν περ ἐόντα'. ἀνδρῶν δ' ἐν πολλῷ ὀμάδῳ πῶς κέν τις ἀκούσῃ, ἢ εἴποι; βλάβεται δὲ λιγύς περ ἐὼν ἀγορητής. ἀλλὰ πίθεσθε καὶ ὕμμες· ἐπεὶ πείθεσθαι ἄμεινον. κέκλυτε μεν πάντες μῦθόν τ' εὖ γνῶτε ἕκαστος.	i 19.80 @ i 19.81 i 19.82 i 1.274 i 19.101 + 84
385	αἰδοῖος νεμεσητός ὃ με προέηκ' ἀγορευσαί· 'καί' μοι ἔφη τάδε πάντα τελευτήσεσθαι ὀπίσσω. πάντων δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστυα καὶ νόον ἔγνω. ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τινὰ φῶτα μέγαν καὶ καλὸν ἐδέγημιν ἐνθάδ' ἐλεύσεσθαι, μεγάλην ἐπειμένον ἀλκὴν,	i 11.649 † o 9.511 † o 1.3 o 9.513 o 9.514
390	ὅς μευ φέρτερός ἐστι νοῆσαί τε 'κρίναί' τε. πρεσβύτερος δ' ἐγὼ εἰμι· βίη δ' ὃ γε πολλὸν ἀμείνων. κρείσσων γὰρ ἐμέθεν καὶ φέρτερος οὐκ ὀλίγον περ. κάρτει τε σθένει τε διακριδὸν ἐστὶν ἄριστος σκηπτουχός τ' εἶη, καὶ οἱ πειθοῖατο λαοί.	o 5.170 @ i 11.787 * i 19.217 † i 15.108 * i 14.93
395	ψεῦδος δ' οὐκ ἐρέει· μάλα γὰρ πεπνυμένος ἐστί. κλυτὲ μεν· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ ᾿μυθήσομαι ὥς ἐνὶ θυμῷ ἀθάνατος βάλλησι καὶ ὥς τελέεσθαι οἴω. καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνῳ φημί τελευτηθῆναι ἅπαντα. εἰ μὲν γὰρ τις μ' ἄλλος ἐπιχθονίων ἐκέλευσεν,	o 3.20 o 15.172 @ o 15.173 * o 2.171 i 24.220 *
400	ἢ οἱ μαντιῆς εἰσι θυοσκοποὶ ἢ ἱερῆες,	i 24.221

---

377 δὲ 378 μετεφώνεεν 385 πυθέσθαι 386 ὅς 391 δὲ σύ ἐσσι 392 εἶς 396  
μαντεύσομαι

	ψεῦδός κεν φαῖμεν καὶ νοσφιζοίμεθα μᾶλλον·	i 24.222
	νῦν δ' αὐτὸς γὰρ ἄκουσα θεοῦ, καὶ ἐσέδρακον ἄντην,	i 24.223
	καὶ μοι ἕκαστ' ἐπέτελλεν, εἶκτο δὲ θέσκελον αὐτῷ.	i 23.107
	τοῦνεκά με προέηκε διδασκόμενα τάδε πάντα.	i 9.442
405	τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ δεῖδοικα καὶ αἰδέομαι περὶ κῆρι.	i 24.435
	λίην γὰρ κράτερος περὶ πάντων ἔστ' ἀνθρώπων.	i 21.566
	οὐ γὰρ πῶ τινά φημι εἰκότα ὧδε ἰδέσθαι,	o 4.141
	ὄσσοις ἔην οἶός τε. θεῶν γὰρ ἄντα ἐφίκει.	i 24.630 *
	τῷ μὴ τίς ποτε πάμπαν ἀνήρ ἀθεμίσιος εἶη,	o 18.141
410	πειθόμενος τεράεσσι θεῶν καὶ Ζηνὸς ἀρωγῇ,	i 4.408 *
	μὴ πως τοι μετόπισθε κοτεσσάμενος χαλεπήνη.	o 5.147
	μὴ πολύπακρα καὶ αἰνὰ βίας ἀποτίσσειται ἐλθὼν	o 16.255 *
	νημερτέως γὰρ τοι μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ἐπικεύσω.	o 19.269
	αἰψὰ κε σὺν ᾧ 'πατρὶ' βίας ἀποτίσσειται 'ἐλθὼν'	o 17.540 † @
415	ἀθάνατος. οἱ δ' αὐτ' ἀνεμώλιοι οἱ τὸ πάρος περ	i 20.123 *
	χρυσῷ τ' ἠλέκτρῳ τε 'κεκοσμένοι' ἢ δ' ἐλέφαντι.	o 4.73 * †
	αἰψὰ κε σὺν ᾧ 'πατρὶ' βίας ἀποτίσσειται ἀνδρῶν	o 17.540 †
	οἱ βίη εἰν ἀγορῇ σκολιάς κρίνωσι θέμιστας,	i 16.387
	ἐκ δὲ δίκην ἐλάσσωσι, θεοῦ ὄπιν οὐκ ἀλέγοντες.	i 16.388 *
420	'ὄς' σφέας τίσεται ἰκετήσιος, ὅς τε καὶ ἄλλους	o 13.213 * †
	ἀνθρώπους ἐφορᾷ καὶ τίνυται ὅς τις ἀμάρτοι,	o 13.214 *
	τῆσδ' ἀπάτης κοτέων· τὰ μὲν ἔσσειται οὐκ ἀτέλεστα.	i 4.168
	ἀλλὰ πίθεσθε καὶ ὕμμες, ἐπεὶ πείθεσθαι ἄμεινον.	i 1.274
	ἦ γὰρ οἴομαι ἄνδρα χολωσέμεν, ὅς μέγα πάντων	i 1.78
425	'ἀνθρώπων' κρατέει καὶ οἱ πείθονται 'ἅπαντες'.	i 1.79 †

---

416 κεκόσμενοι Iv: πετυκασμενοι Steph: καὶ ἀργύρου Hom 414 πατρὶ 417 πατρὶ  
420 Ζεὺς 425 'Αργείων...' Αχαιοί

	ἡ μὲν τοι τάδε πάντα τελείεται ὡς ἀγορεύω.	o 14.160
	οὐ πῶ πάν εἴρητο ἔπος ὅτ' ἄρ' ἤλυθεν αὐτὸς,	i 10.540 *
	ὅς πᾶσι θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσει,	i 12.242
	ἄνερ' εἰδόμενος κούρω αἰσυμητήρι.	i 13.69 † + 24.347
430	τὸν δ' ἐξ ἀγχιμόλοιο ἰδὼν ἐφράσσατο κήρυξ,	i 24.352
	ἦύσεν δὲ διαπρύσιον ἄμεροπέσι' γεγωνώς.	i 8.227 †
	ἐγγὺς ἀνὴρ, οὐ δηθὰ ματεύσομεν, αἶ κ' ἐθέλητε	i 14.110
	ἐκφυγῆεν θάνατόν τε κακὸν καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν.	i 21.66
	ἄλλα γὰρ' οὐδέ τις οἶ δύναται μένος ἰσοφαρίζειν.	i 6.101 †
435	αὐτὸς δ', αἶ κ' ἐθέλησιν ἰήσεται, οὐδέ τις ἄλλος."	o 9.520
	ὡς εἰπὼν ὄτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστου.	i 5.470
	κύσσε δέ μιν περιφύς ἐπιάλμενος ἠδὲ προσηύδα,	o 24.320
	"ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ νόστησας ἐελδομένοισι μάλ' ἡμῖν,	o 24.400
438a	πολλὰ μάλ' εὐχομένοισι καὶ ἐλπομένοισι ἰδεσθαι,	?
	οὐλέ τε καὶ ἄμεγα' χαῖρε, θεὸς δέ τοι ὄλβια δοίη."	o 24.402 * @
 <i>περὶ τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος</i>		
440	ὡς εἰπὼν ὁ μὲν ἦρχ', ὁ δ' ἄμ' ἔσπετο ἰσόθεος φῶς.	i 11.472
	ἔς ποταμὸν δ' εἰλεῦντο βαθύρροον ἀργυροδίην.	i 21.8
	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πόρον ἴξον εὐρρεῖος ποταμοῖο,	i 14.433
	ὅς πολὺ κάλλιστα ποταμῶν ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἴησι,	o 11.239 *
	ἄκα μιν' ἀποπρὸ φέρων λοῦσεν ποταμοῖο ῥοῆσι,	i 16.679 †
445	κρύπτων ἐν δίνησι βαθείησιν μεγάλῃσι,	i 21.239
	αὐτὸς δ' ἀργύρεον φᾶρος μέγα ἔννυτο ἄθειον',	o 5.230 * †
	λεπτὸν, καὶ χάριεν, περὶ δὲ ζώνην βάλετ' ἰξυί.	o 5.231
	αὐτίκ' ἔπειθ' ὑπὸ ποσσὶν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα.	i 24.340

---

429 μάντει 431 Δαναοῖσι 434 μαίνεται 438a om. Steph 444 πολλὸν 446 νύμφη

*περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος καθόδου ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς*

450	ἦμος δ' ἄρ' ὃ γ' ἐλούσατο ἐν ποταμῷ βαθυδίην, ἀμφὶ δὲ εἴματα ἔσσαθ' ἅ οἱ πόρε πάρθενος ἀδιμῆς, εὐχετο χεῖρ' ὀρέγων εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα, ὑψι δ' ὑπαὶ νεφέων ἴδετο τρήρωνα πέλειαν. αἴγλη δ' οὐρανὸν ἴκε, γέλασσε δὲ πᾶσα περὶ χθῶν. ἄγορρον δ' ἄρα κῦμα κατέσσυτο καλὰ ῥέεθρα.	cf. o 6.210 o 6.228 i 15.371 i 23.874 † @ i 19.362 i 21.382
-----	---	--

*περὶ τῆς κλήσεως τῶν ἀποστόλων*

455	ἑκαὶ τότε δὴ κρῖνεν γ' ἐτάρων δυοκαίδεκα ἀρίστους εἰναλίους, οἷσιν τε θαλάσσια ἔργα μεμήλεν, ὄφρα οἱ αὐτόματοι θεῖον δυσαΐατ' ἀγῶνα. τῶν περ καὶ μείζων ἀρετὴ τιμὴ τε βίη τε. οἱ γάρ οἱ εἴσαντο διακριδὸν εἶναι ἀρίστοι	o 9.195 † * o 5.67 * i 18.376 i 9.498 i 12.103
460	τῶν ἄλλων μετὰ γ' αὐτὸν· ὁ δ' ἔπρεπε καὶ διὰ πάντων. οἱ δ' ἔλαχον τοὺς ἄν κε καὶ ἤθελεν αὐτὸς ἐλέσθαι. οἱ δὴ μιν περὶ κῆρι θεὸν ὧς τιμήσαντο. οὔτοι γὰρ κλητοὶ γε βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβῆη καὶ ἀμάρτη.	i 12.104 o 9.334 o 5.36 † * o 17.386 i 9.501
465	τὸν δὲ μέγ' ὦνησαν καὶ τ' ἔκλυον ἐϋξαμένιοι. τοὺς ὃ γε συγκαλέσας πυκινὴν ἀρτύνετο βουλὴν.	i 9.509 @ i 10.302

---

452 ὑπὸ 455 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ 462 κέν

*περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ*

	"Κέκλυτέ μευ, μνηστῆρες ἀγακλειτῆς βασιλείης,	o 18.351
	ὄφρ' εἶπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει.	o 18.352
	οὐ γὰρ ἀπείρητος 'μυθήσομαι', ἀλλ' ἐὺ εἰδώς	o 2.170 †
470	τέκμων. οὐ γὰρ ἐμὸν παλινάγρετον οὐδ' ἀπατηλὸν	i 1.526
	οὐδ' ἀτελεύτητον, ὃ τί κεν κεφαλῇ κατανεύσω.	i 1.527
	οὔτέ τι μάντις ἐὼν οὔτ' οἰωνῶν σάφα εἰδώς,	o 1.202
	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μεγάλου θεοῦ εὐχομαι ἔμμενα υἱός.	cf. i 21.87
	πατρός δ' εἴμ' ἀγαθοῖο, θεὸς δέ με γείνατο 'πατήρ'	i 21.109 * †
475	ἦπιος, ὅς δὴ τοι παρέχει βρωσίν τε πόσιν τε,	o 15.490 *
	ξείνιος, ὅς τε μάλιστα νεμεσῶται κακὰ ἔργα.	o 14.284 *
	τοῦ 'περ' ἐγὼ πάϊς εἰμί, πατήρ δ' ἐμὸς εὐχεται εἶναι.	o 9.519 †
	τοῦνεκά με προέηκε διδασκόμεναί τάδε πάντα	i 9.442
	σήμαθ', ἃ δὴ καὶ νῶϊ κεκρυμμένα ἴδμεν ἀπ' ἄλλων.	o 23.110
480	ἴδμεν δ' ὅσσα γένηται ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρη,	o 12.191
	μοίρην τ' ἀμμορίην τε καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.	o 20.76

*περὶ τῆς ἀγίας τριάδας*

	ἀλλὰ πίθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἐπεὶ πείθεσθαι ἄμεινον	i 1.274
	ἡμῖν, οὐνεκα πομποὶ ἀπήμονές εἰμεν ἀπάντων	o 13.174
	τρεις, ἀμφιστρεφές, ἐνὸς αὐχένος ἐκπεφυῶτες,	i 11.40 *
485	ἦλικες ἰσοφόροι, τῶν τε σθένος οὐκ ἀλαπαδνόν,	o 18.373
	τῶν περ καὶ μείζων ἀρετῆ τιμῆ τε βίῃ τε.	i 9.498

---

469 μαντεύσομαι 474 μήτηρ 477 γὰρ

*περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως*

	ἀλλ' ἄγεθ', ὡς ἂν ἐγὼν εἶπω, πειθώμεθα πάντες.	o 13.179
	ὦδε γὰρ ἐξερέω, τὸ δε καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται.	i 1.212
	οἷδ', οἷ κεν' τεθνάσι καὶ εἶν' Αἶδαο δόμοισι,	o 15.350 †
490	αὐθις ἀναστήσονται ὑπὸ ζόφου ἠερόντος,	i 21.56
	πάντες ὀμηγερῆες, ἡμὲν νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες.	i 2.789
	ἔσσεται ἦ ἠὼς ἦ δαίλη ἦ μέσον ἡμαρ,	i 21.111
	οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητόν γ' ἔπος ἔσσεται, ὅτι κεν εἶπω,	i 2.361
	ἀλλ' αὐτῆ δίκη ἐπὶ βροτῶν. ὅτε 'κεν τε θάνωσιν',	o 11.218 @
495	'ἄψ' ἀναστήσονται'. τότε δὲ γνώσεσθε ἕκαστος	i 23.497 †
	ὡς κακοεργίης εὐεργεσίῃ μέγ' ἀμείνων.	o 22.374
	ἔνθ' ὃ τε δειλὸς ἀνὴρ ὅς τ' ἄλκιμος ἐξεφαάνθη·	i 13.278
	κείνος δ' αὐτὸν περὶ κῆρι μακάρτατος ἔξοχον ἄλλων,	o 6.158
	ὅς τις κε τλαίη, οἷ τ' αὐτῷ κῦδος ἄροιτο.	i 10.307
500	ὅς 'μὲν' ἀμύμων αὐτὸς ἔη, καὶ ἀμύμονα εἰδῆ,	o 19.332 †
	τοῦ μὲν τε κλέος εὐρὺν διὰ ξεῖνοι φορέουσι	o 19.333
	πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, πολλοὶ τέ μιν ἐσθλὸν ἔειπον.	o 19.334
	ὅς 'δὲ' ἀπηνής αὐτὸς ἔη καὶ ἀπηνέα εἰδῆ	o 19.329 †
	τῷ Ἄτην ἄμ' ἔπεσθα, ἵνα βλαφθεὶς ἀποτείση.	i 9.512
505	τῷ δὲ καταρῶνται πάντες βροτοὶ ἄλγε' ὀπίσσω	o 19.330
	ζωῶ, ἀτὰρ τεθνεώτ' ἡ γ' ἐφεψιόωνται ἅπαντες.	o 19.331
	εἰ δ' ἂν ἐμοῖς ἐπέεσσι παθοῖατο ὡς ἀγορεύω,	cf. i 18.273
	οὔτε τι πημανθῆναι ἔπι δέος οὔτ' ἀπολέσθαι.	o 8.563
	ἀλλ' ἴομεν 'ποτὶ' ἄστν, πίθεσθέ μοι· ὦδε γὰρ ἔσται.	i 18.266 †

---

489 ἦ ἦδη 495 ἐνθάδ' ἐλεύσοντα 500 δ' ἂν 503 μὲν 509 προτὶ



- 510 αὐτοὶ δ' ὀτρύνεσθε ἐμοὶ ἅμα πάντες ἔπεσθαι. ο 10.425 †  
ταῦτα δ' ἐγὼν αὐτοῖς τεχνήσομαι ἠδὲ νοήσω." i 23.415

*περὶ τοῦ ἀκολούθοντος ὄχλου*

- ὡς ἄρα φωνήσας ἠγήσατο, τοὶ δ' ἅμ' ἔποντο i 13.833  
ἠχῆ θεσπεσίῃ· ἐπὶ δ' ἴαχε λαὸς ὄπισθεν i 13.834  
'χάρματι' γηθόσυνοι, τό σφιν θεὸς ἔμβαλε θυμῷ. i 13.82 † \*  
515 τοῦ δ' ἄμοτον μεμάρσιν ἀκουέμεν ὀππότη' αἰείδη ο 17.550  
ἐρχόμενον δ' ἀνὰ ἄστου θεὸν ὡς εἰσορόωντο ο 8.173 \*  
'πάντες' θ' οἱ κατὰ ἄστου καὶ οἱ περιναίεταουσιν. ο 8.551 †  
λαοὶ ἔπονθ', ὡς εἶ τε μετὰ κτίλον ἔσπετο μῆλα, i 13.492  
παῖδες πρωθήβια πολιοκρόταφοὶ τε γέροντες. i 8.518 \*  
520 ἦλθον ἔπειθ' ὅσα φύλλα καὶ ἄνθεα γίνεται ἥρος' ο 9.51 @  
χωλοὶ τε ῥυσσοὶ τε παραβλωπές τ' ὀφθαλμῶν. i 9.503 \*  
ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα πολυσπερέων ἀνθρώπων. i 2.804  
'πάντας' δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω. i 2.488 †  
ἀλλήλους τ' εἴροντο τίς εἶη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι. ο 17.368  
525 καὶ γὰρ θαῦμ' ἐτέτυκτο πελώριον, οὐδὲ ἐφκει ο 9.190  
ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ πάϊς ἔμμενα, ἀλλὰ θεοῖο. i 24.259  
τετρήχει δ' ἀγορή, ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαῖα. i 2.95

*περὶ τοῦ ἐν Κανῶ γάμου*

- 'βῆ δ' ἴμενα πρότερος', ἐτέρηφι δὲ λάζετο Πέτρον, i 16.734 †  
ὅς οἱ 'κύδιστος' ἐτάρων ἦν κεδνότατός τε. ο 10.225 \* @  
530 σεύατ' ἔπειτ' ἀνὰ ἄστου, ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι πεποιθώς. i 6.505

---

510 ἅμα πάντες Hom, Steph: ἅπαντες Iv 514 χάρμη 517 ἄλλοι 523 πληθὺν 529  
σκαίῃ ἔγχος ἔχων

	τὸν δ' ἄρα πάντες λαοὶ ἐπερχόμενον θεῦντο,	o 17.64
	οὐνεκ' ἄριστος ἔην, πολὺ δὲ πλείστους ἄγε λαοὺς.	i 2.580
	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ βασιλῆος ἀγκαλυτὰ δάμαθ' ἴκοντο,	o 7.46
	καρπαλίμως ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἐβήσετο δάματος εἴσω.	o 7.135
535	τὸν δ' εὗρεν δαινύντα γάμους πολλοῖσιν ἔτησιν	o 4.3 *
	ὑιέος ἠδὲ θυγατρὸς ἀμύμονος φ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ.	o 4.4
	ἦ γὰρ οἱ ζωὴ γ' ἦν ἄσπετος· οὐ τι τόσση.	o 14.96
	νύμφας δ' ἐκ θαλάμων δοῖδων ὕπο λαμπομενάων,	i 18.492
	ἠγίνεον ἀνά ἄστυ, πολὺς δὲ ὑμέναιος ὀρώρει	i 18.493
540	ἀνδρῶν παιζόντων καλλιζώνων τε γυναικῶν	o 23.147
	τοῖσιν δὲ μέγα δῶμα περιστεναχίζετο ποσσίν.	o 23.146
	κοῦροι δ' ὀρχηστῆρες ἐδίνεον, ἐν δ' ἄρα τοῖσιν	i 18.494
	αὐλοὶ φόρμιγγές τε βοῆν ἔχον· αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες	i 18.495
	μολπῆς ἐξάρχουσα ἐδίνεον κατὰ μέσσης,	o 4.19 *
545	ὄσσαι ἀριστήων ἄλοχοι ἔσαν ἠδὲ θύγατρος.	o 11.227
	πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδὲ' ὀνομήνω.	i 2.488
	ἰστάμενα θαύμαζον ἐπὶ προθύροισιν ἐκάστη.	i 18.496
	ταῖσιν δ' ἐν μέσσησι πάς φόρμιγγι λιγείῃ	i 18.569 *
	ἡμερόεν κιθάριζε, λίνον δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄειδε.	i 18.570
550	ἄστυδ' ἄφ' ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων καταγίνεον ὕλην.	o 10.104
	ἐκ 'πεδίων' δ' 'ἄξαντο' βόας καὶ ἴφια μῆλα	i 8.545 † @
	καρπαλίμως, οἶνον δὲ μελίφρονα οἰνίζοντο,	i 8.546
	σίτόν τ' ἐκ μεγάρων, ἐπὶ δὲ ξύλα πολλὰ λέγοντο	i 8.547
	δαιτρεύειν, μή τις οἱ ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης,	i 11.705
555	'ἄρτω' τε κρέασίν τε ἰδὲ πλείοις δεπάεσσι.	i 8.162 †
	πολλοὶ μὲν βόες ἀργοὶ ὀρέχθοντ' ἀμφὶ σιδήρῳ	i 23.30 *
	σφαζόμενοι, πολλὰ δὲ ὄϊες καὶ μηκάδες αἴγες·	i 23.31 *

	πολλοὶ δ' ἀργιόδοντες ὕες, θαλέθοντες ἀλοιφῇ,	i 23.32
	εὐόμενοι τανύοντο διὰ φλογὸς Ἡφαίστοιο.	i 23.33
560	οἱ δ' ἤδη μοίρας τ' ἔνεμον κερῶντό τε οἶνον,	o 8.470
	ἑστήσαντες κρητήρας ἐπιστεφείας οἴνοιο.	i 8.232 †
	ἔνθα φίλ' ὀπταλέα κρέα ἔδμενα ἠδὲ κύπελλα	i 4.345
	οἴνου πινόμενα μελιθέος, ὄφρ' ἐθέλητον.	i 4.346
	κήρυκες δ' αὐτοῖσι καὶ ὄτρηροὶ θεράποντες	o 1.109
565	δεξάμενοι κατέθεντο πόσιν καὶ βρῶσιν ἄπασαν.	o 13.72
	οἱ μὲν ἄρ' οἶνον ἔμισγον ἐνὶ κρητήρσι καὶ ὕδωρ,	o 1.110
	οἱ δ' αὐτε σπόγγοισι πολυτρήτοισι τραπέζας	o 1.111
	νίζον καὶ προτίθεντο ἰδὲ κρέα πολλὰ δατεῦντο.	o 1.112 @
	οἱ δ' ἦγον μὲν μῆλα, φέρον δ' εὐήνορα οἶνον.	o 4.622
570	οἱ δ' ἐπ' ὀνειῖαθ' ἐτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἰαλλον.	o 1.149
	οἱ δ' ἦος μὲν σίτον ἔχον καὶ οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν	o 12.327
	δαίνυντ'· οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς εἴσης.	i 1.468 *
	δαιτυμόνες δ' ἀνὰ δάματ' ἀκουάζονται αἰοιδού,	o 9.7
	πίνοντες καὶ ἔδοντες· ἐπηετανὸν γὰρ ἔχεσκον	o 7.99
575	δαίνυνθ' ἐζόμενοι· ἐπὶ δ' ἀνέρες ἐσθλοὶ ὄροντο	o 3.471
	οἶνον οἴνοχοεῦντες ἐνὶ χρυσεῖσι δεπάεσσιν.	o 3.472
	ὣς οἱ μὲν δαίνυντο καθ' ὑπερεφές μέγα δάμα.	o 4.15
	πολλὸς δ' ἡμερόεντα χορὸν περίσταθ' ὄμιλος	i 18.603
	τερπόμενοι· μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος αἰοιδὸς	o 4.17
580	φορμίζων· δοιῶ δὲ κυβιστητῆρε κατ' αὐτοῦς	o 4.18
	μολπῆς ἐξάρχοντες ἐδίνεον κατὰ μέσσους.	o 4.19
	ἔνθα μὲν ἠΐθεοι καὶ παρθένοι ἀλφεισίβοιοι	i 18.593
	ᾠρχεῦντ', ἀλλήλων ἐπὶ καρπῷ χεῖρας ἔχοντες.	i 18.594
	τῶν δ' αἰ μὲν λεπτὰς ὀθόνας ἔχον, οἱ δὲ χιτῶνας	i 18.595

---

561 πίνοντες 568 προτίθεν τοὶ δὲ

585	εἶατ' εὐννήτους, ἦκα στίλβοντας ἐλαίῳ. 'ἦμος' δ' ἐκ κεράμων μέθυ πᾶνον τοῖο 'ἀνακτος', οἶνον δὲ φθινίσκοντες, ὑπέρβιον ἐξαφύοντες, ἐνθά οἱ ἠπιόδωρος ἐναντίον ἦλυθε μήτηρ, ἐν τ' ἄρα οἱ φύ χειρὶ ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν·	i 18.596 i 9.469 † * o 14.95 * i 6.251 * i 14.232
590	"τέκνον', ἐπεὶ τοι δῶκε θεὸς μέγεθός τε βίην τε οἶνον ἐν ἀμφιφορευσι δυνάδεκα πᾶσιν ἀφύσσας, δαίνυ δαῖτα γέρουσιν· ἔοικέ τοι, οὐ τοι ἀεικές, ὡς ἂν μοι τιμὴν μεγάλην καὶ κῦδος ἄροιο, ἦ τε καὶ ἐσσομένοισι μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέληται.	i 7.288 † o 9.204 i 9.70 i 16.84 * i 3.287
595	πᾶσά τοι ἐσθ' ὑποδεξίη, πολέεσσι δ' ἀνάσσεις. ἐν δὲ κρητῆρές τε καὶ ἀμφιφορηές ἔασι, ἐν δ' ὕδατ' ἀενάοντα· δύο δέ 'γέ' θύρα εἰσίν. ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἶπέ, τί τοι φρεσὶν εἶδεται εἶναι;" ὣς φάτο. τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέειπεν ἔπεσσι,	i 9.73 o 13.105 o 13.109 † i 24.197 cf. o 16.193
600	"τέτλαθι, μήτηρ ἐμή, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη περ. αἰνῶς γάρ μ' αὐτόν γε μένος καὶ θυμὸς ἱκάνει'. τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ τοι, μήτηρ, ἀληθείην καταλέξω. ἄρη μὲν πολέων μύθων, ἄρη δὲ καὶ ἔργων'." αὐτὰρ ὁ κηρύκεσσι λιγυφθόγγοισι κέλευσε,	i 1.586 i 24.198 † o 17.108 o 11.379 † i 2.50
605	"καρπαλίμως μοι, φίλα τέκνα', κρήνηνατ' ἐέλωρ. ἔρχεσθε κρήνηνδε, καὶ οἴσετε θάσσον ἰόντες 'ὕδαρ ἐκ πηγῶν', ὅθεν ὑδρεύονται πολίται." ὡς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλύον ἠδ' ἐπίθοντο δάδεκα δ' ἔμπλησαν καὶ πάμασιν ἦρσαν ἅπαντας.	o 3.418 † o 20.154 * o 7.131 † o 15.220 o 2.353 *
610	αὐτὰρ ὁ θυμὸν ἔχων ὄν καρτερόν, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ,	i 5.806

---

586 πολλὸν...γέροντος 590 Αἴαν 597 τέ 601 ἄνωγε 603 ὕπνου 605 τέκνα φίλα  
607 πρὸς δόμον ὑψηλόν

	εὐχετο, χεῖρ' ὀρέγων εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα.	ο 9.527
	αὐτίκ' ἔπειτά οἱ οἶνον ἐν ἀμφιφορεῦσιν ἄφυσσεν.	ο 2.379
	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἐνέηκε κέλευσέ τε οἰνοχοῆσα,	ο 4.233
	κοῦροι μὲν κρητῆρας ἐπεστέψαντο ποτοῖο,	ι 1.470
615	οἶνον δ' ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφυσσάμενοι δεπάεσσιν,	ι 3.295
	'κίρνων' νεῖκεα πολλὰ δικαζομένων αἰζηῶν,	ο 12.440 †
	νόμησάν 'τ' ἄρα πᾶσιν ἐπαρξάμενοι δεπάεσσιν.	ι 1.471 †
	ὣς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἡμᾶρ ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα,	ο 9.161
	εἶατο δαινύμενοι κρέα τ' ἀσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἠδύ.	ο 10.184 *
620	οἱ δ' εἰς ὄρχηστὺν τε καὶ ἡμερόεσσαν ἀοιδὴν	ο 1.421
	τρεψάμενοι τέρποντο, μένον δ' ἐπὶ ἔσπερον ἐλθεῖν.	ο 1.422
	τοῖσι δὲ τερπομένοισι μέλας ἐπὶ ἔσπερος ἦλθε·	ο 1.423
	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο,	ο 1.150
	μολπῆς τε γλυκερῆς καὶ ἀμύμονος ὄρχηθμοῖο,	ο 23.145
625	φόρμιγγός θ', ἥ δαιτὶ συνήγορός ἐστι θαλεῖη,	ο 8.99
	δύσετό τ' ἥλιος σκιδώντό τε πᾶσαι ἀγυιαί,	ο 2.388 *
	κοίτου τε μνήσαντο καὶ ὕπνου δῶρον ἔλοντο.	ο 16.481

*περὶ τοῦ παραλύτου*

	ἦμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως,	ο 2.1
	βῆ ῥ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ θαλάμοιο θεῶ ἐναλίγκιος ἄντην.	ο 2.5
630	ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ πτωχὸς πανδήμιος, ὅς κατὰ ἄστυ	ο 18.1
	κεῖτ' ὀλιγηπελέων, κάματος δέ μιν αἰνὸς ἵκανεν	ο 5.457
	τρητοῖς ἐν λεχέεσσιν, ὑπ' αἰθούσῃ ἐριδούπῳ,	ο 3.399
	δάκρυσι καὶ στοναχῆσι καὶ ἄλγεσι θυμὸν ἐρέχθων,	ο 5.83
	'ἦδη' τειρόμενος, χαλεπὸς δέ ἐ δεσμὸς ἐδάμινα.	ι 5.391 † *

---

616 κρίνων 617 δ' 634 ἦδη om. Iv

635	ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ οἱ ἔτ' ἦν ἴς ἔμπεδος οὐδέ τι κίκυς, οἷη περ πάρος ἔσκεν ἐνὶ γναμτοῖσι μέλεσσιν. οὐδ' ὀρθὸς δύναιτο στῆναι ποσὶν οὐδε νέεσθαι οἴκαδ', ὅπη οἱ νόστος, ἐπεὶ φίλα γούνα' λέλυνται. 'κεῖτο δ' ἄσιτος, ἄστατος ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτήτος.	o 11.393 o 11.394 o 18.241 * @ o 18.242 @ o 4.788 †
640	οὐ πῶ μὴν φασιν φαγέμεν καὶ πέμεν αὐτως, οὐδ' ἐπὶ ἔργα ἰδεῖν, ἀλλὰ στοναχῆ τε γόφ τε 'κεῖτο' ὀδυρόμενος φθινύθει δ' ἄμφ' ὀστεόφι χρώς. ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ γίγνωσκε θεοῦ γόνον 'αἰὲν' ἐόντα, ἐρχόμενον προπάροιθεν ὀμίλου μακρὰ βιβῶντα',	o 16.143 o 16.144 o 16.145 † i 6.191 † i 3.22 @
645	τὸν μὲν ἔπειθ' ὑποδύντε δῶω ἐρίηρες ἑταῖροι, 'αὐτοῦ κεν' προπάροιθε ποδῶν βάλον' ἐν κονίησι. δάκρυά 'τ' ἔκβαλε 'πολλά' ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυδνὸν ἔειπεν [νειόθεν ἐκ κραδίης· οὐδ' ἐν μέσσοισιν ἀναστάς.] καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόντα προσηύδα,	i 8.332 i 13.205 † o 19.362 † i 10.10 + i.19.77 o 18.104
650	"αὐδα ὅ τι φρονέεις· τελέσαι δέ με θυμὸς ἀνωγεν." ἔξαυτίς 'δ' ἐπέεσσιν' ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπεν. 'κλυθὶ μοι ὁ χθιζὸς θεὸς ἦλυθες, οὐ γὰρ ἐμῆ ἴς ἔσθ' οἷη πάρος ἔσκεν ἐνὶ γναμτοῖσι μέλεσσιν. οὐ γὰρ ἔτι σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα ἴνες ἔχουσι,	o 5.89 o 21.206 † o 2.262 † + i 11.668 i 11.669 o 11.219
655	καὶ μένος οὐ τόσον ἦσιν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἐμοῖσι. ἔτλην δ' οἷ' οὐ πῶ τις ἐπιχθόνιος βροτὸς ἄλλος. σοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα διαμπερὲς ἤματα πάντα εὐχομαι ὥς τε θεῶ καὶ σευ φίλα γούναθ' ἰκάνω, πολλὰ παθῶν· νῦν αὖ με τεῆς ἐν χερσὶν ἔθηκα.	i 19.202 i 24.505 i 16.498 + 499 o 13.231 i 21.82 *

---

637 στῆναι δύναιτο 638 γυῖα 639 κεῖτ' ἄρ 642 ἦσται 643 ἦν 644 βιβάντα  
646 Ἔκτορι δὲ...πέσεν 647 δ' ...θερμὰ 648 om. Iv 651 σφε ἔπεσσιν αὐτ μιν ἔπεσσιν

660	αὐτὸς δ' αἶ κ' ἐθέλης, ἰήσεαι, οὐδέ τις ἄλλος· γῆρας ἀποξύσας θήσει νέον ἠβώνοντα. ὦ ἄνα', εἶθ', ὡς θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν, ὡς νῦν ἠβώοιμι, βίη δέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἶη. γουννοῦμαί σε ἄναξ', σὺ δέ μ' αἶδεο καὶ μ' ἐλέησον.	o 9.520 * i 9.446 * i 4.313 † o 14.503 † i 21.74 †
665	ἀντί τοί εἰμ' ἰκέταο, διοτρεφές, αἰδοίοιο. πάρ γάρ σοι πρώτῳ πασάμην Δημήτερος ἀκτὴν." ὡς φάτο· τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε μέγας θεὸς εὐξαμένοιο. δεξιτερῆς ἔλε χειρὸς ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν "Ἄ δεῖλ', ἦ μάλα δὴ σε κιχάνεται αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος. 670 ἀλλ' ὅσσον μὲν ἐγὼ δύναιμαι χερσὶν τε ποσὶν τε καὶ σθένει, οὗ σ' ἔτι φημὶ μεθυσέμεν οὐδ' ἠβαιόν. οὕτω δὴ οἰκόνδε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν ἄψ ἀπονοστήσεις, εἰ καὶ μάλα πολλὰ πέπονθας. ὄρσεο, κυλλοπόδιον, ἐμὸν τέκος. ἄντα σέθεν γὰρ 675 οὗ τις ἀνὴρ προπάροιθε μακάρτατος οὗτ' ἄρ' ὀπίσσω ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ σε κακῶν ἐκλύσομαι ἠδὲ σαώσω, ὄφρα γνῶς κατὰ θυμόν, ἀτὰρ εἴπησθα καὶ ἄλλω, ὡς κακοεργίης εὐεργεσίη μέγ' ἀμείνων. ἀλλ' ἄνα, μηδ' ἔτι κείσο. σέβας δέ σε θυμόν ἰκέσθω. 680 τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ τοι ταῦτα μεταστήσω· δύναιμαι γὰρ." αἶψα δὲ κηρύκεσσι λιγυφθόγγοισιν ἔειπεν', "ὦ φίλοι, οὐκ ἂν δὴ τις ἐπὶ ῥηθέντι δικαίῳ ἀντιβίοις ἐπέεσσι καθαπτόμενος χαλεπαῖνοι. μήτέ τι τὸν ξεῖνον στυφελίζετε μήτέ τιν' ἄλλον." 685 ὡς εἰπὼν ἔμπνευσε μένος μέγα. τὸν δ' ὀρόθυνεν·	i 21.75 i 21.76 cf. i 1.453 i 7.108 i 11.441 i 20.360 i 20.361 * i 2.174 o 13.6 * i 21.331 o 11.483 o 10.286 o 22.373 o 22.374 i 18.178 o 4.612 o 2.6 † o 18.414 o 18.415 o 18.416 i 15.262+572

---

662 γέρον 663 τε 664 σ' Ἀχιλεῦ 681 κέλευσε

	ἐν δὲ βίην ὄμοισι καὶ ἐν γούνεσσι ἐθήκε,	i 17.569
	οἷη περ πάρος ἔσκεν ἐνὶ γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσσι,	o 11.394
	μηροῖς τε κνήμαίς τε καὶ ἄμφω χερσὶν ὑπερθεν.	o 8.135 *
	αὐτὸς δ' ὡς τ' ἴρηξ ὠκύπετος ὄρτο πέτεσθαι.	i 13.62
690	τὸν δ' αὐτε προσέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδῆς,	o 15.271
	"ὦ φίλε' ὑπαγόρη, μένος ἄσχετε, μὴ τί τοι ἄλλο	o 2.303 †
	ἐν στήθεσσι κακὸν μελέτω ἔργον τε ἔπος τε."	o 2.304
	ὡς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἡμᾶρ ἐς ἥλιον καταδύοντα	i 1.601
	χείρας ἀνίσχοντες μεγάλ' εὐχετόωντο ἕκαστος.	i 15.369
<i>περὶ τοῦ ἐν τῇ στοᾷ Σολομώντος ἐτέρου παραλύτου</i>		
695	ἥλιος μὲν ἔπειτα νέον προσέβαλλεν ἀρούρας.	o 19.433
	αὐτὰρ ὁ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπεπωλεῖτο στίχας ἀνδρῶν.	i 11.540
	πάπτηνεν δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα κατὰ στίχας, αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνω	i 17.84
	γῆραϊ τειρόμενον, μέγα δ' ἐν' φρεσὶ πένθος ἔχοντα.	o 24.233 †
	οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἔμπεδα γυῖα ποδῶν ἦν ὄρμηθῆναι,	i 13.512 @
700	οὐδέ τι κινήσαι μελέων ἦν οὐδ' ἀναεῖραι.	o 8.298
	ἔγνω δ' αὐτίκα κείνον, ἐπεὶ ἶδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι.	o 11.615 *
	καί μιν λισσόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα,	o 22.366
	δάκρυ ἀναπρήσας· οἴκτος δ' ἔλε λαὸν ἅπαντα.	o 2.81
	"εἰ μὲν δὴ θεὸς ἐσσι, θεοῖό τε ἔκλυες αὐδῆς,	o 4.831
705	πρὸς δ' ἐμὲ τὸν δύστηνον ἔτι φρονέοντ' ἐλέησον.	i 22.59
	οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἔμπεδα γυῖα, φίλος, πόδες, οὐδέ τι χεῖρες	i 23.627
	ἄμων ἄμφοτέρων γε' ἐπαΐσσονται ἐλαφραῖ.	i 23.628 †
	ἔνθεν δὴ νῦν δεῦρο τόδ' ἦκω' πῆματα πάσχων.	o 17.444 @
	αὐτὸς δ' αἶ κ' ἐθέλης ἰήσεαι, οὐδέ τις ἄλλος.	o 9.520 *

---

691 Τήλεμαχ' 698 om. Hom 699 ὄρμηθέντι 707 ἀμφοτέρωθεν 708 ἴκω



710	εἶθ' ὣς ἠβώοιμι, βίη δέ μοι ἔμπεδες εἶη."	i 7.157
	ὣς ἄρ' ἔπειτ' ἠρᾶτο καὶ αὐτὸς πάντα τελεύτα.	o 3.62 *
	τόν δ' αὖ γε προσέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής,	o 15.271
	"ταυτά τοι, ὦ δύστηνε, τελευτήσω τε καὶ ἔρξω."	o 11.80
	Αὐτίκ' ἔπειθ' ἅμα μῦθος ἔην, τετέλεστο δὲ ἔργον.	i 19.242
715	γυῖα δὲ θηκεν ἔλαφρά, πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ὑπερθεν.	i 13.61
	ἐν δὲ βίην ἄμοισι καὶ ἐν γούνεσσιν ἔθηκε.	i 17.569
	βῆ δ' ἴμεν ὣς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος ἀλκί πεποιθώς,	i 12.299 + 17.61
	καρχαλῶν, ταχέες δὲ πόδες φέρον. αἴψα δ' ἔπειτα	i 6.514
	ὑπόσ' ἀνέσχεθε ἄλεκτρα' καὶ εὐχόμενος δ' ἔπος ἠΐδα.	i 10.461 †
720	θάμβησαν δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι, ἐς ἀλλήλους δὲ ἴδοντο.	i 24.484
	καὶ ῥ' ἦγον προτὶ ἄστν, ἀελπτέοντες σόον εἶναι.	i 7.310
	ὦδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον,	o 21.396
	"ὦ φίλοι, οὐ μὲν πά τι πάρος τοιοῦτον ἐτύχθη,	o 18.36
	ἀλλ' οὐ πω τοιοῦτον ἐγὼν ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν.	o 4.269
725	ἦδη μὲν πολέων ἐδάην βουλήν τε νόον τε.	o 4.267
	οὐ γάρ πως ἂν θνητὸς ἀνὴρ τάδε μηχανόφτο	o 16.196
	ἐκτελέσας μέγα ἔργον, ὃ οὐ ποτε ἔλπετο θυμῷ."	o 3.275
<i>περὶ τῆς θυγατρὸς τοῦ ἑκατονάρχου</i>		
	Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κε φάνη καλὴ ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως,	i 9.707
	ἄκρον ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνος ἀλὸς πολιοῖο θέεσκε.	i 20.229 *
730	τόφρα δὲ καρπαλίμως ἐξίκετο νῆυς ἔυεργῆς	o 12.166
	σπερχομένη. τοίων γὰρ ἐπείγετο χέρος' ἐρετῶν.	o 13.115
	ἐν δ' ἄνεμος πρῆσεν μέσον ἰστίον, ἀμφὶ δὲ κῶμα	i 1.481
	στεῖρη πορφύρεον μεγάλ' ἴαχε νηὸς ἰούσης.	i 1.482

	ή δ' ἔθεεν κατὰ κύμα διαπρήσσουσα κέλευθον.	i 1.483
735	ή δὲ μάλ' ἀσφαλέως θέεν ἔμπεδον. οὐδέ κεν ἴρηξ κίρκος ὀμαρτήσειεν, ἐλαφρότατος πετεηνῶν. ὡς ἡ ῥίμφα θέουσα θαλάσσης κύματ' ἔταμινεν, ἄνδρα φέρουσα θεῶ ἑναλίγκια μηδὲ ἔχοντα. ἔνθ' ἐκ πόντου βᾶς ἰοειδέος ἠπειρόνδε,	o 13.86 o 13.87 o 13.88 o 13.89 * o 5.56
740	βῆ ῥ' ἀν' ὁδὸν μεμαῶς. τὸν δὲ φράσατο προσιόντα 'πληθὺς', ὅσσά τε φύλλα καὶ ἄνθηα γίγνεται ὄρη, χωλοὶ τε ῥυσσοὶ τε παραβλώπες τ' ὀφθαλμῶν', νύμφαι τ' ἠΐθεοὶ τε πολύτλητοὶ τε γέροντες. πολλοὶ δὲ ξεῖνοι ταλαπεῖριοι ἐνθάδ' ἴκοντο.	i 10.339 i 2.468 † i 9.503 * @ o 11.38 o 19.379 †
745	'ἔνθ' ἅμα' οἰμωγὴ τε καὶ εὐχλωτὴ πέλεν ἀνδρῶν. αὐτὰρ ὁ πεζὸς ἐὼν ἐπεπωλεῖτο στίχας ἀνδρῶν. ὄφρ' ὃ γε ταῦτα πονεῖτο ἰδυίησι πραπίδεσσι, 'τόφρα' δὲ δὴ μιν ἐταῖρος ἀνήρ ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν. βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἀγγελέων διὰ δώματα ποιμένι λαῶν,	i 8.64 @ i 4.231 i 18.380 i 17.466 † o 4.24
750	δάκρυα θερμὰ χέων, φάτο δ' ἀγγελίην ἀλεγεινήν. καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, "πεύσεα ἀγγελίης, ἢ μὴ ὄφελλε γενέσθαι. 'παρθένος αἰδοίη', Χαρίτων ἅπο κάλλος ἔχουσα, ἦν περὶ κῆρι φίλησε πατῆρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ,	i 18.17 o 1.122 i 18.19 o 6.18 * † i 13.430 *
755	λίην γὰρ πινυτὴ τε καὶ εὖ φρεσὶ μήδεα οἶδε. ἦ μ' ἐφίλει τ' ἐκόμει τε· τί τοι τόδε μυθολογεύω; νούσφ ὑπ' ἀργαλέῃ φθίνεταί οἷς ἐν μεγάροισιν λευγαλέφ θανάτῳ, ὡς μὴ θάνοι ὅς τις ἐμοί γε ἐνθάδε ναιετάων φίλος εἶη καὶ φίλα ἔρδοι.	o 11.445 o 12.450 * i 13.667 * o 15.359 o 15.360
760	ταυτὰ τοι ἀχνύμενός περ, ἀληθείην κατέλεξα.	o 7.297

---

741 μύριοι 742 ὀφθαλμῶ 744 δὴ 745 ἔνθα δ' ἅμ' 748 ὄψε 753 πὰρ δὲ δυ'  
ἀμφίπολοι

	ἀλλ' ἄγε δεῦρο, ἄναξ, ἴν' ἔπος καὶ μῦθον ἀκούσης."	ο 11.561
	Τόνδ' αὖτε προσέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής·	ο 15.271
	"ὥς' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὄδε μῦθος ἐπήτυμος ὡς ἀγορεύεις,	ο 23.62 †
	ἀλλ' ἴομεν, μὴ δηθὰ διατρίβαμεν ὁδοῖο.	ο 2.404
765	οὗ τοι ἔπειθ' ἀλίη ὁδὸς ἔσσεται οὐδ' ἀτέλεστος.	ο 2.273
	θάρσει· μὴ τοι ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ σῆσι μελόντων.	ο 16.436
	αἶ γάρ μιν θανάτοιο δυσηχέος ὠδε δυναίμην	i 18.464
	νόσφιν ἀποκρύψαι, ὅτε μιν μόρος αἰνὸς ἰκάνοι.	i 18.465
	ἀλλ' ἄγ', ἐγὼν αὐτὸς πειρήσομαι ἠδὲ ἴδαμαι."	ο 6.126
770	ὡς εἰπὼν ἄλλους μὲν ἀπέσκεδασ' ἄλλυδις ἄλλη	i 19.309 + ο 11.385
	βῆ δ' ἴμεναι προτέρως. ἐτέρηφι δὲ λάζετο Πέτρον,	cf. ο 2.298 + i 16.734
	ὅς οἱ κήδιστος ἐτάρων ἦν κεδνότατός τε·	ο 10.225
	ἄλλους θ', οἳ οἱ κεδνότατοι καὶ φίλτατοι ἦσαν.	cf. i 9.586
	ἄυτάρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἴκανε δόμους εὐ ναιετάοντας,	i 6.370 †
775	καρπαλίμως ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἐβήσατο δάματος εἴσω.	ο 7.135
	ἐν δὲ θρόνοι περι τοῖχον ἐρηρέδατ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα	ο 7.95
	ἐζέσθην (γάρ) ἔπειτα κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε.	ο 15.134 †
	αἶψα δ' ἄρ εἴσβαινον καὶ ἐπὶ κληῖσι καθίζον·	ο 15.221
	καδδραθέτην δ' οὐ πολλὸν ἐπὶ χρόνον, ἀλλὰ μίνυνθα.	ο 15.494
780	ᾤμωξεν δ' ἔλεινὰ πατὴρ φίλος, ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ	i 22.408
	κωκυτῷ τ' εἶχοντο καὶ οἰμογῆ κατὰ ἄστν.	i 22.409
	θυγατέρες δ' ἀνὰ δάματα ἰδὲ νυοὶ ὠδύροντο	i 24.166
	μήτηρ δ' αὐθ' ἐτέρωθεν ὠδύρετο δακρὺ χέουσα	i 22.79
	θυγατέρ' ἰφθίμην, τὴν ὀπλοτάτην τέκε παίδων.	ο 15.364 @
785	ἠ δὲ μέγα ἰάχουσα ὑπέδραμε καὶ λάβε γούνων	ο 10.323
	οἴκτρ' ὀλοφυρομένη. περι δὲ δμφαὶ μινύριζον	ο 4.719

---

763 ἀλλ' 774 αἶψα δ' ἔπειθ' 777 δ' ἄρ 784 ἰφθίμη

	πάσα, ὅσα κατὰ δώματ' ἔσαν νέα ἠδὲ παλαιά.	ο 4.720
	τὸν μὲν ἄρ' ἐν μεγάρῳ δμῶαὶ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ	ο 15.461
	χερσὶν τ' ἀμφαφόνοντα καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώντο	ο 15.462
790	ἀχνύμεναι. μετὰ δέ σφι πατήρ κίε δάκρυα λείβων.	i 13.658 *
	τὸν δ' ἄχος ἀμφεχύθη θυμοφθόρον, οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτ' ἔτλη.	ο 4.716 *
	Τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής,	ο 15.271
	"ἄ δεῖλ', ἦ δὴ πολλὰ κάκ' ἄνσχεο σὸν κατὰ θυμόν.	i 24.518
	'μηκέτι' τοι θάνατος μελέτω φρεσὶ μηδέ τι 'θυμῶ'	i 24.181 †
795	τάρβει· θαρσαλέος γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀμείνων	ο 7.51
	ἔργοισιν τελέθει, εἰ καὶ ποθεν ἄλλοθεν ἔλθοι.	ο 7.52
	εὔδε 'τ' ἀνακλιθεῖσα, λύθην δέ οἱ ἄνεα πάντα,	ο 4.794 †
	ἠδὺ μάλα κνώσσοις' ἐν ὄνειρείησι πύλῃσιν."	ο 4.809
	Οἱ δὲ καὶ ἀχνύμενοί περ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἠδὺ γέλασσαν.	i 2.270
800	αὐτὰρ ὁ τῶν μὲν ἔπειτα ἀλεύατο πουλὺν ὄμιλον,	ο 17.67
	ἀλλὰ τοκῆε δῶα προτέρω ἄγε· ἐγγύθι δὲ στάς	ο 8.312 + 4.36 + 1.120
	χεῖρ' ἔλε δεξιτερὴν καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν,	ο 1.121 + ο 4.803
	"ὄρσο', μῆδ' ἔτι κείσο· σέβας δέ σε θυμόν ἰκέσθω."	i 18.178 †
	ὡς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, τῇ δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο μῦθος.	ο 22.398
805	ἔζετο δ' ὀρθωθεῖς· ὁ δ' ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν αὔσας·	i 23.235 + 6.66
	"παύεσθον κλαυθμοῖο γόοιό τε δακρυόεντος.	ο 4.801 *
	'καί τε' δότ', ἀμφίπολοι, 'κούρη' βρώσιν τε πόσιν τε."	ο 6.209 †
	ἐκ δ' ἐγέλασσε πατήρ τε φίλος καὶ πότνια μήτηρ.	i 6.471
	ὡς εἰπὼν τοὺς μὲν λίπεν αὐτοῦ, βῆ δὲ μετ' ἄλλους.	i 4.292
810	'πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω.	ο 4.240 †
	κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως, θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντες	ο 10.201
	λισσόμενοι· χρεῖω γὰρ ἰκάνετο. 'αὐτὰρ ὁ πάντων'	i 10.118 * †

794 μὴ δέ τι...τάρβος 797 δ' 803 ἀλλ' ἄνα 807 ἀλλά...ξείνῳ 810 πάντα μὲν  
812 οὐκέτι ἀνέκτος

	χειρα ἐὶν ὑπέρεσχε· τεθαροσθήκασι δὲ λαοί.	<i>i</i> 9.687
	ἄνδρες δ' ἄψ' ἐγένοντο νεώτεροι ἢ πάρος ἦσαν,	<i>o</i> 10.395 @
815	καὶ πολὺ καλλίονες καὶ μείζονες εἰσοράασθαι.	<i>o</i> 10.396
	τόφρα δ' οἱ κοιμῆ γε θεῶ ὡς ἔμπεδος ἦεν.	<i>o</i> 8.453
<i>περὶ τοῦ χαλοῦ τοῦ καὶ ξηρὰν ἔχοντος χειρα</i>		
	ὄψε δὲ δὴ μιν ἐταῖρος ἀνὴρ ἶδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν	<i>i</i> 17.466
	χαλεύων· ὑπὸ δὲ κνήμαι ῥώνοντο ἀραιαί.	<i>i</i> 18.411
	κλαῖε δὲ κεν' λιγέως, θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυον εἴβων.	<i>o</i> 11.391 †
820	αὐτὸς δ' ἐν κονίησι μέγας μεγαλωστί τανυσθεὶς	<i>i</i> 18.26
	κεῖτο, φίλησι δὲ χειρσὶ κόμην ἤσχυνε δαΐζων.	<i>i</i> 18.27
	πολλὰς δ' ἐκ κεφαλῆς προθελύμινους ἔλκετο χαίτας	<i>i</i> 10.15 †
	(αὐτοῦ) δὲ προπάρριθε ποδῶν πέσεν ἐν κονίησι.	<i>i</i> 13.205 †
	αὐτὰρ ὁ τῇ ἑτέρῃ (μιν) ἑλών εἰλίσσετο γούνων.	<i>i</i> 21.71 †
825	καὶ μιν λισσόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα,	<i>o</i> 22.311
	"κλῦθι, ἄναξ, ὅτις ἐσσί· πολὺλλιστον δὲ σ' ἰκάνω.	<i>o</i> 5.445
	οὔτε γὰρ ἔσσω ἄφρων οὔτ' ἄσκοπος οὔτ' ἀλιτήμων,	<i>i</i> 24.157 *
	ἀλλὰ μάλ' ἐνδυκέως ἰκέτεω πεφιδήσεαι ἀνδρός.	<i>i</i> 24.158 † *
	καὶ μοι δὸς τὴν χεῖρ', ὀλοφύρομαι· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἄλλον	<i>i</i> 23.75 †
830	ἦπιον ὦδε ἄνακτα κιχήσομαι, ὀππὸς' ἐπέλω,	<i>o</i> 14.139
	οὐδ' εἴ κεν πατρὸς καὶ μητέρος αὐτίς ἴκαμαι	<i>o</i> 14.140
	οἶκον, ὅθι πρῶτον γενόμην καὶ μ' ἔτρεφον αὐτοί.	<i>o</i> 14.141
	τοῦνεκα νῦν τὰ σὰ γούναθ' ἰκάνομαι, αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα	<i>o</i> 4.322
	καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ξεῖνος ταλαπεῖριος ἐνθάδ' ἰκάνω	<i>o</i> 7.24
835	τηλόθεν ἐξ ἀπίης γαίης· τῷ οὐ τινα οἶδα	<i>o</i> 7.25
	ἀνθρώπων, οἳ τήνδε πόλιν καὶ ἔργα νέμονται.	<i>o</i> 7.26

814 ἄψ 819 δ' ὁ γε 822 om. Hom 823 Ἔκτορι 824 μιν 828 ἐνδυκέως Steph,  
Hom: ἐνδικαίως Iv 829 αὐτίς

	ἦμα δ' ἐν' μεγάροισι· οἴζυραὶ δέ μοι αἰεὶ	ο 11.182 † *
	φθίνουσιν νύκτες τε καὶ ἦματα δακρυ χέοντι.	ο 11.183 *
	νῦν δ' ἔχομαι κακότητι καὶ ἄλγεσι· πολλὰ γὰρ ἔτλην.	ο 8.182
840	βούλομ' ἄπαξ πρὸς κύμα χανῶν ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσαι,	ο 12.350
	ἢ δηθὰ στρεύγεσθαι δύη ἀρημένος αἰνῆ.	ι 15.512 + cf. 18.81
	ἀλλ' ἐλέαιρε, ἄναξ· ἰκέτης δέ τοι εὐχομαι εἶναι.	ο 5.450
	κλυθι, ἄναξ', ἀγαθός μοι ἐπίρροθος ἐλθὲ ποδοῖιν.	ι 23.770 * †
	οὐ μὲν γὰρ μείζον κλέος ἀνέρος ὄφρα κεν ἦσιν	ο 8.147
845	ἢ ὅ τι ποσσὶν τε βρέξη καὶ χερσὶν ἐῆσιν."	ο 8.148
	ὣς φάτο· τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε μέγας θεὸς εὐξαμένοιο.	cf. ι 1.453
	ἄλθετο χεῖρ, ὀδύνα δὲ κατηπρόωντο βαρεῖαι.	ι 5.417
	γούνατα δ' ἐρρώσαντο, πόδες δ' ὑπερικταίνοντο.	ο 23.3
	ὣς δ' ἄρ' ὅ κεν' λαιψηρὰ πόδας καὶ γούνατ' ἐνώμα,	ι 15.269 †
850	ὣς ὅτε τίς στατὸς ἵππος, ἀποστήσας ἐπὶ φάτνη,	ι 15.263
	ἦἴξεν πεδίοιο ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι πέτεσθαι.	ι 21.247
 <i>περὶ τοῦ τυφλοῦ</i>		
	ἄλλος δ' αὐτίς' πτωχὸς ἀνὴρ ἀλαλημένος ἐλθὼν	ο 21.327 †
	ἔστήκει, μέγα πένθος ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἀέξων.	ι 17.139
	ἄκαδδέ' οἱ ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλύς· οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτ' ἔτλη	ι 20.421
855	ὅς τόσον ἀυδήσασχ' ὅσον ἄλλοι πεντήκοντα	ι 5.786
	νειόθεν ἐκ κραδίης, τρομέοντο δὲ οἱ φρένες ἐντός.	ι 10.10
	ἀμφοτέρησι δὲ χερσὶν ἐπεσσύμενος λάβε 'γούνων',	ο 5.428 †
	λισσόμενος· χρεῖω γὰρ ἰκάνετο ουκέτ' ἀνεκτός.	ι 10.118 *
	καὶ ῥ' ὀλοφυρόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσήυδα,	ο 16.22
860	"εἰ μὲν δὴ θεὸς ἔσσι, θεοῖό τε ἔκλυες αὐδῆς,	ο 4.831

---

837 σοῖσιν ἐνὶ 843 θέα 849 Ἔκτωρ 852 ἀλλ' ἄλλος 854 κάρ ρά 857 πέτρης

	κέκλυθι νῦν καὶ ἐμεῖο· μάλιστα γὰρ ἄλγος ἰκάνει.	i 3.97 *
	ὦ ἄνα', οὐ γὰρ ἴδμεν ὅπη ζόφος οὐδ' ὅπη ἠὼς,	o 10.190 * †
	οὐδ' ὅπη ἠέλιος φαεσίμβροτος εἶς' ὑπὸ γαῖαν,	o 10.191
	οὐθ' ὅπῳ ἄν στείχησι πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα,	o 11.17
865	οὐθ' ὅτ' ἄν ἄψ ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἀπ' οὐράνοθεν προτράπηται.	o 11.18
	ποίησον δ' αἴθρην, δὸς δ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι	i 17.646
	ἠέλιόν τε ἀκάμαντα σελήνην τε πλήθουσας.	i 18.484
	γῆς ἐπέβην, ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἔχων ἀλάλημα οἴζυν·	o 11.167
	οὐτέ μοι ὀξύτατον κεφαλῆς ἔκ δέρκεται ὄσσε.	i 23.477 *
870	αὐτὸς δ', αἶ κ' ἐθέλησ', ἰήσασαι, οὐδέ τις ἄλλος.	o 9.520 *
	εἰ δέ κε νοστήσω καὶ ἐσόψομαι ὀφθαλμοῖσι	i 5.212
	πατρίδ' ἐμὴν ἄλοχόν τε καὶ ὑπερεφές μέγα δῶμα	i 5.213
	ὡς οὐδὲν γλύκιον ἦς πατρίδος οὐδὲ τοκῆων	o 9.34
	γίγνεται, εἴ περ καὶ τις ἀπόπροθι πίονα οἶκον	o 9.35
875	γαίῃ ἐν ἀλλοδαπῇ ναίει ἀπάνευθε τοκῆων.	o 9.36
	'ἄλλ', ὦ ἄναξ', ἐλέαρε. σὲ γὰρ κακὰ πολλὰ μογήσας,	o 6.175 *
	ἔς πρῶτον ἰκόμην. τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὐ τίνα οἶδα	o 6.176 *
	ἀνθρώπων, οἳ τήνδε πόλιν καὶ γαῖαν ἔχουσιν.	o 6.177
	σοὺς τε πόδας σά τε γούναθ' ἰκάνω πολλὰ μογήσας,	o 7.147 *
880	ὡς κ' ἐμὲ τὸν δύστηνον ἐμῆς ἐπιβήσασαι πάτρης	o 7.223
	καίπερ πολλὰ παθόντα· ἰδόντα με καὶ λίποι αἰών.	o 7.224
	τοῦνεκα νῦν τὰ σά γούναθ' ἰκάνομαι, αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα	o 4.322
	αὐτόν 'με' ζῶειν καὶ ὄραν φάος ἠελίοιο."	i 24.558 †
	ὡς φάτο· τῷ δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι δρινε.	i 11.804
885	τόν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδῆς,	o 15.271
	"ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ τόσα εἶπες ὅσ' ἄν πεπνυμένος ἀνήρ,	o 4.204

---

862 φίλοι 876 ἀλλά, ἄνασσ' 883 τε

	οὐνεκ' ἐπητής 'τ' ἐσσί καὶ ἀγγίνοος καὶ ἐχέφρων,	ο 13.332 †
	οὐδέ τί πω παρὰ μοῖραν ἔπος νηκερδὲς ἔειπες.	ο 14.509
	γινώσκω δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὃ 'τι' πινυτὸς φρένας ἵκει,	ο 20.228 * †
890	θάρσει, μηδέ τι πάγχυ μετὰ φρεσὶ δειδίθι λίην.	ο 4.825
	'θάρσει' ἔμοι δέ κε ταῦτα μελήσεται, ὄφρα τελέσσω.	i 1.523 †
	ἦδη γάρ μοι θυμὸς ἐπέσσυται ὄφρ' ἐπαμύνω.	i 6.361
	γνοίης χ' οἷη ἐμὴ δύναμις καὶ χεῖρες ἔπονται·	ο 20.237
	ἀλλ' εἰ δὴ ῥ' ἐθέλησθα' καὶ ἀτρεκέως ἀγορεύεις,	i 15.53 †
895	ἐλπωρή τοι ἔπειτα φίλους 'τ' ἰδέειν καὶ ἰκέσθαι	ο 6.314 @
	οἶκον ἐυκτίμενον καὶ ἔην ἐς πάτριδα γαίην.	ο 6.315 *
	τῷ σε καὶ οὐ δύναμαι προλιπεῖν δύστηνον ἐόντα,	ο 13.331
	οὐνεκ' ἐπήτης 'τ' ἐσσί καὶ ἀγγίνοος καὶ ἐχέφρων.	ο 13.332 †
	'ἔλπεο δὴ' τοι ἔπειτα κακῶν ὑπάλυξιν ἔσεσθα	ο 23.287 †
900	ἐξ ἐμεῦ, ὡς ἄν τις σε συναντόμενος μακαρίζοι.	ο 15.538
	ὄψαι, ἦν ἐθέλησθα καὶ αἶ κεν τοι τὰ μεμήλη	i 4.353
	ὀφθαλμοῖσι τεοῖσι τὰ τ' ἔλδεα ἦματα πάντα.	ο 23.6
	ἄνσχεο, μηδ' ἀλίσστον ὀδύρεο σὸν κατὰ θυμόν.	i 24.549
	ἦ μὲν σ' ἐνδυκέως ἀποπέμπομα, ὄφρ' ἄν ἵκηαι	ο 10.65 *
905	χαίρων καρπαλίμως, εἰ καὶ μάλα τηλόθεν ἐσσί,	ο 7.194 *
	πατρίδα σὴν καὶ δῶμα, καὶ εἴ πού τοι φίλον εἶη.	ο 10.66 *
	μή μοι σύγγει θυμὸν ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχεύων."	i 9.612
	αὐτίκ' ἔπειθ' ἅμα μῦθος ἔην, τετέλεστο δὲ ἔργον.	i 19.242
	αὐτίκα δ' ἠέρα μὲν σκέδασεν καὶ ἀπάσατ' ὀμίχλην.	i 17.649 *
910	ἀχλὺν δ' αὖ τοι ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἔλεν, ἧ πρὶν ἐπήεν,	i 5.127 *
	θεσπεσίην. ὃ δ' ἔπειτα μέγ' ἔξιδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν	i 20.342
	γαῖαν ἀπειρεσίην ὀρέων τ' αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα.	i 20.58

887 om. Hom 889 τοι 891 " Ἠρη 894 ἔτεόν γε 895 om. Hom (em. Bentley) 898  
om. Hom 899 ἐλπωρή



	πάντοσε παπταίνων ὡς τ' αἰετός, ὃν ῥά τέ φασιν	i 17.674
	ὀξύτατον δέρκεσθαι ὑπουρανίων πετεηνῶν.	i 17.675
915	τὸν δ' αὐτε προσέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής, "νῦν δ' ἔρχευ πρὸς δῶμα, καὶ ἴσχεο μηδ' ὀνομήνης μηδέ τῳ ἐκφάσθαι μήτ' ἀνδρῶν μήτε γυναικῶν." ἦ τοι ὁ μὲν χαίρων ἐπεβήσετο πατρίδος αἴης, καὶ κύνει ἀπτόμενος ἦν πατρίδα. πολλὰ δ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ	o 15.271 o 11.251 o 13.308 o 4.521 o 4.522
920	δάκρυα θερμὰ χέοντ', ἐπεὶ ἀσπασίως ἴδε γοῶν. θάμβησαν 'δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν' ἰδόντες. οἱ δὲ πανημέριοι μολπῇ θεὸν ἰλάσκοντο ἐν μεγάλῳ ἀδύτῳ ἀκέοντό τε κύδαινόν τε.	o 4.523 i 24.484 * † i 1.472 i 5.448
	<i>περὶ τοῦ δαιμονῶντος</i>	
	ἀλλ' ἄλλος τις πτωχὸς ἀνήρ ἀλαλήμενος ἐλθὼν	o 21.327
925	δεσμῷ ἐν ἀργαλέῳ δέδετο κατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχων. φοίτα 'δὲ' μακρὰ βιβὰς, φωνὴ δὲ οἱ αἰθέρ' ἰκάνεν. στάς δ' ὅτε μὲν παρὰ τάφρον ὀρυκτὴν τείχεος ἐκτός, ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἀκτάων ἐριδούπων μακρὸν αὐτεῖ. ἦτοι ὁ κάπ πεδίον τὸ ἀλήϊον οἶος ἀλάτο,	o 15.232 i 15.686 † i 20.49 * i 20.50 i 6.201
930	ὃν θυμὸν κατέδων, πάτον ἀνθρώπων ἀλεείνων, δηρὸν τηκόμενος, στυγερός δὲ οἱ ἔχραε δαίμων. ἀφλοισιμὸς δὲ περὶ στόμα γίγνεται, τῷ δὲ οἱ ὄσσε δεινὸν ὑπὸ βλεφάρων ὡς εἰ σέλας ἐξεφάανθεν. χαῖται δ' ἐρρώνοντο μετὰ πνοίης ἀνέμοιο.	i 6.202 o 5.396 i 15.607 i 19.17 i 23.367
935	αἰεὶ δ' ἀργαλέῳ ἔχειτ' ἄσθματι, κὰδ δὲ οἱ ἰδρῶς πάντοθεν ἐκ μελέων πολὺς ἔρρεεν, οὐδέ πη εἶχεν	i 16.109 i 16.110

---

921 δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι ἐς ἀλλήλους 926 om. Hom

	ἀμπνεῦσαι· πάντη δὲ κακὸν κακῷ ἐστήρικτο.	i 16.111
	τὸν δ' ἄτη φρένας εἶλε, λύθεν δ' ὑπὸ φαίδιμα γυῖα.	i 16.805
	ἤριπε δ' ἐξοπίσω, ἀπὸ δὲ ψυχὴν ἐκάπυσσε.	i 22.467
940	κάδ δ' ἔπεσ' ἐν κονίησι μακῶν, σὺν δ' ἤλασ' ὄδοντας	o 18.98
	λακτίζων ποσὶ γαῖαν. ἀτὰρ μνηστῆρες ἀγαυοὶ	o 18.99
	χεῖρας ἀνασχόμενοι μεγάλ' εὐχετόωντο ἕκαστος.	i 15.369 *
	ἀγχίμολον δὲ σύες τε καὶ ἀνέρες ἦλθον ὑφορβοί.	o 14.410
	κλαγγὴ δ' ἄσπετος ὄρτο συῶν ἀυλιζομενάων.	o 14.412
945	ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς δρηστήρες ἄγον 'σώζοντες' ἀνάγκη	o 18.76 †
	δειδίωτα· σάρκες δὲ περιτρομέοντο μέλεσσι.	o 18.77
	τὸν δὲ ἰδὼν ᾤκτειρε 'θεὸς καὶ μιν προσέειπε',	i 23.534 †
	"τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν, ὃ μευ ἔτλης ἀντίον ἐλθεῖν;	i 21.150 *
	δυστήνων δέ τε παῖδες ἐμῷ μένει ἀντιώσι.	i 21.151
950	δαιμόνιε, σχεδὸν ἐλθέ· τίη δειδίσσεαι 'οὔτως';	i 13.810 @
	δαιμόνιε, φθίσει σε τὸ σὸν μένος, οὐδ' ἐλεαίρεις	i 6.407
	ἄνδρα γέροντα, δῦη ἀρήμενον, ἢ μιν ἰκάνει,	o 18.81
	καὶ μάλα τειρόμενον καὶ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πένθος ἔχοντα.	o 7.218
	ὡς θην καὶ σὸν ἐγὼ λύσω μένος, εἰ κέ μευ ἄντα	i 17.29
955	στήτης· ἀλλὰ σ' ἔγωγ' ἀναχωρήσαντα κελεύω	i 17.30
	ἐς πληθὺν ἰέναι, μηδ' ἀντίος ἴστασ' ἐμεῖο.	i 17.31
	πέμπω δ' ὄππῃ σε κραδίη θυμός τε κελεύει."	o 15.339 *
	ὡς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, τοὶ δ' ἐφθέγγατο καλεῦντες,	o 10.229 *
	"ἦομεν, ὡς ἐκέλευσας, ἀνὰ 'πληθύν κε συῶν γε.'"	o 10.251 †
960	Αὐτίκ' ἔπεθ' ἅμα μῦθος ἔην, τετέλεστο δὲ ἔργον	i 19.242
	'ρήϊδίως'. πολλοὶ δὲ σύες θαλέθοντες ἀλοιφῇ,	i 9.467 †
	ἔσθοντες βάλανον μενοεικέα καὶ μέλαν ὕδωρ	o 13.409 *

---

945 ζώσοντες 947 ποδάρκης διος Ἀχιλλεύς 950 αὐτως 959 δρυμά, φαίδιμ'  
'Οδυσεῦ 961 ἔσφαζον

	πίνοντες, τά θ' ὕεσσι τρέφει τεθαλυῖαν ἀλοιφήν,	ο 13.410 *
	κύμασιν ἐμφορέοντο, θεὸς δ' ἀποαίνυτο νόστον.	ο 12.419
965	ἐν δ' ἔπεσον μεγάλῳ πατάγῳ, βράχε δ' αἰπὰ ῥέεθρα, ὄχθαι δ' ἀμφὶ περὶ μεγάλ' ἴαχον· οἱ δ' ἀλαλητῶ ἔννεον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα, ἐλισσόμενοι περὶ δίνας. 'καί' ῥ' ἀπὸ πετρῶν ἀνδραχθέσι χερμαδίοισι βάλλον· ἄφαρ δὲ κακὸς κόναβος 'συβοτεσσιν' ὀρώρει	i 21.9 i 21.10 i 21.11 ο 10.121 † ο 10.122 †
970	χοίρων τ' ὄλλυμένων ἀγγελῶν τε σκιδνομενάων. τρέσσαν δ' ἄλλυδις ἄλλη ἐπ' ἠϊόνας προύχούσας. 'ὥς' οἱ τὰς ὄλεκον λιμένος πολυβενθέος 'εἴσω'. ἀσπάσιον δ' ἄρα τὸν γε θεὸς κακότητος ἔλυσεν. ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἄμπνυτο' καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη,	cf. ο 10.123 ο 6.138 ο 10.125 * † ο 5.397 * ο 5.458 @
975	καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, "χαῖρέ μοι', ὅτι μ' ἔπαυσας ἄλης καὶ οἰζύος αἰνῆς. πλαγκτοσύνης δ' οὐκ ἔστι κακώτερον ἄλλο βροτοῖσιν. ἀλλ' ἔνεκ' οὐλομένης γαστροῦ κακὰ κήδε' ἔχουσιν ἄνδρες, οὗς ἵκηται ἄλη καὶ πῆμα καὶ ἄλγος."	ο 15.259 ο 15.342 † ο 15.343 ο 15.344 ο 15.345 *
980	καὶ ῥ' ἦγον προτὶ ἄστυ, ἀελπτέοντες σόον εἶναι. θάμβησαν 'δ' ἄρα πάντες', ἐς ἀλλήλους δὲ ἴδοντο. οἱ δ' ἄνεφ' ἐγένοντο δόμον κάτα φῶτα ἰδόντες. ὧδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον, "ὦ πόποι, ὡς ὅδε πᾶσι φίλος καὶ τίμιός ἐστιν,	i 7.310 i 24.484 † ο 7.144 ο 10.37 ο 10.38
985	ὄς τοῦτον τὸν ἀναλτον ἀλητεῦειν ἀπέπαυσεν. ὄς τὸν λωβητῆρα ἐπεσβόλον ἔσχ' ἀγοράων τοῦτον μαινόμενον, τυκτὸν κακὸν, ἄλλοπρόσἄλλον. καὶ τε χαλιφρονέοντα σαοφροσύνης ἐπέβησεν.	ο 18.114 * i 2.275 i 5.831 ο 23.13 *

---

968 οἱ 969 κατὰ νῆας 972 ὄφρ' ...ἐντὸς 974 ἔμπνυτο 976 ὡς ἐμοί 981 δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι

	ὦ πόποι, ὡς τόνδε ἄνδρα θεὸς κακότητος ἔλυσεν.	ο 16.364 *
990	οὕτως οὐ πάντεσσι θεὸς χαρίεντα δίδωσιν ἀνδράσιν, οὔτε φυὴν οὔτ' ἄρ φρένας οὔτ' ἀγορητύν." ὡς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον.	ο 8.167 * ο 8.168 i 5.431
	<i>περὶ τῆς αἰμορρόουσης</i>	
	ἔσκε δὲ πατρός ἐοῖο γυνὴ Φοίνισσ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ, καλὴ τε μεγάλη τε καὶ ἀγλαὰ ἔργα ἰδυῖα	ο 15.417 * ο 15.418
995	κέρδεά θ', οἷ' οὐ πῶ τιν' ἀκούομεν οὐδὲ παλαιῶν. λίην γὰρ πανυτὴ τε καὶ εὖ φρεσὶ μῆδεα οἶδε ἦτις τοι νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμέματα συνεχὲς αἰεὶ θυμὸν ἀποπνεύουσ', ὡς τε σκώληξ ἐπὶ γαίῃ κεῖτο ταθεῖσ'· ἐκ δ' αἷμα μέλαν ῥέε, δεῦε δὲ γαῖαν.	ο 2.118 ο 11.445 cf. ο 9.74 i 13.654 * i 13.655 *
1000	εἰρώτα δὴ ἔπειτα τίς εἶη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι· ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ γίγνωσκε θεοῦ γόνον 'ἐγγύς' ἐόντα καρπαλίμως· ὁ δὲ ἔπειτα μετ' ἴχνια βαῖνε θεοῖο. δάκρυα δ' ἔκβαλε θερμὰ, ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυδνὸν ἔειπε "κέκλυθι νῦν καὶ ἐμεῖο· μάλιστα γὰρ ἄλγος ἰκάνει.	ο 15.423 i 6.191 † ο 2.406 ο 19.362 i 3.97 *
1005	οὐ γὰρ πω μύσαν ὄσσε 'ἐπὶ' βλεφάροισιν ἐμοῖσιν, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ στενάχω καὶ κήδεα μυρία πέσσω κρήνον νῦν καὶ ἐμοὶ 'ἔπος δειλῆ', ὅττι κεν εἴπω. ἔλκος μὲν γὰρ ἔχω τόδε καρτερόν, οὐδέ μοι αἷμα τέρσεται, 'ἀλλὰ μάλ' ὄκα κατειβόμενον κελαρύζει.	i 24.637 † i 24.639 ο 20.115 † i 16.517 + 518 i 21.261 †
1010	πολλοῖσιν 'δ' ἄρ' ἐγὼ 'δὴ' ὀδυσομένη τόδ' ἰκάνω ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ γυναιξὶν ἀνὰ χθόνα 'βωπιάνειραν'. ὡς μ' ὄφελ' ἡματι τῷ ὅτε με πρῶτον τέκε μήτηρ,	ο 19.407 † @ ο 19.408 @ i 6.345

---

1001 ἠῦν 1105 ὑπὸ 1007 δειλῆ ἔπος 1009 τὸ δέ τ' 1010 γὰρ...γε 1011  
πολυβότειραν

	εἰς ὄρος ἢ εἰς κῦμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης	i 6.347
	οἴχεσθαι προφέρουσα κακῇ ἀνέμοιο θύελλα.	i 6.346
1015	ἔνθά με κῦμ' ἀπόερσε πάρος τάδε ἔργα γενέσθαι.	i 6.348
	ἔλκος δ' ἰητῆρ ἐπιμάσσεται, 'ἠδὲ τίθησι'	i 4.190 †
	φάρμαχ' ἅ κεν παύσῃσι μελαινάων ὀδυνάων.	i 4.191
	πολλάκις ἐν μεγάροισι καθημένη ἡμετέροισιν,	o 4.101 *
	ἄλλοτε μὲν τε γόῳ φρένα τέρπομα, ἄλλοτε δ' αὐτε	o 4.102
1020	παύομα· αἰψηρὸς δὲ κόρος κρυεροῖο γόιο.	o 4.103
	ἀλλὰ σὺ πέρ μοι, ἄναξ, τόδε καρτερόν ἔλκος ἄκεσσαι.	i 16.523
	ἔρξον ὅπως ἐθέλεις· ἰκέτης δέ σοι εὐχομα εἶναι.	o 16.67 *
	ὡς σε, 'ἄναξ', ἄγομαί τε τέθηπά τε δεῖδιά τ' αἰνῶς	o 6.168 †
	γούνων ἄψασθαι· χαλεπὸν δέ με πένθος ἰκάνει."	o 6.169
1025	αὐτῷ δ' οὐ πω φαίνεται' ἐναντίη· αἶδετο γάρ ῥα·	o 6.329
	χειρὶ δὲ νεκταρέου ἕανου ἔτινάξε λαβοῦσα.	i 3.385
	αὐτίκα παῦσ' ὀδύνας, ἀπὸ δ' ἔλκεος ἀργαλέοιο	i 16.528
	αἶμα μέλαν τέρσηνε, μένος δέ οἱ ἔμβαλε θυμῷ.	i 16.529
	αὐτὰρ ὁ ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φώνησέν τε,	i 1.333
1030	"ἦ καὶ ἐμοὶ τάδε πάντα μέλει, γύναι· ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἰνῶς	i 6.441
	θάρσει, μηδέ τί τοι θάνατος καταθύμιος ἔστω.	i 10.383
	οὔτω νῦν καὶ ἐγὼ νοέω, γύναι, ὡς σὺ εἴσκεις.	o 4.148
	ἐν θυμῷ, γρηῦ, χαῖρε καὶ ἴσχεο μηδ' ὀλόλυξε."	o 22.411
	ἀλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα τὰ σ' αὐτῆς ἔργα κόμιζε,	o 21.350
1035	ἴστον τ' ἠλακάτην τε, καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι κέλευε	i 6.491
	ὡς τὸ πάρος, πλοῦτος δὲ καὶ εἰρήνη ἄλις ἔστω.	o 24.486
	'ἦ δ' ἄρα' ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ γήθησέν τε,	i 16.530
	ὅτι οἱ ὦκ' ἦκουσε μέγας θεὸς 'εὐξαμένης κεν'.	i 16.531 *
	ἦ δ' ὅτε δὴ οὐ πατρὸς ἀγακλυτὰ δάμαθ' ἴκανε,	o 7.3

---

1016 ἠδ' ἐπιθήσει 1023 γύναι 1037 Γλαῦκος δ 1038 εὐξαμένοιο

1040	κέκλετό γ' ἀμφιπόλοισιν εὐπλοκάμοις κατὰ δῶμα·	i 22.442
	ἢ δ' εἰς ὑπόροφον θάλαμον κίε διὰ γυναικῶν,	i 3.423
	ἑκάστη γ' ἴστον ὕφαινε μυχῶ δόμον ὑψηλοῖο,	i 22.440 †
	δίπλακα πορφυρέην, ἐν δὲ θρόνα ποικίλ' ἔπασσε.	i 22.441
	ἢ δ' αὐτίς δμῶησιν εὐπλοκάμοισι μετηύδα,	i 22.449
1045	"δεῦτε, δύω μοι ἔπεσθον, ἴδωμ' ἄτιν' ἔργα τέτυκται."	i 22.450 @
<i>περὶ τῆς Σαμαρίτιδος</i>		
	ἦμος δ' ἠέλιος μέσον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβεβήκει,	i 8.68
	ἑκάστη δὲ στείχοντες ὁδὸν κάτα παιπαλόεσσιν,	o 17.204 †
	ἄστεος ἔγγυς ἔσαν καὶ ἐπὶ κρήνην ἀφίκοντο	o 17.205
	τυκτὴν καλλίροον, ὅθεν ὕδρευόντο πολίται.	o 17.206
1050	ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' αἰγείρων ὕδατοτρεφῶν ἦν ἄλλος,	o 17.208
	πάντοσε κυκλοτερές, κατὰ δὲ ψυχρὸν ῥέεν ὕδωρ·	o 17.209
	κούρη δὲ ξύμβλητο πρὸ ἄστεος ὕδενούση,	o 10.105 *
	ἢ μὲν ἄρ' ἐς κρήνην κατεβήσατο καλλιρέεθρον	o 10.107
	Ἄρτακίην· ἔνθεν γὰρ ὕδωρ προτὶ ἄστου φέρεσκεν.	o 10.108 *
1055	ἔνθα καθέζετ' ἰὼν, τῇ δ' ἐξερέεινεν ἕκαστα.	o 17.70 *
	μειλιχίοις δ' ἐπέεσσι καθαπτόμενος προσέειπεν·	o 24.393
	"τίφθ' οὕτω ἄνδρὸς νοσφίζεαι, οὐδέ παρ' αὐτὸν	o 23.98 †
	ἐξομένη μύθοισιν ἀνείρεαι ἢ δὲ μεταλλάξ;	o 23.99 @
	καὶ δ' ἄλλην νεμεσῶ, ἢ τις τοιαυτὰ γε ῥεζοί·	o 6.286 @
1060	ἢ τ' ἀέκητι φίλων πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς ἐόντων,	o 6.287
	ἀνδράσι μίσγηται πρὶν γ' ἀμφάδιον γάμον ἐλθεῖν.	o 6.288
	οὐ μὲν κ' ἄλλη γ' ὦδε γυνὴ τετλήσοι θυμῶ	o 23.100
	ἀνδρὸς ἀποσταίη, ὅς τοι κακὰ πόλλ' ἐμόγησε.	o 23.101 *

---

1042 ἀλλ' ἢ 1045 ὅτιν' 1047 ἀλλ' ὅτε 1057 πατρὸς 1058 οὐδέ 1059 ἄλλη

	σοὶ δ' αἰεὶ κραδίη στερεωτέρη ἐστὶ λίθιοι."	ο 23.103
1065	ἢ δ' οὐτ' ἠρνεῖτο στυγερὸν γάμον οὔτε τελεύτα. "Ὡς ἔφατ'· αἶδετο γὰρ θαλερὸν γάμον ἐξονομήναι 'ἀνδρὶ' φίλῳ· ὁ δὲ πάντα νόει καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ· "ἄστυ τέ μοι δεῖξον, δός 'μοι θ' ὕδωρ κορέσασθαι." ἢ δ' ἄνεω δὴν ἦστο, τάφος δέ οἱ ἦτορ ἵκανεν·	ο 24.126 ο 6.66 ο 6.67 † ο 6.178 †
1070	ὄψει δ' ἄλλοτε μὲν μιν ἐνωπαδίως ἐσίδεσκεν. τὸν δ' αὐτε προσέειπε γυνὴ καὶ ἀμειψατο μύθῳ οὔδει ἐνισκίμψασα καρῆατι· αἶδετο γὰρ 'μιν' "ἔξεινε, ἐπεὶ ἄθυμός μοι ἐνὶ στήθεσσι τέθηπεν, οὐδέ τι προσφάσθαι δύναμαι ἔπος οὐδ' ἐρέεσθαι	ο 23.94 ο 15.434 * i 17.437 * + ο 6.329 † ο 23.105 † ο 23.106
1075	οὐδ' εἰς ὧπα ιδέσθαι ἐναντίον· αἰδέομαι γάρ'. ῥεῖ' ἔγνωσ, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ τά τ' ἄλλα πέρ ἐσσ' ἀνόημων. ταῦτα δ' ἄ μ' εἰρωτῶς καὶ λίσσεαι, οὐκ ἂν ἔγω γε ἄλλα παρεξ εἴποιμι 'παραβλήδην' ἀπατήσων. τῶν οὐδέν τοι ἐγὼ κρύψω ἔπος οὐδ' ἐπικεύσω.	ο 23.107 † ο 17.273 ο 17.138 ο 17.139 †* ο 17.141
1080	πᾶσαν ἀληθείην μυθήσομαι, ὡς με κελεύεις. ἄστυ δέ τοι δεῖξω, ἐρέω δέ τοι οὐνομα λαῶν. εἴμ', ἵνα θαρσύνω θ' ἐτάρους εἶπω τε ἕκαστα. ἔρχεο· ἴσον γάρ σε θεῶ τείσουσιν 'ἅπαντες', ξεῖν', ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀχάριστα μεθ' ἡμῖν ταῦτ' ἀγορεύεις,	ο 11.507 ο 6.194 ο 3.361 i 9.603 † ο 8.236
1085	ἀλλ' ἐθέλεις ἀρετὴν σὴν φαινέμεν, ἢ τοι ὀπηδεῖ. 'ξεῖν', ἐπεὶ ἡμετέρεν τε πόλιν καὶ γαῖαν ἰκάνεις, οὐτ' οὖν 'ἐσθήτος' δευθήσεαι οὔτε 'ποτήτος'. ἐν δ' ἄνδρες ναίουσι πολύρρηνες πολυβοῦται, οἱ κέ σε δωτίνησι θεὸν ὧς τιμήσουσι.	ο 8.237 ο 6.191 † ο 6.192 † i 9.154 i 9.155

---

1067 πατρι 1068 δὲ ῥάκος ἀμφιβαλέσθαι 1072 ῥα 1073 τέκνον ἐμόν 1075 εἰ δ' ἐτεδὸν δὴ 1078 παρακλιδὸν οὐδ' 1083 Ἀχαιοί 1086 νῦν δὲ 1087 ἐσθήτος OCT : βρώσιος Iv...τευ ἄλλου

1090	κείνος δ' αὖ περὶ κῆρι μακάρτατος ἔξοχον ἄλλων, ὃς κέ 'σε ἔδνοισι' βρίσας οἰκόνδ' ἀγάγηται. ξεῖν', ἦ τοι μὲν τοῦτό γ' 'ἐναίσιμον' οὐκ ἐνόησα, ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπέ καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον, ξεῖν', ἐπεὶ οὔτε κακῶ οὔτ' ἄφρονι φωτὶ ἔοικας.	ο 6.158 ο 6.159 @ ο 7.299 † i 10.384 ο 6.187
1095	καὶ μοι τοῦτ' ἀγόρευσον ἐτήτυμον, ὄφρ' ἐὺ εἰδῶ· τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆς; τρισμακάρες μὲν σοὶ γε πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ. εἶπ' ὄνομ' ὅττι σε κείθι κάλεον 'μήτηρ τε πατήρ τε', ἄλλοι θ' οἱ κατὰ ἄστυ καὶ οἱ περιναετᾶουσιν.	ο 1.174 ο 1.170 ο 6.154 ο 8.550 † ο 8.551
1100	οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ δρυός ἐσσι παλαιφάτου οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης. οὐ μὲν γάρ τις πάμπαν ἀνώνυμός ἐστ' ἀνθρώπων, οὐ κακὸς οὐδέ μὲν ἐσθλός, ἐπὴν τὰ πρῶτα γένηται, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τίθενται, ἐπεὶ κε τέκωσι, τοκῆς. εἰπέ δέ μοι γαῖάν τε τετὴν δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε.	ο 19.163 ο 8.552 ο 8.553 ο 8.554 ο 8.555
1105	εἰπέ μοι, αἶ κέ πόθι γνῶω τοιοῦτον ἐόντα. οὐ γὰρ πω 'τοιοῦτον ἴδον βροτῶν' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν, οὔτ' ἄνδρ' οὔτε γυναικά· σέβας μ' ἔχει εἰσορόωσαν. χαῖρε, ξεῖν', ἵνα καὶ ποτ' ἐὼν ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ, μνήση ἔμεϊ', ὅτι μοι πρώτη ζῳάγρι' ὀφέλλεις.	ο 14.118 ο 6.160 @ ο 6.161 * ο 8.461 ο 8.462
1110	τῷ κέν τοι καὶ κείθι θεῶ ὡς εὐχετοφύμην αἰεὶ ἤματα πάντα· σὺ γάρ μ' ἐβιάσσω κούρην. 'ὦ ξεῖν', ἔξοχα δὴ σε βροτῶν αἰνίζομ' ἀπάντων. αἰδῶ καὶ φιλότητα τετὴν μετόπισθε φυλάσσων. ὦ 'ξεῖν', ἦ ῥ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ 'ἐναίσιμα' δῶρα διδοῦναι.	ο 8.467 ο 8.468 ο 8.487 † i 24.111 i 24.425 †
1115	εἴμ', ἵνα θαρσύνω θ' ἐτάρους εἶπω τε ἕκαστα."	ο 3.361

---

1091 σ' ἐέδνοισι 1092 ἔνασιμον Steph, Hom : αἰνέσιμον Iv 1098 πάτηρ τε μήτηρ τε  
1106 τοιοῦτον ἐγὼ ἴδον 1112 Δημόδοκ' 1114 τέκος...ἔνασιμα Steph, Hom: αἰνέσιμα  
Iv



	ὡς ἄρα φωνήσασ' ἀπεβήσατο, τὸν δ' ἔλιπ' αὐτοῦ.	i 1.428
	ἦ δ' ἔθει' οὐ μάλα πολλὸν ἐπὶ χρόνον· αἴψα γὰρ ἦλθε.	o 12.407 †
	αὐτὰρ ἐπὶν πόλιος ἐπεβήσατο ἦν πέρι πύργος	o 6.262 *
	ὑψηλός, καλὸς δὲ λιμὴν ἐκάτερθε πόλης.	o 6.263
1120	θάμβησεν κατὰ θυμόν· ὄϊσατο γὰρ θεὸν εἶναι.	o 1.323
	ἄντίκα καὶ πᾶσιν μυθήσατο ἀνθρώποισιν·	o 8.497 † *
	"Δεῦτ' ἄγε, Σικτήμων' ἠγήτορες ἠδὲ μέδοντες	o 8.11 †
	εἰς ἀγορὴν ἰέναι, ὄφρα ξείνοιο πύθησθε,	o 8.12
	ὅς πέρ μοι βίον εἶπε καὶ ἔργματα καὶ γόνον αὐτόν,	?
1125	ὡς τέ που ἦ αὐτὸς παρεὼν ἢ ἄλλου ἀκούσας,	o 8.491
	τί πρῶτόν 'τι δ' ἔπειτα τί δ' ὑστάτιον καταλέξω;	o 9.14 †
	ἰητρὸς δὲ ἐκάστω ἐπιστάμενος περὶ πάντων	o 4.231 *
	ἀνθρώπων· ἦ γὰρ Παιθόνος ἐστὶ γενέθλης.	o 4.232 *
	ὁ ξείνος μάλα μοι δοκεῖ πεπνυμένος εἶναι.	o 8.388
1130	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τῷ πάντα κατὰ μοῖραν κατέλεξα.	o 12.35 *
	ὄσσο' ἔρξα τ' ἔπαθόν τε καὶ ὄσσο' ἐμόγησα (βίωσκειν),	o 8.490 * †
	ὅτι μοι ἐν μεγάροισι κακὸν τ' ἀγαθὸν τε τέτυκται.	o 4.392 *
	αὐτόν δ' οὐ σάφα οἶδα, πόθεν γένος εὐχεται εἶναι.	o 17.373
	νῦν (δέ γε) κάλλιόν ἐστι μεταλλῆσαι καὶ ἔρυσθαι	o 3.69 †
1135	ὀππόθεν οὗτος ἀνὴρ, ποίης δ' ἐξ εὐχεται εἶναι	o 1.406
	γαίης, ποῦ δέ νύ οἱ γενεὴ καὶ πατρὶς ἄρουρα.	o 1.407
	οὐκ ἔσθ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ διερὸς βροτὸς οὐδὲ γένηται.	o 6.201
	οὐ γὰρ πῶς ἂν θνητὸς ἀνὴρ τάδε μηχανόφθο	o 16.196
	ῶ αὐτοῦ (γε νόφ), ὅτε μὴ θεὸς αὐτὸς ἐπελθῶν	o 16.197 †
1140	ῥηϊδίως ἐθέλων θεῖη νέον ἠδὲ γέροντα.	o 16.198
	ὡς τέ μοι ἀθάνατός γ' ἰνδάλλεται εἰσοράσθαι	o 3.246
	ἄλλω δ' αὐτόν φῶτι κατακρύπτων ἦϊσκε.	o 4.247

---

1117 verbum om. Iv    1121 ἀντίκ' ἐγὼ    1122 Φαιθῶν    1126 τοι    1131 Ἀχαιοί  
1134 δῆ    1139 verba om. Iv

	ἀλλὰ ἴδεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀνασταδόν· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε	i 23.469
	εὖ διαγιγνώσκω· δοκέει δέ μοι ἔμμεναι ἀνήρ."	i 23.470
1145	ὡς εἰποῦσ' ὄτρυνε' μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστου.	o 8.15 @
	καρπαλίμως δ' ἔπληντο βροτῶν ἀγοραὶ τε καὶ ἔδραι	o 8.16
	ἀγρομένων· πολλοὶ δ' ἄρα θηήσαντο ἰδόντες·	o 8.17
	χερσὶν τ' ἠσπάζοντο καὶ ἐδριάσθαι ἄνωγον	o 3.35
	βηλῶ ἐπι λιθέω· τοὶ δ' ὡς ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσι,	i 23.202
1150	πάντες ἀνήϊξαν, κάλεόν τέ μιν εἰς ἕκαστος,	i 23.203
	ἀμφαγαπαζόμενοι ὡς εἶ ἑοῦ' υἱὸν ἐόντα.	i 16.192 * †
	πλήντο δ' ἄρ' αἴθουσαί τε καὶ ἔρκεα καὶ δόμοι ἀνδρῶν.	o 8.57
<i>περὶ τῶν ἐπτὰ ἄρτων</i>		
	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἐκίχανε πολὺν καθ' ὄμιλον ὀπάζων,	i 5.334
	βῆ ῥ' ἀν' ὁδὸν μεμαώς· τὸν δὲ φράσατο προσίοντα	i 10.339
1155	πληθὺς, ὡς ὅποτε 'Ζέφυρος νέφεα' στυφελίξῃ,	i 11.305 * @
	ὅσσα ἀριστήων ἄλοχοι ἔσαν ἠδὲ θύγατρες,	o 11.227
	νύμφαι τ' ἠΐθεοί τε πολύτλητοί τε γέροντες·	o 11.38
	χωλοὶ τε ῥύσσοί τε παραβλῶπές τ' ὀφθαλμῶν'.	i 9.503 @
	ἀλλ' οὐ πω τοιόνδε τοσόνδε τε λαὸν ὄπωπα·	i 2.799
1160	λίην γὰρ φύλλοισιν ἐοικότες ἢ ψαμάθοισιν	i 2.800
	ἠϊόνος προπάροιθε βαθείης ἐστιχόωντο	i 2.92
	ἠχῆ, ὡς ὅτε κύμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης	i 2.209
	αἰγιαλῶ μεγάλῳ βρέμεται, σμαραγεῖ δέ τε πόντος.	i 2.210
	οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἦεν ὁμὸς θρόος οὐδ' ἴα γῆρυς,	i 4.437
1165	ἀλλὰ γλῶσσα μέμικτο, πολύκλητοι δ' ἔσαν ἄνδρες.	i 4.438
	τῶν δ' ἄλλων τίς κεν ἦσι' φρεσὶν οὐνόματ' εἶπη;	i 17.260 * †

---

1145 ὄτρυνε 1151 θ' ἐὼν 1155 νέφεα Ζέφυρος 1158 ὀφθαλμῶ 1165 ἦσι Steph,  
Hom : ἐνὶ Iv

	ὡς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ μέγα στεναχίζετο γαῖα	i 2.784
	έρχομένων· μάλα δ' ὄκα διέπρησσον πεδίοιο,	i 2.785
	ἤνυτε ἔθνεα εἴσι μελισσάων ἀδινάων	i 2.87
1170	πέτρης ἐκ γλαφυρῆς αἰεὶ νέον ἐρχομενάων·	i 2.88
	βοτρυδόν 'τε' πέτονται ἐπ' ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσιν,	i 2.89 †
	αἱ μὲν τ' ἔνθα ἄλις πεποτήγεται, αἱ δέ τε ἔνθα.	i 2.90
	ὡς τῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων	i 2.91
	ἠϊόνος προπάραιθε βαθείης ἐστιχόωντο.	i 2.92
1175	δὴ τότ' ἔπειθ' ἐτάροισιν ἐποτρύνας ἐκελεύσεν·	o 11.44 *
	"ὕμῶν ἀνδρὶ ἐκάστω ἐφιέμενος τάδε εἶρω,	o 13.7
	ὡς ἂν 'καὶ' τιμὴν μεγάλην καὶ κύδος ἄρησθε,	i 16.84 † *
	τιμὴν, ἢ τ' ἄλλων περ ἐπιγνάμπτει νόον ἐσθλῶν·	i 9.514
	πολλοὶ δὴ ξεῖνοι ταλαπείριοι ἐνθάδ' ἴκοντο,	o 19.379
1180	καὶ μάλα τειρόμενοί περ' ἀναγκαίη γὰρ ἐπέγει·	i 6.85
	τοὺς νῦν χρὴ κομέειν. πρὸς γὰρ 'θεοῦ' εἰσὶν ἅπαντες	o 6.207 * †
	ξεῖνοί τε πτωχοὶ τε· δόσις δ' ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε.	o 6.208
	οὐ μὲν γάρ τι που ἐστὶν οἴζυρῶτερον ἀνδρὸς	i 17.446
	πάντων ὅσσα τε γαῖαν ἐπι πνείει τε καὶ ἔρπει.	o 18.131
1185	οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτέ φησὶ κακὸν πείσεσθαι ὀπίσσω,	o 18.132
	ὄφρ' ἀρετὴν παρέχησι θεὸς καὶ γούνατ' ὀρώρη·	o 18.133 *
	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ λυγρὰ θεὸς μάκαρ ἐκτελέησι,	o 18.134 *
	καὶ τὰ φέρει ἀεκαζόμενος τετληότι θυμῷ.	o 18.135
	τοῖος γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπαχθονίων ἀνθρώπων	o 18.136
1190	οἷον ἐπ' ἡμαρ ἄγησι θεὸς πάντεσσιν ἀνάσσων.	o 18.137 + cf. i 1.288
	πάντες μὲν στυγεροὶ θάνατοι δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι,	o 12.341
	λιμῷ δ' οἴκτιστον θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν.	o 12.342

---

1171 δὲ 1177 μοι 1181 Διός

	οὐδὲν ἀκιδνότερον γαῖα τρέφει ἀνθρώποιο.	ο 18.130
	αἴψα γὰρ ἐν κακότητι βροτοὶ καταγηράσκουσιν.	ο 19.360
1195	οἷη περ φύλλων γενεῆ, τοιή δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.	i 6.146
	χρῆ ξεῖνον παρέοντα φιλεῖν, ἐθέλοντα δὲ πέμπειν.	ο 15.74
	τοῦ γὰρ τε ξεῖνος μιμνήσκειται ἤματα πάντα	ο 15.54
	ἀνδρὸς ξεινοδόκου, ὃς κεν φιλότητα παράσχη.	ο 15.55
	ἴσόν τοι κακὸν ἐσθ', ὃς τ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντα νέεσθαι	ο 15.72
1200	ξεῖνον ἐποτρύνει καὶ ὃς ἐσσύμενον κατερύκει.	ο 15.73
	ἀλλ' ἄγεθ', ὡς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω, πειθόμεθα πάντες·	i 2.139
	μοίρας δασσάμενοι δαίνυσθ' ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα.	ο 3.66
	δήμῳ καὶ κε τότε ἀντήσαιοιο δεῦρο μολόντες·	cf. ο 3.44
	μεῖζόν κε κλέος εἶη ἐμὸν καὶ κάλλιον οὕτως."	ο 18.255
1205	ὡς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα τοῦ μὲν κλύον ἠδὲ πίθοντο.	i 23.54
	καρπαλίμως δ' ἐμπληντο βροτῶν ἀγοραὶ τε καὶ ἔδραι.	ο 8.16
	κινήθη δ' ἀγορῆ ὡς κύματα μακρὰ θαλάσσης.	i 2.144 @
	σπουδῇ δ' ἔζετο λαὸς, ἐρήτυθεν δὲ καθ' ἔδρας.	i 2.99
	ἐννέα δ' ἔδραι ἔσαν, πεντηκόσιοι δ' ἐν ἐκάστη.	ο 3.7
1210	δὴ τότε ἔπειθ' ἐτάροισιν ἐποτρύνας ἐκέλευσεν·	ο 11.44
	ἄρτον τ' οὐλον ἐλὼν περικαλλέος ἐκ κανέσιο,	ο 17.343
	εὐχετο· τοὶ δ' ἅμα πάντες ὑπ' αὐτόφιν ἦατο σιγῇ.	i 19.255
	αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἄλλοισι δίδου χαρίεσσαν ἀμοιβήν.	ο 3.58
	λαοὶ δ' ἠρήσαντο θεῶ ἰδὲ χεῖρας ἀνέσχον.	i 7.177 *
1215	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ὀρώμενοι ὀφθαλμοῖσι,	ο 10.181
	χεῖρας νιψάμενοι τεύχοντ' ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα.	ο 10.182
	οἱ δ' ἐπ' ὀνείαθ' ἐτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἱαλλον,	ο 14.453
	ἐσσυμένως δ' ἄρα δόρπον ἐφοπλίσσαντες ἕκαστοι	i 23.55

---

1203 σάρκεσσ' *correcti*: κε τότε Iv, Steph 1207 φῆ 1214 θεοῖσι δὲ

	δαίνυντ', οὐδέ τι θυμός ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς εἴσης.	i 23.56
1220	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτήτος ἀρπαλέως· δηρὸν γὰρ ἐδητύος ἦσαν ἄπαστοι. οἱ μὲν κακκείοντες ἔβαν κλισίηνδε ἕκαστος, ἐν καθαυῶ, ὅθι κύματ' ἐπ' ἠΐονος κλύζεσκεν· οἱ δὲ πανημέριοι μολπῇ θεὸν ἰλάσκοντο.	o 5.201 o 6.250 * i 23.58 i 23.61 * i 1.472
1225	ἦμος δ' ἠέλιος κατέδυ καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἦλθε, 'δὴ τότε' κοιμήσαντο τεταρπόμενοι φίλον ἦτορ σίτου καὶ οἴνιο· τὸ γὰρ μένος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀλκή.	i 1.475 i 9.705 † * i 9.706
<i>περὶ τοῦ Λαζάρου</i>		
	ὡς ὁ μὲν ἔνθα κατέσχετ', ἐπειγόμενός περ ὁδοῖο, εὖτε 'δὲ' ἠέλιος φαέθων ὑπερέσχεθε γαίης,	o 3.284 i 11.735 †
1230	οἶον καὶ τόδ' ἔρεξε καὶ ἔτλη καρτερὸς ἀνήρ. ἄνδρα θνητὸν ἐόντα, πάλα πεπρώμενον αἴση εἰς Ἄϊδος περ ἰόντα πυλάρταο κρατεροῖο, αὐθις ἀνεστήσατο ὑπὸ ζόφου ἠερβέντος. 'δὴ τότε γάρ' τις ἔειπε γυναικῶν, ἧ σάφα ἦδη,	o 4.271 i 22.179 i 13.415 i 21.56 * o 2.108 †
1235	οἴκτρ' ὀλοφυρομένη, θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσα· "πεύσεα ἀγγελίης, ἧ μὴ ὄφελλε γενέσθαι, λυγρῆς ἀγγελίης, ὅτι σοι φίλος ὄλεθ' ἑταῖρος· λυγρῆς, ἧ τέ μοι αἰεὶ ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλον κῆρ τείρει, ἐπεὶ με μάλιστα καθίκετο πένθος ἄλαστον.	o 10.409 * i 18.19 i 17.642 * o 1.341 o 1.342
1240	καὶ γὰρ ἐμὸς τέθνηκεν ἀδελφεός, οὐ τι κάκιστος. τέτρατον ἡμῶν ἔην, καὶ τῶ τετέλεστο ἅπαντα, τύμβος τε στήλη τε· τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων.	o 4.199 o 5.262 i 16.457 *

---

1226 νῦν μὲν 1229 γὰρ 1234 καὶ τότε δὴ

	ἀλλ' εἶ τοι φίλος ἐστί, τεὸν δ' ὀλοφύρεται ἦτορ,	i 16.450
	ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ὄρνυθι τοῦτον, ἐπειγέσθω δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς	i 6.363
1245	ζῶος ἐών· νῦν αὖ θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κιχάνει.	i 17.478
	‘νῦν’ ἐλέαιρε, ἄναξ· ἰκέτις δέ τοι εὐχομαι εἶναι.”	o 5.450 †
	“Ὡς εἰποῦσ’ ὀλόλυξε, θεὸς δέ οἱ ἔκλυεν ἀρῆς.	o 4.767 *
	ὣς φάτο, τὸν δ' ἄχος ὀξὺ κατὰ φρένα τύψε βαθεῖαν,	i 19.125
	καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·	i 2.7
1250	“ὦ γύναι, ἦ μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος θυμαλγὲς ἔειπας·	o 23.183
	ὦ γύναι, οὐ μὲν τοι τάδ' ἐφιεμένη ἀπιθήσω·	i 24.300 *
	ἐσθλὸν γὰρ ‘θείῳ’ χεῖρας ἀνασχέμεν, αἶ κ' ἐλεήση.	i 24.301 †
	θάρσει, μὴ τοι ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ σῆσι μελόντων.	o 24.357
	ἦδη γὰρ μοι θυμὸς ἐπέσσυται ὄφρ' ἐπαμύνω	i 6.361
1255	ῥῆϊδίως· τοῖός τοι ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθος ἦα.	i 5.808 *
	δαμονίη, μὴ μοι τι λίην ἀκαχίζεο θυμῷ·	i 6.486
	θάρσει, μηδέ τί τοι θάνατος καταθύμιος ἔστω.	i 10.383
	ὦδε γὰρ ἐξερῶ, τὸ δὲ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται·	i 1.212
	εἰ δὲ θανόντων περ καταλήθοντ' εἰν' Αἴδαο,	i 22.389
1260	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ κείθι φίλου μεμνήσομ' ἐταίρου.	i 22.390
	ἄψ ἐθέλω θανάτοιο δυσηχέος ἐξαναλύσαι.	i 22.180 *
	καὶ δέ με θυμὸς ἄνωγεν, ἐπεὶ μάθον ἔμμεναι ἐσθλός.	i 6.444
	μηκέτι νῦν θαλερὸν γόνον ὄρνυθι· οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς.	o 10.457 *
	ἀλλ' ἴσχεο κλαυθμοῖο γόοιό τε δακρυόεντος.	o 24.323
1265	‘ἦ’ γὰρ κεν μιν ἔπειτα καὶ ἐκ θανάτοιο σαώσω.”	o 4.753 † *
	“Ὡς φάτο, τῆς δὲ ἐνῶρσε' γόνον, σχέθε δ' ὄσσε γόοιο.	o 4.758 †
	ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας ἠγήσατο· τοὶ δ' ἅμα ἔποντο	i 12.251
	μυρίοι, ὄσσά τε φύλλα καὶ ἄνθεα γίνεται ἄρη.	i 2.468
	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μέσσην ἀγορὴν πολύφημον ἰκέσθην,	o 2.150

---

1246 ἀλλ' 1252 Δί 1265 ἦ 1266 εὔνησε

1270	ἴξεν γ' ἐς σπείος γλαφυρόν θεός ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνήρ. ἰστάμενοι δ' εἶροντο περὶ σπέος ὅτι 'κεν ἔρδοι'. ᾤμωξέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα, φίλον δ' ὀνόμηνεν ἑταῖρον· στῆ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν· "ὄρνυθι', μηδ' ἔτι κείσο." σέβας δ' ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας	o 5.194 o 9.402 † i 23.178 o 23.4 i 18.178+o3.123 * †
1275	"σοὶ δ' αὐτῷ τόδ' ἐγὼν ἐπιτέλλομαι ἠδὲ κελεύω." "Ὡς φάθ', ὁ δ' ἐξ ὕπνοιο μάλα κραιπνῶς ἀνόρουσεν. ᾧς μὲν ἔπειτ' ἀνένεικε καὶ ἦγαγεν ἐξ Αἴδαιο φθηγξάμενος· τὸν δ' αἶψα περὶ φρένας ἦλυθ' ἰωή. ἄψ δὲ μελαγχροῖς γένετο, γναθμοὶ δὲ τάνυσθεν.	i 19.192 i 10.162 o 11.625 † * i 10.139 o 16.175
1280	κυάνεα δ' ἐγένοντο 'έθειράδες' ἀμφὶ γένειον. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἄμπνυτο' καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη, ἔσσυτ' ἀνα 'θορέων' καὶ ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδόν. ἔστη δ' ἐν μέσσοισι· τάφος δ' ἔλεν ἄνδρα ἕκαστον. καρπαλίμως δ' ὄδ' ἔπειτα μετ' ἵχνια βαῖνε θεοῖο.	o 16.176 @ o 24.349 @ o 14.34 † +16.41 o 24.441 * o 7.38
1285	'πάντας' δὲ τρόμος αἰνὸς ὑπήλυθε γυῖα ἐκάστου, ᾧς εἶδον ζῶν τε καὶ ἀρτεμέα προσίοντα. ᾧδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον· "ὦ πόποι, ἦ μέγα θαῦμα τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώμοι· οὐ γάρ πω ἰδόμην, οὐδ' ἔκλυον αὐδήσαντος,	i 7.215 † * i 5.515 i 22.372 i 20.344 i 10.47
1290	ἀθάνατον θεὸν ᾧδε βροτοὺς ἀγαπαζέμεν ἄντην. καὶ νῦν ἐξεσάωσεν οἰόμενον θανέεσθαι. οὐ γάρ πως ἂν θνητὸς ἀνὴρ τάδε μηχανόφτο. οἶον ὄδ' αὐτ' ἐξαυτὶς ἀνέστη πότμον ἀλύξας, ταρβήσας, ὅτ' ἄκουσε θεοῦ ὅσα φωνήσαντος.	i 24.464 i 4.12 o 16.196 i 15.287 i 20.380
1295	ὦ φίλοι, οὐ μὲν πῶ τι πάρος 'περ τοῖον' ἐτύχθη, οἷην τερπωλὴν θεὸς ἦγαγεν ἐς τόδε δῶμα."	o 18.36 * o 18.37

---

1271 ἐ κήδοι 1274 ἀλλ' ἄνα 1277 τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ 1280 γενεΐαδες 1281 ἔμπνυτο  
1282 πρόθυρον 1284 ὁ δ' 1285 Τρώας 1293 δὴ 1295 τοιοῦτον

	Καὶ τότε δὴ πρόπαν ἡμᾶρ ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα,	i 1.601
	πάντες ὀμηγερέες ᾿γ᾿ ἡμὲν νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες,	i 2.789 †
	χεῖρας ἀνίσχοντες μεγάλ᾿ εὐχετόωντο ἕκαστος.	i 15.369
	<i>περὶ τῆς τῶν μύρων ἀλειψάσης τὸν Κύριον</i>	
1300	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ᾿ ἵκανε δόμους εὖ νοιετάοντας,	o 17.28
	καρπαλίμως ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἐβήσατο δώματος εἴσω	o 7.135
	ἐλθόντες δὲ καθίζον ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι λίθοισιν	o 8.6
	οἳ οἱ κεδνότατοι καὶ φίλτατοι ἦσαν ἑταῶρων᾿.	i 9.586 †
	᾿γυνῆ᾿ δ᾿ ἀντίον ᾿ήλθε᾿ παρὰ σταθμὸν μεγάρου.	o 17.96 †
1305	ἄντα παρειάων σχομένη λιπαρὰ κρήδεμνα.	o 1.334
	καὶ ῥα πάροιθ᾿ αὐτοῖο καθέζετο καὶ λάβε γούνων,	i 1.500
	πρόχνηυ καθεζομένη· δεύοντο δὲ δάκρυσι κόλποι	i 9.570
	᾿καὶ οἳ γούνατ᾿ ἔκυσσε καὶ ἔλλαβε χερσὶ ᾿ποδοῖϊν᾿.	i 8.371 * †
	λίσσειτ᾿ ὀδυρομένη, καὶ οἳ κατέλεξεν ἅπαντα.	i 9.591
1310	᾿χεῦσε᾿ δὲ ᾿χρυσέου ἐκ᾿ ληκύθου ᾿γγρὸν ἔλαιον	o 6.79 † *
	αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καὶ ἐπέφραδε χερσὶν ἐλέσθαι.	o 8.68
	μνηστῆρες δ᾿ ἄρα πάντες ὑπερφιάλως ἀγάσαντο.	o 18.71
	αὐτὰρ ὁ ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φώνησέν τε,	i 1.333
	᾿τῆδε δ᾿ ἂν οὐ᾿ φθονέοιμι ποδῶν ἄψασθαι ἐμεῖο.	o 19.348 @
1315	ὦ γύναι, οὐκ ἂν τις σὲ βροτῶν ἐπ᾿ ἀπείρονα γαῖαν	o 19.107
	νικέει· ἦ γάρ σευ κλέος οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἰκάνει,	o 19.108
	ὥς τέ τευ ἦ βασιλῆος ἀμύμονος, ὅς τε θεουδῆς	o 19.109
	ἀνδράσιν ἐν πολλοῖσι καὶ ἰφθίμοισιν ἀνάσσω,	o 19.110
	εὐδικίας ἀνέχῃσι, φέρῃσι δὲ γαῖα μέλαινα.	o 19.111
1320	τοῦτο δ᾿ ἐγὼ πρόφρων δέχομαι, χαίρει δέ μοι ἦτορ,	i 23.647

---

1297 ὦς...μὲν 1298 om. Hom 1303 ἀπάντων 1304 μήτηρ...ἴζε 1309 ἦ...γενείου  
1310 δῶκε...χρυσέῃ ἐν ληκύθῳ 1314 τῆ δ᾿ οὐκ ἂν



	ὡς μευ αἰεὶ μέμνησαι ἐνηέος, οὐδέ σε λήθω.	i 23.648
	θάρσει μοι, ἐπεὶ οὐ τι ἄνευ θεοῦ ἦδε γε βουλή.	o 2.372
	σοὶ δὲ θεὸς τοῦδ' ἀντὶ χάριν μενοεικέα δοίη.	i 23.650 *
	καί μιν ἔτισ' ὡς οὐ τις ἐπὶ χθονὶ τίεται ἄλλη.	o 7.67
1325	ῥήϊδιον δὲ θεῶ, ὅς γ' οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχῃσιν, ἡμὲν κυδῆναι θνητὸν βροτὸν ἠδὲ κακῶσα."	o 16.211 * o 16.212
	<i>περὶ τῆς προδοσίας</i>	
	Ἦν δὲ τις ἐν μνηστήρσιν ἀνὴρ ἀθεμίστια εἰδώς, αἰεὶ ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νόον πολυκερδέα νωμῶν· ὅς μέγα ἔργον ἔρεξεν ἀτασθαλίησι κακῆσι.	o 20.287 o 13.255 o 24.458 *
1330	σχέτλιος οὐδὲ θεοῦ ὄπιν ἠδέσσατ' οὐδὲ τράπεζαν, τὴν ἦν οἱ παρέθηκεν· ἔπειτα δὲ πέφνε καὶ αὐτόν. ἄλλά γε ἠμερμήριζε μένων ὃ τι κύντατον ἔρξει· καὶ δ' ἀκέων κίνησε κάρη, κακὰ βυσσοδομεύων, σχέτλιος, ὀβριμοεργός, ὅς οὐκ ὄθειτ' αἴσυλα ῥέζων,	o 21.28 @ o 21.29 @ i 10.503 † o 17.465 † i 5.403
1335	Ἵς χρυσὸν φίλου ἀνδρὸς ἐδέξατο τιμήντος. κινήσας δὲ κάρη προτὶ ὄν μυθήσατο θυμόν· ᾧ πόποι, ὡς ὄδε πᾶσι φίλος καὶ τίμιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώποις, ὄτεάν κε πόλιν καὶ γαῖαν ἴκηται, ἀνδράσιν ἐν πολλοῖσι καὶ ἰφθίμοισιν ἀνάσσων.	o 11.327 † * i 17.442 o 10.38 o 10.39 o 19.110
1340	ἦ μιν ἀποκτείνω, αἶ κε κρείσσων γε γένωμα." ἀλλ' ὃ γ' ἄρ οὐδὲ θεὸν μέγαν ἄζετο· ἴετο δ' αἰεὶ πρεσβύτατον καὶ ἄριστον ἀτιμίησιν ἰάλλειν. τῷ καὶ ἀτασθαλίησιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐπέσπε· νήπιος, οὐδὲ τί οἱ τό γ' ἐπήρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον.	o 22.167 † i 5.434 † o 13.142 o 22.317 * i 2.873

---

1331 οπ. Iv 1332 αὐτὰρ ὁ...ἔρδοι 1333 ἀλλ' 1340 ἦ

## περὶ τοῦ μυστηρίου

- 1345 αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἐκ' κρίνας ἐτάρων δυοκαίδεκ' ἀρίστους, ο 9.195 †  
 ὄφρα οἱ αὐτόματοι θεῖον δυσσαΐατ' ἀγῶνα, i 18.376  
 στήσεν ἐὺ κρίνας, κρατερόν δ' ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλε i 16.199  
 σημαίνων· αὐτὸς δὲ μέγα κρατέων ἦνασεν. i 16.172 \*  
 οἱ δ' ἔλαχον τοὺς ἄν κε καὶ ἤθελεν αὐτὸς ἐλέσθαι. ο 9.334 \*
- 1350 οἱ γὰρ οἱ εἴσαντο διακριδὸν εἶναι ἄριστοι. i 12.103  
 οὔτοι γὰρ κλητοὶ γε βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν ο 17.386  
 τῶν ἄλλων μετὰ γ' αὐτὸν· ὁ δ' ἔπρεπε καὶ διὰ πάντων. i 12.104  
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἤγερθεν ὀμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο, i 1.57  
 ἔνθά οἱ οἶκος ἔην, περὶ δὲ κλίσιον θέε πάντη, ο 24.208
- 1355 'ὄρμαινε' φρεσὶν ἦσιν, ἅ ῥ' οὐκ ἀτέλεστα γέγοντο. ο 18.345 @  
 οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι δὴν ἦστο, μενοίνησεν δ' ἀγορεύειν. ο 2.36  
 καὶ τι ἔπος προέηκεν ὁ πέρ τ' ἄρητον ἄμεινον. ο 14.466  
 "κέκλυτε νῦν καὶ ἐμεῖο· μάλιστα γὰρ ἄλγος ἰκάνει i 3.97  
 θυμὸν ἐμὸν, φρονέω δὲ διακριθήμεναι ἤδη i 3.98
- 1360 'βουλήν'· ἐν δ' ὑμῖν ἐρέω πάντεσσι φίλοισι. i 9.528  
 ὦ φίλοι, οὐ γὰρ χρὴ ἕνα ἴδμενα οὐδὲ δὴ οἴους. ο 12.154  
 ἦδη γὰρ μοι θυμὸς ἐέλδεται οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι ο 15.66  
 οὐρανὸν ἐς πολύχαλκον, ἴν' ἀθανάτοισι 'μετείην'. ο 3.2 †  
 ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς ἔρχεσθε καὶ ἀγγελίην ἀπόφασθε i 9.649
- 1365 ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ γυναξίν ἐπὶ χθόνα πουλυβότειραν, ο 19.408  
 καὶ μάλα τειρόμενοί περ' ἀναγκαίη γὰρ ἐπέγει· i 6.85  
 ἐχθρὸς 'κέν' μοι κείνος ὁμῶς 'Αἶδαο πύλησιν, i 9.312 †  
 ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθη ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ εἶπη. i 9.313

---

1345 ἐγὼ 1353 οἱ...οὖν 1355 ὄρμαινε 1360 ὡς ἦν 1363 φαείνοι 1367 γὰρ

	ἄφρων δὴ κείνός γε καὶ οὐτιδανὸς πέλει ἀνὴρ.	ο 8.209
1370	ὕμῶν δ' ἀνδρὶ ἐκάστω ἐφιέμενος τάδε εἶρω, μηνιθμὸν μὲν ἀπορρῖψαι, φιλότητα δ' ἐλέσθαι. ὡς ἂν μοι τιμὴν μεγάλην καὶ κύδος ἄρησθε, ἢ τε καὶ ἐσσομένοισι μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέληται. τουτό τι μοι κάλλιστον ἐνὶ φρεσὶν εἶδεται εἶναι,	ο 13.7 i 16.282 i 16.84 * i 3.460 ο 9.11
1375	πάντα μάλ' ἀτρεκέως ἀγορευέμεν ὡς ἐπιτέλλω. ἐσθλὸν καὶ τὸ τέτυκται, ὅτ' ἄγγελος αἴσιμα εἰδῆ. εἰ δ' 'αὐτῶς' τόδε πᾶσι φίλον καὶ ἡδὺ γένοιτο, μάρτυροι ἔσονται καὶ ἐπίσκοποι ἀρμονιάων, ἡμετέρης ἀρετῆς μεμνημένοι ἦματα πάντα.	i 2.10 i 15.207 i 4.17 @ i 22.255 ο 8.244 * †
1380	ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἴομεν· δὴ γὰρ μέμβλωκε μάλιστα ἦμαρ, αὐτὰρ τάχα τοι ποτὶ ἔσπερα ρίγιον ἔσται. ἔρχεσθε πρὸς δάμαθ', ἴν' ἐντυνώμεθα δαῖτα." "Ὡς εἰπὼν εἰσῆλθε δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας. αὐτίκα δ' εἶσω ἴεν, μετὰ δὲ μνηστῆρσι καθίζεν.	ο 17.190 ο 17.191 ο 17.175 ο 17.324 ο 17.256
	<i>περὶ τῆς κλάσεως τοῦ ἄρτου</i>	
1385	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ δειπνηστὸς ἔην καὶ ἐπήλυθεν ὥρα' εὐχετο. τοὶ δ' ἅμα πάντες ὕπ' αὐτόφιν ἦατο σιγῇ ἄρτον τ' οὐλον ἐλὼν περικαλλέος ἐκ κανέοιο, χερσὶ διακλάσσας, μεγάλ' εὐχετο χεῖρας ὀρεγνύς' δῶκε δ' ἑταίροισιν καὶ σφέας πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν,	ο 17.170 † i 19.255 † ο 17.343 i 5.216+1.450 † i 21.32 + i 23.235
1390	"ἄρτου' θ' ἄπτεσθον καὶ χαίρετον· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα, μοίρας δασσάμενοι δαίνυντ' ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα. 'κάδ' δὲ δέπας περικαλλές, ὃ σὶ παλάμηφιν ἀρήρει,	ο 4.60 † ο 20.280 i 11.632 + 3.338 †

---

1377 αὐτῶν 1379 οἶα καὶ ἡμῖν 1385 μῆλα 1386 ἐπ' 1388 ἀνασχών 1389 σφέας  
1390 σίτου 1392 παρ

	ἀμβροσίης πλησας κέρασέν δε νέκταρ ἐρυθρόν.	ο 5.93
	εὔχετ' ἔπειτα στάς μέσῳ ἔρκει, λείβε δὲ οἶνον,	ι 24.306
1395	οὐρανὸν εἰσανιδῶν, καὶ φωνήσας ἔπος ἠὔδα,	ι 24.307
	"οἱ κ' ἐμὸν αἶμα πίνοντες ἀλύσσονται περὶ θυμῷ,	ι 22.70
	ἀθάνατοι δ' εἶεν καὶ ἀγήραοι ἦματα πάντα.	cf. ο 23.336
	αἰεὶ δὴ μέλλοι τε ἀγήραοί τ' ἀθάνατοί τε	ι 12.323 *
	ζῶειν οὐδ' ἄνδρεςσι μετέμμεναι, 'ἀλλ' ἀθανάτοισι'.	ι 18.91 †
1400	ὕμέων δ' ἀνδρὶ ἐκάστῳ ἐφιέμενος τάδε εἶρω,	ο 13.7
	ὄσσοι ἐνὶ μεγάροισι γερούσιον αἴθοπα οἶνον	ο 13.8
	αἰεὶ πίνετ' ἐμοῖσιν, ἀκουάζεσθε δ' αἰοιδῆς.	ο 13.9 *
	'ὄς' τις θαρσαλέος καὶ ἀναιδής ἐστι προίκτης	ο 17.449 @ *
	ἀλλ' ἄγετ' ἐσθίετε βρῶμην καὶ πίνετε οἶνον	ο 10.460
1405	ἀθάνατον, ἐμέθεν μεμνημένοι ἦματα πάντα,	ο 4.592 *
	τόνδε νόον καὶ θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἔχοντες."	ι 4.309
	ἔξαυτίς 'δ' ἐπέεσσιν' ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπεν,	ο 21.206 †
	"ὦ πόποι, οὐ πῶς ἔστιν ὑπερφιάλοισι μεθ' ὑμῖν	ο 2.310 †
	δαίνυσθαί τ' ἀκέοντα καὶ εὐφραίνεσθαι ἔκηλον	ο 2.311
1410	ἔξ ὑμέων γὰρ φασὶ κάκ' ἔμμεναι· ἔστι γὰρ ἔνδον	ο 1.33 * + ι 10.378
	ὄς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθει ἐνὶ φρεσὶν, ἄλλο δὲ εἶπη	ι 9.313 *
	μισθῷ ἐπὶ ῥητῷ· τὸ δὲ ῥίγιον αἶ κεν ἀλώη.	ι 21.445 + 11.405 *
	ἄφρων δὴ κείνός γε καὶ οὐτιδανὸς πέλει ἀνήρ·	ο 8.209
	μόρσιμόν ἐστι θεῷ τε καὶ ἀνέρι Ἴφι δαμῆναι.	ι 19.417
1415	ἀλλὰ τόδ' αἴνον ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν ἰκάνει.	ο 18.274
	ὅπποτε δὴ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἀνὴρ ἐθέλησιν ἀμέρσαι,	ι 16.53
	ἀφρήτωρ ἀθέμιστος ἀνέστιος ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος	ι 9.63
	αἴθ' ὄφελεν ἄγονός τ' ἔμεναι ἄγαμός τ' ἀπολέσθαι	ι 3.40 *

---

1399 αἶ κε μὴ "Ἐκτωρ 1402 αἰοιδῶ 1403 ὄς 1407 σφε ἔπεσσιν 1408 'Ἀντίνο'

	ἢ οὕτω λάβην τ' ἔμεναι καὶ ὑπόψιον ἄλλων	i 3.42
1420	οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ τοῦ φημί χειρότερον βροτὸν ἄλλον. κεῖνος δὴ αὐτ' ἀΐδηλος ἀνὴρ, ὃν ὀνομαζομαι αὐτός. ἦστο γὰρ ἐν μνηστῆρσι φίλον τετιμημένος ἦτορ, ὅς κακὰ πόλλ' ἔρδεσκεν', ὅσ' οὐ σύμπαντες οἱ ἄλλοι. σχέτλιος, ὅς ῥ' ἔριν ὄρσε κακὴν ἐπι δεύτερον αὐτίς, 1425 ἐκτελέσας μέγα ἔργον, ὃ οὐ ποτε ἔλπετο θυμῷ." Τοὺς δ' αὐτὲ προσέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής, "μηκέτι νῦν χαλεποῖσιν ἀμείβεσθε ἐπέεσσι. καὶ δ' ἄλλω νεμεσᾶτε, ὅτις τοιαυτὰ γε ῥέζοι. ἀλλά μοι ἐσθιέμεν καὶ πινέμεν, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ, 1430 καὶ μύθοις τέρπεσθε· εἰκότα γὰρ καταλέξω." "Ὡς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ὑπερφιάλως νεμέσησαν· καὶ νῦν κε δὴ προτέρω ἔτ' ἔρις γένητ' ἀμφοτέροισιν.	i 2.248 * o 22.165 * o 1.114 i 22.380 @ o 3.161 o 3.275 o 15.271 * i 23.492 * i 23.494 * o 2.305 o 4.239 o 17.481 i 23.490
	<i>περὶ τοῦ νικητῆρος</i>	
	"Ὡς οἱ μὲν περὶ δεῖπνον ἐνὶ μεγάροισι πένοντο. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σπεύσειε πονησάμενος τάδε ἔργα, 1435 τοὺς ὃ γε συγκαλέσας πυκινὴν ἀρτύνετο βουλὴν, οἱ οἱ κεδνότατοι καὶ φίλτατοι ἦσαν ἀπάντων. οἱ μὲν τάρβησάν τε καὶ αἰδόμενοι βασιλῆα ἔσταν. οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο· αὐτὰρ ὁ ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φώνησέν τε, 1440 "Κλεῦτε, φίλοι', μὴ τι 'θυμῷ' ἀγάσησθε ἕκαστος. ἦδη γὰρ μευ θυμὸς ἐπέσσυται ὥστε νέεσθαι'. νῦν δὲ δὴ ἐγγύθι μοι θάνατος κακὸς, οὐδ' ἔτ' ἀνευθεν,	o 4.624 o 9.250 i 10.302 i 9.586 i 1.331 * i 1.332 * i 1.333 i 14.111 † i 6.361 * † i 22.300

---

1423 ἔρρεξεν 1434 τὰ ἄ 1440 πείθεσθαι καὶ...κότῳ 1441 ὄφρ' ἐπαμύνω

	οὐδ' ἀλέη· ἢ γάρ ῥα πάλαι τό γε φίλτερον ἦεν	i 22.301
	πατρί τ' ἐμῶ καὶ ἐμοί· νῦν δὲ χρῆ τετλόμεν ἔμπης."	o 3.209
1445	"Ὡς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῆ	i 9.693
	μῦθον ἀγασσάμενοι· μάλα γὰρ κρατερῶς ἀγόρευσε.	i 9.694
	ἦμος δ' ἠέλιος κατέδυ καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἦλθεν,	o 12.31
	τῶν πόδας ἐξαπένιζεν, ὕδωρ δ' ἐνεχεύατο 'πολλόν'.	o 19.387 * @
	καὶ σφιν ἄχος κατὰ θυμὸν ἐγίγνετο δερκομένοισι.	i 13.86
1450	νίψατο δ' αὐτὸς χεῖρας, ἀφύσσατο δ' αἶθοπα οἶνον,	i 16.230
	ἠδὺν ἀκηράσιον, θεῖον ποτόν. οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν	o 9.205
	ἔγνω προσθ' ἀνδρῶν καλλιζώνων τε γυναικῶν,	i 24.698
	τοῦτό νυ καὶ γέρας οἶον οἴζυροῖσι βροτοῖσι.	o 4.197
	τόν δ' 'ὄ κε' πίνοιεν μελιηδέα οἶνον ἐρυθρόν,	o 9.208 †
1455	οὔτε τι πημανθήναι ἐπι δέος οὔτ' ἀπολέσθαι,	o 8.563
	ὅς κε πίη καὶ πρῶτον ἀμείψεται ἔρκος ὀδόντων.	o 10.328
	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δῶκέν τε καὶ ἔκπιον, αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα	o 10.237
	μῦθοισιν τέρποντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐνέποντες.	i 11.643
	τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής·	o 17.151
1460	"ὦ φίλοι, ἄνερες ἔστε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἦτορ ἔλεσθε,	i 5.529
	ἀλλήλους τ' αἰδεῖσθε κατὰ κρατερὴν ὑσμίνην.	i 5.530 *
	οἰοί περ πάρος ἦτε μετ' ἀνδράσιν, ἢ καὶ ἀρείους,	i 16.557
	σχέσθε, φίλοι, καὶ μ' οἶον ἐάσατε κηδόμενοί περ.	i 22.416
	οὐδέ τί πω σάφα ἴδμεν ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα.	i 2.252
1465	ἦ ῥ' ὃ γ' ὁ λυσσώδης φλογὶ εἵκελος ἡγεμονεύει,	i 13.53
	ὅς κ' ἐμὸν αἶμα 'πιών περ' ἀλύσσειται περὶ θυμῶ.	i 22.70 *
	ἀμνηστὴς καὶ ἄπιστος ἀνήρ 'ὄδε, οὐκ ἐλετήμων'.	i 24.207 †
	ἀλλὰ κακὰ φρονέων τεκμαίρεται ἀμφοτέτοισιν,	i 7.70
	θυμὸν ἀπὸ μελέων δύναι δόμον "Αἶδος εἴσω."	i 7.131

---

1448 πουλύ 1454 ὅτε 1466 πίοντες 1467 ὃ γ' οὐ σ' ἐλεήσει

περὶ τοῦ προδότου Ἰούδα

1470	Ἦτοι ὃ γ' ὡς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ ἔξετο· τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη ὅς β' ἔπεα φρεσὶ ἦσιν ἄκουσμά τε πολλά τε ἦδη. κλίμακα δ' ὑψηλὴν κατεβήσατο τοῖο δόμοιο, 'χωόμενος'. μένεος δὲ μέγα φρένες ἀμφὶ μέλαινα πίμπλαντ', ὅσσε δέ οἱ πυρὶ λαμπετόωντι εἴκτην.	i 1.68 i 2.213 o 1.330 * i 1.103 † i 1.104
1475	οὐδέ τι οἶδε νοῆσαι ἅμα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω νήπιος, οὐδέ τὸ ἦδη, 'ὄ περ' πείσεσθαι ἔμελλεν 'νηλῆς', οὐδέ μετατρέπεται φιλότητος ἐταίρων, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ χαλεπὸς περὶ πάντων ἦν μνηστήρων. ὅς δὴ τοι 'ἦτορ' μὲν ἔην κακός, ἀλλὰ ποδώκης,	i 1.343 i 20.466 † i 9.630 o 17.388 * i 10.316 †
1480	εἰδὼς παντοίους τε δόλους καὶ μήδεα πυκνά. ἔσθων καὶ πίνων· ἔτι καὶ παρέκειτο τράπεζα· αὐτὰρ ὃ μερμήριζε μένων ὃ τι κύντατον ἔρδει χωόμενος φρεσὶν ἦσι, καὶ ἄμοσε καρτερόν ὄρκον. βουλήν δὲ πρῶτον μεγαθύμων ἶξε γερόντων·	i 3.202 i 24.476 i 10.503 * i 19.127 i 2.53
1485	αὐτὸς δ' ἐν κορυφῆσι καθέζετο κύδει γαίων. τοὺς μάλα νεικείεσκε χολωτοῖσιν ἐπέεσσι. 'ἄτρυνεν' δὲ ἕκαστον ἐποιχόμενος ἐπέεσσι, "τίπτε καταπτώσσοντες ἀφέστατε, μίμνετε δ' ἄλλους; πῆ δὴ συνθεσῖαι τε καὶ ὄρκια βήσεται ἡμῖν;	i 8.51 i 4.241 i 17.215 @ i 4.340 i 2.339
1490	ψευδάμενοι μαχόμεσθα· τῷ οὖν νῦν τι κέρδιον ἡμῖν ἔλπομαι ἐκτελέεσθαι, ἵνα μὴ ρέξομεν ὧδε. ἐν πυρὶ δὴ βουλαί τε γενοίατο μήδεά τ' ἀνδρῶν. αὐτῶς γάρ 'ρ' ἐπέεσσ' ἐριδαίνομεν, οὐδέ τι μήχος	i 7.352 i 7.353 i 2.340 i 2.342 †

---

1473 ἀχνύμενος 1476 ὃ οὐ 1477 σχέτλιος 1479 εἶδος 1487 ἄτρυνεν 1493 om.  
Hom

	εὐρέμενα δυνάμεσθα, πολὺν χρόνον ἐνθάδ' ἐόντες.	i 2.343
1495	ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν πάντες ὕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένοισθε, ἤμενοι αὐθι ἕκαστοι ἀκήριοι, ἀκλεῆς αὐτως. αἰσχρὸν τοι δηρὸν τε μένειν κενέον τε νέεσθαι. ἀλλὰ χρή καὶ ἐμὸν θέμεναι πόνον οὐκ ἀτέλεστον. ὦ πόποι, ὡς ὄδε πᾶσι φίλος καὶ τίμιός ἐστιν.	i 7.99 i 7.100 i 2.298 i 4.57 o 10.38
1500	τούνεκα πολλοῖσιν τε καὶ ἰφθίμοισιν ἀνάσσει, ὅς με μετ' ἀπρήκτους ἔριδας καὶ νείκεα βάλλει. αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἐπιστήμων βουλῇ τε νόφ τε. ἀλλ' ἄγε δή μοι πάντες ὁμόσσετε καρτερὸν ὄρκον, εἰ κείνῳ γε ἴδοιμι κατελθόντ' Ἄϊδος εἴσω,	o 24.26 * i 2.376 o 16.374 o 12.298 i 6.284
1505	ἧ ἴνα μηδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀνθρώποισι λίπηται, φαίην κε φρέν' ἀτέρπου οἴζυός ἐκλελαθέσθαι." 'ὡς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα' αὐτίκ' ἀπόμενον ὡς ἐκέλευσε. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ὁμοσάν τε τελευτήσαν τε τὸν ὄρκον, αὐτίκα κηρύκεσσι λιγυφθόγοισι κέλευσε.	o 4.710 i 6.285 o 12.303 * @ o 12.304 i 2.50 †
1510	οἱ μὲν ἐκήρυσσον, τοὶ δ' ἠγείροντο μάλ' ὄκα. ὡς εἰπὼν τοὺς μὲν λίπεν αὐτοῦ, βῆ δὲ μετ' ἄλλους κλήδην εἰς ἀγορὴν κικλήσκων ἄνδρα ἕκαστον, μηδὲ βοῶν· αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ πρώτοισι πονεῖτο. ὀπτῆρας δὲ κατὰ σκοπίας ὄτρυνε νέεσθαι,	i 2.52 i 4.292 i 9.11 * i 9.12 * o 17.430 @
1515	μὴ λάθοι αὐτίς ἰών κε' θοὴν διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν τηλόθεν ἐν ἰλίφῃ πεδίφῃ παρὰ δὲ σκοπὸν εἶσεν, εἷ ποθεν ἐξεύροι. μάλα γὰρ δριμύς ἄϊρος αἶρει. αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ, μάλα δ' ὄκα δόμους ἴκανεν ἀνακτος. βῆ δ' ἴμεν ὡς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος, ὅς τ' ἐπιδευῆς	i 10.468 * i 23.359 † i 18.322 * † o 17.255 i 12.299
1520	δηρὸν ἔη κρειῶν, κέλεται δὲ ἔθυμός ἀγίγνωρ	i 12.300

---

1507 ὡς ἐφάμην, οἱ δ'...ἀπόμενον 1509 αὐτὰρ ὁ 1514 ὄτρυνε 1515 ἰόντε 1516  
λείφ om. Iv 1517 χολός



	μήλων πειρήσοντα καὶ ἐς πυκινὸν δόμον ἔλθειν.	i 12.301
	αὐτίκα δ' εἴσω ἱεν, μετὰ δὲ μνηστήρσι κάθιζε,	o 17.256
	νευστάζων κεφαλῇ· δὴ γὰρ κακὸν ὄσσετο θυμῷ.	o 18.154
	μαίνεται δ' ἐκπαγλως, πύσυνος ἄβιη, οὐδέ τι τῆι	i 9.238 * †
1525	ἀνέρας οὐδὲ θεόν· κρατερὴ δὲ ἐλύσσα δέδυκεν.	i 9.239 *
	τῷ καὶ ἀτασθαλίησιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐπέσπε.	o 22.317 *
	τόσσος ἔην, πολλοὺς δὲ πυρῆς ἐπέβησ' ἀλεγεινῆς.	i 9.546
	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δείπνησε καὶ ἤραρε θυμὸν ἐδωδῆ,	o 14.111
	δειπνίσσας, ὡς ἄλῆς τε κατέκτανε βοῦν ἐπὶ φάτνῃ,	o 4.535
1530	μισθῷ ἐπὶ ῥητῷ· ὁ δὲ σημαίνων ἐπέτελλεν	i 21.445
	ἐνδυκέως. τοῖσιν δὲ κακῆ φρεσὶν ἦνδανε βουλή.	o 14.337
	ὡς δὴ μὴ ὄφελεν νικᾶν τοιῷδ' ἐπ' ἀέθλω·	o 11.548
	τοίην γὰρ κεφαλὴν ἔνεκ' αὐτοῦ γαῖα κατέσχευ.	o 11.549 *
	ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ὄλεσε λαὸν ἀτάσθαλον, ὄλετο δ' αὐτὸς.	o 7.60
 <i>περὶ τῆς νυκτὸς ἐν ἣ παρεδόθη ὁ Κύριος</i>		
1535	ἦμος δὲ τρίχα νυκτὸς ἔην, μετὰ δ' ἄστρα βεβήκει,	o 12.312
	ἕξαυτίς γ' ἐπέεσσιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπεν	o 21.206
	ὄς πᾶσι θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσει·	i 12.242
	"κέκλυτέ μευ μύθων κακὰ περ πάσχοντες ἑταῖροι,	o 12.271
	ἀνδρὸς ἑνὸς ῥιπῆ, ὁ δὲ μαίνεται οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτῶς·	i 8.355
1540	ἐγγὺς ὄδε κλονέει· νῦν οἴω λοίγι' ἔσεσθαι.	i 21.533 *
	σχέτλιος, αἰὲν ἀλιτρός, ἐμῶν μενέων ἀπερωεύς,	i 8.361
	ἄγριος, οὔτε δίκας εὖ εἰδὼς οὔτε θέμιστας.	o 9.215 *
	οἶος ἐκείνου θυμὸς ὑπερφίαλος καὶ ἀπηνής.	i 15.94

---

1524 Δίί 1536 σφε ἔπεσσιν 1539 τίς

	καὶ λίην οὐτός γε μένος θυμόν τ' ὀλέσειε	i 8.358
1545	δυσμενέες τ' ἄνδρες σχεδὸν ἦαται· οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν μὴ τι κακὸν βρέξωσι καὶ ἡμέας ἐξελάσσωσι. λίην γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἐπήτριμοι ἦματα πάντα. ἡμεῖς δὲ φραζώμεθ' ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα, οἷ' ὀρώω ὄρησθῆρας' ἀτάσθαλα μηχανόωντας.	i 10.100 o 16.381 i 19.226 o 23.117 + 17.274 o 18.143 †
1550	οὗτοι δ' ἐν' θύρησι καθήμενοι ἐψιάσθων. ἀλλ' εἴ μοι τί πίθεσθε, τό κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἶη, καὶ φυλακῆς μνήσασθε καὶ ἐγρήγορθε ἕκαστος νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίην, καὶ ἀύπνους ὕμμε τίθεσθε, καὶ μάλα τειρόμενοί περ' ἀναγκαίη γὰρ ἐπέγει.	o 17.530 i 7.28 * i 7.371 o 9.404 * i 6.85
1555	οὕτω νῦν, φίλα τέκνα, φυλάσσετε· μηδὲ τιν' ὕπνος νήγρετος ἥδιστος, θανάτῳ ἄγχιστα ἐοικώς, αἰρείτω, μὴ χάρμα γενώμεθα δυσμενέεσιν. ἀλλ' ἦτοι ἐπὶ νυκτὶ φυλάξομεν ἡμέας αὐτούς· τοῖος πᾶσιν θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι γένοιτο·	i 10.192 o 13.80 i 10.193 i 8.529 i 4.289
1560	ἀμφὶ μάλα φράζεσθε, φίλοι· κέλομαι γὰρ ἔγωγε εὐχεσθαι· πάντες δὲ θεοῦ χατέουσ' ἄνθρωποι. ἔσθλὸν θείῳ χεῖρας ἀνασχέμεν, αἶ κ' ἐλεήση. ὄρνυσθ' ἐξείης ἐπιδέξια πάντες ἑταῖροι. μηδέ τις ἀρνεῖσθω· καλέσασθε δὲ θεῖον ἀοιδόν.	i 18.254 o 3.48 * i 24.301 † o 21.141 o 8.43
1565	'ἀλλ' ἄγε, μίμνετε νῦν γε,' ἐμοὶ ἐρίηρες ἑταῖροι, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν εἶμι, κρατερὴ δέ μοι ἔπλετ' ἀνάγκη· ἐν δέ τε μοι κραδίη μεγάλα στέρνοισι πατάσσει. ὕμεῖς δέ, μνηστῆρες, ἐπίσχετε θυμὸν ἐνιπῆς καὶ χειρῶν, ἵνα μὴ τις ἔρις καὶ νεῖκος ὄρηται.	o 9.172 † o 10.273 i 13. 282 * o 20.266 o 20.267

---

1449 μνηστῆρας 1550 ἢ 1562 γὰρ Διὶ 1565 ἄλλοι μὲν νῦν μίμνετ'

- 1570 ἄλλ' ἄγε μηκέτι 'δὴ' κακὰ βέζετε δυσμενέοντες, ο 20.314 †  
 θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλον δαμάσαντες ἀνάγκη. i 19.66  
 ὦ φίλοι, ἤδη μὲν κεν ἐγὼ εἵποιμι καὶ ἄμμι, ο 22.262  
 ὅς τίς κεν τλαίῃ, οἱ τ' αὐτῷ κῦδος ἄροιτο." i 10.307  
 δακρύσας δ' ἐτάρων ἄφαρ ἔζετο νόσφι λιασθείς. i 1.349
- 1575 τοῦ δ' ὠρίνετο θυμός, ἀνὰ ῥίνας δέ οἱ ἤδη ο 24.318  
 δριμύ μένος προὔτυψε φίλον πατέρ' εἰσορόωντι. ο 24.319  
 στή δὲ μέσῳ ἐν ἀγῶνι, πολὺς δ' ἀνεκῆκτιεν ἰδρώς. i 23.507  
 πολλὰ δὲ 'πατρὶ' φίλῳ ἠρήσατο χεῖρας ὄρεγνύς. i 1.351 † \*
- περὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου προσευχῆς*
- 1580 "ὦ πάτερ, σὺ νεμεσίζη ὄρων τάδε καρτερὰ ἔργα; i 5.872 †  
 οἶον δὴ ἄνδρεςσι χαρίζεαι ὑβριστήσι, i 13.633  
 οἱ τέ μ' ἀτιμάζουσι καὶ οἱ 'νηλιτεῖς' εἰσιν. ο 19.498 \* @  
 οἱ μέγα ἔργον ἔρεξαν ἀτασθαλίησι κακῆσι. ο 24.458 \*  
 νῦν αὖ παῖδ' ἀγαπητὸν ἀποκτεῖναι μεμάασιν, ο 5.18
- 1585 οἱ τοι δυσμενέες καὶ ἀνάρσιοι ἐγγὺς ἔασιν. i 24.365  
 οἱ τ' εὖ μὲν βάζουσι, κακῶς δ' ὄπιθεν φρονοῦσιν. ο 18.168  
 ἀλλὰ σὺ, εἰ δύνασαι γε, περίσχεο παιδὸς 'έοιο', i 1.393 @  
 εἰ ἔτεόν γε σός εἰμι, πατήρ δ' ἐμός εὔχεται εἶναι. ο 9.529  
 εἰ δ' οὕτω τοῦτ' ἐστίν, ἐμοὶ μέλλει φίλον εἶναι, i 1.564
- 1590 δύσομα εἰς 'Αἶδαο καὶ ἐν νεκύεσσι φαίνω. ο 12.383  
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τούτοισι φάος πάντεσσι παρέξω. ο 18.317  
 αἴψα δ' ἐλεύσομαι αὐτίς, ἐπήν 'τοῖς εὖ' ἐπαμύνω, i 12.369 †  
 εἰ σὺ γε σῶ θυμῷ ἐθέλοις· κέλομαι γὰρ ἔγωγε. i 23.894  
 κείσομ' ἐπεὶ κε θάνω· νῦν δὲ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀροίμην. i 18.121

---

1570 μοι 1578 μητρὶ 1580 Ζεῦ 1582 νήλιτιδες 1587 ἔηος 1592 εὖ τοῖς

1595	νῦν δ' ἔτι καὶ μάλλον νοέω φρεσὶ τιμήσασθαι. ἀλλὰ 'πάτερ' ἴληθι, δίδωθι δέ μοι κλέος ἐσθλόν."	i 22.235 o 3.380 †
	καὶ τότε ἄρ ἄγγελος ἦλθεν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος, ἀλκῆς καὶ σθένος πλήσας φρένας ἀμφὶ μελαίνας. αὐτίκα δὲ μνηστῆρας ἐπάρχετο ἰσόθεος φῶς·	i 2.786 + 19.130 i 17.499 * o 1.324
1600	οἱ δ' εὐδαιν 'ῶρνυντο' κατὰ 'δόμον', οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι δὴν ἦατ', ἐπεὶ σφίσις ὕπνος ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἔπιπτεν. ἐξαῦτις δ' ἐπέεσσιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπε, "Μηκέτι νῦν εὐδοντες ἀωαεῖτε γλυκὺν ὕπνον. οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὐδαιν βουλευφόρον ἄνδρα.	o 2.397 @ † o 2.398 o 21.206 o 10.548 i 2.24
1605	ἀλλ' ἴομεν· μάλα γὰρ νῦξ ἄνετα, ἐγγύθι δ' ἠώς. ἴομεν'. ἀλλ' ἔτ' ὄπισθεν ἀμέτρητος πόνος (ἔστι'), πολλὸς καὶ χαλεπός, τὸν ἐμὲ χρὴ πάντα τελέσσαι." "Ὡς φάτο, τοῖς δ' ἀσπαστὸν εἰείσατο κοιμηθῆναι καὶ τότε 'κεν' βλεφάρων ἐξέσσυτο νήδυμος ὕπνος.	i 10.251 o 23.249 † @ o 23.250 o 8.295 * o 12.366 †
<i>περὶ τῆς προδοσίας</i>		
1610	οὐ πῶ πάν εἴρητο ἔπος ὅτ' ἄρ ἦλυθον αὐτοῖ, ἔσθλ' ἀγορεύοντες, κακὰ δὲ φρεσὶ βυσσοδόμενον. αὐτὸς δ' ἐν πρώτοισι μέγα φρονέων ἐβεβήκει, ὅς κακὰ πόλλ' ἔρδεσκεν' ὅσ' οὐ σύμπαντες οἱ ἄλλοι. ὣς δ' εἶδ', ὡς μιν μάλλον ἔδου χόλος, ἐν δέ οἱ ὄσσε	i 10.540 o 17.66 i 11.296 i 22.380 @ i 19.16
1615	αἵματόεντε πέλον, δεινὸς δ' εἰς ὧπα ἰδέσθαι. αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' ἐξοπίσω ἀνεχάζετο, αὐτὸς δ' ἐταίρους. ἦλθον ἔπειθ' ὅσα φύλλα καὶ ἄνθεα γίγνεται ὠρη ὄπλ' ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες χάλκεα, πείρατα τέχνης,	o 22.405 * i 11.461 o 9.51 o 3.433 *

---

1596 ἀνασσ' 1600 ὄρνυντο...πτόλιν 1602 σφε ἔπεσσιν 1606 ἦλθομεν... ἔσται 1609  
μοι 1613 ἔρρεξεν

	νήπιοι ἀγροιώται, ἐφημέρια φρονέοντες,	ο 21.85
1620	ψεῦσταί τ' ὄρχησταί τε, χοροϊτυπίησιν ἄριστοι , 'σχέτλιοι', οὔτε δίκας εὖ εἰδότες, οὔτε θέμιστας. οὔτε θεὸν δείσαντο, ὅς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχησιν, οὔτε τιν' ἀνθρώπων νέμεσιν κατόπισθεν ἔσεσθαι. τῶν ὕβρις τε βίη τε σιδήρεον οὐρανὸν ἵκει,	i 24.261 ο 9.215 * † ο 22.39 * ο 22.40 ο 15.329
1625	ἐρχομένων ἄμυδις· μάλα κεν θρασυκάρδιος εἶη ὅς τότε γηθήσειεν ἰδὼν πόνον οὐδ' ἀκάχοιτο. οὐδ' εἶ οἱ κραδίη γε σιδηρῆ ἔνδοθεν ἦεν. ἀμφὶ δέ μιν 'δρηστῆρες' ἀγήνορες ἠγερέθοντο. οἱ δ' ὕβρει εἷξαντες, ἐπισπόμενοι μένει σφῶ,	i 13.343 i 13.344 ο 4.293 ο 17.65 † ο 14.262
1630	λαοῖσιν καθύπερθε πεποιθότες ἠδὲ βίηφιν, νύκτα δι' ὄφθαίην, ὅτε θ' εὐδουσι βροτοὶ ἄλλοι, ἔστασαν αἰθομένας δαΐδας μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχοντες· στὰν δ' ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἰόντες ἀολλέες 'ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος', ἔρδειν ἔργα βίαια κακορραφίησι νόοιο.	i 12.153 i 10.83 ο 7.101 * i 16.601 † ο 2.236
1635	ἠδὺ 'γελῶντες' καὶ δεικανόωντ' ἐπέεσσι, δεινὸν δερκόμενοι, θάμβος δ' ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας, ἴεμενοι κτεῖναι· δὴ γὰρ κεχολώατο λίην. τρώκτης, ὅς δὴ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἐώργει. τούτου γὰρ καὶ ἐκεῖνοι ἀτασθαλίησιν ὄλοντο.	ο 18.111 @ i 3.342 ο 14.282 ο 14.289 ο 10.437
1640	ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὡς τιν' ἔμελλ' ἀπαλεξήσειν κακότητος. οὐ γὰρ πω ἰδόμην, οὐδ' ἔκλυον ἀυδήσαντος ἄνδρ' ἕνα τοσσάδε μέρμερ' ἐπ' ἤματι μητίσασθαι. ὡς δὲ δράκων ἐπὶ χειρὶ ὀρέστερος ἄνδρα μένησι, βεβρωκῶς κακὰ φάρμακ', ἔδου δέ τέ μιν χόλος αἰνός,	ο 17.364 i 10.47 i 10.48 i 22.93 i 22.94
1645	σμερδαλέον δὲ δέδορκεν ἐλισσόμενος περὶ χειρῆ·	i 22.95

---

1621 ἄγριον 1628 μνηστῆρες 1633 οὐδ' ἄρ' Ἀχαιοὶ 1635 γελῶντες

	ὡς ἄρ' ὃ γ' ἄσβεστόν ἔχων μένος οὐχ ὑπεχώρει.	i 22.96 †
	ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ὡς ἀπόλοιτο, θεὸς δέ ἐσιφλώσειε.	i 14.142
	τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδῆς	o 20.350
	"πῆ μέματον; τί σφῶϊν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μαίνεται ἦτορ;	i 8.413
1650	εἶπαθ' ὅπως ὑμέας κραδίη θυμὸς τε κελεύει.	o 21.198
	εἰ δ' ἤδη μ' αὐτὸν κτεῖναι μενεαίνετε χαλκῶ,	o 20.315
	καὶ κε τὸ βουλοίμην, καὶ κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἶη	o 20.316
	τεθνάμεν ἢ τάδε γ' αἰὲν ἀεικέα ἔργ' ὀράασθαι."	o 20.317
	'καὶ τότ' ἄρ' ἄψορρον προσέφη δολίοις ἐπέεσσι,	o 9.282 †*
1655	ὅς κακὰ πόλλ' ἔρδεσκεν' ὅσ' οὐ σύμπαντες οἱ ἄλλοι,	i 22.380 @
	ἐλθὼν σὺν πλεόνεσσι· τό οἱ καὶ ῥίγιον ἔσται.	i 1.325
	κάδ δ' ἔθορ' ἐς μέσσον· θάμβος δ' ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας.	i 4.79
	ἴθυσεν δὲ διὰ προμάχων συὶ εἵκελος ἀλκῆν	i 17.281
	καπρίῳ, ὅς τ' ἐν ὄρεσσι κύνας θαλερούς τ' αἰζηοὺς	i 17.282
1660	ῥηϊδίως ἐκέδασσεν, ἀλυξάμενος' διὰ βήσσας.	i 17.283 †
	καὶ οἱ μυίης θάρσος ἐνὶ στήθεσσι ἐνήκεν,	i 17.570
	ἢ τε καὶ ἐργομένη μάλα περ χροὸς ἀνδομέοιο	i 17.571
	ἰσχανάα δακέειν, λαρόν τέ οἱ αἴμ' ἀνθρώπου.	i 17.572
	ὄφρα τί μιν προτιεῖποι ἀμειβόμενος ἐπέεσσι,	i 22.329
1665	κύσσε δέ μιν περιφύς ἐπιάλμενος ἠδὲ προσηύδα	o 24.320
	μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσι, νόος δέ οἱ ἄλλα μενοίνα,	o 18.283
	"ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ σε πρῶτα κιχάνω τῷδ' ἐνὶ χώρῳ,	o 13.228
	χαῖρέ τε καὶ μή μοί τι κακῶ νόῳ ἀντιβολήσας.	o 13.229
	καὶ δέ σοι αὐτῷ θυμὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἴλαος ἔστω.	i 19.178
1670	οἶδα δ' ὅτι σὺ μὲν ἐσθλός, ἐγὼ δὲ σέθεν πολὺ χείρων."	i 20.434
	Αὐτὰρ ὃ ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φώνησέν τε	i 1.333

---

1646 "Ἐκτωρ 1654 ἀλλά μιν 1655 ἔρρεξεν 1660 ἐλιξάμενος

	"ὦ μοι ἀναιδεῖω ἐπειμένε, κερδαλεόφρον,	i 1.149 *
	φθέγγεο, μηδ' ἀκέων ἐπ' ἔμ' ἔρχεο· τίπτε δέ σε χρεώ;	i 10.85
	ἢ τινά που δόλον ἄλλον οἶεα, οὐδέ τί σε χρή.	o 10.380
1675	σχέτλιε, τίπτ' ἔτι μείζον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μήσεα ἔργον;	o 11.474
	ἔρξον ὅπως ἐθέλεις καὶ τοι φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ.	o 13.145
	δαιμόνι', οὔτε τί σε ῥέζω κακὸν οὔτ' ἀγορεύω.	o 18.15
	αἰεὶ τοι τὰ κάκ' ἐστὶ φίλα φρεσὶ 'μυθεύεσθα'.	i 1.107 †
	ἐσθλὸν δ' οὔτε τί πω εἶπας ἔπος οὔτ' ἐτέλεσσας.	i 1.108
1680	νήπυτι', ὡς ἄνοον κραδίην εἶχες 'μενεαίνων'.	i 21.441 * †
	ταῦτα μὲν οὔτω πάντα πεπείρανται· σὺ 'δὲ αἴψα'	o 12.37 †
	'ῥέξον' ὃ τι φρονέεις· τελέσαι δέ σε θυμὸς ἀνάγει.	o 5.89 † *
	πάντα με θαρσαλέως, κύον ἀδδεές, οὗ τι με λήθεις	o 19.91
	'ἔρδων κεν' μέγα ἔργον, ὃ σῆ κεφαλῇ ἀναμάξεις·	o 19.92 *
1685	μήτε τί μοι ψεύδεσσι χαρίζεο μητέ τι θέλγε.	o 14.387
	οὐ γὰρ τοῦνεκ' ἐγὼ σ' 'αἰδήσομαι', οὐδὲ φιλήσω.	o 14.388 @
	αἰεὶ τοι κραδίη πέλεκυς ὡς ἐστὶν ἀτειρής.	i 3.60
	ὡς τοι ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νόσος ἀτάρβητος νόσος ἐστί.	i 3.63 *
	ἢ σ' εὖ γινώσκων προτιόσσομαι· οὐ γὰρ' ἔμελλον	i 22.356 @
1690	πέσειν· ἢ γὰρ σοί γε σιδήρεος ἐν φρεσὶ θυμὸς.	i 22.357
	εὖ νυ τὸ οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς ὃ μοι μόρος ἐνθάδ' ὀλέσθαι.	i 19.421
	ὡς γὰρ θέσφατόν ἐστι· σέθεν δ' ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀλεγίζω	i 8.477
	'μαινομένου', οὐδ' εἴ κε τὰ νείατα πείραθ' ἴκηαι.	i 8.478 †
	τῶν οὗ τίς μ' ἀέκοντα βιήσεται, αἶ κ' ἐθέλοιμι',	o 21.348 @
1695	'πάντα περ' οἶον ἐμόν γε μένος καὶ χεῖρες ἄαπτοι.	i 8.450 *

---

1678 μαντεύεσθα 1680 οὐδὲ νὺ τῶν περ 1681 δ' ἄκουσον 1682 αὐδα 1684  
ἔρδουσα 1686 αἰδέσσομαι 1689 οὐδ' ἄρ 1693 ξωομένης 1694 ἐθέλωμι 1695  
πάντως

	ὡς γὰρ πάντων τόσσον, ὅσοι κατὰ 'σώματ' ἔασι	ο 21.372 †
	'δρηστήρων', 'χείρεσι' βίηφι τε φέρτερος εἶην.	ο 21.373 † @
	οἶσθα μὲν οἶον ἐμόν μένος ἔμπεδον οὐδ' ἐπεικτόν.	ο 19.493
	ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὡς σε ἔοπλα ὀνόσσεσθαι κακότητος.	ο 5.379
1700	σχέτιε, ποικιλομήτα, δόλων ἄτ', οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες	ο 13.293
	δηρὸν ἔτ' ὄψεσθαι λαμπρὸν φάος ἡλείοιο.	ι 5.120
	καὶ σὺ, κακοῖσι δόλοισι κεκασμένη, κερδαλεόφρον,	ι 4.339
	'οὐκέτι τοι' φρένες εἰσὶν ἐναίσιμοι οὔτε νόημα.	ι 24.40 †
	δαιμόνι', οὐ μὲν καλὰ χόλον τόνδ' ἔνθεο θυμῷ.	ι 6.326
1705	μή τινα γ' οὖν οὐτός γε λάβοι χόλος, ὃν σὺ φυλάσσεις.	ι 16.30
	'σοὶ γὰρ' δ' οὐτ' ἄρ νῦν φρένες ἔμπεδοι οὐτ' ἄρ ὀπίσσω	ι 6.352 †
	ἔσονται· τῷ κέν μιν ἐπαυρήσεσθαι οἴω.	ι 6.353
	αὐτῷ σοι μετόπισθ' ἄχος ἔσσεται, οὐδέ τι μῆχος	ι 9.249 *
	ῥεχθέντος κακοῦ ἔστ' ἄκος εὐρεῖν. ('ὡς ἀπόλοιο').	ι 9.250 †
1710	ἀλλ' οὐ μὰν ἔτι δηρὸν ἀπείρητος πόνος ἔσται.	ι 17.41
	τῷ οὐκ ἂν θάνατόν γε δυσηλεγέα προφύγοισθα,	ο 22.325
	ἀψάμενος βρόχον αἰπὺν ἀφ' 'ὑπορόφοιο' μελάθρου.	ο 11.278 * †
	'οὐδέ σε' φεύξεσθαι οἴομαι αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον.	ο 22.67 †
	σοὶ δὲ κακὸς μὲν θυμὸς, ἀποφθινύθουσι δὲ λαοί.	ι 5.643
1715	σοὶ κ' αἴσχος λώβη τε μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλοιτο.	ο 18.225
	τῷ σ' αὖ νῦν οἴω ἀποτισέμεν ὅσσα 'μ' ἔοργας.	ι 21.399 @
	οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ σέο φημὶ χειρότερον βροτὸν ἄλλον.	ι 2.248
	αἰεὶ γὰρ τοι ἔρις τε φίλη πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε.	ι 1.177
	νήπυτι', οὐδὲ νύ πῶ περ ἐπεφράσω ὅσσον ἀρείων	ι 21.410
1720	εὐχομ' ἐγὼν ἔμεναι, ὅτι μοι μένος 'ἀντιφερίζεις';	ι 21.411 @

---

1696 αἰ...δάματα 1697 μνηστήρων...χερσίν τε 1703 ᾧ οὐτ' ἄρ 1705 τινα 1706  
τούτῳ 1709 ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρὶν 1712 ὑπήλοιο 1713 ἀλλά τιν' οὐ 1716 μ' om. OCT  
1720 ἰσοφαρίζεις



	τῶν οὐ τίς μ' ἀέκοντα βιήσεται αἶ κ' ἐθέλοιμι.	ο 21.348
	αἰὲν ἀναδείην, ἐπειμένε, οὐδ' ἂν ἔμοιγε	ι 9.372 *
	τετλαίης κύνεός περ ἔων εἰς ὧπα ιδέσθαι.	ι 9.373 *
	ἄ δεῖλ' ἧ μάλα δὴ σε κιχάνεται αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος."	ι 11.441
1725	ὧς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ὁδᾶξ ἐν χεῖλεσι φύντο.	ο 1.381 *
	αὐτὰρ ὁ παρ λαμπτήρησι φαείνων αἰθομένοισιν	ο 18.343
	ἑστήκειν ἔς πάντας ὀρώμενος· ἄλλα δέ οἱ κῆρ	ο 18.344
	ἄρμαινε' φρεσὶν ἧσιν, ἅ ρ' οὐκ ἀτέλεστα γέγοντο.	ο 18.345 @
 <i>περὶ τῆς κρατήσεως καὶ τοῦ ἐμποιαγοῦ</i>		
	τοὶ δ' ἄρ' ἐπαΐξαντες ἔλον', ἔρυσάν τέ μιν εἴσω·	ο 22.187 *
1730	ἔλσαν δ' ἐν μέσσοισι μετὰ σφίσι πῆμα τιθέντες.	ι 11.413
	πλείοσιν τ' ἐν δεσμοῖσι δέον, μᾶλλον τε 'πέζευν',	ο 12.196 * @
	'ἀλλήλοισι γέλωτα' καὶ εὐφροσύνην 'τιθέοντες'.	ο 20.8 @ †
	ἐν δ' αὐτὸς κίεν ἧσι προθυμίησι πεποιθῶς	ι 2.588
	καρπαλίμως κατὰ ἄστυ· φίλοι δ' ἅμα πάντες ἔποντο	ι 24.327
1735	πόλλ' ὀλοφυρόμενοι ὡς εἰ θανάτῳδε κίοντα.	ι 24.328
	οἱ δ' ἐπελώβευον καὶ ἐκερτόμεον ἐπέεσιν,	ο 2.323
	"τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆς;	ο 24.298
	τίς δὲ σὺ ἐσοῖ, φέριστε, καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων;"	ι 6.123
	ὧς ἄρα τις εἶπεσκεν· ὁ δ' οὐκ ἐμπάζετο μύθων,	ι 4.85 + ο17.488
1740	βαλλόμενος καὶ ἐνισσόμενος τετληότι θυμῷ.	ο 24.163
	'ἐκ δέ κεν' εἴματα ἔσσαν ἐπήρατα, θαῦμα ιδέσθαι.	ο 8.366 †
	ὦδε δέ τις εἶπεσκε νέων ὑπερῆνορέοντων,	ο 2.324
	"κλήρω νῦν πεπάλασθε διαμπερές, ὅς κε λάχησιν	ι 7.171

---

1728 ὄρμαινε 1731 πίζευον 1732 @ ἀλλήλοισι γέλω τε... παρεχοῦσαι 1741 ἀμφὶ δὲ

- παῖδες ὑπέρθυμοι." καὶ ἐπὰ κλήρους ἐβάλοντο, ο 14.209
- 1745 ἄλλος μὲν χλαῖναν ἐρύων, ἄλλος δὲ χιτῶνα. i 22.493 \*
- ἀμφὶ δ' αἶρα χλαῖναν περονήσατο φοινικόεσσαν. i 10.133
- ἔστη δ' ἐν μέσσοισι· τάφος δ' ἔλεν ἄνδρα ἕκαστον. ο 24.441 \*
- ὣς ὁ μὲν εἰστήκει, τοὶ δ' ἄκριτα πόλλ' ἀγόρευον. ο 8.505
- φύζαν ('δ' οἷς) ἐτάροισι κακὴν βάλον, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη ο 17.438 \*
- 1750 στῆναι ἐναντίβιον· περὶ γὰρ κακὰ πάντοθεν ἔστη ο 17.439
- σχέτλια ἔργ' ὀρώωσιν· ἀμηχανίη δ' ἔχε θυμόν. ο 9.295 \*
- πένθει δ' ἀτλήτῳ βεβολήατο πάντες ἄριστοι, i 9.3
- πάπτηνεν δὲ ἕκαστος ὅπη φύγοι αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον. ο 22.43
- οἱ δ' ἅμ' αἰστώθησαν ἀολλέες, οὐδέ τις αὐτῶν ο 10.259
- 1755 ἐξεφάνη· δηρὸν δὲ καθήμενοι ἐσκοπίαζον, ο 10.260
- πόλλον ἀφισταότες. ὁ δ' ἐνὶ μέσῳ ἄλγε' ἔπασχε. i 17.375 \*

*περὶ τῆς ἀρνήσεως τοῦ Πέτρου*

- αὐτὰρ ὄγ' ἐν προδόμοισι καθῆστο γέρον ἀλιθέρης cf. ο 2.157
- ὅς οἱ κήδιστος ἐτάρων ἦν κεδνότατός τε, ο 10.225
- ἐρπύζων παρὰ πυρκαϊήν, ἀδινὰ στεναχίζων. i 23.225
- 1760 ἄμωξεν δ' ὁ γέρον, κεφαλὴν δ' ὁ γε κόψατο χερσίν, i 22.33
- ὑπόσ' ἀνασχόμενος, 'μέγ' ἀνοιμώξας' ἐγεγώνει. i 22.34 †
- οὐ πέρι μὲν πρόφρων κραδίη καὶ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ i 10.244
- ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι, φίλει δέ ἐ' ἔξοχα πάντων'. i 10.245 †
- ἠρίνθη δέ οἱ ἦτορ 'καὶ' οὐ δύνατο προσαμῦναι. i 16.509
- 1765 στη δ' ἐκτὸς κλισίης, τάχα δ' εἴσιδεν ἔργον ἀεικέες. i 14.13
- ἄσσον δ' οὐκέτ' ἔπειτα δυνήσατο οἶο ἄνακτος ο 17.303
- ἐλθέμεν· αὐτὰρ ὁ νόσφιν ἰδὼν ἀπομόρξατο δάκρυ. ο 17.304

---

1761 μέγα δ' οἰμώξας 1763 Πάλλας Ἀθήνη 1764 ὁ τ'

	ἦν δ' ἐγρηγορών. ταῖ δ' ἐκ μεγάρου γυναικες	ο 20.6 †
	ἦσαν, αἱ δ' ὀρηστήρσιν' ἐμισγέσκοντο πάρος περ.	ο 20.7 †
1770	τοῦ δ' ὀρίνετο θυμός ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισι.	ο 20.9
	ἄψ' δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' οὐδὸν ἰὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο. τοὶ δ' ἴσαν εἴσω	ο 18.110 @
	ἠδὲ γελῶντες καὶ δεικανόωντ' ἐπέεσσι.	ο 18.111
	καὶ τότε δὴ τις ἔειπε γυναικῶν, ἧ σάφα ἦδη	ο 2.108
	ἔρδειν ἔργα βίαια κακορραφίησι νόσιο	ο 2.236
1775	οὐλομένη, ἧ τ' αἰὲν ἀήσυλα ἔργα μέμηλεν,	ι 5.876 *
	δεινὸν ἀποπνεύουσα πυρὸς μένος αἰθομένοιο,	ι 6.182
	θάρσος ἄητον ἔχουσα, μέγας δέ ἐ θυμὸς ἀνήκεν.	ι 21.395 *
	"Μή τις ἔτι πρόφρων ἀγανὸς καὶ ἦπιος ἔστω.	ο 2.230
	ἐγγὺς ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐμόν γε μάλιστ' ἐσεμάσσατο θυμόν,	ι 20.425
1780	ὃς μοι ἐταῖρον ἔκοψε' τετιμένον, 'οὐκ ἀπούρας'."	ι 20.426 †
	δεινὰ δ' ὀμοκλήσασ' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα,	ι 20.448 *
	"ὦ γέρον, οὐχ ἐκάς οὗτος ἀνὴρ, 'μάλα' δ' εἴσεαι αὐτός,	ο 2.40 @
	'ἦ' τέ οἱ ἐξ ἀρχῆς πατρώϊος ἦσθα ἐταῖρος."	ο 2.254 † *
	"ὦς ἔφατ', αὐτὰρ 'τοῦδε' κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ.	ο 4.481 †
1785	θαύμαζεν δ' ὁ γεραίός, ὅπως ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι.	ο 3.373
	οὐδέ τι ἐκφάσθαι δύναιτο ἔπος, ἰέμενός περ,	ο 10.246
	κῆρ ἄχει μεγάλῳ 'βεβλημένος'. ἐν δέ οἱ ὅσσε	ο 10.247 @
	δακρυόφιν πίμπλαντο, γόον δ' ὤϊετο θυμός.	ο 10.248
	πολλὰ δὲ μερμήριζε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν	ο 20.10
1790	ὔστατα καὶ πύματα, κραδίη δέ οἱ ἔνδον ὑλάκτει.	ο 20.13
	αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ἠρνεῖτο στερεῶς, ἐπὶ δ' ὄρκον ὀμοσσεύει.	ι 23.42
	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεύξε δόλον κεχολωμένη 'ἦρωϊ',	ο 8.276 * †

1768 κείτ' 1769 μνηστήρσιν 1771 δ' ὁ γε 1780 ἔπεφνε...οὐδ' ἄν ἔτι δὴν 1782  
τάχα 1783 οἶ 1784 ἐμοί γε 1787 βεβλημένος 1792 Ἄρει

	βῆ ρ' ἴμεν ἐς θάλαμον, ὅθι οἱ φίλα δέμνια κείτο.	ο 8.277
	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ρ' ἐκτός θυράων ἦν ἡδὲ καὶ αὐλῆς,	ο 21.191 *
1795	δὴ ῥα τότε ᾤμωξέν τε καὶ ᾧ πεπλήγετο μηρῶ χερσὶ καταπρηνέσσι. δάκρυα δὲ ἔκβαλε θερμὰ, ὅττι ῥά οἱ πάμπρωτα θεόν γ' ἤρνήσατο πάντων. κλαῖεν δ' ἐν 'κονίησι' καθήμενος, οὐδέ νυ οἱ κῆρ ἦθελ' ἔπι ζῶειν καὶ ὄραν φάος ἡέλισιο.	i 12.162 cf. ο 19.467 + 362 i 17.568 † ο 4.539 * † ο 4.540
1800	ἀμφοτέρησι δὲ χερσὶν ἔλων κόνιν αἰθαλόεσσαν, χεύατο κάκ κεφαλῆς, χάριεν δ' ἤσχυνε πρόσωπον. δὴ τότε μιν προσέειπε γέρων ἄλιος νημερτής· "Ὡς οὐκ αἰνότερον καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο γυναικός, ἦτις δὴ τοιαῦτα μετὰ χερσὶν ἔργα βάληται."	ο 24.316 i 18.24 ο 4.542 * ο 11.427 ο 11.428
1805	ἦ ρ' ὁ γέρων, πολιὰς δ' ἄρ' ἀνὰ τρίχας ἔλκετο χερσὶ, αὐλῆς ἐκτός ἐών· οἱ δ' ἔνδοθι μῆτιν ὕφανον νωλεμέως· ἀτὰρ αὐτὸς ἐλίσσετο ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ὥς δ' ὅτε γαστέρ' ἀνὴρ πολέος πυρός αἰθομένοιο ἐμπλείην κνίσσης τε καὶ αἵματος, ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα	i 22.77 ο 4.678 ο 20.24 ο 20.25 ο 20.26
1810	αἰόλλη, μάλα δ' ᾧκα λιλαίεται ὀπτηθῆναι, ὥς ἄρ' ὁ γ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ἐλίσσετο μερμηρίζων. ἄψ δ' ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο, χάσατο δ' αἰνῶς. δαιτυμόνες δ' ἀνὰ δώματα ἴσαν θείου βασιλῆος, ἀρχοὶ μνηστήρων, ἀρετῆ δ' ἔσαν ἔσοχ' ἄριστοι.	ο 20.27 ο 20.28 i 13.165 ο 4.621 @ ο 4.629
	<i>περὶ τῆς πρὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ μαστιγώσεως</i>	
1815	'Ηὼς μὲν κροκόπεπλος ἐκίδνατο πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν οἴκτρ' ὀλοφυρομένη, θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσα.	i 8.1 ο 10.409 *

---

1796 ἠρήσατο 1798 ψαμαθοῖσι 1813 δ' ἐς

	ἡέριοι δ' ἄρα τοί γε κακὴν ἔριδα προφέροντο·	i 3.7 *
	ἐν πεδίῳ δ' ἴσταντο διαρραῖσαι μεμαῶτες.	i 2.473
	χεροὶ δ' ἔχον ῥόπαλα παγχάλκεα, αἰὲν ἀαγῆ.	o 11.575 *
1820	αὐτίκα δὲ σφήκεσσιν ἐοικότες ἐξεχέοντο	i 16.259
	εἰνοδίους, οὓς παῖδες ἐριδιμαίνωσιν ἔθοντες,	i 16.260
	αἰεὶ κερτομέοντες, ὁδῶ ἐπὶ οἰκί' ἔχοντες',	i 16.261 @
	νηπίαχοι· ξυνὸν δὲ κακὸν πολέεσσι τιθεῖσι.	i 16.262
	ἄζηχῆς δ' ὄρυμαγδὸς ἐπήϊεν ἐρχομένοισιν.	i 17.741
1825	πέπληγόν θ' ἰμάσιν, ὁμόκλησάν τ' ἐπέεσσιν.	i 23.363
	οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἴσαν, ὡς εἶ τε πυρὶ χθὼν πᾶσα νέμοιτο.	i 2.780
	εἰς ἔχετον βασιλῆα, βροτῶν δηλήμονα πάντων.	o 18.116
	ὃς δ' ἦ τοι τὸ πρὶν μὲν ἀναίνετο ἔργον ἀεικές·	o 3.265 *
	κτεῖναι μὲν ῥ' ἄλλεινε, σεβάσσατο γὰρ τό γε 'μύθῳ'.	i 6.167 †
1830	αὐτίκα κήρυκες μὲν ὕδωρ ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἔχευαν	i 9.174
	πρῶτον, ἔπειτα δ' ἔνιψ' ὕδατος καλῆσι ῥοῆσι.	i 16.229
	καὶ σφεας φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·	i 4.284
	"ὦ φίλοι, οὐκ ἂν ἔγώ γε κατακτείνειν ἐθέλοιμι.	o 16.400
	ἀργαλέος γὰρ τ' ἐστὶ θεὸς βροτῶ ἀνδρὶ δαμῆνα,	o 4.397
1835	ὅς περ θνητὸς ἔη' καὶ οὐ τόσα μῆδεα οἶδε.	i 18.363 *
	ἀλλὰ τίη νῦν οὗτος ἀνάτιος ἄλγεα πάσχει,	i 20.297
	μὰν' ἔνεκ' ἀλλοτρίων ἀχέων, κεχαρισμένα δ' αἰεὶ	i 20.298
	δῶρα 'θεὸς γε' δίδωσιν, ὃς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχησι;	i 20.299 *
	μὴ ἀγαθῶ περ ἐόντι 'νεμεσσηθῶμέν' οἱ ἡμεῖς,	i 24.53 @
1840	ἀλλ' ἀναχασσώμεσθα, 'θεοῦ' δ' ἀλεώμεθα μῆνιν.	i 7.264 * + 5.34 †
	οὐ γὰρ πως πάντεσσι θεὸς φαίνοιτο ἐναργής."	o 16.161 *
	"ὦς ἄρα φωνήσας ἀπεβήσατο, τὸν δὲ λίπ' αὐτοῦ,	i 2.35
	δῆμον ὑποδδείσας· δὴ γὰρ κεχολώατο λίην.	o 16.425

---

1822 ἔχοντας 1829 θυμῶ 1835 τ' ἐστὶ 1838 θεοῖσι 1839 νεμεσσηθῶμέν 1840 Διός

	δῆσε δ' ὀπίσσω χεῖρας ἐϋτμήτοισιν ἰμάσι.	i 21.30
1845	πεπλήγει δ' ἀγορήθεν ἀεικέσσι πληγήσιν. σμῶδιξ δ' αἱματόεσσα μεταφρένου ἐξυπανέστη.	i 2.264 * i 2.267
	ἐς δ' ἦλθον δρησθηρες ἀγήνορες· οἱ μὲν ἔπειτα κεκλόμενοι καθ' ὄμιλον ἐπ' αὐτῷ πάντες ἔβησαν, κάρτεϊ τε σθένει τε πεποιθότες ἠνορέη τε	o 20.160 i 11.460 i 17.329 *
1850	πλήθει τε σφετέρῳ, καὶ ὑπερδέα δῆμον ἔχοντες. οὐδ' ὄπιδα τρομέουσι θεοῦ· μεμιάσιν γὰρ ἦδη. οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ πόλιος κατέβαν, τάχα δ' ἀγρὸν ἴκοντο τείχεος ἔκτοσθεν', μέγα δέ σφισι φαίνετο ἔργον.	i 17.330 * o 20.215 o 24.205 i 12.416 †
	<i>περὶ τῆς σταυράσεως</i>	
	ἔστηκε ξύλον αὖτον ὅσον τ' ὄργυι' ὑπὲρ αἴης,	i 23.327
1855	ἢ δρυὸς ἢ πεύκης· τὸ μὲν οὐ καταπύθεται ὄμβρῳ. ἀνδρὸς μὲν τόδε σῆμα πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος. τόσσον ἔην μήκος, τόσσον πάχος εἰσοράσθαι. σειρήν δὲ πλεκτήν ἐξ αὐτοῦ πειρήναντες εἴρυσαν, ἠνορέη πίσυνοι καὶ κάρτεϊ χειρῶν,	i 23.328 i 7.89 o 9.324 o 22.175 *
1860	δήμιοι, οἳ κατ' ἀγῶνας ἐϋ πρήσσεσκον ἕκαστα. νήπιοι, οἱ δ' ἄρα δὴ τάδε 'μήδεα' μηχανόωντο. 'δρηστήρες' δ' ἐτέρωθεν ὀμόκλεον ἐν μεγάροισι. ἴθυσαν δὲ 'λύκοισιν' εἰοκότες ὠμοφάγοισιν. ἀρνεῖῳ μιν ἔγωγε εἴσκω πηγεσιμάλλῳ	o 8.259 i 8.177 † o 22.211 † i 17.725 + 5.782 † i 3.197
1865	ὅς τ' οἰῶν μέγα πῶϋ διέρχεται ἀργεννάων ἀρνεῖός γὰρ ἔην μήλων ὄχ' ἄριστος ἀπάντων.	i 3.198 o 9.432

---

1853 ἔντοσθεν 1861 τείχεα 1862 μνηστήρες 1863 κύνεσσι

	ἐν δ' αὐτὸς κίεν ἦσι προθυμίησι πεποιθώς.	i 2.588
	δεσμῷ δ' ἀργαλέῳ δέδετο, κρατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχων.	o 15.232 @
	σὺν δὲ πόδας χεῖράς τε δέον κεκοτηότι θυμῷ.	o 22.189 + 477
1870	ἔς μέσσον δ' ἄναγον· τῷ δ' ἄμφω χεῖρας ἀνέσχων	o 18.89 *
	καρπαλίμως, ἀπὸ δὲ χλοῖναν θέτο φοινικόεσσαν.	o 14.500
	Ἦμος δ' ἥλιος μέσον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβεβήκει,	i 8.68
	δεξάμενοι δ' ἄρα τοί γε διαστάντες τανύουσι	i 17.391
	ἄσταυροῖσιν πυκνοῖσι' διαμπερές ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα	o 14.11 †
1875	γυμνὸν, ἀτάρ τοι εἴματ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισι κέοντο,	i 22.510 *
	ὀρθὸν ἐν ἰστοπέδῃ· ἐκ δ' αὐτοῦ πείρατ' ἀνήψαν'	o 12.179 @
	ὑψι μάλα μεγάλως· ἐπὶ δ' ἴαχε λαὸς ὄπισθε.	i 17.723
	ὥς ὁ μὲν αὐθι λέλειπτο, ταθεῖς ὀλοῶ ὑπὸ δεσμῷ	o 22.200
	μεσσηγὺς γαίης τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος,	i 5.769
1880	ἄρη ἐν εἰαρινῇ, ὅτε τ' ἤματα μακρὰ πέλονται·	o 18.367
	ὥς κεν δηθὰ ζῶος ἑὼν χαλέπ' ἄλγεα πάσχη.	o 22.177
	οὐδέ τι κινήσαι μελέων ἦν οὐδ' ἀναεῖραι,	o 8.298
	οὔτε στηρίξαι ποσὶν ἔμπεδον οὔτ' ἐπιβῆναι.	o 12.434
	ἰδνώθη δ' ὀπίσω ὁ δ' ἀπὸ χθονὸς ὑψὸς ἀερθεῖς.	o 8.375 *
1885	καὶ τότε δὴ γίγνωσκον ὃ τ' οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλοντο.	o 8.299
	οἱ δ' ἐπελώβευον καὶ ἐκερτόμεον ἐπέεσσιν.	o 2.323
	αὐτὰρ ὁ θυμὸν ἔχων ὄν καρτερόν, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ,	i 5.806
	τρὶς μὲν ἔπειτ' ἦυσεν ὄσον κεφαλή χάδε φωτός.	i 11.462
	στεῦτο δὲ διψάων, πείειν δ' οὐκ ἤθελ' ἐλέσθαι·	o 11.584 †
1890	χείλεα μὲν τε δίην', ὑπερῶην δ' οὐκ ἐδίηεν.	i 22.495
	ὦδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκε νέων ὑπερηνορέοντων,	o 2.324
	"νήπιός εἰς, ὧ ξεῖνε, λίην τόσον ἤε' χαλίφρων,	o 4.371 @

---

1868 ἐν 1874 σταυρούς δ' ἐκτὸς ἔλασσε 1876 ἀνήπτων 1878 ἐνὶ 1899 εἶχεν 1892  
ἠδὲ

	ἤε ἐκὼν μεθειῖς, καὶ τέρπεαι ἄλγεα πάσχων;	ο 4.372
	εἰ μὲν δὴ θεὸς ἐσσί, θεοῖό τε ἔκλυες ἀυδῆς,	ο 4.831
1895	καὶ πού τις δοκέεις μέγας ἔμμεναι ἠδὲ κραταός,	ο 18.382
	οὔνεκα παρ παύροισι καὶ οὐκ ἀγαθοῖσιν ὀμιλεῖς.	ο 18.383
	ἀλλὰ σὺ πέρ μοι εἶπέ, θεὸς δὲ 'τὰ' πάντα ἴσησιν.	ο 4.468 * †
	ἔρξον ὃ περ δὴ τοι νόος ὀτρύνει καὶ ἀνάγει.	cf. i 15.148
	καὶ σὺ, φίλος, μάλα γὰρ σ' ὀρώω καλὸν τε μέγαν τε,	ο 3.199
1900	ἄλκιμος ἔσσ', ἵνα τίς σε καὶ ὀπιγόνων ἐϋ εἴπη.	ο 3.200
	'εἶξον γ' ὀπη σε κραδίη θυμὸς τε κελεύει.	ο 15.339 †
	αὐτὸν μὲν σε πρῶτα σάω, καὶ φράζεο θυμῷ	ο 17.595
	εἰ ἔτεδὸν δὴ πάντα τελευτήσεις ὄσ' ὑπέστης.	i 13.375
	ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν κατάβηθι καὶ ἄψ ἔρχευ μέγαρόνδε·	ο 23.20
1905	'οἶδέ' τοι ἐκτελέσουσιν ὑπόσχεσιν ἦν περ ὑπέστην.	i 2.286 †
	καὶ κέ τοι ἡμεῖς ταυτά γ' ὑποσχόμενοι τελέσαμεν.	i 13.377
	ἦτοι μὲν γὰρ νῶϊ πολέας ὠμόσσαμεν ὄρκους,	i 20.313
	ἔξιν' οὔτω γὰρ κέν τοι ἐϋκλείη τ' ἀρετὴ τε	ο 14.402 *
	εἶη ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἅμα τ' αὐτίκα καὶ μετέπειτα.	ο 14.403
1910	ᾧ πόποι ἦ ῥ' ἀγαθὸς περ ἐὼν ὑπέροπλον ἔειπες."	i 15.185 *
<i>περὶ τοῦ ἑκατοντάρχου</i>		
	ᾧδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν,	i 7.201
	"κείνου μὲν τοι ὄδ' υἱὸς ἐτήτυμος, ὡς ἀγορεύει.	ο 4.157 *
	τοίου γὰρ καὶ πατρός, ὃ καὶ πεπνυμένα βάζει.	ο 4.206 *
	ἀλλὰ σαόφρων ἐστί, νεμεσσᾶται δ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ.	ο 4.158
1915	τῷ δε μάλ' ἐν πείσῃ κραδίη μένε τετληυῖα."	ο 20.23
	Αἶψα δ' ἐὼν πατέρα προσεφώνεεν ἐγγυὸς ἐόντα,	ο 22.355

---

1897 τε 1901 πέμπει δ' 1905 οὐδέ



	"ὦ πάτερ, ἢ μέγα θαῦμα τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώμια. ἴσχεο, μηδὲ περισθενόων δηλήσειο τούσδε, τάων, οἳ δὴ ἐμῆ κεφαλῇ κατ' ὀνειδέα χεῦαν·	ο 19.36 cf. ο 22.367 + 368 ο 22.463 *
1920	οἳ τέ μ' ἀτιμάζουσι καὶ οἳ 'νηλιτεῖς' εἴσι. οἳ τ' ἐμὲ ὑβρίζοντες ἀτάσθαλα μηχανόωνται· νῦν δέ μ' ἀτιμάζουσι κακὰ χροῖ εἴματ' ἔχοντα. νῦν αὖ παῖδ' ἀγαπητὸν ἀποκτεῖναι μεμάασιν. ἀλλὰ 'πάτερ', τόδε πέρ μοι ἐπακρήνηον ἐέλδωρ,	ο 22.418 * @ ο 3.207 * ο 14.506 ο 5.18 i 8.242
1925	αὐτούς δὴ περ ἕασον ὑπεκφυγέειν καὶ ἀλύξαι. ἴσχεο, μηδὲ βίην τίσας ὑπερηνορέωντων ἀνδρῶν δρηστήρων κεχολωμένος, οἳ 'με ἔτισαν'. ἄλλης μὲν λώβης τε καὶ αἴσχεος οὐκ ἐπαδευεῖς. ἤδη γὰρ τετέλεστο ἅ μοι φίλος ἦθελε θυμός."	i 8.243 cf. ο 23.31 ο 22.369 † i 13.622 ο 13.40 *
1930	"Ὡς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντα τέλος θανάτοιο κάλυψε. ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ῥεθέων πταμένη Ἄϊδος δὲ βεβήκει, τῆλε μάλ', ἦχι βάθιστον ἀπὸ χθονός ἐστι βάραθρον, τῶν ἄλλων ψυχᾶς ἰδέειν κατατεθνηώτων. ἔνθα σιδήρεά τε πύλα καὶ χάλχεος οὐδός,	i 22.361 i 22.362 i 8.14 ο 11.567 i 8.15
1935	καρτερός· ἔρρηξεν δὲ πύλας καὶ μακρὸν ὄχηα. οἳ δ' αἰεὶ περὶ νεκρὸν ὀμίλειον, ὡς ὅτε μυῖαι σταθμῶ 'ἔπα' βρομέωσι περιγλαγέας κατὰ πέλλας ᾧρη ἐν εἰαρινῇ, ὅτε γλάγος ἄγγεα δεύει. ἄλλος δ' αὐτ' εἶπεσκε νέων ὑπερηνορέωντων,	i 13.124 i 16.641 i 16.642 † i 16.643 ο 21.401
1940	"ὦ μοι, ξεῖνε, τίη τοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ τοῦτο νόημα ἔπλετο; ἦ σύ γε πάγχυ λιλαίεαι αὐτόθ' ὀλέσθαι, εἰπέ μοι ἢ ἐκὼν ὑποδάμνασαι ἢ σέ γε λαοὶ ἐχθαίρουσ' ἀνά δήμον, ἐπισπόμενοι 'μένει σφῶ',	ο 15.326 ο 15.327 ο 3.214 ο 3.215 †

---

1920 νήλιτιδες 1924 Ζεῦ 1927 μνηστηρων...οἳ ἔκειρον 1932 βέρεθρον 1937 ἔνι  
1943 θεοῦ ὀμφῆ

	τίς δ' οἶδ' εἶ κέ ποτέ σφι βίας ἀποτίσσαι ἔλθῶν.	ο 3.216 @
1945	εἶπέ μοι εἰρομένῳ νημερτέα μηδ' ἐπιτεύσης·	ο 15.263
	εἰ μὲν δὴ θεὸς ἐσσί, θεοῖό τε ἔκλυες αὐδῆς,	ο 4.831
	εἰ δὴ τοι σοῦ πατρὸς ἐνέστακτα μένος ἦύ,	ο 2.271
	οἶος ἐκεῖνος ἔην τελέσσαι ἔργον τε ἔπος τε.	ο 2.272
	ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν κατάβηθι καὶ ἄψ ἔρχευ μέγαρόνδε.	ο 23.20
1950	ἴσῳσον νῦν, ἵνα πάντες ἐπιγνώσῃ καὶ οἶδε,	ο 18.30 †
	εἶ κεν ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ τυπεῖς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσης.	ι 11.433 †
	ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ καὶ δουρὸς ἀκωκῆς ἡμετέροιο	ι 21.60
	γεύσεο· ὄφρα ἴδαμα ἐνὶ φρεσὶ ἠδὲ δαείῳ,	ι 21.61 *
	ἦ γ' ἄρ' ὁμῶς καὶ κεῖθεν ἐλεύσεαι ἦ σέ κ' ἐρύξει	ι 21.62 *
1955	γῆ φυσίζοος, ἦ τε κατὰ κρατερόν περ ἐρύκει."	ι 21.63
	"Ὡς ἄρα τις εἶπεσκε καὶ οὐτήσασκε παραστάς·	ι 22.375
	πάντα δ' ἀπὸ πλευρᾶς χρόα ἔργαθεν, οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔασε.	ι 11.437 *
	τῆ ρά μιν οὐτα τυχῶν, διὰ δὲ χρόα καλὸν ἔδαψεν.	ι 5.858
	εἶθαρ δ' ἄμβροτον αἶμα κατέρρειεν ἐξ ὠτειλῆς,	ι 5.870 †
1960	νηπενθές τ' ἄχολόν τε, κακῶν τ' ἐπίληθον ἀπάντων.	ο 4.221
	τοῦτό νυ καὶ γέρας οἶον οἴζυροῖσι βροτοῖσι.	ο 4.197
	οὐ ποτέ τοι θάνατον προτιόσσετο θυμὸς ἀγῆνωρ,	ο 14.219 *
	ὅς τὸ καταβρόξειεν, ἐπὶν κρητῆρι μιγείη,	ο 4.222
	οὐκ ἂν ἐφημέριός γε βάλῃ κατὰ δάκρυ παρειῶν,	ο 4.223 †
1965	οὐδ' εἶ οἱ κατατεθναίῃ μήτηρ τε πατήρ τε,	ο 4.224
	ἠὲ κασίγνητος ὁμογάστριος ἠὲ καὶ υἱός.	ι 24.47 *
	τοῖσιν δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα θεὸς τέρατα προυφαίνει,	ο 12.394 *†
	σμερδαλέα κτυπέων· τοὺς δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ἤρει.	ι 7.479
	αὐτίκα δ' ἐβρόντησεν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστεροέντος.	ο 20.103 + 113
1970	βροντήσας δ' ἄρα δεινὸν ἀφήκ' ἀργήτα κεραυνόν.	ι 8.133

---

1944 ἀποτίσεται 1950 ζῶσαι 1951 ἦ 1959 δεῖξεν 1964 οὐ κεν 1967 τέρατα

	ἀστράγας δὲ μάλα μεγάλ' ἔκτυπε, τὴν δὲ τίναξε	i 17.595
	γαῖαν ἀπειρεσίην ὀρέων τ' αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα.	i 20.58
	ἀμφὶ δὲ σάλπιγξεν μέγας οὐρανός, αἶε δὲ 'χθών'.	i 21.388 †
	σὺν δ' Εὐρύς τε Νότος τ' ἔπεσον Ζέφυρός τε δυσαιῆς	o 5.295
1975	καὶ Βορέης αἰθρηγενέτης, μέγα κῦμα κυλίνδων	o 5.296
	λαίλαπι θεσπεσίη, σὺν δὲ νεφέεσσι κάλυψε	o 12.314
	γαῖαν ὁμοῦ καὶ πόντον· ὀρώρει δ' οὐρανόθεν νύξ	o 5.294
	θεσπεσίη. ἐπὶ δ' αὐτὸ δεινὸς τρόμος ἔλλαβε πάντας.	cf. o 24.49 *
	λαοὶ δ' ἤρῃσαντο 'θεῶ ἰδὲ' χεῖρας ἀνέσχον.	i 7.177 *
1980	πάντες δ' ἐσσειόντο πόδες πολυπίδακος Ἰδης,	i 20.59
	οὐρεὰ τε σκιδόντα θάλασσά τε ἠγήεσσα,	i 1.157
	καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ γαῖα καὶ οἱ ὑπένερθε καμώντες	i 3.278 *
	πάντοθεν ἐκ κευθμῶν, οὐδ' ἠγνοίησαν ἄνακτα	i 13.28 *
	βαλλόμενον καὶ ἐνισσόμενον τετληῶτι θυμῷ.	o 24.163 *
1985	ἔδεισεν δ' ὑπένερθεν ἄναξ ἐνέρων Ἀϊδωνεύς,	i 20.61
	δείσας δ' ἐκ θρόνου ἄλτο καὶ ἴαχε 'μάλα λιγείως'·	i 20.62 †
	"ὦ μοι!" ἄφαρ δ' αἶξε 'θύρας' καὶ ἀπῶσεν ὀχῆας.	i 24.446 †
	ἦλθον ἔπειθ' ὅσα φύλλα καὶ ἄνθεα γίγνεται ὄρη	o 9.51
	ψυχὰ ὑπὲξ 'Ἐρέβους' νεκύων κατατεθηγῶτων,	o 11.37 @
1990	ἀχνύμεναι· περὶ δ' αὐτὸν ἀγηγέραθ' ὄσσαι 'ἄρισται'.	o 11.388 * @
	ἦὔσεν δὲ διαπρύσιον 'νεκύεσσι' γεγωνάς,	i 8.227 †
	"Καρπαλίμως ἔρχεσθε· ἐγὼ δ' ὀδὸν ἠγεμονεύσω·	o 6.261
	ἔνθα δὲ πατρὸς ἐμοῦ τέμενος τεθαλυῖά τ' ἀλαφή."	o 6.293
	"Ὡς ἄρα φωνήσας ἠγήσατο· τοὶ δ' ἅμ' ἔποντο.	i 13.833
1995	ὦδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον,	o 13.167

---

1973 Ζεὺς 1979 θεοῖσι 1986 μή οἱ ὑπέρθε 1987 πᾶσιν...θύρας 1989 Ἐρέβους  
1990 ἅμ' αὐτῷ 1991 Δαναοῖσι

	"ὦ φίλοι, ἡ μέγα ἔργον ὑπερφιάλως ἐτελέσθη.	ο 4.663
	ἡ μεγάλ' ἐβρόντησεν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος	ο 20.103 + 113
	ὃς πᾶσι θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανατοῖσι ἀνάσσει,	ι 12.242
	ὄφρ' ἀνδρῶν τίσαιτο βίας' ὑπερηνορέοντων,	ο 23.31 @
2000	λώβην τινύμενος θυμαλγέα καὶ κακὰ ἔργα	ο 24.326
	εἵνεκα 'δὴ' ξείνιο τάδ' αἰδοίοιο τέτυκται."	ο 8.544 †
	ἐν δ' ἔπεσ' Ὠκεανῶ λαμπρὸν φάος ἡλίιοιο,	ι 8.485
	ἔλκον νύκτα μέλαιναν ἐπὶ ζείδωρον ἄρουραν,	ι 8.486
	ἡέλιος θ' ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾷ καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούει,	ι 3.277 *
2005	οὐ τε καὶ ὀξύτατον πέλεται φάος εἰσοράασθαί,	ι 14.345
	οὐρανοῦ ἐξαπόλωλε, κακὴ δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν ἀχλύς.	ο 20.357
	ἐνθά κε λοιγὸς ἔην καὶ ἀμήχανα ἔργα γέροντο.	ι 8.130
 <i>περὶ τοῦ πνιγμοῦ τοῦ Ἰούδα</i>		
	ἀλλ' ἡ τοι κείνος μὲν ἐπισμυγερῶς ἀπέτισεν,	ο 3.195
	ὃς μέγα ἔργον ἔρεξεν ἀτασθαλίησιν (ἔησιν),	ο 24.458 * @
2010	ἀψάμενος βρόχον αἰπὺν ἀφ' ὑψηλοῖο μελάθρου	ο 11.278 *
	νήπιος, οὐδέ τί οἱ τό γε ἐπήρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον	ι 2.873
	'ὄς' ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος ὅτις τοιαυτὰ γε ῥέζοι.	ο 1.47 †
	τοίην γὰρ κεφαλὴν ἔνεκ' αὐτοῦ γαῖα κατέσχευ.	ο 11.549 *
	'πάντας' δὲ τρόμος αἰνὸς ὑπήλυθε γυῖα ἐκάστου.	ι 20.44 †
2015	νεκρὸν δὲ προλιπόντες ἐπέτρεσαν 'ἄλλυδις ἄλλος'.	ι 17.275 †
	πρὸς δὲ πόλιν τρωπῶντο λιλαιόμενοι βιότιοιο.	ο 24.536
	πᾶσαι δ' αἰγύνντο πύλα, 'ἔς' δ' ἔσσυτο λαὸς,	ι 2.809 †
	πεζοὶ θ' ἰπτῆές τε· πολὺς δ' ὀρυμαγδὸς ὀρώρει.	ι 2.810
	οἱ δ' ἐφέβοντο κατὰ μέγαρα, 'ὡς βοῦς' ἀγελαῖαι.	ο 22.299 †

---

1996 ὦ πόποι 1999 βίην 2001 γὰρ 2009 κακῆσι 2012 ὡς 2014 Τρῶας 2015  
οὐδέ τιν' αὐτῶν 2017 ἐκ 2019 βόες ὡς

2020	τόφρ' ἄλλοι 'πάντες' πεφοβημένοι ἦλθον ὀμίλῳ ἀσπᾶσιοι προτὶ ἄστυ, πόλις δ' ἔμπλητο ἀλέντων. καὶ τότε δὴ 'ῥ' ἔσχοντο' βίης λῦσαί τε 'κέλευον', νήπιοι ἀγροιώτῃα, ἐφημέρια φρονέοντες, οἱ μέγα ἔργον ἔρεξαν ἀϊδρείησι νόσιοι.	i 21.606 † i 21.607 o 4.422 * † o 21.85 o 11.272 *
2025	καὶ γὰρ δὴ νῦν φῶτα κατέκτανον, ὅς μὲγ' ἄριστος. ὡς δὴ σφιν καὶ πᾶσιν ὀλέθρου πείρατ' ἐφήπτο. οἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἐσκίδναντο ἐὰ πρὸς δάμαθ' ἕκαστος. οἱ δὲ μάλ' ἐτρόμεον καὶ ἐδείδισαν, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη. 'δρηστῆρες' δ' ἀνεχώρησαν μεγάρῳ μυχόνδε.	o 22.29 * o 22.33 o 2.258 i 7.151 o 22.270 †
<i>περὶ τοῦ ἐπιταφίου θρήνου</i>		
2030	'τόνδ' ἄρ' ἔπειθ' ὑποδύντε δῶ εἰρήρες ἑταῖροι, κάτθεσαν ἐν λεχέεσσι· φίλοι δ' ἀμφέσταν ἑταῖροι μυρόμενοι, θαλερὸν δὲ κατεΐβετο δάκρυ παρειῶν. ἀμφὶ δὲ μιν φᾶρος καλὸν βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνα. ἐν λεχέεσσι δὲ θέντες ἕανῶ λιτὴ κάλυψαν	i 8.332 † i 18.233 i 24.794 i 24.588 i 18.352
2035	ἐς πόδας ἐκ κεφαλῆς, καθύπερθε δὲ φάρεϊ λευκῶ. ἐν δ' ὠτειλάς πλησαν ἀλείφατος ἐννεῶροιο. 'ἀλλὰ γὰρ' οὐδέ τι οἱ χρῶς σήπετο, οὐδέ μιν εὐλαὶ ἔσθουσ', αἱ ῥά τε φῶτας ἀρηϊφάτους κατέδουσιν. αἰεὶ τῶδ' ἔσται χρῶς ἔμπεδον, ἦ καὶ ἄρειον.	i 18.353 i 18.351 i 24.414 * † i 24.415 i 19.33 *
2040	μήτηρ δ', ἦ μιν ἔτικτε καὶ ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἐόντα, ἀμφ' αὐτῷ χυμένη λίγ' ἐκώκυε, χερσὶ δ' ἄμυσσε στήθεά τ' ἠδ' ἀπαλήν δειρήν ἰδὲ καλὰ πρόσωπα.	o 23.325 * i 19.284 i 19.285

---

2020 Τρῶες 2022 σχέσθαι τε...γέροντα 2029 μνηστῆρες 2030 τὸν μὲν 2037  
κειμένῳ

	ἐκπάγλως γὰρ παιδὸς ὀδύρετο οἰχομένοιο.	o 15.355 *
	ὄξυ δὲ κωκύσασα κάρη λάβε παιδὸς ἑοῖο.	i 18.71
2045	ἀμβρόσια δ' ἄρα χαῖται ἐπερρώσαντο ἄνακτος. τὴν δὲ κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἐρεβεννὴ νύξ ἐκάλυπεν. ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἄμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη, καὶ ῥ' ὀλοφυρομένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα: "Τέκνον ἔμῳ, πῶς ἦλθες ὑπὸ ζῳφον ἠερόεντα	i 1.529 i 22.466 o 5.458 @ i 18.72 o 11.155
2050	ζωὸς ἐών; χαλεπὸν δὲ τόδε ζωῶσιν ὄρασθα. οἱ μοι, τέκνον ἔμῳ, περὶ πάντων κάμμορε φωτῶν, πῶς ἂν ἔπειτ' ἄπο σείο, φίλον τέκος, αὐθι λιποίμην; πῆ γὰρ ἐγὼ, φίλε τέκνον, ἴω; τεῦ δάμαθ' ἴκωμαι; πῶς ἔτλης "Αἰδόσδε κατελθέμεν, ἔνθα τε νεκροί;"	o 11.156 * o 11.216 i 9.437 o 15.509 o 11.475
2055	ἀμφὶ δὲ παιδί φίλω βάλε πήχεε δάκρυ χέουσα· κύσσε δέ μιν κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλὰ, χεῖρας τ' ἀμφοτέρας· θαλερόν δέ οἱ ἔκπεσε δάκρυ. "Τέκνον", ἔμοι γε μάλιστα λελείπεται ἄλγεα λυγρὰ. οὐ γὰρ μοι θνήσκων λεχέων ἐκ χεῖρας ὄρεξας.	o 17.38 † o 17.39 o 16.16 i 24.742 † i 24.743
2060	οὐδέ τί μοι εἶπες πυκινὸν ἔπος, οὐ τέ κεν αἰεὶ μεμνήμην νύκτας τε καὶ ἡματα δάκρυ χέουσα. ἀλλὰ με σὸς τε πόθος σά τε μήδεα, φαίδιμε υἱέ', σὴ τ' ἀγανοφροσύνη μελιηδέα θυμὸν ἀπηύρα. τῷ σ' ἄμοτον κλαίω τεθνηότα, μείλιχον αἰεὶ.	i 24.744 i 24.745 o 11.202 † o 11.203 i 19.300
2065	νῦν δὲ σὺ μὲν ῥ' Ἄϊδαο δόμους ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης ἔρχεαι, αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ στυγερωῖ ἐνὶ πένθει λείπεις." "Ὡς ἔφατο κλαίουσ', ἐπὶ δ' ἔστανε δῆμος ἀπείρων. 'οὐδὲ γὰρ', οὐδέ τις αὐτόθ' ἐνὶ πτόλει λίπετ' ἀνήρ, οὐδὲ γυνή· πάντας γὰρ ἀάσχετον ἴκετο πένθος.	i 22.482 @ i 22.483 i 24.776 i 24.707 † i 24.708

---

2047 ἔμπνυτο 2055 δακρύσασα 2058 "Ἐκτωρ...δὲ 2062 φαίδιμ'' Ὀδυσσεῦ 2068 ὡς  
ἔφατ' 2085 ῥ' om. OCT

2070	ἄϊψα' τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ὑφ' ἴμερον ὤρσε γόοιο. καὶ νύ κ' ῥδυρομένοισιν ἔδου φάος ἡελίοιο. ἢ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν τάρφθη πολυδακρύτοιο γόοιο, βῆ ῥ' ἴμενα μέγαρόνδε μετὰ μνηστήρας ἀγαυούς.	i 23.108 † o 16.220 o 21.57 o 21.58
	<i>περὶ τῆς ταφῆς</i>	
2075	τορνῶσαντο δὲ σῆμα θεμελίᾳ τε προβάλλοντο. ἀγκὰς δ' ἀλλήλων λαβέτην χερσὶ στιβαρήσιν. οἱ δ' ὥς θ' ἡμίονοι κρατερόν μένος ἀμφιβαλόντες ἔλκωσ' ἐξ ὄρεος κατὰ παυπαλόεσσαν ἀταρπὸν ἢ δοκὸν ἢ ἐ δόρυ μέγα νήϊον ἐν δέ τε θυμὸς	i 23.255 i 23.711 i 17.742 i 17.743 i 17.744
2080	τείρεθ' ὁμοῦ καμάτῳ τε καὶ ἰδρῶ σπυδόντεσσιν· ὥς οἱ γ' ἐμμεμαῶτε νέκυν φέρον. αὐτὰρ ὕπερθεν' χερσὶ μέγαν λίθον ἀείραντές τε προσέθηκον, ὄμβριμον. οὐκ ἂν τόν γε δῶα καὶ εἴκοσ' ἄμαξαι ἐσθλαὶ τετράκυκλοι ἀπ' οὐδοῦς ὀχλίσσειαν.	i 17.745 i 17.746 † cf. o 9.240 o 9.241 o 9.242
2085	ἐκ δὲ φυλακτῆρες σὺν τεύχεσιν ἐσσεύοντο, μὴ λόχος εἰσέλθῃσι πόλιν λαῶν ἀπεόντων. ὦδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκε νέων ὑπερηνορέοντων, "μὴ δὴ τι' κλέψαι μὲν ἐάσετε, οὐδέ πη ἔστι συλεύειν, μὴ 'πως' τί κακὸν μετόπισθε γένοιτο."	i 9.80 i 8.522 o 2.324 i 24.71 † * i 24.436 * †
2090	ἔπτ' ἔσαν ἡγεμόνες φυλάκων, ἑκατὸν δὲ ἐκάστῳ κοῦροι ἅμα στειχὸν δολίχ' ἔγχεα χερσὶν ἔχοντες τῶν δ' ἅπαν ἐπλήσθη πεδίον καὶ λάμπετο χαλκῶ δυσμενέες τ' ἄνδρες σχεδὸν ἦατο 'ἐν φυλάκεσσιν'. οἱ δὲ τριηκόσιοί τε καὶ ἐξήκοντα πέλοντο.	i 9.85 i 9.86 i 20.156 i 10.100 * † o 14.20

---

2070 ὡς ἔφατ' 2081 ὄπισθεν 2088 ἀλλ' ἢ τοι 2089 μοι 2093 οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν

2095	αὐτοῦ δὲ προπάροιθε θυράων ἐδριόωντο. ὡς οἱ μὲν ῥ' ἐκάτερθε καθήατο μητιόωντες. οὐ γὰρ κεν τλαίη βροτὸς ἐλθέμεν, οὐδὲ μάλ' ἠβῶν, ἔς στρατόν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν 'φύλακας' λάθοι, οὐδέ κ' ὄχηα ῥεῖα μετογλίσειε θυράων ἡμετεράων.	o 16.344 i 20.153 i 24.565 i 24.566 @ i 24.567
2100	δαιτυμόνες δ' ἀνά' δώματ' ἴσαν θείου βασιλῆος ἄρχοι μνηστήρων, ἀρετῇ δ' ἔσαν ἔξοχ' ἄριστοι. ἐζόμενοι δὲ κατ' αὐθι γόνων τίλλοντό τε χαίτας οὐδὲ ἐνισκίμψαντε καρήατα· δάκρυα δὲ σφι θερμὰ κατὰ βλεφάρων χαμάδις ῥέε μυρομένοισιν.	o 4.621 @ o 4.629 o 10.567 i 17.437 i 17.438
2105	ἔδεισεν δ' ὑπένερθεν ἄναξ ἐνέρων Ἀίδωνεύς, ἄψ δ' ἀνεχώρησεν ὄχρος τέ μιν εἶλε παρειάς. δὴν δὲ μιν ἀμφασίτη ἐπέων λάβε, τῶ δὲ οἱ ὄσσε δακρυόφιν πλῆσθεν, θαλερῇ δὲ οἱ ἔσχετο φωνή. ταρβήσας δ' ἐτέρωσε βάλ' ὄμματα, μὴ θεὸς εἴη.	i 20.61 i 3.35 i 17.695 i 17.696 o 16.179
2110	'ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἄμπνυτο', καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη, 'καὶ τότε δὴ' μύθοισιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπε· "Γουνουμαί σε, ἄναξ· θεὸς δὲ κεν' ἠ βροτὸς ἐσσί; νημερτὲς μὲν δὴ μοι ὑπόσχεο καὶ κατάνευσον ἠ ἀπόειπ', ἐπεὶ οὐ τοι ἔπα δέος, ὄφρ' εὐ εἰδῶ.	o 24.349 † @ o 24.350 † o 6.149 * † i 1.514 i 1.515
2115	εἰ μὲν 'τοι' θεὸς ἐσσι, ὃς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχησι, τρισμακάρες μὲν σοί γε πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ· εἰ δὲ τίς ἐσσί βροτῶν, οἱ ἀρούρης καρπὸν ἔδουσι, λίσομ' ὑπὲρ ψυχῆς καὶ γούνων σῶν τε τοκῆων, μή μ' ἀπογυιώσης μένεος, ἀλκῆς τε λάθωμαι.	o 6.150 † * o 6.154 i 6.142 i 22.338 i 6.265
2120	κρείσων εἰς ἐμέθεν καὶ φέρτερος οὐκ ὀλίγον περ. νῦν δ' ἐμὲ μὲν μέγα κύδος ἀφείλεο, τοὺς δὲ σάωσας	i 19.217 i 22.18

---

2098 φυλάκουσ 2100 ἔς 2110 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ...ἔμπνυτο 2111 ἑξαῦτις 2112  
ἄνασσα...νύ τις 2115 τις



	ρήιδίως, ἐπεὶ οὐ τι τίσιν γ' ἔδεισας ὀπίσσω,	i 22.19
	ἢ σ' ἂν τεισαίμην, εἴ μοι δύνάμεις γε παρείη.	i 22.20
	οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἀνσχετὰ ἔργα τετεύχεται, οὐδ' ἔτι καλῶς	o 2.63
2125	οἶκος ἐμὸς διόλωλε· νεμεσσήθητε καὶ αὐτοὶ,	o 2.64
	ἄλλους τ' αἰδέσθητε περικτίονας ἀνθρώπους.	o 2.65
	ὡς σὺ μὲν οὐδὲ θανῶν ὄνομ' ὤλεσας, ἀλλὰ τοι αἰεὶ	o 24.93
	πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους 'μάλα δὴ' κλέος ἔσσεται ἔσθλόν.	o 24.94 †
	'ζῶγρει'· ἐγὼ δε κέ τοι ιδέω χάριν ἤματα πάντα.	i 14.235 †
2130	βουλοίμην κ' ἐπάρουρος ἐὼν θητευέμεν ἄλλω,	o 11.489
	ὅς 'κε' θνητὸς ἔη' καὶ οὐ τόσα μῆδεα οἶδε,	i 18.363 † *
	ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν.	o 11.491
	βουλοίμην ἢ σοί γε, διοτρεφές, ἤματα πάντα,	i 23.594
	οὐ περ καὶ μείζων ἀρετὴ τιμὴ τε βίη τε,	i 9.498
2135	ἐκ θυμοῦ πεσέειν καὶ δαίμοσιν εἶναι ἄλιτρός."	i 23.595
	"Ὡς ἄρα μιν προσέειπεν ἄναξ ἐνέρων 'Αἰδωνεὺς	cf. i 20.61
	λισσόμενος ἐπέεσιν, ἀμείλικτον δ' ὄπ' ἄκουσε.	i 21.98
	"Χρὴ μὲν δὴ τὸν μῦθον ἀπηλεγέως ἀποειπεῖν,	i 9.309
	ἢ περ δὴ φρονέω τε καὶ ὡς τετελεσμένον ἔσται,	i 9.310
2140	ἄνδρα θνητὸν ἐόντα, πάλα πεπρωμένον αἴση,	i 22.179
	ἠδὲ γυναικάς ἐυζώνους καὶ νήπια τέκνα	i 23.261 + 22.63
	ἄψ ἐθέλω θανάτοιο 'δυσάλγεος' ἐξαναλύσαι.	i 22.180 * †
	βάλλεαι. ἀλλὰ σ' ἔγωγ' ἀναχωρήσαντα κελεύω	i 20.196
	ἐς πληθὺν ἰέναι, μηδ' ἀντίος ἴστασ' ἐμεῖο.	i 20.197
2145	πρῆξαι δ' ἔμπης οὐ τι δυνήσεαι, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ θυμοῦ	i 1.562
	μᾶλλον ἐμοὶ ἔσειαι· τὸ δέ τοι καὶ ῥιγίον ἔσται."	i 1.563
	"Ὡς εἰπὼν λίπεν αὐτόθ', ἐπεὶ διεπέφραδε πάντα	i 20.340
	δειδιότα· κρατερὸς γὰρ ἔχε τρόμος ἀνδρὸς ὀμοκλή.	i 6.137

2128 μάλα δὴ deest OCT : ἐσθλόν] 'Αχιλλεῦ 2129 πείθειν 2131 περ...τ' ἐστὶ 2142  
δυσηχέος

## περί τῆς ἀναστάσεως

	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τρίτον ἡμαρ ἐϋπλόκαμος τέλεσ' Ἡώς,	ο 5.390
2150	ἦμος δ' οὐτ' ἄρ πω ἠώς, ἔτι δ' ἀμφιλύκη νύξ, ἄγορρόν οἱ θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι ἀγέρθη.	i 7.433 i 4.152
	ἔγρετο δ' ἐξ ὕπνου, θείη δέ μιν ἀμφέχυτ' ὀμφή, ῤεῖα λαθὼν φύλακάς τ' ἄνδρας διμῶάς τε ἄπαντας'.	i 2.41 i 9.477 †
2155	οὐδὲ γάρ' εὐδοντες φυλάκων ἠγήτορες ἔσσαν', ἀλλ' ἐγρηγορτί σὺν τεύχεσιν ἦατο πάντες.	i 10.181 † * i 10.182
	ὡς δὲ κύνες περὶ μῆλα δυσωρήσωνται ἐν αὐλῇ θηρὸς ἀκούσαντες κρατερόφρονος, ὅς τε καθ' ὕλην	i 10.183 i 10.184
	ἔρχηται δι' ὄρεσφι· πολὺς δ' ὀρυμαγδὸς ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἀνδρῶν ἠδὲ κυνῶν, ἀπὸ τέ σφισιν ὕπνος ὄλωλεν.	i 10.185 i 10.186
2160	ὡς τῶν νήδυμος ὕπνος ἀπὸ βλεφάρουιν ὀλώλει. αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες τόφρα ἀολλέες ἦλθον ἅπασαι.	i 10.187 ο 22.446 †
	αἶν' ὀλοφυρόμεναι, θαλερόν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσαι· ἔνθα δύο νύκτας δύο τ' ἡματα (συννεχὲς) αἰεὶ	ο 22.447 ο 9.74 @
	κάππεσεν. ἀμφὶ δ' οἱ θάνατος χύτο θυμοραϊστής.	i 16.414 *
2165	κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως, ἀδινώτερον ἢ τ' οἴωνοι φῆναι ἢ αἰγυπιοὶ γαμψώνυχες, οἷσί τε τέκνα	ο 16.216 ο 16.217
	ἀγρότῃ ἐξείλοντο πάρος πετεηνὰ γενέσθαι· ὡς ἄρα τοί γ' ἐλεινὸν ὑπ' ὀφρύσι δάκρυον εἶβον.	ο 16.218 ο 16.219
	μήτηρ θ' ἢ μιν ἔτικτε καὶ ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἐόντα,	ο 23.325 *
2170	κλαῖε μόνον οὐ παιδὸς ἀμύμονος, ὅς οἱ ἔμελλε αὐτίς ἀναστήσεσθαι ὑπὸ ζόφου ἠερόεντος.	i 24.85 i 21.56 *
	παιδὸς γάρ οἱ ἄλαστον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πένθος ἔκειτο.	ο 24.423

2153 γυναῖκας 2154 μὲν...εὐρον 2161 τόφρα deest Hom : ὡς ἔφαθ' [αἶ 2163  
συννεχὲς

	‘κεῖτο δ’ ἄναυδος’ ἄπαστος ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτήτος,	ο 4.788 @
	ὄρμαίνουσ’ ἢ οἱ θάνατον φύγοι υἱὸς ἀμύμων.	ο 4.789
2175	τῆς δ’ ἐλεινοτάτῳ ἄχει φθινύθεσκον παρειαί.	ο 8.530 *
	καὶ ῥ’ ἀπομόρξατο χερσὶ παρειᾶς φώνησέν τε,	ο 18.200
	"ὦ μοι, τέκνον ἐμόν, τί νύ σ’ ἔτρεφον αἰνὰ τεκοῦσα;	ι 1.414
	‘ὦ μοι’, ἐγὼ πανάποτμος, ἐπεὶ τέκον υἷα ἄριστον."	ι 24.493 * †
	ὡς δὲ χιῶν κατατήκετ’ ἐπ’ ἀκροπόλοισιν ὄρεσσιν,	ο 19.205 †
2180	ἦν τ’ Εὐρος κατέτηξεν, ἐπὴν Ζέφυρος καταχεύη	ο 19.206
	τηκομένης δ’ ἄρα τῆς ποταμοὶ πλήθουσι ῥέοντες,	ο 19.207
	ὡς τῆς τήκετο καλὰ παρήϊα δάκρυ χεούσης.	ο 19.208
	σμερδαλέον δὲ μέγ’ ἄμωξεν, περὶ δ’ ἴαχε πέτρῃ.	ο 9.395
	‘ὀρμήσας δ’ ἄρα οἱ’ παρ’ ἐταίρων ἄγγελος ὠκύς	ο 16.468 †
2185	χερσὶ ψηλαφῶν, ἀπὸ μὲν λίθον εἶλε θυράων.	ο 9.416
	τόν ῥα περιστέψας ἦκε στιβαρῆς ἀπὸ χειρός.	ο 8.189
	αὐτίς ἔπειτα πέδονδε κυλίνδετο λῆας ἀναιδῆς.	ο 11.598
	βόμβησεν δὲ λίθος· κατὰ δ’ ἔπτηξεν ποτὶ γαίῃ.	ο 8.190
	αὐτὸς δ’ εἰνὶ θύρῃσι καθέζετο χεῖρε πετάσσας	ο 9.417
2190	κάλλει καὶ χάρισι στίλβων· θηεῖτο δὲ κούρη.	ο 6.237
	ὡς τε γὰρ ἠελίου πέλεν αἴγλη’ ἠδὲ σελήνης,	ο 7.84 †
	ἢ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο ‘καὶ’ ἠελίου ἀνιόντος.	ι 22.135 †
	φωνῇ τε βροτέῃ κατερήτυε φώνησέν τε,	ο 19.545
	"Εἶπὲ δ’ ὃ τι κλαίεις καὶ ὀδύρεαι ἔνδοθι θυμῷ,	ο 8.577
2195	πένθος ἄλαστον ἔχουσα μετὰ φρεσίν; οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς	ι 24.105
	ὅττι μάλιστ’ ἐθέλεις καὶ τοι φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ.	ο 18.113
	παύσειο δὴ κλαυθμοῖο γόοιό τε δακρυόεντος,	ο 4.801 *
	ὡς ἂν μὴ κλαίουσα κατὰ χροᾶ καλὸν ἰάπτῃς.	ο 4.749

---

2173 κεῖτ’ ἄρ’ ἄσιτος 2178 αὐτὰρ 2179 ἐν 2184 ὠμήρησε δέ μοι παρ’ 2191 αἴγλη  
πέλεν 2192 ἢ 2197 παύσειε

	τώ τοι ἐπιτλήτω κραδίη μύθοισιν ἐμοῖσιν.	i 19.220
2200	μηκέτι νῦν χρόα καλὸν ἐναίρειο μηδέ τι θυμόν. θάρσει, μηδέ τι πάγχυ μετὰ φρεσὶ δειδίθι λίην· τοῖος γάρ σοι ποτιμὸς ἄμ' ἔρχεται, ὄν τε καὶ ἄλλοι ἀνέρες ἠρήσαντο παρεστάμενοι, δύνата γάρ. σοῖσιν δ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν 'ἐσόψεαι', αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα.	o 19.263 o 4.825 o 4.826 * o 4.827 o 20.233 @
2205	ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσιν· ὡς ὁ μὲν οὕτως ἐστὶ σόος καὶ ἐλεύσεται ἤδη 'σὸς' πάϊς, οἷόν ποῦ τις ἐέλδεται ἔμμενοι υἷα ἄγχι μάλ', οὐδ' ἔτι τῆλε φίλων καὶ πατρίδος αἴης. ἧ μὲν τοι τάδε πάντα τελείετα ὡς ἀγορεύω.	o 19.236 o 19.300 o 20.35 † o 19.301 o 19.305
2210	ὄψεαι· οὐ γάρ σε πρόσθεν παύσεσθαι οἶω κλαυθμοῦ τε στυγεροῦ γόοιο τε δακρυόεντος, πρὶν γ' αὐτόν 'κ' ἐσίδηαι'. αὐτὰρ σοί γ' ὦδ' ἐπιτέλλω. ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν ἔρχεαι ἄμ' ἠοὶ φανομένηφιν οἴκαδε, καὶ μνηστήρσιν ὑπερφιάλοισιν ὁμίλει.	o 17.7 * o 17.8 o 17.9 @ o 16.270 o 16.271
2215	οὐ μὲν τοι κείνός γε πολὺν χρόνον ἀμφὶς ἔσοιτο." "Ὡς φάτο, τῆς δ' εὔνησε γόον, σχέθε δ' ὄσσε γόοιο. καὶ τότε μιν μύθοισιν ἀμειβομένη προσέειπε, "ἔσσετα ('οὔτω), 'φίλε'· ἔθεν δ' ἔνεκ' ἐνθάδ' ἰκάνω, ὄφρα ἐ τ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδω καὶ μῦθον ἀκούσω.	o 16.267 * o 4.758 o 19.252 o 16.31 @ † * o 16.32 *
2220	ἀλλὰ μοι ὦδ' ἀνὰ θυμόν οἴεται, ὡς ἔσεταί περ. ἔγνω γὰρ φᾶρός τε χιτῶνά τε εἶματ' ἰδούσα." 'Ἡ μὲν θαμβήσασα πάλιν οἴκόνδε βεβήκει μνηστήρων 'μεθ' ὁμίλον, ἐπεὶ διεπέφραδε πάντα ἐντροπαλιζομένη, θαλερόν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσα.	o 19.312 o 7.234 o 21.354 o 17.590 † i 6.496
2225	παίδος γὰρ μῦθον πεπνυμένον ἔνθετο θυμῷ.	o 21.355

---

2204 ἐπόψεαι 2207 καὶ 2212 με ἴδηται 2218 ἄττα 2223 ἐς

	καί ῥα ἐκάστω φωτὶ παρισταμένη φάτο μῦθον.	ο 2.384
	ὄσσα δ' ἄρ' ἄγγελος ὄκα κατὰ πτόλιν ᾤχετο πάντη.	ο 24.413
	οἱ δὲ βοῆς ἀΐοντες ἐφοίτων ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος,	ο 9.401
	οἱ μὲν χαόμενοι, οἱ δ' αὖ μέγα κυδιῶντες·	ι 21.519
2230	οἱ δ' ἄρα θαμβήσαντες ἰθὺς κίον, ὡς δ' ἐσίδοντο.	ο 24.101 *
	ἀθρόοι ἠγερέθοντο πρὸ ἄστεος εὐρυχόροιο.	ο 24.468
	δὴν δ' ἄνεφ καὶ ἄναυδοι ἐφέστασαν ἀλλήλοισιν.	cf. i 9.30 + i 13.133 *
	Ἦδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον,	ο 21.396
	"ὦ φίλοι, οὐ μὲν πω τι πάρος τοιοῦτον ἐτύχθη.	ο 18.36
2235	ὦ πόποι, ἦ μέγα θαῦμα τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώμαι	ι 13.99
	δεινὸν, ὃ οὐ ποτ' ἔγωγε τελευτήσεσθαι ἔφασκον."	ι 13.100
	Ἦδε δὴ αὐτ' ἐξαυτίς περ' ἀνέστη κῆρας ἀλύξας.	ι 15.287 †
	κείνος 'θ' ὡς ἄγόρευε· τὰ δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται.	ο 18.271 @
	αὐτὰρ ὁ θυμὸν ἔχων ὄν καρτερόν, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ,	ι 5.806
2240	ὃς πᾶσι θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσει,	ι 12.242
	ἦεν. αἰπὺ δ' ὄρος προσέβη καταειμένον ὕλη,	ο 19.431 *
	ἐν περιφαινομένῳ. δοιοὺς δ' ἄρ' ὑπήλυθε θάμνους	ο 5.476
	ἐξ ὁμόθεν πεφυῶτας· ὁ μὲν φυλῆς, ὁ δ' ἐλαίης.	ο 5.477
	ἐνθ' ἀναβάς, ὅθι τε ἄρ' ὄρος ἦν πολυανθέος ὕλης,	ο 14.353 @
2245	ἔστη'. πολλὰ δέ οἱ κραδίη πόρφυρε κιώντι.	ο 4.427 †
	ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ἀνέμιμνε, σάω δ' ἐρίηρας ἐταίρους.	ι 16.363
	οἱ δ' ἐλελίχθησαν καὶ ἐναντίοι ἔσταν ἄπαντες'.	ι 5.497 †
	ἄντ' ἀρ' ἠργερθεν ὀμηγυρέες τ' ἐγένοντο	ι 1.57 †
	γῆθησαν, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸς ἰάνθη,	ο 15.165
2250	ὡς εἶδον ζῶν τε καὶ ἀρτεμέα προσίοντα.	ι 5.515
	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐς ἀλλήλους ὀρόωντες,	ι 24.633
	δεικανόνωντ' ἐπέεσσι καὶ ἐν χεῖρεσσι φύοντο.	ο 24.410

---

2229 αὐ om. OCT 2237 οἶον δ' : περ deest Hom 2238 τως 2244 δρίος 2245 ἦια  
2247 Ἀχαιῶν 2248 οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὐν

	καὶ κύνεον ἀγαπαζόμενοι κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ὠμούς,	ο 17.35 *
	τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής,	ο 20.350
2255	Ἔγω γὰρ θεὸς ἄμβροτος εἰλήλουθα.	ι 24.460 †
	τοῖος ἐὼν τοι χθιζὸς ἐν ὑμετέροισι δόμοισι	ο 24.379 *
	ἔσσομαι, ὡς τὸ πρῶτον ὑπέστην καὶ κατένευσα.	ι 4.267
	νῦν ἤδη τόδε μακρὸν ἐέλδωρ ἐκτετέλεσται.	ο 23.54
	ἀλλ' ὄδ' ἐγὼ τοιόσδε, παθὼν κακὰ, πολλὰ δ' ἀνατλάς,	ο 16.205 @
2260	ἀρνύμενος πατρός τε μέγα κλέος ἢδ' ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ,	ι 6.446
	ἦλυθον, ὄφρα ἴδω νέκυας καὶ ἀτερπέα χῶρον.	ο 11.94 *
	ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς ἔρχεσθε καὶ ἀγγελίην ἀπόφασθε	ι 9.649
	μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσι παρασταδὸν ἀνδρὶ ἐκάστω.	ο 12.207 *
	κεῖθεν δ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ φράσομαι ἔργον τε ἔπος τε."	ι 15.234
2265	Αὐτίκα δ' ἐξ ὄρεος κατεβήσεται παιπαλόεντος.	ι 13.17
	κήρυκες δὲ λίγανον ἅμ' ἠοῖ φαινομένηφι	ι 11.685
	ἔσθλοι, τετίγεσιν ἐοικότες, οἳ τε καθ' ὕλην	ι 3.151
	δενδρέφ' ἐφεζόμενοι ὄπα λειριόεσσαν ἰεῖσι.	ι 3.152
 <i>περὶ τῆς τοῦ Θωμᾶ ψηλαφήσεως</i>		
	Οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἔντοσθε δόμου ἔσαν ὑψηλοῖο	ο 1.126 †
2270	τερπόμενοι φιλότῃ παρ' ἀλλήλοισι κάθηντο).	ο 5.227 * †
	κηληθμῶ δ' ἔσχοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκιόνετα.	ο 13.2
	κλήϊσαν δὲ θύρας μεγάρων ἐν ναεταόντων.	ο 19.30 *
	κλήϊστοι δ' ἔπεσαν σανίδες πυκινῶς ἀραρυῖαι.	ο 2.344
	Ἴημος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως,	ο 5.228
2275	αὐτίκα δὴ μνηστῆρας ἐπάχετο ἰσόθεος φῶς.	ο 1.324
	τοὺς δ' αὐτε προσέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής,	ο 15.271 *

---

2255 γέρον 2259 δ' ἀληθείς 2269 ἔσαν δόμου 2270 μένοντες

	"Ἐνδον μὲν δὴ ὄδ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ, κακὰ πολλὰ μογήσας,	ο 21.207
	γιγνώσκω δ' ὡς σφῶϊν ἐελδομένοισιν ἰκάνω."	ο 21.209
	Ἐκὰς τότε' δὴ μιν ἑταῖρος ἀνὴρ ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν.	ι 17.466 †
2280	μερμήριξε δ' ἔπειτα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν	ο 4.117
	εἰορόων ὄψιν τ' ἀγαθὴν καὶ μῦθον ἀκούων,	ι 24.632
	ἢ πρῶτ' ἐξερέοιτο ἕκαστά τε μῦθήσασατο'.	ο 4.119 @
	στῆ δὲ παρ' αὐτὸν ἰὼν', καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε·	ο 17.414 †
	"ὦ φίλ', ἐπειδὴ ταῦτά μ' ἀνέμνησας καὶ ἔειπες·	ο 3.211
2285	πέθεις δὴ μευ θυμὸν, ἀπηνέα περ μάλ' ἐόντα.	ο 23.230 *
	ἐν μοίρῃ γὰρ πάντα δίκαιο καὶ κατέλεξας.	ι 19.186
	νῦν δ' ἐθέλω ἔπος ἄλλο μεταλλῆσαι καὶ ἐρέσθαι.	ο 3.243
	ἠὲ φίλε', εἰ' καὶ μοι νεμεσήσασα ὅτι κεν εἶπω;	ο 1.158 † @
	σῆμά τί μοι νῦν δειξὼν ἀριφραδές, ὄφρα πεποιθῶ."	ο 24.329 †
2290	Τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής,	ο 15.271
	"ἢ μάλα τίς τοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι ἀπιστος.	ο 14.391
	ἀλλὰ σὺ μὴ μοι ταῦτα νόει φρεσί, μηδέ σε δαίμων	ι 9.600
	ἐνταῦθα τρέψειε, φίλος· κάκιον δέ κεν εἶη.	ι 9.601
	τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ τοι, τέκνον, ἀληθέα πάντ' ἀγορεύσω.	ο 3.254
2295	ἢ τοι μὲν τόδε καὐτὸς οἶσα, ὡς κεν ἐτύχθη.	ο 3.255
	ἀλλ' ἄγε δεῦρο, πέπον, παρ' ἔμ' ἴστασο' καὶ ἴδε ἔργον,	ο 22.233 @
	ὄφρ' ἐὺ εἰδῆς οἶος ἐν ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσι.	ο 22.234 †
	σφῶϊν δ', ὡς ἔσεται περ, ἀληθείην καταλέξω·	ο 21.212
	εἰ δ' ἄγε δὴ καὶ σῆμα ἀριφραδὲς ἄλλο τι δείξω,	ο 21.217
2300	ὄφρα μ' ἐὺ γνῶτον πιστωθῆτόν τ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ.	ο 21.218
	σῆμα δέ τοι ἐρέω μάλ' ἀριφραδές· οὐδέ σε λήσει."	ο 11.126
	"Ὡς εἰπὼν βράκεια μεγάλης ἀποέρραθεν οὐλήης.	ο 21.221

---

2279 ὄψε δὲ 2282 πειρήσασατο 2283 Ἀντίνοον 2288 ξεῖνε φίλ' ...ἢ 2289 εἰπέ  
2297 ἐὺ deest OCT : οἶος] τοι 2296 ἴστασο

	δεξιτερῆς δ' ἔλε χειρός ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἕκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν·	i 7.108
	"Οὐλήν μὲν πρῶτον τήνδε φράσσα ὀφθαλμοῖσι,	o 24.331
2305	ὄφρα γνῶς κατὰ θυμόν, ἀτὰρ εἴπησθα καὶ ἄλλω.	o 22.373
	ὥς ἐπὶ σοὶ μάλα πόλλ' ἔπαθον καὶ πόλλ' ἔμογησα	i 9.492
	ὄφρά μ' ἐὺ γνῶτον πιστωθῆτόν τ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ."	o 21.218
	"Ὡς φάτο, τῶν δ' ἄρα θυμόν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ὄρινε.	o 17.150 *
	οὐλήν δ' ἀμφράσσαιτο καὶ ἀμφοδὰ ἔργα γένοιτο,	o 19.391
2310	χειρῶν δ' ἀψάσθην· ὁ δὲ δακρύσας ἔπος ηὔδα·	i 10.377
	"Νῦν 'γ', ἐπεὶ ἤδη σήματ' ἀριφραδέα 'μοι ἔδειξας'	o 23.225 †
	πείθεις δὴ μευ θυμόν, ἀπηνέα περ μάλ' ἐόντα,	o 23.230
	τοῖος ἐὼν τοι χθιζὸς ἐν ἡμετέροισι δόμοισι,	o 24.379
	οὐδὲ λίην ἄγαμαι, μάλα δ' εὖ οἶδ' οἶος ἔησθα.	o 23.175
2315	αὐτὰρ μὴ νῦν μοι τόδε χῶεο μηδὲ νεμέσσω,	o 23.213
	οὔνεκά σ' οὐ τὸ πρῶτον 'ίδὼν ἐγὼ ᾧδ' ἐπίθησα'.	o 23.214 †
	πρὶν δ' ἔγνω, πρὶν πάντα ἄνακτ' ἐμὸν ἀμφοφάσθαι.	o 19.475
	αἰεὶ γάρ μοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν	o 23.215
	ἔρρίγει μὴ τις βροτῶν ἀπάφοιτο ἔπεσιν."	o 23.216
2320	"Ὡς ἄρα φωνήσαντες ἀπέστασαν ἀλλήλοισιν.	cf. i 13.708
 <i>περὶ τῆς ἀναλήψεως</i>		
	'Δῆ' τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα	i 1.601 †
	χειρας ἀνίσχοντες μεγάλ' εὐχετόωντο ἕκαστος.	i 8.347
	ἦμος δ' ἑωσφόρος εἴσι φῶας ἐρέων ἐπὶ γαῖαν,	i 23.226
	ὄν τε μέτα κροκόπεπλος ὑπεῖρ ἄλλα κίδναται ἠὼς,	i 23.227
2325	ἔσθη 'γε' σκοπῆν ἐς παιπαλόεσσαν ἀνελθὼν,	o 10.97 †
	ἔνθα μὲν οὔτε βοῶν οὔτ' ἀνδρῶν φαίνετο ἔργα.	o 10.98

---

2311 δ' ...κατέλεξας 2316 ἐπεὶ ἴδον, ᾧδ' ἀγάπησα 2321 ὥς 2325 δὲ



	οἱ δ' ἐλελίχθησαν καὶ ἐναντίοι ἔσταν ἅπαντες,	i 5.497
	μήτηρ θ' ἧ μιν ἔτικτε καὶ ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἐόντα.	o 23.325 *
	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἤγερθεν ὀμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο,	i 1.57
2330	τοὺς δ' αὐτὲ προσέειπε θεοκλύμενος θεοειδῆς	o 15.271
	"κλύτε φίλοι', καὶ μή τι 'θυμῶ' ἀγάσησθε ἕκαστος,	i 14.111 †
	ὄφρα ἔπος εἴποιμι' τό μοι καταθύμιόν ἐστιν.	o 22.392 @
	'ἦδη νῦν μευ' θυμὸς ἐπέσσυται ὥστε νέεσθαι	i 9.42 †
	οὐρανὸν ἐς πολύχαλκον, ἴν' ἀθανάτοισι 'μετείην'."	o 3.2 †
2335	μνηστήρες δ' ἀκάχοντο κατήφησάν τ' ἐνὶ θυμῶ.	o 16.342
	ὡς εἰπὼν λίπεν αὐτόθ', ἐπεὶ διεπέφραδε πάντα.	i 20.340
	αὐτὸς δὲ πρὸς πατρὸς ἐρισθενέος πυκινὸν δῶ	i 19.355 *
	φαίνειθ' ὁμοῦ 'νεφέλησιν' ἰὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν,	i 5.867 †
	ἄφθιτον ἀστερόεντα, μεταπρεπέ' ἀθανάτοισιν.	i 18.370
2340	αὐτόματα δὲ πύλα μύκον οὐρανοῦ, ὧς ἔχον ὦραι·	i 5.749
	τῆς ἐπιτέτραπτα μέγας οὐρανὸς ἀστερόεις' τε,	i 5.750 †
	ἡμὲν ἀνακλῖναι πυκινὸν νέφος ἠδ' ἐπιθεῖναι.	i 5.751
	βῆ δὲ 'θέων', μάλα δ' ὄκα φίλον πατέρ' εἰσαφίκανεν.	o 22.99 @
	ἄψ δ' αὐτίς κατ' ἄρ' ἕξειτ' ἐπὶ θρόνου, ἔνθεν ἀνέστη.	o 21.139

---

2330 = o 15.508, 20.363 2331 πείσεσθα...κότῳ 2332 εἴπωμι 2333 εἰ δέ τοι αὐτῶ  
2333 νεφέεσσιν 2334 φαίνοι 2340-42 = i 8.393-95 2341 Οὐλυμπός 2343 θέειν