『オデュッセイア』におけるデーモドコスの第二の歌（8.266－366）

安村典子

和文要旨

『オデュッセイア』の第八巻においてデーモドコスの歌う三つの歌のうち、二番目に歌われるアプロデイーテーとアレースの情事の顛末（以下「第二の歌」と略）は、神々の滑稽な側面が明るい調子で歌われていること、謀略をも含めた広い意味での「智恵」に高い評価が与えられていること、「神々の笑い」が重要な役割を果たすこと、「弱者が強者を制する」というテーマが中心に据えられていること等の点で、きわめて興味深い部分である。この歌は従来、『オデュッセイア』の筋とは本質的な関わりをもたない、娯楽的要素の強い挿話として取り扱われることが多かった。しかしこの部分の「語りの手法」を検討してみると、この歌は『オデュッセイア』の主題と深く関係していることがわかる。

「第二の歌」の語りの手法における最大の特徴は、この歌がいわゆる「入れ子構造」の形式をとっており、パイエーケス人の島における宴の場での余興として歌われていることである。この歌はトロイア戦争の初期と末期の事件を歌う、デーモドコスの第一と第三の歌とも深い関わりをもち、更に『オデュッセイア』全体の構造とも緊密に関わっている点で、入れ子構造としての優れた効果をあげている。すなわち、放浪の旅人の正体は何者かというテーマで第一、第三の歌と関わり、圧倒的に不利な条件のもとで妻を奪い帰すという点で、詩全体のライトモテイーフとも関わっているのである。しかも「第二の歌」では物語の舞台が天上に移され、神々の話として設定されることにより、いくつかの重要な効果がうみだされている。たとえば詩の本筋ではオデュッセウスが復讐者であるが、「第二の歌」ではヘーパイストスが復讐者となることにより、見事な工芸技術による策略が披露され、物語としての面白さが加えられること、

またヘーパイストスの成功はオデュッセウスの最終的勝利を暗示し、詩全体の中で長い時の流れを通じて語られるテーマが、一瞬のエピソードに凝縮されていることなどである。このように入れ子構造の形式をとることにより、「第二の歌」は詩全体に重層的な効果と奥ゆきとを与えているのである。

The Second Song of Demodokos in the Odyssey 8.266-366

Noriko Yasumura

The second song of Demodokos in the Odyssey (8.266-369) is characterised by an emphasis on contrivance, witty treatment of the gods, a light-hearted tone, and most particularly, by the concept of victory of the inferior over the superior; Hephaistos is celebrated for his skill in deception and lying. This suggests that the archaic poet is interested in exploiting qualities that are associated with the trickster, and that they see deceptive skill in a positive light. The narratological techniques used in this text have an important influence on the presentation of the characters and on the structure of the text. It is the aim of this thesis, therefore, to look first at the ways in which the subject is represented, and, second, at how these narratological devices work within the texts.

The second song of Demodokos - the story of Ares and Aphrodite's adultery - offers rich pickings. The divine adultery has been attacked for its moral turpitude since Xenophanes (21 B11 3).[1] Its authenticity was doubted by nineteenth century critics,[2] and even after the unity of this section was generally admitted, the opinion nevertheless prevailed that the story was no more than an amusing interlude. However, recent scholarship has tended to accept that this story is thematically relevant to the action of the *Odyssey*.[3]

Demodokos' three songs take the structure of a story-within-a-story, and this device of embedding used in the second song relates to the central thematic 'problem' of the *Odyssey,* namely, Odysseus' troubled journey home. In essence, by this device, Demodokos' songs focalise the basic themes of the whole epic. The following discussion will concentrate on this function of thematic dualism and convergence in Book 8, but has wider implications in that it relates to a *leitmotif* of the *Odyssey* as a whole.

1

Demodokos' second song appears very different from his first and third, both of which narrate episodes from the Trojan War. However, despite this apparent variation in theme, the three can be linked : they all pertain to contrivance.

Demodokos' first song, the quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles, is briefly narrated in the form of reported speech (8.62-82). Though this story lacks detail (perhaps because the story was familiar to the audience : 74), we can postulate two reasons for why the quarrel occurred. The first is given in a fragment of Sophocles' Syndeipnoi (fr. 562-71 Pearson), possibly taken from the *Kypria* : on the way to Troy, Achilles quarrelled with Agamemnon at Tenedos, over an invitation to a feast. This is obviously problematic - the quarrel is not between Achilles and Odysseus, although the intervention of Odysseus might be implied in fr. 566.[4]

The second possibility is tendered by Scholia BE *ad* Od. 8.77 : Agamemnon rejoiced when Achilles and Odysseus quarrel about the method of taking Troy - Achilles upheld brave spirit (*ἀνδρεία*), Odysseus supported contrivance and thoughtfulness (*μηχανῇ καὶ φρόνησις*). Agamemnon

rejoiced because of the oracle that the Achaeans would destroy Troy soon after the quarrel between the best of the Achaeans. Though the comment of this Scholiast has been much criticised,[5] the reliability of the account may be strengthened by the following considerations:

(1) the antagonism between advocates of physical power versus advocates of contrivance is a recurrent and conventional motif in the Homeric epics (for example, *Il.* 7.142; *Od.* 9.408; 11.120);

(2) this basic difference in the characters of Achilles and Odysseus is already distinguishable in the *Iliad* (for example, 9.308-13; 346-7; 19.216-20);

(3) the rivalry between Achilles and Odysseus is a plausible theme in epic tradition.[6]

The ambiguous τότε at 81 is a liability, but the solution is to read it as referring to the time of the oracle (ὅτε, 80); that is, the oracle was given at the beginning of the war, so the quarrel took place at a later period of the siege.[7]

The result of the quarrel is unknown and this unresolved tension re-emerges in Demodokos' third song. In Agamemnon's view, however, the quarrel is a good omen, for it presupposes an Achaean victory. Odysseus' contrivance plays the decisive role in their victory, but Demodokos' song is not explicit about it. We might presume that a quarrel about the means of taking Troy would naturally call to mind the wooden horse. Thus, when Odysseus requests that Demodokos devote the third song to the Trojan horse, this serves to extend the *topos* of the tension between fighting and contriving. In this way, the first and third songs are manifestly interrelated - representing the commencement and fulfilment of Odysseus' use of contrivance: these are, as Fenik says, "the typically Odyssean symmetrical scenes which are carefully thought out, weighed and balanced

compositions." [8]

Demodokos' third song (499-520) concerns the wooden horse, called δόλος (94) by Odysseus himself. In the *Odyssey* there are two other passages in which the wooden horse appears (4.266-89; 11.523-32), but they describe the events occurring only inside the horse ; in contrast, Demodokos' song presents the events before and after these other accounts : building the horse and the closing fighting at Troy.[9] In each of these three passages about the horse, Odysseus' excellence is recounted, with varying emphases :[10] in Menelaos' speech, Odysseus' steadfast judgement saved all of the Achaeans (4.288) ; in the first *Nekuia*, the responsibilities such as opening and closing the door (11.524-5) are given to Odysseus ; in Demodokos' song, it is the duplicitous aspect of the horse which is emphasised - the horse is called δόλος.

Odysseus' words, in his request for the third song, demonstrate that his request is closely linked with the first song in significance:

ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ μετάβηθι καὶ ἵππον ἄεισον
δουρατέου, τὸν Ἐπειὸς ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ
ὅν ποτ' ἐς ἀκρόπολιν δόλον ἤγαγε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς (492-4)

Odysseus asks that Demodokos devote the third song to the story of the wooden horse - the physical realisation of his trickery.[11] His request is for Demodokos to sing ἱππουκόσμος (492)[12], because he desires to hear of his greatest exploit. It was his stratagem that resulted in Troy's fall ; thus, the early use of the epithet πτολίπορθος for Odysseus at 8.3 is not merely coincidental. Rather, it is representative of the main consideration of this book, which focuses on and reiterates Odysseus' capacity for deception

through an underscoring and reaffirmation of the glorious deeds (κλέα, 73) of his past.

Juxtaposed between these songs which emphasise Odysseus' cunning, the second song also pertains to contrivance, but from a different angle, presenting a different crafty protagonist, namely, Hephaistos, who forges the bonds (δεσμοί) that will ensnare his wife and Ares. Throughout this passage, "craft" (τέχνη) and "contrivance" (δόλος) are repeated : the bonds are made as a δόλος (276, 282); they were made so "cunningly" (δολόεντα τέτυκτο, 281); Hephaistos made "the cunning bonds" (δεσμοὶ τεχνήεντε, 296-7) ; they are "contrivance and bond" (δόλος καὶ δεσμός, 317) ; the gods saw the τέχναι of Hephaistos (327) ; the gods conclude that Hephaistos has caught Ares by τέχνη (332). In this episode, craft and contrivance, like the bonds, are inseparable. While contrivance is not a *sine qua non* of craft, the reverse does not hold true - for contrivance some kind of craft/intellect is required, since contrivance is the manifestation of intelligence (μῆτις).[13]

While the stratagems of the first and third songs take place against a backdrop of war, in contrast, Hephaistos' contrivance is devised in a domestic setting. His metal work in his smithy recalls the scene of *Il.* 18, when Thetis visits Hephaistos for a set of armour for Achilles; indeed, the important phrase κόπτε δὲ δεσμούς (274) is used here also (*Il.* 18. 379).[14] The basic connotation of the bonds is "fastening together" which requires skilful craftsmanship. The magical bonds of Hephaistos also recall the special bed of Odysseus : both are devices around the support of the bed (ἑρμίς, *Od.* 8.273; 23.198). The secret of Odysseus' bed is important, because it is to be used as the last test of his identity : Odysseus constructed his own bed,[15] whose secret only Penelope knows. Here in Demodokos'

song, Hephaistos' artfulness and deceptiveness are emphasised ; the bonds are so fine to be as invisible even to the gods (280-1) ; they are cunningly devised as δόλος (276, 281, 282).

Strangely enough, however, the metal work of this male god is compared to spiders' webs (ἠΰτ' ἀράχνια λεπτά, 280), which are further connected with women's weaving.[16] Weaving, an indoor activity, is characteristically associated with deceit ;[17] thus, Hephaistos' skill echoes Penelope's weaving[18] -an important theme recurring three times in the Odyssey (2.107-9; 19.146 -8; 24.142-5).[19] This motif - appearing as an 'echo' in Demodokos' song - can be read as an intratextual reference, and one which has been constructed to display one variation of the broader theme.

First, Hephaistos' bonds are fashioned by a male god, but constructed as the solution for a domestic problem, namely, Hephaistos' suspicion of his wife. The gods watch them *outside his house* at the gateway (ἐν προθύροισι, 325); this emphasises the point that the problem is peculiarly domestic.[20] The scene has a quasi-proleptic function - it looks forward, and is analogous to what Odysseus must do on his own return home. Second, Penelope's weaving is a stratagem to avoid the suitors' wooing (and thus avoid adultery), whereas Hephaistos' device is intended to catch the lovers-to avenge adultery. Thus, in this episode, the recurrent theme of weaving is inverted in a reversal of oppositions when Hephaistos assumes, in the special artifice of his metal work, some of the duplicitous and explicitly feminine connotations of weaving.

The embedding of this episode - the song-inside-a-song - is a complex echoing and foreshadowing of the interaction of Penelope and Odysseus. Moreover, Hephaistos' bonds echo the incident in the framing narrative,

when, after the second song, Odysseus fastens a cord with a cunning knot (*δεσμὸς ποικίλος*, 447-8) taught to him by Kirke. Hephaistos' *τέχνη* is thus related to Odysseus' and Penelope's contrivance; and, furthermore, Hephaistos' revenge becomes a distorted reflection of that of Odysseus. All these intratextual relationships are appropriately symbolised by the intricate bonds fashioned by Hephaistos.

2

The adultery of Ares and Aphrodite functions as a kind of paradeigma, and this use of an archetypal scenario is paralleled in the story of Klytaimestra and Aigisthos. At the beginning of the poem, Orestes' story is presented by Zeus (1.28-43), and the characters and events serve as a contrast to those of Odysseus' family. The repeated recollection of Agamemnon's homecoming functions as an indicator of the correct course of action,[21] although the story of Ares and Aphrodite shows other facets of this archetypal adultery:

(1) the husband as avenger (who, in this case, has a more direct and stronger connection than the son, Orestes);

(2) the husband as disabled.[22]

This second feature is a new development in the theme of adultery - that is, the seemingly weaker opponent overcoming the stronger.[23]

The theme of revenge is further elaborated: the slow Hephaistos overcomes the swift Ares. The antithetical nature of the two male gods is emphasised by Hephaistos himself and by the gods. Hephaistos says, "Aphrodite scorns me for being lame (*χωλός*, 308) and loves hateful (*αἴδηλος*, 309)[24] Ares, because he is handsome and strong of limb (*καλός τε καὶ ἀρτίπος*, 310) whereas I was born misshapen (*ἠπεδανὸς γενόμην*,

311)." The contrast is reiterated when the gods gather at the scene:

> The slow catches the swift
> Just as now Hephaistos, slow as he is, has caught Ares
> Even though he is the swiftest of the gods who hold Olympos
> Lame, he has caught him by craft. (328-332)

The intellectually superior Hephaistos eventually triumphs over the physically superior Ares: this is a clear picture of the success story of the handicapped person who overcomes his adverse circumstances by craft (*τέχνη*, 332).[25] Although the elaborate details might seem intended to maintain the comical effect, in fact, this story should be read as strongly allusive - prefiguring Odysseus' final victory.

Two types of scenes function as the links which account for why Odysseus occupies a position analogous to that of Hephaistos. The first is the dispute between Odysseus and Euryalos which occurs just before the second song: this conflict mirrors the dispute between Hephaistos and Ares.[26]

Ares and Euryalos are similar figures: Euryalos is pre-eminent (*ἀριπρεπές*, 176) in appearance but dull in mind (*ἀποφώλιος*, 177). He resembles the immortals (174), but no crown of grace is set upon his words (175). Correspondingly, Ares is handsome but destructive (309-10). As Ares is strong of limb (309), so is Euryalos who excels all the princes in wrestling (126-7). Their affinity is emphasised even before the sports scene, when Euryalos is explicitly compared to Ares (*Εὐρύαλος, βροτολοιγῷ ἶσος Ἄρηι*, 115).

During the quarrel, Odysseus describes two types of men; these descriptions are, by implication, applicable to Euryalos and himself (167-77). Regarding the second type of man, he says:

> For one man is inferior in looks,
> But the god sets a crown of beauty upon his words. (169-70)

The implication is clear: Odysseus's looks may not match those of Euryalos, but he is pre-eminent in skill and contrivance.[27] We might regard Hephaistos as similar, although Odysseus' handicap is less obvious.[28]

The contrast of Hephaistos and Ares is, first, one of appearance and reality, and second, one of physical oppositions (slow and fast, weak and strong, inferior and superior). In this former sense, they reflect the two types of men in Odysseus' categorisation - thus, their conflict makes a reappearance in the confrontation of Odysseus and Euryalos. In the latter sense (slow versus fast), the Odysseus-Euryalos incident is not exactly analogous.[29] The story of Hephaistos and Ares, however, picks up at the divine level the theme of appearance and reality in the quarrel between Odysseus and Euryalos. In this sense, Odysseus takes on a role analogous to that of Hephaistos, but the story develops the theme with greater emphasis on the contrast between inferior and superior.

The second type of scene that builds on this dichotomy is the kind in which Odysseus is placed in a handicapped or disadvantageous position, and must play the role of the inferior, in a way comparable to the physically handicapped Hephaistos. The most obvious example of this is the encounter with Polyphemos (9.105-566). This is the archetypal story of the weaker who overcomes the stronger by his cleverness. Similarly, in the

clash with the suitors, while one of the suitors alone is not superior to Odysseus, nevertheless, the body of suitors as a whole represent an immensely physically superior power. One can see the relevance of the recapitulation of the fate of Agamemnon as a reminder that revenge is not an easy task, and that Odysseus - faced with a group of antagonists who pose a real threat - is in a most disadvantageous position to confront alone the violence of the many.

The unequal and disadvantageous situation which arises when the many oppose the one is also demonstrated by the disobedience of Odysseus' comrades, illustrated in three main episodes: with the Kikones (9.39-61); the events after departing from Aiolos (10.34-55); and the final scene of the enterprise at Thrinakie (12.260-402).

On leaving Troy, Odysseus first encounters the Kikones and fights just as at Troy: he destroys the city, slays the men, takes the women and treasure, and divides them (9.40-2).[30] After this victory, however, the companions do not heed Odysseus' warning to flee, and this brings about their defeat (59-61). This defeat displays Odysseus' two-fold disadvantage: his comrades are disobedient; he has failed to fight as an Iliadic hero.[31] In spite of his awareness that his command is the correct one, he yields to his companions because he is grossly outnumbered.

The episode of the Kikones is the first presentation of the motif wherein the comrades' folly and disobedience to Odysseus bring about their downfall. Departing from the island of Aiolos, the comrades, envious of Odysseus' supposed wealth, open the bag of the winds, while the exhausted Odysseus sleeps (10.34-55). During the last adventure at Thrinakie, Eurylochos (with other crew) offers a proposal countering that of Odysseus (12.

279-93); Odysseus, as a single individual (*μοῦνον ἐόντα*, 297), cannot resist the majority, and withdraws his own proposal (297-302). Eurylochos' disobedience was foreshadowed by 10.266-9 and 429-437, but, in these instances, the other comrades did not support Eurylochos (*Εὐρύλοχος δέ μοι οἶος ἐρύκανε πάντας ἑταίρους*, 10.429), and so, his objections were not effective. This implies that the antagonism of one comrade means little, but when the majority challenge, Odysseus is obliged to yield and take the inferior position.

If we consider the handicap of Hephaistos in this broader sense (not necessarily in the sense of a physical disability alone), the whole story of the *Odyssey* might represent how the man in adversity wins the race (with the help of Athena), just as Hephaistos overcomes his handicaps. If we take it in the narrower sense, that is, in the antagonistic relation of superior to inferior, the examples above show that Odysseus in the inferior situation is able to overcome the superior-that is, "the slow catches the swift" (8.329). The story of Hephaistos and Ares is thus closely interrelated to the central theme of the epic: Odysseus' enduring story is condensed here into a momentary episode among the gods.

The "unquenchable laughter" of the gods (*ἄσβεστος γέλως*, 8.326) when they look on the tryst of Ares and Aphrodite, also has thematic relevance.[32] Many suggestions have been propounded about this laughter: the laughter of mockery, followed by a moral judgement;[33] laughter which makes the entire situation comic;[34] the laughter of divine amusement.[35] It is difficult to align the laughter with one of these suggestions alone, since it is caused by several factors. In fact, with a little more interpretation, we can see that, to a certain extent, all of these suggestions may be valid: the laughter implies the gods' admiration of the marvellous *techne* of Hephais-

tos, and also, their praise and approval of "the slow catching the swift".[36] If the swift wins the race, it is uninteresting - it is too natural. However, if the slow wins the race (albeit, by contrivance), this reversal is astonishing and induces laughter. The gods enjoy a surprising result - when the slow catches the swift, they enjoy the story of the inferior turning out to be victorious in adversity.

After listening to Demodokos' second song, Odysseus was glad at heart (*τέρπετ' ἐνὶ φρεσίν*, 368). Odysseus' enjoyment here is similar in effect to the laughter of the gods. He is glad to hear that Hephaistos, like himself, conquers adversity by a superb contrivance. Moreover, he is pleased to note that the gods will approve and enjoy his own victory.

3

Odysseus' identity is a basic theme of the whole poem, and one to which all the episodes in Book 8 are related. When Odysseus arrives on the coast of Scherie, he is naked, exhausted, and nameless. His identity is revealed by a gradual process which may rightly be described as his dehumanisation then regaining of his humanity.[37] When Arete asks his name, Odysseus does not answer directly, but instead reveals the adventure that he experienced prior to his arrival at Scherie (7.237-97). It is generally agreed that Odysseus' identification is delayed for greater dramatic effect.[38] The tension aroused by the unnamed and mysterious stranger remains all through Book 8. As Alkinoos enquires at the end of the book,

> Now do not conceal anything with your crafty intention,
> Whatever I shall ask you; to speak out is better.
> Tell me the name by which your mother, father,

And others who live in town and neighbourhood call you. (548-56)

The phrase τῷ νῦν (548), emphasised by its position at the beginning of the line, shows how long his identity is held back, and how immense is the climax of the revelation when, at the beginning of Book 9, he finally reveals his name (19-20).[39] All the events of Book 8, including Demodokos' three songs, are orchestrated to produce this gradually intensified tension.

The detailed description of Odysseus' reaction after Demodokos' first song implies that Odysseus' crying is a crucial stage in the revelation of his identity. Contrasting sharply with the Phaiakians' enjoyment, Odysseus' sorrow (emphasised by use of the iteratives : ἔλεσκε, 88 ; σπείσασκε, 89 ; γοάασκεν, 92), results in Alkinoos' suspicion that the stranger is an Iliadic hero, possibly one of "the best of the Achaians" (78) of Demodokos' song. But why does Odysseus cry? It may be partly because his experience is as yet unfinished, and partly because of the contrast between his former glorious deeds and his present outcast status, or, perhaps he cries at the memory of toil.[40]

The Odyssean view of the Trojan war is significant - he sees it in terms of the misery both on the Trojan and on the Achaian side (82, also 12.188 -90). Odysseus himself sums up this song about the Trojan war: the story of "the doom of the Achaians" (Ἀχαιῶν οἶτος, 489) or "all that they suffered" (ὅσσ' ἐμόγησεν, 490), even though the Achaians were victorious. In retrospect, after a ten-year interval, the war may be remembered in terms of the suffering and toil of all participants. But are these the only reasons for his grief? His tears are manifest - the reason less so. This obscurity and suppression intensifies Alkinoos' puzzlement that, "he might be an Iliadic hero, but if so, Achaian or Trojan?" At this stage, the

possibility remains unuttered that a Trojan hero wanders as a refugee, like Aineias, but his tears, in Alkinoos' view, might imply the grief of the defeated.

In terms of establishing Odysseus' identity, the quarrel between Odysseus and Euryalos forms an essential part of the book. It is through this quarrel that the hitherto nameless warrior gains his reputation.[41] Odysseus' victory in the discus throw (186-98) has a two-fold effect:
(1) it proves his noble birth: he is familiar with sports, not like a "travelling trader" (159-64);
(2) when Odysseus rejoices after the victory to find a supporter (200), this induces his boast that results in his explicit self-revelation that he is one of the Achaian heroes: "when we Achaeans shot" (*ὅτε τοξαζοίμεθ' Ἀχαιοί*, 220).[42]
Moreover, his competence with the bow foreshadows his future revenge. His noble status is further consolidated by the gift of the elaborate sword - which only a hero deserves - from Euryalos (403-5).

Demodokos' choice for his second song centres on adultery and revenge. It is as though he asks Odysseus' motives: that is, does Odysseus intend revenge by contrivance when he reaches home? Since the stranger is revealed to be an Iliadic hero, Demodokos gives the song a peculiarly Iliadic colouring: the comical scenes among the Olympian gods recur in the Iliad: the conflict and banquet of the gods (1.531-604); Zeus and Hera's love (14. 292-351); the Theomachia (21.383-513). The Odyssey, however, does not show the gods quarrelling or behaving frivolously.[43] Moreover, Ares and Aphrodite are already figures of fun in the Iliad (5.330-417, 846-906), so the closest parallel for this story is in the Iliad.[44] Demodokos thus represents the Iliadic world with what might be deliberate concern for the stranger.

Odysseus and the Phaiakians enjoy this story (368-9). Odysseus is satisfied with the successful outcome of Hephaistos' revenge, which, as I have already discussed, foreshadows his own success. The identity of the stranger is now a little further disclosed: he has shown his interest in the avenging of adultery through contrivance by a husband with a handicap.

Curiously, when Demodokos sings his third song, he shifts his theme slightly from that requested by Odysseus.[45] Odysseus has requested the story of the wooden horse from the viewpoint of the Achaian side (492-5), but Demodokos emphasises the suffering of war, especially on the Trojan side. According to his song, it was the fateful decision of the Trojans that led to their ruin (504-13), not the skilful leadership of Odysseus: Demodokos sings accounts which are otherwise unknown to Odysseus. Demodokos' last mention of the battle at Deiphobos' house (517-20) is highly allusive, since Deiphobos married Helene after Paris' death, and Helene is the implicit reminder of the archetype of adultery. The victory of Odysseus in this "most terrible fight" (*αἰνότατος πόλεμος*, 519) implicitly echoes Hephaistos' victory against the adulterers, and at the same time foreshadows Odysseus' final victory over the suitors.

Conclusion

Demodokos' three songs are thus connected and relevant to the wider themes of the epic. Composition is carefully thought out - distribution of two sports scenes between the songs, variation of songs of war/love/war, reactions of tears/joy/tears - and superb internal rhythm is produced.

The narratological device of the story-within-a-story focalises the main theme of this epic: the theme of the whole poem is reshaped by using

this device. The second song of Ares and Aphrodite's love has special significance not only for its relevance to the *Oresteia* theme, but also to the dominant theme of victory against adversity. The embedded story is the most prominent narratological characteristic of this song.

The theme of the inferior's victory is emphasised by this embedding device. The greatest effect of this device is to represent an alternative version of the main theme with a different setting (Olympos) and different actors (the gods). By this reshaping, some significant distortion or amplification becomes possible:

- the adversity of Odysseus is replaced by the lameness of Hephaistos, and there is greater emphasis on the contrast between inferior and superior;
- Penelope's danger is transformed into immortal adultery, and the theme of revenge is represented more radically;
- Hephaistos is an avenger, and the device of revenge is further elaborated;
- Hephaistos' success prefigures Odysseus' final victory;
- contrivance takes on a magical nature;
- the text becomes filled with humorous touches;
- the main theme of the whole poem is presented in the compacted and condensed miniature of a momentary episode.

Thus, by the device of embedding, the theme of the inferior's victory is visualised in terms of the specific world of the gods, seen in all its exaggerated and humorous detail. The praise awarded to the song of Demodokos (*λίην κατὰ κόσμον*, 489) is, by implication, itself applicable to the condensed and subtle example of the use of embedding: Demodokos' song is praised inside the whole epic, which itself deserves to be praised as *λίην κατὰ κόσμον*.

1 Cf. Plato, *Resp.* 390C.

2 On nineteenth-century attitudes, see Braswell (1982) n.1; Garvie (1994) 293.

3 For example, Burkert (1960) 130-144 demonstrated that Demodokos' song is both topically well motivated and structurally embedded in its setting.

4 Pearson (1917) 199 comments that "the banquet at Tenedos must not be identified with the occasion briefly described in *Od.* 8.75-82."

5 Marg (1956) 21 thinks that the scholiast invented the story to meet the needs of the moment.

6 Nagy (1979) 23 suggests that the quarrel in this passage derives from some lost epic tradition that began with a dispute between Achilleus and Odysseus, based on the claim of each to be the best of the Achaeans.

7 Garvie (1994) 249-50 leaves the question open, but he suggests rather to take the time of the quarrel (*ποτε*, 76) to belong to the beginning of the war.

8 Fenik (1974) 157.

9 In spite of Odysseus' request to sing about the Horse, the theme of Demodokos' song is slightly changed. I will discuss this shift of theme below, p.106.

10 Fenik (1974) 154: " [In the repetition of the theme] the elaboration and intensifying with which the situation is developed increase in a steady line." Goldhill (1988) 21 discusses the significance of the juxtaposition of Menelaos' story of the Wooden Horse (4.266-89) with the Helen story (233-64), which function as supplements to each other.

11 Stanford (1957) 73, by contrast, reads this as a request to "pass over from the general theme of the war of the Achaeans."

12 The connotation of *κόσμος* (492) is difficult. Garvie (1994) *ad* 492, "the fashioning of the horse" ; Stanford (1959) *ad* 492, "the arrangement of the horse" ; Hainsworth (1988) *ad* 492, "i.e. *κατασκεύην*" ; Dimock (in the revised translation of Loeb) "the building of the horse"

13 Detienne and Vernant (1978) 3, "metis is a type of intelligence and of thought, a way of knowing; it implies...intellectual behaviour which combines wisdom, forethought, subtlety of mind, deception, resourcefulness...."

14 However, the usage is different: the *δεσμοί* of the *Iliad* are usually understood to be the "rivets" for the handle of the tripod; Edwards (1991) *ad loc.* Another common phrase is *ἐν ἀκμοθέτῳ μέγαν ἄκμονα* (*Il.* 18.476=*Od.* 8.274).

15 Construction of his bed is carried out after the *θάλαμος* is finished (195), so no one could observe his work; cf. Heubeck (1992) *ad loc.*

16 *ἀράχνια* do not necessarily mean 'webs' as woven on a loom, but the language of

weaving is used of spiders.

17 Detienne and Vernant (1978) 300 point out that weaving, in its circular nature, is associated with the magic powers of artifice and deceit.

18 In *Il.* 18.399-402, Hephaistos forged his crafty metal work for nine years with Eurynome, which may suggest his crafty skill was taught by the female god. Mention of this, before the making of the shield of Achilles, implies that Hephaistos' skill covers both manly metal work and womanly artful craft.

19 Goldhill (1988) 5 discusses the deceptive nature of weaving, and remarks that the vocabulary of weaving helps to define the relationship of Penelope and Odysseus in the household.

20 Brown (1989) 286 thinks that ἐν προθύροισι denotes the space where the public and the inner world of the οἶκος meet, pointing out that the laughter of the gods has a public nature. On the gods' laughter, see below (p.102).

21 Olson (1995) 26, "By the tale of Agamemnon the poet of the *Odyssey* controls the expression and reactions of his audience; Odysseus 'should' return to Ithaca and take revenge upon his enemies." See also March (1987) 84; Garvie (1994) 294.

22 Detienne and Vernant (1978) 272 note that the peculiar shape of Hephaistos' feet is the visible symbol of his *metis.*

23 The marriage of Hephaistos and Aphrodite is not found in any other text; in the *Theogony,* for example, Ares is the husband of Aphrodite (932-4), while Hephaistos is married to Charis (945). In the *Iliad,* too, Hephaistos in married to Charis (18. 382). Therefore, Brown (1989) 283 n.2 suggests the possibility that the marriage between Hephaistos and Aphrodite is "an *ad hoc* invention by the poet."

24 The meaning and etymology of αιδηλος are uncertain: "destructive" or "unbearable to the sight" (from ἀ-ϝιδ-ηλος : Hainsworth, Garvie, *ad loc.*), or "hellish" (from the popular etymology with Ἀιδης : Stanford, *ad loc.*).

25 Garland (1995) 82 thinks that Hephaistos contrives his own public humiliation in his revenge. I think, however, the emphasis in this account is on Hephaistos' victory as well as the praise for his crafty skill.

26 On the link between Ares and Euryalos, and between Hephaistos and Odysseus, see Braswell (1982) 131-5.

27 On the appearance of Odysseus, cf. *Il.* 3.203-24, where the appearance and mental skill of Odysseus is contrasted: he is inferior to Menelaos in height and breadth of shoulders (210). Newton's comment on this passage (1987) 13 n.8, "Odysseus' legs are unusually short and thin" seems rather exaggerated.

28 Newton (1987) 14-5 tries to prove the weakness of Odysseus' legs, giving the

examples of Odysseus' leaning against a pillar (17.340-1), his fear of the suitors' dragging him by his feet (16. 274-7) and so forth. He appears to go too far.

29 Braswell (1982) 135 tries to prove that Euryalos would have outstripped Odysseus, just as Ares would Hephaistos in a fair race; but there is not enough evidence for his claim.

30 The war in Egypt in his false story to Eumaios (14.259-68) gives a similar picture to the war with the Kikones. On the Iliadic aspect of this passage (including the use of language), see Heubeck (1989) 15.

31 A similar example of his failure as an Iliadic fighter can be seen in the episode of Skylla (12.222-33). Here, he arms himself, disobeying Kirke's advice, and it results in ruin for some of his comrades.

32 The second lot of laughter (344) is slightly different from the first - it mainly results from Hermes' extravagant idea.

33 Brown (1989) 287.

34 Olson (1989) 142.

35 Levine (1982) 97.

36 This aspect of laughter is also applied to Zeus' laughter in the *Hymn to Hermes* (389).

37 Schadewaldt (1959) 19.

38 On this discussion, see Fenik (1974) 7-20.

39 Besslich (1966) 67-8 points out that the expression of *νῦν* shows that, in Alkinoos' view, the stranger has so far cunningly evaded the disclosure of his identity.

40 Thalmann (1984) 161-5.

41 Hainsworth (1988) 344, "It is there [the quarrel scene] that Odysseus is converted from a *ἱκέτης*, a *πτωχός* without rank in society, into an *ἄριστος*, to be honoured with gifts."

42 Garvie (1994) *ad* 403-5.

43 Burkert (1960) 134-9.

44 Garvie (1994) 293.

45 For Demodokos' change of theme, see Harrison (1971) 378-9 ; and Olson (1995) 47, n.8.

Bibliography

Besslich, S., *Schweigen-Verschweigen-Übergehen, Die Darstellung des Unausgesprochenen in der Odyssee,* Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1966.

Braswell, B.K., "The Songs of Ares and Aphrodite: Theme and Relevance to Odyssey 8" , *Hermes* 110 (1982), 129-137.

Brown, Christopher G., "Ares, Aphrodite, and the Laughter of the *Gods*" , *Phoenix* 43 (1989), 283-293.

Burkert, W., "Das Lied von Ares und Aphrodite" , *RhM* 103 (1960), 130-144.

-----*Homo Necans* : The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth, tr. P. Bing, University of California Press, 1983.

Clay, Jenny S., *The Wrath of Athena, Gods and Man in the Odyssey,* Princeton University Press, 1983.

-----The *Politics of the Olympus,* Princeton University Press, 1989.

Detienne, Marcel and Vernant, Jean-Pierre, *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society,* tr. J. Lloyd, Sussex : The Harvester Press, 1978 (1974).

Fenik, Bernard, *Studies in the Odyssey, Hermes* Einzelschriften 30 (1974).

Garland, Robert, *The Eye of the Beholder, Deformity and Disability in the Graeco-Roman World,* London: Duckworth, 1995.

Garvie, A.F., *Homer, Odyssey, Book VI-VIII,* Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Goldhill, Simon, "Reading Differences: The *Odyssey* and Juxtaposition" , Ramus 17 (1988), 1-31.

Griffith, Marg, "Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry" , *Cabinet of the Muses, Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer,* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990, 185-207.

Hainsworth, J.B., (Heubeck, A and West, S.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey,* vol. 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Harrison, E.L., "Odysseus and Demodokos: Homer, Odyssey q 492f." , *Hermes* 99(1971), 378-9.

Heubeck, A. (Hoekstra A.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* II, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Heubeck, A., (Fernandez-Galiano, M. and Russo, J.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* III, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Janko, Richard, *Homer, Hesiod and Hymns,* Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Levine, Daniel B., "Homeric Laughter and the Unsmilimg Suitors" , *CJ.* 78 (1982), 97

-104.

March, Jennifer R., *The Creative Poet, BICS* Supplement 49 (1987).

Marg, W., "Das Erste Lied des Demodokos" , *Navicula Chiloniensis: Festschrift F.Jacoby,* Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1956, 16-29.

Nazy, Gregory, *The Best of the Achaeans,* The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Newton, Rick M., "Odysseus and Hephaistus in the Odyssey" , *CJ* 83 (1987), 12-20.

Olson, S. Douglas, *Blood and Iron, Stories and Storytelling in Homer's Odyssey, Mnemosyne Supplement* 148, Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1955.

-----"Odyssey 8: Guile, Force and the Subversive Poetics of Desire" , *Arethusa* 22 (1989), 135-145.

Parry, Hugh, "The Apologos of Odysseus: Lies, all Lies?" , *Phoenix* 48 (1994), 1-20

Pearson, A.C., *The Fragments of Sophocles,* vol. I & II, Cambridge University Press, 1917.

Pratt, Louise H., *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar, Falsehood and Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics,* The University of Michigan Press, 1993.

Schadewaldt, Wolfgang, "Kleiderdinge, Zur Analyse der Odyssee" , *Hermes* 87 (1959), 13-26.

Stanford, W.B., The *Odyssey of Homer,* vol. I& II, London: Macmillam, 1967.

Thalmann, William G., *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry,* The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.