From Villain to Hero

Odysseus in Ancient Thought

SILVIA MONTIGLIO

From Villain to Hero

From Villain to Hero

ODYSSEUS IN ANCIENT THOUGHT

Silvia Montiglio

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS
ANN ARBOR

Copyright © by the University of Michigan 2011
All rights reserved

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, including illustrations, in any form (beyond that copying permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publisher.

Published in the United States of America by
The University of Michigan Press
Manufactured in the United States of America
♾ Printed on acid-free paper

2014 2013 2012 2011 4 3 2 1

A CIP catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Montiglio, Silvia, 1960–
From villain to hero : Odysseus in ancient thought / Silvia Montiglio.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
ISBN 978-0-472-11774-1 (cloth : acid-free paper) —
ISBN 978-0-472-02750-7 (e-book)
1. Odysseus (Greek mythology) in literature. I. Title.
PN57.O3M66 2011
880.9'351—dc22 2011011890

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book has profited from the expertise of several friends and colleagues. David Konstan has provided astute observations on a variety of issues, with his customary wit and a light touch. Christopher Pelling has painstakingly read an early draft of the entire manuscript; without his sharp and encouraging comments this book would not be what it is. Susan Prince has generously made available to me the bulk of her yet unpublished work on Antisthenes and has read chapter 1. Paula Gottlieb has shared her impressive knowledge of Aristotle with me. Ullrich Lange has read the epilogue; William Aylward has provided precious bibliographical references on Odysseus in ancient art. I should also like to thank two anonymous readers for their helpful comments.

Sections of this book have been inflicted on audiences both in the United States and in Europe: it would take too much space to thank by name all who gave me the opportunity to test my ideas, but please accept the expression of my gratitude. Thanks also to Ellen Bauerle for welcoming my work to the University of Michigan Press; to the staff of the Press for their patience; and to Monica Signoretti for help with the indexes. Finally I dedicate this study, with love, to Gareth Schmeling, for his love and support. In spite of his aversion to anything philosophical, he has put up with the author of this book during its gestation with truly philosophical, and Odysseus-like, forbearance.

CONTENTS

Abbreviations ix

Introduction 1

CHAPTER ONE
"Odysseus was not . . .": Antisthenes' Defense of an Abused Hero 20

CHAPTER TWO
Plato's Odysseus: A Soldier in the Soul 38

CHAPTER THREE
Yearning for Excellence: Odysseus in Cynic and Stoic Thought 66

CHAPTER FOUR
King, Friend, and Flatterer: Odysseus in Epicureanism and Beyond 95

CHAPTER FIVE
Between Contemplation and Action 124

EPILOGUE
Odysseus' *Virtus* and Thirst for Knowledge in the Renaissance 148

Notes 157
Bibliography 201
Indexes 213
Index of Ancient Sources 213
Index of Greek Words 225
General Index 227

ABBREVIATIONS

ANRW	W. Haase and H. Temporini (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt,* Berlin, 1972–
DK	H. Diels and W. Kranz (eds.), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker,* 6th ed., 3 vols., Zurich, 1996–98
LSJ	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott (eds.), *Greek-English Lexicon,* rev. H. S. Jones, 9th ed. *Supplement,* Oxford, 1968
PCG	R. Kassel and C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci,* 8 vols., Berlin, 1983–2001
RE	*Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft,* Stuttgart, 1894–1919
SSR	G. Giannantoni (ed.), *Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae,* 4 vols., Naples, 1983–90
SVF	H. von Arnim (ed.), *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta,* 3 vols., Leipzig, 1903–5
TGF	R. Kannicht, S. Radt, and B. Snell (eds.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta,* 5 vols., Göttingen, 1971–2004
TLG	*Thesaurus linguae graecae. A digital library of Greek literature,* Berkeley, 2004

INTRODUCTION

The philosopher: such is the name the twelfth-century Byzantine bishop Eustathius time and again gives Odysseus.[1] The man of many turns, the most versatile of all Greek heroes both in Homeric epic and in his later incarnations, by the twelfth century could also boast of a long journey across philosophy, and one that was bound to continue, down through the ages, even to the modern world. The goal of this study is to map a small portion of that journey: Odysseus' philosophical adventures in the core period of ancient thought.

From the late fifth century onward, among Odysseus' many roles that of the wise man stands out as one of his most compelling performances. Yet no full-scale study of his philosophical impersonations exists. W. B. Stanford in his now classic book *The Ulysses Theme* devotes one chapter and a number of scattered observations to philosophical treatments of Odysseus, but does not go into much detail.[2] The vast scope of his study obviously did not allow for an in-depth examination of each post-Homeric avatar of Odysseus, and Stanford in any case was more concerned with literary analysis than with the history of ideas. Among his book's many merits is to have sparked more interest in the "Ulysses theme," but, again, the main focus of recent studies has been Odysseus in creative literature and art or more generally his manifold presences in Western (and non-Western) cultures, ancient and modern.[3] If scholars have tackled specifically philosophical readings of Odysseus, they have usually confined themselves within one school of thought.[4] Odysseus, however, was exploited and discussed across the philosophical spectrum. No comprehensive examination of these treatments of Odysseus is available, to show the articulations, the elements of continuity and of change, in his philosophical history.

But one might ask: after all, are we justified to single out philosophical readings of Odysseus and devote a separate study to them? An approach driven by moral concerns characterizes interpretations of Odysseus both in philosophical texts and outside philosophy. Every refashioning of him in ancient literature is at the same time a moral evaluation; and each and every picture produced by creative authors is reductive compared to the richness of the Homeric character. Odysseus becomes the deceitful speaker (as in Pindar), the skilled but ruthless politician (as in several tragedies), the glutton (in several comedies), and so forth. We witness something of a paradox: the most complex of Homeric heroes in his post-Homeric reconfigurations is cut into pieces, as it were, and judged for one of his traits. This fragmentation is not simply owing to the tendency of post-Homeric authors (except, we can assume, for the poets of the Epic Cycle) to treat only one episode in Odysseus' career rather than many, as in the *Odyssey,* but is connected to the "Growing Hostility" (as Stanford entitles chapter 7 of his book) against our hero, which can be traced as far back as Pindar or possibly earlier.[5] Odysseus' character, because it invites more and more questions about its goodness, fails to preserve its multifaceted Homeric turns.

In that he becomes close to a type, the nonphilosophical Odysseus rubs elbows with his philosophical counterpart(s). In philosophical texts, however, in addition to serving as the representative of certain character traits, Odysseus serves as illustration of doctrine. He is not merely judged but also utilized to expound a theory or a model of behavior (to be followed or not). Seneca polemically engages with these philosophical exploitations of Odysseus in *Ep.* 88, in which he blames every school for appropriating Odysseus as the mouthpiece of its tenets. Philosophers found Odysseus "good to think with": it will be the main task of this study to investigate how.

HEARING BLAME OF ODYSSEUS: AN ATHENIAN PLEASURE

A second characteristic of philosophical readings of Odysseus, as opposed to strictly literary ones, is that they are generally appreciative of him. From Socrates to his direct disciples as well as his more remote descendants, Cynics and Stoics, from the Epicurean Philodemus (first century BC) to Cicero, Seneca, and Plutarch, Odysseus seems more apt than any other hero to incarnate each philosopher's moral ideals.

Why then does Odysseus come to impersonate the wise man? To attempt an answer, we might benefit from looking at the essential features of the nonphilosophical portrayals of Odysseus that were circulating when philosophers first

adopted him as their hero. The treatment here will necessarily be summary: it will focus only and briefly on fifth-century portrayals and in particular on shared perceptions about Odysseus as we can infer them from those portrayals, for it is with such perceptions that Socrates and his followers, including Plato, seem to have actively engaged at the beginnings of Odysseus' philosophical history. More background detail, when relevant, will be offered in the course of the discussion in the individual chapters.

Stanford maintains that in the fifth century Odysseus was under virulent attack. Though this assessment perhaps needs to be nuanced—the protagonist of the *Odyssey* does not seem to have been treated as badly in drama as was the leader of the Trojan War; the abundance, since the archaic period, of images of Odysseus in art, especially, again, the Odysseus of the *Odyssey,* points to the hero's popularity, even if popularity does not necessarily mean uncritical endorsement of his actions—there is little doubt that at least in the final decades of the century Odysseus was subject to bad press. If asked, "Would you like your son to imitate Odysseus?" I guess that most respectable Athenians in this time would have answered negatively (in spite of the contention, made by the son of the general Nicias in Xenophon's *Symposium* 4.6, that Odysseus was among the Homeric characters a young man might wish to resemble, along with such canonical models of excellence as Achilles, Ajax, and Nestor).

Tragedy is the main "source" for negative assessments of Odysseus and for their appeal to large audiences.[6] Of course, in appraising the tragic Odysseus we must apply caution, for many of the plays featuring him are lost and their titles and sparse fragments generally do not allow any firm reconstruction of the plot.[7] As mentioned above, tragedies inspired by the *Odyssey* do not seem to have attacked its protagonist—though we might wonder how truly "tragic" those plays were, if they staged the always resourceful and ultimately successful Odysseus as their main character.[8] In any case our insufficient evidence should keep us from generalizations. All the more so because it is in the nature of the genre to exploit characters in different ways according to dramatic needs as they arise—and in this regard polymorphic Odysseus was an ideal dramatic character—so that, for example, we should not rush to read in the contrast between the humane Odysseus of Sophocles' *Ajax* and his callous counterpart in *Philoctetes* a change in Sophocles' own evaluation of Odysseus. Yet we cannot overlook that in *all* his significant appearances in extant tragedy except in *Ajax* (and, if we include satyr drama, in Euripides' *Cyclops*) Odysseus is a rogue. He is the main villain in the first half of Euripides' *Hecuba,* the frigid mouthpiece for the *raison d'État;* he lurks behind the doom of the Trojan women in Euripides' homonymous play; he

is the instigator of the mob and the sinister supporter of Iphigenia's sacrifice in both *Iphigenia in Tauris* and *Iphigenia in Aulis;* and the merciless opportunist and pragmatist, indifferent to human suffering, in Sophocles' *Philoctetes.* In *Rhesus,* which stages Odysseus' and Diomedes' raid in the Trojan camp, Odysseus is a thievish trickster, and behaves less courageously than his younger companion.

Odysseus' accusers, to be sure, are also his enemies. Another cautionary measure we have to take in assessing the tragic Odysseus (and tragic characters in general) is to consider "who speaks."[9] The vast majority of the characters who damn Odysseus have suffered at his hands (or their friends have): for instance, Hecuba in Euripides' homonymous play and in *Trojan Women,* Cassandra in *Trojan Women,* Philoctetes, the chorus in Sophocles' *Ajax,* and (to some extent) even Odysseus' political allies Agamemnon and Menelaus in *Iphigenia in Aulis.* Nonetheless, except in *Ajax,* Odysseus' actions on stage confirm, or even implement, the accusations hurled against him by his enemies. In addition the very fact that in the extant plays dramatists rarely allow sympathetic characters to comment on Odysseus (two examples are Agamemnon in Aeschylus' tragedy of the same name, though only in passing [841–42], and Teucer in the second half of *Ajax*) is significant: those inclined to praise him are not asked to speak. More important still, characters unsympathetic to Odysseus, such as Hecuba, Cassandra, Iphigenia, Philoctetes, are generally meant to inspire sympathy in the audience.

The two scenes in *Trojan Women* in which Hecuba first, Cassandra second, vent their hatred for Odysseus strongly suggest that the audience reveled in hearing him blamed. For both scenes are built as a crescendo culminating in an outburst of spite against him. When she is told that she must become the slave of Odysseus, Hecuba erupts into an *a solo* in which she pours out insult after insult against her future master, ending with "my lot is the most unfortunate" (279–91).[10] Cassandra's blame of the Greeks similarly reaches a climax in her prediction of Odysseus' woes on his return journey—an overview of the *Odyssey* but with no mention of the happy ending or of heroic deeds (430–43). The successful politician, the scourge of the Trojan women, in the far-reaching vision of the prophetess will himself meet with endless suffering. In 415, when the play was produced, the shadow of the Melian massacre was looming large over the Athenian theater and the contentious expedition to Sicily was on its way. Many in the audience doubtlessly sympathized with Cassandra's prophecy that the war-enthusiasts would suffer, and identified Odysseus with them. Likewise in *Iphigenia in Tauris,* produced shortly after *Trojan Women,* the news that Odysseus' fortunes were in a bad state (536) must have pleased many a spectator as much as it did Iphigenia, who wished him dead.

But, we might ask, would the Athenian audience *as a whole* agree with the negative picture of Odysseus presented in those plays? The great majority of them are by Euripides, who was hardly successful in his lifetime (he won only three or four victories against the twenty-four or so of Sophocles). Supporters of the war quite possibly felt attacked by the tragedian who condemned it and who branded Odysseus (and them by association) a war criminal. If this is true, we should for now qualify our initial statement: blame of Odysseus perhaps did not appeal to the Athenian audience at large but to the aristocrats, and more generally those who opposed the war policies pushed by the extreme democrats.

Several plays, however, assume that hearing blame of Odysseus pleased at least a significant portion of the audience. So, for instance, does Sophocles' *Philoctetes.* Neoptolemus is instructed by Odysseus to speak ill of him in order to gain Philoctetes' confidence: "Say whatever you want against me, the worst of the worst ills. None of them will pain me, but if you don't do it, you will bring grief to all the Argives" (64–67). When Neoptolemus resolves to go through with Odysseus' schemes, he indeed spares his accomplice no insult: he begins by referring to Odysseus by means of high-sounding Homericizing phrases that antiphrastically highlight his lack of heroism (Ὀδυσσέως βίας [321] and δῖός τ' Ὀδυσσεύς [344]);[11] recounts in a moving tale how Odysseus was unfairly allotted the arms of Achilles, which he had claimed; and imagines his rival to defend his rights, and he himself, in response, to "strike him with all kinds of insults, no one lacking" (374–75), as befits "the most wicked, and born of the most wicked ones—Odysseus" (384).

Is Neoptolemus forcing himself to speak ill of Odysseus against his true sentiments? We might think so, for at the end of his tale he steps back: "I don't fault him as much as I do those in power," since the city belongs to its leaders (385–88). Some critics take Neoptolemus' words to suggest his embarrassment at insulting Odysseus,[12] while others consider the lines an interpolation precisely because they clash with the negative way Neoptolemus speaks of Odysseus elsewhere in the play.[13] Whether they are genuine or not, Neoptolemus' words, however, do not imply that he was going against his feelings when he spoke ill of Odysseus, but only that he is shying away from insulting his superior further. I would indeed think that the son of Achilles, by birth adverse to crookedness and untrained in it, performs his role so well because at least to some extent he speaks his mind—and that the audience is supposed to perceive his sincerity and to appreciate how naturally blame of Odysseus inflames a noble heart.[14]

Whatever the case might be, that flow of insults of Odysseus meets with the expected approving responses from Philoctetes, who contributes more than his

share of denigration in perfect agreement with Neoptolemus (406–409; 417–18; 429–30). Their duet culminates with Neoptolemus thinking of Odysseus when Philoctetes in fact is describing Thersites as “clever and formidable with his tongue” (440). For Odysseus to be taken for the character he hated the most at Troy is the ultimate offense.

The audience thus hears insult after insult against Odysseus, spoken by an accomplice of his (not, in principle, an unsympathetic character, though I have suggested that Neoptolemus’ words might express sincere antipathy for him), echoed and amplified by his innocent victim, and “motioned,” as it were, by Odysseus himself. Odysseus’ willingness to be spoken ill of in order to succeed in his mission recalls Orestes’ availability in *Iphigenia in Tauris* to being called a matricide if this helps prevent his sacrifice—except that Orestes is represented as a sufferer rather than an evildoer. Iphigenia will deftly make use of her brother’s “sorrows” (ἀνίαις, κακοῖσι: 1031, 1034), not flaws of character. We are led to feel compassion for Orestes the matricide but to despise Odysseus the deceiver.

Odysseus’ readiness to offer himself for abuse is a degraded version of his Homeric capability to abase himself and patiently to bear up with all kinds of offenses as he plots to reconquer his household.[15] His behavior is also reminiscent of his habit, in the same circumstances, to tell “lies similar to the truth” (*Od.* 19.203). If captured by the audience, the parallel must have added truth-value to Neoptolemus’ insults against Odysseus. Just as in the *Odyssey* Odysseus conceals his identity but encodes aspects of it in his fictions, in *Philoctetes* he physically hides away but lets his character surface through Neoptolemus’ words.

Even when Odysseus is presented in a positive light, playwrights nonetheless take for granted that audiences enjoy hearing him blamed. In Euripides’ *Cyclops* Odysseus does not fall short of his Homeric inventiveness and courage. Yet, as soon as he walks on stage and introduces himself, he elicits this comment by Silenus: “I know the man, a sharp, rattling fellow, the son of Sisyphus” (104). Silenus speaks from hearsay, not from experience. He reports the *vox populi,* and no doubt earns hearty laughter from the audience. All the more so because Odysseus does not contradict him: “Yes, I am that one. But no insults!” Odysseus stops Silenus but all the same identifies with the scoundrel that Silenus has heard he is. Later in the play Silenus again pokes fun at Odysseus’ bad reputation: “if you eat his tongue,” he tells the Cyclops, “you’ll become witty and quite talkative” (314–15). We hear the audience colluding once more.

In *Ajax* Sophocles likewise assumes a shared disparaging view of Odysseus

and brings it into bold relief by allowing the chorus (admittedly an unsympathetic one) to speak ill of him repeatedly (148–49; 955–58; 971). Its criticisms, soon to be proven wrong by Odysseus' noble behavior, must nonetheless have found enough resonance with the audience to appear plausible and relevant. Sophocles builds his magnanimous Odysseus against the background of commonplace denigration of him.

From what we can judge from the scanty evidence, the Sophists shared in this negative evaluation of Odysseus. Hippias and Gorgias seem to have targeted Odysseus' pliable intelligence, which they equated with immorality. Notably, Gorgias wrote a *Defense of Palamedes* in which Odysseus was accused of shamelessness, envy, and fraudulence (κακοτεχνία), and Hippias quite likely (at least if we believe Plato's *Lesser Hippias*) attacked Odysseus' versatility, which he identified with falsity.

Denigration of Odysseus in sophistic literature might testify to the appeal that blame of Odysseus held for the upper-class Athenians to whom the Sophists catered. The Sophists' opposition to Odysseus appears surprising indeed if read purely in light of their doctrines or practice, for the Sophists advocated the paramount importance of persuasion in human dealings and, like Odysseus, used their speaking skills for gain.[16] Why then did they condemn the versatile and eloquent hero instead of making him their patron? Stanford points out that the Sophists fall into the common tendency to blame someone else for one's dearest faults. But this is a vague explanation. Rather, I would suggest that for them to approve of Odysseus would mean to go against the opinions of their constituency unnecessarily.

Contemporary sources such as Sophocles' *Philoctetes* "superimposed" the Sophists on Odysseus because of their allegiance to language. [17] Since the connection was meant to be disparaging to both, the Sophists might have sought to polish their image by condemning loudly the character who was insultingly paired with them. All the more so because their potential pupils were likely to disapprove of Odysseus. The Sophists looked to the moneyed classes: either the aristocrats, unsympathetic to Odysseus, or more commonly the nouveaux riches, who, we can assume, had interest in sharing with the aristocrats their negative view of Odysseus in order to please them, with the aim of climbing the ladder to power.[18] A Sophist would have nothing to gain by challenging his constituency's prejudice against Odysseus. As a matter of fact, Hippias is shown to agree precisely with a gentleman of the upper class in thinking Achilles better than Odysseus (Plato *Lesser Hippias* 363b1–4).

ODYSSEUS' IMMORAL CLEVERNESS AND IMMORAL DARING

Odysseus' negative traits in tragedy and in sophistic literature can be summarized as follows: falsity, unprincipled endorsement of the winner's policies ("might makes right"), and a propensity coldly to defend the rule "the end justifies the means" at all cost. His cunning, eloquence, and inventiveness are no longer positive qualities, as in Homer, but dubious talents. Even when they happen to serve the common good and a god-willed cause, as in Sophocles' *Philoctetes,* they are condemned as intrinsically immoral. Heracles succeeds in bringing Philoctetes to Troy, whereas Odysseus fails, though both work for the same end in accordance with Zeus' plans (989–90; 1415). Heracles' authoritative intervention as deus ex machina at the conclusion of that play brings out the necessity for Philoctetes to submit to the gods' will, but also Odysseus' moral inadequacy as the interpreter of that will.

Specifically, Odysseus embodies the morally questionable type of the σοφός. In tragedy the term has a range of meanings spanning from "clever" to "knowledgeable" to "wise";[19] but when it is applied to Odysseus, it never connotes moral wisdom except in *Ajax* (1374). In *Philoctetes,* Neoptolemos describes him as a σοφὸς παλαιστής (clever wrestler, 431) and understands that Philoctetes is speaking of Odysseus when he says, "formidable and σοφός with his tongue" (440).[20] In this play Odysseus' σοφία serves justice only if justice resides in success: on this view, which is Odysseus', Neoptolemus "will be called both σοφός and ἀγαθός if he accepts to deceive Philoctetes (119), σοφός for the stratagem, ἀγαθός for the sack of Troy.[21] But Neoptolemus, as he comes to disallow Odysseus' ethics of success, divorces the latter's conception of σοφία from any notion of justice. When Odysseus attacks him for neither saying nor proposing to do σοφά things, Neoptolemus fires back: "But if they are δίκαια, they are better than σοφά things" (1245–46). Neoptolemus rejects σοφά things in the name of an ideal of justice that shuns deceit, regardless of its goal, and consequently charges Odysseus with being σοφός in the sense of clever, but not morally wise (1244: "you are σοφός by nature, but what you say is not σοφόν").

The tragic Odysseus does not hide that σοφία for him is no moral wisdom, when he tells desperate Hecuba: "It is sensible to have the thoughts that necessity demands even when fairing ill" (Euripides *Hecuba* 228: σοφόν τοι κἀν κακοῖς ἃ δεῖ φρονεῖν). Superficially this pronouncement might recall several passages in the *Odyssey* in which Odysseus shows himself aware of the mutability of human fortunes and of the necessity to adjust one's thoughts to it. In *Odyssey* 18, for instance, he warns Amphinomous, one of the suitors, against overconfidence, re-

minding him of man's exposure to reversals of fortune. Consider especially this sententious phrase: "and man bears it [misfortune] in sorrow, with an enduring heart" (l.135). But in that circumstance Odysseus is not a political winner; he is the one who is "fairing ill" and warns Amphinomous at his own risk, after having suffered insult after insult from other suitors. In contrast Euripides' character is pressing σοφόν thinking on his helpless victim, whom he has just notified of the Greeks' decision to sacrifice her daughter Polyxena. Odysseus in *Hecuba* speaks "philosophically" to dress up his advocacy of *Realpolitik,* as he eventually reveals by using σοφός again to design the powerful ("if you obey those who are more σοφοί than you," 399), and as Polyxena makes clear by rephrasing in plain language what Odysseus expressed in a pompous maxim of "wisdom": "do not fight against those in power," she tells her mother (404).

Criticism of Odysseus intensified in the late decades of the fifth century. The great majority of the extant tragedies that denounce him date to this period, and so does Gorgias' *Palamedes.*[22] Euripides won few victories, but one of them was for the posthumous production of *Iphigenia in Aulis* in 406. Almost contemporaneous with this play is Sophocles' *Philoctetes* (409), which also won first prize. Disparagement of Odysseus apparently was appealing to larger and larger audiences.

Stanford speculates, in my view correctly, that Odysseus' reputation worsened along with the corruption of democratic institutions and increasing disenchantment vis-à-vis Athenian politics during the Peloponnesian War.[23] One manifestation of such disenchantment was the loss of confidence in the power of words. Katherine King has nicely traced the developments in the opposition words and deeds as it occurs in fifth-century Athenian authors.[24] As she points out, in Homer words and deeds are complementary rather than in conflict: Odysseus knows *more* and has *better* thoughts, while Achilles fights *better* (*Il.* 19.217–20).[25] In the extant evidence the opposition first appears in Euripides' *Telephus* (438 BC), with Achilles as the doer and Odysseus as the speaker. King ventures to suggest that Euripides' admiration in that play went to Odysseus, and comments: "This play was written during the great days of Athenian democracy under Perikles, when optimism was high about the working of the assembly and delight in the power of words had not yet been soured by the perversions of demagogues and the usurpations of meaning induced by wartime despair."

When confidence in the power of words failed, Odysseus paid the price: the same Euripides who in *Telephus* might have shown preference for Homer's most effective speaker, in *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia in Aulis* identifies him with the type of the demagogue, the "smooth talker" (ἡδυλόγος) pushing for an immoral cause.[26]

In *Hecuba* it is Odysseus, and he alone, who persuades the divided army to go through with Polyxena's sacrifice (130–40). In bringing the Greek warriors out of an impasse he replicates Homeric episodes in which he likewise arrays the army with a powerful speech (as in *Iliad* 2, where he persuades the Greeks to fight on). But in *Hecuba* the cause Odysseus defends with his effective eloquence is morally wrong.

The identification of Odysseus with the type of the demagogue might explain why his Homeric moderation is erased from tragic pictures of him (except in *Ajax*). In *Iphigenia in Aulis* it is—of all characters!—Achilles who displays self-restraint: "I know to moderate grief in misfortune as well as joy in full-sailed prosperity" (920–21).

These are startling words in the mouth of the most passionate and violent of heroes. In his study on Achilles in tragedy, Pantelis Michelakis takes Euripides' "sanitized version of Achilles" to reflect "the need felt . . . more generally in late fifth-century drama and historiography for the individual to control his violent emotions, in order that the πόλις be protected from personal politics and civil strife."[27] Why did this ideal not put forward Odysseus as the prototype of the self-controlled politician? Odysseus certainly had stronger credentials than Achilles to exemplify the type.

Perhaps the personal goal of Odysseus' efforts in the *Odyssey,* to recover his household, could be seen to promote civil strife—as in fact it does at the end of the epic.[28] But this does not seem enough reason for late fifth-century writers to disregard Odysseus' qualifications as moderate leader, for which ample evidence could be found in the *Iliad.* It is more likely that Odysseus failed to become a model for the self-restrained politician because of his close association with the figure of the demagogue, which read like the exact opposite of that ideal leader: unscrupulous, moved by ambition, the embodiment of "personal politics." Even in *Iphigenia in Aulis* this is the role Odysseus is assigned to. Far from controlling his own emotions, he manipulates the crowd's to satisfy his ambition: he will lead the mob to drag Iphigenia to the altar and will perform the task "at once chosen and willing" (αἱρεθεὶς ἑκών, 1364).

Odysseus-the-demagogue is greedy for success and rewards. A liking for κέρδος (profit, gain) characterizes him already in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey,* but with no blame attached. Though κέρδος "never ceases to evoke the idea of getting the better of someone in not particularly heroic ways,"[29] in Homer Odysseus' privileged connection with it on the whole is not disparaging and can even be complimentary: it is not disparaging when Diomedes chooses him for the sake of κέρδος (*Il.* 10.225) as his partner for the nighttime expedition in the

Trojan camp, and is highly complimentary when Athena uses the plural κέρδη "to denote the intellectual acuity that links her and her favorite."[30] Conversely, in fifth-century drama Odysseus' attachment to κέρδος and in general to success bears a stigma, as throughout Sophocles' *Philoctetes.*[31]

Odysseus' ruthlessness in pursuing anything for profit also earned him the epithet πανοῦργος, "ready to do anything for a given purpose."[32] Whereas in Homer Odysseus nobly dares and nobly endures, in tragedy he puts his ability to bear up with hardship to the service of shameless deeds.

If there is a defining trait of the Homeric Odysseus, perhaps it is his being "in the middle voice," as John Peradotto put it,[33] acted upon as much as acting. The verbal root that best describes the epic Odysseus, and not only the more "passive" hero of the *Odyssey,* but also the leader of the *Iliad,* is τλα-in its double meaning of "daring" and "enduring" (as in τλήμων and πολύτλας). In Homer the τλα- terms, in the sense "to dare," have no negative meaning: they denote an effort to go through with a hard thing for a good end.[34] Odysseus excels at this effort just as he excels at endurance. A telling example is *Iliad* 10.231–32: though many champions volunteer for the reconnaissance mission into the Trojan camp, only Odysseus' offer suggests to Homer τλα- terms (τλήμων, ἐτόλμα; cf. also 248: πολύτλας and, toward the end of the narrative, τλήμων again [498]). Conversely, in tragedy the effort implied by a τλα- term often goes against one's noble inclinations and moral principles, and the end is questionable.[35] The latter is especially the case when τλα- terms are applied to Odysseus or used by him. With the exception of Sophocles' *Ajax* tragic Odysseus is indeed πολύτλας because he puts no limit to his immoral daring.[36] Let me give two examples.

The denigration of Odysseus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* is reflected in the meaning of the τλα- terms when employed by or in relation to him. For instance, when Odysseus enjoins on Neoptolemus, τόλμα (82), for it is sweet to win, the term has pejorative connotations: dare do that which is against your noble nature (84: "give yourself to me" for a shameless deed). In contrast, when Philoctetes pleads with Neoptolemus that he should "dare" take him on board (τλῆθι, 475 and τόλμησον, 481), he urges the young man to fight repulsion for the sake of a just cause. Philoctetes employs τλα- terms also to contrast Odysseus' wickedness and Neoptolemus' nobleness: while he admires Neoptolemus for enduring, τλῆναι, his ills and for staying by him (870), he charges Odysseus with "daring anything" (πάντα δὲ / τολμητά, 633–34), and calls him "beyond daring," τόλμης πέρα, or "you, most daring one," τολμήστατε.[37]

My second example is from Euripides' *Hecuba.* Odysseus tells Hecuba, after informing her of the Greeks' decision to sacrifice her daughter: "bear up with

it," τόλμα τάδ᾽ (326). Soon thereafter the chorus echoes the term τόλμα with damning implications for Odysseus: slaves must "bear up with everything that should not be, overcome by violence" (τολμᾷ θ᾽ ἃ μὴ χρή, τῇ βίᾳ νικώμενον, 333). The proximity of the two lines, the quasi-homophony of τόλμα and τολμᾷ (even stronger on a metrical reading), and their identical position at the beginning of the verse say loud and clear that the slave Hecuba must *endure* that which Odysseus' unethical *overdaring* forces on her. In sharp contrast to his Homeric ancestor, the enduring hero who exhorts his fellow fighters to "bear up," τλῆτε, with the war in everyone's interest (*Il.* 2.299), Odysseus in *Hecuba* summons his victims to "bear up" with the winner's policies.[38]

Disparagement of Odysseus in tragedy involves also the "passive" side of his kind of heroism: his fortitude, which is simply ignored. In drama Heracles replaces Odysseus as the paragon of undeserved suffering and endurance. One can contrast the meaning of τλα- terms when applied to each hero: "immoral daring" in the case of Odysseus, "suffering, enduring," in that of Heracles (cf., e.g., Sophocles *Trachiniae* 71; Euripides *Heracles* 1250, 1270).

Heracles' entitlement to endurance over Odysseus comes to the fore in Sophocles' *Philoctetes,* which features both characters. Whereas Odysseus impersonally invokes external forces (the Greeks' welfare, the gods' will) as the reason Philoctetes must go to Troy, Heracles sympathetically urges him to follow his own example, and he does so in the name of their common lot as toiling heroes: both have endured a life of labors, and Philoctetes, like Heracles, will be rewarded for it (1418–22). Seth Schein compares Heracles' intervention at the end of the play and in *Od.* 11.617–26, where Heracles identifies with Odysseus as he does with Philoctetes in the play, for their shared life of suffering.[39] The parallel brings out the distance that separates the πολύτλας hero of the *Odyssey,* with whom Heracles can sympathize ("you, too, drag out some evil lot"), from the cold, unfeeling character of Sophocles' play, who shamelessly dares but no longer suffers.

TIME FRAME AND METHODOLOGY

It fell on Socrates' followers, and quite likely on Socrates himself, to take up the task of rehabilitating Odysseus. Just as they challenged received opinion in many other domains, the Socratics opposed the prejudice against Odysseus that was commonplace in late fifth-century Athens. Odysseus, however, did not appeal to them just because he was under attack. He also had positive qualities that could find favor with Socrates' followers. To some of them, such as Antisthenes and

later the Cynics, his original methods and his individualism, coupled with his endurance, could recommend him as the "philosopher" who strenuously fights against the trappings of society and conventional thinking. A major attraction of Odysseus for the Socratics was his deceptive appearance, and, related to it, the challenge he posed to the canon of κἀλοκαγαθία, for instance by wearing rags or by claiming that the best looks do not make the best man: one is gifted with beauty, but another with intelligence and charming eloquence (*Od.* 8.167–73). Odysseus' misleading appearance joint with his care to distinguish intellectual abilities from physical ones might have inspired Socrates' disciples to see in their teacher, ugly outside, full of treasures inside, an avatar of Odysseus.

Since Odysseus appealed to Socrates' followers for both positive and negative reasons, the Socratic rehabilitation of him runs along two complementary lines: on the one hand it engages with the attacks leveled against Odysseus by turning them around, so that, for instance, eloquence, σοφία, and versatility become good features again; and on the other it restores Odysseus to qualities, such as his "passive" endurance, which were denied him (or at least ignored) in contemporary disparaging portrayals.[40]

Because of the paramount role played by the Socratics in promoting Odysseus as a philosophical hero, this study begins with them, in particular with Antisthenes. Prior to Socrates' followers there is little evidence for the importance of Odysseus in philosophical thought. As suggested above, the Sophists' disparagement of Odysseus was probably no more than uncritical endorsement of the widespread prejudice against him. The other pre-Socratics, at least in the surviving fragments, do not mention him explicitly.[41] Even Parmenides and Democritus, who built aspects of their persona as "the knowledgeable man" or the inquisitive traveler on Odysseus,[42] do not seem to have engaged in evaluating Odysseus for his own sake.[43]

The lower chronological limit of this study is set around the time of the *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* attributed to Plutarch but belonging to the second half of the second century AD. Readers might be disappointed not to find a more extensive discussion of the Neoplatonic interpretation of Odysseus that developed in the third century. For it is in Neoplatonism that the Homeric character rises to true stardom. The Cynic and Stoic idealization of Odysseus seems uninspired compared to the transfiguration he undergoes in Neoplatonic thought, in which he becomes the emblem for the soul tossed about on the "sea of matter" and longing for its unearthly home. I will dwell only briefly on this fascinating recasting of Odysseus (for instance, I attempt no analysis of Porphyry's famous allegory *The Cave of the Nymphs*) because it represents a major break in

the history of his interpretations, the inauguration of a new strain of thought. As Félix Buffière aptly puts it, for the first time Odysseus is not "man" but "soul," and his journey ends beyond the physical world.[44] It is true that already prior to the Neoplatonics "Ithaca" is given several figurative meanings, especially by the Stoics: one's inner self, one's obligations as a citizen, steadiness of mind, or the call of wisdom. But none of those meanings takes Odysseus back to a metaphysical fatherland, the remote and invisible home of our soul.

In spite of the discontinuity it creates, however, the Neoplatonic interpretation of Odysseus does not spring fully armed from the head of Zeus but is prepared by earlier developments, especially within the so-called Middle-Platonism of the second century AD, with Maximus of Tyre and Numenius among its main representatives. It is on these developments that I focus in the conclusive chapter, trying to retrace the steps that lead Odysseus to become the symbol for the soul fighting for its liberation from the body. A decisive factor in promoting Odysseus' disembodiment is his thirst for knowledge, or rather the discussion it generates: how does Odysseus' desire for "theory" fit his commitment to life in this world? Are the two compatible? Should one take precedence over the other? Should Odysseus listen to the song of the Sirens and forsake his communal responsibilities, or even his earthly life, or should he put his knowledge to the service of our terrestrial adventure, and of his own?

If Odysseus becomes a *locus mythicus* around which to debate such issues, it is because of his recognized entitlement to wisdom. As mentioned above, Seneca (in *Ep.* 88) records how Odysseus' reputation for wisdom provided the main philosophical schools with evidence to uphold their theses: the Stoics claimed that Odysseus advocated virtue, the Epicureans, pleasure, the Academics, suspension of judgment . . . Odysseus' philosophical refashioning, which begins as a challenge, is no longer one in the early centuries of the Imperial period. The philosophical corpus in which he is hailed as a paragon of wisdom is substantial enough to offer a solid basis for continuing idealization. Moreover, signature traits of Odysseus, such as his ability to endure blows in silence, and of his biography, such as his experience as an outcast, persecuted by the wrath of a god, were bound to appeal increasingly to moral philosophers as they came to grips with the hazards of life under Imperial rule. Though outside philosophy pictures of Odysseus remain mixed, he achieves a greater and greater philosophical popularity, which is still reflected, over ten centuries later, in the epithet "the philosopher" with which Eustathius celebrates the Homeric character.[45] Eustathius, to be sure, has centuries of Christian culture behind him. Nonetheless, contrary to what was happening in the West, where Odysseus was appreciated

essentially for his "Christian" abstinence and indifference to temporal goods, in the East the classical tradition remained alive.[46] Through Byzantine scholarship and a reliable compilation of Homeric textual criticism Eustathius' monumental commentary on Homer ultimately draws on ancient pagan sources, and thus bears witness to Odysseus' philosophical credentials in earlier periods.[47] Doubtlessly by Seneca's time Odysseus has usurped the title "the wisest hero" from Nestor, who apparently held it in the second half of the fifth century BC.[48]

Odysseus' philosophical popularity in the early Imperial period is shown in the relative agreement among thinkers on their evaluation of him. *Pace* Seneca, whose *Ep.* 88 highlights only differences in the philosophical appropriations of Odysseus, there is also a certain correspondence in various aspects of the interpretation of him among, for instance, Seneca himself, the allegorist Heraclitus (the eclectic author of *Homeric Problems*), the Stoic philosopher and sophist Dio Chrysostom, and the Platonizing moralists Plutarch and Maximus of Tyre, both over the importance of this or that episode in the hero's career (the Sirens, Circe, and Calypso win the prize) and over their meaning or the overall assessment of Odysseus' behavior (his resistance to pleasure and pain appeals to almost all philosophically minded readers of him). It is quite likely that Odysseus' reputation for wisdom extended beyond philosophy, at least into school teaching.[49] Moralists who deal with him at this time are interested in reaching out to large numbers by avoiding esoteric technical language. Plutarch's most extensive comments on Odysseus come from his pedagogic writings, such as *How to Study Poetry* or *On Talkativeness.* The *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer,* in which Odysseus is an unfailingly good character, reproduces mainstream moral ideals as taught at school.

With these observations we are stepping on a minefield: if philosophical treatments of Odysseus extended beyond philosophy, how neatly can we separate philosophy from other literary genres in our discussion? I have already mentioned the difficulties inherent in attempting to distinguish a philosophical Odysseus from his other literary incarnations. An additional problem with such a distinction concerns the status of philosophy as a genre. Several years ago, one of my instructors in Italy gave a lecture on Xenophanes in which apparently he did not treat the sage of Colophon as a philosopher proper, and some in the audience protested against this "Entphilosophierung des Xenophanes." My instructor, of course, was right. As more recently Andrea Nightingale has reminded us, philosophy becomes a separate and self-defined genre only in the fourth century.[50] Then philosophers talk about other philosophers and see themselves as belonging to a separate tradition. As far as interpretations of

Odysseus are concerned, however, we cannot expect the dialogue to remain confined within philosophy, for the most visible presences of the πολύτροπος hero in literature continue to be outside philosophy even when he earns philosophical credentials. Though, as suggested above, in the last two centuries or so of the period under consideration philosophers could rely on a separate tradition of interpretations of Odysseus, it would be misguided to think that they ignored pictures of him in other genres, both past and present. We should be aware of a double line of development in the philosophical interpretations of Odysseus: in some cases they are indeed the result of philosophers talking to one another. Thus, debates over Odysseus' suitability as a Cynic hero seem to be internal to the Cynic movement and to reflect its own specific concern with poverty (though they possibly spill over into nonphilosophical literature, such as Horace's satire on legacy hunting [2.5]). Likewise Seneca's *Ep.* 88 and Lucian's *The Parasite* 10, where the defender of the parasitic art claims Odysseus "back" from the philosophical mistreatments he has endured, might bear witness to a polemic among philosophers over Odysseus, with each school vindicating him as its hero against other schools (at the same time, however, each philosophical appropriation of Odysseus could also be independent of the others and merely grounded in the popularity of Odysseus as a paragon of wisdom). But on the other hand philosophers keep interacting with other traditions. For instance, when Seneca criticizes those who speculate on the location of Odysseus' wanderings instead of referring to Odysseus as a model to correct their own "wanderings" (again, in *Ep.* 88), he is objecting to ways of treating Odysseus that were common among geographers, historians, and more generally men of learning. Or when Plutarch defends Odysseus from charges of greed and soft living, we cannot tell whether he is responding to other moralists (Cynic, for instance) or whether he has in mind a larger variety of sources.[51]

Because of this circulation of perceptions about Odysseus, attempts will be made to situate a philosopher's interpretation of him in its context, both as far as nonphilosophical incarnations of Odysseus are concerned, and as regards the cultural climate that, in some cases, might have influenced a philosopher's approach to Odysseus (for instance, Philodemus' choice of him as model for the ideal ruler will be studied with an eye to Philodemus' audience, the antimonarchic Roman aristocrats of the first century BC). We shall also look at possible influences of philosophical interpretations of Odysseus outside philosophy, as a key to their importance. And, needless to say, we shall keep the Homeric Odysseus constantly in mind, for he remains a major touchstone for philosophical authors.

Some readers might ask why this study does not include a systematic discussion of allegory, since allegory strongly affected philosophical uses of myth.[52] The reason for this absence is threefold. In the first place, the emerging of allegory is not linked to the figure of Odysseus. It is not Odysseus who inspired philosophers to read myths allegorically, as is the case, to give a well-known example, for the Homeric gods fighting each other in the *Iliad;* rather, it is allegory that, once in circulation, found in Odysseus, as in other mythic characters, appropriate material for its exercise. Connected to this is my second consideration in not dealing with allegory as such: though Odysseus eventually earns a higher philosophical status through the application of allegory to him, the beginnings of his idealization as a wise man are unrelated to allegorical readings of his deeds. In our evidence the first philosopher to promote Odysseus as his model hero, the Socratic Antisthenes, does not apply allegory to his interpretation,[53] unless by "allegory" is meant something as general as "Odysseus represents the wise man." But, diluted to this degree, allegory is no useful hermeneutic tool. Third, as I hope to show, in many instances allegorical treatments of Odysseus are in a continuum with nonallegorical ones: for example, the appreciation of Odysseus' pursuit of moral excellence does not significantly change because of the introduction of allegory. Whether Calypso is a goddess or an allegory for the temptation of pleasure, Odysseus in either case is praised for his choice of leaving her, which proves his excellence. Or the allegory "Odysseus blinding the Cyclops stands for the philosopher aspiring to contemplation" can be traced back to Plato's nonallegorical refashioning of Odysseus as a contemplative type. I shall, however, pay attention to the allegorical nature of individual readings when only allegory made them possible, as for the Stoic refashioning of the μῶλυ, the magic root that saves Odysseus from Circe's drug, as his λόγος.

On the positive side, readers might be surprised to find in this study, namely in the discussion of the Socratics and their descendants (Cynics and Stoics), repeated mentions and at times even extensive treatments of Heracles alongside Odysseus. This is because the two heroes—and only they—have earned an equally high status among those philosophers. As if following in the footsteps of Homer's memorable staging of their encounter in Hades (*Od.* 11.601–26), Socratics, Cynics, and Stoics have regularly paired the two enduring heroes, both of whom were forced to wander by the wrath of a deity and, faced with all manners of hardship, "conquered all terrors" (Seneca *De constantia sapientis* 2). In bringing the two together I shall, however, highlight also differences in their treatments, less obvious than their shared traits and more apt to throw light on the specific nature of Odysseus' philosophical significance. Considerations of cultural back-

ground will turn out to be of interest also in this respect, because Odysseus met with harsher criticism than Heracles. Whereas the philosophical idealization of Odysseus develops against literary representations (and to some extent a *communis opinio*) generally hostile to him, that of Heracles since its beginnings—with Pythagoras, and subsequently in Prodicus' famous allegory *Heracles at the Crossroads* and in Antisthenes' lost works on Heracles—has points of contact with literary portraits of him, such as Bacchylides' in his *Fifth Ode,* Pindar's in *Olympian Three,* and Euripides' in *Heracles,* which celebrate him for his righteous actions.[54]

My work is organized for the largest part chronologically and by schools of thought, except for the last two chapters, which combine examinations of readings of Odysseus belonging to a specific philosophical tradition (the main thread being in chapter 4 Epicureanism and in chapter 5 Platonism) with a broader thematic approach, across philosophical affiliations. This shift of emphasis reflects the increasing popularity of Odysseus as a philosophical hero in the later centuries covered by this study, which, as suggested above, is demonstrated both in a certain correspondence between philosophical pictures of him and in his greater relevance for the discussion of important moral issues. For instance, Odysseus is hailed as a model of "tough friendship" (that is, true friendship) by both the Epicurean Philodemus and two (mostly) Platonic authors, Plutarch and Maximus of Tyre. The main question treated in the final chapter, Odysseus' evaluation in respect to the "best life," emerges as a common concern among philosophers in the early Roman period, as documented again by Seneca and Lucian. In particular we shall compare two answers to that question, the Platonic and the Stoic one, both of which negotiate but in different ways Odysseus' contemplative drive with his role as a dedicated member of the human community.

Discussion about how to balance Odysseus' contemplative inklings with his responsibilities in the world resurfaces in more modern interpretations of the hero. From its virtual disappearance in medieval Europe it is revived in the Renaissance, with authors explicitly drawing on classical sources. I have chosen to append to this study (in the epilogue) an examination of the nature of Odysseus' wisdom with respect to contemplation and action in humanistic and Renaissance writers, in order to highlight how our hero remains a fundamental reference in this new spur of debate over the content of wisdom and the role of the wise man in the world.

NOTE ON THE TREATMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

This book is an attempt to bridge literature and philosophical thought, which two subfields unfortunately tend to remain separate in the study of Greco-Roman antiquity. Technical philosophical language has been avoided whenever possible, and discussion of pointed philosophical issues, as well as scholarly debate over details of literary interpretations, has been kept to a minimum and confined to the notes, with an eye to the reader interested in Greek and Roman culture at large in addition to those concerned specifically with philosophy or literature. Scholars of philosophy *stricto sensu* should not expect to find in-depth treatments of entire philosophical texts or theoretical questions, since this book aims to retrace the trajectory, along an array of philosophical authors and problems, that brought a mythic figure, and originally a character of literature, into the philosophical limelight. My hope is that this study will speak to students of ancient literature, culture, and philosophy.

CHAPTER 1

"Odysseus was not . . .": Antisthenes' Defense of an Abused Hero

Tell me, Muse, the man of many turns
(*Od.* 1.1)

VERSATILE, BUT ALSO WISE

Our inquiry begins with Antisthenes (circa 445–365 BC), Socrates' disciple, to whom we owe the first extensive endorsement of Odysseus' actions and character. Antisthenes probably inherited his appreciation for Odysseus from his teacher. Socrates' admiration for Odysseus indeed cannot be doubted,[1] and in a later period was contrasted with Anytus', his accuser's, negative view of the Homeric character: a "wondrous man" for Socrates, "the worst" of those who fought at Troy for Anytus (Libanius 1.125). Socrates apparently criticized Homer for having inflicted countless undeserved sufferings on that wonderful man (ibid. 123–26).[2]

Socrates might have been quite daring in endorsing Odysseus' behavior. He seems to have given a disconcerting reading of the episode in *Iliad* 2 in which Odysseus, to restore order in the assembly, applies double standards, gently exhorting the "kings" and beating the "men of the people." Xenophon tells us that Polycrates, the author of an "accusation of Socrates," charged the philosopher with interpreting Odysseus' words in a way that entailed that the poor (the "men of the people") had to be chastised (*Mem.* 1.2.58–59). Xenophon denies this, and instead claims that Socrates interpreted the lines as advocating punishment of idle and useless men.

The passage is likely to be historically founded, for why would the accuser make up something so specific?[3] Other sources indeed confirm Socrates' predilection for that episode and Polycrates' charge against him for expounding

on it.[4] Moreover Socrates' reported interpretation of those lines fits his elitism (though, admittedly, it clashes with his idealization of poverty).[5] His reading of Odysseus' behavior in *Iliad* 2 must have struck his contemporaries as so scandalous that his accuser thought it worthwhile mentioning it. It certainly did not agree with the tenet of Athenian democratic ideology that poverty bore no stigma, as voiced most famously in Pericles' Funeral Oration (Thuc. 2.37.1–2; 40.1). Its outrageousness matches another bold argument Socrates allegedly made concerning Odysseus: that he deserved praise for stealing the Palladium (Libanius 1.105).[6]

Antisthenes follows in Socrates' footsteps. He resolutely attacks the prejudice against Odysseus that we have seen widespread in his time.[7] He rebuffs criticisms of Odysseus' alleged impiety toward Poseidon in the Cyclops episode; praises his choice to reject Calypso's offer of immortality; and, above all, rushes to defend his versatility, πολυτροπία, and his inventiveness and serviceability as a leader in war and life. Antisthenes' special concern with Odysseus' πολυτροπία and other talents as a leader is related to his philosophical convictions as a disciple of Socrates, as such unwilling to accept received opinion at face value: Odysseus, because of the creativity and intelligent originality of his methods, is entitled to serve as moral reformer in a world marred by preconceptions. His unconventional behavior puts our conventional judgments to the question. At the same time, however, Antisthenes' engagement with Odysseus' unusual methods and qualifications as a leader bears witness to the prominence of those features in contemporary assessments of our hero. Since Odysseus' versatile intelligence and its applications in the political realm were meeting with harsh and pervasive criticism, it seems safe to assume that Antisthenes felt the urgency to rescue Odysseus first and foremost from accusations in those areas.

Antisthenes' defense of Odysseus' πολυτροπία is known to us through a gloss by the third-century Neoplatonic philosopher Porphyry on *Odyssey* 1.1: it could be thought, Antisthenes says,

> that Homer does not praise Odysseus more than he blames him, when he calls him πολύτροπος. Indeed, Homer did not make Agamemnon and Ajax πολύτροποι but simple and noble. Nor, by Zeus, did he give the wise Nestor a deceptive and changeable character: quite to the contrary, Nestor was sincere when he consorted with Agamemnon and everyone else, and if he knew something good for the army, he advised them without hiding it away. Achilles was so far from approving that kind of character (τρόπον) that he held that man as hateful as death "who hides one thing in his heart and speaks another" (*Il.* 9.313).

> Antisthenes solves the difficulty by saying: What then? Is Odysseus bad because he is called πολύτροπος? Is it not because he is wise (σοφός) that Homer has given him that name? τρόπος sometimes designates character, sometimes the use of speech. For on the one hand a man is εὔτροπος (of good ways) when his character is turned toward the good, and on the other, τρόποι of speech are inventions of various kinds. And [Homer] uses τρόπος also for the variations of voice and melodies, as in the case of the nightingale, "who with many changing notes pours out her rich-sounding voice" (*Od.* 19.521).
>
> If wise men (σοφοί) are skilled at discussing (δεινοί . . . διαλέγεσθαι), they also know how to express the same thought in many ways (τρόπους), and since they know many turns of speech (τρόπους λόγων) to say the same thing, they could be called πολύτροποι. Wise men are also good <in their intercourse with people>. For this reason Homer says that Odysseus, being wise (σοφόν), is πολύτροπος, because he knew how to consort with people using many turns of speech. Pythagoras, too, when asked to speak to boys, is said to have held speeches for boys, and to women, speeches apt to women, and to leaders speeches for leaders, and to adolescents, for adolescents. Discovering the style of wisdom (τρόπον τῆς σοφίας) that befits each category is a mark of wisdom, whereas it is a mark of ignorance to use the same kind of speech (μονοτρόπῳ) with people who are differently disposed. This is also known by medicine if applied according to the rules, for therapy employs manifold ways (τὸ πολύτροπον) because of the varied conditions of the patients.[8]

The fragment is likely to summarize a dialogue between Socrates and an accuser of Odysseus, possibly the Sophist Hippias.[9] The first paragraph condenses the argument of the accuser, according to which Homer meant to *blame* Odysseus by calling him πολύτροπος ("he does not praise Odysseus more than he blames him" is not neutral but euphemistic for "blames rather than praises").[10] The accuser bears out his point by mentioning unquestionably noble heroes who are not πολύτροποι. He reads πολύτροπος as most of Antisthenes' contemporaries must have done, as "of a deceptive and shifty character."[11]

To that accuser Antisthenes replies that Odysseus is not a bad person as πολύτροπος, for τρόπος in his case must be taken as referring to speech.[12] Odysseus' πολυτροπία is not pliability of character but the skill to persuade a variety of audiences by expressing *the same thought* (τὸ αὐτὸ νόημα) in many ways. Once Antisthenes has divorced Odysseus' πολυτροπία from his character, the accusation can be converted into praise: far from condemning Odysseus, his "many turns" betoken σοφία.

But is πολύτροπος Odysseus σοφός in a moral sense or just as a clever speaker? Would Antisthenes respond to his interlocutor: "Homer praises Odysseus' *character* rather than blames it by calling him πολύτροπος"?

Our answer largely depends on how we read σοφός. We can take it in a purely rhetorical sense, as "skilled at speaking." So does W. K. Guthrie: "He [Antisthenes] said that it [πολύτροπος] applied both to character and to speech, which gave him the opportunity of introducing the contemporary definition of σοφός as a clever speaker, and hence πολύτροπος because master of many τρόποι or turns of speech and argument."[13] Along similar lines Félix Buffière identifies the "wise men" with the Sophists.[14]

To understand σοφός as skilled at speaking, in a sophistic vein but with no disparagement intended, might be tempting because the σοφοί are credited with being "formidable" at discussing, δεινοὶ διαλέγεσθαι.[15] δεινός commonly describes a persuasive speaker, especially in the public arenas of the assembly and the law courts. Later rhetoricians call forcefulness of speech δεινότης.[16] Antisthenes' phrase, however, strikes an unusual note, for "formidable at speaking" is of course δεινὸς λέγειν, not διαλέγεσθαι, as Antisthenes writes. The choice of διαλέγεσθαι instead of λέγειν cannot but evoke Socrates, who both believed in dialogue as the only means to seek for the truth and made no claim to be a skillful speaker himself: on the contrary, in Plato's *Apology* he dissociates himself from the very type of the δεινὸς λέγειν, unless, he says, by δεινὸς λέγειν is meant one who speaks the truth (17b).

From the catalog of his works we know that Antisthenes wrote on διαλέγεσθαι.[17] Compared to Socrates, at least as presented by Plato, Antisthenes apparently "downgraded" διαλέγεσθαι from the only method to seek for the truth to a means to communicate positive moral knowledge acquired beforehand and independently of dialogue.[18] In the extant evidence about him Antisthenes does not profess ignorance in a Socratic fashion but claims to be in possession of knowledge.[19] Accordingly, while Plato's Socrates engages in dialogue to search, in a joint effort with his interlocutor, for truths he does not know, Antisthenes' σοφός Odysseus is a man who already knows, and is skilled at discussing in the sense that he is capable of finding effective ways to transmit his knowledge to others.

In spite of this difference between Antisthenes and Plato's Socrates in the interpretation of διαλέγεσθαι, however, the choice of the expression δεινοὶ διαλέγεσθαι for the σοφοί strongly opposes Odysseus to the orator who is δεινὸς λέγειν without caring for the truth, and thus invites us to read Antisthenes' picture of Odysseus as effective speaker in a Socratic, rather than sophistic, light.[20]

Odysseus is πολύτροπος at speaking not because he aims to persuade his interlocutors of anything, in Gorgias' style, but because, thanks to his knowledge of a variety of modes of speech, he can push them to learn what is true and beneficial to them.[21] The reference to medicine spells out that the σοφός speaker, far from resembling a Sophist, is concerned with therapy, and if he uses different techniques of persuasion, it is for the good of each individual patient.

In sum, the wisdom of πολύτροπος Odysseus is his competence in speech and its many turns, but as a medium to "heal," or at least improve, his interlocutors.[22] By praising Odysseus' σοφία and by endowing it with ethical content, Antisthenes refutes such accusations against Odysseus' cleverness as are voiced in drama: just as he challenges the current disparaging use of πολύτροπος, he reads σοφός in an unambiguously positive moral sense against a tradition that charged Odysseus with morally questionable intelligence. Odysseus is the skilled speaker; but his words are good deeds. He is not, as many of Antisthenes' contemporaries saw him, the "smooth talker" aiming at his own gain.

THE SAVIOR

Antisthenes defends Odysseus' creative ways also in his version of the contest between Ajax and Odysseus for the armor of Achilles.[23] Each of the contenders pleads his cause by claiming to be the better fighter, and, accordingly, each defines what a good fighter is. Ajax presents himself as a conventionally honorable and straightforward warrior, who faces his opponent openly and dreads shameful conduct and reputation, whereas he accuses Odysseus of fighting under the cover of darkness, of accepting any humiliation for the sake of gain, and of being a speaker rather than a doer. In response Odysseus emphasizes his readiness to abase himself to help his fellows, for instance by wearing rags as a disguise to deceive the enemy; his willingness to conduct dangerous operations; his indefatigable commitment to the common cause; and his successful inventiveness. In conclusion he anticipates that he will be celebrated for those virtues by "a wise poet" (σοφὸς ποιητής), who will call him "much-suffering, of many counsels, of many devices and the Sacker of Troy" (πολύτλαντα καὶ πολύμητιν καὶ πολυμήχανον καὶ πτολίπορθον) (*Odysseus* 79–80).

It cannot be doubted that Antisthenes sides with Odysseus.[24] The philosopher's preference goes once again to the πολύτροπος hero who puts his versatility in words and deeds to the service of others. Odysseus' very speaking style spells out his concern with defending truths beneficial to all, rather than with pleasing the judges with a view to his personal advantage. For the expert in "win-

ning words" this time chooses to be tactless: he ignores a major goal of forensic rhetoric, to try to captivate the jurors by flattering their feelings, and he ignores it intentionally, as the skilled speaker he is, knowledgeable at manipulating language and even literature.

Whereas Ajax belittles the reliability of language by advocating direct witnessing of one's deeds as the only adequate criterion for judging one's valor (You are ill-suited to vote, he tells the jury, because you were not there to watch us fight), Odysseus acts with words by reshaping their meaning (as in the case of "weapons" or "courage," which, as we shall see, he reinterprets in light of Antisthenes' philosophical creed) and recognizes in the literary tradition a chief document to one's valor, a source of knowledge.[25] His final appeal to Homeric poetry as the most compelling witness to his superiority over Ajax sharply contrasts with Ajax's rejection of speech at large as a means for conveying information about one's worth. In endorsing the truth-value of Homeric poetry Odysseus seems to be responding to Pindar's insinuation that Homer has unduly magnified his sufferings: "what is said (λόγον) about Odysseus is more than what he suffered (πάθαν), on account of the sweet poetry of Homer" (*Nem.* 7.20–21). Antisthenes' Odysseus contests Pindar's judgment, for he sees perfect correspondence between Homer's λόγος and his own πάθη or ἔργα.

In spite of his knowledge of literature and rhetorical skills, however, Odysseus does not seek to inspire sympathy by his plea. Its exordium is blunt and arrogant: "I have done more good to the host than you all (ἐγὼ ἢ ὑμεῖς ἅπαντες). I would say this even if Achilles were alive, and now that he is dead I say it to you. For you (ὑμεῖς) have fought no battle which I have not fought with you (καὶ ἐγὼ μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν), whereas none of you (οὐδεὶς ὑμῶν) was privy at all to my (ἐμοί) individual dangers" (2–6). The egotism of this exordium is pointed up by the high concentration of emphatic personal markers, which aim to oppose "I" (plus) and "You all" (minus). Odysseus is only slightly more considerate of the judges than Ajax, who charges them with ignorance at the very beginning of his speech, and in the course of it makes abundant use of the first-person pronoun ἐγώ.[26]

Odysseus goes so far in his neglect of the jury as to ignore them altogether by converting his plea into a direct confrontation with his competitor. In Ovid's version of the contest Odysseus, as befits the deft speaker he is, repeatedly addresses the judges, even with endearing names such as "fellow-citizens" (*Met.* 13.262) or "nobles" (ibid. 370); involves them in Ajax's accusation against him (306–8); and ends his peroration with a moving appeal to them (370–81). In contrast, Antisthenes' character after only fifteen lines disregards the jury to fire di-

rectly at Ajax ("you," σύ, substitutes "you all," ὑμεῖς), and he keeps charging at his opponent to the very end of the speech. Odysseus scorns one of the most standard rules of forensic rhetoric, to conclude one's plea by invoking the jury's competence and goodwill.

Odysseus' indifference to the jury's feelings brings to mind Socrates' self-assured aloofness during the trial. Socrates' contemporaries noted that he did not try to arouse sympathy but spoke arrogantly.[27] As we learn from Xenophon's *Apology,* after death the philosopher was accused of employing "lofty language" (μεγαληγορία) and of "aggrandizing himself" (μεγαλύνειν αὑτόν) before the jurors, an accusation that Xenophon rejects by claiming that Socrates spoke as he did not out of arrogance, but because he desired to die and consequently did not care to endear himself to the jury.[28] In Plato's version of the defense Socrates is haughty and sarcastic. Though his criticisms are mainly directed against his accusers, his account of his fruitless search for the wisest man targets the Athenians as a whole, just as his observation that involvement in Athenian politics is a recipe for death is aimed at the entire citizenry. Socrates' contention that he has been the indefatigable servant of his people (*Ap.* 31b, especially 3: τὸ δὲ ὑμέτερον πράττειν ἀεί) recalls Odysseus' similar emphasis on his tireless serviceability in Antisthenes' declamation (cf. esp. 47–49). Both Socrates and Odysseus speak from lofty heights. It is true that Socrates distances himself from the "inhuman" Odysseus evoked in a Homeric scene, by claiming that, unlike Odysseus there, he does not behave as if he were "born of an oak or of a rock" (*Ap.* 34d5–6; cf. *Od.* 19.163). But Socrates professes humanity only to enhance his superiority, for he immediately qualifies his allegation: though born not of a rock but of human parents, though the father of three children, he will not follow the common practice of bringing any of them in front of the jury to arouse pity. For he has the reputation, whether deserved or not, of being "superior" to most men (34d8–35a1). Thus, Socrates' self-presentation as a more human character than Odysseus sounds ironic, all the more so because he has just argued that his serviceable life is not "like human conduct" (31b1–2: οὐ . . . ἀνθρωπίνῳ) but proves that he is a gift from the gods to Athens.

Antisthenes, then, makes Odysseus speak in a Socratic manner—or in the manner Plato and Xenophon attribute to Socrates. Though we do not know how Socrates actually pleaded his case, whether Antisthenes was present at the trial (as he was present, according to Plato's *Phaedo* 59b, at Socrates' death), or the dates of his declamations for Achilles' armor, it is striking how his Odysseus shares with Socrates (as presented in our sources) a dislike for flattery. Antisthenes must have been impressed by this aspect of his teacher's style and lent it

to his model hero.[29] If we believe Cicero (*De oratore* 3.17.62), in Socrates' way of speaking Antisthenes particularly admired "patience" and "hardness" (*patientiam et duritiam in Socratico sermone maxime adamarat*). The tactless Odysseus of the speech for the arms adopts the Socratic *duritia* that apparently appealed so much to Socrates' disciple.

Odysseus' disregard for winning words thus invites us to read Socratic ideals into his speech. Scholarly opinion is once again divided on whether Antisthenes' declamations are a sophistic exercise or a Socratic manifesto. The choice of genre, set speeches, militates in favor of the sophistic interpretation. Several scholars have nonetheless argued that the declamations bear recognizable and meaningful Socratic marks.[30]

A main issue at stake is to define what excellence is. The judges must "pass a sentence about ἀρετή" (*Ajax* 17 and 32);[31] they must decide "what it meant to be the 'best' of the Achaeans."[32] The most salient feature in Odysseus' view of excellence is the premium put on intellectual qualities as opposed to physical strength. ἀνδρεία, he argues, is not the ability to rescue dead bodies (64–66). Brute force does not belong to it, but σοφία does (76–78), for ἀνδρεία requires knowledge: "you speak to me about excellence? You, who in the first place do not know (οὐκ οἶσθα) how one must fight, but are carried by your anger like a wild boar . . . ?" (30–32). Odysseus reads Ajax's alleged incompetence on the battlefield as a manifestation of his foolishness (29: ἠλίθιος ἦσθα).

Odysseus' emphasis on intelligence and knowledge as prerequisites for bravery challenges criticism of his methods as voiced in contemporary sources. It is true that earlier in the fifth century, when intellectual qualities became paramount in (Athenian) conceptions of bravery, Odysseus' image as a leader benefited from this development. Pericles' praise of the Athenians for combining audacity with calculation (τολμᾶν . . . ἐκλογίζεσθαι), whereas the other Greeks act "confidently in ignorance" (ἀμαθία μὲν θάρσος),[33] could fittingly be applied to the Homeric Odysseus, who both "dares" and "calculates" his moves. Indeed, the victorious general of the Persian Wars, Themistocles, was nicknamed "Odysseus" because of his prudence, φρόνησις (Plutarch *Mor.* 869F). Since Themistocles' φρόνησις showed itself also in the trick he devised to trap the Persian ships within the strait of Salamis, the nickname implies appreciation for Odysseus' cunning. Themistocles and his contemporary admirers do not seem to have found Odysseus' μῆτις despicable, if it helped win a war.

Later in the century, however, when Odysseus-like intellectual talents came under attack, even his military methods could appear to be governed by a "wicked intelligence," and this in spite of the fact that deception remained a

widely accepted practice if applied in war.[34] The condemnation of Odysseus' methods was apparently extended from the political to the military realm; or in any case it involved both. A passage in Euripides' *Orestes* provides a vivid example of the discredit that befell Odysseus' military intelligence: "of evil cunning" (κακόμητις), "intelligent of war" (ξυνετὸς πολέμου), Odysseus is not brave but bold (θρασύς) (1403–6). His nocturnal maneuvering on the battlefield meets with the harshest criticism in *Rhesus,* from Hector, the chorus, and the protagonist himself.[35] Whereas Hector holds Odysseus responsible for more violence (καθυβρίσας, 500) than any other Greek at Troy, he mentions Ajax and Diomedes, not Odysseus, as the unbeaten champions of the enemy's army, worthy of meeting Rhesus in battle (497–98). Rhesus' response, mutatis mutandis, could be spoken by Ajax in Antisthenes' declamation: "no man of spirit thinks it fit to kill the enemy stealthily (λάθρᾳ, as in *Ajax* 23). He rather goes forward and faces him" (510–11). Later the chorus joins in by condemning "the treacherous spear of that thievish man" (κλωπὸς . . . φωτὸς αἱμύλον δόρυ, 709). Both Hector and the chorus recall Odysseus' nighttime expedition into Troy in foul garments, the same Antisthenes lauds (*Odysseus* 52–54), and both depict it in unsavory terms, emphasizing Odysseus' filthiness (716), his mendacity (he pretended to hate the Atridae, 717–19), and labeling him "a wicked plotter of evil" (509). Odysseus' actions bear out these accusations: it is he who deceives the Trojan soldiers by uttering their password, which he wrung from Dolon (687–88). Diomedes keeps his peace—and his respectability.[36] The roles of the two associates in the mission reproduce their collaboration in Homer's narrative of the same exploit (in *Iliad* 10), with Odysseus as the mind and Diomedes as the hand. Except that in Homer's account Odysseus' nocturnal raid draws no criticism for the methods employed: its successful outcome is enough reason to rejoice the Achaeans (*Il.* 10.565).

Countering such censure of Odysseus' stealthy acting as we find it in *Orestes* and *Rhesus,* Antisthenes lauds Odysseus' military intelligence just as he gives Odysseus' σοφία a moral content.[37] The κακόμητις recuperates his dignity as πολύμητις, and his "intelligence of war" is the very key to ἀνδρεία.

Antisthenes, however, gives Odysseus' intelligence a Socratic twist. For the speeches' concern with the attainability of knowledge and with the latter's moral implications matches alleged Socratic pronouncements, sometimes even down to the wording. Ajax un-Socratically boasts of his knowledge (*Ajax* 18–19) and accuses the judges of ignorance (4, 5, 18, 31) because they have not witnessed the events, whereas Odysseus is cautious in claiming that he knows: he rather says, "I think." Odysseus charges Ajax with ignorance but in a Socratic fashion, that is,

with not knowing where the good is and with going by people's opinions:[38] "you know nothing, you who call sacrilegious . . . the man who rescued the statue of the goddess" (*Odysseus* 17); "you are ignorant because you do not know the good things that have been done to you" (21); "you do not know how one should fight" (31); "don't you know that a good man should suffer no wrong from oneself or his comrades?" (33–34). The last phrase, a gauche foreshadowing of Ajax's suicide, echoes the Socratic belief that the good man cannot be harmed but distorts its meaning, which is not that a good man should not be wronged by anyone but that whatever offense is done him, he is not hurt. The clumsy introduction of that phrase might suggest that Antisthenes wanted to slip it into Odysseus' speech at all costs, as a Socratic tag. Socrates would also agree with these words of Odysseus to Ajax (21–23): "I do not blame you for your ignorance, because, like anyone else, you suffer this condition unwillingly."[39]

Ajax does not know how to fight because he stops at conventional weapons, whereas Odysseus employs all sorts of devices. On the battlefield as in speech he is πολύτροπος. With inventiveness he explores every option, no matter how foul some might seem, and fights in whichever manner, or guise, the situation requires (56–57: ὅντινα ἐθέλει τις τρόπον).[40] He regards as weapons (ὅπλα) anything that inflicts harm on the enemy (60), including a filthy, beaten, and slavish appearance.[41]

Odysseus' willingness to wear demeaning clothes looks forward to Cynic ideals. As is well known, Antisthenes was later considered the "grandfather" of the Cynic movement and became a legendary figure from which several Cynics drew inspiration. Though his actual connections with Cynicism are unclear, several of his convictions do match those of Cynic authors. One of them is indifference to appearances, for which Odysseus is the spokesman.

The same is true of Odysseus' emphasis on his role as watcher and savior, which the Cynics entrusted to the wise man.[42] In response to Ajax's boast that he alone (μόνος) was stationed "without a wall" (ἄνευ τείχους, *Ajax* 45–46), Odysseus retorts that he, "without weapons" (ἄοπλος), did not just approach the enemy's walls (τείχη) but went inside of them (43–44); nor did he send another man as a spy (κατασκεψόμενον ἄλλον), but "as the helmsmen watch (σκοποῦσιν) day and night to save (ὅπως σώσουσι) the sailors, I save (σῴζω) you and everyone else" (*Odysseus* 47–49).

Odysseus is a watcher in two interrelated ways, as spy and guardian. He spies into Troy so as to "know (οἶδα) both our situation and that of the enemy" (46: the etymological meaning of οἶδα, "I know because I have seen," comes alive in this sentence).[43] At the same time, he watches over (σκοπέω) his fellow warriors

day and night and thus saves them (cf. also 60–62), just as the Cynic is the indefatigable watcher, ἐπίσκοπος, of his fellow men. Like the Cynic, who is alone but acts for others, Odysseus emphasizes that the missions he undertook were *pro bono publico* but that he was alone in pursuing them (cf. also 5–10).[44]

It is surely possible to object that Odysseus, contrary to the Cynic watcher, is not the savior of humanity but the defender of his people. Antisthenes' hero makes a distinction between "friends," whom he saves by keeping watch, and "enemies," whom he destroys by the same means, whereas the Cynic ἐπίσκοπος orients toward the same target, humanity at large, the two goals of the watch that Antisthenes' hero keeps separate. For the Cynic has no enemy. He "spies" on us, more often than not to chastise our behavior, but, by this very action, he tries to save us all. Diogenes apparently said (Stobaeus 3.13.44): "Other dogs bite their enemies, I, my friends—so that I may save them." Everyone is a friend for the Cynic, but everyone, for each person's own benefit, will be treated harshly, as an enemy.[45]

At a closer look, however, Odysseus comes out as much a universal savior as the subject matter allows. In contrast to Gorgias' *Defense of Palamedes* (B11aDK), which abounds in motifs of Greek propaganda, his speech has no nationalistic thrust.[46] Odysseus refers rarely and casually to the foe even as "Trojan" (*Odysseus* 10, 69) and much more frequently as "enemy," πολέμιοι,[47] choosing an abstract word, devoid of any ethnic or national meaning. "Greek" does not appear at all.

In Gorgias' *Palamedes* a noble man is one who "saves (σῴζει) fatherland, parents, all of Greece" (3); and a benefactor, one who helps the Greeks: "[You will kill] a benefactor of Greece, you Greek—a Greek."[48] In Antisthenes Odysseus saves all of his fellows: "I save (σῴζω) you and everyone else." By using the same verb σῴζειν and giving it a universal object, Antisthenes distances himself from the patriotic vision of Gorgias to embrace a transnational ideal, and chooses Odysseus to embody it. The comparison with the helmsman watching out "so as to save the sailors"—a very general image, with a large spectrum of application[49]—further highlights Odysseus' care for humanity as a whole. This feature, coupled with the antithesis between exterior (the slavish garb, the beaten body) and interior (a free and commanding nature), casts Odysseus as the "true king" in Cynic terms: the reformer of the human race who does not care for appearances or mistreatment.[50]

By offering Odysseus as the true king, Antisthenes once again contests the charges leveled against the Homeric character by fifth-century authors, especially the tragedians, who blamed his style of leadership for the same characteristics that earn it Antisthenes' approval. Whereas Ajax comes out as haughty

and overconfident in his physical prowess as he is in drama,[51] several of Odysseus' stains as perceived by the tragedians are changed into good qualities.

Antisthenes' most visible target is Sophocles' *Philoctetes,* as suggested by several thematic parallels.[52] Odysseus' indifference to ill reputation in that play and his focus on gain match Ajax's charge against him and Odysseus' own description of his behavior, which, however, he turns into a virtue: compare, in the play, "Say whatever you want against me, the worst of the worst ills. None of them will pain me, but if you don't do it, you will bring grief to all the Argives" (64–67), with Ajax's words, "I would never bear bad repute, just as I would not submit to anything shameful, whereas he would be hanged if he were to gain (κερδαίνειν) something" (*Ajax* 24–25), and Odysseus' response, "there is no danger I avoided because I held it shameful, if, in that situation, I were to do the enemy some harm" (50–51). Odysseus' claim, in Antisthenes, "if it is good to capture Troy, it is also good to find the means to do it" (19–20) echoes Odysseus' views throughout *Philoctetes* (cf. especially 108–11).[53]

Antisthenes opposes Odysseus' image in *Philoctetes* also by correcting the language used in that play to stigmatize Odysseus' actions or at best to question their rightfulness. In *Philoctetes* Odysseus never declares that the goal of sacking Troy is admirable as well as desirable. It is a "sweet victory" (81), but not necessarily a noble deed.[54] Antisthenes' hero, in contrast, states loud and clear that the sack of Troy is "beautiful," καλόν (line 19).

On the other hand, in the play Odysseus insists that the pursuit of κέρδος overrides any other concern. His counterpart in Antisthenes makes no such argument. We might expect it, considering that he describes all his actions as goal-oriented, and the "beautiful" goal as winning the war. Nonetheless, the term κερδαίνειν appears only in Ajax's accusing words, not in Odysseus' reply. Instead of turning Ajax's accusation around by saying, for instance, "Yes, I am ready to do anything for gain, and that is a good thing if the goal is a noble one," he puts emphasis on his serviceability. Antisthenes possibly thought that reconfiguring Odysseus' attachment to κέρδος as a positive quality was an impossible task, and for this reason his Odysseus avoids the term.

Antisthenes' polemical stance vis-à-vis denigration of Odysseus as voiced in drama surfaces also in his use of the verb τολμάω, to dare, in connection with Odysseus, for in tragedy shameless daring is one of Odysseus' most condemned features.[55] Ajax charges Odysseus with unprincipled daring as the tragedians, as well as Palamedes in Gorgias' defense of him (24: τολμηρότατε), do. Odysseus' daring, Ajax insinuates, is morally acceptable only in the negative, and, paradoxically, as a mark of cowardice: he will sell the arms, for he would not dare use

them (implying: and he should not) (χρῆσθαι . . . οὐκ ἂν τολμήσειε; 13–14). In contrast Odysseus has no scruples against acting in the most abominable way, in hiding, something Ajax would never dare: "there is nothing that Odysseus would do openly (φανερῶς), whereas I would not dare (τολμήσαιμι) do anything in hiding (λάθρᾳ)" (22–24). Recall that a major feat of Odysseus' daring and enduring spirit in the *Odyssey* is when he disguises himself as a beaten slave to spy into Troy (4.242: οἷον . . . ἔτλη), an episode almost identical to the one Ajax stigmatizes right after pointing his finger at Odysseus' daring (25–28). Odysseus' daring betokens, not unprejudiced courage, as in Homer, but shamelessness, as in tragedy. It is true that Ajax condemns Odysseus' daring actions because they occur in the dark, not because their content is immoral, as the tragedians do. But in Ajax's view acting in the dark is *always* immoral, and therefore his charge chimes with the tragedians'.

Odysseus responds by turning his daring actions in the dark into virtuous behavior: "and if some were going to see me, I would not have been daring (ἐτόλμων) because I was striving after reputation. But if I could harm the enemy in some way, whether as slave, beggar, rogue worth the whip, I would have taken up the mission even if no one saw me" (51–54). On the surface Odysseus might seem to endorse Ajax's accusation by saying that he does not mind conducting a mission far from the public eye ("in hiding"). But the agreement is of course only apparent and brings out Odysseus' opposite interpretation of his daring actions: they are "in hiding" not in the sense that it would be shameful to display them, but in the sense that they do not ask for display. Ajax acts before everyone's eyes because he wants to be seen, whereas Odysseus dares do what is good for the group, not what brings him fame.[56]

By divorcing Odysseus' daring actions from concern with fame Antisthenes defends his hero from charges of personal ambition. In Sophocles' *Philoctetes* Odysseus' indifference to ill reputation is instrumental to his striving for long-standing good reputation and the rewards that come with it. Odysseus accepts being spoken ill of in order to succeed in his endeavor and earn fame and honors. His words to Neoptolemus, "you will be *called* (κεκλῇ') clever and valorous" (119), spell out his expectations for himself: to increase his prestige in the community by accomplishing yet another difficult mission. As he himself admits in Euripides' *Philoctetes,* "it is the eminent and those who dare take up more labors, I suppose, whom we all admire and deem truly men" (Dio Chrysostom 59.1)—and he acts accordingly.[57] Antisthenes counters these critical assessments of Odysseus' eagerness to serve by clearing it of any suspicion of self-interest.[58]

Antisthenes' idealization of Odysseus draws on Homeric features of him. Surely the philosopher's outlook endows Odysseus with unepic qualities, such as indifference to fame and rewards. Yet the overall picture of him does not go against his Homeric image but rather develops from it. In the competitive world of the *Iliad* Odysseus is the most cooperative hero, the most concerned with the common good and the least obsessed with honor and glory. At the same time he is set apart from his fellows; he is, as Antisthenes notes and highlights, "alone."[59] His solitude translates into idiosyncratic methods of action, which Antisthenes recuperates and reinterprets from a Socratic perspective. By his closing "prophecy" that a wise poet will celebrate him with a string of Homeric epithets, Odysseus signs his declamation with an endorsement of his epic image. Homer provides Antisthenes with compelling evidence to rescue Odysseus from the disparagement he has suffered in later literature.

Antisthenes' rehabilitation of Odysseus extends to the recognition and celebration of his endurance, which was disregarded in contemporary hostile portrayals. By listing "much-suffering," πολύτλας, first among Odysseus' epithets, Antisthenes, no matter how gauchely, restores him to his Homeric endurance, while also foreshadowing the Cynic ideal of the toiling king for which Odysseus is a model; and by adding "much-cunning," πολύμητις, and "of many devices," πολυμήχανος, immediately after πολύτλας, he relies on Odysseus' Homeric complexity to make the point that resourcefulness and endurance are *both* tokens of (Odysseus') excellence.[60] Whereas Philoctetes insults Odysseus by calling him πολυμήχανος (Soph. *Phil.* 1135), Antisthenes' Odysseus prides himself on this label just as on πολύτλας.

By endorsing Odysseus' cunning intelligence, Antisthenes "outdoes" even the one positive representation of him in extant tragedy. In *Ajax* Odysseus' good features do not include cunning. Quite to the contrary, *Ajax* joins the other plays by stigmatizing him as "the damned fox" (103).[61] Antisthenes' appreciation for Odysseus' cunning sets him apart also from Plato, who, as we shall see, celebrates the hero's psychic strength, καρτερία, but not his μῆτις.[62]

CLEVER, BUT ALSO VIRTUOUS

Among the many acts of Odysseus targeted by unsympathetic critics was his boast to the Cyclops: "not even your father Poseidon will heal your eye." These words were apparently read as a heedless belittlement of a god's power. Antisthenes comes to Odysseus' rescue: "Why was Odysseus so mindless to esteem

Poseidon lightly when he said: 'Not even the Shaker of the Earth will heal your eye'? Antisthenes says [that Odysseus spoke thus] because he knew that Poseidon was no doctor, but Apollo was."[63]

Antisthenes' take is that Odysseus was not careless at all but spoke from knowledge: of facts and of how to turn them to his advantage. Based on an objective datum, the distribution of powers among the gods, he could claim that Poseidon was not in a position to restore his son's vision because medicine was not in his domain. Antisthenes shows once again admiration for the wisdom of the πολύτροπος hero, understood as the ability to cope creatively with every possible situation.[64] At the same time, however, Odysseus' πολυτροπία even in this circumstance is not unethical. Far from telling a blasphemy, he did not offend against Poseidon but simply stated a "theological truth."[65]

Odysseus' high moral aspirations come to the fore in his choice to reject Calypso's offer of immortality:[66]

> When Calypso offered him immortality, why did Odysseus refuse it? . . . as it seems, he said that he refused the offer not because he was not persuaded but because he did not believe her. For she kept saying she would do it [make him immortal], but he did not believe her words, and not believing her he declined.[67] And there also must be the immortality of the wise: it is not of the kind which such divine beings could give as a favor, but must come from Zeus and from one's deeds, which by nature make one immortal. And such must be the deeds that result from excellence. Had Odysseus rejected his kinsmen and the return home on account of this offer of immortality, he would have lost his excellence . . .[68]
>
> Antisthenes says that Odysseus, being wise, knows that lovers often lie and promise impossible things. He also indicates the cause, the reason on account of which this [his refusal of Calypso's offer] was done. As that goddess was proud of her bodily beauty and stature and valued her qualities higher than Penelope's, Odysseus agreed and equated Calypso's promise to the unknown—for it was unknown to him whether he would become immortal and ageless— while he indicated that he was searching (ζητεῖ) for his wife because she was full of sense (περίφρονα), so that he would neglect even her if she were adorned and beautiful only in her body . . .

What kind of wisdom does Odysseus show in spurning Calypso's offer? Is it true that he rejects immortality out of practical experience rather than for a moral principle?[69] Undoubtedly Odysseus is practically minded: his wisdom here again consists in the adaptability to a variety of situations and in the power

to control them. His skepticism (he does not trust lovers or the unknown), firmly grounded in his Homeric watchfulness, characterizes him as a man knowledgeable of the world and its catches. At the same time, however, the developments on "the immortality of the wise" and on Odysseus' devaluation of beauty in favor of sense suggest that Antisthenes is endowing his hero with a higher wisdom than just the ability to deal with difficulties.[70]

Odysseus leaves Calypso to prove his ἀρετή, by means of which alone a wise man can hope to earn immortality. Odysseus' concern with excellence foreshadows Cynic-Stoic readings of him with their similar emphasis on the interdependency between his ἀρετή and his deeds. In Cynic, and especially Stoic, thought Odysseus toils first and foremost to exercise his virtue, to achieve "the immortality of the wise."[71] His choice to leave Calypso provides Stoic thinkers with undeniable evidence for his aspirations: Odysseus, they claim, commenting on that episode, "would not shrink from honor even at the price of immortality" (Seneca *Ep.* 88.5). Antisthenes' interpretation of Odysseus' choice inaugurates this strand of thought. Since the philosopher was persuaded that, once gained, virtue could not be lost (*SSR* II V A, 99), the argument that by staying with Calypso Odysseus would have lost it is likely to mean that he would have missed the opportunity to gain it,[72] just as in Stoic readings Odysseus achieves excellence by battling hardship and despising pleasure. Whereas the speech for Achilles' armor extols Odysseus' philanthropy, this fragment highlights his urge to act, not for the world, including the members of his household—he would forsake even Penelope were she not wise—but for himself. Later literature suggests that this difference might depend, at least in part, on different perceptions of Odysseus' career at Troy and his adventures during the return journey. While the former lent itself to the idealization of Odysseus' public mission, the latter were preferably recast as an individual quest.[73] Odysseus' rejection of Calypso's offer as read by Antisthenes recalls Heracles' choice of Virtue over Pleasure in the parable by the Sophist Prodicus, in which the young hero is shown to ponder over life's option and to decide for the steep and rugged road (Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.21–33). Both Heracles and Odysseus base their choice of hardship on the benefits it brings to their character.[74]

Odysseus also tells Calypso that he desires Penelope because she is "full of sense." There might be expediency in his words: by hinting at Penelope's mental excellence as the motive for his wish to depart, he tactfully avoids incensing the beautiful goddess' jealousy and possibly her wrath.[75] Odysseus' words, however, for all their diplomacy are not devoid of ethical significance. On the contrary, they match the development on the "immortality of the wise" as the goal for his departure. Since Odysseus is on the road to virtue, Penelope deserves his prefer-

ence not as his wife, but as a sensible woman.[76] Antisthenes upgrades Penelope's epithet περίφρων, which appears in Homer's account (*Od.* 5.216), into the very reason Odysseus wants to go back to her.[77] Conversely his nostalgia (*Od.* 5.219–20: "But even so I wish and long everyday to go home and see the day of my return") is reconfigured as an ethical and rational motive by means of the verb ζητεῖν—a key verb for the pursuit of wisdom in Socratic philosophy. Odysseus' choice stems from his "philosophical" yearning for an intelligent woman, not from homesickness. Stoic thinkers, as we shall see, come to grips with Odysseus' nostalgia. Antisthenes glosses it over by substituting it with the call of excellence.

Antisthenes' manipulation of the Calypso episode foreshadows future readings of Odysseus' choice as evidence for his mastery of temptations. The Homeric Odysseus (at least when we meet him) is not tempted at all to stay with the beautiful goddess: he has been weeping day in, day out sitting by the sea, desperate to leave. Nonetheless, in philosophical readings of both Stoic and Platonic origin this episode is treated in the same way as those of the Sirens or Circe, as an instance of the enticements of sensual pleasures that Odysseus must resist to be wise. Antisthenes' discussion harbors the seeds for those future interpretations in that it points up the contrast between physical and spiritual qualities, and Odysseus' preference for the latter. But at the same time Antisthenes' portrait of Calypso is not an allegory: just as his Odysseus in the speech for Achilles' armor harks back to the Homeric character, Calypso does not signify an abstract concept (pleasure or temptation), but is a goddess Homerically proud of her beauty, and perhaps liable to jealousy and wrath.[78]

A COMPARISON WITH HERACLES

The core of Antisthenes' contribution to the "Ulysses Theme" is apologetic: it is not true that Odysseus was immoral because of his versatility; that he behaved blasphemously toward Poseidon; that his methods on the battlefield were disreputable; or that he was self-seeking. Antisthenes does not seem to have treated Heracles, his other favorite hero, in the same way. Though his works on Heracles are lost, their titles (*The Greater Heracles or on Strength, Heracles or on Wisdom or on Strength*) and the scanty extant fragments show an unapologetic admiration for the toiling hero. Rather than acting as Heracles' advocate, Antisthenes simply praises him for his excellence. Heracles illustrates the principles "to live according to virtue" and "πόνος is a good thing." Possibly he served also as Antisthenes' mouthpiece in a dialogue that contrasted divine and human education.[79] Antis-

thenes apparently was not worried by Heracles' notorious appetite for food and sex. He just ignored it.

A possible reason for this difference in Antisthenes' treatment of his two favorite heroes is that Heracles fared better than Odysseus in the literary tradition. He held the title "the best of men" (ἄριστος ἀνδρῶν), which placed him even higher than Achilles, "the best of the Achaeans" (ἄριστος 'Αχαιῶν).[80] His gluttony and sexual indulgences were targeted essentially on the comic stage and in satyr drama,[81] whereas Odysseus' alleged moral faults met with criticism from a variety of fronts. Antisthenes is not isolated in his apology: as the scholia show, more anonymous critics were rushing to defend Odysseus from (what they perceived as) unfair attacks.[82] These were aimed also at aspects of Odysseus' character shared by Heracles, such as his amorous leanings: why did Odysseus stay so long with Circe and Calypso? How does his erotic extravagance square with his celebrated self-control?[83] Odysseus lay on the examiner's table.

Antisthenes' very choice of Heracles, as opposed to Odysseus, as the embodiment of his ideal of toil also speaks volumes about the contrasting reputation of the two heroes. Antisthenes' reading of the Calypso episode proves that he did see in Odysseus an ardent lover of virtue. Nonetheless, he used Heracles to expound the ideal. Heracles naturally came to appear to him as the hero of πόνος in keeping with well-established tradition, the same tradition on which Prodicus relies for his parable. Heracles had long served as illustration for the beauty of πόνος, whereas Odysseus by the fifth century had lost his title even as the much-suffering hero, which he still held in archaic poetry, and his readiness to serve, as we have seen, was tainted with accusations of self-interest.[84] Of course, the image of Heracles drawn by Prodicus, Antisthenes, and later by the Cynics goes against tradition not only in that it ignores the hero's excesses in food drink and sex, but also because it reshapes his life of hardship as a choice.[85] This innovation, however, aims not so much to rehabilitate Heracles from unsympathetic attacks as to put him above human weakness, by adding to his already superhuman victories (which earned him the title Καλλίνικος) an even more superhuman desire for unending and formidable toil. Though a less towering figure, the popular Heracles, the victim of Hera's wrath, still inspired compassion and even awe for his suffering (as in Euripides' *Heracles*). Antisthenes did not need to go against tradition to extol "the best of men." In contrast the choice of themes and even vocabulary shows our philosopher openly confronting Odysseus' accusers and their colluding audiences. Antisthenes' polemical stance spells out how resonant those accusing voices were at the turn of the fifth century.

CHAPTER 2

Plato's Odysseus: A Soldier in the Soul

He smote his chest and thus rebuked his heart:
"Endure, my heart. A thing nastier than this you once endured."
(*Od.* 20.17–18)

ODYSSEUS' VERSATILITY: AN AMBIVALENT GIFT

Since Plato, like Antisthenes, was Socrates' disciple, it comes naturally to ask: did he side with his fellow Socratic in endorsing Odysseus' ways, or did he agree with Odysseus' accusers?[1]

Plato's most extensive treatment of Odysseus is in the *Lesser Hippias*—and it centers on Odysseus' πολυτροπία, the same quality Antisthenes defends. The dialogue begins as a discussion between Socrates and the Sophist Hippias over the characters of Achilles and Odysseus. Asked which one is the better hero and how he distinguishes them, Hippias states that Achilles is "the best" (ἄριστον), adds Nestor as "the wisest" (σοφώτατον),[2] and calls Odysseus "the wiliest" (πολυτροπώτατον) (364c5–8), by "wily" meaning "false" (πολύτροπός τε καὶ ψευδής, 365b5). Hippias' claim that Odysseus is the falsest leads to an examination of the true and the false man, the conclusion of which is that he who knows the truth also knows how to lie, and that he who lies knowingly is better than he who does it unwittingly. In this respect, Socrates argues, Odysseus is better than Achilles because he both lies and tells the truth with design (371e5–6). Hippias objects: this cannot be, for it would entail that those who do wrong voluntarily are better than those who do it involuntarily. Hippias, though, is forced to agree that it is better indeed to make mistakes voluntarily than involuntarily in all kinds of activities, for instance running, seeing, using instruments. Socrates draws the only possible conclusion: "he who voluntarily errs and does shameful

and unjust things, Hippias, if there is such an one, would be no other than the good man" (376b8–10). This conclusion, however, does not meet with Hippias' endorsement or even Socrates' own. His mind is confused, unsettled: "wandering," πλάνη, is the dialogue's last word.

Is Socrates promoting Odysseus for his intelligent way of lying? For doing it knowingly, when he thinks fit?[3]

Before tackling this issue, let me briefly deal with two questions. First, whom do I mean by Socrates? For our purposes Socrates is the character of Plato's works rather than the nebulous historical figure. Since Plato engages with Odysseus only in dialogues in which Socrates appears, it is quite possible that he took interest in the Homeric hero under his teacher's influence, all the more so because there is enough evidence that "Socrates," not just the character of Plato's dialogues but the hero of Xenophon and even of later authors, was keen on Odysseus.[4] As I will attempt to show, however, Plato's Socrates is more critical of Odysseus than the Socrates we know from other sources.

Second, does Socrates speak for Plato? The so-called "mouthpiece theory" has come under attack in the last decade or so. Those who object to it wish to treat Plato's dialogues like drama, in which characters do not speak for the author.[5] One compelling objection to this approach, however, is that Plato's Socrates (or his other "mouthpieces") is not identical with a dramatic character because he produces arguments; he does not just speak "in character" (and even dramatic characters, at least ancient ones, may sometimes speak for the author). In addition, claiming that Plato's dialogues do not express his beliefs amounts to making him into a skeptic or even a sophist, who would push his readers to go along with his ideas for which the "hidden author" would not vouch.[6] I feel on safer grounds taking Socrates to speak Plato's views of Odysseus (with the partial exception, as we shall see shortly, of the *Lesser Hippias*).

Is Socrates, then, defending Odysseus in the *Lesser Hippias*? Scholars are divided. In an influential study Mary Blundell has read Odysseus in that dialogue as a figure for the Sophist with his shallow versatility and more generally for the Athenian character as described by Thucydides, which she calls Odyssean because of its adaptability, taste for novelty, and intellectual curiosity. She thinks that Plato, far from promoting Odysseus, is criticizing the proliferation of Odysseus-types in the late fifth-century democratic city.[7]

At the opposite end of the spectrum David Lévystone has taken Socrates' defense of Odysseus' ability to lie to reflect both the historical Socrates' and Plato's own high regard for this characteristic of Odysseus.[8] In line with Antis-

thenes, who interprets Odysseus' πολυτροπία as adaptability in speech, not shiftiness of character, Socrates in the *Lesser Hippias* would be arguing that Odysseus' intelligent lying does not affect his moral integrity. Lévystone points out that in the second half of the dialogue, when the subject matter changes from lying to doing wrong, Odysseus is no longer mentioned by name: the master manipulator of the truth is not a wrongdoer.[9]

Both of these readings correctly assume that the *Lesser Hippias* is philosophically serious, in line with other recent scholarship. The dialogue is no longer considered a mere display of intellectual bravura intended to show how Socrates could beat the Sophists at their own game.[10] Its philosophical earnestness, however, does not automatically entail that Socrates' argumentation should be taken to reflect "his" belief (whether of the historical Socrates or of Plato's character) in the moral superiority of Odysseus. As in other early Platonic dialogues, Socrates sets out to test his interlocutor's opinion, which, as is often the case, coincides with received opinion:[11] Socrates is the examiner, not the examined.[12] Whereas Hippias unhesitatingly vouches for the shared view that Achilles is better than Odysseus, Socrates allegedly holds no opinion at all about the relative worth of the two heroes: "I was asking . . . because I was at a loss (ἀπορῶν) as to which one of the two men [Achilles or Odysseus] is represented as better by the poet" (370d8–e1).[13] Of course Socrates' claims of ignorance can be doubted. But regardless of how we take them, his goal in the *Lesser Hippias,* to test Hippias' convictions, should keep us from reading what he says all along as the expression of his own views.[14]

Socrates is not even *required* to say what he thinks, for, as Jean-François Balaudé has forcefully argued, in a Socratic dialogue the obligation to speak one's mind applies only to the respondent, whose thesis is the object of the examination. *He* is the one to be shown that something he holds true is incompatible with other things he also holds true.[15] Socrates' position as the examiner of Hippias pushes him to make statements that go against his own beliefs, such as the conclusive one that the man who does injustice willingly, if he exists, is good. Socrates vocally expresses his discontent with that conclusion by refusing to give it his agreement, except, he says, as the inescapable outcome of the argument (376b11–c1). Balaudé's interpretation well accounts for both the inevitability of the conclusion and Socrates' dissatisfaction with it by reading it as a necessary lie, aimed at unmasking Hippias' errors.[16] The conclusion results from the examination of Hippias' beliefs; it says nothing about Socrates' own.

Can we interpret in the same light Socrates' statement, earlier in the dia-

logue, that "Odysseus, as it seems, is better than Achilles" (371e5)? Is Socrates speaking his mind or is he only drawing the logical conclusion from Hippias' previous concessions? When he claimed that he entered the discussion not knowing who of the two heroes was the better one, Socrates added: "and I thought that both were excellent and that it was difficult to decide which one was better" (370e 1–3). We can take this rare disclosure of Socrates' own opinion to be only partial: Socrates thinks that Odysseus *is* better but instead of saying it bluntly he proceeds more tactfully (or more deviously) to put Hippias at ease and thus encourage him to give himself over to the elenchus. Since Hippias has already shown his unwillingness to be challenged, Socrates' less confrontational approach is more likely to succeed than a direct provocation, say: "Contrary to you, my friend, I thought that Odysseus was the best by far!"

At the same time, however, when Socrates comes to the conclusion that Odysseus is better, he qualifies his statement by "as it seems"[17]—a proviso intimating that the conclusion results, once again, from the development of an argument aimed at testing Hippias' opposite belief in the superiority of Achilles, rather than that it represents Socrates' own thought. Socrates makes that statement to challenge further Hippias' claim that Achilles is better than Odysseus, which Socrates finds in contradiction with something else that Hippias holds true: at this point in the discussion Hippias repeats that Achilles is the better hero, this time on the grounds that he says different things with a good heart, whereas Odysseus speaks both truths and lies "with a scheme" (371e2–4); but previously Hippias had agreed with Socrates on the superiority of those who lie voluntarily ("with a scheme") over those who do it unwittingly. Socrates' conclusion that Odysseus is better is intended to push Hippias to admit the inconsistency.

Predictably Hippias does not give in. His impermeability to Socrates' challenge lasts until the very end of the dialogue, when Hippias denies his agreement to the conclusion that he who does injustice voluntarily, if he should exist, would be the good man (376b11). Socrates' failure to reach ὁμολογία with his interlocutor, however, in this instance is matched by his own failure to reach ὁμολογία with himself, by the aporetic whirling of his mind (372d9; 376c2–3; 376c7). Socrates is bewildered by the result of the examination and does not give it his assent, except, as we have seen, insofar as the argument requires.[18]

Hippias' refusal to agree with the final conclusion and Socrates' own disorientation affect the entire discussion in retrospect by leaving the initial question unanswered: Socrates has not found whether Achilles or Odysseus is the better hero.[19] Though he seems to think that Odysseus is as valuable as Achilles but in

different ways, Socrates stops short of promoting the πολύτροπος hero to a paradigm of excellence: this time he is beaten back, as it were, by received opinion. In Blundell's words, "common sense, as represented by Hippias and Socrates' own uncertainty, still resists."[20]

If, however, Socrates is not speaking his mind when he states that Odysseus is better than Achilles, and if by his lie he seeks to help Hippias correct his mistakes, he himself is as πολύτροπος as Odysseus. We recall that Antisthenes praised Odysseus' πολυτροπία for its "therapeutic" powers: Odysseus is in a position to benefit his interlocutors by adapting his thought and language to theirs. Is that not what Socrates does in the *Lesser Hippias*? If this dialogue could be read as a sophistic game, it is because Plato's Socrates, when he deals with Sophists, accepts their competitive mode of arguing. As Balaudé puts it, "in a way he imitates the eristic," though this does not mean that he is transformed into a Sophist.[21] Socrates goes Hippias' way by embracing the latter's mode of discussion but only outwardly, in order to be more effective in his criticism. This resemblance between Socrates' adaptability to his interlocutor's style and Odysseus' πολυτροπία as read by Antisthenes invites us to qualify the suggestion that Plato's portrait of Odysseus would be aimed to stigmatize the Odysseus-types proliferating in late fifth-century Athens: Odysseus' methods appear to belong to the philosopher, not the sophist.[22]

But isn't the Sophist Hippias Odysseus-like? Socrates seems to suggest this when in jest he charges his "beloved Hippias" with imitating Odysseus and deceiving him (370e11: ἐξαπατᾷς με, ὦ φίλτατε Ἱππία, καὶ αὐτὸς τὸν Ὀδυσσέα μιμεῖ). Hippias' imitation of Odysseus, however, is a poor performance, as imitations are in Plato: remote from the truth, a dim semblance of the original. Hippias is not knowledgeable about either truth telling or lying, as Odysseus is credited to be (371e), but says what is required to defend his preconceived position from Socrates' attacks.

Socrates' judgment on Odysseus is more critical in the *Apology*, where the philosopher sets himself up as an Achilles-type: just as Achilles scorned death to avenge Patroclus, Socrates is ready to die—though for the sake of justice. "May I die straightaway if I can inflict a penalty on the wrongdoer," Achilles is made to say when he goes back to fighting (*Ap.* 28d2–3). In this ethicized refashioning Achilles' choice can serve Socrates' own heroic pursuit.[23] Conversely Odysseus is the underlying reference for the despicable person who tries anything he can to save his life.

Socrates tells the jury that he has been convicted because he lacked "audacity

(τόλμης) and shamelessness"; he did not dare "do or say anything" he could to avoid death (38d–39a). Danger did not push him to act ignobly (ἀνελεύθερον), for "neither in a trial nor in war should I or anyone else contrive (μηχανᾶσθαι) to escape death by every possible means" (or, "by doing whatever it takes," πᾶν ποιῶν). Though not mentioned explicitly, Odysseus immediately comes to mind as the prototype of the behavior Socrates is condemning. For the verb μηχανᾶσθαι has a clear Odyssean ring,[24] and so does a phrase such as "by doing anything," which evokes Odysseus' πανουργία. In late fifth-century literature Odysseus exemplifies that infamous quality, for instance in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* (448, 927–28) or in Gorgias' *Defense of Palamedes* (section 3).[25] Readers, especially contemporary readers, will appreciate Socrates' distancing himself from this characteristic of Odysseus, of which our passage offers a semantic analysis (πᾶν ποιῶν).[26]

That Odysseus is the underlying model for Socrates' description of the πανοῦργος emerges suggestively from the illustration that follows. Socrates continues: it often happens in battle that a man tries to avoid death by throwing down his arms or "by turning to supplication." The latter ploy, to be sure, might have been common enough: at least it is so in the *Iliad.* But the repetition of a cognate of μηχανᾶσθαι ("and there are many other tricks, μηχαναί, to escape death") cannot but reinforce the allusion to Odysseus, even more so because Socrates calls the behavior he is describing "daring," and adds "speaking" to "doing" among the means the coward tries out to survive: "if one dares (τολμᾷ)[27] do and say anything . . ." I would go so far as to propose that Socrates has one particular episode of Odysseus' career in mind. In Euripides' *Hecuba,* Odysseus does exactly what Socrates criticizes: he supplicates the old woman who knows he has infiltrated Troy disguised as a beggar (239–41). Then Odysseus, at Hecuba's mercy, "found many words so as not to die" (250). In fashioning his moral persona Socrates implicitly condemns Odysseus' cowardly audacity, in this agreeing with Euripides' condemnation of it in *Hecuba.*

Socrates' indictment of Odysseus becomes explicit shortly afterward. He imagines himself to hold converse in Hades with Palamedes and Ajax, "or any other man of yore who died because of an unjust verdict," and to compare his experience with theirs (41b1–4). By identifying himself with two distinguished victims of Odysseus' polytropic maneuvers, Socrates charges his own accusers with Odysseus-like daring. This sinister evocation of Odysseus in connection with Socrates' prosecutors also indicates that the projected audience was well disposed to hearing Odysseus blamed, and that the speaker could count on the accusers themselves to be offended by the pairing with Odysseus. Indeed, from the

fourth-century AD orator Libanius we learn that one of them, Anytus, considered Odysseus "the worst" of those who fought at Troy (1.125). If this source is reliable, Anytus' comment shows how far dislike for Odysseus had reached by the turn of the century: even a democratic leader disavows the hero who some eighty years earlier lent his name to Themistocles, the crafty general. Disparagement of Odysseus had come to appeal not only to aristocrats, but also to a chief representative of the new democratic Athens, and quite possibly to his constituency. In spite of Anytus' care to distance himself and the restored democracy from that questionable patron, however, Socrates reinstates the disparaging patronage by presenting the leaders of the regime in the same grim Odyssean light that late fifth-century tragedians cast on ruthless democratic politicians, of whom Odysseus was made to play the mythic avatar.

While Socrates identifies himself with Odysseus' victims, he looks forward to probing Odysseus' wisdom in Hades, along with Agamemnon's and Sisyphus': "And the greatest pleasure will be to spend my time examining and investigating the people there as I do those here, to see who of them is wise and who thinks he is but is not. What price would any of you pay, judges, to examine him who led the great army against Troy, or Odysseus, or Sisyphus, or thousands other men and women?" (41b5–c2).[28] Earlier in his speech Socrates reported to the jury on the negative results of the examinations he conducted on so-called wise men as he was searching for one wiser than himself: each and every one of them turned out to know nothing. Accordingly, his postmortem examination of Odysseus' wisdom is likely to reveal that it is no wisdom at all—and he is telling his accusers, whom he has just paired with Odysseus, as much. The coupling of Odysseus with the avaricious trickster Sisyphus (his father according to one branch of the tradition) casts additional blame on the cunning hero. Whereas in the *Lesser Hippias* Socrates divorces Odysseus' lies from unjust deeds, in the *Apology* he conflates Odysseus' supposed "wisdom" with its immoral applications.[29]

Ambivalence vis-à-vis Odysseus' polytropic intelligence seems to be at work also in Plato's elaboration of the right kind of rhetoric in the *Phaedrus.* Readers who take Socrates' defense of Odysseus in the *Lesser Hippias* to mirror Plato's views argue that appreciation for Odysseus' πολυτροπία underlies Plato's ideal of rhetoric in the *Phaedrus.*[30] This is true, for Socrates states that the main quality of a good speaker is an Odysseus-like adaptability to a variety of audiences (271d1–7). Odysseus, however, is present only in a distant background, and in an unflattering light. Socrates mentions him to Phaedrus among the heroes who wrote essays on rhetoric: "Then you have heard only of the treatises on rhetoric by Nestor and

Odysseus, which they wrote in their leisure time at Troy? You have never heard of Palamedes'?" Phaedrus pleads ignorant: "No, and I swear I have never heard of Nestor's either, unless you disguise Gorgias under one named Nestor and Thrasymachus or Theodorus under one named Odysseus" (261b6–c3).

Socrates is poking fun at the fashion of associating Homeric heroes with the various rhetorical styles, and in particular at the Sophists' efforts to ground their τέχνη, rhetoric, in Homer.[31] Phaedrus' response, while it shows him aware of the trend mocked by Socrates, belittles Odysseus: whereas Nestor comes out nobly enough, identified as he is with the more respectable Gorgias, Odysseus is a pen name for the ruthless Thrasymachus who in the *Republic* argues that "might makes right." Regardless of whether the identification with Odysseus was in fact proposed by Thrasymachus himself—given the Sophists' general hostility to Odysseus (as we know it), this seems unlikely—in the context of a discussion devoted to the search for the philosophical rhetoric it brings out Odysseus' alleged indifference to morality and the truth. Albeit allusively, Plato seems to be endorsing criticisms of Odysseus such as those expressed in tragedy, where Odysseus, the clever speaker, acts upon the very principle defended by Thrasymachus in the *Republic,* that might makes right. The disparaging identification, to be sure, is in the mouth of the ignorant Phaedrus, who could be misunderstanding Socrates.[32] But Socrates does not commit himself either way. He neither supports nor disavows the identification, but just drops it: "Perhaps I do," he says, "but let us forget about them."[33] And forgotten they are. When Socrates deals with the right kind of eloquence, Odysseus, who seems to lie behind it as a model,[34] is no longer mentioned.

Plato's ambivalence vis-à-vis Odysseus' πολυτροπία is connected to his equally ambivalent assessment of μῆτις, cunning intelligence, of which πολυτροπία is an aspect. Marcel Detienne and Jean-Pierre Vernant have argued that fourth-century Greek philosophy as a whole questions the value of that practical and creative kind of intelligence which helped Odysseus navigate across unpredictable situations. Plato in particular shows no high regard for the stochastic disciplines, which make use of μῆτις. Cunning intelligence, whose sphere of application is the changeable world of the senses, could hardly appeal to a philosopher who devalues that world.[35]

This argument, however, has been qualified by Sarah Kofman, who observes that Plato's Socrates, the "stingray," like that fish applies μῆτις.[36] As Eros' ancestor (*Symp.* 203b1–c6), Μῆτις is part and parcel of the philosophical activity. Philosophy needs μῆτις because it proceeds tentatively, along unknown and unsure

paths. The recurrence of ἀπορία in a Socratic inquiry pushes the searcher to develop Odysseus-like inventiveness: "Because it is untenable, the aporetic state, far from paralyzing, encourages one to find, stimulates one to invent some μηχανή, some πόρος to find a way out; it forces one to jump into the water, to swim in the hope of encountering a miraculous dolphin. For no one possesses the πόρος, neither Socrates nor his interlocutors. It has to be found each time, in each case."[37]

Kofman is commenting on *Republic* 453d, where the philosophical adventure is presented as a difficult sea crossing. Socrates, about to attack the tricky subject of women and children, first shrinks from it, but then finds the courage to dive: "we, too, must swim and try to emerge from the argument, hoping that some dolphin will take us up or some other impossible means of rescue." To this passage we could join Simmias' observation in the *Phaedo* that we need a human doctrine as a raft, σχεδία, to sail through life, unless we can find a safer vessel, that is, some divine revelation (85d1–4). It is indeed in this description that Odysseus-like μῆτις comes to the fore as the skill that helps us through the journey. Socrates in the *Republic* does not count on μῆτις for the crossing as much as on miraculous saviors. In particular he alludes to the story of the poet Arion, who was rescued by a dolphin because of the beauty of his song (Herodotus 1.24). Socrates' wish for "poetic greatness" might indicate that the argument he is about to develop requires a "leap of faith," or in any case is so counterintuitive at first glance that the philosopher must become a "poet" to swim successfully across it. The passage from the *Phaedo,* in contrast, has Odysseus with his skills and his "raft" (σχεδία is the same term that repeatedly describes the vessel Odysseus builds in *Odyssey* 5) as underlying model for the sailor through life.[38]

The effectiveness of μῆτις, to be sure, is uncertain. There is no guarantee that Odysseus-like inventiveness will bring you safely to the shore. The insufficiency of μῆτις comes to light in the very episode from *Odyssey* 5 that provides a subtext for Simmias' comment on life's journey: Odysseus coping with the storm sent by Poseidon. For in that episode Odysseus' cunning is not the winner. The sequence "human doctrine-divine revelation" in the *Phaedo* reproduces a similar sequence in *Odyssey* 5, which brings out the limits of Odysseus' "human doctrine," the vessel built and steered by his crafty intelligence, in the face of divine will.

Odysseus' shrewdness both as a shipbuilder and as a sailor is repeatedly emphasized: he smoothed the trees "with knowledge" (ἐπισταμένως, 5.245); he made the sails "with skill" (εὖ τεχνήσατο, 5.259); "he guided [his boat] skillfully (τεχνηέντως) with the steering oar, seated, nor did sleep fall on his eyelids" (5.270–71).[39] Odysseus' nautical expertise, however, this time is defeated and su-

perseded by divine intervention. As the storm breaks out, the nymph Leucothea urges him to leave his vessel immediately and swim, tying around his chest the veil she gives him. Odysseus does not listen. With his characteristic watchfulness, he thinks the advice to be a δόλος (5.356) and holds on to the raft. But his attempt instantly meets with disaster: Poseidon raises a huge wave that shatters the vessel (5.366) Untypically, Odysseus' internal debating, his μερμηρίζειν (5.354), has come to the wrong decision. It takes another goddess, Athena, to steer the thoughts of his helpless protégé in the right direction (5.427).[40]

Like Odysseus, Plato's traveler through life will be better off if he can sail with the guidance of Leucothea and Athena. But he might have to rely only on "the best of human doctrines" (τὸν . . . βέλτιστον τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων λόγων). Odysseus-like intelligence might be the only raft on which he can count to try the crossing.

In spite of acknowledging the value of μῆτις, however, Plato does not praise Odysseus for that quality. No matter how much Socrates might have invited comparison with the wily Odysseus, Plato resisted defending Odysseus' cunning ways openly. In the *Lesser Hippias* the attribution of Odysseus' πολυτροπία to Socrates remains implicit and devious, itself Odysseus-like. The only time Plato identifies Socrates with Odysseus, by means of a Homeric line celebrating the hero's "daring and enduring" (*Od.* 4.242: ἀλλ' οἷον τόδ' ἔρεξε καὶ ἔτλη καρτερὸς ἀνήρ), it is to describe, not Socrates' dissembling and shifty way of arguing, but his staying power (*Symp.* 220c1–d5).[41] Socrates, the embodiment of crafty Eros, is nonetheless celebrated as πολύτλας, not πολύμητις. Plato's reluctance to endorse μῆτις suggests that he is caught between approval of that quality for its usefulness in the difficult navigation of life and philosophy and rejection of it on moral grounds.[42] The hesitant promotion of Odysseus' πολυτροπία in the *Phaedrus* and the *Lesser Hippias,* joint with the indictment of his actions and the questioning of his wisdom in the *Apology,* seems to indicate that Plato grappled with the commonplace view that condemned Odysseus' intelligence, eloquence, and inventiveness for their immoral applications, but ultimately did not settle on a positive evaluation of Odysseus against that view.

THE WITHDRAWN THINKER

Plato's rehabilitation of Odysseus takes a different road: instead of defending features of his character traditionally subjected to criticism, Plato invents a nontraditional life for him; instead of interpreting existing myths in a new light, he creates his own myth.

The warrior Er, who had the privilege to descend to the Underworld and come back, reports how the disembodied souls decided on their new reincarnations (*Rep.* 619b2–620d5). The first soul to choose was one of those coming from the sky, "inexperienced of toils" (πόνων ἀγυμνάστους), which belonged to a man who had lived in a well-ordered community and participated of virtue "by habit, not by philosophy" (ἔθει ἄνευ φιλοσοφίας). It rushed into the life of a tyrant and soon thereafter regretted its choice. Unlike this soul most of those coming from the earth took their time to decide, "because they had themselves toiled and seen the toiling of others." We would expect these souls to have learned from their experience and to choose accordingly. Instead, "[the spectacle] was pitiful to see, ridiculous and strange, for the choice was made for the most part in accordance to the habits of their previous lives." The soul of Orpheus chose a swan because, from hatred for the race of women, it did not want to be born of a woman; that of Ajax picked a lion because it remembered the contest for Achilles' armor and was unwilling to live in a human again; that of Agamemnon likewise chose the life of an eagle out of hatred for the human race. Far off the soul of Thersites wore the body of an ape; and lastly, that of Odysseus came to make its choice, "and from memory of its former toils having tossed away ambition (φιλοτιμίας), it went around for a long time searching for the life of a private citizen who minded his own business (ἀνδρὸς ἰδιώτου ἀπράγμονος), and with difficulty found it lying somewhere and disregarded by the others, and upon seeing it, said that it would have done the same if it had drawn the first lot, and chose it gladly."

This narrative shows Plato fully aware of the main charges leveled against Odysseus in fifth-century literature, but warmly sympathetic to him. Er, himself an Odysseus-figure, a traveler to the Underworld and back, alludes to Odysseus' encounter in Hades with the shades of Agamemnon, Achilles, and Ajax. The absence of Achilles from the account might suggest that Odysseus has gained a higher status: that—duly purified of his ambition—he is a more suitable model of heroism.[43] The soul of Odysseus takes care of the purification by choosing the inconspicuous life of a man who does not meddle in politics.

As if schooled in the Aeschylean maxim τῷ πάθει μάθος (learning through suffering), Odysseus' soul is the only one to make an informed choice, based not on habit but on the lesson it has learned from its experience on earth. The last to choose, it is the exact counterpart to the soul "inexperienced of toils," which chooses first: of all the souls, these two alone pick a life opposite to the previous one, but the untrained soul opts for the worst life, Odysseus', for the best one.

The rushed choice of the untrained soul shows that even good habits, without philosophy, are not enough to make the right decision.[44] For the other souls habit is a blinding force, which prevents them from walking out of their former lives and forces them into degrading incarnations: the souls of Orpheus, Ajax, and Agamemnon choose to cultivate their hatred rather than to dwell in a human again. Take for instance Ajax's soul, which picks the life of a lion because it shuns mankind, "remembering still the judgment for the arms." The choice is owing to that soul's stubborn perseverance in its habit of thought, caused by a myopic memory: Ajax's soul does not remember how it went through life but only the offense it suffered. Odysseus' soul behaves in exactly the opposite way: characteristically, it does not bear grudges but blames itself for its former toils and disavows the life that caused them. Its unique ability to remember and criticize how it lived draws it out of its previous habits and allows it to make the good choice. Loyal to his Homeric ancestor, who could not imagine living as a beast, the Platonic Odysseus chooses humanity once again[45]—and the best kind of humanity, the life of withdrawal from politics that lies neglected in a corner, despised by all. Whereas Antisthenes clears Odysseus' participation in politics of the traditional charges of self-interest, Plato invents an Odysseus with no political involvement at all: an Odysseus ἀπράγμων.

Plato's fantasy of a "quiet Odysseus" has roots in dramatic literature. The closest reference is likely to be Euripides' lost *Philoctetes* (produced with *Medea* in 431), of which we have a handful of fragments, a synopsis, and a partial paraphrase by Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 52 and 59).[46] Content and vocabulary show the proximity of this text to Plato's. The play opened with Odysseus "at a loss on his own account" (διαπορῶν ὑπὲρ αὑτοῦ), inwardly debating whether he really was the wise man he seemed to many, since he could live ἀπραγμόνως (as Plato's ἀνδρὸς ἀπράγμονος) and instead took on willingly all kinds of πόνοι (which Plato's hero remembers) for the sake of φιλοτιμία (which Plato's hero foregoes) and good reputation, εὔκλεια (*Or.* 52.11–12; cf. also 59.1–2). To pursue honors and glory he is forced to involve himself in πράγματα and "to live a life of toil" (ζῆν ἐπιπόνως) beyond all men (59.2), "for it is the eminent and those who dare take up more labors, I suppose, whom we all admire and deem truly men" (59.1).[47]

This monologue pays homage to Odysseus' intelligence, which allows him to see farther than most. Euripides is more sympathetic to him than in several later plays in which Odysseus pursues, and uncritically, the worst kind of φιλοτιμία: not, as seems to be the case in *Philoctetes,* the ambition to be rewarded for one's benefits to the community, but ruthless self-seeking. In *Philoctetes* Odysseus

questions even the nobler kind of φιλοτιμία by analyzing its motives through candid self-scrutiny.[48]

In the early part of the fifth century Odysseus, as we have seen, was hailed for his φρόνησις in the traditional sense of "prudence" or "practical intelligence," especially in the service of military and political action.[49] Euripides' character wonders whether he possesses φρόνησις (Dio Chrys. 59.1) and whether φρόνησις is compatible with participation in public affairs. He reorients the meaning of φρόνησις toward disengagement or tranquility, ἀπραγμοσύνη, because he has a cynical vision of the motives underlying political activity. Why do men undertake difficult public missions, if not out of self-interest? Does he himself toil "for the salvation and victory of the group" (59.1) or, as he intimates shortly afterward, because daring is necessary to preserve reputation?

Odysseus might be the mouthpiece for Euripides' own skepticism vis-à-vis the rhetoric of φιλοτιμία that was developing to preserve that vital drive and yet channel it toward egalitarian goals. In democratic Athens that competitive, individualistic, aristocratic value was converted into fondness for public service: the φιλότιμος, it was claimed, loved the honor of benefiting the whole citizenry.[50] In contrast Odysseus denounces the hypocrisy of the φιλότιμος, regardless of his stated aims, and denies him possession of φρόνησις. His merciless assessment of the nature of politics, however, is not enough for him to give up his mission. He is stuck in a quandary (διαπορῶν) and ultimately cannot walk out of his role because he feels trapped in the prevailing Greek conception of manhood, which values public recognition as a sine qua non.[51]

Plato's Odysseus is ready to choose the lifestyle that Euripides' hero deems an impossible option. His disavowal of φιλοτιμία prepares him to embrace its opposite, φιλοσοφία, for the philosopher, as Plato says for instance in the *Phaedo* (68c2–3), is not φιλότιμος.[52] Plato makes a similar claim a few pages before presenting us with the choice of Odysseus in the *Republic* (581a9–b11), by contrasting the "philosophical" part of the soul (φιλόσοφον) and the spirited one (θυμοειδές), a lover of victory and honors (φιλόνικον, φιλότιμον). For a later reader of Homer the Cyclops' blinding signifies the suppression of the θυμός through which Odysseus attains θεωρία.[53] The seed of this interpretation is in Plato's *Republic,* where Odysseus similarly disown his former attachment to the spirited part of the soul with its yearning for honors. He shares ἀπραγμοσύνη with the philosopher as described at *Republic* 496d6, who "is at peace and minds his own business" (ἡσυχίαν ἔχων, τὰ αὑτοῦ πράττει).[54]

To be sure, a good objection to the identification of Odysseus ἀπράγμων with a philosopher is that minding one's own business is not enough to be a philoso-

pher. But the position of Odysseus' soul in the lottery of lives indicates that it does reincarnate in a philosopher: because it is the last to choose its new life, it stands in diametrical opposition to the soul that chooses tyranny, the first to choose. As the exact opposite of the tyrant, the new Odysseus can only be a philosopher. In the *Phaedrus* the two souls occupy again diametrically opposite positions, with the tyrant's as the last to be mentioned, while the philosopher's is the first (248d1–e3). This parallel, with its reversal in the souls' order, further supports the suggestion that in the Myth of Er Odysseus' soul reincarnates in a philosopher.[55]

Moreover Plato attributes to Odysseus another eminently philosophical quality, νοῦς. In explaining the lottery of lives, the prophet whose words Er is reporting reassures the least fortunate soul, the last to choose, that its choice will be good if made ξὺν νῷ (*Rep.* 619b3–4). Odysseus' soul is precisely that soul: it chooses last but intelligently. It is endowed with the faculty that enables one to emerge completely from the Cave of Ignorance (*Rep.* 508d6: νοῦν ἔχειν).[56] In point of fact an episode from Odysseus' visit to the Underworld provides a subtext to describe the inclinations of the prisoner freed from the Cave, who has reached above the realm of political striving and competition and does not want to return there. Should he be asked whether he will care for the τιμαί and other marks of appreciation valued in the Cave, the freed prisoner would respond as Achilles did to Odysseus in Hades: that he would rather be a serf on earth than live such a life (516d2–7; the reference is to *Od.* 11.489–90).

The enlightened man speaks the words of Achilles but is an avatar of Odysseus, the temporary visitor to the Underworld.[57] Odysseus' journey back from Hades could offer a fitting model for the philosophical ascent from the Cave because both are superhuman endeavors. As Andrea Nightingale puts it, "The philosopher depicted in the Analogy of the Cave is an idealized figure who makes a journey that no human being could ever accomplish."[58] This traveler does not stumble, does not fall backward, but completes the whole journey up to the light in a straight line. He is, in Nightingale's formulation, a σοφός, not a philosopher. Odysseus thus turns out to inform both the imperfect, real searcher, a sailor who might or might not reach the shore, and the ideal philosophic theorist who has a direct, unimpeded vision of the sun. Subsequent to that vision, Odysseus / the σοφός disavows the customary honors and pursuits of life in a political community, which he equates with shadowy Homeric Hades.[59]

Does Plato's Odysseus put his higher vision to the service of this shadowy world? His image in the *Republic* suggests a negative answer, and not because Odysseus in the Myth of Er is too "philosophical" and not spirited enough to afford a model for the city's rulers. Like Odysseus, the philosopher who is forced

to descend into the Cave is no spirited man, and yet, precisely for this reason, he must share in the πόνοι and τιμαί of the unenlightened (*Rep.* 519d4–e2).[60] If unwillingness to rule makes the ideal Platonic ruler, Plato's contemplative Odysseus would be perfectly entitled—or rather, constrained—to go down to the Cave again. Plato, however, does not develop this possibility. One reason might be that he refuses to revise his negative judgment of Odysseus as the prototype of the politician who killed Socrates/Palamedes. While Odysseus is behind the philosopher who has completed his journey out of the Cave, the image of the enlightened sage descending there again to rule (520c2) cannot be inspired by Odysseus' visit to the Underworld: how could Odysseus be a model for the philosopher's redescent into the Cave, since he visits the Underworld not to guide others but to seek guidance himself? Since he is a learner there, not a teacher?[61] The identification of Odysseus with the thinker removed from politics comes to light also in the picture of Socrates drawn by Alcibiades in the *Symposium,* where Odysseus provides a reference for the philosopher's mental labor, not public service.

STRONG ODYSSEUS

At the beginning of the *Symposium,* on his way to Agathon' s house, Socrates starts lagging behind and finally "stands apart" to solve a philosophical problem, as is his habit: "Sometimes he stands apart where he happens to be and there he stands (ἐνίοτε ἀποστὰς ὅποι ἂν τύχῃ ἕστηκεν)" (175b2). Alcibiades later in the dialogue tells us that during the siege of Potidea Socrates again stood thinking for a whole day and night, and he begins his story with a Homeric line in praise of Odysseus: "'but in turn, what the strong man did and endured (οἷον δ' αὖ τόδ' ἔρεξε καὶ ἔτλη καρτερὸς ἀνήρ),' there one day, during the campaign, is worth hearing" (220c1–2).

The line "but in turn, what the strong man did and endured" introduces two major feats of Odysseus: his scouting expedition into Troy disguised as a beaten slave (*Od.* 4.242), and his successful endeavor to hold back his comrades hidden in the Wooden Horse as Helen tries to lure them out by imitating the voice of each warrior's wife (*Od.* 4.271). An informed reader could not miss the allusion to Odysseus because the line is referred only to him. In addition the association of Odysseus with Socrates καρτερός (cf. also *Symp.* 220a1) is reinforced by Plato's emphasis on Odysseus' psychic καρτερία in other contexts. Because of his paradigmatic self-control Odysseus serves Plato well as illustration for the supremacy of the soul over the body.

Plato found one episode particularly apt to suit his purpose: when Odysseus holds back his "barking heart" as he watches, fuming with anger, his maidservants' flirtatious behavior with the suitors (*Od.* 20.17–18). Has not Homer shown the separateness of the soul from the body when he said of him, "he smote his chest and thus rebuked his heart: 'endure, my heart, a thing nastier than this you once endured' (στῆθος δὲ πλήξας κραδίην ἠνίπατε μύθῳ· / τέτλαθι δή, κραδίη· καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ᾽ ἔτλης)"? (*Phaedo* 94d6–7). Plato's exploitation of these lines inaugurates a long history of rewritings.[62] He himself appeals to the scene another time, again in the context of a discussion about the nature of the soul: at *Republic* 441b5–c2, the line "he smote his chest and thus rebuked his heart" is brought in to demonstrate the superiority of the reasoning faculty over the spirited one. In the *Republic* the soul consists of three parts, not one as in the *Phaedo.* Accordingly Odysseus' rebuke to his heart no longer applies to the entire soul chastising bodily appetites and passions, as in the *Phaedo,* but to its rational part arguing with the θυμός. In both cases, however, by his reprimand Odysseus demonstrates the correct functioning of the ruling psychic principle. He is entitled to this role because of his καρτερία, which Plato sees manifested in that scene (cf. *Rep.* 390d1–5).[63]

Twice in the *Phaedo* Socrates falls silent, absorbed in thought, each time after a major development on the nature and destination of the soul (84c1–3, 95e7–8). Perhaps he is imitating Odysseus admonishing his heart. Amihud Gilead has pointed out that Socrates' silent pauses indicate his engagement in an internal dialogue in which his free, philosophical self subjects the fearful prisoner in him, the "child within us" (77e5).[64] Socrates rebukes his heart for behaving irrationally (for being afraid of death? cf. 84b). This suggestion is attractive because, as we have seen, in the same dialogue Plato takes the lines from *Odyssey* 20 to expound on the soul's ruling function. Socrates is shown to abide by Plato's conceptions about the governing role of the soul as exemplified by Odysseus: like Odysseus, he summons his rational principle to discipline his body.

The picture of Socrates in the *Phaedo* as a self-reproaching Odysseus, caught in the act of silencing un-Socratic impulses, in the *Symposium* is changed to the even more heroic image of the philosopher as an unshakeable Odysseus, one who has reached absolute self-mastery in the face of adversity. Whereas in the *Phaedo* the possible allusion is to a Homeric scene of internal debate, in the *Symposium* Socrates' behavior is inspired by Homeric episodes in which Odysseus has triumphed over his emotions and instincts so as to be able to endure marring his body with blows and wearing foul garments (in *Od.* 4.244–45) or to restrain his companions in the Horse (in *Od.* 4.284–88). Odysseus' unbendable καρτερία il-

lustrates Socrates' intellectual endurance, made possible by his indifference to hardships.

Plato's keenness to promote Odysseus as a model of fortitude and self-control might explain his indignation at Odysseus' praise of feasting: "To make the wisest man say that this seems the most beautiful thing to him, 'when the tables are laden / With bread and meats, and the wine-bearer, drawing wine from the mixing bowl, / Brings it around and pours it into the cups'—do you think that hearing this will conduce a young man to temperance (ἐγκράτεια)?" (*Rep.* 390a8–b3, citing *Od.* 9.5–10). Plato's censure paves the way for many more criticisms of Odysseus' words.[65] We note, however, that Plato does not blame *Odysseus* because of his lack of restraint but *Homer* because of his inappropriate verses, for in the same passage he calls Odysseus "the wisest man," as if he existed independently of Homer and only Homer were responsible for the shameful words.[66] To pursue his "program" of purifying Odysseus, the philosopher accuses the poet of having besmirched that paragon of wisdom by attributing to him a pronouncement incompatible with his self-restraint.

Plato's Odysseus puts his καρτερία to the service of Socrates' soul, not his fellows as Antisthenes' hero does. To be sure, Alcibiades' description of Socrates engrossed in thought is inspired by one of the episodes that drew Antisthenes' admiration for Odysseus the "savior": when, displaying endurance and creativity, he reinvents himself as a beaten slave to spy into Troy and help the other Greeks.[67] By pairing Socrates with Odysseus toiling for others Plato possibly points to the public utility of Socrates' intellectual efforts, as might also be suggested by the military setting—a siege—that situates those efforts in a context of civic urgency. Nevertheless, Plato's emphasis in associating καρτερός Odysseus with Socrates concerns the latter's power of concentration, his soldier-like thinking.[68] The Odysseus image highlights Socrates' mental exertion, a solitary exercise, and one whose goal is to grasp concepts that, once he understands them, he does not seem to care to communicate. When he walks away from the spot of his tour de force, the other Athenians at the camp do not know what he has discovered.

By extolling Odysseus' καρτερία, Plato gives him back his celebrated Homeric fortitude against more recent denigration of him. But the rehabilitation happens at a cost: Plato's καρτερός hero is no longer the strategist he is in Homer. In its Homeric version Odysseus' steadfastness allows his success. It is not an exercise corresponding to an abstract moral ideal but a means (no matter how admirable we might find it) to an end. By extrapolating Homeric lines from their contexts, Plato divorces Odysseus' fortitude from any utilitarian goal:

taken alone, Odysseus' rebuke to his heart in *Odyssey* 20 can serve as perfect illustration for the supremacy of reason because, in addition to providing undeniable evidence for reason's power, it does not appear to be aimed at preserving Odysseus' secret as it is in the Homeric scene. The καρτερός hero imposes self-control on himself not to carry out his revenge but to demonstrate the requirements of moral perfection.

THE SOCRATIC INQUIRER

References to Odysseus fashion Socrates' image also as the inquirer engaged in dialogue. It is now commonplace to read in the first word of the *Republic,* κατέβην ("I went down"), with which Socrates describes his walk to the Piraeus, an allusion to Odysseus' descent to the Underworld. Though no explicit citation of Homer is there to corroborate the allusion, and though the verb καταβαίνω is not marked enough to warrant it, the image of Socrates as an Odysseus-like traveler, of extraordinary abilities and scope, fits both Plato's exploitation, always in the *Republic,* of Odysseus' exceptional journey to signify the philosopher's ascent from "Hades" (the Cave) to the sun, and Socrates' intention, stated in the *Apology,* to interrogate the shades of so-called wise men after his death. Odysseus' inquisitive spirit provides a model for Socrates' relentless searching.

As he found out that the oracle declared him the wisest of men, Socrates became a wanderer: "I must relate to you my wandering, as I performed labors, so to speak, in order that the oracle might prove irrefutable" (*Ap.* 22a6–8). It is true that Socrates' main reference here is more likely to be Heracles than Odysseus.[69] The hero who cleared the earth of monsters lent himself to informing the Socratic search with its equally cleansing effects: like Heracles, Socrates kills monsters by dislodging false pretensions of knowledge. But Socrates, as we have seen, plans to follow Odysseus' lead in continuing his search even after death, if something of him should live on. Odysseus' visit to the Underworld is most apt to illustrate Socrates' mission not only because it spells out his unqualified and unending commitment to "the examined life," but also because during that visit Odysseus is even more eager than usually to engage in conversation and ask questions. Socrates will go on interrogating people as Odysseus did in Hades. The projected encounter between Odysseus-like Socrates and the "wise" Odysseus whom Socrates intends to examine epitomizes Plato's treatment of the Homeric character: Odysseus the Socratic Philosopher questions the alleged wisdom of Odysseus the un-Socratic Politician, who put Socrates/ Palamedes to death.

True, at a first look the picture of Socrates as an Odysseus-like investigator might challenge my assessment of the Platonic Odysseus as a purely contemplative philosopher, for the inquisitive wanderer of the *Odyssey* inspires Socrates' paradoxical πολυπραγμονεῖν (*Ap.* 31c5), his moral activism. Though Socrates' "meddlesomeness" indirectly benefits the city, however, it confines itself to the private, rather than the public, realm.[70] By fashioning himself as an Odysseus-like examiner Socrates does not acknowledge Odysseus' political virtues, but only exploits the inquisitiveness of the Homeric hero to depict his own philosophical mission as tireless investigation and interrogation.

Another passage could, however, suggest that Plato did see in Odysseus a model-statesman: "These men—not the counterfeit but the true philosophers—appearing in 'all sorts of shapes' because of the ignorance of the others, 'turn in and out from city to city' looking down from the heights on the lives of those below. To some they seem worthy of nothing, to others of everything. At times they appear as statesmen, at times as sophists, and at times they may give some people the impression of being totally mad" (*Soph.* 216c4–d2).

The words "in all sorts of shapes turn in and out from city to city" come from *Od.* 17.486, where they are referred to Odysseus in disguise.[71] A young man warns the suitors to behave, for the unknown beggar could be a god. Yet the implication that the godlike beggar will intervene on the scene of human action, for instance by chastising or punishing the evildoers, is absent from Plato's text, which rather portrays the philosopher as an unfathomable wandering god to stress his superior marginality and the gap between the knowledgeable few and the ignorant many. The Odysseus-like philosopher might be taken for other things, including a statesman, but he is none of them.

In sum, Plato's remake of Odysseus stopped with the suggestion that his inner qualities, both his fortitude and his intelligence (νοῦς), recommended him as a contemplative philosopher. Plato's reluctance to offer Odysseus as a model for the ideal ruler seems to be owing to his unwillingness to come to terms with Odysseus' treacherous methods on the political scene.[72] For Odysseus to fit Plato's ideal of heroism, which is in the avoidance of wrongdoing,[73] he had to lose his concreteness as a character as well as any touch with the deeds that made him the character he was. Let me explain.

Achilles, whose heroic death Socrates adopts in the *Apology* as the model for his own, is still allowed to retain his Homeric concreteness. He hears his mother's words ("If you avenge Patroclus and kill Hector you yourself will die") and rejects them as he does in the *Iliad,* though the reason for the rejection is transfigured: no longer personal revenge but the pursuit of justice. In contrast,

the only way for Plato to ethicize Odysseus seems to be by glossing over his actions except for his psychic efforts. When he serves as a figure for Socrates in the *Symposium,* Odysseus is not even mentioned by name but only evoked as "that strong man" who "did and endured"; and the original contexts of Odysseus' displays of fortitude are erased. Whereas Achilles still is the warrior going back to fighting, Odysseus is detached from the Homeric episodes recalled in *Odyssey* 4 as illustrations for his endurance. Likewise, in exploiting Odysseus' rebuke to his heart Plato blurs the concrete purposes of Odysseus' feat of καρτερία to the point that the pragmatic hero par excellence appears to be involved in a purely ethical exercise. The only time the philosopher approvingly retains Odysseus as a concrete character acting concretely, in the Myth of Er, it is a novel Odysseus, Plato's own invention, the "recantation" of his existing avatars who chooses the only action that apparently can endow a character like Odysseus with Platonic heroism: withdrawal from politics.

ODYSSEUS AMONG THE SOCRATICS

We shall now go back to Plato's Socratic roots: how widely, then, did he differ from Antisthenes in evaluating Odysseus? And how did other followers of Socrates view the Homeric character? In this section I would like to offer some comparative observations on the appraisal of Odysseus by Socrates' closest disciples and admirers.[74]

Of the Socratics Antisthenes is the strongest supporter of Odysseus' willingness to employ original methods to gain the upper hand in dangerous situations. To the best of my knowledge he is the only Socratic to praise Odysseus for his cunning and flexible mind; the only one unabashedly to applaud his "many turns." It is true that another follower of Socrates, Aristippus, the founder of the so-called Cyrenaic school and the advocate of a hedonistic ethic, apparently appreciated Odysseus for his flexibility. According to the *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer,* Aristippus saw in Odysseus his ideal because of his capability to tailor his behavior to circumstances: "And since Odysseus at times wore a woolly and soft mantle, at times rags and wallets; now he was resting with Calypso, now he was insulted by Irus and Melanthius, Aristippus took him as an image of life and both adapted himself stoutly to poverty and hardships and enjoyed pleasure lavishly" (150).[75] Superficially Aristippus' approval of Odysseus' adaptability may evoke Antisthenes' praise of the versatile hero. But the resemblance is thin at best. First, Aristippus, as befits his hedonistic creed, puts as much emphasis on Odysseus' readiness to enjoy pleasures as on his fortitude. Second, he admires

Odysseus' flexibility as a passive virtue, the talent of adjusting, rather than a creative tool in Antisthenes' style.

Whereas Antisthenes unhesitatingly defends Odysseus' versatility and cunning, Plato is ambivalent toward them. Such ambivalence matches his conservative view of Odysseus' behavior vis-à-vis Ajax and Palamedes, which, in line with mainstream tradition, he condemns, while Antisthenes prefers the imaginatively adaptable Odysseus over the rigid Ajax, leaves out mentions of Palamedes, and even defends the theft of the Palladium according to the principle, for him laudable, that "a good end justifies the means." Antisthenes' idealization of Odysseus' inventiveness as a leader contrasts with Plato's (memorable!) invention of a politically uninvolved Odysseus.

How faithful to Socrates were his followers in their appraisals of Odysseus? Antisthenes' "holistic" Odysseus, the πολύτροπος, πολύτλας, and πολύμητις hero, is likely to reflect the Socratic teaching more accurately than Plato's less rounded character. If it is true that Antisthenes was the closest to Socrates of his students and the one who best interpreted his master's teaching, as Xenophon suggests (in the *Symposium*) by lending him a praise of poverty and by showing him to be as self-controlled as Socrates,[76] it is quite possible that also in his reading of Odysseus Antisthenes closely followed his teacher. In point of fact, of all the Socratics he alone seems to have justified Odysseus' theft of the Palladium, supporting what we are told was Socrates' own view of the matter.[77] In addition, both endorsed Odysseus' behavior in the Cyclops episode. Socrates explained the blinding of the Cyclops as an act of self-defense (Libanius 1.124), while Antisthenes cleared Odysseus' boast in that episode of charges of impiety.[78]

Not surprisingly Xenophon is less courageous than Antisthenes in evaluating Odysseus. Though, as far as we can tell, none of Socrates' followers endorsed his approval of Odysseus' double standards in *Iliad* 2 ("rebuke the kings and beat the commoners"), Xenophon seems to have been particularly disturbed by it: his rebuttal of Polycrates' accusation spells out the extent to which he tried to smooth over what he considered an embarrassing pronouncement.[79] Nonetheless, even his appraisal of Odysseus is likely to have preserved its Socratic imprint better than Plato's.

For one thing, Xenophon has no issue with Odysseus' eloquence: on the contrary, he identifies Odysseus' style with Socrates', and attributes to the philosopher a praise of Odysseus' rhetoric that recalls Antisthenes' views: "And he [Socrates] said that also Homer assigned to Odysseus the quality of being an infallible public speaker, since he was able to conduct his conversations through

what seemed true to people" (*Mem.* 4.6.15).[80] Moreover, Xenophon must have admired Odysseus' effectiveness as a leader. He attributes to Socrates a description of the ideal general that cannot but evoke the multitalented Homeric hero: "Full of resources . . . and tricks . . . enduring and sharp, kindly disposed and harsh . . . plotting and watchful, thievish and lavish, rapacious and generous, greedy and unfaltering" (Ποριστικόν . . . μηχανικόν . . . καρτερικὸν καὶ ἀγχίνουν καὶ φιλόφρονά τε καὶ ὠμόν . . . ἐπίβουλον καὶ φυλακτικόν τε καὶ κλέπτην καὶ προετικὸν καὶ ἅρπαγα καὶ φιλόδωρον καὶ πλεονέκτην καὶ ἀσφαλῆ *Mem.* 3.1.6). We do not want to make much of this passage because Odysseus is neither mentioned by name nor alluded to by a citation, yet most of the qualities listed (all the ones I have transcribed, with the possible exception of lavishness) are present in him. If Odysseus is behind this picture, both his resourcefulness (μηχανικόν) and his καρτερία must have appealed to Xenophon, as they did to Antisthenes, for their usefulness in war.[81]

True, Plato as well appreciated Odysseus' knowledge of war matters. In opposing naval soldiery he cites Odysseus' rebuke to Agamemnon in *Iliad* 14.96–102 to prove the point that ships lined up on the sea next to fighting infantry is a bad thing (*Laws* 706d1–e6).[82] Odysseus, however, is just the mouthpiece for a right way of conducting military operations, not the accomplished general he might have been for Xenophon or the unique leader—in war and life—he is in Antisthenes' view. For Antisthenes, as we have seen, extends the scope of Odysseus' inventiveness, intelligence, and serviceability beyond the battlefield: he transforms the battlefield from a literal into a metaphorical setting in which Odysseus exhibits his excellence as a savior of humanity. While Antisthenes elaborates philosophically on Odysseus' military abilities, Plato retains them only tangentially and shows no interest in defending the hero's original methods.

The *Laws* is one of Plato's latest works. His engagement with Odysseus seems to have faded, if not disappeared entirely, in the late dialogues. Plato's significant contributions to discussion of Odysseus belong to his works of the early and middle periods, all of which feature Socrates as their protagonist: the *Lesser Hippias,* the *Apology,* the *Phaedo,* the *Symposium,* the *Phaedrus,* and the *Republic.* This concentration might indicate that interest in Odysseus was sparked in Plato by Socrates, who himself came to appear like a "purified Odysseus" to his admiring disciple. Odysseus is center stage in the *Lesser Hippias,* one of Plato's earliest dialogues. And the issue at stake in that dialogue, the meaning of πολύτροπος, doubtlessly was a "hot topic" in the immediate Socratic circle, as demonstrated by Antisthenes' commitment to it.

Plato, however, from the start might have disagreed with aspects of Socrates'

admiration for Odysseus, as is suggested by the undecidedness in promoting Odysseus' versatility that he attributes to his own Socrates in the *Lesser Hippias.* Plato remains ambivalent toward Odysseus' versatile intelligence in his middle dialogues, in which he also clears Odysseus of other characteristics he finds questionable (his love for pleasure, his ambition, his meddling in politics) in order to offer him as a model of psychic heroism.

A FOOTNOTE TO PLATO: ARISTOTLE'S DISREGARD FOR ODYSSEUS

Soon after Plato, and already in his lifetime, appreciation for Odysseus strengthens its ties with the Socratic tradition, in its Cynic then Stoic offshoots. Plato's disciple Aristotle has little to say about Odysseus. He rarely engages with the Homeric character in his own right or uses him to illustrate a point of doctrine. Hence my choice of treating Aristotle in a "footnote" to the philosopher whose school he attended but with whom he apparently ended up disagreeing on the moral significance of Odysseus as on many other, and more important, ethical and political issues. Aristotle's disregard for Odysseus marks his distance from both his teacher and the Socratic tradition as it was evolving in the fourth century.[83]

The discovery of Aristotle's lack of interest in Odysseus came to me as a surprise, for I expected to find in him a sympathetic interpreter of the Homeric character.[84] To be sure, it may be that the much-suffering, ill-fated hero of the *Odyssey* was unsuited to illustrate Aristotle's conception of happiness, considering the importance in it of external goods: "No one would call happy a man who has endured the greatest ills and misfortunes (κακοπαθεῖν καὶ ἀτυχεῖν τὰ μέγιστα)" (*EN* 1095b33–1096a2, in part paraphrased). The *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer,* which was largely influenced by Peripatetic philosophy,[85] indeed declares Odysseus inadequate to represent the Peripatetic ideal of happiness: "Homer also includes among the good things those positive factors that relate to the body and to externals. He believes, moreover, that without these virtue alone is insufficient for happiness, and demonstrates this as follows. He shows two men, Nestor and Odysseus, at the pinnacle of virtue, surpassing all other men but equal to each other in reasonableness and bravery and virtue and power of speech, yet he does not portray them as equal in their fortunes. Rather, the gods made Nestor 'happy in marrying and begetting / and granted him a rich old age in his halls / and sons who were wise and masters of the spear' (*Od.* 4.208, 210–11) but Odysseus, though he is 'gentle,' 'shrewd,' and 'reasonable,' is often called 'unfortunate.' The one sails swiftly and safely home while the other wanders for a long time and goes

on enduring countless toils and dangers. Thus the situation to be chosen and considered truly blessed is that in which fortune works with virtue and not against it" (141, translation by Keaney and Lamberton 1996).

Homer is credited with foreshadowing prophetically Peripatetic wisdom, according to which Odysseus should not be our model because good fortune and a lack of suffering are necessary for happiness along with virtue (cf. *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* 137).[86] Aristotle himself, to be sure, does not mention Odysseus in his discussion of happiness but chooses Priam to exemplify the ill-stricken man who cannot be called happy (*EN* 1101a7–8). Odysseus' illustrative role in the *Essay* might reflect later Peripatetic thought, along with the growing importance of Odysseus as a philosophical hero, or be idiosyncratic to the author of the *Essay.* Nonetheless, it is safe to speculate that Aristotle's conception of happiness would recommend Nestor, not Odysseus, as an ideal. As we shall see, the Stoics held the exact opposite view: for them Odysseus is a paragon of happiness because happiness resides only in virtue, and virtue best shows itself in suffering. Their model of a good character shines *especially* in misfortune, whereas Aristotle's shines *even* (καί) in misfortune (*EN* 1100b30).

Odysseus, however, would be perfectly entitled to embody the good man whose mettle shines even in misfortune, who bears everything well and makes the best of circumstances (as described at *EN* 1100b30–33). But he does not. Whereas the Cynics and the Stoics rely precisely on Odysseus (along with Heracles) to uphold the principle "virtue is schooled in misfortune,"[87] Aristotle chooses generals and craftsmen as models for his watered-down version of the same idea (*EN* 1101a1–6).

Other aspects of Aristotle's thought could have recommended Odysseus to him, above all his conception of "prudence," φρόνησις. Aristotle restored φρόνησις to its traditional meaning as "practical, conjectural intelligence," which Plato had dismissed in favor of a reading of the term closer to "science."[88] We shall recall that the savvy and inventive hero of the *Odyssey* in the first half of the fifth century was held to embody φρόνησις precisely in that older and more common sense. In fact, Pierre Aubenque invokes Odysseus as a mythic ancestor of Aristotle's φρόνιμος: the workings of deliberative democracy, he argues, present Aristotle with the model for individual prudent conduct, of which the Homeric avatar is Odysseus, who "deliberates in his heart."[89] The episode in *Odyssey* 20 in which Odysseus quiets his heart and debates with himself over the preferable course of action appears to Aubenque to illustrate this "internalization of the deliberative capacity." And yet Aristotle, contrary to Plato, makes no use whatsoever of that scene.[90]

Quite to the contrary, Aristotle denies to one particular dramatic incarnation of Odysseus even a proper understanding of φρόνησις (*EN* 1142a1–10). He says that according to many, φρόνησις consists in minding one's own business and one's own interest, whereas politicians are not prudent men but busybodies, πολυπράγμονες. Euripides, for instance, stages Odysseus (in the prologue of *Philoctetes*) holding this position. Aristotle bears witness to the "privatization" of life-ideals in the fourth century. Whereas in 431, when *Philoctetes* was produced, the majority apparently connected φρόνησις to participation in politics, the opposite is assumed to be true some eighty years later.[91]

Aristotle, however, objects to the majority position that a man's own good cannot exist without some form of political structure, and that for this reason φρόνησις belongs to the political man. The philosopher reverses the respective roles of Odysseus and the masses in Euripides' play: whereas in *Philoctetes* the masses value the political life, in Aristotle the philosopher values that life; the opinion that one should be concerned only with one's own interests, which in Euripides is propounded by the wisest of the Greeks (F 2.3 Müller: σοφωτάτῳ), for Aristotle belongs to the unwise hoi polloi, of whom Odysseus is the representative.[92]

In denying Odysseus his role as "the wisest of the Greeks" Aristotle stands diametrically opposite Plato, who, based on the same dramatic character, chooses Odysseus to embody the wisest way of life.[93] Whereas Plato elaborates on Odysseus' meditation in *Philoctetes* to make his Odysseus go the extra step and embrace the life of the ἀπράγμων, Aristotle exploits the same character to illustrate a myopic vision, and offers Pericles instead as the exemplar of his political conception of φρόνησις (*EN* 1140b7–8). That Aristotle did not reconnect with the tradition identifying Odysseus with the φρόνιμος in the older sense, the sense he himself embraced, might indicate that praise of Odysseus' political intelligence continued to be off-limits in the mid-fourth century as it was in the late fifth, and that Aristotle was unwilling to go against common opinion.

Aristotle's agreement with Odysseus' critics extends to the charge of military worthlessness. On the grounds that the same act can have many motives, Aristotle argues that an accuser will interpret them for the worse while a defender for the better. Take for instance Diomedes' choice of Odysseus as his associate for the scouting expedition in *Iliad* 10: Odysseus' defender will contend that Diomedes chose him thinking him the best man, whereas the accuser will claim that he did so "because Odysseus, owing to his baseness, would be the only one not to compete with him" (*Rhet.* 1416b9–15). Aristotle seems to agree with the accuser, for he does not oppose the view that Diomedes chose Odysseus as

his partner precisely because he wanted to be the better man: "he might well have done it for this reason" (*Rhet.* 1399b28–30).[94]

Charges of cowardliness were repeatedly aimed at Odysseus since the Cyclic poems, in which the legend of his attempt to dodge the draft developed (if Homer knew it, he might have alluded to it but in a veiled manner at *Od.* 24.116–19, where Agamemnon in the Underworld recounts how he and Menelaus had a hard time persuading Odysseus to join the war).[95] For instance, the comic playwright Epicharmus (early fifth century) apparently represented Odysseus as unwilling to fight.[96] The tormented hero of Euripides' *Philoctetes* behaved no less cowardly, or at least showed unheroic fear, once he resolved to pursue his mission and had to face Philoctetes.[97] An undercurrent of this disparaging tradition can be felt also in *Rhesus,* where Diomedes, who is much more daring than Odysseus, comes out better than his older and more cautious associate.[98]

Evidence for Odysseus' cowardliness was found even in Homer, in the puzzling episode of *Iliad* 8.92–98 in which Odysseus, for turning his back to fighting, earns the epithet κακός from the self-confident Diomedes and yet, even when summoned by the latter's "wondrous cry" (σμερδαλέον δ᾽ ἐβόησεν) to rescue Nestor, "did not hear" (οὐδ᾽ ἐσάκουσε) and "darted past him" (παρήϊξεν). The scholia document an ongoing polemic about the purport of Odysseus' behavior: did he pass by Nestor intentionally or did he truly miss Diomedes' call? It was argued that those who accused Odysseus of cowardliness misinterpreted the verb εἰσακούειν, which denotes failure to hear, not refusal to give ear. After all, in that circumstance Odysseus had been the last of the warriors to fly, and by his lack of precipitation had proven his courage.[99] Diomedes' role as chastiser in this episode, combined with his avowal in *Iliad* 10 that he picked Odysseus because of his intelligence (which some read: because he was not brave),[100] might have fueled the interpretation of Diomedes' choice as self-aggrandizing and demeaning to Odysseus. Aristotle seems to stay with this tradition. Contrary to Antisthenes, who refutes accusations of military inadequacy leveled against Odysseus by proposing the inventive, knowledgeable, and enduring hero as the very paradigm of the brave man, he shows no admiration for Odysseus as a fighter and a leader.

Aristotle's divergence from Antisthenes and more generally the Socratics, Plato included, emerges especially from his disregard for Odysseus' fortitude. Aristotle distinguishes καρτερία from ἐγκράτεια: the former consists in bearing up with pain, the latter in resisting pleasure (*EN* 1150a13–15). In the Socratic tradition Odysseus was held exemplary in both areas (though, as we have seen, Plato disliked his pronouncement on the joy of feasting). Conversely Aristotle

does not even credit Odysseus with his proverbial fortitude in putting up with hardship, with καρτερία. Odysseus does not appear in his discussion of μεγαλοψυχία or "high-mindedness," though fortitude is one dimension of it.

The philosopher's view is that the awareness of one's worth that informs μεγαλοψυχία can result in the scornful conduct of an Achilles, who is high minded in that he cannot bear up with insult and for this reason withdraws from fighting, or, on the other hand, in the equanimity of a Socrates or a Lysander, whose high-mindedness is shown in his indifference to honor or dishonor as well as to good or bad fortune.[101]

Since the second kind of μεγαλοψυχία requires fortitude, why does Aristotle not choose Odysseus as illustrations for it? Would not his ancient Greek audience immediately think of the enduring hero in this context, as does a modern critic?[102] All the more so because Aristotle's contemporaries were witnessing the philosophical refashioning of Odysseus' fortitude precisely as a "Socratic" indifference to hardship, and doubtlessly some of them were familiar with the Odysseus-like picture of Socrates proposed by the philosopher's direct disciples. If we add that Achilles appears as an exemplar of the other kind of μεγαλοψυχία, and that the two heroes were traditionally paired and compared, we cannot help thinking that Aristotle's omission is intentional.[103] By ignoring Odysseus' qualifications to μεγαλοψυχία, Aristotle belittles the hero's steadfastness in the face of misfortune.

Aristotle's appreciation of Odysseus' eloquence likewise spells out his distance from the Socratic tradition, for he casts the πολύτροπος hero as a manipulator of his audience's feelings. One of the scholia on Odysseus' rejection of immortality, the same that reports Antisthenes' reading, begins with invoking expediency as Odysseus' motive and attributes this interpretation to Aristotle: "According to Aristotle, Odysseus spoke thus to the Phaeacians [i.e., told them that he turned down Calypso's offer] in order to impress them more and to show that he cared for the return more than for anything else. It was convenient for him to say this in order to be conveyed fast" (fr. 178 Rose). Another gloss (fr. 173) follows a similar reasoning: "Why did Odysseus tell the Phaeacians that he blinded the Cyclops, since he was the son of Poseidon and they also were descendants of Poseidon? Aristotle's solution is: Odysseus knew that the Phaeacians were enemies of the Cyclops, for Homer says that they came to Scheria after being expelled by the Cyclopes." On both occasions Odysseus spoke as he did to earn his hosts' sympathy.

Aristotle's evaluation is not at odds with the image of the Homeric hero, who elegantly flatters his hosts' wishes by telling them his story, and obtains con-

veyance in exchange for his narrative. At the same time, however, Aristotle's appreciation for Odysseus' tactfulness fits well his own position as a courtier, the friend of kings, from the Macedonian dynasty to Hermias in Assos. Perhaps his emphasis on Odysseus' diplomacy encodes his own aspirations and practice at the various courts where he offered his intellectual services. Whatever the case may be, his Odysseus exploits his dexterity in speech to his own advantage.

A later writer, Megacleides, of whom we know nothing certain, also remarks on Odysseus' carefully studied choice of subjects. According to Athenaeus (12. 513b), he held that Odysseus aimed to please the Phaeacians when he celebrated feasting as the best life (at *Od.* 9. 5–11): "Odysseus was only deferring to the exigencies of the moment, in order to appear to be in sympathy with the manners of the Phaeacians, when he accepted their effeminacy, because he had previously heard Alcinous say (*Od.* 8. 248): 'Ever to us is the feast dear, the harp and dances, raiment oft changed, warm baths, and the love-couch.' Only in this way did he expect to get what he hoped from them" (translation by Gulick, in the Loeb edition).[104]

This interpretation of Odysseus' praise of feasting might bear a Peripatetic mark, though it is not originally Aristotelian. Aristotle (*Politics* 1338a 28–32) did justify Odysseus but by ennobling the pleasures involved: not food and drink, but music. Megacleides' reading, however, is in line with Aristotle's emphasis on Odysseus' ability to ingratiate his addresses by speaking "their language."[105] Aristotle's Odysseus is as skilled as Antisthenes' hero at shaping his words to his audiences. But his goals are not the same: whereas Antisthenes admires Odysseus' verbal inventiveness and adaptability primarily for the benefits they bring to others, Aristotle and Megacleides highlight Odysseus' self-interest. This Odysseus is not a selfless teacher-doctor.

CHAPTER 3

Yearning for Excellence: Odysseus in Cynic and Stoic Thought

But I will tell you all the sorrows you are fated to endure
In your well fitted palace. You must bear them,
And not disclose to anyone, man or woman,
That you have come back from your wanderings, but suffer
In silence many painful things, and subject yourself to the violence of men
(*Od.* 13.306–10)

SOURCES

We now step onto more familiar territory: Odysseus in his Cynic and Stoic garb is a well-known figure to readers acquainted with the hero's reception in antiquity. If we believe the available sources, Diogenes, the father of the Cynic movement, was an enthusiastic admirer of Odysseus. The same is likely to be true for Zeno, the founder of the Stoa, of whom we know that he wrote five books of Homeric Problems. Though there is no evidence in the extant fragments that Zeno promoted Odysseus as a moral exemplar, it is reasonable to assume so because the points of Stoic ethics that Odysseus came to illustrate—the obligations for us to submit to fate cheerfully and to be indifferent to both pleasure and pain—belonged already to the repertoire of the early Stoics and did not undergo significant changes in the subsequent phases of the movement.[1]

That said, however, in the surviving evidence the Stoic engagement with Odysseus dates almost entirely to the Imperial period. A survey of the fragments attributed to the early Stoics (Cleanthes and Chrysippus in addition to Zeno) as well as to the so-called middle Stoics of the second and first centuries BC (Panaetius and Posidonius) shows little or no concern with Odysseus. Cicero is the only author of the late Republican period to document a Stoic interest in Odysseus, but in using Cicero as a source for Stoic ideals we must apply caution

because he is not himself a Stoic (in fact, we shall see that in some important respects his treatment of Odysseus follows in Platonic footsteps). Conversely, Seneca, Epictetus, Musonius, and Dio Chrysostom, Stoic or Stoicizing authors all belonging to the first and second centuries AD, have transmitted to us the image of Odysseus we tend to associate with the Stoics. This wealth of evidence strongly suggests that interest in Odysseus within the Stoic movement increased significantly in the early centuries of the Roman Empire.

Some features of Odysseus, if properly reconfigured, were indeed bound to appeal to a stoically minded subject to Rome. His endurance in particular was fitting to illustrate how to survive the "blows of fortune"—a universal condition, to be sure, but one that must have been poignantly felt under the sway of Roman rule. Odysseus in that context could also teach those excluded from politics or deprived of their estate, exiles and outcasts, that political influence and wealth are not real sources of power, that one may well look like a pauper, but truly be a king.

Did the Cynic admiration for Odysseus likewise grow in the Imperial period? When tackling Cynic sources we are on shaky ground, for almost all of them, not just those concerned with Odysseus, date to several centuries after the beginnings of the movement with Diogenes and his disciple Crates of Thebes. It is possible that interest in Odysseus, among the Cynics as among the Stoics, intensified in the Roman period, though at the same time Diogenes is insistently paired with Odysseus, whereas the founder of the Stoa, Zeno, is not. With the sources at our disposal we can only hope to draw the lines of a Cynic portrait of the hero, but not to give that portrait a date of birth. I shall conventionally speak of "Diogenes" though the character as we have it is a later construct.

Another major problem connected to our sources is how to tell apart Cynic uses of Odysseus from Stoic ones, for the Stoics are an offshoot of the Cynics (Zeno was a follower of Crates). The similarities between the two movements faded with the middle Stoics and the Roman Stoics of the Imperial period (especially Seneca and Marcus Aurelius), but they never disappeared entirely. Though Juvenal exaggerates when he jokingly says (13.121–22) that the Stoics differ from the Cynics only by a *tunica* (meaning that they dress), he could apparently anticipate that readers would see enough proximity between the two philosophies to enjoy the joke (which, if I may, reminds me of the description of a Methodist as a Baptist who wears shoes). In the Imperial period Cynicism and Stoicism were separate creeds,[2] but both could coexist in the same thinker: Dio Chrysostom, for instance, though largely a Stoic, embraced aspects of Cynicism in the period of his exile, and his exploitation of Odysseus, which belongs

mainly to that period, bears resemblances to Cynic uses of him as we know them from other sources. I have therefore chosen to treat the "Cynic-Stoic Odysseus" as a unit, though, as I hope to show, certain features of him seem to have been more markedly Cynic and others Stoic, at least in the extant evidence.

One last methodological clarification: as evidence for the Cynic-Stoic Odysseus I will often draw on the second-century AD Platonist Maximus of Tyre. This is because Maximus' fundamental Platonism absorbs many elements from "competing" philosophies, especially the Peripatos and the Stoa.[3] More specifically, Maximus' interpretation of Odysseus is strongly influenced by Cynic and Stoic thought.[4] I shall, however, rely on Maximus only as supplementary evidence for the Cynic and Stoic Odysseus, except for those passages in which he associates Odysseus with Diogenes. For some important aspects Maximus' readings of Odysseus are Platonic and will be considered in a later chapter.

THE BEGGAR

The Cynics were very much attracted to the character of the second half of the *Odyssey:* the beggar. Admiration for Odysseus in this role is documented in the so-called Cynic letters, a fictional collection attributed to Diogenes and Crates but dated to the early Roman period. Though literary inventions, the letters are not sheer rhetorical exercises, but contain elements of Cynic propaganda.[5] In two of them Diogenes reassures his addressees that there is nothing shameful about wearing tatters. Antisthenes, he says, was not the first to teach him the beauty of rags and begging ("beautiful weapons against the opinions that make war with life," [Diogenes] *Ep.* 34.1.4–5). He learned it already from tragedy and Homer, in the characters of Telephus and Odysseus: "Homer writes that Odysseus, the wisest of the Greeks, when he came back home from Troy wore this cloak, advised by Athena, and it was so beautiful (καλή), that it is agreed that it was not the finding of men but of the gods" ([Diogenes] *Ep.* 7.2.1–5; cf. also 34.2.8–10). There follows the citation (with some changes in the first line) of the scene in which Athena transforms Odysseus into an old man and a beggar.[6]

Such an exalted eulogy of Odysseus the hero in rags is novel. Plato, as much as he exploits Odysseus' endurance to extol Socrates' indifference to cold and hunger, does not retain the image of the beggar-like Odysseus, except, and only allusively, where he quotes the line from *Odyssey* 4 that introduces Odysseus' scouting mission, during which he wears "sorry wraps," to describe Socrates' relentless intellectual searching. And even in that episode Plato highlights

Odysseus' καρτερία, not his accoutrement. Xenophon omits any mention of Odysseus in rags—which is not surprising, given his gentlemanly worldview.

Likewise we are not surprised to find in Antisthenes the closest antecedent to the Cynics even in this respect. Antisthenes, however, idealizes Odysseus not so much for wearing rags as for his readiness to dress and act like a beggar if needed. He lauds Odysseus' indifference to humiliations, which allows him to disguise himself as a beggar in order to carry out a mission. Though a positive figure, it is the same Odysseus who in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* tells Neoptolemus, "say the worst things about me, it does not matter provided that we achieve our goal" (64–67, paraphrased). Being slighted, wearing tatters, and looking slavish are means to a specific end, winning the war. Just as Antisthenes himself would find no job so foul that he could not subsist, Odysseus finds no role too foul if it helps the sack of Troy.[7]

But Antisthenes' Odysseus fights another war, against ignorance and conformity, a war that aims to save not the Greeks at Troy but all of humanity. In the context of this philosophical war his rags acquire a secondary and deeper meaning: they alert us to rethink our categories, to question the assumptions on which we base our actions. Elaborating on the symbolic power of Odysseus' rags, implied in Antisthenes' reading, Diogenes calls Odysseus' disguise "a beautiful weapon," gives it a divine tag, and adopts it as a permanent outfit. If Odysseus' rags are a means to heal the world in that they denounce the emptiness of social conventions, Diogenes will wear them always, as a demonstrative statement, a reminder of the lesson we must learn. The Cynic wears tatters both to achieve happiness himself ([Diogenes] *Ep.* 34.3.4–5) and to advertise his possession of it to those who are still the prisoners of social trappings. Should we ever learn the lesson, he might give up his tatters, for dress or wealth would no longer have any value for anybody. But shall we learn? The permanence of the Cynic accoutrement exposes our tenacious attachment to conventions. At the same time the demonstrativeness of the Cynic attire borders on aestheticism, as is suggested by Diogenes' dwelling on the scene of Odysseus' transformation in *Odyssey* 13.429–38.

The Cynic letters, however, also betray the fragility of the association between Odysseus and the ideal Cynic beggar. In order for Odysseus-the-beggar to become a model for the Cynic, an inescapable detail of his biography had to be ignored: that his outfit was a temporary disguise, intended only to carry out the slaughter. Whereas Heracles, whose dress was the main reference for the Cynics, donned his lion skin and club all his life, Odysseus abased himself to beg in

order to reconquer his kingdom (or, in the episode evoked by Antisthenes, to spy into Troy).[8] "Diogenes" *Ep.* 34 brings out the shakiness in the association between Odysseus and the Cynic beggar in that it cares to distinguish Odysseus' purpose in wearing rags from Diogenes': Odysseus aimed only to kill the suitors, Diogenes to achieve εὐδαιμονία (34.3.2–5). In spite of all the liberties philosophers took in reshaping Odysseus' career to match it with their theories, the Cynic author of that letter apparently did not feel that he could make Odysseus' temporary disguise signify a permanent life-choice.

The Cynic letters indeed bear witness to a polemic, even within Cynicism, over Odysseus' relationship to wealth and pleasure and consequently his suitability as a Cynic hero. Crates in *Ep.* 19 disputes Odysseus' rights to be the father of Cynicism because he was softer than all his companions and held pleasure in the highest honor (πάντων μαλακώτατον ἑταίρων καὶ τὴν ἡδονὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα πρεσβεύοντα). The reason why the Cynics (inappropriately) adopted him as a model is that *once* (ποτέ) he wore the Cynic cloak. Odysseus was regularly conquered by sleep and food, praised the *dolce vita* (τὸν ἡδὺν βίον), was always helped by gods and fortune, asked even the poorest for sustenance, and took anything he could. Diogenes did not wear tatters once (ἅπαξ) but all his life, and was stronger than pleasure and toil.[9]

It perhaps is impossible to establish whether this controversy goes back to the historical Crates or is a later accretion in Cynic literature. To mock Odysseus' love affair with wealth and his hedonistic leanings became a popular exercise in the last centuries BC and the early Imperial period: a parasite is nicknamed "Odysseus" in Plautus' *Menaechmi* (902); one of his colleagues in Alciphron's *Letters* compares his trickery, meant to serve the needs of his demanding stomach, with Odysseus' (3.40.2); and the advocate of the parasitic "art" in Lucian's essay *The Parasite* appeals to Odysseus to make his case. The Epicurean Philodemus (first century BC) joins these ranks by deriding Odysseus for his "parasitic hunger" (*On Flattery,* PHerc. 223, fr. 3), while Horace borrows Odysseus (though how seriously?) to sketch a portrait of the greedy legacy-hunter (*Satires* 2.5), a portrait that might indeed have been inspired by ongoing debate over Odysseus' Cynic credentials.[10] As for Odysseus' enslavement to other kinds of pleasure, it could be evinced from his reputation as a seduced and a seducer, which appealed particularly to Roman writers such as Cicero (*De off.* 1.31.113) and Ovid (*Ars* 2.123–24). Several sources also suggest that Odysseus' praise of the *dolce vita* in *Odyssey* 9, to which Crates refers in the letter, was the target of heated discussion in the early Imperial period.[11]

Plutarch's endearing attempt to defend Odysseus from charges of both

greed and soft living testifies to the loudness of those charges. Why does Odysseus rejoice at the sight of Penelope receiving gifts from the suitors (at *Od.* 18.282)? If because of profit, he is condemnable; but if he is thinking that the gifts betray the suitors' overconfidence, he is justifiable. And what about his concern with counting his possessions as soon as he wakes up on Ithaca? If he truly fears for them, he is pitiful or even despicable. But if, "as some say," he wants to test the honesty of the Phaeacians, his forethought is worthy of praise (*Mor.* 27B–D). Plutarch takes care to specify that he is not alone in justifying Odysseus, unless "as some say" is just meant to confer authority on his argumentation.

Next, Plutarch exculpates Odysseus from the charge of sleepiness, which was based on the episode of his disembarkation on Ithaca. Some argued that Odysseus was naturally sleepy, a tradition preserved by the Etruscans. Plutarch, however, does not give credit to it: perhaps, as others think, Odysseus was not truly sleeping when the Phaeacians put him onshore, but was covering his head owing to shame, for he was not in the position to repay his generous carriers with the appropriate gifts (*Mor.* 27E).

If, as Plutarch's witness seems to suggest, the polemic over Odysseus' greed and soft living intensified around the time of "Crates'" letters (first century AD), it might have been fed by Cynic writers in the context of a larger debate, documented also in the letters, between "harsher" and "softer" Cynics. As Clarence Glad has pointed out, the views of the harsh type are reflected in the letters of Crates (as well as those of Diogenes, Heraclitus, and Hippocrates).[12] The perceived incongruities in Diogenes' identification of himself with Odysseus-the-beggar on the one hand, and Crates' outright rejection of the identification on the other could belong to the tough strain of Cynicism, whereas milder Cynics possibly saw no problem in Odysseus' hedonism and attachment to wealth.[13]

At the same time, however, the opposition between a harsher and a milder strain of Cynicism might date as far back as the end of the fourth century BC.[14] As to Odysseus' love for pleasure, already in the classical period it was a favorite topic of comic and satyr plays and a target for moralists, who pointed their fingers at his weak spot for women and his eulogy of banqueting in *Odyssey* 9. Odysseus' acquisitiveness likewise met with criticism, even from sympathetic witnesses. Aristotle's pupil Theophrastus, while he admired Odysseus' far-reaching travels, apparently claimed that Democritus was more praiseworthy than the Homeric wanderer because he went around the world to gain knowledge, whereas Odysseus accumulated wealth like a Phoenician merchant (Aelian *Varia Historia* 4.20). This observation echoes Democritus' own self-presentation as a "much-wandering man" in Odysseus' style, but with knowledge as his single goal:

"I, among my contemporaries, wandered most over the earth, inquiring about the farthest things. I saw most skies and lands and heard most learned men" (B 299, 6–8 DK). Whether or not Democritus truly spent all his inheritance in travel (Diog. Laert. 9.36), his persona as a wanderer motivated purely by intellectual curiosity contrasts with Odysseus' own emphasis, in Homer, on both his inquisitive and his acquisitive drive (the latter especially in the self-portraits he draws in the second half of the *Odyssey*).

The historical Crates, who came from a wealthy family, allegedly squandered all his money, like Democritus in Diogenes Laertius' account, though, in keeping with his Cynic convictions, he did not use up his substance to expand his knowledge of the world but gave it away.[15] This radical choice might have opened his eyes to the inadequacy of Odysseus as a Cynic hero. Perhaps "Crates" *Ep.* 19 does reflect the exacting and rigorous spirit of Diogenes' follower.[16]

We are told that "Odysseus in tatters" was a model of virtue also for the Stoics. The defender of the parasitic art in Lucian's essay on the subject claims that, had Odysseus wanted to embrace the Stoic end, he would have commended the experience of marring his body and wearing "Stoic rags" to spy into Troy (*The Parasite* 10).

What did the Stoics admire in Odysseus wearing rags? We can be fairly certain that they did not glamorize Odysseus-the-beggar for displaying a "beautiful weapon against opinions." Though we should not rule out the possibility that Lucian might be referring to sources now lost, the Roman Stoics, who provide almost all the extant evidence for the Stoic Odysseus, disavowed the connection with Cynic boldness in moral and social matters that marked the beginnings of the movement (it was apparent, for instance, in Zeno's *Republic,* a utopian project abolishing temples and money and advocating the community of women and the same dress for women and men). The stronger sense of propriety and the respect for social institutions characteristic of the later Stoics prevented them from celebrating begging as a life-choice or even from admiring it.[17] They did not follow the Cynics (at least some of them) in embracing a life of poverty voluntarily, but rather preached that we should be content with poverty if it falls on us. It is perhaps not by chance that Lucian, as illustration for the Stoic ideal, chooses not the image of Odysseus begging in his palace but the less familiar one of Odysseus the spy (from *Odyssey* 4), who does not actively beg (at least the text does not say so) but only looks like a beggar, or rather, a poor slave.[18]

It could, however, be argued that the Homeric image of Odysseus begging in his palace fits Stoic ideals better than Cynic ones. For it is in obedience to Athena, or, as a Stoic would phrase it, to god or fate, that Odysseus begs. The au-

thors of the apocryphal Cynic letters downplayed the fact that Odysseus submitted to necessity when he became a beggar, and instead extolled him for the beauty of his god-inspired station. We have seen how this interpretation appeared problematic even to some Cynics: if Odysseus' rags were "the finding of the gods," why did he give them up? For the Stoics, in contrast, that Odysseus begged only when ordered could not possibly be a problem, because their main tenet is "thou shalt be content with destiny, whatever its commands." The obedient Odysseus, who accepts, but does not choose, to beg, is perfectly entitled to exemplify that Stoic imperative.

THE ACTOR OF LIFE

"The beggar" is indeed one of the many roles Odysseus teaches us to play as directed by destiny. The Stoics exhort us to be like good actors, to interpret as well as we can the part(s) assigned to us by fate.[19] Their reference for our obedient execution of life's script seems to have been the tragic, rather than the comic, stage, first, because life has in store many "tragic" roles (such as the beggar), and, second, because tragic characters are as dedicated to their causes as we should be in our performance of life's drama. The Stoic imperative of detachment from externals does not entail that we should be uncommitted to our roles: on the contrary, we should play them as seriously as possible but always remembering that we are wearing masks, and that each mask might be changed. This conception recommends Odysseus as the model actor on the Stoic stage of life, for Odysseus was able to change masks quickly yet fully to impersonate each of his roles.

Already according to Teles, a third-century BC Cynic, Odysseus was the ideal interpreter of life, and among the "manifold roles" he played well, there was the beggar (52.3 Hense): "a shipwreck, a beggar, an exile, a well-reputed man, an ill-reputed one" (παντοδαπά . . . πρόσωπα, ναυαγοῦ, πτωχοῦ, φυγάδος, ἐνδόξου, ἀδόξου). At the turn of the first century AD Epictetus has recourse to the same image: one should play any role as well as Odysseus, who was no less distinguished in his rags than in his purple (fr. 11).[20] A similar meditation about the theater of life, attributed by Lucian to the philosopher Nigrinus (of whom we know nothing), might have Odysseus in the background (*Nigrinus* 20): "there are reasons to admire philosophy when one observes so much folly, and to despise the goods of fortune when one sees the drama of many roles played on the stage of life (ἐν σκηνῇ καὶ πολυπροσώπῳ δράματι), in which one man enters first as servant, then as master; another first as rich, then as poor; another as poor, then as

satrap or king; another as someone's friend, another as his enemy; another as an exile."[21]

The image of Odysseus-the-actor-of-life is grounded in his versatility and adaptability: the πολύτροπος hero is best suited to interpret the "πολυπροσωπία" of life as fortune or fate demands. At the same time Odysseus is the model actor of life because of his internal firmness, which enables him to keep a distance from each role, and, consequently, to switch roles as needed. The Stoic Odysseus is and is not the character he plays: he is, as a committed performer of life's script; he is not, because his "moral purpose" extends beyond each role and protects him, so to speak, from them.

In a charming passage Maximus of Tyre appeals to a pronouncement by Odysseus as illustration for our power to adjust to the swings of fortune and, accordingly, to the changing roles we are assigned to. Maximus argues that the philosopher must adapt "the character of the speech to suit the varying nature of the episodes in the plot that god writes (δραματουργεῖ) for us." There would be no need "for complex and versatile (πολυτρόπου) musical harmonies . . . if only human affairs maintained a single pattern and an even tenor, never passing from one passion to another, from pleasure to pain or from pain to pleasure, never twisting and turning the individual's purposes this way and that: 'The opinions of mortals who live upon earth are such / As the day the Father of gods and men brings on' (*Od.* 18.136–37)" (1.1a–2c).[22]

We shall deal with this passage more fully in the next chapter, as evidence for ongoing discussion over the issue of the philosopher's versatility, exemplified by Odysseus. Our passage is not Stoic: Maximus does not speak Stoic language when he endorses the common view of life as governed by varying passions and alternatives of pleasure and pain, instead of prescribing, in a Stoic vein, the eradication of the passions and indifference to pleasure and pain. But the emphasis on "life as theater" and on our lack of freedom in writing our plot, as well as on the adaptability required to play it well, resonates with the Stoic ideal.

To demonstrate this need for adaptability Maximus relies on Odysseus' wisdom. The quoted lines from the *Odyssey* ("The opinions of mortals who live upon earth are such / As the day the Father of gods and men brings on") belong to a meditation on the feebleness of life, which Odysseus "the beggar" addresses to the suitor Amphinomous. Man thinks he is invulnerable as long as the gods give him strength, but when they crush him, "he bears that too, in sorrow, with an enduring heart" (*Od.* 18.135). Perhaps it is not by chance that Maximus, while he cites the lines that immediately follow, omits this one, for it taints Odysseus' wisdom with a vein of sadness. Homer's Odysseus has a vision of life as unpre-

dictably mutable, and of man as an adjustable creature, but not a happy one for all that. With his meditation he wishes to warn the suitors against haughty overconfidence. He exhorts them to practice σωφροσύνη, moderation in success, based on the awareness of their own frailty. Extrapolated from their context, however, lines 136–37 (unlike line 135) have no emotional coloring, but only spell out the power of the gods. They were indeed used by the Stoics to explicate the rule of fate, to which the wise Odysseus adjusts, but not "in sorrow."[23] The Odysseus who utters those lines can exemplify the Stoic actor who is *happy* to play the roles of a shipwrecked, an exile, or (as Odysseus is doing in that scene), a beggar.

THE HIDDEN KING

Odysseus' power to detach himself from his roles enables him not only to play any role asked but also not to be what he seems. Behind the rags there lies the king. Dio Chrysostom assimilates Diogenes to Odysseus, the godlike beggar who goes around observing just and unjust deeds. In a way reminiscent of the philosopher in Plato's *Sophist,* who is also fashioned after Odysseus the godlike beggar, Diogenes provokes all kinds of reactions: some think him the wisest man, others a madman, and many scorn him as a pauper, a good-for-nothing. In everything similar to the enduring Odysseus, Diogenes "truly resembled a king and a master who, dressed like a beggar, moved among his slaves and the lowest men while they lived in luxury and did not know who he was, and patiently bore up with them, drunk as they were and driven mad by ignorance and foolishness" (9.9–10).

This image highlights Odysseus' superior knowledge as well as the unreliability of cultural signs. The Cynic Odysseus expresses his power not through artificial marks of authority but his physical strength, the visible translation of his inner strength shining through the beggar's misleading attire. Bion of Borysthenes is reported to have appeared as an avatar of Odysseus revealing his powerful thigh: "such a thigh Bion showed through his rags" (*Od.* 18.74 [obviously modified]; Strabo 1.2.2).[24] Odysseus' natural vigor breaks through the deceptive cultural appearance, dress, and the revelation brings destruction to the wicked: the true beggar Iros, and later the suitors.[25]

Odysseus is entitled to rule because of his moral perfection (Dio Chrys. 14.22): "though a beggar and begging of the suitors, [he] was nonetheless a king and master of the house." "Master of the house" does not simply refer to Odysseus' legitimate status, but also, or rather especially, to his unbreakable self-

possession.[26] Elsewhere (2.41–43) Dio writes that Homer depicts his heroes' dwellings according to their character. Menelaus owns a luxurious house, as befits a fainthearted man; Calypso, a love paradise; Odysseus, who is ἀσφαλής (steadfast), has a house well protected by walls and doors (cf. *Od.* 17.266–68).

Dio's observation resonates with a saying of Antisthenes reported in Diogenes Laertius (6.13-SSR II V A, 134): "prudence is the safest wall, for it does not fall down or fail; one must set up walls in one's impregnable reason" (τεῖχος ἀσφαλέστατον φρόνησιν· μήτε γὰρ καταρρεῖν μήτε προδιδόσθαι. τείχη κατασκευαστέον ἐν τοῖς αὑτῶν ἀναλώτοις λογισμοῖς). We find here the roots of a concept bound to appeal to Stoic thinkers, in particular to Marcus Aurelius: that of the "inner citadel."[27] Odysseus has built such an unassailable fortress inside himself. Dio Chrysostom externalizes the image, as it were: Odysseus' solidity, his internal wall, explicates itself in real walls. Odysseus is "king and master of the house" because no one can shatter his ἀσφάλεια.

The Cynic Odysseus exercises his rule by examining men's behavior and inflicting deserved punishment. Among his favorite Homeric lines are the ones with which he arrays the Greek host in *Iliad* 2, exhorting the kings and beating the common folks. The rebuking Odysseus of that episode appeared to writers with Cynic sympathies a particularly fitting model to describe the activity of Diogenes. Like Odysseus, Diogenes spares no harsh words as he goes around to watch the ways of his fellows:

> Do I need to speak of the exploits of Diogenes? Turning his back on the leisure he might have enjoyed, and going about inspecting (ἐπισκοπῶν) his neighbors' doings, he proved himself no lax or idle overseer. Like Odysseus, "whenever he found some king or eminent man, / He would stand by him and restrain him with courteous words. / But whenever he saw one of the common people and found him shouting / Then he would beat him with his staff." (Maximus of Tyre 15.9.c–d)

Dio Chrysostom likewise highlights Odysseus' role as rightful punisher: Troy deserved being destroyed because of its licentiousness, luxury, and insolence (32.88; 33.19–22). Dio's reading of the sack of Troy as a moral victory suggests that the Stoics agreed with the Cynics in upholding Odysseus' role as a chastiser of vice. Speaking to the Tarsians, Dio indeed fashions himself after Odysseus preparing for the slaughter: like Odysseus he has come to punish vice, though, unlike Odysseus, he is well disposed toward the fellows he upbraids (33.14–15). His emphasis on his solitude and disheveled appearance, both remi-

niscent of Odysseus (33.14), is no message of weakness.[28] On the contrary, Dio/Odysseus enters the stage as a moral conqueror: not one of those well-dressed servants who please the suitors (*Od.* 15.330–32) but the unpleasant beggar (*Od.* 4.244–46), who readies himself to clear his household of wickedness.[29]

We shall see in the next chapter that uses of Odysseus as a paragon of "tough friendship" cut across doctrinal differences: he appeals in this role to Plutarch, Maximus of Tyre, and perhaps already the Epicurean Philodemus (first century BC). We can add the Stoic Dio to the list. Nonetheless, Dio is influenced by Cynicism in his choice of a life of homelessness during the time of his exile and in his Odysseus-persona, characterized by unkempt looks and social marginality (as in our passage). The image of Odysseus as the punisher of moral wrong is not found in authors more markedly Stoic, such as Seneca, Musonius, Epictetus, or Marcus Aurelius, or reporting Stoic thought, such as Cicero.

The Cynic inspiration of the image comes to the fore in its association with Diogenes and with Bion of Borysthenes.[30] Epictetus (Arrian *Dissertations* 3.22.69–70) similarly attributes to the Cynic, not the Stoic, the role of "watcher" (κατάσκοπον) of men.[31] Odysseus the moral reformer is identified with the romanticized Cynic. After his exile, when his allegiances to Cynicism fade, Dio still proposes Odysseus as a model king but for his effective eloquence: Odysseus alone was able to restrain the Achaeans rushing to the ships, thanks to his persuasive speech (2.23–24). Dio exploits the same episode of *Iliad* 2 that he used to describe Diogenes' behavior, but gives Odysseus' role a quite different twist: he is not the rightful punisher but the compelling speaker, whose intervention proves, along with Nestor's, that the success "was clearly due to the orators." In the view of the Stoic thinker, well-read lecturer and acquaintance of Trajan, the ideal king masters philosophy and "true" rhetoric (as opposed to its harmful counterpart: cf. 24), and finds in Odysseus a paradigm because of his endowments in both areas.[32]

THE TRAINER OF HIS OWN VIRTUE

Odysseus in rags is an athlete of life, training himself to endure so-called misfortunes (of which poverty is a major one) and to reject pleasures. Diogenes identifies his own battling pleasure with Odysseus' resistance to Circe's spell (Dio Chrys. 8.21), and invites comparison with the self-flagellating Odysseus evoked by Helen in the *Odyssey:* "Summon me also the athlete from Pontus [Diogenes]: let him too fight a lusty contest against hateful opponents, poverty and obscurity and hunger and cold. I approve of his exercises too: 'He humbled himself

with shaming blows, / Casting mean tatters about his shoulders,' (*Od.* 4.244–45) and by this means won an easy victory" (Maximus of Tyre 34.9.e). And again: "nor did he [Diogenes] spare himself, punishing himself and making life hard, 'Humbling himself with shaming blows, / Casting mean tatters about his shoulders'" (15.9.e). Imitating the Odysseus who tries any weapon, no matter how undignified, to defeat the enemy, Diogenes disciplines his body to come to grips with life's discomforts.

Self-punishment is aimed at strengthening Odysseus'/Diogenes' virtue: "For such deeds I crown these men, and proclaim them victors in their virtue" (Maximus of Tyre 34.9.f). This emphasis on Odysseus' own excellence as the goal of training is of Cynic or perhaps even pre-Cynic origin (we recall Antisthenes' interpretation of Odysseus leaving Calypso to prove his ἀρετή), is particularly dear to the Stoics, and extends into popular morality, where it merges with the commonplace idea that hardship allows one to "acquire" valor by showing it to others.[33] Odysseus becomes a favorite mythic exemplar to illustrate the dictum, "Virtue is schooled in misfortune."

Ills attack Odysseus so that his mettle can shine: "If he was good, as indeed he was, because 'He saw the cities of many men and came to know their minds / and suffered many sorrows in his heart as he voyaged by sea,' how can the testing grounds that gave him both the reputation for goodness and the reality not have been brought his way by divine dispensation?" (Maximus of Tyre 38.7.d–e).[34] The Stoic claim that misfortune is beneficial was grounded in Diogenes', Heracles', and Odysseus' fate. For instance, it was argued that Odysseus before the war was no better than the other natives of Ithaca and even had the reputation of a coward, for he tried to avoid the draft, but then, owing not even so much to the war as to the misadventures encountered on the way home and at home, he became a symbol of excellence: "he showed forth as a man of outstanding virtue when he was shipwrecked, when he was consumed by hunger and had lost his companions, when he lay in bed in poor and ugly rags" (Favorinus *De exilio,* fr. 96.4, lines 18–21).[35]

As we learn from the *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* (136), Odysseus embodies the Stoic conception of happiness precisely because of his ill luck. The Stoics "believe that virtue is sufficient for happiness, taking their lead from those passages in which Homer shows the wisest and most reasonable of men (τὸν σοφώτατον καὶ φρονιμώτατον) thinking nothing of toil endured for the sake of fame and showing contempt for pleasure."[36] In addition, though wise and strong in his soul, compared to Achilles Odysseus "is not shown as equally fortunate in other things, for he does not have the advantages of age and appearance,

his family is undistinguished, his homeland obscure, and he is hated by . . . [a] god. Yet none of these things prevented his being famous, since he possessed virtue of the soul."

This passage hits the core of the Stoic idealization of Odysseus by highlighting the positive role of so-called misfortune in the training of character. The author of the *Essay* twists the beginning of the *Odyssey* to make it fit this Stoic view (163): the poem will tell "what toil (πόνοις) and danger Odysseus fell into, and yet overcame it all through the wisdom and strength of his soul (τῆς ψυχῆς συνέσει καὶ καρτερίᾳ). This moralized rewriting of the Homeric prologue resonates with Horace's celebration of Odysseus' *virtus* and *sapientia,* "which waves of adversity could not sink" (*Ep.* 1.2.22); with Seneca's praise for the hero "unconquered by toils" (*De const. sap.* 2); and with Maximus of Tyre's hymn to Odysseus' ἀρετή, which "saves him as he battles against all kinds of misfortune" (26.9.g).[37] The Stoics allegorically reconfigure the external aids that Odysseus receives as his moral possessions: the magic root that protects him from Circe's spell is the λόγος that weakens the passions, and so are Hermes and the mast to which Odysseus ties himself; or, with a variation, both the root and Leucothea's veil stand for his virtue.[38]

If the Cynic-Stoic Odysseus illustrates the principle "Virtue is schooled in misfortune," will he look for hardship in order to exercise his virtue?

The Cynic Odysseus will—or should. As we have seen, the author of "Crates'" letters is uneasy with Odysseus' softness and hedonistic leanings, and would wish him to have chosen to be a beggar for all his life, as Diogenes did. On the other hand Odysseus draws the Cynics' admiration when he does choose to chastise himself or wear foul clothes, and in this role he is extolled as the mythic avatar of Diogenes: "He humbled himself with shaming blows, / Casting mean tatters about his shoulders" (Maximus of Tyre 15 and 34, above).

Lucian suggests that the Odysseus of that episode appealed to the Stoics as well: if Odysseus wanted to praise the Stoic end, "he would have done so when he brought Philoctetes back from Lemnos, when he sacked Troy, when he restrained the Greeks in their flight, or when he entered Troy after flogging himself and wearing sorry Stoic rags" (*The Parasite* 10). We note, however, that Lucian puts emphasis not specifically on Odysseus' self-flagellation, as in the passages in which Maximus pairs Odysseus with Diogenes, but on the overall enterprise of conquering Troy (which Maximus does not mention). Indeed, we have no evidence associating the self-humbling Odysseus of that episode with Stoic figures, as we do for the Cynics. This might reflect the different kind of asceticism practiced, or at least preached, by adherents to each movement: the

Stoic version is more moderate and less exhibitionist than its Cynic counterpart. Contrary to Diogenes (according to Diogenes Laertius 6.23), the Stoics neither roll in the hot sand nor practice similar exercises. Seneca recommends that one should deprive oneself of the usual comforts but only temporarily, in order to train one's ability to bear hardship if hardship comes, and without exaggeration (sleeping on the ground or eating stale bread will do).[39]

But isn't the Stoic Odysseus a lover of toil, πόνος? Maximus of Tyre (if his reading of Odysseus in the following passage has a Stoic hue) suggests he is: "Inactivity is intolerable to Achilles, silence to Nestor, and absence of risk to Odysseus . . . Odysseus could have stayed at home by Neritus with its fair trees, in the land that rears fine sons, or at the end of his wanderings have stayed with Calypso in her shady and well watered cave, waited on by the Nymphs, ageless and immortal. But he rejected an immortality that came at the cost of inactivity, and the loss of all opportunity to exercise his virtue in action. It is inevitable that he who takes on the life of Virtue, when confronted with human fortunes, should often have cause to cry out, 'Bear up, my heart, a thing nastier than this you once endured!'" (34.7.a–c).

This celebration of Odysseus' choice of a toilsome life can be contrasted with Cicero's more sober appraisal of the hero's aspirations. Blaming Odysseus for his feigned madness, Cicero refutes such justifications of his behavior as, "it was expedient for him to live on Ithaca in peace with his parents, wife, and son" (*Ithacae vivere otiose cum parentibus, cum uxore, cum filio*). No, says Cicero, a life of *tranquillitas* bought at this price is neither right nor expedient: had Odysseus continued in his feigned madness, what would his reputation have been, since in spite of his great deeds in the war Ajax could still accuse him of cowardice? "For him it was better to fight not only against the enemy, but also against the waves, as he did, than to desert Greece when it had agreed to wage war against the barbarians" (*De off.* 3.26.97–99).

Maximus repels such critical assessments of Odysseus' inclinations as Cicero's by first drawing attention to, and then ignoring, the legend of Odysseus' simulated madness.[40] Maximus does not simply leave out mentions of the episode, but states that the opposite is true: Odysseus could have stayed at home (Palamedes apparently did not unmask him!) and chose not to. This argument foreshadows Petrarch's claim that Odysseus was discovered not by Palamedes but by his own virtue, which pressed him on to go to Troy (*Epistolae familiares* 13.4.10–11).[41] Maximus is not content to argue that Odysseus won over every obstacle thanks to his virtue (as at 26.9.g), or that obstacles were set along his way to train his virtue (as at 38.7.b–g, where Palamedes is remembered), but main-

tains that he *chose* to face obstacles in the name of virtue. Maximus' interpretation of Odysseus' rejection of immortality calls to mind Antisthenes' contention that Odysseus left Calypso for virtue's sake.

Maximus, however, soon turns from Odysseus' virtuous initiatives to his more passive forbearance, as demonstrated in the line "Bear up, my heart . . ." In addition the immediate sequence ("who would remember Odysseus, if you deprive him of his sufferings?") betrays a lack of philosophical rigor: is Maximus speaking as a philosopher or is he drawing on a popular motif, an advocate of which is the unphilosophical Ovid in his poetry of exile?[42] The Stoics value hardship for the sake of virtue, not fame, which is an "indifferent."[43] When the author of the *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* claims that the Stoic Odysseus endured toil "for the sake of fame," or "good reputation" (εὐκλείας), he is not borrowing a Stoic view, but is speaking as a popular writer.[44]

Except for this questionable instance, the Stoic Odysseus profits from hardships but does not hunt for them. For the Stoics the hero who willingly embraced a life of hardship was rather Heracles—and this aspect of Heracles' life appeared to them both admirable and problematic. Because Heracles was credited with having freely chosen to toil (as in Prodicus' allegory, "Heracles at the Crossroads"), he could invite a Stoic to ask: did he kill monsters following orders or did he look for battles to satisfy a personal drive? Was he a Stoic saint taking the ills of the world upon his shoulders or a challenger of the cosmic order, who acted ahead of destiny or even in defiance of it?

Epictetus was apparently sensitive to these issues, since he emphatically clears Heracles of all suspicion of overeagerness. He sees Heracles' labors as the correct response to happenings, which one should always turn to a good purpose (θήσεις καλῶς), with the result, in Heracles' case, that he benefited mankind by eradicating wickedness and introducing righteousness.[45] But "ought he to have prepared these [monsters] for himself, and sought to bring a lion into his own country from somewhere or other, and a boar, and a hydra? This would have been folly and madness" (Arrian *Dissertations* 1.6.35–36, in Oldfather's translation). Heracles does not ask for battles; when he fights, he does so in celebration of the god who assigned battles to him. By presenting Heracles' toils as the virtuous response to the calls of destiny, Epictetus seems to be replying to Seneca, who, less ready to dispose of Heracles' thirst for labors, makes it border precisely on madness.

The protagonist of *Hercules Furens,* to be sure, labors to obey Juno's orders, and he does so as happily as a good Stoic follows the dictates of destiny (42: *laetus imperia excipit;* cf. *iussus* at 596 and *iussit* at 604). From his toiling his virtue and glory grow; from Juno's wrath they benefit (33–36), just as a good Stoic profits

from misfortunes. When he appears on stage, however, Heracles[46] shows eagerness for more labors: "What else is left? I have seen and exposed the Underworld. If more is left, give it to me: for a long time already you have endured that my hands rest idle, Juno: what do you order to be conquered?" (613–15: *Quid restat aliud? Vidi et ostendi inferos. / Da si quid ultra est: iam diu pateris manus / cessare nostras, Iuno: quae vinci iubes?*).

It is true that soon thereafter Heracles presents his readiness to fight as a selfless drive, caused not by thirst for labors but by devotion to the human race: "Let no savage and cruel tyrant reign; but if the earth is still to produce any wickedness, let her make haste, and if she is preparing any monster, let it be mine" (*Non saevi ac truces / regnent tyranni, si quod etiamnunc est scelus / latura tellus, properet, et si quod parat/ monstrum, meum sit*).[47] Heracles "offers his future services to humanity for any difficulties or crimes that may arise."[48]

Even in this passage, however, the verb *properare* betrays Heracles' impatience and eagerness, for it echoes its earlier use by the chorus to describe his overly daring spirit: "with too brave a heart, Alcides, you hasten to visit the sad shades" (*nimium, Alcide, pectore forti / properas maestos visere manes*) (186–87). This comment occurs toward the end of a song in which the chorus opposes the *tranquilla quies* of the obscure man and the dangers that meet the ambitious. Heracles is adumbrated in the latter type. The song's last words, "from its heights spirited courage falls" (201: *alte virtus animosa cadit*), foreshadow his doom.

Juno already said that Heracles could not be contained within bounds: *nec satis terrae patent,* "the earth is not vast enough," for him (46). Juno did not mean that the earth was too small for Heracles, but that his labors took him beyond the earth's confines, to the Underworld.[49] But the phrasing cannot but evoke the image of an uncontainable Heracles, one who, as Juno soon adds, will attack the sky and trample on human limits: "go now, haughty one; aim for the gods' dwellings, despise human things" (89–90: *I nunc, superbe, caelitum sedes pete, / humana temne*). Heracles' words at the onset of madness hark back to Juno's *nec satis terrae patent,* but this time to claim that the earth is indeed too small for him: "the earth cannot hold Heracles, and at last she gives him back to the gods above" (*non capit terra Herculem / tandemque superis reddit,* 960–61). Unable to fit any more in this small world, he will violate its boundaries by conquering the sky, a "worthy toil": "the sky is still untouched, a toil worthy of Heracles" (*immune caelum est, dignus Alcide labor,* 957). The play questions the beneficial results of Heracles' labors. His wife (or human father) already protested that his laboring in the Underworld endangered peace on earth (249–53).[50] As he embarks on his conquest of the sky, Heracles imagines overturning the cosmic order imposed

by his divine father (965–73). His thirst for πόνοι thus jeopardizes his philanthropy, for it turns out to be detrimental to his family, mankind, and the order of things.[51]

Odysseus does not meet with the kind of criticism leveled against Heracles in Seneca's tragedy. This might be because, in the literature available to the Stoics, Odysseus is much more ambivalent toward laboring. His career at Troy is fraught with conflicting reports about his level of commitment. Alongside the daring companion of Diomedes, whose heart is "eager in every toil" (*Il.* 10.244–45; cf. 232), there is the coward of the Cyclic poems and of comedy (to mention only a few instances). Furthermore even Odysseus' willingness to take up labors was charged with base motives (in tragedy). In this respect as in others Odysseus' many faces and the multiple traditions about him stood in the way of an unfailing idealization. In particular his attempt to dodge the draft, as we have seen, bothered some Stoics. But at the same time, because Odysseus could not simply be credited with an unquestionable love for πόνος, he was also better endowed than Heracles to exemplify the Stoic ideal, "endure hardship," or even "be happy with it," but "don't create monsters for yourself."

Possibly this difference in Stoic perceptions of the two heroes underlies Seneca's reference to, and belittlement of, Heracles' labors (as opposed to Odysseus') in *De constantia sapientis* 2. This text argues that Cato was an even better Stoic than Heracles and Odysseus because he fought purely spiritual battles.[52] Though Seneca mentions both heroes, however, he seems to have only Heracles in mind as the term of comparison, for he says that Cato did not wrestle with wild beasts; nor did he hunt down monsters with fire and sword; nor did he live in a time when it was possible to believe that the sky rested on one man's shoulders. These are allusions to Heracles' trials, not Odysseus'.

The majority of Odysseus' trials (those in the *Odyssey*) perhaps did not lend themselves to a comparison with the selfless mission of a Cato (in Seneca's view) because their goal was to recover Odysseus' own household, not to save the world. Perhaps the self-oriented dimension of Odysseus' efforts pushed Seneca to disregard him in favor of Heracles, whose labors aimed to clear the world of monsters, not to secure his own position. Heracles was a better match for the disinterested defender of a moral ideal, the Stoic Cato laboring to uphold integrity rather than to promote himself. More importantly, however, Odysseus did not have the same, untainted reputation as a lover of toil as Heracles. Because of his more dubious record, on the positive side Odysseus was less liable than Heracles to the accusation of having toiled uselessly. It is Heracles' labors, Seneca implies by his list, that lack the meaningfulness of Cato's.

Nonetheless, in spite of these differences of emphasis in the treatment of each hero's laboring, the Stoics put Odysseus and Heracles on the same plane as champions of effort. As Seneca succinctly says in the same passage, "The Stoic school, to which I belong, declared them [Odysseus and Heracles] wise men, unconquered by toils, despisers of pleasures, and victorious over every terror" (*Hos* [*Ulixem et Herculem*] *enim Stoici nostri sapientes pronuntiaverunt, invictos laboribus et contemptores voluptatis et victores omnium terrorum*).

THE EXILE SAILING HOME

Rather than a chastiser of humanity in the Cynic fashion, the Stoic Odysseus is an obedient citizen of the cosmos, willing to go wherever he is told. His steadfastness in bearing up with his enforced wanderings recommended him as the model exile, capable of enduring or even enjoying his condition. Odysseus in this role greatly appealed to Stoic philosophers in the first and second centuries AD—we find it in Musonius, Epictetus, Favorinus, Dio Chrysostom—who were all exiled, and to whom the persecuted wanderer of the *Odyssey* could offer support in their predicament. We are reminded of archaic Greek poets, who also drew "emotional help" from him. The closest parallel is Archilochus where he invokes Odysseus' endurance to face his own political misfortune, to stand fast before his enemy.[53] But there is an important difference: while Archilochus finds in Odysseus a model fighter, the Stoic exiles find in him a model follower of destiny. Their Odysseus does not summon his strength to oppose external circumstances, but to accept them.

The Stoic meditation on exile makes use of Odysseus in several ways. For Musonius, Odysseus embodies the truth that people can profit from exile: "Alone, naked, and shipwrecked" when he landed at Phaeacia, he "gathered enormous wealth" (9.63–65). This (un-Stoical) emphasis on wealth, which may echo ongoing debate over Odysseus' attachment to riches, is dropped by Favorinus (*De exilio* fr. 96.4), though otherwise his appeal to the Homeric hero as illustration for the principle "Virtue is schooled in misfortune" fits within the same frame of reference: Odysseus teaches the exile how to bear up with his condition and work it out to his advantage. Epictetus for his part chooses Odysseus to demonstrate the Stoic tenet that we are not meant to stay in one place but to be moved around (Arrian *Dissertations* 3.24.12–13), while Dio Chrysostom, more personally, calls on Odysseus' willingness to leave Ithaca again in order to encourage himself to embrace a life of wandering (*Or.* 13.9–11). Dio does not refer, as was more traditional, to Odysseus' disrupted journey from Troy, but to the

one Tiresias orders him to accomplish after his return, carrying an oar, until he finds people who do not know the sea—a long and uncertain journey, for where are such people from a Greek perspective? The goal of Dio's choice is to glamorize his own decision to wander the earth to its very edges by presenting it as fated, like Odysseus' last journey.[54]

To a Stoic, however, the idealization of Odysseus as a model exile could pose a major problem because Odysseus never denies that to return to Ithaca is his strongest wish, and that he is frustrated in it. How does such a longing for home square with the Stoic ideal of cosmopolitanism and more generally of indifference to externals? To be a wise man, Odysseus should be detached from fatherland and family.

At least Epictetus does not ignore the problem. The exile who time and again preaches that we must go wherever we are sent and ought not to prefer a place over another, condemns Odysseus' yearning for his wife in the same passage in which he lauds the hero's moving and looking around: "Yet Odysseus felt a longing for his wife and wept, sitting on a rock." Epictetus comments: we ought not to believe Homer, for if Odysseus wept he was not a good man. A good man knows that everything that comes into being is transient, and that "it is impossible for one human to live always with another" (Arrian *Dissertations* 3.24.18–21).

Epictetus' target is twofold: both Odysseus' tearfulness and his nostalgia (rather, the tearfulness and nostalgia of Homer's Odysseus: we note once again a dissociation between the idealized hero and his "unworthy" poet). Criticism of Odysseus' tearfulness is not new. A dramatic interpretation of it already displeased Aristotle, who found Odysseus' lament in the dithyramb *Scylla* (by Timotheus) "indecorous and inappropriate," presumably because it was excessive for a hero.[55] Cicero joins in. Dealing with stage renderings of Odysseus' death, he approves the hero's behavior in Pacuvius' *Niptra* more than in a tragedy by Sophocles on the same subject, because in the Roman play Odysseus wept moderately and finally collected himself and even rebuked his entourage for weeping.[56] Nonetheless, the context of Epictetus' passage (we should willingly embrace our destiny, which is not to stay always near our loved ones but to be moved around) indicates that it is not just Odysseus' weeping that bothers the philosopher but the reason for it. Longing for Penelope taints Odysseus' ability to make the best of his enforced wanderings.[57]

We do not know whether the Cynics tackled the problem of Odysseus' nostalgia. Though Diogenes is not attributed any discussion of it, the reason might be that the Cynics were not interested in abstract argument but in demonstrative ac-

tion. An implicit acknowledgment of the problem might underlie their preference for Heracles over Odysseus as the free, cosmopolitan hero. Heracles seems to have been the perfect cosmopolitan already for the early Cynics. Plutarch (*Mor.* 600F) cites two lines from tragedy (author unknown), imitated by the Cynic Crates, in which Heracles says: "Argos or Thebes, I do not boast of one native land: every tower in Greece is my fatherland."[58] Heracles competes with Antisthenes and Diogenes as the founder of the Cynic sect: the emperor Julian contends that there are good reasons to deny Diogenes and Antisthenes this role, and that "the best" Cynics single out Heracles instead for his exemplary life (9[6].187C).[59] The ascetic Sostratos (first century AD), who lived in solitude on Mount Parnassos, killing highwaymen and clearing roads, was even called Heracles.[60] According to Diogenes Laertius (6.71) his Cynic namesake lived in the same way as Heracles, "rating nothing higher than freedom"—a description that might reflect Diogenes' actual thought as expressed in his didactic drama *Heracles*.[61]

Could we imagine Diogenes saying that he lived like Odysseus—the wanderer nostalgic for home—because Odysseus, like himself, rated nothing higher than freedom? In spite of the interpretive license Cynic and Stoic philosophers applied to Odysseus' career, they apparently did not find a way of forcing him into representing the cosmopolitan wanderer in Heracles' style. "Diogenes" in *Ep.* 34, in which Odysseus is front stage for his inspirational rags, does not call on him as a model to celebrate his own freedom as a wanderer, when he says: "I go around, a free person, over the entire earth" (34.3). In Epictetus' view it is Heracles, not Odysseus, who embodies the ideal of freedom from attachments. Epictetus, to be sure, admires Odysseus for accepting and even enjoying his condition as he is forced to wander: we must move around, he says, "at times driven by some necessity, at times for the sake of the spectacle itself. And it is something of this kind that happened to Odysseus: 'he saw the cities of many men and came to learn their minds.'" But Heracles alone earns the philosopher's praise for leaving his dear ones behind to pursue a greater cause, the cause of justice: "and even before, it fell to Heracles to go around the entire inhabited world, 'seeing the haughty and the just behavior of men,' purifying the world by throwing out the one, and introducing the other. Yet, how many friends do you think he had in Thebes, how many in Athens, and how many did he acquire going around? He even married, when he saw fit, and begot children and then left them without groaning or longing for them as though he would leave them to be orphans, for he knew that no man is an orphan, but all men have always and continuously the father who cares about them" (Arrian *Dissertations* 3.24.13–16). Because he truly thought that Zeus was his father, "he could live happily every-

where"—a perfect cosmopolitan. As is suggested by the immediate sequel, which stigmatizes Odysseus' nostalgia, the claim that Odysseus could leave everything behind without regrets was untenable in Epictetus' eyes.

The problem of Odysseus' nostalgia, however, was not altogether insolvable for a Stoic. He could contend that Odysseus, as a citizen of the world but also of Ithaca, was asked to serve his smaller community as much as his larger one. This is Seneca's choice. Seneca reinterprets Odysseus' love for fatherland and family as the call of duty, which Stoically includes service to fatherland and family.[62] One should follow the exemplar of Odysseus and mind home and family while in the midst of storms, that is, never lose one's goal as a responsible member of society. The journey home is to be pursued against the allurements that threaten to drag us away "from fatherland, parents, friends, and virtues" (*Ep.* 123.12). Seneca also shares the common Roman feeling that one's homeland, no matter how insignificant, is one's dearest place, and cites Odysseus' love for Ithaca as illustration for this truth (*Ep.* 66.26). Of course, in Seneca the Roman citizen speaks along with the Stoic philosopher.[63] But even Epictetus, in spite of his lack of patriotic allegiances and his criticism of Odysseus' nostalgia, has him in mind as the model for the dutifully homeward-bound traveler, who stops along the way only temporarily, and better to pursue his journey (Arrian *Dissertations* 2.23.36–39).[64]

VIRTUES AND VICES OF (ODYSSEUS') INQUISITIVENESS

Another quality of Odysseus appeared problematic to some Stoics: his thirst for knowledge. Did Odysseus need to know all he did in order to be wise? This question touches on the uneasy relationship, as some Stoics saw it, between erudition or general culture, and wisdom. What kind of knowledge and how much of it is fitting to help the mind improve its disposition? Naturally the inquisitive Odysseus became a privileged target for those who deemed intellectual curiosity an obstacle to the journey to wisdom.

Odysseus' manifold knowledge did not bother authors with Stoic sympathies but whose agenda was other than teaching Stoic doctrine. Strabo, for instance, a geographer of Stoic leanings, approves of it. To demonstrate that Homer possesses φρόνησις he appeals to Odysseus: Homer's vast expertise in the arts of geography, generalship, agriculture, and rhetoric is proven by Odysseus' own competence in those areas. Strabo finds evidence specifically for Odysseus' knowledge of geography in Homer's presentation of him at *Od.* 1.3: "He saw the cities of many men and came to learn their minds" (1.2.4).

Likewise the allegorist Heraclitus, who also identifies Odysseus with Homer, praises both for their encyclopedic knowledge (*Hom. Probl.* 70.1–12). Heraclitus does not see any incompatibility between the vastness of Odysseus' knowledge and character-building. Odysseus is the instrument of Homer's wisdom both because he possesses virtue and fights vice (as shown by the "allegories" of the Lotus, the Cyclops, Circe, Scylla and Charybdis, and the Cattle of the Sun) and because he is conversant in astronomy (he ties the winds)[65] and in the mysteries of the Underworld. His knowledge of the latter is evidence for his φρόνησις, which "descends to Hades, so that nothing of what lies below remains unexplored" (70.8). The Sirens' song stands for "the varied history of all ages," and Odysseus is admired for listening to it (70.9).

Heraclitus' endorsement of Odysseus' all-embracing knowledge as a mark of wisdom is owing to the goal of his project: not to teach Stoicism (or any other philosophical creed), but to defend Homer's moral and philosophical credentials. In addition Heraclitus is not strictly a Stoic.[66] Among Stoic thinkers, Zeno's student Ariston of Chios, and over three centuries later Epictetus and Dio, all agree in criticizing Odysseus' encyclopedic knowledge. Dio polemically engages with "those who believe that the philosopher must be exceptional in everything under any circumstances" (71.1), as Hippias and Odysseus were (readers of Plato's *Lesser Hippias* might smile at the pairing, considering the pains Hippias takes in that dialogue to condemn Odysseus' πολυτροπία). Though Dio shows admiration for Odysseus' polymathy and skill even in many crafts, he also opposes these multiple talents to the competence of the philosopher, who knows when to act advantageously. Odysseus' erudition does not betoken φρόνησις (71.8).

Rather than contrasting manifold expertise and philosophy, Epictetus subordinates Odysseus' thirst for knowledge to the pursuit of wisdom. The philosopher compares the intellectual exercises that attract our mind with the beautiful inns we might find on our way home: just as the homeward-bound traveler is not supposed to linger in those inns but to resume his journey in order to fulfill his obligations in his country, the traveler to wisdom is called to make use of the enticing art of reasoning only as much as it helps him to continue the journey, and should not be captured (ἁλισκόμενοι) by that art and stay, "rotting as if among the Sirens" (Arrian *Dissertations* 2.23.36–41). The Sirens are not the disembodied call of philosophy that should take possession of us entirely, but the beautiful voice of dialectics, which we need but only as a prop to reach beyond it.[67] Odysseus (though not mentioned explicitly) turns out to be the paradigmatic pursuer of wisdom because he did not pass by the Sirens his ears plugged, but

both listened to their song and sailed forth: that is, he was able to apply the right dose of dialectics to his philosophical goal.

Odysseus' ability to subordinate his intellectual interests to the pursuit of wisdom recommended him as the exemplary philosopher to the twelfth-century bishop and scholar Eustathius, who read in Odysseus leaving Calypso the wise man leaving the study of astronomy and astrology for "regular and methodical philosophy," represented by Penelope (*Od.* 1.17.38–43). The tradition identifying Penelope with philosophy is old and well established: both the Cyrenaic Aristippus and the (prevalently) Cynic Bion compared the pursuers of useless knowledge to the suitors, who could not possess Penelope, but only the maidservants.[68] The Stoic Ariston made the same comparison (*SVF* 1.350). Ariston, Aristippus, Bion, and Eustathius all contrast Penelope-philosophy to less useful, or altogether useless, branches of study.[69]

For Eustathius, Penelope embodies philosophy because of her weaving, a current metaphor in Greek for thinking and speaking.[70] But another reason underlying the identification seems to be that Penelope is at the center of the house: the author of *The Education of Children* attributed to Plutarch mentions Bion's alleged comparison of Penelope with philosophy to illustrate that "it is fine to travel around many cities, but profitable to live in the best one" (*Mor.* 7D). One can read in this phrase an (admittedly vague) allusion to Odysseus, who "saw many cities of men" but dwelled, and wanted to dwell, only in one place, his Ithaca where Penelope was. Because Penelope is the goal of a centripetal journey, back home,[71] she was fitting to appeal as the symbol of philosophy to those who saw a tension between philosophy's moral focus and the distracting attraction of other kinds of studies.

In sum, both Epictetus and Eustathius deem Odysseus the model philosopher because he is not permanently diverted from the pursuit of wisdom by intellectual enticements, call them "Sirens" or "Calypso." Ariston in contrast is utterly unwilling to fit Odysseus' intellectual drive into his philosophical ideal. Of the Stoics the strongest opponent of general culture, Ariston apparently took Odysseus visiting the Underworld as an emblem for the unphilosophical pursuer of encyclopedic knowledge (*SVF* 1.349).[72] Those who neglect philosophy for it are like Odysseus in Hades, who saw almost all the dead but not their queen. The same thinker who implicitly compares the homecoming Odysseus to the philosopher going back to "Penelope" (*SVF* 1. 350 above) demotes the inquirer. While Epictetus has Odysseus in mind as the exemplary pursuer of wisdom, the focused traveler who reached the end of the journey in spite of, or even thanks to, his multiple stays in attractive inns, for Ariston Odysseus stopped short of

the final goal (he could not see the queen of the dead) because he was detained by his distracting and unfocused inquisitiveness.

Among Odysseus' adventures his visit to the Underworld was particularly apt to exemplify useless pursuits owing to his unrestrained eagerness there to interrogate ghost after ghost. Circe sends Odysseus to Hades only to consult Tiresias, but of course Odysseus, though self-possessed enough to let Tiresias speak first, takes full advantage of the opportunity to meet other shades and finds so much pleasure in those encounters that he would not leave were he not scared away (*Od.* 11.628–35). A critic of curiosity yet an admirer of Odysseus could still defend his behavior in Hades precisely by emphasizing his self-possession, by claiming that, far from acting like a busybody, Odysseus refuses to speak even to his mother's ghost until he learns about his homecoming from Tiresias. This is Plutarch's argument in the *De curiositate* (516A–B). If this essay owes much of its material to Ariston,[73] Plutarch disagrees with his source in that he rehabilitates Odysseus by putting forward his self-control. But in spite of his partiality to Odysseus, Plutarch cannot fully tailor him to his ideal. For Odysseus' curiosity finds its way through the narrative in spite of his admirer's attempt to "reign it in": Odysseus, to be sure, first listened to Tiresias; but then he did not hesitate to "make inquiries (ἀνέκρινε) of the other women, who was Tyro, who the beautiful Chloris, and why Epicaste died." The fast pace of this tricolon and the mention of each woman by name convey Odysseus' impatient curiosity. The writer is overtaken by it.[74]

As even Plutarch implicitly admits, Odysseus in the Underworld indeed betrays unfocused curiosity, as when he shifts his attention from Ajax to the prospect of meeting more spirits: "Then he might have spoken to me in spite of his wrath, or I to him, but my heart in my breast desired to see the ghosts of the other dead" (*Od.* 11.565–67). Odysseus seems carried on by a shallow excitement. The more encounters he makes the more satisfied he is. Toward the end of his visit his stubbornness in standing there waiting for more shades to come ("and I remained there steadfastly, in case some other hero might still come . . . And I would have seen other heroes of older times, Theseus and Pirithous, whom I was eager to see . . .") spells out his total absorption in this "futile" endeavor (futile as far as his homecoming is concerned). Homer does not say it, but we might ask: has Odysseus once again forgotten his return, as shortly beforehand with Circe? Is it not intriguing that he lingers on so eagerly in Hades, whither he was sent against his will, and just to find out about his return?

Odysseus' inquisitiveness in Hades could be read as betraying a lack of moderation. Homer suggests as much. Knowledge is always transgressive in the ety-

mological sense: it breaks boundaries, "goes beyond," and that beyond might be an illegitimate call for the human Odysseus, and one that clashes with his opposite aspiration to self-control. One modern critic has identified in Odysseus the archetype of the human condition precisely because he embodies these two opposite drives: thirst for knowledge and self-control.[75] This line of interpretation is detectable in at least one ancient reading that contrasts Odysseus' eagerness for knowledge, as displayed in his desire to hear the song of the Sirens, and his καρτερία: Odysseus "loved learning and was self-controlled (φιλομαθής . . . καὶ ἐγκρατής), so as not to want the lotus, but not to have the strength (οὐκ ἐκαρτέρησεν) to rest content without listening to the Sirens."[76] The image of Odysseus tied to the mast and yet unwilling to deprive himself of the song and unable to resist it visually combines those two conflicting forces. Dante's picture of Odysseus breaks the fragile equilibrium between them: Odysseus is not tied to any "mast," either literally or figuratively; he cannot be held back because he longs for knowledge, and infects his companions with it (*Inferno* 26.121–23). Their desire for knowledge is cast as the negation of self-restraint, both physically and in a moral sense, as staying put and as containing one's ardor: "Che a pena poscia li averei *tenuti*."[77]

The Homeric Odysseus shows self-control also in the domain of knowledge, as when he enjoins on Telemachus, who is keen to find out whether a god has kindled the light that suddenly filled the halls, "be quiet, restrain your thought and don't ask: this is the way of the gods who hold Olympus" (*Od.* 19.42–43). But at the same time, on at least two occasions Homer suggests that Odysseus' inquisitiveness should have been kept in check: in the episode of the Cyclops, where Odysseus gets in trouble because of his eagerness to "see the man himself" in spite of his companions' warning, and admits his mistake even before telling the story (*Od.* 9.228), and precisely toward the end of the *Nekyia,* where his desire to see more shades is cut short by the appearance of myriads of dead noisily thronging together, which makes him fear that Persephone might send up the head of the Gorgon (*Od.* 11.628–35).

To read Odysseus' inquisitiveness as a violation of boundaries, however, is not the Stoics' choice. This might be because the Stoics are not interested in promoting Odysseus for his awareness of his human limits. Their Odysseus does not practice moderation in the fuller, Delphic sense of "Know thyself," but only in the more limited one, as "self-restraint in the satisfaction of bodily appetites" (as when he resists the temptations of pleasure).[78] Accordingly, from what we can judge Stoic philosophers did not say: Odysseus should not (in various degrees) have indulged his inquisitiveness in order to stay within limits. They said: he

should not have done so because inquisitiveness is (in various degrees) useless, and risks diverting the searcher from his philosophical goal. Odysseus' thirst for knowledge jeopardizes his return "home," to "Penelope."

A common feature emerges from the Stoic sources debating the philosophical relevance of Odysseus' intellectual curiosity: wisdom is conceived as a metaphorical home. This is yet another reason a Stoic could appreciate Odysseus' firm resolve to go back to Ithaca—though not his nostalgia. While Odysseus' nostalgia appears condemnable both as an emotional condition and because it implies that he has known a better life and longs for it, his rational determination to accomplish his journey recommends him as a model to the philosophical traveler. As we have seen, Epictetus has Odysseus in mind as the exemplary sailor who aims for home in both a literal and a metaphorical sense (Arrian *Dissertations* 2.23.38–41). And Seneca, for whom happiness is to have reached one's "home" and stay there,[79] praises Odysseus for his focus on Ithaca in contrast to those scholars who engage in erudite discussions about Homer, and in particular about Odysseus. Odysseus serves Seneca well as both a model of philosophical single-mindedness and an emblem around which to gather *our* distracting attraction to morally irrelevant knowledge.

In his letter on the liberal arts (*Ep.* 88), Seneca refers to Odysseus twice as a favorite object of futile inquiries. We shall not profit from investigating whether Homer or Hesiod comes first, whether Helen is older than Hecuba, Patroclus than Achilles, or where Odysseus wandered. Rather than trying to locate Odysseus' wanderings we should stop our own souls from wandering: "We have no time to hear lectures on whether Odysseus was tossed about between Italy and Sicily or beyond the known world (for so long a wandering could not have taken place in such a limited space); we ourselves are tossed about by storms every day, and our badness thrusts us into all the ills Odysseus encountered" (section 7).

The origin of this exhortation might be Cynic: it is also attributed to Diogenes and fits well within the Cynic rejection of culture at large.[80] But it certainly speaks to Seneca's contemporaries, for inquiries of the kind Seneca condemns had become quite fashionable. We might recall Tiberius' habit to prove his knowledge of the *artes liberales* (the same Seneca criticizes) by testing the teachers of literature with such questions as these: Who was Hecuba's mother? What was Achilles' name when he hid among girls? What did the Sirens use to sing? (Svet. *Tib.* 70.3) Or we shall think of Strabo's polemic against Eratosthenes over the location and geographical reality of Odysseus' wanderings,[81] in the footsteps of Polybius (Strabo 1.2.15) and possibly Posidonius (Strabo 3.4.3).[82] To such exer-

cises Seneca objects that Odysseus should not be treated "philologically" but "philosophically," as a guide to follow in our pursuit of happiness. In other words, we should exploit him to gain centripetal focus, not to satisfy a centerless curiosity.

Seneca's condemnation of erudite discussions about Homer is prefaced by his criticism of the philosophical abuses to which Odysseus was subjected. Scholars who want to prove that Homer was a philosopher "sometimes make him into a Stoic, who approves only virtue and avoids pleasures, and would not shrink from honor even at the price of immortality; sometimes an Epicurean, praising the condition of a state at peace where life is spent in feasting and song; sometimes a Peripatetic, classifying three kinds of goods; sometimes an Academic, saying that all things are uncertain" (section 5).

Though Seneca speaks of Homer, he means Odysseus as the mouthpiece for Homer.[83] It is Odysseus who could be held to pursue virtue and honor at the price of immortality, when he leaves Calypso; to advocate a life of pleasures, as in his eulogy of feasting in *Odyssey* 9; to expound on the uncertainty of human things and on the mutability of our minds, as when he ponders over man's exposure to reversals of fortune (though some imagination is required to read in those meditations evidence for a Skeptic "abstention from judgment!").[84] The merging of "wise" Homer with Odysseus bears witness to the latter's strengthening reputation as a philosophical hero, while the absence of any reference to the Cynics, in spite of their partiality to Odysseus, suggests their marginality in such scholarly debates or even their exclusion from the respectable philosophical scene altogether.[85]

Seneca, then, criticizes philosophers for trying to substantiate their doctrines by claiming Homer/Odysseus as their founder.[86] His aim, however, is not to deny that Homer/Odysseus was wise but that learning about those philosophical interpretations makes *us* wise. Those who teach them do something similar to what I am doing in this study (though I have no intention of proving that Homer was a philosopher!), which Seneca would stigmatize as useless or even detrimental to the soul's health. Instead of analyzing how philosophers have appreciated Odysseus, I should analyze my own faults and appeal to Odysseus' wisdom for help; instead of writing a page in the history of ideas, I should be a philosopher in the ancient, nonacademic sense of the term: as a person training herself to live the good life. Seneca indeed proceeds to contrast the erudite approach and the philosophical one: "let us then learn the things that made Homer wise" (*ergo illa discamus quae Homerum fecere sapientem*). Significantly it is only the *Odyssey*—and especially Odysseus—that provides Seneca with ma-

terial to illustrate "the things that made Homer wise," what we should learn. Those are, "how to love fatherland, wife, father, how to navigate to those honorable things even in the midst of storms" (section 7). Likewise, instead of asking whether Penelope was chaste or whether she recognized Odysseus before he revealed himself to her, we should learn what chastity is and how good, whether it is in the body or in the soul.

Seneca, however, seems to fail to notice that he himself is not above his own criticism of other teachers, and on two levels. First, he does not entirely resist the pleasure of erudite discussions over Odysseus. Even as he argues that we should not ask where Odysseus wandered, he cannot help giving his own view on the matter in a telling parenthetical aside: "We have no time to hear lectures on whether Odysseus was tossed about between Italy and Sicily or beyond the known world (*for so long a wandering could not have taken place in such a limited space*)." Seneca's own erudite interests carry him off the straight road he is prescribing for us.

Second, when he exhorts us to learn the things that made Homer wise, Seneca invokes the poet's authority like the teachers he censures. Contrary to them, to be sure, he does not "make Homer into a Stoic" in the sense of intimating that his poetry is a cryptic allegory for Stoic doctrine. Seneca does not trace back Stoic philosophy to Homer in order to give it greater weight. But he does call on Homeric epic to illustrate (if not to sanction) his Stoic views. Here as elsewhere the moral teaching he extrapolates from Odysseus' adventures fits within his Stoic allegiance: a Cynic, for one, would not regard Odysseus' love for fatherland and family as an "honorable thing"; he does not learn this lesson in wisdom from Homer's hero, but the wisdom of wearing rags and begging. Unlike the scholars who discuss the philosophical exploitations of Odysseus to prove that Homer was a philosopher, Seneca does teach virtue (cf. section 4). Yet he makes use of Homer's Odysseus to explain his own conception of it. His own relying on Odysseus, along with his criticism of others who do so, again points to the philosophical popularity achieved by the Homeric hero. Without heeding Seneca's warning against the futility of such exercises, we shall now turn to the Epicurean interpretation, the last important contribution to the philosophical "mistreatments" of Odysseus denounced by Seneca.

CHAPTER 4

King, Friend, and Flatterer: Odysseus in Epicureanism and Beyond

For, I say, no attainment is more delightful
Than when joy possesses all the people
And banqueters in the halls listen to a bard,
Seated in order, and the tables beside them are laden,
With bread and meats, and the wine-bearer, drawing wine from the mixing bowl,
Brings it around and pours it into the cups
(*Od.* 9.5–10)

THE EPICUREAN ODYSSEUS: AN EPICURE?

Is, then, Seneca correct to say that the Epicureans applauded Odysseus for "praising the condition of a state at peace where life is spent in feasting and song?" Other sources maintain that they unfairly exploited Odysseus' eulogy of feasting in *Odyssey* 9 to uphold their theory of the supremacy of pleasure. For instance, the allegorist Heraclitus (*Hom. Probl.* 79.2–3) argues that Epicurus stole (κέκλοφεν) those lines to bear out his shameful doctrine: "What Odysseus said falsely, unwisely, and hypocritically at the court of Alcinous, Epicurus pronounces as the goal (τέλη) of life, and claims to be speaking the truth" (the quotation follows). Athenaeus joins in: by celebrating feasting, Odysseus "seems to have been the first in showing Epicurus his much-spoken-of pleasure" (12.513a). The scholia on the passage provide additional evidence: "they [the Epicureans?] charge Odysseus with love for pleasure (φιληδονίαν), claiming that he makes enjoyment (ἀπόλαυσιν) the end of life."

This alleged Epicurean "theft" of Odysseus' praise of feasting did not escape Lucian's wit. One Simon, the advocate of the parasitic profession in Lucian's essay on the subject, claims Odysseus "back" from the philosophers who have mistreated him, including the Epicureans. Against them Simon appeals to

Odysseus' celebration of feasting to prove the point that "happiness and the parasitic art have the same end" (*The Parasite* 10).

The association of Odysseus with the figure of the parasite was traditional. Instances of parasites modeled after Odysseus are numerous, possibly starting with the buffoon Philip in Xenophon's *Symposium* (1.16), who parodies Odysseus' reprimand to his heart in *Odyssey* 20; on to a parasite of Ptolemy the Third, one Callicrates, so proud of his intelligence that he wore a ring with a picture of Odysseus and named his children after Odysseus' family members (Athenaeus 6.251d–e); to Peniculus in Plautus' *Menaechmi,* nicknamed "meus Ulixes" (902); to one of Alciphron's parasites, who contrives "an Odyssean plan" (3.40.2).[1]

Odysseus encouraged this unflattering association in the first place because of his eloquence, inventiveness, and adaptability. The example of Callicrates is particularly amusing in this respect: his choice of Odysseus as patron might have aimed to please his own patron, since Ptolemy the Third apparently was an admirer of the Homeric hero.[2] By appealing to Odysseus' intelligence to dress up his own, this parasite proves indeed to possess Odysseus-like intelligence, for he publicly endorses his patron's liking for the Homeric character.

Second, Odysseus became the prototypical parasite because of his alleged love for food and drink. This weakness imputed to him had long inspired comic treatments.[3] For instance, the playwrights Epicharmus and Theopompus wrote *Sirens,* in both of which Odysseus was tempted not by song but by the promise of gourmet food.[4] In Epicharmus' play the Sirens whetted Odysseus' appetite by detailing all the dainties they were preparing. But Odysseus could not reach to them: tied as he was to the mast, he suffered the torture of Tantalus. In Theopompus' comedy the Sirens seem to have lured Odysseus and his crew to come to a banquet and eat Sicilian tuna. Odysseus, however, this time resisted the temptation and held his companions back. Another comic playwright, Cratinus, went so far in his irreverence as to interpret Odysseus' wretched wanderings as a "gastronomic tour," and one in which Odysseus behaved more like a gourmand than a gourmet.[5] He and his men traveled the world in search for every kind of delicacy, and paid dearly for their gluttony when they fell in with the Cyclops. E. D. Phillips comments: "the comedy had a moral of a sort: that gluttony led Odysseus and his men into a situation where they found that they themselves were the banquet."[6]

Evidence for Odysseus' appetite could be detected in several Homeric passages in which he admits to the tyranny of the belly.[7] The most extensive is *Od.* 7.215–21: "But allow me to eat despite my grief, for nothing is more shameful than one's hateful belly, which urges a man to think of it even if he is much dis-

tressed and grieved at heart, as I too am grieving at heart, yet my belly always urges me to eat and drink, and makes me forget all I have suffered, and commands to be filled." Odysseus calls on his demanding belly right before wrestling with Iros: "But my belly goads me on, that evildoer, that I may be prostrated by his blows" (*Od.* 18.53–54). These lines perfectly fit the parasitic ethos: to endure beatings in order to provide entertainment and to be fed as a reward for it.[8]

When we hear parasites complain about the needs of their stomachs, we are indeed reminded of Odysseus.[9] For instance, this pronouncement by a comic parasite, "nothing is more wretched than one's belly,"[10] recalls Odysseus' statement, "nothing is more shameless than one's hateful belly" (*Od.* 7.216). Artotrogus, the parasite in Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus,* confesses to his audience: "the belly causes all these sufferings" (*venter creat omnis hasce aerumnas,* 33), echoing Odysseus' description of his belly as an "evildoer" (*Od.* 18.54) and turning his phrase "the belly makes me forget all I have suffered" (*Od.* 7.220–21) upside down. Another parasite builds on Odysseus' complaint: "The evils that we are compelled to suffer by this gluttonous and all-devouring belly of ours!" (Alciphron 3.3.3). A caricature of Homer's hero, he claims that his "disgusting" belly is not content with being filled but asks for delicacies (εἰς τρυφήν), and instead of enduring blows and humiliations for hunger's sake, as Odysseus does, he cannot bear bad treatment and (mockingly) plans to kill himself.

Though Odysseus the Parasite was a familiar image, Lucian is, however, original in grounding his parody not on Odysseus' proverbial hunger but on his eulogy of feasting. To the best of my knowledge no other source associating Odysseus with a parasite calls on Odysseus' praise of εὐφροσύνη in *Odyssey* 9. When Athenaeus refers to it, he does so in the context of a discussion not on parasites but on whether Homer endorses the pleasurable life: "Homer, also, says that feasting and merry-making (τὴν εὐφροσύνην καὶ τὸ εὐφραίνεσθαι) are a more lovely end (τέλος) 'when banqueters listen to a bard, and the tables beside them are laden'" (12.512d).

Lucian's choice of episode is likely to be related to the philosophical controversy it generated. Philosophers were uneasy with Odysseus' eulogy of merry-making in *Odyssey* 9.[11] Odysseus' more basic recognition of the needs of the belly was not so troublesome to them, probably because after all Odysseus admitted that the belly is a "wretched thing." It is true that the Skeptic Timon (320–230 BC) appealed to *Od.* 7.216 ("nothing is more shameful than one's hateful belly") to mock Epicurus, but to do so he had to change στυγερός (hateful), referred to the belly in that line, into λαμυρός (gluttonous): "Timon, writing about Epicurus, does not call the belly hateful, in Homer's fashion, but gluttonous: 'pleasing

one's belly, than which nothing is more gluttonous.'"[12] Odysseus' pronouncements on hunger's tyranny are no celebrations of the *dolce vita*.[13] In contrast, his praise of feasting made him liable to imputations of hedonism. Athenaeus and Heraclitus bear witness to ongoing discussion about that episode: did Odysseus really mean to praise feasting? If so, in what sense? Or was he trying to flatter the feast-loving Phaeacians?

Plato and Aristotle had already expressed their opinion.[14] Heraclitus has his own: Odysseus did not mean what he said but spoke "unwisely and hypocritically" (*Hom. Probl.* 79.3). It should, however, be noted that Heraclitus, eager as he is to defend everything Homeric from charges of immorality, justifies Odysseus' "unwise hypocrisy" by invoking the dire circumstances that forced him to please his hosts. The Odysseus who spoke so falsely is not the hero who triumphed over many great foes but the shipwrecked victim of Poseidon, who needed help and sustenance. Heraclitus' target in this passage is Epicurus, not Odysseus.

Maximus of Tyre also contributes to the debate, but he dithers. In one of his orations he does not seem to be troubled at all by Odysseus' praise of feasting, which he interprets as expedient speech: if Odysseus' hosts had enjoyed greater goods than feasting and happy marriages, "he would have found the right thing (τὰ εἰκότα) to say about them too" (40.1.e–h). But elsewhere (22) Maximus cannot swallow the charge of crass hedonism brought against Odysseus on the basis of that eulogy, and comes to his rescue by proposing, in line with Aristotle (*Politics* 1338a28–32), a nobler meaning to the entertainment in question: Odysseus is extolling not eating or drinking, but only listening to music. And not to melodies, but to words. What kind of words? Not the contentious ones of the law courts. History accounts? History is a pleasure, but has no cure against misfortune. Philosophy is the "song" to which Odysseus' banqueters are listening, as we all should.[15] While Maximus' approval of Odysseus' words in *Or.* 40 matches his admiration for Odysseus' versatility,[16] his indignation vis-à-vis a literal reading of them in *Or.* 22 fits within his Platonizing-Stoicizing spiritualization of the Homeric character.

Since Odysseus' praise of feasting was in the spotlight of philosophical discussions, Lucian's choice of it to uphold the parasitic lifestyle might be owing to the main purpose of his essay, which is to make that lifestyle compete with philosophy. The issue at stake is to prove that to live as a parasite is an art, a τέχνη, especially against the claims of philosophy.[17] When Simon appeals to Odysseus' celebration of εὐφροσύνη, he has just "demonstrated" that the parasitic lifestyle is an art indeed, and according to the Stoic definition (4). As philosophers dis-

puted over the "end" of life, so does Simon propose that the end, τέλος, of the parasitic life is pleasure (9), and bases his claim on a pronouncement, Odysseus' praise of feasting, with which philosophers were particularly concerned.

Lucian aims to ridicule philosophers of any orientation. The very absurdity of the subject matter is sufficient parody of both Homer and those authors who derived a moral lesson from him.[18] The passage as a whole singles out the Stoic interpretation of Odysseus along with the Epicurean one: had Odysseus approved the Stoic τέλος, he would have done so when faced with hardships; had he endorsed Epicureanism, he would have called his life with Calypso the most desirable. But he did neither: he praised the life of the parasite, in his time called "banqueter" (10). Simon objects to the kind of philosophical abuses of Odysseus that we know from Seneca—but of course, only to abuse him even more.

Nonetheless, the Epicureans are the main targets of Lucian's mockery. They have no rights, his spokesman claims, to appropriate Odysseus' celebration of feasting. Lucian poses as if he agreed with the adversaries of Epicurus. Perhaps echoing Heraclitus, who protests that Epicurus "has shamelessly stolen" (κέκλοφεν αἰσχρῶς) those lines, Lucian (11) argues that Epicurus has made his own a τέλος that he has "shamelessly stolen" (ἀναισχύντως ὑφελόμενος), and concludes: "The thing is theft" (κλοπή). As Nesselrath aptly puts it, Lucian "beats Epicurus on his own terrain."[19]

Can we then infer from this wealth of evidence that Odysseus' praise of merrymaking was exploited by the Epicureans to prove the supremacy of pleasure? The sources, except for Seneca, are all polemical against Epicureanism, whether in earnest or in jest. Nor is there any solid indication that the Epicureans were keen on Odysseus' eulogy of feasting, and especially that they interpreted it as those polemical sources claim. Epicurus might have quoted that passage, but we do not know to what effect: to expound our natural inclination toward pleasure? To contrast the pleasures extolled by Odysseus and the true Epicurean pleasure? The latter is possible, for the kind of pleasure Epicurus deems the end of life is a permanent repose of the mind ("katastematic" pleasure), not the enjoyment derived from pleasurable activities ("kinematic" pleasure).[20] At the same time, however, the pursuit of that higher end does not entail a dismissal of those inferior kinds of pleasures. If, as it seems, Epicurus classified εὐφροσύνη among the kinematic pleasures, probably he did use Odysseus' praise of it to illustrate our natural inclination toward pleasure.[21]

Whatever the case, we can be fairly certain that the Epicureans did not admire in Odysseus the food lover. In the extant evidence the only Epicurean au-

thor who deals with Odysseus is Philodemus, the Syrian philosopher, poet, and scholar active in Herculaneum in the first century BC. And Philodemus, far from banqueting with Odysseus, mocks him for his bottomless belly.[22]

Philodemus vividly imagines Odysseus' appetite to lay hands even on the tables of the dead: "the things on the table and on Aeolus' couch . . . he was a parasite (παρεσίτει). At Alcinous, after filling his belly at lunch, he thought it right to take a full pouch (πήραν) with him. When he went down to Hades he took the bloody tables of the dead, thinking that they also were parasites" (*On Flattery* PHerc. 223, fr. 3).[23]

Surely this portrait does not recommend Odysseus as a model Epicurean. If you allow me an anachronism, Philodemus seems to agree with Lucian's champion of parasitic that Odysseus' love for food and drink qualifies him as an adept in that art, not in Epicurean wisdom. By dissociating his Epicurean value-system from Odysseus' parasitic hunger, Philodemus strongly suggests that Odysseus' supposed hedonism was targeted by opponents of Epicureanism as evidence for the "shamefulness" of that doctrine, rather than being exploited by the Epicureans themselves to defend it.

THE PEACE-LOVING RULER

Philodemus' overall portrait of Odysseus shows no endorsement of his alleged fondness for food and drink. In *On the Good King according to Homer,* an essay on the ideal monarch based on Homeric exemplars, Odysseus is praised for his god-fearing respect of justice, for hating strife and promoting peace. As Elisabeth Asmis notes, "The need for conciliation and gentleness is the main theme of Philodemus's treatise, and Homer's recognition of this need is illustrated throughout the . . . discussion."[24] Odysseus embodies Philodemus' ideal for being "gentle like a father," as Telemachus describes him (*Od.* 2.47, at col. 24). Under his rule Ithaca thrived: "Whoever, god-fearing, . . . upholds just decisions, . . . because of this, 'the earth bears' for him in abundance 'wheat and barley, and the trees are heavy with fruit, and the flocks give birth continuously, and the sea provides fish because of good leadership and the people prosper under him'" (*On the Good King* col. 4).[25]

Philodemus is citing *Odyssey* 19.109 and 111–14. Odysseus pronounces those lines in praise of Penelope, whose fame "that reaches the sky" he equates to that of a just king: he himself. Odysseus' thoughts wander off to the memory of happier days and cause him to project his image of his past self onto his wife. His drifting mind and the vividness of the picture it creates betray his longing for the

position he once held and his grief over Ithaca's present disarray. On Philodemus' reading Odysseus' peaceful rule compares him to Alcinous, another peace-loving king: "he [Homer] said . . . also among the Phaeacians . . . the trees stood alongside bearing fruit throughout the year. And among the Ithacans . . . he thinks that for the person who is king with decency and 'justice, the earth bears wheat and barley, and the trees are heavy with fruit' (*Od.* 19.111–12)" (col. 30).

The description of the Phaeacians in *On the Good King* provides additional evidence against those ancient authors who maintained that the Epicureans promoted the image of a "sybaritic" Odysseus. For Philodemus blames the Phaeacians precisely because of their excessive hedonism: he calls them "luxurious," τρυφεροβίοις (col. 19), no doubt a disparaging epithet, and one that marks his rejection of the Phaeacians as archetypal Epicureans.[26] Far from endorsing their indulgent lifestyle, Philodemus redeems them by attributing to them a rigorous physical training, which alone can secure peace (col. 31). This emphasis by an Epicurean on the Phaeacians' care for peace and on Odysseus' equally peaceful rule urges us to take seriously Seneca's claim that the Epicureans, if they at all cited Odysseus' eulogy of feasting, in it "praised the condition of a state at peace."

Odysseus' rightful and peaceful rule recommends him as the model king over any other Homeric hero.[27] He is the most often cited character in *On the Good King* and, at least in the extant fragments, mentions about him are always appreciative. He is Philodemus' "principal example of what are at least once called the ἀρετηφόροι, 'virtue-bearers,' among Homer's characters."[28] Philodemus' preference for Odysseus is in keeping with the context in which the essay was published: the late Republican Rome, plagued by the Civil Wars. Though the precise date of the essay is debated, the two most likely possibilities are 59 BC, when Calpurnius Piso, the dedicatee, was elected consul, or the seventies, at the beginning of Philodemus' friendship with him.[29] It is worth asking why Philodemus would write an essay on the good monarch to honor his influential aristocratic friend, for whom, as for most of his equals, the very term *rex* must have been almost taboo, if used in the political sense. While the choice of regime might be related to Philodemus' Epicurean affiliation,[30] he still had to make it appealing to a member of the Roman establishment, no matter how keen on Epicureanism. As it seems, Philodemus did so by avoiding any reference to a specific political contingency and by drawing his examples from the Homeric world, whose multiple rulers could be proposed as models to a Roman aristocrat less offensively than a single monarch.[31] Of all the Homeric heroes Odysseus was the most suitable to embody the ideal ruler in this context because he was not the king of kings but a *primus inter pares,* as it were, and the most effective and cooperative of all his peers.

Perhaps it is not by chance that Agamemnon, the king of kings, is no more than a neutral figure in the essay. In the heyday of Imperial Rome, Dio Chrysostom chooses precisely Agamemnon to represent the ideal king (in *Orations* 56, composed in the early years of Trajan's reign).[32] Philodemus instead opts for the less "regal" Odysseus, whom—significantly—he praises above all for his restraint vis-à-vis his fellow men and the gods. We shall see more of this shortly. But now I would like to discuss briefly some implications of Philodemus' choice for his contemporaries' appreciation of Odysseus.

The image of Odysseus drawn by Philodemus might have influenced his younger acquaintance Virgil. Virgil's picture of Odysseus in the *Aeneid* is less negative than is sometimes assumed. Odysseus, to be sure, is an unredeemable criminal in book 2; yet, as readers have long seen, he also shares with Aeneas cardinal virtues—endurance, courage, eloquence, and even piety—and his destiny as a suffering wanderer: he is *infelix Ulixes.*[33] Even the condemnation of him in book 2 has perhaps been overstated, for, as Karl Galinsky has pointed out, Virgil distances himself from that damning picture. Let me quote Galinsky: "When the vilification of Odysseus occurs, Virgil dissociates himself from it by two removes by having Aeneas retell the story which Sinon told the Trojans, and truth is not Sinon's objective."[34] Virgil's procedure, which, to quote again Galinsky, "is contrary to [his] empathetic and editorializing narrative style," conveys the Trojans' past enmity to Odysseus rather than Virgil's present one.

To these arguments in favor of a more balanced assessment of Virgil's Odysseus, I would add that Odysseus seems to have appealed to Virgil for his effectiveness and benevolence as a leader and, in this capacity, to have inspired him with the picture of the good *princeps,* able to put an end to political upheavals by his very presence and his compelling eloquence. In *Aeneid* 1.148–56, Neptune stopping the storm that has hit Aeneas is implicitly assimilated to Odysseus as he puts order in the army in *Iliad* 2. The simile of a storm to describe an unruly mob was commonplace, but, as has been noted,[35] Virgil's handling of it is original in that he operates a sophisticated inversion: whereas in Homer (and in topical uses of the simile), it is the mob that is compared to a storm (*Il.* 2.144–49), Virgil, reversing the terms, compares the storm to a mob (148–50). The inversion "politicizes" the storm, so to speak. Neptune withdraws to the backstage and leaves the floor to the *vir pietate gravis,* who steps forward to quiet the seditious waters. Virgil highlights the association of this leader with Odysseus by elaborating on the silence motif, present in *Iliad* 2, where Odysseus' speech is welcomed by general silence according to Athena's orders ("in the semblance of a herald she enjoins silence on the people," 280). Virgil endows his leader with

even greater authority by converting that silence into a spontaneous move caused by his sheer appearance, even before he speaks (151–52).

Virgil's Odysseus-like leader knows how to impose the law of reason on the mob (cf. *Ille regit dictis animos* at 153). His picture chimes with a tradition in Homeric exegesis that saw Odysseus arraying the host in *Iliad* 2 as the *rector* of unruly forces. One scholar has indeed suggested a parallel with a passage from the *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* in which Odysseus, based on the episode in *Iliad* 2, is lauded for "putting an end to the disorder and uproar of the multitude" and "persuading everyone with his sensible words" (166).[36]

In addition to drawing from a common stock, however, it is quite likely that Virgil was inspired specifically by Philodemus' reading of that episode.[37] On two occasions Philodemus claims that the good king will be able to create order in the army as Odysseus did then: "And he [Homer] teaches through Odysseus, in the test brought about by Agamemnon, that it is necessary to put down the threats and disorderliness of the multitude" (col. 25). And again: "in the multitude those who strike a false note in the testing are reproached by Odysseus" (col. 26). Philodemus joins the admirers of Odysseus' firmness in that episode and perhaps exploits his behavior to recommend double standards: force to restrain the mass of the army, reproaches alone to quiet the leaders.[38] This characterization of Odysseus as an effective suppressor of strife could only appeal to the poet of the *Pax Romana*—and, I will now add, apparently it appealed also to his Imperial addressee.

To Augustus the very comparison of Neptune with an Odysseus-like ruler might have suggested civic reconciliation, for Neptune, whom Virgil subtly merges with the best-known victim of his hatred, was associated with the Pompeians.[39] Instead of persecuting Odysseus, Virgil's Neptune will even borrow Odysseus' talents to still the waters. Furthermore this leader who reconciles opposite camps in his own person could be Augustus himself.

Who lies behind the picture of the *vir pietate gravis* is debated. Aeneas, the *vir* and the *pius* par excellence? Menenius Agrippa? Rome herself? These hypotheses have all been advanced. Then, why not Augustus? Perhaps it is best not to search for a specific reference, especially to a contemporary public figure, and instead to read in the *vir* the projection of an ideal.[40] In any case, however, there can be no doubt that Augustus identified with the ideal.

If Augustus saw in the leader of *Aeneid* 1 a model, then we must conclude that he was not so hostile to Odysseus as has sometimes been claimed.[41] For apparently it was possible, or even desirable, for the singer of the *Pax Augusta* to associate its author with the eloquent hero of *Iliad* 2 as read by Philodemus.

MODERATION AND BOASTING

In *On the Good King* Odysseus' paternal gentleness and love for peace are facets of his wide-ranging moderation. Odysseus is aware of his human limits and acts accordingly: "he very much behaved like a human being when he fared well. He did not think immortal thoughts or challenge the gods" (col. 36). Whereas Hector hubristically defies the gods (*Il.* 9.237–39), Odysseus would not even claim that he is better than the heroes of yore, who, for their part, also vied with the gods, in the case of Eurytus to his own destruction (*Od.* 8.223–224, at col. 35). Though Odysseus displays haughtiness in the Cyclops episode, he redeems himself at the end of the slaughter by warning Eurycleia, "it is not pious for you to boast over men who have perished" (*Od.* 22.412, col. 36). Philodemus apparently faulted Odysseus for indulging the pleasure of vengeance when he boastfully disclosed his name to the Cyclops and told him that Poseidon would not heal him.[42] But, claimed the philosopher, Homer corrected Odysseus' overweening behavior and vindictiveness by showing him grown out of his fault, just as he corrected Achilles' anger (cols. 42–43) and excessive grief over Patroclus—the latter through Odysseus' "proverbial" appeal to moderation in mourning (*Il.* 19.228–31, at col. 13).[43]

Odysseus' moderation, however, does not entail indifference to recognition. In Philodemus' conception the good king will even praise himself, provided he does not lose sight of his own limits as an individual and a human. Odysseus illustrates this appropriate way of boasting: if he vaunts his superiority in archery to all men in his time, he does so in full awareness of his weakness compared to the heroes of the previous generation (and even among his contemporaries he makes an exception for Philoctetes [*Od.* 8.219]).[44] Whereas Hector competes with the gods, Odysseus recognizes that the heroes of yore are closer to the gods than he, and from their destruction he once more learns his place in the cosmos. His boasting is respectful of his position in the order of things.

Contributing his opinion to an ongoing debate, Philodemus argues that Odysseus' proud self-disclosure to the Phaeacians, "I am Odysseus, the son of Laertes, who am known to all men by my tricks, and my fame reaches to heaven" (*Od.* 9.19–20), is no bragging (col. 39). Discussion of Odysseus' self-disclosure is detectable in a scholion (on *Il.* 10.249) contrasting Odysseus' behavior in *Od.* 9.19–20 and in the passage from *Iliad* 10 in which he warns Diomedes not to praise him excessively. While admiring Odysseus' self-restraint in the latter passage as illustration for the Delphic μηδὲν ἄγαν, the gloss also justifies his immodest self-disclosure because it allows the Phaeacians to realize who he is.

Philodemus' reasoning seems to have followed along similar lines. He has just observed (col. 38) that Odysseus was stripped of his marks of superiority when he landed on Phaeacia. His self-praise aims to restore them: to reveal him to the ignorant, refresh people's memory, and blind the ungrateful.[45]

Plutarch agrees with Philodemus in appreciating Odysseus' boasting. In his essay *On Praising Oneself Inoffensively* he maintains that a public figure is justified in underscoring his achievements if it is for a good cause (539E), for instance, to boost the mood of his fellows. Thus Odysseus did well, when his companions were dismayed at the roaring of Charybdis, to remind them of the "excellence and wit" with which he saved them from the Cyclops (*Od.* 12.209–12). This kind of self-praise belongs to "a man who offers his virtue and knowledge to his friends as security to lift their spirits. For at critical moments an important element for success is the respect and confidence placed in a man who has the experience and abilities of a leader" (545C–D). Plutarch also considers Odysseus a model of tactful self-blame, as when he admits to his uncontainable curiosity in the episodes of the Sirens (citing *Od.* 12.192–93: "my heart wanted to listen, and I bade my mates unbind me") and of the Cyclops (citing *Od.* 9.228–29: "I did not listen—which would have been much better") (544A–B). This detail does not seem to be shared by Philodemus' hero. Nonetheless, both Philodemus and Plutarch find Odysseus' self-praise appropriate because it aims to increase his prestige for a good purpose.

In that it endows a king with authority, boasting equals a sumptuous dress. A king, Philodemus argues, can benefit from an imposing outfit to strike terror on the enemy. Homer was right to beautify his heroes "with swords, adornment, and complete battle gear, so as to give them a comeliness that produces consternation" (col. 38). Philodemus would disagree with the Cynics over the kingliness of the beggar-like Odysseus. The outside matters.[46] Odysseus' undignified nakedness is contrasted with Agamemnon's impressive appearance (as described in *Il.* 2.482–83) and Achilles' radiant beauty. Proudly by announcing his name the naked hero dresses up: his self-disclosure is the counterpart to Achilles' and Agamemnon's striking looks.

Odysseus' boasts, however, are more imposing than any dress. This is because they not only are appropriate and effective, but also concern intellectual, rather than physical, talents. Though in one instance Odysseus takes pride in his skills as archer, in all the others the object of his self-praise is his mind. The list of claims in the passage that immediately follows Philodemus' discussion of dress and appearance is particularly telling (col. 39): whereas Agamemnon and Achilles display impressive looks, Odysseus vaunts a superior intelligence, of

which he both boasts himself (in his self-disclosure to Alcinous as well as in his words to Achilles, the better fighter: "I can far surpass you in intellect" [*Il.* 19.218–19]) and wants to hear a poetic celebration (when he asks Demodocus to sing of the Wooden Horse, "the trick that divine Odysseus once brought to the acropolis" [*Od.* 8.494]).[47]

Philodemus' admiration for Odysseus' intelligence pervades the essay:[48] together with Nestor, Odysseus is "the wisest of the Greeks" (φρονιμώτατοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων, at col. 29), "a man having wisdom like the gods" (*Od.* 13.89, at col. 32), the one Diomedes chose as his companion because of his mind: "For he [Diomedes] says that if Odysseus, not Ajax, 'came along, we would both return even out of blazing fire, since he is very wise'" (*Il.* 10.246–47, at col. 32). This preference for mental qualities over physical ones even on the battlefield resonates with the Socratic tradition, especially with Antisthenes, who reconfigured the very notion of ἀρετή based on Odysseus' intelligence against Ajax's brutish force. Since Homer does not say that Diomedes chose Odysseus specifically over Ajax, the added emphasis might indicate that Philodemus has in mind the same opposition between the hero of brawn and the hero of brains worked out by Antisthenes to the advantage of the latter. Philodemus' reading of Diomedes' choice counters interpretations of it as evidence for Odysseus' cowardice, which apparently (if we believe the scholia) were current.[49] Against them, Philodemus takes Diomedes' words "since he is very wise" to mean that the young warrior chooses Odysseus for his wisdom, which he himself lacks, but without implying that Odysseus is no brave warrior (and after all this reading is the correct one, if only we recall that Diomedes has just said [*Il.* 10.244–45] that Odysseus' heart is eager in every toil). Though Philodemus in the extant fragments does not touch on the issue of Odysseus' alleged cowardice directly, his admiration for the hero's conduct in every aspect of warfare (Odysseus knows "good counsels and marshaling war": *Il.* 2.273, at col. 33) spells out his take on the matter.

Philodemus' appreciation for Odysseus' intelligence extends to his μῆτις. The philosopher seems to have referred approvingly to two masterworks of Odysseus' cunning: the story in which he tells how he tricked one of his fellow fighters into giving him his cloak on a cold night (*Od.* 14.475–506), and the sack of Troy as mentioned by Nestor in *Od.* 3.130 (col. 34).[50] In a broken line appears πολύμητις (col. 35.11). The French Renaissance scholar and poet Jacques Peletier, in presenting his translation of the *Odyssey* to Francis the First, lauded in Odysseus "the exemplar of wisdom and cunning" (*De sapience et ruse l'exemplaire*).[51] In a similar vein Philodemus offered his powerful patron a eulogy of Odysseus' μῆτις along with his φρόνησις. This endorsement of cunning intelli-

gence in an essay dedicated to a public figure of Piso's caliber challenges the assumption that the Romans of the time (or even as a whole) were generally hostile to Odysseus because he was well endowed with that "Greekish" quality.[52]

INTERLUDE: ODYSSEUS' DELPHIC WISDOM

In praising Odysseus' self-restraint Philodemus reconnects with the old-time tradition that extolled Odysseus as a paragon of σωφροσύνη in the "Delphic" sense of moderation vis-à-vis other men and the gods, based on one's knowledge of one's limits as an individual (as when Odysseus states that Philoctetes is a better archer than he) and, especially, a human (as when he refuses to gloat over the suitors' corpses).

Homer's Odysseus easily lent himself to embodying this virtue, for he acknowledges the mutability of human fortunes and behaves accordingly.[53] Recall the meditation over the fragility of the human condition he offers one of the suitors, with its sobering conclusion: "let us accept in silence" (that is, without boasting or otherwise acting arrogantly) "the gifts given us by the gods" (*Od.* 18.142). The tradition about Odysseus' Delphic self-restraint might go as far back as the Sages, whose maxims are greatly informed by this virtue:[54] in Plutarch's *Banquet of the Seven Sages* Aesop lauds Odysseus' warning to Diomedes, "don't praise me or blame me in excess," which he takes as illustration for the Delphic ideal (164C; cf. *Il.* 10.249). Plutarch himself admires Odysseus for pronouncing that line and quotes his meditation in *Odyssey* 18 as a lesson "from wise men of old."[55]

As I suggested in chapter 3, Odysseus' preoccupation with acting moderately toward his fellow men and the gods does not seem to have caught the Stoics' attention. If the Stoic Odysseus is self-restrained, it is not in the fuller, Delphic sense, but in the narrower and more common one, as abstemious in the use of bodily pleasures. Though well-enough endowed with σωφροσύνη to despise sensual allurements, he is not there to illustrate the imperative "Know thyself." The Stoics did exploit Odysseus' meditation over the fickleness of human fortunes but to illustrate the power of fate, rather than to praise Odysseus' appeal to moderation. We may wish to ask why. Why did Philodemus appreciate Odysseus' Delphic wisdom and the Stoics did not? Can this difference enlighten us further about Philodemus' goals in proposing Odysseus as a model for the good ruler?

Σωφροσύνη in the broader sense is the virtue that consists in avoiding hubris in order to avert nemesis: the prerequisite for success in life rather than a moral quality pursued for its own sake. This meaning is well elucidated by Guthrie

commenting on Heraclitus' fragment 112: "to be moderate is the highest excellence" (σωφρονεῖν ἀρετὴ μεγίστη). Guthrie reads Heraclitus' pronouncement together with a text by Antiphon (fr. 58): "The best judge of a man's temperance is one who makes himself a bulwark against the momentary pleasures of the passions and has been able to conquer and master himself. Whoever chooses to yield to his passions at every moment chooses the worse instead of the better." Guthrie observes:

> This self-mastery however is not recommended by Antiphon on any purely moral grounds, but rather as a piece of calculated self-interest. He has just said that "temperance" or self-restraint . . . consists in admitting the truth of the old Greek adage that the doer shall suffer. "Whoever thinks he can injure his neighbours without suffering himself is not a temperate man . . . Such hopes have brought many to irrevocable disaster, when they have turned out to suffer exactly what they thought to inflict on others."[56]

Traces of this conception of σωφροσύνη are still perceptible in Sophocles' *Ajax,* where it is Odysseus, again, who interprets the virtue. Following the dictates of σωφροσύνη, he treats compassionately his dead enemy in the name of his bravery and their common destiny as mortals.[57] This picture of Odysseus accords with the humane sympathy he shows for his victims already in the *Odyssey.* At the court of Alcinous he asks the bard to sing of the ruse of the Wooden Horse, his major feat in the war (*Od.* 8.492–98). His response to the song is poignant and disquieting: he weeps like a woman who clings to her dying husband while the enemy drags her into slavery (521–31). As many a reader has seen, by means of this simile Odysseus is portrayed in the act of identifying with the victims of the war he won, especially the weakest ones, the Trojan women doomed to be enslaved. The celebration of his major achievement in the war draws tears of empathy from him. He feels no joy or pride.[58]

Philosophy has indeed been invoked to describe Odysseus' behavior in *Ajax.* Stanford, for instance, calls Odysseus' reason to bury Ajax "humanely philosophical—the transience and unpredictability of human fortunes."[59] Odysseus' "philosophy," however, is the old-time wisdom that consists in avoiding hubris in order to avert nemesis.[60] Though generous and magnanimous, his σωφροσύνη shows him concerned also with his own destiny, and in this sense its interpretation resonates with the imperative, grounded in popular morality, "pity and forgive others, for you too are human."[61]

A main theme in the play is Odysseus' "toiling," πονεῖν. In the opening scene

he boasts of it: “And I willingly yoked myself to this toil” (24). But Athena mocks his zeal straightaway by telling him that there is no need to go on spying at Ajax’s door (11–12). What is his eagerness for? He and the other Greeks know nothing certain (12–13; 23). Odysseus’ inflated egotism (κἀγώ 24; ἐγώ 31) points up his defeat at the hands of Athena, whose appropriate appearance (καιρόν 34) brings to naught the so-called appropriateness of Odysseus’ action (38: πρὸς καιρόν), just as she has nullified Ajax’s ability to act appropriately (120: τὰ καίρια). In that it makes humans aware of the gods’ power, Ajax’s lot is no other than Odysseus’ own (124). Both are the puppets of Athena.[62]

Humbled by the goddess, Odysseus reappears on stage to toil again, this time to practice σωφροσύνη by persuading Agamemnon to give Ajax proper burial. Upon his remark, “I, too, will go there,” Agamemnon comments, “everywhere the same: each man toils (πονεῖ) for himself” (1365–66). He insinuates that Odysseus is not thinking of Ajax’s death but of his own: if he behaves with magnanimity, he will be treated likewise when his turn comes. And Odysseus does not contradict him: “for whom else should I toil (πονεῖν) more than for myself?”

It is possible to take Odysseus’ acceptance of Agamemnon’s interpretation of his motives as an expedient and self-effacing gesture to get on with Ajax’s burial: Odysseus wants to get the job done, and a discussion with Agamemnon would not advance it, whereas by conceding he immediately obtains Agamemnon’s uninvolved agreement.[63] But I see no reason to believe that he does not mean it when he says that he is laboring for himself.[64] According to a recent commentator on the play, Odysseus is indeed implying that compassion is always selfish to some degree because it is based on the recognition that another person’s misfortune could become our own.[65] Odysseus’ fresh exposure to the crushing power of the gods invited him to think precisely along these lines: “I think of my own lot no less than his” (124). It is with this lesson in mind that Odysseus now “labors for himself.” His avowal, however, does not need undermine his nobility (as Agamemnon does), because it fits within the archaic and classical (pre-Socratic) moral frame of reference as analyzed by Guthrie.

The self-interest implied in the notion of σωφροσύνη may help shed light on the Stoics’ disregard for this quality of Odysseus. Sophocles’ Odysseus sees nothing wrong in hoping to be rewarded for his moderation, whereas the Socratic wise man and his descendants, including the Stoics, do not think of returns from other men or the gods, but only of the returns coming from the exercise of their own goodness. Though, as *Ajax* shows, the ideal of σωφροσύνη could inform generous actions, the hope to be rewarded for it never entirely disappeared from conceptions of the virtue.[66] For the Stoic Odysseus, who pursues excellence for

excellence's own sake, σωφροσύνη in the sense outlined above is contaminated with extramoral motives.

Moreover, underlying σωφροσύνη in this fuller sense is a vision of the world—a vision Homer's Odysseus shares—that emphasizes our fragility as mortals and the omnipotence of the gods. σωφροσύνη helps feeble humans deal with misfortune by recommending compassion and the avoidance of haughtiness. The Stoics, while they recognize our exposure to so-called misfortune, argue that we can rise above it by changing our outlook: so-called misfortunes become indifferent, and, as such, should inspire neither fear for oneself nor pity for one's fellows. The Stoics ban compassion from their ethics just as they deny the reality of misfortune. How then could their exemplary hero act compassionately toward others based on the recognition that "he, too, will go there?" Would that not amount to admitting the importance of externals? To be a Stoic hero, Odysseus must soar above human weakness.

Read against this background, emphasis on Odysseus' moderation in *On the Good King* brings out the humanity of Philodemus' hero, with ethical and political implications. Philodemus' Odysseus is not an impracticable ideal, to which only Socrates, Diogenes, or the ever-elusive Stoic wise man can live up. Rather, he is a model of leadership offered to a Roman public figure. Odysseus' awareness of his limits as an individual and a human guarantees that he stays within limits, that he refrains from abusing his power like a tyrannical *rex.* His "Delphic" moderation entitles him to embody the ideal of "aristocratic kingship" that, as we have seen, could find more favor than an autocracy with Philodemus' addressee(s).

The moderation of god-fearing Odysseus in Philodemus' essay contrasts sharply with the arrogance of god-like Odysseus the Cynic king, who goes about watching and chiding us, wretched humans, from the heights of his superhuman perfection. For Philodemus, as in Sophocles' *Ajax,* Odysseus' power as ruler is inseparable from his sobering self-knowledge: just as in *Ajax* Odysseus effectively exerts his authority only after he has been reminded of the extent of his human feebleness, so in *On the Good King* he earns his peers' respect because he does not claim to be better than they, and the gods' support because he openly recognizes his subjection to them as a human being.[67]

THE TEACHER-FRIEND

Odysseus' skills as leader shine forth in his role as teacher. Albeit implicitly, he is in the background of the "guide of right speech and action" in a fragment from

Philodemus' essay *On Frank Criticism:* "it is necessary to show him [i.e., the pupil] his errors forthrightly and speak of his failings publicly. For if he has considered this man to be the one guide of right speech and [action] (ὁδηγὸν ὀρθοῦ καὶ λόγου καὶ [ἔργου]), whom he calls the only savior (σωτῆρα) and to whom, citing the phrase, 'with him accompanying [me]' (*Il.* 10.246), he has given himself over to be treated, then how is he not going to show to him those things in which he needs treatment, and [accept admonishment]?"[68]

Philodemus is alluding to Diomedes' choice of Odysseus as partner for the spying mission in *Iliad* 10, which in *On the Good King* he approvingly attributes to Odysseus' wisdom. The reference to Odysseus' role as guide in that episode foreshadows Apuleius' reading of Odysseus' and Diomedes' association there "as counselor and helper, mind and hand, spirit and sword" (*veluti consilium et auxilium, mens et manus, animus et gladius, De deo Socratis* 18). In our passage, however, Odysseus' wisdom is put to the service of character improvement. Philodemus slightly twists the meaning of Odysseus' role in the Homeric episode to make it fit his moral goal. Though in *Iliad* 10 Odysseus teaches Diomedes "the right speech and action," he does so in a different sense: by perfecting Diomedes' maturation as a warrior, the scouting expedition in the Trojan camp endows him with authority as a counselor in the assembly. His words earn greater weight owing to his military exploit, which he accomplishes under Odysseus' guidance. Philodemus recasts Diomedes' maturation in purely moral, rather than political, terms.

For Odysseus to be a "savior," a model teacher, he must apply a certain amount of frankness. To associate Odysseus with frankness might sound paradoxical. Yet, though no other allusion to Odysseus appears in the remains of the essay, his timeliness in speech would fit Philodemus' recommendation that frankness should be employed according to need and circumstances, not indiscriminately. His ideal is not an Achilles-type, for whom outspokenness is a rigid principle, but a flexible, sensitive teacher-friend-doctor, who knows when and how frank speech is beneficial. πολύτροπος Odysseus is fitting to embody this ideal. The very pervasiveness of medical imagery in *On Frank Criticism*[69] harks back to Antisthenes' discussion of Odysseus' πολυτροπία as the ability to talk each individual "patient" into salutary treatment.

That Philodemus might have admired Odysseus for his beneficial frankness is suggested not only by the passage from *On Frank Criticism* that exploits Odysseus' role as guide for moral purposes, but also by parallels from two later authors, Plutarch and Maximus of Tyre, who like Philodemus are concerned with the appropriateness of frank speech in pedagogical contexts. Neither of

them illustrates his conception of frankness based on Achilles. In Maximus' *Oration* 14, devoted to distinguishing friend from flatterer, Achilles does not appear at all. Plutarch, in his essay *How to Tell a Friend from a Flatterer,* does mention him, but either as the addressee of suitable frank speech—the pupil, not the teacher (67A; 74A–B)—or as a negative example, of an ineffective and egotistic use of frankness (66F–67A). Both authors in contrast adopt Odysseus as positive model.

The medical imagery that we have seen applied to Odysseus in Antisthenes' discussion of πολύτροπος reappears in Maximus of Tyre's picture of him as a tough and good-minded friend. Just as the most "philanthropic" (φιλάνθρωπος) doctor is the one who inflicts the most pain when necessary, Odysseus is the truest friend because he does not flatter his companions (as Eurymachus does the suitors) but saves them from alluring dangers (the lotus) by having resort to harshness: "he drags them, unwilling and crying, to the ship" (14.4.c–e).

Plutarch likewise upholds Odysseus as an ideal friend because of his effective use of frank speech. As far as he himself is concerned, Odysseus is insensitive to flattery. The line "son of Tydeus, don't praise me or chide me too much" (*Il.* 10.249), which Plutarch cites as evidence for Odysseus' "Delphic" self-restraint, also serves to characterize the man impervious to flattery (*Mor.* 57E). Because he "knows himself," Odysseus is protected against flattery's allurements, for "Know thyself" is the antidote to them (65F and passim).

The hero who cannot be flattered is a paragon of frankness, understood, as by Philodemus and Maximus, as timely treatment. The friend will do what is good for his friend (*Mor.* 55A–B), whether pleasant or not. Hence he will use frankness aptly and for a good cause.[70] Odysseus is there to illustrate this correct use of frankness, just as he illustrates the correct use of self-praise and self-blame. For instance, when he upbraids Agamemnon in *Iliad* 14.84–85, he does so in the interest of Greece, not out of personal spite. Agamemnon accepts the rebuke because he understands that it is meant to be friendly, whereas he does not accept Achilles', though milder, because his motives are selfish (66F–67A).[71] Odysseus admonishes Diomedes aptly by praising the latter's father (72E). He exemplifies effective frankness also when he scolds Achilles for acting cowardly (74A–B).[72] The comment that follows indicates that Odysseus' frankness is an aspect of his ability to tailor his speech to his interlocutor's character and to circumstances, and for his interlocutor's own good: "by alarming the spirited and brave man with an accusation of cowardice, the modest and orderly with an accusation of intemperance . . . they push such persons toward what is noble" (74B). Odysseus' resourcefulness in speech includes a deft and benevolent use of blame.[73]

In all these instances Odysseus' friendship does not involve any special feeling for the people he helps. It is close to the kind of unemotional friendship that, in Aristotle's description, entails "no passion or affection for those with whom we associate" (*EN* 1126b22–23), but only consideration for their wellness.[74] Odysseus does not share his joys and sorrows with his friend but provides guidance from a higher vantage point, from a knowledgeable perspective and with an eye to the practical consequences of his words and actions. He is a friend insofar as teachers and leaders can be called "friends" in Greek.

This role of Odysseus as unemotional friend is in keeping with his fundamental solitude.[75] In the *Iliad* Odysseus has no personal friend and shows no special attachment to anyone. There is no Patroclus, no Pylades, no Pirithous, no Euryalus at his side. His association with Diomedes is no intimate friendship, but the relationship between a mature man and his young and ambitious apprentice (furthermore, according to a branch of the tradition the relationship between the two was more competitive than cooperative: it was rumored that Diomedes chose Odysseus as a partner in order not to be outshone, and that Odysseus even tried to kill him to claim the theft of the Palladium all for himself).[76] It is true that Menelaus apparently loved Odysseus so much that he was ready to endow him with one of his own cities (*Od.* 4.169–80), but his affection doubtlessly was fueled by Odysseus' successful commitment to a war waged for his cause ("a man dear to me . . . who for my sake endured many toils") and is not conspicuous during the war itself, at least in the part narrated in the *Iliad*.[77] On the journey home Odysseus' "friends" are his companions, of whom he is the leader, whom he often mistrusts and who often mistrust him.[78] When they all die, Odysseus affectively is no more alone than when he was trying to bring them home.

Odysseus' solitude, however, is of a particular kind, which lends itself to being converted into ethical guidance. Existentially the solitary hero in Homeric epic is Achilles, separated as he is from the other warriors by his own individual predicament (to die young and earn undying glory or to live a long, obscure life). But Achilles, precisely because of the nature of his solitude, cannot be a guide. Achilles is tragically alone and rather unconcerned with the welfare of others. Conversely Odysseus' solitude regards personal relations and might translate his difference in pedigree and character (he is less noble than most of the heroes, he is the master of cunning, of disguises, etc.), but does not keep him apart from his fellows: on the contrary, his actions aim at the common good.

Antisthenes saw the nature of Odysseus' solitude most clearly when he praised him for acting on behalf of everyone but "alone," both literally and metaphorically: physically alone and in ways that are only his. The Cynic image

of the hero pushes his solitude to extremes, for godlike Odysseus is not a specimen of the fallible human race but towers above it, as its reformer. Philodemus, Maximus, and Plutarch likewise highlight the hero's solitude by showing him occupied in guiding others: Odysseus sits at the helm, not on the benches with his fellow travelers.[79]

FROM FLEXIBILITY TO FLATTERY

In addition to inspiring pictures of him as a moral guide, Odysseus' failure to form intimate friendships might have grounded the less complimentary claim that he had little sense of loyalty and was ready to shift allegiances whenever profitable. Even in Sophocles' *Ajax,* which presents him in a positive light, Odysseus exposes himself to this charge. To justify his view that Ajax should be buried in spite of having been his bitterest enemy, he says: "many are now friends who later will be hostile" (1359). Agamemnon's comment, "And you recommend that we make such friends?" meets with this rejoinder: "I certainly am not accustomed to praise an inflexible mind." Though of course the spectators know that Odysseus is arguing for a noble cause, this dialogue must have resonated with perceptions of him as changeable in his attachments as in so much else. Agamemnon's criticism finds a louder parallel in a fragment from Accius' lost play *Deiphobus,* in which Odysseus was no doubt a sinister character. The fragment's context is unknown, but its purport is transparent: "But [by?] a man abominable, the son of Laertes, the exile from Ithaca, who has never been serious as friend to friend, or foe to foe" (*At infando homine gnato Laerta, Ithacensi exsule / qui neque amico amicus umquam gravis neque hosti hostis fuit,* 252–53 Warmington).

In *Ajax* Odysseus answers Agamemnon's criticism of his stance on friendship by advocating flexibility. His goal is to push Agamemnon to deal with the matter at hand, Ajax's burial, by intimating that the "inflexible mind" is not that of the loyal friend as prospected by Agamemnon, but that of Agamemnon himself. Odysseus' advocacy of flexibility, however, is not merely a deft way of appealing to Agamemnon's self-image (the term for "inflexible," σκληρός, has no redeeming overtones), but also spells out his own recognition of this value and his readiness, in the name of it, to adjust to changeable human landscapes.[80]

Cicero borrows Odysseus' flexible behavior in human relationships to justify his own. Each person, he argues in the *De officiis,* should keep to one's ways. Even though we deem other human types better and more austere (*graviora atque meliora*) than ourselves, we still have to measure our endeavors on our natural endowments. To do otherwise would make us laughable and out of tune with our-

selves, as is the case with those Romans who intersperse their talk with Greek. Human natures are so different from one another that in the same circumstances one man is constrained by his character to kill himself, and one is not. Cato and the other opponents of Caesar were in the same predicament when their foe triumphed in Africa, yet those who surrendered to him would perhaps have even been blamed if they had taken their lives, because their nature was more gentle (*lenior*) and their ways more tolerant (*faciliores*), whereas Cato both was naturally endowed with austerity (*gravitatem*) and strengthened it by abiding unflinchingly by his ideals. These opposite types are exemplified by Odysseus and Ajax: "How many things Odysseus endured in his long wanderings, when he was subjected to women (if Circe and Calypso are to be called women) and in every speech wanted to be affable with everyone! At home he even put up with insults from his servants and maids, so that he might one day obtain what he wished. But Ajax, with the character attributed to him, would have preferred to die a thousand times than to bear those offenses" (1.110–13).

Cicero is implicitly defending himself for having accepted Caesar's pardon. To this purpose he adopts Odysseus' intelligent adaptability and contrasts it with the inflexibility of Cato/Ajax, who chose death. The shadow of Cato's suicide loomed large over Cicero and his contemporaries, especially after Caesar's own death (the *De officiis* dates to 44 BC) had revived Republican pride.[81] Cicero himself recognizes Cato's moral superiority by referring to his *incredibilem gravitatem,* which harks back to the *graviora atque meliora* human types mentioned earlier. Cicero's strategy is rather to undercut Cato's heroism by putting it on a par with his own less heroic choice: by arguing for different character-types and for life-decisions that harmonize with one's own, Cicero intimates that Cato and he behaved equally well in that neither did violence to his nature. Had Cicero killed himself or otherwise refused to benefit from Caesar's clemency, perhaps he would have been even blameworthy. This argument deprives both Cato's and Cicero's choice of any merit except that of consistency with character. Ultimately, each one's choice is no true choice, for Cato's nature compelled him to die while Cicero's compelled him to live (*alius debeat, alius* [*in eadem causa*] *non debeat*).

Cicero, however, cannot hide his uneasiness. The picture he draws of Odysseus/himself is far from flattering, for it casts him in the demeaning passive role of a woman's slave (*servire*) and reduces his multiple speaking talents to "affability." As Stanford notes, this emphasis on Odysseus' affability is original, and most likely it is a projection of Cicero's own experience as a *novus homo* trying to climb the social ladder and behaving "affably" to succeed.[82] Cicero's discomfort

with his self-image is revealed in the indefinite manner in which he presents Odysseus' goal-oriented strategy: "so that he might one day obtain what he wished" (*ut ad id aliquando, quod cupiebat, veniret*). Why does not Cicero say explicitly what it is that Odysseus wished? Since Odysseus' aim, to recover his household, bore no stigma, Cicero's vagueness in describing it betrays his embarrassment vis-à-vis his own. Cicero could easily have dressed up his goals and strategy by highlighting the righteousness of Odysseus'. Instead, he seems to regret that he was not able to act like Ajax, whose uncompromising choice is given the last word.

Cicero's contemporary Philodemus likewise adopts Odysseus as a role model in a power structure in which he is the inferior partner. In a poem written early in his acquaintance with Piso, Philodemus invites his prospective patron to a modest dinner in celebration of Epicurus' birthday. Should Piso be willing to forsake his luxurious fare for one day, instead of dainties he will find sincere companions (ἑτάρους . . . παναληθέας) and "will hear things far sweeter (μελιχρότερα)" than the Phaeacians did. If Piso catches notice of his host, however, in the future they will celebrate Epicurus' birthday richly.[83]

Philodemus wears an Odysseus-persona.[84] He tells his guest that the dinner's most appetizing dish will be a tantalizing entertainment, which will delight him as Odysseus' story delighted Alcinous. The association with Alcinous expectedly will flatter Piso, for the Phaeacians in Philodemus' view boast an exemplary lifestyle. In addition to fostering peace and prosperity they love to listen to "the glories of men" and do so with decorum (*On the Good King* cols. 18–19).[85] On this occasion "Alcinous" will find pleasure in listening to "Odysseus'" eloquence, whose "honey-ness" Philodemus enhances perhaps to suggest that he will intersperse his already charming conversation with even sweeter poetic recitations.

Odysseus' talent as a "poet" and storyteller, however, is also his limit. By promising Piso words sweeter than those of Odysseus, Philodemus puts himself above Homer/Odysseus in two ways. In jest, he boasts he is a better poet than they. In earnest, he offers Piso also (if not exclusively) a better kind of delight, characterized by "truthfulness": beneficial talk among sincere friends. Philodemus is inviting Piso to share not only in the diversion of light entertainment, but also in the philosophical joy of true companionship to celebrate their spiritual father, Epicurus.[86]

The promise that Piso will hear words sweeter than Odysseus' brings out both Philodemus' interest in molding his role on the charming raconteur and his care to distance his image as a philosopher from the same character, the Odysseus who tells good stories without an eye to his audience's moral edifica-

tion. Philodemus' partial disclaimer might be connected not only to the "poetic" (rather than philosophical) nature of Odysseus' stories, but also to their fabulous content, liable to charges of falsity.[87] Philodemus' conversation in contrast will form Piso's character according to true moral principles.

By being asked to imitate the Phaeacians, however, Piso obviously is not just summoned to go listen to his friend as Alcinous listened to Odysseus. Philodemus makes no mystery of his expectations: to obtain one kind of entertainment for another kind, hospitality and sustenance for the sweet words of poetry and wisdom. He plays host on this occasion, but in the hope of becoming Piso's honored protégé. If this happens, Piso will impersonate Alcinous fully: not just, as this one time, as the enchanted listener to Philodemus' poems and conversation, but also as a munificent protector.[88] Though Philodemus himself aspires to be a "philosophical client" who can provide guidance, his appeal to Odysseus' seductive eloquence as a weapon to attract his potential patron conjures up a less complimentary image of the Homeric character as a self-interested manipulator.

Philodemus indeed crossed the thin line that divided positive from negative assessments of Odysseus' winning eloquence. The charming friend then turns into a smooth-tongued flatterer. I am thinking of the mockery of Odysseus' alleged parasitic leanings in *On Flattery,* for a parasite could hardly succeed without flattering his "hosts." The importance of flattery for a successful practice of the parasitic art is spelled out in the use of the term κόλαξ (flatterer) for parasites, as well as in the pairing of παράσιτος and κόλαξ.[89] It is quite possible that in *On Flattery* Philodemus targeted not only Odysseus' hunger but also his ability to entertain his hosts for profit, because in two of the mentioned episodes, his stays with Aeolus and with Alcinous, Odysseus is the skilled speaker who tells his story to obtain conveyance. Philodemus replaces conveyance with food as Odysseus' goal. His irreverent treatment of Odysseus in *On Flattery* contrasts sharply with his Odysseus-persona in his poem to Piso. The coexistence in the same author of these opposite evaluations of Odysseus' eloquence spells out the unsolvable moral ambivalence of his versatility, of which eloquence is a main component.[90]

The ambivalence comes to light also in the opposite uses made of Odysseus' acting skills, another major manifestation of his versatility. We have seen that Odysseus' readiness to play multiple roles recommends him to the Stoics as the ideal interpreter of destiny, and that a similar appreciation of Odysseus' adaptable mind lies behind Maximus of Tyre's adoption of him as a model for the philosopher (in the *First Oration*). In advocating versatility for the philosopher Maximus appeals to Odysseus' words at *Odyssey* 18.136–37 ("The opinions of

mortals who live upon earth are such / As the day the Father of gods and men brings on") to illustrate our adjustability to changing fortunes, just as the Stoics exploit those words to expound on the power of fate and on man's necessity to go along with it. It now is worth quoting the passage extensively:

> [Suppose also that] . . . he [the philosopher] adapted the character of the speech to suit the varying nature of the episodes in the plot that god writes (δραματουργεῖ) for us. Would anyone think him many-voiced, possessed like the sea-god Proteus in Homer of an inconstant and multiple character (πολύμορφόν τινα καὶ παντοδαπὸν τὴν φύσιν)? Or would it be the same as if human happiness depended on the art and power of music? In that case, I imagine, given all the different modes which that art comprises, a man could count as worthless if he was properly trained to play in the Dorian mode, but fell silent when faced with the need to tune to the Ionian or the Aeolian . . . If there were only one period in the long, unbroken passage of time that needs a philosopher's discourse, then there would be no need for the complex and versatile (πολυτρόπου) musical harmonies of which I speak, any more than there would if human affairs maintained a single pattern and an even tenor, never passing from one passion to another, from pleasure to pain or from pain to pleasure, never twisting and turning the individual's purposes this way and that: "The opinions of mortals who live upon earth are such / As the day the Father of gods and men brings on." (*Od.* 18.136–37); (1.1.a–2.c)

Maximus argues for a primarily rhetorical meaning of πολύτροπος.[91] His high regard for πολυτροπία comes to light in another oration (22.5.g) in which Odysseus is called "wise because versatile" (σοφὸς ὅτι πολύτροπος)—a pairing that harks back to Antisthenes' defense of Odysseus' versatility. The philosopher according to Maximus will follow the lead of Antisthenes' σοφός Odysseus by applying different modes of speech to different life circumstances. Note the musical reference, another similarity with Antisthenes. Just as Antisthenes calls on the tuneful voice of the nightingale as a model for the πολύτροπος speaker, Maximus advocates the necessity for the πολύτροπος philosopher to know the entire gamut of harmonies.

Versatility in speech, however, is not enough to teach or live like a philosopher. By referring to Odysseus' meditation on man's adjustable mind, Maximus upholds the necessity of an adaptable disposition. As he says shortly afterward, if life's appearance and ordering were one, "we would need only one kind of speech and one kind of character" (1.3.b: ἑνὸς ἔδει λόγου καὶ ἤθους ἑνός), but of

course this is not the case. Maximus' endorsement of Odysseus-like versatility cuts deeper than just the domain of speech, into conduct.

On a first reading it might even seem that Maximus is making the case for mutability of character. But his care to distinguish the adaptable philosopher from ever-changing Proteus leaves little doubt that Odysseus appeals to him, as to the Stoics, because he keeps his integrity and constancy of purpose even while he adjusts to changeable circumstances. When he comments on our minds' adaptability, Odysseus means our ability to bear up with the blows of fortune, not a lack of consistency in character. The Odysseus who utters those words has not changed his character or his purpose but his clothes: forced by misfortune to impersonate the beggar, he is nonetheless stable and upright, ἔμπεδον, in his spirit. By saying, "we need more than one kind of ἦθος in the variegated landscape of life," then, Maximus is advocating acting: not a change of φύσις, as in Proteus' case, but the readiness to switch from a *dramatis persona* to another in order to perform the manifold episodes that compose the plot of life.[92]

At the same time, however, Odysseus' ability to divorce his inner thought from his outward behavior contributed to reinforcing his association with the type of the flatterer. Acting, the metaphor employed by philosophers to portray the wise man's approach to life changes, also describes the flatterer's behavior, and Odysseus-the-actor offers a model also for this despicable figure.

Plutarch holds that the flatterer is "an imitator of everything" (*Mor.* 53C),[93] and that the dangerous kind is the one who gives no impression of flattering but rather plays the friend (50E). The flatterer is a tragic actor (τραγικὸς . . . ὑποκριτής), not a comic or a satyric one, because he produces absolute make-believe (50E). This detail fits Odysseus perfectly, for Odysseus is so convincing in each role that he is taken to be the character he plays.

Odysseus' perfect impersonations in fact came to be read not only as expressions of a serious commitment to life's script but also as deceptive, ensnaring disguises. We recall, for instance, that the allegorist Heraclitus blamed Odysseus' praise of feasting (in *Odyssey* 9) as an unwise falsity, said "hypocritically" to please the Phaeacians. The term is ὑποκρίσει, which denotes oratorical delivery and is related to the verb "acting," ὑποκρίνομαι (79.3). By playing the right script in the right way Odysseus will obtain conveyance or even sustenance.

Versatility alone, however, would not suffice to qualify Odysseus as the prototypical flatterer. Odysseus could earn this label also because of his proclivity to work for the powerful. Already in Homer he is bent on making "friends" with the most influential leaders, starting with Agamemnon and Menelaus, for whose cause he fights.[94] Thersites, Agamemnon's challenger, is hated most especially by

Odysseus (and Achilles, *Il.* 2.220). By beating Thersites and persuading the Greeks to fight on, Odysseus promotes the interests of the leaders, not of the anonymous warriors who had rushed to the ships, ready to leave. It is true that in the world of the *Iliad,* in which the anonymous warriors are of no count, Odysseus' tendency to help the powerful is no despicable trait of character because the kings' interest is the "common" good. In drama, though, Odysseus is charged with ruthless self-seeking precisely for allying himself with the powerful (think of *Philoctetes* or *Iphigenia in Aulis*). And one can see how this feature could incriminate him as a self-serving flatterer when, from the Hellenistic period onward, it became more urgent to distinguish flattery from friendship along with the development of socially unequal "friendships."

Perceptions of Odysseus as a flatterer of the powerful, combined with his equally proverbial greed and parasitic leanings, build his character in Horace *Satires* 2.5, where he is chosen to embody the legacy hunter. Presumably upset by Tiresias' prophecy that he will return home impoverished, Odysseus asks him how to make up for his losses (2–3). The seer laughs: isn't it enough for the wily hero to see his Ithaca again? But Odysseus insists on his request, for "birth and virtue, without wealth, are more worthless than seaweed" (8). Tiresias obliges and instructs him in the art of *captatio,* the main aspect of which is a relentless and unprincipled practice of flattery.

I am introducing this satire because it has been taken to mock the early Cynic idealization of Odysseus, in line with objections raised against that idealization even by some Cynics.[95] This reading is attractive, for Horace engages with Stoicism, the "rich cousin" (if I may) of Cynicism, elsewhere in the second book of his *Satires:* at 2.2 he stages an *abnormis sapiens* (l. 3); at 2.3 he ridicules the Stoic tenet that all but the wise man are mad (ll. 43–46); at 2.3 and 2.7 he pokes fun at Stoic philosophers.[96] Line 8 in our poem (*et genus et virtus, nisi cum re, vilior alga est*) might indeed suggest philosophical parody: though *virtus* could simply indicate the Roman ideal (fused as it is in hendiadys with *genus*), by Horace's time it was also a highly philosophical quality, especially among Cynics and Stoics, and Odysseus was one of its main incarnations.[97] Horace himself praises him for his Stoic *virtus* (*Ep.* 1.2.17). In our satire Odysseus seems to be denying any value to the Cynic-Stoic conception of *virtus* by claiming that without wealth *virtus* is worthless.

Another hint that Horace might be thinking of the Cynic idealization of Odysseus is in the allusion to the opening scene of *Odyssey* 20. Faced with the prospect of poverty if he refuses to perform degrading services, Odysseus calls on his "brave heart":

Tiresias: "Then you will be poor." Odysseus: "I will order my strong heart to do this: once I bore up with even worse" (*Ergo / pauper eris. Fortem hoc animum tolerare iubebo; / et quondam maiora tuli*)" (*Sat.* 2.5.19–21).

Horace echoes a Homeric scene that since Plato had been popular among philosophers, including Cynic ones. Athenaeus reports a parodic use of it by one Kunoulkos, a character whose very name irreverently conjures up the philosophical "Dogs." Beset by hunger, Kunoulkos resorts to the first half of the line "bear up, my heart . . ." (*Od.* 20.18) to find strength against his predicament: "Bear up, my poverty (τέτλαθι δή, πενίη), and endure when men talk nonsense; for a bounty of dainties overpowers you, and joyless hunger" (6.270e–f). Kunoulkos' mock impersonation of Odysseus turns the Cynic into a parasite, forced to put up with his hosts' stupidity as Odysseus puts up with his maids' wantonness. The parody would not be fully effective if the line did not belong to the Cynic repertory.[98]

That Horace might be alluding to the Cynic exploitation of *Od.* 20.18 is suggested by a thematic correspondence: both Kunoulkos and Horace's Odysseus exhort their heart as they face the reality or the threat of poverty. Horace wittily deceives the reader, for Odysseus' self-reprimand at first seems to mark his acceptance of Tiresias' observation that he will be poor (*hoc* is naturally taken to refer to the phrase that immediately precedes it, "then you will be poor"), as if Odysseus, the virtuous philosopher, were disciplining himself to bear up with poverty, not with the unpleasant services required to become rich. It is only the following lines ("tell me how to reap up riches") that reveal the true reason for Odysseus' "philosophical" reprimand to his heart.

Horace's picture of Odysseus in *Satires* 2.5 is evidence for the popularity of both the Cynic-Stoic idealization of Odysseus as a paradigm of virtue and the opposite treatment of him as a greedy manipulator putting his eloquence and acting skills to the service of his base interests. Both images must have been familiar enough in Augustan Rome for Horace to play the one against the other.

Indeed, disparagement of Odysseus as a flatterer apparently had a strong hold on people's imagination as late as the first centuries of the Roman Empire, however much appreciation philosophers were showing for the versatile hero. The persistence of that negative judgment is borne out even by two of Odysseus' strongest philosophical advocates: Plutarch and Maximus of Tyre. Though they offer Odysseus as a paragon of appropriate frankness, they themselves are affected by the identification of the character they so much admire with the flatterer.

Maximus feels he has to defend Odysseus from accusations of flattery in the same speech in which he praises his hero's "philanthropic frankness" (*Orations* 14): no one would possibly call Odysseus a flatterer when, shipwrecked, he com-

pared Nausicaa to Artemis (14.5.c–d)! While opposing current interpretations of Odysseus' "winning words" to Nausicaa, which in fact raised suspicions of flattery, Maximus does not even say why such interpretations are wrong but just vents his indignation.[99]

Plutarch would have agreed with Maximus' reading. In *How to Study Poetry* (19B) he cites Odysseus' opening words to Nausicaa as illustration for Homer's method of showing a hero's goodness through the presentation of his speeches. By arguing that the phrase, "straightaway he spoke, a gentle and winning speech," which introduces Odysseus' supplication to Nausicaa, is meant to stir admiration for his character, Plutarch obviously implies that the speech as a whole is no base flattery. He also intimates that Nausicaa is commendable for wishing to marry Odysseus because her desire was kindled by his wonderful speech, the mirror of his character (27B).

Plutarch's own picture of the flatterer, however, testifies to the enduring association of Odysseus with this type. The flatterer's chameleon-like promptitude in changing shapes according to the characters of his victims inspires to Plutarch a comparison with Odysseus taking off his rags:

> if he [the flatterer] is chasing a scholarly and studious young man, in turn he is all absorbed in books, his beard goes down to his feet, his thing is the philosopher's cloak and a Stoic indifference, and he keeps talking about Plato's numbers and right-angled triangles. Then, if a relaxed man falls in his way, who is rich and a lover of drink, "here the wily Odysseus strips off his tatters" (*Od.* 22.1), the cloak is thrown off, the beard is cut off like a fruitless crop, and instead it's all coolers and bowls and laughter while walking around, and jokes against the adepts of philosophy. (*Mor.* 52C–D)

The comparison might baffle the reader who is looking for more than a superficial resemblance between the flatterer stripping off his scholarly gown and Odysseus stripping off his rags. What else do they share? Odysseus takes off his rags to disclose his true identity; the flatterer takes off his scholarly gear to don another disguise. Plutarch seems to have been attracted to the somewhat misguided comparison by the preceding description of the flatterer as a multicolored and changeable Odysseus-like figure: the flatterer is παντοδαπός and ποικίλος (52B), as Odysseus is ποικιλομήτης. Odysseus' metamorphic pliability apparently provided Plutarch with such a natural reference for portraying the multiple impersonations of the flatterer as to affect even the treatment of Odysseus' self-disclosures. To the ever-changing flatterer one should speak like

Telemachus to Odysseus after his appearance has been changed back to his own: "Stranger, you seem now a different man than before" (*Od.* 16.181 at 53B). Plutarch is not considering that Odysseus, here again, is revealing himself, but treats this transformation as the wearing of a new mask.

Thus, in spite of his willingness to promote Odysseus as the model friend, Plutarch has him in mind when he describes the flatterer's snares. The ambivalence might be unintentional because of Plutarch's firm admiration for Odysseus' appropriate frankness and many more virtues. But, if this is the case, the subterranean presence of Odysseus in his admirer's representation of the flatterer speaks volumes about the permanence of perceptions of Odysseus as the embodiment of the type. Plutarch seems to be drawn to the image of Odysseus-the-flatterer by cultural pressure, as to a commonplace.

CHAPTER 5

Between Contemplation and Action

Hither, come hither, much fabled Odysseus, great glory of the Achaeans,
Stop your ship to hear our voice.
No one has ever sailed past in his black ship
Before hearing the honey-sweet voice from our lips.
Then, full of delight, he goes his way, richer with knowledge
(*Od.* 12.184–88)

"THE PHILOSOPHER"

When Eustathius calls Odysseus "the philosopher,"[1] he sanctions a view that has long found currency among authors both pagan and Christian: Odysseus is ὁ φιλόσοφος already at the beginning of the Imperial period. The image of a moralized Odysseus gained in publicity toward the end of the first century BC: witness Virgil's reliance on it in the *Aeneid* to describe the charismatic leader who quiets the storm; Horace's mocking exploitation of the same image in his *Satires* to portray the type of the legacy-hunter; and his endorsement of it in his "pedagogic" *Ep.* 1.2. Perhaps the most telling indication of the popularity of an Odysseus moralized, however, comes from art: the painter of the celebrated series of Odyssey Landscapes on the Esquiline, dated to around 30 BC, seems to have assumed that at least a significant portion of its viewers was acquainted with the Odysseus of philosophy. As Timothy O'Sullivan has shown,[2] the sequence in the panels of the fresco illustrates Odysseus' progress toward (self-) mastery: the first extant panel depicts an episode, that of the Laestrygonians, in which Odysseus is not in control, whereas in his encounter with Circe, which appears in the second panel, and in the subsequent episodes represented in the painting, he shows self-possession. O'Sullivan makes a parallel between the fresco's reading of Odysseus' career and Philodemus' claim that Odysseus corrected his overweening behavior with the Cyclops by his appeal to moderation

after the slaughter: in both the philosopher's argument and the painting Odysseus learns to master his emotions and external circumstances. If the artist of the Odyssey Landscapes had Philodemus' interpretation of Odysseus in mind, that interpretation must have been familiar enough at the time to resonate with a relatively large pool of viewers.[3]

Less than a century later, Seneca unequivocally testifies to Odysseus' achieved popularity as a philosophical hero. Though criticism of his claims to wisdom endures—witness the polemic, to mention just one issue, over his hedonism and attachment to wealth—by the mid-first century his philosophical entitlements are firmly established, as Seneca bears out by collapsing Homer and Odysseus in his protest against philosophical mistreatments of the wise poet. To identify Odysseus' wisdom with Homer's own was becoming a fashionable exercise.

Since the archaic period Homer had tended to be paired with his Odysseus, but those early instances of the pairing are not at all flattering to either Odysseus or Homer: a disparaging identification can be traced back to Hesiod's description of the poet's "lies similar to the truth" (*Theog.* 27) by means of a phrase applied to Odysseus' stories (*Od.* 19.203),[4] and more explicitly to Pindar, who fuses Homer's and Odysseus' shimmering eloquence, guilty of blinding the judges to the truth of Ajax's valor (*Nem.* 7.20–27). For both Hesiod and Pindar, Odysseus is an extension of Homer's own deceitfulness. This trend continues with Ovid (*Tristia* 1.5.79), who dismisses Odysseus' toils as made up (*pars maxima ficta laborum*), echoing Pindar's merging of poet and hero as liars. Who magnified Odysseus' misfortunes? Odysseus himself or Homer?

Because of his close association with Homer, Odysseus suffers more than any other hero from the flare of anti-Homeric propaganda toward the end of the first century AD: "since Homer himself was a liar and a cheat, his favorite hero must have been equally villainous."[5] In Dio Chrysostom's sophistic *Eleventh Oration,* which mocks all the achievements of the Homeric heroes (Troy was never sacked!), Odysseus is a liar just like Homer (17): his descent to the Underworld and the Circe episode are two of Homer's lies (34), and, to top it all off, Odysseus delayed his return voluntarily (134) because he was ashamed of the negative outcome of the war and because he suspected domestic troubles. Lucian draws on this disparaging assimilation of Homer and Odysseus in his *True History,* where Homer reclines at table in the place above Odysseus-the-liar (2.15; cf. 1.3), and Odysseus plays Homer's advocate against Thersites' charge of having been ridiculed by the poet (2.20).

At the same time, however, in addition to Seneca several moralists identify wise Homer with wise Odysseus. Dio Chrysostom claims that Homer, though

homeless by choice, was as attached to his native land as Odysseus: under his name the poet wept and confessed his own longing (47.5–6). Heraclitus, in line with Seneca, argues that Plato relied on Homer, especially in the figure of Odysseus rebuking his heart, to illustrate his theory of the soul (*Hom. Probl.* 18.1–4), and that Homer used Odysseus' wanderings to expound his "philosophy" (70.1). Maximus of Tyre for his part applies the opening lines of the *Odyssey* to Homer himself; claims that Homer made Odysseus, because of his "perfect virtue," the subject of one half of his poetry; and endows Homer with "the most wondrous prudence and the most versatile experience" (φρονήσει δεινοτάτῃ καὶ ἐμπειρίᾳ πολυτροπωτάτει)—qualities that cannot but evoke Odysseus.[6] Likewise for the author of *The Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer,* to praise Homer means to praise Odysseus. This text simply assumes that Odysseus is the wise man par excellence. Contrary to other heroes, who are brought in to exemplify negative qualities as well as positive ones, nowhere is he cited as a negative example. Because it is likely to reflect school teachings,[7] this essay bears witness to the diffusion of the idealized image of Odysseus outside philosophical circles, into general culture.

The popular appeal of Odysseus as the mouthpiece for Homer's wisdom comes to the fore in an oracular pronouncement about Homer's birth, delivered by the Pythia to the emperor Hadrian: "Ithaca is his dwelling, Telemachus was his father, and Epicaste, the daughter of Nestor, his mother, who bore him the wisest by far of mortal men" (*AP* 14.102 = *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* 38–40). Except for his relationship to Nestor's daughter, Homer is a reincarnation of Odysseus, born of his family and on his soil. In the *Certamen* Homer's Odyssean pedigree is taken to explain his praise of the hero: we must believe the Pythia's words, "especially since the poet glorified so much his grandfather [Odysseus!] in his epics" (42–43).

Resonances of a moralized reading of Odysseus can also be detected in a relatively popular genre, the novel. Novelists in the early centuries of the Imperial period engage with the stereotype "Odysseus the philosopher" either as a serious subtext or for comic effects. Chariton's *Callirhoe,* probably dated to about 50 AD, like most specimens of the genre adopts a (modified) *Odyssey* pattern: a couple, Chaereas and Callirhoe, violently separated from each other and from home, endure all sorts of hardships in journeys abroad, are at last reunited, and return to their homeland. The reference to the *Odyssey* becomes apparent toward the end of the narrative, when we are told that an angry deity was the cause of the lovers' wanderings. Outraged by Chaereas' outburst of jealousy toward his new bride, which almost killed her, Aphrodite chased him over land and sea, "from

the West to the East amongst countless sufferings," until, reconciled with him, she decided to put an end to the couple's tribulations (8.1.3). Aphrodite specifies that she is relenting her anger because she has *tried* the lovers enough (γυμνάσασα) and because Chaereas has "nicely made amends" (καλῶς ἀπελογήσατο) to Eros by his wanderings. Not so Poseidon in the *Odyssey:* if he relents, it is not because he thinks that Odysseus deserves reconciliation for having proven himself, but because he has to yield to Zeus' will. Underlying Aphrodite's emphasis on Chaereas' deserts is a moral interpretation of the *Odyssey* according to which Odysseus is the hero schooled in misfortune, who earns his victory by his virtue.

A second novel to testify to the popularity of the Odysseus of philosophers is Apuleius' *Golden Ass,* namely the scene in which Lucius, the protagonist, thanks his asinine appearance for having exposed him to a variety of experiences that have made him well informed (*multiscium*) (9.13). His self-assessment calls for a comparison with the creation of the "divine" Homer, Odysseus, the man "of the highest intelligence" (*summae prudentiae*), who acquired "the highest excellence" (*summas . . . virtutes*) by visiting many cities and learning to know various people. The reference to the virtuous hero, whom knowledge of the world made wise, comically brings out Lucius' foolish curiosity, his proclivity for peeping into people's lives and overhearing stories.[8]

Because of the novel's comparatively large spectrum of readers,[9] it is tempting to speculate that this genre not only reflected the diffusion of the idealized Odysseus outside philosophy but also contributed to broadcasting it further. This is, however, doubtful, if by "contributing" we mean actively promoting that image. The choice of an *Odyssey*-structure for the novels does not necessarily entail their authors' admiration for Odysseus' moral qualities. In fact, though the protagonists go through odysseys, and though, like Odysseus, they prove themselves firm and enduring in the course of their ordeals, in a major respect they are the opposite of Odysseus—especially of the Odysseus of philosophers: they weep day in, day out and are time and again prey to suicidal moods. By their unruly emotionality they rather seem to be countering the Odysseus-like model of behavior upheld by philosophers.

Let me illustrate this with two examples. Both Petronius and Heliodorus, the third- or fourth-century author of the *Aethiopica,* exploit two episodes in Odysseus' career that were in the spotlight of philosophical idealizations: his rebuke to his heart in *Od.* 20 and his show of imperturbability as he watches Penelope weep in *Od.* 19. In the Aethiopica, when the parents of the novel's protagonist recognize her as their daughter, her mother cannot restrain herself and falls

on the ground with her newly found child in a tight embrace, weeping from joy. Her father in contrast tries to keep his eyes dry as Odysseus did in front of Penelope: though moved in his soul and full of pity for his wife, he "stood with his eyes fixed as unblinkingly on the scene before him as if they had been of horn or steel, fighting back the welling tears. His soul was buffeted by waves of fatherly love and manly resolve that fought for possession of his will, which was pulled in two directions by the opposing tide races."[10] In spite of his efforts, however, he soon breaks: "finally he bowed to all-conquering nature: not only was he convinced that he was a father, but also betrayed a father's feelings." This would-be-Odysseus cannot fully impersonate his heroic model, nor does he meet with criticism because he fails to do so: on the contrary, by yielding to his emotions he yields to nature's rightful demands.

Though in a comic vein, Petronius also delves into a famed episode of Odysseus' self-mastery to describe the behavior of a character who cannot live up to it. As he is scolding his flaccid penis, Encolpius finds in Odysseus restraining his heart justification for his own abuse of his organ: "What then? Did not Ulysses argue with his heart?" (*Satyrica* 132). That high-minded rebuke is brought in to legitimize the admonishment of an unresponsive penis. The scene gains in wit and humor if it assumes as its subtext not just the Homeric narrative but its Platonizing reading as evidence for the supremacy of the soul over the body, a tenet by which Encolpius is incapable of abiding.[11]

PLUTARCH'S PATRONAGE OF ODYSSEUS

If novelists are aware of the idealized image of Odysseus proposed by philosophers, their importance in the history of the popularization of the ethicized Odysseus seems to be rather as recipients and reflectors than as active advocates. Conversely, a moralist contemporary to some of the novelists, Plutarch, is likely to have played a significant role in promoting the idealized image of Odysseus, in which he strongly believed. Most of the essays in which Plutarch exploits Odysseus to illustrate moral conduct are pedagogical writings, as such apt to reach out to larger numbers of readers than his more technical works, for instance those dealing with the Delphic oracle or with "the Face of the Moon." And in his pedagogical writings Plutarch shows unconditional admiration for the Homeric hero.

True, in one essay, *Beasts are Rational,* Plutarch is seemingly critical of Odysseus' character. In this witty piece he stages a dialogue between Odysseus and Gryllus or "Grunter," one of his companions turned into swine by Circe.

Odysseus tries to persuade him to recover his human form and go back to human life, but Gryllus details the many good reasons animals are better than humans, and than Odysseus in the first place. Gryllus (and before him Circe, as well as . . . Odysseus himself!) mocks Odysseus' claim to wisdom as was defended by philosophers since at least Antisthenes. Far from being concerned with the common good, Odysseus is moved by ambition, as in tragedy (985E); his longing for a mortal woman does not betoken virtue but desire for fame (985F); his concern with all humans, as extolled by Antisthenes and the Cynic-Stoic tradition, is narrowed to a parochial preference for the Greeks (986C); his φρόνησις, σοφία, and ἀνδρεία are contested (986C; 987A; 986F; 987C), and replaced with πανουργία, again in the spirit of tragedy (987C). Even his reputation for σωφροσύνη and ἐγκράτεια is shattered (988F).

We shall ask, however, how seriously we should take these statements. Because Odysseus was strongly committed to his humanity, which he chose against both "god" and "beast," he must have appeared a natural target to the defender of the virtues of animals. But this is not to say that Plutarch is attacking Odysseus as a character: he only exploits him as the representative of the human species, as Man. If the essay has any philosophical earnestness, its aim is to oppose the anthropocentrism of the Stoics and their dismissive attitude toward animals rather than to demean Odysseus.[12]

Indeed, almost everything Plutarch says about Odysseus in his moral essays contradicts Gryllus' critique. We have already tasted many samples of Plutarch's appreciation for Odysseus: as a model friend, teacher, and leader, one gifted with tact, effective frankness, and savoir faire; as the embodiment of the Delphic motto "Know thyself"; and of course as a paradigm of self-mastery, capable of reining in his desires and passions (including his curiosity!). With one remark Plutarch responds to Gryllus almost word by word: while the Grunter mockingly calls Odysseus the husband of the most self-restrained woman (988F: σωφρονεστάτης . . . γυναικός), in *Advice to Bride and Groom* Plutarch lauds Odysseus for being the "wise" (φρόνιμος) husband of precisely such a woman (σώφρων: 140F). Plutarch is keener on Odysseus than any other thinker of the early Imperial period. Whereas, say, Seneca and Epictetus are interested in the Homeric character only when he can live up to Stoic tenets—and they censure him when he does not—Plutarch admires Odysseus for a variety of talents and in a variety of capacities. He idealizes Odysseus all around, instead of "chopping him up" as the Stoics (and later the Neoplatonics) do.[13]

In addition Plutarch understood the potential appeal of a character like Odysseus, with his capability for self-control, to the muzzled subjects to Roman

rule. Perhaps the most compelling idealization of Odysseus' self-mastery in all of Greek literature is in Plutarch's essay *On Talkativeness,* which is largely a lesson on the importance of keeping secrets in both private and public life. The moralist saw that Odysseus, because of his ability to contain his emotions, could teach steadfastness and prudence to those exposed to external circumstances in which to vent one's feelings, express one's thoughts, or share one's knowledge could be dangerous.

To illustrate Odysseus' self-mastery, Plutarch combines the scene in which he copes with Penelope's tears without showing any emotion with the one in which he rebukes his heart: "And Odysseus himself, as he sat beside Penelope, 'Had pity in his heart for his weeping wife, but his eyes stood firm-fixed in his lids, like horn or iron.' So full of self-control (ἐγκρατείας) was his body in every part and his reason, keeping everything in obedience and submission, ordered his eyes not to cry, his tongue not to utter a sound, his heart not to tremble or bark. 'In obedience his heart remained enduring,' for his reasoning faculty reached to his irrational movements and made his breath and blood obedient and subservient to itself" (506A–B).

Plutarch admires Odysseus' ability not to betray his emotions as an exercise in self-control, following in Plato's footsteps. I have suggested that Plato disregards every utilitarian goal in his reading of Odysseus quieting his barking heart: Odysseus' rebuke exemplifies the dominance of reason, the hallmark of a healthy soul, desirable as such. Plutarch expands on Plato's idealization of self-control for self-control's own sake by magnifying Odysseus' fortitude to the point of transforming the agitated protagonist of the Homeric episode into an image of unruffled firmness.

In Homer Odysseus succeeds in silencing his heart, but not his body and thoughts, which turn round and round until Athena puts him to sleep (*Od.* 20.24 and 28). Plato, though he implies that Odysseus imposes control on his passions and bodily movements, does not show him in this pacified state but while he gives orders to his heart. Plutarch in contrast puts much emphasis on Odysseus' quieted state, which includes silence (absent from Homer and Plato) and even the mastery over vital bodily functions. Odysseus' λόγος is pervasive; it reaches down to every vein and breath.[14]

The model Plutarch seems to have in mind for this inflated exaltation of Odysseus' self-control is the person who does not yield to torture. The exemplar of Odysseus is followed by that of his companions in the Cyclops' cave, who "would not denounce Odysseus nor show that instrument sharpened with fire and prepared against the Cyclops' eye, but preferred to be eaten raw rather than

to reveal anything of the secret (τῶν ἀπορρήτων), an unsurpassed example of self-control (ἐγκρατείας) and loyalty."

This is a curious interpretation! The reason Odysseus' companions do not "denounce" him is not, at least not primarily, that they are loyal to him (they certainly are not when they eat the Cattle of the Sun), but that they hope to survive. Had they revealed the secret, all of them, not just a few, would have died. More episodes in the immediate context of our passage—such as the stories of the philosopher Zeno cutting off his tongue not to betray a secret, or of the courtesan Leaina who did not reveal anything of the conspiracy to which she was privy even when put under the worst pressure (505D–F)—strongly suggest that Plutarch is reading Odysseus' self-mastery, and his companions', thinking of heroic behavior under torture. The addition of silence to the expressions of Odysseus' ἐγκράτεια, besides matching the topic of the essay, is further evidence that Plutarch drew his portrait of Odysseus with that model of heroism in mind.

Self-restraint, however, is not just a token of moral perfection, as in Plato, but also a weapon, which saves Odysseus and his companions. Plutarch presents the blinding of the Cyclops as a conspiracy with Odysseus as the main plotter and his crew as collaborators. By keeping the secret, Odysseus' loyal followers do more than just displaying "unsurpassed self-control": they guarantee the success of the enterprise. Similarly Odysseus repressing his emotions in front of Penelope is there to prove not just his moral excellence but also, more pragmatically, that "no spoken word has ever been as useful as many words unspoken" (505F). Preceding the narration of that episode are mentions not only of two paradigmatic cases of heroic silence, Zeno and Leaina, but also of one instance of imprudent speech: that of the man who (in Plutarch's version) betrayed the Pisonian conspiracy because he could not keep a secret and yet, when tortured, denied everything (505C–D). This array of examples situates our passage within a discussion about the expediency, as well as the nobility, of silence, with Odysseus as the mythic model for both aspects. Odysseus' capability for holding back his emotions, while ethically beautiful, also allows him to carry out his plan. Plutarch revives the pragmatism of Homer's Odysseus but with a slightly different emphasis, one that would resonate with the experience and fears of his contemporaries: Odysseus survives only because of his unbendable self-restraint, not his inventiveness and cunning mind. When he stands, apparently unmoved, before Penelope, he does not hide his tears "with guile," as he does in the Homeric episode (*Od.* 19.212: δόλῳ). By leaving out this important detail Plutarch gives the prize of victory to Odysseus' ἐγκράτεια alone.

ODYSSEUS' ENTITLEMENT TO CONTEMPLATION

When Odysseus' moral credentials are better established, philosophers nonetheless keep debating the *nature* of his wisdom. The main bone of contention among them is not so much whether Odysseus is a good man (as was the case, for instance, in the fashion of comparing him with Achilles),[15] but how and why: which end of life (τέλος) does he illustrate (as in Lucian's *The Parasite* or Seneca's *Ep.* 88)? What does he do to be wise? An emerging theme in discussions over Odysseus' wisdom, and one bound to be of great importance beyond Greco-Roman antiquity, is the rapport between his intellectual drive and the demands of action. In addition to asking, "Is Odysseus' thirst for knowledge useful for the pursuit of wisdom?" or, "How much knowledge does Odysseus need to be wise?" philosophers grapple with the question, "Should Odysseus indulge his desire to learn or be active in the world? Is he wise as a contemplative or a practical sage?"

In the period we have considered Odysseus draws admiration first and foremost for his practical wisdom. All in all philosophers are not so much attracted to his thirst for knowledge as to qualities, such as his endurance, piety, inventiveness, or various skills, which allow him rightfully to succeed in the world. Odysseus knows how to rule, to fight, to deal with his passions, with other men and the gods. He is the sage in action, who exercises his virtue and casts out vice. This shared admiration for Odysseus' practical wisdom comes to the fore in the pervasive attribution of φρόνησις to him, which lasts over several centuries and cuts across doctrinal differences.[16] Like Themistocles, the skillful general, Philodemus' ideal king borrows φρόνησις from Odysseus. The Stoic Odysseus is well endowed with it;[17] and so is Plutarch's hero.[18]

At the same time, however, because of his searching mind Odysseus was cut out to become a model also for the contemplative type. The seeds for this development are in Plato, and it remains essentially Platonic. By "depoliticizing" Odysseus, endowing him with νοῦς, and borrowing his καρτερία to describe Socrates' mental efforts, Plato paves the way for future readings of the hero as the philosopher yearning for knowledge. Thus, harking back to Plato's picture of Odysseus withdrawing from the world and ascending to the light "with intellect," Eustathius claims that Odysseus gained access to contemplation by "blinding the θυμός," the spirited faculty that drives our worldly ambitions and passions (*Od.* 1.22.15–16).

The *locus classicus* for discussions over Odysseus' entitlement to contemplation is the episode of the Sirens, and not only for the obvious reason that the

Sirens promise total knowledge, but also because that knowledge has no practical aim: it is defined by οἶδα (*Od.* 12.188 and 191), not ἐπίσταμαι, which in Homer denotes intellectual abilities with a practical purport (such as the ability to speak) or even know-how.[19] Ancient thinkers asked two main questions concerning the Sirens episode: "What is the meaning of the song?" and "How much of it should one be allowed to absorb to be wise?"

Plato's reading of the Sirens episode is foundational in both respects. In turn sensual temptations and the depositories of higher knowledge, the Sirens elicit different responses from a philosophically minded listener depending on what they offer. In the *Phaedrus* the Sirens are invoked to describe the dangerous seduction of the cicadas' humming voices. As the sun reaches its peak and the cicadas' song fills the air, Socrates stops the conversation and warns Phaedrus that they should not fall asleep, lulled by the cicadas, but "discuss and sail by them as if by the Sirens, without being charmed" (διαλεγομένους καὶ παραπλέοντάς σφας ὥσπερ Σειρῆνας ἀκηλήτους). The cicadas will then grant Socrates and Phaedrus the divine gift they bestow on the philosophically minded: a recommendation to Calliope and Urania, the Muses of philosophy (258e6–259d8).

To obtain the cicadas' sponsorship, one cannot yield to their vocal enchantment. Socrates and Phaedrus have to oppose an even stronger resistance against it than Odysseus against the Sirens' song. For Odysseus drinks in the beauty of that song, whereas Socrates and Phaedrus ultimately are not allowed to listen: they must "sail by the cicadas" with their philosophic activity (259a6–7), by tirelessly producing audible reasoning, διαλέγεσθαι. Listening to the song of the Sirens does not lift one's soul to the upper spheres of knowledge, but puts one to sleep. The model behavior vis-à-vis that drugging song, however, is not that of Odysseus' companions, who did not resist it but plugged their ears: instead, the philosophically minded first will hear the song, as Odysseus did, and then defeat it by his rational efforts, in this showing even more fortitude than Odysseus.[20] The song will stimulate dialectical reasoning as a counter-melody, performed by "the most beautiful voice," that of philosophy.[21]

In the *Symposium* the Sirens' song has a higher philosophical content, which its listener should not resist at all. Alcibiades admits that he could not endure Socrates' words but "stopped his ears and ran away, as if from the Sirens, in order not to grow old sitting there by him" (216a6–8). Alcibiades' deafness characterizes him as one of Odysseus' companions, whereas, had he been a model disciple of Socrates, he would have absorbed more of his teacher's charm than Odysseus did of the Sirens'. For the correct attitude vis-à-vis Socrates the Siren is not even that of Odysseus, who chose to listen to the song and yet to protect himself

from it, but total and permanent abandonment ("growing old by him"). To listen to Socrates properly means to follow him and "die," that is, allow one's rebirth as a philosopher. Socrates asks for a complete surrender. There is no tasting his voice and then sailing on.

Plato turns the Homeric episode upside down by arguing that Alcibiades should have applied καρτερία not to resist the song, as Homer's Odysseus is asked to do, but to listen to it (216a4: οὐκ ἂν καρτερήσαιμι). This reversal, however, happens at the cost of sacrificing the song's vocal beauty: Socrates' "song" has no sound, as it were. It is pure reasoning: "sheer speeches" (ψιλοῖς λόγοις), which nonetheless invite a comparison with the spellbinding music of the αὐλός (215b8–d1). It does not matter whether it is Socrates himself who speaks or someone else who reports Socrates' words: the effect is the same, of an unsettling divine charm (215d2–6; cf. 215c3–6).[22] It is the magic of those "naked words" that takes hold of us, and against which we should oppose no resistance.

By identifying the song of the Sirens with the call of philosophy, the *Symposium* prepares for the refashioning of that song as theoretical knowledge (something that Socrates' "song" of course is not). The refashioning occurs for the first time in a celebrated passage from Cicero's *De finibus* (5.49) in which Antiochus of Ascalon, Cicero's Academic teacher, is made to argue that the Sirens satisfy Odysseus' admirable *cupido sciendi:* "For, it seems, it is not by the sweetness of their voice or by some novelty or variety in their singing that they were accustomed to drive back those sailing past them, but because they promised knowledge of many things, so that men were drawn to their rocks by their desire to know."[23] Follows a translation of the Homeric passage, with the comment: "Homer saw that the story could not be praised if such a great man were held there enticed by petty songs. No, science is their promise, which, not surprisingly, to a man eager for wisdom was dearer than his fatherland."[24]

Aligning himself with Plato, Cicero sacrifices the vocal aspect of the Sirens' song in order to redefine it as the call of wisdom. Just as Plato underscores the "nakedness" of Socrates' Siren-like speeches, Cicero takes care to emphasize that the Sirens offer pure knowledge, not melodies. In so doing he goes against the Roman tradition, which took the song to mean sheer music, with no intellectual content.[25] Once the Sirens' song is purified of its sensual allurements, Odysseus earns Cicero's unconditional admiration for being irresistibly drawn to it.

For in our passage it is *Odysseus* who represents the model listener to the Sirens' promise of wisdom. This is novel. Though already Plato promoted Odysseus as a contemplative, he did so in an implicit manner, by reconfiguring the ambitious villain of tragedy as an ἀπράγμων and endowing him with excep-

tional intelligence. Moreover, Plato's ideal listener to the Sirens' song, as we have seen, is not Odysseus, but is either less absorbed or more committed to the song than he. In the *Phaedrus* Socrates and his companion should be less taken by the song than Odysseus: they should resist its harmful seduction and respond to it by their own conversation, remaining well tied to the mast of their reason. In the *Symposium* Alcibiades should have listened with more abandonment than Odysseus to his philosophical Siren: no "mast" should have kept him from following Socrates' call and "die." By celebrating Odysseus as the model listener to the Sirens' offer of wisdom, Cicero testifies to the growing philosophical prestige of our hero.

Cicero's portrait of Odysseus has invited a comparison with Dante's,[26] for both authors contrast the temptation of knowledge and the homecoming and recognize the greater attraction of the former for a character such as Odysseus. Cicero slightly forces the Homeric text by discounting Odysseus' firmness of purpose in pursuing the journey. Perhaps he does not quite produce a complete "reversal of the Homeric scene,"[27] but he makes a claim that is not in Homer: that to Odysseus "wisdom was dearer than fatherland." The Homeric Odysseus does forget the goal of his journey under the sway of the Sirens' song, and in this sense Cicero is right—though did Odysseus want to be freed from his bonds because he was tempted by the Sirens' promise of knowledge or just because he could not resist their enchanting voice? Nonetheless, by the precautions he has taken, Homer's Odysseus has decided from the outset which is the way to go: toward home. In contrast Cicero's Odysseus does not seek protection from the song but is ready to follow it.[28] To counter his desire there is no mast, either literally or allegorically. Reason is with that desire. Whatever Antiochus' position over the relative value of contemplation and action, Cicero attributes to him a praise of the former around the mythic exemplar of Odysseus, which contradicts Antiochus' previous statement that of the virtues of the mind, those implying volition, such as courage, justice, and temperance, are more valuable than purely intellectual ones, such as a good memory and the desire to learn (5.36). Odysseus represents that desire, which Antiochus now applauds for its own sake (cf. also 51–52), even approving of those who deem learning the ultimate goal in life (57). Perhaps behind these words lurks Cicero himself, speaking from his philosophical seclusion subsequent to his disappointment with politics.

Cicero, however, is careful to specify that the Sirens do not offer multifarious knowledge. His enthusiastic endorsement of Odysseus' eagerness to listen to the song is followed by this clarification: "being eager to know everything, all kinds of things, is the mark of curious men, but being driven by the contem-

plation of greater things to a passionate love for knowledge must be considered the mark of superior men" (5.49).[29] To be impregnable, *scientia* must coincide with *sapientia*.

Is Cicero contributing his opinion to the debate, dear to the Stoics, over Odysseus' inquisitiveness and its relationship to wisdom? This is difficult to gauge because Cicero no longer mentions Odysseus by name but generalizes ("being eager to know . . ."), then moves on to give examples of knowledgeable men (as opposed to curious ones), namely Archimedes, Aristoxenos, Aristophanes (of Byzantium), Pythagoras, Plato, and Democritus. Is Odysseus lingering in his mind from the previous section or is Cicero thinking of no one in particular as negative example? If Odysseus is the implicit reference, Cicero qualifies his admiration for him by making it clear that Odysseus' *cupido* for knowledge is laudable only if we interpret it as a passion for wisdom: but should we?

In spite of the possibly Stoicizing distinction between manifold knowledge and wisdom, Cicero's reading of the Sirens' song is not Stoic but chimes with Plato's refashioning of it as the voice of philosophy (in the *Symposium*).[30] For the Stoics do not interpret the song as the call of philosophical knowledge. In their view the Sirens either represent the temptation of corrupting pleasures, to be resisted altogether, or, at best, the lure of domains of study that might advance the pursuit of philosophy as well as distract one from it.

If the Sirens stand for the temptation of pleasure, Odysseus will sail past them firmly bound to the mast—of his reason. His actual ties could displease a Stoic because they denounced his weakness. The solution was to allegorize them, thus claiming that Odysseus, "the man of sense" (ὁ νοῦν ἔχων), was able to listen to the song of the Sirens "unperturbed" (μεθ' ἡσυχίας) (Dio Chrys. 32.47), a claim that could not possibly be made without transposing the mast and the bonds onto a metaphorical plane. A passage from Lucian's *Nigrinus* (19–20) contrasts the measures Odysseus took to protect himself from the song and the internal disposition that should have protected him: "Indeed . . . do not suppose that there is better training for virtue or a truer test for the soul than this city and the occupations here, for it is no small thing to oppose so many desires, so many sights and sounds laying hold of you and drawing you to them from everywhere. One must simply imitate Odysseus sailing past them, *but not with his hands tied up (that would be cowardly) nor with his ears stopped with wax, but listening to them unfastened, and with true contempt*." This impassive Odysseus, freed from his Homeric eagerness to listen to the song, is no longer in need of external protective implements.

As this passage suggests, however, the Homeric Odysseus could fall short of

a Stoic's expectations precisely because of his eagerness to hear the song and subsequent self-protection. Seneca for one seems to have been bothered by this, since he models his wise man's behavior not on Odysseus bound to the mast, even of his reason, but on his companions. To become wise, Lucilius should plug his ears with thicker material than the wax Odysseus used to stop his companions', for the allurements that threaten us do not come just from one rock but from everywhere (*Ep.* 31.2). Though neither Odysseus nor his companions are models of wisdom (the wax in the latter's ears is no inner strength), it is the companions, not Odysseus, that provide Seneca with the point of departure to fashion the model traveler to wisdom: a sailor even deafer than they, not by means of any mechanical device but "mental earplugs." The fact that Seneca was unwilling to attribute to Odysseus such allegorical mental earplugs (in the form of "the mast of his reason") might suggest that he did not admire his keen self-exposure to the song of the Sirens. This is borne out by an another passage (*Ep.* 123.12) in which he stresses that Odysseus was both reluctant to sail by the Sirens and unwilling to do it without being securely fastened: "those voices must be avoided just like those which Odysseus did not want to sail past if not bound" (*nisi alligatus praetervehi noluit*).

Seneca writes in the negative: Odysseus *did not* want . . . *if not* bound . . . Odysseus is no model of wisdom because he *wanted* to listen to the song, did so, and yet was able to sail forth—because, as in Horace's picture, *Sirenum voces et Circae pocula nosti* (*Ep.* 1.2.23). Whereas Horace highlights Odysseus' intelligence,[31] Seneca would wish him deaf to the corrupting calls of the world (the Sirens). His reading of the Sirens' song is the exact opposite of Plato's in the *Symposium,* both for the meaning attributed to the song and for the disposition required toward it: while in Plato the ideal listener to the philosophical song is an Odysseus without mental bonds, even more eager to listen than the Homeric character, Seneca's wise man will sail by the Sirens' corrupting voices with ears deafer than those of Odysseus' companions.

On the other hand, if the Sirens sing the pleasure of study, Odysseus' keenness to listen to them is laudable for a Stoic, but provided that it is checked and oriented by reason and subjected to the goal of moral improvement. Odysseus will not resist the charm of the song but will exploit its content for the pursuit of wisdom, which the song itself does not contain. We have seen that for Epictetus the attraction of the song signifies that of dialectics, in the study of which we should indulge only insofar as it helps our journey to wisdom. In a passage of Stoic inspiration Plutarch likewise appeals to the Sirens' song to describe the pleasure of poetry, and extols Odysseus as the model listener to it because he

exposed himself to the song (unlike his companions), but with the aid of a rational, "straightening" compass (ὀρθῷ τινι λογισμῷ), the mast, which kept him from being carried off course. Odysseus symbolizes the unemotional, self-controlled reader of poetry, who is able to use it in the right way: as a preparatory exercise in philosophy (προφιλοσοφετέον) (*Mor.* 15D–F).[32]

On either reading of the song, however, the Stoic Odysseus does not stop his ship to absorb philosophical truths but strengthens his virtue/reason against (potentially) dangerous allurements, and sails on.[33] Perhaps from a Stoic perspective the Sirens could not have sung philosophical truths because they did not promise virtue but knowledge for knowledge's sake, with no other goal than its own pleasure, added to the sensual pleasure of hearing a beautiful voice.

The Stoic Odysseus is nonetheless acquainted with contemplation, though he pursues it not by listening to the Sirens' song but by studying the world. Odysseus' spirit of observation provides the Stoics with evidence for his contemplative disposition. Horace (in the Stoicizing picture of Odysseus at *Ep.* 1.2) and Epictetus both admire in Odysseus "the man who saw many cities of men and came to learn their minds." Horace's hero, an exemplar of *virtus* and *sapientia,* "examined (*inspexit*) the cities and the customs of many men" (19–20), whereas for Epictetus Odysseus illustrates the principle that we are meant, not to be rooted in one place, but to move around, "at times driven by some necessity, at times for the sake of the spectacle itself. And it is something of this kind that happened to Odysseus: 'he saw the cities of many men and came to learn their minds'" (Arrian *Dissertations* 3.24.13).

To both Epictetus and Horace Odysseus' interest in the world recommends him as a model for the contemplative sage in the Stoic sense, that is, the grateful student of a cosmos providentially ordered. Odysseus' contemplative leanings, however, do not clash with his role as a practical philosopher. On the contrary, Odysseus is there to illustrate the intertwinement of contemplation and action in the Stoic view, according to which action should implement the cosmic truths learned through contemplation. Posidonius formulates this ideal when he defines our end (τέλος) as "living as a student of the truth and order of the whole, and helping to promote this as far as possible."[34]

Virtuous action requires the understanding of the cosmos and consists in adjusting to it. This implies that virtuous action is not intrinsically different from contemplation because it is endorsement of the cosmos rather than intervention in it. Commenting on the Aristotelian conception of θεωρία and πρᾶξις, Andrea Nightingale draws attention to the production of change as the main distinctive element. Contrary to πρᾶξις, θεωρία "is never productive and cannot

produce a byproduct or change in the external world."[35] This distinction loses relevance in a Stoic context, for, as Pierre Aubenque puts it, "in a perfectly ordered world, like that of the Stoics, moral action cannot be action on the world: since the world is rational, it would be absurd, and, moreover, absolutely vain to try to change it. . . . Thus, the sage does not act on the world but follows it; he accords his private life to the universal harmony."[36] We pursue our goals because we do not know what is in store for us or for the world, but if we were to achieve perfect knowledge of the cosmos, we would act only according to the design of fate, by happily obeying its dictates to "promote the order of the whole." Chrysippus allegedly said that had he known that it was fated for him to be ill, he would have had an impulse to be ill.[37] For the knowledgeable man the purpose of both contemplation and action is to praise the cosmos.

Odysseus fits this ideal. His endurance, coupled with his spirit of observation, could recommend him as the Stoic sage who not only studies the world but also tries to act in keeping with its order, that is, to adapt himself to it. In Epictetus' reading, does Odysseus move around "driven by some necessity" or "for the sake of the spectacle itself"? Epictetus does not specify because he is thinking of both: Odysseus' contemplative attitude allows him to understand and endorse his destiny. Horace's hero, in the mold of the *Odyssey,* observes the world even while he is driven on the sea, beset by hardship. He takes in the spectacle of the world while he is shuffled around in it.

The Stoic Odysseus is the performer of a god-written script training his virtue in order to play it well: when, naked and shipwrecked, he asks the Phaeacian maidens for food, he can do it with dignity because he knows what is under our control and what is not (so Epictetus, in Arrian *Dissertations* 3.26.33–35). Odysseus acts on himself. The Stoics read in his laboring an effort to shape, not the world, but his moral purpose. This might explain their preference for the wanderer, the hero buffeted by the waves of destiny, who reacts rather than acts, and for this reason could easily be recast as an "inward-bound" traveler, a seeker after self-improvement, indifferent to external happenings.[38]

In particular, Odysseus' capability for checking his instincts, for not "giving his assent" rashly, seems indeed to have recommended him as a model of Stoic detachment from external impressions. According to Galen Chrysippus joined the chorus of philosophers who made use of the opening of *Odyssey* 20 to demonstrate their psychological theories. Galen, who himself adopts the standard Platonic interpretation of Odysseus' rebuke to his heart as the victory of the λογισμός over the θυμός, attacks Chrysippus for his alleged misuse of that scene, claiming that, though Chrysippus does not believe in divisions in the soul,

he nonetheless "does not hesitate to mention Odysseus' . . . words which clearly refute his opinion" (*De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* 3.3.21–22). But we shall assume that Chrysippus, the exacting logician of the Stoa, knew better. The scene, to be sure, could not bear out his conception of the soul; but it could serve him well as illustration for the Stoic requirement that one not precipitate one's assent to a representation and act upon it. Odysseus holds back his heart; that is, he does not act upon the impression of the wrong done by the maidservants. He does not endorse what in more technical terms we might call, borrowing Brad Inwood's formula,[39] a "hormetic representation" telling him: "it is fitting that you attack the maidservants now." This exercise in self-restraint, in nonacting, is a quality the Stoics strongly admire in Odysseus.

Ultimately, then, the Stoics see no conflict between the nature of Odysseus' actions and his spirit of observation. If they have an issue with Odysseus' thirst for knowledge it is as a potential threat to his journey to wisdom, not his duties in the world. Conversely, in later Platonic thought a tension is felt between Odysseus' contemplative inklings and his obligations as a citizen: should Odysseus stop his ship forever and live a life of contemplation? Or should he sail on to resume his responsibilities in the world?

This question receives an elaborate answer from Eustathius. In his overview of the various meanings attributed to the Sirens he also reports the identification of them with theoretical knowledge: "the Homeric Sirens seem to be rather given to contemplation, since they are conversant with history, with the study of nature, as it is said, and, to speak in general, with learning."[40] The πολιτικὸς φιλόσοφος, however, will taste of their song in moderation: he neither wishes to avoid all association with the Sirens nor to stay with them forever, but will mix theory and praxis (*Od.* 2.4.35–38). That Odysseus is the underlying model for this ideal emerges from the following development (2.4.40–46): though he could grow old engrossed in learning (ὡς καὶ γεράσκων μανθάνω), Odysseus chooses not to stay with the Sirens and "sit idle" (ἐγκάθηται), occupied in sheer contemplation (μόνῃ τῇ θεωρίᾳ), but promptly to move on to act for the good of his companions and his people as befits the "perfect philosopher" (τέλειος . . . φιλόσοφος). Whereas Alcibiades in Plato's *Symposium* should have grown old listening to Socrates the Siren, Eustathius' perfect philosopher, embodied by Odysseus, cannot grow old feeding on contemplation.

Ten centuries earlier Maximus of Tyre had given a similar answer to the question asked by Eustathius: Odysseus has obligations in the world and must plunge into it. He cannot live a life of theory. Maximus, however, does not choose the episode of the Sirens to emblematize the tension (as he sees it) be-

tween contemplation and action in Odysseus' career.[41] Rather, he opposes Odysseus' wisdom and his works: "Odysseus was a sage (σοφός); but (ἀλλά) in his case too [as in Nestor's] I can see the fruits, both on land and at sea: 'Many were the men whose cities he saw and whose characters he learned, / As he strove to stay alive and bring his comrades home'" (15.6.c).[42]

This emphasis on Odysseus' activity fits within Maximus' overall idealization of Odysseus as a practical philosopher.[43] The image of Odysseus as the active sage occurs again in the same speech, in which Diogenes working to promote moral improvement is compared with Odysseus rebuking the host (15.9.c–d). Odysseus' knowledge of the world and of men, coupled as it is with his suffering ("He suffered many sorrows in his heart as he voyaged by sea"), results from his misfortunes, from his exposure to threats and calamities (38.7.b–d). It is evidence for Odysseus' goodness of character, for his well-trained virtue.

Maximus' portrait of Odysseus as a practical philosopher strikes a Stoic note owing to the preeminence in it of virtue and endurance.[44] Nonetheless, in our passage Maximus' Platonism breaks through his reading of Odysseus' activity. A Stoic would not oppose Odysseus' wisdom and his works, as Maximus does at *Orations* 15.6, but would say: "Odysseus was a sage, *as his works demonstrate.*"[45] Maximus' idealization of Odysseus' practical wisdom in fact is only superficially in agreement with Stoic thought, for Maximus ultimately deems Odysseus imperfect because he stops short of θεωρία. Practical wisdom, Odysseus' endowment, is, un-Stoically, a limited one.

Maximus denies value to the changeable world and the disciplines concerned with it. History ranks lower than philosophy, and practical philosophy lower than its theoretical counterpart. The suggestion at *Orations* 15.6 that Odysseus' wisdom is of a theoretical kind belongs to a speech in which Maximus makes the case for the practical life and is discounted in the next one, a defense of contemplation that wins the day—as if Odysseus could serve the cause of contemplation only when contemplation is under criticism. As the man who knows many cities and other men's minds, and who has gained his knowledge through suffering, Odysseus seems fitting to exemplify only the two inferior domains: in addition to practical philosophy, history—and not even the best kind.

Orations 22 sets Odysseus' dangerous travels against the pleasure of reading history books: whereas Odysseus came to know the world only at the risk of his life, the student of history finds the job done (by "Odysseus") and can enjoy learning about all kinds of monsters and wars in total security. Odysseus offers both an underlying reference and a point of contrast to conceptualize the read-

ing of history: not actual traveling amid dangers but metaphorical traveling under shelter. Maximus, however, rates the sheltered reading of history higher than the firsthand, Odysseus-like inquiry: "If Odysseus is reckoned wise because he was versatile and because 'He saw the cities of many men and came to know their character, / As he strove to stay alive and to bring his comrades home,' then far wiser sure is the man who removes himself from all danger and devours written accounts instead" (22.5.g–h).

This passage echoes a longtime polemic over the correct way of learning history: through personal inquiry or books? Whereas Polybius advocated firsthand study and adopted the much-wandering Odysseus as his model, Diodorus approved of bookish learning for not involving physical toil and dissociated himself from the Homeric hero who acquired knowledge "through great misfortune."[46] Maximus' preference for the armchair historian, which recalls Diodorus',[47] demotes Odysseus even as a student of history. Though Maximus here does not criticize Odysseus' knowledge for its content, he objects to the method of its acquisition.

In *Orations* 16 Maximus further demeans Odysseus, this time for the very content of his knowledge. In this eulogy of contemplation the sights Odysseus saw in his travels are branded as "mortal, ephemeral, and incredible" compared to those of the philosopher, whose body does not move but whose mind crosses every region of the cosmos (16.6.c–d). The argument recalls the beginning of *Orations* 26, in which the journeys of Odysseus are set against the flights of Homer's omniscient soul, the prototype of the philosopher's (26.1.a). Both passages build a climactic contrast between the traveler Odysseus and the traveling soul. That Odysseus functions as a foil for the theoretical philosopher indicates that the knowledge of the world he gained in his wanderings did provide Maximus with a reference to describe the journey of contemplation; but a reference destined to be merely a point of departure to start the contemplative soul on its cosmic travel, toward true sights. The dismissal of the sights Odysseus saw as transient and unbelievable emphasizes opposition over continuity between his knowledge and the philosopher's.

ESCAPING THE SEA

In short, the hero "who saw the cities of many men and came to learn their minds" in Maximus' view is deficient as a student of history because of his methods and as a philosophic theorist because of the content of his knowledge. In pointing out the latter limitation Maximus follows along Plato's lines, for Plato,

contrary to Epictetus, does not offer the Odysseus who studied the world as a model for the contemplative. Maximus' reliance on *Odyssey* 1.3–5 as evidence for Odysseus' "works" rather than abstract wisdom resonates with Plato's disregard of that passage as illustration for Odysseus' contemplative inklings. Though Plato does not reject Odysseus' travels in conceptualizing the theorist's journey to the truth, he exploits, not Odysseus' knowledge of the world, but either his image as a storm-tossed sailor, which lies behind the philosophical traveler in the *Phaedo* and perhaps the *Republic,* or, to build the picture of the ideal theorist in the Allegory of the Cave, his ascent from Hades to the light. Otherwise Plato's contemplative Odysseus does not travel, but stands still (in the picture of Socrates in the *Symposium*), or withdraws from human society and politics (in the Myth of Er).

Plato's disregard for Odysseus' knowledge of men and their minds is related to his notion of contemplation as a vertical movement, rather than more simply to his belief that reality lies beyond the visible world. That the dismissal of the world of the senses cannot but entail the dismissal of Odysseus' knowledge of it might seem a truism. But Plato's "older father," Parmenides, implicitly adopts the model of Odysseus traveling all over the cities to convey the breadth of his own knowledge and the impetus of his journey to reach being, in spite of it lying beyond the visible world (B 1 DK). He can identify with Odysseus, the "knowledgeable man" (εἰδότα φῶτα, l. 3), because he does not apply verticality to his own journey of knowledge, as Plato does. Parmenides' journey is straight, traced by infallible guides, but not upward.

In order for Odysseus the student of the world to become a model for the Platonic contemplative, he needed to be taken uphill. This is suggested by the one instance in which Maximus adopts Odysseus in that capacity to illustrate our contemplative disposition. At *Orations* 11.6.b, Odysseus scrutinizing unknown lands is compared with man in general, who should lift his thoughts and scrutinize the divine indications: "Yet Odysseus, when he landed in a foreign country, used to climb to a point of vantage and search for traces of the inhabitants: 'Are they ruffians and savages, devoid of justice, / Or hospitable to strangers, and of god-fearing mind?' Shall we then not have the courage to set our powers of reasoning on some vantage-point high in the soul and look round for traces of God, his location, and his nature?"

Because of his inquisitive gaze Odysseus provides Maximus with the model for the god-searching man. But this Odysseus inspects the land from on high. To underscore Odysseus' ascent Maximus combines separate scenes from the *Odyssey.* In Homer Odysseus has not walked up to a vantage point when he pro-

nounces the lines, "Are they ruffians . . ." Either he is standing in the same place as before (in *Od.* 6.120–21 and 13.201–202) or he prepares himself to go explore the premises (in *Od.* 9.175–76). The scene in which he reaches a post of outlook is in *Od.* 10.148 (on Circe's island), where our lines do not appear. Maximus does not hesitate to mix Homeric episodes in order to take the "contemplative" Odysseus up to higher regions, and this to preserve the analogy between Odysseus studying the world and our soul's uplifting search for the divine.

To Plato and his later followers the storm-tossed Odysseus appeared more fitting than the student of the world to travel the philosophical journey upward. To be sure, it is possible to object that in the Odysseus-like image of the philosopher as the sailor or the swimmer buffeted by choppy waters and striving to find the shore Plato does not stress the verticality of the journey of knowledge. This holds true insofar as that image, as opposed to the Allegory of the Cave, describes the situation of the real human searcher, who is not able to climb straight to the light but keeps stumbling into obstacles, and must try to swim forward each time he is pushed backward, around, or under. But the image still tells the story of a searcher who fights to stay afloat, at sea level, and whose raft, if he should be fortunate, will take him onshore, above sea level. Later Platonists indeed read Odysseus' bouts with the sea as a journey upward, which rescues the soul from matter and takes it back to its divine dwelling.

Already Maximus embraces the image of the philosophical Odysseus trying to free himself from the sea. At *Orations* 11.10.h, the veil of Leucothea (in *Odyssey* 5) is read as the teachings of philosophy that save Odysseus-the-soul from the stormy sea. As long as he swims in it, he cannot see god. This interpretation recalls Plato's own exploitation of Odysseus' raft in the *Phaedo* as "the best of human doctrines" to sail through life. Maximus sees Odysseus' battling the sea as a movement upward, which rescues the soul from its "fall" (καταπεσοῦσα) by means of a "veil" that is "cast under it" (ὑποβαλοῦσα) to lift it up.[48]

This refashioning of Leucothea's veil as the savior of Odysseus-the-soul wrestling to escape from the sea already smacks of Neoplatonism.[49] Maximus, however, does not push the allegory so far as to read in Odysseus a metaphysical traveler, eager to reach the death of the body and thereafter his true home.[50] This picture of Odysseus is rather to be found in a philosopher contemporary with Maximus, Numenius, who offered the Homeric traveler as the prototypical theorist in the strongest Platonic sense of the term: as the soul striving to reach "the land where no one knows the sea," that is, fighting against the body and longing to be freed from it. Porphyry in the *Cave of the Nymphs* (34) attributes to Numenius the image of Odysseus as the rational man passing through genesis

and returning to his celestial home, "among those who are freed from every wave and do not know the sea."[51]

Parenthetically we might note that in Numenius' reading, to recover his true home Odysseus cannot stop on Ithaca but has to reach the destination of his last journey as predicted by Tiresias ("among men who do not know the sea"). That unruffled land far from the sea is more apt to signify the soul's original dwelling than Odysseus' native Ithaca, and not only because the latter, as an island, is surrounded by the sea, but also, or perhaps especially, because it is besieged by the suitors. To elect Ithaca as Odysseus' metaphysical home, as Plotinus will do, it will be necessary to ignore its chaotic conditions and Odysseus' fight to put an end to them.[52]

This recasting of Odysseus as the traveler to the beyond might be implied already in Plutarch's interpretation of the Sirens' song as the call of that other world, though otherwise Plutarch admires in Odysseus the practical philosopher. Commenting on Plato's interpretation of the Sirens as cosmic musicians (at *Rep.* 617b4–7), Plutarch imagines them to attract an Odysseus already disembodied or longing for death (*Mor.* 745D–F).

As our souls depart from this world, the Sirens' song instills in them love for the heavenly and forgetfulness of mortality: attracted to that song, the soul disincarnated will travel back to its true home. The philosophical man, however, has heard the song already in his terrestrial life and longed for that journey. For the echo of the Sirens' song reaches the earth to remind our souls of their previous lives in heaven. Most souls cannot hear it because they are obstructed by their carnal baggage, but the one that does hear it yearns to break the bonds with the body. Odysseus is such a soul.

To prove his point Plutarch refers to a play by Sophocles in which Odysseus says that he visited the Sirens "singing the tunes of death."[53] This reference, to be sure, is not to the Homeric episode, but the contrast between the impeded and the unimpeded souls strongly suggests that Plutarch has it in mind.[54] Whereas Plato's reading of the Sirens as cosmic musicians, which Plutarch is discussing, builds on the tradition according to which the Sirens were demons leading the souls,[55] Plutarch fuses that tradition (traceable in Sophocles' fragment) and the Homeric scene.[56] This fusion, while expressing Plutarch's warm admiration for Odysseus, testifies to the growing philosophical importance of the Sirens episode as evidence not only for Odysseus' self-restraint but also for his theoretical and metaphysical aspirations.

If we could ask the Plutarch who wrote this passage, "How much of the Sirens' song should Odysseus absorb to be wise?" he would say: on earth he will

try to catch as much of that song as he can, and after death he will follow it entirely until he reaches his heavenly dwelling.[57] Odysseus' thirst for knowledge wins over his commitment to life in this world. For, if the ultimate purpose of earthly life is to transcend itself, Odysseus will not be kept from following the call of contemplation by the imperative of action, which presses him on to sail past the Sirens. He will not stay by the Sirens only temporarily, as Eustathius recommends to an earthbound Odysseus, the "political philosopher." A guide after death, but already a reminder of it in this life, the Sirens' song does not threaten Odysseus' return but makes it happen. These otherworldly Sirens bring Odysseus death, as in Homer, but only to transport him to his true Ithaca. In Félix Buffière's succinct formulation, "les Sirènes ne veulent perdre Ulysse que pour mieux le sauver."[58] The tension in the Homeric episode between Odysseus' determination to return to Ithaca and his desire to drink in the Sirens' song loses relevance: Odysseus-the-soul longs to follow the song precisely in order to return to "Ithaca."

In this context Odysseus' nostalgia becomes philosophically justifiable, or rather, desirable. We have seen that in Stoic thought Odysseus' longing for Ithaca poses problems because it implies that Odysseus has known a better condition, whereas a Stoic should accept the condition he is in and travel toward wisdom, improving himself continuously along the way. In contrast the Platonic Odysseus remembers the better life he has known, and that memory fills him with philosophical nostalgia. Plutarch uses imagery reminiscent of Plato's *Phaedrus:* the soul, maddened with a passion akin to love, "yearns" (ποθούσης) for that previous life. Likewise, in a Neoplatonic reading Odysseus' departure from Calypso was caused by "a philosophical yearning for his fatherland" (τῆς κατὰ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ποθουμένης πατρίδος) (Eustathius on *Od.* 1.51.15–16). Penelope is philosophy, and Odysseus' reunion with her marks the philosopher's liberation from the flesh (1.51.17–18).[59]

If the Sirens provided an emblem for the all-absorbing call of contemplation as world-renouncement, they did not, however, come to represent the temptation to put an end to one's life, and Odysseus did not earn a Platonist's praise for having "sailed past the Sirens' song" in the sense of having resisted the invitation to die before his time. Odysseus longs to follow the song but cannot, and on this earth he stays, constrained in the body.

As is well known, both Plato and his later followers condemned suicide, some of them in spite of questioning the meaningfulness of our life on earth. Odysseus appeared to them, once again, apt to expound their position, "good to think with." The chosen episode, however, was not that of the Sirens but of the

Cyclops. Numenius saw in Odysseus blinding Polyphemus an attempt at suicide, for the Cyclops, claimed the philosopher, stands for our bodily envelope. Because Odysseus tried to escape from it before his time, he incurred the punishment of Poseidon (Porphyry *The Cave of the Nymphs* 35).[60] There might be a reason for this preference.

In the Platonic view suicide is a violent separation of the soul from the body. Possibly the episode of the Sirens was not suitable to illustrating this conception because it did not contain any attack on the body. A modern text in an agnostic mood, the short story *Lighea* by Tomasi di Lampedusa, reads in Odysseus' urge to follow the Sirens forever the call of annihilation—not the soul's eagerness to break away from the body. The protagonist follows the Siren Lighea and dies because nothing has meaning for him.[61] What drives him to be reunited with his Siren is not hatred for the body and a longing for the true life, freed from it, but discontent and disillusionment with life altogether. For a Platonist, on the other hand, what would drive "Odysseus'" suicidal behavior is an uncontainable love for the soul, which cannot wait to be released from its hated bodily envelope. As the main act of physical violence in Odysseus' wanderings, in his "journey through life"—and one that was punished with even harsher wandering—the blinding of the Cyclops was fitting to describe a Platonist's notion of suicide and his stigmatization of it.

But did not another Platonizing reading of the Cyclops episode approve Odysseus' violence for opening his soul to contemplation by "blinding the θυμός"? As an attack on the body, Polyphemus' blinding lent itself to signifying both the commendable drive to contemplation and the condemnable temptation of suicide, because for a Platonist the line separating contemplation and death was thin or even nonexistent, both implying the victory of the soul over the body. As a theorist Odysseus deserved praise for blinding the Cyclops, but as human being, obliged to reside in his mortal dwelling, he deserved Poseidon's punishment for doing so.

Epilogue: Odysseus' *Virtus* and Thirst for Knowledge in the Renaissance

Echoes of the ancient discussion over Odysseus' drive to contemplation in relationship to his duties in the world are heard again in the allegorical interpretation of the *Odyssey* offered in the sixteenth century by the French scholar Jean Dorat, who taught the poets Pierre de Ronsard and Joachim Du Bellay and quite likely influenced their own treatments of Odysseus (the best known of which perhaps is Du Bellay's sonnet *Heureux qui comme Ulysse, a fait un beau voyage*).[1] I say "echoes" because Dorat explicitly draws on classical sources, both Latin and Greek, for his reading of Odysseus.

In medieval Europe moralists and philosophers do not seem to have been concerned with balancing Odysseus' contemplative inklings and his duties in the world. The reason is likely to be that they read Odysseus' wisdom through a Christian lens. In the East, where Homer was never systematically Christianized,[2] that thematic was kept alive: witness Eustathius with his admiration for Odysseus the πολιτικὸς φιλόσοφος, who delights in the Sirens' company but stays with them only temporarily. For Western readers, on the other hand, Odysseus' wisdom mainly consists in his striving to reach his celestial home, Ithaca thus reconfigured.[3] This Christian idealization of Odysseus culminates in the exaltation of him as a figure for Christ the savior, as in this passage from Maximus of Turin (450 AD): "If, then, the story says of Ulysses that having been bound to the mast saved him from danger, how much more ought there to be preached what really happened—namely that today the tree of the cross has snatched the whole human race from the danger of death! For, because Christ the Lord has been bound to the cross, we pass through the world's charming hazards as if our ears were stopped; we are neither detained by the world's destructive sound nor deflected from the course of a better life onto the rocks of wan-

tonness. For the tree of the cross not only hastens the person who is bound to it back to his homeland but also protects those gathered about it by the shadow of its power" (*Sermons* 37.2).[4] As an avatar of Christ, Odysseus perhaps remains a "king"—by binding himself to the mast he saves others in addition to himself—but one projected onto the world beyond, not the wise and competent administrator of the terrestrial city.

The medieval Odysseus is a contemplative in a sense reminiscent of Neoplatonism: as a stranger on earth, eager to leave a world where he does not belong. So for instance in the reading of the Norman philosopher William of Conches (twelfth century), for whom Odysseus blinding the Cyclops is the wise man battling worldly desires: "For Polyphemus, that is, childish vision, is pride, because it seems to a child that he knows and sees many things. He has only one eye, that is, only contemplation of temporal things, and this he has in his forehead, that is, an ostentatious display, because children turn their attention to ostentation and boasting. Ulysses plucks out the eye of childish pride, because the wise man Ulysses is called ὁλονξένον,[5] that is, the far-ranging wanderer (a traveler through all lands), since here is (his?) pilgrimage. But our life is in heaven; he scorns the contemplation and desire for temporal things."[6]

This passage recalls the Platonizing reading of Polyphemus' blinding as the extirpation of the θυμός by the pursuer of contemplation. William of Conches further elaborates on the incompatibility between contemplation of true things on the one hand and worldly sights and actions on the other by presenting Odysseus as a pilgrim on earth. Within this mind-frame there is no negotiating Odysseus' double aspiration as a contemplative and as a practical sage, because the only desirable commitment to the world consists in fighting all worldly goods. As long as he is moving on this earth Odysseus is everywhere a stranger (ὁλονξένον), and his wisdom is nothing but this total estrangement.[7]

The picture is significantly altered in the Renaissance, along with both changes in mentality and the rediscovery of Homer and Greek philosophical authors, especially Plutarch, whose fervid admiration for Odysseus' skills and virtue greatly contributed to recommending him as a model of leadership (Renaissance authors repeatedly quote the story, told by Plutarch, about Alexander the Great knowing Homer by heart and sleeping with the *Iliad* under his pillow).[8]

In keeping with ancient representations the Renaissance Odysseus remains essentially a practical sage, devoted to the welfare of his people and to the exercise of his virtue. This portrait of him appealed already to Petrarch (in his epistles and other prose writings). His Odysseus is the man of *virtus:* the stoical hero in a Horatian vein (*quid virtus et quid sapientia possit*), committed to his comrades

and to the cultivation of his moral excellence. Several passages by Petrarch echo this Stoic ideal: Odysseus, like Heracles, is the hero of *labor,* wherein *virtus* shines.[9]

Aligning himself again with Stoic authors, Petrarch sees no conflict between Odysseus' intellectual inclinations and his duties in the world. As suggested above, when the Stoics questioned Odysseus' intellectual drive it was not because they deemed it an aspiration that, no matter how noble, should be kept in check by a sense of obligation toward others, but because they subordinated that drive to the acquisition of wisdom, which might or might not benefit from it. The opposition drawn by (some of) the Stoics in their readings of Odysseus is not between his theoretical aspirations and his responsibility in the world, but between his curiosity or manifold interests and the pursuit of wisdom. Likewise Petrarch, far from arguing that Odysseus' thirst for knowledge impairs his activity in the world, considers it beneficial to such activity. Petrarch, however, does not even show mistrust vis-à-vis Odysseus' intellectual curiosity with respect to his moral excellence, as some Stoics do, but presents an integrated picture of his hero in which *virtus* includes desire for knowledge and even feeds on it:

> Odysseus went also to Troy and from there farther out; he crossed lands and seas, and did not stop until he found a city with his name in the most remote shore of the West. Yet at home he had a very old father, an infant son, a young wife who was besieged by suitors, while in the meantime he was fighting with Circe's drinks, Sirens' songs, Cyclopes' violence, sea-monsters and storms. A man famous for his wanderings, he trod upon his affections, neglected his kingdom and so many attachments, and preferred to grow old between Scylla and Charybdis, in the dark depths of Avernus and amidst such difficult circumstances and places that wear out even the mind of a reader, rather than at home, and this for no other reason than to go back home some day in his old age richer with knowledge. In truth, if experience increases one's knowledge, if it is the mother of the arts, what beautiful thing and truly worthy of high praise can one hope for, if one perpetually keeps watch over the paternal house? It is fitting for a good farmer to remain in his field, to know the quality of his land, the ways of his cattle, the nature of his waters, how his trees and seeds grow, the seasonal vicissitudes and the alternations in weather conditions, and even rakes, hoes, and ploughs. But it belongs to a noble spirit and one striving for excellence accurately to observe many lands and "the customs of many men." What you read in Apuleius is most true: "it is with good reason," he says, "that the divine author of ancient poetry among the Greeks, when he wished to describe a man of the highest wisdom, celebrated

him for having reached the heights of virtue by visiting many cities and knowing a variety of people." And our poet imitates this by taking his Aeneas around countless cities and places, as you know.[10]

Petrarch's unqualified admiration for Odysseus' intellectual drive is in a humanistic vein, just as his emphasis on traveling as the medium for satisfying that drive and acquiring knowledge foreshadows Renaissance ideals.[11] The knowledge Odysseus longs to satisfy, however, is not of a theoretical kind. First, our hero is the Odysseus *experiens,* whose *doctrina* comes from firsthand exposure to the world (*si experientia doctos facit*). We are reminded of the old-time polemic among historians over the relative merits of autopsy and bookish learning, with Odysseus serving as illustration for the former: he went through hardships that wear out even the mind of a reader (*que legentis quoque animum fatigent*). We think of Diodorus (and Maximus of Tyre), who drew the same opposition but to the advantage of reading. Petrarch's admiration for Odysseus' experience of the world rather chimes with Polybius'.

Second, our excerpt comes from a letter in which Petrarch weaves together a praise of traveling, knowledge, and public activity to defend the French envoy to the Holy See, Cardinal Guy de Boulogne, whom Petrarch's addressee criticized for remaining abroad, in Rome.[12] The eulogy of Odysseus as a man of knowledge, willing for its sake to sacrifice his domestic affections and to face all sorts of dangers, belongs to an argument in favor of *negotium,* not *otium:*[13] Odysseus' desire to become *doctior* is no barrier against his call to attend to the needs of his people, for, as the comparison with the farmer bears out, the goal of Odysseus' traveling abroad is to acquire the knowledge necessary to administer his household and kingdom. While to manage a farm one has to stay put and learn about the crops, the weather, and so on, better to manage his "estate" a public figure has to travel and learn "about many cities of men and their minds."

The citation from Apuleius and the reference to Aeneas reinforce the association of Odysseus' intellectual drive with his practical wisdom and public mission. If Apuleius lauds Odysseus for his *prudentia,* which he compares with the experience of the world allegedly acquired by the protagonist of the *Golden Ass* in the course of his misadventures (9.13–14), Virgil's Aeneas is not even thirsty for knowledge: he is the persecuted wanderer without the ethnographic curiosity that animates Odysseus; the exile ordered to found the Roman nation. By choosing Aeneas as a parallel for Odysseus, Petrarch brings to the fore the political purport of Odysseus' wisdom.[14]

Odysseus' knowledge is "of the cities of many men and their minds." This

specification fits within Petrarch's integrated picture of Odysseus as the virtuous hero who serves his fellows by his *doctrina.* By emphasizing that Odysseus was eager to learn about the world of men, Petrarch avoids questioning the relationship between Odysseus' intellectual drive and his call to activity, because the sort of knowledge involved can easily harmonize with Odysseus' obligations. We have seen that already in antiquity Odysseus' knowledge of cities and men is not perceived as the kind of theoretical or disinterested knowledge that might clash with one's engagement in the world: on the contrary, that knowledge, as is natural, increases Odysseus' practical wisdom, his own virtue as well as his expertise in dealing with people. This line of interpretation keeps appealing to Renaissance critics. Two centuries after Petrarch, in England Roger Asham reads the introductory lines of the *Odyssey* as "a great prayse of Ulysses, for the witte he gathered, and wisedome he used in his traveling," where "wisdom" consists in resisting the corrupting allurements of foreign (predictably, Italian) customs, symbolized by Odysseus' encounters with Circe, the Sirens, and so on.[15] Asham puts emphasis on moral, rather than political, virtue, but Odysseus' knowledge of the world, for Asham as for Petrarch, qualifies him as a practical sage.

We might, however, expect that in the Renaissance appreciation for Odysseus' intellectual curiosity extended beyond his interest in "the cities of many men and their minds." The Renaissance ideal of a well-rounded person, conversant in the arts and sciences, including the most esoteric ones, could easily find in Odysseus its embodiment. This happens with Jean Dorat's *Mythologicum.*[16]

The allegorical interpretation of the *Odyssey* offered in that essay, while not altogether dismissive of moral readings of the poem current at the time, subsumes them under a grander scheme, reminiscent of Neoplatonism, from which we infer that Odysseus represents the soul striving to reach its celestial home: "The fatherland is the sky whence originally the souls are sent down into our bodies. Happiness is signified by rugged Ithaca, for we reach that blessed state but through a rugged, narrow and difficult path, across many toils, torments, and miseries."[17] Based on this passage, another scholar of the same period reads in Odysseus as reconfigured by Dorat a metaphysical traveler: eager for wisdom and true happiness ("Penelope" and "Ithaca" respectively), Odysseus faces all sorts of hardship in his earthly life until, after death, he reaches his otherworldly destination with the help of the Phaeacians, the model conveyors.[18] Philip Ford also suggests that this image of Odysseus as the soul longing for home might have influenced the iconography of the famous Fontainebleau gallery (by the school of Primaticcio) featuring episodes from Odysseus' adventures, at least according to a contemporary explanation of the painting illustrating Odysseus' re-

turn: "Des Phéaciennes accompagnent Ulysse en son pays, où elles le posent doucement, tout endormy qu'il estoit. Ces courtoises Dames sont le vray symbole des Vertus; *Qui après la mort (que les plus Contemplatifs ont compare* [*sic*] *au sommeil) nous ravissent insensiblement au Ciel, d'où nous tirons notre origine.*"[19]

Dorat's Odysseus, however, is not consistently a metaphysical traveler. His *patria* also stands for the "happiness of the citizens," and Odysseus for the *politicus* because he yearns for it: "Ulysses can signify the Politician who looks to his fatherland, that is, to his citizens' happiness. For those who live in their fatherland are deemed happy. . . . And he wishes to protect his companions, that is, to keep his citizens dutiful and just, but the winds blow against him."[20] Since Odysseus' fatherland is both a metaphysical and a terrestrial realm, Odysseus is both the soul striving to leave this world and the wise leader working in and for it.

It is with a view to his role as a *politicus* and a moral subject that Odysseus' thirst for manifold knowledge appears to Dorat as a potential threat, but one that the Renaissance scholar neutralizes by containing it within limits to produce the ideal, well-rounded person who knows more than "the cities of many men and their minds" but does not live a life of pure learning. Odysseus will study everything, but will never lose sight of his active role in the world.

Following in the footsteps of the allegorist Heraclitus, who was popular at the time, Dorat imagines Odysseus' eagerness for knowledge to travel even down to Hades: "The descent of Ulysses to the underworld signifies nothing else than the study of natural science. For Ulysses, the philosopher eager to learn the origin of things and aspiring to reach true happiness, as symbolized by the fatherland, is taught that the soul is immortal."[21] Odysseus, however, does not risk losing himself in metaphysical speculations. Fortified by the knowledge acquired in Hades, he can face the tribulations that await him in his journey through life: "But it is right that the descent [to Hades] is put first, for Odysseus was going to face the Sirens, Scylla and Charybdis, which signify the miseries, troubles, torments and the other accidents, all monsters that we would not be persuaded to conquer or to endure with equanimity if we did not have the immense and noble reward of immortality, shall I say, the knowledge of the soul's divine nature."[22] Odysseus' thirst for arcane knowledge is granted satisfaction but for practical reasons: to help him through life's hardships.

Alternatively Odysseus will balance his thirst for such knowledge with activity in the world. He will not stay forever engrossed in the life of contemplation symbolized by Circe and Calypso: "The condition existing outside politics is twofold: either of physical science, and this is represented by Circe, or of metaphysics, which can be recognized in the traits of Calypso. For the latter contem-

plates excellence, immortality, and the pure essence of divine things, and, because such things no doubt are obscure to mortals, the name she has been allotted comes from καλύπτειν, that is, to cover, to hide. Circe on the other hand investigates the things on earth and under the earth."[23]

This interpretation in part echoes Eustathius', who holds that Calypso signifies the sky and Odysseus the astronomer.[24] Dorat adds his own original reading of Circe as "physics" to round off the philosophical curriculum embraced by Odysseus. Just as for Eustathius, however, for Dorat Odysseus must avoid total absorption in those disciplines: he has to leave Calypso and he visits Circe with the guidance of Mercury, who offers him the magical root to ward off Circe's powers (985–92). This last observation recalls Stoic allegorical readings of the root or the ship's mast as Odysseus' rational compass, which helps him not only to steer clear of sensual pleasures, but also to keep the right course in making his way through the allurements of delightful studies, for instance of poetry.

Poetry is indeed one such areas of study in Dorat's interpretation of the Sirens' episode, which, in line with Eustathius, Plutarch, Cicero, and Epictetus (in his description of the traveler to wisdom as one who does not linger in "beautiful inns"), is held to signify the wise man's confrontation, not with vulgar pleasures, but with nobler intellectual temptations. Dorat vocally opposes the interpretation of the Sirens as prostitutes, common in the Renaissance: "Truly these [the Sirens] are not to be interpreted, as does the majority, as prostitutes or pleasures that normally cause universal destruction. For Cicero [in *De finibus* 5] rejects this allegory entirely."[25] Instead, the Sirens represent the "inferior disciplines, which do not offer truth and virtue as much as pleasantness."[26] Those are poetry, history, oratory, the investigation of nature and other studies that delight the mind, such as mathematics. One should be exposed to such disciplines but in moderation (*modus*), as Gellius recommends (in the passage, cited by Dorat, in which he says that one should not grow old dallying by the "Sirens" of dialectics), as well as Cicero, where he "criticizes those who think that philosophers 'should not do anything else but spend all their time in inquiries and studies concerning the knowledge of nature . . . To embark on all kinds of learning with no distinction is typical of curious men. But to be led by the contemplation of greater things to desiring knowledge must be considered the mark of superior men.'"[27] Whereas imprudent men (*parum cauti*) want to spend all their life with the Sirens (line 449), Odysseus, the *sapiens,* aspires to reach his fatherland, that is, "true happiness" (567–68), and to this end swiftly sails by the Sirens: "Such an interpretation concerns those who for a long time have been engrossed in studies and have learned all their secrets, just as Odysseus, who had already

gone through every science. But since one ought not to grow old lingering in those sciences, full as they are of harmful seduction and charm, Odysseus very quickly sails by the Sirens."[28]

Dorat finds the enticement of study a threat to the pursuit of moral perfection. His interpretation of Odysseus' *patria* as *beatitudo vera* recalls the Stoic identification of one's "home" with virtue/ happiness, rather than the Neoplatonic transference of Odysseus' fatherland onto a metaphysical plane (a reading that Dorat espouses elsewhere, as noted above).[29] The comparison that follows between those who pursue unfocused studies and Odysseus' suitors who could possess only Penelope's maids, not the queen (572–76), is identical with the one drawn by Aristippus (Diog. Laert. 2.79) and Ariston (*SVF* 1.350). As far as the relationship between knowledge and wisdom, Dorat perhaps would qualify as an "enlightened Stoic," one who admires Odysseus' intellectual drive but only if subjected to the quest for happiness.

Dorat's biased reading of the passage from the *De finibus* bears out his care to subordinate Odysseus' thirst for knowledge to practical aims. For Cicero, as we have seen, extols Odysseus as a contemplative type while deeming the contemplative life as unquestionably praiseworthy (perhaps even the most praiseworthy). He does not criticize those who think that philosophers "should not do anything else but spend all their time in inquiries and studies concerning the knowledge of nature," as Dorat claims by stitching together *De fin.* 5.53 and the end of 5.49 ("To embark on all kinds of learning with no distinction is typical of curious men. But to be led by the contemplation of greater things to desiring knowledge must be considered the mark of superior men"). The first passage in fact belongs to a section arguing exactly the opposite, namely that the life of the blessed is spent in pure contemplation. Dorat's admiration for Odysseus' thirst for knowledge, however, extends further than a Stoic's, for he praises the inquisitive hero for having "gone through every science" (line 623). With some inconsistency he tells us that the Sirens' song offers no truth or virtue and yet that it "contains some philosophical ideals" (544: *quaedam philosophia*)—a statement in line with Cicero and the Platonic tradition.

The Platonizing mood of this pronouncement matches the opposition between Odysseus' contemplative inklings and his obligations in the world that Dorat draws in other sections of the *Mythologicum*. If in his analysis of the Sirens episode Dorat subordinates Odysseus' thirst for knowledge to his moral goal, when he discusses Odysseus' stay with Circe and Calypso the tension he sees is rather between contemplation and political action: he calls the sciences Odysseus is offered "outside politics" or "outside the state," and asks him to re-

turn to his political duties and not to let himself be fully absorbed in those intellectual pursuits. Perhaps Dorat would have granted Odysseus a longer stay with the Sirens than Eustathius did, for, when he calls Odysseus *philosophus,* it is to celebrate his *cupiditas sciendi* regardless of his commitment to the world (line 320). But surely his Odysseus must contain that *cupiditas,* and not only by orienting it toward the attainment of happiness, but also by forsaking the delights of *philosophia* in order to guide his citizens to be "dutiful and just," that is, to achieve their own happiness.

NOTES

Introduction

1. Cf. Eustathius, *Od.* 1.17.10; 1.17.39; 1.22.15; 1.27.10; 1.208.8; 1.319.8; 1.332.31; 1.313.45; 2.3.26; 2.4.6 and passim. I cite Eustathius by volume, page, and lines, according to the *TLG.*

2. Cf. Stanford 1968, chapter 9, and the brief sections on Antisthenes, Socrates, and Plato in chapters 7 and 8.

3. Cf., e.g., Stanford and Luce 1974; Brommer 1983; Rubens and Taplin 1989 (an inviting journey in Odysseus' footsteps, across geography, history, archaeology, literature, and art); Bloom 1991 (a collection of previously published essays, with only one on philosophical texts, by Pépin); Boitani 1994; Boitani and Ambrosini 1998; Malkin 1998; Andreae 1999; Babbi and Zardini 2000; Hartog 2001; Hall 2008.

4. Lévystone (2005) focuses on the Socratics; Edwards (1988), Lamberton (1989, 129–33; 221–32), and Pépin (1991) on Neoplatonism. Though Buffière (1956, 365–91) attempts a more comprehensive analysis of Odysseus in ancient thought, his treatment is brief and has gaps. Kaiser (1964) discusses moralizing interpretations of major episodes in the *Odyssey* (the Sirens, Circe, and Calypso), and Wedner (1994) focuses on the episode of the Sirens. Hall (2008) has an excellent chapter (11) on philosophical readings of the *Odyssey*, but mainly by post-Cartesian authors.

5. Though Stanford (especially 1949a and b) privileges Pindar as the first author to denigrate Odysseus, aspects of the denigration might go as far back as the Cyclic poems.

6. Comedy is of less use, for disrespectful mockery is the keynote of the genre as such.

7. Stanford (1968, chapter 8) highlights almost exclusively the negativity of tragic portraits of Odysseus. Garassino (1930), however, mentions several titles of plays in which Odysseus probably appeared in a good light.

8. Hall (2008, 38) has perceptive observations on the intrinsically nontragic quality of the hero of the *Odyssey.* The chief reason for his inadequacy as a tragic character is that he normally succeeds. It might not be accidental that every tragedy based on this epic has been lost, and that several of them featured as their protagonist not Odysseus but his victims. The episode in Odysseus' biography that best lent itself to a tragic reading perhaps was his death at the hands of Telegonus, his son by Circe, who killed his father without recognizing him. But even in this episode the main tragic character must have been the "Oedipus-figure" Telegonus.

9. Stanford (1949a, 39) rightly warns us against taking a tragic character's judgment on Odysseus as the author's own.

10. Translations are mine unless otherwise indicated. To preserve consistency, I have never transliterated Greek terms, not even in quoting scholars who do so.

11. 'Ὀδυσσέως βία is ironically fashioned after a Homeric formula describing strong men (βίη + a hero's name in the genitive or in adjectival form), which in Homer is never applied to Odysseus. In addition to carrying ironic overtones, however, the phrase also foreshadows Odysseus' threats. Cf. Webster 1970 *ad loc.;* Blundell 1987, 327.

12. Cf. Webster 1970 *ad loc.;* Blundell 1987, 307 n. 3.

13. See the apparatus in the Oxford Classical Text, whose editors, H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, bracket the lines.

14. Kirkwood (1994, 431) is convinced that Neoptolemus' "enthusiasm" in insulting Odysseus, especially when he identifies him with Thersites, is genuine: "surely we have here his true and unflattering view of Odysseus."

15. Cf. also *Phil.* 607–8, where the Merchant, Odysseus' creation, says of him: "Odysseus . . . who hears all kinds of shameful and offensive words spoken about him."

16. For Odysseus see below.

17. Cf. Rose 1976, 81 and 83; Blundell 1987, 326–27. Odysseus straightaway uses σόφισμα and related terms for his plan: 14, 77.

18. On the Sophists' constituency, cf. Guthrie 1971, 37; Rose 1976, 86.

19. For discussion of σοφία and σοφός in Sophocles, cf. Levet 2008.

20. Cf. also Euripides *Trojan Women* 1224–25; *Cyclops* 450; *Rhesus* 625; *Telephus* (*TGF,* vol. 5.2, 715); Sophocles in *TGF,* vol. 4, 913. Cf. already Pindar *Nem.* 7.23, where the σοφία that unfairly won Odysseus the armor of Achilles can be read as Odysseus' own as well as Homer's.

21. Cf. the scholion quoted by Webster 1970 *ad loc.:* "clever because of the deceit and valorous because of the sack."

22. We do not want to force the evidence, but cannot help noting that the only surviving tragedy in which Odysseus is presented in a good light, *Ajax,* is also the earliest (440s), and that Euripides in his *Philoctetes,* of 431, treated Odysseus less harshly than in his later plays (see chapter 2).

23. Cf. Stanford 1949b and 1968, 100–101. Stanford points out that πολύτροπος, that quintessentially Odyssean epithet, was negatively applied to late fifth-century politicians and even to the Athenian populace. He adduces Plutarch *Alcibiades* 2.24; [Phocylides] 95; Thucydides 2.44.

24. Cf. King 1987, 68–71.

25. King, however, also mentions Nagy's contention (1999, chapter 3) that there was an epic tradition antedating the *Iliad* in which Odysseus and Achilles competed for the title "Best of the Achaeans" on the basis of intelligence versus might.

26. Cf. *Iphigenia in Aulis* 522–33; 1362–64; *Hecuba* 131–33. ἡδυλόγος is at *Hec.* 132.

27. Michelakis 2002, 95.

28. Malkin (1998, 101–2) mentions a tradition apparently recorded by Aristotle in his *Constitution of Ithaca* according to which Neoptolemus came to Ithaca to mediate between Odysseus and the suitors' relatives: Odysseus was exiled (as many leaders of civil wars) but the relatives had to pay annual gifts to Telemachus. This story is at the origin of a cult of Odysseus on Ithaca.

29. King 1987, 74.

30. King 1987, 74. The reference is *Od.* 13.296–99.

31. Cf., e.g., 111, 81–82 ("victory is sweet"), with Blundell 1987, 313; Boulogne 1988, 104–5.

32. For further discussion, cf. chapter 2.

33. Cf. Peradotto 1990.

34. One exception is *Il.* 8.424, where Iris warns Athena, "If truly you dare (τολμήσεις)" fight against Zeus' will . . .

35. Carter (1986, 11–12) comments on the negativity of τόλμα in fifth-century Athenian culture at large, drawing especially on Thucydides (e.g., 1.70.3 and 1.70.8; but cf. 2.40.3). Similarly Demont (1990, 94) mentions τολμηρός as a negative term in fifth-century authors. A passage from Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (3.8.2), however, suggests that the average Athenian (or even Greek) valued τόλμα, since it is listed among so-called goods such as food and drink, wealth, health, and strength.

36. In *Ajax* Odysseus is accused of immoral daring by the chorus by means of the once-laudatory epithet πολύτλας: "he indeed exults, the much-daring man, in the darkness of his heart (ἦ ῥα κελαινώπᾳ θυμῷ ἐφυβρίζει πολύτλας ἀνήρ)" (955–56). Garvie (1998 *ad loc.*) preserves the Homeric meaning of much enduring for πολύτλας. But see Moore's translation, "laboring" (1959). Stanford (1979 *ad loc.*) also keeps "much enduring," but adds that the epithet is used "almost as παντουργῷ in 445." Mazzoldi 2000, 138, translates, in my view correctly, "che molto osa." Odysseus' noble behavior, however, prompts Teucer to refute the chorus' accusation by echoing two of its key words: "alive in the presence of this dead here, you [Odysseus] did not dare exult arrogantly" (οὐδ᾽ ἔτλης παρὼν / θανόντι τῷδε ζῶν ἐφυβρίσαι μέγα) (1384–85). Far from being much daring in his hubris, Odysseus did not dare commit hubris at all. τλάομαι is attributed to him in the negative, just as

Odysseus himself will use it in the negative to urge Agamemnon to bury their enemy: μὴ τλῇς ἄθαπτον . . . (1333). Another exception to the stigmatization of Odysseus' daring is in Euripides' *Cyclops,* where Odysseus uses τλάω in the negative, and to invite the Cyclops to abide by moral rules: "do not dare kill friends who have come to your cave" (288–89).

37. Line 984. τόλμης πέρα is Pearson's conjecture. The τλα- terms have negative connotations also when referred to Agamemnon and Menelaus (of whom Odysseus is an ally and an accomplice) by Neoptolemus: τλημονέστατον λόγον (363) and τολμήσατ' (369).

38. In *Iphigenia in Aulis,* the daring one in a bad sense is Agamemnon after his initial reluctance, expressed as a refusal to "dare" (96 and 98): cf. 887; 913; 1257. Odysseus, however, is the strongest supporter of the sacrifice, and the one who will ensure its happening because of his φιλοτιμία: cf. 524–33. The theme of daring in connection with Odysseus' φιλοτιμία was prominent also in Euripides' *Philoctetes* (see below and chapter 2), but we cannot be sure that the verb τολμάω, which appears in Dio Chrysostom's paraphrase of the play (*Or.* 59.1), was in the original. In fragment 3 (Müller 2000, 170), Odysseus says that nothing is more *proud* (γαῦρον) than man, and that we honor those who "do more."

39. Cf. Schein 2001, 45.

40. This double line can be seen especially in Antisthenes, the most enthusiastic admirer of Odysseus in the extant Socratic tradition. Cf. chapter 1.

41. Learned studies have argued for Odysseus' importance among the early Pythagoreans, yet the evidence is scanty at best: cf. Detienne 1958 and 1962, and the qualifications by Pépin 1991, 244 n. 9. Uses of Odysseus are better attested for the Pythagoreanism of Imperial times, as Detienne's studies also show. Detienne suggests that the central stucco of the Basilica at Porta Maggiore in Rome (of Augustan age), which quite possibly hosted Neophythagorean ceremonies, represents Odysseus sitting by the shore on Calypso's island and longing for home. If this is true, the stucco bears witness to the importance of Odysseus in Neopythagorean circles at the time (though on the negative side is the lack of mention of a Pythagorean "abuse" of Odysseus in Seneca *Ep.* 88).

42. Parmenides the "knowledgeable man": cf. B 1 DK. On the Odysseus-like quality of Parmenides' journey to being, cf. Havelock 1958; Mourelatos 1970, especially chapter 1; Cassin 1987; Gilead 1994, 88–89; Marincola 1997 and 2007, 7; Montiglio 2005, 147–50. Democritus as an Odysseus-like traveler: cf. B 299, 6–8 DK, with Marincola 1997 and 2007, 6–7.

43. It is possible to object that in several cases also later philosophers do not engage with Odysseus but just exploit Homeric lines to make a point, without thinking of the character involved in the original. We should indeed apply caution when we rely on citations to draw a philosopher's interpretation of a mythic character. My method has generally been to have recourse to such citations if they call immediately

Odysseus to mind (at least to an educated reader), and/or as additional material when there is enough evidence otherwise about an author's interest in Odysseus.

44. Cf. Buffière 1956, 417. Cf. also Pépin 1991, 229.

45. Odysseus' reputation among philosophers, however, throughout the period with which we are concerned is never flawless: issues such as his nostalgia, his hedonism, and his greed bother moralists as late as the Roman Stoics and the writers of the pseudo-epigraphic Cynic letters: cf. chapters 3 and 4. In spite of its philosophical rehabilitations, Odysseus' versatility retains its unsolvable ambivalence even in philosophical authors: cf. chapter 4.

46. Cf. chapter 5 and epilogue.

47. On Eustathius' sources, cf. Brisson 2004, 115, with further bibliography.

48. Hippias in Plato *Lesser Hippias* 364c6 claims that Nestor is "the wisest" without even being asked who the wisest hero is. This judgment is likely to reflect commonplace opinion, for which Hippias is an uncritical mouthpiece.

49. On the diffusion of philosophical ideals, especially through school teaching, in the early centuries AD, cf. Trapp (2007), who speaks of a "ubiquitousness of φιλοσοφία and φιλόσοφοι in both public life and the individual careers of the elite" (14).

50. Cf. Nightingale 2004, 3.

51. In rebuffing the charge of greed, Plutarch vaguely refers to other defenders as "some say," and in contesting the charge of sleepiness, he attributes it to the Etruscans (*Mor.* 27C–E).

52. There is a wealth of bibliography on this topic: cf., recently, Brisson 2004 and the introduction to Heraclitus the allegorist by Russel and Konstan (2006), with further references. An excellent essay connecting the diffusion of allegorical readings of Homer and the social contexts in which Homerists operated is A. Ford 1999.

53. Cf. chapter 1.

54. Cf. Galinsky 1972. Galinsky (p. 24) traces the moralized interpretation of Heracles back to Pisander's epic (sixth century BC). Several cities of Magna Graecia, where the Pythagoreans were active, had a cult of Heracles: cf. Detienne 1960. The hero of Sophocles' *Trachiniae,* however, is a monster. In Gilbert Murray's gripping description, he embodies "triumphant ὕβρις and strength and violence, swollen by the general praise, made more selfish by the devotion of others" (1946, 126).

Chapter 1

1. There is no evidence to bear out Stanford's claim that the historical Socrates condemned Odysseus (1949b, 43), except for the murder of Palamedes, on which Xenophon's *Apology* (26) concurs with Plato's (41b 1–4): "It comforts me that Palamedes died in a similar way as I, for ever yet he offers us far more beautiful subjects for song than Odysseus, who unjustly killed him." Cf. also Xen. *Mem.* 4.2.33.

2. Cf. Giuliano 1995, 40. According to Xenophon Socrates also praised Odysseus' self-restraint in the Circe episode (*Mem.* 1.3.7–8).

3. Cf. Lévystone 2005, 211.

4. Cf. scholion on Ael. Aristid. p. 480, 28–481, 2 Dindorf = *SSR* I C, 137 (the scholion, however, does not attribute to Socrates the same interpretation of the Homeric lines reported by Xenophon, but takes them to prove that Socrates intended to destroy the democracy); Libanius 1.93–94, with Lévystone 2005, 211. Libanius seems to deny that Socrates even approved of that episode, let alone that he interpreted it as Polycrates claims. Rather, Socrates argued that Homer was wrong in having Odysseus say such things. For Odysseus to be praised (as he should), we must believe that he beat no one and that Homer abused him.

5. Xenophon saw this: if Socrates had meant to defend chastisement of the poor, as Polycrates claimed, "he would have thought that he himself should be beaten" (*Mem.* 1.2.59).

6. Cf. Lévystone 2005, 211.

7. Antisthenes' strong interest in Odysseus is demonstrated by several titles of his lost works: *Odysseus or about Odysseus, The Spy, On the Odyssey, On the Wand, On Helen and Penelope, The Cyclops or on Odysseus, The Use of Wine or Drunkenness or the Cyclops, On Circe, On Odysseus and Penelope and on the Dog* (Diog. Laert. 6.15 and 17–18).

8. *SSR* II V A, 187 = schol. HMQR on *Od.* 1.1. The scholion continues: "τρόπος is the changeable, the mutable and the unstable in human character. Nonetheless, πολυτροπία of speech and a variety of ways of using speech, when addressed to a variety of listeners, become μονοτροπία. For what is appropriate to each person makes one in each case. For this reason the adaptation of speech to each person unifies its variety into that which is fitting for each. On the other hand uniformity, because it is not adjustable to different listeners, makes the speech πολύτροπος, rejected by many because they cannot turn to it." Both Decleva Caizzi (1964, 75; 1966, 105–7) and Giannantoni include this paragraph in Antisthenes' fragment, whereas Goulet-Cazé (1992, 16–17) leaves it out (the lacuna that precedes it makes it unclear from where it stems). Other scholars (e.g., Di Benedetto 1966, 213 n. 1) think that the mention of Pythagoras is not by Antisthenes but by Porphyry. Whatever the case, these controversies do not affect significantly Antisthenes' picture of Odysseus as we can draw it from this text.

9. Cf. Decleva Caizzi 1966, 105, and Brancacci 1990, 47–52, followed by Lévystone 2005, 196 n. 47 and Prince, forthcoming.

10. Several scholars take the opening sentence to summarize the whole argument of the fragment, but I agree with Prince, forthcoming, that the interpretation given above makes better sense of the passage and matches Antisthenes' unconditional admiration for Odysseus.

11. πολύτροπος underwent denigration soon after Homer. The meaning more

likely for the epithet, "much-traveled" (cf. Kakridis 1921; though Pucci [1998, 25–26] suggests that Antisthenes' reading of πολύτροπος as "of many turns of speech" is detectable in Homer), was disregarded by later authors in favor of disparaging interpretations: already Hesiod seems to have read πολύτροπος negatively, as suggested by a fragment (198.3 Merkelbach-West) that substitutes πολύτροπος with πολύκροτος (loud-ringing): cf. Erler 1987, 122 n. 11. In the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* πολύτροπος is (slightly) pejorative (13 and 439), as it is in Thucydides 3.83.3 (and so is πολυτροπίη in Herodotus 2.121ε). The moral interpretation is the only one attested in the scholia on *Od.* 1.1, which report, in addition to Antisthenes' fragment, the gloss (schol. P.): πολλῶν τρόπων ἔμπειρον ἢ ἐπὶ πολλὰ τρέποντα τὴν διάνοιαν ("having experience of many ways or turning his mind to many things").

12. The third application of τρόπος, to the modes of the nightingale's song, could be a variation on the meaning "versatile in speech." Decleva Caizzi (1964, 78–80) aptly connects the reference to music in the scholion with a passage from Dio Chrysostom (1.1–5) in which musical τρόποι fulfill the same psychagogic function as verbal τρόποι. Cf. also Lévystone 2005, 196. The rich song of the nightingale indeed suggested effective speech, for instance in Euripides *Hecuba* 336–38.

13. Guthrie 1962–65, vol. 3, 309.

14. Cf. Buffière 1956, 368.

15. Morgan (2000, 100) spots moral ambivalence in Antisthenes' use of σοφία. If σοφία were not entirely positive, however, I doubt whether the accuser would employ it for Nestor (in line 4) in order to contrast the presumed "wisdom" of that honest and straightforward hero with Odysseus' unethical versatility.

16. The pseudo-Plutarchean *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* (172) attributes δεινότης τῶν λόγων precisely to Odysseus.

17. Cf. Diog. Laert. 6.16. The title is Περὶ τοῦ διαλέγεσθαι ἀντιλογικός.

18. I summarize the interpretation of Antisthenes' conception of διαλέγεσθαι offered by Brancacci 1990, 147–71. Cf. also Prince, forthcoming.

19. Brancacci, who pushes this distinction, builds his Antisthenes largely on Xenophon's Socrates, the teacher rather than the searcher (as in Plato). The claim of Plato's Socrates, "I know only this, that I do not know," however, was elevated to the core of Socraticism only with the Middle Academy in the third century BC. Cf. Shields 1994. Vlastos (1991, chapter 1) argues that Plato's Socrates holds "true beliefs," but has no certainties.

20. On Antisthenes' opposition to the Sophists, cf. Brancacci 1990, 114–17 and 153–64, especially 159: Antisthenes is "ostile all'indifferentismo etico della retorica sofistica"; Lévystone 2005, 197 n. 51. Cf. also *SSR* IV, n. 29. Antisthenes' very choice to explain σοφός with δεινὸς διαλέγεσθαι opposes his σοφός to the Sophist with his δεινότης τῶν λόγων. Guthrie (1971, 35) cites Plutarch's description of Mnesiphilus, Themistocles' advisor, as one who "made a practice of what was called σοφία but was

in reality political shrewdness (δεινότης). . . . His successors combined it with the art of forensic eloquence, and, transferring their training from action to speech, were called Sophists" (*Themistocles* 2; Guthrie's translation).

21. Cf. Decleva Caizzi 1964, 77.

22. Cf. Lévystone 2005, 197. Antisthenes himself, according to some testimonies, was called "the physician of the mind": cf. Navia 2001, ix, 5.

23. *SSR* II V A, 53 (*Ajax*) and 54 (*Odysseus*). For a full translation of the speeches, cf. Gagarin and Woodruff 1995, 167–72. The speeches' authenticity, which seemed accepted (cf. *SSR* IV, n. 26), has been questioned again by Goulet-Cazé 1992. She argues that Odysseus does not use πόνος, one of Antisthenes' favorite words, for his services, and that Ajax's speech clashes with many of Antisthenes' beliefs, as we know them. Concerning the latter point, however, one could object that Ajax, who is not Antisthenes' model hero, cannot be expected to represent the philosopher's worldview. Ajax's disagreement with Antisthenes rather spells out the latter's preference for Odysseus.

24. Though Antisthenes' preference for Odysseus does not mean he holds Ajax in no esteem. See the balanced appraisal by Rankin 1986, 151–73, and 154–55 (quoted approvingly by Giannantoni *SSR* IV, n. 26): "Both contending parties represent different facets of the Antisthenean hero. Neither is afraid of πόνος, but Ajax resembles the more elemental and direct Heracles of the comic and serio-comic tradition. . . . Odysseus, on the other hand, is Heracles with brains. Ajax provides an example of πόνος and ἀρετή unrewarded, which, like these qualities in the mythical Heracles, involve tragic doom as far as this world is concerned. In Odysseus the same energy and pursuit of excellence is successful because of his adaptable and inventive intelligence." Cf. also Decleva Caizzi 1964, 67, suggesting that Ajax's devaluation of λόγος in favor of ἔργον matches Antisthenes' conception of virtue as residing in deeds and requiring few words.

25. Cf. Prince, forthcoming. On Odysseus' reinterpretation of "weapons" and "courage," see below.

26. There are more instances of ἐγώ in Odysseus' speech: cf. especially l. 15, with the pronoun in the emphatic position at the end of a sentence, and l. 49, with the strengthened form ἔγωγε.

27. For a review of the scholarship on Socrates' overweening behavior, cf. Brickhouse and Smith 1984. Against the mainstream interpretation they argue that Socrates is not disrespectful of the proceedings but simply telling the truth. Nonetheless, many of his statements, no matter how true, must have appeared arrogant to the jury, as Brickhouse and Smith are ready to concede (pp. 37–39).

28. *Xen. Ap.* 1–3 and 32. Cf. Navia 1984 and 2001, 10–11.

29. Like Socrates, Antisthenes stigmatizes flattery: cf. *SSR* II V A, 94. On Socrates' refusal to flatter the jury, cf. also Xen. *Mem.* 4.4.4.

30. Buffière (1956, 372–77) sees no philosophical content in Antisthenes' Homeric exegesis. Giannantoni (*SSR* IV, n. 26) considers the speeches pure rhetorical exercises. Worman (2002, 185–88) likewise does not read any Socratic content in the speeches, and Guthrie (1962–65, vol. 3, 304–11) thinks that they belong to Antisthenes' "sophistic" period, when he was a student of Gorgias. In the opinion of Decleva Caizzi (1964, 96–98), Giannantoni, and most recently Prince (forthcoming), however, the sequence "student of Gorgias–teacher of rhetoric–student of Socrates disavowing his former allegiances" in Antisthenes' transmitted biography is artificial, in which case the speeches could contain Socratic motifs while at the same time being rhetorical ἐπιδείξεις. Geffcken (1934, vol. 2, 29), quoted by Decleva Caizzi (1966, 87) and by Giannantoni (IV, n. 26), calls the speeches a combination of "sophistic Socraticism and Socratic sophistic." In favor of the Socratic/proto-Cynic interpretation of the two speeches are Höistad 1948, 94–102; Stanford 1968, 96–97; Malherbe 1983, 152; Brancacci 1990 passim (e.g., 115 n. 73); Prince 1999, 61 (cf. also her forthcoming commentary); and Lévystone 2005, 183–89. Morgan (2000, 115–19), while she views Odysseus as the successful speaker and actor in late fifth-century Athens, "the ancestor of sophistic and Athenian versatility" (119), also points out that his indifference to reputation foreshadows the Cynic ἀδοξία.

31. Cf. Lévystone 2005, 184.

32. Cf. Morgan 2000, 115.

33. Thucydides 2.40.3. On this passage, cf. Smoes 1995, 90–91.

34. Cf. Krentz 2000.

35. That the accusations come from Odysseus' enemies detracts little (if anything) from their weight: cf. introduction. In this play as in others, Odysseus is favored as a target of insult over all the Greeks at Troy.

36. Diomedes comes better off than Odysseus also in Sophocles *Philoctetes* 596–97.

37. The question of *Rhesus*' authorship is unimportant for our purposes, though a late date would invalidate the argument that Antisthenes is responding to that play *specifically*.

38. Cf. Lévystone 2005, 185.

39. Cf. Decleva Caizzi 1964, 71.

40. Here τρόπος possibly means "dress": cf. Worman 2002, 189.

41. Antisthenes' conception of weapon in some respects foreshadows Saint Paul's: cf. Malherbe 1983, 149–53.

42. Cf. Höistad 1948, 97–98; Decleva Caizzi 1966, 91; Goulet-Cazé 1992, 27 n. 78.

43. As Prince (forthcoming) notes, this is the only time Odysseus uses οἶδα for himself. Contrary to Ajax, who admits only of firsthand knowledge, Odysseus recognizes two kinds of knowledge, the experiential and the literary. See also above.

44. Worman (2002, 186–87) provides a good analysis of Odysseus' striving to set

himself apart from the group, but does not read philosophical implications into his claim. On the other hand Höistad (1948, 97–98) sees in the motif of solitude a proto-Cynic trait.

45. There is a wealth of bibliography on the Cynic φιλανθρωπία. Cf., e.g., the brief but clear discussion in Moles 2000, 422. We shall touch on the Cynic "tough love" again in chapter 3, in the context of the Cynic Odysseus.

46. Cf. Höistad 1948, 95–96. For the recurrence of nationalistic motifs in the *Palamedes,* cf., e.g., sections 3 (with the opposition Greek/Barbarian and the claim that Odysseus would be justified if he had acted to preserve Greece); 7 (opposition Greek/Barbarian); 13–14, 16 (nationalistic statements); 20, 21 (mentions of Barbarians); 36 (emphasis on Greekness). The speech ends with an appeal to "the first among the first Greeks." On Antisthenes' scorn for nationalism, cf. *SSR* II V A, 5 and 8, with Prince, forthcoming.

47. Cf. sections 28, 34, 38, 43, 46, 51, 53, 56, 59, 62.

48. Cf. section 36. Palamedes also calls himself a benefactor of all men (30), but as an inventor, an intellectual, not a soldier or a politician.

49. For instance, the image might call to mind the "ship of state" as well as man's journey through life or Odysseus' nautical expertise in the literal sense.

50. Cf. Höistad 1948, 100. On Odysseus the Cynic king, cf. chapter 3.

51. Cf. Decleva Caizzi 1964, 69–70.

52. Though we cannot be certain that Antisthenes knew the play, it is probable, for he wrote roughly between 415 and 390, and *Philoctetes* was produced in 409. Aeschylus' homonymous tragedy is a less likely reference because in it Odysseus was not a thoroughly ignoble character: cf. Dio Chys. *Or.* 52.5–9, with Müller 2000, 58–59. As to Euripides' *Philoctetes,* it might have been in the background of Antisthenes' defense of Odysseus' selfless daring: see below. Müller, however, in his discussion of the play's reception in antiquity (pp. 72–82), does not mention Antisthenes.

53. This parallel is in Höistad 1948, 97.

54. Cf. Blundell 1987, 321.

55. Cf. introduction.

56. Cf. Lévystone 2005, 186.

57. As often, Sophocles' *Ajax* is the exception, though Odysseus' serviceability at the beginning of the play does not necessarily exclude self-interest. For further discussion of Odysseus in Euripides' *Philoctetes,* cf. chapter 2.

58. Antisthenes, however, is again a bit clumsy in choosing the contest for Achilles' armor to portray Odysseus as a selfless savior of his fellows: if he is indifferent to public recognition and rewards, why is he pleading to obtain the arms in the first place? In Homer Odysseus regrets his victory when he meets the dead Ajax (*Od.* 11.548–49).

59. Nonetheless, as regards Odysseus' solitude and serviceability, a closer parallel might be Sophocles' *Ajax,* in which Odysseus boasts of his acting *alone* for the group

using emphatic personal markers like Antisthenes' character: "And I willingly (κἀγὼ θελοντὴς) yoked myself to this toil" (24); "I immediately (εὐθέως δ' ἐγὼ) rush to track him down" (31).

60. If Antisthenes does not include πολύτροπος in the list, the reason might be, as Prince has noted (1999, 58–59; the observation is further developed in her forthcoming commentary), that by this inclusion Odysseus would concede to Ajax's contention that he is not a worthy competitor because he is not ὁμοιότροπος, which Prince translates "consistent in ways." Though the meaning of the adjective might rather be "of similar character," the reader could hardly miss that to be similar to Ajax was to be "monotropic," which of course Odysseus was not. Prince, however, observes (1999, 63) that Odysseus does allude to his πολυτροπία at *Odysseus* 56–57, with a periphrasis: ὅντινα ἐθέλει τις τρόπον. Otherwise Goulet-Cazé 1992, 23: she reads the absence of πολύτροπος from the list of epithets as a sign of nonauthenticity.

61. It is true that Euripides' *Cyclops* celebrates Odysseus' most famous feat of cunning, but the chosen episode is fairytale-like and takes place in fairyland, not in the real world of politics or war.

62. Antisthenes, however, does not go so far as to justify Odysseus' most harshly condemned deed of cunning, Palamedes' execution (Ajax does not bring it up, which allows Odysseus to do the same). In this he agrees with the other Socratics (cf. chapter 2; though Xenophon [*Cyn.* 1.11] also denies that Odysseus, a man "near the best," perpetrated such a crime). I know of only two authors who justify the murder, and neither a philosopher: the Pseudo-Alcidamas wrote a speech in which Odysseus accused Palamedes of betrayal (cf. Worman 2002, 182–85) in order to oppose Gorgias, who defended Palamedes. The second is Ovid (in *Metamorphoses* 13), who, however, admires Odysseus primarily for his speaking skills.

63. *SSR* II V A, 190 = schol. on *Od.* 9.525. I have moved the Homeric citation into the body of the scholion.

64. Cf. Decleva Caizzi 1964, 81.

65. Di Benedetto (1966, 215) points out that Odysseus does not lie. Cf. also Brancacci (1990, 115–16), who refers to this fragment (and to *SSR* II V A, 188) to argue that Odysseus' σοφία includes moral knowledge.

66. *SSR* II V A, 188 = Porphyry schol. on *Od.* 23.337, 5.211 and 5.257.

67. Cf. also the end of the fragment: "Antisthenes says that he [Odysseus] knew that lovers lie in their promises, for she [Calypso] would not have been able to do this [make him immortal] without Zeus." This interpretation can indeed be drawn from Homer's line "but she never persuaded my heart in my breast" (*Od.* 7.258), where ἔπειθεν can imply "to stay" but also "that she would make me immortal."

68. I have omitted a few lines of the scholion (4–7) because they report Aristotle's interpretation, and another section (ll. 16–21) because it has a clear Christian imprint: cf. Di Benedetto 1966, 226 n. 2. I have also followed Di Benedetto (p. 227) in attributing the section beginning with "And there also must be the immortality of the

wise" to Antisthenes, based on correspondences with his theories. For instance, the premium put on ἔργα for the attainment of immortality matches Antisthenes' preaching that "virtue is in deeds, it does not need many words or learning" (Diog. Laert. 6.11, fr. 70 Decleva Caizzi 1966).

69. Cf. Decleva Caizzi 1964, 81.

70. Our judgment largely depends on editorial choices: if we do not attribute the sections on the immortality of the wise and on Penelope's sense to Antisthenes, following Decleva Caizzi (1966, fr. 52A and B) instead of Di Benedetto and Giannantoni, we will probably agree with her conclusions. On the moral content of Odysseus' wisdom in this passage, cf. also Brancacci 1990, 115–16.

71. Cf. chapter 3.

72. Cf. Prince, forthcoming.

73. The distinction, to be sure, is not clear cut: Odysseus' commitment to his comrades during their homeward-bound journey could be interpreted as a philanthropic act, though even so the private aim of his efforts remains paramount.

74. Cf. Di Benedetto 1966, 228. Witness Xenophon (*Symp.* 4.62), Antisthenes was acquainted with Prodicus and according to more sources he had been his student: cf. Kerferd 1981, 45–46; Navia 2001, 23. Prodicus, on the other hand, does not seem to have been influenced by Antisthenes for his allegory: in it πόνος is not a good in itself (as according to Antisthenes) but the price to pay to achieve good things, "for, of everything that is good and beautiful the gods grant nothing to men without toil and care on their part" (τῶν γὰρ ὄντων ἀγαθῶν καὶ καλῶν οὐδὲν ἄνευ πόνου καὶ ἐπιμελείας οἱ θεοὶ διδόασιν ἀνθρώποις, Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.28). Cf. Giannantoni *SSR* IV, n. 32. Höistad (1948, 31–33) points out that Heracles is a philanthropist, but also that his philanthropy is egocentric (benefit your friends if you want to be loved by them!) and, more important, that his choice of labors is intimately connected to the completion of his virtue.

75. Cf. Prince, forthcoming.

76. Cf. Di Benedetto 1966.

77. Such an interpretation, however, could be easily drawn from Homer. Cf. Eustathius *Od.* 1.209.2: "and for this reason [because she is wise] he thinks he loves her."

78. Whether Antisthenes allegorizes is debated: for a review of the main positions, cf. Wedner 1994, 24 n. 38, and, extensively, Prince (forthcoming), who thinks that Antisthenes is no allegorist. Cf. also Richardson 2006, 81–86. Brisson (2004, 37–38) seems to consider Antisthenes an allegorist.

79. Cf., respectively, *SSR* II V A, 97 and *SSR* II V A, 96.

80. Cf. G. Murray 1946, 108–10. The main source is Aristophanes *Clouds* 1049–50.

81. Höistad (1948, 26), however, correctly points out that traces of these themes are also in Sophocles' *Trachiniae* (especially Heracles' "polygamous eroticism," the cause of the tragedy).

82. Cf. Buffière 1956, 369–72. Buffière treats Antisthenes together with Odysseus' anonymous apologists.

83. Cf. Kaiser 1964, 212.

84. On Odysseus' endurance in archaic poetry cf., for instance, Alcman, fr. 80 Page: Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος ("Odysseus of the enduring heart"); Theognis 1123–25: μή με κακῶν μίμνησκε· πέπονθά τοι οἶα τ᾽Ὀδυσσεύς / . . . ὅς δὴ καὶ μνηστῆρας ἀνείλετο νηλέι θυμῷ ("Don't remind me of evils: my sufferings are like Odysseus', who killed even the suitors with a pitiless heart"); 1029: τόλμα, θυμέ, κακοῖσιν ὅμως ἄτλητα πεπονθώς ("Endure, my heart, though you have suffered unendurable ills." The line is a possible echo of *Od.* 20. 18); Tyrtaeus, fr. 5. 5 West (of brave ancestors who fought in Messenia): νωλεμέως αἰεὶ ταλασίφρονα θυμὸν ἔχοντες ("Always, unceasingly with an enduring heart"). Cf. also Archilochus fr. 128 West. On the idealization of πόνος in the sixth century through the figure of Heracles, cf. Detienne 1962, 86–87.

85. As Galinsky (1972, chapter 5) points out, philosophers dealing with Heracles are mainly concerned with making his labors vocational.

Chapter 2

1. Scholarly opinion varies. Stanford (1949b, 43; 1968, 100) and Blundell (1992) view Plato's judgment as essentially negative; Eisner (1982) as ambivalent. Prince (forthcoming) emphasizes Plato's preference for Ajax over Odysseus. Others have given a more positive evaluation of the Platonic Odysseus, among them Howland 1993; Klonoski 1993; Gilead 1994; Hobbs 2000, 193–98; 239–40; and especially Lévystone 2005. In my discussion I disregard the *Letters* because of their doubtful authenticity.

2. This addition is likely to reflect the thought of the historical Hippias, who, again according to Plato (*Greater Hippias* 286a8–b4), wrote a speech featuring Nestor as teacher of excellence.

3. The *Lesser Hippias* has been read as dealing with the *ability* to lie and do wrong, with δύναμις rather than actuality, for the term it uses for "better," ἀμείνων, normally means "more powerful or capable, " not morally better (βελτίων): cf. Weiss 1992, 251–52. Socrates and Hippias, however, speak about "those who *do* wrong (ἀδικοῦντες) voluntarily" or "those who *tell* falsehoods (ψευδόμενοι) voluntarily" (371e7–372a2), rather than just those who have the capability of doing so: cf. Balaudé 1997b, 265–68. Both Socrates and Hippias fail to recognize that "more capable" is not the same as "morally better" (cf. Vlastos 1991, 279–80), and merge the two in their very choice of words: Hippias contrasts ἀμείνων and χείρων,"worse" in a moral sense (369c4–6); uses βελτίους for those who do harm voluntarily (372a2); and so does Socrates (372d8).

4. See chapter 1 and below.

5. See the articles in Press 2000.

6. On these two points, cf. Gerson 2000. This scholar forcefully criticizes the "anti-mouthpiece theory" from a variety of angles.

7. Cf. Blundell 1992. Blundell's thesis is accepted by Morgan (2000, 112–13).

8. Cf. Lévystone 2005.

9. Regrettably I became acquainted with the work of Giuliano (1995) only after reading Lévystone's. Already Giuliano suggested that for Plato Odysseus illustrates the good way of lying as described at *Rep.* 414b8–9, and argued for a close resemblance between Plato's and Antisthenes' interpretations of πολυτροπία. *Contra:* Brancacci (1990, 45–60), who sees in the two interpretations "one of the first manifestations of the polemics between the two Socratics."

10. Cf. also, e.g., Erler 1987, 121–44; Vlastos 1991, 275–80; Giuliano 1995. Among earlier scholars Stanford dismisses Socrates' eulogy of Odysseus as a joke (1968, 261 and n. 30).

11. Hippias' superficial endorsement of received opinion comes out in the *Greater Hippias* (288a2–4), where he insists that those who say what everyone thinks cannot be refuted. That Hippias' preference for Achilles was the norm is confirmed by Aristotle, *Topics* 117b12–14. Giuliano (1995, 32) notes that the commonplace view pervades also the scholia on the *Iliad,* which offer an explanation each time the adjective ἄριστος is attributed to another hero than Achilles.

12. The nature and function of the elenchus are beyond the scope of this study. I found the treatment by Balaudé (1997a), who engages with Vlastos' positions, particularly convincing. Against Vlastos, Balaudé argues that Socrates' aim is not to discover moral truths but to persuade his interlocutor of the necessity of self-examination (cf. especially p. 239, 242).

13. Cf. also 372b3–6; d8–e1.

14. Shields (1994, 362) considers the *Lesser Hippias* one of the few Platonic dialogues in which Socrates argues purely *ad hominem,* that is, without expressing any belief he himself holds.

15. Cf. Balaudé 1997b, 276. Balaudé disputes Vlastos' contention (1991, chapter 5) that Socrates never cheats.

16. Cf. Balaudé 1997b, 277. The conclusion has been variously interpreted. In a thought-provoking reading Erler (1987, 131) correctly emphasizes its paradox, which could make people think that Socrates is amoral. His suggestion that "if there is such a man" (who does injustice voluntarily) should be read positively (and there is) has a point, for it matches Plato's ideas about the good way of lying (cf. Erler 136–44). But at the same time this reading does not explain Socrates' refusal to agree with the argument and seems at odds with the claim of Plato's Socrates that wrongdoing is always involuntary.

17. Cf. Bruell 1999, 95.

18. Vlastos (1991, 275–80) thinks that Socrates is honestly perplex, whereas Balaudé (1997b) takes his rejection of the conclusion as evidence that he is not speaking his mind. Perhaps on this subject agreement is possible: Socrates honestly shrinks

from the result of a discussion in which he was forced to go against his deepest beliefs by Hippias' resistance to the examination.

19. Cf. Giuliano 1995, 21. On the importance of ὁμολογία in the progress of a Socratic inquiry, cf. Erler 1987, 131 n. 36.

20. Blundell 1992, 164. On Socrates' reluctance to offer Odysseus as a model of heroism, cf. also Hobbs 2000, 197–98. By "Socrates," I should repeat here, I mean the character of Plato's dialogue.

21. Cf. Balaudé 1997b, 263.

22. Blundell (1992, 169) recognizes in Socrates an Odysseus-type, but the recognition does not push her to revisit her negative evaluation of Odysseus in the *Lesser Hippias.* On Socrates' Odysseus-like πολυτροπία, cf. Lévystone 2005; Howland 1993, 54 (on the *Republic*). On his irony as an Odyssean mask, cf. Eisner 1982, 116.

23. On Socrates' reconfiguration of Achilles to make him fit his ideal of heroism, cf. King 1987, 105–6; Hobbs (2000, 178–86), however, shows the complexities involved in the comparison, for instance that Socrates, contrary to his moral positions, appears to uphold revengeful action in associating himself with Achilles returning to war.

24. Cf. Blundell 1987, 316.

25. Cf. also Sophocles *Ajax* 445. Possibly Odysseus was charged with πανουργία in Euripides' *Philoctetes* as well, if Dio's paraphrase at *Or.* 59.9 (λόγῳ τε καὶ ἔργῳ πανουργότατε ἀνθρώπων) is close to the original.

26. On πᾶν ποιῶν, cf. Blundell 1987, 316.

27. Cf. also τόλμης at 38d8, above.

28. A humorous echo of this passage is in Lucian *Menippus* 18.4–6, where Socrates is seen in Hades going about examining everyone, in the company of "Palamedes, Odysseus, Nestor and all the other talkative corpses."

29. Blundell (1992, n. 142), recognizes that Odysseus in the *Apology* is presented in a negative light. On the other hand Lévystone (2005, 208–9 and n. 85) argues that Socrates wears an Odyssean persona by manipulating a Homeric citation. Socrates openly adopts the model of Achilles, but in quoting *Il.* 18.104 (at 28d3), he changes ἐτώσιον (useless) to κορωνίσιν (curved), which Lévystone takes to suggest a reference to *Il.* 2.297, where Odysseus says νηυσὶ κορωνίσιν (curved ships). The phrase, however, is formulaic. Another Homeric quotation does associate Socrates with Odysseus: at 34d5–6, Socrates claims that he is not "born of an oak or of a rock," citing Penelope's protest to Odysseus (*Od.* 19.163: "tell me your stock . . . for you are not born of an oak . . ."; though cf. also *Il.* 22.126; Hes. *Theog.* 35). But Socrates is saying that he is *not* like Odysseus, who in that scene allegedly behaves like one "born of an oak."

30. Cf. especially Lévystone 2005, 193–94.

31. Cf. Hillgruber 1994, vol. 1, 13. The trend of associating Homeric heroes with

rhetorical styles is documented by later sources. Dio Chrysostom claims that Diomedes, Odysseus, and Nestor devoted themselves to rhetoric (2.20), and Quintilian (12.10.64–65) identifies in Menelaus, Nestor, and Odysseus representatives of the three main rhetorical styles: Odysseus' grand, or "florid," style is also Pericles' (cf. also Gellius 6.14.7). For the association Odysseus/Demosthenes, cf. [Lucian] *Praise of Demosthenes* 5.

32. Cf. Lévystone 2005, 193.

33. Socrates' noncommittal response partially justifies Morgan's disregard for who speaks (2000, 112–13).

34. Lévystone (2005, 193) thinks that Odysseus embodies the right kind of ψυχαγογία at 261a7–9.

35. Cf. Detienne-Vernant 1991, 3–5; 315–16.

36. Cf. Kofman 1988. The reference is to *Meno* 80a5–6.

37. Kofman 1988, 23. Cf. also, from a different perspective, Giuliano (1995, 27 n. 38), who notes that concepts like εὐμηχανία and εὐπορία are associated or even equated with wisdom and goodness (*Prot.* 344e2; *Symp.* 204b6). The importance of μῆτις for sailors is recognized already by Nestor (*Il.* 23.316–17). Cf. Detienne and Vernant 1991, 12.

38. I use the conventional "raft" for Odysseus' σχεδία, though it is a larger vessel. Stanford (1968, 261 n. 30) sees the reference as "incidental," but also suggests that it points to the future Stoic idealization of the *Odyssey* as a *Pilgrim's Progress.* Gilead (1994 *passim*) reads also the description in the *Phaedo* of the journey of the soul after death (107e1–108b2) as an odyssey. There are, however, no unmistakable references to Odysseus in it. In any case, even if Odysseus is in the background, his μῆτις plays no role in that journey.

39. Homer's appreciation for Odysseus' skills in shipbuilding surfaces even when Odysseus is not building a ship. At *Od.* 9.321–24, Odysseus preparing the stick to poke the Cyclops' eye invites nautical imagery: he is like a carpenter carving a mast.

40. When Athena steps in, Odysseus has no more resources but laments over the dangers he sees in every option (5.408–23). Lines 406–7 in particular highlight Odysseus' loss of confidence by echoing lines from the previous scene, in which he thought he could have his way: "then much-enduring, noble Odysseus pondered,/ and sorely vexed he spoke to his great-hearted spirit" (354–55) is replaced by, "and then Odysseus' knees and heart were loosened,/ and sorely vexed he spoke to his great-hearted spirit."

41. See below. Another reference to Odysseus as a model for Socrates might be at *Prot.* 315b9, where the line, "and I became aware of him," which introduces Odysseus' sighting of Heracles in Hades (*Od.* 11.601), is used by Socrates to introduce his sighting of Hippias. If this reference concerns Socrates' characterization, as Hobbs (2000, 196, 239) contends, it points to his Odysseus-like inquisitiveness, to his mission as a researcher, on which see below.

42. Detienne and Vernant recognize that Plato's main objection against μῆτις is moral rather than epistemological (1991, 316).

43. The emphatic absence of Achilles is noted by Allen Bloom, quoted by Klonoski 1993, 269, and developed by Hobbs 2000, 238–39. It is true that Achilles' absence from the list of reincarnating souls could be owing to his immortal status, documented in non-Homeric sources (for instance Pindar *Ol.* 2.79–83; Pausanias 3.19.13, etc.): cf. King 1987, 53. Plato, however, seems to have the Homeric *Nekyia* in mind, as is suggested not only by the nature of Er's journey, but by *Rep.* 516d5–6, an explicit reference to Achilles' words to Odysseus at *Od.* 11.489–90: see below.

44. Plato is less negative at *Phaedo* 82a10–b6, where good habits in life allow happiness after death and prepare for a reincarnation into "gentle and social species."

45. Segal (1978, 333) notes that Odysseus' rejection of bestiality recalls his resistance to Circe's metamorphosis.

46. Cf. Hirst 1940; Stanford 1949a, 43 and 50; Barigazzi 1955; Demont 1990, 148; Müller 2000, 74–75. Müller's is the most recent and complete edition of the play's remnants.

47. The fragments show that Dio's paraphrase preserved at least some of the original wording: for instance, φρόνησις in Dio (59.1) matches ἂν φρονοίην in F 2 (Müller 2000, 168); ἀπραγμόνως and σοφωτάτῳ appear in the same fragment. Dio, however, adds ἀρίστου to σοφωτάτου. This amplification might reflect his own high valuation of Odysseus as well as his contemporaries' readiness to accept the transference to him of an epithet, ἄριστος, traditionally attributed to Achilles. On the various degrees of fidelity in Dio's paraphrase, cf. Müller 2000, 303–4.

48. On the negative kind of φιλοτιμία, cf. Dover 1994, 233. As I have suggested in the introduction, Euripides' more appreciative view of Odysseus in *Philoctetes* might depend, at least in part, on the early date of the play. We shall, however, wonder how truly sympathetic to Odysseus Euripides is. Carter (1986, 28–30) deems Odysseus' meditation to mirror the thoughts of an existing group of upper-class Athenians alienated from politics, but it is unlikely that in 431, when the Peloponnesian War was just beginning, the majority shared that sentiment. Nor can we be sure that Euripides endorsed Odysseus' position, for, as Demont (1990, 147–80) has shown, his criticism of Athenian activism sharpens in the plays produced after Nicias' peace in 421. In addition Odysseus' analysis in the end is self-serving: he knows that the motives behind his actions have been selfish but argues that this is the way men are required to act in order to be real men, in other words, that there is no honorable escape from φιλοτιμία. To top it off, he ended up behaving cowardly (*Dio Chrys.* 59.5) and more ruthlessly than his untroubled namesake in Sophocles' *Philoctetes,* who apparently was πολὺ πρᾳότερον καὶ ἁπλούστερον (52.16). For Dio even to attribute such adjectives as "gentle" and "straightforward" to Sophocles' Odysseus, Euripides' must have come out as a true rascal. He exploited even his famed σωφροσύνη to advance his interests (F 19 Müller).

49. As mentioned in chapter 1, Themistocles apparently was called "Odysseus" because of his φρόνησις (Plutarch, *Mor.* 869F). Cf. Aubenque 1963, 25 and n. 1; Detienne-Vernant 1991, 299–300.

50. On the refashioning of φιλοτιμία in democratic Athens, cf. Whitehead 1983.

51. A striking parallel to Odysseus' admission that only those who dare are deemed truly men is in Plato's *Republic* (549d6), where the wife of the ἀπράγμων complains that he is unmanly, ἄνανδρος. On this passage as evidence for the popularity of the view, cf. Carter 1986, 19. Likewise, at *Symposium* 208c2–d2 it is stated that φιλοτιμία is the most compelling motive for many men, who for its sake undertake all kinds of dangers and toils: cf. Müller 2000, 75 n. 17. A further possible parallel is a fragment from another lost play by Euripides, *Licymnius* (*TGF,* vol. 5.1, 474): πόνος γάρ, ὡς λέγουσιν, εὐκλείας πατήρ ("for toil, as they say, is the father of good reputation").

52. For the parallel with the passage in the Myth of Er, cf. Blundell 1992, 168.

53. Cf. Eustathius *Od.* 1.22.15–16. Already the allegorist Heraclitus in the first century AD interprets the blinding as Odysseus' victory over "the wild θυμός" (*Hom. Probl.* 70.4–5).

54. On τὰ αὑτοῦ πράττειν as an expansion of ἀπραγμοσύνη, cf. Carter 1986, 73. Another parallel, recognized by Blundell (1992, 168), is *Gorg.* 526c1–5.

55. This hypothesis is borne out also by Giuliano's observation (1995, 42) that Plato's invention of an Odysseus ἀπράγμων might have been fed by his disappointment with politics and his subsequent choice of *otium* after the experience in Sicily.

56. Howland (1993, 51–52) connects νοῦς in this passage with Odysseus, but in a different way: as Odysseus' νοῦς allows his νόστος, philosophy is a journey home.

57. Cf. Howland, 1993, 49.

58. Nightingale 2004, 98. The following reference is to p. 99.

59. At *Rep.* 386c3–7 Plato censures Achilles' words for drawing a gloomy picture of Hades. They are more apt to describe our pointless striving on earth. Plato's dismissal of the Homeric picture of Hades might be detectable also in the pun on Ἀλκίνου / ἀλκίμου that introduces the Myth of Er at *Rep.* 614b2–3 ("It is not . . . the tale of Alcinous that I shall unfold, but the tale of a warrior bold, Er"). According to Kaiser (1964, 218), the pun targets both the unmanliness of the Phaeacians (they are not ἄλκιμοι) and the falsity of Odysseus' tale at the court of Alcinous, in particular his description of the afterlife. Er is a "corrected" Odysseus, who knows the truth about Hades. At the same time, however, "tale of Alcinous" might not allude specifically to Odysseus because it was a proverbial expression to describe a lengthy story: cf. Shorey 1994 *ad loc.*

60. A good discussion of this obligation is in Palmer 1995.

61. Contra: Klonoski 1993, who thinks that Odysseus gives shape to the Platonic philosopher in the fuller sense, as the founder of the orderly city.

62. Cf. Létoublon 2003.

63. Odysseus' self-mastery is another aspect of his ἀπραγμοσύνη: cf. *Rep.* 441e1–6.

64. Cf. Gilead 1994, 62.

65. Cf. Kaiser 1964, 213–14, and below, chapter 4. Based on the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi,* where Odysseus' words are quoted for the first time (if the core of the essay goes back to the fifth century) to illustrate what is "the most beautiful thing" in life (82–89), Kaiser speculates that those verses belonged to the repertory of drinking parties already in the sixth century.

66. Cf. Lévystone 2005, 192. Stanford (1949b, 36 n. 5) has a point in calling Plato's abusive interpretation "asinine."

67. For Antisthenes, cf. *SSR* II V A, 54, especially lines 50–51 ("there is no danger I avoided because I held it shameful"), discussed in chapter 1. Likewise Odysseus at *Od.* 4.288 is credited with saving all the Greeks, and his behavior at *Od.* 4.244–45 shows that he considers no service shameful.

68. On the continuity between Socrates the steadfast philosopher and Socrates the steadfast soldier, cf. Loraux 1995, 158.

69. Cf. Höistad 1948, 34; Demont 1990, 302; Rappe 2000, 288.

70. Cf. Whelan 1983, 29.

71. As in the case of Achilles' words to Odysseus in Hades, this Homeric line is acceptable only if used for a different order of reality than in the original: cf. *Rep.* 381d1–4.

72. Even in the *Apology,* where Socrates plans to follow Odysseus in interrogating the dead, he implicitly identifies with Palamedes as a moral reformer: just as Palamedes goaded Odysseus to push him back to his duties, Socrates goads the horse-city: cf. Eisner 1982, 108. We shall add that both Socrates and Palamedes paid dearly for their "goading."

73. Cf. King 1987, 104–9.

74. I add "admirers" thinking of Xenophon, who was not a student of Socrates. This section is indebted to Lévystone's work (2005), which treats some of the issues discussed here, though I do not subscribe to all of its conclusions. In particular I see more differences between the Socratics in their treatment of Odysseus than Lévystone does.

75. Cf. Keaney and Lamberton 1996, 318.

76. Cf. Decleva Caizzi 1964, 96. For a synopsis of the scholarly positions on Antisthenes' faithfulness to Socrates' teaching, still valuable is Höistad 1948, 5–15. Cf. also Navia 2001, 2, 66 and 9. Prince (forthcoming) notes that Antisthenes' mature age at Socrates' death makes it likely that he remained more conservative in interpreting his teacher's philosophy than Plato, who was in his twenties.

77. Cf. chapter 1.

78. Another possible point of contact between Socrates' and Antisthenes' read-

ings of Odysseus is that both seem to have exemplified his ἐγκράτεια on the Circe episode (though we cannot be sure for Antisthenes because we only have a title, *Circe*).

79. Cf. chapter 1. Xenophon matches Socrates' statement with the alleged interpretation by him of Hesiod, *Works and Days* 311: "no work is ignoble, but idleness is." Again, Polycrates apparently claimed that Socrates took the line to mean that one ought to refrain from no job, however shameful, for profit, whereas Xenophon argues that what Socrates meant was that working is good and idleness bad (*Mem.* 1.2.56–57).

80. Prince (forthcoming), adducing Brancacci, connects this passage and Antisthenes' interpretation of Odysseus' speaking skills.

81. Recall that Antisthenes' Odysseus boasts of being πολυμήχανος.

82. Plato's reliance on a Homeric character contradicts his own claim (at *Rep.* 599c6–600a3) that Homer did not know how to lead an army.

83. An important item of disagreement with the Cynics, and one which might have played a role in Aristotle's disregard for such qualities of Odysseus as his extraordinary fortitude and self-reliance, is his conception of αὐτάρκεια: in Aristotle's view an individual to be self-sufficient must be related to the whole state, whereas the man who has no need of others is not autarkic (as the Cynics claim) but is either a low animal or a god (*Politics* 1253a26–29). "Low animal" might refer to Diogenes the Cynic. Cf. Moles 2000, 420.

84. Stanford (1949a, 48) shares my surprise: "we turn to Aristotle—and find surprisingly little." Stanford mentions only *Rhet.* 1416b12–13 and *Poet.* 1454a30. There are more references to Odysseus in Aristotle's corpus, though several do not deal with ethical qualities but have other aims, such as to illustrate correct ways of reasoning and arguing or aesthetic issues. Odysseus interested Aristotle in the larger frame of Homeric exegesis (on which he wrote) more than as a character. He also appears in a few poetic fragments, but from those we can hardly infer anything about Aristotle's valuation of Odysseus because the addressees and the contexts of the poems might have been of paramount importance for the choice of themes.

85. Cf. Buffière 1956, 313. For the essay's Peripatetic (and Platonic) inspiration, cf. also Keaney and Lamberton 1996. Hillgruber (1994, 1:51–53), on the other hand, privileges Middle-Platonism.

86. Cf. Buffière 1956, 312; Hillgruber 1994, 2:311; Keaney and Lamberton 1996, 11–12.

87. Cf. chapter 3.

88. The fundamental study on Aristotle's notion of φρόνησις is Aubenque 1963. Cf. also Nightingale 2004, 194–97; 200–206. In Plato φρόνησις belongs to the realm of certainty; it is the equivalent of ἐπιστήμη. In some texts Plato contrasts the common sense of φρόνησις and his own: cf., for instance, *Gorg.* 490a, 492a, with

Aubenque 1963, 25 n. 1. Conversely Aristotle reads φρόνησις as a virtue of the calculative or opinative part of the soul (*EN* 1140 b25–28; the notorious exception is the *Protrepticus,* where φρόνησις equals νοῦς and θεωρία: cf. Nightingale p. 194). φρόνησις is attributed only to those who aim to find "human goods" (*EN* 1140b 21; 1141 b 8–9), and who know how to recognize "that which is profitable to them" (ibid., 1141 b 5–6). It is a "savoir opportun et efficace" (Aubenque p. 9).

89. Aubenque 1963, 114. The next reference is to p. 111 n. 3.

90. Another characteristic of Aristotelian φρόνησις that would recommend Odysseus as its embodiment is the role of "experience" in its acquisition (*EN* 1142a14–16).

91. Cf. also, e.g., Isocrates' statement in *Antidosis* 151, that he loves "peace and tranquility" (ἡσυχίαν καὶ ἀπραγμοσύνην). Whelan (1983, 23), commenting on this passage, argues that Isocrates' claim would not have gone down well in the time of Pericles, when it could have been construed as disaffection for public life.

92. Cf. Müller 2000, 232–34.

93. Aristotle might have opposed Plato on this point when still in the Academy, for the prologue of *Philoctetes* was discussed in Plato's school: cf. Müller 2000, 234, 321.

94. Cf. Stanford 1949a, 48. The view was expressed in a lost tragedy, Theodectes' *Ajax.*

95. At *Poetics* 1451a 24–29, Aristotle argues that Homer left the episode of Odysseus' madness out for the sake of unity—shall we also say, to preserve Odysseus' heroic stature?

96. Cf. Barigazzi 1955. The play is *Odysseus automolos,* in which Odysseus (according to a probable reconstruction) tried to make the Greeks believe that he had spied into Troy whereas he had not.

97. Odysseus was frightened by Philoctetes' appearance (Dio Chrys. 59.5).

98. Cf. *Rhesus* 580–94. While Diomedes would like to go find Hector, Aeneas, or Paris, Odysseus wants to retreat. Diomedes vocally rejects the proposal but eventually has to yield to his "superior." Nonetheless, Athena's intervention to urge them on to kill Rhesus implies that Diomedes, though he was aiming for the wrong targets, was right not to give up. Odysseus is demoted to the low stature of an Agamemnon, whom Odysseus himself in the *Iliad* rebukes for suggesting withdrawal.

99. Cf. schol. on *Il.* 8.97: "The question is whether Odysseus did not hear at all or whether he was not persuaded. It must be said that those who state that he heard the voice but was not persuaded accuse the hero of cowardliness, ignoring 'he did not hear.' For that phrase does not mean 'take no heed of,' but 'not to perceive fully.' And in fact he was not a coward, since he was the last to flee, and by his slowness he showed his love of danger" (Ἐζήτηται δὲ πότερον ἄρα οὐδ ʼὅλως ἤκουσεν ὁ Ὀδυσσεύς, ἢ οὐκ ἐπείσθη. ῥητέον ὅτι οἱ λέγοντες ὅτι ἀκούσας οὐκ ἐπείσθη δειλίαν κατηγοροῦσιν τοῦ ἥρωος, ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ ʼοὐδʼ ἐσάκουσεν.ʼ οὐ γὰρ τὸ παρακοῦσαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ

αἰσθέσθαι τελείως δηλοῖ. καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἦν δειλὸς τῶν ἄλλων ἔσχαστος φεύγων καὶ τῇ βραδυτῆτι τὸ φιλοκίνδυνον ἐπιδεικνύμενος).

100. Cf. the scholia on *Il.* 10.244: Diomedes apologizes with the heroes he did not choose by saying that he preferred Odysseus because of his φρόνησις, not his ἀνδρεία. Other scholia attributing to Odysseus intellectual qualities in contrast to ἀνδρεία are on *Il.* 3.225 and 9.673.

101. *Posterior Analytics* 97b17–24. On the composite nature of Aristotle's μεγαλοψυχία, cf. Cooper 1989; Hobbs 2000, 184, 195.

102. Cf. Hobbs 2000, 195.

103. Aristotle is unwilling to give Odysseus credit also in a parallel passage (*EN* 1124a14–16) in which he again stresses that μεγαλοψυχία includes moderation in bearing up with both good and bad fortune. Is there a better interpreter of this virtue than Odysseus?

104. See also Eustathius *Od.* 1. 294. 35–36.

105. Megacleides' interpretation finds an echo in the pseudo-Plutarchean *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer:* "When Odysseus is detained by Alcinous, who is accustomed to pleasure and feasting, he says, to please him . . ." (150), and, centuries later still, in Eustathius *Od.* 1.318.26: Odysseus is "flattering opportunely" (κολακεύων καιρίως); *Od.*1.319.7–8: "Odysseus, the clever and much-enduring philosopher (ὁ δεινὸς καὶ πολύτλας φιλόσοφος), opportunely adapts himself to his listeners, the Phaeacians." For further discussion of those lines, cf. chapter 4.

Chapter 3

1. Stanford (1968, 121) thinks that already with Zeno the *Odyssey* became a Stoic *Pilgrim's Progress.*

2. Good discussion of their relationship is in Goulet-Cazé 1990, 2808–12.

3. Cf. Trapp 1997, xxii–xxx.

4. Cf. Castiglioni 1948; Kindstrand 1973, 185 (contra: Buffière 1956, 377–78).

5. Cf. Goulet-Cazé 1990, 2743–44; 2805–6. The epistles may include original material: cf. P. Rosenmeyer (2001, 195), reporting scholarly consensus. Whether the Cynic letters reflect Diogenes' or Crates' thought is, however, less important for my purposes than their philosophical earnestness.

6. *Odyssey* 13.434–38. Cf. also *SSR* II V B, 163 = Varro *Menipp.* 71.20: "Thereafter Diogenes wore only a mantel, just as Odysseus wore only a tunic" (*Diogenem postea pallium solum habuisse, et habere Ulixem meram tunicam*).

7. Cf. *SSR* II V A, 82.29–30. The parallel is in Prince, forthcoming.

8. On Heracles' garb as the main model for the Cynics, cf. Goulet-Cazé 1990, 2744–46. Heracles the ideal beggar: cf. [Diogenes] *Ep.* 10.1. Curiously Goulet-Cazé does not even mention Odysseus as a model for the Cynic beggar, but only Telephus and Socrates alongside Heracles.

9. The polemical twist in [Crates] *Ep.* 19 bears out interpretations of the epistles as documents of Cynic propaganda; see above.

10. Cf. Martorana 1926, 75–80, and below, chapter 4.

11. We shall consider this material in more detail in chapter 4.

12. Cf. Glad 1995, 91.

13. Glad (1995, 91) thinks that Odysseus was the model for the milder Cynic, while Heracles was for the harsher type. Heracles nonetheless seems to have been the main patron of the movement since its inception: see below. In addition two of the writers who according to Glad reflect milder Cynic views, Epictetus and Dio Chrysostom, are enthusiastic admirers of Heracles.

14. Cf. Höistad 1948.

15. Cf., e.g., *SSR* II V H, 5 and 6.

16. In which case, Crates' polemic over Odysseus' Cynic credentials might have earned acolytes already among the early Cynics. In fact, it has been suggested that Philodemus' mocking picture of Odysseus as a parasite (*On Flattery,* PHerc. 223, fr. 3) has its source in Bion of Borysthenes, a third-century BC popular philosopher with strong Cynic leanings (Gigante 1993, 218). Cf. Kaiser 1964, 216, and Gargiulo 1981, 122.

17. For instance, Dio Chrysostom complains about the number of Cynics begging at crossroads and temples in Alexandria (32.9). On Dio's and Musonius' criticism of begging, cf. Montiglio 2005, chapter 8, with further bibliographical references.

18. Dio Chrysostom once expresses admiration for the begging Odysseus (14.22), but in a speech that is likely to belong to the time of his exile, when he was strongly influenced by Cynicism.

19. On the actor metaphor in Stoicism, cf. Goldschmidt 1953, 178–86; Ioppolo 1980, 188–92 and 196–202; Setaioli 2001, 62; Long 2002, 242–43. The metaphor takes up different nuances of meaning in each individual philosopher.

20. The parallel with Teles is in Castiglioni 1948, 39.

21. That Odysseus might be on Nigrinus' mind as the model actor is suggested by the preceding section (19): "Indeed . . . do not suppose that there is better training for virtue or a truer test for the soul than this city and the occupations here, for it is no small thing to oppose so many desires, so many sights and sounds laying hold of you and drawing you to them from everywhere. One must simply imitate Odysseus sailing past them, but not with his hands tied up (that would be cowardly) nor with his ears stopped with wax, but listening to them with his body unfastened, and with true contempt." This passage has a clear Stoic tinge.

22. Translations of Maximus of Tyre are generally taken, but sometimes adapted, from Trapp 1997.

23. On the Stoic exploitation of *Od.* 18.136–37, cf. Cicero's witness (and translation of the lines) in Augustine *The City of God* 5.8, with Trapp 1997, 6 n. 8. Trapp also refers to Plutarch *Mor.* 104E.

24. Bion (third century BC) is an eclectic popular philosopher, but this description of him unmistakably is referred to his Cynic period, when he took "cloak and wallet" (Diog. Laert. 4.51–52). It also fits Bion's alleged theatricality (ibid.), another characteristic shared by many Cynics (as well as his use of "vulgar language," ibid.). Maximus of Tyre appeals to the same Homeric line but as an allegory for the soul of the virtuous man afflicted by bodily disease (7.5.d).

25. The antithesis cultural appearance versus reality is also in Dio Chrys. 49.12: Odysseus and the beggar Iros are not the same, even if they both wear rags.

26. The idea that ruling oneself is the prerequisite for ruling others goes back to fourth-century Cynicism and Socraticism. Cf. Höistad 1948, 170–71.

27. This is the title of Hadot 1998.

28. The same is true for his claim (45.11) that he is even worse off than Odysseus, who underwent bad treatment at home in his absence even if he had left father, wife, and son.

29. The quotation (*Od.* 4.244–46) confuses Odysseus' spying mission with the slaughter. Though Dio stresses his benevolence toward the Tarsians, he is not tactful in insinuating, by means of his self-comparison with Odysseus chastising the suitors, that the Tarsians are like the latter. After all, the suitors are all killed: there is no hope for moral reform.

30. Cf. Dio Chrysostom 9.9; Maximus of Tyre 15.9; Strabo 1.2.2, above. Cf. Höistad 1948, 196.

31. In another passage (3.31.19), Epictetus opposes Diogenes, whom god entrusted with "kingship and castigation," and Zeno, whose task was rather to teach doctrine. Schofield (2008) proposes that this separation of roles bears historical truth.

32. Cf. Kindstrand 1973, 127. Another speech in which Dio shows admiration for Odysseus' eloquence is *Or.* 71.3.

33. In this popular conception valor exists only in the public eye: cf. Dover 1994, 235.

34. On the motif "Virtue is schooled in misfortune" in Maximus, cf. Buffière 1956, 386–88; Kindstrand 1973, 183; Trapp 1997, 304 n. 25, who refers to Seneca *De providentia* 2.2–7. *Orations* 38.7, however, combines this motif with another commonplace token of Odysseus' goodness, namely that he was helped by loving gods (among whom stands out Calypso, not mentioned anywhere else as evidence for the providential care that befell Odysseus).

35. Favorinus' philosophical views are close to those of the Academy, but the *De exilio* owes much to Cynic and Stoic thought: cf. Castiglioni 1948, 33 n. 2; Barigazzi 1966, 25–26.

36. Translation by Keaney and Lamberton 1996, slightly modified. The passages in question are *Od.* 4.242–49. (Odysseus in rags spying into Troy) and 9.29–33. (his account of his rejection of Calypso and Circe).

37. The last parallel is in Hillgruber 1994, 2:305–6. Armstrong (2004, 278) has pro-

posed an Epicurean (Philodemean) influence for Horace *Ep.* 1.2. According to this scholar Odysseus' *virtus* in *Ep.* 1.2 matches his exemplarity as "virtue-bearer" in Philodemus' *On the Good King* col. 22.23. O'Sullivan (2007, 523) likewise thinks that Horace depends on *On the Good King* for much of his argumentation. At the same time, however, Odysseus' endurance and unvanquished spirit, on which Horace insists, are both recognizable Stoic qualities. Stanford (1968, 123) reads in the epistle Stoic themes. In the sequel of the poem Horace indeed reproaches himself and his likes for their Epicurean softness.

38. Cf. Cleanthes in *SVF* 1.526; Heraclitus *Hom. Probl.* 72.4: ὁ ἔμφρων λόγος (cf. also 73.2–3); Maximus of Tyre 26.9.h. Odysseus' aids are recast as moral virtues also in a poem by Palladas (*AP* 10.50.8–10). Cf. Kaiser 1964, 208–9. The popularity of this (originally Stoic) allegorizing is demonstrated also by its appearance in a passage from the *De deo Socratis* (24) by the "Platonicus philosophus" Apuleius (Minerva stands for Odysseus' wisdom).

39. On the difference between the Cynic conception of asceticism and Seneca's, cf. Goulet-Cazé 1986, 182–85. Scholars, however, debate over the extent of Diogenes' asceticism as well as the developments in the practice and meaning of asceticism in later phases of the Cynic movement. It is stated that Diogenes despised pleasure (Diog. Laert. 6.71), but also (Stobaeus 4.39.20–21) that he held a moderately hedonistic conception of happiness. Brancacci (1993) views him as a rigorous ascetic in contrast to Antisthenes, whereas Höistad (1948, 134–38) argues that the very goal in Diogenes' practice of asceticism, happiness ("eudaemonistic asceticism"), should warn us from considering him a thoroughgoing ascetic, and that thoroughgoing asceticism developed with Onesicritus under oriental influences. The latter thesis is contested by Giannantoni *SSR* IV, n. 51.

40. Another Stoicizing text that criticizes Odysseus' attempt to avoid the draft is Favorinus' *De exilio* (fr. 96.4, lines 15–17).

41. Petrarch's Odysseus is the hero of *virtus:* cf. Ferroni 1998, and below, epilogue. In one instance, however, Petrarch criticizes Odysseus for his feigned madness (*Epistolae familiares* 22.5.10–11).

42. Cf., e.g., *Ex Ponto* 3.1.53.

43. For the sources, cf. Ioppolo 1980, 46 nn. 30 and 31.

44. On the *Essay* as a work of popularization, cf. Keaney and Lamberton 1996, 12. Like Maximus and the *Essay* Favorinus is endorsing popular morality when he concerns himself with Odysseus' public reputation (*De exil.* fr. 96.4, line 15: ἐδόκει; line 23: γνώμης), as does Cicero at *De off.* 3.26.98. They embrace the commonplace idea that virtue exists only if recognized by others.

45. Cf. Arrian *Dissertations* 4.10.9–10; 2.16.44–45; 3.26.32.

46. For consistency I use the Greek name also in the discussion of Latin texts.

47. *HF* 936–39, partly in Galinsky's translation (1972, 170).

48. Henry and Walker 1965, 20.

49. Heracles echoes Juno's words in this meaning at 605.

50. Cf. Henry and Walker 1965, 15–16; Galinsky 1972, 171. The monologue is attributed to Amphitryo in the best manuscript, but in the Belles Lettres edition it is given to Megara.

51. Galinsky (1972, 171) points out that Seneca criticizes Heracles because his actions are not for the best, rather than because he cannot live in peace, and adduces *Ep.* 39 as evidence for Seneca's high evaluation of activity when the purpose is good. Doubtlessly Seneca recognizes in ceaseless and selfless activity a Stoic ideal (cf. especially *De otio* 1.4), but he also values caution and at times even abstention from action altogether. His model agent responds energetically to events but does not seek to live dangerously, as Heracles could be seen to have done. Cf., e.g., *Ep.* 28.7; 85.28; *De tranq.* 10.5. As mentioned above, the first choral song in *Hercules Furens* extols *quies* over *virtus:* cf. also, for instance, lines 174–76, where the few who live in *quies* are also, Stoically, those in possession of time (*tempora . . . tenent*).

52. Seneca's view is reminiscent of Lucretius' (5.22–54): cf. Galinsky 1972, 130–31, 174.

53. Cf. 128 West; Stanford 1968, 142; 90–91.

54. Dio's self-portrait as a vocational wanderer has strong Cynic overtones. For further discussion, cf. Montiglio 2005, chapter 8.

55. Cf. *Poetics* 1454a30–31, with Stanford 1949a, 49.

56. Cf. *Tusc.* 2.21.48–50, with Stanford 1968, 121. This line of reasoning is echoed in Eustathius' evaluation of Odysseus' weeping at *Od.* 8.521–31: it is more restrained (ἐγκρατέστερον) than Telemachus' emotional outburst in book 3, "for the philosopher Odysseus had to master himself, so as to weep moderately" (*Od.* 1.313.44–45).

57. Epictetus' condemnation of Odysseus' tearful nostalgia is shared by Dio Chrysostom at *Or.* 13.4–5, though not at *Or.* 47.6–7, where, quite to the contrary, Odysseus' longing is held emblematic for the position of the wise man (Homer himself and most philosophers), who "has" to leave his country and misses it. Dio finds in Odysseus' nostalgia a justification for his own feelings.

58. While Heracles is a model of cosmopolitanism, Odysseus, though "the wisest," is there to prove the smaller point that there is nothing wrong with living on an island (603D).

59. Ausonius (*Epigr.* XLVI and XLVII = *SRR* II V A, 39 and 40) also claims Heracles as the founder of the Cynic sect.

60. Lucian *Demonax* 1. The Cynicism of Sostratos, however, is disputed. Cf. Goulet-Cazé 1990, 2732 and n. 84.

61. Cf. Höistad 1948, 38–47.

62. To honor one's fatherland and family counts among one's "duties," καθήκοντα (cf., e.g., Chrysippus *SVF* 3.495).

63. For parallels, cf. Cic. *De orat.* 1.196; Ov. *Ex Ponto* 1.3.33–34.

64. That Epictetus thinks of Odysseus emerges from the reference to the Sirens at the end of the passage (2.23.41): see below.

65. Heraclitus assimilates Odysseus to Aeolus: cf. Russell and Konstan 2006, 113 n. 2.

66. Cf. Long 1992, 47; Pontani 2005, 70. Wedner (1994, 33 and 80) treats Heraclitus as a main source for Stoic allegory though not a Stoic through and through.

67. Epictetus' passage finds a close parallel in Gellius 16.8.16–17: "and some unquenchable pleasure of learning will follow. If, however, you do not set a limit to it, you will incur the great danger of growing old, like many others, among those twists and turns of dialectics as if on the rocks of the Sirens" (*et sequetur quaedam discendi voluptas insatiabilis, cui sane nisi modum feceris, periculum non mediocre erit, ne, ut plerique alii, tu quoque in illis dialecticae gyris atque maeandris tanquam apud Sirenios scopulos consenescas*). For the parallel, cf. Kaiser 1964, 130. On the Sirens' song as the voice of philosophy, cf. chapter 5.

68. Cf. Diog. Laert. 2.79 and [Plutarch], *The Education of Children* (*Mor.*) 7D respectively.

69. A later, Neoplatonic variation on this tradition seems to be illustrated in the exquisite Apamea mosaic (fourth century AD) called "The Therapainides," which shows Penelope warmly embracing a travel-weary Odysseus and near the couple six women elegantly dancing in a circle. Odysseus the Sage is welcomed from his toilsome "travels" by Penelope/Philosophy along with the chorus of the liberal arts. Cf. Balty 1972, 171; Quet 1993. Quet suggests that the prominence of the dancing women in the mosaic reflects the Neoplatonic integrated vision of the philosophical curriculum, which includes the "ancillary arts" as a stimulus to the pursuit of philosophy.

70. Cf. Buffière 1956, 390; Scheid and Svenbro 1996, chapter 5.

71. Cf. also, in Eustathius, the comparison of "regular and methodical philosophy" with the πατρίς to which Odysseus is now returning (*Od.* 1.17, 40–41).

72. The main sources for Ariston's rejection of encyclopedic culture are in *SVF* 1, frs. 351–57. For discussion of Ariston's position in the context of the Old Stoa, cf. Ioppolo 1980, especially chapter 3. Ariston argues that only ethics has a place in education because only ethics "concerns us." If the Stoic whom Philodemus criticizes for approving "good thoughts found in poems which present good thoughts and actions, or which aim at education" (*On Poems* 5 col. 13.30 Jensen) is Ariston of Chios, as according to Jensen's integration, he still would not be defending liberal education but philosophical poetry, that is, poetry as a medium to teach wisdom. It is, however, possible that the author of the quotation is not our Ariston: see Wigodsky 1995, 58, and Asmis 1995, 149.

73. For the relevant bibliography, see Helmbold's introduction to the Loeb edition and Ioppolo 1980, 10 n. 4. Plutarch cites Ariston at 516F. Plutarch's essay, however, does not target man's thirst for multifarious knowledge but a baser kind of cu-

riosity, concerned with people's secrets. Plutarch has no issue with the study of nature or even of history, which, quite to the contrary, he recommends as a cure against petty curiosity (517D–E).

74. Plutarch is bothered by the *Nekyia* for other reasons. Arguing that the ideal reader of poetry should be unemotional, he exemplifies his claim on that episode: if the reader starts feeling for the dead, he should put an end to the spell and go up to the light (= stop reading or at least being emotional), as Anticleia urges Odysseus to do (*Od.* 11.223–24; *Mor.* 16E–F). Plutarch disregards the grief Odysseus feels in his encounter with his mother (*Od.* 11.208: "the pain grew even sharper in my heart") and of course the fact that he does not go up into the light until he feels forced to do so. Plutarch would have wished Odysseus to have told himself (πρὸς αὑτὸν εἰπεῖν) the words his mother told him (of course, in the transposed meaning in which Plutarch reads them), and to have acted accordingly.

75. Cf. Scalfaro 1998, 157–58.

76. Schol. Q on *Od.* 12.160. This reading is echoed in Eustathius, *Od.* 2.4.4–5 (οὐκ ἐκαρτέρησε).

77. "That then I could hardly have held them back."

78. The term σωφροσύνη does not appear in those contexts, but the ideal of self-restraint (or rather abstinence) in the use of pleasure is there. On the Stoic conception of σωφροσύνη, cf. North 1966, 213–31. Her analysis shows that Stoicism, like most philosophical schools, does not retain the Delphic meaning of the virtue. A passage from Cicero's *Tusculanae disputationes* (5.25.70–71), possibly an echo of Posidonius, offers a rewriting of "Know thyself" in the light of cosmic contemplation: "'Know thyself' thus becomes part of the complex of ideas relating knowledge . . . and the imitation of the Divine . . . to virtue and happiness" (North p. 226). For the Stoics "Know thyself" conveyed the sentiment of man's integration in the cosmos, his being part of a whole. The *modestia* promoted by the knowledge of nature is not owing to one's sense of fragility as a mortal, but in imitation of the cosmic order: even the gods observe *moderatio* (*Cicero De finibus* 4.5.11).

79. For fuller discussion, cf. Montiglio 2006 with further bibliography.

80. Cf. Diog. Laert. 6.27–28 = *SSR* II, V B, 374: Diogenes was surprised at the students of literature who would investigate the ills of Odysseus but ignore their own.

81. Cf. Strabo 1.2.11–12; 1.2.14; cf. also 3.2.13; 3.4.3; 3.4.4; 5.2.6; 7.3.6.

82. Maximus of Tyre (8.2.c) also echoes scholarly discussion on the location of Odysseus' wanderings, and so does Gellius (14.6.3), who is as critical as Seneca vis-à-vis such useless speculations. On the issues involved in the debate, cf. Walbank 1949, 171–73; Romm 1992, 183–96.

83. Cf. Buffière 1956, 321 n. 72.

84. As Buffière notes (1956, 322 n. 72), we have no trace of a Skeptic interpretation of Odysseus outside this passage. Nor I have found any reference to the alleged Peripatetic theory of the three kinds of goods retained by Seneca.

85. The marginalization of Cynicism even concerning philosophical interpretations of Odysseus is confirmed by the pseudo-Plutarchean *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* and by Heraclitus' *Homeric Problems,* neither of which ever mentions it. On the exclusion of Cynicism from the list of philosophical schools, starting already with the Hellenistic period, cf. Goulet-Cazé 1990, 2751.

86. Long (1992, 47 n. 11) thinks that *Ep.* 88 does not prove that the Stoics took Homer to be a philosopher, for the criticism would have been in bad taste if the school of Seneca's own allegiance had done so. The criticism, however, would have been meaningless if it had not targeted recognizable practices. Seneca seems to be aiming at philosophers of any persuasion. Long himself (p. 66 n. 54) says that the *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer,* in making Homer the source of contradictory doctrines, "entirely fits Seneca's sarcastic critique," a critique, then, that must have been based on reality. As additional evidence see Lucian's mockery of the philosophical abuses of Odysseus, including the Stoic one, in *The Parasite* 10.

Chapter 4

By "and beyond" I mean both in later times and in non-Epicurean authors. Several aspects of the interpretation of Odysseus offered by our main Epicurean source, Philodemus (first century BC), appear also in Cicero, Plutarch, and Maximus of Tyre.

1. Cf. Nesselrath 1985, s.v. "Odysseus." Tylawsky (2002) identifies Odysseus as the prototypical parasite but does not follow the concrete threads connecting the two in Greek and Roman culture.

2. On Ptolemy's admiration for Odysseus, cf. Stanford 1968, 264–65.

3. Cf. Garassino 1930, 240–51; Phillips 1959; Stanford 1968, 69; Wedner 1994, 60–61.

4. Cf. Phillips 1959, 62, 65. The fragments discussed are, for Epicharmus, *PCG* vol. 1, 122; for Theopompus, *PCG* vol. 7, 51–54.

5. Cf. *PCG* vol. 4, 143–57.

6. Phillips 1959, 64. Phillips (65–66) mentions another play, by Nikophon, that also teased Odysseus' gluttony. It is possible that the following lines, cited in Athenaeus 6.270c, also come from a satyr drama featuring Odysseus as the protagonist: "For in an empty belly no love of the beautiful can reside, since Cypris is a cruel goddess to them that hunger" (*TGF,* vol. 1, 20 F 6). In Lucian's *Gout* the gluttonous Odysseus is claimed by the disease (261–62).

7. See the discussion in Stanford 1968, 68–70. On Odysseus' concern with the belly, cf. also Setaioli 1998, 42; Zeruneith 2007, 174–76.

8. Cf. also *Il.* 4.343–46, where Agamemnon chides Odysseus for his eagerness to accept dinner invitations.

9. On the parasitic theme of "the belly source of all evils," cf. Damon 1997, 25; Longo 1985, 16.

10. Cf. *PCG* vol. 5, 3–4, from Diphilus' *Parasitus.*

11. A synopsis of the complaints is in the scholia on *Od.* 9.5. On the philosophical importance of these lines, cf. Asmis 2006, 240–41. Asmis summarizes some of interpretations discussed here.

12. Eustathius *Od.* 1.273.33–35.

13. In another passage (10.412c–d), however, Athenaeus might be alluding to attempts at explaining away Odysseus' unabashed confessions of hunger. With a wink at current idealizations of the hero's self-control, he charges him with unrestrained gluttony: Odysseus is unable to διακαρτερεῖν and even to μετριάζειν, a more modest, "Peripatetic," goal (cf. also Eustathius *Od.* 2.167.21–22).

14. Cf. chapter 2.

15. Another attempt to elevate the nature of the entertainment is recorded in a scholion (on *Od.* g.5) according to which the kind of merrymaking called εὐφροσύνη, the object of Odysseus' praise, differs from ἡδονή because it is reasonable and moderate (τῷ φρονεῖν).

16. See below.

17. The other adversary is rhetoric—and the lines from *Od.* 9 played an important role also in rhetorical education, as illustration for the good speaker's adaptability: cf. Nesselrath 1985, 303, adducing Hermog. II 9 p. 371 Rabe. Philosophy, however, is Lucian's main target in this passage, as explicit references and implicit allusions show.

18. Cf. Nesselrath 1985, 301.

19. Nesselrath 1985, 303.

20. Cf. the discussion in Asmis 2006, 241 and n. 12.

21. Cf. Sider 1995a, 36. Eustathius reports that the Epicureans did take the lines to mean that pleasure was the τέλος of life (*Od.* 1.318.22–23), though he might draw from non-Epicurean sources. Cf. also schol. H on *Od.* 9.28.

22. If Philodemus approved of Odysseus' praise of feasting, he most likely took it as illustration for the appropriate way of enjoying song and poetry: see below.

23. I quote the passage in the reconstruction by Gigante-Indelli 1978, 128–29. Gargiulo (1981, 122) thinks that this picture of Odysseus is to be attributed to Bion of Borysthenes, Philodemus' source.

24. Cf. Asmis 1991, 39. The essay has been regarded as an anomaly among Epicurean texts because it draws moral lessons from poetry. Asmis, however, does not consider it heterodox but rather calls it a "major turning point in the history of Epicurean poetics" (2006, 259).

25. The translations of *On the Good King* are generally taken but sometimes slightly modified from Asmis 1991. The text is Dorandi 1982.

26. Cf. Asmis 1991, 36.

27. Nestor inspires comparable admiration but lacks Odysseus' variety of talents: he essentially is the wise counselor and conciliator.

28. Armstrong 2004, 278. The reference is to *On the Good King* col. 22, line 23.

29. O. Murray held both positions (1965 and 1984 respectively), the second drawing on Dorandi 1982, 44–45. For extensive discussion, cf. Dorandi, pp. 39–47. The main positions are summarized also by Asmis 1991, 1 n. 1. Grimal's hypothesis (1966) that Philodemus wrote the essay to support Caesar around 45 BC is generally rejected.

30. On the Epicurean relative interest in, and preference for, monarchy, cf. Dorandi 1982, 24–25; Cairns 1989, 14; de Sanctis 2006, 53.

31. Cf. Dorandi 1982, 34–35, adducing Murray's interpretation (1965). Dorandi also points out the Romans' hostility to the word *rex*. Cairns (1989, 5–10), however, remarks that kingship was not always stigmatized in the last two centuries of the Republic, and argues that Philodemus' choice to dedicate a work on the good king to Piso can be seen as normal for the period.

32. O. Murray (1984, 157) draws the parallel but does not dwell on the different choice of hero in the two texts.

33. On Odysseus' piety, cf. Lanza 1993. Already Petrarch noted that Virgil fashioned the wanderer Aeneas after Odysseus: cf. *Epistolae familiares* 9.13.27; *Rerum memorandarum* 3.81.1, with Ferroni 1998. Cairns (1989, chapter 8) argues that most facets of Aeneas' character are molded after Odysseus, and that Aeneas is, so to speak, a "corrected" Odysseus, lacking his defects. On Virgil's ambivalence vis-à-vis Odysseus, cf. also Stanford 1968, 135–36; Galinsky 1980, 1001–4; Setaioli 1998, chapter 2; Perutelli 2006, 32–41. The most negative assessment of the Virgilian Odysseus that I know is Villers 1976. Cf. also Padoan 1977, 170–73.

34. Galinsky 1980, 1002. Cf. already Stanford 1968, 132–33.

35. Cf. especially Gonzales-Vasquez 1987, with further bibliography.

36. Cf. Schmit-Neuerburg 1999, 68. This scholar also mentions Dio Chrys. 32.22 and a scholion on *Il.* 2.144.

37. Sider (1995b, 43–44) makes a strong case for Philodemus' ascendancy on Virgil during the latter's sojourn in Naples. For Virgil's acquaintance with *On the Good King,* cf. Cairns 1989, 9 n. 41. Gigante (2004, 96–97) argues that Virgil's vision of his epic hero was influenced by Philodemus' ideal ruler.

38. Cf. Dorandi 1982, 167.

39. When the naval power of Sextus Pompeius offered strong resistance to the Caesarians, "The plebs showed their support for him by vigorously applauding the statue of Neptune as it was carried along in procession at the beginning of the games in the Circus" (Cassius Dio 48.31). I owe this reference to Jim McKeown.

40. Cf. especially Austin 1971, 68. Aeneas: Harrison 1986, adduced by Cairns 1989, 94 n. 35 (though Cairns himself opts for the absence of concrete references) and Harrison 1988, 56; Agrippa: Morwood 1998; Rome: Gonzales-Vasquez 1987, 366. Cairns, though not explicitly, advances the possibility of an allusion to Augustus: "In terms of recent Roman history the simile at least recalls the civil war 'stirred up' by M. Antonius, the virtuous suppressor of this *seditio* being Augustus" (95). Likewise

Spence (2002, 50), adducing Anderson (1969, 25), argues that the simile "points to Augustus's efforts to establish political order out of the chaos of the civil wars."

41. Cf., e.g., Perutelli 2006, 37.

42. Cf. Fish 2004, 114.

43. Cf. Asmis 1991, 35, 42–43, 45; Fish 2004, 112–13. Asmis notes that the term "correction" appears at col. 42, line 20. Fish reads "corrected" in Philodemus' account of Odysseus' boast: "And yet, even the one who blinded . . . [the Cyclops], was corrected, just as also some monarchs later in history [were corrected]."

44. By emphasizing Odysseus' modesty Philodemus might be responding to Sophocles' *Philoctetes,* where Odysseus claims (1058–59) that he is as competent an archer as Philoctetes. Contrary to Philodemus, however, Eustathius deems Odysseus' boast in *Od.* 8 excessive (*Od.* 1.292.30–31).

45. I paraphrase the core of an obscure passage at col. 38, thus understood by Dorandi (1982, 199): "[Omero] privò [Odisseo] della facoltà di segnalare i suoi meriti, grazie alla quale, a parte le altre cose, egli potrà rivelarsi ai poco informati, rinfrescare la memoria degli immemori, cavar gli occhi agli ingrati."

46. The passage at col. 38, however, does not allow a firm interpretation, for the sentence concerning Odysseus' marks of superiority could also mean "they were not taken away from him": so Asmis 1991, 44. I have followed Dorandi, who reads: "Omero privò Odisseo della facoltà di segnalare i suoi meriti" (1982, 131). Dress and appearance were important indeed in Roman ideals of kingship: cf. Cairns 1989, 30.

47. Cf. Asmis 1991, 44: "The source of superiority in all these cases is the intellect."

48. Cf. Dorandi 1982; Asmis 1991; de Sanctis 2006, 59.

49. Cf. chapter 2. One of the scholia on *Il.* 10.243 brings in Ajax ("for this reason [because he thought himself brave] Diomedes passes over Ajax"); de Sanctis (2006, 59) makes the parallel with Philodemus.

50. The reconstruction is Olivieri's, adopted by Dorandi 1982, 188.

51. From the dedication of Peletier's translation of the *Odyssey* to the king, line 87 (cf. also 97). On this passage cf. D'Amico 2002, 101–2.

52. Cf., for instance, Stanford 1968, 129. As a matter of fact Odysseus was a popular hero in Italy from early on (cf. Farrell 2004), though his popularity does not necessarily entail that he was liked for his character traits.

53. Cf. Zeruneith 2007, 171–72. This characteristic of Odysseus recommended him also as a model for the historian concerned with reversals of fortune: cf. Marincola 2007, 37–38. Radermaker (2005, 70–74) also recognizes in the Homeric Odysseus a model of σωφροσύνη, but rather in the more limited sense of self-control (namely with respect to anger).

54. Cf. North 1966, 10. In the extant fragments, however, Odysseus does not appear.

55. Cf., respectively, *Mor.* 57E and 104D–E. According to Stobaeus (3.33.16),

Plutarch also admired Odysseus' restraint at *Il.* 2.246–47 (when he censures Thersites) and at *Od.* 19.42–43 (when he stops Telemachus from inquiring about the gods), and connected the latter episode to the Pythagorean obligation of silence.

56. Guthrie 1962–65, 3:259. I cite Guthrie's translation of Antiphon. For a new translation and a thorough analysis of the fragment, cf. Pendrick 2001, 202–5 and 401–7. This scholar notes that several commentators, in addition to Guthrie, "drew attention to this fragment's emphasis on self-interest and to the way in which the virtue of σωφροσύνη is commended not for its own sake nor out of regard for the interests of others, but purely on the basis of self-interest" (p. 402). This fragment also illustrates the "negative" quality of σωφροσύνη ("don't do . . ."), discussed by Dover 1994, 68, 119, and (mentioning our fragment), 122.

57. In his confrontation with Agamemnon Odysseus insists on Ajax's bravery as the main reason he deserves burial, but the spectator knows that Odysseus is also, or rather primarily, acting upon his realization that we humans are all puppets of the gods, "ghosts, or empty shades" (126).

58. Already in 1957 Diano (in an essay reprinted in Diano 1968, 206) interpreted Odysseus' response as one of pity, though he did not comment on the simile. For the interpretation advocated here, cf., for instance, Rutherford 1991, 259, and especially G. de F. Lord 1991, 99–100: "Odysseus reacts in a totally unexpected manner to this account of his exploits. His pride in his heroic accomplishments is suddenly transformed into pity for his victims. . . . The moment of compassion includes for the first time those heretofore excluded from compassion on the grounds of being the 'enemy.' Until this moment the formalism of war prevented Odysseus from recognizing and feeling the humanity of his foes." Most (2003, 59–60) thinks that Odysseus is weeping for himself. This is true, but, as the simile suggests, Odysseus' self is an inclusive one.

59. Stanford 1968, 107. Cf. also Kirkwood 1965, 66: "the enterprising counsellor is also a philosopher with a broad, humane sympathy and a regard for human values." Boulogne (1988, 105) sees in *Ajax* the beginnings of the idealization of Odysseus that will continue with philosophers.

60. Several scholars have pointed out that Odysseus in *Ajax* interprets the moral ethos of democratic Athens (cf., for instance, T. Rosenmeyer 1963, 194–98; Golder 1999; Mazzoldi 2000), but as far as moderation is concerned, his vision can be traced back to Homeric epic.

61. Cf. Dover 1994, 269–71. The citation is on p. 269. On Odysseus' magnanimity, cf. North 1966, 55; Stanford 1979, lv–lvi; Kitto 1968, 185. T. Rosenmeyer's contention (1963, 194) that Odysseus "builds a philosophy of enlightened utilitarianism on his appetites" does not do justice to his humane vision. The contrast between the noble Odysseus of *Ajax* and his villainous counterpart in *Philoctetes* extends to the reading of Odysseus' σωφροσύνη, which in the later play is sarcastically reconfigured (by Neoptolemus) as narrowly self-regarding prudence (1257–60). Cf. Radermaker 2005, 139–40.

62. On the gulf separating Odysseus from Athena in *Ajax,* as opposed to their complicity in Homer, cf. Guthrie 1947. Whereas in the *Odyssey* Odysseus is simply aware of the power of Athena (cf., e.g., 16.211–12), in *Ajax* he is forced to learn it again. The core meaning of σωφροσύνη in this play is the acceptance of a superior's power: cf. Radermaker 2005, 125–33.

63. Cf. Stanford 1979, 229, and 1968, 106.

64. Cf. also Paduano 1998, 93.

65. Cf. Garvie 1998, 136.

66. Cf. North 1966 passim.

67. One might ask why Philodemus does not use σωφροσύνη for Odysseus (at least in the extant fragments) though the ideal is clearly there. Perhaps this is because the main meaning of the term has come to be "moderation in the satisfaction of bodily appetites," and the Epicureans seem to have understood it in this sense: cf. Aubenque 1963, 160; North 1966, passim and 211–13 (on Epicurus).

68. Fr. 40, in the translation of Konstan *et alii* 1998.

69. Cf., for instance, fragments 63 and 64, 88, col. XVIIa, in which medical procedures and frankness are compared. On Philodemus' conception of frankness as therapy, cf. Glad 1995, especially 113–60, and 1996, 30–44; Konstan 1996, 13; 1997, 112.

70. Cf. Glad 1995, 35; Konstan 1997, 103 and 112.

71. Cf. also *Mor.* 29B: Agamemnon respects Odysseus' rebuke to him at *Il.* 4.350–55.

72. Cf. also *Mor.* 72E and 34D, where Plutarch admires this rebuke of Odysseus (from a lost tragedy) to Achilles hiding among the maidens on Scyrus: "You extinguish the brilliance of your race carding wool, son of the noblest of the Greeks?"

73. Another feature of Odysseus that recommends him as a model friend to Plutarch is his moderation. This phrase would be a fitting gloss on Odysseus' behavior toward Amphinomous in *Odyssey* 18: "those who fare well have most need of friends who speak frankly and bring down their excessive pride. For few are those who in good fortune still keep their moderation (τὸ φρονεῖν)" (68F). When Odysseus warns Amphinomous, he means it well. The suitor, though unable to act upon the advice, knows it is right.

74. This φιλία, which can be termed 'friendliness,' is the mean between flattery and quarrelsomeness, a definition that fits the image of Odysseus in the sources we are examining. On "friendliness" versus "friendship" in Aristotle's passage, cf. Gottlieb 2009, chapter 2.

75. Cf. J. Clay (1983, 107) commenting on *Od.* 8.581–86, followed by Konstan 1997, 32; Ruderman 1995.

76. See above, chapter 2 and Servius on Virgil *Aen.* 2.166.12–16 (with Gantz 1993, 644) respectively. The proverbial expression ἡ Διομήδεια ἀνάγκη (Aristophanes *Eccl.* 1029; Plato *Rep.* 393d6) might refer to the episode of the Palladium but is variously explained.

77. The theme of Odysseus' loyalty to his friends recurs in drama. In Aeschylus Agamemnon praises Odysseus for this quality, though at the same time he reminds the audience of his attempt to dodge the draft (*Agamemnon* 841–42). Odysseus' loyalty to his friends is also invoked in Euripides' *Orestes,* and by a hostile character: the Phrygian compares Pylades, who has destroyed him, to Odysseus, the "silent deceiver," "loyal to his friends" (1404–5). In *Cyclops* it is Odysseus himself who proclaims his loyalty to his companions. He will not abandon them in Polyphemus' cave because "it is not fair to leave behind my friends, with whom I came here, and to save myself alone" (481–82). As this statement demonstrates, however, Odysseus is loyal to others as long as they are involved in the same project (a war, the return journey). His commitment is not due to personal attachment. Odysseus is ready to admit that loyalties can shift: see below.

78. Cf. Rutherford 1999, 254–55.

79. The only exception I have found is Plutarch *On Having Many Friends* 95A, where *Odyssey* 4.178 (Menelaus reminiscing about his friendship with Odysseus) serves to illustrate the pleasantness of daily companionship among friends (cf. also *Mor.* 54F). One might, however, note that it is Menelaus, not Odysseus, who is speaking. In this essay on intimate friendship the examples are provided by canonical pairs, such as Achilles and Patroclus or Epaminondas and Pelopidas (93E), whereas Odysseus, except for that passing reference, is absent. Odysseus' insignificance in *On Having Many Friends* contrasts with his importance in *How to Tell . . .* , which is concerned with philanthropic frankness rather than intimacy.

80. On Odysseus' flexible understanding of friendship in drama, cf. Paduano 1998.

81. For the historical background of the passage I follow Perutelli 2006, 26–27.

82. Cf. Stanford 1968, 124–25.

83. Cf. *AP* 11.44 = Sider 1997, poem 27. For the dating of the poem, cf. O. Murray 1984, 158–59.

84. That Philodemus identifies with Odysseus is recognized by Sider 1997, 159. Sider adds Demodocus as another possible reference. Jufresa's suggestion (1982, 517, in Sider *loc. cit.*) that Piso, rather than Philodemus, is the Odysseus figure in this poem, because he is the one who will come as guest, in my view misses Philodemus' emphasis on his role as entertainer and his hope, obliquely expressed, to be favored by Piso's generosity as Odysseus was by Alcinous'. Sider (p. 156) also notes that Philodemus might have wished to evoke Odysseus' companions by choosing the term ἕταροι for his friends.

85. Mention of the Phaeacians might also allude to Epicurus' use of the Phaeacian feast praised by Odysseus as a model for his own school's dinner parties. Cf. Sider 1995a, 41.

86. D. Clay (1986) suggests only philosophical reminiscences, of Epicurus and his doctrines, as Philodemus' proposed entertainment. Conversely Davis (2004, 68–70)

takes Philodemus' offer of sweet words to include poetry alongside philosophy. I prefer the inclusive interpretation because in our poem Philodemus calls himself "lover of the Muses" (μουσοφιλής), while at the same time insisting on the truth-value of the conversation he offers. On μουσοφιλής as referring to Philodemus' poetic creativity, cf. Asmis 2006, 261; Sider 1995b, 47.

87. Doubts on the veracity of a narrative of Odysseus' kind, "from where no one can see," surface already in Homer, though Alcinous presents Odysseus' story as truthful: cf. Romm 1992, 183–84. A hint at the falsity of Odysseus' apologue is in Plato's Myth of Er: cf. chapter 2. Philodemus' comparison might be echoing precisely the introduction to that myth as "not the story told by Alcinous but by a warrior bold": cf. Sider 1997, 159.

88. I take the conclusion of the poem (in D. Clay's translation [1986, 23]), "if ever you [Piso] turn your eyes towards us, we will transform our sober festival of the twentieth into one of greater abundance" literally. Philodemus does not seem to have had anything against celebrating Epicurus' birthday richly: cf. D. Clay 1986, 21 (referring to *On Piety* 104.2–11).

89. There is a wealth of bibliography on the overlap of the two terms: cf., e.g., Nesselrath 1985 (see index s.v. κόλαξ and "Parasit"); McC Brown 1992; Damon 1997, 11–15; Tylawsky 2002, 3–4 and passim.

90. On the ambivalence of Odysseus' versatility, cf. Glad 1995. Building on Stanford 1968, he connects it to discussions on flattery.

91. Contra: Kindstrand 1973, 171.

92. One meaning of ἦθος is precisely *dramatis persona.*

93. On the mimetic quality of the flatterer, cf. also 51C: "trying to adapt and shape himself through imitation," which recalls Theognis' words, probably inspired by Odysseus' pliable ways: "O heart, present a variegated (ποικίλον) character to every friend, blending your temperament with each of them. Keep the disposition of the complex (πολυπλόκου) polypus, which always takes the appearance of the rock to which it clings" (212–15). The cuttlefish and the chameleon are indeed invoked shortly afterward (52F, 53D; cf. also 51D). Cf. Glad 1995, 27.

94. Cf. Meli 2000, 95: "Ulisse soccorre Agamennone nel suo aspetto di sovrano" (though this scholar is concerned with Odysseus' relationship to sovereignty rather than his attachment to the powerful).

95. Cf. Martorana 1926, 75–80 and chapter 3.

96. Cf. Mayer 2006, 151 and 154–55.

97. Mayer (2006, 150 and 152) notes that scholars are divided over the definition of the very concept of *virtus,* some regarding it Roman while others Greek and essentially philosophical.

98. On Cynic parody in this passage, cf. Létoublon 2003, 339.

99. A reason to redeem Odysseus in that scene could be that he does not seek his own advantage at Nausicaa's expense, as flatterers do. But Maximus does not state

this explicitly. For interpretations of Odysseus' speech to Nausicaa as flattery, cf. schol. on *Od.* 6.149. Cf. also Eustathius, *Od.* 1.244.26: "flattering the royal child with words of praise" (τὴν βασιλίδα παῖδα κολακεύων λόγοις ἐπαινετηρίοις).

Chapter 5

1. For references, see the introduction.

2. Cf. O'Sullivan 2007.

3. A philosophical, namely Stoic, interpretation of Odysseus has been assumed also for the group of sculptures at Sperlonga (installed in the late years of Augustus' principate or under Tiberius), which likewise illustrate episodes of Odysseus' career. Cf. Andreae 1974, 105. This hypothesis is, however, rejected by Stuart (1977), who argues that the group "looks to be literary and Alexandrian, with its exaggeration on the hero's chameleon-like personality and its emphasis, over and above what is in Homer, upon the two extremes of his character—his courage and his perfidy" (78). Stuart suggests that Odysseus was chosen for his old connection with Italy and perhaps because his character was curiously similar to Tiberius'.

4. Cf. Stanford 1968, 95: "a subtle hearer might well have taken this [Hesiod's line] as a hint that both the deceitful Odysseus and Homer, his creator, deserved the same condemnation."

5. Stanford 1968, 146.

6. *Or.* 26.1.a; 6.b–c; 4.a. At the same time, however, in the same speech Odysseus' journey is contrasted with the philosophical flights of Homer's soul (26.1): see below.

7. Cf. Keaney and Lamberton 1996.

8. Graverini (2007, 160–165) sees in the reference to Odysseus in Apuleius' novel an allusion to Polybius' ἀνὴρ πραγματικός (12.27.10), for whom Odysseus is a model owing to his knowledge and experience of the world. Contrary to Odysseus, Lucius is a "historian" who relies on hearsay rather than on autopsy. This is an attractive suggestion. It does not, however, exclude an additional reference to the Odysseus of philosophers, who also is praised for his knowledge of the world (see below). Graverini himself agrees with Hijmans et al. 1995 (ad loc.) that "Lucius . . . simply admits that he does not quite dare to aspire to Odysseus' virtue of *prudentia,* which would make him *sapiens* in the philosophical sense of the word." We shall also remember that Apuleius admires Odysseus in his philosophical writings (*De deo Socratis* 18 and 24).

9. The nature of the novels' readership is, however, debated. See the arguments of Hägg 2004 (originally published in 1994) and Bowie 2003.

10. Heliodorus 10.16, in the translation by Morgan (in Reardon 2008).

11. Further indications that Petronius has the Odysseus of philosophers in mind are the reference, in the same passage, to the "men of a more severe meddle" (*severi-*

oris notae), who would not consider that part of the body worthy of attention or reproach, and the polemical address to the *Catones,* one of whom, Cato the Younger, was the Stoic hero par excellence.

12. A clear, if subtle, indication of this is Gryllus' remark that some man wrongly would want to banish anger from fighting (988E). This was the Stoic position: for a Stoic anger is not necessary for valor, whereas Gryllus argues that it is.

13. To Plutarch Odysseus' ethical perfection even recommends him as the ideal poet—a better poet than the most highly valued Homeric bard. Plutarch admires Odysseus' words to Demodocus ("change the subject and sing of the Horse" [*Od.* 8.492]) because they well indicate that musicians and poets should draw their subjects from "wise and sensible men" (*Mor.* 20A). Odysseus is one such man. Plutarch reads his request to Demodocus as that of an expert in the appropriate subjects of poetry and himself one such subject.

14. Cf. also *Mor.* 442D–E, where Plutarch exploits the episode in *Od.* 19 to demonstrate the subjection of the irrational elements, including physical impulses, to reason.

15. As additional evidence, cf. Aristotle *Topics* 117b10–17.

16. Even the common attribution of φρόνησις to Odysseus' patron deity highlights its practical purport, for Athena is the goddess of "cunning and gain," fitting to possess φρόνησις in this capacity, just as Odysseus deserves it as the hero of "guile and craft." Cf. Heracl. *Hom. Probl.* 54.2–3 and 75.9–11 respectively. Cf. also schol. on *Od.* 7.14, with Giuliano 1995, 37.

17. Cf. Heracl. *Hom. Probl.* 70.8; 72.3 (if Heraclitus' inspiration is Stoic here); [Plut.] *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* 136. Though Stoic φρόνησις is a science (Ariston's definition of φρόνησις as a practical virtue [*SVF* 1.374, 375 and 376)] is unorthodox), it is the science "about what to do and not to do," or "of goods, evils, and indifferents": cf. *SVF* 3.262 (Chrysippus), with Aubenque 1963, 33; 89 n. 89. On φρόνησις in Dio Chrysostom (knowledge of good and evil) cf. also Höistad 1948, 201. As concerns Odysseus, however, we cannot always tell for sure whether a Stoic or Stoicizing author is using φρόνησις for him in the doctrinal or the popular sense. For instance, Dio Chrysostom's emphasis on the καιρός (appropriate moment) in his praise of Odysseus' φρόνησις (55.19) harks back to the traditional meaning of the term. Maximus of Tyre, though influenced by Stoicism, understands φρόνησις mostly in the traditional-Aristotelian sense (see below).

18. *Mor.* 642B, 405B, 193A, 140F.

19. On this difference between the two verbs, cf. Chantraine 1968–80, s.v. οἶδα with Staed 2000, 300. For examples, cf. LSJ, s.v. ἐπίσταμαι. There are, however, exceptions, such as *Il.* 7.237.

20. Gilead (1994, 94) thinks that Plato is alluding to Odysseus' companions. The point of the passage, however, is that to have access to the guidance the cicadas offer

one must resist the drugging power of their song, which cannot happen if one is not at all exposed to it.

21. Cf. 259d8: καλλίστην φωνήν.

22. On the Socratic elenchus as countermagic, cf. Belfiore 1980.

23. *Neque enim vocum suavitate videntur aut novitate quadam et varietate cantandi revocare eos solitae, qui praetervehebantur, sed quia multa se scire profitebantur, ut homines ad earum saxa discendi cupiditate adhaerescerent.* That Cicero has theoretical knowledge in mind becomes clear toward the end of the passage (*maiorum rerum contemplatione*).

24. *Vidit Homerus probari fabulam non posse, si cantiunculis tantus irretitus vir teneretur; scientiam pollicentur, quam non erat mirum sapientiae cupido patria esse cariorem.*

25. On this aspect of the Sirens' song in the Roman tradition, cf. Wedner 1994, 88–89.

26. Cf. Perutelli 2006, 20.

27. Cf. Kaiser 1964, 119 ("Umwertung der homerischen Szene").

28. Contrary to Stanford (1968, 124), I do not think that Cicero puts any emphasis whatsoever on Odysseus' resistance to the Sirens' promise of knowledge.

29. *Atque omnia scire, cuiuscumque modi sint, cupere curiosorum, duci vero maiorum rerum contemplatione ad cupiditatem scientiae summorum virorum est putandum.*

30. The mood of the passage as a whole, with its defense of disinterested contemplation, is Peripatetic, and so might be the interpretation of the Sirens' song. Evidence is lacking. In any case the origin of the philosophical interpretation of the song is in Plato.

31. Cf. Wedner 1994, 101.

32. On the Stoic inspiration of this passage, cf. Nussbaum 1993, 131. Plutarch is responding to Epicurus, who recommends to the young Pythocles that he should steer clear of traditional education by means of a transparent reference to the Sirens episode: "lift the sails and flee from all forms of culture, blessed one" (Diog. Laert. 10.6). Nonetheless, it is possible that Epicurus did not mean, "Don't study poetry and the other liberal arts," as in Plutarch's interpretation, but "Enjoy them, provided you don't succumb to their charm": cf. Asmis 2006.

33. A possible exception is Heraclitus (if we consider him close to the Stoics). He claims that the song contains "the varied history of the ages." But even this description calls poetry, rather than philosophy, to mind: cf. Buffière 1956, 383.

34. Long and Sedley 1997, 63J (their translation). Posidonius' formulation does not seem to be unorthodox: Long and Sedley in their commentary to the section "The end" (vol. 1, 398–401) point out the fundamental agreement among the various Stoic views of the τέλος. Inwood, however, observes (1985, 3) that Posidonius' valuation of theoretical knowledge is "abnormally high" for a Stoic.

35. Nightingale 2004, 213.

36. Aubenque 1963, 87: "Dans un monde parfaitement ordonné, comme l'est celui

des stoïciens, l'action morale ne peut être action sur le monde: le monde étant rationnel, il serait absurde et, de surcroît, tout à fait vain de vouloir le changer. . . . Le sage n'agit donc pas sur le monde, mais le 'suit,' accorde sa vie privée à l'harmonie universelle." The Stoics' deterministic system explains why they substituted "assent" for "deliberation" (as in Aristotle) as the locus of rationality: cf. Inwood 1985, 44–45, with further discussion and bibliography.

37. Cf. Epictetus according to Arrian *Dissertations* 2.6.9–10 = Long and Sedley 1997, 58J.

38. On the Stoic preference for the hero of the *Odyssey,* cf. Stanford 1968, 121. The Odysseus of the *Iliad,* however, is not ignored: cf. Pépin 1991, adducing [Plut.] *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* 136. Lucian (*Parasite* 10) lists episodes of Odysseus' life during the war as evidence for his alleged Stoic career.

39. Inwood 1985, passim.

40. ἐοίκασιν οὖν αἱ Ὁμηρικαὶ Σειρῆνες θεωρητικώτεραι εἶναι, οἷα περί τε ἱστορίαν οὖσαι καὶ περὶ φυσιολογίαν, ὡς ἐρρέθη, καὶ ὅλως εἰπεῖν, μάθησιν (*Od.* 2.4.41–42). Cf. also *Od.* 2.4.24–26, with the perceptive insight that the Sirens know also the future: not "whatever happens," but "whatever might happen."

41. For Maximus the Sirens are only the temptation of pleasure, along Stoic lines: cf. *Or.* 22.2.b; 39.3.m.

42. Buffière (1956, 383) brings together the passages from Maximus and from Eustathius. He also adduces Maximus *Or.* 34.7.b, where Odysseus is praised for refusing immortality in the name of activity. That passage, though, does not contrast theory and praxis in Odysseus' choice but emphasizes the needs of his "virtue" in a way reminiscent of Antisthenes: cf. chapter 3.

43. Cf. Kindstrand 1973, 183.

44. Cf. chapter 3.

45. The opposition θεωρία/πρᾶξις is of course of Aristotelian origin. By Maximus' time, however, Platonists had long felt free to borrow Aristotelian elements: cf. Trapp 1997, xxvi.

46. Polybius the wanderer: Pausanis 8.30.8. On Odysseus as Polybius' model, cf. Walbank 1948, 172–73; Zecchini 1991, 119; Peschanski 1993, 65–66; Canfora 1995; Marincola 1997 and 2007, 18–20. Diodorus' rejection of the model: 1.1.2–3. On the polemic, cf. Marincola 2007, 26–28.

47. Cf. Trapp 1997, 191 n. 18.

48. At *Or.* 26.9.h, as we have seen, Leucothea's veil Stoically stands for "virtue." An exception to Maximus' idealization of Odysseus as the exemplary sea-traveler is *Or.* 30.2, where Odysseus is rather the underlying reference for the average sailor who cannot steer clear of obstacles in spite of his nautical expertise.

49. Cf. Kindstrand 1973, 180.

50. The next section (11), in which Maximus maintains that one can truly swim to god only after death, does not have Odysseus as a reference.

51. Cf. Buffière 1956, 413–18; Lamberton 1989, 71–72; 130; Pépin 1991, 233–34. Pépin, who compares Numenius' text with Maximus', thinks that the latter is the earliest formulation of this symbolic treatment of Odysseus. As Lamberton points out, Numenius' reading of Odysseus as the soul escaping the physical world underlies Porphyry's own interpretation of Odysseus depositing the gifts of the Phaeacians in the Cave and disguising himself as a beggar (12–19).

52. Cf. Plotinus *Enn.* 1.6.8.16–21 (with the famous: "let us flee to our country") and 5.9.1.20–22, where Odysseus is, tellingly, the man "who has come back to his *well-ordered country* after much wandering."

53. Soph. fr. 861 *TGF.*

54. Wedner (1994, 73) takes it for granted: "Odysseus, der Weise, hingegen höre und begreife." Cf. also p. 107.

55. Cf. Buffière 1956, 473–76; Detienne 1962, 56–59.

56. In the line by Sophocles that Plutarch quotes, the Sirens do not seem to lead the dead but are still associated with them: cf. Zwicker 1927, 294. Since its emergence, the image of the Sirens singing on tombs might have been connected to the Homeric episode. Thus Wedner (1994, 68–69), whereas Rossi (1970) keeps the two traditions separate.

57. The Sirens guide the soul to its final destination but do not preside over the music of the spheres, as they do in Plato. That music is produced by the Muses: cf. *Mor.* 746C with Wedner 1994, 107. Buffière (1956, 479 n. 65) does not seem to separate the two.

58. Buffière 1956, 478 ("The Sirens wish to destroy Odysseus only to save him better").

59. For more readings of Penelope as philosophy, cf. chapter 3.

60. Cf. Buffière 1956, 415–16.

61. The protagonist of *Lighea* is a professor of Greek who has a portrait of Odysseus in his house and thinks he knows the truth about Odysseus' encounter with the Sirens: "Sul caminetto anfore e crateri antichi: Odisseo legato alla nave, le Sirene che dall'alto della rupe si sfracellavano sugli scogli in espiazione per aver lasciato sfuggire la preda. 'Frottole queste . . . frottole piccolo-borghesi dei poeti; nessuno sfugge e quand'anche qualcuno fosse scampato le Sirene non sarebbero morte per così poco'" (1961, 72). The professor was loved by a Siren in his youth and this experience awoke him to the vulgarity and meaninglessness of normal life and people. He ends his life throwing himself into the sea, his Siren's dwelling, while on his way to a conference.

Epilogue

The goal of these conclusive remarks is not to cover every aspect of the interpretation of Odysseus in the Renaissance (that would require another book!), but to focus

specifically on the treatment of the polarity contemplation/action, which, I think, builds substantially on classical material. For well-informed investigations of other aspects of the Renaissance Odysseus, see the bibliographical references given below.

1. Cf. P. Ford 2000 and D'Amico 2002, passim.

2. Cf. Browning 1992, 139–40, 146.

3. Odysseus, however, occasionally displeased Christian readers who took Ithaca literally, as a terrestrial good: cf. Rahner 1963, 328 and 337. For a thorough analysis of the early medieval interpretations of Odysseus sailing by the Sirens, cf. chapter 7 of his book.

4. Translation by Ramsey 1989.

5. The term does not exist in Greek.

6. William of Conches, *In Iuvenalem,* p. 101. The translation of this clumsy text is by Chance 1994, 441.

7. For further medieval readings of Odysseus as a stranger to this world, cf. Rahner 1963, chapter 7, and Chance 1994, 4; 20 n. 612; 112.

8. On the revival of Plutarch's interpretation of Odysseus in the Renaissance, cf. Stanford 1968, 158; Corti 1998, 204–5; D'Amico 2002, chapter 3.

9. Cf. *De remediis utriusque fortunae* 2.56 (the text is in Ferroni 1998, 181): "Toil is the arena of the virtues, the rest from pleasures. Nothing is laudable without toil, nothing lofty. Hence the basis for Heracles' praise is toil; Ulysses is known by nothing better than toil: no matter how wise he was represented, his wisdom would have been unknown had it been idle" (*Labor area est virtutum, requies voluptatum. Nil sine labore laudabile, nil excelsum. Proinde laudis Herculee fundamentum, labor; nulla re magis Ulyxes quam labore cognoscitur: quantalibet prudentia fingeretur, si otiosa fuisset, ignota esset*). The coupling Odysseus/Heracles and the motif that virtue shows itself in toil could come straight from a Stoic text. Petrarch was familiar with Stoic ethics especially through the channel of Cicero, whom he greatly admired.

10. . . . *ivit et ad Troiam atque inde longius Ulixes, maria lustravit ac terras, nec ante substitit quam urbem sui nominis occidentis ultimo fundasset in litore; et erat illi domi decrepitus pater, infans filius, uxor iuvenis et procis obsessa, cum ipse interea circeis poculis, Sirenum cantibus, Cyclopum violentiis, pelagi monstris ac tempestatibus decertaret. Vir erroribus suis clarus, calcatis affectibus, neglecto regni solio et tot pignoribus spretis, inter Scyllam et Caribdim, inter nigrantes Averni vertices easque difficultates rerum ac locorum que legentis quoque animum fatigent, senescere maluit quam domi, nullam aliam ob causam quam ut aliquando senex doctior in patriam remearet. Et revera si experientia doctos facit, si mater est artium, quid artificiosum quid ve alta laude dignum speret, qui paterne domus perpetuus custos fuit? Boni villici est in proprio rure consistere, terre sue vim boumque mores et naturas aquarum atque arborum seminumque successus et oportunitates temporum et vicissitudines tempestatum, rastra demum et ligones et aratra cognoscere. At nobilis inque altum nitentis animi est, multas terras et "multorum mores hominum" vidisse atque observasse memoriter; verissimumque est quod apud Apuleium legisti: "non immerito" enim, inquit, "prisce poetice divinus auctor apud*

Graios, summe prudentie virum monstrare cupiens multarum civitatum obitu et variorum populorum cognitu summas adeptum virtutes cecinit." Quod poeta noster imitatus, suum Eneam scis quot urbibus atque litoribus circumducit (*Epistolae familiares* 9.13, 24–27).

11. Cf. D'Amico 2002, 52. Ferroni (1998, 175) notes that in one isolated instance (*Triumphus Famae* 2.17) Petrarch echoes Dante's condemnation of Odysseus' thirst for knowledge: *che desiò del mondo veder troppo* ("who longed to see too much of the world," l. 18).

12. Cf. Ferroni 1998, 177.

13. For the interconnection between Odysseus' thirst for knowledge, his *laboriosa virtus,* and *negotium,* cf. also *Epistolae familiares* 13.4.10–11 with Ferroni 1998, 179–80; D'Amico 2002, 53.

14. The comparison between Odysseus' *sapientia* and Aeneas', both acquired through traveling, but with no emphasis on Odysseus' thirst for knowledge, recurs at *Rerum memorandarum* 3.87.1.

15. The text, from *The Scholemaster,* is in Stanford 1968, 183–84.

16. The text and commentary I have used is P. Ford 2000.

17. *Patria est coelum unde a principio animae in corpora n<ost>ra immittuntur. foelicitas significatur per asperam Ithacam. Ad beatitudinem enim nos quidem pervenimus sed per viam asperam angustam et arduam per multos labores cruciatus et miserias* (251–54).

18. Cf. Guillaume Canter, *Novarum lectionum libri septem,* chapter. 14, p. 261, in P. Ford 2000, 113.

19. Melchior Tavernier, in P. Ford 2000, XXVIII (emphasis mine). Translated: "Phaeacian women convey Odysseus to his country, where they lay him down softly, though still asleep. These gentle Ladies are the true symbol of the Virtues, which, after our death (compared with sleep by the most contemplative men), unnoticeably take us up to Heaven, whence we originally come."

20. *Ulysses potest significare Politicum qui ad patriam aspicit id est ad foelicitatem civilem. nam in patria degentes foelices putantur. . . . Et servasse cupit socios, id est cives suos in officio continere et iustitia sed venti reflant* (86–92, on the Aeolus episode).

21. *Descensus Ulyssis ad inferos nihil aliud significat quam naturalis scientiae investigationem. Ulysses enim causarum rerum cupidus, philosophus, et ad beatitudinem veram quae per patriam intelligitur adspirans docetur animam esse immortalem* (319–22). P. Ford (2000, 116) notes that Dorat has Heraclitus in mind. On the popularity of the *Homeric Problems* in the sixteenth century, cf. D'Amico 2002, 60. They had been published in Greek in 1505 and in Latin in 1544: cf. Grafton 1992, 154.

22. *Descensus vero recte praemit<t>itur nam Ulysses venturus erat ad Syrenas* [*sic*] *Scyllam Charybdim quibus miseriae, perturbationes, cruciatus coeteraque infortunia designantur quae omnia monstra evincere aut sufferre aequo animo nisi immensa et nobili immortalitatis mercede adduceremur nisi inquam divinitatem animae cognosceremus* (331–35).

23. *Statu autem qui est extra Rempub <licam> duplex constituitur. aut enim est naturalis nempe φύσικη* [sic] *et continetur sub Circe vel est supranaturalis vocaturque μεταφύσικη*

[sic] *et sub Callypso intelligi potest. haec enim rerum divinarum excellentiam et immortalitatem et puras essentias contemplatur quae quoniam mortalibus sane obscurae id nomen sortita est ἀπὸ τοῦ καλύπτειν id est tegere et latitare. Illa vero investigat quae in terra et quae sub terra sunt*" (181–86).

24. Cf. P. Ford 2000, 110.

25. *Neque vero per has ut plurimi existimant sunt intelligendae meretrices aut voluptates quae unumquemque perdere conseruerunt. huic enim allegoriae penitus Cicero refragatur* (531–34).

26. . . . *inferioribus scientijs quae non tam veritatem et virtutem praebent quam suavitatem* (556–57).

27. Dorat reads *capere* instead of *cupere* and *duce* instead of *duci. De fin.* 5.49 is arbitrarily attached to 5.53.

28. *Talis igitur interpretatio pertinet ad eos qui iam longo tempore in disciplinis versati fuerunt ipsarumque arcana didicerunt qualis erat Ulysses qui iam per omnes scientias discurrerat. Verum quoniam in illis scientijs plenis lenocinio et illebrecis non est consenescendum Ulysses praeter Sirenas celerrime navigat* (621–24).

29. P. Ford (2000, 125) connects Dorat's treatment of Odysseus' home at 566–67 to his metaphysical reading of it at 251–56. In the first passage, however, Dorat does not speak of a metaphysical aspiration but insists that only having a goal (*scopus, propositum*) gives meaning to our studies. This goal seems to be *veram rerum cognitionem et beatitudinem* as much as it is possible on this earth, rather than beyond it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, W. S. *The Art of the Aeneid.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1969.

Andreae, B. *Odysseus. Mythos und Erinnerung.* Mainz, 1999.

Andreae, B. "Die römischen Repliken der mythologischen Skulpturengruppen von Sperlonga." In B. Conticello and B. Andreae (eds.), *Die Skulpturen von Sperlonga: I gruppi scultorei di soggetto mitologico a Sperlonga,* 61–105. Berlin, 1974.

Armstrong, D. Introduction to Armstrong et al. 2004, 1–22.

Armstrong, D., J. Fish, P. Johnston, and M. B. Skinner (eds.). *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans.* Austin, 2004.

Asmis, E. "Philodemus' Epicureanism." In *ANRW* 2.36.4 (1990): 2369–2406.

Asmis, E. "Philodemus' Poetic Theory and *On the Good King According to Homer.*" *Classical Antiquity* 10 (1991): 1–45.

Asmis, E. "Epicurean Poetics." In A. Laird (ed.), *Ancient Literary Criticism.* Oxford, 2006, 238–66. (Originally published in Obbink 1995, 15–34.)

Asmis, E. "Philodemus on Censorship, Moral Utility, and Formalism in Poetry." In Obbink 1995, 148–77.

Aubenque, P. *La prudence chez Aristote.* Paris, 1963.

Austin, R. G. (ed.). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus.* Oxford, 1971.

Babbi, A. M., and F. Zardini (eds.). *Ulisse da Omero a Pascal Quignard.* Verona, 2000.

Balaudé, J.-F. "La finalité de l'*elenchos* d'après les premiers dialogues de Platon." In G. Giannantoni and M. Narcy (eds.), *Lezioni socratiche,* 237–58. Naples, 1997a.

Balaudé, J.-F. "Que veut montrer Socrate dans l'*Hippias Mineur*?" In G. Giannantoni and M. Narcy (eds.), *Lezioni socratiche,* 261–77. Naples, 1997b.

Balty, J. C. "Nouvelles mosaïques du IVe siècle sous la 'cathédrale de l'Est.'" In *Colloque Apamée de Syrie,* 163–83. Brussels, 1972.

Barigazzi, A. "Epicarmo e la figura di Ulisse *hesychos.*" *Rheinisches Museum* 98 (1955): 121–35.

Barigazzi, A. (ed.). *Favorino di Arelate, Opere. Introduzione, testo critico e commento.* Florence, 1966.

Belfiore, E. "*Elenchus*, *Epode,* and Magic: Socrates as Silenus." *Phoenix* 34 (1980): 128–37.

Bloom, H. (ed.). *Odysseus/Ulysses.* New York, 1991.

Blundell, M. W. "The Moral Character of Odysseus in *Philoctetes.*" *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 28 (1987): 307–29.

Blundell, M. W. "Character and Meaning in Plato's *Hippias Minor.*" In J. C. Klagge and N. Smith (eds.), *Methods of Interpreting Plato and His Dialogues* (*Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* Suppl. vol.), 131–72. Oxford, 1992.

Boitani, P. *The Shadow of Ulysses: Figures of a Myth.* Oxford, 1994.

Boitani, P., and R. Ambrosini (eds.). *Ulisse: Archeologia dell'uomo moderno.* Rome, 1998.

Boulogne, J. "Ulysse: Deux figures de la démocratie chez Sophocle." *Revue de philologie* 62 (1988): 99–107.

Bowie, E. "The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novels." In G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World,* 87–106. Leiden, 2003.

Brancacci, A. *Oikeios Logos. La filosofia del linguaggio di Antistene.* Naples, 1990.

Brickhouse, T. C., and N. D. Smith. "Irony, Arrogance, and Truthfulness in Plato's *Apology.*" In E. Kelly (ed.), *New Essays on Socrates,* 29–46. Lanham, MD, 1984.

Brisson, L. *How Philosophers Saved Myth: Allegorical Interpretation and Classical Mythology.* Chicago, 2004. Originally published in German as *Einführung in die Philosophie des Mythos,* vol. 1, *Antike, Mittelalter und Renaissance* (Darmstadt, 1996). The English translation is based on the French edition, *Introduction à la philosophie du mythe,* vol. 1, *Sauver les mythes* (Paris, 1996).

Brommer, F. *Odysseus: Die Taten und Leiden des Helden in antiker Kunst und Literatur.* Darmstadt, 1983.

Browning, R. "The Byzantines and Homer." In Lamberton and Keaney 1992, 134–48.

Bruell, C. *On the Socratic Education: An Introduction to the Shorter Platonic Dialogues.* Lanham, MD, 1999.

Buffière, F. *Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque.* Paris, 1956.

Cairns, F. *Virgil's Augustan Epic.* Cambridge, 1989.

Canfora, L. "Mito e storiografia greca: Minosse, Odisseo, Eraclidi." In M. Rossi Cittadini (ed.), *Presenze classiche nelle letterature occidentali. Il mito dall'età antica all'età moderna e contemporanea,* 109–23. Perugia, 1995.

Carter, L. B. *The Quiet Athenian.* Oxford, 1986.

Cassin, B. "Le chant des Sirènes dans le poème de Parménide." In P. Aubenque (ed.), *Études sur Parménide,* 2:163–69. Paris, 1987.

Castiglioni, L. "Ulisse esemplare di virtù. Tardi echi nella tradizione cinica e stoica." *Acme* 1 (1948): 31–43 (in Latin).

Cesareo, P. "L'evoluzione storica del carattere di Ulisse." *Rivista di storia antica* 4 (1899): 383–412.

Chance, J. *Medieval Mythography.* Gainesville, FL, 1994.

Chantraine, P. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque.* 4 vols. Paris, 1968–80.

Clay, D. "The Cults of Epicurus." *Cronache Ercolanesi* 16 (1986): 12–28.

Clay, J. S. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey.* Princeton, 1983.

Cooper, N. "Aristotle's Crowning Virtue." *Apeiron* 22 (1989): 191–205.

Corti, C. "Viaggiatore, governante, o cortigiano? Ulisse nel Rinascimento inglese." In Boitani and Ambrosini 1998, 201–22.

D'Amico, S. *Heureux qui comme Ulysse . . . Ulisse nella poesia francese e neolatina del XVI secolo.* Milan, 2002.

Damon, C. *The Mask of the Parasite: A Pathology of Roman Patronage.* Ann Arbor, 1997.

Davis, G. "Consolation in the Bucolic Mode: The Epicurean Cadence of Vergil's First Eclogue." In Armstrong et al. 2004, 63–74.

Decleva Caizzi, F. "Antistene." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 38 (1964): 48–99.

Decleva Caizzi, F. (ed.). *Antisthenis fragmenta.* Milan, 1966.

Demont, P. *La cité archaïque et classique et l'idéal de tranquillité.* Paris, 1990.

de Sanctis, D. "Omero e la sua esegesi nel *De Bono Rege* di Filodemo." *Cronache Ercolanesi* 36 (2006): 47–64.

Detienne, M. "Ulysse sur le stuc central de la Basilique de la Porta Maggiore." *Latomus* 17 (1958): 270–86.

Detienne, M. "Héraclès héros pythagoricien." *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 58 (1960): 19–53.

Detienne, M. *Homère, Hésiode et Pythagore.* Collection Latomus 57. Brussels, 1962.

Detienne, M., and J. P. Vernant. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society.* 1978. Atlantic Highlands, NJ. Reprint, Chicago, 1991.

Diano, C. "La poetica dei Feaci." In *Saggezza e poetiche degli antichi,* 185–214. Vicenza, 1968.

Di Benedetto, V. "Tracce di Antistene in alcuni scoli all' 'Odissea.'" *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 38 (1966): 208–28.

Dorandi, T. (ed.). *Filodemo. Il buon re secondo Omero.* Naples, 1982.

Dover, K. J. *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle.* Rev. ed. Indianapolis, 1994.

Edwards, M. J. "Scenes from the Later Wanderings of Odysseus." *Classical Quarterly* 38 (1988): 509–21.

Eisner, R. "Socrates as Hero." *Philosophy and Literature* 6 (1982): 106–18.

Erler, M. *Der Sinn der Aporien in den Dialogen Platons.* Berlin, 1987.

Farrell, J. "Roman Homer." In R. Fowler (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer,* 254–71. Cambridge, 2004.

Ferroni, G. "Fra Dante e Petrarca." In Boitani and Ambrosini 1998, 165–85.

Fish, J. "Anger, Philodemus' *Good King,* and the Helen Episode of *Aeneid* 2. 567–89: A New Proof of Authenticity from Herculaneum." In Armstrong et al. 2004, 111–38.

Ford, A. "Performing Interpretation: Early Allegorical Exegesis of Homer." In M. H. Beissinger, J. Tylus, and S. Wofford (eds.), *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community,* 33–53. Berkeley, 1999.

Ford, P. (ed.). *Jean Dorat. Mythologicum.* Geneva, 2000.

Gagarin, M., and P. Woodruff. *Early Greek Political Thought from Homer to the Sophists.* Cambridge, 1995.

Galinsky, G. K. *The Herakles Theme.* Oxford, 1972.

Galinsky, G. K. "Vergil's *Romanitas* and His Adaptation of Greek Heroes." *ANRW* 2.31.2 (1980): 985–1010.

Gantz, T. *Early Greek Myth.* 2 vols. Baltimore, 1993.

Garassino, A. "Ulisse nel teatro Greco." *Atene e Roma* 11 (1930): 219–51.

Gargiulo, T. "Filodemo sull'adulazione." *Cronache Ercolanesi* 11 (1981): 103–27.

Garvie, A. F. *Sophocles' Ajax. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary by A. F. Garvie.* Warminster, 1998.

Geffcken, J. *Griechische Literaturgeschichte.* 2 vols. Heidelberg, 1926–34.

Gerson, L. P. "Plato *Absconditus.*" In Press 2000, 201–10.

Gigante, M. "Cinismo e epicureismo." In M.-O. Goulet-Cazé and R. Goulet (eds.), *Le Cynisme ancien et ses prolongements,* 159–223. Paris, 1993.

Gigante, M. "Vergil in the Shadow of Vesuvius." In Armstrong et al. 2004, 85–99.

Gigante M., and G. Indelli."Bione e l'Epicureismo." *Cronache Ercolanesi* 8 (1978): 124–31.

Gilead, A. *The Platonic Odyssey: A Philosophical-Literary Inquiry into the* Phaedo. Amsterdam and Atlanta, 1994.

Giuliano, F. M. "L'Odisseo di Platone. Uno *ZHTHMA* omerico nell'*Ippia Minore.*" In G. Arrighetti (ed.), *Poesia greca,* 9–57. Pisa, 1995.

Glad, C. E. *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy.* Leiden, 1995.

Glad, C. E. "Frank Speech, Flattery, and Friendship in Philodemus." In J. T. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World,* 21–59. Leiden, 1996.

Golder, H. Introduction to H. Golder and R. Pevear (eds.), *Sophocles. Aias,* 3–22. New York, 1999.

Goldschmidt, V. *Le système stoïcien et l'idée du temps.* Paris, 1953.

Gonzales-Vasquez, J. "La imagen-comparación de Neptuno (*Aen.* I, 148–156)." *Latomus* 46 (1987): 363–68.

Gottlieb, P. "Aristotle's 'Nameless' Virtues." In *The Virtues of Aristotle's Ethics,* chap. 2. Cambridge, 2009. (First published in *Apeiron* 27 (1994): 1–15).

Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. *L'ascèse cynique.* Paris, 1986.

Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. "Le cynisme à l'époque impériale." *ANRW* 2.36.4 (1990): 2721–833.

Goulet-Cazé, M. O. "L'*Ajax* et l'*Ulysse* d'Antisthène." In M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, G.

Madec, and D. O'Brien (eds.), *ΣΟΦΙΗΣ ΜΑΙΗΤΟΡΕΣ "Chercheurs de sagesse." Hommage à Jean Pépin,* 5–36. Paris, 1992.

Grafton, A. "Renaissance Readers of Homer's Ancient Readers." In Lamberton and Keaney 1992, 149–72.

Graverini, L. *Le* Metamorfosi *di Apuleio. Letteratura e identità.* Ospedaletto (Pisa), 2007.

Grimal, P. "Le 'bon roi' de Philodème et la royauté de César." *Revue des études latines* 44 (1966): 254–85.

Guthrie, W. K. C. "Odysseus in the *Ajax.*" *Greece & Rome* 16 (1947): 115–19.

Guthrie, W. K. C. *A History of Greek Philosophy.* 6 vols. Cambridge, 1962–65.

Guthrie, W. K. C. *The Sophists.* Cambridge, 1971.

Hadot, P. *The Inner Citadel: The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius,* translated by M. Chase, Cambridge, MA, 1998.

Hägg, T. "Orality, Literacy, and the 'Readership' of the Early Greek Novels." In *Parthenope. Selected Studies in Ancient Greek Fiction* (1969–2004), 109–40. Copenhagen, 2004. (First published in Eriksen, R. [ed.]. *Contexts of Pre-Novel Narrative: The European Tradition,* 47–81. Berlin, 1994.)

Hall, E. *The Return of Ulysses: A Cultural History of Homer's Odyssey.* Baltimore, 2008.

Harrison, S. J. "Vergilian Similes: Some Connections." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5 (1986): 99–107.

Harrison, S. J. "Vergil on Kingship: The First Simile of the *Aeneid.*" *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 34 (1988): 55–59.

Hartog, F. *Memories of Odysseus: Frontier Tales from Ancient Greece.* Translated by J. Lloyd. Chicago, 2001.

Havelock, E. A. "Parmenides and Odysseus." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 63 (1958): 133–43.

Henry, D., and B. Walker. "The Futility of Action: A Study of Seneca's 'Hercules Furens.'" *Classical Philology* 60 (1965): 11–22.

Hijmans, B. L. et al. (eds.). *Apuleius Madaurensis. Metamorphoses.* Book IX. Groningen, 1995.

Hillgruber, M. (ed.). *Die Pseudoplutarchische Schrift De Homero.* 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1994.

Hirst, M. E. "The Choice of Odysseus (Plato *Republic* 620 c–d)." *Classical Philology* 35 (1940): 67–68.

Hobbs, A. *Plato and the Hero: Courage, Manliness and the Impersonal Good.* Cambridge, 2000.

Höistad, R. *Cynic Hero and Cynic King: Studies in the Cynic Conception of Man.* Uppsala, 1948.

Howland, J. *The Republic: The Odyssey of Philosophy.* New York, 1993.

Inwood, B. *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism.* Oxford, 1985.

Ioppolo, A. M. *Aristone di Chio e lo Stoicismo antico.* Naples, 1980.

Irwin, T. H. "Socrates and the Tragic Hero." In P. Pucci (ed.), *Language and the Tragic Hero: Essays on Greek Tragedy in Honor of Gordon M. Kirkwood,* 55–83. Atlanta, 1988.

Jufresa, M. "Il mito dei Feaci in Filodemo." In *La regione sotterrata dal Vesuvio: Studi e prospetti. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, 11–15 novembre 1979,* 509–18. Naples, 1982.

Kaiser, E. "Odyssee-Szenen als Topoi." *Museum Helveticum* 21 (1964): 109–36, 197–224.

Kakridis, T. "Die Bedeutung von πολύτροπος in der *Odyssee*." *Glotta* 11 (1921): 288–91.

Keaney, J. J., and R. Lamberton (eds.). *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer.* Atlanta, 1996.

Kerferd, G. B. *The Sophistic Movement.* Cambridge, 1981.

Kindstrand, J. F. *Homer in der zweiten Sophistik.* Uppsala, 1973.

King, K. C. *Achilles: Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to the Middle Ages.* Berkeley, 1987.

Kirkwood, G. M. "Homer and Sophocles' *Ajax*." In M. J. Anderson (ed.), *Classical Drama and Its Influence: Essays Presented to H. D. F. Kitto,* 53–70. New York, 1965.

Kirkwood, G. M. "Persuasion and Allusion in Sophocles' 'Philoctetes.'" *Hermes* 122 (1994): 425–36.

Kitto, H. D. F. *Form and Meaning in Drama.* 1956. Reprint, London, 1968.

Klonoski, R. J. "The Preservation of Homeric Tradition: Heroic Re-Performance in the *Republic* and the *Odyssey*." *Clio* 22 (1993): 251–71.

Kofman, S. "Beyond Aporia." In A. Benjamin (ed.), *Post-Structuralist Classics,* 7–44. London, 1988.

Konstan, D. "Friendship, Frankness and Flattery." In J. T. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World,* 7–19. Leiden, 1996.

Konstan, D. *Friendship in the Classical World.* Cambridge, 1997.

Konstan, D., D. Clay, C. E. Glad, J. C. Thom, and J. Ware (eds.). *Philodemus. On Frank Criticism.* With introduction, translation, and notes. Atlanta, 1998.

Krentz, P. "Deception in Archaic and Classical Greek Warfare." In H. van Wees (ed.), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece,* 167–200. London, 2000.

Kühn, W. *Götterszenen bei Vergil.* Heidelberg, 1971.

Lamberton, R. *Homer the Theologian.* 1986. Reprint, Berkeley, 1989.

Lamberton, R., and J. J. Keaney (eds.). *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes.* Princeton, 1992.

Lanza, D. "Pius Ulixes." In R. Pretagostini (ed.), *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica. Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili,* 9–18. Rome, 1993.

Létoublon, F. "Patience, mon coeur! *Geduld, mein Herze.*" *GAIA* 7 (2003): 321–46.

Levet, J.-P. "Σοφία et σοφός, sagesse et vérité dans les tragédies de Sophocle. Étude

sémantique." In D. Auget and J. Peigney (eds.), *Φιλευριπίδης, Phileuripidès: Mélanges offerts à François Jouan,* 317–37. Nanterre, 2008.

Lévystone, D. "La figure d'Ulysse chez les Socratiques: Socrates *polutropos.*" *Phronesis* 50 (2005): 181–214.

Long, A. A. "Stoic Readings of Homer." In Lamberton and Keaney 1992, 41–66.

Long, A. A. *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life.* Oxford, 2002.

Long, A. A., and D. N. Sedley. *The Hellenistic Philosophers.* 2 vols. 1987. Reprint, Cambridge, 1997.

Longo, O. (ed.). *Alcifrone. Lettere di parassiti e di cortigiane.* With E. Avezzù. Venice, 1985.

Loraux, N. *The Experiences of Tiresias.* Translated by P. Wissing. Princeton, 1995.

Lord, G. de F. "The *Odyssey* and the Western World." In Bloom 1991, 89–102.

Malherbe, A. J. "Antisthenes and Odysseus, and Paul at War." *Harvard Theological Review* 76 (1983): 143–47.

Malkin, I. *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity.* Berkeley, 1998.

Marincola, J. "Odysseus and the Historians." *Histos* 1 (1997). http:/ /www.dur.ac.uk/ Classics/ histos.

Marincola, J. "Odysseus and the Historians." *Syllecta Classica* 18 (2007): 1–79.

Martorana, M. *Ulisse nella letteratura latina.* Palermo, 1926.

Mayer, R. "Sleeping with the Enemy: Satire and Philosophy." In K. Freudenburg (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire,* 146–59. Cambridge, 2006.

Mazzoldi, S. "Odisseo uomo della polis?" In Babbi and Zardini 2000, 135–48.

McC Brown, P. G. "Menander, Fragments 745 and 746 K-T, Menander's *Kolax* and Parasites and Flatterers in Greek Comedy." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 92 (1992): 91–107.

Meli, M. "Ulisse indoeuropeo." In Babbi and Zardini 2000, 91–115.

Michelakis, P. *Achilles in Greek Tragedy.* Cambridge, 2002.

Moles, J. "The Cynics." In C. Rowe and M. Schofield (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought,* 415–34. Cambridge, 2000.

Monsacré, H. *Les larmes d'Achille.* Paris, 1984.

Montiglio, S. *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture.* Chicago, 2005.

Montiglio, S. "Should the Aspiring Wise Man Travel? A Conflict in Seneca's Thought." *American Journal of Philology* 127 (2006): 553–86.

Moore, J. (trans.). Sophocles, *Ajax.* In D. Grene and R. Lattimore (eds.), *The Complete Greek Tragedies,* vol. 2, *Sophocles.* Chicago, 1959.

Morgan, K. A. *Myth and Philosophy from the Presocratics to Plato.* Cambridge, 2000.

Morwood, J. "Virgil's Pious Man and Menenius Agrippa: A Note on Aeneid 1. 148–53." *Greece & Rome* 45 (1998): 195–98.

Most, G. W. "Anger and Pity in Homer's *Iliad.*" In S. Braund and G. W. Most (eds.), *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen,* 50–75. Cambridge, 2003.

Mourelatos, A. P. D. *The Route of Parmenides: A Study of Word, Image, and Argument in the Fragments.* New Haven, 1970.

Müller, C. W. (ed.). *Euripides Philoktet.* Berlin, 2000.

Murray, G. "Heracles, 'The Best of Men.'" In *Greek Studies,* 106–26. Oxford, 1946.

Murray, O. "Philodemus on the Good King According to Homer." *Journal of Roman Studies* 55 (1965): 161–82.

Murray, O. "Rileggendo Il buon re secondo Omero." *Cronache Ercolanesi* 14 (1984): 157–60.

Nagy, G. *The Best of the Achaeans.* Rev. ed. Baltimore, 1999.

Navia, L. E. "A Reappraisal of Xenophon's *Apology.*" In E. Kelly (ed.), *New Essays on Socrates,* 47–65. Lanham, MD, 1984.

Navia, L. E. *Antisthenes of Athens: Setting the World Aright.* Westport, CT, 2001.

Nesselrath, H. G. *Lukians Parasitendialog. Untersuchungen und Kommentar.* Berlin, 1985.

Nightingale, A. W. *Spectacles of Truth in Classical Greek Philosophy:* Theoria *in Its Cultural Context.* Cambridge, 2004.

Nussbaum, M. C. "Poetry and the Passions: Two Stoic Views." In J. Brunschwig and M. C. Nussbaum (eds.), *Passions and Perceptions: Studies in Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind. Proceedings of the Fifth Symposium Hellenisticum,* 97–149. Cambridge, 1993.

Obbink, D. (ed.) *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace.* Oxford, 1995.

Obbink, D. (ed.). *Philodemus* On Piety *Part 1. Critical Text with Commentary.* Oxford, 1996.

O'Sullivan, T. "Walking with Odysseus: The Portico Frame of the Odyssey Landscapes." *American Journal of Philology* 128 (2007): 518–26.

Padoan, G. *Il pio Enea, l'empio Ulisse. Tradizione classica e intendimento medievale in Dante.* Ravenna, 1977.

Paduano, G. "Ulisse e la nostalgia di Achille. Considerazioni sulla presenza di Ulisse nella tragedia attica." In P. Boitani and R. Ambrosini 1998, 87–106.

Palmer, M. "Kings, Philosophers, and Tyrants in Plato's *Republic.*" In M. Palmer and T. L. Pangle (eds.), *Political Philosophy and the Human Soul: Essays in Memory of Allan Bloom,* 121–48. Lanham, MD, 1995.

Pendrick, G. J. (ed.). *Antiphon the Sophist: The Fragments. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary by Gerard J. Pendrick.* Cambridge, 2001.

Pépin, J. "The Platonic and Christian Odysseus." In Bloom 1991, 228–47.

Peradotto, J. *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey.* Princeton, 1990.

Perutelli, A. *Ulisse nella cultura romana.* Florence, 2006.

Peschanski, C. "Temps de l'histoire, temps de l'historien." In M.-F. Baslez, P. Hoffmann, and L. Pernot (eds.), *L'invention de l'autobiographie,* 57–69. Paris, 1993.

Phillips, E. D. "The Comic Odysseus." *Greece & Rome* 6 (1959): 58–67.

Podlecki, A. J. "The Power of the Word in Sophocles' *Philoctetes.*" *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 7 (1966): 233–50.

Pontani, F. *Sguardi su Ulisse. La tradizione esegetica greca all'*Odissea. Rome, 2005.

Press, G. A. (ed.). *Who Speaks for Plato? Studies in Platonic Anonymity.* Lanham, MD, 2000.

Prince, S. "Ajax, Odysseus, and the Act of Self-Representation." *Ancient Philosophy* 19 (1999): 55–64.

Prince, S. *Antisthenes of Athens: Fragments, Translation, and Commentary.* Forthcoming.

Privitera, G. A. "Mito e folklore nella figura di Odisseo." In M. Rossi Cittadini (ed.), *Presenze classiche nelle letterature occidentali,* 93–108. Perugia, 1995.

Pucci, P. "The Proem of the *Odyssey.*" In *The Song of the Sirens: Essays on Homer,* 11–29. Lanham, MD, 1998. Originally published in *Arethusa* 15 (1982): 39–53.

Quet, M.-H. "Naissance d'image: La mosaïque des Thérapénides d'Apamée de Syrie, représentation figurée des connaissances encycliques, 'servantes' de la philosophie hellène." *Cahiers Glotz* 4 (1993): 129–87.

Radermaker, A. Sophrosyne *and the Rhetoric of Self-Restraint.* Leiden, 2005.

Rahner, H. *Greek Myths and Christian Mystery.* Translated by B. Battershaw. London, 1963.

Ramsey, B. (ed.). *The Sermons of Maximus of Turin. Translated and Annotated by Boniface Ramsey.* New York, 1989.

Rankin, H. D. *Anthisthenes* [*sic*] *Sokratikos.* Amsterdam, 1986.

Rappe, S. "Father of the Dogs? Tracking the Cynics in Plato's *Euthydemus.*" *Classical Philology* 95 (2000): 282–303.

Reardon, B. P. (ed.). *Collected Ancient Greek Novels.* Berkeley, 1989. Reprint, 2008.

Richardson, N. J. "Homeric Professors in the Age of the Sophists." In A. Laird (ed.), *Ancient Literary Criticism,* 62–86. Oxford, 2006. Originally published in *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 201 (1975): 65–81.

Romm, J. S. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought.* Princeton, 1992.

Rose, P. W. "Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and the Teachings of the Sophists." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80 (1976): 49–105.

Rosenmeyer, P. A. *Ancient Epistolary Fiction: The Letter in Greek Literature.* Cambridge, 2001.

Rosenmeyer, T. G. *The Masks of Tragedy: Essays on Six Greek Dramas.* Austin, 1963.

Rossi, P. "Sirènes antiques. Poésie, Philosophie, Iconographie." *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (1970): 463–81.

Rubens, B., and O. Taplin. *An Odyssey round Odysseus: The Man and His Story Traced through Time and Place.* London, 1989.

Ruderman, R. S. "Love and Friendship in Homer's *Odyssey.*" In M. Palmer and T. L. Pangle (eds.), *Political Philosophy and the Human Soul: Essays in Memory of Allan Bloom,* 35–53. Lanham, MD, 1995.

Russell, D. A., and D. Konstan (eds.). *Heraclitus: Homeric Problems.* Atlanta, 2006.

Rutherford, R. B. "The Philosophy of the *Odyssey.*" In Bloom 1991, 249–72.

Scalfaro, E. "La morale di Ulisse." In Boitani and Ambrosini 1998, 153–58.

Scheid, J., and J. Svenbro. *The Craft of Zeus: Myths of Weaving and Fabric.* Translated by C. Volk. Cambridge, MA, 1996.

Schein, S. L. "Herakles and the Ending of Sophocles' *Philoctetes.*" *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 19 (2001): 38–52.

Schmit-Neuerburg, T. *Vergils Aeneis und die antike Homerexegese.* Berlin, 1999.

Schofield, M. "Epictetus on Cynicism." In A. S. Mason and T. Scaltsas (eds.), *The Philosophy of Epictetus,* 71–86. Oxford, 2008.

Segal, C. "'The Myth Was Saved': Reflections on Homer and the Mythology of Plato's *Republic.*" *Hermes* 106 (1978): 315–36.

Setaioli, A. *Si tantus amor . . . Studi virgiliani.* Bologna, 1998.

Setaioli, A. "La poesia in Petronio, *Sat.* 80. 9." *Prometheus* 27 (2001): 57–72.

Shields, C. "Socrates among the Skeptiks." In P. A. Vander Waerdt (ed.), *The Socratic Movement,* 341–66. Ithaca, 1994.

Shorey, P. (ed.). *Plato. The Republic.* 2 vols. 1935. Cambridge, MA, 1994.

Sider, D. "Epicurean Poetics: Response and Dialogue." In Obbink 1995, 35–41.

Sider, D. "The Epicurean Philosopher as Hellenistic Poet." In Obbink 1995, 42–57.

Sider, D. (ed.). *The Epigrams of Philodemos.* New York, 1997.

Smoes, É. *Le courage chez les Grecs, d'Homère à Aristote.* Brussels, 1995.

Spence, S. "*Pietas* and *Furor:* Motivational Forces in the *Aeneid.*" In W. S. Anderson and L. N. Quartarone (eds.), *Approaches to Teaching Vergil's* Aeneid, 46–52. New York, 2002.

Stanford, W. B. "Studies in the Characterization of Ulysses.—I." *Hermathena* 73 (1949a): 41–56.

Stanford, W. B. "Studies in the Characterization of Ulysses.—II." *Hermathena* 74 (1949b): 33–51.

Stanford, W. B. (ed.). *Sophocles' Ajax.* London, 1963. Reprint. New York, 1979.

Stanford, W. B. *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero.* Ann Arbor, 1968, second edition (first edition: Oxford 1954).

Stanford, W. B., and J. V. Luce. *The Quest for Ulysses.* London, 1974.

Stead, É. "Le Silence des Sirènes." In Babbi and Zardini 2000, 293–317.

Stewart, A. "To Entertain an Emperor: Sperlonga, Laokoon and Tiberius at the Dinner-Table." *Journal of Roman Studies* 67 (1977): 76–90.

Tomasi di Lampedusa, G. *Racconti.* Milan, 1961.

Trapp, M. B. (ed.). *Maximus Tyrius. Dissertationes.* Stuttgart, 1994.

Trapp, M. B. (ed.). *Maximus of Tyre: The Philosophical Orations.* Oxford, 1997.

Trapp, M. B. "What Is *Philosophia* Anyway?" In J. R. Morgan and M. Jones (eds.), *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel,* 1–22. Ancient Narrative Supplement 10. Groningen, 2007.

Tylawsky, E. I. *Saturio's Inheritance: The Greek Ancestry of the Roman Comic Parasite.* New York, 2002.

Villers, R. "Durus Ulixes." *Revue des études latines* 54 (1976): 214–21.

Vlastos, G. *Socrates, Ironist and Moral Philosopher.* Ithaca, 1991.

Walbank, F. W. "The Geography of Polybius." *Classica et Mediaevalia* 9 (1948): 155–82.
Webster, T. B. L. (ed.). *Sophocles. Philoctetes.* Cambridge, 1970.
Wedner, S. *Tradition und Wandel im allegorischen Verständnis des Syrenenmythos.* Frankfurt, 1994.
Weiss, R. "*Ho Agathos* as *Ho Dunatos* in the *Hippias Minor.*" In H. H. Benson (ed.), *Essays in the Philosophy of Socrates,* 242–62. New York, 1992.
Whelan, G. F. "Socrates and the 'Meddlesomeness' of the Athenians." *History of Political Thought* 4 (1983): 1–29.
Whitehead, D. "Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: φιλοτιμία in Democratic Athens." *Classica et Mediaevalia* 34 (1983): 55–74.
Wigodsky, M. "The Alleged Impossibility of Philosophical Poetry." In Obbink 1995, 58–68.
Worman, N. *The Cast of Character: Style in Greek Literature.* Austin, 2002.
Zecchini, G. "Teoria e prassi del viaggio in Polibio." In G. Camassa and S. Fasce (eds.), *Idea e realtà del viaggio,* 111–41. Genoa, 1991.
Zeruneith, K. *The liberation of the Western mind from Odysseus to Socrates.* New York, 2007.
Zwicker. J. "Sirenen." *RE* 3, no. 1, col. 288–308. 1927.

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

Accius
Fr. 252–53 Warmington, vol. 2: 114

Aelian
Varia Historia 4.20: 71

Aelius Aristides
Scholion on Ael. Arist.: 480, 28–481, 2 = *SSR* I C, 137: 162n4

Aeschylus
Agamemnon 841–42: 4; 191n77

Alciphron
3.3.3: 97
3.40.2: 70; 96

Alcman
Fr. 80 Page: 169n84

Anthologia Palatina
10.50.8–10: 181n38
11.44: 191n83
14.102: 126

Antiphon
Fr. 58: 108

Antisthenes
Ajax (*SSR* II V A, 53)
164n23
4: 28
5: 28
13–14: 32
15: 164n26
17: 27
18: 28
18–19: 28
22–24: 32
23: 28
24–25: 31
25–28: 32
31: 28
32: 27
45–46: 29
Odysseus (*SSR* II V A, 54)
164n23
2–6: 25
5–10: 30
10: 30
15: 164n26
17: 29
19: 31
19–20: 31
21: 29
21–23: 29
28: 166n47
29: 27
30–32: 27
31: 29
33–34: 29
34: 166n47
38: 166n47
43: 166n47
43–44: 29
46: 29; 166n47
47–49: 26; 29
49: 164n26
50–51: 31; 175n67
51: 166n47

51–54: 32
52–54: 28
53: 166n47
56: 166n47
56–57: 29; 167n60
59: 166n47
60: 29
60–62: 30
62: 166n47
64–66: 27
69: 30
76–78: 27
79–80: 24
SSR II V A, 5: 166n46
SSR II V A, 8: 166n46
SSR II V A, 82.29–30: 178n7
SSR II V A, 94: 164n29
SSR II V A, 96: 168n79
SSR II V A, 97: 168n79
SSR II V A, 99: 35
SSR II V A, 134: 76
SSR II V A, 187: 21–22; 162n8; 163n15
SSR II V A, 188: 167n65; 167n66,: 167n67; 167–68n68
SSR II V A, 190: 33–34; 167n63
Frs. 52A and B Decleva Caizzi: 168n70
Fr. 70 Decleva Caizzi: 168n68

Apuleius
De deo Socratis
18: 111; 193n8
24: 181n38; 193n8
The Golden Ass
9.13: 127
9. 13–14: 151

Archilochus
Fr. 128 West: 169n84

Ariston
SVF 1.151–57: 183n72
SVF 1.349: 89
SVF 1.350: 89; 155
SVF 1.374: 194n17
SVF 1.375: 194n17
SVF 1.376: 194n17

Aristophanes
Clouds 1049–50: 168n80
Ecclesiazousae 1029: 190n76

Aristotle
Nicomachean Ethics
1095b33–1096a2: 60
1100b30: 61
1100b30–33: 61
1101a1–6: 61
1101a7–8: 61
1124a14–16: 178n103
1126b22–23: 113
1140b7–8: 62
1140b21: 177n88
1140b25–28: 177n88
1141b5–6: 177n88
1141b8–9: 177n88
1142a1–10: 62
1142a14–16: 177n90
1150a13–15: 63
Poetics
1451a24–29: 177n95
1454a30: 176n84
1454a30–31: 182n55
Politics
1253a26–29: 176n83
1338a28–32: 65; 98
Posterior Analytics
97b17–24: 178n101
Rhetoric
1399b28–30: 63
1416b9–15: 62
1416b12–13: 176n84
Topics
117b10–17: 194n15
117b12–14: 170n11
Fragments
173: 64
178: 64

Athenaeus
6.251d–e: 96
6.270c: 185n6
6.270e–f: 121
10.412c–d: 186n13
12.512d: 97
12.513a: 95
12.513b: 65

Augustine
The City of God 5.8: 179n23

Ausonius
Epigr. XLVI = *SSR* II V A, 39: 182n59
Epigr. XLVII = *SSR* II V A, 40: 182n59

Cassio Dio
48.31: 187n39

Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi
38–40: 126
42–43: 126
82–89: 175n65

Chariton
8.1.3: 126–27

Chrysippus
SVF 3.262: 194n17
SVF 3.495: 182n62

Cicero
De finibus
4.5.11: 184n78
5.36: 135
5.49: 134–36; 155; 195nn23–24; 195n29; 200n27
5.51–52: 135
5.53: 155; 200n27
5.57: 135
De officiis
1.31.113: 70
1.110–13: 114–16
3.26.97–99: 80
3.26.98: 181n44
De oratore
1.196: 182n63
3.17.62: 27
Tusculanae Disputationes
2.21.48–50: 182n56
5.25.70–71: 184n78

Cleanthes
SVF 1.526: 181n38

Crates of Thebes
SSR II V H, 5: 179n15
SSR II V H, 6: 179n15

[Crates of Thebes]
Epistles 19: 70; 72; 179n9

Cratinus
PCG vol. 4, 143–57: 185n5

Democritus
B 299, 6–8 DK: 71–72; 160n42

Dio Chrysostom
1.1–5: 163n12
2.20: 172n31
2.23–24: 77
2. 24: 77
2.41–43: 76
8.21: 77
9.9: 180n30
9.9–10: 75
11.17: 125
11.34: 125
11.134: 125
13.4–5: 182n57
13.9–11: 84
14.22: 75; 179n18
32.9: 179n17
32.22: 187n36
32.47: 136
32.88: 76
33.14: 76–77
33.14–15: 76
33.19–22: 76
45.11: 180n28
47.5–6: 126
47.6–7: 182n57
49.12: 180n25
52.5–9: 166n52
52.11–12: 49
52.16: 173n48
55.19: 194n17
59.1: 32; 49–50; 160n38; 173n47
59.1–2: 50
59.2: 49
59.5: 173n48; 177n97
59.9: 171n25
71.1: 88
71.3: 180n32
71.8: 88

Diodorus
1.1.2–3: 196n46

[Diogenes]
Epistles
7.2.1–5: 68
10.1: 178n8
34.1.4–5: 68
34.2.8–10: 68
34.3: 86
34.3.2–5: 70
34.3.4–5: 69

Diogenes Laertius
2.79: 155; 183n68
4.51–52: 180n24
6.11: 168n68
6.13: 76

6.15: 162n7
6.16: 163n17
6.17–18: 162n7
6.23: 80
6.27–28 = *SSR* II V B, 374: 184n80
6.71: 86; 181n39
9.36: 72
10.6: 195n32

Diphilus
PCG vol. 5, 3–4: 186n10

Epicharmus
PCG vol. 1, 122: 185n4

Epictetus according to Arrian, *Dissertations*
1.6.35–36: 81
2.6.9–10: 196n37
2.16.44–45: 181n45
2.23.36–39: 87
2.23.36–41: 88
2.23.38–41: 92
2.23.41: 183n64
3.22.69–70: 77
3.24.12–13: 84
3.24.13: 138
3.24.13–16: 86–87
3.24.18–21: 85
3.26.32: 181n45
3.26.33–35: 139
3.31.19: 180n31
4.10.9–10: 181n45
Fr. 11: 73

Euripides
Hecuba
130–40: 10
131–33: 159n26
132: 159n26
228: 8
239–41: 43
250: 43
326: 12
333: 12
336–38: 163n12
399: 9
404: 9
Heracles
1250: 12
1270: 12
Iphigenia in Aulis
96: 160n38
98: 160n38
522–33: 159n26
524–33: 160n38
887: 160n38
913: 160n38
920–21: 10
1257: 160n38
1362–64: 159n26
1364: 10
Iphigenia in Tauris
536: 4
1031: 6
1034: 6
Orestes
1403–6: 28
1404–5: 191n77
Rhesus
497–98: 28
500: 28
509: 28
510–11: 28
580–94: 177n98
625: 158n20
687–88: 28
709: 28
716: 28
717–19: 28
Trojan Women
279–91: 4
430–43: 4
1224–25: 158n20
Cyclops
104: 6
288–89: 160n36
314–15: 6
450: 158n20
481–82: 191n77
Fragments
TGF, vol. 5.1, 474: 174n51
TGF, vol. 5.2, 715: 158n20
Philoctetes
F 2 Müller: 62; 173n47
F 3: 160n38
F 19: 173n48

Eustathius
Commentary on Homer's Odyssey (for the citation style, cf.: 157n1)
1.17.10: 157n1
1. 17. 38–43: 89
1.17.39: 157n1
1. 17. 40–41: 183n71
1.22.15: 157n1
1.22.15–16: 132; 174n53

1.27.10: 157n1
1. 51. 15–16: 146
1. 51. 17–18: 146
1.208.8: 157n1
1.209.2: 168n77
1. 244. 26: 193n99
1. 273. 33–35: 186n12
1. 292. 30–31: 188n44
1. 294. 35–36: 178n104
1. 313. 44–45: 182n56
1.313.45: 157n1
1.318.22–23: 186n21
1.318. 26: 178n105
1.319.7–8: 178n105
1.319.8: 157n1
1.332.31: 157n1
2.3.26: 157n1
2. 4. 4–5: 184n76
2.4. 6: 157n1
2.4.24.26: 196n40
2. 4. 35–38: 140
2. 4. 40–46: 140
2.4.41–42: 196n40
2. 167. 21–22: 186n13

Favorinus
De exilio
Fr. 96.4: 84
96.4, 15: 181n44
96.4, 15–17: 181n40
96.4, 18–21: 78
96.4, 23: 181n44

Galen
De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis
3.3.21–22: 139–40

Gellius
6.14.7: 172n31
14.6.3: 184n82
16.8.16–17: 183n67

Gorgias
Defense of Palamedes = B 11a DK
3: 30; 43; 166n46
7: 166n46
13–14: 166n46
16: 166n46
20: 166n46
21: 166n46
24: 31
30: 166n48
36: 166n46; 166n48

Heliodorus
10.16: 193n10

Heraclitus
Fr. B 112 DK: 108

Heraclitus ("Allegoricus")
Homeric Problems
18.1–4: 126
54.2–3: 194n16
70.1: 126
70.1–12: 88
70.4–5: 174n53
70.8: 88; 194n17
70.9: 88
72.3: 194n17
72.4: 181n38
73.2–3: 181n38
75.9–11: 194n16
79.2–3: 95
79.3: 98; 119

Herodotus
1.24: 46
2.121: 163n11

Hesiod
Works and Days
311: 176n79
Theogony
27: 125
35: 171n29
Fragments
198.3 Merkelbach–West: 163n11

Homer
Iliad
2.144–49: 102
2.220: 119–20
2.246–47: 189n55
2.273: 106
2.280: 102
2.297: 171n29
2.299: 12
2.482–83: 105
4.343–46: 185n8
4.350–55: 190n71
7.237: 194n19
8.92–98: 63
8.424: 159n34
9.237–39: 104
9.313: 21
10.225 pp. 10–11

10.231–32: 11
10.232: 83
10.244–45: 83; 106
10.246: 111
10.246–47: 106
10.248: 11
10.249: 107; 112
10.498: 11
10.565: 28
14.84–85: 112
14.96–102: 59
18.104: 171n29
19.217–20: 9
19.218–19: 106
19.228–31: 104
22.126: 171n29
23.316–17: 172n37

Odyssey
1.3: 87
1.3–5: 143
2.47: 100
3.130: 106
4.169–80: 113
4.178: 191n79
4.208: 60
4.210–11: 60
4.242: 32; 47; 52
4.242–49: 180n36
4.244–45: 53; 78; 175n67
4.244–46: 77; 180n29
4.271: 52
4.284–88: 53
4.288: 175n67
5.216: 36
5.219–20: 36
5.245: 46
5.259: 47
5.270–71: 46
5.354: 46–47
5.354–55: 172n40
5.356: 47
5.366: 47
5.406–7: 172n40
5.408–23: 172n40
5.427: 47
6.120–21: 144
7.215–21: 96–97
7.216: 97
7.220–21: 97
7.258: 167n67
8.167–73: 13
8.219: 104
8.223–24: 104
8.248: 65
8.492: 194n13
8.492–98: 108
8.494: 106
8.521–31: 108; 182n56
8.581–86: 190n75
9.5–10: 54
9.5–11: 65
9.19–20: 104
9.29–33: 180n36
9.175–76: 144
9.228: 91
9.228–29: 105
9.321–24: 172n39
10.148: 144
11.208: 184n74
11.223–24: 184n74
11.489–90: 51; 173n43
11.548–49: 166n58
11.565–67: 90
11.601: 172n41
11.601–626: 17
11.617–26: 12
11.628–35: 90; 91
12.188: 133
12.191: 133
12.192–93: 105
13.89: 106
13.201–2: 144
12.209–12: 105
13.296–99: 159n30
13.434–38: 178n6
13. 429–38: 69
14.475–506: 106
15.330–32: 77
16.181: 123
16.211–12: 190n62
17.266–68: 76
17.486: 56
18.53–54: 97
18.54: 97
18.74: 75
18.135: 8–9; 74–75
18.136–37: 74–75; 117–18; 179n23
18.142: 107
18.282: 71
19.42–43: 91; 189n55
19.109: 100
19.111–12: 101
19.111–14: 100
19.163: 26; 171n29
19.203: 6; 125

19.212: 131
19.521: 22
20.17–18: 52
20.18: 121
20.24: 130
20.28: 130
22.1: 122
22.412: 104
24.116–19: 63

Scholia on the *Iliad*
2.144: 187n36
3.225: 178n100
8.97: 177n99
9.673: 178n100
10.243: 188n49
10.244: 178n100
10.249: 104

Scholia on the *Odyssey*
1.1: 162n8; 163n11
5.211: 167n66
5.257: 167n66
6.149: 193n99
7.14: 194n16
9.5: 186n11; 186n15
9.28: 186n21
9.525: 167n63
12.160: 184n76
23.337: 167n66

Homeric Hymn to Hermes
13: 163n11
439: 163n11

Horace
Epistles
1. 2: 124; 138; 180n37
1.2.17: 120
1.2.19–20: 138
1.2.22: 79
1.2.23: 137

Satires
2.2: 120
2.2.3: 120
2.3.43–46: 120
2.5: 16; 70; 120–21
2.5.2–3: 120
2.5.8: 120
2.5.19–21: 120–21

Isocrates
Antidosis 151: 177n91

Julian
9[6] 187C: 86

Juvenal
13.121–22: 67

Libanius
1.93–94: 162n4
1.105: 21
1.123–26: 20
1.124: 58
1.125: 20; 44

Lucian
Demonax
1: 182n60
Gout
261–62: 185n6
Menippus
18.4–6: 171n28
Nigrinus
19: 179n21
19–20: 136
20: 73
The Parasite
4: 98
9: 99
10: 16; 72; 79; 95–96; 185n86; 196n38
11: 99
True History
1.3: 125
2.15: 125
2.20: 125

[Lucian]
Praise of Demosthenes 5: 172n31

Lucretius
5.22–54: 182n52

Maximus of Tyre
1.1.a–2.c: 74; 117–18
1.3.b: 118
7.5.d: 180n24
8.2.c: 184n82
11.6.b: 143
11.10.h: 145
11.11: 196n50
14.4.c–e: 112
14.5.c–d: 121–22
15.6: 141

15.6.c: 140–41
15.9: 180n30
15.9.c–d: 76; 141
15.9.e: 78
16.6.c–d: 142
22: 98
22.2.b: 196n41
22.5.g: 118
22.5.g–h: 141–42
26.1: 193n6
26.1.a: 142; 193n6
26.4.a: 193n6
26.6.b–c: 193n6
26.9.g: 79
26.9.h: 181n38; 196n48
30.2: 196n48
34.7.a–c: 80
34.7.b: 196n42
34.9.e: 78
34.9.f: 78
38.7: 180n34
38.7.b–d: 141
38.7.b–g: 80
38.7.d–e: 78
39.3.m: 196n41
40.1.e–h: 98

Musonius
9.63–65: 84

Ovid
Ars
2.123–24: 70
Epistulae ex Ponto
1.3.33–34: 182n63
3.1.53: 181n42
Metamorphoses
13.262: 25
13.306–8: 25
13.370: 25
13.370–81: 25
Tristia
1.5.79: 125

Palladas
Anthologia Palatina 10.50.8–10: 181n38

Parmenides
Fr. B 1 DK: 160n42
Fr. B 1.3 DK: 143

Pausanias
3.19.13: 173n43
8.30.8: 196n46

Petronius
Satyrica 132: 128

Philodemus
Anthologia Palatina 11.44: 191n83
On Flattery
PHerc. 223, fr.3: 70; 100; 179n16
On Frank Criticism
Fr. 40: 190n68
Fr. 63: 190n69
Fr. 64: 190n69
Fr. 88, col. XVIIa: 190n69
On Piety
104.2–11: 192n88
On Poems
5 col. 13.30: 183n72
On the Good King according to Homer
col. 4: 100
col. 13: 104
cols. 18–19: 116
col. 19: 101
col. 22, line 23: 181n37; 186n28
col. 24: 100
col. 25: 103
col. 26: 103
col. 29: 106
col. 30: 101
col. 31: 101
col. 32: 106
col. 33: 106
col. 34: 106
col. 35: 104
col. 35, line 11: 106
col. 36: 104
col. 38: 105
col. 39: 104; 105
col. 42, line 20: 188n43
cols. 42–43: 104

[Phocylides]
95: 159n23

Pindar
Nemean Odes
7.20–21: 25
7.20–27: 125
7.23: 158n20
Olympian Odes
2.79–83: 173n43

Plato
Apology

17b: 23
22a6–8: 55
28d2–3: 43
28d3: 171n29
31b1–2: 26
31b3: 26
31c5: 56
34d5–6: 26; 171n29
34d8–35a1: 26
38d8: 171n27
38d–39a: 43
41b1–4: 44; 161n1
41b5–c2: 44
Gorgias
490a: 176n88
492a: 176n88
526c1–5: 174n54
Greater Hippias
286a8–b4: 169n2
288a2–4: 170n11
Lesser Hippias
363b1–4: 7
364c5–8: 38
364c6: 161n48
365b5: 38
369c4–6: 169n3
370d8–e1: 40
370e1–3: 41
370e11: 42
371e: 42
371e2–4: 41
371e5: 41
371e5–6: 38
371e7–372a2: 169n3
372a2: 169n3
372b3–6: 170n13
372d8: 169n3
372d8–e1: 170n13
372d9: 42
376b8–10: 38–39
376b11: 41
376b11–c1: 41
376c2–3: 42
376c7: 42
Laws
706d1–e6: 59
Meno
80a5–6: 172n36
Phaedo
59b: 26
68c2–3: 50
77e5: 53
82a10–b6: 173n44
84b: 53
84c1–3: 53
85d1–4: 46
94d6–7: 53
95e7–8: 53
107e1–8b2: 172n38
Phaedrus
248d1–e3: 51
258e6–59d8: 133
259a6–7: 133
259d8: 195n21
261a7–9: 172n34
261b6–c3: 45
271d1–7: 44
Protagoras
315b9: 172n41
344e2: 172n37
Republic
381d1–4: 175n71
386c3–7: 174n59
390a8–b3: 54
390d1–5: 53
393d6: 190n76
414b8–9: 170n9
441b5–c2: 53
441e1–6: 175n63
453d: 46
496d6: 50
508d6: 51
516d2–7: 51
516d5–6: 173n43
519d4–e2: 52
520c2: 52
549d6: 174n51
581a9–b11: 50
599c6–600a3: 176n82
614b2–3: 174n59
617b4–7: 145
619b2–620d5: 48
619b3–4: 51
Sophist
216c4–d2: 56
Symposium
175b2: 52
203b1–c6: 46
204b6: 172n37
208c2–d2: 174n51
215b8–d1: 134
215c3–6: 134
215d2–6: 134
216a4: 134
216a6–8: 133
220a1: 52

220c1–2: 52
220c1–d5: 47

Plautus
Menaechmi 902: 70; 96
Miles Gloriosus 33: 97

Plotinus
1.6.8.16–21: 197n52
5.9.1.20–22: 197n52

Plutarch
Alcibiades 2. 24: 159n23
Themistocles 2: 163–64n20
Moralia
7D: 89; 183n68
15D–F: 138
16E–F: 184n74
19B: 122
20A: 194n13
27B: 122
27B–D: 71
27C–E: 161n51
27E: 71
29B: 190n71
34D: 190n72
50E: 119
51C: 192n93
51D: 192n93
52B: 122
52C–D: 122
52F: 192n93
53B: 123
53C: 119
53D: 192n93
54F: 191n79
55A–B: 112
57E: 112; 188n55
65F: 112
66F–67A: 112
67A: 112
68F: 190n73
72E: 112; 190n72
74A–B: 112
74B: 112
93E: 191n79
95A: 191n79
104D–E: 188n55
104E: 179n23
140F: 129; 194n18
164C: 107
193A: 194n18
405B: 194n18
442D–E: 194n14
544A–B: 105
505C–D: 131
505D–F: 131
505F: 131
506A–B: 130
516A–B: 90
516F: 183n73
517D–E: 184n73
539E: 105
545C–D: 105
600F: 86
603D: 182n58
642B: 194n18
745D–F: 145
746C: 197n57
869F: 27; 174n49
985E:128–29
985F: 129
986C: 129
986F: 129
987A: 129
987C: 129
988E: 194n12
988F: 129

[Plutarch]
Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer
136: 78; 194n17; 196n38
137: 60–61
141: 61
150: 57; 178n105
163: 79
166: 103
172: 163n16

Polybius 12.27.10: 193n8

Porphyry
The Cave of the Nymphs
12–19: 197n51
34: 144–45
35: 147
Scholia on the *Odyssey*
1.1: 21–22
5.211: 167n66
5.257: 167n66
23.337: 167n66

Posidonius
Fr. 63J Long and Sedley: 195n34

Quintilian
12.10.64–65: 172n31
Seneca
De constantia sapientis
2: 17; 79; pp. 83–84
De otio
1.4: 182n51
De providentia
2. 2–7: 180n34
De tranquillitate
10.5: 182n51
Epistulae morales
28.7: 182n51
31.2: 137
39: 182n51
66.26: 87
85.28: 182n51
88: 2; 14–16; 92; 132; 160n41; 185n86
88.4: 94
88.5: 35; 93
88.7: 92; 93–94
123.12: 87; 137
Hercules Furens
33–36: 81
42: 81
46: 82
89–90: 82
174–76: 182n51
186–87: 82
201: 82
249–53: 82
596: 81
604: 81
605: 182n49
613–15: 82
936–39: 82; 181n47
957: 82
960–61: 82
965–73: 83

Servius
On Virgil *Aeneid* 2.166.12–16: 190n76

Sophocles
Ajax
11–12: 109
12–13: 109
23: 109
24: 109; 166n59
31: 109; 166n59
34: 109
38: 109
103: 33
120: 109
124: 109
126: 189n57
148–49: 7
445: 159n36; 171n25
955–56: 159n36
955–58: 7
971: 7
1333: 159n36
1359: 114
1365–66: 109
1374: 8
1384–85: 159n36
Philoctetes
14: 158n17
64–67: 5; 31; 69
77: 158n17
81: 31
81–82: 159n31
82: 11
84: 11
108–11: 31
111: 159n31
119: 8; 32
321: 5
344: 5
363: 160n37
369: 160n37
374–75: 5
384: 5
385–88: 5
406–9: 6
417–18: 6
429–30: 6
431: 8
440: 6; 8
448: 43
475: 11
481: 11
596–97: 165n36
607–8: 158n15
633–34: 11
870: 11
927–28: 43
984: 160n37
989–90: 8
1058–59: 188n44
1135: 33
1244: 8
1245–46: 8
1257–60: 189n61
1415: 8
1418–22: 12

Trachiniae
71: 12
Fragments
TGF, vol. 4, 861: 197n53
TGF, vol. 4, 913: 158n20

Scholion on *Philoctetes* 119: 158n21

Stobaeus
3.13.44: 30
3.33.16: 188n55
4.39.20–21: 181n39

Strabo
1.2.2: 75; 180n30
1.2.4: 87
1.2.11–12: 184n81
1.2.14: 184n81
1.2.15: 92
3.2.13: 184n81
3.4.3: 92; 184n81
3.4.4: 184n81
5.2.6: 184n81
7.3.6: 184n81

Svetonius
Tiberius 70.3: 92

Teles
52.3 Hense: 73

Theognis
212–15: 192n93
1029: 169n84
1123–25: 169n84

Theopompus
PCG vol. 7, 51–54: 185n4

Thucydides
1.70.3: 159n35
1.70.8: 159n35
2.37.1–2: 21
2.40.1: 21
2.40.3: 159n35; 165n33
2.44: 159n23
3.83.3: 163n11

Tyrtaeus
Fr. 5.5 West: 169n84

Varro
Menippean Satires 71.20: 178n6

Virgil
Aeneid
1.148–50: 102
1.148–56: 102
1.151–52: 102–3
1.153: 103

Xenophon
Apology
1–3: 26; 164n28
26: 161n1
32: 26; 164n28
Cynegeticus
1.11: 167n62
Memorabilia
1.2.56–57: 176n79
1.2.58–59: 20
1.2.59: 162n5
1.3.7–8: 162n2
2.1.21–33: 35
2.1.28: 168n74
3.1.6: 59
3.8.2: 159n35
4.2.33: 161n1
4.4.4: 164n29
4.6.15: 59
Symposium
1.16: 96
4.6: 3
4.62: 168n74

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

ἀνδρεία, 27–28, 129, 178n100
ἀπορία/ἀπορέω (and compounds), 40, 45, 49–50
ἀπραγμοσύνη/ἀπράγμων, 50, 62, 134, 174n51, 174n54–55, 175n63, 177n91
ἄριστος, 37, 170n11, 173n47
ἀσφάλεια/ἀσφαλής, 59, 76
αὐτάρκεια, 176n83

δεινότης/δεινὸς (λέγειν), 23, 126, 163n16, 163n20, 178n105

ἐγκράτεια/ἐγκρατής, 54, 63, 91, 129, 130–31, 175n78, 182n56
ἐπίσκοπος/ἐπισκοπέω, 30, 76
εὐδαιμονία, 70
εὐφροσύνη, 97–99, 186n15

καρτερία/καρτερός (and related terms), 33, 52–54, 59, 63–64, 69, 91, 132, 134

μεγαλοψυχία, 64, 178n101, 178n103
μῆτις (and κακόμητις, πολύμητις), 27–28, 33, 45–47, 58, 106, 172nn37–38, 173n42

πανουργία/πανοῦργος, 11, 43, 129, 171n25
πλάνη, 39
πολυμήχανος (and related terms), 24, 33, 43, 58–59, 176n81
πολύτλας/τολμάω (and related terms), 11–12, 33, 47, 58, 159nn35–37, 169n84, 178n105
πολυτροπία/πολύτροπος, 16, 21–24, 29, 34, 38–40, 41–42, 44–45, 47, 58, 59, 74, 88, 111–12, 118, 159n23, 162n8, 162–63n11, 167n60, 170n9, 171n22

σοφία/σοφός/σόφισμα, 8–9, 13, 22–24, 27–28, 38, 51, 62, 78, 118, 129, 141, 158n17, 158nn19–20, 163n15, 163n20, 167n65, 173n47
σωφροσύνη, 75, 107–10, 129, 173n48, 184n78, 188n53, 189n56, 189n61, 190n62, 190n67

φιλανθρωπία/φιλάνθρωπος, 112, 166n45
φιλομαθής, 91
φιλοσοφία/φιλόσοφος, 48, 50, 124, 140, 146, 148, 161n49, 178n105
φιλοτιμία/φιλότιμος, 48–50, 160n38, 173n48, 174nn50–51
φρόνησις/φρόνιμος (and related terms), 27, 50, 58–59, 61–62, 78, 87–88, 106, 129, 132, 173n47, 174n49, 176n88, 177n90, 178n100, 194nn16–17

ψευδής (and related terms), 38, 169n3

GENERAL INDEX

Personal names refer to characters, not titles.

Achilles, 3, 5, 7, 9–10, 21, 24, 25, 26, 35–36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 51, 56, 57, 64, 78, 80, 92, 104, 105–6, 111–12, 113, 120, 132, 158n20, 159n25, 166n58, 170n11, 171n23, 171n29, 173n43, 173n47, 174n59, 175n71, 190n72, 191n79
Ajax, 3, 21, 24–32, 43, 48–49, 58, 80, 90, 106, 108–9, 114, 115–16, 125, 164nn23–24, 165n43, 166n58, 167n60, 167n62, 169n1, 188n49, 189n57
Alcinous, 65, 95, 100–101, 106, 108, 116–17, 174n59, 178n105, 191n84, 192n87
allegory, 12, 17–18, 36, 79, 81, 94, 135, 136, 137, 143–44, 148, 152, 154, 161n53, 168n74, 168n78, 180n24, 181n38, 183n66
ambition, 10, 32, 48–49, 60, 129, 132. *See also* φιλοτιμία
Asham, R., 152
Athena, 11, 47, 68, 72–73, 102, 109, 130, 159n34, 172n40, 177n98, 190n62, 194n16
Augustus, 103, 187n40, 193n3

boasting, 28–29, 33, 58, 104–7, 149, 166n59, 176n81, 188nn43–44

Calypso, 15, 17, 21, 34–37, 57, 64, 76, 78, 80–81, 89, 93, 99, 115, 153–55, 157n4, 160n41, 167n67, 180n34, 180n36, 199n23
Circe, 15, 17, 36, 37, 77, 79, 88, 90, 115, 124, 125, 128–29, 144, 150, 152–55, 157n4, 158n2, 173n45, 175–76n78, 180n36, 198n10, 199n23
cunning, 8, 27–28, 33, 44–47, 58, 106, 113, 131, 167n62, 194n16. *See also* μῆτις
curiosity, 39, 72, 87–94, 105, 127, 129, 135–36, 150–52, 154–55, 183–84n73, 195n29,
Cyclops, 6, 17, 21, 33, 50, 58, 64, 88, 91, 96, 104, 105, 124, 130–31, 147, 149, 159n36, 172n39, 188n43, 190n77, 198n10

Dante, 91, 135, 199n11
Diomedes, 4, 10, 28, 62–63, 83, 104, 106–7, 111, 112, 113, 165n36, 171n31, 177n98, 177n100, 188n49
Dorat, 148, 152–56, 199n17, 199nn20–23, 200nn25–29

endurance, 9, 11–14, 17, 32, 33, 47, 53–54, 57, 59, 61, 63–64, 67, 68, 74–75, 77–78, 80–84, 97, 102, 113, 115, 121–22, 126–27, 130, 132, 133, 139, 141, 153, 159n36, 169n84, 172n40, 178n105, 180n37. *See also* πολύτλας, καρτερία

Er (Myth of), 48, 51, 57, 143, 174n52, 174n59, 192n87

flattery, 25–26, 64, 98, 112, 114–23, 164n29, 178n105, 190n74, 192n90, 192n93, 192n99
frankness, 111–12, 121, 123, 129, 190n69, 190n73, 191n79

Hecuba, 4, 8, 11–12, 43, 92
Heracles, 8, 12, 17–18, 35, 36–37, 55, 69, 78, 81–84, 86, 150, 161n54, 164n24, 168n74, 168n81, 169nn84–85, 172n41, 178n8, 179n13, 182n49, 182n51, 182n58, 198n9

inventiveness. *See* versatility
Iphigenia, 4, 6, 10
Ithaca, 14, 71, 78, 80, 84–85, 87, 89, 92, 100–101, 114, 120, 126, 145–46, 148, 152, 159n28, 198n3, 199n17

Leucothea, 47, 79, 144, 196n48

Maximus of Turin, 148–49

Nausicaa, 121–22, 192n99
Nekyia (and Odysseus' visit to the Underworld), 48, 51–52, 55, 88–91, 125, 153, 173n43, 184n74
Neoptolemus, 5–6, 8, 11, 32, 69, 158n14, 159n28, 160n37, 189n61
Nestor, 3, 15, 21, 38, 45, 60–61, 63, 77, 80, 106, 126, 141, 161n48, 163n15, 169n2, 171n28, 171n31, 172n37, 186n27
nostalgia, 36, 85–87, 92, 126, 146, 152, 160n41, 161n45, 182n57

Odyssey Landscapes, 124–25

Palamedes, 31, 43, 44, 52, 55, 58, 80, 161n1, 166n48, 167n62, 171n28, 175n72
Palladium, 21, 58, 113, 190n76
Penelope, 34–36, 71, 85, 89, 92, 94, 100, 127, 128, 130, 131, 146, 152, 155, 168n70, 171n29, 183n69, 197n59
Petrarch, 80, 149–52, 181n41, 187n33, 198n9, 198n10, 199n11, 199nn13–14
Phaeacians, 64–65, 71, 84, 98, 101, 104–5, 116–17, 119, 152, 174n59, 178n105, 191n85 199n19
Poseidon, 21, 33–34, 36, 46–47, 64, 98, 104, 127, 147

Scylla and Charybdis, 88, 150, 153, 198
sea, 13, 36, 46, 78, 141, 142–47, 150, 197n61
self-control, 10, 37, 52–55, 58, 90–91, 102, 104, 107–8, 128–31, 140, 145, 162n2, 175n63, 184n78, 186n13, 188n53, 188–89n55
self-restraint, self-mastery. *See* self-control
Sirens, 13, 14, 36, 88–89, 91, 92, 96, 105, 132–38, 140, 145–48, 150, 152, 153, 154–56, 157n4, 183n64, 183n67, 195n25, 195n28, 195n30, 195n32, 196n40–41, 197n56–58, 197n61, 198n3, 199n23
Sisyphus, 6, 44
solitude, 33, 76–77, 86, 113–14, 166n59
suitors, 8–9, 53, 56, 70–71, 74–75, 77, 89, 107, 112, 145, 150, 155, 159n28, 169n84, 180n29, 190n73

Themistocles, 27, 44, 132, 163n20, 174n49
Thersites, 6, 48, 119–20, 125, 158n14
Tomasi, G. di Lampedusa, 147

versatility (and inventiveness), 6, 7, 8, 13, 20–24, 29, 36, 38–47, 54, 57–60, 61, 63, 65, 74, 96–98, 117–18, 121, 126, 131, 161n45, 163n12, 163n15, 164n24, 165n30, 192n90. *See also* πολυτροπία