

THE SUBJECTIVE STYLE IN ODYSSEUS' WANDERINGS¹

In his celebrated article on the narrative technique of Odysseus' Wanderings ('Ich-Erzählungen') W. Suerbaum² concludes that this character's narration is not essentially ('wesentlich') different from that of the primary narrator of the *Odyssey* (p. 163). Even though Odysseus is a first-person narrator and hence is subject to certain restrictions, these are almost completely counterbalanced by his *ex eventu* knowledge. For example, he can even report a conversation which took place on Olympus (12.376-88), because it was afterwards reported to him by Calypso, who heard it from Hermes (12.389-90). He can also tell what went on in the minds of his companions (10.415-17), because they later told him what they had felt (10.419-21). Suerbaum's conclusion is shared by M. Fusillo³ ('Ulysse contrôle toujours une vision panoramique avec focalisation zéro et ne la concentre pas en lui-même comme personnage') and A. Heubeck, p. 11 ('the form in which Odysseus is made to tell his story is entirely in harmony with the narrative style elsewhere').

In this paper I will show that there is at least one important respect in which the narration of Odysseus differs from that of the primary narrator: his subjective style.⁴ Recent studies⁵ have shown that there is a marked difference in vocabulary between characters and primary narrator,⁶ in that emotional and evaluative language is only rarely used by the latter.⁷ However, the secondary narrator Odysseus does not shrink from using emotional language, or explicitly commenting on people and events. This subjectivity has been mentioned in passing by scholars,⁸ but has not been described in any detail. I will discuss (1) Odysseus' comments, then (2) his use of emotional and evaluative language. Categories 1 and 2 overlap to some extent, since comments often contain emotional and evaluative words. This is however not always the case; comments may also be couched in neutral language. In section (1) I will use an asterisk to indicate those words which will be discussed separately in section (2).

¹ The research for this article was made possible by a fellowship from the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences. I wish to thank M. W. Edwards, S. R. van der Mije, and D. M. Schenkeveld for their comments and suggestions, and Mrs B. Fasting for her correction of my English.

² The following works are referred to by the author's name: J. Griffin, 'Homeric Words and Speakers', *JHS* 106 (1986), 36-57; A. Heubeck, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, ii (Oxford, 1989); I. J. F. de Jong, 'Homeric Words and Speakers: an Addendum', *JHS* 108 (1988), 188-9 (= de Jong, *Addendum*), *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam, 1987) (= de Jong, *Narrators*); *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (Göttingen, 1955-) (= *LfgzE*); W. Suerbaum, 'Die Ich-Erzählungen des Odysseus', *Poetica* 2 (1968), 150-77.

³ *Poétique* 73 (1988), 114.

⁴ For other differences, see S. Richardson, 'Odysseus, the Narrator', forthcoming.

⁵ Griffin, de Jong, *Addendum*, and de Jong, *Narrators*, pp. 136-46.

⁶ Although strictly speaking there are two primary narrators (one of the *Il.* and one of the *Od.*) I will, for the sake of convenience, refer to the primary narrator in the singular (see S. Richardson, *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville, 1990), p. 6). Likewise, I will use the narrator-text of both *Il.* and *Od.* when analysing the distribution of a word.

⁷ This does not mean that the primary narrator does not *implicitly* make clear his judgement and feelings in various ways. Cf. J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford, 1980), ch. 4, and Griffin, p. 38; de Jong, *Narrators*, ch. 3; Richardson, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-66.

⁸ Cf. C. M. Bowra, *Homer* (London, 1972), p. 76; Suerbaum, p. 162, n. 21; Griffin, p. 35; H. W. Clarke, *The Art of the Odyssey* (reprint, Bristol & Wauconda, 1989), p. 48.

1. COMMENTS

9.12–15 ἐμὰ κήδεα ... στονόεντα | εἶρεσθ' ... | τί πρῶτον ..., τί δ' ὑστάτιον καταλέξω; | κήδε' ... πολλὰ δόσαν θεοί:⁹ although Odysseus' narrative proper starts in 39, he precedes it with a preamble which immediately sets the tone. The narrative to be related will be one full of sorrows (cf. also 37: νόστον ἐμὸν πολυκηδέ'; the adjective πολυκηδής is found in only one other place, in 23.351, where it is again used by Odysseus). Indeed, this very sorrowfulness had previously made Odysseus reluctant to tell his story at all (cf. 7.213–15, 241–2). After the interlude (11.333–77), when he resumes his narrative, he will again indicate beforehand its pitiable content: 380–4. The rhetorical question in 9.14 is an expressive state, meant to convey the number of his sorrows (cf. the primary narrator in *Il.* 5.703–4, 11.299–300, and 16.692–3, and my discussion in *Narrators*, p. 49 [for this and other bibliographical abbreviations, see n. 2]).

9.44 τοὶ δὲ μέγα νήπιοι* οὐκ ἐπίθοντο: this is the first time Odysseus criticizes his companions (cf. 10.26–7, 46; 12.278, 339). They will repeatedly disregard his advice and warnings, until in the end this will prove fatal to them.

9.52–3 τότε δὴ ῥα κακῇ* Διὸς αἶσα* παρέστη | ἡμῖν αἰνομόροισιν*, ἔν' ἄλγεα πολλὰ πάθοιμεν: although he had previously blamed his companions, now – like all Homeric characters – Odysseus *also* ascribes to a (malevolent) god the course of events.¹⁰ There are other places in his narrative where he detects the hand of a god in the course of events, both negative (9.67, 553–5; 12.295, 313, 338, 371–3) and positive (9.142, 154, 158; 10.141, 157; 12.169, 445, 448). It is important to realize that we are dealing here not with facts, but with Odysseus' interpretations.¹¹ It is only in 12.405, 415, 416, and 419 that – thanks to his special knowledge of what went on on Olympus (376–390) – he is able to relate with certainty Zeus' intervention.

9.79–81 καὶ νῦν κεν ἀσκηθῆς* ἰκόμην ..., | ἀλλά ...: similar *if not*-situations are found both in narrator-text and in speeches (for a discussion, see De Jong, *Narrators*, pp. 68–81, and M. Lang, 'Unreal Conditions in Homeric Narrative', *GRBS* 30 (1989), 5–26). Odysseus uses this form to stress the pathos of his story: he had almost reached home. A similar effect is obtained in 10.29–30 by ἤδη and δῆ. The impact of this form is increased by ἀσκηθῆς.

9.106 Κυκλώπων ... ὑπερφιάλων* ἀθεμίστων* and

9.187–9 ὅς ῥα τε μῆλα | οἷος ποιμαίνεισκεν ἀπόπροθεν· οὐδὲ μετ' ἄλλους | πωλεῖτ', ἀλλ' ἀπάνευθεν ἐὼν ἀθεμίστια ἤδη and

9.213–15 αὐτίκα γάρ μοι οἶσατο θυμὸς ἀγῆνων | ἄνδρ' ἐπελεύσεσθαι μεγάλην ἐπιειμένον ἄλκην, | ἄγριον, οὔτε δίκας εὖ εἰδότα οὔτε θέμιστας: the first mention of the Cyclopes immediately elicits a negative comment from Odysseus, and even before Polyphemus enters the scene (in 233) his uncivilized and lawless nature has been mentioned no fewer than three times. The description of the nature and 'culture' of the land of the Cyclopes and of Goat Island in 106–41 implicitly conveys this same message.¹² Odysseus relies on his *ex eventu* knowledge to give this biased information

⁹ Quotations are from the text of T. W. Allen (Oxford, ²1917).

¹⁰ See A. Lesky, *Göttliche und menschliche Motivation im homerischen Epos* (Heidelberg, 1961).

¹¹ See for this question O. Jørgensen, 'Das Auftreten der Götter in den Büchern 1–μ der Odyssee', *Hermes* 39 (1904), 357–82; de Jong, *Narrators*, pp. 212–14; R. Friedrich, 'Thrinakia and Zeus' Ways to Men in the Odyssey', *GRBS* 28 (1987), 375–400; and M. Winterbottom, 'Speaking of the Gods', *G&R* 36 (1989), 33–41.

¹² While Odysseus is enthusiastic about the possibilities for the economic exploitation of goat-island (cf. θαυμάζοντες in 153, the potential optatives in 131, 133, and 134–5, and the frequency

at the very beginning of the episode: in 175–6 he has yet to discover the mentality of ‘these men’. Lines 187–9 are not merely a repetition of the information in 113–15, but a climax: the other Cyclopes, though they live in isolation from each other and mankind, at least have wives and children, whereas Polyphemus lives entirely on his own. Not surprisingly, he will turn out to be the most uncivilized of the uncivilized Cyclopes. In 213–15 Odysseus speaks of ‘a man’, but it is clear that his description only fits Polyphemus.¹³ We have here an effective mixture of Odysseus’ ‘erlebendes Ich’ (on account of the gigantic dimensions of the cave, which he observed in 183–6, he foresaw he would meet a giant) and ‘erzählendes Ich’ (narrating in retrospect, he endows the as yet unknown ‘giant’ with precisely Polyphemus’ characteristics); not only are his addressees’ sympathies directed against Polyphemus,¹⁴ but at the same time we are given an example of Odysseus’ intelligence: he thinks ahead.¹⁵

9.228 ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην, ἦ τ’ ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον* ἦεν: whereas in 44 Odysseus criticized his companions for not obeying him, he now expresses his regret at not having listened to them. In 9.500 he will again fail to listen to them, but here he expresses no self-criticism. Note that Odysseus cannot abide being criticized by others (cf. 10.435–41), a trait which appears to be typical of the Homeric shame culture (cf. e.g. Hector in *Il.* 22.99–110).

9.241–2 οὐκ ἂν τόν... ἄμαξαι | ... ὀχλίσσειαν: this expressive, not to say hyperbolic, description of the stone is given by Odysseus to prepare for his embarrassment in 302–5. A similar expression is used by the primary narrator in *Il.* 12.447–9, in a subjective passage (cf. οἶοι νῦν βροτοί).

9.339 ἦ τι τοῖσάμενος, ἦ καὶ θεὸς ὥς ἐκέλευσεν: this comment, in which he hesitates between two different explanations, reveals that Odysseus is not, after all, an omniscient narrator (cf. also 7.263; here we know that, in fact, the first alternative is the right one).

9.361 τρὶς μὲν ἔδωκα φέρων, τρὶς δ’ ἔκπιεν ἀφραδίῃσιν*: through ἀφραδίῃσιν Odysseus signals that Polyphemus was completely unaware of the risk he was running in drinking so much of the strong wine. In itself the word need not imply criticism; after all, how could Polyphemus know that the stranger had a special purpose in offering him the wine? But seen against the background of Odysseus’ own constant alertness and distrust *vis-à-vis* strangers (displayed a few verses before: 281–2), it does mark the giant as naive.

9.413–14 ἐμὸν δ’ ἐγέλασσε φίλον κῆρ, | ὥς ὄνομ’ ἐξαπάτησεν ἐμὸν καὶ μῆτις* ἀμύμων*: though strictly speaking this is an event (Odysseus describes his emotions at the time), the inside view of his thoughts clearly functions as a comment; intelligence has defeated force. The pun on μῆτις–οὔτις–μῆτις, in particular, reveals his continued pride in his own intelligence (cf. also 20.20–1).

9.419 οὕτω γάρ πού μ’ ἤλπετ’ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ νήπιον* εἶναι: here and in 418, Odysseus is reading Polyphemus’ mind. In theory, this is impossible for him as a first-person

of μάλα in 133–5 (3 times in 3 verses)), the upshot of the description as a whole (which contains no less than 17 negations in 36 lines) is that the Cyclopes lack civilization (both in a material and in an immaterial sense). C. Rothe, *Die Odyssee als Dichtung* (Paderborn, 1914) has completely overlooked Odysseus’ rhetorical strategy here: ‘Dies verschafft dem Dichter zunächst die Möglichkeit, Land, Sitten und Gewohnheiten der Kyklopen *unauffällig* zu schildern’ (my italics).

¹³ Cf. K. F. Ameis & C. Hentze, *Homers Odyssee* (Leipzig, 1940), and Heubeck.

¹⁴ Note that – impartial – Zeus had earlier referred to him as ἀντίθεον Πολύφημον (*Od.* 1.70).

¹⁵ Cf. A. Bergren, ‘Odyssean Temporality: Many (Re)Turns’, in C. A. Rubino & C. W. Shelmerdine (ed.), *Approaches to Homer* (Austin, 1983), pp. 38–77, pp. 46–7.

narrator; he can only make inferences (hence *που*, here and in 418). Odysseus' presentation is far from neutral;¹⁶ the insight into Polyphemos' thoughts is in fact meant to point up Odysseus' cleverness (in not doing what Polyphemos expects him to do) and Polyphemos' stupidity (in thinking Odysseus stupid).

9.442–3 τὸ δὲ νήπιος* οὐκ ἐνόησεν, ὥς...: now Polyphemos is called a fool openly. He does consider the possibility of the Greeks sitting on the back of the sheep (441–2), but not that of them hanging underneath the sheep.

10.27 αὐτῶν γὰρ ἀπωλόμεθ' ἀφραδίησιν*: Odysseus blames both himself (for falling asleep) and his companions (for opening the bag with the winds): ἀπωλόμεθ', and cf. ἡμετέρῃ ματίῃ (79). Thus, human weaknesses (sleep, curiosity) are the cause of this disaster, not the influence of a malevolent god: αὐτῶν.

10.136–7 Κίρκη..., δεινὴ θεὸς...|αὐτοκασιγνήτη ὀλοόφρονος* Αἰήταο: as in the case of Polyphemos, Odysseus gives a biased introduction of his next formidable and initially mischievous 'antagonist' (cf. 9.31–2: Κίρκη...δολόεσσα); cf. also φάρμακα λύγρ' (236), κακὰ φρονέουσ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ (317), φάρμακον οὐλόμενον (394), and, in Hermes' speech, ὀλοφώϊα δήνεα (289).

10.224–5 Πολίτης,..., ὅς μοι κήδιστος* ἐτάρων ἦν κεδνότατός* τε: Odysseus adds this favourable judgement, presumably to make clear why in 273 he 'must' go on his dangerous mission to save this companion and 20 others.¹⁷ Similarly, in 12.246 (οἱ χερσίν τε βίηφί τε φέρτατοι ἦσαν) the favourable description makes the loss of these men all the more sad (cf. 12.258–9, on which see below). For an unfavourable description of a companion, see below on 10.552–3.

10.231 οἱ δ' ἅμα πάντες αἰδρεῖσιν* ἔποντο: as in the case of ἀφραδίησιν in 9.361, Odysseus – who is echoing Eurylochus' report, cf. 257 – uses αἰδρεῖσιν not so much to criticize his companions as to signal their naïvety. Only Eurymachus was suspicious: δισάμενος δόλον εἶναι (232). When Odysseus himself encounters Circe, he will follow her ἀκαχήμενος ἦτορ (313), because he has been forewarned of her bad intentions, both by Eurylochus' report and by Hermes.¹⁸

10.551 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' ἔνθεν περ ἀπήμονας* ἦγον ἐταίρους: the sigh of a leader who feels responsible for his men (cf. 1.6 and *Il.* 3.196–8, where Odysseus is compared to a ram who keeps his flock together).

10.552–3 Ἐλπήνωρ δέ τις ἔσκε νεώτατος*, οὔτε τι λήνη*|ἄλκιμος ἐν πολέμῳ οὔτε φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἀρρηώς: Odysseus gives a somewhat unfavourable description of one of his companions, though νεώτατος may be meant to exculpate Elpenor's behaviour, cf. Antilochus' words in *Il.* 23.587–90. Presumably he is trying to explain why he took no notice of his death at the time (he does not mention it to the other companions in 562ff., and in 11.54 he gives as a reason for having left the body uncared for ἐπεὶ πόνος ἄλλος ἔπειγε).

10.573–4 τίς ἂν θεὸν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα|ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδοιτ' ἢ ἐνθ' ἢ ἐνθα κιόντα,: rhetorical τίς-questions are used by the primary narrator (cf. *Il.* 17.260–1) and also by other characters (Nestor in *Od.* 3.113–14). Odysseus comments on 571–3, in particular ῥεῖα: Circe brought the young ram and black ewe without being noticed.

¹⁶ Cf. W. B. Stanford, *The Odyssey of Homer* (London, ²1977), *ad loc.*: 'O. is unusually boastful in all this incident (cf. 281, 414, 475 ff., 502 ff., 525) presumably because it was the greatest triumph of his skill over tremendous physical force.'

¹⁷ Note that the whole Polites-episode (224–8) is not recorded by Eurylochus. Cf. Suerbaum, p. 155.

¹⁸ The variation between 231 and 313 – which is noted, but not discussed by Heubeck – is due to a difference in knowledge between Odysseus and the companions, not in *ēthos*, as C. Segal suggests: 'Circean Temptations', *TAPA* 99 (1968), 419–42, p. 427.

Odysseus is either inferring Circe's presence, or he alone has noticed her (as in 16.159–62, where he sees Athena, while Telemachus does not). Similarly, in 19.33–43 Odysseus is either inferring Athena's presence or he actually sees her. Here he also says that gods may go about invisibly (43: *αὔτη τοι δίκη ἐστὶ θεῶν*). For the view that gods are not easily recognized, cf. 13.312–13 (Odysseus speaking) and *H.Dem.* 111 (contrast *Il.* 13.72: Ajax speaking).

11.328–30 *πάσας δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι...|πρὶν γάρ...*: this is meta-narrative commentary, i.e. commentary which concerns not so much the content of the narrative as the narration itself. Lines 328–9 resemble *Il.* 2.488–9 (primary narrator in a subjective passage: Muse-invocation), *Od.* 4.240–1 (Helen), 11.517–18 (Odysseus), and, in the form of a rhetorical question, *Od.* 3.113–14 (Nestor). For *πρὶν*..., cf. *Od.* 3.117. The topos is usually employed by way of a priamel, i.e. to select 'a salient or important detail from a general context';¹⁹ Odysseus is the only one to suit the action to the word and actually cease narrating.

11.548 *ὥς δὴ μὴ ὄφελον νικᾶν τοιῶδ' ἐπ' ἀέθλω*: in retrospect Odysseus regrets having won the contest over Achilles' armour, as it led to Ajax' death. In his speech to Ajax he will call the armour *οὐλομένων* and a *πῆμα* (555).

11.565–7 *ἔνθα χ'...προσέφη...|ἀλλά μοι ἤθελε θυμὸς...*: these lines have often been considered an interpolation. They can, however, be explained by seeing them as an attempt by Odysseus to save face after the cool encounter with Ajax: (1) a reconciliation, he suggests, might have taken place after all, and (2) it was his own decision to terminate the meeting.²⁰

11.613–14 *μὴ τεχνησάμενος μηδ' ἄλλο τι τεχνήσαιτο,|ὃς κείνον τελαμῶνα ἐῆ ἐγκάτθετο τέχνη*: a similar expression is used by Penelope in 4.684–5, there in a menacing tone. Odysseus is apparently commenting on the terrifying representations which he perceives on Heracles' *τελαμών*,²¹ cf. *σμερδαλέος* (609), and earlier, with respect to Heracles' appearance as a whole, *ἀτυζομένων*, *ἐρεμνῆ* νυκτὶ* εἰοικώς* (606), *γυμνὸν τόξον* (607), *δεινὸν παπταίνων*, *αἰεὶ βαλέοντι εἰοικώς* (608). The function of these terrifying representations seems to be apotropaic – the threefold repetition of the root *τεχν-* in 613–14 lends Odysseus' reaction to them the appearance of an incantation – and in this respect Heracles' strap may be compared to Athena's aegis (*Il.* 5.738–42, cf. the repeated *δεινός*, *Φόβος*, *κρυόεσσα*, *σμερδνῆ*) and Agamemnon's shield (*Il.* 11.32–40, esp. 36–7: *Γοργῶ βλοσυρῶπις*, *δεινὸν δερκομένη*, *Δεῖμος*, *Φόβος*) rather than, as Heubeck suggests, Achilles' shield (*Il.* 18), which has largely peaceful scenes on it.

12.223 *Σκύλλην, ..., ἀπρηκτον* ἀνίην**: the negative qualification of the monster which Odysseus gives here explains why he does not mention her to his companions. Circe had told him about her in 12.85–100 and had suggested he choose this evil (and lose six men) rather than Charybdis (and lose all of them).

12.258–9 *οἴκτιστον* δὴ κείνο ἐμοῖς ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσι|πάντων ὅσσ' ἐμόγησα πόρους ἀλὸς ἐξερεείνων*: the sight of six of his – best – companions being devoured by Scylla (245–57) elicits this comment from Odysseus. The way the six appeal to him for help (calling his name: 249–50, and stretching out their hands: 257) especially touches the ever solicitous leader Odysseus. The emotional comment *οἴκτιστον* is further

¹⁹ See W. H. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Leiden, 1982), pp. 33–5.

²⁰ Cf. H. Eisenberger, *Studien zur Odyssee* (Wiesbaden, 1973), p. 184. Heubeck has overlooked the rhetoric of Odysseus' presentation: 'any chance of further contact is hindered by *Od.* *θυμός*'.

²¹ So W. W. Merry & J. Riddell, *Homer's Odyssey*, i (Oxford, 1886), *ad loc.*

prepared for by τότε γ' ὕστατον, ἀχνύμενοι κῆρ (250), the simile of 251–5,²² κεκλήγοντες (256), and ἐν αἰνῇ* δηϊοτήτι* (257).

12.295 γίγνωσκον ὁ δὴ κακὰ* μῆδετο daίμων: another case in which Odysseus' thoughts at the time now function as a comment (cf. above on 9.413–14). Odysseus foresees that Eurylochus' suggestion to land on Helios' island (279–93), which runs counter to his own advice to avoid that island (271–6), and which he had already disqualified through στυγερῶ*... μυθῶ* in 278, will lead to disaster.

12.339 Εὐρύλοχος... κακῆς* ἐξάρχετο βουλῆς*: Heubeck comments: 'The phraseology indicates both his evil intention and the fearful consequences.' To speak of Eurylochus' 'evil intention' is not entirely correct: κακῆς is *Odysseus'* evaluation of Eurylochus' speech 340–51, in which he suggests they slaughter Helios' cattle. Odysseus had warned his companions not to do so (298–302, and cf. Circe in 139–41, Teiresias in 11.112–15), and when he later discovers that they did slaughter it, will very much regret this (371–3).²³ Eurylochus himself, of course, considered it a good plan (though he realized its possible negative consequences: 348–51), as did the other companions (352: ἐπὶ δ' ἦνεον ἄλλοι ἑταῖροι).

12.446 οὐ γάρ κεν ὑπέκφυγον αἰπὺν* ὄλεθρον*: Odysseus remarks that he would not have been able to survive a second confrontation with Scylla, presumably because, being the only survivor of his crew, he could not have sacrificed another six men (cf. 12.108–10).

2. EMOTIONAL AND EVALUATIVE WORDS

In this section I have collected those words or combinations of words in Odysseus' narrative which belong to the character vocabulary of the epics, i.e. which occur mainly or exclusively in direct speech and embedded focalization (passages in the narrated parts of the poems where the narrator represents the perceptions, thoughts, emotions, or interpretations of characters).²⁴

9.44 μέγα νήπιοι: the qualification νήπιος is one of the few evaluative words to be used frequently by the primary narrator as well (21 times out of a total of 72 occurrences). In the *Il.* it is used pathetically, to mark the tragic blindness of heroes (e.g. in 2.873), in the *Od.*, moralistically, to indicate the depravity, the self-imposed blindness, of the suitors (e.g. in 22.32). On one other occasion do we find the combination μέγα νήπι-, in *Il.* 16.46, in a subjective passage by the primary narrator.

9.48 ἀρείους: the comparative occurs a total of 18 times, only once in narrator-text (*Il.* 2.707).

9.52 κακῇ... αἶσα: this combination occurs only in direct speech (cf. *Il.* 1.418; 5.209; *Od.* 11.61; 19.259). For κακός, see 9.423.

9.53 αἰνομόροισιν: this adjective occurs only in direct speech (cf. *Il.* 22.481 and *Od.* 24.169), cf. Griffin, p. 41.

9.65 τῶν δειλῶν ἑτάρων: this combination appears only here; δειλός (40 times in all) occurs almost exclusively in direct speech or embedded focalization (*Il.* 23.221); the

²² Heubeck's remark *ad loc.* 'the grisly scene prompts Od. to a comparison with a scene from peaceful everyday life', seems to miss the point. The simile does not stand in contrast to the context, but emphasizes, in a way similar to the fish comparison in 10.124, the horror of what is taking place. Odysseus' companions are helplessly caught by Scylla and then devoured. The sympathy in the simile lies with the fish (note the singular δόλον for 'bait' in 252 and θύραζε in 254: the fish is thrown 'outside' its own element) rather than the fisherman.

²³ Cf. also H. W. Nordheider in *LfgGrE* s.v. κακός (B): κ. never means 'schlecht = böse'.

²⁴ For embedded focalization, see De Jong, *Narrators*, pp. 34–5 and 101–48, *Addendum*, and 'Narratology and Oral Poetry: the Case of Homer', *Poetics Today* (forthcoming).

exceptions are *Il.* 5.574; 22.31 (assimilated simile, see De Jong, *Narrators*, p. 126); 23.65, 223.

9.68 *λαίλαπι θεσπεσίη*: this combination occurs only here and in 12.314. The adjective *θεσπέσιος* is frequently used by the primary narrator as well.

9.74 *συνεχές αiei*: this expressive combination²⁵ – which adds to the effect of the itself expressive formulation *δύω νύκτας δύο τ' ἡματα* – is unique. (However, cf. *ἐμμενές αiei*, *νωλεμές αiei*, etc. which are also used by the primary narrator.)

9.75 *θυμὸν ἔδοντες*: this expression is found only in direct speech (cf. *Il.* 6.202; *Od.* 10.143, 379). Cf. also *ἔδεται κραδίην* (*Il.* 24.129, direct speech).

9.79 *ἀσκηθής*: this word occurs only in direct speech (8 times). It is a key word of Odysseus' *nostos* (cf. *Od.* 5.144, 168).

9.82 *ὄλοοις ἀνέμοισι*: this combination is used only in direct speech and only by Odysseus (cf. 12.425; 14.313). The primary narrator uses mainly descriptive adjectives with *ἄνεμος* (*ζαής*, *ζαχρειός*, *λιγύς*, *παντοῖος*); exceptions are *δυσσής* (*Il.* 5.865: in an assimilated simile; *Od.* 13.99, and cf. 5.295: *Ζέφυρος δυσσής*) and *ἀργαλέος* (*Il.* 13.795).

9.100 *ἐρίηρας ἐταίρους*: this combination is found in the *Il.* 4 times in narrator-text, 3 times in direct speech, in the *Od.* only in direct speech (14 times).²⁶

9.106 *Κυκλώπων... ὑπερφιάλων ἀθεμίστων: ὑπερφιάλος/ὑπερφιάλως* (36 times in all) occurs 27 times in direct speech, 5 times in embedded focalization.²⁷ The qualification *ἀθεμίστων* might at first sight be taken as descriptive (cf. 112: *τοῖσιν δ'... οὔτε θέμιστες*). However, lines 189, 215, and 428 make clear that Odysseus is in fact voicing a negative evaluation here. *ἀθέμιστ(ι)ος* (7 times) occurs five times in direct speech, once in embedded focalization (*Od.* 17.363).

9.133 *μάλα*: see Griffin, p. 45.

9.162 *κρέα... ἄσπετα... μέθυ ἡδύ*: both combinations occur only in direct speech (6 and 9 times respectively).

9.187 *πελώριος*: with three exceptions, this adjective (25 times in all) occurs only in direct speech or embedded focalization (see De Jong, *Narrators*, p. 130). The substantive *πέλωρ* occurs 6 times in direct speech, twice in narrator-text.

9.213 *θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ*: this combination occurs 24 times in all, 20 times in direct speech. Odysseus in particular is fond of the combination (cf. 10.406, 466, 475, 550; 12.28, 324, 414).

9.228 *ἦ τ' ἂν πολὺν κέρδιον ἦεν*: the expression *κέρδιον εἶναι* (31 ×)²⁸ is found either in direct speech or in embedded focalization (type *ὧδε δέ οἱ φρονέοντι δοάσσαντο κέρδιον εἶναι*). The particle *ἦ* is found on only three occasions outside direct speech, one of which concerns embedded focalization (*Od.* 22.31), see De Jong, *Addendum*, p. 188.

9.230 *οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλ' ἐτάροισι φανείς ἐρατεινὸς ἔσεσθαι*: the 'grimly ironical' (Stanford op. cit.) *litotes οὐδ'... ἐρατεινός* is unique.

9.272 *νηλεῖ θυμῷ*: this combination is used only by Odysseus and always in connection with Polyphemus (cf. 9.287, 368). In general *νηλής* (of persons) is confined to direct speech (cf. Griffin, p. 40).

²⁵ Heubeck considers it 'merely a connective' between two formulaic expressions.

²⁶ Cf. M. Schmidt in the *Lfgre*, s.v. *ἐρίηρες**, *ἐρίηρος*: 'Trotz immanenter Kritik am Verhalten der *ἐταῖροι* ist das Beiwort *ἐ* in *μ* 397 nicht bloß "formelhaft", sonder Ausdruck der Trauer des erzählenden Odysseus um seine "Kameraden".'

²⁷ To the three passages mentioned in *Addendum*, p. 188 (*Od.* 1.134, 4.790, 20.12) should be added: *Od.* 13.373 and 14.27.

²⁸ For a discussion of *κέρδος* in Homer, see my paper in *MH* 44 (1987), 79–81, and H. M. Roisman in *ICS* 15 (1991), 225–7.

9.281 Ὡς φάτο πειράζων, ἐμὲ δ' οὐ λάθεν εἰδότα πολλά: with εἰδότα πολλά *Od.* pays himself a compliment, replacing his stock epithet πολύτλας by a positive variant; he has not only suffered much but also seen/learnt much, and hence is not easily fooled.

9.295 σχέτλια ἔργ': this combination is found only in direct speech (cf. *Od.* 14.83; 22.413). The adjective σχέτλιος (31 times) is used only once by the primary narrator (*Od.* 21.28), cf. Griffin, p. 47.

9.295 ἀμηχανίη: a *haraux*, the rhetorical effect of which has been well analysed by Heubeck. The adjective ἀμήχανος occurs 8 times in direct speech, twice in narrator-text (in subjective passages, viz. *if not*-situations).

9.361 ἀφραδίησιν: this noun occurs 3 times in narrator-text (twice in a neutral sense, and once, in *Od.* 17.233, with a disapproving undertone), 7 times in direct speech (cf. Griffin's discussion, p. 44, of ἀφραίνω, ἀφρονέω, ἄφρων: 21 times in direct speech, once in narrator-text).

9.414 μῆτις ἀμύμων: this combination recurs once (*Il.* 10.19, embedded focalization). The use of the adjective ἀμύμων is divided equally over direct speech (58 times) and narrator-text (56 times).

9.418 που: που in the sense of 'perhaps' or 'I suppose' is never used by the primary narrator.

9.423 κακόν: κακός occurs 403 times in direct speech, 19 times in embedded focalization (type κακά δὲ φρεσὶ μῆδετο ἔργα, see *Narrators*, p. 138), and 46 times in narrator-text.

9.435 τετληότι θυμῷ: this combination occurs only in direct speech (9 times, exclusively in the *Odyssey*, the poem about πολύτλας *Odysseus*).

9.440 ὀδύνησι κακῇσι: this combination recurs only once, again in direct speech (*Il.* 5.766). The primary narrator calls pains ἀλεγεινή (*Il.* 11.398), βαρεῖαι (*Il.* 5.417), μελαινάων (*Il.* 15.394), and ὀξεῖαι (*Il.* 11.268, 272).

9.462 ἡβαιόν: this word is used only once by the primary narrator (*Il.* 13.702), as against 6 times by speaking characters.

9.489 κακότητα: this word occurs 21 times in direct speech, once in embedded focalization (*Il.* 12.332), and 3 times in narrator-text (twice in an assimilated simile (*Od.* 5.397, 23.238), and once in a subjective passage by the primary narrator (*Od.* 17.364, an internal prolepsis)).

10.29 πατρίς: the word πατρίς (129 times in all) occurs 114 times in direct speech, and 7 times in embedded focalization (*Il.* 2.454; 11.14; *Od.* 13.197, 219; 23.315, 340; 24.237).

10.46 βουλῇ...κακῇ: this combination is found only in direct speech (cf. *Od.* 12.339; 14.337); see also in 11.276 ὀλοὰς διὰ βουλὰς (a unique combination). The primary narrator also occasionally qualifies the βουλῇ of a character (as πυκινῇν in *Il.* 2.55 and 10.302, as ἐσθλῇν in 18.313).

10.54 κακῇ ἀνέμοιο θυέλλῃ: this combination is used on only one other occasion, again in direct speech (*Il.* 6.346). Only rarely is θυέλλα further qualified, by χαλεπῇν (*Il.* 21.335, Hera is speaking), κραιπναί (*Od.* 6.171, *Odysseus* is speaking), or δεινῇ (*Od.* 5.317, the primary narrator is speaking). Cf. above on ὀλοοῖς ἀνέμοιοι (9.82).

10.78 ὑπ' εἰρεσίης ἀλεγεινῆς: this combination is found only here. The use of the adjective ἀλεγεινός is not restricted to direct speech.

10.79 ἡμετέρῃ ματίῃ: the word ματίῃ occurs only here.

10.115 λυγρὸν δλεθρον: this combination is found 10 times in direct speech, 3 times in narrator-text (in subjective passages: an internal prolepsis (*Il.* 2.873), a necrology (6.16), and an *if not*-situation (20.289)).

10.121 ἀνδραχθέσι: this *hapax*, which apparently means that ‘the stones are so large that they are a weight too heavy for a man to throw’ (Heubeck) seems to have been coined by Odysseus in connection with his preceding remark: [Λαιστρυγόνες] οὐκ ἄνδρεσσιν ἐοικότες, ἀλλὰ Γίγασιν.

10.122 κακὸς κónαβος: a unique combination.

10.124 ἄτερπέα δαίτα: this combination is found only here, and has been well analysed by Ebeling in his *Lexicon Homericum*: ‘non cenantibus, sed Ulixi’. The adjective ἄτερπής (5 times in all) occurs 4 times in direct speech, and once in embedded focalization (*Il.* 19.354).

10.137 ὀλοόφρονος Αἰήταο: the adjective ὀλοόφρων occurs 4 times in direct speech, and once in embedded focalization (*Il.* 2.723). The primary narrator uses it once, in a subjective passage (an assimilated simile: *Il.* 15.630; ὀλοόφρων reflects the Greeks’ frightened perception of Hector, cf. De Jong, *Narrators*, p. 127).

10.225 κήδιστος... κεδνότατος: both words occur only in direct speech (each 3 times). For the tendency of superlatives to be found mainly in direct speech (or embedded focalization), see Griffin, p. 49 and De Jong, *Narrators*, p. 143.

10.231 αἰδρεῖσιν: this word is used only in direct speech (cf. *Od.* 10.257; 11.272; 12.41).

10.245 ἀδευκέα πότμον: a unique combination. The use of the adjective ἀδευκής is confined to direct speech (*Od.* 4.489 and 6.273).

10.276 Κίρκης... πολυφαρμάκου: this qualification might be taken as descriptive (cf. in narrator-text ἡτροὶ πολυφάρμακοι: *Il.* 16.28), but in the present context (and after 213: κακὰ φάρμακ’ and 236: φάρμακα λύγρ’) it reveals the apprehensive mood of Odysseus, who is about to meet the enchantress Circe.

10.363 κάματον θυμοφθόρον: this combination is found only here. The adjective θυμοφθόρος occurs 4 times in direct speech, once in narrator-text (*Od.* 4.716).

10.394 φάρμακον οὐλόμενον: the adjective οὐλόμενος occurs 13 times in direct speech, once in narrator-text (*Il.* 1.2, see De Jong, *Narrators*, pp. 143–4).

10.551 ἀπήμονας: this word occurs 14 times in direct speech, 4 times in embedded focalization (*Il.* 12.80; 13.748, 761; 14.164), and once in narrator-text (*Od.* 5.268).

10.552 νεώτατος: this superlative occurs 5 times in direct speech and once in embedded focalization (*Il.* 20.409).

10.552 λίην: the word occurs 40 times in direct speech and once in embedded focalization (*Od.* 14.461).

11.19 νὺξ ὀλοή: this combination occurs in only one other place, in embedded focalization (*Il.* 16.567).²⁹ The adjective ὀλο(ι)ός (40 times in all) occurs 30 times in direct speech, 6 times in embedded focalization.

11.19 δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι: this combination is found 5 times in direct speech and once in narrator-text, in an assimilated simile (*Il.* 22.31, see De Jong, *Narrators*, p. 126). For δειλός, see above 9.65.

11.47 ἐπαινῇ Περσεφονείῃ: the adjective is found only in direct speech (6 times), always in connection with Persephone.

11.239 πολὺ κάλλιστος: this combination is used only by Odysseus (here and in 11.310). The superlative κάλλιστος occurs 5 times in narrator-text, 11 times in direct speech.

11.267 Ἡρακλῆα θρασυμέμνονα θυμολέοντα: both adjectives occur only in direct speech (θρασυμέμνων: once, θυμολέων: 5 times), in connection with Achilles (once), Heracles (twice), and Odysseus (twice). For θυμολέων, cf. S. R. van der Mije in *Lfgre*, ‘emphatisch, sehr lobend’.

²⁹ Incorrectly Heubeck: ‘used only once in Homer’.

11.292 χαλεπή...μοίρα: a unique combination. Note, however, that the primary narrator (of the *Il.*) also describes 'fate' in emotional terms: δυσώνυμος, κακή, κραταιή, όλοιή.

11.309 μηκίστους: this superlative is found only in direct speech (4 times).

11.582 χαλέπ' άλγε': this combination is found only in direct speech (*Il.* 5.384; *Od.* 22.177). The primary narrator only rarely adds emotional qualifications to άλγος (*λυγρά* in *Il.* 13.346, *δεικέλιον* in *Od.* 14.32, an *if not*-situation).

11.606 έρεμνή νυκτι έοικώς: the primary narrator twice uses night comparisons (*Il.* 1.47 and 12.463), but only here do we find the combination with έρεμνός (for which cf. H. W. Nordheider in *Lfgre*: 'mit Konnot' des Bedrohl., Unheiml.)

12.223 άπρηκτον άνήν: this combination is found only here. Both words occur only in direct speech (*άπρηκτος*: 5 times; *άνή*: 4 times).

12.226 έφημοσύνης άλεγεινής: this combination is found only here. The primary narrator twice uses έφημοσύνη, but without adding an emotional qualification (*Il.* 17.697; *Od.* 16.340).

12.257 αίνή δηιοτήτι: this combination occurs 10 times in direct speech, twice in embedded focalization (*Il.* 3.20; 13.207), and once in a subjective passage by the primary narrator (*Il.* 13.603: note the apostrophe).

12.258 οϊκτιστον: this superlative is found only in direct speech (6 times). The adverb οϊκτιστα is found once, in embedded focalization (*Od.* 22.472).

12.278 στυγερώ...μύθω: this combination is found only here. The adjective στυγερός occurs 34 times, 24 times in direct speech, 4 times in embedded focalization (*Il.* 4.240; 13.670; 14.158; *Od.* 24.414).

12.446 αιπών όλεθρον: this combination occurs 14 times in direct speech, twice in narrator-text (*Il.* 11.274, *Od.* 1.11).

CONCLUSION. SPEECH OR NARRATIVE?

Following the inventory of Odysseus' subjective style contained in the previous two sections, it would now seem appropriate to evaluate that subjectivity. In the first place, there is a technical point to be made. In his paper on 'Homeric words and speakers', Griffin suggests that 'the *άπόλογοι* are to be classed as speech, not as narrative' (pp. 35 and 43). This suggestion, couched in such unspecific terms, requires some elaboration. I agree with Griffin when he says that the Wanderings should be classed as *mimesis* (in Plato's terminology), or character-text (in narratological terminology). Thus *Od.* contains 68% character-text and 32% narrator-text (as against *Il.* 45:55).³⁰ Yet at the same time the Wanderings are a narrative; not of the kind told by the external primary narrator in the *diēgēsis haplē* (Plato), or narrator-text, but a first-person narrative. It is precisely this fact which accounts for its subjective style, for narratologists agree that first-person narratives are in their nature emotional and coloured. A first-person narrative is one which is related by a narrator who has been himself involved in the events he is narrating. The involvement of the narrator precludes a neutral style of presentation.³¹

³⁰ See W. Schmid & O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, i. 3 (Munich, 1961), p. 92, note 7, and De Jong, *Narrators*, pp. x and 149.

³¹ Cf. e.g. J. Lintvelt, *Essai de typologie narrative. Le 'point de vue'* (Paris, 1981), p. 39: 'La narration homodiégétique exclut... le type narratif neutre. Même si le personnage essaie de se limiter à un enregistrement pur et simple..., il s'agira néanmoins d'une perception individuelle'. For another (practical) demonstration of the subjectivity of first-person narration, see I. J. F. de Jong, *Narrative in Drama. The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-speech* (Leiden, 1991), ch. 2.

In the second place, the subjectivity of Odysseus' style has a bearing on the interpretation of the Wanderings themselves. Whereas older scholarship analysed Odysseus' travel stories mainly from the point of view of the poet, who set himself the task of transforming folktale elements into an epic narrative, more attention is now given to the narrator in the text, Odysseus, and the function of his narrative. Odysseus' subjective style is one of the rhetorical devices which he employs to make clear to his audience, the Phaeacians, that he deserves the *πομπή* they have just promised him (in 7.317–28; 8.31–3, 544–5, 556).³² The *πομπή* turns out to be part of the *nostos* of no less a hero than Odysseus, whose fame has only just been sung by Demodocus. Odysseus makes sure that his narrative contains many instances of his famous intelligence and makes clear how his present plight is due largely to the folly of his companions and the malevolence of certain gods. Although I do not agree with those who say that Odysseus' story is wholly invented,³³ it is as well to be aware of its subjective and rhetorical nature.

University of Amsterdam

IRENE J. F. DE JONG

³² Other rhetorical devices are: his handling of time (see Bergren, *op. cit.*), and the structure of his story (see G. W. Most, 'The Structure and Function of Odysseus' *Apologoi*', *TAPA* 119 (1989), 15–30).

³³ Ranging from the ancient scholiasts to I. Calvino in *La machine littérature – Essais* (Paris, 1984), pp. 111–17. Contra Suerbaum, p. 175.