

A. M. BOWIE, *Homer: Odyssey Books XIII and XIV*, Cambridge: CUP, 2014, 272 pp. ISBN 978-05-2176-354-7.

Bowie's commentary on *Odyssey* books 13 and 14 will be of great value to undergraduates who are encountering Homer for the first time as well as to graduate students and Homeric scholars who are seeking insightful discussion of these pivotal books of the epic. Basic grammatical analysis of forms is complemented by historical, linguistic, and literary commentary so that everyone will find B's discussion of interest.

This volume consists of an introduction, Greek text (with selective critical apparatus), 143 pages of line-by-line commentary, a glossary of linguistic terms, 14 pages of useful bibliography, and 2 indices (one on subject, one on Greek words).

The introduction includes commentary on the literary importance of books 13 and 14 as the "hinge" which brings Odysseus from the realm of the Phaeacians to the more "normal way of life" in Ithaca; the "Ideology and Sociology" of the epic; and sections on Homeric metre, the Homeric language, and the history of the text (focusing on Alexandrian scholarship).

In terms of poetic composition, B. does a fine job of showing how the poet can "create a lengthy episode out of very simple elements" (8), primarily the units of disguise, recognition, and "narrative" (tales that defer recognition, such as the story of Odysseus' scar). Indeed, repeated scenes are "central to the story...[for] the poet of the *Odyssey* seems to have set himself to show how it is possible to introduce into it a whole range of variations on the theme that is at the heart of the work: 'Who is the beggar?'" (14). These variations evoke different responses such as humor, pathos, and a sense of loss (14). When in book 13 Odysseus meets Athena in disguise as a young man who "could so easily have been his own son," B. notes "how Homer can use such type-scenes not just to expand the narrative, but also to increase the emotional complexity of the work" (135).

Regarding "ideology," B's remarks upon how unusual it is for the epic genre to have "lower-status" characters, such as Eumaeus, as prominent figures with "laudatory epithets" (16, 163). In fact, B. thinks of the *Odyssey* as "a very radical and innovative kind of epic" which introduces "low" characters into a "high" genre and "avoid[s] tales of aristocratic exploits in battle...in favour of stories of everyday life" (23). The implied comparison between Homer's description of Eumaeus' home with that of Priam's palace is "serious," not parodic: "a humble dwelling thus takes its rightful place in epic verse" (19-20). In the commentary itself, B. observes that Eumaeus'

sacrifice in book 14 receives “the same kind of detail as those [sacrifices] made by grand Iliadic heroes...again, *Od.* blurs the distinctions between aristocrat and pig-farmer;” B. concludes that “in *Od.* correct performance of sacrifice is one of the great indicators of the moral status of those whose homes Od. comes to;” after examples of those who fail to sacrifice correctly (Cyclops, Circe, Calypso, Odysseus’ companions in book 12, and the suitors), he remarks that “Eum. does everything correctly and his moral caliber is stressed” (218). Thus the *Odyssey* makes “clear that aristocratic birth alone is no guarantee for nobility of character” (18 note 62). Indeed, given the “almost unrelievedly gloomy picture” in accounts of Troy, the second half of the epic in effect “devalues” the Trojan War as a great Greek triumph (23–25).

In addition to basic grammar (nouns, verbs, syntax, etc. with examples and English translations), the introductory section on Homeric language includes a succinct, accessible discussion of Indo-European linguistics which explains roots, grades (vowel gradation or *Ablaut*), and the Indo-European case system (31–33, 39–42). This interest is reflected in his note on prepositions which “originally had an independent quasi-adverbial existence” (43). In fact, the preface explicitly lays out the goal for treating Homeric language from a historical perspective: “This is not the result of a desire to deluge the reader with philological erudition, but of a conviction that, if one has an idea of how linguistic forms and constructions came about, they are more comprehensible and so easier to learn and retain” (ix). This practice is successfully demonstrated in the commentary to follow (such extensive grammatical and linguistic discussion if not found in other CUP commentaries).¹

One of the greatest boons to intermediate Greek readers is B’s willingness to define, explain, and give examples of a wide range of grammatical, linguistic, and literary terms. For example, he explains cognate accusative (5), gnomic aorist (102), “periphrastic (i.e., roundabout)” (153), “vehicle” and “tenor” for similes (101), *mise en abyme* (7 note 24), Grassman’s law (34 note 115), closure (2 note 7), “cletic’ from καλέω (‘call’)” (154), and what is meant by a “seed” in narratology: “the planting of an apparently incidental idea in a narrative which will turn out to be significant later” (159 s.v. 13.404, here referring “to the nameless swineherd [which] gives no indication as to how important he is to be in the coming events”). While Homerists may not require these explanations, undergraduates will be exceedingly grateful for such kindnesses. Much like Homer’s relationship with his audience, B. welcomes a wide range of readers.

The line-by-line commentary itself continues this broad discussion of grammatical, linguistic, historical, and literary features of books 13 and 14. There is basic grammatical aid for forms (I give examples below):

¹ E.g., Homer, *Odyssey. Books VI-VIII.* Ed. By A. F. Garvie, Cambridge 1994.

“ἔσχοντο is middle in form, but passive in sense” (93 s.v. 13.2);

“καταειμένον ‘clothed’, perfect passive participle of (κατα-) ἔννυμι < νέσ-νυ-μι, as in Latin *ves-tis*” (154 s.v. 13.351);

“τράφεν ‘were brought up’, 3rd p.pl. aorist passive of τρέφω” (195 s.v. 14.201);

“ὅσσομαι shares the root *okʷ- with ὄσσε, Latin *oculus* ‘eye(s)’; it usually means ‘see’ in a figurative as opposed to physical sense” (197 s.v. 14.219).

B. helpfully notes that “ἐπω ‘busy oneself with’, from the root *sep- (here in the zero grade), is to be distinguished etymologically from ἔπομαι ‘follow’, from *sekʷ- (cf. Latin *sequor*)” (169-70 s.v. 14.33).

I whole-heartedly applaud B.’s decision to discuss Homeric vocabulary with constant reference to Indo-European roots, Sanskrit and Latin cognates, and Mycenaean (Linear B) precursors. For example, the reader learns that “εἴρω ‘I bid’, < the IE root *verh₂- (cf. Lat. *verbum*; Eng. *word*), whose derivatives in Greek and other IE languages can have a formal, religious or juridical overtone: cf. ῥήτρα ‘spoken agreement, law’ (as 14.393), ἀρρητός ‘not to be spoken, secret’, and so ‘numinous, sacred’ (Beekes 393)” (95 s.v. 13.7). (There is frequent citing of Beekes’ etymological dictionary and de Jong’s narratological commentary as well as the scholiasts and Eustathius—and in book 14 Hesiod’s *Works and Days*).² B. later employs the Sanskrit “counterpart” of the phrase ιερὸν μένος to explain how “ιερός in Greek can be used to mean both ‘strong’ and ‘sacred’” (99). B. also acknowledges uncertain and unknown etymologies, such as λυκάβοντος (190 s.v. 14.161), ἀποφόλιος (197 s.v. 14.212), ἀμαιμάκετον (206 s.v. 41.311), and Eumaeus’ name (174).

Certain paragraph-long notes are brilliant recapitulations of central features of the epic which scholars have discussed for millennia, such as the role of poets in Homeric epic (100); the means and social significance of acquiring material wealth (with many examples—104); the allegorical interpretation of the Cave of the Nymphs as well as what archaeology has shown--and whether this suggests that the poet himself visited this cave (112-14); the recurring appearance of olive trees in *Odyssey* (115); instances in Homer and Mesopotamian epic of divine anger and concern for honor (118-19); and the danger of ignoring divine warnings (124-26). B. contrasts the connotations of ambush as a positive skill in the *Odyssey* with the “cowardly tactic” of the *Iliad* (142). There is valuable discussion of the Greeks’ “caricatural” view of the Phoenicians juxtaposed with the historical reality (143); Athena’s fifteen disguises in the *Odyssey* (149); actual and figurative dogs (167); the narrator’s second person address of Eumaeus (and Menelaus and Patroclus—173-74); the importance of one’s polis to personal identity “which suggests that the

² R. S. P. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden 2010; I. J. F. de Jong, *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*, Cambridge 2001.

polis was already an important concept in Homer's time" (193); the "striking example of the self-deprecating way" (in his lying tale) Odysseus speaks of throwing away his weapons during battle (203 s.v. 14.277—with relevant passages ranging from the lyric poets to Aristophanes and Plato); the use of iron in Mycenaean and Archaic Greece (and the difference between cast iron and "chased" objects—208 s.v. 14.324); and a half a page on the oracle of Dodona which speculates on how divination might have taken place as well as mentioning "the oak as a source of divine knowledge...[with] the Druids, who...took their name from that tree (< **dru-(w)id-*, 'oak-seer'; cf. (翫)ιδεῖν, Latin *videre*)" (208 s.v. 14.327). I have to say that I love this stuff!

The heart of books 13 and 14 comprises two extended one-on-one conversations. In his analysis, B. reveals how Odysseus cautiously tests both Athena (in disguise) and Eumeus, withholding information before (re)establishing his relationship with god and swineherd. For example, in book 13, the disguised Athena delays naming Ithaca when Odysseus asks where he is (137). B. notes that Odysseus' speech at 13.250-86 "inaugurates the use by Od. of the 'false tales' which are a particular feature of the second half of *Od*" (139). Athene's response moves in tone "from grudging but affectionate admiration (287-92), to exasperation (at her failure to trick?, 293-5), to complicity (296-9), to an almost childish pleasure at his not having recognised her (299-302), and finally to a pragmatic approach to his problems (303-10). The familiarity between goddess and man is remarkable" (144). After Odysseus attempts to justify his attempted deception, "the intimacy between goddess and mortal in the subsequent discussion deepens, and the equality between them is marked by the way, that, taking the episode as a whole, they both speak roughly the same number of lines" (148). We also learn that in this scene Odysseus is the only one to ever address Athena as γλαυκῶπι (157 s.v. 13.389) and that book 13 has the only instance of a divinity exchanging one form of disguise for another *within* a scene (s.v. 13.288).

B. also traces the trajectory of the conversation in book 14 (in which direct speech dominates more than in any other book with 76.7%—170). B.'s focused analysis leads to the conclusion that Eumeus "skillfully shows himself at once (a) reluctantly less generous than he might be, (b) careful of his masters' resources, and (c) canny enough to know how to behave in tricky circumstances" (174). After a meal and wine, B. charts the growing friendliness between Odysseus and Eumeus by noting "in his addresses to Eum., Od. moves from ξεῖνε (53) to φίλε (115, 149) to his actual name here [14.440]. For the first use of a name at a crucial moment, cf. 16.204, when Od. finally persuades Telemachus that he is his father" (221 s.v. 14.440). We also come to appreciate the five-part "crescendo in the beggar's references to Od., from interest in who he might be (115-6), to a claim on oath that he will soon return (151-2), to claimed knowledge about him and a near meeting

(321-33), to the offer to be killed if Od. does not return (391-400), to actual acquaintance with him here” (223 s.v. 14.457-506).

Syntax and enjambment is profitably used to reveal mood and character. For example, early in Eumaeus’ second speech “a good deal of enjambment... suggests a warm enthusiasm and a certain confidence. Once the swineherd gets to the subject of his master however the lines become end-stopped as a graver tone descends” (173 s.v. 14.55-71). Later we learn that “the fragmented syntax helps convey the fervour of Eum.’s attitudes to wrong-doing. The paratactic mode of composition can, to ears and eyes accustomed to more syntactic forms of language, appear strange, but it enables authors to make their points in a forceful and idiomatic manner” (179 s.v. 14.85-88). We also see (with the frequent enjambment in lines 14.363-8), “the constant fragmenting of the regular rhythm of the metre reflecting the agitated state that Eum. is put in by the beggar’s attempts to talk about his master’s return” (213 s.v. 14.363).

B. often convincingly captures the tone of a particular passage, e.g., as Odysseus refers to himself (when attempting to obtain a blanket for the evening): “the grandiose formulaic address [διογενὲς Δαερτιάδην πολυμήχαν’ Ὀδυσσεῦ] strikes an almost comic note, especially as it is used by Od. to himself...The grandiose beginning is complemented by the unusual poeticisms [examples given]...which contrast with what look like much more colloquial, clipped expressions in 487-9: the clash of styles perhaps aims at a studied incompetence in story-telling, or may be put down to the drink” (227 s.v. 14.486).

Frequently intermediate Greek students are most concerned with translation, yet B. emphasizes some wonderful dramatic moments in the narrative. He notes that by having the guest Odysseus unusually ask his host a question, “Homer...holds back the revelation of Od.’s name until the climax of [Eumaeus’] speech” (184). Later when Odysseus hands the cup of wine to his host Eumaeus, B. remarks on “a kind of parody of [this courtesy] when Od. gives the Cyclops a cup of wine after he has made dinner of two of his men” (182). The “voluntary revelation” of the names of Penelope, Laertes, and Telemachus “is a sign of Eum.’s growing intimacy with and confidence in the beggar” (191 s.v. 14.172-73). B. notes that “the irony is particularly strong” at 14.145 and 14.147 when Eumaeus laments the absence of Odysseus who is “not here” or “far away” as his master sits across from him (186 s.v. 14.145). And a nice discussion (building on earlier scholarship) explains why Eumaeus is “ashamed” to name Odysseus but would rather call him ἡθεῖος (186-87 s.v. 14.146—with reference to scholarship on the idea that names have a magical power). B. also points out puns and word play, e.g., five times in seven lines, there is a play on “truth” ($\alpha\lambdaηθής$) and “wandering” ($\alpha\lambdaάομαι$) (184 s.v. 14.125).

The quality and price are attractive features. There are very few typos:

I found only “a another” (164) and “originally” (248); also Diomedes, not Idomeneus, picks Odysseus as his partner for the night raid in *Iliad* bk. 10 (141). The bibliography ranges widely both in terms of subject and scholarly chronology.³ On “dropping objects as an expression of surprise at cardinal moments,” the examples only come from the *Odyssey* (Andromache at *Iliad* 22.448 is not mentioned—169 s.v. 14.31).

I trust that the great value of this work is revealed by the representative examples I’ve introduced. In his preface, B. presents his goal as “rescuing the reputation of these books” which have “received the least complimentary criticism, as being too leisurely and devoid of incident” (ix). He succeeds admirably in demonstrating how “very tightly constructed” the second half of the *Odyssey* is. We should be grateful for his efforts.

JAMES V. MORRISON
Centre College, Kentucky US
morrison@centre.edu⁴

³ I missed L. Pratt, *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar: Falsehood and Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics*, Ann Arbor 1993.