The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for ***The Classical Quarterly***:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Does the *Odyssey* imitate the *Iliad*?

A. Shewan

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 7 / Issue 04 / October 2013, pp 234 - 242

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800015354, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800015354

How to cite this article:

A. Shewan (1913). Does the *Odyssey* imitate the *Iliad*?. The Classical Quarterly, 7, pp 234-242 doi:10.1017/S0009838800015354

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

DOES THE *ODYSSEY* IMITATE THE *ILIAD*?

IN Appendix II. to his edition of *Odyssey*, xiii.-xxiv., the late Dr. Monro examined the 'Relation of the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*.' One section of this Appendix, pp. 327 sqq., deals with 'passages of the *Iliad* borrowed or imitated in the *Odyssey*.' It is there admitted that repetition is a characteristic of the epic style, and that in many cases of parallelism no detrimental inference can legitimately be drawn. But if, it is said, 'we are able to point to a sufficient number of passages tending to show that the author of the *Odyssey* imitates the *Iliad*, and if no considerable instances can be produced of the converse,' then it is thought there is confirmation of the view that the *Odyssey* is the later poem. The object of the present paper is to suggest that the decisions in individual cases have been arrived at on scanty or disputable grounds, and without due regard to relevant epic practice; and consequently that the reasons for inferring the existence of a later poet imitating an earlier are inadequate.

The instances relied on are chosen from Dr. Karl Sittl's *Die Wiederholungen in der Odyssee* (Munich, 1882), a work published at a time when the repetitions were in high favour as a means of discrediting passages and books, and of breaking the two epics into fragments. It was only one of a number of treatises, the authors of which came to the subject imbued with the belief that each epic was a congeries of lays, composed, patched, and joined together in different ages. They recognized, it is true, that an epic poet, like writers and singers in all early literatures, might repeat himself freely, and that caution was consequently necessary in coming to conclusions; but this very sound principle was generally honoured in the breach. It is not too much to say that the fashionable abuse of a prominent element in the Homeric style became a mania. I forbear to make this charge good by selecting from a collection of excesses and absurdities which might be presented from the multitude of works and essays concerned with the repetitions. It will be better to avoid exciting too much prejudice, and to allow the treatment of the instances now to be enumerated to be judged on its merits.

Dr. Monro, in his Appendix above referred to, has occasion to make two selections from Sittl's treatise. The first is of cases which Sittl regarded as proving that the author of the *Telemachy* has borrowed from the original *Odyssey*. Here Dr. Monro has no difficulty in showing that the demonstration

is a failure. The other is of parallel passages which were sufficient in Sittl's view to prove that the *Odyssey* is later than the *Iliad*, inasmuch as they disclose frequent imitation by the *Odyssey*, and here Sittl's evidence and criteria are accepted without hesitation. The cases discussed are given below, and are separated into two categories—first, those which are believed to show mere borrowing or imitation; and secondly, those in which it is asserted that there is in addition an element of parody in the reproductions by the Odyssean poet. To begin with the former.

α 398, καὶ δμῶων οὓς μοι λήϊσσατο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, and Σ 28, δμῶαί δ' ἄς Ἀχιλεὺς λήϊσσατο Πάτροκλός τε. In the *Iliad* 'the phrase implies that capture in war was the chief or only mode of obtaining slaves. This may be true for the *Iliad*, but is certainly not true for the *Odyssey* (α 430, ξ 450).' This seems to point a contrast between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* which has no foundation. The line in Σ cannot fairly be interpreted as meaning more than that certain handmaidens of Achilles' establishment were captives of the spear. That in the society described in the *Iliad* the chief means of getting slaves was by fighting, may be admitted. But they could also be acquired by purchase or barter (like tripods and horses; Leaf on I 125, 407). That is clear, if proof be necessary, from H 475, Φ 40, 79, and the valuation in Ψ 705. And in spite of the instances in α 430, ξ 450, we may say of Odyssean days also that the chief way of getting slaves would be by capture. See Merry and Riddell on α 398 (one of the present pair of passages), referring to ψ 356 and γ 73. Forays were common, piracy was rife, and nations or tribes were not always at peace (π 426 sq.). Cp. σ 384, ν 49, ϕ 18. The times were 'troublesome times of war' (Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, 259).

γ 245, τρὶς γὰρ δὴ μὲν φασιν ἀνάξασθαι γένε' ἀνδρῶν, of Nestor, said to be in imitation and exaggeration of the well-known lines, A 250-2, τῷ δ' ἦδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων ἐφθίαθ', . . . μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἀνασθεν. The line is a difficult one, and probably corrupt and ungenuine (M. and R., *a.l.*). If it is genuine, the exaggeration consists in saying that Nestor ruled men of three generations instead of merely lived among them. If there is imitation, it has been very badly done. But the ground for alleging it is of the very slightest. On the two passages see van Leeuwen, *Comment. Hom.*, 126 sq.

γ 291, ἐνθα διατμήξας τὰς μὲν Κρήτην ἐπέλασσαν, of the scattering of ships in a storm, said to be less 'natural' than Φ 3, ἐνθα διατμήξας τοὺς μὲν κ.τ.λ., of troops in the field. Why the verb, meaning (Leaf on Φ 3) 'severed into two bodies,' should be less appropriate of Zeus' action than of Achilles' is very hard to see. But Sittl detects a little rift. 'The reference of τὰς to νηυσί, four lines back, is somewhat harsh.' That is surely hypercritical. The English use of 'her' or 'she' for a 'ship' would cause no difficulty in similar circumstances. In ι 78 τὰς is used in the same way, though the nearest occurrence of νηὺς is six lines back. τήν in A 389 is a still worse case. See also δ in Φ 542, τοὺς in μ 243, and η in ν 81. There is nothing against γ 291.

δ 527, μνήσαιτο δὲ θουρίδος ἀλκῆς. 'This is almost a fixed formula in the

Iliad, imitated or borrowed in the *Odyssey*.' This seems to be only prejudiced assertion. So for

χ 73, ἀλλὰ μνησώμεθα χάρμης. 'The phrase occurs O 477, T 148. The word χάρμη is quite common in the *Iliad*'—naturally, and we do not expect it to be common in the *Odyssey*—'but does not occur in any other place in the *Odyssey*. It is evidently a reminiscence of the *Iliad*.' It is surely not fair criticism to object to the poet using stock phrases or formulae when he requires them.

δ 829, ἡ νῦν με προέηκε τεῖν τάδε μνηθῆσασθαι. It is only said here that 'the use of τάδε where we expect ταῦτα is suspicious; in the parallel Λ 201 τάδε refers to what follows.' On this point see Ebeling, s.v. ὅδε, III. B, where similar instances are given. *Facilius fit in oratione quam in narratione*. Editors do not remark on the use in δ, and the ground even for suspicion is of the smallest.

η 197, πείσεται ἄσσα οἱ αἶσα κατὰ Κλωθῆς τε (v.l. Κατακλωθῆς τε) βαρεῖαι γεινομένην νήσαντο λίνφ, ὅτε μιν τέκε μήτηρ, and T 127, τὰ πείσεται ἄσσα οἱ αἶσα γυγνομένην ἐπένησε κ.τ.λ. 'The addition of the Κλωθῆς (or Κατακλωθῆς) to the simple αἶσα of the *Iliad* is surely later. It brings us within sight of Κλωθώ and her sister Fates in Hesiod.' For this see M. and R. (a.l.) on Κλωθῆς, and Lang (*Homer and his Age*, 229 sq.), who is prepared to show that 'the *Klōthes*, the spinning women who "spae" the fate of each new-born child, are not later, but, as less abstract, are if anything earlier than "the simple αἶσα of the *Iliad*."'

θ 258, ἐννέα πάντες ἀνέσταν (= H 161). 'That there were nine champions of the Greeks is part of the story of the *Iliad* (H 161, Θ 266): but for the Phaeacian judges the number is arbitrary.' As to the *Iliad*, one need not refer to discussions that have taken place as to the number of warriors or γέροντες to be placed in the first class. It is enough to point out, as regards the references to H and Θ, that these do not by any means settle nine champions as part of the story of the *Iliad*. The nine are not the same on the two occasions. And as to Phaeacia, it is surely rash for us, in our ignorance, to predicate anything whatever about the number of the judges. But one remark may be ventured. It is well known that (to use Monro's own expression on ω 60) ἐννέα is 'a favourite number' in the epic. If the same poet had to hand a phrase once used, and it suited the new context, then his repetition of the *ipsissima uerba* is just what a study of the Homeric economy in the use of phraseology leads us to expect. We have another instance of the same kind in ι 350, σὺ δὲ μαίνεαι οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτῶς. 'In Θ 355 ὁ δὲ μαίνεται οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτῶς is said of the furious career of a warrior in the field. It does not apply to the Cyclops.' Not if you insist that a verb shall always be used with precisely the same shade of meaning or application. But Ebeling divides the occurrences of μαίνομαι into two classes, and separates the two cases now under reference. The *Odyssean* phrase he classes with uses such as those in Θ 360, ἀλλὰ πατὴρ οὐμὸς φρεσὶ μαίνεται οὐκ ἀγαθῆσι, or φ 298, where the Centaur's proceedings

are not unlike those of Polyphemus. Would the phrase used of the latter ever have attracted attention had it not been used before?

κ 162, τὸ δ' ἀντικρὺ δόρυ χάλκεον ἐξεπέρησε. 'In Π 346 these words describe a spear passing through the *neck* of an antagonist. Sending a spear through the back of a stag would be an improbable feat.' Treating the question on its merits, opinions will, of course, differ. Mr. Andrew Lang, for instance, did not think the feat an improbable one (*op. cit.* 230). Expert opinion would be necessary to decide, for most of us are hardly in a position to judge. Few would believe that a javelin made wholly of wood could be hurled by a man with a force that would carry it through the human body at 60 yards distance (Sollas, *Ancient Hunters*, 72). It is dangerous to dogmatize. And two points may be added—first, the expression in question recurs also N 652, so it has some claim to be regarded as a formula. Secondly, if there is exaggeration in the *Odyssey*, it is only in keeping with the rest of the description. Odysseus is evidently proud of his feat, and does full justice to it in the telling. This case is discussed by Professor Scott in *Am. J. Phil.*, XXXII., 314 sq.—not to the disadvantage of the *Odyssey*.

ν 5, τῷ σ' οὐ τι παλιμπλαγχθέντα γ' ὀίω ἀψ' ἀπονοστήσειν is 'hardly intelligible except as an imitation of A 59, νῦν ἄμμε παλιμπλαγχθέντας ὀίω κ.τ.λ.' See also Dr. Monro's note *a.l.*, in which it seems to be assumed that ἀψ' ἀπονοστήσειν must mean 'return home' as in A. The explanation of Ameis-Hentze, which Monro does not refer to, is in every way preferable—that Alcinous is assuring Odysseus that he will not, on one of the wondrous Phaeacian ships manned by the famous Phaeacian sailors, be foiled in his journey home and compelled to return to Scheria (cf. ἐμὸν ποτὶ χάλκοβατὲς δῶ, 4), as had happened to him on his voyage from Aeolus' isle to Ithaca. See also their *Anhang*, referring to Faesi-Hinrichs, *a.l.* The hypothesis of an imitator—and bungler—is unnecessary.

ξ 156, ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κείνος ὁμῶς Ἀίδαο πύλῃσι γίγνεται. 'In I 312, Achilles' splendid outburst, 'the verb is left unexpressed—to the advantage of the sense. In the *Odyssey* γίγνεται is a weak addition.' It may be, by comparison with the passage in the *Iliad*; but it is to be observed that it is quite common, in *Iliad* and *Odyssey* alike, for γίγνεται to be, as here, initial in the line with a pause after it. There are nine other instances, excluding Ω 45. It is difficult, in face of them, to hold that the effect of the verb is so bad that an imitator must be inferred.

ξ 419, οἱ δ' ὕν εἰσῆγον μάλα πύονα πενταέτηρον. 'From B 402, αὐτὰρ ὁ βοῦν ἱέρευσεν . . . πύονα πενταέτηρον. "Five years old" is right for an ox, but does not apply in the case of a pig, which at that age is too old for use'; and Pierron's note *a.l.* is quoted. *On mange les porcs même dès avant la fin de la première année; et ils ne sont guère bons que jusqu'à trois ans.* But all that Pierron infers is that 'Homer does not appear to have an exact idea of the nature of pork (*or* the pig).' Perhaps not. But does not the argument assume that the heroic taste in pork was the same as it is in modern France? The

reasoning appears to be rash, and the judgment of Paris can hardly be accepted as final here. Dietary ways—and digestions—in Achæan times were not as in these days. Meat was killed and eaten on the spot without any hanging,¹ and men then ate it *πρόπαν ἡμαρ ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα*. How are we then to say they did not like, or could not have stomached, five-year-old pork? See Seymour on the point, in *op. cit.* 222 sq. But it may be, as Pierron suggests, that the poet was not skilled in these matters. That is at least as simple as to assume two poets, one early and impeccable, the other late and given to spoiling everything *quod tetigit*.

ο 479, *ἄντλφ δ' ἐνδούπησε πεσοῦς' ὥς κ.τ.λ.* 'This seems an adaptation of the conventional *δούπησεν δὲ πεσών.*' That is possible, but very questionable; and it is a far cry from that to an imitating poet. *ἐνδούπησα* recurs in much the same sense in μ 443.

φ 125, *τρίς μὲν μιν πελέμξεν ἐρύσσεσθαι μενεαίνων*, of stringing a bow—the bow; in Φ 176, of tugging at a spear to pull it out of the ground. 'It can hardly be doubted that this latter use gives a better sense to *πελέμξεν* "shook" and *ἐρύσσεσθαι* "to pull to himself."' Again it is assumed that the verbs must be used in both passages in exactly the same significations, which is quite impossible, at least in the case of *ἐρύω* (see Ebeling, *s.v.*). But the critic's language seems much too strong. And this comparison of passages has its dangers. In the present case one might argue for imitation by the *Iliad*, on the ground that three attempts would be much more appropriate in the case of a stripling trying to string the great bow of Odysseus, than of a man only trying to pull a spear out of the ground, even if that spear were the great spear of Achilles.

φ 335, *πατὴρ δ' ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ γένος εὔχεται ἔμμεναι υἱός*. 'The origin of this pleonastic verse is to be found in Ξ 113, *πατὴρ δ' ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἐγὼ γένος εὔχομαι εἶναι*. The words *καὶ ἐγὼ* had to be omitted, and *υἱός* was put in to fill the place in the verse.' Here one may admit there is something to argue on. But the point is, is the expedient so heinous or the result so bad that a second poet must be inferred? Many think the line interpolated. Mr. Agar would change *υἱός* to *αὐτός*, 'his own tale is.'

χ 233, *παρ' ἐμ' ἴστασο*. 'This phrase, which is almost conventional in the *Iliad* (Λ 314, P 179)—why not in the *Odyssey* also?—'would imply that Ulysses was to leave his place and go to Athene: whereas the reverse is the case.' This seems unfair to the phrase in the *Odyssey*; for, so far as we are told, the same infirmity attaches to its use in both places in the *Iliad*. We cannot assume that the two heroes in either case were at a distance from each other. In all three cases a formula is used loosely; that is all.

χ 296, *ἤριπε δὲ πρηνής*. Both Sittl and Monro cite Naber's proof (*Q. H.*, 48 sqq.) that in the *Iliad* 'the rule is that those who are wounded in front fall

¹ A critic might learn some lessons from life in countries where old-world conditions still subsist. Sir A. Lyall quotes the following from the statement of a Bhil to a Border Court in India

regarding a foray: 'Two cows we roasted and ate on the spot, and the third we sold for a keg of liquor to wash down the flesh.'

backwards and *vice versa*: except in M 396 sqq., where Sarpedon draws the spear from the wound, and the man falls with it.' But Naber's proof has been accepted too readily. If *all* the cases of wounding in the *Iliad* had been brought under review, the rule might not have been found to be so absolute. In N 545 sqq. a man is struck from behind, μεταστρεφθείς, but he falls ὕπιος. In Π 413 another is wounded in front, but he falls πρηνής. Naber himself notices our passage in χ, and admits that, as in Sarpedon's case, the man may have fallen with the spear as it was drawn out of the wound. That he should incline to fall forward, through 'ducking' as he saw Telemachus' spear coming, (εἰς) μέσον κενεῶνα, is not to be wondered at. And lastly, who expects complete exactitude in the *Mnēstērophonia*? Its absurdities, as has often been pointed out, *sautent aux yeux*. Yet they are not put down to imitation.

χ 308 sq., τύπτων ἐπιστροφάδην τῶν δὲ στόνος ὄρνυτ' αἰκλῆς | κράτων τυπτομένων, δάπεδον δ' ἅπαν αἵματι θύε. 'This couplet occurs in Φ 20 sq.'—but see also K 483 sq. and ω 184 sq.; it is really of the stock epic commonplace—'with the difference that in place of κράτων τυπτομένων we find ἄορι θεινομένων—doubtless the original formula, altered because in the slaughter of the Suitors Ulysses was not armed with a sword. This substitution is not quite successful: κράτων τυπτομένων has not a clear construction; and ἐπιστροφάδην does not suit a battle fought with the spear only.' But Telemachus certainly had a sword (φ 119, 431), though his father apparently had not (χ 326). And it is not correct to speak of a 'battle'; it was the spearing, after the fight, of the living remnant of the Wooers taking refuge where they could (χ 299). As to κράτων τυπτομένων, the mention of heads may be thought peculiar. But if the rejection by the imitator of the ἄορι θεινομένων in his original was due to the fact that Odysseus had not a sword but a spear, why did he not write ἔγχει or δούρατι τυπτομένων? It cannot be said that the proof of an imitator is any clearer than the passage itself. As to the construction of κράτων τυπτ., Hayman finds no difficulty. 'τῶν being the persons, κράτων is in apposition as part to whole, just as in Τηλέμαχον βάλε χεῖρ' above, 277.'

χ 494, μέγαρον καὶ δῶμα καὶ αὐλήν. 'In Z 316 θάλαμον καὶ δ. καὶ αὐ. expresses the three parts of a complete dwelling. Probably μέγαρον was substituted here, because that part especially needed purification: but the phrase thus became tautologous, since δῶμα is properly = μέγαρον.' Surely a trivial objection, both in substance and in effect. δῶμα may include more than the mere μέγαρον, 'the entire pile of buildings' in fact (Hayman, *o.l.*). Here, where the μέγαρον is naturally mentioned first as requiring purification, δῶμα seems to mean the rest of the building. And observe, the expression in Z is not a standing form of words; indeed it does not recur. One might take exception to it. See Dr. Leaf's note on it, and Hayman, *l.c.* Seymour (*op. cit.* 196) treats the phrases in Z and χ as identical.

ρ 57 = τ 29, φ 386, χ 398, τῇ δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο μῦθος. 'This half line must have been formed as an allusion to the ἔπεα πτερόεντα of the *Iliad*. It is not intelligible on any other supposition.' But why 'of the *Iliad*'? ἔπεα

πτερόεντα is not peculiar to that poem. The expression in question is well explained by Hayman on ρ 57, and no supposition of imitation is necessary to the elucidation of its origin.

In the next batch of cases Dr. Monro goes further, and seeks to show that there is not merely imitation but also—a strange intrusion on the gravity of the epic—parody of the *Iliad*. It is not the first attempt to prove the presence of parody. Kayser (*Hom. Abhandlungen*, 54) made a curious collection of parallelisms to establish *illud ridiculi genus quod parodiae insignitur nomine* in Nestor's story in the end of Λ. It is interesting to find among them a case of parody of the *Odyssey* by the *Iliad*—Λ 720, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ἱππεῦσι μετέπρεπον ἡμετέροισι, compared with κ 525, (ὄν ἱερευσέμεν) παμμέλαν', ὃς μήλοισι μεταπρέπει ὑμετέροισι. On the face of this doublette one would be disposed to argue the reverse way, and, in fact, Sittl (*op. cit.* 38) concludes that there is imitation by the *Odyssey*. So much depends on the point of view in this most hazardous enterprise of determining priority.

The passages on which Dr. Monro depends are :

ο 161, αἰετὸς ἀργὴν χήνα φέρων ὀνύχεσσι πέλωρον, said to be imitated from Μ 201 sq., αἰετὸς . . . φοινήεντα δράκοντα φέρων ὀνύχεσσι πέλωρον. 'πέλωρος is appropriate to a serpent, but the application of it to a goose gives a certain mock-heroic effect.' Only because a goose is a goose in these days, and because the translator chooses to use the word 'serpent.' Transfer the goose to the *Iliad* and place a mere snake in the *Odyssey*, and the argument would still go against the latter poem—'how appropriate the epithet is when used of a fat goose, how absurd of a slender reptile!' And see the difficulty in which the mock-heroic explanation lands us. The man who makes this *faux pas* was, to Dr. Monro, the author of the *Odyssey*, of the poem as, with small deductions, we have it to-day, full of magnificent scenes, including this beautiful parting idyll in ο. Yet we are to believe that, when he was writing it, the great poet's taste so failed him that he was incapable of saying 'no' to a goose, when that un-heroic bird obtruded itself on his imagination and tempted him to most un-epic pleasantry. It is hardly thinkable.

In ρ 541 it is said that Telemachus μέγ' ἔπταρεν, ἀμφὶ δὲ δῶμα σμερδαλέον κονάβησε. The final phrase 'is used in the *Iliad* of the shout of an army (B 334, Π 277), of its tread (B 466), of the rattle of armour (N 498, O 648, Φ 255, 593).' In fact, it is of the *Gemeingut* or standing commonplace. 'Applied, as here, to the sound of' (a room resounding to?) 'a sneeze it has the effect of a parody.' The remark is incomprehensible. There are sneezes and sneezes. There is a sneeze that is perceptible only from the facial contortion of the sufferer, and that only excites the pity of the beholder—οἶκτος δ' ἔλε πάντας ὀρώντας. There is also a sneeze which is explodent, almost expletive, which is brain-clearing and attention-compelling, a splendid yell with to some brains all the force of an epithet of the direst kind. To which category did Telemachus' sneeze belong or incline? We can only say the μέγ' seems to indicate that it was no ordinary one. In fact it is one of the numerous omens

of the *Odyssey*, and 'the loudness of the sneeze gave increased weight to the omen' (Hayman). And surely the poet's application of *σμερδαλέον κονάβησε* to the effect of such a sneeze in a ceilingless hall is at least as good as, some might think infinitely better than, its use of a spear striking a corslet or of the tramp of men's feet.

The next is a much discussed case—Z 490 sqq., α 356 sqq., and φ 350 sqq. In the *πόλεμος* δ' ἄνδρεςσι μελήσει πᾶσιν, ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα of the first passage, *πόλεμος* is replaced by *μῦθος* in the second, and by *τόξον* in the third. In both Dr. Monro (on φ 350 sqq.) finds 'adaptation, or parody, of Hector's words in Z.' As regards the lines in φ, surely the close of Dr. Monro's own note settles the point. 'The bow was to be "the concern of men, all of them," in a sense which they did not anticipate.' There is irony, but is that so rare in the poems? For α 359 reference may be made to the note of Merry and Riddell. In both passages Telemachus is speaking with perfect seriousness, and asserting his position in the house. He accepts his responsibilities, after his encouraging interview with Athene in α. In each case his speech ends with the sentence τοῦ γὰρ κράτος ἔστ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ, where τοῦ has not, as has sometimes been assumed, *μύθου* or *τόξου* understood, but is to be translated, 'of me, the man speaking.' There is no ground for alleging parody. And note that there are two other occurrences of the essential words, λ 352 and T 137—five occurrences in all. Shall we not say, not with Dr. Monro that the expression was proverbial—the description does not seem to meet the case—but that it was a formula? And it is unnecessary to insist on what has often been remarked, that, a formula once fixed, the poet allows himself a certain amount of freedom as to its application. But indeed, in the present case, there is no ground for unfavourable comment.

Lastly, 'in some other cases the spirit of parody is shown by the use of a lofty epic formula where the subject is unworthy of it. Thus the sties in the farmyard of Eumaeus (ξ 13-15) imitate the palace of Priam (Z 244 sqq., note *πεντήκοντα* and *πλησίον ἀλλήλων*).' This word and expression, both common in the poems and neither of them lofty in character, are the *only points common* to the two descriptions. A parodist would surely have made better use of his opportunity and materials. The Odyssean poet has failed entirely, unless we are to see the real joke in the exclusion of the boars as contrasted with the treatment accorded to the sons-in-law of Priam. 'The epithet of the dogs, *ὕλακόμωροι* (ξ 29), is a parody of the epic *ἐγχεσίμωροι*.' A very extreme statement in any case, but especially difficult of acceptance as 'we cannot tell what precise meaning (if any) was given by the latter part of the word' (Monro himself on ξ 29). 'Again, in the story of Iros, the language of the *Iliad* is borrowed or parodied—e.g. in σ 5, *πότνια μήτηρ* (of the mother of Iros).' The expression is by no means peculiar to the *Iliad*, and no one who observes how freely, and how inappropriately, to our minds, the Homeric epithets are at times applied, will find any ground for objection. Other authorities differ, as Ameis-Hentze *a.l.* and Filipsky *Das stehende Beiwort in Volksepos*, II. 'σ 46,

ὁππότερος δέ κε νικήσῃ κ.τ.λ. (from the duel of Paris and Menelaus = Γ 92).’ Had the author of σ said (of Odysseus and Iros) ‘whichever of these two champions overcomes the other with soul-rending fury,’ or made some reference to one of the great encounters of the *Iliad*, we should have felt more certain. But, as it is, how *could* the poet have said what he had to say more simply? Had Γ 92 not existed, no one would ever have suggested that σ 46 more than meets the case. The same remark applies to πεπνυμένω ἄμφω, σ 65 (and Γ 148). What ground is there for arguing that Telemachus is not speaking seriously? Finally, σ 105, ἐνταυθοὶ νῦν ἦσο (Odysseus to Iros after he has dragged him out of the house and set him against the ἐρκίον αὐλῆς). It is said to be from Φ 122, ἐνταυθοὶ νῦν κείσο (Achilles to Lycaon, whose body he has flung into the river). In υ 262 we have the same formula—for that is what it is—ἐνταυθοὶ νῦν ἦσο, said respectfully by Telemachus to his father, then disguised as a beggar. Ought we not to say that both σ and Φ parody υ?

This set of cases seems to be particularly weak. If parody is to be argued simply because one of two parallel passages is not so perfectly suited to the context as the other, it must be said to be very common in the poems. But in those under reference it does not appear that evidence even of incongruity has been adduced. To establish parody some proof of an intention to travesty is certainly necessary.

To revert to the passages on which simple imitation or borrowing is inferred, one must surely say that the evidence of this ought to be extremely cogent to negative the *prima facie* presumption which arises from the prevalence of the epic practice of repetition. Now in most of the instances the case set up seems to vanish altogether on examination. In three—γ 245, ξ 156, and φ 335—there is perhaps some slight ground for argument, but they together constitute but a slender basis for a theory of wholesale imitation. The crucial point is, is there reason for inferring the existence of a later poet appropriating and adapting the work of a predecessor? It is submitted, as a result of the examination in detail given above, that there is nothing incompatible with the view that we have the same poet freely availing himself of the epic privilege of repetition.

It would not be difficult to prove, by the method adopted by Sittl and other repetition-experts, that the *Iliad* imitates the *Odyssey*. As has often been said, the method is one by which any given part of the epics may be shown to be later or earlier than another, as the individual enquirer may desire. How easily the tables may be turned has been well shown in pp. 318 sqq. of Professor Scott’s paper quoted above. Other instances could be given.

The Chorizontic attack has been threefold. On this point of imitation it appears to fail. It has not succeeded with the Language. As for the *Realien*, the case remains much as it was when first propounded. Two thousand years have added little to the proof given by the original authors of the *παράδοξον*.