NANCY FELSON and LAURA SLATKIN

NOSTOS, *TISIS*, AND TWO FORMS OF DIALOGISM IN HOMER'S *ODYSSEY*

As Book 1 sends Telemachus out in search of Odysseus, it invites the audience to consider the possibility that the son will be the means of his father's return – that Telemachus will solve the mystery of Odysseus' whereabouts and aid in his safe passage back to Ithaca. In fact the narrative logic of the *Odyssey* offers a more complex weave, combining the traditional story patterns of return and revenge.[1] By opening its narrative with Zeus' invocation of the tale of Agamemnon's murder and Orestes' vengeance, the *Odyssey* offers a negative paradigm for Odysseus and Penelope, but a positive model for Telemachus. In recalling this story, Zeus links the goal of return to that of revenge, bringing to the fore the ethical and political dimensions of homecoming: the need to restore to proper functioning the households and communities left behind by the warriors away at Troy and made susceptible to instability and corruption. From this first invocation, then, we are primed to view that return as more than a private objective in the *Odyssey*; it becomes an instrument of justice, sanctioned by the gods, through which the social order –not simply the story's protagonist – will be rescued and restored.

That the *Odyssey* upholds a general logic of social order, grounded in the *oikos*, is clear.[2] How it introduces us to the problem of the household as vulnerable, threatened, and ultimately restored, is integral to its art. The poem represents examples of a secure order in the households that Telemachus

1. The evidence of traditional narrative patterns, as demonstrated by the South Slavic material studied by Parry and Lord, indicates that in stories of the return of the hero (often from imprisonment), the hero's son plays a limited role; in revenge stories of the Agamemnon-Orestes type, however, the hero's son is essential. The *Odyssey* combines two distinct (though overlapping) structural arrangements into one: Pattern A of the son avenging the father, central to the Agamemnon-Orestes story, converges with – and modifies – Pattern B, that of the hero's rescue and return.

2. See CLAY 1997, 213-246.

finds at Pylos and to some extent even at Sparta, where both return and revenge are in the past: Nestor's smooth homecoming among his sons continues – and epitomizes – the settled patriarchal arrangement of the *oikos*; and on Sparta, the reconciled Menelaus and Helen are marrying off their daughter (and also Menelaus' son), ritually enacting the transition from one generation to the next, by which the structure of the *oikos*, however complex or vexed, is perpetuated.[3]

Ithaca, by contrast, gives us the *oikos* under siege; it becomes the site both of rescue and revenge. We might say that Telemachus' contribution to the restoration of his father takes place only once Odysseus has already returned and has staged his own rescue. Telemachus, moreover, fulfills the revenge plot not as the Oresteian murderer of his own mother who assumes his dead father's place, but as an ally in the re-installation of his father in his household, in a homecoming that is both a a comedy of remarriage and a bloodbath. On Ithaca, father and son unite to support the *oikos* in a brilliant conjunction of rescue and revenge patterns that complicates both.

It is true that the contour of Telemachus' narrative of coming of age and assuming control of his household follows the pattern set by Orestes, as invoked in the *Odyssey* and analyzed by a number of scholars (the journey at *hêbê* with age-mates, in secret from his mother; the encounters with Athena as Mentes / Mentor and with Nestor, Menelaus and Helen; the safe return with gifts; etc.). This Oresteian contour persists, we might say, up until the return of Odysseus, whereupon it collides with the narratives of *nostos* and *tisis* that feature Odysseus, the father, the wily survivor and avenger, whose return and devastation of the suitors Menelaus anticipates at 4.333-40:

ὦ πόποι, ἦ μάλα δὴ κρατερόφρονος ἀνδρὸς ἐν εὐνῇ
ἤθελον εὐνηθῆναι ἀνάλκιδες αὐτοὶ ἐόντες.
ὡς δ' ὁπότ' ἐν ξυλόχῳ ἔλαφος κρατεροῖο λέοντος

3. While the poem signals disquieting tensions in the recovered domesticity of Menelaus and Helen – notably in their (unsurprisingly) contradictory recollections of Troy – the cultural practices that the *oikos* sponsors, and by which it is maintained (*xenia* and marriage, among others), have been re-established there.

νεβροὺς κοιμήσασα νεηγενέας γαλαθηνοὺς
κνημοὺς ἐξερέῃσι καὶ ἄγκεα ποιήεντα
βοσκομένη, ὁ δ' ἔπειτα ἑὴν εἰσήλυθεν εὐνήν,
ἀμφοτέροισι δὲ τοῖσιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφῆκεν,
ὣς Ὀδυσεὺς κείνοισιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφήσει.

Oh for shame, it was in the bed of a bold and strong man
they wished to lie, they themselves being all unwarlike.
As when a doe has brought her fawns to the lair of a lion
and put them there to sleep, they are newborn and still suckling,
then wanders into the foothills and the grassy corners,
grazing there, but now the lion comes back to his own lair
and visits shameful destruction on both mother and children;
so Odysseus will visit shameful destruction on these men… .[4]

Telemachus' potentially Oresteian narrative veers in a new direction once the poem represents him as repressing his intense desire to string his father's bow and be the central character of his own tale of *nostos* and *tisis*. While Odysseus is testing the suitors and servants in his guise as a beggar, Telemachus plays host, as if he, and not Odysseus, were in charge of devising the revenge. At the Slaughter of the Suitors, however, Telemachus is clearly Odysseus' helper and adjunct – not flawless, not fully capable, still proving his mettle as a fighter and an avenger. Once Odysseus and his small team have killed all 108 suitors, in an *aristeia* so spectacular it outdoes the *Iliad* – Telemachus falls back into the secondary role of the obedient son. When he tries to mediate the quarrel between his father and mother, who are conversing at the hearth, Odysseus dismisses him, directing him to punish the implicated handmaidens and Melanthius, the disloyal goatherd who had reviled and later violently threatened the beggar (17.212-53).

At 22.437-45 Odysseus gives instructions to his son, the oxherd, and the swineherd:

4. Throughout, we use the Perseus Project's Greek text from the Loeb Library, and, with occasional adaptations, the translation of LATTIMORE 1999.

ἄρχετε νῦν νέκυας φορέειν καὶ ἄνωχθε γυναῖκας:
αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα θρόνους περικαλλέας ἠδὲ τραπέζας
ὕδατι καὶ σπόγγοισι πολυτρήτοισι καθαίρειν.
αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν δὴ πάντα δόμον κατακοσμήσησθε,
δμῳὰς ἐξαγαγόντες ἐϋσταθέος μεγάροιο,
μεσσηγύς τε θόλου καὶ ἀμύμονος ἕρκεος αὐλῆς,
θεινέμεναι ξίφεσιν τανυήκεσιν, εἰς ὅ κε πασέων
ψυχὰς ἐξαφέλησθε καὶ ἐκλελάθωντ' Ἀφροδίτης,
τὴν ἄρ' ὑπὸ μνηστῆρσιν ἔχον μίσγοντό τε λάθρῃ.

Begin the work of carrying out the bodies, and tell
the women to help, and after that to wash the beautiful
chairs and tables clean, with water and porous sponges.
Then, after you have got all the house back in good order
lead all these maidservants out of the well-built palace
between the round-house and the unfaulted wall of the courtyard,
and hew them with the thin edge of the sword, until you have taken
the lives from all, and they forget Aphrodite, the goddess
they had with them when they lay secretly with the suitors.

The three obey the first part of Odysseus' command (repeated verbatim at 22.457-60). Telemachus then acts on his own, contravening his father's specific instruction, with a speech remarkable both for its zeal and for its justification of the character of the vengeance he intends to visit on the maids (462-64):

μὴ μὲν δὴ καθαρῷ θανάτῳ ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἑλοίμην
τάων, αἳ δὴ ἐμῇ κεφαλῇ κατ' ὀνείδεα χεῦαν
μητέρι θ' ἡμετέρῃ παρά τε μνηστῆρσιν ἴαυον.

I would not take away the lives of these creatures by any
clean death, for they have showered abuse on my head and on
the head of my mother and they have slept with the suitors.[5]

5. Adapted from Lattimore's translation.

Here Telemachus echoes Odysseus' injunction to cleanse the house (καθαίρειν), but offers a striking catachresis in asserting his refusal of a 'clean death' for the maids – καθαρῷ θανάτῳ. His metaphorical use of *katharos*, which elsewhere in the *Odyssey* (and *Iliad*) is used only of material objects, expresses an implacable moral judgment that demands a corresponding form of *tisis*.

The poem describes in detail the brutal slaying of the maids (22.465-72), underscoring both Telemachus' lack of restraint and his alternative view of appropriate punishment, in a slaughter he premeditates and performs apparently without any accomplice. As a grim coda, the team of three then lead the abusive Melanthius along the porch and the courtyard; and the poem draws attention to the fury with which they mutilate and dismember him (22.473-76):

τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ μὲν ῥῖνάς τε καὶ οὔατα νηλέϊ χαλκῷ
τάμνον, μήδεά τ' ἐξέρυσαν, κυσὶν ὠμὰ δάσασθαι,
χεῖράς τ' ἠδὲ πόδας κόπτον κεκοτηότι θυμῷ.

They cut off, with the pitiless bronze, his nose and his ears,
tore off his private parts and gave them to the dogs to feed on
raw, and lopped off his hands and feet, in a fury of anger.

What might these acts of revenge tell us about the weaving of revenge and rescue in the poem, and about the role of Telemachus at this stage of the narrative? Do they suggest the scope of the *tisis* Telemachus would have exacted, had his been an Orestes-like narrative, one of avenging his murdered father? The poem seems to generate an internal tension here and to interrogate the values of *dikê* and *tisis* by representing the son and the two herdsmen as exceeding in vengefulness the commands of the father and king. What notions of *dikê* emerge by the close of the epic? Is revenge a mechanism of retributive justice or a potentially catastrophic cycle that only the gods can interrupt?

A suggestive response is offered by Penelope in Book 17.492-94 when she learns of the stranger being struck by Antinous in her halls (τοῦ δ' ὡς οὖν ἤκουσε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια | βλημένου ἐν μεγάρῳ) and says, as though to Antinous: "Thus may the Bow-famed Apollo strike at you" (αἴθ' οὕτως αὐτόν σε βάλοι κλυτότοξος Ἀπόλλων). The logic of *tisis* implicit in Penelope's

– "Let any other man who does this perish as he did thus," the *Odyssey* displays revenge as a process to be deliberated, calculated, even problematized. How might *huper moron* be measured? As Telemachus' speech about the death of the maids makes clear, the calculus of *tisis* depends upon and reveals a subject position and a set of values.

Certainly, through a variety of strategies, the *Odyssey* places the external audience in the subject position and the value system of Odysseus. It indirectly guides our emotions so that we primarily experience Odysseus' *nostos* and *tisis* through his focalization. In anticipation of Odysseus' return, for example, several characters on Ithaca remark upon his practices as a king, husband, and father. Penelope describes him as protective of his people and judicious, especially when she chides a suitor for ingratitude, as at 16. 424-30, when she reminds Antinous of Odysseus' kindness to his exiled father fleeing the Thresprotians: "Odysseus stayed their hand and held them, for all their fury. | Now you eat up his house without payment, pay court to his wedded | wife, try to murder his son, and do me great indignity" (ἀλλ' Ὀδυσεὺς κατέρυκε καὶ ἔσχεθεν ἱεμένους περ. | τοῦ νῦν οἶκον ἄτιμον ἔδεις, μνάᾳ δὲ γυναῖκα | παῖδά τ' ἀποκτείνεις, ἐμὲ δὲ μεγάλως ἀκαχίζεις). This silences Antinous, but Eurymachus retorts by asserting hypocritically that he would never allow the murder of Telemachus, "since often Odysseus, sacker of cities, | would seat me also upon his knees, and put pieces of roasted | meat in my hands, and hold the red wine out to me" (ἐπεὶ ἦ καὶ ἐμὲ πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεὺς | πολλάκι γούνασιν οἴσιν ἐφεσσάμενος κρέας ὀπτὸν | ἐν χείρεσσιν

6. Such logic is explicit in the *Iliad* in instances in which warriors on the battlefield measure the equivalence of the avenging blows they strike. See SLATKIN 2011, 167-187.

ἔθηκεν, ἐπέσχε τε οἶνον ἐρυθρόν, 16.442-44).

In addition to the comments of other characters on his kingship, Odysseus himself describes the practices of a proper king, as when he tells Penelope in their interview at the hearth at 19.108-14:

ὦ γύναι, οὐκ ἄν τίς σε βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν
νεικέοι: ἦ γάρ σευ κλέος οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἱκάνει,
ὥς τέ τευ ἢ βασιλῆος ἀμύμονος, ὅς τε θεουδὴς
ἀνδράσιν ἐν πολλοῖσι καὶ ἰφθίμοισιν ἀνάσσων
εὐδικίας ἀνέχῃσι, φέρῃσι δὲ γαῖα μέλαινα
πυροὺς καὶ κριθάς, βρίθῃσι δὲ δένδρεα καρπῷ,
τίκτῃ δ' ἔμπεδα μῆλα, θάλασσα δὲ παρέχῃ ἰχθῦς
ἐξ εὐηγεσίης, ἀρετῶσι δὲ λαοὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

Lady, no mortal man on the endless earth could have cause
to find fault with you; your fame goes up to the wide heaven,
as of some king who, as a blameless man and god-fearing,
and ruling as lord over many powerful people,
upholds the way of good government, and the black earth yields him
barley and wheat, his trees are heavy with fruit, his sheepflocks
continue to bear young, the sea gives him fish, because of
his good leadership, and his people prosper under him.

The simile recalls Athena's description of Queen Arete at 7.74: "she dissolves quarrels, even among men, when she favors them."

We therefore expect Odysseus himself to adjudicate quarrels and to bring about the florescence of his people, to rule wisely and fulfill the image Penelope introduces in her longing for him and her rebuke to the suitors, of a king who is like a gentle father to his subjects and who is respectful to his son and to her. For the most part the poem presents us with a fair-minded Odysseus, who does not tyrannize his family, his servants, or his companions. Moreover, it depicts his adversaries as ethically inferior to him, and their vices and

7. For a scathing, critical Marxian take on Odysseus' perpetual survival-through-self-discipline, see HORKHEIMER and ADORNO 2002. Offering a salutary, if eccentric, attack on the prevailing humanist reception of the poem, they read Odysseus as *homo economicus*, a proto-bourgeois calculator, rationalizer, and expropriator.

flaws elevate him in the esteem of the poem's external audiences.[7] This is true, in particular, of the suitors, the twelve maids who sleep with them, and the two disloyal servants.

We are brought, then, to think of Odysseus as fair-minded and judicious, his deceptions as practiced in the service of an honorable goal, with which the poem has led us to sympathize. Nevertheless, the *Odyssey* makes space for alternative perspectives and additional (unharmonized) voices. As a number of scholars have argued, this makes the epic more dialogic than monologic – in contrast to what Bakhtin argues in his famous essay, "Epic and the Novel".[8]

Consider the second of two scenes that (among others) explicitly and overtly reflect on the question of fairness in exacting vengeance. The first, mentioned earlier, is that of Telemachus' hanging of the twelve maids – which notably calls forth Telemachus' commentary and explanation – followed by the dismemberment of Melanthius, in which he and the herdsmen outdo Odysseus himself. The second is the speech of Antinous' father Eupeithes at 24.422-37, blaming Odysseus for the death of a whole generation of his subjects (both his companions and the suitors). That speech inaugurates a proto-democratic debate among the relatives of the suitors over Odysseus' culpability.[9] The meaning of Eupeithes' name, Good Persuader, will be un-

8. On dialogism, as opposed to monologism, in the *Odyssey*, see the pioneering work of PERADOTTO 1990, 53-58, where (invoking BAKHTIN 1983) he discusses and illustrates the tension between the dominant ideologies of the epic and subversive voices. FELSON 1994, 1-14, examines alternative plot-lines alongside dominant ones, particularly with regard to Penelope's choice to hold the contest and her 'Helen apologia' in Book 19. An unpublished dissertation by LONEY 2010, which we came upon after completing this essay and to which we wish to draw attention, investigates multi-vocality in connection to the *tisis* and *nostos* narratives. Following HALVERSON 1985, SAÏD 1979, and PERADOTTO 1990, among others, Loney explores a Bakhtinian reading of the *Odyssey*.

9. Cf. Eurylochus' earlier critique of Odysseus' leadership on the island of Circe and Odysseus' response. Eurylochus begs Odysseus not to lead him back to Circe's hut against his will (10.266) but to flee quickly, "for I know you'll neither come yourself | nor bring any other of your comrades" (οἶδα γάρ, ὡς οὔτ' αὐτὸς ἐλεύσεαι οὔτε τιν' ἄλλον | ἄξεις σῶν ἑτάρων.) Odysseus resolves to leave him there and risk going to Circe on his own. Eurylochus raises the question *in medias res* of whether Odysseus is to blame for his companions' loss of their homecoming, an accusation that Eupeithes forcefully expresses in Book 24, when all the young men of Ithaca are dead. Cf. the accusations made by townsmen at the assembly in Book 2.

derscored at 24.465 by the phrase "they obeyed Eupeithes" (*Eupeithei peithont'*): he has rhetorical skills. The narrator presents the speech (24.422-29) as focalized (like all first person speeches) through the character's emotions:

τοῖσιν δ' Εὐπείθης ἀνά θ' ἵστατο καὶ μετέειπε:
παιδὸς γάρ οἱ ἄλαστον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πένθος ἔκειτο,
Ἀντινόου, τὸν πρῶτον ἐνήρατο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς:
τοῦ ὅ γε δάκρυ χέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν:
ὦ φίλοι, ἦ μέγα ἔργον ἀνὴρ ὅδε μήσατ' Ἀχαιούς:
τοὺς μὲν σὺν νήεσσιν ἄγων πολέας τε καὶ ἐσθλοὺς
ὤλεσε μὲν νῆας γλαφυράς, ἀπὸ δ' ὤλεσε λαούς:
τοὺς δ' ἐλθὼν ἔκτεινε Κεφαλλήνων ὄχ' ἀρίστους

Eupeithes stood up and addressed them, since unforgettable
sorrow was stored away in his heart for the sake of Antinous,
his son, who was the first to be killed by noble Odysseus.
For his sake weeping tears he now stood forth and addressed them:
"Friends, this man's will worked great evil upon the Achaians.
First he took many excellent men away in the vessels
with him, and lost the hollow ships, and lost all the people,
and then returning killed the best men of the Kephallenians."

Then he prods the relatives "to take revenge on the murderers of our brothers and sons" before Odysseus and his men and family can cross the sea and escape.

In response to Eupeithes, Medon the herald, arriving with Phemius the bard, addressing the men of Ithaca, asserts that "Odysseus | devised what he did, not without the consent of immortal/gods." (οὐ γὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς | ἀθανάτων ἀέκητι θεῶν τάδε μήσατο ἔργα, 24.443-44). He testifies that he witnessed an immortal resembling Mentor participate in the Slaughter: "I myself saw a god immortal, who stood close by | Odysseus and seemed entirely like Mentor" (αὐτὸς ἐγὼν εἶδον θεὸν ἄμβροτον, ὅς ῥ' Ὀδυσῆος | ἐγγύθεν εἱστήκει καὶ Μέντορι πάντα ἐῴκει, 445-46).

An aged third speaker, the seer Halitherses, chimes in at 24.455-60:

ὑμετέρῃ κακότητι, φίλοι, τάδε ἔργα γένοντο:
οὐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ πείθεσθ', οὐ Μέντορι ποιμένι λαῶν,

ὑμετέρους παῖδας καταπαυέμεν ἀφροσυνάων,
οἵ μέγα ἔργον ἔρεξαν ἀτασθαλίῃσι κακῇσι,
κτήματα κείροντες καὶ ἀτιμάζοντες ἄκοιτιν
ἀνδρὸς ἀριστῆος...

It is by your own weakness, dear friends, that these things have happened.
You would not listen to me, nor to Mentor, shepherd of the people,
when we told you to make your sons give over their senseless
mood; for they, in their evil recklessness, did a great wrong
in showing no respect to the wife, despoiling the possessions
of a lordly man.

Halitherses urges them not to go to battle, lest they incur some evil; but his words did not please their hearts. Though he dissuaded some, the narrator tells us, "others stayed ... but they listened | to Eupeithes, and now suddenly they ran for their armor" (οὐ γὰρ σφιν ἅδε μῦθος ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἀλλ' Εὐπείθει | πείθοντ': αἶψα δ' ἔπειτ' ἐπὶ τεύχεα ἐσσεύοντο). Eupeithes, the narrator continues, assuming the prophetic tone of Halitherses, was their leader in foolishness. "He thought | he would avenge the slaughter of his son, but he was not | ever to come back but must himself encounter his death there." (φῇ δ' ὅ γε τίσεσθαι παιδὸς φόνον, οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλεν | ἂψ ἀπονοστήσειν, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ πότμον ἐφέψειν) (24.470-71). The newly invigorated Laertes will kill him shortly.

This debate attests to the capaciousness of the *Odyssey* suggested above – its capacity to critique as well as display its logic of social order. It accommodates dominant and minority opinions, including the sentiments of the losers. Consequently, we in the external audience are invited to examine the range of ethical issues that arise upon a hero's return and to engage in conversations over the problematics of revenge.

We might consider these moments that comprise the non-utopian ending of the *Odyssey* as exemplary of two types of Bakhktinian dialogism. One type emerges in scenes of implicitly contested authority, e.g., in Odysseus' order to Telemachus and the herdsmen and their overzealous implementation of revenge and also from the discrepancy between idealistic notions of regal ex-

cellence (curbing excessive behavior and mediating quarrels) and the actual practice of kingship by the returning Odysseus, who cannot mediate a quarrel in which he is a participant. The second type of dialogism arises, as we have seen, in the quasi-democratic debate just before the battle with the suitors' relatives – a debate that recalls the assembly on Ithaca in Book 2 and seems almost Thucydidean, in its expression of diverse and conflicting views through direct and counterbalanced speech. This exchange is the closest we get to a scrutiny of Odysseus' character by his adversaries: they put him, in a sense, on trial.

The non-utopiaan, indeed unsettling and inconclusive ending of the *Odyssey* highlights the cost of defending the *oikos* in an Ithaca that is, like Troy, besieged. The battle over *aretê* that delights Laertes, where he competes alongside his son and grandson, underscores the stability of the Ithacan royal family. The competition belongs to two scenarios, the one domestic (defense and restoration of the *oikos*), the other Iliadic/heroic: an *aristeia* that invokes combat in the *Iliad*. The battle helps establish Ithaca as an inverse of Troy, where the three-generational lineage of Priam-Hector-Astyanax is broken, whereas in Ithaca the lineage survives intact.

The unsettling ending of the *Odyssey* is resolved by divine intervention, timed so that the humans can play out their revenge before Athena and Zeus intervene. The counterfactual at 24.528-32 allows the external audience to view what might have happened: "And now they would have killed them all, and given none of them | homecoming,[10] had not Athena, daughter of Zeus of the aegis, | cried out in a great voice and held back all the company." (καί νύ κε δὴ πάντας ὄλεσαν καὶ ἔθηκαν ἀνόστους, | εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίη, κούρη Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο, | ἤϋσεν φωνῇ, κατὰ δ' ἔσχεθε λαὸν ἅπαντα.). Note that Odysseus still forges on in his act of revenge: "he made a swoop, like a soaring eagle" (οἴμησεν δὲ ἀλεὶς ὥς τ' αἰετὸς ὑψιπετήεις, 537-38). It takes a smoky thunderbolt from Zeus, followed by a command from Athena, to get him to stop this quarrel (543: *neikos*). In a moment reminiscent of *Iliad* 1.193ff., where Athena restrains Achilles from killing Agamemnon, her divine persuasion

10. The odd use of "made them all *anostous*" ties the relatives to their *paides* (the companions and the suitors).

(not Odysseus' self-restraint) wards off a massive depopulation of the kingdom. But the poem has already conditioned us to believe that Athena is internally connected to Odysseus as well as an external force. So as with other inconsistencies and paradoxes in the poem that are either elided or accommodated,[11] the *Odyssey* brings us into the argument and lets us have it both ways.

N. FELSON
University of Georgia
nfelson@gmail.com

L. M. SLATKIN
New York University (Gallatin School)
lmslatkin@gmail.com

11. FELSON 1994, 125-144 explores this accommodation as a result of poetic *thelxis*, 'enchantment'. The art of the *Odyssey* depends on taking in the external audience, in the first place, but also on prodding members of the audience to step back from that enchantment to interrogate what they have just embraced.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BAKHTIN, M.M., 1982. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. M. Holquist (ed. and tr.), C. Emerson (tr.). Austin, TX.

CLAY, J. STRAUSS, 1997. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. 1st pbk. ed. Greek Studies. Lanham.

FELSON, N., 1994. *Regarding Penelope: From Character to Poetics*. Princeton.

HALVERSON, J. 1985. Social order in the Odyssey. *Hermes* 113, 129-45.

HORKHEIMER, M., and TH. W. ADORNO, 2002. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments. Cultural Memory in the Present*. Stanford.

LATTIMORE, R., trans. 1999. *The Odyssey of Homer*. New York.

LONEY, A. C., 2010. *Narrative Revenge and the Poetics of Justice in the Odyssey: A Study on Tisis* (Department of Classical Studies Duke University). Classical Studies, Durham, NC: Duke University.

PERADOTTO, J., 1990. *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey* (Martin Classical Lectures new ser., v. 1). Princeton.

SAÏD, S., 1979. Les crimes des prétendants, la maison d'Ulysse et les festins de l'Odyssée. *Études de Littérature Ancienne* 1, 9-49.

SLATKIN, L.M., 2011. *The Power of Thetis and Selected Essays*. Washington, D.C. - Cambridge, Mass.