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This paper deals primarily with Arete’s role in the *Odyssey* and offers a
gendered as well as a generic interpretation of this figure’s grounding in
the narrative. Arete’s laconic stance in the so-called Phaiakia has raised
controversy over the way in which the queen of Scherie is to be in-
volved in the prime theme of the poem, Odysseus’ nostos.¹ It is not
only the few and extremely cautious words spoken by Arete that are
under discussion in this essay, but also the formalities of further speeches
that frame her textual presence and determine her reception by ancient
and modern audiences. The first part of this paper tackles the question
of whether and to what extent Homer made use of etymological prac-
tice in shaping Arete’s role in the *Odyssey*. On this ground, we suggest
and subsequently analyze the etymological potential of Arete’s name and
the function of these etymologies in the narrative dynamics of the
poem. Our main focus will not be on acknowledging or discovering
possible etymological or para-etymological derivations, but examining
whether the etymologies suggested are justified by the narrative and
how they affect our reading of the *Odyssey*.

1. Etymology and Narratology

Etymological as well as para-etymological practices operated by the nar-
rator in the field of onomastics and denomination are of great signifi-
cance in interpreting narrative texts, and especially the Homeric epics
since, in most cases, the narrator does not consider the meaning of a
proper name fixed; on the contrary, there seems to be a constant inter-
play between primary or explicit meaning established by linguistic der-
ivations and secondary or implicit meaning as this can emerge from con-

¹ For an assessment of this issue see Hölscher 1960; (1989) ³1990, 122–34; Fenik
text-specific parameters. The semantic flexibility of a proper name and its subsequent potential for multiple interpretations allow it to be inscribed within a set of circumscribed, embedded narratives, all familiar with and subordinate to the main narrative. Of course, etymology as a textual phenomenon can entail a certain amount of poetic subjectivism since it shows how the narrator (either primary or secondary) perceives the meaning of a name and how she/he wishes to project it to her/his narratees, internal and external. Etymologizing, however, serves as a rhetorical device that binds the literary character to the story, ‘the events as dispositioned and ordered in the text’;\(^2\) it constitutes the means by which characters are embedded in narrative situations, while it may also reflect the *etymon* of the name-bearer as well as her/his ensuing ambiguities. The etymologies of Arete, in specific, as proposed in the following sections, will show that name-etymologizing stipulates manifold relations between narrative segments that are concerned with the name-bearer. In other words, the etymology of a proper name is to be identified as a mechanism formatting narrative structures.\(^3\)

Etymology is compressed narrative, and unpacking the etymological potential of a word is to deploy its narrative force (*uis*).\(^4\) Etymologies are enmeshed in narrative structures, and thus their use calls for a narratological approach. The etymology of a name, in particular, is closely associated with the characterization of a figure. Given that etymologizing is a dynamic process of revealing or constructing the meaning of a name, etymological analyses are crucial to interpreting the traits of characters as they are presented or perceived not only by the primary narrator, but also by the internal narrators. Defining the meaning of a name is a power game.\(^5\) Thus, etymologies can reveal character features, which are real or artificially constructed or representative of class or type.\(^6\)

---


3 On the narrative use of name-etymologizing see Calame 1995, 174–85; on speaking names foreshadowing the plot see the analysis of Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoriazusae* in Bierl 2001, 276–82.

4 *uis*, the force of the word, means the etymology of a word in Latin.


6 See Phelan 1989, a narratological study of characterization. Phelan distinguishes the mimetic, thematic, and synthetic traits of a character.
As a means of implicit or explicit characterization, the meaning of a name often foreshadows the words and/or acts of a character, or informs the external and internal narratees about the character’s past. Thus, etymologies can function as proleptes, anticipating certain character features, or as analeptes, recalling marked qualities of a figure. Yet, the etymology of a name is not always confirmed by the narrative, but often negated (a narrativized case of etymologizing e contrario), and thus the narrator can misdirect the audience/readers. Anticipating the fulfillment of a name’s etymology can also activate a retardation effect or create suspense (Spannung).

Etymologies can also form a second narrative level which goes in line with or opposes the main narrative. On the one hand, they may be explanatory in relation to the main plot and the motivation of a character, while, on the other, the implications of an etymological analysis may contrast with the main narrative. In the latter case, etymology transcends the basic narrative structure since the meaning derived from an etymological approach points to an alternative narrative version; or it can result in an independent thematic unit that may further function as a complementary excursus. In other words, etymology can be seen as a second narrative voice, which is sometimes in harmony with and other times in opposition to the plot.

After making these preliminary remarks on the association between narratology and etymology, and establishing etymology as a starting-point for our approach, we may proceed to examine the significance of Arete’s name. We shall first deal with the etymology from ἄριστα.

2. Arete-ἀράσματι

The Arete-ἀράσματι connection has been acknowledged long since by various scholars. The basic argument is that this etymology befits a character who is ‘to be prayed to’ by Odysseus. Hence, the name ‘Arete’ fulfills its function in the Odyssey. Peradotto, however, objected to the connection between Odysseus’ supplication to Arete and the etymology of her name from ἄριστα. The basis of his objection is that nowhere is this root used of prayers directed to any but divine beings.

---

7 See Stanford 1974 ad 7.54; Frame 1978, 79 n. 73; Ahl – Roisman 1996, 58.
8 On the semantics of ἄριστα and its affiliation with the context of Homeric prayer see Morrison 1991, 147 with n. 8; Lateiner 1997, 246; Pulley 1997, 70–6.
9 Peradotto 1990, 108.
His observation is valid, but his conclusion needs reconsideration. We argue instead that this etymological connection contributes to the poet’s purpose to present the Phaiakian queen as an elevated, goddess-like figure. So, let us first examine whether our point is justified.

First of all, when the disguised Athene presents Arete to Odysseus, we learn that the Phaiakian people look upon the queen as a goddess (7.71: οἱ μίν ἐπὶ Ἄθηνα ὡς εἰσορόωντες). There are also two formulas used of Arete, which allude to her divine status. The first is the expression Ἀθηνᾶ ἠδέσπαι (6.306) used for the handicrafts of her spindle. The same formula is used when Odysseus marvels at the harbors, ships, markets, and walls of the Phaiakians (7.45). Arete’s works remind us of the semi-divine status that the Phaiakians enjoy. What is more, the formula Ἀθηνᾶ ἠδέσπαι (6.306; 7.45) used both of Arete’s female handicrafts and of constructions that belong to male oriented activities (ships, market place etc.) anticipates the gender juxtaposition between Alkinoos and Arete which is about to follow.

The second formula which might point to Arete’s divine status, is φιλὴ φρονέσσα (‘she has friendly thoughts’, 6.312 = 7.75). This formula is used several times in the Odyssey for Athene. In the Phaiakian episode, in particular, the formula refers to the friendly thoughts that Athene has toward Odysseus (7.15; 42). We will see that this formula, referring to Athene’s divine support of her protégé, is transferred from Athene to Arete. When Athene, disguised as a young girl, meets Odysseus, she tells him that his safe homecoming depends on the friendly thoughts of the Phaiakian queen:

εἰ κέν τοι κείνη φιλὴ φρονέσσα ἐνί Θυμῷ,
ἐλπισμὴ τοι ἐπείτα φίλοις ἰδέειν καὶ ἰκέσθαι
οἶκον ἐς ψυφοφον καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.

So if she (scil. Arete) has thoughts in her mind that are friendly to you, then there is hope that you can see your own people, and come back to your house with the high roof and to the land of your fathers.

(7.75–7)12

10 This expression is used of divine (Il. 5.725; 18.83; 18.377; Od. 8.366; 13.108) or godlike works (Il. 10.439; Od. 7.45).
11 Louden 1999, 11 notes on φιλὴ φρονέσσα at 7.75: ‘Elsewhere in Homer this term (and its opposite κοκῆ φρονέων) usually describes a deity’s attitude toward a mortal.’
12 All translations of the Odyssean passages cited are taken from Lattimore 1999 with occasional slight adaptations, whereas the Hesiodic ones from Most 2007.
At the end of book 6 (6.324–6), Odysseus prayed to Athene and asked to come among the Phaiakians ‘loved’ (φιλοῦ) and ‘pitied’ (ἐλεείνον). Let us examine Odysseus’ prayer to Athene and its relation to Arete closer:

Odysseus prays to Athene and the narrator frames his prayer with the verb ἔρατο at the end of book 6 and at the very first line of book 7. This verb here seems to allude to Arete’s etymology from ἀράμα and functions as an anticipatory echo of the supplication scene that is about to follow (7.139–152). Odysseus’ prayer to Athene follows Nausikaa’s advice that he should supplicate her mother (Arete’s name remaining unmentioned). After Odysseus’ prayer, the disguised Athene gives him the same advice: his homecoming depends on the queen (7.75–7). We see that Odysseus’ prayer, framed with ἔρατο, is placed between Nausikaa’s and Athene’s similar advice, that Arete is the key-person to enable the hero’s homecoming.  

---

13 Nausikaa’s advice (6.303–15): Odysseus should supplicate her mother- ἔρατο (6.323) – Odysseus’ prayer- ἔρατο (7.1) – Athene’s advice: Odysseus’ homecoming depends on Arete (7.53 ff.).
Odysseus’ prayer anticipates his supplication to Arete. What is more, the fact that Arete’s etymology is anticipated in a prayer to a goddess points to her divine status. Athene hearkens to Odysseus’ prayer, but she appears disguised as a girl out of respect for her uncle Poseidon, who is enraged with Odysseus. It turns out that Athene could not help Odysseus straightforwardly. The fulfillment of Odysseus’ prayer is to be made through Arete, and that is what Athene does. She delegates the prayer addressed to herself to the Phaiakian queen. Athene is φίλα φρονέουσα (7.15) to Odysseus, but his safe return home depends overtly on the friendly disposition of the queen (7.75–7), not that of Athene. The redirection of Odysseus’ plea from Athene to Arete, alluded to by the Arete-ἀράσσω etymology and the parallel φίλα φρονέουσα (7.15 for Athene) and φίλα φρονέησι’ (7.75 for Arete), elevates Arete’s status to a divine level.\footnote{Beye 1966, 177 notes that Athene’s presentation of Arete ‘serves to magnify’ Arete; see also Rose 1969, 404.}

She is to play Athene’s role and she will play this role well. It is interesting in this respect that Athene does not appear openly out of respect for her uncle Poseidon (6.229–30: αἴδετο γάρ ῥα/ πατροκασίγνητον). Arete eventually wants to support Odysseus, but must also respect her husband and uncle Alkinoos (who is her πατροκασίγνητος, the brother of her father Rhexenor). Poseidon also stands in Arete’s way since she knows that helping Odysseus is against his will.\footnote{Doherty argues that Arete can be seen as braving Poseidon’s wrath by helping Odysseus. She compares Tyro’s defiance to Poseidon’s order that she remain silent (11.251–2) with Arete’s cautious silence. By telling Tyro’s story, Odysseus is inviting Arete to speak and help him against Poseidon’s will. See Doherty 1993; 1995, 125. That Odysseus’ adventure in Scherie as well as his encounter with Arete should be set against the theme of Poseidon’s wrath against Odysseus is for the first time implied in 7.34–5, where the narrator makes the connection of the Phaiakians with the realm of Poseidon fairly explicit. In this respect, it is also significant that Arete herself descends from Poseidon (7.56–66). On Poseidon and the Phaiakians cf. Reinhardt 1960, 122 ff.; Aronen 2002, 92 ff., 99 f.}

The fact that Odysseus’ prayer to Athene anticipates the supplication scene and the potential etymology of Arete should not surprise us. Homer often uses this technique in order to achieve effects not stated plainly in the narrative. By using a word alluding to the etymology of a character, the poet invokes this character without mentioning her/him by name. When Odysseus leaves Kalypso’s island, for instance, he is washed up naked onto Scherie and faces a difficult dilemma; if
he rests by the river, he may freeze to death, but if he climbs up the
slope to the shady wood and lies down to rest in the thick brushwood,
he may become prey to wild beasts. He finally finds a sheltered copse
guarded from cold and wild beasts. We see here that the first thing
Odysseus must do upon his arrival on a new island after leaving Kalypso
(‘the Concealer’) is to hide and thus secure himself. Odysseus’ eager
willingness to shun eternal concealment and oblivion is now challenged
by his need to be hidden and thus survive. In this passage, the poet al-
ludes to Kalypso by means of her etymology:

\[\text{\textit{ō}s \textit{Ωδυσσεύς} φύλλοις καλύψατο, τῷ δ’ \textit{άρ’} Αθήνης}
\textit{ύπνοιν ἔπι’ ὀμμασι χεῦ’, ἱνα μιν παύειε τάχιστα}
\textit{δυσπονέος καμάτοιο, φίλε βλέφαρ’ ἀμφίκαλυψα}.\]

So Odysseus covered himself in the leaves, and Athene
shed a sleep on his eyes so as most quickly to quit him,
by veiling his eyes, from the exhaustion of his hard labors.

(5.491–3)

Odysseus now has to cover and shield himself from death, something
that Kalypso was also willing to do by granting him immortality. Kalyp-
so is now absent, but at the same time present under cover of her ety-
ymology. It is a nice touch that Kalypso is here concealed, true to her
name. What is more, her function of concealing passes from Odysseus
finally to Athene, who covers his eyes with sleep. \textit{ἀμφίκαλυψα} is the
very last word of book 5; a book where Kalypso is a very prominent
figure. Athene now takes over her functions as she pours sleep that cov-
ers Odysseus’ eyes (7.14–7). We see that Athene takes over Kalypso’s
role and etymology at the end of book 5 and continues to do so in
book 7, as she pours mist over Odysseus in Scherie.

Tsitsibakou-Vasalos has recently called the compositional technique
at issue ‘transference of etymology.’\textsuperscript{16} This technique is an indispensable
tool in enriching narrative structures, since it ‘creates pairs of surrogate
or foil figures, forms alliances or enmities, most importantly of mortals
and immortals…’.\textsuperscript{17} Elaborate cases of transference of etymology con-
tribute to understanding the interaction of characters in the plot, and
consolidate the structure of the narrative.

In Od. 5.491–3 the technique of transferring the etymology of a
character to another functions as a transitional device. This sort of trans-

\textsuperscript{17} Tsitsibakou-Vasalos 2007, 61.
ference is marked by the formula δείνη Ἐδῶς, occurring right after Athene has poured mist to cover Odysseus on his way to Alkinoos’ palace (7.41); a characterization applied elsewhere to designate only Kalypso (7.246; 255; 12.449) and Kirke (11.8; 12.150), the initial ‘blockers’ and eventual ‘helpers’ of Odysseus’ nostos. Furthermore, the motif of the ‘dread goddess’ is curiously linked in the cases of Athene and Kalypso to female affection (7.42: φιλά φρονέουσα; 7.256: ἐνδυκέως ἐφίλει; 12.450: μ’ ἐφίλει): both goddesses show their love towards the hero by covering him. This instance of ‘transference of etymology’ seems, then, to have a rather ambivalent effect: it does not only point out the occasional similarity of Athene’s role to that of Kalypso in terms of covering and sentimental connection to the hero, but also stresses the discrepancy between the two of them since Athene uses the covering device in order to advance Odysseus’ nostos, certainly not to block it. On a further level, Athene hands over her role as a recipient of Odysseus’ prayer to Arete at the beginning of book 7. We see Odysseus’ fate passing from Kalypso to Arete through Athene. The transition is made through Kalypso’s and Arete’s etymologies (Kalypso – Athene [ἀμφίκακον ἱππασ] / Athene [ἡρῴο] – Arete).

This transition underscores Arete’s divine status. We have already mentioned the parallels between Arete and Athene. There are also similarities between Kalypso and Arete. In Kalypso’s first appearance mention is made of the goddess’ hearth and weaving (5.59–62). Likewise, in Arete’s first appearance, Nausikaa approaches her mother, who sits by the hearth spinning her spindle (6.52–3). Another goddess that Arete shows parallels with is Kirke. Louden pointed out the similarities between Kirke and Arete, commenting on the pattern φιλά/κακα φρονέουσα, and argued that Kirke, who is first κακα φρονέουσα (10.317), changes her evil thoughts to friendly ones and helps Odysseus to return to his country. She is at first hostile, but after asking who he is (10.325: τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρόν;) and learning Odysseus’ identity, she changes her attitude. Likewise, Arete, first cautious and suspicious, asks about Odysseus’ identity (7.238: τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρόν) and becomes finally φιλα φρονέουσα after Odysseus’ account of the heroines he met in the under-

---

18 On the inherent ambivalence of women as ‘blockers and helpers’ in the Odyssey see Foley 1995, 107. Within this context, Beye 1974, 95 speaks of an ‘archetype’, on which the poet of the Odyssey relies in order to fabricate the representation of each individual woman of the poem.

19 See Louden 1999, 6, 11.
world. We see that Arete’s role in the *Odyssey* is constantly paralleled with goddesses.

Though presented as if she were a goddess, Arete is definitely not a goddess as far as the *Odyssey* is concerned. However, she appears to flirt with the divinized status acquired by the heroines of Greek cult after their death. In the *Odyssey*, against the contentions of older scholars, the deification of a mortal is possible. In his trip from Ogygia to Scherie, Odysseus’ raft is wrecked by Poseidon and finally the hero is saved by the intervention of Ino-Leukothea (5.333–5). Ino-Leukothea enters the list of powerful female figures that save Odysseus and facilitate his homecoming. Her appearance before Odysseus’ arrival at Scherie gives us the important information that a mortal woman can become a goddess (τὸν δὲ ἱδὲν Καῦμον θυγάτηρ, καλλίσφυρος ἦν, ἢ πρὶν μὲν ἔναν βροτὸς σύνδησα, νῦν δ’ ἀλὸς ἐν πελάγεσι θεῶν ἐξέμορφε τιμῆς, ‘The daughter of Kadmos, sweet-stepping Ino called Leukothea, saw him. She had once been one who spoke as a mortal, but now in the gulf of the sea she holds degree as a goddess’, 5.333–5). Deification of women is also a recurring motif in the *Ehoiai*:

21 Iphimea becomes Artemis Enodia (fr. 23a.22–6 M.-W.) and Phylone becomes immortal and ageless (25a.10–2 M.-W.). Fr. 91 probably refers to Ino-Leukothea and her apotheosis (Hirschberger 2004, 79). The deified Ino in the *Odyssey* might point to a motif and a character of the *Catalogue of Women*. Odysseus’ deliverance by this heroine preludes the importance of Arete and the *Catalogue of Women* in Odysseus’ nostos.

Helen, as she appears in book 4, is another example of a demigodess. Arthur pointed out that Helen’s elevated status in book 4 is related to her semi-divine nature. She also commented on Helen’s similarities with Arete and argued that their elevated status is singled out as anomalous. Helen’s and Arete’s presence in the megaron after the meal and their participation in the reception of a *xeinos* mark them out as exceptional female characters. Arete does not only participate in the recep-

---

20 Wilamowitz 1884; Rohde 1950; Farnell 1921 argued that there is no trace of hero cult in Homer. This view has been challenged by Hack 1929; Hadzisteliou-Price 1973; 1979; Lyons 1997, 7 ff., passim.


tion of Odysseus, but also declares him as her own xeiνos (11.338).23 Another parallel between Helen and Arete is that their exceptional authority seems to be a source of tension with their husbands. It is true that we find a similar implicit, but easily traced conflict between husband and wife both in Sparta and Scherie. Helen’s divine descent guarantees Menelaos’ immortality (4.569), but her peculiarly high status as a woman is a cause of domestic friction. In short, Arete’s parallel with Helen hints at her exceptionally high position. We have reasons to suspect that the queen belongs to the world of the heroines, like Helen and Leukothea, an aspect that Odysseus will later on exploit successfully.

3. Arete-α(ρ)ρητός

Arete’s name and the narrative dynamics of its etymology are not exhausted with the Ἀρητη-άράσωμαι nexus. We suggest that her name is also associated with ἀ(ρ)ρητός (‘unspoken,’ ‘ineffable’) and examine whether this hypothesis can be supported by the narrative. Arete’s name most likely derives from the adjective ἀρητός.24 The etymology of this adjective is, however, doubtful; it could derive either from ἀράσωμαι or be a variant of ἀρητός.25 Both etymologies of ἀρητός, from which Arete’s name derives, are narrativized in the Odyssey.26

Let us examine first whether our text suggests a relation between Arete and ἀ(ρ)ητός. In the beginning of book 6, when Nausikaa,

23 A comparison with a similar scene in Nestor’s palace reveals that the queen does not join the men, but appears only later sleeping at her husband’s side (3.404); see Arthur 1984, 18–9.
25 The adjective ἀρητός with double ρ must be a later spelling of ἈΡΗΤΟΣ (see Eust. Il. 4.10.4 ὅτι δὲ τὸ ἀρητόν πένθος ἄρητον τινὲς γράφουσι, δήλον, καὶ ὡς οὐκ εὔφαστοτοῦνται οἱ παλαιοὶ τῇ γραφῇ and the remarks in LgrE s.v. ἀρητός). It is indicative that the double ρ in ἀρητός was considered superfluous by the ancient etymological dictionaries (Et. Mag. 237.42–4 s.v. γογγύζω: Ἡ τὸ γογ- γύζω ἀπὸ τοῦ γογγύζων πλεοναστικό τοῦ ρ, ὡς ῥητός ἀρητός).
26 On ἀρητόν and ῥητός (αἰεί ῥητόν) see Apion fr. 20 N. with Rengakos 1992, 44; sch. D Il. 17.37e; sch. Il. 24.741. Furthermore, the Hellenistic poet Aratus, to give an example similar to Arete, puns on his name and the word ἀρητόν, as Peter Bing argued, at Phaen. 1–2: ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτ’ ἄνδρας ἔωμεν/ἄρητον. Callimachus makes the same pun in one of his epigrams (Ep. 27.3–4 Pf.: λεπταί/ῥήσιες, Ἀρητοῦ […]). See Bing 1990.
after her dream, goes to report it to her parents, the narrator makes clear that she will speak both to her father and her mother:

Aútika δ’ Ἡώς ἠλθεν ἑῳδρονος, ἢ μιν ἐγείρε
Ναυσικααν εὐπεπλον· ἀφαρ δ’ ἀπεδαύμασσ’ ἄνειρον,
βη δ’ ἰμεναι διὰ δῶμαθ’, ἵν’ ἄγγειλειε τοκεύσι,
ποιτρί φίλω καὶ ἐμπρό τι χίηστο δ’ ἐνδον ἐώτας,
ἡ μὲν ἐπ’ ἐσχάρη ἦστο σὺν ἀμφιπτόλοισι γυναιξίν,
ἠλάκατα στρωφώσ’ ἀλπόρφυρα.

And next the Dawn came, throned in splendor, and wakened the well-robed girl Nausikaa, and she wondered much at her dreaming and went through the house, so as to give the word to her parents, to her dear father and her mother. She found them within there; the queen was sitting by the fireside with her attendant women, turning sea-purple yarn on a distaff.

(6.48–53)

However, Nausikaa will not disclose her dream (or her intention to marry), but will ask her father to provide her with a chariot in order to do the laundry by the river. This is a case of misdirection the effect of which is to make Nausikaa’s reticence more conspicuous, as de Jong points out. What is more, Nausikaa will not speak in the end to her mother, but only to her father. This is a second misdirection since the anticipation of a speech to the Phaiakian queen is not fulfilled, and, therefore, it is emphasized that the queen is not addressed. Arete’s name is not mentioned either. Although the narrator describes her sitting by the hearth and spinning her spindle, she is not introduced by name. We see Arete on stage, but her name remains ‘unmentioned’; we expect Nausikaa to speak to her, but Arete is not to be spoken to. Later on, when Nausikaa advises Odysseus to go to Alkinoos’ palace

27 The poet applies this poetic device in order to manipulate his audience by creating expectations that are eventually not fulfilled; by interspersing false indications that lead to an outcome other than the one that will actually occur. The aim of such strategies is usually to increase the suspense about the way the story unfolds or surprise the audience. On Homeric misdirection see Morrison 1992, de Jong 1997b, 321–2.
28 De Jong 2001a ad 6.49–51.
29 It is odd that Nausikaa does not address her mother about washing the clothes since the task of doing the laundry might be more in the jurisdiction of the lady of the house. The subject of Nausikaa’s request to her father makes her failure to address her mother more prominent. See Ahl – Roisman 1996, 59.
30 Alkinoos’ name, on the other hand, has been mentioned at 6.12.
and supplicate her mother because his return depends on her, Nausikaa
cites Alkinoos’ name twice (6.299; 302), but refers to Arete as
μητέρ’ ἐμήν (6.305). Here the absence of Arete’s name is more conspic-
uous. It makes sense that Odysseus needs to know the name of the
queen since he has to supplicate her, but Nausikaa’s silence about her
mother’s name leaves Arete’s name still ‘unmentioned’. And although
one acknowledges the natural way in which Nausikaa refers to Arete as
‘mother’, her silence does manage to bring about a quite tantalizing re-
tardation effect.

The supplication scene also suggests Arete’s etymology from
[inline equation]. When the mist that covered Odysseus disperses, everyone
is speechless (7.144: οἱ δ’ ἔνεω ἐγένοντο). From all the speechless Phai-
akians Odysseus has to address the queen. When Odysseus finishes his
supplication, everybody is again silent (7.154: οἱ δ’ ἄρα πάντες τάκην
ἐγένοντο σωπῆ) and above all Arete. She now has become ‘speechless’
from ‘unspoken’ and will keep her silence for a long time. Ekheneos
breaks in and tries to resolve the awkward situation, but he ignores
Arete and advises Alkinoos how he should deal with the stranger
(7.155–66). Alkinoos follows his advice and commands Pontonoos to
pour wine and make a libation to Zeus of the suppliants (7.167–81).
Then he speaks to the Phaiakian leaders (7.186). Although Odysseus
supplcated Arete, she remains completely unmentioned afterwards.

It is only when the Phaiakian leaders withdraw that Arete breaks her
silence. It turns out that she did not speak to Odysseus because what she
had to say was not to be spoken publicly. Arete noticed that Odysseus
wore the cloak and tunic that she had made herself and that her daughter
took to wash. Therefore, she knows that Odysseus most likely met Nau-
sikaa. The fact that he wears these clothes makes him suspicious and

---

31 Later on, after Odysseus will have learned Arete’s name and genealogy from the
disguised Athene (7.63–78), he will start his supplication to Arete by stating her
name and her father’s name (Ἀρήτη, Ἡγάστερ Ῥηξήνορος ἄντιθεοι, 7.146). On
the revelation of Nausikaa’s and Arete’s names, see Olson 1992.
32 In Homeric poetry this sort of retardation in naming a hero constitutes a rather
usual poetic technique; cf. II. 1.307/337 (Patroklos); 1.351/413 (Thetis) – we
owe this point to Magdalene Stoievesandt. It is a fact, though, that the interval
between the introduction of a figure and its naming lasts in Arete’s case unusu-
ally long, exceeding the boundaries of a book (6.52–7.54). On retardation
technique in the Odyssey see Rengakos 1999.
33 On the supplication scene see Pedrick 1982, 138; Crotty 1994, 134; Naiden
2006, 39; Dreher 2006. Newton 1984, views this scene of supplication as a
metaphor for ‘the ritual of rebirth’.
Areteskepticaltogranthisrequests. Her silence is cautious and prudent since she does not reveal her concerns in public and thus tarnish her daughter’s reputation (see Besslich (1966) 1990, 61–9). We see now Aretes etymology functioning in a different direction. While Ekheneos and Alkinoos ignored her and left her unmentioned, she herself proves her name to mean a person who knows what and especially when something is not to be spoken. But when the occasion is appropriate, she finally asks Odysseus bluntly:

'ζείνε, το μέν σε πρῶτον ἐγὼν εἰρήσωμαι αὐτῇ;
ποτέν εἰς ἄνδρῶν; τίς τοι τάδε εἴματ' ἔδωκεν;
οὐ δή φής ἐπὶ πόντον ἀλώμενος ἐνφάδ' ἴκεσθαι;'  

Stranger and friend, I myself first have a question to ask you.  
What man are you and whence? And who was it gave you this clothing?  
Did you not say that you came here ranging over the water?  

(7.237–9)

Aretes use of εἰρήσωμαι, a cognate with ἄρητος (see Chantraine s.v. 2 εἴρω), is here particularly significant. εἰρήσωμαι seems to allude to Aretes name e contrario; the queen negates her unutteredness, rendered so far as suppression of her importance by Alkinoos and Ekheneos, and as silence on her own part, and speaks. οὐ φής seems to set up a further etymological wordplay on Aretes narrative profile as ἄρ(ῥ)ητος as well as an anticipatory echo on οὕτις and Odysseus, especially since Odysseus will not reveal his name to Aretes. His name will be also unuttered and hence he will remain very much a ‘nobody.’ 34 If we acknowledge the Aretes-ἄρ(ῥ)ητος connection, the narrators delay to mention Aretes name can be paralleled to Odysseus long delay in revealing his name to the Phaiakians. Odysseus movement from anonymity to heroic kleos is analogous to Aretes elevation from being an unknown character, probably invented by the poet of the Odyssey, to a heroine that finally acquires kleos by her place in the Catalogue of Women (fr. 222 M.–W.). 35

34 The parallel between Odysseus and Aretes on the basis of their names can first be made through Odysseus epithet πολύφητος, which is the name that Eurykleia implicitly suggested that Autolykos should give to Odysseus (19.404). Peradotto 1990, 108, 120–42 discusses Aretes name and its relation to Odysseus epithet πολύφητος. Note also that Odysseus has been mentioned obliquely as a πολύφητος Θεός by Nausikaa at 6.280. On the implications of the epithet see also Murnaghan 1987, 39–41.

35 ἄρητος can mean a person without kleos. See LfggE s.v. ἄρητος β2: ‘von Menschen ungenannt, ruhmlos’, cf. Hes. Op. 2–4: ... Δι’ ἐννέπετε .../όν τε διὰ βροτοί ἄνδρες ὁμός ἄφατοι τε φατοὶ τε,/róbı τ’ ἄρητοι τε...
As a character given prominence in the *Odyssey*, she resembles Kalypso. The names of Kalypso (‘the Concealer’) and Arete (‘the Unmentioned’) are very suitable to these heroines who rise from concealed anonymity to epic prominence by enabling Odysseus’ travel back home; a travel that for him is always a travel from anonymity to heroic fame.

Odysseus, being the master of manipulating his own name, seems to have grasped Arete’s connection with ἀρρητός. In his response, he first tells her that what she asks is hard to be spoken. He goes on to say that he will tell her what she asks him, but then he gives an abbreviated version of his wanderings and, what is more, he does not say who he is or where he is from:  

‘ἄργαλέον, βασίλεια, διηνικέως ἀγορέεσσαι,
κήδε’ ἐπεί μοι πολλά δόσαν θεοὶ Ωὐράνιοις:
tοῦτο δὲ τοι ἐρέω, ὦ μ’ ἀνείρεσσι ἤδε μεταλλάς.

It is a hard thing, O queen, to tell you without intermission, all my troubles, since the gods of the sky have given me many. But this now I will tell you in answer to the question you asked me.

(7.241–3)

Odysseus’ answer to Arete contains linguistic traits that underpin the proposed Arete-ἀρρητός connection further: the use of ἐρέω and ἀνείρεσσι, both cognates with ἀρρητός, invites us to acknowledge a striking and persistent allusion to Arete’s name. Odysseus will end his speech to Arete with a ring composition, saying that he spoke, as was asked to do, although he was distressed (7.297: τούτα τοι ἀχώμενός περ ἀληθείην κατέλεξα).

At this point, it is worth mentioning Virgil’s adaptation of 7.241–2. Dido asks Aeneas at the end of book 1 of the *Aeneid* to tell her about the ambush of the Greeks, the downfall of the Trojans, and his wanderings (1.753–6). Then everyone is silent (2.1). Aeneas answers to the Phoenician queen more or less as Odysseus answered to the Phaiakian queen:

*infandum, regina, iubes renouare dolorem*

‘Queen, you are asking to renew an ineffable pain.

(Aen. 2.2)

The word *infandum*, emphatically placed at the head of the line, corresponds to the Greek word ἀρρητόν. Virgil here alludes to Odysseus’ an-

37 διηνικέως ἀγορέεσσαι (7.241) actually recalls the etymology of ἀρρητός from ἄει ῥητόν, attested at sch. Ο. II. 17.37c; sch. Il. II. 24.741.
sweter to Arete and we suggest that he also alludes, in the subtle way of an
Alexandrian poet, to Arete’s etymological connection with δρ(η)τος. By doing so, he leaves Arete’s (but also Dido’s) name unmentioned, but at the same time, implied. Virgil manages to hint at the scene he adapts here by means of a witty paradoxical pun; Arete is mentioned by remaining ‘unmentioned’.

Turning back to the Odyssey, after 8.445 Arete will remain silent and unmentioned until book 11. Her silence does not reduce her importance in the narrative. We argue against scholars who believed that, although Arete is proclaimed to be the key-person for Odysseus’ return, her role is afterwards downplayed. Doherty argues convincingly that Odysseus organizes the first half of his apologoi as an attempt to win over Arete. Odysseus realizes that the Phaiakian queen has the power to either facilitate his nostos or keep him in Scherie trapping him in a world of anonymity forever. Arete’s ambivalent power resembles that of the goddesses Kalypso and Kirke. All these women threaten Odysseus’ nostos but finally offer valuable help. It seems that the queen can decide whether Odysseus will return home or stay marooned in the fictional and isolated Scherie. Odysseus does not seem to have forgot-

---

38 Arete’s name and its etymology from δρ(η)τος provide a nice paradox that explains her function and her importance in the Odyssey; by remaining unmentioned for a long time, she is present through the etymology of her name. To put it in another way, the etymology of her name evokes her presence through her silence. The emphasis of her importance by means of her withdrawal from the forefront of the narrative resembles Achilles in the Iliad, whose absence from the battlefield does not reduce his importance, but rather emphasizes how crucial he is for the war.


40 See Doherty 1992; 1995, 87–160. See also Minchin 2007a, 20–1 = 2007b, 266.

41 Tsitsibakou-Vasalos suggests an intriguing etymological parallel between Ares and Arete. Ares’ etymological relation to ἀράξομαι/ἀρά (cf. sch. A II. 18. 521b; Hsch. 7145) suggests that the god is ‘a curse, a bane’ (per litteras). Being a belligerent god, Ares is also δρ(η)τος, unpersuaded by words and reason. Thus, Ares shares the same etymological potential with Arete, but while the god of war develops the dark sides of his etymologies in the Iliad, the Phaiakian queen activates the positive dynamics of her etymologies in the Odyssey. Ares and Arete have a relation of polarity. The Iliadic Ares is a baneful god that defies negotiation, while the Phaiakian queen stands for supplication and persuasion. Arete, the daughter of Rhexenor (‘Breaker of Men’), incorporates the semata of Ares, who is a man-slaughtering god (cf. παύσασθαι βροτολογίγν
ten Nausikaa’s (6.310–15) and Athene’s (7.75–7) advice that his safe return to his longed-for fatherland depends on Arete. If he wants to return to Ithaca and claim his kleos, he has to talk his way out of Scherie by winning her over. The only way to accomplish that is to speak of his unspeakable woes.

4. Gender and Generic Tension in Scherie

The above section has made apparent Arete’s double etymological dynamics, which indicates her centrality in the Phaiakian episode. In the following section we argue that Arete belongs to a generic frame that renders her role in the narrative comprehensible. This generic frame, the so-called ehoie-poetry, and its narrative conventions seem to be the point where Arete’s semantic multivalence and her prominent role in the gender-system of the Odyssey intersect. The Phaiakian episode provides a nice glance at the harmonic cooperation of gender and genre mechanics. We are invited to see how gender roles are performed in an archaic epic context, and to what extent the narrative contributes to the construction of gender identities and inter-gender relationships.42

In specific, attention is drawn to the fact that the gender of the narrator (Odysseus) and the narratee (Arete) holds a key position in establishing communication, and consequently that this configuration imposes a certain discourse upon the narrative so that communication can be achieved after all. Moreover, the episode of Odysseus’ encounter with the Phaiakians contains an instance of inter-genre transference of a gendered narrative mode, i.e. the stylized narrative patterns of ehoie-poetry, within an already explicitly gendered genre. Thus, we are called to observe how the gendered narrative of ehoie-poetry works in an epic praising a male hero, and what kind of narrative purposes it serves.

42 For current insights into the relationship of narratology to gender studies see Lanser 1986, Nünning 1994, Prince 1996.

\(^{42}\) For current insights into the relationship of narratology to gender studies see Lanser 1986, Nünning 1994, Prince 1996.
We have already mentioned that Arete’s high position makes her comparable to a heroine of the *Catalogue of Women*. Let us examine this point closer. We begin with Athene’s presentation of Arete to Odysseus (7.53–77). When the disguised Athene introduces Arete’s genealogy, we move from the world of heroic epic poetry, which focuses synchronically on heroes of a certain age and time, to the diachronically oriented catalogue poetry. Athene’s language emphasizes this generic shift, and frames Arete and her genealogy within the poetic tradition of the *Catalogue of Women*.

Earlier as well as contemporary Homeric research has curiously overlooked a trait intrinsic to the presentation of Arete in book 7: the fact that Athene’s speech makes extensive use of linguistic elements and especially formulas that recall the typical language of the so-called *ehioie*-poetry. To begin with, the explicitly genealogical frame of the narrative that Athene puts forward in order to introduce Arete is to be identified as a distinctive feature of this kind of female-oriented narrative mode. According to the genealogical tree given, Arete’s grandmother was Periboia, who is described as a woman of exceptional beauty (7.57: γυναικῶν εἴδος ἄριστη). This expression, attested hapax in the Homeric epics, constitutes an allomorph of the recurrent Iliadic formula ἰογατρῶν εἴδος ἄριστη and should be semantically associated with γυναικῶν φύλον … αἱ τῶτ’ ἄρισται ἔσον in the proem of the Hesiodic *Ehoiai* (fr. 1.1–3 M.-W.) as well as with the introductory section of the Odyssean ‘Catalogue of Women’ (11.225–7: […] αἱ δὲ γυναίκες/ […] ὅσσαι ἄριστην ἀλοχοὶ ἔσον ἢδὲ ἰογατρῶν).43 Its narrative function is to mark and activate the *ehioie*-genre – a turn made all the more explicit as soon as the genealogy reaches its intended point of reference, Arete. This association of Arete with the semantics of ἄριστη, mainly addressing beauty and social status, on the one hand urges us to think of a poet suggesting an oblique wordplay – this wordplay might be implied, as Alkinoos asks his wife to fetch the best chest with a clean cloak and a chiton in it for the stranger to use after his bath (8.423–4: δὴ ἰὰ τῶτ’ Ἄρητην προσέφη μένος Ἀλκινόοιοι’/δεῦρο, γύναι, φέρε χήλὸν

43 Il. 2.175 (Alkestis); 3.124, 6.252 (Laodike); 13.365 (Kassandre); 13.378 (daughter of Atreids); hDem. 146 (Kallidike); cf. also hVen. 41: μέγα εἴδος ἄριστη ἐν ἀνθρώπην πρεσβεύσθαι (Hera). Cf. Meier 1976, 144 with n. 3. On female εἴδος in the Hesiodic *Ehoiai* see Osborne 2005, 10 ff.
44 Lyons 1997, 10 ff. notes the thematic connection of the two Catalogues in terms of these ‘best women’ (ἄρισται). See also Irwin 2005, 41.
Thereupon the king Alkinoos said to Arete: ‘Come, wife, bring out a magnificent coffer, the best one you have’). On the other hand, the term is followed within the narrative by another superlative, πρώτη, stressing Arete’s primary position in the episode (cf. 7.53: πρώτα).

In addition, the formal elements that directly follow the sequence οἷν ... ‘Αρήτην point towards conceiving Arete’s entry as a disguised form of an elhioi: line 7.66 touches on the union of Arete and Alkinoos, brought forth by the formula ‘he made her his wife’ (ποιήσατ’ ἀκοιτίν). That the formula occurs seven times in the Ehoiai in a marriage context is surely indicative of the formula’s connection to elhioi-poetry. In the following line the theme of Arete’s exceptional τιμή is addressed (7.67–8: καὶ μιν ἔτιο’ ὡς οὖ τις ἐπὶ χθονὶ τίται ἂλλη/δόσαι νῦν γε γυναῖκες ὑπ’ ἀνδράσιν οἷον ἑξοσιν [‘and (scil. Alkinoos) honored her as no other woman on earth is honored, such women as there are now and keep a house under their husbands’]). In the Homeric epics men usually honor men, whereas their respect towards women is expressed only twice in the Odyssey, with regard to Arete and Eurykleia. In the case of Eurykleia, we find a slightly similar wording as well as a concise genealogy (1.428–33: τῷ δ’ ἄρ’ ἀμί’ αἰθομένας δοίδας φέρε κενόν ἱεῦσα/Εὐρύκλει’, ὤπος θυγάτηρ Πεισηνορίδας, /τὴν ποτὲ Λαέρτης πρίστο μετατεσσεὶν ἐῳσι, /πρωθήκην ἐτ’ ἐῴσαι, ἐεικοσάβοια δ’ ἐξωκεν, / ἱσα δὲ μιν κενην ἀλόχω τίεν ἐν μεγάροισιν, /ἐνυὴ δ’ οὖ ποτ’ ἐμικτο, χόλον δ’ ἀλέειν γυναικός [‘and devoted Eurykleia went with him, and carried the flaring/torches. She was the daughter of Ops, the son of Peisenor, and Laertes had bought her long ago with his own possessions/when she was still in her first youth, and gave twenty oxen for her,/and he favored her in his house as much as his own devoted/wife, but never slept with her, for fear of his wife’s anger’]). The similarity of the phrasing relat-


47 On the parallel Arete-Eurykleia in terms of τιμή see Wagner-Hasel 2000b, 205. Eurykleia’s low social status seems to be a good reason why the alleged formula might have been modified in this case. Eurykleia’s moral integrity and the fact that she functions as a surrogate for Antikleia show her to be a rather distorted
ing τίω to a discourse of τιμή is, however, to be found also in the ehoie of Alkmene. The diction at Hes. Eh. fr. 195.16–7 M.-W. = Scut. 9–10 (ἥ δὲ καὶ ὃς κατὰ 但不限αν ἔνοι τίτσεκε ἁκοίτην, ὅς οὖ πώ τις ἔστι γυναικῶν ήθαλπιρᾶον [‘and in her spirit she honored her husband as no other female woman ever yet honored hers’]) is strongly reminiscent of Od. 7.67–8, although the circumstances of attributing τιμή are not exactly identical. Alkmene was not being honored by her husband like Arete, but honored her husband in a unique manner. It is our con-tention that the discourse related to female τιμή, as presented in the cases of Eurykleia, Arete and Alkmene, belongs to a fixed concept of an orally transmitted genealogical poetry, the ehoie-poetry. The poet of the Odyssey must have inherited this concept and the subsequent vocabulary from an allegedly pre-Hesiodic genealogical tradition. Thus, by the time of Hesiod it seems to have been already established as a formula. These parallels can explain why Odysseus proceeds to relate his encounter with famous heroines and, what is more, why these tales are appealing to Arete. Minchin (2007a, 20–1 = 2007b, 266) has recently argued that Arete responds positively to the tales of Odysseus in Od. 11.336–7 and encourages him to continue because she enjoys listening to them. This is true, but Minchin fails to explain why Odysseus’ storytelling is so appealing to her as to make her break her protracted silence and retract her cautious behavior concerning Odysseus’ reception as a guest. It is, in our view, precisely the well-established nexus based on multiple implicit and explicit allusions to ehoie-poetry that helps us to comprehend Arete’s approval of the excursus of the ‘Catalogue of Women’ in the Odyssey. As a result, when Odysseus decides

---

48 Hirschberger 2004, 366 on fr. 91.9–10 and Hunter 2005c, 253 n. 51 note the similarity in poetic expression, but do not comment on the stylization of the formulaic language of the Ehoiai. Neitzel 1975 and Cohen 1989–90 do not include the passage in their studies as an example of Homeric reception in Hesiod.

49 On the existence of such a pre-Hesiodic tradition see West 1985, 125; Rutherford 2000, 89–93; Hirschberger 2004, 63, 64 f.; Hunter 2005a, 2; Nasta 2006, 64–8; Arrighetti 2008. Rutherford 2000, 93–6 even believes that an early version of the Hesiodic Ehoiai was available to the poet of the Odyssey.

50 This point has recently been put forward also by Doherty 2006, 313 f., who nevertheless does not develop her argument on a textual basis.
to interrupt his story right after he has finished reciting the heroines he met in the Underworld, he does not do so randomly, and accordingly, the self-interruption is far from unexpected.\textsuperscript{51} Odysseus wants to test the efficiency of the narrative skills he has employed to serve a concrete goal: that of gaining Arete’s sympathy by acknowledging the importance of the heroines in the epic universe of the \textit{Odyssey}.

In the light of this generic interpretation we should now turn back to reassess the verse that introduced Arete (7.65–6: ἐν μεγάρῳ μίαν ὀην παῖδα λιπόντα/Ἀρήτην): she was the one and only daughter of Rhexenor, the brother of Alkinoos. The word ὀη not only expresses the genealogical particularity of Arete, but furthermore implicitly marks her uniqueness as a female Homeric character; it designates, to put it in Kahane’s words, her ‘existence as a heroic one-of-a-kind’ (Kahane 1997, 118). Further we suggest that this precise word (ὁη) might be thought of as subjected to a process of semantic fluctuation, fairly equivalent to R. Barthes’ famous notion of anchorage and his ‘floating chain of signifieds.’\textsuperscript{52} Thus, it sets up an allusive interplay with ὀη. Bearing in mind the predominantly genealogical context of Athene’s speech so far, a reader would be enticed to see in the pronoun an alluring association with the marker of female genealogical poetry (ἡ) ὀη\textsuperscript{53} and subsequently to read the passage as a proper \textit{ehoie}. Against this background, Kahane maintains that ‘within the specific discourse of Homeric hexameter there are significant pragmatic links between the word \textit{oios} (alone, on his own) and the word \textit{hoios} (such a.../what a..., as an expression of emotion), [...]. This idea should not surprise us. What Milman Parry termed calembour (more serious than a pun) is a recurrent feature of Homeric poetry: autme//and aute//; omphe//and odme//; demos// (fat) and demos// (people) are some well known examples, all localized (like the rhythm in later poetry) at the end of the verse’ (Kahane 1997, 121–2). We suggest that a further instance of this calembour might be the semantic approximation of ὀη to ὀη in Athene’s speech.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{51} For a different view on this matter see Rabel 2002; Graziosi – Haubold 2005, 47; Minchin 2007b, 242.
\textsuperscript{52} Barthes 1977, 39.
\textsuperscript{54} Cf. the relevant remark in Minchin 1996, 13: ‘The connectedness of his material at associative and semantic levels would have been of considerable assistance to Homer as he sang his lists and catalogues’.
Of course, in our case there is no double mentioning of σῆ and σῆ, which would make the phonetic parallelism somewhat explicit, and accordingly, no *ehoie*-formula. That the *ehoie*-formula, however, is not attested in the ‘Nekyia’,\(^{55}\) the most straightforward instance of *ehoie*-poetry, can be explained on a narratological basis: Odysseus’ apologetoi, where the ‘Catalogue of Women’ is integrated, requires a formulaic expression adapted to Odysseus’ first-person narrative of his encounter with the heroines instead of the *ehoie*-formula, which is appropriate to third-person narration.\(^{56}\) In other words, Odysseus does not need here the formula in order to make the transition to the *ehoie*-poetry.\(^{57}\) In our view, it is exactly the position of σῆ, appropriated in a passage making extensive use of formulas connected to *ehoie*-poetry and above all introducing a female figure, that effectively triggers the allusive play with the *ehoie*-formula.

The use of variants of the *ehoie*-formula in the *Odyssey* as a means of alluding to the genre of *ehoie*-poetry as crystallized in the Hesiodic *Ehoiai* is not unique. When Telemakhos speaks of his mother to the suitors, σῆ functions as a signpost of poetry related to the *Catalogue of Women*:\(^{58}\)

> Ἄλλα ἐγέτε μνηστήρες, ἐπεὶ τόδε φαίνετ’ ἔξειλον, σῆ νῦν οὐκ ἔστι γυνὴ κατ’ Ἀχαΐδα γαῖαν,

But come on suitors, since there is a prize set before you, a woman such as there is none in all the Akhaian country now.

(21.107–8)

Telemakhos invites the suitors to the bow contest which has Penelope as its prize (ἔξειλον). Note that the wooing of a woman as well as a

\(^{55}\) In this respect, Rutherford 2000, 93–4 believes that the *ehoie*-formula might have been ‘replaced with a set of formulas amounting to “And I saw:” τῇν ἔκ … ἔδον …, καὶ … ἔδον … and so on’ and that ‘the Nekyia catches and preserves for us an earlier stage in the development of *ehoie*-poetry’.

\(^{56}\) On the implications of Odysseus’ first-person narration in the apologetoi see Reinhardt 1960, 58–62; on the arrangement and significance of the apologetoi see Most 1989 and Bierl 2007.

\(^{57}\) Nasta 2006, 60 points out: ‘Au fil des apparitions Ulysse reprend chaque fois le même tour introductif: (ἔδον …/ ἔσειδον … ἔδον…) “J’ai vu …/Je vis encore …/Je vis aussi …”. Ailleurs, selon la spécificité des contextes, ἥ σῆ aurait pu fonctionner comme une formule de relance, tout aussi véhémentement que l’itération du verbe qui faisait revivre dans l’*Odyssée* un témoignage focalisé par le narrateur’.

woman set as the prize of a contest are recurring motifs in the *Ehoiai*.\(^{59}\) The female excellence of Penelope, who is said to be the best of the Akhaian women, is also thematically associated with the Hesiodic *Ehoiai* (cf. fr. 1.1–4 M.-W.). Thus, the passage quoted above relates Penelope to the most characteristic formula and themes of the *Ehoiai*. Penelope is actually compared to the heroines of the *Catalogue of Women* by Anti-noos: ἔργα τ’ ἐπίστασθαι περικαλλέα καὶ φρένας ἐσθαλὸς/κέρδεα Θ’, ο putStrLn πώ τιν’ ἄκούσμεν οὐδὲ παλαιῶν, /τάων α’ πάρος ἤσαν ἐὕπλοκαμίδες Ἄχαιαί, /Τυρώ τ’ Ἀλκμήνη τε ἐὔστεφανός τε Μυκήνη (‘to be expert in beautiful work, to have good character and cleverness, such as we are not told of, even of the ancient queens, the fair-tressed Akhaian women of times before us, Tyro and Alkmene and Mykene, wearer of garlands’; *Od*. 2.117–20). Within this context, οἷα seems to set up an allusion to the *Ehoiai*.

However, this generic interplay is not without tension in Scherie. We argue that the undercurrent of the gender conflict in the Phaiakian episode is reflected upon the generic interplay between heroic and *elhoie*-poetry. Arete is a woman who enjoys a higher status than usual (see Arthur 1984, 16–9). Alkinoos honored her as no other woman/wife on earth is honored (7.67–9). Her authority is so strong that she can even resolve quarrels among men (7.74).\(^{60}\) Nausikaa’s and Athene’s advice to Odysseus to supplicate Arete further elevate her exceptional status. We contend, however, that her elevated status is a cause of covert tension in Phaiakia. When Odysseus beseeches her, her subsequent silence causes Ekheneos’ intervention. Ekheneos ignores her and the fact that Odysseus supplicated her, and addresses Alkinoos. Subsequently, Alkinoos addresses the Phaiakian leaders and also ignores his wife, who is sitting next to him. It also seems that Alkinoos and Arete have constantly opposite attitudes towards Odysseus. While Alkinoos is garrulous and friendly to Odysseus, and offers him Nausikaa’s hand, Arete

\(^{59}\) Several episodes of the *Catalogue* develop the motif of the wooing of a woman and the woman is often the prize of a contest. Atalanta’s suitors woo her by competing with her in a foot race (fr. 72–6 M.-W.). Sisyphos woos Mestra on behalf of his son Glaukos, promising countless wedding gifts (fr. 43a.21: μυρία ἔνδα). The *Ehoiai* conclude with the lengthy episode of the wooing of Helen (fr. 196–204 M.-W.), which is actually a contest of wealth. On the motif of wooing in the *Odyssey* see Tsitsibakou-Vasalos (this volume).

is silent and skeptical. Alkinoos is initially enthusiastic, whereas Arete is cautious and suspicious with the stranger. While Alkinoos speaks publically and makes his offer without knowing the identity of the stranger, Arete speaks in private and asks Odysseus bluntly who he is. Alkinoos offers Odysseus gifts and is confident about his safe return (8.424–32), whereas Arete warns Odysseus that he might be robbed by the Phaiakians on his way home (8.443–5). When Arete has been won over and suggests that the Phaiakians bestow more gifts upon her guest, the gender tension reaches its peak. Arete sees the bond of xenia with Odysseus as a personal one (11.338: ξείνος ... ἐμὸς ἐστιν; see Doherty 1995, 80). Thus, she replies obliquely to Ekheneos (7.159–66), who addressed his speech to Alkinoos, using the word ξείνος three times and passing over the fact that Odysseus had supplicated Arete and not Alkinoos. Ekheneos now intervenes for a second time. He politely seconds the queen’s suggestion, but notes that this business belongs to Alkinoos (11.344–6). Alkinoos agrees with Arete’s proposition, yet in seconding her he uses the same formulaic language in which Telemakhos rebuked Penelope: μῦθος/ποιμή δ’ ἀνδρεσί μελήσει/πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ’ ἐμοί: τοῦ γὰρ κράτος ἐστ’ ἐνί οἰκῷ/δήμῳ (1.358–9 ~ 11.352–3).61 This is the men’s business, not Arete’s, who urged the Phaiakians not to make haste to send Odysseus away (11.339: τῷ μη ἐπειγόμενοι ἀποπέμπετε; 11.352: ποιμή). Telemakhos utters these words while his authority is seriously questioned. By alluding to book 1, the poet parallels the two situations.62 Alkinoos of course is not weak like Telemakhos, but the repetition of the lines implies that Arete’s intervention might intrude into the male sphere of authority. In book 1, Penelope is excluded from the audience of Phemios’ song and retreats to her place after being rebuked. Alkinoos also rebukes Arete (though subtly), but not only has Arete enjoyed Odysseus’ stories (unlike Penelope whom Phemios’ song grieved), but also Odysseus attempted to win her over by choosing a subject matter and a treatment of his topic that would please her.

61 For this formula and possible interpretations of the tensions between Arete and Alkinoos, see Doherty 1991, 151; Wohl 1993, 31–2, 38, 42. Cf. Hektor’s answer to Andromakhe in II. 6.492–3, (πόλεμος δ’ ἀνδρεσί μελήσει/πᾶσιν, ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα, τοῦ ἦλιῳ ἐγγεγέρσην), a passage also pregnant with gender tension; see Rutherford 1991–93, 51; Kahane 2005, 168–71.

62 See Doherty 1992, 166.
Arete belongs to the genre of female ἀφετή, and we know from Hes. Eh. fr. 222 M.-W. that she had a place in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Within the narrative of the Odyssey, Athene’s speech to Odysseus contains two pieces of advice; an overt one (that is to beseech the queen) and a covert one (that is that Arete belongs to the genre of the echoing, and therefore should be treated respectively). Odysseus will exploit the second hint while relating the heroines he met in the Underworld. In order to ingratiate Arete, he will turn to the genre to which Arete belongs.

Let us examine some parallels between Athene’s presentation of Arete’s genealogy and Odysseus’ foray into the ‘Catalogue of Women’: Odysseus relates at length Poseidon’s affair with Tyro. Likewise, Athene mentioned Periboia’s affair with Poseidon. Tyro is also referred to as βασιλεία (11.258), a title also given to Arete (7.241; 11.345). Tyro’s husband Kretheus was her uncle, according to Eh. fr. 30 M.-W. Likewise, Alkinoos and Arete are uncle and niece. The silence motif is also important in Tyro’s story (see Doherty 1993). Poseidon asked Tyro that she not reveal their affair (11.251–2). However, Tyro defies his order as she reports her affair to Odysseus. It is striking that Poseidon’s words are given in direct speech (Od. 11.248–52), although in book 11 women do not speak directly, but their stories are reported in indirect speech by Odysseus. The direct speech stresses Tyro’s defiance. The revelation of the affair is against Poseidon’s prohibition, and his words, which are supposed to remain concealed, resound in direct speech. Doherty argues that Tyro and Arete, like Odysseus, can be seen as resisting the will of the god Poseidon. Tyro’s defiance consists of breaking the taboo of silence, while Arete can also be seen as braving Poseidon’s wrath by helping Odysseus (Doherty 1995, 125). By breaking her silence, Tyro guarantees her place in the echoic-poetry. Hence, her name acquires kleos. Had she obeyed Poseidon’s order, she would remain unknown and unmentioned. Her only escape from anonymity is the fame ensuing from her affair with Poseidon. Therefore, Odysseus’ story of Tyro would be targeting Arete’s cautious silence. The hint is that Arete should not be afraid of Poseidon, and should speak for Odysseus’ cause. Odysseus’ return home will guarantee Arete’s fame. Since Odysseus features as a poet of echoic-poetry, and Arete belongs to this poetic universe, he is her chance to escape ano-

---

63 Doherty 2006, 313 points out some parallels between the stories of Tyro and Periboia.
nymity. The epic world of Odysseus has not been incompatible with the world of the heroines. On the contrary, the one guarantees the *kleos* of the other.

As already mentioned, the gender tension in Phaiakia is reflected upon the generic interplay with the *ehoie*-poetry. Ekheneos is the key-character that connects the gender with the generic tension. In his twofold intervention, he ostentatiously passes over Arete and emphasizes Alkinoos’ authority. He is twice referred to as ‘hero’ (7.155, 11.342: ἥρως Ἐχένηος) by the narrator – a rather peculiar appellative considering the standards of the peaceful Phaiakians, who refrain from any kind of warrior activity.\(^6^4\) As a character underscoring Alkinoos’ authority and undermining Arete’s,\(^6^5\) his characterization as ἥρως may implicitly presuppose an attempted generic shift, which the representative of the heroic world tries here to squeeze out. In this respect, it is significant that these two formulaic references to Ekheneos are carefully placed by the poet after ‘Arete’s *ehoie*’ (7.155–7) and after the ‘Catalogue of Women’ (11.342–3a) respectively.\(^6^6\) Ekheneos undermines Arete’s power by pointing to Alkinoos’ authority and thus exemplifies the undercurrent of conflict between the king and the queen of Scheria.\(^6^7\) In this way, he seems to react implicitly against *ehoie*-poetry. His reaction points against the potential establishment of powerful female figures like Arete and the women of the Catalogue in the narrative of the *Odyssey*. This would signal a grave ‘adulteration’ of the heroic poetry by *ehoie*-poetry. Besides, the significant name of Ekheneos, the one

\(^{6^4}\) On the use of ἥρως in Homer see now van Wees 2006, 366–70, who argues against a secular meaning.

\(^{6^5}\) On this see Doherty 1995, 68 f., 77 f.


\(^{6^7}\) As far as Arete is concerned, her father’s name seems to reveal an analogous semantics of gender conflict, on the condition that one accepts the paternal nomenclature as an *ad hoc* invention by the poet of the *Odyssey* in order to indirectly serve the characterization of Arete: ‘Ῥηξηνωρ’ (7.63) is the one who ‘breaks armed ranks’ (cf. LfgE s.v. ῥηξηνωρ: ‘men-breaking, shattering (the ranks of) his opponents’) and subsequently his daughter displays the same trait, though certainly not on the battlefield. The similar function of Eurykleia’s paternal nomenclature (*Od*. 1.429; 2.347; 20.148: ὦπος Δυγάτηρ Πιεστηριδς) is treated in Skempis (forthcoming). On the identification of epic women with their fathers see Olson 1992, 4 n. 13.
who ‘possesses ships’,\(^6\) suggests the Homeric aristocratic ideal, and makes him particularly appropriate to bring up the subject. The emphasis on Ekheneos’ age in both instances as γέρον and Φατήκων ἀνδρῶν προγενέστερος emphasizes the significance of the old counselor’s opinion. But one is also inclined to think that this reference may also imply the character’s reaction to a lapse of the traditional heroic epic into the thematically diverse genre of the ‘Catalogue of Women’.\(^6\) It is a fact that the \textit{Odyssey} significantly refines the epic tradition, in particular the ideal of the Iliadic warrior hero, and consequently reflects on the evolution of the epic genre.\(^7\) We believe that the Phaiakian episode offers a concrete example of this evolutionary tendency inherent in the \textit{Odyssey} by projecting a generic tension between heroic epic and \textit{ehoie}-poetry.

At 11.363–76, Alkinoos says that Odysseus does not seem to be a dissembler or a thief. Thus, he answers obliquely to Odysseus’ suggestion that he would be willing to stay for one more year in Scherie, should that be more profitable for him (11.355–61). Alkinoos’ attitude to Odysseus is again at odds with that of his wife; while Arete seems willing to shower Odysseus with gifts and delay his escort home (11.339–41), Alkinoos is not at all willing to have Odysseus for one year in Scherie and increase his gifts. Oddly enough, Alkinoos says that Odysseus has surveyed skillfully the story of his own sorrows and of all the Argives (11.368–9). This is of course a strange statement. First of all, Odysseus did not say anything about the sorrows of the Argives, much less about all the Argives. Odysseus has just finished relating his encounter with the heroines, but Alkinoos not only does not praise, but deliberately passes over this part of Odysseus’ account. Then, he asks Odysseus to change the subject. Alkinoos dismisses the ‘ehoie-poetry’ and asks Odysseus to tell them about his comrades who followed him and died at Troy. We see here that Alkinoos is interested in the Iliadic stories of Odysseus. His request is that Odysseus change genre and move from the female catalogue to the male-oriented heroic poetry. He phrases this request by leaving the \textit{ehoie}-like part of Odysseus’ account


\(^7\) For the most recent discussion on this see Slatkin 2005, 316 ff.; cf. Pucci 1995.
Alkinoos seems to imply that Odysseus should speak about the heroes who died at Troy, about the epic world that he claims to be a part of, and not about the women of *ehoiē*-poetry. Arete’s fascination with the account of the heroines and Alkinoos’ request that Odysseus change topic and thus genre represent the gender tension reflected upon the generic question.

Hence, our reading proposes an *ehoiē*-frame that starts in a rather oblique way with Athene’s speech in book 7 and ends more straightforwardly with the ‘Catalogue of Women’ in book 11. Odysseus’ narrative in the ‘Nekyia’ extols female virtue and particularly motherhood through the long conversation with Antikleia in the Underworld. It is worth noting that *ehoiē*-poetry provides a particularly suitable ‘vessel’ for praising motherhood due to the matrifocal emphasis on the presentation of the genealogies of heroes. Gera is right to acknowledge that Arete is the first of Odysseus’ listeners to react to his Catalogue, where the encounter with his dead mother Antikleia is recounted – it seems that the narrative activates Arete’s motherly responses. It is also noteworthy that Nausikaa refrains from naming Arete, but refers to her twice merely as ‘mother’ (6.305; 310), a designation which brings forth the text’s accent on Arete in her capacity as a mother. In this respect, it might be no coincidence that Odysseus decides to narrate the meeting with his dead mother, perhaps seeking to create a link with Arete and her position in Scherie. The point seems to be that in his cultural background, i.e. that of an epic hero, one’s mother is as highly respected as Arete appears to be in the community of the Phaiakians.

5. Conclusion

The usefulness of the formal references to *ehoiē*-poetry lies on creating a codified channel of communication between Odysseus and Arete. This kind of poetry, standing at the heart of an innovative epic, provides a
heuristic tool for honing inter-gender communication. *Ehoie*-poetry is, however, a code, which is phatically articulated, though left unclassified, unnamed, at times even covert, as in the case of Arete’s entry. One sees in the reaction of Ekheneos that this sort of poetry can cause a disruption on the heroic conceptualization of the epic collective and its representatives, i.e. men. Arete’s narrativized etymologies and her affinity to genealogical poetry about women in the Phaiakian episode serve to establish a social communication, which transgresses gender and genre. Besides, the two etymologies of Arete’s name which have been discussed in this paper exhibit the paradoxical nature of her name’s semantics: on the one hand, it claims communication as its basis and, therefore, fosters narrative by suggesting the necessity of her being addressed by Odysseus; on the other, it reveals a character more or less challenging communication since she remains silent most of the time after Odysseus has supplicated her. Yet, in Arete’s case, the meaning of her name as well as her generic affiliation with *ehoie*-poetry have a concrete narrative function: Odysseus understands Athene’s hint in book 7, i.e. that his safe homecoming depends on a heroine of genealogical poetry, and when the time comes, he veers his narrative to Arete’s world, a world of female *arete*. He seems to be aware that his epic nostos passes through *ehoie*-poetry, just as Arete’s *kleos* passes through Odysseus’ nostos.