

# THE ADVERB ΑΝΔΡΑΚΑΣ AND THE COMPOSITION OF THE ODYSSEY

ALDO PAOLO BOTTINO

The present essay will focus on *Odyssey* xiii 13-15: in this famous passage, Alkinoos suggests that each Phaiakian chief (or king<sup>1</sup>), himself included, give Odysseus a great tripod and a cauldron, just before the departure of the hero. My argument will hinge on the interpretation of the adverb ἀνδρακάς, by which line 14 begins and the sentence initiated at line 13 is completed *en enjambement*. I shall explore the possibility that the Odyssean text, in yet another example of auto-referentiality, alludes here to the “collaborative effort”<sup>2</sup> which, according to Douglas Frame, produced the monumental epic of *nóstos* through the expansion of traditional songs<sup>3</sup> before the audiences of the Panionia. The number and the role of the βασιλῆες (twelve with Alkinoos as communal representative<sup>4</sup>), if blended with the specific meaning of the adverb, could indicate the type of poetic performance purportedly held at the Panionia, when a group of poets performed (and composed) together in sequence, and also the particular dynamics of this ‘distributive’ composition in performance — the individual poet contributed by his own effort to the creation of the epic as a *continuum*, while the Homeric epics reached monumental proportions as a result of these contributions diachronically articulated in terms of an ongoing collaboration. At the end of the yearly<sup>5</sup> recurring festival, each Panionic poet could feel himself entitled, as Odysseus did, to return home with an expanded ‘gift’ of song and more stories to tell. It will be my working assumption that the Phaiakes in fact “represent the Ionians”<sup>6</sup> in the context of the Panionia: the complex process that regulates the bestowing of the final series of *xeinía* on Odysseus might both support and be understood by this interpretative hypothesis.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Od.* viii 390: δώδεκα [...] ἀριπρεπέες βασιλῆες “twelve glorious kings.”

<sup>2</sup> See Frame 2009: 560-561: “There had long been poems about a war at Troy, and some of these may already have been developed on a considerable scale by individual poets. I imagine that the poetic collaboration at Panionion began with one such poem about Troy, namely the poem that featured the anger of the Thessalian hero Achilles. The tale of Odysseus was probably less developed when it too was incorporated into a combined performance at the Panionia. The poem about Odysseus was therefore more thoroughly shaped by the collaborative process than was the more traditional poem about the war at Troy.”

<sup>3</sup> When I refer to traditional songs I have in mind what Albert Lord conceptualized as such. Casey Dué effectively and briefly recalled this cornerstone of oral theory: “In an oral traditional song culture such as that in which the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were composed, each new performance is a new composition. In such a system, as Albert Lord demonstrated, there can technically be no original from which all others are copies.” On ‘originals’ and the evolutionary model see also Nagy 2004: 30. In this sense, to be traditional means to entertain an ‘endogenetic’, bio-cultural relationship to a given community, as Nagy pointed out: “I propose to use the concept of *tradition* or *traditional* in conjunction with oral poetry in such a way as to focus on the perception of tradition by the given society in which the given tradition operates, not on any perception by the outside observer who is looking in, as it were, on the given tradition (1996: 14).”

<sup>4</sup> On this particular role of Alkinoos see Frame 2009: 522 n.13 and Frame 2012 § 12.

<sup>5</sup> The frequency of the festival is discussed by Frame 2009: 576 and n. 137.

<sup>6</sup> To envisage a practical path of expansion for the poems, it is crucial to address possible audiences rather than (only) performers: no composition-in-performance (and, thus, no expansion) is thinkable without an audience and its peculiar horizon of expectations. Frame’s opening of chapter 11 is unmistakably clear on that: “If Odysseus’s Phaeacian audience in fact represents the Homeric audience, I think that we have found the occasion on which the Homeric poems were performed during their formative Ionian phase, namely the festival of the Panionia. This, to repeat, was the only occasion on which the Ionians of the dodecapolis, whom the Phaeacians represent, actually came together as one. Among the things that they did there, if the Phaeacians who listen to *Odyssey* 9–12 are a guide, was to listen to a performance of the Homeric poems (2009: 551-2).”

## ΑΝΔΡΑΚΑΣ

At the beginning of scroll xiii Alkinoos urges his noble peers to obey him and bestow extra gifts on Odysseus before his departure:

ἀλλ' ἄγε οἱ δώμεν τρίποδα μέγαν ἠδὲ λέβητα  
ἀνδρακάς, ἡμεῖς δ' αὖτε ἀγειρόμενοι κατὰ δῆμον  
τεισόμεθ' ἄργαλέον γάρ ἓνα προικὸς χαρίσασθαι.

So come, let us give him a great tripod and a cauldron as well  
each man of us; we will recoup the cost from among the people.  
Giving presents without reimbursement is taxing for one man.

*Od.* xiii 13-15

The exact meaning of the word ἀνδρακάς was perhaps no less puzzling to the ancient than it (at least partially) remains to modern scholars. This ἐπίρρημα practically goes through all ancient (and Byzantine) scholarship (Apollonius Dyscolus, as first, discusses its accentual pattern and parallels it, among other adverbs, to that of ἐκάς<sup>7</sup>) and lexicography from Apollonius Sophista, who includes it in the *hapax* number (τῶν ἄπαξ εἰρημένων *LH* 33 9) explaining the adverb as κατ' ἄνδρα, to Pseudo-Zonaras, who restates the gloss κατ' ἄνδρα and (re-)proposes an interesting connection with ἕκαστον<sup>8</sup>. Polybius Sardinianus, Hesychius, Photius, Eustathius (and the *Scholia vetera*<sup>9</sup>) are all consistent, apart

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Apollonius, *De adverbis* 2.1,1.60.19-20: Τὰ εἰς ας λήγοντα ὀξύνονται (ἰδιαίτερον μὲν παρὰ τὸν ἄνδρα παραχθὲν τὸ ἀνδρακάς). οὕτως ἔχει καὶ τὸ ἐντυπίας, ἐκάς, ἀνεκάς [...] “The adverbs terminating in -ας are oxytone: more specifically, we have ἀνδρακάς derived from ἄνδρα. The same is true for ἐντυπίας, ἐκάς, and ἀνεκάς [...]” These examples of oxytone ἐπίρρηματα are reproduced in Aelius Herodianus’ *De prosodia catholica* (3.1.511.7-8), who adds ἀγκάς. The accentuation and the last vowel quantity of ἀνδρακάς, ἐκάς and ἀγκάς are again brought together by Eustathius when he comments on *Il.* V 371 (2.94.1-2), and elsewhere (at *CI* 3.658.5-7 different opinions are discussed: is ἀγκάς an adverb or a noun? At 4.883.13-14 ἀνδρακάς and ἐκάς are said to receive the same accent as the ‘ancient’ adverb of quality ἐντυπίας).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon* alpha 226 10-14: σημαίνει κατὰ ἄνδρα. παρὰ τὸ ἀνδρὸς γενικῆ, καὶ τὸ ἕκαστον, συγκοπῆ ἐκάς, καὶ ἀνδροεκάς, καὶ συγκοπῆ ἀνδροκάς, καὶ τροπῆ ἀνδρακάς ὡς κινόμωια, κινάμωια “It means κατὰ ἄνδρα: it is formed by adding ἕκαστον τὸ ἀνδρὸς, the genitive of ἀνὴρ. Removing -τον we have ἐκάς, and so ἀνδροεκάς. Finally, by syncope we have ἀνδροκάς and then, by change, ἀνδρακάς: similarly we have κινάμωια from κινόμωια.” This was also one of the interpretations of the *Etymologicum genuinum* (ἐπίρρημα σημαίνει κατὰ ἄνδρα ἢ παρὰ τὴν ἀνδρὸς γενικὴν παράγωγον [...] ἕκαστος, συγκοπῆ ἐκάς καὶ ἀνδροεκάς, καὶ ἐν συγκοπῆ ἀνδροκάς καὶ τροπῆ ἀνδρακάς [...] alpha 821-822). The interpretation of Pseudo-Zonaras is ostensibly an abridged form of the entries of the *Etymologicum genuinum*. Cf. *Etymologicum magnum* 102.16-25; *Etymologicum Symeonis* 1.36.27-28. *Etymologicum Gudianum* substantially aligns with its forerunners and followers in explaining the adverb: κατὰ ἄνδρα (alpha 136.10). The *Epimerismi Homeric* confirm that the preferred reading in the Byzantine school tradition was κατὰ ἄνδρα (alpha 344.1). On the importance of the *Epimerismi* see Dickey 2006: “The *Epimerismi Homeric* is a commentary consisting of grammatical explanations and definitions of Homeric words; the ἐπιμερισμὸς format was an instructional method of the Byzantine school tradition (rather like sentence-parsing in English several generations ago), so most of the explanations in the *Epimerismi Homeric* are elementary. The work was based on a wide range of sources, including Herodian, Apion, the D scholia, and several lost works of ancient scholarship. Though anonymously transmitted, the *Epimerismi* are likely to have been composed by Choeroboscus in the ninth century. They are useful not only for what they tell us about the Byzantine reading of Homer, but also because they preserve ancient scholarship that is lost in its original form.” See Also Pontani 2015: 320: “Due to the plurality of its sources [...] and the consequent variety of approaches [...] this collection represents an invaluable source of fragments documenting the evolution of Homeric and grammatical scholarship [...] as well as a very influential tool for the great etymological lexica produced between the 9th and the 10th century.”

<sup>9</sup> The explanation of the V scholia is κατὰ ἄνδρα. The V scholia to the *Odyssey* are the equivalent of the D scholia to the *Iliad*, and it is possible that they preserve very old (pre-Alexandrian) lexicographical interpretations. On D and V scholia see Dickey 2006: 20-22; Nagy 2004: 18-20. The same explanation is given in BQ scholia.

from additions of minor significance, in interpreting the word as ἄνδρα κάτ(α) in the sense of κατ' ἄνδρα. As far as we can judge from the state of the fragments, Phrynichus preferred to 'solve' it as ἀνδρακάδα<sup>10</sup> meaning τὴν τῶν ἀνδρῶν δεκάδα, but also reaffirmed the distributive function by the clarification ἀντὶ τοῦ κατὰ δέκα ἄνδρας (*PS* 20a-20b). Without entering into the merits of these explanations, the distributive function of the preposition κατὰ (obviously intended as postposition) is always pointed out: the ancient critics conjure up an image of the Phaiakian elders donating together, but individually.

At the end of the nineteenth century Michel Bréal and Antoine Meillet substantially endorsed, from a modern linguistic perspective, this interpretation. More in detail, Bréal, aiming to explain the word ἑκάς and, in particular, its second syllable, wrote that “[n]on seulement ἀνδρακάς équivaut à κατ' ἄνδρα, mais nous croyons que c'est exactement κατ' ἄνδρα, avec la seule différence que la préposition est placée après son régime (Bréal 1894: 51).” The French scholar goes on to underline “le sens distributif” of this prepositional use pointing at some ‘comparative’ evidence of Latin, Italian and Spanish (the preposition κατὰ being borrowed by Latin from Greek and by Romance Languages from Latin) and to conclude postulating ἀνδρακάς = κατ' ἄνδρα (prep. + accusative) as a relatively recent formation<sup>11</sup>. Meillet<sup>12</sup>, two years later, essentially adds nothing to this but the tentative explanation of the sibilant at the end of -κάς (“repose sur -\*κατς”), in the wake of the terse notation of Bréal according to whom “[l]e τ de κατ, étant final, s'est changé en ç (Bréal 1894: 51).”

In his *Griechische Grammatik*, Karl Brugmann is the first to propose an alternative explanation, that is the connection between the second part of ἀνδρα-κάς and the Sanskrit suffix *-śás*<sup>13</sup>, used to make distributive adverbs from numerals and other words (*eka-śás* “one by one”, *dvi-śás* “two by two”, *śata-śás* “by hundreds”, *śreni-śás* “in rows” etc.)<sup>14</sup>, a reconstruction implicitly acknowledged also by Schwyzer, who, nevertheless, after translating ἀνδρα-κάς as *viritim*, does not miss the opportunity to recall the textual variants ἄνδρα κάτα and ἄνδρα κάθ', which go back, respectively, to the scholia and to Eustathius (and friends)<sup>15</sup>. Chantraine's *Dictionnaire Étymologique*, *sub voce* ἑκάς, reinstates the connection with the Sanskrit distributive suffix<sup>16</sup>. In Brugmann's words, “[e]ine Entscheidung zwischen beidem zu treffen, ist schwer.”

I think two examples, among those adduced by Silvia Luraghi in her study of prepositions and cases, can provide some valuable help in solving this conundrum (or to see Brugmann's two hypotheses as not mutually exclusive, if not etymologically, at least

<sup>10</sup> The situation was further complicated by the homograph (?) ἀνδρακάς, (-άδος) (“a man's portion LSJ): cf. *Scholia in Nicandrum* 643c 1-4: (ἀνδρακάδα δὲ τὴν μερίδα φασὶν οἱ νεώτεροι· ἀλλ' Ὅμηρος ἐπιρρηματικῶς φησὶ τὸ ἀνδρακάς. ἀπὸ τούτων δὲ τῶν ἐχίων, λέγει, ἀνδρακάδα, ἤγουν μερίδα, κόψον ἰσόμοιρον “Later authors use ἀνδρακάδα [portion] meaning μερίδα [part], but Homer used ἀνδρακάς adverbially. ‘Of these viper's buglosses, he says, cut off an equal portion’ [ἀνδρακάδα], that is a part [μερίδα].” For the variant ἀνδράδας, cf. Apollonius *LH* 33.9-10 (δύναται δὲ καὶ ἀνδράδας, οἶον ἀνδράδασις, ἢ κατ' ἄνδρα μερίς); Hesychius, *Lexicon* alpha 4721.2 (οἱ δὲ μερίδες, μοῖραι); 4749.1 (ἀνδροκάς· μερίς). Hesychius' ἀνδροκάς was probably explanatory (ἀνὴρ, ἀνδρός); see also *Etymologicum Genuinum* alpha 821-822 cited above.

<sup>11</sup> See *infra* n. 32.

<sup>12</sup> See Meillet 1896: 51.

<sup>13</sup> See Brugmann 1900: 254.

<sup>14</sup> See Whitney 2013: 407.

<sup>15</sup> See Schwyzer 1953: 630.

<sup>16</sup> See Chantraine 1977: 328.

functionally). When the scholar deals with the metaphorical use of *κατά*<sup>17</sup> with the accusative<sup>18</sup>, she cites the following Homeric line:

κρίν' ἄνδρας κατὰ φύλα κατὰ φρήτρας Ἀγάμεμνον

distribute your men in order by tribes, by clans, Agamemnon

*Il.* II 362

Considering both the relative ‘mobility’<sup>19</sup> of adpositions (and preverbs) in Homeric Greek and the soundscape of this verse, it is not hard to contemplate how mental processing could in the meantime clearly elaborate the distributive meaning without the strict necessity to conceptualize a ‘specialized’ governing link between *κατά* and *φύλα*, or, to paraphrase Dag Haug’s terms, to distinguish a preposition (or postposition) from a local adverb<sup>20</sup>. In other words, the phonologic representation of the sequence ἄνδρας:κατὰ, within a sentence where distributive meaning is almost superabundant, could also facilitate a kind of phono syntactic conspiracy<sup>21</sup>. Anyway, I have to make it clear that I am not proposing to explain ἄνδρακάς through /andraskata/ of *Il.* II 362. Rather, I am pointing analogically to an older linguistic situation (and suggesting to see it operating) in

---

<sup>17</sup> On this preposition and its origin from a root noun see also Morpurgo Davies 1983: 304-305; Bortone 2010: 140-142 and, for a concise formulation, 2014: 40-41: “At least some Greek prepositions appear to have derived from inflected nouns. Both within Greek and in languages related to Greek, we find formally similar prepositions whose meanings are very similar or identical, and whose morphological differences match case endings: Greek *ἀντί* and *ἀντα* (or *ἀντεν*) have endings that look like the locative and accusative; the same alternation recurs in *περί* and *πέραν*, to which we can add *πέρα*, possibly an old instrumental. Suggestions have long been made (Giles 1895: 291, 300) that *ἀμφί*, *ἐνί*, *ἐπί*, *περί*, and *πρός* are old locatives, and *ἀνά*, *διά*, *μετά*, *κατά* (to which we might add *ἡάμα*) old instrumentals. Likewise, *κατά* is probably an inflected noun (see Morpurgo Davies 1983: 304/f.) and it obviously has a link with *κάτο*, which was perhaps originally an ablative.” For Hittite *katta* and PIE adverb/adposition *\*k’nta* see Hewson and Bubenik 2006: 88; 365-366.

<sup>18</sup> See Luraghi 2003: 203. The two non-locative meanings of *κατά* + accusative express the idea “according to”, based on the locative meaning “along-downwards”, and an idea of ‘distributiveness.’

<sup>19</sup> Adverbial and local particles could precede or follow nouns, as the process leading to adpositional phrases seems not to be completed then. See Bortone 2014: 43. The process leading to adpositional phrases in Homeric Greek is summarized by Hewson and Bubenik 2006: 77: “1. (Homeric Greek). The adverbial particles representing spatial contrasts that were inherited from PIE are used freely as modifiers of verbs (either cliticized as preverbs, separated in the function of tmesis, or otherwise free) and of nouns in oblique cases (preposed, postposed, or elsewhere in the sentence). 2. (Homeric). The frequent preposing and postposing of these particles to nouns in oblique cases indicates a dependency relationship between adverbial noun and adverbial particle, in which the noun in the oblique case indicates by its case a very general adverbial sense, which is then made more precise by the lexical sense of the adverbial particle. 3. (Homeric). The relationship between the two elements may become such that neither is properly meaningful without the other. When this occurs, the particle is not only preposed, but carries, where possible (i.e. when disyllabic), an accent on the final syllable that marks the relationship of the two items. 4. (Homeric). Given the marked reciprocity of the two elements in this new configurational unit, the speaker is free to exploit either element as the head of the phrase. The move makes possible the next stage, where this configuration becomes grammaticalized as a fixture of the language.”

<sup>20</sup> See Haug 2009. In his article, Haug studies the categorial status of what he calls ‘place words’ in Homeric Greek (“a well known group of words as *ἀνά*, *ἀπό*, *ἐπί* etc. [p. 103]”), arguing, on the basis of the dependency relation between them and the relative noun in so-called discontinuous structures (PW relating to a non-adjacent noun), that they should be regarded as prepositions.

<sup>21</sup> “A phono-syntactic conspiracy is proposed to account for a recent language change in spoken Beijing Mandarin Chinese, which involves the loss of general classifier through sound erosion caused by frequency of usage in discourse (Tao 2006: 91).” For grammaticalization of noun phrases as the product of this phenomenon in Mandarin Chinese see Tao 2002: 277-299. Obviously, our case cannot be strictly considered an instance of grammaticalization, because no ‘grammatical’ morpheme evolves from an autonomous word. As an indicative, even though speculative, example, the Latin dative/ablative plural ending *-ibus* could be accounted for as resulting from grammaticalization of a PIE postposition *\*bhi*.

which the presence of postpositions<sup>22</sup> (and ‘tmesis’<sup>23</sup>) could possibly generate ‘new’ phonological words like ἀνδρακάς (*i.e.* by an external sandhi phenomenon) in *appropriate* contexts. The second Homeric passage (describing indeed one of these contexts) I would like to mention is taken from the *Odyssey*:

ἔς δ' ἦλθον μνηστῆρες ἀγήνορες · οἱ μὲν ἔπειτα  
ἔξειψ' ἔζοντο κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε.

Then the proud suitors came in.  
They sat down in rows on benches and chairs.

*Od.* i 144-145

These lines (originally adduced by Chantraine<sup>24</sup>) are cited to explain how the distributive meaning of κατὰ might derive from the locative meaning conveyed by the preposition when we have a multiple trajectory and a multiple landmark<sup>25</sup>. This passage describes a situation of ‘distributed seating’ (ἔξειψ' + ἔζομαι + κατὰ) during commensal activities (including, in this case, listening to Phemios<sup>26</sup>), which I shall consider further when discussing the particular usage of ἀνδρακάς within the corpus of ancient Greek literature. For her part, Luraghi rightly underlines that “the structure of events makes clear that each person takes a seat on one of the chairs: distributiveness does not, strictly speaking, belong to the meaning of the preposition, but is inferred from the situation (Luraghi 2003: 204).”

---

<sup>22</sup> On postpositions and the debated argument of the relationship between Mycenaean and Homeric Greek see Morpurgo Davies 1983: 288: “[...] Mycenaean has prepositions but not postpositions.”; Coleman 1991: 329: “The apparently exclusive use of prepositions in Linear B [...] indicates that the later poetic tradition with its occasional postpositions reflects an older stage of the language, just as Vedic poetry does in relation to Vedic prose.” See also the following note.

<sup>23</sup> See Morpurgo Davies 1983: 286-287: “Yet in Mycenaean univerbation has taken place and it is possible to distinguish between adverbs which occur on their own and preverbs which appear in composition. From this point of view the language of Homer, where ‘tmesis is frequent’, is more archaic than Mycenaean.” Similarly, Morpurgo Davies 1988: 86: “Mycenaean [...] shows regular composition of preverb and verb and no traces of tmesis, even if the odds are that the status of the prepositions/preverbs was somewhat different from that of classical Greek. Thus paradoxically Homeric syntax is linguistically more archaic than the syntax of the Mycenaean tablets.” For a different opinion concerning Mycenaean see Haug 2012: 99: “[...] the evidence is too weak to allow the conclusion that tmesis was disallowed by the syntactic rules of Greek in the Bronze Age.” Indeed, Morpurgo Davies’ opinion appears to be more nuanced than Haug admits, as De Angelis and Gasbarra have rightly noticed: “La Morpurgo-Davies tra i primi ha però mostrato come un tale paradosso sia soltanto apparente: la diversità del miceneo rispetto all’epica omerica potrebbe dipendere in questo caso da ragioni più indirizzate a fattori stilistici che diacronici: sarebbe, insomma, la diversa tipologia testuale ad aver selezionato opzioni diverse, l’univerbizzazione in miceneo, da un lato, la libertà di posizionamento sintattico, in Omero, dall’altro (2010: 150).” As last, see Bortone 2014: 43: “In Greek, already by Mycenaean times, prepositions were the rule and postpositions were obsolescent and stylistically marked. Postpositional use is attested mainly in Homeric Greek (which shows that Homeric usage is a literary archaism reflecting, in part, an *état de langue* older than Mycenaean), e.g. *neôn ápo* (Hom. Il. 2.91) ‘from [the] ships’ (Greek postpositions were normally autotonic, and appear accented on the first syllable; prepositions were proclitic and a grave accent on the last syllable indicated unaccented pronunciation).”

<sup>24</sup> See Chantraine 1953: 114.

<sup>25</sup> See Luraghi 2003: 204. For a definition of landmark see Haug 2009: 106: “We note that prototypical prepositions denote *spatial* relations, i.e. they denote locations relative to some other location. This other location serves as a *landmark* and must either be overtly present, or given anaphorically or deictically.” The trajector is the figure following a path in a relational structure (the other entity is the landmark): part of its trajectory may occupy the area of the landmark, as in the case of location. For prepositional analysis in cognitive linguistics see Ungerer and Schmid 2013: 167 ff.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *Od.* i 153-154.

As I said earlier, the word ἀνδρακάς is a *hapax* in Homer and, apart from lexicographers and ancient commentators, it only resurfaces in a fragment of Cratinus (the text firstly cited and glossed by Photius in his *Lexicon* and then drawn on by others<sup>27</sup>), in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, although in a corrupt passage, and in Plutarch, when the philosopher, citing Homer, introduces a particular moment of the *Banquet of the Seven Wise Men* to which I will return later. I shall presently say a few words on the occurrence of the adverb in the *Agamemnon*. In the final scene, Aegisthus is boasting that the king's murder is a revenge for what Atreus had done, and claims credit for the brutal vengeance: the wrongs attributed to Atreus culminate in the details of the Thyestean banquet.

[...] **ξένια** δὲ τοῦδε δόσθεος πατῆρ  
 Ἄτρεός, προθύμως μᾶλλον ἢ φίλως πατρὶ  
 τῶμῳ, κρεουργόν ἡμᾶρ εὐθύμως ἄγειν  
 δοκῶν, παρέσχε **δαίτα** παιδείων κρεῶν.  
 τὰ μὲν ποδῆρη καὶ χειρῶν ἄκρους κτένας  
 †ἔθρυπτ' ἄνωθεν<sup>28</sup> **ἀνδρακάς** καθημένος  
 ἄσημα δ'† [...]

But Atreus, this man's impious father,  
 in an act of hospitality to my father, that was more eager than it was friendly,  
 pretending to be holding a cheerful day of butchery,  
 served him with a meal of his children's flesh.  
 The foot parts and the combs at the end of the arms  
 † chopped up away from the diner(s) who seated each by himself  
 unrecognizable† [...]

*Ag.* 1590-96

It is important (and sufficient to our purpose) to note that, irrespective of any textual difficulty, the Aeschylean usage situates the word in a (perverted) banquet and hospitality (ξένια 1590) context, with the guest(s) conceivably described as “sitting (each) by himself” (ἀνδρακάς<sup>29</sup> καθημένος<sup>30</sup>). Curiously, the verb κάθ-ημαι follows directly the adverb ἀνδρα-κάς forming a -κάς κάθ- sequence which, I think, would be Brugmann's delight. Luraghi's line of reasoning allows us to see the locative and the distributive meaning coexist and be co-activated in a situation where the commensal(s) had to be placed, aptly distributed and secluded from Atreus' butchering. Thus, two opposite elements are highlighted in connection, that is the communal, festive banquet (δαίτα 1593) and the 'distributed' way of seating (ἀνδρακάς 1595).

Turning now to the *Odyssey*, I shall initially investigate how the Phaiakes collect the extra-gifts for Odysseus, as suggested by Alkinoos. It is apparent that the Homeric passage envisages the elders gathering bronze from their households as acting both 'each by himself' (ἔβαν οἰκόνδε **ἕκαστος** “each one went to his house” *Od.* xiii 17) and as members of a community (ὑμέων δ' ἀνδρὶ **ἕκαστῳ** [...] **ὄσσοι** ἐνὶ μεγάροισι **γερούσιον** αἴθοπα οἶνον / αἰεὶ πίνετ' ἐμοῖσιν [...]) “each man of you [...] who always drink the

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *Suda* alpha 2153; *Lexicon Seguerianum* alpha 1228.

<sup>28</sup> The opposition between ἀνω- of ἄνωθεν and κατ- of καθημένος is also noticeable. Originally ἄνω and κάτω were semantically opposite, like ἀνά and κατά (see Luraghi 2003: 203). The two prepositions developed for a long time as a related pair (see Chantraine 1977: 504: “une couple polaire”). For κατά and κάτω see Bortone 2014: 41 cited at n. 17.

<sup>29</sup> The explanation of the scholia is: ἀντὶ τοῦ καθ' ἑαυτόν (*Scholia in Aeschylum* 1595.1).

<sup>30</sup> Ludwig proposes here καθημένων. Various emendations have been proposed and a lacuna posited by Hermann before line 1596.

glowing wine of the elders in my halls” cf. *Od.* xiii 7-9), whose representational leadership is in the hands of Alkinoos, who himself places the gifts on board (**αὐτός** ἴων διὰ νηός “he went himself throughout the ship” *Od.* xiii 21), stowing them under the benches. Even though the relationship between ἐκάς and ἕκαστος remains problematic (and so the nature and the morphogenetic role of the suffix(?) -κάς, if any), Schwyzer opportunely recalls that when Alkinoos previously summoned the Phaiakian elders to give Odysseus a clean mantle and a tunic each, ἕκαστος served the same logical function in the text as ἀνδρακάς<sup>31</sup> does at xiii 14:

τῶν οἱ ἕκαστος φᾶρος ἐϋπλυνῆς ἠδὲ χιτῶνα  
καὶ χρυσοῖο τάλαντον ἐνεΐκατε τιμήντος.

let each of you bring here now a clean mantle and a tunic  
and a talent of fine gold.

*Od.* viii 392-3

This equivalence is most significant because Alkinoos’ authoritative exhortation is immediately preceded by the brief description of the socio-political *status quo* in Skherie, with twelve kings and Alkinoos as thirteenth *primus inter pares* or, better, as representative figure:

δώδεκα γὰρ κατὰ δῆμον ἀριπρεπέες βασιλῆες  
ἀρχοὶ κραίνουσι, τρεῖσκαιδέκατος δ’ ἐγὼ αὐτός·

Twelve excellent kings rule as leaders among our people,  
and I am the thirteenth;

*Od.* viii 389-390.

I am convinced that the twelve kings (plus Alkinoos) are the ‘we’ who is the subject of δῶμεν at *Odyssey* xiii 13 (and of φέρωμεν at viii 394 alike). At scroll viii the subsequent communal action of the Phaiakian leaders is articulated (or ‘distributively’ individualized) by the pronoun ἕκαστος (δῶρα δ’ ἄρ’ οἰσέμεναι πρόεσαν κήρυκα ἕκαστος “each man ordered his herald to bring forth the gifts” *Od.* viii 399) and their approval to Alkinoos’ proposal is here expressed by the verb ἐπαινέω (οἱ δ’ ἄρα πάντες ἐπῆνεον “everybody praised this suggestion” *Od.* viii 398), while it is ἐφανδάνω at xiii 16 (τοῖσιν δ’ ἐπῆνδανε μῦθος “what he said pleased them”), a verbal form to which I shall return in the next section. On the basis of these considerations, I conclude that in these two passages the Homeric diction assimilates the function and the meaning of ἀνδρακάς to those of ἕκαστος.

All that being said, I believe that ἀνδρακάς was a word already fossilized in Homeric Greek<sup>32</sup> but nevertheless still comprehensible by the means of traditional memory and phonically-based analogy, and by its specialized use in specific contexts as well. I think that these contexts might have been both the occasion and the representation of festival banquets or festival contests and sympotic practices (which possibly contemplated poetic

<sup>31</sup> See Schwyzer 1953: 630: “Für ἕκαστος θ 392 steht an der ähnliche Stelle v 14 ἀνδρακάς [...]”

<sup>32</sup> I am perplexed about the exact chronology suggested by Bréal when he says “On peut seulement se demander si ἄνδρα est un accusatif ou une forme non fléchié, comme dans ἀνδράποδον. Je penche pour l’accusatif, car la locution ἀνδρακάς, quoique employée dans l’*Odyssee* paraît relativement moderne (Bréal 1894: 52).”

singing) during which the individual was principally significant as single articulation of a particular group. It is also possible that the Aeschylean occurrence of ἀνδρακός was reminiscent of the Homeric situation. In fact, it is important to remember that Alkinoos' proposal to give Odysseus more gifts as *xeinía* is exactly situated at the heart of continuing festive occasions, a *dais*<sup>33</sup>, just after the hero bard has completed the song of his *nóstos* (so far) under the roof of the king's shadowy megaron (κατὰ μέγαρα σκίοεντα *Od.* xiii 2), where the Phaiakian leaders have gathered. It is no coincidence that, as I just said, they are defined through their role in festive banquets and sympotic practices:

ὑμέων δ' ἄνδρι ἑκάστω ἐφιέμενος τάδε εἶρω,  
 ὅσσοι ἐνὶ μεγάροισι γερούσιον αἶθοπα οἶνον  
 αἰεὶ πίνετ' ἐμοῖσιν, ἀκουάζεσθε δ' αἰδοῦ [...]

and I say this and give this charge to each man of you  
 who always drink the glowing wine of the elders  
 and also listen to the singer in my halls [...]

*Od.* xiii 7-9.

When the gifts are collected and stowed, the festival goes on and the banquet is obviously accompanied again by singing<sup>34</sup>:

μηῖρα δὲ κήαντες δαίνοντ' ἔρικυδέα δαῖτα  
 τερπόμενοι· μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος αἰοιδός,  
 Δημόδοκος, λαοῖσι τετιμένος [...]

Then, when they burned the thigh pieces, feasted a splendid feast  
 and took pleasure. The divine singer sang among them,  
 Demodokos, honored by the people [...]

*Od.* xiii 26-28.

Bearing this wider setting in mind, we have to consider that the specific form of gift-giving practiced by the Phaiakian elders before Odysseus' departure is equally marked by emulation and collaboration: tripods and cauldrons are gifted by the individual as well as by the community, with Odysseus becoming recipient of precious bronze which cannot be definitely traced back to any of the kings, but is the physical contribution of each of them, as members of the Phaiakian *gerousía*, to the *xeinía* of guest-friendship. Thus, as we will see, the gifts Odysseus takes with him on his journey home, once collected, put away and arranged, first on the ship and then in the cave of the Nymphs, will no more recount the story of the individual contributor, but of a community of individual contributors.

<sup>33</sup> The sequence of festive events proceeds from banqueting to singing, then shifts to athletic events, eventually returning to singing and finally banqueting. Alkinoos himself calls this feast a *dais* (θοῖν ἀλεγόνετε δαῖτα / ἡμέτερόνδ' ἐλθόντες "come to my house and join the feast in a hurry" cf. *Od.* viii 38-39) in honor of Odysseus. On this festive occasion and its context resembling the festival of the Delia see the fundamental analysis of Nagy 2010: 79-91.

<sup>34</sup> The crucial importance of *singing* and *voice* in the Phaiakis is underlined from the very beginning. On this aspect, see the insightful considerations of Van Nortwick: "The ensuing emphasis on *voice* is also significant. He [Odysseus] hears the shouts of either girls or nymphs, and by linking them the poet points to the potential danger in these alluring sounds which *amphélythe* [*Od.* vi 122], "surround" him. [... αὐδηέντων 126] is used in Homer especially of the power of female song as opposed to the bardic *klea andrôn* and is used to describe Calypso, Ino, and Circe (2008: 28)."

## CONSENT AND COLLABORATION

In his study on the phraseology of response and reception in contexts of collective deliberation in the *Iliad* David Elmer analyzes both ἐπαινέω and ἀνδάνω, which occur in formulas expressing, respectively, definitely efficient responses and divisive, individualized preference.<sup>35</sup> As he points out, “the most significant Odyssean addition to the basic system [...] is a formula that frequently and almost exclusively characterizes the deliberations of the suitors, exemplified by the line ὡς ἔφατ’ Ἀντίνοος, τοῖσιν δ’ ἐπίηδανε μῦθος (“thus spoke Antinoos, and his *múthos* pleased them”, *Od.* xviii 50) (Elmer 2013: 226).” Investigating later expressions of political consent, Elmer recalls that *handánein* is epigraphically attested in Crete in the traditional formula ἔφαδε πόλι, “with the collective noun *pólis* implying that the preference subsumes the entire community (Elmer 2013: 244 n. 43).” While I shall wait until my conclusion to factor in this peculiar linguistic circumstance, I intend to address now the language of collective decision in the Phaiakis.

I said above that the Phaiakian kings are said to approve Alkinoos’ calls to reward Odysseus with gifts by the two verbs ἐπαινέω (viii 398) and ἐφανδάνω (xiii 16). Conspicuously, the formula that encompasses the composed ἐφ-ανδάνω is the same that characterizes the deliberations of the suitors, with minimal substitutions in the first and second part of the proper name (Ἀλκί-νοος || Ἀντί-νοος || Ἀμφί-νομος)<sup>36</sup>. The community of the Suitors (an anti-community in Elmer’s terms<sup>37</sup>) is, in my view, an agonistic one, where competition prevails over collaboration. Also, it is a community defined by temporary circumstances and eventually bound to dissolution once the prize (Penelope) is awarded. The use of ἐφ-ανδάνω might suggest that, similarly, in the Phaiakian community emulation and competition play a significant role and that collective interest and consent, even if essentially present and asserted, result from coordination of individualized action (ἕκαστος, ἀνδρακάς) and approval (ἐφ-ανδάνω). More specifically, at Skherie horizontal competition and individualized relationship in the gift-giving process are negotiated into a fundamentally collaborative effort.

It is worth remembering that the tensions generated by the athletic competitions and the twofold provocation of Odysseus (and the hero’s counter-boast as well)<sup>38</sup> are defused by Alkinoos through the staging of a choral performance and the renewed singing of Demodokos. Alkinoos affirms and demonstrates that the Phaiakes excel in less confrontational forms of competition and activities, like seafaring, running, dancing, singing (ναυτιλίη καὶ ποσσὶ καὶ ὄρχηστῷ καὶ ἀοιδῇ *Od.* viii 255) and, of course, arranging festive occasions. He seems primarily concerned with avoiding any conflict or violation of *xenia* and preoccupied that the Phaiakian excellences will spread *kléos* of his harmonized community far and wide (ὄφρα καὶ ἄλλω εἴπῃς ἠρώων [...] ἡμετέρης ἀρετῆς μεμνημένος “that you may tell to other heroes [...] and remember our skill” cf. *Od.* viii 241-244). The precious bronze objects bestowed ἀνδρακάς by the Phaiakian kings on Odysseus provide

---

<sup>35</sup> See Elmer 2013: Chapter 1.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. *Od.* xiii 16; xviii 50.290, xxi 143.269; xvi 406, xx 247.

<sup>37</sup> See Elmer 2013: 226: “The use of a form of *handánein* [...] seems deliberately designed to mark the Suitors as a deficient community, even an anticommunity, organized not around collective interest but around the coordination of selfish ones.”

<sup>38</sup> On the tension characterizing the episode and the violation of hospitality by Eurýalos see Louden 2011: 120, who rightly insists on the ‘peacemaking’ role of Alkinoos. With the summoning of Demodokos, epic singing implicitly comes to the foreground as an ‘acceptable’ form of competition in the world of the Phaiakes: poetic competition cannot be disruptive of social harmony as far as it is enjoyed and regulated by the community.

no less than the tangible evidence of this vocational harmonization of solos, even in gift-giving practices.

When Odysseus finally wakes up on the shore of his homeland, he counts everything, including the cauldrons and tripods, but their number is not made explicit<sup>39</sup>; the exact number remains not specified also later, when the hero tells Telemachus and Penelope of the gifts of the Phaiakes<sup>40</sup>, and it is not told at all even before: it can be only inferred, if the ἀνδρακάς givers are identified with the twelve βασιλῆες (plus Alkinoos)<sup>41</sup>. Even more interesting, though, is the fact that, in the frame of these two micro-Odyssean narratives resuming the last stage of *nóstos*, no name is given, not even Alkinoos', and the Phaiakes are always presented as a beneficent community acting as a whole whose *xeinia* constitute a treasure no more traceable to the individual donors or contributors. If we recall the vital connection that existed between names of guest-friends, the guest-friendship *xeinia*, and the 'story' of (and told by) the precious objects gifted<sup>42</sup>— in short, the network of personal relationships the gift represented and facilitated —, it is obvious that a different pattern is at work here and that the *Odyssey* calls our attention to a different type of exchange.

As it has been recalled<sup>43</sup>, in reflecting on the relation between poetic tradition and the community, the *Odyssey* tends to focus on performers rather than audiences: I shall modulate this concept, proposing that the exchange in question ultimately symbolizes a poetic exchange between performers from distinct communities, gathering to form an agonistic but collaborative *ensemble*, bound to be beneficent for present and future audiences.

#### WORDS AND GIFTS

As Norman Austin recognized, “[t]he wealth Odysseus carries with him from Scheria to his home is not gratuitous; it is earned wealth (Austin 1975: 200).” Alkinoos' renewed invitation to add more gifts for Odysseus comes directly after the last words of the hero bard's narrative resonate in the megaron and meet with the charmed silence of the Phaiakian audience (“Ὡς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ “So he spoke, and

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *Od.* xiii 215-218. The discussion on this detail is amply developed by Malkin 1998: 95-98. I will return on Malkin's overall argument and conclusions about the tripods in my own conclusion.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. *Od.* xvi 231; xxiii 341.

<sup>41</sup> Adopting Frame's model, one can say that this number is hidden on purpose and we have to unmask the identity of the donors as well as their (also metapoetical) role. The problem of the exact number of cauldrons and/or tripods drew the attention of Eustathius himself who dealt with it when discussing the variants ἡέ and ἡδέ of *Od.* xiii 13: εἰ δέ τις εἴπη, ἀνδρακάς λαβεῖν τὸν Ὀδυσσεά καὶ τρίποδας καὶ λέβητας, κωλύεται εἰς τὸν νοῦν διὰ τοῦ, τρίποδα μέγαν ἡέ λέβητα. εἰ μὴ ἄρα γράφοι τις καὶ ἐνταῦθα τρίποδα μέγαν ἡδέ λέβητα. τότε γὰρ ἔσονται ἀνδρακάς τρίποδες δεκατρεῖς καὶ λέβητες δεκατρεῖς, ὃ κρεῖττον. φέρεται γὰρ καὶ τοιαύτη γραφή ἐν τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις τῶν ἀντιγράφων “If the meaning should be that Odysseus took one tripod and cauldron from each of the elders, this reading cannot be supported by the variant ‘a great tripod or (ἡέ) a cauldron.’ Conversely, if one accept here ‘a great tripod and (ἡδέ) a cauldron,’ then we will have thirteen tripods and cauldrons as well, that is better. In fact, also this variant is attested in the best manuscripts (*Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam* 2.36.23-27).”

<sup>42</sup> On gifted objects as ‘storytellers’ see Mueller 2010, in particular p. 6. Mueller underlines how the value of gifts exceed their use value through the acts of remembering which are able to spread the donors' *kléos*, bestowing renown on their names. She discusses ἀνδρακάς briefly, in relationship with the respective role of female and male hosts and explains it by gender prerogatives (“Alcinous makes it clear that he is speaking to the men, especially in the adverb *andrakas* (p. 6).”) Anyway, it is important to stress that Odysseus does not show to Telemachus or Penelope any of the gifts (the canonical situation involving narratives about guest-friends), but refers to them in general. For the commemorative function of gift-exchange and objects as accumulators of stories see also Grethlein 2008: 27-51 and 2012: 22.

<sup>43</sup> See Elmer 2013: 225.

they were all silent” *Od.* xiii 1). This gifts-for-words pattern had been already activated at scroll xi, when Odysseus pauses his tale (xi 333 = xiii 1) and Arete asks the nobles to give him gifts<sup>44</sup> (a request soon endorsed and opportunely conveyed by the authority of Alkinoos), apparently in straightforward reward for showing his noble heart and the extent of his suffering by means of his extraordinary performative skills — such a guest cannot leave without suitable *xeinia*. Even before this exchange, at scroll viii, just after Demodokos had completed his second song (viii 266-366), and Halios and Laodamas had performed their *pas de deux*, as a virtuous coda to the choral dance accompanying the bard’s song, Odysseus elicited from Alkinoos the very first call to offer him gifts as a consequence of the words of appreciation and praise granted to that outstanding performance.

What is relevant for my argument is that in this occasion Alkinoos summons for the first time the twelve Phaiakian βασιλῆες as a coherent group: each of them (ἕκαστος viii 392) will bring Odysseus a cloak, a tunic and a talent of gold. The verb shifts swiftly and significantly from second person plural (ἐνείκατε viii 393, the subject is the singular ἕκαστος, as usual) to first person plural (φέρωμεν viii 394):

τῶν οἱ ἕκαστος φᾶρος ἐϋπλυνὲς ἠδὲ χιτῶνα  
καὶ χρυσοῖο τάλαντον ἐνείκατε τιμήντος.  
αἶψα δὲ πάντα φέρωμεν ἀολλέα [...]

let each of you bring here now a clean mantle and a tunic  
and a talent of fine gold.

*Od.* viii 392-4

The factual response to Odysseus’ laudatory comment is structured as a collective one: Alkinoos represents the twelve kings in such a way that their second-plural identities fuse easily into a collaborative togetherness including the community’s top representative. It is also relevant that Odysseus’ praise for the musical and choreutic ability of the Phaiakes (βητάρμονας εἶναι ἀρίστους “are the best dancers” *Od.* viii 383) appears to be metonymical for the approval of Demodokos’ skills he will later explicitly express (viii 487-98) when suggesting a *metábasis* to cyclic material.

The diverse poetic forms represented by Demodokos’ songs, so extensively analyzed by Nagy<sup>45</sup> regarding their different levels of embedment on a macro-narrative scale, are articulated and alternated with Odysseus’ various reactions and responses: tears, a choice piece of meat as a gift, laudatory words, tears again and, as consequence (and reason for crying), the disclosure of his identity followed by a masterful song in exchange. The singing in relay between Demodokos and Odysseus has been described as an *agón* (Nagy 2010: 91 ff.), with Odysseus eventually reaffirming his vast superiority as a singer just as he previously did as an athlete. However, this competitive singing encounter *de facto* enriches all involved singers’ repertoire, because, while the *Odyssey* preserves and ‘absorbs’ the three songs of Demodokos, the Phaiakian bard is notionally the first singer (after Odysseus as proto-singer) able to entertain audiences with Odysseus’ *nóstos*. If Poseidon’s vengeance on the Phaiakes is really restricted to the petrification of the approaching

<sup>44</sup> For the ‘intermezzo’ as an occasion of ‘collecting’ gifts, see the analysis in Doherty 1995: 65-67.

<sup>45</sup> See Nagy 2010: 79-93.

ship<sup>46</sup>, it is not difficult to imagine Demodokos singing again and again the ἔπεα heard from Odysseus in Alkinoos' hall.

The words-for-words pattern is the basis of the exchange relationship between Demodokos and Odysseus. The piece of meat offered to Demodokos by Odysseus (κῆρυξ, τῆ δῆ, τοῦτο πόρε κρέας, ὄφρα φάγησι, / Δημοδόκῳ “Herald, take and give this portion to Demodokos, that he may eat” *Od.* viii 477-8) can therefore be regarded as an advance on the singing he will in turn perform in the ritual frame of the *dais*: commensal banqueting and epic singing are different moments of the same festive occasion and constitute venue and means of exchange. So, not only gifts are for words, but words themselves can be seen as the exchanged gift<sup>47</sup>. Papalexandrou appropriately noticed that “Odysseus’ gradual accumulation of valuable objects is always the outcome of a competitive performance (Papalexandrou 2005: 17).” The poetic *agón* between Demodokos and Odysseus eventually results in the latter’s endowment with tripods and cauldrons: they are precious tokens of Odysseus’ ability to weave *mūthoi*<sup>48</sup>. Conversely, the gifts the hero returns home with include not only material objects, but also new (or rather *old*, as Nagy pointed out) stories, as the *philótēs* between Ares and Aphrodite, and more episodes to embed in his *nóstos*.

#### COLLECTIVIZATION OF EXPENSE<sup>49</sup> AND TRADITION

The archaic formation ἀνδρακάς, describing the modality of gift-giving, is followed in the next verse by another interesting archaism, the genitive<sup>50</sup> προικός, used adverbially, meaning “at one’s own cost,” “without reimbursement” ([...] ἀργαλέον γὰρ ἕνα προικός χαρίσασθαι “giving presents without reimbursement is taxing for one man” *Od.* xiii 15). Alkinoos suggests that the expense suffered by the community of the nobles be further collectivized by passing on the costs, that is, be balanced by re-collecting wealth in compensation among the *dēmos* (ἡμεῖς δ’ αὖτε ἀγειρόμενοι κατὰ δῆμον / τισόμεθα<α> [...] “we in turn will gather the cost from among the people, and repay ourselves” cf. *Od.* xiii 14-15)<sup>51</sup>. Unfortunately, the construction κατὰ + accusative cannot be as supportive of Bréal’s explanation of ἀνδρακάς (ἄνδρα κάτα) as it intuitively (and also linguistically) seems, for the sense here is not strictly distributive — even though the locatival meaning of line 14 κατὰ may also involve a distributed trajectory. Notwithstanding, it is undeniable that the entire passage describes a progressive, top-down collectivization and a redistribution of the burden due to the extensive gift-giving process.

To better understand how this process is essentially connected to the tale Odysseus tells to the Phaiakian audience, which is, as I assumed, his personal gift of guest-friendship, we can compare the superb and perfectly performed *xeinía* by the Phaiakes to the complete perversion of them enacted by Polyphemus. The Cyclops gets initially a tale in exchange from Odysseus, but a very short and false one<sup>52</sup>, and then, the false ὄνομα follows. It is

---

<sup>46</sup> For the textual variants underpinning the different interpretations about this notoriously difficult passage, see West (2014: 232) who offers a brief *resumé* of the question.

<sup>47</sup> On songs as commodities and the exchange of songs for gifts see Dougherty 2001: 55-59.

<sup>48</sup> See Papalexandrou 2005: 19. The *apólogos* are the occasion that induces Odysseus’ endowment with tripods and cauldrons, as symbol of truthful discourse and political legitimation.

<sup>49</sup> I owe this formulation to David Elmer (personal communication).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *Od.* xvii 413.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. *Od.* xxii 55.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. *Od.* ix 283-286.

significant that, besides any consideration about Homeric formulaicity, the wording of Alkinoos' question (εἴπ' ὄνομ', ὅτι σε κείθι κάλεον μήτηρ τε πατήρ τε / ἄλλοι θ' οἱ κατὰ ἄστῳ καὶ οἱ περιναετᾶουσιν, "tell me the name by which your mother and father called you at home, and the people of the town and those living around it," *Od.* viii 550-51) reappears in Odysseus' answer to Polyphemos (Ὅστις ἐμοί γ' ὄνομα· Ὅστιν δέ με κικλήσκουσι / μήτηρ ἠδὲ πατήρ ἠδ' ἄλλοι πάντες ἑταῖροι, "My name is No-one: my mother and my mother call me No-one, as well as all the rest of my friends," *Od.* ix 366-367). The perverted banquet and symposiums<sup>53</sup> of the Cyclops, with only one commensal, human flesh (as in the Aeschylean occurrence of ἀνδρακάς!) and unmixed wine, are accompanied by a not-at-all entertaining tale told by someone who conceals his identity and eventually reveals himself as being No-one. In reward for being told the name, in this parody of gift-exchange<sup>54</sup> Polyphemos gives Odysseus the comforting assurance that he would eat him last. This cynical, barbaric gift-exchange process provides a potent foil for the socially correct one staged at Skherie, where, after the ritual feast and before the hero's departure, the whole community, nobles and *dēmos* as well, is (or will be soon) mobilized in order to complete and balance the gift and counter-gift dynamic between itself and the honorable guest, who lavished the tale of his *nóstos* on Alkinoos' own guests.

Now, it is legitimate to ask if the *dēmos* ends up being eventually compensated in turn. I think the *Odyssey* (and, in particular, the Phaiakia) contains some hints for answering positively to this question in terms of poetic tradition. If we see Odysseus not only as a returning hero from Troy, but also as a bard returning home<sup>55</sup> (temporarily) from the Phaiakian *panēgyris* (and he is), it is not hard to imagine the Ithakan community both regaining its king and buying into a brand new repertoire of tales to be sung by Phemios. Odysseus, by virtue of his mere presence in Ithaka, will provide the singer (whose life will be significantly spared<sup>56</sup>) with the newest song available, the last *nóstos* from Troy, which is not at all *lugrós*<sup>57</sup>, except for the suitors. Indeed, the return of Odysseus will definitely rearrange the situation described at *Od.* i 325 ff. when Penelope painfully happens to listen to the *nóstoi* while the rest of the audience (Telemachus included?) is apparently entertained by the newness of the song (τῆν γὰρ ἀοιδὴν μᾶλλον ἐπικλείουσ' ἄνθρωποι, / ἣ τις αἰόντεσσι νεωτάτη ἀμφιπέληται "men praise that song the most that comes the newest to their ears" *Od.* i 351-352): Phemios' ἀοιδὴ was not sufficiently up-to-date to rightly claim newness and entertain as well *each* member of the audience. Barbara Clayton is absolutely right when proposing that the circumstances at *Od.* xvii 415-418 (Odysseus asks a bigger piece of bread from Antinoos in exchange for *kléos*: ἐγὼ δέ κέ σε κλείω κατ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν "I would make your fame known all over the endless earth" *Od.* xvii 418)

<sup>53</sup> According to Hobden (2013: 68) "[t]he gracious drinking of the Phaeacians [...] is the absolute reverse of the Cyclops' rapid and reckless draining of the cups passed to him by Odysseus in quick succession."

<sup>54</sup> See Reece 1993: 36, who opportunely underlines how in ritualized gift-giving special value was attached to objects that had a history behind them. On Polyphemos and the parody of honorific gift-exchange see also Segal 1994: 160.

<sup>55</sup> For Odysseus as a wandering bard and see Clayton 2004: 68-69.

<sup>56</sup> Phemios' outliving the *mnesteroiphonia* implicitly guarantees immediate *kléos* to Odysseus on Ithaka and beyond: αὐτῷ τοι μετόπισθ' ἄχος ἔσσεται, εἴ κεν ἀοιδὸν / πέφνης [...] "One day you will look back and feel regret, if you now kill a bard" cf. *Od.* xxii 345-346.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. *Od.* i 326-7. On Phemios singing the grievous homecoming of the Achaeans (ὁ δ' Ἀχαιῶν νόστον ἄειδε λυγρόν) see Barker and Christensen (2016): 95-98. Nagy 2013: 286 parallels this disastrous homecoming, caused by Athena, with the *ouloménē* anger of Achilles.

allude to the bardic nature of Odysseus<sup>58</sup> also by the parallelism with the meat-for-words exchange performed at scroll viii between Demodokos and Odysseus. It is remarkable that the beggar's request is followed by the third Cretan tale<sup>59</sup>, supposed to show his potential skills as story-teller. Ironically, Antinoos seems to elude what I called the gifts-for-words pattern by refusing any handout and, instead, throwing a footstool at Odysseus. Nonetheless, the hero will keep his promise to make him famous (despite, or because of, his refusal): it will happen not within a false, but within the true and newest song, that is a *nóstos* which is not *lúgrós*. As matter of fact, concerning previous episodes of this *nóstos*, Odysseus is factually presented as an active tradition bearer in (and of) the *Odyssey*, as his bardic narrative is notionally coextensive with the narration of scrolls ix-xii. Moreover, if, from Nagy's diachronic perspective, the *Odyssey* represents a newer form of poetry within which the three songs of Demodokos are embedded as older forms, it can be true as well that, from a synchronic perspective, the Odyssean tradition exceeds the purely *nóstos* dimension also thanks to the very same songs, which are brought (or re-brought) to the 'real world' and circulated there into an active framework of exchange by Odysseus-the-home-comer, along with the other gifts stowed in the magic Phaiakian ship.

Keeping this metaphorical course in mind, I think that it would not be difficult (or ill-advised) to match the sequence performance(s) → process of exchange → return of Odysseus to his community → circulation of (expanded) *kléos* with the supposed development and early diffusion of the *in fieri* Homeric epics as poetical phenomena genetically engineered at the Panionic *panégyris*. If this is the case, the citizens who made up the audiences at the festival had the occasion to witness the process of emulation-competition-collaboration that brought into existence the monumentality of the epics, and also to enjoy the final benefits of this process in the form of ever more refined and expanded performances. Each community, with the return of its citizens (and of its poet), could capitalize upon an enlarged poetic tradition as the fruit of a combined effort.

#### AN ΑΝΔΡΑΚΑΣ COMPOSITIONAL EFFORT

According to Douglas Frame, the basic unit of performance, in the sense of the typical sitting, at the Panionia probably covered the extension of four 'books' of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as we know them and that twelve poets, coming each from one city of the Ionic dodecapolis, alternately performed the entire *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.<sup>60</sup> If we accept this

<sup>58</sup> See Clayton 2004: 68. After this, Clayton conveniently recalls Eumaios' laudatory simile (*Od.* xvii 518-521) comparing Odysseus to a divinely taught bard who sings "lovely words for mortals ἔπε' ἱμερόεντα βοροτοῖσι (cf. 519)." The performance (and its effects) described at line 521 (ὥς ἐμὲ κείνος ἔθελεγε παρήμενος ἐν μεγάροισι "so he charmed me when he sat in my halls") overtly recalls the environment and the spellbound audience inside Alkinoos' palace. Needless to say, the verb θέλω activates significative intratextual (and intertextual) resonances: for powerful, negative θέλις cf. *Od.* iii 264 (θέλγεσκ' ἐπέεσσιν), describing Aegisthus' beguiling of Clytemnestra with deceptive words (Aegisthus' words implicitly contrasts the positive role of the bard appointed by the departing Agamemnon as guardian of his wife) and xii 44 (Σειρήνες λιγυρῆ θέλγουσιν ἀοιδῆ "the Sirens beguile <him> with their clear-toned song). When compared to the Iliadic occurrences (cf. XII 255; XIII 435; XV 322. 594; XXI 276. 604; XXIV 343) the Odyssean usage of θέλω reveals also a penchant for expressing 'acoustic' enchantment (cf. i 57; xii 40).

<sup>59</sup> Cf. *Od.* xvii 415-444.

<sup>60</sup> See Frame 2009: 562: "I think that the singers alternated book by book [...] each singer, ideally, would still have sung four books of the combined *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but not in sequence. As for the order in which the poets performed, we can imagine any number of ways in which that order might be determined, and indeed the basic principle here, I think, was flexibility. The indispensable requirement to become one of the twelve poets would have been the ability to perform the entire *Iliad* and *Odyssey* even as the two poems continued to evolve [...]"

hypothesis, we gain also the opportunity to ‘listen’ to the archetypal Panionic poet: Odysseus himself performing before the Phaiakian community intended as a Homeric audience and designed to allude to the Panionic *panégyris*. Within this correspondence, the twelve Phaiakian kings tally with the twelve cities which were members of the Panionic league.<sup>61</sup> Building on this paradigm, the modality of gift-giving expressed by the adverb *ἀνδρακάς*, which I have so far analyzed, appears to be another mirror image and, in general, could further support the idea of the *Odyssey* as the final product of a highly collaborative (if not competitive) poetic effort.

To corroborate this assumption, I shall now examine how Plutarch alludes to *Odyssey* xiii 13-15<sup>62</sup> and uses *ἀνδρακάς* in a context that implies both collaboration and competition during the banquet of the seven wise men. In this passage, after Chilon suggested that Amasis, the king of Egyptians, challenged by the king of the Ethiopians in a wisdom contest, should learn from Bias how to improve his government instead of how to solve riddles, Periander proposes that all the commensals contribute with similar, useful offerings to Amasis:

“Καὶ μὴν,” ἔφη ὁ Περίανδρος, “ἄξιόν γε τοιαύτας ἀπαρχὰς τῷ βασιλεῖ συνεισενεγκεῖν ἅπαντας **ἀνδρακάς**, ὥσπερ ἔφησεν Ὅμηρος· ἐκείνῳ τε γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο πλείονος ἀξία τῆς ἐμπορίας ἢ παρενθήκη, καὶ ἡμῖν ἀντὶ πάντων ὠφέλιμος.”

“Yes, indeed,” said Periander, “it surely is right and proper that we all contribute an offering of this sort to the king, each man in his turn, as Homer has said. For to him these extra items would be more valuable than the burden of his mission, and as profitable for ourselves as anything could be.”

Plutarchus, *Septem sapientium convivium* 151 E

Chilon says that this “addition (παρανθήκη)” will be worthwhile for both parties, that is for Amasis, as recipient, and for the commensals, as donors. Thenceforth, the Sages actually engage themselves in answering one by one the serious question Amasis should have asked: how can a “king or a tyrant be held in highest esteem” (ἔνδοξος γενέσθαι καὶ βασιλεὺς καὶ τύραννος 152 A). Thus, the group of the Sages is originally engaged as a whole (Βίας δὲ βούλεται κοινῇ σκέψασθαι μεθ’ ἡμῶν “Bias wishes to consider it with all of us together” 151 A), but the answers are given *ἀνδρακάς*:

ὁ Σόλων [...] ἔφη, “[...] εἰ δημοκρατίαν ἐκ μοναρχίας κατασκευάσειε τοῖς πολίταις.”  
**Δεύτερος δ’ ὁ Βίας** εἶπεν, “εἰ πρῶτος χρῶτο τοῖς νόμοις τῆς πατρίδος.”  
**Ἐπὶ τούτῳ δ’ ὁ Θαλῆς** ἔφησεν, εὐδαιμονίαν ἄρχοντος νομίζειν, εἰ τελευτήσειε γηράσας κατὰ φύσιν.  
**Τέταρτος Ἀνάχαρσις**, “εἰ μόνον εἶη φρόνιμος.”  
**Πέμπτος δ’ ὁ Κλεόβουλος**, “εἰ μηδενὶ πιστεύοι τῶν συνόντων.”

<sup>61</sup> See Frame 2009: 520-523 and 561: “In the earlier stages of the poems’ development the league itself may still have been in the process of development. The principle that evolved, I think, was that each city of the league should be represented in the collaborative effort, and that as new cities were added to the league the number of poets grew. In the end the league reached its canonical number of twelve cities, and at this point, I think, the number of poets who took part in the recurring performance of the Homeric poems was also, ideally, twelve.” See also Frame 2012 §§ 1-2; 12.

<sup>62</sup> On the frequency and the role of the Homeric references in the *Moralia* (as well as in the Lives) see Bréchet 2008: 85-110. Homer, representing the source of Greek *paideia*, serves as a reminder of the divide between Greeks and non-Greeks and as a symbol of Hellenic identity: here the Seven Sages mediate traditional wisdom for the benefit of Amasis by the means of two Hellenic institutions, Homer (as cultural hero and primal authority) and the symposion.

**Ἔκτος δ' ὁ Πιπτακός,** “εἰ τοὺς ὑπηκόους ὁ ἄρχων παρασκευάσειε φοβεῖσθαι μὴ αὐτὸν ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ.”

**Μετὰ τοῦτον ὁ Χίλων** ἔφη τὸν ἄρχοντα χρῆναι μηδὲν φρονεῖν θνητόν, ἀλλὰ πάντ' ἀθάνατα.

Solon [...] said, “[...] he should organize a democracy for his people.”

Next Bias said, “If he should be the very first to conform to his country’s laws.”

Following him Thales said that he accounted it happiness for a ruler to reach old age and die a natural death.

Fourth, Anacharsis said, “If only he have sound sense.”

Fifth, Cleobulus, “If he trust none of his associates.”

Sixth, Pittacus, “If the ruler should manage to make his subjects fear, not him, but for him.”

Chilon followed by saying that a ruler’s thoughts should never be the thoughts of a mortal, but of an immortal always.

Plutarchus, *Septem sapientium convivium* 152 A-B

The Plutarchean usage of ἀνδρακός in the setting of the symposion, where individual participation and contribution were modulated by strict group equality, demonstrates that the distributive meaning of this Homeric *hapax* was still distinctively perceived and remained appropriate in contexts describing commensal activities and involving contribution and exchange.<sup>63</sup> As Odysseus received more gifts from the twelve Phaiakian kings in the form of tripods and cauldrons, Amasis will greatly benefit from the answers gifted as παρενθήκη by the Seven Sages in the larger dialogic framework of agonistic wisdom stories. The words of the Sages are the ἀπαρχαί to be presented to the king as communal contribution of the group.

Further developing and applying the analogy, and if the twelve Phaiakian kings are there to symbolize the twelve cities of the Ionic dodecapolis, each sending a poet to contribute to the performance at the Panionia, we can imagine the bronze gifts to stand for single contributions and decrypt the role of Odysseus as that of a master poet responsible for collecting these contributions and for the eventual coordination and poetic design in the collaborative process of composition<sup>64</sup>.

## CONCLUSION

Before concluding my study, I shall return once more to the tripods gifted to Odysseus, in order to propose some thoughts on the chronology of development and diffusion of the *Odyssey*. First of all, even though tripods and cauldrons are frequently associated in Homer as the most precious gifts one can aspire to (for instance, they are among the gifts offered to Achilles on the condition that he return to battle: ἔπτ' ἀπύρους τρίποδας [...] αἴθωνας δὲ λέβητας ἑξίκοσι “seven tripods that the fire has not touched [...] and twenty burnished

---

<sup>63</sup> On symposion and its rhetorical dynamics see the cited book by Fiona Hobden (2013). *Gnōmai* and singing possessed also a metasymptotic dimension: “When men reclined on couches and shared conversation, they sang — and heard one another sing — about the symposion’s pleasures and its hazards, and they issued recommendations and instructions to one another for a successful event (Hobden 2013: 23).”

<sup>64</sup> See Frame 2009: 561-563. See also Frame 2012 § 9: “I imagine that among the group of twelve poets that I have posited some were more creative and some were less creative, and that the ultimate design of both poems was under the control of one or possibly two master poets.”

cauldrons” cf. *Il.* IX 122-23), it has to be said that the formula τρίποδα μέγαν ἦδὲ<sup>65</sup> λέβητα occurs only at *Od.* xiii 13<sup>66</sup>. This uncommon expression is semantically coupled with the *hapax* ἀνδρακάς, which directly follows it, pointing to a remarkable spending effort that produced an equally uncommon result: the stranger Odysseus, washed ashore naked and saved by Nausikaa, is able to resume his journey home endowed with some of the most precious gifts available on earth, in such abundance as he would never have taken as his share of plunder from Troy<sup>67</sup>. I interpret this very outcome as metapoetical allusion to the making of the *Odyssey*: there would have been no ‘expanded’ *Odyssey* without the gifts of the Phaiakes, or, rather, there would have been no *Odyssey* at all. The story of Odysseus would have remained *only* one among the *nostoi*, a *lugrós* one, perhaps. The particular, ἀνδρακάς collaboration of the Phaiakes granted Odysseus not only a substitute for his allotted plunder, but also provided him with the continuation of his *nostos*<sup>68</sup> and with more tales to tell: when placed beside other prominent factors — as the stage for the framed narrative of the *apólogoι* and the presence of a competing bard before a competent and dynamic audience — the coordinated operations of the twelve kings reinforce the possibility of understanding the Phaiakes as ‘masked’ Ionians actively engaged in the collaborative effort that could have shaped the *Odyssey*. Furthermore, if we accept the hypothesis that the Ionian dodecapolis enters the poem disguised as the twelve Phaiakian kings, their communal consent expressed through the verb ἐφ-ανδάνω and the traditional Cretan formula ἔφαδε πόλι highlighted by David Elmer could be interpretatively associated. Bronze tripods and cauldrons should be counted as precious metapoetic indicators apt to provide information about the making of the *Odyssey* and its connection with the twelve Panionic cities.

The role of the (twelve plus one) tripods and cauldrons give us the opportunity also to discuss the relationship between relatively free-floating oral traditions and the monumental expansion of the epic. The famous series of bronze tripods (twelve, but at least thirteen were there) discovered in the cave at Polis Bay, on the West coast of Ithaka<sup>69</sup>, and partially dated to the ninth century<sup>70</sup>, led to several speculations about the direction of influence between the epic and the real cult practices that involved the dedications<sup>71</sup>. Whatever the case, it should be said straight away that evidence for Odysseus’ cultic association with the cave seems to be late and scant, dating just from the Hellenistic period. Still, the singular correspondence between the Homeric text and the archeological finds convinced Irad Malkin that “[t]he *Odyssey*, as we know it, existed in the ninth century

<sup>65</sup> Eustathius discusses amply the variants ἦέ and ἦδὲ, eventually opting in favor of the latter as the better one (κρεῖττον) attested in the best manuscripts: φέρεται γὰρ καὶ τοιαύτη γραφή ἐν τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις τῶν ἀντιγράφων *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam* 2.36.26-27. Cf. *supra* n. 41.

<sup>66</sup> The first part of the formula recurs in the same metrical position in three Iliadic passages, which can be read as intratextually related, at *Il.* XVIII 344 (bath is prepared for dead Patroklos), XXII 443 (bath is prepared for not-yet-known-to-be-dead Hector), XXIII 40 (bath is prepared for not-yet-dead Achilles) and at *Od.* viii 434 (bath prepared for Odysseus); λέβητα recurs in 10b-11-12 positions also at *Il.* XXIII 267 (third prize set out by Achilles in the chariot race at the games for Patroklos). For the practical and symbolic function of tripods in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* see Papalexandrou 2005: 33.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. *Od.* v 38-40.

<sup>68</sup> See Barker and Christensen (2016): 28: “The process of telling nostoi tales in Ithaka, Pylos and Sparta dramatizes for the audience the selection and presentation of homecoming narratives, whose metapoetic potential is clear — *nostos* signifies both a homecoming and a *song about homecoming*.”

<sup>69</sup> Sylvia Benton conducted the excavation in the mid 1930s: see Benton 1934-35a and 1938-9. For the number of tripods see in particular 1934-35a: 47-48; 52-53.

<sup>70</sup> The chronology is fundamentally based on stylistic criteria: see Benton 1934-35b: 74-130; Malkin 1998: 114-116.

<sup>71</sup> See Benton 1934-35a: 53; Stubbings (in Wace and Stubbings) 1962: 418-419; Antonaccio 1995: 153-155; Polignac 1996: 59-66; Malkin 1998: 99-119; Currie 2005: 51-53; Papalexandrou 2005: 23; West 2014: 88.

(Malkin 1995: 45)” and that the poem inspired and motivated the precious dedications, which reenacted the sequence of facts that occurred on Odysseus’ returning on Ithaka.

I shall not go through Malkin’s detailed and nuanced argumentation, limiting myself to saying that this conclusion appears not to be plausible (or necessary), all the more so as Malkin is likely to assume a *written* text of the *Odyssey* as early as the ninth century. Admittedly, even much earlier than a possible Panionic phase, various oral traditions could easily circulate about Odysseus bringing home tripods among the precious gifts collected in his wanderings (or, in other alternatives, as plunder from Troy). In fact, Menelaus’ *nóstos* shows a similar motif and this can be integrated in an even more general story-pattern involving war, plunder, wanderings and amassing of riches. But, as Bruno Currie has adequately stated, it is highly unrealistic that such a ninth century *nóstos* story would have had sufficient effect to induce a major hero cult on Ithaka<sup>72</sup> - even assuming that a general explanation of hero cult as directly induced by epic be acceptable, which seems not to be the case<sup>73</sup>. On the other hand, nothing prevents the poets representing the dodecapolis at the Panionia from being aware of these oral traditions and of cults and real dedications at Polis Bay as well. I am not here repurposing the *aition* explanation originally proposed by Benton (who also cursorily suggested that Odysseus was the original recipient of the dedications<sup>74</sup>), and then forcibly rejected by Malkin as “oversophisticated and hypercritical (Malkin 1995: 97)”, I am rather saying that the Panionic poets could have themselves repurposed traditional stories and informations about real cultic practices on Ithaka, conflating them with and sparking attention to the suitable details, in order to reflect their compositional effort, conveniently ‘masked’ in particular situations and narrative actions of the Phaiakis.

Under this perspective, the fundamental role of the tripods and cauldrons gifted ἀνδρακάς by the twelve kings would be that of drawing attention to a peculiar form of collaborative (although competitive) composition in performance, what possibly happened at the Panionia through the latter half of the eighth century and in the first quarter of the seventh. So, the role of emulation concerning the bronze tripods of *Od.* xiii 13 should not be that of explaining the dedications of ninth century proto-colonialists at Polis Bay, but of hinting at the agonistic, or emulative, component of this poetic collaboration. Similarly, a ‘text’ (let alone a *written* text) of the Phaiakis is not at all required to motivate ninth century dedications (whoever the recipient), while early seventh century Panionic poets could well take into account traditional stories and established cultic practices they heard of throughout the process of implementing and enhancing their poetical (and political) agenda.

Accordingly, we can regard the adverb ἀνδρακάς, in its fossilized status, as a useful link between a far reaching (but living) tradition and the Panionic audiences who actually witnessed and participated through their appointed poets (and by their active audiencing) in the expansion of Odysseus’ *nóstos* to a monumental dimension in the recurring context of the Ionian *panégyris*.

---

<sup>72</sup> See Currie 2005: 52.

<sup>73</sup> See the discussion in Antonaccio 1995: 4-10, in particular pp. 5-6: “Some archaeologically based studies have continued to stress the influence of epic on attitudes and behavior. Now, however, burials at Lefkandi in Euboeia in accordance with Homeric practice have been dated to the tenth century, well before the assumed stabilization and diffusion of epic poetry.” See also Snodgrass 1988 (in particular pp. 20-21); Antonaccio 1994. For sets of Homeric passages showing implicit reference to hero cult practices see Nagy 2012: 47-69.

<sup>74</sup> See Benton 1934-35a: 53.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Passages from the *Odyssey* are quoted from von der Mühl 1962. Quotations from the *Iliad* follow Allen 1931. Translations of the *Odyssey* are taken from Powell 2014, Lombardo 2000, and McCrorie 2004. Translations of the *Iliad* are taken from Lombardo, but I have consulted also Murray (rev. Wyatt) 1999. I made minor changes to produce a translated text fully consistent with my argumentation. For Aeschylus, I have consulted Sommerstein 2008; for Plutarchus, Babbitt 1928. All other translations are my own. In transliterating proper names, I have adopted a ‘hybrid’ system, using Latinized forms for names that are largely familiar but otherwise adhering to a precise transliteration of the Greek. When using someone else’s translation, I revised the text for consistency with this system. Passages from Aeschylus, scholia, ancient scholars, and lexicographers are cited according to the TLG editions.

- Allen, T. W., ed. 1931. *Homeri Ilias. Vols. 2-3*. Oxford.
- Antonaccio, C. M. 1994. “Contesting the Past: Hero Cult, Tomb Cult, and Epic in Early Greece.” In *American Journal of Archaeology* 98: 389-410.
- . 1995. *An Archaeology of Ancestors: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece*. Lanham MD.
- Babbitt, F. K. (ed. and tran.) 1928. *Plutarchus. Moralia, Volume II*. Cambridge MA.
- Barker, E. T. E., and Christensen, J. P. (2016). “Odysseus’s nostos and the Odyssey’s nostoi: rivalry within the epic cycle.” In *Philologia Antiqua* 9 (In press).
- Benton, S. 1934-35a. “Excavations in Ithaca III.” In *Annual of the British School at Athens* 35: 45-73.
- . 1934-35b. “The Evolution of the Tripod-Lebes.” In *Annual of the British School at Athens* 35: 74-130.
- . 1938-39. “Excavations in Ithaca III: The Cave at Polis II.” In *Annual of the British School at Athens* 39: 1-51.
- Bortone, P. 2010. *Greek prepositions from antiquity to the present*. Oxford.
- . 2014. “Adpositions.” *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Boston.
- Bréal, M. 1894. “Etymologies latines et grecques.” *Mémoires de la Société linguistique de Paris*. 8: 45-52.
- Brechét, C. 2008. “Grecs, Macédoniens et Romains au ‘test’ d’Homère. Référence homérique et hellénisme chez Plutarque.” In *The Unity of Plutarch’s Work: ‘Moralia’ Themes in the ‘Lives’, Features of the ‘Lives’ in the ‘Moralia’* (ed. A. G. Nikolaidis) 85-110. Berlin and New York.
- Brugmann, K. 1900. *Griechische Grammatik*. Munich.
- Chantraine, P. 1953. *Grammaire homérique. Tome 2: Syntaxe*. Paris.
- . 1977. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris.
- Clayton, B. 1994. *A Penelopean Poetics: Reweaving the Feminine in Homer’s Odyssey*. Lanham MD.
- Coleman, R. 1991. “Latin prepositional syntax in Indo-European perspective.” In *New Studies in Latin Linguistics: Selected Papers from the 4th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Cambridge, April 1987* (ed. R. Coleman) 323-338. Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- Currie, B. G. F. 2005. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford.
- De Angelis, A., and Gasbarra V. 2010. “Tra morfologia e sintassi: mic. *e-pi-ko-wo* / *o-pi-ko-wo* e le forme omeriche del tipo ἐπήρετος\*.” In *La morfologia del greco tra tipologia e diacronia* (ed. I. Puzu, et alii) 150-167. Milan.

- Dickey, E. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica and Grammatical Treatises, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford.
- Doherty, E. L. 1995. *Siren Songs. Gender, Audiences and Narrators in the Odyssey*. Ann Arbor.
- Dougherty, C. 2001. *The Raft of Odysseus: The Ethnographic Imagination of Homer's Odyssey*. New York.
- Du e, C. 2002. *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis*. Lanham MD.
- Elmer D. F. 2013. *The Poetics of Consent: Collective Decision Making and the Iliad*. Baltimore.
- Frame, D. 2009. *Hippota Nestor*. Hellenic Studies 37. Cambridge MA and Washington DC. Online edition: <http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/4101>
- . 2012. “New Light on the Homeric Question: The Phaeacians Unmasked.” In *Donum natalicium digitaliter confectum Gregorio Nagy septuagenario a discipulis collegis familiaribus oblatum*. Online edition: <http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/4453>.
- Grethlein, J. 2008. “Memory and material objects in the Iliad and the Odyssey.” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 128: 27-51.
- . 2012. “Homer and heroic history.” In *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras* (eds. J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones, and C. Maciver) 14-36. Edinburgh.
- Haug, D. T. T. 2009. “Does Homeric Greek has Prepositions? Or Local Adverbs? And What’s the Difference, Anyway?” In *Grammatical Changes in Indo-European Languages: Papers presented at the Workshop on Indo-European Linguistics at the XIIIth International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Montreal, 2007* (eds. V. Bubenik, J. Hewson, and S. Rose) 103-120. Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- . 2012. “Tmesis in the Epic Tradition.” In *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (eds.  . Andersen, and D. T. T. Haug) 96-105. Cambridge.
- Hewson, J. and Bubenik, V. 2006. *From Case to Adposition. The Development of Configurational Syntax in Indo-European Languages*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- Hobden, F. 2013. *The Symposium in Ancient Greek Society and Thought*. Cambridge.
- Lombardo, S., (tran.) 2000. *Odyssey*. Indianapolis and Cambridge.
- . (tran.) 1997. *Iliad*. Indianapolis and Cambridge.
- Louden, B. 2011. *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East*. Cambridge.
- Luraghi, S. 2003. *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases: the Expression of Semantic Roles in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- Malkin, I. 1998. *The Returns of Odysseus*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- McCrorie, E., (tran.) 2004. *The Odyssey*. Baltimore and London.
- Meillet, A. 1896. “Etymologies slaves.” *M moires de la Soci t  linguistique de Paris*. 1896: 49-55.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. 1983. “Mycenaean and Greek Prepositions: o-pi, e-pi etc.” In *Res Mycenaee – Akten des VII. internationalen mykenologischen Colloquiums in N rnberg vom 6.-10. April 1981* (eds. A. Heubeck, and G. Neumann) 287–310. G ttingen.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. 1988. “Mycenaean and Greek Language.” In *Linear B, a 1984 Survey: Proceedings of the Mycenaean Colloquium of the VIIIth Congress of the International Federation of the Societies of Classical Studies (Dublin, 27 August- 1st September 1984)* (eds. A. Morpurgo Davies and, Y. Duhoux) 75-125.
- Mueller, M. 2010. “Helen’s Hands: Weaving for Kleos in the Odyssey.” *Helios* 37: 1-21.
- Murray, A. T. (rev. Wyatt, W. F.) (tran.) 1999. *Homer. Iliad. Volumes I-II*. Cambridge MA.
- Nagy, G. 1996. *Homeric Questions*. Austin TX.
- . 2004. *Homer's Text and Language*. Urbana and Chicago. Online edition: <http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/3374>
- . 2010. *Homer the Preclassic*. Berkeley and Los Angeles CA. Online edition: 2009. <http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/4377>

- . 2012. “Signs of Hero Cult in Homeric Poetry.” In *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (eds. F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and Ch. C. Tsagalis) 27-71. Berlin and Boston.
- . 2013. *The Ancient Greek Hero in 24 Hours*. Cambridge, MA.
- Papalexandrou, N. 2005. *The Visual Poetics of Power: Warriors, Youths, and Tripods in Early Greece*. Lanham MD.
- Polignac, F. de. 1996. “Offrandes, mémoire et compétition ritualisée dans les sanctuaires grecs à l’époque géométrique.” In *Power and religion in ancient Greece, Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium, 1993*. Boreas 24: 59-66.
- Pontani, F. 2015. “Scholarship in the Byzantine Empire (529-1453).” In *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship* (eds. F. Montanari, S. Matthaios, and A. Rengakos) vol. I 297-458. Leiden.
- Powell, B. P., (tran.) 2014. *The Odyssey*. Oxford.
- Reece, S. 1993. *The Stranger’s Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Ann Arbor.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (ed and tran.) 2008. *Oresteia. Agamemnon. Libation-Bearers. Eumenides*. Cambridge MA.
- Schwyzler, E. 1953. *Griechische Grammatik*. Munich.
- Segal, C. 1994. *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey*. New York.
- Snodgrass, A. 1988. “The Archaeology of the Hero.” In *Aion. Annali del seminario di studi del mondo classico, sezione di archeologia e storia antica* 10: 19-26.
- Tao, L. 2002. “Phono-syntactic conspiracy and beyond: Grammaticalization in spoken Beijing Mandarin. In *New Reflections on Grammaticalization* (eds. E. C. Traugott, and B. Heine). Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- . 2006. Tao, L. 2006. “Classifier loss and frozen tone in spoken Beijing Mandarin: the YI+GE phono-syntactic conspiracy.” In *Linguistics*: 91–133.
- Ungerer, F., and Schmid H.-J. 2013 (1996). *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London.
- Van Nortwick, T. 2008. *The Unknown Odysseus. Alternate Words in Homer’s Odyssey*. Ann Arbor.
- Von der Mühl, P. 1962. *Homeri Odyssea*. Basel.
- Wace, A. J. B., and Stubbings, F. H. 1962. *A Companion to Homer*. London.
- West, M. L. 2014. *The Making of the Odyssey*. Oxford.
- Whitney, W. D. 2013 (1879). *Sanskrit Grammar*. Mineola NY (Leipzig).