

## THE SCHOLIA ON THE ENDING OF THE ODYSSEY

Both "Analytic" and "Unitarian" discussions of *Odyssey* Books  $\psi$  297 -  $\omega$  — the so-called "Continuation of the *Odyssey*" — tend to give fuller treatment to the language and narrative structure than to the problems raised by the Scholia. More often than not the diplomatic evidence receives only a brief and hurried treatment. Typical of this approach is a recent essay by C. Moulton<sup>1</sup>, in which the author reviews the various diplomatic, linguistic and structural arguments on the basis of which scholars, both ancient and modern, customarily reject the ending of the *Odyssey* as spurious. After a rather inconclusive discussion of the various modern interpretations of the terminology employed by the ancient grammarians to designate the meaning of the athetesis<sup>2</sup>, the author concludes this section of his essay by remarking "It has been left to more modern critics to supply arguments for and against the poem's final lines"<sup>3</sup>. No doubt the *exact* considerations upon which the Alexandrian scholars based their verdict will never be known, but the Scholia often throw valuable light on points of fact or problems of exegesis, and, as the *disiecta membra* of lost commentaries, they afford a reasonably good idea of the arguments on which the Alexandrian critics rejected the passage. Moulton's sole contribution to this side of the problem is to refer the reader to the commentary of Stanford for a rather unsympathetic discussion of "the scanty comments of the scholiast"<sup>4</sup>. Yet without the notice in the Scholia, modern scholars might always have doubted the authenticity of the passage in question on linguistic or structural grounds, without ever attempting to prove its spuriousness with such apparent conviction. The present paper aims to supply this omission by attempting to look at this portion of the *Odyssey* from the view-point of some of the best critics of antiquity<sup>5</sup>.

### I. The Evidence

The diplomatic evidence indicating the judgement of the two great Alexandrian critics, Aristophanes and Aristarchus, on the last portion or "Continuation" of the *Odyssey* is to be found in two brief announcements (possibly to be regarded as one statement differently worded in different manuscripts) in the Scholia on verse  $\psi$  296. The notices run as follows<sup>6</sup>:

*Schol. MV Vind. 133*

Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος πέρασ τῆς Ὀδυσσεείας τοῦτο ποιῶνται.

1. C. Moulton, "The End of the *Odyssey*", GRBS 15, 1974, 153-169 (hereafter: Moulton).
2. Moulton 154 f. and n. 8.
3. Moulton 157.
4. Moulton 155 and n. 11. Cf. The *Odyssey* of Homer vol. II Commentary on Bks. XIII-XXIV ed. by W.B. Stanford, (2nd edn. London 1965) 409-410 (hereafter: Stanford).
5. It will be seen that the view-point adopted here differs in important essentials from that of Moulton.
6. See A. Nauck, *Aristophanis Byzantii Grammatici Alexandrini Fragmenta*, Halis 1848, 32; W. Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odyseam ex codicibus aucta et emendata*, Oxford 1855, vol. II 722 (hereafter: Dindorf); Otto Carnuth, *Aristonici perì σημείων Ὀδυσσεείας reliquiae emendatiores*, Lipsiae 1869, 162 (hereafter: Carnuth); cf. also Moulton (supra n. 1) 153. See also G. Petzl, *Antike Diskussionen über die beiden Nekyia*, Meisenheim am Glan 1969, 44 f. (hereafter: Petzl), cf. M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text of the Iliad Part II*, Leiden 1964, 260-263 (hereafter: van der Valk); L.E. Rossi, "La fine alessandrina dell' *Odisea* etc.", *Rivista di Filologia* 96, 1968, 151-163 (hereafter: Rossi).

τοῦτο τέλος τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας φησὶν Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης.

To these two statements may be added the comment of Eustathius<sup>7</sup>:

*Eust. p. 1948, 498*

κατὰ τὴν τῶν παλαιῶν ἱστορίαν Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ... εἰς τὸ ... " ἀσπᾶσι ... ἴκοντο " περατοῦσιν τὴν Ὀδύσειαν, τὰ ἐφεξῆς ἕως τέλους τοῦ βιβλίου νοθεύοντες.

The meaning of these three statements is clear: the *Odyssey* ended, in the opinion of Aristophanes and Aristarchus<sup>9</sup>, and perhaps also of their *epigoni*, at verse ψ 296; the rest of the poem was considered spurious. It has been suggested more than once in modern times<sup>10</sup> that in making this judgement Aristophanes and Aristarchus were merely following their predecessors, and that indirect confirmation of their verdict may be inferred from the work of Apollonius Rhodius. On this argument Ap. Rhod. – writing two generations before Aristophanes and a century or more before Aristarchus – was, perhaps, consciously echoing or (much less likely) parodying the scholarly view already current in the mid-third century B.C. That is, when he concluded his *Argonautica* with the verse ἀσπᾶσιως ἀκτὰς Παγασηΐδας εἰσαπέβητε (IV, 1781) he was echoing the Odyssean verse ψ 296 ἀσπᾶσιος λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἴκοντο, which he may have considered to be the last line of the *Odyssey*. But this suggestion remains only a possibility and some scholars reject it<sup>11</sup>. In any case the resemblance between Ap. Rhod. IV, 1781 and ψ 296 is not, perhaps, so close as that between the Odyssean verse and Hesiod *Scutum* 45 ἀσπᾶσιως τε φίλως τε ἐὼν δόμον εἰσαφίκανεν, which has not hitherto been pressed into service on this question<sup>12</sup>.

Modern investigators<sup>13</sup> have surmised that either some record of this view of the extent of the *Odyssey* had survived into the time of Aristophanes and Aristarchus, or these scholars must have been acquainted with manuscripts of the *Odyssey* which ended at verse ψ 296.

7. Eustathius may well have used a work which he called "Apion and Herodorus" which was also the source of the Venetus A Scholia and of some glosses in *Etym. Gen.* See L. Cohn, RE VI, 1 (Stuttgart 1907) s.v. 'Eustathios', cols. 1466 f.; cf. H. Erbse, Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien, München 1960, 122-173, esp. 126 f.
8. See note 18.
9. For a detailed account of the critical and editorial activities of the Alexandrian critics, see R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, Oxford 1968, 105-233, esp. 175 f. (hereafter: Pfeiffer). According to Pfeiffer 175 "Aristophanes only inserted marginal sigla, then Aristarchus in his ὑπομνήματα interpreted his predecessor's σημεῖα and may also have published comments from his lecture notes".
10. See e.g. R. Merkelbach, *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*, 2. Aufl. München 1969, 144 n. 1 (hereafter: Merkelbach); cf. Moulton (supra n. 1) 156 f. with n. 16.
11. See Moulton (supra n. 1) 156 and G.M. Bolling, *External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*, Oxford 1925, 252, where the author leaves the question open. Despite the fact that we have no pre-Aristarchean papyri of the end of the *Odyssey*, it can hardly have been the general opinion current in antiquity, that the *Odyssey* ended at verse ψ 296, since all scribes, as far as we know, included what followed. Clearly the division of the whole poem into twenty-four books was so well established and generally accepted that Aristophanes and Aristarchus could not change it. Cf. Pfeiffer (supra n. 9) 176; Rossi (supra n. 6) 155 f.
12. Note how Ap. Rhod. IV, 1781 corresponds less closely with ψ 296: ἀσπᾶσιος ... εἰσαπέβητε:: ἀσπᾶσιος ... ἴκοντο than with Hes. Sc. 45: ἀσπᾶσιως ... εἰσαπέβητε:: ἀσπᾶσιως ... εἰσαφίκανεν. Cf. Pfeiffer (supra n. 9) 176; Moulton (supra n. 1) 157 and n. 18; van der Valk (supra n. 6) 263; Rossi (supra n. 6) 157 f.
13. See A. Kirchhoff, *Die homerische Odyssee und ihre Entstehung*, Berlin 1879, 532 f.; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, Berlin 1884, 67 f.; idem, *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus*, Berlin 1927, 72 f. (hereafter: Wilamowitz, *Heimkehr*); F. Blass, *Die Interpolationen in der Odyssee*, Halle a.S. 1904, 214 (hereafter: Blass); T.W. Allen, *Homer: Origins and Transmission*, Oxford 1924, 217-224 (hereafter: Allen); Merkelbach (supra n. 10) 142-155; D.L. Page, *The Homeric Odyssey*, Oxford 1955, 101 (hereafter: Page); G.S. Kirk, *The Songs of Homer*, Cambridge 1962, 204-208, 244-252; cf. A. Lesky, RE Suppl. - Bd. XI (Stuttgart 1967) s.v. 'Homeros' cols. 130.f.; H. Eisenberger, *Studien zur Odyssee*, (Palingenesia VII) Wiesbaden 1973, 314 f.; F. Solmsen, "The conclusion of the *Odyssey*" in: *Poetry and Poetics from Ancient Greece to the Renaissance: Studies in Honor of James Hutton* ed. by G.M. Kirkwood, Ithaca/London 1975, 13-28. See also the bibliography cited in Moulton (supra n. 1) 154 n. 7 (esp. H. Erbse, Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee, Berlin 1972, 166-244), and in Stanford (supra n. 4) 405.

As a third possibility one finds the suggestion "it may be that they drew the natural inference from the sudden change for the worse in technique, style and quality"<sup>14</sup>.

## II. Atheteses within the Athetesis.

According to the Scholia<sup>15</sup>, two episodes in the "Continuation" ( $\psi$  310-343 and  $\omega$  1-204) were further athetised by Aristarchus. The evidence is as follows:

*Schol. QV on  $\psi$  310-343* (about the summary of Odysseus' adventures):

οὐ καλῶς ἠθέτησεν Ἀρίσταρχος τοὺς τρεῖς καὶ τριάκοντα. ῥητορικὴν γὰρ πεποιήκεν ἀνακεφαλαίω-  
σω καὶ ἐπιτομὴν τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας,

i.e. the present adversary of Aristarchus objects to the athetesis of verses  $\psi$  310-343. He defends the passage by turning Homer into a kind of model rhetorician, teaching later generations how to make an ἀνακεφαλαίωσις. Since this argument is unimportant, Aristarchus' athetesis of this section certainly deserves serious consideration.

*Schol. MV on  $\omega$  1*

Ἀρίσταρχος ἀθετεῖ (ταύτην) τὴν Νέκυϊαν κεφαλαίους τοῖς συνεκτικωτάτοις τοῖσδε<sup>16</sup>,

i.e. Aristarchus objected to the second *Nekyia* in Book  $\omega$  1-204. For the arguments, see section III infra.

It is not easy to reconcile Aristarchus' rejection of parts of the text with his rejection of the whole of it, but this question is not very important for the present inquiry which is concerned with a discussion of the Scholia on  $\omega$  1-204. As Monro<sup>17</sup> has suggested, Aristarchus may have distinguished between (1) a "Continuation" of the *Odyssey* by some later poet extending from verse  $\psi$  297 to the end of Book  $\omega$ , and (2) two still later additions,  $\psi$  310-343 and  $\omega$  1-204. On the other hand, he may have felt uneasy about the whole portion of the *Odyssey* from verse  $\psi$  297 onwards, but found the chief reasons for the athetesis within the two sections which he singled out ( $\psi$  310-343 and  $\omega$  1-204), marking these with the obelus. Whatever the case may have been, Aristarchus nevertheless thought that *Odyssey*  $\psi$  296 - end was recent, i.e. interpolated<sup>18</sup>.

14. Page (supra n. 13) 101. This verdict of the ancient critics has been accepted by most modern "Analytical" investigators, including P. von der Mühl, RE Suppl.-Bd. VII (Stuttgart 1940) s.v. 'Odyssee' cols. 763 f.; E. Schwartz, Die Odyssee, München 1924, 52; Merkelbach (supra n. 10) 144, who also examines in great detail a suggestion of Schwartz, op. cit. 52, that the "Continuation" is a deliberate composition intended to link the end of the *Odyssey* with the beginning of the *Telegony*. See also Kirk (supra n. 13) 248; cf. Allen (supra n. 13) 221 for another view. On the other hand F. Focke, Die Odyssee, Stuttgart-Berlin 1943, 373, is inclined to extend the end of the *Odyssey* to line  $\psi$  343, making verses 310-343 form part of the original *Odyssey* poem (which he designates with the letter O). Cf. Moulton (supra n. 1) 155 and Pfeiffer (supra n. 9) 177 n. 6. On the *Telegony* see W.B. Stanford, The Ulysses Theme, Oxford 21968, 86 f.; G.L. Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis, London 1969, 168-169.
15. Dindorf (supra n. 6) 723; Blass (supra n. 13) 214-218.
16. Text as emended by A. Roemer, Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homerkritik, Leipzig 1912, 36 (hereafter: Roemer).
17. Homer's *Odyssey* vol. II Books XIII-XXIV ed. with English Notes and Appendices by D.B. Monro, Oxford 1901, 257 ad  $\psi$  296 (hereafter: Monro). (I am indebted to Monro's treatment throughout the sections which follow). Against this view it could be argued that it is anachronistic to regard Aristarchus as distinguishing between various strata ('Schichten') of spurious material like a modern analyst.
18. See Wilamowitz, Heimkehr (supra n. 13) 72 f.; cf. Pfeiffer (supra n. 9) 175 n. 6; van der Valk (supra n. 6) 262 note 787; W.B. Stanford, The Ending of the *Odyssey*: an ethical approach, in: *Hermathena* 100, 1965, 17 (postscript). If Eust. 1948, 49 found the words τὰ ἐφεξῆς ἕως τέλους τοῦ βιβλίου νοθεύοντες in his exemplar of the so-called "Apion and Herodorus" (see supra n. 7), we would have in  $\psi$  310-343 and  $\omega$  1-204 smaller atheteses within the larger athetesis of  $\psi$  297 f. However, Erbse (supra n. 13) 167 f. interprets this passage differently from Wilamowitz (op. cit.) in that he infers from Eustathius' following words (1949, 1 f.) εἴποι ἂν οὖν τις ὅτι Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης οἱ ῥηθέντες οὐ τὸ βιβλίον τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας, ἀλλὰ ἴσως τὰ καίρια ταύτης ἐνταῦθα συντετελέσθαι φασὶν that the words τὰ ἐφεξῆς ... νοθεύοντες are Eustathius' own inference and that he had no more text before him than is preserved in the extant Scholia. But against this view it could be argued that Aristarchus' adversary understood Aristarchus in a different sense (i. e. that Aristarchus rejected the whole passage) and found it necessary to defend especially verses  $\omega$  205-411 (the recognition scene). Eust. 1948, 53 f. Erbse argues (op. cit. 169-170) that, for Aristarchus, an athetesis within an athetesis "seinem System widersprochen hätte". Furthermore, that we have no evidence for Aristarchus' terminology for any other distinction than that between the genuinely Homeric and the spurious, whether this is called νεωτερικόν, κυκλικώτερον, the work of a διασκευαστής, or anything else. But it might still be possible

### III. Arguments in the Scholia on $\omega$ 1-204

More interesting, however, are Aristarchus' arguments for the thesis that the portions mentioned were interpolated.

These arguments are summarised in the Scholia on  $\omega$  1<sup>19</sup> by an apologist who objects to the athetesis of Aristarchus. It will be convenient, for the sake of clarity, first to summarise Aristarchus' reasons for the athetesis and then to discuss the counter-arguments of Aristarchus' adversary:

#### A. Aristarchus' objections

Aristarchus objected to the second *Nekyia* for the following reasons:

- (1)  $\delta\tau\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\kappa\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\theta'\ \text{Όμηρον}\ \psi\upsilon\chi\omicron\pi\omicron\mu\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\ \text{Έρμῆς}.$

The function of Hermes as a  $\psi\upsilon\chi\omicron\pi\omicron\mu\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma$ , i. e. a conductor of souls to Hades, is without precedent in Homer. The silence on this special function of Hermes is indeed surprising, since death is so often described in the *Odyssey*. The argument is confirmed by Schol. A on *Iliad* X 362<sup>20</sup>.

- (2)  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'\ \sigma\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \chi\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma.$

This objection follows from the preceding one: Hermes is not one of the Underworld deities in the Homeric poems.

- (3)  $\text{Κυλλῆνιος}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \sigma\upsilon\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\eta\tau\alpha\iota.$ <sup>21</sup>

Aristarchus observes that the term *Κυλλῆνιος* ( $\omega$  1) is a post-Homeric epithet. It occurs five times in some of the Homeric Hymns which are probably later than "Homer", e. g. *Merc.* 304 (in reference to Hermes), 318, 347, XVIII,1; *Pan* XIX, 31. It is also used at *Iliad* O 518 as an adjective derived from the place-name *Κυλλήνη* without any reference to Hermes.

- (4)  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\ \psi\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\kappa\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\omega\upsilon,\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \text{Ίλιάδι};$ <sup>22</sup>

Aristarchus objects that whereas in the *Iliad* the souls of the dead go down to Hades unchaperoned, in this passage they are accompanied by Hermes, an occurrence without parallel elsewhere in Homer. This repeats essentially the argument in section (1) supra.

- (5)  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\phi\omicron\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\omega\upsilon.$

Aristarchus points out that no attention is paid to the fact that the slain suitors are still unburied at the time when their souls are being conducted to Hades. In the first *Nekyia* (Book  $\lambda$ ) Elpenor, the companion left unburied in Circe's island, meets and entreats Odysseus at the entrance of Hades to grant him funeral rights,

to argue that the athetesis of  $\psi$  297 ff. on the one hand, and of  $\psi$  310-343 and  $\omega$  1-204 on the other, represent two different phases of Aristarchus' treatment of the passage, e. g. he might have followed his predecessor's athetesis of  $\psi$  297 f. in the earlier edition of his *ὑπόμνημα* and then confined the athetesis to  $\psi$  310-343 and  $\omega$  1-204 in *τὰ ἠκρῶμένα ὑπομνήματα*. Cf. the plausible suggestions given by Moulton (supra n. 1) 156.

19. See Dindorf (supra n. 6) 724-725; Carnuth (supra n. 6) 163-164. Aristarchus' reasons for rejecting  $\psi$  310-343 are not given in the Scholia. For a recent discussion along similar lines but in greater detail, see Petzl (supra n. 6) 44-66.

20. See K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis homerici*, 3rd edn. Lipsiae 1882, 184 (hereafter: Lehrs); L. Friedländer, *Aristonici perī σημείων Ίλιάδος reliquiae emendatiores*, Göttingen 1853, 323 (hereafter: Friedländer).

21. See Dindorf (supra n. 6) 724-725. Aristarchus' objection ends with the word *εἴρηται*. Spohn's conjecture *εἴρηται εἰ (μὴ) ἄπαξ* (*ἢ ἄπαξ* codd.) does not yield satisfactory sense. For Aristarchus' objection and the adversary's reply we should perhaps read: *Κυλλῆνιος δὲ σὺδαμοῦ εἴρηται. εἰ ἄπαξ, σὺκ ἔξω λόγου· καὶ σῶκος, καὶ ἦϊος Ἀπόλλων.* See H.J. Polak, *Ad Odysseam eiusque scholiastas curae secundae*, 2 Bde., Leiden 1881-1882, ad loc., who inserts *ὡς* before *καὶ σῶκος*, unnecessarily.

22. Cf. note 20 supra.

without which he will apparently be unable to pass the gates of Hades (λ 51-80). In the present passage the suitors are said to have entered Hades without burial – an occurrence unparalleled in Homer. A similar verse in the *Iliad* (Υ 73) has also been athetised<sup>23</sup>.

- (6) ἄλλ' οὐδέ ἔοικεν εἰς Ἄιδου λευκὴν εἶναι πέτραν (ω 11 f.)  
The geographical details mentioned in verses ω 11-12 do not agree with other Homeric accounts of Hades, except in the case of Oceanus. The White Rock is mentioned only in this passage and the Gates of the Sun are without Homeric precedent. The Community of Dreams is also a location unique in Homer: the notion suggested by the phrase is inconsistent with the account given at *Odyssey* τ 562 of the two gates out of which dreams issue.
- (7) ἄκαιρος δὲ καὶ ἡ Ἀχιλλέως καὶ Ἀγαμέμνωνος ὀμιλία.  
Aristarchus objects to the dialogue between Achilles and Agamemnon (verses ω 23-98) as inappropriate or ill-timed (ἄκαιρος). It is irrelevant to the main story, and the newly-arrived souls of the suitors have to wait until it is over. It is also strange that Agamemnon and Achilles should be assumed not to have met previously in Hades, and the whole meeting itself is irrelevant to the *Odyssey* and to the situation of the suitors.
- (8) πῶς δὲ καὶ σῶμα διέμενε τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως ἐπὶ τσσαύτας ἡμέρας;  
It is stated at verse ω 65 that Achilles' corpse was buried on the eighteenth day after his death. Aristarchus inquires how the corpse could have lain intact for eighteen days without decaying.
- (9) ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀριθμῆν τὰς Μούσας οὐχ Ὀμηρικόν.  
Aristarchus observes that, contrary to Homeric practice, verse ω 60 (Μοῦσαι δ' ἐννέα πᾶσαι) is the only Homeric context where the Muses are given a definite number, and the only place in the *Odyssey* where they are mentioned in the plural (compare the use of the singular at α 1 and θ 63, 481). It is difficult to accept Monro's comment<sup>25</sup> that the words "do not necessarily mean that there were nine Muses", since this is surely what the text says. Moreover the passage is not likely to be as early as the *Theogony*, so it is not worth saying that "it may be source of the later belief" that the Muses were nine in number. On the other hand, nine Muses are mentioned in *Theogony* 76-79:  
ἐννέα θυγατέρες μεγάλου Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖαι,  
Κλειώ τ' Εὐτέρπη τε Θάλεια τε Μελπομένη τε  
Τερψιχόρη τ' Ἐρατώ τε Πολύμνιά τ' Οὐρανὴ τε  
Καλλιόπη θ' ἣ δὲ προφερεστάτη ἐστὼν ἀπασέων,  
and the number nine may have been taken from there.<sup>26</sup>

23. Cf. Schol. A ad ψ 73: ἡ διπλῆ ὅτι ἐκτὸς τοῦ ποταμοῦ ὑποτίθεται τὰς τῶν ἀπάρων ψυχάς, καὶ μὴ ἐπιμισγομένας ταῖς ἐν τῷ ἔρβει. ἡ δὲ ἀναφορὰ πρὸς τὰ ἀθετούμενα ἐν τῇ νεκρίᾳ. See Friedländer (supra n. 20) 327; Lehrs (supra n. 20) 173; Petzl (supra n. 6) 53.

24. Cf. Schol. ad Ω 720; ἀθετητέος δὲ ὁ Μουσῶν ἐπ' Ἀχιλλεῖ θρήνος. See Lehrs (supra n. 20) 184.

25. Monro (supra n. 17) 265; cf. Stanford (supra n. 4) note on ω 60.

26. See also *ibid.* 56-61:

ἐννέα γὰρ οἱ νύκτας ἐμίσητο μητίετα Ζεὺς  
νόσφω ἅπ' ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν λέχος εἰσαναβαῖων·  
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ β' ἐνιαυτὸς ἔην, περὶ δ' ἔτραπον ὤραι  
μηνῶν φθωνόντων, περὶ δ' ἤματα πολλὰ ἔτελέσθη.

- (10) ἄλογον δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν νεῶν ὄντων αὐτῶν λέγειν ὅτι δεισάντες τὰς Νηρηίδας ἐφυγον ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς.

This remark refers to verse ω 50 where Aristarchus objects that the Greeks are already at the ships to which they had brought the body of Achilles (ω 43). This objection is merely concerned with an error in the details of Agamemnon's narrative about the commotion that arose after the death of Achilles, Aristarchus' point being that whoever invented the whole passage in question (ω 1-204) did not know his *Iliad* well enough, if he committed such obvious errors of detail as this.

- (11) πῶς δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀμφιμέδων ἐπίσταται τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς ἐπιβουλήν;

This criticism refers to ω 150 f., to which Aristarchus objects on the grounds that Amphimedon's knowledge of the meeting of Odysseus and Telemachus in the house of Eumaeus, and of the subsequent plot formed there against the suitors, is surprising<sup>27</sup>.

### B. The counter-arguments of Aristarchus' adversary

The counter-arguments to Aristarchus' objections to ω 1-201 are laconically expressed and, in some parts, obscure. They may be enumerated as follows:

- (1) To Aristarchus' objection that the function of Hermes as a ψυχοπομπός is unparalleled in Homer (see III A [1] supra) the counter-argument runs thus:

οὐδὲ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα (μνημονεύει) ἐπὶ τῆς πυκτικῆς· εἰ μὴ ἅπαξ (Ψ 660) 28.

The apologist means that there are other unparalleled passages in Homer to which no one objects: Apollo is said on one occasion (at *Iliad* Ψ 660) to be the god of prize-fighters. This retort does not refute the argument of Aristarchus (see the following section).

- (2) Aristarchus' objection that Hermes is not a god of the Underworld (χθόνιος) is answered as follows:

οὐκ εὐθέως ὁ εἰς Ἄιδου κατελθὼν χθόνιος, ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ δι' Ἡρακλέα (Θ 366-368, λ 626) καὶ ὁ Ἄιδης Ὀλύμπιος (E 398)<sup>29</sup>.

This means that it is a *non sequitur* to say that once a god has gone to the Underworld, he becomes on that account a deity of that place and deserves the title χθόνιος; in fact Athena too once went down to the Underworld on account of Heracles, but she is not for that reason any more a goddess of the Underworld than Hades would count as an Olympian because he once went up to Mount

ἦ δ' ἔτεκε ἑννέα κούρας ὁμόφρονας, ἦσαν αἰοιδῆ  
μέμβλεται ἐν στήθεσσω ἀκῆδεα θυμὸν ἔχούσαις,  
and 915-917:

Μνημοσύνης δ' ἐξαυτίς ἐράσσατο καλλικόμοιο  
ἐξ ἧς οἱ Μοῦσαι χρυσάμπυκες ἐξεγένοντο  
ἑννέα, τῆσιν ἄδον θαλαίαι καὶ τέρψις αἰοιδῆς.

See 'Hesiod Theogony' ed. with Proleg. and Commentary by M.L. West, Oxford 1966, ad loc.

27. Actually, Amphimedon's narrative may be paralleled by other instances of the violation of consistent adherence to a specific narrative point of view in the *Odyssey*, e.g. μ 377 f., where Odysseus reports a dialogue in heaven (here lines 389-390 excuse the violation of the narrative view-point) and ο 415 f., Eumaeus' account of how he came to Ithaca: a small boy at the time, he could not have known about or understood his nurse's amour with the Phoenician and other details of the plot.

28. See Roemer (supra n. 16) 36, who conjectures μνημονεύει.

29. See Roemer (supra n. 16) 36 and 'Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum ad Odysseam pertinentium reliquias' ed. H. Schrader, Leipzig 1890, 129 f.; for the supplements, which perhaps seem superfluous and unnecessary, in view of the laconic style of Aristarchus' adversary.

Olympus (see *Iliad* E 398)<sup>30</sup>. That may be a fair counter-argument as far as it goes, but it ignores Aristarchus' previous objection that Hermes is never known as a *ψυχοπομπός* and it is in this respect that the counter-argument misses the point completely. Aristarchus means that if Hermes is given the function of a *ψυχοπομπός* here, then whoever inserted this passage in its present context must also have thought that he is a god of the Underworld (*χθόνιος*). But Aristarchus has already pointed out (see IV A [1] supra) that the function of a *ψυχοπομπός* does not belong to Hermes, therefore he could not be a *χθόνιος*. Perhaps Aristarchus may have said: "Hermes is not a god of the Underworld (*χθόνιος*) because he is not a *ψυχοπομπός*". Whoever wrote the counter-argument seems to see the individual points raised by Aristarchus in his objections only in isolation and not in relation to one another. He fails to see the wood for the trees.

- (3) Aristarchus objects (see III A [3] supra) that the epithet *Κυλλήνιος* as applied to Hermes is unique in Homer. The apologist counters with the following remark:

*εἰ ἅπαξ οὐκ ἔξω λόγου· καὶ σῶκος* [sc. Ἑρμῆς ἅπαξ καλεῖται], καὶ ἥϊος Ἀπόλλων<sup>31</sup>.

Hermes is also once called *σῶκος* "the Stout One" or "the Strong One" at *Iliad* T 72: *Λητοῖ δ' ἀντέστη σῶκος ἐριούνιος Ἑρμῆς*, and Apollo is once referred to as *ἥϊος*. In fact, Apollo is called by that epithet twice, at *Iliad* O 356 and T 152, to which one may add *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 120. Hence, although it may be conceded that *σῶκος* is as unique in Homer as *Κυλλήνιος*, the citation of *ἥϊος* as an additional instance of an otherwise unknown epithet (to which no one objects) is inaccurate, since the epithet is employed more than once in Homer. It is obvious that Aristarchus' adversary is using both a good and a bad analogy in order to help his case by confusing the point at issue.

- (4) Aristarchus' objection that in the *Iliad* the souls of the dead go down to Hades unaccompanied (see III A [4] supra) is countered by his adversary thus: *οὐδὲν κωλύει καὶ παραπέμποντος αὐτάς τινας*, i.e. nothing prevents them from being accompanied by someone on this occasion. This response is characteristic of the manner and tone in which the counter-arguments are given: *ad hoc*, naïve, and often petulant, and no account is taken of the religious conceptions which prevail in Homer.

- (5) To Aristarchus' objection that nowhere else in Homer are the souls of the dead presented as going down to Hades whilst their bodies are still unburied, Aristarchus' adversary states: *ἴσως διὰ τι καθάρσιον ἢ διὰ τὴν Ἑρμοῦ πρόνοιαν κηδομένου τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν*. In other words, perhaps it was because they may have received some form of purification (from whom?) or because of Hermes' regard for Odysseus, to whom he is related. It is unusual, however,

30. On the other hand, the Scholium, without Roemer's conjectures, may be interpreted as follows: "Athena went down to the Underworld because of Heracles but she is not on that account a goddess of that place. On the other hand, Hades, although living in the Underworld, counts in one instance as an Olympian, since he is the brother of Zeus and Poseidon".

Cf. *Iliad* O 187-193:

*τρεῖς γάρ τ' ἐκ Κρόνου εἰμὲν ἀδελφοί, οὓς τέκετο Ῥέα.  
Ζεὺς καὶ ἐγώ, τρίτατος δ' Αἴδης, ἐνέροισιν ἀνάσσων.  
τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδασται, ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς·  
ἦτοι ἐγὼν ἔλαχον πολὴν ἄλα ναίεμεν αἰεὶ  
παλλομένων, Αἴδης δ' ἔλαχε ζῶρον ἠερόεντα  
Ζεὺς δ' ἔλαχ' οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλῃσι·  
γαῖα δ' ἔτι ξυνή πάντων καὶ μακρὸς Ὀλυμπος.*

31. See Dindorf (supra n. 6) 724-725; Roemer (supra n. 16) 36; for the text see note 21 supra.

in Homer for a god to chaperon the souls of his protégé's victims. The suggestions in the counter-argument are again improvisatory and desperate, and fail to stand up to scrutiny.

- (6) Aristarchus objects that the localities mentioned at  $\omega$  11-12 do not agree with other accounts of Hades in Homer (IV A [6] supra). To this the apologist's objection seems to be off-hand: τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἡμέραν ἐστραμμένα αὐτῆς λευκαίνονται, which probably means "the parts of it (αὐτῆς) which are turned towards or face the daylight are whitened by it"<sup>32</sup>.
- (7) The apologist counters Aristarchus' criticism that the dialogue between Achilles and Agamemnon is ill-timed (ἄκαιρος) as follows: εὐκαιρῶς· ἀναπληροῖ τὰ ἀλλαχοῦ παραλειφθέντα. That is to say, it is not ill-timed or out of place because it fills in the details of the Trojan story which have been omitted elsewhere. While that may be so, it should be pointed out that such an argument could be used to defend any passage inserted out of place.
- (8) Aristarchus objects that it is inconceivable that Achilles' corpse could have lain for eighteen days without decaying (see III A [8] supra). To this the apologist objects: διὰ τὴν Θέτιν, ὡς καὶ τὸ Πατρόκλου. This presumably means, Achilles' body may have been preserved through the divine agency of Thetis, as happened in the case of Patroclus' body. But again this is nothing more than a guess.
- (9) To Aristarchus' objection that the nine Muses are nowhere else mentioned in Homer (see III A [9] supra) the apologist retorts with the question: τί κωλύει ἅπαξ; what prevents the definite number from being given once here? It seems as if the counter-argument, despite its petulant brevity, has some reason on its side: it may be noted that in the fragments of Alcman the Muses are sometimes plural, sometimes singular<sup>33</sup>, so the variation here need not indicate difference in authorship. The same is the case in Pindar<sup>34</sup> and Bacchylides<sup>35</sup>.
- (10) Aristarchus' objection to verse  $\omega$  50 on the grounds that the Greeks were already at the ships where they had brought the body of Achilles and therefore could not be described as having fled, is answered thus: ἀπὸ τοῦ πῶν Μυρμιδόνων ναυστάθμου, ἔφυγον ἐπὶ τὰς αὐτῶν ναῦς. The Greeks fled, then, from the part of the beach where Achilles' men, the Myrmidons, were anchored. This counter-argument is a sensible guess, but nothing more.
- (11) The apologist replies to Aristarchus' criticism that Amphimedon could not have known all the details that he gives about the plot to kill the suitors (see III A [11]) as follows: ἐκ τῶν εἰκότων τεκμαίρεται. That is to say, he inferred from the general probabilities of the situation. What, one might ask, could Amphimedon reasonably infer from the situation? He could, in fact, only infer that he and the other suitors were killed by a plot of some kind engineered by Odysseus, and, probably, also assume from the scene of the slaughter of the suitors that those who aided Odysseus were his confederates in the plot<sup>36</sup>. But it is unlikely that he would know where the plot was planned, unless, perhaps, the suitors happened to have

32. See Erbse (supra n. 13) 235 f.

33. *Mōsa*: 5 fr. 2 i 22; 14 (a) 1 (bis), 27.1, 28.30. *Mōσαν* 31. *Mōσαι* 8, 9, 46. *Mōσάν* 59 (b) 1. References to 'Poetae Melici Graeci' ed. D.L. Page, Oxford 1962. On the number of the Muses see in general M. Mayer, RE XVI (1933) s.v. 'Musai', cols. 687 f.

\*34. See the Index to 'Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis' ed. B. Snell vol. II: Fragmenta (3rd edn. Lipsiae 1964), s.v.; see also, W.J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin 1969, s.v.

35. See the Index to 'Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis' ed. B. Snell (8th edn. Lipsiae 1961), s.v.

36. Cf. Moulton (supra n. 1) 162: "To the mind of a suitor, lately dead almost before he knew what hit him, collusion would appear the rational explanation".

maintained spies in the fields to report on the movements and activities of Eumaeus and of anyone else around. But nothing of the sort was done by the suitors, either collectively or as individuals, hence Amphimedon's detailed knowledge of the plot against the suitors is indeed surprising, although, as has been argued (see III A [11] and n. 27 supra) it fits in with the absence of consistent adherence to a specific narrative point of view in the Homeric epics.

#### IV. Conclusion.

Although the Scholia present the various objections of Aristarchus side by side in a very much abbreviated form without indicating whether he thought one more important than another, whether he denied the poet any unique expression, or whether he relied on the cumulative weight of his arguments, one can form a fairly good idea of the method of criticism which Aristarchus applied to the passage under discussion<sup>37</sup>. Aristarchus has reconstructed the Homeric world in his imagination and carefully separated it from that of his own time and place, and frequently compares the text of Homer with this reconstructed world of his imagination, in order to discover discrepancies and inconsistencies between them. He is chiefly interested in the detection of all types of inconsistency, and constantly subjects every passage in the Homeric text to a rigorous examination in order to discover inconsistencies. The catholicity of his interests and the rigorous application of this method to all details are notable. For instance, such narrative details as the state of Achilles' corpse (III A 8), the Greeks' flight to the ships (III A 10) or the inconsistency in the adherence to a specific narrative view-point at  $\omega$  150 f. (III A 11), such geographical details as the White Rock of Hades (III A 6) and such minor inconsistencies as the variation in the number of the Muses (III A 9), the epithets  $\chi\theta\acute{o}\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\text{Κυλλήνιος}$  as applied to Hermes (III A 2 and 3), do not escape his attention. Admittedly, not all of these objections are of equal weight or significance but, taken together, they lend weight to Aristarchus' suspicion that the passage is spurious. To the modern reader, however, the most convincing of his arguments seem to be his objections to the untimeliness of the conversation between Achilles and Agamemnon (III A 7), and, above all, to the introduction of Hermes as guide of souls (III A 1 and 4) and the descent of the souls of the unburied suitors to Hades (III A 5). The discussions of these two latter objections reveal that Aristarchus conceived misgivings about the conception of the Underworld and the picture of life after death depicted in *Odyssey*  $\omega$  1-204: they are inaccurate and at variance with the orthodox accounts found elsewhere in Homer. His misgivings about these and other inconsistencies already mentioned undoubtedly led him to suspect the authenticity of the passage and to reject it and its surroundings<sup>38</sup>. This was not the only occasion on which Aristarchus rejected a passage in the *Odyssey* on those grounds: verses  $\lambda$  566-640 (King Minos' Hades) were similarly rejected (although the reasons were more explicitly stated) because they show inconsistencies in the presentation of the situation<sup>39</sup>. In contrast, Aristarchus' adversary is ready to permit anything in the text (cf. III B 7), and, in his desperate efforts to save the passage, resorts to retorts, invective and improvisatory arguments.

37. For a detailed discussion of Aristarchus' critical methods, see my article 'The Scholia on *Odyssey*  $\lambda$  566-640', forthcoming in *Eranos*.

38. Modern "Analytical" criticism seems to confirm this explanation, see Page (supra n. 13) 101 with note 14 supra.

39. I.e. Odysseus does not enter Hades but merely stands at the entrance while the shades come to him, yet he claims to describe the inside of Hades from autopsy. For further discussion see "Scholia" note 37 supra.

In rejecting verses  $\omega$  1-204 Aristarchus no doubt raised an important question of criticism concerning that portion of the *Odyssey*, and his verdict has had an enormous effect on subsequent Homeric criticism. What the preceding discussion has tried to show is how Aristarchus (and *ex hypothesi* Aristophanes)<sup>40</sup> arrived at their verdict – at least, to the extent that the surviving evidence permits. The present case illustrates how an observation of ancient critics provides a starting-point for modern “Analytical” and “Unitarian” criticism and retains its essential validity and importance to the present day<sup>41</sup>. The commentator should always try, as far as the available evidence allows, to look at the Homeric poems through the eyes of ancient critics, who were closer in time to the world for which the poems were composed, and whose judgements in such matters are important if not decisive<sup>42</sup>.

40. See *supra* n. 9.

41. Although Aristarchus' arguments may give pause to a “Unitarian” critic, the latter may also derive some comfort from the fact that Aristarchus may not have based his judgement on any manuscript evidence, and consequently had no more authority for athetising the passage than any modern scholar, except by virtue of the reputation of his critical activities for their wide range and high quality. Cf. the remarks of E. Bethe, *Der Schluss der Odyssee und Apollonios von Rhodos*, in: *Hermes* 53, 1918, 445.

42. I would like to thank my colleagues, Professors Duncan Fishwick, John Wilson and Andrew Dyck, for kindly reading through an earlier draft of this essay and suggesting improvements. My thanks are also due to my teachers, Professors R. Merkelbach and M.L. West, for their helpful advice and criticism. I am also grateful to Prof. R. Kassel for some helpful suggestions. Needless to say, I am alone responsible for any errors that still remain in this essay.