The old Analytical view that the union between the Journey of Telemachus and
the rest of the *Odyssey* is post-Homeric, superficial, and incompetently effected
is nowadays widely rejected, and rightly so. However, although many defences—
cumulatively, I believe, successful—of the *content* of the second divine assembly
have been put forward in recent years, no adequate answer has yet been given to
the objections raised against the allegedly anomalous *language* of Athene's speech
of 5.7—20:

> Ζεῦ πάτερ ἠδ' ἄλλοι μάκαρες θεοὶ αἰὲν ἐόντες,
> μή τις ἔτι πρόφρων ἀγανὸς καὶ ἤπιος ἔστω
> σκηπτοῦχος βασιλεύς, μηδὲ φρεσὶν αἴσιμα εἰδώς,
> ἀλλ' αἰεὶ χαλεπός τ' εἴη καὶ αἴσυλα ῥέζοι·   10
> ὡς οὔ τις μέμνηται Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο
> λαῶν οἷσιν ἄνασσε, πατὴρ δ' ὡς ἤπιος ἦεν.
> ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν νήσῳ κεῖται κρατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχων,
> νύμφης ἐν μεγάροισι Καλυψοῦς, ἥ μιν ἀνάγκῃ
> ἴσχει· ὁ δ' οὐ δύναται ἣν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἱκέσθαι·   15
> οὐ γάρ οἱ πάρα νῆες ἐπήρετμοι καὶ ἑταῖροι,'
> οἵ κέν μιν πέμποιεν ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης.
> νῦν αὖ παῖδ' ἀγαπητὸν ἀποκτεῖναι μεμάασιν
> οἴκαδε νισόμενον· ὁ δ' ἔβη μετὰ πατρὸς ἀκουὴν
> ἐς Πύλον ἠγαθέην ἠδ' ἐς Λακεδαίμονα δῖαν.   20

This speech has often been attacked by Analysts of the old school, pre-Parry
in time or outlook, for being a 'cento'.[1] However, Denys Page, who accepts
that 'the stories of Telemachus and Odysseus are organically connected in our
Odyssey'[2] but condemns the second divine assembly as a post-Homeric 'new
prologue, specially designed to introduce the Wanderings of Odysseus when that
part of the poem was selected for separate recitation',[3] objects to the 'patch-
work' character of Athene's speech *although* he accepts the validity of Parry's
work. It is vital to grasp this point and to try to understand the precise nature
of Page's objection to the speech, because some of his adversaries have mis-
understood him; I shall therefore take the liberty of quoting him at length:

---

[1] e.g. V. Bérard, *Introduction à l'Odyssée*
(Paris, 1924—5), iii.226—37; P. Von der
Mühll, *R.E.* Suppl. vii (1940), 711;
R. Merkelbach, *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee,
Zetemata* ii (Munich, 1951, 2nd edn. 1969),
p. 156. *Od.* 5.8—12 = 2.230—4; 5.14—17 =
4.557—60; 5.19—20 = 4.701—2.

[2] *The Homeric Odyssey* (Oxford, 1955),
p. 72, cf. p. 68. It is worth stressing that
this *is* Page's view: F.M. Combellack refers
erroneously to Page's 'conviction that the
story of Telemachus is a later addition to
the Odyssey' (*Gnomon* 28 (1956), 412),

and similarly G.P. Rose wrongly asserts
that 'Denys Page . . . [has] argued that the
"Telemachy" does not belong integrally to
the *Odyssey*' (*TAPA* 98 (1967), 392): they
have presumably been misled by the general
tone of the introduction to Page's Chapter
III and by the stress which he lays on certain
alleged incongruities, but his eventual con-
clusion is actually the very opposite of what
they claim.

[3] Op. cit., p. 71; similarly G.S. Kirk, *The
Songs of Homer* (Cambridge, 1962), pp.
233—4.

At once a most disagreeable fact obtrudes itself: Athene's speech is not a free composi-
tion naturally designed for this place and purpose; it consists of three long sentences, each
one of them a fragment of another person's conversation repeated from very different
surroundings in the preceding story of Telemachus. Her first sentence, in five lines, was
spoken by Mentor to the people of Ithaca in the Second Book; her second sentence, in four
lines, was spoken by Proteus to Menelaus in the Fourth Book; and her third sentence, in
three lines, was spoken by Medon to Penelope only a few minutes ago. In the Greek Epic
parts of lines, whole lines, and groups of lines are commonly repeated from one point to
another; indeed the greater part of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* consists of formular lines and
phrases repeated and adapted to new contexts; this is the technique of oral composition
. . . . But there were limits to what might properly be done; and it must be candidly con-
fessed that so great an abuse of the poet's licence, so insensitive a treatment of his materials,
as we find in this address by Athene, is (by good fortune) not to be found again in the
Greek Epic. It is an abnormally artificial patchwork, whoever composed it. The poet desires
to begin a new and very important episode with a speech by a goddess in heaven: invention
and imagination fail him, as never before or again; . . . he recalls, word for word, portions of
conversation recently assigned to three different persons in different circumstances, and sets
them down side by side to form the opening address. They serve the purpose well enough,
we admit; but I argue no further with those who think that the end justifies even these
means.[4]

If the language of Athene's speech 'serve[s its] purpose well enough', why does
Page think it constitutes an 'abuse of the poet's licence' etc.? He presumably
means (i) that the repetition is *not truly formulaic,* because each of the three
parts of the speech is not itself a formula but a piece of conversation specially
designed for a different purpose earlier in the poem; and (ii) that the repetition
does *not* belong to any of the *truly Homeric* types of *non*-formulaic repetition,
such as where a messenger repeats the message entrusted to him. Thus when
M. van der Valk[5] in his reply to Page states, 'Since this passage in the main *con-
sists of formulary lines,* it has been attributed to an interpolator . . .' (emphasis
mine), he completely misses Page's point. Similarly H.W. Clarke,[6] after giving an
explanation of the formulaic method of composition much like that of Page in
the passage just cited, conveys the impression that Page is totally unaware of this
process, and tries to justify the repetition in *Od.* 5.8–20 by equating it, without
adequate argument, with the formulae of Homer's 'typical scenes'. H. Erbse[7]
also misses Page's point: 'Page selbst muss zugeben: "This is the technique of
oral composition . . . ." Gerade Page, der doch annimmt, unsere Odyssee sei zu
einer Zeit entstanden, als epische Dichtung nur mündlich tradiert wurde, hätte
keinen Grund, hier etwas Ungewöhnliches zu sehen.' Erbse cites only one
parallel, *Il.* 9.17 ff. = 2.110 ff., but this does not take us very far, because here
the *same* speaker, Agamemnon, is addressing the *same* audience, the assembled
Achaeans; the only difference is that in Book 2 his despondency was affected
whereas in Book 9 it is genuine. Although M. Dyson[8] argues for the authenticity
of the *Odyssey*'s second divine assembly he admits that the objection based on
the language of Athene's speech is 'powerful' and has no specific solution to
offer; he says that 'the composition of Athena's speech suggests literature rather
than oral composition and rather lazy literature at that' and that the difficulty
'may be put aside as a problem that will only be solved, if ever, when the whole

[4] Op. cit., pp. 70–1; echoed by Kirk,
op. cit., p. 233.
  [5] *Ant. Class.* 35 (1966), 28.
  [6] *The Art of the Odyssey*.(Englewood
Cliffs, N.J., 1967), pp. 49–50.

[7] *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee*
(Berlin, 1972), p. 128.
  [8] 'The Second Assembly of the Gods in
the *Odyssey*', *Antichthon* 4 (1970), 1–12,
esp. 1, 11.

question of the relationship of our written *Odyssey* and oral poetry is much clearer than it is at present'. Can we really be no more definite than this?

Perhaps the first point to be made is that the repetition is not quite as non-formulaic as may at first sight appear, and that Page's statement 'The poet . . . recalls, word for word' is an exaggeration. Admittedly 5.8–12 = 2.230–4 exactly, and the passage does not really look like a formula. What of the next line, 5.13?[9]

When we assemble all the variations of this line it is clear that it is part of a complex formulaic family:[10]

(a) *Il.* 2.721 (said of Philoctetes with his snake-bite wound):

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν νήσῳ κεῖτο κρατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχων

(b) *Od.* 4.556 (Menelaus telling Telemachus what Proteus said about Odysseus):

τὸν δ' ἴδον ἐν νήσῳ θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα

(c) *Od.* 5.13:

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν νήσῳ κεῖται κρατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχων

(d) *Od.* 5.395 (in a simile):

πατρός, ὃς ἐν νούσῳ κεῖται κρατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχων

(e) *Od.* 17.142 (Telemachus telling Penelope what Menelaus said Proteus said):

φῆ μιν ὅ γ' ἐν νήσῳ ἰδέειν κρατέρ' ἄλγε' ἔχοντα

Example (d) is particularly significant, because the similarity of *sound* between νήσῳ and νούσῳ is typical of one of the ways in which Homeric formulae develop by analogy. The importance of sound-similarity in this connection was pointed out by Milman Parry,[11] who noted, *inter alia*, *Il.* 10.214 ὅσσοι γὰρ νήεσσιν ἐπικρατέουσιν ἄριστοι, *Od.* 1.245 = 16.122 = 19.130 ὅσσοι γὰρ νήσοισιν ἐπικρατέουσιν ἄριστοι; and earlier that splendid mid-Victorian Parryite Henry Hayman gave, among other examples of Homer's oral and formulaic method of composition, the νήσῳ/νούσῳ alternation we have just been considering.[12] Of course this alternation is very like that in Parry's νήεσσιν/νήσοισιν example, since one of the nouns is common to both examples, but we can go even further than this and show that within the νήσῳ/νούσῳ formulaic family νήεσσι is a third possibility, for we have *Il.* 2.771–2 = 7.229–30 ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν νήεσσι . . . | κεῖτ'.

All this makes *Od.* 5.13 look much more respectable as a piece of oral epic. We cannot automatically assume that its author knowingly lifted it from a single source,

His remarkable anticipation of Parryism is well worth quoting: 'The manner of the poet's handling his machine of language seems to me to confirm its purely unwritten character. The love of iterative phrase, and the perpetual grafting of one set of words on another, the great tenacity for a formulaic cast of diction and of thought, and the apparent determination to dwell in familiar cadences, and to run new matter in the same moulds, all seem to me to mark the purely recitative poet ever trading on his fund of memory.'

Il. 2.721, for it forms part of an elaborate formulaic family.

Coupled with the charge that *Od.* 5.13 has been lifted from a single source is the allegation, going back to antiquity, that the plagiarism has resulted in an inappropriate use of language. There is an H scholium on line 13 which runs: οἰκειότερον ἐν Ἰλιάδι κεῖται περὶ Φιλοκτήτου [*Il.* 2.721] · νῦν δὲ ἔδει "τετιημένος ἦτορ" εἶναι.[13] We have already seen that Page supports this objection, regarding κρατέρ᾽ ἄλγεα πάσχων as inappropriate in *Od.* 5.13.[14] However, this position is untenable. κρατέρ᾽ ἄλγεα πάσχων is a strong phrase, but not too strong to describe Odysseus' spiritual agonies. At *Od.* 5.151−3 the poet tells us that 'his eyes were never dry of tears, and his sweet life was ebbing away as he mourned for his lost home-coming'. See also *Od.* 1.49, 57−9. And at *Od.* 5.82−3 we are told that 'he was sitting, as usual, on the sea-shore, δάκρυσι καὶ στοναχῆσι καὶ ἄλγεσι θυμὸν ἐρέχθων'. A pain fit to rival Philoctetes' snake-bite wound, you would think. The noun ἄλγος is used often enough of spiritual pain in contexts similar to *Od.* 5.13: e.g. (1) with πάσχω, at *Od.* 15.487, 20.221; cf. *Od.* 17.555; (2) of the pain of loss or separation, at *Od.* 4.722, 14.39, 21.88; (3) with an intensifying adjective, at *Od.* 2.193 χαλεπὸν . . . ἄλγος, *Il.* 24.742 ἄλγεα λυγρά; cf. *Il.* 11.249 and *Od.* 10.376 κρατερὸν . . . πένθος. Finally, we should note that virtually the same phrase (κρατέρ᾽ ἄλγε᾽ ἔχοντα) is used of Odysseus' detention on Calypso's island in *Od.* 17.142 (example (e) above)—a most interesting fact to which we shall presently return. Of course if we were to grant that κρατέρ᾽ ἄλγεα πάσχων was slightly inappropriate in *Od.* 5.13 we could defend the poet in terms of the formulaic method of composition, but in the light of the parallels there is no need at all to make such a concession.

Each of the examples (b), (c), and (e) above is followed by the lines printed above as *Od.* 5.14−17. I regard it as quite likely that the whole of this four-line group was an established formula for the *Odyssey*-poet, dealing as it does with one of the central elements in the story of Odysseus. At any rate, we can virtually prove that this is true of the last two lines of the group. They recur in the core of the poem as *Od.* 5.141−2, but the context suggests very strongly that they are not being used here for the first time. Calypso tells Hermes: πέμψω δέ μιν οὔ πῃ ἐγώ γε· | οὐ γάρ μοι πάρα νῆες ἐπήρετμοι καὶ ἑταῖροι, | οἵ κέν μιν πέμποιεν κ.τ.λ. Now Proteus or Athene may quite properly say οὐ γάρ οἱ πάρα . . . ἑταῖροι; Odysseus himself may quite properly say οὐ γάρ μοι πάρα . . . ἑταῖροι; but it is faintly absurd for *Calypso* to say οὐ γάρ μοι πάρα . . . ἑταῖροι. μοι, not οἱ, is demanded by the immediately preceding context, and is appropriate enough to νῆες; but ἑταῖροι are what a Homeric hero has, not a goddess. Of course the thought occurs in the negative, but the incongruity remains, because the possibility of Calypso's having ἑταῖροι (she does not merely say 'There are no able-bodied

---

[13] The meaning of the first half of the scholium is: 'This line occurs more appropriately in the *Iliad* apropos of Philoctetes.' Bérard (op. cit. iii.227) strangely misinterprets it as 'The word κεῖται is more appropriate in the *Iliad*'—but that would require τὸ κεῖται, and is hardly compatible with the second half of the scholium. In any case, Bérard's own objection to the use of κεῖται in *Od.* 5.13, 'Ulysse chez Calypso n'est pas "gisant" ', cannot be sustained,

since the word is used elsewhere in Homer, like ἦμαι, of a general state of inactivity or immobility, e.g. *Il.* 2.771−2 = 7.229−30 (formulaically related to *Od.* 5.13, as we have seen) and, I would say, *Il.* 2.721 itself. Moreover, if we are to insist on being literalists we can point out that Odysseus *is* literally 'lying' while he is actually νύμφης ἐν μεγάροισι Καλυψοῦς (5.14): see 5.151−8.

[14] Above, n.9.

men around') is implicitly raised.[15] This is precisely the kind of slight illogicality to which the formulaic method of composition is liable to lead.[16] Moreover, a variation of this formula occurs at *Od.* 14.332–3 = 19.289–90: νῆα κατειρύσθαι καὶ ἐπαρτέας ἔμμεν ἑταίρους, | οἵ δή μιν πέμψουσι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν: here the sound-similarity ἐπήρετμοι–ἐπαρτέας has probably played a part. Now if we regard the whole of the passage 5.14–17 as a formula its presence here is not at all surprising on any theory of composition; and even if only 16–17 are a formula this fact makes the presence of 14–17 easier to account for.

However, I think it likely, for reasons to be explained presently, that in composing 5.13–17 the poet did have the particular passage 4.556–60 in mind. If so, then his alteration of 4.556 (example (b) above) shows some sensitivity: he could have left the line just as it was there, but he realized that τὸν δ᾽ ἴδον would not be quite right here: Athene has not merely *seen* Odysseus in passing on one occasion, like Proteus: she *knows* very well that he is there, and the thought worries her (5.6). Moreover, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ μὲν provides a more effective contrast to 5.11–12, and κρατέρ᾽ ἄλγεα πάσχων states Athene's case more forcefully than Proteus' θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα, and this too is arguably an improvement: to get some action from Zeus she must make Odysseus' plight seem as severe as possible. Of course the poet was using a line which his formulaic stock-in-trade provided for him virtually ready-made, and we cannot be sure that all the resulting felicities were intended: it would be safer to speak in more general terms of a sound poetic instinct. Now when Telemachus tells his mother what Proteus said, he starts φῆ μιν ὅ γ᾽ ἐν νήσῳ ἰδέειν (17.142), and he could quite easily have continued as Proteus did, κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα (4.556);[17] why did he not do so? Instead, he continues κρατέρ᾽ ἄλγε᾽ ἔχοντα, an accusative version of κρατέρ᾽ ἄλγεα πάσχων, which is *not* what Proteus told Menelaus but what Athene told the assembled gods. In other words, it looks as though the influence of *Od.* 5.13 has intervened. If so, the authenticity of this line in the second divine assembly (and thus, on the natural assumption, the authenticity of the assembly itself) would be guaranteed by the corresponding line in Book 17: 5.13 would be at least as early as 17.142, and Page's theory that the assembly is a post-Homeric 'new prologue' would be virtually untenable. However, this argument has its limitations: while I think it does constitute a strong prima facie case, one must admit (1) that it is possible that the *Odyssey*-poet *did* sing κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα in 17.142 and that it was corrupted in the course of oral transmission; and (2) that the difference between the endings of 4.556 and 17.142, whether it was the poet's own or whether it arose in oral transmission, could have occurred quite independently of 5.13 (e.g. through the similarity in sound between χέοντα and ἔχοντα).[18]

[15] Cf. p. 139 of C. Rothe, 'Die Bedeutung der Wiederholungen für die homerische Frage', *Festschrift zur Feier des 200 jährigen Bestehens des französisches Gymnasiums* (Berlin, 1890), pp. 123–68. This point has been missed by Bérard, who assumes that 4.559–60, 5.16–17, and 17.145–6 have all been copied from 5.141–2, where he claims 'tout . . . est logique et nécessaire' (op. cit. iii. 229–30).

[16] It may be objected that the meaning is actually 'I do not have any ships with me or any companions [or: for] *Odysseus*', but this exegesis, though possible, rather

strains the syntax, a fact which would again strongly suggest that the lines were not specially composed for this place.

[17] Depending on the exigencies of the metre the Homeric poet can and does use a long line-ending θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα/χέοντας etc., an intermediate one κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα etc., or a short one δάκρυ χέοντα etc. The intermediate form occurs at *Il.* 1.413, 6.459 (after ἰδών), 18.94, 428.

[18] Is there any external evidence for a *varia lectio* κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα in *Od.* 17.142? Bérard (op. cit. iii.229) tells us with supreme confidence that 'Eustathe

Page states that Athene's 'third sentence, in three lines, was spoken by Medon to Penelope'. It is true that the last two lines of this sentence, 5.19–20, = 4.701–2 exactly, and that this couplet, though highly formulaic in style, is not itself a formula. However, the *first* line of the sentence in Medon's version was Τηλέμαχον μεμάασι κατακτάμεν ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ, whereas in Athene's version it is νῦν αὖ παῖδ' ἀγαπητὸν ἀποκτεῖναι μεμάασιν: the poet has realized that 4.700 is too abrupt to be used here in a transition to a new topic, and has completely remodelled it: the only word common to both lines is μεμάασι, and that occurs in a different position in the line in each case. Moreover, the remodelling has been done in complete accord with the oral poet's formulaic method of composition: we find νῦν αὖ παῖδ' ἀγαπητόν at the beginning of *Od.* 4.727, νῦν αὖ παῖς ἀγαπητός at the beginning of *Od.* 4.817, [παῖδ'. . . |] Ἑκτορίδην ἀγαπητόν at the beginning of *Il.* 6.401 and μοῦνος ἐὼν ἀγαπητός at the beginning of *Od.* 2.365; μεμάασιν ends the line at *Od.* 4.740 and 22.263, ἀποκτάμεναι μεμάασιν at *Il.* 20.165; for the position of ἀποκτεῖναι in the line cf. also *Il.* 4.494, 9.543, 13.660, and 23.775, and for the infinitive κτεῖναι where κτάμεναι would have been metrically possible see *Il.* 5.261, 435, 13.629, 14.47, *Od.* 4.823, 13.426, 14.282, 15.30, 20.50, 315, 23.79.

However, when all this has been said, we are still left with the question of how we are to judge the *non*-formulaic aspects of the repetition in Athene's speech.

First, we may legitimately claim that Page has put us more on the defensive than we need to be. As Dimock has said, 'Homer never used a new phrase, clause, sentence, or verse-paragraph when repeating an old one would do.' 'The tendency in Homer, or we may say the rule, is always to use the same words when essentially the same idea is to be expressed under the same metrical conditions.'[19] These statements are meant to refer to the formulaic method of composition in general, but why should they not also apply to situations where the Homeric poet repeats something (in *whatever* circumstances) which he has only said *once* before?

nous donne le texte vrai . . . κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα'. However, whether or not this is the 'texte vrai', it is not exactly what Eustathius 'nous donne'. The extraordinary note in Eustathius (1813. 16–20) on *Od.* 17.142 must be quoted in full: εἶτα [ὁ Τηλέμαχος,] ὑπερπηδήσας ὅσα ἐφεξῆς ὁ Μενέλαος ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Πρωτέως ἀφηγήσατο, συγκολλᾷ τῇ ἀνακεφαλαιώσει μόνον ἐκ τῶν ἑξῆς τὸ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως, εἰπών· φῇ μιν ὅ γε (ἤγουν ἔφη αὐτὸν ὁ Πρωτεὺς) ἐν νήσῳ ἰδέειν κρατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχοντα ἢ θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα . . . Eustathius' unmetrical ἄλγεα πάσχοντα is of course a conflation of *Od.* 5.13 ἄλγεα πάσχων and 17.142 ἄλγε' ἔχοντα; and his θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα, unmetrical in 17.142, is what Proteus actually said in *Od.* 4.556. Does Eustathius really mean to give us an alternative text here? Probably; the simple ἤ is his usual way of introducing a variant, he professes to be quoting Telemachus (εἰπών), and the Greek could not *logically* mean 'but the actual words of Proteus were θαλερὸν . . . χέοντα'.

But why has he got into such a terrible muddle? I suspect that in one of his sources he had hastily read a scholium pointing out that Telemachus' version of what Proteus said was different from Menelaus' (and perhaps also quoting the ending of 5.13), and that he misunderstood the scholium's citation of the latter half of 4.556 as a variant or emendation in 17.142. However, it is admittedly possible that there really was a variant κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα (without θαλερόν), and that Eustathius' confusion is due to his having studied all three passages (5.13 ff., 4.556 ff., 17.142 ff.) before writing his note and remembered them badly. In that case I would argue that the unanimity of the extant MSS. in reading κρατέρ' ἄλγε' ἔχοντα favours the hypothesis that the variant is an isolated scholarly correction to align Telemachus' report with what Proteus 'actually' said.

[19] G.E. Dimock, Jr., *Arion* 2.4 (Winter 1963), 41, 44.

After all, formulae tend to grow through the repetitious nature of the poet's
subject-matter. If we assume (and I take this to be probable) that it was the
Odyssey-poet himself who first thought of the idea of sending Telemachus on a
journey to search for news of his father,[20] then it follows that in the process of
telling this story in verse the poet must have *created* certain formulae: he used
certain phrases which were new when he first used them but which he repeated
when the subject-matter made their repetition convenient. For example, this is
presumably how we eventually get the full-fledged formula ὁ δ' ἔβη μετὰ πατρὸς
ἀκουήν (*Od.* 4.701, 5.19, 14.179) with its variations μετ' ἀγαυοῦ πατρὸς ἀκουήν
(2.308) and φίλου μετὰ πατρὸς ἀκουήν (17.43). In other words, the line between
'formula' and 'non-formula' is a thin one and in a sense a rather artificial one.
Moreover, there are other places where the *Odyssey*-poet has taken over a fairly
substantial passage which does not look like a formula and used it, with minimum
adaptation, in a completely different situation: e.g. *Od.* 15.105–8 (Helen choos-
ing a special garment for Telemachus) = *Il.* 6.289, 293–5 (Hecuba choosing a
special garment for Athene) almost exactly; *Od.* 1.29–31 (Zeus remembering the
slain Aegisthus) is very probably based on *Od.* 4.187–9 (Peisistratus remembering
the slain Antilochus). In each of these cases the new situation is much more radically
different from the old than in the case of *Od.* 5.8–20, where, though the speaker
and audience are different, the people and events referred to remain the same.[21]
We can fairly say, then, that if someone claims that the repetition in *Od.* 5.8–20
is of a non-Homeric type, the burden of proof rests with him, and that the burden
is a heavy one.

However, we can go further than this—and I now come to the core of my
argument. J.A. Notopoulos[22] has argued that recapitulatory summaries are an
essential part of oral epic in general and the *Odyssey* in particular. They con-
stitute a device to help bind the various parts of the story together and to assist
the audience to get their bearings when the poet resumes after a break in per-
formance. They are like the 'The story so far' sections in magazine serials.
Notopoulos calls *Od.* 5.1–20 such a 'summary retrospection'. 'This second
council', he says, 'is a repetition [of the first] to connect the narrative which is
interrupted by a digression.'[23] I would not agree that the second council is a
simple repetition or recapitulation of the first,[24] but it is easy to see that Athene
gives us 'the story so far'. First, the position of Odysseus: he has been a prisoner
on Calypso's island so long that his subjects have forgotten him (8–17); next,
the suitors' plot against Telemachus (18–19); and finally, ὕστερον πρότερον
Ὁμηρικῶς, Telemachus' journey to Pylos and Sparta (19–20). Now I want to
suggest that when the Homeric poet composes such a summary he casts his mind
back over the poetry he has already composed and often tends as a result to be
verbally repetitive.

---

[20] If the Journey of Telemachus could
hardly have been viable as an independent
poem, yet forms an excellent introduction
to our *Odyssey*, the natural conclusion is
that it was composed specially for that
purpose. See e.g. the Appendix to D.B.
Monro's edition of *Od.* 13–24 (Oxford,
1901), pp. 309–10; W.J. Woodhouse,
The Composition of Homer's Odyssey
(Oxford, 1930), pp. 210–11.

[21] An exception is *Od.* 5.13 in so far as
it almost = *Il.* 2.721, but I have already given
a special explanation of this line.

[22] 'Continuity and Interconnexion in
Homeric Oral Composition', *TAPA* 82
(1951), 81–101, esp. 91–5.

[23] Op. cit. 94.

[24] e.g. it has often been pointed out
that 5.18–20 refer to events which have
occurred *after* the first assembly.

Let us first consider *Od.* 17.109—49, where Telemachus summarizes his travels for his mother on his return to Ithaca. Of this passage twenty-six continuous lines —17.124—49—have been taken over verbatim from earlier passages (with two minor alterations). 17.124—41 = 4.333—50; 17.142—6 = 4.566—60, except for the alteration in 17.142 which we have already noted; 17.147 has been added to mark the end of Menelaus' speech; 17.148—9 = 4.585—6. Now what Telemachus is doing in his first 23 lines is reporting Menelaus' speech (with considerable telescoping), and when speeches are reported it is standard Homeric practice to give the speaker's *ipsissima verba* with the minimum of alteration; so, it may be objected, we do not really have a close parallel here to *Od.* 5.8—20, where Athene is not *reporting* other people's speeches but as it were plagiarizing them for her own purposes. However, we do have such a parallel in Telemachus' last two lines, ταῦτα τελευτήσας νεόμην· ἔδοσαν δέ μοι οὖρον | ἀθάνατοι, τοί μ' ὦκα φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἔπεμψαν (17.148—9 = 4.585—6). Here *Telemachus* is repeating to *Penelope*, as an account of *his own* return, what *Menelaus* said to *Telemachus* apropos of *Menelaus'* return. In fact the liberty which Telemachus takes with his source here is greater than that which Athene takes in *Od.* 5.8—20, since Telemachus uses the lines to refer to a completely different event. It is of course possible that the couplet is a formula used of the νόστοι of various heroes in oral poetry preceding the *Odyssey*; but I think it is at least equally likely not to be a formula—nothing at all close to it occurs anywhere else in Homer—and that in any case the poet probably repeats it here by a process of mental association: he is casting his mind back to Book 4, and the lines occur there a little later on in the speech of Menelaus from which he has just quoted. I am suggesting that in composing such a summary the poet's mind would be particularly open to the possibility of non-formulaic repetition; reported speeches come into this category but do not exhaust it.

Let us next consider the passage in *Od.* 7 (244—96) where Odysseus tells Queen Arete his own 'story so far'. 7.249—51 = 5.131—3 with the simple change of οἱ in 5.131 to μοι in 7.249; 7.256 almost = 5.135; 7.257 = 5.136. These lines were originally spoken by *Calypso* to *Hermes*; in Book 7 *Odysseus* (who was not present when they were spoken) repeats them to *Arete*. This is precisely the kind of thing we have in *Od.* 5.8—20, viz. the repetition of part of a speech with both speaker and audience changed.[25] To continue: *Od.* 7.266 = 5.268; 7.267 almost = 5.278 (πλέεν changed to πλέον); 7.268 = 5.279; 7.281 almost = 5.442; 7.282 = 5.443. Here *Odysseus* is telling *Arete* in the first person what *the poet* told *his audience* in the third person. The parallel with *Od.* 5.8—20 is not quite so close this time, because the speaker repeats not an earlier speech but the poet's own narrative,[26] but why should this difference be regarded as significant?[27]

[25] Aristarchus athetized 7.251—8, but we do not need to suppose that he had any external evidence against the passage, and even if it *is* an interpolation the central point of my argument remains unaffected, since the athetesis does not touch 249—50.

[26] Other examples of this kind of repetition include *Od.* 10.252—8 based on parts of 10.210—32 and *Il.* 1.372—9 = 1.13—16, 22—5; *Il.* 1.372—9 fall within a mammoth Aristarchean athetesis (of 366—92), but, again, we are not obliged to take this seriously, since the scholia make no men-

tion of manuscript omissions.

[27] I here append some other verbally repetitive passages within summaries, even though their value as parallels to *Od.* 5.8—20 may in each case be queried for one reason or another: (1) *Il.* 18.437—43 = 56—62; 18.444—5 (Thetis to Hephaestus) almost = 16.56, 58 (Achilles to Patroclus); (2) *Od.* 13.380—1 (Athene to Odysseus) = 2.91—2 (Antinous to Telemachus); (3) *Od.* 23.335—7 almost = 5.135—6, 7.256—8; 23.339—41 almost = 5.36—8.

Thus a careful study of the language of *Od.* 5.7—20 and of relevant parallels shows that stylistically this speech, far from being anomalous, is typically Homeric, especially in the light of its recapitulatory nature.[28]

University of Adelaide   M. J. APTHORP

[28] The general point that Homer's recapitulations tend to be verbally repetitive was made in passing by E. Pfudel (*Die Wiederholungen bei Homer: I. Beabsichtigte Wiederholungen* (Liegnitz, 1891), p. 8), who did not mention *Od.* 5.8—20, and at greater length in an unpublished dissertation by E. Seitz 'Die Stellung der "Telemachie" im Aufbau der Odyssee', (Marburg, 1950), pp. 36—45), whose object was to defend the authenticity of the passage *Od.* 13.375—81 against the Analysts' charges that it is a cento. However, Seitz did not discriminate adequately between the various *kinds* of repetition which Homer's summaries contain, he lumped together instances of true repetition with cases where there is no real verbal repetition at all (p. 40 n.1), and he gave the *Odyssey*'s second divine assembly only a fleeting mention (as 5.1—28: p. 41 n.1).