

TYPE-SCENES AND HOMERIC HOSPITALITY

MARK W. EDWARDS

Stanford University

In an important recent article, David M. Gunn has drawn attention to two rather odd passages in the *Odyssey*, and set beside them certain scenes in Yugoslavian heroic songs where slight inconsistencies occur; he has suggested that in both cases the difficulties arise from the circumstances of oral composition, in which the singer cannot go back and correct a mistake once made, or alter a preceding passage if he subsequently decides to modify the content of a scene.¹ In each case, Gunn says, change or omission of merely one line would have enabled the poet to avoid the illogicality.

Gunn's conclusion may be correct; but I do not find it easy to accept the idea that our Homer text represents so closely one special performance recorded verbatim from the singer's lips, though of course this is the view of A. B. Lord and other distinguished scholars. In this paper I shall suggest that a close analysis of the scenes in question, using a method applied by Gunn himself in another excellent article,² shows that the problems are greater than Gunn allows, and his explanation thus becomes harder to accept as a full explanation of the difficulties. Two other passages where a similar analysis helps in accounting for a certain awkwardness are also discussed. The argument also casts some light on the nature of type-scenes in Homer.

The question of terminology arises first. Gunn, following Lord, uses "theme" for a description of a simple, regularly-structured activity such as launching a ship, preparing and eating a meal, receiving a guest and the like.³ But Lord in his wide-ranging and seminal works also

¹ "Narrative inconsistency and the oral dictated text in the Homeric epic," *AJP* 91 (1970) 192-203.

² "Thematic composition and Homeric authorship," *HSCP* 75 (1971) 1-31.

³ See the references to Lord's work in the first footnote of each of Gunn's articles.

discussed under the same term another different kind of repetition, that of basic patterns of narrative such as the return of a wanderer after long absence, with its regular component parts of disguise, deceptive tale, recognition and so on, which are found in many different cultures. This ambiguity was quickly pointed out by George E. Dimock Jr., who distinguished the two kinds of repetition as "type-scene" and "stock motif,"⁴ and the problem has more recently been illustrated and examined by the mediaeval scholar Donald K. Fry.⁵ Fry also uses the term "type-scene" for "a recurring stereotyped presentation of conventional details used to describe a certain narrative event, requiring neither verbatim repetition nor a specific formula content" (p. 53). The term properly recognizes the great contribution made to Homeric studies by Walter Arend, the pioneer in the field,⁶ and will be used in this article.⁷

It may be added that Fry's further definition of "theme" as "a recurring concatenation of details and ideas, not restricted to a specific event, verbatim repetition, or certain formulas, which forms an underlying structure for an action or description" is not very satisfactory, at least for Homeric studies. In this connection Fry refers specifically to a demonstration that "certain details adhere to the abstract concept of 'exile' whenever it is embodied in Old English verse, regardless of the identity and circumstances of the exiled characters" (p. 52), but it seems to me that this usage, and that of the other well-documented "themes" in mediaeval poetry, the "hero on the beach" and the "beasts of

⁴ *Arion* 2 (1963) 50.

⁵ "Old English formulaic themes and type-scenes," *Neophilologus* 52 (1968) 48-54.

⁶ *Die typische Szenen bei Homer (Problemata* 7, Berlin 1933). Page-references to Arend below refer to this work. Arend was the Milman Parry in this area. His work was highly original and excellently done, and goes beyond the simple collection and analysis of type-scenes to the identification of the effects of intentional violation of the norm and to cases where problems arise because of overlap of type-scenes. He sometimes corrected the misapprehensions of the mighty Homerists, but his work had little effect and has still not been properly assimilated into general understanding of Homeric style.

⁷ Recent work on Homeric type-scenes is included in the "Theme" section of J. B. Hainsworth's *Homer in Greece and Rome; New Surveys* no. 3 (Oxford 1969). One can now add (besides Gunn's work) the second part of H. Patzer's *Dichterische Kunst und poetisches Handwerk im hom. Epos* (Wiesbaden 1972), W. F. Hansen's fine monograph *The Conference Sequence* (*U. of California Classical Studies* 8, Berkeley 1972), and the articles of J. Russo (*Arion* 7 [1968] 275-95), W. C. Scott (*TAPA* 102 [1971] 541-51) and J. Peradotto (*Texas Studies in Lit. and Lang.* 15 [1974] 803-32). See also the books of M. N. Nagler and C. A. Sowa, mentioned below.

battle," is more accurately considered a symbolical or allusive use of what remains essentially an element in a type-scene, and is different from the recurrent patterns in the structure of the narrative itself.⁸ The equivalent to "theme" in this sense would seem to be, in Homeric studies, the usages studied by Charles Segal and (together with others) by Michael Nagler.⁹ For the kind of patterns and repetitions within the plot which Bernard Fenik has recently demonstrated for the *Odyssey* the pioneers, Propp and Lord, have provided no precise term, and "narrative patterns" might be the best suggestion.¹⁰

I

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο,
δὴ τότε Τηλέμαχος καὶ Νέστορος ἀγλαὸς υἱὸς
ἵππους τε ζεύγυνντ' ἀνά θ' ἄρματα ποικίλ' ἔβαιων, 145
ἐκ δ' ἔλασαν προθύροιο καὶ αἰθούσης ἐριδούπου.

⁸ For example, A. Bonjour suggested that the "theme" of the "beasts of battle" (mention of wolf, eagle and/or raven as attendant on a scene of carnage) might have begun as a harshly realistic note in descriptions of battle and its aftermath, then been used at the outbreak of battle to foreshadow the grim, inexorable outcome; sometimes it is used apparently mechanically, but in *Beowulf* it is withheld during most of the poem and then brilliantly brought in at the close to stress the tragic destiny of the nation and the ultimate triumph of death (*PMLA* 72 [1957] 563-73). In the same way the type-scene of a sea voyage, often used simply for decoration (R. E. Diamond, *PMLA* 76 [1961] 374-92) may also carry the symbolic sense of death (L. C. Ramsay, *Neuphilologische Mitt.* 72 [1971] 51-59). The "theme" of "the hero on the beach" was formulated by David Crowne in *Neuphilologische Mitt.* 61 (1960) 362-72, that of "exile" by S. Greenfield in *Speculum* 30 (1955) 200-206. For more recent work on mediaeval poetry see Edward R. Haymes, *A Bibliog. of studies relating to Parry's and Lord's Oral Theory* (Pub. of the Milman Parry Collection, Harvard U. [Cambridge, Mass., 1973]).

⁹ Segal, *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad* (*Mnemosyne Supp.* 17, Leiden 1971); Nagler (next note).

¹⁰ These patterns occur, of course, at every scale of magnitude within the epics. Much was done here by the older scholars, especially perhaps Schadewaldt (*Iliasstudien*) and Hölscher (*Unters. zur Form der Od.* [*Hermes Einzelschr.* 6, Berlin 1939]), as Fenik is careful to acknowledge. Besides the fundamental works of V. Propp (*Morphology of the Folktales* [Austin 1968²]) and A. B. Lord (*The Singer of Tales* [Cambridge, Mass., 1960]), we now have books by B. Fenik (*Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad* [*Hermes Einzelschr.* 21, Wiesbaden 1968] and *Studies in the Odyssey* [*Hermes Einzelschr.* 30, Wiesbaden 1974]), T. Krischer (*Formale Konventionen der hom. Epik* [*Zetemata* 56, Munich 1971]) and M. N. Nagler (*Spontaneity and Tradition: a Study in the Oral Art of Homer* [Berkeley 1974]); the last-named brilliantly brings out the allusive and evocative effects of repeated "motifs" on the scale of the word, the phrase, the type-scene element (my terminology), and the larger narrative patterns within the epic. Cora A. Sowa will deal with type-scenes and narrative patterns in the *Homeric Hymns* in a forthcoming book, which she kindly allowed me to see in typescript.

τοὺς δὲ μετ' Ἀτρεΐδης ἔκκιε ξανθὸς Μενέλαος,
οἶνον ἔχων ἐν χειρὶ μελίφρονα δεξιτερῇφι,
ἐν δέπαϊ χρυσέῳ, ὄφρα λείψαντε κιοίτην.
στῇ δ' ἵππων προπάροιθε, δεδισκόμενος δὲ προσηύδα· 150
"χαίρετον, ὦ κούρω, καὶ Νέστορι ποιμένι λαῶν
εἶπεῖν. . . ." (*Od.* 15.143-52)

This is part of the description of the departure of Telemachus and Peisistratus from Menelaus' palace. It is preceded by the presentation of gifts and a formal meal, and followed by the unsolicited appearance of an omen and its interpretation by Helen before Telemachus actually whips up his horses and departs.

Gunn's argument is that in using the verse 145 (= *Od.* 3.492, 15.190) the poet has carried the description beyond the point at which elaboration, such as description of the libations and an omen, was possible, and has further added the normal verse of actual departure (146 = *Od.* 3.493, 15.191, *Il.* 24.323). He has then, too late, decided to ornament the scene, and as a result "there springs to mind, perhaps a little unfairly, a picture of the chariot speeding through the gate with Menelaus desperately bringing up the rear, wine slopping on his tunic, waving frantically for them to stop" (p. 195).¹¹ He compares the departure of Priam in *Il.* 24.281 ff., where the libation is poured, the prayer made, and the omen seen, *before* Priam steps into his chariot. Gunn further suggests that "the abruptness of the change makes it unlikely that [the poet] was unaware of his error" (p. 197), and points out that at the actual departure the regular formulaic verses are not used.

The episode contains elements of the following type-scenes:

I. The gift-giving type-scene; the gifts are described, admired, and stowed away in chariot or ship; a meal and the departure follow. There is another example at Odysseus' departure from Phaeacia (*Od.* 13.18 ff., 66 ff.).

Not separately identified by Arend. Here (with much elaboration) lines 99-132.

¹¹ G. R. Rose has suggested (*TAPA* 102 [1971] 509-14) that the humorous tone is intentional and continues Menelaus' "utter inability to grasp Telemachus' inner need" to return home at once; this is why "even as Telemachus is effecting his escape, Menelaus suddenly lurches in pursuit, impelled by the desire to pour a last libation and say a few parting words" (p. 512). This is possible, but does not supplant Gunn's (or my) explanation of the mechanics behind the verses.

II. The chariot-departure type-scene; yoking the horses, mounting the chariot (and often taking up the whip and/or reins), whipping-up the horses, and driving off. A short form of this is found after Telemachus' overnight stops (*Od.* 3.492-94 = 15.190-92), and a slightly elaborated form at his departure from Nestor's palace (*Od.* 3.475 ff.), which includes orders for yoking the horses, the provision of a picnic lunch, and a description of Peisistratus' mounting the car and taking the reins.

Arend 86-91. Here lines 145-46, 182-83.

III. The individual-pours-libation type-scene; this may begin with the proposal by another person that this be done (e.g., Hecuba in *Il.* 24.283 ff., 6.258 ff.), and then there follows the hand-washing, the prayer, and the libation. Often the response to the prayer is included. The major examples are Achilles' libation at the departure of Patroclus (*Il.* 16.220 ff.) and the two Hecuba-passages just mentioned; a short form occurs at *Od.* 14.331-32 = 19.288-89. At *Od.* 3.388-95 a scene of this type passes into a group libation scene, and has the additional peculiarity that Nestor mixes his own drinks.

Arend 77-78 (less satisfactorily than usual). Here lines 147-49.

IV. The greeting type-scene; usually a person hands a cup of wine to another, and with words of welcome, farewell, or honor (often *δεδίσκετο* or some other form of the verb, and *χαίρε*¹²) makes a prayer or wish for him; sometimes he invites the other to make a libation and pray. Examples are Odysseus' toast to Achilles (*Il.* 9.224 ff.), Menelaus' to his young guests (*Od.* 4.59 ff.), Amphinomus' to Odysseus (*Od.* 18.119-23, 151-52), and Peisistratus' to "Mentor" (*Od.* 3.41 ff.). Different in tone are Odysseus' farewell to Arete (*Od.* 13.56-62) and Hephaestus' comforting words to his mother (*Il.* 1.584-96). There are short forms at *Il.* 9.670-71, 15.85-88, 24.101-02, *Od.* 14.112-13, 447-48. Greeting without the offer of wine is found at *Il.* 9.196-97, *Od.* 20.197-99. This theme differs from III in that here the intent is to do honor to the other person rather than to invoke the gods, and often the libation and prayer are not mentioned.

Not separately identified by Arend. Here lines 150-59.

¹² *δεικνύμενος* is also used in this sense, at *Il.* 9.196 and *H. Ap.* 11; see W. B. Stanford's note to *Od.* 15.150 (*The Odyssey of Homer* [London 1965²]). *χαίρε* in these expressions of course sometimes means "farewell," sometimes "good health!"

V. The omen type-scene; an omen is occasionally sought, but more often appears without warning (though it may be cued by an earlier remark, as at *Od.* 2.141 ff., 15.525 ff., 20.345 ff.); normally it is stated who sent it. Then the portent is described, and the reaction of the observers: wonder, if the portent is enigmatic; joy, if it is a bird on the right hand; fear, if the omen is clearly unfavorable. Sometimes an interpretation is offered (not requested), and if so is regularly afterwards approved, disapproved, or commented upon (except *Il.* 2.308 ff., which is narrated by Odysseus).

Not in Arend. Here lines 160–81.

The following type-scene does not occur in our passage, but is needed to complete the analysis of a parallel episode;

VI. The group-libation type-scene; a libation is proposed, and the others present agree; there is washing of hands and mixing of the wine, then the pouring of the libation and drinking, often with a direct connection to the next action. Of many examples, *Il.* 9.171 ff. and *Od.* 21.263 ff. may be mentioned.

Arend 76–77 (well).

Elements of the above type-scenes are gracefully interwoven in two episodes. First, at Priam's departure in *Il.* 24.228 ff.:

228: Priam prepares the ransom, and has it stowed in the mule-wagon (gift-giving type-scene, much elaborated).

279: yoking of Priam's horses (briefly, because the mule-yoking has just been described; start of chariot-departure type-scene).

283: Hecuba proposes a libation, and Priam washes his hands, pours the libation and prays (individual-pours-libation type-scene).

309: request for omen, its appearance, and joyful reaction (omen type-scene, prepared for in 292–95).

322: Priam mounts his chariot and departs (conclusion of departure type-scene; the whipping-up of the horses is held back until 326).

Secondly, Odysseus' departure from Phaeacia (*Od.* 13.10 ff.). Here the departure is by ship, but the pattern is similar:

10: Alcinous refers to the previous gifts to Odysseus, and demands more; they are brought and stowed in the ship (gift-giving type-scene).

23: a feast; the description is elaborated by mention of Odysseus' eagerness to be gone (start of departure type-scene).

38: Odysseus proposes a general libation, which is performed (group-libation type-scene; the hand-washing is omitted, as is often done when the wine-mixing is described, as it is here).

56: Odysseus hands the cup to Arete, with moving words (greeting type-scene).

62: he goes down to the ship (ship-departure type-scene).

66: Arete too sends gifts, which are stowed in the ship (second use of gift-giving type-scene).¹³

73: Odysseus climbs into the ship (ship-departure type-scene, concluded).

Telemachus' departure from Menelaus' palace can now be analyzed in detail:

99-132: Menelaus and Helen select gifts and give them to Telemachus; they are stowed away by Peisistratus. The type-scene is prepared for in 75-76. This is a normal gift-giving scene, complicated by the fact that the choicest gift, the mixing-bowl, has already been described in *Od.* 4.613-19. The repetition of the lines here (113-19) does not in my view warrant their rejection, but there is certainly awkwardness in having Menelaus describe the bowl to Telemachus in glowing terms and then hand him the *cup*; ¹⁴ and this is compounded by the fact that the verse with which he hands over the cup (120) is used (in slightly different form) for the handing-over of the cup in the greeting type-scene (at *Il.* 1.584-85, *Od.* 3.51, 13.57). It seems possible that its use here is a reason for its not being used later in the greeting scene (see below).

132-46: The meal, the harnessing of the horses, the mounting, and the driving out from the portico. This is the departure type-scene, stopping short of the whipping-up of the horses (which comes in 182-83). The poet uses the short form of the scene, which appears in the overnight stops (145-46 = 3.192-93 = 15.190-91), instead of the more

¹³ Arete's gifts here seem to go beyond the *viaticum* given to Telemachus by the housekeeper in *Od.* 3.479-80.

¹⁴ The difficulty was perhaps exaggerated by Wilamowitz, but Hölscher's protest (above, note 10, p. 24) does not entirely remove it.

elaborate style of the departure from the palace of Nestor (*Od.* 3.475 ff.).

Use of the brief form is surprising, and leads directly to the awkwardness which Gunn identifies. Certainly there is a great deal of other elaboration in the scene—the gifts, the omen—but usually there are at least two lines allotted to the process of yoking the horses and mounting the chariot (e.g., *Il.* 3.259 ff., 5.364 ff., 8.41 ff. = 13.23 ff., 5.730 ff., 8.382 ff., 24.278 ff., *Od.* 3.475 ff., 6.72 ff.). Since, however, the poet has stopped short of the whipping-up which almost invariably accompanies a departure, the feeling may be that Telemachus has not actually set off on his way; the poet and his hearers would not actually have the picture Gunn describes.¹⁵ Line 146 is inept, but it is fair to say that the departure scene is not yet completed, but only interrupted. The poet is, however, consistent about Telemachus' having already mounted the chariot, for in 182 there is no repetition.

147–49: Menelaus brings a cup of wine “so that they may pour a libation before they go.” The verses, similar in sense and wording to *Il.* 24.283–84 (Hecuba's approach to Priam before he leaves) are the first element in the individual-pours-libation type-scene, the proposal of it by another person.¹⁶ It may be slightly peculiar for the superior person to call upon the inferior to do so, but there are not really enough parallels to be sure.

150–53: With *δεδισκόμενος* the greeting type-scene is introduced, and Menelaus toasts the young men with the usual *χαίρε*. This is very odd: (a) the greeting scene is not elsewhere employed under circumstances like this—in the departure-scene in *Od.* 13 it is the visitor who toasts his hostess; (b) Menelaus does not make a prayer for Telemachus,

¹⁵ Whipping-up is only omitted when something else is inserted and interrupts the normal sequence. So in *Il.* 3.262 after Priam picks up the reins Antenor steps into the chariot, and mention of whipping-up would necessitate a clumsy return to Priam as subject; in 13.27, a new verse is formed to introduce Poseidon's sea-monster audience; in 24.441–42, Hermes picks up the whip but “breathes strength into the horses and mules;” on *Od.* 15.215–16, see F. M. Combellack, *TAPA* 96 (1965) 45 (suggesting the reading *ἵμασεν*, with some MSS, for the vulgate *ἔλασεν*). In the battle-scenes of the *Iliad* whipping-up is the normal indication of resumption of movement of the chariots; 8.117, 11.519, 15.352, 21.400.

¹⁶ The duals in the second half of 149 = *Il.* 24.285 are of course proper in both contexts. One cannot help wondering if the phrase is formulaic, and was developed in the dual to suit the departures of a pair of heralds, a pair of envoys. The notorious duals in *Il.* 9 might be relevant (see C. Segal, *GRBS* 9 [1968] 101–14, and M. N. Nagler (above, note 10) 95).

or in fact say anything to him except to send his regards to Nestor; (c) he is not said to hand the cup to Telemachus, though this is elsewhere a normal part of the greeting scene;¹⁷ (d) the libation and prayer by the recipient are often not described, but here Telemachus goes on to make a wish without, so far as we are told, pouring a libation—in fact he never seems to get the cup at all. It is clear that the elements of the libation-pouring scene and the greeting scene are mingled, and that the giving of the cup to Telemachus has dropped out. The reason may, of course, be that he is standing in the chariot, or (from a different point of view) that the normal verse for the handing-over has been used in a different context not long before (verse 120).

154-59: Telemachus makes a wish, but no libation.

160-81: The eagle appears, unsummoned (as usual);¹⁸ the observers naturally rejoice, as the bird is on the favorable side, and Peisistratus asks Menelaus whether it applies to Telemachus and himself or to the king. Helen (as in *Od.* 4) rescues her husband from his perplexity, and the omen type-scene is rounded off normally by a few words from Telemachus approving her interpretation. This is all normal—Peisistratus' request to Menelaus is not for an interpretation, which would be irregular, but for clarification about the application of the sign—except for the striking omission of information about the god who sent the omen. In other instances the origin of the bird is specifically mentioned, either as it is despatched or in the interpretation.¹⁹

182-83: Telemachus, already in the chariot, whips up the horses and drives off. This concludes the departure type-scene. Gunn suggests (p. 197) that "it is probably no accident that when [the poet] does finally reach the departure proper he avoids any of his regular 'departure' verses which might have attracted attention to the fact that he had already recited more of the regular theme than he should have done." There is little or no force in this. Line 182 is *not* "precisely equivalent to the *formula* used elsewhere, *Od.* 3.484 = 494 = 15.192" (Gunn p.

¹⁷ It seems clear that this is the poet's habitual procedure. The cup is clearly handed to the person greeted at *Il.* 1.585, 15.88, 24.101, *Od.* 3.40-41, 13.57, 14.112, 14.448, 18.121 (cf. 151-52). At *Il.* 9.224 and 670-71 it is not clear if this is done or not. At *Od.* 4.59 the person giving the greeting does not hand cups to the guests himself, but the housekeeper has just done so.

¹⁸ Arend's comment "aber ohne seine Bitte!" (p. 88) is unjustified.

¹⁹ The only exceptions are the very brief omen description in *Od.* 20.242 f., and Penelope's dream in 19.535 f.

197 note 13, his italics), because it includes the verb ῥῖ which concludes the preceding direct speech, and omission of this would be exceptional;²⁰ the verb cannot be added to the formulaic verse without displacing μάστιξεν. A reshaping of a verse under similar circumstances is found at *Od.* 6.316–17.²¹

In the course of this scene the following unusual features occur:

1. The addition of the cup to the bowl promised to Telemachus in *Od.* 4 leads to some oddity in the gift-giving scene, especially if the use of the handing-over verse (120) here pre-empts its use for the handing-over of the cup in the greeting type-scene later on;
2. The choice of a brief form of chariot-departure type-scene, which leads to the oddities pointed out by Gunn;
3. The mingling of elements from the individual-pours-libation type-scene with those from the greeting type-scene, and the omission of the prayer for the recipient, the handing-over of the cup, and the pouring of the libation;
4. The omission of mention of the sender of the omen.

The third and fourth of these arise from unusually extensive omissions in the regular type-scenes; the libation-scene in particular becomes only a bridge-passage leading up to the omen type-scene, very different from Priam's prayer in *Il.* 24. The resulting feeling of crowding and overcompression may also give the explanation for the second peculiarity, the choice of the brief form of departure scene; the poet is planning to bring in several more type-scenes—perhaps too many—and wants as little elaboration as possible at that early point in the departure. It seems to me that what is involved here is not a moment's error in singing, but an attempt to combine (in shortened form) more type-scenes than the poet can comfortably handle within one episode. In *Il.* 24

²⁰ See F. M. Combellack, "Omitted speech formulas in Homer," *CPCP* 12.4 (1939) 43–44.

²¹ Another whipping-up verse without close parallel is found at *Il.* 24.326, although the verse which usually precedes the regular μάστιξεν-verse is used at 323, because the description of the starting-up of the mule-wagon is inserted between them. At *Il.* 5.748 = 8.392 a different verse is used for the whipping-up (there is something like it at *Il.* 17.430) because of the need to change the subject of the sentence back from Athena, who has just stepped into the chariot and picked up her spear, to Hera, who is at the controls.

and *Od.* 13 the successive type-scenes are given due weight and meshed well together; here they are not, and one of the results is the problem identified by Gunn.

II

In the same article Gunn points to an awkwardness in the description of Hermes' reception by Calypso, and offers the same explanation; a mistake by the bard which, instead of correcting, he attempts to cover-up. The lines in question are:

Ἑρμείαν δ' ἐρέεινε Καλυψώ, διὰ θεάων, 85
 ἐν θρόνῳ ἰδρύσασα φαινω σιγαλόεντι·
 "τίπτε μοι, Ἑρμεία . . .
 ἀλλ' ἔπεο προτέρω, ἵνα τοι παρ ξείνια θείω." 91
 ὥς ἄρα φωνήσασα θεὰ παρέθηκε τράπεζαν. . . . (*Od.* 5.85-87, 91-92)

According to the text, Hermes is given a seat in or before line 86; Calypso begins her questions, but breaks off to invite him to come in for refreshment; but before he has moved—if he needs to—she sets a table before him and proceeds to serve a meal. Gunn compares the reception of Thetis by Charis in *Il.* 18, in which the same question to the visitor (*Il.* 18.385-86 ~ *Od.* 5.87-88) is followed by the same invitation to enter (*Il.* 18.387 = *Od.* 5.91). Here, however, Thetis is still standing outside when the invitation is given, and after it is she goes inside and is given a seat ready for the meal. Gunn suggests that the poet has made Hermes sit down too soon (86), then became aware of his mistake as he sang 91; he then attempted to rectify this by omitting the verses which follow this verse in the *Il.* passage (388-89) and bring Thetis indoors and sit her down. If he had realized his error sooner, he could have omitted 91 and gone straight on to the serving of the meal, 92 ff.; as it is, he saves the situation to some extent by omitting the second seating of Hermes, but omits with it the response to the entry-invitation given in 91.

Here again the construction of the episode can be further broken down, and Gunn's explanation becomes less adequate to explain all the problems.

Arend's treatment of the arrival type-scene is perhaps the most successful in his excellent book. He identifies three parts:

- (a) The simple arrival type-scene (pp. 28 ff.). A person sets off (his subdivision I); he arrives at his destination (II); he finds the person he seeks, sitting, standing or occupied in some way (III); often the bystanders are also mentioned (IIIa); the visitor stands beside the person sought (often *παρίστατο* or the like) (IV) and speaks (V). Thetis' journey to Achilles with the armor at the end of *Il.* 18 and the beginning of 19 may serve as a straightforward example.
- (b) The messenger type-scene (pp. 54 ff.). Someone gives an order to a messenger, who then sets off and delivers the message in the arrival pattern (above). The despatch of Hermes to Priam by Zeus in *Il.* 24.333-71 is an example (with some elaboration).
- (c) The visit type-scene (pp. 34 ff.). This consists of an elaboration on part IV of the arrival type-scene and describes the reception of the visitor by the host, before the conversation proper begins. In Arend's words, "in den Ankunftsszenen tritt der Ankommende sogleich näher (T[eil] IV) und bringt sein Anliegen vor (T. V), in den Besuchsszenen aber werden vorher ausführlich Aufnahme und Bewirtung geschildert, vor T. V treten also verschiedene neue Erzählungsteile" (pp. 34-35).

He identifies a number of elements which may occur:

- (1) the visitor stands in the doorway;
- (2) someone sees him;
- (3) he gets up and hurries to the visitor,
- (4) takes him by the hand and welcomes him,
- (5) and leads him in;
- (6) he then gives the visitor a seat,
- (7) offers him hospitality,
- (8) and they begin to talk.

Nestor's description of his reception in Peleus' palace is a simple example (*Il.* 11.775-80), and there is an ornamented version in Telemachus' welcome to the disguised Athena (*Od.* 1.118-58).

The reception of Thetis in Hephaestus' palace (*Il.* 18) shows a skilful adaptation of the arrival and visit type-scenes to the separate welcome by hostess and host, the meal being passed over altogether, obviously because of the elaboration of the summons to Hephaestus and the

description of his forge. It may be analyzed thus in Arend's subdivisions:

146-47: Thetis sets off for Olympus (arrival type-scene part I).

369: she arrives at Hephaestus' house (II)

372: and finds him in the forge, busy making tripods (III); (there is no mention of his attendants [IIIa], possibly because they will be described below at 417-21);

381: she draws near (*not* IV, "she stood beside the person sought," but part I of the visit type-scene, "she stood in the doorway," reshaped to avoid an awkward transition from forge to palace);

382: and Charis sees her (visit theme, 2).

384: Charis goes and takes her hand, and welcomes her (3, 4).

388: She leads Thetis in (5),

389: offers her a seat (6)

391: (and instead of bringing in a meal, goes to call her husband).

421: Hephaestus arrives, goes to Thetis (3, repeated),

423: takes her hand, and greets her (4, repeated);

428: and the main conversation begins (8; part 7, the meal, again omitted).

Usually the stranger is not both a messenger and a guest, and so the arrival type-scene is not accompanied by both messenger and visit type-scenes. But there is an exception in Achilles' welcome of the embassy in *Il.* 9, which may be analyzed thus:

165-70, 179-81: the embassy are given their instructions (messenger type-scene);

182: they set out (arrival type-scene part I),

185: reach Achilles' hut (II)

186: and find him singing (III)

190: while Patroclus sits nearby (IIIa);

192: they come closer and stand by him (IV).

(They should now deliver their message [V]; instead . . .)

193: Achilles rises in amazement (i.e., the visit type-scene begins with its part 3; it is now too late for part 1, "they stood in the door," and part 2, "he saw them" is subsumed under *ταφών*),

196: and greets them (4).

199: He leads them in²² (5; unnecessarily, because they were already standing beside him. The arrival type-scene had gone a little too far before the visit type-scene began.²³ *Il.* 18 had managed it better, but there the messenger type-scene had not complicated the issue),

200: seats them (6),

201: and offers them hospitality (7, much elaborated).

222: The main conversation is introduced (8, preceded by a greeting type-scene).

The transition from messenger + arrival type-scenes to arrival + visit type-scenes is of course highly significant and both delays the climax and stresses the courtesy of Achilles. But the point of transition is left a little late (through inadvertence, or intentionally to mislead a highly sensitive audience?), and so there is a minor inconsistency over the envoys' having already entered and stood beside Achilles (as messengers) before he leads them in (as visitors).

A detailed analysis can now be given of the arrival and reception of Hermes at Calypso's cave (*Od.* 5).

28-42: Hermes is charged with the message by Zeus (messenger type-scene).

43: He sets off (arrival type-scene I, much elaborated),

55: arrives on the island (II),

58-74: and finds Calypso at home, busied at her loom (III;²⁴ there is a long description of the surroundings of the cave, and perhaps as a result of this there is no IIIa).

75: Hermes stands and admires (a slight adaptation of visit type-scene 1; is the wonder of Hermes transferred from the wonder often felt by the person visited?).

²² Since there is no explicit mention of whether Achilles is sitting inside or outside his hut as he sings, it is fair to assume that the poet was not concerned with the point and hence that the usual situation exists of the host coming forward in the dwelling to greet and lead in his visitor.

²³ There is no *παρίστατο* here, but *βάτην προτέρω* in 192 and *πρόσθ' αὐτοῖο* in 193 must mean the poet is still thinking of the envoys as standing beside Achilles (like messengers), not waiting to be recognized and invited to enter (like guests).

²⁴ Fenik (*Studies in the Od.*, above, note 10) 79 f. discusses other examples of a person finding another, followed by an interruption before they actually begin to converse. He examines this passage, but without drawing any firm conclusions.

76: He enters the cave (this is irregular; it is IV of the arrival type-scene, and will cause embarrassment later on).

78: Calypso sees him (visit type-scene 2, elaborated by an explanation of the reason that she recognizes him, replacing the usual wonder).

(81-84: Here is inserted the explanation of why Odysseus is not present. It can be thought of as a kind of negative reflex of the arrival type-scene III, "he finds the person he seeks" and the description of his occupation. It is the same kind of effect that the poet produces in *Il.* 6 when Hector arrives at his house and *fails* to find his wife at her loom within. This negated repetition of an earlier element of the type-scene follows immediately upon the elaboration of another element in 78-80, and comes just as the poet is modulating from the messenger + arrival type-scenes into the visit type-scene.)

85: Calypso questions (ἐρέεινε) Hermes. (Problems here. Part 3, "she goes to the visitor," is dropped [where *is* Calypso? still walking up and down by her loom?] and this is a remarkably brusque part 4, "she takes his hand and welcomes him." The insertion of the reference to Odysseus necessitated specific return to the visit scene and repetition of the names of both Calypso and Hermes, and the poet has a great deal on his mind.)

86: She seats him (part 6; the scene moves swiftly, and part 5, "she leads him in," has been passed over—since Hermes had entered [as messenger, not guest] in 76-77 it would have been otiose anyway).

87-90: She greets him (a normal part 4),

91: leads him in (part 5),²⁵

92-94: offers him hospitality (part 7),

95: and the talk begins.²⁶

The elements of the scene are clearly out of sequence, and no simple

²⁵ This verse is omitted in some MSS and bracketed by some editors, and has been called by S. West "almost certainly a post-aristarchean interpolation" (*The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* [Pap. Col. III, Köln 1967] 198 note 181). Gunn (above, note 1) 198 note 14 refers to M. Van der Valk (*Textual Criticism of the Odyssey* [Leiden 1949] 272), who cites the omission as an example of Alexandrian abridgement of the text, but Van der Valk's point is vitiated by his apparent misapprehension of the meaning of ξείνια—it must refer to refreshments, both here and in *Il.* 18.387, not (in the latter case) to Hephaestus' gift of the armor.

²⁶ Allen's suggestion (*OCT* crit. app. *ad loc.*) that the plus-verses 95a-d contained an additional remark to Hermes by Calypso would add a further oddity; usually the guest opens the conversation.

restoration of normality is possible. The sources of the trouble are:

- (a) The overlap of messenger + arrival scenes and visit scene, which caused a mild inconsistency in the *Il.* 9 passage, is unskilfully handled; Hermes arrives and comes to a halt outside the cave (75), and smooth progression into the visit scene would make Calypso see him and go to greet him. Instead, he enters the cave (a messenger still, not a guest), and the precise location of the characters becomes unclear from then on.
- (b) The elaboration of Calypso's recognition of Hermes, and still more the rapid (and effective) "cut" after part 2 to the moping Odysseus on the sea-shore, requires an unparalleled return in 85 to the characters in the cave, including mention of both names, and the verb used (*ἐπέειπε*) does inadequate duty for the usual approach and welcome to the visitor.
- (c) Hermes is quickly seated, as if the scene were being compressed, and (with or without mention of hospitality) the main conversation could follow. But instead, the poet retraces his steps to part 4, and a normal visit type-scene is completed, except for the omission of part 6, the seating of the guest.

Omission of 91, a common resource with scholars from antiquity onwards, does not solve the problem, because it leaves the awkward sequence; one suspects that its removal has been suggested mainly for the now unacceptable reason that it occurs again at *Il.* 18.387. Omission of 86 restores a better sequence of elements (2, 4, 5, 7, 8), but means total removal of any mention of seating of the visitor, which is elsewhere always included.²⁷ I would suggest that the poet, having inserted unusual motifs into the scene (Hermes-recognition, absence of Odysseus), at a place where he was already performing the unfamiliar modulation from messenger + arrival to arrival + visit type-scenes, began in 86 a compressed form of the visit scene, omitting the usual approach and greeting and the invitation to enter. This is reminiscent of the use of the brief form of departure in the passage previously discussed. Later he returns to the normal full sequence, omitting in the course of it the "seating" part which would be noticeably inconsistent. This is, of course, exactly what Gunn suggests. But the pas-

²⁷ It does not seem reasonable to consider the "seating" element as displaced to 195-96.

sage is more complicated than he admits, and so the slip, if that is what it is, becomes less obvious to the poet and, I would venture to say, to the later reciters who repeated it.

III

The foregoing analysis of the visit type-scene assists understanding of the scene of Circe's reception of Odysseus in *Od.* 10.308 ff., where again insertion of an unusual element causes minor incongruities.

308-17: First there is a slightly varied arrival type-scene; Odysseus had set out in 274, and comes to Circe's house, but instead of "finding the person sought" and "drawing closer" (or "standing in the doorway," as in a visit type-scene) Odysseus stands outside and shouts to her, as his men did before him (229). Then the visit scene takes over, and Circe comes out, invites him to enter, gives him a seat and offers him hospitality—the drugged potion.

318-41: The guest drinks, but instead of the normal beginnings of conversation Circe strikes him with her wand and consigns him to the sty, and he in return draws his sword on her. She asks who he is, and in a surely unconventional motif invites him to her bed. He demurs.

342-46: Odysseus demands that Circe swear an oath, which is done in the normal style of an oath type-scene; one party demands the oath, and states its content, the other is said to comply (without repetition of the words) and there is a conclusion such as "when this had been done. . . ." ²⁸

347-57: They go to bed together.²⁹ To fill in the time during this unorthodox prelude to the bath and meal which are of course offered to an overnight guest, the poet finds new elements. Normally preparations for the meal are described *after* the guest has had his bath and is seated again in the hall.³⁰ But here four servants appear, nymphs of the island, and three of them set about preparing coverlets for the chairs, laying out the tables and tableware, and mixing the wine. The

²⁸ Arend (122-23) uses this passage as the standard example of the oath type-scene *Od.* 15.435-38 and 18.55-59 are very close in wording to this, 2.373-78 and 12.298-304 identical in plan but slightly different in phrasing.

²⁹ I see nothing in the text to justify Page's assumption that they spend the *night* together (*Folktales in Homer's Odyssey* [Cambridge, Mass. 1973] 56).

³⁰ Cf. Arend 124 (bath precedes the meal), 68 f. (sequence of meal preparations).

closest parallel is at *Od.* 1.110-12, where the arrival scene, as Athena comes to Telemachus and the suitors, includes a part IIIa describing the circumstances in which she finds her quarry; the suitors are playing checkers, while the heralds and menservants are mixing wine, wiping and setting-out tables, and cutting up the meat. In this scene too there is a certain amount of duplication later on (136-48) when the proper time for preparation and eating of the meal arrives.³¹ In both scenes an extraneous item, out of sequence and essentially independent of the type-scene structure, is inserted for special effect (*Od.* 1) or to cover special circumstances (*Od.* 10).

358-67: The fourth maid-servant heats the water for Odysseus' bath, a unique preliminary to the regular washing, anointing, donning of fresh garments, and return for the meal. Arend suggests (p. 125) that this elaboration "ist fein auf die Ermüdung des Odysseus nach den langen Fahren berechnet," but perhaps it is best regarded simply as part of the filling-in of time while Circe and Odysseus are off-stage.

But *who* bathes Odysseus? The subject of the verbs in 358 is the fourth maidservant, and even after the intervening subject *ῥδωρ* in 359 and 360 she would inevitably be still thought of as the subject in 361 and following verses; but in 366 it is almost certainly Circe who leads him back to his seat, and it would in fact be reasonable for her to have bathed him herself.³² No decision should really be made; the poet has simply passed from his exceptional water-heating passage into the normal "washing" elements without taking care to see that a change of subject is made clear to the hearers.

368 f.: The meal type-scene follows normally. The *tamiê* brings bread etc. in the usual phrases,³³ and though she sorts ill with the four nymphs her verses should not be omitted, as they are required to lead up to a later effect. It is the nymphs who are interlopers, but the poet thought them of interest.

³¹ This duplication has been well discussed by W. C. Scott (above, note 7).

³² Arend (71 note 1, 125) considers that Circe bathes him. More recently G. Beck, "Beobachtungen zur Kirke-Episode in der Odyssee," (*Philologus* 109 [1965] 1-29) finds it impossible to consider Circe the subject of 361, but admits that the fourth maid-servant has a surprisingly large role to play, from bringing the bath-water to bidding Odysseus eat (he banishes the *tamiê* altogether).

³³ See Arend 68-72. The ritual handwashing is of course normal, even immediately after a bath (cf. *Od.* 4.52-54, 17.91-93).

But in 373 the familiar sequence of verses is joltingly interrupted. In place of the usual phrase οἱ δ' ἐπ' ὀνείαθ' ἐτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἱαλλον (which of course would not fit into the Apologue) stands ἐσθέμεναι δ' ἐκέλευεν· ἐμῷ δ' οὐ ἥνδανε θυμῷ. The bidding of the guest to eat is unparalleled in phrasing and rare in sense, though Menelaus conveys something like the same idea at *Od.* 4.60; here it is clearly put in to lead up to the climax, Odysseus' refusal to eat.³⁴ In 375-76 a neat negation of the usual verse reinforces the point; οὐδ' ἐπὶ σίτῳ / χεῖρας ἱάλλοντα . . .

But *who* bids Odysseus eat in 373? Circe, one supposes, but the *tamiē* has been the subject of the preceding verb and participles. As before, the poet has inserted a new idea without taking care to carry his hearers along with him. In two parts of this scene the poet has broken away from the normal type-scenes, first to insert extra meal and bath preparations while hostess and guest are in bed together, then to bring in Odysseus' refusal to eat until his companions are restored. Both are skilfully handled, but in both a change of subject has not been well indicated and has caused much subsequent discussion.

IV

Appreciation of a sequence of elements in the poet's mind offers an understanding of a minor inconsistency in Achilles' reception of Priam in *Il.* 24. The problem has recently been aired in a thoroughly-researched article by R. M. Frazer.³⁵ After Priam's appeal, Achilles rises from his *thronos* (*Il.* 24.515) and raises the old man to his feet; he then leaves to prepare Hector's body, and when he returns is described as taking his seat upon the *klismos* (not the *thronos*) from which he had arisen:

ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἐς κλισίην πάλιν ἦϊε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,
ἔζετο δ' ἐν κλισμῷ πολυδαιδάλῳ ἔνθεν ἀνέστη
τοίχου τοῦ ἐτέρου, ποτὶ δὲ Πρίαμον φάτο μῦθον· (*Il.* 24.596-98)

Frazer is reluctant to think that Homer is either unconscious of inconsistency or does not bother to avoid it, and his own solution is to take ἔνθεν ἀνέστη not with κλισμῷ but with τοίχου τοῦ ἐτέρου in the

³⁴ This is pointed out by Arend 71 note 1.

³⁵ "The κλισμός of Achilles, *Iliad* 24.596-98," *GRBS* 12 (1971) 295-301.

following line, and understand "thus the noble Achilles spoke, and returned to the hut, and sat down on a richly-wrought κλισμός on the side opposite that from which he had risen, and spoke a word to Priam" (p. 297). This involves, however, what he admits is an extremely harsh enjambement, which I find it difficult to accept.

There is certainly an inconsistency involved. As Frazer well argues, Achilles does indeed give up his own seat, the *thronos*, to Priam and takes a lower one, in conformity with the usual Homeric etiquette in showing honor to a new arrival; Frazer refers to Nestor's gesture to Patroclus in *Il.* 11.645-46 and Athena's to Thetis in 24.100.³⁶ And even if we feel that the hearers might not remember where Achilles had been sitting 80 verses earlier, they might well have been surprised if they took 597 simply to mean "on the *klismos* from which he had arisen," since the *thronos* would be his normal seat.

If the component parts of the scene are broken down like the elements in a type-scene we may be able to see the separate ideas which are in the poet's mind and which he wants to convey to his hearers. I will suggest these components first, then quote the words in which they take shape.

1. After preparing the corpse, Achilles must return to his hut:

596 ἐς κλισίην πάλιν ἦϊε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς

2. he must sit down:

597 ἔζετο

3. and as host, doing every honor to his distinguished guest, he must take the lower seat:

597 ἐν κλισμῷ πολυδαιδάλῳ

4. but having earlier left his seat to perform an action, he is now returning to his place to sit down again and take up another action, the continuation of his talk with Priam; and for such a return there is a regular phrase whose usage is invariably for this purpose,³⁷

³⁶ Cf. also Alcinous' displacement of his favorite son to seat Odysseus (*Od.* 7.169-71) and the disguised Odysseus' yielding to the noble Telemachus in 16.42. In spite of the scholiast's remark (quoted by Frazer, p. 300) it is not specifically stated in *Od.* 1.130 f. that Telemachus seats the visitor in his *own* chair.

³⁷ There is one exception, *Od.* 5.195-96 (quoted by Frazer, pp. 298-99), where the phrase is followed by an enjambling subject *Ἑρμείας*. I feel that this sophisticated construction, obviously intended to make the subtle point that Calypso does not tell Odysseus of Hermes' visit but takes the credit for releasing him herself, may with more pertinence than usual be said to be the exception that proves the rule.

for example when Amphinomus returns to his seat after pledging Odysseus (*Od.* 18.157), when Telemachus and Leodes sit down after trying to string the bow (21.139, 166), when Odysseus returns to his *diphros* after speaking to Eumaeus and Philoetius to his after fastening the doors (21.243, 392), and when Odysseus comes back to confront Penelope again after his bath (23.164). This phrase is:

597 ἔνθεν ἀνέστη

5. He will naturally be on the opposite side to his guest, and facing him:

598 τοίχου τοῦ ἐτέρου

(here I follow Frazer, pp. 297–98)

6. and he opens the conversation again (598 ff.).

We may have, then, another instance of difficulty arising where two elements of a scene do not quite fit well together—or rather, fit only too well; for it is the unfortunate tendency of the two elements “he sat down on the *klismos*, the lower seat,” and “he went back into the hut he had left” to coalesce into “he sat down on the *klismos* from which he had arisen” which has provoked comment. The inconsistency arises only from the juxtaposition of the words, and does not exist in the poet’s conception of the scene.

In the above arguments I have considered the various type-scenes to have a rigidity of structure (especially of sequence, though omissions of elements occur and the scenes are sometimes interwoven) which may arouse disagreement. In particular, my view may seem opposed to Nagler’s theory of the nature of oral composition; and in fact he shows some slight uneasiness about type-scenes.³⁸ But I do not think our positions are irreconcilable. I fully accept the possibility of superb artistic skill, of the kind Nagler persuasively identifies, in the design of the epics on both the large and the small scale. Nevertheless, I hold that, just as much of the time the common formulae are used

³⁸ “I have tried to apply this approach in a reasonably uniform way to the phrase . . . , to its poetical semantics, to the small narrative pattern, to larger patterns capable of generating a significant part of the narration (between which two categories the concept of the ‘type scene’ sits uncomfortably), and then to whole plot structures” (above, note 10, p. 199).

automatically, even if occasionally imperfect adjustment results in a metrical anomaly,³⁹ so too the regularity of the common type-scenes exerts a compelling force on the poet which can sometimes be seen to result in awkward transitions. The same point has been emphasized by Fenik ("it seems that the pressure exerted by a familiar pattern could be so strong that it forced the inclusion of one of its standard elements into a particular scene where it is either inappropriate or could not be further developed. There are many such cases. . . ." ⁴⁰). The principle is the same as that which occasionally leads to the inclusion of the epithet in a noun-epithet formula even when it has to be relegated to the verse following that in which its noun is contained.⁴¹

Better understanding of what was familiar to Homer and his audience brings the threefold advantage of enabling us to understand and enjoy, as his audience did, the familiar and relaxing regularity of unchanging phrases, lines and scenes; to realize (like Arend⁴²) the force of major or minor changes and innovations, denying fulfilment of our expectations for some emotional effect; and to avoid asking the wrong questions, and providing ingenious but useless answers, when faults occur in the joining of phrases and scenes, or when a normal component part of either has been retained at the cost of inconsistency. It may even be possible—though this is harder—to avoid the appreciation of beauties which are not there. Parry himself, in a work written shortly before his death, referred to the "theme" as probably the most important characteristic of oral style, and had he lived longer might have advanced our knowledge as far in this area as he did in that of the formula.⁴³

³⁹ M. Parry, *Homeric Formulae and Homeric Metre*, now in A. Parry, *The Making of Homeric Verse* (Oxford 1971) *passim*.

⁴⁰ *Typical Battle Scenes* (above, note 10) 53.

⁴¹ See J. B. Hainsworth, *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* (Oxford 1968) esp. 105–09.

⁴² "Auch das Fehlen typische Teile ist für die Interpretation Homers wichtig" (p. 32).

⁴³ In *Cor Huso*, printed in A. Parry (above, note 39) esp. 451–54. Nagler has also suggested that it is by theme-structure, not formulae, that an oral poet is most clearly differentiated from the writer (above, note 10, p. 202).

I am grateful for comments made on an earlier draft of this paper by Professors M. N. Nagler and Cora A. Sowa (who do not, of course, necessarily agree with the views expressed), and for the acute observations of the anonymous reader.