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This dissertation makes the claim that Homer’s landscape descriptions comment on the action of Odysseus’ homecoming through echoes and cross-references. Even descriptive passages such as the *loca amoena* of Elysium in Book 4, the Gardens of Alcinous in Book 7, and Goat Island in Book 9 do not effect a cessation of the action of the narrative, but rather contribute to its furtherance by characterizing Odysseus’ ethic of *nostos* in terms of his rejection of an array of locales. Geography appropriate for mortals is distinguished from that appropriate to gods by the pronounced emphasis in the former on generation and cyclic renewal, which requires that imperfections such as precipitation and the necessity for labor be introduced into even the most *amoena* of *loca* inhabited by mortals. Landscape assists the poet in articulating through physical geography Odysseus’ vested interest in the generational continuity of his mortal household and the immortality of his fame. Unlike Menelaus, who serves as Odysseus’ foil, Odysseus possesses an ethos of toil and self-sufficiency, virtues demonstrated in the final reunion with Laertes in the gardens of Book 24. Chapters are devoted to the proem, the Telemachy, dawn scenes, the succession of landscapes portrayed in Books 5-7 (Odysseus’ journey from Ogygia to the palace of Alcinous), the Apologue, Book 13 and the description of Ithaca, and the Gardens of Laertes in Book 24.
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The text of all Greek quotations from the Odyssey is that of Allen listed in the Bibliography. Translations from the Iliad and Odyssey are freely adapted from Lattimore, with occasional changes introduced in order to make the underlying Greek more clear. Translations are omitted where context makes the meaning of the Greek clear.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

This dissertation examines descriptions of landscape in the *Odyssey*. In particular, I am interested in addressing the contribution which landscape descriptions make through cross-reference, verbal allusion, and repetition to the progression of Odysseus’ evolving *nostos*. Due to the prominence enjoyed by the *locus amoenus* in Roman literature, which in turn has drawn on Alexandrian vignettes of highly stylized, painstakingly self-referential, and nearly plotless countryside tableaux, modern critics have tended to regard landscape description as temporary cessations of action. Stanford’s treatment of the Gardens of Alcinous (ad 7.122ff.) exemplifies the sort of tacit assumptions which have biased much contemporary scholarship:

The whole has the formal proportions of a Dutch Garden... and is hardly paralleled in classical Greek literature. Oriental or Minoan influence is likely.

Such remarks encourage the reader to understand Homer’s account of this topography as a specimen of *descriptio descriptionis gratia*, completely divorced from the context and the narrative that surrounds it. It is automatically presumed to have exotic, ancient, and foreign undertones, and to serve aesthetic aims more consonant with later Christian and European preconceptions about gardens as sheltered and pristine retreats (the *hortus conclusus*, Eden as a Paradise Lost) than with Homer’s text.

Stanford, it should be noted, is generally much less prone to attribute Homer’s aesthetic of landscape to environmentalist, nationalist, and evolutionary mechanisms than many of his predecessors. This Romantic approach to Homer’s landscapes is quite common in nineteenth century German scholarship, of which Alfred Biese’s *Die Entwicklung des Naturgefühls bei den Griechen und Römern* offers an example:

The tone of this statement from Biese, heard in many critical assessments of Homer’s sensitivity to nature, is faintly apologetic. Especially before Milman Parry and his disciples call attention to the formal conventions underlying Homeric poetry, many scholars appear to feel a need to excuse Homer’s failure to demonstrate the sort of pantheistic or spiritual sympathy with nature found in German and English literature from the Romantic period on. Likewise, the assumption of different and unique racial and national sensitivities to nature and the explanation of Homer’s perceived deficiencies through his early position on a scale of cultural evolution would find few followers in the form presented by Biese and his contemporaries. Nonetheless, we should not overlook the contributions which works like his do make toward elucidating Homer’s landscape: by acknowledging that culture and environment influence the manner in which landscape is perceived and presented in literature, Biese and his peers lay the foundation for all later assessments of natural imagery in Homer.

Another trend of scholarship which has influenced the manner in which Homer’s landscapes are viewed is the interest, dating back to the earliest epochs of Homeric criticism, in elucidating Homeric geography. The realization that not all Homer’s topographical and geographical descriptions were easily placed within an increasingly well-known Mediterranean

1 Alfred Biese 1882, 7.
meant that very early on scholars began to divide Homer’s landscapes into the real and the imaginary. Nestle’s seminal 1948 book chapter, “Odysseelandschaften”, furthered the state of scholarship by refuting the prevalent belief that the landscapes of the *Odyssey* fall into a clean division between the fairy-tale landscapes of the journey home and the real landscape of Ithaca. Rather, Nestle identifies fantastic and realistic elements in all Homer’s landscapes:

Die Unterscheidung zwischen “Märchenlandschaft” im Sinne der Landschaften des *Néosτος* und “Ithakalandschaft” hat sich als unhaltbar erwiesen. Selbst bei den wirklichen Märchenlandschaften im Sinn unserer oben aufgestellten Definition sind die märchenhaften Züge nur leicht auf einen durchaus realen Untergrund aufgesetzt, genau wie bei der Ithakalandschaft. Dieser reale Untergrund erweist sich aber weder hier noch dort als die getreue auf Autopsie des Dichters beruhende Wiedergabe bestimmter einzelner Örtlichkeiten, sondern als künstlerische Schöpfung, als dichterische Stilisierung der typischen griechischen Landschaft.

Yet, while Nestle (and Treu, who follows Nestle in this position) convincingly uses this observation to argue that the *Odyssey* – in his view a younger work – reflects a growing interest in the keen observation of nature as it really is, and though he suggests the advent of the era of colonization as one potential historical inspiration for the rise of a keener literary interest in seafaring and its adventures, his treatment, like that of his contemporaries, devotes little attention

2 For attempts to identify Homeric geography with contemporary geography, see, e.g., Strabo 1.1.2-6. Such debates still continue to the present day (e.g., Bittlestone and Underhill, 2005). They will not be dealt with in this dissertation.


to the question of whether the poet intends the landscape imagery of the *Odyssey* to have a cumulative effect as auditors compare new landscapes with those already described.  

Adam Parry, like Nestle and Treu, sets the *Odyssey* on the cusp of a historical turning point. In some ways the reverse of Biese, Parry professes a degree of bemusement at the almost Romantic sensibilities which seem to pervade the *Odyssey*:

One has the sense, in reading the *Odyssey*, of a society which does not have a perfectly stable hold on reality. The beginning of the historical disintegration of a social structure (what we see in the movement to replace monarchy with oligarchy in Ithaca), one might suggest, is reflected in a certain lightness, a touch of the fantastic, which society possesses in the work of Homer’s old age. The *idyllic* has spread to all parts of the *Odyssey*. This makes for an extraordinary richness of sophistication and play of the fancy. The remarkable thing about the *Odyssey* is that it is of such an early date. It could best be understood, one might almost say, as a work standing in the graceful decadence of the Mycenean, rather than at the austere beginning of the classical phase of Hellenic culture.

This statement is valuable in pointing out the richness of the Odyssean landscapes, a richness unprecedented outside the world of the simile in the *Iliad*, and for its recognition that this unusual degree of idealization of landscape might well imply a sense of temporal, social, and cultural distance from the landscapes being described on the part of the poet and his audience.

Winfried Elliger likewise notes that the Odyssean aesthetic of landscape is in one regard the inverse of the Iliadic, and makes a further valuable contribution to scholarly discourse on *Odyssey* landscapes by restating clearly and succinctly the position that individual characters are often indissociable from the landscape which they inhabit:

[In der Odyssee die] Gleichnisse sind nicht nur weniger zahlreich [als in der Ilias], sie beschäftigen sich auch weniger mit Landschaft und Natur, während die eigentliche Erzählung eine ganze Reihe recht breiter und in sich geschlossener

---

5 Indeed, he takes questionable salience of epithets to the landscape they describe as evidence that Homer’s is sometimes simply careless (Nestle 1968, 41, 44-45).
6 Adam Parry 1957, 28.
8 Winfried Elliger 1975, 103: “War sie [i.e., die Darstellung der Landschaft] in der Ilias besonders auf die Gleichnisse konzentriert, zeigt die Odyssee genau das umgekehrte Verhältnis.”
The idea that characters such as Calypso represent the personified ethos of their natural surroundings is consonant with our position that landscapes such as Ogygia serve the end of crystallizing for the reader the importance of Odysseus’ own ethos of labor before leisure. For our purposes, however, Elliger’s greatest contribution is his elaboration of a basic taxonomy of Odyssean landscapes. Addressing himself to (1) Islands and Harbors, (2) Ideallandschaften, (3) Ithaca and (4) Märchenlandschaften, the author identifies formal and thematic characteristics shared by the members of each of these categories. This observation that Homer repeatedly deploys the same landscape features will assist us in identifying the intended impact of this accumulation of images and formulas across the course of the epic. While we may question some of these categories (e.g., should Calypso’s island be considered under the first category as well as the second?), Elliger’s methodological assumption that the epic’s landscapes invite comparison with one another comprises an important underpinning of the present approach to landscape.

9 Winfried Elliger 1975, 103-104.
10 Not, of course, an innovation: see Buchholz 1871 for an earlier taxonomic approach.
11 He concludes (1975, 111), “Kreta, Pharos, Asteris, und Syria sind reale, geographisch faßbare Inseln, während Aiolosinsel, Telepylos und Ziegeninsel ins Reich des Märchens gehören.”
12 For Elliger (1975, 113-118), Olympus of Book 6, Elysium, and Hades.
13 Elliger 1975, 118-128.
14 Elliger 1975, 128-147. In this category he places Calypso’s island (128-133), Circe’s island (134-136, concluding, “das alles weist die Kirkeinsel nicht als ‘Schwester’, sondern als Antipoden der Kalypsoinsel aus: statt einer zusammenhängenden Darstellung des Schauplatzes knappe Landschaftsangaben, die sich meist mit der einfachen Nennung begnügen, statt der Fülle prächtigen Details die Wiederholung einiger weniger landschaftlicher ‘Zeichen’, statt Entsprechung von Figur und Raum eine Landschaft, die erst durch die Handlungsführung in Beziehung zur Zauberin tritt; dazu die formelhafte Schärfe und die überaus klare Gliederung der einzelnen Szenen als weitere märchenhafte Stilmerkmale der Kirkeerzählung.”), Alkinous’ gardens (which he views as closely related to Ogygia; 137-140), Goat Island (141-144), Scylla and Charybdis (144-147).
This taxonomic approach to landscape also appears in Annie Bonnafé’s *Poésie, Nature et Sacré*. Bonnafé’s division of her treatment among the categories, “l’utilisation littéraire de la nature: les images de la nature non-animale”, “utilisation littéraire de la nature: les images animale”, “vision du monde naturel: les formulas”, “la nature dechainee”, “sentiment de la nature et sentiment du sacré”, “la nature sans violence: nature utile et nature aimée”, and “l’homme et les animaux” represents a more ambitious attempt than Elliger’s to divide nature into its component genera as portrayed in the epic and to offer a functional account of these genera relative to epic’s rhetorical objectives. This approach proves very useful for identifying symbolic import conveyed by particular elements (e.g., the sea is “l’élément déchaîné par excellence”, and the storms at sea provide insight into Homer’s assumptions regarding the relations of men and gods) and observing tendencies and assumptions underlying landscape accounts. The direction of Bonnafé’s attentions is indicated by her title (she is most interested in relations between nature and the sacred), but she casts her net wider than this, especially in

15 1984, 119-175.
16 On Bonnafé’s essentially functional approach, see 1984, 119-120: “Ces descriptions sont en outre intégrées au récit épique. La nature n’est pas seulement le décor changeant des voyages d’Ulysse. Elle joue dans l’action un rôle de premier plan. Elle constitue d’abord l’obstacle majeur au retour du héros : il doit sans cesse triompher des embûches de la mer et chaque escale tour à tour le met en danger d’échouer, par les périls auxquels elle l’expose ou par la tentation qu’elle lui offre de renoncer à sa quête. Le voyage achevé, la nature, d’adversaire, se fait allié mais demeure présente : la reconquête du palais et de la royauté passe par celle de la terre d’Ithaque, de ses paysages et de la vie campagnarde qu’on y mène. Ulysse doit d’abord les retrouver, les reconnaître pour siens et s’en faire reconnaître, avant de se venger des ennemis qui ont tenté de l’en déposséder. L’abondance des descriptions de l’*Odyssée* s’explique sans doute par l’existence, chez l’auditoire du poète, d’un intérêt nouveau pour le spectacle de l’univers, mais l’aède les met au service de la progression dramatique du récit.”
17 Bonnafé 1984, 139.
18 Bonnafé 1984, 140-145.
19 E.g., of anthropocentric tendencies in landscape description (1984, 150-151): “Le poète ne brosser pas un tableau des paysages qu’elle offrent, il note uniquement les traits qui pourraient permettre de les reconnaître,” and, “Toutes les descriptions de pays ou de sites particuliers sont marquées d’un anthropocentrisme tout aussi évident – ou, si l’on préfère, du même réalisme. Les lieux jugés dignes de mentions élogieuses ont tous pour points communs de présenter des avantages immédiats pour l’installation momentanée ou définitive de ceux qui les visitent. L’homme déclare s’y plaire parce que la nature y est susceptible de se plaire à ses volontés…. Son admiration pour certains sites ou certains paysages dépend au contraire des possibilités de vie heureuse qu’ils lui offrent.”
short but useful subsections on “la nature ‘civilisée’” (the Gardens of Alcinous), \(^{20}\) and “la nature idéale” (Elysium), \(^{21}\) and “le locus amoenus: la grotte de Calypso.” \(^{22}\)

Theodore Andersson’s *Early Epic Scenery* devotes itself primarily to the aesthetic conventions of landscape description in epic. Andersson’s book is especially useful for his observations on conventional and non-naturalistic elements of Odyssean landscape. Among the peculiarities noted by Andersson are “an indifference toward the location of places relative to one another”, \(^{23}\) an emphasis “not on the view, but on the beholder”, \(^{24}\) a propensity for displaying “narrated rather than experienced scenery”, \(^{25}\) an occasional apparent lapse into “sovereign negligence”, \(^{26}\) and “abundant changes of scenery and… a preference for interior settings” relative to the *Iliad*. \(^{27}\)

Last, among more recent contributions to scholarship on the *Odyssey* should be mentioned the work of Finley, Edwards, Thalmann, Purves, Vidal-Naquet, and Irene de Jong. The works listed in the bibliography by Finley, Edwards, Thalmann, and Purves have greatly improved our understanding of the sociology of space in the *Odyssey*, fleshing out the significance of key distinctions such as city versus country and land versus sea, and enabling us better to apprehend the manner in which the *Odyssey*’s class system is mapped onto the topography of Ithaca. Consonant with this interest in how culture relates to landscape, Vidal-Naquet has proposed that the distinction of cannibal versus civilized man is intimately tied to

---

\(^{20}\) 1984, 153-155.

\(^{21}\) 1984, 155-156.

\(^{22}\) Under the heading, “la nature amie et le sentiment de la nature,” 1984, 156-160.

\(^{23}\) 1976, 42.

\(^{24}\) 1976, 38-39. Of Odysseus in the storm of Book 5, he notes, “Throughout this sequence Odysseus himself is the center of attention; his surroundings are important only to the extent that they highlight his skill, his stamina, his fear, and his will to survive.”

\(^{25}\) 1976, 40: “Much of the scenery is described as part of a recital, or as a report, or a set of directions, or simply in the form of standing epithets …. Explicit descriptions are given of the harbor and the town of the Phaeacians, Antinous’ [read, Alcinous’] park, and the interior of his house… but they are not a record of fresh impressions, only a summary abstracted by Nausicaa to guide Odysseus on his way. In turn, Odysseus’ description of Ithaca… is a geographical summary for the benefit of his listener Antinous [read, Alcinous].” This point might be subsumed as a subspecies of the former: the sort of indirect narration of landscape alluded to here serves the pragmatic individual ends of the characters performing the narration.

\(^{26}\) Referring to the circumstance that Odysseus is able to observe the harbor of Scheria and the gardens of Alcinous despite his arrival at nightfall (6.321) and Athena’s mist (7.15).

\(^{27}\) 1976, 45.
modes of food production and consumption in a given landscape, and to the ritual of sacrifice. These distinctions agree well with the features of Ithaca which, I will conclude, help to cast it as Odysseus’ ideal home, and hence complement the thesis of this dissertation. Finally, de Jong’s *Narratological Commentary*, though not taking landscape is its main object of inquiry, applies the same narratological approach to the *Odyssey* which she applied to the *Iliad* in her book of 2004. The distinction that de Jong draws between narrator and focalizer will prove useful in examining the manner in which Homer attempts to describe landscape. De Jong furnishes a more precise vocabulary for indicating from whose point of view a scene is described (roughly speaking, the focalizer) and for identifying focalization through various characters within the narration of others. Other recent developments in scholarship which will prove important for our arguments include an increasing receptivity on the part of some scholars to acknowledging cross-references within the Homeric tradition (*Iliad, Odyssey*) during a pretextual or prototextual period of mutual influence and, to a less defined degree, to the premise that there exists shared poetic material (in part due to their reliance on the same Near Eastern models) between Homer and Hesiod.

From the foregoing summary, it should be apparent that many scholarly writings on Homeric landscapes share a propensity for treating these descriptive passages as essentially static and self-contained. Stanford’s comment, for example, suggests a questionable assumption that the pleasure derived by the *Odyssey* audience from Homer’s landscape descriptions is essentially analogous to the relaxation an English gentleman might find in the retreat of a Dutch Garden. Similarly, Adam Parry’s use of vocabulary such as “idyllic” retrojects perceptions of landscape as an *illo tempore* retreat from bustling Hellenistic royal courts (in later Greek literature) or early Industrial Revolution cityscapes (in Romantic English literature). Finally, Elliger’s insinuation

---

28 1996, 35: “Arable land, cooking, sacrifice, and sexuality and family life within the oikos – even, at one extreme, political life – form a complex, no element of which can be separated from the others. These are the terms that define man’s estate, in between the age of gold and allelophagia, cannibalism.”

29 This is the premise of Pucci’s *Odysseus Polytropos* (=Pucci 1987) and an assumption underlying Nagy’s *Best of the Achaeans* (=Nagy 1979).


31 For a (somewhat overstated) critique of Stanford’s aristocratic British bias, see Charles Boer’s essay (1992) “The Classicist and the Psychopath.”
that the more mythic characters of the *Odyssey* are indissociable from and serve after a fashion as genii for their impossibly pleasant settings is indubitably true in one sense, but tends to create the impression that the purpose of such descriptions and characterizations is the mere joy of fantasy, and thereby to discourage us from examining whether the landscapes in fact serve more practical structural purposes in the epic; moreover, while he is willing to compare verbally or structurally similar accounts of locales, he puts little emphasis on their ordering within the text of the *Odyssey*, causing him to obviate for the most part consideration of the cumulative effect of these descriptions.\(^{32}\)

Part of this tendency to divorce description from narrative is a relic of traditional approaches and generic assumptions about the role of nature in epic. Many of the aforementioned scholars to some degree succumb to a tendency – almost as old as the study of Western Literature – to regard the most prominent of the *Odyssey* landscapes as prototypical examples of the genre of the *locus amoenus*, literally, “a pleasant place”. These instances of landscape description, as their name implies, are characterized by aesthetically pleasing natural surroundings, and often include examples of supernatural abundance, an absence of unpleasant meteorological phenomena, or other characteristics that set them apart from the everyday world of the poet and his audience.

Modern treatments of the *locus amoenus* often begin with E. R. Curtius’ definition:

> [The *locus amoenus* is] a beautiful, shaded natural site. Its minimum ingredients comprise a tree, (or several trees), a meadow, and a spring or brook. Birdsong and flowers may be added. The most elaborate examples also add a breeze.\(^{33}\)

Schönbeck expanded upon the list of elements included in the *locus amoenus*, casting his net across all *loca amena* from Homer to Horace.\(^{34}\) Rosenmeyer has offered a definition of the *locus amoenus* in the context of pastoral poetry, asserting the intimate connection between the mode of description of the *locus amoenus* and the generic constraints specific to the bucolic genre:

\(^{32}\) This objection also applies to Bonnafé.
\(^{33}\) Curtius 1983, 195.
\(^{34}\) G. Schönbeck 1962.
The *locus amoenus* is a highly selective arrangement of stage properties. The character of the properties is decided, not by the ideals or needs of man, but by the pastoral demand for freedom and pleasure. The stage is set in such a way that the herdsman may pursue their objectives, their affections, and their dreams, as easily as possible, against the smallest number of obstacles.\(^{35}\)

In her treatment of the *locus amoenus* throughout antiquity, Petra Haß notes that strict constructions such as those of Curtius and Schönbeck are not strictly applicable to Homer; for the purposes of her own broad-reaching study, Haß asserts that, “will man das gesamte Phänomen des *locus amoenus* in Früh- und Spätantike in den Blick bekommen, sollte man normative Untersuchungsansätze weitestgehend vermeiden.”\(^{36}\) Haß elects to ground her definition in particular texts, choosing nine concrete examples of *loca amoenia* in Homer and Hesiod and examining broadly similar passages in later literature.\(^{37}\)

Because a common feature which lends the *locus amoenus* its *amoenitas* is its immunity to seasons and the ravages of time, it is often described *sub specie aeternitatis* – i.e., through timeless, generalizing statements. This peculiarity of *loca amoenia* tends to interrupt the flow of narrative and create a certain parity between the characters of the epic and the audience, inasmuch as both are reduced to the status of spectators of an eternal beatitude from the enjoyment of which their shared mortal status precludes them. Because it emphasizes characters’ roles as observers and uses nature’s persistence and ability to regenerate as a foil the mortality of individual human beings, the *locus amoenus* will be of interest periodically throughout this dissertation.

Nevertheless, as Haß’s approach to the topic hints, the concept of the *locus amoenus* in the *Odyssey* is something of an anachronism for modern audiences, for whom Homer’s chronological primacy in the Western canon makes comparison with prior similar *loca* impossible. The value of the very concept of the *locus amoenus* lies largely in the practice of later authors, most markedly Theocritus, to weave dense and dazzling tapestries of allusions to earlier texts, very often Odyssean *loca*, creating a space which is imaginary and divorced from

\(^{35}\) Rosenmeyer 186-187. See also E. W. Leach 1974, 81ff. and E. Curtius 1973, 185-195.
\(^{36}\) Haß 1998, 3-4.
\(^{37}\) Haß 1998, 4-5.
the real world, and markedly literary inasmuch as it is cobbled together from conventional ingredients first created hundreds of years earlier. While it is quite likely that such processes occur in the *Odyssey* as well (though through oral-traditional rather than literary transmission), the relevant antecedents are lost to us. Therefore, this dissertation will employ the term *locus amoenus* and *locus* only as a convenient designation for particular places. My central thesis that fundamentally synchronic *intratextual* allusions within the *Odyssey*, and occasionally with the *Iliad*, are part of the poet’s primary rhetorical stock in trade makes the intrinsically diachronic and *intertextual* concept of the *locus amoenus* less central to this work.

This, then, will be the thesis to be demonstrated here. It will be my aim to elucidate stylistic features which reveal that descriptive “tableaux” are hardly as frozen or as isolated from their narrative context as has traditionally been assumed. Indeed, I will contend that one of the primary purposes of landscape in this epic is to invite contrast with other landscapes, and, in keeping with the tendency of landscape to be identified with certain characters noted by Elliger and others, ultimately to make Ithaca as inevitable a habitation for Odysseus as Ogygia is for Calypso or a cave is for Polyphemus. Accordingly, other characters whom we as audience encounter exhibit very different orientations toward the topography of their native countries than Odysseus. These differing attitudes are all in some fashion earmarked as inferior, and hence serve as foils to Odysseus’ own almost perverse insistence on inhabiting a relatively infertile backwater.

I offer one instance here to demonstrate my point and methodology. In Book 4, Menelaus’ character is defined by his propensity to favor urban centers populated by an hereditary aristocratic elite, to view the places which he encounters in his travels as potential sources of wealth to enrich his own household, and to look forward to his aristocratic inheritance of an afterlife in Elysium. In contrast, the epic’s hero, Odysseus, is characterized by a preference for rough landscapes. His obvious enamourment with Goat Island reveals the relish he takes in eliciting productivity from uncultivated terrain – a feature which will help to demonstrate not only his intimate ties to Ithaca, but also his status as legitimate heir to Laertes in the final book of the epic. Ultimately, while spaces such as Goat Island may offer passing enticements, the cumulative portrayals of landscape in the *Odyssey* cultivate a uniquely Odyssean rhetoric of landscape deployed to frame Ithaca as the hero’s only legitimate home.
In accord with this thesis, other more magical landscapes revealed along the way serve as stage-dressing for an insouciant, bored, and dissatisfied Odysseus (Ogygia) – foils to emphasize the paradisiacal enticements Odysseus is offered along the way (Elysium, which pales in comparison to Calypso’s isle), and points of contrast which help to establish hierarchies of landscapes (Olympus in Book 6, which echoes Elysium and, by contrast, helps to remind us that the toil which Ithaca demands of its inhabitants is what makes the livelihood thus earned worthy of kleos). In short, all the landscapes of the Odyssey conspire to build a framework designed to elevate nostos and the consequent activity of good kingship as a poetic theme truly worthy of kleos and to highlight the facets of Odysseus’ character that enable him to complete his difficult and lengthy journey. Homer’s most compelling descriptions of landscapes, both terrestrial and divine, resonate with one another through verbal and formular echoes which lend context, significance, and motivation to Odysseus’ efforts to return home.

1.1 CONSPECTUS

This first chapter offers a review of approaches to Homeric landscapes seen in scholarship from the nineteenth century to the present. Chapter 2 explores the proem, suggesting that Homer here for the first time conceptualizes landscape in antithetical and culturally significant oppositions such as city versus country and land versus sea. These polar oppositions will become significant later in the narrative, especially in the Apologue, where the poet deliberately problematizes facile equations of city with civilization and lands lacking cities with barbarism.

The third chapter briefly examines the landscapes of the Telemachy. I suggest that Telemachus’ inexperience and the volatile political situation at home on Ithaca account for the relegation of most landscape description in the Telemachy to Nestor’s and Menelaus’ character narratives, where their subjective experience in foreign landscapes offers a competing and often contrasting narrative to that of Odysseus, redounding to the praise of the latter.

38 That the Odyssey sets out to put forth the kleos of nostos is the seminal thesis of Nagy’s Best of the Achaeans, though landscape does not comprise a significant part of his argument.
In Chapter 4, I offer a detailed analysis of one recurrent form of landscape description: sunrise scenes, which are generally highly formulaic in character, and which hence tend to recycle the same topographical elements again and again. The treatment of landscape in the sunrise scenes of Odysseus’ and Telemachus’ travels represents an inversion of the normal relations of space and time as evidenced in the scenes which unfold after Odysseus arrives home in Book 13. For Odysseus the traveler, it is the regularity of celestial phenomena which is the constant, whereas the mores of the men whom he encounters at each stop are variant. Each day on Odysseus’ travel is a self-contained repetition of the last, being introduced by one of a small number of stock formulas and affording few opportunities to learn lessons from the misadventures of previous days, as the setting and population are different at each port. On returning home, Odysseus is confronted with the same Ithaca with each new day, and the plot is able to build on the action of previous days. During Odysseus’ wanderings, formular descriptions of landscape such as the stock phrases of dawn portray Odysseus’ attempts to extrapolate patterns from an utterly unpredictable world. Amidst this predictable rising and falling tide of iterated sunrise scenes, those which depart from established pattern mark off crucial moments in the progression of the action of the *Odyssey*, such as Telemachus’ first journey from home, emulating his father’s example, or Odysseus’ final day on Ogygia.

Chapter 5 addresses this latter episode at greater length. The association of domestic vocabulary with Calypso’s grotto and contrastive backward glances to the domestic situation of Menelaus in Book 4 and Ithaca’s lamentable disorder in Book 1 underpin Homer’s rhetorical auxesis of this island paradise. Tracing Hermes’ flight to Calypso’s home, the poet presents Ogygia’s landscape through the god’s admiring eyes to allow his readers to appreciate the scenery while leaving Odysseus free to grieve unstintingly on the shore.

The sixth chapter attempts to account for the dazzling series of detailed landscape descriptions which traverses Books 5-7, the portion of narrative introducing Odysseus and detailing his escape from the clutches of Calypso, his trial by storm as he sets sail by raft, and his gradual progression from the shore to the palace in the heart of the city of the mysterious 39

---

39 See Austin 1975, 91: “Whatever the original impuse, it is clear that Homeric man sees the world through the structure of polarity and that for this structure the sun is his most definitive guide. The sun is his great measuring rod whose course measures time and divides space.”

40 A theme that resurfaces in Chapter 6.
Phaeacians. An increasing interest in landscape imagery near the end of a hero’s narrative of homecoming has precedent in Menelaus’ narration of his nostos in Book 4, which ended with Proteus’ description of Elysium. In this instance, the insertion of a locus amoenus occurs roughly at the same time that Menelaus improves his relationship with the gods through a series of sacrifices, and the same theme is acted out by Odysseus in Books 5-7, which include Athena’s decision to make her first epiphany to her protégé since the war at Troy. I argue that Odysseus’ changing relation to landscape across these books leads him from the most primitive phases of human social existence (seeking shelter in a pile of leaves beneath an olive on the shore of Scheria) to its pinnacle, embodied by the subordination of the natural world to human aims in the Gardens of Alcinous. This reenactment of the evolution of human civilization serves as a propaedeutic to Odysseus’ restoration of civilization on a chaotic Ithaca, and parallels his improving relationship with Athena, the goddess of civilization par excellence.

The seventh chapter addresses the increasingly fabulous landscapes of the Apologue, in which the search for sustenance and concomitant gustatory imagery color Odysseus’ experience of landscapes. Book 9 begins with praise of Ithaca in terms of its “sweetness”; Chapter Seven contends that this word gains new layers of significance as Odysseus and his men make repeated forays inland for food. During these forays, the wanderings Ithacans are constantly alert to landscape features such as the presence or absence of cultivated fields and the presence of smoke rising in the distance because these are indicators of whether and by whom a land is inhabited – essential intelligence in determining how best to approach the natives to obtain provisions.

The eighth chapter addresses the landscape of Ithaca upon Odysseus’ return, devoting special attention to Odysseus’ landing in the harbor of Phorcys in Book 13. I argue that Homer, through Athena’s repeated attempts to obscure Ithacan topography from Odysseus through mist and then through divergent description of the island, offers an Odysseus much more vulnerable that he is represented as being in Jenny Strauss Clay’s The Wrath of Athena (1997) – an Odysseus who has become accustomed to guarding himself against threats in foreign lands, but who cannot be trusted not to forget himself when it comes to interacting with his fellow-Ithacans.

Chapter 9 offers a reading of the Gardens of Laertes of Book 24 as Homer’s apologia for the distinctively mortal value of Ithaca, largely through comparison and contrast with spaces described previously such as Parnassus and Odysseus’ ideal kingdom (Book 19) and the Gardens of Alcinous (Book 7). The requirement of hard work and the finite productivity of Laertes’
gardens are emblematic of the value and of the limitations of the mortal condition. I explore
Laertes’ motives in retreating to this space, and suggest that when he arrives at his father’s
gardens Odysseus confronts the fundamental incompatibility of his Autolycan and his Laertean
sides; the boar-hunt with Autolycus’ sons on Parnassus and Odysseus’ simile of the ideal king in
Book 19 present the implications of each of these aspects of Laertes’ character in terms of
landscape. Odysseus’ use of both the scar which he obtained in this very boar-hunt and a
description of a landscape that includes some of the features of life under his ideal king in his
final reunion with Laertes effects a reconciliation of seemingly irreconcilable influences on
Odysseus’ character, and, ultimately, the subordination of Odysseus’ Autolycan tendencies to his
Laertean.


2.0 DEFINING SPACE IN THE PROEM OF THE ODYSSEY

Chapter One will elicit a definition of how Homer structures landscape from his wording in the proem. This is, naturally, a key point in the narrative of the Odyssey. Chronologically, it demarcates an almost perfect division between places narrated by Homer and his attendant Muse (the landscapes of Books 5-8, and of Ithaca, both taking place in “real” time) and those narrated by characters (the landscapes of Nestor’s, Menelaus’, and Odysseus’ wanderings, and of Odysseus’ lying tales, all past events narrated in flashbacks). Homer’s (or as he would have it, the Muse’s) choice to begin the frame narrative relatively late in Odysseus’ wanderings means that all adventures from the fall of Troy to the end of Odysseus’ stay with Calypso must be narrated indirectly, through character speech. Further, the divine Council which begins the action of Book 1 is also the point when Athena intercedes on Odysseus’ behalf for the first time since the fall of Troy.\(^{41}\)

\(^{41}\) The full importance of this fact is explored by Jenny Strauss Clay (Clay 1997). See also Woodhouse 1930, 29-40. I accept Clay’s thesis regarding the wrath of Athena as background to my arguments throughout, though I differ in emphasis. Clay (1997, 209) believes the wrath originates because, “Odysseus is too clever; his intelligence calls into question the superiority of the gods themselves”. I am more content to view Athena’s hanging back through all Odysseus’ adventures prior to the Council as ascribable to her wrath over Achaean excesses during the sack of Troy (implied perhaps at 1.326-327; 3.132-136; 3.13-147; 4.499-504; 5.105-111 and likely expressed more fully in whatever version of the Cyclic epics one presumes to have been present at the time; see also Clay 1997, 46-51). Both Athena and Zeus profess a disdain for upsetting Poseidon (Clay 1997, 204; cf. 1.68-77), and, though Clay is right in noting that this still does not account for the period before Odysseus’ provocation of Polyphemus, Odysseus’ sufferings before this point amount to little more than a string of failed plundering expeditions and debauches (the Cicones, a storm, and then the Lotus Eaters). I would view Odysseus’ cleverness and most of all his persistence in clinging to mortal suffering (expressed in his moving renunciation of divine pleasure for the contemplation of the sea with all its uncertainty and threat of death without fame at 5.81-84) as the ultimate cause of Athena’s decision to help him, rather than the cause of her wrath. Note that she begins and ends her first appeal to Zeus in Book 1.
Zeus to begin to assist Odysseus, and the time of the epic’s beginning coincides with Athena’s intercession, from which point she becomes almost a surrogate Homer by driving the twin plotlines of the Telemachy (by visiting Telemachus and prompting him to go listen to Menelaus’ and Nestor’s stories) and the nostos (through the intermediary of Hermes). Foremost, however, I shall argue the Odyssey proem strongly suggests a formulation of nostos as an ethical progression. By continually redefining the epithet polytropos across the proem, Homer intimates with mentions of Odysseus’ wretchedness on Ogygia; in enlisting Zeus’ aid, she then glosses over the atrocities of the fall of Troy, jumping back to Odysseus’ pious hecatombs by the ships of the Argives (perhaps meant to recall the pious hecatombs of Iliad 1.430-474, where Odysseus’ hecatomb by his lone Argive ship mends the damage done by the rape of Chryseis, possibly in Athena’s mind offsetting Aias’ heinous rape of Cassandra in the sack of the city).

But the heart in me is torn for the sake of wise Odysseus, unhappy man, who still, far from his friends, is suffering grieves, on the sea-washed island.…

A reader alert to the epic background of this speech might well perceive a wily Athena foisting her own wrath off on Zeus here (he goes on to deny any wrath on his part in his following speech). In Athena’s eyes Odysseus’ self-imposed suffering have proved adequate penance for transgressions of which he was not the prime instigator, and, by asking Zeus why he is so angry, Athena communicates to her father that she for her part views Odysseus’ role in the crimes of Troy’s sack as long since expiated, and implies that if Odysseus is still suffering it must be because Zeus wills it so.
that the epic about to unfold will develop Odysseus’ *kleos* through his reactions to a series of foreign cultures and landscapes.\(^{42}\)

The proem delimits and defines the landscapes of the *Odyssey* in terms of antitheses:

\[
\text{Ἅνδρα μοι ἑννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ πλάγχθη, ἔτεῐ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολείθρον ἐπερε-}
\text{πολλῶν δ’ ἀνθρώπων ἰδεῖν ἀστεῖα καὶ νόσιν ἄγνω,}
\text{πολλὰ δ’ ὑ’ ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ τιμῶν,}
\text{ἀρνύμενος ἣν τε ψυχῆν καὶ νόσιν ἐτάρρων.}
\text{ἄλλ’ οὐδ’ ὡς ἐτάρρους ἐρρύσατο, ἰεμενός περ-}
\text{αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρησον ἀτασθαλίσιον ὀλοντο,}
\text{νήπιοι, ο’ κατὰ βοὺς ῥπερίους Ἡλίων}
\text{ἤσθιον· αὐτάρ ὁ τοίοιν ἄρειλετο νόστιμον ἡμαρ.}
\text{"Ἐνθ’ ἄλλοι μεν πάντες, ὅσοι φύγουν αἰτπόν ἀλήθρον,}
\text{οἴκους ἔσαν, πόλειν τε πειμνωτής ἤδε δαλάσσαν-}
\text{τόν δ’ οἶνον, νόσιν κεχρημένον ἤδε γυναικός,}
\text{νύμῃ πότνιν ἐρυκε Ἀλυσίω, δία θέας,}
\text{ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι, λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι.}
\text{ἄλλ’ ὄτε δὴ ἔτος ἠδὲ πειρομένων ἐναυτῶν,}
\text{τῷ οἴς επεκώδουσαν θεοὶ οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι}
\text{εἰς Ἰθάκην, οὐδ’ ἐνδ’ περιγραμένος ἢν ἀπλάθων,}
\text{καὶ μετὰ οἴς φίλοισι. θεοὶ δ’ ἐλέαιρον ἀπαντε}
\text{νόσσι Ποσειδάωνος· ὃ δ’ ἀσπέρρε χεῖ μενέαιν}
\text{ἀντιθέω Ὀδυσσῆ πάρος ἢν γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι.}
\]

Tell me, Muse, of the man of many ways, who was driven far journeys, after he had sacked Troy’s sacred citadel.

Many were they whose cities he saw, whose minds he learned of, many the pains he suffered in his spirit on the wide sea, struggling for his own life and the homecoming of his companions. Even so he could not save his companions, hard though he strove to; they were destroyed by their own wild recklessness, fools, who devoured the oxen of Helios, the Sun God, and he took away the day of their homecoming. From some point here, goddess, daughter of Zeus, speak, and begin our story.

Then all the others, as many as fled sheer destruction, were at home now, having escaped the sea and the fighting. This one alone, longing for his wife and his homecoming, was detained by the queenly nymph Calypso, bright among goddesses, in her hollowed caverns, desiring that he should be her husband.

\[^{42}\text{The literature on the Proem is extensive. See especially Bassett 1923; Woodhouse 1930, 22-40; Schadewaldt 1958; Peradotto 1990; Kahane 1992; Clay 1997, 9-53, de Jong 2001, 3-10. For the epithets, see Sheppard 1936; Stanford’s commentary ad 1.1; Stanford 1950; Clay 1997, 29-34.}\]
But when in the circling of the years that very year came in which the gods had spun for him his time of homecoming to Ithaca, not even then was he free of his trials nor among his own people. But all the gods pitied him except Poseidon; he remained relentlessly angry with godlike Odysseus, until his return to his own country.

The word order of lines 1-4 underscores the balanced relation between travel and intellectual acuity.\(^{43}\) The first two lines contain elements which define the anonymous ἄνδρα whom the Muse is invoked to sing: (a\(^1\)) πολύτροπος, “of many ways”; (b\(^1\)) δὲς μάλα πολλὰ / πλάγχθη, “who was driven very far”; (c) ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπεσε, “after he had sacked Troy’s sacred citadel”; (b\(^2\)) πολλῶν δ᾿ ἀνθρώπων ἰδεν ἀστεα, “many were they whose cities he saw”; (a\(^2\)) καὶ νόον ἔγνω, “and learned of their minds”. The chiastically arranged references to mental acuity (a) and experience derived from wide travel (b) ring the reference to Odysseus’ sack of Troy (c). There is, moreover, development throughout the arms of the chiasmus: a\(^1\) and b\(^1\) contain no unequivocal references to mental activity. The word πολύτροπος might mean either a victim of many turns of fate or one capable of many clever twists and turns\(^{44}\); far wanderings, likewise, do not dictate that the wanderer has learned from his travels.

The “legs” of the chiasmus (b\(^2\) and a\(^2\)), in contrast, contain the subject of the epic as grammatical subject of two verbs of physical and intellectual perception, followed by the emotive rather than intellectual summation πάθεν in line 4. In the geographical and temporal space between the polarities of Troy and home an ethical evolution will occur concomitantly with the physical movement implicit in navigation. The movement of the proem from physical journeys (a\(^1\), b\(^1\))\(^{45}\) to intellectual activity (b\(^2\) and a\(^2\)) brings the cognitive implications of Odysseus’ defining epithet of polytropy into closer focus and loosely identifies travel with adaptability and wisdom. In contrast to the rigidity and unwillingness to compromise or

\(^{43}\) For the more pronounced chiasmus of lines 1 and 10 of the proem (creating explicit “paragraphing”), see Bassett 1923, 340.

\(^{44}\) See Stanford’s commentary, ad loc.

\(^{45}\) Taking πολύτροπος in its geographical sense of “much turned-about” (in his journeys).
dissimulate associated with Achilles in the *Iliad*, Odysseus’s cardinal virtue turns flexibility, cleverness, and prevarication to positive attributes. The chiasmus suggests that Odysseus’ name is a process rather than a static designation, affording a greater significance to the external realities (landscape and culture) which define the contours of Odysseus’ *nostos*.

The attribution to Odysseus of the responsibility for Troy’s sack, at the center of the chiasmus described above, affords the spatial and ethical starting point for this progression. While the *Iliad* downplays the event, Odysseus, is, in fact, the Achaean leader most directly responsible for the sack of Troy through the ruse of the horse. The reputation which he thus establishes for himself has two key components: the fact of having sacked the city (a deed of warfare of the kind whose established tradition is evident in the *Iliad*’s well-developed array of formulaic arming scenes and the like), and the means by which it is sacked (*metis*). Element *a* of our chiasmus is thus consistent with this second aspect of the sack of Troy and suggests a continuity between the epic tradition and its particular manifestation in the *Odyssey*: the same guile and intuition into the minds of men which served Odysseus well in the sack of Troy will continue to be examined as a component of Odysseus’ heroic repertoire in the *Odyssey*. The other key component of the sack of Troy, the destruction of a city by the force of arms, is noticeably lacking from the prologue except in this one explicit mention in element *c*. It is to be supplanted instead in element *b* of the chiasmus by another manifestation of the *vita activa*, adventures of the sort which generally adorn travelers’ tales. Thus far, then, our discussion of the structuring of the proem has tended to support the contention of Nagy 1979 that the *Odyssey* engages the *Iliad* in a polemical debate, championing fame for homecoming over and above the fame derived from beautiful death in battle. Further, we have added to Nagy’s discussion the proposition, assumed by many commentators, that Odysseus evolves in the course of his *nostos*, and that this evolution is manifested in the progression from *a* and *b* to *b*² and *a*² in the preliminary chiasmus of the proem.

---

46 Most vividly demonstrated in his rejection of the embassy in *Iliad* 9; as Nagy 1979 (42-58; see especially 52-3) notes, his rejection of deception is aimed specifically at Odysseus’ hatred of deception: *Iliad* 9.312-13.

47 Gregory Nagy 1979 argues that there was a tradition which posited a quarrel between Achilles and Odysseus over the issue of whether Troy would be sacked by force or by guile.
Stanford’s comments in the introduction to the second volume of his *Odyssey* commentary are worth quoting in full on this issue:

In 13-21 he must be eminently πολύμητις, πολύτροπος, ταλασίφρων: he needs all his powers of judging and handling men, all his self-control and patience, as he chooses his allies and waits for a supreme opportunity. Then suddenly in Book 22, throwing aside his disguise and releasing his passions, he stands revealed as the δορικλυτός, κρατερός, κυδάλιμος, μεγάθυμος, φαίδιμος Ὀδυσσεύς.48

This progression observed by Stanford in the narrative is visible in the proem as well. Homer expands Odysseus’ initial epithet in a riff which spirals inward toward increasing specificity, first eliminating the spatially and ethically indeterminate status of the epithet with a relative clause indicating the geographical scope of Odysseus’ wandering (ὅς μάλα πολλὰ πολλὰ / πλάγχθη), then augmenting this information with a temporal clause that delimits the wandering both spatially and temporally by naming the end of the Trojan War as the starting place of his travels (ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε). Though we may anticipate the ethical sense which “man of many turns” will acquire as we watch Odysseus use his wits to overcome all the obstacles which rise to meet him, line 2 implies that the local sense of this epithet (a man much traveled) is the primary one. Line 3 resumes with a recombination of the themes of wandering and cities from the first two lines: there are more cities in the Mediterranean than Troy, and survival in these cities at peace may well require a skill-set entirely different from the art of spear-and-despoil practiced at Troy. The second, ethical sense to πολύτροπος thus results from the first:49 travel and the experience of different cities with different customs fosters a different variety of intellectual dexterity than that which Odysseus used to build the Trojan Horse. It is here that we first begin to perceive room for landscape to figure in the ethical evolution of Odysseus throughout his ethic.

48 Stanford, liii; see also his 1950 article on πολυ- roots.
49 Reece 1994, 159 uses the scarcity of the cities of many men predicted in the proem in the narrative of the *Odyssey* as transmitted in its final version as evidence of an earlier version in which Odysseus traveled through Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Egypt before meeting Telemachus in Crete.
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Line 4 readjusts the reader’s focus again to the act of travel itself by directing us away from the cities which are its destination and to the element which is its medium: πολλὰ δ’ ὃ γ’ ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἀλγεα ὃν κατά θυμόν (“many the pains he suffered in his spirit on the wide sea”). Metrical positioning and phonological analogy (homoeoteleuton, assonance) establish an obvious antithesis between ἀνθρώπως (“of men”) ~ πόντῳ (“on the sea”), ἵδεν ἀστεα (“saw cities”) ~ πάθεν ἀλγεα (“suffered griefs”). Thus Homer unfolds his schematization of landscape in the Odyssey through juxtapositions emphasized by phonological echoes: the sea is the negation of the company of mankind for the civic-minded Greek, and the coping skills required for either lie on opposite ends of a spectrum.50 

Cities are public spaces and require ethical polytropy (καὶ νόον ἔγνω); the sea’s desolation of humankind favors interiority and challenges a man’s inner resolve and endurance – a different but related form of polytropy: πάθεν ἀλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν.51 

The sea also negates the cities of men in a different sense throughout the linear progression of the epic. First, it is the negation of Troy, the proprius locus of Achilles’ fame, and the past which Odysseus is leaving behind: an antithesis between Troy as subject of Iliadic narrative (line 2) and home as telos and epitome of Odyssean narrative (home [5, 9, 21] – specifically Ithaca [line 18]) informs the proem. The poet first suggests this polarity in lines 2-4, expanding upon the opposition between “escaping” to home and destruction in the war 11-12: Ἔνθ᾿ ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες, ὡσοι φύγον αἰπὺν ὀλέθρον, / οἴκοι ἔσαν, πόλεμόν τε πεφευγότες ἥδε θάλασσαν (“Then all the others, as many as fled sheer destruction, / were at home now, having escaped the sea and the fighting”). Second, the sea is also the rejection of alternative homes to Ithaca. Odysseus will approach each city that he visits bearing assumptions bred into him by life among the Achaeans (specifically, Ithacans), and most stops in his trip will challenge these assumptions at some point. When this happens, his landing will be shown not to have been a nostos but an encounter with foreign men, and it is back to the sea that he will turn his ever-lighter ship to replay the entire process. From Odysseus’ own subjective viewpoint, turning to the sea thus represents a rejection of the values or the appeal of the society in which he has been entertained, as is demonstrated most forcefully in his leave-taking of Calypso in Book 5, where

50 See Purves 2006.

51 Edwards 1993, 27-39 demonstrated the social importance of this dichotomy and of shadings between the town-country polarity in an array of Odyssean topographies.
he has become so alienated from his divine mistress that he spends his days sitting on the shore, turned away from a marvelous locus amoenus, staring out at the sea. Odysseus’ rejection of a patent locus amoenus, and the contrast between the uninspiring object of his fixed gaze and the quite different object of his longing which inspires this rejection, begin to crystallize Odysseus’ orientation toward landscape: for the paradigmatic seeker after nostos, the spaces of the world divide into foreign land (not home), sea (the way home) and home. The individual landscapes that Odysseus encounters along the way are relevant only to his short-term goal of survival, and ultimately are destined for rejection, no matter how appealing they may be. Hence, they do not warrant extensive individual mention in the proem.

In the nostos promised in line five, the interior and exterior varieties of polytropy are reconciled and rewarded in the (in part illusory) hope of winning his own life and a homecoming for his companions: once the sea has been traversed, Odysseus will have to ply his political skills as a stranger in his home land. This reconciliation occurs through the addition of the first new attributive adjective to be ascribed to the hero since πολύτροπος: Odysseus’ skills render him capable of winning (ἀρνύμενος) at the very least his own salvation. The interior and exterior aspects of nostos correspond in part to the structural division of the Odyssey into an external (Books 1-13) and an internal (Books 13-24) nostos, with ethical dexterity winning the day on Ithaca after Odysseus has completed his physical wanderings.

It is an oft-remarked fact that the ἀστεα of many men, announced in the proem, which should comprise a forum for Odyssean polytropy in the many passages set during his wanderings, never entirely manage to materialize. In Book 9, there is some mention of piratical raids in the adventures which take place immediately after Odysseus leaves Troy, but we do not receive the grand tour of the fabulous sites of Crete’s ninety or hundred cities, or of the opulent Phoenician trading posts which by this time were beginning to ring the Mediterranean, such as the prominent position of this line in the proem might lead us to expect. From Odysseus’ brief Cretan lies and his few short references to visits to Hellenic sites we might imagine an alternate version of the Odyssey which has much to do with travels in the known Greek Aegean. The dualistic structure of the proem, however, hints at one possible reason why this version of the

\[\text{\footnotesize 52 A distinction established in Schadewaldt 1958.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 53 The thesis of Reece 1994.}\]
homecoming was not the one transmitted in the monumental written text which has come down to us as the *Odyssey*. The poet’s tendency to think of Odysseus’ wanderings as a polar opposite to the company of mankind and their cities (recall ἀνθρώπων ~ πόντω, ἰδεν ἂστεα ~ πάθεν ἄλγεα above) might be hypothesized to have led to a tendency to deselect (or relegate to embedded character speech such as the Cretan lies) travel narratives involving contact with everyday human beings in favor of narratives which present the opposition between wanderings and human cities in exaggerated, mythic proportions: the Lotus Eaters, Cyclops, Circe, Calypso.

The word ἂστυ itself is limited almost exclusively to the transitional Laestrygonians in the Apologue; its only other appearance in Odysseus’ character narration to the Phaeacians is in his remark that the Cyclopes lack access to ships, and hence to the ability to visit other cities after the fashion of humankind (9.125-29). This remark is revealing, as the same might be said of all the supernatural spaces of the Apologue, with the exception only of the Laestrygonians with their harbor: i.e., in the lands of the Lotus Eaters, Circe, Calypso, even the Underworld, inhabitants are rooted to their surroundings and unable or unlikely to engage in traffic of either goods or tales. The same holds true of the landscapes of Menelaus’ narration (Elysium). In such spaces landscape becomes more desirable as a theme of narration, as it is perilous for mortals to visit and only the few who escape can relate the marvelous and unusual sights which wait to be seen there.

More to the point, the very isolation of these places obliges the paradigmatic seeker of nostos to engage in traffic with inhabitants, however anthropophagous or one-eyed they may prove to be, in order to fulfill his short-term obligation to supply sustenance to his men. Chapter 7 will afford opportunity to examine Odysseus’ minimalist approach to these foreign landscapes, in which the formulas of Homer’s oral poetry create the effect of reducing Odysseus’ interest in foreign topographies to the most meaningful signifiers of the kind and character of the inhabitants: smoke on the horizon, men who eat grain, and other facets of strange territories which speak to their likelihood of affording food are all reduced to compact, repeated, formulaic phrases – fittingly, as Odysseus should not appear to be too interested in the locals. Even the

54 A TLG search reveals that the word ἂστυ in the singular is quite common, especially to indicate directionality within the δῆμος (e.g., 6.178, 6.194, 7.2, etc.): the city is the most obvious and useful point of reference and destination for a traveller.
most desirable of all *loca amoena* into which Odysseus alights are the result of cruel change and necessity rather than Odysseus’ innate desire for curiosities.

Homer’s choice to characterize Odysseus as a man in the making, a character in evolution, is underscored by the suspension of Odysseus’ name. Odysseus’ name does not appear until line twenty-one, suggesting that the epic identity of the hero of this poem will be a more contentious point than the heroic identity of Achilles, whose prowess and divine pedigree seem to be taken for granted throughout the former epic. Travel and foreign environments, by making it necessary for Odysseus constantly to alter his extrinsic identity in order to meet their challenges, give Homer repeated chances to develop evolving solutions to the questions, “who is Odysseus?” and “what does it mean for him to be *polytropos*?” Falling victim to Calypso, a “concealer,” repudiating his own name in the cave of the Cyclops, arriving home to an island which he at first does not recognize and which finally cannot recognize him because of the disguise bestowed by Athena, Odysseus is a man whose name requires continual reassertion and seems to shrink insecurely in comparison to that of the unimpeachable unperishing fame of Achilles.

Thus far, then, the proem defines the goal of *nostos* more through a careful array of negations of landscape rather than through listing ports of call: the goal is *not* Troy, it is *not* the stops along the way, it is *not* the open sea. Line 13, however, wrenches the zoom lens one notch further as the poet attempts to determine a proper starting-point for his narrative in correction of the *aporia* implied by ἁμόθεν (“from someplace or other”) of line 10. At last the poet places his finger upon an appropriate page of his script and affects to begin his tale from the time of Odysseus’ captivity in the cave of Calypso. Here for the first time we find a specification of place along the long and sinuous line which both connects and separates Troy and Ithaca:

\[
\text{τὸν δ’ οἶον, νόστου κεχρημένον ἢδὲ γυναικός,}
\text{νύμφη πότνι’ ἔρυκε Καλυψώ, δία θεάων,}
\text{ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι, λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι.}
\]

1.13-15

55 For recent work on the naming of Odysseus, see e.g., Dimock 1963, Webber 1989, Peradotto 1990, Louden 1995; Clay 1997, 26-28; Louden 1995 discusses play on the root *dys-* in Odysseus’ name.
This one alone, longing for his wife and his homecoming,
was detained by the queenly nymph Calypso, bright among goddesses,
in her hollowed caverns, desiring that he should be her husband.

Homer mocks whatever expectations his audience may have conceived that he will name a recognizable place for his hero’s detainment, for Calypso’ name is a transparent formation from the root “conceal,” and her “hollow caves” seem little more than a credible place to perpetrate such concealment over time. As line 13 indicates, Calypso’s cave is privation of home and wife congealed in limestone and made into a tangible feature of the landscape.

Unlike the sea and Poseidon, who is still inimical to Odysseus when the epic ends with the hero having not yet discharged the debt of the sacrifice which he owes to the sea god, Ogygia and the cave of concealment will become a positive enticement before Odysseus departs, underscoring an important distinction for the hero. Death without kleos by sea is the most miserable fate which can befall a man, but eternal life without kleos in an earthly paradise is a much less cut-and-dried outcome.

Chapter 5 will address how Homer employs Calypso’s Ogygia as a foil to other loca amoena encountered by other heroes to demonstrate that Odysseus is offered the best possible enticement to abandon nostos, and rejects it with little compunction. For the present, however, Homer withholds mention of Ogygia’s most individualizing attributes. To be sure, a few lines later he places a slightly lengthier account of the isle in Athena’s mouth:

άλλα μοι Ἀμφὶ Ὀδυσῆι δαίφρονι δαίεται ἦτορ,
δυσιόρο, ὃς δὴ δηθὰ φίλων ἀπο πήματα πᾶσχε
νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύττῃ, ὃτι τ’ ὀμφαλὸς ἔστι θαλάσσης.
νῆσος δενδρήσσα, θέα δ’ ἐν δώματα ναίει,
Ἀτλαντὸς θυγάτηρ ὀλοόφρονος, ὃς τε θαλάσσης
πάσης βένθεα οἴδεν, ἔχει δὲ τε κίονας αὐτός
μακρᾶς, αἱ γαῖαν τε καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσι.
τοῦ θυγάτηρ δύστην ὀδυρόμενον κατερύκει,
αιεὶ δὲ μαλακοίσι καὶ αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισι
θέλγει, ὡς Ἰθάκης ἐπιλήσεται· αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς,
ἰέμενος καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρῴσκοντα νοῆσαι
ὁς γαῖς, ἑαυτὸς ἰμείρεται.

56 See Stanford ad 5.4.
57 But see Chapter 6 below.
58 But note 1.49-55.
But the heart in me is torn for the sake of wise Odysseus, unhappy man, who still, far from his friends, is suffering griefs, on the sea-washed island, the navel of all the waters, a wooded island, and there a goddess has made her dwelling place; she is daughter of the malignant Atlas, who has discovered all the depths of the sea, and himself sustains the towering columns which bracket earth and sky and hold them together. This is his daughter; she detains the grieving, unhappy Man, and ever with soft and flattering words she works to charm him to forget Ithaca; and yet Odysseus, straining to get sight of the very smoke uprising from his own country, longs to die.

The word “island” is repeated in polyptoton in lines 50-51 with varied epithets, the first being relatively otiose (most islands are “sea-girt” – ἀμφιρύτῃ), the second offering possibilities of pleasant shade and shelter (δενδρήεσσα, “wooded”) which will be unpacked into an amenable sylvan setting when Hermes arrives to rescue Odysseus in Book 5. Nevertheless, Homer’s mention of the universe-spanning stature of Calypso’s father Atlas suggests Ogygia as a simple metaphoric negation of home, a space which could possibly be literally anywhere except Ithaca (1.52-54).

One last local polarity emerges with the mention of Poseidon and his wrath in 1.20. Poseidon, we are informed at 1.22-127, has himself retreated to a place of distance, going to receive a sacrifice from the Aethiopians, who mark the extremes of human habitation in the East and the West of the world. Ironically, this distant location does not conceal him from the eyes of his family and comrades, but rather them from him: in his absence, the gods assemble on Olympus (Ζηνὸς ἐνὶ μεγάροις Ὀλυμπίου, 1.27), the center and apex of the mythological cosmos, to plot Odysseus’ return. This relegation of Poseidon to the fringes of mythological society is motivated by the plot (Poseidon needs to be got out of the way so that Athena can make her stirring appeal for Odysseus at 1.44ff.), but also indicates the estrangement of Poseidon from his divine peers. The weight of the divine communis opinio clearly favors Odysseus. Additionally, the poet employs the same word which he employs for human palaces to refer to the dwelling of Zeus (μέγαρον). In the divine and human spheres, the center is defined as the palace of the rightful king, and the fringes as regions distant from this center.
A certain parity emerges between Poseidon and Odysseus as solitary loners lost on the fringes of their societies when Zeus reminds us that the Cyclops was the fruit of Poseidon’s own dalliance in hollow caves (ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι) just like those in which Odysseus mingles with Calypso:

Θόωσα δέ μιν τέκε νύμφη, Φόρκυνος θυγάτηρ, ἀλὸς ἀτρυγέτοι μέδοντος, ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι Ποσειδάωνι μιγεῖσα.  
1.71-73

Thoösa, a nymph, was his mother, and she was daughter of Phorcys, lord of the barren salt water. She in the hollows of the caves had lain with Poseidon.

The verbal parallel between the locus horridus of Polyphemus’ conception and the locus amoenus of Calypso’s home underscores the fact that for Odysseus all space which is not Ithaca is merely an obstacle. No matter how pleasant or gruesome competing prospects for the designation “home” may be, Odysseus’ universe divides squarely into a dichotomy between the Ithaca that he longs for and an array of spaces not-Ithaca that he rejects. Athena’s thinking in her speech to Zeus mirrors Odysseus’ own, for she here proposes to visit Ithaca (1.88-92), paving the way for Homer to present his audience with the first real-world space of the poem: the badly disordered megaron of Odysseus, the ultimate goal of his nostos, which (Homer prepares us to understand already) he will not only have to find, but to restore to order.

In summation, the proem and the beginning of the council of the gods do lay a foundation for Homer’s later use of space within the narrative. In the proem the home is posited as the center of the human geographical cognitive map and the telos of all travel; the sea represents initially a negative space which must be traversed in order to reach home, while cities also represent points on the same journey. One of the paradoxes of the Odyssey as nostos literature is that it is concerned with ascribing determinacy to the indeterminate spaces in between the known cities of men. A series of antitheses (center versus periphery, past versus future, home versus war) sketch out the empty space which will be filled by narrative action and description in the

59 Odysseus’ initial perspective will evolve with time: when he returns to Ithaca, he brings back a vision for a better polity arguably influenced by the marvels of Scheria.
twenty-four books which will follow. Within these spaces room for landscape proper will be seen to emerge.

As we saw at the beginning of this chapter, the proem also parcels out narrative authority to two different groups: internal narrators (characters within the narrative) who are responsible for telling events which fall chronologically before the Council of the gods in Book 1 and whose narration is mediated by Homer, and Homer himself as narrator. This situation creates the potential for at least two varieties of landscape description – a potential which, I will argue in later chapters, is realized and put to good rhetorical purpose, introducing a telling contrast between Menelaus’ account of his Elysian afterlife and Homer’s account of Ogygia, and establishing a persistent note of longing for home and possible cross-references between Phaeacia and the spaces of the Apologue in Odysseus’ tales. Finally, the intimation that Homer will redefine *kleos* across and to a certain extent through the landscapes of Odysseus’ travels instills the expectation that topographical detail will present opportunities for Odysseus’ character to develop.
3.0 THE LANDSCAPES OF THE TELEMACHY

Because it undeniably stands apart as a structural unit of the *Odyssey*, the Telemachy will be treated first. The Telemachy divides naturally into the adventures on Ithaca (Books 1-2) and the adventures in Pylos and Sparta (Books 3-4). Landscape is almost completely absent from Books 1-2, whereas Telemachus’ first adventures include several instances in which it is desirable for Homer to present Telemachus’ reactions to new landscapes.

By emphasizing the youth and inexperience of Odysseus’ son, Homer situates Telemachus nearer to the generations of *epigoni* who will hear his father’s tale as myth from the likes of Phemius. A number of circumstances conspire in Book 1 to create an impression of familiar domesticity. These hints naturally serve as good exposition at the beginning of the epic, but taken as a whole they all tend toward the same end: demonstrating Telemachus’ rootedness within the social fabric of his home. William Race has noted that first appearances in the *Odyssey* often present themes which will become a sort of leitmotif for the character introduced. Considered in light of this observation, Telemachus’ first appearance paints a vivid picture of a boy who has never left home and is only comfortable fending for himself within its confines.

---


61 See Race 1993, 80-83.
3.1 TELEMACHUS’ PROPRMIUS LOCUS

Before we are introduced to Telemachus, Athena arrives – armed in Iliadic fashion – and enters the household. Her arrival establishes the anatomy of the palace with a string of references to the megaron: she alights on the entrance, at the door of the courtyard (1.103), pausing for a moment to observe the suitors playing a board game in what is probably the same place where Odysseus will slay them from his stance on the very threshold which Athena now occupies. Out of this background of domestic chaos appears Telemachus, the ineffectual proprietor and protector of the palace:

Τὴν δὲ πολὺ πρῶτος ἴδε Τηλέμαχος θεοειδής, ἢστο γὰρ ἐν μητῆρας φίλον τετιημένος ἢτορ, ὀσσόμενος πατέρ’ ἐσθλὸν ἐνὶ φρειάς, εἴ ποθεν ἐλθὼν μητῆρας τῶν μὲν σκέδαιν κατὰ δώματα θεί, τιμὴν δ’ αὐτὸς ἔχοι καὶ κτήμασιν οἷσιν ἀνάσσοι.

1.113-117

Now far the first to see Athena was godlike Telemachus, as he sat among the suitors, his heart deep grieving within him, imagining in his mind his great father, how he might come back and all throughout the house might cause the suitors to scatter, And hold his rightful place and be lord of his own possessions.

In the proem we heard nothing of Telemachus; Homer will show rather than tell us that Telemachus is almost entirely defined by his dependence on his father and his impotence in the face of the combined might of the suitors.

Other evidence in Book 1 also causes Telemachus to appear inseparable from his home and the visual cues of his father. He takes Athena’s spear and places it in the well-polished spear-stand of his father. Homer takes this opportunity to remind us that this is where Odysseus himself used to place other spears (ἔνθα περ ἀλλὰ / ἐγχε’ Ὀδυσσόης ταλασίφρονος ἱστατο πολλά. The use of the particle περ to emphasize the place (“where indeed enduring-hearted Odysseus used to place many spears”) has the effect of a double-take: we look back again at the insignificant stand and see it – and by way of it, Odysseus – through his son’s eyes. If the spear
were one of those which Odysseus took with him to Troy, it would signal his return. But it is not. This singular, present, momentously important event of Athena placing her spear there does, unbeknownst to Telemachus, foreshadow Odysseus’ homecoming, but in a manner which contrasts with the habitual action of Odysseus (πολλά). In the ensuing lines Telemachus displays an ease in the role of host which contrasts sharply with his uncertainty when he first meets Nestor in Book 3: he orders food for the guest, puts her at ease, explains the ruckus which the suitors are making, and only then employs the formula usual for finding out a guest’s background. Other authorial excursuses add further support to the sense of tradition and habituation which portrays Telemachus as comfortable and slightly dependent upon his household: the lineage of Euryclea, given at 428ff., to cite another example, points up the fact that the household subsists despite the interference of the suitors. Like the spear-stand, she has been in the family a long time. Up to the time the epic begins, Telemachus has been enfolded in the womb-like space of his palace. Homer’s taciturnity regarding Ithaca’s landscape contributes to the portrait of Telemachus as comfortably entrenched in a womb-like home, so familiar with his native landscape that he takes it entirely for granted. The young son of Odysseus’ limited perspective on the world makes him a character akin to his audience, likewise dependent on bards and travelers for news from abroad.

3.2 NESTOR, MENELAUS, AND TELEMACHUS’ VICARIOUS ENTRY INTO THE LANDSCAPE OF NOSTOS

Telemachus’ delivery from the womb of home comes by stages, first in the discovery of an ally in the person of Athena/Mentor, then by braving his first agore, and at last by physically boarding a ship and setting sail. His journey is not an epic one. He sails only to Pylos, the

62 Denniston 1950, 490 observes that “περ often has little force” when used with relatives and relative conjunctions. Nevertheless, its primary senses all involve “a contrast between an idea and another, or others implied” or expressed. The particle is, of course, postpositive, emphasizing ἔνθα.
nearest Bronze Age palace with respectable epic pedigree, and then makes his way overland to Sparta under the friendly supervision of Nestor’s son Peisistratus. His arrival at Pylos exhibits all the epic pyrotechnics one could hope for on one’s first trip from home: a spectacular sunrise appears just as Telemachus’ boat enters Pylos’ harbor, and he finds the orderly and civilized citizens of Pylos sacrificing to Poseidon when he lands.63

It is only in the travelogues of Nestor and Menelaus that the first meager accounts of foreign topography begin to appear. Nestor gives Telemachus the fullest and most authoritative account of the departure of the Achaean fleet from Troy that he is likely ever to have heard (3.102-200), but his narrative consists of a compressed catalogue of place names and heroes with no topographical detail to spare. Nestor seems intuitively aware of Telemachus’ need to establish connections with his father.64 His purpose is to summon up visions of the massive scale of the Trojan expedition in all its martial pomp and glory – not to indulge in gratuitous traveler’s tales.

Menelaus’ purpose in the narrative is more complex. The aggrieved husband whose wife’s abduction started the Trojan War, Menelaus stands as a symbol of the wealth and splendor of the golden age of Achaean civilization. As grieving brother of Agamemnon, and a tardy home-comer who encountered strange adventures on the way, he is also an analogue to Odysseus. The spaces which he visits and encounters reflect this complexity by exploring an alternate and ostensibly more desirable trajectory of nostos in which plunder from golden age Libya finances an opulent pleasure palace – at the cost of a brother. So confident is Menelaus of the allure of his native Laconia and the Argolid that he wistfully proclaims that he had wished to move Odysseus and his family there (4.169-182). Finally, on the exotic shore of Pharos, Menelaus hears the gratifying news that he himself will spend a placid afterlife in the most amoenus of all loca, Elysium. Unlike Odysseus, man of sorrows and toil, Menelaus leaves the distinct impression of being a man of ease.

We will have cause to address these locales in more detail as points of contrast with Odysseus’ adventures arise, but his visit to Libya and the riches which it imparts will be

63 For discussion of Telemachus’ arrival, see Chapter Four.
64 Note 3.122-123, where Nestor in praising Odysseus flatteringly adds, πατὴρ τεός.
addressed briefly here. In Book 4, attention is twice brought to the resplendence of Menelaus’ palace, once in the voice of the poet (4.45), and again through the words of Telemachus (4.71-75). Telemachus’ wonder sets him apart as the inexperienced and naïve young man that he is, but affords Homer the chance to showcase Menelaus’ affluence. The first mention of the brightness of the δώματα suggests the sun and the moon as suitable comparanda for the palace. Telemachus’ aside to Peisistratus develops the notion of celestial radiance into an explicit comparison with the hall of Olympian Zeus. The formula with which Telemachus concludes his praise of the palace (σέβας μ’ ἔχει εἰσορόωντα, 75) appeared in 3.123 in Nestor’s mouth to express wonder at beholding Odysseus’ own son before his very eyes (if, he jovially qualifies himself, it is in fact he). The same formula appears again later in Book 4, mutatis mutandis to account for gender, in the mouth of Helen, who, like Nestor, marvels at Telemachus’ resemblance to his father. At least during Telemachus’ grand “coming out” into Mycenaean society, the phrase appears to connote generational continuity – the passing on of patrimony from father to son. By applying this phrase to Menelaus’ palace, Telemachus betrays his longing to find in Menelaus’ spoils-funded palace artifacts of his own father’s legacy.

This implicit connection between superhuman abundance and inheritance from the father will appear as well in Proteus’ description of Elysium. Menelaus’ patrimony is of a more suspect sort, however: he will enjoy a pleasant place of eternal repose only because he is the γαμβρὸς Διός. Menelaus’ response to Telemachus’ praise of the palace, invoking his bittersweet adventures in Libya and beyond as a means of accounting for his opulence without bringing in Zeus, may betray a small hint of insecurity about his status as parasitic son-in-law to the gods. To be sure, the earnest admonition that no one of mortals can compete with Zeus is both pious and a truism, but he then goes on to assert that he brought back his riches only πολλὰ πάθων (“having endured many things”, 4.81). In staking this claim, he (without knowing it, of course) puts forth his bid as competitor to Odysseus for the rightful possession of the epic in which he is a character. The audience would surely remember from the proem that Odysseus’ nostos will be defined by suffering many things on the sea (πολλὰ δ’ ὡς ἔν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα, 1.4).

65 For more on the landscapes of Menelaus’ narrative, please see Chapter 5.
66 4.142.
The ports of call of his eight-year wandering, where he frankly admits that he amassed great substance (4.90), intermingle great historical civilizations of the Bronze Age with more mythic lineages such as the Aethiopians, with whom Poseidon was feasting at the outset of the *Odyssey* (4.83-84). Menelaus presents Libya as a golden-age paradise and becomes side-tracked into a small excursus on the “curiosities of nature” of Libya – its abundance of pastoral goods such as milk, cheese, and meat. His uncertainty about the benefits of being a *novus homo* in the Olympian family is painfully raw in his acknowledgement of the most difficult aspect of his journey, his brother’s murder (4.90ff.), culminating in a string of regrets (ὁν ὁφελον... 4.97-99): if he truly possessed the powers and the foresight of a god, he might have averted the death of Agamemnon. The unfortunate reality of Menelaus’ life so far is that, whatever immortal pleasures may await him in his afterlife, they have not enabled him to avoid losing his wife to a stranger, being wounded in battle, the murder of his brother, or an unhappy domestic situation on his return. His mournful expression of regret at 4.97-99 may reflect his discomfort with the fact that, whatever Proteus may have promised, in this life things have just not been going particularly well for him. Even the singular significance which he attaches to Odysseus when he changes gears a few lines later may be a sign that Menelaus envies Odysseus a reputation for accomplishment through hard labor (οὐ τις Ἀχαιῶν τόσον ἐμόγησεν, ὅσσ’ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐμόγησε καὶ ἠρατο). From beginning to end of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus will appear as an hero who earns his reputation by suffering and hard work, rejecting immortality to sail stormy seas, taking on the suitors in an ambush in the palace despite being greatly outnumbered, and ending his journey at the garden plot where he and his father toiled even when Odysseus was but a boy. In contrast, to vouch for his own credentials, Menelaus can only offer that he is the son-in-law of

67 See Stanford, ad loc.
68 4.104-107:

τῶν πάντων οὐ τόσσον ὁδύρομαι, ἀχνύμενός περ, ὡς ἐνός, οὐ τε μοι ὑπνοι ἀπεχθαίρει καὶ ἐδωδὴν ὡς Οδυσσεὺς ἐμόγησε καὶ ἠρατο.

But for none of all these, sorry as I am, do I grieve so much as for one, who makes hateful for me my food and my sleep, when I remember, since no one of the Achaeans labored as much as Odysseus labored and achieved.
Zeus. Even Sparta and the surrounding cities, one of which he rather feebly offers to sack for Odysseus’ sake (4.169-182), came to him through marriage to Tyndareus’ daughter. In all Menelaus’ engagements with landscapes, it is paradises on the fringe of the world which take pride of place, and beneath his fumbling feints at extricating himself from the charge of hanging on Zeus’ apron strings there may lurk a jot of competitive jealousy aimed at Odysseus, whose homeland is not as luxurious and whose afterlife is not as auspicious but who has truly toiled to earn his homecoming and whose real father has likewise engaged in his own share of hard labor. Unlike Menelaus, Odysseus has a real claim to family continuity, and, as we shall later see, this continuity is intimately tied to Ithaca’s landscape.
4.0 SUNRISE SCENES IN THE ODYSSEY

Before pressing on to the theme of generational continuity, we will briefly divert our attention to one example of the formulaic description of landscape in Books 1-13 of the *Odyssey*: that of sunrise scenes. The landscape of sunrise scenes tends toward the monotonous, even by Homeric standards. Yet the rigid regularity with which Homer again and again offers precisely the same dawning sun in the line ἦμος δ’ ἡριγένεια φάνη ἐν Ρόδωδάκτυλος Ἑώς (“Now when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers”), preceded and followed by the same rote interactions of Odysseus and his men with a foreign landscape, demonstrates clearly the traveler’s stuttering and interrupted experience of landscape, in which the consistency and regularity of the diurnal movements of the heavenly bodies are brought forward to fill the void left by the absence of the comforting and persistent backdrop of one’s homeland. When Odysseus does at length return and visit his father in his gardens, consistency of time and space will be reunited as Odysseus recounts the trees which his father gave him in past seasons – the same landscape repeatedly offering varying degrees of plenty in response to human toil and the beneficence of the gods, the ideal sign that Odysseus has once more taken root within his home and restored the past prosperity of his family and lands. Throughout the Apologue and the travelogues of Menelaus, however, iterations of sunset emphasize the disjunction of the lord from his land and his tentative movements into and withdrawal from the uncertain and unknown dangers of foreign lands (4.1 below).

In the Apologue, most foreign lands turn out to conceal life and nostos-threatening perils. Other geographies which appear in Books 1-13 do not present such dangers, and it is in sunrise over some such friendly territories that the poet engages in some of his most interesting wordplay – in particular, there arises self-referentiality in the sense of allusion to other dawn scenes of the epic tradition external to the *Odyssey* or to other passage within the *Odyssey* (4.2 below). In such cases the effect of the wordplay appears to be to represent a foreign arrival as
being welcomed and accepted into a new social group, either literally (e.g., the Phaeacians) or more figuratively (Telemachus proving himself a true heir to his father’s physis).

The examples which I shall examine are as follows. The line ἦμος δ’ ἡριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς, a full-line formula for dawn which occurs only twice in the Iliad, becomes a leitmotif for dawn in the Odyssey, where it is repeated twenty times by the poet.69 This exaggerated significance, I will argue, derives from its association with Odysseus in its first occurrence in the Iliad. After exploring the programmatic character of this line, I will give a close reading of its relation to its immediate context at 3.404 and of another dawn formula’s interaction with its context at 6.48. I will attempt to show that the nexus of contextual cross-references which these dawn sequences introduce creates a directional thrust, drawing a character away from a locale in the first instance, in the second two drawing a character into a new locus.

Third, in addition to repetition and cross-reference, the issue of innovation or originality also demands attention, especially in dawn scenes, a variety of landscape description normally confined to a few very formulaic phrases. When sunrise is permitted a reprieve from its formulaic straight-jacket (4.3 below), it generally marks an important moment in the narrative. The final portion of this chapter will demonstrate how unusual descriptions of dawn emphasize the uniqueness of significant events, such as Telemachus’ experience of his first embassy to a foreign land, permitting him a glimpse of a model society in harmony. Another significant moment which we shall examine is the dawn of 5.1, which cross-references the Iliad to indicate the start of a new plotline: Odysseus’ departure from Calypso. Finally, a third unique dawn scene appears in Book 13, when Odysseus finally sets foot on Ithaca once more.

In his commentary on Iliad 24, MacLeod (1982, 47-48) opines that dawn scenes in the Odyssey, unlike their counterparts in the Iliad, function primarily as temporal markers.70 This chapter will aim to show that MacLeod’s statement is an over-simplification. The conclusions of this discussion make an argument for what I hope will prove a feasible position relative to two basic and longstanding issues in Homeric scholarship. First, I adduce evidence to suggest that,

as Nagy and Pucci⁷¹ have asserted, cross-referencing between Iliadic and Odyssean traditions may well have arisen diachronically through the myriad adjustments and variations which take place in each iteration of an oral epic. While the oral character of Homeric verse invalidates any interpretation of verbatim repetition as a sure sign of deliberate reference to another locus in the epic corpus, exceptions to this rule might plausibly arise under certain circumstances. The scarcity of certain typical scenes such as ship-launching scenes in the war-oriented epic tradition of the Iliad could well have caused them to be viewed as paradigmatic by Odyssean singers working with an eye on the competing, martial body of hexameters associated with the wrath of Achilles which was destined to become our Iliad. In reciting either the Iliad or the Odyssey, bards would have had an incentive to assimilate the unique launching scene associated with Odysseus in Iliad 1 to the iterated launching scenes associated with Telemachus and Odysseus and other returning heroes in the Odyssey. The unusual considerations of a scarcity of launching scenes in the Iliad, the repeated nature of the same in the Odyssey, and the fact that the Iliad storyline involves events preceding the storyline of the Odyssey all create instances in which repeated lines and motifs may serve as meaningful intertextual allusions.

Second, the investigation of language introducing and language preceding dawn aims at furthering our understanding of the aesthetics of Homeric oral poetry by showing how typical elements and comparatively original material interface at the liminal time of dawn. It will be seen that dawn scenes, by virtue of the very time of day which they describe and the syntax in which they are couched, are often preceded by typical and formulaic material and create an expectancy of new material to follow. This situation can be manipulated by the poet to focus the audience closely on what follows, or to track the path of the narrative arc through variations in the repeated, traditional material which accompanies the dawn scene. Further, when traditional dawn formulas are abandoned and Homer realizes sunrise in unprecedented language, this is a glaring signal for an audience familiar with Homeric oral poetic conventions that they have reached a major turning point in the epic’s progress. In the Odyssey, Homer marshals all these devices toward the singular end of presenting Odysseus as encountering, engaging with, and ultimately rejecting foreign landscapes in his quest for nostos – and, in several instances, of presenting Telemachus following his father’s example.

⁷¹ For these citations, see below (n. 96).
Dawn in the Apologue offers a fair selection from the various means which Homer employs to describe this phenomenon in the *Odyssey*. Dawn scenes are in general formulaically dense and well-templated affairs, in the *Odyssey* often involving the repetition of whole lines and series of lines. There are, as de Jong notes, essentially nine ways to convey the fact of sunrise in the *Odyssey*. Excepting only three unique scenes which will be addressed at length in Part III, almost all are repeated verbatim or with minor adjustments several times in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. Nevertheless, they have not, in Kirk’s words, “been reduced to a compact formulaic system.”

Most frequently, the line ἤμος δ᾿ ἐριγένεια φάνη ροδόδακτυλος Ἡώς (“Now when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers…”) serves the poet well as the unmarked, generic descriptor of Dawn’s appearance as focalized by mortals, recurring twenty times in both embedded narration and the poet’s direct narration. The scope for originality permitted within the constraints of such formulaic diction has been well documented by Austin (1975), Vivante (1979), Radin (1988), and De Jong (2001), and the examination of the Polyphemus episode below will suggest further ways in which traditional oral techniques invite originality in application.

Before tracking down particular dawn scenes in the Apologue, however, let us first

---

5.1 is repeated at *Iliad* 11.1. Nevertheless, its occurrence here is unique in the *Odyssey*, and the scene hence comprises one of the three unique scenes discussed below; 6.48 is essentially a variant on 15.495 (αὐτίκα δ᾿ Ἡώς ἦλθεν ἐὐθρονος, ἤ μιν ἐγείρε ~ αἶψα γὰρ Ἡώς ἦλθεν ἐὐθρονος. οἱ δ᾿ ἐπὶ χέρσου), both offering formulas tailored to fill the line up to the bucolic diaeresis. A fourth exception to this generalization, which is closely tied to the recognition scene between Penelope and Odysseus and which hence lies beyond the scope of the present chapter, occurs at the pivotal moment when Athena jump-starts the sun from its retarded progress at 23.344-349.


Vivante 1979, 130 observes a distinction between formulas such as the present which are more suitable to the mortal perspective and formulas which focalize the narrative from a divine perspective. For the terms “focalize” and “focalization”, see De Jong 2001.

See De Jong 2001, ad 2.1 for statistics on frequency and variation in descriptions of dawn in the *Odyssey*. See also Kirk 1985, on *Iliad* 1.477.

Sacks 1987, 20-22 presents a further brief argument for the significance of context to Dawn formulas. See also Buchholz 1871, 27-29.
consider how this line is constructed in the *Odyssey* from formulaic atoms which occur in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The formula ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἑώς ("Dawn with her rosy fingers")\(^{77}\) appears throughout the *Iliad*, in a variety of combinations where it dutifully fills the space following the hephemimeral caesura: ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ δεκάτη ἐφάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἑώς (1.493), αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κε φανῇ καλὴ ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἑώς (9.707), μυρομένοισι δὲ τοῖς φάνῃ ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἑώς (23.109), alongside 1.477 and 24.788, where ἦμος δ’ ἡριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἑώς surfaces. The *Odyssey* poet does use ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἑώς as a formula in this recombinant sense from time to time (ὣς μὲν ὅτ’ Ὠρίων ἑλετο ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἑώς, 5.121; καὶ νῦ κ’ ὀδυρομένοισι φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἑώς, 23.241),\(^{78}\) but for the most part he cultivates a decidedly different approach to the ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἑώς formula by treating it as part of the invariant line quoted above.

What follows the declarative utterance of the time of day need not be nearly so formulaic, as a quick glance at the passages from the Apologue reproduced in Chart 1 below will demonstrate. The relation between clauses beginning with ἦμος ("when") and their apodosis has been clarified by Radin (1988), who argues that ἦμος introduces a special kind of “when” clause in Homer that functions specifically to pinpoint the time of a discrete and unique event in terms of a natural and cyclically recurring action such as sunrise. Whether this action is manifested in a type scene, a repeated motif, or a passage of striking originality, the chronological and formulaic repetitiousness of sunrise in many cases might be interpreted as comprising a foil to the particular events and spaces which the poet moves on to describe next. I therefore suggest that the events of the apodosis are by contrast with the material which precedes them hyper-particularized to get the audience’s full attention, and accordingly offer the potential to focus the poet’s zoom-lens on highly specific features of landscape and on verbal echoes of other similar well-known scenes in the epic tradition.

Table 1 offers a glimpse of how the most common expression for dawn, ἦμος δ’ ἡριγένεια

\(^{77}\) For ῥοδοδάκτυλος, see M. L. West 1978, ad 610: “this formulaic epithet of Dawn is generally taken to refer to a pattern of rays like a spread hand. It might also describe a single sliver of light at the horizon…. Many readers perhaps attached no very precise meaning to it.”

\(^{78}\) Both are atypical cases – in the first, the poet treats Dawn as abductress of Orion in her fully personified aspect, in the second, Athena supernaturally prolongs the night of Penelope’s and Odysseus’ reunion.
φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος Ἑώς, is distributed over a stretch of several books. It reveals that while some passing mentions of dawn do undeniably serve merely to indicate time’s steady march, especially those which simply number dawns, many others form patterns characteristic of Homeric poetic techniques, such as ring composition. The typical elements selected by the poet for the lines preceding the ἤμος formula establish the landscape in which the characters are located (generally the shore) and can set a general tone of danger or safety in the extent to which the seafarers enjoy these activities. As dawn breaks, the poet directs focus to the specific circumstances in which the sailors find themselves on that given day, and sketches his actors working through a decision matrix of possibilities in part determined by their circumstances on the preceding night. Inevitably, this decision amounts to a choice between stasis, motion into the unknown, or motion back into known territory. The correspondences seen in the chart make clear to how much these patterns reflect the pull of the underlying props of the typical arc of Odyssean plot progression, landing → exploration → setback → retreat → new landing.

All instances of ἤμος δ’ ἠριγένεια φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος Ἑώς which occur in the Apologue are included in the table, as well as the two instances of ὡς ἔφατ’, αὐτίκα δὲ

79 E.g., ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ τρίτον ἤμαρ ἐὔπλοκαμος τέλεσ Ἑώς (9.76, 10.144). Instances such as this are omitted from the chart below.
80 For the structure of the Apologue, see inter alia Heubeck 1989, 8-11 and comments ad loc.; Most 1989, passim; De Jong 2001, 222.
81 As noted above, this chart omits mention of some dawns when they seem purely intended to mark the passage of time – most notably, the “cordon sanitaire of twin day storms” which segregates the “fabulous episodes” (Most 1989, 22). The ringing structure is most marked in the Cyclopeia, and the events which follow will not be discussed in detail, though it is clear that there, too, repeated situations result in ringing structures, e.g., when Odysseus converses with Circe all night before and after the Nekuia (marked with the numeral 1 in the chart).

Translations of passages:
A: “and we ourselves stepped out onto the break of the sea beach, / and there we fell asleep and waited for the divine Dawn. / But when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers…”
B: “But when the sun went down and the sacred darkness came over, / then we lay down to sleep along the break of the seashore; / but when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers…”
B1: “So for the whole length of the day until the sun’s setting, / we sat there feasting on unlimited meat and sweet wine. / But when the sun went down and the sacred darkness came over, / then we lay down to sleep along the break of the seashore; / but when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers…”
χρυσόθρονος ἠλυθεν Ἡώς (“So she spoke, and Dawn of the golden throne came on us”). The degree of repetition which inspired McLeod to label the Odyssean dawn a mere temporal marker\textsuperscript{82} becomes much more insistent in the summary narrative style of the Apologue, and indeed comes near to being a hallmark of Odysseus’ personal narrative style.

Γ: “So mourning we waited, just as we were, for the divine Dawn. / But when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers, / he lit his fire, and then set about milking his glorious / flocks.” (“/ then the male sheep hastened out of the cave, toward pasture…,” 438).

ι: “So she spoke, and Dawn of the golden throne came on us.”

Δ: ”Night sprang from heaven. / But when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers, / we berthed our ship, dragging her into a hollow sea cave.”

\textsuperscript{82} See note 70 above and the citation from MacLeod in the text to which it refers.
Table 1. Dawn in the Apologue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.150-152</td>
<td>(Goat Island)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.168-170</td>
<td>(Day of departure from Goat Island to Polyphemus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.306-308</td>
<td>(Captives of Cyclops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.436-438</td>
<td>(Morning of escape from Cyclops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.536-560</td>
<td>(First dawn back on Goat Island)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.163-187</td>
<td>(End of feast of stay on Aiaia and meeting with Circe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ex erai, autika de xrosoθdroun ἡλιθίου Ηών.
   [Circe clothes Odysseus; Elpenor dies as men prepare to leave].
   10.541 (Departure from Circe to the Underworld)

A. ἐκ δὲ καὶ αὐτῷ βῆμα ἐπὶ πηγαίνει θαλάσσας...
   [Odysseus and his men set sail; the Sirens].

Δ. ... ὁμός δὲ οὐρανοθῇ νῦς...
   [Odysseus and Circe meet at a cave of the nymphs; exhibits men not to eat cattle].
   12.315-317 (First day on island of Helios)
In the passage marked A above, Odysseus is landing on Goat Island after previous harrowing adventures. Upon reaching the shore of Goat Island, the sailors are so exhausted that they go to bed without dinner and sleep a sound sleep, but when dawn arrives they stoke their confidence and venture into the potentially inhabitable landscape of Goat Island. When another sun rises in the passage labeled B, Odysseus is more confident, and begins to cast curious glances at the land of the Cyclopes proper. This rising comfort level which results in increased interest in venturing further finds expression in the substitution of a more neutral and oft-repeated line to describe the sailors’ sleep upon the shore (δὴ τότε κοιμήθημεν ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης, instead of the line containing the rare verb for “to sleep soundly,” ἀποβρίζαντες seen in A). In Γ, we find an echo of Α: in both, Odysseus and his men are described as waiting for dawn (ἐμείναμεν Ἠῶ δἰαν). The echo underscores the reversal in their fortunes, for the adventure has gone horribly awry, and they no longer go to sleep, but now await dawn lying awake and groaning in mourning (στενάχοντες). In both Γ passages the men awaken to witness the Cyclops’ household chores, but in the second Γ the scales have begun to shift: after using the very animals which the Cyclops shepherds to escape, Odysseus and his men retreat back to known territory, back to Goat Island.

Their retreat is traced in the ring composition which caps the passage: not only is Γ repeated, but then Β (in the expanded form, Β¹), at which point we may recall that before sailors go to sleep on a shore they frequently dine, and that they did not do this in the first occurrence of Β:

```
ὡς τότε μὲν πρὸπαν ἣμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα ἡμεθα δαινύμενοι κρέα τ᾽ ἀσπέτα καὶ μέθυ ἡδύ· ἦμος δ᾽ ἠέλιος κατέδυ καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἦλθε, δὴ τότε κοιμήθημεν ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης. ἦμος δ᾽ ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς…. 9.168-170; 9.556-560; 10.183-187
```

So for the whole length of the day until the sun’s setting, we sat there feasting on unlimited meat and sweet wine.

83 For the focalization of the description of Goat Island through Odysseus and its potential as a colony, see e.g., Heubeck 1989, ad 116-36 and Clay 1980, 261-264.
84 “Go sound asleep,” LSJ, 9th ed. with New Supplement, s.v. ἀποβρίζω. For other occurrences of the less marked expression, cf. 4.430, 4.575.
But when the sun went down and the sacred darkness came over, then we lay down to sleep along the break of the seashore; but when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers….”

It will be noted that the first passage cited above – the arrival of Odysseus’ men in the land of the Cyclopes (9.168-170) – lacks the first two lines quoted. With grim irony, the Cyclops makes good on this omission when he perpetrates an inversion of human banqueting, gorging himself upon Odysseus’ men, drinking their wine, and reducing the would-be feasters to the status of feast.85 Supporting the attribution of significance to this omission is the fact that this passage recurs again (B¹) – with the first two lines given above – immediately after Odysseus and his men escape Polyphemus’ grubby clutches, when revelry is in fact appropriate. The restoration of the normal sequence of meal-sleep-dawn advertises the deliverance of the sailors from the status of eaten victuals to the status of eaters of victuals.

Note also that while the first occurrence of A prefaces a short pastoral ecphrasis and the first B a quick sequence of truncated type scenes (assembly [171-177], launching of ship [177-180], landing of ship [implied, 181]),86 all designed to get the curious audience as quickly as possible to the new landscape inhabited by the Cyclops (181ff.), in its second manifestation B fizzles into a ship-launching scene (561-564) which is capped by an assertion of the sailors’ grief (565-66). When the ships arrive at the island of Aeolus, Odysseus betrays not the faintest hint of curiosity or volition, instead ringing a description of Aeolus’ court with two matter-of-fact, declarative statements that they then came to Aeolia and Aeolus’ city and home (Αἰολίην δ᾿ ἐς νῆσον ἀφικόμεθ᾿, 10.1; καὶ μὲν τῶν ἰκόμεσθα πόλιν καὶ δῶματα καλά, 10.13). As Odysseus emerges from the Cyclops’ cave, his curiosity is clearly quenched, and the configuration of dawn scenes throughout this episode plays a small but assertive role in tracking this process. The pattern soon repeats itself. After intervening days and intervening adventures, when B¹ is repeated on Circe’s island, Odysseus regains his confidence enough to offer an exhortation similar to the one with which he urged his companions to the land of the Cyclopes, but his companions’ reaction is cowed and listless. Odysseus cites their most recent calamity of

85 So Arend 1933, 100.
86 For assembly scenes see Arend 1933, 116-121 and Edwards 1980, 12; for ship-launching and landing, Arend 1933, Chapter 4, and Edwards 1980, 19-23.
the Laestrygonians and the earlier disaster of the Cyclops as the cause of their reluctance (10.198-200).87

One use to which dawn formulas are put in the Apologue is thus to emphasize the indeterminacy which arises naturally at daybreak, when characters must choose how to proceed in the coming day. Repetition of the same contexts on the charge and on the retreat highlights dawn as the key moment of this choice, when the poet gives his characters free rein to demonstrate their cupidity for new landscapes or their dread of new disasters. It might be objected that the ring composition of dawn scenes in the Cyclops episode and following episodes (A-B-Γ-B1- B1…Α) arises from Homer’s narrative aims at each given moment and merely reflects a more significant underlying architecture of type scenes, motifs, and situations.88 This is indubitably true. It would not, however, invalidate the likelihood that an attentive audience would begin to pick up hints from the context in which even a formulaic line for sunrise occurs, and that they would likely read these sunrise scenes as proleptic indicators of events to come. Dawn scenes thus serve functions far more nuanced than as mere temporal markers, and at least part of MacLeod’s thesis has been called into question.

4.2 DAWN AND POETIC CROSS-REFERENCING: THREE Instances

Let us now turn to three specific instances of dawn to explore how contextual allusion and cross-reference function in microcosm. The first of these instances is the very first sunrise of the *Odyssey*. Here, as Book 2 of the *Odyssey* unfolds, Homer depicts Telemachus’ gradual evolution from a torpid and static character at his wits’ end to an eager youth studious to emulate an image of his father which bears a general resemblance to Odysseus’ own presentation of himself in the Apologue – a paradigmatic sailor, always oriented toward landscapes new and dangerous, boldly

87 A number of works have offered insights on cognitive mapping in Greek literature, especially relative to the shoreline. Purves has recently suggested that travel inland away from this all-important orienting boundary could be as terrifying as travel at sea out of sight of land, and has tied this to Odysseus’ ambiguous fate in Tiresias’ prophecy of Book 11. See Romm 1992, 9-34; Hartog 2001, 23-24; Purves 2006, 1-4.

88 For which, see Most 1989 and Reece 1993, 123-143.
but prudently facing up to the perils and the enticements of the unknown. Like many legion sunrises of the Apologue, this dawn scene witnesses a character propelling anonymous shipmates out to sea. Through cross-references with the *Iliad*, this dawn emphasizes generational continuity between Odysseus and Telemachus: Telemachus sets out from home under much the same stars that once shepherded his father back to Troy from Chryse, indicating that Odysseus’ survival skills and divine favor are also present in his son.

### 4.2.1 Sunrise on Ithaca and Chryse

The sunrise at *Odyssey* 2.1 represents a unique set of circumstances, inasmuch as there are no previous occurrences of dawn in the epic to which this account may be compared. Lacking precedents, the auditors therefore must draw for context on their broader experience with the epic tradition in general, and with the *Iliad* in particular.\(^89\)

Day dawns on Telemachus as he sets forth from the palace to call an assembly, having found inspiration to speak up for himself through an epiphany of Athena on the previous day.\(^90\) The previous night, when Telemachus retreated to the private space of his chamber, Homer had invited sympathy between audience and Telemachus by acquainting us in a matter-of-fact tone with intimate details of Telemachus’ lonely preparations for sleep (1.425-44).\(^91\) Then, beginning Book 2 with the formulaic ἥμος δ᾿ ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδόδακτυλος Ἠώς, the poet complements the description of Telemachus’ undressing with a typical account of him clothing himself the next morning (2.2-5).\(^92\) The minor narrative retardation\(^93\) created by Homer’s

---

\(^89\) For the co-evolution of the two epics, see note 96 below.

\(^90\) Olson 1995, 65-90 has argued that the general consensus that Telemachus experiences character growth in Books 1-4 is misguided: “In fact, he does not, in part because he is already who and what he needs to be, but also because his utter inadequacy for the task which has been set him transforms him into a model auditor of tales like this one.” Olson’s emphasis on the role of Telemachus as ideal auditor of his father is appealing, but passages such as the interchange between Mentor and Telemachus at 3.14-28 make it hard to discount a theme of paideia running through the Telemachy.

\(^91\) For some ways in which Homer encourages the audience to sympathize with his characters see Louden 1997, 95-96.

\(^92\) See Arend 1933, 97-98.

\(^93\) For narrative retardation, see De Jong 2001, xvi-xvii.
lingering briefly with the solitary Telemachus in his chambers at the end of Book 1 now erupts into bustling action as the poet reveals that Odysseus’ heir is no dawdler: as soon as the sun rises, he swiftly obeys Athena’s command to call a meeting of the council, hastily dressing and swiftly (αἶψα, 2.6) sending out the heralds to convocate the Achaeans (2.6-7).

Though Radin’s observations have led us to hypothesize that an attention-getting scene or narrative will immediately follow the description of dawn proper, what we in fact find is a short chain of type scenes (dressing, calling an assembly) designed to hustle the sympathetic audience along with the nervous youth to his first grand entry into Ithacan public life. The Assembly indeed comprises a crisis-point for Telemachus, but the narrative build-up to the agore is leisurely enough to permit our thoughts to linger on Telemachus’ experience of dawn itself. A chain of relatively unremarkable and typical actions (dressing, 3-5; calling heralds, 6-8, etc.) is entirely subsumed under the narrative and temporal paragraph-heading of dawn, and we remain dimly cognizant of her rosy fingertips tingeing the sky in the background as events unfold in the foreground.

We have already observed that the words which preface all this, ἦμος δ’ ἤριγένεια φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς, are much less common in the Iliad, occurring only twice in the earlier epic, once near the very beginning and again at the very end (1.477; 24.788). Kirk believes that the two books of the Iliad in which this line occurs generally possess content which is in part “Odyssean, rather than typically Iliadic, in character.” The converse seems to be true of the

---

94 For dressing scenes, see Arend 1933, 97-98; for assembly scenes, Arend 1933, 116-121; Edwards 1980, 11-12; Nagler 1974, 119-130. For recent remarks on these particular instances, consult De Jong 2001, 44-47.

95 See West 1988, ad 2.1.

96 Kirk 1985 ad 1.477. Kirk speaks approvingly of MacLeod’s assertion (1982, 47-48) that dawn scenes are “mere time markers” in the Odyssey but meaningful constructs in the Iliad, but finds his contention that there is a relationship between Books 1 and 24 of the Iliad doubtful. I would argue that Homeric poets were aware of the thematic parallels between Odysseus’ appearances in the Iliad and the Odyssey and in successive performances instinctively assimilated certain typical and formulaic elements shared between the epics as a means of cross-referencing, reminding an auditor of Iliad 1 of Odysseus’ later seafaring role and an auditor of Odyssey 2 of Odysseus’ appearance as seafarer in the journey to Chryse. Nagy’s assertion that the two epics are “parallel products of parallel evolution”, each demonstrating reaction to and awareness of the other, still seems the best explanation for the sort of mutual cross-references which we find in these passages (1979, 41; 1990, 53-54n8, 1996, 133n97). For this phenomenon, see also Pucci 1987, 18: “The two texts probably evolved simultaneously, each aware of the other, before being fixed
assembly of Book 2 of the *Odyssey*: the appropriateness of lines 6-8 to the *Iliad* rather than to the *Odyssey* was marked enough for Aristarchus to comment upon it and for the scholia to transmit his observation.97

In its first appearance in the *Iliad*, the line describes the dawning of the day upon Odysseus after he has delivered Chryseis to Chryses and has set out to sea buoyed by a god-sent wind.98 Specific verbal and thematic echoes corroborate the existence of a long-stretching pattern of cross-referencing through repeated typical motifs. The thematic characteristics of the *Iliad* account which *Odyssey* 2 reflects are the role of individual and society (the isolated Telemachus versus the corporately erroneous camp of the Achaeans), the aid of a god who sets in motion events that drive the theme of *menis* or *nostos* (Apollo versus Athena), the milieu of the destination of the sea journey (Achaean camp at war versus Achaean palaces at peace), and the material and cultural baggage carried along or left behind on the journey (Odysseus has just dropped off a propitiatory sacrifice at Chryse and now leaves empty-handed; Telemachus carries supplies gathered from his father’s store-room, a sort of Ithaca in miniature, having failed in a negotiation with the corporate body of the Ithacans). All these points of contact between the narratives of the two epics validate the Odyssean ethos in relation to the Iliadic.

Such formal parallels are perceptible at a verbal level, going far beyond the mere fact that both passages are part of a series of type scenes99 which the poet employs to summon the sunrise, call an assembly, and launch a ship.100 Consider how the *Odyssey* substitutes programmatically individualistic and familial language (a reference to Odysseus’ son) where the *Iliad* places

---

97 See West 1988 ad 6-8, who implies the possibility of a self-conscious reference to the *Iliad*.
98 The scene divides Achilles’ pleading request to his mother from Thetis’ fulfillment of the request upon Olympus, stretching out Achilles’ grief and reinforcing his isolation from the army. Cf. Edwards 1980, 24-25.
99 Edwards 1980, 19-25 offers an analysis of the function of type scenes in the embassy to Chryses, concluding that the unusual degree of elaboration strengthens the sketches of Achilles’ isolation given on either side of the embassy. Achilles, as main subject of the epic, naturally acts in a more individualistic manner. Odysseus’ and Telemachus’ individuation within the *Odyssey* brings them up to par with the protagonist of the rival epic.
100 For which, see Arend 1933, Chapter 4.
programmatically corporate language (the army of the Achaeans) in this sunrise/assembly/launching scene:

\[
\text{ἦμος δ’ ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδόδάκτυλος Ἡώς,}
\text{δὴ τότε ἐπεὶτ’ ἀνάγοντο μετὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν.}
\]

*Iliad* 1.477-78

Now when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers, they put forth to sea toward the wide camp of the Achaeans.

\[
\text{‘Ἡμος δ’ ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδόδάκτυλος Ἡώς,}
\text{ὄρνυτ’ ἀρ’ ἔξ εὐνήφιον Ὀδυσσῆος φίλος υίός.}
\]

*Odyssey* 2.1-2

Now when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers, the dear son of Odysseus stirred from where he was sleeping.

Thus the *Odyssey* declares its allegiance to the theme of the individual man, the *aner* of the Proem, over the theme of the camp at war. It introduces its first individual “man,” Telemachus, as a substitute for the camp of the Achaeans as the focus of its introductory books, and interjects a long assembly scene before Telemachus launches his ship precisely so that the audience may witness the failure of recourse to the corporate society of Ithaca in the *Odyssey*. The Chryses-episode of the *Iliad* is also evocative of the theme of societal dissolution and reconstitution, but with reversed directionality: even as the integrity of the society of Chryse is restored, the withdrawal of Achilles from battle and his mother’s embassy to Zeus are at that very moment preparing to unravel the Achaean camp completely. In contrast, the *Odyssey* is an epic of societal reconstruction, and its first dawn consequently hustles Telemachus off to school, from the disordered Ithacan assembly to two orderly households abroad (Nestor’s and Menelaus’) in order that he may learn how hospitality is supposed to function.

When the time for Telemachus’ departure does ultimately come at the end of this same day in Book 2, there are further verbal reminiscences of his own father’s archetypal launching which contrast the Odyssean enterprise of *nostos* with the Iliadic theme of wrath. *Iliad* 1.478 (τοῖσι δ’ ἵκμενον οὖρον ἢγει ἔκαργνος Ἀπόλλων, “and Apollo who works from afar sent them a favoring stern wind”) is a unique line in the *Iliad*, and Apollo the only agent ever described as
sending a following wind to sailors in this epic. Yet the propitious wind which he sends merely returns Odysseus to the war and to the catastrophic quarrel which he has just escalated to a new level by taking home Chryseis. Apollo’s wind ultimately encourages the destructive Iliadic theme of *menis*. In the *Odyssey*, this same line, with the substitution of Athena for Apollo (τοῖσιν δ’ ἵκμενον οὖρον ἵει γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, “The goddess gray-eyed Athena sent them a favoring stern wind,” 2.420), shows us the goddess furthering the socially reconstituting and characteristically Odyssean theme of *nostos*. This line is strategically positioned at 2.420 as Telemachus boards his ship with Athena-Mentor and is repeated at the end of his travels (15.292) when he and Theoclymenus board a ship headed homeward.\(^{101}\)

Soon after 2.420 in the *Odyssey*, a second unique Iliadic reference reminds us of Odysseus’ departure from Chryse:

\[
\text{ἐν δ’ ἄνεμος πρῆσεν μέσον ἵστιον, ἀμφὶ δὲ κύμα}
\text{στείρῃ πορφύρεον μεγάλ’ ἵαχε νηὸς οὐσίς:}
\text{ἡ δ’ ἔθεεν κατὰ κύμα διαπτρήσσουσα κέλευθον.}
\]  
*Iliad* 1.481-83

and the wind blew into the middle of the sail, and at the cutwater a blue wave rose and sang strongly as the ship went onward. She ran swiftly cutting across the swell her pathway.

\[
\text{ἐμπρῆσεν δ’ ἄνεμος μέσον ἵστιον, ἀμφὶ δὲ κύμα}
\text{στείρῃ πορφύρεον μεγάλ’ ἵαχε νηὸς οὐσίς:}
\text{ἡ δ’ ἔθεεν κατὰ κύμα διαπτρήσσουσα κέλευθον.}^{102}
\]  
*Odyssey* 2.427-29

---

\(^{101}\) With some rearrangement, the line is also used by Odysseus to describe his sendoff by Circe, once as he heads off to the underworld (11.7), once as he returns at 12.149 (12.148-150):

\[
\text{ἡμῖν δ’ αὖ κατόπισθε νεὸς κυανοπρyectos}
\text{ίκμενον οὖρον ἵει πλησίστιον, ἐσθλὸν ἐταϊρόν,}
\text{Κίρκη ἐὐπλόκαμος, δειψὴ θεός αὐδήχεσα.}
\]

But fair-haired Circe, the dread goddess who talks with mortals, sent us an excellent companion, a following wind, filling the sails, to carry from astern the ship with the dark prow.

\(^{102}\) This last line is absent or transposed in a number of *Odyssey* manuscripts.
The wind blew into the middle of the sail, and at the cutwater a blue wave rose and sang strongly as the ship went onward. She ran swiftly, cutting across the swell her pathway.

παννυχίη μέν ρ´ ἣ γε καὶ ἡώ πείρε κέλευθον
Odyssey 2.434

All night long and into the dawn she ran on her journey.

Though the expression πρήσω κέλευθον (“cut a pathway across the swell”, in Lattimore’s translation above) is common in Homer, the line in which it here occurs is unique to these two instances, and the repetition of this theme at the end of Book 2 as part of a unique three-line sequence occurring only in Odysseus’ setting sail from Chryse and Telemachus’ setting sail from Ithaca again encourages an audience conversant in both epic traditions to identify Odysseus’ launch after the conclusion of a successful embassy at Chryse with Telemachus’ imitative launch after the failed assembly. While both are undeniably parts of a ship-launching/sailing type scene, the Odyssey’s repetition of these lines fulfills the promise made by the prior Iliadic echo at the beginning of Odyssey 2. There a programmatic echo of the Iliad suggested the image of Odysseus as archetypal sailor through his depiction on the shorter and less challenging journey to Chryse; Telemachus’ present departure indicates that he himself wishes to follow the traces of his father’s epic footsteps in departing on heroic travels.

Following from the analogy which Dougherty draws between sailing and poetry, it is possible to read the depiction of Telemachus loading his ship with cargo at the end of Book 2 as emblematic of this psychological baggage of memories of his father.103 In Odyssey 2, the poet paints in loving detail the process of gathering together ancestral heirlooms of Odysseus – wine saved in Odysseus’ chamber for him to drink upon his homecoming (2.337-355),104 men (2.383-385), and the ship itself (2.386-7). Telemachus’ ultimate goal is the restoration of his household,

103 For Odyssean metapoetics, and the theme of poetic cargo in particular (though not in this passage), see Dougherty 2001, 38-43; 66.
104 See discussion of the Cyclops below in Chapter 7.
but in the meantime he must settle for making off with stolen mementos of his father in order to complete the reenactment of his father’s prior epic ship-launchings.\(^{105}\)

From his first meeting with Athena Telemachus has been pondering his father and attempting to conceive a mental image of an Odysseus whom he has never known. When Athena first appears, Telemachus is described as ὀσσόμενος πατέρ’ ἐσθλὸν ἐνὶ φρεσίν (“imagining in his mind his great father”, 1.115).\(^{106}\) From such evidence of the continual presence of Odysseus in Telemachus’ consciousness, Telemachus may himself reasonably be interpreted as an implied reader of the very Iliadic dawn which his own episode of epic launching has taken such pains to cross-reference.\(^{107}\)

Whence does he derive the raw data to conceive this fantasy of his father, which, to judge from his reluctance to recognize Odysseus when they finally do meet, is based on less than perfect knowledge? At 1.337-38 Penelope attempts to silence public mention of Odysseus, manifesting an understandable reluctance to discuss her (from her perspective, to all appearances) dead spouse. While we are not explicitly told that Phemius sings of this particular scene in Odyssey Book 1 (indeed, we are informed that he is singing the “Returns of the Achaeans”), this Iliadic paradigm for setting sail might plausibly recur as a passing topos in the sort of songs which win him Penelope’s rebuke. Another epic context which likewise presents Odysseus as archetypal outbound soldier will eventually appear in the repeated departures at dawn of the Apologue (examined above), where Odysseus acts as author of his own epic tradition,\(^{108}\) and in the description of his construction of a raft on Calypso’s shoreline in Book 5,

\(^{105}\) See Dougherty 2001, 66; Murnaghan 2002, 145ff.

\(^{106}\) See Felson 1997, 143.

\(^{107}\) Telemachus as implied reader of the epic tradition in one form or another has enjoyed popularity in recent scholarship: See Pucci 1987, 195-208; Peradotto 1990, 117-18; Martin 1993, 239-240; Olson 1995, 65; Felson 1997, 143, and Murnaghan 2002, 139-142, who provides a useful analysis of the foregoing authors’ contributions to this reading of Telemachus, and makes the apposite point that Telemachus, far from being just a passive auditor, “is presented as achieving something significant as he picks his way through the plots, both past stories and possible future scenarios, that are presented to him in the course of his quest for information about his father” (142).

\(^{108}\) For Telemachus as implied reader, see note 107 below. The discrepancy between this image of Odysseus as seafarer par excellence and what actually happens the first time Odysseus sets sail in Book 5 is a paraprosdoketon of tragic proportions.
which Dougherty interprets as an allegory for the composition of epic poetry. These examples remind us that poetic representations of Odysseus setting sail obsess characters within the epic (Penelope, Telemachus), and, if Dougherty is correct, are even identified by the poet himself as the definitive generic characteristic of the Odyssey.

All these representations of the epic hero as perpetually in the process of setting sail and perpetually hounded by his drive to enter new landscapes render plausible the inference that Telemachus as “reader” of Iliad 1 finds the tales of his father’s departure on a boat a powerful symbol of what he imagines his father as doing iteratively in the past and perhaps also at the very moment of the present dawn. In Odyssey 2, Telemachus reenacts that mental image, and the exactness of the repetition demonstrates on a verbal level his zealous emulation of his father.

Discussion thus far has suggested that the positioning of ἥμος δ’ ἰριγένεια φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς within a sequence of type scenes in Odyssey 2 works strategically to inaugurate a chain of meaningful cross-references with the Iliad, and thereby imparts nuance transcending the overt lexical meaning of the line. The manner in which the poet realizes the very first dawn of the epic is especially resonant: it situates Telemachus ethically and spatially as bound on an outward journey following in his father’s footsteps – a journey which will integrate him into the society of the Achaeans, and the ultimate goal of which will be societal restoration.

4.2.2 Dawn at Pylos: Type-Scenes and Foregrounding (3.40ff.)

This same line can also convey meaningful information through its disposition in relation to other elements which accompany it within the Odyssey. Some instances of dialectic between dawn and surrounding motifs were seen in our investigation of the Apologue above. I would next like to turn to other appearances of this and several other dawn lines in the Telemachy where we may observe in action the hypothesis that dawn sometimes adds special emphasis to the landscape or dialogue which immediately follows.

As witnessed previously in the Apologue, the material preceding dawn presents a finite

range of typical possibilities among which the poet must choose the most appropriate. In his seminal study of Homer’s type scenes, Arend treats dawn in general under the rubric of “Schlaf” scenes in deference to this very tendency of the ἥμος line for sunrise to be preceded by a regular retinue of happenings prefatory to sleep. The happenings which regularly precede the ἥμος line are evening/nightfall, dining, and the making of one’s bed. The context and surface structure of this sequence may vary along a spectrum ranging from highly orchestrated hospitality to battered and broken incubation on the beach after adventures at sea. Thus, in a hospitality scene, they take a form suitable to the entertainment of guests, with feasting and bed-making finding lexical representation in formulas which reflect the near-ritual of xenia as understood by Homer, but in a landing scene rougher circumstances prevail.

Taking these considerations under advisement, how does Homer exploit the limited degree of freedom afforded him within the boundaries imposed by his traditional style? The second association of the ἥμος line with Telemachus in the Odyssey (3.404) functions as a narrative lens, bringing into focus what the warm welcome at Pylos means to Telemachus by zooming from a typical sleep scene to the unique description of the area around Nestor’s front porch and an account of Telemachus’ morning appearance with Nestor’s sons there. It thus represents the fulfillment of the promise of social integration offered in the dawn of 3.1ff.

The previous night, Peisistratus and Telemachus bed down as roommates for the night while Nestor lies down by his wife. It is at this point that dawn is described. Caution and propriety lurk beneath the almost invariant order in which the onset of sleep is described in this and other hospitality scenes: guest(s) (3.397-401), then host (3.402) with wife (3.403). The host likely goes to sleep after his guests in order to ensure that they are not prowling the palace seducing and robbing; the mention of the wife in bed with the host reassures us that no

---

110 Though not, it should be stressed, exclusively (e.g., “Zeitangabe” is a regular component of landing scenes – see Tafel 5, Schema 9, “Landung”). For dawn’s role in sleep scenes, see Arend 1933, 99ff. Cf. Reece’s discussion of the bed as an element in the hospitality scene (1993, 32-33).
111 See Arend 1933, Tafel 8.
112 Arend 1933 Tafel 8 offers the following list: Abend, Mahl, Zur Ruhegehen (der übrigen Personen, des Gastes, des Hausherrn), Tagesanbruch. See also Gunn 1971, 17-22.
113 For the latter, see discussion of the Cyclopeia above.
114 See portion of article by Gunn cited above in note 112.
reenactment of Helen’s seduction by Paris is occurring.\textsuperscript{115} Presumably the habitual and ritualistic nature of this order of going to bed causes no offence, and the use of repetitious and formulaic language to describe these acts assists in rendering them habitual and natural on the formal poetic level as well.

Far from mistrusting Telemachus, Nestor feels such confidence for his old army companion’s son that he is willing to tuck him into bed with his own son, putting to rest any concern which might remain over Telemachus’ command of the minutiae of hospitality (cf. 3.22-24). The blend of caution, propriety, and hospitality inhering within the description of sleep integrates Telemachus into the household of Nestor as an honored guest, and the final occurrence of dawn caps this air of hospitality when all guests are found happily in their beds. Telemachus has broken through to a position at the social center of a functional civilization, and the poet permits him to bask in his sense of belonging for a brief moment.

After carefully elaborating the customary trappings of sleep, Homer commences a new day with ἕμος δὲ ἰριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς, and the description suddenly becomes more particularized. A “zooming device”\textsuperscript{116} fleetingly foregrounds the physical geography of the front step of Nestor’s palace, effecting a transition to a reminiscence of previous and future proprietors of the megaron:

\begin{verbatim}

ἕμος δὲ ἰριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς,
ὅρνυτ᾿ ἅρ᾿ ἐξ εὐνήφι Γερήνιος ἱππότα Νέστωρ,
ἐκ δὲ ἑλθὼν κατ᾿ ἅρ᾿ ἐξετ᾿ ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι λίθοισιν,
οί οἱ ἐσαν προπάροιθε θυράων υψηλάων
λευκοί, ἀποστίλβοντες ἀλείφατος· οἷς ἐπὶ μὲν πρὶν
Νηλεὺς ἵζεσκεν, θεόφιν μῆστωρ ἀτάλαντος.

3.404-409
\end{verbatim}

Now when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers, then Nestor the Geranian horseman rose up from his bed, and went outside and took his seat upon the polished stones which were there in place for him in front of the towering doorway, white stones, with a shine on them that glistened. On these before him

\textsuperscript{115} See Arend 1933, 101-102. Note however the violation of this principle at 13.16-18. Homer is likely here hurrying his tale along – Odysseus is soon to depart Scheria and land upon Ithaca.
\textsuperscript{116} I use the word in its literal sense drawn from photography, of bringing the audience into a close prospect of a particular vista. Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood 2003, 15-53.
Neleus, a counselor like the gods, had held his sessions.

The host’s rising/dressing/descent to greet his guests is a common apodosis to the ἥμος clause of dawn (cf. 2.2, 8.1, etc.), but the scene becomes focused with the assertion that Nestor sits upon “polished stones” and that these stones are “white, and glistening with oil.” Finally, Nestor’s proprietary claim to his ancestral seat\^117 is made complete through the inclusion of the fact that Neleus once sat there.

The architectural feature of the polished stones set before Nestor’s door serves as a node to localize and ground in physical reality two sets of cyclical events: the preceding acts of hospitality culminating in the invariant dawn line, and Nestor’s matutinal reflections on the generations which have previously occupied and will in the future occupy the palace (see 411-416). The two are in fact seen to be interrelated when Nestor’s six living sons in a group escort Telemachus to this place possessing obvious sentimental associations for the old man. The vignette of Nestor poring over his ancestral inheritance offers one prospective outcome to the homelessness of Telemachus: settling amiably into stasis in his own home, in a retirement befitting his age and his accomplishments.

This is the most quiescent space which Telemachus will reach in his hospitality abroad, for at 3.491 ἥμος δ᾿ ἡριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς leads into a type scene of chariot-departure such as occurs also at his departure from Menelaus (15.190-92).\^118 Later, the same line, repeated at 4.306, finds Peisistratus and Telemachus in the prodromos of the home of Menelaus, as Menelaus and Helen lie down side by side. Whereas dawn in Nestor’s palace witnessed the old counselor symbolically accepting Telemachus into a space rich in associations of his lineage, this morning contributes to the characterization of Menelaus as distant and impersonal through a sequence of themes and motifs: first his rising from bed (4.307), then a short dressing scene (εἴματα ἐσσάμενος, κτλ., 4.308-309), culminating in an assertion that Menelaus is “like a god to behold” (310). As he sits by Telemachus, we find no description of place such as that with which the poet so expertly incorporated Telemachus into the palace of Nestor, but rather a formal inquiry whether Telemachus’ business is public or private (314). The

\^117 See West 1988, ad 3.408.
\^118 See Edwards 1975, 55.
use of repeated sunrises as a foil for distinctive and unique events has focused the auditors’ complete attention on the finite space before Nestor’s doorstep, and suggested a manner in which this landscape is emblematic for the benefits of nostos and societal restoration.

4.2.3 Nausicaa at Dawn: Poetic Word-Play (6.48ff.)

When we turn to Odysseus’ own storyline in Book 5, we observe a directionality within the narrative of dawn which likewise serves to integrate the protagonist into new surroundings, only in this instance in a fashion opposed to nostos. After the great storm of Book 5, a near-unique formula for dawn is sandwiched between two of the most admired and singular passages in Homer: the description of Olympus at 6.41-47, and Nausicaa’s fulfillment of Athena’s order to wash her clothing at 6.50ff.\(^\text{119}\)

\[\text{Αὐτίκα δ Ἑὼς ἠλθὲν ἑὕρθρονος, ἣ μιν ἔγειρε Ναυσικάαν εὔπεπλον.}\]

6.48-49

And the next Dawn came, throned in splendor, and wakened the well-robed girl Nausicaa.

Vivante remarks upon the staccato sense of “perturbation, disquiet” which results from the splitting of the line between dawn and the inception or the close of an action in the near-identical lines of Odyssey 6.48-49 and 20.91.\(^\text{121}\) In the long view, Nausicaa’s nervous energy to prepare for a groom will – for her – briefly offer the possibility of locking Odysseus in a permanent stasis of the sort that Calypso threatened. From the vantage point of the omniscient narrator, however,\(^\)\(^\text{120}\)

\(^{119}\) Though in many respects the passage conforms to the usual sequence of scenes involving a supernatural visitation and its outcome (for which, see Gunn 1971, 15-17). Many have subjected the Olympus passage to athetesis (see Hainsworth 1988, ad 6.42-47 and bibliography cited there); as Hainsworth and many others note, there is some similarity (though little explicit lexical overlap) with the description of Elysium from Book 4.

\(^{120}\) See above, note 72.

\(^{121}\) Vivante 1979, 127.
Athena’s guidance ensures that the original and charming scene of washing contributes in the long run to Odysseus’ nostos (cf. 6.14).

This dawn thus mediates between a unique vision of immortal freedom from care and a strikingly moving glimpse of the mortal desire to “only connect” which will tug at Odysseus throughout his stay on Scheria and work to seduce him to remain. The leitmotif of seduction is sounded in the present passage in part through a lexical riff on a more traditional dawn formula.\(^{122}\) We should recall from the analysis of the Cyclopeia above that the Homeric bard is in possession of a line-long formula used specifically for the purpose of concluding a nocturnal council or dream, which he declines to use in the present circumstance: \(\omega\sigma\; \varepsilon\phi\alpha\tau\iota\), \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\kappa\alpha\; \delta\varepsilon\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\omega\delta\theta\rho\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\sigma\; \eta\lambda\upsilon\upsilon\beta\varepsilon\nu\; \Gamma\eta\omega\upsilon\) (“so [s]he spoke, and Dawn of the golden throne came on”, 10.541=12.142=15.56=20.91). If we inquire whether any particular effect is achieved by abandoning the more common epithet \(\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\omega\delta\theta\rho\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\sigma\) in favor of the less common \(\epsilon\upsilon\theta\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\)\(^{122}\), the answer is a resounding “yes”.

Just before the passage in question, Athena has given Nausicaa elaborate instructions on the manner in which to render herself \(\epsilon\upsilon\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\omicron\) (“well-robed”, 6.49). A touch of comedic appositeness accrues through the anaphora of the affix \(\epsilon\upsilon\)-, preferred over the more unmarked \(\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\omega\delta\theta\rho\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\sigma\) in despite of the syntactic bump which arises in the superfluous pronoun that appears after the bucolic diaeresis (\(\mu\upsilon\;\ldots\;\Lambda\nu\alpha\iota\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\)). It suits the child-like naiveté and enthusiasm of Nausicaa’s character that in a passage implicitly focalized through her \(\Gamma\eta\omega\upsilon\;\ldots\;\epsilon\upsilon\theta\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\) should wake her in order that she might become \(\Lambda\nu\alpha\iota\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\;\epsilon\upsilon\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\omicron\).

Following as it does at the heels of the \(l\ddot{o}c\text{us}\; am\ddot{o}enus\) of Olympus at 6.41-47, this epithet doublet also projects a hint of eternal Olympic landscape and Olympic time into the youthful exuberance of Nausicaa. Dawn rises from her own leisurely tarriance in the East at the very moment Athena returns to Olympus, and Nausicaa from her bed at the very moment Dawn blooms forth, as if everything were proceeding from Athena’s cue (recall \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\kappa\alpha\; \; \text{“forthwith,”}\) carrying an undertone of both Nausicaa’s and Eos’ promptitude).\(^{123}\) When the charming young Nausicaa awakes at 48-49, a chain of command seems implicit, connecting heaven and earth, from Athena to Eos to Nausicaa.

\(^{122}\) For a recent treatment of Homeric wordplay in general, see Louden 1995, 27-46.
\(^{123}\) So Vivante 1979, 130.
Peering beyond the consideration of causality to the ambience with which this pun endows the passage, we recollect that 6.41-47 concludes its locus amoenus with a distinctively emphatic avowal that Olympus is a place of eternal enjoyment for the gods, and that it was to this sort of place that Athena was headed (τῷ ἐνι τέρπονται μάκαρες θεοὶ ἦματα πάντα / ἐνθ’ ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις, ἐπεὶ διεπέφραδε κούρη, “and there, and all their days, the blessed gods take their pleasure; / there the Gray-eyed One went, when she had talked with the young girl”, 6.46-47). Along the aforementioned thread of divine causality from the Athena to Nausicaa, a drop distilled from the beatitude and radiance of Olympus proceeds agreeably through the sequential assertions of blessedness on all three levels: λευκὴ... αἴγλη, τέρπονται (there, where Athena is going) → ἐὕθρονος (Dawn) → εὐπεπλος (Nausicaa). Through Nausicaa’s dream, an ambrosial trace of divine contentment penetrates the mortal sphere, and it is no wonder that Odysseus and generations of readers, intoxicated by this potent aphrodisiac, find the young princess, still “trailing clouds of glory” from her Olympian encounter, charming, and desire to linger with her for just one moment longer.

4.3 VIRTUOSO DESCRIPTIONS OF DAWN

All passages discussed above involved dawn scenes which conform closely to a formulaic template, employing to describe sunrise either a noun-epithet formula used elsewhere in the Odyssey or a recurrent line-long formula. Mention was also made of three noteworthy, contrasting instances in which sunrise scenes otherwise unattested in the Odyssey are employed to mark events of special significance. It will be demonstrated that these instances punctuate prominent spatial and temporal points in the narrative of the outward voyage of Telemachus and the nostos of Odysseus, marking the beginning of Telemachus’ journey, the beginning of Odysseus’ journey from Calypso to Scheria, and the end of Odysseus’ travels in Book 13.
The first of these appears at the beginning of Book 3 in the unusual depiction of sunrise over Pylos. The passage involves typical components (sacrifice, landing-scene), but the sun’s semi-personified leap up over the sea and the figures dotting the sand, all poised in preparation for the impending sacrificial feast, is completely unique.

I first offer the passage and an analysis of some of the verbal and formulaic cues which Homer employs to paint a landscape of intricate, finely balanced, and divinely governed order. After discussing the passage, I indicate how the sunrise reflects Telemachus’ focalization and sets him off as the narrator’s primary interest by leading into a string of typical scenes (sacrifice, landing) whose typical character foregrounds Telemachus’ aesthetic appreciation and wonderment at the sight of his first sunrise abroad.

All night long and into the dawn she ran on her journey.

Helios, leaving behind the lovely standing waters, rose up into the brazen sky to shine upon the immortals and also on mortal men across the grain-giving farmland. They came to Pylos, Neleus’ strong-founded citadel, where the people on the shore of the sea were making sacrifice of bulls who were all black to the dark-haired Earthshaker. There were nine settlements of them, and in each five hundred holdings, and from each of these nine bulls were provided.

124 See Arend 1933, 79-80.
Now as these tasted the entrails, and burned, for the god, the thigh bones, these others put straight in, and on the balanced ship took off the sails, and stowed them, and moored her in, and themselves landed. Telemachus stepped out of the ship, but Athena went first.

The first line of the book opens with the sun springing up, leaving behind the “extraordinarily fair harbor” of Pylos and entering the bronze-colored (πολύχαλκος) sky. As the sun dissociates itself from a localized body of water and emerges as the sun which illumines the entire world, it first lights the heavens where it shines on the immortal gods. Only then do we learn that its rays also provide light for “mortal men across the grain-giving farmland.” Homer thus lightly sketches out the landscape with the mention of only two elements (water – λίμνη, and sky – οὐρανός), each adorned with its own descriptive epithet (περικαλλής, πολύχαλκος). A purpose clause beginning at line 2 indicates the two varieties of sentient beings to whom the sun’s light is of interest: gods and men. The gods’ more ethereal existence is implied by their priority in this clause, and by the intangible character of the benefit they derive from dawn (light). In contrast, the benefits which mortals receive from the sun are an

---

125 West 1988, ad 3.2 and Stanford 1959, ad 3.2, both following the ancient commentators, read in πολύχαλκος tactile connotations of strength and inflexibility. While this idea may be present, the color and glitter of bronze seems too extraordinarily reminiscent of the orange and yellow hues of sunrise over a beach to be coincidental.

126 West 1988, ad 3.1, “here the all-encircling stream of the ocean is meant.” Cunliffe 1963, s.v. λίμνη, of this passage: “the ocean stream”. So also Stanford 1959, ad loc. Given the large sheltered body of water known to be present around the presumed site of Bronze Age Pylos, however, a shade of λιμήν may be present.

127 As both these epithets connote visual qualities, they carry a proleptic timbre: the sun leaves the harbor so that it is very fair and ascends to the heaven so that it sparkles like bronze. This function of dawn – turning the potential colors which are yet invisible so long as it is night to actual colors – recalls the theme of Telemachus’ desire to realize his own potential raised by the previous sunrise at the beginning of Book 2. There, echoes of a description of the seafaring Odysseus offered a paradigm for what Telemachus might become as he sets sail. Here, the social challenges presented by an integrated society which the sunset reveals will afford Telemachus the chance to discover his own true colors. The position that a distinction between mortal and immortal is a necessary prerequisite to mortals fulfilling their potential will resurface later in this dissertation; in particular, I will argue that the double-olive on Scheria in Book 5 and Athena’s ascent to Olympus in Book 6 manifest this same differentiation of mortal and immortal modes of living.
afterthought, and of a directly and pressingly material nature – it is sunlight which makes the earth supply grain (ζείδωρος).

Homer proceeds to reveal the inhabitants of the beachhead sequentially as the light of sunrise illuminates their identities and activities. First, he establishes the presence of Athena-As-Mentor and Telemachus through the understated οἱ δὲ in line 4. After indicating that it is indeed Pylos at which they have arrived in the same line and reminding us that Pylos is Neleus’ ἐυκτίμενον πτολίεθρον, he begins a description of the people performing a sacrifice upon the beach, the nature of the sacrificial animals (bulls: ταύροι παμμέλανες), and finally the recipient of the sacrifice (Poseidon: ἐνοσίχθων κυανοχαίτης). Like the harbor and the heaven, the victims and the recipient both possess visual epithets (all-black, blue-locked). The accomplishment of the sacrifice marks the close of the agricultural cycle hinted in line 3, in which sun nourishes grain, grain nourishes cattle, and sacrifice of cattle simultaneously strengthens the humans who work the fields and propitiates the gods who control the heavens, seas, and earth (ἐνοσίχθων), permitting the cycle to continue. One function of this remarkable sunrise scene is thus to establish the proper relationship between gods and men, a relationship in which agriculture figures prominently as source of sacrifices for the gods and gift of the gods to mankind.

Beneath this sunrise there thus lies a carefully balanced order which inverts the regular progression of sunrise scenes from typical and habitual actions to a focus on a unique action. The poet has Helios illuminate in turn:

The harbor of Pylos → the heaven (gods) → (humans) the agricultural earth →
Telemachus and Athena → Pylos → Pylians → bulls → [the absent god]

The movement is thus from generalized gods and men to a particular divine-human couple to animals, and then back to the god whom the animals please as sacrificial victims. Visual epithets at the beginning (περικαλλής, πολύχαλκος) give way to agricultural vocabulary (ζείδωρος), then to social/political (ἐυκτίμενον πτολίεθρον), then another two visual epithets (ταύροι παμμέλανες, ἐνοσίχθων κυανοχαίτης). Amidst this progression of epithets, in lines 2-3 there appears also a chiasmus of realms of the cosmos (A) and their inhabitants (B), from heaven (A, οὐρανὸν ἐς πολύχαλκον, “into the brazen sky”) to gods (B, ἵν’ ἀθανάτοιοι φαείνοι, “to shine
upon the immortals”) to mortal men (B, καὶ θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσιν, “and also on mortal men”) to the grain-bearing earth (A, ἐπὶ ζείδωρον ἀρουραν, “across the grain-giving farmland”). On either side of this chiasmus line 1 pairs marine geography (the ocean, λιπών περικαλλέα λίμνην, “leaving behind the lovely standing waters”) with celestial phenomena (the sun, Ἡέλιος δὲ ἀνόρουσε, “Helios rose up”), suggesting once again the importance of the distinction between the proper theaters of action for gods and men;128 Helios’ traversal of both realms suggests the fundamental interconnectedness of these two realms, as the assertion that he gives light gently intimates the differing functions which this light may serve for gods (illumination to observe mortals and their sacrifices) and men (showing up their illustrious deeds, but also nurturing growth in their crops). Line 4 adds specificity to the terrestrial geography through the social and technological theme that emerges in the well-built citadel (οἱ δὲ Πύλον, Νηλῆος ἐυκτίμενον πτολίεθρον, / ἵξον, “they came to Pylos, Neleus’ strong-founded citadel”), perhaps introducing the suggestion that political life evolves from and is dependent on agricultural labor. All these parallels and rings bracket Athena and Telemachus, placing them squarely in the center of the scene which sunrise illumines as surely as if they stood center-stage. The omission of an ἦμος clause particularizes all these details and arrestingly hints that the sunrise itself even more than usually is not a recurrent event used to specify the time of more important events, but is itself a unique subject of poetic narratio.

This intricate order is the more impressive when we realize that the poet has incorporated a series of typical descriptions into it, beginning with a sacrifice scene at 3.5-9.129 The Pylians represent, in De Jong’s words, “a society in harmony, where people are friendly and god-fearing, and obey the rules of hospitality, where feasting always takes place in conjunction with sacrifice, drinking with libation.”130 They are an ideal which Telemachus likely would wish to see instituted on Ithaca.

128 For men, inasmuch as both Telemachus and Odysseus must both venture out onto the sea to rediscover what is most valuable and distinctive about the culture which they inhabit.
Another type scene of landing closes the vignette (10-12), driving from generic activities associated with beaching a ship to the climactic explicit mention of Telemachus and Athena, the two main actors who had as of yet only been referred to obliquely through pronouns. Just as Telemachus’ departure in Book 2 mirrored Odysseus’ departure from Chryse in Book 1 of the *Iliad*, Telamachus’ arrival scene in Book 3 calls for comparison with Odysseus’s scene of arrival at Chryse, memorably conjured up in the insistent repetition of ἐκ δὲ with each new commodity unloaded from his ship (*Iliad* 435-439). Perhaps because Pylos is not his home and final destination, Telemachus does not unload his ship there; an exact reiteration of Odysseus unloading the sacrifice at Chryse will appear much later, when Telamachus completes this voyage and returns to Ithaca (*Odyssey* 15.497-99 ~ *Iliad* 435-437)\(^{131}\) and sets his provisions ashore in a three-line text which occurs only in the scenes of Odysseus on Chryse and Telemachus’ journey to Pylos. In the *Iliad* these lines lead into a propitiatory sacrifice and meal, and in the reminiscence of this locus from the *Iliad* tradition in *Odyssey* 15, they will ultimately lead into a more protracted and metaphorical sacrifice and meal of expiation.\(^{132}\) In Book 3, however, the sacrifice scene which arises serves primarily as a point of contact with his father’s role as outsider arriving in a potentially hostile polity and establishing common ground with the inhabitants through participation in their sacrifice, and the capping landing scene itself brings this issue into focus. The landing scene moves from anonymous sailors performing rote tasks to Telemachus and Athena, the first living individuals to be named in Book 3, and in this way redirects audience interest to the immediate tension over how Telemachus will fare in his first meeting with Nestor.

The very habitual character of the Pylians’ piety and the sailors’ activities effects a role reversal from the usual sunrise scene, where a repeated natural cycle formed a backdrop for a specific event. Whereas events preceding the sunrise tended to be more heavily laden with iterated, typical elements in the scenes from the Cyclopeia analyzed in Part I, here it is the events that follow which manifest less originality than the sunrise itself. This role reversal in which corporate human social activity on land and on sea becomes the more predictable and nature the wild-card proclaims the novelty of Telemachus’ first dawn on non-Ithacan soil, where for the

\(^{131}\) See Kirk 1985, ad 435-437.
\(^{132}\) For the slaughter of the suitors as a “dais of death”, see Clay 1994.
first time the sun is rising over a different shore and all the world seems new and gravid with unexpected possibilities. Telemachus is *departing* from his usual quotidian pattern of subservience to the suitors, and Homer emphasizes the young Ithacan’s entry into the teleological orientation of time entailed by *nostos* by adorning it with a highly unique sunrise which juxtaposes the cyclical ritual patterns of a society at peace with Telemachus’ highly individualistic quest for a final definitive answer regarding his father’s fate.

Homer expresses Telemachus’ wonder by focalizing the passage primarily through him, although the narration of this passage is omniscient and third-person and hints of a more universalizing perspective intrude. His human perspective is suggested by the orderly revelation by sunrise of visual highlights adumbrated by the visually oriented epithets discussed above. The account of Helios leaving the water to rise into heaven simulates the perspective of a ship-bound sailor standing on his boat close to the level of the sea, watching the day dawn over the harbor of Pylos as the ship coasts in. Under such circumstances, the impression that the sun literally leaps up from the harbor must be especially suggestive.

The concrete features of terrestrial geography which appear in the passage also betray a human viewpoint: note the repetitive insistence at line endings of κέλευθον, λίμνην, ἄρουραν, πτολίεθρον. Despite the fact that all but the last of these nouns are the direct objects of divine activity, the locales to which they point are earthly not only in contradistinction to the celestial realm of heaven, but also in representing spaces within which various human activities take place. The first two nouns refer (vaguely in the first instance, more specifically in the second) to the space which separates Ithaca and Pylos; the third refers to the farmland which supports Pylos, and the last to the citadel itself. These last two thus suggest the complementary and mutually dependent societal poles of farm versus city, and the series in general traces Telemachus’ and Athena’s route from Ithaca to Pylos. The net effect of these landscape terms is to establish the first stop on Telemachus’ trip as familiar and civilized in spite of its novelty, and to trace out physically his integration into a civilized society.  

Despite these indicators of a human viewpoint, the narrator also affects superhuman knowledge of the presence and appearance of the gods (ἀθανάτοισι in line 2 and κυανοχαίτης

---

133 Cf. the function fulfilled by the reiteration of εὐ- in Book 6 (see above), and Odysseus’ progression from fringe to the center in Scheria (Books 5-7) and Ithaca (Book 13).
in line 6). The gradual revelation of Pylos by the ascendant sun thus allows a brief ray of light to be cast by the narratorial voice of the poem on the gods in heaven, effectively flashing the audience a glimpse of the divine. This general reminder of the divine machinery operating behind the veil which conceals the gods and their doings from mortals most of the time is apposite to the particular circumstance of Telemachus and the Pylians, both of whom are in the presence of a god without knowing it. The audience, who are in on this fact, may thus enjoy the dramatic irony of Athena guiding Telemachus from within her disguise even as they situate this individual divine providence within a larger and less uniformly benevolent theological hierarchy which includes not only the helper Athena but also the recipient of the Pylians’ sacrifice, Poseidon, who will still have to be appeased if Odysseus is to return home safely. At the very last the narrative lens zooms out, and we watch Telemachus and Athena step off the ship as sympathetic but uninvolved third-person observers.

At the inception of Telemachus’ grand tour, the intricate description of sunrise over Pylos sets humans, gods, and landscape in a highly regimented relationship and establishes Telemachus as the primary lens through which we view these relationships. Landscape assumes a dual role as object of divine action and forum for human action. It is this space which makes possible the most common forms of reciprocity and communication between gods and mortals, whether through cyclical dispensations of fertility (ἀρουρα), unique and heroic deeds of persuasion or arms (πτολίεθρον), or unique and heroic travelers’ feats (κέλευθος, λίμνη). Perhaps not entirely coincidentally, these three realms correspond broadly to the major genres of surviving Greek epic as represented in the Works and Days, Iliad, and Odyssey. At the start of the first leg of his periplous, just as he is beginning to actuate his identity, it is fitting that the all-revealing sun illuminate a buffet of epic plot-lines which Telemachus might choose to try to realize, ranging from the inglorious to the glorious and from the agrarian to the aristocratic.134 Telemachus’ perceptions of the sunrise at the beginning of Book 2 cast in relief his emulousness of his father’s epic actions in the Iliad tradition; the sunrise of Book 3 offers another gesture which helps to define the Odyssean tradition against an Iliadic backdrop, proposing once again a

134 A trace of the theogonic/cosmogonic genre might also be read in the structural opposition between a celestial deity (Helios) and a chthonic deity (Poseidon, who received the typically chthonic sacrifice of black victims here). Athena mediates these two cosmic extremes by acting in the sphere which lies between: the earth and the humans which inhabit it.
studied dance between stasis, exploration of the unknown, and return to the known as the characteristic feature of Odyssean epic. Most of all, however, sunrise unveils a landscape which is tagged as utterly new by its description in unique and non-typical language, yet which Telemachus can easily process through his familiarity with the tales of Odysseus’ and other Achaeans’ landings which he can be presumed to have heard from Phemius, and through his recognition of the Pylians’ sacrifice as a sign that they are god-fearing and cultured.

4.3.2 Olympus (5.1ff.)

When a unique sunrise is next described at the beginning of Book 5, it follows the sunrise at the start of Book 3 in its innovativeness and its overall organization:

\begin{quote}
‘Ἡώς δ’ ἐκ λευκέων παρ’ ἀγαυοῦ Τιθωνοῖο ὁρυθ’, ἵνα ἀθανάτοις φῶς φέροι Ἠδὲ βροτοῖσιν· οἱ δὲ θεοὶ θωκόνδε καθίζανον. ἐν δὲ ἀρα τοῖσι Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης, οὗ τε κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον. τοῖσι δ’ Ἀθηναίη λέγε κήδεα πόλλ’ Ὀδυσσός μυησάμενη· μέλε γάρ οἱ ἔως ἐν δώμασι νύμφης.
\end{quote}

Odyssey 5.1-6

Now Dawn rose from her bed, where she lay by haughty Tithonus, carrying light to the immortal gods and to mortals, and the gods came and took their places in session, and among them Zeus who thunders on high, and it is his power that is greatest, and Athena spoke to them of the many cares of Odysseus, remembering. Though he was in the nymph’s house, she still thought of him.

Here, Dawn is described leaving the bed of her lover Tithonus to bring light to the immortals and the mortals. Although phrased differently, this passage echoes the opening of Book Three in carefully specifying immortals, then mortals as the beneficiaries of the dawn’s light.

Like sunrise at Pylos, this sunrise over the assembly on Olympus refers to a description of Odysseus given in the Iliad. In Book 11 of the Iliad, after Dawn leaves the bed of Tithonus,\(^{136}\)

\(^{135}\) Kahane 1994, 33-34.
Zeus sends Eris as his legate to the ships of the Achaeans to stir up warfare. When she arrives, she alights upon the ship of Odysseus, which, we are told, occupies a middle position between the ships of Achilles on the one side and those of Telamonian Ajax on the other. Thence she raises the war cry.

Given the evidence for co-referentiality among the Iliadic and Odyssean traditions cited above, it is unlikely to be adventitious that, on the very day upon which we will meet the protagonist for the first time in the *Odyssey*, the *Odyssey* poet has used a formulaic *hapax* from the *Iliad* which there leads to a glimpse of the ship of Odysseus on the beach at Troy.\(^{137}\) Like the very first dawn scene of the epic, this dawn brings the Iliadic Odysseus to mind and piques interest in discovering where this ship has taken him after it left Troy. In both cases the sunrise initiates the sending of a divine emissary who will set in motion a series of events fateful for the protagonist. In the *Iliad*, this dawn and Eris’ subsequent embassy mark the beginning of the “great day” which spans to the end of Book 18,\(^{138}\) the last day of Patroclus’ life. In the *Odyssey*, Hermes’ embassy frees Odysseus only to see him snared by Poseidon’s wrath on the open sea, beginning the *Odyssey*’s analogously central voyage from Ogygia to Ithaca (Books 5-13). By prefacing Odysseus’ travels with this same divine dawn, the poet sounds an ominous anthem to the attentive listener, creating an expectation of death which enables him to make Odysseus’ disastrous raft voyage suspenseful even for an audience which knew its likely outcome.

The wording of both passages is unique in another way: as the examples given in Part I of this chapter amply demonstrate, it is relatively common in the *Odyssey* for the formulaic line ἥμος δ’ ἠριγένεια φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς to be followed by a line beginning with ὀρνυτ’, which in turn is followed by a subject at the end of the line. Thus in Book 2.2 we find ὀρνυτ’ ἄρ’ ἐξ εὐνῆφι ὄδυσσηος φίλος υίος (“the dear son of Odysseus *stirred* from where he was sleeping”), in Book 3.405, ὀρνυτ’ ἄρ’ ἐξ εὐνηφίοις Ἕρμηνιος ἱππότα Νέπτωρ (“then Nestor the

\(^{136}\) See Nagy 1979, 174-210 (especially 190-207), and Sacks’ discussion (1987, 21 and 21n56) of a lecture by Nagy on this subject. Vivante 1979, 125-26, groups this association of Dawn with Tithonus together with the *Iliad*’s “saffron-robbed” (κροκόπεπλος) Dawn as instances of formulas suitable only to precede divine action. Lefkowitz 2002, 325-344 explores the implications of visual representations of Eos’ abductions of mortals for Greek sexuality. For further discussion of Eos’ mythological and Indo-European connections, see Nagy 1973, Boedeker 1974, and Budin 2002 in the bibliography.

\(^{137}\) See Pucci 1987, 21 n.10.

\(^{138}\) See Taplin 1992, Chapter 1.3.
Gerenian horseman rose up from his bed”), etc. It is more common in the *Odyssey* for the subject of ὀρνυτ’ to be a mortal human.

In the permutation of the formula which begins Book 5, however, the subject of ὀρνυτ’ is no longer a mortal who rises because of the dawn, but Dawn herself, who leaves the side of her mortal lover to mount her daily path into the sky. What likely originated as a formula for describing the waking of mortals within a mortal household has been transferred to the household of the gods, with a comic effect. Dawn’s preference for dilatory dalliance with a mortal man when she should be bringing light to the gods also recalls Calypso’s detention of Odysseus against his will, presaging the difficulties which the hero will encounter in persuading her to permit his departure.\(^{139}\)

In keeping with Vivante’s precept of the segregation of divine and human dawn formulas,\(^{140}\) ὀρνυτ’ unexpectedly springs upon the reader a decidedly divine orientation at a point in the sleep-dawn-waking sequence where a human viewpoint is as a rule preferred. Even as this celestial focus underscores divine causality and control, it also creates a rapprochement between gods and humans, both of whom leave bed and proverbially put on their pants one leg at a time in much the same manner. Unlike mixed focalization of the dawn scene of 3.1ff., however, 5.1ff. completely rules out the presence of any human viewpoint (except perhaps that of the bard himself) by the exclusion of all human witnesses from the perfectly peaceful scene of sunrise over Olympus.

During the scene, we move from an immortal goddess leaving her semi-mortal lover to the heavens, where she illumines (a) immortals and (b) mortals. Once again, the progression is logical and follows what one actually sees when observing sunrise: the sun appears from the realm of mortals (the horizon of the earth), ascends to the realm of the gods (the heaven) who would presumably receive the sunlight first, as is fitting. The order can thus be summed up as follows:

\[
\text{Immortal from bed with Mortal} \rightarrow \text{Immortals} \rightarrow \text{Mortals} \rightarrow \text{Council of Immortals about Odysseus}
\]

\(^{139}\) See note 136.

\(^{140}\) See note 74.
Absent, however, is the third book’s assertion of the puissance of the human institutions of sacrifice and sheer, stubborn daring as counterbalances to divine determinism. In the earlier sunrise Athena has aggressively taken Telemachus under her tutelage even as he began to work actively to ameliorate his situation, but she chooses to refrain from making personal appearances to Odysseus until Book 6, instead allowing him to come within inches of death in Poseidon’s great storm. This second turning point in the narrative is put in motion by a sunrise which is both less unique and less elaborate than Telemachus’ fateful voyage, and this is appropriate, since Odysseus is not doing anything fundamentally new when we meet him. Even the mention of Tithonus, a mortal who derived both harm and blessings from his relationship with a goddess, resonates with Athena’s ambiguous role of divine helper who nevertheless refuses to intervene directly for fear of offending her uncle Poseidon, and with Calypso’s role as nymph who wishes to immortalize her mortal lover. Working in tandem with this theme of ambivalent relations between men and goddesses, cross-references to Odysseus’ ship at the beginning of the central day of the *Iliad* herald the advent of the physical trial of weathering the storm and the sociological trial of ingratiating himself with the Phaeacians.

4.3.3 Ithaca (13.88ff.)

The preceding sections uncovered a marked discrepancy between the unique sunrises which send Telemachus and Odysseus on their respective ways in their first sea voyages recorded in the *Odyssey*. The former *integrates* Telemachus into a broader society of Achaean aristocracy, while the latter *alienates* Odysseus from his surroundings and the divine level of action from the human. A third and final unique description of sunrise dawns as the Phaeacians unceremoniously unload Odysseus, still asleep, upon the shore of his unrecognized homeland. The programmatic content of this passage is manifest, repeating the key themes from the proem

---

141 Athena attempts to account for her neglect of Odysseus in her epiphany of Book 13; Jenny Strauss Clay’s *Wrath of Athena* (passim) suggests possible hidden motives for her prolonged absence. Perhaps the most important consideration in the poet’s choice to minimize her role in Books 1-12 is the epithet ascribed to Odysseus in the first line of the poem: the hero requires ethical as well as physical latitude in which to exercise his cleverness.
of the poem before describing not dawn itself, but the twilight which precedes dawn and which
masks the Phaeacian sailors as they disburden themselves of Odysseus:

So lightly did the ship run on her way and cut through the sea’s waves.
She carried a man with a mind like the gods for counsel, one whose
spirit up to this time had endured much, suffering many
pains: the wars of men, hard crossing of the big waters;
but now he slept still, oblivious of all he had suffered.
At the time when shines that brightest star, which beyond others
comes with announcement of the light of the young Dawn goddess,
then was the time the sea-faring ship put in to the island.

Lines 88-92 are manifestly a synopsis and expansions of the proem: 142 ἀνδρα... πολύτροπον
(“a man of many turns”, 1.1) is expanded to ἀνδρα... θεοὶς ἐναλίγκια μὴδὲ ἔχοντα (“she
carried a man with a mind like the gods for counsel”); πολλὰ δὲ ὅ γ’ ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἀλγεὰ
ὅν κατὰ θυμόν (“many the pains he suffered in his spirit on the wide sea”, 1.4) is confirmed by
ὁς πρὶν μὲν μάλα πολλὰ πάθ’ ἀλγεὰ ὅν κατὰ θυμόν (“one who previously endured many
pains in his spirit”); οὗ μάλα πολλὰ / πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ιερὸν πτολέμιθρον ἔπεσε,
(“who was driven far journeys, after he sacked Troy’s sacred citadel”, 1.1-2), which toggles
between the Iliadic and Odyssean identities of Odysseus, finds a reflex in ἀνδρῶν τε
πτολέμιους ἀλεγεινά τε κύματα πείρων (“cleaving through the wars of men, the grievous
waves”). All these themes are effectively put to rest and the inception of a new plotline implied
by the assertion that during the journey he is relieved of the burden of his past adventures,

142 See Clay 1997, 190-191; Kahane 1992, 120-21; Schadewaldt 1958, 29 famously divides the
epic into an outer and an inner homecoming at this point.
“having forgotten all the things that he had suffered” (δὴ τότε γ’ ἀτρέμας εὐδε, λελασμένος ὅσο’ ἐπεπόνθει).

In Part II of this chapter, I suggested that in Telemachus’ first departure from home the poet deliberately has the youth take onboard poetic signifiers of his father’s legacy, effectively carrying Ithaca with him to meet his father. Here we observe the converse effect as the Phaeacian ship carries all the legacy of his adventures not as external treasures (though Odysseus has these too), but as an innate part of his character, hidden and latent as he sleeps. Thus these lines self-consciously bring Odysseus’ travels as a poetic theme to a close.

The usual introductory term for the cyclical event of sunrise (ἦμος) has been elided, as in 5.1 – purposefully, I would argue, because of the singular character of the day of Odysseus’s nostos. That the emphasis of the present scene is on the uniqueness of the event for which sunrise provides the time of day is validated by the emphatic inclusion of τῆμος, which otherwise is not generally present in dawn scenes. The morning star (ἕωσφόρος) puts in only one cameo appearance under this name in the Iliad, and that is as day dawns on the dying ashes of Patroclus’ funeral pyre at 23.226. Iliad 24 continues to present potentially significant parallels to Odyssey 13 as it echoes the line ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἀλεγεῖνά τε κύματα πείρων (“the wars of men, hard crossing of the big waters”; Odyssey 13.91 ~ Iliad 24.8). In the Iliad, this line appears as Achilles mournfully recalls his adventures with Patroclus prior to the Iliad’s narrative; in the Odyssey it looks to the past as well, glancing back on Odysseus’ wanderings recounted in Books 1-13 and appropriating them as a similarly worthy source of fame. However, the parallel highlights the superiority of Odysseus’ fame, inasmuch as he is still very much alive and about to move on to the domestic leg of his nostos, while Patroclus’ tale is finished. Both the Iliad description of ἕωσφόρος and the first intimations of dawn at Odyssey 13 are dream-like, surreal passages, and both mark a clear end to a series of events set in motion in the respective epics’

143 Forgetfulness being the converse of the poetic memory embodied in the well-known trope of the Muses as daughters of Mnemosyne, and here also a justification for the commemoration of the nostos theme in poetry: at 1.325-327, the nostos theme caused pain for Penelope because it reminded her of her husband’s failed nostos. Now that he has succeeded and forgotten his toils, the poet may safely celebrate the journey as a just source of kleos. See Frame 2005, Chapter 3, and Nagy 1979, 97-98.
prologues. Unlike Patroclus, however, Odysseus will awaken from his death-like sleep and he will move on to new adventures.

In 13.96 there follows the descriptions of the harbor of Phorcys, introduced by an expression of the est locus variety. In the Apologue we have already seen one instance of this generalized and timeless manner of description in Odysseus’ account of Goat Island. There the description of the place led with the next sunrise to exploitation of the characteristic resource offered by this landscape (goats). Soon, the men’s domination of the landscape encouraged their increasing boldness and led them to investigate the cave of the Cyclops. The poet’s description of the harbor illuminated by Hesperus’ pre-dawn glow is likewise not incorporated into the narrative through character action at all: inasmuch as it simply enumerates landscape features subsisting in a timeless present, it is almost completely sub specie aeternitatis. Nonetheless, careful attention to the poet’s use of adjectives reveals a progression from tactile to visual imagery throughout the passage which reflects the increasing illumination as day dawns without the poet ever having to employ a word for dawn or sun.

The poet first describes the harbor as follows:

Φόρκυνος δὲ τίς ἐστι λιμήν, ἀλίοιο γέροντος,
ἐν δήμῳ Ἰθάκης· δύο δὲ προβλῆτες ἐν αὐτῷ
ἀκταὶ ἀπορρῶγες, λιμένος πότιπεπτηυῖαι,
αἰ τ’ ἀνέμων σκεπόωσι δυσαήων μέγα κύμα
ἐκτοθεν ἐντοοθεν δὲ τ’ ἄνευ δεσμοίο μένουσι νῆις ἐὔσσελμοι, ὡτ’ ἀν ὀρμίου μέτρον ἱκωνται.
αὐτὰρ ἐπι κρατόσ λιμένος ταυύρολλος ἐλαιή,
ἀγχόθι δ’ αὐτῆς ἀντρον ἑπίρατον ἡροειδές,
ἰρόν νυμφάων, αἰ νηϊάδες καλέονται,
ἐν δὲ κρητηρίσει τε καὶ ἀμφιφορήσει εἰσι.

144 The parallels continue to the very end of the Iliad: at the end of Book 24 of this epic, Homer repeats the line ἦμος δ᾿ ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥώς just as he describes the covering of Hector’s bones with the suggestively Odyssean participle καλύψαντες (12.796; I owe this observation to Mae Smethurst). Hector’s “concealment” by death in this last vignette of the Iliad prepares an audience scheduled to hear the Odyssey at a future recitation to appreciate the superiority of a hero able to disentangle himself from the “concealment” of death personified in Calypso and reenacted again and again in death-defying adventures. The same root whence Calypso draws her name is common in association with the death of heroes in the Iliad; it also appears at 24.20 as Apollo attempts to prevent Hector’s corpse from being defiled by Achilles’ outrageous treatment.
There is a harbor of the Old Man of the Sea, Phorcys, in the countryside of Ithaca. There two precipitous promontories opposed jut out, to close in the harbor and shelter it from the big waves made by the winds blowing so hard on the outside; inside, the well-benched vessels can lie without being tied up, once they have found their anchorage.

At the head of the harbor, there is an olive tree with spreading leaves, and nearby is a cave that is shaded, and pleasant, and sacred to the nymphs who are called the Nymphs of the Wellsprings, Naiads. There are mixing bowls and handled jars inside it, all of stone, and there the bees deposit their honey.

And therein also are looms that are made of stone, very long, where the nymphs weave their sea-purple webs, a wonder to look on; and there is water forever flowing. It has two entrances, one of them facing the North Wind, where people can enter, but the one toward the South Wind has more divinity. That is the way of the immortals, and no men enter by that way.

It was into this bay they rowed their ship. They knew of it beforehand. The ship, hard-driven, ran up onto the beach for as much as half her length, such was the force the hands of the oarsmen gave her.

As in the description of sunrise in Book 3, the explicit mention of the light source for the scene fulfills an aesthetic function. Homer privileges his audience to observe the optical effects of the Hesperus’ light waxing and the harbor becoming visible as he incorporates more visual terms into the account of the Harbor of Phorcys. The pre-dawn murk is represented lexically in the initial absence of visual adjectives in this passage, and the vocabulary is one of primal forms and shapes jutting into space, and of murky tactile impressions (δύο δὲ προβλήτες, “and two jutting
This is appropriate, since the scene is still veiled in darkness.

As we move into the harbor (and as Hesperus grows higher and perhaps the first tinge of dawn glows on the horizon), the poet progresses from vague, earthy shapes to more finely drawn details. The headlands seem to form the dividing line (αἵ τ´ ἀνέμων σκεπόωσι δυσαήων μέγα κῦμα / ἐκτοθεν ἐντοθεν δέ τ´ ἄνευ δεσμοῖο μένουσι / νῆες ἔυσσελμοι, “and shelter it from the big waves made by the winds blowing / so hard on the outside; inside, the well-benched vessels / can lie without being tied up”). Whereas outside there are only shifting heaps of earth and stone and water, inside the harbor we find our first man-made objects in these generalized ships which keep their place without any mooring. This opens the gate to natural objects whose epithets suggest minute shades of texture: an olive tree with spreading leaves and a cave that is shaded and pleasant (ταυρὸς ἔλαίη, ἄντρον ἐπηρατον ἡροειδές). Finally this leads to the nymphs themselves, as well as their belongings, which are paradoxically at once objects of nature and objects of artifice (ἐν δὲ κρητῆρές τε καὶ ἀμφιφορῆς ἔασι / λάϊνοι, “mixing bowls and handled jars inside it, / all of stone”; ἰστοὶ λίθεοι περιμήκεες, “looms that are made of stone, very long”). Only at last with the observation that the nymphs employ their looms to weave sea-purple garments (φάρε´ ύφαίνουσιν ἀλιπόρφυρα, θαῦμα ἱδέσθαι) do we find an unambiguously visual epithet, the significance of which to sunrise is underscored by the addition of the Pausanian appreciative remark, θαῦμα ἱδέσθαι.

Yet after this wonderful and painstaking representation of the growing light at dawn through the initial withholding of visual epithets and distinctive forms at the beginning of the description of the Harbor of Phorcys, it is not clear that any of the characters involved in the narrative have yet seen the sight that we have just been privileged to glimpse. Odysseus himself sleeps as the ship rows into harbor, it is not yet light as the Phaeacians row in, and they must rely on previous knowledge (ἐνθ´οϊ γ´εἰσέλασαν πρίν εἰδότες, 13.113). Soon thereafter the ship of the Phaeacians is turned to a rock (13.163) and the city of the Phaeacians is in danger of disappearing behind a mountain (13.177).

---

145 On the participle, see Hoekstra 1989 ad 13.98 (he translates “crouching”).
The ecphrasis is utterly distinctive, and definitively embodies the realization of Odysseus’ external nostos.\textsuperscript{146} This final unique sunrise in Odysseus’ travels presents the last ironic development in terms of the protagonist’s integration into society. Sunrise at the beginning of Book 3 integrated Telemachus into Nestor’s household and through his household into the society of the Achaeans; sunrise at the beginning of Book 5 sets in motion a divine council which reveals the gods acting on Odysseus’ behalf even as they send him out of view of any shore into the limitless and terrifying realms of the open sea; sunrise in Book 13 lights upon Odysseus completing the final leg of the long geographical arc toward home, emerging from a death-like state of sleep and forgetfulness to transcend the accomplishments of his Iliadic epic progenitors.

This progression of landscapes reveals that even though Homer’s two-stranded tale of Telemachus and Odysseus does not follow Odysseus from his departure to his arrival in chronological order, it nevertheless pursues the sequence of motifs of departure from home, departure from foreign captivity, and arrival home. For Odysseus, however, this is not the end of the story. The final act of integration into a household, which seemed to come so easily for Telemachus at 3.404ff., will continue to elude Odysseus until the last miraculous sunrise of Book 23, which Athena preternaturally delays in order to afford Odysseus a happy reunion with his wife.

\section*{4.4 CONCLUSION}

All the sunrise scenes examined above reveal the danger of understating the significance and expressiveness of descriptions of dawn. This significance transcends temporal\textsuperscript{147} and aesthetic\textsuperscript{148} considerations, penetrating to the very core of the nostos theme of the Odyssey. In the Cyclopeia (Part I), we observed that inclusion or exclusion of certain typical elements in association with

\textsuperscript{146} The description of the harbor is dealt with below in Chapter 8.
\textsuperscript{147} See MacLeod 1982, 47-48.
\textsuperscript{148} See Austin 1975, 67-68.
dawn can establish a sort of psychological directionality, dropping hints of the circumstances under which characters went to bed the previous night and varying depending on Odysseus’ and his men’s degree of curiosity. The limited range of formulaic and typical expressions available to the poet actually assists him in creating leitmotif-like sequences which indicate whether stasis, journey to new territory, or backtracking is desired when the sailors rise from their beds.

I examined how Homer accommodates this directionality to individual contexts on a more minute scale in Part II, which addressed three separate sunrises in the Telemachy and in the Scheria episode. The first of these was the inaugural dawn of the epic, and as such it set the tone for the most common expression of dawn in the *Odyssey*. The dawn scene engages an Iliadic analogue in a dialectic which reveals the preconceptual baggage about Odysseus which both Telemachus and the auditor bring with them from the *Iliad*. By drawing parallels between Telemachus’ failed Assembly and the dawn of *Iliad* I through exact verbal repetitions, the poet calls attention to central thematic similarities and differences between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, such Odysseus’ socially reconstitutive journey and his trajectory back to the corporate group of the Achaean camp, which contrasts strongly with Telemachus’ isolation from Ithacan society; to enjoy the same sense of accomplishment and of membership in an extended aristocratic network experienced by Odysseus in the Achaean camp, Telemachus will have to wait for his first dawn on Pylos. Under headings B and C of Part II we examined two other dawn scenes which, in contradistinction to the theme of alienation which necessitated flight in the first dawn, draw upon typical elements to integrate a main character more closely into his immediate social surrounding. These dawn scenes are socially centripetal, and some of Nestor’s welcoming piety and domesticity and of Nausicaa’s seductiveness can be seen to arise from the dexterous manipulation of typical elements in sequence after a dawn scene.

Lastly, Part III demonstrated how the effects of dawn scenes enumerated in Parts I and II can be amplified at narrative pivots by breaking the mold and coining a completely unique way of depicting dawn. In this manner the poet stresses major developments in the *nostos* theme at 3.1ff., 5.1ff., and 13.88ff. Like the first dawn scene of the *Odyssey*, these sunrises bear traces of the poet going out of his way to cross-reference programmatic themes associated with Odysseus and to use landscape as a means of setting an emotional tone. At the beginning of Book 3, the uniqueness of the description of dawn seen through Telemachus’ eyes underscores his sensitivity to a new landscape, presumably the first which he has ever seen outside of Ithaca. In Book 5, the
cross-reference to the portion of the epic tradition which came to be *Iliad* Book 11 forebodes trouble for Odysseus while giving a last retrospective glance at the manner in which the tradition portrayed him at Troy before revealing how he will take shape in the present epic. Finally, the dawn of Book 13, which never entirely blooms into full sunlight, alludes to the *Odyssey*’s own prologue to underscore the fact that Odysseus’ external homecoming is now complete, and that iterated dawns will no longer herald a new shore and new unexpected threat. Rather, the second half of the epic will concentrate on Odysseus’ movements within the society of his home, and each dream-filled night and each new day will mark a temporal advance toward the reclamation of the throne.
Inasmuch as it opposes Odysseus’ unswerving devotion to nostos to the temptations of stasis and stagnation, Calypso’s grotto embodies the fundamental tension of the Odyssey. Placing Odysseus in a luxuriant paradise in the company of a nubile nymph serves Homer as an effective form of rhetorical hyperbole to establish the drive for nostos as Odysseus’ defining characteristic and the one whose fulfillment will signal the telos of the epic. If Odysseus does not want to remain on Ogygia, we can, a fortiori, rest assured as we begin to listen to his narration of the Apologue that whatever erotic temptations and whatever colonialist urges impinge on his psyche, he will not have found any offers to match Calypso’s.\textsuperscript{149}

By opposing this need for nostos and a landscape self-consciously depicted as superior to even the best eschatological hopes of the most important of the Bronze Age kings (basileis), the poet makes the landscape of Calypso’s island an apologia for the very existence of the Odyssey. Odysseus’ Athena-sanctioned self-restraint constitutes a component of his heroic ethos. Achilles demonstrated the same quality in Iliad 1,\textsuperscript{150} but only by virtue of the goddess’ physical

\textsuperscript{149} Circe, to be certain, was an erotic temptation, but she was a different and more dangerous sort of seductress, who metamorphosed men into animals as enthusiastically as she made love to them (which, it should be noted, she does only with the added enticement of a philter). Plass (1969, 104) notes that the contrast between Menelaus on Elysium and Odysseus on Ogygia is favorable to the latter: “For his part, Odysseus actually enjoys a life much like this [i.e., that forecast for Menelaus by Proteus] with Calypso on the island of Ogygia, but he grows weary, rejects her offer of immortality, and is eager to resume the journey homeward.”

\textsuperscript{150} Iliad 1.188-205:

"ὡς φάτο· Πηλείωνι δ’ ἂχος γένετ’, ἐν δὲ οἱ ἦτορ στήθεσιν λασίοισι διάνδιχα μεμηρίζετεν, ἢ ὁ γε φάσγανον ὀξὺ ἐρυσσάμενος παρὰ μηροῦ τοὺς μὲν ἀναστήσειν, δ’ ἂν ἀναστήσεις, δ’ ἂν ἀναστήσεις ἐναρίζοι, ἢς χόλον πάυσει εἰρητύσει τῇ θυμῷ, ἢς δ’ ταύθ’ ὀρμαίνει κατὰ φερένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν,"
intervention to stop him from making the disastrous mistake of slaying Agamemnon. In the *Odyssey*, by contrast, Athena herself will concede, not without embarrassment, that she was unable to bring herself to intercede on Odysseus’ behalf until he washed up among the Phaeacians.¹⁵¹ Both his slips in restraint (most notably his rash rush into the Cyclops’ cave) and his Pyrrhic victories (not himself eating the Cattle of Helios or opening Aeolus’ sack of winds) reflect only his mortal, independent, free-willed agency.

Insidiously, the temptation which Calypso offers is not only erotic. There is more to the goddess than mere sex-appeal and Odysseus’ heroic fortitude in the face thereof, for certain

---

εἶλκετο δ’ ἐκ κολεοίῳ μέγα ξίφος, ἥλθε δ’ Ἀθήνη οὐρανόθεν πρὸ γὰρ ἢκε θεᾶ λευκόλενος Ἡρη, ἀμφώ ὂμὼς θυμῷ φιλέουσα τε κηδομένῃ τε στῇ δ’ ὀπίθεν, ξανθής δὲ κόμης ἔλε Πηλεώνα οἶῶ φαινομένη τῶν δ’ ἄλλων οὐ τις ὀράτον θάμβησεν δ’ Ἀχιλέως, μετὰ δ’ ἐτράπετ’, αὐτίκα δ’ ἔγνω Παλλάδ’ Ἀθηναίην. δεινῷ δ’ ὀς πέφευρ’ καὶ μίν φωνήσας έπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα· τίπτ’ αὖτ’, αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς τέκος, εἰλήλουθας; ἦ ἤνα ὑβριστ’ ἀν Αγαμέμνονος Ατρείδαο; ἦλ’ ἐκ τοι ἐρέω, τὸ δ’ καὶ τελέεσθαι οἶῶ; ἦς υπεροπλίσθαι τάχ’ ἀν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσῃ.

So he spoke. And the anger came on Peleus’ son, and within his shaggy breast the heart was divided two ways, pondering whether to draw from beside his thigh the sharp sword, driving away all those who stood between and kill the son of Atreus, or else to check the spleen within and keep down his anger. Now as he weighed in mind and spirit these two courses and was drawing from its scabbard the great sword, Athena descended from the sky. For Hera the goddess of the white arms sent her, who loved both men equally in her heart and cared for them. The goddess standing behind Peleus’ son caught him by the fair hair, appearing to him only, for no man of the others saw her. Achilles in amazement turned about, and straightaway knew Pallas Athena and the terrible eyes shining. He uttered winged words and addressed her: ‘Why have you come now, o child of Zeus of the aegis, once more? Is it that you may see the outrageousness of the son of Atreus Agamemnon? Yet will I tell you this thing, and I think it shall be accomplished. By such acts of arrogance he may lose even his own life.’

¹⁵¹ *Odyssey* 13.314-319; 339-43.
aspects of her cave suggest a grotesque but comfortable domesticity. Unlike Elysium, which, as we will see, implicitly offers a miserable marriage for Menelaus as a necessary evil to be endured as the price of immortality, Ogygia’s blandishments mold landscape into a clever approximation of an oikos, making up a perceived lack in Elysium’s paradiasiacally but impersonally beatific landscape. It is thus worth considering the possibility that it is as head of a household competing with Penelope’s that Calypso poses the greatest threat, crystallizing the central conflict of Book 5 as one between the mortal life and the divine life in a deliberate gesture toward the fateful heroic choice described by Achilles in Book 9 of the Iliad.\textsuperscript{152}

After setting out how Calypso’s grotto engages Menelaus’ Elysium, the only other contender for a locus amoenus in which mortals may attain an immortal lifestyle thus far in the narrative, and Ithaca, the only other contender for a home thus far, we shall move on to address the rhetorical strategies which Homer employs to turn the landscape of Ogygia into an argument for nostos.

\textsuperscript{152} Iliad 9.410-416:

\begin{verbatim}
μήτηρ γάρ τέ με φησι θεά Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
diçθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν θανάτοιο τέλοςδε.
ei μὲν κ’ αὐθί μένουν Τρώων τόλιν ἀμφίμαχωμαι,
\textsuperscript{19} ἕλετο μέν μοι νόστος, ἀτάρ κλέος ᾠθίτον ἔσται:
ei δὲ κεν οἰκαδ’ ἵκωμι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
\textsuperscript{25} ἕλετοι μοι κλέος ἐσθλόν, ἐπὶ δηρόν δὲ μοι αἰών
\textsuperscript{30} ἔσσεται, οὐδέ κε μ’ ὤκα τέλος θανάτοιο κιχεῖ.
\end{verbatim}

For my mother Thetis the goddess of the silver feet tells me
I carry two sorts of destiny toward the day of my death. Either,
if I stay here and fight beside the city of the Trojans,
my return home is gone, but my glory shall be everlasting;
but if I return home to the beloved land of my fathers,
the excellence of my glory is gone, but there will be a long life
left for me, and my end in death will not come to me quickly.

For agonistic gestures toward the Iliad and the Odyssey poet’s endeavors to privilege the kleos of nostos, see Nagy 1979, 35: “In contrast to the Iliad, it is an overall theme of the Odyssey that Odysseus is indeed aristos Akhaion ‘best of the Achaeans’ …. From the retrospective vantage of the Odyssey, Achilles would trade his kleos for a nostos. It is as if he were now [at 11.489-91] ready to trade an Iliad for an Odyssey.”
5.1 CALYPSO: ODYSSEUS::HELEN: MENELAUS?

Gregory Crane has argued that Calypso’s Ogygia “is an island of the Blessed with sinister undertones, but that the dominant note is positive.”¹⁵³ In Crane’s opinion, the island is a νῆσος μακάρων: this is why Hermes carries his golden wand when he approaches the island (he is present in his capacity as psychopomp) and why the meadows are emphasized at the end of the description of the island (the meadows of the dead). The theme of sex with a goddess (always a perilous activity) and structural parallels between the accounts of Hermes fetching Odysseus from Calypso in Book 5 and of the same deity retrieving Persephone in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter all contribute to Ogygia’s infernal and otherworldly connotations for Crane.¹⁵⁴ I would argue that these otherworldly associations are real and may, as Crane suggests, ultimately derive from a model shared with the Homeric Hymn,¹⁵⁵ but that the scene’s primary sources and the cross-references nearest to the poet’s mind lie much closer to hand, in (1) the embassy scene of Athena in Book 1 and (2) the promise of an Elysian afterlife for Menelaus in Book 4.

5.1.1 Athena’s Embassy Scene in Book 1

Unlike the council scene of Book 1, the council which results in Hermes’ embassy begins with a dawn scene. On the day Hermes goes to fetch Odysseus, the sun rises, not in the normal fashion but – uniquely for the Odyssey – in the guise of a personified goddess rising from the bed of her lover Tithonus (5.1). The mythological significance of this line has been discussed by Nagy and Olson, among others.¹⁵⁶ Setting aside for a moment the more obscure parallels for this dawn, the relevance of a goddess leaving her mortal lover to the day of Odysseus leaving Calypso seems relatively clear. Tithonus, according to the myth, wastes away to a cricket due to Eos’ lack of

¹⁵³ Crane 1988, 18.
¹⁵⁵ Crane is ambivalent about the existence of direction of influence for the parallels which he notes here (1988, 20-21).
foresight in making her request for his immortality; a no sooner has she ascended to the council on Olympus than Athena reminds Zeus of Odysseus’ virtues as king, which have apparently availed him nought (5.8-12). Odysseus – like the lazy and wizened Tithonus, who stays a-bed while his consort rises to her daily duties – is reduced to lying around (κεῖται) in the megaron of a goddess, held back by necessity, against his will (5.12-15).

After sunrise and the council of the gods, Hermes is dispatched on his errand. His departure echoes precisely that of Athena from the council of Book 1, a structuring device which encourages us to weigh the relative merits of the Ithaca which Athena finds in Book 1 with the Ogygia where Hermes lands in Book 5. Odysseus must choose between these two landscapes, and the inducements to settlement offered by the two locales are very different: Ithaca offers home and family, whereas Ogygia offers paradise and release from both the cares and the kleos which beset and obsess mortals. The poet acknowledges that Ithaca and Ogygia are in


Φασὶ δὲ ἠρώνυμον τινα ιστορεῖν, ὃτι Τιθωνὸς ἀδελφὸς Πριάμου ἐς βαθὺ γῆρας ἐλάσας καὶ δεῖν μηκέτι ἔθελον ἠτῆσαι παρὰ τῆς Ἡώς ἀδάνατον, συνοικὼς αὐτῇ κατὰ ἐρώτα. ἡ δὲ ἀδυνατοῦσα— ἡ δέ γὰρ ἐνεγράφη τοῖς ἀθανασίας ὁ Τιθωνός— εἰς τέττιγα μετέβαλεν αὐτὸν, ὡς ἡ τῆς αὐτοῦ φωνῆς ἤς τὸ διηνεκές ἀκόουσα. “Ἐτεροὶ δὲ φασὶ τὴν Ἡώς ἐρασθείσαν τοῦ Τιθωνοῦ ἀράσαι αὐτὸν καὶ ἐντείλασθαι ζητῆσαι, ὅπερ ἀν βούλοντο ἀγαθὸν, τόν δὲ προελέσθαι ἀθανασίαν καὶ λαβεῖν μὴ προσεπιζητήσαντα καὶ τὸ ἄει νέον. ἐπεὶ δὲ γηράσοι, τότε δὴ μαθεῖν, ὡς ἀτελῆ ἐξήτησεν, εἰχε γὰρ ἀδάνατον κακὸν τῆς γῆρος κάκωσιν. οὐδὲν αἰτῆσαι τὴν εἰς ἄλογα μετάστασιν καὶ πολλὰ λιτανεῦσαν τυχεῖν τοῦ μεταπεσεῖν εἰς τέττιγα. Διό καὶ ψυχρὸς ὁ τέττις, ὡς ἐκ Τιθωνοῦ τοῦ πεπέλου, καὶ πολυχρόνως διὰ τὰς πολλὰς λιτάς τοῦ Τιθωνοῦ, περί οὐ, ὥσπερ δὴ καὶ τοῦ κατ’ αὐτὸν ἐρωτὸς, εἰρηνηθαὶ καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ (Eustathius ad 11.1, electronic text of TLG).

158 An interpretation of Tithonous current in late antiquity: cf. Scholia ad 5.1: ἔννοιμοι εἰς ἄνδρα κυνηγήτην, καὶ τῇ μὲν νυκτὶ κοιμώμενον, τῇ δὲ ἡμέρα οὔδε ποσῶς, διά τὸ ἡσυχλῆσθαι περὶ τὰ κυνηγεῖσα· ὃ δὲ Τιθωνὸς εἰς ἀστρονόμοι καὶ τῇ μὲν ἡμέρα κοιμώμενον, τῇ δὲ νυκτί ἑπαγρυπνοῦντα, διά τὸ ἡσυχλῆσθαι περὶ τὰ ἀστρα. V. (W. Dindorf 1885, electronic text of TLG).
competition and points to the paradoxical nature of Odysseus’ rejection of the latter by employing patently parallel messenger scenes:

1. Donning footwear

1.96-98 ὡς εἰ ποοῦσ’ ὑπὸ ποσσίν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα, ἀμβρόσια χρύσεια, τά μιν φέρον ἡμὲν ἐφ’ ὑγρήν ἡδ’ ἐπ’ ἀπείρονα γαίαν ἁμα πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο.

~ 5.44-46 αὔτικ’ ἐπειθ’ ὑπὸ ποσσίν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα, ἀμβρόσια χρύσεια, τά μιν φέρον ἡμὲν ἐφ’ ὑγρήν ἡδ’ ἐπ’ ἀπείρονα γαίαν ἁμα πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο.

2. Assumption of Attribute

1.99-101 εἵλετο δ’ ἀλκίμοιν ἐγχος, ἀκαχμένοι πεντάχω, βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν, τῷ δάμνησι στίχας ἄνδρῶν, ἡρώων, τοῖσίν τε κοτέσσεται ὀβριμόπατρη.

~ 5.47-49 εἵλετο δὲ ῥάβδον, τῇ ἀνδρῶν ὀμματα θέλγει ὅν ἐθέλει, τοὺς δ’ αὐτὰ καὶ ὑπνώοντας ἐγείρει, τὴν μετὰ χερσὺ ἐξων πέτετο κρατὺς ἀργειφόντης.

3. Departure to land via mountaintop; disguise; the state of the inhabitants

1.102-106 βῆ δὲ κατ’ Ὀὐλύμποιο καρήνων ἁίξασα, στῇ δ’ Ἰθάκης ἐνὶ δήμῳ ὑπὸ ἀυλείου, παλάμῃ δ’ ἐχε χάλκεον ἐγχος, εἰδομένη ἤγητορι, Μέντη, εὗρε δ’ ἀρα μηστήρας ἄγινορας.

~ 5.50-58 Πιερίην δ’ ἐπιβας ἐξ αἰθέρου ἐμπέσε πόντω· σειν’ ἐπειτ’ ἐπὶ κῦμα λάρῳ ὁρνιθί ἐοικώς, οὐσ’ τε κατὰ δεινοὺς κόλπους ἀλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο ἱκῆς ἄγρώσσων πυκνα πτερα δεύεται ἀλμη· τῷ ἱκελὸς πολέεσσιν ὁχήσατο κύμασιν ἔρμης, ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ τὴν νῆσον ἀφίκετο τηλόθ’ εὗοσαν, ἔνθ’ ἐκ πόντου βας ἵσειδός ἢπειρόνδε ἤιεν, ὄφρα μέγα στείχος ἐοκε, τῷ ἐν νύμφῃ ναϊεν εὐπλόκαμος· τὴν δ’ ἐνδοθί τέτμεν εὗοσαν.

159 Notice that in both cases, the attribute is portrayed as an instrument through which the god executes his or her will relating to his or her established τιμαί: for Athena, the spear is an instrument of her divine wrath qua war goddess, and for Hermes the staff is an instrument held for the free exercise of his prerogative to put men to sleep and wake them up. The latter usage should stand out, since in the proem Eos has left Tithonus asleep in bed – a state indicative of his passive subordination. Hermes is going to awaken Odysseus from the sleep-like state of his enthrallment to Calypso: Odysseus is about to escape from the thralldom to a goddess which Tithonus will endure forever.

160 1.96-98: Speaking so she bound upon her fair feet the fair sandals, / golden and immortal, that carried her over the water / as over the dry boundless earth abreast of the wind’s blast.
Hermes’ embarkation follows the normal outlines of a divine scene of dressing, departure, and arrival\textsuperscript{161} established by Athena in the parallel council of Book 1, but his departure is more elaborate. Athena put on her sandals (1.96-98) and took her spear (1.99-101); her trip from Olympus to Ithaca consumed all of two lines (βῆ... στῆ, 1.102-103). Contrast Hermes, who binds on his sandals (5.44-46), takes his staff (5.47-49), darts from Pieria to the sea in the form of a sea bird (5.50-54), and finally arrives at the island in line 5.55. The addition of a stopover on Pieria and what might be read as either a literal physical transformation or a figurative bird-like flight prolongs his trip. Vocabulary of distance (ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ τὴν νῆσον ἀφίκετο τηλόθ’ ἐοῦσαν, “but after he had made his way to the far-lying island”, 5.55) calls extra attention to the vast expanse of sea which divides Calypso from the rest of the cosmos. Unlike the homely Ithaca, on which the poet will waste no words in landscape description in Book 1, Ogygia is worth seeing.

It is in the destination of the two gods’ journeys that the different character of their errands becomes apparent. Upon Hermes’ arrival at Ogygia, the verbal parallels with Athena’s errand on Ithaca diverge, a development in keeping with the very different character of their respective tasks. One of the most noteworthy points of contrast is that almost from the moment

\textsuperscript{161} See Arend 1933, 40-41.
of Athena’s arrival on Ithaca the reader is encouraged to place him or herself in the place of the locale’s primary inhabitant (in this case, Telemachus). I cite the complete text of Telemachus’ reception of Athena to illustrate this point:

Now far the first to see Athena was godlike Telemachus, as he sat among the suitors, his heart deep grieving within him, imagining in his mind his great father, how he might come back and all throughout the house might cause the suitors to scatter, and hold his rightful place and be lord of his own possessions. With such thoughts, sitting among the suitors, he saw Athena and went straight to the forecourt, the heart within him scandalized that a guest should still be standing at the doors. He stood beside her and took her by the right hand, and relieved her of the bronze spear, and spoke to her and addressed her in winged words: “Welcome, stranger. You shall be entertained as a guest among us. Afterward, when you have tasted dinner, you shall tell us what your need is.” So speaking he led the way, and Pallas Athena followed him. Now, when the two of them were inside the lofty dwelling, he took the spear he carried and set it against a tall column in a rack for spears, of polished wood, where indeed there were other spears of patient-hearted Odysseus standing in numbers,
and he led her and seated her in a chair, with a cloth to sit on,
the chair splendid and elaborate. For her feet there was a footstool.
For himself, he drew a painted bench next her, apart from the others,
the suitors, for fear the guest, made uneasy by the uproar,
might lose his appetite there among overbearing people
and so he might also ask him about his absent father.

The underlined phrases all explicitly specify Telemachus’ mental state (e.g., νεμεσσήθη δ’ ἐνὶ θυμῷ, “the heart within him was scandalized”) or represent indirectly his purposes or thoughts (e.g., the purpose clauses with which the passage ends). Even the long middle stretch of the selection above seems to convey Telemachus’ mental activity in the form of personal memories of Odysseus (e.g., ἕνθα περ ἄλλα / ἕγχε Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος ἱστατο πολλά, “where indeed there were other spears of patient-hearted Odysseus standing in number”). Given Athena’s tendency to be represented as an embodiment of prudent and providential thought (e.g., Iliad 1.188-205), it would be futile to attempt to sort out precisely from whose point of view this passage is told.

5.1.2 Focalization in the description of Hermes to Ogygia

Hermes’ arrival on Ogygia in Book 5 emphasizes the point of view of the god and of the third-person narrator. Calypso is only glimpsed going back and forth before her loom at 5.61-2, but she shows no awareness that she is being watched by Hermes (or by us!). The focalization is entirely that of an outsider.

The reasons for this lie in the differing purposes of the two passages. Ithaca is not especially problematic for the poet at this phase of the narrative, but describing the island of Calypso presents Homer with a narratological dilemma: he wishes to portray the island as an earthly paradise, as the description of 5.59-77 makes clear. He must also, however, represent Odysseus as miserable and homesick, despite the enticements offered by Ogygia. To accomplish this he employs Hermes and Odysseus as two distinct focalizers within his narrative, implicitly

162 Cf. Irene J.F. de Jong 2004, Glossary: “function consisting of the perceptual, intellectual and emotional presentation of the fabula.”
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enrolling himself and his audience in Hermes’ camp of those who are sensitive to Ogygia’s blandishments.

Hermes’ status as outsider is already established in the Council of the Gods: Hermes’ donning of his herald’s garb functions as a device which invites the audience to experience Ogygia from Hermes’ fresh, new-comer’s perspective. The insistence on Hermes’ grudging admiration for the landscape will be a form of auxesis: if Hermes, accustomed to the blandishments of Olympus, is amazed, it must be a truly spectacular place.

The mitigating of the supernatural element of disguise through the ambiguous use of ἐοικῶς (“resembling” or “[literally] likening himself to a shearwater [with a change in his physical form]”?) and the drawing out of the account of Hermes’ discovery of his objective – a mere one line (ἐὑρε δ’ ἄρα μνηστήρας ἀγήνορας, “and lo! she found the haughty suitors…”) for Athena – into a description of his physical passage from the sea to the cave both bring landscape to the fore as Ogygia’s most striking characteristic, just as social discord is Ithaca’s. The audience has a clear sense of the passage of sea, shore, then cave beneath the fluttering god, whereas Athena passes from βῆ (“went down”) to στῆ (“lighted”) in one line. Though Crane notes that Hermes here carries many of the trappings of psychopomp,¹⁶³ Calypso’s home is not the underworld but an island cave with discrete boundaries: Hermes shows us the way to the door on his way in, and there is no Charon or Cerberus to bar the path. The extended linguistic and typological parallels between Athena’s arrival on Ithaca and Hermes’ on Ogygia (as well as the parallels between the preceding councils of the gods) thus foregrounds Ogygia’s landscape as an object of special interest, calling attention to its status as a locus amoenus viewed through eyes not easily impressed, and setting it in stark contrast to the unpleasantness which greets Athena on Ithaca.

The grotto itself is described as follows:

ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ τὴν νῆσον ἀφίκετο τηλὸθ’ ἑοῦσαν,
ἐνθ’ ἐκ πότου βάς ιοειδέος ἑπειρόνδε
ἡεῖν, ὁφρα μέγα σπέος ἱκετο, τῷ ἔνι νύμφῃ
ναϊεν ὑπάλλακμος· τὴν δ’ ἐνδοθι τέτμεν ἑοῦσαν.
πῦρ μὲν ἐπ’ ἐσχαρόφιν μέγα καίετο, τηλὸθι δ’ ὀδη
κέδρου τ’ ἐυκεάτοιο δύου τ’ ἀνὰ νῆσον ὀδώδει

¹⁶³ 1988, 16.
δαιομένων· ἡ δ’ ἐνδοθεὶσα ἀοιδιάουσ’ ὀπί καλῆ
ἰστόν ἐποιήμενη χρυσεῖθε κερκίδ’ ὑφαίνειν.
ὑλὴ δ’ σπέος ἀμφὶ περφύκει τηλεθῶσα,
κλήρης τῷ αἴγειρὸς τε καὶ εὐώδης κυπάρισσος.
ἔνθα τ’ ὅρνιθες ταυτοπέτεροι εὐνάζουσι,
οκώπος τ’ ἵππης τε ταυτύγλωσσοι τε κορώναι
eἰνάλαι, τῆς τε θαλάσσα έργα μέμηλεν.
ἡ δ’ αὐτοῦ τετάνυστο περὶ σπείους γλαφυροῖο
ἡμερὶς ἡβωῶσα, τεθήλει δε σταφυλῆοι·
κρῆναι δ’ ἑξέιης πίσυρες ἑς ὁδι Τευκρ.,
πλησιαί ἀλλήλων πετραμμέναι ἀλλυδις ἀλλη.
ἀμφὶ δ’ λειμῶνες μαλακοὶ Ἰου ἡδὲ σελίνου
θῆλεον. ἔνθα κ’ ἐπείτα καὶ ἀθάνατός περ ἐπελθὼν
θηήσαιτο ἢδων καὶ τερφθεὶς φρεσίν ἰχνὶ.
ἔνθα στὰς θηήσαι διάκτορος ἀργεῖφόντης.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα ἕωθησατο δυμῶθ’,
αὐτίκ’ ἂρ’ εἰς εὔρυ σπέος ἡμεθεν.

5.55-77

But after he had made his way to the far-lying island,
he stepped then out of the dark blue sea, and walked on over
the dry land, till he came to the great cave, where the lovely-haired
nymph was at home, and he found that she was inside. There was
a great fire blazing on the hearth, and the smell of cedar
split in billets, and sweetwood burning, spread all over
the island. She was singing inside the cave with a sweet voice
as she went up and down the loom and wove with a golden shuttle.
There was a growth of grove around the cavern, flourishing,
alders there was, and the black poplar, and fragrant cypress,
and there were birds with spreading wings who made their nests in it,
little owls, and hawks, and birds of the sea with long beaks
who are like ravens, but all their work is on the sea water;
and right about the hollow cavern extended a flourishing
growth of vine that ripened with grape clusters. Next to it
there were four fountains, and each of them ran shining water,
each next to each, but turned to run in sundry directions;
and round about there were meadows growing soft with parsley
and violets, and even a god who came into that place
would have admired what he saw, the heart delighted within him.
There the courier Argeiphontes stood and admired it.
But after he had admired all in his heart, he went in
to the wide cave.

The poet ends a lengthy description of the god’s descent from the council on Olympus at the
penthememeral caesura with a summative phrase which brings Hermes face to face with Calypso:
τὴν δ’ ἐνδοθεὶ τέτμεν ἐοῦσαν (“and he found that she was inside”, 5.58). Hermes’ discovery of
Calypso within the cave, in a passage in which she has just been explicitly described as a nymph, is a minor wonder in itself, if Odysseus’ more mundane interactions with the nymphs of Phaeacia and on Ithaca are any indication of what a mortal can expect to witness at such a shrine. In this later instance, Odysseus fails to see the nymphs of the shrine, but receives the even greater privilege of seeing Athena herself in her undisguised form.\textsuperscript{164}

A μέν followed by a series of δέ permits the reader to experience Hermes taking in the sights and smells of Calypso’s island. The poet allows us to see the palace of Calypso as Hermes does: the first thing his eyes light upon is the fire in the hearth (πῦρ μὲν ἐπ’ ἔσχαρόφιν μέγα καίετο, “there was a great fire blazing on the hearth”, 5.59).\textsuperscript{165} Homer then effects a transition from the visual characteristics of the grotto to the olfactory: τηλόθι δ᾿ ὀδύμῃ / κέδροι τ᾿ εὐκεάτοι θύου τ᾿ ἀνὰ νῆσον ὀδώδει / δαιομένων, “and the smell of well-cut cedar, and of sweetwood burning, spread all over the island”, 5.59-61. While it may be going too far to suggest that the sight of the fire causes the god to reflect that the smell of burning cedar and incense were the first thing to meet the sense of one approaching, the ordering of sensory impressions represented in this scene reflects a common experience involving the collaboration of sight and smell when one is entering new territory. Often it is possible to detect an unexpected or familiar odor (incense would be both on a desert island), but only to process the odor cognitively after visual inspection of the environs has given the smell a context.

Forster differentiates this cedar from the cedar of Lebanon, but the only other instance which he cites of its appearance in Homer (\textit{Iliad} 24.192) is part of the description of Priam’s palace.\textsuperscript{166} The relative scarcity and value of this wood in Homer suggests that its use for burning

\textsuperscript{164} So Wilamowitz 1927.

\textsuperscript{165} Though Denniston does not class this passage in his list of inceptive uses of μέν, and though there is an answering δέ, it is nonetheless tempting to view this particular instance as at least in part inceptive, beginning a digression which runs from lines 59 to 75, after which we return to the immediate task of Hermes’ interrogation of Calypso.

\textsuperscript{166} Forster 1936, 99. See also passages cited by Forster 1952: Tro. 1141, Alc. 158, Or. 1371, Alc. 365, Phoen. 100. Certainly for Theophrastus (\textit{Historia Plantarum}, 5.8.1) the cedar was the product par-excellence of the Lebanon-Syria region, and of eastern \textit{paradeisoi}: ἕκαστη δὲ τῆς ὑλῆς, ὡσπερ καὶ πρῶτην ἐλέξθη, διαφέρει κατὰ τούς τόπους· ἐνθα δὲ κέδρος γίνεται ὑθμαστή, καθάπερ καὶ περὶ Συρίαν ἐν Συρία γάρ ἐν τοῖς ὀρεσί διαφέροντα γίνεται τὰ δένδρα τῆς κέδρου καὶ τῷ ὑψεί καὶ τῷ πάχει· τηλικαύτα γάρ ἐστιν ὡστέ ἐνα μὲν µὴ δύνασθαι τρεῖς ἄνδρας περιλαμβάνειν· ἐν τοῖς παραδείσοις ἐτὶ μείζω καὶ καλλίω. Nevertheless, the cedar clearly occurs in Greece (e.g.,
is an act of conspicuous consumption and/or possesses religious significance. The coupling of cedar with incense (θύου) makes it yet more likely that the poet wishes to summon up an Eastern connection, possibly sepia-toned with vague recollections of times when trade routes flowed more readily with luxury items from East to West: analysis of charcoal from Santorini has found the Lebanese cedar among the woods in use, and finds of pistacia resin (i.e., incense) in containers from the Ulu Burun shipwreck raise the possibility that the ship was making a counter-clockwise circuit of the Mediterranean, “from Syria/Palestine to the Aegean and then south to Egypt.” According to Burkert the importation of incense may well have been a recent development in Greece, and we may well imagine that the deliberateness with which Homer evokes the fragrance of cedar would give Ogygia connotations of an Eastern paradise.

It is only then that we first hear, then see, the goddess singing and working at her loom (61-2). Hermes’ arrival and the description of the hearth and of the goddess busily at work establish the psychological center of the scene, permitting the poet’s description to spiral back outward to describe the periphery out upon which Odysseus and Calypso have (we infer) gazed during their amours. There follows a panoramic description of the island as visible from within the cave, as Hermes’ eyes drift from Calypso to the surrounding woods (63-4), the birds (65-7), the grapevine (68-9), the four springs (70-1), and finally the meadows which they water (72-3).

In describing the woods of 63-4, the poet lapses back into the unusually pronounced olfactory emphasis: not only is the hearth, the visual and symbolic center of the interior space of Theocritus 7.80-81), where its funereal connotations are well known. The question is complicated by the tendency of Greeks to conflate the juniper and the true cedar under the aegis of kedros. See R. Meiggs 1982 and G.E. Rickman’s review (CR 1984, 120-22).

See citations in previous note.

For Lebanese cedar on Thera/Santorini during the early second millennium BCE, see Asouti 2003, Table 1 (note also the more common occurrence of juniper). For the use of pistacia resin for incense and the significance of its presence on the Ulu Burun shipwreck, Serpico and White 2000, 894-96. LSJ, presumably on the evidence of Theophrastus’ Historia Plantarum 5.3.7, defines thyon as, “thyine-wood, citron-wood, Callitris quadricalvis.”

See Burkert 1985, 62. West 1997, 411 offers “Siduri’s jewelled glades,” or possibly Humbaba’s forest in the Gilgamesh epic, as the possible ultimate source for the locus amoenus of Calypso’s island in general. Humbaba’s forest is, of course, a cedar wood.

See A. Edwards 1993, 33-4 for Hermes’ reasons for ultimately disdaining Calypso’s home island.
Calypso’s home, fair-scented from cedar and incense, but even the woods themselves are redolent (εὐώδης). Comparison of this passage with Homer’s later revisitation of the theme of the island’s thick woods indicates that the “fair-scented cypress” is a deliberate component in his characterization of Ogygia as a locus amoenus at the time of Hermes’ first arrival. Line 64 is echoed again at line 239 when Calypso decks herself out in her finest and leads Odysseus to a copse of trees suitable for the construction of his raft. In this latter passage, it is not fair-smelling cypress but a sky-high, buoyant pine which ends the same formulaic line:

…ἀρχὲ δ᾿ ὁδοῖο
νήσου ἐπ᾿ ἐσχατίης, ὃθι δένδρα μακρὰ πεφύκει,
κλάθρη τ᾿ ἀγειρός τ᾿, ἔλατη τ᾿ ἦν οὐρανομήκης,
αῦτα πάλαι, περίκηλα, τά οἱ πλώοιεν ἐλαφρῶς,
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ δείξ᾿ ὃθι δένδρα μακρὰ πεφύκει,
ἡ μὲν ἔβη πρὸς δῶμα Καλυψώ, δία θεάων,
αὐτὰρ ὁ τάμυντο δόωρα· θῶς δὲ οἱ ἠνυτὸ ἔργον.
εἰκοσὶ δ᾿ ἔκβαλε πάντα, πελέκκησεν δ᾿ ἀρὰ χαλκῷ,
ξέσσε δ᾿ ἐπισταμένως καὶ ἐπι στάθμην ἱθυνεν.
5.237-245

…and led the way onward
to the far end of the island where there were trees, tall grown,
alter and black poplar and fir that towered to the heaven,
but all gone dry long ago and dead, so they would float lightly.
But when she had shown him where the tall trees grew, Calypso,
shining among divinities, went back to her own house
while he turned to cutting his timbers and quickly had his work finished.
He threw down twenty in all, and trimmed them well with his bronze ax,
And planed them expertly, and trued them straight to a chalkline.

Homer explicitly mentions the dryness of the pines in this passage as their most practical attribute, since he believes it to be conducive to buoyancy. In this later instance, these qualities are immediately relevant to Odysseus’ immediate need of raft-building, just as the fragrant cypress with its divine and funereal connotations was apposite to Hermes’ visit.

---

171 Hainsworth 1988 ad 240 observes that dryness is often mentioned as an undesirable quality for wood to be used by shipwrights; his comments imply that he takes this as evidence that Odysseus is building a raft rather than a ship or boat.
Homer’s insistence on the *fragrance* of Ogygia contributes to his auxesis\(^{172}\) of the island in at least two respects. First, Menelaus’ Elysium promised a certain refreshing quality of atmosphere which, though appealing, was vaguely defined:

\[\text{ἀλλ’ αἰεὶ Ζευρόιο λιγὺ πνείοντος ἁήτας} \\
\text{Ὠκεανὸς ἀνίησιν ἀναψύειν ἀνθρώπους.}\]

But always the stream of the Ocean sends up breezes of the West Wind blowing briskly for the refreshment of mortals.

The peculiar insistence that Calypso’s island is *really* fair-scented places Ogygia a step ahead of Elysium. Second, when Calypso at last accosts the wonderstruck messenger, his reaction to Ogygia is strikingly hostile, and the source of his hostility seems to be the *absence* of a particular smell:

\[\text{Ζεὺς ἐμὲ γ’ ἤνωγει δεῦρ’ ἐλθέμεν ὁυκ ἐθέλοντα·} \\
\text{ὁ θαυμάσας ἀλλὰ καὶ τερφθείς.} \\
\text{ὁ δὴ οὐχ’ οἰον ἀλήθως ἔστι τὸ τῆς Καλυψοῦ σπήλαιον,} \\
\text{ἱστορεῖ ὁ ποιητὴς ἀλλ’ οἰον ἀν ὡς εἰκὸς εἶθ τὸ καλῶς ἔχον εἰς ἐνδιαίτημα ἐνδόξου προσώπου.}\]

---

\(^{172}\) For Homer’s use of Hermes’ wonder as a form of auxesis, see Eustathius *ad* 5.73: Τούτοις δὲ ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπάγων ἐπιφωνηματικὴν αὔξησιν, φησίν. ἔνθα καὶ ἀθάνατος περ ἐπελθὼν θηήσατο ιδὼν καὶ τελεφθεὶς φρεσίν. ὂπερ ἔπαθε καὶ ὁ Ἑρμῆς, οὐ μόνον θαυμάσας ἄλλα καὶ τερφθείς. ὁ δὴ οὐκ αἰεὶ συμβαίνει, ἔστι γὰρ θηήσασθαί, καὶ οὐ πρὸς τέρψιν ἄλλα πρὸς μόνον θάμβος. Καὶ δὲ ἐνταῦθα ἐπιμονήν ῥήματος διὰ τὸ καίριον. θηήσατο γὰρ εἰπών, ἐπιφέρει. ἔνθα στὰς, θηήτο. καὶ, πάντα θηήσατο θυμῷ. ἴστεόν δὲ ὀτι οὐχ’ οἰον ἀλήθως ἔστι τὸ τῆς Καλυψοῦ σπήλαιον, ἱστορεῖ ὁ ποιητὴς. ἀλλ’ οἰον ἀν ὡς εἰκὸς εἰθ τὸ καλῶς ἔχον εἰς ἐνδιαίτημα ἐνδόξου προσώπου.
Prometheus’ feast at Mecone. In delivering Odysseus from Calypso, Hermes does in fact fulfil his duty as psychopomp by ultimately conducting the hero back to a space where these relations pertain, and hence to the prospect of eventual death – a prospect which he would have averted had he remained with Calypso in her fabulous home (cf. 5.208-10). These considerations, too, make Ogygia a viable alternative to Elysium, which likewise offers eternal life and freedom from care.

The cypresses, we are told, provide sleeping places for birds (owls, long-tongued hawks, sea-dwelling shearwaters 65-8). Their description deserves attention:

\[
\text{ἔνθα δὲ τ' ὄρνιθες ταυυσίπτεροι εὐνάξουντο,}
\text{σκῶπτες τ' ἵρηκες τε ταυύγλωσσοι τε κορώναι}
\text{εἰνάλιαι, τησίν τε βαλάσσια ἑργα μέμηλεν.}
\]

5.65-67

And there were birds with spreading wings who made their nests in it, little owls, and hawks, and birds of the sea with long beaks who are like ravens, but all their work is on the sea water.

The repetition of \textit{ταυυ}- roots occur in contexts which stress the freedoms enjoyed by the birds: the freedom of movement (\textit{ταυυσίπτεροι})\textsuperscript{173} which Odysseus currently lacks and which the birds lack because of their sedentary posture, and the freedom of speech (\textit{ταυύγλωσσοι}) appropriate to a shrieking hawk and denied (at least, \textit{qua} intercourse with fellow humans) to Odysseus in his present habitation. Odysseus has, in fact, been almost completely deprived of the ability to communicate on Ogygia, reduced as he is to the inarticulate sounds of lamentation and wailing on its shoreline:\textsuperscript{174}

\[
\text{oὐδ’ ἂρ’ Ὀδυσσῆα μεγαλήτορα ἐνδοῦν ἑτεμεν,}
\text{αλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἔπ’ ἀκτῆς κλαῖε καθήμενος, ἕνθα πάρος περ,}
\]

\textsuperscript{173} Eustathius, ad 5.65, rightly notes: \textit{Τὸ δὲ ταυυσίπτεροι κοινὸν ἐπίθετον πτηνῶν ἀ πτετόμενα, ταυύσουσι τά πτερά.} The epithet is also used by Alcaeus (fr. 345, 2) and Ibycus (fr. 36a, 4).

\textsuperscript{174} This observation is due, in part to Hans-Peter Stahl’s discussion of this passage in a paper entitled “The Sadness of Silence,” delivered at the University of Pittsburgh. It is, of course, possible that Odysseus has been speaking to Calypso all this time.
δάκρυσι καὶ στοναχήσι καὶ ἄλγεσι θυμὸν ἐρέχθων. πόντον ἐπ’ ἀτρύγετον δερκέσκετο δάκρυα λείβων.

5.81-4

But Hermes did not find great-hearted Odysseus indoors, but he was sitting out on the beach, crying, as before now he had done, breaking his heart in tears, lamentation, and sorrow, as weeping tears he looked out over the barren water.

The rolling interchange of ictus and arsis and the foamy, washing aspirants and liquids which end the last two lines (ἐρέχθων, δερκέσκετο δάκρυα λείβων), with their alliteration of sibilants and dentals, raise the volume of the background noise to emphasize the human communication which Odysseus lacks on his island paradise. The case of the sea-dwelling shearwater is even more apposite to Odysseus' dilemma: for Odysseus, too, the works of the sea are of concern, and Hermes is about to impart tidings which will offer Odysseus the opportunity to put this long-latent skill to practice once again in building his raft.

The contrast between freedom and submission is continued and given a note of whimsical irony in the description of the vine and springs:

ἡ δ’ αὐτοῦ τετάνυστο περὶ σπείους γλαφυροῖο ἡμερὶς ἡβώωσα, τεθῆλε δὲ σταφυλῆσι· κρῆναι δ’ ἐξείης πίσυρες ἰδίων ὕδατι λευκῷ, πλησίαι ἀλλήλων τετραμμέναι ἀλλυδὶς ἀλλη.

5.68-71

And right about the hollow cavern extended a flourishing growth of vine that ripened with grape clusters. Next to it there were four fountains, and each of them ran shining water, each next to each, but turned to run in sundry directions.

Its name is derived from the word meaning, “tame” (as LSJ s.v. dutifully notes, it is the cultivated vine), but, like its subdued avian companions, it strains (τετάνυστο, the same root τανῦ- seen above) for freedom just outside the natural confines of the cave. This seems to be all the sustenance required for the tame vine, for it merrily burgeons with bunches of grapes. The four springs, too, are a glorious grab-bag of intermingling order and willful self-determination: they are positioned one after another, in order, in a row (LSJ, s.v., ἔξεινς), there
are precisely four, and they have the presence of mind to flow nearby one another (πλησίαι ἀλλήλων). Nevertheless, their flood is vigorous enough to turn their water white (ὑδατὶ λευκῷ), and their streams willfully turn this way and that (τετραμμέναι ἀλλυδίς ἀλλη). At length, the poet’s description bursts out of the cave itself along with the streams from the springs, discovering a resting place at last in meadows soft (moistened, presumably, by the spring’s water) and thickly grown with yet another fragrant plant, parsley. It is at this point that the god stops to gaze in happy admiration.

The language of the passage displays an ordered energy on a par with the nature it describes. Lines 63-75 show a remarkable tendency to begin with a high front vowel (η/ει/ε) immediately preceded or followed by a liquid or nasal: ἐνθ’, ἦιεν, ναἰεν, ὑλη, κλήθρη, εἰνάλιαι, ἡ δ’, ἡμερίς, κρήναι, πλησίαι, θήλεου, θηήσατο. Line endings, on the other hand, manifest a tendency for back vowels (ω/ο/ου/υ/ευ) on the ictus of the final foot: ἐοῦσαν, ἠπειρόνδε, νύμφη, ἐοῦσαν, ὀδμή, ὀδώδει, τηλεθόωσα, εὐνάζοντο, κορῶναι, γλαφυροῖο, λευκῷ, θυμῷ. The last two lines both begin with αὐτ- roots, bringing the description to a close with finality as Hermes abruptly tears himself away from staring admiringly at the scene and proceeds into Calypso’s cave to get down to the errand on which he was dispatched.

Metrically as well, line beginnings manifest a remarkably ordered pattern, alternating spondaic (B) and dactylic (A) line openings from 63-77, picking up speed with three dactylic openings in 71-73 for the description of the vine and the springs, after which every two lines alternate dactylic and spondaic openings, closing on an appropriately heavy spondaic note as Calypso does not fail to recognize Hermes (and likely to divine that he is up to no good, as well):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Syllable Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

175 It is possible that λευκός connotes simply “clear” in this instance.
The entire passage has a catalogic tendency to anaphora and the use of an elided τε or δέ at the A diaeresis to continue the momentum of the list.

Summing up the description of the cave, the poet lapses back into his own point of view to draw a generalizing condition, and then collapses the third-person narratorial voice and the focalizing perspective of Hermes by concluding that they are in accord on this point:

...ἐνθα κ’ ἔπειτα καὶ ἀθάνατός περ ἔπελθὼν θηήσατο ἰδὼν καὶ τερφθείη φρεσὶν ἤσιν. ἐνθα στὰς θηεῖτο διάκτορος ἀργειφόντης.

5.73-75

and even a god who came into that place would have admired what he saw, the heart delighted within him. There the courier Argeiphontes stood and admired it.

This coincidence of the poet’s and Hermes’ assessment of the aesthetic impact of Calypso’s cave frees our attention so that we may interest ourselves in Odysseus’ sorrow when it is introduced a few lines later.

The choice to focalize the cave at least in part through Hermes’ eyes also permits the poet to leave us wanting more, snapping our attention away just as we are beginning to enjoy the description. Hermes is a god on a mission, and, though he is momentarily diverted by the wonders of Calypso’s dwelling, elaborated in a polysyndetic catalogue, we are reminded of why he came – and of what he did not see as his eyes took in his surroundings – in a phrase paralleling the introduction of Calypso: οὐδ᾿ ἄρ᾿ Ὄδυσσηα μεγαλήτορα ἐνδον ἐτετμεν (5.81). In the next line, the voice of the omniscient aoidos resurfaces, informing us that Odysseus was weeping, seated on a promontory.

Odysseus no longer shares Hermes’ sense of wonder at Calypso’s grotto. While Hermes admiringly examines every tree, bird, and vine surrounding the cave of Calypso, Odysseus’ gaze
is turned insouciantly outward toward the sea, immune to the natural beauty of the island: πόντον ἐπ’ ἀτρύγετον δερκέσκετο δάκρυα λείβων (“weeping tears he looked out over the barren water”, 5.84). The auditory implications of this passage have been adverted to above, but we would be remiss if we failed to note that the Odyssey’s first direct description of Odysseus operates on a visual level as well. Odysseus has made a conscious choice not to enjoy the sensory delectations of Calypso’s grotto, staring instead at a seascape which the poet intentionally characterizes as desolate (πόντον ἐπ’ ἀτρύγετον δερκέσκετο). Note the iterative aspect of δερκέσκετο – he kept looking again and again at a sea adorned with one of Homer’s less aesthetically pleasing aspects for the water.176 This obsessively repeated action must indicate that, like Hermes in his speech of 100-102,177 Odysseus is summoning up with his mind’s eye and wishing desperately to see with his physical eye the sight of those amenities which in the long run prove more important to his sense of identity and well-being: a real home with a real wife, who, like Calypso, also weaves, but in a fashion which almost preternaturally furthers her husband’s aims, though he is hundreds of miles away.

5.1.3 Ithaca’s Longing for Odysseus

Our discussion of Ogygia above has showed that the landscape of Ogygia suggested an Eastern retreat where normal relations between gods and men do not obtain. Its emphasis on the tension between freedom and constraint and its status as a locus unimpeachably amoenus play a large

176 Contrast, e.g., the simile of Iliad 5.770-772, describing Hera’s flight from Olympus to Troy, which demonstrates that Homer does have aesthetically pleasing ways to describe a man staring out over the sea:


As far as into the hazing distance a man can see with his eyes, who sits in his eyrie gazing on the wine-blue water, as far as this is the stride of the gods’ proud neighing horses.

177 The parallel is imperfect: in these lines Hermes notes the absence of people to sacrifice to him, rather than a mortal family.
part in constructing Calypso’s function of “concealer” within the narrative. The poet elsewhere hints that Odysseus stands in an analogously intimate relation to Ithaca:  

μή τις ἐτι πρόφρων ἄγανος καὶ ἡπίος ἔστω
σκηπτοῦχος βασιλέως, μηδὲ φρεσίν αἴσιμα εἰδὼς,
ἀλλ’ αἰεὶ χαλεπός τ’ εἶθαι καὶ αίσυλον ρέζοι·
ὡς οὐ τις μέμνηται Ὑδωσήος θείοι
λαών οἶσιν ἀνάσσε, πατήρ δ’ ὃς ἡπίος ἦν.
5.8-12

No longer now let one who is a sceptered king be eager
to be gentle and kind, be one whose thought is schooled in justice,
seeing the way no one of the people he was lord over
remembers godlike Odysseus, and he was kind, like a father.

This consideration is important as well for the development of landscape imagery throughout the epic. Odysseus himself will view just judgments uttered by a king as conducive to fecundity and prosperity in a landscape:

ἔς τέ τευ ἡ βασιλήος ἀμύμονος, ὃς τε βεοῦδης ἀνδράσιν ἐν πολλοῖς καὶ ἱφθίμοις ἀνάσσων εὐδικίας ἀνέχῃσι, φέρῃσι δὲ γαῖα μέλαινα πυροὺς καὶ κριθάς, βρίθῃσι δὲ δένδρεα καρπῷ,
tίκτῃ δ’ ἐμπεδα μήλα, θάλασσα δὲ παρέχῃ ἰχθὺς εὖ ἐχειγοσίης, ἀρετῶσι δὲ λαοὶ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ.
19.109-114

[…Your fame goes up into the wide heaven,]
as of some king who, as a blameless man and god-fearing,
and ruling as lord over many powerful people,
upholds the way of good government, and the black earth yields him barley and wheat, his trees are heavy with fruit, his sheepflocks continue to bear young, the sea gives him fish, because of his good leadership, and his people prosper under him.

The motif is common in Greek and Near Eastern literature. Richard Martin ties it to the Near Eastern theme of “Ruler’s Truth, a force brought into life by the king’s verbal behavior, which

178 For a slightly different approach to the “construction of [Odysseus’] absence” which focuses more on Penelope, see Katz 1991, 20-53.
ensures the prosperity and abundance of a society.”

By speaking in this manner in Book 19, Martin opines, Odysseus reveals his true identity as king to any capable of recognizing the “Instruction of Princes” genre. Whatever the degree to which we accept Martin’s argument that the genre stretches back to a Proto-Indo-European genre apparent in Old Irish literature, the connection in Archaic Greek literature between kings, just verdicts, and civic and agricultural prosperity is generally acknowledged.

The theme of a king’s speech in the assembly as a hallmark of his royalty figures prominently in the passages from the Odyssey (8.166-177) and the Theogony (79-93) with which Martin begins his discussion. In a passage which shares the emphasis on a king’s role in the land’s fertility seen in Odyssey 19, Hesiod’s Works and Days famously links a just king with peace and an absence of political discord, and this blessed state in turn with a harmonious and productive relationship between fecund fields and flocks and the humans who enjoy the fruits of their productivity:

οἱ δὲ δίκας ξείνοισι καὶ ἐνδήμοσι διδούσιν
ἰθεῖας καὶ μὴ τι παρεκβαίνουσι δικαίου,
τοῖσι τέθηλε πόλις, λαοὶ δ’ ἀνθέουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ.
Εἰρήνη δ’ ἀνά γῆν κουροτρόφος, οὐδὲ ποτ’ αὐτοῖς
ἀγραλέον πόλεμον τεκμαίρεται εὐρύποτα Ζεὺς·
οὐδέ ποτ’ ἰθυδίκῃσι μετ’ ἀνδράσι Λιμός ὀπηδεῖ
οὐδ’ Ἀτη, θαλίῃς δὲ μεμηλότα ἐργα νέμονται.
τοῖσι φέρει μὲν γαῖα πολὺ βίον, όυρεσι δὲ ἰρός
ἀκρη μὲν τε φέρει βαλάνους, μέσῃ δὲ μελίσσας·
εἰροτόκοι δ’ ὅ ὅες μαλλοῖς καταβεβριθαίνουν·
τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναίκες ἐοικότα τέκνα γονεύσιν·
θάλλουσιν δ’ ἀγαθοίς διαμπερές· οὐδ’ ἐπὶ νηῶν
νίσονται, καρπον δὲ φέρει ζείδωρος ἀρουρα.
WD 225-237

But they who give straight judgements to strangers and to the men of the land, and go not aside from what is just, their city flourishes, and the people prosper in it:

For discussion of the relation of the Book 19 passage with the diptych of the just and unjust cities from the Works and Days, see West’s commentary (1978) ad loc.

Martin 1984, 34.

Martin 1984, 46.

Cf. West 1978 (p. 213): “The idea that the justice of the ruler is rewarded by the fertility of the earth appears also in Od. 19.109ff….. The association is also reflected in the Myth of Ages (and not only in the Greek version)....”
Peace, the nurse of children, is abroad in their land, and all-seeing Zeus never decrees cruel war against them. Neither famine nor disaster ever haunts men who do true justice; but light-heartedly they tend the fields which are all their care. The earth bears them victual in plenty, and on the mountains the oak bears acorns upon the top and bees in the midst. Their wooly sheep are laden with fleeces; their women bear children like their parent. They flourish continually with good things, and do not travel on ships, for the grain-giving earth bears them fruit.\textsuperscript{183}

In Hesiod, as also in \textit{Odyssey} 19, the notion of a sympathetic and supernatural great chain of fecundity stretching from Zeus who supervises kings down to the mortals who enjoy the blessings of the correspondingly productive earth is undoubtedly operative,\textsuperscript{184} but it is possible to perceive a more pragmatic awareness of political stability as a necessary precondition of agricultural and pastoral prosperity as well: just government permits the nation at large to “blossom” (\textit{τοῖσι} τέθηλε πόλις, \textit{λαοὶ} δ’ ἀνθέουσιν ἐν σźni, 227); under such circumstances, children grow to adulthood and are not cut down in wars (228-9); with peace and a strong workforce, there is less chance of famine or blight (230-31); moreover, these two conditions permit the cultivation of staples (\textit{τοῖσι} φέρει μὲν γαῖα πολὺν βίον) while affording ample chance for simple luxuries and the conversion of raw materials to finished garments (μέσση δὲ μελίσσας· / εἰροπόκοι δ’ ὄιες μαλλοῖς καταβεβρίθασιν).

This is an aspect of Odysseus’ kingship which has been downplayed in Books 1-4, but which will resurface with new momentum during Odysseus’ homecoming. Initially, Telemachus’ floundering first Assembly in Book 2 reveals the extent to which the suitors’ depredations have not made themselves felt yet by the island as a whole. The fact that two of Aegyptius’ sons still work their ancestral fields with no apparent disturbance from the suitors, while another has joined the suitors’ ranks (2.21-22), makes clear that, at least if one is willing to cooperate with the suitors, the agricultural cycle on Ithaca continues undisturbed. Telemachus finds himself having to make a case for why a private, domestic affair should be deemed worthy of a public assembly normally reserved for business touching the welfare of the state as a whole.\textsuperscript{185} As evidenced by Laertes’ ability to farm unmolested on his country estate, the suitors

\textsuperscript{183} Translation is that of Evelyn-White 1936, with minor adjustments.
\textsuperscript{184} See citation from West above.
\textsuperscript{185} \textit{Odyssey} 2.28-32; cf. Raaflaub’s contribution in Robinson 2004, 30-31.
have corrupted some of the household of Odysseus, but they have not yet fully extended their poisonous tentacles into the countryside.

Only when we reach the Harbor of Phorcys in Book 13 do we find hints that the natural landscape of Ithaca has been or may stand to be adversely affected by Odysseus’ absence. We will defer discussion of Ithaca’s landscape until a later chapter; however, to cite one example, Eumaeus’ first speech to Odysseus restates the theme in very pragmatic terms:

...ἡ γὰρ διμώων δίκη ἐστὶν
αἰεὶ δειδιότων, ὃτ’ ἐπικρατέωσιν ἀνακτεῖ
οἱ νέοι. ἥ γὰρ τοῦ γε θεοὶ κατὰ νόστον ἔδησαν,
ός κεν ἐμ’ ἐνδικάς ἐφίλει καὶ κτήσιν ὅπασσεν,
οὐτ’ ἢ τοῦ ὦ ὀικῆι ἀναξ εὐθυμος ἔδωκεν,
οἷκον τε κληρον τε πολυμήστην τε γυναῖκα,
ός οἱ πολλὰ κάμησι, θεὸς δ’ ἐπὶ ἔργον ἄεξη,
ὦς καὶ ἐμοὶ τοῦ ἔργου ἄεξεται, ὃ ἐπιμίμησο.
τῶ κέ με πόλλ’ ὄσιεν ἀναξ, ἐ’y αὐτόθι γήρα:
ἄλλ’ ὀλεθ’. ὦς ὦφελλ’ Ἑλένης ἀπὸ φῦλον ὀλέσθαι
πρόχυν, ἐτεὶ πολλῶν ἀνδρῶν ὑπὸ γούνατ’ ἔλυσε.
καὶ γάρ κεῖνος ἐβη Ἀγαμέμνονος ἔνεκα τιμῆς
Ἤλιον εἰς εὔπωλον, ἱνα Τρώεσσι μάχοιτο.
14.59-71

...for that is the way of us who are servants
and forever are filled with fear when they come under power of masters
who are new. The gods have stopped the homeward voyage of that one
who cared greatly for me, and granted me such possessions
as a good-natured lord grants to the thrall of his house; a home
of his own, and a plot of land, and a wife much sought-after,
when the man accomplishes much work and god speeds the labor
as he has sped for me this labor to which I am given.
So my lord would have done much for me if he had grown old here,
but he perished, as I wish Helen’s seed could all have perished,
pitched away, for she has unstrung the knees of so many
men; for in Agamemnon’s cause my master went also
To Ilion, land of good horses, there to fight with the Trojans.

Young and uppity kings (Ἄνακτες) have produced a situation in which slaves must always be afraid. In contrast, Odysseus (τοῦ) would have heaped possessions on Eumaeus (κτήσιν ὅπασσεν) of the sort suitable to a slave who works hard and whose labor a god prospers (ὅς οἱ πολλὰ κάμησι, θεὸς δ’ ἐπὶ ἔργον ἄεξη). As in the Hesiod passage discussed a moment ago,
Eumaeus’ formulation of the linkage of agricultural prosperity and a just king is flatly practical. He has been a dutiful slave, has tended to his duties well, increasing Odysseus’ wealth (aided, of course, by the help of the gods), and he knows that Odysseus would have rewarded him with a house, a plot of land, and a wife (οἶκόν τε κληρόν τε πολυμνήστην τε γυναῖκα) – essentially a chance to set up his own dependent household and to enjoy the fruits of his labor for himself. 

*WD* 227 promises the same rosy holistic Bronze Age trickle-down economics: τοῖσι τέθηλε πόλις, λαοὶ δ’ ἀνθέουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ (“their city flourishes, and the people prosper in it”).

Instead of this deserved reward, Eumaeus finds his own provisions impinged upon by the gluttony of the suitors (14.80-82), for whose wasteful ways and the effects of whose prodigal feasting on the estate of Odysseus he feels only disgust (14.93-108). Eumaeus himself blames Helen (14.68-71), but when we first meet Odysseus in Book 5 it is clearly Calypso who is the most pressing immediate cause of Odysseus’ failure to materialize at home and restore prosperity. Every moment that Odysseus has wasted in dalliance on her luxuriating island represents one moment longer that Eumaeus and company must endure diminished standards of living.

Book 5 marks one step further in the evolving theme of the relationship between Odysseus’ kingship and the land. Athena’s invocation of the theme of the King’s Justice in the Assembly of Book 5 represents a change in emphasis from her mirror speech in Book 1. There, after a lengthy description of Ogygia, Athena had juxtaposed Odysseus’ heroically persistent desire to lay eyes on his home (note that he is able to retain his focus despite Calypso’s enchantments – she “charms” him – θέλγει, 1.57) with his good behavior *in relation to the gods and to Zeus specifically*:

\[
\text{...οὐ νῦ τ’ Ὅδυσσεὺς}
\]
\[
Αργείων παρὰ νησὶ χαρίζετο ιερὰ βέζων
Τροιῆ ἐν εὐρείῃ; τί νῦ σι ὦδύσσαο, Ζεῦ;  \\
1.60-63
\]

Did not Odysseus

---

186 Observe the near-repetition from *Odyssey* 19.114. Hesiod uses the verb ἀνθέουσιν with its floral connotations in place of the more sociologically-geared ἀρετῶσι. Odysseus will in Book 19 hold out to Penelope a vision which incorporates room for Eumaeus to realize his dream.
do you grace by the ships of the Argives, making sacrifice
in wide Troy? Why, Zeus, are you now so harsh with him?

Now, in Book 5, it is Odysseus’ behavior relative to his people as their king which occupies the forefront of Athena’s arguments. This argument in favor of Odysseus’ deliverance has been voiced once previously by a mortal possessing superhuman capacities. Mentor, as whom Athena disguises herself in Book 3, uses the same words in the mortal Assembly of Book 2 (2.230-234~5.8-12). By the time of the divine Assembly of Book 5 the opinion of just and dutiful humans seems to have filtered its way out of backwoods Ithacan assemblies and up to Olympus. In its contrast with Athena’s speech in Book 1, the opening of Book 5 points the audience forward to the second half of the Odyssey, where the connection between Odysseus and the prosperity of Ithaca will be hinted at through a balance between indications of societal decay and a new emphasis on the restorative properties of Odysseus’ relationship with Ithaca’s landscape.

5.2 THE CONTRAST WITH MENELAUS’ ELYSIUM

The resonance between the Book 1 and Book 5 embassies is evident in their close parallelism on the lexical level. The grounds for suspecting that the poet also had our next passage – Menelaus’ Elysium – in mind when describing Ogygia are thematic rather than verbal. There is, of course, one major difference: Menelaus, stranded in Egypt, hears about his future bliss as part of a prophecy, whereas Odysseus unexpectedly finds himself in the paradise of Ogygia. His present reality surpasses what for Menelaus remains a dream throughout the epic. There are nevertheless several reasons for believing that Menelaus’ Elysium is an important point of contrast here, beyond the mere happenstance of its being the only other earthly paradise thus far described in the epic.

Cf. Eumaeus’ speech above.
The situations in which Odysseus and Menelaus find themselves in Egypt and in Ogygia are very similar. Both Odysseus and Menelaus must be sent on their way from a seemingly inescapable shoreline through divine intervention. The message which Hermes bears in Book 5 reveals one respect in which the stories of Menelaus’ homecoming from Egypt and Odysseus’ homecoming from Ogygia differ: unlike Odysseus, who is chronically unable to obtain pompê, Menelaus was destined to reach his ultimate port of call expressly by the pompê of the gods. Zeus has told Hermes that Odysseus’ nostos will take place οὔτε θεῶν πομπῇ οὔτε θηντῶν ἀνθρώπων, (“neither through the escort of gods nor of mortal men”, 5.32; recall Proteus of Odysseus: οὐ γάρ οἱ πάρα νῆες ἐπηρετμοὶ καὶ ἑταῖροι, / οἱ κέν μιν πέμποιεν ἐπ’ εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης, “for he has not any ships by him, nor any companions who can convey him back across the sea’s wide ridges”). Proteus promises Menelaus, ever the privileged son, an immortal escort to his posthumous pleasure garden: ἀλλὰ σ’ ἐς Ἑλύσιον πεδίον καὶ πείρατα γαίης / ἀθάνατοι πέμψουσιν, ὅθι ξανθὸς Ῥαδάμανθυς (“but the immortals will convoy you to the Elysian Field, where fair-haired Rhadamanthys is…”). Odysseus is entitled only to the right to build a raft – no help beyond that.

Beyond the similarities and contrasts in the methods employed by Menelaus and Odysseus to escape lands from which it proves difficult to extricate themselves, W.S. Anderson notes the following commonalities between the future Elysium and the present Ogygia:

(1) both Elysium and Ogygia are imaginary places; (2) both are islands; (3) both are located far to the west, presumably in the Atlantic; (4) both enjoy similar climate and ease of life; (5) both possess important associations with death.189

Equally importantly, Menelaus’ and Odysseus’ entrées to these blessed locales share a number of typological features: e.g., divine bride, locus amoenus, hope of immortality through marital alliance (note 5.208-209).

Anderson views Menelaus as a foil to Odysseus as well, but on different grounds than I. For Anderson, Menelaus’ promise of future bliss is tainted by his inability to escape the past, as is dramatically illustrated by his present misery in the midst of the greatest opulence in all the

189 Anderson 1958, 6.
Aegean; Odysseus, on the other hand, surrounded by a present which approaches the promise of Menelaus’ marvelous afterlife, resists its temptations, and thereby reveals a superior outlook on life. Anderson’s argument assumes a fundamental parity between the landscape of Elysium and Ogygia which does not hold up under scrutiny. While true to the extent that it is relevant to his argument (both are pleasant enough places, and this is all that Anderson needs to prove), the topographical and climactic features of the two are completely different. I would argue that, rather than seeking to shadow Elysium here, the poet goes out of his way to create a polemical relationship between the locales in which Ogygia is seen to be superior in every respect. By rejecting a fate even better than the one Menelaus longs for but is not described as obtaining, Odysseus demonstrates a heroic determinism worthy of *kleos*.

The entire Proteus narrative is constructed in such a way as to culminate in a juxtaposition of Elysium and Ogygia. At 4.495-98, in a polar opposition made conspicuous by a pronounced homoeoteleuton at either end, Proteus observes:

> Πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ τῶν γε δάμεν, πολλοὶ δὲ λίπους-
> ἀρχοί δ’ αὖ δύο μοῦνοι Αχαιῶν χάλκοχιτῶν ἐν νόστῳ ἀπολοῦσι· μάχη δὲ τε καὶ σὺ παρήσθα.
> εἷς δ’ ἔτι που ζωὸς κατερύκειται εὐρέϊ πόντῳ.

4.495-98

There were many of these men who were lost, and many left over, but two alone who were leaders of the bronze-armored Achaeans died on the way home. You yourself were there at the fighting. And there is one who is being held alive on the wide seas somewhere.

The homoeoteleuton and preference for anonymous notations of rank (ἀρχοί δ’ αὖ δύο μοῦνοι Αχαιῶν χαλκοχιτῶν) rather than a proper name + epithet combination of the more customary sort lend Proteus’ a sonorous, lilting quality. Both its use of marked language and its suppression of the identity of the Achaeans give it the characteristic sound and form of a riddle.

As in any good riddle, the riddler gives away the more obvious details: two perished in homecoming and two remain en route. In both these subcategories, the second element (Agamemnon, Odysseus) represents more marked information. The god immediately goes on to relate the identity of the two who perished: first Ajax and then (placed second for dramatic effect) Agamemnon. These two make striking moral contrasts: Ajax goes out of his way to call
destruction down on his own head by taunting the gods (4.502-511), whereas Agamemnon enjoys the favor of Hera while sailing, only to fall victim to deliberate and devious deceptions (note the language of duplicity and scheming throughout 4.524ff.: σκοπός, ἐκ σκοπίης, δολόμητις, δολίην... τέχην). Proteus has already noted that Menelaus is still on the road – so who is his counterpart, and what sort of contrast does he make to Menelaus?

The issue is deferred until Proteus finishes the sordid tale of Agamemnon’s death, at which point Menelaus has the presence of mind to interject:

\[ \text{τούτους μὲν δὴ οἶδα· σὺ δὲ τρίτον ἄνδρ’ ὀνόμαι·} \]
\[ \text{ὅς τις ἐτὶ ζῶος κατερύκεται εὐρέι πόντῳ} \]
\[ \text{ἡὲ θανών· ἐθέλω δὲ καὶ ἀχνύμενός περ ἀκοῦσαι.} \]

4.551-53

These then I know. But do you tell me the name of the third man, whoever it is who is being held alive on the wide sea, or else he has died, but for all my sorrow, I would hear this.

Odysseus can now be third because of the addition of the qualification “living or dead” (Menelaus has already heard of Ajax and Agamemnon, and does not need to hear of his own travels to date). Menelaus’ characterization of his doublet through the words κατερύκεται εὐρέι πόντῳ (“is being held on the wide sea”) echoes 1.14 and raises the expectations of the audience for the inevitable answer:

\[ \text{νίος Λαέρτεω Ἰθάκῃ ἐνι οἰκία ναϊών·} \]
\[ \text{τὸν ἰδοὺ ἐν νήσῳ βαλεῖν κατὰ δάκρυ χέωντα,} \]
\[ \text{νύμφης ἐν μεγάροις Καλυψοῦς, ὡς μὲν ἀνἀγκη} \]
\[ \text{ἰσχεῖ· ὁ δ` οὐ δυναται ἢν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἰκέομαι·} \]
\[ \text{οὐ γάρ οἱ πάρα νής ἐπὶ ἔρεα καὶ ἔταῖροι,} \]
\[ \text{oἲ κέν μιν πέμποιεν ἐπ` εὐρέα νώτα θαλάσσης.} \]

4.555-560

That was Odysseus son of Laertes, who makes his home in Ithaca, whom I saw on an island, weeping big tears in the palace of the nymph Calypso, and she detains him by constraint, and he cannot make his way to his country, for he has not any ships by him, nor any companions who can convey him back across the sea’s wide ridges.
Like Ajax’s implied characterization as an *hubristes*, Odysseus’ description reveals his character: though lacking any escort home, Odysseus resolutely persists in being miserable, whatever advantage his new station in life might bring. Note that even while in Calypso’s clutches, Odysseus still warrants the generalizing description Ἰθάκῃ ἐνι οἰκίᾳ ναίων (“inhabiting a home in Ithaca”). Even when not physically present in Ithaca, the fact that he makes his home there is still one of his defining characteristics.

Just as Ajax marks a point of contrast with another who shared the same fate (Agamemnon), so also Menelaus and Odysseus, lumped together at the outset as the two still detained on the road, contrast with one another in terms of their *ethos*. It is mention of Odysseus which leads organically into Proteus’ long-awaited answer to Menelaus’ question of how he is to make it home:

σοὶ δ᾿ οὐ θέσφατόν ἐστι, διοτρεφὲς ὃ Μενέλαε,
Ἀργεὶ ἐν ἱπποβότῳ θανέειν καὶ πότιμον ἐπισπεῖν,
ἀλλὰ σ᾿ ἐς Ἡλύσιον πεδίον καὶ πείρατα γαῖς
ἀθάνατοι πέμψουσι, ὦ Μενέλαε Ῥαδάμανθυς,
τῇ περ ῥήστη βιοτῇ πέλει ἀνθρώπωσιν:
οὐ νιφετός, οὔτ᾿ ἄρ χειμὼν πολὺς οὔτ᾿ ὀμβρὸς,
ἀλλ᾿ αἰεὶ Ζεφύροιο λιγὺ πνείοντος ἀήτας
Ὠκεανὸς ἀνίησιν ἀναψύειν ἀνθρώπους,
οὕνεκ᾿ ἔχεις Ἑλένην καί σφιν γαμβρὸς Διὸς ἔσσι.

4.561-69

But for you, Menelaus, O fostered of Zeus, it is not the gods’ will that you shall die and go to your end in horse-pasturing Argos, but the immortals will convey you to the Elysian field, and the limits of the earth, where fair-haired Rhadamanthys is, and where there is made the easiest life for mortals, for there is no snow, nor much winter there, nor is there ever rain, but always the stream of the Ocean sends up breezes of the West Wind blowing briskly for the refreshment of mortals. This because Helen in yours, and you are son-in-law therefore to Zeus.

The adversative δέ here implies that Menelaus’ and Odysseus’ fates are being contrasted: Odysseus is defined in terms of his home (Ithaca – Ἰθάκη ἐνι οἰκίᾳ ναίων, πατρίδα γαῖαν) and the obstacles which keep him from it (Calypso – νύμφης ἐν μεγάροις / Καλυψοῦς, ἦ μιν ἀνάγκη / ἱσχεῖ); Menelaus’ ultimate horizon lies outside home. The pair thus literally tend in
opposite directions relative to the points of reference of their homes and their deaths: Menelaus, despite all the opulence that Telemachus observes in his palace in Book 4, does not define himself by making his way back there, but rather by his destination after his homecoming. Odysseus’ lot is precisely the opposite: the manner of his death is left famously vague by Tiresias’ prophecy, whereas the very act of his homecoming occupies fully twelve of the twenty-four books of the Odyssey.¹⁹⁰

In the contrast between Odysseus’ present and Menelaus’ future, two women play a defining role. Throughout, Helen’s role is ambivalent. She is a true daughter of Zeus, a god who, in Helen’s words, apportions good and evil at different times to different men: ἀτὰρ θεὸς ἄλλοτε ἄλλῳ / Ζεὺς ἄγαθον τε κακόν τε διδοῖ· δύναται γὰρ ἀπαντα (“yet divine Zeus sometimes / gives out good, or sometimes evil; he can do anything”, 4.236-37). Menelaus makes amply clear that he remembers her role at Troy in a less than ideal light (4.332ff.). Helen herself is one such gift – sometimes good, sometimes a bane. The good which this particular gift of Zeus will bring, we might surmise, is the future happiness promised in the prophecy to which Menelaus somewhat desperately clings.¹⁹¹ Book 5 begins by raising the issue of the dangers involved in marrying goddesses and demigoddesses. The first line mentions Eos’ abduction of Tithonus, and, when Hermes breaks his bad news to Calypso, she brings up Orion and Iasion as other examples of mythic misfortunes in loves between goddesses and men. Calypso, however,

¹⁹⁰ See West 2005, 59-64. Beyond the obvious narratological utility to Homer of employing these shared narrative features to set up Menelaus as a foil who will make Odysseus shine all the brighter when he rejects Menelaus’ example of divinity by bride, the history of the narratives of Books 4 and 5 may impose an additional textual requirement that Homer establish clearly the points of contrast between Menelaus and Odysseus. M. L. West’s contention that the adventures attributed to Menelaus in Book 4 were actually the core of Odysseus’ own adventures before the addition of Western and Argonautic elements in later elaborations of the Ur-Odyssey, if correct, adds interesting nuance to the significance of Menelaus’ wanderings. Whenever this change took place, the poet was obliged to represent the “new” adventures which he had transferred to Odysseus as more worthy of extended narration than the adventures which had been transferred to Menelaus, at least if the Odyssey was to remain viable as the epic of Odysseus. Even if West’s hypothesis is not correct, it nevertheless remains true that Menelaus’ adventures with Eidothea (cf. Leucothea) and destination of Elysium must of necessity be made to appear less engaging than Odysseus’ if he is to be viable as the main subject of the epic as a whole.

¹⁹¹ At least, his conflicting story of Helen’s role in the sack of Troy indicates that his present existence has serious drawbacks.
takes pains to paint herself as belonging to the most benevolent variety of goddesses: were it not for her, Odysseus would have drowned at sea with the rest of his companions. By her account, she actually bent the rules by saving Odysseus when a god had it in for him, much as Poseidon with more explicit justification had it in for Ajax in Proteus’ narration:

τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν ἔσάωσα περὶ τρόπιος βεβαώτα
οἶον, ἐπεὶ οἱ νῆα θοὴν ἀργὴτι κεραυνῷ
 Zeus ἔλσας ἐκέασσε μέσῳ ἐπὶ οῖνοπὶ πόντῳ.
ἐνθ’ ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες ἀπέφθιθεν ἐσθλοὶ ἡμεῖς
τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ φίλεόν τε καὶ ἐτρεφον, Ἦδε ἐφασκον
θῇσεν ἄθανατον καὶ ἀγήρων ἡμᾶτα πάντα.

5.130-36

Him I saved when he clung astride of the keel board
all alone, since Zeus with a cast of the shining thunderbolt
had shattered his fast ship midway on the wine-blue water.
Then all the rest of his excellent companions perished,
but the wind and the current carried him here and here they drove him,
and I gave him my love and cherished him, and I had hopes also
that I could make him immortal and ageless all his days.

According to Proteus, it is by virtue of his connection with Helen that Menelaus will achieve a blessed afterlife. Calypso too is a mysterious enchantress, and like Helen, she offers a mortal lover the chance to become an immortal husband on a paradisiacal island\textsuperscript{192} – yet whereas Menelaus has had difficulty in preventing Helen from straying, Calypso is positively floored by the prospect of losing Odysseus. The total effect is telling: Calypso’s similarity to Helen in terms of narrative function reminds us that Odysseus is indeed being prudent even while making him appear the more desirable husband.

The definition of a hero in terms of his lineage (son of Laertes) and his geography (inhabitant of Ithaca) that is affirmed for Odysseus (υἱὸς Λαέρτεω Ἰθάκῃ ἐν οἰκία ναιών) is denied to Menelaus. His afterlife dissociates both his body and his reputation from Argos: σοὶ δ᾿ οὖ θέσφατον ἐστι, διοτρεφὲς ὦ Μενέλαε, / Ἀργεὶ ἐν ἱπποβότῳ θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν (“But for you, Menelaus, O fostered of Zeus, it is not the gods’ will / that you shall die and go to your end in horse-pasturing Argos”). Nor is this the only instance in which we find

\textsuperscript{192} 5.206-10.
Menelaus seeking salvation for himself and his friends by removing them from an unpleasant ambience to one which he deems more suitable.

Critics have always been a bit disturbed by Menelaus’ avowal that he wished to move Odysseus to Argos after their return from the war:

καὶ κέ οἱ Ἀργεῖ ιόντα πόλιν καὶ δῷματ’ ἔτευξα,
ἐξ Ἰθάκης αγαγὼν σὺν κτήμασι καὶ τέκεὶ ὡ
καὶ πᾶσιν λαοίς, μίαν πόλιν ἐξαλαπάξας,
αἱ περιναιετάουσιν, ἀνάσσονται δ’ ἔμοι αὐτῶ.
καὶ Κε δήμερ’ ἔνθεν ἔοντες ἐμισγόμεθ’· οὐδὲ
καὶ πᾶσιν διέκρινεν φιλέοντε τε
τερπομένω τε,
πρὶν γ’ ὅτε 
ἄλλο διέκρινεν

And I thought he would come, and I would love him beyond other Argives, if only Olympian Zeus of the wide brows granted both of us to come home across the sea in our fast ships. I would have settled a city in Argos for him, and made him a home, bringing him from Ithaca with all his possessions, his son, all his people. I would have emptied one city for him out of those that are settled round about and under my lordship. And, both here, we would have seen much of each other; nothing would then have separated us two in our friendship and pleasure, until the darkening cloud of death had shrouded us over.

The sentiment, while touching, contains a number of oddities which could potentially prove offensive to Telemachus. First, Menelaus fails to mention Penelope (is it simply assumed that she will have moved on and remarried, perhaps with a touch of ethos in deference to the trauma which Menelaus has suffered in his brother’s betrayal by his sister-in-law?). Second, though descriptions of Ithaca thus far have been sadly slighting (in the *Iliad* its primary characteristic seems to have been rockiness, \(^{193}\) and it has earned only a few scattered epithets by this point\(^ {194}\),

\[^{193}\text{*Iliad* }3.200-202:\]

Λαερτιάδης πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς,
δὸς τράφή ἐν δήμῳ Ἰθάκης κραναῖς περ’ ἐνύσις
eἰδώς παντοίους τε δόλους καὶ μῆδα πυκνά.
the presumption that Odysseus would want to leave what Menelaus might on the basis of its Iliadic epithets regard as a miserable little rock hovering out on the fringes of civilization is starkly at odds with Odysseus’ own professed sentiments. Further, he uses ἐξαλαπάξας in a sense unique enough to warrant a special entry in LSJ. The autocratic action of sacking and emptying a city on his own lands of his own people seems to mix a romanticized reminiscence of the powers of the long-past Mycenaean ἔναξ as attested at Pylos in the Linear B tablets with the helot system just evolving in Sparta and Messenia at the time the poem was reaching its final state. In its sheer disregard for the claims of the present inhabitants of the land, moreover, it is

---

194 Elsewhere up to Menelaus’ speech only with the following epithets: κραναὴν Ἰθάκην (1.247, as in Iliad 3.201), Ἰθάκης ἐτι ναιεταούσης (1.404, as a genitive absolute), Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον (2.167), ἐν ἀμφιάλῳ Ἰθάκη (1.386, 1.395, 1.401, 2.293), ἐξ Ἰθάκης ὑπονηΐου (3.81).
195 Note that this is a town of his own people! See LSJ, s.v. ἐξαλαπάπαξας.
196 The disregard with which Menelaus treats his Spartans is reminiscent of the relatively recent differentiation of Spartans from helots at historical Sparta. While explicit mention of the helot system is not made in the Odyssey, recent critical reevaluation of the evolution of Spartan helotry creates a picture with tantalizing points of overlap with the Spartan society of the Odyssey. Specifically, Nino Luraghi 2003 notes that an unbiased reading of Tyrtaeus and other early evidence would seem to indicate that “from Tyrtaeus to Isocrates, the Spartans seem to have thought that they had conquered their land and evicted its previous occupants, particularly on the Messenians side. They apparently accepted no distinction between Helots west or East of Taygetos” (my italics). If this Spartan self-image is accurate and/or dates back to the seventh and eighth centuries (the time of the Messenian Wars), Menelaus’ haughty assumption that he might expel the inhabitants of entire cities on a whim is a reflection of events roughly contemporary with the textualization of the Odyssey. Other recent discoveries discussed in the same article (Luraghi 2003, 110-113) make this possibility even more interesting: excavations have now uncovered evidence “that a Geometric settlement existed at the foot of Mt. Ithome in the ninth and eighth centuries”: the site of later Messenian resistance may well have been the locus of the fighting of the early Messenian Wars. Further, the cities offered by Agamemnon to Achilles in Iliad 9 clustered about the Gulf of Messenia, and there is thus other precedent for the Atreidae giving Messenian cities as gifts (indeed, the Iliadic scene may well be the inspiration for Menelaus’ remarks in the Odyssey – so West 1988 ad 174-7, who nevertheless cautions that this passage “should not be taken as a reflection of political reality, either in the Mycenaean age or subsequently”). Messene is known to the Odyssey as the source of Odysseus’ bow – and, as Luraghi notes, its presentation as a home to cattle raiders might “be seen as the first trace of the
a striking violation of the King’s Justice motif which will gradually attach itself to Odysseus through his invocation of it in Books 8 and 19.\textsuperscript{197}

Given the track record of Menelaus and Agamemnon in the \textit{Iliad},\textsuperscript{198} this sort of violation of the prerogatives of their retainers comes as no great shock. Broadly speaking, Menelaus’ hypothetical invitation to Odysseus sets at variance a series of diametrically opposed values: subsistence agriculture and pastoralism on Ithaca versus centralized taxation and land management at Sparta, solicitude for the well-being of one’s subjects versus disregard for their interests, flexibility and survival versus opulence and luxury. Menelaus’ enthusiasm for Elysium and his presumption that Odysseus is looking for an “in” at a major Mycenaean hub both tag him a slightly unsavory social climber.

Homer thus differentiates Menelaus from Odysseus with respect to (1) level of wealth and prosperity possessed at home and (2) – a related point – a general association with an earlier Mycenaean age and/or the contemporary evolving helot system at Sparta, (3) his relation and attitude toward his wife, and most importantly, (4) their attitudes toward Ithaca and Penelope, both of which Menelaus apparently regards as undesirable and disposable, whereas Odysseus regards them as adequate recompense for rejecting immortality at the side of Calypso. Menelaus, in contrast, does not express any great disdain over spending his afterlife in Elysium at the side of his wife the goddess and daughter of Zeus. Much as Odysseus in his own tales of the Apologue will usurp and outdo myths originally of Argonautic provenience, so Homer portrays him going one up on Menelaus. Both Menelaus and Jason are useful as points of contrast for all these reasons and most of all because the domestic situations which await them once they hang up their epic swords are less than ideal.\textsuperscript{199}

When we reach Calypso’s island at the beginning of Book 5, close attention to its details reveals the poet’s attention to the erotic predilections of the character which he has already

\textsuperscript{197} See Martin 1984 and discussion above.
\textsuperscript{198} Most notably in the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles in Book 1.
\textsuperscript{199} For Jason and Medea in early Argonautic tales, see Meuli 1921, West 2005.
defined negatively relative to Menelaus. The defining features of Menelaus’ Elysium are climactic, stressing the ease of life (ῥηΐστη βιοτή). One senses that Proteus is aware that the only contribution which Helen makes to this setting is the incidental circumstance that she is Menelaus’ key to get in. In contrast, the enticements of Calypso’s island are well-rounded, incorporating all the requisite amenities for ease of life (water from a spring, 5.70; soft meadows with violets and parsley, 5.72-3; a grapevine burgeoning with clusters of grapes, 5.69), but with a decidedly new emphasis on replicating the trappings of mortal domesticity (a large fire burning on the hearth, 5.59; Calypso herself sexily singing and weaving, 5.61-2). Though Hermes’ and Homer’s impressions of the isle bring out a certain contrast between freedom and confinement in the natural details of the “long-winged birds” (see above), this does not detract from the fact that Calypso would seem to offer all the components necessary for a happy household.

In this respect, Ogygia holds out the hope of the best of both worlds: aside from the generalities of fresh and refreshing breezes (4.567-68), Elysium is defined exclusively by the absence of cold weather and precipitation (cf. Hesiod Op. 129-186). Calypso’s grotto, in contradistinction, offers all the amenities of home with none of the disadvantages of suitors, sons, or faithless maids. This forces the audience to question what precisely it is about the home island (portrayed as chaotic and barren in Books 1-2 and 4.600-608) which holds Odysseus’ attention as he sits on the shore imagining it lurking on the horizon. The spontaneously arising amenities of Ogygia brilliantly assume features from the Hesiodic Golden Age, in which nature and the gods provide everything for mortals and there is no need of toil.  

For a hero enamoured with reaching house and home, Calypso’s grotto offers a valiant effort at second-best – Hermes’ reaction of wonder (5.73-74) speaks volumes as to both Calypso’s intentions (to deify Odysseus) and the proper (divine) audience for such a space. Yet despite Ogygia’s allure as a place at once domestic, erotic, and paradisiacal, Odysseus wishes to go home, thus distinguishing himself from Menelaus, and imparting a programmatic significance to the landscape of Calypso’s island.

In this chapter, we shall trace Odysseus’ progression from Calypso, a goddess in Hermes’ eyes as far removed from the world of the Olympians as can be imagined, to the storm at sea where Odysseus is the object of Poseidon’s active wrath, to the olive tree on the shore of Scheria, a tree sacred to Athena and a fitting transition from savage to civilized space, and, after a brief visit to Olympus with Athena, to the increasingly sacral landscape of Scheria, complete with a spring sacred to Athena, and, the culmination of this series of landscapes, the Gardens of Alcinous, where Odysseus at last assumes a role of observer analogous to that played by Hermes in Book 5, thereby reclaiming his human agency and abandoning the impotent passivity of his position relative to Calypso. Athena’s visit to Olympus, by echoing many details of Elysium, marks an important structural turning point: it ends the divine embassies of Books 1 and 5, returning to Odysseus a share of autonomy and independence (he is now nearly in the clear from both Calypso and Poseidon, and Athena’s guidance will not be needed again until Book 13). Appearing in the wake of the storm with its identity-defining word-play on the name of Odysseus and its imperilment of his kleos, it also introduces more clearly a criterion by which to judge what is special about Odysseus’ nostos: he willingly opts for the harder road, a choice which valorizes the mortal condition and places it in its proper perspective relative to the divine machinery. The shift to Odysseus’ point of view in the Gardens of Alcinous – especially considered retrospectively from the vantage point of Laertes’ similar but dingier gardens – permits the audience to witness the protagonist appreciating the beauty which exists in foreign lands at the very moment when he is about to pledge his allegiance irrevocably to his own domestic landscapes by asking Alcinous for conveyance home.

Books 5-7 of the Odyssey track Odysseus’ progress from Ogygia to the palace of Alcinous on Scheria. These three books contain an unusual density of landscape description,
including some of the most markedly idealized loca of the epic: Calypso’s grotto, the sheltering olive on the shore of Phaeacia, Olympus, the shrine of Athena where Odysseus pauses on the way to Alcinous’ palace, and the Gardens of Alcinous. With the possible exception of Goat Island, few landscapes within Odysseus’ narration of his primary adventures are so perfect and so pleasant. Why do the majority of the most idyllic places of the epic cluster in this one brief span of a much longer work?

Several considerations need to be addressed in formulating an answer to this question. First, Homer makes it quite clear that Odysseus is unable to appreciate the manifest charm which Ogygia holds for Hermes and the poet (5.81-84). Note as well that Odysseus’ subjective responses to loca amoena become increasingly positive throughout this span of time, generally improving from his despairing refusal to take any pleasure in Ogygia’s grottoes to his genuine appreciation of Alcinous’ garden – an outsider’s admiration which recalls Hermes’ analogous stance as detached outsider having no desire to remain on Ogygia, but nevertheless experiencing wonder at its marvels. Indeed, Odysseus’ appreciation for Alcinous’ gardens is even more muted than Hermes’ qualified appreciation of Ogygia: Odysseus hesitates on the threshold of the palace before entering, and “his heart pondered many things as he stood before approaching the bronze threshold” (πολλὰ δὲ οἱ κῆρ / ὀρμαύ̱ ἵσταμένω, πρὶν χάλκεον οὐδὸν ἰκέσθαι, 7.82-83). Similarly, after taking in the details of Alcinous’ gardens, Odysseus stands and gazes (Ἔνθα στὰς θηεῖτο) on gardens which the poet has just qualified as “splendid gifts of the gods”; yet the poet uses less strong language of admiration to describe Odysseus’ attitude than he did in Hermes’ case: θηεῖτο need mean no more than “was observing”, whereas in characterizing Hermes’ reaction to Ogygia the poet collocated a form of θεάομαι with ἱδών (“then even a god coming there might gaze admiringly at the sight, and might take delight in his heart”), bringing the sense of “admiration” latent in θεάομαι to the fore, and going on to add the unquestionably appreciative verb τερφθείη. Instead, Homer seems at pains to show that

201 “Idealized” is admittedly a subjective term: see Elliger 1975, 113-118; Bonnafé 1984, 150-160.
202 5.73-77:

ἔνθα κ’ ἐπείτα καὶ ἀθάνατός περ ἐπελθὼν θηήσαιτο ἱδών καὶ τερφθείη φρεσὶν ἱσσιν. ἔνθα στὰς θηεῖτο διάκτορος ἀργειφόντης.
Odysseus is capable of observing and appreciating this space with an almost stoical detachment—an impression which is strengthened by the wistful finality with which Odysseus finally bypasses the gardens and enters the palace: “but when Odysseus had observed everything with his heart, he swiftly stepped over the threshold into the house.”

The similarities between Homer’s description of Hermes gazing on Calypso’s grotto and of Odysseus gazing on Alcinous’ gardens suggest one reason for the careful qualification of Odysseus’ admiration: Odysseus does not wish to become mired down in another distraction—a threat made all the more immediate by the charming marriageability of young Nausicaa, who presents all the erotic possibilities of Calypso coupled with the advantage of a more mortal (and hence less perilous) constitution. Further, as we shall see in the final chapter, the similarities between Laertes’ gardens and the gardens of Alcinous provide another motive for Odysseus to refrain from admiring Alcinous’ gardens too much: Odysseus has another garden in mind which is not idealized, but with which he possesses a level of intimacy impossible for a traveler in a foreign land. The measured degree of interest which Odysseus does demonstrate in Alcinous’ gardens, in fact, may well derive from the fact that they represent an idealized version of Laertes’ gardens of home—almost a literary representation of what forgetfulness and his imagination may have conspired to turn his father’s plot into during ten long years of absence: beautiful and

---

αὐτὰρ ἔπει δὴ πάντα ἐὼ θηήσατο θυμῷ,
αὐτίκ’ ἄρ’ εἰς εὐρὺ σπέος ἤλυθεν.

And even a god who came into that place
would have admired what he saw, the heart delighted within him.
There the courier Argeiphontes stood and admired it.
But after he had admired all in his heart, he went in
to the wide cave.

7.133-135. The anaphora of the root of θεάομαι from 133 to 134 with change in tense from imperfect to aorist emphasizes Odysseus tearing himself away from the sight:

Ἐνθα στὰς θηεῖτο πολύτλας δίος Ὀδυσσεύς.
αὐτὰρ ἔπει δὴ πάντα ἐὼ θηήσατο θυμῷ,
καρπαλίμως ύπέρ οὐδὸν ἐβήσατο δώματος εἴσω.

And there long-suffering great Odysseus stopped still and admired it.
But when in his mind he had admired everything,
he stepped over the threshold and went on into the palace.
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fertile, but lacking the immediate, tactile details which will be his signs of recognition with his rather.

Another small verbal cue insinuates that in Alcinous’ gardens Odysseus finds a space closer to the mortal gardens of Odysseus’ home than he has encountered in other recent wanderings: the poet somewhat puzzlingly refers to the palace of Alcinous as κλυτά when he introduces the bipartite ecphrasis describing the palace and the gardens, despite the fact that the Phaeacians seem to live in virtual isolation from the world at large. Clay 1997 observes that the root of κλυτά is appropriate to mortal rather than immortal concerns.\(^{204}\) The application of this epithet to the palace and gardens of Alcinous may thus imply that Odysseus is moving along a spectrum from venues in which obtaining fame from one’s actions seems almost impossible (Ogygia, the Storm) to venues to which rumors of goings on in the heroic Greek world permeate (witness Demodocus’ tales of Troy) and from which news of Odysseus can be expected to filter.\(^{205}\) The inclusion of the epithet κλυτός in the palace’s description silently hints that Odysseus is moving closer to home and the realm of mortals. Odysseus’ aesthetic appreciation of landscapes increases as he reassumes his normal, mortal relation to topography, and in this fashion the depiction of Odysseus’ reactions to landscapes lends credibility and nuanced ethos to Odysseus’ devotion to nostos.\(^{206}\)

---

\(^{204}\) “Compared to the divine knowledge of the Muses, mortals possess mere kleos, aural rather than visual, based on vague hearsay.” Clay 1997, 19.

\(^{205}\) As they in fact do, when Odysseus recounts his wanderings to Penelope in Book 23; Odysseus’ sense that the Phaeacians may provide him with conveyance home permits him to entertain hopes of recounting his adventures at home (foreshadowed when he narrates his adventures to the court of Alcinous) and acquiring fame for his deeds. Though the description of the Gardens is third-person, in this epithet Homer may hint at Odysseus’ subjective hopes that in the palace he will find a means of reclaiming his kleos.

\(^{206}\) This position is in some ways consistent with the popular formulation of the Phaeacians as a race connected with the conveyance of souls from the realm of the living to the dead and back. As we note in our discussion of Calypso above, interpretations of Ogygia as a land of the dead have some validity, but should not be pressed too much. Odysseus is not literally dead, but has found himself in a place where all the attributes which define him as a human and as a hero are denied him (most notably, kleos). The return to the Phaeacians marks a step back toward renewed possibilities for meaningful human attainments, as I argue the characterization of the palace of Alcinous as κλυτά suggests. For a recent interpretation of the Phaeacians as transporters of the dead with a long Indo-European pedigree, see Sergent 2002; see also Thornton 1970, 23-37. For more general discussion, see Hainsworth’s (1988) introductions to Books 6 and 8. Hainsworth (1988, 342) is of the opinion that, “the world of Scheria is thus a
There is a second factor which helps to explain the unusual concentration of landscape imagery in Books 5-7. In Menelaus’ more fragmented narrative of his own nostos, the most idealized and fantastical landscape description likewise occurs at the end of his narrative and the chronological end of his travels. To be sure, his post-Trojan War adventures include brief mention of locales possessing unusual degrees of abundance (Cyprus, Phoenicia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Sidon, Libya, the Erembi, 4.81-89), but his appreciative remarks on Libyan fecundity are fundamentally different from Proteus’ prophecy. Inasmuch as it offers minor wonders similar to those of Odysseus’ Lotus Eaters and the Cyclops’ overabundant stores of milk and cheese, Menelaus’ travel tale harkens back to the more abbreviated varieties of nostoi which may have antedated the Odyssey (Phemius’ songs may perhaps be imagined to be representative of these tales).

However, such accounts differ from truly ideal landscapes in key respects: their interest is overtly ethnographic (they illustrate the character or lifestyle of the inhabitants), and the implication that a causal relation exists between the presence of a divinity and the aesthetically pleasing qualities of nature is not emphasized.

It is only in the topographical Homeric world from which war, the curse as well as the glory of the heroic age, has been removed…. At the same time it is the sort of toilless world for which Hesiod yearned. There are some touches of additional felicity, e.g. the presence of gods vii 201, and a striking difference, the stress upon ships and seafaring, so often the symbols of man’s presumption.” For further discussion, see Garvie 1994, 18-31, who notes, “their society is the ideal society of Utopia, and it represents the final temptation for Odysseus to abandon his quest for home and to settle down here in a state of perpetual bliss” (1994, 23); he aptly remarks that by presenting a contrast with past barbaric adventures in unreal spaces and with the future disorder to be encountered on Ithaca, “the Phaeacian episode represents the last of Odysseus’ adventures in fantasy-world, [but] it also points forward to, and foreshadows, the second half of the poem.”

For Odysseus’ “subjective style” of narration, see e.g., Bergren 1983; de Jong 1992; Beck 2005.

The presence of a divinity is not stressed in relation to the olive (though a number of divinities have played a role in bringing Odysseus safely to its vicinity, and the tree is, of course, sacred to Athena who has just exerted renewed efforts in aiding her protégé). The gardens of Alcinous likewise are not inhabited by a divinity, though their whole society has been described as “wildly utopian” (Vidal-Naquet 1996, 52) and aspects of their society recall Odysseus’ previous encounters with divinities, suggesting that Homer deliberately blurs the line between human and divine in this “ideal and… impossible society” (Vidal-Naquet 1996, 52; god-like features of Phaeacian society noted by Vidal-Naquet include shared feasts with the gods [49], Nausicaa’s resemblance to a goddess [50], the common pursuits of feasting and incestuous propagation pursued by both the god Aeolus and the Phaeacians [51].) For discussion of the odd
detail which crowns Menelaus’ account – Proteus’ prophecy of Elysium – that one encounters an overt and emphatic relationship between divinity and Elysium’s pleasant clime, and that one finds a landscape so manifestly mythical that there is no question of Menelaus attempting to awe his naïve audience with tales of the unusual mores of its inhabitants. Indeed, no inhabitants are mentioned.\footnote{209}

Does the fact that Menelaus’ account also ends with a highly idealized landscape reveal hints as to why Odysseus’ journey should likewise end in a string of idealized topographies viewed by solitary observers? Menelaus begins and ends his tale of Proteus with mention of religious obligations neglected. Menelaus’ question to Eidothea at 4.376-381 \((379-381=468-470)\) takes for granted that his nostos has been impeded because he has slighted a god:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἐκ μὲν τοι ἔρεω, ἢ τις σὺ πέρ ἔσσι θεάων,} \\
\text{ὡς ἔγὼ οὔ τι ἐκὼν κατερύκομαι, άλλα νυ μέλλω} \\
\text{ἄθανάτωσιν ἀλιτέσθαι, οἱ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν.} \\
\text{άλλα σὺ πέρ μοι εἰπέ, θεοὶ δέ τε πάντα ἱσασιν,} \\
\text{ὅς τίς μ᾽ ἄθανάτων πεδάς καὶ ἔδησε κελεύθου,} \\
\text{νόστον θ', ὡς ἐπὶ πόντων ἐλεύσομαι ἱχθυόεντα.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(4.376-381 \ (379-381=468-470)\)

So I will tell, whoever you may be of the goddesses, 
that I am not detained of my own free will, but it must be 
I have offended the immortals who hold wide heaven. 
But do you then tell me, for the gods know everything, which one 
of the immortals hampers me here and kept me from my journey 
and tell me how I shall go home upon the fish-swarmed sea.

Proteus’ response to Menelaus chastises the Spartan king’s past failures to provide pleasing sacrifices to Zeus and the other gods \((4.472-473)\), and then instructs him to perform hecatombs to the immortal gods by the side of the Nile if he wishes to come to his home \((4.475-480)\). Further, after Proteus’ description of Elysium, Menelaus informs his auditors that he carried out the hecatombs by the Nile \((4.581-582)\), which put an end to the anger of the gods \((4.583)\). That

\footnote{209} It should be noted that this example differs from Odysseus’ inasmuch as we have only Menelaus’ account of the final leg of his own nostos. For Odysseus’ the final leg is narrated by the poet, unlike the Apologue.
is not all. The next line tells of a familial religious obligation at long last put right: Menelaus heaped up a tomb for his murdered brother, in order that he might have unquenchable fame (χεῦ’ Ἀγαμέμνονι τύμβον, ἵν’ ἀσβεστον κλέος εἴη, 4.584). That this second religious rite also proves efficacious in facilitating homecoming is suggested by Menelaus’ following assertion:

ταύτα τελευτήσας νεόμην, δίδοσαν δὲ μοι οὐρον ἀθάνατοι, τοί μ’ ὠκα φίλην ἐς πατρίδ’ ἐπεμψαν.
4.585-586

Having completed these things, I sailed homeward, and the immortals gave me a wind, and they speedily brought me to my own dear country.

As a failure of religious obligations has been constantly restated as the cause of the failure of Menelaus’ homecoming, the post hoc implied in ταύτα τελευτήσας likely does here connote propter hoc: it is because Menelaus heaped up a tomb to his brother Agamemnon, ensuring his unperishing fame, that the gods granted a favorable wind and he was able to go home, permitting, it is likely implied, Menelaus, too, to propagate his own fame in venues like the present feast. Even beyond such overt mentions of religious obligations, it has long been noted that Menelaus’ encounter with Proteus contains elements resembling shamanistic practice, indicating perhaps that the entire Protean ordeal results in a sort of transfiguration or rebirth for Menelaus.210

Perhaps Odysseus’ own immersion in subjectively more idealized landscapes also reflects a shift in relationship with the divine at this point in his journey? We noted above that the progression of landscapes across Books 5-7 moves from the entirely immortal landscape of Ogygia to the more mortal varieties of landscape that Odysseus finds on Scheria. The premise that Athena’s wrath against Odysseus has just come to an end before the council of the gods with which the epic begins is the central thesis of Jenny Strauss Clay’s Wrath of Athena.211 It is only on Scheria that Athena begins to intervene once again on Odysseus’ behalf.212 The transition from Ogygia to Scheria, then, involves a passage for Odysseus from the protection of Calypso to

---

210 See Athanassakis 2002.
211 1997; see especially the first chapter for a conspectus of the problem of Athena’s wrath.
that of Athena (enacted progressively in Odysseus’ prayer to Athena of 6.324-327 from her sacred glade and then in Athena’s disguised epiphany of 7.14-81), and, as we have seen in the preceding discussion, from a landscape which is beautiful to others but repulsive to Odysseus to a landscape whose allurements he is capable of both resisting and appreciating. All of this will serve as good practice for the return to Ithaca, where Odysseus must in a similar fashion resist his homeland’s allure (with the aid of Athena’s cloud) even as he rediscovers the ancestral connections and fruits of his childhood’s labors in Laertes’ gardens and remembers what it is that he loves about his native land. In the case of both Menelaus and of Odysseus, an idealized landscape stands as a signpost demarcating a divinely-sponsored change in fortunes that results from a renegotiation of the protagonists’ relations with the divine and that will end the voyage component of nostos.

The dual considerations of the progression from immortal to mortal landscapes and the fact that Menelaus’ divine locus also comes at the end of his adventures just as the poet emphasizes his performance of an expiatory sacrifice suggest that the cluster of loca amoena and near loca amoena of Books 5-7 develop a rhetoric of landscape which prepares the reader for Athena’s wholehearted sponsorship of Odysseus’ revenge plans in Book 13, and which links this sponsorship to Odysseus’ growing appreciation of his proper, limited, toil-troubled mortal role in a world which he has now traversed almost from end to end.

6.1 THE STORM

Odysseus’ parting conversation with Calypso permits Homer to articulate through the hero’s own lips the ethos that Odysseus has developed during his travels. Calypso’s address to Odysseus explores a theme treated in Chapter 5.2 of this dissertation, pointing out all Odysseus’ reasons not to leave for home:

Διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν’ Ὄδυσσεῦ, οὔτω δὴ οἶκόνδε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν αὐτίκα νῦν ἑθέλεις ἰέναι; σὺ δὲ χαίρε καὶ ἐμπης. εἰ γε μὲν εἰδείης σήσαι φρεσίν ὡς τοι αἴσα κῆδε ἀναπλῆσαι, πρὶν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι,
Son of Laertes and seed of Zeus, resourceful Odysseus, 
are you still all so eager to go on back to your own house
and the land of your fathers? I wish you well, however you do it,
but if you only knew in your own heart how many hardships
you were fated to undergo before getting back to your own country,
you would stay here with me and be the lord of this household
and be an immortal, for all your longing once more to look on
that wife for whom you are pining all your days here. And yet
I think that I can claim that I am not her inferior
either in build or stature, since it is not likely that mortal
women can challenge the goddesses for build and beauty.

The goddess first juxtaposes Odysseus’ professed desire for home with the dangers which,
unbeknownst to him, lie in wait between Ogygia and home – a classic antithesis of will (οὖτω δὴ οἶκόνδε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν / αὐτίκα νῦν ἐθέλεις ἰέναι, “are you still all so eager to go on back to your own house / and the land of your fathers?”) versus knowledge (εἴ γε μὲν εἰδείης σῇσι φρεσίν, ὡσα τοι αἶσα / κῆδε’ ἀναπλῆσαι, πρὶν πατρίδα γαῖαν ικέσθαι, “but if you only knew in your own heart how many hardships / you were fated to undergo before getting back to your own country…”). Calypso’s use of evenly balanced phrases to express these alternatives – note that lines 204 and 207 both end with an emphatic mention of Odysseus’ “home country” (πατρίδα γαῖαν ~ πατρίδα γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι) – betray her assumptions about the way mortals think, insinuating that Odysseus expresses willingness to undertake toil to reach his home only because of his imperfect mortal knowledge. She thus offers him an heroic choice which strongly suggests itself as an allomorph of Achilles’ famous heroic choice,213 elaborating

---

213 Iliad 9.410-416:

μήτηρ γάρ τε μέ φησι θεά Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
διχθαδίας κήρας φερέμεν θανάτοιο τέλοσδε.
εἰ μὲν κ’ αὕθι μένων Τρώων πόλιν ἀμφιμάχωμαι,
ὡλετο μὲν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται.
the consequences of either option in the lines that follow. Both Achilles and Odysseus view their choice as in part a choice regarding kinds of wives. Yet Odysseus’ heroic choice, as presented by Calypso, differs with regard to his opportunities for kleos. In one scenario, he sacrifices home (like Achilles), and gains not everlasting fame but its antithesis (if we take Calypso’s name to be significant) accompanied by immortality and erotic bliss. Calypso has no delusions about the fact that Odysseus will pay a price for this choice: he will continue to long for Penelope (5.209).

The Homeric preference for ring composition makes the end of Calypso’s speech even more abrupt than it may initially appear to a modern audience, for, after elaborating the consequences of choosing to keep house with her on Ogygia, she trails into an aposiopesis, never expressing the consequences of his choosing to set sail, despite having hinted that she herself foresees his sufferings (5.206). Nevertheless, the implication of Calypso’s words rings clear: whereas Achilles in his choice of lots knew that he was able to reach Phthia in a few days’ sail (Iliad 9.362-363), Odysseus does not know when or whether he will arrive in Ithaca, or what sufferings he will endure on the road. Failure to make it home will result in the same obscurity he would in any case endure staying on Ogygia, but his bedmates will be fishes rather than Calypso.

Inasmuch as he seems to have prompted the goddess to reveal a bit more from her store of immortal knowledge than she intended, Odysseus may seem to have scored a small victory:

εἴ δὲ κεν ὀἶκαὶ ἱκώμαι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν,
ὡλετό μοι κλέος ἔσθλόν, ἑπὶ δηρόν δέ μοι αἰών
ἔσσεται, οὐδὲ κέ μ’ ὁκα τέλος θανάτων χιλείη.

For my mother Thetis of the silver feet tells me
I carry two sorts of destiny toward the day of my death. Either,
if I stay here and fight beside the city of the Trojans,
my return home is gone, but my glory shall be everlasting;
but if I return home to the beloved land of my fathers,
the excellence of my glory is gone, but there will be a long life
left for me, and my end in death will not come to me quickly.

On the contest between nostos and kleos, see Nagy 1979, 39-41 and passim. Calypso’s choice of the the epithet, Διογενής, for Odysseus adds further support to our argument that we are meant to see an analogy between the paradisiacal immortality offered by Calypso to Odysseus and that offered to Menelaus by Helen. Recall that Menelaus was heir to this immortality because he was the son-in-law of Zeus; Odysseus is actually Διογενής!

214 Achilles tells his interlocutors that Peleus will find him a new bride at home: Iliad 9.393-400.
her revelation that Odysseus is fated to come home only after much suffering could be interpreted as implying that it *is* in fact fated that he will eventually reach home: ὅσσα τοι αἰσα / κήδε’ ἀναπλήσαι, πρὶν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι (“how many hardships / you were fated to undergo before getting back to your own country…”). Nevertheless, Calypso’s words do not afford the hero too great a scope for confidence, as they indicate only that he will reach the shore of his homeland, not what he will find there, whether he will succeed in overcoming whatever adversaries lie in wait, or whether he will gain any fame in the endeavor. Moreover, Odysseus will repeat almost Calypso’s *ipsissima verba* during the storm, when, by his own admission, he believes that his “sheer destruction is certain” (νῦν μοι σῶς αἰπὺς ὀλεθρος, 5.305). For the hero beset by what surely appear to be life-threatening storm swells, a second sense of Calypso’s words κήδε’ ἀναπλήσαι (“fill up one’s share of cares” – i.e., die!) must be apparent.

Odysseus’ response turns Calypso’s attempt at manipulating the rules of the heroic code on its head, embracing *nostos* with all its risks of loss of *kleos* as – ironically – a key component of his identity (i.e., his *kleos*). To gain everlasting fame, Odysseus will have to risk losing it. The hero cites past sufferings as proof that he will be able to endure even the sort of god-driven storm which Poseidon does in fact create a short time later:

πότνα θεά, μή μοι τόδε χώσω· οίδα καὶ αὐτός πάντα μάλ’, οὖνεκα σείο περίφρων Πηνελόπεια εἴδος ἀκιδωτέρη μέγεθός τ’ εἰσάντα ἰδέσθαι· ἢ μὲν γὰρ βροτός ἠστι, σὺ δ’ ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρως. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὦς ἔθελα καὶ ἔλδομαι ἡμέραι ὁμα τάντα οἰκάδε τ’ ἐλθέμεναι καὶ νόστιμον ἠματικὸν ἰδέσθαι. εἰ δ’ αὐ τ’ ἀχτι νεὶ ἔνι, υἱὸν πόντων, τλήσομαι ἐν στήθεσσιν ἐξων ταλαπενθέα θυμόν· ἢ δ’ ἀχτι μάλα πολλὰ πάθων καὶ πολλὰ μόγησα κύμασι καὶ πολέμω· μετὰ καὶ τὸδε τοῖσι γενέσθω. 5.215-224

Goddess and queen, do not be angry with me. I myself know that all you say is true and that circumspect Penelope can never match the impression you make for beauty and stature. She is mortal after all, and you are immortal and ageless. But even so, what I want and all my days I pine for is to go back to my house and see my day of homecoming.

---

215 5.300-302.
And if some god batters me far out on the wine-blue water,
I will endure it, keeping a stubborn spirit inside me,
for already I have suffered many sufferings and toiled many labors
on the waves and in war. So let this adventure follow.

In this passage, there are discernible echoes of the proem in the references to suffering in
war and on the sea (ἠδὴ γὰρ μάλα πολλὰ πάθον καὶ πολλὰ μόχησα / κύμασι καὶ πολέμῳ, “for already I have suffered many sufferings and toiled many labors / on the waves and in war” ~ πολλὰ δ᾿ ὦ γῆ ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἀλγεὰ δὲν κατὰ θυμὸν, “many pains he suffered in his spirit on the sea”, and, ἔπει Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολεῖθρον ἔπερσε, “after he had sacked Troy’s sacred citadel”), warning us that this is a programmatic statement, demonstrative of the hero’s essential drives. What should grab our attention, however, are the spaces in which Odysseus claims to have endured character-defining sufferings: κύμασι καὶ πολέμῳ (“on the waves and in war”). These two places correspond directly to (1) the themes and events of the Iliad and (2) the sea voyages which must necessarily comprise a portion of any route from Troy to Ithaca. This statement is somewhat odd when considered retrospectively in the light of what we learn in the Apologue, where storms by sea and agony endured literally “on the waves” receive relatively short shrift. However, viewed in the light of Calypso’ recent arguments, Odysseus’ vaunt makes sense. By laying claim to accomplishment in both the traditional venue of war and on the very waves at which he has been staring ceaselessly from the shore of Ogygia, he is responding to Calypso’s veiled threat that his sufferings by sea may prove vain and bring him no kleos. In this way, Odysseus gently turns Calypso’s own threat against her, intimating that the sufferings which she forecasts are not a deterrent for a mortal, but will rather be a profitable proving-ground for Odysseus’ mettle, and one from which he will derive fame.

During the storm, we find Odysseus sounding less resolute than he did when leaving Calypso. He wishes that he had died at Troy, where at least he would have earned the admiration of his fellows.\textsuperscript{216} An implication of recent work on Greek cognitive mapping is that absence of

\textsuperscript{216} Odyssey 5.299-312:

"Ω μοι ἐγὼ δειλός, τί νῦ μοι μήκιστα γένηται;
δείδω μὴ δὴ πάντα θέα νημερτέα εἶπεν;
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landscape by Greek terms amounts almost completely to absence of prospects for *kleos*. Hence, heroic exploits in Greek myth (even seafaring myth) are almost invariably performed on land to the advantage or detriment of the inhabitants who till and live from the landscape. Thus among Odysseus’ deep-sea adventures (i.e., experiences onboard a ship rather than onshore), the slaughter in the harbor of the Laestrygonians, the Sirens, the Clashing Rocks, Scylla, and even Charybdis occur at a place where land and sea meet in a recognizable shore or cliff line. Even the foolhardy decision of Odysseus’ men to open the bag of Aeolus occurs when Ithaca is in their sight (ἀνεφαίνετο πατρὶς ἀρουρα, 10.29). The landscape of the storm is a negation of landscape and of heroic *kleos*, and, despite the ambiguous promise that Odysseus will survive to reach the shore of Ithaca implicit in Calypso’s words, the presentation of the storm through

*ἡ μ᾽ ἔφατ᾽ ἐν πόντῳ, πρὶν πατρίδα γαίαιν ικέσθαι, ἀλγε ἀναπλήσειςιν· τὰ δὲ δῆ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται, οἰοίοις νεφέωσοι περιστέφει οὐρανὸν εὐρύν. Ζεὺς, ἔταραξε δὲ πόντον, ἐπισπέρχουσι δ᾽ ἀελλαι παντοίων ἀνέμων· νῦν μοι σῶς αἰτίας ὀλεθρος. τρισμάκαρες Δαναοὶ καὶ τετράκις οἳ τότ᾽ ὀλοντο Τροίη ἐν εὐρείῃ, χάριν Ἀτρείδῃσι φέροντες. ὡς δῆ ἐγὼ γ᾽ ὀφελοῦν θανεῖν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν ἠμιτι τῷ ὅτε μοι πλεῖστοι χαλκήρεα δοῦρα Τρῶες ἐπέρριψαν περὶ Πηλείωνι θανόντι. τῷ κ᾽ ἐλαχου κτερέων, καὶ μευ κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοὶ· νῦν δὲ με λευγαλέωθανάτῳ ἐἵμαρτο ἁλῶναι. *Ah me unhappy, what in the long outcome will befall me? I fear the goddess might have spoken the truth in all ways when she said that on the sea and before I came to my country I would go through hardships; now all this is being accomplished, such clouds are these, with which Zeus is cramming the wide sky and has staggered the sea, and stormblasts of winds from every direction are crowding in. My sheer destruction is certain. Three times and four times happy those Danaans were who died then in wide Troy land, bringing favor to the sons of Atreus, as I wish I too had died at that time and met my destiny on the day when the greatest number of Trojans threw their bronze-headed weapons upon me, over the body of perished Achilles, and I would have had my rites and the Achaeans given me glory. Now it is by a dismal death that I must be taken.*

217 See Purves 2006.
Odysseus’ viewpoint by means of directly quoted laments permits the audience to experience the real fear of oblivion together with the hero.

The storm which Poseidon rouses establishes a set of oppositions and parallels with the island of Calypso, where Odysseus had no opportunity to gain kleos through suffering. The etymology of Calypso’s name suggests her role as a concealer of Odysseus, and in particular as one who negates his fame; Poseidon’s storm, in contrast, conceals the external world from Odysseus. Noteworthy is the manner in which this fact is expressed: Odysseus has just voiced a willingness to endure more sufferings on land\(^{218}\) and sea (5.223-4), but it is these very elements which Poseidon’s storm hides from Odysseus’ sight: σὺν δὲ νεφέεσσι κάλυψε / γαῖαν ὁμοῦ καὶ πόντον (“and he concealed with clouds / land alike and water”, 5.293-4). The appearance of the root whence Calypso’s name is derived in the account of the storm is pointed: concealment with Calypso meant one thing (an eternal life without fame but with the opportunity to enjoy many selfish pleasures); concealment by Poseidon, quite another (neither life nor fame). Yet, as Odysseus’ boast insinuated, hazarding death can be a source of fame for mortals, and this turns out to be the case for Odysseus in the storm. His determination pays off when Ino accosts him with a pun on his name, an implicit acknowledgement that even if he perishes, Odysseus has still made a name for himself through his endurance.

### 6.2 THE STORM AND THE OLIVE TREE ON SCHERIA

When Ino appears to Odysseus on the waves, she greets him with an etymologizing salutation which cements the connection between his present suffering and the immortality of his name: Κάμμορε, τίπτε τοι ὅδε Ποσειδάων ἔνοσίχθων / ὀδύσατ’ ἐκπάγλως (“Poor man, why is Poseidon the shaker of the earth so bitterly cankered against you?”, 5.339-340). Ino’s address affirms what Odysseus himself has already noted: the storm in some way defines his character as one who survives long suffering by his wits even when none of the Olympian gods is

---

\(^{218}\) Implicit in the word, “in war”.
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evidently willing to assist him, and some are actively working for his demise. As Odysseus continues to make his way toward the shoreline buoyed by Ino’s veil, he is granted several inconspicuous but crucial boons by other divinities. The first of these, surprisingly, is Poseidon himself, who gives every appearance of concluding the active pursuit of wrath. Directly addressing Odysseus, he first recapitulates the theme of wandering and suffering at sea (κακὰ πολλὰ παθὼν, 5.377 ~ πολλὰ… ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἀλγεά, 1.4; ἀλῶ κατὰ πόντον 5.377 ~ ἐν πόντῳ, 1.4, and μάλα πολλὰ / πλάγχθη, 1.2), then quite unexpectedly specifies a terminus to this punishment in the next line, a stipulation which degenerates into an almost schoolmasterly admonition that Odysseus should not suppose himself to have gotten off too light:

Οὔτω γὰρ κακὰ πολλὰ παθὼν ἀλῶ κατὰ πόντον, 
εἰς ὁ κεν ἀνθρώποις διοτρεφέσσι μιγήῆς.

---

219 See Hainsworth ad 340 in the Oxford commentary, as well as Stanford 1952 and Clay 1997, 54-68. For the storm and the sea as “un obstacle au retour, une cause de souffrances multiples” see Bonnafée 1984, 139-145; for the significance of the storm in relation to the role of the gods in the Odyssey, see Bonnafée 1984, 146-148.

220 I.e., εἰς ὁ κεν ἀνθρώποις διοτρεφέσσι μιγήῆς. The possibility that Poseidon’s wrath ends almost as soon as he is shown venting it in Book 5 (i.e., the moment Odysseus washes up among the Phaeacians) is unsettling, but line 378 does in fact seem to imply this, and it is nowhere later explicitly contradicted. Tiresias long before had informed Odysseus that, though seeking a sweet (μελιηδὴς) νόστος, a god would make it grievous (ἀργαλέος). He then makes clear that the blinding of Poseidon’s son is the cause of the grudge. At last, Tiresias says that Odysseus will come home after much suffering if he is willing to leave the cattle of Helios unmolested (11.100-137). Since, as Woodhouse (1930, 40) notes, “the missionary journey [described at 11.119-137], then, stands in no relation whatever to the Wrath of Poseidon as motivated by the blinding of the Kyklops”, there is no real evidence that Tiresias understands Poseidon’s anger to extend beyond the arrival of Odysseus among the Phaeacians. Woodhouse (1930, 39) observes, “in the prophecy of Teiresias, Poseidon’s Wrath is obviously not a highly significant element; the god will make it grievous (ἀργαλέος), and he then makes clear the possibility that Poseidon’s son is the cause of the grudge. At last, Tiresias says that Odysseus will come home after much suffering if he is willing to leave the cattle of Helios unmolested (11.100-137). Since, as Woodhouse (1930, 40) notes, “the missionary journey [described at 11.119-137], then, stands in no relation whatever to the Wrath of Poseidon as motivated by the blinding of the Kyklops”, there is no real evidence that Tiresias understands Poseidon’s anger to extend beyond the arrival of Odysseus among the Phaeacians. Woodhouse (1930, 39) observes, “in the prophecy of Teiresias, Poseidon’s Wrath is obviously not a highly significant element; the god will make it grievous (again, ἀργαλέος); and now the Phaeacians have conveyed him sleeping to Ithaca and (in the Odyssey as it stands what seems to be the real foundation of his complaint) have given him countless gifts – more, in fact, than he would have wished if he arrived straight home with his booty from Troy (13.134-138). Here, the great difficulty envisioned by Poseidon for Odysseus’ homecoming boils down to the issue of whether he will arrive wealthy or poor!
ἀλλ’ οὐδ’ ὡς σε ἔσελθα ὀνόσσεσαι κακότητος.

5.377-379

There now, drift on the open sea, suffering much trouble, until you come among certain people who are Zeus’ fosterlings. Even so, I hope that you will not quarrel with your ill-luck.  

Now that Poseidon has removed his own direct agency by rushing away to Aegae, Athena may intervene, and binds up all the winds except Boreas so that Odysseus may be blown to the land of the Phaeacians (5.382-387). As Odysseus clings to the shoreline at 5.424-443, she again assists by inspiring in her protégé a clever means of climbing up onto the shore and avoiding being shredded by the waves – just in time, for he was about to die before his fated day (ἐνθα δὴ δύστηνος ὑπὲρ μόρον ὦλετ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς…, “and Odysseus would have perished, wretched, beyond his destiny”, 5.436). Then, while trying to swim into the river’s mouth against the current, Odysseus prays as suppliant to the anonymous god of the river to have pity, and the god obliges by holding back his stream and creating a calm (5.441-454). In this divine encounter, too, the poet never lets us forget that Odysseus is receiving his full helping of wandering and suffering (ἀλώμενος, πολλὰ μογήσας, 5.448-449) – indeed, Odysseus asserts that these activities win mortals respect with the immortal gods (5.448-449). Finally, once on shore, Odysseus restores to Ino her veil (5.458-462).

It was observed previously that Menelaus’ prophesied enjoyment of an idealized landscape may have had been related to his improving relationship with the gods and with Agamemnon. Here, too, the persistent reiteration that Odysseus is indeed suffering and wandering as Poseidon wishes, coupled with Odysseus’ enlistment of the active aid of three gods in rapid succession, suggests that a similar change has taken place in Odysseus’ relationship with the gods as a result of Athena’s plea for his welfare in the twin divine councils of Books 5 and 1. Despite this newfound divine succor to counter the threats to Odysseus’ life at sea, however, Odysseus will find himself entirely on his own as he stumbles ashore. Odysseus’ forlorn condition is only temporary, however: on Ithaca Athena will escalate her assistance through a prolonged and frank epiphany in which she actively assists Odysseus in conniving the suitors’

\[221\] For the translation of ὄνομαι, see LSJ s.v., followed by Hainsworth 1988 ad 377. For the form of ἀλόω, see Hainsworth 1988 ad 377. Hainsworth ad 378 reasonably interprets διοτρεφέσσι as “a generic epithet (of kings and heroes)".
undoing, and even in Books 5-7 Athena will engage in a more passive variety of behind the scenes divine intervention – a circumstance explicable by the lingering remnants of divine wrath against Odysseus, and one which permits the poet to avoid creating the impression that his hero is a weak plaything of the gods. With the return of the dangers which necessitate divine protection comes a return to humanity and self-sufficiency, prerequisites for the exercise of Odyssean intellectual polytropy.

Odysseus’ landing on Phaeacia is unique for the Odyssey in several respects. First, a number of critics have noted that his arrival is analogous to a literal birth. It is surely not succumbing to Freudian or psychoanalytical fantasies to note that Odysseus, swelling (5.455), naked, and coated in brine, emerges from the water much as a baby emerges from its mother’s womb. Second, Odysseus’ landing differs from the majority of analogous scenes in the Apologue in that Odysseus makes no attempt to seek out inhabitants, and, so far as the audience is made aware, no signs of habitation present themselves on the shore of Scheria. Odysseus is completely alone in a wild landscape that offers immediate and real threats to his wellbeing, and the human aid which eventually materializes will be due to a willful act of divine intervention. These last lines of Book 5 are important to the development of Odysseus’ character. Since Odysseus extricated himself from Calypso, he has been bandied about almost ceaselessly among a string of gods and goddesses in the helpless anti-space of the sea. Now that he is on shore, he can begin to demonstrate his worthiness of Athena’s special favor by displaying the same resourcefulness of which he availed himself at Troy. To a great extent, actions resulting from the goddess’ intervention will be overdetermined: Nausicaa already has marriage on her mind, and could easily have decided to go to the mouth of the river to wash of her own accord, and the information which Athena offers Odysseus about the Phaeacians in their meeting in the grove does not prove decisive in any of their interactions. Rather, Athena’s help seems almost a mere echo on the divine level of Odysseus’ own earnest efforts on his behalf. Throughout most of Odysseus’ travel overland, it is Odysseus’ ingenuity which drives the goddess’ aid, and not the reverse.

Consistent with others’ interpretations of the stay with Calypso as a disguised katabasis to the Isles of the Blessed (for which, see discussion of Calypso above). For treatment of the theme of rebirth and bibliography, see Holtsmark 1966, Newton 1984, and Kardulias 2001, 23n1.
No mention is made of the precise time of day at which Odysseus washes up on shore, yet when Odysseus finally crawls to land battered and bruised, it is clearly nearing evening, for he has no sooner emerged among the reeds of the river than he mournfully considers whether to spend the night crouched there or to creep up into the underbrush above the shoreline. The shorescape is elaborated first through Odysseus’ miserable clamber to land, and then through his imagining of the (by no means improbable) unhealthy fates which may await him in the various excuses for shelter offered by the thus far nameless Scheria.

The possibilities for nightfall shelter spent on the river’s alluvial plain reveal how cold and miserable Odysseus is:

εἰ μὲν κ’ ἐν ποταμῷ δυσκηδέα νύκτα φυλάσσω, 
μὴ μ’ ἄμυδις στίβῃ τε κακή καὶ θῆλυς ἔέρσῃ 
ἐξ ολιγηπελίς δαμάσῃ κεκαφηότα θυμόν·
αὐρῇ δ’ ἐκ ποταμοῦ ψυχρῆ πνέει ἕωθ᾽ πρό.

5.466-69

For if I wait out the uncomfortable night by the river, 
I fear that the moist
dew and the evil frost together 
will be too much for my damaged strength, I am so exhausted, 
and in the morning a chilly wind will blow from the river.

The shelter afforded by the underbrush farther away from the shore is no better, and might actually prove more perilous should Odysseus fall asleep and wild animals take advantage of his helpless state to devour him:

εἰ δὲ κεν ἐς κλιτὸν ἀναβὰς καὶ δάσκιον ὕπνος
θάμνοις ἐν πυκινοῖσι καταδράθω, εἰ μεθὴ
ῥίγος καὶ κάματος, γλυκέρος δὲ μοι ὑπνὸς ἐπέλθῃ,
δεῖδω μὴ θῆρεσιν ἐλωρ καὶ κύρια γένωμαι.

5.470-74

But if I go up the slope and into the shadowy forest,
and lie down to sleep among the dense bushes, even if the chill

223 Cf. Hainsworth 1988 ad 5.467, whose note suggests a possible range of meanings including “nurturing”, “moist”, “soaking”, “chilly”.
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and weariness let me be, and a sweet sleep comes upon me,
I fear I may become spoil and prey to wild animals.
In the division of his heart so it seemed better to him.

Odysseus’ helplessness is consistent with the childlike manner of his coming aground.

Unlike a child, however, Odysseus begins almost immediately a near-Platonic process of diaeresis, dividing the landscape in two (riverbed versus woods) and assigning four lines of speculation to each, implying rational calculus.224 His position on land is better than it was at sea, where, at his wits’ end and gazing about him in an attempt to orient himself, he found only indiscriminate elements (5.299-312). While he momentarily feels himself at the end of his rope again (τί νῦ μοι μήκιστα γένηται, 5.465 ~ 5.299, “what in the long outcome will befall me?”), being on land provides the opportunity to discriminate and to plan, and it is significant that a verb of intellection prefaces two improvements in his condition as he moves away from the water and plants himself solidly on land. Odysseus is able to assert a new degree of control over his fate when he reaches the river mouth at 5.441-444, and he “recognizes” (ἔγνω) the presence of shelter, and prays to the god for admittance. Soon, Odysseus once again begins to discriminate (φρονέοντι) and at long last reaches a decision.

Reasoning wisely, Odysseus resolves to venture into the woods, and is rewarded by the discovery of a copse of olives to afford him shelter from the night. The description is noteworthy:

βῆ ρ’ ἵμεν εἰς ὕλην· τήν δὲ σχεδὸν ὕδατος εὗρεν
ἐν περιφαινομένῳ· δοιούς δ’ ἅρ’ ὑπῆλυθε θάμνοις
ἐξ ὁμὸθεν πεφυῶτας· ὁ μὲν φυλίης, ὁ δ’ ἐλαῖης,
τοὺς μὲν ἅρ’ οὐτ’ ἀνέμων διάη μένος ὕγρον ἄεντων,
οὔτε ποτ’ ἥλιος φαέθων ἀκτῖσιν ἔβαλλεν,
οὔτ’ ὄμβρος περάασκε διαμπερές· ὡς ἄρα πυκνοί
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And he went to go into the wood and found it close to the water in a conspicuous place, and went underneath two bushes that grew from the same place, one of shrub, and one of wild olive, and neither the force of the wet-blowing winds could penetrate these nor could the shining sun ever strike through with his rays, nor yet could the rain pass all the way through them, so close together were they grown, interlacing each other; and under these now Odysseus entered, and with his own hands heaped him a bed to sleep on, making it wide, since there was great store of fallen leaves there, enough for two men to take cover in or even three men in the winter season, even in the very worst kind of weather.

Seeing this, long-suffering great Odysseus was happy, and lay down in the middle, and heaped up a pile of leaves over him.

Odysseus’ fear of freezing in the river overrules his fear of wild animals. This choice is a logical development from events in the sea, where the purely elemental nature of the enemy prevented him from using his wits to fight back. Now he quite sanely realizes that, while there is nothing that he can do against frost and dew, he can take precautions in the woods to stave off wild creatures.

The nature of Odysseus’ accommodations and his reaction to them is highly significant. His shelter consists of two copses of trees, one of wild olive or fig, the other of cultivated olive. Odysseus’ fundamental humanity comes across in his attempts to use even the most

---

225 The Oxford commentary notes a range of possible meanings for φυλίη: it might be a fig or a wild olive. Vidal-Naquet 1996, 40 observes that the olive is the “one specifically human tree present in the world of the ‘stories’”. More generally, Bonnafé 1984, 156-157 reads the shelter of the olive as a strongly maternal image which contrasts with the chaos and fury of the storm: “L’hostilité de la mere, qu’Ulysse vient d’essuyer, cède la place à la bienveillance de la terre pour l’homme: de nourricière, elle se fait protectrice, mais reste maternelle…. Ulysse, chaudement couché sous le double abri des feuilles sèches et du buisson, trouve près de la terre une protection bienveillante qui lui redonne vie. Sa joie est celle de l’enfant retrouvant la douceur et l’abri du giron maternel.”
primitive of tools to provide for his comfort and shelter (ἄφαρ δ᾿ εὗρην ἐπαμήσατο χερσὶ
φύλησιν / εὑρεῖαν, “and with his own hands heaped him a bed to sleep on, / making it wide”,
and ἐν δ᾿ ἀρα μέσῃ λέκτο, χύσιν δ᾿ ἐπεχεύσατο φύλλων, “and lay down in the middle, and
heaped up a pile of leaves over him”). The description of his actual bedding recalls more the lair
of a beast than the home of a human, even if leaves are implied to be an acceptable resting spot
for men by the words, ὅσον τ᾿ ἡ δύω ἡ τρεῖς ἄνδρας ἔρυσθαι / ὥρη χειμερίη (“enough
for two men to take cover in or even three men / in the winter season”). A criterion for judging a
Homeric audience’s reaction to this bed of leaves may be found in Anticlea’s reaction to Laertes’
bed of leaves in Book 11: though there is some reason to believe that Anticlea exaggerates
Laertes’ fallen state,226 Anticlea asserts that Laertes lacks normal bedclothes and bedding,
sleeping on the dust by the fire (where slaves normally sleep) or on a bed of leaves in the winter
(11.188-196). For Anticlea this demeaning bedding is related to Laertes’ general grief for
Odysseus and his old age (11.195-196). Considered together with the other details of Odysseus’
condition given in Books 5-6 (the unsuitability of his garb becomes especially evident at 6.127-
148, when he must present himself to Nausicaa and her friends – note the wildness and danger
implied by the lion simile of these lines), the bed of leaves reveals Odysseus at the nadir of a
broad continuum of degrees of culture of which the Phaeacians seem to come near the apex.

Yet even under these circumstances the poet is sensitive to the attractions of the Archaic
Age version of the “noble savage” myth seen so clearly in Hesiod’s myth of the Golden Age.
Within the limited range of amenities which nature might provide, his is, if not the best, more
than ample for his present needs. The exorbitant terms in which the size and capacity of the pile
of leaves is extolled takes on a note of pathos if read as a brief intrusion of Odysseus’ point of
view into the poet’s narration: after the dripping, wet, briny violence of the storm, Odysseus is
grateful for the rudimentary comforts afforded by the abundant bed of leaves and the olive. He
has an additional, even better thing to be thankful for as well: he is once again the master of his
own fate.

226 See the discussion of Laertes’ gardens below.
I have earlier suggested that the juxtaposition of Elysium and Ogygia was intended to create the impression that the latter was the more desirable of the two places; on the other side of this equation, after the description of Odysseus’ spare accommodations on the shore of Scheria and balancing out Elysium by echoing it in landscape features and in rhetoric, is Homer’s description of Olympus. This “sandwich” construction, in which Odysseus’ bereft state is positioned snugly in the midst of a series of loca amoena, continues the theme of changing relations between human and divine: Ogygia and Olympus are both the native environs of goddesses (Calypso and Athena); on the other hand, Elysium was a borrowed house for the mortal-born Menelaus, the nepotistic side-benefit of an erotic attachment, just as Ogygia was for the mortal Odysseus. For Odysseus, whose rejection of Calypso indicates his wise preference to live as a mortal rather than as a dependent inferior among immortals, the pairing of his landing on Scheria with Athena’s flight back to her proper home suggests that the proper reciprocal relations between mortals and humans are slowly being resumed. Pursuant to the helpful but inconspicuous aid offered by Ino, Athena, and the River God during the storm, active but surreptitious divine assistance will emerge on Scheria as Odysseus returns to the status of an enterprising mortal human being worthy and capable of receiving the aid and tutelage of his patroness Athena.

This shift in the role of the gods in the action is reflected also in the safe conclusion of the escape subplot inaugurated by Athena in the divine councils (1.81-95; 5.7-17). Athena has now completed the short-term goal expressed in these passages of extricating Odysseus from Calypso, as evidenced by the fact that she returns to her natural home rather than bustling off on another errand. She views her short-term efforts relative to Odysseus’ homecoming as successful. In the meantime, at the beginning of Book 6, she initiates a new plotline which will create impetus on a level of human motivation for Odysseus’ homecoming by dispatching Nausicaa to the shore where she will meet the naked stranger. With Nausicaa safely sent on her

227 Lucian perhaps reached the same conclusion about the relative merits of both places: in the Verae Historiae, he has his Odysseus write Calypso an epistle from the Isles of the Blessed (of which Elysium is in Lucian’s formulation but one part) wishing to come back and live as an immortal with her on Ogygia.
merry way to the shore to take the goddess’ place as guide and supporter, Athena can ease her own hold on the reins.

Let us first look at the entire Olympus account:

ἡ μὲν ἄρ’ ὡς εἶποῦσ’ ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη
Οὐλυμπόνδ’, ὥθη φασὶ θεῶν ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
ἐμεναι: οὔτ’ ἀνέμοις τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ’ ὀμβρῳ
dεύται οὔτε χίων ἐπιπίλναται, ἄλλα μᾶλ’ αἴθρῃ
πέπταται ἀννέφελος, λευκῇ δ’ ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλῃ.
tῷ ἐνὶ τέρπονται μάκαρες θεοὶ ἡματα πάντα.
ἐνθ’ ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις, ἐπεὶ διεπέφραδε κούρῃ.

6.41-47

So the gray-eyed Athena spoke and went away from her to Olympus, where, they say, is the firm and unmoving abode of the gods, and it is not shaken by winds nor spattered with rains, nor does snow pile there ever, but shining bright air stretches out cloudless, and the white light glances upon it. And there, and all their days, the blessed gods take their pleasure. There the Gray-eyed One went, when she had talked to the young girl.

Olympus is a highly idealized landscape. Structural and grammatical features of the description contribute to characterization of Olympus as orderly. Garvie observes the artful use of enjambment, balanced clauses (“three negative οὔτε clauses… followed by two positive clauses”) and chiastic word order (“the two positive clauses are arranged chiastically: noun-verb-epithet, epithet-verb-noun”). The formal similarities between Elysium and the Olympus

228 For the unusual degree of idealization seen in this passage, see Stanford ad 6.42 ff.
229 Garvie 1994 ad 43-45. See also Elliger 1975, 113-114: “Die ganze Versgruppe, ein Musterbeispiel archaischer Ringkomposition, is in sich klar gegliedert. An Anfang und Ende steht die Göttin als Trägerin der Handlung, die Mitte nimmt die Beschreibung des Olymp ein, wobei als Bindeglied jeweils die Götter fungieren: der Olymp als θεῶν ἔδος (42), dann τῷ ἐν τῷ ἔνι τέρπονται μάκαρες θεοί (46), dazu die inhaltliche Entsprechung ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ und ἡματα πάντα (jeweils Veresschluß). Das Schema ist mit fast mathematischer Genauigkeit eingehalten: a (1 V.) – b (1 V.) – c (3 V.) – b (1 V.) – a (1 V.), aber trotz dieser Geschlossenheit fallen die Verse nicht als selbständiges Gebilde aus dem Zusammenhang heraus. Die Beschreibung selbst erfolgt in zwei Teilen, wobei, ähnlich etwa der platonischen Definition der Urschönen (Symp. 211a), den positiven Aussagen die Abgrenzung von dem Nichtzutreffenden vorausgeht. In den Olympversen folgen auf drei negative Glieder zwei positive. Trotzdem ist das Gleichgewicht genau gewahrt, weil in der Dreiergruppe die Substantive ohne Beiwort, in der Zweiergruppe
description of Book 6 are well-rehearsed by all commentators.\textsuperscript{230} Olympus is made even more perfect than it is usually portrayed as being snowless (it often enjoys the company of the epithet \textit{υφόεις} elsewhere in Homer),\textsuperscript{231} making the parallel with Elysium more obvious.\textsuperscript{232} If we are drawn by Olympus’ snowlessness to reflect on the \textit{Iliad} passages in which it is described as snowy, we will note that all three instances of the association of Olympus with snow in the \textit{Iliad}

dagegen mit Beiwort stehen, so daß sich in der ersten Gruppe drei zweiliedrige Kola, in der zweiten zwei dreigliedrige ergeben.”

\textsuperscript{230} The shared absence of adverse weather conditions stands out as a marked feature shared only by Elysium and the Olympus of Book 6 in the \textit{Odyssey}. Garvie 1994, 92-94 gives an excellent synopsis of the parallels: “The ‘romantic’ tone of the passage is scarcely paralleled in H., unless in the account of Hera’s seduction of Zeus in \textit{Il.} 14 (esp. 346-51), and in the description of the Elysian Plain at 4.565-8. It has some affinities with Hesiods picture of the Golden Age (\textit{Op.} 112-119) and of the fate of the Heroes in the Isles of the Blessed (\textit{Op.} 170-3); cf. also Pind. \textit{Ol.} 2.61-7.” For the question of the authenticity of these lines, see Hainsworth 1988 ad 42-47, as well as Garvie (\textit{loc. cit.}).

\textsuperscript{231} Cf. \textit{Iliad} 1.420: εἶμι αὐτῆ πρὸς Όλυμπον ἀγάννιφον (“I will go to snowy Olympus”). See also \textit{Iliad} 18.184-186:

``
Ἡρὴ μὲ προέγκε Δίος κυδρὴ παράκοιτις
οὐδ’ ὦδε Κρονίδης ὑψίζυγος οὐδὲ τις ἄλλος
ἀθανάτων, οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἀγάννιφον ἀμφινέμονται.
``

Hera sent me, the honored wife of Zeus; but the son of Cronus, who sits on high, does not know this, nor any other immortal, of all those who dwell about snowy Olympus.

and \textit{Iliad} 18.616-617:

``
ἡ δ’ ἱρῆς ὦς ἄλτο κατ’ Οὐλύμπου νιφόεντος
τεῦχεα μαρμάροντα παρ’ Ἡφαίστοιο φέρουσα.
``

And she like a hawk came sweeping down snowy Olympus carrying with her the shining armour, the gift of Hephaestus.

\textsuperscript{232} Cf. Elliger 1975, 115: “Und so hat man denn immer wieder die Darstellung des ‘zum Verwechseln ähnlichen’ Elysium δ565ff zum Vergleich herangezogen und bisweilen sogar zur Quelle der Olympverse erklärt. Bei allen Gemeinsamkeiten sollte man jedoch die Unterschiede beider Stellen nicht übersehen.” These differences include the fact that Elysium is inserted at the end of Proteus’ prophecy, lacks the ring composition of the Olympus description, and is generally more bland in use of epithets and verbs. From this, Elliger concludes (1975, 116): “Das Elysium ist in Beziehung auf den Menschen geschildert, der Olymp in seinem objektiven Sein.”
involve communication between Achilles (himself a Thessalian, and hence presumably somewhat familiar with the real, earthly Olympus) and divine intermediaries (Thetis in two instances, Iris in one – note as well that the Book 18 references bracket the forging of Achilles’ arms). Unlike Odysseus, Achilles has access to divine venues because of his relation by blood with Thetis – as Menelaus, future inhabitant of a similarly snowless Elysium, has admittance to that place because of a relation by marriage. Odysseus, who must repeatedly prove himself worthy of the goddess’ aid (cf. 13.330-332), cannot similarly take her assistance for granted. His relationship with Athena is of an entirely different character than that of Menelaus and Achilles with their divine patrons.

The atypical snowlessness of Olympus in *Odyssey* 6 contrasts the ease of Athena’s home with Odysseus’ need to seek shelter from precipitation at the end of the previous book. De Jong (2001, ad 41-47) succinctly states the situation as follows:

The passage serves to stress the difference between the gods, living their lives of pleasure in an ideal climate, and the mortal Odysseus, who has just struggled with the elements for two days, now lies exhausted, and will soon face new exertions.

De Jong (2001 ad 41-7) also comments on the peculiar use of the qualification φασί, “they say” to distance the entire account from the poet’s authority (it is “hearsay”). A departure from the usual pretense of access to divine knowledge through the channel of the Muses, this rhetorical stance introduces a further layer of distance between even a divinely inspired poet and the gods, draping an extra veil of mystery and majesty about their abode.

Such contrasts naturally provoke questions of what gods and mortals have in common and what they do not. Here, Homer expatiates on this issue by creating a number of intersections between the natural imagery of Olympus and the natural imagery of the olive under which Odysseus spends his first night on Scheria.233 Both the woods and Olympus are characterized by

---

233 Hainsworth 1988, 289 argues that the fact that Odysseus “apprehends yet another addition to his woes” on the shore of Scheria (rather than a surcease of sorrows), “taken together with the abrupt introduction of the world of fantasy when Odysseus passed from Cape Malea to the land of the Lotus-Eaters…, should prevent too ready an assumption that the Phaeacians are intended to be some sort of literary bridge between the world of folktale and the real world of Ithaca.” Neither of these arguments seems the final word: woes and toil are part of the human lot, and the
(1) an absence of wind, (2) a particular quality of light, (3) an absence of precipitation, (4) the presence of at least one word denoting perpetual or habitual action. On Scheria these are manifested as follows:

τοὺς μὲν ἀρ᾽ οὔτ᾽ ἀνέμων διὰ μένος ύγρὸν ἀέντων,
οὔτε ποτ᾽ ἥλιος φαέθων ἀκτίσιν ἐβαλλεν,
οὔτε ὄμβρος περάσσει διαμπερές.

5.478-480

and neither the force of the wet-blowing winds could penetrate these nor could the shining sun ever strike through with his rays, nor yet could the rain pass all the way through them.

On Olympus, the same qualities are expressed thus:

(Olympus) ὅθι φασὶ θεῶν ἑδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ ἐμμεναι·
οὔτ᾽ ἀνέμοισιν τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ᾽ ὄμβρῳ
δευται οὔτε χιών ἐπιπίλναται, ἀλλὰ μάλ᾽ αἴθρῃ
πέπταται ἀνέφελος, λευκὴ δ᾽ ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλῃ.
τῷ δ᾽ ἐνι τέρπονται μάκαρες θεοὶ ηματα πάντα.

6.42-46

Olympus, where, they say, is the firm and unmoving abode of the gods, and it is not shaken by winds nor spattered with rains, nor does snow pile there ever, but shining bright air stretches out cloudless, and the white light glances upon it. And there, and all their days, the blessed gods take their pleasure.

Olympus and Scheria in their catalogue of elements and in the poet’s relative evaluation of these elements’ subjective qualities are in some respects closer than Olympus and Elysium, where the apprehension of “yet another addition to his woes” could equally be regarded (though not without a certain irony) as a positive sign that Odysseus has begun this transition. Likewise, the rapidity of Odysseus’ initial transition to the world of the unreal need not indicate that Odysseus’ return must be equally abrupt.

234 Cf. the discussion of Elysium earlier in this chapter.
wind was a *positive* attribute. Nevertheless, Homer’s wording carefully differentiates Olympus and the olive on the shore of Scheria by the criteria of duration and extent of their respective benefits. The Olympus passage begins and ends with references to perpetual happiness and security, whereas the syntax of δισμπερές in the account of the olive is more ambiguous (it might go closely with the negative – rain does not constantly [i.e., sometimes] get through, or govern the whole clause – consistently rain does not [i.e., ever] get through. For Odysseus in his exposed condition, the rays of the sun represent a hostile force; for Athena, there is a natural glow to Olympus which does not even seem to emanate from the sun.

The meaning of rain in these passages is especially telling: rain does in fact fall on Scheria, but the trees provide Odysseus with shelter from its drops, whereas there simply is not precipitation of any sort on Olympus (as in Elysium). In other contexts, rain is associated with the lot of mortals who require agriculture for their livelihood: the presence of ample rain is one of the positive inducements of the Ithaca of days gone by which Odysseus recounts for Penelope in Book 19.107ff. Athena herself later includes the attribute of perpetual rain (ὀμβρος) in what is apparently intended a catalog of the good qualities of Ithaca (13.245; 243 marks the turning point from conceded shortcomings of Ithaca to qualities which render the island attractive). To escape the need for rain is to escape mortality, as Menelaus stands a chance of doing according to Proteus’ prophecy in Book 4 (recall that Elysium, like Olympus, is characterized by a lack of rain). Both the possibility of rain on Scheria and Odysseus’ ability to contrive shelter against it are therefore positive signs that he is moving back closer to mortal and real realms, and away from the sterile immutability of Ogygia. It is only in this middle ground that Odysseus can exercise his free will and ingenuity to shift for himself: Olympus and the double olive share many similarities, but the positive attributes of the double olive are at Odysseus’ disposal because of the careful decision making process delineated above, not automatically, as Olympus is automatically accessible to the goddess as her birthright.

The shift from the inscrutable and unreal to something closer to the human and the familiar is also indicated in the transference of Odysseus from Athena’s protection to the divinely inspired Nausicaa’s protection. The description of Olympus at the beginning of Book 6

---

235 See Garvie 1994 ad 43-45: “At 4.566-8 the Elysian Plain is free from snow, storm, and rain, but its inhabitants are *refreshed* by west winds” (unlike Olympus, where the winds too represent an intrusive negative force).
thus serves a second purpose beyond setting Odysseus in a landscape which embodies him as a character: it defines the relationship between Nausicaa and Athena. Critics have long been aware that Nausicaa and Athena play parallel roles.\(^{236}\) Nausicaa is the first to greet Odysseus when he arrives on Scheria, Athena (disguised as a shepherd), the first to meet Odysseus on Ithaca. Odysseus is asleep onshore after an unusual journey in both cases. The parallels are not merely formal, but lexical. Odysseus employs the same words to lament his destitute state in both Books 6 and 13 immediately before meeting his new protectress:

```
Ὤ μοι ἐγώ, τέων αὑτε βροτῶν ἐς γαῖαν ικάνω;
ἡ ῥ’ οἴ γ’ ὑβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι σφίν
ἡ θεοδής φιλόξειοι, καὶ σφιν νός ἐστι θεουδής;

6.119-121 ~ 13.200-202
```

Ah me, what are the people whose land I have come to this time, and are they violent or savage, and without justice, or hospitable to strangers, with a godly mind?

The progression of landscapes presented by Homer in Books 6 and 7 – first the riverbank, then Olympus, then Athena’s glade and the gardens of Alcinous – allows the audience to perceive the bifurcation of the same basic narrative function across two personages as relatively natural. Nausicaa is an agent of Athena’s will, and by offering the audience a glimpse of Olympus just as Nausicaa is inspired to go to the shore where she will encounter Odysseus, Homer acknowledges

\(^{236}\) See e.g. Hainsworth 1988, 290-291, who observes that the same pattern is repeated twice in Book 13 [(1) Dream; (2) Awakening of the hero; (3) Supplication, welcome, and advice] and in the account of Odysseus in the presence of Eumaeus and the suitors [(4) Arrival at the palace/homestead, and description of the buildings; (5) Supplication and welcome; (6) The stranger’s tale; (7) The testing of the stranger; (8) Revelation of his identity]. As Hainsworth notes, Nausicaa also parallels Telemachus’ function in some ways. His remarks on the origins of the parallelism of narrative pattern in these three episodes are just (“It is unnecessary and probably misleading to suggest that either of these episodes is modelled on the other. Both are instances of the same sequence of themes, and both show the minor incongruities inevitable when a general concept is applied to a particular instance.”) Nevertheless, it seems the more naïve position to assume with Hainsworth that because these parallels originate from the repeated application of the same narrative pattern that variations in detail are without significance (“It is superfluous, or nearly so, that the Phaiakis should insist on the possibility of a hostile reception..., that Athena should meet Odysseus in the Phaeacian town..., that Odysseus should be concealed by mist..., or that there should be a ‘testing’ of Eumaeus.”)}
that she will step into the goddess’ shoes for the duration of Odysseus’ stay in Phaeacia in order to play a role most inappropriate for the virgin goddess to fill even in disguise: that of eligible young bride.

6.4 ATHENA’S SACRED GROVE (6.291-292, 321-331) AND THE GARDENS OF ALCINOUS (7.81-135)

Before embarking on a discussion of Odysseus’ approach to the palace of Alcinous, we should note the overt verbal cues which help the audience to situate themselves on Scheria. First, the genealogy of the Phaeacians delivered at the beginning of Book 6 defines them as in some respects intermediate between gods and men: before Nausithous led them away, they inhabited Hyperia, where they were the victims of raids by the more powerful Cyclopes; yet the land which they choose to settle is “far from men who eat bread” (ἐκὰς ἀνδρῶν ἀλφηστάων, 6.8). This adjective is used only thrice in the Odyssey, its first use being in Telemachus’ reply to Penelope’s rebuke of Phemius in Book 1:

οὐ νῦ τ’ ἄοιδοι
ἀῖτιοι, ἀλλὰ ποθὶ Ζεὺς αἴτιος, ὃς τε δίδωσιν ἀνδράσιν ἀλφηστήσιν ὑπὲρ ἑθέλησιν ἐκάστῳ.
1.347-349

It is not the singers who are to blame, it must be Zeus is to blame, who gives out to men who enterprisement eat bread, to each and all, the way he wills it.

238 Or, “who enterprise”. See below.
239 LSJ defines ἀλφηστής as “earners (ἀλφάνω), i.e., enterprising men… esp. of traders or seafarers.” Cf. related words ἀλφή (“produce, gain”), ἀλφάνω (“bring in, yield, fetch”). More recently, however, S. West (1988, ad 1.349), citing Chantraine’s Dictionnaire, derives from ἄλφι- and observes that Hesiod fr. 211.12-13 supports this derivation. In this case, the meaning would be “grain-eating men”, in contradistinction to “gods and savages”. It is conceivable that both interpretations were current at the time of the Odyssey.
240 Its other use is at 13.261, in Odysseus’ Cretan tale of the murder of Orsilochus.
Whether we understand the epithet to mean “bread eating” or “enterprising”, it imports the notion that humankind is distinguished by its employment in labor of either the agricultural or economic variety.

The fact that the Phaeacians live far from “men who labor/eat bread” suggests that they are somehow exempt from the more rigorous and demanding sort of impositions that Zeus makes upon most mortals, and this general impression is confirmed by small details such as the fact that Nausithous “wrought the ships of the gods” (6.10) and that Alcinous is described as “knowing his counsels from the gods” (θεῶν ἀπὸ μήδεα εἰδῶς, 6.12). Nevertheless, this impression is undercut by the poet’s assertion that they have fields, a city, houses, and ships (6.9-10) – all likely indicators of trade and agricultural labor. While inconsistent, the portrait of the Phaeacians arguably achieves the end of placing Odysseus in a place neither human nor divine, neither Greek nor foreign, but a transitional space, where he may reestablish himself as a mortal subordinate, rather than an artificially immortalized241 equal, to Athena before proceeding on to Ithaca.

Nausicaa’s speech of 6.255-315 offers an expansive panorama of Phaeacian society. We hear once more of their fields (259), in which it is permissible for Nausicaa to be seen with a stranger, and of their walled city, harbor, and agora, all singled out by Nausicaa as spaces in which she wishes to avoid the bad repute which might come of being seen with a stranger (262-277). In her view there is a strong division in rank and status between the people of the countryside, whose opinion Nausicaa does not seem to regard likely to filter back to the city, and the people of the city, whose censure she shuns. Indeed, she explicitly applies the denomination “Phaeacians” only to the inhabitants of the city, whom she characterizes as expert sailors (268-272), raising the possibility that Nausithous’ innovation of settling the Phaeacians ἐκάς ἀνδρῶν ἀλφηστάων and his “division of the fields” (ἐδάσσατ᾿ ἀρούρας, 6.10) represents a form of radical social engineering in which the specialized Phaeacian sailing class is “divided” (i.e., segregated) as much as possible from the agricultural class.242

241 I.e., by Calypso.
242 For seminal characteristics of city and country, see Edwards 1993, 36-40. For the foundation of the city of the Phaeacians as exemplifying a “binary opposition” between country and city, see
This segregation assists us in making sense of Nausicaa’s direction to Odysseus to deposit himself in the glade of Athena. Nausicaa’s earlier account of the Phaeacians’ land suggests two possible routes by which Odysseus might have approached the palace of Alcinous, a division that corresponds roughly to the that of the landscape into country and city. Odysseus might have approached as he did, by way of a circuitous route through the countryside, or he might have approached by a much more urban route, through the agora with its sanctuary of Poseidon (6.263-267). Edwards observes that shrines such as this are to the countryside what temples are to the urban space, a consideration which strengthens the parallelism between the two potential routes. Nausicaa’s description of Athena’s shrine distinguishes it as a space that stands in the same relation to the city of the Phaeacians (segregated country enclave outside an inhabited social space) as the gardens of Alcinous stand to his palace. The entire passage thus is a harbinger of Odysseus’ gradual approach to his palace on Ithaca, which likewise involves a long acclimatizing approach through the countryside and a stop at a rural shrine.

Nausicaa’s preface to her description of Athena’s glade stresses that it is essential to securing Alcinous’ aid in traveling to Ithaca:

εἰς τὸν ἀστέρα ἐπὶ τὴν ἐρήμον ἐπιφέρω σὺ δὲ γένοις ἐμεῖς ἑπότισθ′, εὐρύτατα
πολιτεία καὶ οὐσία τυχεῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἐμοῖο.
6.289-290

Then, stranger understand what I say, in order soon to win escort and a voyage home from my father.

Edwards 1993, 29-30: “These originative acts for the city of Scheria [i.e., Nausithous’] also possess a cosmogonic quality in the process of separation and designation and through the creation and construction which brings order out of chaos. In this context the line marked by the wall is decisive. Within its interior, space is filled with human artifacts, places of habitation, and by implication gods and men. But except for the boundary marks imposed there by the city there is no mention of the contents of the country, its inhabitant and their dwellings. The passage testifies not only to Homer’s sense of a fundamental distinction between country and city marked by the wall, but also to the authority of the city and its population over the rural district.”

Edwards 1993, 38: “Homer does not refer to temples outside the city walls, but rather to shrines or sacred places such as the cave of the nymphs with its stone looms and jars (Od. 13.103-112), the spring and the grove sacred to Athena where Odysseus pauses before continuing into the city of the Phaeacians (Od. 6.291-92), the grove of the nymphs containing the spring supplying the Ithacan πόλις with water (Od. 17.204-211), or the peak of Ida from which Hector sacrificed (Il. 22.170).”
Nausicaa then describes the shrine itself:

δήεις ἀγλαὸν ἀλσος Αθήνης ἄγχι κελεύθου
 αἰγείρων· ἐν δὲ κρήπη νάει, ἀμφὶ δὲ λειμῶν.
 ἔνθα δὲ πατρός ἐμοῦ τέμενος τεθαλυῖα τ’ ἀλωή,
 τόσσον ἀπὸ πτόλιος ὀσσου τε γέγωνε βοήσας·
 ἔνθα καθεξόμενος μεῖναι χρόνου, εἰς δὲ κεν ἠμείς
 ἁστυδε ἐλθωμεν καὶ ἰκώμεθα δώματα πατρός.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν ἠμείς ἔλθωμεν καὶ ἱκώμεθα δώματα
 αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν οῆμεν ἐς πόλιν ἡδ’ ἐρέεσθαι
 δώματα πατρός ἐμοῦ μεγαλήτορος Ἀλκινόοιο.

6.291-299

You will find a glorious grove of poplars belonging to Athena near the road, and a spring runs there, and there is a meadow about it, and there is my father’s estate and his flowering orchard, as far from the city as the shout of a man will carry. Sit down there and wait for time enough for the rest of us to reach the town and make our way to my father’s palace, then go to the city of the Phaeacians and inquire for the palace of my father, great-hearted Alcinous.

The seemingly simple description of the glade is rich in stock and conventional elements. The reminiscences of stock elements from Calypso’s grotto in the previous book are likely the most

---

244 See Garvie 1994 ad 291, 292, 293, and bibliography cited there. As Garvie notes, the temenos as secular precinct of the king finds precedent in the Shield of Achilles. See also Burkert 1985, 86 – “the land cut off and dedicated to the god or hero is known by the ancient term which really signifies any domain at all, temenos”; and Taplin 1980, 8, who plausibly views the temenos of Iliad 18.550 as analogous to the idealized Ithaca envisioned by Odysseus in his simile of 19.109-114. Further, see Hainsworth 1988 ad 293 for the word’s possible Sumerian and Akkadian origins. For the aloe, see Ure 1955 and Garvie ad loc., who observes that the epithet τεθαλυῖα indicates that here Homer has in mind “any cultivated ground, an orchard or garden or vineyard.” One should note that, to judge from Nausicaa’s description, this must be a different ἀλωή from that in the Gardens of Alcinous (as assumed by Ure 1955, 225) – it is expected that Odysseus will have to both enter the city and inquire after Alcinous’ palace after leaving the grove, whereas in Book 7 Odysseus actually observes the palace before we hear a description of the gardens proper, precluding any need for Odysseus to seek directions to the palace. Alcinous’ temenos is evidence of his ancestor Nausithous’ (or perhaps of his own) replication of the order of the town and the palace in the countryside, and vice versa. For stock
purposeful. There too, we found poplars, springs, and a meadow, but in the environs of Athena’s
grove, these elements are all manifestly cultivated.²⁴⁵

Containing trees, springs, and shelter from prying eyes, just like Calypso’s cave,
Athena’s grove nevertheless fills a very different function, more analogous to Odysseus’ double
olive from the end of Book 5. Both the olive and Athena’s grove provided shelter – the former
from elemental, the latter from political threats. Both these locales are thus essentially human
spaces of sanctuary and refuge at varying degrees of proximity to the political space of Alcinous’
palace and city – the olive being located on the most distant fringes of Alcinous’ kingdom, the
grove, at a midway point between the isolated shore and the city. Contrast the foliage of
Calypso’s cave, which is more decorative than functional, and whose shelter is less essential to
Odysseus’ survival, since the only possible threat from which Odysseus could possibly crave
shelter is Calypso herself, who seems to provide for his every need. There are poplars on Ogygia
(5.64), as in Athena’s grove, but in the latter locale the poplars serve Odysseus’ ends by
concealing him from prying eyes until the time has come to make his grand entrance. On
Ogygia, they were merely the home to birds. Similarly, four springs feed a meadow on Ogygia,
but their unfettered and self-directed wandering “hither and thither” (πλησίαι ἀλλήλων
tετραμμέναι ἀλλυδις ἄλλη, 5.71) and the meadows of parsley and violet which they feed
(ἀμφὶ δὲ λειμῶνες μαλακοὶ ἰδὲ σελίνου / θήλεον, 5.72-73) betray no signs of Calypso’s
guidance or cultivation. If they are influenced by her at all, it is through the invisible influence
of her divine fecundity – not through artificial walls, channels, and agriculture.

Athena’s grove is thus a second step on Odysseus’ journey from natural to political
space, and one with definite political consequences for his reception: it presents a neutral
alternative to being seen publicly with Nausicaa, which, by her own admission, would have been
a virtual declaration of candidacy for the Phaeacian princess’s hand (6.277). It permits Odysseus
to approach Alcinous without following to its logical conclusion the theme of foreign suitor with
which Book 6 began. The presentation of natural imagery reinforces the readers’ sense that the
grove is fundamentally different and fundamentally more human and more Greek than Calypso’s

²⁴⁵ See Elliger 1975, 137: “Eher könnte man von einer Verwandtschaft zwischen Ogygia und
Alkinoosgarten sprechen…, auch wenn es sich jetzt um eine Kulturlandschaft handelt.”
grotto: it is arranged in a *temenos* and subject to the ordering and cultivation of a king, and dedicated to an Olympian deity. Unlike Calypso’s island, this is a familiar space in which human labor and social institutions collaborate with divine benefaction to protect the land and render it fruitful.

At the end of Book 6, Odysseus settles down in Athena’s grove just as the sun sets. He utters a prayer to Athena that she hear him now as she did not before, and permit him to come among the Phaeacians as a friend and an object of pity:

> κλῦθι μεν, αἰγιόχοιο Διός τέκος, Ἀτρυτώνῃ·
> νῦν δή πέρ μεν ἄκουσον, ἔπει πάρος οὐ ποτὲ ἄκουσας
> ῥαιομένου. ὃτε μ’ ἔρραιε κλυτὸς ἑπνοοῖγαίος,
> δός μ’ ἐσ Φαίηκας φίλου ἐλθεῖν ἡδ’ ἔλεεινόν.
> 6.324-327

Hear me, Atrytone child of aegis bearing Zeus,
and listen to me now, since before you did not listen
to my stricken voice as the famous shaker of the earth battered me.
Grant that I come, as one loved and pitied, among the Phaeacians.

For the more usual reminders of past instances of offerings by the suppliant to the goddess or of the goddess’ past favors,²⁴⁶ he here substitutes a variant in which Athena’s aid is predicated not on his past offerings to the goddess but her *failure* to respond to prior prayers. This is soon plausibly explained by the poet’s third-person reminder that Athena had not yet appeared face to face with Odysseus out of respect for her uncle, who raged against Odysseus (6.329-331).

The unusual nature of Odysseus’ prayer, combined with the reminder that Athena has made no epiphanies to Odysseus since the Trojan War, makes her disguised appearance at the beginning of Book 7 a more emphatic sign that, parallel with his progression from shore to city, Odysseus is acquiring Athena’s more active protection. She disguises the hero in a mist and gives him a guided tour of the Phaeacians’ city before depositing him at the palace of Alcinous, herself taking wing and flying away to Athens. This choice of destinations is likely not adventitious: the goddess of civilization par excellence has just placed Odysseus’ footsteps

²⁴⁶ See e.g., Burkert 1985, 74: “…earlier proofs of friendship are invoked by way of precedent: if ever the god has come to the aid of the suppliant, or if the suppliant has performed works pleasing to the god, has burned sacrifices and built temples, then this should now hold good.”
firmly on the path to a city that represents human society in its most idealized form. By departing for the home of a known hero, it itself located on the acropolis of a “real” city whose reputation would have been known to the audience, Athena reinforces the message that she cohabitates with the rulers of such cities, creating a context for all the instances of divine favor which will appear in Alcinous’ palace. In addition to offering Odysseus useful advice on how to approach Alcinous and Arete, Athena’s guided tour has safely brought Odysseus through the harbor and the political spaces of Alcinous’ city, which Nausicaa had associated with Poseidon’s protection, and back to another garden, a space strongly resembling the grove in which she found Odysseus. Just as the grove was an ordered enclave of pristine nature just outside the political space of the city, so Alcinous’ gardens are a separate but connected natural space just outside the political space of his palace.

Thus equipped with a better first-hand understanding of the workings of the society of the Phaeacians, Odysseus finds himself at the gates of the palace, near Alcinous’ gardens. Unlike Athena’s grove outside the city, which carries a faintly subversive stigma due to its association with Nausicaa’s well-intentioned attempts at pulling the wool over her parents’ eyes and Athena’s virtually giving Odysseus the key to the Phaeacian city through their secret spying mission, this space, juxtaposed in a narrative diptych with the palace, exhibits nature, craft, and divine benevolence all made completely subservient to the needs of the king. Here within the city, gods, nature, and human techne collaborate to make possible an idealized existence of ease and eternal feasting. Because its details closely resemble those of Laertes’ gardens in Book 24, we shall defer treatment of some aspects of Alcinous’ Gardens until Chapter 9. For the present, however, we shall content ourselves with demonstrating how the Gardens of Alcinous complete Odysseus’ journey from object of divine wrath to a rehabilitated protégé of Athena.

---

247 See Hainsworth 1988 ad 81: these “words are odd, since we should expect Athena, having withdrawn to her favourite city, to take pleasure… in the apparatus of cult…, and seem to express an old idea that gods dwelt in the palaces of kings.” See also Burkert 1985, 49-50.
248 Nausicaa had associated Poseidon’s sanctuary with the agora in 6.266 (Garvie 1994 ad 6.266 translates “place of assembly”), and Odysseus and Athena apparently observe several of the assemblies in action (Garvie ad 43-45 notes the oddness of the expression αὐτῶν θ’ ἡρώων, which becomes slightly less unusual when we reflect that Nausicaa has already anticipated this scene by describing the place, and Odysseus is now viewing an area previously alluded to, together with “the heroes – i.e., assembly-goers – themselves.”)
249 Cf. the more sinister instance at 4.244-264.
shall suggest that by appearing to her favorite and then leaving him once again to his own devices, Athena demonstrates her trust in Odysseus, allowing him to brave the test of a new variety of temptation to tarry in foreign lands – marriage to Nausicaa, and life in an idealized human kingdom, where Odysseus would enjoy greater autonomy than he would have with Calypso. Odysseus’ decision not to enter Alcinous’ gardens constitutes a silent rejection of this more moderate life of ease and freedom from toil, demonstrating a degree of sobriety and mature caution which outshines his less successful exercise of these virtues in the Apologue. At the same time, as we shall see in Chapter 9, his glimpse of the gardens inspires him with memories of his own ancestral plot at home, and adds further impetus to his yearning to depart for Ithaca.

The palace itself contains many elements which indicate that the Phaeacians occupy an idealized human space, particularly with regards to the definitive criterion of kleos: its splendor is compared to the sun and the moon, making it a clear counterpart to Menelaus’ palace in Book 4, where this observation is placed in the mouth of Telemachus. The Phaeacian palace, like that of Menelaus, provides more grand accommodations than any Ithacan can boast. Despite the similarity between Menelaus’ and Alcinous’ palaces, however, Homer still varies the wording of the description of the “glow” of the latter in ways which hint that he views Phaeacian architecture as slightly more akin to the divine: whereas Telemachus marveled at the “flashing of bronze” (χαλκοῦ... στεροπή) in Menelaus’ palace, Homer uses the same word which he has used earlier in the Scheria episode to characterize the quality of light on Olympus: αἴγλη. Whereas στεροπή connotes the violent flashing of lightning, αἴγλη likely imports more serene and celestial connotations for Alcinous’ palace, if its previous usage in any indication. Though terrestrial, it has some celestial attributes.

Counterbalancing the reminiscences of the mortal Menelaus on the more fanciful side is the consideration that the walls of Alcinous’ palace are of bronze (7.85); the more patently

250 Odyssey 7.84-85: ὡς τε γὰρ ἥλιον αἴγλη πέλεν ἢ σελήνης / δῶμα καθ ὑπερεφές μεγαλῆτορος Ἀλκινόοιο ("for as from the sun the light goes or from the moon, such was / the glory on the high-roofed house of great-hearted Alcinous.") ~ Odyssey 4.71-73: Φράζεο, Νεστορίδη, τῷ ἐμῷ κεχαρισμένε δυθών, / χαλκοῦ τε στεροπήν καθ δώματα ηχήεα, / χρυσοῦ τ᾿ ἥλεκτρον τε καὶ ἀργύρου ἢβ᾿ ἔλεφαντος ("Son of Nestor, you who delight my heart, only look at / the gleaming of the bronze all through these echoing mansions, / and the gleaming of gold and amber, of silver and of ivory.").

251 The first definition listed by LSJ, s.v., appropriate to a palace which Telemachus is comparing to the home of Zeus.
fantastic Aeolus also has a palace with an unbreakable bronze wall (10.3-4). From here, the account becomes increasingly lavish. Lines 7.87-94 contain an artfully arranged description of the entranceway, which begins with an expansion of the theme of the brightness of the palace (note the chiastic repetition of the words “gold” and “silver” throughout lines 88-90, terminating in the dogs which are both gold and silver in line 91), and concludes by adding the detail that Hephaestus wrought these golden guardians:

χρυσείαι δὲ θύραι ποικιλόν δόμον ἐντός ἔργον.
ἀργύρεοι οἱ σταθμοὶ δὲ ἐν χαλκῷ ἔστασαν οὐδέ.
ἀργύρεον δὲ ἐφ᾿ ὑπερθύριον, χρυσέη δὲ κορώνη.
χρυσείοι δὲ ἐκάτερβα καὶ ἄργυρεοι κύνες ἦσαν,
οὕς Ἡφαίστος τεῦξεν ἰδιῷ πραπίδεσσι
δῶμα φυλασσέμεναι μεγαλήτορος Ἀλκινόοιο,
ἀθανάτους δοῦσα καὶ ἀγήρως ἡματα πάντα.
7.88-94

And golden were the doors that guarded the close of the palace,
and silver were the pillars set in the brazen threshold,
and there was a silver lintel above, and a golden handle,
and dogs made out of gold and silver were on each side of it,
which Hephaestus with his crafty mind fashioned,
to watch over the palace of great-hearted Alcinous,
being themselves immortal, and all their days they are ageless.

This last addition gives the audience an indication of the Phaeacians’ close proximity to the gods. The phrase “immortal and ageless” is especially noteworthy, as it is applied not to the Phaeacians themselves, but to the lifelike craftsmanship of Hephaestus. In the Iliad, the pairing of these epithets appears several times in a variety of wish examined by Combellack 1981, but its most noteworthy application is to two objects which belong to the world of the gods, but

252 Hainsworth (1988 ad 83, 86) notes commonalities between the metallic architectural elements of Alcinous’ palace and the threshold of Tartarus; he follows Wace in suggesting that such mentions of “metallic walls reflect the Mycenaean use of bronze plaques to ornament, for example, the walls of the grander tholos tombs.”

253 On this expression, see Clay 1981-1982; more generally, see Finkelberg 1994 for a treatment of Odysseus’ relation to the traditional category of “hero”.
marginaly: the horses of Achilles (17.444) and Athena’s aegis (2.447). The same words appear in coordination five times in the *Odyssey*, and in all instances except the present they refer to Calypso’s offer to make Odysseus immortal. This formula’s occurrence here, of a work crafted by Hephaestus, in light of this tendency to associate the words with Odysseus’ declined chance of immortality, constitutes a further hint that Scheria is a midway point between the normal and the fantastic. The Phaeacians, are thus not, as Odysseus was, in danger of surrendering their autonomy to a goddess in order to become “immortal and ageless”, but instead justly and authoritatively employ “immortal and ageless” gifts of the gods in controlling and adorning their demesnes. As with the details of the architecture, so, too, with the division of labor in the palace: while some of the work has been done by the immortal Hephaestus, Alcinous still has fifty servants to perform his weaving and the grinding of his meal (7.103-106), a clear contrast from Calypso, who did her own weaving (5.61-62), and the nymphs of the harbor of Phorcys, who weave for themselves on stone looms (13.106-107). The Phaeacians are closer to mortals inasmuch as they have servants who perform their tasks in a relatively mundane fashion, but the presence of divine artifacts reminds us that they also have less human handiworks.

By the time we reach the description of Alcinous’ gardens at line 112, we are thus keenly aware of the antithesis of human craftsmanship and divine munificence. Since Homer has taken pains to blur this line in the description of the palace, it seems logical to read the description of the gardens themselves as a continuation of the same theme of the balance between human initiative and divine aid. Elliger, for example, who treats the gardens under the heading, *Märchenlandschaften*, and observes a number of formal parallels with the Calypso’s grotto, differentiates the two locales as follows:

---

254 In the Book 17 passage, Zeus raises the issue of the horses’ immortality, expressing regret that he entrusted them to a mortal. Their intermediate status is thus clearly an issue. The aegis is something of a mystery (see recently R. L. Fowler 1988 and Calvert Watkins 2000), but the oft-advanced etymology relating it to a goatskin would indicate that it was acquired from an earthly goat by either Athena or Zeus, making it, like the horses of Achilles, an object which has crossed at least once the boundary between the mortal and the divine.

255 The other instances are *Odyssey* 5.136; 5.218; 7.257; 23.336. A *TLG* search reveals that the expression “to render [a mortal] immortal and ageless” is not uncommon in epic poetry (cf. Hesiod *Theogony* 949, *Fragment* 23a, lines 12 and 24).

256 Cf. 7.132.

For Elliger, then, Alcinous’ gardens differentiate themselves from the more idealized landscape of Calypso’s isle through their admission of the cycles of birth, death, and decay, even if the deteriorative forces are amply replenished by new growth. Victor Davis Hanson is also sensitive to the paradoxes of Homer’s description of Alcinous’ gardens:

Homer goes to great lengths to portray the wealth, prestige, and abundant resources at Alkinoös’ disposal. All are assets that Odysseus can draw on during his sojourn and relaxation. His farm, then, is part and parcel of a general image of serenity and affluence. It should appear on a more lavish scale than Laertes’ property. After all, the poet’s literary aims here are entirely different: Homer seeks now to emphasize the luxuriousness and bounty of Alkinoös’ land..., rather than, as in the case of Laertes, to remind us of the hard work and isolation involved in farming.258

Let us now turn to the description itself, first outlining its general structure and then addressing the impact of its variegated crops.

The passage reads:

ἔκτοσθεν δ’ αὐλῆς μέγας ὀρχατος ἀγχι θυράων τετράγυος· περὶ δ’ ἐρκος ἐληλαται ἀμφοτέρωθεν.

258 Hanson 1999, 444.
Ἐνθα δὲ δένδρα μακρὰ πεφύκασι τηλεθόωντα, δένδρα μακρὰ πεφύκασι τηλεθοώντα, ὑγραί δὲ τὰ μὲν φυέται, ἀλλὰ δὲ πέσσαι. ὑγραί δὲ τὰ μὲν φυέται, ἀλλὰ δὲ πέσσαι.

τάων οὐ ποτε καρπὸς ἀπόλλυται οὐδ᾽ ἀπολεῖτε τάων οὐ ποτε καρπὸς ἀπόλλυται οὐδ᾽ ἀπολεῖτε  
χείματος οὐδὲ θέρευς ἐπετήσιος ἐπετήσιος, ἀλλὰ μάλιστ᾽ αἰεί ἀλλὰ μάλιστ᾽ αἰεί

ἔνθα δέ οἱ πολύκαρπος ἀλῳὴ ἐρρίζωται, τῆς ἄλλος ἀλῳὴ ἐρρίζωται, τῆς ἄλλος ἀλῳὴ ἐρρίζωται,

κοσμηταὶ πρασιαὶ παρὰ νείατον ὀρχον παντοῖας χείματος οὐδὲ θέρευς ἐπετήσιος ἐπετήσιος, χείματος οὐδὲ θέρευς ἐπετήσιος

ὅτι ἔτερον μὲν θειόπεδον λευρῷ ἐνὶ χώρῳ τέρσεται ἡελίῳ, ἔτερας δ᾽ ἀρα τε τρυγόωσιν, ἔτερας δ᾽ ἀρα τε τρυγόωσιν.

ὄγχνη ἐπ᾽ ὀγχνῃ γηράσκει, μῆλον δʹ ἐπὶ μήλῳ, ὀγχνη ἐπ᾽ ὀγχνῃ γηράσκει, μῆλον δʹ ἐπὶ μήλῳ, ὀγχνη ἐπ᾽ ὀγχνῃ γηράσκει, μῆλον δʹ ἐπὶ μήλῳ,

δάφνης καὶ ῥοιαὶ καὶ μηλέαι ἀγλαόκαρποι συκέαι τε γλυκεραι καὶ ἐλαίαι τηλεθόωσαι. δάφνης καὶ ῥοιαὶ καὶ μηλέαι ἀγλαόκαρποι συκέαι τε γλυκεραι καὶ ἐλαίαι τηλεθόωσαι.

τάων οὐ ποτε καρπὸς ἀπόλλυται οὐδ᾽ ἀπολεῖτε τάων οὐ ποτε καρπὸς ἀπόλλυται οὐδ᾽ ἀπολεῖτε

νέας ἅπαντα σκίδναται, ἡ ἑτέρωθεν ὑπ᾽ αὐλῆς οὐδὸν ἢῆσι, ἅπαντα σκίδναται, ἡ ἑτέρωθεν ὑπ᾽ αὐλῆς οὐδὸν ἢῆσι

τοῖς ἄρα ἐν Ἀλκινόοιο θεῶν ἀγλαὶ δῶρα. τοῖς ἄρα ἐν Ἀλκινόοιο θεῶν ἀγλαὶ δῶρα.

On the outside of the courtyard and next the doors is his orchard, a great one, four land measures, with a fence driven all around it, and there is the place where his fruit trees are grown tall and flourishing, pear trees and pomegranate trees and apple trees with their shining fruit, and the sweet fig trees and the flourishing olive. Never is the fruit spoiled on these, never does it give out, neither in winter time nor summer, but always the West Wind blowing on the fruits brings some to ripeness while he starts others. Pear matures on pear in that place, apple upon apple, grape cluster on grape cluster, fig upon fig. There also he has a vineyard planted that gives abundant produce, some of it a warm area on level ground where the grapes are left to dry in the sun, but elsewhere they are gathering others and trampling out yet others, and in front of these are unripe grapes that have cast off their bloom while others are darkening. And there at the bottom strip of the field are growing orderly rows of greens, all kinds, and these are lush through the seasons; and there are two springs there; one scatters water through all the garden space, and one on the other side jets out under the courtyard door near the lofty house, whence townspeople draw off water. Such were the glorious gifts of the gods at the house of Alcinous. And there long-suffering great Odysseus stopped still and admired it. But when his mind was done with all admiration, lightly he stepped over the threshold and went on into the palace.
Homer begins by underscoring that the gardens are a self-contained entity, enclosed in a fence (ἕρκος), yet near to the doors of the palace (ἅγχι θυράων). The description then divides the gardens into two spaces based on produce: the fruit orchard (114-121), and the syntactically parallel (note ἐνθα… ἐνθα) account of the vineyard (122-126). Finally, introduced with another ἐνθα, there comes a brief mention of a garden of leafy greens (127-128), and, in conclusion, a fourth section (note the summative variatio of ἐν δέ for ἐνθα) noting the presence of two springs, one of which scatters its waters about the garden, the other of which feeds the palace with water for the use of citizens (129-131). A final sentence concludes the diptych of the palace and garden by one last time referring Alcinous’ prosperity to the benevolence of the gods (τοῖς ἀρ᾽ ἐν Ἀλκινόοιο θεῶν ἔσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα, “such were the glorious gifts at the house of Alcinous”) before describing Odysseus’ reaction to the gardens (133-135).

Each of these subdivisions invokes parallels with prior loca amoena to establish Alcinous’ garden as a place in which divine benefactions and the will of the king are in complete accord. Particularly noteworthy is the intermingling of natural and artificial imagery in the

259 See especially Elliger (discussed above) and Garvie 1994 ad 112-131, who emphasizes the garden as embodiment of “the transitional nature of Phaeacian society”: “On the one hand Alcinous’ useful garden, with its fruit-trees and vegetables, contrasts with that of Calypso, who as a nymph eats only ambrosia….., and whose alders, poplars, and cypresses are purely decorative…. On the other hand there is a contrast between the fantasy world of Scheria in which the trees bear never-failing fruit, summer and winter, and in which we hear little of human labour, and the ‘real’ world of Ithaca in which the garden requires hard work of Laertes (24.227, 244-7), his legs and hands covered to protect them from the brambles and thorns (228-30). Alcinous’ garden has no such disadvantages.” For the organization of space in the garden, see Edwards 1993, 46-48, who emphasizes the careful concealment of laborers through the uncharacteristic ellipsis of the subject of the verbs of lines 124 and 125. Edwards adds to Garvie’s observation that the gardens blend the real and the fantastic the further insight that they also blend city and country: “Alcinous’s garden exhibits the generic elements of gentle weather, unfailing fertility, an effortless livelihood, distant location…., and even the quality of divinity associated with Olympus and Elysium. Yet the description simultaneously emphasizes the fertility of the soil and the variety of crops, which invoke from their side the opposing model of the productive land, the site of labor. The enclosure of this hybrid of locus amoenus and farm within the circuit of the city’s walls as rus in urbe heightens the tension between the easy fertility of the one and the toil of cultivating the land associated with the other. We witness in Alcinous’s garden the city’s utopian dream of an ideal ἀγρός, constructed from the locus amoenus as a countryside purged of labor (and laborers), and as a consequence admissible within the space encircled by the city’s walls.” For the narrative point of view (focalization) see de Jong 2001 ad loc., who notes the frequent intrusion of omniscient narration (e.g., the awareness that the
description of the trees of the Gardens. The varieties of trees resonate with previous stops on Odysseus’ journey of this day. After spending the night under a half-cultivated, half-wild olive on the shore of Scheria, he moved on to a rural sanctuary just outside the city – a grove containing poplars, which appeared also in their wild native state as the homes of birds on Ogygia – and at last has arrived at an enclave embracing exclusively cultivated trees. Ironically, poplars do appear in the city of the Phaeacians, but in a simile describing the Athena-inspired artifice of spinning and weaving rather than in Alcinous’ gardens. Homer invokes poplars for imagery to describe the process of the servingwomen creating handicrafts (they turn their distaffs [moving] like the leaves of a tall poplar – οἷα τε φύλλα μακεδνῆς αἰγείροιο260), and their cloth (handiwork) seems to be softened with olive oil (the fruit of the olive tree seen in the Gardens) in some way.261 In Books 5-7, then, poplars have first been associated with apolitical divine spaces (Ogygia), then with divine spaces outside the city which nevertheless are part of a mortal king’s domain (Athena’s grove), and now through this simile are incorporated into the realm of ordered human habitation.

The attributes of the other trees in Alcinous’ gardens likewise contribute to the impression that they – and the entire palace complex – represent an intersection of artifice, nature, and divine blessing. They possess innate fertility (τηλεθοώντα, τηλεθόωσαι), but the end product of this fertility, the fruit, is perennial and superabundant (117-121). The adjective ἀγλαόκαρπος (“with shining fruit”), too, brings preternatural and ageless connotations to the fruits of Alcinous’ gardens – it appears elsewhere in the Odyssey only of the fruit that Tantalus strains to reach in the underworld.262 Rather than disposable and consumable fruit, these trees in their paradoxical longevity yield produce which are more like works of art than comestibles, and which evokes literary antecedents in the realm of the fantastic and supernatural.263

metallic dogs were wrought by Hephaestus) into a scene viewed primarily through the eyes of Odysseus.

260 See Garvie 1994 ad 106: “The constant movement of the women’s hands is compared to the leaves of a tall poplar.” As he notes, this seems better than the alternative, that the expression describes the way in which the women sit (close, like the leaves of a poplar).

261 See Garvie 1994 ad 107.


263 Everything in Alcinous’ palace conspires to subordinate artifice, nature, and divine fecundity to the needs of the inhabitants of the palace. Other examples: the lifelike dogs crafted for the palace by Hephaestus and the golden torchbearers were works of art so vivid that they
Paradoxically, Homer characterizes the maturation of fruit with the decidedly anthropomorphic verb, γηράσκει ("matures", "grows old"), with all its strong implications of human mortality. This fact, taken in conjunction with the remark that "pear grows old on pear, apple on apple", as Garvie observes, hints that the Phaeacians are "poised... between the real world in which mortals eat fruit... and the world of paradise in which the trees bear that fruit in constant succession all the year round". The conflation of nature and craft in the imagery attached to Alcinous’ palace highlights the supreme unity and harmony of this ideal society: the fertility of the land and the labor of the people unquestioningly make their respective contributions to the maintenance of the state. On Scheria the polis is unified to the point of becoming an irreducible organism – a level of social organization which can only remain an unattainable ideal in a society such as that on Ithaca, where competing families all labor to advance their own claims to influence and power in the assembly.

Of Odysseus’ prior adventures, the vineyard recalls most of all the single vine that twined round Calypso’s grotto, burgeoning with bunches of grapes. Whereas that was but one tame vine, however, here there is diversified labor by anonymous workers, with the activities of drying grapes, picking them, and treading them clearly distinguished. Calypso, as a goddess, fed on nectar rather than wine, a point made explicit by her offer of immortality to Odysseus: there is no reason to believe that she ever put this vine to the “civilized” purpose of producing wine. Though not as extraordinary as the orchards, the vineyard adds the important element of appropriated characteristics normally associated with nature. As Garvie reminds us (1994 ad 91-94), these dogs and the torchbearers are reminiscent of the more explicitly lifelike golden servants who attend Hephaestus at Iliad 18.417-421; likewise, the Iliad describes Hephaestus constructing the homes of the gods on Olympus “with cunning craft” (see Garvie ad 92: “in this respect Alcinous’ palace resembles the homes of the gods themselves”).

---

See 1994 ad 117-121.

5.68-69:

ἡ δ᾿ αὐτοῦ τετάνυστο περι σπείους γλαφυροῖο
ημερίς ἡβώωσα, τεθήλει δὲ σταφυλῆσαι.

And right about the hollow cavern extended a flourishing growth of vine that ripened with grape clusters.

When the two sit down to dinner, she feeds on nectar and ambrosia, while she has mortal food set before Odysseus (5.196-199). See Clay 1981-1982.
human labor to the mix of fertility and divine blessings. This labor continues the catalogue of
the palace’s more human attributes, a theme developed almost to the point of bathos in the
inclusion of a vegetable garden (7.127-128) as the final botanical element of Alcinous’ enclave.
Though not as plebeian as the leafy greens, the springs which follow likewise serve very
practical needs. Calypso’s springs wander hither and thither (πλησίαι ἀλλήλων τετραμμέναι ἀλλυδις ἀλλη, 5.71: they ran “each next to each, but turned to run in sundry directions”),
meandering out to a meadow of violet and parsley which gives the impression of having been
included largely for its aesthetic impact; at any rate, Homer’s assertion that even a god would be
amazed and delighted coming upon such a place follows immediately upon the mention of these
meadows. Alcinous’ springs give a rather schizophrenic impression, with one seemingly having
inherited a bit of the unfettered and wandering character of Calypso’s spring (note σκίδναται,
130); the other, however, is all business, serving to provide the citizens with water. After
impressing his audience with the highly idealized palace and orchards, Homer lessens slightly
the degree of supernaturalism of the gardens, revealing in the final lines of his description that it
does, in fact, serve practical needs such as leafy greens for the table and water for the
townspeople.

When he concludes by characterizing these things as “the glorious gifts of the gods at the
house of Alcinous”, then, and proceeds to indicate Odysseus’ admiration (ἐνθὰ στὰς θηεῖτο πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, “and there long-suffering great Odysseus stood still and admired
it”), the effect is very different from the formally very similar description of Hermes’ admiration
at Calypso’s gardens in Book 5 (5.73-77 ~ 7.133-135). Hermes’ admiration is for a landscape
ideally suited to the immortal who inhabits it; Odysseus’ amazement is at a landscape ideally
suited not just to the needs of a mortal king (albeit one of immortal lineage) but to the needs of a
well-ordered society. It is diversified,267 including both the ornamental and sweet fruit and the
more pragmatic water and green vegetables. Calypso’s isle, in contrast, mixed the ornamental
with the wild and the untamed (e.g., the birds of 5.65-67). Alcinous’ garden admits the need for
laborers,268 but leaves them anonymous and gives no indication that their toil is in any way a
hardship. As we shall see in Chapter 9, Laertes’ toil in his own gardens is given a great deal of

---

267 See Hanson’s comments above.
268 Calypso has them, as well: 5.199.
stress; and the passage under discussion concludes by attaching to Odysseus an epithet, πολύτλας (“long-suffering”), which invites the audience to contrast all the sufferings endured by Odysseus during the storm with the ease enjoyed by Alcinous.

Indeed, as Odysseus lingers for a moment on the threshold before quickly stepping over (7.133-135), the audience might reflect on the significance of labor in his trajectory since leaving Calypso. During this time he has declined a laborless immortality as consort of a minor goddess, after near-annihilation in a storm which prompted him to wish he had died laboring in the fighting of Troy, worked to scratch together a shelter for himself in Scheria’s woods, visited a goddess in a grove also associated with the king of the land, and at last reached the king’s palace, to all appearances the highest summit human enterprise can hope to attain with the favor of the gods and a well-disposed landscape. Odysseus’ bypassing of the Gardens themselves as he enters the palace suggests a Bodhisattva-like rejection of this particular idealized society in favor of returning home to Ithaca and rehabilitating his own; just as he rejected Calypso’s offer of immortality, so too he declines the possibility of a marital alliance with Nausicaa by first hiding in Athena’s grove and then choosing not to enter the Gardens which approximate an idealized version of his own father’s plot back on Ithaca.269 His reaction to the Gardens reveals both a desire to tarry a moment longer (στὰς θηεῖτο, “stopped still and admired”), and an ultimate resolution to tear himself away (καρπαλίμως υπὲρ οὐδὸν ἐβήσετο, “lightly / he stepped over the threshold”) and continue on to new labors and new adventures in the process of restoring order in his own home.

Odysseus in his journey from the world of the fantastic back to the mundane has traversed raw savage nature (the storm), nature with the potential to benefit mankind with cultivation (the olive), and positively benevolent and divinely blessed nature (the grove of Athena, the Gardens of Alcinous). During this time, his relationship with the gods also undergoes a crucial alteration when his one-time protectess Athena, goddess of guile and handicrafts, chooses to hearken to his prayer, even if only in a muted fashion due to her concern for the wrath of her uncle Poseidon (6.328-331). The importance attached to the description of Olympus at the start of Book 6, to Odysseus’ prayer to Athena at the end of Book 6 and to the goddess’ epiphany and her grove in Book 7 all underscore that an increasingly intimate and

269 See Chapter 9 below.
favourable relationship to the gods also attends Odysseus' progression from savagery to civilization. In fact, the more Odysseus labors and uses his wits to help himself, the more actively Athena assists him, as when she permits him to tour the city from the safe vantage point of a cloud. His journey replicates societal evolution from the primitive cave-dweller to the apex of human culture even as he seeks to accomplish his nostos, making the transition from self-sufficiency in the face of nature to a complex balance of industry and fecundity a sort of propaedeutic for reestablishing order and political harmony on Ithaca. Rather than functioning as a mysterious portal from the land of the fantastic to the realm of the usual, then, Scheria is transitional in a slightly different sense: it represents a positive model of what the toil implied in πολύτλας ("long-suffering") can accomplish; and, inasmuch as Odysseus almost ritually reenacts the progress of humankind from isolated savage to highly ordered polis as he traverses this progression of landscapes on Scheria, the sojourn in the land of the Phaeacians offers a paradigm for Odysseus' own efforts in Books 13-24 to rehabilitate an Ithacan society which has regressed back toward the pole of savagery.

---

270 In this instance, his memorable meeting with Nausicaa has demonstrated his wits and discretion: he has had the sense to take advantage of the opportunity which Athena has provided for him, and refrain from making inappropriate overtures to the young girl whom he has discovered on the shore. While this is not make explicit, this act of piety cannot have failed to dispose Athena at least a bit more to positively toward the hero when it comes time for her to decide whether to heed his prayer for help.
Chapter 7 will explore the landscape of the spaces that Odysseus describes to the Phaeacians in the Apologue. The majority of these spaces provide the setting for varied and dreadful catastrophes for Odysseus and his men. This is in one sense an exigency arising from the very nature of travel narrative: for these adventures to be hair-raising and engaging, and to account for Odysseus’ arrival alone and much-buffeted by the elements, Homer must include a variety of setbacks and disasters – otherwise, Odysseus’ pendant to Demodocus’ series of divine and heroic Trojan narratives would be an anticlimax, rather than the pinnacle of *kleos* which it must be to justify the existence of the *Odyssey*. By its very nature, then, the Apologue presents Odysseus and Homer both with a rhetorical dilemma: Odysseus must repeatedly plunge himself and his men into difficulties in the strange new worlds which he explores, but must do so in such a way that Odysseus’ Phaeacian audience and Homer’s audience both can comfortably place under the rubric, “actions worthy of *kleos*”.

Homer has been constructing such a rubric from the very beginning of the epic, dissipating potential blame that might be directed at Odysseus with a range of dodges: already in the proem Homer avers that Odysseus’ men perished “by their own wild recklessness” (1.7), and in the early adventures of the Apologue he takes special care to have Odysseus establish the inferior judgment of his men (e.g., among the Cicones, Odysseus relates, “they [his sailors] were greatly foolish and would not obey”, τοὶ δὲ μέγα νήπιοι οὐκ ἔπιθοντο, 9.45; likewise, among the Lotus Eaters, Odysseus’ men foolishly succumb to the addictive properties of the natives’ drugged food and it is Odysseus who must risk carrying them bodily back to the ship at 9.98-99). Especially through examples such as the latter, Homer constructs Odysseus as the enforcer of normative Greek standards of behavior and Odysseus’ men as morally wavering fools in need of constant supervision and correction. This pattern, though absolving Odysseus of guilt for his men’s loss, risks becoming rather formulaic, and, even worse, is difficult to impose on many of
the traditional patterns of travelers’ tales, in which the protagonist is tempted by pleasures labeled taboo in his homeland, is flattered by the attentions of superior beings, and proves his wit superior to that of prodigious and frightful monsters. Such tales lend themselves most naturally to scenarios in which the traveler himself as newcomer initiates contact with the natives. In other words, the hero must exhibit curiosity. Stanford observes:

Odysseus is alone among Homer’s heroes in displaying... intellectual curiosity strongly. There is an obvious reason for this. A spirit of inquiry would naturally get more stimulus from the unexplored territories of Odysseus’s fabulous wanderings than from the conventional environment of the Iliad. But it was hardly accidental that Odysseus should have had these special opportunities for acquiring fresh knowledge. To him that hath shall be given: adventures are for the adventurous.  

Yet this curiosity creates complications for Homer, who is authoring an epic which must hold its own in comparison to the cooperative and communal-minded spirit of the Iliad: surviving adversity oneself may be laudable, but what is fame-worthy about getting one’s men killed through curiosity and inattention?

Odysseus’ shortcomings in judgment in the Apologue are also mitigated by his portrayal in Books 5-8, where, his men already dead, he has been reduced to a situation familiar to the audience of the Iliad – a pawn in a vast divine chess game, who has unwittingly offended against a deity and is being forced by that deity’s partisans to pay a terrible price. Battered about by the elements and brought near to death, then behaving with impeccable and polished courtesy to Nausicaa, Odysseus has offered little grounds for censure up to the moment he begins to narrate his own past sufferings. It is in the Apologue that we may begin to feel hints of discomfort with his behavior, and where he thus becomes a richer character and gives evidence of having grown in prudence during his nearly ten years of travel. Stanford memorably identifies the twin motives of inquisitiveness and acquisitiveness as underlying Odysseus’ decision to explore Polyphemus’ cave, but senses that

there is a deeper difficulty to the incident. To anyone who has followed Odysseus’s career from the beginning of the *Iliad* up to his encounter with the Cyclops, Odysseus’s general lack of prudence and self-control in it must seem quite uncharacteristic of his usual conduct, especially his foolhardy boastfulness after his escape from the Cyclops’s clutches.\(^{272}\)

This aspect of the Cyclops episode leaves Stanford in a state of apparent *aporia*, capable only of speculating that Homer has here permitted inherited traditional material intrinsic to the “man versus monster” tale pattern to overpower “his own conception of Odysseus’s character more than elsewhere”,\(^{273}\) and of adding the valuable observation that Odysseus’ greater caution in the episode of the Sirens shows that he has learned from his past mistakes.

This chapter posits that a further factor should be considered in accounting for Odysseus’ mistakes of the Apologue: that of landscape. In particular, many of the landscapes that Odysseus and his men encounter at first present appearances similar enough to Ithaca that Odysseus might assume (falsely) that, like the Trojans in the *Iliad*, the inhabitants share the same social patterns, values, and gods as the Achaeans. Indeed, in his key failure of restraint in the

\(^{272}\) Stanford 1992, 76-77. Clay 1997, 112-132 argues that the Polyphemus episode “constitutes the most ‘Odyssean’ of all the adventures” (112), noting the absence of any presentiment of what lurks in wait in the cave, the absence of divine assistance – in general, the necessity for Odysseus to rely entirely on his wits. Clay also emphasizes the role of the Polyphemus adventure in quenching Odysseus’ curiosity and the contrast between culture (specifically, intelligence) and nature (with its propensity for force) which runs throughout the tale.

\(^{273}\) Stanford 1992, 77. His explanation is actually quite nuanced: “while in one way the victory over the Cyclops was Odysseus’s greatest Autolycan triumph – especially in the typically Autolycan equivocation of his No-man formula – it was also his greatest failure as the favourite of Athene. And, significantly, by provoking Poseidon’s enmity it was the main cause of his losing Athene’s personal protection for nine years.” Compare Heubeck 1989, 7-8, who similarly emphasizes the uniqueness of Odysseus’ lapse of judgement in the Cyclops episode: “all his other adventures are setbacks which delay his safe and happy return to his much desired home, obstacles set in the way of his goal by a cruel fate, heaven’s will, and divine wrath, inextricably combined with faults on his own part and on the part of his companions. For all their intrinsic fascination, the colourful variety and exotic character of these adventures cannot conceal the fact that in them is worked out the destiny of a man who must pass through the lowest depths of human existence, through unspeakable hazards and humiliations, through disappointment and despair, in order to become again, at last, what he once had been. A man capable of surmounting all these terrors and dangers must be made of quite different stuff from his adventurous ‘predecessors’; and so the poet has endowed him, above all, with patience and determination, with the power to endure stoically the very worst.”
Cyclops’ cave, Odysseus specifically states that he entered the cave, in Stanford's notable rendition, “to see whether its unknown inhabitants were ‘violent, savage and lawless, or else hospitable men with god-fearing mind’ – almost as if, in modern terms, he wanted to do some anthropological research.” If we take into account Odysseus’ interest in determining the economic base of the countryside among the Cicones (where he contrasts his own pragmatic willingness to sack the city [9.41-42] with the men’s unreflective and ruinous enthusiasm for plundering the wine, flocks, and cattle of the countryside surrounding the city at 9.45-46) and in the land of the Lotus Eaters (9.87-90), we find a pattern beginning to emerge which comes to a tragic head in the land of the Cyclopes: despite Odysseus’ caution in sending scouts to try to determine what sort of men inhabit the land, the values and even the physiology of the inhabitants fail to correspond to the broad clusters of values shared by Aegean peoples such as the Achaeans and Trojans. Odysseus repeatedly attempts to extrapolate economy from landscape, and from economy, culture, suggesting that his curiosity is less “anthropological” in the academic sense than practical. When this is taken into account, Odysseus’ choice in the Cyclopeia to lead the scouting expedition himself for the very first time seems almost to have been forced upon him by circumstance. Among the Lotus Eaters, his men proved unequal to the task of dealing with cultures which are Other; growing increasingly doubtful about the socio-ecological hermeneutic of landscape which he had tried to apply with only limited success in the prior two episodes, Odysseus becomes determined to venture forth himself this time to see what manner of men corresponds to the landscape of Polyphemus’ cave.

Although in the episode of the Cyclops Odysseus wants the excuse of dearth of food for his bad judgment, he and his men have been lost since the storm of 9.67-83, and the development of an adequate hermeneutic of landscapes is therefore a quite real concern. As a good leader, Odysseus knows that their supplies are likely only to decrease, and that the more information that can be gleaned from cursory observation of the lay of the land, the better their chances of survival. Ruth Scodel observes that in the Apologue, “the availability of game is absolutely crucial to the plot of the poem; through the three major episodes [the Cyclops, Circe, and

---

274 Stanford 1992, 76.
275 I.e., the hypothesis that the kind of culture present can be extrapolated from landscape features.
Thrinacia], the supply diminishes.\textsuperscript{276} This fact can help us to account for the evolution of Odysseus’ approach to reconnaissance throughout the Apologue. As Scodel and many others note, most of the episodes of the Apologue share certain commonalities (landing on shore, quest for food, etc.), often expressed in the exact repetition of themes or formulas from one to the next. These themes include the purposeful search on the part of the sailors for signs of agricultural cultivation, the observation of smoke as evidence of human habitation instead, and the sending of an expedition to explore the landscape further.

There is another factor which also influences Homer’s method of presenting the Apologue’s landscapes: nostos is Odysseus’ defining attribute, and Ithaca his goal. By scrolling through a cascade of enticing and repulsive potential attributes of culture and topography, Homer brings into clearer focus the manner in which the positive and negative attributes of home, Ithaca, have contributed to the formation of Odysseus’ character. By portraying himself as alternately succumbing to the allure of or rejecting the many and varied manifestations of societies which are “Other” in landscape and in mores, Odysseus cobbles together a personal and highly-partisan Bildungsgeschichte for the captive audience of the Phaeacians – a tale of the experiences which have made him who he is, and an apologia for the versatility and durability of this identity. In this manner the entire Apologue comes to serve as a priamel of sorts, exploring and discarding configurations of family, land, and food which differ in crucial respects from that which exists on Ithaca.

7.1 THE SWEETNESS OF ITHACA

Odysseus’ introduction of the Apologue with a nostalgic meditation on the sweetness of home provides a comparandum with which to contrast all the varied landscapes which he is about to describe. He constructs this contrast in terms that foreshadow the linkage between food and the landscape which will gradually develop across his narrative, twice summing up home (which for him must mean Ithaca) as “sweet”:

(1) τρηχεῖ·, ἀλλ᾽ ἀγαθὴ κουροτρόφος· οὐ τοι ἐγὼ γε ἢς γαίης δύναμαι γλυκερότερον ἄλλο ιδέοθαι.

9.27-28

a rugged place, but a good nurse of men; for my part I cannot look on any thing sweeter than one’s own land.

(2) ὡς οὐδὲν γλύκιον ἢς πατρίδος οὐδὲ τοκήων γίγνεται, εἰ περ καὶ τις ἀπόπροθι πίονα οἶκον γαίη ἐν ἄλλοδαπῇ ναίει ἀπάνευθε τοκήων.

9.34-36

So it is that nothing is more sweet in the end than one’s country and parents even when far away one lives in a fertile place, in alien country, far from one’s parents.

These affirmations of the “sweetness” of home bracket Odysseus’ reminiscence of Ogygia: the juxtaposition of Ithaca’s sweetness and Calypso’s more sultry charms helps shed light on the reasons for Odysseus’ preference for the former. The virtues in question are essentially the same in both iterations, and in fact form a chiasmus:

A Family (prospective: ἀγαθὴ κουροτρόφος)
B Land (ἡς γαίης)
B¹ Land (ἡς πατρίδος, a word for land with heavy familial connotations)
A¹ Family (retrospective: τοκήων)
C Both (πίονα οἶκον: the first a term normally associated with fertile land, while οἶκον summons up the entire household)
D Versus prospect of privation of both (B, A¹: γαίη ἐν ἄλλοδαπῇ, ἀπάνευθε τοκήων)

Though γλυκ- roots in the Odyssey often connote little more than “pleasant” (cf. the very common formula γλυκὺς ὑπνος), its use as a point of contrast to Ogygia is more meaningful. At 5.152, Homer uses the same adjective with irony to draw attention to Odysseus’ misery on Ogygia:

τὸν δ᾽ ἀρ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀκτῆς εὑρε καθῆμενον· οὐδὲ ποτ᾽ ὅσε
and she found him sitting on the seashore, and his eyes were never wiped dry of tears, and the sweet lifetime was draining out of him, as he wept for a way home, since the nymph was no longer pleasing.

Odysseus’ “sweet life” ebbs away as he grieves for his homecoming, lingering miserably on Ogygia’ shores.

The use of γλυκύς as a formulaic adjective here is highly ironic, inviting the listener to contrast the truly γλυκύς αἰών which Odysseus would enjoy if he could only effect his nostos with the merely formulaic γλυκύς αἰών which Calypso is slowly bleeding out of Odysseus with her futile attempts to make him happy and immortal. As noted in our discussion of Ogygia above, a profusion of smells characterizes Calypso’s island; in contrast to the ultimately unedifying titillation of the olfactory, Ithaca will offer up real gardens bearing real substantial fruit as a physical sign of recognition between Odysseus and father in Book 24. While the dalliance along the road brings arousal, in the Odyssey satiety ultimately lies in one’s homeland. Further, given the amatory connotations which γλυκύς acquires not too much later in Sappho, it may not be going too far to suggest that Homer is contrasting the limited and literal eroticism of Calypso with a richer and deeper fecundity which encompasses the former, but which also takes into account the family and land which sex serves to propagate and preserve.

Between B and B¹, Calypso offers the same blandishments with the same demand (that Odysseus be her husband) that she offered in the proem, the only difference between the two passages being a greater emphasis on place (ἦ μέν μ᾽ αὐτὸθ’ ἔρυκε) – an emphasis suited to Odysseus’ desire to contrast the Ogygia he rejects with the Ithaca he longs for:

277 See especially the γλυκύμαλον of Sappho’s epithalamion (fr. 104a; see commentary in Campbell 1982, 282); in associating the sweetness of the apple with eroticism – here especially, eroticism postponed for marriage (the apple-pickers have missed it because it is positioned so high on the branch) – the “sweet apple” connotes the kind of careful, deliberate harvesting appropriate to both horticulture and family planning. See also fr. 130, where Eros is a γλυκύπικρον ἀμάχανον ὀρπέτον, fr. 185, the isolated quotation, μελλιχόφωνοι, and discussion in Yopie Prins 1999, 23-24.
the queenly nymph Calypso detained him, bright among goddesses, in her hollow caverns, desiring that he should be her husband.

For in truth, Calypso, bright among goddesses, kept me with her in her hollow caverns, desiring that I should be her husband.

Odysseus’ description of Calypso in Book 9 interfaces with the nexus of familial vocabulary that appears in his praise of Ithaca. Calypso wants a husband (λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι, “desiring that I should be her husband”), an essentially selfish aim characterized in her case by indulgence in sensual pleasure. In contrast, Odysseus’ main interest in Book 9 is in family continuity and prosperity, an aim not only less selfish but more in keeping with the role of provider which Odysseus consistently arrogates to himself in the succession of hunting and foraging scenes which comprises much of the Apologue. His tendency to link this role to the physical soil of Ithaca and ultimately to conflate fertility and the household (πίονα οἶκον, “fertile home”) suggests that he sees long-term agricultural labor as the characteristic component of settled home life which guarantees the stability and continuity requisite for a seamless progression from generation to generation.

Other descriptions of Ithaca, most notably the gardens of Laertes, establish the link between long-term cultivation and sweetness. In fact, it is the inconvenient need for toil which

278 Cf. Calypso’s emphasis on the extent to which her physical endowments excel Penelope’s at 5.211-13:

οὐ μέν θην κείνης γε χερείων εὐχομαι εἶναι,
οὐ δέμας οὐδὲ φυήν, ἐπεὶ οὐ πῶς οὐδὲ ἔοικε
θυητᾶς ἀθανάτησι δέμας καὶ εἴδος ἐρίζειν.

I think that I can claim that I am not her inferior either in build or in stature, since it is not likely that mortal women can challenge the goddesses for build and beauty.
ultimately enables Laertes to recognize his son. The theme that fecundity comes to Ithaca only at the cost of great (indeed, slavish) labor on the part of its steward basileus resurfaces in Odysseus’ frank appraisal of Laertes’ disarray in Book 24:

Old sir, there is in you no lack of expertness in tending your orchard; everything is well cared for, and there is never a plant, neither fig tree nor yet grapevine nor olive nor pear tree nor leek be uncared for in your garden. But I will also tell you this; do not take it as cause for anger. You yourself are ill cared for; together with dismal old age, which is yours, you are squalid and wear foul clothing upon you. It is not for your laziness that your lord does not take care of you, nor is your stature and beauty, as I see it, such as ought to belong to a slave. You look like a man who is royal, and such a one as who, after he has bathed and eaten, should sleep on a soft bed; for such is the right of elders.

Odysseus contrasts the “good care” (εὖ τοι κομιδὴ ἔχει) evident in the garden with the lack thereof evident in Laertes’ own appearance (αὐτὸν σ’ οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κομιδὴ ἔχει, “you yourself are ill cared for”). His words suggest that he mistakes Laertes for a slave, but they also tellingly contrast the Mycenaean word for king (οὐ μὲν ἀεργίης γε ἀναξ ἔνεκ’ οὐ σε κομίζει, “it is not for your laziness that your lord does not take care of you”) with the Mycenaean word for steward (βασιλῆι γὰρ ἄνδρι ἔοικας, “you look like a man who is royal”), indicating that Laertes’ stature and looks are consistent with the latter, who might be expected to take an active role in the tending of the lands entrusted to him.
Proof of having participated in this labor with Laertes as a child soon serves as decisive evidence for Laertes that Odysseus really is who he claims to be (24.336-344). In Book 24, then, it is intimate familiarity with the land (term A, in the description of Ithaca of Book 9) that reestablishes Odysseus’ connection to his τοκῆες (term B in the description of Ithaca of Book 9); and it is the rough terrain which both Odysseus and Telemachus ascribe to the island which makes cultivation hard and therefore a meaningful sign of recognition. The trees and vineyards, requiring long care over successive generations, are the literally “sweet” counterparts of a family tended with analogous diligence and at greater personal cost. The word γλυκύς does not itself appear in the description of the Gardens of Laertes, but the catalogue instead includes a mix of staple foods symbolic of cultivation and civilization (ἐλαίη, olive) with fruits whose primary value would be in their sweetness: συκέη, ἄμπελος, ὄγχνη (fig, vine, pear). The exacting character of Laertes’ labor contrasts with the literal sweetness of the fruits which this labor produces. Father and son thus both preserve the continuity of culture on Ithaca through hard toil, inasmuch as Odysseus toils at his nostos in order that he may someday begin tending this garden plot once again. In Theocritus the consistency with which trees produce fruits of their own kind becomes a hallmark for normalcy, the violation of which constitutes an adynaton, and this recognition of the reliability of natural processes resurfaces in the gardens of Laertes and Alcinous. One of the great frustrations for Odysseus in his nautical labors will be the fact of the maddening inconsistency of the world in which he finds himself: the face that a landscape presents to those disembarking from a ship does not always lead Odysseus to correct conclusions about its inhabitants, a circumstance which serves only to pique a curiosity which at times leads him into labors which, unlike the agricultural labors of home, sometimes have tragically unpredictable results.

279 *Idylls* 1.132-34:

νῦν δ´ ία μὲν φορέοιτε βάτοι, φορέοιτε δ´ ἀκανθαι, 
ά δ´ καλά νάρκισσος ἐπ´ ἀρκεύθοις κομίσαι·
πάντα ἐναλλα γένοιτο, καὶ ἀ πίτυς ὄχνας ἐνεῖκαι.

Now you bramble-bushes bear violets, you thistles bear them too, 
and let the fair narcissus flourish on the junipers: 
let all things come into being contrary, and let the pine bear pears.

280 E.g., in the assertion that “pear matures on pear” in the gardens of Alcinous.
Odysseus’ successive adventures in the Apologue give him the opportunity to explore a number of alternative possible methods of obtaining food from unknown lands and waters, all of which possess obvious shortcomings and create a pria mel of discarded possible means of sustenance, foils for Laertes’ gardens. The Cicones and the Lotophagoi establish a skeleton for first encounters with topographies for Homer to flesh out as Odysseus is drawn into increasingly complex interactions with new worlds. Odysseus’ narration of the Cicones moves from arrival to sack of the city in the space of two line (9.39-40). As the first adventure after Troy, its contraction of the entire theme of the Iliad into two lines both is reflective of a programmatic concern specific to the Odyssey (this is no epic of the sacking of cities, though this theme receives a few additional lines of expansion before it collapses in a defeat for Odysseus and his men) and obviates the need for significant description of the land of the Cicones. As is typical of successful cattle raids, the men find themselves with no shortage of meat; rather, they gorge themselves quite liberally on wine and sacrifice many cattle (9.45-46).

The raid serves as an introduction to Odysseus’ nostos narrative: feasting and fighting are familiar Iliadic topoi, but the poet introduces elements into this compressed cattle raid narrative which will appear later in the Apologue transfigured into strange, new forms: the cattle, prefiguring the disastrous feast on the island of Helios, the wine, which the men will use to addle Polyphemus’ wits, even the inhabitants of the neighboring land, the numbers of whose swarming army, compared to flowers in springtime (ἦλθον ἔπειτ᾿ ὡσά φύλλα καὶ ἀνθέα γίγνεται ὡρῇ, “they came then, as many as leaves and flowers arise in season”, 9.52), prefigure the flowery food (ἀνθίνων εἶδαρ) of the Lotophagoi. The inclusion of elements which will accrue unforeseen fantastic connotations later hints perhaps at the transformative power of travel: even while the Ithacans’ Hellenicity erodes, Odysseus’ new and broader vision of the world will permit him an enlarged view of Ithaca – rocks and all – upon his return; however, and perhaps more importantly, it also hints that, after the storm off Cape Malia, landscape and culture will be

281 Even the use of chronological markers drawn from cattle ranching (9.58) parallel the allegorical significance ascribed to the cattle of Helios in Austin 1975.
completely unpredictable. Even seemingly mundane and unremarkable landscape features may
prove to conceal deadly threats.

The land of the Lotus Eaters establishes the relation between landscape, food, and
inhabitants as a moral one. The Lotophagoi are not city-dwellers, and the episode thus requires
that Odysseus and his men engage in a greater degree of reconnaissance in order to find food.
As a result, Odysseus creates a slightly fuller sense of space in this narrative, in which each step
taken reveals new possibilities for food and drink.

Nine days then I was swept along by the force of the hostile
winds on the fishy sea, but on the tenth day we landed
in the country of the Lotus-Eaters, who eat a flowering
food, and there we set foot on the mainland, and fetched water,
and my companions soon took their supper there by the fast ships.
But after we had tasted of food and drink, then I sent
some of my companions ahead, telling them to find out
what men, eaters of bread, might live here in this country.
I chose two men, and sent a third with them, as a herald.
My men went on and presently met the Lotus-Eaters,
nor did these Lotus-Eaters have any thoughts of destroying
our companions, but they only gave them lotus to taste of.
But any who ate the honey-sweet fruit of the lotus
was unwilling to take any message back, or to go
away, but they wanted to stay there with the lotus-eating
people, feeding on lotus, and forget the way home. I myself
took these men back weeping, by force, to the ships, and dragged them in the hollow ships and tied them under the rowing benches.

Within this passage at the very least four means of sustenance are mentioned: the fishy sea (πόντον ἐπ’ ἰχθυόεντα),282 the lotus which is the characteristic food of the Lotus Eaters (οἵ τ’ ἄνθισαν εἰδαρ ἐδουσιν, “who eat a flowering food”), the declining stores which the sailors use to produce their dinner (αἱψα δὲ δείπνου ἐλοντο θοῆς παρὰ νηυσὶν ἐταῖροι, “and my companions soon took their supper there by the fast ships”), and the counterfactual or at least imperfectly informed characterization of the inhabitants of the land of the Lotus Eaters as οἵ τινες ἄνερες εἴεν ἐπὶ χθοιν οἰτον ἔδοντες (“what men, eaters of bread, might live here in this country”).

Theoretically, both the Lotus Eaters and Odysseus’ men might choose to avail themselves of a range of food sources: Odysseus and his men will later resort to the eating of fish when marooned on the island of Helios, but it is clear that this is a last-ditch expedient.283 Here they eschew it entirely, but, under circumstances where food is clearly a concern, ἰχθυόεις (“fishy”) offers an as yet unrealized possibility. The description of the feast which the Ithacans do eat includes formulas thus far familiar to the audience from descriptions of aristocratic feasting in the palaces (αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ οἶτοί τ’ ἐπασσάμεθ’ ἑδὲ ποτῆτος, “but after we had tasted of bread and drink” – cf. 1.150, 3.67, etc.), but makes clear through the use of such phrases as ἐνθα δ’ ἐπ’ ἦπείρου βῆμεν καὶ ἀφυσσάμεθ’ ὕδωρ (“and there we set foot on the mainland, and fetched water”) and αἰψα δὲ δείπνου ἐλοντο θοῆς παρὰ νηυσὶν ἐταῖροι (“and my companions soon took their supper there by the fast ships”) that Odysseus and his men are here enmeshed in a special subgenre of aristocratic feasting – the feast under difficult circumstances while journeying. This feast reminds us that Odysseus and his men, despite the savagery of their recent toil at Troy, are still respectable Homeric heroes who observe decorous and aristocratic eating habits even on the road; because the conservation of such customs in exile requires trade or raiding with “men who eat bread”, the feast also makes a reconnaissance expedition inevitable.

282 For discussion of the role of fish in the Homeric diet, see e.g. Couch 1936, Fraser 1936, Combellack 1953.
283 12.329-332; see Combellack 1953, 257.
The Lotus Eaters, too, define themselves in part by what they do not eat, failing Odysseus’ expectation of men who feed on bread. We are never explicitly told that they do not possess or eat grain, but their name and their habits clearly imply which native crop defines their character. As Odysseus is narrator, we observe these cultural differences through his eyes. In his lead-in to the episode, he adopts a retrospective, omniscient point of view, rightly characterizing the Lotophagoi by the food which defines them as indolent and non-Greek (οἱ τ’ ἀνθῖνον εἰδὰρ ἔδουσιν, “who eat a flowering food”, 9.84), but then drawing the audience into his perspective of limited knowledge at the time of the initial encounter. He thus betrays his naïve initial expectation of meeting men like himself by employing the formula for “normal” bread-eating men which is metrically identical to the more marked description of the Lotus Eaters seen in 9.84: (δὴ τὸτ’ ἐγὼν ἐτάρους προὶς πεύθεσθαι ἱόντας, / οἱ τινες ἀνέρες εἰς ἡπὶ χθονι σῖτον ἔδοντες “then I sent some of my companions ahead, telling them to find out what men, eaters of bread, might live here in this country” ~ οἱ τ’ ἀνθῖνον εἰδὰρ ἔδουσιν, “who eat a flowering food”). These expectations are, of course, disastrously deflated when Odysseus’ scouts succumb to the pressure of their newfound peers and accept the “honey-sweet” fruit of the lotus (τῶν δ᾿ ος τις λωτοῖο φάγωι μελιδέα καρπῶν / οὐκέτ᾿ ἀπαγγεῖλαι πάλιν ἦβελεν οὐδὲ νέσθαι, “but any who ate the honey-sweet fruit of the lotus was unwilling to take any message back”, 9.94-95). The contrasting feasts of Odysseus’ men on the beach and of Odysseus’ men among the Lotus Eaters thus serve as emblems for the cultural differences that separate the two groups.

The pronounced moral undertones of Odysseus’ portrayal of the Lotus Eaters resonate with events at home on Ithaca. We have already seen that Odysseus associates family and Ithaca’s terrain with “sweetness” and adverted to one instance in which the superficial sweetness of life with Calypso served as a foil to the deeper and more meaningful sweetness of nostos. What are we to make of the fact that the lotus is characterized as “honey-sweet”? Among the Lotus Eaters, too, Odysseus encounters a variety of “sweetness” which rivals the sweetness of home, but with very different effects on character. Whereas the result of Calypso’s futile blandishments was a painful enhancement of memory (recall νόστον ὀδυρομένῳ, “weeping for a way home”, at 5.153 – Odysseus sits on the beach mourning for home precisely because Calypso cannot weaken his memories of Ithaca), the Lotus Eaters pose the more insidious danger of causing the men to forget their nostos (μὴ πώς τις λωτοῖο φαγὼν νόστοιο λάθηται, “lest
someone might taste of the lotus and forget the way home”, 9.102). While enjoyment of the sweetness of Ithaca demanded the prerequisite of long and dutiful labor, the lotus consumed by the Lotus Eaters can simply be plucked from the plant, and literally incapacitates Odysseus’ sailors, precluding even the question of tending to families, orchards, or fields or even of going home.

In the majority of its occurrences in the Odyssey the word μελιηδής refers to wine, or, slightly less frequently, to the heart (θυμός) or to fruit, as here (καρπός); from the first of these associations – that with a mind-altering and potentially addictive substance – the word may acquire connotations of the illicit and the destructive. It is, at the very least, an interesting coincidence that the word’s occurrence elsewhere in the Apologue in unique (i.e., not repeated) combinations with a noun other than these three tends to highlight the problematic nature of nostos:284 Tiresias’ first words to Odysseus are νόστον δίζηαι μελιηδέα, φαίδιμ Ὀδυσσεύ· / τὸν δὲ τοι ἀργαλέων θῆσει θεός (“Glorious Odysseus, you are seeking honey-sweet homecoming, but the god will make it hard for you”, 11.100-101), making nostos the fulcrum of a see-saw which totters between sweetness and bitter grief. In Circe’s predictions about the Sirens, too, the word μελιηδέα highlights the deadly seduction of the Sirens’ song:

And that man who unsuspecting approaches them and listens to the Sirens singing, has no prospect of coming home and delighting

284 Aside from the instances noted below, the only appearance of the word in the Odyssey which does not modify one of these three words is 6.90, where it describes the fodder for Nausicaa’s mules, and μελιηδής ὑπνός at 19.551.
his wife and little children as they stand about him in greeting, but the Sirens by their shrill singing enchant him. They sit in their meadow, but the beach before it is piled with boneheaps of men now rotted away, and the skins shrivel upon them. You must drive straight on past, but melt down sweet wax of honey and with it stop yourcompanions’ ears, so none can listen; the rest, that is, but if you yourself are wanting to hear them, then have them tie you hand and foot on the fast ship, standing upright against the mast with the ropes’ ends lashed around it, so that you can have joy in hearing the song of the Sirens.

While Odysseus will ironically close his comrades’ ears with honey-sweet wax, he will experience the Sirens’ aesthetically sweet song (note ὄφρα κε τερπόμενος ὀπ’ ἀκούσῃς, “so that you can have joy in hearing the song”, and, earlier, λιγυρῇ θέλγουσιν ἀοιδή, “the Sirens by their shrill singing enchant him”), but risk experiencing the fate which plagues those who experience this joy: privation of wife and children, the very pleasures of home which Odysseus had praised as what made Ithaca sweet to him at the beginning of the Apologue (ὅς τις ἁϊδρείῃ πελάσῃ καὶ φθόγγον ἀκούσῃ / Σειρήνων, τῷ δ’ οὐ τι γυνῇ καὶ νήπια τέκνα / οἷκαδε νοστήσαντι παρίσταται οὐδὲ γάνυνται, “and that man who unsuspecting approaches them and listens to the Sirens / singing, has no prospect of coming home and delighting / his wife and little children as they stand about him in greeting”). By establishing this antithetical variety of sweetness as a force which works against nostos at the outset of the Apologue, Odysseus helps his audience to weigh with him the respective allurements of travel and home. We appreciate Odysseus’ boldness the more for the fact that he is willing to take risks in order to experience the Sirens’ song, and the foresight which he shows in taking Circe’s advice sets him apart from his men who readily succumb to the strange sweetness of foreign lands in the land of the Lotus Eaters. Yet this pleasure is a self-destructive one, and the source of the respective sweetness of the land of the Lotus Eaters and the Sirens differs from that of Ithaca. Whereas the fruits noted by Homer in his account of Laertes’ garden all require diligent tending, honey can be a serendipitous discovery. The tendency of non-formulaic uses of μελιηδής to occur in associations with situations which illuminate threats to nostos may hint at the perils in which this variety of short-term, on-the road pleasure can implicate the unwary traveler. Because such threats as the Lotus Eaters’ unfortunate gustatory proclivities cannot be predicted at first glance from a cursory examination of the landscape, any exploration of foreign lands is implicitly
hazardous.

The antithesis to Odysseus’ deliberate and heroic exercise of caution relative to the “sweetness” proffered by strangers is, of course, the suitors, who constitute another point of contact between Ithaca and the land of the Lotus Eaters. On Ithaca the suitors’ privileged languorous uselessness and refusal to go home echo the Lotus Eaters’ more extreme lassitude – a parallel damning to suitors and sailors alike. Odysseus’ refusal to stray too far down the broad and bonny road of self-indulgence tells us something about his qualities as basileus, especially when contrasted with the only other passage in the Odyssey where lotus is mentioned: the description of Menelaus’ Sparta, where both lotus and all manner of grain spring up in abundance. The presence of lotus commingled with grain on Greek lands underscores the fact that it is not the presence of an exotic food which characterizes the Lotus Eaters’ land as foreign, but the ethical choices which they make in exploiting their landscape’s sweetness.

For this reason Sparta too is ethically suspect. Menelaus and Helen also exhibit a predilection for indulging in recreational drug-use, though Helen’s drugs are not explicitly linked to the lotus which flourishes at Sparta. In other ways as well, the divinely and geographically favored couple exhibit similarly poor stewardship of the lands under their protection: Menelaus at one point offers to evict the inhabitants of a town and bring Odysseus over from Ithaca with all his family and belongings to take over as king in the Peloponnesus (4.171-180), a gesture which compares unfavorably to the organic intimacy with his own land which Odysseus shows in his description of Ithaca at the beginning of Book 9. On Ithaca the hardness of life is always underscored by the poet, and the fruits yielded by Laertes’ gardens are the result of back-breaking ponos. The suitors are able to remain idle only because they rely on economic mechanisms long nurtured and guarded by Odysseus and his ancestors (thetes, Laertes’ gardens, pastoralism, etc.). In contrast, consumption of the fruit of the land of the Lotophagoi has

285 4.220-221:

αὐτίκ’ ἄρ’ ἐς οἶνον βάλε φάρμακον, ἐνθὲν ἐπινοῦν,
νηπενθές τ’ ἄχολόν τε, κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἀπάντων.

Into the wine of which they were drinking she cast a medicine of heartsease, free of gall, to make one forget all sorrows.

286 Discussed at more length previously in this dissertation.
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consequences only for Odysseus’ Greeks, who need their wits about them to remember their journey; for the inhabitants, consumption of the Lotus is not explicitly stated to have adverse side effects.

We had occasion to refer above to Odysseus’ expectation of finding bread-eating men in the land of the Lotus Eaters, and the interesting implications of the fact that both grain and lotus grow at Sparta. The formula used by Homer to express “men who eat bread” occurs only three times in the *Odyssey*, all during Odysseus’ stay with the Phaeacians. In both instances (9.89, 10.101) where the formula ἐπὶ χθονὶ σῖτον ἔδοντες appears in the Apologue in a precise repetition of three lines (the other is in the narrative of the Laestrygonians), Odysseus’ men go on to meet peoples who eat highly unusual food and who pose a danger to both him and his men. It receives its inaugural run in *Odyssey* Book 8. Here, Odysseus sets up “men who eat grain” as a known quantity against whom, he says, he is capable of defending his home. After Philoctetes, Odysseus is the best archer:

\[
\text{τῶν δ’ ἄλλων ἐμὲ φημὶ πολὺ προφερέστερον εἶναι,}
\text{ὅσσοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ σῖτον ἔδοντες.}
\text{8.221-22}
\]

But I will say that I stand out far ahead of all others
Such as are living mortals now and feed on the earth.

In this speech Odysseus identifies himself with the category of grain-consuming men (despite Ithaca’s rocky soil!), but it is not so much the food he consumes as his character manifested in action which defines him, for his appointment of himself to the group of men who eat bread occurs in a context related to the use of his signature weapon – the bow, the implement with which he will ultimately destroy the suitors. Odysseus’ statement here implies that bread-eating mortals (“such as are living mortals now and feed on the earth”) – ὅσσοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ σῖτον ἔδοντες – constitute the appropriate group of individuals against whom a warrior may win praise in battle. The limited distribution of this phrase in the *Odyssey* and this programmatic first usage mark it off as a reminder to the audience of Odysseus’ ultimate goal of returning to the sweetness world of “real” men from the more dangerous sweetness of the fantastical fairy-tale spaces of the Apologue.
In both the first two episodes of the Apologue, Odysseus weighs risk and benefit of the landscapes he encounters in gustatory terms. The food which a land provides, the toil required to extract it, and its effects upon its consumers all contribute to formulating an assessment of the region’s attractions and healthfulness. Yet by earlier identifying “men who feed on the earth” as his appropriate adversaries, Odysseus insinuates what is wrong with applying this heuristic to the “fantastic” adventures of the Apologue: the normative constructs underlying Greek culture (most notably in the case of the Cyclops, xenia) repeatedly prove useless in predicting the behavior of men who are completely Other, and all the usually reliable indicators to which Odysseus and his men might turn in gauging the character of civilized men (landscape and economy foremost) in these strange new worlds reveal no useful data about what sort of reception or what sort of hazards to expect.

7.3 THE CYCLOPS

These first two exploratory expeditions with their abortive quests for food help to account for the elaborately-structured narrative of the Cyclops. The unexpected character of the Lotus Eaters marks a clear line in the sand between the mundane Iliadic world of cattle raids and battles found among the Cicones and the fantastic adventures to come. Further, the pattern established by Odysseus among the Lotus Eaters of expecting and seeking bread-eating men, and of ultimately proving himself unprepared for what he does find, is amplified and taken to an horrific extreme in the Cyclopeia. Just as the Lotus Eaters’ addiction to lotus proved a circumstance as dangerous as it was unforeseeable, so, too will an aspect of the Cyclops’ diet – specifically, his unfortunate proclivity for eating men – come as a shock to Odysseus, all the more so because the Cyclopes otherwise enjoy a peaceful pastoral existence. Another factor which helps to lull Odysseus and his men into a false sense of security is the landscape of Goat Island, where Odysseus first puts in with his men by the guidance of some god, without even seeing where he is landing his ship (9.142-148). Goat Island instills overconfidence through its manifest suitability for settlement (the goats practically cast themselves upon the spears of Odysseus’ men when they go goat-
hunting), while at the same time raising the specter of Odysseus’ culpability for the disastrous outcome of the episode.

Here Homer poses the question of the relation between landscape, economy, and culture most strikingly: had Odysseus entered upon the adventure expecting to find something other than “bread-eating men”, is it possible that his men might have been saved, or was their grisly demise fated, as the reference to a god driving them ashore on Goat Island might be taken to indicate? Further, were there hints in the landscape of Goat Island – perhaps its very desolation, given its suitability for settlement – that some species of mortal peril lurked nearby? The answer to these questions likely lies in the very folkloric monstrosity of the Cyclops, which underscores that Odysseus’ ships are now anchored firmly in the world of the fantastic, where anything whatsoever might happen, even being consumed by one-eyed monsters. The only viable antidote to the uncertainty intrinsic to the world of folktale is to rely on one’s wits and to attempt to make one’s way back to the world of the real – a solution which elevates the predictable Ithaca, with all its flaws and shortcomings, over the sometimes utopian but always inscrutable fairy lands and fairy folks of the Apologue.

The Cicones episode was summed up by Odysseus in one line (9.40). Similarly, sufficient preface is given to the Lotus Eaters in one line of text: they eat lotus (9.84), and this seminal trait is all that is important for the audience to know going into the narrative. The Cyclops episode requires more introduction (9.106-115) to give the audience adequate background to the Cyclopes. This prefatory account of what Odysseus has learned from his encounter with them outlines the foods sustained by their land (copious supplies of grapes and grains), their economy (unlimited fertility without the cost of any labor), and the political and moral character to which their indolent lifestyle has given rise (cave dwelling, with no political organization beyond the level of the family):

```
Ενθεν δὲ προτέρω πλέομεν ἀκαχήμενοι ἦτορ. Κυκλώτων δ᾽ έσ γαϊν ύπερφιάλων ἀθεμίστων ἱκόμεθ', οἳ μ' θεοίς πεποιθότες ἀθανάτοισιν οὔτε φυτεύουσιν χερσὶν φυτὸν οὔτ᾽ ἀρόωσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ γ᾽ ἀσπαρτα καὶ ἀνήροτα πάντα φύουται, πυροὶ καὶ κρίθαι ἀμπέλους, αἳ τε φέρουσιν οἴνον ἐριστάφυλον, καὶ σφιν Διὸς οἴμβρος άξεζει. τοῖσιν δ᾽ οὔτ᾽ ἀγοραὶ βουληφόροι οὔτε θέμιστες, ἀλλ᾽ οἳ γ᾽ ύψηλων ὀρέων ναίουσί κάρηνα
```
ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι, θεμιστεύει δὲ ἐκαστὸς
παίδων ἢ ἀλόχων, οὐδὲ ἀλλήλων ἀλέγουσι.

9.105-115

From there, grieving still at heart, we sailed on further
along, and reached the country of the lawless outrageous
Cyclopes who, putting all their trust in the immortal
gods, neither plough with their hands nor plant anything,
but all grows for them without seed planting, without cultivation,
wheat and barley and also the grapevines, which in general yield
wine of strength, and it is Zeus’ rain that waters them for them.
These people have no institutions, no meetings for counsels;
rather they make their habitations in caverns hollowed
among the peaks of the high mountains, and each one is the law
for his own wives and children, and they care nothing about one another.

In retrospect, Odysseus has structured his experience with Polyphemus into a political and
ecological generalization reflective of his Greek prejudice for “civilized” diversified agriculture.
The relative clause beginning in 107 has as the nearest expression of its antecedent
ὑπερφιάλων ἀθεμίστων (“lawless outrageous men”). This stark moral disapproval cannot
help but color the manner in which we read the relative clause – they are overweening and
lawless because they trust in the gods for their food and do not sow crops with their hands or
plough, but everything grows without sowing or plowing. The catalog of things which grow for
them ironically includes grains which could be used for bread-making (which would bring the
Cyclopes into the fold of “men who eat bread”) and grapes for wine, but the generalizing τε of
the relative clause describing the ἄμπελοι hints that the production of wine is merely a general
use to which grapes are put to which the barbaric Cyclopes have not yet caught on. They possess
the raw materials to live like normal cultured men, but they are unwilling, unable, or have no
need to put forth the labor to do so.

We have noted previously that lands lacking rain tend to be classed by the poet as
immortal (Elysium, 4.566; Olympus, 6.43). Here especially, the attribution of the credit for the
rain which does fall among the Cyclopes to Zeus (καὶ σφιν Διὸς ὁμόρος ἀέξει, “and it is Zeus’
rain that waters them for them”) smacks of pure invidium: the king of gods and god of kings
affords an ample supply of all the ingredients for “civilized” existence, and the Cyclopes not
only obstinately refuse to comply, but lead a happier life for their refusal. The effects of this
situation summed up by lines 112-115 (Τοῖσι δ᾿ οὔτ᾿ ἀγοραὶ βουληφόροι οὔτε θέμιστες,
“These people have no institutions, no meetings for counsels”, etc.) do not become detrimental to Polyphemus until Odysseus’ name game causes Polyphemus’ cries for help to go unheeded. The Cyclopes, robbed of the incentive for collaboration afforded by agriculture, have no societal organization beyond the familial level (θεμιστεύει δὲ ἐκαστος / παιδών Ἰδ᾿ ἀλόχων, οὐδ᾿ ἀλλήλων ἀλέγουσι, “and each one is the law / for his own wives and children, and they care nothing about one another”). Hence, even though the other Cyclopes ostensibly do not come to their fellow Cyclops’ aid because they believe that “no one” is harming Polyphemus, their lack of familiarity with the world beyond their individual family caves, resulting from the absence of need for cooperative labor, councils, or courts, is likely at least partly to blame for this naïve interpretation of Polyphemus’ words. This observation again prompts us to consider how this applies to Ithaca.

Laertes’ private garden and the familial continuity which it embodies seem not so different from the Cyclopean system of family law, diverging only in the grueling toil in which Laertes must engage to achieve the same results enjoyed by the Cyclopes through divine dispensation. Yet, as Chapter 9 of this dissertation will attempt to demonstrate, Laertes’ residence in the country is an exceptional and complex circumstance resulting from the usurpation of the palace’s mechanisms of economic and political control by the suitors. Certain other circumstances support this connection between the suitors and the Cyclopes: the anarchy imposed by the suitors has resulted in a trickling off of agoraí among the Ithacans. Conversely, Aegyptius, the speaker who observes this absence of agoraí on Ithaca at 2.26-7, was the unfortunate father of Antiphus, the last man whom the Cyclops had eaten for dinner before Odysseus made his narrow escape (2.19-20). While the character Aegyptius cannot yet himself know of his son’s death, perhaps Homer wishes us to make a connection between the clannish and anarchic organization of the Cyclopes and the socially and politically disruptive character of the suitors, who are, after all, likely responsible for the lapse in Ithaca’s agoraí of which Aegyptius complains. Before the epic ends in Book 24, Ithacan society will have descended into internecine strife of family against family as the slain suitors’ kin band together to overthrow Odysseus’ family, confronting Odysseus with the prospect of witnessing the conversion of his beloved sweet home to the social system of the monstrous Cyclopes. Inasmuch as the Cyclops episode is meant as a realization of civilized humanity’s worst fears of social devolution and degeneration, it holds an important lesson for Odysseus about the rougher and less appealing
aspects of his homeland. By ensuring that all things do not come easily for the human inhabitants of the island, these features of Ithaca’s landscape force the inhabitants to cooperate with one another both within the family, as exemplified by Odysseus’ childhood farming with Laertes, and outside the family, as happens with Eumaeus and the various other country people whom Odysseus encounters on the way back to his palace. Hardship gives rise to the bonds that undergird human society, and where no cooperative labor is necessary, neither are councils, kings, and laws.

The well-known description of Goat Island which begins the Cyclopeia exemplifies this principle at work among Odysseus and his sailors. The suitors by placing their own selfish aims above the good of the community hazard returning Ithaca to a prepolitical Cyclops-like state in which the extended family is the highest law. They thus represent reduction to a prepolitical state as a result of competing family interests. This same outcome however is also possible from environmental causes. Humans placed in an environment similar to that in which the Cyclopes live could easily succumb to the same malaise, not through selfish and antisocial tendencies, but simply by falling victim to the allure of easy food and easy drink. In this regard, it is perhaps not insignificant that, immediately before making what most commentators consider to be his cardinal blunder, Odysseus finds himself surrounded by precisely the same sort of amenities which have obviated the need for political organization for the Cyclopes. Does Odysseus become curious about the landscape of Polyphemus’ cave because everything on Goat Island simply comes too easily?

Much of the description of the topography of this space might be termed *sub specie aeternitatis*: connections with the narrative appear at the beginning and at the end, but the bulk of the passage itself is devoid of narrative and dissociated from surrounding events. Only after Homer describes the island’s topography does he explain how the men arrived there: as happens also when Odysseus returns to Ithaca, the poet makes clear that no one actually sees Goat Island as the ship puts in to shore due to a combination of fog, darkness, and a night moonless by dint of excessive cloud cover (9.144-146). Their arrival is entirely fortuitous, so much so that Odysseus concludes that a god guided their ship (9.142). After hearing the tally of all the pleasing features which the men will have at their disposal during their stay, the audience learns that, as happens for the Cyclopes, the good fortune of landing in such a place occurred entirely without rational discrimination, thought or planning, through the agency of some dimly-
conceived guiding deity. Only after sunrise the next morning do we learn of the jocund hunting party which was the means by which Odysseus learned of the details that he relates in the earlier timeless description.

The word used to introduce the description of Goat Island sub specie aeternitatis (ἔπειτα, 9.116) appears in an unusual position and meaning. In normal Homeric usage, it acts as a temporal adverb, marking off successive events. It is usually preceded or followed by a connective; conversely, it is very rare in the two major epics for a noun to precede it directly. As it cannot itself serve as a conjunction, this passage is an asyndeton, suggesting an ellipsis in the preceding line: the Cyclopes have no concern for anyone other than their families (as what they did to my men amply demonstrates). This likely accounts for its rather striking and emphatic juxtaposition with νῆσος: the connective which might normally part the two words has deliberately been dropped. By reining himself back to a description of Goat Island, Odysseus ostentatiously buries the atrocity of anthropophagy in silence, only to divulge it in a more abrupt and shocking manner later on. The ἔπειτα (9.119) thus marks Odysseus’ turn from his ethical account of the Cyclopes to priming the audience for ensuing events with the specifics of the setting which led him to act in so foolhardy a fashion as to go to investigate the Cyclopes (“well, then, at any rate, this is how it all began” might be an appropriate English parallel).

The pastoral peace which greets the audience’s ears in the account of the island thus carries with it a sense of catastrophe postponed. Line 117 (the island is neither near to nor far from the territory of the Cyclopes) maintains the tone of imminent danger (the island is not far enough, one suspects). A considerable hyperbaton, by Homeric standards, encompasses the mention of the Cyclopes, and at 118 we find the final adjective which attaches to νῆσος: ὑλήεσσ’. After attributing one more important characteristic to the island in 118-19 (it is teeming with countless wild goats), Odysseus delivers a largely negative catalog in lines 119-131 enumerating the many cultural amenities which the island does not have (paths, hunters, shepherds, farmers, humans, ships, shipbuilders):

Greek text:

Νῆσος ἔπειτα λάχεια παρέκ λιμένος τετάνυσται γαῖης Κυκλώπων οὔτε σχεδὸν οὔτ’ ἀποτηλοῦ, ὑλήεσσ’. ἐν δ’ αἴγες ἀπειρέσιαι γεγάασιν ἄγριαι· οὐ μὲν γὰρ πάτος ἀνθρώπων ἀπερύκει, οὔθε μιν εἰσοιχεύει κυνηγέται, οἳ τε καθ’ ὕλην ἀλγεα πάσχουσιν κορυφάς ὀρέων ἐφέποντες.
There is a wooded island that spreads, away from the harbor, neither close in to the land of the Cyclopes nor far out from it; forested; wild goats beyond number breed there, for there is no coming and going of human kind to disturb them, nor do hunters visit it, who in the forest suffer hardships as they haunt the peaks of the mountains, neither again is it held by herded flocks, nor fields, but all its days, never plowed up and never planted, it goes without people and supports the bleating wild goats.

For the Cyclopes have no ships with cheeks of vermillion, nor have they builders of ships among them, who could have made them strong-benched vessels, and these if made could have run them sailings to all the various cities of men, in the way that people cross the sea by means of ships and visit each other, and they could have made this island a strong settlement for them.

The negatives of this passage are implemented through alternation of οὐ and alpha-privative. This leads to expatiation on what is wanting among the Cyclopes that they do not cultivate the island (ships, shipwrights, intercourse with other polities and the technological and cultural exchange which accompanies this). The final negative is a litotes which leads into the island’s good qualities: οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακή γε, φέροι δέ κεν οἰρία πάντα (“for it is not a bad place at all, it could bear all crops in season”, 131).

Between twin mentions of the goats which give the island the sobriquet by which it has become known to later scholars, we find an other catalog of potential means of obtaining food: αἶγες, κυνηγέται, ποίμνῃσιν, ἀρότοισιν (goats, hunters, flocks, fields). Odysseus devotes the most attention to this last possibility, elaborating ἢ γ’ ἁσπαρτος καὶ ἀνήροτος ἡματα πάντα (“but all its days, never plowed nor planted”). All of these features of goat island resonate with Odysseus’ career to date: Ithaca itself was σιγίβοτος (“fostering of goats”, 4.606), Odysseus earned his tell-tale scar from his hunting expedition on Parnassus, and the quotation from Book 8
discussed above suggests that he gauges the suitability of his opponents by whether they subsist on bread. While this catalogue of civilization-sustaining activities which do not occur on Goat Island strongly hints that the island presents ample opportunity for most of them to occur, the island itself forestalls Odysseus from engaging in these labors in any meaningful way, as we shall see in a moment: when he and his men start to hunt, the nymphs of the island drive the goats to them, reducing the Ithacans to an infantile, Cyclops-like state of helplessness and passivity.

The positive characteristic delineated from 131-141 also highlight its potential for exploitation, but in a fashion which affords the island unique advantages which surpass Odysseus’ Ithacan home:

οὐ μὲν γὰρ τι κακή γε, φέροι δὲ κεν ὡρια πάντα·
ἐν μὲν γάρ λειμώνες ἀλὸς πολιοῖο παρ’ οὖθας
υδρηλοί μαλακοί· μάλα κ’ ἄφθιτοι ἀμπελοὶ εἰεν.
ἐν δ’ ἄροσις λείη· μάλα κεν βαθὺ λήιον αἰεὶ
eis ὡρας ἀμωκεν, ἐπεί μάλα πιάρ ὑπ’ οὖδας.
ἐν δὲ λιμὴν εὔορμος, ἵν’ οὐ χρεῶ πεισματὸς ἔστιν,
οὔτ’ εὐνὰς βαλέειν οὔτε πρυμνήσι’ ἀνάγαι,
ἀλλ’ ἔπικελοαντας μεῖναι χρόνον εἰς δ’ κε ναυτέων
θυμὸς ἐποτρύνῃ καὶ ἐπιπνεύσωσιν αἵται.
αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ κατάστασι λιμένος ἰδεί αὐγλαὸν ὕδωρ,
κρήνη ὑπὸ σπείους· περὶ δ’ αἰγεῖροι πεφύσσιν.

9.131-41

For it is not a bad place at all, it could bear all crops
in season, and there are meadow lands near the shores of the gray sea,
well watered and soft; there could be grapes grown endlessly,
and there is smooth land for plowing, men could reap a full harvest
always in season, since there is very rich subsoil. Also
there is an easy harbor, with no need for a hawser
nor anchor stones to be thrown ashore nor cables to make fast;
one could just run ashore and wait for the time when the sailors’
desire stirred them to go and the right winds were blowing.
Also at the head of the harbor there runs bright water,
spring beneath rock, and there are black poplars growing around it.

The λειμώνες excel Ithaca, which seems to lack them (4.605), ἀμπελοί comprise part of the
Gardens of Laertes as well as the Gardens of Alcinous (though the fact the vineyards of Book 9
are ἄφθιτοι ἀμπελοί gives them a preternatural aura), and generic features such as the springs
occur on virtually every site Odysseus and his men visit. If we group line 131 together with the island’s positive characteristics, we find near symmetrical balance between the list of qualities which the island does not possess and those which it does (119-130 [11 lines] → 131-141 [10 lines]). Line 142 brashly suggests the advent of Odysseus and his men with their civilizing ships as correctives to the final want (ships and men) with which Odysseus had closed the catalog of desiderata (ἐνθα κατεπλέομεν…), rounding off the eleventh line of the positive characteristics which the island has.

Goat Island has seemed a colonialist’s paradise to some, a foreboding place to others. Its springs and greenery summon to mind the haunts of nymphs, and these demigods will in fact put in an appearance without any preliminaries at 9.154-5. The island’s schizophrenic character is in actuality not nearly so pronounced as appears at first sight. The purpose of including such a striking slew of landscape details familiar from other settings in the poem may be simply to

---

287 For structural analysis of Goat Island, see Elliger 1975, 141-144; Elliger also observes that ecology and culture are the defining themes of the episode: “Die vorangestellte Charakteristik der Kyklopen (106ff) konzentriert sich auf zwei Punkte: auf die durch die “asoziale” Lebensweise bedingte Gesetzlosigkeit und die an das Märchen erinnernde Fruchtbarkeit des Landes, die jede Arbeit von Menschenhand entbehrlieh macht. Beide Motive sind auch für die Darstellung der Ziegeninsel von maßgeblicher Bedeutung” (142); he notes further (142-143) that landscape as a reflection (and possibly cause) of culture is a theme which recurs with Calypso, the Phaeacians, and the Cyclops: “Dasselbe [wie schon bei Kalypso und den Phaiaken] wiederholt sich bei der Höhle des Kyklopen…. In ihrer Verbindung von wilden (eingegrabene Felssteine, große Fichten, hochbelaubte Eichen) und pastoralen Elementen (sich über die Höhle wölbender Lorbeer, Schafe und Ziegen, dazu später die Melkeimer) ist auch sie ein Spiegelbild ihres Bewohners: eines Barbaren mit Gefühl.”

288 Malkin 1998 in his introduction offers an incisive analysis of the problems attendant on defining what constitutes “colonization” in the ancient world. Cf. Byre 1994, 366: “It is not merely like a colonialist that Odysseus is speaking here; he is speaking like a man whose outlook and values are very much like those of his civilized, Phaeacian hosts… The Goat Island that Odysseus envisages, implied beneath the negatives and potential optatives, is much like Scheria: a land with all the advantages of nature, whose potential can be brought to realization by the work of man.” In this regard, it is interesting to note that description of Alcinous’ palace and gardens applies architectural imagery to nature and natural imagery to scenes of domestic craft and architecture (see previous chapter). The culmination of Goat Island on Scheria betrays hints of its origins. See also de Jong 2001, 234: “The sequence of elements is determined not by their spatial contiguity, but by Odysseus’ associative reasoning: he starts with the island’s most conspicuous characteristic, the presence of countless goats. This fact is then explained by the absence of hunters, which brings him to the absence of farmers. This, in turn, is explained by the fact that the people who live the closest, the Cyclopes, have no ships. Had they had people to build ships for them, those same people would also have helped them cultivate Goat Island.”
underscore what it is that makes Goat Island different from all these other places: the fact that it is completely uninhabited by men. The presence of harbors and plough land in the absence of inhabitants adds the air of a ghost town to the island, and this is likely the point. Goat Island is a lure to hungry sailors, reeling in unsuspecting vagabonds to the land of the anthropophagous Cyclopes, whetting their appetite, and setting them at ease. From a practical standpoint, the refreshments which it offers are either insufficient for feeding an army of hearty sailors (ἀφθιτοι ἄμπελοι might be refreshing, but grapes can hardly be stocked as provisions for a long journey) or such as to require long cultivation (e.g., the plough land). This aspect of its landscape gives us new insight into Odysseus’ quest for men ἐπὶ χθὸνι σῖτον ἔδοντες: for the homeless traveler wishing to be fed in the manner to which he is accustomed, plundering the fruits of the labor of others is the only viable option. A place like Goat Island really offers only one substantial possible repast for Odysseus and his men: the commodity with which the Ithacan begins both his sub specie aeternitatis description of the island and his “action sequence” of 9.153ff.”: goats.

Everything about Odysseus’ stay on the island is determined entirely by fortune. He landed here entirely by chance during the night:


9.142-148

There we sailed ashore, and there was some god guiding us through the gloom of the night, nothing showed to look at, for there was a deep mist around the ships, nor was there any moon showing in the sky, but she was under the clouds and hidden. There was none of us there whose eyes had spied out the island, and we never saw any long waves rolling in and breaking on the shore, but the first thing was when we beached the well-bench vessels.

289 Though it might be argued that Calypso’s island is likewise remote and inhabited by only one nymph (Calypso herself), whereas Goat Island has multiple nymphs. On Goat Island the nymphs function differently: Homer never permits them to step forward and take on personalities distinct from the landscape of which they are personifications.
The elaboration of impediments to perception is especially pronounced: the dark of night, fog, and clouds which obscure the moon together result in a situation in which their boats have literally hit the shore before they realize that they have put in on the island. Odysseus absolves himself of blame by alerting his auditors that no unsuspecting mortal could have predicted either the empty, unrealized potential of Goat Island or the Cyclopes lurking beyond. The manner of their landing also marks the beginning of an uncanny trend. Not only does the island come to him unawares, but so does his dinner.

Odysseus and his men wake the next morning and find themselves in an earthly paradise: 

\[ \text{νῆσον θαυμάζοντες ἐδινεόμεσθα κατ᾿ αὐτήν ("we made a tour about the island admiring it", 9.153).} \]

Without further ado, the nymphs rouse the goats which had formed a virtual refrain to his description of the island (cf. 118-19, 124, and the root \( \alphaἰγ \) at 141):

\[ \text{And the nymphs, daughters of Zeus of the aegis, started} \]
\[ \text{the hill-roving goats our way for my companions to feast on.} \]
\[ \text{At once we went and took from the ships curved bows and javelins} \]
\[ \text{with long sockets, and arranging ourselves in three divisions} \]
\[ \text{cast about, and the god granted the game we longed for.} \]

There is a certain irony to the fact that Odysseus’ experience of an island with such civilized and agricultural potential is defined by the word \( \alphaἰγ \). Even the Zeus of this island is a goaty father of goaty daughters, and a leader of men is reduced to hunting pastoral animals with weapons produced from the ships for the purpose. Odysseus’ harping on this root may convey growing discontent with scrounging sustenance from foreign shores as a stranger, but it also brings to the fore the irony of the men’s monotonous diet on an island so rich with potential for diversified

\[ \text{It should be noted that the derivation of \( \alphaἰγ\) from \( \alpha\ĩ\) is disputed: Stanford ad 9.156} \]
\[ \text{posits that it stems from the same root as \( \alpha\ˊ\omega \).} \]
agricultural exploitation, had they only a few years to settle and labor to extract its fruits. There is no mention of sending out a party to seek “men who eat bread” in this instance, nor are there any Ciconian cities to plunder, nor do the men unload their own provisions to devour as they did among the Lotus Eaters – all these preliminaries are dispensed with by the bare and immediately apparent observation that there are no men on the island at all, nor apparently sufficient provisions remaining. Odysseus must make do with goats for breakfast, goats for lunch, goats for dinner. This contrasts starkly with the two primary idealized civilized representations of agriculture in the *Odyssey*, Alcinous’ gardens and Laertes’, in the former of which the fruits are readily available for consumption year round because of the diversity of crops, and in the latter of these two spaces, the one which comes to embody the concept of home for Odysseus, the fruits do not arise automatically through fortune, but through labor so exacting that it has reduced Laertes to a state of such filth that his own son can mistake him for a slave.

It is just as the Ithacans are settling down to enjoy their catch of goat and their stores of Ciconian wine (9.161-164), when they should be free of care and concern, that Odysseus begins to glance curiously in the direction of the land of the Cyclopes. At the same time, they mark the sounds of the Cyclopes and their sheep and goats as night falls. The next day, Odysseus engages in the distinctly non-Cyclopean custom of calling an assembly, with the aim of encouraging his men to explore the land of the Cyclopes. What makes this expedition appear especially poorly-motivated is that as they gaze across at the Cyclopes through the evening light, they observe for the most part only goods which are accessible to them already on Goat Island: Κυκλώπων δ᾿ ές γαῖαν ἐλευσσομεν ἐγγὺς ἐόντων, / καπνόν τ᾿ αὐτῶν τε φθογγὴν ὀϊῶν τε καὶ αἴγῶν (‘we looked across at the land of the Cyclopes, and they were near by, and we saw their smoke and heard sheep and goats bleating’, 9.166-167). Of wood for fires and goats Odysseus has ample store already. Only the sheep whose voices they distantly detect are not readily available on Goat Island, and Odysseus’ presentiment that the Cyclopes will prove less than civilized (9.213-215) should suggest to him that they will have little to offer in the way of agricultural

291 Though when Odysseus first spies the Cyclops, he keenly observes that he is not like a bread-eating man (οὐδὲ ἐώκει / ἀνδρὶ γε σῖτοφάγῳ, “and he was not like a man, / an eater of bread”, 9.190-91).
292 See chapter 9.
produce or luxury goods (in this regard, the cheese may well come as a pleasant surprise). Why therefore does he insist on making the journey in the assembly?

There may be some validity to Stanford’s position that Homer stretches the frame of Odysseus’ character in the *Odyssey* to enable him to fill the role of protagonist in this particular traditional tale of trickster versus giant; nevertheless, Odysseus’ words and actions suggest that, having enjoyed a brief taste of a life in which necessities such as food and shelter come to one by chance, Odysseus wishes to pit this Cyclopean existence against the qualities which enable humans to sustain civilization – wit, guile, and craft. In doing so, he asserts his own “civilized” nature and its ability to transcend his environment by turning nature’s produce into works of artifice.

The intention which he declares to his men in the assembly is basically this, if one reads between the lines:

\[\text{ἐλθὼν τῶνδ᾿ ἄνδρῶν πειρήσομαι, οἳ τινὲς εἰσίν, ἢ ὅ’ οἳ γ’ ὑβρισταί τε καὶ ἀγριοὶ οὐδὲ δίκαιοι, ἢς φιλόξευοι καὶ σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής.} \]

9.174-176

Going I shall make trial of these people, what sort they are, whether they are savage and violent, and not just, or hospitable to strangers and with minds that are godly.

This statement leaves much unanswered – why does he wish to find this out, if he can safely avoid what is obviously a potentially dangerous encounter? – but suggests that Odysseus wishes to discover the effects of inhabiting a landscape in which all is provided automatically and without labor upon the culture and the character of the inhabitants.

Odysseus’ flask of Ismaric wine that he carries with him into the cave serves as an emblem of the contrast between tough and roughshod Ithacan civilization and the mode of existence of the noble savage, and of the cunning and craft which the inhabitants of Ithaca must possess in order to mold raw nature to meet their needs. Like the wine flask, the Ithacans contain a force of civilization (their minds) within a rough-shod, goatskin-clad exterior:

\[\ldots \text{ἀτὰρ αἴγεον ἀσκὸν ἕχουν μέλανος οἶνοιο, ἱδέος, ὃν μοι δῶκε Μάρων, Εὐάνθεος υἱός,} \]
But I had with me a goatskin bottle of black wine, sweet wine, given my by Maron, son of Euanthes and priest of Apollo, who bestrides Ismarus; he gave it because, respecting him with his wife and child, we saved them from harm. He made his dwelling among the trees of the sacred grove of Phoebus Apollo, and he gave me glorious presents. He gave me seven talents of well-wrought gold, and he gave me a mixing bowl made all of silver, and gave along with it wine, drawing it off in storing jars, twelve in all. This was a sweet wine, unmixed, a divine drink. No one of his servants or thralls that were in his household knew anything about it, but only himself and his dear wife and a single housekeeper. Whenever he drank this honey-sweet wine, he would pour out enough to fill one cup, then twenty measures of water were added, and the mixing bowl gave off a sweet smell; magical; then would be no pleasure in holding off. Of this wine I filled a great wineskin full, and took too provisions in a bag, for my proud heart had an idea that presently I would encounter a man who was endowed with great strength, and wild, with no true knowledge of laws or any good customs.
bouquet”; Maron gives the wine as a gift together with implements of gold and silver for its mixing and serving. Most of all, the wine is superlatively sweet to taste and to smell. The sweetness associated with the civilizing power of Maron’s wine harks back to the “sweetness of home” motif with which the chapter opened: wine is a product of civilization carefully tended through the generations, and, like the lotus, it is innocuous to those who understand its properties but perilous for those who do not. This distilled substance of civilization, though stored within a goatskin flask, enables Odysseus and his men, albeit in ephemeral fashion, to graft a “civilized” hierarchy upon the society of the Cyclopes, forcing pastoralists to provide a share of their wares to a centralized agricultural and viticultural authority, just as is done on Odysseus’ Ithaca (as begins to occur immediately at 216, albeit with a few unpleasant intervening moments of anthropophagy to raise the suspense). At least in retrospect, Odysseus seems to have had something of this sort in mind: even as he recollects the manner in which he obtained this wine from Maron, he anticipates seeing the ferocious Cyclops face to face (αὐτίκα γάρ μοι ὀίσατο θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ / ἀνδρ’ ἐπελεύσεσθαι μεγάλην ἐπιειμένου ἀλκήν, / ἄγριον, οὐτε δίκας εὐ εἰδότα οὔτε θέμιστας, “for my proud heart had an idea that presently / I would encounter a man who was endowed with great strength, / and wild, with no true knowledge of laws or any good customs”). The fact that this wine ultimately subdues the Cyclops proves the superiority of culture’s almost magical power to transform the fruits of a bountiful landscape through toil into a drink potent enough to put down a one-eyed monster. Not only wine, but another product of human craft – ships – proves crucial to Odysseus’ ultimate escape, reminding the audience of the importance of all the attributes of civilization that we are initially told Goat Island lacks. In the final analysis, the curiosity which seduces Odysseus into entering the Cyclops’ cave can be seen as a response to Goat Island’s absence of those forces which Odysseus intuitively senses drive men to artifice, cooperation, and civilization – an attempt to set his own skills as culture hero against the product of a life of laborless ease.
In his next adventure, Odysseus encounters the opposite extreme of modes of subsistence and government. Aeolia is an island, and the comportment of its inhabitants has all the earmarks of superior civilization: indeed, in this episode, it is the Ithacans who will appear to be barbarians. Aeolus himself is a friend of the gods (φίλος ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι, 10.2). Like the Cyclopes, however, he enjoys enviable ease, only in his case a combination of craft and magic seems to be to blame: his island is buoyant (being πλωτῇ ἐνὶ νῆσῳ, 10.3) and his walls are of a sort which never existed in the real world, made of bronze rather than stone and mortar:

\[
\text{πᾶσαν δὲ τέ μιν πέρι τεῖχος χάλκεον ἀρρηκτον, λισσὴ δ᾽ ἀναδέδρομε πέτρη.}
\]

10.3-4

the whole enclosed by a rampart of bronze, not to be broken, and the sheer of the cliff runs upward to it.

His food is superabundant (παρὰ δὲ σφιν ὀνείατα μυρία κεῖται, “and good things beyond number are set before them”, 10.9), and his feasts seem to have served as a setting for recitations of Iliadic and Odyssean-themed poetry, much as Alcinous’ present feast does (10.14-16). In these respects, he shares the civilized conventions of the Greeks and their gods. He enjoys Zeus’s special favor, and Odysseus’ mortified return to Aeolus’ island after coming so close to home suggests that Aeolus actually excels the civilized conventions of the Greeks in some ways.

In contrast to Aeolus’ refined existence, Telepylus,293 the city of the Laestrygonians, is a rugged herdsmen’s home. The Ithacans’ disregard for their hyper-civilized Aeolian host’s benevolence has sent them spinning out to the opposite end of the social spectrum, to a land of anthropophagous giants, as Antiphates reveals at 116-17. While certain features of the

293 The name Telepylus has been put forward by M. L. West elsewhere as a possible reminiscence of Gilgamesh, noting that Telepylus means “Distant Portal,” and Siduri in the Gilgamesh epic inhabits Mt. Mashu, and that to reach Siduri, Gilgamesh convince two “guardians, a Scorpion-man and his wife, to let him enter the portal.” See M. L. West 1997, 406-7.
Laestrygonians such as their stature recall the Cyclopes, their relation to their environment is very different from that of the prior prodigious people: the former lacked any social organization, whereas the Laestrygonians have a city (ἄστυ, 10.104) with a council-place of some sort (ἀγορή, 10.114) and a king (βασιλεύς, 10.110) to whose defense – in stark contrast to Polyphemus’ cronies – all citizens rush with fearful alacrity. Further, their city has an established industrial relationship with the woods and the mountains of the countryside (10.103-104): like normal human society and unlike the Cyclopes, their civilization is founded on toil and the organization and exploitation of natural space to meet essential needs.

By the end of the episode, every one of Odysseus’ ships perishes in the harbor, with his alone escaping the Laestrygonians’ massive missiles. Aeolus’ land was tailor-made to speed Odysseus on his way, offering the ability to guarantee perfect weather in whatever direction he should choose to travel; Telepylus’ deep harbor represents the opposite extreme, a trap for Odysseus’ men. After describing the herdsmen who frequent the countryside around Telepylus, Odysseus emphasizes the steepness and maw-like (ἐν στόματι) circumference of the harbor:

ἐνθ’ ἐπεὶ ἐς λιμένα κλυτοῦ ἠλθομεν, ὲν πέρι πέτρη ἠλίβατος τετύχηκε διαμπερὲς ἀμφιελίσσας, αἵτ’ ἐς προβλῆτες ἐναντίαι ἀλλήλησιν ἐν στόματι προύχουσιν, ἀραιὴ δ’ ἐἰσοδός ἐστιν, ἐνθ’ οἶ γ’ ἐσσω πάντες ἐχον νέας ἀμφιελίσσας, αἱ μὲν ἀρ’ ἐντοσθεν λιμένος κοίλοιο δέδεντο πλησίαι: οὐ μέν γάρ ποτ’ ἀξέτο κύμα γ’ ἐν αὐτῷ, οὔτε μέγ’ οὔτ’ ὀλίγον, λευκὴ δ’ ἦν ἀμφὶ γαλήνη, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν οἶος σχέθον ἔξω νῆα μέλαιναν, αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ ἐσχατίᾳ, πέτρης ἐκ πείσματα δήσας. 10.87-96

There as we entered the glorious harbor, which a sky-towering cliff encloses on either side, with no break anywhere,

294 Meuli and Kirchoff both suggest that the Doliones episode of the Argonautica lies behind the Odyssey’s Telepylus episode. Artakia is a real spring at Cyzicus, and the rocks thrown by the giants explain the origin of the breakwater in the harbor there; M. L. West, who summarizes the arguments of the above, argues for the harbor of Balaclava in the Crimea as the inspiration for the Laestrygonians’ harbor, attributing the long days of Telepylus to tales which drifted down from further north via the amber trade routes. On these matters, see S. West 2003, Nesselrath 2005, M. L. West 2005.
and two projecting promontories facing each other
run out toward the mouth, and there is a narrow entrance,
there all the rest of them had their oar-swept ships in the inward
part, they were tied up close together inside the hollow
harbor, for there was never a swell of surf inside it,
neither great nor small, but there was a pale calm on it.
I myself, however, kept my black ship on the outside,
at the very end, making her fast to the cliff with a cable.

The cumulative effect of the imagery of these lines is extremely sinister. The passage bristles
with vocabulary of opposition (ἐναντίαι) and discomfort, beginning, as the description of the
harbor of Phorcys will in Book 13,295 with terms suggesting textured, hulking, jutting formless
masses of land. Everything about the terrain renders it inhospitable to humans: the shoreline is
steep (ἡλίβατος), likely indicating that disembarking from the ships may be perilous; the entry
itself is narrow (ἀραιὴ δ’ ἐξοδὸς ἔστιν),296 making both entrance and egress difficult – the
perfect spot for an ambush. When Homer terms the harbor “hollow” (κοῖλος), the more literal
meaning of the word used to describe the “mouth” of the harbor (στόμα) comes to the fore:
κοῖλος itself can be applied to the “cavities of the body”, and its near relation κοιλία has “cavity
of the body, i.e., thorax with abdomen” as its primary meaning.297 This second reference to the
human digestive tract activates the more literal meaning of στόμα: the entire harbor assumes
the lineaments of the maw of a gigantic monster.

Verbal echoes between the harbor of Phorcys and that of the Laestrygonians emphasize
the essential difference between the two. The harbor of Phorkys seems amorphous and
foreboding at first due to the dim light of dawn, and not, as the harbor of Telepylus, because of
its intrinsically noxious character. The Book 13 passage starts with language very like that of
Book 10:


295 See Chapter 8 below. Heubeck 1989 ad 87-94 observes “the similarity with the natural
advantages of the Phaeacians’ country”.
296 De Jong 2001 ad 87-96 notes that the “enclosing rocks” are “a unique element” in what is an
otherwise typical harbor description. See also Elliger 1975, 110.
297 LSJ s.v.
There two precipitous promontories opposed jut out, to close in the harbor and shelter it from the big waves made by the winds blowing so hard on the outside; inside, the well benched vessels can lie without being tied up, once they have found their anchorage.

The language used of the headlands is almost the same as that in Book 10 (προβλῆτες is a verbatim echo; ἀκταὶ ἀπορρῶγες adds steep rocks, corresponding to the πέτρη ἡλίβατος of Book 10). There are even parallels in the development of the account of the entry of the ships: at Telepylus, Odysseus’ men find a “pale calm” (λευκὴ ἤν ἀμφὶ γαλήνη) and in Phorcys’ harbor we are informed that the headlands ward off the effects of the winds and that there ships “can lie without being tied up”. Yet the development of this same fact in the land of the Laestrygonians is much more ominous: whereas on Ithaca Homer underscores the sheltering and welcoming aspects of the harbor more and more the further he progresses in his description, the crescendo of gastrointestinal imagery surrounding Telepylus looks forward to the literal cannibalism which is soon to ensue in the harbor. The “pale calm” of its harbor is the calm of death and desolation.

The remainder of the landscape suffices merely to paint the inhabitants as uncivilized, readying the reader for the act of savagery which will soon ensue:

And I climbed to a rocky point of observation and stood there. From here no trace of cattle nor working of men was visible; all we could see was the smoke going up from the country.

Despite the mention of βουκόλοι earlier (85), Odysseus does not espy even signs of herdsmen as he surveys the landscape. Yet there are clear signs of habitation – smoke leaping up in the distance. Odysseus sends men to reconnoiter, who witness wagons bearing wood from the
mountains (presumably to feed the fires mentioned above) and then the daughter of Antiphates bearing water from the fair-flowing Artacia. As in Odysseus’ previous attempt at forage-and-plunder expeditions among the Lotus Eaters, he dispatches his men to seek “bread-eating men” and they find instead men who eat a substance much more invidious (in this case, Odysseus’ men!):

δὴ τὸτ' ἐγὼν ἑτάρους προΐειν πεύθεαθαι ἱόντας,  
of two men, and sent a third with them, as a herald.  I chose two men, and sent a third with them, as a herald.

They left the ship and walked on a smooth road where the wagons carried the timber down from the high hills to the city.

So I sent companions ahead telling them to find out what men, eaters of bread, might live here in this country.

Odysseus’ experience of the hostile landscape of the Laestrygonians betrays more interest in the exoticism of Odysseus’ experience: irregular daylight hours, man-eating giants, foreboding, timber-stocked mountains – all possess fairy-tale connotations which suggest that Homer is less interested in discussing the hunger of Odysseus and his men and more interested in reveling for the moment in the fantastic. The episode’s terrifying quality results in part from the free and indiscriminate commingling of civilized and barbarous characteristics: though more like Giants than men and ultimately shown to be perilous monsters, the inhabitants live in a city and cut timber (104), send their women to fetch water at fair-flowing springs (105-108), and burn wood for heat or cooking (99). Unlike the Cyclopes, whom Odysseus and his men heard and saw long before they explored Polyphemus’ cave, the Laestrygonians’ unnatural proportions apparently only become noticeable when Odysseus’ men meet the (as it turns out, not yet fully grown) princess’ parents. The contrast with the Cyclopes and the purpose of the ominously described harbor landscape become evident at precisely the same moment, when Antiphates calls for aid and the Laestrygonians reveal themselves capable of coordinated action in concert with their fellows, annihilating Odysseus’ ships as his men try to escape from the mouth of the harbor. The fish which, it may have occurred to some listeners, might have served as supper for
Odysseus and his hungry men when they put ashore among the Lotus-Eaters, now reappear as a comparandum for Odysseus’s men who do not escape and are fixed on spits:

οἵ ῥ ἀπὸ πετράων ἄνδραξβέσι χερμαδίοισι 
βάλλον· ἀφαρ δὲ κακὸς κόναβος κατὰ νῆας ὑμὼρει 
ἄνδρων τ᾽ ὀλυμπίεσι βελων θ᾽ ἀμα ἄγνυμενάων· 
ἰχθὺς δ᾽ ὡς πείροντες ἄτερπεα δαίτα φέροντο.

10.121-124

These, standing along the cliffs, pelted my men with man-sized boulders, and a horrid racket went up by the ships, of men being killed and ships being smashed to pieces. They speared them like fish, and carried them away for their joyless feasting.

This sort of imagery entirely inverts the relation between civilization, man, landscape, and monsters that Homer represented among the Cyclopes: Odysseus used the crafts and implements of civilization to overcome the barbarous Polyphemus, but now an entire civilization of barbarous giants who to all appearances are capable of a fair degree of sophistication in landscape exploitation and political organization have just reduced him and his men to the level of food, just at the Cyclops did.

Having just permitted the reconnaissance of Telepylus to unfold in such an unforeseeably disastrous fashion, the poet can capitalize on the ominous shades which the elements of its landscape now possess. In particular, the mixture of civilized and savage elements in Telepylus plays a valuable role in setting the stage for later, more nuanced treatments of native inhabitants. Whereas the Ciconians and Lotus Eaters were both human and the dangers they posed relatively obvious, the Laestrygonians and Circe both conceal hidden dangers which require the discriminating faculties of a true polytropos. By the time Odysseus readies himself to describe the second component of his triad of major narratives in the Apologue, he has thus amassed a handy repertoire of images to lend nuance to the reconnaissance of Aeaea. The scene describing the Ithacans’ landing on Aeaea shares more commonalities with their previous landing on Goat Island than with the more recent Laestrygonians:

ἔνθα δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἄκτης νηὶ κατηγαγόμεσθα σιωπῇ 
ναύλοχον ἐς λιμένα, καὶ τῖς θεὸς ἤγεμόνευν. 
ἔνθα τὸτ᾽ ἐκβάντες δύο τ᾽ ἡματα καὶ δύο νύκτας

201
There we brought our ship in to the shore, in silence, at a harbor fit for ships to lie, and some god guided us in. There we disembarked, and for two days and two nights we lay there, for sorrow and weariness eating our hearts out.

The aporetic shoulder-shrug, τις θεός ἠγεμόνευεν, is repeated word-for-word in both Goat Island and Aeaea. But whereas on Goat Island Odysseus is up hunting goats with spears the next morning, on Aeaea he makes no mention of anyone attempting to bring food: they only eat their hearts out in grief for the companions killed by the Laestrygonians.

In the land of the Laestrygonians, Odysseus ties up his own ship near the entrance to the harbor and climbs to a prospect of the surrounding fields:

αὐτάρ ἔγων οἶος σχέθον ἐξώ νήα μέλαιναν, 
αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ ἐσχατῇ, πέτρῃς ἐκ πείσματα δῆσας·
ἔστην δὲ σκοπῆν ἐς παίπαλοεσσαν ἄνελθον.
ἔνθα μὲν ὦτε βοῶν οὔτε ἄνδρῶν φαίνετο ἔργα,
καπνὸν δ’ ὡν ὅρωμεν ἀπὸ χθονὸς ἀἴσσοντα.

On Aeaea again he repeats this process, and once again sees smoke, a likely sign of human habitation:

ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ τρίτον ἡμαρ εὐπλόκαμος τέλεσ’ Ἦώς, 
καὶ τότ’ ἔγων ἐμὸν ἐγχος ἐλὼν καὶ φάσγανοι ὀξὺ 
καρπαλίμως παρὰ νῆα ἀνήϊον ἐς περίσσην,
εἰ πως ἔργα ἱδομὶ βρωτῶν ἐνοίητε τε πυθίμην.
ἔστην δὲ σκοπῆν ἐς παιπαλοέςσαν ἄνελθον,
καὶ μοι ἐείσατο καπνός ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυδείης 
Κήρης ἐν μεγάροισι διὰ δρυμὰ πυκνὰ καὶ ύλην. 
μερμήριξα δ’ ἐπεῖτα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν 
ἐλθεῖν ὡδε πυθέσθαι, ἔπει ἱδον αἰθοτα καπνὸν.
But when the fair-haired Dawn in her rounds brought on the third day, then at last I took up my spear again, my sharp sword, and went up quickly from beside the ship to find a lookout place, if perchance I might see the fields of mortals and hear some sound. I climbed to a rocky point of the observation and stood there, and got a sight of smoke which came from the halls of Circe going up from wide-wayed earth through undergrowth and forest. Then I pondered deeply in my heart and my spirit, whether, since I had seen the fire and smoke, to investigate.

The hopeful anticipation of seeing fields of men (εἴ πως ἔργα ἴδομι βροτῶν, “if perchance I might see the fields of mortals”) is disappointed, as it was among the Laestrygonians (ἔνθα μὲν οὕτε βοῶν οὔτ᾽ ἀνδρῶν φαίνετο ἔργα, “from here no trace of cattle nor working of men was visible”, 10.98). Parallels with the Laestrygonians include the fact that the earth is here qualified with the civilization-implying adjective ἐὐρυοδείης (recall that the Laestrygonians too had a wagon-path [10.103-104]), and the thick woods which provided the Laestrygonians with timber and provide Circe with a copse to shelter her home (10.104). Odysseus indicates that it is the sight of the smoke rising through the forest that finally causes him to postpone meetings with the inhabitants and tend to his crew’s needs (ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἴθοπα καπνόν, “since I had seen the fire and smoke”). Perhaps this whole sequence of interactions with landscape is beginning to feel a bit too reminiscent of his misadventures in Telepylus.

Much ink has been spilled over the significance of the stag hunt upon which Odysseus embarks after seeing Circe’s habitation. Scodel’s article (1994) cited at the beginning of this chapter provides part of the solution. She notes that the hunt followed by the feast is a characteristic institution of civilized human society, contrasting sharply with the pastoralist Cyclopes and Laestrygonians. By hunting, Odysseus takes matters into his own hands and engages in an activity with an aristocratic pedigree which dates back to Mycenaean times, and which (more importantly) invokes a nexus of connections essential to his identity. The hunt with his maternal grandfather Autolycus in Book 19 has left him with the scar which will serve as one of the proofs of his identity to his servants, but also leads to a reminiscence of Autolycus’ earlier visit in which he named Odysseus in honor of his own antagonistic relation with many men.
(presumably as a result of his thieving ways!).\(^{298}\) In keeping with Scodel’s thesis,\(^{299}\) hunting serves as a useful propaedeutic for the struggle to reclaim Ithaca, which, as befits a grandson of Autolycus, is itself regularly characterized as a rocky and out of the way place,\(^ {300}\) and which has at last to be re-conquered by force.

I would argue that the pattern traced throughout the present chapter adds new implications for the theme of food-seekers turned to food. As we have seen, putative “men who eat bread” have previously turned out to be purveyors of narcotics and cannibalistic monsters. As a preface to the first extended narrative of the Apologue, we also witnessed a goat hunt bringing Odysseus and his men into a more intimate relation with Goat Island, as nymphs almost literally provided Odysseus and his men with food, only to find that Odysseus and his men became potential food themselves the next day for Polyphemus. Then, the Laestrygonians embarrass the Ithacans even further by decisively winning the engagement, leaving Odysseus with only one ship while spearing and eating many others. On Circe’s island Odysseus and his men will become potential food not for uncivilized monsters but for one another as they are transformed into pigs.\(^ {301}\) The deer hunt thus raises the looming specter of cannibalism. Once we have seen what Circe does to the emissaries which Odysseus does at length muster the courage to send, we will likely wonder whether this deer may not be another unfortunate, formerly human

\(^{298}\) Odysseus’ naming presents problems of interpretation, chiefly whether the sense of the verb whence his name is derived is active/middle or passive. See W.B. Stanford’s 1952 article for detailed discussion.

\(^{299}\) Scodel interprets the hunt on Parnassus as “normal hunting”, inasmuch as it “anticipates the conflicts of war, rather than the effort to find food.” The boar-hunt on Parnassus may also have slightly more sinister connotations, however: Autolykos is a thief under the protection of Hermes (19.395-397), who in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes himself steals Apollo’s cattle. The fact that Autolykos and his brood frequent the slopes of Apollo’s sacred mountain hunting boars carries faint suggestions of impropriety.


\(^{301}\) There has been some debate over which of the animals on Aeaea are transformed human beings: Heubeck 1989 ad 10.213 opines of the animals mentioned here that, “though it may be natural to interpret these lines in terms of the familiar folk-tale motif of men turned into beasts (cf. 239), in fact the poet has at this point deliberately excluded that traditional element of magic from his story.” Homer does not stress the possibility that the deer eaten by the men were transformed humans, but for Eurylochus, at least, who has seen what Circe can do, the possibility that transformation into a pig could mean being caught and consumed by one’s fellow Ithacans must be a very real fear.
victim of Circe’s wiles. David Roessel (1989) remarks on the suggestive use of τέλωρον in the of the stag in the hunting episode – it is used elsewhere in the same passage to refer to animals more clearly transformed by the enchantress. For audience members who choose to note this unsettling opening offered by the text, the Ithacan one-time victims of anthropophagy ironically progress from eaten to eaters of men on Aeaea – a role which accords with Circe’s brother’s family’s propensity for cutting up humans to small bits (Absyrtus, Pelias). Odysseus’ words to his companions as they begin a feast replete with well-worn formulas suggestive of a return to civilization (e.g., hand-washing, sweet wine, 182, 184) indicate the irony of their actions:

ὦ φίλοι, οὐ γάρ πω καταδυσόμεθ', ἀχνύμενοι περ,
εἰς Ἀἴδος δόμοις, πρὶν μόρσιμον ἡμαρ ἐπέλθῃ·
άλλῳ ἄγετ’, δὲ φρ’ ἐν νηῒ θοῇ βρῶσις τε πόσις τε,
μησόμεθα βρῶσις μηδὲ τρυχώμεθα λιμῷ.
10.174-177

Dear friends, sorry as we are, we shall not yet go down into the house of Hades. Not until our day is appointed.

Come then, while there is something to eat and drink by the fast ship, let us think of our food and not be worn out with hunger.

By eating the flesh of the potential man-become-beast which Odysseus tells them will help them avoid Hades, Odysseus and his men are sustained long enough for Circe to send them to that very place. The deer hunt thus eases Odysseus’ anxieties about sending out his men and boosts their confidence, but – more nefariously – involves Odysseus and his men for the first time in the complicated issue of determining who is human and who is really an animal. In keeping with the greater moral complexity of the minor episodes after the Cyclops (Aeolus’ hyper-civilized Isle, the Laestrygonians’ feral character lurking under a veneer of civilization), the first major episode allows this issue for the first time to impugn the Ithacans themselves. With Circe, all Odysseus’ attempts to predict what he and his men will find proved vain: there is nothing about the landscape of Circe’s island which could have led them to surmise that an enchantress made her home there. As all hope of using topography to predict culture melt away, Odysseus is reduced to relying on divine aid, which thankfully arrives in the form of Hermes’ epiphany (10.277-308).

Only on the next day does Odysseus at last feel that the men are up to hearing his suggestion that some go to explore Circe’s island. In the passage leading up to the meeting with
Circe, certain landscape elements serve as motifs recalling past disasters. An awareness shared by both Odysseus and the poet of the eerie similarities with past botched forays into seemingly innocuous pastoral enclaves is never disguised:

Ὣς ἐφάμην, τοῖσι δὲ κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἢτορ 

μυησαμένοις ἔργων Λαιατρυγῶνος Ἀντιφάτοιο 

Κύκλωπός τε βίης μεγαλήτορος, ἀνδροφάγοιο.

So I spoke, and the inward heart in them was broken, as they remembered Antiphates the Laestrygonian and the violence of the great-hearted cannibal Cyclops.

Odysseus’ ascent of a beetling lookout followed by the sighting of smoke followed by his sending out a foraging expedition has not turned out auspiciously in the past, and the men see the writing on the wall as clearly as Odysseus.

On arriving at Circe’s home, Odysseus’ scouts are fed a brew of civilizing and wild foods in the form of Circe’s κυκεών. The significantly named Polites (citizen of a polis!) addresses the goddess, and accepts a mixture of civilized elements (barley and grain) associated with men who eat bread and hence reminiscent of the produce which Odysseus vainly hoped to find among the Lotus Eaters and Laestrygonians, pastoral elements reminiscent of the Cyclops (cheese), wine, which has appeared as a champion of civilization against the unaccustomed Cyclops, honey, the sweetness of which has appeared at the beginning of Book 9 in association with nostos, and, of course, drugs.\(^\text{302}\)

\[\text{302 See Heubeck ad 10.234-243: Hecamede likewise prepares a κυκεών employing many of the same ingredients in Iliad 11.638-640.}\]
She brought them inside and seated them on chairs and benches, and mixed them a potion, with barley and cheese and pale honey added to Pramneian wine, but put into the mixture malignant drugs, to make them forgetful of their own country. When she had given them this and they had drunk it down, next thing she struck them with her wand and drove them into her pig pens, and they took on the look of pigs, with the heads and voices and bristles of pigs, but the minds within them stayed as they had been before.

The effect of this variegated concoction which confounds foods significant of home, pastoralism, agriculturalism, and witchcraft is forgetfulness of one’s homeland, just like that effected by the eating of lotus in Book 9. Paradoxically, though Circe’s drug makes the men forget their homeland, transformation into swine leaves their minds intact. The fact that the preparation of Circe’s potion requires a complex array of the products of pastoral and agricultural economies does not sit entirely comfortably with the absence of other inhabitants and fields on her island, but that may be in accordance with Homer’s intentions. Aeaea represents the logical conclusion of the tendency of the Apologue to establish the magical or fantastic character of a landscape by using its physical geography to raise expectations about the people who live there, and then frustrating these expectations. Circe is a practitioner of magic, and it matters not at all that she does not possess workers to grow the barley and make the cheese, for the same reason that the transformation of men into pigs presents her with no obstacle. Her island embodies on the ethical level what the sea represents in the natural world for Odysseus: complete flux, in which the only fixed points are the human mind (αὐτὰρ νοῦς ἦν ἐμπεδὸς ὡς τὸ πάρος περ, “but the minds within them stayed as they had been before”) and the gods, as demonstrated by Hermes’ intervention. When he conquers Circe even as he simultaneously becomes her lover, Odysseus accepts the vulnerability and dependency upon the gods which this proposition entails, suggesting his readiness himself to be transformed by Athena in Book 13 when the time comes to try to infiltrate his palace at home.

When, after returning from the underworld and surviving the Sirens, Scylla, and Charybdis, Odysseus and his men arrive at the island of the Sun, the last extended narrative of the Apologue, they commit their final violation of culinary mores by consuming the Cattle of Helios. By this point, the men are beset by overt famine:
μῆνα δὲ πάντ’ ἄληκτος ἀπὶ Νότος, οὐδὲ τὸς ἄλλος γίνετ’ ἐπεὶ ἀνέμου, εἰ μὴ Ἔρυθρος τὸ Νότος τε.
οἱ δ’ ἂν μὲν σῖτον ἔχον καὶ οἶνον ἑρυθρὸν,
τόφρα βοῶν ἀπέχοντο λιλαίόμενοι βιότοιο.
ἄλλ’ ὅτε δὴ νῆσος ἐξέφθιτο ἤια πάντα,
καὶ δὴ ἄγρην ἐφέπεσκον ἀλητεύοντες ἀνάγκη,
ἵθις ὑδριθάς τε, φίλας ὁ τι χεῖρας ἰκεῖτο,
γυμνᾶτοις ἄγκιστροισιν: ἔτειρε δὲ γαστέρα λιμός.
12.325-332

But the South Wind blew for a whole month long, nor did any other wind befall after that, but only the South and East Wind.
As long as they still had food to eat and red wine, the men kept their hands off the cattle, striving as they were for sustenance. Then, when all the provisions that had been in the ship had given out, they turned to hunting, forced to it, and went ranging after fish and birds, anything that they could lay hands on, and with curved hooks, for the hunger was exhausting their stomachs.

This despairing statement contains a catalogue of the principal sources for food which the men have explored to this point on their journey, in decreasing order of preference. Bread and wine, the preferred comestibles of the civilized, come first, followed by the even more desirable beef, which under normal circumstances would be associated with sacral feasting but which is here deselected in deference to Circe’s taboo. The ship’s stores, in the past the first recourse for those wanting more sophisticated fare, are for the first time explicitly stated to run out. At last they resort to hunting birds and fishing to survive in an echo of Menelaus’ description of analogous desperation at 4.368-369 – significantly, in both passages fishing is paired in a formulaic line with hunger gnawing at the stomach. Fishing is a last option of men with no other way to sustain themselves. Eating the animals of Circe’s land was dangerous because one might be consuming men; on the island of Helios, one might be consuming the property of the gods.

In deliberating whether to eat the cattle of Helios, Odysseus and his men play off the two constants seen in the Circe episode – the human mind and divine will – against one another. Their ultimate sin of eating the cattle serves Homer’s need to represent the other Ithacans as responsible for their own fates, but also is valuable in revealing Odysseus’ own willingness (unlike his men) to subordinate his own cleverness to the divine injunction against eating the cattle. The scene establishes a limit beyond which Odysseus will not press his guile, and it is left
for Eurylochus to offer the sophistic argument that eating the cattle could even be interpreted as a pious sacrifice.  

In this chapter I have endeavored to show that encounters with landscape for Odysseus and his men are conditioned by the pressing need of reconnaissance for food. In the initial landscapes of Books 9-12, Odysseus repeatedly puts the hypothesis that landscape determines culture to the test, and finds it seriously wanting. In exploring the lack of social institutions among the Cyclopes, Odysseus confronts the possibility of finding similar conditions prevailing at home on Ithaca when he returns, and is forced to acknowledge that geography is no sure predictor of the character of a people: the suitors have reduced the level of political organization to conflicting family allegiances, and only Laertes’ country enclave stands as a possible last refuge where labor and sweat still sustain civilization from the soil up. The Laestrygonians undermine further the possibility of a connection between the necessity for agricultural toil and civilized behavior, for this nation has cities and labor, yet still eats Odysseus’ men. At last, Odysseus is left with nothing upon which to rely except his wits and the gods.

Odysseus recites the Apologue as the pendant to a feast, giving instructions on the replenishment of the diners’ victuals before beginning to sing his own deeds:

Ἀλκίνως κρείον, πάντων ἄριστεκέτε λαῶν,
ηὶ τοι μὲν τόδε καλὸν ἀκουέμεν ἐστίν ἄοιδοῦ
tοιουθ’, οίος δ’ ἐστί, θεοὶ ἐναλίγκιος αὐθίν.
οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ γέ τί φημι τέλος χαριέστερον εἶναι
ἡ δ’ ἐύφροσύνη μὲν ἔχῃ κατὰ δήμων ἀπαντὰ,
δαιτυμῶν δ’ ἀνὰ δώματ’ ἀκουάζωνται ἄοιδοῦ
ἡμεῦν ἐξείηξ, παρὰ δὲ πλήθωσι τράπεζαι
οἰνοχόος φορέῃσι καὶ ἐγχεὶς δεπάεσσι·
τοῦτό τί μοι κάλλιστον ἐνὶ φρεσὶν εἶδεται εἶναι.

9.2-11

O great Alcinous, pre-eminent among all people, surely indeed it is a good thing to listen to a singer such as this one before us, who is like the gods in his singing; for I think there is no occasion accomplished that is more pleasant than when festivity holds sway among all the populace, and the feasters up and down the houses are sitting in order

and listening to the singer, and beside them the tables are loaded with bread and meats, and from the mixing bowl the wine steward draws the wine and carries it about and fills the cups. This seems to my own mind to be best.

Heubeck (ad loc.) insightfully observes the relevance of this remark to both Ithaca and the Phaeacians: the orderly enjoyment of the feast is “an outward and visible sign of a stable and peacefully ordered community.” I have suggested that this “outward and visible sign” works its way into Odysseus’ tales, beginning with his protestation that nothing is sweeter than one’s own home – in his case, Ithaca. The tales essentially prove this: new landscapes and new threats open up to the errant heroes largely because they must probe them for sources of victuals. In each case, the inhabitants’ unexpected eating habits bring new disasters for Odysseus until he reaches Aeaea, where Circe’s unforeseen talents with magic bring him near to becoming the cannibal himself. Especially in these earlier adventures, landscape serves as a marker for the kinds of food – and the what kinds of men – that are to be expected, fields giving hope of men who eat grain, smoke rising on the horizon signifying human or superhuman inhabitants who may be pillaged by Odysseus or may enchant him with their drugs, and deserted fallow land ominously leading the reader to wonder the cause of its desertion. All of these locales are rejected for their obvious drawbacks, affirming Odysseus’ suspicion that no place is sweeter than home when he returns to Ithaca and the Gardens of Laertes.
Another aspect of landscape which benefits from renewed attention is the surprising profusion of places whose descriptions are rendered at night or under other conditions which would tend to make them for all practical purposes invisible.\(^{304}\) This effects a sharp division between what the inhabitants of the narrative see (nothing!) and what the narrator and the audience are privileged to see and to know with their mind’s eye. It divorces the objects being described from the time-frame of the narrative (there is no question of their being focalized through a character) and at least temporarily causes them to subsist in the eternal present of iterated epic performance. It will be recalled that one instance of such “\textit{sub specie aeternitatis}” description appeared in the Cyclops episode, where Odysseus as narrator followed his generalizing description of dawn with an account of his men involved the next day in active exploitation of the natural features previously adumbrated. Another example of this phenomenon was Olympus (6.41-47): other than Homer’s specification of Olympus as Athena’s destination, the landscape is presented as eternal (\textit{ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ}) and completely unaffected by human or divine agency. In both these examples, it was remarked that the very absence of human voices and signs of human activity added up to a numinous and faintly unsettling impression of the landscape.

The scene to which we shall devote most of this chapter shares with Olympus the feature of being described just before dawn, and on casual inspection possesses all the hallmarks of leading into a description of Ithaca \textit{sub specie aeternitatis}. This is the scene of Odysseus’ arrival on Ithaca just before dawn, as the morning star rises (13.93ff.). In describing how the Phaeacians unceremoniously leave Odysseus on the shore of his homeland, the poet emphasizes

\(^{304}\) An interesting facet of the poem, in light of the tradition that Homer himself was blind (see René Nünlist 1998, 162-163). Odysseus and his men likewise arrive at Goat Island at night, and it is explicitly stated at line 146-147 that he and his men do not look at the island as they put their ship in.
the obstacles which prevent them from properly perceiving the harbor: in addition to the fact that it is still presumably before dawn, just after the well-known description of the harbor of Phorcys the poet obscurely remarks that “they [the Phaeacians] put in there, having seen it previously” (13.113). The poet has told us that the lighting is obscure (13.93-95), and the Phaeacians’ experiential knowledge of how to approach Ithaca as outsiders offers a foil to Odysseus, who has only experienced Ithaca from the standpoint of a native. To complicate matters further, Athena soon pours a mist around Odysseus, making the features of the area in question even more difficult to perceive, and proceeds to deliver two differing descriptions of Ithaca under different guises, one of which defines the island in terms of exploitability by human beings, the other of which seems to touch on spaces and objects in which humans meet divinities and offer them worship.

The harbor of Phorcys shares with Olympus and Goat Island the uncanny silence and hair-raising sense of expectancy that ruffles the hair on the back of our necks and sets our hearts aflutter in places which invite habitation, yet are inexplicably uninhabited. The emptiness of the shoreline and the absence of even the nymphs as the sun rises reveal Ithaca as uncannily divine yet desolate, and it remains to be seen whether the coming episode will prove a Cyclopeia, an ascent to Olympus of an Elysium, or a nostos. I will argue in this chapter that Athena deliberately obscures Ithaca’s landscape, thereby deceiving Odysseus about his location, because she believes that Odysseus is by this point an old hand at surviving in foreign lands, but fears that he will prematurely rush home if he realizes that he is on Ithaca.

8.1 ARRIVAL AT ITHACA

The appearance of Ithaca can only be appreciated fully in the context of the description of Odysseus’ departure from Scheria that precedes it. In the first ninety-two lines of Book 13, Homer creates an effect which hovers between lullaby and fairytale in its emphasis on the muting of both hearing and sight. The first line of the book closes with a reference to silence – the Phaeacians’ awed reaction to the end of Odysseus’ Apologue (οἱ δ׳ ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ, “and all of them stayed stricken to silence”, 1); the second, to the darkness of
the palace (κηληθμῷ δ’ ἔσχοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκιόεντα, “and they were held in thrall by the story all through the shadowy chambers”, 2). Silence and darkness will continue as scenic characteristics throughout the remainder of Odysseus’s stay on Scheria, both adding to the surreal tone of this last transitional day in Odysseus’ external nostos.

One gets the impression that, had Odysseus failed to assert his desire to be off and on his way home at 13.38, he might easily have found himself stuck in another fairyland home like Ogygia, perpetually listening to Demodocus sing other men’s klea and abandoning the forging of his own. It is therefore of special significance that the mention of the Phaeacians’ silence is soon followed by Demodocus once again picking up his lyre and beginning to sing (μετὰ δὲ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδός, / Δημόδοκος, λαοίσι τετιμένος, “and among them, Demodocus, the divine singer, sang his songs and was prized by the people”, 27-28). To be sure, the Phaeacians are amazed at his tales, but Odysseus has now exhausted his quiver of adventures to relate to the court, and as the lyre strikes up a new note Odysseus stands in danger of becoming just another one of a company of half-divine beings enjoying a blessed existence while hearing the sagas of mortal men’s accomplishments. Among them, he would enjoy only reputation for things past.

While living men can have kleos, its true test is whether it persists after one’s death. Thus, for Odysseus’ family, his ever-propagating kleos raises half-conscious resistance from those who would prefer to have the man himself rather than his reputation. Most notably, an assumption which underlies Penelope’s objection to Phemius’ songs seems to be that she is left with Odysseus’ kleos but does not have the man Odysseus himself: τοίην γὰρ κεφαλήν ποθέω μεμνημένη αἰεὶ / ἀνδρός, τοῦ κλέος εὐρύ καθ’ Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἀργος (“so dear a head do I long for whenever I am reminded / of my husband, whose fame goes wide through Hellas and midmost Argos”, 1.343-44). Demodocus has previously demonstrated proficiency in divine myth and in Iliadic poetry (Odyssey 8.266-367, 8.487-520), and even if the blind bard should hymn Odysseus’ martial feats to high heaven, for Odysseus to stay among the Phaeacians would amount to his becoming the Iliadic ghost of Odysseus who haunts Demodocus’ tales and never attaining the distinction of having carved out for himself a positive nostos tale for Phemius to sing along with his many more woeful accounts of returning heroes (cf. 1.326).

For this reason, Odysseus must press the Phaeacians to grant him the pompê which he was promised: failure is the equivalent of death, as the undertones of katabasis which become more pronounced in this portion of the Phaeacian episode demonstrate. Some of the Phaeacians’
more otherworldly features come to the fore in these last conversations. Awing the king and queen of the underworld through song in order to be reunited with one’s wife in the world of the living resonates with the myth of Orpheus. Alcinous’ characterization of Odysseus as παλιμπλαγχθείς indicates that he is about to be transported back over the hazy dividing line between the supernatural realms of Calypso, Circe, and the underworld into the securely known world of Western Greece. The giving of “all gifts” (πάντα δῶρα, 11-12) faintly echoes the role of Hades as Pluton. Likewise, Odysseus’ strangely ornate farewell to Arete implicitly contrasts his status as mortal prone to old age and death with the happiness which he wishes the queen:

Χαίρέ μοι ὦ βασίλεια, διαμπερές, εἰς ὁ κε γῆρας ἐλθῇ καὶ θάνατος, τά τ´ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπωσι πέλουται. αὐτάρ ἐγώ νέωμαι· σὺ δὲ τέρπεσ τῶδ´ ἐνι οἶκῳ παισί τε καὶ λαοίσι καὶ Ἀλκινόω βασιλῆι.

13.59-62

Farewell to you, O queen, and for all time, until old age comes to you, and death, which befall all human creatures. Now I am on my way; but have joy here in your household, in your children and your people, and in your king Alcinous.

Though Odysseus’ words imply that he believes Arete to be mortal, he imagines her spending the rest of her existence in the same recreations which she has enjoyed during his stay – having joy in her house. This life of complete ease recalls Elysium, but couched in much more mortal terms. By closing the farewell with benevolent regards for Arete’s children, people, and king Odysseus places Arete and her people at a midway point between entirely Golden Age settings such as Elysium and his own mortal Ithaca.

A dense cluster of words for sleep, darkness, and silence continues to contribute to the vaguely suggestive ambience of dreamy revelry throughout the remainder of Odysseus’ evening with the Phaeacians, beginning with the desiderative κακκείοντες (13.17). The next day, as the Phaeacian nobles give Odysseus their gifts, he longs for the sunset and welcomes it like a weary and hungry farmer in the fields (13.28-35).³⁰⁵ Further, Arete’s final gift to Odysseus is a φᾶρος

³⁰⁵ Once again, the emphasis on night as a period of time to be longed for and susceptible to
– the same word used for Penelope’s feigned burial shroud of Laertes. The poet is oddly insistent that the ship is provisioned with food and bedding, recalling the provisioning of a funeral feast:

Also Arete sent her serving women with him. One carried a mantle, washed and clean, and a tunic. Another one she sent along with him to carry the well-made chest, and a third went along with them bearing food and red wine. But when they had gone down to the sea, and where the ship was,

\[\text{Ἀρήτη δ' ἀρα οἱ διμωάς ἀμ' ἐπεμπτε γυναῖκας, τὴν μὲν φάρος ἔχουσαν ἐὑπλυνές ὡδὲ χιτώνα, τὴν δ' ἔτέρην χηλὸν πυκινήν ἀμ' ὀπτασε κομίζειν ὡδ' ἀλλη ὑτόν τ' ἐφερεν καὶ οἶνον ἔρυθρον. Αὐταρ ἔπειρ ρ' ἔπι νηὰ κατήλυθην ὡδὲ θάλασσαν, αἴγα τά γ' ἐν νηὶ γλαφυρῇ πομπῆς ἄγανοι δεξάμενοι κατέθεντο, πόοιν καὶ βρῶσιν ἀπασαν. κάδ δ' ἀρ' Ὀδυσσεί ὁτόρεσαν ρηγός τε λίνον τε νηὸς ἀτ' ἰκριόφιν γλαφυρῆς, ἕνα νήγρετον εὐδοὶ, πρυμνῆς ἀν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐβήσετο καὶ κατέλεκτο σιγῆ; τοὶ δὲ καθίζον ὡδ' χλιόν ἐκαστοὶ κόσμω, πεῖσμα δ' ἐλυσαν ἀπὸ τρητοῦ λίθου. εὐδ' οἱ ἀνακλινθέντες ἀνερρίπτουν ἀλα πῆδῳ, καὶ τά νήδυμος ὑπὸς ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἐπιπτε. νήγρετος ἡδοτος, θανάτῳ ἄγχιστα ἠοικὼς. 13.66-80]

Cf. Odyssey 2.96-98:

\[\text{κοῦροι, ἐμοὶ μνηστῆρες, ἐπεὶ θάνε δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς, μὴ μου μεταμώνια νήματ 'ὀληται. Young men, my suitors now that the great Odysseus has perished, wait, though you are eager to marry me, until I finish this web, so that my weaving will not be useless and wasted.} \]

---

division into discreet units of time other than watches is rare in Homeric epic. The prevalent mode of sailing in the Odyssey famously presumes beatching ships for the night and sleeping upon the shore, as the existence of a formulaic and typical paradigm for this phenomenon demonstrates; while critical opinion on the actual praxis of Archaic age sailors has been shifting to one of more versatile and enterprising sailors unafraid to venture into the open sea or sail by night, the Phaeacians’ willingness to sail through the night is an Odyssean hapax, and contributes to their otherworldly mystique. Note that they are explicitly designated magical vessels at 8.557ff.
the proud escorts promptly took over the gifts, and stowed them away in the hollow hull, and all the food and the drink, then spread out a coverlet for Odysseus, and linen, out on the deck, at the stern of the ship’s hull, so that he could sleep there undisturbed, and he himself went aboard and lay down silently. They sat down each in his place at the oarlocks in order, and slipped the cable free from its hole in the stone post. They bent to their rowing, and with their oars tossed up the sea spray, and upon the eyes of Odysseus there fell a sleep, gentle, the sweetest kind of sleep with no awakening, most like death.

Odysseus’ bedding is even such that he will sleep “without waking” – surely an adverb meant to call to mind more than the usual light nap on the road (ἲνα νῆγρετον εὕδοι, repeated again a few lines later – νῆγρετος). Words of silence and softness continue to recur (σιγῇ); νήδυμος ὑπνος may connote either “sweet sleep” or “sleep from which one does not get up”307, and – lest we had any doubts – Homer concludes the passage by observing that Odysseus’ sleep was like death. While sleep is often characterized as “sweet” in the Odyssey (the positive degree of comparison), it is more rare to find it referred to in the superlative degree (ἥδιστος – the superlative form occurs only here in both epics). It will be recalled from our discussion of the description of Ithaca at the beginning of the Apologue that Odysseus there characterized nostos, and by association, Ithaca, as “sweet”. Can it be mere coincidence that the only appearance of the superlative degree of this word for sweet distinguishes the sleep which renders Odysseus unconscious at the very moment when the longed-for nostos to Ithaca is at last made fact?

Words of sleep and silence continue in the Phaeacians’ pompê as the ship sails along. The effect of Odysseus’ soporific sedation is that, by the time they reach Ithaca, he has forgotten the things which he has suffered (δὴ τότε γ᾿ἀτρέμας εὗδε, λελασμένος ὅσσ᾿ ἐπεπόνθει, 13.92) – presumably the very sufferings which have comprised the gist of the Apologue and all his adventures to date.308 Douglas Frame has demonstrated the opposition between the concepts nous and nostos on the one hand and lanthano and the loss of nostos the other in the Odyssey,309 and therein, I would propose, lies the rub for Odysseus during his homecoming: in the very

307 LSJ s.v. equivocates as to whether it is derived from ἡδύς or whether it represents a negative form of δύναμις.
308 This does not, of course, mean that he has literally forgotten that these events happened.
309 See Frame 2005.
sweetest sleep which takes away the pain of all his travels and causes him to forget lies the potential for Odysseus to botch his nostos; for, by forgetting what he has suffered, it may be feared, he may well have unlearned some of the valuable lessons which accompanied that suffering. It was this very patience which made him who he was in the character-defining moments of the storm of Book 5. Moreover, experiences such as his conversation with Agamemnon in Book 11 should have been sufficient to warn him that domestic dangers may lie in wait for him once he has reached Ithaca. The superlative sweetness of nostos thus proves double-edged, and I would argue that it is this assumption which causes Athena to transform Ithaca from a familiar to a foreign setting, and to prevent Odysseus from seeing it clearly.

Against this tabula rasa of silence and neutralized kleos the first distinctive landscape of Book 13 appears. First, Homer recaps the proem (13.88-92), then specifies the time of day with the advent of Eosphoros. As in the description of sunrise in Book 3, the explicit mention of the light source for the scene fulfills an aesthetic function. The poet permits the changing light to bring about the apparition of minute landscape details. Where a Romantic or modernist writer would likely have striven to express verbally the virtual ex nihilo act of creation embodied in dawn’s gradual illumination, Homer simply mentions that the dawn-star is rising and permits the optical effect of the increasing light to find expression gradually as he describes the Harbor of Phorcys:

Φόρκυνος δὲ τις ἔστι λιμήν, ἀλίοιο γέροντος,
ἐν δὴ μω Ἱθάκης· δύο δὲ προβλήτες ἐν αὐτῷ ἀκταὶ ἀπορρώγες, λιμένιος πότιπετπτημιαί,
αἰ τ’ ἀνέμων σκεπόωσι δυσαῆναν μέγα κύμα ἐκτοθεν· ἐντοθεν δὲ τ’ ἀνευ δεσμοίοι μένουσι νῆις εὐσσέλμωι, ὅτ’ ἂν ὀρμοῦ μέτρον ἱκοιτα. ἀυτὰρ ἐπὶ κρατὸς λιμένιος πανύφυλλος ἐλαίη, ἀγχόθι δ’ αὐτῆς ἀντρον ἔπηρατον ἠνοεἰδές, ἱρον νυμφᾶς, αἱ ηπιάδες καλέονται.
ἐν δὲ κρητηρίδες τε καὶ ἀμφιφορητές ἔσσι λάινοι· ἔνθα δ’ ἐπείτε τιθαβώσουσι μέλισσαι.
ἐν δ’ ἵστοι λίθοι περιμήκεες, ἐνθα τε νύμφαι φάρε’ ὑφαίνουσιν ἀλλόπορφωρα, θαῦμα ἱδέσθαι· ἐν δ’ ὑβατ’ ἀνάοντα, δύω δὲ τε ὁι θύραι εἰσίν, αἱ μὲν πρὸς Βορέαο καταιβαταὶ ἀνθρώποις, αἱ δ’ αὖ πρὸς Νότου εἰσὶ θεώτεραι· οὐδὲ τ’ εἰσίν ἄνδρες ἐσέρχονται, ἀλλ’ ἀθανάτων ὁδός ἐστιν.

"Ενθ’ οἱ γ’ εἰσέλασαν, πρὶν εἰδότες, ἡ μὲν ἐπείτα ἡπείρω ἑπέκελσεν, ὅσον τ’ ἐπὶ ἡμιον πάσης,
There is a harbor of the Old Man of the Sea, Phorcys, in the countryside of Ithaca. There two precipitous promontories opposed jut out, to close in the harbor and shelter it from the big waves made by the winds blowing so hard on the outside; inside, the well-benched vessels can lie without being tied up, once they have found their anchorage.

At the head of the harbor, there is an olive tree with spreading leaves, and nearby is a cave that is shaded, and pleasant, and sacred to the nymphs who are called the Nymphs of the Wellsprings, Naiads. There are mixing bowls and the handled jars inside it, all of stone, and there the bees deposit their honey. And therein also are looms that are made of stone, very long, where the nymphs weave their sea-purple webs, a wonder to look on; and there is water forever flowing. It has two entrances, one of them facing the North Wind, where people can enter, but the other one toward the South Wind has more divinity. That is the way of the immortals, and no men enter by that way. It was into this bay they rowed their ship. They knew of it beforehand. The ship, hard-driven, ran up onto the beach for as much as half her length, such was the force the hands of the oarsmen gave her.

In our chapter on dawn scenes we noted the gradual build-up to the inclusion of visual adjectives in this passage which effects a transition from the mode of description to the mode of narration, leading from timeless landscape to immediate, circumstance-specific setting. Between the mention that dawn is coming in 13.94 and the Phaeacians ramming their boat into the shoreline in 113-115, our vista has widened from amorphous and elemental blobs of land-masses to specific beautiful features of landscape. After bringing us tantalizingly near to an encounter with the nymphs in 13.113, Homer adds further paradoxical detail to his description: the locus amoenus which he has just described is quite literally for his audience’s eyes only, for (allowing for hyperbole) even the Phaeacian sailors rely on previous memories of the place rather than what they can see at present: Ἔνθ’οἱ γ’εἰσέλασαν πρὶν εἰδότες.
8.2 THE CAVE OF THE NYMPHS

The entire scene, with its uncanny domestic setting hewn from the mythological fusion of water and land, complete with stone kraters, stone looms, and sea-purple cloth, creates a feeling of anticipation and wonder. As Hoekstra observes,\textsuperscript{310} the “topographical introduction” arrests the narrative and brings the attention of the audience to bear upon the scenery which will serve as the backdrop to Odysseus’ coming adventures. In this way, the landscape of the harbor of Phorcys acts for the reader much as the somnolent sea voyage does for Odysseus, effecting a forgetfulness of things past and directing the attention forward to the new obstacles which await in the approaching shore. The landscape itself is constructed of elements drawn from both the fairy and the real worlds, all culminating in the famous cave of the nymphs with its two entrances, one of which is designated for gods, the other for men.\textsuperscript{311}

In our discussion of the olive on the shore of Scheria we noted the divergence of the human and the divine storylines of the epic, as Athena flew off to an idyllic and untroubled Olympus while Odysseus was piling up a bed of leaves for himself under a double olive tree, obtaining his shelter through the work of his own two hands. Here in the harbor, these two lines converge once again through landscape features such as the double cave and through the narrative of Athena’s most involved epiphany within the epic, which follows the description of the harbor. The elements of danger and toil which have by this point been solidly associated with Odysseus’ heroic identity find representation in the topography of the harbor. There is a near-echo of the land of the Laestrygonians in the description of the headlands which shelter the harbor. On Ithaca, these headlands provide shelter from the waves kicked up by the wind:

\begin{quote}
1989 ad 96.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Elliger 1975, 127 observes that the harbor becomes more mysterious the farther the description progresses: “Je tiefer man in die Bucht eindringt, desto geheimnisvoller scheint sie zu werden. Das Hafenbecken selbst ist noch ganz realistisch gesehen und unterscheidet sich grundsätzlich nicht von anderen Beispielen dieses Typs. Doch dann gleitet die Darstellung unmerklich aus der vordergründigen Realität heraus. Ölbaum und Höhle gehören ihr noch an, aber die Erwähnung der Nymphen eröffnet eine neue Dimension. In ihr liegen fast alle Einzelheiten, die noch folgen. Die überlangen Webstühle, an denen die Nymphen ihre Purpurgewänder wirken, führen bereits in das Reich des Märchens. Jedoch sind die Grenzen fließend.”
\end{quote}
δύο δὲ προβλῆτες ἐν αὐτῷ
ἀκταὶ ἀπορρώγες, λιμένος πότιπεττημεῖαι,
αἳ τ´ ἀνέμων σκεπώσι δυσαήων μέγα κῦμα
ἐκτοθεν.
There two precipitous
promontories opposed jut out, to close in the harbor
and shelter it from the big waves made by the winds blowing
so hard on the outside.

In the land of the Laestrygonians there are also jutting headlands, but they give no shelter,
instead creating the impression of a vast carnivorous maw waiting in ambush for unsuspecting ships:

ἀκταὶ δὲ προβλῆτες ἐναντίαι ἀλλήλησιν
ἐν στόματι προὔχουσιν, ἀραιή δ´ εἴσοδός ἐστιν,
ἐνθ´ ο´ι γ´ εἴσω πάντες ἔχου νέας ἀμφιελίσσας.
10.89-91
And two projecting promontories facing each other
jut out in the mouth, and there is a narrow entrance,
there all the rest of them had their oar-swept ships in the inward part.

In this second example, Homer goes on the note the absence of waves inside the harbor, but the
appearance of a calm in conjunction with the reference to the harbor’s ominous “mouth” casts a
pall over the tone of the entire description. The similarity of the harbor of Phorcys with this
earlier and less auspicious harbor makes the landscape of Ithaca seem benevolent in comparison,
even as it reminds us of the most disastrous loss of men which Odysseus suffered in his travels.
The “olive with spreading leaves” which appears immediately after Homer has set out the
geography of the harbor (13.102) stands as another reminder of Odysseus’ determination in the
face of defeats, recalling the olive under which Laertes’ son sheltered after weathering
Poseidon’s storm. In this regard, too, Odysseus’ condition on Ithaca can be seen as better than
that on Scheria: there he was in danger of freezing in the riverbed or being torn apart by wild
beasts, but here the olive offers the possibility of a rough shelter of which Odysseus will not have
to avail himself, thanks to Eumaeus’ hospitality. On the shore of Scheria, to the best of his
limited knowledge, he had only his wits upon which to rely, whereas events will soon reveal that
he now has Athena as a staunch ally.
Next after the olive in Odysseus’ description comes the Cave of the Nymphs. Nymphs appeared previously on Goat Island, a rough locale with great potential for cultivation but no actual inhabitants. Whereas there the nymphs provided easy food which seemed to lull Odysseus into a false sense of security and a need to seek adventure among the Cyclopes, here they will prove entirely welcoming and benevolent presences. Their appearance on Ithaca is also consistent with Athena’s attempts to return Odysseus to the attitude of one approaching Ithaca as a foreign landscape: nymphs constitute a baseline inhabitant for appealing but deserted locales, tending to inhabit marginal spaces apart from society, yet capable of aiding strangers. The much-vexed δύω… θύραι of their abode suggests their liminal status: one of Odysseus’ first actions upon recovering his memory of Ithaca will be to supplicate these demigoddesses to whom he now recalls having made offerings in the past. Their cave, at once familiar and strange, offers an entrée into a more civilized relationship with Ithaca’s landscape from the outside in, just as the nymphs of Goat Island did for Odysseus by providing him with food to feed his hungry men, but with a much better outcome.

The image of an empty and artificial replica of a domestic setting peopled by invisible inhabitants is evocative. It is an externalization of Odysseus’ internal state of homelessness and anchorlessness – a ghost domestic space which offers surrogate, nonfunctional imitations of everything which makes a home a home. I suggested above that Calypso’s cave offers a similar surrogate domestic space. The existence of such a space on Ithaca, as well, highlights the fact that Odysseus’s first perceptions of his home are those of a stranger: instead of rushing to his home, Odysseus instead finds himself in the same sort of space he had occupied during his years of thralldom to Calypso. Still, there is this difference: these nymphs are never implied to pose a threat to Odysseus in the same sense that Calypso did. Rather, they offer a transition from foreign to increasingly more intimate modes of experiencing Ithaca’s landscape.

The liminal character of nymphs is underscored by archaeological findings. Larson 2001 at several points averts to the “poor quality” of offerings in caves sacred to nymphs as an indication that cult of the nymphs was often the province of the lower classes of Greek society. They often are nurses or mother figures to unwanted children and are sometimes

312 Larson 2001, 228; cf. also the marginal status in Attic society which Larson ascribes to Archedamos at Vari cave.
associated with Aphrodite.\textsuperscript{313} As such, they are capable of effecting fairy-tale transformations from abandoned beggars to kings (cf. Oedipus, Aeneas, and even Zeus himself), and thus are suited to welcoming back the long-lost native son of Ithaca who must overturn the status quo of the suitors in order to reclaim his own throne. Their association with water and with river deities\textsuperscript{314} makes them ideal transitional figures in a second sense which looks forward to events beyond the πέρας of the text itself: as daughters of rivers, they are suited to acting as intercessors with Poseidon; Athena’s avoidant response to Odysseus’ promise to make future sacrifices to these nymphs (13.362: θάρσει, μή τοι ταύτα μετὰ φρεσὶ σῆσι μελόντων, “never fear, let none of these matters trouble your mind”) may be a tacit gesture to the tradition that Odysseus must leave Ithaca and travel inland with his oar in order to be reconciled to Poseidon, and that he will die “from the sea”.\textsuperscript{315}

The cave of the nymphs serves as a segue to Athena’s grand entrance at 13.189. In lines which a number of manuscripts omit, Athena describes the nymphs’ cave as ἠεροειδές (misty; cf. also 13.366, where the application of this epithet to the cave has not been questioned), intriguingly suggesting the cave itself as the source of the fog which the goddess pours around Odysseus on his landing.\textsuperscript{316} As Athena’s interview with Odysseus advances, the revelation that Odysseus has made offerings to these very nymphs in the past transforms the cave to a symbol of restored order and continuity:

\begin{quote}
ἀγχόθι δ’ αὐτῆς ἀντρον ἑπήρατον ἠεροειδές,
ιρὸν νυμφάων αἳ νηϊάδες καλέονται·
τοῦτο δέ τοι σπέος εὐρὺ κατηρεφές, ἐνθα σοῦ πολλάς
ἐρδεσκες νύμφησι τεληέσσας ἑκατόμβας.
\end{quote}

13.347-50

And nearby is the cave that is shaded, and pleasant,

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{313} As, for example, in the \textit{Homer Hymn to Aphrodite}, 257-273. Clay 1989, 194 observes that “it is fully appropriate that the offspring of the goddess and a mortal be nursed by these intermediate beings who inhabit the very wilds where the child was conceived and which constitute the domain of Aphrodite.” Thus the nymphs function as ambivalent and transitional figures in a slightly different but analogous way in the \textit{Hymn}.

\textsuperscript{314} See Larson 2001, 8.

\textsuperscript{315} For recent discussion of Odysseus’ inland journey, see Purves 2006.

\textsuperscript{316} Cf. also 6.14-17, where Athena likewise pours a cloud around her protégé to prevent his premature recognition by the Phaeacians.
and sacred to the nymphs who are called the Nymphs of the Wellsprings, Naiads. That is the wide over-arching cave, where often you used to accomplish for the nymphs their complete hecatombs.

Odysseus will eventually vow to reinstitute this practice (356-358).

8.3 ODYSSEUS’ AWAKENING

But Homer has one last deliberate blurring of the lines between illusion and reality up his sleeve. Finally, in the caesura κατὰ τὸ τρίτον τροχαῖον in line 187, Odysseus awakes. His entire landing has been dream-like, and Odysseus experiences a momentary disorientation in which the timeless, dream-like quality of his boat-ride from Phaeacia invades the ordinary world of Ithaca. He does not recognize his homeland: οὐδὲ μιν ἔγνω / ἤδη δὴν ἀπεών.

The reason for this momentary failure of recognition has been much discussed, but on the most superficial level it is quite clear what it is: at 13.190ff. the goddess has just “poured fog around” ὀφρα μιν αὐτῶν / ἄγνωστον τεύξειεν ἐκαστά τε μυθήσαιτο (190-191). The pronoun μιν is problematic: one might take it as referring to Ithaca, (reading the dative αὐτῷ with Aristophanes), with the meaning, “that she might make Ithaca unrecognizable to Odysseus.” Our choice of readings here has serious implications for how we understand Odysseus’ experience of his home country upon his arrival. Aristophanes’ reading, while lacking manuscript authority, not only renders a more consistent organization and progression of events (the first two-thirds of the book addressing Athena’s attempts to prevent Odysseus from running home, the final third at last introducing the disguise), but also portrays an Odysseus much more in keeping with the hero described in section 8.1 above: an Odysseus in danger of forgetting himself, and through this forgetfulness losing his homecoming before it is complete.

Let us turn to the passage of Odysseus awakening:

οδ᾽ ἔγρετο δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
eὐδεικτον ἐν γαῖῃ πατρωΐῃ, οὐδὲ μιν ἔγνω,
ἠδὴ δὴν ἀπεών· περὶ γὰρ θεὸς ἡέρα χεῦ
Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη, κούρη Διός, ὀφρα μιν αὐτῶν
But now great Odysseus wakened from sleep in his own fatherland, and did not know it, having been long away, for the goddess, Pallas Athena, daughter of Zeus, poured a mist over all, so she could make him unrecognizable and explain all the details to him, lest his wife recognize him, and his townspeople and friends, before he punished the suitors for their overbearing oppression. Therefore to the lord Odysseus she made everything look otherwise than it was, the penetrating roads, the harbors where all could anchor, the rocks going straight up, and the trees tall growing. He sprang and stood upright and looked about at his native country, and groaned aloud and struck himself on both thighs with the flats of his hands, and spoke a word of lamentation: “Ah me, what are the people whose land I have come to this time, and are they savage and violent, and without justice, or hospitable to strangers and with minds that are godly?”

The problem which apparently troubled Aristophanes involves the question of what it is that Athena is rendering unrecognizable in 190. The text as printed by Allen and most other modern editions states that Athena pours mist around in order to “make Odysseus himself ἄγνωστον”, a phrase which should then refer to the disguise that Athena puts on Odysseus at the end of Book 13. Indeed, at 13.397 Athena even employs the same expression to describe the act of disguising Odysseus: ἀλλ’ ἀγε σ’ ἄγνωστον τεύξω πάντεσσι βροτοῖς. There is, however, a problem with seeing a reference to Odysseus’ disguise here: the mist which Athena pours around never gets the chance to serve the purpose of sheltering her and Odysseus while she disguises him: she dispels it at line 352, well before she effects Odysseus’ magical transformation. If the mist is already gone when Athena disguises Odysseus, how can concealing this transformation be its
purpose?

One way of circumventing this difficulty is provided by Stanford in his commentary: if we assign the ὀφρα clause a meaning “intermediate” between temporal and final clause, it means that Athena pours a mist around “to give herself time to make him [Odysseus] unrecognizable and tell him the circumstances.” This way, the purpose of the mist is to prevent Odysseus from running off before Athena has a chance to tell him about the suitors and work her magic. The precise time at which the mist is dispelled becomes irrelevant.

Aristophanes, however, like some modern critics, seems to have read the ὀφρα clause very literally and to have been troubled by the consequent inconsistency. He hence changed αὐτὸν to αὐτῷ. We arrive at the following text for 189-91: “Pallas Athena poured a mist over all… in order that she might make it (Ithaca) unrecognizable to him (Odysseus).” This conveniently removes a problematic reference to Odysseus’ disguise; and in general, with one apparent exception, it results in a seamless consistency: the passage begins with the main idea that Odysseus does not recognize Ithaca in lines 187-188; makes the means of concealment explicit with the γὰρ clause in line 189; and reiterates and expands the purpose of the mist in the ὀφρα clause – to make Ithaca unrecognizable and to tell Odysseus how things stand at home. Last, lines 194-96 describe the process of making Ithaca unrecognizable to Odysseus, poignantly listing landmarks which should have been familiar to Odysseus, but are not: “Therefore to the lord Odysseus she made everything look otherwise / than it was, the penetrating roads, the harbors where all could / anchor, the rocks going straight up, and the trees tall growing.”

There are several good reasons to be skeptical of Aristophanes’ reading. It may ultimately prove impossible to say with certainty whether Aristophanes found his reading in a manuscript or whether it is a conjecture.\textsuperscript{317} However, there is precedent in Homeric usage for this expression, albeit somewhat ambiguous: While there are three or four Homeric lines ending with the vulgate’s μιν αὐτὸν and none ending with Aristophanes’ μιν αὐτῷ, at other positions in the line the pronoun μιν occurs side by side with a differing case of αὐτός.\textsuperscript{318} Moreover,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{317} A burning issue on the scholarship: see West 2001 and Nagy 2004 for two of the most prominent opposing viewpoints on the manuscript authority for Alexandrian readings.
\textsuperscript{318} A TLG search turns up four other examples of the vulgate’s reading μιν αὐτὸν or μιν αὐτῆν at line endings in Homer (Iliad 21.245, 21.318, 24.472), 24.729, but none of μιν αὐτῷ. There are, however, attested appearances of μιν followed by differing cases of αὐτός at other metrical
\end{flushright}
though the regular use to which clouds are put in Homer does seem to be by gods to disguise mortals, there are telling exceptions.\textsuperscript{319} The putting in place and removal of the cloud is reminiscent of Athena’s removal of the fog from the eyes of Diomedes during his aristeia in \textit{Iliad} 5.124-32. The use of fog as a means to conceal mortals is a recurrent topos in the \textit{Iliad}, but the fog which is removed from Diomedes’ eyes at \textit{Iliad} 5.124ff. is presumed to represent the ubiquitous and normal state of humankind – a veil through which only certain privileged heroes of prior generations were able to peer:

\begin{verse}
ἐν γάρ τοι στήθεσσι μένος πατρώιον ἢκα
ἀτρομοὺ, οἶον ἔχεσθε σακέσπαλος ἵππεστα Τυδεύς:
ἀχλίν δ’ αὖ τοι ἀπ’ ὀφθαλμών ἔλον, ἢ πρὶν ἐπήνει,
ὅφι’ ἐγιγνώσκης ἡμέν θεόν ἢδε καὶ ἄνδρα.
\textit{Iliad} 5.125-128
\end{verse}

Since I have put inside your chest the strength of your father untremulous, such as the horseman Tydeus of the great shield had; I have taken away the mist from your eyes, that before now was there, so that you may well recognize the god and the mortal.

\textsuperscript{319} De Jong 2001, 322 notes that the most natural interpretation of the passage is that the mist is meant to disguise the island rather than Odysseus: “At first sight, lines 189-193 suggest that Athena pours mist around Odysseus, so as to make him invisible, as she did in 7.14-143. From 194-6 (and cf. 352), however, it appears that she in fact pours mist around the Ithacan scenery, so as to make it unrecognizable to Odysseus… Athena’s actorial motivation must be – rather forcefully – extracted from her embedded focalization in 190-3: because of the mist Odysseus does not recognize Ithaca and therefore does not immediately leave for home, which gives her the time to make him unrecognizable and discuss his incognito return with him.”
The lifting of this cloud grants Diomedes the fulfillment of his aspirations in the here and now, allowing him to negotiate the perils of the battlefield successfully. The cloud which Athena imposes on Odysseus serves the converse function (preventing Odysseus from attempting to negotiate perils to which he is unaccustomed and for which he is unprepared), but it is otherwise analogous in being a fog which conceals not mortals from the world, but a world for which humans are unprepared from mortals.

A more serious problem for Aristophanes has to do with making sense of the μη clause of lines 192-193: “Lest his wife recognize him, and his townspeople / and friends, before he punished the suitors for their overbearing oppression.” Indeed, Hoekstra (ad loc.) views these lines as the main obstacle to Aristophanes’ reading (“Aristophanes read αὑτῷ, but if μιν refers to the Ithaca, μη…” γνοίη (192) makes no sense.”) In the text printed by Allen it is the disguising of Odysseus which prevents his kin from recognizing him. By removing mention of the disguise, Aristophanes introduces a seeming quandary: Why would the fact that Athena conceals Ithaca prevent Odysseus’ wife and kin from recognizing him?

Some critics solved this problem by cutting these two lines altogether. However, since, in our meager evidence, Aristophanes is nowhere cited as having questioned 192-193, it might be worth asking how he reconciled his lines 190-191 with lines 192-193. There is, of course, a perfectly plausible reason why Odysseus recognizing Ithaca would result in him being recognized by wife and kin: upon finding himself at home, Odysseus might turn and run straight to his palace.

320 Heubeck (1954 61n93) feels that the two most viable options are either (a) to cut 190-193, boldly removing any mention of Athena’s name until 221 and leaving her an anonymous theos, or (b) to accept their presence as a slightly illogical but characteristically Homeric preparation for the description of the disguise at 397ff. and 429ff. Clay 1997, 192n12 defends the vulgate: “But more than mere preparation, the transformation of Odysseus and the transformation of Ithaca are closely related thematically and point to the crucial problem of appearance and reality throughout the scene.” Likewise, 192: “…its foreshadowing at the very outset of the scene points to its submerged relevance throughout the conversation. It is the ultimate purpose for Athena’s coming.”

321 So Munro 1901, ad 191.
The reader has had hints that this danger exists and that Odysseus is unprepared to meet it. Not too much earlier in Book 13, Odysseus’ parting words to Alcinous reveal that going to his home and finding Penelope are foremost on his mind as he sets sail for Ithaca:

 traged ήδη γάρ τετέλεσται ἀ μοι φίλος ᾦθελε θυμός,
πομπὴ καὶ φίλα δῶρα, τά μοι θεοὶ Οὐρανίωνες
οὔλβια ποιήσειαν. ἰμύμωνα δ´ οίκοι ἄκοιτιν
νοστίσας εὑροίμι σὺν ἀρτεμέεσσι φίλοισιν.
13.40-43

…for all my heart desired is now made
good, conveyance and loving gifts. May the sky gods make these
prosper for me. May I return to my house and find there
a blameless wife, and all who are dear to me unharmed.

These words must create a hint of nagging worry for the attentive audience: in Odysseus’ meeting with Agamemnon in the underworld Agamemnon had warned the errant hero to return clandestinely and test Penelope (11.442; 455-56); yet Odysseus seemed oddly obtuse about the possibility that Agamemnon’s homecoming disaster could portend his own. At 11.439-440 Clytemnestra’s treachery reminds him of Helen’s perfidious behavior, but it does not cause him anxiety about Penelope. Odysseus’ parting words to Agamemnon are oddly dismissive: κακὸν
δ´ ανεμώλια βάζειν (“it is bad to babble emptily”).322

Thus, during their meeting in the underworld, Odysseus never acknowledges Agamemnon’s warning that Penelope might be his undoing. Moreover, his comportment when he awakens in Book 13 only increases the impression of an Odysseus uncharacteristically nervous, distracted, and emotional. Odysseus *leaps up* when he sees his homeland, and, at least in the 197a contained in several manuscripts, *rejoices* to see his home,323 then in an abrupt about-

322 The immediate context of Odysseus’ remark is Agamemnon’s question about Orestes’ well-being: Odysseus is dismissive because he has not been home and hence has no way of knowing how Orestes fares. Nevertheless, this conversation develops organically from Agamemnon’s warnings not to trust one’s wife. Though Agamemnon does not explicitly say as much, Orestes’ established role as Agamemnon’s avenger makes this question relevant to his concern with Clytemnestra’s perfidy, and Odysseus’ discomfort with this theme might be speculated to be the cause of some of the unexpected vehemence of this dismissal.
323 Not accepted by any modern editors.
face groans and strikes his thighs in despair when he sees features which do not correspond to his memory of Ithaca. But when this fleeting flare of excitement has passed, and Odysseus makes up his mind that he is in hostile foreign territory, his demeanor completely changes: he descends straight back into combat mode. Perhaps Athena desires Odysseus to adopt this defensive stance at which he is now an old hand?

Odysseus’ response to finding Agamemnon among the dead in Hades in Book 11 is revelatory of the kinds of threats which he is accustomed to anticipating:

Ἀτρεΐδη κύδιστε, ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν, Ἀγάμεμνον, τίς νῦ σε κηρ ἐδάμασσε ταυμαλεγέος θανάτω; ἢ σε γʹ εν νήσαι Ποσειδάων ἐδάμασσεν ὅρρας ἀργαλέων ἀνέμων ἀμέγαρτον ἀὔτμην, ἢ σερ ανάρσιοι ἀνδρες ἐδηλήσαντε υπί χέρσου βοῦς περιταμνόμενου ἢδ οἰων πώεα καλά, ἢ περί πτόλιοι μαχεομενου ἢδ γυναικών;

Son of Atreus, most lordly and king of men, Agamemnon, what doom of death that lays men low has been your undoing? Was it with the ships, and did Poseidon, rousing a stormblast of battering winds that none would wish for, prove your undoing? Or was it on the dry land, did men embattled destroy you as you tried to cut off cattle and fleecy sheep from their holdings, or fighting against them for the sake of their city and women?

Death at sea, hostile strangers, and defending armies are dangers with which Odysseus is by this point well familiar. The one threat which Odysseus did not dare to guess as Agamemnon’s cause of death is the one which actually killed him: his own dear wife. Similarly, Odysseus’ first words on waking in Book 13 show that he immediately snaps to the ready against the sort of external dangers that he initially blamed for the death of Agamemnon.

ὦ μοι ἕγω, τέων σωτε βροτῶν ἐς γαῖαν ἱκάνω; ἢ βιοὶ γʹ ὑβρισται τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὔδε δίκαιοι, ἢ φιλοξεινοι καὶ σφιν νόσοι ἔστι θεουδής;

Ah me, what are the people whose land I have come to this time, And are they savage and violent, and without justice,
Or hospitable to strangers and with minds that are godly?³²⁴

Athena herself gives evidence that she worries that Odysseus’ acquired habit of anticipating threats from strangers rather than from friends may prove his undoing. After Odysseus has proved to her that he has regained his usual steely self-possession, Athena proceeds to contrast him with an hypothetical “other man” who would not have been so cautious about his homecoming.³²⁵

ἀσπασίως γάρ κ’ ἄλλος ἄνηρ ἀλαλήμενος ἐλθὼν
ίτε’ ἐνι μεγάροισ’ ἵδειν παῖδας τ’ ἀλόχον τε’ ἵνα δ’ οὐ πῶ φιλὸν ἐστὶ δαήμεναι οὐδὲ πυθέσθαι,
πρὶν γ’ ἐτὶ σῆς ἄλοχου πειρήσει. ³²⁶

Anyone else come home from wandering would have run happily
Off to see his children and wife in his halls; but it is not
Your pleasure to investigate and ask questions, not till
You have made trial of your wife…

Not long after Athena describes the lugubrious credulity of this ἄλλος ἄνηρ, Odysseus admits that he stood in real danger of death-by-suitor:

ὦ πόποι, ἦ μάλα δὴ Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρείδαο

³²⁴ See 9.175-6, where Odysseus employs the same words in his speech to his comrades while exhorting them to launch an expedition to explore the land of the Cyclopes. When he assumes this same guarded defensive posture among the Phaeacians in Book 6 during another tricky introduction overseen by Athena – a scene described by Homer using precisely the same lines (6.199-121), he demonstrates that the disaster with Polyphemus has taught him to be cautious. By again putting him on guard in Ithaca, Athena prevents Odysseus from botching his homecoming until she can to tell his how matters stand at home: just as the purpose clause at 13.190-191 implies, with Aristophanes’ reading included in the text.
³²⁵ Athena never really did give him the chance to take the final test of overcoming his first wave of pothos to see Penelope, and perhaps it is better for us as readers if he does not: shouldn’t he want to rush right home to see the woman for whom he declined immortality, as he seems to indicate to Agamemnon at 13.42?
³²⁶ The scholia note that 333-38 are subject to athetesis, while the a family of manuscripts omits 333-335. See the apparatus in Allen 1924.
Surely I was on the point of perishing by an evil
fate in my palace, like Atreus’ son Agamemnon, unless
you had told me, goddess, the very truth of all that has happened.
Come, then, weave the design, the way I shall take my vengeance upon them!

Thus Odysseus acknowledges that, had Athena not “told him the very truth of all that has
happened” – i.e., informed him of the presence of the suitors – he really likely would have died a
death resembling Agamemnon’s. His statement that Athena has prevented him from dying in his
palace presupposes the same danger that Odysseus will break down and run home that the
Aristophanic reading introduces at 13.190. This thematic resonance is strengthened by a verbal
echo: ἐκαστα… ἔειπες in line 385 recalls ἐκαστά τε μυθήσαιτο in line 191, and ὅπως ἀποτέισομαί αὐτοὺς in line 386 echoes πρὶν πᾶσαν μνηστῆρας ὑπερβασίην ἀποτεῖσαι in line 193. Odysseus’ verbal echo at 13.383-386 of Homer’s earlier words at last signals that
Athena has accomplished her purpose – expressed at 13.189-193 – of warning him of the danger
and preventing him from going to the palace.

In summation, Aristophanes offers us a Book 13 in which the stakes are higher and
Agamemnon’s negative exemplum more pronounced, and an at-risk Odysseus whose potential
for forgetting himself at a crucial moment foreshadows the immemor Theseus of Catullus 64 and
the wishy-washy ways of the Hellenistic Jason. The text printed by Allen in 190-193 merely
implies that Athena intends to disguise Odysseus lest Penelope recognize him, leaving out any
suggestion that at the very moment he awakens Odysseus almost lets his emotion get the better
of his wife. In contrast, Aristophanes’ reading suggests that Odysseus’ emotions run so strong
that Athena must hide Ithaca from him, because if he were to learn his true whereabouts he
would run home and be prematurely recognized. Though this emotional tone may seem distinctly
Hellenistic, it also taps into an established nexus of Homeric imagery, in particular the recurring
motif of the loss of one’s homecoming being the result of “forgetfulness” seen, for example, in
the episode of the Lotus Eaters. In Aristophanes’ text Athena’s deception serves a definite
purpose: to place Odysseus in his customary, guarded frame of mind, and thereby to prevent his
forgetfulness of Agamemnon’s advice from resulting in the loss of his nostos even as it reaches its climax.

At this point (221 ff.), Athena intervenes in the guise of a shepherd to reveal to the desperate hero his true location, and Odysseus replies with his tale of the Cretan traveler (256-287). Athena smiles, changes her shape to that of a beautiful woman, and remarks on Odysseus’ wiliness.

Although Athena may seem to take a slightly sadistic pleasure in changing shape to deceive Odysseus, part of the point may be to encourage Odysseus to go through the motions of approaching Ithaca as a stranger (i.e., guardedly and clandestinely, as recommended by Agamemnon) even as she reveals to him that he is home. She describes Ithaca twice, first in her guise as a shepherd, then under her more usual appearance as a fair woman. The first description, which at last reveals to Odysseus where he has landed, recalls features of landscapes which Odysseus has already encountered as a foreign traveler. It runs as follows:


ήπιος εἰς, ὃ ξεῖν’, ἥ τηλόθεν εἰλήλουθας,
eἰ δὴ τῆμεν τε γαῖαν ἀνείρεαν, οὐδὲ τι λίπν
οὐτώ νόμιμος ἐστιν· ἱσασι δὲ μιν μάλα πολλοί,
ἡμέν ὅσοι οἰκούσι πρὸς ἥν τ’ ἡλίον τε,
ἡδ’ ὅσοι μετόπισε φοτί ζόφον ἥρθενα.
ἡ τοι μὲν τρηχεῖα καὶ οὐχ ἰππήλατος ἐστιν,
οὐδὲ λίπν ἐρυκτή, ἀτάρ οὐδ’ εὐρεία τέτυκται.
ἐν μὲν γὰρ οἱ σῖτος ἀθέσφατος,
ἐν δὲ τε οἶνος
γίνεται· αἰεὶ δ’ ὀμβρὸς ἔχει τεθαλώσια τ’ ἀείρη
αιγίβοτος δ’ ἀγαθὴ καὶ βουβοτος· ἔστι μὲν ὑλὴ
παντοῖα, ἐν δ’ ἀρδμοὶ ἐπηετανοὶ παρέασι.
τῷ τοι, ξεῖν’, Ἰθάκης γε καὶ ὃς Τροίην ὄνομ’ ἱκεῖ,
τὴν περ τηλοὺ φασίν Ἀχαιόδος ἐμμεναι αἴης.

13.237-249

You are some innocent, O stranger, or else you have come from far away, if you ask about this land, for it is not

---

327 Cf. Hoekstra ad loc. Wilamowitz 1927, 9 suggests that the youth resembles Paris on Mount Ida, and views Athena’s second disguise as similar to how Athena’s undisguised human form may have been envisioned by Ionians. De Jong 2001, 324, like Wilamowitz, notes that Athena in her capacity of “patroness of female handiwork” is not so different from the second disguise; De Jong, however, emphasizes the youth’s role as proud local (“with obvious relish, Athena plays her role of local, and her speech thrives with ambiguity”). See also Clay 1997, 186-212 for this meeting.
so nameless as all that. There are indeed many who know it, whether among those who live toward the east and the sunrise, or those who live up and away toward the mist and the darkness. See now, this is a rugged country and not for the driving of horses, but neither is it so unpleasant, though not widely shapen; for there is abundant grain for bread grown here, it produces wine, and there is always rain and the dew to make it fertile; it is good to feed goats and cattle; and timber is there of all sorts, and watering places good through the seasons; so that, stranger, the name of Ithaca has gone even to Troy, though they say that it is very far from the Achaean country.

The assertion that Ithaca’s fame stretches from East to West and even to Troy is meant as a gentle compliment to Odysseus, the vehicle of its fame (note that the litotes νόνυμος /ἀνώνυμος occurs only here and at 8.552, where Alcinous fishes for Odysseus’ name). More importantly, however, the entire catalog of features listed is ringed by (ὦ) ξεῖν’ (237, 248): Athena’s words again and again remind Odysseus that he is an outsider, now. He is foolish for not knowing where he is (νήπιός εἰς, ὦ ξεῖν’, ἢ τηλόθεν εἰλήλουθας), he clearly cannot come from a civilized land since almost everybody in the world knows this land (ἴσασι δέ μιν μάλα πολλοί), and even the assertion that Ithaca’s fame extends as far as Troy (τῶ τοι, ξεῖν’, Ἰθάκης γε καὶ ἔς Τροίην ὄνομ’ ἰκεῖ), undoubtedly due to Odysseus’ having fought there, robs him of this kleos through the shepherd’s failure to recognize him and his presumption that the newly arrived stranger must be some sort of imbecile. This speech must be painful for Odysseus to hear, but Athena’s choice to address him as a stranger, just as he has been addressed on so many other foreign shores, surely begins to erode any intention he may have of strolling directly back to his palace.

One aspect of the Athena’s speech which we might expect to come as a relief, however, is her characterization of the landscape as decidedly mundane and mortal. It is instructive to compare this description both with the description of the same features at the beginning of Book 13 and with Odysseus’ and Telemachus’ prior descriptions. Some of these earlier accounts are very brief. Homer himself often is content to attach a descriptive epithet to Ithaca (e.g. “sea-girt” or “conspicuous” – cf. 1.386, 1.395, 1.401, 2.167). Telemachus refers to it as “rocky” (1.247).

328 The same line is addressed to Odysseus by Polyphemus at 9.273. Once again, this echo of a prior failure in exploration seems perfectly calculated to put Odysseus on his guard.
The negative catalogue of positive traits which Ithaca does not possess contained in Athena’s speech, however, recalls earlier statements by Odysseus and Telemachus. Telemachus has anticipated her admission, οὐχ ἵππηλατός ἐστιν, when refusing the offer of a gift of horses from Menelaus:

Ion πους δ’ εἰς Ἰθάκην οὐκ ἀξομαί, ἀλλὰ σοὶ αὐτῶ ἐνθάδε λείψω ἄγαλμα· σὺ γὰρ πεδίοιο ἀνάσσεις εὐρέος, ὡς ἐνὶ μὲν λωτός πολὺς, ἐν δὲ κύπειρον πυροὶ τε ζειαί τε ἵδε εὐρυφυές κρῖ λευκόν.

ἐν δὲ Ἰθάκῃ οὔτ’ ἄρ δρόμοι εὐρέες οὔτε τι λειμών· αἰγίβωτος, καὶ μᾶλλον ἐπίρατος ἵπποβότοιο.

οὐ γὰρ τὶς νήσων ἵππηλατος οὐδ’ εὐλείμων,

αἱ θ’ ἀλὶ κεκλίσται· Ἰθάκη δὲ τε καὶ περὶ πασέων.

4.601-608

I will not take the horses to Ithaca, but will leave them here, for your own delight, since you are lord of a spreading plain, there is plenty of clover here, there is galingale, and there is wheat and millet here and white barley, wide grown. There are no wide courses in Ithaca, and there is no meadow; a place to feed goats; but lovelier than a place to feed horses; for there is no one of the islands that has meadows for the driving of horses; they are all sea slopes; and Ithaca more than all the others.

Athena’s first description in Book 13 flatteringly contradicts Telemachus’ modest claim that in comparison to Sparta Ithaca is impoverished in grain (ἐν μὲν γὰρ οἱ σῖτος ἄθεσφατος, versus Telemachus’ admiration for the quantity of corn at Sparta – σὺ γὰρ πεδίοιο ἀνάσσεις / εὐρέος, ὥς ἐνὶ μὲν λωτός πολὺς, ἐν δὲ κύπειρον / πυροὶ τε ζειαί τε ἵδε εὐρυφυές κρῖ λευκόν).

Athena follows up her own pronouncement that Ithaca is rich in grain and wine with the implicitly explanatory assertion that rain and dew abound on the island. This assertion evokes the need for precipitation as a dividing line between gods and mortals: Olympus is never wetted by either rain or snow (at least at 6.43-44), and Elysium is similarly blessed (4.566); in contrast, the best that mortals can hope for is that rain does not “pass through” their shelters (5.480, 19.442), and even terrestrial paradises such as the primeval pastoral golden age of the Cyclopes are fueled by the rain of Zeus (9.111). Indeed, Athena’s kindly assertion that rain falls on Ithaca combines elements of Telemachus’ blandishing remark on Sparta’s generous grain supplies with
the role of rain in growing grain adverted to in the Cyclops episode (πυροί καὶ κριθαὶ ἢδ’ ἁμπελοί, αἱ τε φέρουσιν / οἴνον ἐριστάφυλον, καὶ σφίν Διὸς ὀμβρὸς ἀέξει, 9.110-111). Like Telemachus, Athena notes that the island is suitable for goats, adding cattle to the mix for good measure, as well as woods and watering places. Still, she concedes that it is rough, and, taken all in all, neither too painful a place to inhabit nor overly spacious (οὐδὲ λίην λυπρῆ, ἀτὰρ οὐδ’ εὐρεῖα). While complimenting Odysseus on the eminent inhabitability of his home and on the fame which he has earned for it, she at the same time emphasizes that he has returned to realms both mortal and civilized, which are rough and rely on rain to sustain them.

Her description may also profitably be compared with that offered by Odysseus himself at 9.21ff., when, after long silence, Odysseus tells Alcinous his true identity the night before Alcinous arranges his transport home:

ναιετάω δ’ Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον· ἐν δ’ ὀροῖς αὐτῇ, Ἡρῴδων εἰνοσίφυλλον ἀριπρεπές· ἀμφὶ δὲ νῆσοι πολλαὶ ναιετάουσι μάλα σχεδὸν ἀλλήλησι, Δουλίχιον τε Σάμη τε καὶ ύλῆσσα Ζάκυνθος, αὐτῇ δὲ χθαμαλὴ πανυπερτάτη εἰν ἄλλο κεῖται πρὸς ζόφον, αἱ δὲ τ’ ἀνευθε πρὸς ἡδίω τ’ ἡλίον τε, τρηχεῖ, ἀλλ’ ἀγαθὴ κουροτρόφος· οὐ τι ἐγὼ γε ἡς γαῖης δύναμαι γλυκερώτερον ἄλλο ἰδέσθαι.  9.21-28

I am at home in sunny Ithaca. There is a mountain there that stands tall, leaf-trembling Neritos, and there are islands settled around it, lying one very close to another. There is Doulichion and Same, and wooded Zacynthus, but my island lies low and away, last of all on the water toward the dark, with the rest below facing east and sunshine, a rugged place, but a good nurse of men; for my part I cannot think of any place sweeter to look at than one’s land.

Odysseus’ description foreshadows Athena’s own in its essentials (note especially that both emphasize the mix of roughness and laborious fecundity on the island), but incorporates numerous landmarks and geographical references likely intended as navigational aids from one old sea-salt to others.

After donning the form of a woman (likely closer to her real appearance as a goddess), Athena offers a tour of the island, to assure her skeptical protégé that he really is where she has
told him he is. She enumerates four landmarks, all of which contrast considerably with Odysseus’ and Telemachus’ descriptions of Ithaca:

ἀλλ’ ἄγε τοι δειέξω Ἴθάκης ἐδος, ὀφρα πεποίθης.  
Φόρκυνος μὲν οδ’ ἐστὶ λιμὴν, ἀλίσιο γέροντος,  
ἡδὲ δ’ ἐπὶ κρατός λιμένος ταυρύφυλλος ἐλαίη·  
ἀγχόθι δ’ αὐτῆς ἀντρον ἐπὴρατον ἡροείδες,  
ἱρὸν νυμφάων αἱ νηιάδες καλέονται·  
tοῦτο δὲ τοι σπέος εὐρὺ κατημερέτες, ἕνθα οὐ πολλὰς  
ἐρδεσκες νύμφησι τεληέσας ἐκατόμβας·  
tοῦτο δὲ Νηηρίτον ἐστιν ὄρος καταιμένων ὕλη.

13.344-351

Come, I will show you settled Ithaca, so you will believe me.  
This is the harbor of the Old Man of the Sea, Phorcys,  
and here at the head of the harbor is the olive tree with spreading  
leaves, and nearby is the cave that is shaded, and pleasant,  
and sacred to the nymphs who are called the Nymphs of the Wellsprings,  
Naiads. That is the wide over-arching cave, where often  
you used to accomplish for the nymphs their complete hecatombs;  
and there is the mountain, Neritos, all covered with forest.

Athena mentions (1) the harbor of Phorcys, old man of the sea,\textsuperscript{329} (2) the thick-foliaged olive at the head of the harbor, (3) the Cave of the Nymphs, (4) the wooded mountain Neriton.

Athena’s first description of Ithaca encouraged Odysseus to regard his home as an outsider would in part due to the emphasis on Ithaca’ reputation abroad (οὐδὲ τι λίην / νώμυθος ἐστιν ἱσσαί δὲ μιν μάλα πολλοί; Ἴθάκης γε καὶ ἐς Τροίην ἐναύε οἰκεί)\. In her second description Athena is much more concerned with showing Odysseus landmarks (ἀλλ’ ἄγε τοι δειέξω). Her goal is to persuade Odysseus that he really is in fact home, and one of the means persuasion available to her (ὀφρα πεποίθης) is the naming of specific landmarks as she points to them (note also the repetition of τοι and the demonstratives ἥδε and τοῦτο, presumably accompanied by a gesture). Knowledge to which Homer has already made his audience privy in the initial description of Odysseus arriving on Ithaca is now shared with Odysseus – he is not just in any harbor, but the harbor of Phorcys; the olive is pointed out as one

\textsuperscript{329} For recent discussion of Phorcys, see Apostolos N. Athanassakis 2002, 45-56.
landmark (note the demonstrative ἥδε) before Athena moves on to the next – the Cave of the Nymphs, where again she is careful to name names (ἱρὸν Νυμφάων, αἱ Νηϊάδες καλέονται). Only near the end of this list does Athena explicitly allude to the intimate connection between Odysseus and this landscape: ἔνθα σὺ πολλὰς / ἔρδεσκες Νύμφῃσι τελήσσας ἑκατόμβας.

The final landmark, Neriton, is also named, and its anthropomorphization (it is “garbed” in forest) lends an air of familiarity, and perhaps obliquely glances at the source of the timber for the ship on which Odysseus had originally sailed for Troy.

Athena’s presentation of the landscape of Ithaca to Odysseus thus progresses in several stages. Her first description of Ithaca to Odysseus is intended to put him on guard and to encourage him to view himself as a stranger to the island. After she has revealed her true identity and ensured that Odysseus has no immediate plans to run home, Athena can reorient Odysseus by ascribing familiar names to the places which he can see. Though recent scholarship has often tended to see this passage as one in which Odysseus comes very near to outwitting his divine patroness, the considerations which I have outlined above suggest that it is possible that Athena’s concern that Odysseus may be inclined to run home prematurely may have merit.

---

After Odysseus and Athena plot Odysseus’ return to the palace in Book 13, the focus of the epic becomes increasingly political, as the action shifts from travel back to the internal conflict within the palace. Odysseus’s disguise as a wizened beggar to some degree dictates the tack which he ultimately adopts in presenting himself in the palace. The tales which he tells must account for his forlorn and friendless state, and his Cretan lies to his fellow Ithacans thus consistently portray him as an outcast: in Book 14, he is the son of a concubine in his tale to Eumaeus (ἔμε δ' ὠνητή τέκε μήτηρ / παλλακίς, 14.202-3 and in Book 19 he is the lesser younger son of Deucalion (19.180).

In these tales, landscape plays only a limited role. After Odysseus kills the suitors, however, his reunion with Laertes in Book 24 elevates the landscape of a humble garden plot to the role of embodiment of all that Odysseus held dear in his wanderings. In the Odyssey as we have it, it is not the reclamation of the megaron that places the seal of completion upon the reconquest of Ithaca, but Odysseus’ reestablishment of a relationship with Laertes through his demonstration of an intimate knowledge of Ithaca’s cultivated countryside. The final chapter of the dissertation will in its first two sections examine the motives and significance behind Laertes’ retreat to the country; then, after addressing the description of the gardens in Book 24 in section 9.3, I will conclude with an argument that two landscape vignettes of Book 19 help to account for Odysseus’ need to use two distinct proofs of his identity with Laertes.

9.1 LAERTES’ CONDITION IN BOOK 11: BEDS OF FALLEN LEAVES

Odysseus’ encounter with his father in his ancestral gardens on Ithaca in Book 24 marks the
culmination of the landscape themes analyzed throughout this dissertation: it is a landscape immanently mortal, and in Homer’s account its distinguishing characteristics are its familiarity, toil, and mortality. Prior accounts of Laertes have prepared us for the paradox which greets Odysseus on his return. Mostmovingly, the ghost of Anticlea had informed Odysseus that during the crisis of the king’s long absence Laertes chooses to dirty his own hands working in the fields side by side with slaves. While reading Anticlea’s account of Laertes’ degraded state in Book 11, it is important to keep in mind the context of her own situation and her rhetorical aim. Anticlea is a shade, and, like the shades of Achilles and Agamemnon, it is her function is to embody the irrecoverable loss and sacrifice which the Achaean warriors endured in the Trojan expedition. It will be the purpose of this and the following section to look beyond Anticlea’s stirring account of Laertes’ retreat to the country, and to attempt to divine what other motives may have driven him to abandon his ancestral home.

The deceased queen’s pathos-ridden description of Laertes betrays a tone of futility

331 Victor Davis Hanson 1999, 48 questions the applicability of the word “gardens”, suggesting “farm” as a better alternative (in note 2 of this chapter he also employs “farm” of the gardens of Alcinous). He also concludes from the emphasis on the “much labor” required of Laertes (24.205-207) that his “ground apparently was not inherited, or at least not inherited in its present state as developed farmland.” While it is possible that this passage suggests a shift to habitation on the countryside as Hanson suggests, the emphasis afforded by Book 24 to the gardens’ status as a token of recognition between Odysseus and Laertes and the circumstance that Penelope’s slave Dolius works with Laertes on the garden indicates the importance of this space in binding together at least two generations of Ithacan aristocracy. For the role of Laertes relative to succession in the Odyssey, see Finley 2002, 84-86; Halverson 1986, passim questions the existence of kingship as a meaningful position in the Odyssey. See page 127:

If there is a succession issue at all in the Odyssey, it is at a politically primitive level very remote from the monarchic state. Ithaka and the adjacent islands are pictured as a region inhabited by farming people in which some families, because of their material wealth, tend to dominate. The heads of these families and their sons are the important men, the big men, of the region; they enjoy prestige and influence first because of their economic resources – they can grant and withhold favours – and second because of their manpower resources – they can marshal coercive force. It is in this way that they ‘hold power’ (ἐπικρατέουσιν) in the islands and ‘lord it’ (κοιρανέουσιν) in the islands.

Finkelberg 1991, 306-307 argues for matrimonial succession as the norm, excising the issue of Laertes’ kingship and Telemachus’ succession in one stroke.
absent in the still pathetic but more muted description of Laertes’ squalor found in Book 24.\(^\text{332}\)

In Book 11, Odysseus has inquired how Penelope has fared in his absence, and Anticlea responds by first reassuring Odysseus of her steadfastness and longing for him (11.181-183), then proceeds to note the ways in which Telemachus has grown into a dutiful son (11.184-187) before prefacing the grievous news of her own death with an account of Laertes’ similarly wretched and grieving state (11.187-203):\(^\text{333}\)

> But your father remains there on the farm estate and does not go down to the city. And there are no beds for him, nor are there bedclothes or blankets or shining coverlets, but in the wintertime he sleeps in the house where the thralls do, in the dirt next to the fire, and he wears foul clothes against his skin. But when the summer comes and the blossoming time of harvest, everywhere he has beds of fallen leaves tossed down on the ground along the rising slope of his orchard, where he lies, grieving, and the sorrow grows big within him as he longs for your homecoming, and old age comes upon him as a hard thing.

Norman Austin has noted that Anticlea’s portrayal of Laertes in Book 11 is rich with metaphoric significance:

> In the autumn of his grief and old age he has moved both outward [from the city] and downward [to a bed on dry leaves on the ground]. He has descended in every way, from the city to the fields, from beds to the ground. He has abdicated

\(^{332}\) See Finley 2002, 85n.

\(^{333}\) See Heubeck 1989 on this passage for an account of the logic of Anticlea’s reply.
political authority and social order. He has exchanged riches for poverty, fine fabrics for ashes and leaves, growth for decay, order for dissolution. He has descended from the human level to the animal and even to the vegetable. Now one with the season’s drying leaves, he is, like them, strewn on the ground, drifting at random in the wind…. Here, in Antikleia’s description, Laertes is metaphor personified. He has become Autumn, an embodiment, fully realized in all details, of the aspects and processes of the season of dissolution.  

There is much to be said for this observation, though explicit specification of how Laertes spends different seasons of the year (χεῖμα, θέρος, τεθαλυϊά… ὀπώρη) argues against insisting too strongly on Laertes as metaphor for autumn. Recent scholarship also raises questions which indicate that caution is necessary in speaking of Laertes abdicating political authority – he may well have had little formal authority to abdicate.  

On a more basic level, in keeping with our resolution to take Anticlea’s own biased perspective into account, we might well question how unnatural or miserable Laertes’ state is. Victor Davis Hanson, for example, sees Laertes as a misunderstood practitioner of a newer method of land exploitation. Technical issues of agricultural practice aside, we should note that most aspects of this mode of existence have precedents in Odysseus’ wanderings. Laertes’ seemingly unorthodox choice of beddings, for example, has precedent in the landscape diptych of the double olive and Olympus which spans Books 5-6. Like his father, Odysseus sleeps on a bed of leaves beneath the olive on the shore of Scheria:

βῆρ’ ἵμεν εἰς ὕλην· τὴν δὲ σχεδὸν ὑδατὸς εὑρέν ἐν περιφαινομένῳ· δοιούς δ’ ἀρ’ ὑπῆλυθε θάμνους ἐξ ὁμοθέν πεφυῶτας· ὁ μὲν φυλίης, ὁ δ’ ἐλαίης. τοὺς μὲν ἀρ’ οὔτ’ ἀνέμου διάθ μένος ἑγὼν ἁέντων, οὔτε ποτ’ ἡλίος φαέθων ἀκτίσιν ἔβαλεν, οὔτε ὀμβρὸς περάσκε διαμπέρες· ὡς ἄρα πυκνοὶ

\[334\] Austin 1975, 102-103.  
\[335\] See note 331.  
\[336\] V. D. Hanson 1999, 48: “Laertes’ farm and indeed Laertes himself are something entirely different from past agricultural practice. Is it not possible to see in them elements of a novel agriculture quite at odds with what many scholars have called ‘peasant’ or ‘subsistence’ farming, or, on the opposite end of the social scale, ‘manorial,’ ‘absentee,’ or ‘estate’ agriculture?… Odysseus’ brief walk from palace out to farm is therefore a radical passage from the Dark-Age cloister of the aristocratic hall into the new world of the intensive geōrgos.”
And he went to look for the wood and found it close to the water in a conspicuous place, and stopped underneath two bushes that grew from the same place, one of shrub, and one of wild olive, and neither the force of the wet-blowing winds could penetrate these nor could the shining sun ever strike through with his rays, nor yet could the rain pass all the way through them, so close together were they grown, interlacing each other; and under these now Odysseus entered, and with his own hands heaped him a bed to sleep on, making it wide, since there was great store of fallen leaves there, enough for two men to take cover in or even three men in the winter season, even in the very worst kind of weather. Seeing this, long-suffering great Odysseus was happy, and lay down in the middle, and made a pile of leaves over him.

Like Laertes, Odysseus gathers himself a bed from fallen leaves (ἄφαρ δ᾿ εὐνὴν ἐπαμήσατο χερσὶ φίλῃσιν / εὐρεῖαν). In these lines, Homer emphasizes the combination of Odyssean ponos (he heaps up the leaves “with his own hands”) and good fortune, happily honeyed with divine benefaction: note that Odysseus just happens to find a massive heap of leaves (φύλλων γὰρ ἐξὶν χύσις ἤλθα πολλῆ), and that the accommodations are just slightly more than Odysseus needs (ὅσσον τ᾿ ἦ δύω ἢ τρεῖς ἀνδράς ἔρυσθαι / ὡρη χειμερίη, εἰ καὶ μάλα περ χαλεπάινοι, “enough for two men to take cover in or even three men / in the winter season, even in the very worst kind of weather”) – a situation emblematic of the manner of living among the Phaeacians in general, where the lifestyle is generally mortal, but just a bit better than the norm for mortal men in key respects.

As noted previously, the glimpse of Olympus at the beginning of Book 6 will echo the summary anaphora of the negative qualities that the copse of trees lacks, but in such a fashion as to call attention to the differences between the lots of mortals and humans: 

‘Η μὲν ἄρ’ ὡς εἰποῦσ᾽ ἀπέβη γλαυκῶτις Ἀθήνη
So the gray-eyed Athena spoke and went away from her to Olympus, where the abode of the gods stands firm and unmoving forever, they say, and is not shaken with winds nor spattered with rains, nor does snow pile ever there, but the shining bright air stretches cloudless away, and the white light glances upon it. And there, and all their days, the blessed gods take their pleasure. There the Gray-eyed One went, when she had talked with the young girl.

The parallels between these two earlier scenes are extensive, and establish a series of unequitable analogies between the life of the gods and the life of men: Odysseus finds beneath the olives shelter from a variety of hostile elements which simply do not molest the gods on Olympus: wet-blowing winds (τοὺς μὲν ἄρ’ οὔτ’ ἀνέμων διάη μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων, “and neither the force of the wet-blowing winds could penetrate these” ~ οὔτ’ ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται, “it is not shaken with winds”), the rays of the sun (οὔτε ποτ’ ἡέλιος φαέθων ἀκτῖσιν ἐβαλλεν, “nor could the shining sun ever strike through with his rays” ~ λευκὴ δ’ ἐπιδέδρομεν αἵγη “and the white light glances upon it” – Olympus evidently never experiences the harshness of the mortal sun), and the rain itself (οὔτ’ ὄμβρος περάσκε διαμπερές, “nor yet / could the rain pass all the way through them” ~ οὔτε ποτ’ ὄμβρῳ / δεύεται οὔτε χιὼν ἐπιπίλναται, “nor spattered / with rains, nor does snow pile ever there”). Yet he enjoys this protection only because he has taken the initiative to seek out this place of shelter and enter it (οὓς ὑπ’ Ὀδυσσεὺς / δύσετ’, “and under these now Odysseus / entered”). In contrast, Athena, even as Odysseus is left to fend for himself naked and alone, can safely ascend to an Olympus which by its very nature lacks the same elements from which Odysseus found shelter only after considerable debate and toil.

Odysseus’ bedding on Scheria casts a faint romantic glow on his accommodations as a man in the state of nature, both in respect to the conveniences which the state of nature shares with Olympus and in its small instances of serendipity, such as his discovery of more leaves than he needs. In Laertes’ case, too, Anticlea’s words allow that her husband can obtain his minimum
requirements of shelter in bad weather and attendants to look after him. Nevertheless, there is undeniably hardship, and Laertes’ willingness to undergo this hardship rather than share the palace with the suitors resonates with the olive-Olympus diptych to make a positive statement about the kind of men who comprise the ruling class of Ithaca: they are hearty enough to undergo willingly a degree of discomfort, and clever enough to find ways of softening nature’s harsh effects. Thus, although Laertes’ bedding of leaves is indeed part of a complex of autumnal imagery which does call attention to the circumstance that Odysseus’ father is past his prime, he is not entirely a victim of “processes of the season of dissolution” as Norman Austin and Anticlea might have it: from an alternate perspective, his bedding is an heroic choice to share his son’s condition at his most hopeless and defenseless moment after the wreck of his raft, and an acknowledgement of the limits placed by the gods on mortal prosperity which contrasts strongly with the godless and limitless behavior of the suitors.

9.2 FARMER AND KING

Another aspect of Laertes’ gardens as represented by Anticlea calls for attention: we are told, it will be recalled, that the beds of leaves upon which Laertes dozes in summer and fall lie “on the ground along the rising slope of his orchard”, in my adaptation of Lattimore’s translation. Several of these terms used in the Greek (πάντη οἱ κατὰ γονὸν ἀλωῆς οἶνοπέδοιο / φύλλων κεκλιμένων χαμαλαὶ βεβλήαται εὐναί) are ambiguous. According to LSJ, the word ἀλωῆ may mean either “vineyard” or “orchard”, and γονός, here translated “slope”, is of uncertain signification. For our purposes, however, the precise meaning of these terms is less

337 He cannot, of course, be aware of this fact; but the audience can choose to note the heroic restraint and self-denial of both father and son.
338 A. D. Ure 1955, 226 suggests one possible scenario for this shared signification: “It seems then by no means improbable that far back in antiquity also the threshing-floor served as a drying-floor, the requirements being practically the same for both purposes – a smooth floor, a site that catches the breeze, and a sunny aspect – and that the ἀλωη of Alkinoos contained near to his vines on a piece of level ground, λευρῳ ἐνὶ χώρῳ a threshing-floor, or something very closely akin to one.”
relevant than the fact that Laertes has opted to sleep literally amidst his crops. Victor Davis Hanson, drawing on his own personal experience as a twentieth century organic farmer, describes the challenges created by diversified farming of plots containing vines and fruit trees, as we shall see Laertes’ does. He observes, “quite simply, the establishment of arboriculture and viticulture at the end of the eighth century would not have been possible without constant care of young stock”; he notes further that “their novel vision [i.e., that of farmers who began to inhabit their individual plots in post-Dark Age Greece] of a bustling, populated countryside required a vast cadre of slaves – men and women more forgotten in the historical record than the geórgoi themselves”, and that unskilled agricultural laborers often require extensive instruction and supervision. All these considerations suggest to Hanson – rightly, I would argue – that a desire to provide this necessary supervision comprises part of Laertes’ motivation for “retirement” to the countryside. Anticlea’s indication that Laertes sleeps outdoors in autumn and summer may support Hanson: sleeping near one’s crops would be a sensible response to the the fragmented political situation on the island, especially during the seasons when the fruits are coming ripe and enterprising thieves would be most inclined to attempt to purloin their dinner; conversely, sharing a hovel with the slaves during the winter would help to create a sense of solidarity among the workers on the garden plot.

This hands-on approach to landscape exploitation should prompt us to reconsider the issue of succession and kingship in the Homeric epics. For our purposes the question whether succession is father-to-son or matrimonial, as Margelit Finkelberg has argued, or even whether Laertes himself has ever been king, is not as important as that of the king’s relation to his landscape. While Halverson at times overstates his case, we would do well to keep in mind his admonition (quoted also above) regarding the nature of power on Ithaca:

Victor Davis Hanson 1999, 62-63.
Finkelberg 1991, 306: “Each single case, taken alone, proves nothing. But the evidence is cumulative, and the persistence with which the same basic situations recur suggests that kingship by marriage represents the general rule. Still more so when we are fortunate enough to possess a document that can only be properly explained by application of this rule. I mean the situation in Ithaca as described in the Homeric Odyssey.”
See John Halverson 1986, 119: “in fact there is no throne, no office of the king, indeed no real Ithakan state, and therefore no succession struggle.”
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Ithaka and the adjacent islands are pictured as a region inhabited by farming people in which some families, because of their material wealth, tend to dominate. The heads of these families and their sons are the important big men, of the region; they enjoy prestige and influence first because of their economic resources – they can grant and withhold favours – and second because of their manpower resources – they can marshal coercive force.\textsuperscript{342}

As a member of one of these dominant agricultural families and as one who, as the imminent wrath of the suitors’ families will soon show, must continually strive and vie to retain dominance, Laertes has chosen to cultivate the first source of prestige and power noted by Halverson (material wealth in the form of diversified agricultural produce) rather than the political power base favored by the suitors (a variant of Halverson’s second alternative, manpower grouped in aristocratic \textit{thiasoi} within the \textit{megaron} and backed up by family members and retainers at home who, while disadvantaged by the suitors’ self-segregation from the community of the \textit{oikos}, will nevertheless duly put in an appearance in time to fulfill their familial obligations to the deceased).

The sack of Troy is often portrayed in terms of competing strategies of \textit{metis} and \textit{bie}. Similarly, the house of Odysseus is the site for a contest between the competing methods of coercion by numbers (the suitors’ strategy) and of control through economic mechanisms (Laertes’ cultivation of his country estate). That Laertes’ economic war against the suitors is not entirely successful is evidenced by Eumaeus’ complaint at 14.81-84:

\begin{quote}
…ἀτὰρ σιάλους γε σύς μινηστήρες ἔδουσιν,
οὐκ ὅπλα φρονέωντες ἐνί φρεσίν οὐδ’ ἔλεητύν.
οὐ μὲν σχέτλια ἔργα θεοὶ μᾶκαρες φιλέουσιν,
ἀλλὰ δίκην τίουσι καὶ αἵσιμα ἔργ’ ἀνθρώπων.
14.81-84
\end{quote}

…but the fattened swine the suitors devour,
having no regard for anyone in their minds, nor pity.
The blessed gods have no love for merciless deeds,
but rather they reward justice and the lawful deeds of men.

We are never given a clear explanation for Laertes’ motives in withdrawal to the country, and he

\textsuperscript{342} Halverson 1986, 127.
may at least aim, if not to overthrow the suitors, at least to render himself economically independent of them. Nevertheless, Eumaeus and Laertes both subscribe to a sufficiently cynical Weltanschauung to realize that their prospects of overcoming the suitors are poor, and that their best hope lies in the sort of divine intervention which actually occurs.

Relative to this hope, too, the similarity between the gardens of Laertes and the gardens of Alcinous is suggestive. That a good king enjoys the favor of the gods and that his crops prosper is a general assumption in the Odyssey. Alcinous’ temenos on Scheria exemplified this tenet, existing either near or coterminous with Athena’s pristine grove. The association of the king with a sacral landscape may go back to the Bronze Age, and in the passage under discussion Homers’s designation of the temenos as land sacred to Athena makes its numinous character virtually certain. A belief that labor in such a place would propitiate a god or goddess may not have seemed as illogical to the Homeric audience as it does to us. We will recall that it was in such a place that Odysseus met Athena, and that this meeting was literally the key to the kingdom of Scheria for the errant Ithacan monarch: her cloud permitted him to explore the city freely and invisibly. Similarly, once Odysseus’ palace itself has been compromised and defiled by the suitors’ disruptions, the temenos of the family garden – an analogue of Alcinous’ grove of Athena, an extrapolalatial and extrapolitical plot of land in which regal and divine prerogatives are both represented as reminders of the political order in the country – would be the most logical fallback position for Laertes to go to await the assistance of the goddess.

This would provide an additional explanation for the dogged protectiveness that Laertes demonstrates relative to the garden. Not only does Laertes sleep there in summer, he assigns the slaves to mend the wall of the vineyard (24.223-225) while reserving for himself the actual

---

343 E.g., we shall have occasion at a later point in this chapter to discuss a simile in which Odysseus describes the benefits to the landscape of a good king (19.106-114).
344 See Hainsworth 1988 ad 6.293, who cites Palmer for the use of the term in association with the Pylian king in a context “where… the sacral nature of the Pylian king is properly stressed.”
345 Explicit divine associations are admittedly lacking in Laertes’ gardens; nevertheless, there are several hints that the space is meant to be read in antithesis to the Nekuia of Book 24 which precedes it: Book 24 begins from the underworld, and moves on to the Gardens; the reunion with Laertes terminates with a grateful proclamation by Laertes that Zeus and the gods really do exist (24.351-352). At the end of Book 24, Zeus will make his presence known in a more insistent fashion. Laertes’ gardens thus serve the same purpose for Laertes that the grove of Athena on Scheria fills for Odysseus: to provide the first solid indications that the gods have hearkened to his prayers.
intimate work with the plants within this boundary (24.226-231: note that Homer specifies that Laertes is alone in the vineyard – τὸν δ’ οἶον πατέρ’ ἐὑρεν ἐὐκτιμένῃ ἐν ἀλώῃ, 226). The slaves may tend to the outside of the king’s temenos and secure its boundaries, but to make his labors more persuasive to the goddess Laertes insists on wearing himself down by performing the most important tasks himself. Recall as well that it is Odysseus’ intimacy with these same plants and trees that constitutes sure proof for Laertes (24.336-346) that Odysseus is who he claims to be, a proof which would be more convincing if work with the actual plants and trees of the garden had been limited to members of Laertes’ family. All these considerations are indirect evidence that this agricultural, viticultural, and arboricultural work in Laertes’ temenos was on Ithaca a prerogative of the ruling family, and that this dutiful maintenance of a space which, at least on Scheria, was sacred to Athena was considered a propitious means of regaining her good will. In contrast, the suitors’ superior numbers permit them for the time-being to monopolize the palace and even to feed off the produce of the countryside, but their actions are not legitimized by the cultivation of intimate and pious relationship with the gods through the maintenance of the king’s temenos.

Thus far, we have identified a number of motives for Laertes’ retreat to the country: it may in part be an heroic choice to share his son’s sufferings, placing him in a state of prepolitical subsistence farming which mimics some of the conditions endured by Odysseus under the olive on Scheria. Withdrawal from the palace also has a political dimension: in the countryside, Laertes sustains his own economic independence from the suitors by tending a plot that existed before their new and illegitimate regime. This garden plot thus becomes an inchoate rival state on Ithaca in two ways, by freeing Laertes from the suitors’ control of the palace’s economy, and by enlisting sympathy for an old man whose messy garb and behavior mirror that of the men of the countryside and at the same time evince ongoing mourning for the missing rightful king. It is quite possible that the plot is meant to be read as a variety of king’s temenos; even if it is not, the Garden fills the same function as Alcinous’ temenos by bringing Laertes into a closer relationship with a divinity. At 24.351-352, his recognition of Odysseus prompts him to avow to Zeus that the gods really do still exist on Olympus, and, at 24.516-519, Athena appears to Laertes in a disguised epiphany and gives him permission to hurl a spear at the relatives of the

suitors before Athena and Zeus puts an end to the battle with the suitors.

9.3 THE GARDENS OF LAERTES

Let us now turn one more time to the description proper of the Gardens of Laertes. The passage that describes the garden rings in Odysseus’ false tale to Laertes. First, in an abrupt transition from the second Nekuia, an anonymous “they” are described going out from the city and coming to Laertes’ farmland:

οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐκ πόλιος κατέβαν, τάχα δ’ ἀγρὸν ἱκοντο
καλὸν Λαέρταο τετυγμένον, ὃν ῥα ποτ’ αὐτὸς
Λαέρτης κτεάτισε, ἐπεὶ μάλα πόλλ’ ἐμόγησεν.
24.205-207

But they went from the city, and presently came to the country place of Laertes, handsomely cultivated. Laertes himself had reclaimed it, after he spent much labor upon it.

Line 205 evokes a strong thematic contrast between city and country: while the ἀγρὸς of 205 is revealed to be the plot of Laertes in line 206, its isolation at the end of 205 at first suggests to the listener the more generalized meaning of “countryside.” When Odysseus puts aside his arms before approaching his father at line 219, the impression is made stronger that a transition in theme, from the martial and bloody slaughter of the suitors to the restoration of peaceful rule as the sort of agrarian king which Odysseus described to Penelope at 19.107-114, is also effected.

Homer then describes the farmstead, which, despite the presence of slavery, gives the impression of a harmonious country household functioning as an organic unit:

[Note: Details of the note are not transcribed here.]
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There was his house, and all around the house ran an outhouse, in which the slaves, under compulsion, would take their meals, and sit, and pass the night, who did the things he wished. There was also an old Sicilian woman there, who duly looked after the old man out on his estate, far away from the city.

Despite having been reduced to slavery, Laertes’ attendants have all they could reasonably wish by the standards of the day: food, and shelter in which sit and sleep. They form a society in microcosm, headed by the king and master Laertes, who directs his consort and his servants, but, as we shall soon learn, does much of the most delicate and most difficult work himself. The woman who tends Laertes is the wife of Dolius; the myriad connections radiating out from this garden to link Penelope, Laertes, Dolius, the Sicilian woman, and finally Odysseus further cement the impression that this garden plot is staffed and overseen by a band of highly trusted servants all bound closely to the older generation of rulers, comprising Laertes, Odysseus, and Penelope. The cottage is hence thus far an idyllic portrait of comfort earned through hard work, taking the reader back through the years to a simpler time before the turmoil of the Trojan War had intruded on Ithaca’s harmony.

The withholding of Odysseus’ name and the naming only of Laertes adds to the sense of timelessness pervading the passage. Only after a description of Laertes’ farmstead does the “they” of these lines turn out to be Odysseus, Telemachus, and several slaves (24.213: “there Odysseus spoke a word to his son and his servants” – ἕνθ’ Ὀδυσσέας διμώεσα καὶ υἱόμην ἔειπεν). This snaps the focus out of the timeless illud tempus of antebellum agrarian living back to the present, and to the specific circumstances of Odysseus and his son after the slaying of the suitors. Odysseus dismisses the slaves and Telemachus (24.214-218). Then, having left his weapons behind with the slaves (24.219), Odysseus goes forward to encounter his father, who is

---

348 For this much-vexed word, see Heubeck 1992, ad 208, and Mary Knox 1971.
350 See Heubeck 1992 ad 24.211.
alone, having sent his own slaves along to mend the wall.

At their meeting, Homer emphasizes Odysseus’ somewhat uncomfortable transition from conquering hero (recall his leaving his arms with the slaves) to dutiful son, concerned for his father’s deteriorated condition:

οἱ μὲν ἔπειτα δόμονδε θοῶς κίον, αὐτάρ Ὀδυσσεύς ἄσσον ἵεν πολυκάρπου ἀλωῆς πειρητίζων. οὔδ’ εὗρεν Δολίον, μέγαν ὀρχατον ἐσκαταβαίνων, οὔδε τινα δημῶν οὔδε νιών· ἀλλ’ ἄρα τοί ὑπ’ αἰμασιὰς λέξοντες ἀλωῆς ἔμμεναι ἕρκος οἰχοντ’, αὐτάρ ὁ τοῖσι γέρων ὀδὸν ἤγεμόνευε. τὸν δ’ οἶον πατέρ’ εὗρεν ἐὐκτιμένη ἐν ἀλωῆ, λιστρεύοντα φυτὸν.

24.220-227

And they went quickly on their way to the house, but Odysseus went closer to the abundant orchard, searching. He did not find either Dolius, as he came into the great orchard, nor any of his thralls, nor his sons, for all these had gone off to gather stones to be a wall of the orchard, and the old man had guided them on their errand; but he did find his father alone in the well-worked orchard, spading out a plant.

Odysseus’ approach to his father at first continues in the same harmonious tone that pervaded the description of the farmstead proper: the orchard, for example, possesses much fruit (24.221). But ripples of worry move across this impression of serenity: Odysseus does not find Dolius or the other slaves about their tasks—a worrisome sign, given the degree of influence that the suitors have exercised in Ithaca for so long. Could they have done something to Laertes? What if he has died—and event which the subplot of the weaving of his shroud might well lead us to expect to hear narrated within the epic?

These worries are dispelled when we learn that the slaves have merely been sent to mend the wall, and that Laertes—suspensefully postponed to line 226—is alive and still able enough to work in the fields. With this welcome knowledge, we hear another poetic sigh of relief in the form of a favorable adjective attached to the orchard: it is now a “well-worked orchard” (ἐὐκτιμένη ἐν ἀλωῆ). The epithet attached to the orchard is significant. Though Lattimore translates, “well-worked”, this word is, as Heubeck notes in his comment on this line, reserved
for “well-founded” buildings or cities. In fact, it is cognate with the word regularly used of founding cities or colonies, κτίζω. Nor is this the first time in this passage we have heard an architectural word applied to landscape: in 206, the adjective τετυγμένος, “well-constructed”, is applied to Laertes’ ἄγρος, or farmland. The conflation of house, household, and land in these lines reminds us that these concepts are mutually dependent and in some ways virtually equivalent. The fact that the architectural adjectives are always applied in a positive light to the landscape suggests that it is human and divine government – the combination of the imposition of human and divine order from above, human toil, and divine benevolence – that make the countryside prosper. The countryside is literally an architectural member within the larger structure of the polis-centered society, useless and incomplete in itself, indispensable when put in its proper place. It also recalls the confounding of organic and technological terminology in the Gardens of Alcinous, suggesting that the Gardens of Laertes hold the potential to sprout and grow into a nearly equally imposing edifice.

Homer then describes Laertes’ condition to the audience.

...and he had a squalid tunic upon him, patched together and ugly, and on his legs he had oxhide gaiters fastened and patched together, to prevent scratching, and gloves on his hands because of the bushes, and he was wearing a cap of goatskin on his head, to increase his misery.

Now when much-enduring great Odysseus observed him, with great misery in his heart, and oppressed by old age, he stood underneath a towering pear tree and shed tears for him.

Although Laertes is not in the best condition, his filth and hard labor are an alternative preferable

---

by far to the death or disappearance which the eerie emptiness of the farm a few lines earlier might have led Odysseus to fear. The details of Laertes’ squalor vacillate between overtly pejorative terms and phrases (ῥυπόωντα, “squalid”; ἁεικέλιον, “ugly”; πένθος ἀέξων, “to increase his misery”; γήραϊ τειρόμενον, “worn out by old age”) and vocabulary which, while suggestive of hard labor, does not necessarily indicate discontentment with his state (e.g., χειρῖδὰς ἐπὶ χερσὶ βάτων ἑνεκὰ, “[wearing] gloves on his hands because of the bushes”). Laertes grieves as he works, and he seems to have let himself go a bit as a demonstrative reminder of his loss (the goatskin cap, for example, is enigmatically qualified by the words, πένθος ἀέξων, “to increase his misery”).

This impression coheres well with Penelope’s earlier expression of hope that Laertes will complain to the people: wearing lowly clothes and pouring dust on one’s head are standard gestures of grieving which can be employed to stir relatives and allies to action against a foe believed to have wronged the dead. None of these considerations necessarily mean that work in the gardens is itself unseemly, however. Indeed, Homer has already taken care to inform us that Laertes has a Sicilian slave to tend to him; he must therefore sport his soiled and disordered appearance by choice rather than by necessity.

After a detailed description of Laertes’ state, Odysseus implies that there is an inverse relationship between Laertes and the upkeep of his garden: while his work has resulted in a well-kept garden, Laertes himself has not taken good care of himself.

352 On this expression, see Heubeck 1992 ad 24.231.
353 As he does at 24.316-317. Pace Heubeck (1992 ad 24.315-317: “in helping his father to give expression to his grief Odysseus has prepared the way forward to the moment of recognition”), Laertes’ outward expression of grief may have less to do with his emotional healing than with his desire to demonstrate to the stranger that he continues to manifest all the signs of mourning as a reminder to all the countrypeople of the wrongs done to his son. The parallel between these lines and their occurrence at Iliad 18.22-24 may thus be closer than Heubeck allows.
354 As in tragedy, we might expect Laertes’ ostentatious mourning (see esp. 24.315-317) to represent a call to action for the people of the countryside, many of whom, like Eumaeus, are sympathetic to Odysseus; by keeping Odysseus’ memory fresh, Laertes ensures that the likes of Eumaeus will give the wanderer a sympathetic reception should he ever return. See Seaford 1994, 86-92, and note 366 below.
355 But see Heubeck 1992, ad 24.211 and 24.222. The Sicilian woman is Dolius’ wife; the fact that their daughter Melantho and son Melanthius prove to be villains could be taken to indicate that the Sicilian woman too, like her children, has grown remiss in tending to Laertes now that his family has fallen in public esteem. There is, however, no textual evidence that either of the pair proves faithless.
ὦ γέρον, οὐκ ἀδαημονίη σ᾽ ἔχει ἄμφιπολεύειν ὀρχατον, ἀλλ᾽ εὖ τοι κομιδὴ ἔχει, οὐδὲ τί πάμπαν, οὐ φυτόν, οὐ συκέη, οὐ ἄμπελος, οὐ μὲν ἐλαῖη, οὐκ ὄξυχη, οὐ πρασιή τοι ἀνευ κομιδῆς κατὰ κῆπον. ἀλλο δὲ τοι ἐρέω, οὐ δὲ μὴ χόλον ἐνθεο θυμῷ· αὐτὸν σ᾽ οὐκ ἁγαθή κομιδὴ ἔχει, ἀλλ᾽ ἁμα γήρας λυγρὸν ἔχεις αὐχμεῖς τε κακῶς καὶ ἀεικέα ἐσσαι. οὐ μὲν ἀεργίης γε ἁναξ ἐνθεο· οὐ σε κομίζει, οὐδὲ τί τοι δουλειον ἐπιπρέπει εἰσοράασθαι εἰδος καὶ μέγεθος· βασιλῆι γάρ ἄνδρι ἐοικας. τοιούτω δε ἐοικας, ἐπει λουσατο φάγοι τε, ενδέμεναι μαλακώς· ἢ γάρ δικη ἐστι γερόντων. ἀλλ᾽ ἁγε μοι τὸδε εἰπὲ καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον, τεῦ δμώς εἰς ἄνδρων· τεῦ δ ὀρχατον ἄμφιπολεύεις;

Old sir, there is in you no lack of expertness in tending your orchard; everything is well cared for, and there is never a plant, neither fig tree nor yet grapevine nor olive nor pear tree nor leek bed uncared for in your garden. But I will also tell you this; do not take it as cause for anger. You yourself are ill cared for; together with dismal old age, which is yours, you are squalid and wear foul clothing upon you. It is not for your laziness that your lord does not take care of you, nor is your stature and beauty, as I see it, such as ought to belong to a slave. You look like a man who is royal, and such a one as who, after he has bathed and eaten, should sleep on a soft bed; for such is the right of elders. But come now, tell me this and give me an accurate answer. What man’s thrall are you? Whose orchard are you laboring?

Previously Homer mixed his architectural imagery with his landscapes; here, he conflates the language of human hygiene with that of cultivation (they are both varieties of κομιδῆ). At present for Laertes, there is an inverse proportion between the two: his gardens have flourished, while he has grown dirty and old. If his stratagem of enlisting pity through ostentatious mourning is successful, however, it holds the potential to sustain future rebellion against the suitors. As an alternate plan for destroying the suitors, one which is never brought into play, simultaneously cultivating bad hygiene and good crops is an excellent way to continue working against those who would destroy what he and his son have built up.

After insistently commenting on the contrast between Laertes’ disrepair and the well-kept
gardens that Laertes has tended at the expense of his own health (24.244-260) and briefly deceiving Laertes with yet another lying tale, Odysseus proves his identity first by showing the scar from the boar-hunt, then by linking concrete objects in the gardens with memories shared by the father and son:

εἰ δ' ἁγε τοι καὶ δένδρα' ἐὑκτιμένην κατ' ἄλωήν 
εἶπο, ἃ μοι ποτ' ἐδώκας, ἑγὼ δ' ἤτεόν σε ἐκαστα 
παιδνὸς ἐών, κατὰ κῆπον ἐπιστόμενος· διὰ δ' αὐτῶν 
ἰκνεύμεσθα, σὺ δ' ὄνόμασας καὶ ἔειπες ἐκαστα. 
ὄγχας μοι δώκας τρισκαίδεκα καὶ δέκα μηλέας, 
σύκεας τεσσαράκοντ'· ὅρχους δὲ μοι ὄδι' ὄνόμηνας 
δώσεὶν πεντίκουτα, διατρύγιος δὲ ἐκαστος 
ἡμν· ἐνθα δ' ἀνὰ σταφυλαὶ παντοῖαι ἔασιν, 
ὦππότε δὴ Δίος ὦραι ἐπιβρίσειαν ὑπέρθεν.

Or come then, let me tell you of the trees in the well-worked orchard, which you gave me once. I asked you of each one, when I was a child, following you through the garden. We went among the trees, and you named them all and told me what each one was, and you gave me thirteen pear trees, and ten apple trees, and forty fig trees; and so also you named the fifty vines you would give. Each of them bore regularly, for there were grapes at every stage upon them, whenever the seasons of Zeus came down from the sky upon them, to make them heavy.

Odysseus’ language in this passage repeatedly invokes the mutual exchange of tokens no longer present (information and fruits). Note the changes of person throughout the conversation, from second person to first person to first person plural, then ending with a string of second persons which emphasize not only that Odysseus is who he says he is, but that he is an attentive son: ἃ μοι ποτ' ἐδώκας → ἑγὼ δ' ἤτεόν σε → διὰ δ' αὐτῶν / ἐκαστα → σὺ δ' ὄνόμασας καὶ 
ἑειπες ἐκαστα → δώκας → ὄνόμηλας. The inclusion of specific numbers in 340-342 contrasts with the seemingly limitless abundance of Alcinous’ gardens:

356 Scodel 1998, 10 suggests: “Odysseus tests Laertes because he needs him as an ally against the families of the suitors. The old man he finds in the orchard is in no condition to help him, and the test is Odysseus’ attempt to prepare Laertes to fight.” On the use of two tokens of recognition, see Heubeck 1992 ad 24.331-44.
Ὅγχυν ἐπὶ ὅγχυν γηρᾶσκει, μῆλον δὲ ἐπὶ μήλῳ,
αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ σταφυλῆ σταφυλῆ, σῦκον δὲ ἐπὶ σῦκῳ.

7.120-121

Pear matures on pear in that place, apple upon apple,
grape cluster on grape cluster, fig upon fig.

Homer lists almost the same fruits in each garden, but that the mortal garden’s output is finite. Laertes’ gardens also diverge from the gardens of foreign lands in the consistency with which the gods pour out their munificence upon the land: Alcinous’ gardens were the gifts of the gods (7.132), and, as seen above, resembled Olympus and Elysium in enjoying a seemingly changeless existence whose hallmark is temporal adverbs meaning “forever” or “for all time”; we have also seen that Olympus (as described in Book 6) and Elysium lack rain, yet somehow are magically fertile despite this fact. In contrast, Odysseus’ final word on Laertes’ gardens implies that the munificence of the gods is sporadic and conditional – not automatic: ὁππότε δὴ Διὸς ῥοῖαι ἐπιβρίσειαν ὑπερθεν. LSJ notes the use of ἐπιβρίθω in the sense of “to fall heavy upon,” of rain, but does not explicitly translate thus in this passage; nevertheless, “the seasons of Zeus falling heavy from above”, taken literally, would indicate that Odysseus underscores the fragile contingency of this mortal landscape upon a meteorological phenomenon as capable of destroying as it is of producing fertility. In comparison to the landscapes abroad, the landscape of home has very human limitations in productivity; it is subject to decay, shortages of water, and inattention of attendants. All these shortcomings lend extra poignancy to the fact that Laertes, in sharp contrast to Alcinous, has had to work so hard to maintain this plot. Odysseus should have been there to continue farming it with him, but was not, and Laertes’ retreat into the farm is an attempt to enact this counterfactual and unrealized desideratum. The accumulation of details in this passage thus reveals much about Ithacan society and its relation to more fantastic landscapes.
The tokens of recognition that Odysseus uses with his father betray key data about Odysseus’ attitude to his homeland. This is not the end of the story, however, for lurking beneath the surface of the gardens of Laertes lie two other formative landscapes from Odysseus’ past that have come to epitomize the irreconcilable regal and antisocial tendencies intrinsic to his character. Consideration of these two will elucidate how Odysseus approaches his father in the guarded frame of mind which Athena had inculcated in him throughout Book 13, and gradually thaws throughout the passage, first setting aside his weapons before visiting his father, then backsliding when he employs an inappropriate false tale to test Laertes.\textsuperscript{357} When he does try to prove his identity, his results are similarly mixed. He first offers the boar-hunt scar as evidence, but seems intuitively to know that this is not enough, for he goes on to give the second proof of intimate knowledge of his father’s gardens as his final argument. These two signs are emblematic of two different aspects of Odysseus’ character: the boar-hunt, of his mother’s side of the family – deceitful, wily, and able to survive in the wilderness on their wits alone. This is the Hermes-like Odysseus, the trickster, the one who washed up on the shore of Scheria with nothing and was able to shift for himself using nothing more than an olive tree, leaves, and his persuasive abilities. The proof that finally convinces Laertes gives evidence of a quite different side of Odysseus’ character: the settled agriculturalist, the managerial king, the real-world analog of Alcinous.\textsuperscript{358} These two very different sides of the wandering hero find expression in
Book 19 in two separate narrative digressions detailing landscapes that embody these traits, the first from Odysseus’ childhood and associated with his naming by Autolycus, the second space one which exists only in Odysseus’ imaginings of the future which he envisions for Ithaca.

Let us now proceed to the first of these passages from Book 19 which serve as foils to Laertes’ Gardens: Odysseus’ description of the ideal king. In 19.106-114, Odysseus praises Penelope lavishly in a simile emphasizing her rootedness and intimate ties to her home landscape. The queen has just been interrogating the disguised stranger as to his identity, and the effusive praise of this simile helps Odysseus to blunt his subsequent refusal to reveal his identity by demonstrating that it is not lack of respect for Penelope which drives it.

ὦ γύναι, οὐκ ἂν τίς σε βροτῶν ἐπ᾽ ἀπείρονα γαῖαν νεικεῖοι· ὢ γάρ σευ κλέος οὐρανόν εὐρύν ἰκάνει, ὡς τε τευ ἢ βασιλῆος ἀμύμονος, ὡς τε θεουδής ἀνδράσιν ἐν πολλοίσι καὶ ἱφθίμοισι ἀνάσσων εὐδικίας ἀνέχῃσι, ἄρετωσι δὲ λαοὶ ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.

19.106-114

Lady, no mortal man on the endless earth could have cause to find fault with you; your fame goes up into the wide heaven, as of some king who, as a blameless man and a god-fearing, and ruling as lord over many powerful people, upholds the way of good government, and the black earth yields him barley and wheat, his trees are heavy with fruit, his sheepflocks continue to bear young, the sea gives him fish, because of his good leadership, and his people prosper under him.

No small share of the pathos and irony of this simile arises from the fact that Odysseus himself once was this very βασιλεὺς ἀμύμων (“blameless king”), yet he is now a stranger in his own home. Penelope, we are told at 4.737, has a garden tended by a slave whom her father sent with conversation on that ‘imaginary walk’ to brand his boy’s mind. Passage there into the Law/lore of the Father gave the boy meaning, and (a) language, an image-repertoire, for (dealing with) life. Odysseus learned not just this or that item, not just what learning is, learned not just cognitively, but folded all this into the activity of relating to his teacher, holding to his environment, grafted onto his experience.”

258
her when she married Odysseus, and in Book 24 Homer indicates that Odysseus and Laertes have tended their own garden together at least since Odysseus’ childhood. All family members of the generation of Laertes and the generation of Odysseus have strong ties to this garden, lending weight to my contention that it comprises the family temenos and is held sacred to Athena. Within the scope of the Odyssey, the audience will look in vain for some of the wishful ideal landscape features of the simile of Book 19 to find expression: there will be no vignettes of fishing, no further mentions of Ithaca’s fields of golden grain. The moderate and hard-won fruits of a family-owned plot are all that Homer privileges us to hear about, and the more far-reaching signs of fertility beyond Odysseus’ family holdings remain hopes, the fulfillment of which will depend to no small degree on the outcome of the battle with the suitors’ family. Nevertheless, as the temenos of Alcinous was a symbolic analogue of his gardens, an intermediate space between city and country which subsumed traits of each, imposing the social order of the city on the country by associating a particular space in the countryside with the king and his protector deity, the Gardens of Laertes stand as a symbol for the potential for order and prosperity to radiate out from the political center across the entire countryside, and the vision of the ideal king in Book 19 alerts the audience that Odysseus holds this hope.

The digression on the ideal king also looks backwards to previous models of idealized landscapes. The Golden Age relation with landscape envisioned by Odysseus here reads as a catalogue of elements which Odysseus has sought in his past wanderings. Here a desirable landscape is combined with a just king and robust inhabitants, a state which contrasts starkly with the kind of men whom Odysseus has met with on most shores. The landscape features of

359 Both Penelope’s and Laertes’ gardens are tended by the slave Dolios, suggesting that the gardens are one and the same (see 4.735 and 24.222-3: οὐδὲ εὗρεν Άδολίον, μέγαν ὄρχατον ἐσκαταβαίνων, / οὐδὲ τινα δεμῶν οὐδ’ υἱῶν, “He did not / find either Dolius, as he came into the great orchard, / nor any of his thralls, nor his sons”). Cf. Heubeck 1992 ad 24.222 and the literature which he cites on critical opinions regarding this figure; as he notes, “there is no compelling reason to postulate more than one servant Dolius”.

360 Cf. Circe’s characterization of Odysseus’ adventures to date at 10.457-459:

μηκέτι νῦν θαλερὸν γόον ὄρνυτε· οἶδα καὶ αὖτή ἡμέν ὅσ’ ἐν πόντῳ πάθετ’ ἄλγεα ἰχθυόεντι, ἢδ’ ὅσ’ ἀνάρσιοι ἀνδρεῖς ἐδηλήσαντ’ ἐπὶ χέρσου.

No longer raise the swell of your lamentation. I too
this hypothetical good kingdom echo (but never verbatim) prior advantages less than optimally situated for human exploitation: Odysseus and his men sought men who fed on grain (\textit{sitos}) in the Apologue, but found only the lethargic Lotus Eaters and the cannibalistic Laestrygonians. Here we find that Odysseus’ imaginary kingdom possesses grain in good store: \textit{φέρῃσι δὲ γαῖα μέλαινα / πυροὺς καὶ κριθάς} (“and the black earth yields him / barley and wheat”, 19.111-112). One other place visited by Odysseus and his men sustained these same grains, Goat Island (\textit{ἀλλὰ τά γ’ ἀσπαρτα καὶ ἀνήροτα πάντα φύονται, / πυροὶ καὶ κριθαὶ ἥδ’ ἀμπελοὶ}, “but all grows for them without seed planting, without cultivation, / wheat and barley and also the grapevines”, 9.109-110), but that was beset by the not inconsiderable disadvantage of being located uncomfortably close to the Cyclopes. The flocks (\textit{μῆλα}) which bear young without stint recall the similarly fecund flocks of Libya which so impressed Menelaus in Book 4, but surpass them in being the good king’s own possessions, rather than mere booty gained by rapine and plunder. Abundance of fish, the use of which for food is elsewhere portrayed in a rather negative light,\textsuperscript{361} uniquely here is viewed positively – perhaps an acknowledgement that a truly good king’s providence extends even to the lowest classes of his domain, for whom eating fish likely does not have the same stigma that it may carry for the warrior elite. By forging a connection between these foreign lands and Laertes’ gardens, the simile of the good king presents a vision of what Ithaca could be, but at the same time summons to mind serious detriments present overseas that are blessedly absent on Ithaca.

There is, however, one idealized landscape which does excel Laertes’ gardens in many respects and which holds no Cyclopes or other anthropophagous monsters. The association of an ideal peaceful society with a diversified agrarian base headed by a king appears elsewhere only in the Gardens of Alcinous. Having previously witnessed how a king of fairyland disposes his own gardens under ideal circumstances, Odysseus is able to project a return to abundant fertility for his own homeland in the simile of 19.107-114. The Gardens of Alcinous, admired by Odysseus in Book 7, are part of a diptych which describes both the palace and the gardens of the king of the Phaeacians; for the sake of the present discussion, we shall reproduce the description of the Gardens here:

\begin{quote}
know all the pains you have suffered on the fish-filled sea, and all the damage done you on dry land by hostile men.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{361} See Couch 1936, Fraser 1936, Combellack 1953.
On the outside of the courtyard and next the doors is his orchard, a great one, four land measures, with a fence driven all around it, and there is the place where his fruit trees are grown tall and flourishing, pear trees and pomegranate trees and apple trees with their shining fruit, and the sweet fig trees and flourishing olives. Never is the fruit spoiled on these, never does it give out, neither in wintertime nor summer, but always the West Wind blowing on the fruits brings some to ripeness while he starts others. Pear matures on pear in that place, apple upon apple, grape cluster on grape cluster, fig upon fig. There also he has a vineyard planted that gives abundant produce, some of it a warm area on level ground where the grapes are left to dry in the sun, but elsewhere they are gathering others and trampling out yet others, and in front of these are unripe grapes that have cast off their bloom while others are darkening. And there at the bottom strip of the field are growing orderly rows of greens, all kinds, and these are lush through the seasons; and there two springs distribute water, one through all the garden space, and one on the other side jets out by the courtyard door, and the lofty house, where townspeople come for their water. Such are the glorious gifts of the gods at the house of Alcinous.
And there long-suffering great Odysseus stopped still and admired it. But when his mind was done with all admiration, lightly he stepped over the threshold and went on into the palace.

The emphasis on eternality and superabundance in the Gardens of Alcinous is extremely pronounced. The variety of luxury fruits is stressed (παντοῖαι); in an age of limited access to artificial sweeteners, many of these fruits would likely have been synonymous with sweetness, but Homer is willing to restate the fact in order to contrast the sweetness of figs with the saltier and more practical connotations of the olive (συκέας τε γλυκεραὶ καὶ ἐλαῖαι τηλεθώσαι, “sweet figs and the flourishing olives”). As noted in a previous chapter, when it comes time for Odysseus to describe his own home to Alcinous, this same root (γλυκ-) will trip to Odysseus’ lips (οὐ τοι ἐγώ γε / ἂς γαίς δύναμαι γλυκέρωτερον ἄλλο ἰδέοθαι, “for my part, / I cannot think of any place sweeter on earth to look at”, 9.27-28) – a not entirely unconnected reminiscence, when we recollect the importance which Laertes’ gardens will have in reuniting father and son.

Homer is especially insistent on the fact that fruit is available year-round in lines 117-119:

τάων οὐ ποτὲ καρπὸς ἀπόλλυται οὐδ’ ἀπολεῖπει χεῖματος οὐδὲ θέρευς, ἐπετήσιος· ἀλλὰ μάλ’ αἰεὶ ξεφυρίη πνείουσα τὰ μὲν φύει, ἄλλα δὲ πέσσει.

Never is the fruit spoiled on these, never does it give out, neither in wintertime nor summer, but always the West Wind blowing on the fruits brings some to ripeness while he starts others.

Not only is the fruit perennial, but the trees literally teem with it:

362 Consistent with other supernatural loca amoena with which we have dealt: cf. Olympus at 6. 41-47 (Εἶδος ἄσφαλες αἰεί... τῶν ἐν τερποῦται μάκαρες τοι ηματα πάντα, “an abode firm and unmoving forever... and there, and all their days, the blessed gods take their pleasure”) and Elysium at 4.567-8 (ἀλλ’ αἰεί Ζεφύροιο λιγύ πνείντος ἀήτας / Ὠκεανὸς ἀνίησιν ἀναψύχειν ἀνθρώπως, “but always the stream of the Ocean sends up breezes / of the West Wind blowing briskly for the refreshment of mortals”).
The only aging done in these magical gardens, ironically, is that involved in the ripening of fruit (γηράσκει). In all other respects, age and mortal care are banned from the gardens. The association of Zephyrus with the pleasant clime of the gardens is familiar from Elysium, a similarly deathless land. In concluding his description of this locale, the poet emphasizes that the gardens are no normal variety, but the gifts of the gods (τοῖς ἄρτοῖς ἐν Ἀλκινόοιο θεῶν ἔσαν ἄγλαα δῶρα, “such are the glorious gifts of the gods at the house of Alcinous”). Immediately after these words, Homer conveys Odysseus’ amazed reaction (ἐνθὰ στὰς θηεῖτο πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, “and there long-suffering great Odysseus stopped still and admired it”). Odysseus’ wonder at the gardens hints that perhaps this brief glimpse of a more fully and

363 See Stanford on 7.119, who notes that Elysium (4.567) and this passage are unique in portraying Zephyrus in a favorable light.

364 Note also the similar emphasis on the heavenly luster of the facades of the palaces of Alcinous and of Menelaus:

Φράξεο, Νεστορίδη, τῷ ἐμῶ κεχαρισμένε θυμῷ,
χαλκοῦ τε στεροπῆν καὶ δώματα ἡχήεντα,
χρυσοῦ τ’ ἥλεκτρον τε καὶ ἀργύρου ἠδ’ ἔλεφαντος.
Σήνος που τοιῇδε γ’ Ὀλυμπίου ἐνδοθεν αὐλῆ,
ὅσσα τάδ’ ἀσπετα πολλά· σέβας μ’ ἐχει εἰσορόωντα.

Son of Nestor, you who delight my heart, only look at
the gleaming of the bronze all through these echoing mansions,
and the gleaming of gold and amber, of silver and ivory.
The court of Zeus on Olympus must be like this on the inside,
such abundance of everything. Wonder takes me as I look on it.

4.71-75

ως τε γὰρ ἥλιον αἰγίλη πέλεν ἥ σελήνης
δώμα καθ’ ὑμερεφές μεγαλήτορος Ἀλκινόοιο.

For as from the sun the light goes or from the moon, such was
the glory on the high-roofed house of Alcinous.

263
luxuriantly described Elysium-like setting impresses on Odysseus a lasting glimpse of a human-like kingdom comparable to Ithaca which enjoys greater abundance than that to which any human society can possibly aspire. Thus, when it comes time for him to paint an idealized picture for Penelope of her fame, it seems natural that his wording should recall the Gardens of Alcinous even as it suggests that Ithaca in some golden lost *illo tempore* of the past before the Trojan War may have enjoyed an analogous share of divine favor.

Odysseus’ good king’s kingdom is clearly not identical with Alcinous’ kingdom, including as it does features recalling the sometimes-harsh epithets often introduced in descriptions of Ithaca. Alcinous’ leisure class lives the life of luxury and consumption (ἐνθα δὲ Φαιήκων ἡγήτορες ἐδριόωντο / πίνοντες καὶ ἔδοντες· ἐπηετανὸν γὰρ ἔχεσκον, “There the leaders of the Phaeacians held their sessions / and drank and ate, since they held these forever”, 7.98-99), tended to by their handy maids and wives (7.103-111). When the time comes to indicate workmen in the garden, Homer employs the awkward construction of subjectless verbs (“they”), leaving the workers literally nameless. For Odysseus, there is seemingly an organic relation between the justice of the king, the industry of the people, their manly vigor, and the fertility of the land. Note the lines which frame the description of the good king’s abundance:

\[ ὡς τέ τευ ἢ βασιλῆος ἀμύμονος, ὡς τε θεουδής ἀνδράσιν ἐν πολλοῖσι καὶ ἰφθίμοισιν ἀνάσσων εὐδικίας ἀνέχῃσι… \]

... ἀρετῶσι δὲ λαοὶ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ.
19.109-111; 114

as of some king who, as a blameless man and a god-fearing, and ruling as lord over many powerful people, upholds the way of good government,

... 

...and his people prosper under him.

Not only do assertions of the people’s strength, number, and character ring the landscape description (πολλοῖσι καὶ ἰφθίμοισιν... ἀρετῶσι), but mention of the king’s piety and just
Odysseus’ good king enjoys his prosperity not from the benefactions of the gods, but from the justice of his rule and the labor of his people. Likewise, in Odysseus’ ideal kingdom, there is more diversity of livelihood: not only fruit, but grains (πυροὺς καὶ κριθάς), flocks (μῆλα), and fish (θάλασσα δὲ παρέχη ἵχθος) are all explicitly said to be the result of the king’s good rule (ἐξ εὐηγεσίης). This in turn should remind us that, unlike Alcinous’ sheltered palace enclave, Odysseus imagines the landscape of his entire kingdom as an organic whole in which all components (fishermen, farmers, horticulturalists, etc.) contribute their share. Further, whereas Alcinous’ garden produces fruit in endless succession, with new fruit coming to replace the old the moment it is ripe (ὀγχνη ἐπ’ ὁγχνη γηράσκει, μῆλον δ’ ἐπὶ μῆλῳ, / αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ σταφυλῇ σταφυλῆ, σῦκον δ’ ἐπὶ σῦκῳ, “pear matures on pear in that place, apple upon apple, / grape cluster on grape cluster, fig upon fig”), the fruit trees in the land of Odysseus’ idealized king merely produce pendulously large fruit (βρίθῃσι δὲ δένδρα καρπῷ, “his trees are heavy with fruit”), reflecting a more realistic arboriculturalist’s concern that hail or late frosts not destroy the fruit on the tree before the mature fruits weigh down the branches. In summation, then, despite the fact that Alcinous’ gardens and the lands of the king in the simile share many similarities and despite the fact that both exist in agricultural kingdoms ruled by a monarch, Odysseus’ idealized landscape, expresses more clearly realistic details which underscore that prosperity results from all members of society honoring the mutual obligations between king and the producers of food in the countryside.

Laertes’ gardens, which I have attempted to show above share some characteristics with the king’s temenos on Scheria, may seem unlikely candidates to fulfill this more egalitarian vision; however, several factors indicate that they do precisely this. First, we will recall the observation above that Laertes’ gardens are linked to Penelope through the slave Dolius. At 4.735-741, Penelope gives every impression that Dolius has a privileged status with her, as he was given by her father, and is specially summoned from the garden (kepos) to carry a message back to Laertes:

365 See Chapter 5 for further observations on the Hesiodic context of this passage.
ἀλλὰ τις ὀτρηρῶς Δολίον καλέσει γέροντα, 
διώκει ἐμόν, ὃν μοι δώκε πατήρ ἐτι δέυρο κιούσῃ, 
καὶ μοι κήπον ἔχει πολυδένδρεον, οὕτω τάχιστα 
Λαέρτῃ τάδε πάντα παρεξόμενος καταλέξῃ, 
εἰ δὴ ποῦ τινα κεῖνος ἔνι φρεσὶν, μήτιν ύφήνας 
ἐξελθὼν λαοῖσιν οὗτοι οὖν καὶ Ὀδυσσήος, 
ὁ δὲ Neleus παρεζόμενος καταλέξῃ, 
καὶ μοι κήπον ἔχει πολυδένδρεον, ὃν καὶ Ὀδυσσήος λαμβάνει γόνον ἀντιθέοιο.

4.735-741

But let someone quickly summon the old man Dolius, my own servant, whom my father gave me as I came here, and he keeps an orchard with many trees for me, so that he may with speed sit beside Laertes and tell him all, and perhaps he, weaving out some design in his heart, may go outside and complain to the people of those who are striving to waste away his own seed and that of godlike Odysseus.

The fact that Penelope feels compelled to summon a personal slave of long standing from the gardens to convey her message is consonant with the sensitive message which Dolius will convey – she would not wish all to know that Telemachus has left her without a male protector in the palace. It also supports the hypothesis adumbrated above that Laertes’ garden is a temenos and as such functions as a sort of secondary bastion of the royal house in the countryside, from which Laertes can still fly the flag of Odysseus’ house should the palace itself be overwhelmed by the outrages of the suitors. Moreover, while Laertes possibly reserves the care of this enclave to himself, Penelope’s instructions (“perhaps he… may go outside and complain to the people” of the suitors) assume that Laertes can use this semi-public kepos as a forum for voicing the concerns of Odysseus’ house among the country people.366 The association of the gardens with both Penelope and Laertes, both family members whom Odysseus fails to convince of his identity using the sign of the scar from his childhood boar-hunt as a token of recognition, thus emphasizes that Odysseus’ family, both genetic and by marriage, interests itself directly in diverse modes of exploiting Ithaca’s landscape, a prerequisite for the hierarchical management of diverse labor in the prosperous kingdom portrayed in Odysseus’ simile of Book 19. Odysseus’ ideal king simile gives us (and Penelope) crucial hints about what sort of king he intends to be

366 For grief and lamentation as a means of spurring friends to action, see e.g. Foley 2001, 19-56; a copious literature exists on this topic, much drawing its inspiration from Alexiou 2002 (2nd ed. of Alexiou 1974).
once he doffs Athena’s disguise. The extremes of violence and deceit in which Odysseus engages in cleansing the palace of suitors could easily cause a suspicious Penelope worry regarding the kind of husband and king this long-absent lord will make. It is vitally important that Odysseus plant the promise of a return to antebellum peacetime activities in Penelope’s mind, so that when he does reveal himself she will not shrink from him. The partial realization of this promise in the Gardens of Laertes demonstrates Odysseus permitting his preference for peacetime activities (namely the trees of the garden) to triumph over his delight in deceit (recalling his Autolycan background) as the self which he presents to his father.

The Autolycan side to which Odysseus obliquely alludes in his mention of the scar to Laertes was dealt with at more length in the narrative ecphrasis on the boar-hunt on Parnassus in Book 19. Unlike the description of the hypothetical ideal king’s lands, the hunt is not narrated by Odysseus, and refers to a specific formative event that has occurred at a specific time in the past. After describing how Autolycus named the young Odysseus, Homer indulges in a seemingly excessive narrative recounting how Odysseus received the wound by which Euryclea recognizes him. Homer must provide some explanation of how Euryclea is aware of this scar and why it is important, but why does he digress at such length?

I would offer that part of his motive was to provide an aition for the wilier traits evinced by the hero during his travels, and to insinuate that they are on some level incompatible with the role of king of a peaceful land that Odysseus wishes to assume. Even the etymology of Odysseus’ name offered here suggests that the Autolycan model of behavior will prove egregiously inappropriate for resuming life on Ithaca. Before narrating the hunt proper, Homer relates that Autolycus came to Ithaca to pay a visit to his newborn grandson. After arriving and being invited to bestow a name upon the baby, Autolycus declares:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{γαμβρὸς ἐμὸς θυγάτηρ τε, τίθεσθ’ ὄνομα ὃττι κεν εἴπω· πολλοῖσιν γὰρ ἐγὼ γε ὀδυσσάμενος τὸδ’ ἱκάνω, ἀνδράσιν ἤδὲ γυναιξὶν ἀνὰ χθόνα πολυβότειραν· τῷ δ’ Ὄδυσεύς ὄνομ’ ἐστω ἐπώνυμον.} \\
19.406-409
\end{align*}
\]

My son-in-law and daughter, give him the name I tell you; since I have come to this place distasteful to many, women and men alike on the prospering earth, so let him be given the name Odysseus, that is distasteful.
The meaning of this etymology is a subject of great perplexity. Russo takes the participle ὀδυσσάμενος in an active sense ("since Autolycus in his career as trickster has dealt harshly with many men and women, the child, as Autolycus’ heir, will be ‘Odysseus’, ‘the man who deals out harsh treatment’. The suffix points to such an active sense.” Autolycus’ application of this verb to himself seems to lend itself most easily to a passive usage of the participle here (as a thief and trickster, Autolycus should come “hateful to all” or “distasteful”, in Lattimore’s words). Rutherford observes that both the middle and passive interpretations are applicable to “different aspects of Odysseus’ career”.

A moral might be read into this etymology with telling implications for Odysseus’ use of the scar as a token of recognition: if Odysseus makes this side of his heritage the basis for his kingship, he will be hated by all. To ensure that we get the point, Homer provides an exemplum as soon as the Parnassus narrative is complete: Odysseus finds himself threatening his trusted childhood nurse Euryclea with murder (19.479-490), an act remarkable not only for its violence but, as Euryclea points out (19.492-498), for the valuable intelligence about which servants have been faithful that would perish along with the aging nurse. At the same time, however, Odysseus’ Autolycan genes are not for naught, and it is in this regard that the topographical

367 19.399-412. On this issue, see Stanford 1952 and 1992, 8-24; Clay 1997, 54-89; and Russo 1992 ad 19.407. Autolycus’ application of this verb to himself seem to lend itself most easily to a passive interpretation of the participle (as a thief and trickster, Autolycus should come “hateful to all”). Clay 1997 in her discussion of Maronitis anticipates some aspects of my discussion of “doubleness of Odysseus” (1997, 70-71); unlike Clay, I assert that Homer consciously manipulates the Autolycan background of his hero, and that Odysseus makes a demonstrative choice between the Autolycan and the Laertean paths by throwing in his lot with Laertes in the final scene: it is not so much the case that “the whitewash of Odysseus in the Odyssey remains complete”; instead, Homer uses the ambivalent character of Odysseus in the tradition to good purpose. The view expressed by Stanford 1992, 14 on Odysseus’ dual nature is in some ways the inverse of this position: “Perhaps in presenting the contrast between Odysseus’s reputation for ‘devices’ and his scrupulously straightforward conduct in the Iliad the poet intended his hearers to enjoy the spectacle of a wily, sensitive, and self-controlled man disciplining his personality to fit into a rigid code of heroic conduct.” I.e., for Staford, the Autolycan Odysseus is the “real” Odysseus, but he is capable of reigning himself in. This, however, leaves unanswered the question of what he will do as king when he returns to Ithaca – is it possible to be a conniving and self-serving (see Clay’s synopsis of Maronitis in 1997, 69-70) Trickster while looking to the best interest of one’s society?

details of the Parnassus narrative prove useful.

Homer describes the hunting party setting out thus:

But when the young Dawn showed again with her rosy fingers, they went out on their way to the hunt, the dogs and the people, these sons of Autolycus, and with them noble Odysseus went. They came to the steep mountain, mantled in forest, Parnassus, and soon they were up into the windy folds. At this time, the sun had just begin to strike on the plowlands, rising out of the quiet water and the deep stream of the Ocean, and the hunters came to a wooded valley, and on ahead of them ran the dogs, casting about for the tracks, and behind them the sons of Autolycus, and with them noble Odysseus went close behind the hounds, shaking his spear far-shadowing. Now there, inside that thick of the bush, was the lair of a great boar. Neither could the force of wet-blown winds penetrate here, nor could the shining sun ever strike through with his rays, nor yet could the rain pass all the way through it, so close together it grew, with a fall of leaves drifted in dense profusion. The thudding made by the feet of men and dogs came to him as they closed on him in the hunt, and against them he from his woodlair bristled strongly his nape, and with fire from his eyes glaring stood up nearby them.
Just before this passage, Homer had represented Odysseus feasting with Autolycus’ family. This background suggests to the reader that the thievish Autolycus’ family likely views sustaining kin as the purpose of its depredations. Though Autolycus is hateful to many, he and his family feast together and support one another. The converse of this position is that they also likely do not recognize any higher level of authority: inasmuch as they prey on their neighbors, thieves are intrinsically anti-political, in the etymological sense of the term.

As this family strikes out to hunt together, the poet lingers for a time on Parnassus’ topography, which offers a graphic representation of Autolycus’ relation to society. Parnassus itself, where Odysseus and his uncles hunt, is forbidding and offers much cover in the form of dales and shelters. It is a “steep mountain, mantled in forest” (αἰπὺ δ’ ὄρος... καταειμένων ὀλη); its sides are riddled with “windy folds” (πτύχας ἠνεμοέσσας). The winds render Parnassus uncomfortable in a way that Olympus was not (6.43); far from a paradise on earth, Parnassus’s slopes are unwelcoming, the sort of place where only desperate men would make their home. From this vantage point, the hunters espy the borders of the agrarian fringe of the political world even as they themselves ascend farther and farther into a landscape which is its antithesis:

’Ἡλίος μὲν ἐπείτα νέον προσέβαλλεν ἀρούρας
ἐξ ἀκαλαρρείταο βαθυρρόου Ὀκεανοῖο,
οἱ δ’ ἐς βῆσσαν ἴκανον ἐπακτῆρες.
19.433-435

At this time, the sun had just begin to strike on the plowlands, rising out of the quiet water and the deep stream of the Ocean, and the hunters came to a wooded valley.

Beyond the dichotomy of city and country, there lies a primordial realm which is neither, and it is here that Odysseus’ maternal grandfather, the outsider par excellence, makes his living.

The boar’s lair itself is nearly identical to the description of the double olive under which Odysseus shelters on Scheria when he lands in Book 5. I reproduce the relevant parts of this earlier passage here for comparison:

βῆ ρ’ ἵμεν εἰς ὑλήν· τὴν δὲ σχεδὸν ὑδατος εὑρεν
And he went to look for the wood and found it close to the water in a conspicuous place, and stopped underneath two bushes that grew from the same place, one of shrub, and one of wild olive, and neither the force of the wet-blowing winds could penetrate these nor could the shining sun ever strike through with his rays, nor yet could the rain pass all the way through them, so close together were they grown, interlacing each other; and under these now Odysseus entered.

Russo (1992 ad 19.439-443) sums up the similarities admirably:

The boar’s lair described here closely resembles the shelter seen at the end of ν, formed by the growing together of two bushes, olive and the obscure φυλίη, in which the exhausted Odysseus finds protection from the cold by burying himself in the leaves, like a seed of fire to be reborn the next day. Verses 440-2 are nearly identical to ν 478-80, while 443 reproduces most of ν 483. It is surprising that there should be an underlying connection between the lair of Odysseus and the lair of boar that gave him his identifying wound. The poet has perhaps made an unconscious association based on the concept of birth/rebirth. Just as the ‘seed of fire’ ensures that a new fire will be born, so Odysseus, in his encounter with the boar, will be (re)born as the man with the scar, which becomes the sign of his identity for those people closest to him.

While the theme of birth and rebirth is certainly significant in both passages, attention to the progression of landscape imagery across the epic permits us to observe another meaning in this close verbal repetition. On Scheria, Odysseus initially finds himself at the nadir of human existence, engaging in individualistic basic subsistence foraging just to survive. Despite this fact, his shelter, we observed previously, shares provocative traits with Olympus as described at the beginning of Book 6: in both cases, freedom from rain and wind is offered – on the human level, through shelter, on the divine, as part and parcel of the package of sheer blessedness which comes with being a god or goddess.
The boar’s lair serves as a counterfactual representation of another kind of lifestyle which Odysseus might have chosen to pursue: instead of becoming king, it would have been possible for him to become a simple Trickster and thief, haunting the fringes of society, beyond country and city, and beyond their laws. Although he did not do this, on Scheria, Odysseus retrospectively can be seen to have benefited from his Autolycan heritage: having survived rough terrain, with no laws or political institutions with his outlaw maternal relations, he was able to use his Autolycan skills to contrive a shelter which conferred to a limited and appropriately human degree the same benefits which Olympus conferred on Athena.\(^{369}\)

Throughout most of the travels of the Apologue which these two landscapes bracket, Odysseus seeks agricultural land and seldom finds it; in such instances, it is the skills of the outsider, the skills of the thief, which permit him to prosper, and which will continue to permit him to prosper as he enters his homeland in the guise and the attitude of a stranger aiming at nothing less than the overthrow of the suitors’ illegitimate regime.

In both Book 5 and Book 19, natural imagery also suggests that this part of his identity has been subsumed by his opposing identity as civilizer and king: in Book 5, the olive is half wild and half domesticated. Like this tree, Odysseus’ rougher traits can be made to serve the ends of civilization. In Books 5-7, Homer afforded us a glimpse of the hero in progressively more “civilized” locales, allowing us to appreciate his acumen at fending for himself at every step along the way. As he moves into progressively more political spaces on Scheria, raw guile becomes less and less important, and it is tact and the supremely civilized skill at improvising narrative poetry which ultimately win over Nausicaa and Alcinous. These feats draw on deceit and craft, but also on a sensitivity to the more refined conventions of Homeric social living. On Parnassus, Odysseus’ uncles help to heal the wound given by the boar, and it becomes a scar and a token of recognition with those near and dear to him about the palace. Nevertheless, it proves an inadequate token with those whose recognition was most important to him: Penelope and Laertes. The association of both these characters with Laertes’ gardens highlights that Odysseus’ Autolycan character is on a fundamental level incongruous with settled agricultural life and

\(^{369}\) Rutherford 1992 ad 439-443 doubts that the verbal parallels are significant: “it may be far-fetched to compare the savage but doomed boar, here slain by the youthful Odysseus, with the older Odysseus who finds a similar lair but emerges to survival and eventual triumph. A casual reuse of formulae is the simpler explanation.”
above all with being enforcer of rather than transgressor of the law. Hence Odysseus must supply other proofs which speak to his ability to function in the domestic and political sphere: his bed, and the gardens he once farmed with his father. Parnassus, then, stands as an emblem of the lineage which bequeathed to him his wilier traits, and the crystallization of these traits in the form of a scar suggests their tempering and their subordination to the normative conventions of society.

This chapter has attempted to illustrate the complexity of the Gardens of Laertes. They are a polyvalent place, and do not lend themselves easily to generalizations. Anticlea presents Laertes’ life in the gardens as one of degraded exile, and Odysseus too echoes these sentiments. However, it is the very work which has reduced him to his filthy rags that proves the most trustworthy token of recognition between father and son and which may in any case have represented a calculated attempt to keep Odysseus’ memory alive through carefully orchestrated lamentation. The space of the garden also has religious and political connotations, and Laertes’ labors may also serve to endear him further to the gods and to establish an economic bastion of the old order in the countryside, which will prevent him from being forced to depend on and interact with the suitors for food. Finally, the gardens resolve a tension articulated largely through landscape in Book 19 between the antisocial or asocial outlaw hero of the boar-hunt and the orderly utopian king of Odysseus’ simile. Both these aspects of Odysseus’ character have contributed to his surviving what has indeed been a long journey, but his choice to place a proof which draws on the imagery of the good king simile last gives grounds for hope that it is this aspect of his personality which will prevail in those chapters of Odysseus’ life which lay beyond the end of Book 24 of the Odyssey.
10.0 CONCLUSION

In the conspectus of scholarship on landscape in Homer provided in the introduction of this dissertation, I described the approaches of a number of scholars of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries to this issue. Prior scholarship has addressed the questions of Homeric cognitive geography in various ways: Buchholz divides the Homeric world into categories which seem to reflect nineteenth century science (Thierreich, Pflanzenreich, Mineralreich), and imputes a particularized immediacy to Homeric man’s way of viewing the world: “Für ihn ist die Natur vielmehr eine bunte Mannigfaltigkeit von concreten Erscheinungen, in denen er ebenso viele Manifestationen seiner Götter erblickt.” Edwards 1993, a seminal study of the distinction between town and country in the Homeric poems, cites Goat Island as an ideal example of “the normative conceptualization of space in epos” (28). Edwards notes that Odysseus divides this space into “four regions in terms of their utility to man” and suggests that this reflects “an implicit hierarchy favoring the polis, the protected center, the space most thoroughly transformed for human ends.” Beyond these more fine hierarchic distinctions, Edwards goes on to cite examples of a more clear-cut physical and social dichotomy between country and city. This division between polis (“town”, nascent polis in the Classical sense) and countryside is one that is consistently recognized by those who have addressed the conceptual division of space in the

370 Buchholz 1871, 1.
371 The hierarchy on Goat Island consists of “wilderness suited to hunting, grazing land, farm land divided into plow land and vineyard, and the site for a city with a spring and a good harbor.” As another example of hierarchic organization of landscape Edwards cites the three regions (city, fields, pasture lands) of the shield of Achilles, each of which “is divided in turn into subordinate vignettes.”
372 As examples of the latter, Edwards cites Odyssey 6.7-10 (1993, 29) and an array of other evidence.
More recently, the class divisions which are mapped onto the countryside have been reexamined in Thalmann 1998. Other salient conceptual divisions of the countryside have also been observed. Purves 2006, taking works such as Romm 1992 as his starting point, has explored the importance of the shoreline in Homeric psychology as means of orienting oneself. My own contribution to scholarly discussion on landscape is the thesis that the topographies of the *Odyssey* are teleological. Throughout the *Odyssey*, Homer develops a language of landscape features that act as road signs which, by repeatedly having recourse to strategically positioned formulas and themes, impart specific connotations to individual locales. Each landscape through which Odysseus passes on his homeward voyage positions itself relative to Ithaca and to other landscapes already described in a manner which highlights Odysseus’ determination to forge ahead home and which helps to explain his motivation for doing so.

Such multifarious intratextual repetitions across scenes of topographical description have elicited the attention of many: since at least the days of Alexandrian scholarship, repetition of words, formulas, lines, and entire passages has prompted recommendations of obelization or deletion, or been viewed as evidence of Homer’s far-reaching design. The crucial work of Parry and his followers created serious obstacles to this latter view by raising the possibility that formulas were simply architectural members of the edifice of epic, their usage being more dependent upon whether they fit their metrical environs than upon any aesthetic considerations. Since then, scholars such as Austin and Pucci have called into question some of the too-exuberant overgeneralizations which resulted from Parry’s limpid and elegant demonstration of how Homeric verse works. Such work has revealed that cross-references and the repetition of identical formulas can possess great significance when other contextual clues also militate in this direction. Nowhere is this point better demonstrated than in Homer’s descriptions of landscape, where the recurrence of *topoi* and themes such as the absence of rain from immortal paradises and the need for mortals to contend with such discomforts resonate throughout the entire epic and are crucial to delimiting mankind’s proper place in the universe and its position relative to the gods.

The appreciation and analysis of the implications of recurrent imagery and formulas

---

373 See quotations from Calhoun and Finley in the notes below.
374 See Milman Parry 1987.
accordingly have for some time been and still remain a major preoccupation of those who focus their critical lens on landscape in book-length works. Thus Buchholz, Nestle, Treu, Elliger, and Bonnafé all marshal invaluable catalogues of landscape features neatly compartmentalized according to formal, functional, and aesthetic criteria. To this mix, Edwards’ monograph-length article (1993) on the city-country dichotomy in the *Odyssey* has added cognitive and sociological criteria. Edwards’ article is in many ways the closest in aim and focus to this dissertation: he, too, is interested in the social and psychological boundaries used to construct Odyssean spaces. His focus, however, is somewhat narrower than mine: he deals primarily with the distinction between city and country, and with the unusual degree of emphasis accorded to the *agros* and its people in the second half of the epic.376

10.1 NO MAN’S LAND (AUTOLYCAN SPACE), POLITICAL SPACE (POLIS AND AGROS), AND LAERTEAN SPACE (POLIS AND AGROS UNIFIED UNDER A JUST KING PROGRESSING TOWARD AN IDEAL)

The point that this city-countryside amalgam is constitutive of civilization in the *Odyssey* and that places outside this comprise a sort of No Man’s Land is essential to this dissertation. The distinction between Menelaus’ Sparta and Odysseus’ Ithaca is one of degree, whereas that between Odysseus’ Ithaca and the land of the Cyclopes is one of nature. No Man’s Land offers no potential for a hero to earn *kleos* because it does not adhere to even the most basic social conventions; even those portions of No Man’s Land which are highly organized like the Laestrygonians threaten to devour both the bodies and the fame of men. Conversely, about idealized societies in No Man’s Land, such as Aeolus’ island, Homer proves strangely reticent.

375 Long before Edwards, Calhoun notes that the distinction between the “town” (*polis*) and the “rural area belonging to it” is fundamental to Homeric formulations of topography (1963, 432): “The town is consistently distinguished from the rural area belonging to it (*ἄγρος*, *ἐργα*), and its entire territory, rural and urban together, is termed ἔθνος or *γαῖα*.”

376 For the people of the countryside of the *Odyssey* and Homer’s representation of persons of lower status (slaves, servants, etc.) see Thalmann 1998.
The gulf between an Aeolus – or, for that matter, a Calypso – and Odysseus is simply too great for either of these quasi-divines to serve as an audience for mortal fame. If they are indeed immortal, they likely do not see the same pressing need to enshrine the deeds of days gone by in song, for their doers will always be present to recount the tale again. It is thus a failure or absence of the mechanisms which ensure social stability, with its promise of continuity of crops and culture (including κλέος) which makes a No Man’s Land a No Man’s Land. Accordingly, No Man’s Land lurks even on the borders of the civilized world threatening to irrupt – sometimes doing so through deceptively civilized means, as when the suitors turn the institution of wooing a widowed woman against the society over which her husband once ruled, resulting in a narcissistic reign of chaos and competing self-interests, and entirely obviating the centralized government.

There is also a positive aspect to the journey into No Man’s Land. Because they offer configurations of landscape and social institutions not previously dreamed of by those living inside the relatively closed social system of home, No Man’s Lands sometimes provide the chance of social renewal and reform from the outside in. Circe, for example, provides Odysseus with valuable intelligence as to his future course, pushing him along to the next adventures, and even Calypso offers some advice for the journey. By standing outside the world of knowledge organized according to the rules of human existence, such figures are in a position to access past and future knowledge in different ways than humans do. Such places also offer an ideal training-ground for an Odysseus whose family has been forced to the margins of Ithacan society and who must perforce reenter his native civilization as an outsider: by concealing threats unforeseeable to the traveler, resulting in unpredictable and dangerous situations in which Odysseus has only his wits and what little good will exists toward him among the gods upon which to rely for salvation and safety, they prepare him to plot his own course through the inverted social order which meets him on his return to Ithaca. In this manner, a trip to No Man’s Land can furnish the key to reconstituting a society like Ithaca which has drifted in the direction of anarchy as a new and better polity. Because it consistently forces Odysseus outside the rules and conventions of appropriate behavior as constituted by Achaean society, this space can be thought of as Autolycan space, in reference to Odysseus’ thieving maternal grandfather, who even on Ithaca arrived as a source of animosity for all civilized folks. The converse sort of space – a space in the process of being wisely and justly ordered by a hard-working mortal – may be thought of as
Laertean space, embodying, as it does, the ideal of landscape as a mortal work-in-progress, which its overseers strive to make ever closer to a paradigm such as the Gardens of Alcinous, and which, if never entirely reaching its ideal, nevertheless forces its custodians to impose order and harmony on their households and society to ensure that they will be able to continue their labors. Between the two, there are infinite shades of chaos verging on political space, many organized into countryside and city, yet lacking the ordering and vision of the Ithaca with which Homer leaves us at the end of the epic.

All of the major journeys which comprise the four major “movements” of the epic begin on the fringes of No Man’s Land, in places where the established political order has suffered a massive failure – a dysfunctional political space such as Ithaca (Telemachus’ journey to Pylos and Sparta), a defunct political space such as Troy (Menelaus’ and Nestor’s journeys home, and, in the Apologue, Odysseus’), or a liminal natural space such as the shore (Odysseus on the shore of Scheria and of Ithaca) – and move toward a more highly organized political space. The exception to this tenet is Odysseus’ journey of the Apologue (the epic’s third “movement”), which ends in a pleasant place – Ogygia – but one which is the antithesis of political space. This almost evolutionary tendency to motion toward a greater degree of organization and hierarchy has a relatively straightforward narratological relation to the plot: generally speaking, the Odyssey is the tale of Odysseus’ return to the stability of home and civilization from the chaos of war and uncivilized foreign lands; the journey into No Man’s Land culminating in Ogygia is necessary to account for how Odysseus came to be on the outermost fringes of the world, and to permit him to reinvigorate the No Man’s Land of home by bringing back a fresh vision of an ideal society which has taken shape in the course of his wanderings.

To create the necessary tension between No Man’s Land and an ideal restored home, __________

377 See below. I define a “movement” as a protracted treatment of a character’s journey across landscapes sharing certain thematic links and contained within a single overarching narrative. The first movement corresponds to the Telemachy (Telemachus’ journey of Books 1-4, all narrated by Homer in the third-person, encompassing also the relatively short character narratives of Nestor and Menelaus), the second to Odysseus’ “present” journey from Ogygia to Scheria (third-person narration, Books 5-8, Odysseus is introduced as wanderer and man of sorrows), the third to the Apologue (Books 9-12, past adventures of Odysseus, first person character narration), the fourth, Odysseus’ journey to and reclamation of the palace (third-person narration, Books 13-24, a continuation of the second movement, but set off by the intrusion of the Apologue and its unified geography and theme – homecoming on Ithaca).
Homer draws on the mythic and archaeological past for inspiration. If we accept Finley’s arguments about the real-world inspiration for the social conventions portrayed in the epic, the *Odyssey* presents institutions emerging from a period of decentralization (the so-called “Dark Age”) and moving toward the urban and centralized *polis* that will dominate during the Classical Period. The journey toward social centralization is thus an imaginative journey *backwards* toward the idealized and dimly-remembered Mycenaean and Minoan past preceding the Dark Age, remnants of which littered the landscape to prompt fantastic tales of Cyclopean and divine masons; however, it is also an impetus *forward* toward the future of increased urbanization, trade, and colonization just emerging centered around tightly organized urban centers (*poleis*). Indeed, the fact that Homer lived and composed his *Odyssey* in an era which was in many ways transitional between a highly structured past and an increasingly structured future likely contributed to his awareness of and willingness to explore the implications of cultural diversity and cultures in transition. Aware of the need for peace and political stability, but witness to the fleeting character of these virtues, Homer sets out an array of different cultures all in various stages of motion toward or away from this ideal, and permits his hero to be educated through his first-hand experiences in these proving grounds.

The fact that the *Odyssey* purports to describe Bronze Age institutions but often actually draws on contemporary ones has significant implications for our interpretation of the political landscapes in which each of the four “movements” terminates: the gardens of Laertes, for example, combine the motif of the king’s father displaced from his kingdom by usurping suitors and left to languish in squalor in the countryside with descriptions of more favorable diversified agricultural practices (according to Hanson) just arising. The essential identity of produce and farming practices between Laertes’ gardens and those of Alcinous suggests that the poet wishes to invoke Laertes’ farm as something enjoying the same misty Minoan antiquity as Alcinous’ gardens (associated with marvelous works of Hephaestus’ handicraft – the metallic guard-dogs and torchbearers – and hence evocative of the mysterious lost arts of the vanished civilizations that flourished prior to the Dark Age), but also infinitely more immediate and recognizable to his audience, a humble family plot on which the king of the island and his father have diligently
labored side by side planting crops. The resulting garden is thus something both old and new. Likewise, Odysseus’ prescient simile of Book 19 may point forward to a return of some of the imagined abundance of the Bronze Age under a contemporary regime capable of reining in and mitigating the problem of lazy aristocratic families whose competitive feasting and hunting disturb an otherwise harmonious social cooperative. Implicit in this simile is a reunion of city and country to produce a state as prosperous as the Bronze Age palace culture, but perhaps surpassing it (if Menelaus’ shabby treatment of his own people in Book 4 can be taken as typical of Bronze Age Spartan monarchic rule). Laertes’ garden is a space outside the polis and outside the palace, yet it embodies a happy blending of past prosperity and modern down-to-earth egalitarianism and cooperation which, connected to the city through the harmony engendered by a good king, could result in the happy fusion of city and country dreamed of in Odysseus’ simile.

The quality of the well-managed political space toward which the central characters of the *Odyssey* tend to travel is determined in part by their ability to harmonize a range of overlapping groups and regions. Finley observes that political space is shaped by the interaction of four groups which “defined a man’s life, materially and psychologically.” Beyond these groups radiating out from the unit of the family, despite strong physical and psychological boundaries such as the town wall, country and town are also interdependent entities in

\[\text{\textsuperscript{378}}\] Cf. Hanson 1999: through his portrayal of the farm, “the poet contrasts Laertes as much as possible with the luxury of the suitors in the palace below, the old world that, in the absence of his son, he has apparently lost.”

\[\text{\textsuperscript{379}}\] M. I. Finley 2002, 75: “The coexistence of three distinct but overlapping groups, class, kin, and oikos, was what defined a man’s life, materially and psychologically. The demands of each of the three did not always coincide; when they conflicted openly there were inevitable tensions and disequilibriums. And [sic] then there was still a fourth group in the picture…An assembly is no simple institution. As a precondition it requires a relatively settled, stable community made up of many households and kinship groups; in other words, the imposition upon kinship of some territorial superstructure. That means that the several households and larger family groups had substituted for physical coexistence at arm’s length a measure of common existence, a community, and hence a partial surrender of their own autonomy. In this new and more complex structure of society a pricate affair was one that remained within the sole authority of the oikos or kinship group, a public matter one in which the decision was for the heads of all the separate groups to make, consulting together.” While these groups are social rather than local, certain spaces make claims and statements regarding the membership of those who frequent them: e.g., the megaron indicates class (aristocrat) and serves as a focus (in the etymological sense) for kin and oikos. For those who are part of the oikos, the manner in which custom permits them to utilize the space of the megaron proclaims yet more nuanced distinctions of class and kinship.
“civilized” spaces like Scheria and Ithaca, tied to one another by economic boundaries (witness the tribute of pigs exacted from Eumaeus by the suitors), political jurisdiction (e.g., Odysseus’ ideal king of Book 19, who brings prosperity to the countryside through his just adjudication of disputes), and attempts to reproduce symbolically aspects of one space within the other (the rus in urbe – to use Edwards’ term – of the Gardens of Alcinous, and the urbs ruri of the temenos of Alcinous, Athena’s grove). Outside these “civilized” regions there still remains the literal No Man’s Land of Autolycus’ Parnassus, a space which foreshadows Odysseus’ facility at navigating “imaginary” societies such as that of the Cyclopes, to which fundamental laws and customs are also unknown.

Homer is keenly aware of the poetic potential of No Man’s land, and in fact predicates the definition of kleos which he implicitly assumes in the Odyssey on the hero’s ability to enter this land and return in a manner that is beneficial to himself and to his society. The tale of the boar-hunt on Parnassus associates Odysseus’ naming with this space literally from the moment of his birth, and it is a series of such spaces to which he must return to discover his identity and the key to restoring the civilization which initially spurned this side of his character, labeling it “hateful”. Odysseus’ peculiar species of heroism is consistently predicated upon the tension between Iliadic man’s need for kleos accrued in the presence of his military peers and made material in the form of geras (“a prize”) and sailors’ tales’ tendency to fling their protagonists into situations in which no peers bear witness to the hero’s deed or where, as in the Cyclops’ cave, all witnesses are imperiled and stand in danger of never making it home to deliver the kleos to its intended audience. The Odyssey plays on the unverifiable, irrecoverable character of the sailor’s kleos throughout all four movements, representing Odysseus telling false tales even to his loved ones, and ultimately leaving only the hero – and hopefully Homer’s referees, the Muses – alive to tell the tales of the Apologue to the Phaeacians, to Penelope, and to Homer’s audience. The Odyssean brand of fame is a much riskier zero-sum competition than that of the Iliad, occurring not between man and man, but between man and the threat of oblivion and complete forgetfulness. Even the loser of an Iliadic fight can recoup some honor by dying bravely (the beautiful death), but the greater the risk of completely disappearing from the radar of those back home – both into places of great pleasure (Calypso, Circe) and of great agony (the Cyclops) – the greater Odysseus’ kleos when he does in fact survive and tell the story of these dangers.

Accordingly kleos becomes a structuring principle of the poem, evolving across each of
the four movements: the first asks the question of what deeds comprise Odysseus’ *kleos* (Telemachus and Penelope do not know because he is missing); the second subjectifies the issue by representing Odysseus’ experience of his lost *kleos* (personified in Calypso) – the far extreme of his journey into No Man’s Land, but also the moment at which he has, as the beginning of Book 1 informs us, attracted the attention of Athena, and is about to begin his return. The third movement represents him laying claim to his *kleos* by becoming the poet of his own deeds (through a narrative which augments his fame by portraying him repeatedly coming within a hair’s breadth of an anonymous death abroad); the fourth portrays the hero restoring his home to an ideal audience for his *kleos*. While the other three movements of the *Odyssey* are thus important for representing various stages of journeys in which fame is propagated and exchanged almost like currency, the Apologue is most crucial, inasmuch as it represents Odysseus’ descent to his apogee, where he stands just on the cusp of being completely lost and forgotten, his brave deeds done for naught. The end point of this series of adventures is Calypso, whose very name suggests that her island represents this state of suspended animation, this death-like state, more dire than the fear of death experienced by an Iliadic hero during battle; it is therefore entirely appropriate that another etymological play on Odysseus’ name occurs just as a negative outcome appears most likely, when, buffeted by wind and waves, Odysseus must be rescued by Ino and make good his escape from the κλέος-negating forces of Calypso and Poseidon.

For this struggle between death and immortal fame, between culture and anarchy, landscape forms a dynamic backdrop. The degree and manner of cultivation of unknown lands serves as an index of whether these spaces are part of “civilized space” – the symbiotic relationship of city and country – or whether they are part of No Man’s Land. At least, Odysseus hypothesizes it should do so. In fact, the Apologue reveals him uncovering gross distortions of normal Greek configurations of space and approaching them as if he were still with the army in the camp at Troy. Odysseus’ routine once he lands upon a foreign shore is defined by a series of

---

380 In addition to the commerce of *kleos* described above, fame undergoes other kinds of evolution throughout the *Odyssey*. For example, in the first movement, Telemachus capitalizes on the stories of his father from Nestor and Menelaus, and repays the favor by hearing of these other Greeks’ deeds and being able to repeat them at home; in the second, Odysseus goes to Alcinous’ palace and hears his deeds sung of and finally disburdens himself of all the dangerous deeds of the sequel which have had no audience up to this point; in the final, he at last is able to impart these tales to Penelope, ensuring that his fame is passed on to future generations.
repeated activities elaborated through typical language and formulas: he and his men prepare a
dinner on shore, note the presence or absence of fields and other means of livelihood, the
presence or absence of signs such as smoke which would indicate human habitation, and send
foraging parties farther inland. This methodical approach to landing is a more complex
manifestation of Odysseus’ logical approach to assessing the prospects of the landscape of
Scheria at the end of Book 5 – dividing up the varieties of spaces visible and carefully
considering which proffers the most predictable and controllable prospects for survival. While
this method is the best available, it cannot compensate for the foolish decisions of his men
(which prove ruinous among the Cicones, Aeolus, and the Laestrygonians) or unexpected
magical properties or barbarous customs of inhabitants of a land (the Lotus Eaters, the Cyclops,
the Laestrygonians, Circe). In short, it cannot compensate for the uncertainty and chaos intrinsic
to No Man’s Land.

If Odysseus’ reconnaissance activities were capable of extrapolating the mores of
inhabitants from their environment, the Apologue adventures would resemble Iliadic battle
scenes, with predictable conventions and with both opponents subscribing to near-identical
assumptions about the goal and rules for engagement. Instead, there is no such predictability in
the Apologue, and it is this randomness that is ideally suited to put Odysseus’ innate
inventiveness to the test. In Book 9, for example, Homer’s explicit statement that the Cyclopes
lack councils or laws makes it clear that Odysseus is in Autolycan space – space outside the
political sphere of any city of men – and that the Autolycan, Hermes-like, boundary-
transgressing side of Odysseus’ character will need to put in an appearance in order to extricate
him from difficulties. Thus he ventures on an heroic scouting expedition into Polyphemus’ cave
which on the surface is relatively similar to his scouting expedition in Book 10 of the Iliad, with
the telling exception that there is no strategic goal to the raid of the cave and no army waiting to
sack the Cyclops’ wares. Here he at first constructs a fictive identity – “Noman” – which
threatens to overwhelm his real identity each time it becomes apparent that Odysseus may die
and the tale of how he met his death may not be related to his family. Odysseus’ inventiveness
saves him and some of his men, but his choice to vaunt his true name to the Cyclops betrays the
same fundamental failure to understand the differences between the Cyclopes’ culture and his
own which led him to investigate their lands in the first place. The Cyclopes will not appreciate
his kleos, but Polyphemus will report Odysseus’ name to his father Poseidon and bring about
many woes for the wandering sailor in the process. What would have been an appropriate boast before the army becomes in the short term a self-defeating and futile gesture in No Man’s Land, but by plunging him into a danger which threatens not only his life but his very memory, it will ultimately secure him a fame greater than that of his Iliadic companions. Considered across the four movements of the Odyssey, it is this willingness to plunge himself into such unpredictable situations that enables Odysseus to escape Calypso’s concealment, and, in conjunction with his ability rapidly to reassert his polished tact and courtly behavior almost at the drop of a hat, helps him navigate the unpredictability of the Apologue, the regimented society of the Phaeacians, and the need to present an array of appearances to a variety of people on Ithaca. By virtue of having stepped outside the conventions of civilization, Odysseus is able to get back in touch with the Autolycon side of his character and to resist the temptation in the fourth movement of the epic to approach the suitors who have taken over his palace in typical Iliadic fashion, employing an open frontal assault. Instead, he hovers on the geographical and political fringes of the countryside, keeping the company of marginal hangers-on to civilization, and retakes his palace by guile rather than by force. His transitions from Iliadic spaces (Troy, the Cicones) to fantastic spaces (everything from the Lotus Eaters to Calypso) and back to places in which conventional institutions of political rule and religious sanctuaries to known gods such as Athena exist, and finally back to the space of home constitute an education in negotiating boundaries between the civilized and the lawless aspects of society and of the hero’s character.

10.2 PROGRESSIONS OF LANDSCAPE ACROSS THE EPIC (CHAPTER-BY-CHAPTER SYNOPSIS)

Accordingly, this dissertation has taken as its topic progressions of cumulative representations of landscape as means of constructing Odysseus’ motive for – and method of – accomplishing his nostos. After an introduction, the second chapter of this dissertation asserts that the proem of the Odyssey parses out space through a series of antitheses. These antitheses balance the audience’s focus between ethical concerns (Odysseus’ planning and intuition – the fact that he is “a man of many turns” and that he knew the minds of many men) and expanse of geographical wandering,
raising the question of the relation between travel, knowledge, and culture. By distinguishing these three elements from one another, the proem creates the potential for Odysseus to explore various reconfigurations of them over the course of his journeys.

Chapter 3 explores the landscape of the Telemachy: here Homer initially unveils first-person travel narratives (foreshadowed by Phemius’ songs) involving the homecoming of the Greeks from Troy. Their manner of narration and the character which they will betray differ from Odysseus’ tale in many ways: most of all, Menelaus’ narrative is presented as a fait accompli. There is no potential to avert disasters (Agamemnon’s death, the recovery of Helen and the miserable domestic life that follows), only potential to put an optimistic spin on Menelaus’ role in these events. Hyperbolic boasts regarding his own afterlife (Proteus’ prophecy of Elysium) are the only forward-looking aspects of his tale, but they cannot compensate for obvious turmoil in his home life with Helen. Tellingly, the landscapes of Menelaus’ homecoming are not presented as a progression for the simple reason that Menelaus did not experience them as such. Failing to learn and evolve to adapt to the demands of change and circumstance, Menelaus came home with no desire to remake his Spartan environment, but rather predictably goes straight back to the same unsatisfactory state of affairs that prevailed before the war.

Chapter 4 examines how Homer interchanges repetition and originality to modulate the pace of Odysseus’ journey: the most original descriptions of dawn occur at key turning points in the narrative and reveal great sensitivity to the aesthetic experience of the traveler experiencing dawn on his first foreign land, or on his homeland’s shore for the first time in twenty years. The disposition of the most original dawn scenes lends credence to the division of the epic into four movements set out above, as well. Dawn over Pylos punctuates the most salient moment of Telemachus’ outward journey in the first movement; the dawn of Odysseus’ last day on Calypso’s island marks off his journey back from the realm of the unreal to civilized lands which comprises the subject of the second movement, and dawn on Ithaca in Book 13 inaugurates the fourth movement. These last two dawns thus bracket the second and third movements of the epic – the ones which showcase Odysseus’ ability to adapt to his environment.

Chapter 5 examines the setting in which the audience encounters Odysseus for the first time, and suggests that Calypso’s grotto is meant to represent the most appealing habitation possible, an aim which gains momentum through favorable points of contrast between Odysseus’
scorn for his Ogygian paradise and Menelaus’ rather pathetic enthusiasm for an Elysian dream which he enjoys by marriage. Here landscape embodies the allure of the most extreme of the No Man’s Lands of the Apologue, conspiring with Calypso’s own physical enticement to convey the seduction of a death-like but pleasing immortality, whence only the action of another goddess, Athena, can deliver the hero. The narrative transition from Menelaus to Calypso poses the question of why Odysseus departs a marvelous space which in many respects excels even Elysium, priming the audience to receive an answer to these questions in the form of a cascade of positive and negative landscape imagery first on Scheria, then in the “imaginary” spaces of the Apologue, and at last on Ithaca itself.

Chapter 6 explores the progression of landscapes which Odysseus traverses as he leaves Calypso and is entertained by Alcinous. The expanse of text between Books 5 and 7 contains a high concentration of detailed and significant landscape descriptions, a circumstance which foregrounds the contrast between the oblivion of Calypso’s isle and the increasing opportunities for fame which arise as Odysseus reenters political space in a movement from the lowest and most savage state of scrounging for shelter on the shore to the well-organized palace of Alcinous. I also note the connection between this movement and Odysseus’ reconciliation with Athena in her grove. The landscapes of Scheria are presented in such a way as to distinguish gods from mortals: Odysseus finds shelter from rain beneath an olive, while Athena enjoys a rainless existence on Olympus. Only after this distinction is established can Odysseus become Athena’s mortal protégé once again and enter the civic space of Alcinous’ city and palace, discovering there an idealized image of what he wishes to reestablish upon his home island in the organic fusion of nature and culture in Alcinous’ gardens and palace.

Chapter 7 explores the manner in which Homer offers a back-story for Odysseus’ sojourn with Calypso. Through Odysseus’ own words, the poem’s audience hears of how the hero was blown off course and entered the realm of the fantastic. The Apologue bridges the gap between the landscape of Troy (a venue for martial kleos) and the kleos-negating landscape of Ogygia by representing Odysseus attempting to use landscape as a predictor of culture and repeatedly being surprised and disappointed. The progression of landscapes forms an education for Odysseus, inasmuch as he begins in short episodes that highlight his failure to foresee dangers which arise organically from the land (the addictive food of the Lotus Eaters), finds himself becoming curious about pastoralist cultures which enjoy boundless prosperity at the cost of no labor and
under the rule of no political organizations (the Cyclopes), incurs the wrath of the gods by slighting one such creature (Polyphemus), and spends the rest of his travels attempting to avoid replicating his past mistakes. After succumbing to his curiosity in Polyphemus’ cave, Odysseus relies increasingly on what exiguous hints of divine guidance he can obtain – Hermes’ helpful hints about how to approach Circe, and Tiresias’ and Circe’s warnings about the perils of eating the cattle of Helios. These dangers are essentially unforeseeable for one with only the appearance of the landscape to go on. Throughout them, Odysseus and his men confront increasing shortages of food and in the course of exploring their new environs for sources of sustenance become food for the city of the Laestrygonians or, it is hinted, may consume other human beings by eating the game on Circe’s magic island, or devour animals sacred to a god by eating the Cattle of Helios. Odysseus finds that while landscape cannot reveal whether or not its inhabitants abide by recognizable conventions of the civilized world, it can conspire with its inhabitants to make it increasingly difficult for Odysseus and his men to act in ways in keeping with their cultural and religious tenets regarding food and behavior. Throughout the adventures of Aeolus, the Sirens, and Thrinacia Odysseus manifests a caution learned at great cost in the disasters of the Cyclops and the Laestrygonians, but as human culture recedes farther and farther away, he eventually finds himself on the island of Calypso, where the end result of traversing virtually all imaginable extremes of combinations of landscape and culture is found to be a god-like immortal existence which hovers somewhere between apotheosis and death.

Chapter 8 details the landscape of Odysseus’ landing on the shore of Ithaca. A central issue in Odysseus’ reunion with his homeland is why he must fail to recognize it after waiting so long to be reunited with family and friends. I argue that Odysseus’ adventures of the Apologue have schooled him to approach foreign landscapes with caution, but that Athena has no way of knowing how Odysseus will react to finding himself once more at home. While she praises his circumspection and desire to test his wife, there are nevertheless outward indications that he in fact may be prone to rush home prematurely and incautiously to his death among the suitors. Accordingly, Athena disguises Ithaca from Odysseus, and permits him to become acquainted with his home’s topography in more gradual phases. Just as the landscapes of Odysseus’ wanderings offered him an education in his own humanity, the landscapes of Ithaca must give him an education in what it is to be at home, a chance to reconcile the Autolycan and the Laertean, the violent and the domestic, sides of his character.
This chance comes in Book 24. Chapter 9 asks why Homer ends his epic with a surprisingly earthy scene of a dirty family farm where the father of Ithaca’s once and future king labors with his own hands. This vision of Ithaca in fact represents the fulfillment of what Odysseus and Telemachus have learned in the preceding twenty-three books is the ideal state for mortals. Toil with one’s own hands, whether one is at sea or one is at home, is an integral part of being human. The final chapter defines nostos as an ongoing process, a perpetual struggle of human beings and especially of kings to improve their country through toil and good rule, leading it in the opposite direction from No Man’s Land and from chaos.

10.3 ODYSSEUS’ CHARACTER, THE GODS, AND LANDSCAPE: EVOLVING FORMULATIONS OF KINGSHIP AND HOMECOMING

As noted above, the landscape progressions of the Odyssey can be divided into essentially four movements: Ithaca and Odysseus’ family in his absence (Books 1-4), Odysseus’ progression from isolation on Ogygia to being entertained in Alcinous’ palace (Books 1-8), prior adventures narrated by Odysseus (Books 9-12), and Odysseus’ progression from the shore to the palace to his father’s gardens on Ithaca (Books 13-24). Each of these movements explores a different facet of Odysseus’ character. For the sake of completeness, I here offer an outline of this progression divided not according to chapter, but by “movement”.

The first examines his static kleos. Because Odysseus’ family presumes him dead, they can only lament their lack of knowledge of his fate and wish that he had died in a venue such as the Trojan War where he would have won a more conventional fame. The audience is thus able to live out for Odysseus Trimalchio’s literary fantasy of being present at his own funeral: had Odysseus died during his travels, what his family and former brothers-in-arms say about him during these four books would be all that was known of him in Ithaca and all that would be transmitted into perpetuity as his eternal kleos. The landscapes elaborated in the Telemachy therefore have less to do with Odysseus himself than with the figures who arise as foils to Odysseus. Menelaus’ relationship both with his home and with fantastic lands abroad provides fertile ground for contrasts favorable to Odysseus. It offers a foil for Odysseus’ own actions and
attitudes as they arise. Menelaus is willing to displace an entire city’s inhabitants to provide a home for a friend; Odysseus, in contrast, rewards loyal retainers on his return, and was raised with a close connection to the land, made concrete in his father’s farm. His vision for the future is for a golden-age paradise in his own country potentiated by just rule and hard work (described in the simile of Book 19); Menelaus’ vision of the future is narcissistic and selfish: the details of Proteus’ prophecy about the Spartan king’s afterlife in Elysium all focus on its comfort for Menelaus.

The second movement explores his progressive return from a death-like existence on Ogygia to civilized relations (xenia) with the Phaeacians. In this movement, Odysseus’ changing relations with landscape reflect his changing relationship with the gods: while under the tutelage of Calypso, Odysseus shows only disdain for an apparently beautiful island vista, but once liberated from her clutches he begins to take pleasure from sheltering himself even in the roughest of conditions in a forest, and can receive the assistance of his patroness Athena, who appears to him in the sacro-political landscape of Alcinous’ country temenos. This change in perspectives highlights self-sufficiency and hard work as the qualities which animate Odysseus. As he increasingly takes control of his fate and resumes his autonomy, Odysseus engages in reconnaissance of Scheria in a way which illustrates the cogent cognitive boundaries which this accomplished sailor imposes on a foreign shoreline: first he moves inland from the shore and toward the heart of the country, into the forest to seek shelter from the elements under the trees; he then approaches a relatively innocuous inhabitant (Nausicaa) and allows her to guide him through the countryside to a grove of Athena near the city, whither he makes his way alone in order to preserve Nausicaa’s honor. In the mean-time, the vignette describing the idealized Olympus serves as a signpost marking the divergence of Odysseus’ mortal path from Athena’s immortal trajectory. The hero, somewhat like Achilles, has just been offered an obscure immortality, but has rejected it in favor of an all-or-nothing wager that he will survive all the dangers of the road and live to enjoy hearing his own fame in his palace at home. By spurning Calypso and immortality, Odysseus willingly enlists in the camp of humankind (unlike Menelaus, who seems quite pleased with himself for having managed to insinuate himself among a more-than-human company in the hereafter, but who also seems uncomfortable with the wife who is his means of obtaining this fate). As a mortal, Odysseus can appropriately receive the aid of his once and future protectress, Athena. Further, the second movement also represents the
culmination of Odysseus’ journey through a series of idealized landscapes that showcase his cleverness and divine patronage working in concert, and as such forms a favorable contrast to Odysseus’ more naïve earlier exploration in the *Odyssey*’s third movement, the Apologue.

In the third progression of landscapes, the Apologue, Odysseus is able to revisit past adventures which have systematically deconstructed his initially conventional and naïve Greek assumptions about the relationship between landscape, culture, and hospitality, and which have brought about through trial and error the circumspect and discreet Odysseus who carefully prepares his entrance into the palace of Alcinous. Earlier, Odysseus’ divine protectress had been nowhere to be found, and Odysseus had attempted to exercise his wits in inappropriate ways. The example of Goat Island mentioned above exemplifies most strikingly Odysseus’ fruitless preoccupation with using landscape features to try to predict what sorts of men inhabit a land, and with selectively focusing on certain landscape cues as justification for further exploration. In the case of the Cyclops, Odysseus arbitrarily decides that the desolation of a neighboring island indicates that it would serve as an ideal *locus* for settlement, and hence sets out to explore what the neighbors are like. This unnecessary foray and its fatal results stand as a hard lesson learned as Odysseus approaches other landscapes later on. Further disasters such as the Laestrygonians rob Odysseus of all his ships but one, and in the process demonstrate that even a high degree of social organization does not guarantee that a given society will not be violent and lawless to foreigners such as himself. The Apologue is Odysseus’ own *Bildungsgeschichte*, and reveals him failing in most of his attempts to read foreign landscapes and provision his men through barter and plunder with native inhabitants.

The fourth movement transfers this skill set to the shore of Ithaca, where the hero faces the same temptation which confronted him among the Cyclopes, but for opposite reasons: in one instance, he was curious about a culture which was completely Other and by his standards lackadaisical and provincially disorganized; in the other, he is eager to rush home and restore a political order damaged by his absence. In either case, Odysseus risks rushing headlong into potentially fatal circumstances. On Ithaca, Odysseus has his past experience and his patroness Athena to prevent him from doing so. Instead, he is able to focus on defeating the suitors and constructing a coherent vision for Ithaca’s future based on his experiences abroad. His simile of 19.107-114 owes much to Alcinous’ palace; on the other hand, Laertes’ gardens reveal that, in a more realistic and down-to-earth fashion, Ithaca’s economy has always shared many of the ideal
traits of Alcinous’ gardens.

10.4 SEREGATING LANDSCAPE FROM NARRATIVE: INVISIBLE LANDSCAPES AND THE METHOD AND SIGNIFICANCE OF EXTENDED LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION IN THE ODYSSEY

It should be clear already from previous chapters that I would in no way argue that Homer is incapable of viewing his landscapes as entities enjoying a separate existence outside of and independent from his narrative. Indeed, it is his mastery at effecting this illusion which has given the topography of the Odyssey its power to convince and entrance so many audiences over the centuries. Rather, somewhat paradoxically, instances in which Homer sets off a landscape in this manner assist him in modulating the flow of time in a narration of events which a descriptive ecphrasis has interrupted. The poet has a veritable arsenal of devices at his disposal to invest descriptive ecphrases with the power to instill conviction that they have existed before and will continue to exist long after Odysseus’ brief stop. While simple syntactic breaks (e.g., asyndeta) sometimes serve this function, Homer transitions from place to place and episode to episode fairly fluidly.

His most striking method of creating this effect is through disturbing temporal and sensory disjunctions, most notably when he describes a prospect occluded by insuperable obstacles to characters’ view of their surroundings, and then embarks upon a lengthy description of the very setting which he has just made invisible to his characters. I discuss this phenomenon above in my treatment of Book 13, but additional examples are surprisingly abundant. One of the most striking instances arises on Scheria, where Odysseus observes Alcinous’ palace and gardens while they are entirely cloaked in night, for the sun has just set at 6.321. In the interim, after the sun has set and before he approaches the gardens, Odysseus briefly visits

381 De Jong 2001 notes many passages containing instances of this kind of narrative “retardation” (for which term, see her Glossary).
382 Noted by Andersson 1976, 40-41, as an example of Homer’s “sovereign negligence” in the treatment of “visual realities”.
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Athena and is even given a guided tour of the city safely enfolded in a cloud which she summons for the purpose. Because Odysseus had agreed with Nausicaa to wait outside the palace for as long as it took her to enter her home separately, and because the audience knows from her journey out to do laundry earlier in the same day that the trip from Athena’s grove to the palace could not possibly have taken the hero all night, even allowing for the brief diversion of the tour, it is safe to conclude that simply not enough time has passed for it to be daylight when Odysseus views the palace and the gardens. While a doctrinaire Parryan might cite this as an example of the sorts of minor illogicalities which appear when an oral poet is performing traditional poetry or dictating it to a scribe, circumstantial details of the description of the palace hint at an awareness that it is night: he pointedly reports that the radiance of the palace of Alcinous is like that of the sun or of the moon (7.84). A possible inference might be that Odysseus can tour the palace at night because this magical space exudes its own glow. Further, the anaphora of the words “gold” and “silver” (five times in lines 7.88-91) provide one possible origin for the palace’s unnatural aura. Artificial guard dogs are present – appropriate for the nighttime, when dogs are active, and the artificial torch-bearers actually hold torches (7.100-102). Likewise suggestive of the late hour is the fact that the Phaeacians are dining and preparing to go to bed (7.136-138) when Odysseus appears to them. If there are some clues that Alcinous’ palace is self-illumining, it is also conceivable, based on the godlike second-sight that Athena bestows on Diomedes in the Iliad through the removal of a cloud from his eyes, that the cloud in which Athena conceals Odysseus in this instance has the magical property of granting him better-than-mortal sight – after all, she did introduce the cloud for the purpose of giving him a tour unobserved.

Nevertheless, despite various indications that a number of quasi-magical means of optical augmentation could be conspiring to help Odysseus inspect the palace, the unsettling impression remains that we are watching him view a space which technically should be near-invisible due to darkness. Indeed, there are more explicit passages, where Odysseus himself admits to entering a space without seeing where he was going. Most conspicuous of these is Goat Island, where Odysseus flatly admits that the black of night and the fog prevented anyone onboard from seeing where they were about to land:

ἔνθα κατεπλέομεν, καὶ τις θεὸς ἡγεμόνευε
There we sailed ashore, and there was some god guiding us in through the gloom of the night, nothing showed to look at, for there was a deep mist around the ships, nor was there any moon showing in the sky, but she was under the clouds and hidden.

In this instance, the description of an “invisible” landscape is placed in Odysseus’ own mouth. Here it is not a case of the poet perceiving something that his character cannot, but rather of Odysseus drawing on knowledge obtained through later reconnaissance first to describe a place, then to describe his blind landing at that place at night, and only afterwards to integrate action and description, detailing the goat hunt and exploration by which he became acquainted with the landscape.

In either case, however, Homer deliberately separates descriptive from narrative modes, and thereby accords the landscape with which he is dealing a sense of an existence independent from his epic. This illusion lends credibility to the *Odyssey* by offering a generic aesthetic response to a landscape that is not tied to a particular character: the generic character of the account is perhaps meant to make the audience feel that it could replicate this experience by visiting the site and observing it for themselves. On Goat Island, the initially invisible landscape becomes more and more concrete as Odysseus and his men explore – the emphasis on its transition from *terra incognita* to a place known well enough that Odysseus can deliver an extended catalogue of its potential amenities gives the description an additional level of concreteness, but also stresses Odysseus’ imposition of his own very biased constructs upon an essentially blank slate. Lacking the sort of lifelong experience with Goat Island’s territory that he has with Ithaca, Odysseus glosses over the significance of the nymphs who inhabit the island, and focuses entirely on the island’s desolation as a sign of potential for habitation rather than an ominous sign of past disasters, as Jenny Strauss Clay’s hypothesis that the island is identical with Hyperia would suggest is an equally viable interpretation of the same space. Similarly, Odysseus’ surveillance of the Gardens of Alcinous at night calls attention to the subjective character of his impressions – the gardens produce many of the same fruits as Laertes’ gardens, and one cannot help but wonder whether the odd lack of nominal subjects for the verbs denoting
the activities of the servants who tend the gardens hints that these activities exist more in Odysseus’ mind than in the physical garden as Odysseus observes it late in the evening. Lastly, the perceptual obstacles to viewing Ithaca as Odysseus is brought ashore to Ithaca in Book 13 find echoes in the conflicting accounts of Ithaca delivered by Athena. Here, too, a night landing on an obscure shore calls attention to the importance of the subjective interpretations which the poet and characters impose on a landscape too polyvalent to be reduced to one monolithic interpretation.

This distinction between real landscape and interpretation of landscape is essential in developing an hermeneutic to explore Homer’s topographical descriptions: one must pay attention to the progression of interpretations of landscapes presented across the narrative. Strictly archaeological investigations of Odyssean landscapes may help to elucidate the time and place of composition of the epic and the conventions of contemporary society, but should be taken with a grain of salt, since Homer generally aims not to compose a realistic geographical manual for sailors, but rather subordinates landscape description to his narratological aims. In order to ascertain how landscape bolsters narrative, one must consider it in the light of the epic’s major structural divisions.

**10.5 LANDSCAPE FEATURES ACROSS THE FOUR MOVEMENTS: CONSTRUCTING THE IDEAL ITHACA**

The preceding discussion should make clear that it is impossible to offer a static typology of landscapes in the *Odyssey*. Landscapes and landscape features acquire their significance through repetition and context, rather than conveying any meaning intrinsic to themselves. Nevertheless, a few elements recur frequently enough that certain connotations should be noted here. Most significant for this dissertation has been the array of landscape features that are key in distinguishing mortals from immortals and in shaping how mortals view the physical world around them. The ultimate point of contrast for all landscape features is Ithaca, Odysseus’ destination, both as it has been in the past and as he envisions it being in the future in the simile of 19.107-114.
10.5.1 Rain, Precipitation, Sunshine, and the Elements

Rain and precipitation have great importance as prerequisites for human civilized life in the *Odyssey*. By necessitating the existence of some sort of shelter, precipitation also defines human life negatively in terms of the discomforts it can entail – discomforts which can be positive attributes inasmuch as they force mortals to employ *techne* to mitigate their effects.

The Olympus-Olive diptych that spans the end of Book 5 and the beginning of Book 6 is the most striking example of Homer’s use of precipitation to underscore the value of culture. Olympus simply lacks rain and snow (6.43-44) and harsh light (6.45); it does not say anything about Athena’s cleverness or nature that she inhabits such a place, other than the obvious fact that she is a goddess and by nature has the privilege of enjoying this freedom from discomfort. Just previously, Odysseus, by contrast, went through a very deliberate rational calculus to free himself from this same inconveniences, balancing the risks and advantages of bedding down exposed to the elements against those of wild animals lurking in the forest, and opting to seek shelter in the woods despite the danger of being eaten.

Menelaus’ Elysium like Olympus, lacks snow, winter storms, and rain (4.566); tellingly, there is no mention whatsoever of crops in this passage. The climatic details of the passage thus represent a sort of wish-fulfillment, a taking of the comforts of Odysseus’ olive to their logical conclusion. The introduction to Elysium makes clear what Menelaus has taken as the main moral of Proteus’ words: life is easiest there for men (4.565). The word “men” occurs twice in the passage, and it seems to be not without significance. The possibility of humans enjoying absolute comfort raises awkward questions about whether this is an advantageous thing, as does the nepotistic relationship of recently-estranged in-law of Zeus which has won Menelaus this afterlife. Could mortals be happy in a paradise which shares many features with Olympus, or do they need to experience the discomfort of being chilled by rain regularly and the satisfaction of eating crops diligently tended and nurtured with the help of Zeus’ rain to appreciate the benefits of shelter from the elements? The state of affairs in the land of the Cyclopes helps to answer this question by portraying as brutish, dull, and violent a race subject to the same meteorological
phenomena as human beings, not subject to any requirement to work to avoid rain’s chill or to take advantage of its nurturing capacity.

The land of the Cyclopes presents an interesting example of the tendency of spaces in the Apologue to distort categorical tendencies familiar to Odysseus from the more mundane world of Achaean culture. They experience rain (as one would expect), and rain fulfils one of its normal agricultural functions – causing grapes to grow (9.110-111) – but the Cyclopes do not drink wine, as Odysseus’ trick of getting Polyphemus drunk makes clear. Here the mention of rain serves to emphasize the cultural differences between the Cyclopes and the Ithacans: crops grow without sowing or plowing for the Cyclopes. Likewise, they have caves in which to live, and hence the need for such fine-points of techne as making houses or making wine has never arisen. The Cyclopes are unable to take advantage of the amenities that their land produces because they rely over-much on nature’s spontaneous productivity. The episode makes clear through such contrasts that discomfort is an important impetus to human accomplishment, and rain’s double nature as nurturer of crops but inconvenience to the humans who grow the crops becomes an emblem for humankind’s ambivalent lot.

Other elements such as wind are slightly more ambivalent: Odysseus’ olive keeps the wind out in Book 13, but Zephyrus is refreshing in Elysium in Book 4. As does the role of rain, this state of affairs reflects the real-world ambiguity of this element in a Mediterranean climate, where moderate wind is beneficial and soothing, but excessive rain can prove disastrous for crops, commerce, and ships. Because its benefits are less material (it does not contribute so directly to the fertility of fields and orchards), its blandishments on Elysium contributes further to the impression that Menelaus’ vision of his afterlife is more self-centered and narcissistic than the more detached description of Olympus.

10.5.2 Plants: Foliage, Pasturage, and Agriculture

As the sampling of examples treated in the previous section has shown, the elements help to define the human condition by driving the need to protect the human body from their ravages while their positive powers of engendering fertility are harnessed. The olive on Scheria combines both these functions by sheltering Odysseus in his moment of immediate need, but also
by reminding the audience of its potential to reward long tending and cultivation with the fruit which forms one corner of the Mediterranean triad. Its civilizing fruit is not immediately accessible to Odysseus, but this latent possibility looks forward to a time when Odysseus will return to his home land and be able to engage in the intensive arboriculture which actually does permit the olive tree to yield usable olives.

During the Apologue, we noted that Odysseus seems obsessed with discovering fields (ἔργα) of men and men who eat bread. For a passer-by intent on reprovisioning his ships, discovering a culture with an agricultural economic base can be imagined to have many advantages: because agriculture demands a settled lifestyle, its practitioners will be more likely to have a city with a settled marketplace where Odysseus and his men will be able to trade for a variety of goods. As noted previously, this criterion proves almost useless for the Ithacan king. Whether he sights fields or not, almost all his adventures in Books 9-12 take unexpected turns which result in near-scrapes with death and the loss of the lives of some of his men. Grain and large-scale agriculture thus prove poor signs of civilization.

Instead, both among the Phaeacians and in the Gardens of Laertes, it is a diversified mix of horticulture, viticulture, tending of herd animals, and arboriculture which comes to embody all things harmonious, good, and civilized. Odysseus’ simile in 19.107-114 helps to elucidate why this diversity of crops and food sources is important. The description of life under an ideal mortal king makes no mention of the elements at all, and Odysseus’ emphasis on diversity makes the presence of rain or sunshine less important than it otherwise would be. Grains and fruit trees, which require fixed minimums of precipitation to yield a harvest, appear here, but also flocks (which can be watered at a lake or spring) and fish. Neither of these latter sources of sustenance is so immediately dependent on weather conditions for their survival. The message of this diversified picture of Ithaca’s economy seems to lie in the portrayal of the ideal king himself: it is his just judgments that ring in this vision of prosperity. Skills as mediator and arbitrator become more important the more specialized food-producing laborers become. Pastoralists and agriculturalists, for example, may compete for land on a small island, necessitating a just king to resolve such disputes. The absence of prominent mention of the elements on Ithaca thus is highly significant: Odysseus believes that an effective king can balance competing interests in society in such a fashion that if one crop fails, the populace can still be fed from the produce of other crops and animals. To sustain such a system, close ties between the city and country must
be closely guarded: sanctifying certain country spaces as the province of a city-protecting goddess (the grove of Athena) and by maintaining royal garden plots in the city (the Gardens of Alcinous) and in the country (the Gardens of Laertes) serves to establish visible, physical reminders of the king’s interest in the countryside and of the countryside’s interest in the king.

10.5.3 Ithaca

Landscape imagery of this sort helps to establish the telos of the landscape progressions of the four movements of the Odyssey as the best possible for human beings. Ithaca, in other words, is the place in comparison to which all other landscapes come up short. I have argued above that the Odyssey poet first develops contrasts between Menelaus’ landscapes and Ogygia to underscore Odysseus’ self-sufficiency and the value which he places on hard labor. The conclusion that Ithaca embodies the perfect degree of roughness and natural abundance to serve as the ideal home for Odysseus develops only gradually across successive descriptions of the island. Indeed, I argue that it is one of the main purposes of Homer’s and, in the Apologue, of Odysseus’ own representation of landscape to demonstrate through contrast this very fact.

The goal of Odysseus’ travel has appeared in various guises throughout the previous chapters. Books 1-4 ascribe Ithaca only passing epithets: it is rocky (ὅσσοι κραναὴν Ἀθηναίαν κάτα κοιρανέουσι, “who in rocky Ithaca are holders of lordship”, 1.247), sea-girt (ἐν ἀμφιάλῳ Ἀθηναία, “in seagirt Ithaca”, 1.395), conspicuous (οἳ νεμόμεσθ’ Ἀθηναίαν εὐθείειλον, “we who inhabit sunny Ithaca”, 2.167). Through these early books of the Telemachy, it is the idea of nostos which is a meaningful topic of discourse: Agamemnon’s failed homecoming and the summative, catalogic nostoi found in Nestor’s and Menelaus’ narratives establish an array of contrasting alternatives for how a homecoming may unfold, dramatically leaving Odysseus’ nostos the great unknown. These homecomings in miniature are mundane and episodic, lack long-term development, and in short embody by contrast a form of nostos poetry which might well have enjoyed an independent existence in the real world of previous ages (witness Phemius’ song), but which the Odyssey sets out to supercede. By way of contrast, Ithaca’s topography is largely taken for granted in Books 1-4, as evidenced by the marked contrast between the sociological orientation of Homer’s narrative of Athena’s welcome by Telemachus in Book 1
and the deliberate lingering on landscape which characterizes Hermes’ arrival on Ogygia in Book 5.

As our preceding discussion of the elements and economies intimates, Homer goes far beyond epithets to underscore Ithaca’s unique importance as goal of Odysseus’ journey. As a home than which nothing is sweeter in the Apologue, it is the antithesis of the unpredictability and barbarity of foreign lands. As a vision of future prosperity in the mind of its king, it is an imperfectly realized Scheria, and the land of Odysseus’ Book 19 simile. As the hero’s childhood home, it is a place where he has once farmed with great toil a humble plot together with his father, and where he hopes to labor once again in the hope of restoring peace and prosperity to his home, and of at least in part turning his dreams for a harmonious and wealthy Ithaca into a reality. It is, in fact, the perfect home for a mortal.
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