

**Models of Reception in the Divine Audience of the *Iliad***

**Tobias Anthony Myers**

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

**COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY**  
**2011**

© 2011  
Tobias Anthony Myers  
All rights reserved

# ABSTRACT

## Models of Reception in the Divine Audience of the *Iliad*

Tobias Anthony Myers

This study argues that the *Iliad* in certain key passages construes the Olympian gods as an internal epic audience offering and exploring multiple configurations of response to the poem. Chapter 1 explores the special features of the divine audience in general terms and considers previous scholarship. Chapter 2 reads Zeus' provocation of Hera and Athena in Book 4 as a "metaperformative" provocation of the poet's audience. Chapter 3 argues that the audience's mental "viewing" experience is construed as attendance at a live spectacle where the gods also attend, a spectacle for which the duel in Book 3 provides a paradigm. Chapter 4 interprets the duel in Book 7 as a reevaluation of that paradigm, motivated intratextually by the internal audience of Apollo and Athena. Chapter 5 shows that the climactic duel in Book 22, and especially the passage describing Hector and Achilles circling Troy as the gods watch and discuss, problematizes the ethical stance of the extratextual audience. Chapter 6 argues that in the *Iliad* as a whole the poet uses "the gods" to model a shift in audience sympathy from pro-Achaean bias to pity for the Trojans.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Chapter 1 – Introduction and Overview	1
Chapter 2 – Reflections on Audience and Poet in Book 4: Zeus, Hera, Athena	31
Chapter 3 – Reflections on Audience and Poem in Books 3-5: Epic Experienced as Spectacle	59
Chapter 4 – Reception Reevaluated in Book 7: Athena, Apollo, and the Second Spectacular Duel	91
Chapter 5 – Duel and Athletics in the Death of Hector	123
Chapter 6 – The Divine and the Human Audience	159
Conclusion	174
Bibliography	176

## Acknowledgements

Numerous people have contributed to this project in its many stages to date. I would like to thank especially Elizabeth Irwin, Katharina Volk, and my adviser Deborah Steiner for their guidance, invaluable suggestions, and remarkably close reading of my drafts over a period of years. Jenny Strauss Clay, Marco Fantuzzi, Helene Foley, Sarah Nooter, Suzanne Saïd, Laura Slatkin, James Uden, and Nancy Worman gave generously of their time in providing helpful criticism at key moments in the project's development. Conversations with Elizabeth Scharffenberger, who directed me to certain remarks by Nietzsche, and with many other friends and colleagues inspired new directions of thinking. It is a special pleasure to acknowledge my daughters; thanks to Nora for her timely words of wisdom, such as «Έλα, μπαμπά! - Δεν περνάζει», to Natalia for teaching delight by example, and to both girls for making sure I never missed a morning of work due to oversleeping. Most of all I thank their mother, Nina Papathanasopoulou, for her support, energy, and the countless hours she devoted to revising my work and finding the patterns I could not yet see, sometimes reading new drafts on a daily basis. Without her this dissertation would not only have been impossible to write but – what is perhaps worse – incomprehensible and generally not much fun to read.

Responsibility for faults that remain belongs to Zeus, Moira, and Ate, though not necessarily in that order.

## CHAPTER 1 – Introduction and Overview

The *Iliad* offers the story of Achilles' wrath as tragedy and bloody entertainment, a complex combination of aural performance and the vivid immediacy (*enargeia*) that creates a viewing experience.<sup>1</sup> The present study examines how these elements of performance and reception are modeled within the text through the figures of Zeus and the other Olympian gods. Much extant scholarship shows how the *Odyssey*'s representations of performances of epic poetry – and of Odysseus' own bard-like storytelling – serve to explore the purpose and nature of the live performance medium.<sup>2</sup> By contrast, the only Iliadic representation of epic performance is an enigmatic, six-line description of Achilles singing while Patroclus waits.<sup>3</sup> The passage is typically held to be less sophisticated than its Odyssean parallels, and the *Iliad* as a whole less concerned with the dynamics of performance than the *Odyssey*.<sup>4</sup> My aim however will be to show that the *Iliad* can be read as a sophisticated, sustained meditation on the role of the performing poet, his audience, and the story itself in some ways even more interesting than that offered by the *Odyssey*. The gods of Olympus are the key to such a reading: as a variegated, participatory audience of

---

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes *enargeia* in terms of vision and presence, the power by which listeners are made “to see” (ὁρᾶν) and “to mingle with the persons brought on by the speaker as if they were present” (γινόμενα τὰ δηλούμενα ὁρᾶν καὶ ὥσπερ παροῦσιν οἷς ἂν ὁ ῥήτωρ εἰσάγη προσώποις ὁμιλεῖν. *Lys.*7) The quality of *enargeia* in Homeric poetics is discussed in Chapter 3.

<sup>2</sup> Recent examples include: Walsh 1984; Pucci 1987; Segal 1992, 1994; Doherty 1995; Zervou 2007; Murray 2008.

<sup>3</sup> 9.186-91. Frontisi-Ducroux 1986 uses this image as the starting point for a study of Iliadic self-reflexivity.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Murray 2008: “The *Iliad* is not a self-reflective poem: nowhere do we find a poet performing an epic or even a fragment of an epic for the kings in private or in public.” Many studies demonstrate Iliadic self-reflexivity of other sorts, however. The poem's concern with *kleos* suggests awareness of its own ability to transcend time through repeated performance (Nagy 1979). So too objects such as Helen's web (Bergren 1979-80, and see Chapter 3 below) and the Achaean wall (Porter forthcoming) have been read as reflections on the poet's work. Narratological approaches to self-reflexivity are discussed below.

often dubious morality, they can raise – and even voice within the text – important questions about audience complicity, pity, and desire.

The Iliadic gods model response in two ways that are interwoven in practice, though I will sometimes discuss them separately for the sake of clarity. First, by depicting Zeus and the other gods deliberating on the course the events will take, the poet offers internal models of audience response to an internal narrator persona, Zeus.<sup>5</sup> While many scholars have drawn connections between Zeus and the poet, few have asked how and to what purpose Zeus is constructed as a poet figure within the text. My analysis shows that through Zeus' interactions with the gods in council on Olympus – particularly in Books 4 (Chapter 2) and 22 (Chapter 5) – the poet is able to stage within the text a dramatic rendition of the subtle process of “poet-audience symbiosis” that notionally determines the course of the story on an extradiegetic level.<sup>6</sup> In so doing, the poet invites vicarious participation while emphasizing the complicity such participation entails.

Second, by depicting the gods observing events at Troy the poet offers a representation of his own audience's mental “viewing” experience of his narration. Previous scholarship has shown that the poet positions his audience as eye-witnesses of the poem's events.<sup>7</sup> I draw on this work and take it a step further, arguing that the

---

<sup>5</sup> In this dissertation the terms “poet's audience” (or “listeners”), the “epic audience,” and “extradiegetic audience” all denote the same construct: namely, the audience projected by the text, to whom the narrative voice sings. These phrases never refer to any more particular or historical audience. To refer to the corresponding extradiegetic performer implied by the text, who notionally sings to the audience, I use “singer,” “poet,” and “narrator” equivalently (varying between them to emphasize different aspects of that figure's role, and for euphony.)

<sup>6</sup> On the “poet-audience symbiosis,” see Taplin 1992: 5 and further below.

<sup>7</sup> For the “viewing” experience of the audience, which is discussed in Chapter 3 below, see Pseudo-Longinus 26.1; Bakker 1993, 13-14; Bakker 1997: 55; Bakker 2001; Slatkin 2007; and Clay 2011: 14-37, with further bibliography. I am very grateful to have had the opportunity to read a draft of Professor Clay's book manuscript at an early stage of work on this dissertation. An important source for the relationship of the visual to the verbal in the poet's art is the description of the shield of Achilles in Book 18: Becker 1995 combines a survey of theoretical approaches with exacting readings of the text

poem promotes a particular way of conceptualizing the viewer's role as attendance at a live spectacle attended by both the divine and the extradiegetic audiences. The gods' responses to this spectacle then provoke reflection on the moral status of the viewer. The particular terms for conceiving of this experience of epic spectacle during performance, and the viewer's relationship to the action, are laid out in the duel between Paris and Menelaus in Books 3-4 (Chapter 3), and reevaluated in the duels between Hector and Aias in Book 7 (Chapter 4), and Hector and Achilles in Book 22 (Chapter 5).

In this introductory chapter I lay the groundwork for my argument by indicating what in the text invites this study's "metaperformative" approach to the gods, while situating my approach in respect to various areas of Homeric scholarship. After that, I begin with the poem's first depiction of the divine audience, in Book 4; it turns out to be crucial that this comes just at the close of the duel between Paris and Menelaus, and just *before* the poem's first descriptions of large scale combat. The passage is so rich that two chapters have been devoted to it – first to the gods' discussion (Chapter 2), and then to their function in bridging the duel and the warfare, by which the poem offers a model of epic as spectacle (Chapter 3). The very next appearance of the divine audience motif comes in Book 7, and it is no coincidence that this is also in the context of a duel, this time fought by Hector and Aias (Chapter 4). This passage looks ahead intently to the duel between Hector and Achilles in Book 22, which has received much attention, but yields fresh results in response to questions about the gods' role as internal epic audience (Chapter 5). Chapter 6 steps back to read the divine council scene in Book 24 in light of the *Iliad* as a whole, and argues that the poet uses "the gods" to model a shift in audience sympathy from pro-Achaean bias to

---

and extensive bibliography, to which can now be added Scott 2009: 1-13 and the most recent studies cited there (*ibid.* 207 n.2). Another is Helen's web, for which see Chapter 3 below.



pity for the Trojans. Set against the internal audience of Olympians, the extradiegetic listeners are construed as a human(e) divine audience: divine in scope of vision, but with a human potential for responding emotionally to suffering.

### Divine Viewing

The bT-scholia for *Iliad* 4.4, a verse which describes how the gods “toast each other while gazing down at Troy” (δειδέχαιτ’ ἀλλήλους, Τρώων πόλιν εἰσορόωντες), begins thus: “they say that it is unfitting, if the viewing of wars gives pleasure to the gods” (ἀπρεπές φασιν, εἰ τέρπει τοὺς θεοὺς πολέμων θέα). One way to understand such representations of divine viewing is to see these gods, as the scholiast does, as “real” gods, figures of divinity, possessed of a special divine perspective that sets them apart from mortals.<sup>8</sup> Whereas the scholiast suggests that this divine perspective allows them to see harmony even in wars that is invisible to mortals,<sup>9</sup> modern critics who read the gods as “real” gods tend to see the divine perspective as characterized by a fundamental lack of seriousness which Reinhardt memorably called ‘sublime frivolity.’<sup>10</sup> On this view, the deathless gods cannot truly understand human suffering, and it is humans’ very mortality that affords them dignity. That human life and death provides the gods with entertainment then adds to

---

<sup>8</sup> The debate as to whether the Homeric gods are “real” or “literary” gods is very old; for a survey of scholarship on the question see Bremer 1987: 31-32. Analysis of the Homeric gods as poetic devices rather than straightforward representations of divine beings goes at least back to Aristotle (see note 78 below).

<sup>9</sup> The full comment of the scholiast: ἀπρεπές φασιν, εἰ τέρπει τοὺς θεοὺς πολέμων θέα. ἢ οὐκ ἀπρεπές· τέρπει γὰρ τὰ γενναῖα ἔργα· ἄλλως τε πόλεμοι καὶ μάχαι ἡμῖν δεινὰ δοκεῖ, τῷ δὲ θεῷ οὐδὲ ταῦτα δεινὰ· συμπληροῖ γὰρ ἅπαντα τὴν ἁρμονίαν τῶν ὅλων, ἅπερ καὶ Ἡράκλειτος λέγει, ὡς τῷ μὲν θεῷ καλὰ πάντα καὶ ἀγαθὰ καὶ δίκαια, ἄνθρωποι δὲ ἃ μὲν ἄδικοι ὑπελήφασιν, ἃ δὲ δίκαια. (“They say that it is unfitting, if the viewing of wars gives pleasure to the gods. Or it is not unfitting: for it is noble things that give pleasure. While wars and battles seem terrible to us, to the divine not even those are terrible, for [the divine] fills out the total harmony of all – and this is just what Heraclitus says, that ‘to the divine all things are beautiful and good and just, whereas humans regard some as unjust, others as just.’ ”)

<sup>10</sup> “Erbabener Unernst” Reinhardt 1960: 25.

the poem's pathos. This may be called the "theological approach" and it has also become the standard approach.<sup>11</sup>

The theological approach is essential, but is not in itself sufficient. The gods are multi-faceted, and their perspective is not wholly divided from that of mortals. Nietzsche's (characteristically enigmatic) reading of the Iliadic divine audience aligns poets' mental "viewership" with that of the gods they describe, thus finding not sublime frivolity but human cruelty behind the gods' watching eyes:

With what eyes do you think Homer made his gods look down upon the destinies of men? What was at bottom the ultimate meaning of Trojan Wars and other such tragic terrors? There can be no doubt whatever: they were intended as *festival plays* for the gods; and, insofar as the poet is in these matters of a more "godlike" disposition than other men, no doubt also as festivals for the poets.<sup>12</sup>

Elsewhere in the same essay he remarks: "without cruelty there is no festival."<sup>13</sup>

Nietzsche's reading blurs the distinction between the Trojan war as the subject of poetry on the one hand and real suffering on the other. He is right to do so because, as I will show in this dissertation, the blurring of this distinction is a particular strategy of the poet. For Nietzsche, Homer's attitude is aligned with the gods', due to his "godlike disposition." But in seeing the gods as expressions of the perspective of poets only, Nietzsche omits a key component from his formulation: the human audience that the poets address, and with whom they purport to share their privileged perspective.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Griffin 1978, appearing in a slightly different form as the final chapter of Griffin 1980, has been very influential in this regard; other examples include Thalmann 1984: 78-112, Ford 1987: 138-42.

<sup>12</sup> "Mit welchen Augen glaubt ihr denn, dass Homer seine Götter auf die Schicksale der Menschen niederblicken liess? Welchen letzten Sinn hatten im Grunde trojanische Kriege und ähnliche tragische Furchtbarkeiten? Man kann gar nicht daran zweifeln: sie waren als Festspiele für die Götter gemeint: und, insofern der Dichter darin mehr als die übrigen Menschen "göttlich" geartet ist, wohl auch als Festspiele für die Dichter." Nietzsche 1991: 299. The English translation used above is that of Kaufmann and Hollingdale (1967: 69.)

<sup>13</sup> "Ohne Grausamkeit kein Fest" *ibid.* 296. (Engl. trans. from Kaufmann and Hollingdale 1967: 67.)

<sup>14</sup> For the sharing of the poet's privileged perspective with his listeners, see Bakker 1993 esp. 14.

Critics have often noted that the Homeric narrator purports to share his privileged vision with his listeners; this is explicit in the *Odyssey* proem, when the poet urges the Muse to tell Odysseus' story "to us as well" (καὶ ἡμῖν *Od.*1.10), thereby aligning himself with his listeners.<sup>15</sup> Recent years have seen increased attention to the role and experience of the audience in the oral performance context assumed by the Homeric poems. Particularly germane to the present study is a recent article by Pietro Pucci, which draws attention to the "effect of mediation" on the extradiegetic audience produced by the gods' viewership.<sup>16</sup> Pucci reads the gods' pleasure and pity as "inducement" of those same feelings on the part of the poet's listeners. This is welcome as a recognition of parallels between the divine audience and the poet's audience, but glosses over the difficulty that the theological readings have brought out so well – namely the dubious moral status of these watching gods, which so disturbed the scholiast. The present study's "metaperformative" reading of the divine audience considers both the ways in which the divine and extradiegetic perspectives align and the moral problems which this raises.<sup>17</sup>

This study's approach draws on and connects diverse areas of Homeric scholarship, particularly narratology, oral theory, and the study of visualization and *enargeia* in Homeric poetics. Work on visualization and *enargeia* will be surveyed in

---

<sup>15</sup> Bakker 2009: 134 has a novel interpretation of this "too" (καὶ) as indicating "an inclusion in what Odysseus already knew: 'to us , too' – in addition to Odysseus."

<sup>16</sup> Pucci 2002.

<sup>17</sup> A note on terminology is in order here. In a refinement of the opposition "real gods" and "literary gods," Pucci contrasts the "theological" aspect of the gods' representation to the "poetical" aspect (he recognizes the importance of both, while focusing on the latter in his article). Both sets of terms can be misleading, however – "real" for example could mean either "real in the story world" (rather than poetic ornamentation) or "corresponding to gods believed to exist outside of the story world." Then too, even a "theological" interpretation of the gods entails many "poetic" effects (as Reinhardt 1960 and others bring out). My opposition of "metaperformative" to "theological" is intended to refer as plainly as possible to the distinction important for the present study, *viz* the extradiegetic audience's relationship to these gods. A "theological" reading emphasizes the vast gulf between the gods represented in the poem and the poet's (mortal) listeners, whereas a "metaperformative" reading focuses on the parallels between them. The two types of readings, theological and metaperformative, are not mutually exclusive but should inform each other.

the beginning of Chapter 3, but a few words on narratology and oral theory will be useful here. Following Irene de Jong's book *Narrators and Focalizers*, the last two and a half decades have seen the publication of many works applying narratological tools of analysis to the Homeric poems.<sup>18</sup> A key contribution of this work has been to emphasize the sophistication of Homeric narrative technique and to provide a language for discussing it – as, for example, the phenomenon of embedded focalization, whereby the language of the poet-narrator reflects the perspective and mental processes of a certain intradiegetic character or characters.<sup>19</sup> However, as Egbert Bakker has recently pointed out, narratology is not yet capable of addressing issues of live performance.<sup>20</sup> As it is precisely live performance, or aspects of live performance, that I argue is modeled by the gods in the *Iliad*, this study adapts certain analytical tools of narratology to a poem that never represents itself as narrative in the abstract, but as a live, public event capable of transporting its listeners into an imagined past.

One key issue is the relationship between performer and audience. In Bakker's words, "what is fictional in narratology and in the novel (i.e., the narrator and the narratee), becomes embodied in epic....;" and "Homeric performance... is much more than the mere declamation or recitation of the story of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. That recitation is built into the very fabric of its narrative contract."<sup>21</sup> Bakker is here concerned with the differences between the performing poet's adoption of the role of "Homer" (which he calls "indexical") and his adoption of the roles of characters

---

<sup>18</sup> Important studies on the *Iliad* include de Jong 1987; Richardson 1990; Rengakos 2006.

<sup>19</sup> Bremer 1987, published in the same year as de Jong's *Narrators and Focalizers*, already discusses this kind of focalization in a few Iliadic passages.

<sup>20</sup> Bakker 2009.

<sup>21</sup> Bakker 2009: 118, 123.

within the story (which he calls “mimetic”).<sup>22</sup> I would like to pursue this issue in a somewhat different direction than Bakker, asking what it means for the “narratee” of Homeric epic to be a live, pluralistic entity responding to a “composition in performance.”<sup>23</sup>

Our *Iliad*, regardless of the historical circumstances of its production, assumes a live audience. Beginning with the work of Parry and Lord, comparative studies of oral story-telling cultures emphasize the role of the audience – or rather, of the performer’s perception of the audience’s desires – in determining the content of the narrative. Richard Martin’s survey brings out the “*participating* audience as a key element in the performance of oral epic,” and “the contractual nature of the epic event and the intensity of contact [between performer and audience] thus produced.”<sup>24</sup> Ruth Scodel’s account emphasizes the potential variety in audiences’ knowledge, critical sophistication, and attentiveness, and cites instances of performers including content comprehensible or meaningful only to certain groups or even individuals within the audience.<sup>25</sup> While details differ to an astonishing degree, one broad conclusion holds true for nearly all the comparative evidence: the oral performer, confronted by a live audience and capable at any given moment of altering his performance in small or

---

<sup>22</sup> Bakker (*ibid.*) focuses in the first part of his article on the epic’s claim to perpetuity, by which every performance is conceived as a re-performance (122-27). The latter part of the article aims at showing that the hierarchical relationship between narrator and character assumed by narratology does not work in Homer, especially in the case of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* (128-36).

<sup>23</sup> The model of composition in performance, articulated in Lord 1960 (esp. 13-123), has been variously developed and interpreted in such works as Nagy 1979, 1996; J.M. Foley 1995, and Scodel 2002. Articles by J.M. Foley and Russo in Morriss and Powell 1997 survey trends in oral theory since Parry. Evidence from comparative studies must be used with great caution since contemporary oral song cultures differ widely among themselves – and one cannot forget that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* that we have are in fact texts. In broad terms, however, the model of composition-in-performance has won wide acceptance at least as part of the cultural background assumed by the poems, and the term “oral-derived texts” has been usefully applied (J. M. Foley 1997) to acknowledge their textual character while emphasizing the importance of the oral tradition from which they stem.

<sup>24</sup> Martin 1989: 232.

<sup>25</sup> Scodel 2002 esp. 6-11.

large ways, must be attentive to the mood of his audience in a way that the narrator of a work of modern fiction cannot be. Oliver Taplin describes the result of this as a “poet-audience symbiosis”:

The symbiotic collaboration of poet and audience decides what to include in the poem (and what not) and how to treat it; it decides, in other words, whom and what to celebrate or make notorious through poetry.... Such choices lie with the poet, taking due consideration of the expectations of his audience....

And the poet-audience symbiosis not only determines who are given time and attention, but what they are given it for. There is no other external, impersonal power (not even ‘the plot’ or ‘tradition’) which determines that Agamemnon’s rejection of Chryses is the very first incident of the poem, or that he play virtually no part after book 19;.... By including some things and not others, emphasizing some more than others, putting them in a particular sequence, the poet wields mighty power. That extends to the power to influence his audiences, to stimulate change or encourage stability in various ways and degrees in their aesthetics, their values, and their politics. At the same time that power is not unlimited, because of the need to catch a public and to retain it....<sup>26</sup>

My interest here is not in trying to decide how “the audience” – corresponding to the “narratee” of literary narratives in the modern fiction whose study gave birth to narratology – should be assumed to be reacting during the *Iliad*’s performance, which is after all unknowable and must vary to some degree in any case from listener to listener in a plural audience. Nor am I concerned with describing an original audience for the *Iliad*. This is not only futile in practice but problematic in its very conception. From the perspective of an “evolutionary” model of the poem’s development, the poem is a multiform with no original.<sup>27</sup> On the other hand, if one believes that the poem was composed and written down by a literate poet well-versed in the oral tradition, or dictated to an amanuensis,<sup>28</sup> the “original” audience turns out again to be a figment of the poet’s imagination: he is not then performing in the traditional

---

<sup>26</sup> Taplin 1992: 5.

<sup>27</sup> Nagy 2003: 1-19 is a recent formulation of his influential, if controversial, evolutionary model.

<sup>28</sup> For Martin West, “each epic was written down only once, or if other versions ever existed, they disappeared at an early date. Our *Iliad* took on its definitive form as it was written down” (2000: 3). Cf. Janko 1998, who differs from West on many points but not on this main one.

context from which his poetic idiom derives, but only composing as though he were, using the same traditional language and tropes.

While the *Iliad* does not necessarily have an original audience, it does imply an audience, that to which the narrative voice speaks; this audience is an essential component of Homeric poetry, yet notoriously difficult to define.<sup>29</sup> Many critics have argued that the poem reinforces aristocratic values and that this suggests it is aimed at an elite audience;<sup>30</sup> others have argued that its audience is lower class.<sup>31</sup> However, Ruth Scodel is persuasive in arguing for the inclusivity of Homeric epic; its success depends in part on its ability to speak to a variety of audiences: “patently, the epics were available for different understandings; otherwise, they could not have achieved the canonical status they did during a period of immense change.”<sup>32</sup>

Rather than trying to reconstruct a particular implied audience, I show that internal *representations* of a participatory audience are to be found among the gods on Olympus, and I consider their potential significance bearing in mind the possibility of varying attitudes among listeners. In contrast to the recent project of J. Marks on the *Odyssey*,<sup>33</sup> I do not claim that these passages of divine decision-making occur at places where the *Iliad* makes an actual choice between extant competing story-lines. Instead, I will argue that the internal model of causality generates a type of dramatic effect: the poet-narrator wants to present certain points as critical, and invites his (the

---

<sup>29</sup> The *Iliad* also has many historical audiences in actual instances of performance. The fraught question of historical audiences is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

<sup>30</sup> See especially Morris 1986; Latacz 1996: 48-66. Janko 1998: 12-13 sees implicit support for kings rather than for aristocrats.

<sup>31</sup> Dalby 1995 is particularly interesting.

<sup>32</sup> Scodel 2002: 173-212 (quote from 182). Cf. Doherty 1995: 24: “We need to consider whether the conception of the relationship between bard and audience is inspired by a (projected) nostalgia for a more homogeneous society than our own, one in which ideology was not as overtly contested.”

<sup>33</sup> Marks 2008.

extradiegetic) audience to participate *vicariously* at those points by portraying dynamics reflective of a performing poet's wish to satisfy his audience.

While Pucci speaks of the poem's ability to "induce" a certain response through intratextual models like the gods,<sup>34</sup> Lillian Doherty shows greater caution in speaking of the way "epic elicits our assent to a particular, gendered model of response;" any given listener or reader has the potential to reject the model, or accept it only provisionally.<sup>35</sup> The present study also recognizes the audience's possible resistance to the internal models of response offered by the gods. However, it goes further, arguing that the poem engages with and even encourages this potential for resistance to the internal model it presents, and thereby problematizes the act of reception; this reveals a high level of sophistication on the part of the *Iliad*. In contrast to the many studies that focus on gender and class, the present study focuses on problems such as pity, desire, and complicity; the reason is that these are the issues that the internal audience on Olympus problematizes in the most direct way.

Fundamental to this reading is the issue of viewer complicity which Nietzsche seems to have sensed, and which is central to the *Iliad*'s treatment of the divine audience but has not received the attention it deserves. For instance, when Zeus finds himself witness to the impending death of Hector, he laments: "Alas! that I see with my eyes a man dear to me / pursued around the wall – my heart grieves / for Hector..." (ὦ πόποι ἦ φίλον ἄνδρα διωκόμενον περὶ τεῖχος / ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώμαι· ἐμὸν δ' ὀλοφύρεται ἦτορ / Ἑκτορος 22.168-70). Here Griffin compares Zeus to the audience for a tragedy. But this approach is not sufficient because it does not recognize the extent to which viewership and control are intertwined in this

---

<sup>34</sup> Pucci 2002.

<sup>35</sup> Doherty 1995: 25.



passage.<sup>36</sup> Zeus concludes by asking the assembled gods: “... should we now slay [Hector] through Achilles son of Peleus?” (... μιν ἦδη / Πηλεΐδῃ Ἀχιλλῆϊ δαμάσσομεν 22.175-76). Though Zeus takes no active hand in the slaying, nor does any other god except Athena, he makes himself and the Olympians the subject of the verb of killing. The implication that the divine audience could decide even at this moment of “performance” to call off the slaughter if they really wanted to communicates complicity beyond that shared by viewers of a staged theatrical performance.<sup>37</sup> If comparisons are worth making simply for the sake of illustration, I would suggest that in terms of complicity the divine audience is rather like the crowd gathered at a stoning. Not everyone watching throws a rock, and not everyone may be happy. But when it’s all over the chosen person is dead at the hands of the crowd.

How does this divine complicity attach to the audience of the poem? To address this question, it is necessary first to ask what it is in particular that makes the gods of special significance as viewers – to make a fuller argument for the prominence of Pucci’s “effect of mediation.” After all, the *Iliad*’s interest in the act of viewing is well known, and in particular the possibility that the poem’s many internal observers

---

<sup>36</sup> Griffin selectively cites only 22.166-70 in his discussion of those lines.

<sup>37</sup> It is frustrating that although seeking to capture the big picture Griffin’s beautiful and influential essay sometimes fails to consider the context of the passages cited (the *caveat* offered on pg 5 of the 1978 version is not enough). For instance, Griffin includes Hera’s viewing at 8.350 as an example of the divine audience suggesting the audience for a tragedy; yet Hera moves to act in lines 8.351ff. This is not an example of passive “looking on”; certainly there is nothing “tragic” about the passage. Griffin’s other four examples of the gods as the audience for a “show” or a “tragedy” are also cited without discussion or attention to context. All of these passages emphasize complicity on further examination, by detailing the gods’ previous agency which led to the spectacle in question, or their failure to intervene now despite an interest in doing so: the passivity of Hera and Athena in 4.1-4 is commented on by Zeus, who teases them for their failure to intervene; 7.61ff shows Athena and Apollo taking their positions to attend a spectacle which they have just orchestrated, namely the duel between Hector and an Achaean champion; 8.51 shows Zeus exulting in his glory as he watches the battle over which he has just taken personal control, as is signalled by his descent to Ida and emphasized throughout Book 8; Zeus’ contemplation of the impending death of Sarpedon (16.438) emphasizes his own complicity.

may serve as models of response for the poet's listening audience.<sup>38</sup> I suggest that among these internal observers the gods are of special interest for particular reasons, which the poet exploits to construe the gods as an internal audience for the *Iliad*. First, they form an identifiable group, generally gathered in one place: this is not remarkable in and of itself – as the same could be said, for example, of the Trojans in the city – but it is striking that for the *gods* this situation seems to be an invention of epic.<sup>39</sup> In any case, this feature requires attention because it turns out to be important for how the gods function as the model of a plural audience. The second point is that the setting in which they are normally found is a banquet (*dais*) at Zeus' house; similar settings are associated in the *Odyssey* with the performance of poetry. Third, though they are free (like the poet's listeners) to choose other entertainment, the object of their attention as a group corresponds to the essential action of the poem. Fourth, the gods' ambiguous relationship to the story-world allows for a unique way of modeling vicarious participation. Finally, the gods are not only characters within the story but also author events and influence narrative strategy through the figure of Zeus. This last point is fundamental in addressing the issue of complicity.

To begin with the first point: the gods form a notionally coherent group of diverse individuals. This is key to their function as an internal audience, and not as trivial as it may seem. On the one hand, the poem's abiding concern with what divides the human from the divine prepares the listener to understand divine observers as examples of a type – to recognize not only instances of divine observation but also an Iliadic “divine

---

<sup>38</sup> Scholarship on internal observers who model audience response includes Bremer 1987: 41-43; Pucci 2002; Slatkin 2007. For a narratological approach, see De Jong 1987, with bibliography. See also Morrison 1997: 20: “The audience's experience of hearing the epic, then, is analogous in crucial ways to the experience of characters within the epic who also confront the unexpected against a backdrop of what appears likely to occur.”

<sup>39</sup> So Griffin 1978: 9: “The conception of a unified *Götterstaat* is alien to later Greek religion, and doubtless Nilsson is right to regard it as essentially a creation of the epic.”

audience.” Yet the gods are not all together and not always based on Olympus: Aidoneus for example dwells in Hades (e.g. 20.61-65); Thetis in her grotto (e.g. 1.337-38); even the Olympian Apollo can sometimes be assumed to be in his *temenos* on the citadel of Ilium (e.g. 7.20-21). Historical religious practices associate the gods with a variety of cult centers. Also, the gods are characterized frequently by disagreement and in that sense do not present a unified audience. It is striking, then, that the *Iliad* marks off “the gods” as a notionally coherent group in terms of their response to events at Troy. Significantly, the notional collective of the gods is not a constant: its composition and overall attitude in a given passage can vary – and may depend on the aim of the speaker who invokes it.

The first time in the *Iliad* that the gods are depicted as a group gazing down from Olympus comes in the uncertain aftermath of the duel between Paris and Menelaus:

Οἱ δὲ θεοὶ παρ Ζηνὶ καθήμενοι ἡγορόωντο  
 χρυσεῶν ἐν δαπέδῳ, μετὰ δέ σφισι πότνια Ἥβη  
 νέκταρ ἔοινοχόει· τοῖ δὲ χρυσεῖς δεπάεσσι  
 δειδέχατ' ἀλλήλους, Τρώων πόλιν εἰσορόωντες. – 4.1-4

But the gods for their part, seated beside Zeus, were assembled  
 on the golden floor, and among them lady Hebe  
 was the “wine”-pouder of their nectar. And they, with golden goblets  
 made toasts to each other, gazing upon the city of the Trojans.

The gods (οἱ δὲ θεοὶ 4.1) sit beside Zeus and toast each other while gazing on the city of the Trojans. Zeus is among them, but not quite of them – it is notable that he is not included in the actual phrase “the gods.”<sup>40</sup> Does the phrase “the gods... beside Zeus” then denote a group made up of *all* the gods who dwell on Olympus?<sup>41</sup> That is at least possible here – though we are not told whether Aphrodite has returned to Olympus

<sup>40</sup> Zeus is sometimes included with the gods, sometimes set beside them. Cf. 24.98-99: εὖρον δ' εὐρύοπα Κρονίδην, περὶ δ' ἄλλοι ἅπαντες / εἶαθ' ὀμηγερέες μάκαρες θεοὶ αἰὲν ἔοντες.

<sup>41</sup> The “gods who dwell on Olympus” is of course a grouping familiar to epic, appearing in the formulaic language (Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες): 1.18, 2.13 etc. The formula is also used of the Muses: Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσιν e.g. 2.284; see Said 2007 for the Muses' connection to Olympus.

after seating Helen next to Paris in their bedroom (3.424-26) – but even so it is not always the case. Much later, for example, in Book 24, the narrator says that “the gods” (θεοί) pity Hector as they gaze upon his mistreatment by Achilles, and keep asking Hermes to spirit his body away.<sup>42</sup> “The gods” in this example are again being represented as a monolithic whole, but now that whole clearly does not include Hera, Athena, or Poseidon, to whom the suggestion of the corpse’s rescue is not pleasing (24.25-26). The poet’s generalization is not neutral: what he has done is put Hera, Athena, and Poseidon in the minority, to make their opinion sound as though it runs against the grain of the group’s will. When Zeus later describes the situation to Thetis, it suits him to conceal the existence of that minority opinion entirely: he tells Thetis that a quarrel has arisen among “the immortals” (ἀθανάτοισιν 24.107), but according to Zeus the disagreement is that “they” were rousing Hermes to steal the body, while he (Zeus) alone was holding out – not out of spite against Troy, but out of respect for his promise to Thetis (24.109-11).<sup>43</sup> He then instructs Thetis to tell Achilles that “the gods” (θεοὺς 24.113) – as well as now Zeus himself – are angry at him (Achilles). This reflects the poet’s earlier generalization, for it again leaves out Hera, Poseidon, and Athena, but to a different end. However, Zeus does not give any hint to Thetis (or Achilles) that “the gods” do not now represent a perfectly unified front. And after all, what would it have served to give her the whole picture? By giving Thetis a blanket statement that the gods’ response as a group to her son’s behavior is outrage, he emphasizes his own faithfulness to his promise even in the face of what he misleadingly construes as unanimous opposition; then, by telling her to say to Achilles that “the

---

<sup>42</sup> τὸν δ’ ἐλεείρεσκον μάκαρες θεοὶ εἰσορόωντες / κλέψαι δ’ ὀτρύνεσκον εὐσκοπον Ἀργειφόντην. 24.23-24

<sup>43</sup> κλέψαι δ’ ὀτρύνουσιν εὐσκοπον Ἀργειφόντην / αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τόδε κῆδος Ἀχιλλῆϊ προτιάπτω / αἰδῶ καὶ φιλόττητα τεῖν μετόπισθε φυλάσσων 24.109-11.

gods” as a group are angry,<sup>44</sup> Zeus avoids mentioning the dissenting views and thereby presents the discussion as closed, ruling out, for example, any possibility of appeal by Achilles to some sympathetic deity.<sup>45</sup>

Zeus’s rhetoric in Book 24 shows his awareness that the notion of a unified “divine audience” can be used as a strategic tool for shaping the responses of Thetis and Achilles: the poet is not likely then to be unaware of the possibility of shaping with similar kinds of rhetoric the response of his own audience. In Chapter 6 I will argue that the poet’s varying characterization of the never-perfectly unified “divine audience” forms part of the poem’s broader exploration of the relationship between pathos and glory: the “group” response changes over time in such a way as to represent a transformation of pro-Achaean bias into sympathy for both sides in the war. For now, it is enough to note that in the course of treating divine response to events at Troy, the text does identify the divine audience as a single group despite the heterogeneity of individual responses within it – a feint that can result in a rich subtext of characterization. As a plural body observing and discussing the action at Troy, the gods can offer multiple configurations of response to the poem within the framework of a group – much like the extradiegetic audience.

The second reason that the gods are marked as an internal audience of particular interest is that they are normally situated in a setting associated with the performance of poetry. Passages in Books 1, 4, 8, 15, 19, 21, and 24 in particular represent the gods as gathered at a banquet (*dais*) at Zeus’ house on Olympus.<sup>46</sup> This is very like the

---

<sup>44</sup> σκύζεσθαί οἱ εἰπὲ θεοῦς, ἐμὲ δ’ ἔξοχα πάντων / ἄθανάτων κεχολῶσθαι... 24.113-14.

<sup>45</sup> Such an appeal would not be out of character for Achilles; Book 1 shows his ability to play on divine politics. For the background to Zeus’ delicate maneuvering around Thetis, see Slatkin 1991.

<sup>46</sup> For the passages in Books 1 and 4 see Chapter 3. For the rest: in 8.436-37 Athena and Hera return and rejoin the others in their golden chairs; on Hera’s return after seducing Zeus, the other gods raise their glasses to her (15.84-86) and she invites Themis to lead the gods in the *dais* (15.87-88, 95). Her suggestion that the *dais* might be less than pleasant “already” due to the machinations of Zeus in

setting at which the Odyssean audiences of epic enjoy the banquet and the accompanying entertainment, and indeed the Iliadic *dais* on Olympus when first introduced is the venue for poetic performance by Apollo and the Muses.<sup>47</sup> The leisurely enjoyment of the Iliadic gods at their feast has inspired comparisons with that of the Phaeacians and suitors in the *Odyssey*.<sup>48</sup> Recent work on the origins of the *symposium* provides evidence that such an association between these *dais* scenes is already discernible in the composition of the poems. Marek Wecowski finds evidence in the Iliadic *dais* on Olympus as well as in those on Scheria and Ithaca that the epics assume knowledge of the institution of the *symposion*, while suppressing it in the heroic settings in order to represent an archaic past.<sup>49</sup> If the *symposion* is a subtext for both the Olympian and the Odyssean banquets, there are other parallels as well.<sup>50</sup> It is notable that, like the Phaeacians and suitors of the *Odyssey*, the gods are a part of the

---

support of the Trojans (15.96-99) indicates that events in the Trojan war are still the gods' chief entertainment as they drink together. That the setting of the *dais* at Zeus' home on Olympus remains constant through Book 24 is made plain when Iris brings Thetis up from the sea, and they find Zeus and "all the other blessed gods who are eternal gathered around," (24.98-99), and Hera offers Thetis a goblet, which she accepts, drinking (24.101-2). 15.84-85, 19.355, 21.438 all specify "Zeus' house" as the location of the gathering.

<sup>47</sup> 1.584-611. The Odyssean *dais* is featured for example on Ithaca at *Od.* 1.144-55, 339-40; on Scheria at *Od.* 9.1-10. Cf. Pucci 2002: 21. To be clear, I do not suggest that historical performance settings of epic resembled the banquets depicted in the texts. Homeric epic encourages its audience to see itself as part of a continuum reaching all the way back to the mythical past, when Demodocus sang to the Phaeacians, and all the way into the future, since Achilles' *kleos* is undying. Cf. Murray 1991: 95: "it may indeed be that our problem in envisaging a physical context for the performance of the Homeric poems relates to the fact that the Homeric descriptions are themselves attempts to accommodate the role of the poet to a changing environment...."

<sup>48</sup> E.g. Griffin 1978: 13.

<sup>49</sup> Wecowski 2002 makes a strong case that our Homeric texts already betray knowledge of the institution of the *symposion*. On the continuity between epic treatment of commensality and the *symposion* see also Slater 1990; Murray 1991; Ford 1999 and 2002 Chptr 1; Irwin 2005: 43-45.

<sup>50</sup> It is instructive to compare two omissions in the two Homeric epics which I believe to be related: on the one hand, the *Iliad* never depicts *dais* scenes of poetic performance of the sort found in the *Odyssey* (as is commonly noted). On the other, the *Odyssey* nowhere depicts the *dais* on Olympus that is a constant backdrop for the gods in the *Iliad*. I suggest that these omissions are reciprocal in the sense that the *dais* on Olympus and those at Phaeacia and Ithaca occupy parallel, though not identical, functions in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. This then provides an answer to the old question, voiced recently by Murray 2008: 61: "Why this difference between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*? Is it pure chance that the content of the *Iliad* is silent about the role of the poet...?" As I hope to show, the self-reflexive possibilities of the banquet scene *are* explored in both poems.

epic events which absorb their attention. Yet the Phaeacians do not at first realize that the character Odysseus from Demodocus' songs is among them, any more than the suitors listening to Phemius' song of Achaean *nostos* realize that they themselves will soon be slaughtered to a man as part of the most famous instance of the genre. By contrast, the gods of the *Iliad* participate in events with full knowledge and of their own choosing, and this allows the poet to create heightened tension in scenes which construe them as an audience for the performance that is underway.

The third factor making the gods of special interest as an internal audience is that the object of their attention roughly corresponds to the poem's core narrative. While the image of the gods looking down from Olympus on some level reflects the expectation of divine oversight for all mortal affairs,<sup>51</sup> in practice the *Iliad* makes the gods an audience for the events comprising the story of Achilles' wrath. The poem makes clear that the gods cannot look in two places at once: thus, to take one example, when Zeus turns his shining eyes away from Troy in the first lines of Book 13, Poseidon has the opportunity to help the Achaeans unnoticed.<sup>52</sup> This means that the gods' attention cannot be taken for granted: their focus on Troy is a choice, and hence a good internal advertisement for the poet's narrative. Furthermore, the gods' moments of distraction from the story encourage the poet's audience to follow all the more closely, for such moments are typically associated with events unwanted by the god in question. Like sports fans convinced that if they miss a second of play their team will lose, the poet's audience is prodded to stay alert by the negative example of Zeus whose team indeed starts losing when he turns his eyes away from Troy (13.1ff), or when he makes love and sleeps afterward (14.153ff), and of Ares whose own son dies when he is not watching (13.521-25).

---

<sup>51</sup> Agamemnon for example swears by Zeus and "Helios who sees all." 3.276-77.

<sup>52</sup> Ζεύς... δὲ πάλιν τρέπεν ὅσσε φαεινῶ.... ἐς Τροίην δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἔτι τρέπεν ὅσσε φαεινῶ 13.1-7.

The fourth reason that the gods are of special interest as an internal audience is that their ambiguous relationship to the story-world allows them to model (vicarious) audience participation in a unique way. The *Iliad*'s other internal observers fall into two basic types. Some are characters within the story; these can model complex emotional responses. Others stand outside of the story, and their very "remoteness" draws attention to the audience's own exteriority and hence to the act of reception itself. The gods however are paradoxically both crucial and incidental to the story's events, both outside the story and bound up within it, and this makes them uniquely well positioned to model complex emotional responses while simultaneously drawing attention to the audience's act of viewing. The importance of this is best illustrated by a comparison between three kinds of internal observer in the poem.

In Book 22 of the *Iliad*, Achilles runs toward Troy. One among the poet's audience, observing this movement in his mind's eye, might focus on Achilles' marvelous speed and the expectant hush as countless eyes follow his course across the plain. This much is expressed in the simile of a horse in a chariot race at full gallop:

ὣς εἰπὼν προτὶ ἄστυ μέγα φρονέων ἐβεβήκει,  
 σευάμενος ὥς θ' ἵππος ἀεθλοφόρος σὺν ὄχεσφιν,  
 ὅς ῥά τε ῥεῖα θέησι τιταινόμενος πεδίοιο·  
 ὥς Ἀχιλεὺς λαιψηρὰ πόδας καὶ γούνατ' ἐνώμα. – 22.21-24

So speaking he made for the citadel, full of confidence,  
 rushing as a prize-winning horse with a chariot,  
 that runs easily, galloping, over the plain –  
 so Achilles speedily put his feet and his knees in motion.

But as Priam becomes an internal observer of this action, the poet invites the audience to see through Priam's eyes and so become emotionally involved in a particular way:

Τὸν δ' ὁ γέρων Πρίαμος πρῶτος ἶδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι                      25  
 παμφαίνονθ' ὥς τ' ἀστέρ' ἐπεσσύμενον πεδίοιο,  
 ὅς ῥά τ' ὀπώρης εἴσιν, ἀρίζηλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαὶ  
 φαίνονται πολλοῖσι μετ' ἀστράσι νυκτὸς ἀμολγῶ,  
 ὃν τε κύν' Ὠρίωνος ἐπὶ κλησὶν καλέουσι.  
 λαμπρότατος μὲν ὁ γ' ἐστί, κακὸν δέ τε σῆμα τέτυκται,                      30



καί τε φέρει πολλὸν πυρετὸν δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν·  
ὥς τοῦ χαλκὸς ἔλαμπε περὶ στήθεσσι θεόντος.  
ῥμῶξεν δ' ὁ γέρων.... – 22.25-33

And the old man Priam was first to see him with his eyes  
shining like a star as he rushed across the plain,  
the star of late summer, whose bright rays  
stand out among the many stars in the darkness of night,  
and which they call the dog of Orion.  
It is exceedingly bright, but is a sign of evil,  
and brings much fever to wretched mortals.  
So the bronze shone on his chest as he ran.  
And the old man groaned....

To Priam the sight of Achilles does not evoke horse-races: instead he shines like bright, baleful Sirius, a “sign of evil” for humans as Achilles signifies evil for Priam and his people. Through Priam’s eyes, Achilles looms as both an immediate threat and a portentous apparition embodying Hector’s imminent death and his city’s eventual fall with all of the misery that will bring (22.37-76). As a viewer internal to the story, Priam prompts the extradiegetic listener to recontextualize the picture of Achilles running in a web of claustrophobic emotional entanglements. Yet nothing in this passage draws attention to the audience’s role as a viewer or to the poet’s manipulation of the shift from Achilles as race-horse to Achilles as coming doom. While this example is particularly striking, most acts of observation described in the *Iliad* are similar to Priam’s in this much: while they invite the audience to adopt the observer’s perspective, they do not invite the audience to reflect on their own role in the process.

But some internal observers are different in that, while part of the text, they stand outside the world of the story.<sup>53</sup> Such is the shepherd who gazes at the stars to which the Trojan campfires are likened at the end of Book 8:

<sup>53</sup> In de Jong’s terminology one would say that these figures are outside the fabula. The fabula, “consisting of a logically and chronologically related series of events, is the result of all kinds of activities by characters in a fictional world.” The “story” on the other hand “is the result of the focalizing activity (focalization) of a focalizer” – and the text is the result of the narration of the focalized story. De Jong 1987: 31.

Οἱ δὲ μέγα φρονέοντες ἐπὶ πτολέμοιο γεφύρας  
 ἦατο παννύχιοι, πυρὰ δέ σφισι καίετο πολλά.  
 ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἐν οὐρανῷ ἄστρα φαεινὴν ἀμφὶ σελήνην 555  
 φαίνεται ἄριπρεπέα, ὅτε τ' ἔπλετο νήνεμος αἰθήρ·  
 ἔκ τ' ἔφανε πᾶσαι σκοπιαὶ καὶ πρόωνες ἄκροι  
 καὶ νάπαι· οὐρανόθεν δ' ἄρ' ὑπερράγη ἄσπετος αἰθήρ,  
 πάντα δὲ εἶδεται ἄστρα, γέγηθε δέ τε φρένα ποιμήν·  
 τόσσα μεσηγὺ νεῶν ἠδὲ Ξάνθοιο ῥοάων 560  
 Τρώων καίωντων πυρὰ φαίνετο Ἰλίοθι πρό. – 8.553-61

But [the Trojans], thinking high thoughts on the bridges of war,  
 sat through the night, and their fires burned in their multitudes.  
 As when in the sky the stars around the bright moon  
 appear brilliantly, when the air is windless;  
 and all the peaks and beetling crags stand out,  
 and the glens; and from the heavens the infinite air is rent,  
 and all the stars appear, and the shepherd rejoices in his heart –  
 so many between the ships and the streams of Xanthus  
 appeared the fires that the Trojans burned before Ilium.

The shepherd's gladness (γέγηθε 8.559) at the starry sky suggests a possible audience response to the poet's description of the field lit by campfires. In the context of the main narrative, the Trojan campfires are reminders of Trojan dominance in the past day's fighting and the prospects of pressing this advantage on the following day. But the shepherd's view of the stars offers a different way of seeing the campfires, with an emotional distance from the characters and events of the main narrative. This remoteness has the potential to draw attention to the audience's own remoteness from the world of the story. Notably, the poet has represented here a keeper of sheep whose gaze is presently turned toward the sky – i.e. who is, like the extradiegetic audience, at leisure. The simile invites the audience to view the campfires with deep aesthetic appreciation and wonder; the cosmic beauty and order of the sky mirrors the beauty and order of the poem's design.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Clay 2011: 8: "But the pleasure of the internal observer also invites the audience to be entranced by the sheer beauty of the scene and to share momentarily a divine perspective, viewing the Trojan watch fires from afar, where a transient human moment is mirrored in the eternal cosmic phenomena of the heavens. Like the gods, we the audience can witness this interplay of the ephemeral and the timeless, this conversion of the fleeting into the everlasting, that constitutes the transformative power

Another “remote” observer of the *Iliad* is the “would-be eye-witness” or “hypothetical observer” invoked in passages such as “Not even a perceptive man would have recognized Sarpedon....” (οὐδ’ ἄν ἔτι φράδμων περ ἀνὴρ Σαρπηδόνα δῖον ἔγνων 16.638).<sup>55</sup> This perceptive man is barely a character, because he has no characteristic, except for the (hypothetical) fact of his capacity for observation. Since this, his only attribute, is one that the poet’s listeners also share, the observer constitutes a blank onto which the audience may easily project themselves.<sup>56</sup> There is some difference in effect between the shepherd and the hypothetical observer. The shepherd could hardly be more remote from the story and still be mentioned in the text – he neither knows of the heroes nor they of him, and he has no effect on their actions, nor they on his. But the observant man is (hypothetically) observing the action of the narrative: he gives the sense of being *almost* there. But he is still ethereal, a figment in the imagined “reality” of the war. He and the shepherd are alike in this: while calling attention to the audience’s activity of reception, they do not offer a complex or intensely emotional model of response as do characters embroiled in the plot.

The gods, however, share traits with both the characters at Troy and the “remote” observers, for they read ambiguously as both internal to and external to the story. It has often been remarked that the *Iliad* plot could be summarized without much mention of the gods,<sup>57</sup> yet the gods are also depicted as responsible for all major

---

of poetry transcending both time and space and transforming the visual into the verbal, which in turn allows the mind’s eye to re-imagine the initial vision.”

<sup>55</sup> For a fuller discussion of the hypothetical observer, with bibliography, see Chapter 3.

<sup>56</sup> One might say that the passage invites the listener to become his own focalizer for the narration. Contrast the specificity of *Od.* 11.418: “You [Odysseus] would have been sorry to see [us all lying slaughtered at that feast]...” (ἀλλὰ κε κείνα μάλιστα ἰδὼν ὀλοφύραο θυμῷ).

<sup>57</sup> Lloyd-Jones 1971: 10: “... the part played by the god can always be subtracted without making nonsense of the action.” Also Janko 1985: 4: “It is a remarkable paradox that nearly every important

events and many minor ones.<sup>58</sup> This points to their paradoxical nature of being both remote and implicated at the same time. However, the effects of this paradox have not been adequately examined: the gods' detachment as observers can be used to recall the audience's own remove, but their personal engagement with events can also draw the audience into the action. In other words, they are ideally suited to model vicarious participation; instances of this effect in practice will be analyzed in Chapters 2-5.

Finally, the gods will be seen to provide a model for poet-audience dynamics. It is not only by leaping down to Troy that the gods engage with the story; they also influence Zeus in making decisions about narrative outcomes. My analysis in Chapters 2 and 5 will show that in such cases Zeus is sometimes construed as a poet figure. Then his verbal interactions with the other gods – particularly their influence over his “plotting” decisions – offer an intratextual model of poet-audience dynamics aimed to give the extradiegetic audience a greater sense of involvement and complicity by suggesting that the poet is in some sense answerable to their (collective) wishes and expectations. I am not the first to see a connection between Zeus and the poet,<sup>59</sup> but in the history of scholarship Zeus' “authorial” role has not been interpreted in light of the gods' mediating role as intratextual viewers. Instead, it has been seen as part of a related set of questions: to what extent the divine machinery – including Zeus, the gods, and “fate” – should be viewed as intratextual expressions of the poet's will; and to what extent Zeus' decision-making corresponds to the plotting of the poem, the will of the poet, or the story tradition. Therefore in order to

---

event in the *Iliad* is the doing of a god, and that one can give a clear account of the poem's entire action with no reference to the gods at all.” These remarks perhaps overstate the case, however, since some events, such as Paris' removal to Troy in Book 3, are hard to account for without reference to the gods.

<sup>58</sup> See Dodds 1951: 7, 16 for “over-determination” in Homeric causality, and Lesky 2001: 201 for “the Homeric conception of collaborating divine and human forces.”

<sup>59</sup> See notes 74 and 75 below for bibliography.

locate my approach within this body of scholarship, it will be helpful to review briefly the difficulties in assessing the *Iliad*'s account of cosmic order and design.

The terms commonly (and somewhat misleadingly) translated “fate” in English – *moira*, *aisa*, *moros*, and their cognates – all suggest order arising from a process of allotment or apportioning.<sup>60</sup> In the case of an individual mortal this allotment constitutes “the particular shape of his life,”<sup>61</sup> and it is particularly the use of these terms to refer to events in mortal lives (rather than “portions” of land for example) that I am interested in here.<sup>62</sup> How are such allotments made and who makes them?<sup>63</sup> Some language posits Zeus’ agency: Helen asserts that Zeus has assigned her and Paris their “evil portion” (κακὸν μέρος 6.357) and the traditional phrase Διὸς αἶσαν “portion from Zeus” is used not only by mortal characters but also by the narrator.<sup>64</sup> Other passages suggest that it is the gods as a group that decide how events will come out.<sup>65</sup> Some passages hint that ‘Zeus’ and ‘the gods’ are in fact two different ways of

---

<sup>60</sup> The ultimate lot of mortals is death, and *Moira* is also a goddess worshipped in cult and associated with death; *aisa* and *moros* also have or take on associations with death. For these terms, which the *Iliad* frequently uses interchangeably (regardless of their diverse origins), see Dietrich 1967 esp 249-83; Yamagata 1994 Chapter 7; Sarischoulis 2008 esp 27-99. Sarischoulis persuasively argues on the basis of an exhaustive analysis of the relevant terms in both Homeric texts that no concept “fate” can be abstracted from them: “Meine Untersuchung zeigt also, dass die “traditionelle” Interpretation der sogenannten Schicksalsbegriffe als umfassend das “Schicksal” bezeichnende Ausdrücke nicht zutreffend ist” (127). Accepting this conclusion, and recognizing that “fate” is an incurably loaded word in any case, I avoid the term here. Though this practice sometimes necessitates unwieldy language, it seems worth avoiding the evidently anachronistic and pernicious associations that “fate” can bring. [The ultimate aim of Sarischoulis’ monograph – namely to attempt to establish that freedom of action and choice exist for mortals in Homer – does not bear directly on the present study.]

<sup>61</sup> Phrase taken from Clay 1983: 156.

<sup>62</sup> For the full semantic range of these terms, see bibliography in note 61 above.

<sup>63</sup> Yamagata 1994: 105-120 covers many of the following examples, and adds evidence from the *Odyssey*.

<sup>64</sup> Διὸς αἶση by Achilles 9.608. The narrator fashions ὑπὲρ Διὸς αἶσαν, (17.321) as a combination of Διὸς αἶσα and ὑπὲρ αἶσαν (examples of the latter include 3.59 and 16.780). Scholars now regularly acknowledge the distinction drawn in both Homeric epics between mortal ignorance and the privileged view of divine workings granted by the poet, for which see, e.g. Lloyd-Jones 1971: 7, Winterbottom 1999: 33; Taalman Kip 2000 *passim*. Dietrich 1967 is less than perfectly careful here; see note below.

<sup>65</sup> At 16.693 the narrator speaks of “the gods” calling Patroclus to death (Ἐνθα τίνα πρῶτον τίνα δ’ ὕστατον ἐξενάριξας / Πατρόκλεις, ὅτε δὴ σε θεοὶ θάνατον δὲ κάλεσσαν; 16.692-93). Cf. Priam’s

referring to the same idea;<sup>66</sup> others suggest that this is true of ‘Zeus’ and *moira* (or Moira).<sup>67</sup> Sometimes Moira, or Aisa, is a personified figure who spins out the thread of a mortal’s life at his birth, apparently independent of Zeus and the gods;<sup>68</sup> other passages makes *moira* an impersonal construction.<sup>69</sup> Given this range, it is impossible to tell whether, for example, Hector refers to a personified Moira or an impersonal ‘allotment’ when he tells Andromache that none have escaped *moira* (μοῖραν δ’ οὐ τινά φημι πεφυγμένον ἔμμεναι ἀνδρῶν 6.488). It is striking that within a few lines Achilles, in his famous speech to Priam in Book 24, mixes up both imagery and agency with no discomfort as he first describes “the gods” in the act of “weaving” a mortal’s future, and then “Zeus” in the act of “dispensing” evils and blessings from two jars.<sup>70</sup> It is evidently not the case that Achilles is confused, but rather that the discourse about cosmic design in which Achilles participates does not value consistency of this kind.

---

assertion that the gods instead of Helen are to blame for the war (θεοί νύ μοι αἴτιοί εἰσιν 3.164). Dietrich offers several examples to demonstrate that Zeus alone or θεοί together can assign a fate (1967: 322-33), but does not acknowledge the fact that every one of his examples is taken from the speech of a (potentially ignorant) mortal rather than a god or the narrator.

<sup>66</sup> The people “pray” (ἡρήσαντο 3.318) and reach out their hands “to the gods” (θεοῖσι 3.318); but address “Zeus” (3.20): λαοὶ δ’ ἡρήσαντο, θεοῖσι δὲ χεῖρας ἀνέσχον, / ὣδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε· / Ζεῦ πάτερ Ἰδὲθεν μεδέων κύδιστε μέγιστε. 6.318-20. This lovely example is taken from Yagamata 1994: 4.

<sup>67</sup> Lycaon says that because (a) destructive *moira* has placed him in Achilles’ hands he must therefore be hateful to Zeus, “who gave me again to you”: νῦν αὖ με τεῆς ἐν χερσὶν ἔθηκε / μοῖρ’ ὅλοή· μέλλω που ἀπεχθέσθαι Διὶ πατρί, / ὅς με σοὶ αὖτις δῶκε 21.82-84. Zeus and *moira* appear to be interchangeable here. Cf. Dietrich 1968: 215.

<sup>68</sup> Hera speaks of Achilles’ life having been spun out by a personified Aisa: αἴσα / γιγνομένη ἐπένησε λίνω ὅτε μιν τέκε μήτηρ 20.125-28. Hecuba apparently uses the same traditional language as Hera when she refers to Hector’s lot spun out by a personified Moira: τῶ δ’ ὥς ποθὶ Μοῖρα κραταιή / γιγνομένη ἐπένησε λίνω, ὅτε μιν τέκον αὐτῇ 24.209-12.

<sup>69</sup> E.g., the Trojans fighting the Achaeans for Patroclus’ corpse vow to fight even if “it is allotted (*moira*) that all alike die beside this man” (...εἰ καὶ μοῖρα παρ’ ἀνέρι τῶδε δαμῆναι / πάντας ὁμῶς 17.421-22).

<sup>70</sup> ὥς γὰρ ἐπεκλώσαντο θεοὶ δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι / ζῶειν ἀχνυμένοις· αὐτοὶ δέ τ’ ἀκηδέες εἰσί. / δοιοὶ γὰρ τε πίθοι κατακείαται ἐν Διὸς οὔδει / δῶρων οἷα δίδωσι κακῶν, ἕτερος δὲ ἑάων· / ᾧ μὲν κ’ ἀμμίξας δῶη Ζεὺς τερπικέραυνος... 24.525-29.

There have been various ways of treating “fate” and the *Dios boulē* metapoetically. In 1923 P. E. Eberhard sought a solution for the old debate about whether fate or the gods are the higher power by suggesting that both are representations of what he called the *poetische Idee*.<sup>71</sup> Others too have noticed that the gods’ interventions sometimes prevent events from transpiring “beyond” their fixed allotments (ὑπέρμορα, ὑπέρμορον), and have interpreted those interventions as expressions of the poet’s will within the poem.<sup>72</sup> Gregory Nagy has called Zeus’ *boulē* in 1.5 “the self-proclaimed plot of the *Iliad*,”<sup>73</sup> which Allan accepts as a “primary (local) referent” for the phrase.<sup>74</sup> Redfield finds a “sense” in which “fate is plot;”<sup>75</sup> Richardson one in which “fate is Homer;” Mark Edwards remarks that “fate, of course, is the will of the poet, limited by the major features of the traditional legends.”<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Eberhard 1923.

<sup>72</sup> So Bremer 1987: 34 comments on Zeus’ mobilization of the gods to prevent Achilles from sacking Troy at 20.4-31: “Here the poet shows his hand: the interventions of the gods which are to follow will serve the purpose of preventing things from happening that should not yet happen at this moment. The divine planning of the moment of the fall of Troy thus coincides with the poetical planning of it, or – to put it differently – if an early fall of Troy is proclaimed by Zeus to be ὑπὲρ μόρον, this means also that it would conflict with the organization of the story by the poet.” Cf. Nagy 1979/99: 40: “The poet Demodocus lives up to the challenge of Odysseus that he recite the story of the Trojan Horse κατὰ μοῖραν ‘according to destiny (viii 496).’ Within the conventions of epic composition, an incident that is untraditional would be ὑπὲρ μοῖραν ‘beyond destiny.’”

<sup>73</sup> Nagy 1979/1999: 81-82, incl n.25.2. Cf Nagy 2003: 59; Fowler 2004: 230 n.40. Not all agree: v. e.g. Friedman 2001: 100 n.4.

<sup>74</sup> Allan 2008 does not cite Nagy, but evidently knows his work, because his cited source for the idea of *boulē* as plot is Fowler 2004, who gives Nagy’s work some attention. Allan 2008: 207: “Of course, the primary (local) referent of the *Dios boulē* [at 1.5] is the plot of the *Iliad* itself, that is, Zeus’s plan to bring honour to Achilles by strengthening the Trojans.” This article features a problem not uncommon in discussions about the *Dios boulē* at line 1.5: they easily slide into discussions of Zeus’ “will,” or Zeus’ desires whatever they might be, without acknowledging the shift (212-14 *ibid*).

<sup>75</sup> Redfield 1994: 133. Redfield’s comment “everything which happens is according to fate,” while part of an insightful set of suggestions for thinking about fate, is nevertheless illustrative of the dangers of importing a concept “fate” into the text. When held up to the language of the text, Redfield’s statement proves false (assuming that his “fate” includes *aisa*): as Patroclus leads the Achaean assault on the Trojans, the Achaeans prove stronger “beyond their allotment” καὶ τότε δὴ ῥ’ ὑπὲρ αἴσαν Ἀχαιοὶ φέρτεροι ἦσαν 16.780.

<sup>76</sup> M. Edwards:1987: 136. See further *ibid*. 127.

If there is self-reflexivity in the divine apparatus, what is the point of it? After all, it is a disservice to Homer to assume the answer lies in his inability to compose a poem in which his planning and control are not exposed. Yet many critics have seen the gods' appearance as tools of the poet as a compositional crutch: "[The Olympian gods] become a machine, always at the poet's disposal, who uses their superhuman strength to impose his will on the action of the poem. This machine is a convenient tool, often detrimental to the art of the epic...."<sup>77</sup> More recent work tends to view the *display* of plotting operations as a positive achievement.<sup>78</sup> Richardson is most explicit in this, articulating the idea that directing attention to the existence of an all-powerful narrator constitutes a "point" that is being made.<sup>79</sup> Nevertheless, most commentators seem content to identify rather than justify instances of self-reflexivity. Yamagata helpfully discusses the self-reflexive aspect in terms of point of view: "from the poet's point of view, these 'fates' are... the legendary 'facts' that he cannot change."<sup>80</sup> Frontisi-Ducroux locates that "poet's point of view" within the text, in the figure of Zeus: she suggests that Zeus' worries about upsetting the gods might mirror the poet's need to work within the story tradition.<sup>81</sup> However, Frontisi-Ducroux does not provide

---

<sup>77</sup> Dietrich 1965/67 297-98. Cf. Bremer 1987: 32 on Nilsson et al; also Aristotle *Poetics* 1454a37-b2: φανερόν οὖν ὅτι καὶ τὰς λύσεις τῶν μύθων ἐξ αὐτοῦ δεῖ τοῦ μύθου συμβαίνειν, καὶ μὴ ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ Μηδείᾳ ἀπὸ μηχανῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι τὰ περὶ τὸν ἀπόπλουν. "It is clear therefore that the resolutions of the stories should come about through the story itself, and not as in the *Medea* from the *mechanē* and in the *Iliad* in the situation of the disembarkment [i.e. when Athena and Hera stop the Achaeans' stampede for the ships at 2.155ff – criticized by Aristotle here as a *deus ex machina* solution]."

<sup>78</sup> E.g. Richardson 1990; Morrison 1992. But Bremer 1987 winds up being more neutral (see his comments on *hyper moron* at page 34), and Redfield 1975/1994 thinks that showing the poet's hand can be a weakness (see page 271 n.6.)

<sup>79</sup> This is of course natural in the context of a study whose purpose is to search for the "Homeric narrator." Richardson 1990 writes that depictions of the gods making the equivalent of "plot decisions" on Olympus make the self-reflexive "point... that the characters do not act of their own accord, but are controlled by a narrator who is godlike in his power to shape the course of their actions according to his artistic judgment" (193).

<sup>80</sup> Yamagata 1994: 99 n.7.



analysis to show that the poet actually draws such a parallel in the passage in question, nor does she ask why the poet might want to draw such a parallel if that is what he is in fact doing.

The remarks about what “fate is” run into another problem: they presuppose that some concept “fate” exists in Homer, while the usage of terms translated “fate” is sufficiently complicated to warn against such a presupposition.<sup>82</sup> Eberhard begins his study with a reference to “Die hauptsächlichsten Ausdrücke, die Homer für das Schicksal verwendet;”<sup>83</sup> in so taking the existence of a concept of “fate” for granted, Eberhard stands with the majority. Dietrich is well aware of the variety in terms, but still presupposes the existence of fate in Homer’s universe when he refers to the “terms for fate” – and suggests that they correspond to known mythological material and/or the poet’s design.<sup>84</sup> Richardson begins with a promisingly guarded stance, remarking that “fate in Homer, μοῖρα (or μόρος or αἶσα), *can* have a narrative significance,”<sup>85</sup> but does not look at particular passages,<sup>86</sup> instead citing Redfield and Schein before quickly moving on to suggest that there is a sense in which “fate is

---

<sup>81</sup> “Ce dosage de liberté et de nécessité reproduit-il la situation de l’aède bridé par les impératifs de la tradition mais maître des détours du récit? La réaction d’Athéna lorsque Zeus feint d’hésiter, de consulter les dieux pour arracher Hector au trépas, préfigurerait alors l’indignation du public à qui un aède oserait proposer une fin inattendue: [cites 22.179-81]” Frontisi-Ducroux 1986: 53. Cf *ibid.* 57.

<sup>82</sup> See note 61 on Sarischoulis 2008 above.

<sup>83</sup> Eberhard 1923: 9.

<sup>84</sup> Dietrich 1965/67: 282: “As has been seen, however, [the words for fate in Homer] extend over a wide field of meanings which can be outlined in the following way. Firstly, the outcome of an event in Homer could be determined by the content of an existing older myth which was known to the poet and his audience, and which had already told of the eventual fate of that hero. Secondly, the poet avails himself of various means to ‘motivate the dramatic action’ of the poem, and he in this way creates certain conditions of fate which have to be fulfilled within the poem.”

<sup>85</sup> Richardson 1990: 194; emphasis added.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.* 194-195. Richardson also notes correspondences in specific passages between the narrator and Muse(s) on the one hand, and Zeus and *moira* on the other.

Homer.”<sup>87</sup> Key questions remain largely unaddressed: to whom is this “narrative significance” significant? And why?

The present study’s approach is to avoid treating “fate” or the *Dios boulē* as conceptual objects and instead to concentrate on what the poet has made available in the particular: namely the gods and Zeus interacting together to make plot decisions. The factors that link Zeus to the extradiegetic poet, rather than being an end in themselves, are here used as supporting evidence for the close reading of passages in which Zeus poses questions about narrative direction. Broad considerations that facilitate the positioning of Zeus as a poet figure include the following: Zeus alone makes decisions that cannot be contravened.<sup>88</sup> His *boulē* looms behind the action of the poem (1.5), and this appears to be a traditional motif. Furthermore, Zeus is among the gods, but not (quite) of them; the formulaic language speaks of “Zeus and the gods,” or of “the gods” sitting “beside Zeus.”<sup>89</sup> He shares in their viewing of Troy, but there are consistent differences in the nature of his engagement with that ongoing spectacle. The gods normally descend from Olympus in order to take a hand in the action – all except for Zeus.<sup>90</sup> In mythology Zeus also descends to the mortal world in various guises, but never does so in the *Iliad*.<sup>91</sup> Instead, his will alone makes things

---

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.* 195. These citations imply that all of these formulations – “fate is Homer,” “fate is plot” – convey more or less the same thing idea, the only slight criticism being to say that Nagy makes the point “rather strongly” (189). But Homer is more than narrative – he is (notionally) a human presence speaking to a live audience.

<sup>88</sup> His nod in particular is final, as he tells Thetis: τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξ ἐμέθεν γε μετ’ ἀθανάτοισι μέγιστον / τέκμωρ· οὐ γὰρ ἐμὸν παλινάγρετον οὐδ’ ἀπατηλὸν / οὐδ’ ἀτελεύτητον ὃ τί κεν κεφαλῇ κατανεύσω 1.525-27.

<sup>89</sup> E.g. οἱ δὲ θεοὶ παρ Ζηνὶ καθήμενοι ... / θηεῦντο.... 7.443-44. The expression “Zeus and the other gods” (e.g. Ζεὺς μὲν που τό γε οἶδε καὶ ἀθανάτοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι 3.338) likewise implies Zeus’ separateness.

<sup>90</sup> The typical pattern of leaps between divine and human spheres by the other gods is evident at 1.44-48; 1.194-195; 3.121; 4.73-73; 11.3-5; 15.169 (from Ida); 15.237 (from Ida); 16.677 (from Ida); 17.544-45; 18.166-68, 202; 18.614-17; 19.350-51, 355-56; 20.32, 21.504-505, 468, 478, 22.213, 518-20; 22.186-187; 24.76-78; 24.144-45, 159, 188; 24.340-48, 468-69.

happen, as for example when he is said to “rouse terrible confusion” (ἐν δὲ κυδοιμὸν / ὤρσε κακὸν 11.52-53) on the battlefield.<sup>92</sup> In this regard, Zeus is somewhat mysteriously presented as being the enactor of events in which he takes no hand, as when Patroclus in his dying vision recognizes Zeus and Apollo as his divine slayers (rather than just Apollo, as the action described by the narrator would warrant),<sup>93</sup> and as when Zeus asks whether he should slay Sarpedon (“shall I slay [Sarpedon] at the hands of Patroclus?” ἤδη ὑπὸ χερσὶ Μενoitιιάδαο δαμάσσω 16.438). These general considerations contribute to Zeus’ potential as a poet-figure, which is then available to be exploited by the poet in particular passages – an important instance of which is the topic of the next chapter.

---

<sup>91</sup> The closest he comes is Mt. Ida: e.g. 8.41-52.

<sup>92</sup> Some other examples of Zeus guiding events directly from afar include 8.69-77; 8.169-171; 11.163; 11.336; 11.544; 12.37; 12.437-38, 450; 15.242; 15.567, 594-95; 15.594-95; 15.637; 15.694-95; 16.656; 17.268-273; 17.400-01; 17.593-96, 545-45.

<sup>93</sup> ... Ζεὺς Κρονίδης καὶ Ἀπόλλων, οἳ με δάμασσαν 16.845. Patroclus’ dying speech, in which he correctly predicts Hector’s death, is a case of a mortal character partaking of divinely privileged vision, and so entails a glance “behind the curtain.” Zeus’ special role is also apparent in that Patroclus seems to equate Zeus with Moira (or his *moira*) by following the above statement with this one a few lines later: ἀλλὰ με μοῖρ’ ὅλοη καὶ Λητοῦς ἔκτανεν υἱός. 16.849. For Patroclus, it seems, to say that Zeus and Apollo have killed him is to say that Moira/*moira* and Apollo have killed him.

## CHAPTER 2

### Reflections on Audience and Poet in Book 4: Zeus, Hera, Athena

The opening of Book 4 of the *Iliad* depicts a conversation between Zeus and Hera at the assembly of the gods on Olympus, in which they agree to and thereby confirm Troy's future destruction, sending Athena to accomplish the breaking of the truce which will set the necessary chain of events in motion. This conversation and its consequences raise questions of causality, temporality, and divine morality in the epic, to which previous scholarship has been fruitfully attentive. In terms of divine morality, at issue has been Hera's excessive wrath, and the ready acquiescence of both her and Zeus to the destruction of their most beloved cities, on the principle which they appear to hold in common that a god's wrath against mortals takes precedence over a god's protection of those same mortals.<sup>1</sup> In terms of temporality, the discussion on Olympus and confirmation of Troy's doom is seen by some as a "reenactment" of a divine discussion that one should imagine having taken place before the war began – in much the same way that the *teichoskopia* and other episodes in Books 2 and 3 are seen as being out of sequence chronologically.<sup>2</sup> Finally, the episode of the truce-breaking, like others in the poem, presents an apparent paradox of causation – and responsibility – whereby the Trojan Pandarus' truce-breaking bow-

---

<sup>1</sup> Zeus acquiesces to Hera's wish that Troy be destroyed in exchange for her agreement not to make trouble if he later wishes to destroy a city beloved to her (4.34-49). O'Brien 1993: 82-83 sums up Hera's hostility toward Troy as portrayed by Zeus in this scene as being "incessant... bestial... [and] incurable."

<sup>2</sup> See Whitman 1958: 268 for "the scenes of Aphrodite, Paris, and Helen, Menelaus in mad frustration hunting for a vanished Paris, and finally Pandarus shooting Menelaus" as "a kind of compressed reënactment of the original treachery which caused the war." Taalman Kip 2000: 6 applies this observation to the conversation on Olympus, which "must be seen as a re-enactment of the negotiations which, at some time in the past, sealed the fate of Troy. Apparently the narrator wanted us to know why the gods passed this sentence on Troy." But by focusing exclusively on the scene's function of elucidating an earlier divine "sentence" on Troy, Taalman Kip downplays too much the scene's function in its present location (for example on pg 6 n.5). For other episodes, such as the *teichoskopia*, as reenactments or reflections of the early part of the war see Kullmann 1960: 366-67; Whitman 1958: 269-71; Rengakos 2006: 20-21 n.8.

shot is “doubly motivated” by the gods’ decision and Athena’s intervention on the one hand, and Pandarus’ desire for glory on the other.<sup>3</sup>

In Chapters 2 and 3 I argue that this scene, which constitutes the gods’ first appearance as a “divine audience” for events at Troy, construes them as an internal epic audience. All of the tensions just described take on another layer of significance for listeners who accept the poet’s invitation to see the divine audience in this scene not only as a body that by virtue of its divine status can direct mortal affairs, but also as an alternative epic audience that is internal to the poem. In Chapter 2, I analyze the conversation on Olympus as a staged model of the poet-narrator provoking his listeners to demand the continuation of the performance. The models provided by Hera and Athena connect audience desire for the *Iliad* to excessive bloodthirst and unreasonable hostility toward Troy: the *Iliad*, then, is advertised as simultaneously awful and irresistible. Chapter 3 then steps back to read this scene on Olympus in its local context in Books 3-5 and their treatment of the theme of spectacle: here I show the particular techniques by which the poet aims to blur the distinction between listening to a story of the mythic past and viewing a live spectacle in which real humans are made to die before the audience’s eyes for their pleasure.

The poet begins by describing the merriment of “the gods” as a group on Olympus:

Οἱ δὲ θεοὶ παρ Ζηνὶ καθήμενοι ἡγορόωντο  
 χρυσέῳ ἐν δαπέδῳ, μετὰ δέ σφισι πότνια Ἥβη  
 νέκταρ ἐοινοχόει· τοὶ δὲ χρυσεοῖς δεπάεσσι  
 δειδέχατ’ ἀλλήλους, Τρώων πόλιν εἰσορόωντες. – 4.1-4

But the gods for their part, seated beside Zeus, were assembled  
 on the golden floor, and among them lady Hebe  
 was the “wine”-pourer of their nectar. And they, with golden goblets  
 made toasts to each other, gazing upon the city of the Trojans.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Lesky 1961 for *doppelte Motivation* and earlier bibliography. Dodds 1951 applies the term “over-determination” to the world view of the Homeric poems.

This passage recalls the close of Book 1, the previous – and so far only other – depiction in the poem of the gods as a group engaged in shared activity. Similarities of setting and mood emphasize a contrast which adds to the present scene’s dramatic effect. Book 1 had ended with the conclusion of a “banquet” (*dais* 1.602) at Zeus’ house with the featured entertainment consisting of poetic performance by Apollo and the Muses:

ὥς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἡμαρ ἐς ἡέλιον καταδύντα  
δαίνυντ’, οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς εἵσης,  
οὐ μὲν φόρμιγγος περικαλλέος ἦν ἔχ’ Ἀπόλλων,  
Μουσάων θ’ αἶ ἄειδον ἀμειβόμεναι ὀπὶ καλῇ. – 1.601-4

In this way then all day until the setting of the sun  
they banqueted, nor did their hearts lack whatsoever in measured *dais*,  
nor in the beautiful *phorminx* held by Apollo  
and the Muses who picked up each other’s singing with lovely voice.

This scene in Book 1 ensures that for audiences hearing about Olympus in the *Iliad*, as for those hearing about Scheria in the *Odyssey*, the performance of poetry is marked as the natural “companion of the *dais*.”<sup>4</sup> When Book 4 opens, it is now the following day,<sup>5</sup> and the gods are again gathered at Zeus’ house;<sup>6</sup> a “wine”-pourer (Hebe rather than Hephaestus) makes the rounds, glasses are raised and a fine time is being had by all. The setting and mood are the same, but the accompaniment of this *dais* is different. While the gods making toasts “to each other” (ἀλλήλους 4.4) still recall the inward-looking revelers at the end of Book 1, the final phrase following the strong caesura marks a switch: “gazing on the city of the Trojans” (Τρώων πόλιν εἰσορόωντες 4.4). With this, the poet has neatly substituted spectacle for song as the

<sup>4</sup> “...and the *phorminx*, which is the ‘companion’ of the bounteous banquet.” (φόρμιγγός θ’ ἢ δαιτὶ συνήορός ἐστι θαλεῖη *Od.* 8.98). This quote from Alcinous appears proverbial. The context makes clear that *phorminx* is being used here as a metonym for poetic performance – specifically, the epic poem which Demodocus has just performed, and of which Alcinous is saying that all have had their fill (κεκορήμεθα 8.98) since he saw Odysseus’ tears. συνήορος is a hapax.

<sup>5</sup> Nightfall at the end of Book 1; night and morning in opening of Book 2; same day through books 2 and 3.

<sup>6</sup> Suggested by παρ Ζηνὶ (4.1) and confirmed by πρὸς δῶμα Διὸς (5.907).

entertainment at the gods' banquet, implicitly drawing an analogy between the gods' viewing activity and the reception of poetry. In fact, the shift from Book 1, where the gods are an audience for poetic performance, to Book 4, where the gods are a live viewership for the events constituting the *Iliad* story, can be seen as a metaphor for the mental transformation sought by the poet for his audience from hearers of song to viewers of what his song describes. It is this transformation that can bridge the great distance between the world of the heroes and that of the audience, making them seem to exist in the same time and space with each other.<sup>7</sup>

The gods in this initial description appear unified in the conviviality and merriment of the *dais* as they “make toasts to each other” and gaze on the very events being narrated by the poet (4.4).<sup>8</sup> Drinking together and observing the Trojan war at their *dais* on Olympus, they resemble the Phaeacians of the *Odyssey* who enjoy poetry about the Trojan war (τέρποντ' ἐπέεσσιν *Od.* 8.91) while drinking together at their *dais* on Scheria.<sup>9</sup> If one were to apply the standards of Alcinous in the *Odyssey* to judge this *dais* on Olympus, it could be called a success. Alcinous values shared

---

<sup>7</sup> On this distance and its bridging, see Clay 2011: 17-26.

<sup>8</sup> For Greek audiences familiar with the institution of the *symposion*, the activity of toasting could add a generic dimension to the passage: here an incongruously light-hearted “sympotic” audience is posited against the gravity of the *epic* material that entertains them. The middle voice of *deiknumi* (or *deikanaō*) is used to mean “offer a toast to” [+ acc.] in three other passages in the *Iliad*: in Book 9 Odysseus toasts Achilles as a prelude to his speech (πλησάμενος δ' οἴνοιο δέπας δειδέκτ' Ἀχιλλῆα / χαῖρ' Ἀχιλεῦ· δαιτὸς μὲν εἴσης οὐκ ἐπιδευεῖς 9.224-25), and the Achaeans then greet the embassy on their return by standing up and toasting them with their glasses (τοὺς μὲν ἄρα χρυσέοισι κυπέλλοις υἷες Ἀχαιῶν / δειδέχατ' ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος ἀνασταδόν, ἔκ τ' ἐρέοντο 9.670-71); the Olympians do the same for Hera when she returns to Olympus from Ida in Book 15 (ἴκετο δ' αἰπὺν Ὀλυμπον, ὀμηγερέεσσι δ' ἐπῆλθεν / ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι Διὸς δόμῳ· οἳ δὲ ἰδόντες / πάντες ἀνήϊξαν καὶ δεικανόωντο δέπασσιν. 15.84-86). But the situation in Book 4 is somewhat different: since the gods are toasting “one another” synchronously with the action of gazing upon Troy it is clear that this toasting activity continues over a period of time (Cunliffe calls δειδέχατο pluperfect with imperfect sense). Thus, if the toasting is a prelude to speeches or greetings as in the parallel passages, those speeches or greetings are multiple and they are a part of the ongoing event. To audiences familiar with the *symposion*, where “virtually every... activity was subordinated to wine and its manipulations” (Wecowski 2002: 629), and toasts between symposiasts were frequent (Critias, fr. 6 West 1971 vol.2, v.3-7; Dionysius Chalcus, fr. 1 *ibid.*), this toasting would suggestively position the gods' merriment in that premier contemporary setting of conviviality – and of poetic criticism.

<sup>9</sup> Demodocus' first and third songs are of the Trojan war: *Od.* 8.62-92; 499-531.

enjoyment, in contrast to which Odysseus's weeping (ὀϊζυροῖο γόοιο *Od.*8.540) and grief (ἄχος *Od.*8.541) are taken by Alcinous as proof that Demodocus' song has failed in the case of Odysseus: "in singing these things [Demodocus] does not delight everyone" (οὐ γάρ πως πάντεσσι χαριζόμενος τὰδ' αἶδει *Od.*8.538), and Demodocus should cease "so that we may all take pleasure alike" (ἵν' ὁμῶς τερπώμεθα πάντες *Od.*8.542).<sup>10</sup> From such a perspective the gods at this point would appear to present a model of an audience successfully entertained by the poet's performance, i.e. of the *Iliad*.<sup>11</sup>

Despite the gods' evident enjoyment, however, they do not represent a straightforwardly positive model of "reception."<sup>12</sup> Indeed, the interest of this scene on Olympus is that it suggests a variety of possible responses to the poem. First of all, their attention appears to be divided. When Odysseus praises Alcinous' hospitality at Scheria, he specifies in his conception of the "most pleasant consummation" (τέλος χαριέστερον *Od.*9.5) that the poet's audience sits all in order (ἀκουάζωνται ἁοιδοῦ / ἥμενοι ἐξείης *Od.*9.7-8). When Penelope enjoins Phemius to sing another song than the Achaean *nostoi*, she specifies that the suitors will listen and drink "in silence" (σιωπῇ *Od.*1.340).<sup>13</sup> The Phaeacians are so gripped by the magic (κηληθμῶ *Od.*11.334) of Odysseus' song-like story that they remain silent (πάντες ἀκὴν

<sup>10</sup> This criterion is echoed in Odysseus' famous praise of Alcinous' hospitality, which extols the excellence of Demodocus' poetry and the ideal *dais* at which "good spirits abound throughout the entire company" (ἐὺφροσύνη μὲν ἔχῃ κατά δῆμον ἅπαντα *Od.*9.5). Nevertheless, it is very difficult to determine where, to what extent, and for whose benefit Odysseus may be adopting an ironical attitude in this speech; does he include himself among the company in "good spirits"?

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Pucci 2002: 22.

<sup>12</sup> Zervou 2007:38, in a discussion of the Phaeacian games in the *Odyssey*, uses *recepteur* to cover both "celui qui entend attentivement un chant et qui suit consciemment un spectacle" (see also *ibid.* 33), i.e. the intradiegetic viewers of the action and the extradiegetic audience of the poem. It is worth noting that the English word "audience" is similarly inclusive and therefore useful in this regard, as it is commonly used of those who attend primarily visual spectacles as well as (the more etymologically correct) audial performances.

<sup>13</sup> οἱ δὲ σιωπῇ / οἶνον πινόντων *Od.*1.339.40. This may or may not be taken to mean that sitting in silence is the suitors' normal practice when listening to Phemius.



ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ *Od.*11.333) even after it has abruptly stopped.<sup>14</sup> By contrast, the gods in the *Iliad* are pledging each other with their cups even as they watch: the activity of “reception” occupies only part of their minds, while they also talk and interact socially.<sup>15</sup>

Furthermore Alcinous’ criteria for a poem’s success are not the only possible ones. Plato’s rhapsode Ion considers tears the measure of a successful performance. “If I leave [my audience] crying, I laugh;” the rhapsode is glad for the money he will earn from his grateful listeners who have been moved to tears.<sup>16</sup> That text is late, and Ion’s performing role not the same as that of a bard like Demodocus,<sup>17</sup> but this is a useful reminder that from another perspective Odysseus actually displays a more appropriate response to the Iliadic poetry of Demodocus than do the Phaeacians. Here it is well to recall that *terpomai* is also used to denote the paradoxical pleasure derived from grieving.<sup>18</sup> In fact, the term for the weeping which Alcinous observes in Odysseus (γόοιο *Od.*8.540) is frequently the object of the verb *terpomai*, as when Achilles

---

<sup>14</sup> οἱ δ’ ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ, / κληθμῶ δ’ ἔσχοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκιοέοντα. *Od.*11.333-34.

<sup>15</sup> Studies of contemporary oral traditions frequently emphasize the performer’s potential difficulty in keeping his audience focused: e.g., Lord 1960: 17 emphasizes the “variability and instability of the audience” of the guslar in Serbia. Scodel 2002: 7 cites J. Fleuckiger’s description of epic in Central India, where members of the audience “may come and go, drink tea and talk, and even fall asleep.”

<sup>16</sup> Καὶ μάλα καλῶς οἶδα· καθορῶ γὰρ ἐκάστοτε αὐτοὺς ἄνωθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος κλάοντάς τε καὶ δεινὸν ἐμβλέποντας καὶ συνθαμβοῦντας τοῖς λεγομένοις. δεῖ γὰρ με καὶ σφόδρ’ αὐτοῖς τὸν νοῦν προσέχειν· ὥς ἐὰν μὲν κλάοντας αὐτοὺς καθίσω, αὐτὸς γελάσομαι ἀργύριον λαμβάνων, ἐὰν δὲ γελῶντας, αὐτὸς κλαύσομαι ἀργύριον ἀπολλύς. Pl. *Ion* 535e.

<sup>17</sup> But see Nagy 1996: 59-86 for an argument that the metaphor of sewing implicit in the word *rhapsoidos* describes Homeric composition in performance.

<sup>18</sup> Walsh 1984 identifies two separate poetics in the Odyssean scenes of epic reception (on Ithaca as well as Scheria): one that assumes poetry should produce pleasure, and another (represented by Odysseus) that also sees possible benefit in poetry that causes sorrow - the paradoxical pleasure of sorrow already suggested by the Homeric phrase *gooio terpein*. Cf. Segal 1992: “Through these contrasting responses, Homer reveals the paradox... between the pleasure that mimetic art affords its audience and the pain in its contents.” For the further development of this poetics in Euripides, see Segal 1993; Fantuzzi 2007; Said 2007.

enjoins all to “take our pleasure of weeping” for Patroclus (τεταρπώμεσθα γόοιο 23.10).<sup>19</sup>

The text does not rule out the possibility that Odysseus is indeed taking “pleasure” (*terpomai*) in weeping, a pleasure made possible by the song; his coming praise of Alcinous’ hospitality could thus be read partly as an endorsement of Demodocus’ performance from the only competent listener in the room. After all, it is Odysseus himself who requests the song of Troy’s capture (*Od.*8.487-98), which features himself and causes his tears. Various interpretations of this request are possible: that he does not anticipate his own emotional response; that he does anticipate it, but endures the pain in order to set the stage the more perfectly for the coming revelation of his own identity; that he does anticipate his own response and in fact desires the experience.<sup>20</sup> Whichever reading one prefers, it is evident that Odysseus’ emotional engagement with Demodocus’ Iliadic song appears to be deeper than that of the Phaeacians. Thus, even if Odysseus suffers more than one could wish from listening to an epic poem, the intensity of his response also makes the Phaeacians seem overly casual, even shallow by comparison.<sup>21</sup> All of these complications should caution against reading the gods’ enjoyment in Book 4 of the *Iliad* simply as a representation of ideal audience response.

The *Iliad* narrator, as I hope to show, is not satisfied to have an audience of Phaeacians (or suitors) who indulge in his performance as casually as they drink their

---

<sup>19</sup> There are countless other examples of the expression. See further Latacz 1966: 174-219.

<sup>20</sup> A related issue is Odysseus’ attitude toward the pain which he says Alcinous gives him by asking him to recount his troubles (*Od.*9.1-12). How does this reflect on his praise of Alcinous’ hospitality?

<sup>21</sup> One possible interpretation is that the scene delineates two extremes: the ideal listener being somewhere in between, touched more than the Phaeacians (or the suitors listening to Phemius’ song on Ithaca in *Odyssey* Book 1) but less than a character for whom the suffering described is or has been fully real – i.e., Odysseus (and Penelope.)

wine. Rather, he wants an audience on emotional tenter-hooks.<sup>22</sup> The image of the gods as an internal audience united in casual, complacent pleasure is vividly drawn in the opening lines only to be fractured and complicated by Zeus:

αὐτίκ' ἐπειρᾶτο Κρονίδης ἐρεθιζέμεν Ἥρην 5  
 κερτομίῳ ἐπέεσσι παραβλήδην ἀγορεύων·  
 δοιαὶ μὲν Μενελάῳ ἀρηγόνες εἰσὶ θεάων  
 Ἥρῃ τ' Ἀργεῖῃ καὶ Ἀλαλκομενῆϊς Ἀθήνῃ.  
 ἀλλ' ἦτοι ταὶ νόσφι καθήμεναι εἰσορόωσαι  
 τέρπεσθον· τῶ δ' αὖτε φιλομειδῆς Ἀφροδίτῃ 10  
 αἰεὶ παρμέμβλωκε καὶ αὐτοῦ κῆρας ἀμύνει·  
 καὶ νῦν ἐξεσάωσεν ὀϊόμενον θανέεσθαι. – 4.5-12

Right away the son of Kronos began trying to provoke Hera by speaking obliquely<sup>23</sup> with teasing words: “Two goddesses are the helpers of Menelaus, Argive Hera and the defender Athena. But look!, those two sit apart looking on and taking delight (*terpesthon*). But as for *him* [Paris] – laughter-loving Aphrodite consistently protects him and wards off death. Even now, she has spirited him away, when he thought he would die.

Zeus has singled out Hera and Athena, not because they are now behaving differently from “the gods” but because the passivity they share with the others is most incongruous in those who desire most to see Troy fall. Zeus’ description of Hera and Athena echoes the poet’s description of the gods as a group. Like the rest of the group, Hera and Athena are sitting and looking on (καθήμεναι εἰσορόωσαι 4.9; καθήμενοι 1.1, εἰσορόωντες 4.4). But by setting this behavior against the goddesses’ particular partisan interests, Zeus gives that description a critical bite: he calls Hera and Athena the “helpers of Menelaus” (δοιαὶ μὲν Μενελάῳ ἀρηγόνες 4.7), and contrasts their passivity with Aphrodite’s activity on behalf of her own favorite, Paris. Zeus notes that in sitting and watching along with the others, Hera and Athena are far

<sup>22</sup> *pace* Pucci 2002: 22, who says “[The gods] are the intra-textual readers who effect a certain reading of the scene, first by assuring us of the truth of what is going on, secondly by inviting us *to see* the action as they see it and to be detached enough from it to enjoy it.”

<sup>23</sup> I use Pucci’s translation “obliquely” for *parableden* (Pucci 2002: 22). The point of *parableden* seems to be that Zeus has aimed his words at Hera while addressing not her but rather the group as a whole. See Taalman Kip 2000: 6 n.5 for other possibilities regarding *parableden*.

(νόσφι καθήμεναι 4.9) from Menelaus, in contrast to Aphrodite who always stands beside (αἰεὶ παρμέμβλωκε 4.11) Paris.<sup>24</sup>

Zeus' use of the verb *terpomai* (τέρπεσθον 9.10) drives the point home further. *terpomai* evokes shared pleasure<sup>25</sup> and pleasure taken at leisure,<sup>26</sup> and is regularly used of those enjoying the pleasures of a *dais*.<sup>27</sup> Thus, its application to Hera and Athena further emphasizes their participation in the activities of the group.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, its appearance develops the metaperformative dimension of the scene, for *terpomai* denotes the expected effect of poetry in both Homeric epics. It is significant that the word for this enjoyment appears first in Zeus' taunt, rather than in the initial description (which conveys enjoyment without using a word to denote that enjoyment). By giving *terpomai* a provocative edge, the poet (through Zeus) suggests

<sup>24</sup> One could also take νόσφι καθήμεναι as meaning that Athena and Hera have removed themselves physically from the other gods (the two are sitting 'close to each other,' πλησίαι 4.21) rather than Menelaus. But when a character sits or stands "apart" (νόσφι) from the main group this normally entails a greater degree of separation: e.g. when Zeus sits "apart" he must be sought out by those who want to speak to him; Achilles is "apart" from the Achaeans when angered at Agamemnon (e.g. 9.348). In any case, the reading I follow supports Zeus' point that Athena and Hera, unlike Aphrodite, are not being good helpers.

<sup>25</sup> In the *Iliad*, only Zeus and Achilles are said to *terpomai* alone. Interestingly, these cases can all be interpreted in terms of the subject's special capacity for enjoying a work of art: for Achilles his own poetry (9.186-89) and the images on the shield made by Hephaestus (18.19), and for Zeus the grand battle scene at Troy that he has just put together (20.20-25). See further Chapter 5. (Apollo's pleasure in the songs sung in his honor at 1.467-74 is not really lone enjoyment, since his pleasure is much in harmony with that of the celebrants who are themselves engaged in a banquet, drinking, and singing.)

<sup>26</sup> In fact it is often used to emphasize that the party in question is (temporarily) at rest or otherwise not involved in a given activity or labor – especially the war. Examples include the Myrmidons enjoying games amongst themselves instead of fighting Trojans (2.773-75) and Achilles enjoying his own music while the Achaeans are embattled (9.186).

<sup>27</sup> Only the gods are ever said to take the pleasure of *terpomai* by being witnesses to conflict before their eyes; the special application of the word puts their pleasure in another class, serving as a reminder of the detachment which their immortality ultimately affords them. Cf Pucci 2002: 22 "[The gods] are the intra-textual readers who effect a certain reading of the scene [of the duel], first by assuring us of the truth of what is going on, secondly by inviting us to see the action as they see it and to be detached enough from it to enjoy it." Mortals, who are not detached, can of course feel very good about battle scenes – as when the Achaeans delight in Aias' ferocious appearance (τὸν δὲ καὶ Ἀργεῖοι μὲν ἐγρήθεον εἰσορόωντες 7.214). The point is that the term is then different: not *terpomai* but *getheō*.

<sup>28</sup> The bT-scholia (*ad loc*) themselves use the verb *terpei* to describe the pleasure taken by all the group of gods in lines 1-4: it seems likely that the scholiast extrapolates it from line 7 (where Zeus uses it of Hera and Athena), and from its frequent use in banquet scenes more generally.

that the casual, complacent enjoyment depicted in lines 1-4 is not in itself a sufficient response to what is happening at Troy – at any rate not for anyone who, like Hera and Athena, is invested in the idea that Troy must fall.<sup>29</sup>

In the following lines Zeus’ provocation expands to encompass a wider audience:

ἀλλ’ ἦτοι νίκη μὲν ἀρηϊφίλου Μενελάου·  
 ἡμεῖς δὲ φραζώμεθ’ ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα,  
 ἢ ῥ’ αὖτις πόλεμόν τε κακὸν καὶ φύλοπιν αἰνὴν 15  
 ὄρσομεν, ἢ φιλότητα μετ’ ἀμφοτέροισι βάλλωμεν.  
 εἰ δ’ αὖ πῶς τόδε πᾶσι φίλον καὶ ἡδὺ γένοιτο,  
 ἦτοι μὲν οἰκέοιτο πόλις Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος,  
 αὖτις δ’ Ἀργεῖην Ἑλένην Μενέλαος ἄγοιτο. - 4.13-19

Well, look now – as to the victory, it belongs to war-loving Menelaus.  
 But as for us, let us take thought how these things will be:  
 whether we will again stir up the evil warfare and the terrible strife,  
 or whether we will cast friendship among them on both sides.  
 And if, somehow, this thing in its turn should be welcome and sweet to all –  
 well!, the city of lord Priam could continue to be inhabited,  
 and Menelaus could lead Argive Helen back again.”

By having Zeus articulate this provocation,<sup>30</sup> the poet is able to give it voice himself as well, for Zeus’ words, like all the words of the poem, are to be imagined issuing from the singer’s lips. These lines create a heightened awareness of the world of the performance setting, in which the poet is able to speak to his audience without ever ceasing to play the role of Zeus speaking to the gods.<sup>31</sup> On one level, Zeus is the blustering yet enigmatic ruler of the divine realm – a character in his own right – and

<sup>29</sup> Another possible interpretation is that Zeus’ use of *terpomai* actually distinguishes Hera and Athena from the group in terms of the nature or degree of their enjoyment; perhaps the two have enjoyed Menelaus’ easy victory over Paris (Pucci 2002: 23). The two readings are not mutually exclusive, and both ideas may be present to some degree.

<sup>30</sup> My reading takes Zeus’ provocation, indicated by ἐρεθιζέμεν (5) and κερτομίους ἐπέεσσι (6) as applicable to his whole speech (7-19) rather than only to lines 7-12 (as Taalman Kip 2000: 38-39 would have it). This puts me in agreement with Flaig 1994: 20 n.27, though for very different reasons.

<sup>31</sup> Bakker 2009 esp. 125-26 proposes a useful theoretical framework for the effect I am describing: the performer has both a “mimetic” role by which he takes on the role of a character in the story, such as Zeus, and an “indexical” role by which he plays the part of the performing “Homer.” In these terms, what I am arguing is that in this passage in Book 4 the poet cultivates ambiguity from moment to moment, thus blurring the boundaries between the indexical and the mimetic to create a particularly challenging and engaging persona. Cf. Nagy 1996: 80: “the ‘I’ of the *Iliad* proem’s ‘Tell me, Muse’ is perhaps the most dramatic of all the characters in heroic song – once we see this song on the level of performance as well as composition.” See further Nagy 1996:59-86 and Bakker 1999: 8 for the nature of mimesis for the poet performing the part of the “quintessential narrator” (Bakker 1999: 8).

the gods constitute his divine court.<sup>32</sup> But on another level the poet is now engaging his listeners through Zeus, and this he does in three ways: his words draw attention to a glaring lack of resolution in the plot at this point; they claim that the traditional narrative could come out differently in this telling, no matter how familiar it may be; and they suggestively tie the outcome of the narrative, and indeed its continuation, to the collective will of those who are its audience.

Zeus' activity parallels that of the poet. The poet's insertion of the truce episode in Book 3, whose terms guarantee friendship thereafter between Trojans and Achaeans (3.94), has implicitly invited his listeners to consider a scenario in which Troy does not fall after all. Zeus now explicitly issues the same invitation to the gods on Olympus: "well!, the city of lord Priam could continue to be inhabited...." (ἦτοι μὲν οἰκέοιτο πόλις Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος 4.18). Both Zeus and the poet thus provide the opportunity for their respective auditors to contemplate the possibility of an early end to the war. The model provided by Zeus within the text raises the possibility that the poet, too, is doing this teasingly – to provoke a response.

This is not the first time that the poet has teased his listeners in this way. Agamemnon's testing of the troops in Book 2 causes a stampede for the ships, which the poet makes vivid and urgent by describing it with the same grand similes and other language normally used to give a sense of magnified scale and significance when armies clash together in battle.<sup>33</sup> He then explicitly invites his audience to

---

<sup>32</sup> Flaig 1984 analyzes the decision-making process of the gods in terms of deliberating governmental bodies.

<sup>33</sup> 2.142-54. The whole passage is a succession of war language geared to magnify the scale of fleeing rather than of fighting: the similes of winds blowing waves; the noise of the rush; the dust rising up from their feet (ποδῶν δ' ὑπένερθε κονίη / ἴστατ' αἰρομένη 2.150-51). "The shouting reaches to the heavens" (ἀϋτὴ δ' οὐρανὸν ἵκεν 2.153), a line used so often of intense battles, is given a nice twist with the enjambed continuation "of them as they rushed homeward" (οἴκαδε ἱεμένων 2.154).

imagine the consequences of this development if allowed to go on, thereby presenting the route as a narrowly avoided threat:

Ἐνθά κεν Ἀργείοισιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος ἐτύχθη  
εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίην Ἥρῃ πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν· - 2.155-56

Then would the Argives have had a home-coming *hypermora*,  
if Hera had not spoken to Athena.....

This early *nostos* would have preempted the rest of the performance and resulted in an unsatisfying end to the story, with the Achaeans gone home and Troy not sacked.

Through Zeus in Book 4 the poet is able to make his flirtation with the idea of an early *nostos* work in new ways. The present case begins as an enlarged version of the same strategy: the Catalogue of Ships later in Book 2 sets up listeners for an epic battle of gigantic proportions,<sup>34</sup> but when the armies come together at last in the beginning of Book 3 the battle is called off by Paris' challenge to Menelaus before a single blow is described (3.1-110). There is first of all here a difference of scale: the stampede for the ships lasts only a few lines, but the duel and the peace treaty associated with it keep the threat of an early Achaean homecoming hovering throughout Book 3. But there is difference of kind as well. In Book 2 the poet explicitly voices the possibility of an early Achaean *nostos* only while simultaneously assuring his listeners of its unreality by means of a contrafactual: the Argives "would have had" (κεν ... ἐτύχθη 2.155) an early *nostos*. By contrast, when Zeus says in Book 4 that the war might end now "if this is welcome and sweet to all" the possibility of the early *nostos* is still open. This is a very different matter, for it confronts listeners with the question of whether such an ending *would* be sweet to them at this moment.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>34</sup> Morrison 1992: 54-63 sees Book 3 as building suspense; he does not consider Book 4 in this context. Cf. Rengakos 2006: 43-45, whose conclusions on this topic are similar to Morrison's.

<sup>35</sup> This is the first of four times in the text that Zeus presents the gods with the possibility that events contrary to what has been allotted may yet occur: he asks Hera whether he should spirit away or kill Sarpedon in Book 16, suggests to the gods that Achilles might sack Troy in person in Book 20, and asks the gods whether they should save or kill Hector in Book 22. Zeus' questions about Sarpedon and

The whole scene is constructed so as to elicit a negative answer, working simultaneously on both the audience's suspense and their familiarity with the tradition. As regards the first factor, suspense: if the poet's performance has been going well, no one would want it to end now. In this respect the poet's strategy is reminiscent of Odysseus' pause at a suspenseful moment in the telling of his travels to the Phaeacians in the *Odyssey*: sensing that his listeners are hooked, he pauses and suggests that the story may end here.<sup>36</sup> Odysseus seems to have had financial benefit in mind – he passes the hat, as it were, to collect more lucre before continuing.<sup>37</sup> Like Odysseus, the *Iliad* narrator takes his story to a moment of heightened suspense and pauses to solicit a renewed commitment from his audience: not material goods in this case, but focus and engagement with the story-telling.<sup>38</sup>

In the case of the *Iliad* narrator it is not only through suspense that he sets up his audience to be resistant to the proposed possibility of an Achaean departure. He also plays on an oft-noted similarity between the perspective of an epic audience and that of the gods, namely that both groups will have some idea of what is supposed to happen in advance, stemming in the gods' case from their special knowledge of the apportionment of mortals' lots,<sup>39</sup> and in the case of the epic audience from their

---

Hector are formulated on the same model as the present scene, and are treated in Chapter 5. His suggestion that Achilles might sack Troy motivates the *theomachia*; for this see Chapter 6.

<sup>36</sup> For this persuasive interpretation of Odysseus' strategy at *Od.*11.328-84 see Dougherty 1991: 3.

<sup>37</sup> Note the gifts which his pause elicits (*Od.*11.335-61). *ibid.*

<sup>38</sup> Of course, material goods and audience engagement are not separate in the case of real performers, whose careers and economic well-being would have depended upon their audiences' engagement. It is notable that the Odyssean passage too toys with the idea that the audience helps determine the direction that the narration will take, though in a very different way: Alcinous asks Odysseus whether he saw any of his comrades from Troy in the underworld (*Od.*11.370ff) and Odysseus continues his story-telling in the direction suggested by his rapt audience.

<sup>39</sup> This feature of the divine perspective has recently been alluded to by Priam, in his final words before the duel between Paris and Menelaus, which he cannot watch for worry: "Zeus, I suppose, and the other immortal gods, know this much at least – / to which of the two the finality of death has been



knowledge of stable elements in the traditional tales. One need not take any particular stand on the Homeric question(s) to accept the minimal assertion that the *Iliad* assumes some prior familiarity with some elements of the story, and that the fall of Troy is among the most important of those elements: if anything is necessary, it is the fall of Troy.<sup>40</sup> Through Zeus' suggestion that the gods' prior arrangements might be altered, the poet is also challenging his audience to conceive of the story's events as contingent, rather than inevitable – and hence not to feel the complacency which Zeus described as pervading some in the divine audience, but to sit up and pay attention.

In this scene, Zeus' teasing provokes Hera and Athena into taking responsibility off of Zeus' shoulders for something that Zeus is already obliged to accomplish, namely honoring Achilles according to his promise to Thetis, as a scholiast saw: "He wished to bring about the breaking of the oaths for Achilles' sake, but put the blame on them."<sup>41</sup> It is worth noting that Zeus and the poet have parallel obligations: as Zeus has promised Thetis that Achilles will be honored, the poet has already provided the outline of a plot that will necessitate a good deal of violence for the sake of Achilles (1.1-5).

A key feature of Zeus' rhetoric is that it allows the poet to engage his listeners by implicating them in the decision making process. It should be noted that Zeus' speech, though directed at Hera, is not addressed to her: Hera is spoken of in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person throughout. Thus, when Zeus says "let us take thought" (ἡμεῖς δὲ φραζώμεθα[α] 4.14), the "us" is broadly inclusive: on the level of the gods on Olympus, it includes Zeus and the gathered gods; on the level of the poem's implied performance setting, the

---

apportioned" (Ζεὺς μὲν που τό γε οἶδε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι / ὅπποτέρῳ θανάτοιο τέλος πεπρωμένον ἐστίν 3.305-9).

<sup>40</sup> Kullman 1960: 12-13 refers to the basic assumptions of audience knowledge as the *Faktenkanon*.

<sup>41</sup> ἤθελε μὲν παράβασιν τῶν ὅρκων ποιῆσαι δι' Ἀχιλλέα, τὴν δὲ αἰτίαν αὐταῖς περιτιθέναι bT-scholia *ad loc*.

poet's "us" potentially includes himself and his listeners. The same is true for the "all" (πᾶσι 4.17) whose pleasure is said to be important for the story's direction at this point; it is a broadly inclusive term, easily suggestive of the external as well as the divine audience. In the moment of performance, as he plays for thirteen lines the part of Zeus, the singer takes the opportunity to challenge his own listeners to take a stake in the outcome of events. The key to the challenge is the conditional construction, which both suggests the nature of the poet's game and ups the ante: "... if... this ... should be welcome and sweet to all – well!, let Troy stand" (εἰ... τόδε πᾶσι φίλον καὶ ἡδὺ γένοιτο, / ἦτοι... οἰκέοιτο πόλιν... 4.17-18).<sup>42</sup> The rhetoric implicates the poet's listeners in the story's events by representing narrative outcome as contingent on audience response: if Troy is to fall, say Zeus and the poet, it will be because "we" (ἡμεῖς 4.14) as a group want this.

Hera and Athena rise to the bait, reacting emotionally to Zeus' provocation. Hera even voices her displeasure. Of course, Hera and Athena are characters in their own right, with their personal reasons for resisting Zeus' suggestion of Trojan peace. However, the language keeps the scene working on two levels simultaneously, those of divine council and internal audience of the epic:

ὥς ἔφαθ', αἶ δ' ἐπέμυξαν Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη· πλησίαι αἶ γ' ἦσθην, κακὰ δὲ Τρώεσσι μεδέσθην. ἦτοι Ἀθηναίη ἀκέων ἦν οὐδέ τι εἶπε σκυζομένη Διὶ πατρί, χόλος δέ μιν ἄγριος ἦρει· Ἥρη δ' οὐκ ἔχαδε στῆθος χόλον, ἀλλὰ προσηύδα· αἰνότατε Κρονίδη ποῖον τὸν μῦθον ἔειπες· πῶς ἐθέλεις ἄλιον θεῖναι πόνον ἢ δ' ἀτέλεστον,	20      25
---	------------------------------

<sup>42</sup> Sweetness is a standard attribute of poetry in Archaic as well as later poetry: e.g. ἡδυέπειαι of the Muses in Hes. *Th.* 965-66; ἡδεῖα of the Muses' song in *Th.* 39-40; ἡδεῖαν ἀοιδὴν granted to poets by the Muses in *Od.* 8.64. Cf. Liebert forthcoming (doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago). The potential for connections between poet and Zeus is also exploited in sympotic poetry. Theognis' sphragis seems to be playing with the present passage of the *Iliad*, as he both compares himself to Zeus and despairs of pleasing all (πᾶσιν 23): "But I am in no way able to please all (*pasin*) the people; / nor is this to be wondered at, Polypaides, for not even Zeus / pleases everyone, either when he rains or when he holds back" (ἀστοῖσιν δ' οὐπὼ πᾶσιν ἀδεῖν δύνάμαι / οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, Πολυπαΐδῃ οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς / οὐθ' ὕων πάντεσσ' ἀνδάνει οὔτ' ἀνέχων. – *Theognis* 23-25).

ἰδρῶ θ' ὃν ἰδρῶσα μόγῳ, καμέτην δέ μοι ἵπποι  
 λαὸν ἀγειρούση, Πριάμῳ κακὰ τοῖό τε παισίν.  
 ἔρδ'· ἀτὰρ οὐ τοι πάντες ἐπαινέομεν θεοὶ ἄλλοι. – 4.20-29

So [Zeus] spoke, but as for them – Athena and Hera – they muttered at him.  
 They were sitting beside each other, those two, plotting hardship for the Trojans.  
 Athena, to be sure, was silent, and said nothing  
 though she was angry at father Zeus, and a fierce rancor took her.  
 But Hera's breast did not restrain her rancor, and she spoke:  
 'Wretch! Son of Kronos, what sort of word have you spoken?  
 How are you willing to make the labor vain and unfinished? -  
 and the sweat that I sweated in toil! And my horses labored for me,  
 as I roused the people - the hardship on Priam and his children.  
 Do it – but not all of us other gods will praise you.'

Hera declares that if Zeus allows the mortals' truce to hold "not all of us other gods will praise you" (οὐ τοι πάντες ἐπαινέομεν θεοὶ ἄλλοι 4.29). This language is particularly suggestive of poet-audience dynamics, because audience satisfaction is precisely what a poet must negotiate for his poem to be successful.<sup>43</sup> Zeus' challenge is a reminder that in live performance, audience desire requires narrative resolution. Hera's response picks up on this subtext, by articulating the source of an audience's power over a poet in the context of the oral poetic tradition that forms the background to the *Iliad*: the ability to give or withhold praise.<sup>44</sup>

Hera's verb for praise, *epaineō* (ἐπαινέομεν 4.29), is regularly used in the *Iliad* to denote voiced approval of a leader's decision or proposed course of action.<sup>45</sup>

However, it also resonates on a metaperformative level. In Book 8 of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus uses *ainizomai* (ἔξοχα δὴ σε βροτῶν αἰνίζομ' ἀπάντων *Od.* 8.487), a

<sup>43</sup> Frontisi-Ducroux 1986 touches briefly on this idea in a different context, that of Zeus' interchange with Athena in 22.166-87: "La réaction d'Athéna lorsque Zeus feint d'hésiter, de consulter les dieux pour arracher Hector au trépas, préfigurerait alors l'indignation du public à qui un aède oserait proposer une fin inattendue..."

<sup>44</sup> Commentators have noted that Hera's implied threat is mysterious: Taplin 1992: 5 says "clearly this threatens something far worse than merely withholding praise;" Clay 1983: 157 (commenting on the parallel passage in the death of Sarpedon (4.29 = 16.443)) says "Hera only hints at the consequences of Zeus' acting in opposition to what he knows to be fated: the collapse of all order both among the gods and in the relations between gods and men." On a metaperformative level, the praise *is* the point.

<sup>45</sup> E.g. 7.344; 9.710; 18.312.

cognate of *epaineō*, to praise Demodocus for putting the events of his Iliadic poetry in order, the way that they happened (κατὰ κόσμον *Od.*8.489),<sup>46</sup> “as if there [at the Trojan war] yourself, or having heard it from another” (ὥς τέ που ἢ αὐτὸς παρεὼν ἢ ἄλλου ἀκούσας *Od.*8.491). Odysseus then says that he will spread the word of Demodocus’ gift to all the world if he should go on to sing the sack of Troy according to *moira* (κατὰ μοῖραν *Od.*8.492-98), by which he apparently means the same thing: as the story goes.<sup>47</sup> As Nagy notes, the opposite would be for Demodocus to sing something “beyond” *moira*.<sup>48</sup> Thus, Hera’s words to Zeus are, on a metaperformative level, an inversion of Odysseus’ promise of praise to Demodocus. As Demodocus is promised further praise for getting the story right, Hera’s words to Zeus model a listener promising *not* to praise the poet in the event of an early Achaean *nostos* – an event that has already been explicitly called “beyond *moira*” during the stampede for the ships (Ἐνθά κεν Ἀργείοισιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος ἐτύχθη 2.155). The exchange thus serves as a reminder that the poet is bound by his audience’s knowledge of the story to get it right, make it convincing, or risk his song becoming the object of blame rather than praise.

Having made their bid to provoke resistance, Zeus and through him the poet now issue a challenge on a different order:

δαιμονίη τί νύ σε Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες  
τόσσα κακὰ ῥέζουσιν, ὃ τ’ ἀσπερχές μενεαίνεις

<sup>46</sup> See Finkelberg 1998: 124-30 and further next note.

<sup>47</sup> Finkelberg 1998: 124-30 demonstrates that these phrases essentially mean the same thing and reads them in terms of the epic’s claim to telling truth. Indeed, for a listener who accepts that the poet sings of historical events – and this certainly includes Odysseus listening to Demodocus – to sing “as the story should go” to a large extent means “as these events actually happened.” But in practice, as Scodel 2002 esp 65-89 shows, the singer of Homeric poetry asks his audience to accept his story not only by claiming truthfulness (guaranteed by the Muses) but also by reminding them at every turn of the *familiarity* of the events narrated and the manner of narration, and the generations of others who have heard these tales too: in other words, the poem’s claim to traditionality is part of what makes it acceptable to its audiences.

<sup>48</sup> Nagy 1979/99: 40.

Ἰλίου ἐξαλαπάξει ἔυκτίμενον πτολίεθρον;  
 εἰ δὲ σύ γ' εἰσελθοῦσα πύλας καὶ τείχεα μακρὰ  
 ὤμῳ βεβρώθοις Πρίαμον Πριάμοιο τε παῖδας 35  
 ἄλλους τε Τρῶας, τότε κεν χόλον ἐξακέσαιο.  
 ἔρξον ὅπως ἐθέλεις.... - 4.30-37

Incredible woman, what wrongs so great have Priam  
 and the children of Priam actually (νύ) done to you, that you rage  
 ceaselessly to demolish the well-built city of Ilium?  
 But if you should enter the gates and high walls  
 and eat Priam and the children of Priam  
 and the other Trojans raw – *then* you would purge your rage.  
 Do as you wish....

The image conjured up by Zeus of Hera eating the Trojans raw in her rage (4.34-36) is one of hyperbolic vengeance.<sup>49</sup> His question “what wrongs so great have Priam and his children done to you?” (4.30-31) is never answered by Hera. Scholars have seen in this unanswered question a suppression of Hera’s “real” motivation for wanting Troy destroyed, namely the Judgment of Paris.<sup>50</sup> One explanation for the suppression of the story – especially at this point in Book 4, which literally asks for it – is that its inclusion would make Hera’s wrath seem merely petty, rather than terrible.<sup>51</sup> I would concur with this as far as it goes. However, the important issue is not so much why the poet has Hera leave the question unanswered, as why the poet creates tension by having Zeus ask the question in the first place, so that it is then left to hang, unanswered. This study’s approach leads to a new interpretation of that issue.

Zeus’ question is openly voiced not only on Olympus but also in the setting of the poem’s performance. Raised and left open at a charged moment in the text, the question “what wrongs so great have the Trojans done to you?” is also up for

<sup>49</sup> The two parallel passages of raw-eating are Achilles speaking to Hector (22.346-47) and Hecuba fantasizing about eating Achilles’ liver (24.212-13), both likewise evoking hyperbolic bloodthirst.

<sup>50</sup> Reinhardt 1960 convincingly argued that the Judgment of Paris is part of the background knowledge of the poem. Cf. Griffin 1980: 197; Taplin 1992: 132-33.

<sup>51</sup> Edwards 1987: 128: the judgment is omitted “perhaps to make her anger – and thus the causes of man’s suffering – seem even more irrational.”

consideration by the poet's audience. Of course, for the audience Priam and his children are story-characters, figures of the mythic past; but it is precisely this distinction between story-characters and living human beings that the poem aims to blur by staging its listeners as spectators at a live event also attended by the gods.<sup>52</sup>

An audience that continues to listen continues to participate; to want the poem to go on at this point is to want what Hera wants too. Thus, Zeus' negative characterization of Hera puts the extradiegetic audience in a potentially uncomfortable position. Zeus and Hera's conversation implicitly raises two related issues: audience complicity, and audience desire for the bloodshed and destruction depicted in such great quantity and vividness in the poem.

Hera's single-mindedness, which Zeus links to excessive bloodlust, suggests one model of audience response to the poem: she is a member of the audience who, on some level, just can't wait to see Trojans slaughtered. This in itself may not be surprising. The *Iliad* is full of carnage; there is an artistry to the depictions of gore, that forms part of the poem's draw, such as Patroclus' killing of Cebriones, a son of Priam:

οὐδ' ἀλίωσε βέλος, βάλε δ' Ἑκτορος ἡνιοχῆα  
 Κεβριόνην νόθον υἷον ἀγακλῆος Πριάμοιο  
 ἵππων ἥνι' ἔχοντα μετώπιον ὀξεί λαϊ.  
 ἀμφοτέρας δ' ὀφρῦς σύνελεν λίθος, οὐδέ οἱ ἔσχευ 740  
 ὀστέον, ὀφθαλμοὶ δὲ χαμαὶ πέσον ἐν κονίῃσιν  
 αὐτοῦ πρόσθε ποδῶν· ὃ δ' ἄρ' ἀρνευτῆρι ἐοικῶς  
 κάππεσ' ἀπ' εὐεργέος δίφρου, λίπε δ' ὀστέα θυμός. – 16.739-40

He did not cast the missile in vain, but struck Hector's charioteer,  
 Cebriones, a bastard son of renowned Priam  
 in the forehead with the jagged rock as he held the horses' reins.  
 And the stone caved both his eyebrows in together, nor did the bone  
 withstand it, and his eyes fell on the ground in the dust  
 there in front of his feet. And so he plunged like a diver  
 from the well-built chariot, and his life left his bones.

---

<sup>52</sup> See Chapter 3.

Even Patroclus - praised by all for kindness or gentleness<sup>53</sup> - then jests at length over the corpse:

τὸν δ' ἐπικερτομέων προσέφη Πατρόκλεες ἵππευ·  
ὦ πόποι ἦ μάλ' ἐλαφρὸς ἀνὴρ, ὥς ρεῖα κυβιστᾶ. 745  
εἰ δὴ που καὶ πόντῳ ἐν ἰχθυόεντι γένοιτο,  
πολλοὺς ἂν κορέσειεν ἀνὴρ ὅδε τήθεα διφῶν  
νηὸς ἀποθρώσκων, εἰ καὶ δυσπέμφελος εἴη,  
ὥς νῦν ἐν πεδίῳ ἐξ ἵππων ρεῖα κυβιστᾶ.  
ἦ ῥα καὶ ἐν Τρώεσσι κυβιστητῆρες ἔασιν. – 16.744-70

And as for him, mocking over him you spoke, Patroclus the horseman:  
Oh, no! My my! The man's quite light, how he easily tumbles.  
Why, if he'd also been born somewhere in the fishy sea,  
this fellow would've fed many men, diving for shell-fish,  
leaping from his ship, even in a stormy sea,  
as now in the plain from his horses he easily tumbles.  
Yes indeed! There are acrobats even among the Trojans.

This extended burst of wit appears in the episode featuring Patroclus' own death, whose overall tone is one of grief at that central event. If exultation in inflicting death and misery is possible for kind Patroclus, it is possible vicariously for an epic audience as well, and the picture of Hera eating Trojans in part reflects and comments on that possibility. By characterizing Hera's blood-lust as excessive, Zeus' words at this point in the performance caution against any "reading" of the poem which would simply glory in slaughter and Achaean victory. If any in the audience feel themselves anticipating a vicarious revel in the coming brutality, they are first asked, on the eve of the grand spectacle, what wrongs so great the Trojans have done to them.

Hera, on the model offered in Book 4 is not herself "us," but rather among "us." Nevertheless, it is not easy to dismiss Hera, for it is her desires that are carried out in what is nominally a group decision. Other gods might disagree with her, but they are silent. Apollo will raise the issue of pity for the Trojans in Books 7 and 24 - but here Apollo, with the others, remains unmentioned and essentially invisible, helping to

<sup>53</sup> 17.204; 17.670, 21.91; 23.252-3; 23.281.

form the divine audience simply by filling out the numbers of “the gods” (4.1). In their silence, the gods are still complicit, and this raises the issue of audience complicity in the events of the poem. After all, the poet’s listeners and the gods, for all their potential differences, have this in common: they are each members of a collective whose pleasure guides the course that events will take.

The close of the conversation between Zeus and Hera returns to the issue of audience complicity. At this point, Zeus has offered not to oppose Troy’s destruction in return for a free hand with a city beloved of Hera (4.39-49). Hera agrees, and the conversation then ends with these lines from Hera:

... σὺ δὲ θᾶσσον Ἀθηναίῃ ἐπιτεῖλαι  
ἐλθεῖν ἐς Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν φύλοπιν αἰνήν,  
πειρᾶν δ’ ὥς κε Τρῶες ὑπερκύδαντας Ἀχαιοὺς  
ἄρξωσι πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὅρκια δηλήσασθαι. - 4.64-67

.... but you, quickly send Athena  
to go to the terrible strife of the Trojans and Achaeans  
and see to it that the Trojans, before the glorious Achaeans,  
lead the way in transgressing the oaths first.

Hera’s concluding point, that it should be the Trojans who first break the truce, is taken up and repeated by Zeus to Athena (4.68-72; 4.71-72 = 4.66-67), and Athena then carries it out, through Pandarus. The stipulation that makes the Trojans the truce-breakers deserves special attention, not only because of its pleonasm (ἄρξωσι πρότεροι 4.67), because of its repetition by Zeus, and by virtue of its placement as the concluding words of the conversation, but also because of its content. The insistence that it is the Trojans who must be the oath-breakers is strangely satisfying and confusing at once. As I will show, these words are also operating on the level of poet-audience dynamics, in a way that accounts for both the satisfaction and the confusion that they generate.



The implication of Hera's words, and Zeus' endorsement of them, is that having the Trojans break the truce will somehow ensure Troy's destruction. But why should this be so? When mortal characters think that Trojan truce-breaking will result in Trojan destruction, it is because they expect the gods' punishment to come.<sup>54</sup> However, as many have pointed out, a central irony of the scene is that the gods are actually agents in bringing about the truce-breaking.<sup>55</sup> It is rather on the level of performance and story-telling that the decision to make the Trojans the truce-breakers, rather than the Achaeans, is motivated. The duel in Book 3 has framed the conflict at Troy in terms of transgression and punishment, with Paris' egregious breach of Menelaus' hospitality leading inexorably toward the destruction of his city. The narrative is invested in the idea of the Trojans as the transgressors, and it is on the basis of this underlying thematic consistency that it is important – for the poet, for his audience, and by extension for the gods – that the Trojans be kept in that role. Hera as an audience figure wants the story to continue, which means Trojan transgression and punishment; Zeus as a poet figure agrees. With Pandarus' bowshot, the fall of Troy is

---

<sup>54</sup> The Trojans and Achaeans alike pray that the truce-breakers and their families be made to pay the price: οἶνον δ' ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφυσσόμενοι δεπάεσσιν / ἔκχεον, ἦ δ' εὐχοντο θεοῖς αἰειγενέτησιν. / ὦδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε: / Ζεῦ κύδιστε μέγιστε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι / ὅππότεροι πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὄρκια πημήνεια / ὦδε σφ' ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέοι ὡς ὅδε οἶνος / αὐτῶν καὶ τεκέων, ἄλοχοι δ' ἄλλοισι δαμεῖν. – 3.295-301 Later, Agamemnon shows confidence in eventual retribution for the oath-breaking (4.158-68). For the mortals, we also have Antenor's words in Book 7 that fighting as oath-breakers will come to no good: δεῦτ' ἄγετ' Ἀργεῖην Ἑλένην καὶ κτήμαθ' ἅμ' αὐτῇ / δώομεν Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν ἄγειν· νῦν δ' ὄρκια πιστὰ / ψευσάμενοι μαχόμεσθα· τῶ οὐ νύ τι κέρδιον ἡμῖν / ἔλπομαι ἐκτελέεσθαι, ἵνα μὴ ῥέξομεν ὦδε. (By the terms of the oath when it is actually announced by Agamemnon (3.276-91), Paris or Menelaus would have to be actually killed for the two sides to part in friendship. However, this seems not to be an issue: since Zeus and Hera use the phrase ὑπὲρ ὄρκια δηλήσασθαι it is clear that they understand a truce to be in effect.)

<sup>55</sup> Thalmann 1984: 86 remarks on this passage: "Men may not always get what they deserve, it seems, but they are made to deserve what they get, at least formally." Cf. Taalman Kip 2000, 18: "And in creating this re-enactment of Paris' transgression and of the gods' process of decision, [Homer] drew a sharp line between the human level and the divine, between the motives of men and those of the gods, between human expectations concerning the gods and their actual behaviour." Taalman Kip argues that the transgression(s) exist in order to justify the Achaean aggression, which would otherwise be too "naked" for audience tastes.

overdetermined by multiple transgressions – rather than being simply a matter of Hera’s vindictiveness. This accounts for the satisfaction.

The confusion arises from the way that the gods’ decision, following the demands of story-telling, diminishes the sense of moral outrage available to be enjoyed. This is partly because it makes the Trojans, and Pandarus in particular, seem helpless pawns. Lesky’s view that Athena’s role in the arrow-shooting does not remove Pandarus’ responsibility for the deed has been widely, though not universally, accepted.<sup>56</sup> However, it should be noted that by Lesky’s account Pandarus’ motivation no more diminishes Athena’s responsibility than her motivation diminishes his. Nor, I would add, does it let the poem’s audience off the hook: pleasing them is a third motivation, external to the plot, but configured within the text in the figures of Zeus and Hera.

This third level of causation, sketched out by Zeus’ exchange with Hera, stages an inverted causality whereby the audience is implicated in the creation of its own villains. Zeus’ conditional sentence,<sup>57</sup> with Hera’s reply,<sup>58</sup> imply that the truce will be broken not merely due to Trojan arrogance, nor solely by such arrogance in combination with fate and Zeus’ will, but also by demand. Accordingly, the natural causal relationship between Trojan transgression and audience demand for retribution has been reversed: it is not only Trojan transgression (Paris taking Helen) which fuels (audience) demand for retribution, but also (audience) demand for retribution that causes the Trojan transgression (Pandarus’ bow-shot). A self-fulfilling loop of causality has been created: we want them to pay, so we make them transgress, so they

---

<sup>56</sup> Sarischoulis 2008: 151-60 sees humans and divine decision as separate. Pucci 1998:194-99 sees in Athena’s intervention in Book 1 “the violent intrusion of textual concerns” (197). Greenberg 1993: 194 n.5 has a salutary warning about how far the implications of Lesky’s analysis can be taken.

<sup>57</sup> εἰ δ’ αὖ πως τόδε πᾶσι φίλον καὶ ἡδὺ γένοιτο, / ἥτοι μὲν οἰκέοιτο πόλις Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος, / αὖτις δ’ Ἀργείην Ἑλένην Μενέλαος ἄγοιτο 4.17-19.

<sup>58</sup> ἔρδ’· ἀτὰρ οὐ τοι πάντες ἐπαινέομεν θεοὶ ἄλλοι. 4.29

transgress, so we want them to pay. But what comes first? Do the Trojan characters act as they do simply to satisfy audience desire for transgressors? The question may not be as whimsical as it sounds – Helen, for one, comes to just such a conclusion:

οἷσιν ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε κακὸν μόρον, ὥς καὶ ὀπίσσω  
ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ' ἀοίδιμοι ἐσσομένοισι. – 6.357-58

Upon [Paris and me] Zeus has set an evil fate, so that in the future as well we might be song-worthy for the men who are yet to be.<sup>59</sup>

Even from her position within the story, Helen can assert to Hector (and to herself, the gods, and the future generations that will hear of her) that hers and Paris' transgressions, and their grievous consequences, exist to satisfy the needs of the poetic medium.<sup>60</sup> I suggest that these words of Helen's are a good description of what happens in Book 4. There Zeus is in the very process of assigning an "evil fate" to the Trojans for the very reason that they be "song-worthy." The "evil fate" is that they, like Paris and Helen, become transgressors. The song-worthiness comes out in the fact that Zeus does this at the behest of (4.71-72 = 4.66-67), and needful of praise from (4.29), the internal audience represented by Hera.

Helen attributes what for her is a cruel and arbitrary fate to the demands of poetic performance – song-worthiness – and makes Zeus an agent concerned with fulfilling audience desire: this is the role which I have tried to show that he plays in the opening of Book 4. Helen's tone is accusatory, and indeed, to the degree that one accepts the *Iliad's* illusion that these mythical story-characters are real people living and dying before one's eyes, the issues of audience participation and complicity raised in Zeus and Hera's conversation create a rich tension as the war is about to be reignited. I will

---

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Alcinous at *Od.* 8.579-80.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Thalmann 1984: 153: "the realization of the song Helen imagines is the *Iliad*, which bears out the truth of her words even as it records them;" Finkelberg 1998: 152: "... the song has become more privileged than the events in which it originated... [and this] allows the work of poetry a degree of ontological independence not envisaged in the 'poetics of truth.'" While de Jong 2006: 195-6 sees Helen thinking of future *singers*, my reading recognizes also the future *audiences* in *essomenoisi*.

close this chapter by showing how this tension is increased by the brilliantly perverse choice of Menelaus as the target of the truce-breaking arrow. But first, a brief word about the relationship between Athena and Hera as models of response is in order.

In terms of modeling audience response to events of the poem, Athena's role and Hera's intertwine. When Hera is moved by care for Agamemnon and Achilles (1.206-9), or by her chagrin at the prospect of Achaean flight from Troy (2.155-65), she sends Athena. That Athena does Hera's bidding is not just a matter of obedience to authority; she shares Hera's perspective and desires. This is confirmed in the opening of Book 4, the first real evidence of Athena's motivations: Zeus links Hera and Athena as "supporters of Menelaus" (4.7); Athena joins Hera in muttering angrily at Zeus' idea of calling off the sack of Troy (4.20); together they scheme with ill-intention toward the Trojans (4.21).<sup>61</sup> Athena remains the silent partner when Hera takes the issue up with Zeus (4.22ff), but is already eager to go when Hera obtains Zeus' agreement to have her desires enacted once more (4.73). By emphasizing the shared perspectives of Athena and Hera, by not offering clues as to how to distinguish between their attitudes toward the Trojan conflict, and by presenting Athena as the agent who regularly carries out what are understood to be the shared desires of herself and Hera, the poet ties Athena's actions, especially her leap down to Troy in Book 4, to the internal audience model developed through the figure of Hera.

Zeus' taunt begins by implying that the two goddesses who should have been "helpers" (ἄρηγόνες 4.7) to Menelaus have been negligently passive, "sitting far off, looking on and having a good time" (νόσφι καθήμεναι εἰσορόωσαι / τέρπεσθον 4.9-10), and Zeus drives home the point by referring to Hera as "Argive" (Ἀργεῖη 4.8)

---

<sup>61</sup> O'Brien 1993 81-82 finds too much significance in the fact that Hera's angry feeling is said to be coming from within and Athena's from without; it is not, in my view, the nature of their feelings that is thus distinguished, but rather their ability or willingness to suppress those feelings. Their feelings about the developments at Troy, and Zeus' taunts, are essentially the same.

and Athena as “Protector” (Ἀλαλκομενηῖς 4.8).<sup>62</sup> The correction to such negligence would be, logically, to get involved and go help Menelaus. Instead, Athena goes to wound him. The irony in the fact that it is Menelaus, neglected by his protectors, who is singled out to be wounded, is highlighted and exacerbated in what follows:

Οὐδὲ σέθεν Μενέλαε θεοὶ μάκαρες λελάθοντο  
 ἄθάνατοι, πρώτη δὲ Διὸς θυγάτηρ ἄγελείη,  
 ἣ τοι πρόσθε στᾶσα βέλος ἔχεπευκὲς ἄμυνεν.  
 ἣ δὲ τόσον μὲν ἔργεν ἀπὸ χροὸς ὥς ὅτε μήτηρ 130  
 παιδὸς ἐέργη μυῖαν ὅθ' ἠδέϊ λέξεται ὕπνῳ,  
 αὐτὴ δ' αὖτ' ἴθυνεν ὅθι ζωστῆρος ὀχῆες  
 χρύσειοι σύνεχον καὶ διπλόος ἦντετο θώρηξ. – 4.127-33

But no, Menelaus, they did not fail to take note of you, the blessed gods,  
 the immortals – and first [among them] the daughter of Zeus, drawer of spoils,  
 who stood in front of you and protected you from the pointed arrow.  
 And she kept it away from your flesh just so much as when a mother  
 keeps a fly from her child, when he has lain down in sweet sleep;  
 and she herself directed it on a new course (αὖτ') to where the golden fastenings  
 of [your] belt held together, and double plates of armor overlapped.

The irony in saying that the blessed gods did not fail to notice Menelaus is evident: it is the blessed gods who have personally engineered his deadly predicament. The enjambed “immortals” pushes the point further: where Menelaus is in mortal peril, those who have put him there not only live in happiness (μάκαρες) but are themselves deathless (ἄθάνατοι) and hence can never pay the price Menelaus is now threatened with paying. Finally, that Athena was “first” of the gods as a group to take note of Menelaus’ peril and move to help him heightens the irony another notch: of course she is first! She’s on hand for no other reason than to ensure that he is shot down. It should be noted in addition that the formulaic πρώτη δὲ...+ *name* implies that she is leading the charge, as it were, of a group effort to rescue Menelaus: the *Iliad* is full of

<sup>62</sup> This critical bite is all the stronger because of the pointed contrast between Hera’s and the Achaeans’ reactions to the parallel speeches of Agamemnon demanding (3.455-60) and Zeus suggesting (4.5-19) that the terms of the treaty be upheld: the Achaeans voice approval (ἐπὶ δ’ ἦνεον 3.461), while Hera threatens the opposite (οὐ... ἐπαινέομεν 4.29). It is thus made clear how different are the desires of the Achaeans themselves from the desires of their patron goddesses – “Argive Hera and Athena the Defender” (“Ἡρῇ τ’ Ἀργεῖῃ καὶ Ἀλαλκομενηῖς Ἀθήνῃ 4.8) as Zeus mockingly calls them. This is the only use of the epithet for Hera.

battle sequences that begin with the phrase “X was the first to kill a man....” to signal a new direction in the fighting, a change of fortunes.<sup>63</sup> In reality, of course, Athena is leading the charge to resume the warfare; many gods will soon leap down to Troy to take part.

The singer mixes pathos into the irony: the direct address to Menelaus in apostrophe establishes a bond between singer and hero. The simile of the sweetly sleeping child evokes a maternal tenderness. Agamemnon’s fraternal affection is brought out and then tied to Menelaus’ fear for his own life by repetition of the verb *ρίγησεν*:

Ῥίγησεν δ’ ἄρ’ ἔπειτα ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων  
 ὥς εἶδεν μέλαν αἷμα καταρρέον ἐξ ὤτειλῆς·  
 Ῥίγησεν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος. 150  
 ὥς δὲ ἶδεν νεῦρόν τε καὶ ὄγκους ἐκτὸς ἐόντας  
 ἄσπορρόν οἱ θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἀγέρθη. – 4.148-52

And the lord of men Agamemnon then shivered  
 when he saw the black blood flow down from the wound;  
 and war-loving Menelaos himself also shivered –  
 but when he saw that the arrow-band and barbs were on the outside  
 his heart rose once more in his chest.

Though it has been made clear that Menelaus will not die of his wound, the poet holds his listeners in the crucial moment of the wounding, using the figure of the frightened Agamemnon to explore the possible ramifications of the disaster, so narrowly avoided, of his brother’s death. For Agamemnon, Menelaus’ death would have meant the end of the expedition (4.153-182) – for the audience, that means the end of the epic.<sup>64</sup> By *almost* but not quite killing Menelaus, Athena as agent of the gods’ will makes sure that the story continues, negotiating a treacherous path on either side of which looms the supposedly impossible prospect of Troy not being sacked – either by

<sup>63</sup> Some are about to come up in these first battle sequences: e.g. ...ἔλε δ’ ἄνδρα ἕκαστος / ἡγεμόνων· πρῶτος δὲ ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων / ἀρχὸν Ἀλίζωνων Ὀδίων μέγαν ἐκβαλε δίφρου... 5.37-39.

<sup>64</sup> Note Talthybius’ coda to Machaon on the subject of Men.’s wounding: τῷ μὲν κλέος, ἄμμι δὲ πένθος 4.207. This implies that treachery or no treachery, *kleos* attends victory and slaying.

truce and victory for Menelaus, as teasingly suggested by Zeus, or Achaean flight and *death* for Menelaus, as feared by Agamemnon.<sup>65</sup> Furthermore, since she has been set up as the agent acting out the result of Zeus' discussion with Hera, which model dynamics between poet and audience, her actions adumbrate a picture of audience complicity in the transgression against Menelaus as well.

The internal epic audience represented by the gods on Olympus in Book 4 is an audience that looks on, and also participates. Athena's leap, in particular, is an image of audience participation elicited by the poet's narrative strategies. This raises the question: what is the relationship of the audience to the story-world created by the performance of the poem? Chapter 3 will show that the *Iliad* offers a way of conceptualizing its audience's role as viewers and vicarious participants: the duel in Book 3, set against the large battle scenes in Books 4 and 5, provides a paradigm for understanding the latter as a virtual spectacle created by the *Iliad*'s performance.

---

<sup>65</sup> I have held off the unthinkable in a similar way many times in the course of a dream.

### CHAPTER 3

#### Reflections on Audience and Poem in Books 3-5: Epic Experienced as Spectacle

The previous chapter argued that the gods in Book 4 are construed as an internal audience for the poem. Interestingly, while the gods follow the story simultaneously with the extradiegetic audience – seeing events just at the moment that they are narrated by the poet – for the gods these events are not narration but rather actual occurrences taking place live in front of their eyes. The present chapter steps back to consider the significance of this difference in the context of Books 3-5, and the theme of spectacle with which these books are so concerned.

Recent narratological studies of Homer have usefully applied the concept of *mise en abyme*, the image of a work within itself, and its relative, the “mirror” tale or *récit spéculaire*, to sections of the Homeric poems that reprise the overarching themes and situations of the main narrative.<sup>1</sup> But the *Iliad* does not present itself simply as narrative. Critics since antiquity have praised the poem’s *enargeia* (vividness and immediacy), and have identified particular strategies by which the poet positions his listeners as eye-witnesses of the events he narrates.<sup>2</sup> Already in antiquity one scholiast observed in the context of the funeral games of Patroclus that “[the poet] has set forth the whole imaginative representation so vividly (*enargōs*) as to render his listeners nothing less than spectators (*theatai*).”<sup>3</sup> In fact, this observation applies not only to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Rinon 2008: 114-26 considers the three songs of Demodocus as instances of *mise en abyme*. Rengakos 2006 analyzes the funeral games for Patroclus in *Iliad* Book 23, particularly the chariot race, as a *passage spéculaire* “for they refract in manifold ways the epic motifs of anger and honor....” (103).

<sup>2</sup> Of particular interest are Pseudo-Longinus 26.1; Richardson 1990; Bakker 1993: 13-14; Bakker 1997: 55; Bakker 1999: 18; Clay 2011: 23-26.

<sup>3</sup> bT Scholia at 23. 362: πᾶσαν φαντασίαν ἐναργῶς προβέβληται ὥς μηδὲν ἥττον τῶν θεατῶν ἐσχηκέναι τοὺς ἀκροατάς. Translation taken from Clay 2011: 6.



funeral games, but to the epic as a whole, for its *enargeia* renders listeners spectators whenever “confrontations with things seen place the unfolding of the poem before the audience’s eyes.”<sup>4</sup>

What I argue here is that the gods provide a way of conceptualizing audience “viewership” of those events as attendance at a live spectacle, in such a way as to invite and problematize audience participation. While previous critics have described the atmosphere of spectacle conveyed by the gods’ viewing activity through metaphors of theatrical shows<sup>5</sup> and athletics,<sup>6</sup> I show that within the text it is the duel between Paris and Menelaus in Book 3 that first provides a paradigm for conceiving of the Trojan war as live spectacle. I will begin with a look at scholarship concerning the poem’s emphasis on viewership and visualization. Afterward, I examine the factors, such as the duel’s special placement and terminology used to describe it, which make the duel stand for the larger war. I proceed to analyze the duel as a model of spectacle, and then show how the gods’ appearance as an audience facilitates the transfer of the duel paradigm of spectacle to the scenes of warfare that follow. The chapter concludes by looking at the significance of this paradigm for the extradiegetic viewer’s experience of the scenes of warfare.

Much recent scholarship has been concerned with the epic poet’s adoption of the stance of virtual eyewitness to the events he relates, and the corresponding positioning

---

<sup>4</sup> Slatkin 2007: 19.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. Griffin 1978 *passim*. Of course, given how little is known about theater before Aeschylus, synchronic connections between the *Iliad* and theater would be impossible to establish. Diachronic connections between the *Iliad* and Athenian tragedy constitute a separate question; Griffin 1978: 16 n.51 gathers material on this subject from the scholiasts. See Rinon 2008 for an attempt to define “the tragic” across both Homeric epics, and Redfield 1994 for a reading of the *Iliad* through an Aristotelian lens, as the tragedy of Hector. Clay 2011 uses the theater metaphor in a new way, connecting her book’s themes of viewing (dramatic theater), memory (the Renaissance “theater of memory”) and space (“theater of war”) in the *Iliad*.

<sup>6</sup> The text itself makes a comparison to athletics in Book 22, when the poet famously likens Achilles’ pursuit of Hector to a chariot race (22.162-66). This is analyzed in detail in Chapter 5.

of his listeners as virtual eyewitnesses. By these strategies, the audience is invited through visualization virtually to enter the world of the story and enjoy the illusion of events unfolding right before their eyes.<sup>7</sup> Egbert Bakker has applied tools of discourse analysis to demonstrate that various deictic devices create the illusion of the poet's and audience's shared presence at the events being narrated.<sup>8</sup> Here I quote some of his reflections about the particle *δή*:

The particle *δή*, belonging to a class of linguistic markers that is sometimes called “evidentials,” is typically used in conversation when a speaker wants to convey that he or she thinks that what he or she says is obvious, not only to himself or herself, but to the addressee as well, or better: *visible* (*δῆλον*), present already in the mental or physical context shared between speaker and addressee.<sup>9</sup>

The narrative voice thus establishes a relationship with the extradiegetic audience, suggesting that poet and listeners share an experience of viewing the (narrated) events unfolding before all of their eyes:

...what becomes real for the narrator, due to his involvement with the scenes of his imaginative memory, activates visual images in the minds of the audience as well. The “presencing” of the past, therefore, is not limited to the poet's private consciousness, but due to the dynamics of the epic performance is no less an experience of the audience; and the involvement of the performer with his images is nothing other than the natural counterpart of the audience's involvement with *their* images, the natural consequences of their being “drawn” into the reality deployed by the performer.<sup>10</sup>

In point of fact, of course, the mental images viewed by the poet will never be exactly the same as those of any given member of an audience, nor any audience member's just like another's. But as Bakker's analysis brings out, the poet's rhetoric persistently

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.* 11.1.3 on the enjoyment produced by such virtual “viewing”: ἡδεται γὰρ ἡ διάνοια παντὸς ἀνθρώπου χειραγωγούμενη διὰ τῶν λόγων ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα καὶ μὴ μόνον ἀκούουσα τῶν λεγομένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ πραττόμενα ὁρῶσα.

<sup>8</sup> Bakker 1993.

<sup>9</sup> Bakker 1993: 13.

<sup>10</sup> *ibid.* 18-19.

creates the impression that all parties are seeing the same thing. Thus, *enargeia* in Homeric poetics does not only make the poem's contents an object of viewing but of *shared* viewing.

There are various ways that one can interpret such viewing. Some discussions of *enargeia* have emphasized its "pictorial" quality,<sup>11</sup> and Helen's tapestry in Book 3 of the *Iliad* indeed suggests that the *Iliad*'s strong visual character could be thought of in terms of shared appreciation on the part of the audience of lovely (and terrible) pictures.<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, there is a tendency nowadays to emphasize the poem's visual character as a kind of "cinema of the mind."<sup>13</sup> By contrast with both of these models, I argue here that the *Iliad* invites its audience to understand its reception experience in terms of attendance at a live spectacle at which viewers play – or can feel that they play – a more active role than movie-goers or admirers of already-crafted imagery.

According to this model, the story world constitutes a well-defined space into which the audience is invited to enter. The depth of the *Iliad*'s spatial conception is only recently coming to be appreciated.<sup>14</sup> A recent study by Jenny Strauss Clay shows that the poet-narrator's use of spatial and visual memory not only allows him to follow the story-path (*oimē*) as the sighted Muse "puts him in mind" (*mimnetai*) of the sequences of images which he conveys to his audience as narrative poetry, but also allows him to keep track of where the heroes are in the imagined geography of Troy and what they are doing in complex battle sequences with remarkable consistency.

---

<sup>11</sup> E.g. Zanker 1981 and many of the ancient critics discussed therein.

<sup>12</sup> For discussion and bibliography on Helen's web, see below.

<sup>13</sup> Bonifazi 2008: 45-61 (quote taken from 61); Winkler 2007; de Jong and Nunlist 2004. Casual use of the metaphor is also common: e.g. Van Wees 1997: 673-74; Clay 2011: 36.

<sup>14</sup> Minchin 2008; Purves 2010; Clay 2011.

Clay's argumentation demonstrates the surprising (to a modern readership) degree to which the Iliadic theater of war is conceived by the poet, and understood by the audience, both visually and spatially.<sup>15</sup>

While discussions of *enargeia* often make the key difference between listening and viewing,<sup>16</sup> even more important is the distinction between the performance setting projected by the text and the story-world described by the narrative: *enargeia* is not only about vision, but virtual *presence*. Bakker describes this effect of the poet's art as a "presencing" of the mythic past, and this is in harmony with the poet's "mimetic" role as performer: by speaking the words of e.g. Achilles, he takes Achilles' part, so that in a sense it appears that Achilles himself has manifested in the setting of the poetic performance.<sup>17</sup> Anna Bonifazi concludes her study of discourse markers with language echoing Bakker's: "neither the performer nor the members of the audience transfer themselves into the remote world of the past; rather, they stay respectively in front of the audience or in front of the performer, and re-experience all the events on the spot."<sup>18</sup> However, Clay's study of the spatial and visual brings out a different sense:

To claim that the Homeric poet makes the past present to his audience or that he transports them from the present into the past – although he manages to do both – does not quite do justice to the kaleidoscopic and shifting character of the *aoidos'* relation to the heroic world of which he sings. I would prefer to describe that relation less in terms of past and present than in spatial terms. The world of the heroes is not only past but elsewhere.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Purves 2010 takes a very different approach to the *Iliad*'s spatial character, which she calls "protocartographic" (24). See also Minchin 2008 for the importance of spatial memory in the *Iliad*'s composition (without however much attention to reception). To the discussion of composition Minchin adds that "in turn, the poet's audience would construct a spatial model from the information he has given them in order to understand the text" (28) citing in this context the work of G. Miller.

<sup>16</sup> Zanker 1981 surveys *enargeia* in ancient criticism and often focuses on it as a "pictorial" quality in verbal art.

<sup>17</sup> The fullest exposition of this argument is to be found in Bakker 2005: 154-76.

<sup>18</sup> Bonifazi 2008: 61.

I contend that a model for entering this “elsewhere” is offered in Books 3-5. The engaged listener is invited, not to sit and passively experience images alternately presented at greater and lesser remove – as the cinematic metaphor suggests – but to move god-like, invisible and invulnerable, through the imaginary space of the field at Troy.

Let us now turn to the duel. Discussions of this episode have often focused on the apparent lack of logic in the scene’s placement – as the duel would more properly belong at the beginning of the war – and scholars have shown how through this and other scenes in the early books (such as the Catalogue of Ships), the poet is able to reach beyond the poem’s narrative horizons.<sup>20</sup> But the duel episode does not only look toward the war’s beginning: it also looks ahead to and prepares for the poem’s coming battle scenes by offering an initial set of terms for conceiving of the Trojan war as spectacle.

The duel has been carefully constructed to seem to stand for the larger war, and this is true on several levels. On a basic level the duel’s mortal authors have designed it specifically as a replacement for the war: following the duel, the Achaeans are to go home and the Trojans to remain at Troy, with friendship established between them.<sup>21</sup> Further, the episode is internally constructed so as to emphasize connections between war and duel: that they represent the same conflict, stemming from the same dispute

---

<sup>19</sup> Clay 2011: 26.

<sup>20</sup> Whitman 1958; Kullman 1960; cf. Dowden 1996: 55-58. Bergren 1979-80 persuasively argues that the *teichoskopia* and other episodes that seem temporally displaced from a naturalistic perspective are not illogical but should be interpreted through the paradigm of the epic medium offered by Helen’s weaving (3.126-27): “by [the] transcendence of linear time, [these scenes] show simultaneously both something that happened once and what there is in that “something” that ever recurs” (23). See below.

<sup>21</sup> οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι φιλόττητα καὶ ὄρκια πιστὰ ταμόντες / ναίοιτε Τροίην ἐριβώλακα, τοὶ δὲ νεέσθων / ναίοιτε / Τροίην ἐριβώλακα, τοὶ δὲ νεέσθων / Ἄργος ἐς ἵππόβοτον καὶ Ἀχαιΐδα καλλιγύναικα. 3.72-75. Cf. 3.94, 3.283, 4.15-16.

and fought for the same prizes. Within the space of ten lines, Helen is identified as the cause and prize of the duel (περὶ σεῖο 3.137)<sup>22</sup> and of the war (έθεν εἵνεκ' 3.128) by Iris and the narrator respectively. Riches are also at stake in both, as is made clear elsewhere (3.91-93, 136-38). The identity of the combatants in the duel suggests a particular narrative about the war, framing it in terms of transgression and punishment.<sup>23</sup> With Paris as the transgressor and Menelaus the aggrieved, the death of either would remove the ostensible cause for the conflict even outside of the duel's terms,<sup>24</sup> and this is reflected in the structuring of the duel which looks to the death of one or the other.<sup>25</sup>

Finally, the duel has replaced the war in terms of narrative sequence. Anticipation of a grand battle scene has been building since the proem's promise of Achaean suffering and many noble souls sent to Hades. The Catalogue of Ships (2.484ff) is a display of the great scale of the conflict, and the grand similes at the end of Book 2 make battle seem imminent (2.708-85; 3.1.ff).<sup>26</sup> Then, as battle is about to be joined at last, with the clamorous Trojans rushing at the disciplined and determined Achaeans (3.1-9), the poet compares the dust that is tossed up to a vision-obscuring fog (3.10-14):

<sup>22</sup> αὐτὰρ Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ ἀρηΐφίλος Μενέλαος / μακρῆς ἐγχείησι μαχήσονται περὶ σεῖο· / τῷ δέ κε νικήσαντι φίλη κεκλήσῃ ἄκοιτις. 3.136-38. (She is much like a prize in games – cf 23.659, etc.)

<sup>23</sup> Both Trojans and Achaeans hope for an outcome in which the culpable party will be slain: ὧδε δέ τις εἵπεσκεν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε· / Ζεῦ πάτερ Ἰδηθεν μεδέων κύδιστε μέγιστε / ὀππότερος τάδε ἔργα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἔθηκε, τὸν δὲ ἀποφθίμενον δῦναι δόμον Ἄϊδος εἴσω 3.119-22.

<sup>24</sup> Fearing his brother might die, Agamemnon bemoans the prospect of the war effort collapsing as a result (4.169-182), while other passages make it clear that it is Paris' determination to keep Helen at all costs that prevents the Trojans from coming to peaceful terms with the Achaeans. The Trojan council at 7.345-78, in which Paris refuses Antenor's suggestion of offering Helen to the Achaeans, is a good example. Cf. Idaius' irrepressible condemnation of Paris as he delivers the message later: κτήματα μὲν ὅς' Ἀλέξανδρος κοίλῃς ἐνὶ νηυσὶν / ἡγάγετο Τροίηνδ'· ὥς πρὶν ὧφελλ' ἀπολέσθαι· / πάντ' ἐθέλει δόμεναι 7.389-91.

<sup>25</sup> εἰ μὲν κεν Μενέλαον Ἀλέξανδρος καταπέφνη... / εἰ δέ κ' Ἀλέξανδρον κτείνῃ ξανθὸς Μενέλαος. 4.281, 284.

<sup>26</sup> See Morrison 1992, 54-63 and Rengakos 2006, 43-45 for this delay as a building of suspense.

Εὗτ' ὄρεος κορυφῇσι Νότος κατέχευεν ὁμίχλην 10  
 ποιμέσιν οὐ τι φίλην, κλέπτῃ δέ τε νυκτὸς ἀμείνω,  
 τόσσόν τις τ' ἐπιλεύσσει ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ λαῶν ἴησιν·  
 ὥς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ κονίσαλος ὄρνυτ' ἀελλῆς  
 ἐρχομένων· μάλα δ' ὤκα διέπρησσαν πεδίοιο. – 3.10-14

As on mountain peaks the South Wind pours down fog,  
 no friend to the shepherds, but better than night to the thief,  
 and a man sees only as far as [one could] throw a stone –  
 so the dust rose dense from under their feet  
 as they came on – and very quickly they crossed the plain.

This last magnification or glorification of the armies also removes them from sight.

That dusty blur is the last the armies are seen until Hector and Agamemnon bring them all to a halt (3.76-85) for the purpose of announcing the duel. In terms of narrative sequence and expectation, the small spectacle has been set in the place of the grand one.<sup>27</sup>

What is the purpose of prefacing the first representations of the Trojan war waged in earnest with a smaller representation of that conflict, conceived as spectacle, with detailed attention to audience response? I suggest that the duel episode within the *Iliad* is self-reflexive, a *mise en abyme*<sup>28</sup> of the spectacle experience offered by the poet to his listeners. The text supports such an interpretation, pointing to the self-reflexive function of this spectacle by the unusual phrase with which Iris describes the duel to Helen when she summons her to become one of its viewers:

δεῦρ' ἴθι νύμφα φίλη, ἵνα **θέσκελα ἔργα** ἴδῃαι 130  
 Τρώων θ' ἵπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων  
 οἳ πρὶν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι φέρον πολύδακρυν Ἄρηα  
 ἐν πεδίῳ ὀλοοῖο λιλαϊόμενοι πολέμοιο·  
 οἳ δὲ νῦν ἔαται σιγῇ, πόλεμος δὲ πέπαυται,

<sup>27</sup> Rabel 1997: 38 points out how the perspective of the characters, for whom the warfare has merely paused during the duel between Paris and Menelaus, contrasts with that of the poet's listeners, for whom the war's depiction is about to begin for the first time in this performance of the *Iliad*.

<sup>28</sup> I do not use *mise en abyme* in the narratological sense developed by Dallenbach 1977 and usefully applied to the *Odyssey* by Rinon 2008, and to Book 23 of the *Iliad* by Rengakos 2006, but in the broader (and closer to the original) sense: the image of a work of art within itself. The narratological approach is insufficient for the present purposes, because in these duels the epic offers a conception – an image – of itself not just as narrative but as live spectacle, and of its listeners not as abstract narratees but as participants in a public performance and as virtual viewers present on the scene.

ἀσπίσι κεκλιμένοι, παρὰ δ' ἔγχεα μακρὰ πέπηγεν. 135  
 αὐτὰρ Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ ἄρηίφιλος Μενέλαος  
 μακρῆς ἐγχείησι μαχήσονται περὶ σεῖο·  
 τῷ δέ κε νικήσαντι φίλη κεκλήσῃ ἄκοιτις. – 3.130-38

Come here dear bride, so that you may see the wondrous deeds [*theskela erga*]  
 of the horse-taming Trojans and bronze-clad Achaeans  
 who earlier were bringing tearful battle against each other,  
 on the plain, eager for baneful warfare:  
 Those very ones now sit quietly - and the warfare has stopped –  
 [they] leaning on their shields, and their long spears are fixed beside [them].  
 But Paris and war-loving Menelaus  
 with their long spears will fight over you:  
 and you will be called the dear/own wife of him who is victorious.

By calling Helen to “see the wondrous deeds” (θέσκελα ἔργα ἴδῃαι 3.130) of the Trojans and Achaeans, Iris invites her to become a viewer of the duel. *Theskela erga* is striking, because it includes not only the coming fight between Paris and Menelaus (3.136-38) but also the troops’ disarmament (3.131-35), as is clear from the fact that the disarmament is described in five full verses prior to mention of the two combatants, and that the *erga* are described as being not just those of Menelaus and Paris but “of the Trojans and Achaeans.” To be sure, the fact that “the warfare has stopped” (3.134) and the conflict is apparently about to be resolved may well be “wondrous” (θέσκελα) to Helen.<sup>29</sup> But there is also an apparent paradox in the use of *erga* in such a way that it also includes the Trojans’ and Achaeans’ assumption of the passive role of spectators: the *erga* of warriors on the battlefield usually constitute a display of battle prowess (πολεμῆϊα ἔργα).<sup>30</sup> The “terrible work (*ergon*) of the Trojans and Achaeans” (ἔργον... ἀργαλέον Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν 4.470-1) should properly consist of fighting with wolf-like ferocity (4.471-2). Here, their *erga* seem to consist of disarmament. Can entering a state of inactivity really be an *ergon*?

<sup>29</sup> This reading is consistent with Helen’s reaction to Iris’ words: her impulsive longing for her former life (3.139-40) reflects her sense that the end, and a return to that life, may suddenly be near. Of course, the fact that it will be a combat between her current and former husbands that decides the outcome is related and equally important.

<sup>30</sup> As in 13.727.



The beginnings of an answer can be sought in the resonance of the marked phrase *theskela erga*, which appears in only two other places in the Homeric epics, both in Book 11 of the *Odyssey*.<sup>31</sup> First, Alcinous denotes with *theskela erga* the spell-binding narrative of a poet-like story-teller: captivated, Alcinous urges Odysseus to continue to tell the “wondrous deeds” (θέσκελα ἔργα *Od.*11.374).<sup>32</sup> Odysseus also uses the phrase of the designs on the belt of Heracles’ eidolon in the underworld:

χρύσεος ἦν τελαμών, ἵνα θέσκελα ἔργα τέτυκτο,  
ἄρκτοι τ’ ἀγρότεροί τε σύες χαροποί τε λέοντες,  
ὑσμῖναί τε μάχαι τε φόνοι τ’ ἀνδροκτασίαι τε. – *Od.*11.610-12

Golden was the baldrick, and there *theskela erga* had been worked:  
bears and wild pigs and bright-eyed lions,  
fierce battles and the slaughter of men.

Heracles’ belt is an artistically fashioned visual representation of wild beasts and “fierce battles and the slaughter of men” (ὑσμῖναί τε μάχαι τε φόνοι τ’ ἀνδροκτασίαι τε *Od.*11.612). These passages suggest that the traditional referentiality<sup>33</sup> of the phrase includes both the power of vivid narrative description and unsettlingly<sup>34</sup> life-like visual representations of combat: on both counts, this is precisely what a singer provides for his audience through performance of the *Iliad*. On a self-reflexive level, the *erga* of the Trojans and Achaeans are not only their deeds but also the poet’s *representation* of their deeds – and it is this latter sense which the phrase *theskela erga* voiced by Iris evokes.

<sup>31</sup> *Theskelos* appears only once otherwise, used adverbially by Achilles to describe Patroclus’ shade: “it looked wondrously (*theskelon*) like him” 23.107.

<sup>32</sup> ...σὺ δέ μοι λέγε θέσκελα ἔργα. *Od.*11.374

<sup>33</sup> See J. M. Foley 1997 for “traditional referentiality.” Some are happy to see the *Iliad* making references to the *Odyssey*, but many are not – and such is not necessary for this reading, which requires nothing beyond the traditionality of the phrase.

<sup>34</sup> Odysseus goes on to wish that the artificer of the belt would never make such a thing again: μὴ τεχνησάμενος μηδ’ ἄλλο τι τεχνήσαιτο / ὃς κείνον τελαμῶνα ἐῖς ἐγκάτθετο τέχνη. (*Od.*11.613-14). It is perhaps worth noting that while *theskela* is not related etymologically to *theomai* and similar words denoting seeing (Chantraine *GE* 21), the ancients might easily have understood it to be so in a context such as this.

Significantly, Iris' phrase *theskela erga* comes at a moment already charged with heightened awareness of the extradiegetic process of story creation. Only three lines earlier, when Iris comes upon Helen in her chambers, Helen is at work weaving "the many contests/toils (*aethlous*)" of the Trojans and Achaeans (πολέας... ἀέθλους / Τρώων θ' ἵπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων 3.126-7). Critics from antiquity to today have taken Helen's weaving as a metaphor for the poet's craft.<sup>35</sup> I suggest that the tapestry and the duel are juxtaposed here as complementary models of the *Iliad*'s functioning. That Helen's web and the duel are both internal representation of the same subject – the Trojan war – is emphasized by the language: Helen weaves "the many *aethlous* of the Trojans and Achaeans," while Iris summons her to see "the *theskela erga* of the Trojans and Achaeans." What is remarkable here is that each phrase points to the context in which the other appears. *Aethloi*, describing Helen's weaving, suggests spectacle: while the term can mean "toils" in Homer, it also frequently refers to "contests" in the sense of athletic contests in front of crowds, fought for particular prizes – very much like the duel between Paris and Menelaos.<sup>36</sup> *Theskela erga*, on the other hand, referring to the duel, suggests craftsmanship: aside from the *theskela erga* of Heracles' belt noted above, *erga* often refers to such things as the works of an artisan (χαρίεντα ἔργα *Od.* 6.234) – or indeed to a woman's work

<sup>35</sup> ἀξιόχρεων ἀρχέτυπον ἀνέπλασεν ὁ ποιητὴς τῆς ἰδίας ποιήσεως bT-Scholia at 3.126-27. Bergren 1979-80; Clader 1976. The web can also be interpreted in terms of Helen's psychology: Whitman 1958: 117-18 says the web "becomes in an instant the symbol of her self-conscious greatness and guilt." Cf. Yamagata 1994: 23: "Even the web she is weaving depicts the battle between the Achaeans and the Trojans... No doubt she cannot get it out of her head at any time." The scholiast's speculation that Helen's web would emphasize the justice of the Achaean cause (ἴσως δὲ τοῦτω τοῖς ὁρῶσιν ἐπειρᾶτο δεικνύναι τὴν Τρώων βίαν καὶ τὴν Ἑλλήνων δικαίαν ἰσχύν bT at 3.126-27) seems ill-founded, since Helen's longing for her former home and husband are aroused by Iris as she *leaves* the web (3.139-40).

<sup>36</sup> *Aethloi* is used in the plural of Patroclus' funeral games (23.646) and in the singular of the individual competitions (23.707, 753, 831). In the *Odyssey*, the contest of the bow is an *aethlos*, both athletic and deadly in the event (*Od.* 19.572). Recent treatments of the *Iliad*-poet's interest in the line dividing athletics from martial contests include the papers by Letoublon, Clay and Maronitis in the 2007 collection edited by Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Rengakos and Tsagalis. See further Chapter 5 below.

of weaving (6.490-92) like that in which Helen is engaged. The two phrases, so similar, positioned so closely to each other, and pointing to each other in the way just described, ask to be interpreted in terms of each other.

The tapestry, as Bergren has effectively argued, provides a metaphor for conceiving of the poet's creative process that captures the diachronic dimension of the epic medium.<sup>37</sup> A tapestry depicts "the action of struggle in stasis, both movement in time and metatemporal permanence." That is, the tapestry's imagery captures ephemeral moments, and holds them in a sense outside of time by making them available for repeated viewings. The tapestry's ability to "capture" and preserve the moment in this way corresponds to epic's traditionality, for it is through repeated performances over time that epic claims the power to save ephemeral moments from oblivion – to give what the poem refers to as "unperishing glory/fame (*kleos*)"<sup>38</sup> to those whose deeds it recounts – or (in Bergren's phrase) to "make the historical universal." Thus, to see the *Iliad* as tapestry is to take a step back from the current performance, and to see the poet's craft and the poet himself as part of a larger tradition.

Nevertheless, while it is a wonderful interpretive tool the tapestry model is markedly incomplete: within the text Helen's work has no viewers other than herself, and even the poet's audience is denied a description of the imagery.<sup>39</sup> Without viewers, the tapestry model conveys its sense of the eternal, of a moment that is held forever outside of time, without treating the immediacy of live performance. It is

---

<sup>37</sup> Bergren 1979-80: 23 from which the quotes in this paragraph are also taken.

<sup>38</sup> κλέος ἄφθιτον 9.413. For the debate on the traditionality of this phrase (and whether or not it constitutes a phrase) see Volk 2002.

<sup>39</sup> Contrast the description of Achilles' new shield in Book 18, which both displays the poet's skill at making pictures live and demonstrates his interest in exploring this aspect of poetry's power. Yet Helen's web remains a mystery if taken on its own, all the more tantalizing for the revelation of its subject matter. In this it is like Achilles' song in Book 9, which is also not described – though at least in that case its effect on its intended audience (Achilles himself) *is* described, as pleasure (*terpein*).

these gaps which the duel fills, offering a neat complement to the model of the tapestry by providing an invitation out of “metatemporal permanence” and into the story-world, where a live viewership responds to events as they happen from moment to moment. In this sense, Iris’ call to Helen, “come look!” (δεῦρ’ ἴθι ... ἴνα... ἴδῃαι 3.130), is also a call to the poet’s listeners to join the duel’s many audiences: to experience the work not just as a story handed down by tradition but as the actions of living humans carried out before their eyes.

The effect of this transition is complicated and enriched by the fact that it is accomplished within the text through the figure of Helen, whose roles are multiple. She is the creator of the conflict at Troy in more than one sense, being a cause of the war and also the artist who depicts it. Further, she is marked as a figure of lamentation for the conflict she creates – not only in the formal lament for Hector in Book 24, but already in her speeches in Books 3 and 6 as Richard Martin has shown.<sup>40</sup> In Helen, too, the transition from tapestry to duel displays both rupture and continuity. In the same moment that she appears to take on a poet-like role through her weaving, she sets that weaving aside, so that her art and the poet’s part ways for a time: the tapestry is left unfinished, while the performance continues. And yet, Helen’s “authorial” role is also reprised in the new paradigm; no longer a weaver, she is now a speaker, doing the poet’s duty of description, helping to set the stage for the conflict by identifying the Achaean leaders on the field, and thus bringing them before Priam’s – and the audience’s – eye.

Having shown that the duel in some way stands in for the poet’s depictions of warfare, I now turn to analyze the duel itself, and the terms it provides for conceiving of the viewer’s role. I aim to show that viewership is constructed on the following

---

<sup>40</sup> Martin 2008.

terms: spectators, while not part of the action, are part of the spectacle, and frequently objects of viewing and criticism; and it is by entering the space in which the action occurs that individuals assume the role of actor. Importantly, these terms will then be available in Books 4 and 5 when the extradiegetic audience is cast as an ethereal “viewership” of the Trojans and Achaeans clashing in arms on the large scale, with the suggestion that by “watching” they too have become a part of the spectacle at Troy – and that by mentally transporting themselves to the battlefield they can become part of the action as well.

As soon as Menelaus accepts Paris’ challenge, the Achaean and Trojan armies rejoice (3.111-12), and then rein in their horses, dismount, and strip off their arms and armor:

καί ῥ’ ἵππους μὲν ἔρυσαν ἐπὶ στίχας, ἐκ δ’ ἔβαν αὐτοί,  
 τεύχεά τ’ ἐξεδύοντο· τὰ μὲν κατέθεντ’ ἐπὶ γαίῃ  
 πλησίον ἀλλήλων, ὀλίγη δ’ ἦν ἀμφὶς ἄρουρα. – 3.113-15

And their horses they drew up in ranks, and dismounted themselves,  
 and removed their armor – which they placed down on the earth  
 one man’s beside another’s, and little space was free.

Kirk (*IC ad loc*) calls the disarmament “a surprising detail”, but it is precisely this detail that the poet uses in ring composition to open and then to conclude the preparation scene (3.113-339). The poet uses the detail of disarmament to mark the warriors’ assumption of the role of spectators, and to characterize that role through two basic distinctions. First, lines 111-115 make a temporal contrast: the troops’ transition from their active role as fighters in the war to their passive role as spectators for the duel. Then at the close of the preparation scene, just before the duel begins, the image of the disarmed troops is conjured again and this time set against the arming of Paris and Menelaus: spectators outside contrasted with actors as part of the action.

οἱ μὲν ἔπειθ’ ἵζοντο κατὰ στίχας, ἥχι ἐκάστῳ  
 ἵπποι ἀερσίποδες καὶ ποικίλα τεύχε’ ἔκειτο·  
 αὐτὰρ ὁ γ’ ἀμφ’ ὥμοισιν ἐδύσετο τεύχεα καλὰ

δῖος Ἀλέξανδρος....

-- 3.326-329

[The troops] on the one hand, sat in their ranks, where each man's high-stepping horses stood and where his decorated armor lay. But shining Paris for his part placed his beautiful armor over his shoulders....

These are precisely the same two contrasts used by Iris to sum up the duel to Helen:

“those who were waging tearful war now sit quietly” (132-34), and “Paris and Menelaus will fight with their spears (ἐγχείησι 137)” while the rest sit inactive with their own spears (ἐγχεα 135) fixed in the ground. Far from being an odd detail, the troops' disarmament is a defining feature of the formal duel scene, separating the troops from both their own past activity and the coming activity of the duelists.

Importantly, the conceptual distinction between actor and viewer is constructed in spatial terms. Hector and Odysseus “measure out” the space in which the duel will take place (χώρον μὲν πρῶτον διεμέτρεον 3.315), and this circumscribed area corresponds to the “middle” space in which Paris and Hector declare that Menelaus and Paris will fight (ἐν μέσσω 3.69, 90). The spatial coordinates of the spectacle are re-emphasized just as the action is first beginning, following the arming of the combatants (3.329-39):

Οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐκάτερθεν ὀμίλου θωρήχθησαν,      340  
 ἐς μέσσον Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἐστιχόωντο  
 δεινὸν δερκόμενοι· θάμβος δ' ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας  
 Τρῳάς θ' ἵπποδάμους καὶ εὐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς.  
 καὶ ῥ' ἐγγὺς στήτην διαμετρητῷ ἐνὶ χώρῳ  
 σείοντ' ἐγχείας ἀλλήλοισιν κοτέοντε.      345  
 πρόσθε δ' Ἀλέξανδρος προΐει δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος....

And when they had then armed on either side of the crowd, they marched into the middle of the Trojans and Achaeans, glaring fiercely – and wonder held those watching, the horse-taming Trojans and the well-greaved Achaeans. And they stood close within the measured out space brandishing their spears at each other fiercely. Paris first hurled his long spear...      - 3.340-46

While the armies are immobile and seated,<sup>41</sup> the actors, Paris and Menelaus, take up arms and enter the middle (ἐς μέσσον 3.341). It is just at this point that wonder strikes the armies who are looking on (θάμβος δ' ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας 3.342), spears are brandished and the first spear-cast is made (3.344-45). The crossing of the boundary, emphasized by ἐγγὺς στήτην διαμετρητῶ ἐνὶ χώρῳ 3.344, marks the beginning of the action: it is by their entry into the arena, their separation from the viewers who remain outside, that viewers and actors assume their roles in earnest.<sup>42</sup>

The viewers are not only a defining part of the spectacle, but are themselves frequently objects of viewing, and criticism. As already noted, Iris summons Helen to see not just the combat but also the disarmed warriors. In the event, the time spent by Helen and Priam gazing on and discussing those passive warriors in the *teichoskopia* occupies much more of the duel episode line for line than does the combat itself. Helen's own appearance on the wall provides another example: accepting Iris' invitation and assuming the role of viewer, Helen is immediately spotted (εἶδονθ' Ἑλένην 3.154) and remarked upon by the Trojan elders, who are awed at her beauty – commenting that one can't blame the Trojans and Achaeans for fighting for her – but hope she goes home, regardless (3.155-60). Notably, all of the duel's viewers are also part of the conflict it represents, and they attract comment from each other concerning their roles in that conflict: Helen from the elders for her dangerous beauty (3.155-60); Agamemnon from Priam for his ability to marshal large forces (3.182-90); Odysseus from Antenor for his eloquence as an ambassador before the

---

<sup>41</sup> 3.68; 3.78; 3.326-27.

<sup>42</sup> This “arena of action” corresponds roughly to what Stansbury-O'Donnell 2006 calls the “nucleus” of action in vase paintings that depict a spectacle with viewers: the nucleus is “the essential action and its participants on which a narrative hinges.” (236; cf. *ibid* 12). However as will be seen shortly, spectacle as conceived in the *Iliad* allows for the crossing of this spatial/conceptual boundary, which is not possible for painted figures.

opening of hostilities (3.203-224).<sup>43</sup> “The warfare has stopped” but the conflict continues. With everyone watching, there is now opportunity for reflection on it.

By casting his work as a spectacle and elaborating on the audiences, the poet also makes that work more of a draw. A cat caught in a tree might catch one’s eye, but a cat in a tree surrounded by a crowd is almost irresistible: one is impelled to stare at what everyone else seems to find so interesting, and also to gawk at the other onlookers. In the case of the duel, the extra interest generated by a multitude of watchers is not without a certain irony. In place of the expected bloodshed, deaths, and derring-do on the large scale, the duel is tiny, almost silly in comparison. And yet, the very number and variety of the onlookers seems to increase its significance. The irony is that in the course of adding an interesting crowd to this exciting war, the poet has removed almost all the combatants. There is an unsettling reversal in the move from the tapestry, in which the Trojans and Achaeans engage in motionless “contests,” to the duel, in which the Trojans and Achaeans are not cloth but flesh and blood – yet have ceased to move, becoming themselves passive viewers of the spectacle that is beginning. Through the device of the duel, the war is simultaneously spectacularized and stripped to its bare, unglorious essentials.

Indeed, the action of this duel (3.340-80) is short and amusingly lop-sided. It is ended by Aphrodite’s last minute rescue of Paris, where begins a sequence of events

---

<sup>43</sup> It is worth noting as an aside how Helen’s role is taken up by the poet in this passage. Helen takes her place beside Priam on the wall and supplements his autopsy with comments and orientation based on her own outside information. But the episode concludes with an instance in which Helen’s knowledge fails her; she does not know where Castor and Polydeuces are. At this moment, the poet steps in to do for his listeners just what Helen has been doing so well till now for Priam – he tells them, on the authority of his own outside knowledge, that Helen’s brothers are dead and buried in Lakedaimon (3.243-44). The effect of these parallel roles is to enhance the illusion that what the extradiegetic audience is “seeing” *does* represent autopsy – like that experienced by Priam within the story – though in fact such “vision” is just as dependent on the words of the poet-narrator as the information he gives in supplementary asides.



unknown to most of the duel's spectators – but known to the gods<sup>44</sup> and to the poet's listeners – that culminate with Paris and Helen making love in bed (3.380-448). The duel is now over, but its audiences continue to expand – for it is revealed that the gods on Olympus have been viewing the scene as well (4.1ff).

The divine audience motif facilitates the transfer of the duel paradigm to the warfare that follows. In the context of the above reading, it is evident that the phrase “gazing on the city of the Trojans” (Τρώων πόλιν εἰσορόωντες 4.4) carries a double valence, which underlines the duel's function as a stand in for the war. On the one hand, “gazing on the city of the Trojans” suggests the gods' abiding interest in the conflict at Troy being waged about that city, as discussed above.<sup>45</sup> On the other hand, it construes the gods as an extension of the internal audiences for the duel, as quickly becomes clear when Zeus speaks. The last lines of Book 3 consist essentially of a survey of audience responses to what just happened in the duel: the Trojans are ready to see the fight finished, and would throw Paris back to Menelaus if they could see him; Agamemnon claims a victory for Menelaus; the other Achaeans voice their agreement (3.451-61). Here one might expect a reply from Hector, or another Trojan prince; instead the discussion of the duel's outcome and implications continues on Olympus amongst the gods. Agamemnon's assertion “indeed the victory clearly

---

<sup>44</sup> I disagree with Pucci 2002: 23 on this point. The gods' enjoyment (4.1-4, 7) seems to me partly to reflect appreciation of the comedic quality of the juxtaposition of cuckold Menelaus roaming the battlefield and Paris making love to Helen within: Τῷ μὲν ἄρ' ἐν τρητοῖσι κατεύνασθεν λεχέεσσιν, / Ἀτρεΐδης δ' ἄν' ὄμιλον ἐφοῖτα θηρὶ ἐοικώς / εἴ που ἐσαθρήσειεν Ἀλέξανδρον θεοειδέα. (3.348-50). “[Paris and Helen] lay in their fitted bed, but Menelaus wandered through the crowd like a beast, if perchance he might catch sight of Paris with his god-like good looks.” (My over-translation of θεοειδέα (“with god-like appearance”) is intended to emphasize a contrast which does seem to me to be in the text: Menelaus looks like an animal, Paris like a god, and who has Helen?) The humorous character of the scene finds a parallel in Demodocus' song of Ares and Aphrodite in Book 8 of the *Odyssey*: there too, the gods join in laughter at a comedy of adultery, again arranged (however unwittingly) by Aphrodite.

<sup>45</sup> Chapters 1 and 2. For the bT scholiast this is an iconic image of the gods engaged in their usual activity of viewing the Trojan war. : ἀπρεπές φασιν, εἰ τέρπει τοὺς θεοὺς πολέμων θέα. ἢ οὐκ ἀπρεπές· τέρπει γὰρ τὰ γενναῖα ἔργα.

belongs to war-loving Menelaos” (νίκη μὲν δὴ φαίνεται ἄρηϊφίλου Μενελάου 3.457) is essentially restated by Zeus to the gods just a few lines later: “but as you see, the victory belongs to war-loving Menelaos” (ἀλλ’ ἦτοι νίκη μὲν ἄρηϊφίλου Μενελάου 4.13). Agamemnon’s μὲν (3.457) looks ahead to his demand in the δὲ-clause that the Trojans “[therefore] give over Helen and the treasure” (ὕμεις δ’ Ἀργεῖην Ἑλένην καὶ κτήμαθ’ ἅμ’ αὐτῇ / ἔκδοτε 3.458-9).<sup>46</sup> Zeus’ μὲν (4.13) looks ahead to his entertainment of the idea that the Trojans be allowed to do just that (4.14ff). The movement from Troy to Olympus is almost seamless in that the conversation is continuous, picking up above from where it left off below.<sup>47</sup>

The phrase “city of the Trojans” (4.4) may seem ill-suited to indicate the duel, which takes place on the plain between the city and ships, but in fact conveys very well the sense of smoothly expanding scale that characterizes the poet’s depiction of that spectacle. The duel’s audiences form a kind of tier arrangement: the first tier is constituted by the massed Trojans and Achaeans on the field, who remain outside the duel’s “marked off space” (διαμετρητῶ ἐνὶ χώρῳ 3.344) and “marvel gazing at” (θάμβος δ’ ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας 3.342) the combatants Paris and Menelaus within that central arena. But further away and higher up on the walls of Troy are still more spectators, including Helen, Priam and the Trojan elders. This second tier observes not only the duel but also the inner ring of spectators: in the *teichoskopia* (3.121-244) Priam asks Helen about particular Achaean chiefs present in the first tier below.<sup>48</sup>

This provides an excellent point of departure for constructing the divine audience: on

<sup>46</sup> Agamemnon adds an additional penalty (τιμὴν 3.459); see further Chapter 4 below for comparison of the terms of the three spectacular duels in Books 3, 7, and 22.

<sup>47</sup> The book divisions are generally agreed to be late features of the epics but it requires vigilance to resist the temptation to see them as inherent divisions. Such vigilance is called for here. On the possibility of the *Iliad*’s self-division into three parts, see Taplin 1992 and Heiden 1996 and 2008.

<sup>48</sup> Of course, watchers on the second tier also observe each other, as the Trojan elders observe and comment on Helen (3.155-60).

Olympus, the gods are still higher and much further away, constituting in effect a third tier of spectators. They observe not only the duel and the first ring of spectators, but also see each other and the second ring of spectators on the city walls: this expansive view is encapsulated in “gazing upon the city of the Trojans.” The effect is a continuous regression of ever more remote audiences. One might be tempted to imagine at one further remove the poem’s extradiegetic listeners, who will be aware of each of the inner tiers and perhaps have an eye on each other as well.

That the divine audience is introduced as an audience for the duel is in one sense simply a matter of careful timing: to be looking down at Troy at this moment is to be looking down at the duel and its inner tiers of audiences. Yet the gods’ role as spectators also fits the temporal contrast with which the poet and Iris have characterized the duel: those who before were active are now passive. Just as the armies have seated themselves and put aside their arms, so too the gods who normally “look after” mortal doings now sit passively “looking on.”<sup>49</sup> Griffin’s terms for the divine audience can be applied to the human audience of the duel as well, since in the *Iliad* it is not only the gods for whom observation is expected to lead to intervention: humans too look after their comrades in arms, and both warriors on the battlefield and gods on Olympus are regularly criticized for perceived failures to perform the “looking after” function.<sup>50</sup> Both have set aside that function for now, to become a passive spectatorship.

Yet the gods are different from the duel’s other internal audiences in a way that also aligns them with the extradiegetic audience: when the duel ends and the war

---

<sup>49</sup> Griffin 1978: 1-2.

<sup>50</sup> For example, Menelaus calls Zeus the most “baneful” (ὀλοώτερος 3.365) of gods when he (Menelaus) fails to slay Paris on the spot. Among innumerable examples for mortals are Diomedes’ criticism of the fleeing Odysseus at 8.92-96 as Diomedes moves to rescue Nestor. For the close connection in the *Iliad* between pitying one’s friends and taking action accordingly, see Kim 2000: 26 with bibliography.

breaks out, the gods will still be watching.<sup>51</sup> The depiction of the divine audience thus bridges the two spectacles of duel and warfare, not only in terms of narrative sequence, and of causal connection, but also in such a way as to invite the application of the paradigm established in the former to the latter. This invitation comes through clearly in the language used to describe Athena's leap to Troy (4.73-79). Darting from Olympus to Troy like a comet, Athena leaps onto the ground (4.75-78) and into the space in which Paris and Menelaus have just been fighting. Now Athena, who 70 lines earlier was an internal audience gazing on Troy (εἰσορόωσαι 4.9), becomes the viewed:

καὶ δ' ἔθορ' ἐς μέσσον· θάμβος δ' ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας  
Τρῳᾶς θ' ἵπποδάμους καὶ εὐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοῦς.

And she leapt into the middle, and wonder held those watching –  
the horse-taming Trojans and the well-greaved Achaeans. – 4.79-80

This closely recalls the language which earlier signaled the beginning of the duel:

ἐς μέσσον Τρῳῶν καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἐστιχόωντο  
δεινὸν δερκόμενοι· θάμβος δ' ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας  
Τρῳᾶς θ' ἵπποδάμους καὶ εὐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοῦς.

[Paris and Menelaus] marched into the middle of the Trojans and Achaeans,  
glaring fiercely – and wonder held those watching,  
the horse-taming Trojans and the well-greaved Achaeans. – 3.341-42

The unmistakable suggestion is that a new spectacle is now to begin, taking the place of the old. The poet has gone out of his way to accomplish this effect, by making Athena go out of her way: in a moment she will induce the Trojan Pandarus to break the truce, yet instead of going to Pandarus directly, who is surrounded by the strong ranks of his spearmen (4.90-91) amid the crowd of the Trojans (Τρῳῶν... ὄμιλον 4.86), she first symbolically enters the arena (ἐς μέσσον 4.79). The transition between spectacles of duel and war is wonderfully fluid: the Trojans and Achaeans are

<sup>51</sup> Notable examples include: 7.61; 16.431; 20.22; 22.166; 24.23.

momentarily held in their spectator roles, as they recognize a divine portent and wonder what the gods have decided (4.81-84). Then the familiar sequence proceeds: just as Paris struck the first blow after entering the arena (3.346-49), so now Athena, having symbolically entered the arena, will join Pandarus in striking the first blow in the larger conflict for which the duel had till now been a substitute. The parallelism between the two scenes is underlined by the fact that in both cases Menelaus is the target of attack.<sup>52</sup>

Accepting the invitation to see the warfare which now ensues as an expanded version of what has gone before, one finds that each of the duel's defining features corresponds to features of the spectacle on the larger scale. The duel's "marked off" space corresponds to the space in which the poem's action takes place: the city, the ships and the plain between. Within the text, this space is most clearly defined by the descriptions of the gods' viewing activity. Thus for example when Zeus sits glorying on Ida he looks down at "the city of the Trojans and the ships of the Achaeans" (εἰσορόων Τρώων τε πόλιν καὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν 11.82); Zeus' position outside of the "theater of war" helps the poet demarcate it as a particular area.<sup>53</sup> Descriptions of the gods' viewing not only define the center of the spectacle in spatial terms, but also mark it as the area within which the conflict is fought. It is striking that although there is no battle underway when Hera enjoins Zeus to send Athena to break the truce in Book 4 – and indeed, the question raised by the scene is whether or not the action will start again – she asks him to send Athena to "the terrible strife of the Trojans and Achaeans" (ἐλθεῖν ἐς Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν φύλοπιν αἰνίην 4.65). This is not a case of

---

<sup>52</sup> Taalman Kip 2000 makes the attractive suggestion that Pandarus' wounding of Menelaus – a transgression of the truce's oaths – constitutes a "reenactment" of Paris' original transgression against Menelaus and the laws of hospitality. Both transgressions point to a narrative of Troy's fall as retribution for transgression. See Chapter 2 above.

<sup>53</sup> Other passages that help define ships and city as the outer limits of action include (but this is not a complete list): 5.791, 7.71-72, 8.52 (= 11.82), 11.181, 16.66-70, 18.259-65.

Homer nodding: rather the “strife of the Trojans and Achaeans” is being used to denote the spectacle at Troy by referring in broad terms to its action.

As Troy corresponds to the arena of the duel, Olympus – the usual site of the gods’ viewing – corresponds to the area of passive viewing outside the duel’s “marked off” space. While the gods play many fundamental roles, the action of the poem takes place not on Olympus but at Troy. Of course, the gods themselves are not always passive viewers: in fact, the *Iliad* sometimes presents the conflict at Troy as the expression of a divine conflict, between Athena and Hera on the one hand and Aphrodite on the other (4.7-12; 24.28-30), or between opposing factions of deities (20.19-40, 54-155; 21.328-520). Yet the gods never attack one another except within the arena of activity, the Trojan plain – everything from Athena’s attacks on Ares and Aphrodite in Book 5 to the *theomachia* in Books 20 and 21 transpire at Troy. When the gods do want to take action they, like Paris and Menelaus stepping into the marked-off middle space, must typically leap down from Olympus to Troy.<sup>54</sup> The consistent exception is Zeus, who often intervenes directly yet never descends to Troy at all. Zeus aside then, it is striking that when the gods want to act within the story of Achilles’ wrath they first literally enter the arena.

The duel’s motif of tiered viewership, whereby the act of viewing marks one as part of the spectacle, is also carried over to the large scale. In Book 8, Zeus moves to Ida above Troy, where he sits for several books “gazing upon the Trojans’ city and the ships of the Achaeans” (εἰσορόων Τρώων τε πόλιν καὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν 8.52 = 11.82). In effect, the poet’s listeners are being given a view of both Troy and Zeus gazing at Troy. But they are not the only ones with such a vantage. Poseidon, as it

---

<sup>54</sup> The typical pattern of leaps between divine and human spheres by the gods is evident at 1.44-48; 1.194-195; 3.121; 4.73-73; 11.3-5; 15.169 (from Ida); 15.237 (from Ida); 16.677 (from Ida); 17.544-45; 18.166-68, 202; 18.614-17; 19.350-51, 355-56; 20.32, 21.504-505, 468, 478, 22.213, 518-20; 22.186-187; 24.76-78; 24.144-45, 159, 188; 24.340-48, 468-69.

emerges in Book 13, has been sitting marveling at the warfare and fighting (καὶ γὰρ ὁ θαυμάζων ἦστο πτόλεμόν τε μάχην τε 13.12) from atop Thracian Samos, “for (γὰρ) from there all of Ida was visible, and the city of Priam and the ships of the Achaeans” (ἔνθεν γὰρ ἐφαίνετο πᾶσα μὲν Ἴδη, / φαίνετο δὲ Πριάμοιο πόλις καὶ νῆες Ἀχαιῶν 13.13-14). To see the spectacle of war, Poseidon watches not only the action but also the first tier of viewership – in this case Zeus – and has now himself become an object of observation for the poet’s audience.

Perhaps the clearest schematic recollection of the duel in descriptions of the warfare comes at 20.144-57, when the gods sit on the very edges of the arena of action – some on “Heracles’ wall” by the sea, and others on the brow of a hill – and watch as “the whole plain” (ἅπαν... πεδῖον 20.156) is filled with men and horses and glows with their bronze. As with the armies watching the duel, the gods have now taken seats on opposing sides of the action, according to their partisanship in the conflict they observe. All of this is evidence of the continuing relevance of the duel paradigm for the interpretation of the epic as spectacle. Most important, however, are the implications for the role of the extradiegetic viewer of the epic material, to whom I now turn.

It is in the warfare scenes that will follow that the role of the extradiegetic “spectator” begins to be defined. Following the bow-shot of Pandarus and Athena, the old spectacle on its own terms has been unmade: the armies who before sat passively now “take up arms” and “remember their fighting spirit” (4.220-22).<sup>55</sup> It is at the very moment when this audience is gone, swept up in the expanding conflict, that the poet begins to allude to another:

Ἔνθ' οὐκ ἂν βρίζοντα ἴδοις Ἀγαμέμνονα δῖον

<sup>55</sup> Ὅφρα τοὶ ἀμπεπένοντο βοὴν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον / τόφρα δ' ἐπὶ Τρώων στίχες ἤλυθον ἀσπιστάων· / οἱ δ' αὖτις κατὰ τεύχε' ἔδυν, μνήσαντο δὲ χάρμης. 4.220-22

οὐδὲ καταπτώσσοντ' οὐδ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντα μάχεσθαι,  
ἀλλὰ μάλα σπεύδοντα μάχην ἐς κυδιάνειραν. - 4.223-25

Then you would not see bright Agamemnon dozing  
or cowering or avoiding the fight,  
but exceedingly eager for glorious battle.

The phrase “then you would see...” is an example of the device sometimes called the hypothetical observer, or the would-be eye-witness, widely recognized by critics as a way for the poet to engage his audience.<sup>56</sup> The placement of these would-be eye-witnesses is significant: the passage under consideration is the very first occurrence of the device in the poem, and four of the poem’s remaining eight are clustered together in these first depictions of mass combat in Books 4 and 5.<sup>57</sup> Furthermore, their placement punctuates the structural segments of this battle episode: 1) beginning the survey of the ranks; 2) concluding the survey of the ranks (and hence in ring-composition with 1);<sup>58</sup> 3) appearing as the troops clash *en masse*, prior to the first

<sup>56</sup> For bibliography see note 2 above.

<sup>57</sup> Those four are 4.223-25; 4.421; 4.429-31; 4.539-44; 5.85-86. The others are scattered widely through later battle books (13.343-44; 15.697-98; 16.638-40; 17.366-67). I follow Clay 2011: 23 in treating the 2<sup>nd</sup>-person potential observers together with the 3<sup>rd</sup>-person examples: the phrase “you would not have seen Agamemnon dozing” is very similar to such a phrase as “not even a perceptive man would have recognized Sarpedon” (16.638-39). They read as variations on a single trope; neither the 2<sup>nd</sup> nor the 3<sup>rd</sup> person examples are transparent direct addresses to the extradiegetic audience. In this, I would suggest a refinement of de Jong’s discussion (1987: 54-60). De Jong considers the “you” in this and similar passages to be equivalent to her Primary Narratee-Focalizee (NeFe1), but this elides an important distinction – or, if it is correct in narratological terms, then the narratological approach is insufficient here. The narrative voice of the *Iliad* (what I have been calling the “poet” or the “narrator”, without reference to any historical singer) is assumed to be singing to a group of listeners, a plurality. However, the “you” of ἴδοις (4.223), as in every other example of the device, is singular. If de Jong is right to say that the second person singular addresses are addresses to her Primary Narratee-Focalizee (NeFe1), then the terminology ignores an even more primary, plural audience assumed by the text, so we may as well call that the NeFe1. The point is that the singular “you” is actually constructing and addressing a new focalizer within the text. This resolves de Jong’s difficulty in evaluating the 2<sup>nd</sup> person passages, where it seems that insistence on a particular terminology has led to needless confusion: “in fact, the focalizee here functions as a focalizer, yet, of course, as a focalizer who is instructed by the NF1 what to see, think” (De Jong 1987: 55). A better approach is to group the 2<sup>nd</sup> person examples with the 3<sup>rd</sup> person examples. Both offer ethereal, hypothetical focalizers to the extradiegetic audience. Both types sketch a generic observer, a listener-turned-spectator onto whom any listener may project himself.

<sup>58</sup> Ἥ ῥα καὶ ἐξ ὀχέων σὺν τεύχεσιν ἄλτο χαμᾶζε· / δεινὸν δ' ἔβραχε χαλκὸς ἐπὶ στήθεσσι  
ἄνακτος / ὀρνημένου· ὑπὸ κεν ταλασίφρονά περ δέος εἶλεν. 4.419-21



sequence of individual combats;<sup>59</sup> 4) concluding the first sequence of individual combats (and hence in ring-composition with 3);<sup>60</sup> 5) appearing within Diomedes' *aristeia*.<sup>61</sup>

What are the effects of this trope? In the first place, each occurrence will have its own point. In the passage just cited, the sudden direct address accomplishes a shift in focus and energy, looking forward to Agamemnon's survey of the ranks, his praise and blame of the commanders which represent the Achaean's preparations for battle (4.223-421). The Achaean camp in the last minutes before battle will be joined is an exciting place to be, and the poet's use of a direct address here contributes to the mood of anticipation that will run throughout Agamemnon's survey of the ranks and that culminates in the three consecutive similes of the armies meeting in 4.422-56.<sup>62</sup>

But the hypothetical observer technique also has a peculiar effect of its own. As other scholars have noted, in a sense invoking a hypothetical observer stages or invites the poet's listeners into the story-world.<sup>63</sup> I would emphasize that these invitations, or stagings, are always double-edged, on account of the optative verb on which they are founded. The phrase "You would not see Agamemnon dozing...." comes laden with the unspoken "if you could see it..." and the teasing reminder that any such vision is not based on genuine autopsy but is mediated by the poet's narration. In this context, one should bear in mind that to a greater or lesser degree *all* of the poem's descriptive passages invite listeners to enter the story – whenever

---

<sup>59</sup> ... οἱ δ' ἄλλοι ἀκὴν ἴσαν, οὐδέ κε φαίης / τόσσον λαὸν ἔπεσθαι ἔχοντ' ἐν στήθεσιν αὐδὴν, / σιγῇ δειδιότες σημάντορας.... 4.429-31

<sup>60</sup> 4.539-45. See below for analysis.

<sup>61</sup> Τυδείδην δ' οὐκ ἄν γνοίης ποτέροισι μετείη / ἥε μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ὀμιλέοι ἢ μετ' Ἀχαιοῖς. 5.85-86

<sup>62</sup> De Jong 1987: 60 notes that "the function" of this and similar passages "is to involve the NeFe1 [extradiegetic audience] more directly into the story," but does not give a reading in context.

<sup>63</sup> Frontisi-Ducroux 1986: 27-29, Bakker 1999: 18; Clay 2011: 23.

“confrontations with things seen place the unfolding of the poem before the audience’s eyes.”<sup>64</sup> To an audience already caught up in the story-telling, the potential optative’s reminder that they are *not* actually there but in fact far removed in time and space can actually register as a waking pinch on the arm. Given these considerations, I would suggest that in constructing his extradiegetic audience as an ephemeral phantom in the text, the poet induces listeners not so much to enter the story – they are already there at this point of Book 4, if the bard sings as well as the text reads – but rather to conceptualize the accomplished fact of their entry.

A particularly rich example of such conceptualization concludes Book 4:

Ἐνθά κεν οὐκέτι ἔργον ἀνὴρ ὀνόσαιτο μετελθὼν,  
 ὅς τις ἔτ’ ἄβλητος καὶ ἀνούτατος ὀξεῖ χαλκῷ 540  
 δινεύοι κατὰ μέσσον, ἄγοι δέ εἰ Πάλλας Ἀθήνη  
 χειρὸς ἐλοῦσ’, αὐτὰρ βελέων ἀπερύκοι ἐρωήν·  
 πολλοὶ γὰρ Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἥματι κείνῳ  
 πρηνέες ἐν κονίῃσι παρ’ ἀλλήλοισι τέταντο. -- 4.539-44

Then no longer would a man disparage the work as he went among [the fighters],  
 [a man] who, still unharmed, unwounded by the sharp bronze,  
 would move about through the midst of it, and Pallas Athene would lead him  
 taking him by the hand, and ward off the rush of missiles;  
 for many Trojans and Achaeans on that day  
 lay prone in the dust stretched beside each other.

The man being (hypothetically) led through the combat by Athena is there to observe and also to critique – to disparage or not to disparage. In this, his role is the audience’s role as well. By stating that a man would not disparage the fighting the poet seems to be asking his listeners to admire the warriors’ prowess and valor, and perhaps also the poet’s skill in describing them. Though hypothetical, the man takes on greater reality as the poet spends more and more time on him, becoming almost as vivid as the battle itself, and indeed almost a part of it. The liminal position of this observer, who is simultaneously present and absent, points to the liminal position of

---

<sup>64</sup> Slatkin 2007: 19.

the audience in relation to the world of the story. To see oneself in this viewer is to accept the illusion that the tableaux one is beholding and the deeds of the heroes have an independent existence. After all, in these passages it is the outside observer, not the story characters, who is ethereal, whose presence is conditional, while the world of the story is vivid and primary.

This passage suggests a model for understanding listeners' experience of the shifting points of view supplied by the poet's descriptions. Shifting points of view are a feature of the epic as a whole, and are exemplified in the battle scene through which this observer is understood to be moving. Unlike 4.223, the passage about Agamemnon which prefaced an especially exciting portion of the performance, the present passage directs attention backward: the fierce melee through which the observer moves is the very one that the poet has just described at length. The first view is from a distance: far enough that the armies appear to clash like rivers, and their sound resembles that heard by a shepherd who hears rivers roaring "far away" (τηλόσε 4.455) in the mountains (4.446-56). Following this broad and imaginative view of the action, the poet draws in to offer a succession of highlights,<sup>65</sup> from Antilochus' slaying of Echeolos (4.457-62) to Aias' slaughter of Simoeisios (4.473-89), and finally to the disembowling of Dioreas (4.524-26) and the subsequent death of his killer (4.527-531). At this point, the bridging statement "many others also were being killed around them" (4.538) entails a shift back to a somewhat wider visual perspective. There are various theoretical models one could offer of these changes in perspective.<sup>66</sup> But the poet's description of the man led by Athena suggests that one

---

<sup>65</sup> The poet brackets these single combats with lines emphasizing that many other deaths are meanwhile happening all around: 4.450-51, 538.

<sup>66</sup> Recent critics have noted that these shifts in point of view lend themselves well to description in cinematographic terms of zooming, panning and so forth (e.g. Winkler 2007: 46-63.) Here I am interested in the poem's own model of its functioning, which does not, of course, involve cinema.

should understand these changes in perspective, and by extension the changes in perspective experienced throughout the epic performance, as a function of (mental) movement through the same space as that occupied by the story characters. As Pseudo-Longinus notes in *On the Sublime*, the hypothetical observer has the effect of “making the listener seem to find himself in the midst of the dangers” (ἐν μέσοις τοῖς κινδύνοις ποιοῦσα τὸν ἀκροατὴν δοκεῖν στρέφεσθαι 26.1). Though Pseudo-Longinus includes only the 2<sup>nd</sup> person examples of hypothetical observers in his discussion,<sup>67</sup> his observation applies even better to this “observant man” led by Athena through the fray.

This model for conceiving of the audience’s mental experience finds support in the following passage in Book 15 where Hera is said to move as a person travels with his thoughts:

βῆ δ’ ἐξ Ἰδαίων ὀρέων ἐς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον.  
ὥς δ’ ὅτ’ ἂν αἴξη νόος ἀνέρος, ὅς τ’ ἐπὶ πολλὴν  
γαῖαν ἐληλουθὼς φρεσὶ πευκαλίμησι νοήσῃ  
ἔνθ’ εἶην ἢ ἐνθα, μενοινήσῃ τε πολλά,  
ὥς κραιπνῶς μεμαυῖα διέπττατο πότνια Ἥρη. -- 15.79-83

And [Hera] went from the mountains of Ida to high Olympus.  
And as when flits the mind of a man who has traveled  
over many lands, and conceives an intention in his shrewd mind  
“Let me be there! – or there!”, and yearns for many things,  
so swiftly did queenly Hera fly in her eagerness.

In this passage, the poet represents something ineffable, which his listeners cannot experience – namely the movement of a god through space – in terms of something familiar to them, namely the speed with which a man can travel with his thoughts.

When the man conceives an intention “let me be there! – or there!” (νοήσῃ / ἐνθ’ εἶην ἢ ἐνθα 15.81-82) he can achieve not actual but virtual presence, which is also what the poem’s audience is invited to experience through *enargeia*. The most direct points

---

<sup>67</sup> Pseudo-Longinus *On the Sublime* 26.

of contact between the simile and the situation in the main narrative are these: as the man's mind flits (ἀΐξῃ νόος ἀνέρος 15.80) and he yearns for many things (μενοινήησί... πολλά 15.82), Hera swiftly flies in her eagerness (κραίπνῳς μεμαυῖα διέπτατο 15.83). Interestingly, while this man's desire is emphasized, it is not clear whether his mental activity satisfies that desire or whether his yearning is unfulfilled. On the one hand, μενοινήησί... πολλά could easily mean the desire to actually be in places he can now only imagine. Yet the comparison in itself suggests that his "movement" is in some way successful, since the point of the simile seems to be that the human imagination is comparable to the gods' miraculous flight: by this interpretation, μενοινήησί... πολλά denotes a successful effort of the will, and is a celebration of mental powers. Taking this passage and the one in Book 4 together, they seem to be advancing a connection between the gods' movement as described within the world of the poem and the audience's power to travel mentally in that same space: both extradiegetic audience and Olympian gods move freely, invisibly and invincibly through the Trojan plain.

The terms for conceiving of this spectacle of warfare, elaborated in the duel in Book 3, are now relevant. The detailed description of this hypothetical observer on the battlefield moving amongst the warriors suggests an audience who has entered the "arena" – carrying with it an association of the transition from passive viewership to active participation. As shown above (Chapter 2), Athena's leap to Troy to break the truce models audience demand for the *Iliad* to go on, provocatively coupled with the desire to see the Trojans punished, and invites vicarious participation in her actions. With the present passage, the poet offers a vision of an engaged audience, that has been successfully provoked by the poet's performance – and the particular narrative strategies articulated by Zeus – to "enter" the story-world at Troy, joining Athena on

the battlefield. Why Athena? This configuration of the audience, led by Athena in particular through the fray, implies a particular partisan outlook: after all, Athena has been rousing the Achaeans to greater efforts just twenty lines prior to the present passage (4.514-16), and in the lines immediately following it Athena will incite Diomedes to his bloody *aristeia* (5.1-8), so fierce that it sends Hector back to Troy in Book 6.

Yet the partisan view of the combat offered by these lines is mixed with a striking aloofness, pointing to the fact that the poet's listeners – whatever their involvement with the story characters – can afford to step back and appreciate the quality of the battle scene (κεν οὐκέτι ἔργον ἀνὴρ ὀνόσαιτο 5.439), for they are as little vulnerable in this conflict as the gods.<sup>68</sup> Indeed, in two parallel passages it is the gods Ares and Athena who are attributed such dispassionate evaluation of the quality of fighting.<sup>69</sup> I read this balance of aloofness and engagement as a reflection of the observer's liminal position in the story world, which mirrors that of the extradiegetic audience. After all, the extent to which one enters the story-world depends on the engagement of each listener. It is notable that this model (illusionistically) gives mythic Troy a higher ontological status, thereby making the invitation to participate all the more enticing: that is, it is not so much that each listener's visualization will bring the story-

---

<sup>68</sup> In the combat that the observer would not disparage, the poet has worked hard to give the impression of much action and high casualties on both sides: the final single combats have been balanced with an Epeian chief and a Thracian chief slain, and the last word on the fight is the even-handed “many Trojans and Achaeans” lay dead (5.533-34). This observer is neither found pitying the Achaeans nor glorying in Trojan defeats; instead, he appreciates a good fight, a dead-lock, in which warriors on both sides are not hanging back but giving their all, even their lives, in accordance with heroic ideals of valor. Lop-sided battles might make good comedy, but for a fight to be blameless it has to be a close contest. That the viewer “no longer” (οὐκέτι 4.539) disparages the “work” or *ergon* (4.359) is difficult to explain except in metaperformative terms: now that the warfare has begun in earnest it is worth seeing – but there has been a great delay in the first three books of the epic.

<sup>69</sup> 13.126-28: ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' Αἴαντας δοιοὺς ἴσταντο φάλαγγες / καρτεραί, ἅς οὔτ' ἄν κεν Ἄρης ὀνόσαιτο μετελθῶν / οὔτε κ' Ἀθηναίη λαοσσόος....; and 17. 398-99: οὐδέ κ' Ἄρης λαοσσόος οὐδέ κ' Ἀθήνη / τὸν γε ἰδοῦσ' ὀνόσαιτ', οὐδ' εἰ μάλα μιν χόλος ἴκοι.

world and the characters into existence for him, as that it will bring *himself* into existence in the world of the story. It is all a question of how much he wants the *Iliad*.

By the paradigm laid down in the duel, the extradiegetic “viewer,” whether part of the action or not, may also now be the object of viewing and criticism: and indeed, this passage raises two potential types of criticism. First, as argued in Chapter 2, close association with the Athena/Hera perspective on the epic, as in the configuration of the man led by Athena, carries with it the implicit criticism of excessive bloodlust, and unjustified hostility toward the Trojans, raised by Zeus against Hera (Chapter 2). Second, by linking his listeners’ invulnerability to that of the gods in this passage, the poet emphasizes the ethical dimension of viewership: are we to be voyeurs on the field, enjoying the graphic depictions of slaughter? Is our emotional involvement to be merely casual? These questions become more pointed and complex as the *Iliad* progresses, and Apollo begins to raise the issue of pity for the Trojans. In particular, the next two chapters look at how the notion of the epic as spectacle is reevaluated in the spectacular duels of Books 7 and 22.

## CHAPTER 4

### Reception Reevaluated in Book 7: Athena, Apollo, and the Second Spectacular Duel

Three times the *Iliad* offers a treatment of a single combat between Trojan and Achaean champions conceived as spectacle: the “first duel” between Paris and Menelaus, treated in Books 3-4; a “second duel” between Hector and Aias in Book 7; and a “third duel,” the deadly encounter between Hector and Achilles in Book 22.<sup>1</sup> Each of the three is viewed by assembled Trojans and Achaeans who wait passively by, having paused from taking part in the struggle that two lone champions now continue before their eyes. These duels also feature the only three times in the poem that the divine audience is compared to the audience for some particular type of spectacle.<sup>2</sup> No study has yet been devoted to exploring these important parallels. Structural parallels have been noted between the first and third duels: they occupy much of Books 3 and 22, respectively,<sup>3</sup> and represent the first and last<sup>4</sup> combat scenes of the poem.<sup>5</sup> Scholars have noted many internal structural (and some lexical) parallels between the two “formal duels” of Books 3 and 7.<sup>6</sup> Finally, some have

---

<sup>1</sup> The duel between Aias and Diomedes at the funeral games of Patroclus (23.798-825) is different for a number of reasons, chief among them being that it is fought between Achaeans, with an audience of Achaeans, and is not meant to end in death. It functions partly as a counterpoint view of combat as spectacle, with reference to the three duels between a Trojan and Achaean. See further Chapter 5.

<sup>2</sup> In Books 4 and 7, the gods are constructed as an extension of the audiences for each duel; in Book 22, they are likened to the audience for a chariot race.

<sup>3</sup> Bowra 1950: 16: “In the third book, *I*, we have the duel between Paris and Menelaus and the home-life of Troy with Priam and the old men, with Helen and Aphrodite. In the last book but two, *X*, we have the duel between Achilles and Hector which ends not in the bridal chamber as the first duel ended, but in death and the broken-hearted lamentations of Andromache.”

<sup>4</sup> Again, the duel between Aias and Diomedes in Book 23 is not really an exception.

<sup>5</sup> This is at least implied in Schein 1997: 346.

<sup>6</sup> Kirk 1978 makes some interesting points, but is mostly occupied with trying to work out which duel is the more likely prototype for the other. Duban 1981: 99-109 charts out the parallels between these two duels even more extensively than Kirk. See further Chapter 5 for discussion of the traditionality of



pointed out that Hector's loss in Book 7, the second duel, foreshadows his ultimate defeat in Book 22.<sup>7</sup> What previous studies have neglected is the three duels' shared concern with spectacle and audience response, an omission which the present study aims to redress.<sup>8</sup>

As shown in Chapter 3, the first duel offers a way of thinking about the extradiegetic audience's relationship to the spectacle of combat created by performance of the *Iliad*. The duel represents the larger conflict of the war; the demarcated space in which it is fought corresponds to the "Trojan theater" in which the *Iliad*'s action occurs; and the divine audience provides a kind of *mise en abyme* of the poet's listeners, who are conceived as viewers like the gods and whose mental travel to and within the story-world is like the gods' movement to and within Troy. In Chapters 4 and 5 I show that the duels in Books 7 and 22 develop the themes of the first, with each offering a different epitome of the epic material and a different understanding of what the struggle at Troy is all about. The three duels taken together constitute a sustained reflection on the kind of spectacle the poem is offering to its audience, and the kinds of responses it sees itself eliciting.

---

the "formal duel" motif and its relationship to its genetic cousins in the Homeric *Kunstsprache*, namely the motifs of *promachoi* combat and athletic competition.

<sup>7</sup> Duban 1981: 99: "... [le duel] du chant VII sert manifestement de repoussoir à l'action du chant XXII...." Kirk 1978: 27 notes that Hector's "concern for the treatment of the loser's body, as well as his dismay, soon overcome, when Ajax advances so imposingly, accord quite closely with his character and behaviour just before his death in 22." Also v. Bassett 1927 153; Frontisi-Ducroux 1986: 68.

<sup>8</sup> Duban 1981 is the only study of the three duels as a set that I have been able to find. The English preface to the (French) article notes that they might be called "spectator duels, as they are the only such [*sic*] duels to be detached from the general battle melee and observed by the opposing sides. This feature gives the duels a set-off or staged quality shared by no others." (97) However the article does not investigate this aspect further, and in the title and body of the article the author abandons 'spectator duels' – a phrase that draws attention to the viewers' role – in favor of *les duels majeurs*. The article is very good on connections between any two of the duels, but does not deal further with the element of spectacle. Duban's account of the relationship of *les duels majeurs* to the rest of the poem also differs significantly from that advanced in the present study. Starting with the premise that the most basic function of epic is to glorify the heroes, Duban suggests "il n'est pas improbable que les duels majeurs, dès le départ, avaient quelque autonomie par rapport à ce qui est devenu le plan principal de l'oeuvre et qu'ils ont été appréciés pour eux-mêmes, indépendamment de l'ensemble." (*ibid.* 99) By contrast, I view the duels as problematizations of the role of the spectator.

A brief summary of the second duel episode will be useful. The duel follows soon after the intimacy of the domestic scenes in Book 6, which depict Hector's interactions within the walls of Ilium with his mother, his sister-in-law and brother, and finally his wife and child (6.237-502). When Hector and Paris return to the field, they turn the tide in favor of the Trojans (7.1-16), despite the fact that Hector's mission to secure divine aid through Trojan prayers has failed (6.110-15, 311). In fact it is Athena, the goddess whose aid he had hoped to secure, who leaps down from Olympus to intervene on the Achaeans' behalf when she sees the Trojans slaying Achaeans (7.17-20). On the battlefield, Athena comes face to face with Apollo who has just leapt down himself from the citadel of Troy (7.20-22). After a brief discussion, the two gods agree to arrange a pause in the warfare, in the form of a duel between Hector and an Achaean champion (7.23-43). The clairvoyant Helenus "overhears"<sup>9</sup> the gods' conversation and passes on their wish to Hector (7.44-53). As Hector and Agamemnon halt the fighting, Apollo and Athena settle themselves to observe – not from the vantage of Olympus (from which one can only assume that the other Olympians are watching), but within the arena of war between city and ships, perched on the oak-tree in the Trojan plain (7.54-61). After initial speeches, and difficulty in finding an Achaean willing to accept Hector's challenge, Aias is selected by lot from several volunteers to fight Hector (7.62-199). The fight begins and Aias is getting the better of it when the heralds of both sides, Idaius and Talthybius, urge that the duel be halted (7.200-82). Aias leaves it to Hector, as the challenger, to call off the duel and Hector does so (7.283-302). The two champions exchange goods in a public show of friendship, and the two armies retire to their respective camps, with the

---

<sup>9</sup> σύνθετο θυμῷ (7.44) has been variously interpreted as mystic understanding and audial reception of the gods' words, or some mixture, but ὅπ' ἄκουσα θεῶν αἰεργενετῶν (7.53) indicates that the latter interpretation is correct. Cf. Bassett 1927 who adduces *Od.* 1.328, 15.27, 20.92 and Kirk *IC* at 7.44-45, 52-53, who notes that "this kind of prophetic eavesdropping on divine plans is unparalleled in Homer."

Trojans rejoicing to have Hector back alive and the Achaeans rejoicing in Aias' "victory" (7.303-12; νίκη 312).

The second duel has been criticized for being a poorly motivated, disconnected episode with no satisfactory conclusion and no real reason for existing.<sup>10</sup> The troubles can be summarized as follows. The episode appears unmotivated and artificial:<sup>11</sup> the gods initiate the duel for obscure reasons, it is called off by heralds, and it ends in friendship. Moreover, the use of the duel motif again so soon after Book 3 seems anticlimactic:<sup>12</sup> in contrast with that first duel, which is presented as an attempt to end the entire war once and for all, this one is fought for no particular stakes.<sup>13</sup> Critics sometimes suggest that the gods' interventions serve the purpose of delaying the progress of the plot,<sup>14</sup> but this kind of explanation is never sufficient or satisfying in itself because it leaves a key question unaddressed: why effect delay in this way, i.e. through divine intervention? There are many other ways to accomplish delay, if that is the aim, as Books 8-15 attest by their existence. In short, while the motivations of the

---

<sup>10</sup> Kirk's commentary calls this duel "curiously like that of bk 3 but without stated or accomplished purpose" and "bizarrely curtailed by the heralds." *IC* Vol 2. 230.

<sup>11</sup> "As for the duel's ultimate effects, they are non-existent apart from the provision of a transition, convenient but not necessary, to the gathering of the dead and the building of the wall and trench. Contextually, then, the duel in 7 is negative in effect and weak in inception." Kirk 1978: 23.

<sup>12</sup> Fenik 1968: 213-15 by identifying "anticipatory doublets" is able to account for some scenes that are otherwise hard to explain: the small version anticipates the grand, thus building toward a satisfying climax. Here, the order is reversed.

<sup>13</sup> Kirk 1978: 19 quotes Leaf's commentary: "It is in itself somewhat surprising that the two duels should be fought on the same day; but when we remember the very remarkable manner in which the first had ended, by an unpardonable violation of a truce made with all possible solemnities, and then find that the second is entered upon by the two parties without apology or reproach, the difficulty is one which can hardly be explained. Nor can it be smoothed over by the excuse of artistic propriety; for no canon of art will justify what we have before us; a duel which is proposed as a decisive ordeal, designed to finish the war, is succeeded at the distance of a few hours by another which is a mere trial of prowess... This surely approaches near to the limits of an anticlimax."

<sup>14</sup> Kirk 1978; Bremer 1987.

characters within the episode have been illuminated by previous scholarship,<sup>15</sup> the poet's motivation in offering the scene as part of his epic have not.

The scene's apparent weaknesses can be explained in terms of the poet's larger intention. On the one hand, the gods effect the delay because the gods are the point: their perspective on the epic spectacle, here conceived again as a duel, suggests multiple potential responses to the poem. The conversation between Apollo and Athena not only introduces but also motivates the duel, by framing the issues of reception with which the episode is concerned. On the other hand, the contrast in stakes between the first and second duel is made so noticeable precisely because it is vital to their interpretation as a pair. The first part of this chapter analyzes the gods as an internal audience. The second part looks at the duel itself, showing that it offers a view of the epic material that complements and develops the one already provided by the first duel, while looking ahead to Book 22 as well.

The episode begins as Paris and Hector return to the battlefield:

ὥς δὲ θεὸς ναύτησιν ἐελδομένοισιν ἔδωκεν  
οὔρον, ἐπεὶ κε κάμωσιν ἐϋξέστης ἐλάτῃσι 5  
πόντον ἐλαύνοντες, καμάτῳ δ' ὑπὸ γυῖα λέλυνται,  
ὥς ἄρα τῷ Τρῳέσσιν ἐελδομένοισι φανήτην.  
Ἔνθ' ἐλέτην ὃ μὲν υἱὸν Ἀρηϊθόοιο ἄνακτος  
Ἄρνη ναιετάοντα Μενέσθιον, ὃν κορυνήτης  
γείνατ' Ἀρηϊθόος καὶ Φυλομέδουσα βοῶπις· 10  
Ἐκτωρ δ' Ἡϊονῆα βάλ' ἔγχεϊ ὀξυόεντι  
αὐχέν' ὑπὸ στεφάνης εὐχάλκου, λύντο δὲ γυῖα.  
Γλαῦκος δ' Ἴππολόχοιο πᾶϊς Λυκίων ἀγὸς ἀνδρῶν  
Ἰφίνοον βάλε δουρὶ κατὰ κρατερὴν ὕσμινην  
Δεξιὰδην ἵππων ἐπιάλμενον ὠκείῳ  
ῶμον· ὃ δ' ἐξ ἵππων χαμάδις πέσε, λύντο δὲ γυῖα. – 7.4-16

And as a god brings to sailors who long for it  
a breeze, when they toil with polished oars,  
pushing against the sea, and their limbs give out with the toil –  
so then those two [Paris and Hector] appeared to the Trojans who longed

<sup>15</sup> Bassett 1927 defends this episode's integrity both in philological terms and by showing that the speeches and actions it depicts have been shown to be artfully crafted with attention to the psychology of each character. Kirk 1978 also finds that the duel has internal interest, while expressing regret for the poet's supposedly botched job of fitting it into the poem.

for them.  
 Then each of the two killed [a man] – the one [killed] lord Arithous' son  
 Menestheus who lived in Arnes, whose parents were the club-wielder  
 Arithous and cow-eyed Philomedusa.  
 And Hector struck Eioneus with his sharp spear  
 in the throat beneath his bronze helmet, and his limbs gave out.  
 And Glaucus son of Hippolochus, lord of the Lycian men  
 struck Iphinous with his spear in the fierce fighting  
 as [Iphinous] was leaping onto his swift horses,  
 [struck] him in the shoulder – and he fell from his horses to the earth, and  
 his limbs gave out.

The Trojans are now dominant, the Achaeans on the defensive, and this creates tension. The *Iliad*, after all, is told from an Achaean perspective. It begins by drawing its listeners' attention to, and presumably asking them to pity, Achaean tribulations (ἄλγεα 1.2). The epithet system for the Trojans marks them as the enemy, traditionally.<sup>16</sup> Underlying the duel in Book 3 is an understanding of the Trojan war as a narrative not of Achaean aggression but of Trojan transgression and ensuing punishment.<sup>17</sup> Even the poet's spatial orientation in describing (and, presumably, visualizing) battle scenes in terms of left and right is consistently taken from the Achaean side.<sup>18</sup> All of these factors position the audience as pro-Achaean – a group expected, all other things being equal, to be cheering for the Achaean side of the conflict, wincing at Achaean setbacks, and looking forward to expected Achaean victories. The *Iliad*'s power depends partly on the fact that in spite of this basic

---

<sup>16</sup> Sale 1987 demonstrates that the epithet system for the Trojans suggests that they are traditionally regarded as the enemy rather than sympathetically as in the *Iliad*. Cf. Taplin 1980: 11-18. Iliadic flyting speeches also show a well-developed idiom for gloating over a vanquished warrior's death, humiliation, mutilation and the prospect of terrible grief and/or slavery on the part of his loved ones. An epic poem featuring such language, but lacking the *Iliad*'s sensitive characterization of the losers, would tend to involve its audiences in this gloating attitude as well, and it is against the background of such hypothetical poems that it seems best to assess the *Iliad*.

<sup>17</sup> Taalman Kip 2000 notes the discrepancy between certain Achaeans' belief that the gods will punish Trojan transgression and the lack of interest in such considerations on the part of the gods themselves. However, the gods *do* insist that the Trojans must be the ones to break the truce, thereby ensuring that the underlying tale of transgression and punishment remains intact. See Chapter 2.

<sup>18</sup> Clay 2011: 43-52. It is appropriate that the divine viewer Eris, perched on Odysseus' ship at 11.3-11, has an orienting function in a depiction of armed conflict.

Achaean orientation it does not demonize the Trojans but instead portrays them more sympathetically than it does the Achaeans.<sup>19</sup>

For all these reasons, the switch to Trojan dominance on the field is a tense moment in the performance, for all that it is a narrative necessity guaranteed by Zeus' promise to Thetis in Book 1. Thus, when Athena is spurred by these developments in the narrative<sup>20</sup> to end her passivity and enter the arena of war, she is set up, potentially, as a model of response:

Τοὺς δ' ὥς οὖν ἐνόησε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη  
 Ἀργείους ὀλέκοντας ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὕσμίνῃ,  
 βῆ ῥα κατ' Οὐλύμποιο καρῆνων αἴξασα  
 Ἴλιον εἰς ἱερήν.... - 7.17-20

But when she took note of them<sup>21</sup> – the goddess, bright-eyed Athena –  
 slaying Argives in the thick of the fight,  
 she leapt and descended from the peaks of Olympus  
 to sacred Ilium....

The language here is formulaic, used frequently of warriors who observe a comrade in need and go to their aid – or of gods doing so –<sup>22</sup> but this instance reads differently for

<sup>19</sup> It is perhaps significant in this context that the Iliadic passages which connect divine travel to visualization, precisely the kind of participation that is demanded of the audience, both involve Hera and Athena: 4.539-44; 15.80-83. See Chapter 3.

<sup>20</sup> As no verb of seeing is used of Athena in the passage that follows, the element of spectacle is not yet being foregrounded: that will come, appropriately, with the duel itself. Nor is it not necessary for my reading that Athena be understood as a viewer in this passage, since it is response to the narrated events, rather than viewership, that the text seems to be emphasizing and in which I am interested. However, I note in passing that the opening of Book 4 seems to me to be paradigmatic, and thus informs the reading of later passages such as this one: the gods of the *Iliad* follow events at Troy by watching them, not through some kind of omniscience. This is supported by passages in which the gods are unaware of events at Troy as a result of their vision being distracted or obscured: e.g. 13.1-9 of Zeus; 13.521-25 of Ares (of which Janko *IC ad loc* remarks “the clouds explain why Ares cannot see.”) Of course, ἐνόησε frequently does refer to specifically visual perception – as when Andromache sees Hector being dragged in the dust (ἔστη παπτήνας ἐπὶ τείχεϊ, τὸν δὲ νόησεν.... 22.63).

<sup>21</sup> I note in passing that the addition of Glaucus' feat of arms (7.13-16), following the killings accomplished by Paris and Hector, nicely facilitates the reading of these individual victories as representative of the general state of the battle, i.e. a switch to Trojan dominance. The dual “each of the two killed” (ἐλέτην 7.8) refers to Paris and Hector, who have just returned. Glaucus is then appended to the list, signalling an expansion of the shift in battle fortunes from the reinforcements to one of the leaders who is already fighting and whom they have now joined. This expansion continues, as the “them” (τοὺς 7.17) observed by Athena refers to Paris, Hector, and Glaucus specifically, and also the Trojans by extension.

two reasons. First, it marks the end of a period in which the gods have not been involved. The period of fast and furious divine interventions that followed Athena's dramatic leap as a comet to Troy (4.74-80)<sup>23</sup> comes to a definite end with the final lines of Book 5, after the climax of the wounding of Ares and his removal to Olympus (5.825-906). Now Hera and Athena also return "to the house of Zeus" (πρὸς δῶμα Διὸς 6.907), and the poet makes clear that this means an end of their participation for the present: "the strife of Trojans and Achaeans was left alone" (Τρώων δ' οἰώθη καὶ Ἀχαιῶν φύλοπις αἰνὴ 6.1). The image of the gods with which the poet has now left his listeners is that of Ares being restored to his glory by Hebe (5.905-6) – the same figure found pouring the wine at the beginning of Book 4, just before the phase of multiple interventions began.<sup>24</sup> With this image, the passivity and aloofness so memorably represented in the opening of Book 4 has been restored. The phrase "left alone" (οἰώθη 6.1) is not idle: though the battle goes on for some time, in Book 6 the gods are barely mentioned, and do not intervene.<sup>25</sup> As a result, Athena's descent from Olympus at this moment does not suggest a warrior's ongoing activity so much as a passive, outside observer's renewed engagement with the action on the battlefield.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> As when Odysseus sees Tlepolemus go down and leaps to action (...νόησε δὲ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς 5.669). It is also different because of what follows. Near identical language is used in Book 5 before Hera and Athena move to put a stop to Ares: Τοὺς δ' ὥς οὖν ἐνόησε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη / Ἀργείους ὀλέκοντας ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὕσμινη 5.711-12.

<sup>23</sup> E.g. 4.507-14 (Apollo); 4.514-16 (Athena); 5.1-8 (Athena); 5.22-24 (Hephaestus); etc.

<sup>24</sup> There is only one other mention of the figure Hebe in the *Iliad*, also within this 'episode' – at 5.722.

<sup>25</sup> I take Zeus' stealing of Glaucus' wits (6.234-36) as a self-conscious witticism – a figure of speech – on the poet's part, not an intervention by Zeus. The only other mention of the gods' activity in Book 6 is a half-line stating that Athena refuses the Trojan women's prayers to save their city: "ὥς ἔφατ' εὐχομένη, ἀνένευε δὲ Πάλλας Ἀθήνη. 6.311 "So [Hecuba] spoke in prayer, but Pallas Athena nodded upward [in refusal]." Book 6 also contains Helen's famous statement that Zeus gave her and Paris their fates for the sake of the epic medium (6.357-58) for which see Chapter 2.

<sup>26</sup> This is also emphasized by the wording of Apollo's questioning of Athena following her intervention: "why *again* (αὖ) have you come?" (7.24). The gods had been removed from the action for some time.

The second way in which this intervention is marked emerges in the follow-up. While Athena's leap, met immediately by Apollo's, would seem to herald a new battle sequence in which gods fight alongside mortals, it instead prompts a peaceable (if barbed) conversation between those two deities on the topic of viewer response.

... τῇ δ' ἀντίος ὄρνυτ' Ἀπόλλων  
 Περγάμου ἐκκατιδών, Τρώεσσι δὲ βούλετο νίκην·  
 ἀλλήλοισι δὲ τῷ γε συναντέσθην παρὰ φηγῷ.  
 τὴν πρότερος προσέειπεν ἄναξ Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων·  
 τίπτε σὺ δ' αὖ μεμαυῖα Διὸς θυγάτηρ μέγαλοιο  
 ἦλθες ἀπ' Οὐλύμπιοι, μέγας δέ σε θυμὸς ἀνῆκεν; – 7.20-25

... but Apollo rose to meet her,  
 having descended from Pergamum – and he plotted victory for the  
 Trojans.  
 So those two came face to face with one another by the oak tree.  
 He addressed her first, the lord Apollo son of Zeus:  
 'And why is it that eagerly, daughter of great Zeus, again you  
 have come from Olympus, and your great heart stirred you up?

Apollo's questions are apt. Clearly, Athena presents a model of renewed engagement, but at this point the nature of that engagement is unclear – her efforts on behalf of the Achaean war effort are familiar, but the motivations are various. Her leap might be interpreted as care for Achaeans being killed, like Hera's care (κήδετο 1.56) at the sight of Achaeans dying of plague in Book 1 (κήδετο γὰρ Δαναῶν, ὅτι ῥα θνήσκοντας ὄρατο 1.56). Alternatively, it might represent *nemesis* at Achaean disgrace, like the *nemesis* attributed to Apollo in Book 4 as the Trojans are routed in their turn;<sup>27</sup> after all, Athena's move to halt the Achaean's rush for the ships in Book 2 was motivated by what Hera described as concern that Achaean defeat would allow Trojan gloating.<sup>28</sup> A third possibility is to see this intervention as an expression of desire for Troy's destruction, a desire superseding concern for the Argives

<sup>27</sup> ... νεμέσῃσθε δ' Ἀπόλλων / Περγάμου ἐκκατιδών... 4.507-8. On *nemesis* as “justified anger or public disapproval” (conceived as external social pressure, as opposed to the internal pressure of αἰδώς) see Yamagata 1994: 149-56 (quote taken from pg 149). As Yamagata notes, “νέμεσις is also felt... at military shortcomings” (*ibid.* 152).

<sup>28</sup> 2.155-65, esp 160-62: καὶ δὲ κεν εὐχολὴν Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ λίποιν / Ἀργεῖην Ἑλένην, ἧς εἵνεκα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν / ἐν Τροίῃ ἀπόλοντο φίλης ἀπὸ πατρίδος αἵης.



themselves.<sup>29</sup> All of these could be plausible for Athena, but in a departure from the parallel passages the poet does not propose a particular model.<sup>30</sup> Instead of detailing her response, how she feels and what she intends to do, the poet has Apollo leap down and ask her about it.

Apollo's questions draw attention to the fact that the perspective of Athena, who with Hera has become the most familiar divine figure for modeling response at this point in the poem,<sup>31</sup> is now made to be strange, with the poet giving no direct access to it. Into this blank left by the poet, Apollo inserts his own interpretation of Athena's response:

ἥ ἵνα δὴ Δαναοῖσι μάχης ἑτεραλκέα νίκην  
 δῶς; ἐπεὶ οὐ τι Τρῶας ἀπολλυμένους ἐλεαίρεις.  
 ἀλλ' εἴ μοί τι πίθοιο τό κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη·  
 νῦν μὲν παύσωμεν πόλεμον καὶ δηϊοτῆτα  
 σήμερον· ὕστερον αὖτε μαχήσονται εἰς ὃ κε τέκμωρ      30  
 Ἰλίου εὐρωσιν, ἐπεὶ ὥς φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ  
 ὑμῖν ἀθανάτησι, διαπραθέειν τόδε ἄστυ.      - 7.26-32

Ahh – surely it was in order to give tide-turning victory in battle to the Danaans?  
 For you don't pity the Trojans dying at all.  
 But if you should somehow be persuaded by me, it would be far better:  
 For now, let's stop the warfare and fighting –  
 for today. Later, when the time comes, let them fight until they come  
 upon the end of Ilium, since thus did it please the heart  
 of you goddessess – that this city should be destroyed.'

Apollo's "why" (τίπτε 7.24) is really a two-fold question, "prompted by what?" and "in order to do what?" – corresponding to the two missing elements in Athena's

<sup>29</sup> Athena's dramatic leap at 4.74-80 is construed as hostility to Troy overriding concern for Achaean death: contrast the joy shared by Achaeans and Trojans (ἐχάρησαν 3.111) when they think the war is over at the announcement of the first duel (3.111-12).

<sup>30</sup> Previous instances of Athena's interventions have all included two things: a statement about the emotions – hers or Hera's – that motivate her descent from Olympus, and the implementation of her desire. For example, as Achilles prepares to kill Agamemnon in Book 1, Athena's sudden appearance (...ἦλθε δ' Ἀθήνη 1.194) is followed immediately by a flashback which specifies Hera's feelings that prompted the intervention (1.195-6) and a description of Athena's restraining action (1.197ff). Thus, in effect Apollo's words have taken the place in the narrative of the very information they solicit.

<sup>31</sup> See Chapters 2 and 6.



– and trying to figure it out is not the point. Athena’s inscrutability in this passage,<sup>34</sup> emphasized by Apollo’s criticism, points to the variety of conflicting desires which the poem sees itself engendering. The passage thus works as a kind of Rorschach test for the audience: what do you see in the inkplot of Athena’s reaction? Each listener may answer differently, for the question is as much about them as it is about Athena.

The construction of Athena and Apollo as an internal audience follows closely the developing events and themes of the poem. This is the first time that the issue of pity for the Trojans has been explicitly raised among the gods,<sup>35</sup> and it comes immediately after the scenes in Book 6 which are famous precisely for evoking pity for the Trojans. Hector’s interactions with Andromache and Astyanax in particular bring out the humanity of these characters, and Andromache’s laughter through tears elicits pity not just from Hector (δακρυόεν γέλασασα· πόσις δ’ ἐλέησε νοήσας 6.484) but from legions of readers and commentators. The vivid depictions of Thebe’s fall, Andromache’s plight, and future slavery (6.405-65) lay out the consequences of Trojan defeat in the war, from a Trojan perspective.

This sympathetic picture of the Trojans, set against a background of Trojan doom, directly precedes the duel episode at the beginning of Book 7 and even serves as an introduction to it: there is no pause between them. It is important to see that the book division between Books 6 and 7 – while making sense inasmuch as it divides the

---

<sup>34</sup> Athena is inscrutable also in the *Odyssey*, which subtly raises the question of why she abandons Odysseus during part of his travels. Clay 1983: 44 warns against “swallow[ing] the goddess’ alibi” (that she did not want trouble with Poseidon, *Od.* 13.341-43) which is “at best partial,” and ultimately concludes that it is “the pressure of events on Ithaca that compels Athena to release Odysseus and to bring him home to set things right” (*ibid.* 234).

<sup>35</sup> Though there are inclinations in that direction. Zeus’ question to Hera in Book 4, “what have the Trojans done to you?”, does not appeal to pity directly: it focuses more on Hera’s behavior than the plight of the Trojans. Apollo’s reaction to Chryses’ prayer is presented in terms of anger, not pity, nor does his *nemesis* in Book 4 constitute pity. Finally, Ares’ complaint to Zeus in Book 5 focuses on the behavior of Athena, which he claims is inappropriate – he does not solicit pity for the Trojans he supports.

domestic scenes from the warfare – masks an important continuity and would not likely correspond to a pause in performance:<sup>36</sup>

τὸν πρότερος προσέειπεν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής·  
 ἦθεϊ' ἢ μάλα δὴ σε καὶ ἐσσύμενον κατερύκω  
 δηθύνων, οὐδ' ἦλθον ἐναίσιμον ὥς ἐκέλευες;  
 Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ· 520  
 δαιμόνι' οὐκ ἄν τις τοι ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐναίσιμος εἴη  
 ἔργον ἀτιμήσειε μάχης, ἐπεὶ ἄλκιμός ἐσσι·  
 ἀλλὰ ἐκὼν μεθιῖς τε καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλεις· τὸ δ' ἐμὸν κῆρ  
 ἄχνηται ἐν θυμῳ, ὅθ' ὑπὲρ σέθεν αἴσχε' ἀκούω  
 πρὸς Τρώων, οἳ ἔχουσι πολὺν πόνον εἵνεκα σεῖο. 525  
 ἀλλ' ἵομεν· τὰ δ' ὀπίσθεν ἀρεσσόμεθ', αἶ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς  
 δῶη ἐπουρανίοισι θεοῖς αἰειγενέτησι  
 κρητῆρα στήσασθαι ἐλεύθερον ἐν μεγάροισιν  
 ἐκ Τροίης ἐλάσαντας εὐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς.  
 ὣς εἰπὼν πυλέων ἐξέσσυτο φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ, 1  
 τῷ δ' ἅμ' Ἀλέξανδρος κί' ἀδελφεός....

Godlike Alexandros addressed him first:

‘Sir, have I not indeed overtaken you even as you hurried –

I, as I ‘tarried’?<sup>37</sup> And have I not come at the due time as you bid?’

And bright-helmed Hector addressed him in answer:

‘[Yes], incredible man, nor would any man who gives things their due speak ill of your deeds in battle, since you are possessed of prowess.

But of your own accord you hang back and don’t want [to fight]. And my heart is pained in my chest, when I hear shameful things about you from the Trojans, who have so much hardship for your sake.

But come: these things we will reconcile in the future, if ever Zeus

grants that to the gods who live in heaven, born to exist forever,

we might set up the *krater* of freedom in our halls

after driving the well-greaved Achaeans from Troy.’

So speaking, glorious Hector rushed out from the gates

and with him went his brother Alexandros....

- 6.518-29, 7.1-2

The words exchanged by Hector and Paris as they leave the city together give a life-like picture of affection and familiarity in the face of brotherly frustration, and a twinkling illusion of hope for Trojan victory, reified as “the *krater* of freedom”

<sup>36</sup> For bibliography on book divisions, see Chapter 3 note 48.

<sup>37</sup> I put “tarried” in quotation marks because it seems to me that Paris, by adding the enjambed δηθύνων (519), makes a playful retort to what he knows to be *Hector*’s expectation of his own behavior after their meeting in Paris’ chamber with Helen. The point is that it is not true – Paris has *not* now been loitering (as the narrator has just remarked - Οὐδὲ Πάρις δῆθυνεν ἐν ὑψηλοῖσι δόμοισιν 6.503) – and that this must also now be obvious to Hector from the fact that Paris has indeed overtaken him at the gate. In fact, it is Hector’s own tarrying – with Andromache – that has made this meeting possible.

(6.518-29). There is no possible stopping place for the singer between the final lines of Book 6 and the rush to combat that begins Book 7: “so speaking, glorious Hector rushed out from the gates...” The Trojan princes’ onslaught, which seems to the Trojans as welcome as a godsent wind to exhausted rowers (7.4-7), flows out in one breath from this illusion of future freedom, and is set starkly against the still-vivid picture of Trojan doom painted by Hector and Andromache. This continuity between books sets up the poet’s audience to see Trojan victory on the battlefield still from a Trojan perspective: that is, as desirable – a postponement, at least, of the coming doom. And yet, when the fighting begins in Book 7, and it is the Achaeans who are being cut down, Athena’s appearance also recalls the jumble of reasons why such a sight may not please an audience.

At this point, I suggest that the poem’s internal epic audience – previously represented primarily by the Hera and Athena duo – has been diversified to reflect upon the possibility of an extradiegetic audience moved by the pathos of Hector and Andromache’s farewell, with the meeting of Apollo and Athena staging a confrontation between responses to events on the battlefield. Athena embodies the poem’s Achaean orientation, representing possible aversion to the prospect of an Achaean route, and also the desire for Troy’s fall that looms beyond the poem’s horizon. Apollo’s criticism connects identification with the Achaean war effort to lack of pity for the Trojans, thus voicing and implying questions that are relevant for the extradiegetic listener: do you feel pity for the Trojans – enough not to want Troy to fall? Not to relish Achaean victory? Not to cringe at Achaean losses?

Apollo wants a pause in the fighting, saying it “would be far better” than what he takes to be Athena’s plan of routing the Trojans (7.28ff), and Athena quickly agrees. This desire for a pause, like the rest of the conversation, operates on two levels. On

one level, it is in some sense logical from each god's point of view as a character: Athena as defender of the Achaeans wants to delay the Trojan victory, which is now underway in accordance with Zeus' plan and promise to Thetis. A pause in the fighting makes sense for her (τὰ γὰρ φρονέουσα καὶ αὐτῇ 7.34) in terms of the immediate situation, in which the Achaeans are harried and simply in need of defense. Apollo's corresponding wish for delay looks to the long-term situation, in which he recognizes that Troy is doomed to fall at the Achaeans' hands (εἰς ὃ κε τέκμωρ... διαπραθέειν τόδε ἄστυ. 7.30-32). However, while the desire for a pause is motivated on this level, the decision to make that pause take the form of a duel appears arbitrary.

It is on the second, extradiegetic level that the decision to make this pause take the form of a duel becomes intelligible: to provide a reevaluation of the view of the epic conflict presented in the first duel, with a treatment of the issues that the conversation between the internal audience of Apollo and Athena has raised. The many parallels between the two duels signal their parallel function: once more there is a call for parley on the battlefield; once more the armies are seated by the leaders, and two champions will fight in the center.<sup>38</sup> The role of the gods in viewing both duel and war also recalls the previous use of the divine audience motif, with certain important variations:

καὶ ῥ' ἐς μέσσον ἰὼν Τρώων ἀνέεργε φάλαγγας,	55
μέσσου δουρὸς ἐλών· οἳ δ' ἰδρύνθησαν ἅπαντες.	
καδ δ' Ἀγαμέμνων εἶσεν εὐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοῦς·	
καδ δ' ἄρ' Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων	
ἐξέσθην ὄρνισιν ἐοικότες αἰγυπιοῖσι	
φηγῶ ἐφ' ὑψηλῇ πατρὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο	60
ἀνδράσι τερπόμενοι· τῶν δὲ στίχες ἦατο πυκναὶ	
ἀσπίσι καὶ κορύθεσσι καὶ ἔγχεσι πεφρικυῖαι	
οἷη δὲ Ζεφύροιο ἐχεύατο πόντον ἐπὶ φριξ	
ὀρνυμένοιο νέον, μελάνει δὲ τε πόντος ὑπ' αὐτῆς,	
τοῖαι ἄρα στίχες ἦατ' Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε	65
ἐν πεδίῳ....	-- 7.55-66

<sup>38</sup> See Duban 1981 for a schematic arrangement of these and other parallels.

And going into their midst, [Hector] held back the ranks of Trojans,  
 holding his spear by the middle, and they drew back one and all.  
 And down Agamemnon seated the well-greaved Achaeans,  
 and down Athena and golden-bowed Apollo  
 seated themselves, as predatory birds,  
 upon the high oak tree of aegis-bearing Zeus,  
 taking pleasure in the men, whose thick ranks were settling,  
 bristling with shields, helmets and spears –  
 and as a ruffling ripples over the sea, with Zephyr  
 rousing anew, and the sea goes dark beneath it,  
 so did the ranks of Achaeans and Trojans settle  
 in the plain....

As in Book 4, the divine audience is construed both as an extension of and in contrast to the mortal audiences for the duel. The juxtaposition of divine and mortal viewers in this case is even closer. By making the gods arrange the duel, then sit down along with those who will watch it, the poet raises the expectation that the gods are essentially joining the mortal audiences. The suggestion is amplified by the repetition of  $\kappa\alpha\delta\ \delta'$  and  $\kappa\alpha\delta\ \delta'\ \alpha\rho'$  (7.57-58) in the initial position of the line, and the enjambment of  $\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$  (7.59), completing the parallel with  $\kappa\alpha\delta\ldots \acute{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\nu$  (7.57), techniques which give the juxtaposition a powerful rhetorical pull,<sup>39</sup> and sharpening the contrast that is then drawn between them. As  $\alpha\acute{\nu}\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\ \tau\epsilon\rho\pi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$  (7.60) and the simile make clear, the spectacle for the two gods includes the very audience they had seemed to be joining. One thinks of the tiers of viewership in Book 3, with the armies watching the duel, Helen and Priam watching duel and armies, and the gods on Olympus seeing all of the above and more ( $\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\omega\nu\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\nu\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\omicron\rho\acute{o}\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  4.4).<sup>40</sup> Here

<sup>39</sup> Kirk (*ad loc*) calls the lines “primarily a rhetorical device” that gives the duel “a special and unworldly status,” presumably because it indicates that the upcoming duel will have gods amongst its spectators.

<sup>40</sup> On tiers of viewing, cf. Maronitis 2007: 62 n.10.

the tiers are condensed, as the gods are present among the audience on the battlefield, yet nevertheless occupying a somewhat higher vantage point.<sup>41</sup>

The gods' closer proximity models closer engagement with the poem's events: Apollo and Athena are apart from the other gods because it is they who have been moved to leap down into the arena of war. Even so, the verb *terpomai* (τερπόμενοι 7.61) recalls the pleasure of Athena and Hera watching from Olympus in Book 4 (τέρπεσθον 4.10),<sup>42</sup> and the shared pleasure of the partisans Apollo and Athena, who sit beside each other on the oak, points to the capacity of the extradiegetic listener to maintain a double perspective on the story's events, simultaneously becoming emotionally involved while maintaining an appreciation of the beauty and excitement of the poet's art in the performative moment. Here, it is evident that the pleasure shared by Athena and Apollo in viewing is an aesthetic pleasure, derived from the image of the vast armies settling themselves like a rippling ocean: "Enjoying the men, whose thick ranks were settling...." (ἀνδράσι τερπόμενοι τῶν δὲ στίχες ἦατο πυκναὶ 7.61). The comparison of armed ranks to the sea is not uncommon in the *Iliad*,<sup>43</sup> but is special here in that the image is focalized through the watching gods: the gods are enjoying the same aesthetic pleasure, derived from the same image, which the poet is simultaneously offering to his listeners by means of his song. This is why *terpomai*, the verb for the enjoyment of poetry, resonates so strongly at this moment, and contributes further to the sense that this duel too will offer an internal representation of audience enjoyment of the *Iliad*'s depiction of the conflict at Troy.

---

<sup>41</sup> This recalls a recurring theme from the first duel: that a spectacle consists not only of the participants, but the spectators as well. All are objects worthy of attention, and by watching the spectacle one becomes part of it too.

<sup>42</sup> See Chapter 2.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. 4.422-28.



The second use of the duel motif invites reappraisal of the first instance: is this really, after all, a story about Paris and Menelaus? About just punishment for transgression? About money and a woman? Or is the center shifting as the poem moves forward? What stands to be won in this war? A pause is also an opportunity to reflect; and the gods' conversation has just illustrated the need for reflection in light of recent thematic developments. If the pause agreed on by Apollo and Athena is the mechanism for this reevaluation, the second duel will be its venue.

### **Combatants**

As views of the epic conflict at Troy, each duel provides a very different but equally coherent vision of what the war is "about," and this emerges partly in the identity of the combatants. Confrontations between leaders are the *Iliad's* regular way of depicting combat on a large scale. In the spectacular duels, this regular system is taken to its limit: each combatant stands for the entirety of his side in the war. Whereas the first duel presents the conflict at Troy as a match between transgressor and aggrieved, the second is fought by the armies' greatest champions. The result is a shift of emphasis and narrative. Whereas the first duel offers one understanding of the causes for the war - adultery and the breach of hospitality -, <sup>44</sup> the second takes the war as a given and instead foregrounds concerns of heroes fighting within the war, namely immortal glory and proper funeral rights. Both duels are concerned with proper and improper behavior, and look ahead to Achilles' and Hector's confrontation

---

<sup>44</sup> Other possible understandings of the wars' causes are also subtexts for the first duel: Eris' golden apple and the Judgment of Paris are recalled by the opposition of Hera and Athena on the one hand and Aphrodite on the other (especially in Zeus' teasing at 4.5-19). The war may also be seen as a glorified act of piracy, and indeed the many pointed references to the riches at stake keep this interpretation always in play.

in Book 22, for which the Book 7 duel in particular forms an anticipatory doublet, as it is the poem's first sketch of Hector's death.<sup>45</sup>

Paris and Menelaus represent the two sides of the conflict, inasmuch as it is their quarrel that underlies it. Indeed, the premise of the first duel is that with Helen and riches parceled out to one side or the other, everyone can go home. At various points, the poem reinforces the impression that the death of either, by removing a major impetus for the conflict, might be enough to end it. With Menelaus dead, the Achaeans would probably just go home: such at any rate is Agamemnon's fear when he confronts the prospect of Menelaus' death by Pandarus' arrow in Book 4 (4.172-82). Other passages make it clear that it is Paris' determination to keep Helen at all costs that prevents the Trojans from coming to peaceful terms with the Achaeans, suggesting that his removal could be enough to end the war.<sup>46</sup> The duel between Paris and Menelaus presents these two visions of the war's end in terms of a formal arrangement.

But Aias and Hector also represent the two sides of the conflict, as each side's best hope for warding off destruction, and this puts a different face on the spectacle created by the epic, corresponding to the issues raised in the conversation of Apollo and Athena. Apollo raises the issue of pity for the Trojans, and then suggests that Hector fight a duel. In Book 6, Hector has just been portrayed for the first time as doomed in his defense of Troy.<sup>47</sup> It is also Book 6 that first makes a point of

---

<sup>45</sup> See Fenik 1968: 213-215 for anticipatory doublets. However, Fenik's distinction between "genuine doublets" on the one hand and "previews of scenes to come" on the other, a distinction he proposes to make based on "similarity of detail" (214), is hard to understand or usefully apply here.

<sup>46</sup> The Trojan *agorē* at 7.345-78, in which Paris refuses to Antenor's suggestion of offering Helen to the Achaeans, is a good example. Cf. Idaius' irrepresible condemnation of Paris as he delivers the message later: κτήματα μὲν ὅς' Ἀλέξανδρος κοίλῃς ἐνὶ νηυσὶν / ἡγάγετο Τροίηνδ' ὥς πρὶν ὤφελ' ἀπολέσθαι / πάντ' ἐθέλει δόμεναι... 7.389-91.

<sup>47</sup> 6.497-502 is the scene of the lament for the still-living man in his own halls.

interweaving Hector's fate and his city's:<sup>48</sup> Astyanax has his name from the Trojan people, as the poet says, because "Hector alone was the protector of Ilium" (οἷος γὰρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἐκτώρ 6.403). Meanwhile, depictions of Andromache enslaved and Astyanax orphaned create a picture of the grievous consequences of the city's destruction in microcosm, in Hector's immediate family. Paris is responsible for the Trojan predicament, but Hector is responsible for Troy.

This development is incorporated into Helenus' account of the gods' wishes for the duel. Helenus' words do not form an exact or even particularly close copy of the words he overheard the gods speaking, and this is odd because more or less precise repetition – with necessary grammatical changes (for a switch between second and third person, for example) – is the poet's normal practice when one character repeats the speech of another.<sup>49</sup> Here are Apollo's words to Athena:

Τὴν δ' αὖτε προσέειπεν ἄναξ Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων·  
 Ἕκτορος ὄρωμεν κρατερὸν μένος ἵπποδάμοιο,  
 ἦν τινά που Δαναῶν προκαλέσσεταί οἱόθεν οἷος  
 ἀντίβιον μαχέσασθαι ἐν αἰνῇ δηϊοτῆτι, 40  
 οἳ δέ κ' ἀγασσάμενοι χαλκοκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ  
 οἷον ἐπόρσειαν πολεμίζειν Ἕκτορι δίῳ. - 7.37-42

And lord Apollo son of Zeus addressed her in turn:  
 'Let us rouse the mighty spirit of Hector tamer of horses,  
 [to see] if he might challenge one of the Danaans, alone and unaided  
 to fight face to face in fierce battle.  
 As for the bronze-greaved Achaeans, let them be provoked  
 into rousing [someone] to stand alone in battle against brilliant Hector.'

Helenus conveys the gods' wish, but uses other words:

Ἕκτορ υἱὲ Πριάμοιο Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντε  
 ἦ ῥά νύ μοί τι πίθοιο, κασίγνητος δέ τοί εἰμι·  
 ἄλλους μὲν κάθισον Τρῶας καὶ πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς,  
 αὐτὸς δὲ προκαλέσσαι Ἀχαιῶν ὅς τις ἄριστος 50  
 ἀντίβιον μαχέσασθαι ἐν αἰνῇ δηϊοτῆτι·

<sup>48</sup> Contrast 5.595-96, 5.703ff, where he is killing alongside that nasty piece of work, Ares. Cf. Redfield 1975/1999: 109 "[Hector's] story does not properly begin until Book 7."

<sup>49</sup> There are also sometimes changes for cleverness and characterization: as in the interjection by Idaius cited above (note 46), or in the embassy scene in Book 9 when Odysseus repeats Agamemnon's offer to Achilles –verbatim, but for the cleverly modified final lines (9.158-61 replaced by 9.300-6).

οὐ γάρ πώ τοι μοῖρα θανεῖν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν·  
ὥς γὰρ ἐγὼ ὅπ' ἄκουσα θεῶν αἰειγενετάων. - 7.47-53

Hector son of Priam, equal to Zeus in wits,  
come now and be persuaded by me in something; for I am your brother.  
The other Trojans and all the Achaeans, seat them down,  
but you, challenge whomever of the Achaeans is *aristos*<sup>50</sup>  
to fight face to face in fierce battle.  
For it is not yet your portion to die and come upon your fate –  
for so I myself heard the voice of the gods of eternal generation  
[speaking].

Only one line is repeated verbatim (40=51), with the corresponding previous lines

also sharing the lemma for “challenge” (προκάλεσσαι and προκαλέσεται).

Particularly striking is Helenus’ statement that it is not yet Hector’s portion (*moira*

7.52) to die – despite the fact that Hector’s *moira* is not mentioned by the gods at all.

Helenus’ claim that he heard the gods speaking “thus” (ὥς 7.53)<sup>51</sup> might not be taken

to apply to the whole statement, but surely must at least include the contents of the

line that directly precedes it. The seer should not be understood to be wrong or lying

here;<sup>52</sup> instead, I suggest that the seer accurately reads both the divine will and the

link between Hector’s fate and Troy’s. The gods say that the fall of Troy will come

later (7.29-32); Helenus correctly understands this to be equivalent to saying that

Hector will not yet die. By making Helenus, with the authority of a seer, “repeat” the

gods’ words in a way that replaces Troy’s fall with Hector’s, the poet makes the

equivalence of Hector’s and Troy’s survival a key part of the duel episode as well.

So much for Hector; what of Aias? The poet has set up a situation in the opening

of Book 7 in which concern for both Trojan and Achaean destruction are at issue

(though it is never in doubt which will actually happen). This will remain a central

<sup>50</sup> Often translated “best,” the word has connotations of nobility as well as prowess; Yamagata 1994: 202-7 gives a useful overview of its uses. Nagy 1979/99: 28-29 shows that the phrase in this passage points to the absence of Achilles, the true “best of the Achaeans.” See further *ibid.* 26-41.

<sup>51</sup> ὥς with a verb of speaking is elsewhere used of speeches reported more or less verbatim: e.g. Agamemnon’s report of the Baneful Dream’s words ends ...ὥς ὁ μὲν εἰπὼν / ὥχεται... (2.70-1).

<sup>52</sup> So I disagree with Dietrich 1965/1967: 200 that Helenus prophesies “falsely” to Hector here.

issue for a large part of the poem to come, as the Achaeans will now go on the defensive in fulfillment of Zeus' promise to Thetis. Though a burning city looms beyond the poem's horizon, it is the image of burning ships, and Achaeans slaughtered beside them, which will be conjured insistently between now and Patroclus' entry into battle in Book 16.<sup>53</sup> Aias is the perfect choice<sup>54</sup> to represent the Achaean side in this altered situation. The offensive champion, Diomedes, may have a good claim to be "the best (*aristos*) of the Achaeans" (Ἀχαιῶν ὃς τις ἄριστος 7.50) after Achilles: he has so dominated the Achaean offensive in Books 5-6 that Helenus himself said that Diomedes is more fearsome than Achilles.<sup>55</sup> In fact, Diomedes actually gets the best of Aias in their (friendly) duel in Book 23.<sup>56</sup> But Diomedes would not embody the Achaean side in terms of the issues raised by the gods' conversation. The poet's choice of Aias signals a shift from the period of Achaean victory to a period of defensive fighting in which Aias will emerge as the crucial figure: the Achaeans' bulwark against destruction, who is never wounded himself,<sup>57</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Morrison 1994: 209-27 documents this phenomenon extensively, and argues persuasively that this creates an inversion by which the experience of being in a city under siege is represented from the point of view of the Achaeans rather than the Trojans. Morrison sees the turning point in the Achaeans' fortunes as beginning with Book 8, and thus says of the building of the Achaean wall in Book 7 – which will allow for the language and imagery of a city under siege to be used of the Achaean camp – that it is "unmotivated at this point" (212). I agree with Morrison's interpretation of the wall's function, but do not agree that it is unmotivated at the time of construction: the rush of Paris and Hector into battle in the opening of Book 7 is where the shift to the period of Achaeans on the defensive first begins – and this is also reflected in the poet's choice of Aias rather than Diomedes as the champion who stands against Hector. See further Porter forthcoming on the purpose of the Achaean wall.

<sup>54</sup> The motif of selection by lot emphasizes (if more emphasis were needed) that Hector's opponent will be chosen by the powers that be (i.e. the poet).

<sup>55</sup> ὃν [i.e. Diomedes] δὴ ἐγὼ κάρτιστον Ἀχαιῶν φημι γενέσθαι. / οὐδ' Ἀχιλλῆά ποθ' ὦδέ γ' ἐδείδιμεν ὄρχαμον ἀνδρῶν, / ὃν πέρ φασι θεὰς ἐξέμμεναι· ἀλλ' ὅδε λίην / μαίνεται, οὐδέ τις οἱ δύναται μένος ἰσοφαρίζειν. 6.98-101 Hector's mission to solicit divine aid is explicitly meant to procure against Diomedes: 6.275-78; 6.306-7. See Nagy 1979-99: 26-41 on the claims of Diomedes and others to be *aristos*.

<sup>56</sup> 23.798-825.

<sup>57</sup> Though Diomedes in the funeral games keeps touching his neck with a spear: Τυδείδης δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα ὑπὲρ σάκεος μέγαλοιο / αἰὲν ἐπ' ἀυχένι κῦρε φαεινοῦ δουρὸς ἀκωκῇ 23.820-21.

and stands valiantly – and in vain – trying to keep off the fire from the ships.<sup>58</sup> The second duel is a staged version of the epic conflict as sketched by Apollo and Athena at the time of their conversation and as it will be for some time to come: Achaeans and Trojans both in their own ways in need of succor.

Whereas the first duel casts the conflict as a morality tale, with revenge or punishment following transgression, the second reflects realities on the ground: the loss of Paris or Menelaus could end the conflict by removing the reason for fighting, but the loss of either Hector or Aias could end it by removing the ability to resist enemy attack. The shift between these two perspectives on the epic struggle – the shift from the first duel to the second – is itself made visible by subtle early suggestions in Book 7 that it could again be Paris and Menelaus who will represent their sides in the war. Just before the first duel Paris is fighting out in front, challenging all the best of the Achaeans (3.16); now in Book 7, just before the second duel, he is again a *promachos* – in fact, he kills a man first, before Hector (7.7-10).<sup>59</sup> Then, just as Menelaus came forth in Book 3 to accept Paris’ challenge for the first duel (3.19), it is Menelaus who first accepts Hector’s challenge for the second duel, before he can be convinced that his prowess is insufficient for the task (7.92-122) – a reminder that in a sense this is Menelaus’ fight, and that this was how the previous duel staged the conflict. Thus, Paris and Menelaus each appear briefly, in such a way as to recall their prior roles, before being visibly shuffled out of the deck in favor of each side’s greatest defenders.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>58</sup> 15. 727-46; 16.102-124. For Aias’ role as great defender, see for example Trapp 1961: 275.

<sup>59</sup> The poet shows attentiveness to the order of slayings in descriptions of combat, as for example at the beginning of the *aristeia* of Agamemnon: “Tell me now you Muses who have homes on Olympus, who indeed was first to come against Agamemnon....?” (“Εσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχουσαι / ὅς τις δὴ πρῶτος Ἀγαμέμνονος ἀντίον ἦλθεν 11.218-19).

<sup>60</sup> Paris’ opening onslaught, which has troubled many commentators, has not been otherwise explained. Duban 1981: 102 n.10 says the fact that Paris kills an enemy at all prior to the second duel appears

## Stakes

A common complaint about the second duel is that it does not specify stakes, but this is not quite true, as a comparison of the speeches that introduce the two duels can show. In Book 3, Agamemnon begins by invoking Zeus, Helios and other oath-guarding gods to bear witness (μάρτυροι ἔστε 3.276-80). He then continues:

εἰ μὲν κεν Μενέλαον Ἀλέξανδρος καταπέφνη  
αὐτὸς ἔπειθ' Ἑλένην ἐχέτω καὶ κτήματα πάντα,  
ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν νήεσσι νεώμεθα ποντοπόροισιν·  
εἰ δέ κ' Ἀλέξανδρον κτείνει ξανθὸς Μενέλαος,  
Τρῶας ἔπειθ' Ἑλένην καὶ κτήματα πάντ' ἀποδοῦναι, 285  
τιμὴν δ' Ἀργείοις ἀποτινέμεν ἢν τιν' ἔοικεν,  
ἢ τε καὶ ἐσσομένοισι μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέληται.  
εἰ δ' ἂν ἐμοὶ τιμὴν Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες  
τίνειν οὐκ ἐθέλωσιν Ἀλεξάνδροιο πεσόντος,  
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα μαχήσομαι εἵνεκα ποινῆς 290  
αὖθι μένων, ἧός κε **τέλος πολέμοιο** κιχέω.<sup>61</sup>  
-- 3.281-91

If, on the one hand, Paris kills Menelaus,  
then let him have Helen and all the wealth,  
and let us go home in our sea-crossing vessels.  
But if yellow-haired Menelaus kills Paris,  
then must the Trojans give back Helen and all the wealth,  
and pay back a penalty to the Argives, one which is fitting,  
and which will be also among future generations.  
But if Priam and the children of Priam are not willing  
to pay me the penalty, with Paris having fallen,  
then I will fight for the penalty,  
and keep on until I come to the war's finish.

This speech lays out the stakes for which the duel is to be fought, namely Helen and possessions. Since the war is to end with the duel, the implication is that these are the stakes of, and the motivation for, the war as well. This formulation is versatile in a

---

“peu motivé” – and, in a telling slip, places Hector *before* Paris in his listing of the killings (*ibid.* 102). M. Edwards points out that Paris’ preeminence prior to both of the two duels constitutes a parallel between them, but without explaining or interpreting the parallel (this in a personal communication to Duban cited in *ibid.* 102 n.10).

<sup>61</sup> Agamemnon goes on to add a third possibility, in which the Trojans refuse to pay his extra monetary penalty in which case he vows to go on to sack Troy “on account of the penalty” εἵνεκα ποινῆς 3.290 (not any more on account of Helen or her riches – cf Iris’s “about you [Helen]” περὶ σεῖο 3.137). The Trojans, for their part, had set up the duel without reference to such a penalty: ...οἷους ἀμφ’ Ἑλένη καὶ κτήμασι πᾶσι μάχεσθαι. / ὁππότερος δέ κε νικήσῃ κρείσσων τε γένηται / κτήμαθ’ ἐλὼν εὖ πάντα γυναικὰ τε οἴκαδ’ ἀγέσθω 3.91-93 (Hector announcing Paris’s offer to all.)

sense: it encompasses both the view that Helen is at the heart of the war (recalling the common vows taken by her suitors) on the one hand, and an economic view of the war as an attempt to recover stolen resources – or perhaps a glorified act of piracy – on the other. Agamemnon’s conclusion is very much in character for him, with demand and threat uttered in the same breath: there is an extra monetary penalty for the Trojans if Paris loses, and if they refuse to pay he vows to go on to sack Troy “on account of the penalty” (εἵνεκα ποινῆς 3.290). But these concluding words of Agamemnon’s also suggest an overarching narrative for the story of Ilium: the Trojans will pay the penalty for what they have done. This is not just Agamemnon’s idea: the whole structure of the duel, with Paris the transgressor pitted against Menelaus the aggrieved, conveys just such a picture.

Hector’s speech follows the same format, but specifies different concerns than Helen, riches and penalties:

ὦδε δὲ μυθέομαι, Ζεὺς δ’ ἄμμ’ ἐπιμάρτυρος ἔστω·  
 εἰ μὲν κεν ἐμὲ κεῖνος ἔλη ταναήκεϊ χαλκῷ,  
 τεύχεα συλήσας φερέτω κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας,  
 σῶμα δὲ οἴκαδ’ ἐμὸν δόμεναι πάλιν, ὄφρα πυρός με  
 Τρῶες καὶ Τρώων ἄλοχοι λελάχωσι θανόντα. 80  
 εἰ δέ κ’ ἐγὼ τὸν ἔλω, δῶη δέ μοι εὖχος Ἀπόλλων,  
 τεύχεα σύλησας οἴσω προτὶ Ἴλιον ἱρήν,  
 καὶ κρεμῶω προτὶ νηὸν Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκάτοιο,  
 τὸν δὲ νέκυν ἐπὶ νῆας εὖσσέλμους ἀποδώσω,  
 ὄφρα ἔ ταρχύσωσι κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί, 85  
 σῆμά τέ οἱ χεύωσιν ἐπὶ πλατεῖ Ἑλλησπόντῳ.  
 καὶ ποτέ τις εἴπησι καὶ ὀπιγόνων ἀνθρώπων  
 νηὶ πολυκλήϊδι πλέων ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον·  
 ἀνδρὸς μὲν τόδε σῆμα πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος,  
 ὃν ποτ’ ἀριστεύοντα κατέκτανε φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ. 90  
 ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει· τὸ δ’ ἐμὸν κλέος οὐ ποτ’ ὀλεῖται.  
 - 7.76-91

But thus do I speak, and let Zeus be the witness for us:  
 if on the one hand that man takes me with his sharp-edged bronze,  
 let him strip my arms and bear them to the hollow ships,  
 and let him return my body home again, so that  
 the Trojans and the Trojans’ wives may make me a pyre when I have died.  
 But if I take him, and Apollo grants me the right of boasting,  
 I will strip his arms and bear them toward holy Ilium,



and I will hand them before the temple of Apollo far-shooter,  
 and as for him, I will give back his dead body, to go to the well-benched ships,  
 so that the long-haired Achaeans may give him funeral rites,  
 and heap up a grave-mound for him on the wide Hellespont.  
 And someday even people born in later times will say,  
 as they travel in ships of many oar-locks on the wine-dark sea:  
 “This is the grave-mound of a man who died long ago,  
 whom shining Hector once slew, even as he fought at his best.”  
 Thus will they say some day – and my *kleos* will never perish.

The structural parallels are clear. Hector’s speech begins with an invocation of Zeus as witness of oaths. He then gives an account of what will happen in the case of victory for either side, starting with the less favored scenario (his own death), just as did Agamemnon. The symmetry of these lines recalls that of Agamemnon’s statement of terms: εἰ μὲν κεν... καταπέφνη (3.281) mirrored by εἰ μὲν κεν... ἔλῃ (7.76), and εἰ δέ κ’... κτείνῃ (3.284) matching εἰ δέ κ’... ἔλω (7.81). As did Agamemnon, Hector then goes beyond the symmetry to add a personal vision of the future very much in keeping with his own character: he allows his mind to wander into an elaborate fantasy (cf. 22.98-130, his fantasy of intimacy with Achilles) centered on his personal reputation (cf. 6.440-65, where the sad thought of Andromache enslaved climaxes with someone saying “and that was the wife of Hector!”).<sup>62</sup>

In both speeches, the poet indicates awareness of all the duels’ audiences: the Achaeans and Trojans whom Agamemnon and Hector actually address; the gods whose presence is acknowledged through the initial invocations; and the extradiegetic audience lurking behind the ὀψίγονοι ἄνθρωποι whom Hector envisions looking at his opponent’s grave-mound, and the ἐσσόμενοι ἄνθρωποι mentioned by Agamemnon.<sup>63</sup> This reference to future audiences of epic not only recalls the role of

<sup>62</sup> For Hector’s tendency to “drift briefly into dreams of the *kleos* he will get in the future” see Mackie 1996: 98-99. Duban 1981 is also good on Hector’s language here and for the duel of Book 22.

<sup>63</sup> τιμὴν ... ἣ τε καὶ ἐσσομένοισι μετ’ ἀνθρώποισι πέληται 3.286-7. Thus, while concern with future generations is characteristic of Hector it is also characteristic of the spectacular duels, appearing as it does in the first duel which does not feature Hector. In the case of the first duel Menelaus, too, thinks

the extradiegetic audience, who is in fact hearing such an epic, but locates that audience in a community of previous and future epic audiences hearing about these same deeds; after all, it is through successions of reperformance that those deeds are preserved. In summary, Hector's speech, parallel in structure and position to Agamemnon's, also plays a parallel role in articulating the vision of epic as spectacle to be staged in the coming duel. But instead of Helen and riches, Hector's speech asks its audiences to witness a struggle fought for *kleos* (7.91). The term as used here suggests the tradition of epic poetry which will preserve and glorify Hector.

Hector's speech offers no narrative of the Trojan war, but instead takes the war as a given. This is not only a reflection of Hector's position as brother of the adulterer Paris, but also an important viable alternative view of the conflict: as is widely recognized, the society depicted in the Homeric poems is based on war. Sarpedon's speech to Glaucus in Book 12 is often pointed to as an account of how "Homeric" society is structured:<sup>64</sup>

Γλαῦκε τί ἦ δὴ νῶϊ **τετιμήμεσθα** μάλιστα                      310  
 ἔδρη τε κρέασιν τε ἰδὲ πλείοις δεπάεσσιν  
 ἐν Λυκίῃ, πάντες δὲ θεοὺς ὥς εἰσορώσι...;  
 ...  
 τῷ νῦν χρή Λυκίοισι μέτα πρώτοισιν ἐόντας                      315  
 ἐστάμεν ἡδὲ μάχης καυστήρης ἀντιβολῆσαι,  
 ὄφρα τις ᾧδ' εἴπη Λυκίων πύκα θωρηκτάων·  
**οὐ μὰν ἀκλέες** Λυκίην κάτα κοιρανέουσιν  
 ἡμέτεροι βασιλῆες....                      -- 12.310-12, 315-19

Glaucus, why indeed are we two honored most  
 in our place at table, in meats and full goblets  
 in Lycia, and everyone looks on us as though we were gods?....

---

of the extradiegetic audience, as he prays to Zeus to make of the conflict a morality tale for those who hear it told in the future: Menelaus asks Zeus to allow him to punish (τίσασθαι 3.351) Paris who transgressed first (ὁ με πρότερος κάκ' ἔοργε 3.351) "in order that those of the future (ὁψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων) might fear / to work evil against their host, the one who offers hospitality" (ὄφρα τις ἐρρίγησι καὶ ὁψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων / ξεινοδόκον κακὰ ῥέξαι, ὃ κεν φιλότητα παράσχη 3.353-54.)

<sup>64</sup> On the warrior's role in the society depicted in the poems, see Raaflaub 1997: esp 633-36. Pucci 1996: 49-68 rightly draws attention to pointed ambiguities in this speech's construction of the role of the "kings" (βασιλῆες 12.319.)

....Therefore, now we must go among the first Lycians in the ranks  
and stand, and confront the blazing battle,  
so that the close-armored Lycians may speak thus:  
'No, not without *kleos* do our kings rule  
over Lycia....'

The Homeric warrior's willingness to risk his life in battle for his people, and thus to receive honor (*timē* 310) and glory (*kleos* 318), is the basis for his position in society: and a society without warriors is not liable to last very long. It is this view of war as a fundamental fact of life and the source of the leaders' social position and identity which informs Hector's speech. The *Iliad* presents the warriors at Troy as fighting not just for Helen and her riches, but also for honor, and for the glory entailed in their inclusion in the poem's performance. The second duel provides a necessary corrective to the overly simplistic morality tale delineated in the first duel. Here, the war is its own narrative.

### View from Within

The second duel provides a representation of the war from within, as seen by those in the thick of it. This difference emerges in the attitude of the observers. In the first duel, in Book 3, the Achaeans and Trojans are characterized by a unified response: it is their status as spectators, more than representatives of opposite sides in the conflict, that determines their point of view. The moment that first duel is declared, they become the joint subject of a series of verbs: rejoicing at the decision, drawing up their horses, dismounting, and disarming (3.111-14). This shared response continues during the duel itself: at 3.342-43 they are together awestruck at the sight of the combatants.<sup>65</sup> Even at the fight's conclusion, the Trojans display antipathy to Paris,

<sup>65</sup> ... θάμβος δ' ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας / Τρῳάς θ' ἵπποδάμους καὶ εὐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοῦς. 3.342-3. Kirk 1978: 36, contrasts 20.159-60 and 23.814-15, highlighting how in 3.341-3 the poet emphasizes the viewers.

whom they “all” hate like “black death”<sup>66</sup> – with reason, since it is black death that he brings them – rather than disappointment at their side’s loss in the duel. This shared perspective is striking because for most of the poem the Achaean and Trojan forces present opposite perspectives on events that occur, since their interests are opposite: victory for one is defeat for the other. A victory for Menelaus would mean, according to the terms of the first duel, empty coffers and Trojan dishonor. For the Trojan and Achaean warriors however, shared freedom from the danger of war has overridden their partisan positions in the conflict.<sup>67</sup>

In the second duel, by contrast, the armies’ status as spectators removed from the combat does not play the crucial role in forming their response as it did in the previous duel. Now, they greet the appearance of Aias with opposite reactions: the Achaeans are gladdened (ἐγήθεον 7.214), while the Trojans feel fear:

τὸν δὲ καὶ Ἀργεῖοι μὲν ἐγήθεον εἰσορόωντες,  
Τρῶας δὲ τρόμος αἰνὸς ὑπήλυθε γυῖα ἕκαστον. – 7.214-15

And the Argives were gladdened as they gazed upon [Aias],  
but as for the Trojans, terrible fear came into the limbs of each.

Hector the combatant in the ring shares the response of the watching Trojans:

Ἕκτορί τ’ αὐτῷ θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι πάτασεν·  
ἀλλ’ οὐ πῶς ἔτι εἶχεν ὑποτρέσαι οὐδ’ ἀναδύναι  
ἄψ λαῶν ἐς ὄμιλον, ἐπεὶ προκαλέσσατο χάρμη. – 7.216-18

And the heart of Hector himself beat fast in his breast,  
but he was no longer able to shrink back or withdraw  
again into the crowd of his people, since he had issued a fighting  
challenge.

Hector is like the Trojans – except he cannot retreat into their ranks. In contrast to the first duel, the mortal spectators are reacting according to their partisan positions,

<sup>66</sup> ἴσον γάρ σφιν πᾶσιν ἀπήχθετο κηρὶ μελαίνῃ 3.454.

<sup>67</sup> Redfield 1978/1994: 99 notes that “combat generates a tight-knit community” that “consists, in effect, of those who are ready to die for one another; the perimeter of each community is a potential battlefield.” The first duel seems to temporarily redraw the lines of these communities: the distinction of spectator vs. actor overcomes the distinction of Trojan vs. Achaean.

rather than their shared status as spectators. It is easy to see why that is so: as spectators for the first duel they considered themselves outside the war and free of danger, whereas now their perspective is no different than it is for any of the single *promachos* combats that take place around them while they fight. As spectators they may not intervene, but their own lives are still at stake, for the loss of either hero would put all his allies at greater risk. Unlike in the first duel, that grim prospect is seen not by those believing themselves beyond the threat of war's deadliness, but by those caught up within it.<sup>68</sup>

The divine audience is perfectly positioned so as to reflect this shift in perspective: perched on the tree, they watch not from Olympus but within the theater of war. Their spatial proximity is directly connected to their engagement with the story: they are there because they were moved to take a leap. As an internal audience, they represent views strong enough to bring a listener into the story, Athena's ambiguous negative reaction to Trojan victory and Apollo's sense that one should pity the Trojans. Their partisanship does not vanish during the duel: Apollo helps Hector rise after he is struck by a boulder (7.272). Yet the poet's description of the gods' attitude as an audience again emphasizes unity: their viewing of the warriors produces a single and shared response, namely pleasure (*terpomenoi*). They do not glower at the sight of one army and smile benignly upon the other. In marked contrast to Achaeans and Trojans, they even sit together. Their proximity and shared experience of pleasure suggest that their contrasting reactions to the war are subsumed under the poem's power to entertain, and that their conflicting views may be present within a single audience or even within a single person. By representing Apollo and Athena as an internal audience in this way, the poet claims for the *Iliad* the ability to involve a

---

<sup>68</sup> This fits well with the narrative of punishment for transgression inherent in this duel's perspective on the war: given the narrative, every audience can get behind it, with the exception of those who love Paris, namely Priam (3.304-9) and Aphrodite (3.399-409).

variety of listeners, with conflicting interests and attitudes, in the communal experience of pleasure in listening – and viewing.

### **Second Duel Looks to First and Third**

As the second duel looks back toward the first, thereby presenting itself as a development of the themes there treated, so too it looks ahead to the epic's final commentary on itself as a spectacle, the confrontation between Achilles and Hector in Book 22. As the poet toys with Paris and Menelaus as combatants before moving on to Hector and Aias, he also directs his listeners' attention to Achilles in the distance: just before the fight begins, Aias remarks to Hector that Achilles is really the Achaeans' greatest champion, though presently indisposed (7.228-30). Other parallels abound, and in each case the situation in Book 7 looks ahead to its reversal in Book 22: the terms of the duel in 7 are to honor the corpse of the loser, starkly contrasted with Achilles' refusal to accept similar terms with Hector in 22 (22.254-72). In 7 Apollo raises up Hector when he is wounded; but he will suddenly abandon him in 22 (22.213). The contest in 7 presents a proper limit to strife – the night to which it is good that combatants should yield (7.282 = 293) – while it is the lack of proper limits that characterizes Achilles' behavior in 22.

In fact, the second duel's strange ending – it is called off by the heralds as Hector seems in danger of losing, and then friendship between Hector and Aias is sealed by gift exchange – can partly be explained by its function as an anticipation of the confrontation of Hector and Achilles: it dangles a few very particular loose threads, each of which is recalled and tied up in 22. Helenus' remark that Hector is not yet fated to die in 7 is recalled and reversed by the sinking of Hector's "fated day" (αἴσιμον ἥμαρ) on Zeus' golden scales (22.209-13). The friendship (φιλότιτι 7.302)

in which Hector and Aias will part, while Hector has been wounded and seems in danger of losing, is recalled and reversed by Hector's desperate, hopeless fantasy of intimacy between himself and Achilles<sup>69</sup> and Achilles' disavowal of the possibility of friendliness (φιλήμεναι 22.265) between them.

What makes these links between 3, 7, and 22 solid and memorable is the reduction of the grand conflict to a single fight, a spectacle with the whole world watching, in three progressive installments, like a triptych that offers three views on the conflict at Troy. Apollo acknowledges the finality of the decision made in Book 4, that Troy will indeed fall, for "so did it please the heart of you goddesses – that this city should be destroyed" (7.31-32). But now voice has been given to a part of the divine audience which does not respond as Hera and Athena. With the combat concluded, and Hector back safe for now with his people, the gods' reactions to the second duel are left to the imagination. The extradiegetic audience is left to ponder in the space that the gods have defined by their questions and their subsequent staging of the duel, and to look ahead to the final confrontation that it foreshadows.

---

<sup>69</sup> 22.111-30. See further Chapter 5.

## CHAPTER 5

### Duel and Athletics in the Death of Hector

The confrontation between Hector and Achilles in Book 22 is a spectacle of particular intensity. With the Trojans watching from the walls, Achaeans in the field, and the gods looking down from Olympus, two lone figures contend for the survival of Troy, which will not be able to stand after the loss of its greatest defender. In this chapter I will try to show that this scene creates a third *mise en abyme* of the epic experienced as live viewing, wherein the role and attitude of the extradiegetic listener is a central concern, and is provocatively modeled within the text by the gods on Olympus. The poet initially toys with two ways of construing the spectacle, namely the formal duel and the athletic competition. These two paradigms vie quietly, both on offer, until the contrasts between them are brought to the foreground in the famous lines comparing Achilles and Hector first to runners in a foot-race (22.157-61), then to race-horses (22.162-66), whereupon an abrupt cut to the watching gods confronts the extradiegetic audience with a reflection of their own parallel activity of “viewing:” “and all the gods looked on” (θεοὶ δ’ ἐς πάντες ὁρῶντο 22.166). I will show that in this passage, and the conversation on Olympus that follows, the poet presents his listeners with a fractured perspective, with multiple configurations of possible response – including casual enjoyment versus intense engagement – and provokes them to feel compassion for Hector while joining in his ritual slaughter. The final section of the chapter follows the evolving significance of the image of Troy being circled as it is reprised in the funeral rites for Patroclus.

In contrast to the two contests analyzed in Chapters 3 and 4, in Book 22 no duel is formally declared. Instead, the scene is constructed by the combination of elements



from three kinds of type scene:<sup>1</sup> the combat between warriors in the front ranks (*promachoi*), the formal duel, and the athletic competition. I begin with a few general observations about the relationship between these traditional scenes and note significant differences, before showing how the poet combines the three types to construct in measured steps a spectacle grander and of greater import than those that have gone before, with richly ambiguous implications for the role of the extradiegetic “viewer.”

Confrontations between warriors in the front ranks (*promachoi*) form part of the regular depiction of mass combat in the *Iliad*, and have been analyzed in depth under the somewhat misleading rubric “duel.”<sup>2</sup> As Van Wees notes, it is often the case for these encounters that “ ‘hit-and-run attack’ is a more appropriate label than ‘duel.’ ” In the briefest cases, which are plentiful, a warrior simply leaps out of the ranks and hurls a spear at one of the *promachoi*, retreating thereafter to the safety of his comrades.<sup>3</sup> The term “duel” becomes more appropriate when this type scene nudges closer to its cousin, the formal duel: i.e. in its expanded form, where it shares with the formal duels not only formulaic language but also motifs such as flyting and the

---

<sup>1</sup> Edwards 1992 has a useful general bibliography on “type” or “typical” scenes. On the creation of song through recombination of traditional elements, see especially Lord 1960. Lord considered a “type scene” and “theme” to be essentially the same thing: that is, “a recurrent element of narration or description in traditional oral poetry” (Lord 1951: 73). Attempts at more precise definition than that are probably not helpful for the present study. Edwards 1992 for example differentiates “amplified [i.e. expanded] type scenes” from traditional “themes” in narratological terms: “themes” are the building blocks that make up the “story” (the events of the plot), whereas “type scenes” are not part of the “story” as such but rather part of the “discourse,” i.e. the narrator’s representation of the story (Edwards 1992: 2). But it is not clear how such a distinction could be applied for instance to the duel in Book 3. The duel is part of the story, but also the narrator’s representation of the story, as it looks both to the beginning of the war and to the beginning of the poet’s depiction of the war. My aim here is simply to investigate what resonance and associations the use of any given traditional material is likely to convey.

<sup>2</sup> Latacz 1977 esp. 77-78, Thornton 1984: 93-100, Van Wees 1987: 676-80, 687-89 with further bibliography; M. Edwards 1992 esp. 17 also has extensive bibliography. I follow Van Wees in referring to instances of this motif as encounters between *promachoi* rather than as ‘duels.’ Fenik’s 1968 classic analyzes in depth the components of combat descriptions in general, looking at the use of formulaic language and common sequences of action. It does not consider the books containing the three spectacular duels (but rather analyzes only Books 5, 11, 13, 17, 16 and 8).

<sup>3</sup> Van Wees 1997: 688, citing 13.642-49 as an example.

exchange of blows.<sup>4</sup> As noted in Chapter 4, the meeting of Hector and Aias in the front ranks of battle in Book 14 (14.402-439) is strikingly similar to their formal duel in Book 7. Nevertheless, there are certain defining differences between the two kinds of scene, to which I now turn.

The formal duel appears in Books 3 and 7 (discussed in Chapters 3 and 4) and also in Nestor's account of his own duel with Eurythalion in the war between the Pylians and the Arcadians.<sup>5</sup> Its distinguishing features can be gathered from those examples: the duel entails a fight between champions during a truce on the battlefield, and is marked by the shift of the armies from active fighting to passivity, the creation of a marked off space separating action from viewers, the mutual oaths which put the contest on formal terms, and the intensified focus of viewer attention on the kernel of action.<sup>6</sup> As the duel exists within the context of a war and is witnessed by those involved in the war, the duel paradigm of viewership implies partisanship for one side or the other –<sup>7</sup> as Trojans and Achaeans watch the *Iliad*'s formal duels, the Pylians

---

<sup>4</sup> Kirk 1978; Duban 1981.

<sup>5</sup> 7.132-158. The fact that Eurythalion “was challenging all the *aristoi*” (7.150) does not in and of itself ensure that the reference is to a formal duel rather than *promachoi* combat, since that same phrase is used of Paris' challenge in the front ranks of battle (3.19) *before* he puts the challenge that leads to a formal duel. Nevertheless, the fact that Nestor uses the story as a paradigm for the present situation, as all are “trembling and fearing greatly” (7.151) so that none dare accept until Nestor steps in to save the day, suggests that the passage be read as a description of another formal duel on the battlefield, fought in prior generations. This implies the traditionality of the duel motif in epic, as do the many structural parallels between the two in Books 3 and 7, for which see Kirk 1978 esp 18 and 40, and Duban 1981. Whether the sophisticated technique of *mise en abyme* that I argue is found in the *Iliad* is a traditional feature of the formal duel in epic is unknowable, but I am tempted to suppose, as is often argued for cases in which the *Iliad* apparently reflects on its own meaning, that it is a feature setting the *Iliad* apart from the tradition.

<sup>6</sup> See Chapters 3 and 4. A good illustration of the key differences is obtained by juxtaposing 1) Paris' first challenge to the Achaean warriors as a fighter in the front ranks and Menelaus' acceptance of the challenge (3.15-29) with 2) the formal duel that follows Paris' retreat and Hector's rebuke, and occupies the rest of Book 3: places are taken; oaths made; eyes turned to the actors.

<sup>7</sup> The duel between Paris and Menelaus is exceptional in that the Trojan warriors appear quite happy to see their own “side” lose, and the poet makes much of this situation; see Chapter 4.

and Arcadians would presumably be witnessing Nestor's duel with Eurythalion on the battlefield.<sup>8</sup>

The athletic contest is clearly traditional epic material as well; aside from the funeral games for Patroclus in Book 23, there are the (non-funeral) games contested by Tydeus (4.385-90), and two instances of games in past times being discussed by characters during the games for Patroclus (23.629-45, 23.678-80).<sup>9</sup> In addition to these, and fundamental for this chapter, are the similes and 'reverse simile' (see below) that evoke chariot-races and foot races at 22.21-24 and 22.157-66. Athletic games are fundamentally displays of martial skills and prowess and hence closely related to the fight between *promachoi* as well as the formal duel: contestants vie in strength, speed, horsemanship, skill with the javelin and bow, and outright fighting with fists or with weapons.<sup>10</sup> This last event, which could be called simply the armed combat, is exemplified in the funeral games for Patroclus when Aias and Diomedes arm and face each other in a public contest to be decided by the first drawing of blood from the "innards" (23.798-825).<sup>11</sup> This event in particular closely resembles the formal duel on the battlefield. A comparison between parallel passages in the formal duel in Book 3 and the armed combat in the games in Book 23 highlights the shared

---

<sup>8</sup> Eurythalion's challenge, certainly, has cowed the Pylians into passivity – it seems that they are paying attention.... [Eurythalion] προκαλίζετο πάντας ἀρίστους / οἳ δὲ [i.e. the Pylians] μάλ' ἐτρόμεον καὶ ἐδείδιον, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη / ἀλλ' ἐμὲ [i.e. Nestor] θυμὸς ἀνῆκε.... 7.151-53.

<sup>9</sup> Richardson *IC*: 23.262-897 conveniently gathers these, together with passages involving games in the *Odyssey*: aside from the Phaeacians' games that feature prominently in Book 8, two others are mentioned at *Od.* 8.100-103 and *Od.* 24.85-92 (the latter are funeral games for Achilles). In addition to these Richardson mentions the Myrmidons in Book 2. However, it is not clear to me whether they are in fact participating in athletic contests or simply entertaining themselves by practicing for future contests (and of course battles) in an informal fashion: λαοὶ δὲ παρὰ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης / δίσκοισιν τέρποντο καὶ αἰγανέησιν ἰέντες / τόξοισιν θ' 2.773-75. The word *terpomai* (τέρποντο 2.774), not elsewhere used of those competing in athletic games, indicates perhaps the latter.

<sup>10</sup> These are featured at the funeral games for Patroclus (23.262-897); most appear elsewhere in Homer as well. See further Richardson *IC ad loc.*

<sup>11</sup> The victor will be "whoever reaches the innards, through the armor and the black blood" (ψαύσῃ δ' ἐνδίνων διὰ τ' ἔντεα καὶ μέλαν αἷμα 23.806.)

formulaic language and similarities between the two types of spectacle, as well as one of the key differences. The enemies Paris and Menelaus meet in a formal duel:

Οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐκάτερθεν ὀμίλου θωρήχθησαν,  
 ἐς μέσσον Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἐστιχόωντο  
 δεινὸν δερκόμενοι· θάμβος δ' ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας  
 Τρῳάς θ' ἵπποδάμους καὶ εὐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς. - 3.340-43

But when they had then armed on either side of the crowd,  
 they marched into the middle of the Trojans and Achaeans  
 glancing fiercely – and wonder held them looking on,  
 the horse-taming Trojans and well-greaved Achaeans.

The same moment in the contest between Diomedes and Aias in the funeral games is described in nearly equivalent lines:

οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐκάτερθεν ὀμίλου θωρήχθησαν,  
 ἐς μέσον ἀμφοτέρω συνίτην μεμαῶτε μάχεσθαι  
 δεινὸν δερκομένω·<sup>12</sup> θάμβος δ' ἔχε πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς. – 23.813-15

And when they had then armed on either side of the crowd  
 they both went together into the middle, eager to fight,  
 glancing fiercely – and wonder held all the Achaeans.

Both events are presented as spectacles, with wonder (θάμβος 3.343, 23.815) holding the onlookers. However, the formal duel is contested between enemies, with the two mutually hostile bodies of Achaeans *and* Trojans watching (ἐς μέσσον Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν 3.341, Τρῳάς... καὶ... Ἀχαιοὺς 3.343), while the athletic games are contested between and witnessed by allies (πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς, 23.815).<sup>13</sup> Thus, whereas viewers of a duel are divided according to their partisan positions in the war, the audience for an athletic competition is part of a united body (whatever their

<sup>12</sup> The dual δερκομένω (23.815) is used rather than the plural δερκόμενοι (3.342). The choice (whether of the composer or of early copiers, for whom the visual difference between omega and omicron iota is not likely to have been great) appears to be based simply on the inclination to follow the example set by the preceding grammatical construction in each case: the dual form in 23 (23.815) follows the dual ἀμφοτέρω (23.814) (itself apparently a modification of the formulaic ἐς μέσον ἀμφοτέρων (6.120) in the meeting of Diomedes and Glaucus on the battlefield) while the plural form in 3 (3.342) follows the formulaic θωρήχθησαν (3.340 = 23.813).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. comments of Kirk 1978: 36.

various interpersonal relationships) which also includes the contestants.<sup>14</sup> This common identity and common sense of purpose is particularly true for funeral games, in which spectators and contestants are joined in honoring the dead. The athletic competition is overseen by an arbiter who keeps order and to whom the audience and contestants may appeal;<sup>15</sup> no such safety exists for formal duels. A final key difference is that of stakes: both are fought for prizes of honor, but athletic contests are normally non-fatal whereas the formal duel on the battlefield is conceived as a fight to the death.<sup>16</sup>

The confrontation between Hector and Achilles is atypical.<sup>17</sup> Hector's meeting with Achilles in Book 22 is arranged on no formal terms, either as duel or as games. In this much it is a fight between *promachoi*: indeed, it is the climax of the series of deaths of Sarpedon, Patroclus, and Hector, the first two of whom fall in the front lines of combat, in extended versions of the *promachoi* combat scene.<sup>18</sup> The warfare has not stopped: when Hector praises the false Deiphobus – Athena in disguise – for coming to his aid (22.232-37), his words also draw attention to the fact that the

---

<sup>14</sup> Tydeus competes with the Thebans who will soon be his enemies (4.385-90), but at the time of the competition he is a guest (ξείνός 4.387). Viewership at such an event might be characterized by something in between the shared purpose of the games and the partisan structure of the formal duel on the battlefield. It is notable that Tydeus' victory in the games both leads to his conflict with the Thebans in battle and prefigures his victory there (4.391-98).

<sup>15</sup> Achilles is that arbiter for the funeral games in Book 23: he sets the prizes for all events; he accounts for the caprice of the gods, misfortune, and cheating in the chariot race by considering irregularities and awarding extra prizes accordingly (23.514ff). Through him, the Achaeans as a body have a say as well: "let *us* give (δῶμεν) second prize to [Menelaus], as is fitting" (23.537-38) says Achilles, and the Achaean crowd voices approval (οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπήνεον 23.540). The unified Achaean audience is also able to call off the armed combat between Aias and Diomedes by their "urging" (...Αἴαντι περιδείσαντες Ἀχαιοὶ / παυσαμένους ἐκέλευσαν ἀέθλια 23.822-23); cf. Zervou 2007 52.

<sup>16</sup> While the formal duel between Hector and Aias in Book 7 ends in friendship and exchange of gifts, and Helenus assures Hector in advance that he at least will not die (7.52-53), it is intended as a battle to death, as Hector's proposal of terms for disposing of the loser's body makes clear (7.76-86).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Duban 1981: 98, 118 n.74.

<sup>18</sup> Zeus himself construes the deaths of Sarpedon, Patroclus, and Hector as a series at 15.65-68. For the motifs connecting their death scenes, see Segal 1971. Thalmann 1984: 45-47 suggests that Ares's son Ascapalus should be counted as first in that series of connected deaths.

warriors on the walls are held back not by oaths and demarcated spaces – as in the formal duels – but by fear of Achilles.<sup>19</sup> As a combat between *promachoi* the contest of Achilles and Hector stands outside any rule-bound, civilizing framework.

Nevertheless, Hector and Achilles fight under bizarre circumstances which defy the conventions of *promachoi* combat: while the warfare has not been formally stopped, the armies nevertheless cease to fight, and instead watch the expression of the war in more focused form as a contest between two lone figures, just as in Books 3 and 7.

The following reading shows how the poet subtly molds the action into a spectacle. By bringing material from the three kinds of type scenes together in this way, with their shared and contrasting associations, the poet exploits the resources of the traditional language to problematize the act of viewing.

### Construction of an Atypical Scene

The process begins with the first lines of Book 22. At this point in the narrative Achilles is far from Troy and moving still further off, on the banks of the Scamander: Apollo has lured him away, disguised as Agenor (21.606-11).<sup>20</sup> Now the Trojans rush into the city, wipe off their sweat and quench their thirst, leaning on the breastworks:

ὥς οἱ μὲν κατὰ ἄστυ πεφυζότες ἤύτε νεβροὶ  
 ἰδρῶ ἀπεψύχοντο πῖον τ' ἀκέοντό τε δίψαν  
 κεκλιμένοι καλῇσιν ἐπάλξεσιν· αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ  
 τείχεος ἄσσον ἴσαν σάκε' ὥμοισι κλίναντες.  
 Ἑκτορα δ' αὐτοῦ μῆναι ὅλοιη μοῖρα πέδησεν 5  
 Ἰλίου προπάροιθε πυλάων τε Σκαιάων.  
 αὐτὰρ Πηλείωνα προσηύδα Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.... – 22.1-7

Thus they, on the one hand, having fled throughout the citadel like fawns,  
 dried off their sweat and drank and healed their thirst  
 leaning on the lovely breastworks – but the Achaeans

<sup>19</sup> “You dared for me, when you saw with your eyes, to come out from the wall; but the others remain within” (ἔτλης ἐμεῦ εἶνεκ', ἐπεὶ ἴδες ὀφθαλμοῖσι, / τείχεος ἐξελθεῖν, ἄλλοι δ' ἐντοσθε μένουσι 22.236-37).

<sup>20</sup> 21. 602-04. See Clay 2011: 103 for the course of the Scamander in the *Iliad*'s imagined geography.

went close to the wall leaning their shields on their shoulders.  
 But as for Hector, [a/his] deadly *moira* <sup>21</sup> bound him to wait there  
 before Ilium and the Scaean gates.  
 But as for the son of Peleus, Phoebus Apollo addressed him....

On the one hand, this tableau suggests a variation on a scenario familiar from *promachoi* combat, particularly in the first six lines which describe Hector and the two armies. While the Trojans have fled, the Achaeans are approaching the wall, apparently with the intention to press the attack: ἄσσον ἴσαν (22.4) in a military context conveys aggression.<sup>22</sup> Hector, meanwhile, positions himself in front of the gate. It happens several times in the *Iliad* during scenes of mass combat that all the troops of one side turn to flight, except for one hero who stands alone against the advancing enemies.<sup>23</sup> One recurring lesson of these scenes is that this is a hopeless proposition – no warrior, however great, can fight an entire army. Odysseus requires rescue in such a situation (11.401-463), and even Achilles himself proclaims that it would be *argaleon* – which in parallel passages<sup>24</sup> means essentially impossible – for him to fight all the Trojans alone (20.353-63).<sup>25</sup> Here, that common motif is brilliantly joined to a set of associations particular to Hector – for Hector has elsewhere been cast symbolically as the lone figure standing between all the Achaeans and his people and city. That symbolic role now finds momentary visual expression on the

<sup>21</sup> It is also possible to take this as *Moira* the death goddess, as Dietrich 1965: 78 n.7.

<sup>22</sup> The same expression is in fact used of Achilles' own furious onrush 88 lines later: ἀλλ' ὃ γε [i.e. Hector] μῖν' Ἀχιλῆα πελώριον ἄσσον ἰόντα 22.92. Achilles' advance has replaced that of the Achaean armies; Hector is still waiting.

<sup>23</sup> E.g. 11.401-463 (Odysseus); 8.76-91 (Nestor, who remains not out of courage, but because he is wounded). A closely related motif is the warrior approached by a (single) stronger enemy in the front ranks; Fenik 1978b treats the two together and indeed they sometimes are mixed. In Agenor's lone stand (21.544-598), which anticipates Hector's own stand (Fenik 1968: 214), Agenor is placed by Apollo to stop single-handedly the oncoming *Achaeans* from sacking Troy (21.544)... but all of his thought concerns Achilles alone.

<sup>24</sup> Hephaestus for instance says it would be *argaleon* to battle Zeus (1.589).

<sup>25</sup> Is this insistence on the limit of what a lone man can do, however strong, particular to the thematic bent of the *Iliad*? It is not hard to imagine more fanciful epics in which heroes vanquish large armies single-handedly. Even the *Iliad* gestures in that direction with Achilles' *aristeia*, and with Patroclus' slaughter of nine men in each of three offensive swoops (16.784-85).

battlefield, as the Achaeans' threatening advance is juxtaposed in sequential verses with Hector's stand before the gates.<sup>26</sup> In this much, the tableau depicted in lines 1-6 still represents *promachoi* combat, and the war being fought on the large scale.

With line 7, the situation changes. The poet suddenly shifts his audience's "eyes" away from the city to the plain, far out by the river Scamander, where Achilles is still chasing the will-o-the-wisp he thinks is Agenor. With the move from Hector to Achilles in line 7, the opening lines take on a new significance, silently signaling the spectacular character of the coming scene by completing the regular pattern for the introduction of formal duels. According to this pattern, the poet first directs his listeners' attention to the armies taking the places from which they will view the duel, and then immediately to the two combatants-to-be. Compare the first formal duel, which Iris announces to Helen in these words:

δεῦρ' ἴθι νύμφα φίλη, ἵνα θέσκελα ἔργα ἴδῃαι	130
Τρώων θ' ἵπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων	
οἳ πρὶν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι φέρον πολὺδακρυν Ἄρηα	
ἐν πεδίῳ ὀλοοῖο λιλαιόμενοι πολέμοιο·	
<b>οἳ δὴ νῦν ἔαται σιγῇ, πόλεμος δὲ πέπαυται,</b>	
<b>ἄσπίσι κεκλιμένοι, παρὰ δ' ἔγχεα μακρὰ πέπηγεν.</b>	135
<b>αὐτὰρ Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος</b>	
μακρῆς ἐγχείησι μαχήσονται περὶ σείο·	
τῷ δέ κε νικήσαντι φίλη κεκλήσῃ ἄκοιτις.	-3.132-38

Come here dear bride, so that you may see the wondrous deeds [*theskela erga*] of the horse-taming Trojans and bronze-clad Achaeans who earlier were bringing tearful battle against each other, on the plain, eager for baneful warfare:

**Those very ones now sit quietly** - and the warfare has stopped – [they] **leaning on their shields**, and their long spears are fixed beside [them].

**But Paris and war-loving Menelaos**

<sup>26</sup> Astyanax is so named because Hector "alone protects" the city (οἷος γὰρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἐκτώρ 6.403; οἷος γὰρ σφιν ἔρυσσεν πύλας καὶ τείχεα μακρὰ 22.507). In her pleas, Andromache conjures the image of "the Achaeans, all of them" (Ἀχαιοὶ / πάντες 6.409-410) killing Hector in a great onrush. (τάχα γὰρ σε κατακτανέουσιν Ἀχαιοὶ / πάντες ἐφορμηθέντες.... 6.409-10. The enjambment of πάντες gives it weight: "for soon they will kill you, the Achaeans: all of them, rushing [upon you]....") When Hector is lamented, still living, by Andromache and her servants, they do not expect him to return unharmed from "the hands of the Achaeans" (6.502). Achilles is not yet a part of the image at that point. Of course, Andromache's fearful vision is ultimately fulfilled in gruesome form when the Achaean soldiers all stick their swords into Hector's body (22.369-75).



with their long spears will fight over you:  
and you will be called the dear/own wife of whoever is victorious.

Lines 132-135 set the armies in their places and emphasize their transition to a passive state;<sup>27</sup> line 136 then identifies the combatants Paris and Menelaus.<sup>28</sup> That same juxtaposition appears in Book 7 when Helenus speaks to Hector:

ἄλλους μὲν κάθισον Τρῶας καὶ πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς,  
αὐτὸς δὲ προκάλεσσαι Ἀχαιῶν ὅς τις ἄριστος  
ἀντίβιον μαχέσασθαι ἐν αἰνῇ δηϊοτῆτι.... –7.49-51

The other Trojans and all the Achaeans, seat them down,  
but you, challenge whichever of the Achaeans is *aristos*  
to fight face to face in fierce battle.

Again the settling of the armies in their places is set against the image of the combatants assuming their roles.<sup>29</sup> In this case, the identity of one combatant is unknown.

Lines 1-7 of Books 22 employ the same juxtaposition though in rougher fashion, with no formal announcement and with loose ends left hanging. As Iris helps signal the start of the formal duel in Book 3 by telling Helen that the warfare has stopped and the Trojans and Achaeans are “leaning on their shields” (ἀσπίσι κεκλιμένοι 3.135), so now the Trojans are “leaning on the breastworks” (κεκλιμένοι... ἐπ’ἀλξεσιν 22.3) in an attitude of resting.<sup>30</sup> At this point, the Trojan armies have already become passive and occupied the place from which they will view the duel.<sup>31</sup> The eyes of

<sup>27</sup> It is a common feature of these scenes that the armies’ transition to a passive state is emphasized at first, rather than their role as viewers. The viewing role is implicit, however, and eventually made plain: θάμβος δ’ ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας / Τρῶας θ’ ἵπποδάμους καὶ εὐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς 3.342-343 (quoted above, pg 5).

<sup>28</sup> See Chapter 3 for the poet’s use of this same juxtaposition elsewhere in the first duel as well.

<sup>29</sup> Again, their role as viewers will be emphasized later: τὸν [i.e. Aias] δὲ καὶ Ἀργεῖοι μὲν ἐγῆθεον εἰσορόωντες, / Τρῶας δὲ τρόμος αἰνὸς ὑπήλυθε γυῖα ἕκαστον.... 7.214-215

<sup>30</sup> The word breastworks (*epalksis*) otherwise appears only in Book 12, of the Achaean wall. There, it is clear from its many uses that the *epalksis* could be a platform for fighting off attackers – and hence, certainly, for viewing as well.

<sup>31</sup> For walls as place of viewing, see also 8.518-22 and cf Taplin 1980: 6-7.

Trojan warriors are felt strongly by Hector throughout the scene,<sup>32</sup> and their presence as a viewership is recalled again after he is dead: when Andromache mounts to the tower she is said thereby to be joining “the crowd of men” (ἀνδρῶν... ὄμιλον 22.462) who can be on the wall for no other purpose than her own – to look.<sup>33</sup>

As for the Achaeans, they seem menacing in lines 3-4 but the sudden switch to Achilles in line 7 effectively cuts them out of the realm of activity, by leaving them hanging indefinitely: their menacing never materializes into action, and they are not mentioned again until their passivity is emphasized – and belatedly accounted for – when Achilles nods them away as he pursues Hector around the walls: “but godlike Achilles nodded refusal to the people with his head, and did not allow them to hurl bitter missiles at Hector, lest someone strike and win glory, and he come in second” (λαοῖσιν δ’ ἀνένευε καρήατι δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς / οὐδ’ ἔα ἰέμεναι ἐπὶ Ἑκτορι πικρὰ βέλεμνα, / μή τις κῦδος ἄροιτο βαλῶν, ὃ δὲ δεύτερος ἔλθοι 22.205-7).

Interestingly, this nod to the conventions of the formal duel, whereby a leader’s authority renders the people passive, is couched in terms that also recall athletics, the alternative paradigm: the idea that one might “come in second” (δεύτερος ἔλθοι 22.207) evokes the games’ prizes that are awarded to first (πρώτῳ), second (δευτέρῳ) and so on (see e.g. the prizes for the chariot race at 23.262-70).<sup>34</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Waiting for Achilles, Hector imagines the Trojans’ censure should he too retreat inside the walls (22.98-107) – particularly that of Polydamas, a warrior who had been out on the field with him (18.249ff). Later, mistakenly believing that his brother Deiphobus – actually the disguised Athena – has come to stand with him against Achilles, Hector envisions Deiphobus as part of a group looking on: “you dared to come out from the city-wall on my account when you saw with your eyes – but the others remain inside” (... ἔτλης ἐμεῦ εἶνεκ’, ἐπεὶ ἴδες ὀφθαλμοῖσι, / τείχεος ἐξελθεῖν, ἄλλοι δ’ ἔντοσθε μένουσι 22.236-37). The commendation for Deiphobus’ bravery implicit in the contrast with the “others’ ” behavior requires that those others, like Deiphobus, be warriors. Thus, it is apparent that Hector feels that the Trojan warriors who reached the breastworks in the opening of Book 22 are now viewing from within.

<sup>33</sup> αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πύργον τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν ἴξεν ὄμιλον / ἔστη παπτήνας’ ἐπὶ τείχεϊ, τὸν δὲ νόησεν.... 22.462-63.

Thus, though rarely mentioned,<sup>35</sup> the Achaeans, like the Trojans, are a viewership whose silent presence adds to the intensity of the scene's focus. By line 7 all fighting has stopped, the armies are in their places, and Hector and Achilles have been identified as the focus of attention. Though no oaths are sworn, the formal duel is present, woven into the fabric of the scene. Later, following Achilles' pursuit of Hector round the walls, the poet will bring his flirtation with the duel motif to a serious point, as Hector proposes terms like those on which he fought Aias in Book 7:

ἀλλ' ἄγε δεῦρο θεοὺς ἐπιδώμεθα· τοὶ γὰρ ἄριστοι  
 μάρτυροι ἔσσονται καὶ ἐπίσκοποι ἁρμονιάων· 255  
 οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ σ' ἔκπαγλον ἀεικίω, αἴ κεν ἐμοὶ Ζεὺς  
 δώῃ καμμονίην, σὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ἀφέλωμαι·  
 ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἄρ κέ σε συλήσω κλυτὰ τεύχε' Ἀχιλλεῦ  
 νεκρὸν Ἀχαιοῖσιν δώσω πάλιν· ὥς δὲ σὺ ῥέζειν. – 22.254-59

But come here, let us give each other the gods [as witnesses]; for they will be the best witnesses and watchers over agreements.  
 For as for me, I will not abuse you outrageously, if Zeus grants me perseverance, and I take your life;  
 but after I strip you of your glorious arms, Achilles,  
 I will give your body back to the Achaeans – and you, do likewise.

Though much abbreviated, this is clearly from the same traditional stock as the agreements prior to the other duels, and brings the encounter right up to the brink of becoming a formal duel after all: yet Achilles rejects the possibility of sworn agreements between such bitter enemies (22.260-67). Thus, by incorporating elements of the formal duel early, the poet prepares to create meaning not only through positive assertion but also through significant omission.

<sup>34</sup> An interesting parallel is the case of Patroclus' death, where P. essentially tells Hector that he came in third place: με μοῖρ' ὀλοή καὶ Λητοῦς ἔκτανεν υἱός, / ἀνδρῶν δ' Εὐφορβός· σὺ δέ με τρίτος ἐξεναρίζεις. The language of the present passage appears elsewhere only in Book 10, thought by most scholars to be a later addition. There, Athena lends power to Diomedes, to stop Dolon before he reaches the ships: ... ἵνα μή τις Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων / φθαίῃ ἐπευξάμενος βαλέειν, ὃ δὲ δεύτερος ἔλθοι. 10.367-68. The suggestion of athletics seems unmotivated in Book 10.

<sup>35</sup> Their other turn as viewers comes at the end of the duel when they approach Hector and "marvel at his form and wondrous appearance" (... θηήσαντο φῆν καὶ εἶδος ἀγητὸν 22.370), before stabbing him in an almost ritualistic act. For the beauty of the dead man see Vernant 1982: 59-60, who compares Priam's words at 22.71-76, which contrast the beauty of a slaughtered young man to the envisioned mutilation of his own aged body.

The poet loses little time in building on and complicating these first hints of coming spectacle, by subtly evoking an alternative form of public contest, the athletic games. This solidifies the sense of crowds having taken their places for a spectacular competition on the one hand, but otherwise calls up quite a different set of associations. Having learned of Apollo's deception, Achilles races back toward Troy from his position far off on the Scamander's banks, whereupon the poet compares Achilles to a "prize-winning horse with chariot" (22.22):

ὥς εἰπὼν προτὶ ἄστυ μέγα φρονέων ἐβεβήκει,  
 σευάμενος ὥς θ' ἵππος ἀθλοφόρος σὺν ὄχεσφιν,  
 ὃς ῥά τε ῥεῖα θέησι τιταινόμενος πεδίοιο·  
 ὥς Ἀχιλεὺς λαιψηρὰ πόδας καὶ γούνατ' ἐνώμα.  
 Τὸν δ' ὁ γέρων Πρίαμος πρῶτος ἶδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι... - 22.21-25

So speaking he made for the citadel, full of confidence,  
 rushing as a prize-winning horse with a chariot,  
 that runs easily, galloping, over the plain –  
 so Achilles speedily put his feet and his knees in motion.  
 And the old man Priam was first to see him with his eyes....

The comparison with the racehorse primarily emphasizes Achilles' speed, but also comes with a strong traditional resonance: race-horses run for display, before crowds.<sup>36</sup>

The simile meshes with the visual elements already in place in the main narrative in such a way as to give it special vividness and power: bringing about, in effect, a conflation of duel and race. It is first of all striking that the setting of this simile overlaps with that of the main narrative, for the plain over which the horse runs in the simile (ἵππος... τιταινόμενος πεδίοιο 22.23) might as well be the plain over which Achilles *is* in fact running at the moment of the comparison ([Ἀχιλλῆα] ἐπεσσύμενον πεδίοιο 22.26). Moreover, listeners already familiar with the games for Patroclus (from previous performances of this or similar *Iliads*) will know that the plain on

<sup>36</sup> Maronitis 2007: 59-60 observes that the image of the chariot race that will soon appear in the famous simile seems already to be in the poet's mind at this early point.

which Achilles is running in the main narrative will soon host the very scene described in the simile, as race-horses speed across the plain in honor of Achilles' friend ([ἵπποι] ὤκα διέπρησσον πεδίοιο 23.364).<sup>37</sup> Thus, this is no passing reference to a “world of similes,” populated by lions, herdsmen, and inclement weather,<sup>38</sup> but the incursion of one major Iliadic motif, athletic games, into another, warfare.

The invitation to superimpose a race framework on this scene is made even more compelling by the surreal manner in which such a framework maps onto the visual topography of the situation in the main narrative. Whereas formal duels are fought “in the middle space” between two armies who watch from either side,<sup>39</sup> chariot-races are run over a wide expanse of plain, viewed by a single group gathered in one spot.<sup>40</sup> At this moment the “race-horse” from far off by the river Scamander<sup>41</sup> surges toward Ilium (22.21), on or around which all the others are gathered (Trojans and Achaeans). Priam, from his perch on the wall, is the first to discern Achilles' approach (22.25), evoking the moment at which the lead horse is discerned by the waiting spectators during a race. The importance of this moment is clear from the description of the chariot race in Book 23:

---

<sup>37</sup> Thus begins the opening description of the race, and that description ends on a similar note, in ring composition: ἵπποις, οἳ δ' ἐπέτοντο κονίοντες πεδίοιο 23.372. The equivalence of the space on which the war is fought and in which this race is run comes out strongly with the specification “Trojan plain” for the race at 23.463-64: ...πάντῃ δέ μοι ὅσσε / Τρωϊκὸν ἄμ πεδίων παπταίνεται εἰσορόωντι.

<sup>38</sup> On the “world of the similes” see for example Buxton 2004, who comments that “the cumulative effect of these comparisons... is to build up a picture of a world outside, a world alongside, a world which will exist when all the bloodied dust has settled, all the lamentations have ceased, and all the booty has been distributed” (152). Buxton also notes the interest then generated by the rare similes which come quite close to the situation in the main narrative, using as an example the comparison of Priam to a suppliant polluted by bloodshed at 24.477-84 (*ibid* 153-5). For the weather in the *Iliad*'s similes and its curious absence for the most part in the main narrative, see Fränkel 1921: 121 and the interesting treatment of Purves 2010: 324-34. Scott 2009: 221 n.94 notes that the two Iliadic race similes are unusual (“there are not enough parallel horse similes to derive a simileme”) and that they look ahead to funeral games in Book 23, but does not go further with this thinking.

<sup>39</sup> See discussion above.

<sup>40</sup> Called an *agōn* – e.g. ἐν ἀγῶνι 23.448. On this term see Zervou 2007: 42-43.

<sup>41</sup> Achilles' pursuit of the disguised Apollo had taken him to the Scamander and along its banks; v. 21.600-5.

Ἀργεῖοι δ' ἐν ἀγῶνι καθήμενοι εἰσορόωντο  
 ἵππους· τοὶ δὲ πέτοντο κονίοντες πεδίοιο.  
 πρῶτος δ' Ἰδομενεὺς Κρητῶν ἀγὸς ἐφράσαθ' ἵππους·  
 ἦστο γὰρ ἐκτὸς ἀγῶνος ὑπέρτατος ἐν περιωπῇ· - 23.448-51

And the Argives sitting in their gathering gazed upon  
 [Diomedes'] horses – which flew, raising dust, over the plain.  
 But the first to recognize the horses was Idomeneus lord of the Cretans,  
 for he sat outside of the gathering, very high up on a lookout....

The actual chariot race scene gives an idea of the traditional material on which the scene with Priam is playing: race-goers are eager to find out which horses lead as they return into view, and someone on a raised vantage point (περιωπῇ 23.451) with particular interest in the event will logically be the first to see. Just as Idomeneus spots the horses of Diomedes, Priam is first to see the “race-horse” Achilles from his vantage on the wall.<sup>42</sup> Thus, for an audience familiar with chariot-race scenes in epic Priam’s glimpse of Achilles eerily locates him within the situation of the simile – as the first to spot a race-horse approaching the crowd.

The result is a split perspective, as the emotional distance required to see Priam and the other mortals on and around Troy as race-goers flows as suddenly and smoothly as a cataract into Priam’s own deep distress: from Priam’s point of view Achilles is no horse but a supernatural harbinger of death.<sup>43</sup> The emphasis on the importance of spectators remains; the nature of the spectacle shifts. Priam’s

<sup>42</sup> Why Idomeneus? “[The] bT [scholia] comment that Idomeneus was clearly anxious about his companion Meriones, and so went up to a vantage point to watch: not an unreasonable guess as to why the poet should introduce him at this point,” Richardson 1985: 220. In passing, I propose an alternative reason, namely Idomeneus’ age. Priam is an old man, and the scene in the funeral games clearly recalls the scene in Book 22: as Idomeneus recognizes the “white sign” (λευκὸν σῆμα 23.455) like the moon on one horse’s forehead; Priam sees Achilles blaze like the star Sirius, the “evil sign” (κακὸν... σῆμα 22) for men. Oilean Aias makes much of Idomeneus’ age, insisting he can’t be right about who’s in front since old men have bad eyes: οὔτε νεώτατός ἐσσι μετ’ Ἀργείοισι τοσοῦτον, / οὔτε τοι ὀξύτατον κεφαλῆς ἐκδέρκεται ὅσσε (23.476-77). The scene in the games could read as parody: the moment at which Priam first spies Achilles coming, and recognizes the import of this doom, is recalled, but reprised as a spat about the quality of his vision. (Cassandra’s view of Priam coming back to Troy (23.696-706) also clearly recalls Priam’s view of Achilles, but interacts differently with it, having little to do with race imagery.)

<sup>43</sup> Bremer 1985 persuasively reads the simile of the dog-star as ‘focalized’ through Priam. However, I disagree with Bremer’s view that the second chariot simile is ‘focalized’ through the gods, for reasons discussed below.

appearance on the walls (22.25-32) not only suggests a key moment in a chariot-race but also unmistakably recalls Book 3, and thus the paradigm of the formal duel. In Book 3, Priam gazes down onto the plain with Helen in the *teichoskopia*, but ultimately chooses not to be a spectator for Paris' match with Menelaus, recoiling from the possibility of seeing his son slain before his eyes (3.303-09). Now, it becomes clear that Priam *will* attend his son Hector's death in single combat along with all the other onlookers. In Priam and Hecuba's impassioned speeches which now follow, the consequences of Hector's loss for themselves and for the Trojans are spelled out graphically, including Troy's fall, and Priam's death and mutilation by the dogs of his table (22.33-89). All of this hangs on Hector's life, so that when the poet later declares that "Hector's life" is the prize in this contest at Troy (περὶ ψυχῆς θεόν Ἑκτορος 22.161), the listeners will recognize this as signifying not only his life but also the devastation tied to its loss. The contrast between the two paradigms of viewership, with the athletics paradigm implying a safer (though still exciting and engaging) spectacle, and the duel paradigm implying emotional involvement of a greater intensity because of the gravity of what is at stake, has become a powerful subtext already at this point in the narrative.

### **Foot Race, Chariot Race, and Divine Audience**

The dissonance between the two ways of seeing becomes greatly pronounced as Hector, having failed to stand by his resolution to face Achilles outside the gate, is pursued around the city walls. Hector and Achilles have just passed the two springs where the Trojan women used to do laundry in times of peace, before the sons of the Achaeans came:

τῇ ῥα παραδραμέτην φεύγων ὃ δ' ὀπίσθε διώκων·  
πρόσθε μὲν ἐσθλὸς ἔφευγε, δίωκε δέ μιν μέγ' ἀμείνων

καρπαλίμως, ἐπεὶ οὐχ ἱερήϊον οὐδὲ βοεῖην  
 ἀρνύσθην, ἃ τε ποσσὶν ἀέθλια γίγνεται ἀνδρῶν, 160  
 ἀλλὰ περὶ ψυχῆς θεὸν Ἑκτορὸς ἵπποδάμοιο.  
 ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἀθλοφόροι περὶ τέρματα μώνυχες ἵπποι  
 ῥίμφα μάλα τρωχῶσι· τὸ δὲ μέγα κέϊται ἄεθλον  
 ἢ τρίπος ἢ γυνὴ ἀνδρὸς κατατεθνηῶτος·  
 ὥς τῶ τρις Πριάμοιο πόλιν πέρι δινηθήτην 165  
 καρπαλίμοισι πόδεσσι· θεοὶ δ' ἐς πάντες ὄρῳντο.  
 - 22.157-66

There, then, they raced by – [he] fleeing, and the other pursuing behind.  
 In front there fled a man of high birth and prowess, but one much greater pursued  
 him.  
 [They ran] quickly, since no sacrificial beast nor bull's hide  
 were they striving after – which are the prizes in the foot-races of men –  
 but they ran for the life of Hector the horse-tamer.  
 But as when around goal-posts prize-winning solid-hoofed horses  
 swiftly race – and a great prize is offered,  
 a tripod or a woman, with a man having died [i.e. at funeral games]<sup>44</sup> –  
 so then three times they circled the city of Priam  
 with swift feet – and all the gods looked on.

Lines 158-61 constitute a kind of reverse simile: instead of identifying a  
 correspondence between two images, as is done with a simile, the poet here points to  
 a particular lack of correspondence. Achilles and Hector are *not* running to win beasts  
 or hides, the prizes in men's foot-races, but rather are running for Hector's life.  
 However, the device has an effect similar to that of a simile: it superimposes one  
 image or idea – men running in a foot-race – over another – Hector fleeing Achilles.  
 The implication is that there *are* correspondences between the two situations, which  
 the audience is expected to notice; otherwise they could hardly recognize the  
 incongruity pointed out by the poet between the prizes in each. These implicit  
 correspondences are not limited to the action of running (θέον 22.61) along a pre-  
 made course (κατ' ἀμαξιτὸν 22.146) with the aim of outperforming one's opponent  
 (ἀρνύσθην 22.60; περὶ + gen 22.61), but also include the presence of many

<sup>44</sup> Importantly, it is also possible to read γυνὴ ἀνδρὸς κατατεθνηῶτος with no comma: “the wife of a man who has died.” See below.



onlookers.<sup>45</sup> Thus, by conjuring the image of the race, the poet brings to the foreground the issue of what correspondence or lack thereof there might be between the role of spectators at a race and all those who gaze upon Hector and Achilles – including the extradiegetic listeners. The poet then proceeds to articulate a simile after all, not of a foot-race but a chariot-race (22.162-66), in which he lays heavy emphasis on the prize (ἄεθλοφόροι... τὸ δὲ μέγα κεῖται ἄεθλον / ἧ τρίπος ἡὲ γυνή... 22.162-64) – the very factor that is supposed to make a race comparison unworkable. Why suddenly embrace athletics as a point of comparison immediately after rejecting it? And why the switch from foot to chariot? One could read this apparent contradiction as evidence of the narrator’s shifting thoughts,<sup>46</sup> but I think it is best understood as a deliberate act of communication with the audience.<sup>47</sup>

In what follows, I argue that the switch is phrased so as to construct a possible audience perspective from which this suspenseful moment in the narrative seems just as entertaining as a grand sports event, and simultaneously to criticize that perspective as callous. The effect of this is to suggest that the very nature of the *Iliad* spectacle depends on the attitude of each viewer, and to provoke listeners to care more about the characters, particularly Hector – a provocation which the poet then develops and amplifies through the figure of Zeus. The remainder of the chapter follows the imagery of the simile through the funeral rites for Patroclus in Book 23, wherein the athletics paradigm acquires an ethical dimension of its own, and develops a

---

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Bremer 1985.

<sup>46</sup> So Richardson *IC*: *ad loc.*

<sup>47</sup> de Jong 1987: 130-1 also emphasizes the contrast between the two passages, and reads them as representative of a straightforward division between human and divine perspectives. This is useful to a point, but insufficient. For one thing, the poet’s (human) listeners might adopt what de Jong calls the “divine” perspective to a greater or lesser extent, and this is part of the point of the lines as I will show. Further, Zeus takes on some of what de Jong calls the “human” perspective in the lines that immediately follow. Griffin 1978:14-16 points out both of these complications, but does not recognize the importance of the contrast between the foot-race and the chariot-race. See further below.

perspective from which the spectacle offered by the *Iliad* is not only a competitive event, but part of a ritual in honor of the dead.

### The Prize

The switch from foot-race to chariot-race offers a tempting path of interpretation which it simultaneously undermines; following the flow of thought leaves the listener with a fractured perspective, and a choice. The “since” (ἐπεὶ 22.159) clause naturally follows on the adverb “quickly” (καρπαλίμως 22.159), indicating that Hector and Achilles are running even faster than would be the case in a footrace, *because* they are pursuing no ordinary prize (καρπαλίμως, ἐπεὶ οὐχ ἱερήϊον οὐδὲ βοεῖην / ἄρνύσθην... ἀλλὰ περὶ ψυχῆς θεόν Ἑκτορος... 22.159-61). This discrepancy then appears to motivate the switch from foot-race imagery to chariot-race imagery: horses are much faster.<sup>48</sup> Chariot races are also more prestigious, the prizes more valuable than in foot-races – hence the emphasis on the prize (μέγα... ἄεθλον). The implication is that while the sight of two men running evokes a foot race, a chariot race better conveys the spectacle’s magnificence, which is heightened after all not only by the speed of the runners and the importance of the prize, but also by the gods’ attendance as spectators (22.166). This sequence of thought constructs within the text the perspective of a listener who finds the *Iliad* quite as diverting as a particularly impressive chariot race. By developing the athletics paradigm in this way, the poet invites his audience to appreciate the excitement and suspense of the moment, and to enjoy the feeling of being part of the crowd at an event so prestigious that the gods likewise attend.

---

<sup>48</sup> Achilles was famous for being as fast as a horse – for chasing down on foot the mounted Troilus. The poet makes clear that Hector could never keep ahead of him without Apollo’s help (22.202-204).

However, in constructing this perspective the poet also critiques it. The fundamental problem with comparing Hector's life to the prizes in foot-races is that they are different not so much in magnitude as in kind. Not only has Hector's life just been explicitly connected to the disaster of Troy's fall (in Priam's speech), but the idea is thematic to the *Iliad* that no matter how valuable a given object, nor how much prestige (*timē*) attaches to it, a man's *life* (ψυχῆς 22.161) is of a different order of importance altogether.<sup>49</sup> This at any rate is what Achilles avows to the embassy, and to himself, in Book 9:

ληϊστοὶ μὲν γάρ τε βόες καὶ ἴφια μῆλα,  
κτῆτοὶ δὲ τρίποδες τε καὶ ἵππων ξανθὰ κάρηνα,  
ἀνδρὸς δὲ ψυχὴ πάλιν ἐλθεῖν οὔτε λείσθη  
οὔθ' ἐλετή, ἐπεὶ ἄρ κεν ἀμείψεται ἔρκος ὀδόντων.<sup>50</sup>  
- 9.401-409

For while cattle and fat sheep can be seized,  
and tripods and tawny-headed horses can be acquired,  
a man's life cannot be seized so that it comes back again  
nor snatched up after it has crossed the gate of his teeth.

Tripods can be lifted too: the tripod of the chariot-race simile (22.164) is no more comparable to a man's life than the sacrificial beasts of the foot-race (22.159). By suggesting that comparison with a grander spectacle is the way to capture the importance of the contest between Achilles and Hector (22.162-66), the passage thus elaborates a seductive misreading of its own first lines, provoking listeners to assent or object based on their own ethical judgment.

The incongruity between a race and the present situation in terms of stakes is especially pronounced from a Trojan perspective, and for some time now the poet has been offering a Trojan perspective to his listeners. Priam's view of Achilles shining

<sup>49</sup> Note too how in the shift from the foot-race to the chariot-race the sequential line-enders ἵπποδάμοιο and ἵπποι bring out some of the irony in looking ahead to Hector's death through this particular simile: ἀλλὰ περὶ ψυχῆς θεὸν Ἑκτορὸς ἵπποδάμοιο. / ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἀεθλοφόροι περὶ τέρματα μώνυχες ἵπποι (22.161-62). Hector "horse-tamer" is made into a horse – and one that is also about to be "tamed" (δαμάσσομεν 22.176) by the gods at the hands of Achilles.

<sup>50</sup> The 'woman' is here too: Helen, the greatest prize of the war, is alluded to with ἐλετή.

like Sirius (22.25-32) flows without interruption into Priam's and Hecuba's pleas to Hector (22.33-92), Hector's intensely psychological internal monologue (22.98-130), and Hector's own view of Achilles' approach (22.131-135). The description of the washing troughs (22.145-156) reinforces the sense of a Trojan orientation: the references to the "lookout" (22.145) and the city-wall (22.146) under which Hector and Achilles run are also both suggestive reminders of the presence of Trojan onlookers. The description of the springs' function then gives information which would be known by, and relevant to, watching Trojans. The final reflection before the reverse simile, that it is no longer safe for women to leave the walls to wash the clothes (22.156), conveys familiarity with and yearning for the past times of peace – at Troy. The reverse simile does nothing to change this. The sight of two men aiming to outdo each other in running round a track, combined with awareness of the crowds looking on, is unusual for war and so brings foot races eerily to mind: but a Trojan perspective demands the comparison be rejected, since the "prize" is Hector's life and hence also their own lives, and utterly incongruous with material prizes of honor.

While the watching Trojans could not imagine themselves as spectators at a race, the extradiegetic audience, having viewed the scene for a time from a Trojan perspective, is asked to be more versatile: to be aware that for them the possibility exists of also seeing it from a greater emotional remove. The first chariot simile has pointed the way to this; in that earlier case the poet offers an emotionally distant perspective on the tableau at Troy (the chariot simile) set against an emotionally involved one (Priam's), but moves his listeners smoothly between the two perspectives and does not ask that they choose between them. Now the poet again superimposes the race framework on the tableau at Troy, but this time he *points out*

the emotional distance that such a perspective requires, and renders it problematic, by focusing on the “prize” of life in the reverse simile.

It is at this moment of heightened tension, with two contrasting perspectives on offer, that the poet deploys the divine audience motif in an arresting hemistich: “and all the gods looked on” (θεοὶ δ’ ἐς πάντες ὁρῶντο 22.166). The immediate juxtaposition of the simile with the abrupt move to the gods raises the possibility that the gods view the scene as one would view a race. Several recent commentators have emphasized the theological implications of 22.162-66: here is a reminder that the gods’ immortality and easy living make them capable of watching the life-and-death struggles of mortals as one might watch an athletic competition.<sup>51</sup> This is a compelling reading and contributes greatly to the scene’s effect, but the theological dimension does not in itself give a sufficient account of the passage’s complexity. While the passage suggests the gods might watch this event as a chariot race, it does not say that they do. Moreover, the phrase θεοὶ δ’ ἐς πάντες ὁρῶντο (22.166) not only provides a sharp, unsettling coda to the race simile but also introduces a conversation on Olympus (22.166-87). If divine aloofness is implied by line 166, it is immediately complicated in line 167 and following:

....θεοὶ δ’ ἐς πάντες ὁρῶντο·  
 τοῖσι δὲ μύθων ἤρχε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε·  
 ὦ πόποι ἦ φίλον ἄνδρα διωκόμενον περὶ τεῖχος  
 ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρῶμαι· ἐμὸν δ’ ὀλοφύρεται ἦτορ  
 Ἕκτορος,....

22.166-70

..... And all the gods looked on.  
 And to them, the father of gods and men began with these words:  
 ‘Alas! that I see with my eyes a man dear to me  
 pursued around the wall – my heart grieves  
 for Hector....

The two speakers in this conversation, Zeus and Athena, are quite aware of the difference between war and sports, and in fact speak of little else but Hector’s

<sup>51</sup> E.g. Griffin 1978 esp. 14; de Jong 1987: 130-1; Clay 2011: 5-6.

impending death, the very element which the poet has picked out as making a race simile unworkable. Zeus says his heart aches (ἐμὸν δ' ὀλοφύρεται ἦτορ 22.169) as he watches. He then asks of the gods “shall we save [Hector] from death?” (ἡέ μιν ἐκ θανάτοιο σάωσομεν.... 22.175). Athena’s answer also focuses on life and death: “will you save a mortal, long-ago given his portion, from death that brings agonies?” (ἄνδρα θνητὸν ἔόντα πάλαι πεπρωμένον αἴση / ἅψ' ἐθέλεις θανάτοιο δυσηχέος ἐξαναλῦσαι; 22.179-80). Athena and Zeus have a cosmic perspective, but they are not race-goers, and the chariot race simile cannot be said to be ‘focalized’ through them<sup>52</sup> – at least not in a straightforward way.

I suggest that the image of the gods watching Hector and Achilles should not be taken as a sudden, isolated vision of divine aloofness, slightly softened by Zeus’ speech: rather, the divine audience motif is being used to explore the problem of viewership pinpointed by means of the race simile – audience aloofness. Like the extradiegetic audience, the divine audience has the *potential* to be either dispassionate or engaged, to an extent impossible for the internal mortal characters, who must endure the consequences of the story’s action or else fail to do so. Both gods and extradiegetic listeners are ultimately immune to any serious consequences from events occurring in the story world; though both may be mightily invested in the story at a given movement, neither is in any danger of dying tonight at Troy. In the present passage, I suggest that the image of the watching gods, with no verb of emotion attached to their viewing, raises the question “with what eyes” any one of them might be looking on the scene below: the perfect intratextual figures to treat that issue of emotional distance that has just been brought to the fore.

---

<sup>52</sup> *pace* Bremer 1985 and de Jong 1987: 130-1.

As in Book 4,<sup>53</sup> the line between the poet performing Zeus and the poet performing himself blurs in this passage:

....θεοὶ δ' ἐς πάντες ὁρῶντο·  
 τοῖσι δὲ μύθων ἤρχε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε·  
 ὦ πόποι ἦ φίλον ἄνδρα διωκόμενον περὶ τεῖχος  
 ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρῶμαι· ἐμὸν δ' ὀλοφύρεται ἦτορ  
 Ἕκτορος, ὅς μοι πολλὰ βοῶν ἐπὶ μηρί' ἔκην  
 Ἰδης ἐν κορυφῇσι πολυπτύχου, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε  
 ἐν πόλει ἀκροτάτῃ· νῦν αὖτέ ἐ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς  
 ἄστνυ πέρι Πριάμοιο ποσὶν ταχέεσσι διώκει.  
 ἀλλ' ἄγετε φράζεσθε θεοὶ καὶ μητιάσθε  
 ἥέ μιν ἐκ θανάτοιο σάωσομεν, ἥέ μιν ἤδη  
 Πηλεΐδῃ Ἀχιλῆϊ δαμάσσομεν ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα.  
 – 22.166-76

..... And all the gods looked on.  
 And to them, the father of gods and men began with these words:  
 'Alas! that I see with my eyes a man dear to me  
 pursued around the wall – my heart grieves  
 for Hector, who burned many thighs of bulls for me  
 on the crests of ridged Ida, and other times too  
 on the summit of the citadel. But now godlike Achilles  
 pursues him with his swift feet around the city of Priam.  
 But come, gods, let us consider and take thought  
 whether we should save him from death, or whether right now  
 we should slay him through Achilles son of Peleus, noble though he is.'

Zeus' activity mirrors the poet's: through Zeus, the poet stages within the text an image of the provocation he has made to his readers. The poet first points to the *possibility* that some of the group gathered before him may be enjoying their virtual "viewing" as one does a chariot race, and provokes them to reconsider such a perspective by pointing out that Hector's life is at stake (22.158-66). He then raises the *possibility* that the gods, too, have the perspective of race-goers, by the sudden juxtaposition of the divine audience (22.166), and has Zeus provoke them while pointing out that Hector's life is at stake. This allows him to advance his strategy of engaging his audience emotionally in the events of the story, and also to develop it along new lines by posing a potential "response" through the figure of Athena.

<sup>53</sup> See Chapter 2.

As a poet figure, Zeus fleshes out the personality already discernible behind the narrator's words. A certain pathos emerges from the lines "since no sacrificial beast nor bull's hide / were they striving after... / but... the life of Hector...." (ἐπεὶ οὐχ ἱερήϊον οὐδὲ βοεῖην / ἀρνύσθην... / ἀλλὰ περὶ ψυχῆς... Ἑκτορος... 22.159-61).

When Zeus reprises this thought to the gods, he says that his heart aches, thus providing within the text an image of this elusive narrator, and giving the sense that the narrator does indeed pity Hector – or at the least that he adopts an attitude of pity toward Hector as a way of moving his audience to pity.

According to Zeus' rhetoric, when all is done it will not only be Athena, nor only Athena and Zeus, who join Achilles in slaying Hector, but the gods as a body: "should we save him from death or should we slay him?" (ἤέ μιν... σαώσομεν, ἤέ μιν... δαμάσομεν 22.175-76). Whether or not individual gods agree or disagree, the death of Hector (and the fall of Troy) in this way becomes an expression of their collective will. For the performing poet speaking in the context of performance, the "we" of these 1<sup>st</sup> person plural verbs potentially includes and implicates his listeners as well: the poet has the power to dictate the outcome, and rhetorically includes his audience not only in the decision but in the execution too.

Athena's reply also works on a metaperformative level, as she suggests that an action contrary to Hector's longstanding "allotment" (πάλαι πεπρωμένον αἶση 22.179) would be wrong, and makes withholding praise a threat:

Τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη·  
 ὦ πάτερ ἀργικέραυνε κελαινεφές οἷον ἔειπες·  
 ἄνδρα θνητὸν ἐόντα πάλαι πεπρωμένον αἶση  
 ἄψ' ἐθέλεις θανάτοιο δυσηχέος ἐξαναλῦσαι;  
 ἔρδ'· ἀτὰρ οὐ τοι πάντες ἐπαινέομεν θεοὶ ἄλλοι. – 22.177-81

Then she answered him in turn, the grey-eyed goddess Athena:  
 'Loud-thundering father of the dark clouds, what word have you spoken?  
 A man – a mortal – who long ago received his allotment –  
 you wish to lift him up out of death that brings agonies?



Do it – but not all of us other gods will praise you.’

Athena does not address Zeus’ pity for Hector, nor deny Hector’s great piety, nor does she try to justify Hector’s death by presenting it as a consequence of Trojan transgression. Instead she gets her way by making two points, which I take as logically connected: that Hector’s death is necessary, and that Zeus will be denied the endorsement he wants if he should ignore that necessity.<sup>54</sup> Scholars have long debated whether or not Zeus could “actually” save Hector at this point if he decided to,<sup>55</sup> but what is more important is the evident fact that Zeus and Athena speak as if he could. Moreover, Athena’s point seems to be that it is precisely Zeus’ desire or need for praise from the others that will prevent him from acting contrary to what has already been established. This logic is obscure on a theological level, but resonates powerfully on the level of poet-audience dynamics: a story-teller who deviates from the pre-established ‘facts’ of the story will not earn the praise that is the measure of a poem’s success.<sup>56</sup> Hector’s death is necessary not only because of his “lot” (αἷσῃ 22.179), but because of Zeus’ prior announcements that he will die.<sup>57</sup> As scholars have noted, in these moments of telling future events Zeus takes on the poet’s role to a certain degree, and Zeus’ word guarantees the future not only intratextually but also for the benefit of the listening audience. When Zeus awakes following the *Dios apatē*, he

---

<sup>54</sup> Contrast Yamagata 1994: 115 who considers these to be two separate arguments, the second weaker: “...the point that the other gods would not approve his action is not so powerful as the argument implied in the first two lines: ‘He is destined to die anyway; if you cannot give him an eternal life, what is the point in letting him die a little later than now?’ ” By my reading the specific and compelling reason why Zeus (standing for the poet) will not want to bring about events contrary to Hector’s lot is that to do so would invite the gods’ (standing for the audience’s) disfavor. Frontisi-Ducroux 1986 also suggests a correspondence between the gods and the audience of the *Iliad* in this scene, and Zeus and the poet, though without argumentation or analysis of the effect.

<sup>55</sup> See Chapter 1.

<sup>56</sup> See Chapter 2 for more detailed discussion of the parallel passage in Book 4.

<sup>57</sup> The two may in fact be connected: while the epic describes no fixed system for cosmic allotments (see Chapter 1), the formulaic language sometimes associates Zeus’ decision-making with *aisa*, as when Achilles says that he will be honored sufficiently by the Διὸς αἷσῃ 9.608.

reasserts control of the narrative by summarizing the plot to come, including the death of Hector at the hands of an enraged Achilles.<sup>58</sup> The event is necessary on both the extradiegetic and intradiegetic levels; read in metaperformative terms, Athena's words suggestively tie that necessity (22.179-80) to audience demand (22.181).

Thus, at this crucial moment of the narrative, with Hector's death and Troy's fate on the line, Athena provides an internal model of audience insistence that Hector must be slaughtered. The model is convincing because of its wide applicability: rather than being framed in terms of hostility to Troy – a model that would have limited appeal at this point in the *Iliad*, particularly after Priam's and Hecuba's piteous entreaties – it is framed in terms of unwillingness to see the story depart from its necessary course. In this way Athena, who is herself characterized by hostility to Troy, becomes uncomfortably persuasive in her ability to represent a wider group, including many who might pity Hector.

The exchange concludes with Zeus' invitation to Athena to act as she desires:

Τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς·  
θάρσει Τριτογένεια φίλον τέκος· οὐ νύ τι θυμῷ  
πρόφρονι μυθέομαι, ἐθέλω δέ τοι ἥπιος εἶναι·  
**ἔρξον ὅπῃ δὴ τοι νόος ἔπλετο**, μὴ δ' ἔτ' ἐρώει - 22.182-85

And answering Zeus the cloud-gatherer addressed her:  
'Take heart Tritogeneia, dear child – in no way with a willing  
heart do I make my speech, but I wish to be mild to you:  
act in whatever way you wish, and hold back no longer.'

I suggest that when Zeus bids Athena to “do as you wish, and hold back no longer”

(ἔρξον ὅπῃ δὴ τοι νόος ἔπλετο, μὴ δ' ἔτ' ἐρώει 22.185), these words – voiced aloud

by the poet in the setting of performance – also invite vicarious participation on the

<sup>58</sup> 15.49-77; τοῦ δὲ χολωσάμενος κτενεῖ Ἑκτορα δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς 15.68. Friedman 2001 notes that Zeus here becomes the “mouthpiece” for plot summary, but finds a lingering gap between Zeus' and the poet's authority in this speech because of the reminder of Zeus' promise to Thetis (and hence his function as an intradiegetic story character) in its final lines. I would emphasize again here the moment of performance: when the poet performs Zeus making pronouncements about the future, with language emphasizing his own power to make that future happen, there is a conflation of the poet's and Zeus' authority. Zeus is not only predicting to Hera; the poet is predicting to his audience. In this sense, each takes on – and ultimately fulfills – corresponding obligations.

part of the extradiegetic audience in bringing about the story's climax. Here it is worth noticing the attribution of agency in the exchange between Zeus and Athena. Zeus' initial 1<sup>st</sup>-person plural ("shall *we* slay him?"), includes the group in both the decision and the act. Athena's response, however, while underlining the importance of audience desire in the poet's decision-making, attributes the actual action of saving or slaying to Zeus alone: "do you wish to save....?" (ἐθέλεις... ἐξαναλῦσαι 22.180), and "do it!" (ἔρδ[ε] 22.181). By the disarming mildness of his reply, Zeus neatly transfers agency in carrying out the decision to Athena (ἔρδ[ε] 22.181; ἔρξον 22.185): here is the invitation to vicarious participation. Most of the scene's internal viewers are powerless: the Trojans would like to come to Hector's aid, but are held back by fear of Achilles;<sup>59</sup> the Achaeans would like to attack Hector, but are held back by the authority of Achilles.<sup>60</sup> All they can do is watch. Not so Athena: her leap from Olympus to Troy now offers the audience a way into the story-world to act – and a provocation to join in the terrible, and necessary, slaughter of Hector.

Support for the above reading is found in the way it gives a point to behavior that is perplexing if the passage is read simply as a representation of divine decision-making. In the latter case, Zeus' motivation in inviting the gods to reconsider the necessity of Hector's death is obscure, and his statement afterward that he was not in full earnest in the first place when he spoke (οὐ νύ τι θυμῷ / πρόφρονι μυθέομαι) is dramatically unsatisfying.<sup>61</sup> But while Zeus the divine tyrant generates puzzlement at

---

<sup>59</sup> 22.236-37.

<sup>60</sup> 22.205-7.

<sup>61</sup> Richardson *IC*: 22.182-5: "To us it seems as if Zeus gives way all too easily, and οὐ νύ τι / θυμῷ πρόφρονι μυθέομαι sounds very casual. It is as if he knew all along that nothing could be done to save Hektor. But this debate, and Zeus's consent, serve the dramatic function of re-enacting for us the process of divine decision which seals Hektor's doom...." It should be noted that there is internal consistency in the representation of Athena as Zeus' normal favorite: his wish to be mild to her appears elsewhere as well (following Athena's protest at his prohibition of divine interference at the beginning

this point, as an intratextual stand-in for the poet Zeus' attitude is fiendishly convincing. Here is an internal model of performance dynamics whereby a poet-figure suggests that he, for one, pities Hector and would like to save him. In doing so, and through the exchange that follows, he successfully moves the responsibility for killing Hector off of his own shoulders and onto an audience-figure, Athena, with the silent complicity of the group as a whole. As an internal representation of the poet, this Zeus' satisfied air is justified, for by first pointing out that Hector should be pitied and then implicating his audience in Hector's killing he has offered his listeners a more powerful emotional experience – the better to generate some tears of the sort that Plato's *Ion* depends on for his livelihood – as well as satisfaction in the completion of a necessary part of the plot.

### **The *Iliad* as Funeral Rites**

I have shown that the poet's focus on the "prize" in the chariot simile, following as it does the observation that Achilles and Hector are contending for the latter's life, brings out one salient difference between the paradigms of athletics and duel – the gravity of the stakes – and attaches an ethical component to the choice between them. However, this picture is complicated by a second key difference between athletics and duels, namely that whereas the formal duels are contests between enemies, witnessed by opposed partisans, athletic spectacle suggests a communal activity with shared purpose – a sense that is developed in Book 23. In this section I argue that Book 23 recalls and responds to the passage in Book 22 in such a way that the athletics paradigm of spectacle also acquires an ethical dimension. This development underlines a perspective in which the *Iliad* becomes a ritual in honor of the dead, and

---

of Book 8: 8.39-40 = 22.183-184). However, this parallel does not solve the problems presented by the present passage.

reveals new layers of irony and pathos in the image of Achilles and Hector circling Troy.

The sense of communal purpose and its ironies are already hinted at in the simile in Book 22, before they are recalled and developed in Book 23. This emerges from analysis of two features of the simile, the first of which is the phrase *ἀνδρὸς κατατεθνηῶτος* (22.164):

τῇ ῥά παραδραμέτην φεύγων ὃ δ' ὄπισθε διώκων  
 πρόσθε μὲν ἐσθλὸς ἔφευγε, δίωκε δέ μιν μέγ' ἀμείνων  
 καρπαλίμως, ἐπεὶ οὐχ ἱερήϊον οὐδὲ βοεῖην  
 ἀρνύσθην, ἃ τε ποσσὶν ἀέθλια γίγνεται ἀνδρῶν, 160  
 ἀλλὰ περὶ ψυχῆς θεὸν Ἑκτορος ἵπποδάμοιο.  
 ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἀεθλοφόροι περὶ τέρματα μώνυχες ἵπποι  
 ῥίμφα μάλα τρωχῶσι· τὸ δὲ μέγα κεῖται ἄεθλον  
 ἢ τρίπος ἢ γυνὴ **ἀνδρὸς κατατεθνηῶτος**·  
 ὥς τῶ τρις Πριάμοιο πόλιν πέρι δινηθήτην 165  
 καρπαλίμοισι πόδεσσι· θεοὶ δ' ἐς πάντες ὀρῶντο.  
 - 22.157-66

There, then, they raced by – [he] fleeing, and the other pursuing behind.  
 In front they fled a man of high birth and prowess, but one much greater pursued him.

[They ran] quickly, since no sacrificial beast nor bull's hide  
 were they striving after – which are the prizes in the foot-races of men -  
 but they ran for the life of Hector the horse-tamer.  
 But as when around goal-posts prize-winning solid-hoofed horses  
 swiftly race – and a great prize is offered,  
 a tripod or a woman, with a man having died,  
 [OR: a tripod or the wife of a man who has died]  
 so then three times they circled the city of Priam  
 with swift feet – and all the gods looked on.

In this passage *ἀνδρὸς κατατεθνηῶτος* has a rich ambiguity noted already in antiquity.<sup>62</sup> The standard interpretation is that it specifies the situation of the race in the simile: “at funeral games.” By adding such a context, the poet evokes – however

<sup>62</sup> Scholia: (164a.) ἢ τρίπος ἢ γυνὴ *ἀνδρὸς κατατεθνηῶτος*· ὅτι ἀμφίβολον, πότερον ἀνδρὸς τεθνεῶτος γυνὴ ἢ ἐπὶ τεθνεῶτι ἀνδρὶ, ὃ καὶ ὑγιές· οὐκ οἶδεν γὰρ ἄλλους ἢ τοὺς ἐπιταφίους ἀγῶνας Ὅμηρος. // A (164b.) ἀνδρὸς ΚΑΤΑΤΕΘΝΕΙΩΤΟΣ· ἢ κατὰ ἀντὶ τῆς ἐπὶ, b(BCE<sup>3</sup>E<sup>4</sup>) ἐπὶ ἀνδρὸς τεθνεῶτος. b(BCE<sup>3</sup>E<sup>4</sup>)T οὐκ οἶδε δὲ στεφανίτας, ἀλλ' ἐπιταφίους ἀγῶνας. b(BCE<sup>3</sup>)T. As so often, the performer's tone, pacing, and body language could easily prefer one or the other “reading” almost, but not quite, to the point of excluding the other – or could cultivate the ambiguity.

briefly – associations other than the issue of the prize. This does not assume an audience already familiar with Book 23 of our *Iliad*, which gives modern readers our closest look at the Homeric conception of funeral games.<sup>63</sup> Certain lessons from Book 23 – particularly their social function – can and should be applied to the present passage insofar as they seem to be general features of funeral games.

In Book 23 the games are one integrated part of the funeral rites for Patroclus; they serve not only to honor the dead man<sup>64</sup> but also to heal the community. James Redfield puts it this way, drawing general conclusions from the games for Patroclus:

Funeral games thus function as a kind of monument, an event by which the property of the dead man and his mourners is converted into memorials of his death, and as a social occasion through which the community, wounded and disordered by the loss of one of its heroes, reasserts its structure and vitality.<sup>65</sup>

By including the phrase ἀνδρὸς κατατεθνηῶτος in the simile, the poet deepens its import, subtly implying that to see these runners as horses and chariots is to imagine them as participants in an agonistic, ritual spectacle that honors the dead and strengthens the community.

But the poet also points to an inherent irony in the communal healing associated with funeral games by positioning ἀνδρὸς κατατεθνηῶτος directly after γυνή. This encourages the ear to associate the three words, with the undertone “wife of a man who has died” as the prize in the race;<sup>66</sup> a reminder that prizes at funeral games are often the spoils of war.<sup>67</sup> Indeed, several factors encourage the listener to associate

---

<sup>63</sup> The question of how funeral games in epic relate to historical funeral games is outside the scope of this dissertation, and not important to the argument.

<sup>64</sup> Though the purpose of honoring the dead is never explicitly stated it seems clear enough. Nestor tells Achilles at 23.646: ἀλλ’ ἴθι καὶ σὸν ἑταῖρον ἀέθλοισι κτερεῖζε.

<sup>65</sup> Redfield 1994: 210.

<sup>66</sup> This interpretation also goes back to the scholia. See note 62 above.

<sup>67</sup> In the chariot race in the games for Patroclus first prize is a slave woman and a tripod (23.263-64).

Andromache, the paradigmatic widow of war, with the “woman” (γυνή), and the dead man with Hector himself: in stating that Hector’s life is at stake, the poet uses ψυχή plus the genitive of Hector’s name (ἀλλὰ περὶ ψυχῆς θεόν Ἑκτορος ἵπποδάμοιο 22.161); elsewhere in Homer the combination ψυχή + proper name is always a reference to the shade of one who is already dead.<sup>68</sup> Hector’s name is itself positioned at the end of the line, giving it added resonance with ἀνδρὸς κατατεθνηῶτος, also at line end slightly below (22.164). The idea that Hector is somehow already dead is thematic to the *Iliad* – evoked most vividly by Andromache’s lament for him in Book 6 – and the enslavement of Andromache that will follow his death is emblematic for the suffering attendant on the fall of Troy. Thus the slave woman in the prize evokes Andromache’s reduction to chattel status in Hector’s foreboding vision of Troy’s fall in Book 6, and the suggestion has a point: if Hector’s life is the prize of the chase (22.161), then so is Troy – and the women of Troy, of whom Andromache is representative.

A second feature of the passage subtly reinforces this suggestion that the spectacle at Troy, which the poet invites his audience to attend, can be seen as an honoring of the dead and affirmation of community: namely, the visual associations evoked by the application of chariot race imagery<sup>69</sup> to Achilles and Hector. The two men likened to horses in a chariot race circle Troy three times (ὥς τῶ τρις Πριάμοιο πόλιν πέρι δινηθήτην 22.165) – and circling a corpse three times<sup>70</sup> with chariots is a traditional

<sup>68</sup> ψυχή Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο 23.65; 23.106, 23.221 (also Patroclus); *Od.* 10.492, 565 (Teiresias); *Od.* 11.52 (Elpenor); also Achilles to the embassy: ἀνδρὸς δὲ ψυχὴ πάλιν ἔλθεῖν οὔτε λείσστη 9.408.

<sup>69</sup> ἀεθλοφόροι... ἵπποι 22.162.

<sup>70</sup> Of course the number three – and the adverb *tris* “three times” – is prominent in the formulaic diction. This does not necessarily mean that it is deadweight, however. Scholarship in recent decades tends to emphasize the power of formulaic language to create meaning, rather than its use as a tool in rapid composition in performance. (For the latter, see Lord 1960. The cumulative work of J. M. Foley (see bibliography) has been influential in the shift of emphasis.)

way to honor the dead.<sup>71</sup> Evidence for this practice is found in Book 23, prior to the games for Patroclus, when the other Achaeans have scattered to their shelters.

Achilles leads the Myrmidons in lamentation (23.4-23), and as he begins, the

Myrmidons approach with horses and chariots (αὐτοῖς ἵπποισι καὶ ἄρμασιν 23.8):

οἱ δὲ τρις **περὶ νεκρὸν** εὐτρίχας ἤλασαν ἵππους  
μυρόμενοι.... – 23.13-14

And [the Myrmidons] thrice around the corpse drove their well-maned horses  
grieving....

That this ritual circling is traditional in epic is evident in that Achilles refers to it, together with the lamentation, as “the honor due to the dead” (ὁ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων 23.9).<sup>72</sup> It is therefore a motif assumed to be familiar to the extradiegetic audience. Thus, even as the poet’s rhetoric is primarily dwelling on the issue of stakes, he simultaneously creates *imagery* suggestive of a ritual in honor of the dead. Notably, it is the city of Troy that is in the position of the dead hero.

Book 23 not only provides evidence for the function and character of funeral rites, but follows the climax of Book 22 sequentially, and in so doing brings to the surface the implications and ironies of the circling of Troy. The connections between the two sections of text are dense. James Redfield has noted that for Achilles, after the death of Patroclus “there remains one more task: to bury Patroclus, and, as part of that burial, to kill Hector.”<sup>73</sup> From this perspective, the fall of Troy – heralded and ensured by Hector’s death – redounds to Patroclus’ honor. Yet there is also the lingering image of *Troy* being circled, inviting listeners to find a sense in which the spectacle

<sup>71</sup> By “traditional” I mean traditional in Homeric epic, without reference to historical practices.

<sup>72</sup> The Myrmidons carry it out without specific direction from Achilles – he tells them simply to approach in their chariots, and both he and the Myrmidons apparently understand what this implies: μὴ δὴ πῶς ὑπ’ ὄχεσφι λυώμεθα μώνυχας ἵππους, / ἀλλ’ αὐτοῖς ἵπποισι καὶ ἄρμασιν ἄσσον ἰόντες / Πάτροκλον κλαίωμεν· ὁ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων. 23.7-9 (Do not yet loose the single-hoofed horses from their chariots, / but come close, with horses, chariots and all, /and let us weep for Patroclus – for that is the rightful prize of the deceased).

<sup>73</sup> Redfield 1975/94: 107.



offered to them by the *Iliad*, with all its conflict and destruction, is ultimately about the honoring of Troy. Here I would like briefly to consider the situation of historical audiences, for whom the performance of the *Iliad* became a regular event, as it is for these such listeners that the greatest treasures and ironies become available.

For repeat listeners in a festival context,<sup>74</sup> to whom the *Iliad* is a special yet familiar ritual, the circling of Troy in Book 22 looks ahead already to Book 23. As the poet has tied the stories of the war and the *menis* together in such a way as to make the fall of Troy appear to be a consequence of Achilles' wrath, here, perhaps, Troy's fall is envisioned as part of the holocaust in Patroclus' honor. Now the Trojans soon to be slaughtered correspond to the Trojan youths slaughtered on Patroclus' actual funeral pyre (23.176). The "race" around Troy, by this reading, becomes the first contest in the funeral games for Patroclus – Hector's life is the prize, and goes to Achilles.

But it is also possible to see Troy and the Trojans themselves as the corpse that is being honored by the "chariots:" with bitter irony, as their destruction becomes paradoxically their memorialization. After all, Patroclus is not actually being circled by Hector and Achilles: the Trojans are. The paradox is delicious. Performing the *Iliad* is a commemoration of Ilium: yet it also entails reliving, recreating, the brutality and tragedy of it, and this is what the poet's audience is invited to partake in at a visceral level, with full knowledge. The *Iliad* is a ritual that simultaneously honors Troy in the distant past and wipes it out in the performative moment.

---

<sup>74</sup> One such setting was the festival of the Panathenaea (Lycourgos *Against Leocrates* 102: Βούλομαι δ' ὑμῖν καὶ τῶν Ὀμήρου παρασχέσθαι ἐπῶν. οὕτω γὰρ ὑπέλαβον ὑμῶν οἱ πατέρες σπουδαῖον εἶναι ποιητὴν, ὥστε νόμον ἔθεντο καθ' ἐκάστην πεντετηρίδα τῶν Παναθηναίων μόνου τῶν ἄλλων ποιητῶν ῥαψωδεῖσθαι τὰ ἔπη...) on which see for example Nagy 1996: 69-71. For discussion of certain issues of reception of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* at the Panathenaea in the sixth and fifth centuries, see Haubold 2000: 145-96. See also Taplin 1992: 39-40.

The irony is worked out at each step of the commemoration. Following the circling of the corpse, the dead man is immolated and a *sema* (barrow or grave-marker) heaped up over him (Πάτροκλον θέμεναι πυρὶ σῆμά τε χεῦναι 23.45).<sup>75</sup> After the “horses” Achilles and Hector circle it thrice (22.165-66), Troy too is “immolated,” or rather its future immolation evoked, in a simile describing the Trojans’ grief at Hector’s death:

τῷ δὲ μάλιστ’ ἄρ’ ἔην ἐναλίγκιον ὥς εἰ ἅπασα  
Ἴλιος ὄφρυόεσσα πυρὶ σμύχοιτο κατ’ ἄκρης. – 22.410-11.

Then it was very much as if all  
lofty Ilium were consumed entirely by fire.

For a corpse, the burning is done as the honor due to the dead. But the Trojans within the city are trapped on their own “pyre.”

In this split temporal perspective, with Hector’s death being mourned while his life is still on the line – and indeed being mourned *by means of* the public event that will kill him – the sense of common purpose associated with funeral games and evoked through the simile becomes terrible rather than healing. Through it, the Trojans and Hector are reimagined not just as enemies deserving of pity, but as part of a larger community that includes all those who watch these “funeral rites:” Achaeans, gods, and the audience attending the performance. The paradigm of commonality offered in the simile thus shows its fangs, in that it places Hector, who has joined in enacting the ritual, and also Priam and the other Trojans who are watching, as participants in a public event honoring and enacting the doom that for them is not part of the mythic past – as it is for the historical audiences – but a horror of the imminent present.

Thus, as the repeat listener becomes intimately familiar with the *Iliad*, a new kind of ethical interpretive choice emerges from this scene. If the *Iliad* is a communal

<sup>75</sup> οὐ θέμις ἐστὶ λοετρὰ καρήατος ἄσσον ἰκέσθαι / πρὶν γ’ ἐν Πάτροκλον θέμεναι πυρὶ σῆμά τε χεῦναι / κείρασθαι τε κόμην 23.44-46.

event, one that honors the dead heroes, does the audience join in honoring the dead at Troy? Does it witness Troy's destruction as a legitimate part of the honor for Patroclus? Either path involves elements of the terrible. And in each performance, the chariot simile and circling of Troy are followed immediately by the poet's reminder, spoken through Zeus, to consider Hector: 'Alas! that I see with my eyes a man dear / pursued around the wall – my heart grieves / for Hector...' (ὦ πόποι ἦ φίλον ἄνδρα διωκόμενον περὶ τεῖχος / ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώμαι· ἐμὸν δ' ὀλοφύρεται ἦτορ / Ἕκτορος... 22.168-70). Thus, through the course of many performances, the *Iliad* becomes a lament and, simultaneously, a ritual slaughter, in which the rhapsode performing Zeus invites his listeners to acquiesce and even vicariously to participate.

In this chapter I hope to have shown that the climactic character of Book 22 is enhanced by the treatment of the spectacle motif, which offers increased involvement and rich layers of pathos to the listening audience. The next chapter examines the final appearance of the divine audience in Book 24, a passage whose complexities prompt reflection on the role of the gods as internal audience in the poem up to that point.

## CHAPTER 6

### The Divine and the Human Audience

The final appearance of the divine audience in the *Iliad* comes at the beginning of Book 24. As Achilles continues at intervals to indulge in mounting his chariot and dragging Hector three times around the *sema* of Patroclus (24.10-18), perverting a mourning ritual and recalling the terrible spectacle of Book 22 in new form, Apollo preserves Hector's body out of pity (24.18-21, ἐλεαίρων 24.19). "The gods" too now pity Hector:

ὥς ὃ μὲν Ἑκτορα δῖον ἀείκιζεν μενεαίνων·  
τὸν δ' ἐλεαίρεσκον μάκαρες θεοὶ εἰσορόωντες,  
κλέψαι δ' ὀτρύνεσκον εὐσκοπον Ἀργειφόντην. – 24.20-22

In this way [Achilles] in his fury abused godlike Hector;  
and the blessed gods would pity him as they looked on,  
and would urge the sharp-sighted slayer of Argus to steal [the body].

"The gods" (θεοὶ 24.21) is here used to denote not all of the gods, but a representative body. This representative body specifically excludes Hera, Athena, and Poseidon, who object to the idea of Hermes stealing Hector's body away and are thereby distinguished from the main group. This is a remarkable shift, and I argue here that this is the culmination of a shift already long underway: in the course of the *Iliad* as a whole, the divine audience provides an intratextual model of an audience shifting from support for the Achaean attack on Troy, associated with the perspective of Hera and Athena, to pity for the Trojans.

The poem's Achaean orientation<sup>1</sup> is crystallized and problematized in the figures of Hera and Athena. Hera as a character is many things, none of which change during the course of the poem: she is Zeus' shrewish wife, a sometimes comedic figure; the patron goddess of Argos and other Greek cities; the face of the cosmic forces ensuring Troy's

---

<sup>1</sup> For the poem's Achaean orientation see above at Chapter 4, pp 99-100.

destruction. But she is also the poet's choice as a figure of divine observation of the poem's events in the opening books. Hera is versatile as an audience figure, and her multiple responses in Books 1-4 emphasize different aspects of the audience being sketched. By combining aversion to the prospect of Achaean death and dishonor, desire that the events follow their necessary course, and hostility toward Troy in the figure of Hera, the poet identifies a range of potential implications of the poem's Achaean orientation.

Book 4 contains the first representation of the gods as a body observing events at Troy – the first use of the “divine audience” motif. Books 1-3, while they do not yet use the divine audience motif as found dramatically in Book 4, do sometimes present an individual deity in the role of an interested, engaged observer of events at Troy. Strikingly, this observer figure is always Hera. Not all instances of divine intervention involve divine observation, and a look at one negative example will usefully bring out the difference. The first divine response in the *Iliad* is Apollo's anger at the treatment of his priest in Book 1, which prompts him to inflict the plague on the Achaean camp. However, Apollo's anger and intervention are not presented as the result of Apollo watching what happens at Troy, but as a direct response to prayer:

“ὣς ἔφατ’ εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ’ ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων,  
βῆ δὲ κατ’ Οὐλύμποιο καρήνων χωόμενος κῆρ. – 1.43-44

So [Chryses] spoke in prayer, and Phoebus Apollo heard him –  
and he went down from the peaks of Olympus, wrathful at heart.

No verb of seeing or perceiving marks Apollo as an observer, and there is no indication that he has been paying attention to Troy or to Chryses prior to the prayer; he “hears” the prayer and answers. To be sure, this does not rule out the possibility that Apollo has been

looking on with interest all along, but the poem does not do anything to characterize Apollo as one occupied with the events narrated by the poet as they unfold at Troy.<sup>2</sup>

The opposite is true of Hera's intervention 10 lines later, where her first appearance in the poem marks her as an interested observer of events at Troy:

Ἐννῆμαρ μὲν ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὥχετο κῆλα θεοῖο,  
τῇ δεκάτῃ δ' ἀγορὴν δὲ καλέσσατο λαὸν Ἀχιλλεύς·  
τῷ γὰρ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη·  
**κῆδετο γὰρ Δαναῶν, ὅτι ῥα θνήσκοντας ὄρᾱτο.** – 1.53-56

For nine days the god's [Apollo's] weapons made their way through the  
army,  
but on the tenth day Achilles called the people to assembly –  
for she put it into his mind to do so, the goddess, white-armed Hera;  
for she was weighed with care for the Danaans as she watched them dying.

Though nine days of plague will surely have left the Achaeans supplicating the gods, and Hera as a patron deity of the Argives would be a logical choice, the supplication motif is not repeated. Rather than a response to a summons, Hera's intervention is presented as a natural extension of her role as an interested onlooker: she “watches” the Danaans dying (ὄρᾱτο 1.56) and responds emotionally to what she sees (κῆδετο 1.56). This passage is relatively brief, and does not use the *dais* setting and other factors which come together in the opening of Book 4 to construe the gods as an internal epic audience. However, it does form part of the background for that later scene and helps inform its interpretation: by marking Hera as an interested onlooker, and describing what she feels as she observes, the passage in Book 1 provides an opportunity for the poem's extradiegetic audience to compare their own responses to the same events. “Care” for the dying is a far cry from the wrath that will be on display in Book 4, and this contrast is important: while the epic as a whole includes a depiction of Hera as vengeful and unrelenting, her first appearance casts her as a remote observer who feels care for dying Achaean warriors.

<sup>2</sup> The same is true for other passages in which a god responds to prayer or supplication: e.g., Achilles' call to Thetis, and Zeus' response to Thetis' request.

The next instance of divine observation and response to events at Troy occurs when Achilles debates whether to attack and kill Agamemnon, and is actually drawing his sword from its sheath:

.... ἦλθε δ' Ἀθήνη  
οὐρανόθεν· πρὸ γὰρ ἦκε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη  
ἄμφω ὁμῶς θυμῷ φιλέουσά τε κηδομένη τε. – 1.194-96

... and Athena came  
from the sky – for the goddess, white-armed Hera, had sent her forth,  
loving and weighed with care for both [heroes] alike in her heart.<sup>3</sup>

Though there has been much discussion about Athena's role in this episode, it is again Hera who is paying attention, whose reaction to the story's events the poet describes, and who thus offers a possible model for the extradiegetic audience to compare, consider, accept or reject: in any case, the two goddesses share a single perspective. This time, there is no verb of seeing: Hera is simply assumed to be following the action as it develops. The same verb κηδομένη (1.196) characterizes her internal reaction to what she sees: as the sight of Achaeans dying of plague is upsetting, so too is the prospect of violence between two of their leaders. The verb φιλέουσα (1.196), here accompanying κηδομένη, is often used to denote divine favor for a mortal. As such, it does not reflect a judgment on the relative merits of the two chieftains' stances in the quarrel; instead, it implies Hera's general interest in the welfare of both.<sup>4</sup> These lines convey in Hera a feeling of concern and the wish to avoid imminent bloodshed.

From an Achaean perspective, the quarrel between leaders is *prima facie* bad for the team. The proem already says as much in its chain of causes leading to Achilles'

<sup>3</sup> This passage has become a standard focus point for scholarly debate about the degree to which the Homeric gods might best be understood simply as vivid expressions of the mortal characters' mental processes and other natural phenomena: contrast Dodds 1951 with Griffin 1978, Russo and Simon 1978: 44ff, Redfield 1994, and Pucci 1998: 194-99. I note in passing that among other arguments against the strong version of this claim is the fact that to whatever extent Athena may conceivably stand for wisdom and self-control, it is the goddess Hera who is really being characterized in this passage. Note also how Russo and Simon, analyzing the gods as mental states, miss that Hera is a *motivated* character.

<sup>4</sup> Hera has a traditional role as a patron deity of heroes in the Greek-speaking world, as O'Brien 1983 usefully brings out and applies to her analysis of the *Iliad*.

“perishing” wrath. Nestor points it out again just after Hera’s intervention, calling “fighting” (μαρναμένοιῖν 1.257) between the chiefs a “great grief” (μέγα πένθος 1.254) come upon “the Achaean land” (Ἀχαιΐδα γαῖαν 1.254), and adding that Priam, his sons and all the Trojans would rejoice to see it (1.255-58). Hera in this passage is again a protector figure, who feels distress at the prospect of strife between the Achaean chiefs. As a model for audience response, she projects a desire to avert a *penthos* of the kind envisioned by Nestor, which would be bad for the Achaeans – causing them much suffering – and good for the Trojans.<sup>5</sup>

The passage in which Agamemnon tests the troops’ morale in Book 2 further develops Hera’s function as an audience figure:<sup>6</sup>

Ἐνθά κεν Ἀργείοισιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος ἐτύχθη  
εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίην Ἥρη πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν.... 2.155-56

Then the Argives would have come upon a home-coming in contravention of  
how events had been allotted,  
If Hera had not spoken a word to Athena....

There is no verb of seeing, nor of emotion, but the incident reinforces the impression that Hera is an interested outside observer; her attention, it seems, is still fixed on Troy.

Moreover, the poet makes known her internal reaction to the events he has just recounted by means of her words to Athena:

οὕτω δὴ οἶκονδὲ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν  
Ἀργεῖοι φεύξονται ἐπ’ εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης;  
κὰδ δέ κεν εὐχολὴν Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρῳσὶ λίποιν

<sup>5</sup> Ironically, her first intervention, putting it into Achilles’ mind to call an assembly to deal with the plague, is a necessary part of the tangled web of causes which bring about the *menis* sending Achaeans to Hades in the poem.

<sup>6</sup> For the sake of completeness, and in support of my claim for Hera’s primacy as an observer in these early books, a word is in order about the only examples of unsolicited intervention from a deity other than Hera in Books 1-3. Two feature Iris. First, Iris comes “from the side of Zeus” (*par Dios* 2.787) to warn the Trojans about the Achaean approach. Shortly afterward, she comes to summon Helen to the walls of Ilium to watch the duel between her former husbands (3.121ff). The third is Aphrodite’s rescue of Paris during the duel: καὶ νῦν κεν εἵρυσσέν τε καὶ ἄσπετον ἦρατο κῦδος, / εἰ μὴ ἄρ’ ὁξὺ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη... – 3.373-74 (And now [Menelaus] would have drawn [Paris up by the strangling strap] and won endless glory, if she had not quickly taken notice, the daughter of Zeus, Aphrodite...) In none of these three passages is any description offered of thoughts and emotions on the part of the onlooker, and they do not provide potential models for audience response.



Ἀργεῖην Ἑλένην, ἧς εἵνεκα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν  
ἐν Τροίῃ ἀπόλοντο φίλης ἀπὸ πατρίδος αἵης. – 2.158-62

Is it really like *this* that homeward, toward their dear fatherland,  
the Argives will flee on the broad back of the sea?  
But they would leave behind, as a source of boasts for Priam and the  
Trojans,  
Argive Helen, for whom many Achaeans  
at Troy have laid down their lives – *away* from their dear fatherland.

Hera's words to Athena cast the proposed intervention as an attempt to prevent Priam and the Trojans from being able to boast that they won, and thus to avoid a dishonorable situation in which the Achaeans will have fled and left "so many dead so far from their own homeland."<sup>7</sup> That Hera ends her speech with the image of Achaeans buried at Troy is telling: it is at once a poignant reminder of the need for avenging fallen comrades and a standard of bravery against which to measure the shame of flight. Hera's words here illustrate how concern for the Achaeans, by extending into concern for Achaean dishonor, in and of itself entails hostility toward Troy in the circumstances depicted in the epic: the Trojans must be defeated lest Helen be left for them to boast over, with many Achaeans already having died to get her back.<sup>8</sup> Though the verb *kēdomai* is not repeated here, the passage is consistent with the previous two in that it is couched in terms of care for Achaeans: an early *nostos* would reflect badly on them, and leave their dead unavenged, and so is undesirable.<sup>9</sup>

By establishing Hera as an observer figure, and describing her reactions to the poem's events in the way that he does, the poet offers a model of response that moves from the most palatable to the most challenging. The first model is the most straightforward: care

<sup>7</sup> Josef Brodsky, "Odysseus to Telemachus." In Brodsky's poem, victory and defeat are no longer part of Odysseus' thoughts; it is the dead far from home, irrespective of victory, that he foregrounds.

<sup>8</sup> To die for something unfinished (ἀτελευτήτω ἐπὶ ἔργῳ 4.175) is shameful: Agamemnon later envisions Trojans jumping up and down on Menelaus' grave, jeering that Agamemnon left his dead brother at Troy and went home (4.173-182). The shame would be awful: he concludes by wishing the earth would swallow him up if it should come to that (τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρεῖα χθών 4.182).

<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, according to the narrator Hera is here interceding on behalf of fate, for the Achaean return at this point would be "beyond what has been allotted" (ὑπέρμορα 2.155).

for the dying, who are Achaeans. The second takes a more overtly Achaean perspective, appealing to audience desire for Achaean unity. The third model represents an observer who reacts negatively to the sight of Achaeans fleeing homeward out of concern for Achaean honor. Thus, the successive descriptions of Hera's responses move from an attitude of (defensive) care for the Achaeans toward (aggressive) hostility toward Troy and the Trojans.

This is not to imply a change in Hera's own attitude. In chronological terms, Hera has already conceived the powerful hatred for Troy that will be on display in Book 4. As a character, she is a composite – she cares for the Achaeans, wants them to fight on despite their wishes and hates Troy. But it is significant that these responses come on display in a certain sequence, following the arc of the early books as the poet moves from describing Achaeans dying to Achaeans prosecuting the invasion of Troy. The point is that the poet describes Hera's successive emotional responses as an observer in such a way as to illustrate the variety of issues, which are then up for consideration as a paradigm by the time Book 4 begins.

The development of Hera, with Athena, as a figure of divine response sets up the scene in Book 4, where the patterns analyzed above both continue and also move to the foreground: Hera's views remain the focus of attention, despite the presence now of the other gods who are also interested onlookers; the personal reasons for Hera's response are suppressed, now pointedly; the shift from concern for Achaean suffering to hostility toward Troy comes to a climax, as the latter takes the spotlight at last, in such a way as to explicitly trump the former: when confronted with Zeus' resistance Hera offers whichever Argive cities Zeus prefers to destroy in return (4.39-56).

Zeus characterizes Hera as bloodthirsty. Apollo later criticizes Athena for failing to pity the Trojans. Nevertheless, from Book 8 to the *theomachia* "the gods" when

mentioned as a group are still mostly pro-Achaean, and typically set against Zeus' aid to the Trojans. Thus, when Zeus forbids any god but himself from taking part in the action at Troy in the beginning of Book 8, Athena responds:

ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη ὕπατε κρειόντων  
 εὔ νυ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ὅ τοι σθένος οὐκ ἐπικτόν·  
 ἀλλ' ἔμπηξ Δαναῶν ὀλοφυρόμεθ' αἰχμητῶν,  
 οἳ κεν δὴ κακὸν οἶτον ἀναπλήσαντες ὄλωνται.  
 ἀλλ' ἦτοι πολέμου μὲν ἀφεξόμεθ' ὥς σὺ κελεύεις· 35  
 βουλήν δ' Ἀργείοις ὑποθησόμεθ' ἢ τις ὀνήσει,  
 ὥς μὴ πάντες ὄλωνται ὀδυσσαμένοιο τεοῖο. – 8.31-37

Father ours, son of Kronos, highest of the powerful,  
 we know well that your strength is irresistible –  
 and yet we pity the Danaan spear-men,  
 who perish and fill their evil dooms.  
 Indeed, we will keep away from the warfare as you bid –  
 but let us offer counsel to the Argives, whatever may help,  
 lest they all perish through your anger.

Athena has taken it upon herself to speak for the group; “we pity the Danaan spear-men” (Δαναῶν ὀλοφυρόμεθ' αἰχμητῶν 8.33) and “we will give counsel to the Argives” (βουλήν δ' Ἀργείοις ὑποθησόμεθ[α] 8.36). Her words do not present a picture of divided partisanship on Olympus, but rather of the gods united in support of the Achaeans against Zeus' plans to honor Achilles by supporting the Trojans. This impression is enhanced by the way her “we” begins as a response to Zeus' claim to be able to out-pull *all* of the gods (θεοὶ... πάντες 8.18): “we know” (ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν 8.32) that Zeus' power is irresistible. There is no question that some of the gods, such as Apollo, would rather support the Trojans than give the Achaeans advice, but Athena's rhetoric stands unchallenged.

The theme of pitying the Achaeans is picked up again in the same book, when Hera accuses the pro-Achaean Poseidon of not feeling sufficient pity for the Danaans that are being cut down:

ὦ πόποι ἐννοσίγαι' εὐρυσθενές, οὐδέ νυ σοί περ  
 ὀλλυμένων Δαναῶν ὀλοφύρεται ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός.  
 οἳ δέ τοι εἰς Ἑλίκην τε καὶ Αἰγᾶς δῶρ' ἀνάγουσι

πολλά τε καὶ χαρίεντα· σὺ δέ σφισι βούλεο νίκην.  
 εἴ περ γάρ κ' ἐθέλοιμεν, ὅσοι Δαναοῖσιν ἄρωγοί, 205  
 Τρῶας ἀπώσασθαι καὶ ἐρυκέμεν εὐρύοπα Ζῆν,  
 αὐτοῦ κ' ἔνθ' ἀκάχοιτο καθήμενος οἶος ἐν Ἰδῇ. – 8.201-7

Ah, mighty earth-shaker, not even your heart  
 pities in your breast the Danaans as they perish.  
 They bring gifts to Helice and Aigai,  
 many and pleasing – you, counsel victory for them.  
 For if we – as many as aid the Danaans – should wish  
 to push back the Trojans and resist broad-browed Zeus,  
 he would be sorry as he sat there alone on Ida.

Hera's accusation implicitly raises the question of whether the extradiegetic audience is feeling sufficient pity for the Danaans. Moreover, in lines 205-7 Hera envisions all the divine partisans for the Danaans struggling against Zeus.

The statements of Athena and Hera above receive not only silent support from the narrator, who does not undermine them, but explicit endorsement later in Book 11:<sup>10</sup>

Ἔρις δ' ἄρ' ἔχαιρε πολύστονος εἰσορόωσα·  
 οἷη γάρ ῥα θεῶν παρετύγχανε μαρναμένοισιν,  
 οἱ δ' ἄλλοι οὐ σφιν πάρεσαν θεοί, ἀλλὰ ἔκηλοι 75  
 σφοῖσιν ἐνὶ μεγάροισι καθήατο, ἦχι ἐκάστῳ  
 δώματα καλὰ τέτυκτο κατὰ πτύχας Οὐλύμποιο.  
 πάντες δ' ἡτιόωντο κελαινεφέα Κρονίωνα  
 οὔνεκ' ἄρα Τρῶεσσιν ἐβούλετο κῦδος ὀρέξαι. – 11.73-79

But baneful Eris rejoiced as she looked on –  
 for she alone of the gods was there with the fighters,  
 while the other gods were not beside them, but at ease  
 sat in their own halls, where for each  
 a beautiful home was built on the folds of Olympus.  
 For all of them (*pantes*) blamed dark-clouding Zeus,  
 because he was planning to hold out glory to the Trojans.

The battle is at its thickest, and Eris alone rejoices: to rejoice in viewing, by this model, is to join with the personification of strife. There is an invitation to rejoice, but it requires some “hard-heartedness,” as the poet will later point out.<sup>11</sup> The other gods (οἱ δ'

<sup>10</sup> Which follows closely on Book 8 in these terms, since Book 9 is concerned with the embassy to Achilles and does not involve the gods at all, and Book 10 is held by many to be an interpolation. Lines 8.549-61, according to which “the gods” hate Troy, Priam, and his people, are not accepted by most editors.

<sup>11</sup> ... μάλα κεν θρασυκάρδιος εἴη / ὅς τότε γηθήσειεν ἰδὼν πόνον οὐδ' ἀκάχοιτο. 13.344 Only a bold-hearted man would *gēthēseien* and not *akachōito*: i.e., be Eris, and not Poseidon?

ἄλλοι...θεοὶ 11.75) are not even watching, but they all (πάντες 11.78) blame Zeus for his plan to hold out glory to the Trojans. No one is watching but Eris. Thus, to watch now is to delight as Eris delights – or as Zeus does, in his creation.<sup>12</sup>

The sense that “the gods” are a generally pro-Achaean body, in opposition to Zeus’ plans for Trojan victory, is consistent through the battle books. First, the poet describes “the gods, all of them” in pain at the sight of the Achaeans losing – though he then qualifies this with the phrase “those who support the Danaans:”

Ἀργεῖοι δὲ καὶ ἀχνύμενοί περ ἀνάγκῃ  
νηῶν ἡμύνοντο· θεοὶ δ’ ἀκαχήατο θυμὸν  
πάντες ὅσοι Δαναοῖσι μάχης ἐπιτάρροθοι ἦσαν. – 12.176-78

And though they sorrowed, by necessity the Argives  
defended the ships – and the gods were grieved at heart,  
all of them, as many as were helpers of the Danaans in battle.

The qualification carries the reminder that not all gods are pro-Achaean, but still emphasizes the pro-Achaean perspective. When Zeus wakes following the *Dios apatē*, he reminds Hera how he once punished her despite “the gods” (θεοὶ 15.21) wanting to save her.<sup>13</sup> By bringing this up as a point of comparison, Zeus enhances the sense that here too in the main narrative he stands against the gods as a group in his support of the Trojans. Athena prevents Ares from going to avenge his son Ascalphus on the battlefield “out of fear for all the gods” (πᾶσι περιδείσασα θεοῖσιν 15.123) and the wrath that Zeus will show to them.

The *theomachia* presents a different picture of “the gods” as a body. Again, no particular god has changed in attitude, but the impression given of an overall pro-

<sup>12</sup> Zeus is treated in the following lines: τῶν μὲν ἄρ’ οὐκ ἀλέγιζε πατήρ· ὃ δὲ νόσφι λιασθεῖς / τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάνευθε καθέζετο κύδεις γαίῳ / εἰσορόων Τρώων τε πόλιν καὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν / χαλκοῦ τε στεροπὴν, ὀλλύντάς τ’ ὀλλυμένους τε. 11.80-83. Maybe that’s why many readers are bored by these books today – they haven’t got the Eris or the Zeus perspective. It’s interesting to note that it’s when all the gods have gone home and aren’t watching that Achilles *is* watching 11.599-615.

<sup>13</sup> οὐ δ’ ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλῃσιν / ἐκρέμω· ἡλάστεον δὲ θεοὶ κατὰ μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον, / λῦσαι δ’ οὐκ ἐδύναντο παρασταδόν 15.20-22.

Achaean body has shifted. In the opening of Book 20, Zeus invites the gods to take part in the action at Troy according to their leanings toward one side or the other:

ἀλλ' ἦτοι μὲν ἐγὼ μενέω πτυχὶ Οὐλύμπιοι  
 ἦμενος, ἔνθ' ὁρώων φρένα τέρψομαι· οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι  
 ἔρχεσθ' ὄφρ' ἂν ἵκησθε μετὰ Τρῳᾶς καὶ Ἀχαιοὺς,  
 ἀμφοτέροισι δ' ἀρήγεθ' ὅπη νόος ἐστὶν ἐκάστου. 25  
 εἰ γὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς οἶος ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι μαχεῖται  
 οὐδὲ μίνυνθ' ἔξουσι ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα.  
 καὶ δέ τί μιν καὶ πρόσθεν ὑποτρομέεσκον ὁρώντες·  
 νῦν δ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ θυμὸν ἐταίρου χῶεται αἰνῶς  
 δεῖδω μὴ καὶ τεῖχος ὑπέρμορον ἐξαλαπάξῃ. – 20.22-30

But I will remain on the fold of Olympus  
 sitting, whence I will look and delight (*terpsomai*) my heart; but you others,  
 go until you come among the Trojans and Achaeans,  
 and give aid to either side, according to the desire of each.  
 For if Achilles attacks the Trojans alone  
 they will not hold back the swift-footed son of Peleus even for a while.  
 Even before they shuddered when they gazed upon him,  
 but now when his heart rages terribly for his companion  
 I fear lest he even take the wall beyond what is allotted (*hypermoron*).

This passage has a particularly strong metaperformative aspect. Zeus' plan makes little sense on the face of it: given that the gods for the Achaeans are the more powerful (as their round victory shows) it is hard to accept that sending them all to fight would have the effect of delaying Troy's fall. Moreover, once they've arrived they all sit down and watch before they ever fight (20.132-55). On a metaperformative level, Zeus' plan becomes more intelligible: Zeus the divine orchestrator of the grand war conveys a creator's pleasure (τέρψομαι 20.23) in his work, and in seeing his audience involved in that work.<sup>14</sup> He asks the gods to "give help to both sides according to the wish of each [of you]" (ἀμφοτέροισι δ' ἀρήγεθ' ὅπη νόος ἐστὶν ἐκάστου 20.25). The motivation to take part is strong for both gods and extradiegetic listeners: Zeus has made the tantalizing suggestion that the supposedly fixed course of events is not sure – that something might happen *hypermoron*, the sack of Troy by Achilles. This prospect meets mixed reactions

<sup>14</sup> For the leap from Olympus to Troy as an image of vicarious audience participation in the poem's action, see Chapter 3.

from the Olympians, as Zeus knows it will, but engages them enough to cause them to abandon their passivity and enter the arena of combat. Mixed reactions could be expected in the extradiegetic audience as well, and even within a single listener. On the one hand, what could be more exciting than the prospect of seeing Achilles himself sacking Troy? The idea is irresistible. On the other hand, what could be more terrible for Andromache, Priam, and the others – and ultimately unacceptable, in face of the story tradition?

Conflict comes to an end in Book 24. The poet's consignment of Hera, Athena, and Poseidon to a non-representative minority (cited above) is the beginning of a process in which their viewpoint is marginalized out of existence – simply by manipulation of the construct “the gods,” and without evidence of any particular god having a change of heart. The minority's dissent is apparently enough to prevent action, as after nine days Apollo accuses “the gods” of supporting Achilles:

σχέτλιοί ἐστε θεοί, δηλήμονες· οὐ νύ ποθ' ὑμῖν  
 Ἔκτωρ μηρί' ἔκηε βοῶν αἰγῶν τε τελείων;  
 τὸν νῦν οὐκ ἔτλητε νέκυν περ ἑόντα σαῶσαι      35  
 ἦ τ' ἀλόχῳ ἰδέειν καὶ μητέρι καὶ τέκεϊ ᾧ  
 καὶ πατέρι Πριάμῳ λαοῖσί τε, τοί κέ μιν ᾧκα  
 ἐν πυρὶ κήαιεν καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερίσαιεν.  
 ἀλλ' ὅλοῳ Ἀχιλῆϊ θεοὶ βούλεσθ' ἐπαρήγειν.... – 24.33-39

You gods are scoundrels, wicked. Did Hector never burn  
 for you the thigh-bones of cows and perfect goats?  
 Now you do not dare to save him, corpse that he is,  
 for his wife and mother to see and his child  
 and father Priam, and the people, who would quickly  
 burn him on a pyre and perform funeral rites.  
 But you gods contrive to help baneful Achilles....

Apollo's rhetoric holds the gods as a body accountable, whatever the personal feelings of each. Hera responds angrily, saying that Achilles as son of Thetis cannot be held in equal honor with Hector, and reminds the group that “you gods, all of you attended the wedding” of Achilles' parents (24.55-63, πάντες δ' ἀντιάσθε θεοὶ γάμου 24.62).

At this point Zeus speaks up and urges Hera not to be angry at “the gods” (θεοῖσιν 24.65). By doing so, Zeus again places Hera in the minority, as did the poet in lines

24.21-22. He then goes on to silence the minority view altogether when he describes the debate on Olympus to Thetis as follows:

ἐννῆμαρ δὴ νεῖκος ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ὄρωρεν  
 Ἕκτορος ἀμφὶ νέκυι καὶ Ἀχιλλῆϊ πτολιπόρθω·  
 κλέψαι δ' ὀτρύνουσιν εὐσκοπον Ἀργειφόντην·  
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τόδε κῦδος Ἀχιλλῆϊ προτιάπτω  
 αἰδῶ καὶ φιλότητα τεῆν μετόπισθε φυλάσσων. – 24.107-11

For nine days now a quarrel has risen among the gods  
 concerning the corpse of Hector and Achilles the sacker of cities:  
 they are rousing the sharp-eyed slayer of Argus to steal [the corpse],  
 but I am granting this honor (*kudos*) to Achilles,  
 respecting still your friendship and the reverence due to you (*aidōs*).

By casting himself as the one who until now has resisted the rescuing of Hector – out of consideration for Thetis – and not mentioning Hera, Athena, or Poseidon, Zeus conceals the existence of their dissenting view. His message for Achilles makes “the gods” a perfectly united body:

σκούζεσθαί οἱ εἶπε θεούς, ἐμὲ δ' ἔξοχα πάντων  
 ἀθανάτων κεχολῶσθαι, ὅτι φρεσὶ μαινομένησιν  
 Ἕκτορ' ἔχει παρὰ νηυσὶ κορωνίσιν οὐδ' ἀπέλυσεν. – 24.113-15

Tell him that the gods are angry with him, and that I most of all  
 the immortals am wroth, because with his mind raging  
 he holds Hector by the beaked ships and has not ransomed him.

All of this entails significant sleight-of-hand on the poet's part, because that movement in sympathy on the part of the notional collective “the gods” overlays fundamental divisions within that body, whereby Hera, Athena, Poseidon, and others on the Achaean side stand against Apollo, Aphrodite, Ares, and others on the Trojan side.

In considering the effect of this overall shift, it is important to bear in mind not only the metaperformative but also the theological aspect of the gods' depiction in the *Iliad*, and thus to recognize certain fundamental differences between extradiegetic and divine audiences. Even as the poem nears its end, and Zeus urges pity of Hector and the Trojans, the poet also makes more and more of a basic distinction between the capacity of gods and mortals for pity. The gods, we find, are typically and often emphatically moved to



pity due to bonds of *philia* between themselves and the mortals in question. Thus, Zeus is grieved at heart to watch Hector, that φίλον ἄνδρα (22.168), fleeing from Achilles: that Hector is *philos* to Zeus is apparently the result of his many sacrifices (22.169-72). It is impossible for the extradiegetic audience to have bonds of *philia* with any of the characters; if we feel pity, it is of a different sort.

At the same time, the *Iliad* develops another distinct model for one person caring for someone else's sorrows, one which is not closed to the extradiegetic listeners.<sup>15</sup> According to this model, through the act of witnessing someone else's sorrows, an onlooker thinks of his own sorrows, and thus joins in lamenting.

“ὣς ἔφατο κλαίουσ’, ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες  
Πάτροκλον πρόφασιν, σφῶν δ’ αὐτῶν κήδε’ ἐκάστη. – 19.301-4

So she spoke, weeping – and the women followed in the lamenting of Patroclus, in name – but [in reality] each for her own cares.

By this model, one laments because of one's own κήδεα. Perhaps that's what makes the women such good mourners – as well as old men:

“ὣς ἔφατο κλαίων, ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γέροντες,  
μνησάμενοι τὰ ἕκαστος ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔλειπον – 19.338-339

So he spoke, weeping, and the old men followed in the lamenting – each recalling the things he had left behind in his home.

The shared weeping of Achilles and Priam (24.509-12) is the culmination of such scenes: they weep together, but alone. This model of sorrowing for another emphasizes the understanding of a shared human capacity for suffering, while setting this shared capacity against the isolation implied by the uniqueness of each person's pain.<sup>16</sup> It is developed through the poem's mortal characters, and is as available to us as it is to them. This

<sup>15</sup> For an interesting treatment of female lamentation (focused, however, on Book 24) with up-to-date bibliography, see Perkell 2008.

<sup>16</sup> See Mackie 1996: 164 who concludes that “even when the pair [i.e. Priam and Achilles] grieve together, the diction seems to imply the separateness of their experience....”

model of lament is not available to the gods, who after all do not have κήδεα as Achilles points out (αὐτοὶ δέ τ' ἄκηδέες εἰσὶ 24.526).

The two patterns just outlined are divergent. The first shows the divine audience modeling shifting sympathies throughout the *Iliad*; the second pattern shows that by the end of the poem, they have not been able to experience the characters' sorrows in the same way that the poet's listeners may have done. Thus, the *Iliad* presents the gods both as a divine *audience*, with which we as an audience for the same event can identify, and a *divine* audience whose divinity removes us completely from their ken. The extradiegetic audience, while challenged by ethical questions posed through depiction of the gods, must ultimately respond to them in a human way: through contrast with them, the poet constructs his listeners as an audience at once god-like and potentially humane.

Zeus is, once more, the great exception: non-partisan, he pities not only Hector (15.12-13, 17.201) but Aias (17.648); he pities Achilles' horses, with whom he is not likely to have any bond of *philia*,<sup>17</sup> and indeed his pity stems from insight into the relationship of mortality to immortality and compassion for humanity (17.441-47). Perhaps most remarkably, Zeus pities the old men who lament Patroclus' death while thinking of their own lives – in this way implying, perhaps, pity for the extradiegetic listeners who weep at the *Iliad* because it touches somehow on their own sorrows. Here, as elsewhere, the narrator seems to reach out through the persona of Zeus to engage with his audience during performance: the arrogant bluster of the king of the gods is tempered by the human compassion of the narrative voice.

---

<sup>17</sup> It may also be argued from 17.443-44 that Zeus feels responsibility for the gods' gift of the immortal horses to the mortal Peleus.

## Conclusion

The *Iliad*, like the *Odyssey*, contains representations of the dynamics of performance and reception, yet the two poems approach this common area of interest from different directions. The *Odyssey* depicts the performance itself, with an external view of the participants: the bard performs, the audiences listen and enjoy (the suitors and Phaeacians), or are moved to tears or complaint (Odysseus and Penelope), or engage in “literary” criticism (Telemachus).<sup>1</sup> A key determining factor in response is the degree to which each listener is part of the story: Odysseus and Penelope understand themselves to be caught up in the events of which they hear, while the suitors and Phaeacians do not. Telemachus, on the other hand, is in the process of working out for himself to what degree he fits in the story of his father and his father’s comrades at Troy; and indeed the *Odyssey* leaves this problem as an unresolved source of tension.<sup>2</sup>

The *Iliad* depicts not the external elements of performance – the acts of singing and listening, and the social function of epic within the Homeric world – but rather the dynamics of the communicative moment: the mental experience of the listener presented with a riveting vision, the sense of shared enterprise in the symbiosis of poet and audience. The gods on Olympus are not a listening audience for epic poetry, but an internal audience for the very epic of which they are also a part. Nevertheless, their immortality and spatial separation from Troy on Olympus – which is also the separation between two spheres, the human and the divine – allow them the potential for aloofness that would make them as complacent as the *Odyssey*’s Phaeacians. They

---

<sup>1</sup> On Telemachus’ speech at *Od.* 1.345-59 as the earliest surviving example of the important social institution of “table-talk,” see Ford 2002: 5-8: “Homer shows pronouncing about poetry as part of a male citizen’s repertoire of public performances, and he suggests it was something they learned from well-disposed elders and kin” (7-8).

<sup>2</sup> Murnaghan 2002 is a thought-provoking discussion of this and other issues surrounding Telemachus.

are both involved and detached, characters within the story and remote observers of the action, capable of great detachment as well as hyperbolic emotion. With the gods providing an internal model of a variety of possible attitudes, as well as a metaphor for the transition between degrees of involvement – the mental “leap” to Troy – the *Iliad* encourages and challenges its listeners to mentally enter the story and join the singer in bringing the tale to completion.

By developing Zeus as an internal poet-figure, the *Iliad* also provides a different perspective on the Homeric bard. The *Odyssey* depicts the social function of bards at the court of kings: they are dependents, sometimes deserving of honor and praise, but helpless in the face of superior force, as the comical scene of Phemius begging Odysseus for his life brings out (23.330-53).<sup>3</sup> The attitude of the performer toward his own work is not treated. The *Iliad* gives a very different picture of the epic poet: within the story-world of which he sings, he is like Zeus whose will and authority are absolute; he abides by his audience’s wishes not out of servility,<sup>4</sup> but with an attitude of combined magnanimity and cunning (in the second he is most like Odysseus narrating his travels), and ultimately from a position of unassailable power. He does not sing only to make his living, the picture one derives from the *Odyssey*, but also delights in his work. He glories at his success in bringing to life great and portentous battles, and takes pride in his ability to make his audience see what he sees and enter the world into which he invites them. Finally, he aims to confront them with a recurring question: “with what eyes,” and what emotions, they are – or should be – gazing on the spectacle at Troy.

---

<sup>3</sup> The comedy derives in large part from the *Odyssey*-poet’s implicit professional connection to the character Phemius; the external epic performer is having fun with his intratextual colleague.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Phemius and the suitors: *Od.* 1.154; 22.331, 350-53.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allan, W. 2006. "Divine Justice and Cosmic Order in Early Greek Epic." *JHS* 126: 1-35.
- . 2008. "Performing the Will of Zeus: The Διὸς βουλή and the Scope of Early Greek Epic." In Reverman and Wilson 2008: 204-216.
- Atchity, K., R. Hogart and D. Price edd. 1987. *Critical Essays on Homer*. Boston.
- Austin, N. 1978. "The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad*." In Wright 1978: 70-84.
- Bakker, E. 1993. "Discourse and Performance: Involvement, Visualization and "Presence" in Homeric Poetry" in *CQ* 12: 1, 1-29.
- . 1999. "Mimesis as Performance: Rereading Auerbach's First Chapter." *Poetics Today* 20/1: 11-26. [also appears in Bakker 2005]
- . 2001. "Similes, Augment, and the Language of Immediacy" in Watson 2001, pp 1-23. [also appears in Bakker 2005]
- . 2005. *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics*. Washington.
- . 2009. "Homer, Odysseus and the Narratology of Performance" in Grethlein and Rengakos, edd: 117-136.
- Barrett, J. 1998. "Pentheus and the Spectator in Euripides' *Bacchae*." *AJP* 119/3: 337-360.
- Bassett, S. E. 1927. "The Single Combat between Hector and Aias." *The American Journal of Philology*, 48: 2, 148-156.
- Becker, A. S. 1995. "The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Ekphrasis." Lanham, Maryland.
- Bergren, A. 1979-80. "Helen's Web: Time and Tableau in the *Iliad*." *Helios* 7:1, 19-34.
- Bowra, M. 1950 *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*. Oxford. (First printed 1930.)
- Bremer, J. M. 1985. "Four Similes in *Iliad* 22." In *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, Volume 5*: 367-72. Liverpool
- . 1987. "The So-called 'Götterapparat' in *Iliad* XX-XXII." In *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry, Recent Trends in Homeric Interpretation*. ed. J.M. Bremer, I.J.F. de Jong and J. Kalaff, 31-46. Amsterdam.
- Buxton, R. 2004. "Similes and Other Likenesses." In Fowler, ed.: 139-55.
- Clay, J. S. 1983. *The Wrath of Athena*. Princeton.
- . 1999. "The Will and the Whip of Zeus," in *Literary Imagination* 1: 40-60.
- . 2007. "Art, Nature and the Gods in the Chariot Race of *Iliad* Ψ." In Paizi Apostolopoulou, Rengakos and Tsagalis (edd) 2007: 69-74.
- . 2011. *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision, and Memory in the Iliad*.

Cambridge.

- Jong, I.J.F. de. 1987. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam.
- . 2006. "The Homeric Narrator and his own *kleos*." *Mnemosyne* 59: 188-207.
- . 2009. "Metalepsis in Ancient Greek Literature." In Grethlein and Rengakos 2009: 87-116.
- Jong, I.J.F. de and R. Nünlist. 2004. "From bird's eye view to close-up: the standpoint of the narrator in the Homeric epics." In *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung. Festschrift für Joachim Latacz anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstages*, A. Bierl, A. Schmitt, A. Willi eds.: 63-84. Munich.
- Dalby, A. 1995. "The *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and Their Audiences." *CQ* 45:2, 269-279.
- Dallenbach, L. 1977. *Le récit spéculaire. Essai sur la mise en abyme*. Paris.
- Dietrich, B. C. 1967. *Death, Fate and the Gods*. London.
- Dodds, E. R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley.
- Doherty, L. E. 1991. "The Internal and Implied Audiences of *Odyssey* 11." *Arethusa* 24:2, 145-76.
- . 1995. *Siren Songs: Gender, Audiences, and Narrators in the Odyssey*. Ann Arbor.
- Donlan, W. 1989. "The Unequal Exchange between Glaucus and Diomedes in Light of the Homeric Gift-Economy." *Phoenix* 43, 1-15.
- Dowden, Ken. 1996. "Homer's Sense of Text." *JHS* 116: 47-61.
- Duban, J. M. 1981. "Les duels majeurs de l'*Illiade* et le langage d'Hector." *Les études classiques* 49: 97-121.
- Eberhard, P. E. 1923. *Das Schicksal als poetische Idee bei Homer*. Paderborn.
- Edmunds, L. and R. W. Wallace, edd. 1997. *Poet, Public and Performance in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore.
- Edwards, A. 1985. *Achilles in the Odyssey*. Königstein.
- Edwards, M. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 4: Books 17-20. Cambridge.
- . 1987. *Homer, Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore.
- . 1992. "Homer and Oral Tradition: the Type Scene." *Oral Tradition* 7/2: 284-330.
- Fantuzzi, M. 2007. "La *mousa* del lamento in Euripide, e il lamento della Musa nel *Reso* ascritto a Euripide." *Eikasmos* 18: 173-199.
- Fenik, B. 1968. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description*. Wiesbaden.

- , ed. 1978a. *Homer: Tradition and Invention*. Cincinnati Classical Studies 2. Leiden.
- . 1978b. "Stylization and Variety: Four Monologues in the *Iliad*." In Fenik 1978a: 68-90.
- Finkelberg, M. 1998. *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece*. Oxford.
- Flaig, E. 1994. "Das Konsensprinzip im Homerischen Olympe Überlegungen zum Göttlichen Entscheidungsprozess Ilias 4.1-72." *Hermes* 122:1, 13-31.
- Foley, J. M. 1995. *The Singer of Tales in Performance*. Bloomington.
- . 1997. "Oral Tradition and its Implications." In Morris and Powell 1997: 146-173.
- Ford, A. 1992. *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca and London.
- . 1999. "Odysseus after Dinner: *Od.* 9.2-11 and the Traditions of Symptotic Song" in *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis, Kazazis and Rengakos* edd., Stuttgart. 109-123.
- . 2002. *The Origins of Criticism*. Princeton.  
has BIBL on symposium, 26 // has S. West "the earliest literary criticism in Greek literature" of *Od.* 1.346ff, 5
- Fowler, R. ed. 2004. *A Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge.
- Fränkel, H. 1921. *Die homerischen Gleichnisse*. Göttingen.
- . 1997. "Essence and Nature of the Homeric Simile." In Wright, G. M. and P. V. Jones, eds.: 103-23. *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*. (Translation of Fränkel 1921: 98-114)
- Friedman, R. 2001. "Divine Dissension and the Narrative of the *Iliad*." *Helios* 28:2, 99-118.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F. 1986. *La cithare d'Achille*. Rome.
- Gentili, B. 1988. *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore.
- Greenberg, N. 1993. "The Attitude of Agamemnon." *CW* 86: 3, 193-205.
- Grethlein, J. and A. Rengakos, edd. 2009. *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York.
- Gnoli, G. and J.-P. Vernant, eds. *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*. Cambridge
- Griffin, J. 1978 "The Divine Audience and the Religion of the *Iliad*." *CQ* 28: 1, 1-22.
- . 1980. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford. (Modified version of Griffin 1978.)
- Griffith, M. 1990. "Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry." In *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer*, Griffith and Mastronarde edd.: 185-207.

- Heiden, B. 1996. "The Three Movements of the *Iliad*." *GRBS* 37, 5-22.  
 ----. 2008. *Homer's Cosmic Fabrication: Choice and Design in the Iliad*. Oxford.
- Irwin, E. 2005. *Solon and Early Greek Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Janko, R. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 4: Books 13-16. Cambridge.  
 ----. 1998. "The Homeric Poems as Oral Dictated Texts." *CQ* 48: 1-13.
- Kaufmann, Walter and R. J. Hollingdale. 1967. *On the Genealogy of Morals, Ecce Homo*. (Translations of *Zur Genealogie der Moral* and *Ecce homo: Wie man wird, was man ist* by Friedrich Nietzsche.) New York.
- Kennedy, G. A. 1989. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*: Vol. 1, *Classical Criticism*. Cambridge.
- Kim, J. 2000. *The Pity of Achilles: Oral Style and the Unity of the Iliad*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford.
- Kullmann, W. 1956. *Das Wirken der Gotter in der Ilias*. Berlin.  
 ----. 1960. *Die Quellen der Ilias*. Hermes Einzelschriften 14. Wiesbaden.  
 ----. 1985. "Gods and Men in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*." *HSCP* 89, 1-23.
- Latacz, J. 1966. *Zum Wortfeld 'Freude' in der Sprache Homers*. Heidelberg.  
 ----. 1996. *Homer: His Art and His World*. Trans. J. Holoka. Ann Arbor.
- Lesky, A. 1961. *Göttliche und menschliche Motivation im homerischen Epos*. Heidelberg.  
 ----. 2001. "Divine and Human Causation in the *Iliad*" in *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad*, Cairns, D. ed.: Oxford. 170-202.
- Letoublon, F. 2007. "L'esprit de compétition chez Homère." In Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Rengakos, Tsaggalis 2007: 11-28.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1971. *The Justice of Zeus*. Berkeley.
- Lord, A. 1951. "Composition by theme in Homer and South Slavic epos." *TAPA* 82: 71-80.  
 ----. 1960/2000. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, Mass.  
 ----. 1995. *The Singer Resumes His Tale*. Ithaca.
- Mackie, H. 1996. *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, London.
- Marks, J. 2008. *Zeus in the Odyssey*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Maronitis, D. N. 2007. «Φωνικά άθλα και έπαθλα στα ομηρικά έπη» in Paizi-Apostolopoulou 2007.
- Martin, R. 1989. *The Language of Heroes*. Ithaca.



----. 2008. "Keens from the Absent Chorus: Troy to Ulster." In Suter 2008: 118-38.

Minchin, E. 2001. *Homer and the Resources of Memory: Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Oxford.

----. 2008. "Spatial Memory and the Composition of the *Iliad*." In *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*. Leiden.

Morris, I. 1986. "The Use and Abuse of Homer." *Classical Antiquity* 5:81-138.

Morris, I. and B. Powell, edd. 1997. *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden.

Morrison, J. V. 1992. *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the Iliad*. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

----. 1994. "Thematic Inversion in the *Iliad*: The Greeks Under Siege." *GRBS* 35, 209-27.

----. 1997. "Kerostasia, the Dictates of Fate, and the Will of Zeus in the *Iliad*." *Arethusa* 30: 273-296.

Murnaghan, S. 2002. "The Trials of Telemachus: Who Was the *Odyssey* Meant For?" *Arethusa* 35:1, 133-53.

Murray, O. 1991. "War and the Symposium." In *Dining in a Classical Context*, W. Slater ed.: 83-104. Ann Arbor.

----. 2008. "The *Odyssey* as Performance Poetry." In Revermann and Wilson, 161-76.

Nagler, M. 1974. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley.

Nagy, G. 1979/1999. *The Best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore.

----. 1989 "Early Greek Views of Poets and Poetry." In Kennedy 1989: 1-77.

----. 1996. *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge.

----. 2003. *Homeric Responses*. Austin.

Neal, T. 2006. "Blood and Hunger in the *Iliad*." *CP* 101:1, 15-33.

Nietzsche, F. 1991. *Jenseits von Gut und Böse; Zur Genealogie der Moral*. Stuttgart.

Nilsson, M. 1967-74. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. Munchen. [Nilsson, M. 1980. *A History of Greek Religion*. trans. F. J. Fielden.]

O'Brien, J. V. 1993. *The Transformation of Hera: A Study of Ritual, Hero and the Goddess in the Iliad*. Lanham, Maryland.

Olson, D. 1989. "Odyssey 8: Guide, Force, and the Subversive Poetics of Desire." *Arethusa* 22.

Paizi-Apostolopoulou, M. – Rengakos, A. – Tsagalis, Ch. (edd) 2007. *Άθλα και έπαθλα στα Ομηρικά Έπη. Από τα Πρακτικά του Ι' Συνεδρίου για την Οδύσσεια (15-19 Σεπτεμβρίου 2004)*. Center for Odyssean Studies. Ithaca, Greece.

- Parry, A. 1978. "Have We Homer's *Iliad*?" In Wright 1978, pp 1-27. [Parry, A. 1966. "Have We Homer's *Iliad*?" in *Yale Classical Studies* 20, 177-216.]
- Perkell, C. 2008. "Reading the Laments of *Iliad* 24." In Suter 2008: 93-117.
- Porter, J. (forthcoming). "Making and Unmaking: The Achaean wall and the Limits of Fictionality in Homeric Criticism."
- Postlethwaite, N. 1985. "The Duel of Paris and Menelaos and the Teichoskopia in *Iliad* 3." *Antichthon*, 19:1-6.
- Pucci, P. 1987. *Odysseus Polytropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad*. Ithaca.
- . 1998. *The Song of the Sirens: Essays on Homer*. Oxford.
- . 2002. "Theology and Poetics in the *Iliad*." In C. Higbie (ed.) *Epos and Mythos: Language and Narrative in Homeric Epic*, *Arethusa*. 35:1, 17-34.
- Purves, A. 2010. *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative*. Cambridge.
- Raaflaub, K. 1997. "Homeric Society." In Morris and Powell 1997: 624-48.
- Redfield, J. M. 1994. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*. Durham. (1<sup>st</sup> printing 1975)
- Rengakos, A. 2006. *Το χαμόγελο του Αχιλλέα. Θέματα αφήγησης και ποιητικής στα ομηρικά έπη*. Athens. [pp 17-30 appear in modified form in English as "The Smile of Achilles, or the *Iliad* and its Mirror-Image" in Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Rengakos, Tsangalis (edd) 2007 pp 101-110]
- Reinhardt, K. 1960. "Das Parisurteil" in *Tradition und Geist*, 16-36. Göttingen.
- . 1961. *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*. Göttingen.
- Reverman, M. and P. Wilson (edd.) 2008. *Peformance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin*. Oxford.
- Richardson, N. J. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 6: Books 21-24. Cambridge.
- Richardson, S. 1990. *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville.
- Rinon, Y. 2008. *Homer and the Dual Model of the Tragic*. Ann Arbor.
- Russo, J. 1997. "The Formula." In Morris and Powell, 1997: 238-260.
- Said, S. 2007. "Les transformations de la muse dans la tragédie grecque" in *Dalla lirica corale alla poesia drammatica*, Perusino and Colantonio edd.: 1-48.
- Sale, W. 1987. "The Formularity of the Place Phrases in the *Iliad*." *TAPA* 117, 21-50.
- Sarischoulis, E. 2008. *Schicksal, Götter und Handlungsfreiheit in den Epen Homers. Palingenesia, Bd. 92*. Stuttgart.

- Schein, S. 1997. "The *Iliad*: Structure and Interpretation." In Morris and Powell 1997: 345-59.
- Scodel, R. 2002. *Listening to Homer*. Ann Arbor.
- Segal, C. 1971. *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad*. *Mnemosyne* supp. 17. Leiden.
- . 1992. "Bard and Audience in Homer" in *Homer's Ancient Readers*, Lamberton and Keaney edd.: 3-29.
- . 1993. *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow: Art, Gender, and Commemoration in Alcestis, Hippolytus and Hecuba*. Durham.
- . 1994. *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey*. Ithaca.
- Slater, W. J. 1990. "Symptotic Ethics in the *Odyssey*" in *Sympotica: a symposium on the symposium*, O. Murray ed.: 213-220. Oxford.
- Slatkin, L. 1991. *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad*. Berkeley.
- . 2007. "Notes on Tragic Visualizing in the *Iliad*." In *Visualizing the Tragic: Drama, Myth and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature; Essays in Honour of Froma Zeitlin*, Kraus, Goldhill, Foley, Elsner edd.: 19-34.
- Suter, A., ed. 2008. *Lament: Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond*. New York.
- Suzuki, M. 1989. *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic*. Cornell.
- Taalman Kip, M. 2000. "The Gods of the *Iliad* and the Fate of Troy." *Mnemosyne* 53/4: 385-402.
- Taplin, O. 1980. "The Shield of Achilles within the *Iliad*." *Greece and Rome* 27:1-21.
- . 1992. *Homeric Soundings*. Oxford.
- Thalmann, W. G. 1984. *Conventions in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Baltimore and London.
- Trapp, R. 1961. "Aias in the *Iliad*." *CJ* 56:6, 271-75.
- Van Wees, H. 1997. "Homeric Warfare." In Morris and Powell 1997: 668-693.
- Vernant, J.-P. 1965. *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs: études de psychologie historique*. Paris.
- . 1982. 'La belle mort et le cadavre outragé.' In Gnoli and Vernant 1982: 45-76.
- Volk, K. 2002. "ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ Revisited." *CPh* 97/1: 61-68.
- Walsh, G. 1984. *The Varieties of Enchantment*. Chapel Hill.

- Watson, J. ed. 2001. *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*. Leiden – Boston – Köln.
- Wecowski, M. 2002. "Homer and the Origins of the *Symposion*." In *Omero Tremila Anni Dopo*. Rome: 625-638.
- West, M. L., ed. 1971. *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*. 2 vols. Oxford.  
 ----. 2001. *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*. Leipzig.
- Whitman, C. H. 1958. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Willcock, M. M. 1978. "Some Aspects of the Gods in the *Iliad*." In Wright 1978: 58-69.
- Wright, G. M. and P. V. Jones, eds. 1997. *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*. Oxford.
- Wright, J. ed. 1978. *Essays on the Iliad*. Bloomington, Indiana.
- Yamagata, N. 1994. *Homeric Morality*. Leiden, New York and Köln.
- Zanker, G. 1981. "*Enargeia* in the Ancient Criticism of Poetry." In *Rheinisches Museum* 124: 297-311.
- Zervou, A. 2007. "Jeux athlétiques – jeux de reception." In Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Rengakos and Tsagalis 2007: 29-53.