T is commonly supposed that Parmenides’ statement of his philosophical principles is preceded by a “proem” of an allegorical nature (the precise symbolism of the allegory being in dispute) which describes the philosopher’s inspired journey from darkness to light. Among others who have shared this assumption are pre-eminently Diels (1897), Reinhardt (1916), Kranz (1916), H. Fränkel (1930), Bowra (1953), and now Kirk-Raven (1957). The first question to ask is whether it is proper to identify such a “proem” at all, as a separate entity in the poem. Would the author himself have recognized it as such? Reinhardt pointed out that of the 32 lines which are now printed as the presumed “proem”, the first 30 owe their survival as a coherent unit to Sextus, who quoted them in order to demonstrate that Parmenides could be “allegorized” as a thinker who distinguished between the senses and right reason. The supporting paraphrase, supplied by Sextus, drew heavily upon the symbolism of the myth of the charioteer in the Phaedrus, and applied this to the details of Parmenides’ own chariot journey. Reinhardt argued that the whole interpretation was taken from Posidonius and represented support for a neo-Stoic position in epistemology. Be that as it may, the Platonic coloration as applied here was plainly artificial, and modern interpreters have agreed to ignore it.

If, however, the motive in Sextus for first identifying and then explaining this allegory in Parmenides was itself unhistorical, modern criticism has two resources with which to correct him. It can supply a better interpretation of the “proem”; or it can conclude that the original identification of the “proem” as such was a mistake. It is in part to this more radical view that the present article addresses itself. The journey, the horses, the daughters of the sun, the gateway, the courtyard, and the rest of it are admittedly highly concrete symbols, but it is possible that they are designed to recall and reinforce certain contexts of experience which interpenetrate the philosophy of the whole poem. Some indication that this may be so was supplied by Sextus himself, who, in his quotation, subjoined to line 30 of fragment 1 the lines which are now printed as fragment 7 lines 3–7. This addition, according to Sextus, formed part of the allegory, or at least explained...
it. His instinct (or that of his source) may have been sounder here than the color he put upon it. It is interesting to note how Bowra's treatment, though addressed specifically to the "proem" as such, is induced to spill over into the later parts of the poem by the very force of the logic employed upon the supposed preface.

If fragment 1 does indeed form a separable and prefatory unit, what precisely is its purport? Diels insisted that it must have reflected an Orphic model though not necessarily an Orphic experience. His philological arguments relied on interpreting δαλμονος and εἰδότα in line 3 as indicating respectively "possessed" and "initiated". The implication of veiled heads in line 10 he argued was taken from religious ritual. As for Δίῃς πολύτονος (line 14) is she not also called πολύτονος in an Orphic verse? And does the figure of Ἄληθεία (line 29) not remind us of the cosmic figure of Zeus in Orphic rhapsodies? All this does not amount to much, nor could Diels add effective strength to his case by speculating that behind the "proem" lay several hypothetical models, mystical or Orphic, which might be inferred from the traditions which relate to Epimenides, Hermotimus, the oracle of Trophonius, and the vision of Phormion of Croton. This last suggestion perhaps produced a slight revulsion even in its own author, for he returned to earth by adding that perhaps after all the model for Parmenides was the chariot journey of Telemachus.

Kranz, on the other hand, rejecting all Orphic and ecstatic prototypes, argued that the whole figure of the allegory depends on the Phaethon story. Parmenides is a sort of reversed Phaethon (for according to Kranz he passes from west to east) and therefore a more fortunate one; his path follows in reverse the sun's daily track. The philological arguments here rested heavily on the Ἡλιάδες κοῦραι who in one version of the legend, perhaps Hesiodic, harnessed the horses for Phaethon and are represented as προπομποί of Eos or Helios, though only in reliefs which are admittedly late. Likewise, the formula κατὰ πάντ' ἄστη is in an Orphic hymn applied to Helios and the σήματα πολλά of fragment 8 lines 2–3 are reminiscent of the constellations which lie on the sun's path. Kranz, however, also noted, as had Diels, some parallel phraseology in that poetic chariot journey described by Pindar in Olympian 6, 22ff., and so concluded, sensibly enough, that such poetic journeys were an accepted convention. But the particular journey of Parmenides, according to Kranz, was more complicated than at first appeared. A comparison of the tenses used throughout the whole "proem" led him to the inference that the philosopher's celestial experience really began in lines 11–21, which described his original
departure from the halls of night in the west; it was then continued during lines 1–10, which describe his journey across the heavens, and was concluded by his reception in the east by the goddess in lines 23 to 32 — surely a curious feat of celestial mechanics.\textsuperscript{16}

Fränkel,\textsuperscript{17} while noting the exactitude of the parallel in Ol.6.22ff. and suggesting a common original behind both Parmenides and Pindar, nevertheless discounted all attempts at finding sources for the poem in earlier tradition or at figuring out the spatial and material aspects of the journey.

This did not deter Bowra from reviving and combining\textsuperscript{18} the suggestions of Diels (an Orphic journey through the sky) and Kranz (Phaethon’s drive in reverse), nor from adding\textsuperscript{19} a fresh and unexpected ingredient to the composition in the person of Heracles, relying here on that tradition which transported the hero, accompanied by gods, to heaven in a chariot. Finally, noting the persistence in Parmenides of the ὀδός motif, he interpreted\textsuperscript{20} this to be the symbol of a Pythagorean experience “of a special kind”, which did not follow the Pythagorean party line and for which the supposed allegory supplied a justification against fellow Pythagoreans. This suggestion, intricate and even fantastic as it may appear, would seem designed to give support — surely not unneeded — to those who would interpret Parmenides’ philosophical system as a reply to a Pythagorean dualism.

Kirk and Raven adopt\textsuperscript{21} from Diels the speculation that “the allegorical form is borrowed from mystery literature” and from Bowra the notion that “Parmenides desired particularly in the ‘proem’ to arm himself in advance, by stressing the religious nature of his revelation, with an answer to his potential critics”, these latter being “his fellow Pythagoreans”.

The fabled Chimaera was an animal in which only three species were combined. But to reconcile these competing interpretations would produce a symbolism in which Orpheus, Pythagoras, Phaethon, and Heracles all sought to unite themselves with Parmenides in a five-fold monstrosity. It would surely require a surrealist experience to reconcile such incompatibles, and the fact that they have all been suggested, while none has been felt to be in itself wholly satisfactory, may suggest that interpretation of Parmenides’ poem has got off on the wrong track. His style is highly allusive, that is to be admitted, but in tracking down allusion the recondite has been pursued at the expense of the obvious. For it is one of the oddities of all this criticism that while most — though not all — of the Homeric echoes in Parmenides have been noted, the evocative contexts in Homer, from which they are mostly
drawn, have been ignored. One reason for the reluctance to recognize their influence may be that it is not confined to the "proem" but affects also the general structure of Parmenides' philosophical argument.

The opening lines of the poem read as follows:

ιπποι ταῖ με φέρουσιν ὅσου τ’ἐπὶ θυμὸς ἴκανοι
πέμπτον, ἐπεῖ μ’ἐς δὸν βήσαν πολύφημον ἄγουσαι
δαιμόνος, ἡ κατὰ πάντ’ ἁστη φέρει εἰδότα φώτα·
tῇ φερόμην τῇ γάρ με πολύφραστοι φέρον ἴπποι.22

The philosopher's audience knew their Iliad and Odyssey by heart. The associations conveyed by these lines would be instinctive and automatic. The "thinking-and-speaking horses", who begin and end these four verses, are those of Achilles.23 The "man who knows" who is conveyed on a "famous journey" "through all towns" is that Odysseus who is introduced at the opening of the Odyssey. These overlapping images, unlike those of Phaethon (foolish, impious, and doomed) and of Heracles (renowned for brawn rather than brains) and Orphic or Pythagorean worthies (obscure and unproven), have an essential congruence relative to Greek tradition, to the instinctive psychology of any Greek audience, and to Parmenides' own conception of himself. In these four lines he has already suggested to us that his journey, whatever else it may be and however short it may be by comparison, is akin to the heroic proportions of both Iliad and Odyssey. Parmenides' own achievement is to be an intellectual one; but that is only a new form of heroism. Above all, it carries that same hallmark of the supernatural which rested also upon the heads of Achilles and Odysseus.

The Odyssey motif predominates, and its interweaving into the body of the philosophic poem is an achievement of some complexity. The goddess or "daimon", who by ambiguous syntax is represented as both controlling the journey and conveying the hero, would at once recall the Athena who is mentor to Telemachus24 and guide and helper of Odysseus. The "journeying" which, once it is introduced in Parmenides' second line, remains so obsessive throughout his poem, had of course been equally obsessive in the Odyssey: in fact it was the Odyssey, or a large part of it. But in Homer's epic scheme there are complications which must be noted, for Parmenides had remembered them. The third and fourth lines of the preface to the epic read:

πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἱδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω,
pollà δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμὸν.
The listener might assume that the encounter with “many human beings” and the infliction of “many woes” described experiences which were contemporaneous and were included in the body of the epic. But a comparison with two rather crucial passages later in the story suggests otherwise. In Odyssey II. 119ff. Teiresias prophesies for the hero further travels which will take place after his present adventures are over; and in the “happy ending” (23, 248ff.) when wife and husband settle down to compare stories, Odysseus begins by recalling that prophecy:

οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸς
χαίρων, ἔπει μάλα πολλὰ βροτῶν ἐπὶ ἀστεί αἴσχὺν
ἐλθεῖν.

Homeric formulas tie all three passages together and suggest that the “knowledge of the towns of many men” refers to experiences which were to follow the nostos. On his voyage he encounters not natural men but marvels, monsters and supernatural beings. Parmenides adopts the same device of a reversed chronology. “All the towns” of line 3 describes his present itinerary. This he undertakes already equipped with a superhuman experience previously acquired but still to be described in the body of the poem. Critical instinct had been right in perceiving a temporal cleavage, but it should be confined to the transition which occurs after line 3. For Parmenides, however, previous experience and present insight overlap. Hence his own goddess is in charge of both periods of the journey.

The word ὁδὸς and its correlative ἱππάρτως occur thirteen times in Parmenides’ poem. Usually the philosopher is “conveyed” but sometimes he is “dispatched” or “guided” along a route which is described as “posted with many signs”. The journeying metaphor is indeed obsessive. If one turns back to the Odyssey, it is noticeable that the theme of the ὁδὸς likewise becomes obsessive at that point where the year’s sojourn on Circe’s isle is about to end. “Dispatch me homewards,” pleads Odysseus to his divinely inspired mistress: “my heart and spirit are now set to go.” She replies, “you must first achieve another journey.” “Who then,” asks the hero, “will be my guide on this journey?” “No mortal guide is needed,” replies Circe, “but after you reach Teiresias he will declare the journey and measures of your path.” The hero accordingly sets out, first repeating to his men Circe’s directive, “She has marked out another journey for us...” He receives Teiresias’ instructions and returns, but that is not enough. Circe has to give further sailing directions: “I will reveal
your journey and give you all signs and marks.”35 It is thus in the Circe-
Teiresias “episode” that the ὠδής theme, basic to the Odyssey, is con-
centrated and intensified. We suggest that in the memory of Parmenides
the concentration lingered, and that he composed a philosophical poem
partly in the mood of an Odysseus, voyaging successively to Hades and
past the Planctae and Scylla and Charybdis to Thrinacia’s isle. We
say, in the mood of an Odysseus. The parallel must not be pressed
mechanically; the horses and chariot clearly belong to a different set of
associations,38 which however are progressively discarded as his poem
proceeds. The impression of the voyage lingers after the chariot journey
has faded out. The philosopher’s poetic memory is behaving in much
the same way as that of Coleridge.37 Once books ten to twelve of the
Odyssey (or a section approximating thereto) are accepted as his
central frame of reference, the patterning of his poem becomes clearer
and some of his symbols become easier to interpret.

If his philosophical experience had partaken of the mystical, whether
Orphic or Pythagorean, one would have expected him to describe it as a
single illuminating event, but in fact he several times identified it as a
“questing”.38 The epic-Ionic verb was employed by Teiresias to
identify the experience of Odysseus: “Your quest is for a home-
coming”;39 and the significant formula is recollected by Odysseus him-
self in that passage already noted where he summarizes his journey for
Penelope’s benefit: “On that day when I went down into the house of
Hades questing a homecoming for my comrades and myself.”40 This
parallel may appear tenuous, but there are others. Circe’s second set of
sailing directions speaks ambiguously of a dangerous choice to be made
as the Planctae, Scylla and Charybdis are approached. It is not quite
clear whether she means to indicate two or three different alternatives.41
The hero himself at the critical moment warns his steersman: “Ponder
this in your spirit... ward off the ship from the smoke and billow
over there. Take heed, you there, for the crag. Don’t let the ship drift to
that side.”42 It is not implausible to conclude that when Parmenides
— or his goddess — speaks first of two ways and then of three and
identifies two of them as highly dangerous, his method of expressing
himself is influenced by his memory of this most dramatic and critical
episode in Odysseus’ voyage. The philosopher’s advice “ward off your
sense-and-thought from this... and from that...”43 would not have
exploited quite so bold a metaphor if he were not remembering the
advice of Odysseus to his helmsman. The object to be controlled is no
longer a ship but a mental process. Can we also infer that Parmenides’
picture of mortal men swept helplessly down one of these dangerous
routes, completely off course,⁴⁴ is a reminiscence of Odysseus’ shipwreck? This would also explain why the path of these mortals keeps reversing itself.⁴⁵ They are like the ship’s company, who in their folly first open the bag of winds which reversed their course when in sight of home and who later committed an act of impiety for which they were drowned while their captain drifted helplessly backward to Charybdis.⁴⁶ In short, this metaphor of a reversing course simply identifies a journey which through the failure of intelligence gets nowhere, as against the course set by Parmenides which very definitely gets somewhere.

Why would these particular episodes in the story of Odysseus assume such significance for Parmenides as a prototype of his own very different journey of the mind? He himself supplies his own symbolic answers to this question by embedding further Homeric clues in his text. The voyage of his exemplar carried its hero beyond normal human latitudes. This for Parmenides is the essential point. His own journey is also an excursion beyond the bounds of accepted experience. Odysseus, in fact, had already touched on the edge of the world before he met Circe. For at Laestrygonia were “the gates of the paths of night and day”,⁴⁷ just as in the isle of Aeaea were “the house of the dawn and her dancing floors and the risings of the sun”,⁴⁸ and in Thrinacia the immortal cattle of the sun were pastured.⁴⁹ In the imagination of Parmenides these are all correctly remembered as allegories of the world’s end, a mysterious bourne far off the beaten track, a region of mystery and peril but also of revelation. He incorporates the melodious formula for Laestrygonia in his own poem⁵⁰ to describe the bourne of his own journey and he remembered also that, beginning with the folly of the ship’s crew after leaving Aeolus, it was the events which occurred in these mysterious regions which successively isolated Odysseus and left him to survive alone through his own sagacity. Even in the Odyssey, these episodes have a slight overtone of allegory, for sandwiched between Aeaea and Thrinacia is the journey to Hades, undertaken, as Homer emphasizes, to “gain knowledge from Teiresias”.⁵¹ This formula perhaps reveals the central affinity which Parmenides feels for his prototype. He also is to have “knowledge of all”, avoiding routes of which man “may not have knowledge”; for “destruction is not something of which you can have knowledge”.⁵² The Greek verb and its derivative strike another obsessive note, and it is Homeric influence which again may be responsible.

The hero’s voyage and the philosopher’s journey both obey supernatural directives. Here the philosopher amalgamates and poetically
confuses his memories of the types of guidance given to Odysseus. The hero had received his first set of sailing directions from a daughter of the sun, his second from Teiresias “who alone has sense and wit while the others dart as shadows” and his third set from Circe again. The solitary grandeur of Teiresias, sole figure of wit and sense amid the strengthless heads of the dead, may have helped to inspire Parmenides’ vision of a complete wit and sense which can with the mind’s eye visualize “distant places” in contrast to the mental helplessness of the “tribes uncounted and uncritical”, who in this case recall not only the foolish company of Odysseus but also the ghosts in Hades (soon to be joined by the crew themselves).

But Teiresias is only there in the background. The foreground of Parmenides’ imagination is occupied by Circe on Aeaea and the nymphs on Thrinacia, all of them daughters of the sun. The latter he has converted from herdsmen into outriders, perhaps assisted therein by the common image of the sun’s chariot. Both Teiresias and Circe had forewarned him concerning Thrinacia, the sun’s island. But Circe’s warning held also a hint of promise: “You will come to the isle Thrinacia, where feed many herds of the sun; and there is no birth of them nor do they pass away. Their herdsmen are nymphs... daughters of the sun.” In short, the island is involved with some implication of immortality; it holds a mystery which can be approached but not violated. The centrality of this episode in the memory of the philosopher and his audience was guaranteed by the fact that Homer had selected it from among all others for dramatization in the preface to his epic as central to Odysseus’ experience in the nostos. So Parmenides remembered how on that island coming to be and perishing had been banished. This provided his climatic poetic excuse for linking the daughters of the sun with the marvels of a mental journey which had taken the traveller into an absolute, where there is no coming to be and no passing away. For the philosopher, this was where the nostos ended. The journey of his mind and thought had reached the mansions of home.

NOTES
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2. pp. 32-34.
3. With the prefatory clause ἐναρχόμενος γοῦν τοῦ Περὶ φύσεως γράφει τῶν τρόπων τούτων.
4. Since lines 28-32 of what is now Frag. 1 are quoted by Simplicius, the overlap with Sextus has encouraged editors to print these as the true ending of Frag. 1, while relegating the terminal lines of Sextus to a different fragment and a later part of the poem. The solution originally offered by Diels was different (FVS, fourth (1922) and previous editions), but yielded before the criticisms of Reinhardt (pp. 33-34).
7. p. 21.
8. pp. 46-56.
9. This is the MS reading, retained by Kirk and Raven; Kranz, FVS, fifth (1934) and subsequent editions, regrettably adopts the conjecture δαιμόνες.
11. See below note 36.
14. The presence of Ἡλιάδες in the catalogue of Aeschylus' tragedies had already been noted by Diels, p. 50.
15. pp. 1161-1162.
16. The occurrence of the imperfect tense in line 21 would seem to invalidate Kranz' argument, so far as it was based on tense usage, but his distinction if confined to the opening lines was sound. See below note 25.
19. p. 46.
20. p. 50.
22. FVS 28 B 1; on the reading δαιμόνες see above note 9.
23. See below note 36.
24. See below note 36.
25. See above note 15.
26. ὅδος: Frag. 1, lines 2, 5, and 27; Frag. 2, line 1; Frag. 6, line 3; Frag. 7, lines 2 and 3; Frag. 8, lines 1 and 18.
    κέλευθος: Frag. 1, line 11; Frag. 2, line 4; Frag. 6, line 9.
    άταρπός: Frag. 2, line 6.
    Note also αμαξιόν; Frag. 1, line 21.
27. φέρω: Frag. 1, lines 1, 3, 4 (twice), 25; Frag. 6, line 6 (φορέω).
    πέμπω: Frag. 1, lines 2, 8, 26 (προπέμπω).
    ἡγεμονεύω: Frag. 1, line 5.
28. Frag. 8, lines 2 and 3. ταύτη δ' ἐπὶ σήματ' ἐσοιν/πολλὰ μάλι ... .
29. Od. 10. 484. οἶκαδε πεμφέμεναι: θυμός δὲ μοι ἐσσται ἤδη
30. Od. 10. 490. ἄλλον ἄλλην χρή πρῶτον ὄδον τελέσαι καὶ ίκέσθαι
31. Od. 10. 501. τίς γὰρ ταύτην ὄδον ἡγεμονεύεις;
32. Od. 10. 505. μὴ τί τοι ἡγεμόνος γε ποθὴ παρὰ νη ἰτελέσθω
33. Od. 10. 539. ὁς κέν τοι εἴπησιν ὄδον τεκμήριατο Κήρη.
34. Od. 10. 563. ἀλλήν δ’ ἣμιν ὀδὸν τεκμήρια τῷ Κύρκῃ
35. Od. 12. 25. αὐτῷ ἐγὼ δεῖξω ὀδὸν ἵνα ἔκαστα/κεμανέω
36. Reminiscences in Parmenides of other Homeric situations (Od. 1. 120ff.; 3. 475 to 4. 75; 15. 64-215; II. 1. 357-427; 5. 720-754; 17. 426-458; 18. 369-489; 19. 352-420) lie beyond the scope of the present article, as also do the echoes of Theog. 720-819. Many of the formulaic parallels had been noticed by Diels, who had also observed the possible relevance of the journey of Telemachus and the horses of Achilles. But these have not been exploited by commentators. They all seem confined to Frag. 1, whereas reminiscences of Odysseus seem to have continued to affect later parts of the poem.
38. ὁδὸς διξήσιος: Frag. 2, line 2; Frag. 6, line 3; Frag. 7, line 2; διξήσιον: Frag. 8, line 6; cf. Herac. 22 B 101, and L.S. sub vv. The verb is Homeric and lyric. The noun seems confined to Parmenides, though Diels introduced it (in the pl.) into the corrupt text of a magical formula which Kern (Orph. Frag. p. 333) rejected as non-Orphic.
39. Od. 11. 100. νόστον διξήσει μεληθέα . . .
40. Od. 23. 253. νόστον ἐταίρισιν διξήσεσιν ἥδ’. ἐμοὶ αὐτῷ
cf. 12. 73. οἱ δὲ δῶν ακόπελοι . . .
and 12. 101. τὸν δ’ ἔτερον σκόπελον . . .
42. Od. 12. 217-221. ἀλλ’ ἐνὶ θυμῷ/βάλλει, ἐπεὶ νῆσος γλαυκής οἰήμα νωμᾶς./τοῦτο μὲν καπνὸ καὶ κύματος ἐκτὸς ἐργεῖ/νῆσα, οὐ δὲ ακόπελον ἐπιμαίεσο, μή σε λαθῇ/κεῖν ἐξορμήσασα . . .
43. Frag. 6, lines 3 and 4. πρῶτης γὰρ α’ ἂν’ ὀδοὶ ταύτης διξήσιος <εἰργῳ>/αὐτὰρ ἐπεν’ ἀπὸ τῆς . . .
Frag. 7, lines 2 and 3. ἀλλὰ σὺ πῆθ’ ἂν’ ὀδοὶ διξήσιος εἰργε νόησα/μηδὲ α’ ἔδος/πολύτερον ὀδὸν κατὰ τήνδε βιάσθω
44. Frag. 6, lines 5 and 6. πλάττονται δίκρανοι’ ἀμηχανίν’ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῶν/ιστήδεσιν ἰδύου πλακτὸν νῦν’ οἱ δὲ φοροῦνται . . .
45. Frag. 6, line 9. πάντων δὲ παλίντροπος ἐστὶ κάλευσθ’
46. Od. 10. 22ff.; 12. 426ff.
47. Od. 10. 86. ἐγώ γὰρ νυκτὸς τε καὶ ἡμάτος εἰς κάλευσθ’
48. Od. 12. 3. ἡμῶν τ’ Ἀιαῖν, ὁδὶ τ’ Ἡρώδηρ ἡργενεῖς/οἰκίᾳ καὶ χοροὶ εἰσὶ καὶ ἀντολαὶ Ἡλλοῖο
50. Frag. 1, line 11.
51. Od. 10. 537. πρὸν Τειρεσίαο πυθέοια; the formula is repeated at 11.
50 and 89.
52. Frag. 1, line 28. χρεω δὲ σε πάντα πυθέοια οὐ/κατ’ ἀταρπόν; Frag. 2, line 6 παναπενθέει ἀταρπόν’ Frag. 8, line 21 ἀπυνθός ὀλεθρος
53. Od. 10. 494-5. τῷ καὶ τεθητοί νῦν πόρε Περσεφόνεια
54. Frag. 4, line 1. λεύσα δ’ ὄμως ἅπαντα νῦν παροῦντα βεβαίως.
55. Frag. 6, line 7. και ὧν ὁμοί τυφλοί τε τεθητοίτες ἓκρεμοτές φύλα.
56. Od. 12. 130. γόνον δ’ οὐ γίγνεται αὐτῶν/οὐδὲ ποτε φθινύθωσι. θειά
57. Od. 1. 7-9.
Parmenides and Odysseus

58. Frag. 8. 21. τῶς γένεσις μὲν ἀπέβεβαι καὶ ἀπνεοσ ὀλεθρος

59. The Odysseus theme may persist even into the "second part" of Parmenides' poem. The Homeric hero, so Circe had told him, while his ship "bypassed" the Sirens, was to be allowed the pleasure of hearing their song (Od. 12. 47 and 52; cf. also 10. 109). When they sing, they admonish him that to "bypass" without listening is impossible and that to listen is to learn of all things that happened at Troy and of "all that is born on the earth" (12. 186-190). So Odysseus listens, while the ship "bypasses" them (12. 197). Correspondingly, Parmenides comes to the end of his "reliable discourse and thought" (Frag. 8, line 50, equivalent to the "true" directives of Teiresias and Circe) and then allows his listener to hear a "deceitful composition of my epic tale" (Frag. 8, line 52), a story of how all things "are born and end" (Frag. 19). This story is told so that his audience may not be "bypassed" by any mortal type of intelligence (Frag. 8, sub fin.). Is the verb παρελάσον which he here uses a reminiscence of the corresponding verb which Homer had used four times? If so, the philosopher's poetic memory has transposed it in application.