

FOR BERNARD KNOX

The Inner Man in Archilochus and the Odyssey

Joseph Russo

I

Comparisons between Archilochus and Homer commonly center on the wider range of perceptions and greater 'psychic depth' expressed by poets once the Epic Age is left behind and a new Lyric Age has dawned. This tradition of interpretation has had as its exponents some of the leading literary philologists of our century, and its influence can hardly be overestimated.¹ No one today reads the early lyric poets without an acute awareness that he is hearing the first utterances of the 'personal' voice in early Greece, and no commentary on these poets fails to call attention to the dramatically expanded self-awareness of the seventh century, which expresses itself in its emphasis on new personal values in lieu of—or in deliberate contradiction of—the traditional Homeric values.

¹ The most influential figure of this group is Bruno Snell: see *The Discovery of the Mind*, transl. T. G. Rosenmeyer (Oxford 1953) ch. 3, "The Rise of the Individual in the Early Greek Lyric"; *Poetry and Society* (Bloomington 1961) and its expanded German edition *Dichtung und Gesellschaft* (Hamburg 1965), esp. chs. 3 and 4 on early and late archaic lyric poetry. Snell lays great stress on the concept of a "new 'mental' concord that apparently was not possible before the seventh century" (PS 31=DG 68-69) when "a new dimension of the intellect is opened," "the 'depth' of the heart [is] to be revealed. The difference between appearance and reality is strikingly emphasized for the first time in this difference between uttered words and hidden truth" (PS 34=DG 75-76 with some modification of phrasing and elaboration of examples).

Snell's discussion of "Late Archaic Lyric Poetry" opens with the declaration: "Never in European history has there been a time so rich in fundamentally new ideas as the epoch of early Greek lyrics. . . . The poets led the way in this new development. A new feeling of personal and inner friendship appeared with Archilochus and Sappho" (PS 75=DG 113). Such a vision of Greek intellectual history depends on the assumption that, unlike the genres of modern literature that coexist alongside one another, "among the Greeks . . . the genres flourished in chronological succession. When the strains of the epic subsided, the lyric took its place" (*Discovery* 43).

Snell's views on the strong cleavage between epic and lyric are shared by Hermann Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (New York 1951) ch. 4, "Die Alte Lyrik," and by Max Treu, *Von Homer zu Lyrik*² (Munich 1968) *passim* (but see K. J. Dover's warnings, *JHS* 77 [1957] 322f, about drawing inferences for society as a whole from what may be the habits of certain poets or schools of poetry).

There is no denying that personal expression and a concern for 'psychic depth' are common in the verse that survives from the first century after Homer; but it is perhaps time to cease begging the question of their novelty and to assert the almost forgotten truth that these concerns were within Homer's imaginative and verbal range also. (Personal expression from the poet's own mouth was of course limited by conventions of the epic genre, but he could certainly create it in the mouths of his characters.) We must be careful not to underestimate the continuities in early Greek culture by creating an unjustifiably rigid barrier between the Epic and the Lyric periods, as if lyric poetry and its more complex and subtle presentation of the individual or 'self' were developments possible *only after* the year 700, while all poetry composed earlier had necessarily to reflect the less complicated conception of man that we associate more naturally with the epic.

Perhaps the best argument against such a view is the interesting observation that lyric poetry has been composed at all times and in all places, and that regardless of the supposed primitiveness or intellectual sophistication of the culture this poetry tends to express the same familiar personal themes. K. J. Dover has recently surveyed several collections of short poems from non-literate societies and noted their similarity to early Greek lyric.² He suggests that since the Greeks must have composed such poems for centuries before they had the technique for writing them down, the Greek Lyric Age cannot be said in any meaningful sense to begin in the 600's. Dover's demonstration should alert us to the possibility that we have been reading early Greek poetry with an exaggerated belief in a new era in which lyric, and in conjunction with it the individual personality, is 'discovered'.

II

A full panoply of arguments for minimizing the newness of the lyric era cannot be presented here. I should like to focus attention on Archilochus, the poet regularly hailed as the first apostle of the new

² "The Poetry of Archilochus," *Entretiens Hardt X, Archiloque* (Geneva 1964) 199-204. For a wide sampling of poetry of this type see Willard Trask (ed.), *The Unwritten Song* (New York 1966/67), in addition to the references cited by Dover; and for discussion, C. M. Bowra, *Primitive Song* (London 1962). The existence of personal lyric expression long before Archilochus is most recently emphasized by H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus* (Berkeley 1971) 37f.

lyric sensibility, whom Hermann Fränkel has labeled, with grand simplicity, “der Begründer der griechischen Lyrik.”³ My contention is that Archilochus’ lyric perceptions can be identical to those of Homer’s world, especially the world of the *Odyssey*, to a greater degree than is commonly allowed, and that a strong argument can be made in a short space by a close reading of fr.114 W. (60 D.).

These four lines of trochaic tetrameter have been characterized consistently as unhomeric in their sharply etched portrait of the ineffective *versus* the effective *στρατηγός*.⁴ The contrasting commanders, or as I prefer to call them, captains, are used by the poet as a vehicle for presenting his view that inner qualities are more important than, and may very well stand in direct contrast to, external appearances—an insight supposedly impossible in the Homeric world, where inner and outer qualities are normally unified. Albin Lesky sums up scholarly consensus when he says “In Homer’s world a man’s inner and outer merits were inseparably united.” Archilochus, he adds, “consciously polemicizes against this unity (fr.60 D.).”⁵ We

³ *Op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 185. Of course Fränkel’s language here is frankly rhetorical, like that of A. R. Burn, *The Lyric Age of Greece* (London 1960) 159: “A generation or two later [than Hesiod], individual self-expression in poetry bursts into full view with Archilochus of Paros.” A few lines later Burn adds, “No doubt the forms of personal poetry and choral song . . . were traditional.” My point is that we cannot have it both ways, and that figures of speech about the sunburst of lyric expression in the seventh century have managed to mask a very serious issue of literary history, *viz.* the distinction between the first *use* of poetry expressing a personal viewpoint and the first *surviving specimens* of such poetry.

⁴ See, for example, D. A. Campbell’s recent *Greek Lyric Poetry* (New York 1967), already the standard textbook: “the short, knock-kneed commander of Archilochus’ choice cuts a very unhomeric figure . . . only the insubordinate ranker Thersites is described in similar terms” (152). Fränkel’s judgement is similar (*op.cit.* [*supra* n.1] 189): “Gegenüber romantischen Ideologien greift Archilochos energisch auf die ersten Realitäten zurück und setzt die Werte dort wo sie der Sache nach hingehören. Er will sich von keinem unechten Glanz blenden lassen. Bei Homer war der heldenhafte Krieger selbstverständlich ein stattlicher Mann, in Schönheit prangend und mit lang wallendem Haupthaar geziert . . . Selbst die Odyssee macht in ihrer erhaltenen Gestalt diesem Ideal eine unerfreuliche Konzession, indem sie Odysseus zauberhaft verjüngen und verschönern lässt. Der Bastard von Paros aber sagt (60)”: (fr.114 W. [60 D.] follows).

⁵ “In der Welt Homers waren die äusseren und inneren Vorzüge eines Menschen untrennbar verbunden . . . Archilochus (60 D.) zertrennt mit bewusster Polemik diese Einheit.” *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur*³ (Bern/Munich 1971) 136. One might object that descriptions like that of Paris—*καλὸν εἶδος ἐπ’*, *ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔστι βίη φρεσίν, οὐδέ τις ἀλκή* (Il. 3.44–45)—show that Homer was capable of presenting inner and outer qualities as contradictory or at least inconsistent. This point is emphasized by Sir Denys Page, in *Entretiens Hardt X* (*supra* n.2) 214, discussing Dover’s paper. Thus he takes a view opposite to that of Lasserre-Bonnard and Treu (“on the fragment *οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγόν*, is not this very much in the spirit of Homer?”) but for inadequate reasons. Such an objection to Lesky’s

see here that our four lines of tetrameter have entered the scholarly tradition—to be set, shall we assume, alongside ἀσπίδι μὲν Καίων τις ἀγάλλεται?—as *prima facie* evidence for the conceptual gap supposed to exist between Homer and Archilochus. Let us look at this little poem closely to see precisely what it is saying and how that relates to what Homer has said.⁶

οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγὸν οὐδὲ διαπεπλιγμένον,
οὐδὲ βοστρύχοις γαῦρον οὐδ' ὑπεξυρημένον,
ἀλλὰ μοι μικρὸς τις εἴη καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν
ῥοικός, ἀσφαλέως βεβηκῶς ποσσὶ, καρδίας πλέως.

I don't care for the tall captain, the one with the long stride;
for the one who's proud of his curly locks, or very carefully shaved.
Let me have a short fellow, let him have crooked legs:
a man who's steady in his walk, a man who's full of heart.

Archilochus has expressed his rejection of a tall, long-legged, apparently dandyish captain in favor of a short, bow-legged (or possibly bandy-legged) one with 'guts', in four tetrameters that make a perfectly balanced little poem. The first two verses set out the four rejected qualities—οὐ followed by three uses of οὐδέ, each οὐδέ beginning one of the dimeters making up the tetrameter—of the man who looks good but is all show; while the next two verses, beginning with the pivotal ἀλλά, give the four corresponding and antithetical qualities of the tough little captain. These last four qualities, however, are not the direct counterparts of the four physically attractive but superficial qualities of the μέγας στρατηγός, although they begin as if they are going to be given as parallels, μικρός answering to μέγας and ῥοικός to διαπεπλιγμένος. The new turn comes in the fourth line. Here we see the regularly positioned conjunctions of the first three verses give way to a powerful asyndeton in the description of the final three qualities of the μικρὸς στρατηγός. Note how Archilochus delays the second descriptive term, ῥοικός, until the fourth line by the one enjambement used in the poem, an enjambement made especially emphatic by holding back the word until after its

formulation would still be unable to deal with Snell's more subtle presentation of the traditionalist position, in terms of 'mere contrast' vs. 'playing off', as discussed below.

⁶ I print the text of West and Diehl. The four verses are not found all together in any single source, but their sequence seems obvious from citations in Galen and Dio Chrysostom. The single important textual emendation has been Hemsterhuys' universally accepted διαπεπλιγμένον for the διαπεπλεγμένον of Dio and the διαπεπτηγμένον of Galen.

epexegetic *περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν* has been expressed. Now Archilochus abandons the point-for-point comparison of the two captains. The very next words extend the idea of *ῥοικός* to describe the third quality of the little captain: we are told—or reminded, if this is a piece of popular lore⁷—that being *ῥοικός* means having an extra steadiness on your feet, *ἀσφαλέως βεβηκῶς ποσσί*.

Finally we come to the point towards which Archilochus, with his devices of word choice and rhetorical structure, has been leading us. The fourth quality of the good little leader Archilochus prefers, obviously the most important quality, is no longer in the realm of the physical and easily observable. The man is *καρδίας πλέως*, full of heart (courage), a quality of mind or spirit for which the first three physical qualities served as rough but meaningful markers. The physical qualities were arranged so that bowleggedness was taken to imply a broad and sturdy gait, and this sturdiness or sureness (*ἀσφάλεια*) became the outer sign of the inner virtue of courage (*καρδία*). The taller and less worthy officer, on the other hand, has nothing but external qualities. His height, long-leggedness, carefully tended locks and careful shave all add up to nothing inside, so that the first two lines have no phrase to parallel the *καρδίας πλέως* that concludes line four. Thus we feel the full impact of the sudden transference from the physical to the metaphysical plane in the very last image of the poem. The climax has been so carefully prepared and the concluding phrase is so forceful and final that I find it difficult to conceive of this four-line epigrammatic statement as anything less than a finished poem; although for tradition's sake we shall continue calling it fr.114 W. (60 D.).

III

I have discussed the structure of Archilochus' poem in some detail because this interesting 'fragment' seems never to have gotten the careful criticism it deserves. Most of the existing commentary is brief and superficial. The commentaries in the standard editions of Las-serre-Bonnard and Treu assume too simply that Archilochus' verses

⁷ Galen, in *Hippocr.* 3 (18.1 p.604 Kühn), says he is citing Archilochus' verses as corroboration of the fact that "men who are bow- or bandy-legged [*ῥοικοί* or *ῥαιβοί*] stand more solidly and are harder to overturn than those whose legs are perfectly straight." This intriguing idea is taken up in the excellent commentary of G. Perrotta and B. Gentili, *Polinnia: Poesia greca arcaica*³ (Messina/Florence 1965) 82, who cite a modern parallel attested by Romagnoli: "tale principio è tuttora affermato, e ripetuto, con strano compiacimento, dal popolino di Roma."

amount to a strong rejection of the traditional values or ideal of Homeric epic;⁸ while at least one writer has suggested that Archilochus is actually inspired by a specific passage in Homer, that he is echoing a Homeric contrast of two heroes and is expanding it into a more explicit statement of the paradox of seeming *versus* true worth. Bonnard's commentary, which begins "rien de moins homérique que ces quatre vers," epitomizes the first line of interpretation. Bonnard's suggestion that the Homeric love of good looks has here yielded to a new taste for ugliness full of character, a taste that foreshadows the later charismatic figures of Aesop and Socrates, loses all credibility by the time we reach his farfetched conclusion, that Archilochus will be won over *only* by military courage housed in the ugly frame of a Thersites. Yet the fact that Thersites comes to mind at all here is significant, as we shall see. Archilochus is, I believe, evoking an established pattern, a conventional cluster of images and attitudes whose origins are most likely in Homer and one of whose elements is the figure, or paradigm, of Thersites.

⁸ The French and German assessments share common assumptions, reflecting the authoritative influence of Schmid-Stählin, *GGL* I.i 389ff. F. Lasserre and A. Bonnard, *Archiloque, Fragments* (Paris 1958) 30: "Quant au fragment 93 [114 W. (60 D.)], rien de moins homérique que ces quatre vers, rien de plus hardi dans cette Grèce du VII^e siècle où coule encore le fleuve 'limoneux' de la poésie cyclique. Schmid-Stählin (I,1, 392) et Pasquali (*Pagine meno stravaganti* [Firenze 1935] 98) remarquent que l'admiration d'Homère pour la beauté cède ici soudain la place au goût de la laideur pleine de caractère, qui s'incarnera en Esope et Socrate. La bravoure militaire, pour gagner Archiloque, doit revêtir le corps de Thersite." Max Treu, *Archilochus* (Munich 1959) 219: "Das Bild, das Archilochus vom kleinen x-beinigen Heerführer zeichnet, steht zum homerischen Ideal des grossen und tüchtigen bzw. grossen und schönen Mannes fast in allem in krassem Gegensatz: allerdings nur in allem Äusserlichen. Das, worauf es eigentlich ankommt, den Mut, wertet er nicht minder hoch, ja, um so höher."

R. Peppmüller (*Anthologie aus den Lyrikern der Griechen*, edd. E. Buchholz/Peppmüller⁵, I [Leipzig/Berlin 1899] 131, *comm. ad fr.*12.2) finds the officer who delights in his "long curls" comparable to Paris at *Il.* 11.385, addressed as *κέραι ἀγλαέ*; a point of view which, if developed further, might have brought Archilochus' outlook closer to Homer's by emphasizing their common antipathy to the (merely) vain and handsome warrior. For a properly balanced view, in which the Homeric aspects of Archilochus are given their due, we should keep in mind the almost paradoxical comment with which Schmid-Stählin (*op.cit.* [*supra* n.8] 389) begin their discussion: "Archilochus . . . den Alten mit Recht als ein in seiner Art ebenbürtiger Antipode Homers und doch zugleich auch als Schüler Homers erschien." They cite (389 n.2) several ancient writers who felt impelled to pair the two, either because Archilochus was judged simply *δμηρικός* (cf. [Longinus], *Subl.* 13.3), or because he was seen as a potentially formidable rival who, fortunately for Homer, worked in a different (iambic) genre (cf. *AP* 7.674, Adrianos); or because they were considered generally the two most perfect or masterful poets in the handling of their material.

One critic who has followed a different line of interpretation, who sees in the contrasting *στρατηγοί* a deliberate echo of Homer, shows good intuition, perhaps, in selecting the figure of Odysseus for the rôle of the stalwart little leader—but I believe he has gone to the wrong epic. W. B. Stanford thinks Archilochus is referring to the contrasting appearances of “stocky, ram-like” Odysseus and “tall, lordly” Agamemnon at *Iliad* 3.192ff;⁹ but a simple reading of this passage should convince anyone that the interpretation is very wide of the mark. There is no valid parallel because nothing about Odysseus is presented as physically ungainly. He is in fact called ‘ram-like’ in two different ways (*κτίλος ὤς*, 196; *ἀρνειῶ μιν ἔγωγε εἶκω πηγεσι-μάλλω*, 197), an emphatically expressed compliment, as he moves along marshalling his men. Stanford is wrong to imply Odysseus is small: he is merely a head shorter than Agamemnon (*μείων μὲν κεφαλῇ Ἀγαμέμνωνος*, 193), which hardly makes him a *σμικρός*.¹⁰

IV

Yet when all this is said, it is still, intriguingly, the figure of Odysseus—not in the *Iliad* but in the *Odyssey*—that holds part of the answer to our problem of understanding Archilochus’ poem in its proper literary-historical context. The most subtle and elaborate interpretation of these lines that I have been able to find, that of Bruno Snell,¹¹ shows an intuitive understanding that the *Odyssey* provides the nearest Homeric parallel to Archilochus with its interest in false appearances and true merit. And yet Snell’s approach, because it is committed above all else to keeping an unbridgeable distance between the ‘old’ heroic and the ‘new’ lyric worlds, leads to what I believe is ultimately a misreading of Archilochus’ poem.

Snell’s starting point is the assertion that “this separation between internal and external values is never made” in Homer. The reader’s

⁹ W. B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme* (Oxford 1963) 91.

¹⁰ Closer to the spirit of Archilochus’ comparison is the contrast, in the same passage, between Menelaos’ and Odysseus’ power with words (3.212ff). Menelaos spoke briefly and fluently, but when Odysseus prepared to speak he gave the impression of a man who would be inept, witless and surly. His speech, of course, showed exactly the opposite.

¹¹ *Discovery* (*supra* n.1) 49. The thorough bibliography of Tarditi’s recent edition (*Archilochus*) [Rome 1968] lists no articles on this poem (96 T.) except for a linguistic discussion of the root *πλιχ-* by V. Pisani in *Mélanges Boisacq* II (Brussels 1938) 83, and a seemingly mistaken reference to Wilamowitz, “Lese Früchte,” *Hermes* 59 (1924) 270.

immediate response to this should be to cite the prominent disguise-motif in the *Odyssey*: the hero spends most of the second half of that epic behind a façade of physical wretchedness that successfully conceals his inner greatness. But that does not count, says Snell, who has anticipated this likely objection. Odysseus' wretchedness as a beggar is "merely a mask"; "appearance and merit are *contrasted* with one another, but the inner qualities are not, as in Archilochus, *played off* against the surface impression" [emphases added].

Can this subtle distinction hold up under analysis? The difference between contrasting two levels and playing them off against one another is a delicate one; it is not an intrinsic difference, and may sometimes lie in the eye of the beholder. The distinction should depend on how long you focus on the contrast and how hard you press it to give it some special point. It would be in that act of pressing that the 'playing off' is achieved. Because he is eager to find a maximum of 'playing off' in the Archilochus fragment rather than mere Homeric 'contrast', Snell is tempted to read more into the poem than Archilochus probably meant. The insistence on a separation between internal and external values that exceeds anything possible in Homeric thought, on a separation that transcends mere contrast as a sign that the lyric has transcended the epic in its perceptions, leads Snell to conclude his analysis with the judgement: "But no one before Archilochus underlines the paradox that the officer is enfeebled by his splendour, that he does not use his long legs except to run away (that seems to be the implication), that the outer appearance undoes the good within."

I find this a strained interpretation. The elegant officer is clearly going to be less effective, less steadfast and courageous, than the bandy-legged (bowlegged?) one. But to conclude that he is going to use his long-leggedness only to run away seems to run far beyond the evidence of our text. I should like to propose a reading of Archilochus' four lines that differs considerably from Snell's, but that, like his, is inevitably drawn to the *Odyssey* as the source of the tradition against which Archilochus' statement must be measured if we are to discover its full meaning.

V

Archilochus' comparison recalls, first of all, some of the central Odyssean ironies that suggest that you cannot judge quality, or any

aspect of reality, by appearances. The major theme of the *Odyssey* is essentially that of true worth (or accurate perceptions) *versus* specious attractiveness (or misleading perceptions), and these are played off against one another at many points in the narrative. Think, for example, of Eumaios, *δίος ὑφορβός*, outwardly a swineherd, intrinsically (and literally, by descent) a prince; and contrast him with the supposedly lordly Suitors, whose aristocratic 'manliness' has already degenerated semantically into overbearing self-assertion (see *LSJ s.v. ὑπερηγορέων*). The prominence given to the virtues of the first and the vices of the second in the latter half of the poem, and the persistence of Homer's emphasis, suggest the kind of sustained contrast that amounts to 'playing off' inner qualities against surface impressions. And there are other instances of appearances played off against reality which may similarly be taken as statements given special emphasis by the author, since they are not brief allusions or narrative asides but are developed into fairly large-scale narrative structures. Even if we discount, with Snell, Odysseus' disguise as a worn-out derelict in Books 13 through 21, we should not overlook the special emphasis given to the disguise motif and the contrast between appearance and reality in Homer's presentation of Helen's story about herself and Odysseus at Troy (4.238ff), or in the careful way Homer has engineered Odysseus' shedding his disguise of anonymity, by stages, among the Phaiakians in Book 8.

The scene with Helen is developed into a subtle game of ploy and counterploy between Menelaos and his once unfaithful wife. She uses her recognition of Telemachus' resemblance to his father as a springboard for an historical vignette in which she presents herself as secretly converted to the Greek cause while still at Troy, delighted to come upon the disguised Odysseus and to be able to give him a bath and a change of clothes, and fully cooperative in getting him out of the city safely and back to the Greek lines. Menelaos compliments her on a tale well told, but immediately gives his own Trojan tale about Helen, describing how near she came to uncovering the Greeks' stratagem of the hollow wooden horse filled with fighting men. Her clever trick of imitating the voices of the Greek soldiers' wives almost broke the self-control of the men inside the horse, and only Odysseus' legendary capacity for self-restraint and quick response kept the Greeks safe, until finally "Pallas Athena led you away," as Menelaos says (4.289).

This subtle exchange has highlighted not only Odysseus' capacity for playing rôles but also Helen's adroitness at shifting rôles to suit the advantages present in each situation. Since the episode recounted by Menelaos happened at the end of the war we might well suspect Helen's claim to an earlier return to Greek allegiance. Whether or not Helen has played two different and inconsistent rôles in the past, it is interesting to see how adept she is at rôle-playing, or the game of façades, in the present situation. Her present rôle or façade for Menelaos and his company is that of the good wife, dutifully repentant ("for the sake of me, shameless dog [κυνώπιδος], the Achaians came to Troy," 4.145–46; "I lamented afterwards the madness Aphrodite gave me when she led me there away from my homeland, leaving behind my child, bedchamber and husband—a man who lacked nothing in either intelligence or looks," 4.261–64). And yet Menelaos' retort is a subtle but clear reminder that her rôle-playing is notorious and transparent to those who know her, and that he has learned to be a bit wary of her stated intentions.

The Phaiakian episode as well shows Homer's interest in a sustained handling of the combined motifs of disguise and appearance vs. reality, carefully structured to lead to the eventual shedding of the disguise. The stranger appears among the Phaiakians as an anonymous traveller, but obviously a man of some stature. His weeping at the Trojan war stories reveals to king Alkinoos that he is somehow intimately involved in that war. The movement from the palace outdoors to the games allows him to assert himself in the face of Euryalos' criticism by showing how greatly he surpasses the Phaiakians in feats of sheer strength, a sign that he comes from a world where heroic force, rather than running, dancing, feasting, "changing of clothing and warm baths and beds" (cf. 8.244–49), rules the day. We are moving very close to a revelation of the "inner reality" that is Odysseus, and when they return indoors for more feasting and another song from Demodokos, Odysseus' second onset of weeping finally pushes Alkinoos to ask who he is, as the eighth book closes. Book 9 begins with Odysseus revealing his name and in a sense defining what it means by recounting all his adventures and difficulties since he left Troy.

It should be evident from the episodes described that the author of the *Odyssey* has a special fondness for narrative development that exploits the manipulation of façades by characters in the story and

carefully leads the audience underneath these façades to the contrasting reality that they mask. It is a narrative predilection found throughout the poem and not just in the latter scenes where Odysseus is masquerading as a beggar; and it is precisely this delicate treatment of the appearance vs. reality motif at various levels throughout the poem that has given the *Odyssey*, in the eyes of many readers, a special fascination not present in the *Iliad*. It is hard to understand, in view of the Odyssean qualities just outlined, how it can be said that “to the world of Homer the inner and the outer man were inseparably linked.” One fears that the *Iliad* has been taken as the Homeric document *par excellence* and the testimony of the *Odyssey* minimized—a habit of thought that critics may unconsciously fall into.

VI

If we are willing, then, to consider the *Odyssey* as part of the Homeric world, we will see that world as one in which many of Archilochus’ surviving statements would not be out of place. And if we wish to probe the meaning of Archilochus’ poem on the two captains in terms of its Homeric background, the answer is not that Archilochus is rejecting the Homeric world-view, nor that he is alluding to the Homeric portrait of a short, ungainly Odysseus whom it is impossible to find in our text, but rather that he has remembered his Homer extremely well, better certainly than his commentators have. As specific Homeric models that underlie the point Archilochus is making concerning outer appearance that belies inner excellence, I should like to propose the figures of Thersites in the *Iliad* (2.212ff) and Odysseus’ herald Eurybates in the *Odyssey* (19.244ff).¹²

The important fact about Thersites is that he *is* just as bad as he *looks*: bandy-legged (*φολκός*), hunched and round-shouldered (*τὼ δέ οἱ ὤμω | κυρτῷ*), balding (*φοξός*), and lame and sunken-chested to boot, his inner man matches the outer one. “He knew in his wits (*φρεσὶ*) many utterances, but disordered ones, useless, since they were not ordered, for quarreling with kings” (*Iliad* 2.213ff)—

ὅς ῥ’ ἔπεα φρεσὶν ἦεν ἄκοσμά τε πολλά τε ἦδη,
μάψ, ἀτὰρ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον, ἐριζέμεναι βασιλεῦσιν,
ἀλλ’ ὅτι οἱ εἴκαιτο γελοίου Ἀργείοισιν

¹² For the juxtaposition of these two passages I owe a debt to Peter W. Rose, who first called my attention to the similar descriptions involved.

ἔμμεναι. αἴσχιστος δὲ ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἰλιον ἦλθε·
 φορκὸς ἔην, χλωὸς δ' ἕτερον πόδα· τὼ δέ οἱ ὤμω
 κυρτώ, ἐπὶ στήθος κυνοχωκότε· αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε
 φοξὸς ἔην κεφαλὴν, ψεδνή δ' ἐπενήνοθε λάχνη.
 ἔχθιστος δ' Ἀχιλλῆι μάλιτ' ἦν ἠδ' Ὀδυσῆι.

He is most hateful, ἔχθιστος, to those epic paragons, Achilles and Odysseus, almost *because* he is the ugliest, αἴσχιστος, who ever came to Ilion. The very ambiguity in αἴσχιστος—does it mean 'ugliest', introducing the physical description that follows, or 'most disgraceful', summing up his quarrelsome behavior mentioned previously?—illustrates perfectly the Homeric norm that would equate physical appearance with inner worth. If, indeed, all Homeric figures were as easy to appraise at first sight as Thersites, the epic world would be as conceptually simple a place as some critics have taken it to be. But Thersites is merely a simple and perfect example of one Homeric paradigm, a polar type, we might say. A more complicated type is represented by the herald Eurybates.

Eurybates has similarities both to Thersites and, less obviously, to Archilochus' good little captain. He is, like Thersites, round-shouldered (*γυρὸς ἐν ὤμοισιν*). Yet he also recalls Archilochus' good captain indirectly, since he too may be seen as a type opposite to the tall barbered captain in that he is οὐλοκάρηνος, 'woolly-headed'. This term suggests a hair style as different as possible from the elegant βόστρυχοι and careful shaving of the vain man.¹³ It is difficult to catch the exact coloring intended by οὐλοκάρηνος, but it is probably an unaristocratic touch, the sign of a 'natural', carelessly kept or perhaps infrequently trimmed head of curly hair.¹⁴ His full description is as follows (*Odyssey* 19.246ff):

γυρὸς ἐν ὤμοισιν, μελανόχροος, οὐλοκάρηνος,
 Εὐρυβάτης δ' ὄνομ' ἔσκε· τίεν δέ μιν ἔξοχον ἄλλων
 ὦν ἐτάρων Ὀδυσσεύς, ὅτι οἱ φρεσὶν ἄρτια ἦδη.

round-shouldered, dark-skinned, with a woolly head of hair:
 Eurybates was his name, and Odysseus used to value him
 above the other companions, because in his wits he fit in well with him.

¹³ Euripides at *Or.* 1532 gives us a picture of long βόστρυχοι reaching down to the shoulders, and the use of γαυρούμενος gives us a picture very similar to that of Archilochus' tall captain: ξανθοῖς ἐπ' ὤμων βοστρήχοις γαυρούμενος.

¹⁴ Quite possibly an African type is intended in the description of Eurybates as μελανόχροος

Exactly what sort of portrait is Homer painting in this three-line cameo? The first line, with its three distinctive physical traits, sounds like the beginning of an unfavorable picture, rather along Thersitean lines. Then we are given his name, Eurybates, which means ‘wide strider’. Such a meaning would be the direct antithesis of Archilochus’ tall captain who is *διαπεπλιγμένος*, a ‘long strider’. The only notice scholars have taken of Eurybates’ significant name is apparently the comment by Max Treu that it is a typically heroic name, meaning the same as the stock heroic formula *μακρὰ βιβάς* that is often applied to great warriors.¹⁵ According to my interpretation exactly the opposite must be true: *μακρὰ βιβάς* is the equivalent of *διαπεπλιγμένος*. This equation finds support in the scholiast’s comment on the rare word *πλίccοντο* at *Odyssey* 6.318: the Dorians, we are told, for *βῆμα*, ‘step’, say *πλίξ*.¹⁶ If we can take the name Eurybates together with the adjectives preceding it as descriptive of the man, we have the portrait of a character who in *appearance* seems to be the same type as Archilochus’ preferred officer, the solid little fellow of the wide, bowlegged or bandy-legged but in either case sturdy stance. While Homer does not explicitly call Eurybates either short or bowlegged, the same traditional paradigm or type would seem to be invoked. His round-

and *οὐλοκάρηνος* and the hair style depicted by *οὐλοκάρηνος* is the ‘Afro’. The likelihood that Eurybates was in fact an Ethiopian is accepted by Frank M. Snowden, *Blacks in Antiquity* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1970) 101–02, 122, 181: “A black-skinned, woolly-haired individual, we have seen, was to the Greeks an Ethiopian” (102, discussing Eurybates); but a few pages later (122) he is more cautious: “If the black-skinned, woolly-haired Eurybates was Ethiopian or Negroid, and such a possibility cannot be excluded . . .”

For the alternative hypothesis, that the male standard of beauty is to be dark-skinned and the female to be fair, anticipating the conventions of vase painting, see Treu, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 52, 79f. Odysseus is himself called *μελαγχροῖς* at *Od.* 16.175, when Athena temporarily restores his former beauty so that Telemachos can recognize him. It is clear that ‘dark-skinned’ itself does not imply African in Homer, but the combination with ‘woolly-headed’ is unique, and Snowden’s inference may be correct.

¹⁵ Treu, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 72: “Und doch ist diese extensive Betrachtungsweise des Schrittes bei Homer die herrschende, wenn nicht gar die einzige und einer archaischen Sehweise einzig gemässe. Namen wie Eurybates (vgl. lat. *Pansa*, dazu Ernout-Meillet s.v. *pando*) und die Formel *μακρὰ βιβάς* zeigen das.” If Treu is wrong here, as I believe he is, the accuracy of his reconstruction of the Greek “archaische Sehweise” is called into question along the lines of Dover’s criticism, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1; and *cf.* n.16 *infra*).

¹⁶ *πλίccειν ἐστὶ τὸ μεταφέρειν κέλος παρὰ κέλος . . . ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν δισταμένων τῶν μηρῶν τὸ βῆμα γίνεται, οὐκ ἀφυῶς οἱ Δωριεῖς τὰ βήματα πλίccας λέγουσι.* The significant point is that *βῆμα* is understood as the space covered by stretching one thigh forward ahead of the other. Taking a big step, then, is *μακρὰ βῆναι*, and the man taking such an heroic stride is properly called *μακρὰ βιβάς*.

shoulderedness suggests that this figure does not stand tall like the conventional hero, and the name Eurybates conjures up the very image of a bowlegged or sailor's gait.

The more important point, however, is the relation of the outer to the inner man. It is in his inner reality as opposed to his mere appearance that Eurybates is quite the opposite of Thersites and very much like Archilochus' little captain. Thersites' mind (*φρεσί*) is characterized by the emphatic repetition of *οὐ κατὰ κόσμον* and *ἄκοσμά τε πολλά τε ἤδη*, in perfect accord with his looks. The exact opposite of the man who knew *ἄκοσμα* is the one who knew *ἄρτια*, things that fit in perfectly with Odysseus' thoughts. The sharp three-line description turns emphatically on the concluding phrases, "Odysseus used to value him above the other companions because in his wits [= mind, *φρεσί*] he fit in well with him." Odysseus values the man for what he is, in disregard of his unpretentious, if not unpropitious, appearance, in much the same way that Archilochus places great value on his *σμηκρὸς στρατηγός*. If there is any cleavage between the epic and lyric perceptions of value, the shrewd Odysseus and the experienced Archilochus in this instance have bridged it over.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

November, 1973