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Abstract

This dissertation examines the narratives of two pedestrian journeys made by Odysseus in the Odyssey in apposition to the Apologue’s narrative of his fleet’s destruction. The first journey takes place on Scheria (6.254-7.135) and the second on Ithaca (17.182-17.341). Though the Phaeacian episode, and that of Odysseus’ return to Ithaca have been studied extensively, the pedestrian narratives within them have generally been overlooked. These narratives depict the hero in lowly circumstances, enduring the anonymity and dishonour that other heroes would not. I thus argue that the walking journeys serve a characterizing function.

My analysis is informed by spatial and phenomenological theory. Odysseus’ fleet is interpreted as a “centre” of Hellenic culture that implaces him and its destruction as his social and spatial displacement. I conclude that Odysseus’ displacement is both a consequence and a reflection of an overall shift in his ethos from one that was balanced between the active, (violent and assertive) and passive (enduring and deferential) to one that favours passivity.

For Odysseus, walking produces ambivalent results. Pedestrianism, in the ancient world, is born of necessity and lowliness. Nevertheless, walking allows the pedestrian a great degree of engagement, both somatic and mental, with his surroundings. The two pedestrian journeys under consideration are read as narrative doublets. Both begin with the hero in lowly circumstances, on the social and spatial margins of society. They conclude with his (re)integration into the
respective communities. But while the Phaeacian journey, through his somatic engagement with the cultural landscape, leads to the hero’s integration into the Hellenic-type society, the Ithacan walk is part of his beggar’s disguise and highlights his exteriority. During this walk Odysseus avoids engagement with the landscape and suppresses signs of his familiarity with it. Consequently, the disguised hero is able enter his palace, to test his household while incognito, and ultimately to take revenge on Penelope’s suitors.

Overall the pedestrian journeys are read as emblematic of Odysseus’ mental and physical endurance. These narratives are seen as the *Odyssey*’s celebration of its hero’s uncommon ability to passively endure and to prioritize *nostos* over heroic glory.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction

This dissertation examines the narratives of two pedestrian journeys made by Odysseus in Homer’s *Odyssey*. Both walking journeys take place after the hero has lost his ships and companions during his maritime wanderings through unknown and exotic places; the first journey takes place on the Phaeacian island of Scheria in Books 6 through 7 (6.254-7.135) and the second, in Book 17, begins on the outskirts of Ithaca and ends at the hero’s palace (17.182-17.341). Both of these journeys will be investigated in apposition to Odysseus’ maritime adventures in the *Apologue* in order to consider their relationships to the plot of the *Odyssey* and their effect on the characterization of Odysseus.

Though the Phaeacian episode (Books 6-8) and the episode encompassing Odysseus’ return to Ithaca (Books 13-22) are generally well-studied in their entirety, little attention has been paid specifically to the narratives that trace Odysseus’ journeys on foot from the outskirts of both territories to the cities and palaces. Indeed, these two episodes have not attracted much scholarly attention as narratives of any of substance.\(^1\) While they do little to advance the plot, I argue that these two pedestrian narratives are worthy of closer attention. Both journeys depict the hero in strange circumstances, enduring long periods of anonymity and dishonour that other Homeric heroes would find intolerable. In this respect, I argue that the journeys serve a characterizing function for Odysseus: they complicate our understanding of Odysseus as a Greek, as a member of the social elite, and as a hero.

---

1 De Jong (2001) 168 makes a brief comment on the lowly nature of the hero’s Phaeacian journey and generally has the most extensive treatment of the scenery description of Nausicaa’s directions to the Phaeacian palace. Still, her analysis is focused on narratological concerns and does not elaborate extensively upon the walking motif or the spatiality of the episode. Steiner (2010), esp. 99-104, also comments quite extensively on Odysseus’ disguised return in Books 17 and 18 and covers some of the spatial interest in the meeting at the Ithacan well, though the pedestrian aspect of the journey remains unconsidered.
My analysis of Odysseus’ pedestrian journeys is heavily informed by ideas from modern spatial theory and phenomenological study. I developed this approach after a close spatial reading of the Apologue and the episodes surrounding it. I was struck by how differently the Odysseus character was portrayed in his words, actions, and internal thoughts when he was outside the sheltered centre of his fleet and crew—and indeed without any external signs of his identity—as is the case in both of the episodes under investigation here. Some of the most iconic stories about Odysseus involve his maritime travel, periods during which he enters an unchartered realm and discovers unknown places and exotic peoples. Other well-known stories centre on his heroics in battle and his reputation as the wiliest of the Greek heroes in the Trojan War. When considered carefully, the two narratives in the Odyssey portray the hero engaged in mundane, small-scale foot travel that is uncharacteristically humble. Using the lens of contemporary spatial theory, and aided by the observations of scholars who have studied walking both as a literary motif and cultural symbol, this study adds a new dimension to the analysis of the hero’s nostos and to the study of the character of Odysseus.

In addition to the close analysis and attention paid to under-studied episodes in the Odyssey, this dissertation will have further ramifications. There is a long tradition in Homeric scholarship of studying the contrast between Odysseus’ character and that of other Greek heroes. One of the most common contrasts is drawn between Odysseus and Achilles, who, in addition to being the central characters of the two very different epics, are also found in opposition to each other. Their antagonism is reported in the song of the Phaeacian bard, Demodocus, in Odyssey 8.73-82. This polemical relationship is most often illustrated by pointing to the contrast between the heroes’ defining characteristics: in the Iliad, the heroic ideal is embodied by Achilles’ impetuous use of his force (βίη) and his willingness to accept a premature death for the sake of kleos, while the Odyssey’s hero often relies on his cleverness (µῆτις) and prioritizes homecoming
Indeed, for the sake of his nostos, Odysseus focuses not on cultivating and preserving his heroic honour but on enduring the insult and degradation that accompanies anonymity. The pair of pedestrian journeys in the *Odyssey* highlights this distinguishing feature of the Odysseus character: instead of striving for the attainment of honour, our hero focuses on enduring insults and tolerating his own anonymity in order to achieve nostos. The readings proposed in this dissertation reinforce the contrast between Odysseus and Achilles, and the possibility that the *Odyssey* deliberately sets its main character in opposition to that of the *Iliad*. As I will show, the *Odyssey* highlights and celebrates Odysseus’ capacity for suffering and endurance.

1 Walking

Much like modern scholars of the Classics, the ancient Greeks did not devote much time to thinking about the act of walking. Instead, maritime travel seems constantly to have been on the Greek mind and figures prominently in Greek literature. This is understandable given that the Mediterranean is sea bound. But as a result, other forms of travel and movement, including pedestrian travel, are less commonly considered in the scholarly work about Greek literature.

Walking is so basic a human activity and so integral an action to human existence that its significance is easily ignored. This is certainly the case in most ancient Greek literature, which

---

3 See Nagy (1979), especially Ch. 2-3. Finkelberg (1995) takes a slightly different tack: a hero in the *Iliad* is one who is prepared to die for glory; in the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, he is an individual “who is prepared to go through life enduring toil and suffering” (12). See also Cook (1999).
4 This overarching argument for the present chapter is heavily indebted to Murnaghan’s (1987) study on Odysseus’ “disguise and recognition.” This work throws into relief Odysseus’ capacity for disguise and anonymity against that of the other grand Greek heroes for whom the suspension of kleos, honour, and prestige—directly linked to identity and lineage—is intolerable (4-19).
5 Pucci (1987) studies the “intertext” between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and points out many “agonistic” allusions in both epics. Burgess (2006) 164 calls the perceived competition between the two epics a “plausible possibility” due to the Homeric epics’ shared “metacyclic” natures (149).
remains quite silent about the pedestrian act. But the significance of the act of walking has started to garner more attention in modern literary and anthropological arenas in recent years. Rebecca Solnitt, a popular essayist, views the topic as follows:

…the subject of walking is, in some sense, about how we invest universal acts with particular meanings. Like eating or breathing, it can be invested with wildly different cultural meanings, from the erotic to the spiritual, from the revolutionary to the artistic.\(^6\)

Solnitt’s comments allude to the high degree of consciousness about the pedestrian act among today’s thinkers. As she points out, the study of walking can produce keen insights into a culture. But before discussing the role of walking in modern scholarly work, I would like to take a moment to trace the historical lineage of the topic of walking from ancient Greece and to investigate when, why, and how this topic became one worthy of consideration. Though this study concentrates on walking in epic, and more specifically in the *Odyssey*, the present section will explore the evolution of consciousness surrounding the pedestrian act by surveying all genres of literature of the ancient Mediterranean. It is by no means an exhaustive study and is intended merely as an introduction to the topic.

Pedestrian activity is somewhat of an afterthought in ancient Greek literature and is often articulated by phrases comprised only of a verb (with implied subject) and perhaps a place of departure and/or a direct object representing destination. Nor are extended pedestrian narratives very common in ancient Greek literature in comparison with other (especially maritime) forms of travel. It was not until the rise of the peripatetic schools of philosophy that walking was self-

consciously undertaken and discussed. With this philosophical school pedestrianism becomes, as Solnitt puts it, a “conscious cultural act.”

There was also a small group of ancient Greek and Roman scholars called the physiognomists who studied the ways in which people walked. For example, they determined that heroes always walked with broad strides that matched their strength and importance. Other ancient scholars also made passing mentions of walking: according to Aristotle and Plutarch, a slow and measured gait was the mark of great and indeed aristocratic men. Thus the physiognomists and other scholars would study walking as part of the tacit cultural exchange that is contained in body language. In the world of Greek epic, however, the commonplace act of walking is usually inferred and glossed over in favour of descriptions of more “noteworthy” actions such as conversing, doing battle, and feasting. Notable exceptions include Odysseus’ two pedestrian journeys that will be examined in Chapters 3 and 4 of this dissertation.

The consciousness surrounding pedestrianism increased with the Romans. To the Romans, walking was a carefully considered cultural act. Not only did they believe, much like the physiognomists, that the style of one’s gait was linked to one’s character, but they also identified preferred styles of walking that advertised an individual as one type of person or another. Indeed, as O’Sullivan points out, elite Romans went to considerable lengths to learn to walk with “the right” bodily comportment. Elective pedestrianism was a performative tool through which the Roman elite could distinguish themselves both by the manner in which they walked.

---

7 O’Sullivan (2011) 3. See Montiglio (1995) 91-117 for the significance of wandering (not necessarily on foot) to the pursuit of knowledge and wisdom by “itinerant sages”.
9 See Evans (1969) for a detailed study on physiognomics in the ancient world including the major treatises, and physiognomic observations on literary works. See also Bremmer (1991) 15ff. for a succinct overview of the work of the ancient physiognomists and the ancient sources from which they worked, with special attention paid to the body language incorporating the actions of walking, sitting, and standing.
walked as well as by the company of those with whom they walked.\textsuperscript{10} Having taken hold as a physical act imbued with meaning, walking was also held meaning in some Latin literature.

During the Augustan period of Latin poetry, travel was a significant symbolic mechanism and poetic trope. Maritime imagery—the sea, sailing, and ships—was a common literary symbol that accompanied heroic themes and symbolized the grandeur of the epic genre.\textsuperscript{11} Though this type of imagery may not have exclusively indicated the presence of heroic themes or epic poetics, it was commonly used to these ends. Pedestrianism, on the other hand, came to symbolize just the opposite. Horace’s hexametric \textit{Sermones}, of which the iconic symbol was the pedestrian muse, was distinctly non-heroic. In fact, his \textit{musa pedestris} (\textit{Sermones} 2.6.17) was regarded as a symbol of the versified prose from which the typically high-flown language of hexameter poetry was conspicuously absent.\textsuperscript{12}

Many centuries later, the politics and aesthetics of walking found a closer affinity in the English and American literatures of the Romantic period. Travelers, who often became writers of their traveling experiences, undertook long journeys on foot not out of necessity but by choice. Jarvis maintains that, “It is against <this> deeply-sedimented history of associating walking with indigence, necessity and fate, and in later centuries with the illicit freedom of the road and the deterrent force of the still-active vagrancy laws, that the early Romantic pedestrians set out on their tours and expeditions.”\textsuperscript{13} Pedestrian travel imbued the writings of these walkers of the Romantic period with a novel political statement and a fresh aesthetic viewpoint. Going on foot allowed the walker closer contact with his surroundings and thus perhaps created opportunities

\textsuperscript{10} See O’Sullivan (2011) 4.
\textsuperscript{11} See Harrison (2007), who finds examples of nautical and maritime imagery as metaphors for the epic genre in passages of Catullus, Vergil, and Horace.
\textsuperscript{12} Freudenburg (1993) 207. The entirety of this work is crucial to understanding Horace’s poetics in relation to the \textit{Sermones}.
\textsuperscript{13} Jarvis (1997) 23.
for some recovery of past experiences and for enhanced creative expression. Wallace, whose study looks closely at the pedestrian act in 19th-century British and American Romantic writing, suggests that these writers all agree that:

…the natural, primitive quality of the physical act of walking restores the natural proportions of our perceptions, reconnecting us with both the physical world and the moral order inherent in it, and enabling us to recollect both our personal past and our national and/or racial past—that is, human life before mechanization. As a result, the walker may expect an enhanced sense of self, clearer thinking, more acute moral apprehension, and higher powers of expression.¹⁴

Two observations about the perception of pedestrianism in Romantic period literature are striking when considered in relation to the two Homeric walking journeys studied in this dissertation. First, the evidence in the *Odyssey* suggests that walking is indeed associated in the world of Homeric epic with necessity, as it was prior to the 19th century.¹⁵ Despite this, there is also ample indication in the *Odyssey* that, as Wallace stresses in relation to the 19th century Romantic walkers, walking helps Odysseus to reconnect with his surroundings, to regain some sort of emplacement after losing his fleet and indeed to overcome the *atopia* and *anomie* that are so intimately linked with his displacement. The role of walking in the *Odyssey* is thus ambivalent.

Modern Classical scholarship has thus far been reticent to broach the topic of walking in any great detail. Two recent monographs have foregrounded the topic: Purves (2010) analyzes Odysseus’ final pedestrian journey, as foretold by the seer Tiresias at Book 11.121-131 of the

---

¹⁵ See below in Chapter 3. Nausicaa’s father (*Od. 6.39-40*) makes reference to travelling in the cart being more seemly for the princess.
and also the narrative of the long walk back to Greece undertaken by Greek mercenary soldiers and recounted in the Xenophon’s *Anabasis*. Both narratives are subjected to a spatial analysis and are thus of great importance to my project. O’Sullivan (2011) has worked on the topic of pedestrianism very explicitly. Drawing on evidence from art, architecture, and literature, he focuses on the cultural and performative aspects of private and public walking in ancient Rome. As discussed above, the pedestrian act took on the role of status symbol as walking for the sake of walking became a leisure activity practiced by the elite and educated. Montiglio (2005) touches on the topic while studying the act of wandering (either walking or by some other mode of transportation) as both a literary motif and a cultural reality in ancient Greece, and Bremmer (1991) discusses the physiognomic preoccupation with walking styles and types of strides. My study builds on this existing literature and incorporates spatial and phenomenological theory to provide a new perspective on pedestrianism in the Classics, with a particular focus on walking as a literary motif in the *Odyssey*.

Walking in the *Odyssey* is not an aristocratic activity but one born of necessity. As Amato notes, the great and powerful did not walk out of necessity in antiquity:

> …those who had to walk formed the legions of the inferior and less powerful. They went on foot because they couldn’t ride. They were compelled to walk because of the force of circumstances or at the command of others. Walking out of necessity rather than by choice, they literally inherited the inferiority of the foot, which fastened them to the soiling earth.

Through a close analysis of the narratives of Odysseus’ Phaecian and Ithacan walking journeys, I will demonstrate how the motif of necessary walking characterizes Odysseus as a hero of

---

16 This journey is only alluded to in the epic and is not part of the *Odyssey*’s narrative. It will therefore not be studied in this work, as I intend to focus solely on extended pedestrian narratives in which Odysseus participates within the scope of the *Odyssey*.
17 See Purves (2010), esp. 65-96 and 159-195.
mental and physical endurance, a trait that gains prominence over the course of his protracted return and which is particularly important for this nostos story. Through applications of spatial and phenomenological ideas to the text, I will also show how the pedestrian act allows Odysseus to engage with his surroundings and to re-engage with his identity after experiencing the displacement that results from the loss of his fleet and crew.

2 The Sea, Ships, and Maritime Travel in Archaic Greek Literature

If walking has been neglected in Greek literature and Classical scholarship, the opposite is true of maritime tropes, which have often been central topics of investigation. This section will examine the ways in which the sea, ships, and travel over the sea have been employed as common symbols and imagery in ancient Greek poetry. This short survey will concentrate mostly on the poetry of the Archaic period, including both Homeric and non-Homeric poetry, in order to help shed some light on the ways in which contemporary Greeks may have viewed the sea. It will concentrate less on the ancients’ speculation over the form and geography of major bodies of water and more on the Greeks’ attitudes and relationships to the sea and maritime travel as depicted in literature. We will look at three types of common maritime imagery that have important ramifications for this study: the sea as a place of danger and of the unknown, ships and their crews as communities or collectives, and, in accordance with the principles of modern spatial theories, ships as centres of cultural origin.
In Archaic Greek literature, ideas about the sea are ambivalent: it is both a source of livelihood and also a boundless place of danger and of unpredictability.\(^{19}\) This is made clear in Hesiod’s *Works and Days*. One section in the “Days” portion concerns Hesiod’s advice on sailing, and, as such, is often called the *Nautilia* (*WD* 618-694). Here, the poet clearly states that seafaring ought not to comprise one’s whole source of income due to the risks associated with maritime mercantile pursuits.\(^{20}\) The reader quickly realizes that Hesiod holds a strong bias against seafaring. The opening line of the passage reads: Εἰ δὲ σε ναυτιλίης δυσπέμφελου ἒμερος αἵρει… (“If the desire for ill-tempered seafaring takes hold of you…” *WD* 618).\(^{21}\) Thus Hesiod attempts to discourage his reader from the outset of the section, making it clear that seafaring is not the safest choice for securing one’s livelihood (βίος). Nevertheless he continues with seafaring advice for those who should choose to ignore his warning and to chance the vicissitudes of the open waters in hopes of making a relatively quick fortune. But in continuing Hesiod also emphasizes that he himself is quite ignorant of maritime matters and that his poetry

\(^{19}\) Beaulieu (2015, forthcoming). Lindenlauf (2003) also compiles both literary and archaeological evidence on the ambivalent attitude of the Greeks, who both revered the sea as a source of many important resources and were frightened by its violence and power. While Lesky (1947) is an older study, its documentation of the Greek attitude towards the sea in literature is still referenced frequently. He views the ambivalence as a progression, from approaching the sea with awe and fear in the Archaic period to seeing it as a benevolent source of livelihood in the Hellenistic. Though the progression may have been more nuanced and subjective than he suggests, the evidence implies that a growing familiarity with seafaring brought with it more positive thinking about the sea and maritime travel.

\(^{20}\) As West (1978) 313 n. 618 ff puts it, going to sea for Hesiod “…is not an alternative way of life to farming… but an optional supplement to it… We are now concerned with the man who has surplus produces…to sell, and travels some distance to do so because there is no local shortage.” For practical considerations regarding opportunities for a farmer of Hesiod’s time-period and geographical location, see Wallinga (1993), who uses his extensive knowledge of archaic seafaring to interpret Hesiod’s nautical pronouncements. Several issues are explored in this article, including the time and extent of the sailing season, the structure of the ships, and who exactly would own and operate seagoing vessels.

\(^{21}\) West (1978) 315 n. 618 remarks that the danger and risk that sailing entailed would have made this a common Greek attitude towards any seafaring profession or pursuit, and he directs his reader to other literary sources that display such biases.
is that of farming, of reliability, and of the earth, instead of the unpredictability and danger of the seas.\textsuperscript{22}

The danger of the sea is closely related to its seemingly limitless nature and the difficulty encountered in navigating this unmeasured and unexplored space.\textsuperscript{23} In the Homeric corpus, this is demonstrated by use of the epithet \textit{ἄπειρος} or \textit{ἀπείρητος} (boundless) for the sea.\textsuperscript{24} Romm notes, too, that this adjective may be more specifically understood as “uncrossable” when used in reference to the sea.\textsuperscript{25} Nevertheless, certain individuals, especially heroes like Odysseus, are sometimes able, through experience and skill, to find paths (πόρος) through the unbounded spaces of the sea.\textsuperscript{26} While it is through skill and heroic ability that these mythical characters can navigate their maritime paths, their ships are the tools through which this feat is possible. Ships serve as defined places of safety in the boundless space of the sea.

In apposition to the dangerous and unbounded space of the sea is the walled and livable place engendered by the ship. A ship is a floating community with shared values and pursuits. Many archaic lyric poets used the sea as a symbol of dangerous exterior conditions.\textsuperscript{27} These metaphorical or allegorical images equated seagoing vessels in danger on stormy waters with groups that were under threat, usually by external powers.\textsuperscript{28} This sense of a collectivity fighting

\textsuperscript{22} See Nagy (1982), Rosen (1990), and Steiner (2005) 349-350 who feel that the \textit{Nautilia} represents Hesiod’s attempt to differentiate his poetry from that of grand heroic epic through reference to his inexperience with the sea and sailing.

\textsuperscript{23} See Beaulieu (2015, forthcoming) and Hopman (2012) (a) 80-83, both of whom pay special attention to the sea in the Archaic period and more specifically in the Homeric corpus.

\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Il.} 1.350; 17.41; \textit{Od.} 4.510; 10.195.

\textsuperscript{25} Romm (1992) 10, n. 3.

\textsuperscript{26} See Hopman (2012) (a) 80-83 and the bibliography therein on the association of \textit{metis} and the ability to ascertain and maintain a path through the sea’s uncharted territories. Therefore the Phaeacians are the paragons of those with \textit{metis} about the sea, while Odysseus oscillates between understanding and ignorance of the topic. She emphasizes, quite rightly, that wandering on the sea is due to the absence of \textit{metis} about the paths of the sea. See also Beaulieu (2015, forthcoming) on the self-affirming nature of heroic maritime voyages.

\textsuperscript{27} On Pindar’s nautical imagery, see Péron (1974). For a more general overview on imagery of maritime distress in ancient literature, see Kahlmeyer (1934).

\textsuperscript{28} Cf. Archilochus frr. 105-6 in West (1974) 128-129: \textit{Γλαύ\'χ, ὃρα: βαθ\'υς γάρ ἡ δεῖ κύμαισιν ταράσσεται/}
against outside forces is also at the heart of the overtly political “Ship of State”
metaphors/allegories that were featured by many ancient lyric poets; the unity and unanimity of
the embattled ship’s crew characterizes that of the factions involved.\textsuperscript{29} The metaphor also plays
out spatially. The floating community on the inside of the ship is a safe place compared to the
dangers of the open seas on the outside.

One could also think of the communities that result from life on a ship as mobile centres of origin. This interpretation is based on a very important observation made by many
phenomenologists: people tend to think of their homes/homelands as the centre of their worlds.\textsuperscript{30}
When undertaking sea voyages, the homogenous populations most often found aboard ancient
ships would probably act as centres of culture for travellers. Thalmann (2011) applies this idea to
the ship Argo, which serves as a Greek space to ground Jason and his crew in their home culture
as they travel strange and exotic places.\textsuperscript{31} This reading of sea-going vessels as mobile centres of origin can soundly be applied to most ships, especially in the ancient world when the crew was
most likely culturally homogenous. Thus heroes, soldiers, and travellers can be thought of as
being simultaneously away from home and at home (by proxy). There exists some evidence from

\begin{quote}
πόντος, ἄμφι δ’ ἀκρα Γυρέων ὀρθῶν ἱσταται νέφος/σήμα χειμῶνος· κιχάνει δ’ ἐξ ἀελπτίης φόβος. This is not
technically a “Ship of State” metaphor or allegory since its subject is not an embattled state. Nevertheless,
Archilochus is here setting the groundwork for later poets, like the Lesbian poet Alcaeus, to use the image of a
flagging ship on stormy waters to represent a nation in turmoil. Adrados (1955) argues that this fragment of
Archilochus is the origin or starting point for the development of the “Ship of State” allegory/metaphor. See also
Page (1955) 181-182 on the relationship between Archilochus and Alcaeus in the development of Ship of State
imagery. For further analysis on the development of the “Ship of State” allegory, refer to Kahlmeyer (1934) 39ff.
\textsuperscript{29} Brock (2013) 53-55.
\textsuperscript{30} Tuan (1977) 38 and 137-159. See especially 151-153, where he comments on this phenomenon in ancient
societies, and classical Greece and Rome in particular. On the ancient Greek concept of the centre and its sacred
nature, see Cole (2004) 67ff, and on the perception of one’s own polis as the centre of a “conceptual” map, see Cole
\textsuperscript{31} Thalmann (2011) 21, 63-71. Examples of the Hellenic nature of the ship’s space include models of both an
egalitarian social model and also one based on merit and prestige. These models are “characteristically Hellenic
because they have prototypes in earlier or contemporary Greek society, or both” (67).
\end{quote}
the Homeric corpus to suggest that sailing vessels sometimes stood in substitution for Hellenic homelands.

In the *Catalogue of Ships* in Book 2 of the *Iliad*, the names of warriors, chiefs, and their fleets are arranged in a narrative sequence that roughly replicates the geography of Greece in a clockwise loop around the Greek peninsula, starting from Thessaly. Here, the ships are indirectly substituted in for the real Hellenic homeland. Once arrived at Troy, the Greek soldiers set up their camp close to the ships, as if to maintain a connection to their homelands. This is where they hold their war councils, and is the place to which Achilles retires when he refuses to fight. Finally, in *Iliad* 15, Ajax, while defending the Achaean ships, gives a speech that further establishes the connection between the Greek homeland and its Trojan substitute—the vessels that carried them there. He exhorts his comrades to defend the ships with all their strength, since, for them, their ships are as much protection and as much a homeland as they have at the moment (*Il*. 15.733-741):

> ὦ φίλοι ἡρωες Δαναοί, θεράποντες Ἀρηος ἀνέρες ἔστε, φίλοι, μνήσασθε δὲ θουρίδος ἀλκῆς, ἦ τινὰς φαμεν εἶναι ἀδοσητήρας ὀπίσσω, ἦ τι τεῖχος ἄρειον, ὡ ἐν γὰρ Τρώων πεδίῳ πόντῳ κεκλιένος ἡμεθα πατρίδος αἴης· τῶ ἐν χεροι φόσω, ὦ μειλιχίῃ πολέμῳ.

Friends and fighting men of the Danaans, henchmen of Ares, be men now, dear friends, remember your furious valour. Do we think there are others who stand behind us to help us? Have we some stronger wall that can rescue men from perdition?

---

32 For this geographical arrangement, see Kirk (1984) 183-186. Heiden (2008) 134-145 discusses all the entries in the *Catalogue* as emphasizing communities of people instead of individual - and indeed the most important - heroes.

33 The expressions ἐν νῆσοι or ἐν νησίων stands in for the camp where the Achaeans beached their boats and temporarily made their homes on the shores of Troy. See *Il*. 2.688 and 11.659.
We have no city built strong with towers lying near us, within which we could defend ourselves and hold off this host that matches us. We hold position in this plain of the close-armoured Trojans, bent back against the sea, and far from the land of our fathers. Salvation's light is in our hands' work, not the mercy of battle. (*Il. 15.733-741*)

Here, the Greek ships are viewed, even by the characters of the *Iliad*, as significant and representative of their homeland. The protection offered by city walls, which the Greeks are lacking, is supplied instead by the barrier created by the beached ships. Taken together with the example formulated by Thalmann, the view of the ship as a mobile centre of origin has a history in Greek epic poetry.

In this dissertation, Odysseus’ fleet and crew are read as floating substitutes for his Hellenic homeland in general, and for Ithaca in particular. Within his fleet, Odysseus is an aristocratic leader, as he was in Ithaca. Odysseus’ fleet thus serves to implace him even though he is wandering on the open and boundless sea. Moreover, when in the company of his fleet, Odysseus remains amidst Greek thought and value systems, to the exclusion of all others with which he comes into contact. The exclusivity of Odysseus’ maritime community isolates him and precludes his integration, however temporary, into the exotic—and pointedly non-Hellenic—societies in which he and his crew find themselves.³⁴

---

³⁴ In this work I view Odysseus’ wanderings through a New Historicist lens, as per Burgess (2014) (a) which reads his encounters with exotic peoples not as fantasy without purpose, but as stories that are inspired by and explore different, human, non-Greek socio-economic behaviours. For further explanation and analysis of Odysseus’ explorations of different livelihoods, see Burgess (2014) (b). The New Historicist approach is unlike many older studies that read the wanderings as travel through a “fantasy” realm that is free of human culture or commentary on it. Cf. Vidal-Naquet’s (1995) structuralist approach, which concludes that the presence of agriculture points to human culture in the wanderings (37-39).
3 Theories and Methodology

3.1 Modern Spatial Theory and Phenomenology

This investigation’s main method of analysis draws from modern spatial theory and phenomenology. Ideas from both approaches are used to explore the narrative that recounts Odysseus’ loss of his fleet and crew and his concomitant displacement during his post-Troy maritime adventures. They will also be applied to the narratives surrounding Odysseus’ pedestrian journeys on Scheria in Books 6-7 and on Ithaca in Book 17, with special attention paid to the particularly vivid spatiality of the narratives of walking themselves. While I choose to introduce some spatial and phenomenological concepts where they are applicable, others are particularly important to the study as a whole and deserve introduction now.

First, it would be useful to explain why a study of the spatial aspects of the maritime/pedestrian narratives is worthwhile. De Jong (2012) argues that space can serve several kinds of functions in ancient Greek narrative: 1) thematic, as in travel stories or city novels; 2) emphatic, reflecting or contrasting themes present in the narrative; 3) symbolic, when space holds meaning beyond its scene-setting function; and 4) “characterizing” or “psychologizing,” reflecting a character’s permanent or temporary disposition. A focus on space allows us to observe how some of these functions play out in the Odyssey. For example, Odysseus’ losses of fleet and crew, which I read as the hero’s loss of a “centre” or a mobile proxy for his homeland, can be understood to have a characterizing function; the hero takes on a different ethos—from a generally active and violent character to one that is more often passive, enduring, and tolerant—

35 For additional information on these functions of narrative space, see de Jong (2012) 14-16, where she acknowledges that the differences between the symbolic and characterizing/psychologizing function of space are subtle. Other studies that have successfully employed modern spatial theory to re-interpret Classical texts include Purves (2010), Thalmann (2011), and Clay (2011).
with the loss of his spatial ‘centre.’ Odysseus’ characterization is further reflected in the spatial elements of both pedestrian episodes. Odysseus begins as an outsider and a marginal figure (a no-name, destitute suppliant/beggar) who slowly, through re-engagement with cultural space and social mores, is accepted into the elite centre of both the Scherian and Ithacan societies. The centripetal movement of both pedestrian journeys reflects his character’s overall progression. As a result, this approach, when applied to the text, reveals the characterizing role that spatial elements can play and the way in which these elements can reflect narrative themes.

Before discussing the application of modern spatial theory to the *Odyssey*, it is important to highlight the important distinction that this theory makes between ‘space’ and ‘place,’ each of which takes on its own significance. To generalize, space is often described as the static backdrop for human activity, whereas place is something more particular, more structured, and more meaningful to humans. ‘Place’ denotes a space that holds meaning and value for groups and individuals.

Humanist geographer Yi-Fu Tuan describes place as a space invested with meaning and value. Although he does not explicitly lay out the processes by which places are created within undefined space, he does give a series of examples from which different stages of the transformation can be discerned. For example, the positioning of the body in space works to endow space with basic meaning: “…man is the measure of all things… Man, out of his intimate experience with his body and with other people, organizes space so that it conforms with and caters to his biological needs and social relations.” This particular idea belongs to the realm of phenomenology which studies space and place based on subjective experiences of different

---

36 Tuan (1977) especially 6, 136.
37 Tuan (1977) 34. He continues, “What does it mean to be in command of space, to feel at home in it? It means that the objective reference points in space, such as landmarks and the cardinal positions, conform with the intention and the co-ordinates of the human body” (36). See also Casey (1993) 50, in which he discusses the body’s position in relation to the landscape and how this relation helps to create space.
locales. Both Tuan’s ideas about the somatic experience of space, and some general thoughts derived from the phenomenological approach to spatial study figure prominently in my analysis of Odysseus’ journeys on foot. Indeed the pedestrian journeys, in contrast to his travels via ship, allow Odysseus a more intimate and somatic experience of his surroundings.

In addition to the corporeal experience of space and the body’s relation to features of the landscape, space can take on meaning in other ways. Especially significant place-making activities include the experience of intimate social relations within space. While it is apparent that Tuan’s definition of place is quite broad and based on subjective and general criteria, others have helped to clarify the idea of place as space that has been endowed with meaning.

John Agnew (1987) states that space becomes a “meaningful location” when 1) the location can be expressed geographically in relation to other locations; 2) it conforms to the notion of locale as “the setting in which social relations are constituted”; and 3) it inspires a sense of place.38 Along with Tuan and Agnew, both Lefebvre39 and Casey40 see place as a social entity—either as a setting for or product of social relations. To generalize, then, while space becomes place at the individual level through somatic experience, social groups create space through meaningful social relations within and shared experience of the space in question. The two levels of production are closely interrelated.

Thus far we have reviewed some of the most important ideas about the difference between space and place, and the actions that lead to the creation of meaningful places. Also

---

39 Lefebvre (1991) 26: “(Social) space is a (social) product.” Although Lefebvre calls the locales produced by social relations ‘social space,’ Cresswell (2005) 10 concludes that Lefebvre’s socially produced space is essentially the same thing as Tuan’s ‘place.’
40 Casey (1993) 23: “The power a place such as a mere room possesses determines not only where I am in the limited sense of cartographic location but how I am together with others (i.e., how I commingle and communicate with them) and even who we shall become together. The “how” and the “who” are intimately tied to the “where” which gives to them a specific content and coloration not available from any other source. Place bestows upon them “a local habitation and a name” by establishing a concreted situatedness in the common world. This implantation is as social as it is personal.”
important for this study of Odysseus’ journeys are ideas of implacement and displacement.

Closely connected with the ideas of implacement and displacement are Relph’s categories of “insideness” and “outsideness.” According to Relph, “insideness” is the condition of being inside a place, which in turn “is to belong to it <a place> and to identify with it, and the more profoundly inside you are the stronger is this identity with the place.”

“Outsideness,” of course, just the opposite. In the previous section we discussed how Odysseus’ fleet, ship, and crew can be considered to act as his ‘mobile centre.’ Once Odysseus is deprived of this centre, he seems to experience two effects of displacement or outsideness that are described by Casey (1993): atopia and anomie. According to Casey, atopia (being displaced or without place) causes a sort of place-panic: “The emotional symptoms of placelessness—homesickness, disorientation, depression, desolation—mimic the phenomenon itself… Separation from place is perhaps most poignantly felt in the forced homelessness of the reluctant emigrant, the displaced person, the involuntary exile.”

Anomie, the result of being atopos (without place), is defined as a lack of social norms and values that often stems from being separated from one’s familiar environment and without a place to go. For Odysseus, the wily hero whose exceptional rationality is one of his defining characteristics, this anomie sometimes entails the privileging of instincts and fulfillment of somatic need over more civilized responses to problematic situations.

All of the aforementioned spatial works share one very important point of agreement, which in turn becomes essential to anyone analyzing written accounts of space and place: their definitions of place include experiential or phenomenological dimensions. In another article that discusses representations of space and place in discourse, Tuan indicates that space can become

---

41 Relph (1976) 49.
42 Casey (1993) x.
43 Casey (1993) x-xi uses this Greek term, which literally means “without law” or “without custom,” in his phenomenological discussions of space and place.
meaningful through the oral or textual transmission of a story in which a certain space figures prominently: “The telling itself…has the power to endow a site with vibrant meaning.” This idea will be applied to the detailed directions that the Phaeacian princess, Nausicaa, gives to Odysseus in order for him to get to the palace. Her instructions not only function as a verbal map for the hero, but by telling stories about particular sites and describing them to Odysseus in culturally relative terms, she endows the Phaeacian landscape with meaning for the hero. Odysseus is thus able to engage with the Phaeacian culture in a way that would have been impossible without Nausicaa’s detailed directions and stories. Her narration of the hero’s path initiates Odysseus’ temporary implantation at the Phaeacian elite centre.

While most of the aforementioned theorists consider the attribution of meaning to space as a function of pause and lack of movement, Michel de Certeau, in his *The Practice of Everyday Life*, emphasizes the ways in which a static, panoptic view of the landscape has a distancing and detaching effect on the subject’s connection to the space around him, while the action of walking actually connects the subject with the landscape and produces a meaningful experience:

> The panorama-city is a “theoretical” (that is, visual) simulacrum, in short a picture, whose condition of possibility is an oblivion and a misunderstanding of practices... The ordinary practitioners of the city live “down below,” below the thresholds at which visibility begins. They walk—an elementary form of this experience of the city...  

This effect is readily witnessed in oral and written accounts and is evident in the narratives that recount Odysseus’ journeys on foot.  

---

44 Tuan (1991) 687.  
45 De Certeau (1984) 93. For a similar view of walking and its ability to produce somatic relations to spaces and places, see Macauley (2000).  
46 De Certeau (1984) 118-122 discusses tours and maps as different ways of conveying space and landscape. Tours foreground the practices (actions) that enable the descriptions of these locations, thereby bringing to the forefront activities that have taken place, while maps essentially hide and eliminate the practices that produce them.
Finally, this work will also study both the incidentally and the purposefully created spatial relations between people, and those between individuals and inanimate objects. These spatial relations are called proxemics and can be defined as “the human uses of …position to structure communicative events.” Proxemics, along with other non-verbal channels of communication, have been shown to be particularly evocative elements for study within ancient works. This study will highlight some important non-verbal behaviours, such as gestures, where applicable and will question the Homeric narrator’s choice to include these details within the narrative. Indeed the study of non-verbal behaviours in Homeric narrative is aided by narratological analysis that is heavily focused on the motivation behind choices that structure the narrative.

3.2 Narratology

Narratology—the technical analysis of narrative—is a method of textual examination that has been increasingly employed by scholars of the Classics. And though the topic of space had been adumbrated by questions about time and perspective in the work of classical narratologists, the integral role played by space in the construction of stories is now being perceived. Indeed the narrative description of space is interesting to narratologists precisely because space can never be totally and completely represented in a narrative text; the author must select certain details. Some details about physical space cannot even be conveyed through words. Thus writers and oral poets must make significant and unique choices in order to transmit the details of their imagined space. An author can choose to present a space through a focalizer, that is, a figure

---

48 Lateiner (1995) vii maintains that non-verbal communication can and should be studied in ancient texts, for they can “enhance, devalue, or disguise verbal messages.”
through whose eyes a certain space is being depicted, or can choose to focalize a scene through the narrator. Closely related to the focalization of space and scenery is the standpoint from which the space is being viewed, which categorizes the distance between the presenter of the space and the space being described. A ‘panoramic’ viewpoint is used when the narrator or character is placed at a distance from the scenery they describe, while a scenic viewpoint has the narrator or character positioned within the scene they describe. I will return to these narratological devices in chapters 3 and 4 of my analysis to consider the effects that the hero’s somatic engagement with the landscape, provided by walking, has on his focalization of space.

4 Outline of the Work

I have suggested thus far that walking and space have been underused and generally underappreciated themes for analysis in the history of Classical scholarship, especially with respect to Greek literature. Yet the perspectives offered by spatial theorists, as surveyed above, show promise in providing a new lens through which we can understand oft-analyzed texts such as the Iliad and Odyssey. This dissertation will make use of ideas from spatial theory and phenomenological inquiry to conclude that Odysseus in the walking journeys is certainly out-of-place and therefore must assume, on the whole, a passive and enduring ethos in order to achieve nostos and regain his rightful role as ruler and husband.

The project proceeds as follows. Chapter 2 reads the Apologue’s narrative of Odysseus’ gradual loss of his fleet and his crew as a loss of his ‘centre’ and ‘place.’ When he sets sail from Troy, Odysseus’ companions and fleet serve as a mobile centre for him, and he in turn is clearly located at the social centre of that community. His displacement not only entails the destruction of his ships and companions, but also an ethical fracture between the hero as leader and the rest
of his mobile community. Indeed there are several occasions on which disagreement between Odysseus and his companions is highlighted by the hero’s spatial separation from the rest of his fleet.

The different degrees and types of displacement experienced by the hero in the Apologue are concomitant with shifts in his behaviour and ethos. There is an overall arc or trajectory of the hero’s ethos: he moves from being a character who has a balanced ethos of both active (forceful, self-confident, violent) and passive (wily, deferential, enduring) traits to one who is, in relative terms, proportionately more passive, deferential, and humble. Nevertheless, as I will demonstrate, these two positions exist on a continuum and the hero oscillates constantly between them. There is no absolute or final transition in the hero’s ethos, nor do the changes follow a smooth trajectory; there are observable cycles in his projection of character. Throughout his wanderings, the balance of the active and passive facets of the hero’s ethos is often weighted in favour of one extreme. To put it differently, Odysseus has the ability—perhaps more than any other Greek hero—to adapt to different situations. With the gradual displacement that he experiences, he more often favours a passive approach, as he suppresses the impulse towards violence and rash reactions that typify the responses of more active heroes. Therefore the narrative of constant diminution of Odysseus’ fleet and crew in the Apologue will be interpreted not merely as a narratological convenience, but as indicative of the overall arc in the hero’s displacement and, in turn, in his ethical development.  

Building upon the interpretation developed in Chapter 2, Chapter 3 examines Odysseus’ pedestrian journey in Odyssey Books 6 and 7. The motif of the pedestrian journey is interpreted

---

50 Both Heubeck (1989) 9 and de Jong (2001) 222-223 note the “sole survivor” motif as the driving force behind Odysseus’ trials that are recounted in the Apologue. While it is true that the story requires Odysseus to return home alone, I would like to think that there is more to these adventures than devices for inducing the hero’s losses. Indeed, I see the misadventures of Books 9-12 and the loss of ships and crew that results from them as integral to shaping the character and heroism of the Odysseus we meet in Book 5.
as a particularly pointed instantiation of the hero’s social diminution that is consequential to the loss of his ships and his resulting exteriority. Before setting out on his small-scale pedestrian journey, Odysseus finds himself in the Phaeacian wilderness experiencing the effects of displacement. More particularly, he suffers from *anomie*, assuming animalistic mannerisms that are fitting of his current social and spatial position but unfitting of his true elite and heroic social status.

After meeting Nausicaa he submits to a lowly pedestrian journey behind the wagon of the Phaeacian princess. Odysseus’ walk at Scheria can be read as both an act that highlights his endurance and tolerance, and also as a sign of progress toward civilization and indeed a more fitting, if temporary, social position as an honoured guest among the Phaeacians. Here the motif of pedestrian travel is complex: it is born of necessity but also facilitates a more meaningful interaction with one’s surroundings. For, as he walks through the Scherian terrain and re-engages with advanced human culture, Odysseus begins to regain the Hellenic refinement that reflects his elite status. His temporary integration into Phaeacian society, in turn, leads to a degree of re-engagement with his active and forceful attributes. This is naturally consequential to hearing about his Trojan exploits from Demodocus and recounting his maritime wanderings to the Phaeacians. With a detailed literary and spatial examination of the narrative of the pedestrian journey, as well as of the surrounding text in Books 5 through 8, Chapter 3 will interpret the motif of the pedestrian journey as emblematic of Odysseus’ tendency towards a passive and enduring *ethos* and also as an act that highlights his re-engagement with his former identity and balanced *ethos*.

Chapter 4 focuses on Odysseus’ final pedestrian journey narrated in *Odyssey* 17 and on the narrative surrounding it. When the Phaeacians return Odysseus to Ithaca, the hero once again adopts a mainly passive, enduring *ethos* purposely, before reverting to his more violent *ethos* to
take revenge on Penelope’s suitors and to fully regain his former position as leader in Ithaca. Odysseus’ *nostos* is initially a lowly one, as he is disguised as a poor beggar. Once again, the pedestrian journey serves to emphasize the hero’s temporary assumption of a more passive nature. In contrast to the episode on Scheria, where his destitution forces him to endure some slights to his honour, Odysseus now purposely assumes a strategy of endurance and passivity. He does this strategically to gain entrance to his palace. The pedestrian journey of Book 17 will be read as a performance of the Odysseus-beggar’s exteriority and inferiority. With this performance, Odysseus is allowed to enter his own palace and to test, while incognito, the suitors and members of his household. In this way, the hero’s final pedestrian journey of the *Odyssey* showcases the beggar’s exteriority, but also facilitates the hero’s resumption of his former roles as Ithacan leader and husband to Penelope.

The pedestrian journey on Ithaca follows a similar spatial trajectory as the one made by the hero in Scheria. It begins in a lowly and humble place—the countryside—and ends in the cultured centre of Ithaca inhabited by the social elite. But though the hero’s final pedestrian journey is anticipated by the Phaeacian walk, this foot journey is different. This time Odysseus experiences insideness, or belonging, on the periphery (the countryside) among Eumaeus and the rest of the herdsmen. And, the closer he moves towards the cultured centre of Ithaca, the more he is viewed as an outsider. Moreover, instead of reengaging with the places of his homeland, Odysseus highlights his beggar’s exteriority through his mastery of space and spatial-relations in order to go un-noticed. Therefore, Chapter 4 will read Odysseus’ final pedestrian journey in the *Odyssey* as emblematic of his ability to adopt an enduring *ethos*. Odysseus must purposely accept insult and anonymity in order to achieve *nostos*, and, indeed, his own uniquely won *kleos*. 
Chapter 2
From Fleet to Foot

This chapter studies the connection between Odysseus’ frequent assumption of a passive *ethos* and his slow but continuous loss of ships and companions—and his resulting displacement—in the *Apologue*. This narrative will be interpreted using modern spatial theories. Odysseus’ loss of his fleet and crew will be read as a gradual displacement from his “mobile centre.” This displacement both contributes to and is a reflection of an overall shift in his *ethos* from one that was balanced between the active, (violent and assertive) and passive (enduring and deferential) to one that favours passivity.

In the Introduction, we looked at ships as mobile centres of origin. This interpretation can be extended to Odysseus’ fleet and crew, which provide him with a protected centre where Hellenic and heroic values are the norm. It is also a well-established notion that Greek epic heroes receive honour and prestige from recognition. Indeed a hero’s identity is bound up very closely not only with his heroic achievements (prowess in battle) but also with his lineage and his homeland. On the return journey from Troy, Odysseus’ ships are the most tangible and immediate symbols of his elite standing as commander, his lineage as a son of Laertes and his Ithacan stock. His fleet and companions are thus important symbols of Odysseus’ Hellenic, heroic and elite status. In this chapter, I highlight how both changes—Odysseus’ gradual displacement and his more frequent adoption of passive responses—seem to reinforce and parallel each other. In the first section of this chapter, I do so by focusing on Odysseus’ post-Trojan maritime wanderings.

---

51 Murnaghan (1987) 5-7. See also Stewart (1976) 62 who calls the hero’s ships and crew the “last vestige of [his] heroic office.”
I begin by looking at both the explicit and implicit characterization that Odysseus provides of himself in the *Apologue*. Odysseus’ explicit self-characterization includes the way in which he describes himself verbally using nouns, adjectives, and epithets; his implicit self-characterization can be inferred from his thoughts and from his non-verbal behaviours such as actions, body positions, and movement through space. A close reading of these details highlights the hero’s more frequent adoption of passivity as he tries to make his way home from Troy. In addition to tracing the overall arc of this character shift, I make special note of the hero’s gradual detachment from the social norms of an aristocratic Greek martial leader that accompanies his gradual displacement as he loses his fleet and crew.

The final portion of this chapter is dedicated to a thorough investigation of Odysseus’ characterization while he is on the island of Ogygia, which, in proper chronology, happens after the adventures that he narrates in the *Apologue*. On Ogygia, Odysseus’ self-characterization as offered in the *Apologue* is corroborated through the observations of the external Odyssean narrator and focalized through the eyes of Athena, Hermes, and his paramour-captor, Calypso. Here, Ogygia is interpreted as a place of desperation and stagnation for the hero who has travelled so far but made no progress in his goal of *nostos*.

Ultimately, this chapter seeks to read Odysseus’ loss of his ships and the community that comes with them as both a cause and reflection of the change in his *ethos*; in some instances, Odysseus’ loss of crew or ships, and his resulting displacement lead to the hero’s adoption of a more passive approach. At other times, his passivity leads to a greater degree of displacement. It is also important to mention that, in addition to the spatial displacement that Odysseus experiences when his mobile centre is diminished, he also undergoes a sort of ethical displacement from his crew when his approaches and opinions lead to the fracture of the group. From a forceful and confident Iliadic warrior with a fleet under his command to a solitary
shipwrecked captive on Ogygia, Odysseus’ losses and displacement mirror the gradual decline of his forceful and active *ethos* and his adoption of a passive and enduring one instead. This chapter anticipates Chapters 3 and 4 of this project, in which I investigate Odysseus’ pedestrian journeys, from the shores of Scheria to the Phaeacian palace in Book 6, and from the shores of Ithaca to his own palace in Book 17. The hero’s walking journeys will be interpreted as reflections of his overall shift to a more enduring *ethos* and also as important actions that aid in Odysseus’ re-engagement with his former roles as an elite Greek leader.

Before delving into the narrative of the *Apologue*, it would be prudent to revisit some of the scholarly discussion about Odysseus’ character. Indeed, in countless traditions, Odysseus has some unique approaches to dealing with the predicaments in which he finds himself: he frequently resorts to cunning rather than violence in order to achieve his ends, and also prioritizes survival and *nostos* over his own *kleos*. These attitudes and approaches are less prominent in other epic heroes such as Achilles or Ajax. Ancient commentators had much to say on the topic, usually identifying Odysseus and Achilles *qua* heroes as the embodiments of the qualities of *metis* (cleverness) in the former case, and *bie* (might) in the latter.\(^52\)

Modern scholars have approached the question with a bit more nuance. Finkelberg (1995) differentiates between Odyssean and Iliadic forms of heroism; while the *Iliad* focuses on the martial prowess of Achilles and his preference for an early but gloriously heroic death, Odysseus, who is given the option of immortality by Calypso, shuns it and instead chooses to

---

52 See Nagy (1979) 43-45, who maintains that the quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles in *Od*. 8.78 (Demodocus’ song) is probably based on an epic tradition that has Odysseus advocating for *metis* and Achilles for *bie* as means to bring down the city of Troy, a theme that also appears in the scholia to *Od*. 8.75 and 77. Though the scholia are “garbled” and other scholars reject the possibility of a previously existing epic tradition of the quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles, Nagy believes that he has found evidence of just that in the Embassy scene in *Il*. Book 9 (46-48). I do believe that there is something to the scholia’s interpretation of the quarrel, insofar as Odysseus seems to rely frequently—though not exclusively—on trickery and cunning. But his character may be more nuanced than the scholiasts admit. When Odysseus and Achilles are compared directly, however, Odysseus comes down clearly on the side of *metis* and Achilles on the side of *bie*. 
endure a long life, with its accompanying labours and humiliation.\footnote{Finkelberg (1995) 9-12.} While I focus here on the change in the Odysseus character in the \textit{Odyssey} alone, it is helpful to note how the character compares to other heroes of the epic tradition. I would also point to the fact that there likely existed many competing (and non-Homeric) stories about Odysseus in the epic tradition to which we do not have access in modern times. We should therefore be careful not to assume that the Odysseus of the \textit{Iliad} and the \textit{Odyssey} were the only versions of the character that existed, nor that Odysseus’ passivity in the \textit{Odyssey} is a novelty that did not exist in other stories belonging to the epic tradition. Finally, I would like to note one more caveat: my reading of Odysseus’ ethical tendency towards passivity in the \textit{Apologue} and the walking journeys should not be taken to attribute a lack of heroism to the character. Odysseus seems to adopt a more enduring, passive \textit{ethos} in order to accomplish different ends—survival and \textit{nostos}. Moreover, the \textit{Odyssey} celebrates the hero’s passivity and prioritization of \textit{nostos}. In this way it distinguishes itself as a different type of epic—an epic of endurance and homecoming—with a hero who has the less-common heroic ability to be passive.

Along the same lines as Finkleberg, Cook (1999) identifies a distinction between “active” and “passive” heroism. The active aspect of heroism is centred on martial prowess and the tendency to inflict suffering on others, whereas the passive aspect of the Greek hero comes to the fore when he plays the trickster or endures labours and pain. The “traditional” hero displays both active and passive facets.\footnote{Cook (1999) 149-150.} While this holds true for most heroes in the \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey}, Cook notices that the Odysseus of the \textit{Odyssey} tends disproportionately towards the passive side of the heroic persona, especially in Books 6 through 12.\footnote{See especially Cook (1999) 151. \textit{Odyssey} Books 6-12 are comprised of the hero’s washing ashore on the island of Scheria and his own narration of his past adventures to the Phaeacians. Cook sees the hero reassuming the active facet of his heroic persona upon his return to Ithaca in Book 13, though he does acknowledge Odysseus’ suffering}
The following analyses of the *Apologue* and the Ogygia episode of Book 5 will borrow the terms ‘active’ and ‘passive’ as defined by Cook to describe Odysseus’ character, while de-emphasizing the terms in relation to Odysseus’ brand of heroism. Instead, ‘active’ and ‘passive’ are used here as descriptors that can apply to characters of many types, both heroic and otherwise. Furthermore my designations of ‘active’ and ‘passive’ do not strictly adhere to the *bie/metis* dichotomy, as I prefer a more nuanced approach. As a result, the remainder of this study will use the term ‘active’ to describe an *ethos*, character, or approach that is assertive, forceful, high-spirited, confident, and sometimes violent. Passivity will be characterized by deference, inactivity, suffering, and endurance. It is also necessary here to emphasize that the designations of ‘active’ and ‘passive’ are located along a continuum and should not be taken to represent absolute categories. Moreover, neither the more active nor more passive incarnations of the Odysseus character ought to be seen as preferable, more heroic, or more true to the oral and literary traditions surrounding Odysseus.

In the following sections I discuss the role that the hero’s continuous loss of his ships and crew plays in his transition from an *ethos* with balanced active and passive aspects to one that is almost wholly passive. I begin by considering the *Apologue*.

---

on Ithaca as a means to active revenge (163-166). I do not believe that Cook stresses enough the endurance and suffering of the hero that continues well past at Book 13. Nevertheless it can be said that, in Book 13, Odysseus regains control over his suffering and chooses to endure the disgrace for the sake of a full and successful *nostos* complete with revenge.

56 While *bie* seems to fit in generally with my definition of an active *ethos*, I find the equation of *metis* with a passive *ethos* troubling. For example, in the epic cycle’s *Ilias Minor* and *Iliou Persis* Odysseus uses the trick of the Trojan Horse, a feat accomplished by his *metis*. Yet the scheme is also very violent, as the horse is filled with Greek warriors who conquer the city with their might, or *bie*. This is just one illustration of the ways in which trickery can also include active violence.

57 Rutherford (1986) takes a similar approach to the one in this chapter by observing and tracking Odysseus’ change in character. Nevertheless, Rutherford is focused on supporting the idea of Odysseus’ changing characterization as indicative of a moralizing function of the *Odyssey*: “…I shall attempt to offer a more refined version of the unitarian position, based on the assumption that Odysseus’ character does change or develop, and that this development is not simply of psychological interest, but serves to reinforce, to convey more vividly and more thoughtfully, the moral lessons of the Odyssey” (150). This is not an objective that I share. Cf. Stewart (1976) who reads the *Odyssey* as a counterepic to the *Iliad* and who looks at the second half of the epic as “the story of a man devising a new
1 Odysseus’ *Apologue*: Fleet to foot

Odysseus washes up on the shores of Scheria at the very end of Book 5. He is alone, naked, and rendered helpless by the situation. In line with this helplessness, Odysseus maintains a meek demeanor, supplicating the princess Nausicaa, and remaining unassuming with his royal hosts, Alcinous and Arete. Moreover, he withholds his true identity despite being asked for it on several occasions, appeasing the Phaeacians instead with snippets of information about the suffering he endured on Ogygia and his harrowing shipwreck on the shores of Scheria. But the anonymity with which he proceeds among the Phaeacians is soon compromised by his tearful reaction to the Trojan stories of the Phaeacian bard, Demodocus. After witnessing his quiet weeping, the Phaeacian king presses Odysseus with more specific questions about his identity and story (*Od. 8.572-586*). Prompted to do so, the hero identifies himself at *Odyssey* 9.16-21 before offering the details of his past misadventures:

\[
νῦν δ’ ὅνομα πρῶτον μυθῆσομαι, ὃφρα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἑιδέτ’, ἐγὼ δ’ ἀν ἐπείτα φυγὼν ὑπὸ νηλεῖς ἡμὰρ ὑμῖν ξέινος ἐκ καὶ ἀπόπροθι δώματα ναίων. εἰμ’ Ὀδυσσεύς Λαερτίαδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν ἀνθρώπους ἐμέλω, καὶ μεν κλέως οὐρανὸν ἑκεί. ναιετάω δ’ Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον  59

(*Od. 9.16-21*)

personality because he has lost his old identity and is forced to think of who he now is…” (34). While I look at Odysseus’ wanderings and homecoming as a series of incidents in which Odysseus either distances himself from his true identity or embrace and highlights it, Stewart’s reading is another good example of a study that notices an overall arc or shift in the hero’s behaviour (see esp.62-63).

58 *Od. 8.71ff* is the narrative that includes the subject on which Demodocus sings: a quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles during the Trojan War. His song, however, is not an embedded story like Odysseus’ *Apologue*, but is rather described in indirect speech. See Broeniman (1996) for Demodocus’ songs and how they reflect the context of the Phaeacian episode.

59 All text of the *Odyssey* is from the most recent OCT edition.
Now, I will speak my name first, so you will know it, too, and, once I have escaped the ruthless day, I may be your host, though I live in a home that is far away. I am Odysseus son of Laertes, who am of interest to all men for my wiles, and my renown reaches heaven. I live in clear Ithaca.\(^{60}\) 

\((Od.\ 9.16-21)\)

In contrast to the desperation, humility, and anonymity with which the shipwrecked Odysseus began his tenure among the Phaeacians, he introduces his *Apologue* from a place of confidence in his *kleos*.

When he does begin to tell of his wanderings, he commences the flashback with a note of Iliadic vigour. Straight from Troy, the Ithacan contingent alights upon Ismarus, the city of the Ciccones: Ἰλιόθεν μὲ φέρων ἀνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσεν, Ἡσιμάρως (“The wind carried and drove me from Ilium to the Ciconians, at Ismarus.” *Od.* 9.39-40). Although the –θεν suffix on “Ἰλιόθεν” signals movement away from Troy, the fact that Odysseus does not use a phrase that means “homeward” or “to Ithaca” emphasizes that he still perceives himself as a crusading Iliadic warrior, rather than a Greek leader attempting his *nostos*. Further confirmation of the lingering warrior culture among Odysseus’ crew comes with the unprompted attack on the Cicconian city, the first place they land: … ἐνθαδ’ ἐγὼ πόλιν ἐπραθον, ὡλεσα δ’ αὐτούς/ ἐκ πόλιος δ’ ἀλόχους καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ λαβόντες ἄδασσάμεθ’, ὡς μὴ τίς μοι ἀτεμβόμενος κλοι ἰσης. (“…There I sacked the city and destroyed them. We took their wives and many possessions from the city, and divided up so none would go cheated of a fair share by me”. *Od.* 9.40-42).\(^{61}\) Despite the confidence with which the episode is introduced, however, Odysseus

---

\(^{60}\) Translations of the *Odyssey* are from James Huddleston’s translation – with some liberal adaptations - found online at the Chicago Homer.

\(^{61}\) De Jong (2001) 229 states that this first adventure is “…Iliadic in flavor.” Rinon (2007) 302-303, 307 remarks, “…the meeting with the Cicones raises the question of Odysseus’ identity: is he a heroic warrior whose main aim is glory in battle or is he a war veteran whose chief desire is to return safely home? Odysseus’ hesitation, which is clearly traced in his narration, reflects one of the deepest conundrums of the epic as a whole: how to reconcile the
makes it clear that, after their initial success, his strategy would have been to adopt a passive strategy and flee. His companions disagree: ἐνθ’ ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ διερῤῥοὶ φευγήμεν ἡμέας/ ἕνωγεα, τοὶ δὲ μέγα νῆπιοι οὐκ ἐπίθουντο. (“Then indeed I ordered that with nimble feet we flee,/ but, greatly foolish, they did not obey;” Od. 9.43-44) This is the first moment in the hero’s narrative when the audience realizes that Odysseus and the rest of his men are not in complete agreeance about how to proceed. Indeed this is the first small fracture that exists in their floating community.

When the situation finally plays out, the hero mentions that flight would have been a better alternative. The violent sack of the Cicconian city actually leads to the diminishing of Odysseus’ fleet and crew, as the hero and his companions are routed by Cicconian reinforcements:

They came then, in the morning, as many as leaves and flowers come in season. Then Zeus’s evil destiny was with us, grimly doomed, so that we would suffer many sorrows. Setting up for battle, they fought beside the swift ships, and threw bronze spears at each other.

seemingly mutually exclusive values of heroic valor calling for self-sacrifice on the altar of glory with unheroic survival that bids flight and sometimes even humiliation for the sake of self-preservation” (307).
While it was morning and sacred day was growing, we stayed and fought them off though there were more of them. But when the sun had passed beyond the time to unyoke oxen, right then Ciconians turned and tamed Achaeans, and six well-greaved comrades from each ship were killed, but the rest of us escaped death and doom. We sailed on from there with grief in our hearts at the loss of our dear companions, glad to have escaped death. 

*(Od. 9.51-63)*

Significantly, the ending of this episode marks the first occurrence of the oft-repeated lines:

ēνθεν δὲ προτέρω πλέομεν ἀκαχήμενοι ἔτορ, ἀσμενοι ἐκ θανάτοιο, φίλους ὀλέσαντες ἔταίρους. (“We sailed on from there with grief in our hearts at the loss of our dear companions, glad to have escaped death.” *Od. 9.62-63*). Variations on these verses are used several times in the *Apologue* to close episodes in which Odysseus sustains losses of crew and/or ships.⁶² This type of refrain-composition is usually used to strengthen the connection between the scenes in which it is used and, in so doing, produces a cataloguing effect in the narrative structure of the *Apologue*. Indeed, there is a distinct pattern to the episodes in Odysseus’ narrative, usually beginning with an encounter with a new people, followed by a confrontation with them, and ending with Odysseus’ narrow escape. Piling loss upon loss, the “catalogue” structure of the *Apologue* highlights the mounting misfortune of the hero’s ever-belated nostos and indeed his gradual displacement from his mobile centre.⁶³

From here, Odysseus continues to narrate his adventures in chronological order and, as events unfold, his losses mount. Together with the gradual destruction of his ships and their crew, Odysseus depicts himself as relying on his passive ability to endure more often than

---

⁶² This line appears after each of the first five episodes of the *Apologue*; the Ciconians (9.39-66); the Lotus Eaters (9.82-105); the Cyclopeia (9.106-566); Aeolus’ island (10.1-79); and the meeting with the Laestrygonians (10.80-134). See de Jong (2001) 222 for the narrative structure of the *Apologue* and the episodes that comprise it.

⁶³ For more information on refrain composition, see de Jong (2001) Introduction xiv and, with specific reference to these lines, 222 of the same work.
relying on active responses of force or violence. I treat Odysseus’ progression from leader of a fleet to sole survivor of shipwreck as a social and spatial displacement from his mobile centre, which, at different times, is either the cause of or the reflection of his present tendency towards passive endurance. It is not my intention, however, to analyze my way through the Apologue episode by episode, but instead to highlight certain sections that display the hero’s changing ethos.

1.1 The Cyclopeía: From Active to Passive and Back Again

By the end of the wanderings, the balance of active and passive aspects in Odysseus’ character is reweighted in favour of his passive endurance. This overall arc occurs gradually and does not follow a smooth progression. Nevertheless, following the losses sustained in the battle with the Cicconians, Odysseus’ reactions to unknown lands and peoples begin to evolve. Indeed, in his retelling of the Cyclopeia (Od. 9.105ff), the hero recounts his complex psychological and emotional negotiation of the situation and his oscillation between active and passive responses.64

Upon their arrival on the island, he and his companions set about exploring and eventually find Polyphemus’ cave. Odysseus wishes to wait in the cave until the giant returns in the hopes that the Cyclops would honour him with guest-gifts:

έλθόντες δ’ εἰς ἄντρον ἐθηεύ̄µεσθα ἐκαστα’…
…ἐνθ’ ἐμὲ μὲν πρώτισθ’ ἔταροι λίσσοντο ἐπέσσι
tυρῶν αἰνυμένους ἰέναι πάλιν, αὐτάρ ἔπειτα
καρπαλίµως ἐπὶ νῆα θοῦν ἐρίφους τε καὶ ἄρνας
σηκὼν ἐξελάσαντας ἐπιπλεῖν ἀλμυρῶν ὠδωρ’
ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόν, ἦ τ’ ἀν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦν,
όφρ’ αὐτόν τε ἱδοµι, καὶ εἰ μοι ξείνια δοίη.
οὐδ’ ἀρ’ ἐµελλ’ ἔταροισι φανεῖς ἐρατείυσ ἐσσθαι.
(Od. 9.218, 224-3-230)

---

64 See Cook (1999) 153-156 for his interpretation of the active and passive features of Odysseus’ responses in the Cyclopeia.
We went into the cave and gazed at every single thing.
…Then my comrades entreated me, first of all,
that they should help themselves to the cheeses and go back and
thereupon
to drive the kids and lambs swiftly out from their pens
and onto our swift ship and sail over the briny water.
But I did not give in, though that would have been much better,
so I could see him and in hope he would give me guest gifts.
As it turned out, he would be no welcome sight for my comrades.
(Od. 9.218, 224-230)

When Polyphemus finally returns, the hero begins his interactions with the Cyclops in much the
same way as he begins his Apologue—with a tone of heroic confidence. Odysseus introduces
himself and his companions as Greek warriors who took part in the famous destruction of Troy:

Ἡμεῖς τοι Τροίηθεν ἀποπλαγχέντες Ἀχαιοὶ
παντοίοις ἀνέμοιοι ὑπὲρ μέγα λαίτιμα θαλάσσης,
οίκαδε ἐίμενοι, ἄλλην ὀδὸν ἄλλα κέλευσα
ἡλθομεν οὕτω ποι Ζεὺς ἠθελε μητίασον πολλοὺς.
λαοὶ δὲ Ἀτρείδεω Αγαμέμνονος εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι,
τοῦ δὴ γὰρ μεγίστον ὑπουργίον κλέος ἐστι·
tόσσην γὰρ διέπεσε πόλιν καὶ ἀπώλεσε λαοὺς
πολλοὺς.
(Od. 259-265)

We are Achaeans, driven off course from Troy
by all kinds of winds over the great gulf of the sea,
and on our way home we took a different route, wrong ways,
as I suppose Zeus wished to contrive it.
We claim we are people of Atreides Agamemnon,
whose fame is now greatest under heaven,
for he sacked so great a city and destroyed many men.
(Od. 9.259-265)

Though he does not specify his name, Odysseus’ expectation of guest-gifts and his boasting
about his deeds mark him not only as an assertive leader, but also as a very typical epic hero.

---

65 The act of boasting by proclaiming name and deed is a heroic norm. Indeed, as Newton (1983) 139 n. 9 explains,
“…an epic hero is expected to assert his identity to those he meets….“ On the ways in which Odysseus’ boasts both
conform to and differ from generic norms of the heroic boast, see Eisenberger (1973) 141 and Stewart (1976) 37-50.
But Polyphemus does not subscribe to the same customs or value system as do the Hellenic heroes. He does not even hold sacred the seemingly universal (in the *Odyssey*) institution of *xenia*, as he snatches up and devours several of the hero’s companions in response to Odysseus’ request for guest-gifts (*Od. 9.287-293*).\(^{67}\) Once the hero sees that the Cyclops does not value such heroic achievements and, more importantly, will not be a friend, he seems to realize the consequences of his over-confidence. Trapped in Polyphemus’ cave and watching his companions being eaten one by one, Odysseus revises his approach; in this moment, the hero’s passive, suffering side of his *ethos* wins out over the active.

While this transformation is hardly total or final, the more frequent adoption of passivity with which Odysseus proceeds is evidenced by several of his decisions. For instance, when Polyphemus demands the hero’s name, Odysseus uses the name Οὖτις (Nobody).\(^{68}\) Instead of identifying himself by name, as he has already done by renown and deeds, the hero changes his strategy and retains a passive anonymity that works to his advantage later on when Polyphemus calls for help because “Nobody” is attacking him.\(^{69}\) It is not a light matter for the hero to purposely “abnegate” his name like this. Heroic assertion of one’s name and deeds is an important part of the active heroic *ethos*, and Odysseus is dishonouring himself not only by

\(^{66}\) See Stanford (1971) 354 on Odysseus’ “inquisitiveness and acquisitiveness” as unbecoming of a Greek hero. But Friedrich (1991) 22 disagrees with Stanford; for him, Odysseus’ “inquisitiveness” about Polyphemus’ cave is directly in line with the heroic *ethos* in that “Heroic Man does as it pleases his megalé tor thymos.” Moreover, his “acquisitiveness,” or desire for guest gifts from Polyphemus, can been interpreted as the desire for “geras” or “a gift of honour, the tangible token of the hero's superior reputation” (22).

\(^{67}\) Page (1955) b 19 n. 4 and Podlecki (1961) 127-129 both absolve Odysseus of any naivety concerning Polyphemus.

\(^{68}\) On the topic of Odysseus’ name, his hesitation to reveal his identity throughout the *Odyssey*, and name-magic in Homer, see Austin (1972). Olson (1992) agrees with Austin’s observation that members of Odysseus’ family and his close friends avoid using his name in the *Odyssey*, but does not agree that this phenomenon is due to some sort of name “tabu.” On the contrary, Odysseus’ inner circle does not name the hero for a more practical reason—to guard against profit-seeking strangers who would lie to them about Odysseus.

\(^{69}\) For a thoughtful treatment of the many layers to the “Nobody” pun, see Podlecki (1961) esp. 129-133.
refusing to assert his name but also by replacing it with a pseudo-name that obliterates his identity.\textsuperscript{70}

In addition to changing his self-identification, Odysseus also revises his approach to defeating his foes. As we saw with the Cicconion episode, active, violent domination was just as much part of Odysseus’ \textit{ethos} as was his ability to be passive. However, after losing men to the Cyclops, Odysseus decides not to act with reckless violence, for fear that he and his men would still be trapped in the closed cave with the brute, even after an attack:

\begin{verbatim}
τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ βούλευσα κατὰ μεγαλήτωρα θυμὸν ἄσσον ἱών, ξίφος δὲν ἐρύσσαμενος παρὰ μηροὺ, οὐτάμεναι πρὸς στῆθος, ὃθι φρένες ἢπαρ ἔχουσι, χείρ′ ἐπιμασσάμενος· έτερος δὲ με θυμὸν ἔρυκεν. αὐτοῦ γάρ κε καὶ άμμες ἀπολόμεθα αἰτίων ὀλέθρον· οὖ γάρ κεν δυνάμεσθα θυράων ὑψηλάων χερσίν ἀπώσασθαι λίθον ὅβριον, ὃν προσέθηκεν. (Od. 9.299-305)
\end{verbatim}

I planned, according to my great-hearted spirit to get closer to him, draw my sharp sword from beside my thigh, and stab him in the chest, where the midriff holds the liver, feeling for it with my hand. But the other side of my spirit restrained me, for, where we were, we too would perish in sheer destruction, since we would not be able, with our hands, to push from the lofty door the mighty stone he had put there.

\begin{verbatim}
(Od. 9.299-305)
\end{verbatim}

In this passage, Odysseus speaks of his two \textit{thumoi}, or spirits, at lines 9.299 and 302. One is described as \textit{μεγαλήτωρ} (great hearted) while the other is simply \textit{ἕτερος} (other).\textsuperscript{71} I suggest that Odysseus is contrasting here two conflicting sides of his personality. While his “great hearted” spirit encourages assertive violent behaviour, his “other” spirit restrains him and is more cautious

\textsuperscript{70} Friedrich (1991) 22 calls this the “ultimate outrage” for a ‘Heroic Man’ to inflict upon himself. This is also a denial of his \textit{μεγαλήτωρ} \textit{θύμος} because the hero’s default is to assert himself and his name (“abnegate” is Friedrich’s terminology).

\textsuperscript{71} See Friedrich (1991) 22-24 for the role of Odysseus’ \textit{μεγαλήτωρ} \textit{θύμος} in the \textit{Cyclopeia}. 
and passive. Though Odysseus’ assertive and violent action in the Cicconian episode offered an initial victory, the situation quickly deteriorated into pitiful defeat. Having learned the lesson of these events, Odysseus is very careful thereafter when selecting a course of action, increasingly relying on endurance and passivity in order to help his companions achieve their nostos. This restraint, however, gradually gives way once again to his active and assertive thumos when the hero finally executes his plan to escape from the Cyclops’ cave. It is important to emphasize that the division between activity and passivity stands on a continuum and need not represent a dichotomy, and that Odysseus oscillates between both positions.

Odysseus’ solution to the predicament with Polyphemus, like the violent trickery of the wooden horse at Troy, employs a strategy that is both cunning and violent. The trickster devises a plan whereby the Cyclops is rendered incapable of defending himself after Odysseus plies him with wine. Once Polyphemus is good and drunk, the hero acts violently, putting out the Cyclops’ only eye with a sharpened olive-wood stake:

καὶ τότ’ ἐγὼ τὸν μοχλὸν ὑπὸ σποδοῦ ἠλασάμενον ἡλικίας πολλῆς, ἢς θερμαίνοντο· ἔπεσοι τῇ πάντῃς ἐταῖρως ἄρανον, μὴ τὶς μοι ύποδείσας ἀναδύμην. ἀλλὰ ὅτι δὴ τάχ᾿ ὁ μοχλὸς ἐλαίνον ἔν πυρὶ μέλλειν ἄφεθαι, χλωρὸς περ ἐὼν, διεφάινετο δ᾿ αἰνῶς, καὶ τότ’ ἐγὼ δολοφόνος φέρον ἐκ πυρὸς, ἄμφη δ᾿ ἐταῖροι ἔσταντι· αὐτὰρ ἄρας ἐνέπνευσεν μέγα δαίμων. οἱ μὲν μοχλὸν ἐλόντες ἐλαίνον, ὦξιν ἐπὶ ἀκρῷ, ὀφθαλμῷ ἐνέρειαν· ἐγὼ δ᾿ ἐφύπεθει ἐρεισθεὶς δίνεω, ὥς ὅτε τῷ τρυπῷ δόρῳ νῆιον ἀνὴρ τρυπάνω, οἱ δὲ τῷ ἐνερθεὶς ὑποσσείουσιν ἰμάντι ἀψάμενοι ἐκάπησαν· ἐγὼ δ᾿ ἐφύπεθει ἐρεισθεὶς δίνεον, ὥς ὅτε τῷ τρυπῷ δόρῳ νῆιον ἀνὴρ τρυπάνω, οἱ δὲ τῷ ἐνερθεὶς ὑποσσείουσιν ἰμάντι ἀψάμενοι ἐκάπησαν· ἐγὼ δ᾿ ἐφύπεθει ἐρεισθεὶς δίνεον, ὥς ὅτε τῷ τρυπῷ δόρῳ νῆιον ἀνὴρ τρυπάνω, οἱ δὲ τῷ ἐνερθεὶς ὑποσσείουσιν ἰμάντι ἀψάμενοι ἐκάπησαν· ἐγὼ δ᾿ ἐφύπεθει ἐρεισθεὶς δίνεον, ὥς ὅτε τῷ τρυπῷ δόρῳ νῆιον ἀνὴρ τρυπάνω, οἱ δὲ τῷ ἐνερθεὶς ὑποσσείουσιν ἰμάντι ἀψάμενοι ἐκάπησαν· ἐγὼ δ᾿ ἐφύπεθει ἐρεισθεὶς δίνεον, ὥς ὅτε τῷ τρυπῷ δόρῳ νῆιον ἀνὴρ τρυπάνω, οἱ δὲ τῷ ἐνερθεὶς ὑποσσείουσιν ἰμάντι ἀψάμενοι ἐκάπησαν· ἐγὼ δ᾿ ἐφύπεθει ἐρεισθεὶς δίνεον, ὥς ὅτε τῷ τρυπῷ δόρῳ νῆιον ἀνὴρ τρυπάνω, οἱ δὲ τῷ ἐνερθεὶς ὑποσσείουσιν ἰμάντι ἀψάμενοι ἐκάπησαν· ἐγὼ δ᾿ ἐφύπεθει ἐρεισθεὶς δίνεον, ὥς ὅτε τῷ τρυπῷ δόρῳ νῆιον ἀνὴρ τρυπάνω, οἱ δὲ τῷ ἐνερθεὶς ὑποσσείουσιν ἰμάντι ἀψάμενοι ἐκάπησαν· ἐγὼ δ᾿ ἐφύπεθει ἐρεισθεὶς δίνεον, ὥς ὅτε τῷ τρυπῷ δόρῳ νῆιον ἀνὴρ τρυπάνω, οἱ δὲ τῷ ἐνερθεὶς ὑποσσείουσιν ἰμάντι ἀψάμενοι ἐκάπησαν· ἐγὼ δ᾿ ἐφύπεθει ἐρεισθεὶς δίνεον, ὥς ὅτε τῷ τρυπῷ δόρῳ νῆιον ἀνὴρ τρυπάνω, οἱ δὲ τῷ ἐνερθεἴς ὑποσσείουσιν ἰμάντι ἀψάμενοι ἐκάπησαν· ἐγὼ δ᾿ ἐφύπεθει ἐρεισθεὶς δίνεον, ὥς ὅτε τῷ τρυπῷ δόρῳ νῆιον ἀνὴρ τρυπάνω, οἱ δὲ τῷ ἐνερθε፡
Right then I drove the stake under deep ashes until it got hot, and with words encouraged all my comrades, lest any of mine flinch in fear. But when, before long, the olive-wood stake in the fire, green as it was, was about to catch fire and glowed terribly, right then I brought it nearer, out of the fire, and my comrades stood about me. Then a divinity breathed great confidence in us. While they lifted the olive-wood stake, sharp at the end, and thrust him in his eye, I pressed my weight from above and twisted it, as when some man bores a ship's plank with an auger, while others below rotate it with a strap they clasp at either end, so it always runs continuously. So we took the fire-sharpened stake and twisted it in his eye, and blood, hot as it was, flowed around it. The entirety of his burning pupil singed all around his eyelids and eyebrows, and the roots of his eye crackled with fire. As when a smith plunges a big axe or adze in cold water to temper it, and it hisses greatly, for this is how it has again the strength of iron, so his eye sizzled around the olive-wood stake.

(Od. 9.375-394)

The whole blinding episode—from the craftsmanship similes used to describe the manufacturing of the stake to the cultural symbolism behind the olive wood that is used for the weapon—is thought to evoke the idea of technology and civilization overcoming the savagery of nature.\(^72\)

This contrast between civilization and savagery highlights Odysseus’ role as a cultured Hellenic aristocrat and an agent of civilization—a typical role for an epic hero.\(^73\) This same contrast will become important to our discussion later on, when the hero experiences different degrees and

---

\(^72\) See Newton (1983) 138 n. 6 for a brief summary of the scholarship on the civilization and savagery theme in the Cyclopeia. Kirk (1970) 162 comments on the strange nature of the Cyclopes’ primitiveness—they live in a state of Golden-Age bounty, yet they are also lawless and without regard for social organization. Austin (1975) 143-149 takes a different approach by structuring his discussion around the themes of order and disorder. According to him, the “disorder” displayed by the primitive Cyclopes is not extreme, since they possess some techne. Segal (1974) is a good place to start on the theme of civilization and savagery in ancient Greek literature. For the connection between human culture and the olive-wood used for the stake, see Vidal-Naquet (1996) 40 and Cook (2005) 107-108.

\(^73\) On Odysseus as an agent of civilization, see Segal (1974) 291. The same work (290-301) looks at Heracles as a civilizing hero and lays out the characteristics of civilizing heroes in chart form. See also Malkin (1998) 4-31.
types of isolation and displacement from his highly cultured floating society after losing his ships and crew, as is the case on Ogygia and in his landing on Scheria. Nevertheless in this episode, Odysseus and his companions oppose the savagery of Polyphemus. But, they do so violently, re-establishing the influence of the hero’s active and assertive side of his ethos. The constant shifting between the two aspects of Odysseus’ persona in this episode comes full circle with the final words exchanged between the hero and the Cyclops.

Just as the Cyclopeia began with Odysseus’ self-identification by deed, the episode closes with another heroic boast, this time one that includes his real name. Although the hero had temporarily abandoned the assertiveness with which he began the encounter, Odysseus’ violent triumph over Polyphemus and subsequent escape seems to have renewed confidence in his more active, assertive ethos. Thus, although the hero opts for self-deprecating anonymity with the ‘Nobody’ trick, and though his comrades beg him not to rouse Polyphemus further (9.494-499), he re-engages the monster with another heroic boast once he has safely returned to his ship:

Κύκλωψ, αἳ κέν τίς σε καταθητῶν ἀνθρώπων ὀφθαλμῶν ἐφεξῆς ἀεικελίην ἀλαωτύν, χάσθαι Ὀδυσσῆα πτολιπόρθιον ἐξαλαῶσαι, υἱὸν Λαέρτεω, Ἰθάκη ἐν οἰκί ἔχοντα.’
(Od. 9.502-505)

Cyclops, if any mortal man ever asks you about the shameful blinding of your eye, say that Odysseus the sacker of cities blinded you, Laertes' son who is from Ithaca!
(Od. 9.502-505)

There are several indications that Odysseus has re-adopted some aspects of his active, aggressive ethos with this boast. First, though heroic boasts are common in the epic genre, this one is

---

74 See below in Chapter 3.
particularly poignant given that he is boasting of his violence to his vanquished enemy. Next, Odysseus uses his own name to taunt the Cyclops, perhaps in order to feel fulfilled with his retribution. Finally, in using the epithet “city-sacker,” Odysseus associates his present actions (the blinding and the boasting) with his martial achievements at Troy. The combination of these elements makes this boast a particularly brazen one. However, the hero’s final address to the Cyclops also offers the opportunity for Polyphemus to use Odysseus’ name against him.

While the hero had so cautiously guarded his name while trapped in the cave, the reckless abandon with which he approaches this boast and offers up his name facilitates Polyphemus’ curse upon the hero:

κλῆθι, Ποσειδάου γαιήοχε κυανοχαίτα·
ei έτεον γε σόσ ειμι, πατήρ δ’ έμός εύχεαι είναι,
dός μή Οδυσσότα πτολίπορθον οίκαδ’ ικέσθαι,
υίον Λαέρτεω, Ιθάκη είν οίκι’ έχοντα.
άλλ’ ε’ οί μοιρ’ εστί φίλους ιδέειν και ικέσθαι
οίκου εύκτιμουν και ένη ές πατρίδα γάιαν,
όψε κακώς ἐλθοί, ὀλέσας ἀπο πάντας ἐταίρος,
νηὸς ἐπ’ ἀλλοτρίης, εὐρόι δ’ ἐν πήματα οἰκω.

75 Newton (1983) 139, especially n. 9, comments on the moral ambivalence of Odysseus’ boast to Polyphemus. Epic heroes will normally boast of their names and illustrious deeds. However, as Brown points out, bragging about an act of violence is also be considered “improper” or “unholy,” given internal evidence in the Odyssey (cited in his note). See also Kyriakou (2001) who would not, according to her schema, categorize this as a heroic “vaunt” because of the fact that the opponent (Polyphemus) is not dead. See especially 252, n. 6 with attendant bibliography about the Odyssey’s tendency to shy away from gloating over the dead.

76 Aristotle Rhetoric 2.3.1380b remarks that Polyphemus would not have been properly punished and Odysseus would not feel properly vindicated if the Cyclops did not know the name of the person who blinded him and the reason behind his assailant’s actions. This could suggest an additional, psychological reason for Odysseus’ addition of his name to the boast. See Brown (1966) 196-197 who endorses Aristotle’s view. Dimock (1956) 55-56 claims that Odysseus performs the violent act so that he could finally identify himself and to escape anonymity. I do not share the view that this was his primary motivation; from the text he seems, rather, to be motivated by escape and perhaps also revenge for his dead companions. Indeed, I am of the opinion that Odysseus frequently suffers through periods of anonymity for the sake of his nostos and that, for him, recognition and repute is not a strong motivator.

77 Segal (1983) 34-35 sees an incongruity in Odysseus’ calling himself a “city-sacker”, and thereby identifying himself with his Iliadic kleos when, in this episode, he overcomes Polyphemus using deception (dolos). I see this association between force and kleos as very fitting given the violence of the final stage of Odysseus’ dolos at Troy and, indeed, in the blinding the sleeping Polyphemus. On the epithet, πτολίπορθος / πτολιπόρθιος, used of Odysseus in both the Iliad and Odyssey, refer to Haft (1990).

78 Brown (1966), who studies name ‘tabu’, asserts (196) that it is precisely the fact that Odysseus names himself that allows Polyphemus’ curse to be fulfilled. Most others who have looked at the curses, like Austin (1972) 4 and Segal (1983) 34, agree with this reading of the relationship between Odysseus’ boast and Polyphemus’ subsequent curse.
(Od. 9.528-535)

Hear me, earth-holder Poseidon, dark-haired one,  
if I am truly yours, and you claim to be my father,  
grant that Odysseus the sacker of cities not reach home,  
Laertes' son who has a house in Ithaca!  
But if it is his lot to see his loved ones and reach  
his well-built house and his fatherland,  
may he get there cruelly late, having lost all his comrades,  
on someone else's ship, and may he find trouble in his house!  
(Od. 9.528-535)

The Cyclops calls upon his father Poseidon and, making the imprecation, emphasizes Odysseus’ identity several times by proper name, epithet, patronymic and homeland, in the exact same order that Odysseus has just identified himself, thus ensuring that the curse will be successful.79 The rest of the Apologue is dedicated to the retelling of how the curse imperils the hero’s nostos. Despite their early benefits, we can infer from the success of Polyphemus’ curse, which results in Odysseus’ subsequent loss of ships and crew, that the hero’s active, assertive, and forceful actions still have unfortunate repercussions in this episode. Odysseus too seems to recognize his reckless blunder. From this point on, the equitable balance of both active (assertive, violent, confident) and passive (enduring, inactive, deferential) characteristics begins to deteriorate. Gradually, with subtle verbal cues and the implicit characterization that I analyze below, the hero informs us of the shift in his ethos towards one that is predominantly passive.

1.2 From Aeolia to Ogygia: Odysseus’ Endurance

In direct contrast to Odysseus’ assertiveness at both the outset and the close of the tragic Cyclopeia, the hero is not so assertive when in crisis at the end of the Aeolian episode. The

79 Brown (1966) 201 stresses the point that Polyphemus’ almost-verbatim repetition of Odysseus’ self-identification ensures the effectiveness of the curse.
crisis, however, is not the result of any threat presented by the exotic Aeolians. In fact, Aeolus treats Odysseus and his companions with the customary Hellenic reverence for guests; Odysseus is even given the guest-gift of a bag of winds upon his departure (Od. 10.19-20). This bag of winds contains all the winds that would hinder their progress homewards if released; containing them in this way would allow Odysseus and his men a speedy return. Nevertheless the gift becomes a point of contention between the hero and his crew; it remains hidden away below decks and Odysseus does not offer to share it with his friends (10.23-24).

Once Odysseus is confident that his contingent is on its way home, he succumbs to sleep. While he is sleeping, his companions open the bag. Indeed they feel that the guest-gift ought to be divided equally among them. Consequently, the whole fleet is thrown off course by the opposing winds (Od. 10.46-49). The sudden turning of the ship wakes Odysseus, but he does not react. This inaction constitutes a conscious decision as evidenced by Odysseus’ narration of the internal debate that took place in his mind:

…αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ γέ
ἐγρόμενος κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονα μερμηρίζα,
ηὲ πεσών ἐκ νηὸς ἀποφθίην ἐνὶ πόντῳ,
ἡ ἀκέων τλαίην καὶ ἔτι ζωοῖσι μετείην.
(Od. 10.49-52)

…Then I awoke and pondered in my noble heart
whether to throw myself from the ship and perish in the sea
or submit in silence and stay still among the living.
(Od. 10.49-52)

In addition to the fact that he never considers any violent course of action, Odysseus seems to be avoiding any action whatsoever, perhaps due to the ill fortune that his active, assertive ethos brought him during the Cyclopeia. The diction with which he speaks of this decision testifies to his adoption of a passive, suffering ethos in response to the situation:
ἀλλ’ ἔτλην καὶ ἔμεινα, καλυψάμενος δ’ ἐνι νηῆ
cείμην· αἱ δ’ ἔφεροντο κακῆ ἀνέμου θυέλλῃ
αὐτὶς ἐπ’ Αἰολὶν νῆζον, στενάχοντο δ’ ἔταϊροι.
(Od. 10.53-55)

But I endured and stayed, covered myself, and lay in the ship. The ships were borne by the evil windstorm to the island of Aeolia, as my comrades groaned.
(Od. 10.53-55)

Three key words in the first line and a half of this passage highlight the change in the hero’s ethos: τλῆναι, μένειν, and κείσθαι.80 First, the verb “τλῆναι,” meaning “to suffer/to endure,” is used by Odysseus to characterize his response. This verb and its cognates (from the Greek root τλ) figure prominently in the characterization of Odysseus, especially on Ogygia in Book 5, where Calypso, Hermes, and the hero himself employ it to characterize him.81 More importantly, this is the first location in the Apologue where Odysseus uses this verb or any of its cognates in reference to his own person or actions. And given that the Aeolus episode of Book 10 precedes the events on Ogygia in Book 5 chronologically, we can assume that when Odysseus describes himself as “suffering/enduring” in Book 5, he is referring to the misadventures narrated in the Apologue that begin with his companions’ misuse of the bag of winds. Prior to his crew’s indiscretion, he seems to view himself variously as both an active agent and passive sufferer, as demonstrated by his interaction with Polyphemus. Now, however, after being carried off course due to the recklessness of his companions, Odysseus adopts exclusively the ethos of the passive sufferer.

Further evidence for this comes from the combination of the verbs μένω and κείμαι. Instead of taking action immediately at the onset of this misfortune, Odysseus signals his passivity with a verb for inactivity, μένειν (to remain, to stay) and emphasizes the character

80 In perhaps a fitting coincidence, all three words that mark Odysseus’ inactivity are verbs.
81 On the meaning of epithets and verbs with τλε- and τλα- roots in the Odyssey (and Iliad), see Pucci (1987) 44-49.
change with the verb κεῖσθαι, which signals a passive, prostrate bodily position. Furthermore, by employing the passive voice of the verbs καλύπτειν and φέρειν in line 10.54, Odysseus conveys the idea that he has lost his agency and feels invisible, as if he is simply being carried along by the flow of events. Explicit verbal signs and implicit nonverbal gestures of resignation and passivity abound in this passage.

The adversity that Odysseus faces in this episode is not external in origin; internal dissent within his fleet, and his companions’ choice to act against him are the causes of this crisis. The crew’s disregard for their leader signals to the audience that Odysseus’ views and tactics do not reflect the ethos of the collectivity; he is, at this moment, ethically displaced. Though he is not yet undergoing physical separation or displacement from his crew, he is nevertheless becoming more of an outsider. He is beginning to lose his centrality as a leader. The hero chooses to mark the beginning of his ethical displacement from his fleet by covering himself with his cloak and effectively separating himself off from the rest of his crew. This ethical displacement manifests itself spatially in the next episode when Odysseus’ crew encounters the Laestrygonians who live in Telepylus. In the Laestrygonian episode, the hero’s passivity, in opposition to his crew’s preference for bold action, is ultimately the cause of the hero’s greater degree of displacement when he loses all of his ships except for his own.

Both the lines that close the Aeolian episode and those that open the hero’s narration of the Laestrygonian incident highlight the endurance and passivity with which the hero proceeds following the recent setback with the bag of winds:

ἔνθεν δὲ προτέρω πλέομεν ἀκαχήμενοι ἦτορ·

---

82 Bremmer (1991) 25-26 notes that in ancient Greek society, the act of sitting, crouching or kneeling in proximity to another individual that is seated or standing in higher position denotes self-abasement or submission. This body position is also associated with mourning. Thus he concludes that “…begging, supplication, rites of integration, and initiation—sitting or lying on the ground is part of a complex of gestures which all aim at a total self-abasement of the subject” (26).
We sailed on from there with grief in our hearts, and my men's spirit was afflicted by painful rowing for our foolishness, since a convoy no longer appeared. All the same, six days we sailed day and night; (Od. 10-77-80)

The closing lines of the Aeolus episode (10.77-78) serve to remind the audience of the hero’s ongoing suffering. And, highlighted in the very first line of the new episode (10.80) is the hero’s continuing endurance indicated by the adverb ὅμως (all the same; nevertheless); though he suffers, he nevertheless sails on hoping to return home to Ithaca. The hero’s newly adopted passivity extends to his tenuous approach of the harbour at Telepylus; instead of sailing directly into the harbour as do his other ships, Odysseus hangs back and ties his ship just outside of it:

(10.87-97) Then when we entered the famous harbor, around which steep rock extends continuously on both sides, and, at its mouth, jutting headlands protrude, opposite each other, and the entrance is narrow, all of them kept their double-curved ships inside. They were moored close together inside the hollow harbor, for waves never grew in it, neither great nor small,
but there was a white calm about it.
But I alone kept my black ship outside
at its edge, tied the cables to the rock,
climbed to a rugged lookout, and stood.
(Od. 10.87-97)

Unlike his self-assured entrance into Polyphemus’ cave, Odysseus is more cautious here and
hangs back when the rest of his fleet enters the unknown harbour. In fact, the above passage is
not only indicative of the hero’s restrained behaviour, but it is also replete with signs of the
ethical and physical distance that now separates him and his fleet and companions.

At the beginning of this episode, Odysseus speaks of the fleet as a single unit using the
first person plural to describe the fleet’s activities (lines 77-80) but, as of line 91, he stops. He
resumes by describing what the rest of the fleet does: ἐνθ’ ο’ίς’ εἰσώ πάντες ἔχουν νέας
ἀμφιελίσσας… (“all of them kept their double-curved ships inside [the harbour]” Od.10.91) and
how he takes a different approach by hanging back: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν οἶος σχέθον ἔξω νῆα
μέλαιαν/ αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ ἐσχατίῃ, πέτρης ἐκ πείσματα δήσας; (“But I alone kept my black ship
outside,/ at its edge, tying the cables to the rock;” 10. 95-96). He puts special emphasis on the
fact that he is alone in the decision with the phrase ἐγὼν οἶος (10.95). The ethical separation and
displacement that Odysseus experiences—and in this instance engineers for himself—is also
spatially demarcated. Odysseus is quite literally an outsider as the rest of his fleet sails into the
harbour, while he himself waits outside. Of course the hero’s narrative reflects this separation
using deictic and spatial signposts to distinguish Odysseus (ἐξω; ἐπ’ ἐσχατίῃ) from the fleet
(εἰσω; ἐντοσθεν). Within his fleet, Odysseus is experiencing outsideness in that he is not
identifying with the ethos of the group and this outsideness is echoed by the location of his ship
away from the rest.

Though Odysseus holds most of his own crew back at his ship, he sends out an envoy to
learn about the Laestrygonians and to possibly secure hospitality. Upon its arrival at the palace,
the party is greeted instead with violence—the Laestrygonians kill and devour some of the hero’s crew and, upon their retreat to the harbor, destroy every ship except Odysseus’:

But when they entered the famous house, they found a woman, as big as a mountain peak, and they shrank from the sight of her. She immediately called from assembly famous Antiphates, her husband, who devised wretched destruction for them. At once he seized one of my comrades and prepared him for dinner.

The other two jumped up and came in flight to the ships. Then he made a cry throughout the city, and the mighty Laestrygonians heard, and stalked from one place and other, countless ones, not like men, but like Giants. They threw from the rocks with boulders big as a man can carry, and at once an evil din arose throughout the ships, of ships being smashed and men being killed. Piercing them like fish, they carried off their gruesome meal. While they were destroying them in the very deep harbor
I drew my sharp sword from beside my thigh
and with it cut away my cyan-prowed ship's cable.
once I urged and bid my comrades
lay on the oar handles, so we would get out of danger,
and they all tossed up the sea in fear of destruction.
My ship gladly fled the overhanging rocks to the sea,
but the others were all destroyed together where they were.
We sailed on from there with grief in our hearts
at the loss of dear comrades, glad to have escaped death.

(Od. 10.112–134)

Odysseus’ cautious decision to moor his ship outside of the harbour thus turns out to be a
prudent one. And although it is a cautious decision, the hero’s response to the violence of
Laestrygonians is important and certainly passive. Faced with the violence of the cannibals,
Odysseus informs his audience at 127 that he cut the mooring rope of his ship so that he and his
own crew could retreat and survive. He abandons the rest of his fleet and the only ship and crew
to survive the attack is his. By subverting audience expectations for a display of assertive
violence to protect his fleet, Odysseus emphasizes the passivity that currently dominates his
ethos. From here, Odysseus’ solitary ship is left to wander the open seas alone. He is no longer
the master of a fleet and is now reduced to the captain of a single ship. Indeed it is his passivity
that ultimately engenders this new level of separation from the protected centre of his fleet. But
before the tragic culmination of events on Thrinacia (Helius’ island) in Book 13, Odysseus’
maritime wanderings still provide several examples of the hero’s preference for passivity and his
rejection of his balanced ethos.

During Odysseus’ lengthy stay on Circe’s island of Aeaea (Od. 12.1ff) the goddess
apprises the hero of his future encounters and tells him how he must proceed in order to achieve
his nostos. Coincidentally, most of her advice compels Odysseus to take on a more passive
role. When he encounters the Sirens, Odysseus does just as the goddess bid him: he stops his companions’ ears with wax and orders himself lashed to the ship’s mast, such that he will not be drawn from the ship by the Sirens’ alluring songs. Tied to the mast, he is unable to move, the very definition of passive. Indeed when he casts himself as the audience of the Sirens’ songs, Odysseus implicitly contrasts his former role as passive listener to his present role as the narrator/poet of his own adventures that he is recounting (the Apologue).

Next, as per the goddess’ directions, Odysseus and his crew must negotiate the strait between the cavernous home of Scylla, a man-eating monster, and Charybdis, a rapacious whirlpool. While Circe is advising him of the near impossibility of passing unscathed between the two, Odysseus asks if there is any way that he could steer clear of Charybdis and fight against the inevitable attack of Scylla:

εἰ δ` ἄγε δὴ μοι τούτο, θεά, υπερτές ἐνίσπες, εἰ πῶς τὴν ὀλοίην μὲν ὑπεκπροφύγομι Χάρυβδιν, τὴν δὲ κ´ ἀμναίμην, ὦτε μοι σινοιτῷ γ´ ἐταίρους. (Od. 12.112-114)

Come, goddess, if you can tell me this infallibly, if somehow I can stay out of the reach of baneful Charybdis but ward off Scylla when she assails my comrades. (Od. 12.112-114)

Circe rebukes his ideas of a violent confrontation and replies that fleeing—the passive response—is a much more appropriate reaction to the monster:

σχέτλει, καὶ δὴ αὐτοὶ πολεμήσῃ ἑργα μέμηλε καὶ πόνος· οὔδε θεοῖσι υπείξεαι ἀθανάτοισιν; ή δὲ τοι οὐ θνητή, ἀλλ` ἀθάνατον κακὸν ἐστὶ, δεινὸν τ´ ἀργαλέου τε καὶ ἀγρίου οὔδε μαχητῶν· οὔδε τις ἐστ` ἀλκὴ φυγεῖν κάρτιστον ἀπ` αὐτῆς.

---

83 On Circe’s advice to Odysseus see Cook (1999) 161-162.
84 For Odysseus as the passive listener and recipient of the Sirens’ ‘text,’ see Karanika (2011) 14-15. Moreover, Odysseus is forced to listen to a song that references the Trojan cycle. See Burgess (2012) 282 n.42 on the cyclic nature of the song’s content, contra Pucci (1987) on the Iliadic intertext. See also briefly Cook (1999) 161-162.
(Od. 12.116-120)

Reckless one, even now your mind is on warlike deeds and hard work; will you not yield to gods immortal? She is not mortal, but is an immortal evil, dread, horrifying, savage, and not to be battled. And there is no defense. To flee from her is best.

(Od. 12.116-120)

When actually faced with the two horrible obstacles, however, Odysseus forgets Circe’s warnings and arms himself for battle, all the while trying to catch sight of Scylla (Od. 12.226-231). While he and his crew concentrate on avoiding Charybdis, the hero does not see Scylla until she snatches up six of his companions. With their hands outstretched as if imploring his help, Odysseus’ friends look to him before they are eaten:

σκεψάμενος δ’ εἰς νῆα βοήν ἁμα καὶ μεθ’ ἐταῖρους ἡδη τῶν ἐνόησα πόδας καὶ χείρας ὑπερθεν υψόν’ αειροένων ἐμε δὲ φθέγγοντο καλεύντες ἐξονομακλήδην, τότε ὑςτατον, ἀχνύμενοι κηρ… …αυτοῦ δ’ εἰνὶ τιρῆσι κατήσας κεκλήγοντας, χεῖρας ἐμοὶ ὑρόγοντας ἐν αἰνή δηιστήτι.
οἰκτιστον δή κείνο ἐμοῖς ἰδον ὀρθαλμοίσι πάντων, ὀς’ ἐμύγγσα πόρους ἀλὸς ἑξερεείνων.

(Od. 12.247-250; 256-259)

Looking back into my swift ship and at the same time for my comrades, I spotted the hands and feet of those who had already been lifted high up above me. They were screaming, calling me by name, for the very last time, their hearts grieving… …She devoured them in her doorway, as they screeched, reaching out their arms to me in their grim death struggle.

---

85 On the “displaced” martial diction present in Odysseus’ discussion of Scylla with Circe, and in the “arming scene” against Scylla see Hopman (2012) (b) 13-16. She calls this scene a “parodic duel” in that the Iliadic diction “calls to mind the narrative sequence of the combat scene against which the audience was encouraged to compare Odysseus’ encounter with Scylla. The phenomenon comes across especially clearly in the narrative of the encounter itself, which triggers, displaces, and finally inverts the Iliadic sequence of the arming scene and the consequent achievement of aristeia.” (14) She also notes the failed expectations for a heroic battle: “As they heard about Odysseus donning his armor, ancient auditors awaited to hear a combat tale between the hero Odysseus and the sea monster Scylla. Against these expectations, the absence of fighting and the fact that Odysseus cannot even see Scylla in spite of his careful scrutiny of the rock (12.232–33) become even more striking” (15).
That was surely the most pitiful thing I ever saw with my eyes, of all the things I suffered as I explored the pathways of the sea.  
(Od. 12.247-250; 256-259)

Indeed, Odysseus paints a pitiful scene that emphasizes his helplessness in the situation. Though he is armed and ready to do battle with the monster, the hero never even had the chance to strike. Odysseus’ rejection of Circe’s advice, and his ad hoc attempt to reassert an active ethos do not succeed, just as the goddess warned. Instead of actively defeating the monster and rescuing his companions, the hero’s narrative highlights, through the use of several verbs and participles of seeing (σκέπτειν, 247; νοεῖν, 248; ἰδεῖν ὑφαλμοῖο, 258,) the ways in which his failure to avoid Scylla’s precipitous attack makes him the passive observer of the horrors inflicted on his companions. In his encounter with Polyphemus and in the episode with Aeolus’ bag of winds, Odysseus deliberately chooses passivity. He even chooses to become the passive audience of the Sirens. But against Scylla, while attempting to be proactive, he is not afforded the opportunity to put his active ethos to use. Moreover, he has now lost another six companions from the dwindling numbers aboard his final ship. In addition to losing his agency, Odysseus loses more companions who are his last links to his Hellenic community, however fragile, and thus to his former identity. After Scylla’s attack, Odysseus and his crew make their final stop on the island of Thrinacia, where the hero’s helplessness and enforced passivity continue.

Thrinacia is the last place where Odysseus’ final ship is intact and its crew together.

When he and his companions first sight the island, the hero thinks it best to pass it by, for fear that his men will not be able to abstain from Helius’ sacred cattle (Od. 12.271-276). This in itself would constitute a passive response. Nevertheless, Eurylochus, one of Odysseus’ crewmembers, chides the hero for being too harsh and unsympathetic to their plight of hunger and sleeplessness. Having recounted Eurylochus’ speech, the hero admits to his Phaeacian audience that he had already foreseen the evil outcome of the situation (Od. 12.295-296), and Odysseus’ response to
Eurylochus is accordingly resigned and passive. He assents to their landing on the island, citing his inability as one man to stand up to the rest of the crew. But despite the hero’s knowledge of the outcome, the crew is made to swear an oath not to lay hands upon the cattle of the sun god.

Finally, it is with the ultimate display of passivity that Odysseus loses control of the situation. After his crew swears the oath, Odysseus wanders off to pray and falls asleep far off from the rest of his contingent. For a second time, the hero’s involuntary surrender to slumber brings about misfortune: Eurylochus convinces the remaining men to cull some of Helius’ cattle, since it is better to die on the sea than of starvation (Od. 12.340-352). Thus Eurylochus and the rest of the crew continue to feast on Helius’ sacred cattle for the rest of the week, until favourable winds pick up and the men once again embark on their course. But divine retribution is swift. Immediately after they lose sight of land Zeus sends a storm that immediately throws Odysseus’ companions to their watery deaths and destroys the ship. Having left Troy implaced within his Hellenic fleet, Odysseus now washes up on Ogygia, now completely displaced and clinging to the two remaining planks of his ship.

Thus far in this chapter, I have drawn on the arguments of scholars who highlight the fluctuating nature of Odysseus’ characterization in the Odyssey. He is represented at first in the Cicconian episode with a balanced ethos. But, as he loses his fleet in the Apologue, Odysseus’ vigourous spirit seems to wane, and he displays with increasing frequency a type of heroism that is decidedly non-Iliadic: he generally does not succeed in his endeavors by employing violence or force, but suffers and endures instead. Now that we have examined events from the flashback narrative of the Apologue up to and including the final destruction of Odysseus’ last ship and

---

86 Acquiescing to his companions’ foolish plans is a sign of Odysseus’ new tendency passivity: in the Cyclopeia, when his crew wishes to raid the Cyclops’ cattle and leave the cave, no amount of persuasion from the crew could change Odysseus’ mind. The same is true during their first sojourn with Circe. Eurylochus disagreed with the hero’s plan to stay with the goddess (Od.10. 429-437), but Odysseus insisted.
crew, we turn to the narrative of Book 5, which documents his stay on Ogygia following the shipwreck.

2 Ogygia: Landscape of Stagnation and Isolation

Odysseus’ arrival on Ogygia marks the end of his nautical travels with his fleet and crew. Two major themes characterize this episode: stagnation and isolation. Without access to maritime transportation, the hero is unable to make any real spatial progress. In this episode there is also great emphasis on the hero’s physical and mental stagnation; he prefers to sit on the beach all day and to fixate on his inability to go home. To the hero, progress seems impossible. Moreover, Odysseus has lost all of his ships and his crew. Without them he is displaced from his “mobile centre” and is bereft of some of the most important signs of his station. Thus not only do we witness an overall increasing indolence and passivity in the hero, but also signs of social isolation both circumstantial and self-imposed. In what follows, I will investigate Odysseus’ characterization in Book 5, which takes up where the Apologue leaves off. As if to corroborate the hero’s self-characterization as a predominantly passive and suffering individual in the Apologue, several other characters witness the same qualities in the hero. Significantly, Book 5 marks both Odysseus’ introduction into the narrative as well as, arguably, the period of his greatest suffering.

The first glimpse of the hero in the Odyssey narrative happens as he laments his captivity by the nymph Calypso. He who once ended the Trojan War with both deception and violent destruction is now unable to escape the amorous nymph and her island. On Ogygia, Odysseus is cut off from all cultural and social networks. His fleet and crew once provided him with a substitute for his homeland, where he was a leader at the centre of social relations. In stark
contrast, the first half of Book 5 emphasizes the change that the hero has undergone and constantly reinforces the social and spatial isolation that he experiences on Ogygia.\(^87\) At first, it seems as if even the omnipotent gods have forgotten about Odysseus, until Athena discards her anger\(^88\) at him and broaches the subject of his captivity with Zeus using a “forgetting/remembering motif”:

Ωδείς θείοι λαῶν, οἷσιν ἄνασσε, πατήρ δὲ ὡς ἦσεν.

Father Zeus, and other blessed gods who are forever,

Let no sceptered king ever be earnestly
gentle and kind, or know justice in his mind,
but may he always be hard and do injustice,
seeing that none of the people whom he ruled
remembers godlike Odysseus, who was kind as a father to them.

But he lies on an island, suffering mighty sorrows
in the palace of nymph Calypso, who holds him back
by force. He is unable to reach his fatherland,
for he has not oared ships nor comrades at his side
to convey him on the broad back of the sea.

---

\(^87\) On the importance of first appearances in the _Odyssey_, see Race (1993). He concludes that the first appearances of characters in the _Odyssey_ are constructed by the narrator such that the audience is allowed a glimpse of the character in an unguarded moment “engaged in a telling activity and to observe how they react to the presence of others once contact is established, particularly when they are provoked to a spontaneous outburst of emotion.” (101).

\(^88\) See Clay (1976) and Clay (1983) on Athena’s anger at the Greek forces and the resumption of her support for Odysseus at the beginning of the _Odyssey_—that is, at its narrative beginning, with Odysseus on Ogygia.
Now they intend to kill his beloved son
on his way home. He went after news of his father,
to sacred Pylos and divine Lacedaemon.
(Od. 5. 7-20)

By having Athena reintroduce Odysseus’ cause in this way, the poet subtly implies that both Odysseus’ person and memory are distant. Also relevant to this discussion is the goddess’ rhetoric, which draws specific attention to Odysseus’ lack of ships and crew at lines 16-17. She is distressed not only by his inactivity but, in reality, by the hero’s lack of resources. Without his heroic community or a vehicle to overcome the sea’s desolation, Odysseus is essentially stuck in a state of limbo and anonymity. Integral to this verbal depiction of the hero are several directional and somatic indicators of exteriority and resignation.

Athena first depicts Odysseus in a supine position. The application of the verb κέισθαι (to lie) to describe Odysseus’ somatic position at line 5.13 reflects an air of resignation. Astute audience members or readers of the epic might identify parallels between the goddess’ description of the hero and that in the proem of the Odyssey, which introduces a passive hero who suffers much, and one very unlike his Iliadic counterpart:

"Ἄνδρα μοι ἔνεπτε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλά πλάγχη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολείθρου ἔπεσε· πολλῶν δ’ ἄνθρωπων ἵδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόσον ἔγνω, πολλὰ δ’ ὁ γ’ ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἀλγεα δὲν κατά θυμόν, ἄρνυμενος ἢν τε ψυχήν καὶ νόστον ἐταίρων, ἀλλ’ οὐδ’, ὥς ἐτάρους ἐρρύσατο, ἰέμενός περ’ αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρησιν ἀτασθάλισιν ὄλοτο, νῆπιοι, οἳ κατὰ βοῦς 'Ὑπερίονος 'Ηελίου ἡσθίον' αὐτάρ τ’ ἔνθεν ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἡμαρ. τῶν ἀμόθες γε, θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἴπε καὶ ἦμιν.
(Od. 1.1-10)

89 De Jong (2001) 125 dubs Athena’s introduction of Odysseus’ plight to the council a “forgetting/remembering motif,” which is common narratological terminology. In using this motif, the narrator not only resumes the “Odysseus storyline” but also subtly implies that Odysseus is not only spatially isolated, but also far from the minds of everyone.
Tell me, Muse, about the wily man who wandered long and far after he sacked the sacred citadel of Troy. He saw the cities and knew the minds of many men, but suffered at sea many sorrows in his heart, struggling for his life and comrades' return home. But he did not save his comrades, much though he wanted to, for by their own recklessness they perished, childish fools, who devoured the cattle of the Sun, Hyperion, who then deprived them of their homecoming day.

Tell us also, goddess, daughter of Zeus, of sundry things. (Od. 1.1-10)

Looking back at line 4 of the proem, we see an important echo with Athena’s description of Odysseus in Book 5; the participial phrase ἄλγεα πάσχων (Od. 5.13) recalls, whether purposely or not, the verb-object pair “to suffer pains,” or πάσχειν ἄλγεα, in Odyssey 1.4. Thus readers or audience members would be reminded to think of this newly introduced character as the hero to which the proem alludes, the one who has been lost at sea and has now lost himself on an island in the middle of the world, rather than of his Iliadic incarnation. The Odyssean Odysseus, at this moment, embodies the suffering and passive side of the complete hero persona.91 The hero’s passivity is even noted internally by other characters.

When he approaches Ogygia Hermes finds that Odysseus is not in Calypso’s company:

οὐδ’ ἄρ’ Ὀδυσσῆα μεγαλήτωρ αὖδου ἐτέτμεν,
ἀλλ’ ὡς’ ἐπ’ ἀκτῆσι κλαίει καθῆμενος, ἔνθα πάρος περ,
δάκρυσι καὶ στοναχήσι καὶ ἄλγεοι θυμὸν ἐρέχθων
πόντον ἐπ’ ἀτρύγετον δερκέσκετο δάκρυα λεύβων.
(Od. 5.81-84)

But he did not see great-hearted Odysseus inside, since he was sitting on the shore crying, there as before, rending his heart with tears and groans and sorrows,

91 Cook (1999) 151 also observes that “ἀτασθαλία” (reckless/violent behavior), which usually characterizes a hero’s actions and causes suffering for others, is displaced from the character of Odysseus onto his crew instead in the proem. Odysseus is only portrayed as the sufferer of ills, whereas his crew, although they suffer, are also perpetrators of reckless deeds that ultimately lead to their own suffering and that of others.
showering tears as he looked out upon the barren sea.
*(Od. 5.81-84)*

First, we learn that Odysseus is not inside Calypso’s cavernous house: οὐδ᾿ ἄρ᾿ Ὄδυσσῆα μεγαλήτορα ἐνδον ἔτετμεν…(5.81). This observation is phrased as if it were contrary to expectation, as Hermes seems to expect the hero and the nymph to be living harmoniously.92 Instead, Odysseus has removed himself to the periphery of the island and remains on the beach, as far as he can get from the intimate space inhabited by Calypso and as close as he can get to his homeland. Moreover, in segregating himself from the nymph, the hero has removed himself from the little social interaction available to him, a stark contrast to a hero who was once at the centre of his Ithacan kingdom, his Greek retinue at Troy, and the society of his ships and companions.93 Finally, the narrator uses the participle καθήμενος, or “sitting down,” to describe Odysseus’ behaviour. Depicted in this abased position, the hero would seem helpless and downtrodden to an ancient or modern audience alike. This characterization of Odysseus as suffering and mentally anguished is realized both externally by the narratees of the epic and internally by other *dramatis personae*. Before discussing this section of narrative, however, I would like to continue to analyze Odysseus’ characterization during his time on Ogygia, this time through the eyes of Calypso.

Both Athena and Hermes, who played some role in Odysseus’ emancipation from Calypso, are attuned to the hero’s suffering. Calypso too focalizes a very detailed picture of the

---

92 De Jong (2001) 129 remarks that both Hermes and the narratees would expect Odysseus to be found inside the cave since, in several instances up to this point (1.15; 4.557; 5.14), the hero is said to be there.

93 This self-imposed segregation anticipates the separation from culture and elevated society that Odysseus will undergo in the Phaeacian episode. On Scheria in Books 6–7, as well as when he first lands back on Ithaca in Books 13–21, Odysseus remains on the margins of civilization and high society due to his lack of apparent social network.
hero’s distress while on her way to apprise Odysseus of the Olympians’ decision to force his release:

ἡ δ’ ἐπ’ Ὀδυσσὴα μεγαλίτωρα πότνια νύμφῃ ἤ’, ἐπεὶ δὴ Ζηνὸς ἐπέκλυεν ἀγγελιάων.
τὸν δ’ ἄρ’ ἐπ’ ἀκτῆς εὑρε καθήμενον· οὐδὲ ποτ’ ὅσα δακρυόφιν τέρσοντο, κατείβετο δὲ γλυκὸς αἰών νόστου οὐδυρομένῳ, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι ήνδας νύμφῃ.
ἀλλὰ ἦ τοι υἱκτασ μὲν ἵνα εἰς εἰς γλυκὰ ἀἰὼν νόστον ὡσπερ ὕπερ
ἐν σπέεσι γαλαφυροῖς παρ’ οὐκ ἐξελῶν ἐβελούσῃ· ἦματα δ’ ἤμι πέτρησαι καὶ ἥνεμεσι καθίζων
δάκρυσι καὶ στονάχῃσι καὶ ἄλγεσι θυμῷ ἐρέχθειν
πόντον ἐπ’ ἀτρύγετον δέρκεσκετο δὰκρυα λείβων.

(Οδ. 5.149-158)

The lady nymph went to great-hearted Odysseus after she heard Zeus’ message.
She found him sitting on the shore, but his eyes were never dry of tears and his sweet lifetime was passing from him as he mourned for his return, since the nymph no longer pleased him.
But, indeed, he spent the nights, by necessity, in her hollow caves, the unwilling beside the willing, then by day he sat on the rocks and spits, rending his heart with tears and groans and sorrows, shedding tears as he looked out upon the barren sea.

(Οδ. 5.149-158)

This description of the hero is very similar to the one given by Athena at the beginning of Book 5, and also to Hermes’ observations at 5.79ff, with the hero sitting down, looking out over the water and weeping. A few observations about Calypso’s focalization are worth making. First and most importantly, this meeting between Calypso and Odysseus is the first time that the audience encounters the hero in person, instead of merely hearing about him from other characters or from the narrator. Thus his characterization is all the more vivid, as his actions are being observed by

94 De Jong (2001) 133 maintains that this passage should be read as Calypso’s embedded character focalization, though she does make the allowance that the narrator intrudes on the focalization to provide details that are exterior to the scene she is focalizing, like Odysseus’ nighttime activities in 5.154-155.
a character who is actually in his presence. Next, Odysseus’ somatic position, sitting and looking out onto the sea, has renewed significance. With his back to Calypso, Odysseus is indicating his rejection of the nymph and her offer of immortality.\(^{95}\) The nymph seems to perceive it as such, interpreting his weeping as homesickness due to her failure to be pleasing to him at line 153. Calypso notices that he will not wipe his eyes of the tears he cries. She perceives his inconsolable lamentation as “weeping the sweet life out of him.” Here, Odysseus’ life is described with the adjective γλυκύς, implying that his life and his nostos, for which he continues to live and lament, are dear to him. This adjective, however, has a particularly interesting history in relation to the Iliadic heroic persona. For, in the *Iliad* (II. 2.453-54 and 11.13-14), war is sweeter to the Achaean heroes than is nostos.\(^{96}\) But here, combined with Odysseus’ supine position and his rejection of divine immortality, his preference for nostos completes a very important descriptive characterization of Odysseus as the hero of passive endurance. Odysseus showcases the passive and enduring aspect of his ethos to the nymph when she grants him his freedom, all the while attempting to entice him to stay with her.

A conversation between the hero and the nymph (5.160ff) follows her initial exposition of Zeus’ decree. During this exchange, Calypso informs Odysseus about his need to build a raft to leave the island (5.162-163), while the hero voices his concern that she might be attempting to trick him (5.173ff). But the nymph swears her sincerity by the river Styx and Odysseus finally comes around to the idea that he will indeed be leaving the island after seven years. However, as her name suggests, Calypso must try once more to keep Odysseus sheltered from the rest of the world. She entices him to stay by offering him immortality on her idyllic island:

\[Διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν’ Ὀδυσσεύ,\]
\[οὐτώ δὲ οἰκόνδε φιλήν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν\]

\(^{95}\) On his bodily position see de Jong (2001) 129.
\(^{96}\) Pucci (1987) 56-57.
Zeus-born son of Laertes, resourceful Odysseus,
Do you wish to go homeward this way, right now,
to your beloved fatherland? Then, fare you well, nonetheless.
If you only knew in your mind how many sorrows make up
your destiny before you reach your fatherland,
you would stay right here with me, guard this home,
and be immortal, despite your eagerness to see
your wife, whom you long for every day.
Surely, I claim I am no worse than she
in either form or stature, since it is no way fitting
that mortals vie with immortals in form and appearance.

In her plea that he remain, Calypso addresses several factors that might deter Odysseus from
leaving: the fact that he has so many trials left to endure before he returning home (5.206-208),
her offer of immortality (5.208-210), and her physical superiority to Penelope (5.211-213). To
this, Odysseus replies in a manner that reflects his current ethos:

(5.203-213)
Much-scheming Odysseus said to her in reply:
Lady goddess, do not be angry with me for this. I know this all
myself very well, because prudent Penelope is weaker than you
in appearance and size, when one sees her face to face,
for she is mortal, but you are immortal and unaging.
But even so, I want and wish for, every day,
to go home and see homecoming day.
If some god again wrecks me on the wine-dark sea,
I will endure it, with a heart in my chest that endures sorrows,
for I have already suffered very many and toiled much
in waves and war. Let this also be among them.
(Od. 5.214-224)

He dismisses her offer of immortality that will allow him to escape his suffering, emphasizing
that indeed he has suffered much already, but that he is also willing and able to suffer longer
(5.221-224).

Here, Odysseus seems to be differentiating himself from not only his past warrior
ethos, but also from that of the Iliad in general. He, unlike any of his Iliadic counterparts—
Achilles in particular—has learned to endure the trials of a long and arduous life. Moreover, he
seems to take pride in his suffering, emphasizing the tenacity of his endurance with various
instantiations of the Greek root *tle-* (to endure/to dare) in line 5.222, τῇσομαι ἐν στῆσιν
ἔχων ταλαπενθέα θυμόν. He then highlights the great extent of that which he has already
suffered using past-tense verbs for suffering and enduring (πάθον and μόγησα, 5.223). The
direct object of each of the verbs, a substantive adjective denoting extent or quantity (πολλά, 5.223), is repeated for emphasis. This pattern of word/root repetition and the stacking of
synonyms one upon another mimic the frequency and duration of his struggles. Finally, in his

---

97 See Pucci (1987) 46-49 for the range of options in the translation of words with the root *tle-* In the Odyssey, it always denotes “endurance” for Pucci.

98 See Pucci (1987) 45 says of Od. 5.221ff.: “Although all the formal conditions that shape an Iliadic hero are present in this passage, no lines like these would ever surface in the Iliad. What that poem would not accept in its text is a certain passivity in Odysseus’ sense of heroism, a somewhat vulgar pride in, as it were, exhibiting the marks of his griefs, blows, humiliations, defeats, and survivals and so great a tolerance for these injuries that his already long record could be indefinitely lengthened. The hero is already thinking of the length, of the excitement, of the adventurousness of his own poem, not of the kleos of his death.”
use of the future-more-vivid conditional, which conveys some certainty of the future, we recognize that Odysseus is adamant about leaving the island and once again enduring his fateful wandering. Overall, Odysseus’ reply is an act of rejection and defiance, not only of the nymph and immortality but also of Iliadic *mores*.

The audience has thus witnessed Odysseus undergo a slight shift in the continuum towards a more active *ethos*. Though he is still the suffering and enduring hero whom we encounter in the proem and in the beginning of Book 5, the renewed hope of resuming his protracted *nostos* has brought out Odysseus’ forceful and assertive side. No longer is he bound by enforced inactivity, hanging his head to weep helplessly on the beach. Rather, he is now confident enough to reject his divine captor and to undertake another period of difficult wandering if it means that he can finally accomplish his *nostos*. This resurgence of a more forceful and active Odysseus continues after his emancipation with the building of his raft.

Short-lived as the raft may be, many scholars see in this episode a temporary renewal of Odysseus’ erstwhile identity and self-confidence:

...θοῶς δέ οἱ ἠνυτὸ ἔργον.
εἴκοσι δ’ ἐκβαλε πάντα, πελέκκησεν δ’ ἀρα χαλκῷ,
ξέσσε δ’ ἐπισταμένως καὶ ἐπὶ στάθμην ἑθυνεν.

τόφρα δ’ ἐνεικε τέρετρα Καλυψώ, δία θεάων’
τέτρηνεν δ’ ἀρα πάντα καὶ ἔρισεν ἀλλήλοις,
γόμφοισιν δ’ ἀρα τήν γε καὶ ἀρμονίησιν ἄρασσεν.

όσσον τὶς τ’ ἔδαφος νηὸς τορνώσεται ἀνήρ
φορτίδος εὐρείης, εὖ ἐιδὼς τεκτοσυνάων,
τόσσον ἐπ’ εὐρεῖαν σχεδίην ποιήσατ’ Ὀδυσσεύς.

当之无愧 δε στήσας, ἀραρών δομέσθης σταμίνεσι,
ποιεῖ ἀτάρ μακρήσιν ἔπηκενδεσθεὶς τελεύτα.
ἐν δ’ ἑδαφὸς ποιεῖ καὶ ἐπίκριον ἄρμενον αὐτῷ’
πρὸς δ’ ἀρα πηδάλιον ποιήσατο, ὦφρ’ ἱθύνοι.
φάτε θεῖν καὶ μίν βίπτεσθι διαμπέρας οἰσινίαι,
κύματος εἰλαρ ἐμεν’ πολλὴν δ’ ἐπεχεύσατο ὕλην.

(*Od.* 5.243-257)
and he took care of his work quickly. He struck down twenty in all, then trimmed them with the bronze, planed them expertly and made them straight to the line. Meanwhile the goddess divine, Calypso, brought augers, and he bored all of them and fit them to each other, then with pegs and cords pounded it together. As wide as some man well skilled in carpentry would mark off the bottom of a wide freighter, just as wide Odysseus made his raft. Setting up the deck, fitting it to the closely-set ribs, he worked, then finished it with long side planks. He made a mast and yardarm that fit in it, then made a steering oar besides so he could steer. He fenced it in throughout with wickerwork of willow to be a defense against the waves, then piled up much wood for himself.  

(Od.  5.243-257)

Before proceeding with my reading, I will briefly summarize the scholarly discussion of this passage, of Odysseus’ raft, and of his departure from Ogygia. Most agree that Odysseus’ leaving Calypso’s island is a critical turning point and one that signifies a renewal in the hero’s ethos; here, he can be recognized as the vigorous and industrious hero from other epic stories, especially the Iliad. Some of these interpretations are quite fanciful, and thus less harmonious with my reading. Nevertheless the basic idea of the episode as evocative of Odysseus’ re-engagement with his identity and his goal of nostos is relevant.

Holtsmark reads the whole episode of Odysseus’ departure from Ogyia as a metaphor for spiritual rebirth and a return to reality: from leaving the womblike concealment of the island of Calypso, who is, for Holtsmark, like a chthonic deity99, to being cradled by the womb of the sea during his journey and then finally washing ashore on Scheria, naked as a newborn. The building of the raft, then, would represent the moment when Odysseus can once again take charge of his

99 Güntert (1919) 167ff. seems to have been among the first to put forth the reading of Ogygia as an underworld locale and Calypso as a goddess of death. Anderson (1958) agrees that Ogygia is a place of death, but one more akin to Elysium or the Isles of the Blessed, where only a chosen few go after death. Holtsmark (1966) takes this interpretation to a new level with the images of rebirth and the uterine analogies for the sea.
Focusing on the series of similes applied in Book 5 to Odysseus’ departure from Ogygia and maritime journey on the raft, Bergen sees them working together to trace the hero’s psychological and emotional development from that of a helpless baby (fetus, really) through to a independently thinking grown man.\footnote{Bergren (1980) notices a progression in similes, from Odysseus being characterized at first as “a seed enclosed in a thistle, to a seed separated from the chaff, to an independent human rider, to a child whose father near death is restored, to a man who preserves his source of fire” and posits that these similes gradually trace “the internal development of the hero's psyche” (123).} In a meta-poetic reading of the shipbuilding scene, Dougherty equates the act of building the raft with that of composing oral poetry: just as each sense unit is fit together extemporaneously, so does Odysseus deftly cobble together and improvise his raft into creation. Thus the building of the raft symbolizes Odysseus’ newfound poetic voice, with which he will tell his story to the Phaeacians. Ultimately this is another reading of a “new beginning,” as it leads to a reawakening of the hero’s active and adventurous sensibilities that will be highlighted in his retelling of his previous adventures.\footnote{Dougherty (2001) 27-37. As Dougherty summarizes it, the raft “enables both heroic travel and poetic celebration” (37).}

While some of these readings may overreach, they all read the raft and the escape from Ogygia as symbols for the changes in Odysseus’ character—his rebirth, re-engagement, or the reawakening of his active and industrious \textit{ethos} that are on display in the \textit{Iliad} and at the beginning of the \textit{Apologue}. Segal provides the most measured response to the symbol of the raft:

\begin{quote}
Odysseus’ activity in building a raft is thus not only a literal requisite for his physical passage, but also a symbolical re-engagement of his rational faculties and his active temperament that are the psychological pre-requisites for his return, a reassertion of his power to act creatively upon his environment and master it for his own ends.\footnote{Segal (1962) 22.}
\end{quote}

Much like Segal’s, my interpretation of the raft-building scene, to which we now turn, focuses on Odysseus’ re-engagement and reassertion.
In stark contrast to the indolence with which the hero is portrayed upon his introduction to the narrative in Book 5 is the description of his raft-building process, during which Odysseus reasserts his agency. First, the renewal of Odysseus’ active and industrious nature is complemented by the “dynamic description” of the raft, that is, a description in which the object being described is also being made, akin to the passage detailing the shield of Achilles in Iliad 18. The poet also highlights the hero’s re-engagement in fulfilling his goal of nostos through the prevalence of transitive verbs of which Odysseus is the subject. In the two previously examined descriptions of Odysseus at Od. 5.79-84 and Od. 5.149-158, Odysseus is the direct object of the characters’—first Hermes’ and the Calypso’s—gazes (οὐδὲ ἄρ’ Ὀδυσσῆα μεγαλήτορα ἑνδον ἑτέτεμεν… Od.5.81; ἢ δ’ ἐπ’ Ὀδυσσῆα μεγαλήτορα πότνια νύμφη/ ἦ’…Od. 5.149-150). When describing his actions in the following lines, Odysseus is only made the subject of transitive verbs that portray him as fragile and inactive, both physically and psychologically: either he is staring at the sea’s expanse (ἀλλ’ ὁ γ’ ἐπ’ ἀκτῆς κλαίε καθήμενος…Od. 5.82; δάκρυσι καὶ στοναχῇσι καὶ ἀλγεσι θυμὸν ἐρέχθων/ πόντον ἐπ’ ἀτρύγετον δερκέσκετο δάκρυα λείβων… Od. 5.157-158), or crying tears (δάκρυσι καὶ στοναχῇσι καὶ ἀλγεσι θυμὸν ἐρέχθων/πόντον ἐπ’ ἀτρύγετον δερκέσκετο δάκρυα λείβων…Od. 5.83-84; τὸν δ’ ἄρ’ ἐπ’ ἀκτῆς εὑρε καθήμενον’ οὔδε ποτ’ ὀσσε/δακρυόφιν τέρσοντο, κατείβετο δὲ γλυκὺς αἰών’/νόστον ὀδυρομένῳ, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι ἣνδανε νύμφη… Od. 5.151-153), but in either case he does nothing to change his situation. Conversely, after being allowed his freedom and given the raw materials with which to build a raft, Odysseus seems re-engaged in his goal of nostos. He becomes increasingly active both physically and mentally, a state now highlighted by the proliferation of transitive verbs of which he is the subject, and by the adverbs that describe the expertise with which he is completing these tasks. Moreover, the

104 De Jong (2001). For further information on “dynamic description” in Homer and Greek literature, see the introduction of the same work, xiii, n. 13.
verb ποιεῖν appears three times (Od. 5.251, 253, 255) in this short passage, signaling the hero’s renewed productivity. Where just a short while ago he was producing nothing but tears, Odysseus is now expertly crafting a vessel that will bring him closer to his nostos. In working on the raw material for the raft, the poet signals Odysseus’ reassertion of his agency and renewed sense of purpose.

While the raft-building process has positive effects on the hero’s psyche, the finished product also aids in his re-engagement with some of the traits of the more active side of his ethos. Though the makeshift vessel will never replace the society that his fleet provided, it will once again enable Odysseus to negotiate the wild sea, a feat performed by his former, more actively heroic self. Odysseus may not yet be re-integrated into society or normal human social relations, nor will he yet resume his role as a leader, but the raft does allow him to reassume his identity as a sailing/civilizing hero, and to resume his journey towards nostos, however temporarily.

During the course of this chapter, I have shown how Odysseus’ self-characterization in the Apologue constantly shifts on a continuum between an active, assertive, and confident ethos to one that is passive, enduring, and deferential. I devoted particular attention to the theme of the hero’s gradual loss of his ships and crew. These losses constitute a loss of a centre and a meaningful place. Moreover, the hero’s displacement is both effected by and reflective of his more frequent adoption of a relatively passive and enduring ethos. Setting out from Troy with a full fleet under his control and nostos as his goal, Odysseus’ fleet and crew diminish as his travels turn to wandering. In sustaining these losses, the hero begins to take a more passive, enduring approaches to crisis situations. In the Cyclopeia, he oscillates between assertive self-confidence and the passive endurance of suffering. After his escape from Polyphemus’s cave,
where several of his companions are killed, he begins more regularly to occupy a place closer to the passive extreme of the continuum in the *Apologue*. And, when finally his wandering travels come to a temporary—though lengthy—halt on Ogygia, Odysseus stalls in an almost wholly passive and helpless state. For the hero, his time on Ogygia is characterized by mental and physical stagnation; his mind is fixated on his home without any thought of how he will get there, and his body is fixed in one position on the beach, with his eyes trained on the sea in the direction of Ithaca. It is not until Calypso gives Odysseus the material with which to build a sailing vessel that he regains any portion of his former active and industrious *ethos*. But all seems for naught, as Odysseus’s improvised raft is also doomed to wreckage.

To continue with this line of inquiry in Chapter 3, I will investigate the hero’s landing on the Phaeacian island of Scheria and his walking journey to the Phaeacian palace. His new mode of transportation—his feet—is fittingly humble for a castaway. But the journey itself, from the untamed shores to the cultured Phaeacian city, though it begins from a place of helplessness and isolation, is actually indicative of another transition in his overall character his re-engagement with his former, more active personality traits and indeed with the elite Hellenic *ethos* from which he is estranged after the loss of his fleet and crew.
Chapter 3
Odysseus on Foot in Scheria

Chapter 2 interprets the narrative of Odysseus’ loss of his ships and crew in the *Apologue* as the spatial instantiation of a social displacement that brings with it the hero’s tendency towards passivity. In contrast to this narrative of increasing displacement, the present examination of Odysseus’ pedestrian travel in Scheria begins with the hero exhibiting extreme symptoms of his displacement (*aporia*) and concludes with his re-engagement with Hellenic-type places, and consequently the renewal of his human, aristocratic, and heroic identities. The hero’s foot journey is central to this investigation; it is through his pedestrian activity—a journey that at first highlights the degree of Odysseus’ social and spatial displacement—that the hero re-engages with the types of social structures and institutions from which he has been displaced.

As previously discussed, several scholars have identified in the larger narrative of Odysseus’ wanderings—from Troy to the unknown world and back home again—themes of renewal, rebirth, and resumption of identity. Among them, Segal makes the most comprehensive argument: “The return of Odysseus can be regarded as a return to humanity, in its broadest sense; a return to the familiar, man-scale realities of Ithaca but also a renewal of the basic human relations with parents, wife, son, friends and retainers, and country.” The small-scale journey under consideration in this chapter, from the shores of Scheria to the Phaeacian city in Books 5 through 7, revisits the theme of rebirth and renewal in miniature, encapsulated in a larger-scale journey with the same symbolic resonance—a thematic mise-en-abyme. Odysseus begins his stay on the outskirts of the Phaeacian realm and, through several similes, is

---

105 Holtsmark (1966) interprets Odysseus’ landing on Scheria as a type of spiritual rebirth back into “real” life. The whole process begins with his building of the raft and ends with him emerging from the “watery womb” of the ocean onto the Scherian shore. On this theme of rebirth, see also Newton (1984) and Kardulas (2001).
106 Segal (1962) 20.
represented as a wild animal. With his walk to the city, though, he reassumes his cultured aristocratic identity when he is welcomed as a guest-friend among the Phaeacians, and, most importantly, when he identifies himself as the famous Greek hero and recounts his heroic exploits and misadventures. This chapter will focus on the spatial ramifications of Odysseus’ pedestrian journey in Books 6 and 7. The narrative surrounding this journey will be analyzed for thematic details pertinent to the discussion of the hero’s walk.

In Chapters 1 and 2, we examined the spatial significance of Odysseus’ fleet and ships, as well as the symbolic function of that space as a mobile microcosm and centre of Hellenic society. For Odysseus specifically as the leader of the fleet, his ships constitute a mobile Hellenic centre, and indeed a place where he rules as he did in Ithaca. Chapter 2 examines how the gradual destruction of Odysseus’ grand fleet mirrors the hero’s gradual displacement. With each blow dealt to the crew and ships, Odysseus renegotiates his relationship to his surroundings as he himself comes closer to complete displacement (atopia), which finally occurs when his last ship is destroyed after the debacle on Thrinacia. Having lost his ships, Odysseus then washes up onto the no-place island of Ogygia. There he lives for ten years, not at all engaging in the normal place-making activities of environmental and human social interaction within a community. On Ogygia, the hero is for the first time an outsider both spatially, when he reallocates himself to the periphery of the island, and socially. Odysseus is similarly displaced after landing on Scheria; it is to this episode, starting in Book 5, that our discussion now turns.

This chapter will suggest that, much like the symbolic and characterizing functions of the Apologue’s narrative of travel and loss, Odysseus’ pedestrian journey from the shore of Scheria to the Phaeacian city can be read as a symbol of progress and re-integration into cultured human society, and as a re-engagement with his aristocratic and heroic background. While the initial meeting with the Phaeacian princess and the beginning of the walk highlight Odysseus’
displacement after his tumultuous experience on the high seas, the places that Nausicaa creates with her directions, along with those engendered by Odysseus’ somatic experience of the Scherian landscape, aid in the hero’s temporary integration into the Phaeacian society. Since the sophistication and rich culture of Scheria is similar to that of Odysseus’ own Ithacan homeland, the hero begins here to re-engage with Hellenic-type social spaces and relations. This reading of Odysseus’ pedestrian journey will be facilitated by the application of modern spatial theory, as well as an examination of the characters’ non-verbal behaviours and indications of proxemics in the text.

But first I proceed with a brief summary of the episodes with which this chapter is concerned. At the end of Book 5, Odysseus, whose raft is destroyed on the open sea, washes up on Scheria. Night falls and he must seek shelter in a copse. Book 6 begins with the Phaeacian princess Nausicaa being visited in a dream by Athena, disguised as one of the princess’ friends. The goddess suggests that Nausicaa start thinking about her marriage, and that a marriageable girl and her family should have clean clothes to wear. As a result, Nausicaa and her companions go to the shores of the river to do their laundry close to Odysseus’ sleeping place. When the girls break from their chores, Odysseus is awoken by their playful shouting. He supplicates the princess and begs her to show him to the city and to give him clothes. To this she agrees, although she stipulates that she will only accompany the hero to the grove dedicated to the goddess Athena, which lies just outside the city walls, lest any of her countrymen see her with a stranger. Then Nausicaa orders her handmaidens to bathe and clothe Odysseus. Once he is more presentable, she gives him detailed directions about how to proceed after she leaves him at the grove. She also asks the hero to wait for a while as she enters the gates ahead of him, thus avoiding suspicion. Book 6 concludes with Nausicaa giving the hero a lengthy account of the directions to the palace from the gates of the city and, finally, a shorter narrative of the hero’s
journey, accompanied by the princess, through the countryside of Scheria up to the gates. This journey will be the centerpiece of our discussions.

In Book 7, we find the hero exactly where Nausicaa has left him at Athena’s grove. After a prayer to the goddess, the hero decides to leave. The narration of Odysseus’ solitary journey will also be important for our discussion since the path to the palace, first described by Nausicaa, is now focalized through his eyes. At the gates of the city, Odysseus meets what he presumes to be a young Phaeacian girl, not knowing that she is really Athena in disguise. She agrees to lead Odysseus through the city to Alcinous’ palace, having drifted a mist about him so that the Phaeacians would not see him. Book 7 concludes with Odysseus making his way through the palace to the place where the king, Alcinous, and his queen, Arete, are sitting. There he supplicates them and asks them for conveyance home without divulging much about his identity or past until he narrates the Apologue of Books 9 through 13.

We now commence with an examination of the ways in which the text emphasizes Odysseus’ displacement or outsideness in Scheria, not least of which is his continuous association with the animal world. With the hero established as an outsider, both to the Phaeacian way of life and, indeed, to human culture, this chapter then investigates the non-verbal and proxemic aspects of the meeting between Odysseus and Nausicaa, which indicate that she and the hero both perceive him to be inferior to her and an outsider. Nevertheless, through Nausicaa’s detailed directions, which simulate a path to the palace, and Odysseus’ pedestrian journey along that path, the hero is able to interact meaningfully with his surroundings, and eventually to begin placing himself within the Phaeacian society that is much akin to civilized Hellenic culture. Finally, the last section of this chapter will meditate on the spatial progression and centripetal movement of the journey, from the uncultured and wild periphery of Scheria to the refined city centre, and on the ways in which this movement mirrors Odysseus’ ethical
progression from an individual deprived of social interaction (on Ogygia) to one who is gradually reintegrated into a highly structured and polite society. Thus the pedestrian journey, though at first appearing as a reflection of the downtrodden hero’s fortunes, becomes a symbol of progress, reinvigoration, and change.

1 Setting the Scene in Scheria: Odysseus’ Outsideness

Throughout their wanderings, it is clear that Odysseus and his crew do not belong in the exotic places in which they find themselves. Nevertheless, at these times, the hero still has a protected centre and a place—his fleet and his own ships—where he experiences relative “insideness,” however imperfect or temporary. Upon his arrival on Scheria, however, the theme of Odysseus’ outsideness is foregrounded. The spatial and ethical manifestations of this condition are poignant. At the outset of his tenure in the Phaeacian land, Odysseus seems to experience what Casey calls anomie—a lack of social norms and values that often stems from being separated from one’s familiar environment and without a place to go. For Odysseus, the wily hero whose exceptional rationality is one of his defining characteristics, this anomie sometimes entails the privileging of instincts and fulfillment of somatic need over more civilized responses to problematic situations. Consequently his anomie is often illustrated by the narrator’s subtle and sometimes outright equation of the hero with wild animals.

---

107 See Introduction for Relph’s spatial terminology (“insideness” and “outsideness”) used here.
108 See Introduction for Casey’s terminology for placelessness and its symptoms.
109 Though it is the Homeric narrator who orchestrates these associations of Odysseus with the animal kingdom, the hero himself often points out his somatic needs and frequently privileges those needs over matters of social interaction. Cf. Odysseus’ interaction with Alcinous at Od. 7.186ff, where the Phaeacian king Alcinous implies to the court that Odysseus should identify himself. Odysseus, rather than deriving gratification, and perhaps some
First, the poet describes the place where the beleaguered hero chooses to make his bed with the same diction and elements that he uses, especially in Book 19, to describe the haunts of wild boars:

"Ὡς ἄρα οἱ φρονέοντι δοάσατο κέρδιον εἶναι· βή ρ’ ἵμεν εἰς ὕλην· τὴν δὲ σχέδον ύδατος εὑρεν ἐν περιφαινομένῳ. δοιοὺς δ’ ἄρ’ ύπηλυθε βάμνους ἐξ ὁμόθεν περφωτας· ὁ μὲν φυλίης, ὁ δ’ ἐλαίης. τοὺς μὲν ἄρ’ οὔτ’ ἀνέμων διαὶ μένος ὕγρον ἄεντων, οὔτε ποτ’ ἥλιος φαέθων ἀκτίσιν ἔβαλλεν, οὔτ’ ὄμβρος περάσακε διαμπρεσ’ ὡς ἄρα πυκνοὶ ἀλληλοιοίς ἐριν ἐπαμοιβαδίς· οὖς ὑπ’ Ὀδυσσεύς δύσετ’, ἀφαρ δ’ εὐνὴν ἐπαμήσατο χερσὶ φίλῃσιν εὐρεῖαν· φύλλων γὰρ ἔην χύσις ἠὲλίθα πολλή, ὡς τε ἠέλιος φαέθων ἀκτίσιν ἔβαλλεν, οὔτε ποτ’ ὄβρος περάσκε διαπερές· καίκε’ Ὀδυσσεύς δύσετ’. ὧς τε ἠέλιος φαέθων ἀκτίσιν ἔβαλλεν, ὥστε χειμέρηι, εἰ καὶ μάλα περ χαλεπαίνοι. τὴν μὲν ἀρ’ οὔτ’ ἀνέων διάημος ἐπεχεύατο φύλλων.

(Od. 5.474-487).

Upon consideration, this seemed better to him. He made his way to the woods. He found it near the water in a clearing. He went under two bushes growing out of the same place, one a wild olive, one an olive. Neither the strength of wetly blowing wind would blow through them nor would the shining sun ever beat them with its rays, nor would rain penetrate through them, they grew so thickly, intertwined with each other. Odysseus crawled under them. At once he scraped together a bed with his own hands, a wide one, for there was a pile of leaves big enough

esteem, from identifying himself as a well-known Greek warrior, makes clear that the needs of his belly take precedence and asks the king to let him eat and drink in peace (Od. 7.215-225). For further discussions on Odysseus’ emphasis on his belly, see Pucci (1987) 157-164, where the thumos is interpreted as an Iliadic concern, while the gaster is an Odyssean one.

Both Hainsworth (1988) 287 and de Jong (2001) 147 point out similarities between this passage and Od. 19.440-442, which describes the lair of the wild boar that had wounded Odysseus’ thigh when he was a youth. Both passages do indeed show great affinities in detail and diction: lines 5.478-480 are almost repeated verbatim in 19.440-442 (Ἰὸς μὲν ἂρ’ οὖτ’ ἀνέμων διάμ μένος ὕγρον ἄεντων, οὔτε μὲν ἥλιος φαέθων ἀκτίσιν ἔβαλλεν, οὔτ’ ὄμβρος περάσακε διαμπρεσ’), painting nearly identical pictures of a closely woven thicket through which neither wind, sunlight, or rain can penetrate. Nevertheless, the detail about the lair’s composition of wild and cultivated olive, which I will interpret as symbolic of the mingling of Odysseus’ present animalistic tendencies with his cultured heritage, is conspicuously absent in the description of the actual boar’s lair in Book 19.
to shelter either two or three men in wintertime, even if it was very hard. Long-suffering divine Odysseus saw it and was glad, then lay in the middle and heaped a pile of leaves upon himself. (*Od.* 5.474-487)

De Jong comments that the use of the same diction to describe both Odysseus’ sleeping place and the boar’s lair “suggest[s] the dehumanized situation he finds himself in.”\(^{111}\) Furthermore, Odysseus focalizes this rustic setting for his bed with pleasure, furthering the link being made between the hero’s actions and the simple, instinctual behaviour of wild animals (*Od.* 5.486-487).\(^{112}\) Indeed, if the hero was not compelled by such necessity, he may have reacted to sleeping in such a place with less postitivity. A brief spatial reading of this passage may further this line of interpretation.

As discussed in the Introduction to this work, Yi-Fu Tuan describes human place-making activities as those actions performed in order to organize space to fulfill unique biological needs.\(^{113}\) Moreover, the places in which humans dwell are often especially tailored to human biological needs and cultural preferences: a building is the imposition of cultural norms on natural raw materials.\(^{114}\) In this passage, however, Odysseus does not dwell like a human, in Tuan’s terms. The indications of cultural preferences and the modification for human use are prominent in the description of his sleeping place. He simply settles for the first place that seems inhabitable and protective. Instead of modifying this place or building a shelter, he quickly overlooks his human standards and instead adapts to a place that is not really fit for human occupation (though amply suited to a wild boar). Not only is he sleeping under the stars instead

---

\(^{111}\) De Jong 2001 (147).
\(^{112}\) Ibid.
\(^{113}\) See Introduction.
\(^{114}\) Casey (1993) 112 ff speaks of the affinity that buildings and dwellings have with the human body and identity.
of inside a human dwelling, but he is also lying on the ground instead of raised up on from the
ground on a human bed.

In associating Odysseus’ temporary dwelling with that of a wild animal, the Odyssey
narrator is also commenting on the hero himself, for, as many contemporary thinkers posit,
residents not only shape their dwellings but are also shaped by them in turn.115 Thus, the bard
seems to be hinting that the hero has adopted, if only temporarily, the instinct-driven psyche of a
wild beast that seeks simply to satisfy its corporeal desires instead of modifying its surroundings
to suit its purposes more carefully. We must not overlook, however, the tension that the Homeric
bard subtly creates between the animal and human worlds in this simile; though Odysseus lays
himself down in what is, in other contexts, a boar’s lair, the description of Odysseus’ choice of a
sleeping spot belies a human aspect to the process by using verbs of human reasoning (φρονέω,
6.474) and by employing vocabulary denoting manual fabrication (ἐπαµήσατο χερσὶ φίλησιν,
6.482; χέω, 6.487).116 Moreover, the fact that the “bed” is composed of half wild and half
cultivated olive also speaks to this tension, for cultivated olive is a symbol of culture and human
intervention.117 Overall the association of Odysseus’ sleeping place with that of a boar
characterizes the hero as an individual who is exterior to both his former Hellenic community
and the highly cultured Phaeacian society. Nevertheless the diction used by the narrator in this
passage which describes the hero’s choice and rudimentary preparation of the bed, reminds us
that Odysseus’s disengagement with cultured norms does not entail a complete break with them.
This ‘Odysseus as wild animal’ trope is employed again when the poet uses a lion simile to
describe the hero’s initial meeting with the Phaeacian princess, Nausicaa. But before examining

115 Casey (1993) 120.
116 I must credit Victoria Wohl for this interpretation.
117 See Vidal-Naquet (1996) 47-48 for the anomalous nature of the double olive in this passage. He points to
Scheria’s odd position on the border of the human and divine worlds and the combination of characteristics in
Scheria’s landscape that derives from each of these realms.
this trope in greater detail, several more symbolic indications of Odysseus’ placelessness and exteriority ought to be highlighted.

The final simile of Book 5 (488-491) further emphasizes the notion of the hero’s social exteriority, while still recognizing his lingering humanity. The simile associates Odysseus with a man who lives on the margins (ἐσχατιή) of the countryside:

\[
\text{ὡς δ’ ὅτε τις δαλὸν σποδὶ ἑνέκρυψε μελαιῆ ἄγρον ἐπ’ ἔσχατιῆς, ὅπειρα γείτονες ἄλλοι, σπέρμα πυρὸς σώζων, ἵνα μὴ πὸθεν ἄλλοθεν αὐτῷ, ὡς Ὁδυσσεὺς φύλλοισι καλύψατο...}
\]

\[(Od. 5.488-491)\]

As when someone hides a firebrand in a black pile of ashes, on the margins of the countryside with no other neighbors beside him, to save a seed of fire, so not to get a light from somewhere else, so did Odysseus hide himself with leaves.

\[(Od. 5.488-491)\]

Having already compared the hero to a wild boar living outside of human society, the poet reminds us with this simile that Odysseus, although he has been long absent from it, hails from a technologically advanced, cultured civilization. The simile does not compare Odysseus directly to the man who is concerned with conserving his embers. Instead, the poet likens the hero, while he is tucking himself into his bed of leaves, to the ember itself which the marginalized man buries. Fire, and the ability to control and use it, is associated symbolically with human civilization and is seen as a factor in distinguishing civilized beings from savages, even in the Homeric poems. Thus in equating Odysseus with a smoldering spark that is buried for

---

118 In Homeric poetry, this designation of space always means the furthest or the most extreme. Casey (1993) 188 comments, “…we would be mistaken to believe that wilderness has always been an object of veneration—far from it… It was the domain of be-wildered members of the human species such as hermits, mad people, wanderers, and “savages” who threatened to undo the fragile fabric human civilization had begun to weave…”.

119 See Segal (1974), esp. 291-299, for a discussion on how fire and its uses (mainly to cook food) are associated in Greek philosophy and literature with the tameness of human culture.
preservation, the poet implies that although Odysseus’ link to human culture may appear weak, it remains intact. Nevertheless, Odysseus and the man in the simile still seem to have much in common, including the fact that they are both on the margins of human civilization. In the very short narrative since Odysseus’ landing on Scheria, two passages have already intimated our hero’s outsideness and change in characterization—from the socially important leader of a civilized retinue to a marginalized and somewhat savage outsider. Further spatial and proxemic analysis of the subsequent Phaeacian narrative in Books 6 and 7 will document yet another change in the hero’s fortunes.

The beginning of Book 6 reminds the audience of Odysseus’ uncivilized resting place:

"ὡς ὁ μὲν ἐνθα καθεῦδε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς ὑπνῷ καὶ καμάτω ἀρημένος· ("So, long-suffering divine Odysseus slept there/worn out by sleep and exhaustion;" Od. 6.1-2) with the "ὡς” picking back up where Book 5 left off, with Odysseus buried under a pile of leaves, sleeping like the hidden embers of a flame. After this, the audience’s focus is turned to the city, as follows Athena’s journey from the hero’s side to the city centre in order to appear to Nausicaa in a dream:

...αὐτὰρ Ἀθήνη
βῆ ρ ἐς Φαιήκων ἀνδρῶν δήμον τε πόλιν τε
οἳ πρὶν μὲν ποτε ναῖον ἐν εὐρυχόρῳ Ἄγπερεη, ἀγχοῦ Κυκλώπων ἀνδρῶν ὑπερηνορεόντων, οἵ σφεας σινέσκοντο, βήθη δὲ φέρτεροι ἦσαν. ἐνθὲν ἀναστήσας ἀγνούσιδος θεοειδής,
εἰσεν δὲ Σχερίη, ἐκάς ἀνδρῶν ἀλφηστάων, ἀμφὶ δὲ τείχος ἔλασσε πόλει καὶ ἐδείματο οἶκους
καὶ ἐνηὐς ποίησε θεων καὶ ἐδάσσατ’ ἀρούρας.
(Od. 6.2-10)

120 Cf. Rose (1969) 387 who automatically assumes that the man in this simile is a shepherd, though this is not something that is indicated by the text. Rose’s assumption may derive from a longstanding tradition of shepherds cast as outsiders in Greek literature and history. On the figure of the herdsmen in Greek literature and thought, see Gutzwiller (2006), who refers to them as “marginal figures” (1).
121 For buildings as signs of culture, see Casey (1993) 32.
… but Athena came to the district and city of Phaeacian men, who once dwelt in broad Hypereia, close by the Cyclopes, overbearing men, who were stronger and used to harass them violently. Getting them to migrate, godlike Nausithous led them from there and settled them in Scheria far from men who eat bread. He drove a wall around the city, had houses built, made temples of the gods, and parceled out fields. 

(Od. 6.2-10)

With this scene change comes a short *ktisis* myth that lists the foundational deeds of the Phaeacian leader Nausithoos, including his organization of Scheria’s landscape into cultured social spaces and rustic countryside. The jarring effect of the sudden shift in focus, from the rusticity of Odysseus’ bed to the refined splendour of Scheria’s history and monuments, serves to juxtapose the hero’s present uncouthness with the implied sophistication of the Phaeacian institutions and citizens. Moreover, it highlights the great distance between the hero’s present and former social standing. Odysseus is indeed displaced, and his initial meeting with the Phaeacian princess furthers the presentation of his exteriority.

The encounter between the hero and Nausicaa is orchestrated in such a way as to separate the parties and to emphasize the former’s outsideness and the latter’s insideness. Nausicaa, a native of the island, is accompanied by her handmaidens and represents the ruling elite who experience Scheria from the inside both socially as the centre of public affairs and spatially as those who inhabit the palace at the centre of the city. Meanwhile Odysseus, as a foreigner without any local affiliation or social ties, who currently spent the night in haunt of a feral beast in the wilderness on the outskirts of the Phaeacian land, represents the outside. The ‘lion simile’

---

122 See Edwards (1993) 29-30 for the opposition between city and country, and for the cosmogonic qualities of the passage.
of *Od*. 6.130-136, which is used to describe Odysseus as he approaches the royal retinue, recalls the ‘Odysseus as wild animal’ trope at the end of Book 5:

βῆ δ’ ἵμιεν ὡς τε λέων ὀρεινότροφος, ἀλκὶ πεποιθῶς, ὡς τ’ εἰσ’ ὑόμενος καὶ ἀήμενος, ἐν δὲ οἱ ὅσσι δαίεται αὐτάρ ὅ βουοι μετέρχεται ἢ ὅπεσιν ἢ μετ’ ἀγροτέρας ἐλάφους. κέλεται δὲ ἐ γασσήρ μῆλων πειρῆσοντα καὶ ἐς τυκινὸν δόμον ἐλθεῖν. ὡς Ὄδυσσεύς κούροισιν ἐν ὑσσομάλλοις ἠμέλλε μείξεσθαι, γυμνὸς περ ἐὼν’ χρείσον ὀρὲὶ ἱκανε. (*Od*. 6.130-136)

He made his way like a mountain-bred lion, sure in strength, who comes, though rained and blown upon, and in whom eyes blaze. He comes after sheep and cattle or deer in the wild, and his belly commands him to go, even into a fenced sheepfold, to try for sheep and dgoats. So Odysseus was about to mingle with the fair-haired girls, though he was naked, for the need had arrived. (*Od*. 6.130-136)

Our hero is thus cast as a wild, “mountain-bred” lion whose savagery encounters the semi-tamed world of the countryside, that of the flock of sheep. Interestingly, the verb μείξεσθαι (to mingle/mix) is used to describe the lion’s action of going amongst the sheep.124 While Odysseus

123 My own term. Friedrich (1981) 127-128 discusses the lion simile as part of a pair of similes, along with the artist simile of 6.232, both of which contrast images of “raw nature” to those of “civilized life.”

124 Concerning the possible sexual connotation of this verb, see Garvie (1994) 115-117, who notes that the verb is most often used either of “hostile contact in battle” (117) or of sexual activity. Lonsdale (1990) 35, n. 9 proffers the idea that Odysseus’ sexual appetite is “expressed in terms of the lion’s physical appetite.” Glenn (1998) 11, who reads the whole lion simile as evocative of the erotic overtones of the passage, calls the imagery Odysseus’ nakedness, combined with this verb, the only “self-evidently” sexual element in the simile. Dougherty (2001) 133, whose post-colonial reading of the *Odyssey* emphasizes the connection between marriage/sexual violence and colonization, sees in this episode a potential rape scene (akin to that of Persephone’s rape by Hades) that is replaced with the offer of marriage. Odysseus plays the role of the would-be colonizer; his marriage to Nausicaa, like that of Aeneas to Lavinia in the *Aeneid*, would solidify his grasp on the overseas settlement of Scheria. Cf. Karakantza (2003), reads the sexual overtones of the encounter as an allusion to more sinister rape *topoi* of Greek literature. See especially 16-20 where she comments on the typical usage of the lion simile for Homeric warriors and how this martial overtone relates to the violence of Homeric rape scenes: “Significantly enough the language used for rape very often borrows from the language of war: *phthieron* and *diaphthieron* are some of the verbs describing the act of rape; they mean destroy, ravage, despoil in a clearly martial context and the male is always the active agent when sexual intercourse is concerned” (19). Cf. also Doherty (2008), who explains the meeting as a pre-epic type-tale called an “idyll of courtship,” which is defined by the author as an “idealized account of sexual (or potentially...
and the lion represent the wild side of nature, the girls and the sheep represent a degree of culture, since sheep are domesticated animals and the sheep of the simile live in man-made enclosures. So the hero’s “mingling” with the girls may suggest that the encounter is between representatives of wild nature and those of refined culture. Moreover, line 133, which ends with the word γαστὴρ characterizes the motivation for the hero’s infiltration of the girls’ group as the instinctual fulfillment of biological needs rather than a more human desire for social contact or a cultural expectation of hospitality. I suggest here that Odysseus’ outsideness is presented in this simile as a separation from human cultural space and human social relations. This lion simile also reflects a more nuanced reading of Odysseus’ displacement in that it highlights his deviation from his former roles as administrative centre of the Ithacan polis and as authoritative centre of his heroic fleet. Odysseus is “out of place” not merely in a concrete spatial sense, but in social terms as well. A brief examination of the unique usage of the lion simile will reveal that, much like Odysseus, the lion simile is “out of place” compared to its traditional Homeric usage.

Homeric similes that equate heroes with charging lions are usually reserved for the most vigorous and savage warriors. Odysseus, at this point, is anything but; though his appearance may startle Nausicaa and her companions, they pose more of a threat to him than he would to them. There are those who, positing that the Odyssey is the later Homeric epic, explain the use of the lion comparandum as an unthoughtful, almost mechanical choice, carried over from the sexual) encounters between divinely beautiful women and males of superior status and power.” In these tales, the females are usually willing parties to the romantic overtures (63).

125 Fränkel (1921) 69-70.
126 Cook (1999) 158 connects the imagery of the girls’ private play and Odysseus’ intrusion upon it with the story of Actaeon who accidentally intrudes upon Artemis’ bath and pays the penalty with his life. In that episode, too, the females pose a threat to the male. This reading contrasts the many interpretations of the meeting between the princess and the hero as alluding to other rape scenes in Greek literature.
Iliad to describe an advancing hero. Others find the simile to be more deliberate, carefully crafted, and adapted to Odysseus’ situation: like the hero, the lion, which is normally the most noble of creatures, is storm-battered and hungry. Indeed, several interpretations even read the misapplication of the common Homeric lion as a deliberate attempt to lend a “mock-heroic” tone to the episode.

I agree that this simile evokes epic norms before subverting audience expectations with a further description of the lion’s more pathetic characteristics. Indeed the beast even possesses the characteristically Odyssean quality of being plagued by a nagging stomach. While hungry lions are not unusual in a biological sense, Homeric lions that are used as comparanda for heroes are traditionally compelled by their thumoi, or their war-like spirits. Much like the hungry lion, Odysseus is distanced from the typical heroic figure and is driven by somatic need instead of spirited vigour, as he is quick to point out on several occasions. Regardless of its original intentions, the lion simile works both to frame the initial meeting between Odysseus and Nausicaa as one between the representatives of culture and wilderness, and to highlight

127 Fränkel (1921). Nevertheless, even Fränkel himself asserts that similes and narratives often complement each other (105), and that features of the comparison might sometimes disrupt the comparison, having a contrastive effect (106). This similes seems to me to do both; the application of a comparandum usually reserved for heroic figures to the now downtrodden Odysseus seems purposely contrastive to call to attention his misfortune while the particular characteristics of the lion—the fact that it is storm-beaten and urged on by its belly—complements the hero’s situation perfectly.

128 Whitman (1958) 116 and Scott (1974) 90-91 both comment on how the pitiful condition of the lion matches that of Odysseus. Friedrich (1981) 123 explains why the lion motif purposely changes its character: “At this point of the epic action, the poet aims at a precise description of Odysseus’ physical appearance which is both wretched and terrifying: having been exposed helplessly to sea and storm and stripped of all exterior attributes of civilized man, Odysseus has been reduced to the condition of Natural Man and has taken on the appearance of a troll-like figure. To give vivid expression to the terror such a figure evokes in civilized beings, the Odyssey poet has adapted the Iliadic simile of the λέων ὀρεστρόφος in such a way as to form an exactly analogous image to the sight Odysseus in his wretched condition offers to these young girls. In the process the lion motif has changed its character… Viewed in a passive role, the lion is depicted as a plaything of nature's elements and his stomach-just like Odysseus.”

129 Garvie (1994) 115-117 thinks that the incongruity between the traditional use of the lion in heroic poetry and the one that it is put to here constitutes an attempt at pathos-driven humor.

130 Magrath (1982) 207-208 holds that it is the lion’s hunger that makes it such a good representative of the hero’s situation.

131 Pucci (1987), esp. 178-179, 182 goes so far as to suggest that the word gaster cannot be applied to those of high social status. The word thumos, which is a both a synonym and antonym, must be used in relation to the elite instead.
Odysseus’ weakness and need in the situation, thereby distancing him further from the traditional archetype of the Homeric hero.\textsuperscript{132}

2 Nausicaa and Odysseus: Proxemics, Non-verbal Communication and the Pedestrian Journey

Though we have discussed the \textit{Odyssey}-narrator’s program to highlight the hero’s spatial and social outsideness on Scheria, we have not yet considered any of the hero’s social interactions with the Phaeacian natives. In doing so, we will be able to move beyond verbal cues and interpret a greater variety of indicators of the hero’s precarious social situation. This discussion will concentrate on the initial social exchange between Nausicaa and Odysseus, which begins after the lion simile and constitutes the prelude to the hero’s pedestrian journey. It will also include the verbal directions to the palace that the princess gives Odysseus. Their interactions will be analyzed according to theories of what Lateiner (1992) calls “non-verbal behaviors”—“gestures, postures, verboids, and other sounds to convey status, dominance, affect, emotion, and thought”\textsuperscript{133}—that point to the social dynamics between the two. I will also consider spatial relations, or proxemics, which, as explained in the Introduction, are essentially the use of

\textsuperscript{132} See Moulton (1977), esp. Ch. 4, which treats similes in the \textit{Odyssey} and advocates their ability to accurately illustrate the immediate context (126-134). Also helpful is her short section on lion similes at 139-141. More recently, Scott (2009) makes a study of “the variations and modifications to each of the topics that Homer employs [in similes] in order to make similes blend expressively with the larger context” (vii). In this study (42-65) he focuses on the ironic characterization, accomplished in large part by similes, of the Greek forces in Book 2 of the \textit{Iliad}. “Homer’s audience would recognize that the similemes are in most cases the ones used throughout the \textit{Iliad} to describe a strong fighting force. Yet in the individual extended similes the strength possible in each subject is so diminished that the army, which should be ennobled by similes of fire, winds, and birds, seems only to be mocked—the fire is safe, the winds are harmless, and the birds are tame. Although the design of the similes in Book 2 is deeply conditioned by the tradition, the master poet—aware of how effective the concentrated use of poetic background can be in developing the theme—is at every point in control—and the co-creating audience has been prepared to follow his direction” (65). Scott’s hypothesis about the uses of similes for ironic characterization is applicable to the lion simile discussed here.

\textsuperscript{133} Lateiner (1992) 134.
different bodily positions in relation to other human bodies and objects in order to communicate a desired message. For, as Lateiner explains, social rank and personal sentiments can be conveyed in literature through depictions of relative distance and elevation.\(^{134}\)

At the outset of this discussion, it is important to note the deterioration in the hero’s social position; without the outward signs of his identity—his ships and companions, one may not recognize him as a great hero worthy of hospitality, reverence, or even trust. His knowledge of his vulnerability and his doubts about his safety are clear in the narration of his internal deliberations before he crawls out from his thicket and reveals himself to the Phaeacian girls:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ὤ μοι ἐγώ, τέων αὐτή βροτῶν ἐς γαῖαν ἴκανω; } \\
\text{ἡ ρ` οἱ γ` ύβρισταί τε καὶ ἀγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι, } \\
\text{ἡ φιλόξενοι καὶ σφιν νόος ἐστι θεοῦδῆς; } \\
\text{ὡς τε με κουράων ἀμφίλυθε δῆλος ἀὐτή, } \\
\text{Νυμφάων, αἳ ἔχουσι' ὅρεων αἰπεινά κάρηνα } \\
\text{καὶ πηγᾶς ποταμῶν καὶ πίσεα ποιῆσενα· } \\
\text{ἡ νύ που ἀνθρώπων εἰμί σχεδὸν αὐδηέντων. } \\
\text{άλλ` ἀγ` ἐγών αὐτός πειρήσομαι ἢ δε ἰδωμαι.}
\end{align*}
\]

\((Od. 6.119-126)\)

Oh my me, in what mortals' land have I arrived?  
Are they violent, wild, and unjust  
or hospitable and have god-fearing minds?  
How feminine shouts surrounds me, of girls,  
of nymphs, who dwell on mountains' sheer peaks,  
and rivers' headwaters, and grassy meadows.  
Or, am I somewhere close to men of mortal voice?  
But come, I will try to find out for myself.  
\((Od. 6.119-126)\)

The first three lines of this passage mirror the formula that Odysseus used in Book 9.174-176, to declare to his crew that he would venture out to meet Polyphemus, and Book 13.200-202, once he arrives back on Ithaca but does not yet know where he has landed. In both chronologically

\(^{134}\) Ibid.
later instances (Book 6 and Book 13), the hero appears more cautious about the situation, not mentioning anything about testing the locals as he does with reference to the Cyclopes. Moreover, as de Jong notes, he is wary of approaching the locals since, as indicated by the temporal adverb \( \alphaὐτε \) (this time) he has been in this situation before and is debating what he will do now that he finds himself in a similar spot.\(^{135}\) Thus, in this scenario, the hero is not so quick to make the decision to approach, instead contemplating further his choices and the types of individuals that he may encounter—including nymphs who could be dangerous. Nevertheless, as we learn from the lion simile, the hero is in need of assistance and thus decides to reveal himself—but he does so in a very measured way.

Once Odysseus decides to approach Nausicaa and her handmaidens, he purposefully makes several gestures, both verbal and non-verbal, that reinforce his own self-perception as one in need and convey his acknowledgement of his status as an inferior suppliant. First, he prostrates himself taking on the traditional bodily position of a suppliant (\( \gammaουνοῦμαι \; σε, \; ἁνάσσα\ldots \text{Od. 6.149} \)). This constitutes a proxemic display of inferiority. Odysseus carries on with his supplication, verbally highlighting his self-abasement and then continuing with blandishment, likening the girl to Artemis, the maiden goddess of hunting and wild animals, before asking her for aid:\(^{136}\):

\[...	ext{θεός \; νῦ \; τις \; ἢ \; βροτός \; ἔσσι:}
\; εἰ \; μὲν \; τις \; θεός \; ἔσσι, \; τοῖς \; οὐρανοῖς \; εὐρύν \; ἔχουσιν,
\; Ἀρτέμιδι \; σε \; ἐγὼ \; γε, \; Διὸς \; κοῦρη \; μεγάλοιο,
\; εἴδος \; τε \; μέγεθος \; τε \; φυὴν \; τ` \; ἄγχιστα \; ἔίσκω:}
\text{(Od. 6.149-152)}
\[... \text{Are you a god or mortal?}
\text{If you are a god, who holds wide heaven,}
\text{I think you nearest Artemis, great Zeus's daughter,}
\]

\(^{135}\) De Jong (2001) 157-158.

\(^{136}\) De Jong (2001) 159-161 details the ways in which Odysseus’ supplication speech both conforms to and strays from the supplication type scene.
in figure, form, and stature.

(Od. 6.149-152)

Interestingly, the passage also reinforces the hero’s association with a wild animal by combining his prostration before the princess with a comparison of her to Artemis. With Odysseus’ link to the forlorn lion already established, an ancient Greek might picture this downtrodden lion-hero kneeling at the goddess-princess’ feet and be reminded of the common artistic depictions of Artemis as the *potnia theron*, or “Mistress of Beasts.”

In response to the hero’s deference, the princess grants his requests for clothing and an escort into the city. More noteworthy, perhaps, to this project is the imperiousness with which she communicates with the hero. In doing so, Nausicaa tacitly concurs with the hero’s assessment of their social relation and agrees that she is his better. It is to her response that we now shift focus.

Before Odysseus begins his supplication, Nausicaa displays a quiet confidence as she stands her ground in reaction to Odysseus’ fearsome appearance, which causes her maids to flee:

οἴη δ’ Ἀλκινόου θυγάτηρ μένε· τῇ γὰρ Ἀθήνη /θάρσος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε καὶ ἐκ δέος εἵλετο γνίων./στῇ δὲ ἄντα σχομένη·… (“Only Alcinous’ daughter remained, for Athena had put courage in her heart and taken terror f...”

(,”Od. 6.139-141). When his speech is over, Nausicaca replies to him in a manner that de Jong calls “borders on condescending,” especially in her use of the word ταλαπείριος (unhappy) and her insistence about her own superior position as daughter of the ruling family (Od. 6.187-197). Then, as if to distinguish herself from the mere commoners of Phaeacia and to give truth to her claim of high birth, she orders her handmaids to “stand fast” as she has in the presence of this stranger:

στῆτέ μοι ἄμφιπολοι· /πόσε ϕεύγετε ϕῶτα ἰδούσαι; (“Stand with me, handmaids. To where do you flee on seeing a


138 De Jong (2001) 161: “Nausicaa grants the stranger his request out of a sense of duty (193, 207-8), compassion (193: ‘unhappy’, and 206: ’wretched’), and self-esteem (196-7, 200-55), which at this point borders on the condescending (cf. 208, where she puts him in the category of ‘strangers and beggars’).”
man?” *Od. 6.199-200*). Later in the speech, Nausicaa further reinforces that Odysseus poses no threat as she exhorts her maids not to be frightened of the hero, reminding them that the Phaeacians are dear to the gods and that he is just a poor wanderer; instead, they ought to care for him (*Od. 6.206-210*). Throughout her speech accompanied by steadfast action, Nausicaa projects an air of superiority, unintimidated by the hero and safe in her superior social position.

The proxemic analysis of the social negotiation between the two is most revealing after the hero has been bathed and fed, and the girls are ready to head back into the city. Having initially shown Odysseus hospitality, Nausicaa decides how to proceed with his request to lead him to the city. From *6.255-6.315*, Nausicaa explains the path that the hero will take and that she, for propriety’s sake, can only accompany him up to the grove of Athena:

```
ὦρσε δὴ νῦν, ξεῖνε, πόλινδ’ ἵμεν, ὄφρα σε πέμψω πατρός ἔμου πρὸς δώμα δαίμονοι, ἐνθὰ σε φημὶ πάντων Φαείκων εἰδησέμεν, ὅσσοι ἄριστοι.
ἀλλὰ μάλι’ ὅδ’ ἐρδειν’ δοκείς δὲ μοι οὐκ ἀπινύσσειν’ ὥρρ’ ἀν μὲν κ’ ἀγροὺς ἵμεν καὶ ἔργ’ ἀνθρώπων, τόφρα σὺν ἄμφιπολοις μεθ’ ἡμιόνους καὶ ἄμαξαν καρπαλίως ἔρχεσθαι ἕγω δ’ ὀδὸν ἡγεσενοῦς. αὐτάρ ἐπῆν πόλιος ἐπιβήομεν, ἢν πέρι πύργος ψηλός, καλὸς δὲ λιθὴν ἑκάτερθε πόληος, καλὸς δὲ λιθὴν ἑκάτερθε πόληος, λεπτὴ δ’ εἰσίθη καὶ ἐπανείπεσσιν’ ἠδείαν καὶ ἔραται: τὰ ἡμῖν γὰρ ἐπίστιον ἐστὶν ἕκαστῳ.
ξῆνα δὲ τὲ σφ’ ἀγορή καλὸν Ποσιδήϊον ἀμφίς, ῥυτοῖσιν λάεσσι κατωρυχέεσσ’ ἀραρυῖα.
ξῆνα δ’ νηῶν ὥπλα ἑλαινάων ἀλέγουσι, πείσαται καὶ σπείρα, καὶ ἀποξύνουσιν ἔρετα, οὐ γὰρ Φαιήκεσσα μέλει βίους οὐδὲ φαρέταρ, ἀλλ’ ἱστὶ καὶ ἔρετα νεῶν καὶ νῆες έἴσαι, ἢσιν ἄγαλλόμενοι πολίην περοῦσι βάλασαν. τῶν ἀλεείνω ψῆμοι ἀδεικέα, μὴ τὰ ὃπίσω μομεύσῃ’ μάλα δ’ εἰσίν ὑπερφίλαιοι κατὰ δήμουν’ καὶ νῦ τὶς ὃδ’ εἴησθ’ κακότερος ἀντιβολῆς’ τίς δ’ ὅδε Ναυσικά’ ἔπεται καλὸς τε μέγας τε ἕξεινος; ποῦ δὲ μιν ἐῤῥέ; πόσις νῦ οἱ ἔσσεται αὐτῆ’ ἢ τινά που πλαγχέταντα κοιμίασατο ἢς ἀπὸ νηὸς ἀνδρῶν τηλεδαπῶν, ἐπεὶ οὗ τινες ἐγγύθεν εἰσίν’ ἢ τὶς οἱ εὐξαμένῃ πολύρητος θεός ἠλθεν
```
Get up now, stranger, to go to the city, so I can send you to my skilled father's house, where I think you will be seen by all the Phaeacians, all the best. But do it just this way, as you seem to me not without sense. While we are going through men's fields and farms, go quickly with the handmaids, behind the mules and wagon. I will guide the way.
Then when we come to the city, there is a lofty battlement around it, and on either side of the city a fine harbor and a narrow entrance. Double-oared ships are drawn up on the way, for all have a slip for each.
There they have an agora on both sides of a fine Posideum, [an agora] fitted with quarried stones.
There they are concerned over the equipment of black ships and the cables and sails, and they taper the oars.
For neither bow nor quiver matter to Phaeacians, but ships' masts and oars and balanced ships do matter, with which in exultation they traverse the gray sea.
I shun their unkind speech, lest someone censure us hereafter. They are very haughty throughout the district, and one of the crueler, if he met us now by chance, might say so: "Who is this big handsome stranger who follows Nausicaa? Where did she find him? He is sure to be her husband, or perhaps she has rescued one who has wandered from his ship of men who live far off, since there none are nearby.
Or did some god, long prayed to, come down to her from heaven, and will he have her all her days?
It is better, even if she went about herself and found a husband elsewhere, for throughout the district she slights her own Phaeacians, the many good ones who woo her."
So they would say, and these would be censures for me.
I, too, would resent another who did such things, who, while her dear father and mother are alive, against their will mixes with men before she goes to her public wedding.
Stranger, quickly heed my words, so you may very quickly obtain escort and return home from my father.
You will find Athena's splendid grove of poplars near the road. A spring flows in it, with a meadow on both sides.
My father's property and luxuriant garden are there, as far from the city as one who shouts is heard.
Sit there and wait for time for us
to come to the city and reach my father's house.
Then, when you suppose we have arrived at the house, go to the Phaeacians' city then and ask for the house of my great-hearted father Alcinous.
It is easily recognized. Even a foolish child could lead the way, for it is not built at all like theirs, the Phaeacian's houses, such is the house of Alcinous the hero. But when the house and courtyard cover you,
go very quickly through the hall until you reach
my mother, seated in firelight at the hearth,
spinning sea-purple wool, a wonder to behold,
as she leans against a pillar and her slaves sit behind her.
There, leaning on the same, is the throne of my father,
on which he sits and drinks wine like an immortal.
Go past him and throw your hand around our mother's
knees, so you might quickly rejoice to see
your homecoming day, even if you are from very far away.
For if she, in her heart, thinks friendly thoughts for you,
then there is hope for you, that you will see your loved ones
and reach your well-built house and your fatherland.

(Od. 6.255-315)

Just as Odysseus subtly signals his submissiveness to the princess with his prostration upon their
meeting, several of Nausicaa’s verbal commands in this passage instructing Odysseus where and
how to position himself indicate her perceived superiority. These also demonstrate, however, that
she wishes to help this unlucky stranger, primarily by emplacing him in the spaces and social
structures of Scheria. For example, she begins by exhorting the hero to stand upright: ὅρσεο ὃ ἦ

vōv, ξεῖνε… (6.255). Tuan has commented on how the upright bipedal position signifies a truly
human use of space, as opposed to the quadripedal and prostrate position of animals. So the
walking journey begins with Odysseus rising to his feet, a moment of marked contrast to his
portrayal through the lion simile and a non-verbal action which signals his reemergence into
human social relations. This new bodily position represents a significant development from the
crouching that was required to sleep in the thicket at the end of Book 5, or indeed from the

139 Tuan (1977) 37 provides a very clever discussion of the upright, standing position of the human being versus the
prone stance of most animals: “Each day we defy gravity and other natural forces to create and sustain an orderly
human world…The standing posture is assertive, solemn, and aloof. The prone position is submissive signifying the
acceptance of our biological condition. A person assumes his full human stature when he is upright.”
Complimenting this line of argument, Haller (2007) 14 argues that “Odysseus’ changing relation to landscape...
leads him from the most primitive phases of human social existence (seeking shelter in a pile of leaves beneath an
olive on the shore of Scheria) to its pinnacle, embodied by the subordination of the natural world to human aims in
the Gardens of Alcinous. This reenactment of the evolution of human civilization serves as a propaedeutic to
Odysseus’ restoration of civilization on a chaotic Ithaca, and parallels his improving relationship with Athena, the
goddess of civilization par excellence.”
deferential prostration with which he approaches Nausicaa when they first meet. This action does not, however, indicate that Odysseus is now Nausicaa’s social equal. He remains an outsider in Phaeacia and a stranger of dubious background who lacks any identity and is treated as such. Indeed, the simple fact that the princess must command the hero to occupy space as a man should points to her perceived superiority.

Although he stands upright and is elevated to the level of humanity, Odysseus is still not allowed to occupy a higher position than Nausicaa, who is seated in her mule-drawn cart. Thus Nausicaa’s relative power and social superiority continue to be manifested proxemically in the difference in elevation. Odysseus is also relegated to walking behind the wagon. By forcing Odysseus to walk while an alternative mode of transportation is available, Nausicaa implies his social inferiority; walking out of necessity is not the way of the elite, maintains Amato (2004), who has written a monograph on bipedalism and walking throughout history. Perhaps more degrading still is the fact that Odysseus travels in the company of the maidservants, a group that is female, servile, and very unlike his heroic entourage. As de Jong (2001) suggests, despite his progress, Odysseus is still a long way off from regaining his former identity.\footnote{De Jong (2001) 168.}

There is evidence in the Odyssey to support Amato’s suggestion. First, though Nausicaa’s speech does not highlight the hero’s humble mode of transportation—as she instructs him to follow the wagon with the verb ἔρχεσθαι meaning simply “to go,” with the adverbial modifier καρπαλίμως (swiftly)—the short passage of lines 6.316-320, which narrates the part of the journey undertaken together to the grove of Athena, certainly does emphasize the fact that Odysseus travels on foot:

'Ὡς ἄρα φωνήσασ' ἱμασεν μάστιγι φαεινή
ἡμόνους' αἱ δ' ὠκα λίπον ποταμοῖο ῥεέθρα.
ἀἱ δ' εὖ μὲν τρώχων, εὖ δὲ πλίσσοντο πόδεσσιν;
By using words that focus on the foot, the narrator groups the hero in with other humble creatures who walk; only draught animals (ἐπλίσσοντο πόδεσσιν) and maidservants (ἐποίατο πεζοὶ) should go on foot. These references to foot travel recall the words of Nausicaa’s father, Alcinous, who agrees to lend his daughter the wagon because, as he remarks at the beginning of this episode, it is more seemly (κάλλιον) for Nausicaa to ride in a wagon than to rely on her own feet: καὶ δὲ σοί ὧδε αὐτῇ πολὺ κάλλιον ἦ πόδεσσιν/ἐρχεσθαι: πολλὸν γὰρ ἀπὸ πλυνοί εἰσι πόλησ. (“And, going this way is much better for you than on foot, since the washing places are quite far from the city.” Od. 6.39-40). Both of these instances seem to suggest that purposeful travel on foot—not mere walking, but travel—is unsuited to the elite, but is common practice for those of inferior status. Odysseus’ transformation from the sailing hero with a whole fleet at his command to a walking supplicant who is now part of the serving retinue that follows Nausicaa on foot is one of symbolic degradation and increasing social humility resulting from the hero’s cultural displacement.

Nevertheless, this walk also marks a turning point of sorts and begins to symbolize Odysseus’ progress. At his lowest point, he was likened to several wild animals and inhabited places outside of the influence of human culture.¹⁴¹ Now, instead of being forced to struggle for

¹⁴¹ De Jong (2001) 152, 165 comments on the fact that Nausicaa’s decision not to accompany Odysseus into the city subverts the “stranger meets with local inhabitant” story-pattern, which would usually require some sort of
survival on the periphery of Scheria, Odysseus has been invited to the cultured Phaeacian city by one of its elite. Nevertheless before turning to the journey’s centripetal movement—with Odysseus’ return to a cultural “centre,” represented here by the city—we will continue to investigate the characteristics and consequences of Odysseus’ pedestrian travel.

3 Two Feet In/To Fit In: Odysseus’ Experiential and Place-making Journey to the Phaeacian Palace

As previously discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, Odysseus is without a meaningful place after losing his ships on Thrinacia. Then, on Ogygia, he is hidden in a secret no-place by his nymph-lover Calypso. And now, in Scheria, Odysseus has yet to create any meaningful places for himself by interacting with its landscape or peoples. The similes discussed at the beginning of this chapter, along with his preliminary interactions with Nausicaa, all point to the hero’s exteriority in Scherian, and indeed human, society. Still, perpetual displacement is neither desirable nor easy to maintain, especially for one like Odysseus who is so intent on coming home. This section of the chapter will focus on how NausicaaS’s directions to the city present a hodological, or teleological, path (ὀδός; 261), and on how Odysseus’ somatic interaction with the landscape, facilitated by the pedestrian act, lead to the hero’s implacement, albeit temporary, within Scherian society. While the destruction of Odysseus’ ships marks his loss of a mobile centre of escort. Nevertheless, one could argue, as I do, that NausicaaS’s words are indeed an adequate substitute, insofar as they present a path to be followed. 

142 I use the term “hodological” as per Janni (1984), Part 2 (79 ff) whose term, spazio odologico, is put to good use in Purves’ (2010) discussion on hodological versus cartographic representations of space in Herodotus’ Histories (144-150). I find Purves’ use of the term to be the most accurate for the type of movement that is described by NausicaaS’s directions: moving along a path with some stops to look to one side or the other, or straight in front for the purpose of pointing something out. For a discussion of hodological versus cartographic/eusynoptic (bird’s eye) description, see Clay (2011) 14-37. De Jong (2012) 21 would call the structure of the spatial description a mixture
origin, it also opens up other possibilities for implacement, especially in a place like Scheria where society very much resembles that of his Hellenic homeland.

In the “Modern Spatial Theory and Phenomenology” section of this work’s Introduction, I discussed the distinction between space and place and the ways in which non-descript, undifferentiated space can be transformed into meaningful place. For individuals, somatic experience of a locale is key to its placehood. Social groups create place by conducting meaningful social relations and through mutual understanding of the purposes and characteristics of a space. Moreover, Tuan (1991) asserts that space can be endowed with meaning, and become place, through detailed oral or written accounts of the space. And de Certeau (1984) suggests that the path-like or hodological type of spatial organization in narratives portrays a more intimate connection between subject and space, not least due to the clear relation of the body to defining features of the landscape. We will begin this discussion by examining Nausicaa’s directions to the palace for spatial indicators, emphasizing the way in which her narration of the landscape constructs a teleological path and creates meaningful places with which Odysseus might identify. According to the ‘Stranger Meets Local Inhabitant’ type scene, it is Nausicaa’s duty as the stranger’s only guide to accompany the hero into the city and up to the palace. This seems to be the way in which wandering strangers mediate their arrival in new places within Homeric

---

143 De Certeau (1984) 93: “The panorama-city is a ‘theoretical’ (that is, visual) simulacrum, in short a picture, whose condition of possibility is an oblivion and a misunderstanding of practices... The ordinary practitioners of the city live ‘down below,’ below the thresholds at which visibility begins. They walk—an elementary form of this experience of the city; they are walkers...whose bodies follow the thicks and thins of an urban ‘text’ they write out without being able to read it.” See also Maccauley (2000) 10 who says that the key to relative implacement is the relative slowness of walking which “elicits attention to detail.”

144 De Jong (2001) 152, 165 comments on the fact that Nausicaa’s decision not to accompany Odysseus into the city subverts the “stranger meets with local inhabitant” story-pattern, (N.B. that this is De Jong’s own terminology for this category of type scene. Reece would term it a “hospitality type scene) which would usually include some sort of escort. Nevertheless, one could argue, as this paper does, that Nausicaa’s words are indeed, as a path to be followed, a good substitute. For more general information on hospitality type scenes, see Reece (1993).
epic. Though the princess fails to perform her generic duty, the itinerary that she dictates displays her familiarity and engagement with the spaces and places of Scheria and suffices to direct the hero.

The hodological organization of space in the princess’ narrative is immediately evident through the verbs, adverbs, and prepositions that emphasize the teleological movement towards something—in this case, the palace—and the positioning of the traveller’s body in the space. In the very first line of her speech (6.255), Nausicaa uses the verb ἵμεν paired with πόλινδ’ to indicate the teleological movement of both her narration and their path. Other verbs functioning as signifiers of movement through space are plentiful (ἴομεν, 6.259; ἔρχεσθαι, 261; ἠγεμονεύσω, 261; ἐπιβήμεν, 262). Moreover, the refrain composition using the deictic ἔνθα (6.266; 268; 293; 295) to point out landmarks not only gives the impression of the continuity of the path, with the repeated deictic acting as milestones along the road, but also highlights the positions of the landmarks in relation to her own body and, when he follows her directions, that of the hero.

There is also a keen sense of spatial awareness in this passage, highlighted through the use of prepositional phrases such as ἄχι κελεύθου (6.291), ἐν δὲ κρήνη νάει, ἀμφὶ δὲ λειμὼν (292), and ἀστυδὲ ἐλθὼμεν (296), which relate the point at which Odysseus should be on the path to the positions of various landmarks. When Nausicaa does arrive at the goal of her description—that is, the city and her father’s palace—her description becomes more static and fixates very intently on the palace. The telos of the journey is emphasized time and again, with variants on the noun δόμος appearing in prominent positions at the beginning and end (or second to last word) of the hexameters in lines 296 (δὼματα πατρός), 297 (δὼματ’ ἀφὶχθαι), 299 (δὼματα πατρός), and at both the start (δῴματα Φαιήκων) and end (δόμος Ἀλκινόοιο) of line 302. Not only do Nausicaa’s hodological directions indicate her experiential familiarity with
the Scherian landscape, but by describing the path in the order that Odysseus will experience it, Nausicaa facilitates the hero’s orientation in this new land and thereby his place-making ability.

Beyond this, these directions also help the hero to mediate the unfamiliar spaces of the new land and to engage with them in such a way as for Odysseus to start building place. Once she has facilitated Odysseus’ organization of space using somatic reference points, Nausicaa proceeds to endow the space with meaning by recounting important stories about certain landmarks and by relating these stories to his Greek cultural sensibility. For example, Odysseus is told that the harbour is of utmost importance because the Phaeacians are master ship builders (6.268-272) and do not engage in hunting or war, as evidenced by their lack of care for the bow and arrow. Nausicaa also relates details to Odysseus in terms that are culturally familiar. For example, she not only describes the meeting place of the Phaeacian heroes in terms of a Greek agora (6.266-267), but also mentions that it is walled in with a sacred precinct to the Greek god Poseidon. This allows Odysseus to associate places that are significant to the Phaeacians with Greek civic and religious sites, and would further enhance his familiarity with the landscape.\(^\text{145}\)

When the external narrator finally describes in Book 7 (14 ff.) Odysseus traversing the very path described by Nausicaa in Book 6, the princess’ directions are recalled with direct allusions to her speech in the very first line of this passage: καὶ τότ’ Ὀδυσσεὺς ὠρτο πόλινδ’ ἵμεν· (7.14). The verb ὀρνυσθαι echoes the very first word of Nausicaa’s instructions (ὀρσεο νῦν, ὥξεῖν, πόλινδ’ ἵμεν; 6.255), and calls attention to the fact that Odysseus, by standing up

\(^{145}\) Edwards (1993) 36-37 notes that Nausicaa describes the city as having all the features—its walls, harbour, temple, and meeting place—that a city normally has and with which it symbolizes its “power and preeminence.” Dougherty (2001) 103 comments on how Nausicaa’s description of the Phaeacian city sounds like that of an early Greek city and would be a source of familiarity for the Greek Odysseus. Haller (2007) 146 asserts that Scheria and the Phaeacians represent a midpoint between the human and the divine. The Phaeacians live apart from other mortals and also hold council with the gods but, on the other hand, the features of their city (walls, temple, meeting place and farmer’s fields at distance) reflect a very human way of life: “While inconsistent, the portrait of the Phaeacians arguably achieves the end of placing Odysseus in a place neither human nor divine, neither Greek nor foreign, but a transitional space, where he may reestablish himself as a mortal subordinate, rather than an artificially immortalized equal, to Athena before proceeding on to Ithaca.”
and positioning his body in the temporary place that Nausicaa has created for him, has assumed a more active role and is no longer a passive subject to the landscape. Directly following this allusion comes another in the form of the combination πόλινδ’ ἵμεν (7.14), reminding the audience of Odysseus’ destination as prescribed by Nausicaa (πόλινδ’ ἵμεν; 6.255). Finally, at line 7.43, we are made privy to a description of the path focalized through Odysseus: θαύμαζεν δ’ Ὀδυσσέως λιμένας καὶ νῆας ἔσας, /αὐτῶν θ’ ἱρώον ἀγορᾶς καὶ τείχεα μακρά / ὑψηλά, σκολόπεσσιν ἀρηρότα, θαύμα ἱδέσθαι. (“Odysseus marveled at the trim ships and the harbors/ the assembly places of the heroes themselves, and the long/ lofty walls, fitted with palisades, a wonder to behold.” Od. 7.43-45). With the idea of the wonder produced by the sights surrounding him both introducing and closing the hero’s focalization of the path, the epic audience almost experiences its own amazement, moderated through Odysseus’. Moreover, the experiential element of the path is also emphasized through the emphasis on the hero’s visual engagement with his surroundings.\(^{146}\) And although it is much shorter and less detailed than Nausicaa’s, certain words and phrases recall her description so vividly that Odysseus’ focalization of the path elides with hers. Among other less direct allusions, attention should be paid specifically to the νῆας ἔσας (7.43), which corresponds to line 6.271 of Nausicaa’s speech, and the ήρώων ἀγορᾶ (7.44), which recalls line 266 (ἔνθα δὲ τέ σφ’ ἀγορὴ καλὸν Ποσιδήϊον ἑμφίς). This elision allows the audience to infer that Odysseus makes the exact same journey

\(^{146}\) See Chapter 1 of Prier (1989) for an intriguing discussion on the relationship between thought and external phenomena in Homer and archaic Greek literature. In this chapter, Prier distinguishes between verbs such as dokein, which describe the gazes of the observer that are projected outward in response to phenomena, and those such as phainesthai that denote the perception projected outward from external phenomena towards the perceiver. Interestingly, the verbs thaumazein and the various combinations of terms denoting sight and wonder indicate “place[s] of intermediation,” or instances of two-way dialogue between outward projection from the observer and that of the phenomenon (68-117). So, in using these verbs of wonder here, we observe the Scherian environment working on Odysseus just as much as he is acting on it when viewing it through the lens coloured by his own experiences. Cf. Nightengale (2001) 44-45 who points out that in the Homeric corpus, the phrase “θαύμα ἱδέσθαι” characterizes visual responses that are “not only cognitive but affective, intellectual and emotional” (44) and that the expression denotes an experience that includes “a feeling of reverence for looking at something divine but also familiar” (45).
Nausicaa has described. Her words are turned into the road, and the old connection between speech/song and the walking of a path is redrawn. Consequently, Odysseus is prepared with places already made for him, even though he has not yet experienced the landscape somatically. Thus, on his walk, familiarity with the locale takes the form of not only the somatic presence in the space, but also of socio-historical knowledge of the created places.

4 Nature and Culture, Periphery and Centre, Outsideness and Insideness: The Ramifications of Odysseus’ Centripetal Movement

This chapter has, thus far, focused on Odysseus’ outsideness at the beginning of his stay on Scheria and his subsequent walk to the Phaeacian palace, during which both Nausicaa’s directions and his somatic experience of the landscape assist him in creating meaningful places. In turn, Odysseus seems to recognize Scheria as a place similar to his Hellenic homeland. In this final section we make a study of the centripetal movement of the pedestrian journey, from the periphery of the occupied Phaeacian land (the wilderness) to its political and administrative centre (the city). Here we will investigate the types of landscape through which the hero passes. It will be shown that, mirroring the transition of landscape from the untamed and natural to the structured and manmade is the transformation of the hero’s ethos, from association with uncultured wild beasts to the resumption of his cultured, aristocratic, and heroic identity. Thus, the centripetal movement of the walking journey on Scheria is key to the interpretation of Odysseus’ journey as a process of re-integration and re-engagement with his former identity. In

---

147 See Ford (1992) 42, n. 48 on the “path of song” and the etymology of the word, which is often used as a “quasi-technical” name for the ways in which Homeric poets are said to follow the paths that the Muses lay for them.
order to illustrate this, we proceed with an examination of the key spaces and places described in
the narrative before, during, and subsequent to Odysseus’ pedestrian journey to the Phaeacian
palace and Odysseus’ interaction with them.

As I have already established, the Scherian episode begins by emphasizing Odysseus’
exteriority to Phaeacian and human culture, with the description of the hero’s rustic bed
employing the same diction as that used to describe a boar’s lair earlier in the Odyssey (Od.
5.474-485). This places him squarely in the realm of the beasts. Nevertheless, like the hero’s
dwindling but still-present humanity, this resting place is also infused with signs of human
culture and civilization, being composed partially of cultivated olive.148

From this starting point, Odysseus sets out toward the city. The narrator does not mention
the countryside of Scheria in the short passage that describes Odysseus’ journey, accompanied
by Nausicaa, from the riverbank to the Grove of Athena (Od. 6.316-323).149 Nevertheless, the
princess, in her detailed directions before the walk, does briefly make note of the countryside
through which they will be passing together: ὡφρ’ ἀν μέν κ’ ἄγροῡς ἵοµεν καὶ ἕργ’ ἄνθρωπων,
/τόφρα σύν ἀμφιπόλοισι μεθ’ ἱµίονους καὶ ἀμαξαν / καρπαλίως ἔρχεσθαι:
ἐγὼ δ’ ὀδὸν ἰγεµονεύσω. (“While we're going through men's fields and farms,/ go quickly
with the handmaids, behind the mules/ and wagon. I will guide the way.” Od. 6.259-261).
Significantly, her mention of the practice of cultivation, so often symbol of a civilized culture,
would necessarily indicate to the audience, and to Odysseus himself, that he has arrived in a
nation that is unlike many of the other exotic places in which he had landed. Instead, he is in the

148 See above in Chapter 3.
149 Edwards (1993) maintains that Homer’s concentration on the warrior elite and the place they inhabit (the city) is
part of the ethics of Homeric epic and that the second half of the Odyssey reverses this “ethical geography” in its
focus on the countryside as the locus of piety and morality.
land of a highly civilized people. Moreover, with this phrase the princess’ directions highlight the fact that the hero will quit the disorganization and untamed nature of the wilderness in favour of a landscape that has been brought under human control and is subject to human modification. Still, neither Nausicaa nor the external narrator pays much attention to the Phaeacian countryside. The next important stop made along the route is that at the sacred grove of Athena, where the hero rests and prays to his patron goddess while Nausicaa continues on to the city alone.

The grove of Athena is a place of transition. It marks the point, both in Nausicaa’s directions and in the narrative of her journey with the hero, at which their mutual path comes to an end (Od. 6.291-294; Od. 6. 321-322). Moreover, the grove, separated from all surrounding landscape (τέµενος; 6.293), marks the midpoint in the spatial transition from the countryside to the cultured, political space of the city. As a liminal place, it displays qualities from both nature and civilization; it is a purposely cultivated sanctuary where both wild and domesticated trees are grown, but outside the political space of the city. Furthermore, while this grove is dedicated to Athena, the goddess of cities (who is usually an intra-mural deity), it lies outside the walls and is thus divided from the city itself.

Here, Odysseus sits down, rests for a while, and prays to his patron goddess for success among the Phaeacians. For the first time since he left Troy, Athena hearkens to Odysseus’ call,

---

150 Vidal-Naquet (1996) shows how agricultural pursuits are connected with religious sacrifice and thereby with human civilization. He contrasts the absence of agriculture and sacrifice in the “mythical world” with the presence of those practices in the contemporary “real world.” Cf. Burgess (2014) (a).

151 De Polignac (1995) 36: “The sanctuary, the place where two worlds meet, is accordingly seen as the stable point where a controlled passage from the one to the other is possible.” It must be noted, however, that de Polignac must not be referring to his own interpretation of Homeric sanctuaries, since he asserts that Homeric cult sites are spatially indeterminate and that it is not until the 8th century that Greek cult sites start to be thought of as distinct from the dominating landscape. Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1993), esp. 1-2, where she directly opposes de Polignac’s claims of spatial indeterminacy in Homeric cult sites. Also helpful for interpreting the transition in landscape is Haller (2007), esp. 117 ff.: “Athena’s grove is … a second step on Odysseus’ journey from natural to political space” (149). Haller thus makes a similar, though brief, observation as the present study with respect to Odysseus’ spatial transition from periphery to centre.

though she does not yet show herself to him (Od. 6.328-331). De Polignac (1995) asserts that Greek religious sanctuaries controlled the movement between one world and another and that, in passing through a sanctuary, one’s “otherness” could be rehabilitated. Here, with his connection to Athena re-established, Odysseus has also renewed his relationship with his highly cultured, elite ethos and can now pass unhindered into the civilized realm of the city.

The final stage of the journey takes place with Athena, in the disguise of a young Phaeacian serving girl, leading the hero from her own grove to the palace. Once in the city, Odysseus marvels at the sights. At Book 7, lines 43-45, we are made privy to a description of the path through Odysseus’ eyes: θαύμαξεν δ’ Ὄδυσσεως λιμένας καὶ νῆας ἐίσας/αὐτῶν θ’ ἕρωων ἄγοράς καὶ τείχεα μακρά,/ ὑψηλά, σκολόπεσσιν ἀρηρότα, θαῦμα ιδέσθαι. (“Odysseus marveled at the trim ships and the harbors,/the assembly places of the heroes themselves, and the long/lofty walls, joined by palisades, a wonder to behold.” Od. 7.43-45). The first two features of the landscape that garner his attention are the ships at rest in the harbour and the marketplace, which serves as a meeting spot for the Phaeacian heroes. Both of these cultural features—the use of sailing vessels and social institutions, along with the cultivation of crops—are ones that Odysseus points to in his Apologue as lacking in the comparatively savage Cyclopean society (Od. 9.105-141). High walls, too, like the ones that Odysseus focalizes on Scheria’s citadel, are noted symbols of advanced human technology and civilization. Thus, Odysseus’ observation of the landscape serves to highlight the Phaeacian use of human “τέχνη”

---


154 Byre (1994) 366 compares Odysseus’ description of the potential displayed by Goat Island for human settlement to the description of Scheria: “The Goat Island that Odysseus envisages, implied beneath the negatives and potential optatives is much like Scheria; a land with all of the advantages of nature whose potential can be brought to realization by the work of man.”

155 Edwards (1993) 36-37 points out the details of the urban landscape of Scheria, which “typify the city and express its power and pre-eminence” (36). These features include “…the wall; the port, associated through ships with τέχνη; the ἀγορή, connoting justice and the legal and moral power of the city; the stone temples of the Olympian gods; and the stone houses of the nobles, especially the kings” (37).
and their proclivity for civic interaction, and thereby casts their society as a highly civilized one. Finally, Odysseus’ wonderment at these sights (θαύμαζεν, 7.43; θαύμα ἵδεσθαι, 7.45) should be viewed in contrast to the pleasure with which he focalized his rustic bed at the end of Book 5. This is a sure sign of Odysseus’ transition from the uncultured periphery to the civilized centre not only in a physical sense, but also psychologically.

Echoing the culture of the city is the palace of Alcinous, which stands as a tangible testament to the communion of human and divine τέχνη. Indeed, both divine and human skills are on display in Odysseus’ focalization of the Phaeacian leader’s abode:

...αὐτάρ 'Οδυσσεύς
Ἀλκινόου πρός δῶματ᾽ ἵε κλυτά· πολλά δὲ ὁ κήρ ὄρμαιν’ ἤσταμένῳ, πρὶν χάλκεον οὐδόν ἰκέσθαι.
ὡς τε γὰρ ἰδέοις ἀγάλη πέλεν ἥε σελήνης
dῶμα καθ’ ὑπερφερέσι μεγαλίττορος Ἀλκινόοιο.
χάλκεοι μὲν γὰρ τοῖχοι ἐληλέατ’ ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα,
ἐς μυχὸν ἐς οὖδοῦ, περὶ δὲ θριγκὸς κυάνιος·
χρύσεα δὲ τίμια τοῖχοι οὐδῷ ἐς τὸν τόπον ἐς ὑπερθύριον,
χρυσέη δὲ κορώνη.
χρυσείοι δὲ ἑκάτερθε καὶ ἀργύρεοι κύνες ἦσαν,
οὗς Ἡφαῖστος τεῦξεν ὑδυίῃσι πραπίδεσσι
dῶμα φυλασσέμεναι μεγαλίττορος Ἀλκινόοιο,
ἀθανάτους ὑπάρχοντας καὶ ἀγήρως ἤματα πάντα.
ἐν δὲ τούτοις πρὶν τοῖχον ἐπηκόλληθαν ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα
ἐς μυχὸν ἐς οὖδοῖο διαμετερόταες,
ἐνθα’ ἐνὶ πεπλῶι λεπτοὶ ἐφήνητοι βεβλήατο,
ἐργα γυναικῶν.
ἐνθα’ ἐδ Φαιήκου ἡγήτορες ἐδριώνυτο
tίνοντες καὶ ἐδουντες’ ἐπητεσανόν γὰρ ἐχεσκον
χρύσειοι δὲ ἅρα κοῦροι εὐδημήτων ἐπὶ βωμῶν
estaαν αἰδομένας δαιδας μετά χεριῶν ἐχοντες,
φαίνοντες νύκτας κατὰ δῶματα δαιμονώντες.
πεντήκοντα δὲ ὁ δῶμα κατὰ δῶμα γυναίκες
αἱ μὲν ἀλτερεύουσι μύλῃς’ ἐπὶ μῆλοπα καρπῶν,
αἱ δ’ ἱστῶν κατὰ κατὰ στρωμοὺς
ἐνυννητοι βεβλήδοτο, ὑργα γυναικῶν.

'Ενθα’ ἐδ Φαιήκους ἦγητορες ἐδριώνυτο
tίνοντες καὶ ἐδουντες’ ἐπητεσανόν γὰρ ἐχεσκον
χρύσειοι δὲ ἅρα κοῦροι εὐδημήτων ἐπὶ βωμῶν
estaαν αἰδομένας δαιδας μετά χεριῶν ἐχοντες,
But Odysseus went toward the splendid house of Alcinous. His heart pondered much as he stood there before reaching the bronze threshold, for there was a radiance, as of the sun or moon, throughout great-hearted Alcinous' high-roofed house. For walls of bronze had been driven here and there, from the threshold to the inner room, with a cyan coping about it. Golden doors kept the strongly-built house closed. Silver doorposts stood on the bronze threshold, a silver lintel upon them, and the door handle was of gold. There were dogs of gold and silver on each side, that Hephaestus had fashioned with expert ingenuity to guard the house of great-hearted Alcinous, that were ageless and immortal all their days. Inside, chairs were pressed against the wall, here and there, from the threshold straight through to the inner room. Delicate, well-woven cloths, works of women, had been thrown upon them. Phaeacian leaders sat there eating and drinking, for they had endless abundance. Boys of gold stood on well-shaped pedestals, holding burning torches in their hands, lighting nights throughout the house for diners. Throughout the house he had fifty slave women, some at the mill, who grind grain of apple color, others, who weave webs and spin yarn, sitting, like leaves of a tall poplar, as liquid olive oil trickles from the close-woven linen. Just as Phaeacians are skilled beyond all men in driving a swift ship on the sea, so are their women in weaving at the loom, for Athena granted them, beyond others, skill in making gorgeous works and good dispositions.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁶ See Cook (2004) for the Near Eastern influences on the description of Alcinous' palace. Cook suggests that elements of Assyrian palatial architecture are present in the depiction.
narrator is careful to mention the divine elements, such as the precious-metal dogs, made by Hephaestus, flanking the entryway. Following the description of the exterior of the palace is the interior spatial tour, an order which defies logic given that Odysseus could not possibly see both the inside and outside at once. Nevertheless, this description allows the audience to be borne over the threshold of the dwelling before the hero actually enters. Inside is a world replete with the products and activities of human social interaction and technological ingenuity: the fine-spun cloths that cover the thrones and chairs are the work of Phaeacian women (7.95-97); upon these chairs the leaders of the city sit and feast (7.98-102); and the serving women in the house either grind grain, a product of their agricultural pursuits, or weave, or press olive oil (7.103-108). Each one of these pass-times displays some sort of human technology or skill. Taken together with the impeccably kept orchard next to the palace, this vignette characterizes the interior of the palace as a highly civilized human space tinged with divine benefaction.157

From wilderness to countryside to city (by way of a religious sanctuary) and finally to the Phaeacian palace, the hero passes through a range of landscapes that complement his changing ethos. It is at the telos of this journey, in the highly cultured Phaeacian city and indeed the interior of the palace—the centre of the civilized centre—that Odysseus begins to recover his former ethos again. Being invited into Alcinous’ palace and accepting the hospitality provided (a very Greek concept) allows Odysseus to be adopted back into polite society and to reconnect with Hellenic-type social institutions.158 In fact, his social reinstatement manifests itself proxemically. Once he has satisfied Queen Arete and King Alcinous with his supplication, they

158 De Jong (2001) 150 states that the Phaeacians play an important role in the hero’s regaining of his “heroic identity,” especially because it is here that he is reminded of his heroic past through the songs of the Phaeacian bard Demodocus (Od. 8.73-82; 499-520), through his participation in the athletic games, and through his narration of his past adventures.
raise him from the prostrate stance of a suppliant to a position of equality on a chair, one that had
previously been occupied by one of their sons (Od. 7.167-171).

Finally, the Homeric poet playfully acknowledges Odysseus’ present reintegration into a
highly cultured human society when, at the end of Book 7, Queen Arete offers him a bed in the
palace. Indeed, this can be viewed as a thematic ring-composition. Odysseus is woken in his
makeshift rustic bed on the periphery of Scheria by Nausicaa and her friends; the princess tells
him to rise and conducts him to the palace ("Ὀρσεο δὴ νῦν, ἕξειν, πόλινδ’ ἵμεν…Od. 6. 255);
there, after he has dined, Arete commands him to rise ("Ὀρσο κέων, ὦ ἕξειν· πεποίηται δὲ τοι
εὐνή. Od.7.342); and she then shows him to his proper bed, this time in the cultured centre.

With Odysseus accepted as a guest-friend of the cultured Phaeacians, we get a better
sense of the symbolic function of the centripetal walking journey on Scheria. It has been key to
the interpretation of Odysseus’ journey as a symbol of re-integration and re-engagement with his
former identity, for it is among the Phaeacians that Odysseus recounts his former adventures and
deeds and thereby reaffirms his aristocratic and heroic status. From the outskirts of Scheria,
where Odysseus experiences the anomie effected by his displacement, he travels inwards
towards the cultured centre of the Phaeacians. During his meeting with Nausicaa, and at the
beginning of the foot journey, Odysseus is the epitome of the enduring hero, tolerating many
insults to his station from the unknowing princess. However, using phenomenological
observation, we witness the hero experiencing Scheria’s landscape and re-engaging with the
physical monuments of the highly civilized culture. His somatic experience of the terrain is key
to this re-engagement. When finally he arrives at the elite Phaeacian centre, we can track
Odysseus’ rise to elite status with proxemic observations; indeed, after prostrating himself in
front of Nausicaa (Od. 6.149) and, upon his arrival at the palace, her mother Arete (Od. 7.142-
143), Odysseus is raised up and given a seat of honour by Alcinous himself (Od. 7.167-171). During his stay among the Phaeacians, Odysseus participates in elite and Hellenic-type pursuits like the athletic games held in his honour in Book 8 (186-233). After these new interactions with elite practices and institutions that harken to those of his past, Odysseus is finally ready to reengage with his Hellenic, elite, and heroic ethos and identity by telling the tale of his adventures after leaving Troy in the Apologue.
Chapter 4
Odysseus on Foot on Ithaca

Chapter 4 analyzes the narrative, contained in *Odyssey* 17, of Odysseus’ pedestrian journey on his home island of Ithaca. More specifically, this chapter interprets the journey in Book 17 with special reference back to Odysseus’ prior pedestrianism in Scheria. The Scherian walk displays significant anticipatory correspondences to this Ithacan journey; the correspondences between the two pedestrian narratives, as well as their differences, will be highlighted throughout my analysis.

Many scholars note and discuss the important parallels between the Scherian episode (Books 6 through 8) and that of the hero’s disguised return to Ithaca (Books 13 and following).\(^{159}\) My approach differs in several ways, but, most importantly, it foregrounds the narratives of Odysseus’ pedestrian journeys within the two broader episodes. And, as with my discussion of the hero’s Phaeacian walk, this examination is especially concerned with the spatiality of the pedestrian journey that Odysseus undertakes, while in beggar’s disguise, to his own palace. The pedestrian journey in Book 17, I argue, can be interpreted as a non-verbal performance of the exteriority represented in Odysseus’ disguise as a beggar.

When he arrives back in Ithaca, Odysseus uses lying tales to encourage people to accept him as a beggar and thus to overlook and underestimate him, leaving him free to assess the situation undisturbed and to test his family and household while incognito. These lying tales capitalize on the trickster hero’s celebrated capacity for verbal performance.\(^{160}\) The verbal

---


\(^{160}\) See Pratt (1993) 55ff (Chapter 1) for a good discussion of Odysseus’s connections with the trickster figure Hermes, and the positive associations drawn between poets and trickster figures like Odysseus in the *Odyssey* and the *Hymn to Hermes*. For further discussion specifically on the lying tales told by Odysseus in Books 13ff, see Trahman (1952), Haft (1984), Emlyn-Jones (1986), and King (1999).
communication (direct speech) of characters is easily and explicitly transmitted in narrative. But there is also another layer to Odysseus’ performance of the beggar role that relies heavily on body language and use of spatial relations (proxemics).\footnote{See the Introduction above for the definition of “proxemics.”} These textual elements are often overlooked. As previously mentioned in the Introduction, the literary study of non-verbal behaviours (including proxemics), as advocated by Lateiner, can help to shed new light on works of all types. Lateiner also suggests that Odysseus is a master at manipulating his body and the space around him to convey messages. I argue below that in the pedestrian journey of Book 17, Odysseus manipulates his body and space to enhance and highlight the humility and exteriority of his beggar’s disguise.\footnote{Lateiner (1992) 137 provides inspiration for my reading of the pedestrian journey: “The Odyssey deploys space and the control of delimited territory as a semiotic code that shapes its plot. Every reader marks the excluded hero’s disguised approach and entry into his own perimeter, yard and marital space. His false outerness (physical appearance, object-adaptors, assumed role, “perches”) enables him to achieve physical innerness but step-by-step, slowly, by stages, first enduring and overcoming self-appointed gate-keepers like the goatherd Melanthios and the officially sanctioned parasite, Iros. He searches for an appropriate entrée and an appropriate location and social niche to occupy.”} This chapter considers how Odysseus positions himself in relation to others and what these bodily positions signal, and how the hero engages with his Ithacan surroundings. These lines of inquiry will apply modern spatial and phenomenological ideas to the narrative of Odysseus’ pedestrian journey on Ithaca and to the relevant episodes both leading up to and following it.

This chapter also relies heavily on narratological analysis. As with Chapter 3, the narrative details surrounding the focalization of space and the standpoint of the viewer of scenery are important. In the present chapter, I also consider the main narrator’s role in the narrative development. Narratological analysis explains that all narrative can be variously motivated by characters and by the main narrator. When assessing actorial motivation, we analyze “...the ‘why’ of the story in terms of the aims and intentions of a character. An actorial motivation is
Narratorial motivation, on the other hand, is “…the ‘why’ of the story in terms of the aims and intentions of the narrator.” We see both types of motivation at work in the narrative of Book 17’s pedestrian journey. At one level are the hero’s actions. The motivations behind Odysseus’ actions are explicit: he must put on a performance to avoid recognition. His actions are intended for reception by other characters. On another level is the narrator’s recounting of the hero’s actions. The narrator makes certain choices to give voice to or be silent about certain elements of the plot, or to highlight some elements of the story but downplay others. These choices affect the ways in which the audience of the epic perceives the characters’ actions. Interestingly, the narrator’s telling of Odysseus’ final pedestrian journey in the *Odyssey* acts as a complement to the hero’s performance, strengthening the audiences’ perception of the hero’s necessity for and achievement of outsideness within his own community.

A striking example of the narrator’s complementing of Odysseus’ performance, which will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter, occurs when the hero arrives at the Ithacan water well. Scenery description in Homeric epic is usually brief and most often occurs only when necessary for the plot. And since the well is a culturally and historically significant Ithacan site, akin to the sites of cultural significance in Scheria, it offers the possibility for re-engaging with the landscape of his origin. Indeed, the reader expects that the hero’s rediscovery and re-engagement with the Ithacan *locus amoenus* is the purpose for the detailed scenery description.

165 De Jong (2001) xvii: “…in Homer scenery is never described systematically for its own sake; rather, we find descriptions or brief references when the story needs them.” She explains that the description of this tranquil setting serves to contrast the aggression of Melanthius’ confrontation of Odysseus. The shrine to the nymphs also serves as the physical instantiation of the deities to whom Eumaeus will pray for Odysseus’ return and Melanthius’ punishment (419). While I see other, and perhaps more pertinent, reasons for this scenery description (enumerated below) these are two relevant observations. Steiner (2010) 102-103 follows de Jong in highlighting the contrast between the peaceful scenery and the violent behaviour of the goatherd. She also makes connections between this *locus amoenus* and the description of Calypso’s cave, Alcinous’ gardens, and the Grove of Athena on Scheria (103).
Nevertheless the hero does not “leak” any engagement with his Ithacan surroundings nor does the narrator make mention of any such outward indication of emotion or familiarity. Thus it seems that, at face value, the scenery has no real function within the plot. The well and the *locus amoenus* are overlooked. But it is precisely the fact that the hero ignores these Ithacan landmarks that makes this detailed description integral to the plot. The narrator presents us with the description of the culturally significant water well in order to emphasize the point that the place-making potential of the site will not be realized because of the hero’s dedication to the performance of his exteriority. This is but one of many examples studied in this chapter in which the narrative complements the hero’s performance of exteriority. Indeed, one could say from a narratological point of view that actorial and narratorial motivations converge on the purpose of highlighting the exteriority of the beggar. The hero performs his social exteriority through non-verbal gestures and his manipulation of space and spatial relations (proxemics), while the narrator highlights the hero’s humble return within the narrative, giving special attention to the humility of the final journey home—a pedestrian journey.

Our hero’s Scherian trials are recalled by events in Book 17. When we as audience and readers hear about Odysseus’ anonymous arrival on Ithaca, we are made to think back to Books 6 through 7, and, if we know the story, to anticipate his return to his Ithacan community. Among the Phaeacians he initially endured insults in the form of exposure, anonymity, and the necessity of a pedestrian journey. Ultimately, though, the Scherian journey resulted in the hero’s ethical renewal and reintegration into a Hellenic-type aristocratic community which was achieved through and demonstrated by place-making and proxemic means. The Ithacan journey has the opposite effect on the hero, with beggar-Odysseus experiencing more outsideness than

---

Lateiner (1995) 22, 83-88 in his discussion of non-verbal behaviour in the Homeric epics, also discusses modes in which these non-verbal actions are presented: they can either be “purposely performed” or “uncontrollably leaked,” meaning that the character loses self-control over his emotions and displays them for the external audience.
“insideness,” more alienation than belonging. But though the pedestrian journey to the Ithacan centre brings with it insult, alienation, and the emphasis on the outsideness of the disguised hero, this effect is intentional, planned, and desired by the hero, his patron goddess Athena, and the narrator, as I will demonstrate in this chapter. Odysseus, Athena, and the main narrator are motivated by the same purpose—to highlight the hero’s exteriority and humility. 

Finally, before proceeding with a detailed analysis of Odysseus’ final journey on foot, I must make a distinction between the elective disguise that Odysseus assumes on Ithaca and the anonymity with which he arrives in Scheria. In the land of the Phaeacians, Odysseus lacks any outward signifiers of his identity (clothing, ships, companions, booty from Troy) and is thus forced to accept many hardships due to his loss of status. Here, his endurance and humility come as a result of loss and lack of resources. But once on Ithaca, where Odysseus could easily be recognized, he elects to conceal his identity. His disguised and humble return is now a useful tool with which to test and then take revenge on the suitors and the disloyal members of his household. And though it is true that the hero must remain anonymous to the suitors for his own safety, it must also be said that he can and does achieve recognition by others who are faithful to him before making his final revelation and taking revenge on the suitors. In Scheria Odysseus truly is a nameless and status-free suppliant. He does not attempt to identify himself until he is sure that he will be believed. On Ithaca he has the means by which to achieve recognition—his scar, his appearance, his true backstory, his guest-gifts from the Phaeacians—but instead plays the part of a humble beggar. He actively conceals his true identity by assuming the humility and

---

167 Many scholars argue for the strong affinity between the Homeric narrator-poet and the hero. On bardic identification with the epic hero, see Martin (1989) 147, Rose (1992) 114-116, Mackie (1997) 83-86, Richardson (2006) and Bakker (2009) 128-131, who uses narratological analysis to assert that, especially in performance traditions, there is a special relation between narrator and character because poet-performers identify strongly and empathize with their main heroes. This empathy is perhaps what may lead to the external narrator’s co-operation in the hero’s plan for revenge.

168 On the scar as a token of recognition, see De Smit (2006), esp. 288-289.
meekness of a beggar in order to be admitted into his own house and to observe without rousing any suspicion. Odysseus’ performance—his active suppression of his identity by assuming a disguise and performing the role of a character with a lesser identity—is an exercise in endurance, self-control, and restraint.\(^{169}\)

This fourth and final chapter will be broken down into three main sections, each of which studies the elements of the pedestrian journey and its surrounding narrative as Odysseus’ performance of the beggar’s exteriority. The first will examine the initial “insideness” that Odysseus experiences on the periphery of Ithaca while staying with the swineherd, Eumaeus. Indeed, being an “insider” in the hard-working and loyal countryside leads to the beggar’s exteriority in the disloyal and lascivious city-centre and the palace. Next, the chapter will focus on the progression of the journey from periphery to centre, the unexpected outcome of which is the disguised hero’s increasing “outsideness.” In this section I will be most concerned with indications of centripetal movement to the palace and will study both the hero's performance and the narrator’s tactics that complement it. Phenomenological observations will also figure prominently in this discussion. Finally, in the last section of this chapter, I will study the ways in which the hero manipulates his spatial relations to other people and to the landscape or setting (proxemics) in order to perform his exteriority.

\(^{169}\) Murnaghan (1987) 103 “The disguise of a ragged beggar involves a far more overt and challenging declension from his true social status than does his empty-handed anonymity on Scheria.” I agree with this point and develop it in what follows in this chapter.
1 Insideness on the Periphery: Hospitality, and Ithaca’s Unique “Ethical Geography” \(^{170}\)

Odysseus begins his tenure on Scheria much as he does his return to Ithaca: on the periphery of the inhabited area. Here on Ithaca, however, Odysseus experiences insideness and belonging on the periphery, where only the most uncultured people live. This entails the reversal of the Homeric ethical geography, which associates culture to the city and its absence to the country. Indeed, the second half of the *Odyssey* is unusually concerned with rural life and the simplicity of the countryside. As noted in Chapter 3’s discussion on the division between country and city in the Phaeacian episode, the Homeric epics are more often focused on the interests of the elite, whose daily lives are conducted in urban areas, than in rural affairs. City-centres are the spatial embodiments of the qualities and institutions that structure elite Homeric society. These include generosity, loyalty, and formality. \(^{171}\) In contrast, the wilderness and countryside are considered to be dangerous places that remain untransformed for human ends. Edwards (1993) has studied extensively the Homeric epics’ implied spatial hierarchy and concludes that it usually favours the elite and, thus, the protected city centres. He has termed this “normative conceptualization of space” in the two epics the “ethical geography” of Homer. \(^{172}\)

The second half of the *Odyssey*, beginning with Book 14, subverts this norm by giving attention to the countryside and its inhabitants. More than that, the narrator seems to confer on the countryside an air of nobility and ethical superiority usually reserved for the city. Indeed, the inhabitants of the Ithacan countryside remain, for the most part, loyal to Odysseus. In their loyalty they uphold their master’s values, including the maintenance of a productive household

---

through hard work and, most importantly, Hellenic hospitality (xenia), the means by which the disguised Odysseus can test the unwitting members of his household.\footnote{See Thalmann (1998) 124-140 for the relationship of the oikos to the wider community. The oikos ought to be a place of exclusivity, in which the male head of the household holds absolute power and there is no place for competition. The suitors and the unfaithful members of Odysseus’ household introduce competition (in the form of the challenge to Odysseus’ rule) to the household.} It is the swineherd, Eumaeus, who acts as the paragon of hospitality in Ithaca. His humble steading and limited means are contrasted to the overweening and violent suitors’ ignorance of proper social customs and rules of hospitality. This ethical reversal of the two distinct geographic spaces has significant ramifications for Odysseus’ nostos, and, indeed, for the beggar’s performance of outsideness that must accompany his return.

Several scholars argue that the concept of nostos involves more than a simple return to one’s home, but is also inextricably linked to other processes and customs, including recognition (anagnoresis) and hospitality (xenia).\footnote{Katz (1994) studies seven important recognition scenes in the second half of the Odyssey and highlights the ways in which nostos and the institution of xenia overlap and blend together. Alexopoulos (2009) comments on how Odysseus’ nostos compares and contrasts to other nostos story-patterns in the Odyssey. She points to the fact that the process of “reintegration” (one of the stages of the nostos story-pattern) necessarily entails xenia, as the returning hero is always a stranger in some sense before reintegrating (51). Murnaghan (1987), esp. 75-77, discusses the ways in which xenia leads to recognition and stresses that in Odysseus’ case, recognition is delayed as xenia is an institution in decline in Ithaca due to the hero’s long absence and to the growing prominence of Penelope’s suitors. Cf. Kearns (1982) who reads Odysseus’ return to Ithaca, the testing and recognition scenes, the suitors’ failures at this testing, and the perceived morality of their slaughter as reminiscent of a theoxeny narrative.} In Odysseus’ case, the practice of Hellenic-type xenia leads to his recognition twice: first in Scheria, and then finally on Ithaca while staying with Eumaeus. But Murnaghan notes that Odysseus’ absence from Ithaca has created social conditions in which xenia is not readily offered everywhere on the island.\footnote{Murnaghan (1987) 76-77.} The lack of reverence for this important Hellenic institution is illustrated vividly in the behaviour of the suitors: they unrepentantly usurp Odysseus’ home and display a general disregard for strangers and those of lower social station. Conversely, the Ithacan countryside is actually a safe place for Odysseus, one where he is welcomed and experiences anew the implacement or insideness that
he achieved in the Phaeacian city-centre by displaying similar customs and values to the people who live there.

We can also compare and contrast Odysseus’ experience of the Ithacan countryside to the one he had in Scheria, where the wilderness and countryside are fraught with danger and uncertainty. But instead of being a place of danger from which he must flee to the city, the wilderness and countryside of his native territory are a haven of civilized, if humble, hospitality and friendship. The narrative of Odysseus’ stay with the swineherd highlights both the rustic simplicity of the countryside and its hospitality, but also subtly paints it as morally superior and, in turn, infused with a type of nobility that cannot be claimed by the corrupted elite centre.

As with Odysseus’ arrival in Scheria, the narrative of the hero’s landing on his home island highlights the fact that he is on the margins of the inhabited land of Ithaca:

Then he proceeded from the harbor along a rugged path, up wooded country, through the hilltops, where Athena had shown him the divine swineherd, who cared the most for his substance of the servants divine Odysseus had acquired.

Thus, in order to get to the swineherd’s place as instructed, the hero must leave the natural harbour where the Phaeacians dropped him off (ἐκ λιμένος; 14.1) and traverse a wooded area (χώρος ὑλήεις; 14.2) that is located in the heights (ἄκρα; 14.2) of Ithaca. In the Phaeacian episode, Odysseus’ isolation in the wild periphery causes him stress and uncertainty and leads to anomie. But this time the Homeric narrator follows up on his description of the hero’s rustic surroundings with a reminder that Odysseus can find shelter at the home of his faithful servant.
and swineherd, Eumaeus (Od. 14.3-4). Lines 3-4 subvert audience expectations for the same sort of helplessness and uncertainty that Odysseus experiences when landing in the isolated landscape of the Scherian periphery. This is but the first of many examples that undermine our expectations in similar ways. Most of the episodes to which I now draw attention portray the island’s periphery and its inhabitants as ethically and morally superior to those who dwell in the city. The narrator goes so far as to colour the lives of the humble rural folk with hints of nobility and grandeur. Eumaeus the swineherd, Odysseus’ erstwhile host, is often the subject of the narrator’s attempts to ennoble the periphery, contrasting him to the elite suitors and their hangers-on who are bereft of moral integrity.

Most obvious in the narrator’s arsenal of techniques to cast Eumaeus as a noble figure is the use of honorific titles and epithets. Several times the swineherd is referred to as “δῖος” (godlike), an epithet normally reserved for the elite. The narrator also reminds the audience of the swineherd’s noble stock during the exchange of life stories and hardships with the disguised Odysseus. Throughout the episode, the narrator emphasizes Eumaeus’ hard work and loyalty

---

176 Eumaeus is given the epithet δῖος 13 times in the Odyssey: Od.14.48; 14.401; 14.413; 15.301; 16.1; 16.20; 16.333; 16.452; 17.183; 17.260; 17.589; 21.359; and 22.162. Hoekstra (1989) 192 follows Parry (1971), who simply explains the incongruity here with Homer’s use of a regularized epithet to denote a person of the heroic age, though he does think that it must be “a late adaptation of an old prototype…that was created for kings and noblemen…” and also notes its unsuitability, thus, for Eumaeus. Steiner (2010) 100 n. 183 gives possible reasons for the application of this epithet to a lowly character like Eumaeus. She also notes that it may be that it serves merely as a designation for an individual who belongs to the heroic era of epic poetry and is used “in mechanical fashion and for metrical convenience.” There are other suggestions that it may be a deliberate choice or a paradox of sorts given the obvious ways in which status and identity are being manipulated in this episode with Odysseus in beggar’s disguise. There is also Eumaeus’ royal lineage to consider. Others read into the use of this epithet an intended parody. I find it unlikely that this application of the epithet is mechanical or without specific purpose, especially when, as in 17.183, it is accompanied by another designation of honour, δράχμος ἄνδρῶν (leader of men), and given the fact that this epithet is used exclusively of Odysseus and Eumaeus, and another herdsman, Philoetius (20.185, 254) who also is loyal to the hero, in the second half of the epic (Books 13-24). Reece (1993) 151 deems that its application to the latter makes untenable the idea that the epithet is used purposefully in Eumaeus’ case. I disagree, given Edwards’ (1993) argument about the “ethical geography” of the second half of the Odyssey in which we find “the paradox of a vulgar city and a noble countryside” (49). In the first half of the Odyssey, the only other characters that are called δῖος are Orestes (Od. 1.298; 3.306; 11.461) and Nestor’s son Ecephon (3.439). See Thalmann (1998) 90 whose argument is aligned with mine in that he sees this epithet to be “the one way in which the text does attribute heroic qualities to nonaristocrats…”

177 Eumaeus reveals his noble ancestry to the disguised Odysseus at 15.403-484. See de Jong (2001) n. 398-400 and n. 403-484 for Eumaeus relating to the disguised Odysseus with stories of poor fortunes and hardships. Many
to his absent master, and, in turn, his commitment to upholding his master’s pious values, including xenia.

In keeping with this program, the narrative establishes several parallels between Eumaeus and the Odysseus’ Phaeacian host Alcinous who, after delivering his promise of conveyance home, must be recognized as an exemplary host and practitioner of Hellenic-type xenia, despite his few minor blunders of formality. Indeed several scholars comment on these parallels, citing both Eumaeus and Alcinous’ roles as hosts and as internal audiences for Odysseus’ tales. Furthermore, Eumaeus and Alcinous also share spatial associations, providing the ailing hero with safe spaces that embody the elite Hellenic ideals of generosity and formality with which Odysseus is familiar. As a result, the hero experiences a renewed sense of “insideness” in both of their homes, however temporary or contrived (in the case of his disguised as beggar on Ithaca) his implantation may be.

The spatial connection between Alcinous’ and Eumaeus’ homes is first emphasized in the narrative of Odysseus’ approach to the swineherd’s hut, which bears many similarities to the description of Alcinous’ ornate palace in Book 7 in its sequence and structure. As with the scholars, including Emlyn-Jones (1986) 6-7, Pratt (1993) 90, Louden (1997) 101, and King (1999) 75-80 conclude that the purpose of Odysseus’ tale of the disguised beggar’s misfortunes is to establish some commonalities between himself and his host and to provoke sympathy.

178 Scholars generally recognize the ambivalence present in Phaecian hospitality; they both provide well for their guest and make some serious blunders when measured against the standard of Hellenic hospitality within the Odyssey. Rose (1969) considers the Phaecians to be less-than-exemplary hosts at first, who are eventually won over due to Odysseus’ immense talents at negotiating tense situations. Reece (1993) 101-118 outlines several possibilities given by other scholars for the seemingly inconsistent Phaecian hospitality and proposes that this ambivalence in their treatment of strangers is the result of a unique combination of motifs from older traditions and various folktales such as the foreign suitor motif (109-112). While Alcinous’ numerous faux-pas of Hellenic xenia cannot be ignored, I stand with those who consider the Phaecians to be good, generous hosts who take into consideration the well-being and wishes of their guest.

179 Louden (1997) devotes a whole article to viewing Eumaeus and Alcinous as contrasting models of internal audiences for Odysseus’ tales. See especially 97-100, where he discusses the pair as “multiforms” and enumerates the many parallels between the two characters. Both Segal (1994) 164-165 and, with more detail, Doherty (1995) 66-69, 148-150 and 157-159, elaborate upon Eumaeus and Alcinous’ roles as internal audiences.
pedestrian journey to the Phaeacian palace, Odysseus’ eyes provide the lenses through which the narrator presents the swineherd’s dwelling at *Od.* 14.5-22:

He found him sitting on the porch, where his high yard was built, in a place with a view all around, big and fine, with a walk around it. The swineherd himself had built it for the pigs of his lord who had gone away, without help from his mistress and old man Laertes, of quarried stones, and he’d finished the top with prickly shrubs. Outside he had driven stakes throughout, this way and that, thick and close together, by splitting the black part of oak, and inside the yard he made twelve pigpens, next to each other, as beds for the pigs. In each one fifty pigs that sleep on the ground were penned, breeding females. The males slept outside, far fewer of them, for the godlike suitors ate them and reduced their number, since the swineherd was always sending them the best of all the well-fed fattened hogs. There were three hundred and sixty of them. Four dogs that were like wild beasts always slept beside them, that the swineherd, a leader of men, had raised. (*Od.* 14.5-22)
Though less ornate than Alcinous’ compound, the order of the elements used to describe the steading is similar to that in Odysseus’ focalization of the Phaeacian palace at Od. 7.81-132:

...αὐτάρ Ὄδυσσεύς
Ἀλκινόου πρὸς δῶματ’ ἵε κλυτά’ πολλά δὲ οἱ κήρ ὀρμαίν’ ἵσταμένῳ, πρὶν χάλκεον οὐδόν Ἰκέσθαι.
ὡς τε γὰρ ἤλλου αἰγήλη πέλεν ἢ σελήνης δῶμα καθ’ ύψερφές μεγαλήττορος Ἀλκινόοιο.
χάλκεοι μὲν γὰρ τοῖχοι ἐληλέατ’ ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα, ἐς μυχὸν ἐς οὐδοῦ, περὶ δὲ θρυγκὸς κυάνοιο·
χρύσειαι δὲ θύραι πυκνῶν δόμων ἐντὸς ἔργου’ ἀργύρεοι σταθμοὶ δ’ ἐν χαλκέω ἔστασαν οὐδῶς,
ἀργύρεον δ’ ἐφ’ ὑπερθύριον, χρυσεῖ δὲ κορώνην.
χρύσειοι δ’ ἐκάτερθε καὶ ἀργύρεοι κόνες ἱσαν, οὐδὲ Ὅμαροστος τεύξεν ἰδυίησεν πραπίδεσαι
dῶμα φυλασσόμενει μεγαλῆττορος Ἀλκινόοιο, ᾧ αὐτάντως ὄντας καὶ ἀγήρως ἰματα πάντα.
ἐν δὲ θρόνοι περὶ τοῖχον ἐρημεῦτα’ ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα
ἐς μυχὸν ἐς οὐδοῖο διαμπερές, ἔνθα’ ἐνὶ πέπλοι
λεπτοὶ ἐўνητοι βεβληῆτο, ἐγα ῥυναῖκων.
ἔνθα δὲ Φαίηκοι ἡγήττορες ἐδρίωντο πίνοντες καὶ ἔδοντες· ἐπητανῦν γὰρ ἔχεσκοι.
χρυσεῖοι δ’ ἀρα κοῦροι ἐῳμήτως ἐπὶ βομῶν
ἔστασαν αἰθομένας δαίδας μετὰ χεροῖν ἔχοντες,
φαῖνοντες νύκτας κατὰ δῶματα δαιτυμόνεσσι.
πεντήκοντα δὲ οἱ δωμαὶ κατὰ δῶμα γυναῖκες
αἱ μὲν ἀλετρεύουσι μύλης ἐπὶ μήλοπα καρπῶν,
αἱ δ’ ἱστῶς ὑφόωσι καὶ ἤλακατα στρωφῶσιν
ἡμεῖς, οἶα τε φύλλα μακεδῆς αἰγεῖροις·
καιροσέων δ’ ὠθονέων ἀπολείβεται ψρόν ἐλαῖον.
ὅσον Φαίηκες περὶ πάντων ἴδρεις ἄνδρῶν
νῆα θοῦν ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἐλαυνέμεν, ὡς δὲ γυναῖκες
ἰστῶν τεχνῆσαι· περὶ γὰρ σφισθεὶς δῶκεν Αθῆνην
ἔργα τ’ ἐπιτάσσεσαι περικαλλέας καὶ φρένας ἐσβλᾶς.
ἐκτοθθὲν δ’ αὐλῆς μέγας ὀρχατος ἀγχι θυράων
τετράγνοιο; περὶ δ’ ἔρκος ἐλήλαται ἁμφοτέρωθεν.
ἔνθα δὲ δένδρεα μακρὰ πεφύκασι τηλεβόωντα,
ὄγχυναι καὶ ῥοῖαι καὶ μηλάει ἀγλαόκαρποι
οὐκέα τε γυναῖκας καὶ ἔλαϊ τηλεβόωσαι.
τάων οὖ ποτε καρπός ἀπόλλυται οὐδ’ ἀπολείπει
χειματος οὐδὲ θέρεως, ἐπετήσιοι· ἀλλὰ μάλ’ ἀιεὶ
ζευρήπην πνεύσουσα τὰ μὲν φύει, ἀλλὰ δὲ πέσσει,
ὄγχυνη ἐπ’ ὄγχυνη γυράσκει, μῆλου δ’ ἐπὶ μῆλῳ,
αὐτάρ ἐπὶ σταφυλῆ σταφυλῆ, σοῦκον δ’ ἐπὶ σῦκῳ.
ἔνθα δὲ οἱ πολύκαρπος ἀλωὴ ἔρριζοται,
τῆς ἔτερου μὲν θειλόπεδον λευρῷ ἕνι χώρῳ
τέρσεται ἡλίῳ, ἔτερας δὲ ἄρα τε τρυγώσιν,
ἅλλας δὲ τραπέουσιν πάροιθε δὲ τῇ ὁμφακές εἰσιν ἄνθος ἀφιεῖσαι, ἔτεραι δ᾽ ὑποπερκάζουσιν.
ἔνθα δὲ κοσμοῖται πρασιαὶ παρὰ νείατόν ὄρχον παντοίαι πεφύασιν, ἔπετανὸν γανόωσαι.
ἐν δὲ δύο κηταὶ ἡμῖν τῷ ἁνὰ κητον ἀπαντά σκιδναται, ἥ δ᾽ ἐτέρωθεν ὑπ᾽ αὐλῆς οὐδόν ἱησι πρὸς δόμον ύψηλῶν, ὀβεν ύδρεύοντο πολίται.
τοῖς ἐν Ἀλκινόοιοι θεῶν ἐσάν ἄγλαὶ δῶρα.

(Οd. 7.81-132)

…But Odysseus went toward the splendid house of Alcinous. His heart pondered much as he stood there before reaching the bronze threshold, for there was a radiance, as of the sun or moon, throughout great-hearted Alcinous' high-roofed house. For walls of bronze had been driven here and there, from the threshold to the inner room, with a cyan coping about it. Golden doors kept the strongly-built house closed. Silver doorposts stood on the bronze threshold, a silver lintel upon them, and the door handle was of gold. There were dogs of gold and silver on each side, that Hephaestus had fashioned with expert ingenuity to guard the house of great-hearted Alcinous, that were ageless and immortal all their days. Inside, chairs were pressed against the wall, here and there, from the threshold straight through to the inner room. Delicate, well-woven cloths, works of women, had been thrown upon them. Phaeacian leaders sat there eating and drinking, for they had endless abundance. Boys of gold stood on well-shaped pedestals, holding burning torches in their hands, lighting nights throughout the house for diners. Throughout the house he had fifty slave women, some at the mill, who grind grain of apple color, others, who weave webs and spin yarn, sitting, like leaves of a tall poplar, as liquid olive oil trickles from the close-woven linen.
Just as Phaeacians are skilled beyond all men
in driving a swift ship on the sea, so are their women
in weaving at the loom, for Athena granted them, beyond others,
skill in making gorgeous works and good dispositions.
Outside the courtyard near the doors is a large orchard,
four measures big, and a wall is driven round it on both sides.
Trees grow there, tall and luxuriant,
splendid-fruit pear, pomegranate, and apple,
sweet fig, and luxuriant olive.
Their fruit never perishes or fails
winter or summer, all through the year, but always and ever
West Wind, blowing, grows some and ripens others.
Pear ripens on pear, apple on apple,
grape cluster on grape cluster, fig upon fig.
His vineyard, full of fruit, takes root there,
part of it, a sunny spot in a level place,
dries in the sun, in another part, they gather some
while stomping others. Unripe grapes are at the front,
some shedding blossoms, others darkening.
There, beside the lowest row, trim beds of herbs
of all kinds grow and are perennially green.
In it are two springs. One spreads through the whole garden,
and, on the other side, one flows under the courtyard threshold
toward the lofty house, from which cityfolk draw water.
Such were the splendid gifts of gods in the palace of Alcinous.
(Od. 7.81-132)

Though little attention has been paid to the similarities between these descriptions, there are
some obvious parallels: in both descriptions Odysseus’ focus is first drawn to a panoramic
view of the exterior of the complex, where the expanse of surroundings in both directions is
denoted by the phrase ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα (7.86; 14.11); next, he focalizes objects or beings on the

---

180 Most scholars, like de Jong (2001) 343 and Edwards (1993) 60 n. 75, comment on the similarities between the
description of Eumaeus’ hut and the cave of Polyphemus, for obvious reasons surrounding the rusticity of both
dwellings. Nevertheless, I believe that there are obvious and specific connections being drawn between Alcinous’
palace and Eumaeus’ steading, especially due to the correspondence in the Phaeacian and Ithacan episodes. None of
the other descriptions of dwellings in the Odyssey, including those of Calypso and Polyphemus, are composed with
the same pattern that I enumerate here. Segal (1994) 166 realizes that the description of the Scherian palace is
“echoed in miniature” by that of Eumaeus’ hut. Cook (2004) 53 n. 59 astutely notices the phrase “θριγκὸς κυάνοιο”
(Od. 7.87) in the description of Alcinous’ walls and notes that the verb form of the noun is used to describe
Eumaeus’ hut, as the swineherd “ἐθρίγκωσεν (encloses) his steading with some sort of thorny bush for protection.
interior (ἐν δὲ, 7.95; ἐντοσθὲν δὲ 14.13), and finally objects or beings on the exterior (ἐκτοσθὲν δὲ, 7.112; τοὶ δ’ ἄρσενες ἐκτὸς ἵππον, 14.16). Thus the description of the Phaeacian palace begins with the walls that are built around it in each direction (Od. 7.86-87), then the door and the threshold (7.88-94), then the interior of the palace replete with rich objects, servants and the elite (7.95-111), and finally the palace grounds, which include an orchard and a vineyard (7.112-132). Owing to its relatively modest size, the description of Eumaeus’ steading is considerably shorter, and the space and its contents are rustic and unrefined. Nevertheless, the pattern of the description remains the same, with a panoramic view of the exterior, a description of the interior, and a final look at the exterior of the dwelling. The first element described is enclosure built for the pigs (14.5-12), then the interior of the enclosure inhabited not by servants and elite but by his master’s sows (14.13-16), and finally the exterior of the enclosure where the male pigs are kept (14.16-22).

From there, the similarities continue: both of the buildings are described with terms of height—Alcinous’ palace is ὑψερεφὲς (high-roofed; 7.85) while Eumaeus’ enclosure is ὑψηλὴ (lofty; 14.6).\textsuperscript{181} The building materials of certain features are listed, and the craftsman who has accomplished the handiwork is named. Alcinous’ palace is rich with precious materials: it features a bronze threshold (7.83), a cobalt frieze (7.87), golden doors (7.88), silver pillars (7.89) and dogs of gold and silver (7.91) crafted by Hephaestus himself. In contrast, Eumaeus’s steading is built with materials as humble as its country surroundings, including the oakwood fence (14.11-12). Inside are enclosures for the pigs made of large stones from a nearby field and topped with shrubbery, (14.10) all fashioned by the swineherd himself. Even the dogs on guard outside Eumaeus’ place are of humble origin as mere mortal dogs that sleep with the pigs and

\textsuperscript{181} Reece (1993) 151-152 notices many formulae and descriptors that are “remarkable” given their use to describe a swineherd’s steading, including its height.
attack Odysseus upon his approach (14.21-22).\footnote{182} These similar structures suggest the narrator’s concentration on ennobling the swineherd while still acknowledging his humility and rusticity, and the parallels being established between this and the Phaeacian episode. Among the Phaeacians Odysseus happens upon exactly what he needs: a highly cultured society that welcomes him so that he can begin to reassume some of his former identity as a Hellenic leader and, ultimately, find his way home. The similarities in the mode of description of Alcinous’ and Eumaeus’ homes suggest that the hero could find his needs met by the swineherd too. Indeed, the swineherd proves to be not only loyal to his master, but also a staunch practitioner of all of the customs of xenia that his humble circumstances allow.\footnote{183}

Within the Homeric corpus, scenes of hospitality generally follow a certain pattern and include common narrative elements. They are thus treated as “type scenes.” The portion of the narrative that depicts Odysseus’ arrival at and acceptance into Eumaeus’ home follows the normal progression of hospitality scenes in Homeric epic: the swineherd escorts of the beggar into his home, seats him, feeds him, and exchanges information with him.\footnote{184} Reece (1993) goes so far as to call the swineherd, in his adherence to the customs of xenia, a “model of piety toward the gods.”\footnote{185} In this way, Eumaeus’ hospitality also functions as a foil for the treatment that the hero will receive in the city among the suitors. Nevertheless, there are two important factors that also set Eumaeus’ particular brand of hospitality apart from other Homeric xenia type scenes.

\footnote{182}{On how the conditions and characters of dogs reflect the conditions and character of the master and the master’s household, see Beck (1991). He points to the similarity between the immortally fashioned guard dogs of Alcinous who himself has connections to the gods and also between the “rough” and “functional” character of Eumaeus and the dogs who guard his herds (160-161).}

\footnote{183}{Segal (1994) 164-166 reads Eumaeus’ hospitality as a rustic recall of his stay with the Phaeacians.}

\footnote{184}{For a more detailed account of the adherence of this scene to the formal requirements of Homeric hospitality scenes, see Reece (1993) 146-147.}

\footnote{185}{See Reece (1993) 146-147 for a detailed analysis of this specific hospitality scene. He does, however, allow that Odysseus’ stay in Eumaeus’ hut may be contested as a scene of real xenia, since Odysseus is posing as a beggar and xenia relationships, in the Homeric corpus, are always between those of equal status. Though the disguised Odysseus is not a true guest-friend, the scene is still built on the patterns of all other hospitalities scenes in the Odyssey and includes almost all of the formal elements that could be present in one of these type scenes.}
First, unique to this scene are the many rustic elements and the allowances that have been made in order to accommodate the swineherd’s social situation. Also significant is the extremely personal and less-formal nature of the hospitality offered. These two distinguishing elements of the hospitality offered to the disguised Odysseus are particularly important for this study. Though the Homeric narrator links Alcinous and Eumaeus as hosts and audiences for Odysseus’ stories, Eumaeus’ type of hospitality is much less grand than that of the Phaeacians, and indeed than what is typical of hosts in Homeric poetry. In fact, all other hospitality scenes are set in the aristocratic milieu. Eumaeus’ particular version of xenia is markedly humble and purposefully rustic. Scholars have identified several elements that distinguish the swineherd’s welcome, including his offer of a goatskin as a seat (14.49-51) and sheepskins as a bed (14.518-19), his rustic drinking vessel (14.78), and the feast of piglets that he prepares for Odysseus (14.73), especially given the fact that the fatted pigs go to suitors. In addition, several elements that are normally present in Homeric hospitality type scenes, such as a bath for the guest and an offer of clothing, are omitted due to Eumaeus’ relative poverty. These novel additions, substitutions, omissions, and changes serve not to disparage the swineherd as host, but to elevate his marginal character to the level of nobility, at least with respect to his ethos, and to call attention to the unusual “ethical geography” present in Ithaca. Indeed Odysseus, himself impersonating a more

186 Reece (1993) 147 observes, cursorily, the personal nature of Eumaeus’ reception of the hero given the personal items with which he entertains him, including the goatskin from his bed and his own cup. I will elaborate further below.

187 Except for the Cyclopeia in which Reece (1993) 123-143 finds a “parody” (125) of the theme of hospitality.

188 All of these elements are enumerated by Reece (1993) 148. As he points out (154), some have suggested that the lowly elements present in a type scene that is normally reserved for heroic “parody” for Eumaeus scene. Williams (1986) provides one such reading of Odysseus’ return as a parody of welcome type scenes. Reece responds: “But parody, inasmuch as it is a self-conscious and intentional imitation for comic effect, does not seem an apt term for the scene of Eumaeus’ hospitality. I do not perceive anything comical in the depiction of Eumaeus or his hospitality toward Odysseus. Homer portrays Eumaeus as loyal, generous, and pious; he is one of the most sympathetic characters of the Odyssey, not a mock-heroic object of humor.” For a more general appraisal of this narrative as a hospitality type scene, see de Jong (2001) 341-343.
humble character than befits his station, begins to experience a type of belonging among the now ethically superior people who are normally marginalized in Homeric poetry.

Eumaeus’ level of personal involvement with his guest further distinguishes Odysseus’ reception from the epic model. Most Homeric hosts fulfill their formal obligations towards their guests with the help of their household slaves. Eumaeus, a slave himself, has only one slave of his own and entrusts to him few responsibilities concerning his beggar guest. Instead the swineherd cares for the disguised hero personally. Consequently, the swineherd and the disguised hero develop a close relationship built on reciprocity and mutual understanding. While Eumaeus provides for the hero’s physical needs with his own limited possessions, the beggar reveals his (feigned) identity and exchanges stories with the swineherd. Although a typical feature of the guest-host relationship in Homeric hospitality type scenes, this exchange of information takes place at an extremely personal level, especially on the part of the swineherd who tells the true tale of his life.\(^{189}\) Lying or not, the disguised Odysseus establishes a meaningful relationship with the swineherd through these stories and finds himself belonging to the fringes of Ithacan society.

By the end of Odysseus’ disguised stay, Eumaeus clearly views him as a part of the ethical realm of the countryside—as a friend and a community member whom the swineherd would rather not send off to the corrupt city:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ξεῖν'}, \ & \text{ἐπεὶ ἂρ δὴ ἔπειτα πόλινδ' ἰέναι μενεαίνεις} \\
\ & \text{σήμερον, ὡς ἐπέτελλεν ἀναξ ἐμός,} \quad — \ & \text{ἡ σ' ἂν ἐγὼ γε} \\
\ & \text{αὐτοῦ βουλοίμην σταθὼν ρυτήρα λιπέσθαι'} \\n\text{(Od. 17.185-187)}
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^{189}\) Reece (1993) 28 specifies that the “exchange of information” as a commodity is typical to hospitality scenes. Both host and guest may provide information, and the provision of information by a guest is rewarded with material hospitality. See also Louden (1997), especially 95-96, on the reciprocal relationship of host and guest as related to the relationship between performer and audience. Louden specifically studies the host/guest interactions between Alcinous and Odysseus and between Eumaeus and Odysseus.
Stranger, since you are eager then to go to the city today, as my lord commanded, but as for me, I would indeed prefer to leave you right here as a guard for the farmhouse.

*(Od. 17.185-187)*

Eumaeus, like others loyal to Odysseus’ interests, avoids the city due to its associations with the wanton behaviour of the suitors. He has also come to associate bad behaviour, such as the shirking of duty by the cowherd Melanthius, with the suitors’ urban social sphere. Here, Eumaeus not only wishes for the beggar to avoid dishonor by remaining spatially in the realm of the honourable, but he also sees potential in him to be ethically incorporated into the countryside through productive labour.

Odysseus’ integration into the ethical and spatial realm of the Ithacan countryside has important ramifications for this study. Odysseus has chosen to delay revealing his identity, thereby rejecting the grandeur and concern for honour typical to Iliadic heroes. Instead, he and Athena have engineered his reception as a no-name into a community of outsiders. The initial part of Odysseus’ *nostos* is thus intentionally humble. It is Odysseus’ ability to endure, to remain disguised, and to come home, albeit ingloriously, that distinguishes him from Achilles, and thus the *Odyssey* from the *Iliad*. Indeed the hero’s “insideness” while on the periphery contrasts with the traditional expectations of the genre, according to which the city, not the countryside, is the hero’s place of belonging. As we will see in the next section, his “insideness” on the periphery precludes him from achieving the same type of implantation in the city; unlike on Scheria, the closer Odysseus comes to the city, the more outsideness he experiences.

---

191 For the “labour motif” in the *Odyssey*, see de Jong (2001) 376.
Towards the Centre, Away from Belonging: Periphery and Centre, “Insideness” and outsideness

With the warm reception that Eumaeus offers the beggar Odysseus, the hero achieves “insideness” on the periphery of Ithaca where the Greek obligations of hospitality are still observed and, by extension, where the people are still loyal to him. While his assimilation into this peripheral community defies his true identity and his aristocratic station, it is integral to his own performance of exteriority and indeed to the purposes of the Homeric narrator, whose program is to laud the hero’s performance through his control of the narrative and thereby to distinguish the enduring Odyssean hero from the Achilles of the Iliad. Odysseus’ task will remain incomplete until he actually ventures into his own household—only there can he observe and test his family, his staff, and Penelope’s suitors.¹⁹²

The narrative of Odysseus’ pedestrian transition from periphery to centre (Od. 17.182-344) fills 162 lines of hexameter. The mere fact that the journey takes up so much narrative space suggests its importance. As a point of comparison, Telemachus makes the very same pedestrian journey at the beginning of Book 17 (lines 26-28) in a mere three lines!¹⁹³ Some suggest that this narrative interlude has the function of delaying and protracting the hero’s return and therefore of heightening the emotions associated with it.¹⁹⁴ While I do not expressly disagree

---

¹⁹² See Murnaghan (1987) 20-55 for the crucial role played by disguise, timing, and testing in Odysseus’ successful return, revenge, and re-establishment of his rule.

¹⁹³ De Jong (2001) 409 and Steiner (2010) 78 both note the discrepancy between the lengths of narrative devoted to the very same journey undertaken by the two characters.

¹⁹⁴ De Jong (2001) 409 claims that the “climactic” moment of the hero’s return is highlighted by “a series of retardations,” and that Odysseus’ stay among the suitors is a very expanded “visit” type scene, so much so that it is almost unrecognizable as such. See also 416, n. 204-260. For a definition of the narratological technique of “retardation,” see de Jong (2001) Introduction xvi-xvii. Steiner (2010) 74, taking a similar approach, calls the whole episode a “long-drawn-out type-scene, the arrival and reception of a ξεῖνος…” with a “…series of perversions of the proper norms of hospitality…which further retard his reincorporation into the household.” For a comprehensive
with this reading, the situations in which the hero finds himself on the journey seem to be more significant, especially given the parallels that can be drawn between this journey and the one undertaken in Scheria.

While Chapter 3 interpreted the centripetal movement of Odysseus’ pedestrian journey in Scheria as indicative of his re-integration into a highly civilized, Hellenic-type society, the centripetal movement of Book 17’s journey does not have the same effect. Instead, the disguised Odysseus is as unwanted in the city as he is welcomed in the countryside. The suitors and their allies make clear their distaste for the disguised beggar. At key intervals along the journey—the beginning, midway, and finally upon arrival—the efforts of both the external narrator and the hero demonstrate the ways in which he does not belong in the Ithacan centre. First, Odysseus ventures into the city for the explicit purpose of begging. Though the Odyssey’s characters believe that begging is a shameful way to make a living, the beggar’s humility and his association with the honourable people of the countryside seem to redeem him as a morally upright character. The frequency with which the beggar Odysseus is contrasted to the depravity of the suitors makes the case for his absorption into the ethically superior community of the countryside. Moreover, the narrative of the hero’s pedestrian journey, while emphasizing the place-making potential of the route, also highlights the lack of actual place-making. Indeed, Odysseus resists “leaking” any signs of familiarity with the landscape of his native land. Finally, the narrative of Odysseus’ first glimpse of his palace, voiced by the hero through his beggar’s disguise, is heavily laden with irony in that it forces the hero to feign unfamiliarity with the place and thereby to distance himself from his former identity and to highlight the dissonance in this nostos. Odysseus returns to his home as a beggar and an outsider. Thus the Homeric narrator’s discussion of Odysseus’ return to his palace as a hospitality type scene (with the suitors as the hosts who pervert the custom), see Reece (1993) 165-187.
choice to present Odysseus’ reaction to his palace through direct speech instead of through character focalization contributes further to the narrator’s role of supporting and complementing the hero’s performance of exteriority. Reiterating the main proposition of this chapter, I suggest that each of these narrative elements of Odysseus’ walk, which I examine more closely below, is integral to his performance of exteriority.

Before considering the individual elements of the journey’s narrative in greater detail, it should first be noted that the Homeric narrator does indeed highlight the journey’s centripetal movement, and thereby forges a link between this narrative and that of the hero’s earlier pedestrian journey in Book 6 through 7. In the Phaeacian narrative, the teleological movement towards the city was emphasized through the pairing of verbs of movement with direct objects denoting the city and the palace as the destination. A similar pairing appears at the very first hint of the journey’s beginning, with a mid-line scene change from the suitors’ preparation for a sumptuous feast to the stirrings of Odysseus and Eumaeus:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ὑ’ ἵκοντο δόμους ἐν ναιετάοντας,
χλαίνας μὲν κατέθεντο κατὰ κλισιμούς τε βρόνους τε,
οἱ δ’ ἱέρευον δῖς μεγάλους καὶ πίόνας αἴγας,
ἱέρευον δὲ σύς σιάλους καὶ βοῦν ἀγελαίην,
δαῖτ’ ἐντυνόμενοι. τοὶ δ’ ἐξ ἀγροῖο πόλινδε
ωτρύνοντ’ Ὀδυσσέας τ’ ἱέναι καὶ δῖος ψορβός.

(Od. 17.178-183)

Then after they arrived at the well-settled house they put down their cloaks on chairs and couches. They slaughtered big sheep and fat goats, then slaughtered pigs, fat hogs, and a cow from the herd, as they got dinner ready. And Odysseus and the divine swineherd were getting ready to go from the country to the city.

(Od. 17.178-183)

---

195 See above in Chapter 3.
Note the pairing of the verbs of movement (ὠτρύνοντι ἱέναι; 17.183) with the noun πόλις to denote its destination (πόλινδε, “city”; 17.182). This pairing (ἱέναι and πόλινδε) is used at Od. 6.255 in Nausicaa’s instructions to the hero to rise and begin the journey: ὥρσε νῦν, ὦ ἔξειν, πόλινδε ἵµεν. Finally, the direction of the journey is indicated clearly at the end of line 17.182 with the phrase …ἐξ ἀγροῖο πόλινδε which is, in essence, a synoptic description of their intended journey. The pairing of the adverbial ἔξ and the suffix –δε also emphasizes the projected movement towards the city centre. Here, the directional and lexical similarities to the narrative of the Scherian pedestrian journey make a strong case for intentional parallels between the two episodes. The passage quoted above also marks the first in a pair of instances that contrast the humility and ethical association of the beggar with the spatial realm of the countryside to the suitors’ lack of morality and the life of excess that characterizes those who live in or frequent the city.

Line 182 of Book 17 (quoted above) represents a rare but not unparalleled instance of a mid-line setting change. The abrupt nature of this change serves to contrast the suitors’ lives of leisure and excess to Odysseus and Eumaeus’ humble situation. Immediately before the preparing their lavish feast, the suitors are at leisure exercising in Odysseus’ courtyard:

μνηστῆρες δὲ πάροιθεν Ὀδυσσῆος μεγάροιο διόκοιοιν τέρποντο καὶ αἰγανέῃσιν ἱέντες ἐν τυκτῷ δαπέδῳ, ὅθι περ πάρος, ὑβριν ἔχοντες. ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ δείπνηστος ἤν καὶ ἐπήλυθε μῆλα πάντοθεν ἔξ ἄγρων, οἱ δ’ ἤγαγον οἱ τὸ πάρος περ, καὶ τότε δὴ σφίν ἔειπε Μέδων: (Od. 17.167-172)

196 Also on this juxtaposition, see Steiner (2010) 99, n. 182.
198 See de Jong (2001) 414, who notices the juxtaposition between the suitors’ carefree sporting and Penelope’s worry over Odysseus (17). She does not, however, mention my observation that the mid-line scene change of 17.182 could also function as an instance of juxtaposition between the suitors in the city and Odysseus in the countryside. Steiner’s (2010) 98 interpretation of the “intermezzo” depicting the suitors’ sporting is very similar to mine: “The intermezzo sharply contrasts with the episode that follows, which will focus on Od.’s degraded and excluded state…”
…the suitors in front of Odysseus' hall enjoyed themselves throwing with discs and javelins on leveled flat ground, where they had before, with wanton arrogance.
But when it was time for dinner, and the sheep came from all sides from the fields, and they led them who did it before, right then Medon spoke to them…

(Od. 17.167-172)

The narrator even highlights the suitors’ carefree and knowing usurpation of the hero’s household with the phrase ὅβριν ἔχοντες. Meanwhile, shortly after the scene change of line 182 comes a description of the humble circumstances of Eumaeus and the downtrodden appearance of Odysseus in disguise:

…καὶ ἀμφ’ ὥμοισιν ἀεικέα βάλλετο πήρην, πυκνά βωγαλέην ἐν δὲ στρόφος ἦν ἀορτήρ’
Εὔμαεος δ’ ἄρα οἱ σκηπτρον θυμαρές ἐδωκέ.
τῶ βήτην, σταθμὸν δὲ κύνες καὶ βώτορες ἄνδρες ῥυατ’ ὄπισθε μένοντες, ὁ δ’ ἐς πόλιν ἦγεν ἀνακτὰ πτωχώ υπαλέω ἑναλήκιον ἦδ’ γέροντι,
σκηπτόμενον’ τὰ δὲ λυγρὰ περὶ χρώμα ἔστο.
(Od. 17.197-203)

… and he threw around his shoulder the unseemly pouch, full of holes. A twisted cord was on it as a strap. Eumaeus gave him a staff that pleased his heart. The two set out, and the dogs and the herdsmen men stayed behind and guarded. He led his lord to the city, looking like a sordid beggar and old man, propping himself up, and wretched were the things he wore as clothes around his flesh.
(Od. 17.197-203)

This scene, bookended by scenes of the suitors’ excess on the one hand and Odysseus’ (and Eumaeus’) poverty on the other, allows for the close juxtaposition of the two groups, which in turn highlights the sharp contrast between the two spatial realms—the city and the country,

respectively. Indeed the audience is reminded that Odysseus, whose is disguised as a beggar, does not belong among the suitors, but is nevertheless headed into the “lion’s den” of the town centre.

Another contrast between these two spatial poles exists in the aforementioned passage at *Od.* 17.200-201: τὼ βήτην, σταθμὸν δὲ κύνες καὶ βώτορες ἄνδρες/ ῥύατ’ ὀπισθε μένοντες. ὁ δὲ ἐς πόλιν ἦγεν ἀνακτα. Read closely, these lines reveal a chiastic or “ABBA” structure that has important ramifications for the interpretation of the pedestrian journey. First, line 200 begins with the dual verb, denoting the actions of both Eumaeus and Odysseus walking towards the city (A). The end of 200 contrasts the pair’s centripetal journey with the activities of the other herdsmen, who have been left behind at the fold with their charges (B). Line 201 picks up again with the herdsmen who have been left behind (ὁπισθε) (B), and ends with a statement of the city as Eumaeus and Odysseus’ destination (A). Thus the following effect is achieved: Odysseus and Eumaeus depart (A), but the other herdsmen are at the fold (B). They remain in the countryside (B), while Eumaeus leads his master to the city (A).

These lines draw attention to the directionality of the journey by emphasizing both the origin and *telos*. Furthermore, this chiastic structure serves to make an important statement about the epic’s disposition towards the country and city. As we have already discussed, those of the household who are loyal to Odysseus seem to avoid the city and are content with lives of duty and labour, like the herdsmen in the countryside. Eumaeus makes a point of announcing his fidelity to his master’s memory by stating his preference to avoid the city and the overbearing, hubristic excess of the suitors who “eat up” Odysseus’ house. In contrast, those who frequent the city, like the goatherd Melanthius, are cast as indolent and prone to luxury.

Having accepted the beggar into his community of hardworking, ethically superior slaves, Eumaeus has already expressed his wish for Odysseus to stay back in the countryside to
tend the flocks (Od. 17.185-187). In his view, Odysseus does not belong among the languid and morally corrupt suitors. Thus, even at the outset of his journey, the exteriority of the Odysseus beggar is emphasized, though this time not by an individual attempting to exclude him from a community to which he belongs, but by one who is attempting to protect the hero from the corruption of the spatial realm of the community that he seeks to infiltrate. As the journey progresses, the Homeric narrator picks up where Eumaeus leaves off, aiding the hero in his performance of exteriority by contrasting the journey’s place-making potential to the lack of engagement with the landscape that the hero displays. Indeed, the narrator emphasizes the potential for many similarities between this journey and the earlier one on Scheria, yet also subtly indicates that this journey will serve a different purpose.

Though the narrative detailing the journey from Eumaeus’ hut to the fountain is brief (Od. 17.200-203), the audience is told that the hero and the swineherd are close to the city when they come to the fountain (17.204-211):

```
Ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ στείχοντες ὃδὸν κάτα παιπαλόεσσαν
ἀστεος ἐγγύς ἔσαν καὶ ἐπὶ κρήνην ἀφίκοντο
πολιτεῖαν τυκτὴν καλλίροον,
ὅτε θηρίον καὶ Νήριτος ἤδη Πολύκτωρ
αμφὶ δ’ ἄρ’ αἰγείρων ὕδατοτρεφέων ἢν ἀλσος,
πάντοσε κυκλοτερές, κατὰ δὲ ψυχρὸν ῥέεν ὕδωρ
ὑψόθεν ἐκ πέτρης· ὡμος δ’ ἐφύπερθε τέτυκτο
Νυμφάων, ὅθι πάντες ἐπιρρέζεσκον ὀδίται.
(Od. 7.204-211)
```

But at last, when they walked down the rugged road, they were near the city and reached a fountain, a fair-flowing well-made one, from which the city folk drew water, that Ithacus and Neritus and Polyctor had made. About it was a grove of poplars, fed by water, in a circle all around, and cold water flowed from a rock above it. An altar of the nymphs was built atop it, where all travelers made offerings;

```
But at last, when they walked down the rugged road, they were near the city and reached a fountain, a fair-flowing well-made one, from which the city folk drew water, that Ithacus and Neritus and Polyctor had made. About it was a grove of poplars, fed by water, in a circle all around, and cold water flowed from a rock above it. An altar of the nymphs was built atop it, where all travelers made offerings;
```

(Od. 7.204-211)
Immediately following their arrival at the fountain, Odysseus and Eumaeus are met by the
cowherd Melanthius. This interlude at the fountain, with its *locus amoenus*-type setting, seems to
me far more significant than the mere contrast it provides to the disturbance created by
Melanthius’ insults. Instead, it purposefully mirrors the stop that Odysseus makes at the Grove
of Athena during his journey to the Phaeacian city in Book 6, and thus recalls the similarities and
differences between the two episodes. Indeed the tranquil landscape of the fountain closely
resembles that of the Grove of Athena in Scheria. Both places are just off the road and just
outside the city; both include running water (in the Grove of Athena, a spring, in Ithaca, a
fountain), poplar trees, and some kind of shrine (to Athena and to the nymphs, respectively).

In our examination of the Phaeacian episode we learned that pedestrian travel facilitates
the creation of place. The body’s interaction with landscape and the relative slow progress of
walking compared to travelling in a vehicle allows attention to be given to one’s surroundings.
Nausicaa’s directions, simple as they were, contributed to Odysseus’ engagement with his
surroundings, as she attempted to explain the landmarks to the hero in culturally relative terms.
Indeed, as Yi-Fu Tuan elaborates, place is carved out of non-descript space simply through
naming and description (both oral and written). During his Scherian walk, all of these place-
making activities converge in Odysseus’ first real stop at the Grove of Athena. There, the hero
interacts with his surroundings: he remembers Nausicaa’s description of the place and her
instructions to stop there. Once stopped, he prays to the goddess and thereby re-establishes his

---

200 See de Jong (2001) 416, n. 204-211 and Steiner (2010) 102-104, esp. n. 205-211. Both indicate that this peaceful
*locus amoenus* heightens the contrast between the beautiful setting and the awful actions of Melanthius. It must be
noted, however, that Steiner notes three similarities to Odysseus’ Scherian journey, comparing the overall scene of
the Ithacan *locus amoenus* to Alcinous’ gardens (102, n. 205-211), the fountain in Scheria to the Ithacan spring (102,
n. 205), and the grove of poplars in the Ithacan *locus amoenus* to those found in the grove of Athena in Phaeacia
(103, n. 208).

201 See Tuan (1991), esp. 692 ff. where he discusses the relative inattention paid by cultural geographers to the role
of language, naming, and storytelling in the making of place.
relationship with Hellenic-type places and the social practices that accompany them (i.e., shrines and the cultivation of the gods therein). Moreover, the grove served as a transitional space for the hero’s *ethos*, from the instinct-driven roughness inspired by the equally untamed wilderness of Scheria through the grove to a revival of his relationship with his highly cultured, elite *ethos*. The grove thus allowed him to pass unhindered into the civilized Phaeacian centre. Ultimately, the hero’s experiences in the Scherian *locus amoenus* indicate that it is a place of re-engagement with his former identity as a civilized Greek hero. But at the Ithacan fountain, a *locus amoenus* and a place so similar to the Grove of Athena on Scheria, it seems that the hero does not interact with the landscape. At very least, no mention is made of any interaction by the narrator. Indeed, Odysseus’ experience at the Ithacan *locus amoenus* and the shrine to the nymphs instead serves to highlight his exteriority in several different ways.

First, the scenery of this Ithacan *locus amoenus* is not explicitly focalized by the hero, as was the case in the Phaeacian narrative. While taking in the sights of the harbour and *agora* in Scheria, the hero’s focalization allows the audience to observe some of his reactions to the landscape (…πολλα δε οι κηρ/ ὑμαιν’ ἵσταμένω, πρὶν χάλκεον οὐδὸν ἱκέσθαι; 7.82-83), including the wonder he experiences (θαύμαζεν δ’ Ὀδυσσεύς… 7.43; …θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι, 7.45). Here we get a sense of how a character’s focalization of landscape grants the audience a window into his thoughts and emotions. Conversely, in the passage describing the *locus amoenus* surrounding the fountain on Ithaca, the narrator is the focalizer of the scenery, making the description completely devoid of these insights. Moreover, though the narrative is laid out spatially (as evidenced by the myriad of spatial markers—ὁθεν, 17.206; ἀμφί, 17.208; πάντοσε, 202 See above (Chapter 3).

203 I stand with Steiner (2010) 102, n. 205-211 who asserts that this scene is presented directly by the narrator. De Jong (2001) 416, n. 204-211 holds that this scenery description is “implicitly” focalized by the hero, especially due to the use of past tense verbs, which are usually used when scenery description is focalized by a character. Nevertheless, this passage lacks any indication of the hero’s perception of the scene, including verbs denoting perception, as are found in other places where characters focalize scenery.
it is difficult for the audience to imagine the hero’s position because there is no indication of where he himself is positioned—another symptom of the fact that he is not focalizing the scene.\footnote{See Steiner (2010) 103.} Just as the hero is careful not to leak any familiarity with the landscape, the choice of the Homeric bard to use the narrator as focalizer of this scene contributes to the overall effect of the hero’s disengagement with the landscape.

Finally, the conditions of Odysseus’ journey—on foot and passing through important Ithacan landmarks—should create opportunities for the hero’s engagement with the landscape.\footnote{Contrast, for example, Odysseus’ focalization of Alcinous’ palace at 7.81ff, where the audience is explicitly told that Odysseus stands at the threshold, gazing at the wonders that the external narrator enumerates. See also Odysseus coming upon Eumaeus’ hut at Book 14.5ff. Though we are not privy to his somatic positioning, the verb of perception, (εὑρίσκω), coupled with the indication of the object’s (Eumaeus’) somatic position in front of the house, leads the audience to infer that Odysseus is standing facing the swineherd, who is sitting on his front porch. See Steiner (2010) 103, n. 207.}

The narrator’s presentation of the history of the fountain, established as it was by the important Ithacan historical figures Ithakos, Neritos and Polyktor, is reminiscent of Nausicaa’s description of the Phaeacian agora (\textit{Od.} 6.262-272) and the disguised Athena’s history lesson to the hero before the Phaeacian palace (\textit{Od.} 7.48-77).\footnote{Macauley (2000) 8 “…walking loosens, unties, and releases the mnemonic knots in the body, triggering an active engagement with and archival recollection of the places through which we walk.”} These descriptions allude to the significance of the landmarks within the history and society of the community of which they are a part. And, as we have learned from Tuan, spaces can be invested with meaning, and thereby become places, through language—through naming sites and incorporating them into cultural narratives.\footnote{See Russo (1992) 27 for the comments from the scholia on the mention of Ithakos, Neritos, and Polyktor who are named by scholion V as founders of Cephaleniala and then Ithaca.} As Steiner puts it, “Typical … of practices in pre-literate cultures is the combination of topography and history: objects in the landscape serve as catalysts for recalling past event.”\footnote{Tuan (1991), esp. 687.}

Homeric scenery description usually only occurs when it is relevant to the plot. In the Phaeacian episode, the \textit{locus amoenus} of the Grove of Athena is an important place where...
Odysseus’ interactions with the landscape lead to his re-engagement with Hellenic religious and cultural practices. But despite the clear cultural significance of Ithacan locus amoenus, which the narrator makes a point to describe in careful spatial detail, Odysseus makes absolutely no mention of their familiarity, nor does he show any signs of emotion. We can contrast this lack of reaction to the episode when the Phaeacian singer, Demodocus, began singing of the Trojan War (Od. 8. 83-86). One could object that Odysseus, who is not privy to the words of the external narrator, is not in a position to react to the narrative history of the fountain. Yet we must remember that Odysseus would be familiar with the cultural narrative of the fountain and the history surrounding it. After all, Ithaca is his homeland, and he was once a very integral part of the community. Without Odysseus’ acknowledgement of the well, which the epic audience would now expect due to the correspondence that this episode displays with the episode on Scheria, we are left to ponder the scenery description’s significance to the plot. Besides the allusion the the “meeting of a local you at the well” type scene, I believe that the Homeric narrator is playing with his audience; he makes detailed mention of the Ithacan history behind the well and colours it with reminiscences of the Grove of Athena in order to engender the expectation of Odysseus’ leakage of emotion or familiarity with the landscape. He does this purposely to thwart our expectations when the hero does not engage with the surroundings and to highlight the hero’s endurance and forbearance. The hero’s lack of place-making in this narrative is a significant and deliberate element of both the hero’s performance of exteriority and the narrator’s purposeful complementing of the performance. Before Odysseus arrives at his palace, the Homeric narrator makes two more narratological choices deserving of further study that

210 ταύτ’ ἀρ’ άοιδος άειδε περικλυτός’ αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς / πορφύρεον μέγας φάρος ἐλών χεροί στιβαρῆσι /κάκ
κεφαλῆς ἔφυσε, κάλυψε δὲ καλὰ πρόσωπα’ / αἰδετο γάρ Φαίηκας ὑπ’ ὀφρύς δάκρυα λείβων” (Od. 8.83-86). Here, Odysseus is non-verbally leaking emotion by literally leaking tears. On Odysseus’ lack of emotional leakage in the Iliad, in contrast to his behaviour in the Odyssey, see Pache (2000) esp. 16-18, 22-23. Her overall thesis is that Odysseus’ lack of emotional involvement in the Trojan expedition reflects his role in the Iliad as not the main hero, but a minor character.
complement Odysseus’ performance of exteriority during his pedestrian journey. The first is the perversion of the hospitality type scene, in which the hero encounters the violent cowherd Melanthius at the Ithacan well in the aforementioned locus amonenus.

Reece (1993) argues that the final stages of Odysseus’ return home, beginning with his encounter with the goatherd Melanthius, represent a reversal or perversion of the typical Homeric hospitality type scene. The first of the 38 possible elements that can make up the Homeric hospitality scene is the meeting of a local maiden at a well or a male youth on the road. In the Odyssey, the encounter with a maiden at a well happens four times, and so too does the meeting of a local youth on the road. In most of these instances, the local maiden or youth helps the stranger, usually by escorting him to his destination. In fact, the encounter with Melanthius is the only aberrant episode of its type. As the very first element in the final hospitality scene, the meeting between Melanthius, Eumaeus, and Odysseus sets the tone for the rest of scene in which the suitors pervert all Hellenic hospitality practices. The most obvious points of inversion in this scene are the insults that Melanthius directs towards the disguised hero upon encountering him. Melanthius, it turns out, is not the hospitable “youth on the road,” but a disgraceful inversion of the trope. In addition to insulting what ought to be a Zeus-protected stranger, the goatherd discourages the pair from coming to the palace by threatening them violence:

\[
\begin{align*}
\nu\nu\nu \mu\varepsilon\nu \delta\iota \mu\alpha\lambda\alpha \pi\acute{a} \gamma\chi\upsilon \kappa\acute{a}k\acute{o}\varsigma \kappa\acute{a}k\acute{o}\varsigma \h\acute{a}\gamma\nu\lambda\acute{a}\zeta\epsilon i,
\omega\varsigma \alpha\acute{e}i \tau\omicron \omicron\iota \omicron\iota\omicron\iota \upsilon \acute{a} \chi\epsilon\iota \theta\acute{e}\dot{o}\varsigma \acute{\omega} \tau\omicron \omicron \omicron\iota \omicron\iota\nu \upsilon.
\pi\acute{e} \delta\iota \tau\acute{o}n \mu\lambda\omicron\omicron\beta\rho\omicron\upsilon \acute{a} \chi\epsilon\iota, \acute{\alpha} \acute{m}\acute{e}\acute{g}a\acute{a}rte \supsym\acute{\omega}t\acute{a},
\pi\tau\omega\chi\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}n\iota\eta\rho\omicron\upsilon, \dot{d}a\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\nu \acute{\alpha}p\omicron\omicron\uomicron\omicron\nu\uomicron\omicron\n\acute{\tau}i\acute{e}\nu\acute{a}p\omicron\upsilon\upsigma\upsilon\nu\upsi\upsigma\iota\upsigma\upsigma\acute{\upsi}\upsigma\upsigma\upsi\upsigma\upsi\upsigma\upsi\upsi\upsi\upsigma\upsi
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{Reece (1993) 167-187 (Chapter 8): “…Odysseus’ homecoming can be profitably analyzed as a hospitality scene, for architecturally it is built on the structure of the conventional hospitality scene…” (168).}\]

\[\text{See Reece (1993) 6-7 for a succinct grid of the 38 possible elements of the Homeric hospitality scene and 12-13 for a descriptive synopsis of the “Maiden at the Well/Youth on the Road” formal element.}\]
Now a quite completely vile one acts as leader for a vile one, as god always brings one like him, as he brings one like him.

You miserable swineherd, where do you bring this greedy pig, this annoying beggar, this one who takes the joy from feasts, who might stand beside and rub his shoulders on many doorposts, and beg for scraps but not for swords and cauldrons?

If you would give him to me, to become the keeper of my farmsteads,
to be a cleaner of the pens, and carry young shoots to the kids, he would even build big thigh muscles, drinking whey.

But, since he has no doubt learned evil deeds, he wouldn’t want to go about his work, but he’d rather go cringing through the kingdom and beg to feed his insatiable belly.

But I will declare this to you, and it will come to pass, too.

If he should come to divine Odysseus’ home, his head and ribs will wear out many footstools from the palms of men as he is pelted through the house.

(/** Od. 17. 217-232**)

Indeed, instead of playing the part of the gracious local and escorting Odysseus to the palace, Melanthius discourages the disguised hero from going there, citing his undesirability and poverty as marks of his unsuitability for keeping company among the suitors. What is perhaps most outrageous is the threat of violence that Melanthius makes against the beggar, which should be seen not only as an affront to the disguised hero, but also to Zeus.

Several other elements in Melanthius’ speech also characterize the goatherd as a violator of xenia and indicate that he, and by extension the suitors, view Odysseus (the beggar) as
unworthy of proper guest treatment. Indeed the external narrator seems to be directly contrasting Melanthius with Eumaeus in terms of their observance of the *xenia* customs. As we have noted, both herdsmen are part of Odysseus’ household. But Eumaeus exemplifies those who remained loyal to their absent master, while Melanthius is representative of those who betrayed Odysseus and went over to the suitors’ camp. Nevertheless, Melanthius offers an exchange of board for work, much as Eumaeus did at *Od.* 17.186-187. But Melanthius’ offer is only a thinly veiled mark of contempt for the disguised beggar. He immediately follows it up with more criticism of the disguised hero’s character, suggesting that he is morally unfit for any type of rural labour (17.126-128)—an irony since Melanthius himself would fit into this category. Eumaeus, in contrast, asks the disguised Odysseus to stay in the countryside and work for him, both for the sake of the beggar’s protection and in recognition of the beggar’s affinity with his way of life and his morality. Melanthius, on the other hand, makes the offer expressly so that he may rescind it. Indeed Melanthius is a useful tool for the external narrator to employ. He emphasizes Odysseus’ exteriority by suggesting that Odysseus’ humble beggar persona is unfit to fraternize with the noble suitors. More ironically, however, Melanthius reflects and foreshadows the suitors’ complete lack of moral integrity, emphasizing the ethical polarity between them on the one hand and Odysseus and his loyal followers on the other.

Odysseus’ first glimpse of his own palace and his reaction to it are laden with irony that serves to highlight the exteriority of the beggar. The narrator has Odysseus, in direct character speech, describe his first glimpse of the palace with wonder:

```
Εὐμαι’, ἦ μάλα δὴ τάδε δώματα κάλ’ Ὀδυσῆος·
μείξα δ’ ἄριγνωτ’ ἐστὶ καὶ ἐν πολλοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι.
ἐξ ἑτέρων ἔτερ’ ἐστίν, ἐπήσκηται δὲ οἱ αὐλὴ
τοίχῳ καὶ θριγκοῖσι, θύραι δ’ εὐερκέες εἰσὶ
δικλίδες· οὐ ἄν τὸι τῖς μιν ἀνήρ ὑπερπλῖσσαιτο.
γιγνώσκω δ’ ὅτι πολλοὶ ἐν αὐτῷ δαίτα τίθενται
ἀνδρεῖς, ἐπεὶ κυίσθη μὲν ἐνήνθεθεν, ἐν δὲ τε φόρμιγξ
```
ἡπύει, ἢν ἄρα δαιτὶ θεοὶ ποίησαν ἑταῖρην.
(Od. 17.264-271)

Eumaeus, this is very surely the beautiful house of Odysseus and it is easy to recognize and easy to see among many. One room comes out of another, the courtyard is finished with a wall and coping, and the doors are well-secured and double-paneled. No man would look down on it. I perceive that in the house itself many men are holding a feast, since the smell of sacrifice rises up, and a lyre, that the gods created as companion to a feast, is calling.

Nevertheless, the hero is not describing his own wonder at his palace but that of the disguised beggar whom he is impersonating. This type of wonder—the kind that occurs when seeing something for the first time, again signals the beggar’s exteriority. In choosing to forego a third-person scenery description and to put it instead into the words of the main character, the Homeric poet-narrator has cleverly engineered the situation such that Odysseus, gazing at his home after twenty long years away, must respond to it by putting on an act. As de Jong comments, “This procedure also shows us Odysseus’ talent as an actor, who is pretending to see the palace for the first time…and his self control…”213 Once again, the external narrator’s choices have enhanced the hero’s performance of the beggar’s outsideness. When he finally arrives at the palace, Odysseus continues his performance through a combination of different means: through his lying speeches, his physical disguise, and an elaborate proxemic display of his inferiority and outsideness. Even though the most intense examples of his proxemic performance show up during his re-introduction to the palace environment, the hero’s manipulation of proxemics during his nostos begins immediately after he is wakened on Ithaca.

3 Odysseus’ Spatial Relations: Proxemics and Nonverbal Communication

With his secret arrival on the island of Ithaca, Odysseus has a quiet homecoming unlike that of Agamemnon, who is feasted and then murdered.\(^\text{214}\) In fact, his first encounter with what he thinks is a local inhabitant begins in much the same way as his pedestrian journey on Scheria: he presents himself as a suppliant to Athena, disguised as a shepherd boy, and implores her not to hurt him but instead to tell him where he is:

\[
\text{o w } \phi i l', \; \epsilon p e i \; s e \; p r o \omega t a \; k i x \alpha n o w \; t o \delta ' \; e n i \; x \omega r o w, \\
\text{xa e r e t e k a i } \mu e i \; m o i \; t i \; k a k o w \; n o w \; a n t i b o l \i s a i s, \\
\text{a ll a } \sigma a w \; m e n \; t a u t a, \; \sigma a w \; d ' \; e m e \; s o i \; y a r \; e g w y \; g e \; e u x o m a i \; \omega s \; t e \; t e w o k a i \; s e n \; f i l a \; g o u n a t h ' \; i k a n o w. \\
\text{k a i } \mu o i \; t o u t ' \; \alpha g \o r e u s o u n \; e t \i t i t u m o n, \; \delta o r r ' \; e u i d o w' \; t i s \; \gamma h i, \; t i s \; d e m o s, \; t i n e s \; a n e r e s \; e g g e g a s a i s n; \\
\text{h i } \; \text{p o u } \; t i s \; n h s o w n \; e u d e i l o s, \; h e \; t i s \; a k t i \; k e i h ' \; a l i \; k e k l i m e n h \; e r i b o l a k o s \; h p e i r o i o; \\
(Od. 13.228-235)
\]

Friend, since you are the first that I have met in this place, hello, and may you not at all meet me with evil intent, but save these things, and save me. For I pray to you as to a god, and I come to your dear knees. And tell me this truly, so I will know it well. What land is this, what kingdom, what men are born here? Is it perhaps some clear island or some headland that lies sloping from the fertile mainland to the sea? 

\[(Od. 13.228-235)\]

Once again, the audience finds itself looking upon a terrified and vulnerable Odysseus. His helplessness is conveyed through the use of the accusative form of the noun \(\gamma o \upsilon a t a\) (13.231) as the destination of the verb \(i k a n e i n\), (13.231) almost as if the intended goal of his journey is to be a suppliant once again. This proxemic position of inferiority, and the imagery of the hero

\(?\text{214}\) On Agamemnon’s \(n o s t o s\) as a foil for Odysseus’, see Alexopoulou (2009) 21-26.
kneeling literally or figuratively at the knees of another person, recall the vulnerability with which Odysseus approaches Nausicaa in Book 6: γονοῦμαι σε, ἀνασσα· (6.149). Thus, Odysseus begins the final stage of his nostos in a state of unexpected vulnerability. But this is the only encounter during which Odysseus will be forced, out of lack of options, to strike such a deferential pose. Once Athena reveals herself and the pair devise their plan, the deference and humility with which Odysseus interacts with others becomes part of the performance that complements his humble appearance, his verbal deference, and lying tales. In what follows in this section, I will present and analyze several of Odysseus’ most suggestive gestural, postural, and proxemic displays from the very beginning of his time on Ithaca up to his entrance into his own palace disguised as a beggar.

As directed by Athena at the end of Book 13, Odysseus makes his way to the swineherd Eumaeus’ hut. The swineherd’s first glimpse of Odysseus has the hero almost being attacked by Eumaeus’ dogs:

Ἐξαπίνης δ’ Ὀδυσῆα ἱδον κύνες ύλακόμωροι. οἱ μὲν κεκλήγοντες ἐπέδραμον· αὐτάρ Ὀδυσσεύς ἐξέτο κερδοσύνη, σκῆπτρον δέ ὦ ἐκπέσε χειρός. ἔνθα κεν ὡ πάρ σταθμῷ ἄεικέλιον πάθεν ἄλγος· ἀλλὰ συβώτης ὦκα ποσὶ κραινοὶς μετασπῶν ἔσσυτ’ ἀνὰ πρόθυρον, σκῦτος δέ ὦ ἐκπέσε χειρός. (Od. 14.29-34)

Suddenly, the barking dogs saw Odysseus. They rushed at him with a loud cry, but Odysseus sat down with cunning and the staff fell out of his hand. Then he would have suffered mean sorrow beside his own farmhouse, but the swineherd, following quickly on swift feet, rushed through the gateway, and the hide fell out of his hand. (Od. 14.29-34)

Although Eumaeus saved him, the swineherd’s exclamation to Odysseus highlights the shame the situation would have brought about had the dogs injured the guest (Od. 14.37-38). Indeed, if
Eumaeus actually knew the identity of the old beggar, he would no doubt have been scandalized that his master was on the ground in deference to his dogs. A closer look at Odysseus’ body language throughout this scene helps support this interpretation. As the dogs rush towards him, the hero immediately sits down and drops his staff, thereby rendering his appearance unthreatening. This is typical animal behavior, in which the weaker members of a pack lay down in the presence of the dominant beast. In doing so, Odysseus not only debases himself by communicating deference in the language of animals, but he also positions himself physically beneath the level of the dogs. Proxemically, he has reaffirmed the inferiority signaled by his clothing. Indeed Odysseus could not be in a lower position, as dogs and pigs are commonly regarded as among the lowliest of animals in the Homeric schema. So far on Ithaca, then, Odysseus’ non-verbal and proxemic communication is very similar to that of the beginning of his stay on Scheria: he has presented himself as a suppliant (although this time unknowingly to a god) and put himself on the same level as animals (lower, even) in falling to the ground to avoid being mauled by Eumaeus’ dogs.

The disguised hero continues to make a display of the beggar’s humility, through both verbal and complementary non-verbal means, in his relationship to Eumaeus. Though he is a lowly herdsman, the disguised Odysseus is deferential to the swineherd and his guests, and he treats Eumaeus as if he were his superior. As Lateiner notices, deference for the perpetually penniless and newly arrived Odysseus takes the form of allowing his local hosts and guides to “call the shots.” The disguised hero does so on several occasions. First, at Od. 17.193, the hero verbally demonstrates his approval of Eumaeus’ obeisance and deference to his master.

---

215 On this episode as part of an overall parody of a guest-welcome type scene and the hounds as Eumaeus’ “royal attendants” (397), see Williams (1986).


217 Lateiner (1995) 99-100 also talks of the customs of xenia and the host’s obligations to honour and protect guests and suppliants, while it is the responsibility of the guest to be deferential to the host.
Telemachus: γινώσκω, φρονέω· τά γε δή νοέοντι κελεύεις. (“I see. I understand. You order one who has the wits for this.” *Od.* 17.193). By responding in this way, Odysseus points to a similar relationship with his host, who has also become his *de facto* master. Then, at *Od.* 17.194, he asks Eumaeus to commence their pedestrian journey: ἀλλ’ ἵομεν, σὺ δ’ ἔπειτα διαμπερὲς ἠγεμόνευε. (“So let us go, and you guide me all the way thereafter.” *Od.* 17.194). The disguised beggar thus reinforces his position as the swineherd’s follower, and also allows the relationship to be borne out proxemically, with Eumaeus taking spatial precedence.

As the two begin walking, their relative positions are described in lines 200-201: τῶ βήτην, σταθὼν δὲ κύνες καὶ βωτορες ἄνδρες/ῥύατ’ ὁπισθε μένοντες. ὁ δ’ ἐς πόλιν ἴγεν ἀνακτα… (“The two set out, and the dogs and the men who were herders/stayed behind and guarded. He led his lord to the city…” *Od.* 17.200-201). Line 201 begins with the dual of the verb “βαίνειν” (to walk), signaling the fact that Odysseus and Eumaeus are setting off together. The narrator’s choice to use a dual verb form emphasizes Odysseus’ humility by making him a subject indistinguishable from the swineherd, himself the truly marginal figure. And in order to reinforce the reversed stratification within this humble grouping, line 201 ends with particularly significant word placement: the definite article ὁ refers to Eumaeus and, placed behind the article at line’s end, is the title that signifies the true station—ἄναξ—of the hero, who is being led to town by his slave. Thus, the word placement reflects not only the proxemic situation (that is, Eumaeus leading Odysseus), but also the current social hierarchy in their relationship. Furthermore, the choice to use Odysseus’ former socially constructed title instead of his name or another referent allows the poet to imbue the scene with a heavy dose of irony.

It is not only during his pedestrian journey, but also upon arrival at his own palace that Odysseus uses proxemics and non-verbal communication to enhance his performance of humility.
and exteriority. This seems to be the motivation behind his decision to stay outside the palace when Eumaeus gives him the choice to precede him or not:

\[
\text{ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ φραζώµεθ', ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα,}
\text{ἡὲ σὺ πρῶτος ἔσελθε δόµους εὐ ναιετάουτας,}
\text{δύσεο δὲ µηστηρὰς, ἐγὼ δ' ὑπολείψωµαι αὐτοῦ·}
\text{εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις, ἐπίµεινον, ἐγὼ δ' εἰµι προπάροιβε.}
\]

\[Od. 17.274-277\]

But come, let us think about how these deeds will be. Either you go first into the well-settled house, and plunge into the suitors, while I am left behind here, or if you want, stay here, and I will go ahead of you.

\[Od. 17-274-277\]

Instead of going inside and tending to his ravenous stomach, which he once again references in his reply, Odysseus encourages Eumaeus to enter before him, citing his endurance and familiarity with abuse as reasons for his lack of intimidation. In making this choice, Odysseus highlights his performed humility and deference for both Eumaeus and the suitors, while we as the audience are reminded of Odysseus’ capacity for forbearance. Eumaeus also seems to have some clout in the palace, at least with Telemachus and Penelope. He is summoned by Telemachus upon his entry, then seats himself next to his young master and is served by the household staff along with the suitors \[Od. 17. 328-332\].

When Eumaeus is finally seated and served, Odysseus makes his way into the palace:

\[
\text{ἀγχίµολον δὲ µετ' αὐτὸν ἐδύσετο δῶµατ' Ὀδυσσεύς,}
\text{πτωχῷ λευγαλέῳ ἐναλίγκιος ἢδὲ γέροντι,}
\text{σκηπτόµενος: τὰ δὲ λυγρά περὶ χροὶ εἰµιτα ἔστο.}
\text{ϊξε δ' ἐπὶ µελίνου οὐδοῦ ἐντοσθε θυράων}
\text{κλινάµενος σταθµῷ κυπαρισσίῳ, ὃν ποτε τέκτων}
\text{ξέσσευ ἐπισταµένως καὶ ἐπὶ στάµην ἱθευε.}
\]

\[Od. 17.336-341\]

\[218\] See de Jong (2001) 422-23 for the series of three entrances (Melanthius, Eumaeus, and Odysseus) into the palace.
Odysseus entered the house close after him,
looking like a sordid beggar and old man, propping himself up,
and wretched were the things he wore as clothes around his
flesh.
He sat on the ash threshold, inside the doors,
and leaned on a cypress doorpost, that a carpenter
had once expertly planed and made straight to the line.

(*Od. 17.336-341*)

The poet’s artful description of the hero’s actions in this passage complements Odysseus’
effective performance. With his entrance into the palace, the hero controls and manipulates space
to maximize the efficacy of his display of inferiority. From leaning on his staff to sitting at the
threshold to leaning up against the doorposts as he sits, Odysseus gradually debases himself in
front of the suitors. And just as the hero descends, so too would the audience’s ears and the
reader’s eyes be drawn to the words describing his descent that are given priority of position as
the first words of three consecutive lines (σκηπτόμενος, 338; ἵζε, 339; κλινάμενος, 340). From
line to line to line, the audience’s attention is drawn to the emphasis placed on Odysseus’ bodily
position. Moreover, his feigned frailty is contrasted by the stoutness and soundness of the
threshold and doorsill’s manufacture. The placement of the verb “ἰθύνειν” (to straighten),
referring to the building of the doorpost against which Odysseus leans, is significant. The verb
directly contrasts with the hero’s hunched body, which is actually being supported by the robust
structure. In contrast to the structure of his house, Odysseus’ body seems fragile and altogether
unfit for the splendor of the setting. Finally, the hero’s spatial manipulation in this scene is
crowned by his choice to sit at and occupy the door’s threshold.

The threshold has special symbolic resonance in Homeric poetry. It is a place of
liminality, occupied by people such as guests who arrive and wait at the threshold to be escorted
inside. Beggars, too, are liminal figures: they are both on the margins of society and yet simultaneously allowed to occupy the elite centre to beg. Thresholds are also often the sites chosen for expressions of weakness or helplessness, used to intensify the theme of transition.

While to the suitors the beggar’s choice of seat indicates his inferiority and submission, to the audience of the epic it would have further resonances. Seating his hero on the threshold, the Homeric narrator can highlight the hero’s liminality—he is at once a beggar and the master of the house, at once both a marginal figure and an insider—and can also foreshadow Odysseus’ great transition from nameless beggar to honoured guest to master of his own household.

Not surprisingly, the Homeric narrator employs spatial and proxemic means to illustrate Odysseus’ changes in status. Most significantly, as several scholars have noted, Odysseus goes from being seated first on the threshold as a beggar, then on a humble chair (δίφρος) as Penelope’s guest, before finally retaking his seat on the θρόνος of the master. Though Odysseus’ proxemtics and non-verbal display continues throughout his slow reclamation of his household and identity, I leave my analysis here, since, with his display on the threshold, Odysseus has completed his pedestrian journey home.

My aim in this chapter was to demonstrate how both Odysseus and the external narrator employ the pedestrian journey of *Odyssey* 17 as a showpiece. To Odysseus, the pedestrian journey allows for a strategic performance of his outsideness, one which ironically is required for

---

219 Reece (1993) 15-16 includes the motif of the guest waiting on the threshold to be escorted inside as a formative element of the Homeric welcome type scene.

220 See de Jong (2001) 423 for an excellent summary of the functions of the threshold in Homeric poetry and from which all above noted functions are taken. For the threshold’s significance and Odysseus’ manipulation of this liminal space, see Lateiner (1993) 121-122.

221 For this observation, see Reece (1993) 166-167 in the context of his interpretation of Odysseus’ return to his palace as a hospitality scene. He also notes that the elevation in Odysseus’ status from πτωχός (beggar) to ξεῖνος (stranger/guest) to ἀναξ (master/king) is mirrored by the different locations and types of beds that are offered to the hero (167-168).
him to regain his status as insider within his own palace. The performance allows him to return to and re-enter his own community, having tested the loyalty of the members of his household. At the same time, Odysseus’ performance relies on many of the same strategies considered in earlier chapters of my analysis, including proxemics and intentional manipulations of space.

While the narrator’s careful narrative choices complement Odysseus’ performance of his exteriority, he also pursues his own objective—that of differentiating the hero from the Iliadic archetype. If Achilles, who is focused solely on attaining *kleos apthiton*, does not suffer insult to his honour, Odysseus clearly demonstrates his willingness to debase himself in order to achieve his own brand of *kleos* through a humble and attenuated *nostos*. 
Chapter 5
Conclusion

This work, which investigates the roles that the pedestrian journeys play in the *Odyssey*, was born out of an observation of how “out of place” Odysseus seems to be when journeying on foot. I consider here two separate narratives that fit this category, the first of which takes place in the Phaeacian land of Scheria in Books 6 through 7, and the second of which takes the hero from the outskirts of Ithaca back home to his palace in Book 17. Given the prominent role that ships and maritime imagery plays in the rest of the epic, these pedestrian journeys seemed uncharacteristic, if not peculiar. Both narratives also depict the hero in strange circumstances, enduring long periods of anonymity and dishonour that other Homeric heroes would find intolerable. Finally, they also occur at a point in the narrative when Odysseus must walk out of necessity, having lost his ships and his crew, and thus also his last remaining link to his homeland.

This investigation also draws heavily from the literature on space and place, and is influenced by the so-called “spatial turn” in the humanities. After neglecting spatial elements and categories that enhance interpretation and convey meaning, scholars in various disciplines were returning to classic and seminal works in their field to reconsider the neglected role that space could be observed to play. There appeared to be an opportunity to apply these theories to one of the most seminal works in the Classics, especially given the little scholarly attention paid to the narratives that trace Odysseus’ pedestrian journeys.

Ultimately, this work argues that the pedestrian journeys of the *Odyssey* serve a characterizing function for Odysseus: they complicate our understanding of Odysseus as a Greek, as a member of the social elite, and as a hero. Odysseus’ fleet and crew served to implace him in a Hellenic, heroic community even as he wanders the open sea and comes into contact
with exotic peoples and customs. Their loss requires that he take on a new way of being, one that sees him passively endure his trials instead of resorting more active response of rash violence that he seemed to favour in the Cicconian episode and which was still a strong component of his \textit{ethos} in the \textit{Cyclopeia}.

In the Introduction to this work, I suggested that a close spatial reading of the \textit{Apologue} and of Odysseus’ two pedestrian journeys in the \textit{Odyssey} could bring to the fore previously unconsidered aspects of the narratives. I also maintained that the modes of travel used in each episode are important. Odysseus is an iconic maritime adventurer; as such, however, he often fails to interact in any detail with new spaces, since he always has his fleet and crew—along with the heroic \textit{ethos} that accompanies them—to steer his character. Having lost these touchstones in the pedestrian episodes, however, the hero can have somatic experience of the spaces through which he walks, allowing him greater engagement with his surroundings. This shift in Odysseus’ mode of relation to his environment in turn brings with it a shift in characterization, which is considered in detail in the following chapters. I argue that the spatiality of the episodes considered here— from the early encounters of the \textit{Apologue} to the walks in Scheria and on Ithaca—either reflect or starkly contrast important themes and storylines, and I draw on phenomenological and proxemic observations to trace Odysseus’ characterization as a displaced hero who employs passivity and endurance in order to regain his rightful place as Ithacan leader and achieve a full \textit{nostos}.

In the \textit{Apologue}, where the loss of fleet and crew mean the forfeiture of a protected centre of uniform values, Odysseus’ displacement is vividly represented by the image of reduction. Odysseus begins his post-Troy travels as leader of numerous men and a whole fleet of ships. His community is first diminished through loss of life, and then, in the tragic encounter with the Laestrygonians his fleet is swiftly reduced to one ship. Odysseus continues to lose companions
from this single ship until he is dealt the final blow off the coast of Thrinacia and loses the remaining ship and all of his companions. The image is not only one of constantly diminishing social status—from leader of a fleet, to ship’s captain, to solitary, shipwrecked wanderer—but the change is also borne out with directional significance. Odysseus starts out the journey in a lofty position, sailing on a grand ship on the high seas, and is gradually reduced to a lowly position as a pedestrian whose down-to-earth nature is reflected in the contact of his feet with the soil.

The *Apologue*’s narrative of displacement is concomitant with a discernable shift in his behaviour and *ethos* from a character who has a balanced *ethos* of both active (forceful, self-confident, violent) and passive (wily, deferential, enduring) traits to one who is, in relative terms, proportionately more passive, deferential, and humble. I read this overall privileging of his passive traits as sometimes necessitated by his displacement from the heroic, Hellenic community of his fleet/crew, and, at other times, a cause of his increasing ethical and spatial distancing from that same community.

Chapter 3’s investigation into Odysseus’ first pedestrian journey finds the hero in a lowly position as he washes ashore. Indeed he appears so lowly and so riddled with *anomie* that he is almost animalistic, sleeping on a rustic bed similar to a boar’s haunt and compared to a ravenous lion whose only concern is for a full belly. Here, Odysseus’ experience and use of space is not even human. The hero’s animalistic crouching before Nausicaa is also a significant. This prostrate position conveys proxemically the hero’s perceived inferiority. When the princess invites him to stand upright in the bipedal position, she also compels him to experience landscape in a thoroughly human manner.

While initially Odysseus has difficulty engaging with the Phaeacian landscape and its people, Nausicaa creates places for him verbally by naming and telling background stories about
places of cultural importance for the Phaeacians. Her description of the path to the palace creates virtual places for Odysseus, which he then experiences somatically as he physically walks the journey. The Grove of Athena is an especially important stop for Odysseus. Here, he re-engages with a place that reflects his Hellenism, one that is akin to a Greek shrine. As he stops to pray to his patron goddess at the grove, Odysseus achieves mental and emotional re-engagement with his Hellenism, which he had lost during his long tenure on Ogygia, and his brief stay in the wilderness of Scheria.

Odysseus’ situation is also symbolically reflected in the walking journey’s teleology towards the centre and away from the periphery of Scheria. Here, his starting point on the periphery of the inhabited spaces of Scheria reflects his status as an anonymous outsider who does not belong among the Phaeacians. Nevertheless, the centripetal motion of the pedestrian journey aligns itself with the symbolism of change and implacement as he is accepted into the elite centre of the Phaeacian peoples.

The hero’s walk back to his palace on Ithaca provides a point of contrast to the centripetal walk to the cultural centre on Scheria. Here the hero, disguised as a beggar, must first be accepted into the morally superior culture of the lowly dwellers in Ithaca’s periphery before he can safely return to his palace. Odysseus’ walk from periphery to the highly cultured centre of Ithaca sees the hero’s displacement increase the further he travels into the city. The beggar, having gained the trust of Eumaeus and the similarly principled country folk, is morally and ethically more connected to the countryside. This necessarily precludes him from integration in the corrupt and morally bereft place that is the city. And once he reaches the urban centre, the suitors treat him as an unwanted outsider. Yet this reduction in status is both willful and necessary, as it is his place as an outsider that allows Odysseus access to observe his household and to test its members.
Once on Ithaca, Odysseus also suppresses any sign of his somatic experience of the familiar landscape. Though he is finally home, he refuses to betray any sense of familiarity. An example of this can be found in the scene that takes place in the Ithacan locus amoenus that surrounds the historically significant well in Ithaca. Described with intricate spatial detail, this well is at the centre of a Greek sanctuary or shrine. Though Odysseus must know its history and its cultural significance, he leaks no signs of this at all, maintaining his performance of the beggar’s exteriority. He further enhances his performance with proxemic displays of deference and inferiority to Eumaeus and especially to the suitors, as when he lowers himself to the ground on the threshold of his own palace. Ultimately, Odysseus’ masterful command of spatial relations contributes to the success of his disguise and allows him to achieve his goal: to gain entrance, unrecognized, into his own palace.

The spatial analyses of the episodes that I consider serve to highlight the characterizing role that these narratives play. The narrative of maritime travel, Odysseus’ gradual loss of his fleet, and his ensuing pedestrian travel all contribute to a developing complexity of the Odysseus character that take him beyond the image of the active, violent hero. Though I treat these narratives as separate entities, they do form a coherent sequence of formative events for the hero. During the *Apologue*, Odysseus begins his return journey as a hero whose active violence in the Cicconian episode temporarily outweighs his passivity, recalling perhaps his Trojan exploits. Nevertheless, after two disastrous encounters—with the Cicconians and with the Cyclops, Polyphemus—during which the hero’s active, assertive traits dominate, Odysseus begins, on the whole, to approach situations much differently. Accompanying the narrative of Odysseus’ displacement from his mobile centre is the narrative of Odysseus’ more frequent adoption of a comparatively passive and enduring *ethos*. The hero often chooses to remain passive in response
to new problems that arise, such as his final escape from the Cyclops, or in reaction to his companions’ misuse of Aeolus’ bag of winds.

The two pedestrian journeys reflect the shift in the hero’s ethos that favours the passive extreme. In Scheria, Odysseus endures many insults to his station, including the necessity of the journey on foot, as he is displaced and bereft of any outward signs of his true identity. Nevertheless, the centripetal motion of the journey, and the hero’s engagement with the important landmarks of the highly cultured Phaeacian civilization reflect a nascent rebalancing in the hero ethos. Where the maritime journey of the Apologue, rife with constant loss and growing displacement, is a time of realization for the hero, the pedestrian journey in Scheria is a narrative of acceptance. The hero accepts that he must endure insults and displacement, and in doing so progresses to the point (the Phaeacian city) where he can not only engage with the local Hellenic-type customs, but also with his own background and identity as a Greek, as a member of the elite, and as an active hero.

When Odysseus lands back on Ithaca, he purposefully harnesses his carefully cultivated ability to endure in order to achieve revenge and a fully articulated nostos. Indeed, on Ithaca, Odysseus seems to invite dishonor intentionally. He takes on the disguise of a lowly and outcast beggar, and at every possible turn embraces his performance of the beggar’s exteriority and social inferiority. More than this, Odysseus suppresses any outward signs of his familiarity with Ithaca. He deliberately plays the outsider, not only to gain entry to his own palace, but also to reinforce his status as the hero of endurance. The situation requires that he put off revealing his identity and regaining all of the advantages of his position as leader in Ithaca until he can test his household and take his revenge on the suitors. His pedestrian journey from Eumaeus’ hut to into his own palace is not only a performance of the Odysseus-beggar’s lowliness and exteriority. It also acts as the emblematic centerpiece of a nostos that is characterized by self-restraint and
endurance. It is during the final pedestrian journey of the *Odyssey* that Odysseus and the external narrator purposely harness the image of the pedestrian hero in order to characterize Odysseus as the hero that endures trials and insults for the sake of *nóstos*. As the walking hero who endures passively rather than acting violently, rashly, or proudly, Odysseus can be contrasted to many typical epic heroes whose concern for *kleós* and honour would outweigh their ability to endure such insults. Indeed, the *Odyssey* celebrates Odysseus’ characteristic ability to suffer and endure.

With this thesis, I have demonstrated that Odysseus’ pedestrian journeys are rife with spatial significance which, when studied, yields important observations about the hero’s evolving characterization in the *Odyssey*. This type of spatial analysis can open up new avenues for the consideration of the role that space plays in ancient epic and other narrative genres. We might consider the results, for example, of giving attention to the spatial details surrounding Priam’s journey to the Achaean camp to ransom Hector’s body in *Iliad* 24. Is there any significance to the centrifugal direction of the journey? How do proxemics come to bear in the meeting between Priam and Achilles? Is there any metapoetic significance to the journey’s position in the final book of the epic? The same could be asked of Theocritus’ *Idylls* 7 and 15, both of which contain the extended narratives of pedestrian journeys, and a host of other Classical texts of the Hellenistic period. Seen in this light, the analysis presented in this work, which considers the particular uses of space that accompany the walking journeys in the *Odyssey*, introduces a lens which might be applied to a variety of other works in the Classical tradition. In doing so, the reintroduction of a neglected category allows us to revisit texts and gain an appreciation for the role that space can play in constructing and conveying meaning in a work, and thus to shed a new light of our traditional understandings of these works in general.
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