

Athena’s “Unreasonable Advice”: The Education of Telemachus in Ancient Interpretations of Homer

Jessica Wissmann

“I, too, dear child, have here a gift for thee,” as Helen says in Homer when she is giving Telemachus a parting gift. You are celebrating your first birthday since reaching man’s estate, and of all festive events this is the one which I enjoy and prize most highly.

WITH THESE WORDS Dionysius of Halicarnassus dedicates his treatise *On Literary Composition* to the young Rufus Metilius.¹ Which mythological parallel could be more apt to someone who has just reached adulthood than Telemachus when about to return to Ithaca? If we look at our age, Telemachus is generally perceived as the educatee *par excellence* of all mythological characters. As Kipf has shown in a recent article, whenever Telemachus is the subject-matter in modern literature for the young (which is, however, not as often the case as one might expect),² he is presented as a young man in search of his identity, undergoing an education under the guidance of Athena in disguise. Much of this is owed to the influential novel *Les aventures de Télémaque* by Fénelon, the tutor of the then dauphin. Printed in 1699, it is an account of

¹ “δώρόν τοι καὶ ἐγώ, τέκνον φίλε, τοῦτο δίδωμι,” καθάπερ ἡ παρ’ Ὀμήρω φησὶν Ἑλένη ξενίζουσα τὸν Τηλέμαχον, πρώτην ἡμέραν ἄγοντι ταύτην γενέθλιον, ἀφ’ οὗ παραγέγονας εἰς ἀνδρὸς ἡλικίαν, ἡδίστην καὶ τιμωτάτην ἑορτῶν ἐμοί (*Comp.* 1; transl. S. Usher [Loeb]).

² In many modern paraphrases of the *Odyssey* tailored to young readers, Telemachus does not appear at all: S. Kipf, “Eine mythische Gestalt mit pädagogischer Kraft oder nur Odysseus’ Sohn? Telemach in der neuzeitlichen Kinder- und Jugendliteratur,” in A. Luther (ed.), *Odysseerezeptionen* (Frankfurt am Main 2005) 95–105, at 101–103.

Telemachus' travels in search of his father, accompanied by Minerva disguised as Mentor, resulting in a finally grown-up Telemachus returning to Ithaca. This novel was so obviously educative that it was part of French reading, e.g., in German high-schools for much of the 19th century.³ But how important was Telemachus as a prototype of an educatee in antiquity? In his review, Pontani criticises that Kipf neglects to mention that "the ancients had already a clear sense of the paedagogical purport of Telemachus' adventures as is certified by several scholia focusing on Telemachus' paideia and psychology."⁴

The question whether the ancients perceived the character of Telemachus as useful for, or exemplary of, the education of the young, is the more significant as Homer's poetry was abundantly used in ancient education (as the number of school-papyri and numerous literary references show), and as the educational aspect formed an important part of Homeric criticism in antiquity.

As regards the school-texts, it is a long-known fact that they show a clear preponderance of the reading of the *Iliad*, while the *Odyssey* is represented by a mere handful of texts. There is always a good chance that copies were used in school that do not show the typical markers of school-texts, and for this reason our idea of what was read in ancient classrooms will never be complete. But the school-texts reflect the predilections of ancient readers in general: papyri on the whole show the same imbalance, with texts taken from the *Iliad* outnumbering those from the *Odyssey* by far.⁵ Not only was the *Odyssey* studied less extensively in the schools; there was an even further narrowing down to passages culled from only a very few books, and none

³ Kipf, in *Odysserezeptionen* 98.

⁴ F. Pontani, *BMCR* 2005.10.18.

⁵ On the frequencies of school-texts taken from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* see R. Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind. Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton 2001) 194–196; T. Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge 1998) 105–115. Regarding Homeric papyri in general, too, "the *Iliad* is constantly favored over the *Odyssey* by 2:1 or better": M. Haslam, "Homeric Papyri and Transmission of the Text," in I. Morris and B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer* (New York 1997) 60–61.

of the passages copied on school-papyri reflects any specific interest in Telemachus.

But what about the evaluation of Homer's poetry with a view to its educational utility? Do not Homeric scholia profusely point out all the things we can learn from Homer, or, as it is frequently put, all the things that Homer "teaches us"?⁶ The areas covered range from politics, religion, and philosophy, to sciences, ethics, and skills such as farming or fishing. In some cases even the education a character undergoes or has undergone is discussed. The speech of Phoenix, for instance, in *Iliad* 9 has triggered ample discussion of this "teacher's" relationship with his "student" Achilles, all the way to details such as which subjects Achilles was taught by Phoenix and which he was taught by Cheiron.⁷ Considering the numerous instances in the *Odyssey* in which Telemachus is given advice, is depicted as young and naive, or shows signs of coming of age, one should expect ancient commentators of Homer to have a comparable (if not greater) interest in these passages.

Compared with the scholia on the *Iliad*, the scholia on the *Odyssey*, as we have them, show little tendency to draw didactic lessons from the poem. It is indicative (though by no means the only indication) of this lack of interest that the phrase "the poet teaches us" occurs only a few times. And yet, as a potentially important text, Antisthenes' Ἀθηνᾶ ἢ περὶ Τηλεμάχου, is lost and known only by title, the scholia on the *Odyssey* remain one of the central texts in which the education of Telemachus is discussed. The other is a passage from the *Homeric Questions* of Heraclitus (61–63).⁸

⁶ This thought is usually expressed by διδάσκω or (less frequently) παιδεύω, as in phrases like διδάσκει/παιδεύει ὁ ποιητής/Ὀμηρος ὅτι...

⁷ Schol. bT *Il.* 9.443a ex.: εἰ ὑπὸ Φοίνικος οὖν πεπαιδευται, τί παρὰ Χείρωνος ἐδιδάχθη; δηλονότι δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἰατρικὴν ("if now he has been educated by Phoenix, what was he taught by Cheiron? Obviously, justice and the art of healing"). Needless to say, the heroic motto of *Il.* 9.443 ("to be a speaker of words and a doer of deeds") was interpreted with a certain eagerness as a kind of rhetorical instruction (schol. T *Il.* 9.443a ex.; schol. A *Il.* 9.443b ex.).

⁸ The scholia on Books 1 and 2 of the *Odyssey* are quoted after F. Pontani, *Scholia graeca in Odysseam* I (Rome 2007); occasionally, reference will also be

But even though the education of Telemachus is discussed by these texts to a significant degree, I shall argue that it is not the primary focus, but rather contributes to a particular understanding of Athena. The concern is with the representation of the goddess rather than with the development of the young man. This is not to say that the "education" of Telemachus and his coming of age are ignored by the scholia altogether. But it is significant that the question of Telemachus' education is raised in the context of the question why Athena sends him on a journey in the first place.

Telemachus' conventional education

Although this paper is not about what is said in the *Odyssey* itself about Telemachus' education, it is expedient to recall those three passages of the *Odyssey* in which the goddess gives her reasons for sending Telemachus on a journey. In the assembly of the gods, she mentions inquiries about his father and the winning of fame (1.93–95); next, speaking directly to Telemachus, Athena (disguised as Mentès) gives what in essence is practical advice and addresses the notion of fame not with regard to the journey but in reference to taking revenge on the suitors, for which Orestes serves as a paradigm (1.267–302). Finally, when she brings Odysseus up to date in *Od.* 13, she explains to him that Telemachus went out to search for "your fame, if you are still somewhere" (13.415); she then assuages Odysseus' worries and points out that Telemachus is supposed to "win fame." In none of these passages does she expressly mention an educative intention, although when speaking to Telemachus she once uses the verb ὑποτίθεσθαι (1.279), a word often used when an older person gives advice to a younger one.⁹

made to A. Ludwich, *Scholia in Homeri Odysseae A 1–309* (Königsberg 1888–1890). For the scholia on the other books of the *Odyssey*, quotations follow W. Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam I–II* (Oxford 1855). The *scholia vetera* on the *Iliad* are cited from H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem I–VII* (Berlin 1969–1988); Erbse's marker of the exegetical type of scholia (*ex.*) is part of the reference. The D-Scholia after H. van Thiel, *Scholia D in Iliadem*, www.ub.uni-koeln.de/digital/fachinfos/alertum/volltexte/index_ger.html.

⁹ For the educational aspect of ὑποθήκαι, especially that in father-son

The scholia on the two passages from Book 1 start out with a criticism of Athena's advice: it is "preposterous" (ἄτοπος) to send Telemachus on his journey, dangerous for both Telemachus and the house, especially as the suitors might take action (presumably against Telemachus) or use violence against Penelope, there being no man in charge of the house; moreover, the journey is fruitless.¹⁰ Much of this criticism might derive from Odysseus' dismay in Book 13 (417–419) when he first hears of his son's travel abroad, such as the danger involved for Telemachus, or the fact that the house is left unattended.¹¹ The "problem" that some unnamed critics of Homer identified is the question how such poor advice could be appropriate to a goddess, especially since Athena herself commends it as given "shrewdly" (πυκνῶς, 1.279).¹²

The question whether Athena's advice is reasonable constitutes the starting point for the two most extensive discussions of Telemachus' education in the scholia; two types of "solution" are suggested. The first type pertains to literary technique; it can be found in schol. HM^aO *Od.* 1.284c and schol. DE *Od.* 1.284d. The journey provides an opportunity for variety (ποικιλία), with regard both to the narrative mode (i.e., by interspersing the narrative with direct speeches) and, "as the *Odyssey* does not offer sufficient variety," to the subject-matter, with Nestor and Menelaus telling stories about the events at Troy (Helen is not mentioned in either scholion); schol. *Od.* 1.284d refers to these stories by the technical term παρεκβάσεις, "digressions."¹³ But within the logic of the plot, these

relationships or those similar to them, see e.g. J. Kroll, *Theognisinterpretationen* (Leipzig 1936) 98–99; K. Bielowlawek, *Hypothek und Gnome. Untersuchungen über die griechische Weisheitsdichtung der vorhellenistischen Zeit* (Leipzig 1940) 5–6.

¹⁰ Schol. DEJM^aO *Od.* 1.93b; schol. DH(O) *Od.* 1.284a. The texts of schol. *Od.* 1.93b as well as the relevant portions of schol. *Od.* 1.111 and of the scholia on *Od.* 1.284 are given with translation in the Appendix.

¹¹ Athena's account, potentially providing some ammunition for the scholia, is at 13.412–415 and 421–428.

¹² Schol. DHO *Od.* 1.284a (pp.150.53–151.55).

¹³ In a similar manner, schol. bT *Il.* 24.804a ex. (preceding the *hypothesis c Od.* 1 in cod. O; printed by Ludwich as part of this *hypothesis* [p.5.19–23], but not by Pontani) reports the view of Menecrates (for possible identifi-

explanations do not save Athena from the charge of giving unsound advice.¹⁴

The second type of "solution," found in schol. *Od.* 1.284b1, b2, and c, remains *figurenimmanent*:¹⁵ Telemachus is sent on his journey to Nestor in order to be educated (παιδευθησόμενον) and to Menelaus in order to gather the most recent information about Odysseus.¹⁶ As regards the latter point, the lack of response Telemachus shows in *Od.* 4.594 ff. after listening to Menelaus' report of what Proteus has told him about Odysseus¹⁷ could have induced commentators to regard the journey as pointless or, at any rate, not to pursue this aspect any further in their attempt to justify Athena's actions.

Whether owing to a lack of interest in that matter, or to the haphazardness of transmission, not much else is said by the

cation see Erbse *ad loc.*) that "the poet sensed his own weakness and that he could not pass over in silence the events after Hector's death"; for this reason, and because the plot about the house of Odysseus alone would be too small, he has characters in the *Odyssey* narrate stories of the events subsequent to Hector's death. Erbse gives more parallels for this view of the *Odyssey* as "completing" the *Iliad* in his annotations on this scholion. In the scholia on the *Odyssey*, this view is expressed by schol. E *Od.* 3.248; see also R. Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work. Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* (Cambridge 2009) 48.

¹⁴ In the long explanation of schol. DH *Od.* 1.284a, the idea is rejected that Homer has Athena send Telemachus on the journey in order to bring about his meeting with Odysseus at Eumaeus' farm in Book 16, as Telemachus could go there just as well without having returned from a journey; the scholion does acknowledge, however, that Athena orders Telemachus to hurry back home (*Od.* 15.10–42) so that he will meet with Odysseus (schol. *Od.* 1.284a, p.153.18–23).

¹⁵ Schol. HTVY *Od.* 1.284b1 and schol. E *Od.* 1.284b2 also point out that Telemachus will gain glory in searching for his father.

¹⁶ As the last to have returned home, Menelaus could provide information about Odysseus' whereabouts—which is essentially a paraphrase of the Homeric text (*Od.* 1.286). The same distinction is also made by Heraclitus at 62.7, on which more will be said below. Cf. also schol. DEJM^aO *Od.* 1.93d1 and schol. M *Od.* 3.317.

¹⁷ Telemachus responds to Menelaus' invitation to stay longer at his house; his only reaction to Menelaus' report is the more or less conventional praise of the pleasure derived from it. He does not make any mention of the information he has received about his father.

scholia about the education Telemachus received from Nestor. No “educational” interpretation of Nestor’s lengthy speeches addressed to Telemachus in *Od.* 3 has come down to us. Only his exhortation to Telemachus to be brave “in order that his descendants speak well of him” (3.199–200) is duly noted as such (προτροπή); the scholion adds that future fame is the best incentive for noblemen.¹⁸ His mention of Orestes as an example for Telemachus is, at any rate in the extant scholia, not seen as an educative tool; all that is said is that the story of Orestes has gripped Telemachus so much that he praises Orestes and therefore neglects the thought of his father.¹⁹ So one is left essentially with the rather general observation in schol. DE *Od.* 1.284b2 that Nestor has an educative influence on account of “experience that comes with old age.”

The thought that such experience “rubs off” occurs also in schol. DEHM^aOT *Od.* 1.279a, and this time Menelaus is included: the commentator suggests that Telemachus would benefit from the journey because he meets the older men (i.e. Nestor and Menelaus). Again, this is rather unspecific and does not venture any information as to *what* it is that Telemachus would learn from them; moreover, the notion that the mere company of other, especially older, persons has an educative effect was a commonplace.²⁰ Phoenix and Achilles are a good

¹⁸ Schol. MQ *Od.* 3.199.200, ἐν συντόμοις ἡ προτροπή. μάλιστα γὰρ τῶν εὐφυῶν ἄπτεται ἢ ἐπὶ ταῖς καλαῖς πράξεσιν ἐσομένη δόξα, “The exhortation in a nutshell. For future glory on account of fine deeds has the strongest grip on nobles.” Cf. also schol. HJM^aTe *Od.* 1.302e (on Athena’s exhortation): ἵνα τίς σε καὶ ὀψιγόνων ἐν εἴπῃ] ... ταῦτα λοιπὸν εἰδυῖα τὸ φιλότιμον τῶν νέων λέγει, “In order that one of your descendants will praise you’: ... She says this knowing that the ambition of the young is aimed at the future.”

¹⁹ καὶ λίην κείνος μὲν] οὕτως ἤψατο ὁ λόγος τοῦ Τηλεμάχου, ὡς τὰ περὶ τὸν πατέρα ἀφείς μακαρίζειν Ὀρέστην (schol. EQ *Od.* 3.203).

²⁰ Strangely, though, Telemachus appears in Aelian (*VH* 12.25) in a list of mythical and historical characters who benefited from someone else as having profited from Menelaus, not Nestor. This may be due to the fact that Nestor expressly sent Telemachus to Menelaus. Another explanation could be that Nestor has been mentioned as part of the preceding pair, Agamemnon with Nestor as his advisor, so that Menelaus was chosen rather than Nestor, who would otherwise have been part of two pairs. In general, Aelian’s distribution into pairs seems not to be based on the principle of

example from the Homeric world that (as mentioned at the outset of this paper) is discussed extensively in the *Iliad* scholia, especially regarding the question what it was that Achilles was taught by Phoenix. They occur as a model in the treatise *On the Education of Children* (transmitted among Plutarch's writings). Its author discusses the very principle of good or bad company that influences a young person and urges parents to choose their servants carefully because children could become "contaminated by barbarians and persons of low character, and so take on some of their commonness." Contrasting them with Homer's Phoenix and Achilles, the author specifically warns against choosing a "wine-bibber and glutton" as slave in charge of one's son.²¹

The suitors both as represented in the *Odyssey* and as discussed by the scholia are precisely this: wine-drinkers and gluttons.²² It does not come as a surprise, therefore, that a scholion also identifies them as a potentially harmful influence (schol. *Od.* 1.284a; for the Greek text, see the Appendix):

older advisor and younger advisee, although Achilles and Cheiron are among them.

²¹ *Mor.* 3F–4B; transl. Babbitt (Loeb).

²² See, e.g., commenting on Antinoös, schol. DEHM^a *Od.* 2.305, ἄκρωσ ἀπομμεῖται φωνᾶς ἀσώτου μειρακίου. τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλα πάντα ἀπορρίψαι τῆς ψυχῆς παρακελεύεται, μόνη δὲ τῇ γαστρὶ σχολάσαι. τοιαῦτα δὲ τὰ τῶν παροίνων ῥήματα, Homer "ably represents the utterances of a profligate young man. For he [i.e. Antinoös] urges to cast away everything else from one's soul and to devote one's time to the stomach alone. Such are the words of the drunken." Schol. M^a *Od.* 2.310c explains (quite uniquely, it seems; see Pontani *ad loc.*) the suitors' epithet ὑπερφιάλος ("heedless, reckless") as derived from the word for drinking vessel (φιάλη), in that in the old days at symposia the drinking-cup was used by all participants; these "called those *hyperphialos* who insolently and in an uneducated manner hung on to the drinking-bowl," τοὺς δὲ ἀναισχύντως καὶ ἀπαιδεύτως {έν} τῇ φιάλῃ προσκαθημένους ὑπερφιάλους ὠνόμαζον. For a similar portrayal of Antinoös see Dio Chrys. 55.20–21. There is another, more common explanation of ὑπερφιάλος given by schol. DEJ *Od.* 1.134g, as having to do with breaking an oath, as in the case of Priam's sons; the oath was sworn with a holy drinking-vessel and accompanied by the words "just as water pours from the drinking vessel, so also does the soul of the one that has broken an oath," ὥσπερ τὸ ὕδωρ χέεται ἐκ τῆς φιάλης, οὕτω καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ ἀθετήσαντος τὸν ὅρκον; see also the parallels given by Pontani on this scholion.

Homer seems to have thought that a man who has been raised by a woman—even if she were exceedingly prudent—who has been confined in a house with a great number of licentious men, who has grown up among wanton maid-servants on an insignificant island that has been without a king for a long time, and who has not experienced dangers abroad and has not had his share of unpleasantness and has struggled in as many troubles as Telemachus was when about to travel to Nestor and Menelaus and Helen, [Homer] now seems to have thought that he could not have got his share of *areté* in any other way.

According to this interpretation, it is not only bad company (the suitors and the maid-servants who have sex with them) that endangers Telemachus' development; it is also a lack of the right company. The scholion points out that even the most prudent woman is not the appropriate person to guide the young man to *areté*; schol. DEJM^aO *Od.* 1.93b also sees the fact that Telemachus has grown up among women (implying the lack of beneficial male influence) as a major factor in his stalled development.²³ What prevents him from being properly educated is a lack of role models. But the journey can compensate for this; schol. DH 1.284a states that if it was Telemachus' education that Athena had in mind, then her advice was indeed appropriate to a goddess (p.151.73–79):

but remaining in Ithaca without an education he would either attach himself to the suitors and betray the house, or he would get killed in an attempt to attack them, when Odysseus with his superior intelligence and experience is only just able to attack them with trickery, and he [Telemachus] would not have become worthy of his father had he not heard from his [father's] companions in arms about his deeds. For this reason, even though he is being prevented from being with him upon his return, he is already educated and knows how to behave towards his father, on the basis of the stories he has heard about him.

²³ ἐν γυναιξὶ τεθραμμένον (p.65.56). Philodemus, without making a reference to the environment (at least not in the surviving text), characterizes Telemachus as someone who has not seen, has no information, and is inexperienced in frank speech on equal terms; the same sentence mentions that someone “educates,” but it is not clear who (ἐπεὶ καὶ ἀθέατο[ν] ἀνάγκη καὶ ἀνιστόρητον εἶναι πολλῶν καὶ [π]αρορησίας ἄπειρον ἰσηγόρου πολλάκις [ἐξ]επαίδευσεν: *De bono rege* col. 23.14–19 Dorandi).

In this interpretation, both Nestor and Menelaus enable him to take his father as his role model, as they are the most competent to tell him stories about Odysseus the hero, the warrior at Troy and sacker of this city. Stories about exemplary characters were a common educational tool, mentioned e.g. in Plato's *Protagoras* (326A): but these are stories about men of old that were supposed to incite emulation. One's own father as role model appears in Isocrates' *Ad Demonicum* (9–12). As Strauss points out, with Demonicus' father, Hipponicus, recently deceased, the son "is urged to compete not with a living father but with the memory of a dead one."²⁴ And although Odysseus is not dead (at least not for certain), Strauss sees Telemachus and Odysseus as the ancestors of this constellation. The competitive aspect is indeed emphasized by Isocrates: Hipponicus is not only the "model" (παράδειγμα, 9), Demonicus not only the "imitator" but the "emulator" (μιμητήν ... καὶ ζηλωτὴν τῆς πατρῶας ἀρετῆς γιγνόμενον, 11).²⁵ I cannot detect a similar competition between father and son in the case of Telemachus and Odysseus, nor do the scholia; but Isocrates' exhortation to imitate one's father follows the same principle as do those scholia that see it as the objective of Telemachus' education to become, essentially, like his father.²⁶

Telemachus' own experiences will contribute to this end. Schol. *Od.* DEJM^aO 1.93b writes about this "method":

But the one who had been raised among women, had been abased by sorrows, and had never tried his skill in speeches, had to become *polytropos* in a manner similar to his father, and had to achieve this through his wandering and share with his father in the achievements in the Slaughter of the Suitors.

In other words: Telemachus must undergo the same experience as his father in order to become like his father—*πολύτροπος*. The ancient debate about the meaning of this notorious epithet of Odysseus reflects the changing attitudes

²⁴ B. Strauss, *Fathers and Sons in Classical Athens* (Princeton 1993) 80.

²⁵ Cf. also ὅπως ἐφάμιλλος γενήσῃ τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν (Isoc. *Ad Dem.* 12).

²⁶ Cf. αἰσχρὸν γὰρ ... τοὺς δὲ παῖδας μὴ μιμῆσθαι τοὺς σπουδαίους τῶν γονέων (*Ad Dem.* 11).

towards Odysseus in Greek literature. Schol. HM¹Z *Od.* 1.111 is an important testimony to this, as it reports the views of the philosopher Antisthenes. He argues that πολύτροπος implies both character and rhetorical skill.²⁷ Throughout antiquity, Odysseus was indeed regarded as one of the Homeric prototypes of an orator, together with Nestor and Menelaus.²⁸ The passage about Odysseus usually referred to in this context is Antenor's description of his rather idiosyncratic style (*Il.* 3.216–24); a scholion on the *Odyssey* quotes this description of Odysseus as part of its argument that Telemachus, in the assembly he has summoned in *Od.* 2, imitates his father's style.²⁹

There are some traces outside of the scholia of a Telemachus in his father's oratorical footsteps. Favorinus, a pupil of Dio Chrysostom, addresses a young man with comparisons to other famous young and beautiful men: "Speak, young man; speak, Antilochus: you will speak more sweetly than Nestor; speak, Telemachus; you will speak more forcefully than Odysseus."³⁰

²⁷ Text and translation in Appendix. Antisthenes' views are reported by Porphyry. It is perhaps no coincidence that in schol. DEJM^aO *Od.* 1.93b the notion of being πολύτροπος is introduced immediately after the description of Telemachus as "unskilled in words," which may indicate a "rhetorical" understanding of the term.

²⁸ The passages naming Odysseus as one of the Homeric prototypes of oratory are too numerous to be listed here exhaustively; see e.g. Ps.-Plutarch *De Homero* 172 (the three heroes as the representatives of genres of style) and *Prolegomenon Sylloge* 5, p.51 Rabe (the three heroes as representatives of the three *genera dicendi*; cf. also schol. AbT *Il.* 2.283 *ex.*). Philostratus even calls Odysseus "most rhetorical and eloquent" (ἠητορικώτατος καὶ δεινός, *Heroicus* 34.1). See L. Radermacher, *Artium Scriptores (Reste der voraristotelischen Rhetorik)* (*SBWien* 227.3 [1951]) 3–9, for more examples.

²⁹ Schol. DEHJM^aO *Od.* 2.15a, ἅμα δὲ τῷ γέροντι τοῦ δημηγορεῖν ὁ Τηλέμαχος ἤρξατο. καὶ οὐκ ἐπῆρται τῇ τιμῇ τῶν γερόντων ὁ νέος, ἀλλὰ μιμείται τὸ ἠθικὸν τοῦ πατρὸς. τοιοῦτος γάρ καὶ ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐν τῷ λέγειν, οὐ ταχέως ἀρχόμενος, ἀλλὰ "στάσκειν, ὑπαὶ δὲ ἴδεσκε κατὰ χθονὸς ὄμματα πῆξας": "Telemachus began the speaking in the assembly together with the old man [Aegyptius]. The young man is not elevated by the honour of the *gerontes* but imitates his father's style. For Odysseus too was such in speaking: not one to begin quickly, but he 'would just stand and stare down, eyes fixed on the ground beneath him' (*Il.* 3.217, transl. Lattimore)."

³⁰ Favorinus *ap.* Stobaeus *Ecl.* 4.21.8; his next example is Alcibiades, wonderfully drunk.

This obviously reflects the Homeric “orators” as representatives of the types of style, with the third, Menelaus, missing. Telemachus’ development as an orator is used as an example by Aelius Aristides in his defence of oratory as something natural and thus god-given (2.93–95). He refers to the passage at the beginning of *Od.* 3 where Telemachus confesses that he feels too shy and not sufficiently skilled to address Nestor while Athena/Mentor tries to boost his confidence.³¹ Aristides exhorts Telemachus, with his lack of experience (ἐμπειρία), not to be impressed by “Sophistic” criticism but rather to rely on his natural and god-given inspiration; after all, it is the wisest goddess and that of *phronesis* and the arts who is guiding him. According to Aristides, it becomes clear from Nestor’s praise—someone who should know—that Telemachus is in fact a good speaker, and Menelaus shares Nestor’s positive judgement when he commends Telemachus for being of “good blood, the way you are speaking” (*Od.* 4.611). All this, Aristides continues, goes to show that rhetoric comes from the gods and that art and training are secondary; this is also the case with Odysseus, whom Homer has say that a god gives beauty to someone’s words (*Od.* 8.169–170).

Even though this passage of Aristides is a rather extensive (and unique)³² treatment of Telemachus as becoming an orator, it seems that the Homeric depiction happened to fit (or to be made to fit) Aristides’ specific message; in addition, the tradition of Odysseus as prototype of an orator looms in the background. At any rate, advocating the view that Telemachus did not really need to “learn” oratory, Aristides does not provide any clues as to what exactly Telemachus was supposed to learn during his journey abroad, as claimed by the scholia. If one tries to sum up what the scholia say about Telemachus’ learning process, it is essentially common-places of traditional

³¹ Plato quotes these lines (*Od.* 3.26–28) to illustrate that the young will be told by their *daimon* when and to which god they should present dances (*Leg.* 804A). Maximus uses the lines once to explain Socrates’ *daimonion* (*Diss.* 8.5) and once as a testimony to the benignity of the gods (38.1).

³² To the best of my knowledge, the lines in question are not used by any other writer on rhetoric as exemplification of a budding orator.

education that are not very specific: the company of older men, the father as a role model, a coming of age, also as an orator. But there is no specification as to what it is that Telemachus is supposed to learn from the older men, nor does it seem reasonable to assume that a rhetorical training was the purpose of the journey. Apart from the mention of being *πολύτροπος*—whatever this may comprise—no details are given as to which of his father’s traits Telemachus was supposed to adopt from this role model.

Athena and φρόνησις

There is, however, another type of interpretation of Athena’s influence on Telemachus, which appears to be connected with the one represented by schol. DEJM^aO *Od.* 1.93b and DH(O) 284a. One group of scholia in particular, when commenting on other passages from the *Odyssey*, displays an interest in one of the typical characteristics of Odysseus, and applies it also to Telemachus. In addition to being *πολύτροπος*, Odysseus is credited with such qualities as endurance,³³ self-control,³⁴ or

³³ His endurance is pointed out in connection with the story about the Wooden Horse and as the poet’s “preparation” for Odysseus’ endurance toward the suitors (schol. Q *Od.* 4.245), or during the storm (schol. PQ *Od.* 5.439). The author of *De Homero* summarizes the proem of the *Odyssey* as describing “how many toils and dangers Odysseus encountered and overcame all through his intelligence in his soul and endurance” (ὅσοις πόνοις καὶ κινδύνοις περιπεσὼν ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς πάντων τῆ τῆς ψυχῆς συνέσει καὶ καρτερίᾳ περιεγένετο, 163.1). The same writer mentions that the Stoics regarded Odysseus’ “intelligence and endurance in his soul” (συνετὸν ... καὶ καρτερόν τῆ ψυχῆ) as his main virtues (136.5). W. B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme* (Oxford 1968) 121, argues that Odysseus was one of the Stoic prototypes for virtues such as endurance, but the evidence does not warrant a special position of Odysseus within Stoic philosophy proper. P. De Lacy, “Stoic Views of Poetry,” *AJP* 69 (1948) 241–271, at 264, simply mentions Odysseus as one among other heroes that the Stoics regarded as examples of virtue (and vices).

³⁴ See e.g. schol. HPQT *Od.* 5.81 (his *ἐγκράτεια* in resisting the temptation of Calypso), schol. HQ *Od.* 9.98 (the *ἐγκράτεια* displayed in dealing with the Lotus-Eaters; cf. also Hclt. *Homeric Questions* 70.1–4, quoted in schol. T *Od.* 9.89); curiosity and self-control are combined in Odysseus’ listening to the Sirens while bound to the mast (schol. Q *Od.* 12.160), but his begging to be unbound shows that pleasure defeats even the rather self-controlled (schol. BHV *Od.* 12.193). There were differing views as to how

wisdom and intelligence.³⁵ Especially often, however, Odysseus is seen as φρόνιμος or associated with φρόνησις.³⁶ This is also reflected in a sentence from schol. DH *Od.* 1.284a, which mentions Odysseus' "superior φρόνησις and experience" in the context of Telemachus' education. Telemachus is about to emerge from the status of being νήπιος, which means "not grown-up" in terms of both age and lack of sense, thus "childish."³⁷ His youth is emphasized both in the *Odyssey* itself and in the scholia.³⁸ A good example is the beginning of Telemachus and Peisistratus' stay with Menelaus (who addresses both as "dear boys," τέκνα φίλ', *Od.* 4.78): having just arrived, the young men stop to marvel at the palace; the scholion (E *Od.* 4.44) sees this as an indication that the poet depicts them as "uneducated" and "inexperienced."³⁹

It is not only when obviously "foolish" characters, such as

much of this quality can also be found in the son. According to schol. DEHM^aΓ *Od.* 1.132a, Telemachus' hospitality is interpreted as indicating "the self-control of the young man." But contrast Plutarch's interpretation: Odysseus, even though he is himself enraged, not only restrains himself but also the equally enraged Telemachus (*Mor.* 31C–D, quoting *Od.* 16.274–277).

³⁵ Schol. E *Od.* 5.211 reports Antisthenes' view (commenting on Odysseus' dealing with Calypso) that Odysseus, as σοφός, knows "that lovers tell many lies and promise the impossible"; Odysseus' σύνεσις is paired with Achilles' ἀνδρεία in schol. HQV *Od.* 8.75.

³⁶ Although other human characters are mentioned in conjunction with φρόνησις or are called φρόνιμος (such as Echeneos, Arete, Penelope), none is as often as Odysseus.

³⁷ See *LfggrE* s.v. νήπιος.

³⁸ Telemachus characterizes himself in the past with the formula ἐγὼ (or πάρος) δ' ἔτι νήπιος ἦα, (*Od.* 2.313, 18.229, 19.19, 20.310; used by Antinoüs in 21.95: πάς δ' ἔτι νήπιος ἦα). But he also acknowledges his youth and the resulting difficulty to accommodate the stranger at Eumaeus' house (αὐτὸς μὲν νέος εἰμί, *Od.* 16.71), and plays with the notion of being "too young" to bend Odysseus' bow (21.132–133).

³⁹ Athenaeus focuses on the youth of Telemachus and Peisistratus when he writes that "the young lads arriving at Menelaus' ... keep quiet, as they ought to, when Helen sits next to them, stunned by her famous beauty" (188B–C). That their silence is not (only) due to the effect of Helen's beauty, but is expected of young men, becomes clear from his statement a little later that "they eat in silence, as young men ought to" (188F).

Odysseus' companions, are called νήπιος in the *Odyssey* that the scholia gloss this by words that denote “senselessness”;⁴⁰ the same is done also in the case of Telemachus. The Homeric (con)text may already suggest this meaning; still, the explanations given by the scholia are interesting. When Athena/Mentes says to Telemachus that he no longer ought to “cling to childish thoughts” (νηπιάσ ὀχέειν, *Od.* 1.297), the scholia gloss this rather extensively, explaining it, among other things, as ἄφρων and ἀφροσύνη induced by youth (schol. *Od.* 1.297a–c).

Do then the scholia see a development from ἀφροσύνη to φρόνησις? On the face of it, they do not seem to give a very clear picture. It is here that Athena's initiative comes into play. The scholia describe her activity not as actual παιδεύειν, but only in terms that can typically, though not exclusively, denote educational speech acts such as ὑποτίθεσθαι/ὑποθήκη, παραινέω, προτρέπειν/προτροπή, παρορμάν, παροτρύνειν, ἐγείρειν.⁴¹ Only once do the scholia expressly point out a “didactic” strategy in her advice.⁴² What Athena seems to do is

⁴⁰ E.g. schol. *Od.* 1.8c: νήπιος ὁ νέος, D ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦν ἦπιον ἔχειν. DN νήπιος ὁ γέρον, ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦ ἄπο (λέναι), ὡς καὶ ἐνταῦθα. D / ἴγουν οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ νοός N (“*nepios* is the young, from having a gentle mind; *nepios* is the old man, from <going> away from sense / i.e., those away from sense”); schol. *Od.* 1.8 b1 and b2 also list a number of synonyms. Cf. also the explanation of Eidothea rebuking Menelaus (νήπιός εἰς) as ἀμαθής, ἔτι τὰ παίδων φρονῶν (“ignorant, still having the thoughts of children,” schol. EQP *Od.* 4.371).

⁴¹ For instance, *hyp.* a–c *Od.* 1; schol. DEHM^aT *Od.* 1.268a; schol. DEJs *Od.* 1.270a; schol. DH(O) *Od.* 1.284a; schol. DEHM^aOT/HJM^aOTs *Od.* 1.298a. Her more or less educative influence in the *Odyssey*, as seen by the scholia, is not restricted to Telemachus, as e.g. in schol. DEJM^c *Od.* 1.100d (on the Homeric phrase “the spear ... with which she subdues the ranks of the heroes”) “subdues” is glossed as “educates” (παιδεύει). Nor is Athena the sole divinity to exercise an educational activity. To give but one example: Hermes, not succeeding in persuading Aegisthus to abandon his evil plans, is explained in schol. DE²HJM^a *Od.* 1.43e as “trying to educate” (παιδεύων). Cf. the description of Hermes' educative influence in general in schol. DE²e *Od.* 1.38b.

⁴² Schol. M^aY *Od.* 1.305d observes that Athena/Mentes' concluding injunction “pay attention to my words” (ἐμπάξτε μύθων) takes up the same thought at the beginning of the exhortatory part of her speech (*Od.* 1.271)

to give Telemachus a push towards growing up. She appears to be not so much an educator herself as a facilitator of education who puts Telemachus in situations that foster his growing up.

The second type of interpretation of Athena's influence on Telemachus is especially advocated by Heraclitus in the account he gives of Telemachus' "education" in his *Homeric Problems*.⁴³ It is not only the fullest account; it is also interesting for its "psychological" approach, which is set out more systematically than in the scholia, but traces of which can be found there as well.

"Psychological" does not mean that the focus is on Telemachus. The aim of the *Homeric Problems* is to defend Homer against the charge of disrespect for the gods by means of allegorical interpretation: "if he meant nothing allegorically, he was impious through and through" (1). Clearly, then, Heraclitus' main concern is with the depiction of the gods, not of human characters in the Homeric epics.⁴⁴ Just as the scholia argue that Athena's advice is not "unreasonable" (ἄλογος), Heraclitus seeks to show that it is "reasonable" (εὐλόγως, 61.1) that Athena is sent to Telemachus by Zeus. To prove his point, he sees in Athena not the goddess but "the developing rationality (λογισμός) in Telemachus" (61.3). The terminology is anything but consistent: in the following paragraphs, Heraclitus uses several words to describe the reason that develops in Telemachus: λογισμός (61.2, 61.3, 62.3, 63.2), νοῦς (62.1), φρόνησις (62.2, 62.6, 63.5). But this does not make the principle that underlies Telemachus' development less distinct.

What makes Heraclitus' account so interesting is that Athena is not a universal φρόνησις, rationality, or reason, but that of an individual, Telemachus, and that, at the same time, it is yet presented as another person who exerts an influence on him, or rather, teaches him: "So what did reason (νοῦς), when it ar-

⁴³ "in a didactic manner": διδασκαλικῶς ἐπιλέγει πάλιν περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπιστρέφου, φρόντιζε.

⁴³ Text and translation of D. A. Russell and D. Konstan: *Heraclitus: Homeric Problems* (Atlanta 2005).

⁴⁴ As also indicated by the subtitle (whether genuine or not) εἰς ἃ περὶ θεῶν Ὅμηρος ἠλληγόρησεν.

rived, teach Telemachus—reason, not a goddess sitting down beside him and giving him her advice as he plays at dice?” (62.1). As Russell and Konstan point out, in the *Odyssey* it is the suitors who play dice, not Telemachus.⁴⁵ I think that this is not a lapse of memory but that Heraclitus deliberately distorts the Homeric account and fleshes out the notion of Homeric νήπιος by portraying Telemachus as the prototype of the idle young noble who wastes his time in folly.⁴⁶ This is also indicated by his description of how Telemachus conceived the idea to get a ship ready and search for Odysseus: “The first pious and just thought to emerge from the deep folly (ἀφροσύνη) of Telemachus’ youth is that it is unworthy of him to spend time idly in Ithaca with no thought of his father” (62.3), clearly implying that Telemachus was little concerned with his father’s fate until Athena’s arrival. This is yet another misrepresentation: in the *Odyssey*, one of the first things Telemachus tells Mentès/Athena is a rather mournful imagining of his dead father’s rotting bones (1.161–168). But in Heraclitus’ view, it is about time that someone talk some sense into Telemachus: “His reason (λογισμός), you see, behaved as a tutor or father and aroused in him a readiness to undertake responsibility” (63.2).

But as “external” as this reason may seem, Heraclitus uses the same words also for the *result* of this awakening reason. This lack of distinction is especially obvious in 63.1–2: here, the admonishing words spoken by Mentès/Athena follow a depiction of Telemachus as giving himself a tap on the shoulder; as Russell and Konstan observe, this identification works only if we are to picture Telemachus’ reason reproaching himself.⁴⁷ However unsystematic this may seem to us, the underlying principle is that of interpreting a divinity as a personal faculty,

⁴⁵ *Heraclitus* p.101 n.1 (*Od.* 1.106–107).

⁴⁶ One is reminded of the young good-for-nothing Kottalos in Herodas’ *Mimiamb* 3.19–21, about whom his mother complains that he is playing dice rather than going to school and learning to read and write.

⁴⁷ *Heraclitus* p.101 n.5. Cf. 63.8, where Athena meets Telemachus on the ship resembling “Mentor, a man who brings intelligence, the mother of wisdom, to bear on his anxieties (πρὸς φροντίδας τὴν διάνοιαν ἔχοντι, μητέρα φρονήσεως)”; 63.2: Reason exhorts Telemachus “to show the same good sense (φρόνησις)” as Orestes.

an interpretation that foreshadows the modern view of the Homeric gods as externalized psychological processes.⁴⁸

Much of this is reflected in the scholia, even though they take a more positive view of Telemachus' character. In one instance, the scholia too see Telemachus as a typical young noble: in his appearance at the assembly in *Od.* 2, where he is accompanied by his dogs and looks like a hunter.⁴⁹ But this is a far cry from the idler as Heraclitus characterizes him. Heraclitus' view of Athena/Mentes/Reason acting like a father also has only one parallel in the scholia, and this is already suggested by the Homeric text itself. At *Od.* 1.308 Telemachus remarks that "Mentes" speaks to him "as a father to his son," and the scholion on this line points out that "in her [Athena's] imitation of the father's guest-friend, she uses castigation" (as though this were something to be expected from a "fatherly" friend) and that Telemachus takes this quite well.⁵⁰

There is, then, a difference in the views that Heraclitus and the (extant) scholia hold of Telemachus' character: the idle young aristocrat as opposed to the thoughtful one who is easily roused to an ambition befitting his status. Accordingly, Heraclitus does not mention the suitors as a backdrop against which Telemachus' character shines more positively, which is exactly what one scholion does: Telemachus is the first to behold the arriving Athena "because he alone is more intelligent (φρονιμώτερος) than the others, with the suitors being occupied with the drinking-party, according to allegory."⁵¹ One can only

⁴⁸ For a critical discussion of such views see A. Schmitt, *Selbständigkeit und Abhängigkeit menschlichen Handelns bei Homer* (AbhMainz 1990.5), esp. 72–76 on Athena's interaction with Telemachus (focusing especially on *Od.* 15).

⁴⁹ Schol. DEHM^aO *Od.* 2.10c. A contrasting interpretation, perhaps more in agreement with Heraclitus, is given by schol. M^a and H *Od.* 2.11g1 and g2: the dogs are an allegory of Telemachus' shamelessness or boldness.

⁵⁰ μιμουμένη γὰρ πατρικὸν ξένον ἐπιτιμήσει ἐχρήσατο. ὁ δὲ συνετῶς οὐκ ἐδυσχέρανεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ χάριν ὁμολογεῖ (schol. DEHM^aOT *Od.* 1.308a).

⁵¹ καλῶς πρῶτος Τηλέμαχος Ἀθηνᾶν ἐφορᾷ ὡς αὐτὸς μόνος ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων φρονιμώτερος, τῶν μνηστήρων περὶ συμπόσια ἀσχολουμένων DEJ, κατὰ τὸ ἀλληγορικόν DJ (schol. *Od.* 1.113c). There is an alternative explanation (schol. M^a *Od.* 1.113a): Telemachus saw Athena first because he was constantly looking at the door in the hope that he might see his father.

guess what this allegory is supposed to be; perhaps it is indeed Telemachus' own φρόνησις. Precisely this more positive view of Telemachus as being φρονημώτερος gives the clue here: the one who is intelligent more easily recognizes (the goddess of) intelligence. And this is where the scholia and Heraclitus meet, in spite of differences in detail.

Athena, φρόνησις, and Telemachus

The meeting-point is the identification of Athena with φρόνησις, (practical) intelligence. This identification, or allegory—whichever one wishes to call it—was pervasive throughout antiquity and beyond, from Democritus to Tzetzes. Its long tradition originates with the mythological account of Athena's birth from Zeus' head, and with Metis, “Shrewdness,” her mother as in Hesiod's *Theogony*.⁵² Plato mentions an interpretation according to which Homer “has presented intellect and thought (νοῦν τε καὶ διάνοιαν) as Athena,” backed up by the etymology of her epithet Theonoe (*Cra.* 407B). Another epithet of the goddess, Τριτογένεια, is interpreted by Democritus as referring to her as φρόνησις, since three things derive from φρόνησις/φρονεῖν: “to think well, to speak flawlessly, and to do what is necessary.”⁵³

⁵² Hes. *Th.* 886–900, 924–929; fr. dub. 343 Merkelbach-West.

⁵³ Τριτογένεια ἢ Ἀθηνᾶ κατὰ Δημόκριτον φρόνησις νομίζεται. γίνεται δὲ ἐκ τοῦ φρονεῖν τρία ταῦτα· βουλευέσθαι καλῶς, λέγειν ἀναμαρτητῶς καὶ πράττειν ἅ δει. There are multiple versions of this fragment (68 B 2 D.-K.), varying not in regarding Athena Tritogeneia as φρόνησις, but in the exact phrasing of the three things derived from it. Cf. schol. bT *Il.* 8.39a *ex.* (with Erbse's remarks in the apparatus), which discusses the epithet in the context of Athena's birth. For other interpretations of Τριτογένεια see schol. E *Od.* 3.378 (referring to the three parts of the soul), and Cornutus (see below). According to Athenaeus, Sophocles made a similar identification (fr.361 *TrGF*). Schol. A *Il.* 20.67 (from Porphyry; 8.2 D.-K.) gives examples of allegorical interpretations of individual gods, among them Athena = φρόνησις, and remarks that “this manner of defence, being very ancient and originating with Theagenes of Rhegium, who first wrote about Homer, is such as is based on the diction” (οὗτος μὲν οὖν <ὁ> τρόπος ἀπολογίας ἀρχαῖος ὢν πάνυ καὶ ἀπὸ Θεαγένους τοῦ Ῥηγίνου, ὃς πρῶτος ἔγραψε περὶ Ὁμήρου, τοιοῦτός ἐστιν ἀπὸ τῆς λέξεως). But this does not necessarily mean that Theagenes made exactly these identifications. F. Buffière, *Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque* (Paris 1956) 288, points out the significance of

Athena, without epithet, is equated with φρόνησις specifically by Theophrastus, who also equates Zeus with νοῦς.⁵⁴ Unfortunately, this fragment does not allow for conclusions as to the further implications this equation had, e.g., in literary criticism.

Among the Stoics, Diogenes of Babylon wrote a treatise entirely on Athena, in which he defends the position of his teacher, Chrysippus, that Athena = φρόνησις was actually born from Zeus' chest, not head, because that is where the "ruling element of the soul" (ἡγεμονικόν) is located;⁵⁵ Diogenes tries to reconcile this with the myth of Athena's birth from Zeus' head by pointing out that the mouth issued the voice so that people thought that φρόνησις was located in the head.⁵⁶ In his *Compendium of the Tradition of Greek Theology*, Cornutus reports the same identification in a similar vein, where Athena as φρόνησις καὶ ἀγχίνοια is contrasted with the "craftsman" Hephaestus.⁵⁷

Undeniably, the Stoics were fond of identifying Athena with φρόνησις. This is not surprising, considering that it was an im-

epithets in ancient allegorical interpretations of Athena. Perhaps Strabo's expression ἡ ἠπτορικὴ φρόνησις τοῦ λόγου (1.2.5) is a late echo of Democritus.

⁵⁴ ἐν δὲ / [...] [...]τιο[.]ο[.]ιαις / [τ]ὸ τὴν μὲν Ἀθηνᾶν / [φ]ρόνησιν εἶναι, τὸν / [Δ]ία δὲ νοῦν. ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ἐγκωμίοις / τῶν θεῶν πᾶμ/πολλὰ ὅσα καὶ μ[.] (Theophrastus fr.581 Fortenbaugh = Philodemus, *De pietate* 7c, *P.Herc.* 1428 fr.23.3–9; cf. A. Henrichs, *GRBS* 13 [1972] 67–98, at 94–97).

⁵⁵ *SVF* III Diogenes 33 (partly also *SVF* II Chrysippus 910) = Philodemus *De pietate*, *P.Herc.* 1428 cols. 8.14–10.8. Text with translation in D. Obbink, *Philodemus: On Piety* I (Oxford 1996) 19–20.

⁵⁶ See also *SVF* II Chrysippus 908; 909 = Galen *De Hipp. et Plat. plac.* 3.8. Text and translation in P. De Lacy, *Galen: On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato* I (Berlin 1978) 222–226.

⁵⁷ *Theol. Graec.* 19. In 20 she is equated with "the intelligence of Zeus" (ἡ δὲ Ἀθηνᾶ ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ Διὸς σύνεσις), and her birth is also discussed with regard to the seat of the "ruling element and the essence of intelligence" (ὄπου τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ καὶ τῆς φρονήσεως οὐσία). Cornutus goes on to discuss the etymology of her name (Ἀθηνᾶ as derived from ἀθρέω, *observe*), and her epithets, among which he mentions an interpretation of Τριτογένεια as "fear-inducing" (derived from τρέω); see also schol. *E. Od.* 3.378.

portant concept in their philosophy,⁵⁸ and that it was almost as important to back up their notion of the term by references to poets such as Homer and Hesiod. But the equation was by no means exclusive to Stoic thought. In the *Orphic Hymn* to Athena (32.9), the goddess is addressed as “frenzy-inspiring to the bad, intelligence to the good,” φίλοιστρε κακοῖς, ἀγαθοῖς δὲ φρόνησις. Both Middle Platonists and Neoplatonists draw on this tradition, too. Arguably the most famous equation of Athena with φρόνησις is in Porphyry’s *On the Cave of the Nymphs*, an interpretation of the cave near which the Phaeacians leave Odysseus after taking him to Ithaca (*Od.* 13.102–112). Porphyry interprets the olive-tree that is said to stand at the head of the harbor and next to the cave (102–103) as a symbol of a god’s wisdom, for “it is the plant of Athena, and Athena is φρόνησις.”⁵⁹ He goes on to argue that Athena’s birth from Zeus’ head is reflected in Homer’s positioning the olive-tree at the “head” of the harbor, which in turn signifies that the universe is the work not of “irrational chance” but “the product of intellectual nature and wisdom.” Thus, “the world is governed by intellectual nature, being guided by an eternal and ever-flourishing intelligence (φρόνησις).” In the concluding part of the essay, Porphyry also praises Homer himself for his “φρόνησις and exactitude in every virtue” (36).

As tempting as it may be to assume Neoplatonic traits in identifications of Athena with φρόνησις in the scholia, it seems better not to do so. It is true that Schrader attributes the two scholia that are central to Athena’s interaction with Telemachus (schol. DEJM^aO *Od.* 1.93b and schol. DH(O) *Od.* 1.284a) to Porphyry, and Pontani in his recent edition of the scholia accepts this attribution.⁶⁰ But not everyone shares their con-

⁵⁸ Cf. *SVF* III Chrysippus 103 = Stob. *Ecl.* 2.7.5c; *SVF* I Apollophanes 406 = Diog. Laert. 7.92, ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ἀπολλοφάνης μίαν λέγει (sc. ἀρετήν), τὴν φρόνησιν.

⁵⁹ *De antro* 32, σύμβολον φρονήσεως θεοῦ ἡ ἐλαία. Ἀθηνᾶς μὲν γὰρ τὸ φυτόν, φρόνησις δὲ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ. Cf. Apuleius’ important reading of Athena as “prudence” that accompanies Odysseus (*De deo Soc.* 24): *nec aliud te in eodem Ulixē Homerus docet, qui semper ei comitem voluit esse prudentiam: quam poetica ritu Minervam nuncupavit.*

⁶⁰ In fact, H. Schrader, *Porphyrii quaestionum Homericarum ad Odysseam per-*

fidence; Erbse in particular has pointed out the potential subjectivity of such attributions.⁶¹

Even though there are numerous scholia on the *Odyssey*, and quite a few on the *Iliad*, in which Athena is identified with φρόνησις, I shall concentrate on those that concern Telemachus, but, at the same time, try to position them in a wider context.⁶² The reason for this lies in the hypothesis suggested at the beginning of this paper: that the scholiasts' interpretation of Athena's influence on Telemachus as educational is part of an apologetic argument. To give a brief recapitulation: Athena's advice to Telemachus was criticised as "preposterous" and even entailing multiple kinds of dangers, and both schol. DEJM^aO *Od.* 1.93b and schol. DH *Od.* 1.284a respond to this criticism by arguing that Athena sends out Telemachus for his education. This "education" is then fleshed out by drawing both on the common-places of traditional Greek education and on some prominent traits of Odysseus. Heraclitus, quite to the contrary, it seems, gives a detailed account of this "education" by allegorising Athena as Telemachus' awakening reason. In doing so, he combines the idea of Telemachus' education and the identification of Athena with φρόνησις and related concepts. In the scholia, these two aspects are transmitted as two different strands of interpretation.

tinentium reliquiae (Leipzig 1890), regards schol. *Od.* 1.93b as belonging with schol. 1.284a and consequently prints it as part of Porphyry on *Od.* 1.284.

⁶¹ H. Erbse, *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien* (*Zetemata* 24 [1960]) 17–77, pertaining mainly to the *Quaestiones* on the *Iliad*, but see 29 n.3 on Schrader's attribution of schol. DH(O) *Od.* 1.284a to Porphyry. I shall, however, point out what I feel to be echoes or similarities.

⁶² For a list of such scholia as well as relevant observations of Eustathius and other allegorical readings, see M. van der Valk, "Ἀθηναίη, Ἀθήνη," *LfggrE* I 207–221, at 209–211. A comprehensive corpus of allegorical identifications of Athena is provided by G. Jöhrens, *Der Athenahymnus des Ailios Aristides* (Bonn 1981) 393–407 for "ethical allegories," 414–430 for "personal *phronesis*." On Plato's interpretations of Athena and their *Nachleben*, see H. Schwabl, "Athena bei Platon und in allegorischer Tradition," in H.-C. Günther and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Beiträge zur antiken Philosophie. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann* (Stuttgart 1997) 35–50. Buffière, *Les mythes* 279–289, discusses ancient interpretations of Athena as goddess of intelligence in the Homeric poems.

Neither schol. *Od.* DEJM^aO 1.93b nor schol. DH(O) *Od.* 1.284a identifies Athena with φρόνησις. But they belong to a group of scholia that is characterized by an interest in a certain type of interpretation that often includes the identification of Athena with φρόνησις. This corpus, which Pontani calls the “famiglia orientale” or *ramus Constantinopolitanus*,⁶³ consists of the MSS. D, E, X, s, and C; the more recent MSS. J, W, and e are descendants of this family. Pontani characterizes this group as having a particular interest in ethical matters and allegorical readings, including a view of Odysseus as a wise and temperate philosopher; many interpretations of Porphyry, Heraclitus, Ps.-Plutarch, Hermogenes, and Tzetzes are incorporated.⁶⁴ Tzetzes’ contribution is based on his *Allegories on the Odyssey*, on which more will be said below.

The interest of this group in ethical matters and its tendency towards allegorical readings is also clear in those manuscripts that discuss Athena’s interaction with Telemachus. Of course, not all manuscripts of this group are represented in each of the explanations, but enough do to imply a specific interest in, and a particular view of, these two characters.⁶⁵ This is especially indicated by a particular phrase that occurs only in this group: “<XY> hints at nothing other than that ...” (οὐκ ἄλλο αἰνίττεται ἢ ὅτι). It occurs five times in the scholia on the *Odyssey* (never in the scholia on the *Iliad*); in four instances it refers to Athena as φρόνησις, while one instance is completely different.⁶⁶ Of those cases in which it refers to Athena, three

⁶³ F. Pontani, *Sguardi su Ulisse. La tradizione esegetica greca all’ Odissea* (Rome 2005), e.g. 277; also in his edition, *Scholia* xii.

⁶⁴ Pontani, *Sguardi* 273–274.

⁶⁵ To give a brief overview of the various MSS. and traditions: schol. *Od.* 1.93b is transmitted by DEJM^aO; schol. *Od.* 1.284a by DH; 284b2 by E; 284d by DE. From different branches are 284b1 (HTVY); 284c (HM^aO).

⁶⁶ It is schol. E *Od.* 4.188, explaining the Homeric “Antilochus, whom the shining son of bright Eos had killed” (*Od.* 4.187–188): “this means that Antilochos was killed by Memnon. It hints at nothing other than that he died young and before his time” (τούτο λέγει, τὸν Ἀντίλοχον φονευθῆναι ὑπὸ Μέμνονος. οὐκ ἄλλο αἰνίττεται ἢ ὅτι νέος καὶ παρὰ τὸν καιρὸν τὸν δέοντα ἐτελεύτησε). In this instance, it becomes quite obvious that αἰνίτ-

pertain to her interaction with Telemachus.

The first of these is that of *hypothesis* c *Od.* 1, given only by codex D and, from a different branch, H³. It begins with a summary similar to that of *hypotheses* a and b, stating that the gods wished to bring Odysseus home to Ithaca and that Athena went to Telemachus and advised him to travel to Nestor and Menelaus. It then continues:

τοῦτο δὲ τὸ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν εἰς Ἰθάκην παραγενέσθαι διὰ τὸ ὀτρύνειν τὸν Τηλέμαχον ἀναζητῆσαι τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα, οὐκ ἄλλο αἰνίττεται ἢ ὅτι Ἀθηνᾶ λέγεται ἢ φρόνησις, παῖς δὲ ὢν ὁ Τηλέμαχος, εἶτα ἀνατραφεὶς καὶ εἰς γνῶσιν ἐλθὼν διηγέσθαι διὰ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, ἥτοι διὰ τῆς οἰκείας φρονήσεως, ἀναζητῆσαι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ. DH³

The fact that Athena goes to Ithaca for the sake of exhorting Telemachus to go in search of his father hints at nothing other than that "Athena" means *phronesis*, and as Telemachus is a youth, then having grown up and come to his senses, he has been stirred up by Athena, that is, by his own *phronesis*, to go in search of his father.

The first few sentences of Heraclitus' account of Telemachus' development are then added to the actual *hypothesis*,⁶⁷ almost as if Heraclitus were quoted in support. But it goes beyond Heraclitus in emphasizing that it is "by his *own phronesis*" (οἰκείας φρονήσεως). Heraclitus does speak of Athena's appearance as a representation of "the rationality developing in Telemachus" (61.3); but for lack of distinction between Telemachus and his reason, the underlying notion is still that of, to some degree, external influence, like that of a tutor or father (63.2). Interpreting Athena as a psychological faculty within an individual is yet another step to take.

The second instance in which Athena is interpreted as Telemachus' own φρόνησις is schol. DEJ *Od.* 1.96, commenting on Athena's departure for Ithaca (*Od.* 1.96–101):

τεσθαι does not simply mean "to allegorise," as is sometimes assumed, but generally "to hint at," which of course can include allegorisation.

⁶⁷ *Homeric Questions* 60.2–61.4. Ludwich prints it preceding the *hypothesis* in question; as becomes clear from Pontani's apparatus criticus (he does not print the quotation), the quotation followed *hyp.* c.

τὸ λέγειν τὴν Ἀθηναίαν καλὰ πέδιλα φορεῖν οὐκ ἄλλο δηλοῖ ἢ ὅτι τῆς φρονήσεως αἱ ἐνεργητικαὶ δυνάμεις στιβαραὶ καὶ ἄλκιμοι λίαν εἰσὶ. τὸ δὲ ἐπέχειν ἔγχος ἐν ᾧ τινι δαμάζει τοὺς ἥρωας τὸ πληκτικὸν ὑποσημαίνει τῆς φρονήσεως· ὁ γὰρ φρόνιμος διὰ τοῦ οἰκείου λόγου πλήττει τὸν ἀτακτοῦντα. τὸ δὲ τὴν Ἀθηναίαν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατελθεῖν οὐκ ἄλλο αἰνίττεται ἢ ὅτι ἡ φρόνησις ἐκ τοῦ νοῦς κατέρχεται.

To say that Athena wears beautiful sandals indicates nothing other than that the energetic forces are very sturdy and strong. The fact that she holds a spear with which she subdues the heroes intimates the striking quality of *phronesis*. For the intelligent man (*phronimos*) strikes the one that lacks discipline through his own reasoning. The fact that Athena comes down from heaven hints at nothing other than that *phronesis* comes from the *nous*.

Hardly any opportunity to interpret each aspect of this passage as indicating the identification of Athena with φρόνησις is left out in this scholion. Athena coming down from heaven is interpreted in almost the same way in schol. D *Il.* 1.195 (on which more will be said below). The spear as representing the capacities of φρόνησις has a parallel in another scholion that explains it as λόγος.⁶⁸ The sandals, however, are indeed puzzling.⁶⁹ But they were probably the best one could come up

⁶⁸ ἤγουν τὸν λόγον (schol. M^a *Od.* 1.99e). The spear as part of Athena's weaponry is also discussed by Proclus, reporting the allegorical interpretations of Porphyry and Iamblichus (*In Ti.* I 156.12–157.23 Diehl).

⁶⁹ Cf. van der Valk, *LfggrE* I 211: “eigenartig die Bedeutung von Athenes Sandalen als Attribut der φρόνησις.” He refers to Eustathius (*In Od.* p. 1395.5 ff.), who among other things interprets the sandals and other attributes as indicating the swiftness of φρόνησις. See also Buffière *Les mythes* 288. The only other interpretation of the sandals in conjunction with φρόνησις is in Tzetzes' *Allegories on the Odyssey*; but it differs considerably. As part of the “pragmatic” interpretation (i.e., in the tradition of Euhemerus or Palaephatus, interpreting gods and heroes as human beings of elevated status; see H. Hunger: “Allegorische Mythendeutung in der Antike und bei Johannes Tzetzes,” *JÖBG* 3 [1954] 35–54, at 47), Athena represents the letter sent to Telemachus by Mentis, not as part of a “psychological” allegorical reading. Tzetzes calls the composition of the letter “sandal of *phronesis*,” seeing the spear as the letter's exhortative force, and Athena's epithet *obrimopatre* as denoting *phronesis* as being the “daughter” of *nous*: τὴν δὲ συνθήκην τῆς γραφῆς πέδιλα ταύτης λέγει / ἀμβρόσια καὶ χρύσεια, φέροντα

with if one wanted to superimpose the notion of φρόνησις on all possible aspects of this passage.⁷⁰

The phrase “hints at nothing other than that” is used a third time in an interpretation of Athena’s advice to get rid of the suitors in a manner very similar to the *hypothesis* just quoted:

τὸ τὴν Ἀθηναίαν παροτρύνειν τὸν Τηλέμαχον εἰς ἀποσόβησιν τῶν μνηστήρων οὐκ ἄλλο αἰνίττεται ἢ ὅτι Ἀθηναίη λέγεται ἡ φρόνησις, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς οἰκειᾶς φρονήσεως ὁ Τηλέμαχος παρωτρύνθη τοὺς μνηστήρας ἀποσοβῆσαι (schol. DEJs *Od.* 1.270a).

The fact that Athena exhorts Telemachus to scare away the suitors hints at nothing other than that “Athena” means *phronesis*, and Telemachus is exhorted by his own *phronesis* to scare away the suitors.

As in *hypothesis* c, Athena’s influence is interpreted as Telemachus’ *own* psychological faculty.

One might think that this association of Telemachus with Athena = φρόνησις is closely related to those instances in which the scholia speak of Odysseus’ “own *phronesis*” with regard to Athena’s interaction with him. There are several cases in which this interpretation occurs. When in the *Odyssey*, after receiving directions from Nausicaa, he “is stirred to go towards the town” and Athena pours mist around him, the scholion explains: “i.e., his own *phronesis* advised him to go by night.”⁷¹ Arriving at the palace of Alcinous, Odysseus is still clouded in

πάντα ταύτην. / ἡ δὲ γραφή φρονήσεως πέδιλόν ἐστιν ὄντως. / τὴν δὲ γε παροτρύνουσαν δύναμιν τῶν γραμμάτων / ἔγχος χαλκοῦν ὠνόμασε δαμάζον ἐναντίους. / δύναται γὰρ ἀμύνασθαι, ὅς πρῶτος χαλεπήνη, / ὀβριμοπάτρη φρόνησις οὐσα νοὸς θυγάτηρ. / καὶ τί γὰρ ἰσχυρότερον νοὸς ἐστὶν ἀνθρώποις; (*All.Od.* 1.216–223, followed by an elaboration of the last point). The text of Tzetzes has been edited by H. Hunger, “Johannes Tzetzes, Allegorien zur Odyssee, Buch 13–24,” *BZ* 48 (1955) 4–48, and “Johannes Tzetzes, Allegorien zur Odyssee, Buch 1–12,” *BZ* 49 (1956) 249–310.

⁷⁰ It is perhaps significant in this respect that Tzetzes draws attention to exactly this, writing that Homer “calls not only Athena *phronesis*, and everything that happens to her either as writing or as action, but also her instruments, as in countless others”: οὐ μόνον δὲ τὴν φρόνησιν Ἀθήνην ὀνομάζει, / καὶ ὅσα γίνεται αὐτῇ γραφαῖς εἴτε καὶ πράξει, / ἀλλὰ καὶ ὄργανα αὐτῆς, ὡς κἂν μυριοῖς ἄλλοις (1.230–232).

⁷¹ ἦτοι ἡ οἰκεία φρόνησις ὑπέθετο αὐτῷ κατὰ νύκτα ἰέναι (schol. E *Od.* 7.14).

mist by Athena, who is simply explained as “his *phronesis*,” with slightly less emphasis than expressed by the phrase “his *own phronesis*.”⁷² When Demodocus sings of the Wooden Horse that Odysseus was victorious “on account of great-hearted Athena,” the scholia explain: “i.e., on account of his own *phronesis* and resourcefulness.”⁷³ Clearly, since Odysseus is regarded as the prototype of intellectual faculties anyway, the identification of Athena with φρόνησις reinforces this characteristic.

But there are two major differences from the instances involving Telemachus which indicate that the association of Odysseus with Athena = φρόνησις has, at best, only partly influenced such interpretations of Athena’s dealings with Telemachus. The first difference is that two of the identifications Athena = φρόνησις are in another group of manuscripts; the second, and probably more significant, difference is that the phrase “hints at nothing other than that” is absent. This makes it difficult to see a close connection made in the DEJ group (or its source) between father and son as guided by Athena = φρόνησις. In other words: the principle behind an interpretation of Athena as φρόνησις is not that of “like father, like son.” The identification is not used as re-enforcement of qualities for which Telemachus already has a reputation, as in the case of Odysseus. The focus is on Athena, not Telemachus.

Defending Athena = φρόνησις

This focus on Athena becomes especially clear from the fourth instance of “hints at nothing other than that.” It is said not with regard to Odysseus but to a character with a much weaker relation to Telemachus than Odysseus: Phemius. The scholion interprets Athena’s command to sing of the homecomings of the Achaeans:

φησὶν ὅτι ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ προσέταξε τῷ Φημίῳ ἵνα τὸν ἐκ Τροίας νόστον τῶν Ἀχαιῶν εἰς οἰκείαν ἀοιδίην ἔχη. οὐκ ἄλλο δὲ τοῦτο αἰνίττεται ἢ ὅτι Ἀθηνᾶ λέγεται ἡ φρόνησις, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς οἰκείας φρονήσεως συνήκεν ὁ Φήμιος τὸ ἀεΐδειν τὸν νόστον τῶν Ἀχαιῶν. ἀποροῦσι δὲ τινες λέγοντες· διὰ τί ὁ Φήμιος τοῦτο ποιεῖ,

⁷² ἡ φρόνησις αὐτοῦ (schol. P *Od.* 7.140).

⁷³ ἦτοι διὰ τὴν οἰκείαν φρόνησιν καὶ πανουργίαν (schol. Q *Od.* 8.519 and schol. P *Od.* 8.520).

καὶ ταῦτα τῆς Πηνελόπης ἐπὶ τῇ τοιαύτῃ ᾠδῇ δακνομένης; καὶ φαμέν ὅτι οἰκονομικῶς ὁ Φήμιος τοῦτο ποιεῖ, ἵνα τῆς τοιαύτης ἀοιδῆς τοῦ Φημίου ἢ Πηνελόπῃ ἀκροωμένη τοῦ οἰκείου ἀνδρὸς μνημονεύῃ καὶ ἀποσοβῇ τοὺς μνηστήρας (schol. *DE Od.* 1.327j).

He [Homer] says that Athena ordered Phemius to put the homecoming of the Achaeans from Troy into his own song. This hints at nothing other than that "Athena" is *phronesis*, and Phemius understood by his own *phronesis* to sing of the homecoming of the Achaeans. Some raise the following problem: why does Phemius do that, especially as Penelope is deeply distraught by such a song? Our answer is that Phemius does this with a view to the plot, in order that Penelope, while listening to such a song from Phemius, be mindful of her own husband and scare away the suitors.

Here, as in two other instances where οὐκ ἄλλο αἰνίττεται ἢ ὅτι is used, Athena is first established as φρόνησις, and then, in another step, this φρόνησις is established as the character's own φρόνησις that guides his actions.⁷⁴ There is reason to believe that this is a principle of interpretation applied to the Homeric text. This two-step principle is another indication of the DEJ group's specific interest in Athena = φρόνησις in addition to the mere phraseology, especially as the identical phrase or very similar ones seem to have been commentary-jargon.⁷⁵ But even though the phrase is not unique in Greek scholarship, it is striking that it occurs in the scholia on the *Odyssey*, not the *Iliad*, that it is used by a particular group of scholia, that four out of five instances pertain to Athena = φρόνησις, and that three of these involve Telemachus.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ The other two instances are *hyp. c Od.* 1 and schol. DEJs *Od.* 1.270.

⁷⁵ A TLG search shows that it is used especially frequently in ancient commentaries on the Bible, first and foremost by John Chrysostom. But even though it does not seem to appear in scholia on pagan authors other than those on the *Odyssey*, it is not necessarily a phrase restricted to Christian commentators. Maximus of Tyre once asks τί γὰρ δὴ ἄλλο αἰνίττεται ἢ (*Diss.* 5.1); a similar phrase is μήποτε οὐν ἔοικέν τι Ὅμηρος αἰνίττεσθαι ἄλλο κρείττον ἢ (*Diss.* 22.2).

⁷⁶ The Phemius scholion and schol. DEJs *Od.* 1.270a are also linked through the notion of "scaring away" (ἀποσοβεῖν) the suitors. In schol. *Od.* 1.270a, this is seen as part of Athena's exhortation and thus represents what Telemachus' own φρόνησις tells him to do. In the note concerning Phem-

The scholion about Phemius combines two types of explanation, one within the logic of the plot and one that pertains to literary technique.⁷⁷ The latter addresses the problem why Phemius does something that causes Penelope such anguish, and seeks the answer in the “greater good” of the development of the plot. It seems that the two explanations were unrelated and joined together in the process of commenting on the passage. Exactly this is interesting, however, and sets this scholion a little apart from the other three of the group. By itself, the identification of Athena with φρόνησις is not apologetic or “defensive,” just as it is not in the case of the other scholia of that group. But it seems that whoever combined the two explanations felt that perceiving Athena as φρόνησις did not solve the problem why Phemius did such a hurtful thing but perhaps even made the problem more acute. For the obvious question is: if Athena is φρόνησις, how could she (or it) cause such a harmful action?

A problem very similar to this is seen in ancient discussions of the Pandarus episode in *Iliad* 4. Pandarus violates the oaths taken by the Achaeans and the Trojans by shooting an arrow at Menelaus. The difficulty of this passage is that Athena in disguise, dispatched by Zeus, induced him to do so. One scholion

⁷⁷ ius, it is seen as part of the purpose of his song. The word is used for scaring away birds (LSJ s.v.).

⁷⁷ Another possibility is that the second explanation is text-internal also, using the idea of an educative role of the bard, as in the case of the bard left behind by Agamemnon to monitor Clytaemestra in his absence (*Od.* 3.267–272, with schol. EM *Od.* 3.267 commenting on the bard’s function). It is conceivable that Penelope, although she never gives any reason to be thought unfaithful, is seen as being in need of such a monitor; cf. the (rather far-fetched) view of Timolaus (a pupil of Anaximenes) that the brother of the bard in Agamemnon’s service was Phemius, who followed Penelope to Ithaca to “guard her, therefore sang for the suitors only against his will” (Τιμόλαος δὲ ἀδελφὸν αὐτὸν φησιν εἶναι Φημίου, ὃν ἀκολουθήσαι εἰς Ἰθάκην πρὸς παραφυλακὴν αὐτῆς· διὸ καὶ βίᾳ τοῖς μνηστήρσιν ἄδει, schol. EHMQR *Od.* 3.267). On the other hand, οικονομικῶς is a term referring to the arrangement of the plot (see Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic* ch. 1), which rather suggests that the commentator seeks the solution in Homer’s narrative technique.

reports the following view:⁷⁸

οὐκ ἀσεβεί δέ, φασίν, ὁ Πάνδαρος, εἰ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ συνεβούλευσεν καὶ ὁ Ζεὺς ἀπέσταλκεν. ῥητέον οὖν ὅτι ὁ μὲν Ζεὺς εἰδὼς τοὺς ὄρκους κακῶς γεγενημένους (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἕτερον Τρῶες ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις ὤμοσαν), διὰ τοῦτο ἐσπούδασεν λυθῆναι τὰς ἀδίκους συνθήκας. Ἀθηνᾶν δὲ νῦν ὑποληπτέον τὸν λογισμόν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πανδάρου, καὶ ὅτι αὐτὸς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα ἐλογίζετο. ἄπιστοι γὰρ Λυκάονες, καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης μαρτυρεῖ (fr. 151 Rose). ἄλλοι δὲ καὶ αὐτοῖς τοῖς Ὁμήρου λύοντές φασιν προειρηκέναι τὸν ποιητὴν “πειρᾶν” (*Il.* 4.71), αἱ κε θέλησιν οὐχὶ πείθειν (schol. D [ZYQXAR] *Il.* 4.88).

Pandarus, they say, does not commit a sacrilege, if Athena gave him the advice and Zeus has sent [her]. One should respond that Zeus, knowing that the oaths had come into existence in a bad way (for the Trojans did nothing other than to swear by foreign terms), for this reason hastened to have the unjust treaties dissolved. One should understand Athena here as the reasoning (*logismos*) of Pandarus himself, and that he himself debated these things with himself. For the Lycaones are untrustworthy; Aristotle too testifies to that (fr. 151 Rose). Others, finding a solution even in Homer's [text itself], say that the poet has beforehand spoken of “to try” (*Il.* 4.71), whether he perhaps is not willing to obey.

The scholion rejects the idea that Pandarus is more or less “excused” for violating the oaths because he was induced by the gods to shoot at Menelaus. Athena is seen as the “reasoning” part of Pandarus, as she is the one to induce him to act foolishly. Exactly this alleged contradiction—the “reasoning” part causing a foolish action—is discussed by Proclus. He tries to show that just as the causes of surgery and cautery are not with the physicians but with the illnesses, so it is not the gods that are responsible for the violation of the oaths but the “dispositions of those who are acting” (αἱ ἕξεις τῶν ποιούντων).⁷⁹ Consequently, Athena is not an instigator but “tries” Pandarus;

⁷⁸ It has been included by H. Schrader in his edition (*Porphyrii Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquiae* I–II [Leipzig 1880–1882]), but without manuscript evidence. On Pandarus as “problem” see also Buffière, *Les mythes* 286.

⁷⁹ Procl. *In Rem Publ.* I 104.4–7 Kroll.

his own deficits, especially his foolishness (ἄνοια), are the decisive factor. As in the scholion, the responsibility is ascribed to Pandarus' own character, but this interpretation leads to the question that Proclus himself poses: "How could it not be astonishing if Athena is the cause not of *phronesis*, but of foolishness?"⁸⁰ The answer is that everything is moved by the gods in accordance with its suitability (ἐπιτηδειότης).⁸¹ Essentially, for the greater good of the punishment of the Trojans and in order to make them see their own baseness,⁸² the goddess of φρόνησις exercises her influence in the same category to which φρόνησις belongs, with foolishness being its counterpart.

The case of Pandarus thus raises the problem of how the goddess of φρόνησις can initiate an action that seems to be the opposite of her usual positive characteristic. The solution is found in the very domain of hers.⁸³ But the identification is not made with an apologetic or defensive intention. Rather it is itself being defended against anything that might endanger its validity. The identification itself remains positive.

Yet the positive identification can also be used in a wider defensive context. Concerning Athena's intervention during the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles in *Iliad* 1, schol. D

⁸⁰ καίτοι πῶς οὐ θαυμαστόν, εἰ Ἀθηνᾶ μὴ φρονήσεως αἰτία, ἀλλὰ ἀνοίας; (I 105.1–2).

⁸¹ I 105.9–10.

⁸² I 103.20 ff., cf. 102.19 ff. See also schol. bT *Il.* 4.66a *ex.* for the idea of punishment that the Trojans deserve.

⁸³ In my view, it can be argued that Proclus did not broach the notion of Athena = φρόνησις just in order to counterbalance a negative interpretation of Athena's actions. Not only is the identification pervasive in Neoplatonic philosophy, and especially Proclus himself (cf. *In Ti.* I 157.24–160.5); he has also presented a positive conception of Athena earlier in his *In Rem Publ.*, in a *syncretis* of Athena and Bendis, where he emphasizes Athena's role as "guide of souls and *choregos* of the *nous* and true *phronesis*, being powerful in the heavenly regions, perfecting from above all the sublunar world" (ἀναγωγὸς ψυχῶν καὶ νοῦ χορηγὸς καὶ φρονήσεως ἀληθοῦς καὶ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανίοις μειζόνως, ἄνωθεν δὲ τελειοῦσα πᾶσαν τὴν σεληναίαν διακόσμησιν, I 18.28–19.2). He is referring to the shine radiating from Diomedes' armour (*Il.* 5.4) and Athena's removing the darkness from his sight (5.127), interpreting it as indicating the "light-bearing" quality of Athena (I 18.21–25; taken up by Anonymus, *De incredibilibus* 20 [Festa, *Myth.Gr.* III.2 98]).

Il. 1.195 explains that Athena arrives from heaven in her capacity as *phronesis* (ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ παρεγένετο, φησίν, ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ φρόνησις), and that she pulls Achilles' hair because the head is the seat of the "reasoning part of the soul" (τὸ λογικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς μέρος), and connects this with the story of Metis as Athena's mother and her birth from Zeus' head. Here Athena = φρόνησις exerts a restraining and reasonable influence, as one would expect of her.⁸⁴ Heraclitus, however, uses it as part of his defence of Homer's representation of the gods (17–20). He sees the origin of Plato's division of the soul into the rational and the irrational parts as actually being "stolen" from this Homeric passage (17, νοσφισάμενος). He also conceives of Athena as an allegory of φρόνησις (19.7, 20.5) and other forms of reason and wisdom. In a lack of distinction similar to that in his interpretation of her influence on Telemachus, Athena is both the "wisdom in perfection" (τελέως φρόνησις, 20.1) and a "human reasoning" (λογισμὸς ἀνθρώπινος, 20.10) and thus not able to assuage Achilles' anger, only to act as a "mediator" and restrain him from exercising violence.⁸⁵ Still, as Russell points out, this does not create a "need for allegory as a defence of impropriety"; rather—whether or not Heraclitus was aware of it—"to show allegory in innocent contexts ... strengthens the case for seeing it where it is needed to counter the charge of impiety."⁸⁶ In this way, the positive

⁸⁴ The popularity of this interpretation emerges, e.g., from Max. Tyr. *Diss.* 4.8

⁸⁵ Contrast the much more "personal" approach in schol. *D Il.* 1.198: οἴω φαινομένη: μόνῳ αὐτῷ ὄρωμένη / μόνος γὰρ αὐτὸς τὸν οἰκεῖον δαίμονα καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ φρόνησιν ἐώρα (=Aⁱⁱ) ZYQ(X), "appearing to him alone: being seen only by him; for he himself alone was seeing his personal *daemon* and the *phronesis* contained in him." In a discussion of the various appearances of the Homeric gods, Proclus points out that Athena, undisguised, is visible only to Achilles, and contrasts this with her appearance disguised as Mentor and visible to all (*In Rem Publ.* I 113.28–114.6).

⁸⁶ D. A. Russell, "The Rhetoric of the *Homeric Problems*," in G. R. Boys-Stones (ed.), *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition. Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions* (Oxford 2003) 217–234, at 220. P. T. Struck, *Birth of the Symbol. Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts* (Princeton 2004) 14–16, expresses his doubts about the validity of a strict distinction between "positive" and "defensive" allegory (following J. Tate's opinion that the origins of

identification is in the service of a defence.

The identification of Athena with φρόνησις, being in itself positive, could, therefore, both solve and create problems. It is also clear that it is firmly established in the DEJ group as part of their view of Athena's interaction with Telemachus.⁸⁷ As to its origins, especially with regard to its ubiquity in the scholia on the *Odyssey*, one can only guess. The *Allegories* of Tzetzes show the same ubiquity, but it is difficult to decide whether his interpretations were used in the scholia or Tzetzes draws on older material that has been used in the scholia too.⁸⁸ Tzetzes not only applies *ad nauseam* the allegorical reading of Athena as φρόνησις.⁸⁹ he is also quite fond of the concept of "personal" φρόνησις, as part of his "psychological" interpretation. He uses

allegorical interpretation do not lie in attempts to defend poetry: "On the History of Allegorism," *CQ* 28 [1934] 105–114). But I think that in cases where the author makes clear what his intention is, one is allowed to speak of "positive" or "defensive" allegorical reading, where it is usually more obvious. The passage of Heraclitus is interesting in that respect, as the general intention is defensive, but a positive interpretation is used. Russell observes that the words with which Heraclitus concludes the passage ("The episode of Athena, whom Homer represents as the mediator in Achilles' anger against Agamemnon, may thus be seen to merit an allegorized interpretation," 20.12), betray some unease and need for justification.

⁸⁷ Another example is schol. E *Od.* 5.5 (on Athena raising again in the assembly of the gods the issue of Odysseus' return to Ithaca), which states that "the *phronesis* above is different from that of humans. For the one of humans often misses what is necessary, the one above, or that of providence, never does" (ἄλλη ἢ ἄνω φρόνησις καὶ ἄλλη ἢ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ἢ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πολλάκις ἀμαρτάνει τοῦ δέοντος, ἢ δὲ ἄνω ἦτοι τῆς προνοίας οὐδέποτε). Outside of this group, other attempts to find φρόνησις in all aspects of Athena are, e.g., schol. Q *Od.* 16.207 (her epithet ἀγελείη, "driver of spoil," is explained as "carrying off the booty," "for *phronesis* knows how to do this": τῆς ἀγούσης τὰς λείας ἦτοι τὰς λαφυραγωγίας. ἢ γὰρ φρόνησις τοιαῦτα δρᾶν οἶδε) or schol. M¹ *Od.* 1.365c (Athena throwing sleep on Penelope's eyes is glossed, as an alternative to physical allegory, as φρόνησις).

⁸⁸ See Pontani, *Sguardi* 168. One codex (Y) clearly takes much of its material from Tzetzes (Pontani 236), but as I focus on a different group of codices, this is not relevant for the matter discussed here.

⁸⁹ Even the editor of the *Allegories* acknowledges: "Diese Allegorie gehört zu den häufigsten, man muß schon sagen, abgedroschensten des Tzetzes," amounting to 10 times in the *All.II.* and 56 in the *All.Od.* (Hunger, *JÖBG* 3 [1954] 49).

the phrase *οικεία φρόνησις* or *φρόνησις* with the genitive of a person that occurs so often in the scholia on the *Odyssey*.⁹⁰ On the other hand, the general concept is considerably older, as can be gathered from Heraclitus, whom Tzetzes mentions among his predecessors.⁹¹ It is even more significant that the passages that are so prominent in the DEJ group do not have a parallel in Tzetzes; he does not identify Athena with *φρόνησις* with regard to her interaction with Telemachus, as the scholia do in *hyp.* c and schol. *Od.* 1.270a, nor, for that matter, with regard to Phemius as in schol. *Od.* 1.327j.⁹² Only schol. DEJ *Od.* 1.96 shows some proximity to Tzetzes in interpreting Athena's sandals in conjunction with *φρόνησις*. But in Tzetzes, Athena is already allegorized as the letter sent by Zeus/Mentes.

Conclusion

A consequence of the DEJ group's emphasis on the identification of Athena with *φρόνησις* is that it looms so large in its interpretation of the *Odyssey* that it even overshadows the characteristics of individual humans. Telemachus is such a case. Even in instances where there is no need to justify Athena's actions, the primary focus is on the goddess, not on Telemachus.⁹³ The identification does not serve to link Telemachus

⁹⁰ With genitive, e.g. *All.Od.* 2.80 ἡ Μέντου φρ., 6.24 ἡ φρ. ... τῆς Ναυσικάας, 8.14 Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη φρ. τανῦν τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως, 8.22 ἡ φρ. αὐτοῦ, 8.32 ἡ Ὀδυσσέως φρ. With *οικεία*, e.g. 7.59, 9.79, 10.84 (not about Athena). On the whole, he seems to use the *φρόνησις* + genitive formula more often than attributive *οικεία*.

⁹¹ The others being Demo, Cornutus, Palaephatos, and Psellus (*All.Od. proem.* 35–36).

⁹² In the latter instance, he uses a physical allegory instead (*All.Od.* 1.315). Most of the instances in which the scholia speak of Odysseus' own *φρόνησις* (which are in a different MSS. tradition) do have a parallel in Tzetzes (e.g. schol. P *Od.* 7.140, schol. Q *Od.* 8.519; schol. P *Od.* 8.520, but not schol. E *Od.* 7.14).

⁹³ Cf. Erbse's explanation that the complexity of the plot of the *Odyssey* necessitates the aid of the gods, and that the exceptional subject-matter determined also the character of Athena ("Die komplizierte Handlung erforderte die Mithilfe der Götter, und die Besonderheit des Stoffes bestimmte auch Athenes Charakter"): H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im homerischen Epos* (Berlin/New York 1986) 8. But this alone does not explain the tenacity with which Athena was interpreted as *φρόνησις*.

to his father, as sharing with him in the guidance of Athena = φρόνησις. This would indicate that the focus is on human characters. Instead, Telemachus is linked with Phemius, in the manuscript group containing the phrase “hints at nothing other than that Athena is φρόνησις.” But since nothing else links these two human characters, this can only mean that the focus is on the sole factor that is common to both: Athena as φρόνησις.

Yet the question remains where to position this positive identification with regard to the problem posed by Athena’s actions. Was it an existing notion of Athena as φρόνησις that created the problem of her giving advice that is ἄλογος in the first place? Or is the idea of Athena as φρόνησις used in order to solve the problem of a goddess as giving “unreasonable advice” by finding practical wisdom in it?

The evidence of the scholia on the *Odyssey* appears to be somewhat inconclusive. In schol. DEJM^aO *Od.* 1.93b and schol. DH(O) *Od.* 1.284a, the question of Athena’s unreasonable advice is raised independently from her identification with φρόνησις, and the same is true of the solutions that are discussed there. The line pursued in these passages—that of attributing a traditional education to Telemachus—differs in many aspects from the other line that explains Athena as φρόνησις. Where the one sees the journey as instrumental in acquiring traditional skills and reputation, the other emphasizes concrete actions (such as dealing with the suitors) as being induced by φρόνησις. Whereas the one includes the father as a role model, the other virtually excludes him. Whereas the one is expressly defensive, the other is clearly positive.

Yet, with all due caution, it may have been a positive allegory in the service of a greater defensive context. Heraclitus shows that a combination of the “education” branch and that of Athena as φρόνησις and related notions existed, in which Reason is the educator. It is true that the education is rather metaphorical, illustrated by a comparison with a father or tutor. But how “real” is a goddess as educator, as suggested by the scholia? What the Athena of this type of interpretation does is to confront Telemachus with individuals, situations, and events that make him grow up. In essence, this supposed purpose of Telemachus’ journey matches Heraclitus’ concept of a

foolish young man coming to his senses, awakened by his own φρόνησις. In the scholia, too—namely in the *hypothesis c Od.* 1—φρόνησις already exists in the young man and induces him to grow up by means of going on the search for his father. It is only a small step from there to fleshing this process out with elements of traditional education, as presented by the scholia on *Od.* 1.93 and 1.284.

But both in those interpretations in which Athena exerts her influence as φρόνησις, and in those where she is simply the deity, the focus is on the goddess.⁹⁴ It is indicative of such a tendency that the work of Antisthenes mentioned at the beginning of this paper dealt not with Telemachus alone but with Athena and Telemachus.⁹⁵

This may have to do with the fact that ancient educators did not, as modern educators would do, make more frequent use of him as a role model. Modern readers would be interested in ideas about the various steps in Telemachus' development, that is, in the process rather than the starting point and result, and read it like a *Bildungsroman* to give some guidance to readers of Telemachus' age. But ancient schooling appears not to have been interested in using material tailored to the age of the students, at least as we would understand it. Telemachus was, of course, the prototype of a young man coming of age, but only in a very limited way: as a comparatively short, illustrative reference.⁹⁶ But he was apparently not regarded as role model

⁹⁴ The fact that both branches of explanations appear only in scholia on *Od.* 1 may support this possibility that the concern is with Athena and her sending Telemachus on his journey. Still, here too, the influence of chance (or lack of the scholiasts' stamina or interest) may have been the decisive factor.

⁹⁵ The title is not uniformly transmitted in the manuscripts containing the list of works given by Diogenes Laertius. Instead of Ἀθηνᾶ ἢ περὶ Τηλεμάχου, *cod.* B has Ἀθηνᾶ ἢ περὶ τῆς ..., with a *lacuna* of approximately 7–8 letters, most likely a noun (F. Decleva Caizzi: *Antisthenis Fragmenta* [Milan 1966] 83–84). Could it have been φρονήσεως?

⁹⁶ A typical instance of this is when Philodemus uses Telemachus as an example in his treatise *On the Good King according to Homer*, pointing out both his youth and presumably some virtues of a (future) ruler: παρὰδ[ε]ίγμα δ' ἡμῖν ὁ [Τ]ηλέμαχος γενέσθω· τοῦτον γὰρ καὶ νέον ὑπ[α]ρχοντα καὶ (a long *lacuna* follows): "Let Telemachus be our example, for him being both young

material. The comparison with Achilles makes this very apparent: although the scholia take a considerable interest in this hero's education, he first and foremost is the *result* of that education—a finished product, so to speak. This is what makes him more suitable as a role model than Telemachus, as becomes clear from one of the most famous formulations of this educational concept: “The teachers ... set before them [the students] on their benches the poems of great poets and compel them to memorize them, poems in which are contained many admonitions, many narratives and praises and encomia of noble men of old, in order that the boy zealously imitate them and strive to become like them” (Plato *Prt.* 325E–326A). Heroes were chosen with a view towards the life of a grown-up—not even an ordinary and contemporary life—rather than towards a young man in search of his identity, outgrowing his doubts with the help of a goddess.⁹⁷

APPENDIX

(Texts after Pontani's edition)

Schol. *Od.* 1.111 (p.8.14–25) (Porphyry): λύων οὖν ὁ Ἀντισθένης φησί· τί οὖν; ἄρά γε πονηρὸς ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς ὅτι πολύτροπος ἐρρέθη; καὶ μὴν, διότι σοφός, οὕτως αὐτὸν προσειρήκεν. μήποτε οὖν τρόπος τὸ μὲν τι σημαίνει τὸ ἦθος, τὸ δὲ τι σημαίνει τὴν τοῦ λόγου χρῆσιν· εὐτροπος γὰρ ἀνὴρ ὁ τὸ ἦθος ἔχων εἰς τὸ εὖ τετραμμένον. τρόποι δὲ λόγων ἴαίτιοι αἰτ' πλάσεις· καὶ χρῆται τῷ τρόπῳ καὶ ἐπὶ φωνῆς καὶ ἐπὶ μελῶν ἐξαλλαγῆς, ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς ἀηδόνος “ἦτε θαμὰ τροπώσα χέει πολυηχέα φωνήν” [τ 521]. εἰ δὲ οἱ σοφοὶ δεινοὶ εἰσι διαλέγεσθαι, ἐπίστανται καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ νόημα κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους λέγειν· ἐπιστάμενοι δὲ πολλοὺς τρόπους λόγων περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολύτροποι ἂν εἶεν. εἰ δὲ οἱ σοφοί, καὶ ἀγαθοὶ εἰσι, διὰ τοῦτό φησι τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα Ὅμηρος σοφὸν ὄντα πολύτροπον εἶναι, ὅτι δὴ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἠπίστατο πολλοῖς τρόποις συνεῖναι.

Antisthenes' solution: What then? Is it that Odysseus is wicked because he is called *polytropos*? On the contrary: because he is wise, he [Hom.] has thus expressed himself in reference to him. *Tropos* perhaps partly indicates the character, partly the use of speech. For a man is *eutropos* who has a character that is turned towards the “well.” The various styles are responsible for the

and” (col. 22.36–37 Dorandi). It is quite significant, that the text is addressed to Philodemus' patron, Piso—not to a schoolboy.

⁹⁷ I would like to thank David Konstan and René Nünlist for their critical and helpful comments.

mode of speeches, and he [Hom.] uses the word *tropos* with regard both to voice and to diversity of songs, as in the case of the nightingale “that, varying the manifold strains of her voice, pours out the melody” [*Od.* 19.521, transl. Lattimore]. If the wise are skillful speakers, they also know to express the same thought in many ways; knowing many ways of speaking about the same thing, they could well be *polytropoi*. If the wise are also noble, it is because of this that Homer says that Odysseus, being wise, is *polytropos*, because [in Homer’s opinion] he knew to associate with people in many ways.

Schol. *Od.* 1.93b: πέμψω δ’ ἐς Σπάρτην: ἄτοπος εἶναι δοκεῖ Τηλεμάχου ἢ ἀποδημία πρῶτον μὲν κίνδυνον προξενούσα τῷ νέῳ, δεύτερον ἐπανάστασιν τῶν μνηστήρων ἀπειλούσα, τρίτον οὐκ ὠφελούσα τὴν ζήτησιν τοῦ πατρὸς. ἀλλ’ ἔδει τὸν ἐν γυναιξὶ τεθραμμένον, λύπαις τεταπεινωμένον, ῥητορειῶν οὐ πεπειραμένον οὐδεπώποτε, πολύτροπον γενέσθαι παραπλησίως τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ τοῦτο κερδάναι τῇ πλάνῃ, καὶ κοινωνεῖν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν κατορθωμάτων ἐν τῇ μνηστηροκτονίᾳ. ἀσφαλίζεται δὲ τὰ κατ’ οἶκον πρῶτον μὲν ἐπαναστήσας τὸν δῆμον κατὰ τῶν μνηστήρων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, δεύτερον δὲ ταῖς ὑποσχέσεσιν ἀνεξικακεῖν διδάξας τοὺς μνηστῆρας εἰπὼν “καὶ ἀνέρι μητέρα δώσω” [β 223]. DEJM^aO ἔτι μᾶλλον καὶ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς τῶν μνηστήρων ὁ κίνδυνος ἠκρόνησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν προθυμίαν. M^aO

“I will send him to Sparta”: The journey of Telemachus seems preposterous as first it puts danger upon the young man, second threatens the suitors’ taking action, third does not further the search for his father. But the one who had been raised among women, had been abased by sorrows, and had never tried his skill in speeches, had to become *polytropos* in a manner similar to his father, and had to achieve this through his wandering and share with his father in the achievements in the Slaughter of the Suitors. He safeguards the affairs at the house first by making the people take a stand against the suitors in the assembly, second by teaching the suitors through his promises to be patient, saying “and I will give my mother to a husband” (*Od.* 2.223). DEJM^aO The danger of the suitors’ plot has even further goaded on his eagerness. M^aO

Schol. *Od.* 1.284a (pp.150.48–151.79). πρῶτα μὲν ἐς Πύλον ἔλθῃ καὶ εἴρειο Νέστορα δῖον: οὐκ ἀποδέχονται τινες τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τὴν ὑποθήκην ἐκπεμπούσης Τηλέμαχον, ὅτε ἦν ἐν μεγίστοις κινδύνοις ἢ οἰκία, πρὸς τὴν ἄπρακτον ζήτησιν τοῦ πατρὸς, τῶν μὲν μνηστήρων ἐτοιμῶν ὄντων καὶ βίαν προσφέρειν τῇ Πηνελόπῃ διὰ τὴν πολυχρόνιον μνηστειάν, τῆς δὲ οἰκίας οὐκ ἐχούσης τὸν προϊστάμενον ἄνδρα· καὶ ὁμῶς ὑπαιτίας οὔσης τῆς συμβουλῆς οὐκ ὀκνεῖ ἢ Ἀθηνᾶ λέγειν “σοὶ δ’ αὐτῷ πυκινῶς ὑποθήσομαι, αἶ κε πίθηαι” [α 279], ἐπαινούσα ὡς σοφὴν τὴν τοιαύτην παραίνεσιν. ἢ οὖν δεικτέον τὸ σοφὸν τῆς εἰς ἀποδημίαν ἀποστολῆς, ἢ ἀλόγου οὔσης ὑποθήκης ἄτοπος ὁ τοιαῦτα θεοῖς ἀνατιθεῖς νοήματα. DHO

φαίνεται τοίνυν Ὅμηρος ἀδύνατον νομίσαι ἄνδρα ὑπὸ γυναικὶ τεθραμμένον, εἰ καὶ σωφρονεστάτη εἴη, καὶ ἐν οἴκῳ κατακεκλειμένον πλήρει ὕβριστῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐν θεραπαίαις τε ἀσελγέσιν ἐναυξόμενον καὶ νήσῳ μικροπρεπεῖ καὶ ἀβασιλεύτῳ πολὺν χρόνον, κινδύνων τε ξενικῶν μὴ εἰληφότα πείραν, μηδὲ μετασχόντα ἀηδιῶν καὶ ἀγωνιάσαντα ἐν ὄσας ἀδημονίας γέγονε Τηλέμαχος προσεῖναι μέλλον Νέστορι τε καὶ Μενελάῳ καὶ Ἑλένῃ, φαίνεται οὖν

μή τοι ἄν δυνηθῆναι νομίσει ἀρετῆς ἄλλως γέ πως μετασχεῖν. διὸ πρόφασιν μὲν ἔχει ἢ ἀποδημία περὶ ἐξετάσεως τοῦ πατρὸς, σκοπὸς δέ ἐστι τῆ συμβουλεύουσα Ἀθηνᾶ παιδεύσις, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμελλεν ἔσεσθαι ὁ προὔθετο μάλιστα ἢ θεός· καὶ ἐρεῖ “πέμψω δ' ἐς Σπάρτην τε {παρὰ ξανθὸν Μενέλαον} καὶ ἐς Πύλον ἡμαθόεντα / νόστον πευσόμενον πατρὸς φίλου, ἦν που ἀκούση, / ἢ δ' ἵνα μιν κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἔχησιν” [α 93–95]. εἰ μὲν <ὄν> ἢ πρόφασις ἐξέτασιν εἶχε πατρὸς ἐπανόδου, σκοπὸς δ' ἦν ταύτης παιδεύσις, ἀφ' ἧς τὸ “κλέος ἐν ἀνθρώποισι” γίνεται, εἴη ἄν θεία ἢ παραινέσις καὶ τῆ Ἀθηνᾶ πρόπουσα· μένων δ' ἐν Ἰθάκῃ ἀπαιδευτὸς ἢ τῶν μνηστήρων εἶχετο καὶ προὔδωκεν ἄν τὸν οἶκον, ἢ ἐπιτιθέμενος αὐτὸς ἀπώλετο ἄν, μόλις τοῦ Ὀδυσσεὺς δι' ὑπερβολὴν φρονήσεως καὶ ἐμπειρίας δυνηθέντος αὐτοῖς δολίως ἐπιθέσθαι, ἄξιός τε οὐκ ἄν τοῦ πατρὸς ἐγένετο μή τί γε παρὰ τῶν συστρατησάντων πυθόμενος περὶ τῶν ἐκείνου πράξεων. διὸ καὶ συνεῖναι αὐτῷ ἐλθόντι κωλύμενος πεπαίδευται ἤδη, καὶ οἶδε πῶς προσηνεχθῆ τῷ πατρὶ ἀφ' ὧν ἀκήκοε περὶ αὐτοῦ διηγημάτων. DH

“First go to Pylos and ask divine Nestor”: Some do not accept the advice of Athena as she sends Telemachus off, when the house was in greatest danger, to a fruitless search for his father, while the suitors are ready even to use force against Penelope because of the protracted wooing with the house lacking the man in charge. And yet Athena, in spite of this questionable advice, does not hesitate to say “But for yourself, I will counsel you shrewdly, and hope you will listen” (*Od.* 1.279, transl. Lattimore), commending such exhortation as wise. Either one has to show what is wise about sending him on the journey; or, if the advice is unreasonable, it is preposterous to attribute such thoughts to gods. DHO

Homer seems to have thought that a man who has been raised by a woman—even if she were exceedingly prudent—who has been confined in a house with a great number of licentious men, who has grown up among wanton maid-servants on an insignificant island that has been without a king for a long time, and who has not experienced dangers abroad and has not had his share of unpleasantness and has struggled in as many troubles as Telemachus was when about to travel to Nestor and Menelaus and Helena, [Homer] now seems to have thought that he could not have got his share of *areté* in any other way. For this reason the pretext for the journey is the inquiry about his father, but for Athena, who is advising it, the aim is education, from which would result that which the goddess had in mind most; she will say “I will convey him to Sparta {to fair-haired Menelaus} and to sandy Pylos to ask about his dear father’s home-coming, if he can hear something, and so that among people he may win a good reputation” (*Od.* 1.93–95, transl. Lattimore). Now if the pretext was the inquiry into his father’s return, but its aim was education, from which “good reputation among people” results, the exhortation would be divine and appropriate to Athena; but remaining in Ithaca without an education he would either attach himself to the suitors and betray the house, or he would get killed in an attempt to attack them, when Odysseus with his superior intelligence and experience is only just able to attack them with trickery, and he [Tel.] would not have become worthy of his father had he not heard from his [father’s]

companions in arms about his deeds. For this reason, even though he is being prevented from being with him upon his return, he is already educated and knows how to behave towards his father, on the basis of the stories he has heard about him. DH

Schol. *Od.* 1.284b1: πρῶτα μὲν ἐς Πύλον: πέμπει αὐτὸν παιδευθησόμενον καὶ ἅμα ἐνδοξὸν ἐσόμενον, ἐπεὶ διὰ πατέρα ἀπεδήμησεν. HTVY

She sends him in order to be educated and at the same time to gain glory, because he went on a journey on account of his father. HTVY

Schol. *Od.* 1.284b2: πρῶτα μὲν ἐς Πύλον: πέμπει αὐτὸν παιδευθησόμενον παρὰ τὸν Νέστορα (οὗτος γὰρ εἶχε τὴν ἀπὸ γήρωσ ἐμπειρίαν), εἶτα εἰς Σπάρτην πρὸς Μενέλαον (οὗτος γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀκταετοῦς πλάνης ἐπανήλυθε νεωστὶ), DE κοινῶς δὲ δοξασθησόμενον διὰ τὴν ἀναζητήσιν τοῦ πατρὸς. E

She sends him to Nestor for education (for he had the experience that comes with age), then to Sparta, to Menelaus (for he has recently returned from eight years of roaming) DE; in general, in order to gain glory through his search for his father. E

Schol. *Od.* 1.284c: πρῶτα μὲν ἐς Πύλον ἐλθέ: διὰ τί δὲ πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἐς Πύλον πέμπει; παιδευθησόμενον αὐτὸν ὡς Νέστορα πέμπει. περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀποδημίας Τηλεμάχου εἵπομεν <εἰς τὸ> “πέμψον δ’ ἐς Σπάρτην τε” [α 93]. καὶ νῦν δὲ λεκτέον ὡς ὑπόθεσιν αὐτὴν πεποιήκειν ὁ ποιητὴς ποικιλίας λόγων καὶ ἐξαλλαγῆς ἰδεῶν, ἵνα μὴ μονότροπος ἢ τῆς ποιήσεως ὁ τρόπος. HM^aO

Why does she first send him to Pylos? She sends him to Nestor for education. We have dealt with Telemachus' journey on line 93. Here, one should state that the poet has made it an occasion for variety of speeches and variation of forms, lest the poetic mode be uniform. HM^aO

Schol. *Od.* 1. 284d: ἐς Πύλον: τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας οὐκ ἐχούσης ἐξ αὐτῆς ποικιλίαν ἱκανήν, τὸν Τηλέμαχον ἐξελεθῆν εἰς Σπάρτην καὶ Πύλον ποιεῖ, ὅπως ἂν τῶν Ἰλιακῶν ἐν παρεκβάσει πολλὰ λεχθεῖη διὰ τε τοῦ Νέστορος καὶ τοῦ Μενελάου. DE

As the *Odyssey* does not offer sufficient variety by itself, he [Hom.] has Telemachus travel to Sparta and Pylos, in order that in digressions many of the Trojan events are narrated by Nestor and Menelaus. DE

January, 2009

Department of Classics
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242
jessica-wissmann@uiowa.edu