

A Special Model of Classical Reception

A Special Model of Classical Reception:

Summaries and Short Narratives

Edited by

Maria de Fátima Silva, David Bouvier
and Maria das Graças Augusto

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



A Special Model of Classical Reception: Summaries and Short Narratives

Edited by Maria de Fátima Silva, David Bouvier
and Maria das Graças Augusto

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2020 by Maria de Fátima Silva, David Bouvier,
Maria das Graças Augusto and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-5714-6

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-5714-7

CONTENTS

Contributors.....	vii
Introduction	1
Chapter One.....	10
Three Summaries of the Ruse of the Wooden Horse in the <i>Odyssey</i> <i>Yoshinori Sano (International Christian University, Japan)</i>	
Chapter Two.....	22
Homeric Summaries in Plato <i>Naoko Yamagata (The Open University, UK)</i>	
Chapter Three.....	34
Perfection – The Immortals’ Default. Eça de Queiroz and Calypso’s Island Appendix, Eça de Queiroz, <i>Perfection</i> <i>Maria de Fátima Silva (University of Coimbra, Portugal)</i>	
Chapter Four.....	73
Alice Oswald’s <i>Memorial</i> , A New <i>Iliad</i> <i>Jan Haywood (The Open University, UK)</i>	
Chapter Five.....	91
Inversion and Perversion of Greek Mythology in Marco Denevi’s Short Narrative <i>Graciela Zecchin de Fasano (Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina)</i>	
Chapter Six.....	115
Greek Mythology for Children and Classical Reception for Young Readers <i>Amy Pistone (Gonzaga University, USA)</i>	

Chapter Seven.....	131
Revisiting the Classics in the Portuguese Program of Primary Education: Maria Alberta Menéres, <i>Odysseus</i> <i>Susana Marques Pereira (University of Coimbra, Portugal)</i>	
Chapter Eight.....	149
The Twelve Labours of Heracles in a Mozambican Short-Story: “Os Sapatos Novos de Josefate Ngwetana”, by João Paulo Borges Coelho <i>Maria Fernanda Brasete (University of Aveiro, Portugal)</i>	
Chapter Nine.....	167
Gonçalo M. Tavares’ <i>Histórias Falsas</i> (False Stories): Encountering tradition and confronting fragments of truth <i>Ana Isabel Martins (University of Coimbra, Portugal)</i>	
Index of Authors and Quotations.....	191
Index of Subjects	200

CONTRIBUTORS

Amy Pistone earned her BA from the University of California, Berkeley in 2008 and her Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in 2017. She is currently an Assistant Professor at Gonzaga University. Her primary research explores the question of Greek tragedy's interaction with 5th-century Athenian society, in particular the misunderstanding of oracular or prophetic speech in Sophoclean tragedy. She is also very interested in public scholarship and contemporary receptions of Greek tragedy in modern society and popular culture.

Ana Isabel Correia Martins has been teaching at University of Rennes 2 (France) since 2018. That same year, she finished her post-doctoral project, sponsored by *Foundation for Science and Technology* (2015-2018). In 2014, she won a fellowship from *International Society for the History of Rhetoric* to develop a project in Renaissance Humanism. Between 2008-2013, she was dedicated to her PhD also sponsored by FCT and since 2013 she is Integrated Researcher at CECH-FLUC. Her main research domains are the Reception of Classical Antiquity in the Renaissance and Portuguese Literature, Rhetoric, Historiography and Latin Language and Literature. She integrates the scientific committee of journal *Letras Clássicas* (University of S. Paolo), *Phaine: Revista de Estudos sobre Antiguidade*, sponsored by Unesco and *Revista Castilla. Estudios de Literatura* (University of Valladolid).

Graciela Cristina Zecchin de Fasano is Professor of Classics at the University of La Plata. Member of the Scientific Committee of the Centre of Hellenic Studies, University of La Plata, Argentina. She was Editor and Director of *Synthesis* Journal (CEH-IdIHCS-CONICET). Her PhD field of research was Homer's Epic (*Odyssey: Speech and Narrative*). Her main areas of research include Ancient Epic, Archaic Poetry and Greek Tragedy. She has been Fellow of the Centre for Hellenic Studies (Harvard University 2013-2014) and editor of *Social Deixis and Performance in Classical Greek Literature* (2011, EDULP), *The Tale of History in Ancient Greek Literature and its performative mythical value* (2015, EDULP) and *Literature and Society in Ancient Greece* (2018, Mauad, UFRJ, Brasil, with Fabio Lessa).

Jan Haywood is Lecturer in Classical Studies at The Open University. He is the co-author of a volume on cross-cultural receptions of the Trojan War tradition with Professor Naoise Mac Sweeney (*Homer's Iliad and the Trojan War: Dialogues on Tradition*; Bloomsbury, 2018), and he has co-edited with Dr Zosia Archibald a volume in honour of the ancient historian John K. Davies (*The Power of Individual and Community in Ancient Athens and Beyond*; Classical Press of Wales, 2019). Jan has also published several articles on the ancient Greek historians, and is now working on a revised version of his PhD thesis, *Herodotus and his Sources*. He has also recently set up the Herodotus Helpline with Professor Thomas Harrison – an online international seminar series for anyone interested in Herodotus and his world.

Maria de Fátima Silva is Full Professor in the Institute of Classical Studies, Faculty of Letters, University of Coimbra, Portugal. She belongs to the Section 'Rewriting of Myths', in the Research Centre for Classical and Humanistic Studies, of the same University. She is a member of CAPN (Classics and Poetry Now, coordinated by Prof. Lorna Hardwick). Greek Theatre and Reception of the Classics in Portuguese Literature are her main subjects of research.

Maria Fernanda Brasete received her Ph.D. in Literature at the University of Aveiro, and is Assistant Professor at the Department of Languages and Cultures. Her research interests are on Homer's epic, Archaic Lyric, Greek Tragedy, especially Euripidean, and the reception of Greek drama in Portuguese literature. She is the author of various articles and book chapters, and editor and co-editor of several books in her various fields of research. Her works of translation from Greek to Portuguese includes the Fr. 7 of Semonides of Amorgos (2005), Pindar, *Nemea V* (2006) and most recently the translation with notes and introduction of Euripides' *Electra* (2018).

Naoko Yamagata is Senior Lecturer in Classical Studies at The Open University. She is the author of *Homeric Morality* (Brill 1994) and a number of articles on Homer, the reception of Homer in antiquity (especially in Plato) and comparative studies of Homer and the *Tale of the Heike*, a medieval Japanese tale of warriors.

Susana Marques Pereira is Adjunct Professor of Classical Studies at the University of Coimbra and belongs to the Centre of Classical and Humanistic Studies at the same University. Her PhD field of research was

ancient Greek tragedy – her PhD thesis (2006) was entitled “Dreams and visions in Greek tragedy”. Her main areas of research include Greek literature and the reception of the Classics.

Yoshinori Sano is Professor of Classics at International Christian University, Tokyo. He holds the degree of D.Phil. from Oxford University. His publications include ‘The First Stasimon of Sophocles’ *Antigone* (332-375): Comparison with Texts on Cultural Progress’ in *Japan Studies in Classical Antiquity*, vol. 2 (2014) and ‘Meeting of Croesus and Solon in Herodotus’ *Histories* I’ in J. U. Ro (ed.), *Story and History: The Kings of Israel and Judah in Context* (Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

INTRODUCTION

Reception studies have paid great attention in these last years to the ways Greek mythology and poetry have inspired artists (writers, painters, sculptors, musicians) all over the world and throughout successive centuries. The international bibliography about these subjects has been enriched with numerous and excellent titles,¹ which not only identify and comment the infinite recreations, but also theorize on the variety of processes that the reception of Classics makes use of. Most of the studies deal with a particular myth or character (Ædipus, Helen, Odysseus, Penelope), or with an author or a literary genre (perhaps the epic and the theatre being the ones that have deserved the most attention). However, we are aware that reception studies are a constantly evolving process, not only because each day sees new recreations appear, but because there are still specific motifs or artistic modalities that need research.

It is from this perspective that we propose to focus on particular forms of transmission and reception, we believe not yet fully explored. And we begin by asking: is there any literary genre or form that contributes in particular to the transmission and reception of ancient Greek poetic and mythological material? In other words: is there any literary modality which, being itself the result of the transmission of a motive, also serves as a tool for the reception process? To what extent can we talk about reception among authors in Antiquity, or even between different stages of the same text? More precisely we are interested in summaries and short narratives, and firstly in how they were used in Antiquity itself.

¹ Without injustice to so many other titles, we could cite as an example: Bañuls Oller, J. V., Sánchez Méndez, J., Sanmartín Sáez, J. (eds.) (1999), *Literatura Iberoamericana y Tradición Clásica*. València: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Universitat de València; Hall, E., Macintosh, F. and Wrigley, A. (eds.) (2004), *Dionysus Since 69*. Oxford: University Press; Hardwick, L., Stray, C. (eds.) (2008), *A Companion to Classical Receptions*. Malden MA: Blackwell; Lauriola, R., Demetriou, K. N. (eds.) (2015), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Euripides*. Leiden: Brill; Lauriola, R., Demetriou, K. N. (eds.) (2017), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Sophocles*. Leiden: Brill; López Férez, J. A. (ed.) (2009), *Mitos clásicos en la Literatura Española e Hispanoamericana del siglo XX. I-II*. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas; Nikoloutsos, K. (ed.) (2013), *Ancient Greek women in film*. Oxford: University Press.

The art of synthesizing stories or mythical episodes had enormous vitality in the Homeric Poems, as the best-preserved model of a literary pattern with which other poems and heroes - included in what we call the 'epic cycle' (Heracles, the Argonauts, the Labdacids) - dialogued in Antiquity. The extent, temporal and spatial, of the Homeric Poems, as well as the possible intervention of various contributors in their composition, invited the recapitulation of certain episodes, undoubtedly popular among listeners, but also determinant in the characterization of the heroes involved in the campaign against Troy. The singers (e.g., Phemius in Ithaca, or more relevant for our purposes Demodocus in the land of the Phaeacians), in charge of entertaining the guests in the courts far from the battlefield, are decisive agents in the recreation, more or less long, of the episodes that animate the combat and its actors. But the heroes themselves in the *Iliad*, directly experiencing the daily life of war, produce and transmit different versions of the events. Successive recapitulations or summaries confront different versions of the same story, adding a 'personal or psychological' contribution to the reading of the same episode. For its part the *Odyssey*, in presenting Odysseus' journey along an extensive and unknown route, the contacts that he had with different entities or peoples, required the identification of the hero, the same is to say, the memory of his origin and life experience. Therefore, the king of Ithaca himself is often called upon to relate his deeds in Troy, or confronted with the narratives that his hosts provide him with from his own saga.

On the other hand, Homer has persisted as a cultural reference over the centuries. Remembering his verses, in order to imitate or criticize them, always implied quoting them or, often, summarizing them. Plato, for example, was unable to criticize Homer without summarizing him (*see below*). And our interest goes beyond checking the fidelity of these quotations or summaries, but above all to assess the significance that small deviations or alterations in Plato may have for his interpretation of the Homeric text. Later, mythographers played an essential role collecting and summarizing mythical arguments, sometimes preserving to posterity stories or literary versions of myths that would otherwise be lost. In conclusion, the summary constituted in Antiquity a process of interpretative and expressive reception of the myths and literary versions by which they have been narrated.

Taken into account this practice in antiquity, another question was needed: How much did all that influence our modern and contemporary writers? Has this practice of summaries, or short narratives in general, had repercussions on our way of rewriting the Classics? Therefore, it seemed

inevitable to extend this kind of approach beyond the limits of the ancient world and to observe it among different authors and cultural contexts that, over time, manifested unexpected coherencies. This is the miracle of globalisation to which the classical tradition gives extraordinary coherence.

Greek mythology appears as an infinite repertoire or reserve for narrative scenarios, models of characters, thematic arguments, plots, etc. But more than that, they also offer and bequeath us numerous models of rewriting. From the Ancients on, rewriting was a way to write. From epic and lyric to tragedy, from one tragedy to another one, from poetry to prose, the ancient poets and writers were constantly active in reformulating and recapturing their stories. Composing or writing for religious and socio-cultural occasions, Greek poets or writers were not interested in inventing new scenarios *ex nihilo*. The inventive dimension of their work was to reformulate and transform, in an agonistic perspective, the stories and myths told by their predecessors.

Therefore, in this volume, we begin by focusing our attention on a specific way to recapture and perpetuate ancient Greek mythology and reference literary creations.² Short stories or novels were not a literary genre in Archaic or Classical Greece, although we find in so many different texts summaries of ancient events or stories. Can we compare these summaries between themselves? Do they reveal a particular technique or specific skills? What was the function and role of these summaries? What about a distinction between intratextual summaries (inside a same work) and extratextual summaries (when a short text summarizes a song or poem)? Can we consider summaries as an origin for later short narratives or short stories?

² Some bibliography on this specific issue can be mentioned: Anderson, M. (1977), *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. Oxford: University Press; Darbo-Peschanski, C. (ed.), *La citation dans l'Antiquité: Actes du colloque du PARSAs, Lyon, ENS LSH, 6-8 Novembre 2002*. Grenoble: Editions Jérôme Millon; Efstathiou, A., Kramanou, I. (eds.) (2016), *Homeric Receptions across Generic and Cultural Contexts*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter; Flack, L. C. (2015), *Modernism and Homer: The Odysseys of H.D., James Joyce, Osip Mandelstam, and Ezra Pound*. Cambridge: University Press; Graziosi, B., Greenwood, E. (eds.) (2010), *Homer in the Twentieth Century: Between World Literature and the Western Canon*. Oxford: University Press; Hunter, R. (2012), *Plato and the Traditions of Ancient Literature: The Silent Stream*. Cambridge: University Press; Macintosh, F., M'Connell, J., Harrison, S., Kenward, C. (eds.) (2018), *Epic Performances from the Middle Ages into the Twenty-First Century*. Oxford: University Press.

Some theoretical reflection later came to join a secular practice. Through Callimachus' poetry and ancient commentators referring to it,³ we know, in the erudite Alexandria of the 3rd century BC, of discussions about the reciprocal qualities and merits of long and short poems. Already before, in the 4th century, Aristotle had introduced the question of the proper length for an epic poem or tragedy. He was perfectly aware of the necessity to adapt the length of a tragedy or epic to the conditions of its performance, but he nevertheless introduced the idea of a natural and aesthetical limit linked to the nature of the genre itself. Such considerations about the appropriate length of poetic works depended on new conceptions and conditions of literature and writing, and paved the way for future Literary Theory or Comparative Literature.

Aristotle himself understood the relevance of the poet's capacity synthesizing, and the intense critical perspective that a summary of *Odyssey's* argument implies. In *Poetics* 1455b16-24, he summarizes the *Odyssey's* *logos* as something 'ou makron' in order to point out that it can be transmitted in essence and that the poet's task is to establish the definitive dimension of an epic poem.

In a second moment, we turned to the contemporary repercussion of that practice. Contemporary times have prolonged this process, adjusting it to new contexts and other audiences. To the characterizing elements of each myth and the expression models already adopted, it has added new details and expanded the aesthetic variety of treatments. The comparative process, always involved in reception studies, demanded an increasingly wider view, taking into account the multiple crossings and 'new originals' that the course of the centuries and the different geographies produced. The importation of old myths and texts is not always done directly. New successful treatments have become, over time, other points of reference, and so there was a need to perceive a network of influences as wide as possible. Simultaneously, besides the summary, the tale has evolved to an autonomous genre in itself, and the art of reducing to a few pages or even lines the long content of a model - epic or tragic, to take as an example genres characterized by extension - an interesting challenge.

³ See, e.g., Acosta-Hughes, B., Lehnus, L., Stephens, S. (eds.) (2011), *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*. Leiden, Boston: Brill; Cameron, A. (1995), *Callimachus and his Critics*. Princeton: University Press; Clauss, J. J., Cuypers, M. (eds.) (2011), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*. Malden, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

This volume

The different chapters of this volume cover a diachronic, geographical, and cultural space. Some of the texts - constituting a first part - go back to Antiquity, being the *Odyssey* the most significant source for several reflections, ancient and contemporary, and therefore the safest link between old and contemporary versions considered in a second part. This creates a specific nucleus that gives a global cohesion to the whole. At the same time, in modern and contemporary summaries and tales here analysed predominance goes again to epics (Homer and other famous stories known from the epic cycle) as a source, exemplified by texts belonging to several literatures (expressed in Portuguese, from Portugal and Mozambique; of Ibero-American origin, from Argentina; and finally from the UK and USA, focused on the importance that major political phenomena can have on universal creativity), covering a period that goes from the nineteenth to our century.

Part I - Summaries and short stories in Antiquity

Yoshinori Sano (Chapter 1, "Three summaries of the ruse of the wooden horse in the *Odyssey* and beyond") focuses on Homer. He privileges, to a certain extent, the role of the *aoidoi* - particularly Demodocus - in the use of the summaries, besides a paradigmatic incidence in the Wooden Horse episode. For a Homeric singer, theoretical questions (about the appropriate length of poetic works) were irrelevant. As Lord reminded us, the singer was trained to adapt his singing to his audience and it was the length of the song that was "most affected by the audience's restlessness". The singer knew how to lengthen or shorten his tale according to the interest of his public, and how to make the same story long or short on different occasions. The ability to lengthen or shorten a story was an essential component of the poet's art. We have proofs of this capacity when we study the many examples of summaries found in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*. In *Iliad*, 1.366-92, Achilles makes for Thetis a summary of the events described so far (8.344); his speech is ten times shorter. And in the *Odyssey*, the three accounts of the ruse of the Wooden Horse, at 4.271-89 (told by Menelaus), 8.500-20 (the third song of Demodocus), and 11.505-37 (told by Odysseus), give a good example of the manipulation of the same episode in accordance not only with the auditorium, but also with the draftsmen's circumstances, attitude, and interests.

Naoko Yamagata (Chapter 2, "Homeric Summaries in Plato") considers summaries of Homer in Plato. The competence of summarizing,

condensing or shortening a story (even if the modalities are not the same) played an essential role for the reception and critique of Homer and ancient mythology already in Antiquity. The summary, in addition to quotation as a literary and philosophical tool, is exemplified by Plato in his criticism of Homeric poetry. In passages taken from *Apology*, *Republic* and *Ion*, we can observe and study varying strategies of summaries, according to a special purpose or intention. A summary is never "neutral".

Part II - Reception of summaries and short stories in modern and contemporary times

In the chapters dedicated to the tradition of summaries in modern and contemporaneous tales and short narratives, we begin by considering examples where the Homeric Poems are the direct source.

Maria de Fátima Silva (Chapter 3, "Perfection - The Immortals' Default. Eça de Queiroz, *Perfection*") makes an analysis of a typical case in Portuguese Literature. Taking as a model Book V of the *Odyssey*, the Portuguese writer Eça de Queiroz (19th century) transforms into a short story the adventure of Odysseus on Calypso's island. Here the short story is also a way to reinvent Homer and adapt it to new audiences. With this example, Silva illustrates the potential of Homeric poetry to offer argument for short stories (was not the *Odyssey* already a collection of short stories?), and deals with a particular topic that concerns the next papers as well: the dialogue between long and short literary genres. How much is the short story of Eça de Queiroz (included in translation as an appendix) different from the Homeric scenario? What figures and moments does it reproduce from the Greek model? What changes does it introduce in the narrative structure and its tools? And therefore, what new sense may be taken from a similar structure and equivalent aesthetic strategies? The keyword is here 'Perfection', which gives the tale its title. For the Portuguese author, Ulysses' stay on the island of Calypso is not above all an episode more in the *nostos* of a *polymechanos* hero; it is the utopian encounter of the divine and the human and the denunciation of the incompatibility between these two distinct orders of the universe.

Jan Haywood (Chapter 4, "Alice Oswald's *Memorial*, a new *Iliad*") takes as his subject an English rewriting inspired in the conventional motive of the epic 'catalogue', doing justice to those many fighters whom the war has wiped out without the memory of men having preserved their identity. Even a long epic can't tell everything. Because it emphasizes the glory of the famous heroes, space is missing to sing the death of minor warriors. The singer (or poet) of the *Iliad* often just mentions their names.

Haywood explores one of the most significant literary responses to Homer's *Iliad* in the twenty-first century: Alice Oswald's *Memorial* (2011), a kind of *anti-Iliad* that sings the death of multiple heroic and non-heroic characters from the Homeric version.

This poem was composed as a "condensed version" of the *Iliad*. In this case the "short version" is a new poem with its own rhythm, its own similes and repetitions. In this chapter, the ways in which the poet conveys multiple aspects of the Homeric poem are analysed, while ultimately producing a distinctive work that excavates the *Iliad*, unearthing the solemnity of the Homeric poem, highlighting its status as a poem of death.

Another perspective of taking up themes used by Homer, especially in the *Odyssey*, is the one that gets inspiration from late mythographers. It is from this material that Graciela Zecchin de Fasano (Chapter 5, "Inversion and perversion of Greek Mythology in Marco Denevi's short narrative") goes back to some popular myths recognizable in Homer and the epic cycle in general through ancient summaries.

How much is it possible to shorten a story without changing it, perverting it, falsifying it? Reading Marco Denevi's *Falsifications* (1966), Zecchin de Fasano studies how the Argentinean writer proposed in his book a series of micronarratives whose title shows a notoriously and controversial reception: a "desacralized" perspective, which is supported *ab initio* as a derived falsehood. Examples focused on love, war, and women (Perseus, Oedipus, Orpheus, Odysseus, Polyphemus and Heracles, Sirens, Helene and Penelope) bring back a mythical material to which the epic has given enormous vitality. At the same time, this paper contributes to the discussion of ancient versions told by mythographers as Apollodorus, or other writers as Pausanias or Hyginus.

Very particular is the rewriting of Homer and the traditional myths for young readers. Children's literature that recounts Greek mythology sits at the intersection of contemporary short narrative and summaries, since stories from Greek myth were often shortened and adapted to make them more suitable for a young audience. However, this process of adaptation is rarely a simple bowdlerization and instead often involves substantial rewriting to avoid plot points that were not deemed appropriate for children while simultaneously crafting a story line that would appeal to young readers.

Two examples of suggestive creations directed to English- and Portuguese-speakers are included in this volume. Amy Pistone (Chapter 6, "Greek Mythology for Children and Classical Reception for Young Readers") reflects on the ability of the Greek mythology to serve this goal using the example of Nathaniel Hawthorne's *A Wonder Book for Girls &*

Boys (published in 1851). This production represents the first significant project of this sort for young English-speaking readers and sets the tone for a new sort of classical reception that would influence a great deal of subsequent children's literature. Lerer's recent work on the history of children's literature highlights the centrality of lists and catalogues as well as theatrical performance, two elements which make Greek mythology a natural source for children's literature.

Susana Marques Pereira (Chapter 7, "Revisiting the Classics in the Portuguese Program of Primary Education: Maria Alberta Menéres, *Odysseus*") focuses on a similar Portuguese example. To retell the fascinating adventures of Odysseus to a young audience was the challenge that Maria Alberta Menéres set out in her adaptation of the Homeric *Odyssey*. This rewriting was included in its selection by the Portuguese Program of Basic Education, as one of the comprehensive reading works suggested to the students of the 6th level. The repeated overcoming of dangers and obstacles by a hero or the use of the marvellous are *per se* seductive ingredients for the recipients. Using images or drawings and rewriting an epic into short chapters is, in this case, a good tool for the transmission of the Classics among young audiences. This age group, however, presupposes a very specific dissemination of a famous myth. It is a purpose of this study to focus precisely on particularities that a narrative devised for a young audience implied.

The last two chapters, also associated with Homer, imply a greater distance from his direct import, as they represent the result of crossing Homeric versions with other myths or literary genres from Antiquity.

Maria Fernanda Brasete (Chapter 8, "The Twelve Labours of Heracles in a Mozambican short-story: *Os Sapatos Novos de Josefate Ngwetana*, de João Paulo Borges Coelho") studies a tale in which the saga of a wandering Ulysses is put in parallel with that of Heracles, a similar protagonist of difficult adventures.

"*Os Sapatos Novos de Josefate Ngwetana*" is one of the short stories of the second volume of the series *Índicos Índicios*, entitled *Meridião* (2005), written by the Mozambican writer and historian João Paulo Borges Coelho. It echoes both Heracles' myths and the *Odyssey*. The narrative focuses on the character of Herculano, son of Josefate, who decides to go away in search of a better life than his father's. The journey that the young Herculano undertakes takes place on the southern coast of Mozambique, but the various stages of his wandering can be read as a Mozambican recreation of the mythological labours of Heracles and also the *Odyssey*. As Heracles, this character will also have to pass and surpass "twelve points" to reach his goal, in this case, to find his identity and his memory, in some

kind of a *nostos* to Ithaca. At the end of the short-story, the author presents a "Note" on the return journey of Herculano, in which he discusses the relationship between history and reality, mentioning some of the Greek authors who reported "this wondering of Herculano", in a parody to Lucian of Samosata, to affirm that the one presented in this tale "is the only true description."

Finally, Ana Isabel Martins (Chapter 9, "Gonçalo M. Tavares' *Histórias Falsas* (False Stories): encountering tradition and confronting fragments of truth") focuses her attention on a collection, *Histórias Falsas*, composed by 9 short stories (echoing each other). The difference between fiction and reality (history) is here abolished. The Presocratics become the personages of short stories taking the form of tales. In them, the adventure of the Homeric hero, Odysseus, is filtered through the reformulated or even deformed versions to which the epic text was subjected still in Antiquity. Lucian of Samosata's *A True Story* is the first intermediary clearly suggested in the inversion produced in the new title, *False Stories*. Moving from the adventures around a hero to a 'biographic' model, this narrative is also indebted to Plutarch, *Parallel Lives*, as the most influential text of its kind in the European tradition. In the diversity of tales, Homer also appears under another skin: that which makes him the author of *Margites*, a text with comic tones, lost for us. These are, among others, visible sources in Gonçalo M. Tavares' return to the classics.

Variety and coherence are the basic features of this volume, in which Homer appears as a uniting feature and as an axis capable of producing eternal flexibility and reformulation. The use of different literatures, confluent in the genre adopted - the summary and the short story - seeks to suggest the expansion of classical models in this specific form. Even if scattered over several continents, historical moments, cultural contexts, they maintain an evident and strong presence.

David Bouvier
Maria de Fátima Silva
Maria das Graças de Moraes Augusto

CHAPTER ONE

THREE SUMMARIES OF THE RUSE OF THE WOODEN HORSE IN THE *ODYSSEY*

YOSHINORI SANO

Introduction

There are three accounts of the ruse of the Wooden Horse in the *Odyssey*: at 4.271-89 (told by Menelaus), 8.500-20 (the third song of Demodocus), and 11.505-37 (told by Odysseus). These three accounts contain details different from each other. Menelaus in *Odyssey* 4 describes Helen's visit to the Wooden Horse and Odysseus's restraint of those who were about to respond to her call. Demodocus in *Odyssey* 8 describes the debate among the Trojans as to how to deal with the Wooden Horse and their eventual decision to let it stand within the Trojan Wall. Odysseus in *Odyssey* 11 describes how Odysseus himself and Neoptolemus behaved in the Wooden Horse.

From Proclus's summary, we know that two epics belonging to the Trojan epic cycle, the *Little Iliad* and the *Sack of Ilion*, contained the episode of the Wooden Horse. Since the accounts of the Wooden Horse in the *Odyssey* have many details in common with the two cyclic epics, it is probable that the poet of the *Odyssey* knew the oral traditions that were taken into the *Little Iliad* and the *Sack of Ilion*.¹ The three accounts of the

¹ See Anderson (1997) 86 with n. 22; West (2014) 28-9. Details of the episode of the Wooden Horse common to the *Odyssey* and Proclus's summary (cited below according to page and line numbers of *EGF* (Davies (1988)) include the construction of the horse by Epeius (*Od.* 8.493; 11.523 / *Little Iliad*, *EGF* 52, 17-8), the entrance of Greek soldiers into the horse (*Od.* 8.495/ *Little Iliad*, *EGF* 52, 25), the Greeks' burning of their camp and departure on ship (*Od.* 8.500-2 / *Little Iliad*, *EGF* 52, 26-7), the conveyance of the horse into the Trojan wall (*Od.* 8.494, 8.504 / *Little Iliad*, *EGF* 53, 28-30), the Trojans' discussion about what to do with the

Wooden Horse in the *Odyssey* can be seen as summaries of longer accounts that existed before.

As we examine the details of these accounts, we shall pay attention to whether the inside or the outside of the Wooden Horse is depicted during the time when the Greeks were hiding in it.² The period of time when the Greeks were hiding inside the Wooden Horse was an intense moment of imminent danger both to the Greeks inside and to the Trojans outside. The Greeks had to keep quiet to avoid being detected by the Trojans. The Trojans made a fatal decision to let the Wooden Horse stand within the walls, rather than to cut it open or to cast it down from a cliff (Book 8). The option chosen by the Trojans led to the destruction of Troy, while the rejected two options would have brought about immediate deaths to the Greeks inside. Helen also brought a danger of nearly revealing the Greeks inside (Book 4).

The different details of the three summary accounts of the Wooden Horse are obviously affected by the choice of the narrators (Menelaus / Demodocus / Odysseus) and the addressees (Helen and Telemachus / the Phaeacians and (not yet recognized) Odysseus / the ghost of Achilles) for each account.³ In this connection, we will pay special attention to Odysseus, who not only features in all three accounts of the Wooden Horse, but also is the addressee in Demodocus's second song in Book 8 and the speaker of his own exploit in Book 11.

The object of this paper is to consider the function which each of the summary accounts fulfills in the context of the *Odyssey*, paying special attention to the choice of details. These three summaries will offer impressive examples of possible functions that summaries can fulfill within a larger whole.

Menelaus's account of the Wooden Horse (*Od.* 4.271-89)

Telemachus accompanied by Pisistratus visits Sparta in quest of information about his father. Helen tells the story of Odysseus's spying mission to Troy (*Od.* 4.242-64) in which she tells that Odysseus entered

Wooden Horse (*Od.* 8.505-10 / *Sack of Ilion*, *EGF* 62, 3-7).

² Andersen (1977) 7 points out the significance of whether the inside or the outside of the Wooden Horse is described.

³ De Jong (2001) 103 (on 4.271-89). Bouvier (2019) 87 points out the possibility that Demodocus alone among the Phaeacians, has recognized the true identity of Odysseus.

Troy disguising himself and revealed to her all the plan (πάντα νόον, 256) of the Achaeans. Helen further speaks about herself that her heart was looking forward to returning home and she was repenting her departure from Sparta, ascribing her folly (ἄτη) to Aphrodite (259-62). She concludes by saying that Menelaus is a husband who lacks nothing both in mind and in form (263-4).

Menelaus tells an account of the Wooden Horse in reply to Helen, addressing her in the second person. An outline of Menelaus's account (*Od.* 4.271-89) is as below, with square brackets indicating whether the inside or the outside of the Wooden Horse is described.

271–73 [inside] Odysseus, I (Menelaus), and others were hiding in the Wooden Horse.

274–79 [outside] You (Helen) came. A god may have sent you. Deiphobus followed you. You walked around the horse three times touching it, calling names of Greek heroes imitating their wives' voices.

280–89a [inside] I, Diomedes, and Odysseus were hearing your voice. I and Diomedes had the desire to go out or respond from inside, but Odysseus restrained us. While all others kept silent, Anticlus alone was about to respond to your voice, but Odysseus shut Anticlus's mouth with his hands and saved all the Achaeans. Odysseus kept Anticlus's mouth shut,

289b [outside] until Pallas Athena led you away.

Comparing the accounts of Helen and Menelaus, one finds that both represent Odysseus as penetrating into Troy hiding his identity, whether the deceptive guise is that of a beggar or a huge votive offering. Another person who features prominently in both of these accounts is Helen. Helen represents herself in Troy as repenting her departure from Sparta, and as sympathetic to the Greeks and to Menelaus.⁴ On the other hand, her act of calling the Greeks around the Wooden Horse in Menelaus's story is incongruous, all the more so because she has heard 'all the plan' from the disguised Odysseus. Menelaus's account seems to be an implied objection to her representation of herself as sympathetic to the Greeks.⁵ If the Greek

⁴ De Jong (2001) 101 (on 4.234-89).

⁵ Schmiel (1972) 469; Anderson (1997) 85; de Jong (2001) 101-2 (on 4.234-89). Andersen (1977) 11 suggests that Helen's visit to the Wooden Horse may be an invention by the poet of the *Odyssey*; see also Heubeck, West, Hainsworth (1988)

heroes had answered to Helen's voice, they would have been in great danger, especially since the Trojan Deiphobus was following her (276).⁶ The mention of Deiphobus's name may be embarrassing to Helen, since she was married to him after the death of Paris.⁷ In spite of Helen's claim that she repented deserting her first husband, Menelaus, the mention of Deiphobus reveals that Helen had yet another husband after the death of Paris.

Menelaus describes both the inside and the outside of the Wooden Horse because there are two foci, Odysseus, who was inside the Wooden Horse, and Helen, who was outside of it. Menelaus can describe the great endurance of Odysseus to Telemachus because he was in the horse with Odysseus. Although Menelaus was inside the Wooden Horse, he was greatly interested in the behaviour of Helen outside, and describes her mysterious behaviour, which might imply a correction of Helen's representation of herself.

As for the depiction of the inside of the Wooden Horse, Odysseus is the main focus. But it should be noted that Odysseus's endurance and leadership that Menelaus describes are manifested in his restraining of other Greek soldiers from responding to Helen's call. So, although more lines are spent on the description of the inside of the Wooden Horse (a little more than 12 lines – 271-73, 280-88 and the beginning of 289) than to the description of the outside (almost 7 lines – 274-9 and the larger part of 289), the presence of Helen looms prominently in the whole of Menelaus's account.

It has been pointed out that Odysseus's act of shutting Anticlus's mouth with his hands resembles his claspings Euryclea's throat to stop her from revealing Odysseus's true identity in *Odyssey* 19 (479-80).⁸ The audience/readers of the *Odyssey* can perceive this foreshadowing, which transcends the level of the communication between Menelaus, Telemachus, and Helen.

210-1 (on 4.266ff.); Danek (1998) 111 (on 4.271-89).

⁶ West (2017) brackets line 276 as spurious. See West (2013) 207.

⁷ Olson (1989) 393.

⁸ Andersen (1977) 12.

Demodocus's second song on the Wooden Horse (*Od.* 8.500-20)

Demodocus sings three songs at the court of Alcinoos in *Odyssey* 8. The first song (75-82) is about the quarrel between Achilles and Odysseus. The second (266-366) is about the adultery of Ares and Aphrodite and their punishment by Hephaestus. The third (500-20) is about the ruse of the Wooden Horse. Odysseus himself requests the subject of the third song from Demodocus:

ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ μετάβηθι καὶ ἵππου κόσμον ἄεισον
 δουρατέου, τὸν Ἐπειὸς ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ,
 ὃν ποτ' ἐς ἀκρόπολιν δόλον ἤγαγε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς
 ἀνδρῶν ἐμπλήσας, οἳ ῥ' Ἴλιον ἐξάλαπαξαν. (*Od.* 8.492-5)

Come, change the topic and sing the *kosmos* of the Wooden Horse,

which Epeius built helped by Athena,

which contrivance godlike Odysseus led to the citadel,

filling it with men, who sacked Ilium.

There seems to be a multiplicity of meanings in κόσμον (492).⁹ One meaning that readily suggests itself is (1) “the orderly or beautiful shape” of the Wooden Horse, since κόσμος means “orderly beauty” or “ornament”. Another meaning, (2) “process of building” of the Wooden Horse is perfectly possible, since κοσμέω can mean “to prepare, get ready” and the relative clause on 493 (“which Epeius built helped by Athena”) is relevant to this meaning.¹⁰ I would like to suggest another possible connotation of κόσμος, (3) “command, stratagem” of the Wooden Horse, since the verb κοσμέω can mean “to marshal” and the noun κοσμητῶρ is repeatedly used in Homeric epics in the sense of “commander”.¹¹ The relative clause of

⁹ Davies (2000) 58.

¹⁰ Garvie (1994) 332 (on 8.492); Bouvier (2019) 90.

¹¹ *Il.* 1.16, 1.375, 3.236; *Od.* 18.152.

494-5 “which contrivance godlike Odysseus led to the citadel, filling it with men, who sacked Ilium” would conform to this third possible connotation. Whether this last connotation is possible or not, it is certain that Odysseus emphasizes his own leading role in the ruse of the Wooden Horse in his request to Demodocus.

Having heard Odysseus’s request, Demodocus sings his third song (500-20),¹² the outline of which is as shown below, again with square brackets indicating whether the inside or outside of the Wooden Horse is described while the Greeks were hiding in it:

500-1	The Greeks sailed away, burning their tents.
502-3	[inside] The selected Greeks were sitting around Odysseus hidden in the Wooden Horse, in the midst of the assembly of the Trojans.
504	[outside] The Trojans themselves dragged the Wooden Horse to the citadel.
505-10	[outside] The Trojans, sitting around the Wooden Horse, debated whether they should cut it open, cast it down from cliffs, or leave it as an offering to the gods. The last view prevailed.
511-12a	[outside] Because Troy was destined to perish when it took the Wooden Horse inside,
512b-13	[inside] in which all the best Greeks were sitting, intending to bring deaths to the Trojans.
514-16	The Greeks poured out of the Wooden Horse and sacked Troy.
517-20	Odysseus, along with Menelaus, fought in Deiphobus’s palace, and won.

One may notice that it is the Trojans themselves who actually carried the Wooden Horse to the acropolis: αὐτοὶ γὰρ μιν Τρῶες ἐς ἀκρόπολιν ἐρύσαντο (“for the Trojans themselves dragged it to the citadel”) (504). This is in apparent contradiction with Odysseus’s words in his request: ὄν ποτ’ ἐς ἀκρόπολιν δόλον ἤγαγε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς (“which contrivance godlike Odysseus led to the citadel”) (494).¹³ Odysseus emphasizes his

¹² For the grammatical construction of the third song of Demodocus (combination of indirect speech and free indirect speech), see Beck (2012) 141-7, and for the discussion concerning 8.519-20, see Bouvier (2019) 93-5.

¹³ Harrison (1971) 378-9.

leading role in the ruse of the Wooden Horse in figurative language,¹⁴ and actual hands which brought the horse within the Trojan wall belong to the Trojans, so there is not a real contradiction. Nevertheless, this reveals difference in emphasis. While Odysseus wishes to emphasize his own role, Demodocus pays more attention to the Trojans. Odysseus's leading role is mentioned in respect of his central position among the Greeks sitting within the Wooden Horse and in the battle at Deiphobus's house. Rather than Odysseus's role in the Wooden Horse, his role in the battle at Deiphobus's house is emphasized (517–20).¹⁵ In comparison with Odysseus's active roles within the Wooden Horse in the account by Menelaus in *Odyssey* 4, as we have seen above, and in the account by Odysseus in *Odyssey* 11, as we will see below, his role within the horse in the third song of Demodocus is relatively inconspicuous. Fewer than four lines (502-3, 512b-13) are spent for the Greeks sitting around Odysseus, while more than eight lines (504-12a) are spent on the description of the Trojans, debating what to do with the horse. More attention is paid to the fatal decision of the Trojans outside the Wooden Horse than to the Greeks inside while they were hiding in it.¹⁶ Odysseus, as a participant of the Trojan War who performed a leading role in the ruse of the Wooden Horse, requests the subject of a song from his point of view. Demodocus, from the perspective of a bard, puts more emphasis on the fatal decision of the Trojans outside the horse.

Odysseus's account of the Wooden Horse (*Od.* 11.505-37)

Odysseus encounters the ghost of Achilles in the underworld. Achilles asks him about Peleus and Neoptolemus. Odysseus does not have any information about Peleus, but tells Achilles an account of Neoptolemus's exploits including his presence in the Wooden Horse (11.505-37). The outline of Odysseus's account is as below, yet again with the indication of whether the inside or outside of the Wooden Horse is described while the Greeks were hiding in it.

¹⁴ Garvie (1994) 333 (on 8.494-5).

¹⁵ Danek (1998) 158–9 (on 8.499-520). Proclus's summary of the *Sack of Ilium* does not mention Odysseus's participation in the killing of Deiphobus (*EGF* 62, 21–2). See also Davies (2000) 59-60.

¹⁶ De Jong (2001) 216 (on 8.499-520).

- 505-7 I (Odysseus) haven't heard anything about Peleus, but I will tell all the truth about Neoptolemus.
- 508-9 I brought Neoptolemus to Greek camp.
- 510-2 Only Nestor and I surpassed Neoptolemus in counsel.
- 513-6 In battle, he fought foremost, yielding to no one.
- 517-21 Neoptolemus killed great many foes, including Eurypylus, son of Telephus.
- 522 Eurypylus was the handsomest man second only to Memnon.
- 523-5 [inside] In the Wooden Horse, everything, opening or closing of it, was entrusted to me.
- 526-30a [inside] Others wiped tears, but Neoptolemus didn't.
- 530b-32 [inside] Neoptolemus implored to go out and fight with his sword.
- 533-7 After the sack of Troy, Neoptolemus went on board his ship with his share of spoils, without getting injured.

There are two foci in this account. One obvious focus is Neoptolemus, about whom Achilles asked and Odysseus provides information. Neoptolemus is described as a foremost fighter, who charges alone against enemies (514-5). In this respect, he resembles Achilles. Achilles says of himself: *πέφνον λαὸν ἄριστον ἀμύνων Ἀργείοισιν*, "I killed bravest people, defending the Argives" (500). A similar expression is used as Odysseus emphasizes the great number of foes that Neoptolemus killed: *ὅσσον λαὸν ἔπεφνον ἀμύνων Ἀργείοισιν*, "he killed so many people, defending the Argives" (518). This correspondence also underlines the similarity of the roles which the father and the son played among the Greeks.¹⁷ The reference to Neoptolemus's killing of Eurypylus (519-22) provides a further link to Achilles.¹⁸ Eurypylus's father was Telephus (519), whom Achilles wounded.¹⁹ Odysseus adds that Eurypylus was the most beautiful hero after Memnon (11.522), which also links Neoptolemus's exploit with his father's because Achilles killed Memnon.²⁰ Within the Wooden Horse, Neoptolemus implores Odysseus to let him go out as soon as possible to

¹⁷ Heubeck & Hoekstra (1989) 108 (on 11.518).

¹⁸ The *Little Iliad* contained Neoptolemus's killing of Eurypylus (*EGF* 52, 14-5).

¹⁹ Achilles's wounding of Telephus was included in the *Cypria* (*EGF* 32, 47-9).

²⁰ Danek (1998) 242-3 (on 11.522). Achilles's killing of Memnon was included in the *Aethiopsis* (*EGF* 47, 14-9).

fight. This impatience to fight resembles his father, Achilles²¹. Odysseus concludes with the remark that after the sack of Troy, Neoptolemus received a fair share of booty and went on board his ship without having been injured (533-7). Neoptolemus is represented as a hero who inherited the heroic quality of Achilles. Hearing these, Achilles is said to have walked away “rejoicing (γηθοσύνη), for I (Odysseus) said that his son was prominent (ἀριδείκετον)” (11.540).²²

Odysseus says that he brought Neoptolemus to Troy (508-9) and that only Nestor and Odysseus surpassed Neoptolemus in counsel (512). Odysseus also claims that he assumed the ultimate responsibility inside the Wooden Horse:

..... ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπὶ πάντα τέταλτο,
ἤμην ἀνακλῖναι πυκινὸν λόχον ἢ δ' ἐπιθεῖναι (*Od.* 11.524-5)²³

And all was entrusted to me, to open and close the solidly constructed ambush.

We have seen above that Odysseus (before disclosing his identity) requested Demodocus to sing of his own leading role in the ruse of the Wooden Horse, while Demodocus's account places more emphasis on the outside of the Wooden Horse, confining Odysseus's role within it to be sitting at the centre of the Greek soldiers. Thus this mention of Odysseus's ultimate responsibility within the Wooden Horse complements Demodocus's third song, reflecting Odysseus's desire to emphasize his own leading role in the ruse.²⁴

²¹ One may recall the impatient proposal to attack Troy (*Il.* 19.148-53) by Achilles, who is restrained by Odysseus (19.155-72).

²² Neoptolemus's killing of Priam at the altar of Zeus Herkeios (included in the *Sack of Ilium* (*EGF* 62, 19-20)), a negative episode of the young hero, is not mentioned by Odysseus. Anderson (1997) 90-1; Danek (1998) 241 (on 11.506-40).

²³ See Heubeck & Hoekstra (1989) 108-9 (on 11.525). West (2017) brackets line 525 as spurious. This line seems to be an adaptation from another employed twice in the *Iliad*: ἤμην ἀνακλῖναι πυκινὸν νέφος ἢ δ' ἐπιθεῖναι (5.751, 8.395), in a description of the goddesses of Seasons (Ἔρραι) opening and closing the gates of heaven (5.749-51, 8.393-5). If genuine, this line provides a specification of Odysseus's responsibility. If not, simply “all (πάντα)” (11.524) was entrusted to Odysseus in the Wooden Horse.

²⁴ The reference to the construction of the Wooden Horse by Epeius (ὄν καμ' Ἐπειός, 11.523) is also common to Odysseus's request to Demodocus (τὸν ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ, 8.493).

Odysseus describes only the inside of the Wooden Horse while Greeks were hiding in it (523-32). This is in accordance with the fact that the two foci, both Neoptolemus and Odysseus himself, were among the Greeks within the horse.

Conclusion

The choice of details to be included reveals the interests and concerns of those who utter the summary accounts. The balance of emphasis between the inside and outside of the Wooden Horse is closely related to what the foci of these summary accounts are: Odysseus and Helen (Book 4), Odysseus and the debate of the Trojans (Book 8), Neoptolemus and Odysseus (Book 11). These richly varied summaries of the same mythological material,²⁵ as we have seen, are so constructed that they contribute to the lively interactions where these accounts are presented: among Menelaus, Telemachus, and Helen (Book 4), between Odysseus and Demodocus (Book 8), between Odysseus and the ghost of Achilles (Book 11).

At the same time, these summaries represent unity in that all mention Odysseus's ability to stay incognito among enemies.²⁶ This same ability of Odysseus is attested repeatedly²⁷ in the *Odyssey*, especially when he is disguised as a beggar among the suitors in the latter half of the epic. Just like the detail of his shutting Anticlus's mouth in the account by Menelaus in Book 4 foreshadows his similar act of pressing Eurycleia's throat in

²⁵ This reminds us that the same poet utilizes the mythological material of Agamemnon and Orestes also from varied perspectives in different contexts in the *Odyssey*. See Hölscher (1967).

²⁶ Andersen (1977) 7. Menelaus's account in book 4 resembles Odysseus's account in book 11 in that both represent Odysseus restraining those who desire to go out of the Wooden Horse (Menelaus and Diomedes / Neoptolemus). See Danek (1998) 242 (on 11. 506-40).

²⁷ This includes Odysseus's adventure on the island of Cyclopes in *Odyssey* 9 (I owe this point to Naoko Yamagata). Odysseus concealed his true identity by giving a false name Οὔτις to Polyphemus (9.366-7) and hid himself and his comrades under the abdomens of male sheep as they were carried out of the cave escaping the Cyclops's notice (9.425-35). This successful escape is recalled by Odysseus twice (12.208-12, 20.18-21). From his ship on the sea, however, Odysseus, in his rage, could not resist revealing his name and identity (9.501-5), which has grave consequences in the *Odyssey*. This revelation enabled Polyphemus to pray to his father, Poseidon, for the delay in Odysseus's homecoming, loss of his comrades, and further troubles at home (9.528-35), all of which are realized.

Book 19 as mentioned above, all three summary accounts of the Wooden Horse function as foreshadowing of the activities of Odysseus in the latter half of the epic.²⁸ One may add that the summaries of the ruse of the Wooden Horse also unite the major building blocks of the *Odyssey*. After Odysseus's ruse of the Wooden Horse is hinted at in the proem (*Od.* 1.2),²⁹ one summary (by Menelaus) belongs to Telemacheia (Books 1-4), two (by Demodocus and Odysseus) belong to Odysseus's *nostos* (Books 5-12), and Athena reminds Odysseus of the ruse in the battle against the suitors (22. 230),³⁰ which is the climax of his activities on the island of Ithaca (Books 13-24).

Bibliography

- Andersen, Ø. (1977), "Odysseus and the Wooden Horse", *Symbolae Osloenses* 52: 5-18.
- Anderson, M. (1997), *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. Oxford: University Press.
- Beck, D. (2012), *Speech Presentation in Homeric Epic*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bouvier, D. (2019), "De Démodocos à "Homère comme poète", réappropriation d'un chant aédique dans une épopée", in Desclos, M.-L. (ed.), *La Poésie archaïque comme discours de savoir*. Paris, Classiques Garnier: 73-100.
- Danek, G. (1998), *Epos und Zitat: Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Davies, M. (ed.) (1988), *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (EGF)*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . (2000), "Climax and Structure in *Odyssey* 8.492-520: Further Reflections on Odysseus and the Wooden Horse", *Symbolae Osloenses* 75: 56–61.
- De Jong, I. (2001), *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Edwards, A. T. (1985), *Achilles in the Odyssey*. Meisenheim: Hain.

²⁸ Andersen (1977) 15; De Jong (2001) 102 (on 4. 234-89).

²⁹ The phrase 'Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίετρον ἔπερσεν' ("he destroyed the holy citadel of Troy", *Od.* 1. 1-2) reminds the audience/readers the means by which Odysseus sacked Troy.

³⁰ Athena disguised as Mentor says to Odysseus that Troy was sacked "by your counsel" (σῆ βουλῆ, *Od.* 22. 230), by which the goddess implies the ruse of the Wooden Horse. See Andersen (1977) 15.