NOTES / KORT BYDRAES

A NOTE ON ODYSSEY 10. 189–97

This speech by Odysseus, which has understandably puzzled commentators from Aristarchus on (see Schol. HQ on 193), should not be regarded as totally pessimistic.¹ When Odysseus says, "φροιζομένθα θιστοσον / ετ' τις ετ' ἐσται μῆτις· ἐγὼ δ' ὅσκ οἴσμα εἶναι" (192f.), he cannot mean that he envisages no possibility of any kind of useful action at all, for he has already decided on some such action (151–5) and is about to put this decision into operation (203ff.). He presumably means (if the traditional text is sound) that because they have no idea where they are or in which direction Ithaca lies (190–92, 194f.), they cannot decide on their own in which direction they should sail: in this context the process of seeking advice hinted at in 196f. is regarded as a means towards the forming of an appropriate μῆτις rather than as a μῆτις itself.² I agree with M. van der Valk³ that Odysseus is trying to persuade his demoralized companions to go off in the direction of the smoke to make the necessary inquiries, but I doubt whether φροιζομένθα ... / ετ' τις ετ' ἐσται μῆτις can mean 'Let us think, if there is another way left (i.e. than to go on patrol)', as Van der Valk paraphrases it (my emphasis): that would surely require ετ' ἄλλῃ μῆτις.⁴ The most recent Ameis-Hentze edition⁵ takes μῆτις in 193 to mean a plan to avoid the necessity of the plan Odysseus is about to hint at in 196f.; but this seems highly artificial.

Admittedly with my interpretation of 193 it remains rather surprising that Odysseus should say without qualification ἐγὼ δ' ὅσκ οἴσμα εἶναι when he does have a definite course of action in mind and that he should deny this

---

¹ For the relevance of this point to the wider question of the relationship between Odysseus and his companions see Acta Classica 17 (1974) 11–23, especially 17–19.
² This was roughly the interpretation of Ameis: see K. F. Ameis and C. Hentze, Anhang zu Homer's Odyssee Heft 2 (3rd ed. Leipzig 1889) ad loc.
³ Textual Criticism of the Odyssey (Leiden 1949) 274ff.
⁴ G. W. Nitzsch, Erklärende Anmerkungen zu Homer's Odyssee Band III (Hanover 1840) and J. U. Faesi, Homer's Odyssee Band II (8th ed., revised by G. Hinrichs, Berlin 1884) ad loc. understand ἄλλῃ with μῆτις. Nitzsch compares Od. 17. 587 – but there it is not necessary to supply ἄλλοι, since ὅσκ naturally implies 'as the suitors do', and then ὅσκ ... τινὲς ... ἄνεργες can quite logically exclude the suitors just as it stands; even Faesi admits this, op. cit. Band III (7th ed., revised by G. Hinrichs, Berlin 1885) ad loc.: 'Man kann ἄλλοις ergänzen ... Doch ist der Ausdruck mit Weglassung von ἄλλοι noch nachdrücklicher: nicht irgende, welche Männer so (wie diese)'. Moreover, the difficulty caused by one's having to supply ἄλλη in Od. 10. 193 is increased by the odd anticipatory use of the word which this interpretation supposes.
⁵ Band I Heft 2 (11th ed. Leipzig 1908, repr. Amsterdam 1964) ad loc.
plan the status of a μήτις. I suspect that οὐχ in 193 may be a corruption: perhaps we should emend to ἐγὼ δ’ ἀρ’ δόμαι εἶναι. (The restoration of the normal scansion δόμαι for οὐχ would be an advantage.) The force of the γάρ in 194 will then extend to the end of the speech, and the purpose of 194f. will be to lead up to the point made in 196f. by both setting the scene and hinting that no alternative plan is available. The thought in 190–97 will then be: ‘We have no idea where we are; but let us quickly consider whether there is still any plan available. I, for my part, think there is, for I saw smoke in the middle of the island’. It then becomes easier to understand the companions’ evident realization that in 196f. Odysseus has proposed a course of action (198–200; and in 203ff. Odysseus proceeds as though they have already understood the general nature of his proposal). The corruption would presumably have occurred in the pre-written tradition: it would be a mistake in memorization arising from the apparently pessimistic tone of 190–92 and (with a misinterpretation of the force of the γάρ in 194) doubtless facilitated by the fact that δόμαι and δόω are more often than not preceded by a negative in Homer.

I had already written my draft of the above when I discovered that at least one radical emendation, and one radical quasi-emendation, of 193 have already been proposed. V. Bérand prints his own conjecture in his text: ἐὰν τις ἐνίστοι μὴν μητίς. ἐγὼ δ’ οὖ οἴδα γ’ ἀμείνω’. This is ingenious; but ἐνίστοι is unconvincing: in Bérand’s context a verb of speaking seems inapposite: one would expect instead a verb of invention such as εὐρίσκων (cf. Od. 19. 158, 9. 421f.) or ὑφείμειν (cf. e.g. Od. 9. 422, 13. 386); cf. also II. 10. 19. Moreover, the anticipatory use of ἀμείνω is odd. Merkelbach believes that ‘B’ (the Bearbeiter) deliberately altered 193, which originally ran . . . ἐγὼ γάρ δόμαι εἶναι, and shortened the original version of Odysseus’ speech by ending it at 197. But why should anyone have deliberately made such changes? The reason suggested by Merkelbach is unconvincing, and his reconstruction of the earlier text is marred by the fact that he assigns without hesitation to ‘A’, the ‘Dichter der älteren Odyssee’, lines 201f., which are in all probability a post-Aristarchean interpolation. However, the merit of ἐγὼ γάρ δόμαι εἶναι as a simple emendation (though this is not what Merkelbach

6. Thus Hentze, loc. cit. (above, n. 2), criticizes the interpretation of Ameis: ‘... bei dem feststehenden Entschluss des Odysseus Kundschafter auszusenden ... [bleibt] das Geständnis völlig ratslos zu sein seltsam’. Cf. also R. Merkelbach, Untersuchungen zur Odyssee (Zetemata Heft 2, Munich 1951, 2nd ed. 1969) 184: ‘Es ist sonderbar, dass der πολλημήτης vorgibt, keinen Rat zu wissen; wir wissen doch aus 155, dass er den Plan hat, eine Schar auf Erkundigung auszusenden’.
9. See G. M. Bolling, The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer (Oxford 1925, repr. 1968) 25, and T. W. Allen, Odyssea (2nd ed. Oxford 1917–19) ad loc.: note that our two earliest minuscules, Allen’s L4 and L8, are among those which omit the lines, and that there is no homoiographic temptation to omission.
means it to be) can be considered independently of his general thesis. He has of course anticipated me in removing the οὖκ, and makes roughly the same point as I have about the scansion δομα μα vs. δομα; but γὰρ would produce a virtual non sequitur: the fact that Odysseus has already thought of a particular plan hardly constitutes a reason why they should all consider whether any plan is available. I would therefore prefer εὑρό δ᾽ ἄρι δομα εἶναι.
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NOTES ON SOME HOMERIC ECHOES IN HELIODORUS’ AETHIOPICA

Heliodorus’ indebtedness to Homer is conspicuous at many points, and a fair impression of its nature and extent may be gained from the commentary in the edition of Rattenbury, Lumb and Maillon (Paris, 1935-40; 2nd ed. 1960), or from the listings with occasional remarks by E. Feuillâtre, pp. 105–114 of Études sur les Éthiopiokes d’Héliodore (Paris, 1966). A brief overall view is to be found, also, on pp. 77–78 of E. H. Haight’s Essays on the Greek Romances (Port Washington, N.Y., 1965). In these notes I have selected a handful of the more interesting adaptations for somewhat more detailed comment involving, also, an interpretation of their significance.

A series of stark contrasts colours δ δὲ πόλεμος ἡμῖν μελήσει (1. 28), which patently recalls Hector’s farewell to Andromache πόλεμος δ’ ἀνδρεσι μελήσει/πάσι... (II. 6. 492–3). Hector and Andromache are, of course, the very prototype of conjugal devotion, and Hector here bids his wife go indoors to attend to her domestic tasks while he fights for Troy. But in Heliodorus the words are spoken by Thyamis the pirate chief whose main design is to wed Chariclea, the heroine of the novel, against her will. Being attacked by brigands he is bundling her off to be imprisoned in a cavern, and when the fight to which he here pledges himself goes against him he tries to kill her so that no one else may enjoy her. (In fact, he kills a different woman by mistake.)

A Homeric echo serves to introduce a touch of humorous irony at 2.19 where Cnemon gently mocks the appearance of Chariclea and her beloved Theagenes disguised as beggars. His words έμοι δοκεῖτε τοιοῦτον ὅτες οὐκ ἀκόλουθος ἄλλο δοράς τε καὶ λέπητας αἰτήσειν reverse Melanthius’ brutal taunt of Odysseus disguised as a beggar αἰτίζων ἄκολον, οὐκ ἄρας οὐδὲ λέβητας (Od. 17. 222). Though none too happy about their situation, Theagenes and Chariclea
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