Chapter 1

The Conventions of the Homeric Hospitality Scene

Ζεὺς δ' ἐπιτιμήτωρ ἱκετάων τε ξείνων τε,
ξείνιος, ὃς ξείνοισιν ἅμ' αἰδοίοισιν ὀπηδεῖ.

[Zeus is the protector of suppliants and guests,
Zeus Xeinios, who attends to revered guests.]
—(*Od.* 9.270–71)

In the hospitality scene, I include everything that occurs from the moment a visitor approaches someone's house until the moment he departs. As such, it is really a composite of many smaller type-scenes, including, among others, arrival, reception, seating, feasting, identification, bedding down, bathing, gift giving, and departure, all composed in highly formulaic diction and arranged in a relatively fixed order. I count eighteen such hospitality scenes in the verses that have come down to us under the name "Homer": twelve in the *Odyssey* (Athena-Mentes in Ithaca, Telemachus in Pylos, Telemachus in Sparta, Hermes and Calypso, Odysseus and the Phaeacians, Odysseus and Polyphemus, Odysseus and Aeolus, Odysseus and the Laestrygonians, Odysseus and Circe, Odysseus and Eumaeus, Telemachus and Eumaeus, Odysseus' homecoming); four in the *Iliad* (the embassy to Achilles, Nestor and Odysseus in Phthia, Thetis and Hephaestus, Priam and Achilles); and two in the *Hymns* (Demeter in the home of Celeos, Aphrodite and Anchises). In addition to these, a few minor hospitality scenes scattered throughout Homer are considered in this study (e.g., *Od.* 3.488–90; 15.186–88; *Il.* 6.171–77), but since they are too short to contribute much of importance to my analysis, I give them less formal treatment.

Some of the scenes that I have included in my analysis could just as well, perhaps better, be categorized as messenger scenes (Athena-Mentes in Ithaca, Hermes and Calypso, the embassy to Achilles) or supplication

scenes (Odysseus and the Phaeacians, Odysseus and Polyphemus, Priam and Achilles). Many conventional elements, such as arrival, seating, feasting, sacrifice, and libation, are not tied exclusively to the hospitality scene; they are more fluid and can be found attached to various kinds of scenes. I include messenger and supplication scenes in my treatment of hospitality scenes because conventional elements of hospitality intrude and even become pervasive in each of them (see Appendix). In the embassy to Achilles (*Il.* 9.185–668), for example, the messenger scene is transformed into a scene of hospitality when Achilles rises from his seat, greets the visitors as friends, leads them in, and serves them a feast. Similarly, when Priam approaches Achilles as a suppliant in order to ransom the body of his son (*Il.* 24.334–694), Achilles first pushes him away from his knees and then takes him by the hand, offers him a seat, serves him a meal, and even provides him a bed in the portico. The shifts on a formal level from messenger or supplication scene to hospitality scene mirror the activity on the contextual level of Achilles' generous elevation of messengers and suppliants to the status of revered guests.

As a tool for defining the conventional background against which each individual instance of hospitality may be viewed, I have constructed a grid of thirty-eight elements that occur repeatedly in the eighteen hospitality scenes under consideration:

I. Maiden at the well/Youth on the road
II. Arrival at the destination
III. Description of the surroundings
  a. Of the residence
  b. Of (the activities of) the person sought
  c. Of (the activities of) the others
IV. Dog at the door
V. Waiting at the threshold
VI. Supplication
VII. Reception
  a. Host catches sight of the visitor
  b. Host hesitates to offer hospitality
  c. Host rises from his seat
  d. Host approaches the visitor
  e. Host attends to the visitor's horses
  f. Host takes the visitor by the hand

  g. Host bids the visitor v
  h. Host takes the visitor'
  i. Host leads the visitor i
VIII. Seat
IX. Feast
  a. Preparation
  b. Consumption
  c. Conclusion
X. After-dinner drink
XI. Identification
  a. Host questions the vi
  b. Visitor reveals his ide
XII. Exchange of informatio
XIII. Entertainment
XIV. Visitor pronounces a ble
XV. Visitor shares in a libati
XVI. Visitor asks to be allow
XVII. Bed
XVIII. Bath
XIX. Host detains the visitor
XX. Guest-gifts
XXI. Departure meal
XXII. Departure libation
XXIII. Farewell blessing
XXIV. Departure omen and in
XXV. Escort to visitor's next

This grid is of course a highly arti
by which the modern reader may b
the backdrop of inherited conventi
explicit analysis; Homer himself di
for the composition of his hospita
tive, not prescriptive; in practice
narration of these scenes, from t
hospitality toward Telemachus an
the multi-book description of the
seus in Scheria (5.388–13.187). N
every element on this grid; in fa
exactly identical to any other. Ye

g. Host bids the visitor welcome
h. Host takes the visitor's spear
i. Host leads the visitor in

VIII. Seat
IX. Feast
a. Preparation
b. Consumption
c. Conclusion
X. After-dinner drink
XI. Identification
a. Host questions the visitor
b. Visitor reveals his identity
XII. Exchange of information
XIII. Entertainment
XIV. Visitor pronounces a blessing on the host
XV. Visitor shares in a libation or sacrifice
XVI. Visitor asks to be allowed to sleep
XVII. Bed
XVIII. Bath
XIX. Host detains the visitor
XX. Guest-gifts
XXI. Departure meal
XXII. Departure libation
XXIII. Farewell blessing
XXIV. Departure omen and interpretation
XXV. Escort to visitor's next destination

This grid is of course a highly artificial abstraction, a mechanical device by which the modern reader may by conscious effort shed some light on the backdrop of inherited conventions. Homer's audience needed no such explicit analysis; Homer himself did not consciously rely on it as a pattern for the composition of his hospitality scenes. The grid is merely descriptive, not prescriptive; in practice Homer shows great flexibility in his narration of these scenes, from the three-verse description of Diocles' hospitality toward Telemachus and Pisistratus in Pherae (3.488–90) to the multi-book description of the Phaeacians' hospitality toward Odysseus in Scheria (5.388–13.187). No hospitality scene in Homer contains every element on this grid; in fact, no hospitality scene in Homer is exactly identical to any other. Yet many of these elements on the grid

are to be found in each hospitality scene, and perhaps more important, the sequence into which these elements fall seems to underlie every scene. This grid, then, reveals the "syntax" of the standard Homeric hospitality scene and provides us, an audience unfamiliar with the linguistic, poetic, and mythic acculturation of Homer's contemporary audience, with a device by which to elucidate and appreciate the operation of Homer's individual work against its backdrop of inherited conventions.[1]

Homer's audience was well versed in the conventions of epic poetry, and Homer relied on this familiarity in order to communicate with them. Such a familiarity is essential in order for an audience to appreciate the nuances and connotations of the formulaic diction; recognize significant sequences and patterns in their various combinations; detect allusions, irony, parody, humor, and foreshadowing; and, in general, distinguish between what is deliberately conventional and generic and what is innovative and unique. It is precisely this tension, between the conventional and the innovative, between the generic and the context-specific, between the background of tradition and the foreground of a particular performance, that defines the aesthetics of Homeric poetry.

The main barrier to our appreciation of the artistry of Homer is our ignorance, as a modern audience, of the backdrop of conventions against which he is working; because of our lack of proper experience with other performances, we are simply not well educated enough in the oral poetic tradition to be an effective audience. The Homeric scholar, then, must overcome, and help others overcome, the wide gap that separates us linguistically and culturally from Homer's audience, using lexica and concordances, charts of formulaic phrases, parallel verses, and scenes, comparative collections of myths and folktales, and a thorough immersion in the diction and narrative patterns of the epic poetry that has survived from this period, including the Homeric Hymns, the epic frag-

1. Almost all the conventional elements occur at least twice in Homer, most of them several times. But a simple enumeration of occurrences should not be the only criterion for judging conventionality. A conventional element may happen to occur only once in the surviving Homeric corpus. The motif of hospitality extended to horses (VIIe), for example, occurs only once in Homer (*Od.* 4.39–42), but this is because visitors arrive by horse and chariot only once in the surviving corpus. There is no reason to think that this scene was unique in epic verse; similar scenes of "horse hospitality" occur in the *Iliad,* although not in hospitality scenes (*Il.* 8.432–35; 13.34–38). And there is no reason to doubt that the motif would prove to be a regular element of hospitality scenes if more epic poetry had survived. All this also holds true for the motif of the departure omen and interpretation (XXIV), which happens to occur only once in surviving hospitality scenes (*Od.* 15.160–81).

ments, and Hesiod, while always ke
that this is but a small portion of th
Homer's audience was familiar. In th
way, we may learn to share, albeit o
level of communication between Ho
and we may thereby aspire to beco
a reasonably competent audience.[2]

The conventions of the Homeric
schematized in this introductory cha
an individual hospitality scene from
background of these conventions; h
chronic. These analyses reveal ma
transformations of conventional ele
of the *Odyssey,* some of which are o
themes of the epic whole. Finally, c
hospitality in the *Odyssey* interact
of this individual epic, anticipating
one another; hence, the perspective

The terms *synchronic* and *diachr*
opposition between the static and
but insofar as the formulae, the t
patterns of Greek epic poetry funct
the syntax of the oral poet, the ter
the opposition and balance betwe
viewed as a particular event and t
against its traditional background.
other; they are simply different pe
diachronic perspective, for example
as independent allomorphs of a co
perspective observes how these sam
other within the epic—an epic that
a particular historic performance b
perspectives cannot be separated,

2. On the challenge inherent in an oral t
185–212. Foley has maintained a fine balance
traditions of oral poetry while still apprecia
these traditions; cf. Foley 1986, 1988, 1990

3. De Saussure 1959, 79–100.

ments, and Hesiod, while always keeping in mind the salutary caution that this is but a small portion of the corpus of epic poetry with which Homer's audience was familiar. In this admittedly artificial and pedantic way, we may learn to share, albeit obscurely, in that tacit and subliminal level of communication between Homer and his contemporary audience, and we may thereby aspire to become, even in this highly literate age, a reasonably competent audience.[2]

The conventions of the Homeric hospitality scene are described and schematized in this introductory chapter. Chapters 2–8 each analyze how an individual hospitality scene from the *Odyssey* functions against the background of these conventions; hence, the perspective is largely diachronic. These analyses reveal many artistic, yet seldom appreciated, transformations of conventional elements in the major hospitality scenes of the *Odyssey,* some of which are of great importance to the underlying themes of the epic whole. Finally, chapter 9 examines how the scenes of hospitality in the *Odyssey* interact with one another within the bounds of this individual epic, anticipating, echoing, and variously informing one another; hence, the perspective is largely synchronic.

The terms *synchronic* and *diachronic* were first coined to describe the opposition between the static and evolutionary aspects of linguistics,[3] but insofar as the formulae, the type-scenes, and the larger narrative patterns of Greek epic poetry function as the diction, the grammar, and the syntax of the oral poet, the terms are equally useful for describing the opposition and balance between a performance of Homer when viewed as a particular event and that same performance when viewed against its traditional background. These viewpoints do not exclude each other; they are simply different perspectives on the same material: the diachronic perspective, for example, sees motifs repeated within an epic as independent allomorphs of a common ancestor, while the synchronic perspective observes how these same repeated motifs interact with each other within the epic—an epic that presumably reflects, however dimly, a particular historic performance before a live audience. While the two perspectives cannot be separated, and while indeed they complement

2. On the challenge inherent in an oral tradition for a literate audience, see Foley 1987, 185–212. Foley has maintained a fine balance in articulating a common aesthetic for various traditions of oral poetry while still appreciating the significant generic differences between these traditions; cf. Foley 1986, 1988, 1990.

3. De Saussure 1959, 79–100.

each other and depend upon each other for meaning, my emphasis in chapters 2–8 is primarily diachronic; in chapter 9, primarily synchronic.[4]

The scene of Athena's visit to Ithaca (see chap. 2), in its simplest form merely a messenger scene, is molded into the framework of a theoxeny, in which a divinity comes to earth to test the hospitality of mortals and is rejected by some, usually the rich and greedy, and hospitably received by others, usually the impoverished but generous. This framework of a theoxeny increases the suspense surrounding the reception of Athena in Ithaca, and it serves to accentuate the contrast between Telemachus' generous hospitality and the suitors' blatant disregard for the stranger, a theme more fully developed later in the epic, upon Odysseus' return. This contrast is articulated at every level of Homer's diction, from the short formulaic phrases to the larger elements of the conventional type-scene. Thus the poet draws the contrast between Telemachus and the suitors on the level of form as well as content.

Consideration of the hospitality that Telemachus receives from Nestor in Pylos (chap. 3) and Menelaus in Sparta (chap. 4) reveals an underlying flaw in these otherwise proper, indeed paradigmatic, hosts: both Nestor and Menelaus are overzealous in their hospitality, detaining Telemachus and thus threatening to become obstacles to his return home (νόστος). This threat of obstruction ties the experience of Telemachus thematically to that of his father: both son and father must sagaciously extricate themselves from the hands of overbearing hosts who have become obstacles to their homecomings (νόστοι).

Close attention to the deviations of the Phaeacians from the usual conventions of hospitality (chap. 5) reveals a curious ambivalence toward visitors. Scheria is not simply a realm of safety and hospitality for Odysseus; it poses obstacles to his return similar to those that he has recently confronted during his wanderings, and it poses dangers similar to those that he will soon confront in Ithaca. The ambiguity of the Phaeacians' hospitality thus connects this episode thematically both to what precedes and to what will follow.

An analysis of Polyphemus' treatment of Odysseus and his men as guests against the backdrop of conventional elements of hospitality (chap. 6) accentuates the cynical parody that colors this episode. Perhaps most memorable are Polyphemus' perversions of the rituals of feasting (IX)—rather than offering a feast to his guests, he makes a feast of

4. With good results, Foley (1990, esp. 1–19, 235–39, 386–87) applies the terms *synchronic* and *diachronic* to various comparative oral traditions.

them—and of gift giving (XX)—hi
him last. But the Cyclops also pe
conventional elements of hospitali
identity (XIa), the departure libatio
departure (XXIII), and the offer of
(XXV), all of which add to the pa

Eumaeus' hospitality toward th
follows the pattern of the convent
almost all the conventional elemer
of these elements emphasize the hi
and intensely personal nature of E
guest that he will not interrogate h
offers the portion of honor, the chi
guest a bed by the hearth, while h
gives his guest a goatskin from his
cup to drink from (X), and his ow
order to accommodate the uniquely
scene—a swineherd's hut rather tha
ified much of the inherited diction
Remarkably, it is precisely at these
concentration of late linguistic forn
ondary and derivative nature of th
preformulated diction in which to
swineherd, Homer relied more thai
ular. This raises the possibility tha
though undoubtedly a staple of po
were not part of the epic tradition
medium of dactylic hexameter vers

The final hospitality scene of t
and reception by the suitors (see cha
upon the conventional scene of hos
the suitors invert the conventiona
scene: they turn the very impleme
and the contents of the meat bask
guest, and they offer the guest "es
tination but as a slave to the wick
breaches of convention on the level
of conduct in the topsy-turvy wo
have virtually exchanged positions

ior meaning, my emphasis in
ıpter 9, primarily synchronic.[4]
(see chap. 2), in its simplest
ıed into the framework of a
ırth to test the hospitality of
the rich and greedy, and hos-
poverished but generous. This
ense surrounding the reception
:entuate the contrast between
suitors' blatant disregard for
l later in the epic, upon Odys-
every level of Homer's diction,
arger elements of the conven-
: contrast between Telemachus
ell as content.
lemachus receives from Nestor
(chap. 4) reveals an underlying
:adigmatic, hosts: both Nestor
spitality, detaining Telemachus
to his return home (νόστος).
ıce of Telemachus thematically
ıer must sagaciously extricate
hosts who have become obsta-

ıe Phaeacians from the usual
; a curious ambivalence toward
of safety and hospitality for
ı similar to those that he has
;, and it poses dangers similar
Ithaca. The ambiguity of the
s episode thematically both to

: of Odysseus and his men as
:ional elements of hospitality
ıat colors this episode. Perhaps
sions of the rituals of feasting
; guests, he makes a feast of

35–39, 386–87) applies the terms *syn-*
traditions.

them—and of gift giving (XX)—his gift to Odysseus is his offer to eat him last. But the Cyclops also perverts some of the less conspicuous conventional elements of hospitality: the formal request for a guest's identity (XIa), the departure libation (XXII), the farewell blessing upon departure (XXIII), and the offer of escort to the guest's next destination (XXV), all of which add to the parody of the scene.

Eumaeus' hospitality toward the disguised Odysseus (see chap. 7) follows the pattern of the conventional hospitality scene and includes almost all the conventional elements. Slight innovations in the details of these elements emphasize the highly proper, exceptionally generous, and intensely personal nature of Eumaeus' hospitality: he assures his guest that he will not interrogate him until after he has eaten (XIa); he offers the portion of honor, the chine, to his guest (IX); he provides his guest a bed by the hearth, while he himself sleeps outside (XVII); he gives his guest a goatskin from his own bed as a seat (VIII), his own cup to drink from (X), and his own cloak as a blanket (XVII). Yet in order to accommodate the uniquely humble and unheroic setting of this scene—a swineherd's hut rather than a king's palace—the poet has modified much of the inherited diction of the conventional hospitality scene. Remarkably, it is precisely at these points of modification that a high concentration of late linguistic forms can be detected, revealing the secondary and derivative nature of this scene. In the absence of inherited, preformulated diction in which to describe the humble hospitality of a swineherd, Homer relied more than usual on his own linguistic vernacular. This raises the possibility that such tales of swineherd hospitality, though undoubtedly a staple of popular folktale from the earliest times, were not part of the epic tradition passed down to Homer through the medium of dactylic hexameter verse.

The final hospitality scene of the *Odyssey,* Odysseus' homecoming and reception by the suitors (see chap. 8), is also structured architecturally upon the conventional scene of hospitality. But in almost every instance, the suitors invert the conventional elements of the proper hospitality scene: they turn the very implements of hospitality—footstools (VIII) and the contents of the meat basket (IX)—into weapons to hurl at the guest, and they offer the guest "escort" (XXV) not to his desired destination but as a slave to the wicked king Echetus. The suitors' many breaches of convention on the level of form mirror their actual breaches of conduct in the topsy-turvy world of Ithaca, where host and guest have virtually exchanged positions.

Descriptive Synopses of Conventions of Hospitality

The following detailed descriptions of each of the thirty-eight conventional elements that make up the Homeric hospitality scene, both in their standard forms and in their various transformations, were elicited largely from the eighteen scenes of hospitality under consideration. A schema of each of these eighteen scenes of hospitality may be seen in synoptic form in the Appendix.

I. Maiden at the Well/Youth on the Road

Four times in the *Odyssey*, a newly arrived stranger encounters at a fountain, well, or river a young maiden who is kind to him and directs him to the city or palace. The various occurrences of this motif seem to inform one another, and in this case, the earlier occurrences seem to provide the pattern—on a linguistic level the diction, grammar, and syntax—in a standard form whereby later transformations of the motif may be appreciated for their emotional and aesthetic value. First, the shipwrecked Odysseus meets Nausicaa washing clothes at a river; in this very elaborate version of the motif, the princess assists him and directs him to her father's palace (6.110–322). Second, in a shorter doublet of this episode that occurs soon thereafter, Odysseus approaches the city and meets Athena, who, disguised as a young girl carrying a water jar, directs him to Alcinous' palace (7.18–81). Third, in a less auspicious version of the motif, Odysseus' men meet with the daughter of the Laestrygonian king, who is drawing water at a spring; she too directs the men to her father's palace, but with a less fortunate outcome (10.103–11). And fourth, Eumaeus tells a tale about how Phoenician traders met a Sidonian slave girl from his father's house washing clothes at the beach; an erotic encounter with one of the men leads to her aiding them in looting the palace and kidnapping Eumaeus (15.415–84). A version of this motif also occurs in the *Hymn to Demeter* (98–183): Demeter encounters the daughters of Celeos by the spring Parthenion, where they have come to draw water, and is led by them to the palace.[5]

This motif must have had its basis in historical reality; the town well was one of the few places in archaic Greece where a young man might encounter an unmarried maiden. It is often the site of abduction, both in

5. On the traditional nature of this scene, see Richardson 1974, 179–80, 339–43.

Greek myth and in art. But the mot
It is a universal tale that knows no g
Four times in the *Odyssey*, the
motif, in which a young man, twi
newly arrived stranger and directs
himself to a young man, meets O
and instructs him about how to
Athena, in the form of a young
arrived Odysseus on Ithaca, and s
his wife and palace, advising him t
Eumaeus (13.221–440). The son o
comes to the aid of the shipwrec
father's palace (14.314–20). In a ra
the abusive goatherd Melanthius
palace at the spring of the nymph
palace, he warns him to stay awa
also occurs in the *Iliad* (24.334–4
young man, meets Priam, who is
and escorts him to Achilles' camp

II. Arrival at

A hospitality scene is initiated by th
Whether this destination is an isla
a cave, the visitor's arrival is alm
verb ἱκνέομαι: ἵκετο (5.57, etc.),
ἱκόμεσθα (10.13, etc.), ἷξε (*Il.*
(*H.Aphr.* 68), ἀφίκετο (5.55, etc
(9.181, etc.), ἀφίκανε (*H.Aphr.*
ἤϊα 10.309; ἴε 7.82), ἔρχομαι (ἐρχ
μεν 10.87), or βαίνω (βῆν 10.60; π
ἐδύσετο (17.336), and εὗρον (10.

IIIa–c. Descriptio

Upon a visitor's arrival at his desti
tion of the physical residence and
at least of their appearance.

6. Thompson 1955–58, N715.1. For oc
24:10–61), Rachel (Gen. 29:1–20), Zippo

ntions of Hospitality

ach of the thirty-eight conven-
ieric hospitality scene, both in
s transformations, were elicited
pitality under consideration. A
; of hospitality may be seen in

uth on the Road

rived stranger encounters at a
who is kind to him and directs
occurrences of this motif seem
the earlier occurrences seem to
vel the diction, grammar, and
er transformations of the motif
and aesthetic value. First, the
ashing clothes at a river; in this
princess assists him and directs
Second, in a shorter doublet of
, Odysseus approaches the city
young girl carrying a water jar,
31). Third, in a less auspicious
neet with the daughter of the
iter at a spring; she too directs
less fortunate outcome (10.103–
out how Phoenician traders met
ise washing clothes at the beach;
en leads to her aiding them in
iaeus (15.415–84). A version of
neter (98–183): Demeter encoun-
ng Parthenion, where they have
1 to the palace.[5]
historical reality; the town well
eece where a young man might
en the site of abduction, both in

Richardson 1974, 179–80, 339–43.

Greek myth and in art. But the motif is not restricted to the Greek world; it is a universal tale that knows no geographical bounds.[6]

Four times in the *Odyssey*, there occurs a male counterpart to this motif, in which a young man, twice the son of a king, gives aid to a newly arrived stranger and directs him to the palace. Hermes, likening himself to a young man, meets Odysseus on his way to Circe's palace and instructs him about how to conduct himself there (10.274–306). Athena, in the form of a young man, is the first to meet the newly arrived Odysseus on Ithaca, and she instructs him about how to regain his wife and palace, advising him to go first to the hut of the swineherd Eumaeus (13.221–440). The son of Pheidon, king of the Thesprotians, comes to the aid of the shipwrecked Odysseus and leads him to his father's palace (14.314–20). In a rather contorted version of this motif, the abusive goatherd Melanthius encounters Odysseus en route to his palace at the spring of the nymphs, but instead of directing him to the palace, he warns him to stay away (17.204–53). A version of this motif also occurs in the *Iliad* (24.334–467), where Hermes, in the form of a young man, meets Priam, who is on his way to recover Hector's body, and escorts him to Achilles' camp.

II. Arrival at the Destination

A hospitality scene is initiated by the arrival of a visitor at his destination. Whether this destination is an island, a harbor, a city, a palace, or even a cave, the visitor's arrival is almost always signified by a form of the verb ἱκνέομαι: ἵκετο (5.57, etc.), ἵκοντο (3.388, etc.), ἷξον (3.5, etc.), ἱκόμεσθα (10.13, etc.), ἷξε (*Il.* 6.172), ἱκέσθην (*Il.* 9.185), ἵκανεν (*H.Aphr.* 68), ἀφίκετο (5.55, etc.), ἀφίκοντο (*Il.* 24.448), ἀφικόμεθα (9.181, etc.), ἀφίκανε (*H.Aphr.* 75). Rarely a form of εἶμι (ἤϊεν 5.57; ἤϊα 10.309; ἴε 7.82), ἔρχομαι (ἐρχομένω 17.261; ἦλθε [*Il.*18.381]; ἤλθομεν 10.87), or βαίνω (βῆν 10.60; προσέβη 14.1) is used; κίεν (*Il.* 24.471), ἐδύσετο (17.336), and εὗρον (10.210) each occur once.

IIIa–c. Description of the Surroundings

Upon a visitor's arrival at his destination there is almost always a description of the physical residence and of the activities of the inhabitants, or at least of their appearance.

6. Thompson 1955–58, N715.1. For occurrences in the Old Testament—Rebekah (Gen. 24:10–61), Rachel (Gen. 29:1–20), Zipporah (Exod. 2:15b–21)—see Alter 1981, 51–62.

a. Of the Residence

Often the sight of the residence inspires awe in the visitor, as do Menelaus' and Alcinous' palaces and Calypso's and Polyphemus' caves: ἰδόντες θαύμαζον (4.43–44); τάρπησαν ὁρώμενοι ὀφθαλμοῖσιν (4.47); σέβας μ᾽ ἔχει εἰσορόωντα (4.75); θηήσαιτο ἰδὼν καὶ τερφθείη φρεσὶν ᾗσιν (5.74); στὰς θηεῖτο (5.75, 7.133); θηήσατο θυμῷ (5.76, 7.134). Whether the residence is a swineherd's hut, a god's palace, or a warrior's tent, it is typically described in a syntactic structure in which a series of adjectives describing the building is followed by a relative clause acknowledging the builder (14.5–10; *Il.* 18.369–71; 24.448–50; cf. *Od.* 24.205–7).

b–c. Of (the Activities of) the Person Sought and Others

The visitor commonly "catches sight"—εὗρε, εὗρον, εὕρομεν (1.106; 4.3; 7.136; 9.217; 10.113; 14.5; *Il.* 9.186; 11.771; 18.372; 24.473; *H.Aphr.* 76), alternatively τέτμεν (5.58), ἔτετμεν (5.81), ἐκίχανον (10.60), ἄκουον (10.221), γιγνώσκω (17.269)—of the inhabitant(s), who is usually involved in the activities of the banquet: sacrifice, libation, feast preparation, eating and drinking, lyre and song. An account of the inhabitant(s) is often given, even when he is not home: Odysseus is down at the shore weeping (5.81–84), Polyphemus is out herding cattle (9.216–17), Eumaeus' fellow workers are attending to the pigs (14.24–28; 16.3), and Anchises' companions are grazing the cows (*H.Aphr.* 78–80). A particularly striking example of Homer's tendency to adhere to the conventional schema is his substitution, in the face of Polyphemus' absence from his cave upon Odysseus' arrival, of a description not of what Polyphemus is doing but of what he usually does, and his further substitution, in view of the absence of companions, of a remark on the Cyclops' notorious isolation from society (9.187–92).

IV. Dog at the Door

Often a newly arrived stranger confronts a guard dog at the door. This motif occurs five times in the *Odyssey* in a variety of forms, the unique properties of each occurrence providing a special aura and significance to the respective scene. The immortal gold and silver dogs, the work of Hephaestus, that guard the palace of the Phaeacian king Alcinous, hint at the supernatural qualities of the inhabitants and contribute to the

extravagant splendor of the pal
Odysseus with awe (7.91–94). Th
the enchanted wolves and moun
which fawn on the men and wa
their master, foreshadows the da
in the palace (10.212–19). The fo
beasts (14.21), attack Odysseus
ground, even as he arrives "at his
presage his treatment at the han
symbolize the initial helplessness
32).[7] Later, upon the arrival of T
but with fawning and tail-wagg
ognize (16.4–10). Then, in a rat
same dogs, upon the arrival of
other side of the steading (16.162-
of receptions of strangers by do
his old dog Argus (17.291–327).
bitten dog, neglected by the hou
is a sympathetic representation o
and neglected.[8]

V. Waiting

The area in front of the door
σταθμῷ), and specifically the t
bolic and practical function in H
did in the historic society tha
boundary between the worlds of
this physical boundary, the vis
of the master of the house. Typ
for some time, waiting for th
hospitality or send him elsewhe

7. Note that Odysseus himself later
8. Edwards (1987a, 76–77; 1987b,
mations of type-scenes, attributes this
genius of the poet; I agree. For a full
dog, house, and master in the *Odysse*
9. No visitor in Homer is actually
sending Telemachus and Pisistratus to
Sparta (4.28–29).

in the visitor, as do Menelaus'
Polyphemus' caves: ἰδόντες
ι ὀφθαλμοῖσιν (4.47); σέβας
ὸν καὶ τερφθείη φρεσὶν ᾗσιν
ο θυμῷ (5.76, 7.134). Whether
; palace, or a warrior's tent, it
e in which a series of adjectives
relative clause acknowledging
8–50; cf. *Od.* 24.205–7).

ought and Others

–εὗρε, εὗρον, εὕρομεν (1.106;
11.771; 18.372; 24.473; *H.Aphr.*
5.81), ἐκίχανον (10.60), ἄκουον
inhabitant(s), who is usually
: sacrifice, libation, feast prep-
song. An account of the inhab-
not home: Odysseus is down at
us is out herding cattle (9.216–
ling to the pigs (14.24–28; 16.3),
the cows (*H.Aphr.* 78–80). A
's tendency to adhere to the con-
the face of Polyphemus' absence
, of a description not of what
sually does, and his further sub-
ompanions, of a remark on the
ety (9.187–92).

ie Door

nts a guard dog at the door. This
in a variety of forms, the unique
ng a special aura and significance
gold and silver dogs, the work of
the Phaeacian king Alcinous, hint
nhabitants and contribute to the

extravagant splendor of the palace, which inspires the newly arrived Odysseus with awe (7.91–94). The eerie reception of Odysseus' men by the enchanted wolves and mountain lions surrounding Circe's palace, which fawn on the men and wag their tails at them like dogs greeting their master, foreshadows the danger of enchantment that awaits them in the palace (10.212–19). The four dogs of Eumaeus, which, like wild beasts (14.21), attack Odysseus and force him to sit helplessly on the ground, even as he arrives "at his own steading" (ᾧ πὰρ σταθμῷ 14.32), presage his treatment at the hands of the suitors in his own home and symbolize the initial helplessness of the returned master (14.21–22, 29–32).[7] Later, upon the arrival of Telemachus, these same dogs do not bark but with fawning and tail-wagging welcome a master whom they recognize (16.4–10). Then, in a rather humorous finale to this series, these same dogs, upon the arrival of Athena, cower, with a whimper, to the other side of the steading (16.162–63). The culmination of this progression of receptions of strangers by dogs at the door is Odysseus' reception by his old dog Argus (17.291–327). It is a powerful scene. The old, flea-bitten dog, neglected by the household, lying in dung outside the door, is a sympathetic representation of his master: Odysseus too will be abused and neglected.[8]

V. Waiting at the Threshold

The area in front of the doorway (ἐν προθύροισι, εἰνὶ θύρῃσι, πὰρ σταθμῷ), and specifically the threshold (οὐδός) itself, has both a symbolic and practical function in Homeric hospitality scenes, as it no doubt did in the historic society that underlies the epics. It is the physical boundary between the worlds of the outsider and insider, and by crossing this physical boundary, the visitor places himself under the protection of the master of the house. Typically the visitor remains at the doorway for some time, waiting for the master to notice him and either offer hospitality or send him elsewhere.[9] If the visitor is a social equal, coming

7. Note that Odysseus himself later addresses the suitors as "dogs" (ὦ κύνες 22.35)

8. Edwards (1987a, 76–77; 1987b, 54), in his discussion of expansions and transformations of type-scenes, attributes this varied usage of a common motif to the original genius of the poet; I agree. For a fuller exposition of the thematic relationship between dog, house, and master in the *Odyssey*, see Beck 1991.

9. No visitor in Homer is actually sent away, but Eteoneus raises the possibility of sending Telemachus and Pisistratus to someone else for hospitality upon their arrival in Sparta (4.28–29).

as a messenger (ἄγγελος) or a guest (ξεῖνος), he stands at the doorway: στῆ . . . ἐπὶ προθύροις . . . οὐδοῦ ἐπ' αὐλείου (1.103–4); ἐν προθύροισι δόμων . . . στῆσαν (4.20–22); ἔνθα στάς (5.75); ἱσταμένῳ, πρὶν χάλκεον οὐδὸν ἱκέσθαι (7.83); ἔνθα στάς . . . ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἐβήσετο δώματος εἴσω (7.133–35); ἔσταν δ' ἐν προθύροισι (10.220); ἔστην δ' εἰνὶ θύρῃσι . . . ἔνθα στάς (10.310–11); ἔστη ἐνὶ προθύροισι (16.12); στήτην ἐρχομένω (17.261); στὰν δὲ πρόσθ' αὐτοῖο (*Il.* 9.193); στῆμεν ἐνὶ προθύροισι (*Il.* 11.777); ἐπ' οὐδὸν ἔβη ποσί (*H.Dem.* 188); στῆ δ' αὐτοῦ προπάροιθε (*H.Aphr.* 81). If the visitor is a social inferior, coming as a beggar (πτωχός) or a suppliant (ἱκέτης), he sits at the doorway in a posture that symbolizes submission and helplessness: παρὰ σταθμοῖσιν ἐπ' οὐδοῦ ἑζόμεθ' (10.62–63); ἕζετο . . . ἔνθα κεν ᾧ πὰρ σταθμῷ (14.31–32); ἷζε δ' ἐπὶ μελίνου οὐδοῦ ἔντοσθε θυράων, κλινάμενος σταθμῷ (17.339–40).

By modifying and adapting this conventional element of waiting at the threshold, Homer sometimes emphasizes the setting of a particular scene. Odysseus and his men disregard the sanctity of the threshold by entering Polyphemus' cave uninvited (9.216–18); appropriately Polyphemus places a huge rock on this very threshold (9.240–43), as though to make inaccessible what had previously been too accessible. The goddess Demeter's presence at the doorway of Celeos' palace takes on the form of a divine epiphany, as she fills the doorway with her greatness and radiance (*H.Dem.* 188–89). Upon his homecoming, Odysseus not only waits at the threshold of his own palace but maintains a permanent position there (17.339–41; 20.257–59); his ambiguous status—whether master or beggar, insider or outsider—is thus visualized by his position in this liminal space.

VI. Supplication

In three hospitality scenes—Odysseus and the Phaeacians, Odysseus and Polyphemus, Priam and Achilles—the visitor is in such dire straits that he initially approaches his host not as a guest but as a suppliant, assuming the standard position of the suppliant by prostrating himself and clasping the knees of his host, a type of physical contact that entailed a powerful ritual sanctity: ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' Ἀρήτης βάλε γούνασι χεῖρας (7.141); σά τε γούναθ' ἱκάνω (7.147); τὰ σὰ γοῦνα ἱκόμεθ' (9.266–67); χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος λάβε γούνατα (*Il.* 24.478).[10] Both Alcinous and Achilles gen-

10. The full range of physical gesture in a proper supplication—prostration, clasping

erously elevate their suppliants to
the hand and lifting them up (χει
ἀνίστη *Il.* 24.515; cf. *Od.* 14.319).
θρόνου εἷσε 7.169; ἕζευ ἐπὶ θρόν
them in a manner appropriate tc
phemus, who does not care for Z
pliants and guests" (ἐπιτιμήτωρ ἱ
such consideration.

VIIa–i

A host's reception of a visitor fol
catches sight of the visitor, hesitat
from his seat, approaches him, a
hand, bids him welcome, relieves
the house. As usual Homer show
includes the entire range of eler
none of them, and some elemer
elements that do occur generally

a. Host Catches Sight of the Vi

It is often the youngest son of th
a visitor and rises to greet him
Pisistratus in Pylos (3.36), Ach
sighting of the visitor is usually
πολὺ πρῶτος ἴδε (1.113), εἴσιδ'
ἰδοῦσα (5.78), ἰδόντες, θαύμαζο
18.382), θάμβησεν ἰδών (*Il.* 24.
it is signified by ταφών (16.12;

Homer often manipulates this
effect. While Telemachus is "by
ἴδε 1.113) Athena-Mentes standi
ious to her presence; this contra
separates the proper and impro

(even kissing) the knees, and taking h
plication of Zeus (*Il.* 1.498–527; 8.370–
on the relationship between suppliancy
institution, see Gould 1973.

erously elevate their suppliants to the level of guests by taking them by the hand and lifting them up (χειρὸς ἑλὼν . . . ὦρσεν 7.168–69; χειρὸς ἀνίστη *Il.* 24.515; cf. *Od.* 14.319), seating them on a seat of honor (ἐπὶ θρόνου εἷσε 7.169; ἕζευ ἐπὶ θρόνου *Il.* 24.522), and thereafter treating them in a manner appropriate to guests rather than suppliants. Polyphemus, who does not care for Zeus (9.272–78), the "protector of suppliants and guests" (ἐπιτιμήτωρ ἱκετάων τε ξείνων τε 9.270), shows no such consideration.

VIIa-i. Reception

A host's reception of a visitor follows a conventional sequence: the host catches sight of the visitor, hesitates at first to offer hospitality, then rises from his seat, approaches him, attends to his horses, takes him by the hand, bids him welcome, relieves him of his spear, and leads him into the house. As usual Homer shows great flexibility: no hospitality scene includes the entire range of elements, some hospitality scenes contain none of them, and some elements occur only once or twice. But the elements that do occur generally follow this sequence.

a. Host Catches Sight of the Visitor

It is often the youngest son of the master of the house who first notices a visitor and rises to greet him: Telemachus in Ithaca (1.113; 17.328), Pisistratus in Pylos (3.36), Achilles in Phthia (*Il.* 11.777). The actual sighting of the visitor is usually signified by a form of the verb ὁράω: πολὺ πρῶτος ἴδε (1.113), εἶσιδ' (1.118), ἴδον (3.34; 14.29), ἴδετο (4.22), ἰδοῦσα (5.78), ἰδόντες, θαύμαζον δ' ὁρόωντες (7.144–45), ἴδε (*Il.* 9.195; 18.382), θάμβησεν ἰδών (*Il.* 24.483), ὁρόων (*H.Aphr.* 84); occasionally it is signified by ταφών (16.12; *Il.* 9.193; 11.777).

Homer often manipulates this conventional element with great artistic effect. While Telemachus is "by far the first to notice" (πολύ πρῶτος ἴδε 1.113) Athena-Mentes standing at the door, the suitors remain oblivious to her presence; this contrast draws attention to the wide gulf that separates the proper and improper hosts. In Sparta, not the host but

---

(even kissing) the knees, and taking hold of the chin—can best be seen in Thetis' supplication of Zeus (*Il.* 1.498–527; 8.370–72). On the physical gestures of supplication, and on the relationship between suppliancy in Greek literature and its reality as a historical institution, see Gould 1973.

the official herald of the palace notices Telemachus and Pisistratus at the door (4.22–23); this herald embodies the extravagant, but somewhat impersonal, hospitality that awaits these guests in Sparta. At Eumaeus' hut, not Eumaeus but the dogs first notice the visitor (ἴδον 14.29); the danger they pose to Odysseus foreshadows the danger he will soon face from the "dogs" (ὦ κύνες) in his own palace, as Odysseus himself calls the suitors (22.35). The description of Metaneira's first sight of Demeter at the door is expanded to include the great fear that overcomes her (*H.Dem.* 190); this anticipates the divine epiphany of the goddess.

b. Host Hesitates to Offer Hospitality

Telemachus, a paradigm of a proper host, is anxious that his guest not suffer the indignity of waiting for a long time at the door (νεμεσσήθη δ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ ξεῖνον δηθὰ θύρῃσιν ἐφεστάμεν 1.119–20). But this is exactly what happens in two other hospitality scenes. In Sparta, Menelaus' herald Eteoneus sees Telemachus and Pisistratus at the door, but instead of hastening to them and leading them in, he goes to consult with Menelaus as to whether they should offer the visitors hospitality or send them elsewhere. Menelaus angrily rebukes him and orders him to lead the visitors in (4.24–36). Similarly, in Scheria, Alcinous and Arete fail to respond to their suppliant Odysseus, who is sitting in the ashes of the hearth, until the old hero Echeneus, "after some time" (ὀψέ 7.155), reprimands them for their inhospitality and bids them to provide a seat and a meal and to offer a libation to Zeus, who looks after suppliants (7.153–66).

The immediate context of both these scenes provides sufficient excuse for hesitation: the Spartans are in the middle of a wedding celebration; the Phaeacians are simply incapacitated by their surprise at the sudden appearance of a stranger in their midst. Outside the immediate context, too, there appears to be some motive for hesitation: the Spartans' hospitality had previously been violated by their most notorious guest, Paris, who had seized his host's wife;[11] the Phaeacians had been fated to suffer punishment at the hands of Poseidon for their hospitable provision of an escort for strangers (13.170–83). But the Spartans' and Phaeacians' ambivalence toward strangers, and the Phaeacians' reputed intolerance of foreigners generally (7.32–33), is perhaps also a reflection of the basic

11. This is the explanation given by the scholiast to 4.26.

ambivalence of archaic Greek societ
who could prove to be either frien
encapsulated in the term ξεῖνος, whi
"a guest-friend from a foreign coun
respect of an 'insider'" (a φίλος), to
is outside one's own social group"

c. Host Rises from his Seat

When a host catches sight of a visit
in order to welcome him; the verb is
11.777), alternatively ἀνέστη (*Il.*
appear to yield their own seats to v
goddess Demeter (εἶξε δέ οἱ κλισ
respect for the aged Priam (ἀπὸ θρ
553, 597).[13]

d. Host Approaches the Visitor

Since it is improper to let a visito
approaches him quickly: βῆ δ' ἰθὺς
συτο (4.37); αἶψ' ἐξελθοῦσα (10.23
ρον (14.33–34).

e. Host Attends to the Visitor's Ho

In Homeric hospitality scenes, there
being extended to horses—Menelau
machus' and Pisistratus' horses in
should not be regarded as unconve
to the rarity of arrivals by chariot
parable scenes of attending to horse
are fairly common in the *Iliad* (cf.
5.368–69, 775–77; 8.49–50, 440–41

12. On the semantic range of ξεῖνος, se
alence toward strangers is reflected in the e
On this ambivalence in an Indo-European
13. R.M. Frazer (1971) notes the delicat
up his royal θρόνος to Priam and taking a

ambivalence of archaic Greek society toward strangers, a dubious class who could prove to be either friendly or hostile. This ambivalence is encapsulated in the term ξεῖνος, which has a broad semantic range, from "a guest-friend from a foreign country, who is to be treated with all the respect of an 'insider'" (a φίλος), to "a potentially hostile stranger, who is outside one's own social group" (a non-φίλος).[12]

c. *Host Rises from his Seat*

When a host catches sight of a visitor at the door, he rises from his seat in order to welcome him; the verb is usually ἀνόρουσε (16.12; *Il.* 9.193; 11.777), alternatively ἀνέστη (*Il.* 9.195). In two instances, the hosts appear to yield their own seats to visitors, Metaneira out of fear of the goddess Demeter (εἶξε δέ οἱ κλισμοῖο *H.Dem.* 191), Achilles out of respect for the aged Priam (ἀπὸ θρόνου ὦρτο *Il.* 24.515; cf. *Il.* 24.522, 553, 597).[13]

d. *Host Approaches the Visitor*

Since it is improper to let a visitor linger at the door, a proper host approaches him quickly: βῆ δ' ἰθὺς προθύροιο (1.119); μεγάροιο διέσσυτο (4.37); αἶψ' ἐξελθοῦσα (10.230, 312); ὦκα ... ἔσσυτ' ἀνὰ πρόθυρον (14.33–34).

e. *Host Attends to the Visitor's Horses*

In Homeric hospitality scenes, there is only one occurrence of hospitality being extended to horses—Menelaus' generous accommodation of Telemachus' and Pisistratus' horses in Sparta (4.39–42). But this element should not be regarded as unconventional; its uniqueness is due simply to the rarity of arrivals by chariot in Homeric hospitality scenes. Comparable scenes of attending to horses, although not in hospitality scenes, are fairly common in the *Iliad* (cf. especially 8.432–35; 13.34–38; also 5.368–69, 775–77; 8.49–50, 440–41).

12. On the semantic range of ξεῖνος, see H. Kakridis 1963, 87–105. A similar ambivalence toward strangers is reflected in the etymologically related Latin *hostis* and *hospes*. On this ambivalence in an Indo-European context, see Benveniste 1969, 65–101.

13. R.M. Frazer (1971) notes the delicate point of etiquette involved in Achilles giving up his royal θρόνος to Priam and taking a lesser κλισμός for himself.

SKIDMORE COLLEGE LIBRARY

ices Telemachus and Pisistratus at
lies the extravagant, but somewhat
iese guests in Sparta. At Eumaeus'
notice the visitor (ἴδον 14.29); the
adows the danger he will soon face
n palace, as Odysseus himself calls
f Metaneira's first sight of Demeter
the great fear that overcomes her
ivine epiphany of the goddess.

ty

host, is anxious that his guest not
long time at the door (νεμεσσήθη
στάμεν 1.119–20). But this is exactly
scenes. In Sparta, Menelaus' herald
stratus at the door, but instead of
in, he goes to consult with Menelaus
e visitors hospitality or send them
s him and orders him to lead the
Scheria, Alcinous and Arete fail to
s, who is sitting in the ashes of the
is, "after some time" (ὀψέ 7.155),
lity and bids them to provide a seat
to Zeus, who looks after suppliants

hese scenes provides sufficient excuse
he middle of a wedding celebration;
ated by their surprise at the sudden
idst. Outside the immediate context,
ve for hesitation: the Spartans' hos-
by their most notorious guest, Paris,
Phaeacians had been fated to suffer
on for their hospitable provision of
But the Spartans' and Phaeacians'
the Phaeacians' reputed intolerance
perhaps also a reflection of the basic

scholiast to 4.26.

f. Host Takes the Visitor by the Hand

A host first makes physical contact with a visitor by grasping (αἱρέω) one or both of his hands—only the right hand is specified, never the left: χεῖρ' ἕλε δεξιτερήν (1.121); ἀμφοτέρων ἕλε χεῖρα (3.37); χειρὸς ἑλών (7.168; *Il.* 11.778); ἐν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρί (*Il.* 18.384, 423).

Homer manipulates this conventional element in several scenes. Eumaeus, in his joy at seeing his master Telemachus, "kisses both his hands" (κύσσε . . . χεῖρας τ' ἀμφοτέρας 16.15–16). Achilles, after pushing Priam away from his knees (*Il.* 24.508), "lifts him up by the hand" (χειρὸς ἀνίστη *Il.* 24.515), signifying by this gesture his elevation of Priam's status from suppliant to guest (cf. *Od.* 14.319). Anchises "seizes Aphrodite by the hand" (λάβε χεῖρα *H.Aphr.* 155), a gesture evocative of a seduction scene, in which a man is leading a maiden to bed.

g. Host Bids the Visitor Welcome

Sometimes a host greets a visitor with a formal welcoming speech. The content of the speech varies, but it is usually introduced with the greeting χαῖρε followed by a vocative: χαῖρε ξεῖνε (1.123), χαῖρετον (4.60; *Il.* 9.197), χαῖρε γύναι (*H.Dem.* 213), χαῖρε ἄνασσ' (*H.Aphr.* 92).

h. Host Takes the Visitor's Spear

In two hospitality scenes, Athena-Mentes in Ithaca and Telemachus and Eumaeus, the host relieves the visitor of his spear before he enters the house: ἐδέξατο χάλκεον ἔγχος (1.121; 16.40; cf. 15.282). This gesture perhaps had its origin in the historic society underlying the epics, where it served the practical function of disarming a potentially dangerous stranger. In the hospitality scene in Ithaca, this element is elaborated to emphasize Telemachus' generous and personal hospitality toward Athena-Mentes: he places her spear in his father's own spear stand (1.127–29).

i. Host Leads the Visitor In

Finally a host leads (ἄγω, ἡγέομαι) a visitor into the house, and the visitor follows (ἕπομαι): ἡγεῖθ', ἡ δ' ἕσπετο (1.125); εἰσῆγον (4.43); ἕπεο προτέρω ([5.91]; *Il.* 18.387); ἕποντο (10.231); εἰσαγαγοῦσα (10.233, 314); ἑπόμην (10.313); ἕπεο (14.45); ἡγήσατο (14.48); εἰσα-

γαγών (14.49); προτέρω ἄγε (*Il.* 9
ἄγε (*Il.* 18.388). This gesture of es
over the threshold, and into the ho
between the two: the visitor agrees
host agrees to protect the visitor w
that whereas Eumaeus "leads" (ἡγ
guised Odysseus into his hut, whe
arrives soon thereafter, he does not
the swineherd's hut of his own acc

VIII

Once inside the house, a host's fir
proper host offers a seat at the pl
offers to Athena-Mentes his own
Priam (*Il.* 24.515, 522, 553, 597)
191); in Pylos, Pisistratus seats Tel
his brother Thrasymedes (3.36–39);
are seated beside Menelaus (4.51);
Odysseus at the place of his own

Several different formulae are u
Sometimes a simple invitation to
Il. 11.778; *H.Dem.* 191). The actu
verbs ἕζομαι, ἵζω, ἱδρύω, εἷσα, an
5.86; 7.169, 469; 10.233, 314, 366;
553). A rather longer formulaic
ἑξείης ἕζοντο κατὰ κλισμούς τε
alternatively modified to ἐξέσθην
ους τε (15.134) and εἷσεν δ' εἰσα
τε (10.233). The most elaborate e
mula, with some variation in the
a footstool (1.130–31; 10.314–[15]

αὐτὴν δ' ἐς θρόνον εἷσεν ἄγ
καλὸν δαιδάλεον· ὑπὸ δὲ θρ

εἷσε δέ μ' εἰσαγαγοῦσα ἐπὶ θ
καλοῦ δαιδαλέου· ὑπὸ δὲ θρ

γαγών (14.49); προτέρω ἄγε (*Il.* 9.199); ἐς δ' ἄγε (*Il.* 11.778); πρόσω ἄγε (*Il.* 18.388). This gesture of escorting a stranger from the outside, over the threshold, and into the house, symbolizes a reciprocal contract between the two: the visitor agrees to submit to the host's authority; the host agrees to protect the visitor while in his house. It is notable, then, that whereas Eumaeus "leads" (ἡγήσατο, εἰσαγαγών 14.48–49) the disguised Odysseus into his hut, when Telemachus, his recognized master, arrives soon thereafter, he does not lead him in; Telemachus simply enters the swineherd's hut of his own accord (εἴσελθε 16.25; ἴεν 16.41).

VIII. Seat

Once inside the house, a host's first provision for a visitor is a seat. A proper host offers a seat at the place of honor: Telemachus apparently offers to Athena-Mentes his own seat (1.130–32), as does Achilles to Priam (*Il.* 24.515, 522, 553, 597) and Metaneira to Demeter (*H.Dem.* 191); in Pylos, Pisistratus seats Telemachus beside his father, Nestor, and his brother Thrasymedes (3.36–39); in Sparta, Telemachus and Pisistratus are seated beside Menelaus (4.51); in Scheria, Alcinous makes room for Odysseus at the place of his own son Laodamas (7.169–71; cf. 7.468).

Several different formulae are used to describe the seating of visitors. Sometimes a simple invitation to sit suffices: ἑδριάασθαι ἄνωγον (3.35; *Il.* 11.778; *H.Dem.* 191). The actual seating is signified by a form of the verbs ἕζομαι, ἵζω, ἱδρύω, εἷσα, and καθεῖσα (1.130, 145; 3.37, 389; 4.51; 5.86; 7.169, 469; 10.233, 314, 366; 14.49; 15.134; *Il.* 9.200; 18.389; 24.522, 553). A rather longer formulaic expression occurs with some variety: ἑξείης ἕζοντο κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε (1.145; 3.389; cf. 24.385), alternatively modified to ἑξέσθην δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε (15.134) and εἷσεν δ' εἰσαγαγοῦσα κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε (10.233). The most elaborate expression for seating is a two-verse formula, with some variation in the first verse, which adds a description of a footstool (1.130–31; 10.314–[15] = 366–67; *Il.* 18.389–90):

> αὐτὴν δ' ἐς θρόνον εἷσεν ἄγων, ὑπὸ λῖτα πετάσσας,
> καλὸν δαιδάλεον· ὑπὸ δὲ θρῆνυς ποσὶν ἦεν.

> εἷσε δέ μ' εἰσαγαγοῦσα ἐπὶ θρόνου ἀργυροήλου,
> καλοῦ δαιδαλέου· ὑπὸ δὲ θρῆνυς ποσὶν ἦεν.

τὴν μὲν ἔπειτα καθεῖσεν ἐπὶ θρόνου ἀργυροήλου,
καλοῦ δαιδαλέου· ὑπὸ δὲ θρῆνυς ποσὶν ἦεν.

Niceties of etiquette may be observed in the types of seats offered to visitors: θρόνος, κλισμός, and δίφρος. The θρόνος, a chair with upright back and armrests, is usually reserved for gods and nobles (gods 5.86, 195; *Il.* 8.199, 442; 14.238; 15.124, 142; 18.389, 422; 20.62; *H.Ap.* 9; nobles 6.308; 7.95; 8.422; 16.408; 17.32; 18.157; 20.150; 21.139, 166; 22.23; 23.164; *Il.* 11.645; 24.515) and for guests who are invited to take the seat of honor (1.130; 4.51; 5.86, 195; 7.162, 169; 8.65, 469; 10.314, 352, 354, 366; *Il.* 18.389; 24.522, 533), but it is never used by women. The κλισμός, a chair with a reclined back, is used by men when feasting or relaxing (17.90; *Il.* 9.200; 11.623; 24.597) and by women (4.136; 17.97; *H.Dem.* 191, 193). The δίφρος, a stool, is used especially by subordinates and servants (17.330; 19.97, 101, 506; 20.259; 21.243; *Il.* 24.578; *H.Dem.* 198).[14]

It is indicative of Telemachus' generous hospitality that he offers Athena-Mentes a θρόνος with a footstool (θρῆνυς) for her feet, while he takes a κλισμός for himself (1.130–32). Achilles likewise shows proper etiquette by offering his θρόνος to Priam (*Il.* 24.515, 522, 553) and taking for himself a κλισμός (*Il.* 24.597); meanwhile, Priam's herald is made to sit on a δίφρος (*Il.* 24.578). Metaneira offers her own κλισμός to Demeter, but the goddess prefers a seat more in line with her disguise as a humble servant woman, so she accepts only a δίφρος (*H.Dem.* 191, 198). Upon his homecoming, Odysseus' own elevation in stature from beggar to master is visualized concretely by his change in seats from a δίφρος (19.97, 101, 506; 20.259; 21.243, 420) to a θρόνος (23.164).

IXa–c. Feast

The sharing of a feast is one of the most intimate means by which a stranger is welcomed into a home, for the banquet is the primary locus for participation in *xenia;* significantly, the term ξείνια, ξεινήϊα may specifically denote the food offered to a guest (4.33; [5.91]; *Il.* 11.779–80; 18.387, 408). Homer economically constructed his tale so that a visitor usually arrives at someone's house precisely at a time of feasting, either

14. On the distinction between these types of seats, see Athenaeus *Deipnosophists* 192e–f; Laser 1968, 34–56.

ἀργυροήλου,
ῖν ἦεν.

n the types of seats offered to
ιε θρόνος, a chair with upright
r gods and nobles (gods 5.86,
18.389, 422; 20.62; *H.Ap.* 9;
18.157; 20.150; 21.139, 166;
guests who are invited to take
7.162, 169; 8.65, 469; 10.314,
ut it is never used by women.
, is used by men when feasting
') and by women (4.136; 17.97;
ısed especially by subordinates
59; 21.243; *Il.* 24.578; *H.Dem.*

ous hospitality that he offers
l (θρῆνυς) for her feet, while
Achilles likewise shows proper
m (*Il.* 24.515, 522, 553) and
meanwhile, Priam's herald is
ıneira offers her own κλισμός
more in line with her disguise
s only a δίφρος (*H.Dem.* 191,
own elevation in stature from
by his change in seats from a
20) to a θρόνος (23.164).

st intimate means by which a
banquet is the primary locus
he term ξείνια, ξεινήϊα may
guest (4.33; [5.91]; *Il.* 11.779–
tructed his tale so that a visitor
ly at a time of feasting, either

, see Athenaeus *Deipnosophists* 192e–

during the feast's preparation or during its actual consumption; thus the visitor may be immediately and effortlessly accommodated.

a. Preparation

Great attention is given to the details of the preparation of feasts. The epic diction is very rich in formulae for describing feast preparation, from the simple τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα (8.61; 16.478; 24.384; *Il.* 1.467; 2.430; 7.319) to the elaborate and variously described preparation of a banquet in conjunction with a sacrifice (e.g., 3.418–63, 470–72; 14.418–52; 20.250–55; *Il.* 1.457–66; 2.419–29; 9.206–20; 24.621–26). The most distinctive description of feast preparation for the entertainment of guests is a formulaic five-verse block that details the duties of the handmaid, who provides water for handwashing and a table, and the housekeeper, who serves bread and other food (1.136–40 = 4.52–56; 7.172–76; [10.368–72]; 15.135–[39]; 17.91–95):

> χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχόῳ ἐπέχευε φέρουσα
> καλῇ χρυσείῃ, ὑπὲρ ἀργυρέοιο λέβητος,
> νίψασθαι· παρὰ δὲ ξεστὴν ἐτάνυσσε τράπεζαν.
> σῖτον δ' αἰδοίη ταμίη παρέθηκε φέρουσα,
> εἴδατα πόλλ' ἐπιθεῖσα, χαριζομένη παρεόντων.

An addendum of two or three verses, which adds the duties of a carver, who serves platters of meat, and a herald, who pours the wine, is sometimes attached to this five-verse block (1.141–43 (cf. [4.57–58]); 15.140–41):

> δαιτρὸς δὲ κρειῶν πίνακας παρέθηκεν ἀείρας
> παντοίων, παρὰ δέ σφι τίθει χρύσεια κύπελλα,
> κῆρυξ δ' αὐτοῖσιν θάμ' ἐπῴχετο οἰνοχοεύων.

> πὰρ δὲ Βοηθοΐδης κρέα δαίετο καὶ νέμε μοίρας·
> οἰνοχόει δ' υἱὸς Μενελάου κυδαλίμοιο.

A truly generous host may "bestow great honor" (γεραίρω 14.437, 441; *Il.* 7.321) on his guest by relinquishing his own "designated portion" (γέρας 4.66), the fatty "chine" (νῶτον) of the cow, pig, sheep, or goat (4.65–66; 8.474–83; 14.437–41; *Il.* 7.321–22; 9.206–8).

b. Consumption

The preparation of the feast is generally described in great detail, but the actual consumption of the food merits only a simple, one-verse formula. In the *Odyssey,* the most common by far is οἱ δ' ἐπ' ὀνείαθ' ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον (1.149; 4.67, 218; 5.200; 8.71, 484; 14.453; 15.142; 16.54; 17.98; 20.256; *Il.* 9.91, 221; 24.627). In the *Iliad,* the most common is δαίνυντ', οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἐΐσης (16.479; 19.425; *Il.* 1.468, 602; 2.431; 7.320; 23.56). The first-person dialogue of Odysseus' *Apologoi* requires the modification ἥμεθα, δαινύμενοι κρέα τ' ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἡδύ (9.162, 557; 10.184, 468, [477]; 12.30). A few shorter formulaic phrases sometimes suffice to describe consumption: δαίνυντ' ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα (3.66; 13.26; 20.280; *Il.* 24.802), δαίνυνθ' ἑζόμενοι (3.471), πῖνε καὶ ἦσθε (5.94; 6.249; 7.177), κρέα τ' ἤσθιε πῖνέ τε οἶνον (14.109).

c. Conclusion

The feasting is concluded with a one-verse formula that also functions as a transition to the post-feast activities: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο (1.150; 3.67, 473; 4.68; 8.72, 485; 12.308; 14.454; 15.143, 303, 501; 16.55, 480; 17.99; *Il.* 1.469; 2.432; 7.323; 9.92, 222; 23.57; 24.628); alternatively, αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δείπνησε καὶ ἤραρε θυμὸν ἐδωδῇ (5.95; 14.111), αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος (5.201), πλησάμενος δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος (17.603), or σίτου καὶ οἴνοιο κορεσσάμενος κατὰ θυμὸν (14.46). The first-person dialogues of Odysseus' Apologoi and of Nestor's story require the modifications αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτοιό τ' ἐπασσάμεθ' ἠδὲ ποτῆτος (9.87; 10.58) and αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπημεν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος (*Il.* 11.780).

Homer freely modifies the conventional formulae of feasting to accommodate the particular circumstances of each scene. Most conspicuous, perhaps, are his modifications of the formulae for sacrificing cows in order to accommodate Eumaeus' sacrifice of a pig (cf. 14.75 and, e.g., 3.462; 14.418–56 and, e.g., *Il.* 1.447–74) and his modifications of the formulae for the serving of the feast in order to take into account the absence of meat-carvers, heralds, and servant girls in Eumaeus' hut (cf. 16.49–52 and, e.g., 1.141–43, 147). Sometimes Homer manipulates these conventional formulae with great poetic effect. The elaborate description of the feast preparation for Athena-Mentes in Ithaca, using the conven-

tional five-verse block and adden
to the three-verse potpourri that
(1.146–[48]); the juxtaposition of
tions of feast preparation serves t
tion of Athena-Mentes with his
describing Polyphemus' and the L
their guests, Homer perverts the
parody on a formal level, by ap
banquet to their cannibalistic fe
cf. 1.149), ὁπλίσσατο δόρπον or
344; 10.116; cf. 16.453; 24.360).

X. After

Immediately after the feast, eithe
with wine and propose a toast. T
general eating and drinking of th
the libation that is occasionally
This formal element of an after-
the feast in Achilles' tent, Odyss
host (*Il.* 9.224); after the feast in
cup with wine for the disguised
suitors for a time of drinking (2
hut, Eumaeus demonstrates the
refilling his own cup with wine
Odysseus (14.112–13); after Pol
Cyclopeia, a parody of proper hos
the wine of Maron, which inebr
(9.345–61).

XIa–b.

The revelation of a guest's identi
in the development of a relationsh
guarantees the host reciprocal h
9.16–18). It is understandable, th
name is requested and revealed ta

tional five-verse block and addendum (1.136–43), is a striking contrast to the three-verse potpourri that describes the serving of the suitors (1.146–[48]); the juxtaposition of these two remarkably different descriptions of feast preparation serves to contrast Telemachus' generous reception of Athena-Mentes with his reluctant tolerance of the suitors. In describing Polyphemus' and the Laestrygonian Antiphates' treatment of their guests, Homer perverts the typical banquet scene, creating a black parody on a formal level, by applying the conventional diction of the banquet to their cannibalistic feast: ἑτάροις ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἴαλλε (9.288; cf. 1.149), ὁπλίσσατο δόρπον or ὁπλίσσατο δεῖπνον (2.20; 9.291, 311, 344; 10.116; cf. 16.453; 24.360).

X. After-dinner Drink

Immediately after the feast, either the host or the guest may fill a cup with wine and propose a toast. This wine drinking is distinct from the general eating and drinking of the feast (IXb), and it is separate from the libation that is occasionally shared between host and guest (XV). This formal element of an after-dinner drink takes many shapes: after the feast in Achilles' tent, Odysseus fills a cup of wine and salutes his host (*Il.* 9.224); after the feast in Odysseus' palace, Telemachus fills a cup with wine for the disguised Odysseus and seats him among the suitors for a time of drinking (20.260–62); after the feast in Eumaeus' hut, Eumaeus demonstrates the personal nature of his hospitality by refilling his own cup with wine and offering it to his disguised guest Odysseus (14.112–13); after Polyphemus' cannibalistic feast in the Cyclopeia, a parody of proper hospitality, Odysseus offers to the Cyclops the wine of Maron, which inebriates him and facilitates his blinding (9.345–61).

XIa–b. Identification

The revelation of a guest's identity is perhaps the most critical element in the development of a relationship of *xenia*, for it is the vital link that guarantees the host reciprocal hospitality as a guest in the future (cf. 9.16–18). It is understandable, then, that the manner in which a guest's name is requested and revealed takes on an almost ritualistic formality.

a. Host Questions the Visitor

A proper host requests his guest's name and inquires into his business only after providing him a meal; the stranger is to remain anonymous throughout the meal.[15] This point of etiquette may be observed in the hospitality of Telemachus (1.123–24; 16.54–59), Nestor (3.69–70), Menelaus (4.60–62), Arete (7.230–39), Eumaeus (14.45–47), the ruler of Lycia (*Il.* 6.171–77), Achilles (*Il.* 9.221–24), Charis and Hephaestus (*Il.* 18.385–87), and Metaneira (*H.Dem.* 206–12). The most paradigmatic hosts—Telemachus (1.123–24), Menelaus (4.60–62), and Eumaeus (14.45–47)—set their guests at ease on arrival by explicitly assuring them that they will not inquire into their identity or business until after the meal. Blame is attached to those who breach this convention: Hermes disregards Calypso's premature questions until after they have eaten (5.85–96); Odysseus gently reprimands Alcinous for probing into his identity before his belly is thoroughly satisfied (7.199–206, 215–21); and Polyphemus' role as a paradigm of perverted hospitality is reinforced by his demand for his guests' identity upon first setting eye on them (9.251–55).

The most routine formula of inquiry entails a request for information about a stranger's homeland and parentage: τίς πόθεν εἶς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες; (1.170; 10.325; 14.187; 15.264; 19.105; 24.298; cf. 7.238; *H.Dem.* 113). This question may be elaborated to include an inquiry into the stranger's means of transportation and business in the land (1.171–77; 14.188–90; 24.299–301; *H.Dem.* 114–17). When more than one stranger is present, and their means of transportation is assumed to be by ship, a different formula is used: ὦ ξεῖνοι, τίνες ἐστέ; πόθεν πλεῖθ' ὑγρὰ κέλευθα; (3.71; 9.252; *H.Ap.* 452). This question too may be expanded to include an inquiry into the strangers' business (3.72–74; 9.253–55; *H.Ap.* 453–55). The host often expresses great concern that the stranger answer truthfully and accurately: ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπὲ καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον (1.169; 8.572; 24.287); καί μοι τοῦτ' ἀγόρευσον ἐτήτυμον, ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῶ (1.174; 14.186; 24.297).

b. Visitor Reveals his Identity

In turn, the stranger's revelation of his identity and business is often preceded by assurances that this information will be true and accurate:

15. For comparative material evidencing this rule, see J.T. Kakridis 1975, 13–21.

τοιγὰρ ἐγώ τοι ταῦτα μάλ' ἀτ
15.266; 16.61); τοιγὰρ ἐγώ τοι
(24.303); sometimes simply by και
(9.16; *H.Dem.* 120), or ἐρέω (7.
provided may include the strange
of transportation, and business
366–67, 504–5; 14.199–359; 15.40
122–44; *H.Aphr.* 109–42). A pr
obligation on his host by strate
xenia with a relative: Athena-Me
xenos of his father (1.187–88),
Laertes that he is a *xenos* of his
given him gifts (24.265–79).

Homer demonstrates great flex
the formal elements of identific
scene. In Arete's interrogation o
ἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ
ἀνδρῶν; τίς τοι τάδε εἵματ' ἔδ
clothing central to this scene. Od
a form of countergift for a hos
the Cyclopeia: his false name O
revelation of his real name at de
The longest interrogation of a vi
of Odysseus (8.548–86); Odysse
comprising the four-book Apolo

Because gods can always rec
place for the formal element of
tality. Homer replaces the usual
request that the visiting deity sta
The usual revelation of the stran
by the god's explanation for his

Since one of the key themes
and particularly the self-recogni
of whom have difficulties comi
(cf. 1.215–16), it is appropriate
occasionally replaced by an iden
times this is a conscious act by
identification of Telemachus (4.1
seus (10.325–35). Sometimes th

τοιγὰρ ἐγώ τοι ταῦτα μάλ' ἀτρεκέως ἀγορεύσω (1.179; 14.192; cf. 15.266; 16.61); τοιγὰρ ἐγώ τοι πάντα μάλ' ἀτρεκέως καταλέξω (24.303); sometimes simply by καταλέξω (3.80; 9.14; 16.226), μυθήσομαι (9.16; *H.Dem.* 120), or ἐρέω (7.243; 15.402; 19.171). The information provided may include the stranger's name, parentage, homeland, means of transportation, and business (1.180–93; 3.81–101; 9.19–38, 259–71, 366–67, 504–5; 14.199–359; 15.403–84; 19.172–202; 24.304–14; *H.Dem.* 122–44; *H.Aphr.* 109–42). A prudent stranger will impose a sense of obligation on his host by strategically mentioning his relationship of *xenia* with a relative: Athena-Mentes claims to Telemachus that she is a *xenos* of his father (1.187–88), and the disguised Odysseus claims to Laertes that he is a *xenos* of his son, having once entertained him and given him gifts (24.265–79).

Homer demonstrates great flexibility and innovation by manipulating the formal elements of identification to accommodate each individual scene. In Arete's interrogation of Odysseus, the formulaic τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες; is replaced by τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; τίς τοι τάδε εἵματ' ἔδωκεν; (7.238), reinforcing the theme of clothing central to this scene. Odysseus' revelation of his name, normally a form of countergift for a host's hospitality, proves to be a curse in the Cyclopeia: his false name Οὖτις tricks the Cyclops (9.364–414); his revelation of his real name at departure is framed as a taunt (9.502–5). The longest interrogation of a visitor in Homer is Alcinous' questioning of Odysseus (8.548–86); Odysseus' response is correspondingly lengthy, comprising the four-book Apologoi (9.1–11.330; 11.385–12.453).

Because gods can always recognize each other (5.79–80), there is no place for the formal element of identification in scenes of divine hospitality. Homer replaces the usual request for a stranger's identity with a request that the visiting deity state his business (5.87–90 ≈ *Il.* 18.424–27). The usual revelation of the stranger's identity is correspondingly replaced by the god's explanation for his visit (5.97–115; *Il.* 18.429–61).

Since one of the key themes of the *Odyssey* is that of recognition, and particularly the self-recognition of Telemachus and Odysseus, both of whom have difficulties coming to terms with their own identities (cf. 1.215–16), it is appropriate that their self-revelation as guests be occasionally replaced by an identification of them by their hosts. Sometimes this is a conscious act by the host, as in Helen's and Menelaus' identification of Telemachus (4.138–54) or Circe's identification of Odysseus (10.325–35). Sometimes the identification is inadvertent: Demo-

docus sings of Odysseus' exploits to the unknown stranger (8.73–82, 499–520); Eumaeus tells stories of Odysseus to his disguised guest (14.115–47); Penelope speaks of Odysseus to the disguised beggar (19.124–63); Penelope, Eurycleia, and Philoetius all remark on the similarities between the disguised beggar and Odysseus (19.357–81; 20.191–207).

XII. Exchange of Information

Information is as valuable a commodity as treasured guest-gifts. Sometimes the host provides specific information to an inquisitive visitor; other times the visitor provides news from abroad to a curious host, as though in exchange for material hospitality. This reciprocal exchange of information normally follows the feast and may include news, messages, instructions and advice, prophecies, and, very often, stories.

In the *Odyssey*, the exchange of information is often laden with irony because the hosts frequently fail to recognize the disguised Odysseus. Eumaeus informs the disguised Odysseus of the identity of his master (14.115–47) and fills him in on his supposed status (14.42–44, 133–36), and Odysseus in turn prophecies his own return (14.149–64, 321–33). Penelope tells the disguised Odysseus about her longing for her husband, whom she presumes dead (19.124–61), and Odysseus in turn tells a story about entertaining Odysseus in Crete (19.172–248) and prophecies his return and the death of the suitors (19.269–307, 555–58, 583–87). And the disguised Odysseus claims to Laertes, who craves information about his son, that he once entertained him in Alybas (24.266–314).

XIII. Entertainment

The after-dinner entertainment takes many forms. Song and dance are common accoutrements of the feast—μολπή τ' ὀρχηστύς τε· τὰ γάρ τ' ἀναθήματα δαιτός (1.152; cf. 8.246–65; 17.605–6)—but in the grandest palaces, the entertainment may also include exhibitions of athletic contests (boxing, wrestling, leaping, running, discus) or a special type of dancing while simultaneously throwing balls and performing gymnastic feats, as in Scheria and Sparta (8.100–131, 370–80; cf. 4.18–19). But by

far the most prevalent form of e
of stories, sometimes by a prof
a lyre (κίθαρις, φόρμιγξ 1.151–
369, 486–520; 13.27–28; 17.358–
98, 247–312; 4.76–112, 212–89,
the guest (9.1–12.453; 10.14–16
favorite topics of storytelling a
adventures of the returns (νόσ
3.102–98, 247–312; 4.76–112, 2
12.453; 10.14–16; 14.462–506),
own repertoire.

Homer's handling of after-di
primary theme of vengeance
bard Phemius is made to sing
the suitors. Ironically, Phemius
as the goddess, in disguise as M
with Telemachus; and Phemius
the Achaeans, a subject of pre
that the return of Odysseus wi
suitors' perverse hospitality to
strated by their deriving amuse
and the local beggar Irus for t
the "guest" in effect providing
contests had functioned proper
ment in Scheria (8.100–131), b
versity is appropriately aveng
himself provides the entertainn
καὶ φόρμιγγι 21.430), a vivid
retribution.

XIV. Visitor Prono

A visitor abroad usually lacks
a host for his material provisic
by providing news from abroad
and he may provide the means
in the future by revealing his na
for material provisions by pron

far the most prevalent form of entertainment after the feast is the telling of stories, sometimes by a professional bard to the accompaniment of a lyre (κίθαρις, φόρμιγξ 1.151–55, 325–27; 8.43–47, 62–70, 73–82, 241–369, 486–520; 13.27–28; 17.358–59, 605–6), sometimes by the host (3.102–98, 247–312; 4.76–112, 212–89, 347–586; 15.383–494), and sometimes by the guest (9.1–12.453; 10.14–16; 14.191–359, 462–506; 18.428–30). The favorite topics of storytelling are the events of the Trojan war and the adventures of the returns (νόστοι) in the war's aftermath (1.325–27; 3.102–98, 247–312; 4.76–112, 212–89, 347–586; 8.73–82, 486–520; 9.1–12.453; 10.14–16; 14.462–506), perhaps Homer's advertisement of his own repertoire.

Homer's handling of after-dinner entertainment often emphasizes the primary theme of vengeance underlying the *Odyssey*. In Ithaca, the bard Phemius is made to sing "under compulsion" (ἀνάγκῃ 1.154) by the suitors. Ironically, Phemius sings about the wrath of Athena, even as the goddess, in disguise as Mentes, is sitting in the corner conversing with Telemachus; and Phemius' song is about the return (νόστος) of the Achaeans, a subject of pressing concern to the suitors, who hope that the return of Odysseus will not be accomplished (1.325–27). The suitors' perverse hospitality toward the disguised Odysseus is demonstrated by their deriving amusement from a boxing match between him and the local beggar Irus for the right to beg in the palace (18.1–111), the "guest" in effect providing the after-dinner entertainment; athletic contests had functioned properly as part of the after-dinner entertainment in Scheria (8.100–131), but not here in Ithaca. The suitors' perversity is appropriately avenged, for in their final feast, Odysseus himself provides the entertainment: "the singing and the lyre" (μολπῇ καὶ φόρμιγγι 21.430), a vivid allusion to the bow with which he exacts retribution.

XIV. Visitor Pronounces a Blessing on the Host

A visitor abroad usually lacks the resources with which to compensate a host for his material provisions. He may reciprocate for the moment by providing news from abroad or entertainment by way of storytelling, and he may provide the means for his host to gain reciprocal hospitality in the future by revealing his name and country. He may also reciprocate for material provisions by pronouncing a blessing on his host; often the

graciousness of the host's hospitality inspires such a blessing (7.148–50; 14.51–54, 439–41; 15.340–42; 17.353–55; *H.Dem.* 135–37, 224–25). The guest typically prays that his host be blessed with "glory" (κῦδος 3.55–59), with "the affection of Zeus" (φίλος Διὶ πατρὶ γένοιο 14.439–41; 15.340–42), with "material wealth" (ὄλβια 7.148–50; ὄλβιον 17.353–55; ἐσθλά *H.Dem.* 224–25), with a "prosperous and blessed posterity" (παισὶν ἐπιτρέψειεν ἕκαστος κτήματ'; τέκνα τεκέσθαι 7.148–50; *H.Dem.* 135–37), or rather generally, with "whatever he might desire" (ὅττι μάλιστ' ἐθέλεις 14.51–54; οἱ πάντα γένοιτο ὅσα φρεσὶν ᾗσι μενοινᾷ 17.353–55). Sometimes the guest invokes the gods generally (7.148–50; 14.51–54; *H.Dem.* 135–37, 224–25), sometimes Zeus specifically (14.51–54, 439–41; 15.340–42; 17.353–55)—and appropriately so, since he is the patron of suppliants and guests (6.206–8; 9.270–71, 477–79; 14.56–59, 283–84, 388–89).

Just as a guest may pronounce a blessing on a gracious host, so he may pronounce a curse on an ungracious one. When Antinous demonstrates his perverted hospitality by casting a footstool, an instrument of kind reception in normal circumstances, at the newly arrived Odysseus, he responds with a curse that is essentially a negation of the guest's usual prayer for a prosperous and blessed posterity: "If there are gods and Furies [ἐρινύες] for beggars, may death come upon Antinous before marriage." (17.475–76).

XV. Visitor Shares in a Libation or Sacrifice

Perhaps the most symbolically powerful gesture of a host's willingness to incorporate a stranger into the community, to transform an outsider into an insider, is an invitation to participate in the community's religious rituals. Shared participation in libations and sacrifices is a mark of the most generous hospitality. Nestor is particularly accommodating to Athena-Mentor and Telemachus on their arrival, encouraging them to participate in the sacrifices, libations, and prayers of the Pylian community (3.40–67, 338–42, 390–94, 418–63). Alcinous invites the newly arrived Odysseus to share in a libation to Zeus, "who protects revered suppliants" (ὅς θ' ἱκέτῃσιν ἅμ' αἰδοίοισιν ὀπηδεῖ 7.179–84). Eumaeus includes Odysseus in all his sacrifices and libations, humble though they be (14.407–48; 16.452–54). Amphinomus, who alone of the suitors shows proper respect toward guests, allows Odysseus to share in a libation (18.151–52). And

Achilles honors those who have
ing them to share in a sacrifice

XVI. Visitor Asl

The most hospitable hosts are
drink, and entertainment, espec
to the point of being overbeari
that it is time for bed. The lo
day until the setting of the su
Athena-Mentor, who encourage
that we may think of sleep, for
μεδώμεθα· τοῖο γὰρ ὥρη 3.3
entertained their guests throug
stories about Troy, Telemachus,
says, "Come, lead us to bed,
delight in sweet sleep" (ἀλλ' ἄ
ἤδη ὕπνῳ ὕπο γλυκερῷ ταρ
Odysseus wishes to rest from
Phaeacian hosts, he alerts the
καὶ ὥρη εὕδειν 11.330–31), t
stories, denies him: "This nig
hour for sleep in the hall" (νὺ
πω ὥρη εὕδειν ἐν μεγάρῳ·
immensely his exchange of tal
remain awake into the night:
νύκτες ἀθέσφατοι 15.392), he
it is time; much sleep is a vexa
καταλέχθαι· ἀνίη καὶ πολὺς
is reunited with his wife, he re
even now we may lie down an
ἴομεν, γύναι, ὄφρα καὶ ἤδη
ηθέντε. 23.254–55). Penelope a
he wishes but then delays him,
of Teiresias. Priam uses simila
wine for the first time since his
conversing with Achilles, he a
me down quickly, god-born on

Achilles honors those who have come to him as mere messengers by inviting them to share in a sacrifice and meal (*Il.* 9.219-20).

XVI. Visitor Asks to Be Allowed to Sleep

The most hospitable hosts are so generous in their provisions of food, drink, and entertainment, especially in the form of stories—perhaps even to the point of being overbearing—that a guest often has to alert them that it is time for bed. The loquacious Nestor, having spent the entire day until the setting of the sun telling stories, is finally interrupted by Athena-Mentor, who encourages him to put an end to the sacrifice, "so that we may think of sleep, for it is the hour for such" (ὄφρα . . . κοίτοιο μεδώμεθα· τοῖο γὰρ ὥρη 3.333-34). After Helen and Menelaus have entertained their guests throughout the evening with food, wine, and stories about Troy, Telemachus, in his first words to his hosts in Sparta, says, "Come, lead us to bed, so that we may even now lie down and delight in sweet sleep" (ἀλλ' ἄγετ' εἰς εὐνὴν τράπεθ' ἡμέας, ὄφρα καὶ ἤδη ὕπνῳ ὕπο γλυκερῷ ταρπώμεθα κοιμηθέντες. 4.294-95). When Odysseus wishes to rest from the narration of his adventures to his Phaeacian hosts, he alerts them that "it is the hour for sleep" (ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥρη εὕδειν 11.330-31), but Alcinous, who is anxious for more stories, denies him: "This night is unspeakably long; not yet is it the hour for sleep in the hall" (νὺξ δ' ἥδε μάλα μακρὴ ἀθέσφατος· οὐδέ πω ὥρη εὕδειν ἐν μεγάρῳ· 11.373-74). Eumaeus, who is enjoying immensely his exchange of tales with Odysseus, encourages his guest to remain awake into the night: "These nights are immense" (αἵδε δὲ νύκτες ἀθέσφατοι 15.392), he says; "You should not lie down before it is time; much sleep is a vexatious thing" (οὐδέ τί σε χρή, πρὶν ὥρη, καταλέχθαι· ἀνίη καὶ πολὺς ὕπνος. 15.393-94). When at last Odysseus is reunited with his wife, he requests, "Let us go to bed, wife, so that even now we may lie down and take delight in sweet sleep" (λέκτρονδ' ἴομεν, γύναι, ὄφρα καὶ ἤδη ὕπνῳ ὕπο γλυκερῷ ταρπώμεθα κοιμηθέντε. 23.254-55). Penelope assures him that he may go to bed whenever he wishes but then delays him, wanting to hear more about the prophecy of Teiresias. Priam uses similar language when, having tasted food and wine for the first time since his son's death and having spent the evening conversing with Achilles, he at last asks his host to let him sleep: "Lay me down quickly, god-born one, so that even now we may lie down and

take delight in sweet sleep" (λέξον νῦν με τάχιστα, διοτρεφές, ὄφρα καὶ ἤδη ὕπνῳ ὕπο γλυκερῷ ταρπώμεθα κοιμηθέντες˙. *Il.* 24.635–36).

XVII. Bed

A bed for the guest is normally placed in the portico immediately outside the front door of the house (ὑπ' αἰθούσῃ 3.399; 4.297; 7.336, 345; *Il.* 24.644; ἐν προδόμῳ 4.302; 20.1, 143; *Il.* 24.673); meanwhile, the host retreats to the innermost room of the house (μυχῷ 3.402; 4.304; 7.346; *Il.* 9.663; 24.675), where he sleeps beside his wife or concubine (3.403; 4.305; 7.347; *Il.* 9.664–68; 24.676).

The description of the bedding itself receives various degrees of elaboration. Although the general picture of Nestor's hospitality in Pylos as relatively humble is reinforced by the simple description of Telemachus' bed (τρητοῖς ἐν λεχέεσσιν 4.399), the personal nature of his hospitality is demonstrated by the provision of his own youngest son as Telemachus' bedmate in the portico (3.400–401). The material hospitality in Sparta is more lavish but less personal: Helen orders the servants to place a bed in the portico, to throw on it beautiful, purple rugs, to spread blankets above, and to put woolen mantles on top (4.296–99). The bed provided for Odysseus by the Phaeacians is equally elaborate (7.336–39 = 4.297–300), but the bedding scene is further augmented by an official announcement that the bed is ready (7.342). Achilles' wealth and generous hospitality, even in the harsh environment of the battlefield, are accentuated by Homer's use of the structure and formulae of the typical bedding scene of the palace to describe his provision of a bed for Phoenix and Priam in his shelter (*Il.* 9.617–22, 658–68; 24.643–55, 671–76; note that *Il.* 24.644–47 = *Od.* 4.297–300, 7.336–39; *Il.* 24.673 = *Od.* 4.302).

Manipulations of the bedding scene for poetic effect may be observed in the scenes of Odysseus' homecoming. Although the humbleness of Eumaeus' hospitality is accentuated by the substitution of sheepskins and goatskins for the usual rugs and blankets (14.519), his graciousness and loyalty is revealed by a reversal of the geography of the normal bedding scene: Eumaeus provides for Odysseus, the guest, a bed inside next to the fire, while he himself, the host, sleeps outside in the shelter of a hollow rock (14.518–33). Upon Odysseus' arrival at his own home, the geographical location of his bed acquires great symbolic value: at first Melantho suggests that he go away and sleep in a public lounging place for beggars (18.327–29); then Penelope acknowledges him as a

guest and offers a bed in the portico (19.317–19, 598–99; 20.1); and once Odysseus has gained the upper hand against the suitors and has reestablished himself as master, he reclaims the bedroom in the innermost part of the house (23.295). His spatial progression from outside the house, to its periphery in the portico, to its innermost room, is symbolic of his elevation from beggar to guest to master.

XVIII. Bath

The provision of a bath for a guest is a normal part of proper hospitality, usually in conjunction with the preparation for a feast (1.310; 3.464–68; 4.48–50; 6.210–35; 8.426–27, 433–37, 449–57; 10.358–65, 449–51; 17.87–89; 19.317, 320, 343–60, 386–88, 503–7; 23.153–63). Usually the bath is provided well after the initial reception of the guest, sometimes even on the second day of the visit; rarely it is offered to the guest immediately on arrival (4.48–50; cf. 6.210–35; 17.87–90). It is usually the servant women who administer the bath (δμῳαί; ἀμφίπολοι; ταμίη; 4.49; 6.209; 8.454; 10.348; 17.88; 19.317; 23.154; cf. 24.366), occasionally the mistress of the house (Helen 4.252; Calypso 5.264; Circe 10.449), and once the unmarried princess (Nestor's daughter Polycaste 3.464–65).

A typical Homeric bath entails heating water in a tripod (τρίπους); the attendant pours water from this tripod upon the guest, who is seated in a bathtub (ἀσάμινθος; cf. 8.426, 433–37; 10.358–63). The attendant then washes the guest and anoints him with olive oil (λοῦσέν τε καὶ ἔχρισεν λίπ' ἐλαίῳ 3.466; cf. 4.49, 252; 8.454; 10.364, 450; 17.88; 23.154; 24.366). Finally, the attendant provides a fresh change of clothing (ἀμφὶ δέ μιν φᾶρος καλὸν βάλεν ἠδὲ χιτῶνα 3.467; cf. 4.50; 6.214; 8.455; 10.365, 451; 17.89; 23.155; 24.367).[16] Hence the Homeric bath is not a provision to be offered casually; it requires the active and intimate participation of a member of the host's household.

The quality of the bath is often indicative of the quality of the host's hospitality. In Sparta, the guests are offered a bath immediately on

---

16. Many of the elements of the Homeric bath are attested in the Linear B tablets: the tripod (ti-ri-po = τρίπους on the Pylos Ta series), the bath itself (a-sa-mi-to = ἀσάμινθος on Knossos Ws 8497), the employment of bath attendants of both sexes (re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo = λοετροχόοι on Pylos Ab 27 [553], Ad 676, Aa 783), and oil and cloaks reserved for guests (ke-se-ni-wi-jo, describing oil, on Pylos Fr 1231; pa-we-a ke-se-nu-wi-ja = φάρεα ξείνια on Knossos Ld 573). The clay bathtub (a-sa-mi-to = ἀσάμινθος) uncovered in the so-called palace of Nestor at Ano Englianos also evokes the Homeric bath.

arrival, perhaps an indication of the resources available to Menelaus, who can afford to keep a bath continuously heated in anticipation of the arrival of guests (4.48–50). In Pylos, the guest waits until the next day before a bath is offered, but the personal nature of Nestor's hospitality is demonstrated by the provision of his own unmarried daughter as bath attendant (3.464–68).

The transformative function of the bath is a key to the theme of disguise and recognition in the *Odyssey*. Often the guest rises from the bath with an enhanced appearance, sometimes "looking like a god" (δέμας ἀθανάτοισιν ὁμοῖος 3.468; 23.163; θεοῖσιν ἔοικε 6.243; cf. ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς ἐναλίγκιον ἄντην 24.371), causing those who see him to "marvel" (θηεῖτο 6.237; θαύμαζε 8.459; cf. 24.370). Odysseus rightly fears that a bath will destroy his disguise and reveal his true identity; hence, he opts for a footbath (19.317, 320, 343–60, 386–88, 503–7). His eventual restoration as master of the house is symbolically realized later through the transformative function of a proper bath (23.153–63).

XIX. Host Detains the Visitor

Menelaus, an apparent model of hospitable behavior, advises his guest Telemachus (15.69–74):

> νεμεσσῶμαι δὲ καὶ ἄλλῳ
> ἀνδρὶ ξεινοδόκῳ, ὅς κ' ἔξοχα μὲν φιλέῃσιν,
> ἔξοχα δ' ἐχθαίρῃσιν· ἀμείνω δ' αἴσιμα πάντα.
> ἶσόν τοι κακόν ἐσθ', ὅς τ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντα νέεσθαι
> ξεῖνον ἐποτρύνει καὶ ὃς ἐσσύμενον κατερύκει.
> χρὴ ξεῖνον παρεόντα φιλεῖν, ἐθέλοντα δὲ πέμπειν.

> [I would be indignant at another man
> who, receiving guests, acted excessively hospitable
> or excessively hostile; all things are better in due measure.
> It is as blameworthy to urge a guest to leave who does not
> want to as it is to detain a guest who is eager to leave.
> One must grant hospitality to a guest who is present and grant
> conveyance to a guest who wants to leave.]

But generous hospitality often borders dangerously on forced detention, and the host's frequently reiterated invitation to stay ([ἐπι] μεῖναι) is

often met by the guest's plea
cf. 1.309–13, 315; 3.343–55; 4.5
14, 340, 417–19, 517; 10.14–16,
35; 15.64–91, 199–201, 209–14,
19; 24.682–88).

In the *Odyssey*, such hospital
(νόστοι) of both Telemachus
Sparta for as long as possible
disposal: his stories, which deli
about home and stay in Sparta
and a chariot as guest-gifts, gift
were to abandon his homecom
on the broad Lacedaemonian
wealth to be collected on his
(15.75–85); and his scrupulous
gift giving, libation, farewell sp
all of which delay his guest's ine
expressly chooses to bypass Pyl
that he will confront such obst
This threat of detention is m
Odysseus, whose return home i
ciated with hospitality: the fo
songs of the Sirens, the "gues
Circe and Calypso. These shar
sympathetic harmony between
theme of obstructed homecom

XX

Gifts (ξεινήϊα, δῶρα, δωτίνη
vice versa, as a material symb
the host expects the guest to r
μιμνήσκεται 15.54; μνῆμα 15
ation, to reciprocate with an e
(ἀμοιβῆς 1.318; ἀμειψάμενος
24.285–86) that guest-gifts be
fail to elicit countergifts are s

17. Homeric gift giving surely refl

often met by the guest's plea not to be detained (μὴ . . . [κατ] ἔρυκε; cf. 1.309–13, 315; 3.343–55; 4.587–88, 593–608; 7.311–15; 9.303–5, 313–14, 340, 417–19, 517; 10.14–16, 467–74, 489; 11.338–41, 350–52; 13.28–35; 15.64–91, 199–201, 209–14, 335–36, 346; 16.82; 17.16–21; *Il.* 9.617–19; 24.682–88).

In the *Odyssey*, such hospitality threatens to obstruct the homecomings (νόστοι) of both Telemachus and Odysseus. To detain Telemachus in Sparta for as long as possible, Menelaus uses all the resources at his disposal: his stories, which delight Telemachus and tempt him to forget about home and stay in Sparta indefinitely (4.595–98); his offer of horses and a chariot as guest-gifts, gifts that would be useful only if Telemachus were to abandon his homecoming to rocky Ithaca and remain instead on the broad Lacedaemonian plain (4.600–608); the temptation of the wealth to be collected on his proposed leisurely tour through Hellas (15.75–85); and his scrupulous attention to the formalities of feasting, gift giving, libation, farewell speeches, and the interpretation of an omen, all of which delay his guest's inevitable departure (15.92–181). Telemachus expressly chooses to bypass Pylos altogether on his return home for fear that he will confront such obstructive hospitality in Nestor (15.195–219). This threat of detention is mirrored in the experiences of his father Odysseus, whose return home is constantly obstructed by elements associated with hospitality: the food of the Lotus-eaters and of Circe, the songs of the Sirens, the "guest-gift" of Polyphemus, and the beds of Circe and Calypso. These shared experiences of father and son create a sympathetic harmony between the two and reinforce the centrality of the theme of obstructed homecoming in the *Odyssey*.

XX. Guest-gifts

Gifts (ξεινήϊα, δῶρα, δωτίνη) are offered by a host to a guest, never vice versa, as a material symbol of their bond of friendship. In return, the host expects the guest to remember him (μεμνημένος 4.592; 8.431; μιμνήσκεται 15.54; μνῆμα 15.126), and as a purely practical consideration, to reciprocate with an equally valuable gift sometime in the future (ἀμοιβῆς 1.318; ἀμειψάμενος 24.285). It is the custom (θέμις 9.267–68; 24.285–86) that guest-gifts be exchanged back and forth, and gifts that fail to elicit countergifts are said to be given in vain (ἐτώσια 24.283).[17]

17. Homeric gift giving surely reflects a historical custom of gift exchange, perhaps of

The most prized type of guest-gift is treasure that can be stored up (κειμήλια). When Telemachus wishes to detain Athena-Mentes in Ithaca, he promises her the best kind of gift he can think of: "treasure . . . such as dear *xeinoi* give to *xeinoi*" (κειμήλιον . . . οἷα φίλοι ξεῖνοι ξείνοισι διδοῦσι 1.312–13). When Menelaus offers Telemachus a gift of horses and a chariot, Telemachus refuses them and insists, "let it be treasure" (κειμήλιον ἔστω 4.600). A gift of κειμήλια may include actual talents of gold (χρυσοῖο τάλαντον 8.393; cf. 8.440; 9.202; 13.11; 24.274), but it usually denotes items made of precious metals—bronze, silver, gold—such as weapons and armor (ἄορ 8.403–5; 19.241; ξίφος 8.406; 16.80; 21.34, 341; ἔγχος 21.34; ἄκων 21.340; τόξον 21.31; τεύχεα *Il.* 6.230; ζωστήρ *Il.* 6.219; θώρηξ *Il.* 11.19; κυνέη *Il.* 10.261) or various household utensils (κρητήρ 4.615; 9.203; 15.103; 24.275; ἄλεισον 8.430–31; τρίπους 13.13; λέβης 13.13; δέπας 15.102; *Il.* 6.220). It may also denote items of clothing (πέπλος 15.105–8; χλαῖνα 15.338; 16.79; 21.339; 24.276; χίτων 8.392, 425, 441; 15.338; 16.79; 19.241–42; 21.339; 24.277; φᾶρος 8.392, 425, 441; 24.277; ἐσθῆτα 8.440; εἵματα 13.10; τάπης 24.276; πέδιλα 16.80; 21.341).

Special value is attached to gifts that have a history behind them (i.e., gifts that have been passed down from someone else): Menelaus gives Telemachus a krater that he had received from Phaedimus, king of the Sidonians (4.613–19); Iphitus gives Odysseus a bow that he had received from Eurytus (21.31–33); Priam gives Achilles a cup that he had received from Thracian men (*Il.* 24.233–37); and the helmet that Meriones gives Odysseus is traced back through four previous exchanges (*Il.* 10.260–71).

Homer manipulates this typical element of gift giving to produce poignant parody on two occasions in the *Odyssey*. Polyphemus' cynical guest-gift (ξεινήϊον 9.370) to Odysseus is the privilege of being eaten last of the men. The suitor Ctesippus offers as an equally cynical guest-gift (ξείνιον 20.296) a pelting with an ox-hoof from the meat basket. This blatant disregard for the civilizing institution of *xenia* places Ctesippus and the suitors on the same level of savagery as the Cyclops.

---

the tenth and ninth centuries—so Finley 1955; Finley [1965] 1978, 58–164. Or perhaps it better reflects the institutions of the society contemporaneous with the poet—so Coldstream 1983, 201–7. For a salutary deemphasis of an underlying historical institution of gift exchange, see Hooker 1989. Gift giving is probably a genetically Indo-European institution—so Benveniste 1969, 65–101—although it is an equally prevalent custom in unrelated primitive and archaic societies—so Mauss 1924.

On the role of gift giving in ancient Greek myth and literature, see Gould 1973, 90–101; Nagy 1981; Donlan 1982a; Donlan 1982b.

XXI.

The didactic Menelaus advises
that "it is an honor and a glc
a boundless trek" (ἀμφότερο
νήσαντας ἵμεν πολλὴν ἐπ' ἀπ
the provision of a meal for a
element. Yet this element pla
hospitality scenes of the *Ody*
(15.92–98, 133–43) and Odys
Elsewhere the departure of th
and Pylos, the hospitality scer
ture scene can occur.

XXII. I

The pouring of a libation is a
Il. 6.258–62; 9.171–77; 24.283-
departure plays a part in the
the *Odyssey*: Telemachus' dep
seus' departure from Scheria
upon Odysseus' and Aias' de

Homer's handling of the t
scenes of guest departure is i
ventional elements to their cor
from Achilles' tent, the libatic
ically, reflecting the impatienc
to the visit. In an effective c
even obstructive, Menelaus, I
achus and Pisistratus in order
are driving away on their cha
hospitality, their libation upo
most elaborately described.

XXIII

In the two most extensive hos
in Sparta and Odysseus in Sc
rocal blessings on departure.

XXI. Departure Meal

The didactic Menelaus advises Telemachus shortly before his departure that "it is an honor and a glory and a benefit, having dined, to go on a boundless trek" (ἀμφότερον κῦδός τε καὶ ἀγλαΐη καὶ ὄνειαρ δειπνήσαντας ἴμεν πολλὴν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν. 15.78–79); and in practice, the provision of a meal for a departing guest appears to be a typical element. Yet this element plays a part in only the two most extensive hospitality scenes of the *Odyssey*: Telemachus' departure from Sparta (15.92–98, 133–43) and Odysseus' departure from Scheria (13.23–27). Elsewhere the departure of the guest is not elaborated, or as in Ithaca and Pylos, the hospitality scene is curtailed long before a proper departure scene can occur.

XXII. Departure Libation

The pouring of a libation is a regular element in departure scenes (cf. *Il.* 6.258–62; 9.171–77; 24.283–86). A libation specifically before a guest's departure plays a part in the two most extensive hospitality scenes of the *Odyssey*: Telemachus' departure from Sparta (15.147–50) and Odysseus' departure from Scheria (13.50–56). A libation is also performed upon Odysseus' and Aias' departure from Achilles' tent (*Il.* 9.656–57).

Homer's handling of the typical element of libation in these three scenes of guest departure is indicative of his practice of adapting conventional elements to their context. Upon Odysseus' and Aias' departure from Achilles' tent, the libation is mentioned cursorily, almost mechanically, reflecting the impatience of both guests and host to put an end to the visit. In an effective character sketch of the overly hospitable, even obstructive, Menelaus, Homer pictures him running after Telemachus and Pisistratus in order to perform a final libation, even as they are driving away on their chariot. Befitting the Phaeacians' extravagant hospitality, their libation upon Odysseus' departure from Scheria is the most elaborately described.

XXIII. Farewell Blessing

In the two most extensive hospitality scenes in the *Odyssey*, Telemachus in Sparta and Odysseus in Scheria, the hosts and guests exchange reciprocal blessings on departure. The host introduces his blessing by wishing

his guest a farewell (χαῖρε 8.408, 461; 15.128, 151), then he prays specifically that his guest will enjoy a safe return to his family and homeland: "May Zeus accomplish your return home" (νόστον . . . Ζεὺς τελέσειεν 15.111–12); "May you fare well and return to to your well built home and to your fatherland" (σὺ δέ μοι χαίρων ἀφίκοιο οἶκον ἐϋκτίμενον καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν. 15.128–29); "May the gods grant that you see your wife and come to your homeland, since you have suffered woes away from your loved ones for a long time" (σοὶ δὲ θεοὶ ἄλοχον ἰδέειν καὶ πατρίδ' ἱκέσθαι δοῖεν, ἐπεὶ δὴ δηθὰ φίλων ἄπο πήματα πάσχεις. 8.410–11). The guest in turn echoes the host's farewell (χαῖρε 8.413; 13.39, 59), concurs with the prayer for his safe return (8.465–66; 13.38–43), then pronounces a reciprocal blessing upon his host: "May the gods grant you wealth" (θεοὶ δέ τοι ὄλβια δοῖεν 8.413); "May you, remaining here, take pleasure in your wedded wives and children, and may the gods grant you every excellence, and may there not be any evil for the city" (ὑμεῖς δ' αὖθι μένοντες ἐϋφραίνοιτε γυναῖκας κουριδίας καὶ τέκνα· θεοὶ δ' ἀρετὴν ὀπάσειαν παντοίην, καὶ μή τι κακὸν μεταδήμιον εἴη. 13.44–46); "Take delight in your house and in your children and people and in your king Alcinous" (σὺ δὲ τέρπεο τῷδ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ παισί τε καὶ λαοῖσι καὶ Ἀλκινόῳ βασιλῆϊ. 13.61–62).

Homer parodies the structure and diction of the typical departure blessing in the Cyclopeia, where Polyphemus curses rather than blesses his "guest," praying that he *not* arrive home (δὸς μὴ Ὀδυσσῆα πτολίπορθον οἴκαδ' ἱκέσθαι 9.530), and that if he is fated "to see his loved ones and come to his well built home and to his fatherland" (φίλους ἰδέειν καὶ ἱκέσθαι οἶκον ἐϋκτίμενον καὶ ἑὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν 9.532–33), that "he arrive late and badly off" (ὀψὲ κακῶς ἔλθοι 9.534), and that "he find troubles at home" (εὕροι δ' ἐν πήματα οἴκῳ 9.535). This negation of the diction of the conventional blessing reflects the Cyclops' negation of the civilizing institution of *xenia* generally.

XXIV. Departure Omen and Interpretation

It was traditional, both historically and in Homer's poetic cosmos, to seek a favorable omen before setting out on a journey (cf. *Il.* 24.290–321). In scenes of guest departure, a proper omen and interpretation occurs only once in the surviving epic corpus—in Telemachus' departure from Sparta. Just as Telemachus and Pisistratus prepare to depart, an eagle flies by on their right side, carrying a goose in its talons. Helen

interprets this omen favorably,
geance on the suitors (15.160–8
In a rather parodic inversior
as he departs from the land c
spoils from the Cyclops' cave,
phemus' favorite ram, to Zeu
intended to honor Zeus as pı
Odysseus avenge Polyphemus'
accept the sacrifice (ὁ δ' οὐκ ἐμ
the stolen ram is symbolic of
guest. It is with this unfavoral
on a journey that will prove di

XXV. Escort to

Escort (πομπή) to a visitor's n
host to his guest. This obligatic
the host simply provides directi
27). Sometimes supplies of fo
wine, and cooked meats (3.479–
a favorable wind for the travel
But the most generous hosts
himself acts as Odysseus' guide
Telemachus horses and a chari
for his journey to Sparta (3.3
who are famous for delivering
even to distant destinations (πο
13.174; cf. 7.191–98, 317–28; 8
accompany Odysseus to Ithaca

The suitors, who are notorio
of hospitality, are eager to off
not the proper πομπή to the g
the Phaeacians are deservedly
expel by force" from the house
ἐκπέμψησι 18.336) or "to se
(17.448; πέμψωμεν 20.382–83)
21.307–9), who is notorious fo
of his victims (18.84–87).

interprets this omen favorably, as a sign of Odysseus' return and vengeance on the suitors (15.160–81).

In a rather parodic inversion, Odysseus suffers an unfavorable omen as he departs from the land of the Cyclopes. Having divided up the spoils from the Cyclops' cave, Odysseus sacrifices his portion, Polyphemus' favorite ram, to Zeus (9.550–53). Although the sacrifice is intended to honor Zeus as protector of guests, since he has helped Odysseus avenge Polyphemus' violations of hospitality, Zeus refuses to accept the sacrifice (ὁ δ' οὐκ ἐμπάζετο ἱρῶν 9.553), apparently because the stolen ram is symbolic of Odysseus' violations of hospitality as a guest. It is with this unfavorable omen, then, that Odysseus proceeds on a journey that will prove disastrous.

XXV. Escort to Visitor's Next Destination

Escort (πομπή) to a visitor's next destination is the last obligation of a host to his guest. This obligation is fulfilled in various ways. Sometimes the host simply provides directions to the destination (10.508–40; 12.25–27). Sometimes supplies of food for the journey are provided: bread, wine, and cooked meats (3.479–80; 12.301–2; 13.69). Divinities may raise a favorable wind for the traveler (10.17–26; 10.507; 11.6–8; 12.148–50). But the most generous hosts escort their guests personally: Eumaeus himself acts as Odysseus' guide to the city (17.194, 201–3); Nestor offers Telemachus horses and a chariot and his own sons as guides (πομπῆες) for his journey to Sparta (3.324–26, 368–70, 474–86); the Phaeacians, who are famous for delivering their guests safely and speedily by ship even to distant destinations (πομποὶ ἀπήμονές εἰμεν ἁπάντων 8.566 = 13.174; cf. 7.191–98, 317–28; 8.30–38, 555–71), gather a select crew to accompany Odysseus to Ithaca (13.4–6, 47–52, 63–125).

The suitors, who are notorious for their inversions of various elements of hospitality, are eager to offer escort (πομπή) to Odysseus, but it is not the proper πομπή to the guest's desired destination, that for which the Phaeacians are deservedly praised; to the suitors, πομπή means "to expel by force" from the house (ἐκπέμψασθε θύραζε 20.361; δώματος ἐκπέμψῃσι 18.336) or "to send as a slave" to Egypt, Cyprus, Sicily (17.448; πέμψωμεν 20.382–83), or, worse yet, king Echetus (πέμψομεν 21.307–9), who is notorious for cutting off the noses, ears, and genitals of his victims (18.84–87).

The Problem of Concordance Interpolations

Anyone who wishes to treat the Homeric epics as orally generated and orally performed poems must face squarely the fact that they have been transmitted for more than two and a half millennia in written form, largely by scribes and scholars who appreciated even less than we do today the mechanisms of oral poetry. The poems have thereby suffered excisions, accretions, and various other changes, sometimes through the accidents that are a normal part of the process of transmission, other times through conscious and purposeful manipulation by human hands.

In my view, the tightly knit and balanced structures of both epics and the remarkable homogeneity in the massive body of our inherited texts, lacking as they do any substantial variations in the overall plots of the tales, argue against any large scale post-Homeric omissions or additions; yet changes on a smaller scale, the inevitable result of a long textual, and at times perhaps oral, transmission, are to be expected. There is little we can do to detect changes in the text, whether from rhapsodic embellishment and curtailment or from scribal expansion and omission, before the standardization of the text by Aristarchus in the second century B.C.; and we should take note, as a reminder of our ignorance and as a caution to any generalizations we might wish to make, of the considerable textual variants attested in early quotations of Homer and in the Ptolemaic papyri.[18]

We can take some comfort in Aristarchus' exceptional caution as an editor; while he did omit verses from the already heavily interpolated texts that he inherited, he almost always did so on the basis of external, documentary evidence, omitting only those verses that were absent from a majority of manuscripts.[19] Like his Alexandrian predecessors, he did frequently *athetize* verses on internal grounds (i.e., he left the verse in the text, but with an obelus marked in the left column to indicate some doubt as to authenticity). He did not understand the oral nature of the poetry and therefore objected to the repetition of identical verses, freely athetizing on these grounds; he also athetized on stylistic grounds, because of incongruities, because he was offended by certain religious

---

18. On the early quotations of Homer, see van der Valk 1964, 264–369; van der Valk 1949, 278–85; Allen [1924] 1969, 249–70. On the pre-Aristarchean papyri, see S. West 1967; Allen [1924] 1969, 271–301.

19. Apthorp 1980a, 47–125.

points, or because he considered a verse inappropriate. But such *atheteses,* far from being evidence of a verse's inauthenticity, are ironically a testimony of authenticity; at least one can be certain that such verses are ancient, since the Alexandrians read them in their manuscripts.[20]

Our basis for suspecting pre-Aristarchean interpolation, therefore, is not the *atheteses* but the record of the scholia regarding the readings of various pre-Aristarchean authorities. To this record we may apply the same criterion that is productively applied to post-Aristarchean interpolations—namely, that weakness of attestation in pre-Aristarchean editions constitutes grounds for suspicion. There are two added difficulties, however: (1) rather than having the manuscripts themselves, we are relying on the report of the scholia; (2) pre-Aristarchean critics, unlike post-Aristarchean copyists, did in fact omit verses on internal grounds; hence, we must take into account possible motives for their omission of weakly attested verses.

We can do much more about the considerable post-Aristarchean interpolations that have made their way into our inherited texts. We have inherited more manuscripts of Homer than of any other ancient text except the New Testament; and although this plethora of manuscripts multiplies the variants, resulting in many complexities, this very multiplicity furnishes a sound basis on which to evaluate the authenticity of variant readings. In the last century, we have been particularly fortunate to add to our manuscripts the evidence of many early papyri, the discovery of which has substantially increased our knowledge of the state of the Homeric text at various periods. The accumulated evidence suggests that interpolations are a real and prevalent problem in the post-Aristarchean period. But these are not generally difficult to identify. I have based my evaluation of weakly attested verses on the criteria established by G.M. Bolling and refined by M.J. Apthorp,[21] which acknowledge the clearly demonstrated tendency that in the transmission of Homer's epics, as in the transmission of other sacred or highly regarded texts, accretion, not deletion, is the normal habit of copyists. The manuscript tradition of Homer, therefore, not only retained all of Aristarchus' vulgate text but acquired a fair amount of new material. The proof of this is in the consistent correlation between weakly attested verses in later manuscripts and the absence of these verses in earlier papyri. These observations led Bolling to the conclusion that the *numerus versuum* of

20. On this point, see Janko 1992, 20–29.

21. Bolling [1925] 1968, 3–30; Apthorp 1980a, 35–125.

the Aristarchean text could be reconstructed by omitting from the vulgate all weakly attested verses that show no sign of surface corruption. This conclusion appears fundamentally sound; consequently I have generally regarded weakly attested verses, particularly those absent in early manuscripts and those to which there are no Aristarchean scholia attached, as interpolations, unless there is a possibility of a copyist's error evidenced by *homoeoarchon, homoeomeson,* or *homoeoteleuton.* Occasionally, though, I have considered reasons other than mechanical ones for the omission of a verse, attempting to guess at possible contextual motives for omission; hence, while sometimes retaining suspected verses for consideration, I have tried not to make such verses a mainstay of my arguments.

Whenever we make general statements or construct elaborate theories about the intentions of Homer as a historical poet, about the nature of an original oral performance, or about the resonance of repeated formulae or the thematic echoes between reiterated type-scenes, we should keep an eye on the apparatus of our modern editions, lest we base our theories about Homer on late scribal additions. We should not regard our inherited texts, and the modern editions in which they are most readily accessible, as identical to a Homeric performance. The Wolfian vulgate, from which perhaps the most popular edition today, Allen's Oxford edition, differs but little—the Oxford edition adds *Od.* 18.111a and omits *Il.* 8.548, 550-52; 9.458-61; 11.543—has achieved such sacred status that many scholars naively accept this (or other modern eclectic editions) as canonical, without any acknowledgment of manuscript problems. In fact, some seventy-six weakly attested verses still reside in the Oxford *Iliad,* some ninety-four in the Oxford *Odyssey,*[22] and these late scribal interpolations are frequently marshaled as evidence in identifying verbal echoes, tracing thematic patterns, or supporting a particular theory of oral poetics.[23]

22. Apthorp 1980a, xvii.

23. A few representative examples will suffice:

Brown (1966), arguing that in order to be successful a formal curse must repeat the name and address of the object of the curse, relies heavily on *Od.* 9.531, Polyphemus' repetition of Odysseus' father's name and his address in Ithaca. But this verse is surely a concordance interpolation (from *Od.* 9.505); it is attested in only two very late manuscripts (P^3 and P^7).

Block (1985), tracing the theme of clothing requested by, and offered to, Odysseus, marshals as evidence two interpolated verses (*Od.* 14.154, 516; see Block, 5-6). By thus choosing to follow the Oxford text, even against overwhelming manuscript evidence of

At first glance, the interpol
total verses in the epics might r
But to the detriment of treatm
my analysis of conventional ele
polations are concentrated in
poems, for it is here that a scri
a verse in a shorter than norma
is most likely to interpolate th
make a *concordance interpolat*
tality scene in the *Odyssey,* bec
contains serious manuscript pr

This problem of concordanc
in the feasting scenes of the *O*
describes the preparation of a fe
(1.136-40; 4.52-56; 7.172-76; 1

χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχ
καλῇ χρυσείῃ, ὑπὲρ ἀργυρέ
νίψασθαι· παρὰ δὲ ξεστὴν
σῖτον δ' αἰδοίη ταμίη παρέ
εἴδατα πόλλ' ἐπιθεῖσα, χαρ

[A handmaid brought water
a beautiful, golden one, into
to wash with; and set out b
A respected housekeeper bro
adding many dishes, graciou

Four of the scenes in which th
various degrees of interpolation
aration is a concordance interp
to the feast preparation scene in
58). In two other scenes, the te

interpolation, Block causes the theme to
W.C. Scott (1971), analyzing the sc
to parallel scenes of feasting in the *O*
10.368-72, 15.139, and 21.270 are all v
casts some doubt on his resulting theory

For further examples of failures to
195-227.

At first glance, the interpolation of some 170 verses out of 27,803 total verses in the epics might not appear to present a serious problem. But to the detriment of treatments of type-scenes and themes, such as my analysis of conventional elements in hospitality scenes, these interpolations are concentrated in the most conventional passages of the poems, for it is here that a scribe, incorrectly construing an absence of a verse in a shorter than normal version of a type-scene as an omission, is most likely to interpolate the verse from a parallel passage (i.e., to make a *concordance interpolation*). Consequently almost every hospitality scene in the *Odyssey,* because of its largely conventional nature, contains serious manuscript problems.

This problem of concordance interpolations is critical, for example, in the feasting scenes of the *Odyssey.* The typical five-verse block that describes the preparation of a feast occurs six times in our inherited text (1.136–40; 4.52–56; 7.172–76; 10.368–72; 15.135–39; 17.91–95):

> χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχόῳ ἐπέχευε φέρουσα
> καλῇ χρυσείῃ, ὑπὲρ ἀργυρέοιο λέβητος,
> νίψασθαι· παρὰ δὲ ξεστὴν ἐτάνυσσε τράπεζαν.
> σῖτον δ' αἰδοίη ταμίη παρέθηκε φέρουσα,
> εἴδατα πόλλ' ἐπιθεῖσα, χαριζομένη παρεόντων.
>
> [A handmaid brought water and poured it from an ewer,
> a beautiful, golden one, into a silver basin,
> to wash with; and set out beside them a polished table.
> A respected housekeeper brought bread and set it beside them,
> adding many dishes, gracious with her provisions.]

Four of the scenes in which this five-verse block occurs have suffered various degrees of interpolation. The entire scene of Circe's feast preparation is a concordance interpolation (10.368–72), and the addendum to the feast preparation scene in Sparta appears to be interpolated (4.57–58). In two other scenes, the textual problems are complicated owing to

interpolation, Block causes the theme to appear more pervasive in this scene than it should.

W.C. Scott (1971), analyzing the scenes of feasting in Ithaca, with frequent recourse to parallel scenes of feasting in the *Odyssey,* fails to recognize that *Od.* 1.148, 4.57–58, 10.368–72, 15.139, and 21.270 are all very likely concordance interpolations. This failure casts some doubt on his resulting theory of the nature of oral composition and performance.

For further examples of failures to recognize interpolated verses, see Apthorp 1980a, 195–227.

a confusion in antiquity over the meaning of εἴδατα (misconstrued as "leftover meat") and whether it can appropriately be served in conjunction with freshly cut meat (1.139–40; 15.139).[24]

The disagreement over the meaning of εἴδατα goes at least as far back as Aristarchus. The HMQ scholia to 4.55–56 relate Aristarchus' suspicion of 1.139–40: εἰκότως δὲ νῦν τὰ περὶ τῆς ταμίας παράκειται· οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ξενίζεσθαι παρὰ Τηλεμάχῳ τὴν 'Αθηνᾶν. ἐπεισεληλύθασι γὰρ οὗτοι τοῖς περὶ τὸν Μενέλαον, ἐξ ἀρχῆς δὲ παρὰ τῷ Τηλεμάχῳ πάρεστιν ὁ Μέντης. Apparently the problem entailed a misunderstanding of εἴδατα to mean "leftover meat," which would be appropriate in Sparta, where Telemachus and Pisistratus arrive after the initial feast has been served, but inappropriate in Ithaca, where Athena-Mentes arrives at the beginning of the preparation of the feast. This misunderstanding of εἴδατα led Athenaeus too (*Deipnosophists* 193b) to suspect 4.55–57 (and perhaps 1.139–41): διαμαρτάνουσι δὲ πολλοὶ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ ἐφεξῆς τιθέντες τούτους τοὺς στίχους· [quotes 4.55–57 = 1.139–41] εἰ γὰρ εἴδατα παρέθηκεν ἡ ταμίη, δῆλον ὡς κρεάτων λείψανα τυγχάνοντα, τὸν δαιτρὸν οὐκ ἔδει παρεισφέρειν. διόπερ τὸ δίστιχον ἀπαρκεῖ. More important here than Athenaeus' bungled textual criticism is that, whereas Aristarchus gives no indication that he suspected 1.139–40 on external grounds, we may infer from Athenaeus' words (διαμαρτάνουσι δὲ πολλοὶ) that he (or his source) knew of some manuscripts that did not have 4.57 (and perhaps 1.141). The absence of 4.57–58 in many medieval manuscripts suggests their spuriousness, raising suspicion that Athenaeus' source probably noted that 4.57–58 were missing in some manuscripts and present in others (a result of simple concordance interpolation) and attributed this weakness of attestation to falsely deduced internal evidence. The authenticity of 1.141–42, on the other hand, remains unquestionable. S. West surprisingly perpetuates Athenaeus' definition of εἴδατα as "leftover meat" and purports to solve the perceived inconcinnity in 1.139–42 by doing away with the ταμιή (1.139–40)—like Aristarchus, entirely on internal grounds.[25] But surely the the omission of 1.139 by L[4] is a mistake, for the omission of the single verse leaves 1.140 stranded.

My own, fairly simple view is that εἴδατα is a generic word for food and does not necessarily mean leftover food. After all, do the Lotus-

24. In 4.57–58 and 15.139, there is some difficulty in determining whether the textual problems result from simple concordance interpolation or from a lexical misconception.

25. S. West, in Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988, 1.139–40n.

eaters enjoy "flowery leftovers"
of the gods eat "ambrosial lefto
The serving of εἴδατα with fre
would not strike a Homeric au
both εἴδατα and the cutting of
feasting scene of the *Odyssey*
elaborating this scene a little m
My conclusions about the a
Odyssey of this five-verse block
after this block) follow.

(1.136–43). All verses are auth
mistake. Both ancient and mo
grounds are the result of a mis

(4.52–58). Athenaeus' objection
grounds is ill-founded, but in
manuscripts at his (or his sou
Many medieval manuscripts, in
no scholia attached to them. T
cordance interpolations (from 1.
that I regard these verses as spur
edition may have omitted them
Athenaeus' suspicion of 4.57–5

(7.172–76). All verses are authe

(10.368–72). The entire passage
(1–2 A.D.) and *L*[4] in Allen's fa
It is in the margins of Allen's f
and Br. Further, there are no
and Eustathius does not ment
scene is clearly a post-Aristarc

(15.135–41). All medieval manu
h omit 15.139, and there are n
suggesting that it is a post-Aris
to strike off the last verse of a
integrity in every other case, es

meaning of εἴδατα (misconstrued as
can appropriately be served in con
139–40; 15.139).[24]
aning of εἴδατα goes at least as far
scholia to 4.55–56 relate Aristarchus
νῦν τὰ περὶ τῆς ταμίας παράκειται
εμάχῳ τὴν 'Αθηνᾶν. ἐπεισεληλύθασι
ον, ἐξ ἀρχῆς δὲ παρὰ τῷ Τηλεμάχῳ
he problem entailed a misunderstand
neat," which would be appropriate in
isistratus arrive after the initial feast
ate in Ithaca, where Athena-Mentes
eparation of the feast. This misunder
too (*Deipnosophists* 193b) to suspect
διαμαρτάνουσι δὲ πολλοὶ παρὰ τῷ
οὺς στίχους· [quotes 4.55–57 = 1.139–
ταμίη, δῆλον ὡς κρεάτων λείψανα
ει παρεισφέρειν. διόπερ τὸ δίστιχον
n Athenaeus' bungled textual criticism
no indication that he suspected 1.139–
ıfer from Athenaeus' words (διαμαρ–
is source) knew of some manuscripts
ıps 1.141). The absence of 4.57–58 in
ts their spuriousness, raising suspicion
oted that 4.57–58 were missing in some
(a result of simple concordance inter-
ness of attestation to falsely deduced
ty of 1.141–42, on the other hand,
surprisingly perpetuates Athenaeus'
meat" and purports to solve the per
y doing away with the ταμιή (1.139–
internal grounds.[25] But surely the the
ce, for the omission of the single verse

hat εἴδατα is a generic word for food
ftover food. After all, do the Lotus-

ie difficulty in determining whether the textual
nterpolation or from a lexical misconception."
ainsworth 1988, 1.139–40n.

eaters enjoy "flowery leftovers" (ἄνθινον εἶδαρ *Od.* 9.84)? Do the horses of the gods eat "ambrosial leftovers" (ἀμβρόσιον εἶδαρ *Il.* 5.369; 13.35)? The serving of εἴδατα with fresh meat, as at 1.140–41 and 15.139–40, would not strike a Homeric audience as incongruous, and the fact that both εἴδατα and the cutting of the meat by a δαιτρός occur in the first feasting scene of the *Odyssey* only serves to show that the poet was elaborating this scene a little more than some of the others.

My conclusions about the authenticity of the six occurrences in the *Odyssey* of this five-verse block (and of some of the verses immediately after this block) follow.

(1.136–43). All verses are authentic. The omission of 1.139 by L[4] is a mistake. Both ancient and modern objections to 1.139–41 on internal grounds are the result of a misunderstanding of εἴδατα.

(4.52–58). Athenaeus' objection to 4.57 (and presumably 4.58) on internal grounds is ill-founded, but in his report, he incidentally betrays that manuscripts at his (or his source's) disposal did not contain 4.57–58. Many medieval manuscripts, including L[8], omit the verses, and there are no scholia attached to them. They are probably post-Aristarchean concordance interpolations (from 1.141–42); yet, it is with some tentativeness that I regard these verses as spurious, since an influential pre-Aristarchean edition may have omitted them on the same internal grounds that aroused Athenaeus' suspicion of 4.57–58 and Aristarchus' suspicion of 1.139–40.

(7.172–76). All verses are authentic.

(10.368–72). The entire passage is absent in the oldest manuscripts—Π[8] (1–2 A.D.) and *L*[4] in Allen's families e, f, i, j, k, and in Pal., T, and Z. It is in the margins of Allen's families e and j. It is bracketed in P[3], V[4], and Br. Further, there are no scholia attached to any of these verses, and Eustathius does not mention them in his commentary. The entire scene is clearly a post-Aristarchean concordance interpolation.

(15.135–41). All medieval manuscripts except Allen's families d, f, g, and h omit 15.139, and there are no scholia attached to the verse, strongly suggesting that it is a post-Aristarchean interpolation. Yet I am reluctant to strike off the last verse of a five-verse block that has maintained its integrity in every other case, especially since 15.139 is a clause dependent

both grammatically and contextually on 15.138. Moreover, the same falsely deduced argument against 1.139–41 could account for the suspicion attached to 15.139; namely, that since Boethoides (= Eteoneus) is carving fresh meat at 15.140, the "leftovers" (εἴδατα) at 15.139 do not make sense. 15.135–41 are structurally similar to 1.136–43: after the five-verse block, someone carves and distributes meat, then someone else passes around the wine. I think the addendum to the five-verse block was a conventional element with which the poet could elaborate the scene. Thus, despite manuscript evidence to the contrary, I tentatively regard 15.139 as authentic.

(17.91–95). All verses are authentic.

In sum, when we consider the transmission of the Homeric epics, we face a problem that everyone who works on Homer must confront—namely, that we can never be absolutely certain of the authenticity of our inherited texts; everything we say must be affixed by an imaginary asterisk denoting that our conclusions are conditional. But these difficulties should not cause us to abandon hope of saying anything meaningful about Homer, nor should they necessarily compel us to take cover behind the protective shield of literary theories that claim to consider only the text "as we have it." In the following analyses of Homeric hospitality scenes, I base my conclusions on as early and as reliable a text as the resources available permit; beyond this I can do little more than be admittedly tentative about conclusions based on problematic verses, while studiously avoiding all the forms of dogmatism for which Homeric scholarship has become so notorious.

(

Ithaca (

καί τε θεοὶ ξείνοισιν ἐ
παντοῖοι τελέθοντες, ἐ
ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν τε κα

[Even the gods, likening
taking on all forms, fre
observing both the viol

In the first scene of hospitali
Mentes, a guest-friend of Ody
the simple purpose of her visi
(1.80–95), is to encourage the
motion his journey to Sparta
enriched, and its tension heig
folktale motif in which a god
order to test their hospitality. T
universally,[1] is well attested in
is an often reiterated motif in t
Odysseus of being a god in di
his father's sudden change in a
79); and the suitors raise the

1. Thompson 1955–58, K1811, Q1.
2. The motif occurs in its most star
and Philemon (Ovid *Met.* 8.611–724),
and Apollo's visit to Macello (Nonnus
on *Aeneid* 6.618), and Jupiter's, Nep
5.495–536). On the possibility of Gree
see Malten 1939; Fontenrose 1945; H
the tale of Jupiter and Lycaon, see A
For a complete list of the various ty
Burnett 1970, 24–25n.8. On Odysseus'

CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY

vid's Metamorphoses *Book 2*

:tions in the Iliad

an and Cassius Dio

ory and the Aesthetics

The Stranger's Welcome

Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene

STEVE REECE

Ann Arbor

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS