INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

UMI®
800-521-0600

PARIS IN THE EPIC TRADITION:

A STUDY IN HOMERIC TECHNIQUES OF CHARACTERIZATION

by

Roberto Nickel

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Graduate Department of Classical Studies
University of Toronto

©Copyright by Roberto Nickel 1997.

National Library of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services

Acquisitions et services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-41568-6

Canada

ABSTRACT

Paris in the Epic Tradition:
A Study in Homeric Techniques of Characterization

Ph.D. 1997

Roberto Nickel

Department of Classical Studies

University of Toronto

In this dissertation I argue that the characterization of Paris as an anti-heroic, erotic figure is untraditional, that it is either the work of the main composer of the *Iliad* or that it entered the oral tradition not long before the *Iliad* took its final shape.

I begin with an overview of scholarship on techniques of characterization in oral poetry. I argue that characterization is achieved within the context of a poem's specific ethical framework. Characters act either in conformity with or in opposition to this system of values, and their *characterization* emerges accordingly. For the *Iliad*, the dominant ethical framework is that of the warrior. The negative characterization of Paris results from his poor performance as a warrior in Books 3 and 6. I go on to argue, however, that in the rest of the poem Paris acts in accordance with the value system of the warrior. This results in a figure who is characterized in a heroic manner in the rest of the poem.

In the second chapter, I explore these two opposing characterizations of the same hero. I conclude, on the basis of an examination of the hero's epithets, that the anti-heroic figure enters the tradition late. The stories that

are known about Paris from the epic tradition — the Judgement of Paris, the death of Achilles, and Paris' own death — indicate that he was traditionally a heroic figure.

In the third chapter, I examine the type-scene of arming, for Paris receives one of only four of these scenes in the *Iliad*. I argue that the arming scene always serves to glorify the hero who is its subject. As such, Paris' arming scene is further evidence that in the epic tradition Paris was a heroic figure.

In the fourth chapter, I proceed with a similar analysis, this time of the story pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return. I demonstrate that vestiges of this pattern exist in the scene between Hector and Paris in Book 6. I then argue that, because the purpose of this story pattern is the *auxesis* of the hero, it too is proof that Paris was originally a heroic figure.

In short, I attempt a thorough examination of how Paris is characterized in the *Iliad* by looking at both his place in that poem and his place in the larger tradition which gave rise to the *Iliad*.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank, first and foremost, my supervisor Prof. Wallace McLeod who saw this project through from its beginning to its end. His advice and support at every stage in the research for and writing of this dissertation were invaluable and contributed in countless ways to its final shape. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Prof. Emmet Robbins and Prof. Jonathan Burgess. Their encouragement, criticism and insights have without a doubt made this a better dissertation than it would otherwise have been. I also owe a debt of thanks to the other members of my oral examination committee, in particular Prof. Hugh Perry and the graduate co-ordinator, Prof. Brad Inwood, whose helpful skepticism about some of my claims has resulted, I hope, in a more strongly argued case.

I would also like to thank my fellow students, Patricia Fagan, Andrew Connolly, and Gottskalk Jensson who listened patiently to the many permutations through which my arguments went. My thanks are also owed to Ann-Marie Matti, the departmental administrative assistant, and to Beverly Clarkson, whose help and kindness over the years I shall always remember. Finally, I would like to thank André Paradis, Graham Jackson, and Michael Bogart for their emotional and often financial support at various stages in the completion of this dissertation. And Barbara, Franklin, and Louise who gave me nothing but their love every day.

Table of Contents

Introduction **1**

Chapter 1: Characterization **6**
I. Introduction 6
II. Paris' Appearances in the *Iliad* 8
III. Traditional Figures & the Epic Tradition 14
  A. The Pre-Homeric Tradition 32
  B. Characterization in Homer 36
IV. The Characterization of Paris in *Iliad* 3 & 6 45
  A. Aphrodite's Favourite 46
  B. Paris and Menelaus 52
  C. Paris and Helen 63
  D. Paris and Hector 68
V. The Characterization of Paris as a Warrior 73
VI. Conclusion 80

Chapter 2: The Epic Tradition **82**
I. Introduction: Analytical Scholarship 82
II. Paris/Alexandros: The Problem of the Double Name 90
III. Paris' Early Life 103
  A. Hecuba's Dream 105
  B. Boyhood on Mt. Ida 105
  C. Oenone 107
IV. The Judgement of Paris 110
V. The Death of Achilles 135
  A. Direct References in the *Iliad* 135
  B. Other Literary and Iconographic Evidence 136
  C. Indirect References in the *Iliad* 141
    1. The Death of Patroclus 141
    2. The Wounding of Diomedes 146
    3. The Death of Euchenor 149
  D. Conclusion 152
VI. The Death of Paris 154
VII. Conclusion 160

Chapter 3: Arming Scenes ... **162**
I. Introduction ... 162
A. Type-Scenes ... 163
B. Arming Scenes ... 173
II. The Arming Scene of Agamemnon ... 179
III. The Arming Scene of Patroclus ... 183
IV. The Arming Scene of Achilles ... 192
A. Structural Development and Elaboration ... 192
B. The Pelian Ash Spear ... 202
C. Conclusion ... 206
V. The Arming Scene of Paris ... 207
A. Structural Development and Immanent Meaning ... 207
B. The Function of Paris' Arming Scene in the *Iliad* ... 220
C. Elaboration in Paris' Arming Scene ... 228
VI. Conclusion ... 237

Chapter 4: The Wrath of Paris ... **239**
I. Introduction ... 239
II. The Scholia to *Iliad* 6.326 ... 242
III. Ad hoc Inventions, Story Patterns, and the Wrath of Paris ... 249
IV. Comparative Wrath, Withdrawal, and Return Narratives ... 260
A. The Wrath of Demeter ... 264
B. The Wrath of Achilles ... 276
C. The Wrath of Meleager ... 291
D. The Wrath of Hera ... 299
E. Conclusion ... 308
V. Paris and the Wrath, Withdrawal, and Return Pattern ... 310

Conclusion ... **321**

Bibliography ... **325**

Introduction

Until recently, among English-speaking Homerists, the character of Paris has not received much attention. Though he figures prominently in Books 3, 6, and, to a lesser extent, in Books 7 and 11, though he is the first warrior we see on the battlefield in the *Iliad*, and is, after all, the cause of the war, these critics have all but ignored Paris, or, at best, treated him cursorily. The oversight may seem understandable given that the *Iliad*'s primary focus is Achilles' wrath, a story which involves Paris only tangentially. For the most part, Agamemnon, Patroclus, and Hector, besides Achilles himself, are the poet's main concern. Nonetheless, Homer takes great pains to draw a detailed picture of Paris and stresses his importance in the Trojan War, at its beginning, towards its end, and in the narrative present of the *Iliad* itself. We meet him in a number of significant scenes with some of the poem's most important characters, with Menelaus, Hector, Helen, Aphrodite, and Diomedes. Homer's portrayal of this hero is complex, at times seemingly paradoxical and problematic. It poses, as I shall demonstrate in the ensuing chapters, basic questions about the degree of freedom Homer possessed in characterizing the heroes he inherited from the oral epic tradition in which he worked.

In the this study, I shall compare the roles which Paris plays in the oral epic tradition and in the one poem in which he appears from that tradition. I believe that such a comparison leads to the conclusion that this hero was represented in a significantly different way in the larger tradition than he is in the poem from which our impressions of him are formed. The basic premise of my argument will be that we can use the *Iliad* itself to help us recover the traditional Paris.

The *Iliad* is, of course, a work that stands on its own, focuses on particular characters and themes and develops these in accordance with its own distinct narrative objectives. Some scholars, as we shall see, go so far as to say that Homer was the first poet to sing of Achilles' wrath. Though I do not share this view, I do believe its basic premise is sound, that, in the *Iliad,* Homer tells a story that is uniquely his own and not merely a song that he inherited pretty much fully formed from the singers who preceded him. I believe, and shall argue in the following chapters, that an oral poet, particularly one as talented as Homer, possessed virtually infinite freedom in his adaptation of traditional forms, such as the type-scene and the story pattern, to his own poetic objectives.

The crucial point here is that an oral poet does inherit traditional forms out of which he composes an original song. I shall argue that by examining these traditional forms we can glimpse the tradition out of which the *Iliad* was formed and thereby better understand the oral poet's capacity for innovation. This argument rests on the assumption that traditional forms are imbued with immanent meaning and that this meaning is present every time a poet uses a particular traditional form. I am speaking here of a quite general level of meaning. For example, the type-scene of arming and the story pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return, I shall argue, convey an inherent, unchangeable meaning, the *auxesis* of the hero. For the most part, this is an obvious and uncontroversial point of view; however, when a traditionally heroic form such as the arming scene is applied to an unheroic figure such as Paris this argument does become controversial. Arguments are made that the form is being used ironically or, failing this, denials of the form's very existence. I shall proceed, instead, from the point of view that the traditional form is being used traditionally, even when applied to a seemingly

inappropriate figure, namely Paris. This approach, I believe, will put us in a better position to see how Homer can use traditional forms with traditional meanings attached to them and still create a character that is unique to his poem.

I am using the term *character* purposely to indicate that the portrayal of a traditional figure in a traditional poem need not be in keeping with the general representation of that *figure* in the broader tradition. The traditional figure of Paris was, I shall argue, a generally heroic one. Homer was able to create the unheroic characterization of this figure by emphasizing certain qualities in his career within an ethical framework chosen for his poem in which those qualities must be perceived negatively. Nonetheless, heroic elements traditionally attached to this figure remain in his poem which allow us to see his more heroic origins.

Much has been written about innovation in the Homeric poems, particularly a phenomenon known as *ad hoc* invention in which certain mythological or narrative details are thought to be invented purely for the moment in which they exist and serve a function only in that moment. The obvious difficulty in invoking this phenomenon is that it must necessarily rely on an argument *ex silentio*. As such it can all too easily become a convenient explanation of many difficulties in our texts of Homer. *Ad hoc* invention undoubtedly exists and can, used judiciously, be helpful in confronting difficult passages. I am thinking here primarily of Homer's use of myths as paradigms, a case in which we can expect adaptation of certain elements so as to conform with the larger narrative. Two well-known examples in which innovation of this sort is most probably occurring are Phoenix' account of Meleager's wrath and withdrawal and Achilles' of Niobe's grief and attendant fasting. All in all, however, I believe that *ad hoc*

invention is an argument to which we should resort only occasionally and that for the most part we have no way of knowing the extent to which this was a feature of Homer's art.

Instead, I shall argue that the area in which we can measure Homer's ability to innovate, to create something new out of his tradition, is his characterization of traditional figures. By placing the figures he inherits in carefully chosen situations, or in opposition to certain heroic values, or by emphasizing certain episodes in their careers, Homer is able to use his tradition to create characters both in keeping with the tradition from which they arise and unique to the poem in which he places them. In this way, tradition and innovation co-exist. By examining traditional forms not only with a view to their place in the *Iliad* but also with a view to what was probably their place in the oral epic tradition, we can begin to recover traditional figures and thereby see the ways in which Homer creates his characters.

I shall begin in my first chapter with an overview of scholarship on characterization in Homer and in oral poetry in general and continue with the characterization of Paris in the *Iliad*. In the second chapter, my focus will be on Paris as a traditional figure. I shall examine the epithets which are attached to him and the myths which we can be certain Homer knew. I shall argue that a remarkably different pictures emerges from this body of information, that the traditional figure and the Iliadic character are by no means identical. Of course, the latter arises from the former but with significant differences that warrant examination and an attempt at explication. I shall argue that the redefinition of the traditional figure is facilitated by the particular ethical framework of the *Iliad*. In the third and final chapters, I shall attempt to supplement the picture of the traditional

figure by examining two traditional forms attached to him, the type-scene of arming and the wrath, withdrawal, and return story pattern. The application of these two forms to Paris, I believe, points to his general heroic status in the oral tradition. In short, my purpose in this study is to examine, by focusing on one figure, Homeric techniques of characterization, techniques which are on the one hand, circumscribed by tradition and, on the other, amenable to innovation.

Chapter 1: Characterization

I. Introduction

I shall begin with a brief survey of Paris in, primarily, but not exclusively, English language criticism of Homer. E.T. Owen, in a justly famous survey of the *Iliad*, *The Story of the Iliad*, sees Paris as "superficially an attractive figure, good-natured, lighthearted, irresponsible — out of place and hence something of a relief among the grimly earnest warriors about him — he shows in his actions the underlying nature of which such engaging qualities are often the index."[1] These qualities, he goes on to say, include remorselessness, self-centredness, frivolity of mind, and indifference to honour and to the suffering of others. In essence, this hero is like a child who lives entirely for himself from moment to moment, taking what good he can from life and avoiding any evil. The result is the destruction of his city and the annihilation of his people.[2] Owen's assessment of Homer's Paris is both lengthier and more comprehensive than those of most other critics. He recognizes some of the complexity of this character when he acknowledges his appeal, one might even say, his *panache*; however, his general condemnation runs through most critics' works.

For Cedric Whitman, Paris' overriding characteristic is effeminacy: "Paris diverges widely from the heroic norm, having few pretensions as a man of battle ... . He is regularly compared to a woman, for indeed women,

---

[1]Owen 31.
[2]Owen 35.

not war, are his natural sphere."[3] James Redfield holds a similar view: "Paris accepts himself as he is; he did not make himself, he says, and he cannot be otherwise. For the poet of the *Iliad* such an attitude is fundamentally unheroic — because it is unsocialized. Paris, content with his own knowledge of himself, is unaffected by other people's opinion of him, he is aware of their contempt, but it does not touch him."[4] Seth Schein, Paolo Vivante, and Froma Zeitlin all share Redfield's opinion. For Schein, the hero has "a unique grace and appeal, a lightheartedness in a world of rather heavy heroes ... but this lightness is fundamentally trivial."[5] Vivante dismisses Paris as a "light-hearted adventurer," characterized by "the disarming self-conscious levity of Aphrodite's fondling."[6] For Zeitlin, he is "*always* (italics mine) preferring bed to battle and taking his pleasures as he can with charming insouciance."[7]

I will offer only one other particularly vituperative assessment by another famous Homerist. Others will come up in the course of this study. Jasper Griffin variously calls Paris "a fop," "glamorous," "irresponsible," a "childless seducer of another man's wife," "slack in battle," a man who owns weapons "merely for show," and "the ruin of his people."[8]

All of these evaluations of Paris' character have in common two remarkable features. All the critics write decisively and conclusively, as though Homer's depiction of this hero were simple and straightforward,

---

[3]Whitman, *HHT* 223.
[4]Redfield 114.
[5]Schein 21-22.
[6]Vivante, *Homer* 97 and *The Homeric Imagination* 13.
[7]Zeitlin 30.
[8]Griffin, *Homer* 26, 29; *HLD* 5, 8.

lacking in the nuance, complexity, and even paradox of so many others of his characters. Secondly, not one of these critics offers an examination of the numerous passages in the poem where Paris appears and from which, presumably, such an overwhelmingly negative and unanimous evaluation would arise. For if one looks at *all* of the places Paris appears in the *Iliad*, inevitably a much more complex picture emerges.

II. Paris' Appearances in the *Iliad*

Before proceeding any further, then, an overview of Paris' appearances in the *Iliad* is in order. In Book 3, the Trojan and Greek armies are ready to meet in battle. However, as the two armies approach, Paris jumps out in front of the Trojan line and challenges any one of the Greeks to single combat. Menelaus accepts. But, on seeing him, Paris shrinks back in fear (15-37). Hector then rebukes his brother for his cowardice, a cowardice which shames the Trojans and has resulted in their hatred of him. Paris, says Hector, is all the things that one would expect of Aphrodite's favourite — vain, handsome, woman-crazy, a musician — and, by implication, not a warrior (38-57). Paris responds that the gifts of the gods are not to be disparaged; no man would seek them out of his own accord, and yet no man can refuse them when offered. That said, he announces that he will fulfill his earlier boast and meet Menelaus in single combat. The duel is to be decisive. The winner will take Helen and her possessions and the war will end. Hector announces these terms to the Greeks, and Menelaus eagerly accepts (58-110). Preparations for the duel are made (111- 327), at the end of which Paris arms in the first of four formal type-scenes of arming in the poem (328-338). The duel itself is over rather quickly (340-382), in comparison with the

preparations which led up to it. Paris casts the first spear, in vain; it bounces off Menelaus' shield. Menelaus' spear goes through Paris' shield and corselet, but the hero turns aside in time to avoid a fatal blow. Next, Menelaus strikes at his opponent's helmet with his sword, but it shatters on impact. He then grabs Paris by the helmet and drags him toward the Greek line, as Paris chokes on the chin strap of his helmet. At this point, Aphrodite breaks the chin strap, whisks Paris off wrapped in a mist and sets him down in his bedchamber.

The goddess then summons Helen to her husband's side (383-420). She stresses to her Paris' beauty, saying that he resembles not so much a warrior, but a man just coming from, or perhaps about to go to, a dance. Helen, at first, refuses to go to Paris, claiming that it would be shameful to her, but when the goddess commands her to go, she obeys.

Once together in their bedroom (421-448), Helen rebukes her husband, making clear, like Hector before her, that she hates him and wishes he had been killed by Menelaus, a far better warrior, she asserts, than he. Paris acknowledges Menelaus' victory, but seems non plussed by it. He then expresses his sexual desire for Helen and leads the way to their bed.

As the two make love, Menelaus searches for Paris on the battlefield (448-461). No one can find him, and no one, not even his own people, would have concealed him, for their hatred of him is as strong as their hatred of death. Agamemnon declares Menelaus the victor and demands Helen's return.

Paris' next appearance is not until Book 6, when Hector comes to his house after meeting with Hecuba and before going to see his wife (313-368). When Hector sees Paris, he remarks that it is not good for Paris to be away from battle because of his anger. Paris denies being absent on account of anger

and replies that the true reason for his absence is sorrow. At any rate, Helen has already convinced him to return and Paris agrees to meet Hector at the gate and proceed out onto the battlefield with him. Helen and Hector have a brief exchange in which the former stresses her hatred of her present husband. Hector then goes to find his wife and, after their encounter, meets Paris who, as he runs up to his brother, is compared in a famous simile to a horse freed from its stall and galloping across a plain (503-514). Hector addresses Paris, acknowledges his bravery and expertise in battle, but says that this is undermined by an unwillingness to fight, to be a warrior (520-529).

The beginning of Book 7 sees the two brothers issue forth onto the battlefield, each one killing an enemy man. The beleaguered Trojans are relieved to see them as sailors are relieved when they can finally discern land as they are being tossed on a stormy sea (1-11). At the end of this book, when the first day's fighting is over, the Trojans hold a council at which Antenor advocates the return of Helen and her possessions. Paris refuses to give up Helen, but is willing to return her possessions. Priam sends the herald Idaeus to deliver this message to the Greeks who promptly refuse the offer (345-420).

It is in these three books, 3, 6, and 7, that Paris makes his most extended appearances. The action of these books takes up the first day of fighting; the prominent figure at the beginning and the end of this day is appropriately the man whose actions, on the human plane, brought about the present conflict. For most of the rest of the poem's fighting, Paris recedes into the background, except in Book 11, where his brief appearances are pivotal.[9]

---

[9]Paris does appear in the fighting in Book 8 when his arrow fatally wounds one of Nestor's horses, leaving the old man stranded and in danger of being killed by Hector. Diomedes rescues him (78-111). I mention this scene only to provide a complete catalogue of Paris' military exploits in the

(cont.)

The beginning of this book marks the beginning of the second day of fighting, which will continue through into Book 18, thus comprising fully a third of the poem. This is the crucial day for the narrative of the *Iliad*, the day on which Zeus' promise to Thetis to honour her son by granting ascendancy to the Trojans in his absence is fulfilled. By the end of Book 11, the Greeks are in dire straits; five of their best men, including their supreme commander, have been wounded and forced to withdraw. Of these five, three are wounded by Paris — Diomedes (373-378), Machaon (504-507), and Eurypylus (579-583). The other two, Agamemnon and Odysseus, are wounded by minor Trojan fighters. Paris' role is crucial here and will have far-reaching results. With many of the best Greek fighters disabled, the Trojans, at the end of Book 15, are able to drive the enemy back and attack the ships. Moreover, Achilles sees Machaon, struck by Paris' arrow, leaving the battlefield and sends out Patroclus to confirm the man's identity (598-616). This was, for Patroclus, "the beginning of his evil" (603), as the poet stresses, for in the encounter with Nestor that follows the idea of sending out Patroclus disguised in Achilles' armour is introduced (795-800).[10]

Paris appears five more times on this day of fighting. In Book 12, he heads one of the five Trojan contingents, along with Hector, Helenus, Aeneas, and Sarpedon (88-104). In Book 13, he again leads a group of Trojans

---

Iliad; however, it should be acknowledged that it is an important scene for neo-analysts, some of whom have seen it as a conscious reworking of Antilochus' rescue of Nestor (after his horse was wounded by Paris) from Memnon in the *Aethiopis*. Cf., for example, Pestalozzi 9-11; Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk;* and Kullmann, *Die Quellen der Ilias* 45, 314.

[10]For the connection between Paris' wounding of Machaon and Patroclus' role as Achilles' surrogate, cf. Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien* 62, n. 2 and Erbse, "Betrachtungen über das 5. Buch der Ilias" 176, n. 29.

(487-495). In the same book, he kills Euchenor (660-672), and, in Book 15, he kills Deïochos (341-342). Again in Book 13, Hector comes across Paris encouraging his men to fight. Hector insults his brother with same words he had used in Book 3. This time, however, Paris responds that the rebuke is unjust and that he is not, after all, a bad fighter (765-787).[11]

The remaining references to Paris can be surveyed briefly for the time being. One group refers to the origins and the early events of the war. The most famous occurs at 24.25-30 and, in all likelihood, refers to the Judgement of Paris. Oddities exist in the passage which have caused many critics, starting with Aristarchus, to doubt that the lines are authentic or, if they are, even do refer to this well-known myth which is nowhere else mentioned in the *Iliad*. The passage will be examined in Chapter 2. In Books 5 (59-68), 6 (289-292), and 22 (111-116), we hear of Paris' abduction of Helen. Finally, in Book 22 (358-360), the dying Hector prophesies that Paris and Apollo will kill Achilles in the Scaean Gate. Paris' role as the slayer of Achilles will also be examined in Chapter 2.

When we examine collectively all of Paris' appearances in the *Iliad*, two distinct sides of this figure emerge. On the one hand, we have the cowardly warrior who must be shamed into living up to the challenge he has just made and who, in the duel which follows, needs the intervention of a

---

[11]One remarkable feature of Paris' performance in battle is that his weapons never miss their mark. He always either wounds or kills his man. Nor is it unusual that he kills only three men (and a horse) and wounds three others. None of the Trojans, except Hector, have particularly remarkable careers on the *Iliad*'s battlefield. For example, Aeneas kills six men (5.305, 542; 13.54; 15.332; 17.344); Sarpedon kills just one man (5.657) and Achilles' horse, Pedasus (16.466); Glaucus kills two men (7.13; 16.593); and Polydamas kills three (14.449-452; 15.339, 518) and wounds one (17.600).

goddess to escape with his life. This hero, seemingly out of place on the battlefield, finds his true niche in the bedroom making love with his wife while the fighting which he caused continues outside. This is obviously the hero behind all of the negative criticism which I surveyed at the outset.

By the end of Book 6, however, a different picture begins to develop. Hector admits that Paris is a good fighter, and, indeed, he does acquit himself rather well on the battlefield. We also learn that he began the Trojan War when he abducted Helen. He has managed to keep her in spite of diplomatic efforts to retrieve her on the part of the Greeks, support of the Greek cause within Troy, and nine years of warfare. We might also add here, presuming for the moment that 24.25-30 does refer to the Judgement of Paris, that Homer's Paris is also the man whom Zeus appointed to arbitrate between the poem's three most powerful goddesses in the famous beauty contest — the only Greek myth known to us in which a human being judges a contest exclusively between gods. Finally, this is the hero who will succeed in killing Achilles, the best of the Achaeans.

Thus, two seemingly contradictory pictures of the same hero in the same poem emerge. One I will call the traditional picture, that is to say, a reflection of the figure of Paris as Homer inherited him from the oral epic tradition in which he worked; the other I will refer to as the Homeric Paris, the character taken from the inherited tradition, but adapted to the specific narrative circumstances of the poem in which he appears. Before discussing these two realizations of Paris, it will be necessary to examine how characterization in general is accomplished in a traditional oral epic poem like the *Iliad*.

III. Traditional Figures & the Epic Tradition

It is, of course, stating the obvious to say that the majority, if not all, of the principal characters of the *Iliad* were well known to both the poet and his audience through acquaintance with a vast store of myths in which these characters appeared, myths that the *Iliad* does not mention or mentions only in passing. A question which necessarily arises from the tradition-bound nature of Homeric poetry concerns the characterization of the figures of that tradition. Does Homer present the characters of his poem as they appeared in the oral epic tradition? In other words, is characterization traditionally determined like, for example, the system of noun-epithet formulae?

The answer to this question appears to be no. Although Homer inherits the figures in his poem from the same tradition which gave him the system of noun-epithet formulae, he has much greater freedom to characterize these figures in accordance with the narrative and thematic exigencies of his poem than he has in the application of epithets to nouns. The system of nouns and epithets is fixed in such a way that presumably no poet could ever have spoken of swift-footed Odysseus or wily Achilles; however, no such fixity appears to exist with regard to characterization. The reason for this, I believe, lies in the very nature of the pre-Homeric epic tradition, a tradition in which story-telling, that is to say the recounting of a series of events, seems to have been more important than the presentation of the reasons, motives, desires, or values of the people involved, in short, the presentation of complex characterizations of the figures in these stories.

Admittedly, the proofs on which to base such a claim are not abundant, but neither are they entirely lacking. Our main evidence for other epic poems which dealt with the Trojan War is the *Chrestomathy* of Proclus which is discussed in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius, a few extant fragments from these

poems, and various other *testimonia*. It is generally believed that the poems of the Epic Cycle reached their final forms later than the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Malcolm Davies, for example, has concluded from an examination of the fragments from the Cyclic poems and that, "it is indeed remarkable just how many late linguistic features and Attic forms are thrown up by so minute a sampling of directly cited verses, and how those two epics with the largest number of directly cited fragments (*Cypria* and *Ilias Parva*) exhibit the largest number of such forms."[12] He, therefore, places the poems after Homer, but before the fifth century, and in an Attic context (c. 560-520), though not necessarily all from the same period.[13]

In spite of the probable lateness of the final written versions of these poems, we must be careful not to assume that they are Homeric derivatives, or composed with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in mind. Two things should make us question such an assumption. Firstly, the arrangement of the poems into a neat cycle with no repetition of events between poems is perhaps indicative of an editor's handiwork. Have the beginnings and endings of the poems been changed in order to eliminate any such overlap?[14] For example, it

---

[12]Davies, "The Date of the Epic Cycle" 98.

[13]Davies, "The Date of the Epic Cycle" 97-100. Davies places the poems later than most scholars. Bernabé places them much earlier, assigning, for example, the *Thebais* to the eighth century and the *Cypria* to the seventh (*Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum* 22, 43). Davies dismisses these dates as "not only misleadingly specific but far too early" because they take no account of the linguistic evidence ("Kinkel Redivivus" 5). Lesky (*A History of Greek Literature* 82) and Janko (*Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns* 228-231) both prefer a mid seventh century date. Cf. also Scaife, "The *Kypria* and its Early Reception" 165, n. 4. Whether scholars place the poems of the Cycle in the seventh or sixth century, there is a consensus, with the exception of Bernabé, that their final versions are later than those of the Homeric poems.

[14]For a detailed examination of this question, cf. Burgess, *The Death of Achilles* 32ff.

seems curious that the *Aethiopis* would have ended with the dispute over Achilles' arms without narrating this episode to its conclusion, and that the *Ilias Parva* would have begun with the judgement of the dispute without any of the events leading up to it. *Testimonia* to the Cycle reinforce the suspicion that editing has occurred. According to Proclus, Ajax' suicide was related only in the *Ilias Parva;* but a *testimonium* asserts that it was also narrated in the *Aethiopis.*[15] The ending of the *Ilias Parva* gives similar cause for concern. Proclus reports that the poem ended with the Trojans taking the wooden horse into the city, but numerous *testimonia* indicate that the poem went on to recount the sack of Troy.[16] The conclusion that the beginnings and endings of the various poems have been "cropped" to create a continuous cycle is hard to resist.[17] Thus, we should be suspicious of the impression left by Proclus' summary that these poems function as attempts to fill in the gaps in the Trojan cycle left by the Homeric poems. The poems themselves may be later than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey,* but the assumption that they depend heavily on Homeric predecessors may be more a product of Proclus' summary (or,

---

[15]Cf. Bernabé, fr. 5; Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry* 149; Davies, *The Epic Cycle* 60.

[16]Cf. Bernabé, fr. 9-22. On the beginnings and endings of the *Ilias Parva,* the *Ilii Excidium,* the *Nosti,* and the *Odyssey,* cf. Burgess, *The Death of Achilles* 40-41. On the more complicated question of the beginnings and endings of the *Cypria,* the *Iliad,* and the *Aethiopis,* cf. Burgess, *The Death of Achilles* 60ff.

[17]Burgess believes that Proclus read the poems of the Cycle (and not just summaries) and reported their contents accurately, as far as he knew them from the available manuscripts. If this is correct then editing had already occurred. Since the poems were probably first arranged into a cycle in Hellenistic times, it seems likely that any editorial work would have been done at this time also. Cf. Burgess, *The Death of Achilles* 42-48.

more accurately, his summary of already edited texts) than of the original poems themselves.

Secondly, in spite of the probable lateness of the written versions of the Cyclic poems, the material contained in them is undeniably early and in large part derived from the same oral epic tradition that gave rise to the Homeric poems. This has been confirmed most persuasively by Wolfgang Kullmann who, in *Die Quellen der Ilias*, has studied the many allusions in Homer to other epic stories known to us from the Cycle. The evidence he gathers points unequivocably to a common tradition for the Homeric and Cyclic poems.[18] All in all, the summary and fragments of the Cyclic epics serve as a source of information about some of the different stories in the oral epic tradition, though admittedly not without occasionally raising problems of their own.[19]

---

[18]Kullmann, *Quellen passim*, but esp. 18-28, 362-379 and "Zur Methode der Neoanalyse" 18. Cf. also Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature* 82ff.; Stinton, "Euripides and the Judgement of Paris" 60-61; and Davies, "The Date of the Epic Cycle" 100, n. 64.

[19]For example, the vexed question of Paris' return trip to Troy after the abduction of Helen. In Proclus' summary, Hera stirs up a storm which drives the lovers off course to Sidon, where Paris besieges and takes the city. From there, the two proceed to Troy. This account agrees with *Iliad* 6.289-292, where we are told that Paris brought to Troy Sidonian women on the same trip on which he brought back Helen. Herodotus (2.117), however, claims that in the *Cypria*, Paris sailed from Sparta with a fair wind and calm seas, reaching Troy in three days. Several solutions to this contradiction have been posited: (i) Herodotus was incorrectly "remembering" the *Cypria* without consulting a text; (ii) Proclus' summary has been contaminated with material from the *Iliad*; (iii) two *Cyprias*, by different authors, existed; (iv) the version which Herodotus knew was subsequently expanded into the one known by Proclus. Cf. Gantz 572; Bernabé 52-53; Huxley, "A Problem in the *Kypria*" 25-27; Ghali-Khahil 30; Kullmann, *Quellen* 204-205; Davies, *The Epic Cycle* 41; Scaife, "The *Kypria* and its Early Reception" 165, n. 6.

What I wish to stress here, however, is a basic point of comparison between the poems of the Cycle and the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The Homeric poems both concentrate on a single theme, the wrath of Achilles and the homecoming of Odysseus, and do so within a short chronological span. The poems of the Cycle, on the other hand, deal with numerous events and cover much longer time periods. Kullmann, for one, believes that the Cyclic epics were organized around a chronologically ordered sequence of episodes that spans a much longer period of time than is the case in the Homeric poems:

> Wenn auch nur Inhaltsangaben und wenige Fragmente dieser Epen auf uns gekommen sind, ist ihr allgemeiner Erzählstil doch noch einigermaßen kenntlich. Diese Epen erzählten ohne dramatische Kunstgriffe eine Fülle locker miteinander verknüpfter Vorgänge in genauer chronologischer Reihenfolge.[20]

The *Cypria*, for example, chronicled events from the very beginning of the Trojan War to its ninth year.[21] The *Aethiopis* recounted the exploits of Penthesileia at Troy, Achilles' murder of Thersites and his purification on Lesbos, the deaths of Antilochus, Memnon, and Achilles, the latter's funeral games, and at least the beginning of the quarrel between Ajax and Odysseus over Achilles' arms. Perhaps the most telling difference is between the *Nostoi*, in which the homecomings of all the major Greek heroes are recounted, and the *Odyssey*, which focuses on one man's return. Kullmann

---

[20]Kullmann, "Vergangenheit" 17.

[21]Cf. Chamoux 8-9: "Dans cette suite de récits chronologiquement enchaînés, embrassant les événements d'une dizaine d'années (sans compter les nombreuses digressions), rien qui rappelle l'unité d'intérêt ni l'ordonnance subtilement ménagée des poèmes homériques, si propre à donner une couleur dramatique à l'histoire." For a similar view, cf. Lang, "War Story" 149-150.

comments that the result would likely be, in the *Nostoi*, a plot developed around different episodes, but containing very similar events, "offenbar ohne dramatische Funktion."[22]

Kakridis, like Kullmann, argues that "the poems of the Cycle narrate their subject matter in chronological order from beginning to end, so that their action lasts for months and even whole years."[23] He calls this form of epic narration "chronographic," in comparison with the "dramatic" form of the *Iliad*: "This poem arranges its material around one single incident, Achilles' wrath, and covers only a very few days; and yet it is the 'Iliad', in other words, the story of the whole Trojan war."[24] The principal way in which the *Iliad* achieves this comprehensiveness is through the narration of events which must be read symbolically. That is to say, events which take place in the narrative present serve to recall events from the past or to anticipate future ones. In this way, the duel between Menelaus and Paris reminds the audience of the original cause of the present conflict, while the death of Patroclus stands in the narrative also as Achilles' death. The concentration upon a single theme is, of course, the reason for this symbolic narration, for it allows the poet to focus on one theme without sacrificing an all-encompassing view of the larger context within which the story of Achilles' wrath takes place.[25]

---

[22]Kullmann, "Vergangenheit" 17. Cf. further Griffin, "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer" 40-47.

[23]Kakridis, *HR* 91.

[24]Kakridis, *HR* 91.

[25]Kullman and Kakridis argue that the *Odyssey* is different in this regard from both the Cyclic epics and the *Iliad*. Although it is not a straightforward chronological narrative, its scope is wider than that of the *Iliad*. Within the main narrative of Odysseus' homecoming, it encompasses his wanderings, the events of his return home, and the destruction of the

(cont.)

It is precisely this concentration of the narrative which appears to set the *Iliad* apart from all other Greek oral epic:

> Daß ein Großepos wie die Ilias sich auf die Behandlung eines solchen einzelnen Motivs konzentriert, ist unter allen frühgriechischen Epen, von denen wir wissen, etwas Besonderes. Ein Motiv, das von anderen Epen her gesehen nur als Stoff einer Episode möglich erscheint, wird in der Ilias zum tragenden Thema des ganzen Gedichtes. Wie im Drama wird auf diese Weise die erzählte Zeit außerordentlich zusammengedrängt.[26]

Kakridis and Kullmann both argue that the chronological narrative of the Cyclic poems represents an earlier stage in the development of oral epic poetry than the compressed and often symbolic narrative of the *Iliad*. As Kakridis states, "[t]he epic is the first form of chronicle writing, it speaks of deeds μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστά, which should be described in the order in which they happened."[27] Bowra observes the same phenomenon in modern oral epic poetry. Shorter poems of about 4,000 lines tend to be arranged chronologically. Only when a skilled poet expands the events of such a poem, to say 12,000 lines, does a more interesting structure emerge than a series of episodes. This must necessarily be the case if the poem is not to become

---

suitors. These events are, however, telescoped into a short time frame by the use of flashback narrative. Kakridis sums up the difference between the two Homeric epics: "The technique of the Odyssey, however, is fundamentally different from that of the Iliad, because this abridgment of time is only external: if we transfer the ἀπόλογοι to the beginning of the Odyssey it becomes a chronographic epic, a thing impossible with the Iliad. In the Iliad we have a *poetic abridgment*, in the Odyssey a *material disruption*, of the time scheme" (*HR* 91; cf. also Kullmann, "Vergangenheit" 16-17). This may be so, but the *Odyssey* is still organized around one principal theme, like the *Iliad*, which I argue allows for a high degree of characterization in relation to this theme. In this regard, the *Odyssey*, like the *Iliad*, appears to differ from the Cyclic poems.

[26]Kullmann, "Vergangenheit" 16.

[27]Kakridis, *HR* 91; cf. also Kullmann, "Vergangenheit" 17.

tedious to its listeners.[28] However, for a less skilled poet, or in a tradition that is still young, a chronological narrative has clear advantages. Both composition, on the poet's part, and comprehension, on the audience's, are facilitated. Moreover, the poet can interrupt and resume his song easily, and individual episodes can readily be excerpted for recitation.[29]

As regards characterization, it seems likely that, if the narrative structure of the Cyclic epics was simpler than that of the Homeric poems, the presentation of character was also less developed. What's more, it seems difficult to imagine that, within the great sweep of events contained in these poems, their creators were concerned with the detailed presentation of character. One scholar, for example, laments the loss of the Cyclic poems, not because of their poetic value but because they were a repository of information that has not survived elsewhere in archaic literature. With reference to the legends about Achilles, she says: "their loss does, however, limit our understanding of how Achilles was viewed, for the cycle transmitted many popular legends, providing him with a fabulous boyhood, superhuman strength and swiftness, an additional set of Hephaistean armor, two semidivine opponents, three or four sexual intrigues, and miscellaneous adventures both at and on the way to Troy."[30] We have here much more biographical information than is found in the *Iliad*, but what was probably lacking in these poems was the complex characterization of this hero which we do find in the *Iliad*. A comprehensive biography is not a requirement of detailed characterization, and can, in fact, work against it by focusing attention

---

[28]Bowra, *Heroic Poetry* 359-367.
[29]Kakridis, *HR* 92.
[30]King 51.

on events rather than motives, feelings, values, and similar features of character.[31]

If we look to the Hesiodic corpus and to the longer of the Homeric Hymns, we see a similar emphasis on narration of events at the expense of presentation of character. The *Theogony*, if it can be said to have a principal narrative, recounts the divine succession in the kingship of the universe through three generations. We learn things about the nature of the gods, particularly about Zeus, but we do not have anything approaching characterization of these figures. In the four long Homeric Hymns, the poets' main concern is to sing about the unique nature and qualities of the gods who are their subjects. For example, in the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, we learn about the goddess and her unique powers through the story of her union with Anchises, and yet the picture remains rather generalized. We learn little more about Aphrodite than that she is a goddess of awesome power and terrifying to mortals. Much the same can be said of Demeter, Apollo, and Hermes in their hymns. Characterization is of a generalized nature in these poems.

---

[31]Thus, Aristotle says, in the *Poetics*, that authors are wrong to write *Heracleids* and *Theseids*, thinking that the narrative is given unity by focusing on a single individual. Homer, he claims, knew this, as we see from the *Odyssey*, in which there is no attempt to give a thorough overview of the eponymous hero's life; instead, he constructed the plot around a single action (περὶ μίαν πρᾶξιν, 1451a28): Μῦθος δ' ἐστὶν εἷς οὐχ ὥσπερ τινὲς οἴονται ἐὰν περὶ ἕνα ᾖ· πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἄπειρα τῷ ἑνὶ συμβαίνει, ἐξ ὧν ἐνίων οὐδέν ἐστιν ἕν· οὕτως δὲ καὶ πράξεις ἑνὸς πολλαί εἰσιν, ἐξ ὧν μία οὐδεμία γίνεται πρᾶξις (1451a16-19): "A plot does not have unity, as some people think, simply because it deals with a single hero. Many and indeed innumerable things happen to an individual, some of which do not go to make up any unity, and similarly an individual is concerned in many actions which do not combine into a single piece of action" (W.H. Fyfe, tr.).

Homer's detailed characterizations, on the other hand, have frequently occasioned comments from critics who wonder how much of these is traditional and how much innovation. For example, the negative view which the poet of the *Iliad* takes of Agamemnon appears problematic from the point of view of the oral epic tradition as a whole. Whitman, for one, feels that "the great king of Mycenae must have been represented as noble at least in his own court. But Homer has handled him with the most subtle irony, as a foil to Achilles, using all his traditional eminence as a means of diminishing the man."[32] He shows how traditional motifs like the dejection of a leader and his proposal to go home, which he argues would have been acceptable under certain circumstances, and the *aristeia*, which normally glorifies a hero, are used to achieve an overwhelmingly negative portrayal of Agamemnon, "the nadir, as Achilles is the zenith, of the heroic assumption."[33] He concludes that "there is no reason to believe that [Agamemnon] was always drawn as Homer draws him; rather the opposite."[34]

Kullmann argues that this untraditional or uniquely Homeric portrayal of Agamemnon is derived from the epic tradition. He sees Agamemnon characterized in the *Iliad* primarily by uncertainty and delusion and finds the roots of this picture in the tradition which told of his problematic leadership of the Greek army at Troy and of his unhappy homecoming: "Der Unsicherheit seines *Lebens* in Sage entspricht in der Ilias ein *Charakter*, der durch Unsicherheit und Blindheit gekennzeichnet ist."[35]

---

[32]Whitman, *HHT* 156.
[33]Whitman, *HHT* 162.
[34]Whitman, *HHT* 162; cf. also Bowra *T&D* 203.
[35]Kullmann, "Vergangenheit" 26; cf. also *Quellen* 384.

Kullmann, therefore, sees Homer's Agamemnon as a unique character, but one that was created by using traditional material in an innovative way, rather than by ignoring or contradicting the tradition.

Mark Edwards writes in the same vein when he says that characters "are often delineated in ways we might not have expected to find. That the mighty commander-in-chief of the greatest legendary exploit of the Greek race should be a weak leader, insecure and the first to give up hope: that the unfaithful wife who caused all the suffering should be a remorseful and grief-stricken woman, as well as one who yields too easily to her passion for a man she despises: this seems unlikely to be a traditional portrayal, and is very probably due to the imagination of the poet."[36] Kakridis attributes to Homer the characterization of Helen as a grieving and remorseful woman. He argues that in the early oral tradition she would have been a woman carried off by a man to whom she has given hospitality, a "grieved innocent woman."[37] This is the figure behind Nestor's words to the Achaeans that no one should return home before he has slept with the wife of a Trojan in order to avenge the suffering of Helen (2.353-355) and behind the duel of Paris and Menelaus, for "if Menelaus accepts Paris' challenge to a duel without any objection, this means he lays no blame on his wife for the whole adventure."[38] However, the *Iliad* does also emphasize Helen's remorse and, therefore, her culpability. Kakridis believes that it was the lack of specific characterization in the oral tradition in general that gave the poet of the *Iliad* the freedom to create such a complex characterization of Helen, one in which

---

[36]Edwards, *HPI* 96.
[37]Kakridis, *Homer Revisited* 31.
[38]*Homer Revisited*, 26.

she is simultaneously guilty (the self-reproaching, repentant wife) and innocent (the woman who is blamed neither by Priam and the Trojan elders nor by Nestor and Menelaus).[39]

That characters such as Agamemnon, Helen, and Priam are characterized in ways that might strike an audience familiar with the many other stories in which they appear as unusual should not, in fact, come as a surprise. These highly specific characterizations arise naturally from the narrow and circumscribed form of the *Iliad*. By this I mean that, since the poet tells one story that extends over little time, all characters must firmly take their place within this story. He knows other stories that involve his characters; he even mentions some of these in passing and reworks others, especially those about the early parts of the Trojan War, into the narrative present of his poem. By and large, however, he recounts only one story out of many in the Trojan cycle. It follows that one result of such a precise narrative focus is the detailed portrayal of traditional characters in a way that is surprising when compared to the simpler pictures an audience would have been accustomed to in other poems. For thematic restrictions necessitate detailed characterizations as a means of the development of the theme or themes chosen by the poet, whereas a poem concerned with chronicling the events of a whole period will probably not also have a thematic unity from

---

[39]*Homer Revisited*, 25-31. Kirk ("Homer" 56) compares the favourable portraits of Helen and Priam: "It is important for the *Iliad* that both Priam and Helen should be sympathetic figures, even though neither can have been so in the ordinary heroic tradition." On Helen in Homer and the oral tradition, cf. Austin, *Helen of Troy* 43-46; Bowra, *T&D* 212-213; Kullman, "Vergangenheit" 20-22; and Reckford 5-20. On Priam, cf. Kullmann, "Vergangenheit" 34-35. For a good general survey of the major figures of the *Iliad*, cf. Griffin, *HLD* 50-80; Whitman, *HHT* 154-180; Vivante, *Homer* 45-148; and Bowra, *T&D* 192-214.

which complex character portraits arise. As Aristotle commented in comparing the Homeric poems with the poems of the Cycle, a series of events, such as those of the Trojan war, does not necessarily have a common thread which will give a poem the kind of unity which the *Iliad*, by virtue of its chronological and thematic compression, has.[40]

Linda Clader, in her study of Helen in the epic tradition, observes the same phenomenon. She notes that "individual characters may have a wealth of information or history traditionally surrounding them, but in the context

---

[40]ὅτι δεῖ μύθους καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις συνιστάναι δραματικοὺς καὶ περὶ μίαν πρᾶξιν ὅλην καὶ τελείαν ἔχουσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ μέσα καὶ τέλος, ἵν' ὥσπερ ζῷον ἓν ὅλον ποιῇ τὴν οἰκείαν ἡδονήν, δῆλον, καὶ μὴ ὁμοίας ἱστορίαις τὰς συνθέσεις εἶναι, ἐν αἷς ἀνάγκη οὐχὶ μιᾶς πράξεως ποιεῖσθαι δήλωσιν ἀλλ' ἑνὸς χρόνου, ὅσα ἐν τούτῳ συνέβη περὶ ἕνα ἢ πλείους, ὧν ἕκαστον ὡς ἔτυχεν ἔχει πρὸς ἄλληλα. ... διὸ ὥσπερ εἴπομεν ἤδη καὶ ταύτῃ θεσπέσιος ἂν φανείη Ὅμηρος παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους, τῷ μηδὲ τὸν πόλεμον καίπερ ἔχοντα ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος ἐπιχειρῆσαι ποιεῖν ὅλον· λίαν γὰρ ἂν μέγας καὶ οὐκ εὐσύνοπτος ἔμελλεν ἔσεσθαι ὁ μῦθος, ἢ τῷ μεγέθει μετριάζοντα καταπεπλεγμένον τῇ ποικιλίᾳ. νῦν δ' ἓν μέρος ἀπολαβὼν ἐπεισοδίοις κέχρηται αὐτῶν πολλοῖς ... οἱ δ' ἄλλοι περὶ ἕνα ποιοῦσι καὶ περὶ ἕνα χρόνον καὶ μίαν πρᾶξιν πολυμερῆ, οἷον ὁ τὰ Κύπρια ποιήσας καὶ τὴν μικρὰν Ἰλιάδα. (*Poetics* 1459a18-1459b2): "Clearly the story must be constructed as in tragedy, dramatically, round a single piece of action, whole and complete in itself, with a beginning, middle, and end, so that like a single living organism it may produce its own peculiar form of pleasure. It must not be such as we normally find in history, where what is required is an exposition not of a single piece of action but of a single period of time, showing all that within the period befell one or more persons, events that have a merely casual relation to each other. ... So in this respect, too, compared with all other poets Homer may seem, as we have already said, divinely inspired in that even with the Trojan War, which has a beginning and an end, he did not endeavour to dramatize it as a whole since it would have been either too long to be taken in all at once or, if he had moderated the length, he would have complicated it by the variety of incident. As it is he takes one part of the story only and uses many other parts. ... The others, on the contrary, all write about a single hero or about a single period or about a single action with a great many parts, as the authors, for example, of the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad*" (W.H. Fyfe, tr.).

of the *Iliad* they fulfill specialized functions for the sake of artistic unity." One such character, she says, is Ajax, an important figure in the epic tradition and an important fighter at Troy, but who, in the *Iliad*, functions almost exclusively as a contrast to Achilles.[41] Homer refers to Ajax as the greatest of the Achaeans after Achilles and seems to be aware of at least two traditional stories about him which point to his prominence in the Trojan cycle — the rescue of Achilles' corpse and his madness and suicide after the loss of Achilles' arms to Odysseus. In spite of his importance, he receives no *aristeia*, and "no scene of distinction which is his alone."[42] The *Iliad* is not concerned with the exploits of Ajax, any more than it is with those of Agamemnon; Ajax, like Agamemnon, is characterized in relation to the poem's main hero. For Agamemnon, this resulted in a negative portrayal; the opposite is the case for Ajax. In the *Iliad*, "Ajax is the man of *aidôs*," which Whitman defines as "the word for responsibility to others, and a sense of their importance to oneself."[43] We see this most clearly in the embassy in Book 9 where Ajax "rebukes Achilles for his lack of human regard for his fellows, and calls upon him to remember *aidôs*."[44] Achilles thinks only of his own honour; Ajax reminds him of his responsibility to others. Achilles holds onto his wrath, but he acknowledges the validity of Ajax' reproach when he gives up the notion of going home and sets the conditions for his return to battle. The

---

[41]Clader 5.

[42]Clader 5. In Book 23, the outcome of the wrestling match seems designed to prefigure the judgement of the arms of Achilles, and in Book 17, Ajax' role in the rescue of Patroclus' corpse mirrors his role when Achilles is struck down. Cf. Pestalozzi 20-22; Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk* 170; Kullmann, *Quellen* 79-85, 327-380; and Whitman, *HHT* 169-170.

[43]Whitman, *HHT* 171.

[44]Whitman, *HHT*172.

characterization of Ajax around the concept of αἰδώς is developed further and always in contrast to Achilles' seeming lack thereof. For it is Ajax who "bears the chief brunt of Achilles' defection, that is his lack of regard for his fellows."[45] Agamemnon, Odysseus, and Diomedes are wounded, but Ajax remains till the end, as the poet reminds us when, immediately before the arming of Patroclus, we see him alone defending the ships. Clader sums up Ajax' function in the *Iliad* as follows: "while Achilles withdraws further and further from human society and any feeling of duty to his comrades, Ajax stands as the constant reminder of exactly what the traditional heroic ethic requires."[46] In the *Iliad*, he is characterized as the man of αἰδώς, but we should not be led to the conclusion that this is how he appeared in other traditional oral epic poetry. His characterization is designed to provide a contrast with Achilles and may, therefore, be unique to the *Iliad*.

Alfred Heubeck, too, examines possible untraditional or specifically Iliadic characterizations, in particular with regard to Achilles. The elements which he sees as traditional for this character are "his outstanding strength, his passionate fighting-spirit, his over-intense *thymos*, which tends to uncontrollability, his sensitivity in all things concerning his honour as a hero, and, in connection with this, his unquenched thirst for fame and esteem, even at the cost of his own life — in short, his uncompromising efforts to realize the ideal image of the hero. All this allies Achilles to the mighty heroes who, before him and with him, moved the hearts of singers and audience alike;" however, "Homer enriched this traditional, self-centered image with features which not only add a new, important dimension to the

---

[45]Whitman, *HHT* 172.
[46]Clader 5.

old, but which even put it in question."[47] This happens principally in Book 24, where aspects of Achilles' character are revealed which the audience could only vaguely have suspected before now, namely in the scenes with Patroclus at the beginning of Book 16 and with Lycaon in Book 21. Achilles reveals a magnanimity which allows him to feel compassion for Priam, to approach him with sympathy and understanding, and to see in him not the enemy, but a man suffering. The contrast with Achilles' behaviour on the battlefield and his outrage of Hector's corpse could not be greater. This complex picture, Heubeck argues, was in all likelihood not traditional: "With this portrayal of a hero in which the greatest conceivable contrasts unite to form one whole, in which the gentle light of humanity joins company with the radiance of heroic splendour, Homer has ... not only transcended epic tradition, but even grown out of it."[48]

G.S. Kirk's views on Homeric versus traditional characterization are remarkably similar to Heubeck's. In *The Songs of Homer,* he asserts that "[o]ne of the most important kinds of unity revealed in the [Homeric] poems, itself the product of complete mastery of the tradition, is unity of character. The depiction of the heroic character is limited both by the technique and aims of oral poetry and by the simplicity of heroic virtues and vices. Yet in a few cases — notably Achilles and Hector, and to some extent Odysseus and Telemachus in the *Odyssey* — the great epics manage to transcend these limitations. These characters achieve a complexity which has the appearance of being consistently developed as each poem progresses."[49] Later in the same

---

[47]Heubeck, "Homeric Studies Today" 14.
[48]Heubeck, "Homeric Studies Today" 14.
[49]Kirk, *The Songs of Homer* 265.

work, he extends his assessment of the complexity of Homeric characterization to include virtually all the main characters in the *Iliad*. He argues that what is unique to the *Iliad* and not a part of the oral epic tradition "must be the subtle observation that diversifies the egregious heroic personalities of many of the chief figures — for instance in the hysterical pride and intermittent defeatism of Agamemnon, the tetchiness of Priam, Hector's unfairness to Polydamas and the resentment towards him shown by Aeneas or Sarpedon; not to speak of the complexities and introspections of Achilles which give such solidity to the main theme of the poem."[50]

Kirk goes on to examine "the mental and emotional history of Achilles."[51] He speaks of

> the transformation of his pride and anger, first in the Embassy into doubt of the whole heroic code, then into indecision and the compromise that leads to Patroclus's death, then into obsessional madness, and finally into some sort of reluctant acceptance of the basic laws of society and at least a similitude of generosity — all this is the moral core of the whole poem, and that which raises it beyond the level of reiterated cruelty and death to a more universal plane of pride, purgation and divine law. There is little doubt in my mind that this deepening of the themes of war is the work of Homer, the main composer of the poem.[52]

---

[50]Kirk, *The Songs of Homer* 349.

[51]Kirk, *The Songs of Homer* 353.

[52]Kirk, *The Songs of Homer* 353. Cf. further Kirk's comments on the Embassy of Book 9 ("the portrayal of Achilles there must surely belong to Homer and to the original form of the great poem," 354) and Achilles' interview with Priam in Book 24 ("the reactions of Achilles must belong to Homer's conception of how the whole poem should develop," and are "the supreme justification for the development in Greece of the monumental epic form," 354). For a similar view on the untraditional characterization of Achilles from the point of view of traditional epic diction, cf. Adam Parry "The Language of Achilles" 1-7. Parry's basic assertion is that, in his response

(cont.)

From this survey, there emerges a consensus among prominent Homerists that the individual characterizations of heroes in the *Iliad* are not the same ones we would encounter if we had before us other oral epic poems, that these character portraits in many cases are likely to have been unique to the poem in which they are found. Furthermore, the detailed delineation of character we find in the Homeric poems is not present in Hesiod or the longer Hymns. In the Cyclic poems, the chronological presentation of events over an extended period of time, which seems to have been a distinguishing feature, is probably indicative of a narrative focus that does not emphasize characterization to the same degree as we find in Homer.

If agreement then exists on the probable uniqueness of characterization in the Homeric poems, two questions arise. Firstly, what constitutes characterization in Homer and by what means is it achieved? Secondly, if characterization in Homer is different from what we would expect to find in the tradition in general, what do we think characterization in the oral epic tradition amounted to?

---

to Odysseus in Book 9, "Achilles has no language with which to express his disillusionment. Yet he expresses it, and in a remarkable way. He does it by misusing the language he disposes of. He asks questions that cannot be answered and makes demands that cannot be met" (6-7). Parry concludes that, in his characterization of Achilles, "Homer uses the epic speech a long poetic tradition gave him to transcend the limits of that speech" (7). Cf. William Sale ("Achilles and Heroic Values" 86-100) whose purpose is also to examine "what Homer has done with the material he inherited" about Achilles (98).

A. The Pre-Homeric Tradition

I begin with the second question, for an answer thereto will put us in a better position to examine characterization in Homer, by furnishing a point of comparison. As so often, a useful starting point is provided by A.B. Lord, in a book of posthumously published essays, *The Singer Resumes the Tale*. Here Lord examines the Greek oral tradition:

> It may be that from the beginning, some stories and songs were simple, brief and ephemeral. They consisted of loosely structured, short-lived anecdotes and songs with a limited frame of reference. Yet it is certain that there came into being, as time went on, well-structured narratives and songs of wider reference and deeper meaning or sung by skillful creator-storytellers or singers.[53]

Lord's conjecture that the early stages in the development of an oral poetic tradition produced "simple," "brief," "loosely-structured" songs "with a limited frame of reference" suggests that he believed characterization in these songs would have been similarly limited. He goes on to say that:

> In attempting to trace the unfolding of *oral traditional aesthetics*, one realizes that some storytellers or singers were more talented than others and that they influenced

---

[53]Lord, *The Singer Resumes the Tale* 4. M.L. West holds the same view, that early oral epic poems would have been short songs of several hundred lines which "told of battle and death in battle, of gods and of heroes with qualities commensurate with the gods'" ("The Rise of the Greek Epic" 158). West argues that such poems came into being in early Mycenaean Greece, with roots that go back ultimately to Indo-European praise poetry (152-159); however, it was not until the ninth and eighth centuries that longer, more complex narratives became the standard (159-165). As West explains: "it is scarcely to be supposed that the Homeric epics are simply late examples of something that had existed in much the same state for seven or eight hundred years. There is surely a tradition that, however old its roots, burst spectacularly into flower within the last few generations before Homer" (151).

> the way in which stories were told and songs sung by introducing what have later been called figures of speech, thus establishing artistic norms and enriching the tale or song. ... It is to these gifted storytellers and singers that we owe also *the elaboration of descriptions of heroes and maidens*, of horses, and their trappings, of assemblies of men, of catalogs of chieftains and of detailed accounts of battles. (italics mine)[54]

When Lord speaks of "oral traditional aesthetics" and the "descriptions of heroes and maidens," I think it safe to say that one of things he has in mind is characterization. Again he suggests that characterization, like the poetic language itself, develops as the tradition becomes more established. In a young oral tradition, characterization is, therefore, rudimentary by comparison with what we find in Homer.

More than sixty years earlier, before Parry and Lord had conducted their fieldwork in Yugoslavia and revealed the conditions and techniques which formed a living oral tradition, C.M. Bowra came to much the same conclusion. He felt that the pre-Homeric oral tradition was one of simple stories involving characters differentiated from one another in only the most basic ways. Agamemnon would have been little more than ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν, Odysseus πολύμητις, and Achilles πόδας ὠκύς. As Bowra says, Homer "must have found his important characters existing in earlier poetry and possessing some of the characteristics which he gives them. His stock of epithets bears the marks of ancient tradition, and show his heroes as old story knew them ... With such simple labels [as ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν and πολύμητις] early poetry differentiates its characters, and helps its hearers to remember them."[55]

---

[54]Lord, *The Singer Resumes the Tale* 13.
[55]Bowra, *T&D* 192-193.

Some years later, Whitman developed this idea further. He argued that early heroic songs would have been about the glorious exploits of various heroes. For such songs, highly differentiated character portraits would not have been necessary. Because all characters would have shared the same ethical values and set out on heroic adventures to realize those values, one hero engaged in one exploit would have been very like any other:

> From the first, the various famous figures must have been characterized by certain individual traits, some perhaps more than others, but there could have been little motive to represent their special relationship to the heroic heritage, their comparative individual interpretations of its meaning. Nobility, *arete*, a value composite of personal, social, and military features, was the assumption for all, and though in different times and districts it would have presented varying aspects, the implicit cultural aspiration was universally accepted without definition.[56]

Kullmann, too, believes that in Homer's predecessors the heroes were presented in a generalized manner and that the differentiated portraits of the *Iliad*, though arising from the tradition, are specific to that poem precisely in regard to their high degree of differentiation:

> Man gewinnt den Eindruck, als habe der Iliasdichter überhaupt erst den eigentümlichen "Charakter" vielen Helden "geschaffen." Gewiß waren wohl auch in seinen Quellen die Helden schon irgendwie charakterisiert, aber es hat doch den Anschein, als ob deren Darstellungskraft nur zur Schaffung relativ einfacher "Typen" geführt hätte.[57]

Odysseus, for example, would have been little more than the artful and cruel hero who always looked to his own advantage; Ajax, the strong but awkward

---

[56]Whitman, *HHT* 163.
[57]Kullmann, *Quellen* 383.

hero; and Achilles, the noble hero: "Viel weiter wird die Charakterisierungskunst in den Quellen der Ilias nicht gegangen sein."[58]

In the *Iliad*, on the other hand, characters are developed in complex and varied ways:

> In der Ilias selbst findet sich dagegen eine außerordentliche Differenziertheit der Personenschilderung. Man kann erkennen, daß der Dichter dabei die alten Sagengestalten neu "interpretiert", indem er ein Bild von ihrem Charakter und ihrer Psychologie entwirft, das zu ihrem Handeln und Leiden im alten Mythos paßt.[59]

Therefore, it is the poet of the *Iliad* who, in accordance with the tradition and not the tradition itself, makes Agamemnon irresolute and pessimistic or Helen introspective and remorseful. The tradition provided the stories which made such characterizations possible and plausible. But, just as oral poetic diction developed over time, so did the ability to present differentiated and increasingly complex depictions of character.

What, however, were the forces that brought about or initiated an increasingly complex depiction of heroes in this tradition? Whitman provides a plausible explanation:

> With the first attempt to weld the short tales of single exploits into a panorama of all the heroes, a new problem arises. The characters must either duplicate each other to the point of utter boredom, or their individual differences must begin to distinguish them. Once the latter process has begun, we are on our way toward that extraordinary

---

[58]Kullmann, *Quellen* 384. Cf. also Kullmann's study of the portrayal of the gods in the pre-Homeric tradition, for which his conclusions are similar: *Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias* 35-38.

[59]Kullmann, *Quellen* 384.

> roster of unforgettable individuals which Homer presents.[60]

As a tradition matures and its singers become more skilled, songs can become longer and more varied in form and, concomitantly, the possibility of complex characterization emerges.

B. Characterization in Homer

This brings us to the first of the two questions which I posed earlier (p. 31). What is it that makes the traditional figures of Homeric poetry so extraordinary? In other words, what do we mean when we speak of characterization in Homer and how does the poet achieve it?

I begin with the second part of this question — the means by which characterization is created in Homer. I start here because we find in the comments of noted critics like Kirk, Whitman, and Heubeck the assertion that in the area of characterization Homer transcends his tradition, that he manages to break through the limiting and constricting rules of oral poetry to forge something new and unique. This is a view which is quite rightly criticized by Leslie Collins in her study of characterization in the *Iliad*. The danger inherent in such a view is that "the appreciation of Homer's skill becomes an end in itself; his poetic genius is both the premise of and the conclusion to the argument."[61] Moreover, the examination of specific character portraits then runs the danger of being carried out in accordance with "the subjective psychological, social, and ethical categories of the

---

[60]Whitman, *HHT* 163-164.
[61]Collins, *Characterization* 16.

critic."[62] We have seen this frequently occurring in critics' responses to Homer's Paris. Everyone agrees that Homer is a master of characterization and that Paris is superbly drawn in terms that are easy to discern and unequivocal; however, neither the complexity of that characterization nor the means by which it is achieved are examined.

Milman Parry suggested a more productive approach, one that recognized the greatness of Homeric poetry without devaluing the tradition which gave rise to it. He believed that the greatness of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* was grounded in the oral epic tradition and not achieved by overcoming that tradition. If we maintain that Homer transcends his tradition, we run the risk of examining his poetry, at worst, in accordance with the subjective personal criteria which Collins mentions, or, at best, by the conventions of later, literate poetry. Parry, Lord, and those who have continued their researches in the present, scholars such as Michael Nagler and John Miles Foley to name only two of the most prominent, have demonstrated beyond a doubt that we must study Homer as an oral poet working in a long-standing tradition of oral epic poetry. Thus, as Parry asserted long ago:

> One oral poet is better than another not because he has by himself found a more striking way of expressing his own thought but because he has been better able to make use of the tradition. He strives not to create a new ideal in poetry but to achieve that which everyone knows to be the best.[63]

---

[62]Collins, *Characterization* 17. Cf. Lord, "Homer as Oral Poet" 34-46, for a discussion of the dangers inherent in "subjective interpretation and appreciation of the Homeric poems" (1).

[63]Parry, *MHV* 334. Cf. also p. 335: "the fame of such a singer [i.e., a good singer] comes not from quitting the tradition but from putting it to the best

(cont.)

Bowra, too, stresses the same sort of relationship between an individual oral poet's creativity and the tradition:

> When we read Homer, we may indeed enjoy it very much as we enjoy other poetry, but we can hardly ever say that it is because of the poet's originality; for in the last analysis we may never be certain what is his own invention and what he has taken from tradition. Indeed, however original an oral poet may be, he must always conform to the traditional manner and his inventions must be adapted to it and made to look at home in it.[64]

If we agree with scholars like Kirk and Heubeck that in his depictions of traditional characters, Homer transcends his tradition, we come to a dead end in Homeric scholarship. For such a conclusion assumes two different views of Homer which cannot exist together, inasmuch as the traditional poet who transcends his tradition ceases to be a traditional poet. If we regard Homer as a non-traditional poet working in a traditional medium, we are at a loss how to study his poetry; oral models cease to have value and we are forced to study the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in the same way as we study later literate works. The formulaic nature of Homeric diction, the use of type scenes, story patterns, and much else make this proposition untenable. If we insist on pursuing this path, nonetheless, we are back to a view of the poet of the *Iliad*

---

use" and "the highest sort of oral verse-making achieves the new by the best and most varied and perhaps the fullest use of the old." Parry already held this view as early as 1923 in his Master's thesis, "A comparative study of diction as one of the elements of style in early Greek epic poetry": "This does not mean that personal talent had no effect on style, nothing to do with the choice and use of the medium whereby an author undertook to express his ideas: Aristotle points out Homer's superiority to other writers of early epic verse in the organization of his material. It does mean, though, that there were certain established limits of form to which the play of genius must confine itself" (*MHV* 42).

[64]Bowra, "Composition" 39.

who, on the one hand, gives us his brilliant portraits of Achilles, Agamemnon, and Helen, but who, on the other, "nods off" in the repetitive battle books and the numerous perceived contradictions which fed Analytical scholarship before Parry.[65]

Edward Irving, an eminent scholar of Old English poetry, sums up the task facing all students of oral poetry:

> What we literary critics have been struggling with for years is reaching an understanding of how rich and complex meanings can be expressed in a style subject to such severe limitations, or, to put this in a much more promising way, to understand how such richness is

---

[65]On the Analytical and Unitarian schools, cf., for example, Foley, "The Oral Theory in Context" 29: "The task of the Analysts, then, was to separate the poems into their chronological and geographical-dialectical parts, most often by locating what were taken as narrative inconsistencies, dialect usages, and archaeological infelicities. Their implicit answer to the Homeric Question was, in effect, that there had been many 'Homers,' many contributors to the texts which have reached us." As Foley goes on to say, Parry's most important contribution was that he was able to ignore the controversy between Analysts and Unitarians, who believed that the greatness of the Homeric poems could only have been achieved by a single poet, and "posit an ongoing traditional *process* instead of either a series of nonintegrated stages involving a *mélange* of parts, editors, and interpolators or an individual act of poetic creation" (30). Parry himself explains how his research should put an end to the Analytical-Unitarian debates: "The first move in this attempt to rebuild the Homeric idea of epic poetry will be to show that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are composed in a traditional style, and are composed orally, then to see just how such poetry differs from our own in style and form. When that is done, we shall have solid ground beneath us when we undertake the problem of unity in the poems, or judge a doubtful verse ... or how the greatness of a Singer would show itself. We shall find, I think, that this failure to see the difference between written and oral verse was the greatest single obstacle to our understanding of Homer, we shall cease to be puzzled by much, we shall no longer look for much that Homer would never have thought of saying, and above all, we shall find that many, if not most of the questions we were asking, were not the right ones to ask" (*MHV* 269). Cf. also Lord, "Homer as Oral Poet" 46 and Fenik, *Studies in the Odyssey* 133-136.

> attained *through* these conventions rather than *in spite of* them.[66]

Since Parry, many scholars have demonstrated that, although Homer worked with traditional units of composition that covered all aspects of his poetry from the level of noun-epithet combinations to large-scale story patterns, he, in fact, possessed infinite freedom in his selection and deployment of these units. Once again, Bowra saw this long ago when he wrote that, "though oral poetry has its strict conventions, within them it allows a certain freedom to its practitioners. They are expected to keep the main outline of a story, but they are free to include what details they choose and even to change the whole temper of its events."[67]

Lord, like Parry, witnessed the phenomenon of originality within a highly regulated system of composition first hand. From his research on the Yugoslav oral tradition, he concluded that

> the oral poet has a great degree of freedom in the construction of his song, if he wished to be creative and to make use of that freedom. ... On both the formulaic and the thematic level, then, the oral technique not only allows freedom for change and creation but aids in providing the means by which the singer may exercise his creative imagination if he so desires. His medium is not so restrictive that he is stifled by his tradition. An oral poet can be creative to whatever degree his inspiration moves him and his mastery of technique permits.[68]

In his obituary article on Avdo Mededovic, Lord recounts how, in 1935, Parry had Avdo listen to another singer perform a song which Avdo had never before heard. The song, when finished, amounted to 2,294 lines. Parry

---

[66]Irving, "What to do with old kings" 259-260. Also quoted in Foley, *IA* 5.

[67]Bowra, "Composition" 39.

[68]Lord, "Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts" 128.

then asked Avdo if he could sing the same song, perhaps even improve upon it. He agreed, "and the pupil's version of the tale reached 6,313 lines, nearly three times the length of his 'original' on the first hearing!"[69] Avdo's method, as that of his fellow singers, was expansion of the song through "ornamentation," that is the addition of detailed descriptions of heroes, horses, or journeys, the insertion of speeches, digressions, and new narrative details:

> Avdo has culled his 'ornaments,' as he himself called them, from all the singers whom he heard. But he did not stop there. He admitted that he thought up some of them himself; and this is true. He told me once that he "saw in his mind every piece of trapping which he put on a horse." He visualized the scene or the action, and from that mental image he formed a verbal reflection in his song. Avdo's songs are living proof that the best oral epic singers are original poets working within the tradition in the traditional manner.[70]

Nagler was perhaps the first Homerist to devote a whole book to the study of originality in the traditional medium of oral poetry in *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. His focus is on the epithet and the story pattern and not characterization *per se*; however, his comments on myth, and by extension, the figures of myth, indicate that in the area of characterization the poet of the *Iliad* inherits traditional characters and adapts them for his specific narrative purposes:

> There was no fixed form of the myth from which the oral bards (or, for that matter, the fifth century tragedians) departed, any more than there were fixed phrases or fixed themes. All these existed in the minds of the bearers of the tradition in the abstract form of general ideas, which

---

[69]Lord, "Avdo Mededovic, Guslar" 327. Cf. also Lord, *ST* 78-79.
[70]Lord, "Avdo Mededovic, Guslar" 323-324.

> the poets realized when and in the particular ways in which they needed them, thereby enriching the tradition by making available to it their own associative pathways, their own experiments in usage and meaning.[71]

The oral poet inherits traditional stories and characters, the outlines of both being only generally drawn. The individual poet is able, by bringing to these stories and their characters his "own associative pathways" and "experiments in usage and meaning," to create something new each time he sings. Foley examines this phenomenon by focusing on one hero who appears frequently in Serbo-Croatian epic. Mustabeg is one of the great heroes of this tradition, "a curiously ambiguous character, one who leads the favored Turks and yet may turn treasonous at any moment."[72] In one story, for example, he refuses to open the city gates to a fellow Turk, the main character of the story, who is being pursued by the Christians, and is subsequently captured and imprisoned. The audience expects such double-dealing from Mustabeg because they have heard other stories in which his actions are also questionable. Foley concludes that

> Mustabeg lives not as a original creation in this or that special situation, not even as a generic character simply imported from one situation to another, but as a fully formed, multidimensional actor in a composite drama much larger and more involved than any single scene. The tremendous advantage of characterization in such a medium stems from the metonymic resonance of the idiom: far from being a prisoner of a repetitive, mechanical style, the poet can summon heroes who live not in this or that situation or story only but in the narrative tradition as a whole. To the single, present situation such a character brings a lifetime of achievement, reputation — perhaps even ignominy; in

---

[71]Nagler, *S&T* 25.
[72]Foley, *IA* 18.

> short, he brings the heroic personality developed in all the stories in which he appears, the personality given him by the tradition.[73]

The tradition, that is to say all the stories in which a particular figure appears, gives the audience and the poet a general picture within which the poet is free to characterize that figure in accordance with his larger narrative aims.

The starting point, therefore, for a particular character portrait in a particular poem lies in the general personality, to use Foley's term, that all the stories in which that figure appears have given him. How, then, does the poet adapt this general personality to create a character who lives in a specific poem, as opposed to a figure in a tradition?

Collins, for one, argues that characterization in the Homeric poems is achieved by adapting traditional figures to the specific ethical standards which are most prominent in a given poem. For example, the tradition provides Helen with her association with Aphrodite and Achilles with his pre-eminence as a warrior. However, it is the particular ethical framework of the *Iliad* which celebrates the warrior and trivializes Aphrodite.[74] How this ethical framework influences characterization is the focus of Collins' study:

> It remains then to apply the study of ethical systems and the institutions they legitimate within the poems to the primary purpose of elucidating the presentation of characters — characters who are also playing roles defined to some extent by tradition, and thus precede and are partly independent of the ethical system of the narrative which presents them. In other words, what we will be examining largely is the interaction of a character — partly

---

[73]Foley, *IA* 18; cf. also Lord, "The Theme of the Withdrawn Hero" 19-21.

[74]Collins 14.

> defined by a larger received tradition — with the ethics of a particular poem.[75]

The great value of Collins' work, like that of Foley and Nagler, lies in her attempt to create a method by which we can see the difference between what is traditional and what is unique to a specific poem. The key lies in recognizing that any poem is ultimately one "particular realization of the tradition which might not be shared by the tradition in general."[76] The result of such a study, one hopes, will be a further elucidation of the way in which the poet of the *Iliad*, to paraphrase Irving, composes through and not in spite of the limitations imposed by his tradition.

The approach of using ethics to determine what may be specifically "Iliadic" in Homer's presentation of traditional figures is also the one favoured by Christopher Gill in the introductory essay to a book devoted to the study of characterization in Greek literature. He defines character as follows:

> I have associated the term "character" with the process of making moral judgements; and I have taken this process to involve (i) placing people in a determinate ethical framework and (ii) treating them as psychological and moral "agents", that is, as the originators of intentional actions for which they are normally held responsible and which are treated as indexes of goodness or badness of character.[77]

Gill illustrates what he means by this definition with reference to the *Odyssey*, a poem which he argues "typically presents its figures as agents who show their (ethical) character by their considered responses to certain key

---

[75]Collins 18.
[76]Collins 19.
[77]Gill 2.

situations, in which a clear choice of action is demanded of them. This presentation is exemplified above all in Odysseus' recurrent, and often noted, role as 'testing' those he encounters, so as to judge, by their responses, whether they are 'violent, savage, and unjust or hospitable and godly in their mind (νοῦς)'."[78] Like Odysseus, the audience or the critic must pay attention to significant "character-markers" in order to form a picture of the figures they encounter. These include "character-indicating speeches and actions by the relevant figures and significant statements about them by the narrator and other figures."[79] In this way, both Odysseus and the audience are able to determine the nature of an individual's character. For the poet, characterization is achieved by a figure's behaviour within the ethical framework of his poem. This situation, though perhaps a more prominent part of the *Odyssey*, is equally discernible in the *Iliad*, not least of all, as we shall see, with regard to Paris.

IV. The Characterization of Paris in *Iliad* 3 & 6

In recent years there have been several detailed studies of the characterization of Paris in the *Iliad*. All of these attempt to place Paris within an ethical framework deemed to be at the heart of the poem. Within this framework, he functions as the antihero, the antithesis of the *Iliad*'s heroic values, and the figure who, by his deviation from and rejection of these values, puts them in sharp relief for the audience.

---

[78]Gill 9. Cf. *Od*. 6.120-121, 9.175-176, 13.201-202.
[79]Gill 7.

A. Aphrodite's Favourite

Collins sees in the *Iliad* two opposing ethical systems, one is πόλεμος-centred, the other ἔρως-centred. The *Iliad* valorizes the former, and the majority of its heroes conform to its values, or rather are characterized favourably with regard to this system. The second one is presided over by Aphrodite, and the poet characterizes Aphrodite's favourites, Helen and Paris, with regard to its values. For Paris, tension is created because he is a warrior, while Aphrodite is a goddess who the poet of the *Iliad* asserts has no place on the battlefield. In other words, in the *Iliad*, ἔρως and πόλεμος are delineated as separate and opposing spheres.[80] Zeus defines Aphrodite's sphere of influence as ἱμερόεντα ... ἔργα γάμοιο, and sets this in opposition to πολεμήϊα ἔργα, which are governed by Ares and Athena:

> οὔ τοι, τέκνον ἐμόν, δέδοται πολεμήϊα ἔργα,
> ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ἱμερόεντα μετέρχεο ἔργα γάμοιο,
> ταῦτα δ' Ἄρηϊ θοῷ καὶ Ἀθήνῃ πάντα μελήσει.
> (5.428-430)

Diomedes, upon seeing Aphrodite on the battlefield, knows her to be an ἄναλκις θεός and not one of those goddesses who marshal men in battle, like Athene and Enyo (5.331-533). After wounding her, he tells her to stay out of the fighting, that her place is to deceive γυναῖκας ἀνάλκιδας (348-351).

Because Paris is the favourite of Aphrodite and even endowed with her gifts, as Hector tells us, his status as a warrior is compromised from the start. For, as Boedeker says, in the *Iliad*, "Aphrodite is represented as an effeminate and debasing love goddess."[81] Homer emphasizes throughout

---

[80]Collins 36-38.

[81]Boedeker 35. It is curious that in the *Iliad*, Aeneas is not likewise characterized as Aphrodite's favourite. He, unlike Paris, is one of the Trojans'

(cont.)

Book 3 his status as Aphrodite's favourite. Hector, who is the first to address Paris, stresses repeatedly his good looks and his seductiveness. Aphrodite, too, when she describes for Helen how he looks waiting for her in their bedroom, stresses his beauty and desirability. Book 3 ends with the clearest possible contrast between ἔρως and πόλεμος as Paris makes love to Helen while Menelaus searches in vain for him on the battlefield. It is also worth noting that Paris is the only hero in the *Iliad* who is shown engaging in sexual intercourse, in the day-time no less.[82] This distinction seems purposely

---

most important fighters, and the poet appears to go to some length in distancing him from his mother in this regard. She does rescue him when he is injured by Diomedes (5.311ff.). But notice how different this passage is from the one in Book 3 where she alone saves Paris. Here, Apollo completes the rescue after Diomedes wounds Aphrodite (343-346), and Leto and Artemis heal his wound (447-448). Moreover, when Aeneas is about to meet Achilles in battle, it is not Aphrodite, but Poseidon, a god normally opposed to the Trojan cause who rescues Aeneas (20.288ff.). The passage in Book 5 is the only place in the *Iliad* where Aeneas comes into contact with his mother. Therefore, I cannot agree with Slatkin that Aeneas' heroism, like that of Paris is, "from an epic standpoint, permanently compromised," because he is Aphrodite's beneficiary (43, n. 30; cf. also Fröhder 254-255). Aeneas is traditionally the son of Aphrodite, but, in the *Iliad*, he does not particularly benefit from this status (less certainly than Achilles does, as the son of Thetis), nor is he presented as her particular favourite; that status is reserved for Paris and Helen. The result is that Aeneas' heroism, in spite of his potentially problematic parentage, is not compromised.

[82]Cf. Plutarch's comments: οὐδένα γὰρ ἄλλον ἀνθρώπων ἡμέρας συγκοιμώμενον γυναικὶ ποιήσας ἢ τὸν ἀκόλαστον καὶ μοιχικὸν ἐν αἰσχύνῃ δῆλός ἐστι καὶ ψόγῳ τιθέμενος τὴν τοιαύτην ἀκρασίαν (*De Audiendis Poetis* 3=18F): "For since the poet represents no other save this licentious and adulterous man as dallying with a woman in the daytime, it is clear that he classes such sensuality as a shame and reproach" (F. Cole, trans., Plutarch, *Moralia*, vol. 1, 97).
Also: ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ἡρώων οὔτε γαμετῇ τινα μεθ' ἡμέραν οὔτε πολλακίδι συγκατέκλινεν πλὴν ἢ τὸν Πάριν δραπετεύσαντα ποιήσας καταδυόμενον εἰς τοὺς κόλπους τῆς γυναικός, ὡς οὐδ ἀνδρὸς ἀλλὰ μοιχοῦ λυσσῶντος οὖσαν τὴν μεθημερινὴν ἀκρασίαν (*Quaestionum Convivalium* iii,6=655A): "Then the poet

(cont.)

reserved for him to emphasize his proximity to Aphrodite. In Book 6, Hector must come to retrieve Paris who is still at home in his bedroom with his wife. Even during Paris' greatest moment on the battlefield, when he wounds Diomedes in Book 11, the poet stresses his connection with Aphrodite. Diomedes belittles him by remarking on his physical beauty (385-395) and claiming that the wound he has just received is inconsequential.[83] Thus, in his most significant appearances in the *Iliad*, Paris is consistently associated with Aphrodite.[84] This association is always seen to be inappropriate and unheroic because Aphrodite is portrayed as being ineffectual on the battlefield. And it is precisely in his capacity as a warrior

---

too puts none of his heroes to bed during the day either with wife or with mistress, except when he represented Paris slinking off to his wife's bosom after he had run away from his post, as much to say that the incontinence of day-time love-making is no part of an honest husband's behaviour but a mad adulterer's" (P. Clement, trans., Plutarch, *Moralia* vol. 8, 255).

[83]Cf. Stanley 133, who calls Paris in this scene a "superannuated Cupid," picking up on this connection with Aphrodite. According to Muellner (*The Meaning of Homeric* εὔχομαι 91), Diomedes stresses that Paris' use of the bow is a sign of his "effeminate, cowardly fear of manly, competitive single combat until death." Cf. also Whitman, *HHT* 129. The use of the bow as a sign of effeminacy or cowardliness is, of course, questionable, as the examples of Odysseus, Heracles, and Philoctetes — all warriors connected with the Trojan cycle — demonstrate. The use of the bow as a hero's weapon will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4.

[84]Cf. further Muellner, "Cranes and Pygmies" 80-88, who examines the imagery of dancing which is developed around Paris in Book 3, for example, in Hector's reproach and in Aphrodite's description of him to Helen. He demonstrates that the dance is particularly associated with Aphrodite as the "traditional locale for the seduction of nubile adolescent virgins in epic and in cult myths" (80). As such, this imagery further emphasizes the poet's unheroic characterization of Paris as Aphrodite's favourite. Of Hector's reproach at 3.54-57, Muellner says, "[t]he lyre, Aphrodite's gifts, sensual beauty — these attributes of the dancer are also the tokens of his inadequacy in war" (88). Cf. also Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk* 62-65; on dancing and its connections with Aphrodite, cf. Boedeker 43-63.

fighting on behalf of a besieged city that Homer chooses to remind his audience that Paris is Aphrodite's favourite. The audience, therefore, sees Paris as an ineffectual warrior because the poet explicitly characterizes him in this way.

Hélène Monsacré, in her study of the role of Aphrodite in the military world of the *Iliad*, comes to much the same conclusion:

> On voudrait, en effet, montrer qu'il existe une corrélation entre la fureur guerrière et l'éloignement d'Aphdrodite, que la lâcheté s'accompagne de et se définit par une excessive proximité avec le monde de la déesse, voire une immersion dans ce monde.[85]

Moreover, the inappropriateness of a warrior's closeness with this goddess is especially pronounced in the situation which is at the heart of the *Iliad*: "être, pendant le siège d'une ville, à distance ou à proximité du «monde» d'Aphrodite est un critère de qualification guerrière."[86] For proximity to Aphrodite results in the warrior's removal from the battlefield, from the defense of his city. This is precisely what happens to Paris. He is the only hero in the *Iliad* who in broad daylight is seen away from the fighting in his bedroom.[87] Hector, by contrast, is seen in the city only on a mission of direct

---

[85]Monsacré 41

[86]Monsacré 41.

[87]A possible exception is Meleager who is in his θάλαμος with his wife (9.556, 565, 588), and may also be engaging in sexual intercourse with her, as παρκατέλεκτο (9.565) suggests. Achilles, who of course has no θάλαμος at Troy, is consistently said to be beside his ships or in his tent (1.329, 2.688ff., 4.513, 7.229-230, 9.186-187). He too may be making love with a woman at 9.664, though the presence of Patroclus is odd. This may be a feature of the wrath and withdrawal story pattern (discussed in detail in chapter 4), in which the angry warrior withdraws to his own quarters, where his wife, if he has one or if she has not been taken from him, naturally would be. The difference between Paris, on the one hand, and Meleager and Achilles, on the other, is,

(cont.)

military importance, and when he takes advantage of being there to see his wife, the poet is careful not to set this meeting in their bedroom.

Paris, on the other hand, forfeits all claim to heroic reputation because of his association with Aphrodite:

> C'est parce que Pâris est totalement sous l'emprise d'Aphrodite, qu'il en est comme son émanation, qu'il est impropre à l'activité masculine par excellence: la guerre qui assure, par les exploits qu'elle exige, une gloire impérissable.[88]

Otto Lendle examines in more detail than either Collins or Monsacré how the poet creates and exploits the tension that exists between Paris' roles as a warrior and as Aphrodite's favourite. He too sees Paris characterized primarily by his association with this goddess.[89] The poet creates this picture by consciously and systematically setting him up as a great hero when we first meet him in Book 3 and then destroying that heroism. We first see Paris issuing a challenge to single combat, with a bravado appropriate to a hero, and as Hector will also do later on (7.73-91); but all too quickly, he retreats in fear when an antagonist steps forward. When he finally agrees to fulfill his challenge, the poet gives him an arming scene, which raises expectations of glorious exploits to come, perhaps even a full-fledged *aristeia*, as is normal after such a scene. His subsequent performance is miserable, and right when he should be proving his heroism, the poet introduces his protector, the most unheroic of the major Olympians:

---

however, striking in that Paris openly expresses his desire for Helen and fulfills it (3.438ff.).

[88]Monsacré 48.

[89]Lendle 67: "Paris wird uns immer deutlicher als ein Mann vorgestellt, der vollständig und widerstandlos und mit klarem Bewußtsein von Aphrodite abhängig ist."

> Um dieses Bild in aller Deutlichkeit zu gewinnen, wird der Held Paris ... systematisch vernichtet. Es kam dem Dichter hier am Beginn des Epos offenbar ganz überwiegend darauf an, seine Hörer mit der dämonischen Liebeskraft und Leibesbesessenheit dieses Mannes vertraut zu machen.[90]

For Lendle, when Paris goes to bed with Helen when he should be on the battlefield, the poet's destruction of his heroism is complete. All this is accomplished by the end of the third book, in the course of Paris' first appearance in the *Iliad*.[91]

Paris is characterized, then, first and foremost by his association with Aphrodite. This places him within an ethical framework which is trivialized in the *Iliad* and set up in opposition to the poem's dominant ethical framework, that of the warrior, and, therefore, results in the negative picture which so many readers and critics of the poem have formed of him. Homer's characterization, however, achieves a certain complexity, as we have seen, because Paris does occupy the inherently paradoxical role of Aphrodite's

---

[90]Lendle 67.

[91]Muellner sees a similar development in the characterization of Paris from the beginning to the end of Book 3. Hector's purpose in reproaching Paris is to shame him out of "his dancer's identity," that is out of the realm of Aphrodite, and into that of a fighter. Paris tries, but fails miserably. "At the end of Book 3 Paris is what he was at the beginning. He has failed to respond to Hector's challenge that he shed his dancer's identity and become a fighter. So the dancer's single combat ends with a seduction, not a victory or even a defeat" ("Cranes and Pygmies" 89). Meltzer (273) also observes the ways in which Paris' boldness at the beginning of Book 3 and his arming scene raise expectations for an important encounter. The duel, however, turns out to be anticlimactic: "no one gets hurt and nothing is decided in a combat which was to be decisive." Monsacré (47) too notes the difference between Paris' appearance and his performance here in Book 3. In this regard she likens him to Pandora, for both possess "un exterieur tout de beauté et de séduction, une apparence trompeuse qui cache un dedans nefaste et rusé."

warrior. This role brings him into contact with Menelaus, the other hero at the centre of the whole conflict, with his wife, another favourite of Aphrodite, and with his brother, the principal warrior fighting for the defense of Troy.

B. Paris and Menelaus

One of the most striking ways in which Paris is characterized in Book 3 is through his epithets — striking because Parry asserted that this should not be so, that, in fact, it is a fallacy to look "to a hero's epithets for a résumé of his character. Even among the 40 distinctive epithets for heroes, few refer specifically to their persons. We learn the characters of the men and women on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* not from epithets but from what they do and from what they say."[92] He asserted that "the essential idea of the words ... πολύτλας δῖος 'Οδυσσεύς is 'Odysseus,'" even though πολύτλας is used only of Odysseus.[93] Distinctive epithets, ones that appear with the name of one hero only, like πολύτλας and πολύμητις of Odysseus "tell us that he was a man of extraordinary ingenuity and that in the course of his life he experienced extraordinary suffering."[94] Parry, however, believed that neither poet nor audience would have expected that the specific meaning of these epithets would be realized in any given poetic context. They knew Odysseus to be clever and long-suffering; thus, these epithets defined his traditional character, but they did little else. For the poet, πολύτλας and πολύμητις are chosen because they fulfill metrical needs in a specific part of the hexameter

---

[92]Parry, *MHV* 152.
[93]Parry, *MHV* 13-14.
[94]Parry, *MHV* 145.

line; therefore, "long-suffering Odysseus" and "crafty Odysseus" both mean simply "Odysseus." The same is true of the audience because they have heard epithets used in this strictly ornamental way so many times that they cease to hear any particular meaning in them.[95]

For Parry, generic epithets, ones used of more than one hero, have even less meaning than distinctive ones. Distinctive epithets at least define the traditional character of a figure, even if they do not realize that meaning in a specific context; generic epithets merely tell us that their recipients exist in an oral epic tradition. In this regard, the generic epithet is for Parry the fullest realization of the fixed and ornamental, that is metrically determined, epithet:

> The fixed epithet then adds to the combination of substantive and epithet an element of nobility and grandeur, but no more than that. Its sole effect is to form with its substantive a heroic expression of the idea of that substantive.[96]

Thus, πτολίπορθος indicates "a man, who being a hero, was capable of sacking cities"; κρείων, "a man who reigns, like other heroes"; and βοὴν ἀγαθός, "good at the war-cry as ordinary men are not."[97] In his application of epithets to all manner of nouns, not just heroes' names, "Homer sacrificed precision of thought to ease of versification."[98]

Since the early 1960s, scholars have increasingly questioned the absolute distinction between versification and precision of thought which

---

[95]Parry, *MHV* 139-141.
[96]Parry, *MHV* 127.
[97]Parry, *MHV* 146.
[98]Parry, *MHV* 138.

Parry championed.[99] They concede that in the majority of cases epithets appear to be used in a purely ornamental way; this does not, however, mean that a given epithet, used ornamentally most of the time, could not be particular on occasion. It does not necessarily follow, as Parry asserted, that, because versification plays *a* role in the choice of epithets, that it plays the *only* role.

At the very least, all epithets, generic and distinctive, must be true to character, that is, they must accurately describe the figures to which they are applied, even if each occurrence of a given epithet is not directly relevant to the immediate context. Epithets must always provide an accurate *résumé* of *traditional* character, even if they do not illuminate the specific characterization of traditional figures at a given moment in a poem. As Lowenstam concludes:

> Parry overstated his case when he suggested that the poet and audience were indifferent to the particular meaning of a fixed, traditional epithet. Rather, they expected the generic epithet genuinely to reflect a regular quality in the genus even if it was absent in the particular case involved.[100]

Such studies have demonstrated that the exigencies of versification must accommodate, at the very least, traditional representations of characters in each occurrence of an epithet.

---

[99]Cf., for example, Whallon, "The Homeric Epithets" 135-142; Austin, *Archery* 11-80, esp. 74-79; Heubeck, *Die Homerische Frage* 138-152; A. Parry, "Language and Characterization" 1-22, esp. 5-9; Fenik, *Studies in the Odyssey* 136-141; Kullmann, "Zur Methode der Neoanalyse" 14-16; and Sacks, *The Traditional Phrase* 106-107, 201-211.

[100]Lowenstam, *The Death of Patroclus* 16; cf. 1-17 for a full discussion, as well as Whallon, *Formula, Character, and Context* 1-70 and A. Amory Parry 162-167.

If generic epithets can be seen as indicators of traditional characterization, then it is conceivable that the poet could use them in a particular way, as a means of negotiating meaning in a specific piece of narrative. As Adam Parry says, "epithets ..., however convenient metrically and however often repeated, can have the kind of meaning we naturally find in them, can help to define the characters and to tell the story that depends on those characters."[101] Tsagarakis, for example, looks at those two epithets, πολύτλας and πολύμητις, which Parry asserted mean nothing more than Odysseus when they occur with their substantive. He demonstrates that in many cases, in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the poet's choice of epithet depends precisely on the suitability to the context of the particular aspect of Odysseus' traditional character that each epithet denotes. Epithet and noun do not only and always mean "Odysseus"; they can also refer to and emphasize the hero's intelligence or his suffering in a way that is discernibly relevant to the context.[102]

Similarly, at the beginning of *Iliad* 3, when Paris is introduced, his epithets play an important part in both his characterization and in the immediate context.[103] At line 16, he first appears as 'Αλέξανδρος θεοειδής,

---

[101]A. Parry, "Language and Characterization" 5; cf. also A. Amory Parry (163-164) on such generic epithets as μεγαλήτωρ, φαίδιμος, ἀγαθός, and δῖος: "all these epithets glorify warriors and can therefore be used interchangeably as the metre demands or as a desire for variety suggests, but that is not to say either that they are exactly synonymous or that they are so vague in meaning as to have no relation at all to the context."

[102]Tsagarakis, *Form and Content* 34-42.

[103]Paris is more frequently referred to as Alexandros (45 times; Paris, 13 times, including Dusparis, twice). In Book 3, he is called Paris only three times; therefore, it is the noun-epithet combinations for Alexandros that concern us here. The questions surrounding the two names will be dealt with in Chapter 2.

issuing a challenge to single combat. Ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος takes note of him (21), and is compared to a lion overjoyed at coming across a carcass: ὥς τε λέων ἐχάρη ... ὣς ἐχάρη Μενέλαος Ἀλέξανδρον θεοειδέα ... ἰδών (23-28). Then Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής notices Menelaus (30), is frightened (καταπλήγη φίλον ἦτορ, 31) and retreats in order to avoid death (κῆρ' ἀλεείνων, 32). Just as a man is frightened and retreats when he sees a snake, so does godlike Alexander retreat in fear before Atreus' son (δείσας Ἀτρέος υἱὸν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής, 37).

Hector then abuses his brother for this show of cowardice: he was brave enough once to abduct a beautiful foreign woman; why does he not now stand up to her husband, ἀρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον (52)? Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής replies (58), agreeing to fight ἀρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον (69). Hector announces to both sides that Paris will meet ἀρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον in single combat (90). Menelaus accepts, and the scene ends as preparations for the duel begin.

Iris summons Helen to watch the duel between Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος (136). Helen goes to the Trojan wall, where she identifies the Greek leaders for the elders. Antenor recalls how Odysseus came on an embassy σὺν ἀρηϊφίλῳ Μενελάῳ (206). Helen recalls how ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος often entertained Idomeneus (232). Presently, a herald arrives to bring Priam to the battlefield for the oath-swearing before the duel between Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος (253). When his task is completed Priam leaves the battlefield because he cannot bear to watch his son fight warlike Menelaus (οὔ πω τλήσομ' ... ὁρᾶσθαι / μαρνάμενον φίλον υἱὸν ἀρηϊφίλῳ Μενελάῳ, 306-307).

After the inconclusive duel, Paris sits in his bedroom and Menelaus is still on the battlefield. Helen taunts Paris, saying that he used to boast that he was a better warrior than ἀρηϊφίλου Μενελάου (430). That being the case, he should go right now and summon ἀρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον to fight (432). Meanwhile, Menelaus, like a wild beast (θηρὶ ἐοικώς, 449), searches for

'Αλέξανδρον θεοειδέα (450). None of the Trojans, however, could point him out to warlike Menelaus (οὔ τις δύνατο ... / δεῖξαι 'Αλέξανδρον τότ' ἀρηϊφίλῳ Μενελάῳ, 451-452). The book ends with Agamemnon declaring warlike Menelaus the victor (νίκη μὲν δὴ φαίνετ' ἀρηϊφίλου Μενελάου, 457).

The concentrated use of these two epithet, θεοειδής for Paris and ἀρηΐφιλος for Menelaus, and their consistent juxtaposition is remarkable and alone suggestes that the poet achieved this precisely in order to characterize the two men in the specific context of their duel. θεοειδής is used 6 times of Alexandros in this book out of a total of 12 occurrences in the whole poem. This is not surprising, given that Paris' most extended appearance is here in Book 3. Menelaus, however, is described as ἀρηΐφιλος 13 times in this book. The epithet is used of him only 6 times in the rest of the poem.[104] In addition to his prominence in Book 3, he plays a major role in Book 4, when Pandarus wounds him, and in Book 17, in the fight over Patroclus' corpse. He appears frequently on the battlefield, in Books 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15, and 16. He takes part in the council in Book 10; he figures prominently in the chariot race during the funeral games for Patroclus in Book 23. His system of epithets is extensive, with three others besides ἀρηΐφιλος frequently used: βοὴν ἀγαθός (18 times), ξανθός (16 times), and ἀρήϊος (9 times).[105] That 13 out of 19

---

[104]Both θεοειδής and ἀρηΐφιλος are generic epithets. θεοειδής , in the *Iliad*, is used of Priam (9 times, Book 24 only) and once each of six heroes (Polyxeinus, Ascanius, Deïphobus, Arytus, Chromius, and Neoptolemus); in the *Odyssey*, it is applied to Telemachus (6 times), Theoclymenus (5 times), Eurymachus (twice), and once each to Alcinous, Antinous, Eurylochus, and Nausithous. ἀρηΐφιλος occurs less frequently. In the *Iliad*, it describes the Achaeans four times and is used once each of Achilles, Meleager, and Lycomedes. In the *Odyssey*, it is used once, of Menelaus.

[105]In addition, we find Διοτρεφής (8 times), κυδάλιμος (7 times), δουρίκλειτος (4 times), ἀγακλεής (twice), and ἀγαθός, αἰδοῖος, ἀμύμων, ἄναξ, and

(cont.)

occurrences of ἀρηΐφιλος are confined to Book 3 becomes more remarkable when we consider that only one occurrence out of 18 of βοὴν ἀγαθός, 2 out of 16 of ξανθός, and 1 out of 9 of ἀρήϊος occur in this book. None of his nine other epithets appear in this book. Thus, many epithets exist which the poet could have made greater use of in Book 3; instead ἀρηΐφιλος, out of all Menelaus' epithets, appears to have been singled out for use in this book compared to its relative infrequency elsewhere.

The most noteworthy comparison, however, is between Menelaus' two most common epithets: ἀρηΐφιλος used 13 times in Book 3; βοὴν ἀγαθός once, but 17 times elsewhere. This becomes more striking because βοὴν ἀγαθός Μενέλαος and ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος are metrical equivalents occupying the space from the tritotrochaic caesura to the line end. Parry himself conceded that in such cases reasons other than those of metrical convenience may dictate the poet's choice of epithet:

> When we find two or even more epithets or noun-epithet formulae of the same metre used with the same substantive, we can sometimes see that the poet is deliberately choosing a particular word in view of the immediate context. It was when the poet wanted to include an adjective for its sense rather than for its convenience that the influence of metre ceased to dictate the use of an epithet of a given measure, and the poet chose another, even though it duplicated that measure. Consequently, we can regard the repetition of metrical

> quantities as a sign that the epithet has been used to complete the meaning of the sentence.[106]

In the case of βοὴν ἀγαθός and ἀρηΐφιλος, because one begins with a consonant and the other with a vowel, in practice they only become metrical equivalents when the preceding word can end with a moveable nu. In the whole poem this occurs 15 times for Menelaus with these two epithets. But, as we are concerned here only with the possibility of a particular use of ἀρηΐφιλος in Book 3, only its three occurrences in this book will be examined.

At 3.21, Menelaus is introduced: τὸν δ' ὡς οὖν ἐνόησεν ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος. Here the poet could just as easily have used βοὴν ἀγαθός. But, by adding moveable nu, Menelaus' first epithet becomes ἀρηΐφιλος, and in a line in which the pronoun refers to Paris, who five lines earlier had been introduced as θεοειδής. Thus a contrast between the two men is immediately set up through their epithets.

At 3.232, Helen says that Menelaus frequently entertained Idomeneus: πολλάκι μιν ξείνισσεν ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος. In this case, one cannot point to a possible contrast between epithets for Paris and Menelaus, as in the previous example. Instead, the selection of ἀρηΐφιλος over βοὴν ἀγαθός appears to be consistent with a general preference for the former in this book. One also observes that Helen never refers to Menelaus as βοὴν ἀγαθός, but uses ἀρηΐφιλος at 3.430 and 432.

ἴφθιμος (once each). None of these is distinctive. The noun-epithet system for Ἀλέξανδρος is less extensive. It will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 2. Besides θεοειδής, he receives δῖος (4 times), βασιλεύς (once), and Ἑλένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο (4 times). The name Paris receives no epithets other than υἱὸς Πριάμοιο (once).

[106]Parry, *MHV* 155.

At 3.96-110, Menelaus accepts Paris' challenge to fight in single combat. His speech's introductory verse contains the one use of βοὴν ἀγαθός in Book 3: τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος (96). If the duel is to be fought specifically between θεοειδής Alexander and ἀρηΐφιλος Menelaus, why did the poet not use ἀρηΐφιλος here, at the moment when Menelaus agrees to fight, when the evidence suggests that he could have done so? When we examine all other occurrences of μετέειπε(ν) in Homer before the tritotrochaic caesura, there is not one instance in which the verb occurs before a clear vowel.[107] In this position μετέειπε(ν) is regularly followed by an epithet beginning with a consonant. This suggests that the presence of βοὴν ἀγαθός here is determined by the choice of verb preceding it; therefore, one cannot argue for a particular use of the one appearance of βοὴν ἀγαθός in Book 3. As Parry said, metrical equivalence is a *sign* not a *proof* of particular use of epithets. Other factors than context may have determined which epithet is used, as appears to be the case here.[108] The presence of moveable nu on two occasions in Book 3 allows us to argue for a particular use of ἀρηΐφιλος. This, coupled with the density of usage it receives in this book, strengthens the case that context is the determining factor in the overall application of this epithet to Menelaus here.

The case is further strengthened when we consider that Diomedes, whose name in the nominative and the accusative is of the same metrical shape as Menelaus', also receives the epithet βοὴν ἀγαθός in the same part of

---

[107]The anomalies are μετέειπεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν 'Αγαμέμνων (*Iliad*, 3 times) and τοῖς δ' 'Αγέλεως μετέειπεν, ἔπος πάντεσσι πιφαύσκων (*Odyssey*, twice). Both instances are curious because the failure to observe digamma before ἄναξ and ἔπος makes moveable nu necessary, whereas, if digamma were observed, as it commonly is, moveable nu would not be present.

[108]Parry, *MHV* 155 and 173-190.

the line as Menelaus does, from the tritotrochaic caesura to the line end. Moreover, he has two metrically equivalent epithets which can take the place of βοὴν ἀγαθός in this position in the line. At 4.365, we read: εὗρε δὲ Τυδέος υἱὸν ὑπέρθυμον Διομήδεα ; at 5.376: οὗτά με Τυδέος υἱὸς ὑπέρθυμος Διομήδης; and at 5.881: ἦ νῦν Τυδέος υἱὸν ὑπερφίαλον Διομήδεα.[109] Thus, both Menelaus and Diomedes have metrical equivalents to a noun-epithet formula which they share and which is frequently used of both heroes. However, the metrical equivalents to the noun-epithet formulae for βοὴν ἀγαθός Menelaus and Diomedes are interchangeable. In other words, we never encounter ἀρηΐφιλος Διομήδης or ὑπέρθυμος Μενέλαος. This suggests that ἀρηΐφιλος, though a generic epithet, appears in the *Iliad* to be reserved largely for Menelaus. It is only used once each of three other heroes and seems to be purposely avoided with the name Diomedes.[110]

---

[109]The metrically equivalent epithets in these three passages all appear to be particular. The presence of Tydeus implies a comparison between the father and his high-spirited or overweening son. In the Epipoleisis at 4.365ff., Agamemnon explicitly and unfavourably compares Diomedes to his father. The two other instances involve first Aphrodite and then Ares complaining to Zeus about their injuries at the hands of Diomedes, a context which surely justifies calling Diomedes ὑπέρθυμος or ὑπερφίαλος. Oddly, Kirk finds the first occurrence of ὑπέρθυμος unremarkable (*Comm.* I, 367), but the second one "especially appropriate to Diomedes here" (*Comm.* II, 100).

[110]Parry denies that a generic epithet used frequently of one hero and only occasionally of others can take on a distinctive force. The fact that an epithet is used of other heroes, however infrequently in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, indicates that it was chosen for metrical reasons and was probably used commonly and indiscriminately (that is, ornamentally) in the tradition as a whole (*MHV* 148-149). But Parry's reasoning is not sound here; because versification plays a role and because an epithet may be more widely used in the tradition as a whole does not mean that a poet could not use a generic epithet frequently of only one hero in order to associate the quality contained in the epithet with that hero in a particular poem. Contrary to what Parry says, πτολίπορθος used of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* can surely mean "the sacker

(cont.)

The evidence, therefore, suggests that ἀρηΐφιλος is used in a concentrated and virtually exclusive way that points to a particular use of this epithet to describe Menelaus in Book 3 The fact that he has an extensive system of noun-epithet formulae in the *Iliad* which is largely absent in Book 3, that ἀρηΐφιλος appears to be reserved almost exclusively for him, and that he has a metrically equivalent epithet which occurs frequently elsewhere but only once in this book all support this conclusion.

The poet uses ἀρηΐφιλος at the beginning of Book 3 as a contrast to Paris' epithet θεοειδής. In the first scene, up to line 110, θεοειδής describes Paris five times and ἀρηΐφιλος describes Menelaus four times. θεοειδής draws attention to Paris' beautiful physical appearance. Hector calls him εἶδος ἄριστε (39) and says that the Achaeans think him the Trojans' best fighter οὕνεκα καλὸν εἶδος ἔπ' (44-45); Aphrodite stresses Paris' beauty to Helen (391-394). But, whereas Paris is like a god in his beauty, Menelaus is beloved of Ares. This contrast is set up from the beginning. Paris is θεοειδής at 16; Menelaus is ἀρηΐφιλος at 21.[111] The two men are given contrasting similes, as we have seen, which draw attention to the bravery of one and the cowardice of the other. That the

---

of Troy." That it is used generically in the *Iliad* does not mean that it must always indicate only "a man who, being a hero, was capable of sacking cities" (*MHV* 146). The same, I argue, is true of ἀρηΐφιλος in *Iliad* 3 where it is used exclusively and so frequently of one hero that it takes on a distinctive force and points to a particular aspect of this hero's character.

[111]One might argue that there is not much to differentiate ἀρηΐφιλος and βοὴν ἀγαθος, that one or the other, or a mixture of the two could have been used without any loss of meaning, since both distinguish warriors in a general sense. However, the concentration of one epithet is surely more effective than an indiscriminate use of the two. Secondly, ἀρηΐφιλος draws attention to the war god and, therefore, contrasts nicely with the more general θεός of θεοειδής.

similes are meant to be read together is underlined by the verses which introduce them: τὸν δ' ὡς οὖν ἐνόησεν ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος (21); τὸν δ' ὡς οὖν ἐνόησεν 'Αλέξανδρος θεοειδής (30). The juxtaposition of the two enemies' names in line 27 strengthens the contrast: ὣς ἐχάρη Μενέλαος 'Αλέξανδρον θεοειδέα.[112]

Thus, throughout the first scene, in which the challenge to the duel is issued, Paris is singled out for his beauty and is compared to his opponent whose epithet characterizes him as a formidable warrior. The contrast further suggests that here Paris' beauty excludes military valour. When the duel is finally fought, the audience knows it will be between a man of godlike beauty and a man of strength and valour whom the war god himself favours. The epithets at the beginning of Book 3, therefore, serve to characterize both Paris and Menelaus, and do so in a way that is closely tied to the narrative context. In this way, the outcome of the duel later on in the book comes as no surprise.

C. Paris and Helen

Aphrodite herself informs Helen and us that Helen is one of her favourites when she goes to summon Helen to Paris' side after the duel. When Helen initially refuses to go, Aphrodite says to her:

> μή μ' ἔρεθε, σχετλίη, μὴ χωσαμένη σε μεθείω,
> τὼς δέ σ' ἀπεχθήρω ὡς νῦν ἔκπαγλα φίλησα.
> (3.414-415)

---

[112]Cf. also lines 136 and 253 where the two names again appear in the same line.

Helen, however, is never reproached for her association with the goddess, nor for the actions she committed under her influence, as Paris regularly is. On the contrary, when we do hear what any of the Trojans think of her, the view expressed is surprisingly positive. The famous lines of the Trojan elders as they see Helen approaching on the ramparts bear repeating for they contrast so strikingly with what his countrymen have to say about Paris:

> οὐ νέμεσις Τρῶας καὶ ἐϋκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς
> τοιῇδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα πάσχειν·
> αἰνῶς ἀθανάτῃσι θεῇς εἰς ὦπα ἔοικεν·
> ἀλλὰ καὶ ὣς τοίη περ ἐοῦσ' ἐν νηυσὶ νεέσθω,
> μηδ' ἡμῖν τεκέεσσί τ' ὀπίσσω πῆμα λίποιτο.
> (3.156-160)

Both Priam and Hector, the only Trojans other than her husband with whom Helen interacts, consistently treat her with respect (cf. 3.161-164, 6.360, 24.762-772). Priam even says that he does not blame her for the war (οὔ τί μοι αἰτίη ἐσσί, 3.164).[113] Paris, on the other hand, is vehemently hated by the Trojans

---

[113]Whallon argues that "Helen like Paris is hated by those whose relatives and friends are slain in the war to regain her" ("The Homeric Epithets" 115). However, it is only from Helen herself that we hear of ill feeling, at 24. 775 where she uses the verb πεφρίκασεν, from φρίσσω, "shudder at." This may well be part of her characterization as self-reproaching and self-loathing. At 19.325, Achilles calls her ῥιγεδανῆς, the root of which is from ῥιγέω, "shudder." As Whallon says of Achilles' epithet for Helen, "men do not otherwise shudder in the Homeric poems except at the sight of an evil portent or a mighty opponent or blood pouring from a wound. When men shudder at Helen and when she is called *a woman who makes men shudder* we are reminded of the realization among all the Achaeans and Trojans that the pain of war arises from her" ("The Homeric Epithets" 115). This is true, and the elders express as much when they see her approaching on the walls; however, it is not the same as hatred of Helen, for which not only is there no evidence in the *Iliad*, but indicators to the contrary. For Trojan feeling about Helen and her own about herself, cf. Focke, "Paris und Helena" 385-386 and Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie* 96, n. 3.

(cf. esp. 3.454: ἶσον γάρ σφιν πᾶσιν ἀπήχθετο κηρὶ μελαίνῃ). The reason for this hatred is that he is deemed to be responsible for the war, a reason that could just as easily be applied to Helen, but is not (cf. 3.321-322: ὁππότερος τάδε ἔργα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἔθηκε, / τὸν δὸς ἀποφθίμενον δῦναι δόμον Ἄϊδος εἴσω).[114]

Why is it that in a poem which takes such a negative view of the realm of Aphrodite is one of her favourites vilified and the other respected? The different responses which these similar characters produce result from their very different attitudes toward themselves, their situations, and the goddess who controls them.

Paris makes it clear in his reply to Hector at the beginning of Book 3 that he does not share his brother's, and the poem's, views of the shame attendant upon being Aphrodite's favourite and of the worthlessness of her gifts:

> μή μοι δῶρ' ἐρατὰ πρόφερε χρυσέης Ἀφροδίτης·
> οὔ τοι ἀπόβλητ' ἐστὶ θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα,

---

[114]Cf. Taplin, *Homeric Soundings* 96-103 for a discussion of the different attitudes the poem takes toward Helen and Paris as the causes of the war, and pp. 104-109 which examine Pandarus' role as Paris' substitute in a symbolic re-enactment of the causes of the war. Taplin, too, argues that in the *Iliad* blame for the cause of the war is apportioned much more to Paris than to Helen. Note also that in the words of the elders quoted above, they wish that Helen would return to Sparta so that she not be left behind as a πῆμα for future generations of Trojans. The words imply that they do not consider Helen to be a πῆμα at present, only that she might turn into one. Paris, on the other hand, is described as a πῆμα to his people almost immediately after he first appears, in Hector's reproach at 3.50. Hector also says to Hecuba that Zeus has raised Paris as a πῆμα for the Trojans at 6.282. The only other person consistently referred to as a πῆμα for the Trojans is Achilles (22.288, 421; cf. 24.547 and 9.228).

> ὅσσα κεν αὐτοὶ δῶσιν, ἑκὼν δ' οὐκ ἄν τις ἕλοιτο·
> (3.64-66)[115]

Later in the same book, Paris responds similarly to Helen when she rebukes him for his poor performance in the duel:

> μή με, γύναι, χαλεποῖσιν ὀνείδεσι θυμὸν ἔνιπτε·
> νῦν μὲν γὰρ Μενέλαος ἐνίκησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ,
> κεῖνον δ' αὖτις ἐγώ· πάρα γὰρ θεοί εἰσι καὶ ἡμῖν.
> (3.438-440)

In both passages, Paris acknowledges and accepts his status as Aphrodite's favourite. He does not feel shame and will not be chastised on account of his relationship with Aphrodite. On the contrary, his words to Hector indicate that he thinks Aphrodite as worthy of respect as any other god. The attitude revealed in these two passages explains why Paris never once expresses regret or responsibility for the suffering caused by his actions.

Helen, on the other hand, whenever she speaks to another Trojan, immediately states her remorse about the suffering she is causing, vilifies herself, and even wishes for her own death (3.172-176, 6.344-348, 24.764). Moreover, when Aphrodite summons her to Paris, she reviles the goddess and speaks of the grief she feels at being her favourite (3.399-412, especially 41-412).[116] This scene and the following one in which Helen and Paris make love are commonly viewed as a symbolic re-enactment of the first time that

---

[115]Paris is right to challenge Hector on this point, for, in fact, he will shortly be proven wrong: Aphrodite's gifts will save Paris from death on the battlefield (cf. οὐκ ἄν τοι χραίσμῃ κίθαρις τά τε δῶρ' Ἀφροδίτης, / ἥ τε κόμη τό τε εἶδος, ὅτ' ἐν κονίῃσι μιγείης, 3. 54-55). Cf. further Heath 387-388 and van der Mije 252-254.

[116]Cf. Boedeker 34 and Austin, *Helen of Troy* 48-49 who examine Helen's feelings of shame regarding her status in Troy.

Aphrodite brought the two mortals together.[117] If such is indeed the poet's intent here, then we can assume that he also conceived of Helen as (at least partially) opposed right from the beginning to the favoured status which Aphrodite granted her. Helen, like Paris, cannot refuse the gifts of the gods, even though she did not want them. Helen, unlike Paris, remains unhappy with these gifts.

It is these different attitudes toward Aphrodite that are the key to the characterizations of Helen and Paris. Helen tries to reject her association with the goddess and vilifies herself for this closeness. In doing so, she distances herself as much as she can from the world of Aphrodite. In essence, she rejects the ἔρως-centred ethical framework represented by the goddess, and, in doing so, endorses the dominant πόλεμος-centred values of the poem. In this way, the poet creates for Helen a character who is viewed in a positive way by the audience.[118]

Paris, however, accepts his association with Aphrodite, makes no apologies for it and does not attempt to change it or himself in any way. In doing so, he endorses precisely those values which the *Iliad* belittles. The result is a character who lacks those very qualities which the poem endorses and who consequently is deserving of his fellow characters' and the audience's hatred.[119]

---

[117]Cf., for example, Reinhardt, "Das Parisurteil" 30-31; Kullmann, *Das Wirken der Götter* 113 and "Vergangenheit" 18; and Ghali-Khahil 21.

[118]For a different view, cf van der Valk, "Homer's Nationalistic Attitude" 16-17, who sees the positive portrayal of Helen and the negative one of Paris as part of the poet's Greek nationalism.

[119]Beye, *The Iliad, the Odyssey, and the Epic Tradition* 69-70 examines the connections that Helen and Paris have with Aphrodite. He acknowledges the different attitudes of the two characters toward the goddess, but sees nothing significant therein. For him, both function mainly as symbols of

(cont.)

D. Paris and Hector

The majority of critics regard Paris' principal function in the *Iliad* as providing a contrast to Hector. According to Griffin, "the virtuous Hector, good husband and father and champion of Troy, is contrasted with his glamorous and irresponsible brother Paris, childless seducer of a foreign woman, who is slack in battle and will be the ruin of his people."[120] Monsacré sums up the contrast in similar terms: "Hector est un héros sans faille; son frère Pâris, en revanche, est un lâche. Le premier représente le modèle de la virilité guerrière, le second son contraire, et cela aussi bien sur le champ de bataille qu'à l'intérieur de la cité de Troie."[121] Schadewaldt speaks of the contrast between "dem harten Kämpfer" and "der gepflegte Musiker und Tänzer," "der 'Playboy'."[122]

The critical emphasis on this contrast is well placed. Paris, the less important hero of the pair, most frequently appears together with Hector. When he retreats before Menelaus, it is Hector who challenges him. When Paris sits at home overlong, it is Hector who fetches him. Hector again reproaches him on the battlefield in Book 13. And Hector's dying words contain the prophecy that Paris, with Apollo, will avenge him.

Troy's doom: "frivolity, irresponsibility, enchantment, destiny — these are the components of their story. They are the cancer in Troy's side" (149).

[120]Griffin, *Homer* 26; cf. also pp. 5-8 and "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer" 43.

[121]Monsacré 41-42; cf. also p. 48: "C'est en tant que «serviteur» d'Aphrodite et non d'Arès qu'il [Pâris] se distingue des autres héros, et tout particulièrement d'Hector dont il est l'exact opposé."

[122]Schadewaldt, "Das Bild des griechischen Menschen" 660. Cf. also Bethe, *Homer: Dichtung und Sage* 246-247; Redfield 113-115; and Muellner, "Cranes and Pygmies" 87.

Meltzer has examined how this contrast is developed and the function it serves. He argues that early in the *Iliad* the principal fighter on both the Greek and the Trojan side is contrasted with a warrior of his own side who stands as his opposite in order to sharpen the characterization of the two principal fighters. Achilles is compared to Thersites, Hector to Paris:

> As men who are 'worse than average,' both Thersites and Paris merit our contempt while sharpening our appreciation of the heroes' virtues. Thersites, who is selfish and opportunistic, enhances our sense of Achilles' dignity and seriousness of purpose, while the irresponsible, light-hearted Paris highlights Hector's virtues by contrast."[123]

Meltzer is, of course, not alone in seeing the importance of the contrast between Hector and Paris; however, he demonstrates more thoroughly than anyone the extent to which Homer's characterization of the two brothers depends on their juxtaposition. For example, the duel between Paris and Menelaus constitutes the first fighting in the *Iliad*; that between Hector and Achilles, the last. The former is placed three books from the poem's beginning; the latter, three books from its end. On each single combat, the outcome of the war and the fate of Troy are thought to depend. The wives of both heroes are summoned from their houses to witness the fighting.[124] At first, both men retreat when their opponent draws near, but in the end decide to fight. The trickery of a goddess figures prominently in each episode. Especially interesting is that after his duel, Paris claims to Helen that Athena

---

[123]Meltzer 265-266. For Thersites, cf. further pp. 266-272; Thalmann, "Thersites: Comedy, Scapegoats, and Heroic Ideology" 1-28; and Monsacré 53.

[124]It would be more accurate to say that both wives are present for at least a part of each scene, for Andromache is "summoned" only by the cries of the Trojans and arrives only to see Hector's corpse. The attendance, however, of both wives remains noteworthy.

assisted Menelaus (Μενέλαος ἐνίκησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ, 3.339). We have heard nothing of this before and know Paris' assertion to be false; however, Athena will help Achilles to conquer Hector (22.214ff.).[125] In addition, Muellner points out the similar similes given to Paris and Hector when they first see their opponents. Paris retreats in fear before Menelaus like a man who has come unexpectedly upon a snake in the mountains (3.33-37). Hector is given the same imagery, but in such a way that his courage rather than his fear is brought out. He awaits Achilles like a snake, full of venom and coiled up inside its mountain lair, awaits a man (22.93-97).[126]

In Book 6, the contrast is further developed as we see each brother with his wife. As Meltzer observes, "the scorn Helen holds for the shirker Paris, who is seemingly oblivious to it, contrasts with the tenderness and mutual regard which characterizes Hector's relationship with his wife."[127] Most telling of all in this regard is Helen's wish that Paris had died at Menelaus'

---

[125]Meltzer 274.

[126]Muellner, "Cranes and Pygmies" 87; cf. also Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk* 305. Loraux 92-94 also discusses these two similes as contrasting pairs. She, however, sees them as evidence that both the hero and the coward can feel fear in battle ("Il ne reste pas de grand guerrier qui n'ait un jour éprouvé dans tout son être le tremblement de la terreur. Comme si la peur était l'épreuve qualifiante du héros," 92). This is true enough; however, the imagery in the two similes stresses the different responses to that fear — in the one case unheroic retreat, in the other steadfastness. Cf. also Moulton 89-90, who also argues that the details of the Paris simile stress the hero's cowardice specifically as a contrast to Menelaus, who is given a simile just before this one in which he is compared to a lion coming upon a goat's carcass; the lion eats it in spite of the menacing presence of hunters and their dogs (3.21-28): "the two descriptions are clearly set forth as contrasting units. The lion finding a carcass is overjoyed, and oblivious to the danger presented by the hunter; the man finding a snake is overcome with fright. Menelaus is thus characterized in simile as brave, Paris as cowardly" (Moulton 90).

[127]Meltzer 275.

hands (3.428-429). Andromache, on the other hand, worries that her husband will be killed and pleads with him to fight from a position of safety (6.431-434).

Although the marriage of Paris and Helen has nothing in common with that of Hector and Andromache, it is strikingly similar to that of Zeus and Hera:

> The marriage of Zeus and Hera, like that of Paris and Helen, is marred by henpecking, enforced seductions, deceits, and power struggles. (Both of these tawdry relationships invite comparison with the marriage of Hector and Andromache.) Zeus' affirmation of love for Hera in the deception scene directly echoes Paris' declaration of love to Helen in the bedroom scene in *Iliad* 3. Both speeches begin with the same expression, repeated nearly verbatim, of unique and fervent desire for the woman: 'But come, then, let us go to bed and turn to love. For never yet has desire so ... .'[128]

Both the seductions in 3 and in 14 contain an atmosphere of frivolity that contrasts powerfully with the seriousness of events on the battlefield.

The comparison with the gods suits Paris particularly well in one regard. He is more like the gods than mortals inasmuch as he ignores the moral values which should motivate human behaviour. In Books 3 and 6, he is "insensitive to both *nemesis*, the moral disapproval of others, and has

---

[128]Meltzer 279. Compare 3.441-442 (ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ φιλότητι τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε· / οὐ γάρ πώ ποτέ μ' ὧδέ γε ἔρως φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν) with 14.314-316 (νῶϊ δ' ἄγ' ἐν φιλότητι τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε· / οὐ γάρ πώ ποτέ μ' ὧδε θεᾶς ἔρος οὐδὲ γυναικὸς / θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι περιπροχυθεὶς ἐδάμασσεν). Note also that Zeus and Paris alone in the *Iliad* share an epithet system which describes them in terms of their wives: 'Αλέξανδρος 'Ελένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο, 3.329, 7.355, 8.82, 11.369 and 505; πόσις Ἥρης ἠϋκόμοιο, 10.5; Ζεὺς ... ἐρίγδουπος πόσις Ἥρης, 7.411, 10.329, 13.154, 16.88. Cf. Clader 45-46 and Higbie 127.

no sense of *aischos*, shame."[129] Hector, however, feels both intensely and is also keenly aware of their opposite, honour.[130] He recognizes his role as Troy's chief defender and acts the part. As Whitman says, "he is held to his obligations by his feeling for the feelings of others."[131] Paris, however, feels no personal responsibility for the war which he has caused, and, in Book 6, appears not to think he has even any duty to be fighting for his city's survival.

Meltzer argues that, throughout the *Iliad*, Paris embodies the exception to the tragic view of life expressed in Achilles' parable about the two urns (24.527-533), in which the "urn of evils" makes human happiness an impossibility. Paris, however, seems to have received a life of unmixed blessings, fulfilling his desire and suffering no consequences for it, while all around him is misery:

> Paris' rescue in Book 3 by Aphrodite epitomizes his godlike capacity to avoid fate and responsibility throughout the poem. The question of Paris' undeserved good fortune goes to the heart of the heroic ethos. Lacking Hector's sense of shame and foreboding, he also lacks the passionate courage and humanity that combine to grant Hector heroic stature. A crowning irony about Paris' martial exploits is that he will succeed in killing Achilles with Apollo's help, according to Hector's dying prophecy (22.359-60). While always escaping 'black death' himself, Paris serves as both an emblem and engine of doom.[132]

Thus, Paris is characterized in opposition to the heroic values of αἰδώς and νέμεσις, on the one hand, and τιμή on the other. By consistently

---

[129]Redfield 115; cf. also Whallon, "The Homeric Epithets" 116: "Paris is in some ways very similar to the gods: he is gay, light-heartedly selfish, difficult to pain."

[130]Cf. especially his speech to Andromache at 6. 441-446 which is full of the vocabulary of honour and shame (i.e., αἰδέομαι, κακός, ἐσθλός, κλέος).

[131]Whitman, *HHT* 115.

[132]Meltzer 278.

transgressing against these values in Books 3 and 6, he serves to define them and the kinds of behaviour which they demand more sharply. His actions surrounding the duel with Menelaus, his association with Aphrodite, and his interactions with Helen and, above all, with Hector create a vivid picture of the *Iliad*'s principal exception to the heroic standards to which virtually all other characters conform.

V. The Characterization of Paris as a Warrior

While the anti-heroic characterization of Paris is carefully developed in Book 3 and the bedroom scene in Book 6, at the end of Book 6 another and different picture of the hero supersedes this one. As Paris runs through the city to meet Hector, he is given two similes, the imagery of which is not altogether appropriate for the figure we have seen up to now:

> Οὐδὲ Πάρις δήθυνεν ἐν ὑψηλοῖσι δόμοισιν,
> ἀλλ' ὅ γ', ἐπεὶ κατέδυ κλυτὰ τεύχεα, ποικίλα χαλκῷ,
> σεύατ' ἔπειτ' ἀνὰ ἄστυ, ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι πεποιθώς.
> ὡς δ' ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος, ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτνῃ,
> δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θείῃ πεδίοιο κροαίνων,
> εἰωθὼς λούεσθαι ἐϋρρεῖος ποταμοῖο,
> κυδιόων· ὑψοῦ δὲ κάρη ἔχει, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται
> ὤμοις ἀΐσσονται· ὁ δ' ἀγλαΐηφι πεποιθώς,
> ῥίμφα ἑ γοῦνα φέρει μετά τ' ἤθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων·
> ὣς υἱὸς Πριάμοιο Πάρις κατὰ Περγάμου ἄκρης
> τεύχεσι παμφαίνων ὥς τ' ἠλέκτωρ ἐβεβήκει
> καγχαλόων, ταχέες δὲ πόδες φέρον·
> (6.503-514)

The main point of comparison is the swiftness with which Paris moves (cf. ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι πεποιθώς, 505; ταχέες δὲ πόδες φέρον, 514). He is compared to a horse which, freed from its stall, gallops across a plain. The poet stresses the horse's beauty (ἀγλαΐηφι πεποιθώς, 509) and its delight at its new found

freedom (δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θείῃ ... κυδιόων, 507-509). The mention of the horse's beauty comes as no surprise.[133] As a whole, however, the passage evokes power and freedom and transforms Paris from a dallier into a warrior.[134] The simile suits the narrative situation well in that the horse freed from its stall and running across the plain parallels Paris leaving his bedroom and returning to the battlefield, where he will remain for the rest of the poem.[135] What is surprising, however, is that the imagery of the simile is overwhelmingly positive and heroic, as is confirmed by its re-application to Hector in the midst of battle in Book 15 (263-268), where, after being badly wounded, he is revived by Apollo and rushes forth into the battle.[136]

---

[133]Moulton 95, sees this as the main function of the simile, "to stress Paris' handsome appearance; this emphasis is thoroughly consistent with the contrast in his characterization between impressive exterior and disappointing reality." Although beauty does figure as a point of comparison in the simile, I argue that it is not here the principal one.

[134]Meltzer 277.

[135]I think we can safely reject the interpretation of Beye who tries to make the simile into a sexual allegory for Paris, and finds its re-application to Hector in Book 15 inappropriate for the lack of sexual correspondence in the main narrative there (*The Iliad, the Odyssey and the Epic Tradition* 27-28 and *Ancient Epic Poetry* 14-15). As Moulton observes, this interpretation "should be rejected as not only unnecessary but as out of keeping with the tone of the poems. It is only if one accepts this unnecessary gloss that the simile's repetition in XV appears awkward" (95, n. 18).

[136]In both of its occurrences, the simile is used to mark the re-entry of a warrior into battle. On repeated extended similes, of which there are six in the *Iliad* and two in the *Odyssey*, cf. Scott, *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile* 52-53, 127-140. Of these similes, scholars have tended to ask in which context of two each one is more appropriate (cf., for example, Scott 138 and Beye, *The Iliad, the Odyssey, and the Epic Tradition* 28). Bowra rightly asserts that this is the wrong approach: "Each simile must be taken in its own context without reference to any appearances it may have elsewhere. It derives its life and its character from its context, and we are right to associate it as closely as we can" (*Homer* 42).

A second, brief simile compares the appearance of Paris in his armour to the brilliance of the sun. This simile is also repeated, although not *verbatim*, again in the context of a hero preparing to return to the battlefield. At the end of his arming scene, Achilles too is radiant in his armour like the sun (τεύχεσι παμφαίνων ὥς τ' ἠλέκτωρ Ὑπερίων, 19.398). The similes in Book 6 also provide a contrast with the imagery of fear and cowardice evoked by the simile which introduced Paris, also on the battlefield, in Book 3. Thus, in every respect the two similes applied here to Paris are ones that we would expect to see, and do see, applied to the poem's greatest heroes just before they go out into the fighting, but we would not necessarily expect them to be applied to Paris.

Bowra, for one, saw that with these two similes we are introduced to a new aspect of Paris' character. When Paris re-arms and goes to meet Hector, "he is acting rather against his character as a frivolous and none too courageous fighter. He puts on the heroic panoply of war, and we are interested to see how the new role will suit him."[137] He, however, concludes that in the subsequent action we are disappointed of any expectations which this passage may have raised, that "Paris cuts no important figure in the fight."[138] In this regard, Bowra is manifestly wrong. Paris' role in the fighting and in council will prove to be crucial in the development of the story.

Hector's words to Paris after these similes indicate a tension between the characterization of his brother which has been developed thus far and the different picture introduced by the similes:

---

[137]Bowra, *T&D* 92; cf. also Robert, *Griechische Heldensage* 978, n. 1; and Suter, "Aphrodite/Paris/Helen" 57.

[138]Bowra, *T&D* 92.

δαιμόνι', οὐκ ἄν τίς τοι ἀνὴρ, ὃς ἐναίσιμος εἴη,
ἔργον ἀτιμήσειε μάχης, ἐπεὶ ἄλκιμός ἐσσι·
ἀλλὰ ἑκὼν μεθιεῖς τε καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλεις.
(6.521-523)

Paris is valiant, and no one could rightly disparage his performance in battle, says Hector. The problem is that he hangs back and is unwilling to fight, as we saw when Hector found him at home. However, Hector did dishonour Paris precisely in regard to his performance in battle (οὐκ ἔστι βίη φρεσὶν οὐδέ τις ἀλκή, 3.45), and Paris has admitted that Hector's reproach was just and has also shown himself to be a poor fighter. Therefore, the problem is not merely that he is a dallier, as Hector now says; he is *both* a dallier *and* a poor fighter. Or rather, this is how he has been portrayed thus far. Subsequently, he will prove himself to be, as Hector now describes him, ἄλκιμος.[139]

Book 7 opens with the two brothers coming onto the battlefield and relieving the beleaguered Trojans. Each one, and Glaucus too, kills a man before merging into the general fighting (1-16). At the end of the book, which corresponds to the end of the first day's fighting, the Trojans hold an assembly at which Antenor proposes Helen's return on the grounds that, because of Pandarus' treachery, they are fighting after having broken an oath and that nothing good can come of this. Paris violently rebukes Antenor and refuses to give up Helen. No one opposes Paris, and Priam ends the assembly acceding to Paris' authority (345-378). The Trojans are thus doomed to continue fighting, having transgressed their oaths and thereby having

---

[139]Nagler calls ἀλκή "the supreme heroic value term, [connoting] both the (etymological) defensive and (by extension) aggressive modes of heroic behavior" ("Ethical Anxiety and Artistic Inconsistency" 227).

offended Zeus. Paris' refusal to return Helen, therefore, finalizes the eventual doom of the Trojans just as much as does Pandarus' bowshot.

As we have already seen, it is Paris' skill with his bow that effectively changes the fortunes in favour of the Trojans when, in Book 11, he wounds three principal fighters, including Diomedes, who has proven to be the most important Greek warrior thus far in Achilles' absence. The disabling of the Greek army results in the firing of the ships, the return of Patroclus, and, eventually, the return of Achilles himself. Therefore, Book 11 and Paris' role therein are crucial to the plan of Zeus. When the fighting in the *Iliad* comes to an end, when Achilles kills Hector and the plan of Zeus is brought to its conclusion, the poet reminds us in the words of the dying Hector that it will be Paris, with the help of Apollo, who will kill Achilles himself.

At the end of Book 13, Paris and Hector meet again on the battlefield. Hector rebukes his brother with the same words he used in Book 3 (Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε, γυναιμανές, ἠπεροπευτά, 3.39=13.769). Hector addresses him αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσι (768) in spite of the fact that he has found his brother θαρσύνονθ' ἑτάρους καὶ ἐποτρύνοντα μάχεσθαι (767). In other words, Paris is acting every bit the warrior and leader. At the moment, the Trojans are in trouble; Helenus and Deïphobus are wounded, and Adamas, Asios, and Othryoneus have all been killed (780-783). Paris is not hanging back, nor unwilling to fight and, indeed, nowhere in the *Iliad*, except in Book 3, does this description fit his performance in battle.[140] Paris says as much to Hector, when he replies to his rebuke:

---

[140]Collins (35) attempts to reconcile the "unheroic" Paris with the warrior who is "generally adequate" on the battlefield by arguing that, "[s]poradic attempts at living up to the warrior ideal are certainly in keeping with Paris' ethical values in this poem which celebrates the warrior."

(cont.)

> Ἕκτωρ ἐπεί τοι θυμὸς ἀναίτιον αἰτιάασθαι,
> ἄλλοτε δή ποτε μᾶλλον ἐρωῆσαι πολέμοιο
> μέλλω, ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ πάμπαν ἀνάλκιδα γείνατο μήτηρ·
> ...
> νῦν δ' ἄρχ', ὅππῃ σε κραδίη θυμός τε κελεύει·
> ἡμεῖς δ' ἐμμεμαῶτες ἅμ' ἑψόμεθ', οὐδέ τί φημι
> ἀλκῆς δευήσεσθαι, ὅση δύναμίς γε πάρεστι.
> (13.775-786)

Paris' response to Hector's rebukes in Books 3 and 6 was quite different. There he agreed that reproach was merited (Ἕκτωρ, ἐπεί με κατ' αἶσαν ἐνείκεσας οὐδ' ὑπὲρ αἶσαν, 3.59=6.333). But here, in Book 13, his response is different because the insult is manifestly unmerited. Moreover, Paris seems to be saying that the terms in which Hector had insulted him in the past are not now appropriate. He is not lacking in warcraft, as Hector had earlier accused him, nor, in fact, is it foreign to his general nature. He has shown himself to be, as Hector himself admitted, ἄλκιμος. Hector seems to have forgotten this, and here Paris reminds him. Moreover, Paris reminds him in terms that seem designed to recall the earlier rebukes. We have already discussed the references to ἀλκή. But he also tells Hector that now is not a good time to withdraw from the fighting (ἐρωῆσαι πολεμοῖο). It seems at the very least fair to ask whether the poet has in mind the scene in Paris' bedroom when Hector rebuked Paris for having withdrawn himself from the fighting. Hector had told him that it was not a good time to be absent from the fighting; Paris now tells Hector pretty much the same thing.

However, Paris does not make *sporadic attempts* to live up to the warrior ideal. From Book 7 on, he performs consistently and successfully as a warrior.

Once before this scene, Paris had already been rebuked in battle, and in that scene too, I argue, unfairly. When he wounds Diomedes with an arrow in the foot, the latter insults Paris in terms familiar to us from Hector's earlier insults and ones which emphasize his connection with Aphrodite. He addresses him as τοξότα, λωβητήρ, κέρᾳ ἀγλαέ, παρθενοπῖπα (11.385). He then claims that the wound Paris has dealt him is minor, a mere scratch like that a woman or child would inflict (νῦν δέ μ' ἐπιγράψας ταρσὸν ποδὸς εὔχεαι αὔτως· / οὐκ ἀλέγω, ὡς εἴ με γυνὴ βάλοι ἢ πάϊς ἄφρων, 388-389), for the weapon belonged to a man without warlike valour (κωφὸν γὰρ βέλος ἀνδρὸς ἀνάλκιδος οὐτιδανοῖο, 390).

The audience, however, knows that Diomedes' words are untrue. The wound he has received is no scratch; the poet has told us that the arrow went right through the foot and pinned it to the ground (διὰ ο' ἀμπερὲς ἰὸς / ἐν γαίῃ κατέπηκτο, 377-378). It is not the wound a child or a woman would have inflicted, nor was the arrow shot by a man without ἀλκή. And, as Taplin observes, Diomedes, for all his bluster, must leave the battlefield and is disabled for the remainder of the poem's fighting.[141]

---

[141]Taplin, *Homeric Soundings* 164. For a different interpretation, cf. Muellner (*Homeric εὔχομαι* 90-91). He observes that the line-ending phrase καὶ εὐχόμενος ἔπος ηὔδα, which occurs six times in Homer, introduces a Greek speaking over a dead Trojan, except for the scene in Book 11 where Paris boasts that he has wounded Diomedes (cf. 11.379). He concludes from this that, "[f]or Paris, a Trojan wounding a Greek to receive the introductory speech formula of a Greek who has slain a Trojan constitutes a *formal* perversion of the heroic code which parallels precisely his *actual* perversion of it." It may, indeed, be unusual to see this formula so used; however, Muellner's conclusion cannot stand, as there is nothing else in the scene to suggest any *perversion* of the heroic code on Paris' part. Instead, we see him successfully fighting in defense of his city, *in conformity with* the heroic code.

Diomedes' rebuke here, just like Hector's in Book 13, is not appropriate to Paris' performance on this occasion or at any other time in the general fighting. To Diomedes, Paris says nothing; however, he does remind Hector of what Hector himself knows. Paris was not born altogether without valour.

VI. Conclusion

In summary, we can discern in the *Iliad* two different portraits of Paris. The one we first encounter is the man who is characterized through his association with Aphrodite. The *Iliad* trivializes Aphrodite, inasmuch as the values which the battlefield demands are not those which a warrior can obtain from this goddess. In fact, Homer presents the values and qualities which emanate from Aphrodite as the opposite of those which the warrior needs. As a result, Paris, the favourite of Aphrodite, necessarily becomes an object of scorn and hatred in a poem that first and foremost valorizes the warrior. In many other songs where the warrior is not the principal character, the one who defines the ethical values central to the song, it is easy to imagine that Paris, the favourite of Aphrodite, could be characterized in a much more positive light. The subject matter for such songs was plentiful. The exploits of Theseus, Heracles, or Jason, for example, would not have centred exclusively on their careers as fighting men. Indeed, in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus is many other things besides a warrior. In such poems, a favourite of Aphrodite could be viewed very differently than such a man is viewed in the *Iliad*.

The second picture emerges at the end of Book 6 and is dominant for the remainder of the poem. This is the Paris of the battlefield, and appropriately it is defined as Paris leaves his wife, his house, and the city to

return to the fighting. Significantly, from this point on, he no longer comes into contact with Aphrodite. This is the Paris who is very much like the warriors with whom he keeps company — a man of strength and valour, as his performance proves, as Hector admits, and as Paris himself asserts.

The next step in this study must be to determine how two such different portrayals of the same hero can exist in the same poem. This will involve an examination of the stories about Paris which can be proven to be pre-Homeric, or at least reasonably assumed to be so, but are not related in the *Iliad*.

Chapter 2: The Epic Tradition

I. Introduction: Analytical Scholarship

I began the previous chapter by noting that in English-language scholarship Paris has been, for the most part, negatively received. Quite the opposite is the case in German scholarship, particularly in the Analytical school of the 19th and early 20th centuries. These scholars observed the seemingly contradictory presentation of Paris in different parts of the *Iliad*, a question which I examined in the previous chapter. Analytical scholars were, of course, concerned precisely with pinpointing narrative inconsistencies of all sorts in our texts of Homer, for these were the key to their ultimate goal, determining the *Urtext* of the *Iliad*, by deducing what were perceived to be separate but still early poems, known as *Einzellieder*, or simply later accretions, both of which were inserted by a hypothetical *Redaktor* or *Überarbeiter* some time not long before the texts became standardized.

We know from the *Iliad* that Paris is the slayer of Achilles, and yet in the same poem he cannot even fight successfully against Menelaus, a warrior far inferior to Achilles. In some parts of the poem, Paris performs well on the battlefield; in others, he cannot even muster a passable spear-cast. The *Iliad* knows Paris to have been Helen's abductor, and yet Hector plays the primary role in the war that arises from Paris' actions. For the Analysts, these oddities pointed unequivocally to the hand of the *Redaktor*. In the early epic tradition, the abductor of Helen and the slayer of Achilles must have been a great hero, in fact, the greatest Trojan hero and the city's principal defender.

The entry for Paris in Roscher's lexicon of Greek and Roman mythology, published at the turn of the century, when the Analysts were at

their most productive, sums up what these scholars found so contradictory about Homer's Paris:

> In der Schilderung des Paris, wie er in der *Ilias* erscheint, ist ein gewisser Widerspruch vorhanden. Einmal wird er als prahlerisch kampfunlustig und feige dargestellt, den Troern verhaßt; bei anderen Gelegenheiten ist er ein tüchtiger Mitkämpfer, über den sich die Troer gerade so freuen wie über Hektor.[142]

These contradictions had long interested German scholars. Georg Schömann, Heinrich Düntzer, and Samuel Naber were among the earliest to make note of them; others, such as Ferdinand Dümmler, Carl Rothe, and Georg Finsler, also thought that something was amiss.[143]

Carl Robert was the first Analyst, however, to examine all of Paris' appearances in the *Iliad*. He, too, concluded that Paris was originally a much greater hero than he is depicted as in Homer, but that an *Überarbeiter* diminished his status through the insertion of the duel with Menelaus. For Robert, the main evidence for Paris' importance is that he is the slayer of Achilles; in addition, the name "Alexandros," coming as it does from the verb ἀλέξω, indicates "Tapferkeit."[144] Robert saw the anger which Hector ascribes to Paris at 6.326 as the most compelling piece of evidence of a more

---

[142]Roscher, vol. 3, pt.1, 1600. Cf. also Wüst 1487-1489.

[143]Schömann 1858: 6-7; Düntzer 1872: 271-272; Naber 1877: 157-158; Dümmler 1901: 249; Rothe 1910: 207-211; Finsler 1918: 60-61. It is worthwhile to quote Dümmler's conclusions here, as they speak for the early Analytical view in general: "Es ist auch schwer abzusehen, weshalb die Troer sich für Helena totschlagen lassen, wenn Paris immer ein elender Feigling und nicht vielmehr ursprünglich ihr mächtigster Hort war, als welchen ihm noch der Name Alexandros deutlich bezeichnet, ein ebenbürtiger Gegner des Achilleus, welchen er ja auch schließlich erlegt" (p. 249).

[144]Robert, *Studien zur Ilias* 366 and *Griechische Heldensage* 977. The notion that the duel between Paris and Menelaus is an *Einzellied* inserted into our *Iliad* originates with Niese (1882: 73).

heroic figure in the *Ur-Ilias*. Originally, he believed, Helenus would have sent Hector to Troy, not with a message for Hecuba to appease Athena, as in our text (6.86-98), but to retrieve his withdrawn and angry brother. With the insertion of the duel, Paris' wrath became otiose, on account of his defeat at the hands of Menelaus, and was, therefore, changed to the sorrow (over his defeat) which Paris claims is the true reason for his absence from the battlefield (6.335-336).[145] In the original *Iliad*, on the first day of fighting, Paris did not accompany his brothers to the battlefield, but stayed back in anger. Our *Iliad* still contains the reason for this anger in the Trojan council at the end of Book 7, where Antenor advocates the return of Helen (7.348-353).[146] Robert concludes that originally Paris must have been one of the Trojans' most important fighters:

> Wenn er dort [in the *Ur-Ilias*], als der Achill der Troer, sich grollend vom Schlachtfeld fernhält, wenn sein Beistand so hoch eingeschätzt wird, dass, um ihn herbeizuholen, Hektor das Schlachtfeld verläßt, so muss er ein Krieger ersten Ranges und für den Verlauf der Handlung von großer Bedeutung gewesen sein.[147]

---

[145]Robert, *Studien zur Ilias* 96-98. Other Analysts before Robert had also puzzled over Paris' wrath, but did little more than note that it must belong to some lost *Einzellied* which would have portrayed Paris more heroically. Cf. Schömann 6-7; Kammer 22, 27; Düntzer 271-272; Naber 157-158; and Finsler 60. Cf. further Ameis-Hentze, *Anhang zu Homers Ilias* II, 128-129 and Heitsch 226-227 for a bibliographic survey of Analytical views on the wrath of Paris. The topic of Paris' wrath will be treated in detail in chapter 4.

[146]Robert, *Studien zur Ilias* 205-206. The idea of the Trojan council as the cause of Paris' wrath originates with Erhardt (1894: 99-100) and is supported by Leaf, *Iliad* I, 257. Needless to say, in the *Ur-Ilias* of the Analysts, the Trojan council, at present in Book 7, would have been placed much earlier.

[147]Robert, *Studien zur Ilias* 257.

Erich Bethe came to similar conclusions. Helen's abductor and Achilles' slayer are incompatible with the figure who fights so poorly in the duel with Menelaus. Moreover, the duel is anomalous, as everywhere else Paris performs well on the battlefield. The original poet, the one who composed the *Ur*-text, knew Paris to be a great hero: "Aber ein Held ist ihm Paris doch, ein starker Kämpfer, untadelig in der Schlacht, trotz seines wankelmütigen Charakters."[148] All this was changed by the *Redaktor*, and, again, the main evidence for Paris' former heroism is the anger attributed to him at 6.326. Bethe, rather over-ingeniously, connects this anger to the death of Achilles. He postulates that when Hector goes to Troy to fetch his withdrawn brother (which, like Robert, he believes to have been the original reason for his return to the city), the poet meant his audience to understand that he was bringing back with him to the battlefield his avenger. For Hector will soon be killed by Achilles, and, thereafter, Achilles by Paris.[149]

Bethe's interpretation of Paris' wrath was not followed by other Analysts, but his general argument, that behind the wrath there was a lost song which showed Paris to have been a great hero, was largely accepted as fact. In the 1920s, in his overview of Homeric scholarship, Paul Cauer asserted that the evidence showed that Paris was originally not the despised coward of the *Iliad*, but a worthy opponent of the poem's main hero.[150] Martin Nilsson maintained that, "[i]t is genèrally agreed that the man who slew Achilles was no weakling but a valiant warrior and so he is sometimes

---

[148]Bethe, *Homer* I, 248-249.
[149]Bethe, *Homer* I, 254-255.
[150]Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik* 261-262,

described in Homer also."[151] This had become the majority view in Analytical circles.[152]

Among Unitarians only John A. Scott, the leading American Homerist of his day, believed in the heroic Paris, but without ever acknowledging the Analytical origins of this idea, something he could not very well do, given the ridicule with which he treats Analytical scholarship in *The Unity of Homer*. He, too, observes that Paris consistently plays the most important role in the Trojan War, apart from the events of the *Iliad*. He maintains that Proclus' summary of the *Cypria* indicates that Paris was its principal character; moreover, he figures prominently in the *Aethiopis* and in the *Ilias Parva*. Thus, the extra-Homeric tradition knew Paris to be a great hero, and even Homer could not suppress this altogether, as, from time to time, his military prowess shines through.[153]

---

[151]Nilsson, *Homer and Mycenae* 252.

[152]Of course, even among Analysts, there was disagreement. Wilamowitz, in particular, dismissed the notion of Paris' heroism and of a wrath story with him as its subject: "Hector is der Held des Gedichtes, nicht Paris, seine Zerwürfnis mit dem Volke ist ein Hilfsmotiv, kein wesentlicher Zug der Geschichte. Es verschließt sich dem Verständnis und dem Genüße des Erhaltenen, wer sich ein anderes Gedicht und eine andere Ilias mit Alexandros als Helden findet" (*Die Ilias und Homer* 310). Roemer 349-350, Rothe 209 and Fischl 72-73 occupy a mid-point, believing that Paris' Homeric character has been revised so as to produce the negative figure we find in the *Iliad*, while dismissing reconstructions of lost Paris-*Einzellieder* as futile. Fischl (73) sums up this view: "Wir füllen gerade noch, daß etwas älteres unter dem Texte hindurchschimmert, aber mehr behaupten zu wollen, wäre vermessen."

[153]Scott, "Paris and Hector" 160-171 and *The Unity of Homer* 225-230. Scott's observance of hermeneutic problems is often more interesting than his solutions. For example, he attributes Homer's negative re-characterization of Paris to the poet's moral disapproval of adultery: "Paris' sole weakness was moral weakness, and great as he was in tradition and is in Homer, the adulterer and false friend could not be permitted a position of

(cont.)

Albert Severyns, too, believed that Paris must once have been an important hero, in fact, Troy's principal defender; his associations with Helen and Achilles both point in this direction. Again, traces of the heroic Paris remain in our *Iliad*: "Loin de ressembler à un couard efféminé, le Pâris du chant onzième fait bien plutôt penser à un Robin des Bois intrépide et vailleur."[154] Finally, Kirk mentions in passing, with no explanation, that "[o]ne is tempted to wonder whether Hector or any other Trojan hero except Paris had been conspicuous in heroic poetry before Homer."[155]

On the whole, however, the view that the traditionally heroic Paris was re-characterized in Homer, be it by a *Redaktor*, as the Analysts would have it, or by Homer himself, as Scott and Severyns would assert, found little credence outside Analytical circles, and seems, for the most part, to have disappeared along with the school that gave rise to it. The proofs upon which the theory were based are the seeming contradictions in the portrayal of Paris. Such contradictions were at the heart of many Analytical investigations; however, after Parry demonstrated that the Homeric poems were composed orally, such contradictions could no longer be used with the same confidence to subtract the *Redaktor's* accretions in order to recover the older and original parts of the poem, since oral poetry is naturally more tolerant in this regard than are literate poems. In the face of Parry's evidence of orality, the

---

epic leadership. No people under the control of such a leader as Paris could win sympathy" ("Paris and Hector" 165).

[154]Severyns, *Homère* III, 84.

[155]Kirk, *Songs of Homer* 331.

Analytical school dwindled, and, in the process, the question of Paris' heroism disappeared.[156]

In English language scholarship, Frederick Combellack effectively destroyed any currency the notion may have held in a famous article from 1944 entitled "Homer and Hector."[157] However, Combellack's summary and unsatisfactory dismissal of Paris' traditional heroism needs to be reconsidered. For his position that "we have no reason to believe that [Paris] is preëminently a warrior" and the fact that "he could kill or wound several Greeks without being himself killed in the *Iliad* is of no significance whatever," is plainly untenable.[158] Neither the Analysts' nor Scott's methods yielded satisfactory solutions; however, the contradictions they noted remain and need to be re-examined. For, in the *Iliad*, Paris does play two very different roles in different parts of the poem, and in the Trojan cycle he plays a much more significant role than he does in the one surviving poem in which he appears.[159]

---

[156]The Analytical school had already been under serious attack for some time prior to Parry's work. Anti-German sentiment after the First World War seems to have played a part. Dodds ("Homer" 9), however, sees the main reason in a general aesthetic shift around the time of the war in other scholarly areas such as New Testament criticism, philosophy, and philology in general, in which "the old arrogant disregard for manuscript tradition began to be replaced in many quarters by an almost superstitious reverence for it." In the case of Homer, the notion of "a supreme poetic genius whose work it was sacrilege to analyse, undoubtedly corresponded to certain tendencies of the time — a distrust of cold logic, a yearning to follow the dictates of the heart, and, more specifically, a widespread rejection of the intellectual approach to poetry" (Dodds, "Homer" 9). Cf. also Janko, "The *Iliad* and its Editors" 326-327.

[157]Combellack, "Homer and Hector," *AJP* 65 (1944): 209-243.

[158]Combellack 223, 229.

[159]Recently, Wathelet (*Dictionnaire des Troyens* I, 1476, n. 215) has drawn attention to Combellack's unsatisfactory dismissal of Scott's arguments

(cont.)

I have already examined the characterization of Paris and postulated that the poet of the *Iliad* has recharacterized the traditional and distinguished hero by emphasizing in a generally inappropriate context his association with Aphrodite. When Paris moves to the centre of the narrative in Books 3 and 6, this association is stressed; when he is only one of many Trojans fighting in defense of their city, Aphrodite disappears and we catch a glimpse of what I argue is the traditional hero. What remains now is to establish that the contradictions inherent in Homer's characterization of Paris do in fact arise from a recharacterization of a traditionally more heroic figure. In other words, can we find evidence in the oral tradition that Paris was any different than he is in the *Iliad*?

This will involve, first, an examination of Paris' role in the Trojan cycle, where the stories of the judgement of the three goddesses and the abduction of Helen, the death of Achilles, and Paris' own death all demand a heroic figure at the centre quite different from the one we meet in *Iliad* 3. I will examine these myths in the second half of this chapter. In the following chapter, I will examine the arming scene of Paris in *Iliad* 3, for a comparison with other arming scenes in the *Iliad* and the function of such scenes in oral epic in general will help us to determine why such an unheroic figure as Paris is in Book 3 should receive a scene which by its very nature must be reserved for important warriors. In the final chapter, I will examine the principal *zetema* of Analytical work on Paris, his wrath, to determine, by applying current work on the function of story patterns in oral poetry, if a wrath and withdrawal story for Paris existed in the oral epic tradition. In this way, I

---

and the need to examine anew Paris' different roles in the *Iliad*. I argue that the same re-consideration must be given to the Analysts' views.

believe we can demonstrate that the Analytical hypothesis about Paris not only warrants re-evaluation, but is justifiable in all its major elements.

Parry's proofs that the language of oral epic poetry was based on a wealth of formulae built up by many singers over a lengthy period of time made it impossible for scholars to continue labeling different parts of the poem as original or interpolated. Thus, Analytical attempts to explain the oddities in the presentation of Paris through their hypotheses of various poems which presented a different, more heroic and more ancient portrayal as being inserted into the *Ur-Ilias* have become untenable. However, to dismiss the methods of the Analysts does not likewise justify ignoring the frequently provocative questions these scholars asked. Analytical *solutions* no longer work; the *questions* the Analysts asked in many cases remain. In particular, the contradictions in the presentation of Paris' character are still striking. The hypothesis that these are explained by a recharacterization of an important hero likewise deserves re-examination. Some recent work on the Trojan scenes of the *Iliad*, in general, and on Paris, in particular, sets the stage for such a re-examination.

II. Paris/Alexandros: The Problem of the Double Name

William Merritt Sale has studied the *Iliad*'s place phrases, particularly those denoting location within the Greek camp, the battlefield, the Troad, Olympus, and the city of Troy, and motion to and from them. His premise is that, if a given idea, such as being inside the Greek camp, is traditional,

Homer will usually express it with a formula.[160] Traditional ideas are ones requiring frequent expression and formulae will have been invented to meet this requirement, for the traditional poet will tend to express an idea with a formula if one is available. Therefore, if Homer does not use a formula, there must be something about the idea he is expressing which prevents this, namely the absence of a formula.[161] The idea of movement to the Greek camp, Troy-city, etc. is regularly expressed by a formula in the *Iliad*, with little difference in the frequency of the use of formulae (which Sale terms an idea's "formularity"[162]) for different destinations. That is to say, "to the battlefield," "to the Troad," and "to Olympus" are all expressed using formulae roughly with the same frequency. Between 71% and 86% of the time that a "motion to" idea is expressed for one of the regularly occurring places in the *Iliad* a formula is used. The high degree of formularity indicates that these formulae were well established when the *Iliad* was composed.[163] The same is true for the locative phrases, with one exception. For all locative expressions regularly used in the *Iliad* a high degree of formularity exists, except for those which deal with the city of Troy. For all others, the degree of formularity is between 72% and 89%; however, the idea of being inside Troy is expressed

---

[160]This was one of Parry's central arguments in *The Traditional Epithet in Homer* (cf. *MHV* 2-23), and has been accepted as fact by subsequent scholars, such as Hainsworth (*The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* 110-128) and Hoekstra (*Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes* 131-153).

[161]Sale, "The Formularity of Place Phrases" 22-23.

[162]Sale ("The Formularity of Place Phrases" 22) defines *formularity* as follows: "I shall term the relative frequency of formulaic occurrence of an idea its 'formularity,' to be expressed as a percentage of *all* the occurrences, thus, the essential idea 'in the Greek camp' is expressed 133 times altogether in the *Iliad*. 115 of these use a formula, for a relative frequency, a formularity, of 86%."

[163]Sale, "The Formularity of Place Phrases" 30-31.

with a formula only 32% of the time. There is, in fact, only one certain full formula to express this idea: κατὰ ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμοιο.[164]

The "motion from" groups show less uniformity among phrases referring to the camp, the battlefield, the Troad, and Olympus. Particularly notable is the "from the Greek camp" group; this idea is expressed with a formula only 41% of the time and only four full formulae exist for this idea. Compare this first to the motion to and the location within the Greek camp phrases which have a formularity of 78% and 86% respectively, and secondly to the other motion from phrases which have formularity of between 66% and 84%. The evidence indicates that there were some, though not many, existing formulae to express the idea of leaving the Greek camp.[165]

The evidence for the motion-from-Troy phrases is most striking of all. These phrases have a formularity of 0%; no formulae exist for leaving Troy. There are many phrases for leaving Troy, but none of these is fully formulaic.[166]

---

[164]Sale, "The Formularity of Place Phrases" 32-34. "Full formulae" are those which combine a noun with an adjective, a verb, an adverb, or another noun. Sale makes the distinction between full and minimal formulae, the latter consisting of only noun plus preposition or postposition, such as ἐπὶ, παρὰ νηυσί. These may not be formulae, especially if they lack a fixed position in the line, in which case they may simply be ordinary ways of expressing an idea (p. 28). Sale makes his calculations for the formularity of an idea by classing minimal formulae once with full formulae and once with non-formulaic ways of expressing the same idea to ensure that the results will not differ significantly by classing them only with one group or the other. In no case do minimal formulae alter the formularity of an idea by more than one or two percentage points.

[165]Sale, "The Formularity of Place Phrases" 35-36.

[166]For a full list of these phrases, cf. Sale, "The Formularity of Place Phrases" 36.

It would seem that in the oral epic tradition there were few occasions to say that someone was inside Troy or leaving it. (Note, of course, that saying someone is going to Troy does not necessarily mean he enters the city.) If there were many occasions to say either of these things, formulae would have developed for them. However, in the *Iliad*, Homer does have frequent occasion to say that someone is in Troy or leaving it, for he has 33 Trojan scenes; remarkably, he expresses these ideas with non-formulaic phrases. Sale concludes:

> Most of the "in Troy" and "from Troy" phrases occur in the 33 Trojan scenes: the density is one every 46 lines for locatives in Trojan scenes, one in 1615 outside; one in every 96 lines for "from Troy" in Trojan scenes, one in 2423 outside. It is the existence of Trojan scenes which calls for the frequent occurrence of Troy-city locative and motion-from phrases. If there were few such phrases in a poem, it is because that poem has few Trojan scenes. But the poets of the pre-Iliadic tradition did not have many such phrases: if they had had them, formulae would have developed. It follows that there were few Trojan scenes in pre-Iliadic poetry. We owe the bulk of the Trojan scenes to Homer's invention.[167]

Using Sale's work as a model, Ann Suter has compared the formulaic development of the names *Paris* and *Alexandros*, examining their positions and fixity in the hexameter line, both with and without epithets, and the degree of formulaic development in the lines as a whole in which the two

---

[167]Sale, "The Formularity of Place Phrases" 37. In an earlier study, Sale argued that a relative date could be assigned for the entrance into the epic tradition of Olympus and Uranus as the homes of the gods by, as here, comparing their formulae. He concluded that in the epic tradition Olympus is the earlier divine home because its formulae are much more numerous, while the Uranus formulae seem to have been adjusted to pre-existing Olympus ones. Cf. Sale, "Homeric Olympus and its Formulae," *AJP* 105 (1984): 1-28.

names appear.[168] The results of her study show that "*Alexandros* has a modest but secure presence in epic diction. The name has epithets for three of the five cases, and together they have attained a large degree of fixity in two positions in the hexameter line."[169] Moreover, the verses in which the name *Alexandros* appears generally show a high degree of formulaic development.[170] *Paris*, on the other hand, lacks a fixed position in the hexameter line and is virtually devoid of epithets. The verses in which it appears also show a comparatively low degree of formulaic development.[171]

Alexandros appears in two places (out of a possible four) in the hexameter line in 43 out of 45 occurrences of the name; *Paris* appears in four different positions in the line, with no specialization by case, in its eleven appearances. Four epithets are used with *Alexandros*; one, used once (υἱὸς Πριάμοιο, 6.512), with *Paris*.[172] The randomness of placement in the line and the dearth of epithets for *Paris* are particularly striking because the name is an alternative for *Alexandros*; moreover, its disyllabic shape should be more

---

168When "Paris" or "Alexandros" appears in italics, the name itself is being referred to; when they are not in italics, this indicates that the character is being discussed.

169 Suter, "Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε ... " 10.

170Suter, "Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε ... " chart 1, pp. 23-26.

171Suter, "Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε ... " 11-12 and chart 2, pp. 26-27.

172Suter, "Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε ... " 13-14, considers whether there is something intrinsic about the metrical shape of *Paris* which made it difficult to incorporate into formulaic diction. A comparison with the metrically equivalent *Thetis* shows that this is not the case, for *Thetis* does attain fixity of position in the line, and has several epithets for use in different cases in different parts of the line. The lines in which *Thetis* appears also show a high density of formulae. Thus, *Paris* and *Thetis* both possess a metrical shape fully compatible with formulaic development. Moreover, there is no reason why *Paris* should be so devoid of epithets, as many are compatible with the name: θράσυς, πεπνυμένος, ἠϋγενής, μεγάθυμος, ἐϋμμελίης, and all the epithets which accompany *Alexandros* (θεοειδής, Ἑλένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο, βασιλεύς, δῖος).

amenable to formulaic treatment, that is, incorporation into a noun-epithet system and the fixity of that system within the hexameter line. Thus, all the evidence points to a later entry into the epic diction for *Paris* than for *Alexandros*. In addition, the lack of fixity in the *Paris* lines, the lack of epithets, and the low formularity of the lines in which the name appears are indicators that this name entered the epic diction much later than did *Alexandros*. The general formularity of the latter must have taken many generations to develop; the lack of such for *Paris* points to its entrance into the epic tradition probably not long before the *Iliad* took its final shape.[173]

Kirk believes that "there is no difference in nuance between the two names," though "the poet must, of course, have found it useful to have two such metrical alternatives at his disposal."[174] However, if one can demonstrate, as Suter has done, that there are grounds for arguing that one

---

[173]Earlier work on the double name also frequently was concerned with establishing the priority of one name. It was generally assumed that *Paris*, being foreign, was older and that two separate mythological figures, an Asian Paris and a Greek Alexandros, were fused together. Cf. Wilamowitz, "Die griechische Heldensage" 91; Draheim 205; Howald 10-12; Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* I, 476, n. 1; and Heubeck, "Die homerische Göttersprache" 216-217. Bethe (*Homer* III, 90-91) and Robert (*Griechische Heldensage* II, 977, n. 3) disagreed. Bethe believed *Alexandros* is the original name and that *Paris*, though late and foreign (in his opinion), refers to the same figure. Robert thought it likely that *Alexandros* is simply the Greek translation of the Phrygian *Paris*. Kretschmer (205-213) postulated that 'Αλέξανδρος was a transliteration of the Hittite name Alaksandus. This has been disproven by the discovery of the Mycenaean name "a-re-ka-sa-da-ra" (Alexandra), which demonstrates that names composed of a second unit -ανδρος/-α date back to the Mycenaean era and that 'Αλέξανδρος is, therefore, in all likelihood, a Greek name (cf. Heubeck, "KE-RA-SO: Untersuchungen zu einem Mykenischen Personennamen" 138-145; Scherer 38, n. 2; Watkins, "The Language of the Trojans" 48-49, 57; and Güterbrock 33-35). The name *Paris* remains of unknown etymology (cf. Heubeck, *Praegraeca* 43, n. 55 and Neumann 316).

[174]Kirk, *Comm.* I, 267.

name entered the tradition later than the other, we can then consider that reasons other than metrical convenience may have played a part.

Irene de Jong has argued, *pace* Kirk, that context does, in fact, determine the poet's selection of name.[175] In direct discourse, *Paris* is used by Trojan characters in exclusively Trojan contexts; *Alexandros* is used in all other cases. *Paris* is, thus, the familial name, *Alexandros* the international name. The narrator, when speaking in his own voice, uses *Paris* when he wishes to emphasize the character's Trojan origins and *Alexandros* at all other times. For example, only Hector uses *Paris* (6.280, 22.359, and Dusparis at 3.39=13.769). Menelaus (3.100, 352, 366), Agamemnon (3.281, 284, 289) Diomedes (7.400), and, remarkably, Helen (3.403, 6.356, 24.763) use *Alexandros*.[176] The gods, as we would expect, use the international *Alexandros* (Iris, 3.136; Aphrodite, 3.390; Athena, 4.96).[177]

---

[175]De Jong 124-128.

[176]De Jong (124) wonders whether Helen's use of *Alexandros* is not the poet's way of stressing her Greek identity and longing for her first husband (cf. 3.139-140).

[177]Seeming exceptions, such as 3.87, 3.253, and 7.374 where Hector, Idaeus, and Priam, respectively, use *Alexandros*, are explained by an "international context." Hector addresses Greeks and Trojans and, therefore, would not use the familial *Paris*. Idaeus is a herald reporting actions taking place between the Greeks and Trojans. Priam uses *Alexandros* when he tells Idaeus what to say to the Greeks. The poet also uses *Paris* and *Alexandros* to represent the point of view of his characters. For example, he reports that Aeneas sees *Paris* (13.490), but that Menelaus sees *Alexandros* (3.27; cf. also 3.450 and 24.239). When the poet's own point of view is concerned, he uses the international name, unless he is stressing the character's Trojan nationality, his personal point of view, or his position as Priam's son, in which cases he uses *Paris*. Cf. further de Jong 124-126. De Jong's arguments were rejected by Lloyd (76-79), who feels that exceptions to the use of the familial versus the international name are not adequately explained by references to the audience, as when Hector uses *Alexandros* when addressing both Greeks and Trojans. In Euripides, he observes, there is no

(cont.)

De Jong has uncovered an important pattern of usage for *Paris* versus *Alexandros* which may have been helpful as a means of stressing a Trojan point of view. If the Trojan scenes can, with some plausibility, be attributed to the monumental composer of the *Iliad*, it would follow that *Alexandros*, the international name, is the older, and, therefore, formulaically better established name. For, in earlier versions of the poem which lacked scenes within Troy, at least in the numbers in which they occur in our *Iliad*, there would have been no need for the alternative familial name. However, as Suter points out, this does not explain why so many *hapax legomena* are used to describe *Paris*, or why these are mostly of an abusive nature, especially when the epithets for *Alexandros* are shared with other characters and are generally laudatory.[178] Suter believes that these factors are best explained "by the proposal that the name [*Paris*] was introduced as part of a recharacterization of the prince."[179] The new characterization, however, "is not an abrupt departure from the old: rather, the words describing *Paris* build on certain possibilities in the rather bland *Alexandros* epithets, and give the Iliadic prince, by their meaning and style, the carefree, erotic personality he has had ever since, and created for him the role of butt of abuse."[180]

Paris and *Alexandros* are described by a total of 13 epithets (or, more accurately for *Paris*, descriptive adjectives); however, none of these appears

---

differentiation between the names; however, it is difficult to see how linguistic evidence from Euripides is relevant to Homeric usage.

[178]Suter, "Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε ... " 14. Suter rightly does not designate the descriptive terms for *Paris* epithets, as most of them do not recur either with Paris or with other characters (γυναιμανές, ἠπεροπευτά, τοξότα, κέρᾳ ἀγλαέ, and παρθενοπῖπα; λωβητήρ recurs only twice). Cf. chart in note 181.

[179]Suter, "Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε ... " 14-15

[180]Suter, "Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε ... " 15.

with both *Paris* and *Alexandros*.[181] In other words, the two names have different name-epithet systems, in spite of the metrical suitability of the *Alexandros* epithets for *Paris*. All of them describe either 1) physical appearance, 2) personal relationships, or 3) behaviour of an uncertain moral value.[182] None of them describes excellence on the battlefield or in council, even though Paris performs well in both. The epithets describing appearance and relationships, which include all the *Alexandros* ones, are widely shared; those describing behaviour are never shared with more than two others.

181Chart is reproduced, with adaptations, from Suter, "Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε ... " 16.

Name	Epithet or descriptive term	Occurs	Shared with (in *Il.* & *Od.*)
No Name	δαιμόνι'	2x	11
Alexandros	θεοειδής/έα	12x	14
	δῖος/ν	6x	50+
	Ἑλένης πόσις	6x	none
	ἠϋκόμοιο βασιλῆϊ	1x	19+
Paris	υἱὸς Πριάμοιο	1x	9
	εἶδος ἄριστε	2x} in rpt'd ln.	6
	γυναιμανές	2x} in rpt'd ln.	none
	ἠπεροπευτά	2x} in rpt'd ln.	none
	τοξότα	1x	none
	λωβητήρ	1x	2
	κέρᾳ ἀγλαέ	1x	none
	παρθενοπῖπα	1x	none

182Suter, "Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε ... " 16.

That the *Alexandros* epithets occur commonly with other characters indicates that these were not developed exclusively for him. Out of 13 occurrences of Paris/Dusparis, only three are accompanied by epithets. This can hardly be called a system, since each epithet appears only once with him, with the exception of the repeated line. All but one *Paris* epithet are contained in two lines, 3.39=13.769 (Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε, γυναιμανές, ἠπεροπευτά) and 11.385 (τοξότα, λωβητήρ, κέρᾳ ἀγλαέ, παρθενοπῖπα).[183] Both lines amount to a string of insults centring on Paris' alleged interest in women, his physical beauty, deceptiveness, and prowess with the bow (the last of which, in the mouth of its speaker, a spearman fighting at close quarters and wounded by an archer, is clearly meant as an insult). Both lines contain a large number of *hapax legomena* (5) and almost no formulae.[184] Again, this is very different from the *Alexandros* epithets, which are widely shared, and describe their subject in rather ordinary, but complimentary, heroic terms; moreover, they appear in lines made up of a large number of formulae.

The *Paris* epithets characterize the Trojan prince "as a deceiver of superlative beauty, who exercises his deceptions through his beauty, particularly on women; and second, as an object of abuse because of these characteristics."[185] The terms in which Paris is abused are not altogether

---

[183]The exception is υἱὸς Πριάμοιο, which is shared with nine others; cf. Suter, "Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε ... " 18-19, for an analysis of each epithet.

[184]Only εἶδος ἄριστε counts as a formula, since it also appears in the same position in the line at 17.142; cf. also νεῖκος ἄριστε at 23.483.

[185]Suter, "Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε ... " 19-20. Note that those *Paris*-epithets which are shared also occur in contexts of abuse. Apollo upbraids Hermes and calls him ἠπεροπευτά (*h. Hermes* 282). Priam abuses the townspeople and calls them λωβητῆρες (24.239); Thersites is verbally and physically abused by

(cont.)

surprising, for they denote characteristics latent within the *Alexandros* epithets, even though with this or other names these epithets are not pejorative. θεοειδής and perhaps δῖος denote beauty; Ἑλένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο a relationship with a female. It is not difficult to see how the beautiful husband of Helen became a woman-crazy maiden-ogler or a deceiver who excels only in his appearance. What is surprising, however, is how ill-suited to their contexts, and to Paris' role in the *Iliad* as a whole, these insults are. For example, at 3.39, where some sort of abuse is appropriate, the terms Hector uses have nothing to do with cowardice or lack of valour; they simply describe characteristics which are irrelevant to battle. Good looks and attraction to women are not necessarily indicators of cowardice. Diomedes insults Paris for being a bowman, yet Paris fights with sword and spear as well. In addition, his taunts about bowmanship, though strictly speaking apposite in context, are inappropriate if we recall that the (cowardly) bowman has disabled his people's most dangerous opponent for the rest of the poem. Diomedes calls him a maiden-ogler (παρθενοπῖπα) and Hector calls him woman-crazy (or he who drives women mad, γυναιμανές[186]); however, in the

---

Odysseus and then called λωβητῆρα by the Achaean army (2.275). When Glaucus call Hector εἶδος ἄριστε (17.142), it is meant as an insult, for Hector has just retreated from Patroclus' body when he saw Ajax coming. It is also worth noting that whenever anyone speaks to Paris, his words are always described as insulting: Hector (νείκεσσεν ... αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσι, 3.38, 6.325; προσέφη αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσι, 13.768); Helen (ἠνίπαπε μύθῳ, 3.425); and Priam (νεικείων, 24.249).

[186]γυναιμανές occurs elsewhere in early hexameter only at *h. Dion*. 34.17 of Dionysus, where it must mean "he who drives women mad." Cunliffe (81) and Kirk (*Comm*. I, 271) translate the word as "woman-crazy," ignoring any other possible meaning. Liddell and Scott also define it as "mad for women" and cite *Il*. 3.39. They do, however, allow for the meaning "making women mad" in Hesychius.

Iliad, his relations with women are restricted to one only. Whether γυναιμανές means that Paris is mad for women or that he drives women mad, the description is hardly appropriate, for in Homer and in the epic tradition as a whole (if indeed his relationship with Oenone is late) Paris is involved with only one woman. In this regard, he is certainly not like Heracles, Theseus, or, in the *Iliad,* Agamemnon.[187] Diomedes calls him λωβητήρ, but it is difficult to see what he has done that is outrageous in this context; the same can be said of Hector's insult ἠπεροπευτά — how has Paris been deceptive? If these two terms refer to his behaviour at Sparta, we should remember that Homer elsewhere calls this ἄτη, something altogether different from outrageous or deceptive behaviour and perhaps indicative of the fact that Helen's abduction was not brought about by human agency alone.[188]

Suter concludes that the lines containing Hector's and Diomedes' insults serve to characterize Paris as a figure of abuse in terms of beauty and

---

[187]Macleod (89) feels that Paris can be accurately described as a "ladies' man," but his only evidence is Hector's words here, Helen's willingness to have intercourse with him at the end of Book 3, and Aphrodite's gift of μαχλοσύνη to him at 24.30 (on which more below). Perhaps this makes Paris a "ladies' man" in the *Iliad,* but Suter's argument is that it does not necessarily mean that he was viewed as such in the epic tradition as a whole.

[188]Cf. 6.356 and 24.28 (Ἀλεξάνδρου ἕνεκ' ἄτης). At 3.100, the mss., with Aristarchus, read Ἀλεξάνδρου ἕνεκ' ἀρχῆς; Zenodotus, however, read ἄτης as the last word. Aristarchus argued that ἄτη or delusion of some sort is inappropriate at 3.100 because, if Menelaus, the speaker here, used this term, he would be conceding diminished responsibility to Paris; whereas ἀρχῆς means simply that Paris started the whole conflict. Kirk feels that, because we find ἄτης in two other passages, we should not reject Zenodotus' reading out of hand: "other things being equal, one would expect the wording of other passages to be maintained. The point about ἄτη implying a kind of sympathy by Menelaus for Paris is a fine one, and I suspect that ἄτης is indeed the earlier reading; but with Aristarchus and the medieval tradition on the other side, one would not choose to alter the text" (*Comm.* I, 277).

immoral behaviour; this abuse fits neither the context in which it occurs nor the more general portrayal of Paris in the *Iliad*. This disjunction supports the notion that the figure of Paris is being recharacterized in the *Iliad* from a generally heroic figure to one of abuse.[189]

Suter has shown that by examining the diction of oral epic, there are grounds for believing that a negative recharacterization of a previously more heroic figure has taken place. Her evidence may be slim, being based on only three lines of text; however, if we also examine Paris' role in the epic tradition, we shall see that the evidence for recharacterization is quite extensive. In the previous chapter, I argued that two different and contradictory characterizations of Paris appear in the *Iliad*. Suter's arguments support this hypothesis and also suggest that the negative characterization as an erotic figure of abuse is the later one. She claims that, based on his generic epithets, the earlier figure must have been a somewhat bland and generic hero. This argument finds support in the works of scholars such as Whitman, Kullmann, and Heubeck which were also discussed in the previous chapter. They argued that pre-Homeric heroic figures were generally undifferentiated from one another and found their distinct personalities only in the Homeric poems. Suter uses linguistic evidence to argue that such hypotheses are, in fact, tenable, at least with regard to the characterization of Paris.

In the remainder of this chapter and in those that follow, I will examine what this earlier figure may have been like, for blandly or generically heroic though he may have been, he will still have existed in a

---

[189]Suter, "Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε ... " 21.

series of stories and performed certain deeds that belong to him alone and from which a specific characterization will eventually have been formed.

III. Paris' Early Life

The focus of my study in the rest of this chapter will be on three well-known events of Paris' life. Two of them are mentioned in the *Iliad* and, therefore, known, in some form, to Homer: the Judgement of Paris and the death of Achilles. Although the third one, the death of Paris himself, is not mentioned by Homer, it can still be placed rather securely in the oral tradition through the use of other evidence principally from the Epic Cycle. Paris' mythological biography is, however, quite detailed; a word, therefore, must be said about the myths excluded from this study and the reasons for their exclusion. These myths concern the early life of Paris up to the judgement of the three goddesses, and, although they may be as old as any of the stories told about Paris, there is no way to prove this. For none of these stories is attested before the fifth century, making arguments based on the portrayal of Paris in them extremely tenuous.

Paris' biography begins even before his birth when the pregnant Hecuba dreamed that she gave birth either to snakes or to a firebrand which covered the whole city and destroyed it. After consulting with diviners, it was agreed that the baby, when born, should be exposed in an attempt to divert the ruin of the city with which his life was conterminous. The exposed infant, named Alexandros by his parents, was saved and reared on Mt. Ida by a kindly shepherd who named the foundling *Paris* because he carried him in a purse, a πήρη. As a youth, Paris tended flocks and herds, and eventually fell in love with and married a nymph named Oenone, the daughter of a river

and endowed with prophetic powers, which she later used to warn Paris of the consequences attendant upon carrying off Helen. One day, a servant of Priam came to Paris' steading and took away his favourite bull, to be a prize in the funeral games held to commemorate the infant son who had been exposed. In an effort to retrieve the bull, Paris went to Troy and competed in the games. Having defeated all the princes of Troy, he won the bull back, but also raised suspicions among the Trojans, for a low-born shepherd should not be capable of defeating the sons of a king. Deïphobus and Hecuba even plotted to kill the young shepherd, who had to take refuge at an altar. In due course, Paris was recognized by Cassandra and welcomed back to the royal palace, everyone seemingly forgetting the original reason for which he had been exposed.

So much the ancient mythographers tell us; moreover, it seems fairly certain that these events made up the plot of Euripides' lost *Alexandros*, and some of these events were probably dealt with in Sophocles' own *Alexandros* and in his satyr play about the Judgement, the *Krisis*.[190] Strikingly, none of these stories is told in the *Cypria*, as far as we can tell from Proclus' summary, a place where we might expect to find them. The evidence from Archaic art is also meager.

---

[190]Cf. Apollodorus, *Bib.* 3.12.5-6; Hyginus, *Fab.* 91; the various arguments for the reconstruction of Euripides' *Alexandros* and for Sophocles' *Alexandros* and *Krisis* are best treated, with extensive bibliography, by Stinton 56-70 and Jouan, *Euripide et les chants cypriens* 113-142.

A. Hecuba's Dream

The first mention of Paris' birth is in Pindar, *Paean* 8a, which tells how Hecuba dreamed that she gave birth to a fiery Hundred-hander who razed Troy (τεκεῖν πυρφόρον ... Ἑκατόγχειρα ... Ἴλιον πᾶσάν νιν ἐπὶ π[έδον / κατερεῖψαι, 20-23). There follows a mention of forethought (προμάθεια, 25), and the fragment breaks off.[191] We can safely say that the story of Hecuba's dream indicates that Pindar also knew of the infant Paris' exposure on Mt. Ida. In Euripides' *Trojan Women* (920-922), there is an allusion to Hecuba's dream of the torch, familiar from later mythographers; and in the *Andromache* (293-300), the chorus sings of how Cassandra vainly called for the destruction of the infant Hecuba was to bear. Whether Sophocles told the story of the dream and the exposure in the *Krisis* cannot be ascertained from the meager fragments; in Euripides' *Alexandros*, it may have been told in the Prologue.[192] The important point to note, however, is that the story cannot be dated earlier than the fifth century.[193]

B. Boyhood on Mt. Ida

For the stories of Paris' boyhood on Mt. Ida and his recognition by his parents, the nature of the evidence is even sketchier. This part of the story is told fully only by Hyginus, whose sources may have been the two plays by Sophocles and Euripides. Even if this were the case, there is no way of

---

[191]Cf. Gantz 562 and Stinton 57.

[192]Cf. Stinton 66-70 and Jouan, *Euripide et les chants cypriens* 117.

[193]Note also that no artistic representations of Hecuba's dream exist. Only one even suggests the dream; it depicts Hecuba holding the infant Paris, with Cassandra and Priam in attendance. This is on a wall painting from Pompeii, for which, cf. Laurens, "Hekabe," *LIMC* #3.

determining what details came from which play or even if any were added from later sources. To Sophocles' *Alexandros*, we can assign only a context of a herdsman who defeats the Trojans.[194] From the more substantial fragments of Euripides' *Alexandros*, we can determine that Cassandra appeared, that Deïphobus took offense at being defeated by a slave, and that Hecuba, likewise finding this situation intolerable, proposed to her sons that they kill Paris.[195]

Two late Archaic cups may depict the homecoming and recognition of Paris. One is by the Briseis Painter and is taken by Beazley and Hampe to portray Paris' return to his father's house after the judgement of the goddesses. He is welcomed home by Priam and Hecuba, while Cassandra, behind her parents, has her hand raised, as if in imprecation.[196] Hampe also interprets a cup by the Brygos Painter as depicting Paris' recognition. It shows a young man being greeted by an old woman, whom he takes to be Paris and Hecuba. A bearded man, perhaps Hector, also greets him, as does a seated, white-haired old man, perhaps Priam. Two women are present, one of whom may be Cassandra, for her hand is again raised as if to provide

---

[194]Gantz 562. Cf. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* IV, fr. 93.

[195]Cf. Scodel, *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides* 20-42; and Gantz 563. Cf. also Jouan, *Euripide et les chants cypriens* 135-137, who believes that the *Cypria* is the source for Euripides' *Alexandros*. His arguments, however, are not convincing: both works involve the plan of Zeus, present Cassandra as a prophet and Paris as enjoying the protection of Aphrodite. These similarities are too general — and certainly not restricted to these two works — to argue for the dependence of one upon the other.

[196]Beazley, *ARV*[2] 406.8; Hampe, "Alexandros," *LIMC* #17. For a more cautious interpretation, cf. Stinton 58.

warning.[197] In neither piece is there any trace of the funeral games which made up the plot of Euripides' *Alexandros*.

Based on this evidence, Gantz concludes that "we must admit, as so often, that though the motif of prophecy and abandonment is certainly old, we cannot say how old it is in the particular case of Paris. Proklos' summary of the *Kypria*, where we might have expected to find it, has nothing on Paris' early life at all, and one does not immediately see where else it might have been told."[198] Stinton agrees, but goes on to say that the particular story of the lost bull and the funeral games was probably invented by the tragedians "to give a suitable dramatic background for the judgement,"[199] though this too must remain in the realm of conjecture.

C. Oenone

While Paris is living as a herdsman on Mt. Ida, he meets and falls in love with the nymph, Oenone, daughter of the stream Kebres. They live together happily until the judgement of the goddesses. Oenone, who has been endowed with the powers of healing and prophecy by Rhea, warns Paris not to abduct Helen. He, of course, pays no heed, deserts her, and thinks no more of her until wounded by Philoctetes, when he asks her to heal him. She refuses, telling him to go to Helen for help, and Paris dies. In grief, because she still loves him, she kills herself. This is the basic story of Paris' relationship with Oenone, as culled from such Hellenistic writers as Bion,

---

[197] Hampe, "Alexandros," *LIMC* #16; cf. also Beazley, *ARV*[2] 369.4; Robertson, *The Art of Vase-painting* 96; and, again more cautiously, Stinton 58-59.

[198] Gantz 564.

[199] Stinton 59.

Lycophron, and Parthenius, and from Ovid who is the first to treat it fully.[200] The romantic elements of the story, the shepherd's love for the nymph, his desertion of her, and her eventual suicide, would obviously have appealed to Hellenistic writers, but this does not necessarily mean that they invented these elements, much less the whole story. What we must determine here is whether a case can be made for the inclusion of Oenone in the epic tradition.

To start with, it seems that Oenone had no place in the Epic Cycle. The only point at which she might have appeared is in the context of the Judgement in the *Cypria*.[201] However, as there is no evidence to suggest that any events of Paris' early life were known to the *Cypria* poet, it seems unlikely that Oenone would have figured in this poem at all. According to Proclus, in the *Ilias Parva*, Paris dies on the battlefield after being wounded by Philoctetes; this obviously excludes any visit by the dying Paris to his former mistress, and may well indicate that this part of the story, at least, was not known to the oral epic tradition.

However, the story is certainly older than the Hellenistic period, for it was known in some form by Hellanicus. Parthenius cites Hellanicus as a source for the story that Korythos, the son of Oenone and Paris and more beautiful than his father, came to Troy, perhaps sent by a jealous Oenone to seduce Helen, and was received by Helen. When Paris found them together, not recognizing him for his son, he killed Korythos in a fit of jealousy.[202]

---

[200]Cf. Lycophron 57-68; Bion ii. 2; Parthenius 4; Ovid, *Her*. 5; cf. also Apollodorus, *Bib*. 3.12.6.

[201]Welcker (*Der epische Cyclus* II, 92) thought it likely that Oenone did appear in the *Cypria*, but offers no arguments to support this.

[202]Parthenius 45 = Jacoby, *FGrHist* 4 F 29. Cf. Stinton 49-52; Vian 50; and Gantz 638. Oenone's motivation for sending Korythos to seduce Helen is reported by Konon (Jacoby, *FGrHist* 26 F 1.23), who adds that it is the murder

(cont.)

This is the only part of the Oenone story that is demonstrably earlier than the Hellenistic period.

In art, there are only two secure identifications of Oenone, the earlier of which is from the first century of the Common Era.[203] It is possible that on a tripod kothon of the second quarter of the sixth century B.C., depicting the Judgement of Paris, an unidentified woman standing between Paris and Hermes may be Oenone, though Iris, Eris, and simply a generic nymph have also been suggested.[204] Also worth noting is the complete silence of the tragedians, especially Euripides, who could easily have mentioned her in one of several accounts of the Judgement, in *Iphigenia in Aulis* (573-585, 1283-1310), *Hecuba* (629-656) and *Andromache* (274-308), for example.[205]

Thus, the only thing we can say for certain is that Hellanicus knew of a son of Paris by Oenone whom his father rashly kills. This means that the relationship of Paris and Oenone, in some form or other, was known in the Archaic period. We cannot say whether the version of the story known to Ovid and the Hellenistic writers is likewise early. The romantic elements of the story seem out of keeping with heroic epic and may well have been invented at a later point. Moreover, Proclus' summary of the *Ilias Parva* seems to preclude the part of the story that recounted Paris' death because of Oenone's refusal to heal him and her subsequent suicide. In conclusion, so little evidence exists to argue for an epic version of the story of Paris and

---

of her son, and not Paris' desertion of her, that prompts Oenone's refusal to heal the mortally wounded Paris. Neither Apollodorus nor Ovid mentions any son of Paris and Oenone.

[203]Kahil, "Oenone," *LIMC* #1-2.

[204]Kahil, "Oenone," *LIMC* #3 and Kossatz-Deissmann, "Paridis Iudicium," *LIMC* #6.

[205]Cf. Krischam, "Oinone" 2252.

Oenone, that this part of Paris' biography, like the stories of his birth, exposure, and recognition, are best left aside in any assessment of this figure's place in the oral epic tradition. As I said at the outset, these stories may have been part of the oral epic tradition, but unfortunately our limited knowledge of that tradition prevents us from being able to argue for their inclusion.

IV. The Judgement of Paris

As we have seen, Homer is silent about Paris' early life, and it may well be that the myths surrounding his birth and youth are late. Homer certainly knows that Paris abducted Helen from Sparta and brought her back to Troy, but by the time this act took place Paris was already a grown man. The references to the abduction are numerous, as it, of course, forms the necessary background to the plot of the *Iliad*. However, scholars have been much less certain whether Homer knew of the immediate cause which we take to be behind Helen's abduction, namely Aphrodite's promise of the most beautiful woman if Paris chose her in the beauty contest between her, Hera, and Athena. There is only one passage in the *Iliad* where this myth is referred to directly, but the wording is so curious that since antiquity its authenticity has been questioned. It is important, therefore, to begin with an examination of this passage and the objections commonly raised against it. For, if the authenticity of the passage cannot be defended, then the job of proving that Homer knew of the Judgement of Paris must rely only on indirect and external evidence.

The one reference to the Judgement comes near the beginning of Book 24, as the gods are discussing Achilles' continuing outrage of Hector's corpse. Homer tells us that the gods all felt pity for Hector and were urging Hermes to

steal the corpse away from Achilles. However, this plan was not pleasing to Hera, Poseidon, and Athena, who continued to hate the Trojans as from the beginning because of Paris' insult to the two goddesses and his praise for her who gave him grievous lust:

> τὸν δ' ἐλεαίρεσκον μάκαρες θεοὶ εἰσορόωντες,
> κλέψαι δ' ὀτρύνεσκον ἐΰσκοπον Ἀργειφόντην.
> ἔνθ' ἄλλοις μὲν πᾶσιν ἑήνδανεν, οὐδέ ποθ' Ἥρῃ
> οὐδὲ Ποσειδάων' οὐδὲ γλαυκώπιδι κούρῃ,
> ἀλλ' ἔχον ὥς σφιν πρῶτον ἀπήχθετο Ἴλιος ἱρὴ
> καὶ Πρίαμος καὶ λαὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου ἕνεκ' ἄτης,
> ὃς νείκεσσε θεάς, ὅτε οἱ μέσσαυλον ἵκοντο,
> τὴν δ' ᾔνησ' ἥ οἱ πόρε μαχλοσύνην ἀλεγεινήν.
> (24.23-30)

It is difficult to say if this is a reference to the myth to the Judgement of Paris as we know it from later writers. The scholiasts report that Aristarchus felt the whole passage to be a late interpolation and, accordingly, athetized these lines.[206] Some of his reasons for athetesis are obviously based on subjective notions of what constitutes Homeric ethics and values, as van der Valk points out.[207] Others, however, raise serious problems that must be

---

[206]There is actually some confusion in the scholia about exactly which lines Aristarchus athetized. Aristonicus, in the A scholia at 24.25, says that Aristarchus athetized only 25-30, but the bT scholia at 24.23 claim that he athetized 23-30. Van der Valk (*Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* II, 29-30) thinks that Aristonicus is correct, for he says that Aristarchus athetized six lines and relates in detail the reasons for athetesis; therefore, if, to his knowledge, Aristarchus had also athetized the two preceding lines, he would have said that eight lines had been athetized and discussed the reasons for the athetesis of 23-24 as well. Cf. also Bolling, *The Athetized Lines of the Iliad* 187-189.

[207]Van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* II, 29. These include the supposed absurdity of Athena or the matronly Hera participating in a beauty contest with Aphrodite. Aristarchus also objects that all sorts of things are said to be the cause of the war, but that the Judgement is never mentioned as one of them. Priam blames the gods (3.164), Helen

(cont.)

addressed. These are cited in the bT scholia at 24.23 and in the A scholia at 24.25-30:[208]

1. The mention of Poseidon at line 26 is odd because he is not consistently an ally of the Greeks.

2. The verb νείκεσσε is inappropriate for a judge, such as Paris is supposed to be in this myth.

3. A μέσσαυλος, where Paris encounters the goddesses, signifies a rural dwelling; however, Homer thought of Paris as having been raised in the city, for he is an accomplished musician, which is out of keeping with a rustic life.

4. The word μαχλοσύνην is spurious and late. It cannot be applied to men, but describes γυναικομανία; moreover, this was not what Aphrodite gave Paris; she gave him τὴν καλλίστην τῶν τότε Ἑλένην.

5. Homer obviously does not know about the Judgement, for if he did he would have mentioned it often (τήν τε περὶ τοῦ κάλλους κρίσιν οὐκ οἶδεν· πολλαχῇ γὰρ ἂν ἐμνήσθη).[209] Moreover, he ignores it at key

---

blames Paris (3.172-242, 6.344-358, 24.762-775), and the poet calls the ships which took Paris to Sparta ἀρχεκάκους (5.63). But, mortals blame the gods for all sorts of things, as Zeus observes (*Od.* 1.32-34). Helen's hatred of her husband can easily account for his blameworthiness in her eyes. That the ships which took Paris to Sparta should be called ἀρχεκάκους does not preclude all other ἀρχαί of the war. Aristarchus also objects that it would be unseemly (οὐ πρέπον) for the gods to encourage Hermes to steal Hector's corpse; but, as Richardson observes, "the idea of Hermes stealing the corpse is odd but not impossible" (*Comm.* VI, 276).

[208]Cf. Erbse, *Scholia* V, 519-522 and Severyns, *Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque*, 261-263.

[209]Cf. Erbse, *Scholia* V, 521-522. Eustathius (vol. V, 1337.30-40) too records the general objection that if Homer had known of the myth he would have mentioned it more than once and notes that Aristarchus objected to the

(cont.)

places, the most important of which is at 4.31-32, where Zeus asks Hera why she hates the Trojans so much (τί νύ σε Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες / τόσσα κακὰ ῥέξουσιν;). Apparently, Homer would not have Zeus ask the question, if he knew the answer.[210]

Analytical scholars, in particular, accepted Aristarchus' condemnation of these lines and his conclusion that the Judgement was unknown to Homer.[211] Welcker seems to have been the first scholar to argue for the lines' authenticity, on the grounds that the Judgement forms one of the necessary pieces of background information about the Trojan war which the poet can depend on his audience knowing.[212] The discovery in the early part of this century of an ivory comb in the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta gave concrete support for Welcker's position. It shows Paris seated on an elaborate chair, while three goddesses approach, first Hera, followed by Athena and Aphrodite. The majority of scholars have dated the comb to the middle of the seventh century.[213] One other depiction of the Judgement also survives

---

use of νείκεσσε and μαχλοσύνην for the same reasons as preserved in the scholiasts.

[210]This objection is also recorded by the AbT scholia at 4.51-52, where they all say that, if Homer had known of the Judgement, Hera would have given this as the reason for her hatred here; cf. Erbse, *Scholia* I, 453-454.

[211]Cf. Ameis-Hentze, *Anhang zu Homers Ilias* V, 94-99, 114-115 for a bibliographic survey.

[212]Welcker, *Der epische Cyclus* II, 113-120, esp. 114-115. Scott, "The Choice of Paris in Homer" 326-330 also argued that Homer and his audience knew of the Judgement. He presents many of the same arguments as does Welcker, but, once again, nowhere cites his Analytical predecessor. Drerup, *Homerische Poetik* I, 360, n. 1, too believed that the Judgement would have been known to the audience of the *Iliad* as a general piece of background information.

[213] Cf. Dawkins 223 and pl. 127; Hampe, "Das Parisurteil auf dem Elfenbeinkamm aus Sparta" 77-86 and "Alexandros," *LIMC* #6; Ahlberg-Cornell 50-51; Kossatz-Deissmann, "Paridis Iudicium," *LIMC* #22; Clairmont

(cont.)

in Archaic art, on the Proto-Corinthian Chigi vase, which dates from c. 640-630. The principal scene on the vase is a hoplite battle, but tucked beneath the handle we see Hermes leading the three goddesses towards Paris. The vase is damaged, and the three goddesses in particular are fragmentary. Paris is well preserved and inscriptions confirm the identity of Athena and Aphrodite.[214] The iconographic evidence, therefore, demonstrates that the Judgement of Paris was known in some form already in the Archaic period.

In 1938, encouraged by the discovery of the Spartan ivory comb, Karl Reinhardt set out to prove that the lines in Book 24 were not an interpolation and that the Judgement was, in fact, known to Homer.[215] Reinhardt argued that, though Homer knew the story as an integral part of the Trojan cycle, he chose not to tell it in detail because its unheroic atmosphere was unsuited to epic narrative. Such stories are at times referred to in the Homeric epics, but they are never fully narrated and then always with their unheroic features adapted to the epic style. One example is the story of Penelope's web, a simple tale of cunning, stupidity, and betrayal and told only briefly in the *Odyssey*. The real influence of the story is felt in the way Homer adapts its basic components to epic situations. Accordingly, Penelope's cunning becomes wisdom and the suitors' stupidity becomes arrogance and impiety which

---

14-15; Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry* 132; Wathelet, *Dictionnaire des Troyens* 835; Gantz 568; and Scaife 179-180.

[214]Cf. Hampe, "Alexandros," *LIMC* #5; Kossatz-Deissmann, "Paridis Iudicium," *LIMC* #26; Clairmont 13-14; Robertson, *A History of Greek Art* I, 52-53; Ahlberg-Cornell 50-51; Wathelet, *Dictionnaire des Troyens* 834-835; and Scaife 179.

[215]Reinhardt, "Das Parisurteil," in *Tradition und Geist* 16-36 (orig. publ. in *Wissenschaft und Gegenwart*, 11 [1938]). Griffin has called this work "a landmark in Homeric studies" (*HLD* 195, n. 49); Wüst (1496-1497) asserts that Reinhardt's conclusions must be taken as fact — which now seems to be the majority view (cf., for example, Richardson, *Comm.* VI, 277-278).

warrant retribution. Thus, the basic elements of the story are "heroized" to suit the conventions of epic poetry.[216]

The same is true of the Judgement in the *Iliad*: "Auch die Parisgeschichte wird nur ein einziges Mal erwähnt, auch sie ist Vorgeschichte in einem doppelten Sinn: nicht nur, weil ihr Geschehen dem 'Zorne Achills' vorausliegt, sondern auch weil sie von einem Geist zeugt, der dem epischen Stil, wenn nicht der späteren Stoffsammler, der 'Kykliker,' doch um so mehr der Ilias widersprach." The basic elements of the story — the shepherd tending his flocks and the beauty contest between the goddesses — are unsuited to the epic style; accordingly, as with Penelope's web, it is only told once and briefly. However, its influence is felt throughout the poem in the relations between the three goddesses who took part in the beauty contest: Hera and Athena are the most outspoken and active of the pro-Greek gods and tend to work together, while Aphrodite not only favours the Trojans, but Paris and Helen in particular.

But the general political alignment of the gods is well-known and can, to some extent, be explained at the level of religion and cult. Hera's association with Argos is well established, and known to Homer, as we can see from the choice of her three favourite cities — Argos, Sparta, and Mycenae — which she offers up to Zeus in return for Troy's destruction (4.51-52); this makes her a natural, even indigenous, ally of the Greeks. Aphrodite's origins are probably in the Near East and may, therefore, provide some explanation for her association with the Trojans.[217] However, what

[216]Reinhardt, "Das Parisurteil" 19-20.

[217]On the antiquity of Hera's connections with mainland Greece, cf. Burkert, *Greek Religion* 131-132; Athena's connections with the mainland are likewise very ancient, cf. *Greek Religion* 139-140; on Aphrodite's origins, cf.

(cont.)

Reinhardt found most puzzling, if Homer were supposed to be ignorant of the Judgement, was not Hera's and Athena's love for the Greeks, but their intense hatred of the Trojans. Both goddesses are unflinchingly committed to the annihilation of the Trojans, Hera so much so that she is willing even to offer up her three favourite cities to ensure this.[218]

The other gods do not show this degree of hatred for the side which they do not favour. Apollo is pro-Trojan and Poseidon pro-Greek. Yet their favouritism does not require the complete destruction of the other side. Apollo, for example, sends a plague against the Greeks in Book 1, but relents after restitution is made. In Book 20, Poseidon, feeling pity for Aeneas because of his blamelessness and piety, rescues the Trojan from Achilles so that fate will not be altered by his unavoidable death should he be allowed to meet Achilles. Hera and Athena, on the other hand, refuse to help Poseidon, good though his reasons may be, for, as Hera says to him:

> ἤτοι μὲν γὰρ νῶϊ πολέας ὠμόσσαμεν ὅρκους
> πᾶσι μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν, ἐγὼ καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη,
> μή ποτ' ἐπὶ Τρώεσσιν ἀλεξήσειν κακὸν ἦμαρ,
> μηδ' ὁπότ' ἂν Τροίη μαλερῷ πυρὶ πᾶσα δάηται
> καιομένη, καίωσι δ' ἀρήϊοι υἷες Ἀχαιῶν.
> (20.313-317)

Reinhardt sums up the difference between Hera's and Athena's favouritism from that of any of the other gods: "So viel ist sicher: deutlicher ließe sich nicht sagen, daß die Hilfe, die Poseidon den Achäern leistet, nicht zu verwechseln sei mit dem gemeinsamen Haß der beiden Göttinnen auf Troia. Hasserinnen um jeden Preis sind einzig Hera und Athene; sie wollen

---

Greek Religion 152-154, where Burkert tentatively supports an association with the Semitic goddess of love, Ishtar-Astarte.

[218]Reinhardt, "Das Parisurteil" 21-29.

nicht nur den Ihren helfen, sie wollen vernichten."[219] Thus, Hera and Athena are committed, more so than any of the other pro-Greek gods, to Troy's destruction; furthermore, Troy's destruction takes priority over the welfare of the Greeks. According to Reinhardt, only the Judgement of Paris can adequately explain the unique hatred that these two goddesses have for the Trojans.

A passage in Book 8 illustrates this point particularly well. Zeus forbids all the gods to take part in the battle, but Hera and Athena disobey, and the two of them prepare Athena for battle. Zeus sends Iris to recall them and chastises them. Their response to Zeus reveals a contradiction between what the poet tells us they are thinking and what, in fact, they say to Zeus. At 457-458, they contrive evil for the Trojans:

> Ὣς ἔφαθ', αἱ δ' ἐπέμυξαν Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη·
> πλησίαι αἵ γ' ἥσθην, κακὰ δὲ Τρώεσσι μεδέσθην.

At 464-468, however, Hera says that they feel pity for the Danaans and are afraid that they will perish altogether, unless she and Athena can, at the very least, put good counsel in their heads:

> ἀλλ' ἔμπης Δαναῶν ὀλοφυρόμεθ' αἰχμητάων,
> οἵ κεν δὴ κακὸν οἶτον ἀναπλήσαντες ὄλωνται.
> ἀλλ' ἤτοι πολέμου μὲν ἀφεξόμεθ', εἰ σὺ κελεύεις·
> βουλὴν δ' Ἀργείοις ὑποθησόμεθ', ἥ τις ὀνήσει,
> ὡς μὴ πάντες ὄλωνται ὀδυσσαμένοιο τεοῖο.

The two goddesses claim that their actions are motivated by feelings of compassion for the Greeks; the poet asserts that they are motivated by feelings of hatred for the Trojans.[220]

---

[219]Reinhardt, "Das Parisurteil" 22.
[220]Reinhardt, "Das Parisurteil" 22.

Reinhardt also points to other passages which he argues can only be understood with reference to the Judgement. For example, when Aphrodite is wounded by Diomedes, Athena, at Hera's bidding, teases her (5.418-425), and in the battle of the gods, Hera encourages Athena to fight Aphrodite and, with one blow, Athena sends her sprawling (21.418-433).[221] Only one myth can explain this unusual triangle in which two goddesses act together against the third.

One other passage is particularly interesting. At the beginning of Book 4, after the duel between Paris and Menelaus, Zeus contrasts Hera and Athena as helpers of Menelaus with Aphrodite as the helper of Paris:

> δοιαὶ μὲν Μενελάῳ ἀρηγόνες εἰσὶ θεάων,
> Ἥρη τ' Ἀργείη καὶ Ἀλαλκομενηῒς Ἀθήνη.
> ἀλλ' ἤτοι ταὶ νόσφι καθήμεναι εἰσορόωσαι
> τέρπεσθον· τῷ δ' αὖτε φιλομμειδὴς Ἀφροδίτη
> αἰεὶ παρμέμβλωκε καὶ αὐτοῦ κῆρας ἀμύνει·
> καὶ νῦν ἐξεσάωσεν οἰόμενον θανέεσθαι.
> (4.7-12)

It is curious that Zeus does not speak of Hera and Athena as allies of the Greeks, but rather specifically as helpers of Menelaus and contrasts them as such with Aphrodite as the helper of Paris.[222] Kullmann adds that, while it is not unusual for Athena to help Menelaus (since she does the same for other Greeks such as Achilles, Diomedes, and Odysseus), Hera's role as patron of

---

[221]Scott, "The Choice of Paris in Homer" 328, also notes that in Book 5 Athena tells Diomedes that the only god he can attack is Aphrodite (5.129-133). Reinhardt compares the scene between Athena and Aphrodite in Book 21 to the stand-off between Apollo and Poseidon which follows immediately. Their favouritism for one side does not involve hatred for the allies of the other side ("Das Parisurteil" 21).

[222]Reinhardt, "Das Parisurteil" 29.

Menelaus needs explanation. Generally speaking, in the *Iliad*, Hera does not favour specific mortals; therefore, her role here as Menelaus' helper invites the audience to remember the Judgement.[223]

Thus, Reinhardt concludes that, not only did Homer know of the myth of the judgement of the three goddesses by Paris, but that he used this myth throughout his poem as the basis for the all-important political loyalties of the gods. The hatred of Hera and Athena for the Trojans is the epic working out of the simple, unheroic tale of the shepherd who arbitrates in the beauty contest. The original story may only be referred to in passing; nonetheless, its influence is pervasive. As Reinhardt says, "Ohne Parisurteil, keine Ilias."[224]

An answer then emerges to one of Aristarchus' principal objections, namely that, if Homer had known of the Judgement, he would have mentioned it not once, but often, and most certainly in Book 4 when Zeus asks Hera why she hates the Trojans so much. Not only is the true reason unheroic, or out of keeping with the atmosphere of epic, but silence makes the goddesses' implacable hatred all that much more terrifying:

> Der gewaltige Haß der gewaltigen Göttin lodert, lebt und rechtfertigt sich aus sich selbst. Das Parisurteil als Begründung würde hier nur schwächen, oder würde doch, als Ursache, die Wirkung nimmermehr erklären. Von so furchtbarem Rätselcharakter ist die Gottheit — nicht nur

---

[223]Kullmann, *Quellen* 238. Kullmann also refers to 5.714-717, where Hera reminds Athena of the promise they made to Menelaus that he would return home having sacked Troy (*Quellen* 239). He also believes that when Hera and Athena are first introduced in the *Iliad* as working together for the general benefit of the Greeks without any explanation, the poet is assuming an acquaintance on the part of his audience with the Judgement (*Quellen* 237). Cf. *Quellen* 236-244 and "Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung zu Homer" 433-434, for a complete discussion of all the passages which Kullmann argues demonstrate the poet's awareness of this myth.

[224]Reinhardt, "Das Parisurteil" 32.

> Hera; Zeus selbst, wenn erst er einmal beschlossen haben wird, eine Stadt zu vernichten, wird nicht anders sein! Daher ihr beider Pakt: laß du mir dies, laß ich dir das! Daß hier das Parisurteil nicht erwähnt wird, liegt nicht daran, daß der Dichter es noch nicht gekannt hätte, sondern liegt daran, daß die Größe der olympischen Begebenheit über den Geist der alten Geschichte hinauswuchs. Das alte Motiv wird wesenlos, die ihn entsprungene epische Situation wird zum Gefäß neuen Gehalts.[225]

Thus, Reinhardt argues that Homer's general silence about the Judgement does not warrant the athetization of its one mention. He demonstrates that a number of passages, in fact, presuppose a knowledge of the Judgement. Moreover, he suggests a reason why the poet does not mention this myth more often, namely that silence makes the gods' hatred of Troy all that much more terrifying than ascribing a specific reason would.[226] Stinton sums up the importance of Reinhardt's argument: "what Reinhardt shows is that the *Iliad* is consistent with Homer's having known the story; and the burden of proof now lies on those who say he did not."[227]

Reinhardt, however, does not answer all of the problems raised in the scholia. We should still wonder why Poseidon is mentioned in the context of the Judgement? Why is a Trojan prince playing the part of a shepherd? Why does Homer use the verb νείκεσσε to describe Paris' rejection of the two goddesses? And, why is Aphrodite's gift to Paris described as μαχλοσύνη?

---

[225]Reinhardt, "Das Parisurteil" 29.

[226]Cf. also van der Valk, "Homer's Nationalistic Attitude" 17-18, on this point, who agrees with Reinhardt and suggests further that the poet is silent about the Judgement in general because Paris' crime against Menelaus is much more serious than his offending two goddesses in a beauty contest. The poet wants to emphasize the Trojans' guilt and their consequent doom; therefore, he frequently recalls Paris' abduction of Helen and not his judgement of the goddesses.

[227]Stinton 19.

Two of these objections do not really pose problems at all. As Robert pointed out long ago, shepherding on Mt. Ida is a common activity for Trojan princes in the *Iliad*.[228] Nor does νείκεσσε require the elaborate hypotheses about alternative versions of the myth some have invented in attempts to explain it away.[229] As Adkins points out, "when Paris gave his judgement that Aphrodite had won, the other two goddesses naturally felt his words to be hostile, and indeed would feel ἐλεγχείη at their defeat."[230] Thus, νείκεσσε describes not so much Paris' action as the way it was received by Hera and Athena and makes perfect sense in a passage meant to explain why they are so angry.

Poseidon's persistent anger is perhaps explained by his betrayal at the hands of Laomedon, as he himself recounts (21.441-457).[231] But, as Davies observes, the fact still remains "that as they stand the lines in effect present us with the remarkable statement that Poseidon, no less than the two goddesses,

---

[228]Robert, *Griechische Heldensage* II, 978, n. 3. Robert lists Aeneas (21.91), Anchises (5.313 and *h.Aph.* 55), the brothers of Andromache (6.424-425), and six other minor figures as examples of Trojan princes who also engage in shepherding.

[229]Wilamowitz suggested that there existed a version of the myth in which Paris haughtily turned away Hera and Athena and graciously received Aphrodite, and that this basic myth of gods testing human piety via hospitality was turned by the *Cypria* poet into the judgement of the three goddesses ("Lesefrüchte" 242). Rose agreed that νείκεσσε indicates open insult and some kind of hospitality motif, and suggested that Poseidon may also have been present and rejected along with Hera and Athena ("De loco Homerico male intellecto" 282-283). Even the much more cautious Stinton (3, n. 4) leaves open the possibility that "there may well have been a version in which Paris added insult to injury by open abuse."

[230]Adkins, "Threatening, Abusing and Feeling Angry in the Homeric Poems" 20.

[231]Cf. Macleod 88 who comments that "[t]he curt and elliptical style is natural when, as here, a story is only mentioned, not told."

was angry with Troy and its inhabitants because of the Judgement of Paris."[232] Moreover, the scholiasts' objections to μαχλοσύνη have never been adequately addressed: this is not what Aphrodite gave Paris, and, besides, the word is late and only applies to women.

Davies suggests a solution to these problems by examining not why Homer is silent about the Judgement in places where he could easily have mentioned it, as Reinhardt did, but why Homer chooses to mention it where he does. He argues that its placement at the beginning of Book 24, just before the final resolution of the plot, is significant. The *Iliad* ends with Achilles giving up his anger at Hector and, in an act of compassion, restoring his enemy's corpse to Priam. Just before this final movement is set in motion, we see the gods on Mt. Olympus. Homer tells us that the majority of them felt compassion for Hector and wanted Achilles' outrage of his corpse to stop. However, three important gods object because of their unending hatred of the Trojans. It is only in this one place that the Judgement is mentioned, that is to say, it is only here that we are told why it is that Hera and Athena hate the Trojans. In this context, the reference to the Judgement serves to underline the difference between the gods and men. Priam and Achilles, both of whom have good reason to hate one another, can put aside their hatred and be reconciled with one another. The gods, however, continue to hold onto their hatred, no matter how old and trivial the reasons for it may be. Priam and his city will be destroyed because the gods are incapable of the kind of generosity that Achilles can show toward his enemy. Davies sums up: "[o]n the mortal level Achilles abandons his anger and becomes finally reconciled

---

[232]Davies, "The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* XXIV" 57.

with Priam and with humanity. On the divine level the first explicit mention of the Judgement reminds us of grudges and resentments which are not resolved, but linger on relentlessly and inexorably, to issue in the destruction of Troy."[233]

In short, Homer mentions the Judgement in order to juxtapose the lasting nature of divine anger to Achilles' abandonment of his anger against Hector. In this context, the inclusion of Poseidon makes sense, for he, like Hera and Athena, has a grudge against the Trojans. The different reasons for the different gods' hatred are not set out because it is not the specific reasons which are important here, but simply the existence of the hatred itself. Poseidon is present because he "is still firmly registered in our minds within the company of gods who cherish undying hatreds because of past offenses."[234]

Davies tries to account for μαχλοσύνη along the same lines. He notes that μαχλοσύνη, that is, some kind of sexual impropriety, is normally the punishment which Aphrodite inflicts upon her enemies, not a reward that she would give to one of her favourites.[235] For example, according to

---

[233]Davies, "The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* XXIV" 59-60. Davies sees this as a reversal of the situations on the divine and human planes in Book 1, where the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles found no resolution, while the argument on Olympus dissolves in laughter and music. Cf. also Macleod 88: "the origin of Hera's and Athena's hatred of Troy comes effectively at the end of the poem ... Homer heightens and extends his tragedy by taking us back to where it started. This reminds us that even if for the moment 'the gods' are to unite in allowing the ransom of Hector's body, the gods hostile to Troy still have reason to be as angry as ever; and the city they hate must fall."

[234]Davies, "The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* XXIV" 59.

[235]The evidence shows that μαχλοσύνη and its derivatives are not confined to women at all, as the scholiasts claimed. Hesiod uses it twice of women (*W&D* 586 and fr. 132MW), Herodotus once (4.154). But in

(cont.)

Stesichorus, she, in anger at Tyndareus for omitting her in his sacrifices, punishes him by making his daughters promiscuous.[236] Likewise, she punishes Pasiphae, who neglected her rites, by perverting her sexuality.[237] And Euripides' *Hippolytus* makes Phaedra's desire for her step-son the result of Aphrodite's vengeance against him.[238] Thus, the scholiasts were right to object to the idea that Aphrodite should give this quality as a reward. With this one word, the poet casts Aphrodite's gift to Paris in a negative light.

Davies does not elaborate beyond this ; I would argue, however, that we can push his suggestion further. By describing Aphrodite's gift to Paris in terms that normally would describe the way this goddess punishes mortals,

---

Aeschylus' *Suppliants* (636), the adjective is used of Ares; and, in Aeschylus, fr. 325 (Radt), it is used to describe an over-luxuriant ἄμπελος. Much later, Lucian (*Alexandros* 11) uses μάχλος to describe a man. Thus, Friis Johansen and Whittle suggest that μαχλοσύνη and μάχλος are not so much associated with women as descriptive of sexual immorality, such as adultery, that stems from Aphrodite and is applicable equally to men and women (Friis Johansen and Whittle, *The Suppliants* III, 13-14). Cf. further, Stinton 19, n. 9 and Davies, "The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* XXIV" 57, n. 13.

[236]οὕνεκα Τυνδάρεος / ῥέζων ποκὰ πᾶσι θεοῖς μόνας λάθετ' ἠπιοδώρου / Κύπριδος· κείνα δὲ Τυνδαρέου κόρας / χολωσαμένα διγάμους τε καὶ τριγάμους ἐτίθει / καὶ λιπεσάνορας, fr. 223 Davies.

[237]This version appears only late, in Hyginus, *Fab.* 40; in other versions, also late, it is Poseidon, for reasons similar to those of Aphrodite, who punishes Minos by afflicting his wife with her passion for the bull (Diodorus Siculus 4.77.1-4). The story, however, of Pasiphae's desire for the bull is certainly much older, as it is attested to in Pindar (fr. 91 SM) and Bacchylides' fragmentary *Ode* 26. The latter may have presented Aphrodite as responsible in some way for Pasiphae's passion, for, in the third line of the papyrus we read the letters εν κυπ, which Snell (in the Teubner edition of Bacchylides, 10th ed., p. 77), followed by Campbell (*Greek Lyric* IV, p. 242), suggests may have been ἐν Κύπρις. Cf. further, Gantz 260-261.

[238]Cf. Davies, "The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* XXIV" 58, n. 14 and Gantz 105, for further examples of individuals punished in this way by Aphrodite. Cf. also Walcot 33-37.

her gift is consistent with other gifts which the gods give to mortals in the *Iliad*. For divine gifts in the *Iliad* bring little benefit for their recipients; instead, they frequently serve to underline the very mortality of those who receive or even come into contact with them. The most famous example is the divinely wrought armour which the gods gave to Peleus at his wedding to Thetis.[239] In the *Iliad*, both men who wear this armour die in it. When Hephaestus agrees to replace the armour which Achilles has lost, he says that the new panoply will not save the hero from death (18.464-467); he too will die wearing the gifts of the gods.[240]

Divine gifts are inappropriate for humans, for they blur the otherwise distinct boundaries between mortality and immortality, with fatal results for the gifts' recipients. As Heath concludes, "in the world of the *Iliad*, then, it is not the case that human beings turn the gifts of the gods to perverse use — the gifts themselves are pernicious."[241] Just so, Aphrodite's gift of Helen to Paris brings with it death; perhaps the poet had this in mind when he called her gift ἀλεγεινήν (24.30). In this way, her gift, like all divine gifts, can rightly

---

[239]Cf. Heath, "The Legacy of Peleus" 387-400, who argues that "not only are the divine offerings of little use to their recipients, but they are frequently connected in a most destructive fashion with human mortality. Even the most illustrious benefaction of all, Hephaestus' armor for Achilles, will not protect the hero from death, as its creator himself laments (18.464-467). Indeed, it is only with this armor that Achilles can re-enter the battle to kill Hector and meet his own death soon thereafter" (388).

[240]Cf. also Odysseus' words to Dolon who hoped to receive as his reward for the spying mission Achilles' divine horses. Odysseus tells him that they are difficult for mortals to handle, except for Achilles, τὸν ἀθανάτη τέκε μήτηρ (10.404). Achilles can handle the horses, because he is partially divine, but even so they cannot save him from death in battle (cf. 19.408-410). As for Dolon, the mere hope of owning them results in his death.

[241]Heath, "The Legacy of Peleus" 394.

be described in less than positive terms, even, as here, in terms befitting punishment.[242]

Thus, Davies demonstrates that we should not expect Homer to provide us with a straightforward version of the Judgement of Paris. Instead, he uses the myth to underscore certain thematic developments, namely the contrast between human forgiveness and divine implacability. Homer's curious wording in his one mention of the myth tells us that Hera and Athena continued to hate the Trojans on account of Paris' judgement. Poseidon is mentioned as another god who, likewise, has reasons to hate the Trojans and persists in his hatred. Even Aphrodite, the Trojans' divine ally, is absorbed into this theme. For her gift to Paris, no less than the three other gods' hatred, will result in the Troy's destruction; accordingly, her gift is described as a punishment.

Taken together, Reinhardt and Davies answer the scholiasts' objections to this passage by demonstrating that Homer not only knew the passage, but had good reasons not to mention it more often and equally good reasons to word his single mention of it the way he did. Thus, we can safely conclude that there are no reasons to follow Aristarchus' athetization of the lines about the Judgement and that the allusive nature of the passage indicates that the myth was well-known to both poet and audience. As Gantz asserts, "if we cannot get the exact sense of these last words, we still have enough to say that this is the Judgment as we know it: two goddesses are disappointed, while the

---

[242]We would do well to recall Helen's own situation as the recipient of Aphrodite's favour (3.399ff.). The goddess makes clear that her love could easily turn into an equally strong hatred which would destroy Helen. Moreover, it is clear that Helen has not gained happiness as a result of Aphrodite's love.

entire *Iliad* proclaims that the third, here chosen by Paris, has provided him with Helen."[243]

Since we can say that, in all likelihood, the heroic tradition in which Homer worked knew of the Judgement, we are entitled to ask what this myth tells about Paris. First and foremost, we must ask why Paris was chosen to arbitrate between the three goddesses. For in this respect his role in the Judgement is unique; no other Greek myth exists in which a mortal is called upon to settle a dispute that is exclusively between gods about an issue that concerns them only.[244] The selection of Paris as arbitrator implies a singular honour, one that would be accorded only to an important hero.

Though it is nowhere stated why Paris is chosen as the judge particularly of a beauty contest, his role as such suggests that he was well suited to determine who was most beautiful because he himself possessed great physical beauty. In the *Iliad*, as we have seen, he is preeminent among the Trojans for his beauty and is even insulted because of his beauty. Hector calls him εἶδος ἄριστε and says that the Achaeans think him the Trojans' best fighter because of his beauty, but in fact he is without valour (3.44-45).[245]

---

[243]Gantz 567.

[244]The closest parallel is the contest between Athena and Poseidon regarding the patronship of Athens in which, variously, Cecrops or the Athenians are asked to arbitrate between the gods and their offerings (cf. Preller, *Griechische Mythologie* I, 202-204). However, the prize over which the contest is being fought is one which is closely connected to the mortal judges. In Paris' case, the gods ask him to settle an issue of concern to themselves only.

[245]Paris' surpassing beauty would make him the most appropriate judge of a beauty contest in the same way that Helen's status as the most beautiful mortal in Sappho fr. 16 LP make her the most reliable judge of what is most beautiful. As Most (15) argues, "Rhadamanthys' actions have the greatest authority for determining what is τὸ δικαιότατον; Achilles', for τὸ ἀνδρειότατον; and Helen's, for τὸ κάλλιστον. We sense here the notion of

(cont.)

Paris' beauty in the *Iliad* is one component of his unheroic characterization. In other passages, a similar juxtaposition of beauty and cowardice is apparent. When Glaucus calls Hector εἶδος ἄριστε (17.142), he means to insult the Trojan leader who has just withdrawn from the fight over Patroclus' corpse when he saw Ajax approaching. Nireus, a minor Greek leader, is described in the catalogue of ships as the most beautiful Greek after Achilles (κάλλιστος ... μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλείωνα, 2.673-674) and also as weak (ἀλαπαδνός, 2.675). The routed Achaeans are twice reproached for their cowardice before the enemy and called εἶδος ἀγητοί (5.787=8.228). Thus, a connection appears to exist between male beauty and cowardice. However, the description of Nireus compares him in beauty to Achilles, who certainly could not be accused of cowardice of any sort. In fact, in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Achilles is several times referred to as the most beautiful man at Troy, in passages that simultaneously draw attention to Ajax' beauty and compare it to Achilles'. At *Iliad* 17.279-280, Ajax is described as ὃς περὶ μὲν εἶδος, περὶ δ' ἔργα τέτυκτο / τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλείωνα. The verses recur in the *Odyssey* (11.550-551), where the comparison is made again when Ajax is referred to as ὃς ἄριστος ἔην εἶδός τε δέμας τε / τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλείωνα (11.468-470=24.17-18).[246]

The physical beauty of Achilles and Ajax would seem to be something different from that of Paris and Nireus; in the former, it is an attribute of heroism, in the latter, of cowardice. And yet, Homer uses the same word,

---

ὅμοιον ὁμοίῳ, which we can certainly presume to have been a common model of thought in ordinary Greek life ... ."

[246]For the physical beauty of other heroes, cf. *Il.* 21.108 and 24.376 (Achilles), 22.370 (Hector), 20.233 (Ganymede); *Od.* 4.264 (Menelaus), 8.116 (Naubolides), 24.374 (Laertes).

εἶδος, to describe the beauty of Ajax, Achilles, and Paris, and directly compares the weak Nireus to Achilles in beauty.

The passages describing Ajax and Achilles point to the beauty of the two heroes as a component of their heroism. In fact, the references to Nireus and Paris confirm this. Nireus is not described as beautiful *and* ineffectual; he is described as beautiful, *but nonetheless* ineffectual (κάλλιστος ... ἀλλ' ἀλαπαδνός). Likewise, Hector says that the Greeks will naturally think that Paris is the Trojans' best fighter because he is most beautiful, but, in spite of his beauty, he has no strength or valour (φάντες ἀριστῆα πρόμον ἔμμεναι, οὕνεκα καλὸν / εἶδος ἔπ', ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι βίη οὐδέ τις ἀλκή, 3.44-45). The fact that Nireus and Paris are both beautiful should mean that, like Achilles and Ajax, they are great heroes. Homer asserts that they are not, but in order to make this clear, he must make explicit mention of it, for their beauty would lead automatically to the opposite conclusion. Thus, the heroic ethos of the *Iliad* naturally connects beauty with valour; however, it does allow that beauty can exist without other heroic qualities. When this is the case, a man's beauty can be a source of abuse, for then, instead of confirming heroism, it appears to mock it.

I have argued that Paris as a figure of abuse, in part for his beauty, is part of the Homeric recharacterization of the hero. The *Iliad* shows us that latent within the concept of beauty is the potential for abuse. In the epic tradition as a whole, however, physical beauty is a regular attribute of heroism. Therefore, the story of the beautiful judge of a beauty contest naturally assumes a heroic figure as its subject.

Perhaps another reason for the selection of Paris as judge is provided by his ancestry, for he comes from a family that has extremely close connections and relations with the gods. His grandfather is Laomedon, in

whose service, as we have seen, both Poseidon and Apollo worked. His uncle Tithonus is the immortalized lover of the Dawn; and Anchises is the still mortal lover of Aphrodite. His cousin, Aeneas, is the son of Aphrodite. Another ancestor, Ganymede, is the immortal lover of Zeus. Dardanus, the founder of the Trojan royal dynasty, is the son of Zeus.

In the *Iliad*, Paris' choice of Aphrodite is represented as a foolish one. On one level, he favours a goddess who has no place in a military epic like the *Iliad*. Either Hera or Athena would have been a better choice in this poem. In addition, Homer says explicitly that Paris' choice of Aphrodite ensured the hatred of the other two goddesses, a hatred that will only be appeased by the destruction of the city. In this regard, however, we should remember that any choice would have made enemies of Troy of two goddesses who, no matter which two, would have been instrumental in bringing about the destruction of the city. Thus, it is not in actuality Paris' choice of Aphrodite which brings about the destruction of Troy, but his role as arbitrator between the goddesses, a role which he did not choose.

Dumézil has shown that originally the myth probably portrayed Paris in a more positive light than does Homer's use of it. He sees the Judgement as an example of an Indo-European trifunctional myth in which a mortal is asked to choose between three standard mythological functions which appear in all Indo-European mythological systems. Paris is asked not so much to decide which of the three goddesses is most beautiful, but which of the things they represent is best — sovereignty, valour, or prosperity. Paris chooses

which of three things is best, or, since his choice will alter the rest of his life, what life is the best.[247]

In the *Iliad*, Paris chooses Aphrodite because she offered him a bribe, μαχλοσύνη. Thus, from early on, the notion of gifts or bribes is present, and it may well have been that Homer knew of the other two goddesses also offering gifts that are representative of the givers' specific qualities. In another passage, the opposition of Aphrodite and Athena is described as being one of marriage and war (5.429-430), demonstrating that there is, already in Homer, a close connection between a divinity and his or her sphere of influence. Wathelet notes that the dichotomy between choosing the most beautiful versus the best prize would perhaps not have existed for Homer and the ancient Greeks, "parce qu'il ne s'agit pas de mortelles, mais de déesses, dont l'apparence physique est inséparable de leurs fonctions et de leurs pouvoirs."[248] Thus, choosing a particular goddess is akin to dedicating oneself to her, or choosing for oneself what she stands for. Whether or not Homer and the oral epic tradition knew of explicit offers of gifts to Paris by the three goddesses, the myth itself certainly implies that there is more at stake than physical beauty in the choice of one goddess over others. With such a choice comes the selection of everything that goddess represents and a rejection of what the others represent. The bribes merely make explicit what is already implicit in the myth.

Dumézil defends μαχλοσύνη as an appropriate term to describe Aphrodite's bribe on the grounds that an abstract gift like μαχλοσύνη provides an appropriate contrast with the well-known, though unstated, abstract

---

[247]Dumézil, *Mythe et épopée* 580-586 and *L'Oubli de l'homme* 15-17.
[248]Wathelet, *Dictionnaire des Troyens* 861.

concepts which Athena and Hera would traditionally have offered the prince. On the other hand, if Aphrodite had offered Helen, we would have two abstract bribes juxtaposed with a concrete one. In addition, a pejorative term is chosen because the word denotes the feelings of the goddesses about this gift and constitutes a further insult to the man whom they detest. The three goddesses, and by extension their gifts, represent three ideas which appear throughout Indo-European myth. According to Dumézil, Aphrodite's gift of Helen to Paris, the concrete realization of her offer, symbolizes prosperity. For originally Helen would have been simply the fulfillment of the offer of prosperity, for she represents not so much the most beautiful woman — a frivolous, sensuous choice — but marriage, fertility, and, hence, prosperity — as wise a choice as any.[249]

Dumézil's interpretation of Paris' choice appears contradicted by everything we know about the marriage of Helen and Paris in the *Iliad*, where their union is presented as barren, adulterous, devoid of love and is contrasted to the marriage of Hector and Andromache which is lawful and fertile. But, as with much else to do with Paris in this poem, this appears to be a re-working of traditional material. For Helen seems to have been, outside of the oral epic tradition, a divine figure. She remains in the *Iliad* the daughter of Zeus, that is, the only mortal daughter of Zeus — a status which itself deserves attention, since the gods do not normally produce female offspring in their relations with mortals. Nilsson, Farnell, and Calame, among others, have argued that she is an ancient fertility goddess, closely associated with vegetation and with streams, whose cult was observed

---

[249]Dumézil, *Mythe et épopée* 583.

particularly in Laconia, Rhodes, and Cyprus. In fact, a cult of Helen persisted in Sparta into the Classical period.[250] Clader has studied Helen's epithet systems in the Homeric poems and found that Helen tends to share her epithets not with other mortal women, but with goddesses, particularly the other daughters of Zeus, Athena, Artemis, and Aphrodite. This, she argues, supports the notion that Helen's origins are divine.[251]

As a fertility goddess, myths of abduction and rape logically attached themselves to Helen, as with Persephone. The tale of her abduction as a young girl by Theseus appears to be known to the oral epic tradition.[252] Moreover, though in Homer Helen has only one child, other sources indicate that this may not have been the case outside of the Homeric poems. For the ancients knew of children of Helen by Theseus, Menelaus, and Paris.[253] The

---

[250]Nilsson, *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* 73-76 and *Homer and Mycenae* 252; Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, 323-325; Calame, *Les Chœurs de jeunes filles* I, 335-350 and "Hélène: son culte et l'initiation tribale féminine en Grèce" 489-491; and Backès 12-14.

[251]Clader 41-62.

[252]At *Iliad* 3.143-144 Helen is accompanied by Aethra, the daughter of Pittheus, and mother of Theseus. Kullmann (*Quellen* 248), Ghali-Kahil (19), Huxley (*Greek Epic Poetry* 120), and Gantz (289) argue that Aithra's presence can only be accounted for by the story of Helen's abduction by Theseus and her rescue by the Dioscuri, who took Aithra with them as retribution. Moreover, Pausanias claims the story was mentioned in the *Iliou Persis* (10.25.5) and depicted on the Cypselus chest (5.19.3), which makes it pre-fifth century. The A scholia at *Iliad* 3.242 claim that the story was told by in the Epic Cycle, though where is not specified, and by Alcman (Alcman, fr. 21 PMG and Erbse I, 404); Pausanias says that Alcman and Pindar told the story (1.41.4=Alcman, fr. 21 Davies).

[253]According to Pausanias, Stesichorus claimed that she is the mother of Iphigeneia by Theseus (2.22.6; Stes. 191 PMG); four children by Paris are recorded — Korythos (elsewhere the son of Oenone and Paris), Bounomos (or Bounikos), Idaios, and Aganos (Dictys Cretensis 5.5, Tzetzes' scholia to Lycophron 851; Parthenius 34); three children by unnamed fathers are also mentioned — Aithiolas (Tzetz. Lyk. 851), and Nikostratos and Pleisthenes (*Cypria* 12 Bernabé). Cf. further, Robert, *Griechische Heldensage* 984-985;

(cont.)

choice of Helen, if indeed she was a fertility goddess, would not at all have been fool's choice, as Homer suggests. Rather, when Paris chooses Helen he chooses prosperity.

When Homer mentions the Judgement of Paris, he reminds us that Paris' choice of Aphrodite — an essentially unheroic choice in the *Iliad* — will lead to the destruction of his people. The choice of Paris, especially since it is described by the term μαχλοσύνη, accords with the overall characterization of Paris as the unheroic, cowardly favourite of Aphrodite. However, if we separate the myth from its place in the *Iliad*, this negative portrayal must stay behind. For it is clear that Homer has used the myth to support themes and characterizations important to his poem. The myth itself does not carry with it only the interpretative use Homer makes of it. In other poems with other thematic concerns, it could very easily have been told in a way in which Paris' choice would not have been viewed so negatively.

At the very least, the myth places Paris in the unique position of arbiter of the gods, an honour bestowed upon him because of his place in a family especially honoured by the gods. Moreover, his own surpassing physical beauty made him the most appropriate judge of this particular contest. No matter what choice Paris might have made, a poet could emphasize the alienation of the two goddesses he did not choose and the foolishness of the choice he did make. For any choice involves not only giving up two other

---

Bethe, *Homer* III, 100-101; Clader 74; Ghali-Kahil 34-35; Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry* 134; and Griffin, "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer" 43; and, on Iphigeneia, Gantz 291. These sources are, of course, late and cannot be used to prove that Homer knew of children of Helen other than Hermione; however, they do raise the interesting possibility that the barren marriage of Helen and Paris in the *Iliad* may also be part of the Homeric re-characterization of Paris for which I am arguing.

important qualities, but also setting oneself up in opposition to them. As Dumézil shows, Paris' choice may originally have been a preeminently sensible one. Thus, Paris' choice of Aphrodite does not necessarily mark him as unheroic in the oral epic tradition, even though it does in the *Iliad*. Rather, the myth itself, first and foremost, draws attention to Paris' unique status as arbiter of the gods, a heroic status by any measure.

V. The Death of Achilles

A. Direct References in the *Iliad*

Besides the judgement of the three goddesses and the abduction of Helen, Paris performs one other outstanding feat in the Trojan cycle. He slays Achilles. Given Paris' characterization in the *Iliad*, this is surprising. We expect great heroes to be slain by great heroes. Patroclus kills Sarpedon; Hector kills Patroclus; and Achilles kills Hector. That Paris, who cannot even fight successfully against Menelaus, should be the slayer of Achilles does not follow this pattern. And yet Homer is explicit on this point. The dying Hector says to Achilles that Paris and Apollo will slay Achilles in the Scaean Gates (ἤματι τῷ ὅτε κέν σε Πάρις καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων / ἐσθλὸν ἐόντ' ὀλέσωσιν ἐνὶ Σκαιῇσι πύλῃσιν, 22. 359-360).

Achilles' death is referred to in other passages as well, and these confirm the details set out by Hector. Achilles' immortal horse, Xanthus, prophesies his master's death just before the hero returns to the battlefield: ἀλλὰ σοὶ αὐτῷ / μόρσιμόν ἐστι θεῷ τε καὶ ἀνέρι ἶφι δαμῆναι (19.416-417). Achilles will die through the combined agency of a god and a man. The ghost of Patroclus, too, foretells his friend's death: καὶ δὲ σοὶ αὐτῷ μοῖρα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ, / τείχει ὕπο Τρώων εὐηφενέων ἀπολέσθαι (23.80-81). Achilles will die

beneath the walls of Troy. Achilles himself knows that he will die by the shafts of Apollo, for his immortal mother has told him so: ἥ μ' ἔφατο Τρώων ὑπὸ τείχεϊ θωρηκτάων / λαιψηροῖς ὀλέεσθαι Ἀπόλλωνος βελέεσσιν (21.277-278).

Taken together, these passages tell us that Achilles will be slain by Paris and Apollo, at the Scaean Gates, and by bow and arrow. These three elements, though not all present in any one passage, are nowhere in the poem contradicted. Homer, though he does not narrate it as part of the events of the *Iliad*, is explicit about the circumstances of Achilles' death.[254]

B. Other Literary and Iconographic Evidence

These three elements were probably not unique to Homer. Proclus tells us that, in the *Aethiopis*, Achilles is killed by Paris and Apollo near the walls of Troy (τρεψάμενος δ' Ἀχιλλεὺς τοὺς Τρῶας καὶ εἰς τὴν πόλιν συνεισπεσὼν ὑπὸ Πάριδος ἀναιρεῖται καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος[255]). A fragment of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (212 MW) refers to death at the Scaean Gates which March has argued refers to the death of Achilles.[256] Pindar tells us that Achilles is killed in battle by arrows (ἐν πολέμῳ τόξοις ἀπὸ ψυχὰν λιπών, *Pythian* 3. 101), though, as we shall see, elsewhere he has a rather strange account of who the bowman was.

Representations in Archaic art further confirm these details. The earliest possible depiction of Achilles' death is on a proto-Corinthian lekythos

---

[254]Cf. Burgess, *The Death of Achilles in the Iliad* 98-104 and Erbse, "Betrachtungen über das 5. Buch der Ilias" 173-176.

[255]Bernabé, p. 69, lines 15-16.

[256]March 8-23 and Burgess, *The Death of Achilles in the Iliad* 128-129. Note, however, that Merkelbach and West argue that the passage refers to the death of Patroclus.

from the early seventh century B.C. On it we see a kneeling archer who has just shot an arrow that is headed for a standing warrior's shin. There has been much controversy whether this scene depicts Paris shooting Achilles or Diomedes, or, indeed, whether it depicts a mythological scene at all.[257] Likewise, a proto-Corinthian aryballos of the mid-seventh century may also represent the death of Achilles by Paris' bow and arrow, though this interpretation is far from certain. In the midst of a battle, we see a fallen warrior and a kneeling bowman; however, it cannot be discerned whether the warrior has been killed by the archer's bow and arrow.[258]

From the late sixth century, we have an Attic neck-amphora which depicts Ajax removing Achilles' corpse from the battlefield. On the left-hand side is a warrior in Scythian dress with a quiver at his side who could well be Paris.[259] From the same period, an Etruscan black-figure amphora apparently depicts a duel between Achilles and another warrior. A bowman wearing a Phrygian cap, who may be Paris, comes up from behind and appears to take aim at the lower part of the leg of the warrior closest to him.[260] A lost Chalcidian amphora by the Inscription Painter from the mid-sixth century B.C. depicts a scene immediately after Achilles' death. Positive identifications are possible as most of the figures are named. Ajax kills Glaucus over Achilles' corpse. To the right, fleeing the scene, is Paris, turning to fire an

---

[257]Cf. Kossatz-Deissmann, "Achilleus," *LIMC* #848; Hampe, "Alexandros," *LIMC* #93; Gantz 626; and Burgess, "Achilles' Heel" 227, with bibliography.

[258]Hampe, "Alexandros," *LIMC* #94.

[259]Hampe, "Alexandros," *LIMC* #95.

[260]Hampe, "Alexandros," *LIMC* #97; Gantz 626; and Burgess, "Achilles' Heel" 227.

arrow at Ajax.[261] A mid-sixth century cup after the manner of the Heidelberg Painter may also depict Paris wounding Achilles with bow and arrows. It shows a fight over a fallen warrior struck by two arrows, one in the back and one in the buttock; a third arrow is directed toward his heel. At the handle is an archer with a high pointed oriental cap who may be Paris.[262]

An Attic red-figure kyathos by the Oinophile Painter from the early fifth century shows Achilles having just wounded Memnon; from the right comes a bowman wearing a Phrygian cap and a leopard skin over his shoulders and left arm and aiming his bow, much as Homer describes Paris at *Iliad* 3.17.[263] Finally, an Attic red-figure pelike by the Niobid Painter, also from the early fifth century, shows an archer on the left who has just shot an arrow at a fully armed warrior standing on the right. The arrow is apparently being guided by a figure standing in the middle. The scene probably represents Paris and Apollo together slaying Achilles, just as Hector prophesied they would.[264]

Thus, all the earliest evidence, literary and artistic, is in agreement. Achilles is killed before Troy, frequently at the Scaean Gate, by an arrow. The agent of his death is Paris, frequently aided by Apollo.

Curiously, when we turn to slightly later sources, lyric and tragic poetry, there appears to be some confusion about the agents of Achilles' death, as sometimes Apollo alone is represented, while at other times it is Paris

---

[261]Kossatz-Deissmann, "Achilleus," *LIMC* #850; Hampe, "Alexandros," *LIMC* #90; Gantz 626; and Burgess, "Achilles' Heel" 226-227.

[262]Brijder 427ff., esp. 430-432.

[263]Hampe, "Alexandros," *LIMC* #91.

[264]Hampe, "Alexandros," *LIMC* #92; Gantz 626; and Burgess, "Achilles' Heel" 227-228.

alone. In Pindar (*Paean* 6.75-86), Apollo, in the guise of Paris, kills Achilles himself.[265] In a fragment of Aeschylus, which Gantz believes may be from the third play of the Memnon trilogy and about the death of Achilles, Thetis rebukes Apollo as the god of prophecy for saying that her children would be long-lived and then slaying Achilles.[266] However, the statement that Apollo is the killer of Thetis' child, especially given the dramatic circumstances, does not mean that Apollo acted alone or that Paris played no part.[267] The same can be said of Neoptolemus' words in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* that his father was killed not by a mortal but by the god Apollo (τέθνηκεν, ἀνδρὸς οὐδενός, θεοῦ δ' ὕπο, / τοξευτός, ὡς λέγουσιν, ἐκ Φοίβου δαμείς, 334-335), for, as Gantz says, "the point here is the hero's invincibility under normal circumstances and the god's maliciousness."[268]

Euripides, on the other hand, twice has characters say that it was Paris, with no mention of Apollo's assistance, who killed Achilles. Hecuba, in begging for Polyxena's life, asks Odysseus to sacrifice her on Achilles' pyre, since it was she who bore Paris, the slayer of Achilles (ἐγὼ 'τεκον Πάριν, / ὃς

---

[265]Cf. Gantz 625 and Roussel 369. The scholiast to Pindar, *Pythian* 3.178a says that Achilles was killed by the arrows of Apollo; however, this appears to be simply an explanatory expansion of Pindar's line rather than evidence for an alternative tradition. Compare the scholiast's comment (ἐν τῷ 'Ιλιακῷ πολέμῳ τοῖς 'Απόλλωνος τόξοις ἀπολιπὼν τὴν ψυχήν) with Pindar's words (ἐν πολέμῳ τόξοις ἀπὸ ψυχὰν λιπών, *Pythian* 3. 101). In Hyginus, *Fab*. 107, Apollo also takes the form of Paris and kills Achilles himself.

[266]Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 3, fr. 350. Cf. esp. lines 8-9: αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ κτανὼν / τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἐμόν.

[267]Cf. Gantz 625 and Roussel 369.

[268]Gantz 625. Cf. also Roussel 370. Quintus Smyrnaeus also has Apollo alone kill Achilles (*Posthomerica* 3.61-62). Horace (*Ode* 4.6.3ff.) mentions only Apollo in connection with Achilles' death, though he does not give an account of the actual killing and, therefore, does not explicitly exclude Paris.

παῖδα Θέτιδος ὤλεσεν τόξοις βαλών, *Hecuba* 387-388). Menelaus rebukes Peleus for his kindly treatment of Andromache, saying that, as the sister-in-law of Paris, the killer of Achilles, she deserves no mercy (Πάρις γάρ, ὃς σὸν παῖδ' ἔπεφν' Ἀχιλλέα, / Ἕκτορος ἀδελφὸς ἦν, δάμαρ δ' ἥδ' Ἕκτορος, *Andromache* 655-656). But again, the dramatic circumstances explain the mention of Paris, for in both passages Trojan, and not divine, culpability for Achilles' death is the point at issue. Hecuba stresses that Paris, and indirectly she as his mother, are responsible; while Menelaus argues that Andromache through her connection with Paris is also to blame. In this context, the absence of Apollo as an additional agent of Achilles' death is probably not significant.

The representation of either Apollo or Paris alone as the killer of Achilles in post-Homeric literary and artistic sources does not, in all likelihood, indicate that alternative versions of the death of Achilles existed in the heroic tradition; instead these poets and artists seem to select one agent or the other in accordance with their own narrative or artistic purposes.[269] The most plausible explanation of Homer's insistence on the god and the man working together to slay Achilles is that Paris shot the arrow and Apollo guided it.[270] This is what the Niobid Painter depicts on the Attic red-figure pelike discussed above. Curiously, it is not until Virgil that we find an author who states what Homer seems to imply: Phoebe, graves Troiae semper miserate labores, / Dardana qui Paridis derexti tela manusque / corpus in Aeacidae (*Aen.* 6.56-58).[271]

---

[269]Cf. Burgess, "Achilles' Heel" 235-236.

[270]This is the majority view among scholars; cf. Burgess, "Achilles' Heel" 236, n. 77 for bibliography.

[271]Ovid, likewise, has Apollo guide Paris' shaft against Achilles (*Met.* 12.598-606).

C. Indirect References in the *Iliad*

There are also several passages in the *Iliad* which scholars have argued indirectly prefigure the death of Achilles. As I have already said, the *Iliad* is a chronologically constricted narrative which relates events that encompass only a brief period in the story of the Trojan war. The chronological scope of the story is, however, opened up by symbolically re-enacting within the narrative present events which fall out of the time-frame of the poem. For the most part, the poet employs this technique to recall events from the early years of the Trojan war; however, he also uses it to pre-figure events which occur later in the war. The most striking and frequently anticipated of these is the death of Achilles.

1. The Death of Patroclus

The passage which most certainly looks forward to Achilles' death is the death of Patroclus.[272] Perhaps this is to be expected given the poet's tendency to recast important events in the Trojan war that fall outside the *Iliad* and his explicit use of Patroclus as a substitute for Achilles on the battlefield. The circumstances of Patroclus' death mirror those of Achilles' in quite specific ways. Both men are killed attacking Troy, specifically while driving the Trojans back toward their city. Both men are killed at the walls of Troy. Apollo is instrumental in the death of both men.[273]

---

[272]This notion is now generally accepted in Homeric scholarship. Cf. the discussion of Burgess, *The Death of Achilles in the Iliad* 229-234, esp. 230, n. 120 with extensive bibliography.

[273]For Burgess this last point of comparison is the strongest piece of evidence in proving that Patroclus' death anticipates Achilles': "The fact that

(cont.)

There are, of course, differences in the circumstances of the two heroes' deaths: Patroclus is killed by a spear, Achilles by an arrow; Euphorbus and Hector are the mortal slayers of Patroclus, Paris of Achilles. But, we should not expect Homer to reproduce all the circumstances of one event in another in order to justify an argument that one scene anticipates or recalls another event outside his poem. For traditionally fixed elements in both the Iliadic and the extra-Iliadic event are not endlessly flexible; the event must remain recognizably what it traditionally is. That is to say, the death of Patroclus must function first and foremost as the death of Patroclus, the pivotal event of the *Iliad*. Its anticipation of the death of Achilles is an important *secondary* function. Thus, it may well have been fixed in the oral epic tradition that Hector and Euphorbus are the slayers of Patroclus. Paris, then, could not be substituted, no matter how much stronger that might make the correspondence with Achilles' death. Furthermore, as Burgess points out, Paris could not kill Patroclus, for that would mean that Achilles' anger would have to be directed against Paris — "an unsuitable recipient of it" because Achilles must avenge Patroclus' death.[274] If this meant that Achilles had to kill Paris, this would leave him in the ridiculous position of being deprived of his traditional slayer.

Apollo is involved in the death of Patroclus seems to be certain evidence that this scene imitates the death of Achilles, for the famous participation of the Apollo in the slaying of Achilles is undoubtedly a specific motif that belongs to that hero's story" (*The Death of Achilles in the Iliad* 230-231. Heubeck ("Homeric Studies Today" 12) too makes this claim. Other correspondences between the two deaths exist beyond this specific scene: most notably the roles of Ajax and Odysseus in the difficult rescues of the warriors' bodies; the mourning of Thetis and the Nereids for both men; and the funeral games for both men. Cf. further, Burgess, *The Death of Achilles in the Iliad* 234-241 and 249-252.

[274]Burgess, *The Death of Achilles in the Iliad* 233.

Hugo Mühlestein has argued that Euphorbus serves as a doublet for Paris in his role as one of Patroclus' mortal slayers, thus providing a further correspondence between the deaths of Patroclus and Achilles.[275] His views have generally been accepted by subsequent commentators on this passage.[276] Mühlestein's arguments, however, are far from certain, as they depend largely on correspondences between the two figures that cannot be confirmed from the Homeric poems or be demonstrated to have been part of the oral epic tradition. He maintains that *Euphorbus* is a pastoral name, signifying "mit guter Weide," or "with good pasturage, " and indicates that the character is represented as being a shepherd.[277] This is further confirmed by his being described as a Dardanian (16.807), since Dardanians live on Mt. Ida where shepherds keep their flocks.[278] Moreover, Homer tells us that he surpassed all other men his age in spear-throwing, horsemanship, and swiftness of foot (16.808-809). In addition, he attacks Patroclus from behind (16.806-807). In Book 17, he is killed by Menelaus, at which point the poet draws special attention to the sullying in the dust of Euphorbus' hair and to his beauty in general (50-60).

Mühlestein argues that all of these points correspond to the biography of Paris. Paris was a shepherd on Mt. Ida. He excelled at athletic competitions, as we know from his success in the funeral games in his own

---

[275]Mühlestein, "Euphorbus und der Tod des Patroklos" 78-89, esp. 80-84.

[276]Cf. Janko, *Comm.* IV, 410, 414-415; Edwards, *Comm.* V, 18, 64; and Baldick 81. For a different view on Euphorbus' role, cf. Lowenstam, *The Death of Patroklos* 122-124, who argues that he is like Achilles and, therefore, serves to remind us of Achilles at the moment of Patroclus' death in order to emphasize that the latter dies because he is no Achilles.

[277]Mühlestein 79.

[278]Cf. 2.819ff.; 11.105-106; 20.215ff.; and 21.448-449.

honour. He kills Achilles by attacking him from behind. He is noted for his beauty, and his hair is singled out as one his most comely attributes (3.55). And, Menelaus, according to Mühlestein, hates both Paris and Euphorbus.

To begin with the last of Mühlestein's points, Homer does not say that Menelaus hated Euphorbus, but simply reports that he killed him. This does not warrant an argument of enmity, particularly since Menelaus kills many others in the *Iliad*, including Euphorbus' brother, Hyperenor, at 14.516. Euphorbus is indeed noted for his beauty and his hair is singled out. But, the defilement of beautiful hair in the dust is a favourite motif in the *Iliad*. Hector says that this will happen to Paris (3.55) and it does happen to Hector (22.401).[279] In addition, the assertion that Paris, like Euphorbus, attacked his opponent from behind is untenable. We simply do not know whether such a detail was traditional. It is not reported in Proclus' summary of the *Aethiopis*; nor is it a consistent feature of the iconographic material.[280] When Paris wounds Diomedes, Machaon, and Eurypylus, all with bow and arrow, there is no mention of his doing so from behind.

Most tenuous of all are the parallels which Mühlestein adduces to Paris' early life. For they presume the story of Paris' exposure on Mt. Ida, his life there as a shepherd, and his subsequent recognition by his family at his own funeral games. As we saw above, none of these details can be confirmed as belonging to the oral epic tradition. The story of the Judgement is traditional, but it is just as likely as not that the other details were added either in conformity with or to account for Paris' presence on Mt. Ida when

---

[279]Cf. Fenik, *TBS* 163 for further examples.

[280]Though note that attack from behind is featured on the Etruscan black-figure amphora discussed above. The Attic red-figure vase by the Niobid Painter, also discussed above, is ambiguous in this regard.

Hermes and the goddesses came to him. In no way does the *Iliad* demand these details about Paris' early life, since Trojan princes commonly tend flocks on Mt. Ida.

Moreover, it appears likely that Euphorbus is a traditional character. A plate from Cnidos dating from the late seventh century shows Hector and Menelaus fighting over his corpse. The artist suggests that Menelaus will obtain the fallen warrior's armour. Euphorbus' corpse lies on the side of his opponent Menelaus. The decoration on his shield is similar to that on Menelaus' but altogether different from that on Hector's. In the *Iliad,* Menelaus does not obtain Euphorbus' armour (17.69ff.). Schefold concludes from this that the plate represents an alternative tradition which explains Menelaus' dedication of Euphorbus' shield in the Argive Sanctuary of Hera.[281] If Euphorbus is a traditional figure, the details of his biography at 16.808-811 may be traditionally fixed and not meant to recall similar features in Paris' biography.

Thus, Mühlestein's argument that Euphorbus is a doublet for Paris in the scene of Patroclus' death is by no means conclusive. It depends on details that both men share with other heroes as well — so much so that Lowenstam could argue that Euphorbus is a doublet for Achilles, not Paris[282] — or on details which do not correspond to what we know for certain about the Homeric Paris.

The scene as a whole, however, remains the poem's most powerful anticipation of Achilles' own death. It confirms the role of Apollo therein, as well as the location before the walls of Troy. Moreover, the wider general

---

[281]Schefold 9, 90 and pl. 75.
[282]Cf. n. 276 above.

context in which the scene is placed confirms its function in this regard, most strongly in Patroclus' role as Achilles' substitute on the battlefield. However, we cannot look to this scene for additional confirmation of Paris' role in Achilles' death. For that we must look elsewhere, and, indeed, the poem does provide such confirmation of what Hector and the poet tell us explicitly.

2. The Wounding of Diomedes

In Book 11, Paris wounds Diomedes — a scene which I have already discussed in the previous chapter in a different context and will have occasion to return to again. It has long been thought that Diomedes serves as a substitute for Achilles during the latter's absence from battle and before Patroclus takes on that role in Book 16.[283] Consequently, when he is shot with an arrow in the foot by Paris (11.369-378), many scholars have seen this as an anticipation of Achilles' own death.[284] The similarities are striking, but before a clear-cut association between the two events can be made other factors must be taken into consideration. Fenik has shown that the scene in Book 11 is, in most ways, made up of elements common to other battle scenes.[285] Diomedes is shot while stripping the armour from a fallen enemy. These are the same circumstances under which Agamemnon (11.246), Eurypylus (11.580), and Deïphobus (13.525) are wounded. Paris appears

---

[283]Cf., for example, Erbse, "Betrachtungen über das 5. Buch der Ilias" *passim*; Schoeck 75-80; Nagy, *Best of the Achaeans* 30-31; Mueller 97-98; Kullmann, "Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis" 312-315; and Burgess, "Achilles' Heel" 239, n. 87.

[284]In addition to those mentioned in the previous note, cf. von der Mühll 195-196; Ph. Kakridis 293, n. 1; and Heubeck, *Die homerische Frage* 46.

[285]Fenik, *TBS* 234; cf. also Erbse, "Betrachtungen über das 5. Buch der Ilias" 175-176.

frequently with his bow and is always successful in hitting his target (11.504, 581; 13.660). Most importantly, the scene of Diomedes' wounding by Paris shares a remarkable number of elements with the scene in which he is wounded by Pandarus (5.95 ff.). On both occasions, Diomedes is wounded while fighting successfully. Both Pandarus and Paris use the bow and arrow. Both heroes rejoice, though, in Book 5, Diomedes does not respond, as he does in Book 11. Both times, he withdraws from the fighting; in the earlier scene, Sthenelus extracts the arrow, in the latter, Odysseus does so. Thus, the scene in Book 11 has more in common with the scene in Book 5 than with what we know for certain about the death of Achilles.

The wounding of Diomedes specifically in the foot remains remarkable. No one else in the *Iliad* receives such a wound. Therefore, the poet may well be drawing special attention to this wound, and the reason seems obvious — it mirrors the fatal wound of Achilles in nearly the same location, the heel. Recently, however, Burgess has argued that we do not possess sufficient evidence to support the notion that, in the oral epic tradition, Achilles enjoyed partial invulnerability, that is to say that, for whatever reason, his body was impervious to all attacks except for one vulnerable spot, the heel, to which a wound would prove fatal.[286] Without any evidence to support the claim that Achilles died because of a wound to the heel, the argument that Diomedes' wound in the foot mirrors Achilles'

---

[286]Burgess ("Achilles' Heel" 224-237) argues that a wound to the lower leg was traditional, but not connected with the motif of imperfect invulnerability. This motif, which is realized most fully in the myth of Thetis dipping the infant Achilles in the River Styx, cannot be attested before the Roman era, though it may well go back to Hellenistic times (cf. "Achilles' Heel" 221-222).

death would seem to disintegrate. However, though the story of the fatal heel wound cannot be presumed traditional, Burgess has demonstrated that a lower leg wound of some sort did play a part in Achilles' death. The wound was probably not a fatal wound, as frequently the iconographic evidence shows more than one wound. It probably stems from Achilles' best known traditional characteristic, his swiftness of foot, which would make immobilization a necessary pre-condition of death in battle.

Thus, we are in a position to say that both Achilles and Diomedes suffered lower leg wounds that were inflicted by the arrows of Paris. Where does this leave us with regard to interpreting the wounding of Diomedes by Paris in *Iliad* 11 as an anticipation of Achilles' death at the hands of the same hero? To begin with, we must note that some of the traditional elements in Achilles' death are absent from Paris' wounding of Diomedes, namely the location at or near the Scaean Gates and the presence of Apollo. These elements are both present in the death of Patroclus, where, however, any representation of the agency of Paris is difficult to determine with certainty. Nonetheless, that scene remains the most fully worked out anticipation of Achilles' death, as we would expect given Patroclus' function as Achilles' substitute. The wounding of Diomedes does not suggest the death of Achilles nearly so strongly. However, the suggestion, muted though it may be, remains. Diomedes, the hero who most conspicuously replaces Achilles in his absence, is wounded in roughly the same place, by the same weapon, and by the same attacker.[287] Surely we cannot be accused of over-interpretation to see at least a fleeting anticipation of Achilles' death. As such, the scene

---

[287]Cf. Burgess, "Achilles' Heel" 239-240.

confirms implicitly what is elsewhere stated explicitly: Paris is the slayer of Achilles.

3. The Death of Euchenor

In Book 13, Paris, in anger over the death of his guest-friend, Harpalion, kills Euchenor, the rich son of the Corinthian seer, Polyidos, who had foretold his son's fate to him before he came to Troy. That fate is reminiscent of the fate which Achilles tells us his mother prophesied for him. Both men possess a double fate, that is one in which different lives are available to them, depending on whether or not they choose to participate in the Trojan war.

Thetis has told Achilles that for him the choice is between heroic fame (κλέος) and an early death, on the one hand, and a long life and obscurity, on the other. By being at Troy, Achilles seems to have committed himself to the former destiny; however, his reason for iterating the prophecy is to inform the ambassadors of Agamemnon who sit before him that, not only will he not rejoin the fighting, as they have requested, but he has chosen not to fight at Troy at all but to go home and enjoy a long and ordinary life:

> μήτηρ γάρ τέ μέ φησι θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
> διχθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν θανάτοιο τέλοσδε.
> εἰ μέν κ' αὖθι μένων Τρώων πόλιν ἀμφιμάχωμαι,
> ὤλετο μέν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται·
> εἰ δέ κεν οἴκαδ' ἵκωμι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
> ὤλετό μοι κλέος ἐσθλόν, ἐπὶ δηρὸν δέ μοι αἰὼν
> ἔσσεται, οὐδέ κέ μ' ὦκα τέλος θανάτοιο κιχείη.
> (9. 410-416)

The poet narrates Euchenor's double destiny just before he is killed, thus making clear what his choice has been:

> ἦν δέ τις Εὐχήνωρ, Πολυΐδου μάντιος υἱός,

> ἀφνειός τ' ἀγαθός τε, Κορινθόθι οἰκία ναίων,
> ὅς ῥ' εὖ εἰδὼς κῆρ' ὀλοὴν ἐπὶ νηὸς ἔβαινε·
> πολλάκι γάρ οἱ ἔειπε γέρων ἀγαθὸς Πολύϊδος
> νούσῳ ὑπ' ἀργαλέῃ φθίσθαι οἷς ἐν μεγάροισιν,
> ἢ μετ' Ἀχαιῶν νηυσὶν ὑπὸ Τρώεσσι δαμῆναι·
> τῶ ῥ' ἅμα τ' ἀργαλέην θωὴν ἀλέεινεν Ἀχαιῶν
> νοῦσόν τε στυγερήν, ἵνα μὴ πάθοι ἄλγεα θυμῷ.
> (13.663-670)

That Euchenor possesses a twofold fate involving a choice between an early death and an inglorious one and that he is killed by Paris suggest that he serves as a doublet for Achilles, that his purpose is to remind the audience that Achilles will die at Troy at the hands of Paris after having made a similar choice. Aristarchus certainly thought so, and the majority of modern scholars have agreed.[288]

Fenik, however, has argued that there are factors which militate against a certain conclusion.[289] First of all, we should notice that Achilles' and Euchenor's choices are not exactly the same. The former chooses between an early, glorious death and a long, obscure life; the latter between a short, glorious life and a premature, unheroic death. Moreover, the biographical details which make up the account of Euchenor's death are not unique to him. The sons of priests and seers are a widely represented group in the *Iliad*.[290] Two of these seers are mentioned in connection with their sons' deaths. At 5.148-151, Diomedes kills the sons of the dream interpreter Eurydamas, who failed to foresee his sons' deaths at Troy. At 11.328-334,

---

[288]For Aristarchus, cf. the A scholia at 13. 663 (Erbse III, 526): δισσὰς εἱμαρμένας ὑποτίθεται τοῦ Εὐχήνορος, καθάπερ καὶ ἐπ' Ἀχιλλέως, "διχθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν". Cf. also, Strasburger 75-76; Erbse "Betrachtungen über das 5. Buch der Ilias" 174-175; Michel 103-104; and Janko, *Comm.* III, 127-128.

[289]Fenik, *TBS* 148-150, 235-237.

[290]Cf. 5.9, 76-78, 149; 11.329; and 16.604-605.

Diomedes kills the sons of the prophet Merops, who foresaw his sons' deaths but was unable to prevent them from going to Troy; they, like Achilles and Euchenor, knew what awaited them at Troy and went regardless. Finally, Paris strikes several other warriors with his bow and arrows, warriors who have no connection with Achilles or with Euchenor, such as Machaon and Eurypylus (11.505-507, 581-583). Thus, his biographical details connect Euchenor not only to Achilles but also to other warriors who have little or nothing in common with Achilles. Fenik concludes that "[w]e cannot, therefore, say that the poet was thinking *only* of Achilles when he composed the story of Euchenor."[291] For we must remember that just as there are typical elements that make up type-scenes and battle narrative, so there are motifs which the poet uses in constructing the lives of his characters. This is not to say that all heroic biographies or type-scenes are identical; they clearly are not. But we should remember that within these and other categories certain elements and motifs tend to re-appear and are recognizable as belonging together. Thus, when the poet inserts a biography for a character like Euchenor, who appears only once and may well have been invented exclusively for the place in which he occurs in the narrative, we must consider the possibility that he constructs his biography using one of many endlessly malleable models or outlines available to him.

Fenik is undoubtedly correct in arguing that Homeric compositional techniques argue against an exclusive correlation between Euchenor and Achilles. For all we know, a double destiny of the sort they share may have been common to many other heroes as well. We cannot say that, given his

---

[291]Fenik, *TBS* 150.

knowledge of a tradition about which we are largely ignorant, Homer was thinking *only* of Achilles when he sang of Euchenor. However, in view of the importance of Achilles' fate in the *Iliad*, surely we can say that, when Homer sang of the double fate of another hero who is killed by the same warrior who will kill Achilles, he is thinking *first and foremost* of Achilles. The motif of parents who prophesy their sons' deaths or of warriors who possess a double destiny may be typical and widespread in the tradition; but, in the *Iliad*, they are of great thematic importance, and, therefore, all their appearances warrant attention.

This is especially true in the case of Euchenor. For, although there are, in the *Iliad*, other seers who could potentially alter their sons' destinies, he is the only Greek warrior besides Achilles who possesses a double destiny. Moreover, as Erbse concludes, despite the fact that their choices are not exactly identical, the respect for and valuation of heroic κλέος, like the arrow of Paris, clearly binds Euchenor and Achilles together: "Euchenor steht allerdings nicht vor der Wahl zwischen Ruhmlosigkeit und Ruhm, sondern vor der schlichteren, auch durch praktische Erwägungen erleichterten Entscheidung zwischen schmerzvoller Krankheit und raschem Tod. Aber die Hochachtung des Heldentums hat er doch mit Achilleus gemeinsam, und der Pfeilschuß des Paris bindet beide Schicksale auch äußerlich aneinander."[292]

D. Conclusion

Thus, the evidence, explicit and implicit, from the *Iliad*, supported as it is by later iconographic and literary sources, allows us to say that the oral epic

---

[292]Erbse, "Betrachtungen über das 5. Buch der Ilias" 175.

tradition presented Paris as the slayer of Achilles. This, like so much of Homer's Paris, is curious. Why would Homer have his principal hero, the greatest warrior at Troy, killed by his least heroic character? To say as Pestalozzi, for example, does, that "[e]ine zweite tragische Idee liegt Achills Tod zugrunde: der Starke und Heldenhafte wird vom Schwächeren, je Feigen überwunden" will simply not do.[293] Great heroes in the *Iliad* are not killed by cowards. Such a death is not "tragic," but unheroic. It has no place in a hero's life, and certainly not in the life of the greatest hero. A great hero must be killed by an equally great or even greater one, as the examples of Sarpedon, Patroclus, and Hector attest. Anything else would diminish the hero's κλέος.

At one level, the reason Homer tells us that Paris kills Achilles is simply that the anticipation of Achilles' death is thematically important in the *Iliad* and the identity of his slayer was fixed in the tradition and could not be altered. The incongruity, however, remains between the heroic victim and the cowardly victor. Essentially, this is similar to the contradictory characterizations of Paris in different parts of the poem that I examined in the previous chapter. The unheroic coward we meet in the early books becomes a hero like any other in the latter part of the poem. There, we could merely observe the contradictions. Here, we are in a position to say that the oral epic tradition, in all likelihood, portrayed the slayer of Achilles in a manner in keeping with, not contradictory to, this status. This myth, like Suter's arguments about the double name, and even more so than the story of the Judgement, supports the hypothesis that the poet of the *Iliad* has portrayed the traditionally heroic figure of Paris in a new and unheroic manner, most

---

[293]Pestalozzi 16.

evidently in Books 3 and 6 when the character is in the forefront of the narrative. Thus, perhaps it is not entirely coincidental that the references to Paris as Achilles' slayer never occur in parts of the poem where Paris is presented as anything less than a hero; perhaps the poet himself is being careful not to associate Aphrodite's favourite too closely with Achilles' slayer.

VI. The Death of Paris

For the placement of the death of Paris in the Trojan cycle, we must turn to Proclus' summary of the *Ilias Parva*. According to him, that poem told how Odysseus captured the Trojan seer, Helenus, who then prophesied about the taking of Troy (χρήσαντος περὶ τῆς ἁλώσεως).[294] Unfortunately, Proclus does not divulge the contents of that prophecy. Next, and seemingly in response to the prophecy, Diomedes brings Philoctetes from Lemnos to Troy, where he is healed of his snake-wound by Machaon. Philoctetes fights Paris in single combat and kills him (μονομαχήσας Ἀλεξάνδρῳ κτείνει). Menelaus outrages his corpse, but eventually the Trojans recover and bury it.

Some of these details are confirmed by the *Iliad*. The entry for Philoctetes in the catalogue of ships explains briefly why he is not at Troy. He is suffering from a snake-bite on the island of Lemnos; however, the Achaeans will soon remember him (2. 721-725). Thus, we can say that Homer knew of Philoctetes' late arrival at Troy, although he offers no information about his accomplishments there. Nor is there any mention in the Homeric poems of Paris' death, let alone the circumstances surrounding it.

---

[294]Cf. Bernabé, p. 74, lines 6-9. Note that in the *Iliad* Helenus also possesses prophetic skill (6.76).

Philoctetes' story is not treated again until the fifth century. Pindar tells us that, when Philoctetes fought at Troy, he had not yet been healed of his wound (*Pythian* 1. 50-55). The scholiast explains this odd detail by noting that Hieron, the ode's dedicatee, was suffering from gall stones; therefore, Pindar probably adapted the myth for the sake of the analogy between the hero and his own patron. The scholiast also says that a dithyramb by Bacchylides (fr. 7 SM) contained the story of Philoctetes' late arrival at Troy; he was brought back because Helenus prophesied that Troy could only be taken with the bow of Heracles.[295]

In Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, Neoptolemus tells Philoctetes that he must come to Troy, where he will be cured of his wound and, with the bow's help and Neoptolemus', will sack Troy (1329-1335). Later on, Heracles prophesies that Philoctetes will go to Troy, be cured there, and with Heracles' bow, kill Paris and sack Troy (1421-1430, especially 1425-1428: ἀρετῇ τε πρῶτος ἐκκριθεὶς στρατεύματος, / Πάριν μέν, ὃς τῶνδ' αἴτιος κακῶν ἔφυ, / τόξοισι τοῖς ἐμοῖσι νοσφιεῖς βίου, / πέρσεις τε Τροίαν).[296]

Artistic representations of Philoctetes with the bow of Heracles are rare. The earliest certain one dates from c.460 on an Attic red-figure crater. It depicts Heracles lying dead on the pyre and Philoctetes to the right of him holding Heracles' bow.[297] Roughly contemporary is an Attic red-figure

---

[295]Cf. Gantz 635.

[296]Aeschylus and Euripides also wrote plays about Philoctetes. In Aeschylus, Odysseus alone appears to gave gone to Lemnos; in Euripides, Odysseus and Diomedes go. Helenus also appears to have prophesied in Euripides' version about the bow of Heracles being necessary for the fall of Troy. It is also interesting to note that in Euripides' version a rival Trojan embassy, perhaps led by Paris, came to Lemnos to retrieve him. Cf. Calder 171-179; Webster's edition of the *Philoctetes*, pp. 3-5; and Gantz 635-636.

[297]Pipili, "Philoctetes," *LIMC* #3.

psykter, c.460-450, which shows Heracles reclining on his pyre and handing over his bow and quiver to Philoctetes.[298] An Attic red-figure calyx-crater from c.450 is less securely identified as depicting the same scene. It shows Athena giving a quiver to a warrior standing on her left; on her right is a draped man with a club. The scene has been interpreted as Heracles entrusting his weapons to Philoctetes through the mediating agency of Athena.[299]

Some of the details in Apollodorus' account (*Epit.* 5.8) differ from those of the earlier sources discussed above. He tells us that Calchas, not Helenus, prophesied about the need to retrieve Philoctetes and to bring the bow of Heracles to Troy.[300] Diomedes and Odysseus, not just Diomedes, go to Lemnos. Philoctetes is cured at Troy by Podalirius, not Machaon, and then kills Paris. Apollodorus may be relying on another tradition, for he has Machaon killed by Penthesileia (*Epit.* 5.1); therefore, Machaon cannot cure Philoctetes, since the Amazon's arrival and death at Troy precede Philoctetes' arrival. In the *Ilias Parva,* however, Machaon is killed by Eurypylus, which would leave him alive at the time of Philoctetes' arrival and available as his healer. The role of Podalirius as the healer of Philoctetes may well belong to a version of the story in which Machaon is killed before Philoctetes' arrival.[301] This may also account for the prophecy of Calchas and the different ambassadors who go to Lemnos. In addition, Konon, followed by

[298]Pipili, "Philoctetes," *LIMC* #4.

[299]Pipili, "Philoctetes," *LIMC* #10.

[300]Quintus Smyrnaeus (9.326-332) offers the same account.

[301]Schnebele 48-49. One might also mention that if he is the healer of Philoctetes, Machaon has the satisfaction of curing the man who will kill Paris, by whom he himself had been wounded in the *Iliad*.

Apollodorus, relates that Helenus and Deïphobus both sought to marry Helen after Paris' death.[302] This would mean that Helenus was in Troy at the time of Philoctetes' retrieval and may explain why, in Apollodorus, Calchas delivers the prophecy. If this series of events does represent an alternative version, it was probably not the version treated by the poet of the *Ilias Parva*. For Proclus reports that in that poem Helenus was captured by the Greeks well before Paris' death. This would make his presence in Troy as one of the widowed Helen's suitors unlikely.

In general, later sources agree with Proclus' summary of the *Ilias Parva*. Lycophron (911-915) confirms that Philoctetes killed Paris, with bow and arrow, and Athena guiding the fatal arrow. Tzetzes says that Helenus delivered the prophesy and that Machaon cured Philoctetes who then killed Paris with Heracles' bow. He adds that Paris was wounded three times before he died: first in the left hand, then the right eye, and in the feet (*Posthomerica* 571-595 and the scholia to Lycophron at 911). In Dictys Cretensis (4.19-20), there is a fierce battle around the corpse which is eventually recovered by the Trojans, as in the *Ilias Parva*. Dictys and Hyginus (*Fab.* 112) also have the detail about the three wounds. Dio Chrysostom mentions Philoctetes as the slayer of Paris (*Discourse* 11.117).

Only one possible artistic representation of the death of Paris exists. This is on one of the *Tabulae Iliacae*, probably from the first century of the Common Era. Most scholars believe that the literary sources for these reliefs are the Homeric and Cyclic poems, as well as Stesichorus and Virgil.[303] The

---

[302]Jacoby, *FGrHist* 26 F 1.34 and Apollod. *Epit.* 5.9.

[303]Cf. Sadurska 26-29; Gantz 637; Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry* 105-106; and Fuqua 38, n. 28.

one in question shows scenes from the *Iliad*, the *Iliou Persis*, the *Aethiopis*, as well as five scenes from the *Ilias Parva*. These five scenes comprise the death of Paris, an unidentified scene (perhaps Eurypylus pledging fidelity to Priam), the fight between Eurypylus and Neoptolemus, the theft of the Palladium by Diomedes and Odysseus, and the Trojans bringing into the city the wooden horse. The part of the relief depicting the death of Paris is damaged, but we can see clearly an archer falling backwards with his bow; the part depicting his assailant is missing. But, in the broader context of the tablet, there can be little doubt that the scene represents the death of Paris.[304]

From all this material, we must determine what was known to the oral epic tradition. Though it is tempting to utilize the material of later sources, especially given the limited nature of the early material, this material must be set aside if its contents cannot be corroborated by evidence from the early epic or iconographic traditions. Once this is done, we can say with certainty that the oral epic tradition knew of the late arrival of Philoctetes at Troy, that he was part of the original expedition but had been left behind on Lemnos because of a wound inflicted by a snake. This much Homer tells us. We can also say with relative certainty, based on Proclus' summary of the *Ilias Parva*, that Philoctetes was brought back to Troy as a result of a prophecy by Helenus, and that, upon his return, he was healed of his wound by Machaon and killed Paris in single combat. After a fierce battle, the Trojans recovered Paris' corpse. Iconographic evidence does not expand upon these few details; and further literary evidence does not exist until the fifth century.

---

[304]Cf. Sadurska 27-28; Pipili, "Philoctetes," *LIMC* #78; and Gantz 637. For an illustration, cf. Kossatz-Deissmann, "Achilleus," *LIMC* #543. In addition, Paris and Philoctetes are depicted shooting at each other on an Etruscan urn from the second century B.C. (cf. Pipili, "Philoctetes," *LIMC* #77).

As a result, we are not in a position to say what role, if any, the bow of Heracles played in the tradition about the sack of Troy, for there is no mention in Homer or in Proclus' summary of Philoctetes being in possession of the bow. No connection between the bow of Heracles and the fall of Troy is attested before the fifth century. Moreover, we should note that we cannot even be certain that the oral tradition knew of Philoctetes as the inheritor of Heracles' bow, for this too is not attested before the fifth century.

It would be tempting to connect the unelaborated prophecy of Helenus in Proclus' summary of the *Ilias Parva* with the events of Sophocles' play, to propose that the latter depends upon Helenus having prophesied that Heracles' bow is necessary for the sack of Troy. One could then argue that the story of Heracles' bow being necessary for the taking of Troy is traditional, since we know that Helenus' prophecy was recounted in the *Ilias Parva*. This appears to be what Kullmann believes, for he argues that, in the oral epic tradition, Troy could not be taken so long as Paris remained alive to defend it, and that only this can adequately explain why Philoctetes and Heracles' bow had to be brought to Troy.[305] This argument, however, depends upon two details which cannot be proven to have been part of the oral epic tradition. As I have said, we cannot say with certainty that Philoctetes traditionally possessed Heracles' bow. Nor can we even say that Philoctetes killed Paris using a bow and arrow. Proclus' summary says that the two men fought a duel. The word he uses, μονομαχήσας, implies a duel with spears and swords, as in the duels in Books 3 and 7 of the *Iliad*, not with bows and arrows.[306]

---

[305]Kullmann, *Quellen* 43-44; cf. also van der Valk, "Ajax and Diomede in the Iliad" 272.

[306]Dictys Cretensis (4.19) and Quintus Smyrnaeus (10.230 ff.) recount that Paris and Philoctetes fought a duel with bows and arrows. This detail

(cont.)

All we can say for certain is that the available evidence about the circumstances surrounding the death of Paris shows that his death was an important incident in the final stages of the Trojan war, that it was the culmination of a long series of events that began with a prophecy by his brother and required the retrieval of a long-forgotten warrior. In the *Ilias Parva*, further importance was attached to the event by isolating it from the general combat and presenting it as part of a duel, and then by narrating the battle over the corpse. Perhaps the importance of the event would have been further underlined in the tradition by the fact that Paris is the last Trojan warrior of any significance, with the possible exception of Aeneas, still alive at this stage in the war. All in all, the traditional story of his death, even from what little we know about it with certainty, points, like the story of the Judgement, to Paris' general importance in the oral tradition. Moreover, like the story of Achilles' death, it points to his prominence as a warrior fighting in the defense of Troy.

VII. Conclusion

Taken together, these three myths — the judgement of the three goddesses, the death of Achilles, and Paris' own death — the only ones which

---

may well be late, as no other duel with bows and arrows is attested in Greek myth or literature. Gantz (459) thinks that the two men would have fought in hand to hand combat in the *Ilias Parva*. The only piece of evidence which might support the notion of a duel with bows and arrows is the depiction of Paris' death on the *Tabula Iliaca* discussed above, for it shows an archer falling backwards. But to use this as evidence we must assume that the artist's source was the *Ilias Parva*, that the scene does depict Paris' death, and that the missing assailant is the archer Philoctetes — all of which are tenuous assumptions.

can be securely ascribed to the oral epic tradition, require a hero very different from the one we meet in the opening scenes of *Iliad* 3. For these myths require a heroic figure at their centre not much different from the other heroes of Trojan cycle. They require a figure of noble birth, of great physical beauty, and capable of notable achievements on the battlefield. All of these elements are, of course, present in Homer's Paris, even if the last of these is there only grudgingly. In Homer, however, we see that these heroic qualities are undermined by an indifferent and sometimes cowardly attitude to his role as a warrior in Books 3 and 6. Homer's Paris is characterized as having no regard for κλέος or for αἰδώς, as Helen in fact says of him (6.350-353). His priorities appear to be the physical pleasures of the realm of Aphrodite, as the final glimpse of him at the end of Book 3 suggests.

Nothing in the traditional stories about Paris that we have examined here excludes a figure who prefers erotic pleasure to military achievement. On the contrary, Paris' traditional association with Aphrodite would obviously lend itself well to such a portrayal. However, the seemingly disparate characterizations of Paris in different parts of the *Iliad*, coupled with Suter's conclusions about the double name of the hero and with what can securely be said of him as a traditional figure, suggest that the anti-heroic, erotic figure is Homer's creation. In the tradition from which Homer took him, Paris appears to have been a heroic figure who had much in common with the other heroes of that tradition, instead of one who was essentially their opposite.

Chapter 3: Arming Scenes

I. Introduction

Book 3 of the *Iliad* opens with the Greek and Trojan armies advancing against one another. The poem's first day of fighting is about to begin. Then, rather unexpectedly, Paris steps forward from the Trojan battle lines and challenges anyone of the Greeks to a formal duel, and Menelaus accepts. The duel is meant to bring the war to a quick end, as the winner will obtain Helen and her possessions and the two sides will make peace.

The duel between Paris and Menelaus is the focal point of Book 3, as the poet sings of the preparations for the duel, the duel itself, and its immediate aftermath. In this chapter, I will examine one important narrative sequence in the preparation for the duel. This is the arming scene of Paris which precedes the contest with Menelaus. As arming scenes are one of many different kinds of type-scenes in the *Iliad*, I will begin with a discussion of the nature and purpose of type-scenes in general. From there, I will move on to the type-scene of arming, its structural features and its purpose both in the oral epic tradition and in the *Iliad*. This will involve an examination of the other Homeric arming scenes, which will provide a basis of comparison with the arming scene of Paris. From this body of evidence, I hope to draw conclusions about the way in which Homer uses arming scenes both as traditional stock material of oral epic and as material which he has adapted to serve themes, imagery, and characterization which are probably unique to his poem. This combination of the traditional, or inherent, meaning of a type-scene and the meaning which the poet can confer on the

same scene will be examined in the arming scenes of Agamemnon, Achilles, Patroclus, and, finally, Paris.

A. Type-Scenes

Any discussion of type-scenes must begin with Walter Arend's 1933 work *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer* in which Arend studied the structure of scenes depicting arrivals, journeys by land and by sea, sacrifices, assemblies, and the donning of armour and clothing, among others. He noted that such scenes were built up around a more or less fixed sequence of elements. He then meticulously outlined this sequence for a variety of different type-scenes and went on to show how, in many cases, the type-scene was adapted to the narrative situation of the moment, most frequently by means of elaboration of one or more of the regularly present elements of the scene.[307]

Arend's work was done before Parry's research on the oral formulaic nature of the Homeric poems was disseminated in Germany. Parry, in a largely appreciative review of Arend's work, points out that the fixed sequence of elements in type-scenes is something which the poet would have learned from his tradition, in much the same way that he learned the many noun-epithet combinations which form the basis of his poetic diction.[308]

---

[307]For a fuller discussion of the importance of Arend's work, cf. Edwards, *Comm.* V, 11 and "Homer and Oral Tradition" 290; and Patzer 26-27. In the same year that *Die typischen Scenen* appeared, George Calhoun published a short article ("Homeric Repetitions" 1-25) in which he examined repeated scenes, such as arming, in the *Iliad*, their structure and the way they were adapted to the specific narrative moment.

[308]*MHV* 404-407, originally published as "On Typical Scenes in Homer," *CP* (1936): 357-60. Cf. Shannon 20-21 for a discussion of Parry's views of Arend's work.

Parry himself, in his unfinished work *Cor Huso*, turned his attention to type-scenes, which he called "themes," and which he came to regard as probably the most important of the oral poet's compositional tools.[309] Lord studied the type-scene, or theme, at considerable length, demonstrating that in Serbo-Croatian oral epic it is one of the principal tools of composition, inasmuch as it allows the singer to work with a fairly large unit of narrative that is schematized in its basic structure but flexible enough with regard to the development of this structure to allow for its adaptation to a variety of stories.[310]

Fenik was the first to apply Arend's and Lord's work on type-scenes to the Homeric poems in any detailed kind of way. In *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad*, he examined the poet's use of and dependence on recurrent details, scenes, and narrative patterns in the composition of battle scenes. He was

---

[309]*MHV* 451-452 and xli-xliii. As Adam Parry states in the introduction to *MHV*, "[t]he principle change in Parry's work ... in the last year of his life is the emphasis on the *theme* in oral poetry at the expense of the *formula*" (*MHV* xli). Lord also uses "theme" to designate what is more generally referred to as "type-scene." Early in his career, he defined the theme as "a subject unit, a group of ideas, regularly employed by a singer, not merely in any given poem, but in the poetry as a whole" ("Homer and Huso" 440). This definition can take in a larger number of oral poetic features than just the type-scene, and, at times, Lord uses "theme" to refer to narrative units which subsequent scholars would define as elements of story pattern (cf. Edwards, "Homer and Oral Tradition" 291-292). Most frequently, however, it is clear that he uses "theme" to mean "type-scene." He later made the equation explicit: "the theme can be defined as a recurrent element of narration or description in traditional oral poetry. It is not restricted, as is the formula, by metrical considerations, hence, it should not be limited to exact word-for-word repetition. It is approximately what Arend has called 'die typischen Scenen' in his work on Homer" ("Composition by Theme" 73; cf. also Foley, "The Oral Theory in Context" 34-36 and *Oral Formulaic Theory* 33-34).

[310]Lord, *ST* 68-98. Lord also offers a more limited discussion of themes such as "the assembly" and "the donning of armour" in the Homeric poems (pp. 89-91, 145-148, 158-164).

able to demonstrate that "almost all the *Iliad*'s battle narrative consists of an extensive, but limited store of 'typical' or repeated details and action sequences which undergo numerous and repeated combinations" and that the "poet put together his battle descriptions in much the same way as he constructed his verses and sentences, namely out of smaller, relatively unchanging 'building blocks' — phrase and sentence formula at one level, typical descriptive details and action sequences at another."[311]

From the work of such scholars, it is possible to define the Homeric type-scene as "a recurrent block of narrative with an identifiable structure, such as a sacrifice, the reception of a guest, the launching or beaching of a ship, the donning of armor."[312] What is of primary importance here is that the type-scene can be identified by its structure, by a number of narrative elements in a more or less regular sequence. Sufficient flexibility, however, exists in the application of these elements to allow the poet to fit a specific instantiation of a type-scene to the immediate demands of the narrative. To this end, he may omit some elements altogether, while amplifying others in considerable detail.[313] For example, it is rare to find two instances of the same

---

[311]Fenik, *TBS* "Summary of Contents" (no page number). Cf. also Patzer's discussion of Fenik, particularly his application of Arend's work on type-scenes to the *Iliad*'s battle narratives (p. 27).

[312]Edwards, "Homer and Oral Tradition" 285. Edwards' article is particularly useful, for he provides an extensive annotated bibliography on the Homeric type-scene in general, as well as various specific type-scenes.

[313]Tilman Krischer examined this phenomenon in the large-scale *aristeiai* of the *Iliad* (*Formale Konventionen*, 23-36). He demonstrated that certain structural elements, of which the arming scene is one, are regularly present in an *aristeia* and that these elements tend to occur in a regular sequence; however, one or more of these elements may be absent in a pariticular *aristeia*. For example, the *aristeiai* of Diomedes and Hector have no arming scenes. Nonetheless, the presence of other elements enables the audience to identify these narrative sequences as *aristeiai*.

type-scene in close proximity to one another, even though, at times, a fairly small section of narrative may require more than one application of the action sequence contained in a particular type-scene. To avoid redundancy, the poet will relate an attenuated version of the type-scene or even reduce it to a single verse, as at the end of Paris' arming scene, when Menelaus arms in just one line.[314]

More important, however, for the following discussion of the *Iliad*'s arming scenes, is the way in which the poet uses the principle of amplification or elaboration in order to fit a type-scene to his narrative needs.[315] As Shannon comments, "in the case of Homer, we find elaboration and variation used with scrupulous selectivity in sets of typical scenes which range from unelaborated narratives of action to descriptions so fully elaborated that they digress completely from the action — all composed on the same basic pattern but selectively adapted by the poet to their contexts."[316] The poet can take any one of the regular elements in a type-scene and develop it at greater length, as we shall see particularly in the case of Agamemnon's arming scene. Often this technique allows the poet to focus the audience's attention on a particular character, image, or theme. As Edwards says, "the major means of giving dignity, color, and emotional impact to the narrative is by controlled elaboration of details of the type-scenes, by skillful selection of the amount of elaboration in a particular instance and of its nature and

---

[314]Arend 72, 79 and Edwards, "*Topos* and Transformation" 50.

[315]On elaboration of traditional elements of type-scenes in general, cf. Armstrong 342; Danek 205; Edwards, "Convention and Individuality" 2-3, "*Topos* and Transformation" 47-49, *HPI* 71-77, *Comm.* V, 200, "Homer and Oral Tradition" 287-288; Hainsworth, *Comm.* III, 216; and Reece 193.

[316]Shannon 21.

relevance to the situation."[317] In narratological terms, this is "a slowing down, a deceleration, of time,"[318] the purpose of which is to focus the audience's attention on a moment in the story which the poet wishes to stress.

Deceleration is a feature of Homeric narrative in general, as the scholiasts themselves were aware. They refer to the phenomenon as αὔξησις, by which they seem to mean "the art of making something seem more significant."[319] This includes a wide variety of techniques such as the use of similes or the expansion of a narrative pattern.[320] Furthermore, Austin argues that elaboration is perhaps the fundamental principle which underlies the poet's handling of digressions, for the length of a digression establishes the speaker's claim to be heard and lends authority to his advice or his warning by the appeal to precedent.[321] The same principle operates in battle narrative. For example, Book 17 is entirely devoted to the fight over Patroclus' corpse, "for the duration of the battle reflects the importance of the

---

[317]Edwards, "Convention and Individuality" 1.

[318]Edwards, "*Topos* and Transformation" 47.

[319]Richardson, "Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia" 276.

[320]Richardson, "Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia" 276: "In general, the expansion of standard themes and the addition of details adds to the importance of what is being described. Thus divine assemblies, 'typical scenes' such as those of arming, invocation of the Muses, an accumulation of similes and other devices can be used to signal a major episode, whilst details of wounds or a hero's background are used to draw specific attention to a character or scene in the midst of battle."

[321]Austin, "The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad*" 306: "It is a surprising fact in Homer that where the drama is most intense the digressions are the longest and the details the fullest. In paradigmatic digressions the length of the anecdote is in direct proportion to the necessity for persuasion at the moment. The more urgent the situation, the more expansive the speech and its illustrative paradigm."

person over whom the fighting is taking place."[322] Again, we shall see that Homer uses this principle extensively in the *Iliad*'s various arming scenes.

These two principles, elaboration and the avoidance of repetition of the same type-scene in close proximity, indicate that there is no standard model, no *Grundform*, of any type-scene. As we shall, type-scenes can vary dramatically in both structure and content. At *Iliad* 11.16ff., Agamemnon arms in thirty verses, while Ajax in Book 7 arms in just one line (7.206). Nagler argues that such diversity exists because the type-scene is fundamentally an abstract idea which only takes on a fixed form when the poet introduces it into his song:

> [I]t also seems clear that a type scene is not essentially a fixed sequence ..., nor even a fixed pattern for the progressive selection of fixed or variable elements ..., but an inherited pre-verbal Gestalt for the spontaneous generation of a 'family' of meaningful details. An absence of variation in the realization of such a pattern, as with the phrases or the narrative details themselves, need not mean that the pattern could never be different or that it was fixed in the poet's mind in the form in which we know it from the texts. In practice, therefore, not only are no two passages normally the same *verbatim*, they need not be of a pattern (an identical sequence of elements) in order to be recognized as the same motif.[323]

---

[322]Fenik, *TBS* 159.

[323]Nagler, *S&T* 81-82. Cf. also Lord, *ST* 94: "The theme in oral poetry exists at one and the same time in and for itself and for the whole song. This can be said both for the theme in general and also for any individual singer's forms of it. His task is to adapt and adjust it to the particular song that he is re-creating. It does not have a single 'pure' form either for the individual singer or for the tradition as a whole. Its form is ever changing in the singer's mind, because the theme is in reality protean; in the singer's mind it has many shapes, all the forms in which he has ever sung it ... . It is not a static entity, but a living, changing, adaptable artistic creation."

Nagler introduced the concept of the pre-verbal *Gestalt* as a means of understanding how the oral poet selects, both consciously and unconsciously, specific formulae. He was particularly interested in groups of phrases which the poet employed in a formulaic manner, at the level of metre, but not at the level of signification.[324] For example, the word κρήδεμνον, though having one etymological sense, "top-, or head-binder," is used with at least three different meanings: veil, battlement, and stopper or seal.[325] Regardless of meaning, however, the various κρήδεμνον word groupings, or allomorphs (to use Nagler's term), are consistently used under the same metrical conditions. This disparity between the lexical and metrical use of identical word groupings led Nagler to reject the notion that the *Grundform* of any given allomorph in such a group could be any other existing phrase. Instead, he postulated that all these allomorphs are realizations of "some central Gestalt ... which is the real mental template underlying the production of all such phrases. The Gestalt itself ... would seem to exist on a pre-verbal level of the poet's mind, since we have found it impossible to define other than as a comprehensive list of all the allomorphs which happen to exist in the recorded corpus."[326] Because the *Gestalt* is pre-verbal, it is undifferentiated into any of its possible representations; therefore, the poet cannot be said to

---

[324]When referring to "a formulaic manner," I, of course, have in mind Parry's classic definition of the formula as "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea" (*MHV* 272). Cf. Austin, *Archery at the Dark of the Moon* 13-23 for a useful summary of Parry's work on the formula. Adam Parry (*MHV*, xli-lxii [introduction]) and Foley ("The Oral Theory in Context" 60-79) survey work on the formula since Parry.

[325]Nagler, "Generative View" 279-280.

[326]Nagler, "Generative View" 281.

adapt or change it.[327] Nagler notes that rhythmical and phonetic patterns, as well as syntax, can be observed in a given *Gestalt*, but that not all such parameters need be present in a specific allomorph. What one must look for is the "poetic meaningfulness [which] inheres in the preverbal Gestalt."[328] The κρήδεμνον groupings, for example, are unified as one such preverbal *Gestalt* by the inherent idea of "chastity," literally applied when it signifies "veil," and metaphorically when used to mean "battlement" or "stopper."[329]

More recently, Foley has taken the idea of inherent poetic meaningfulness and applied it to oral traditional elements other than the formula, namely to story patterns and type-scenes. He argues that, just as the poet creates his song by putting together traditional units such as formulae and type-scenes, he also generates meaning in his poetry in a traditional way:

> If traditional phraseology and narrative are conventional in structure, then they must also be conventional in their modes of generating meaning. That is, at least part of the answer to the question of "how" these elements function is "in the same way each time." There will of course be room for the individual poet to contribute to the negotiation of meaning, the relative importance of that

---

[327]Nagler, "Generative View" 285-286.

[328]Nagler, "Generative View" 296.

[329]Nagler, "Generative View" 298-307. Cf. Shannon 31-86 for a similar study of the inherent meaning in a particular formula group. He examines μελίη, the ash-tree or ash-spear and its derivatives, μείλινος and ἐϋμμελίης. Shannon associates the ash-spear with the origin of the human race, its mortality, and with fire. He then demonstrates how Homer uses these inherent associations in a thematically organized manner, specifically around the ash-spear which Achilles received from Peleus and which he uses to kill Hector. He concludes that "[t]he use of μελίη, μείλινος, and ἐϋμμελίης offers an example of the extent to which an oral poet, using his inherited tradition proficiently, was able to perceive, organize, and regulate narrative details in order to achieve a desired thematic effect, even in an epic of the size and scope of the *Iliad*" (86).

> contribution depending on factors such as the idiosyncrasies of each tradition, genre, and text. But by and large the referential function of traditional units will remain consistent everything else being equal.[330]

Traditional oral compositional units are imbued with traditional, immanent meaning. This means that the audience of an oral poem must constantly reach beyond the poem it is hearing performed to the larger tradition from which the poem was generated in order to understand and interpret what it is hearing. This "extratextual dimension [is] uniquely the domain of oral traditional art" and is encapsulated by Foley in the rhetorical figure of metonymy.[331] Each traditional element in an oral poem is meaningful only once it has been re-connected with the traditional *Gestalt* from which it originated. Foley calls this feature of oral poetry "traditional referentiality."[332]

---

[330]Foley, *IA* 6. Lord also observed the same phenomenon: "Each theme, small or large — one might even say, each formula — has around it an aura of meaning which has been put there by all the contexts in which it has occurred in the past. It is the meaning that has been given it by the tradition in its creativeness" (*ST* 148).

[331]Foley, *IA* 7. For Foley, metonymy is coincident with "a situation in which a text or version is enriched by an unspoken context that dwarfs the textual artifact, in which the experience is filled out — and made traditional — by what the conventionality attracts to itself from that context" (*IA* 7-8). Cf. also *IA* 29: "Homeric diction is not 'literary' in its powers of inherent signification; embedded in the idiomatic fabric are metonymic meanings derivable only from the extrasituational, finally extratextual context."

[332]Foley, *IA* 6-8. Once again, Lord also observed both the poet's and the audience's dependence on the larger tradition in order to understand the individual song: "To any given poet at any given time, meaning involves all the occasions on which he has used the theme, especially those contexts in which he uses it most frequently; it involves also all the occasions on which he has heard it used by others .... To the audience the meaning of the theme involves its own experience of it as well. The communication of this supra-meaning is possible because of the community of experience of poet and audience" (*ST* 148). Cf. also p. 94: "In a traditional poem, therefore, there is a

(cont.)

Perhaps most important for the following discussion of the type-scene of arming is Foley's assertion that the inherent or immanent meaning of any oral traditional element is fixed both in the tradition and in any specific textual realization of a traditional element. It must be, or the audience of a traditional song would be unable to interpret what it is hearing:

> Though all structures in oral tradition are to one degree or another multiform, the relation between multiform structures and their meanings is fixed; while the superficial demands of the narrative may add situation specific details, the core meaning of these metonyms is inherent, not conferred. The ability to (re-)instill what may appear, from a literary perspective, to be repetitive, mechanical structures with the referentiality they command under the aegis of tradition allows an audience to respond faithfully to the signals encoded in the text and thus to assist in fashioning an aesthetically coherent work.[333]

For example, the type-scene of feasting, whether it appears in a more developed form, as at the beginning of *Odyssey* 3, or, as happens more frequently, in an attenuated form, will always be interpreted by Homer's audience as "a celebration of community, an affirmation of comity and hospitality near the center of the Homeric world."[334] The traditional poet is then free to adapt the "traditional referentiality" inherent in the scene to his immediate narrative, as we see in *Odyssey* 1 when Telemachus and Athena eat together as the suitors continue to abuse the hospitality of Odysseus' household. "In this case Homer's representation of the severity of the [suitors'] insult depends directly on realizing not only how boorishly the

---

pull in two directions: one is toward the song being sung and the other is toward the previous uses of the same theme."

[333]Foley, *IA* 47.

[334]Foley, *IA* 34.

suitors are behaving but also how starkly that behavior contrasts with the values metonymically embodied in the conventionality of the Feast theme."[335]

In summary, the type-scene is one of the fundamental building blocks of an oral traditional poem. It appears as a recurring block of narrative with an identifiable, but fluid, structure which the poet can amplify or abbreviate to suit his narrative requirements. In the type-scene, therefore, the poet can develop his unique version of the traditional story he is singing, for it is flexible enough to allow for the presence of the poet's own themes, images, and characterization. At the same time, however, the type-scene exists separately from any particular realization of it. It exists in the oral tradition as an abstract notion, as a thought pattern. This extra-textual existence necessarily implies that a fixed meaning inheres within the type-scene. It is this immanent meaning which the poet requires and summons each time he re-creates a type-scene.

B. Arming Scenes

That descriptions of armour should find a place in epic poetry is not surprising, since the epic genre frequently deals with the careers of men whose reputations are established and maintained on the battlefield. As Fenik says, "there can be scarcely any doubt that splendid armour was a popular theme in all epic poetry."[336] Homer often describes the beauty and

---

[335]Foley, *IA* 35. Cf. also Edwards, "Type-Scenes and Homeric Hospitality" 51-72 and Tsagarakis, "Oral Composition" 23-48.

[336]Fenik, *TBS* 78. Cf. Arend 92; Patzer, 28, 34-35; Krischer, *Formale Konventionen* 23; Shannon 26; Thornton 101; Edwards, "*Topos* and Transformation" 50; Bannert, *Formen des Wiederholens* 13-14; Danek 205;

(cont.)

magnificence of a particular hero's armour.[337] On the battlefield, warriors risk their lives in the effort to strip the armour from the corpse of a fallen enemy, for this is the warrior's pre-eminent trophy. Armour in the *Iliad* represents nothing less than the achievements and reputation of the hero. Descriptions of armour, therefore, are never decorative embellishments; their purpose is to honour the hero associated with the armour in question.

The most highly developed type of description of armour is the arming scene, which Fenik describes a "a typical scene par excellence ... where identical actions are described in exactly or almost exactly the same words."[338] As one would expect, no two type-scenes of arming are identical. Their general structure, however, is consistent; the heroes all put on or take up the same pieces of armour and do so in the same order. The scene is always introduced by a verse announcing that the hero is about to arm.[339] He then puts on his armour always in the same order: greaves first, followed by

---

Fehling 16-17; and Hainsworth, *Comm.* III, 215-217. Cf. also Lord, *ST 86-89,* who shows that arming scenes continue to serve this fuction in Serbo-Croatian epics.

[337]In addition to the four arming scenes to be discussed below and the description of Achilles' shield in Book 18, the *Iliad* contains descriptions of the armour of Sarpedon (12.294ff.), the shield of Ajax (7.219ff.), and the bow of Pandarus (4.104ff.). Homer also takes note of the fantastic armour of Peleus (17.194), Areithoös (7.136), Idomeneus (12.241), and of Nestor and Diomedes (8.191). Cf. Calhoun 12, n. 36 and Fenik, *TBS* 78.

[338]Fenik, *TBS* 191.

[339]On the announcement verse, or *Ankündigungsvers*, cf. Arend 93 and Bannert, *Formen des Wiederholens* 12. Compare the following verses which announce the four arming scenes in the *Iliad*:

3.328: αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν ἐδύσετο τεύχεα καλά.

11.16: ἐν δ' αὐτὸς ἐδύσετο νώροπα χαλκόν.

16.130: Πάτροκλος δὲ κορύσσετο νώροπι χαλκῷ.

19.364: ἐν δὲ μέσοισι κορύσσετο δῖος 'Αχιλλεύς.

breastplate, sword, shield, and helmet. Then the hero picks up one or two spears and enters the fighting. The differences between the *Iliad*'s four arming scenes arise from the degree of elaboration of these standard elements.[340]

The description of the greaves with which all the arming scenes begin is the same in all four cases:

> κνημῖδας μὲν πρῶτα περὶ κνήμῃσιν ἔθηκε
> καλάς, ἀργυρέοισιν ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρυίας·
> (3.330-331=11.17-18=
> 16.131-132=19.369-370)[341]

The basic corselet verse is also identical in all four cases: δεύτερον αὖ θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσιν ἔδυνε (3.332=11.19=16.133=19.371).[342] In three cases, the description of the corselet continues, with the next verse indicating its provenance.[343] For Paris and Patroclus, this is accomplished in one line. The poet then moves on to the next item in the arming sequence. Agamemnon's breastplate, however, is described over ten lines in which we learn from whom the hero obtained it, from what it is made, and how it is decorated.

---

[340]For a comparative analysis of the structure of the four arming scenes, cf. Kirk, *Comm.* I, 313-314; Thornton 101; Shannon 24; Willcock, "The Search for the Poet Homer" 5-6.

[341]The *Aspis* contains an arming scene (for Heracles) in which "many of the same verses [as found in the Homeric versions] recur, despite two centuries' evolution of the oral tradition" (Janko, *Comm.* IV, 333). Heracles' arming scene also begins with a two line description of the greaves, though it differs from what we see in the *Iliad*:

> Ὣς εἰπὼν κνημῖδας ὀρειχάλκοιο φαεινοῦ
> Ἡφαίστου κλυτὰ δῶρα, περὶ κνήμῃσιν ἔθηκε.
> (*Aspis* 122-123)

[342]At *Aspis* 124, following directly upon the description of the greaves, we find the identical verse, introducing the breastplate.

[343]In the *Aspis*, we learn that Heracles received his breastplate from Athena when he first set off on his labours (125-127).

Achilles' breastplate is not elaborated because this would be inappropriate as most of Book 18 was devoted to the provenance of this armour; we know very well from where it came.

Paris and Patroclus share identical verses, with no elaboration, for their swords and shields:

> ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὤμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον
> χάλκεον, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε.
> (3.334-335=16.135-136)

Achilles also shares these two verses (19.372-373), but the poet then describes in a simile how brightly his shield shines. Agamemnon's sword is introduced at 11.29 in the same way as are the others', albeit with a different line-ending after the bucolic diaeresis. Over the next eleven verses, the composition and decoration of both the sword and shield are described.

Paris and Patroclus share the same two verses for the helmet:

> κρατὶ δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμῳ κυνέην εὔτυκτον ἔθηκε
> ἵππουριν· δεινὸν δὲ λόφος καθύπερθεν ἔνευεν.
> (3.336-337=16.137-138)

The poet varies the first verse in Agamemnon's case, making his helmet a superior object (cf. ἀμφίφαλον and τετραφάληρον, 11.41), but the second verse is the same as in Books 3 and 16. Achilles' helmet is a τρυφάλεια. Its brightness is also emphasized in a simile of four lines (19.380-383).

Paris takes one spear, described in a single verse (3.338). Achilles too takes one spear which he removes from his spear case in a unique verse (19.387). The poet then elaborates on the spear in four more lines. Patroclus and Agamemnon both pick up two spears. The verses are introduced in the same way, εἵλετο δ' ἄλκιμα δοῦρε, but completed differently (11.43-44, 16.139).

The four arming scenes in the *Iliad* all begin with the same three lines and share other lines and phrases throughout. No two of the arming scenes

are exactly the same, just as no two of any kind of type-scene are the same. For, as we saw earlier, a type-scene appears to exist as an abstract notion with a general structure and an immanent meaning. As a result, no fixed set of phrases and formulae can be identified as the definitive form of the arming scene. None of the *Iliad*'s arming scenes is a better or an inferior example of this type-scene. The poet creates, or re-creates, the arming scene anew from the pre-verbal notion which underlies it each time he wants this particular action sequence.

Nonetheless, the arming scene does have a general pattern. The same weapons are always put on in the same order, and some lines, those about the greaves and the breastplate, may in fact be fixed. It appears, however, that at any point in the scene the poet can elaborate, sometimes at considerable length, on any piece of armour (with the possible exception of the greaves) in a number of ways. For example, he can insert similes or describe the provenance, composition or decoration of a piece of armour.

These elaborations, as we shall see below, are never random; the poet uses them to achieve specific ends. Elaboration serves to slow down the narrative pace, which the poet tends to do at important points in the story. We must also pay attention to the surrounding narrative in which any highly elaborated example of a type-scene is placed. For the events which precede or follow a type-scene may shed light on the poet's use of amplification in that scene. For instance, the sacrifice to Apollo which follows the return of Chryseis to her father in Book 1 (447-474) is one of the lengthiest examples of

this type-scene.[344] This is in all likelihood due to the importance of the events which have led to this juncture. Agamemnon has been forced to hand over Chryseis in order to appease the wrath of Apollo, but has demanded immediate recompense, which has roused the anger of Achilles. The detailed description of the sacrifice to Apollo constitutes the formal end of the god's wrath, which has been and will, indirectly, continue to be so calamitous for the Achaeans. The poet keeps the audience focused on the momentous nature of this wrath by slowing down the narrative pace in a highly elaborated type-scene at the crucial moment of the appeasement of that wrath.

Secondly, each instance of elaboration is uniquely fitted to the situation. It supports or furthers the development of the plot, specific themes, imagery, or the characterization of the hero in question. All of these are ways in which Homer can use the arming scene to shape the unique poem that is the *Iliad*. For this reason, each arming scene must be examined individually, to discern the specific meaning which the poet has conferred on it.

However, at another level, Nagler's pre-verbal level, or Foley's of traditional referentiality, the arming scene is imbued with immanent meaning. We must also examine this inherent level, for each realization of an arming scene metonymically reflects this inherent meaning. This combination of conferred and immanent meaning gives each of the four arming scenes its particular resonance.

---

[344]Arend isolated 21 elements in the sacrifice scene (pp. 64-78); 18 are present here. For a detailed analysis of this scene, cf. Edwards, "Convention and Individuality" 20-22.

I will proceed at this point, firstly, to examine each one of the arming scenes in the *Iliad* as a unique scene in a specific narrative context. Secondly, I will consider the four arming scenes together in order to understand what the immanent meaning of the type-scene may be. For this is the approach which will best allow us to interpret these arming scenes, particularly the one which I feel is the most unusual, that of Paris.

II. The Arming Scene of Agamemnon

Agamemnon's arming scene in Book 11 is the longest example of this type-scene in the *Iliad*. The scene begins, after the announcement verses (15-16), with the two unvarying lines about the donning of the greaves (17-18). The poet continues with the standard verse for the corselet (18), and then specifies in the next line from whom Agamemnon received it. This appears to be the traditional way in which the corselet verse is amplified. Here, the elaboration is particularly extensive, as the corselet receives ten lines of description: Agamemnon obtained it from King Cinyras when the Greek armada stopped in Cyprus on its way to Troy. It is composed of ten bands of κύανος, twelve of gold, and twenty of tin (24-25), and decorated with three snakes on either side extending upwards to the bearer's neck (26-27). These snakes are like rainbows which Zeus fixes among the clouds to serve as a portent to humans (27-28).

The sword verse is changed so as to give Agamemnon a sword with gold rivets (29-30), instead of silver ones as Paris, Patroclus, and Achilles have; ἐν δέ οἱ ἧλοι (29) replaces ἀργυρόηλον (3.334, 16.135, 19.372) at the line end. Only in the case of Agamemnon is the sword's scabbard described. It is silver, and attached to it are golden straps (30-31).

Agamemnon's shield is also described in detail. It is elaborated with a unique accumulation of descriptive adjectives: ἂν δ' ἕλετ' ἀμφιβρότην πολυδαίδαλον ἀσπίδα θοῦριν / καλήν (32-33).[345] The description of Agamemnon's shield is unique: ἀμφιβρότην is taken from the formula ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης which occurs only three times in the *Iliad;* πολυδαίδαλον is used only here of a corselet; and θοῦριν is an unusual adjective for a piece of defensive equipment.[346] The shield, like the breastplate, is composed of various precious metals: bronze, tin, and κύανος (33-35), and decorated with the figures of Gorgo, Deimos and Phobos. The shield strap is made of silver and on it is depicted a three-headed snake.

Like Paris and Patroclus, Agamemnon receives two verses for his helmet, but this object is made grander by the epithets ἀμφίφαλον and τετραφάληρον (41). Agamemnon takes up two spears. The scene ends with the poet noting that the gleam of the armour went up to heaven and that Hera and Athena thundered to honour the king (44-46).

Agamemnon's arming scene follows the typical sequence, but is unique in the degree of elaboration which the poet has employed, particularly with regard to the breastplate and the shield.[347] What is the purpose of all this elaboration? As elsewhere, Homer adapts this type-scene to the situation and to the character in question. The detail which he lavishes on the breastplate, with its bands of κύανος and its silver strap, all draw attention to the

---

[345]Cf. the shield verse that serves for Paris, Patroclus, and Achilles: — αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε (3.335=16.136=19.373).

[346]Cf. Hainsworth, *Comm.* III, 220-221.

[347]On the elaboration in Agamemnon's arming scene, cf. Armstrong 344-345; Hainsworth, *Comm.* III, 216-217; Patzer 29; Russo 282-286; Thornton 101-102; and Willcock, "The Search for the Poet Homer" 6.

magnificent wealth of Agamemnon. Homer makes this explicit when, at the end of the scene, he refers to his subject as βασιλῆα πολυχρύσοιο Μυκήνης (46).[348] We also learn that the shield was a guest gift from Cinyras, a figure proverbial for his wealth.[349] This provenance underlines Agamemnon's wealth and status, as one king honours another.

In addition to informing his audience about the origin and composition of the breastplate, Homer describes its decoration:

> κυάνεοι δὲ δράκοντες ὀρωρέχατο προτὶ δειρὴν
> τρεῖς ἑκάτερθ', ἴρισσιν ἐοικότες, ἅς τε Κρονίων
> ἐν νέφεϊ στήριξε, τέρας μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.
> (26-28)

According to Hermann Fränkel, snakes in Homer are a symbol of "Kampfeswut und lauernden Todes," while the rainbow generally announces that some sort of disaster is in store. Thus, "[i]n Begriffssprache übersetzt, bedeutet die Beschreibung des Panzers: Agamemnon legt einen wilden Mordwillen an, und grauenhafte Kriegsereignisse bereiteten sich vor."[350]

---

[348]On the proverbial wealth of Mycenae and its kings in antiquity, cf. Hainsworth, *Comm.* III, 223 and Russo 284.

[349]Cf. Tyrtaeus 12.6 W where Minos and Cinyras are mentioned as proverbially rich kings.

[350]Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie* 56-57. On snake imagery, Fränkel refers to 3.33-37 where Paris, retreating at the sight of Menelaus, is compared to a man retreating before a snake. On the rainbow sent by Zeus and its connection to war, he cites 17.547ff. where its function is explicitly τέρας ἔμμεναι ἢ πολέμοιο, / ἢ καὶ χειμῶνος δυσθαλπέος (548-549). Thornton (102) also calls the snake an image of warlike aggression, and refers to 22.93-95, where Hector, in his determination to face Achilles, is compared to a snake. Russo (285-286) notes the prophecy of Calchas (2.301-330), where the Greeks are likened to a snake which devours a sparrow and her nestlings who are identified with the Trojans. At 12.200-207, an eagle wounded by a snake it is carrying in its talons is interpreted as an omen that the Trojans should give up their present onslaught against the Greeks. As Russo notes, "[a]gain, the

(cont.)

Γοργὼ βλοσυρῶπις and her attendants, Δεῖμος and Φόβος, further the imagery of the terror of war, its violence and destruction. The cumulative result is to emphasize the formidable presence of Agamemnon as a warrior, as well as the leader of warriors. As Patzer sums up, the elaborations in this scene "dienen offenbar der kennzeichnenden Hervorhebung dieser Rüstung und durch sie des Helden, hier des mächtigen, geehrten und reichen ... Kriegsherren Agamemnon."[351]

This arming scene, through its elaboration, supports the general Iliadic characterization of Agamemnon as the wealthy king of a wealthy city, leader of the expedition to Troy, and a powerful warrior in his own right. But, as we have noted, the arming scene, ideally, should also be fitted to the immediate narrative. We must next examine if this is the case here.

The arming of Agamemnon occurs at a crucial point in the narrative. It comes after the disastrous embassy to Achilles, and it stands at the beginning of the longest and the most important day of fighting in the *Iliad*, the third day which begins with the dawn in the first line of Book 11 and lasts until the sun goes down at 18.241.[352] As Book 11 opens, Achilles has already refused to return to the fighting. The Greeks must face an enemy who on the previous day were so successful that, for the first time in nine years, they were able to bivouac on the plain in full view of the Greek camp. Agamemnon

Greeks are identified with the snake's destructive powers" (295, n. 8). Cf. also Mueller 97.

[351]Patzer 29.

[352]As Danek observes, "[d]ie Rüstung des Agamemnon im Λ ... markiert vor allem den Beginn des langen dritten Schlachttages, der das Zentrum des Kampfgeschehens der Ilias darstellt" (209).

must now lead his army into the battle without the help of his most powerful warrior.

By beginning this day of fighting with the leader of the Achaean forces, who, through this treatment of Achilles, has brought matters to this point, Homer emphasizes the nature of the crisis for the Greeks. Agamemnon is indeed a wealthy king and a powerful warrior, but, without the aid of Achilles, his efforts will come to nothing. Agamemnon arms and then leads his forces into battle. The poet describes his successful *aristeia,* as the Trojans are driven back toward the city. But this success soon comes to an end when he is disabled by a sword wound and forced to withdraw. The Trojans quickly regain the upper hand, and four more Greek leaders are injured in quick succession.

The immediate context in which the arming occurs is of the utmost importance in the development of the *Iliad*'s principal narrative, the wrath of Achilles. One way in which Homer signals this importance is by granting an arming scene to the man who initiated this wrath and then by amplifying the traditional details of the scene to the point where this becomes the longest arming scene in the poem. For, as we saw above, it is precisely when the poet comes to a crucial point in his story that he is most likely to slow down the narrative pace, as he does here through the copious elaboration which Agamemnon's arming receives.

III. The Arming Scene of Patroclus

The structure of the arming scene of Patroclus is fully typical insofar as all of the normally found elements of the scene are present. The hero puts on the greaves, breastplate, sword, shield, and helmet, and then takes up a pair of

spears. The scene proceeds quickly, and, unlike Agamemnon's arming, with very little amplification. In all, only two elements are elaborated, but both of these are significant and serve a very different purpose from the elaborations in Agamemnon's arming scene.

The breastplate which Patroclus dons receives the standard verse of elaboration about its provenance:

> δεύτερον αὖ θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσιν ἔδυνε
> ποικίλον ἀστερόεντα ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο.
> (16.133-134)

Agamemnon received his breastplate from Cinyras; Patroclus receives his from Achilles. But there is also a difference which the poet here introduces and will develop shortly. Cinyras gave Agamemnon a corselet as a gift, a ξεινήϊον; it now belongs to the Greek leader. Achilles, however, only lends his armour to Patroclus. It still belongs to Achilles and the poet reminds us of this at line 134. This reminder is significant for, when a hero arms, he puts on the outward symbol of his military valour. Here, Homer stresses that Patroclus is not doing this. His own valour is not enough in the present crisis; only Achilles' is, and, hence, the necessity for the exchange of armour.

The second elaboration develops this idea more fully. After putting on his (borrowed) helmet, Patroclus takes up two spears:

> εἵλετο δ' ἄλκιμα δοῦρε, τά οἱ παλάμηφιν ἀρήρει.
> ἔγχος δ' οὐχ ἕλετ' οἶον ἀμύμονος Αἰακίδαο,
> βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν· τὸ μὲν οὐ δύνατ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν
> πάλλειν, ἀλλά μιν οἶος ἐπίστατο πῆλαι Ἀχιλλεύς
> Πηλιάδα μελίην, τὴν πατρὶ φίλῳ πόρε Χείρων
> Πηλίου ἐκ κορυφῆς, φόνον ἔμμεναι ἡρώεσσιν.
> (16.139-144)

The only part of Patroclus' armour that belongs to him is this pair of spears. He takes them because they fit his grasp. The spear of Achilles does not; only

the great hero himself can wield the Pelian ash spear. Patroclus must leave it behind, and the poet reminds his audience that, although he is borrowing Achilles' armour and will present himself as Achilles, he is in fact no Achilles.

The elaboration is unique in the poem's four arming scenes for being, as Arend observed, "eine Variation ins Negative."[353] This has caused much consternation among scholars since antiquity, not least of all because the lines re-appear in the arming of Achilles at 19.388-391. As Leaf said, in arguing against their authenticity, "the poet should enlarge upon the spear when it is being taken, not when it is being left behind."[354] The notion that these lines were interpolated from their original place in Book 19 originates with Zenodotus who, according to Aristonicus, athetized line 140 and did not print lines 141-144.[355] But, as Janko notes, the fourth century historian, Megaclides, read lines 140-144 in his text and, therefore, Zenodotus' athetesis of 140 and omission of 141-144 is, in all likelihood, not based on manuscript evidence but on his own dislike of repeated passages.[356] The same can also be said of

---

[353]Arend 93.

[354]Leaf, *Iliad* II, 166.

[355]Ζηνόδοτος τοῦτον ἀθετήσας τοὺς ἑξῆς τέσσαρας οὐκ ἔγραφεν (A Scholia. Erbse, *Scholia* IV, 193). Aristarchus, on the other hand, felt that the lines belonged in Book 16, because they explained why Patroclus did not take the spear, but were out of place in Book 19:

> ἀθετοῦνται στίχοι τέσσαρες, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Πατρόκλου ὁπλισμοῦ (sc. Π 141-4) μετάκεινται. ἡ δὲ περιεστιγμένη διπλῆ, ὅτι ἐνταῦθα μὲν αὐτοὺς Ζηνόδοτος καταλέλοιπεν, ἐπὶ δὲ Πατρόκλου ἠθέτηκεν ⟨***⟩. ἐκεῖ δὲ ἀναγκαίως λέγονται, ἵνα γνῶμεν, διὰ τί οὐκ ἔλαβε τὴν μελίαν. (A Scholia. Erbse, *Scholia* IV, 644)

[356]Janko, *Comm.* IV, 335. According to the D Scholia, Megaclides argued that Patroclus could not take the Pelian ash spear because it was the one piece of armour which Hephaestus could not replace, once the original

(cont.)

the suspicion with which the passage has been viewed in much of pre-Parryian scholarship, both Analytical and Unitarian.[357] Since the work of Parry, however, such *verbatim* repetitions no longer present a problem, since they are recognized as a standard feature of oral diction. Instead, we must, as here, look for some sort of poetic link between repeated passages.

In Book 16, these lines serve to characterize Patroclus, and they do so by direct comparison with Achilles. Patzer notes that they are especially important since they are the scene's only major elaboration. That this elaboration takes a negative form indicates that it serves a function opposite to that which we normally find for amplification in arming scenes. Instead of adding to the hero's glory, these lines reveal his weakness.[358] The comparison with Achilles which the lines evoke is a negative one. It is not simply the case that Patroclus leaves behind Achilles' spear because he cannot

---

armour was lost to Hector, because the wood necessary for making a spear did not exist on Olympus. Only materials worthy of the gods, such as gold and silver, were available to them; the very idea of heavenly wood was καταγελαστότατον (cf. Erbse, *Scholia* IV, 194).

[357]Cf. Bolling, *Interpolation* 163-164 for a bibliographical survey of nineteenth and early twentieth century scholarship on this question. It was also once common to object to these lines' authenticity on the grounds that the whole idea of the exchange of armour was a late interpolation. Cf., for example, Leaf, *Iliad* II, 154-155, 217-218; Bolling, *Interpolation* 163; and Ph. Kakridis 288. Cf. van der Valk, *Researches* II, 80-81 for a discussion of the question in the scholia. A brief glance, however, at the number of passages, some widely separated, in which the exchange is referred to demonstrates just how carefully integrated into the main narrative this theme is and how unlikely it is that is was interpolated. Cf., for example, 11.792ff. where Nestor introduces the idea and 15.403-404 where Patroclus repeats some of Nestor's words; cf. also 16.34ff., 17.186ff. For a fuller discussion on the question of the exchange of armour, cf. Shannon 23-24 and Edwards, *HPI* 255-256.

[358]Cf. Patzer 36: "Die einzige Verbreiterung des Grundmodells, die diese Rüstungsszene aufweist ... bedeutet, in die negative Form gewendet, gerade das Gegenteil des Üblichen: statt den Helden zu erhöhen, enthüllt sie an ihm eine schwache Stelle." Cf. also Griffin, *HLD* 36.

wield it. He can disguise himself as Achilles by putting on the hero's armour, but his military prowess is inferior to that of his friend. It is the mistaken assumption on the Trojans' part that Achilles has returned and the panic that results which will turn the tide of battle, not Patroclus' skill as a warrior.[359]

The elaboration on the spear which is not taken also serves to foreshadow Patroclus' death. At the very moment when Patroclus arms himself, Hector is enjoying his greatest military success in the whole of the war. In Book 11, Zeus granted him supremacy on the battlefield until the end of the third day of fighting (191-194). It is still this same day when Patroclus prepares to go to battle. The lines on the spear then serve to foreshadow Patroclus' death at the hands of Hector, for Homer emphasizes that he is no Achilles, and the audience knows that only Achilles could stand against Hector, especially now that he has the support of Zeus himself.

Homer has, in fact, prepared us for the death of Patroclus since Book 8, where Zeus announced to the assembled gods that Achilles will not return to battle until the fighting is around the corpse of Patroclus:

> οὐ γὰρ πρὶν πολέμου ἀποπαύσεται ὄβριμος Ἕκτωρ,
> πρὶν ὄρθαι παρὰ ναῦφι ποδώκεα Πηλείωνα,
> ἤματι τῷ ὅτ' ἂν οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ πρύμνῃσι μάχωνται

[359]Thornton (102) argues that the paucity of elaboration in comparison with the arming scenes of Achilles and Agamemnon indicates that Patroclus is inferior to these men as a warrior. I will argue below, in regard to the arming of Paris, that the immanent meaning of the type-scene of arming does not permit such a conclusion. Patroclus' inferiority as a warrior is here meant to be seen in direct comparison with Achilles and, less directly, with the dangerous situation created by the Διὸς βουλή which has resulted in Hector's ascendancy. This was also true for Agamemnon who, Thornton argues, is superior to Patroclus as a warrior. He too was no replacement for Achilles and could not fight against the plans of Zeus any more than Patroclus can. And yet, his arming scene was highly elaborated.

> στείνει ἐν αἰνοτάτῳ περὶ Πατρόκλοιο θανόντος,
> ὡς γὰρ θέσφατόν ἐστι·
> (8.473-477)

Later, in Book 11, when Achilles sent Patroclus on a mission to Nestor who would propose the exchange of armour, the poet commented that this was for Patroclus the beginning of evil (κακοῦ δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλεν ἀρχή, 604). In Book 15, we heard for the first time how Patroclus will die: Achilles will send him forth into the fighting and Hector will kill him (ὁ δ' ἀνστήσει ὃν ἑταῖρον / Πάτροκλον· τὸν δὲ κτενεῖ ἔγχεϊ φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ / Ἰλίου προπάροιθε, 64-66). Finally, when Patroclus puts the proposal before Achilles, Homer comments:

> Ὣς φάτο λισσόμενος μέγα νήπιος· ἦ γὰρ ἔμελλεν
> οἷ αὐτῷ θάνατόν τε κακὸν καὶ κῆρα λιτέσθαι.
> (16.46-47)

The introduction and conclusion to the arming scene also serve to anticipate Patroclus' death. The verse which announces the arming is unusual in the verb which the poet chooses to describe the arming: Ὣς φάτο, Πάτροκλος δὲ <u>κορύσσετο</u> νώροπι χαλκῷ (16.130). Shannon notes that there are only two other instances of the unaugmented inceptive imperfect of κορύσσω in the *Iliad*: in the arming scene of Achilles (19.364) and in the arming of Ajax before the duel with Hector (7.206). In both cases, the verb is followed by a more generalized one for arming, ἕσσατο for Ajax (7.207) and δύσετο for Achilles (19.368).[360] This is not so for Patroclus; κορύσσετο stands alone to describe his arming. Shannon argues that Homer uses κορύσσετο here both in its general sense of "arming" and in its more restricted sense of "helming" in

---

[360]Shannon 24-25.

order to anticipate the particular emphasis on the loss of the helmet at his death:

> τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ μὲν κρατὸς κυνέην βάλε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων·
> ἡ δὲ κυλινδομένη καναχὴν ἔχε ποσσὶν ὑφ' ἵππων
> αὐλῶπις τρυφάλεια, μιάνθησαν δὲ ἔθειραι
> αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσι· πάρος γε μὲν οὐ θέμις ἦεν
> ἱππόκομον πήληκα μιαίνεσθαι κονίῃσιν,
> ἀλλ' ἀνδρὸς θείοιο κάρη χαρίεν τε μέτωπον
> ῥύετ' Ἀχιλλῆος· τότε δὲ Ζεὺς Ἕκτορι δῶκεν
> ᾗ κεφαλῇ φορέειν, σχεδόθεν δέ οἱ ἦεν ὄλεθρος.
> (16.793-800)

Shannon concludes that "Patroklos' 'helming' is isolated by its idiosyncratic diction because his defeat is the result of his 'unhelming' by Apollo."[361] In this way, Patroclus' death is foreshadowed in the verse which introduces his arming scene by anticipating a specific feature of his death.

The arming scene is followed immediately, as also in the case of Agamemnon, with preparations for chariot warfare, as Automedon harnesses Achilles' horses (16.145-154). These are the immortal horses Xanthus and Balius. They are accompanied by a third horse, Pedasus, who is mortal and serves as a trace horse (cf. ἐν δὲ παρηορίῃσιν, 152). These lines have puzzled critics, since divine horses obviously would have no need of a trace horse.

---

[361]Shannon 25. Reinhardt (*Ilias* 319) and Patzer (37) both interpret the death of Patroclus as a mirror image of his arming scene. First the hero is unhelmed, then his spear is shattered (801-802); his shield drops to the ground (802-803); and Apollo breaks his corselet (804). As Patzer states: "Die Katalogform der typischen Rüstung wird bei dieser Abrüstung genau beibehalten, nur das jetzt, auch im Gegensinn, von oben nach unten abgerüstet wird. So wird die Erniedrigung in der dem Hörer eindrücklichen gegensätzlichen Entsprechung zur anfänglichen Rüstung, die den Helden erhöhte, durchaus sinnfällig" (37). Cf. also Bannert, *Formen des Wiederholens* 162-163 and Stanley 167.

Armstrong argues that Homer introduces Pedasus not for any practical reason, but rather for a symbolic one:

> the mortal horse reinforces our sense of the mortality of Patroclus. In the sequel and at the height of the Patrocleia Pedasus is slain. The fate of the mortal Pedasus becomes the counterpart of the fate of Patroclus.[362]

The arming scene thus ends as it began, with the poet preparing his audience for the imminent death of Patroclus by the introduction of details whose full meaning will only become apparent when the hero is actually dead.

In conclusion, lines 140-144, which are the only substantial elaboration in the arming of Patroclus, serve to characterize the hero as inferior to Achilles in battle, and, on account of this inferiority, to foreshadow his death. As such, the elaboration is part of a complex and ultimately interconnected series of references that stretches back to Book 8 and culminates here in the arming of the hero. As Fenik states, "[t]he futility of Patroclus' attempt to fill the role of Achilles, the inevitability of his failure and his imminent death are all expressed in the few lines about the Pelian spear."[363]

In this way, the elaboration in the scene serves a thematically narrower purpose than did the elaborations in Agamemnon's arming scene. There they served to glorify the hero by concentrating on his wealth and his skill in battle. The poet did so in a manner which fitted this characterization of Agamemnon, but which also served the general purpose of glorifying the hero by slowing down the progress of the narrative and focusing the audience's attention on him before he goes out to fight. Here, in the arming of Patroclus, Homer amplifies the scene so as to foreshadow what will prove

---

[362]Armstrong 348. Cf. also Wilson 386.
[363]Fenik, *TBS* 191.

to be the pivotal event of the whole poem. In this way, lines 140-144 contribute to the particular way in which Homer has shaped the traditional narrative material that underlies his poem. Therefore, we see in these two arming scenes that the oral poet can use elaboration in quite different ways, both to make more generalized effects, which one could expect to find in any heroic poem that utilized this type-scene, and to emphasize very specific developments in his narrative.

I noted earlier that Homer places arming scenes at significant points in the narrative. Agamemnon's arming followed upon the failed embassy to Achilles and introduced the all-important third day of fighting. The arming of Patroclus inaugurates the second half of this day's fighting.[364] So far on this day, five of the front rank of Greek fighters have been injured, all in Book 11. At the end of Book 12, Hector breaks through the Achaeans' defensive wall. At the end of Book 15, he leads his men up to the enemy's ships, and early in Book 16, the Trojans hurl fire onto the ships. Homer draws attention to the moment of supreme crisis with an invocation to the Muses:

> Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι
> ὅππως δὴ πρῶτον πῦρ ἔμπεσε νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.
> (16.112-113)

Ajax can no longer withstand the onslaught and retreats; Protesilaus' ship is set on fire. At this critical moment, Achilles tells Patroclus to arm for battle (16.126-129). Thus, the arming of Patroclus, which the audience has been waiting for since Nestor first suggested the idea of the exchange of armour in

---

[364]As Danek notes, "[m]it dem Eingreifen des Patroklos im Π beginnt der zweite Teil des dritten Schlachttages, der deutlich als selbständige Einheit erscheinen soll und als solche folglich auch durch die Rüstungsszene, die den Neueinsatz markiert, gekennzeichnet ist" (209-210).

Book 11, is delayed until the crisis reaches its greatest point, when the Greeks are on the verge of defeat and, if they lose their only means of escape, annihilation.

IV. The Arming Scene of Achilles

A. Structural Development and Elaboration

The arming scene of Achilles occurs at the end of Book 19, after the formal reconciliation between Agamemnon and Achilles. It introduces the final, climactic fourth day of fighting and, with it, the culmination of the central story pattern of the poem, Achilles' wrath, withdrawal, and return. Danek sums up the scene's significance as follows:

> Die Rüstung des Achill im T steht am Beginn der Aristie dieses Helden, die den ganzen vierten Schlachttag umfaßt, gleichzeitig aber auch Abschluß und Höhepunkt des Kampfgeschehens der Ilias bildet.[365]

The importance of Achilles' return has already been established in Book 18, through the lengthy description of the making of his new set of armour. The so-called ὁπλοποιΐα obviously has direct relevance for the scene at the end of Book 19 where Achilles puts on this newly made armour. Patzer argues that the plot demands that the two scenes be read together, as the loss of Achilles' original armour makes it necessary that the gods supply him with a new set:

> Der Verlust von Achills Waffen durch Patroklos' Niederlage, eine Erniedrigung auch Achills, die er durch seine eigene Verblendung heraufbeschwor, macht es nötig, daß neue Götterwaffen für ihn gefertigt werden, die dann in seiner letzten großen Rüstung von ihm angelegt

---

[365]Danek 210.

> und in seiner letzten Aristie zu erhabenster Wirkung in Tätigkeit gesetzt werden. Waffenfertigung (Σ) und Achillrüstung (T) gehören also zusammen.[366]

The connection between the two scenes at the level of narrative development is easy enough to see. But, as Patzer and Edwards both point out, the conventional structure of the type-scene of arming further underlines this connection. Edwards call the ὁπλοποιΐα "a relocated expansion of Akhilleus' arming-scene."[367] For it serves the function of informing us of the provenance of the hero's armour, jointly from Thetis and Hephaestus.[368] The extraordinary length of the expansion is in keeping with the importance of Achilles' return to battle. It is also, as Patzer notes, our first indication, well before the arming scene itself, that this final arming scene will be the most important one in the poem.[369] Homer again anticipates the importance of this arming scene at the beginning of Book 19. When Thetis presents the armour to Achilles, he records the terrified reactions of the Myrmidons and the joyful one of Achilles, as they all gaze upon the armour (12-18). Therefore, before the arming scene itself, Achilles' armour is described in two

---

[366]Patzer 40.

[367]Edwards, *Comm.*V, 200. Cf. also Mueller 97.

[368]Cf. Patzer 40: "Der Bericht von der Herstellung der neuen Waffen durch Hephaistos ist im Grunde ein zerdehntes und verselbständigtes typisches Element, das sich in den typischen Rüstungsszenen beobachten ließ, der rühmenden Herkunftsgeschichte. Im Rahmen der Waffenfertigung ist die großangelegte in Handlungsform gegebene Beschreibung des Achillschildes wiederum die vergrößerte und gesteigerte Gestaltung des in den typischen Szenen festen Elementes der rühmenden Beschreibung."

[369]Cf. Patzer 38, n. 1: "Nimmt man die Waffenfertigung des Σ zur Rüstungsszene hinzu, wie sie sicher vom Dichter verstanden wurde, dann ergibt sich, daß auch im Umfang die Achillrüstung alle übrigen weit übertrifft."

separate scenes: as it is being made in Book 18 and when Achilles first sees it in Book 19.[370]

The scene's *Ankündigungsvers* comes at line 364 (ἐν δὲ μέσοισι κορύσσετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς) and employs the same verb of arming that introduced Patroclus' scene (16.130). Achilles, like Agamemnon and Patroclus, arms immediately before a major new phase in the battle. Like his two predecessors, he arms while the army itself prepares to go out to battle.[371]

In the three other arming scenes in the *Iliad*, the *Ankündigungsvers* leads directly into the arming scene, with the two seemingly fixed verses about the greaves following. But here, four lines intervene which describe the emotional state in which the hero arms and which introduce imagery that will pervade the arming scene and, beyond that, the whole of Achilles' *aristeia*:

> τοῦ καὶ ὀδόντων μὲν καναχὴ πέλε, τὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε
> λαμπέσθην ὡς εἴ τε πυρὸς σέλας, ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ
> δῦν' ἄχος ἄτλητον· ὁ δ' ἄρα Τρωσὶν μενεαίνων
> δύσετο δῶρα θεοῦ, τά οἱ Ἥφαιστος κάμε τεύχων.
> (19.365-368)

The poet emphasizes that Achilles arms in grief and in anger (ἄχος ἄτλητον, μενεαίνων). The hero's emotional state is further reflected in his bodily responses, in the gnashing of his teeth and in his eyes which flash like blazing fire. These verses are important for the arming scene which they introduce, for, as Armstrong notes, "[t]he tone and color which is to pervade this

---

[370]Mueller 97.

[371]αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ / αὐτίκα θωρήσσοντο κατὰ στρατόν, 19.351-352; cf. Ἀτρεΐδης δ' ἐβόησεν ἰδὲ ζώννυσθαι ἄνωγεν / Ἀργείους, 11.15-16; Μυρμιδόνας δ' ἄρ' ἐποιχόμενος θώρηξεν Ἀχιλλεὺς / πάντας ἀνὰ κλισίας σὺν τεύχεσιν, 16.155-156.

climactic moment are set indelibly at the outset."[372] They stress Achilles' anger and associate that anger with the image of fire, which is introduced here in a brief simile at line 366. The lines also tell us that, not only do Achilles' eyes flash like fire, but that the armour he puts on was made for him by the god of fire, Hephaestus. As we have seen, it is conventional for the poet to describe the origin of either all of the armour or specific pieces of it. Here, we see Homer invoke the convention and simultaneously link it to the narrative beyond the scene itself, for, from now on, fire will be almost exclusively Achilles' image.[373]

---

[372]Armstrong 350. On these four verses, cf. further Patzer 38, n. 1 and Edwards, *Comm.* V, 278.

[373]Whitman discusses the overall importance of fire imagery in the poem, from the funeral pyres of the Achaeans in Book 1 to those of Patroclus and Hector at the end of the poem (*HHT* 129-146). He draws attention to the image of fire in the individual hero's *aristeia*, as when Athena kindles fire from Diomedes' head (5.4-7) or when Idomeneus goes out to battle like a lightning blast sent by Zeus (13.240-244). As Whitman observes, "[t]here could scarcely be a more apt symbol of Greek heroism, which turns upon the poles of divinity and death. The fire of the funeral pyres betokens one side of the heroic nature; the other reaches toward the gods through the lightning-flashes, which presently become the explicit sign of Zeus' acceptance of the hero's cause" (132-133). He also notes that, after the death of Patroclus, this prevalent and thus far generalized image becomes concentrated around the figure of Achilles and his wrath over his companion's death. The image first appears in this connection in Book 18 when Achilles stands at the trench as the Achaeans and Trojans fight over the corpse of Patroclus, and Athena kindles fire around his head which is likened to the fire seen from a distance which burns in a city as it is being sacked by enemy warriors (205-214). Whitman calls this moment "the peripeteia of the *Iliad*," presumably because it marks the hero's return to battle (137). Moulton discusses in more detail how fire imagery is developed in the *aristeia* of Achilles, particularly in the similes, and how it is connected with the hero's wrath against Hector and, therefore, ultimately with the fall of Troy (106-111). Cf. also Scott, *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile* 114-120; Patzer 28-29; Krischer, *Formale Konventionen* 26-28, 36-38; Shannon 26-28; Strasburger 116; and Griffin, *HLD* 37.

In Patroclus' scene, Homer employed the convention of noting the armour's provenance in a thematically significant way. For the fact that Patroclus received his arms from Achilles both transformed him into a substitute for the great hero and led directly to the events of Book 18. Now Achilles needs new armour, and none that is available to him is worthy of him.[374] All that is left of his original armour is the spear he inherited from his father. Thetis, therefore, commissions a new suit from Hephaestus and presents it to her son. In this way, Homer makes the element of the armour's provenance even more complicated than it was in Patroclus' case. For now we must consider three different sources. The spear is from Peleus. The rest is made by Hephaestus, and presented to the hero by Thetis.

The divinely made armour is, of course, a sign of great honour for the hero, just as was the armour which Peleus received from the gods or the immortal horses which Zeus gave to Tros as recompense for the abduction of Ganymede.[375] But Homer makes more of this divine gift by connecting it to the image of fire, which, as Whitman argued, encompasses the paradoxical nature of Greek heroism, the simultaneous mortality and immortality of the hero. The divinely made armour, presented to the hero by his divine mother, emphasizes Achilles' immortal side. The Pelian ash spear reminds

---

[374]As Achilles himself says at 18.192-193: ἄλλου δ' οὔ τευ οἶδα τεῦ ἂν κλυτὰ τεύχεα δύω, / εἰ μὴ Αἴαντός γε σάκος Τελαμωνιάδαο. Shannon (26) notes that Achilles gives prominence to the shield here as the most important piece of armour, a notion which he says has previously been associated only with Ajax. This newly placed emphasis anticipates the centrality of the shield in the ὁπλοποιΐα later in the book.

[375]On Peleus' armour, cf. 17.194-197; on Tros's horses, cf. 5.260-273. Regarding the latter, Diomedes is acutely aware that their capture would bring him great renown; cf. 5.273, where he says to Sthenelos: εἰ τούτω κε λάβοιμεν, ἀροίμεθά κε κλέος ἐσθλόν.

us of his mortal side because of its links with his father Peleus. Hephaestus' association with the armour mediates between these two sides of Achilles' nature. For the armour's origin in the workshop of the fire god connects it to the poem's fire imagery and the twin themes of death and immortality which attend that image.[376] In this way, the multifaceted provenance of Achilles' new armour brings out the complex nature of this hero with its simultaneous links to mortality and immortality. This is particularly fitting here, for the audience already knows that, as a result of going out to battle to kill Hector, Achilles himself will die. However, his performance on the battlefield will now be superhuman; just before his death, he becomes, for a short time, more god than man.

Furthermore, the image of fire is also connected with the wrath of Achilles, as we see when Thetis presents the newly made armour to him.[377] The Myrmidons tremble in fear and dare not look at it directly (19.14-15). Achilles, however, responds quite differently; the very sight of the armour increases his anger. Here, as in the opening of the arming scene, Achilles' emotional state is underlined by a description of his bodily responses; his anger causes his eyes to shine like fire:

> αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς
> ὡς εἶδ', ὥς μιν μᾶλλον ἔδυ χόλος, ἐν δέ οἱ ὄσσε
> δεινὸν ὑπὸ βλεφάρων ὡς εἰ σέλας ἐξεφάανθεν·
> (19.15-17)

---

[376]Cf. Shannon 27-28.

[377]On the multivalence of the image and its application to Achilles after Patroclus' death, Whitman states that "[a]ll the associations of the image — death, rage, heroic greatness, the fall of Troy, and divinity itself — now play against each other constantly" (*HHT* 137-138).

The opening of the arming scene re-enforces the connection. Achilles gnashes his teeth, and, again, his eyes flash like blazing fire. The physical response is once more related to the hero's emotional state of anger and grief.

The arming scene itself is most like that of Agamemnon in the richness of elaboration which the familiar elements of the scene undergo. However, unlike Agamemnon's arming, the elaborations here are dominated by a single image, that of fire, and a single form, the simile. The scene contains four similes and is both introduced and completed by a simile. In five of these six instances, the similes' point of comparison is fire. As Moulton observes, "[t]he concentration within such a small segment of the narrative (33 verses) of so many similes with essentially the same vehicle is unparalleled in the Homeric poems."[378] The effect of this concentration of fire similes is to enforce the notion that from now on this previously generalized image will now be associated particularly with Achilles.[379]

---

[378]Moulton 108. The only comparable passage is the cluster of similes describing the marshalling of the Achaean army before the catalogue of ships (2.455-483), on which cf. Moulton 27-33 and Kirk, *Comm.* I, 162-166. The effect of such a large group of similes is like that of the arming scene itself: it slows down the narrative and focuses the audience's attention before a significant moment in the poem. As Moulton (33) says of this passage, "[t]here can be no doubt that this group of successive similes powerfully emphasizes the appearance of the army *en masse*, and its effect is to draw attention to this picture before the poet turns to enumerating the individual contingents." Seven similes appear in just under thirty verses; however, unlike the passage in Book 19, each simile has a different point of comparison. The army is compared first to a forest fire, then to flocks of birds descending on a meadow, to flowers blooming in season, and finally to flies around a milk pail. The leaders of the different contingents are compared to goatherds, and Agamemnon to various gods and to an ox pre-eminent in the herd. Thus, each of the similes draws upon an image not shared with any of the others in the series.

[379]Just before the arming scene, there is a simile which compares the armour of the Myrmidons as it is being taken from the ships to snowflakes:

(cont.)

The first elaboration in the arming scene comes after the description of the greaves, breastplate, and sword; it is applied to the shield and takes the form of two similes:

> αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε
> εἵλετο, τοῦ δ' ἀπάνευθε σέλας γένετ' ἠΰτε μήνης.
> ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἐκ πόντοιο σέλας ναύτῃσι φανήῃ
> καιομένοιο πυρός, τό κεκαίεται ὑψόθ' ὄρεσφι
> σταθμῷ ἐν οἰοπόλῳ· τοὺς δ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντας ἄελλαι
> πόντον ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντα φίλων ἀπάνευθε φέρουσιν·
> ὣς ἀπ' Ἀχιλλῆος σάκεος σέλας αἰθέρ' ἵκανε
> καλοῦ δαιδαλέου·
> (19.373-380)

The light from Achilles' shield is compared first to the light of the moon and then to a fire burning on a mountain top in a sheep steading and seen by sailors on a stormy sea. The latter simile emphasizes the longing which the

---

> ὡς δ' ὅτε ταρφειαὶ νιφάδες Διὸς ἐκποτέονται,
> ψυχραί, ὑπὸ ῥιπῆς αἰθρηγενέος Βορέαο,
> ὣς τότε ταρφειαὶ κόρυθες λαμπρὸν γανόωσαι
> νηῶν ἐκφορέοντο καὶ ἀσπίδες ὀμφαλόεσσαι
> θώρηκές τε κραταιγύαλοι καὶ μείλινα δοῦρα.
> αἴγλη δ' οὐρανὸν ἷκε, γέλασσε δὲ πᾶσα περὶ χθὼν
> χαλκοῦ ὑπὸ στεροπῆς·
> (19.357-363)

There are only three other snow similes in the *Iliad* (3.222; 12.156-158, 278-289). None is applied to the type-scene of the marching out of an army to battle, as here, although similes are applied to this type-scene in Books 2.455ff., 3.1-7, and 16.259-267. Perhaps Homer is avoiding the use of a fire simile here and stressing the application of fire imagery to Achilles by setting up a contrast to that image by the use of its virtual opposite. The main point of comparison in the simile is the density and relentless movement of the snow *vis-à-vis* the armour as it is being brought from the ships (cf. ταρφειαί, 357, 359; ἐκποτέονται, 357; ἐκφορέοντο, 360). But the brightness and glitter of the armour is also mentioned, though it is not amplified by a fire simile (cf. λαμπρὸν γανόωσαι, 359; αἴγλη, 362; χαλκοῦ ὑπὸ στεροπῆς, 363). On snow similes, cf. Moulton 64-66 and Edwards, *Comm.* V, 276.

beleaguered Greeks are feeling for Achilles and depends upon the notion of light shining through darkness as the symbol of salvation.

Achilles' helmet also shines, this time like a star:

> περὶ δὲ τρυφάλειαν ἀείρας
> κρατὶ θέτο βριαρήν· ἡ δ' ἀστὴρ ὣς ἀπέλαμπεν
> ἵππουρις τρυφάλεια, περισσείοντο δ' ἔθειραι
> χρύσεαι, ἃς Ἥφαιστος ἵει λόφον ἀμφὶ θαμειάς.
> (19.380-383)

The image of light is further enhanced by the description of the golden plumes which flutter around the helmet and which, the poet reminds us, were set there by the fire god himself.

The lines which follow have no precedent in any of the other arming scenes, and contain the only simile whose point of comparison is not fire:

> πειρήθη δ' ἕο αὐτοῦ ἐν ἔντεσι δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,
> εἰ οἷ ἐφαρμόσσειε καὶ ἐντρέχοι ἀγλαὰ γυῖα·
> τῷ δ' εὖτε πτερὰ γίγνετ', ἄειρε δὲ ποιμένα λαῶν.
> (384-386)

In none of the other arming scenes is the fit of the suit of armour, as opposed to the simple donning of armour, mentioned. A similar passage does occur in Book 17, when Hector puts on the armour he stripped from Patroclus. We are told that the armour fit him and that, as a result of this fit, he acquires a renewed fighting spirit and strength.[380] Achilles, however, wants to see if he can run in his new armour, and, when he does so, it becomes like a pair of wings, lifting him up. Thornton points out that the image stresses "the god-given mobility of [Achilles'] limbs in the armour."[381] But perhaps Homer is

---

[380]Ἕκτορι δ' ἥρμοσε τεύχε' ἐπὶ χροΐ, δῦ δέ μιν Ἄρης / δεινὸς ἐνυάλιος, πλῆσθεν δ' ἄρα οἱ μέλε' ἐντὸς / ἀλκῆς καὶ σθένεος (17.210-212).

[381]Thonton 103.

also telling us that the armour enhances Achilles' already considerable swiftness, with the result that we know in advance that, when Hector tries to outrun him in Book 22, the attempt will be futile.[382]

The final simile of the scene comes at its very end. After Automedon and Alkimos harness the horses, Achilles steps into the chariot and takes his place behind Automedon:

> ὄπιθεν δὲ κορυσσάμενος βῆ Ἀχιλλεύς,
> τεύχεσι παμφαίνων ὥς τ' ἠλέκτωρ Ὑπερίων.
> (19.397-398)

Achilles is now fully armed (the aorist participle κορυσσάμενος echoing and completing the inceptive imperfect κορύσσετο which introduced the scene at line 364) and he shines like the sun. The two similes which frame the arming scene both attach the image of fire to Achilles himself. In the first, his eyes blaze like fire; in the second, having donned his armour, his whole person has taken on the splendour of the armour.[383]

---

[382]Cf. τῇ ῥα παραδραμέτην, φεύγων, ὁ δ' ὄπισθε διώκων· (22.157) and ὥς Ἕκτωρ οὐ λῆθε ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα (22.193).

[383]Cf. the T scholia: περὶ τοῦ θώρακος ἔφη "φαινότερον πυρὸς αὐγῆς" (Σ610)· περὶ δὲ τοῦ σάκους "σέλας γένετ' ἠΰτε μήνης" (T374)· περὶ δὲ τῆς κόρυθος "ἡ δ' ἀστὴρ ὣς ἀπέλαμπεν" (T381). εἰκότως οὖν αὐτὸν τὸν ὡπλισμένον ἡλίῳ ἀπεικάζει (Erbse, *Scholia* IV, 645; cf. also Edwards *Comm.*V, 281-282). We should note that, although Achilles' spear receives no simile and is not here associated with the image of fire, when the hero fatally hurls it against Hector it does receive a fire-based simile:

> οἷος δ' ἀστὴρ εἶσι μετ' ἀστράσι νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ
> ἕσπερος, ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν οὐρανῷ ἵσταται ἀστήρ,
> ὣς αἰχμῆς ἀπέλαμπ' εὐήκεος, ἣν ἄρ' Ἀχιλλεὺς
> πάλλεν δεξιτερῇ φρονέων κακὸν Ἕκτορι δίῳ.
> (22.317-320)

B. The Pelian Ash Spear

One problem must still be addressed in this arming scene, namely the function of the lines about the Pelian ash spear which are repeated from Patroclus' arming scene (16.141-144=19.388-391). The repetition of the lines in Book 19 links the two scenes together in an immediate and undeniable manner.[384] For, although each Iliadic arming scene shares verses with one or more of its parallel scenes, such shared verses consist of more or less fixed elements in the structure of the scene. For example, all four scenes contain the same two lines about the warrior's greaves, Paris and Patroclus share the same helmet couplet, and Paris, Patroclus and Achilles are all given the same verse for their shields. The repeated lines about Achilles' spear, however, are different, for they amount to the *verbatim* repetition of an elaboration in the type-scene.

We have seen that the function of such elaborations is to adapt the generic scene to its specific subject and the surrounding narrative. The repetition, therefore, of such an elaboration in two of the same type-scenes is undoubtedly purposeful. The unique context in which the lines first appear in Patroclus' scene should draw the audience's attention and isolate them as significant. For they constitute the only example of the description in an arming scene of a piece of armour which is not taken. The inclusion in the scene of the single piece of Achilles' armour which Patroclus leaves behind prepares the way for the re-appearance of that very same piece when Achilles arms. The first passage explains why the spear is still available to Achilles,

---

[384]Cf. Bannert, *Formen des Wiederholens* 163: "Die Szene mit der Rüstung Achills T 369ff. hat ihr Gegenstück und ihre Vorbereitung in der Rüstung Patroklos, mit der Negation einer wesentlichen Gegebenheit, des Aufnehmens der Lanze."

when the rest of his arms are not. Furthermore, it is with this very spear that Achilles will kill Hector. The repetition then becomes highly significant; as Thornton sums up, "the spear which Patroclus could not wield Achilles will wield in order to avenge his friend on Hector."[385]

As we saw earlier, Patroclus' inability to wield Achilles' spear foreshadowed the disastrous end of his *aristeia*; when Achilles takes the famous spear with him to battle, it serves as an indicator of his successful return. As Patzer says:

> Der in der Rüstung Achills nun anders als bei Patroklos rechtens ergriffene Speer besagt, daß die so eingeleitete Aristie Achills nach der unwahren, nur halberfüllten und deswegen scheiternden des Patroklos die wahre, voll geleistete und von höchstem Gelingen gekrönte sein wird.[386]

The presence of the spear foreshadows Achilles' successful *aristeia*. This, in turn, connects the repeated lines about the spear to the poem's main story pattern, Achilles' wrath, withdrawal, and return, and its most important concomitant pattern, the death of the substitute. For the death of his companion is the event which brings the hero back to the fighting. The repetition of the four lines about the spear in Book 19 refers the audience back to the arming of the substitute in Book 16 and, therefore, brings into focus the events which follow upon that earlier arming and ultimately are the reason for Achilles' own arming. Patzer, once again, sums up the situation:

> Aber in ihrem ausdrücklichen Rückbezug auf die Rüstung des Patroklos enthüllt sie sich zugleich als tragisch hintergründig. Der bisher unversöhnlich Grollende ist nun durch den von ihm selbst

---

[385]Thornton 103.

[386]Patzer 38.

> verschuldeten Tod des Gefährten unvorhergesehen und ungewollt gezwungen seinen Groll aufzugeben und zu kämpfen, und seine letzten alles überstrahlenden Heldentaten, nach denen ihm der Tod gewiß ist, geschehen vor diesem dunklen Hintergrund.[387]

The death of Patroclus brings about the end of Achilles' wrath and his return to battle. This progression in the narrative begins with Patroclus' arming and ends with Achilles'; the four line repetition about the ash spear makes explicit this crucial connection between the two scenes.

Finally, Shannon sees the importance of the repeated verses in terms of what they reveal about the two heroes. He argues that the armour which Achilles dons in Book 19 is symbolic of the duality of his nature as the child of one mortal and one immortal parent:

> Achilles' original armor, although divine, was inherited from his mortal parent; the new armor with which Thetis supplies Achilles is divine in all senses and lends him new stature which fits his immortal parentage. The element of continuity which connects them and gives Achilles the strength of both his parents is Peleus' spear, the only piece of original armor not replaced by Hephaistos .... Peleus' spear is made a special symbol of Achilles' mortal prowess, just as the arms forged by Hephaistos ... become the symbol of his immortal stature.[388]

As we have seen, the similes attached to the armour depend upon the image of fire, the attribute of the arms' creator. The effect of these similes is to associate fire with Achilles, as we see at the end of the arming scene when he himself, and not just his arms, shines like fire. The provenance of the arms and the image of fire, connected as it is with Hephaestus and with

---

[387]Patzer 39.

[388]Shannon 27.

immortality in general, emphasize the superhuman stature of Achilles. The spear, on the other hand, coming as it does from his mortal parent balances this picture. For, not only is Peleus mortal, but in the *Iliad* he is consistently represented as old and on the verge of death (cf. 16.14-16, 18.432-435, and 24.486-487).

In both arming scenes, therefore, the presence of the spear characterizes the hero. The spear which only Achilles can wield defines, firstly, its owner's unique stature as a warrior and, secondly, the inability of Achilles' substitute to take his place.[389] Furthermore, in both scenes, the spear symbolizes mortality and foreshadows the deaths of both Patroclus and Achilles. Patroclus is shown to be no Achilles and will, therefore, be unable to stand against Hector. Achilles, when he takes his father's spear, and, with it, his mortality, to battle, goes out to fight with one purpose only, to kill Hector, knowing full well that the act is suicidal, that his death must come shortly after Hector's (18.95-96). Thus, the spear symbolizes the paradoxical nature of Achilles' return to battle. He must return in order to kill Hector, and killing Hector is the only measure of success for Achilles. The spear will be the weapon he uses to kill his enemy. However, in killing Hector, Achilles also kills himself. In this way, the spear is simultaneously the instrument of Achilles' success and of his death. The spear is most aptly described as a

---

[389]Cf. Shannon 71: "the repetition of the special nature and origin of the spear emphasizes the difference between the two heroes. The reiterated description brackets Patroklos' substitution for Achilles in the battle, and just as the exhange of armor stresses Patroklos' role as a surrogate for Achilles, Achilles' retention of the spear affirms his individuality and his special prowess. The ash spear consequently both unifies the two preparations for, and entries into, battle and also defines the distinction between the two heroes." Cf. also Fehling 72-73.

source of death for heroes (φόνον ἔμμεναι ἡρώεσσιν, 16.144=19.391), not only for Hector, the one hero in the poem struck by it, but also for the two heroes who wield it.[390]

C. Conclusion

To sum up, we have seen that the arming scene of Achilles, like those of Agamemnon and Patroclus, comes at a crucial point in the narrative and that the basic type-scene is adapted to the present situation and to the arming warrior. The scene marks the beginning of the fourth day of fighting and Achilles' return to the battlefield. It introduces the event which, according to the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern, we have been led to believe will be the climax of the poem. The fact that Achilles puts on a new set of armour made for him by Hephaestus underlines the importance of both the hero and the moment. In addition, it reminds us that Achilles' previous armour is no longer available to him, while the repetition from Patroclus' arming scene of the lines about the ash spear reminds us why Achilles cannot put on his old armour. This scene, however, more than the other two already examined, focuses on the characterization of its subject. Agamemnon's arming scene gave us a picture of the wealth and the military prowess of the Trojan leader; Patroclus' stressed his position as Achilles' substitute. In the present scene, the single dominant image of fire emphasizes that Achilles arms in anger, that his purpose in returning to the battle is to avenge the death of Patroclus

---

[390]Achilles casts the ash spear at only two other warriors throughout his long and bloody *aristeia*, at Aeneas and at Asteropaeus (20.272-281, 21.169-179). In both cases, he misses. The spear, it seems, is meant for Hector alone. Cf. Shannon 83-84 and Bannert, *Formen des Wiederholens* 159.

by killing Hector. Almost every single elaboration in the scene directly supports and adds to this picture of Achilles. The scene, therefore, emphasizes a major thematic shift in the poem. Achilles returns to battle not because he has given up his wrath, but because his wrath is no longer directed against Agamemnon, which led to his withdrawal, but against Hector, which requires his return.

V. The Arming Scene of Paris

A. Structural Development and Immanent Meaning

Paris receives the first arming scene in the *Iliad*. After the preparations for the duel have been completed, the poet introduces the arming scene:

> αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν ἐδύσετο τεύχεα καλὰ
> δῖος Ἀλέξανδρος, Ἑλένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο.
> (3.328-329)

Paris then proceeds to put on his greaves, breastplate, sword, shield, and helmet. Lastly, he takes up one spear. Thus, in its basic outline, the scene contains all of the same elements as the three other arming scenes already examined. It receives one elaboration, which appears to be a standard one, inasmuch as the same kind of elaboration occurs at the same point in three of the four scenes. We are told from whom the hero acquired this breastplate. Paris borrowed his from his brother, Lycaon (333).

The brevity of the scene (11 lines in all, compared with 15 for Patroclus, 27 for Achilles, and 28 for Agamemnon) and the paucity of elaboration have resulted in a lack of critical appraisal of this scene. Arend had little to say about it, other than that the structure of the type-scene can be seen in its simplest form here. Patzer's only comment is that the scene amounts to "die

einfache Form, offenbar die Grundform" of the arming scene; while Thornton sees it as "schematic and almost entirely formulaic."[391]

These scholars and, indeed, the majority of those who work on type-scenes are interested primarily in the elaborations attached to a hypothetical standard, or *Grundform*, of the scene. Reece sums up this view, using as his example Paris' arming scene:

> The simplest kind of interaction between type-scenes is their relative length, considered entirely apart from their content. A short, synoptic, bare-bones type-scene carries relatively little weight compared to a fully-developed and elaborated scene. The scene of Paris' arming in the *Iliad*, for example, is short and perfunctory, containing just the skeleton of the arming type-scene, and thereby suggesting Paris' relative unimportance on the battlefield. This is in stark contrast to the fully developed arming scenes of Agamemnon and Achilles, which are elaborated with extended descriptions of the armor .... Such elaboration slows down the pace of the narrative, adds weight to the scene, and signals the advent of a major episode on the battlefield.[392]

The length of one type-scene compared with that of another example of the same type-scene is certainly an important criterion for interpreting the function of that type-scene in a given poem. However, Reece simplifies the issues involved and mixes together features common to type-scenes which need to be treated separately. He states that Paris' arming scene, in comparison with those of Agamemnon and Achilles, is not fully developed or elaborated. But what does it mean for a type-scene to be fully developed?

---

[391]Arend 93; Patzer 29, who also dismisses Patroclus' arming scene for the same reason; Thornton 54. Cf. also Calhoun 11; Russo 282; Hainsworth, *Comm.* III, 216; and Willcock, "The Search for the Poet Homer" 6, all of whom similarly dismiss the scene as lacking in importance.

[392]Reece 192-193.

Such a designation suggests that there must exist a standard form of a type-scene to which all examples can be compared and deemed fully or under developed. As we have seen, the work of Lord, Nagler, and Foley demonstrates that no such standard exists, for the type-scene originates as an abstract, pre-verbal idea that comes into existence only and every time that a poet places it into his song. This accounts for the fact that no two examples of the same type-scene are the same.

The arming scenes of Agamemnon and Achilles are longer than that of Paris, but this does not allow the critic to designate them as fully developed, for such a designation suggests a norm which does not exist. What we can say is that all four arming scenes in the *Iliad* contain common structural elements which occur in a fixed sequence.

Thus, instead of speaking of a type-scene as being fully developed, we would do better to note the different ways in which a type-scene can be composed, in terms of the presence or absence of structural elements common to the type. When noting the presence of common structural elements, it is more accurate to speak of the scene as more developed or less developed, rather than fully or under developed. The latter designations refer to a non-existent standard. The former acknowledge the presence of common elements, but see the development of a type-scene along a continuum that has no fixed *termini*.

This is easier to demonstrate with kinds of type-scenes that occur more often than those of arming, such as the feast scene, in which certain elements occur with sufficient frequency from scene to scene to allow for a positive identification of the scene whenever it occurs. However, not every feast scene employs all of the elements associated with this type-scene. At times, the absence of particular elements indicates the relative lack of importance of

the narrative moment; at other times, however, it indicates that the poet has chosen to stress the importance of the moment in some other way. Similarly, the presence of a large number of shared elements can indicate the importance of the narrative moment or equally the adaptation of the scene to the demands of the narrative at a specific point.

To illustrate this point, I will examine three instances of the type-scene of feasting in the *Iliad*. The first occurs in Book 1 when Odysseus returns Chryseis to her father (458-474); the second in Book 7 after the duel between Hector and Ajax (313-322); and the third in Book 24 at the end of Priam's successful appeal to Achilles (621-627).

The first scene contains more of the structural elements common to this type-scene than either of the other two. In particular, the preparation of the sacrificial victim is described in more detail. Between lines 458 and 466, we are told that prayers are said and barley scattered over the victims. They are then slaughtered, skinned, and butchered. The thigh bones are wrapped in fat and roasted, while Chryses pours a libation of wine over them. Then the remainder of the carcasses is spitted, roasted, and eaten.

In the scene in Book 7, we are told simply that Agamemnon sacrificed an ox to Zeus. The victim is then skinned, butchered, spitted, and roasted (314-318).

The scene in Book 1 is twice as long as that in Book 7; it contains more of the structural elements common to the type and is, therefore, more developed. In part, this is a reflection of the importance of the former scene which signals the end of Apollo's wrath against the Greeks and the plague which accompanied it. The wrath of Apollo led to the argument between Agamemnon and Achilles and the latter's withdrawal from battle. It is an

event of the utmost importance in the poem, and the detailed description of the sacrifice to the god and the preparations for the feast reflect this.

The scene in Book 7, however, does not come at a moment of particular importance in the poem. It simply forms the conclusion to the duel which ended the martial exploits of the inconclusive first day of fighting. The brevity of the scene is commensurate with its lack of importance in the surrounding narrative.

The poet's art is, however, more complex than a simple correlation between the length of a scene and its importance. The elements which are present in the scene in Book 1 draw attention to the religious function of this scene. What is of primary importance here is the sacrifice to the angry god; therefore, the poet incorporates those elements found in other examples of the type-scene of feasting which emphasize the sacrificial aspect of the feast. In Book 7, there is no particular reason why a sacrifice to Zeus should be important or necessary at this moment; accordingly, the poet abbreviates these parts. This feast is meant to honour Ajax as the victor in the duel. The poet notes this by ending the scene with the hero being given the prized portion of the sacrificial animal (321-322).

We see from these two examples that the length of a type-scene as measured by the presence of structural components common to the type-scene in question can indicate two things: the importance of the narrative moment, as well as adaptation to the immediate exigencies of the narrative. Length is not, as Reece argues, simply an indicator of narrative importance.

We can see this most clearly when the poet inserts a brief instance of a type-scene at a significant point in the story. An example of this is the feast scene in Book 24 between Achilles and Priam. The whole scene is narrated in only seven verses (621-627), and obviously a number of common elements

are omitted. Even so, the scene is one of great importance, for it marks the climax of Priam's successful appeal to Achilles. In addition, the meal marks the end of Achilles' self-imposed fasting in his grief over Patroclus. And yet Homer chooses to give us an attenuated example of the feast scene. He can do this because he has at his disposal other devices to mark the importance of the occasion. Here, it is by means of a mythological paradigm, the story of Niobe and her grief (602-617). The story slows down the narrative pace and makes a comparison between the situations of Priam and Niobe, and thereby stresses the importance of Priam's grief. The peculiar emphasis on eating relates the story back to the immediate moment and also involves Achilles and his refusal to eat in his grief, a motif which goes back to Book 19 (209-214) and reaches completion here with the shared meal.[393] Strictly speaking, this feast scene contains fewer of the structural elements common in this type-scene and is, therefore, less developed than the scene in Book 1, just as the feast scene of Book 7 was seen to be. However, even though the scene is a less developed example of its type, it still carries with it considerable importance for the narrative.[394]

Reece over-simplifies matters when he argues that length is primarily an indicator of a type-scene's importance. Length is, in part, a function of the

---

[393]On the function of the Niobe story, cf. Richardson, *Comm.* VI, 339-342, who also supplies a bibliography, to which add: Braswell 16-17, 24-26; Austin, *Archery at the Dark of the Moon* 124-126 and "The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad*" 301; Lang, "Reverberation and Mythology" 143-146; and Gantz 536-537.

[394]Arend examines these three scenes, among others, in his chapter on sacrifices and meals (pp. 64-78, especially 68-76, and Table 4). He isolates twenty-one elements in the feast scene, of which seventeen are present in the scene in Book 1, six in the scene in Book 7, six in Book 24. Cf. also Edwards, *Comm.* V, 13.

number of elements present in a particular type-scene, and this can be just as much an indicator of a scene's adaptation to the narrative exigencies of the moment, as of the scene's importance in the overall narrative. Moreover, the brevity of a type-scene may result from the poet having given emphasis to an important moment in the narrative in some other way. Therefore, length, when it is evaluated based on the number of structural elements in a scene, is not necessarily an indicator of a scene's importance.

In returning to the arming scene of Paris, we see that it contains all of the same structural components as the *Iliad*'s three other arming scenes. In this regard, its development is equal to that of these scenes. Moreover, its length, as measured by the presence of these elements, is also equal to these scenes, as the table below demonstrates.

Structural Elements of Arming Scenes

(excluding elaboration)

	Paris (Book 3)	**Agamemnon** (Book 11)	**Patroclus** (Book 16)	**Achilles** (Book 19)
Greaves	2 lines (330-331)	2 lines (17-18)	2 lines (131-132)	2 lines (369-370)
Corselet	1 line (332)	1 line (19)	1 line (133)	1 line (371)
Sword & Shield	2 lines (334-335)	2 1/2 lines (29-30, 32)‡	2 lines (135-136)	2 lines (372-373)
Helmet	2 lines (336-337)	2 lines (41-42)	2 lines (137-138)	1 line (380-381)*
Spear(s)	1 line (338)	1 line (43)	1 line (139)	1 line (387)
TOTAL	8 lines	9 lines	8 lines	7 lines

‡Agamemnon's sword is described in line 29 and line 30 up to the tritotrochaic caesura.

*2 lines from the penthemimeral caesura of 380 to the penthimemeral caesura of 381. N.B. 1 line as defined by six dactylic feet, but in fact spread out over 2 verses.

In this table, I have separated the six structural components which regularly occur in the *Iliad*'s arming scenes from the various elaborations

which the poet attaches to them. In doing so, we see that the length of each scene, as measured by these elements, is approximately equal, that each of the arming scenes is developed to the same degree in terms of the presence of these elements. The table also reveals that the length of the four arming scenes is not a result of the presence of common structural components, that is to say of the scenes' development, but of elaboration of these structural elements.

Each of the three arming scenes already examined contains some elaboration. The arming scene of Paris, however, lacks all but the most rudimentary elaboration. Does this want of amplification, however, suggest, as Reece concludes, Paris' relative unimportance as a warrior in comparison to Agamemnon and Achilles? The answer to this question is more complex than Reece would have us believe. If his conclusion is correct, then we would also have to conclude that Patroclus is a relatively unimportant figure on the battlefield. For his scene is much less elaborated than either Agamemnon's or Achilles'. And yet, Patroclus is a more important figure on the battlefield than Agamemnon. He, after all, saves the Greeks from defeat and annihilation by driving the Trojans back from the ships. In addition, he slays one of the most important warriors on the enemy side, Sarpedon, the leader of the allied forces.

On the other hand, the principal function of Agamemnon's short-lived *aristeia*, which is introduced by his arming scene, is to demonstrate that he cannot hope to be successful against the Trojans without the support of Achilles.[395] That Agamemnon receives one of only five large-scale *aristeiai* in

---

[395]Willcock fails to see this point; for him, the importance of this arming scene and the *aristeia* it introduces is simply to honour the Greek

(cont.)

the poem does indicate his importance as a warrior in the *Iliad*. However, of these five *aristeiai*, his is the shortest and least impressive. Agamemnon kills the fewest number of named opponents and, in fact, does not even come face-to-face with a major Trojan warrior.[396] Patroclus, Hector, and Achilles all accomplish tactically important feats and slay important opponents. Diomedes kills Pandarus, fights against Aeneas, and brings the Trojans to the crisis which results in Hector's return to the city to instruct the women to make a special appeal for help to Athena. Less than three hundred lines after the commencement of his *aristeia*, Agamemnon is wounded by the otherwise unknown and insignificant Koön.

In the cases of Agamemnon and Patroclus, the degree of elaboration does not accurately reflect each warrior's importance on the battlefield. In the case of Agamemnon, the high degree of elaboration draws attention as much to the crisis on the battlefield as to the warrior who is preparing to go out on that battlefield. In the case of Patroclus, the whole structure of the first part of Book 16, all the events leading up to the marching out of the Myrmidons, draws attention to the hero's importance. Patroclus' appeal to Achilles which opens the book, Achilles' injunction that Patroclus arm once he sees Hector

---

leader: "Agamemnon is to have an *aristeia*, to show that though he may make mistakes in man-management and strategy, he at least deserves his position by his status as a warrior. Consequently, the poet gives him a big arming scene" ("The Search for the Poet Homer" 6). In fact, the purpose of his arming scene is to underline just how serious Agamemnon's "mistakes in man-management and strategy" are, and to demonstrate that his "status as a warrior" can do nothing to mitigate these mistakes.

[396] Cf. Krischer, *Formale Konventionen*, 23-24, 28-29 and 35-36. The four other *aristeiai* which he isolates belong to Diomedes, Hector, Patroclus, and Achilles. Cf. also Edwards, *HPI* 79-81, who gives a useful summary of Krischer's work; and Mueller 96-98, for a different view.

fire the ships, the arming scene itself, Achilles' address to his battle-ready men, and his prayer to Zeus for his companion's safe return focus the audience's attention to a singular degree on the figure of Patroclus. The arming scene is but one element in this extraordinary prelude to the hero's *aristeia*.

Therefore, we cannot say, as Reece argues, that elaboration in an arming scene draws attention to the arming warrior's importance on the battlefield. Instead, elaboration is one, but not the only, way that the poet has of drawing attention to the importance of events which are about to take place on the battlefield. These events need not necessarily demonstrate the importance as a warrior of the hero involved in them.

This is not to deny that arming scenes draw attention to their subjects. Without a doubt, one of the purposes of depicting a hero putting on his armour is to emphasize his status as a warrior. However, we have also seen that, in the *Iliad*, the three arming scenes already discussed come at critical moments in the narrative. These three scenes all contain a high degree of elaboration (or, in the case of Patroclus, an equivalent to elaboration), which underlines the significance of the narrative moment. The arming scene of Paris contains virtually no elaboration. What can we make of this? Does it mean that Paris is not an important warrior, or that this is not an important moment in the poem?

Firstly, that Paris receives an arming scene at all indicates that he must be worthy of such a scene. The arming scene draws attention to the hero as a warrior. It honours him in precisely this capacity. This is, as Foley would say, the immanent meaning of the arming scene, which is invoked each time the poet creates this scene. This must be so, for, as we have seen, referentiality in oral poetry is traditional. As both Lord and Foley have observed, traditional

units of oral composition, such as the type-scene, generate a meaning that arises from the tradition which created it; moreover, this basic meaning must remain constant in order for the poet's audience to be able to interpret and understand what it is hearing.[397]

Paris, therefore, must be familiar to the poet's audience as a warrior of some distinction. If he were not, the traditional meaning inherent in the arming scene would be undermined, as would be the audience's ability to interpret what it is hearing. This, however, does not mean that Paris need necessarily be portrayed as an important warrior on the battlefield in the *Iliad*. As Foley says, the poet can "contribute to the negotiation of meaning" of traditional units,[398] and, here, in Paris' scene, that the lack of elaboration is the means by which Homer negotiates the inherent meaning of the arming scene. Paris must be a warrior of importance in the epic tradition; however, he will not be one of the most important warriors in this poem. This is, I suggest, the first reason why his arming scene receives so little elaboration.

The second reason for this paucity is that the narrative moment is less important than those of the three other scenes. Each of these scenes is directly related to the main story of Achilles' wrath, withdrawal, and return. Agamemnon's arming scene introduces a narrative sequence which demonstrates how grave the situation is on account of Achilles' absence. Patroclus' scene comes at the moment of supreme crisis for the Greeks, while Achilles' scene signals the hero's return.[399] The arming scene of Paris lies

---

[397]Lord, *ST* 148; Foley, *IA* 6-11.

[398]Foley, *IA* 11.

[399]This is a point which Willcock fails to see. He argues that arming scenes sometimes give us information about characterization, but do little else: "I would not argue that there is any evident artistic intention or

(cont.)

outside the *Iliad's* main story. It is part of a series of events from Books 2 through 7 which recalls in the narrative present the events which belong more appropriately to the early stages of the Trojan war. Danek sums up the function of the scene within this framework:

> Die Rüstung des Paris im Γ steht vor dem ersten Kampf der Ilias, markiert damit symbolisch den Beginn des Krieges; Paris als der erste Held, der sich in der Ilias zum Kampf rüstet, ist gleichzeitig der, durch dessen Schuld der Krieg ausgebrochen ist.[400]

Paris is the first hero to arm prior to the first military encounter in the poem because Homer wishes to remind us that he is the ultimate cause of everything that has happened during the whole course of the war. The arming scene reflects his importance in this capacity. The lack of elaboration given to the scene by the poet indicates that this scene and this hero are less important *in his poem* than are the three other scenes and their heroes. The arming scene of Paris forms part of a secondary narrative sequence in the *Iliad*. As such, it is not as fully elaborated as those which belong to the poem's principal narrative.

In conclusion, the fact that Paris receives an arming scene as structurally developed as any in the poem indicates that he must have been an important warrior in the epic tradition. That he receives a relatively unelaborated arming scene indicates that he is not a warrior of the first degree of importance in the *Iliad*.

---

connection between the four descriptions. They do not interact. We do not see through a comparison of them into the individuality of the poet. Merely, there is an available sequence, and expansion is used to add effect in appropriate cases" ("The Search for the Poet Homer" 6).

[400]Danek 209

B. The Function of Paris' Arming Scene in the *Iliad*

Three of the heroes who receive arming scenes in the *Iliad* are central to its main story. Paris is not. In this sense his scene is anomalous, and we are entitled to ask why he receives one. Moreover, since the arming scene is one of the ways in which traditional oral epic glorifies the hero, we must also ask why heroes such as Hector, Diomedes, and Ajax, who all play more significant roles than Paris, do not receive one.

To answer the second question first, we have already seen that Agamemnon, Patroclus, and Achilles are central figures in the poem's principal story pattern, and that their arming scenes come at crucial points in the development of this pattern. Characters such as Diomedes, Odysseus, and Ajax, although they feature prominently in the poem, are not essential to the development of the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern. It is not that in the oral tradition these heroes would be inappropriate candidates for an arming scene — clearly they would be — but rather that the poet of the *Iliad* has, in general, linked the traditional arming scene with the main story pattern of his poem. This limits the number of heroes to whom the scene can be applied.

This conclusion further complicates my initial question, inasmuch as it suggests another reason why Paris should not have an arming scene. Not only is he less important than other heroes who do not receive arming scenes, but, in a poem which tends to use these scenes in connection with its principal narrative, Paris, who has no connection with this narrative, receives one of only four such scenes.

Before we are in a position to explain this apparent anomaly, we must answer another question. Hector is important to the wrath, withdrawal, and

return pattern. He poses the most serious threat to the Greeks during Achilles' withdrawal and effects Achilles' return to the battlefield. Why then does he not receive an arming scene?

In Book 17, Hector, in fact, puts on the armour which he has stripped from the body of Patroclus (192-212). Here, it would seem, is the perfect opportunity to grant an arming scene to one of the poem's most important heroes and one closely connected with its main narrative. At lines 192-197, we are told that Hector removes himself from the fighting and exchanges his arms for those of Achilles. Moreover, line 194 (ὁ δ' ἄμβροτα τεύχεα δῦνε) is similar to 2.328, 11.16, and 19.368 which announce the arming scenes of Paris, Agamemnon, and Achilles. However, no arming scene follows. Instead, Zeus observes Hector and expresses pity for him since, unknown to him, by putting on Achilles' armour, he seals his fate (210-208). One prominent critic has called this Hector's arming scene.[401] Danek, more accurately, refers to it as Hector's "Rüstungswechsel," as none of the elements of a formal arming scene are present.[402]

The reason that Hector receives no arming scene here is simple. The moment does not indicate a turning point or a new phase in the narrative. Book 17 is closely tied to Book 16 and the figure of Patroclus remains central. As Danek observes:

> Der Kampf um die Leiche des Patroklos bildet innerhalb des Aufbaus der Ilias eine Einheit mit seiner Aristie im 16. Gesang; die Person des Patroklos bleibt auch für den ganzen 17. Gesang im Zentrum des Geschehens. Die

---

[401]Edwards, *Comm.* V, 13 and 80. More recently, however, he states that "Hector never receives an arming scene" ("Homer and Oral Tradition" 288).

[402]Danek 212.

> übermaßige Hervorhebung von Hektors Rüstung würde daher, wenn man sich an den Gestaltungsprinzipien der Ilias orientiert, diesen Zusammenhang zerreißen, die übergreifende Einheit weniger deutlich hervortreten lassen.[403]

Danek is surely correct. Were Hector to receive an arming scene here, this would indicate, based on the placement of the three previous arming scenes, a new narrative development, when, in fact, the poet appears to envision the events from the arming of Patroclus up to the arming of Achilles as one continuous phase in his narrative. In order to retain this unity, Homer substitutes Zeus' forebodings for a formal arming scene. In this way, he is able to fix the audience's attention on Hector, glorify him through Zeus' comments, and still reserve the arming scene for different and very specific kinds of moments.[404]

---

[403]Danek 212.

[404]We see the poet apply the same principle with regard to his use of arming scenes in Book 7, just before the duel between Ajax and Hector. At line 206, as Arend observes (93, n. 1), we find the appropriate *Ankündigungsvers* for an arming scene: "Ὣς ἄρ' ἔφαν, Αἴας δὲ κορύσσετο νώροπι χαλκῷ. But no arming scene follows. Once again, the reason is clear: "der Kampf zwischen Aias und Hektor stellt innerhalb des Geschehensablaufs der Ilias eine relativ bedeutungslose Episode dar, er dient vor allem dazu, das allgemeine Kampfgeschehen für diesen Tag zu beenden, den Kampftag abzurunden. Das Duell soll nicht in gleicher Weise eine wesentliche Phase der Ilias einleiten wie die ... 'großen' Rüstungsszenen" (Danek 212). Far from initiating a new phase in the story, the duel in Book 7 marks the *end* of the first day of fighting. Ajax is, however, an important hero in the poem and Homer does honour him at this point. Our attention is fixed on him as he proceeds fully armed to the duelling ground. His advance is compared to that of Ares when he goes to war (208-210). Upon seeing him, the Argives rejoice (214), while the Trojans and Hector tremble with fear (215-216). The poet's gaze then moves back to Ajax and fixes on his shield, the origin and construction of which he describes (219-223), until finally he stands before Hector at line 225 (cf. Danek 211, n. 77). By comparing him to Ares, by allowing us to see the effect he has on those present, and by describing his

(cont.)

Hector does, however, receive an *aristeia*. After Agamemnon arms, the scene switches to the Trojans and specifically to Hector who appears, moving among the ranks like the dog star seen intermittently in a partially clouded sky:

> Ἕκτωρ δ' ἐν πρώτοισι φέρ' ἀσπίδα πάντοσ' ἐΐσην.
> οἷος δ' ἐκ νεφέων ἀναφαίνεται οὔλιος ἀστὴρ
> παμφαίνων, τοτὲ δ' αὖτις ἔδυ νέφεα σκιόεντα,
> ὣς Ἕκτωρ ὁτὲ μέν τε μετὰ πρώτοισι φάνεσκεν,
> ἄλλοτε δ' ἐν πυμάτοισι κελεύων· πᾶς δ' ἄρα χαλκῷ
> λάμφ' ὥς τε στεροπὴ πατρὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.
> (11.61-66)

An important motif accompanies Hector here, which will be discussed presently in greater detail. The poet draws attention to the way in which he glitters in his panoply, that is to the play of light off the armour. The two similes, the first comparing the shining armour to a star and the second to Zeus' thunderbolt, underline this image. Krischer was the first scholar to study this image, which he called the *Waffenglanz* motif and which, he observed, regularly occurred at the beginning of a successful *aristeia*.[405] This is the first indication that Hector's *aristeia* is soon to begin. This is confirmed a few lines later when Zeus instructs Iris to inform Hector that as soon as Agamemnon is injured he will make the hero pre-eminent for the remainder of the day (186-194). The *aristeia* of Hector begins at line 284 and continues, albeit with major interruptions, until the death of Patroclus at the

---

most famous piece of armour, Homer honours Ajax in much the same way that giving him an arming scene would. Cf. further Danek 206-207; Edwards, "Convention and Individuality" 4; Tsagarakis, *Form and Content* 95-96; and Bergold 107.

[405]Krischer, *Formale Konventionen* 23.

end of Book 16.[406] Hector's *aristeia* is the most important event during the highly eventful third day of fighting, for it encompasses the firing of the ships and the slaying of Patroclus.

Given its importance, why is Hector's *aristeia* not introduced by an arming scene? This question is important, not least of all because the beginning of his *aristeia* in Book 11 is the only other place, besides Book 17, where one could plausibly envision an arming scene for him. The answer to this question reveals another aspect of Homer's particular use of arming scenes. We have seen that he uses this type-scene to draw attention to developments in his main story pattern. Moreover, it is also significant that the arming scenes of Books 11, 16, and 19 all belong to Greek warriors. That Achilles and Patroclus receive arming scenes needs no justification, but the case is not so clear with Agamemnon. We can easily imagine a poem in which the third day of fighting began with the arming of Hector. Homer chooses not to do this, and the reason, I argue, is that he wishes to emphasize the situation of the Greeks, and not the Trojans, at each major stage, from inception to completion, of the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern. It begins in Book 1 with the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles and ends in Book 19 with Achilles' return to battle. In Book 16, a new development is initiated with the introduction of Patroclus as Achilles' substitute on the battlefield. At the beginning of Book 11, as the Greeks prepare for battle, Homer emphasizes the futility of any further military

---

[406]Cf. Krischer, *Formale Konventionen* 31-35 for a discussion of the structure of Hector's *aristeia* which is complicated by the insertions of Agamemnon's and Patroclus' *aristeiai*. For a different view, cf. Mueller 96, who argues that Hector does not have a real *aristeia*.

engagement against the Trojans without the help of Achilles. The devastation of the Greek army for which Achilles prayed reaches its fullest scope in Books 11 to 15. By having Agamemnon, and not Hector, arm at the beginning of this sequence, the audience's attention is firmly focused on the Greeks' fortunes in the absence of Achilles.[407]

Thus far we have seen why heroes who are more important than Paris do not receive arming scenes, and, particularly, why Hector, who is intimately connected with the principal story, does not. We must now answer the primary question. Why does Paris, given his relative insignificance in the poem, receive an arming scene?

Let us begin by examining the ways in which Paris' arming scene is consistent with Homer's use of this type-scene. Arming scenes function as preludes to *aristeiai*. By showing the hero putting on his armour and by describing the magnificence of that armour, the poet shows us the hero donning his valour, and, thereby, anticipates the feats of valour which the audience can reasonably expect will now be narrated. This is the essential function of the arming scene in traditional oral epic, and, to a large extent, explains its function in the *Iliad*. Moreover, Homer makes the arming scenes serve as pivotal points in the development of his story, or, as Patzer states, "wie die Pfeiler riesiger Brückenbögen der Iliashandlung."[408] However, he adds a peculiar dimension to each of the *aristeiai* which follow the poem's three arming scenes for Greek heroes. These *aristeiai* all end disastrously for their subjects, or, in one case, foreshadow disaster as a direct result of the *aristeia*. Agamemnon is wounded and cannot fight for the remainder of the

---

[407]Cf. Owen 111-112 and Stanley 129.
[408]Patzer 39.

poem. Patroclus is killed. In the case of Achilles, both audience and hero know that a successful *aristeia*, which for Achilles is nothing else than the slaying of Hector, will result presently in his own death. Bannert calls this the *Unheil* motif.[409] Paris' arming scene conforms to this pattern, even though it is not followed by an *aristeia*. In the duel with Menelaus, he loses and is very nearly killed. Moreover, his expressed intention to bring the war to an end by means of a decisive duel with his personal enemy is thwarted when Pandarus, who is unwittingly encouraged by a god determined upon Troy's destruction, breaks the truce by firing upon Menelaus. Pandarus' bowshot will prove fatal to the Trojans, for, in light of the oaths they have just sworn, Zeus must make them atone.[410] His bowshot also serves to remind the audience at the outset of the fighting, of the Trojans' over-arching guilt, for in important ways, Pandarus stands in for Paris here. He, like Paris, is an archer and his crime is directed against Menelaus. Thus, the duel and its immediate aftermath remind the audience of Menelaus' initial injury and also predict the Greeks' eventual victory over the Trojans through Menelaus' present victory over Paris.[411]

We are now in a position to answer the initial question of why Paris has an arming scene in the *Iliad*. The narrative of Books 3 to 7 serves to recapitulate the events which led up to and took place during the early years of the Trojan War. Whitman observes that, for these five books, "very little

---

[409]Bannert, *Formen des Wiederholens* 13-14.

[410]For Zeus' role in the punishment of perjury, cf. Parker 201 and Lloyd-Jones, 7-8, 37, and 44. Cf. also Agamemnon's words at 4.157-158 that, even if Zeus does not exact punishement immediately, sooner or later, he will make the Trojans, along with their wives and children, atone for their crime, and will destroy their city (4.157-158).

[411]Cf. Whitman, *HHT* 232 and Taplin, *Homeric Soundings* 104-109.

notice is taken of the main theme of the Wrath."[412] Nonetheless, these books constitute "a most intricately designed, perhaps the most intricately designed, block of narrative in the whole *Iliad*."[413] They are a distinct unit with its own narrative objectives, most importantly the recapitulation of the war. As such, they tend to ignore the principal story of Achilles' wrath. In Books 11, 16, and 19, arming scenes are intimately connected with this principal narrative. The arming scene in Book 3 also reflects the thematic objectives of the narrative unit to which it belongs. Just like the three later arming scenes, this one comes at a crucial point in the story, that point at which Homer reminds us of the cause of the war and emphasizes the Trojans' ultimate guilt. Just like the three later arming scenes, this one concentrates on a warrior whose military exploits will end in misfortune for himself, and, through him, for his people (the *Unheil* motif). Thus, Homer applies the same criteria to the arming scene of Paris as he does to the three other arming scenes: the scene marks a crucial point in the narrative; it stresses the thematic imperatives of the narrative unit in which it occurs; and it introduces a sequence which ends badly for its subject.

To sum up, Paris receives an arming scene because he is, traditionally, an appropriate recipient of such a scene. Moreover, the use which the poet of the *Iliad* has made of these scenes as a means of introducing imminent calamity allows him to foreshadow the Trojans' final defeat through the present defeat of the one who caused the war.

---

[412]Whitman, *HHT* 264.

[413]Whitman, *HHT* 265. One could also add the omen at Aulis and the marshalling of the fleet from Book 2 to the list of events that recapitulates the beginning of the war.

C. Elaboration in Paris' Arming Scene

Before leaving the arming scene of Paris, it is necessary to look at those features of the scene which make it unique. This is not as complicated an undertaking as it was for the poem's other arming scenes, as this one has only one elaboration. As we have seen, most of the scholars who have worked on arming scenes have dismissed this one as the basic form of the scene, containing nothing of great interest. A few, however, most notably Keith Stanley, have examined it in more detail.

Stanley argues that the arming scene anticipates Paris' defeat in the duel. The poet achieves this effect in three ways: through an emphasis on Paris' helmet, through elaboration on the breastplate, and through the absence of a motif which is normally present in arming scenes, namely flashing of the armour.[414] I will argue that the evidence does not support Stanley's claim, that these three elements do not prefigure Paris' defeat. Paris is, indeed, defeated in the action which follows his arming scene. However, it is not the individual features of his scene which allow us to anticipate this; instead, it is the general Homeric usage of arming scenes that permits the connection to be made between this type-scene and imminent defeat.[415] For, as we have seen, the four arming scenes of the *Iliad* are all followed by disaster for their subjects. Only in the arming scene of Patroclus, with its

---

[414]Stanley 34-35.

[415]Stanley argues that Paris' defeat is foreshadowed by elements in the scene; I maintain that Paris' defeat is consistent with Homer's use of the scene elsewhere. This naturally means the audience would not know while it is listening to the first such scene in the poem that it portends some sort of *Unheil*. For Paris' arming scene sets out how other such scenes will be used; thus anticipated defeat can only be read into the scene retroactively.

verses describing the spear which the hero does not take, do we find an incontrovertible example of a feature in the scene itself foreshadowing defeat. Normally, the scene as a whole carries with it, in the *Iliad*, the notion of *Unheil*.[416]

Stanley's first point is that Paris' arming scene reaches its climax not with the spear, but with the helmet. The spear, he claims, receives only cursory treatment at line 338, in comparison with the two verses given to the helmet at 336-337. This apparently anticipates the finale of the duel in which Menelaus grabs hold of Paris' helmet and begins to drag him toward the Achaean ranks. At this point Menelaus would have been the winner and Paris would have lost his life, if Aphrodite had not intervened (369-378). Stanley sees here a parallel to the "helming" of Patroclus emphasized at the beginning of his arming scene and the "dishelming" which occurs at his death.[417] Shannon was able to argue for this interpretation of Patroclus' scene by pointing to the unique use of the verb κορύσσω to introduce the scene and to the emphasis on the helmet at his "dis-arming." Stanley, however, cannot provide any similar evidence for his assertion. I fail to see in what sense the poet marks lines 336-337 as the climax of his scene, as Stanley argues. These lines recur in the arming of Patroclus (16.137-138) and in Book 15 when Teucer puts down his bow and takes up a shield, helmet, and spear (480-481).

---

[416]In Patroclus' arming scene, the verses about the Pelian ash spear underline the *Unheil* motif, for the most important feature of Patroclus' arming is that it will result in his death. The scene itself can and does convey this; the scene's one and only substantial elaboration makes this its most important feature. In the same way, the scenes belonging to Agamemnon and to Achilles also, in and of themselves, convey the notion of imminent *Unheil*; however, the elaborations of each scene serve different functions which make those scenes unique.

[417]Stanley 34, n. 106.

Line 337, moreover, appears in Agamemnon's arming scene at 11.42. Therefore, it is difficult to see how the poet singles out these lines, which appear to be the standard way of expressing that a warrior is putting on his helmet, as the climactic finale of the scene.

The second feature which Stanley argues predicts Paris' defeat is the elaboration on the breastplate. At 3.332-333, we learn that Paris borrowed a corselet from his brother Lycaon: δεύτερον αὖ θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσιν ἔδυνεν / οἷο κασιγνήτοιο Λυκάονος· ἥρμοσε δ' αὐτῷ. The elaboration appears to be conventional, as we have seen, inasmuch as the breastplates of Agamemnon and Patroclus are similarly amplified. Most scholars who comment on these lines merely observe that, because Paris first appeared at 3.17ff. as an archer, he has no corselet; therefore, he must borrow one for the duel.[418]

---

[418]Cf. Leaf, *Iliad* I, 144; Ameis-Hentze, Vol.1.1, 132; Willcock, *Commentary* 111; Kirk, *Comm.* I, 315; Edwards, *Comm.* V, 13. Thornton and Bergold both argue that the mention of Lycaon is significant. Thornton states that "[t]his piece of information [that the breastplate is Lycaon's] is pointless in its context, but foreshadows what happens in the arming of Patroclus who puts on ... [the] corselet of Achilles. It may also be a foreshadowing, if only in the mind of the poet, of Lycaon's death, who is killed naked by Achilles in the river-battle (21.50)" (101). Thornton surely goes too far in trying to create a parallel between Paris and Lycaon, on the one hand, and Patroclus and Achilles, on the other. In the second case, we have a complete exchange of armour; in the first, only one piece of armour, which the hero lacks but now needs, is borrowed. Paris' situation, far from foreshadowing Patroclus', finds better parallels in Meriones' acquisition of a spear from Idomeneus' store (13.294ff.) and in Diomedes' and Odysseus' borrowing of various pieces of armour from Thrasymedes and Meriones (10.254-271). In all three cases, pieces of armour necessary for the task at hand are missing and, therefore, borrowed from the nearest source. Thornton's second point, that the mention of Lycaon may foreshadow his death, is developed further by Bergold. He sees a direct progression from the defeat of Paris to the death of Lycaon, then of Hector and, through him, ultimately to the fall of Troy (108, n. 1). Although one can see the connection between Lycaon's and Hector's deaths (cf. especially 22.46-55, where Priam makes it explicit), I fail to see any

(cont.)

Stanley, however, sees more in the elaboration than a simple explanation of how the presently corselet-less Paris came by this now essential piece of armour. For him, this is evidence that "Paris is here preparing to play an atypical role in borrowed armor .... For he is an archer, and his preparations to do battle as a spearman carry a suggestion of sham, as the result is something of a farce."[419] Homer, Stanley argues, is telling us that the bowman will necessarily be defeated by the spearman.

However, if we examine the role of archers in the *Iliad*, we find that the poet makes no such clear-cut distinction between archers and spearmen. All of the warriors who use the bow in battle also use either a sword or a spear. Teucer, who is perhaps the poem's most prominent bowman (he is the only one to receive an *aristeia*, 8.273-334), kills with a spear at 13.177-178, and at 15.478-482 he exchanges his bow for a shield, helmet, and spear. Meriones is successful with both the bow and the spear.[420] Pandarus, who wounds Menelaus (4.105ff.) and Diomedes (5.95-100) with his bow, can also fight as a spearman (5.237-238, 277-279). In Book 13, Helenus, in a matter of a few verses, switches from the sword, with which he kills Deïpyrus, to the bow with which he shoots at Menelaus (13.576-587).[421] Finally, Paris himself,

---

similar relationship between Paris and Lycaon, who are nowhere mentioned together except in this one verse.

[419]Stanley 34. Edwards agrees, noting that Paris is presented as an archer, and, therefore, "unused to the hand-to-hand combat he will face against Menelaus" (*Comm.* V, 13).

[420]At 5.65-67, 13.527-530 and 567, he uses a spear; at 13.650, he kills with an arrow.

[421]Similarly, at 3.17, Paris is armed with both sword and bow. Janko observes that a sword is a vital part of the archer's panoply in the event that he is attacked at close range (*Comm.* IV, 118).

whose success with the bow in Book 11 we have already discussed, fights with the spear as well (15.341-342).[422]

The evidence of the poem suggests that warriors who have reputations as archers must also be able to wield sword and spear. It may even be that Homer envisaged the warrior's training as encompassing all the weapons of the battlefield: sword, spear, and bow. Pandarus suggests as much when he curses his lack of success with the bow, referring to his failure to kill either Menelaus or Diomedes. He recalls how his father, Lycaon, urged him to come to Troy with his horses and chariot instead of his weapon of choice, the bow (5.180-215). His father's preference for horse and chariot is based on their greater prestige (5.199-200). Pandarus now wishes that he had taken Lycaon's advice, not because of their prestige, but because he feels that, having failed with the bow, he could have done better as a spearman fighting from a chariot (201-211). His words suggest that, although he prefers the bow, he has been trained to fight with the spear and could have done so at least as successfully as has done with the bow. Odysseus, too, can wield the bow with great success. Although, in the *Iliad*, he prefers the spear, when he and Diomedes set out for the Trojan encampment in Book 10, the poet notes that Meriones lent Odysseus his bow and quiver (260). In the *Odyssey*, he boasts

---

[422]Cf. Janko, *Comm.* IV, 264: "Deïkhos is hit with a spear: διαπρὸ δὲ χαλκὸν ἔλασσεν implies that this is Paris' weapon, not an arrow as at 13.662." Incidentally, Paris is only rarely depicted in vase painting with a bow; his most frequent representation is in the context of the judgement of the three goddesses. Here, he frequently holds a sceptre, and in one case (the famous Munich amphora by the so-called Paris Painter), a spear. Most frequently, he holds a lyre, though seldom before the middle of the sixth century. The judgement is also a popular subject on Etruscan mirrors, where his most common implements are the spear, followed by the sword. Cf. Clairmont 104-105 and Beazley 1 and pl. 1, no. 3-4.

that he was the best archer who went to Troy, after Philoctetes.[423] In light of all this, Stanley's argument that an archer and a spearman joining in hand-to-hand combat carries with it a suggestion of sham and is ultimately predictive of the archer's defeat cannot stand.[424]

Finally, Stanley observes that Paris' armour does not flash or glint as the hero puts it on. The absence of this detail, he feels, foreshadows Paris' defeat. Stanley refers here to Krischer's work on the five large scale *aristeiai* in the *Iliad*. Krischer notes that as the hero arms just before his *aristeia*, "von

---

[423]*Od.* 8.215-220. Cf. also *Od.* 1.260-264, where Athena/Mentes tells Telemachus that Odysseus is nearby in Ephrya collecting poison to smear on his arrows. The only other place in the *Odyssey* where is he is presented as an archer is when he takes vengeance on the suitors (21.393ff. and 22.1ff.). The name of his son also suggests a predisposition to the bow. On Odysseus' skill as an archer in the *Odyssey*, cf. Heubeck *et al.*, *Homer's Odyssey* I, 91-92, 107-108, 359 and Kirk, *Songs of Homer* 290, who sees Odysseus' bowmanship in the *Odyssey* as evidence of major compositional difference between the two epics.

[424]Archery does not play a very important role in the fighting in the *Iliad*. In general, it is associated with the Trojans and their allies or else with heroes of an earlier generation, such as Heracles and Eurytus. Among the Trojans, Paris, Pandarus, Helenus, and Dolon are all archers; of their allies the Carians and Paeonians are described as ἀγκυλότοξοι (10.428 and 2.848). The Paeonians, incidentally, are first introduced in the Trojan catalogue as ἀγκυλότοξοι, but are later described as spearmen (δολιχεγχέας, 21.155). Among the Greeks, Teucer and Meriones are prominent archers (both participate in the archery contest at 23.850ff.); in addition, the Locrians fight with bows (13.712-722). Most scholars feel that this lack of prominence of archery in the *Iliad* reflects military practices on mainland Greece during the Bronze and Iron Ages, where archaeological evidence for archery, most in the form of arrowheads, is scarce. This is in contrast to Egypt, the Near East, and Crete (from where Meriones comes) where archery was clearly important in warfare. On archery in early Greek warfare, cf. Lorimer 276-301, especially 289ff.; Stubbings, "Arms and Armour" 505-520; Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* 278-280; Kirk, *Oral Tradition* 40-64; Greenhalgh 90-95; Luce 101-119; Snodgrass, *Arms and Armour* 17-24, 80-84, and *Early Greek Armour* 141-156.

seinen Waffen erstrahlt ein siegverheißender Glanz."[425] The flash of the armour is usually developed by a simile whose point of comparison is either fire, lightning, or the gleam of a star. This is most fully realized in Achilles' arming scene where the flash of both individual pieces of armour and the whole of the hero's panoply is emphasized in no fewer than six similes.[426] The *aristeiai* of Diomedes and Hector have no arming scenes; nonetheless, each one is preceded by the flash of the armour and an attendant simile. At the beginning of Book 5, Athena kindles fire from Diomedes' helmet and shield; it burns "like that star of the waning summer who beyond all stars rises bathed in the ocean stream to glitter in brilliance."[427] In Book 11 Hector's shield shines like a star moving across a partially clouded sky (61-66). The motif is missing in the arming scene of Patroclus, and this, Krischer argues, foreshadows the tragic outcome of his arming.[428] Agamemnon's case falls between those of Achilles, Diomedes, and Hector, on the one hand, and that of Patroclus, on the other. In his arming scene, the poet notes the flash of the armour, but does not develop it with a simile (11.43-44). Agamemnon's is the only one of the five principal *aristeiai* which ends with the warrior being injured. This is reflected in the underdeveloped nature of the preparatory motif, which has the flash of the armour but no attendant simile.[429] Krischer summarizes his findings as follows:

---

[425]Krischer, *Formale Konventionen* 23.

[426]Krischer, *Formale Konventionen* 27.

[427]5.4-6, trans. Lattimore.

[428]Krischer, *Formale Konventionen* 29: "Die Patroklie is die einzige der fünf großen Aristien, in der dieses Vorbereitungsmotiv fehlt, und damit deutet der Dichter ... den tragischen Ausgang an."

[429]Krischer, *Formale Konventionen* 29.

> Blicken wir einen Augenblick zurück auf die Behandlung der fünf großen Aristien, so kommen wir zur folgendem Resultat: die Aristien von Achill, Hektor und Diomedes werden durch ein Waffenglanz-Gleichnis angekündigt. Bei Patroklos fällt das Motiv weg wegen des bevorstehenden Todes, während es bei Agamemnon angedeutet, nicht aber im Gleichnis ausgemalt wird. In der Tat steht ja auch diese Aristie, was das Ende anlangt, zwischen derjeniger des Patroklos und den drei anderen. Wir dürfen also annehmen, daß im Normalfall die Aristie durch ein Waffenglanz-Gleichnis angekündigt wurde.[430]

In Paris' arming scene, there is no mention of his armour flashing. Can we conclude, based on Krischer's work, that this indicates his upcoming defeat in the duel, as Stanley asserts? Krischer nowhere refers to Paris' arming scene, and we might do well to ask why this is the case. The answer lies in the fact that he is interested in *aristeiai* principally and arming scenes only insofar as they are part of *aristeiai*. Moreover, he examines the *Waffenglanz-Gleichnis* motif as a feature of the *aristeia* and not of the arming scene. It may occur in an arming scene, as in the case of Achilles, but it can also stand on its own, as at the beginning of Diomedes' and Hector's *aristeiai*. Thus, the motif serves mainly to introduce *aristeiai* and to characterize them. It need not be connected with an arming scene. Krischer makes this clear. For him, the arming scene and the *Waffenglanz* are two separate motifs which introduce the *aristeia*.[431]

---

[430]Krischer, *Formale Konventionen* 38. Krischer (36-38) also examines the *aristeia* of Idomeneus in Book 13 and the marshalling of the Greek army in Book 2, where, in both cases, the poet notes the flash of the armour and expands upon it with similes.

[431]Cf. Krischer, *Formale Konventionen* 24, where he lists the individual elements of the *aristeia*: "Die Vorbereitungsmotive sind beide vorhanden: T368ff. wird die Wappnung des Helden beschrieben und T374ff. der Glanz der Waffen."

Paris has an arming scene, but neither here in Book 3 nor anywhere else in the poem does he have an *aristeia*. He does perform notable deeds on the battlefield, particularly in Book 11, but nowhere is he given a formal *aristeia* such as Agamemnon and Hector have in that book.[432] In fact, this is one of the ways in which his arming scene stands apart from the others in the poem, and, thereby, serves to indicate that the role which this scene plays in the narrative is also different. The absence of the *Waffenglanz* motif is not an indicator of Paris' imminent defeat; there is no reason for the motif to be present here because no *aristeia* follows.

Moreover, Krischer argues that a purposeful omission of the motif indicates more than imminent defeat, as Stanley would have it. Rather, it announces death. As Krischer says, "Wenn der Kampf, zu dem der Held sich rüstet, sein letzten ist, wird das Motiv 'Waffenglanz' weggelassen. Der Hörer der Erzählung weiß damit, was geschehen wird."[433] The only example in support of this usage is the arming of Patroclus. Even there, the poet has other means of indicating that this will be the last time the hero arms for battle, namely the verses about Achilles' spear. In Paris' case, defeat ends the narrative sequence that began with his arming; however, this is by no means the last time we will see Paris on the battlefield.

---

[432]Lendle (67) sees Book 3 as "eine Parisaristie," albeit a negative one; and Ph. Kakridis (293, n. 1) speaks in passing of an *aristeia* for Paris in Book 11. But these can only be very loose uses of the term. In Book 3, none of the elements of an *aristeia* is present, other than the arming scene, which Krischer lists as one of the possible preparatory elements; likewise, in Book 11, none of the elements of this action sequence is present for Paris, as Hainsworth (*Comm.* III, 267) observes. Cf. further Krischer, *Formale Konventionen* 23-36.

[433]Krischer, *Formale Konventionen* 36; cf also 29.

In conclusion, Stanley's analysis of Paris' arming scene cannot stand. The scene itself contains nothing which foreshadows the hero's defeat in the duel. Instead, a comparison of the way in which the poet uses all four arming scenes as indicators of new and important narrative sequences which will end badly for the principal figures allows us to see, in retrospect, that Paris' arming will end in defeat.

VI. Conclusion

I began this chapter with a claim that the arming scene of Paris, though the shortest in the *Iliad*, is the poem's most unusual. The characterization which Paris receives on his first appearance in Book 3, and, indeed, for much of the rest of this book and also in Book 6, is hardly that of a great warrior. Arming scenes serve the traditional function of glorifying heroes before they proceed to battle to prove themselves as warriors. This is so in the cases of Agamemnon, Patroclus, and Achilles. But, Paris goes onto the battlefield and is roundly and swiftly defeated. This, if nothing else, should arouse the critic's curiosity about the scene. Instead, scholars have tended to dismiss it as basic in form and uninteresting.

First of all, my examination of the traditional referentiality of the arming scene, that is, the immanent meaning which the scene carries in order for it to be understood, revealed that Paris must be a hero for whom an arming scene is appropriate. He must be seen by the poem's audience as a hero who can be classed together with Agamemnon, Patroclus, and Achilles in the oral epic tradition.

Secondly, we have seen that arming scenes, like all type-scenes, are composed of basic structural elements which can appear by themselves or be

elaborated in a variety of ways. When elaboration does occur, however, it is always purposeful. It can support or amplify characterization, as in the case of Agamemnon, or it can be linked to larger themes, as in the case of Patroclus. Elaboration is a tool which the poet can use to shape a traditional unit, like the arming scene, to his unique narrative and thematic needs; it does not, however, affect the scene's immanent meaning. We cannot, therefore, dismiss the arming scene of Paris on account of its lack of elaboration. The scene itself, in whatever form the poet chooses to give it, carries a level of signification which he inherits from his tradition.

Finally, we have seen that Homer uses the arming scene to mark pivotal moments in his narrative. Arming scenes inaugurate new developments in the story which always turn out badly for the hero who arms, and, by extension, for his side. Paris' defeat at the hands of Menelaus is, therefore, the logical conclusion of his arming scene. Moreover, just as the duel recapitulates the cause of the war, Paris' defeat foreshadows the defeat of all the Trojans.

That Homer should give Paris an arming scene is, at first glance, odd. Instead, of dismissing it as uninteresting in form and content and curiously applied to a substandard hero, a careful examination of the scene, as part of a tradition and as part of a whole poem, reveals that it is as complex as any in the *Iliad*.

Chapter 4: The Wrath of Paris

I. Introduction

In Book 6 of the *Iliad*, Hector leaves the battlefield and returns to Troy in order to convey to his mother Helenus' injunction to propitiate Athena, in the hope that the goddess may put a stop to the onslaught of Diomedes. Once he has conveyed the message to Hecuba, Hector goes on to the house of Paris, who has been absent from the fighting since Aphrodite rescued him from death at the hands of Menelaus in Book 3. Hector enters his brother's house and addresses him as follows:

> δαιμόνι', οὐ μὲν καλὰ χόλον τόνδ' ἔνθεο θυμῷ.
> λαοὶ μὲν φθινύθουσι περὶ πτόλιν αἰπύ τε τεῖχος
> μαρνάμενοι· σέο δ' εἵνεκ' ἀϋτή τε πτολεμός τε
> ἄστυ τόδ' ἀμφιδέδηε· σὺ δ' ἂν μαχέσαιο καὶ ἄλλῳ
> ὅν τινά που μεθιέντα ἴδοις στυγεροῦ πολέμοιο.
> ἀλλ' ἄνα, μὴ τάχα ἄστυ πυρὸς δηΐοιο θέρηται.
> (6.326-331)

He assumes that Paris is away from the fighting because he is angry. He urges him to return by emphasizing how dire the situation is for the Trojans — the city itself, he says, is in danger. Paris responds, by saying that he is not angry with the Trojans, that he feels sorrow, but that he has already been convinced to return to battle:

> Ἕκτορ, ἐπεί με κατ' αἶσαν ἐνείκεσας οὐδ' ὑπὲρ αἶσαν,
> τοὔνεκά τοι ἐρέω· σὺ δὲ σύνθεο καί μευ ἄκουσον·
> οὔ τοι ἐγὼ Τρώων τόσσον χόλῳ οὐδὲ νεμέσσι
> ἥμην ἐν θαλάμῳ, ἔθελον δ' ἄχεϊ προτραπέσθαι.
> νῦν δέ με παρειποῦσ' ἄλοχος μαλακοῖς ἐπέεσσιν
> ὅρμησ' ἐς πόλεμον· δοκέει δέ μοι ὧδε καὶ αὐτῷ
> λώϊον ἔσσεσθαι· νίκη δ' ἐπαμείβεται ἄνδρας.
> ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἐπίμεινον, Ἀρήϊα τεύχεα δύω·
> ἢ ἴθ', ἐγὼ δὲ μέτειμι· κιχήσεσθαι δέ σ' ὀΐω.
> (6.333-341)

Paris' sorrow is easy to understand in light of his earlier defeat in the duel. He himself may allude to this in his response to Hector when he says that victory is changeable. He had said much the same thing to Helen in Book 3, immediately after he had been rescued by Aphrodite (νῦν μὲν γὰρ Μενέλαος ἐνίκησεν σὺν 'Αθήνῃ, / κεῖνον δ' αὖτις ἐγώ· πάρα γὰρ θεοί εἰσι καὶ ἡμῖν, 3.439-440). These remarks may indicate that Paris does feel grief at his defeat, in which case they would explain the reference to ἄχος at 6.336.[434]

But what of the χόλος that Hector initially attributes to Paris? This is more difficult to explain. We have heard nothing before this of Paris' anger and will hear nothing of it afterwards. Paris takes some pains to correct his brother; he is not angry, he is sorrowful, he says. Indeed, it would appear that Paris is rather slow to anger. When Hector reviles Paris for challenging anyone of the Greeks to single combat and then retreating before Menelaus (3.39ff.), his response in surprisingly cool: ''Εκτορ, ἐπεί με κατ' αἶσαν ἐνείκεσας οὐδ' ὑπὲρ αἶσαν (59), he begins, just as at 6.333. Paris is not angered even though he has been publicly abused. And yet in Book 6, Hector assumes right away that Paris is not fighting because he is angry. Furthermore, Hector speaks in such a way as to lead the audience to believe that Paris' anger is manifest and its causes are well-known enough that they do not need to be rehearsed. For Hector refers to χόλον τόνδ'. The force of the demonstrative adjective τόνδ' appears to be deictic, and the phrase might well be rendered, "this well-known anger of yours."[435]

---

[434]Cf. Ameis-Hentze I.2, 124; Jachmann 11-12; Heitsch 221; Hijmans 181; and Bergold 179-182.

[435]Kirk, *Comm.* II, 203: "Emphatic τόνδ' might seem to suggest a more specific cause for resentment." Leaf, *Iliad* I, 218 refers to the "proper deictic

(cont.)

Paris' anger has occasioned much comment in Homeric scholarship, for its implications are obvious. Wrath is the main theme of the *Iliad* and is closely tied to the poem's greatest hero, Achilles. To have Paris sitting at home and refusing to fight on account of wrath suggests a comparison between the two men. Paris, however, is thought to be one of the poem's least heroic figures and has already shown himself, on his first appearance, to be a poor fighter and a coward . When, in Book 9, Phoenix draws a parallel between the wrath of Achilles and the wrath of Meleager, we feel the parallel to be appropriate: one great hero is compared to another. The same certainly cannot be said if we make the connection between Achilles' wrath and that of Paris.

For this reason, the wrath attributed to Paris at 6.326 has been the principal *zetema* of Homeric scholarship on this character since antiquity. In this chapter, I shall examine the different interpretations of the wrath and their implications for Paris in the oral tradition and in the *Iliad*. I shall begin with the Alexandrian scholiasts, since their views are varied and frequently referred to by modern commentators as viable solutions to the problems posed by Paris' wrath. I shall then move on to the modern commentators themselves. As I noted in Chapter 2, Paris' wrath was widely treated in Analytical scholarship and was the main evidence for the belief among many Analysts that the pre-Homeric Paris was a great hero, who, at some point during the Trojan war, created a crisis for the Trojans by absenting himself from battle because of an insult to his honour. Finally, I shall study the story pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return in the oral epic tradition to see what

---

force" of τόνδε, which he says must mean that the anger referred to by Hector is readily discernible to both men.

elements the different examples of this motif have in common. This will involve a study of the wrath of Achilles and of Meleager in the *Iliad*, of Demeter in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*, and of Hera in the *Hymn to Apollo*. By isolating the regularly recurring elements of the motif, we will have a body of evidence to apply to the scene in the *Iliad* in which Paris is presumed to be sitting at home on account of wrath. An examination of the scene along these lines will put us in a position where we can re-evaluate the Analysts' belief that a wrath, withdrawal, and return story for Paris existed in the epic tradition. The evidence will not allow us to argue, as the Analysts did, for the existence of a lost Paris-epic, but it will allow us to see whether Homer had in mind the same story pattern when he composed the scene between Hector and Paris in *Iliad* 6 as he did when he composed Phoenix' story about Meleager or when he sang of the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles. If this can be demonstrated, then I believe we have still more reason to believe that the traditional Paris was a heroic figure who has been re-characterized in a generally negative way to play his unique role in the *Iliad*.

II. The Scholia to *Iliad* 6.326

All the principal Iliadic scholia address the problem of Paris' wrath and propose solutions.[436] The A scholia are of particular interest here, for, as van der Valk has shown, they probably reflect the views of Aristonicus, who summarized the comments of Aristarchus wherever Aristarchus placed an

---

[436]For the following discussion, I am particularly indebted to Heitsch's examination of the scholia to 6.326 ("Der Zorn des Paris" 222-226).

obelus to indicate athetesis or a diple to refer to a critical note in his recension.[437] Aristarchus appears to have placed a diple at 6.326. If this is so, then this line has puzzled critics from at least the second century B.C.[438]

The A Scholia read as follows:

> ὅτι ἄπορον, ποῖον χόλον. λύοιτο δ' ἄν ἐξ ὑποθέσεως. μήποτ' οὖν ἀκούων τοὺς Τρῶας καταρᾶσθαι αὐτῷ ἐχολοῦτο. ἀμείβεται γοῦν «οὔτοι ἐγὼ ⟨Τρώων⟩ τόσσον χόλῳ οὐδὲ νεμέσσει» (Z 335)[439]

The A scholia propose to solve the problem of Paris' wrath by suggesting that Paris has heard the terrible things the Trojans have been saying about him. In Book 3, Trojan sentiment toward Paris was revealed to be overwhelmingly negative, as the scholiast aptly notes with καταρᾶσθαι. Just before the duel between Paris and Menelaus, both Trojans and Achaeans pray for the death of

---

[437]Van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* I, 553-592. Cf. also Kirk, *Comm.* I, 38-43, esp. 39. Although van der Valk shows that Aristonicus used other sources than Aristarchus, and offers his own observations without always indicating that he was doing so (cf. 506-507), he feels, nonetheless, that Aristonicus is a reliable source for the views of Aristarchus, even more so than Didymus. Cf., in particular, van der Valk's discussion of Aristonicus' treatment of the Aristarchan obelus (554-561).

[438]Heitsch (225-226) believes that we can push this date back to the fourth century. He argues that the bT scholia here, as well as Plutarch who also comments on this line (discussed below), were indebted to the Peripatetics for their views on Homer, in particular the lost 'Απορήματα 'Ομηρικά of Aristotle. Both Heitsch (225-226) and Lamberton (ix-x) show that by the fifth century a hermeneutic tradition was well established for the Homeric poems. Heitsch, therefore, concludes that 6.326 was already a *zetema* in pre-Alexandrian work on Homer. Cf. also Richardson, "Homeric Professors" 65-81.

[439]Erbse I, 188. "Because it is difficult [to see] what sort of anger. But it might be solved by the [following] hypothesis. Accordingly, perhaps he became angry when he heard that the Trojans were cursing him. At any rate, he replies, 'Not so much on account of [the] anger and indignation <for the Trojans>.'" All translations of the scholia are my own.

the man who began the conflict (ὁππότερος τάδε ἔργα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἔθηκε, / τὸν δὸς ἀποφθίμενον δῦναι δόμον Ἄϊδος εἴσω, 3.321-322). The Trojans, like the Greeks, seem to be praying for Menelaus to be victorious and for Paris to die. After Aphrodite rescues Paris, Menelaus searches for him up and down the Trojan ranks, but no one knows where he is. We are told that not even his own people would have hidden him, so strong was their hatred of him (cf. esp. 3.454: ἶσον γάρ σφιν πᾶσιν ἀπήχθετο κηρὶ μελαίνῃ).[440]

The bT scholia offer a different solution to the perceived inappropriateness of Hector's assumption of wrath on Paris' part:

> b(BCE^{3}E^4) :
> ἀφορμὴν λαμβάνει διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀργίας· οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἀσθενοῦς, ἀλλ' ὡς ῥᾳθύμου αὐτοῦ κατηγορεῖ. καί φησιν · οὐχ ὑγιῶς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν μῆνιν ἔχεις· σοὶ γὰρ οἱ Τρῶες μηνίουσιν (ὡς θελησάντων αὐτὸν ἐκδοῦναι Μενελάῳ). ἢ χόλον τὴν ῥᾳθυμίαν λέγει. ἐβούλετο μὲν οὖν αὐτοῦ πλειόνως καθάψασθαι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔδει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ Ἑλένης λοιδορεῖσθαι.[441]
>
> T :
> ἀφορμὴν αὐτῷ δίδωσι τῆς ἀργίας· οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἀσθενοῦς, ἀλλ' ὡς ῥᾳθύμου κατηγορεῖ. οὐχ ὑγιῶς, φησίν, ἐν νῷ ἔχεις τὴν μῆνιν, ἥν σοι

---

[440]Hector, in particular, frequently expresses his hatred of Paris; cf. 3.39-42 (addressed to Paris), 6.282-285 (to Hecuba), 13.769-773 (to Paris). Cf. also 3.159-160, where the Trojan elders express their wish that Helen return to Greece, indicating, at the very least, disapproval of the marriage of Helen and Paris, and perhaps in keeping with a more general antipathy to Paris on the part of the Trojans.

[441]Erbse I, 188. "He takes his start through [Paris'] inactivity. For he accuses him not of being weak, but of being easy-going. And he says, 'It is not sound for you to keep this wrath in yourself; for the Trojans are angry at you' (because they want to hand him over to Menelaus). Or he calls his indifference 'anger'. So he wanted to upbraid him more, but it was not right to revile him in the presence of Helen."

οἱ Τρῶες μηνίουσιν (ὡς θελήσαντες αὐτὸν ἐκδοῦναι Μενελάῳ).
ἄλλως τε οὐκ ἔδει ἐπὶ Ἑλένης αὐτὸν λοιδορεῖσθαι.[442]

The b scholiast notes that Hector accuses Paris of ἀργία and ῥᾳθυμία, not of ἀσθένεια which he implies would be the more obvious or appropriate charge. In the scholiast's paraphrase of Hector's words, the γάρ-clause appears to function as a justification of οὐχ ὑγιῶς. If this is correct, the sense of the γάρ-clause would be as follows: you have no reason to be angry with the Trojans, rather it is they who are rightly angered with you.[443] The scholiast seems to think that Hector would like to have said more to Paris or perhaps have addressed him more openly and severely, but that he was constrained by the presence of Helen; it would be ill-mannered of the gentlemanly Hector to upbraid Paris in front of his wife.

The T scholion is a variant of b, with one important difference: χόλον τόνδ' ἔνθεο θυμῷ is understood not as the anger of Paris against the Trojans, but of the Trojans against Paris. The b scholia say that Paris is angry, but that the Trojans have more reason to be the angry ones. According to T, however, the sense of Hector's words is, "It is not right that you have taken to heart the

---

[442]Erbse I, 188. "He gives him the motivation of inactivity. For he accuses him not of weakness, but of indifference. For he says, 'Not rightly do you dwell on the anger which the Trojans have against you' (because they wanted to hand him over to Menelaus). And besides, he could not revile him in Helen's presence." The G Scholia have the following note at 6.326: οὐ καλῶς ὀργίζῃ ἡγούμενος τοὺς Τρῶας ἀγανακτεῖν κατὰ σοῦ, ἢ ὅτι τῷ Μενελάῳ ἀποδοῦναι ἠβούλοντο ἅπερ ἔλαβες (Nicole, *Les Scolies Genevoises de l'Iliade* I-II, 101). G is a paraphrase of bT, and I cite it here for completeness. On the history and character of G, cf. the introductory essays in vol. I-II of Nicole's edition and Erbse, "Iliasscholien" 170-191.

[443]Heitsch 223: "der γάρ-Satz scheint das οὐχ ὑγιῶς begründen zu sollen: Du tust nicht recht (hast keinen Grund), den Troern zu zürnen, vielmehr zürnen zu Recht die Troer dir."

anger which the Trojans harbour against you." Heitsch has shown that such an interpretation is linguistically impossible, on the grounds that, since the dative, θυμῷ, refers to the person being addressed, the anger must belong to the same person, and not to a third party:

> (ἐν) θυμῷ τίθεσθαι, βάλλεσθαι o.ä. bedeutet in Verbindung mit dem Akkusativ eines Nomens (χόλος, μῆτις, ἔπος u. dgl.) immer, daß derjenige, von dessen θυμός oder φρένες die Rede ist, sich den Inhalt des Nomens zu eigen macht (also: in wessen θυμός χόλος fällt, der zürnt; wer in seinen θυμός das Wort eines anderen aufnimmt, der macht sich dessen Gedanken zu eigen).[444]

According to Heitsch, there is no example of the phrase (ἐν) θυμῷ τίθεσθαι, βάλλεσθαι etc. plus a noun such as χόλος, μῆτις, or ἔπος meaning "to take note of the feelings or actions of another person (and to draw conclusions for oneself from them)."[445]

Leaf raises a second objection to the interpretation of the T scholion. To understand χόλον τόνδ' as the anger of the Trojans against Paris "leaves τόνδε without its proper deictic force."[446] For the demonstrative adjective indicates that Hector is referring to some immediately perceivable

---

[444]Heitsch 223. He cites the following examples to support his argument: 1) *Il.* 14.49-50 (ὢ πόποι, ἦ ῥα καὶ ἄλλοι ἐϋκνήμιδες 'Αχαιοὶ / ἐν θυμῷ βάλλονται ἐμοὶ χόλον, ὥς περ 'Αχιλλεύς); 2) *Il.* 13.82 (χάρμῃ γηθόσυνοι, τήν σφιν θεὸς ἔμβαλλε θυμῷ); 3) *Il.* 15.561 (ὦ φίλοι, ἀνέρες ἔστε, καὶ αἰδῶ θέσθ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ, / ἀλλήλους τ' αἰδεῖσθε κατὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας); 4) *Od.* 14.490 (ὣς ἐφάμην, ὁ δ' ἔπειτα νόον σχέθε τόνδ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ); 5) *Il.* 7.44-45 (τῶν δ' Ἕλενος, Πριάμοιο φίλος παῖς, σύνθετο θυμῷ / βουλήν, ἥ ῥα θεοῖσιν ἐφήνδανε μητιόωσι); 6) *Il.* 10.447 (μὴ δή μοι φύξιν γε, Δόλων, ἐμβάλλεο θυμῷ). For further examples, cf. 223-224, notes 17-20.

[445]Heitsch 224.

[446]Leaf, *Iliad* I, 282.

manifestation of anger when he comes into Paris' house, namely Paris' own anger.

Eustathius, in his comments on 6.326, combines both the interpretations of the A scholia and the bT scholia:

> Ὅτι καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὸν ἀδελφὸν Πάριν Ἕκτωρ νείκεσεν ἰδὼν αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσιν εἰπών «δαιμόνι', οὐ μὲν καλὰ», ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐ καλῶς, «χόλον τόνδ' ἔνθεο θυμῷ», ἤγουν ἐνέθου τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. καὶ σημείωσαι ὅπως τὴν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ δειλίαν συσκιάζων καὶ μὴ ἀνέδην ἐξονειδίζων χόλον αὐτὴν εὐσχημονέστερον λέγει, ὡς δῆθεν χολουμένου τοῦ Πάριδος κατὰ τῶν Τρώων, οἷα μισούντων αὐτὸν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκδεδωκότων εἰς μονομαχίαν τῷ Μενελάῳ.[447]

He explains Hector's attribution of anger to Paris with regard to the gentlemanly manners of Homeric society (τὴν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ δειλίαν συσκιάζων καὶ μὴ ἀνέδην ἐξονειδίζων χόλον αὐτὴν εὐσχημονέστερον λέγει), and then accounts for the anger itself as being Paris' response to the Trojans' hatred of him.

Outside the explanatory literature on the *Iliad*, the wrath of Paris appears also in Plutarch, where Hector's attitude toward Paris becomes an example of how a good man can make a worse man rise above himself:

> οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο ποιεῖ τὸν παρρησιαζόμενον ἥκιστα λυπεῖν καὶ μάλιστα θεραπεύειν ἢ τὸ φειδόμενον ὀργῆς ἐν ἤθει καὶ μετ' εὐνοίας προφέρεσθαι τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν. ὅθεν οὔτε ἀρνουμένους δεῖ

---

[447]Eustathius II, 322-323. "Because here too, when he saw his brother Paris, Hector reproached him with shameful words saying, 'Strange creature, it is not good (i.e., it is not right) for you to put this anger in your heart (i.e., put it in your spirit),' and the rest. And note how, veiling his brother's cowardice and not just simply reproaching him, he calls it more elegantly anger, as if on these grounds Paris is angry at the Trojans, because they hate him and for this reason had handed him over to Menelaus for the duel." The translations of Eustathius are mine.

> πικρῶς ἐξελέγχειν οὔτε κωλύειν ἀπολογουμένους, ἀλλὰ καὶ προφάσεις εὐσχήμονας ἀμωσγέπως συνεκπορίζειν καὶ τῆς χείρονος αἰτίας ἀφιστάμενον αὐτὸν ἐνδιδόναι μετριωτέραν, ὡς ὁ Ἕκτωρ (Z326), "δαιμόνι', οὐ μὲν καλὰ χόλον τόνδ' ἔνθεο θυμῷ," πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφόν, ὡς οὐκ ἀπόδρασιν οὐδὲ δειλίαν οὖσαν ἀλλ' ὀργὴν τὴν ἐκ τῆς μάχης ἀναχώρησιν αὐτοῦ.[448]

By resorting to praise rather than blame, Hector gives Paris the opportunity to correct his behaviour. Presented with an honourable reason for being absent from battle, Paris is encouraged to raise himself up to this standard of behaviour.

All the ancient commentators on 6.326 have a common starting point, that Hector's attribution of wrath to Paris is not immediately comprehensible and must be explained. Their views fall into two categories. Firstly, in the A scholia, which probably reflect the views of Aristarchus, Paris' anger is presumed to be real and is a reaction to Trojan hatred of him.[449] Secondly, the b and T scholia, Eustathius, and Plutarch deny that the anger really existed and interpret Hector's words either as those of a gentleman loathe to

---

[448]Plutarch, *De Adulatore et Amico*, 73E-F. "For nothing else makes the free-speaker give the least pain and the most help than to be sparing of anger in usage and to bring himself before those who are in error with kindly thought. Accordingly, neither should one bitterly refute them when they deny it, nor hinder them when they defend themselves, but in some way or other help them to make plausible excuses, and, distancing oneself from the worse motivation, give them a more moderate one, just as Hector [said] to his brother, 'Strange man, it is not good for you to put this anger in your heart,' as if his retirement from battle were not running away or cowardice, but anger." The translations of Plutarch are mine.

[449]This view is shared by the majority of 19th and early 20th century commentators not of the Analytical school; cf., for example, Kennedy 299, Heyne 318, Paley I.227, Trollope, Pierron 228, Seymour 176-177, van Leeuwen 167, Monro I.315, Henry 97, and Bassett 134-135. It continues to find acceptance; cf. Bergold 179-183; Hohendahl-Zoetelief 11-15; and Kirk, *Comm.* II, 203.

embarrass Paris in front of his wife or as those of a moralist concerned to improve his fellow man; Hector asserts that his brother is angry rather than accusing him more accurately of being weak and cowardly.[450] All the ancient commentators agree that the Trojans have more reason to be angry at Paris than he at them, and the T scholia, in fact, presume that the anger which Hector mentions is the anger of the Trojans directed at Paris.

Although the various comments of the scholiasts have frequently been cited to explain Paris' wrath, their solutions are rather limited. They consider only why Paris is angry or why Hector would say that Paris is angry. The question is, of course, interesting, and the poem itself may provide the answer in the enmity of the Trojans for their prince. However, none of them considers the wider implications of this anger for the figure of Paris in the poem itself or beyond its confines. None of them considers the parallels the wrath suggests with the stories of Achilles and Meleager. For such questions, we must turn to more recent scholars.

III. *Ad hoc* Inventions, Story Patterns, and the Wrath of Paris

While the Analysts tended to argue that Hector's attribution of wrath to Paris was an indication of a traditional wrath story attached to this hero, other scholars, most prominently Schadewaldt and Jachmann, have argued that Paris' wrath is nothing more than an *ad hoc* invention. According to this view, it is created specifically for the scene in which we find it, and serves

---

[450]Kakridis, *HR* 46, and Reinhardt, *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* 20 have also found this view to be plausible.

a function only in that scene. It may be created out of traditional motifs, but it is not an indicator that a traditional story lies behind the reference.[451]

Schadewaldt argues that Hector's attribution of wrath to Paris is an example of the way in which Homer uses traditional motifs for specific purposes and then sets them aside once these have been fulfilled. According to him, absence from battle on account of anger at some slight was a common theme of early epic and, indeed, probably reflected the social reality of the time. Therefore, one need not hypothesize about a now lost story known to the epic tradition in which the wrath of Paris was treated fully.[452]

Jachmann also considers Paris' wrath an *ad hoc* invention.[453] It is, however, a specific kind which he terms *ein Hilfsmotiv* and defines as follows:

> der χόλος ist insofern ein Hilfsmotiv, als er gleich einer Brücke dem Dichter dazu dient, den Hörer zur wahren

---

[451]Other scholars who treat the wrath of Paris as an *ad hoc* invention include Willcock, "B356, Z326 and A404" 24 and "Ad Hoc Invention in the *Iliad*" 51; Heubeck, *Die homerische Frage* 67-68; Kirk, *Comm.* II, 203; Collins 28-29; and Lowenstam, *The Scepter and the Spear* 86.

[452]Cf. *Von Homers Werk und Welt* 227: "Daß Hektor zunächst eine Verärgerung bei Paris voraussetzt, die ihn von Kampf abhalte ist noch lange kein Grund, auf einen älteren und anderen Zustand des Gedichts zu schließen. Das Sichverzürnen war die edle Untugend dieser Herren, die beherrscht von großen Trieben lebten; es war ein häufiges Thema der frühen grieschischen wie auch der Epik verwandter Völker und lag also nahe genug, um im Vorbeigehn aufgegriffen zu werden."; cf. also "Homerische Szene" 165; and *Iliasstudien* 142, n. 3. Cf. further, Reinhardt, *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* 20, whose views are essentially the same as Schadewaldt's.

[453]Cf. Jachmann 13: "Der Zorn des Paris aber als Möglichkeit, die er ja immerhin darstellt, gehört letzten Endes nicht der hehren und hellen Sphäre der großen Gestaltungen an wie der des Achill oder des Meleager, sondern jenem Bereich des Unter- und Hintergründigen, aus welchem die Dichter in beliebiger und willkürlicher Weise ihre flüchtigen Augenblickserfindungen und ausmalenden Nebenzüge holen."

> Vorstellung zu leiten, nämlich zu der vom ἄχος des Alexandros. Wohl könnte es Grimm und Unwille sein, was er im Busen hegt; Hektor nimmt das an und fragt den Bruder danach und auf diesem Wege erfährt er und erfahren wir, daß es nicht Zorn ist, was ihn eigentlich erfüllt, sondern Gram und Schmerz.[454]

The main issue for Jachmann is not the χόλος which Hector attributes to Paris, but the ἄχος to which Paris confesses. The only purpose which χόλος serves is to introduce the principal issue, ἄχος. The wrath of Paris is, therefore, not a problem, for it does not really exist:

> Das ist nicht eben schwer, der Dichter hat es uns leicht genug gemacht, wir brauchen ihn eigentlich nur beim Wort zu nehmen, um dann zu erkennen, daß ein χόλος des Paris im Grunde garnicht existiert oder doch nur in der Vorstellung Hektors.[455]

---

[454]Jachmann 13; cf. also Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer* 310, with whom the idea of a *Hilfsmotiv* originates. I shall pass over Jachmann's secondary line of argumentation in which he contends that any inconsistencies with the overall narrative resulting from 6.326 are attributable to the independent status of the section dealing with Hector's visit to Troy, the so-called *Homilia*. He argues that this was originally an *Einzellied*, composed for recitation on its own, without reference to the plot of the *Iliad*. At some point, this *Einzellied* was incorporated into the *Iliad*, adaptations were made, particularly at the beginning and end, to facilitate a smooth narrative progression. Because of this kind of editorial work, infelicities inevitably remain, such as the wrath of Paris. Cf. Jachmann 29-40. Needless to say, theories about independent *Einzellieder* joined together to form longer poems are no longer tenable in light of Parry's and Lord's proofs of the oral nature of the Homeric poems, which, among other things, preclude the existence of fixed texts, such as a *Homilia*, which could be edited and adapted by subsequent poets.

[455]Jachmann 10. Cf. also 12: "Als letztes Ergebnis buchen wir, daß es den vielerörterten Zorn des Paris in Wahrheit garnicht gibt." A little later on, however, he argues rather curiously that Paris is probably somewhat angry (*etwas gram*) with the Trojans, because of their sentiments towards him, but not sufficiently so to warrant a withdrawal from fighting (12-13). This would seem to contradict his assertion that the wrath exists only in the mind of

(cont.)

Hector assumes that Paris is away from the battlefield on account of anger, because this is the only heroic reason which could justify a hero's absence. Paris, however, corrects him, saying that he feels ἄχος, an emotion which Jachmann also finds readily comprehensible. Paris has just been defeated in the duel with Menelaus; he must now return Helen; and he knows that his own people despise him.[456] Thus, the one emotion, anger, is explained by the conventions of epic poetry, the second, grief, by the narrative context.[457]

Hector. Even if Paris is only a little bit angry, his anger then exists in its own right. Cf. further Heitsch 242 for a critique of Jachmann's argumentation.

[456]Jachmann 11: "Und den Kummer des Paris würden wir doch unschwer begreifen, selbst wenn er seine Ursache nicht in den folgenden Versen andeutend, doch im Grunde unmißverständlich zu erkennen gäbe. Soeben ist er im Zweikampf mit Menelaos offenkundig unterlegen, eigentlich müßte er nun Helena herausgeben und er weiß auch, daß die Masse des Volkes ebenso denkt und daß viele ihn geradezu verwünschen. ... [F]ür Paris hat sich diese mißliche Gesamtsituation jetzt geradezu kritisch zugespitzt, er hat als Kämpfer eine zwar nicht unwürdige, aber doch unglückliche Figur gemacht — was Wunder, daß ihn tiefes ἄχος überfällt und er in lähmendem Ungemach zu versinken droht."

[457]Even if we assume for the moment, with Jachmann, that Paris' wrath is an *ad hoc* invention, his argument that Hector's attribution of wrath to Paris is a mistaken assumption which Paris corrects does not solve the problem of 6.326, for the poet speaks as much in the voice of Hector as in the voice of Paris. In everyday life, an assumption on the part of one person can be corrected and put to rest by another person. However, when a literary character says something unexpected or out of keeping with the dramatic situation, but is then corrected by another character, the audience will not necessarily be satisfied. The poet speaks with equal intent through both characters, the one making the unexpected comment and the one offering a seemingly more appropriate point of view. The audience is expected to take note of the original comment, and, in the case of a traditional poem, they can legitimately ask if something deeper lies behind the original comment. Moreover, this particular motif happens to suit Paris quite well. The Trojans regularly express their hatred of Paris. For a Trojan prince and a prominent warrior to respond to this animosity with wrath and a refusal to fight is not only reasonable but also follows a well-established pattern. Thus, Hector's assumption that his brother is not fighting because of wrath is well-grounded,

(cont.)

Schadewaldt and Jachmann both argue that wrath was a stock motif of the Greek oral epic, and that, therefore, we need not pay attention to the wrath of Paris.[458] This argument is based on the reasonable assumption that not every mention of a particular motif must be based on a fully developed, but now lost, account in the oral tradition. It is plausible that common motifs can be introduced because they serve an immediate need, and that, once the need has been fulfilled, they are dropped.

Before proceeding any further, a definition of this phenomenon is in order. According to Heitsch, *ad hoc* inventions, or *Augenblickserfindungen*, are created for a specific moment and purpose in the narrative; they have no function outside that moment. Therefore, once they have served the purpose for which they were created, they cease to operate:

> Das liegt schließlich im Wesen solcher Erfindungen; denn wenn der Dichter nichts mit ihnen begründen wollte, würde er sie eben für den Augenblick nicht erfinden. Augenblickserfindungen sind zusätzliche Faktoren, mit denen der Dichter im Augenblick etwas erreichen will; sie sind in gewissem Sinne immer ‚überher'. Der Dichter wird aber nicht etwas zusätzlich erfinden, was ihn und sein Publikum in diesem Augenblick stört.[459]

---

and we are still entitled to ask why Homer has attached such an important motif to such a significant character in the Trojan cycle. Cf. further Heitsch 230-231, 242.

[458]In addition to the wrath of Achilles, the *Iliad* alone gives us the wrath of Meleager (9.524 ff.), Agamemnon (1.247, 282), Aeneas, (13.460-61), and the Achaean army as a whole (13.107-110, 14.49-51, 19.85-86). Heitsch 228, n. 37, expands the motif of wrath to quarrels in general; in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* combined, he then counts sixteen examples.

[459]Heitsch 228, n. 38. Cf. also Willcock, "Ad Hoc Invention in the *Iliad*" 44-45: "I intend here to consider a large class of assertions found in speeches, mostly of statements, promises, threats, and so on, allegedly made in the past. In some cases there is striking inconsistency with another passage in the *Iliad*; in all, it can be demonstrated that the assertion is directly related to the occasion on which it is made, and to the particular circumstances of the

(cont.)

Because an *ad hoc* invention serves a specific and limited purpose, this may, at times, create a contradiction with other elements in the larger narrative or even in the mythological tradition as a whole. According to those who regularly explain difficulties in the text with reference to this phenomenon, this is merely a peculiarity of the oral poet's art, and should not lead to complex or outlandish hypotheses of variant traditions. It is worth noting Heitsch's final comment that the oral poet would not invent anything which would strike his audience as troublesome or odd. Presumably by this he means that such inventions must not directly contradict the audience's general knowledge of traditional stories and the figures in them.

Undoubtedly, *ad hoc* invention is a feature of oral composition, and it can, perhaps, explain some difficulties in our texts of Homer. Invariably, however, such a claim must depend on an argument *ex silentio*. Moreover, a danger exists of resorting to *ad hoc* invention as a ready-to-hand explanation for difficulties that could be treated more productively by admitting the possibility that such difficulties may just as well be due to our limited knowledge of the oral epic tradition. Edwards rightly asserts that no passage can positively be identified as invention and that any such identification is "bold." Instead, he says that "it is safer to speak of the adaptation of conventional motifs, or the modification of a tale by the inclusion of a different traditional motif."[460]

I argue that we should do more than this. Certainly, we must be wary of claims that Homer invents myths, like Thetis' story of an attempted coup

---

person who is being addressed. These examples cumulatively build a case for a technique of ad hoc invention by the *Iliad* poet." Cf. further Braswell, "Mythological Innovation" 16-26.

[460]Edwards, "Neoanalysis and Beyond" 313; cf. also Slatkin 115-118.

against Zeus by Poseidon, Hera, and Athena. Our knowledge of the epic tradition is simply too limited to support such a position. Moreover, the claim that a conventional motif, such as wrath, has been applied for the first time to a traditional story, such as that of Meleager and the Calydonian boar-hunt, remains equally tenuous. A more productive starting point is to assume that seemingly odd passages reflect traditional stories. In many cases, this position too must remain hypothetical, for little or no evidence will be found to lend it concrete support. But, by examining the different elements which have been used to create what seem like narrative inconsistencies in a given passage, one should be able to determine if some sort of larger pattern forms the basis of the passage in question. If one can determine that a particular story pattern has been used to make up the reference in question, a connection has been made to the epic tradition. The possibility can then be examined that the events which serve to make up the reference may also have been part of the epic tradition.

I shall proceed in this way in my examination of the wrath of Paris. Because the scene in which the reference to Paris' wrath occurs shares certain elements with the story pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return, I shall assume at the outset that the poet had this pattern in mind when he composed this scene. In order to substantiate this assumption, I shall examine other examples of this story pattern from Greek oral epic in order to ascertain what elements commonly make up this pattern. This will put us in a position to determine whether the scene between Paris and Hector has been created with reference to this pattern.

This does not, of course, mean that the oral tradition knew of a story of wrath, withdrawal, and return in which Paris was the central hero; however, it does mean that such a story *could* have been attached to him. In other

words, if an oral poet like Homer composed a scene around Paris based on the pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return, this must strike him and his audience as reasonable. Paris must be known to poet and audience as a figure for whom such a story pattern would be appropriate. For, in an oral poetic system, story patterns, like type-scenes and formulae, carry an immanent meaning which is conveyed metonymically every time a particular pattern is used.[461] The pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return serves to glorify the hero at the centre of the pattern. For this motif must develop in such a way as to demonstrate that the withdrawn hero is essential to his community. He cannot be insulted, for the community's very survival depends upon him. Thus, when he leaves his community, any measures necessary to effect his return are justified. In fact, the hero must be given even more honours than he had before his withdrawal; therefore, the culmination of this story pattern shows the hero to be even greater than he was at its beginning.[462]

The importance of inherent meaning was the basic premise of my argument about the type-scene of arming and its application to Paris. Because arming scenes serve a specific function in oral epic, this function must apply to Paris in his arming scene. Its function is essentially the glorification of the hero before a significant military engagement. I argued that this meaning was at work as much in Paris' arming as in that of any other hero and, therefore,

---

[461]On this function of story patterns in oral poetry, cf. Lord, *ST* 186-197, "The Theme of the Withdrawn Hero in Serbo-Croatian Oral Epic" 18-30, "Tradition and the Oral Poet" 13-28; Foley, *IA* 42-48; *The Singer of Tales in Performance* 175-179.

[462]Cf. Nagler's comments (*S&T* 131): "the poetic value of the pattern as *auxesis* of the hero's importance is obvious."

provided evidence for a traditionally heroic conception of Paris that is at odds with his general characterization in the *Iliad*.

I shall be applying the same argument to the story pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return and its application to Paris, with one important difference. Story patterns are the largest of the oral poet's compositional units and form the main organizing principal for his songs. Lord defines them as "narrative patterns that, no matter how much the stories built around them may seem to vary, have great vitality and function as organizing elements in the composition and transmission of oral story texts."[463] Because they function as the fundamental organizing element in a specific song, both in its composition and transmission, story patterns are in one sense more stable units than type-scenes or formulae. Story patterns cannot be separated from the songs formed around them, for their essential function is to define song.[464] The *Iliad* could not possibly be the story of Achilles' wrath if the story pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return were removed from it.[465] However, one can conceive of an *Iliad* without arming scenes. No matter how integrally they are connected to the narrative as we know it, they are not an essential feature of the poem. As Foley says, the story pattern "inheres in certain songs and in certain types of songs as an inseparable (indeed defining)

---

[463]Lord, "The Theme of the Withdrawn Hero in Serbo-Croatian Oral Epic" 18.

[464]As Lord says ("The Theme of the Withdrawn Hero" 22), the force of the story pattern is "the subconscious strength of the traditional pattern to maintain itself, frequently in the same linear order."

[465]This is not to say that there is no room for variation in story patterns. Different elements can be elaborated more than others, simplified or even omitted. The order of basic elements can also be changed. This capacity for variation is the same as that which operates in the type-scene. Cf. further Lord, "The Theme of the Withdrawn Hero" *passim* and *ST* 68-98; and Foley, *Traditional Oral Epic* 359-387.

feature of those songs and supersedes the individual text or performance, poet, local tradition, and so forth."[466] Thus, we can say with relative certainty that the oral tradition knew of a wrath, withdrawal, and return story centred on Achilles or on Demeter. These stories were probably not invented by a single poet for a single poem.[467] Because the story pattern is the largest compositional element in an oral poem and the one which defines the very nature of a specific poem, we can be fairly certain that a song with a complex, detailed narrative built up around a particular story pattern has developed over a period of time. The essential nature of the story pattern, coupled with its detailed exposition in a particular song, indicates that such a song had enjoyed a traditional status before any one version of that song became "definitive", in the way that our *Iliad*, by virtue of its survival, is the definitive version of any story of Achilles' wrath.

Can we say the same about an isolated reference to a story pattern involving a specific hero, that this too indicates that the pattern was traditionally attached to this hero? Here we must exercise caution, for a reference or even a more detailed explication of the pattern within another poem is not a whole poem in itself. A reference or a digression may have been composed for the poem in which it occurs; it need not necessarily have a traditional basis. We will see that this possibility must be taken into

---

[466]Foley, *IA* 46.

[467]This is contrary to the view of Kullmann ("Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis" 316) that Achilles' wrath is the invention of a single poet, albeit one using conventional motifs. Kullmann, however, does not take into account that formulae for the absence of Achilles from battle are well established in epic diction, something which makes it difficult to maintain that the story of Achilles' anger and withdrawal entered the tradition relatively late. Cf. Nagler, *S&T* 131-132.

consideration with regard to the wrath of Meleager. Its status as a paradigm for Achilles in a poem of his wrath may indicate that no story of wrath, withdrawal, and return was traditionally attached to Meleager. Of course, there is no way of proving this, but the possibility must be taken into consideration. When we are dealing only with a reference to a particular story pattern, we can never be certain that a traditional story formed the basis of the reference. The reference indicates that the possibility exists; all we can do, and should do, is explore that possibility. In the case of Paris' wrath, I will argue, firstly, that the story pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return forms the basis of the reference and, secondly, that there is a *possibility* that a traditional story also forms the basis of the reference.

The approach which I am here advocating owes an obvious debt to the work of such Neo-analytical scholars as Johannes Kakridis and Wolfgang Kullman. Recognizing the tradition-dependent nature of the Homeric poems, they have shown that thoughtful examination of problematic passages can yield tantalizing results which often shed light on the tradition of stories that lies behind the Homeric poems. One of the methods which they regularly employ is the comparison of one myth with other myths showing the same or a similar narrative development, or story pattern. For my purposes, Kakridis' work has been an illuminating starting point. He is less concerned with the role which Paris' wrath may play in the *Iliad* than with examining how this motif may have come to be applied to Paris. His hypothesis is provocative:

> As Hector enters Ilium, he finds his brother shut in his wife's chamber with her. Outside the battle is raging and the besieged town is in danger of being burned (331). But Paris is angry and keeps away from the fighting, although he is the cause of it himself (326, 328f.). In the end, it seems that his wife persuades him with 'soft words' to go

> back and fight (337). One has only to change the names and it will at once be seen that there is here an exact repetition of the circumstances of another epic narrative, the Meleagris.[468]

In the story of Meleager, each of these motifs was of vital importance to the narrative, but here in *Iliad* 6 they are, "kept within the scope of words alone, either as a merely polite pretext (anger in Hector's words) or out of shame (persuasion on the part of Helen in Paris' words), or as an exaggeration (the imminent danger of the burning of Ilium)."[469]

While no Homerist today would argue that one story of wrath and withdrawal is modeled on another, let alone that the origin of all such stories is a now lost poem, such as a hypothetical *Meleagris*, Kakridis nonetheless makes the important observation that the scene in Paris' bedroom with the supposedly angry warrior shares some basic elements with another story in which we find an angry warrior sitting idly in his bedroom. Rather than arguing that one scene is consciously modeled on the other, I shall begin by examining the possibility that both scenes are made up of conventional elements common to the same story pattern.

IV. Comparative Wrath, Withdrawal, and Return Narratives

In the following section, I shall examine the four extant examples from the Greek oral epic tradition of the story pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return: the wrath of Achilles and of Meleager in the *Iliad*, the wrath of

---

[468]Kakridis 46-47. The *Meleagris* is the name Kakridis gives to his hypothetical reconstruction of a lost oral epic about Meleager and the Calydonian boar hunt which, he argues, was the source for Phoenix' account of Meleager in *Iliad* 9. Cf. *HR*, chapter 1.

[469]Kakridis, *HR* 47.

Demeter in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*, and the wrath of Hera in the *Hymn to Apollo*. I shall analyse the component parts of this story pattern and pinpoint their presence in the four stories named above. This will establish a point of comparison for the wrath of Paris in the *Iliad* and will allow us to determine with greater probability whether Hector's assumption of wrath on his brother's part is based on a traditional story of wrath, withdrawal, and return centred on the figure of Paris.

A word is in order here about the story pattern which I have been calling wrath, withdrawal, and return. Readers familiar with the seminal work of Lord and Nagler on story pattern will be familiar with what they call the pattern of wrath, devastation and return, or the eternal return.[470] Lord argues that this pattern forms the basis of the plot of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, that both poems essentially are about "an absence that causes havoc to the beloved of the absentee and of his return to set matters aright."[471] He has also argued that it forms the basis of poems in the Anglo-Saxon,

---

[470]Lord, *ST* chapter 9 and "The Theme of the Withdrawn Hero" *passim;* and Nagler, *S&T* chapter 5; cf. also Edwards, *HPI* 7-10, 61-64 and *Comm*. V, 15-19.

[471]Lord, *ST* 186. Cf. also Edwards, *HPI* 62: "a state of order is thrown into disorder and eventually returned to order. This is generally called the 'withdrawal, devastation, and return' pattern, or the 'eternal return'. This obviously forms the main plot of the *Odyssey*: the initial scenes in Ithaca show the evils resulting from Odysseus's absence, then the young son Telemachus sets off to find his father, and the eventual return of both brings about the punishment of the wicked and the end of the troubles. ... The 'withdrawal-devastation-return' structure is the obvious foundation of the *Iliad* plot, too, with revenge and consolation tales added at the end."

Medieval, and Serbo-Croatian oral epic traditions, among others.[472] Edwards calls this "perhaps the commonest of all basic story patterns."[473]

What I am calling the pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return encompasses all the features of Lord's withdrawal, devastation, and return pattern: the absence of a powerful figure, devastation, the return of that figure, and the restoration of order. For my purposes, however, this pattern is too general. Because the starting point is the hero's withdrawal, and not why he has withdrawn, this pattern can encompass a great variety of oral epic songs, such as the *nostos* stories of the Trojan cycle.[474] I wish to limit myself to a particular sub-set of the withdrawal, devastation, and return pattern, that in which the hero's withdrawal is occasioned by anger. My reason for doing so should be obvious: all that we know for certain about Paris' absence from the battlefield, his "withdrawal," is that it is due to — or, at least, presumed to be due to — anger. In order to determine whether Paris' absence may have had a traditional basis, I will be examining other withdrawal narratives in which the hero's absence is likewise motivated by anger. As a result, I have called the story pattern which I will be discussing for the remainder of this chapter "wrath, withdrawal, and return." I see this pattern simply as one particular category in the more general "withdrawal, devastation, and return" pattern.

---

[472]Lord, *ST* 198-221; "The Theme of the Withdrawn Hero in Serbo-Croatian Oral Epic" *passim*; and *The Singer Resumes the Tale* 11-13. Cf. also M.L. Lord 241-248.

[473]Edwards, *HPI* 62.

[474]As Lord says ("The Theme of the Withdrawn Hero" 21), "the essential element in the theme of the withdrawn hero is neither the manner of his withdrawal, nor the degree of volition involved, but the absence itself."

I summarize the narrative pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return as follows:

1. At the instigation of a king, the principal character is deprived of someone or something dear. This deprivation amounts to a loss of τιμή.
2. The offended party feels grief, then anger, on account of his/her loss. At this point, the hero/goddess withdraws. From story to story, linguistic similarities are most pronounced here in the frequency with which the poets refer to their characters' ἄχος and χόλος. In addition, the adverb νόσφι and its cognates are used to signal the character's withdrawal.
3. Withdrawal results in devastation as the community is deprived of an element essential to its success and ultimately its survival.
4. Embassies are sent to bring the goddess/hero back, but she/he rejects them and sets certain conditions for her/his return. Here, verbs of beseeching and persuading (particularly λίσσομαι, λιτανεύω, and πείθω) predominate.
5. Reconciliation is eventually effected, usually by a female to whom the principal character is closest, and the goddess/hero returns, restoring her/his community's good fortune.[475]

These five elements are found in the three complete wrath, withdrawal, and return narratives which occur in archaic epic, those of Demeter, Achilles, and

---

[475]My summary is based on the account of Sowa 95-96, with some additions and modifications on my part; cf. also Lord, "The Theme of the Withdrawn Hero" 19; H. Foley 92-94; and Muellner, *The Anger of Achilles* 11-25.

Meleager. The wrath of Hera in the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo,* because of its peripheral function in the poem as a whole, does not contain all these elements; nonetheless, the principal narrative motif here will also be seen to be that of wrath, withdrawal, and return.

A. The Wrath of Demeter

I begin my analysis with the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter.* Although the composition of the hymn is later than that of the *Iliad,* the unquestioned antiquity of the myth of the rape of Persephone and the anger of Demeter may well make this the earliest story of wrath, withdrawal, and return in the oral epic tradition.[476]

The first element in the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern occurs in the very first lines of the hymn:

---

[476]The use of the word μῆνις to describe Demeter's wrath at *h. Dem.* 350 and 410 supports the idea that this is the earliest wrath, withdrawal, and return story, for it has been shown that μῆνις describes divine wrath in particular, while χόλος can be used of either divine or human anger. This suggests that the story of the goddess's wrath is earlier than that of the hero's. Cf. Watkins, "À propos de μῆνις" 187-190; Nagy, *Best of the Achaeans* 73-74; Slatkin 86-93; H. Foley 92; and Muellner, *The Anger of Achilles* 177-194. On the μῆνις of Achilles, Watkins comments: "L'association de la colère divine et d'un mortel élève ce mortel par ce fait même lors de l'ambiance normale de la condition humaine vers la sphère du divine." Richardson, *Demeter* 3-11, discusses the linguistic and iconographic evidence, as well as Athenian interest in the Eleusinian Mysteries for dating the hymn. He favours a seventh century date, as do Allen, Halliday, and Sikes 110-114. Cf. also H. Foley 29-30. On the rape of Persephone and the withdrawal of Demeter, Burkert (*Greek Religion,* 159) says, "[t]he earliest extended version is the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter,* but Hesiod already alludes to it in the *Theogony* as an ancient and well known story, and aspects of the later tradition seem to preserve very ancient material." Cf. also Nilsson, *Homer and Mycenae* 252 and *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* 75, 172-173; and Lord, *ST* 186.

Δήμητρ' ἠύκομον σεμνὴν θεὸν ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν
αὐτὴν ἠδὲ θύγατρα τανύσφυρον ἣν 'Αϊδονεὺς
ἥρπαξεν, δῶκεν δὲ βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεύς,
νόσφιν Δήμητρος χρυσαόρου ἀγλαοκάρπου
παίζουσαν κούρῃσι σὺν 'Ωκεανοῦ βαθυκόλποις.
(1-5)

At the instigation of the king of the gods, Demeter is deprived of that which is dearest to her, her daughter. For Zeus has given her in marriage to Hades. As we will see in the other stories to be discussed, deprivation of something dear amounts to a loss of τιμή. The clearest example of this is Achilles' loss of Briseis. Persephone serves the same function here. On the one hand, Demeter feels grief, as any mother would who has lost her daughter. (Similarly, Achilles will say that he grieves for Briseis as a husband for his wife.) But Persephone serves another function at least as important, one that is frequently overlooked because the story of the mother who has lost her daughter evokes such sympathy. Persephone is also the symbol of her mother's power as a fertility goddess, much as Briseis is commensurate with Achilles' success as a warrior. Responsibility for the fertility of the earth, Demeter's unique τιμή, is symbolised by her own fertility. Before Persephone was taken from Demeter, the earth was always fertile. When she is taken away, the earth is barren. The compromise achieved at the end of the hymn results in periods of fertility alternating with periods of barrenness. The crucial element is Persephone and the dual role she plays. On the personal level, she is a daughter and her absence grieves her mother who, as a result, cannot perform her duties. On the cosmic level, she is the symbol of Demeter's power, her τιμή, and, therefore, of the earth's fertility. Accordingly, her simultaneous removal from her mother and from her mother's realm, the earth, results in drought and famine.

In arranging a marriage for Persephone without Demeter's consent (νόσφιν Δήμητρος, 4), Zeus has offended Demeter's τιμή. The goddess herself may allude to this when, disguised as an old woman, she says to the daughters of Celeus and Metaneira that she hopes the gods will grant them husbands of whom (both) parents approve:

> ἀλλ' ὑμῖν μὲν πάντες 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
> δοῖεν κουριδίους ἄνδρας καὶ τέκνα τεκέσθαι
> ὡς ἐθέλουσι τοκῆες· ἐμὲ δ' αὖτ' οἰκτείρατε, κοῦραι.
> (135-137)[477]

Demeter hears her daughter's cries as Hades carries her off; her reaction is immediate. She is overcome with grief, which the hymn poet emphasizes through the repeated use of ἄχος and its cognates:

> 'Οξὺ δέ μιν κραδίην ἄχος ἔλλαβεν, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαίταις
> ἀμβροσίαις κρήδεμνα δαΐζετο χερσὶ φίλῃσι,
> κυάνεον δὲ κάλυμμα κατ' ἀμφοτέρων βάλετ' ὤμων.
> (40-42)

Demeter does not know what has happened to Persephone, and no one will tell her. She wanders over the earth for nine days in search of her daughter. Her grief is so intense that she will neither eat, drink, nor wash:

> ἐννῆμαρ μὲν ἔπειτα κατὰ χθόνα πότνια Δηὼ
> στρωφᾶτ' αἰθομένας δαΐδας μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχουσα
> οὐδέ ποτ' ἀμβροσίης καὶ νέκταρος ἡδυπότοιο

---

[477]Cf. Clay, *Politics of Olympus* 229: "The prosperity appropriate to young girls is a husband and a family in accordance with their *parents'* wishes. We are inevitably reminded of Demeter's lack of consent to her own daughter's marriage, but we should note that she is not opposed to *all* marriage, but only to the uniquely wrenching one between Persephone and the lord of the netherworld."

πάσσατ' <u>ἀκηχεμένη</u>, οὐδὲ χρόα βάλλετο λουτροῖς.
(47-50)[478]

Eventually, she learns from Hecate and Helios what has happened to Persephone. Her grief and the reason for it are apparent to both gods. Hecate, who only heard the girl's cries, but did not see what happened, asks Demeter who it was that kidnapped her daughter, thereby causing her such grief (τίς θεῶν οὐρανίων ἠὲ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων / ἥρπασε Περσεφόνην καὶ σὸν φίλον <u>ἤκαχε</u> θυμόν; 55-56). Helios, who did see what happened, says to her that he will tell her who the abductor is because he reveres her and pities her in her grief (εἰδήσεις· δὴ γὰρ μέγα σ' ἅζομαι ἠδ' ἐλεαίρω / <u>ἀχνυμένην</u> περὶ παιδὶ τανυσφύρῳ, 75-77). He informs her that Zeus has given Persephone as a bride to Hades.

Demeter's reaction is once again immediate. Anger takes its place beside grief, even as Helios speaks:

> ἀλλὰ θεὰ κατάπαυε μέγαν γόον· οὐδέ τι σὲ χρὴ
> μὰψ αὔτως ἄπλητον ἔχειν <u>χόλον</u>. οὔ τοι ἀεικὴς
> γαμβρὸς ἐν ἀθανάτοις Πολυσημάντωρ 'Αϊδωνεὺς
> αὐτοκασίγνητος καὶ ὁμόσπορος· ἀμφὶ δὲ τιμὴν
> ἔλλαχεν ὡς τὰ πρῶτα διάτριχα δασμὸς ἐτύχθη·
> τοῖς μεταναιετάει τῶν ἔλλαχε κοίρανος εἶναι.
> (82-87)

---

[478]Cf. lines 197-201, where she is so overcome with sorrow in the house of Celeus in Eleusis that she will not speak, eat, or drink:

> ἔνθα καθεζομένη προκατέσχετο χερσὶ καλύπτρην·
> δηρὸν δ' ἄφθογγος τετιημένη ἧστ' ἐπὶ δίφρου,
> οὐδέ τιν' οὔτ' ἔπεϊ προσπτύσσετο οὔτε τι ἔργῳ,
> ἀλλ' ἀγέλαστος, ἄπαστος ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος
> ἧστο πόθῳ μινύθουσα βαθυζώνοιο θυγατρός.

Cf. also 181-182 : ἡ δ' ἄρ' ὄπισθε φίλον τετιημένη ἦτορ / στεῖχε. Sinos (67) notes that one of Demeter's cult titles is 'Αχαία, because of her ἄχος for her missing daughter.

But Demeter does not heed this advice; her anger will prove to be relentless. In the end, Helios will be proven wrong. He claims that Demeter's anger can only be a wasted effort (μὰψ αὔτως, 83), for Persephone's marriage has been arranged by two gods whose τιμαί are greater than her own: Zeus, the king of the gods, and Hades who received a third of the universe as his τιμή. These are powerful gods to oppose, but, as we shall see, the goddess's, or the hero's, anger is never in vain. Demeter's τιμή too must be taken into consideration. This is precisely what Zeus has failed to do. In the end, however, he will be forced to make up for this offense.

Demeter's anger results in her withdrawal from the Olympian community:

> τὴν δ' <u>ἄχος</u> αἰνότερον καὶ κύντερον ἵκετο θυμόν.
> <u>χωσαμένη</u> δ' ἤπειτα κελαινεφέϊ Κρονίωνι
> <u>νοσφισθεῖσα</u> θεῶν ἀγορὴν καὶ μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον
> ᾤχετ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων πόλιας καὶ πίονα ἔργα
> εἶδος ἀμαλδύνουσα πολὺν χρόνον·
> (90-94)[479]

Demeter's grief has intensified to the point where it results in a second emotion, anger.[480] The combination of grief and anger which resulted from the loss of her daughter and the loss of τιμή causes her to withdraw from the community which caused this loss.

---

[479]Clay, *Politics of Olympus* 222, points out that "[a]s the abduction was carried out in Demeter's absence ([νόσφιν Δήμητρος,] 4), and Zeus absented himself from the scene of the crime ([θεῶν ἀπάνευθε,] 28), so now Demeter absents herself from Olympus and takes up her abode among mortals."

[480]Although grief gives rise to anger, it is not replaced by anger. The goddess/hero feels both emotions at the same time until the crisis caused by her/his withdrawal is resolved. On the collocation of ἄχος and χόλος, cf. Nagy, *Best of thc Achaeans* 79-83; Slatkin 85-87; and Muellner, *The Anger of Achilles* 23-25.

Demeter wanders over the earth until she comes to Eleusis. She sits down at the side of the road, near a well, overcome by sorrow (φίλον τετιημένη ἦτορ, 98).[481] She transforms herself into a barren old woman ἥ τε τόκοιο / εἴργηται δώρων τε φιλοστεφάνου Ἀφροδίτης (101-102). Presently, the daughters of the king, Celeus, come across the goddess and take her to their mother, Metaneira, who employs the old woman as nurse to her infant son, Demophoön. Demeter's choice of disguise is unusual, in that it reflects the opposite of the gods' true nature, which is ageless and eternally youthful. Clay argues that the purpose of the disguise is meant simply to elicit pity from the daughters of Celeus and ensure that she will be taken on as Demophoön's nursemaid.[482] I find the significance of the transformation to be more closely related to the pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return. By presenting herself as a barren old woman, Demeter becomes the opposite not just of what all the gods are, but of what she in particular is, a fertility goddess who is concerned

---

[481]The formula is used again of Demeter at 181, when Celeus' daughters return to the well to fetch her; at 198 τετιημένη alone is used to describe her sitting in her grief inside Celeus' house. According to Slatkin (98-99, n. 10), in Homer, the formula τετιημένος ἦτορ, when it is used to describe the gods, always means "angry." When Hera and Athena sit apart from Zeus and refuse to speak to him because he has prevented them from assisting the Achaeans, they are said to be φίλον τετιημέναι ἦτορ (8.437); when Hephaestus discovers Aphrodite and Ares together, he is φίλον τετιημένος ἦτορ(*Od.* 8.303). Of mortals, this meaning is less clear. At *Il.* 11.555, sorrow rather than anger seems to be the issue for Ajax; the same seems to be the case with Penelope (*Od.* 4.804), Odysseus (*Od.* 7.287), and Amphinomos (*Od.* 18.153). However, it is used twice to describe Telemachus' response to the suitors' arrogance (*Od.* 1.114, 2.298), where it could mean anger, sorrow, or possibly both. If the formula can indicate sorrow, anger, or perhaps both at the same time, it is especially appropriate for Demeter.

[482]Clay, *Politics of Olympus* 227. Allen, Halliday, and Sikes (142) see no special significance in Demeter's choice of metamorphosis. Arthur (15-16) sees the transformation into an old woman as a sign of Demeter's depression.

especially with agriculture. Through her transformation into a barren old woman Demeter represents physically what has been done to her with the removal of Persephone. On one level, the lonely old woman is an appropriate disguise for the grieving mother. But it is even more appropriate to the goddess deprived of her τιμή. With the symbol of her fertility gone, what could be more fitting than for Demeter to transform herself into something infertile? Moreover, her metamorphosis foreshadows the transformation of the earth from a fertile to a barren place, which will happen shortly, when Demeter withdraws her services from the cosmos.

The *Hymn to Demeter* is unusual in that it has two withdrawals. The first withdrawal, after the loss of Persephone, is from the divine community to the world of mortals (92-93). After Demeter fails in her attempt to make Demophoön immortal, she withdraws once again. This time her withdrawal is complete; she shuts herself off from both gods and mortals.

When Metaneira spies Demeter putting Demophoön in the fire, she cries out in fear, breaking the spell which is necessary to make the child immortal. Demeter is angered (χολωσαμένη, 251) and demands that the Eleusinians build her a temple. Once this is done, she withdraws into the temple:

> ἔνθα καθεζομένη μακάρων ἀπὸ <u>νόσφιν</u> ἁπάντων
> μίμνε πόθῳ μινύθουσα βαθυζώνοιο θυγατρός.
> αἰνότατον δ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπὶ χθόνα πολυβότειραν
> ποίησ' ἀνθρώποις καὶ κύντατον· οὐδέ τι γαῖα
> σπέρμ' ἀνίει, κρύπτεν γὰρ ἐϋστέφανος Δημήτηρ.
> πολλὰ δὲ καμπύλ' ἄροτρα μάτην βόες ἕλκον ἀρούραις,
> πολλὸν δὲ κρῖ λευκὸν ἐτώσιον ἔμπεσε γαίῃ.
> (303-309)

Demeter's second withdrawal is also signalled by the word νόσφιν. She sits in her temple, wasting away in grief for her daughter (πόθῳ μινύθουσα ... θυγατρός,

304). Thus, the second element of the motif is worked out at considerable length as the poet delineates the goddess's grief, anger, and two withdrawals.

This second and complete withdrawal effects the transition to the third element of the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern. As Demeter absents herself from all livings things, so the principle of agricultural fertility disappears. The earth is barren, and soon famine results. This is not merely negligence on the part of the goddess; Demeter has not forgotten or ceased to care about her special area of influence as a goddess. The hymn poet indicates that she expressly planned that famine would result from her withdrawal:

> καί νύ κε πάμπαν ὄλεσσε γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
> λιμοῦ ὑπ' ἀργαλέης, γεράων τ' ἐρικυδέα τιμὴν
> καὶ θυσιῶν ἤμερσεν 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντας,
> εἰ μὴ Ζεὺς ἐνόησεν ἑῷ τ' ἐφράσσατο θυμῷ.
> (310-313)

Demeter intends to accomplish two things through her withdrawal: to destroy human beings in a huge famine, and, thereby, to deprive the gods of their collective τιμή, which consists of γέρα, gifts which denote the esteem in which the giver regards the recipient, and sacrifices from humans.

Demeter's revenge is particularly fitting. Zeus, in depriving Demeter of her daughter, has deprived the fertility goddess of her τιμή. In this regard, we must remember that the worship of Demeter is always associated with the worship of Persephone. In Greek myth and ritual, these two gods are much more closely connected than are any other members of the Olympian family. They are frequently referred to simply as the Two Goddesses or as the Δημήτερες.[483] Persephone is, in many ways, the principal symbol of Demeter

---

[483]Burkert, *Greek Religion* 159-160.

as a fertility goddess, as I argued above. For this reason, the abduction and rape of Persephone amount to an offense against Demeter's particular τιμή in the Olympian community. Therefore, it is fitting that she use her τιμή as a fertility goddess in order to exact revenge. She achieves this through her withdrawal, which deprives the earth of its fertility, which in turn threatens to deprive the gods of their τιμή. Zeus must learn that he cannot with impunity dishonour Demeter. For even though she is subordinate to him, her τιμή and the powers which emanate from it are considerable and hers alone to dispense or withhold.

Zeus realizes the magnitude of the crisis which has resulted from Demeter's withdrawal, and, accordingly, sends ambassadors to the goddess. This is the fourth element in the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern. He does not go in person to attempt a reconciliation, but he sends his messenger, Iris (314-323). When she fails, Zeus sends all of the gods, one after another. The ambassadors' purpose is to persuade the goddess to give up her wrath by beseeching her. This is done through the offer of gifts and new τιμαί:

> αὖτις ἔπειτα πατὴρ μάκαρας θεοὺς αἰὲν ἐόντας
> πάντας ἐπιπροΐαλλεν· ἀμοιβηδὶς δὲ κιόντες
> κίκλησκον καὶ πολλὰ δίδον περικαλλέα <u>δῶρα</u>,
> <u>τιμάς</u> θ' ἅς κ' †ἐθέλοιτο† μετ' ἀθανάτοισι ἑλέσθαι.
> (325-328)

But the goddess does not want gifts and τιμαί; she rejects the ambassadors' offers (Ὣς φάτο <u>λισσομένη</u>· τῆς δ' οὐκ <u>ἐπεπείθετο</u> θυμός, 324), and sets the terms under which she will return to the divine community:

> ἀλλ' οὔ τις <u>πεῖσαι</u> δύνατο φρένας οὐδὲ νόημα
> θυμῷ <u>χωομένης</u>, στερεῶς δ' ἠναίνετο μύθους,
> οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ' ἔφασκε θυώδεος Οὐλύμποιο
> <u>πρίν</u> γ' ἐπιβήσεσθαι, οὐ <u>πρὶν</u> γῆς καρπὸν ἀνήσειν,

πρὶν ἴδοι ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἑὴν εὐώπιδα κούρην.
(329-333)

She will not return to Olympus or restore the earth's fertility until she sees her daughter again. The absolute nature of Demeter's demand is emphasized in a tricolon crescendo with anaphora of πρὶν in asyndeton. What Demeter insists upon is nothing less than the restoration of her τιμή.

Zeus recognizes Demeter's implacability and sets out to accomplish her demands. He sends Hermes to the underworld to bring Persephone back to her mother so that she will end her wrath:

> Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
> εἰς Ἔρεβος πέμψε χρυσόρραπιν Ἀργειφόντην,
> ὄφρ' Ἀΐδην μαλακοῖσι παραιφάμενος ἐπέεσσιν
> ἁγνὴν Περσεφόνειαν ἀπὸ ζόφου ἠερόεντος
> ἐς φάος ἐξαγάγοι μετὰ δαίμονας, ὄφρα ἑ μήτηρ
> ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδοῦσα μεταλλήξειε χόλοιο.
> (334-339)[484]

Hermes leads Persephone back to her mother. Although the text is badly damaged here, enough survives that we can discern that Demeter, upon seeing her daughter, leaves the temple into which she had withdrawn (ἡ δὲ ἰδοῦσα / ἤϊξ' ἠΰτε μαινὰς ὄρος κάτα δάσκιον ὕλης, 385-386; ἆλτο θέει[ν, 389). The

---

[484]Compare also Hermes' summary of the situation to Hades:

> Ζεύς σε πατὴρ ἤνωγεν ἀγαυὴν Περσεφόνειαν
> ἐξαγαγεῖν Ἐρέβευσφι μετὰ σφέας, ὄφρα ἑ μήτηρ
> ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδοῦσα χόλου καὶ μήνιος αἰνῆς
> ἀθανάτοις παύσειεν· ἐπεὶ μέγα μήδεται ἔργον,
> φθῖσαι φῦλ' ἀμενηνὰ χαμαιγενέων ἀνθρώπων,
> σπέρμ' ὑπὸ γῆς κρύπτουσα, καταφθινύθουσα δὲ τιμὰς
> ἀθανάτων· ἣ δ' αἰνὸν ἔχει χόλον, οὐδὲ θεοῖσι
> μίσγεται, ἀλλ' ἀπάνευθε θυώδεος ἔνδοθι νηοῦ
> ἧσται Ἐλευσῖνος κραναὸν πτολίεθρον ἔχουσα.
> (348-356)

sight of her daughter puts an end to Demeter's grief (ἀχέων δ' ἀποπαύετο θυμός, 436). Since her ἄχος originally gave rise to her χόλος, we can assume that the end of ἄχος signals the end of χόλος as well.

Zeus then sends Demeter's mother, Rhea, to bring the goddess back to Olympus. Rhea says to Demeter:

> Δεῦρο τέκος, καλέει σε βαρύκτοπος εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
> ἐλθέμεναι μετὰ φῦλα θεῶν, ὑπέδεκτο δὲ <u>τιμὰς</u>
> [δωσέμεν, ἅς κ' ἐθέλησθα] μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.
> (460-462)
> [ἀλλ' ἴθι τέκνον] ἐμὸν καὶ <u>πείθεο,</u> μηδέ τι λίην
> ἀ[ζηχὲς μεν]έαινε κελαινεφέϊ Κρονίωνι·
> α[ἶψα δὲ κα]ρπὸν ἄεξε φερέσβιον ἀνθρώποισιν.
> Ὣ[ς ἔφατ', οὐ]δ' <u>ἀπίθησεν</u> ἐϋστέφανος Δημήτηρ,
> αἶψα δὲ καρπὸν ἀνῆκεν ἀρουράων ἐριβώλων.
> (467-471)

Rhea is the final and successful ambassador whom Zeus dispatches to Demeter. Her success depends, of course, on the fact that Zeus is now willing to make full restitution; however, as we will see in comparison with other wrath, withdrawal, and return narratives, her propinquity to Demeter is a conventional element in the story pattern. As the mother of Demeter, Rhea is closer to the goddess than any of the other ambassadors, and in all likelihood second only to Persephone in her affections. Therefore, we see in the ambassadors to Demeter an ascending order of importance or closeness to the withdrawn goddess. Iris, the usual messenger of Zeus, comes first; she is followed by all the other gods, who would have included Demeter's brothers, sisters, and other relatives. Finally, her mother comes and effects the goddess's return.

Demeter's τιμή is restored with the return of Persephone. Zeus had also offered her additional τιμαί as well as gifts. This offer of gifts and new τιμαί seems to be a conventional part of the wrath, withdrawal, and return motif as

well, and forms an important, albeit secondary, function in accomplishing the withdrawn goddess's, or hero's, return. Once Persephone is restored to Demeter, it would seem that Zeus' offer of gifts and new τιμαί, which Demeter had earlier refused, should become obsolete. Instead, it continues to play an important role in her full reconciliation with the gods. For Rhea is sent with a message that the offer to τιμαί still holds good:

> ταῖς δὲ μέτ' ἄγγελον ἧκε βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
> 'Ρείην ἠΰκομον, ἣν μητέρα κυανόπεπλον
> ἀξέμεναι μετὰ φῦλα θεῶν, ὑπέδεκτο δὲ τιμὰς
> δωσέμεν, ἅς κεν ἕλοιτο μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι·
> (441-444)

We are nowhere told that the goddess accepts the gifts, but the hymn does end with Demeter establishing new τιμαί for herself in the form of the Eleusinian Mysteries. As Clay says:

> The establishment of the Mysteries forms the culmination of the *Hymn to Demeter* and the final goal of the narrative. Yet it does not merely symbolize Demeter's reconciliation with mankind; for that, the restoration of agriculture and, with it, the prevailing relations between gods and men would have sufficed. Nor can we view Demeter's action as a reward or sign of gratitude toward the Eleusinians, as some versions suggest. In establishing her rites, Demeter has finally chosen the *timai* that Zeus repeatedly promised her. In accepting those *timai*, Demeter signals her participation in the new cosmic order. As *the* goddess of Eleusis and the Mysteries, Demeter not only acquiesces to Zeus' design [the marriage of Hades and Persephone], but that design becomes the basis for her new *timai*.[485]

Demeter no longer has any reason to be angry. She restores the earth's fertility and then returns with her daughter to Olympus (βάν ῥ' ἴμεν Οὔλυμπον

---

[485]Clay, *Politics of Olympus* 261.

δὲ θεῶν μεθ' ὁμήγυριν ἄλλων, 484). The reconciliation between Zeus and Demeter is now complete.

B. The Wrath of Achilles

The *Iliad* is the most important narrative based on the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern. I have, however, chosen to discuss the *Hymn to Demeter* first because of that poem's much simpler narrative structure. There we can see the component parts of the motif more readily and thereby construct a model of comparison.[486] The *Iliad* is a much longer and more complex narrative, and the pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return is correspondingly more complicated. For the sake of brevity, I shall limit my examination to the causes of Achilles' wrath in Book 1, its consequences in the ensuing battle books, the embassy of Book 9, Patroclus' intervention in Book 16, and Achilles' return in Book 19.[487]

---

[486]The principal narrative pattern of both poems is wrath, withdrawal, and return. Homer makes this clear in the poem's first line; the hymn poet chooses not to do this. However, the Orphic version of the Demeter and Persephone poem began: Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Δημήτερος ἀγλαοκάρπου (cf. *Orphicorum Fragmenta* 119, fr. 48). As Clay comments (*Politics of Olympus* 249), "the words could well serve as the opening of our hymn."

[487]For a more detailed examination cf. Nagler, *S&T* 131-166, who argues that the whole poem is unified by three interlocking instantiations of the withdrawal, devastation, and return pattern. In Book 1, Achilles withdraws in anger because of an attack on his τιμή. This leads to the devastation of the army. In Book 9, embassies are sent offering recompense if he will return. Achilles' refusal initiates the second instantiation of the motif, when, in Book 16, Patroclus goes out to battle in Achilles' armour; this amounts to Achilles' first return by means of surrogacy. It also serves as the equivalent of his second withdrawal, for, in reality, he stays behind. The second devastation occurs with Patroclus' death, which leads to Achilles' second return, when he makes his armourless appearance on the battlements in order to facilitate the rescue of Patroclus' body. Patroclus' death brings

(cont.)

The first episode in the *Iliad* recounts how Chryses comes to the Achaean camp to ransom his daughter. The young woman has been given to Agamemnon as his share of the spoils obtained from an attack on the town of Thebe. Agamemnon refuses to return Chryseis to her father and sends the priest away with threats of violence should he return. Chryses leaves and prays to Apollo to exact vengeance on his behalf. The angered god (χωόμενος κῆρ, 44) descends from Mount Olympus and causes a plague in the Achaean army. After ten days, Achilles calls an assembly at which Agamemnon agrees reluctantly to return Chryseis to her father.[488] Agamemnon, however, demands that the Achaeans provide him with another prize to replace the one he is relinquishing (αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ γέρας αὐτιχ' ἑτοιμάσατ', ὄφρα μὴ οἶος / 'Αργείων ἀγέραστος ἔω, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ ἔοικε, 1.118-119). Achilles reminds

---

about Achilles' third withdrawal which is from human society in general and is symbolized by his refusal to eat and by the gods' distillation of ambrosia into his body. Paradoxically, the withdrawn Achilles now returns to the battlefield where his actions result in the poem's third devastation. His third and final return is effected in Book 24 where his meeting with Priam signals his return to the human community.

[488]The parallels between the treatment which Chryses and then Achilles receive at the hands of Agamemnon and the ensuing consequences are remarkable and surely meant to suggest that Agamemnon is in the wrong in the second incident as he was in the first, and that he and his army will suffer as a result of his treatment of Achilles, just as they suffered on account of his treatment of Chryses. Cf. Reinhardt, *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* 60-63; Kakridis, *Homer Revisited* 125-137; Rabel 473-481. The story of Chryses is an example, as Lord points out (*ST* 188), of the more general pattern of withdrawal, devastation, and return, rather than wrath, withdrawal, and return. Chryses never feels any wrath. When Agamemnon dishonours the priest (οὕνεκα τὸν Χρύσην ἠτίμασεν ἀρητῆρα / 'Ατρεΐδης, *Iliad* 1.11-12; cf. also 1.94), he is afraid and obeys (ἔδεισεν δ' ὁ γέρων καὶ ἐπείθετο μύθῳ, 1.33). Achilles will report to his mother that Chryses left in anger (χωόμενος, 1.380), but the narrative does not support this. Achilles appears to be assimilating his own situation to that of the wronged priest (cf. Robbins 3). On the parallels between Chryses' and Achilles' situations, cf. Robbins 1-9 and Rabel 473-481.

Agamemnon that this is not possible, as all the γέρα have been distributed (1.122-124), but soon he will be generously recompensed for his present loss (1.127-129). Agamemnon responds that he cannot go without a prize of honour, that the Achaeans must promptly supply him with one or else he will take one himself from one of the commanders, which will cause that man to be angered (ὁ δέ κεν κεχολώσεται ὅν κεν ἵκωμαι, 1.139). This threat first rouses Achilles' anger. He tells Agamemnon that, even though he, Achilles, is a great fighter, his γέρας is always less than that of Agamemnon (1.163, 167). In spite of this, Agamemnon now proposes to rob him of his γέρας (1.161). For this reason, Achilles threatens to withdraw and go home to Phthia (1.169-171). Agamemnon responds that he will take Briseis (τὸ σὸν γέρας, 1.185) from Achilles, so that Achilles will know how much greater Agamemnon is and so that others will shrink from setting themselves up as equals to the king. Thus the first element in the wrath, withdrawal, and return motif is completed: the king has deprived the hero of something very dear to him. As in the *Hymn to Demeter*, the hero's wrath is precipitated by the ruler of the community to which he belongs.

Achilles' reaction to Agamemnon introduces the second element of the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern. He feels grief at being thus dishonoured, and simultaneously anger at the king who proposes to dishonour him:

> Πηλεΐωνι δ' <u>ἄχος</u> γένετ', ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ
> στήθεσσιν λασίοισι διάνδιχα μερμηρίζει,
> ἢ ὅ γε φάσγανον ὀξὺ ἐρυσσάμενος παρὰ μηροῦ
> τοὺς μὲν ἀναστήσειεν, ὁ δ' Ἀτρεΐδην ἐναρίζοι,

ἦε χόλον παύσειεν ἐρητύσειέ τε θυμόν.
(1.188-192)

Athena tells Achilles not to kill Agamemnon, but only to abuse him with words. He agrees, even though, as he says, he is greatly angered (μάλα περ θυμῷ κεχολωμένον, 217). Athena leaves, and Achilles angrily reviles Agamemnon (Πηλεΐδης δ' ἐξαῦτις ἀταρτηροῖς ἐπέεσσιν / 'Ατρεΐδην προσέειπε, καὶ οὔ πω λῆγε χόλοιο, 1.223-224).[489] He ends his speech with the assertion that one day the Achaeans will long for Achilles and regret the dishonour done to him, as they fall before Hector (239-244). The assembly is dissolved. Achilles returns to his ships, and Agamemnon makes preparations to return Chryseis. The culmination in withdrawal of the hero's grief and then wrath completes the second element in the pattern.

Achilles has felt sorrow and anger at the loss of something dear to him and at the affront to his honour. Now he withdraws. He returns to his ships (1.306-307) and will not return to the assembly place which he has just left until Book 19. When the heralds, Talthybius and Eurybates, come to take away Briseis, they find Achilles sitting apart from his companions, weeping:

---

[489]Compare the way Homer introduces Achilles' first insulting speech to Agamemnon (τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς 'Αχιλλεύς, 148). Achilles is certainly upset here, as ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν indicates, but the difference between the speeches at 149ff. and 225ff. is that in the first speech Agamemnon has only threatened to deprive one of the commanders of his γέρας. Prior to Achilles' second speech Agamemnon has stated that he will take Achilles' γέρας. This is what rouses χόλος in him, the explicit and specific affront to his honour. On the formula ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν, cf. Holoka, "Looking Darkly" 1-16, who comments that it "conveys anger on the part of a speaker who takes umbrage at what he judges to be rude or inconsiderate words spoken by the addressee" (4); cf. also Edwards, "Homeric Speech Introductions" 7-8.

αὐτὰρ 'Αχιλλεὺς / δακρύσας ἑτάρων ἄφαρ ἕζετο νόσφι λιασθείς (348-349).[490] This is the first scene in the poem in which we see Achilles in his withdrawal. The poet emphasizes the hero's withdrawal by joining a verb of withdrawal

[490]Briseis functions as a symbol of Achilles' honour. Overwhelmingly, she is referred to as his γέρας (1.161, 163, 167; 9.111,344, 367; 16.54-56). Her removal is first and foremost an affront to Achilles' honour. Achilles himself indicates as much when he says that Agamemnon will rue the day that he dishonoured the best of the Achaeans (ἄριστον 'Αχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτεισας, 1.244; cf. also 1.412) and in his prayer to his mother (τιμήν πέρ μοι ὄφελλεν ... Ζεύς, 1.353-354; νῦν δ' οὐδέ με τυτθὸν ἔτεισεν, 354; ἦ γάρ μ' 'Ατρεΐδης ... ἠτίμησεν,355-356). Agamemnon too sees giving up Chryseis as a diminution of his honour (cf. 1.118-119, 137-139). Only once does Achilles refer to Briseis in terms of affection. In Book 9, he calls her his beloved wife (ἄλοχον θυμαρέα, 336), and claims that he loves her (καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν / ἐκ θυμοῦ φίλεον, 342-343). Perhaps the contradiction with the more straightforward portrayal of Briseis as a prize of war, a γέρας, is explained by the fact that Achilles is making a rhetorical point here. By stating that Briseis is his wife, just as Helen and Clytemnestra are the wives of Menelaus and Agamemnon, he makes Agamemnon's action that much more serious. Agamemnon becomes Paris to Achilles' Menelaus. This can only be a distortion of the actual situation; Achilles' honour has been attacked, but not to the same degree as Menelaus' was by Paris. We should also recall Achilles' words of reconciliation in Book 19, where he regrets that he and Agamemnon fought for the sake of a girl whom he wishes had died before any of this had happened (56-64). Here there is no mention of Briseis as a beloved wife. Finally, Achilles' claim of affection may find a more appropriate parallel in the love which Demeter has for Persephone. I argued above that the abduction of Persephone is an affront to Demeter's τιμή. This does not, however, preclude the love and grief which Demeter feels for her daughter. Persephone is "dear" to her, but she also functions as a symbol of the fertility goddess's honour. In the *Iliad*, we find Briseis fulfilling the same double function. She is "dear" to Achilles principally as a symbol of his honour. When she is taken from him, Homer gives this affront to the hero's honour an added emotional emphasis by having Achilles claim that he also loved her as his wife. There is no reason to believe that Achilles' claim of love for Briseis reflects his true feelings; in fact, I suggest that this claim is purely rhetorical. However, the assertion, whether it is real or rhetorical, I would say finds its roots in the wrath pattern and is seen most clearly in the double role that Persephone plays of beloved daughter and symbol of τιμή.

(λιάζομαι) with the key word νόσφι.[491] He is also combining two important narrative strands, both of which resonate more powerfully through their juxtaposition. We see Achilles simultaneously deprived of his τιμή and withdrawn on account of this deprivation. In the *Hymn to Demeter*, the deprivation necessarily preceded the withdrawal; here, however, by having Agamemnon threaten Achilles with the removal of his γέρας before actually taking it away, we can see both the cause and the result of the affront to Achilles' honour at the same time.

After Briseis is taken, Achilles prays to his mother and elicits from her a promise to intercede with Zeus on his behalf. This sets in motion the course of events meant to bring home to Agamemnon how great his need of Achilles is. As Thetis takes leave of her son, she enjoins him to maintain both his wrath and his withdrawal (ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν νηυσὶ παρήμενος ὠκυπόροισι / μήνι' Ἀχαιοῖσιν, πολέμου δ' ἀποπαύεο πάμπαν, 1.421-422). Our final glimpse of Achilles in Book 1 underlines the consequences of all that has happened between him and Agamemnon. He is now withdrawn, grieving, and angry:

> Αὐτὰρ ὁ μήνιε νηυσὶ παρήμενος ὠκυπόροισι
> διογενὴς Πηλῆος υἱός, πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς·
> οὔτε ποτ' εἰς ἀγορὴν πωλέσκετο κυδιάνειραν
> οὔτε ποτ' ἐς πόλεμον, ἀλλὰ φθινύθεσκε φίλον κῆρ

---

[491]Cf. also Achilles' words to Odysseus at 9.348: ἦ μὲν δὴ μάλα πολλὰ πονήσατο <u>νόσφιν</u> ἐμεῖο.

αὖθι μένων.

(1.488-492)[492]

The third element in the motif is the devastation which results from the hero's withdrawal. Surprisingly, the first day of fighting without Achilles goes rather well for the Achaeans.[493] By the end of Book 8, however, as the second day of fighting ends, the Greeks find themselves in a dangerous and unprecedented situation on account of Achilles' absence. Hector and the Trojans have so successfully routed the Greeks that for the first time in nine years they decide to bivouac on the plain. Hector's reason for doing this, he says, is to make sure that the Greeks do not board their ships and flee by night (8.503-511). So confident is he of victory that he fears the Greeks may deny him this by taking flight.

The devastation of the Greek army continues in Books 11 to 15. In Book 11, several of the most prominent fighters are injured: Agamemnon, Diomedes, Odysseus, Machaon, and Eurypylus. This leaves Ajax virtually alone of the first rank of warriors to stand against Hector. By the end of Book 15, this proves too much even for him. Hector and Sarpedon, at the head of the assembled Trojan forces, cross over the ditch and the fortifying wall in front of the Achaean camp and fall upon the ships. Thereby, the third element of the motif is completed: the hero's withdrawal has resulted in the devastation of his own army.

---

[492]Although Achilles disappears from the narrative, the poet reminds us of his presence, or rather absence, in several passages that underline that absence and the anger which accompanies it (cf. 2.240-241, 688-694; 4.512-513; 7.229-230).

[493]Menelaus is the victor in the duel with Paris in Book 3, although he himself is wounded in the duel's aftermath. The Achaeans advance against the Trojans in Book 4. Diomedes enjoys enormous success in Book 5. And Ajax is the undeclared winner in the aborted duel with Hector in Book 7.

The devastation of the Achaean army reaches a crisis point by the end of Book 8. This results in the dispatch of ambassadors to the withdrawn hero, the next element in the story pattern. However, both the fourth and fifth elements of the motif — the devastation and the hero's eventual return — are complicated first by Achilles' refusal to accept the ambassadors' offer and then by the introduction of a substitute for him on the battlefield. The rejection of the embassy is in and of itself not surprising, for, as we have already seen, Demeter also rejects a number of ambassadors. It is only when her demand for the return of her daughter is met that she acquiesces and returns. Once Zeus is willing to restore Demeter's τιμή, her withdrawal no longer serves a purpose. Zeus offers many gifts and additional τιμαί as well (327-328), but the goddess insists upon and effects the return of the τιμή of which she has been deprived. Achilles is sent only one embassy, and he too is offered many gifts and additional τιμαί. Only one embassy should be necessary, for Agamemnon is willing to restore Briseis and, with her, the τιμή of which he deprived Achilles in Book 1.[494] The comparison with the *Hymn to Demeter* shows that Achilles can have no good reason, in terms of the wrath and withdrawal pattern, to refuse Agamemnon's offer. Moreover, Homer himself has led us to expect that the embassy, with its offers of additional gifts and the return of Briseis, should end Achilles' withdrawal. When Athena prevented Achilles from drawing his sword against

---

[494]Multiple embassies such as we find in the *Hymn to Demeter* are in all likelihood conventional in this motif. We may see a reflection of this in the *Iliad* when Achilles says to the ambassadors that he will state his position openly so that he will not be bothered in future by additional embassies (ὡς μή μοι τρύζητε παρήμενοι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος, 9.311). Meleager, as we shall see, also receives many separate ambassadors.

Agamemnon during their quarrel, she told him that one day he would be given great recompense for the outrage now being done to him (1.213-214). This promise leads naturally to the assumption that Achilles will accept the ambassadors' offer.[495] In addition, the opening scenes of the poem, with Agamemnon's brutal treatment of Chryses, set up an important paradigm for the poem. Agamemnon's treatment of Chryses was unjust and was punished, just as his treatment of Achilles is unjust and eventually punished. But when Agamemnon returned Chryseis, Chryses relented and prayed to Apollo that he end the plague. Thus, when Briseis is offered back to Achilles, we can expect that he should act like Chryses. Lord summarizes this odd situation:

> the refusal of the embassy is parallel to Agamemnon's refusal of the ransom of Chryses ... . The difference is that whereas up to this point we have seen Achilles playing Chryses to Agamemnon, now we find him playing Agamemnon to Chryses. In other words, he was the bereaved seeking restitution ..., but now he is the mortal refusing to accept just return. And by slipping into the role of Agamemnon he brings further disaster upon the Achaeans and on himself ... .[496]

Achilles' surprising rejection of the embassy is prefigured as early as Book 8, when Zeus announces the conditions under which Achilles will return to battle. Hector, not Agamemnon, will effect his return by slaying Patroclus.[497] This comes as a surprise, not least of all because Patroclus has played virtually no role in the poem up to this point. Suddenly we are told

---

[495]Lord, *ST* 193.

[496]Lord, *ST* 189.

[497]οὐ γὰρ πρὶν πολέμου ἀποπαύσεται ὄβριμος Ἕκτωρ, / πρὶν ὄρθαι παρὰ ναῦφι ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα, / ἤματι τῷ ὅτ' ἂν οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ πρύμνῃσι μάχωνται / στείνει ἐν αἰνοτάτῳ περὶ Πατρόκλοιο θανόντος, / ὣς γὰρ θέσφατόν ἐστι· (8.473-477).

that the most important event of the poem, the hero's return, hinges upon him. But Zeus' announcement is remarkable at another level as well; it is the first indication that the expected narrative pattern established by the wrath, withdrawal, and return motif will be interrupted by and joined with another motif, the death of the substitute.[498] Lord sums up the situation as follows:

> by his withdrawal from the fighting Achilles has brought another powerful pattern into play, that of death and return. The story pattern of the wrath ... leads to the troubles of the Achaeans, even to the duplication of those troubles before and after the embassy. But it does not in itself seem to include the death of Patroclus. This appears to belong to another pattern into which the story of the wrath has modulated.[499]

The ramifications of the introduction of this new pattern presently become evident. For the new pattern necessitates the failure of the embassy. Achilles will return in the end. But he will not do so because his τιμή has been restored and even augmented; he will return to avenge the death of his surrogate on the battlefield.

The question of Achilles' rejection of the embassy is one that must be addressed on many levels, and not only that of story pattern. The complex characterization of Achilles, the poet's treatment of themes such as the nature

---

[498]On the motif of the death of the substitute, cf. Lord, *ST* 189-195; Atchity 162, 229; Redfield 107; Vivante, *The Homeric Imagination* 56-57; Whitman, *HHT* 194-204; Nagler, *S&T* 136-146; Halperin 75-87; Janko, *Comm.* IV, 309-314; Edwards, *HPI* 8-9, 63, 228-229, and *Comm.*V, 15-18; Richardson, *Comm.* VI, 18-19. Edwards lists, as other examples of the substitute, Antilochus in the lost *Aethiopis*, Enkidu in the *Epic of Gilgamesh,* Jonathan in *Samuel*, and Oliver in *Le Chanson de Roland*. In addition, he cites the stories of Castor and Pollux and Theseus and Peirithous (*HPI* 63). For a different view, cf. Hooker 30-35 and Finlay 267-273 who argue against viewing Patroclus as a substitute for Achilles.

[499]Lord, *ST* 190; cf. also Nagler, *S&T* 133-137.

of heroism, honour, and fame must also be considered in order to answer as fully as possible this much vexed question. I am arguing, however, that the normal development of the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern (that is, one uninterrupted by another pattern, as here) suggests that Achilles' continued withdrawal after the offer to return Briseis is pointless. His refusal to return is, in part at least, explained by the introduction of the death of the substitute pattern, with which the poet commits himself to Achilles' return depending on Patroclus' death. Achilles must reject the embassy.

Even though Achilles' rejection of the embassy is not part of the expected pattern, much that occurs in Book 9 does accord with it. Nestor suggests that ambassadors be sent to persuade Achilles to return (φραζώμεσθ' ὥς κέν μιν ἀρεσσάμενοι πεπίθωμεν, 9.112). He then exhorts the chosen ambassadors to try to persuade Achilles (δενδίλλων ἐς ἕκαστον ... πειρᾶν ὡς πεπίθοιεν ἀμύμονα Πηλείωνα, 180-181). As they make their way to Achilles' ships, they pray to Poseidon that they may easily persuade the hero (ῥηϊδίως πεπιθεῖν, 184). Agamemnon offers Achilles numerous gifts and new τιμαί.[500] In addition, he offers to return Briseis (131-134). Nestor says that these are

[500]Nestor first advises Agamemnon to make reparations by persuading Achilles with offers of gifts and soothing words (δώροισίν τ' ἀγανοῖσιν ἔπεσσί τε μειλιχοῖσι, 113). Agamemnon responds that he will enumerate the gifts he will give (περικλυτὰ δῶρ' ὀνομήνω, 121). There is no explicit mention of offers of additional τιμή as Zeus makes to Demeter, but I would argue that Agamemnon's offer to make Achilles his son-in-law, to honour him as the equal of Orestes (τείσω δέ μιν ἶσον Ὀρέστῃ, 142), and to make him king of seven settlements in the Peloponnese (149-155) is nothing less that the offer of additional τιμή (cf. esp. τείσω,142 and τιμήσουσι, 155).

gifts which Achilles could not readily scorn (δῶρα μὲν οὐκέτ' ὀνοστὰ διδοῖς, 164), and he is correct.[501]

Unexpectedly, however, Achilles rejects Agamemnon's offer. He says to Odysseus that Agamemnon will not persuade him (οὔτ' ἔμεγ' 'Ατρεΐδην 'Αγαμέμνονα πεισέμεν οἴω, 9.315; οὐδέ με πείσει, 345; οὐδέ κεν ὧς ἔτι θυμὸν ἐμὸν πείσει' 'Αγαμέμνων, 386). He also sets out *new* terms, which have nothing to do with the restoration of τιμή, under which he will return. Achilles says that he will not return until Hector is at the ships of Achaeans:

> ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς ἔρχεσθε καὶ ἀγγελίην ἀπόφασθε·
> οὐ γὰρ πρὶν πολέμοιο μεδήσομαι αἱματόεντος,
> πρίν γ' υἱὸν Πριάμοιο δαΐφρονος, Ἕκτορα δῖον,
> Μυρμιδόνων ἐπί τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας ἱκέσθαι
> κτείνοντ' 'Αργείους, κατά τε σμῦξαι πυρὶ νῆας.
> (9.649-653)[502]

---

[501]The μέν *solitarium* at 164 may be seen to refer to line 113 where Nestor said that gifts *and* words should be used to persuade Achilles. But as Hainsworth notes (*Comm.* III, 80-81), Nestor's words at 163 ff. confirm that Agamemnon is neglecting nothing, for he is restoring Achilles' γέρας and offering him new honours as well, while μέν *solitarium* is too regular an occurrence to require an explanation.

[502]Because Agamemnon's offer constitutes a complete restitution of τιμή, Achilles cannot declare that he will not come back until his τιμή is restored. This declaration may be a traditional element in the motif. We see Demeter do just this when she rejects the ambassadors' preliminary offers, saying she will not return to Olympus and end the famine until she sees her daughter (330-333). Achilles also sets out the terms under which he will return, and these are couched in language and phrasing reminiscent of the hymn (cf. the use of a verb of refusal, ἠναίνετο [*h. Dem.* 330], coupled with πρὶν [332, 333]), but they have nothing to do with the restoration of his τιμή, for this has just now been offered to him. The new terms also have little to do with the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern. In this passage, Homer may well be using a conventional element of the wrath pattern, the iteration of terms to the ambassadors, to look ahead to a new motif which will soon to take precedence, the role of the surrogate, who, instead of Achilles, will halt Hector's attack on the Greek ships.

After the failure of the ambassadors, no more embassies are sent to Achilles because Agamemnon can offer him nothing more.

The immediate effect for the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern is the delay of the return which should follow upon the (successful) embassy. Achilles does not return until Book 19, and, although this is the final and necessary element in the motif, thematically it comes not as the conclusion of the wrath pattern, but as a result of the death of the substitute.

The pivotal moment for Patroclus comes at the beginning of Book 16, when the hero's tears and supplication (λισσόμενος, 16.3, 46) arouse sympathy in Achilles (ᾤκτιρε, 5). Patroclus manages to break through Achilles' anger (οὐδ' ἄρα πως ἦν / ἀσπερχὲς κεχολῶσθαι ἐνὶ φρεσίν, 60-61) and gains his permission to replace him on the battlefield. Nagler points out that Patroclus here plays a role in the wrath pattern, for he becomes the successful suppliant who effects the hero's return. In this capacity, he functions in much the same way that Rhea does in the *Hymn to Demeter* and Cleopatra will do in the story of Meleager's withdrawal, for it is typically the person dearest to the principal character who brings about his return. Kakridis argues that it is normally a closely related female who effects the hero's return, as in the two examples just named.[503] We may see a reflection of this in the *Iliad* when, at the beginning of Book 16, Achilles asks Patroclus why he is weeping like some young girl:

> τίπτε δεδάκρυσαι, Πατρόκλεες, <u>ἠΰτε κούρη</u>
> νηπίη, ἥ θ' ἅμα μητρὶ θέουσ' ἀνελέσθαι ἀνώγει,
> εἱανοῦ ἁπτομένη, καί τ' ἐσσυμένην κατερύκει,
> δακρυόεσσα δέ μιν ποτιδέρκεται, ὄφρ' ἀνέληται·

---

[503] *HR* 19-20; cf. also, Nagler, *S&T* 135.

τῇ ἴκελος, Πάτροκλε, τέρεν κατὰ δάκρυον εἴβεις.
(16.7-11)

Thus, Patroclus plays a dual role in the development of the main narrative. He is the successful suppliant as well as the surrogate. Paradoxically, the return which his entreaty achieves is his own. Disguised as Achilles, Patroclus returns to battle. Initially, everyone believes Achilles has returned. When the Trojans see Patroclus on the battlefield, they turn in flight, ἐλπόμενοι παρὰ ναῦφι ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα / μηνιθμὸν μὲν ἀπορρῖψαι, φιλότητα δ' ἑλέσθαι (16.281-282). However, by the time he is killed, everyone knows his real identity.

The traditional form of the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern has undergone modification by the introduction of the substitute. We have seen that the major consequence of this mingling of patterns is that Achilles returns not once his τιμή is restored, but as a result of the surrogate's death, which gives rise to a new grief and anger on his part, directed not against Agamemnon, but against Hector who killed Patroclus.[504]

At the beginning of Book 19, Achilles calls another assembly. Everyone comes, even those who do not normally attend, like the helmsmen and the food distributors, οὕνεκ' Ἀχιλλεὺς / ἐξεφάνη, δηρὸν δὲ μάχης ἐπέπαυτ' ἀλεγεινῆς (19.45-46). Achilles announces that his wrath against Agamemnon and the army is now at an end: νῦν δ' ἤτοι μὲν ἐγὼ παύω χόλον, οὐδέ τί με χρὴ / ἀσκελέως αἰεὶ μενεαινέμεν (67-68). All the Achaeans rejoice at the announcement (οἱ δ' ἐχάρησαν ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ / μῆνιν ἀποειπόντος μεγαθύμου Πηλεΐωνος, 74-75).

---

[504]Nagy, Best *of the Achaeans* 94, notes that the same words ἄχος and πένθος are used to "designate the grief of Achilles over his loss of τιμή (ἄχος : I 188, XVI 52, 55; πένθος : I 362) ... and the grief of Achilles over his loss of Patroklos (ἄχος: XVIII 22, XXIII 47; πένθος: XVIII 73)."

Achilles' withdrawal has ended, but Agamemnon still insists, just as Zeus did in the *Hymn to Demeter*, on giving Achilles the recompense he had promised ten books earlier (ἄψ ἐθέλω ἀρέσαι, δόμεναι τ' ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα, 19.138). However, with Patroclus dead, Briseis and the additional gifts have no meaning for Achilles. Comparison with the *Hymn to Demeter* and the rest of the assembly scene in Book 19 suggests that Homer deviates from the conventional pattern of the motif here. Demeter accepted Zeus' offer after Persephone was returned; Agamemnon and Odysseus do not seem to understand why Achilles does not care for the gifts which the king now offers and which can only augment the hero's honour. Odysseus insists that public display and acceptance of the gifts is necessary:

> τὰ δὲ δῶρα ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων
> οἰσέτω ἐς μέσσην ἀγορήν, ἵνα πάντες Ἀχαιοὶ
> ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδωσι, σὺ δὲ φρεσὶ σῇσιν ἰανθῇς.[505]
> (19.172-174)

Agamemnon too is insistent; the assembly cannot be dissolved until Achilles accepts the gifts (188-191). Even Achilles, eager as he is to have this moment finished and to be on the battlefield, acknowledges that this is proper procedure (Ἀγάμεμνον, / δῶρα μὲν αἴ κ' ἐθέλῃσθα παρασχέμεν, ὡς ἐπιεικές, / ἤ τ' ἐχέμεν, παρὰ σοί, 145-147). That Briseis and the gifts now have no significance for Achilles is not so much an innovation in the wrath pattern as a result of the intrusion of the new pattern of the substitute's death.

At 19.241ff., the gifts and Briseis are presented to Achilles. Only after he has accepted them can the assembly end, for this moment signals that

---

[505]The same verb is used to describe the effect which reconciliation has on Demeter and Persephone: Ὣς τότε πρόπαν ἦμαρ ὁμόφρονα θυμὸν ἔχουσαι / πολλὰ μάλ' ἀλλήλων κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν ἴαινον (434-435).

Achilles has truly returned and is again part of his community, the Achaean army. With the end of the assembly at 276, the wrath, withdrawal, and return narrative that began in Book 1 also comes to an end.

C. The Wrath of Meleager

In Book 9 of the *Iliad*, Phoenix tells the story of Meleager's wrath and withdrawal as a paradigm for Achilles. Meleager withdraws in anger at his mother from the fighting around the city of Calydon. This deprives the Aetolians of their foremost warrior and, thereby, gives the upper hand to the enemy, the Curetes. Things soon go so badly for the Aetolians that they decide to supplicate the hero. Various embassies are sent to him, all offering gifts if he will return to battle. Meleager refuses them all. When the city itself is on fire and defeat imminent, the hero's wife, Cleopatra, entreats him, and out of pity for her, he relents and returns. Meleager drives the Curetes away from Calydon; however, the Aetolians now give him no gifts. Phoenix concludes that Achilles should not act like Meleager; he should not wait until the Greek fleet is endangered. He should accept Agamemnon's gifts and return immediately, for if he returns later and without gifts, like Meleager, his τιμή will be less.

The use of the story of Meleager as a paradigm in the *Iliad* poses obvious problems about the extent to which the myth has been adapted to fit the situation at hand.[506] For example, scholars have commented on the role

---

[506]On the use of the Meleager story as a paradigm in the *Iliad* and the possible adaptations to the immediate situation, see the following which I found particularly useful from a large bibliography: Kakridis, *HR* 11-33; Rosner 314-327; Nagy, *Best of the Achaeans* 105; March 27-46; Edwards, *HPI* 226-229; Held 245-261; Bremmer, "La Plasticité du mythe" 37-56; Morrison,

(cont.)

that Althaea plays in Phoenix' version. Her curse on her son appears to contradict the well-known story of the brand with which Meleager's life is co-eval. In addition, her presence in one of the embassies sent to her son seems odd given that she cursed him because he had killed her brother on whose behalf the Curetes are taking vengeance in attacking Calydon. The double name, and lengthy digression on it, of Meleager's wife, Cleopatra-Alcyone, has also caused dismay among scholars. Many have investigated how details such as these have perhaps been added to the Homeric account of Meleager's wrath and, consequently, the degree to which the traditional story itself has been modified.[507]

I do not propose to enter into this debate, for, important as the issues are with regard to the oral poet's use of traditional source material and the flexibility of that material, I am here concerned with an examination of the structure of the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern in the Homeric version of the Meleager story. It may well be that significant parts of the narrative are not traditional but have been invented by the poet to fit the situation. Bremmer and March, for example, argue that Meleager's wrath and withdrawal have been invented by the poet. Both point to the different narrative pace between the first part of the story, the boar hunt (529-549), and

---

Homeric Misdirection 119-124. For a bibliography of earlier scholarship, cf. Heubeck, "Das Meleagros-Paradeigma in der Ilias" 13, n. 1. On mythological innovation in Homer in general, cf. Willcock, "Mythological Paradeigmata" 141-154, especially 148-149 for the Meleager story, "Ad Hoc Invention in the *Iliad*" 41-53, "Homer, the Individual Poet" 11-18; Braswell 16-26; Lang 140-164; Griffin, "The Epic Cycle"39-53; Edwards, *HPI* 61-70.

[507]Kakridis, for example, attempts to tease apart Phoenix' account to reveal the plot of Homer's *Urtext*, the lost *Meleagris* (*HR* 11-33).

the second part, the withdrawal of the hero (550-598), as evidence of a non-traditional story. Bremmer sums up the problem:

> la première partie du récit de Phénix (529-549) est prononcée de façon très rapide, reprenant de toute évidence une histoire qui était fondamentalement connue. La seconde partie (550-598) est racontée avec beaucoup plus de détails — ce qui n'est pas surprenant si l'auteur est en train de narrer une histoire peu connue.[508]

March also points out that Meleager's wrath appears nowhere but in Homer or sources which draw upon Homer:

> Thus it is possible that Homer is innovating here; and this possibility becomes a high probability when we consider in detail this second part of the story which contains so many close similarities between the situations of Meleager and Achilles that it seems very likely that here in the tale of the Embassy Homer has adapted the legend of Meleager to parallel Achilles' own situation as closely as possible, so as the more urgently, in the person of Phoenix, to persuade the hero to return to battle.[509]

If Meleager's wrath is a Homeric innovation, this may, however, be helpful in the examination of the motif. For, if Homer has invented details to fit the situation, those details should conform to the pattern which is being invoked. Even though the poet may not be working with traditional mythological material, he is, nonetheless, working with a traditional pattern.

---

[508]Bremmer, "La Plasticité du mythe" 41.

[509]March 30. Bremmer argues that Meleager is first and foremost an adolescent in Greek myth and that the story of the Calydonian Boar Hunt is one of initiation. Once Homer transformed the dispute over the boar's hide into a full-fledged war, "il ne lui était plus possible de maintenir le statut éphébique de Méléagre: les cités ne sont pas sauvées par des adolescents, mais par des guerriers adultes" ("La Plasticité du mythe" 42). Sargent (217-223) discusses the initiatory nature of the myth in detail, paying special attention to the role of the maternal uncles, such as Althaea's brother, in Greek initiation myths in general.

Meleager withdraws in anger to his own house and the company of his wife, Cleopatra (τῇ ὅ γε παρκατέλεκτο χόλον θυμαλγέα πέσσων, 565).[510] Soon the city itself is in danger (573-574), and embassies are sent to entreat the angry hero.[511] As in the *Hymn to Demeter*, numerous embassies are sent. First the Aetolian elders and priests come, then Meleager's father, mother, and sisters, and finally his friends.[512] The elders and priests offer the hero a gift (ὑποσχόμενοι μέγα δῶρον, 576); he may choose the choicest piece of land in

---

[510]The same expression is used of Achilles at 4.513 where Apollo exhorts the Trojans, reminding them that Achilles is no longer fighting, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶ χόλον θυμαλγέα πέσσει.

[511]Note the repeated use of verbs of beseeching: λίσσοντο, 574; λιτάνευε, 581; ἐλλίσσονθ', 585; λίσσετ', 591. It is also worth observing that several embassies are sent to Meleager, as they were to Demeter. Achilles, on the other hand, receives only one embassy. I believe, however, that what we see in *Iliad* 9 is the compression of several embassies into one. Rosner (316-318) has argued that the different embassies which are sent to Meleager parallel the ambassadors sitting before Achilles. The elders who make the initial offer of land to Meleager are paralleled by Odysseus who reports Agamemnon's offer of gifts. Phoenix, whose autobiography established his connection with Achilles as a family member, finds his counterpart in Meleager's relatives (cf. especially lines 9.485-495). Thirdly, Ajax, who emphasizes his position as a friend (cf. 630, οὐδὲ μετατρέπεται φιλότητος ἑταίρων), is paralleled by the ἑταῖροι of Meleager. By selecting for the same embassy ambassadors who can appeal to Achilles from three different positions, the poet calls into play the idea of multiple embassies without actually having to send them off one by one. Cf. also Bannert, "Phoinix Jugend" 69-94.

[512]Kakridis (*HR* 19-24, 152-164) has written on what he calls "the ascending scale of affection" in such embassies. Typically, he argues, the friends of the hero should rank lower than his family, that is to say, they should be among the first to come, with pressure on the hero increasing as ever closer ambassadors entreat him. Their exalted presence here is meant to parallel the presence of the friends who are sitting before Achilles at the very moment Phoenix is telling Meleager's story. Kakridis feels that the ascending scale of affection also necessitates and accounts for the presence of the hero's mother among the ambassadors.

Calydon for his own property (ὁππόθι πιότατον πεδίον Καλυδῶνος ἐραννῆς, / ἔνθα μιν ἤνωγον τέμενος περικαλλὲς ἑλέσθαι, 577-578).[513]

The offer which the ambassadors make to Meleager differs in two important ways from those we have examined in the cases of Demeter and Achilles. Firstly, there is no mention of restitution of τιμή, for Meleager has not been deprived of his τιμή in any tangible way, which may be a sign of the story's adaptation to the wrath of Achilles. Secondly, there is no overt mention of new τιμαί. Here, however, an examination of the nature of the gift of land which is offered to Meleager proves significant.

In the famous exchange between Sarpedon and Glaucus in *Iliad* 12, Sarpedon asks his friend why they risk their lives in battle. The reason he gives is the honour which the community bestows on its warrior kings:

> Γλαῦκε, τίη δὴ νῶϊ τετιήμεσθα μάλιστα
> ἕδρῃ τε κρέασίν τε ἰδὲ πλείοις δεπάεσσιν
> ἐν Λυκίῃ, πάντες δὲ θεοὺς ὣς εἰσορόωσι,
> καὶ τέμενος νεμόμεσθα μέγα Ξάνθοιο παρ' ὄχθας,
> κάλον φυταλιῆς καὶ ἀρούρης πυροφόροιο;
> (12.310-314)

Kings are accorded honour in their community in two tangible ways: the pride of place at public festivals and symposia and the choicest τέμενος in the district. In Book 6, Glaucus recounts the story of his ancestor, Bellerophon.

---

[513]At 598, Phoenix refers to *gifts* (τῷ δ' οὐκέτι δῶρ' ἐτέλεσσαν), although earlier Meleager had been offered only one gift. Phoenix' use of the plural comes at the end of his speech when he is exhorting Achilles not to be like Meleager who eventually returned to the fighting but received no gifts. Achilles should return now and receive the gifts on offer (ἀλλ' ἐπὶ δώρων / ἔρχεο, 602-603). Therefore, the use of the plural at 598 could well be meant to further the parallel between the two heroes, at the point when Phoenix ends his account.

After Bellerophon had demonstrated his valour for the king of Lycia, the king married him to his daughter:

> δίδου δ' ὅ γε θυγατέρα ἥν,
> δῶκε δέ οἱ τιμῆς βασιληΐδος ἥμισυ πάσης·
> καὶ μέν οἱ Λύκιοι τέμενος τάμον ἔξοχον ἄλλων.
> (6.192-194)

Bellerophon, as the king's son-in-law, receives half the kingdom and the best τέμενος. In Book 20, Achilles taunts Aeneas by asking him if he thinks that, as a reward for killing Achilles, the Trojans will honour him with the best τέμενος:

> ἦ σέ γε θυμὸς ἐμοὶ μαχέσασθαι ἀνώγει
> ἐλπόμενον Τρώεσσι ἀνάξειν ἱπποδάμοισι
> τιμῆς τῆς Πριάμου; ...
> ἦ νύ τί τοι Τρῶες τέμενος τάμον ἔξοχον ἄλλων,
> καλὸν φυταλιῆς καὶ ἀρούρης, ὄφρα νέμηαι,
> αἴ κεν ἐμὲ κτείνῃς;
> (20.179-186)

All three passages show that having an outstanding τέμενος in one's community is a powerful symbol of τιμή. They also demonstrate a close connection between kingship and the possession of such a τέμενος. This is frequently the case in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Kings, or those hoping to be kings, and gods are overwhelmingly the possessors of τέμενη.[514] Therefore, when Meleager is offered the best τέμενος in Calydon, he is being offered τιμή which he did not possess before, τιμή which is normally reserved for the most powerful individual in the community, the king.

---

[514]For τέμενος connected with kings cf. *Il.* 18.550; *Od.* 6.293, 17.299. For the gods and their τέμενη cf. *Il.* 2.696, 8.48, 23.148; *Od.* 8.363; *h. Aph.* 59; *h. Ap.* 88.

Like Achilles and Demeter, Meleager refuses the ambassadors (ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὣς τοῦ θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἔπειθον, 587). His initial refusal to return, however, is not due to the reason which I argued was the conventional one, the one cited by Demeter who refuses to return until her daughter and her τιμή are restored. Achilles' refusal to return after the offer to restore his τιμή had been made was, I argued, contrary to the traditional narrative development of the wrath pattern and, at least in part, a result of the introduction of the motif of the substitute. In the case of Meleager, no offer of a restoration of τιμή is made because he is not deprived of any tangible τιμή.[515] More importantly, however, the function of Meleager's wrath as a paradigm determines its development. Meleager refuses the ambassadors because Achilles is doing so at this very moment. Meleager will eventually return to the fighting because Achilles also will. Meleager is eventually reconciled with the Calydonians by the person closest to him, his wife, Cleopatra, because Achilles too will relent when faced with the pleas of the person he holds dearest.[516]

However, the story of Meleager's wrath also develops in a way that is in keeping with the traditional pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return. Therefore, Meleager also refuses the ambassadors, as Demeter did, because this is a traditional feature of the motif. Moreover, the hero's wife is the

---

[515]Because there has been no loss of τιμή, Meleager cannot set the conditions for his return as being dependent on its restoration. Nonetheless, his return is marked by the same phraseology that occurred in the Demeter story and in Achilles' response to Odysseus:

ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὣς τοῦ θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἔπειθον
πρὶν γ' ὅτε δὴ θάλαμος πύκ' ἐβάλλετο.
(9.587-588)

[516]Cf. Rosner 324-326; March 32-33; Bremmer, "La Plasticité du mythe" 41-42.

successful suppliant because she is the person closest to him, as both Rhea to Demeter and Patroclus to Achilles.

Meleager, however, does not receive the gifts which he had earlier been promised (τῷ δ' οὐκέτι δῶρ' ἐτέλεσσαν, 598). This is odd, for we saw that gifts and τιμαί played an important part in the returns of both Demeter and Achilles. Some scholars have argued that Meleager does not receive his gifts because he died very soon after his return, as a result of his mother's curse.[517] But the simplest explanation is that mention of Meleager's death would be inappropriate in Phoenix' narrative. For Meleager is meant to serve as a *negative* paradigm for Achilles. Achilles should not act like Meleager and refuse the ambassadors' offer. He should accept their gifts and return at once. Meleager refused the ambassadors, but in the end returned to battle anyway. At that time, for whatever reason, the Aetolians would not give him any gifts. The suggestion that Meleager died before he could receive the gifts, rather than that the Aetolians refused to give them, would undermine Phoenix' use of the story as a negative paradigm. The point which Phoenix stresses is that Meleager returns but is *refused* the earlier offer of gifts. This is the relevant climax of what is a cautionary tale for Achilles.[518]

---

[517]Kakridis, *HR* 13; Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien* 141. It is worth noting that the earliest references to Meleager's death make no mention of Althaea as the cause of her son's death, either in connection with a curse or the more famous firebrand. In the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and in the *Minyas,* Meleager dies at the hands of Apollo. Cf. Hesiod, fr. 25 MW, discussed by March 41-42 and Bremmer, "La Plasticité du mythe" 43.

[518]Morrison, *Homeric Misdirection* 122, sees an interesting parallel between the denial of gifts to Meleager and Achilles' reluctant acceptance of gifts in Book 19. Athena promises that Achilles will receive compensation for his treatment by Agamemnon (1.212-214). Zeus swears to Thetis that Achilles will be honoured (1.508-530). These divine predictions lead the audience to expect that he will receive gifts and honours. Ironically,

(cont.)

Meleager's failure to be compensated upon his return is a breach of the conventional narrative development of the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern. What we see here is that the pattern which was used by the poet as a paradigm for Achilles is in its final phase modified so that the story can serve Phoenix' rhetorical purposes. In spite of this, however, we do see most of the major elements of the pattern in the Iliadic version of the Meleager story.

D. The Wrath of Hera

The final example of a wrath, withdrawal, and return narrative I wish to examine before returning to Paris occurs in a digression in the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*. Near the site where Apollo is laying out the foundations for his temple at Pytho is a spring in which a she-dragon dwells whom Apollo kills (302-303). We are told that this is the same dragon who received the infant Typhaon from Hera and reared him. Hera conceived and bore him herself out of anger at Zeus who had given birth to Athena from his head and, thereby, offended the goddess' τιμή as the wife of Zeus. Hera intends for her child to be stronger than Zeus to the same degree that Zeus was stronger than Cronus.

This digression has been frequently condemned as a late interpolation into the text of the hymn, principally because the poet appears to be adapting the story of Typhoeus from Hesiod's *Theogony* (820-880).[519] Typhoeus was

---

however, when these are finally given to him, the death of Patroclus has made them meaningless. Thus, in one sense, Achilles, like Meleager, returns, but returns too late to receive anything that he values for his efforts.

[519]Cf. Clay (*Politics of Olympus* 64, n. 145) who gives a bibliography of those who condemn the passage as an interpolation. More recently scholars have attempted to interpret the Hera-Typhaon passage as a thematically

(cont.)

the offspring of a malevolent Gaea and served as the final threat Zeus had to overcome before he could firmly establish his kingship. Janko, however, has shown that there are no linguistic grounds for supposing that the digression is an interpolation by another poet.[520] Moreover, Stesichorus too made Typhaon the son of Hera, not of Gaea, indicating that this version existed in the sixth century and may even have been part of a group of myths which characterize Hera as the opponent of Zeus' rule, a figure analogous to Gaea, the enemy of the status quo in the *Theogony*.[521]

The similarities between Hera and Gaea in these two accounts accord with Hera's origins as an earth goddess. Archaeological excavations of her

---

integral part of the hymn; cf. Clay, *Politics of Olympus* 63-74; Miller 82-94; Thalmann, *Conventions* 70-71.

[520]Janko, *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns* 118-119. Typhaon and Typhoeus are equivalent forms denoting the same character in both the *Theogony* (306, 820ff.) and the *Hymn to Apollo* (306, 352, 367). On the variants of the name, cf. West, *Theogony* 252, 380.

[521]Stesichorus, fr. 239 (PMG): Τυφωεύς· Ἡσίοδος αὐτὸν Γῆς γενεαλογεῖ, Στησίχορος δὲ Ἥρας μόνης κατὰ μνησικακίαν Διὸς τεκούσης αὐτόν. Typhoeus is mentioned only once in Homer, in a simile at the end of the catalogue of ships:

γαῖα δ' ὑπεστενάχιζε Διὶ ὣς τερπικεραύνῳ
χωομένῳ, ὅτε τ' ἀμφὶ Τυφωέϊ γαῖαν ἱμάσσῃ
εἰν Ἀρίμοις, ὅθι φασὶ Τυφωέος ἔμμεναι εὐνάς·
(2.781-783)

The mythical Arimoi seem to have been situated in Cilicia (cf. Leaf, *Iliad* I, 108). Pindar says that Typhaon was raised in a Cilician cave (*Pythian* 1.16-17; cf. *Pythian* 8.16). Aeschylus also situates him in Cilicia (*PV* 351-352), and calls him γηγενῆ (*PV* 351), which would seem to indicate that he thought of him as the offspring of Gaea. That Typhoeus' one appearance in Homer is in connection with a simile describing the earth may indicate that Homer too conceived of him as Gaea's, and not Hera's, child. Moreover, the tradition which saw him as Gaea's child may also have associated him, or at least his birth, with Cilicia. If this is so, then Pindar and Aeschylus too think of him as Gaea's child. Cf. Gantz 49-51 on the various early sources for Typhaon/Typhoeus.

cult centres at Samos and Argos, dating from at least the eighth century, reveal that she was worshipped as a fertility goddess.[522] The *Iliad* too seems to preserve vestiges of Hera as an earth goddess. The Διὸς ἀπάτη of Book 14 is generally agreed to be a reworking of the myth of the ἱερὸς γάμος.[523] Moreover, she is the god in the *Iliad* most closely associated with chthonic powers. She is the only one to swear by the river Styx or to mention the Titans (14.271-279, 15.36-40). The story Zeus tells at the beginning of Book 15 of Hera suspended between heaven and earth by a golden chain with anvils hung from her feet may also refer to some earlier cosmic struggle between sky god and earth goddess.[524]

In the *Theogony*, Hera gives birth parthenogenetically to Hephaestus as an angry response to the birth of Athena from the head of Zeus:

> αὐτὸς δ' ἐκ κεφαλῆς γλαυκώπιδα γείνατ' Ἀθήνην,
> δεινὴν ἐγρεκύδοιμον ἀγέστρατον ἀτρυτώνην,
> πότνιαν, ᾗ κέλαδοί τε ἅδον πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε·
> Ἥρη δ' Ἥφαιστον κλυτὸν οὐ φιλότητι μιγεῖσα
> γείνατο, καὶ ζαμένησε καὶ ἤρισεν ᾧ παρακοίτῃ.
> (924-928)

---

[522]Cf. O'Brien, *Transformation* 17-76 and 113-166 for the evidence from Samos and Argos, respectively; cf. also Farnell, *Cults* I, 181-192.

[523]Cf. Whitman, "Hera's Anvils" 37-38; O'Brien, *Transformation* 95-96; Janko, *Comm.* IV, 171-172 (with bibliography); and Muellner, *The Anger of Achilles* 5-7. According to Whitman (38), Hera's lustral purification, her borrowing of Aphrodite's κεστὸς ἱμάς, and the magical growth of flowers during the union with Zeus are all appropriate to the ἱερὸς γάμος (*Il.* 14.170ff.).

[524]Cf. O'Brien, *Transformation* 95-103; Whitman, "Hera's Anvils" 37-42; Janko, *Comm.* IV, 229-231. O'Brien, in connection with this story, notes that the only two gods whom Zeus lashes are Typhaon and Hera (cf. *Il.* 2.782, ἱμάσσῃ of Typhaon and 15.17 ἱμάσσω of Hera): "a strange way to treat one's wife, one might say, but a lashing with thunderbolts is a perfect punishment for a sky god to inflict on an earth goddess plotting insurrection" (*Transformation* 100).

The circumstances of Hephaestus' birth are, of course, the same as those of Typhaon in the *Hymn to Apollo* and may indicate that one story is modelled on the other, though we cannot say which one is earlier. However, the Hesiodic passage does represent Hera as angry with Zeus, seemingly because of an offense against her τιμή as his wife. Again, her response is revenge. One might even say that the crippled god she gives birth to is also a monster like Typhoeus. Moreover, parthenogenetic birth is normally associated with an earth goddess. In this regard, it is worth remembering that in Homer Hephaestus is the child of Hera *and* Zeus.

The b scholia to *Iliad* 11.783 preserve a curious story in which Gaea, who is angry over the death of the Giants, complains to Hera about Zeus. Hera goes to Cronus from whom she receives two eggs smeared with his semen which she buries in the ground at Arimon in Cilicia. From these eggs, Typhaon is born. Hera, however, relents and reveals all to Zeus, who smites Typhaon with his thunderbolt. The T scholia to *Iliad* 14.296 tells us that Hera bore Prometheus, another enemy of Zeus, having conceived him by the giant, Eurymedon.[525]

Finally, in the *Theogony*, the union of Typhaon and Echidna results in numerous monsters. Among them is the Hydra of Lerna which Hera rears out of anger at Heracles. Heracles kills it with the help of Athena (314-318), in a story which has two children of Zeus, whose very existence is an affront to

---

[525]Kirk, Raven, and Schofield (*The Presocratic Philosophers* 59-60) argue for the antiquity of the myth about Hera and Cronus on the grounds that it contains Orphic elements. Cf. also West, *Theogony* 380; Potscher 95-103; and Clay, *Politics of Olympus* 67, n. 157.

Hera's τιμή as the wife of Zeus, working in conjunction.[526] Echidna also gives birth, apparently in union with Typhaon as well, to the Nemean lion whom Hera also reared and who was also killed by Heracles (*Theogony*, 326-332).[527] Since Nemea and Lerna are both in the vicinity of the Argolid, which was the centre of Hera's worship, these stories presumably reflect local legend.[528] The epic tradition regularly presents Hera as the mother or nurse of monsters whom she rears out of anger at Zeus for his affronts to her τιμή as his wife.

Therefore, the portrayal of Hera in the *Hymn to Apollo* as an earth goddess possessed of chthonic powers and opposed to the rule of Zeus may well have been traditional. The *Iliad*, for all that it presents us with a rather more subdued and civilized Hera, nonetheless preserves a tradition in which the depiction of the marriage between the two supreme gods remains frequently tense and even violent. In fact, it is not the hymn poet's account of Hera as mother of Typhaon which should surprise us, but Hesiod's claim that it was Gaea who bore the last and greatest enemy of Zeus. For, as West notes, "Gaia's part in producing an enemy to Zeus' régime is at variance with her benevolence toward Zeus in the rest of the *Theogony*."[529] On the other hand,

---

[526]The hymn poet's story of Typhaon as Hera's angry response to the illegitimate birth of Athena finds a striking counterpart in Hesiod's account of the Hydra who is born to Typhaon, nursed by Hera (with the roles of divine parent and monstrous nurse neatly reversed) and killed by one bastard child of Zeus through the counsels of the same bastard child who initially caused the birth of Typhaon.

[527]Bacchylides also has Hera rear the Nemean Lion (*Ode* 9.6-9); moreover, in Pindar, Hera sends two serpents to kill the infant Heracles in his crib; the babe, of course, kills them (*Nem.* 1.34-47). Apollodorus claims that it was Hera who sends the Sphinx to Thebes with its famous riddle (3.5.8).

[528]O'Brien, *Transformation* 95.

[529]West, *Theogony* 381.

in Homer, as well as the in the *Hymn to Apollo*, Hera's attitude toward Zeus' rule can never be described as benevolent. Therefore, it should not surprise us that she would produce a child to usurp his place.

The hymn poet introduces the digression by telling us that Hera bore Typhaon in anger at Zeus (χολωσαμένη Διὶ πατρί, 307), when he gave birth to Athena from his head. Hera announces her wrath and her intentions to the assembled gods:

> ἡ δ' αἶψα χολώσατο πότνια Ἥρη
> ἠδὲ καὶ ἀγρομένοισι μετ' ἀθανάτοισι ἔειπε·
> κέκλυτέ μευ, πάντες τε θεοὶ πᾶσαί τε θέαιναι
> ὡς ἔμ' ἀτιμάζειν ἄρχει νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς
> πρῶτος, ἐπεί μ' ἄλοχον ποιήσατο κέδν' εἰδυῖαν·
> καὶ νῦν νόσφιν ἐμεῖο τέκε γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην.
> (309-314)
>
> πῶς ἔτλης οἶος τεκέειν γλαυκῶπιδ' Ἀθήνην;
> οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ τεκόμην; καὶ σὴ κεκλημένη ἔμπης
> ἦα ῥ' ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν οἱ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσι. 325
> φράζεο νῦν μή τοί τι κακὸν μήτισομ' ὀπίσσω· 325a
> καὶ νῦν μέν τοι ἐγὼ τεχνήσομαι ὥς κε γένηται
> παῖς ἐμὸς ὅς κε θεοῖσι μεταπρέποι ἀθανάτοισιν,
> οὔτε σὸν αἰσχύνασ' ἱερὸν λέχος οὔτ' ἐμὸν αὐτῆς
> οὐδέ τοι εἰς εὐνὴν πωλήσομαι, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ σεῖο
> τηλόθεν οὖσα θεοῖσι μετέσσομαι ἀθανάτοισιν.
> (323-330)

Hera is angered because Zeus has dishonoured her (ἔμ' ἀτιμάζειν, 312), as he dishonoured Demeter and as Agamemnon dishonoured Achilles.[530] Hera

---

[530]Hera's announcement of her wrath against Zeus takes place under the same conditions as does Achilles' announcement, at an assembly at which the whole community is present, the Olympian gods (ἀγρομένοισι μετ' ἀθανάτοισι, 310) and the Achaean army (ἀγορήνδε καλέσσατο λαὸν Ἀχιλλεύς, *Il.* 1.54).

says that Zeus has taken away her τιμή as his wife, a crucial component of which is to bear his children. In an ironic use of a key phrase in the wrath, withdrawal, and return motif, the hymn poet has Hera say that Zeus contrived this dishonour against her apart from her (νόσφιν ἐμεῖο, 314), just as he made his plans to marry Persephone to Hades νόσφιν Δημήτερος (*h. Dem.* 4). The use is ironic for now Hera will separate herself from Zeus (ἀπὸ σεῖο / τηλόθεν, 229-230).

Hera says, however, that she will continue to have relations with the immortal gods (θεοῖσι μετέσσομαι ἀθανάτοισι, 330), seeming to imply that she is only withdrawing from Zeus. This turns out not to be the case. In separating herself from Zeus, she withdraws from the entire Olympian community, as the poet in facts says, Ὣς εἰποῦσ' ἀπονόσφι θεῶν κίε χωομένη περ (331). The gods she refers to at line 330 must be the only ones that she does have contact with after the assembly is dissolved, the Titans, Gaea and Uranus.

Thus in Hera's speech, we see the first two elements of the wrath, withdrawal, and return motif: the principal character is dishonoured by the leader of her community; she becomes angry and announces her withdrawal.

The nature of Hera's revenge differs from what we have seen in the three stories already examined. Normally, the principal character's withdrawal *is* his/her revenge, for the withdrawal results in the community's loss of the withdrawn character's unique skills. Without these, the community is brought to the brink of disaster and must send gift-laden embassies to effect a reconciliation. Hera's withdrawal and her revenge are, however, separate. She withdraws and prays to Gaea, Uranus and the Titans

to grant her a son apart from Zeus, but in no way weaker than Zeus (δότε παῖδα / νόσφι Διός, μηδέν τι βίην ἐπιδευέα κείνου, 337-338).[531] By bearing a son stronger than Zeus, Hera demonstrates that Zeus cannot dishonour her without catastrophic consequences.

Her revenge upon Zeus is, of course, appropriate, for she bears a child parthenogenetically, just as Zeus did. The birth must be parthenogenetic for another reason as well. Zeus offended against Hera's τιμή as his wife by bearing Athena apart from her. Her desire for revenge, however, must be accomplished without her dishonouring herself through an adulterous liaison.

Because Hera's withdrawal is not, strictly speaking, her revenge, no embassies are sent to her. In the stories of Demeter, Achilles, and Meleager embassies are sent in order to persuade the withdrawn one to return to his community because his very absence threatens the survival of that community. In these three stories, the revenge of the withdrawn party is passive — all that is needed is a withdrawal of services to the community. With Hera, this is not the case; her absence alone does not threaten the gods. It is her actions during her absence that pose this threat. Instead of sending

---

[531]Hera's prayer is preceded and followed by an image of her striking the ground with the flat of her hand, presumably to gain the attention of the chthonic deities to whom she addresses herself (χειρὶ καταπρηνεῖ δ' ἔλασε χθόνα, 333; ἵμασε χθόνα χειρὶ παχείῃ, 340). Lowenstam (*The Death of Patroklos* 68-73) and O'Brien (*Transformation* 96) note that the behaviour is meant to invoke the aid of the chthonic gods in the destruction of an enemy. As such it is particularly appropriate to Hera as an earth goddess in the *Hymn to Apollo*. Althaea makes the same gesture when she calls upon Hades and Persephone to kill her son (πολλὰ δὲ καὶ γαῖαν πολυφόρβην χερσὶν ἀλοία, *Il.* 9.568).

embassies to entreat the goddess to return, other measures must be taken to thwart her active plans to destroy Zeus.

Hera becomes pregnant. She keeps away from Zeus and spends the year in her temple delighting in the sacrifices which her human subjects bring.[532] At the end of the year, she gives birth to Typhaon and entrusts him to the dragon whom Apollo kills. The digression ends at this point, as it began with the dragon receiving the infant from Hera.

When revenge and withdrawal are one and the same, the appropriate means to bring about reconciliation is through embassies and gifts, because the only thing that matters is to bring about the return of the withdrawn party. Since the two elements are separate here, embassies would serve no purpose; Hera could return, but Typhaon would still exist. Zeus' response to Hera's revenge is the only appropriate one. He must destroy Typhaon, rather than try to appease Hera. Therefore, as a result of the separation of the withdrawal and the revenge, the wrath pattern ends here with the goddess's withdrawal. Embassies would serve no purpose, and, without embassies, there can be no reconciliation and return, for this is the function which embassies serve. In this way, the hymn poet's story of Hera and Typhaon serves as an attenuated example of the pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return. The goddess is angered; she withdraws; but, her actions during her period of absence preclude the possibility that the story can end with her return to her community. Presumably she does return; however, once Typhaon is born, the story must find its climax elsewhere.

---

[532]Note that Demeter also spends a year withdrawn in her temple (*h. Dem.* 301-306).

E. Conclusion

The wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern has been shown to have a recognizably consistent, though somewhat malleable, form. In the four cases we have examined, the principal character's wrath and withdrawal are triggered by an affront to his τιμή, in the form of the loss of someone or something dear, at the hands of the king. Agamemnon strips Achilles of his γέρας when he takes Briseis. Zeus offends Demeter's τιμή when he arranges, without her consent, a marriage between Persephone and Hades. Zeus also offends Hera's τιμή by himself giving birth to Athena. The case of Meleager is a bit more complicated, perhaps because this was not traditionally a wrath, withdrawal, and return story, but was made into one in order to serve as a parallel to the main narrative of the *Iliad*. This could account for the odd way in which the pattern is introduced. It is not Meleager who is deprived of someone dear, rather it is Meleager who deprives Althaea of someone dear, her brother. This may have been a traditional element in Meleager's story and one that Homer could not change, but only adapt, somewhat awkwardly, to a new story of the hero's wrath and withdrawal.

The hero/goddess feels grief as a result of this deprivation. Typically, this is signaled by the noun ἄχος and its verbal derivatives. Both Demeter and Achilles feel ἄχος. In the Meleager story, the ἄχος is transferred to Althaea, since it is she who has suffered the loss. In the attenuated wrath narrative in the *Hymn to Apollo*, ἄχος is not mentioned.

In addition to grief, the hero/goddess soon feels anger, most frequently indicated by the noun χόλος and its cognates. At this point, the withdrawal occurs. Here the key word is νόσφι or its verbal counterpart νοσφίζομαι. The two goddesses withdraw into their temples; the two heroes to their quarters, where they find the companionship of the person to whom each is closest,

Patroclus for Achilles, Cleopatra for Meleager. The absence of such a companion for the two goddesses is probably due to the fact that they withdraw from Olympus which constitutes a withdrawal from their closest relatives.

The withdrawal amounts to an act of vengeance, for it removes from the community something essential to its survival which the goddess/hero alone contributed. Consequently, the withdrawal results in devastation for the community. The Achaeans are on the verge of being defeated by the Trojans, and the Aetolians by the Curetes. Demeter's withdrawal results in a famine which will annihilate the human race and deprive the gods of the τιμή they receive from humans.

To forestall the destruction of the community, the offending king sends ambassadors to entreat, persuade, and offer gifts and new τιμαί. Here the verbs λίσσομαι or λιτάνευω and πείθω are frequently used. Typically, the injured party refuses the ambassadors and sets out the conditions for his/her return, which amount to the restoration of the τιμή which was initially taken away.

In fact, only in the *Hymn to Demeter* do we find all of these elements, which may indicate that the version which the hymn poet relates is the oldest account we possess of a traditional wrath, withdrawal, and return narrative. In the *Iliad*, one embassy comes to Achilles and tries to persuade him to return with an offer of gifts, new τιμαί, *and* the return of his old τιμή. Achilles can have no legitimate reason, within the confines of the motif, to refuse the offer; nonetheless, he does. At the level of the poem's narrative structure, I argued that his refusal resulted from the introduction of Patroclus as the substitute. In the Iliadic story of Meleager, the hero refuses the various ambassadors who offer him a new gift. This is typical; however, Meleager

cannot, like Demeter, set conditions for his return because he was not the one who was deprived of anything dear to him. This element of the pattern was transferred to Althaea.

The goddess's or hero's anger and withdrawal should come to an end with the restoration of τιμή. This happens in the *Hymn to Demeter*; once Persephone is returned, Demeter ends her withdrawal. Her reconciliation with Zeus and her return to the Olympian community is effected by her mother, Rhea. This too appears to be conventional: the person closest to the withdrawn character effects his/her return. Usually this figure is female. In the case of Achilles, we saw that the motif of the substitute prevents the hero's return, even after Agamemnon offers to return Briseis. Homer combines the patterns of the substitute and wrath, withdrawal, and return in his use of Patroclus. For it is the substitute, who is also the person closest to the hero, who achieves his return. In the story of Meleager, because the initial loss and the withdrawal are connected with different characters, the restoration of τιμή plays no part in the hero's return. However, his return is accomplished by the person dearest to him, his wife.

In the following and concluding section, I shall examine the scene in Book 6 where Hector accuses Paris of being absent from battle because of wrath. Having isolated the various elements which make up the wrath pattern, we are now in a position to see if such a story pattern played a role in the composition of this scene.

V. Paris and the Wrath, Withdrawal, and Return Pattern

When Hector enters Paris' house, he finds his brother in his bedchamber tending to his armour and in the company of Helen (6.313ff.). He

has come to persuade Paris to return to the battlefield, as he had said to Hecuba shortly before.[533] Hector attributes Paris' absence from battle to χόλος (326). We have not heard of Paris' χόλος before now, and learn nothing about Hector's reasons for ascribing it to his brother. Moreover, he refers Paris' wrath as χόλον τόνδ'. As I said earlier (n. 435 above), the force of the demonstrative adjective is probably deictic and implies that Paris' wrath is readily discernible and well-known to the two brothers, for it receives, and appears to need, no further qualification than a simple τόνδε. Hector then explains why Paris' χόλος is a negative thing. The people are perishing about the city while Paris sits nursing his anger (327-328). At this moment of crisis, Hector has come to urge Paris to return to the fighting, to save the city from enemy fire (331). Paris responds to his brother that he does not feel χόλος (or νέμεσις), but rather ἄχος (335-336), and that Helen has just now persuaded him with gentle words to return to the battlefield (337-338). The colloquy ends with Paris telling Hector to be on his way, that he will don his armour and follow him directly (340-341).

This scene contains, whole or in part, the second, third, fourth and fifth elements of the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern as I have delineated them above (p. 263): grief, anger and withdrawal; devastation; the dispatch of embassies; and reconciliation. The hero is thought to have withdrawn as a result of χόλος. This χόλος is connected by Paris with ἄχος, albeit so as to deny the presence of one over the other (element 2). It is worth noting that the withdrawal itself is conventionally ascribed to χόλος, not ἄχος, just as Hector assumes it has in the present case. Demeter first feels ἄχος when Persephone

---

[533]ἐγὼ δὲ Πάριν μετελεύσομαι, ὄφρα καλέσσω, / αἴ κ' ἐθέλῃσ' εἰπόντος ἀκουέμεν (6. 280-281).

is abducted, but it is not until she feels χόλος that she withdraws. Achilles too withdraws in anger. Meleager feels only χόλος, as the ἄχος has been transferred to Althaea. In the aborted wrath, withdrawal, and return narrative of the *Hymn to Apollo*, Hera too feels only χόλος.

The result of the hero's withdrawal is the devastation of his community (element 3). Hector emphasizes that this is precisely what is happening to the Trojan army. The men are perishing in the battle about the city, and the city itself is in danger of being destroyed. Kakridis sees a link between Hector's words and the danger facing the Calydonians due to Meleager's withdrawal. His city too is on fire when Meleager ends his withdrawal (9.588-589). Kakridis concluded that this was evidence of the poet's use of a now lost "Meleagris" epic in shaping the scene between Hector and Paris.[534] I have argued, instead, that the situation the Calydonians and the Trojans find themselves in is a typical element of the story pattern which the poet is using. Demeter does not return to Olympus until the famine caused by her withdrawal almost wipes out the human race. Achilles says to the ambassadors that he will not return to battle until the ships of the Achaeans are on fire and his own ships are in danger (9.650-655).

In response to the imminent danger in which the community finds itself, ambassadors are sent to the hero to entreat him to return to battle and ward off destruction (element 4). Hector, here in Book 6, appears to function as an ambassador come to persuade Paris to return. As Paris' brother, he would be a typical choice for ambassador. Meleager and Demeter are both

---

[534] *HR* 46-49.

entreated by close family members, and Phoenix stands in for the absent family of Achilles.

As it turns out, Hector's plea is superfluous, for Helen has already entreated Paris successfully. This too is probably conventional; the hero's return is effected by the person closest to him, most frequently a female. Demeter's mother urges the goddess to accept Zeus' gifts and go with her back to Olympus. Meleager's wife brings about his return. Patroclus effects both the surrogate and the actual return of Achilles.

At the beginning of Book 7, we see Paris return, with his brother, to the battlefield. The poet emphasizes in a simile how welcome to the beleaguered Trojans is the sight of the two brothers returning:

> ὡς δὲ θεὸς ναύτῃσιν ἐελδομένοισιν ἔδωκεν
> οὖρον, ἐπεί κε κάμωσιν εὐξέστῃς ἐλάτῃσι
> πόντον ἐλαύνοντες, καμάτῳ δ' ὑπὸ γυῖα λέλυνται,
> ὣς ἄρα τὼ Τρώεσσιν ἐελδομένοισι φανήτην.
> (7.4-7)

In the last part of the wrath, withdrawal, and return motif, the return of the hero averts the community's destruction. This is the case in the stories of Achilles, Meleager, and Demeter. To what extent, if any, is it also the case when Paris returns? We saw that in Books 4 to 6 the tide of battle had turned against the Trojans. Hector goes to Troy to instruct his mother to lead a procession of Trojan women to the citadel to entreat Athena to put an end to the onslaught of Diomedes, but the goddess rejects their prayers (ἀνένευε δὲ Πάλλας Ἀθήνη, 6.311). In the very next scene, Hector goes to Paris' house to entreat him to return to battle. The juxtaposition of the two scenes is interesting. The Trojan women ask Athena for help; she refuses. Hector asks Paris; he accepts. With the return of Paris, the tide of battle changes in the Trojans' favour. Paris' words to Hector prove themselves true: νίκη δ'

ἐπαμείβεται ἄνδρας (339). By the end of Book 8, Trojan successes have been such that for the first time in the course of the war, the Trojans are able to bivouac on the plain. For the Greeks, the crisis is such that ambassadors are sent to the withdrawn Achilles. When Achilles rejects the embassy, the Achaeans are forced to continue the fighting. Book 11 is the turning point. Five Greek leaders are wounded: Agamemnon by Antenor's son, Koön (248-253), Odysseus by Sokos (434-438), Diomedes by Paris (369-378), Machaon by Paris (504-507), and Eurypylus by Paris (579-583). The Achaean army is seriously disabled and Paris has played the principal role in bringing this about.

We should also remember that as Achilles sees Nestor conveying Machaon from the battlefield, he dispatches Patroclus to confirm the identity of the wounded man (607- 614). Patroclus goes to Nestor's tent where the old councilor first proposes the idea that, if Achilles is still unwilling to return to battle, he should at least let Patroclus do so wearing his commander's armour (793-800). Paris' success in Book 11 sets in motion one of the principal narrative sequences in the poem.

With so many Greek leaders disabled, the Trojans gain the upper hand. By the end of Book 12, they break through the Achaean wall; at the end of Book 15, they attack the ships themselves. This is Hector's most glorious moment in the poem thus far, and also the event which will result in Patroclus', and therefore, Achilles', return to the fighting. It is Paris' successes on the battlefield in Book 11, more than Hector's, Aeneas', or Sarpedon's, which prove to be decisive in bringing the Trojans to the brink of victory, and thereby fulfilling the promise Zeus made to Thetis in Book 1. In this way, the return of Paris to the battlefield is a crucial event for the Trojans.

In summary, four of the five structural elements of the wrath, withdrawal, and return motif are present, some albeit in attenuated form, in the scene between Paris and Hector and its aftermath. The grief and anger of the hero are both discussed, and his withdrawal from the fighting variously attributed to them (second element). His withdrawal coincides with the military crisis facing the Trojans on account of Diomedes' successes (third element). Hector comes to persuade Paris to return; Helen has already entreated her husband successfully (fourth element). With Paris' return the destruction of the city is averted and the Trojans gain the military upper hand (fifth element).

Thus, it appears that, in composing the scene between Hector and Paris in Book 6, Homer used the basic structure of the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern. Does this mean that he was adapting a traditional wrath story attached to Paris? Although this is a tempting conclusion, it must remain in the realm of conjecture. Two things, however, might serve to strengthen this conjecture. The first is the Trojan assembly at the end of Book 7, the second the general thematic purpose of many of the events narrated from the end of Book 2 through Book 7.

The Trojan assembly is of interest here because it is the only place in the *Iliad* where Paris actually does display anger. At the end of the first day's fighting, Antenor proposes that Helen and her possessions be returned to the Achaeans, for, as he says, the Trojans are now fighting after having broken the oaths they swore to in Book 3, a reference to Pandarus' wounding of Menelaus in Book 4. Although the poet nowhere in this scene tells us explicitly that Paris is angered over Antenor's proposal, his reply to the old man indicates as much:

'Αντῆνορ, σὺ μὲν οὐκέτ' ἐμοὶ φίλα ταῦτ' ἀγορεύεις·

οἶσθα καὶ ἄλλον μῦθον ἀμείνονα τοῦδε νοῆσαι.
εἰ δ' ἐτεὸν δὴ τοῦτον ἀπὸ σπουδῆς ἀγορεύεις,
ἐξ ἄρα δή τοι ἔπειτα θεοὶ φρένας ὤλεσαν αὐτοί.
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Τρώεσσι μεθ' ἱπποδάμοις ἀγορεύσω·
ἀντικρὺ δ' ἀπόφημι, γυναῖκα μὲν οὐκ ἀποδώσω·
(7.357-362)

Paris publicly insults one of the senior Trojan councilors and repudiates his proposal with such force that, when Priam speaks after his son has had his say, he makes no mention of Antenor's proposal. No one, not even Priam, dares to debate with Paris about the return of Helen. It is hard to imagine that Paris' words, especially in light of the reaction they provoke, could be spoken in any other way than in anger.[535]

Kirk wonders if the deictic force of the demonstrative adjective in χόλον τόνδ' indicates that Homer had in mind a story known to the oral tradition in which Paris' wrath figured. He raises the possibility that the origin of such a story may be glimpsed in the Trojan assembly, particularly in Antenor's proposal. He quickly dismisses the suggestion as "improbable," though he provides no explanation of this "improbability."[536] The suggestion, however, deserves consideration.

It has long been recognized that the Trojan assembly of Book 7 is part of a series of events beginning in Book 2 that is meant to recapitulate the cause and early events of the Trojan war, a topic that falls outside of the compressed

---

[535]Later on, Hector speaks the same words to another Trojan councilor, Polydamas, who has just urged Hector not to cross the ditch and fight the Achaeans by their ships (7.357-360=12.231-234). In his reply to Polydamas, Hector is said by the poet to be speaking these words, the ones he shares with Paris, in anger (τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ, 230). On the formula ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν as expressive of anger, cf. n. 489 above.

[536] Kirk, *Comm.* II, 203.

chronological framework of the *Iliad*.[537] This sequence begins with the catalogue of ships in Book 2, which most scholars believe was originally a roll call of the Achaean forces assembled at Aulis, for this most conveniently explains the important position of the Boeotian contingents in the catalogue. It also makes more sense to enumerate the contingents fighting on both sides in a poem that dealt with the beginning of the war. The duel between Paris and Menelaus in Book 3, as well as the sequence at the end of the book when Aphrodite summons Helen to Paris' bed while Menelaus vainly searches for Paris, symbolically recreate the original cause of the war. The *teichoscopia*, like the catalogue, would find a more appropriate place at the beginning of the war than near its end. In Book 4, Pandarus seems to function, in part at least, as a Paris substitute when he wounds Menelaus with his bow and arrows. This event too functions as a recapitulation of the causes of the war when Paris too broke an oath and injured Menelaus. Diomedes' encounter with Glaucus in Book 6 too seems out of place so late in the war and better suited to its first year where his failure to recognize one of the principal fighters on the Trojan side would be more plausible. At the end of the first day of fighting in Book 7, the Achaeans build a wall to fortify their camp. Again, it seems a little odd that this idea has not occurred to the Greeks in nine years of fighting. On the other side, the Trojan elders are in assembly

---

[537]This lengthy sequence does nothing to advance the main story line as neither the wrath of Achilles nor the plan of Zeus are much, if at all, in evidence. The plot may remain static, but as Whitman says (*HHT* 269), the events of these books "serve to expand enormously the tapestry of the poem and to bring within the scheme of the wrath of Achilles a total view of the war up to that point."

and Antenor argues for the return of Helen, a proposal which rouses the anger of Paris and is, therefore, dropped.

Antenor's proposal to return Helen to the Achaeans is well motivated in the immediate narrative, as the obvious and honourable aftermath of the duel which Menelaus would have won but for Aphrodite's interference and especially in light of Pandarus' treacherous bow shot. However, the debate over the return of Helen is also a scene which could be easily placed at the beginning of the war. In fact, we learn from Proclus' summary of the *Cypria* that in the early days of the war the Achaeans had sent envoys to Troy demanding the surrender of Helen and her possessions.[538] Homer too knows of this event, for in the *teichoscopia*, Antenor says that he hosted Odysseus and Menelaus when they came as envoys to Troy to discuss the return of Helen (3.204ff.). Later on, Agamemnon kills the two sons of Antimachus because their father had advised the Trojans to kill Menelaus when he and Odysseus came to Troy as envoys (11. 122ff.). It would thus appear that an embassy, probably headed by Menelaus and Odysseus, to negotiate for the return of Helen in the early days of the war was known to the epic tradition. According to the *Cypria*, the Trojans refused the ambassadors. That is to say, they must have called an assembly in which Antenor, as the host of Odysseus and Menelaus, could be expected to champion the position of his guests and in which Paris would have refused to hand over Helen. After this, the *Cypria* tells us that the Achaeans attacked Troy, then laid waste the countryside and cities round about.

---

[538]Bernabé, p.42, lines 55-57. Cf. also Apollodorus, *Epit*. 3.28.

The position and subject of debate of the Trojan assembly in *Iliad* 7 at the end of a long sequence of events designed to recapitulate the causes and early history of the war point to its inclusion in this sequence. Some of these events, like the catalogue of ships and the *teichoscopia*, may have been traditionally attached to poems dealing with the early part of the war, but refashioned for the *Iliad*. The same argument can be made for the Trojan assembly. It is at this point in the oral epic tradition about the first stages of the Trojan war that I suggest the wrath of Paris, if it existed, would originally have been placed.

Antenor's proposal to return Helen and Paris' angry response could well have been the genesis of a wrath and withdrawal story for the Trojan prince. The assembly serves as the locale for the introduction of Achilles' and Hera's wrath stories. More importantly, Antenor's proposal amounts to depriving Paris of his prize, just as Agamemnon does to Achilles. Here we need only recall what sort of prize Helen was. Her status as the only mortal daughter of Zeus makes her the greatest prize anyone could acquire.

In summary, I have attempted to show that the story pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return forms the basis of the scene between Hector and Paris in Book 6. A sufficient number of the elements connected with this pattern are present in this scene to warrant such a conclusion. In addition, I have examined the possibility that a wrath story was traditionally attached to Paris by looking at the placement of the scene within an extended sequence that serves to recall the early days of the war. This led me to connect the scene in Book 6 with the assembly of Book 7 and suggest that the latter may be a reworking of a scene traditionally attached to this earlier period and the beginning of a wrath of Paris story, while the former represents the appeal to the withdrawn warrior.

This conclusion must remain in the realm of conjecture; nonetheless, I believe it deserves consideration. In focusing on the analysis of a story pattern, I have attempted to explain the wrath of Paris by looking beyond the Homeric characterization of Paris and the immediate narrative sequence in which the wrath has been placed. By restricting their focus to the Homeric character and the immediate context, scholars have come to the unsatisfactory conclusions that the wrath is inappropriate when attached to such an unheroic character or simply that it is an *ad hoc* invention. As I have shown, there are many reasons to believe that Paris was not traditionally an unheroic character, that his characterization in the *Iliad* may have been peculiar to that poem. Thus, there is little reason to believe that the wrath pattern would not have suited Paris. Secondly, the appeal to *ad hoc* invention must always rely on an argument *ex silentio.* Again, I have attempted to show that there are many reasons why such an argument must be questioned. Although any reconstruction of a traditional wrath of Paris story is tentative, it seems clear that the scene in Book 6 was composed with this story pattern in mind. This in and of itself is an indicator that a wrath story could have been applied to Paris, that he is not an inappropriate figure for this story pattern. Since the fundamental purpose of the wrath, withdrawal, and return pattern is to demonstrate the greatness of its central character, this function must be applicable to Paris as well. As such, Hector's attribution of wrath to Paris, at the very least, is another piece of evidence that this figure was traditionally a heroic one.

Conclusion

This study has focused on the figure of Paris in both the *Iliad* and the oral epic tradition. For the most part, Homeric scholars have viewed Paris as an unheroic figure because of the way in which he is characterized in Books 3 and 6 of the *Iliad*. I have attempted to show that in the oral epic tradition Paris was, in fact, a heroic figure much like the other heroes of the Trojan cycle. I have done this by reading the *Iliad* as a traditional text. By doing so, I argue that we can glimpse the heroic figure behind the Homeric characterization of Paris.

In Chapter 1, I examined the issue of characterization in Homer and in oral poetry in general. Most scholars agree that Homer is able to take the figures of the oral tradition and characterize them in specific ways that serve the thematic exigencies of his poem. I argued that this is particularly striking with regard to Paris. In Books 3 and 6, he is characterized as the antithesis of the warrior, as an antiheroic, erotic figure — a favourite of Aphrodite. In the rest of the poem, however, we see a different picture of Paris. We performs well on the battlefield where, in fact, his performance as a warrior is crucial to the Trojans' military success during Achilles' absence. From this, I concluded that two characterizations of Paris actually co-exist in the *Iliad*.

In the second chapter, I argued that the characterization of Paris outside of Books 3 and 6, the heroic Paris, represents the older, traditional figure. Ann Suter's work on the double name Paris/Alexandros has shown that the figure known as Alexandros was in all likelihood the traditional, heroic one, while the one known as Paris represents a Homeric re-characterization of this figure as the erotic anti-hero and figure of abuse. Building upon this body of research, I examined the myths about Paris that we can say for certain were known to Homer and the oral tradition: the Judgement of Paris, his role as the slayer of

Achilles, and Paris' own death. These myths consistently demand a heroic figure as their subject and indicate that the figure whom Homer inherited must also have been a heroic one. In this way, the body of myth from the oral tradition which Homer utilized indicates that Paris was, in that tradition, a heroic figure.

In the third chapter, I examined the type-scene of arming. This scene is a traditional element of oral epic and its function is to glorify the hero who is its subject. This is obviously the case when it is applied in the *Iliad* to Agamemnon, Patroclus, and Achilles. Yet scholars who have examined Paris' arming scene have assumed that this is not the case with the Trojan hero. I have argued, on the other hand, that traditional elements of oral poetry, like type-scenes and story patterns, carry with them an immanent, unchangeable meaning. Therefore, when Paris receives an arming scene, the same inherent meaning must apply to him as applies to Agamemnon, Patroclus, and Achilles. The arming scene always serves to glorify its subject. That Paris receives one indicates that he must have been an appropriate subject for this scene, that he must have been known to Homer's audience as a heroic figure very much like the other recipients of this scene.

In the fourth and final chapter, I undertook a similar study to the one in chapter 3. I examined the story pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return. Like the type-scene of arming, this story pattern carries an immanent meaning, the *auxesis* of the hero who is its subject. I argued that in the scene between Paris and Hector in *Iliad* 6 vestiges of this story pattern can be seen. By looking at other examples of this story pattern from Greek oral epic — the wrath of Demeter in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*, the wrath of Achilles and of Meleager in the *Iliad*, and the wrath of Hera in the *Hymn to Apollo* — I isolated the various elements which commonly occur in this story pattern. I then argued that we see a sufficient number of these elements in the scene in Book 6 of the *Iliad* to argue

that Homer had this story pattern in mind when he composed the encounter between the two brothers. From this, I concluded that there are grounds for believing that the oral tradition knew of a story of wrath, withdrawal, and return that centred on Paris. This part of my argument must, of course, remain within the realm of conjecture; however, at the very least, we can say that, because Homer appears to have modelled a scene for Paris around this story pattern, Paris must have been an appropriately heroic subject for this pattern.

In summary, I have argued that Homer has re-characterized a traditionally heroic figure as an anti-heroic, erotic one. This newly defined character served largely to define the dominant heroic values of the poem's main heroes and was himself defined in opposition to these values. I believe that the implications of my work are important for the study of characterization in Homer. For I have argued that Homer was able to take the figures he inherited from his tradition and re-create them so as to conform to the specific narrative and thematic priorities of his poem. In addition, I have attempted to set out a way in which we can determine the extent of such re-characterizations. By looking at the stories traditionally attached to these figures, but not part of the main narrative of the Homeric poems, we can determine what sort of figures would perhaps have been the subjects of these stories. In the case of Paris, this study revealed that a different sort of figure was demanded by these stories than the one we find in the *Iliad*. In addition, we must also look at the traditional elements attached to Homer's characters in his poems. I examined two of these, the type-scene of arming and the story pattern of wrath, withdrawal, and return. Again, I concluded that the traditional subject of these two elements must have been a more heroic figure than Homer's Paris. In other cases, obviously, an examination of different elements will be necessary, different type-scenes and different story patterns. A study of epithets, which was only a small part of my

work, could also be instructive. The results of my examination of the figure of Paris, I believe, contribute to a better understanding of the many ways in which an oral poet like Homer was able to characterize the figures he inherited from the tradition in which he worked.

Bibliography

Frequently Used Abbreviations

Note: Please consult bibliography which follows for complete publication information.

Bowra, *T&D*	C.M. Bowra, *Tradition and Design in the* Iliad.
Edwards, *Comm.* V	M. Edwards, *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*, Vol. V.
Edwards, *HPI*	M. Edwards, *Homer, Poet of the* Iliad.
Foley, *IA*	J.M. Foley, *Immanent Art.*
Griffin, *HLD*	J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death.*
Hainsworth, *Comm.* III	B. Hainsworth, *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*, Vol. III.
Janko, *Comm.* IV	R. Janko, *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*, Vol. IV.
Kakridis, *HR*	J. Kakridis, *Homeric Researches.*
Kirk, *Comm.* I	G.S. Kirk, *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*, Vol. I.
Kirk, *Comm.* II	G.S. Kirk, *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*, Vol. II.
Kullmann, *Quellen*	W. Kullmann, *Die Quellen der Ilias.*
LIMC	*Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae.*
Lord, *ST*	A.B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales.*
Nagler, *S&T*	M. Nagler, *Spontaneity and Tradition.*
Parry, *MHV*	M. Parry, *The Making of Homeric Verse.*
Richardson, *Comm.* VI	N.J. Richardson, *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*, Vol. VI.
Whitman, *HHT*	C. Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition.*

Primary Sources

Aeschylus. *Prometheus Bound.* Ed. Mark Griffith. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.

____. *Septem quae supersunt Tragoedias.* Ed. Denys Page. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

____. *The Suppliants.* 3 vols. Ed. H. Friis Johansen and Edward W. Whittle. Gyldendalske Boghandel: Nordisk Forlag, 1980.

Apollodorus. *The Library.* 2 vols. Tr. James Frazer. London: Heinemann, 1921.

Aristotle. *De Arte Poetica.* Ed. Rudolf Kassel. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.

____. *The Poetics*. Tr. W. Hamilton Fyfe. London: Heinemann, 1927.

Bacchylides. *Carmina cum fragmentis*. Ed. B. Snell and H. Maehler. 10th ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1970.

Denys d'Halicarnasse. Les Antiquités romaines. Ed. Valerie Fromentin and Jacques Schnäbele. Vol. 1-2. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1990.

Dictys Cretensis. *Ephemeridos Belli Troiani Libri a Lucio Septimio ex Graeco in Latinum Sermonem translati*. Ed. Werner Eisenhut. 2nd. ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1973.

Dio Chrysostom. *Discourses*. 5 vols. Tr. J.W. Cohoon. London: Heinemann, 1932.

Eustathius. *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii Ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes*. 5 vols. Ed. M.H.A.L.H. van der Valk. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976-1987.

Greek Lyric. Vol. 4 (Bacchylides, Corinna, and others). Ed. David Campbell. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1992.

Hesiod. *Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum; Fragmenta Selecta*. Ed. F. Solmsen, R. Merkelbach, and M.L. West. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

____. *Theogony*. Ed. M.L. West. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.

____. *Works and Days*. Ed. M.L. West. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.

Homer. *Opera*. 5 vols. Ed. T.W. Allen. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.

Hyginus. *Fabulae*. Ed. Peter K. Marshall. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1993.

Iambi et Elegi Graeci. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Ed. M.L. West. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989 (vol. 1), 1992 (vol. 2).

Lycophron. *Alexandra*. Ed. Lorenzo Mascialino. Leipzig: Teubner, 1964.

Orphicorum Fragmenta. Ed. Otto Kern. Berlin: Weidmann, 1922.

Philostratus. *Heroicus*. Ed. L. de Lannoy. Leipzig: Teubner, 1977.

Pindar. *Carmina cum fragmentis*. 2 vols. Ed. H. Maehler. Leipzig: Teubner, 1987 (vol. 1), 1989 (vol.2).

Plutarch. "De Adulatore et Amico." *Moralia*. Vol. 1. Ed. W.R. Paton and I. Wegehaupt. Leipzig: Teubner, 1974.

____. *Moralia*. Vol. 1. Tr. Frank Cole. London: Heinemann, 1927.

____. *Moralia*. Vol. 8. Tr. Paul A. Clement. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1969.

____. "Quaestionum Convivalium." *Moralia*. Vol. 4. Ed. C. Hubert. Leipzig: Teubner, 1971.

Poetae Melici Graeci. Ed. D.L. Page. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.

Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta. Ed. E. Lobel and D. Page. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.

Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. I. Ed. Malcolm Davies. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.

Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem: Scholia Vetera. Ed. Hartmut Erbse. 5 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969-1987.

Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina. Ed. A.B. Drachmann. Vol. 2 (*Pythians*). Leipzig: Teubner, 1910.

Sophocles. *Philoctetes*. Ed. T.B.L. Webster. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1970.

Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Ed. Augustus Nauck. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964.

Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vols. 3 (Aeschylus) and 4 (Sophocles). Ed. Stefan Radt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977, 1985.

Tzetzes, Ioannes. *Antehomerica, Homerica, et Posthomerica*. Ed. Emmanuel Bekker. Berlin: Reimer, 1816.

____. *ΣΧΟΛΙΑ ΕΙΣ ΛΥΚΟΦΡΟΝΑ*. 3 vols. C.G. Müller. Leipzig: F. Vogel, 1811.

Secondary Sources

Adkins, Arthur W.H. *Merit and Responsibility: A Study in Greek Values*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1960.

____. "Threatening, Abusing and Feeling Angry in the Homeric Poems." *JHS* 89 (1969): 7-21.

Ahlberg-Cornell, Gudrun. *Myth and Epos in Early Greek Art: Representation and Interpretation. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology* ,100. Jonsered: Paul Aström, 1992.

Allen, T.W., W.R. Halliday, and E.E. Sikes. *The Homeric Hymns.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1936.

Ameis, Carl Friedrich and Carl Hentze. *Anhang zu Homers Ilias: Schulausgabe.* 5 vols. 2nd ed. Leigzig: Teubner, 1897.

____. *Homers Ilias: für den Schulgebrauch.* 7th rev. ed. Paul Cauer. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965.

Andersen, Øivind. "The Making of the Past in the *Iliad.*" *HSCP* 93 (1990): 25-45.

Arend, Walter. *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer.* Berlin: Weidmann, 1933, rpt. 1975.

Armstrong, J.I. "The Arming Motif in the *Iliad.*" *AJP* 79 (1958): 337-354.

Arthur, Marilyn. "Politics and Pomegranates: An Interpretation of the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter.*" *Arethusa* 10 (1977): 7-47.

Atchity, Kenneth John. *Homer's* Iliad*: The Shield of Memory.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1978.

Austin, Norman. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's* Odyssey. Berkeley: U of California P, 1975.

____. "The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad.*" *GRBS* 7 (1966): 295-312.

____. *Helen of Troy and her Shameless Phantom.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994.

Backès, Jean Louis. *Le Mythe d'Hélène.* Clermont-Ferrand: Adosa, 1984.

Baldick, Julian. *Homer and the Indo-Europeans: Comparing Mythologies.* London: I.B. Tauris, 1994.

Bannert, Herbert. *Formen des Wiederholens bei Homer. Wiener Studien*, 12. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1988.

____. "Phoinix Jugend und der Zorn des Meleagros." *Weiner Studien* 94 (1981): 69-94.

Bassett, Samuel Elliot. *The Poetry of Homer. Sather Classical Lectures,* 15. Berkeley: U of California P, 1938.

Beazley, John Davidson, Sir. *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1956.

____. *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters.* 2nd ed. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.

____. *Etruscan Vase-Painting.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1947.

Bergold, Wolfgang. *Der Zweikampf des Paris und Menelaos. Habelts Dissertationsdrucke (Reihe klassische Philologie),* 28. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1977.

Bernabé, Albert, ed. *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum: Testimonia et Fragmenta.* Vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner, 1987.

Bethe, Erich. *Homer: Dichtung und Sage.* Vol. 1 (*Ilias*). Leipzig: Teubner, 1914.

____. *Homer: Dichtung und Sage.* Vol. 3 (*Die Sage vom Troischen Kriege*). Leipzig: Teubner, 1927.

Beye, Charles Rowan. *Ancient Epic Poetry: Homer, Apollonius, Virgil.* Ithaca: Cornel UP, 1993.

____. *The* Iliad, *the* Odyssey, *and the Epic Tradition.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966.

Boedeker, Deborah Dickman. *Aphrodite's Entry into Greek Epic. Mnemosyne* Suppl. 31. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974.

Bolling, George Melville. *The Athetized Lines of the* Iliad. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1944.

____. *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1925.

Bowra, Cecil Maurice, Sir. "Composition." In Wace and Stubbings, *Companion.* 38-74.

____. *Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcman to Simonides*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.

____. *Heroic Poetry*. London: Macmillan, 1952.

____. *Homer*. London: Duckworth, 1972.

____. *Tradition and Design in the* Iliad. Oxford: Clarendon, 1930.

Braswell, B.K. "Mythological Innovation in the *Iliad*." *CQ* 21 (1971): 16-26.

Bremmer, Jan. "La Plasticité du mythe: Méléagre dans la poésie homérique." *Métamorphoses du mythe en Grèce antique*. Ed. Claude Calame. Genève: Éditions Labor et Fides, 1988. 37-56.

Brijder, H.A.G. and G. Strietman. *Siana Cups II: The Heidelberg Painter*. Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Series, 1991.

Brillante, C., M. Cantilena, and C.O. Pavese. *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale*. Padua: Antenore, 1981.

Burgess, Jonathan. "Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth." *CA* 14 (1995): 217-243.

____. *The Death of Achilles in the* Iliad. Dissertation. University of Toronto, 1995.

Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion*. Tr. John Raffan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1985.

____. *Homo Necans* . Tr. P. Bing. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1983.

Calame, Claude. *Les Chœurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque*. 2 vols. Rome: Ateneo & Bizzarri,1977.

____. "Hélène: son culte et l'initiation tribale féminine en Grèce." *Dictionnaire des mythologies et des religions des sociétés traditionnelles et du monde antique*. Paris: Flammarion, 1981. Vol. 1, 487-491.

Calder, William, III. "Aeschylus' *Philoctetes*." *GRBS* 11 (1970): 171-179.

Calhoun, George. "Homeric Repetitions." *UCPCP* 12 (1933): 1-25.

Cauer, Paul. *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*. 2 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1971, orig. publ. 1921, 1923.

Chadwick, John. "The Descent of the Greek Epic." *JHS* 109 (1989): 174-177.

Chamoux, François. "La Poésie épique après Homère." *Cahier des Études Anciennes* 2 (1973): 5-29.

Clader, Linda Lee. *Helen: The Evolution from Divine to Heroic in the Greek Epic Tradition. Mnemosyne* Suppl. 42. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.

Clairmont, Christoph. *Das Parisurteil in der antiken Kunst.* Zürich: Im Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1951.

Clauss, David B. "*Aidôs* in the Language of Achilles." *TAPA* 105 (1975): 13-28.

Clay, Jenny Strauss. *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989.

____. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the* Odyssey. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1983.

Collins, Leslie. *Studies in Characterization in the* Iliad. *Athenäums Monografien: Altertumswissenschaft*, 189. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1988.

Combellack, Frederick M. "Homer and Hector." *AJP* 65 (1944): 209-243.

Cunliffe, Richard John. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect.* Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1963.

Danek, Georg. *Studien zur Dolonie. Wiener Studien*, 13. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1988.

Davies, Malcolm. "The Date of the Epic Cycle." *Glotta* 67 (1989): 89-100.

____. *The Epic Cycle.* Bristol: Bristol Classical P, 1989.

____, ed. *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.

____. "The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* XXIV." *JHS* 101 (1981): 56-62.

____. "Kinkel Redivivus." *CR* 103 (1989): 4-9.

Dawkins, R.M. *The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta. Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies*, Supp. 5. London: Macmillan, 1929.

de Jong, I.J.F. "Paris/Alexandros in the *Iliad*." *Mnemosyne* 40 (1987): 124-128.

Dodds, E.R. "Homer." *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship*. Ed. Maurice Platnauer. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.

Draheim, Hans. "Homerische Doppelnamen." *Philologische Wochenschrift* 45 (1925): 205.

Drerup, Engelbert. *Homerische Poetik*. Vol. 1 (*Das Homerproblem in der Gegenwart*). Würzburg: C.J. Becker, 1921.

Dumézil, Georges. *Mythe et épopée: l'idéologie des trois fonctions dans l'épopée des peuples indo-européens*. Paris: Gallimard, 1968.

_____. *L'Oubli de l'homme et l'honneur des dieux: et autres essais*. Paris: Gallimard, 1985.

Dümmler, Ferdinand. "Hektor." *Kleine Schriften*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1901. 240-249. Orig. publ. in F. Studniczka, *Kyrene, ein altgriechische Gottin* (Leigzig, 1890): 194-205.

Düntzer, Heinrich. *Homerische Abhandlungen*. Leipzig: Hahn, 1872.

Edwards, Mark W. "Convention and Individuality in *Iliad* 1." *HSCP* 84 (1980): 1-28.

_____. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type-Scene." *Oral Tradition* 7 (1992): 284-330.

_____. *Homer: Poet of the* Iliad. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987.

_____. "Homeric Speech Introductions." *HSCP* 74 (1970): 1-36.

_____. *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*. Ed. G.S. Kirk. Vol. V: books 17-20. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

_____. "Neoanalysis and Beyond." *CA* 9 (1990): 311-325.

_____. "*Topos* and Transformation in Homer." *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*. Ed. J.M. Bremer, I.J.F. de Jong, and J. Kalff. Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner, 1987. 47-60.

_____. "Type-Scenes and Homeric Hospitality." *TAPA* 105 (1975): 51-72.

Erbse, Hartmut. "Betrachtungun über das 5. Buch der Ilias." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 104 (1961): 156-189.

____. "Die Genfer Iliasscholien." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 95 (1952): 170-191.

____. "Ilias und 'Patroklie'." *Hermes* 111 (1983): 1-15.

Erhardt, Louis. *Die Entstehung der homerischen Gedichte.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1894.

Farnell, Lewis Richard. *The Cults of the Greek States.* 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1896-1907.

____. *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1921.

Fehling, Detlev. *Die ursprüngliche Geschichte vom Fall Trojas, oder: Interpretationen zur Troja-Geschichte. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft*, 75. Innsbruck: Universität Innsbruck, 1991.

Fenik, Bernard. *Studies in the Odyssey. Hermes* Einzelschriften, 30. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1974.

____. *Typical Battle Scenes in the* Iliad. *Hermes* Einzelschriften, 21. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1968.

Finlay, Robert. "Patroklos, Achilleus, and Peleus: Fathers and Sons in the *Iliad.*" CW 73 (1979-80): 267-273.

Finsler, Georg. *Homer.* Vol. 2 (*Inhalt und Aufbau der Gedichte*). 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1918.

Fischl, Hans. *Ergebnisse und Aussichten der Homeranalyse.* Vienna: Carl Fromme, 1918.

Focke, Friedrich. "Paris und Helena: eine sagengeschichtliche Studie." *Gymnasium* 65 (1958): 383-401.

Foley, Helene P. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.

Foley, John Miles, ed. *Comparative Research on Oral Traditions: A Memorial for Milman Parry.* Columbus: Slavica Publications, 1987.

____. *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991.

____. *Oral Formulaic Theory: an Introduction and Annotated Bibliography*. New York: Garland, 1985.

____. "The Oral Theory in Context." *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*. Ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1980. 27-122.

____. *The Singer of Tales in Performance*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1995.

Fränkel, Hermann. *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums: Eine Geschichte der griechischen Literatur von Homer bis Pindar*. New York: American Philological Ass'n, 1951.

Fröhder, Dorothea. *Die dichterische Form der Homerischen Hymnen: untersucht am Typus der mittelgroßen Preislieder*. *Spudasmata*, 53. Zurich: Georg Olms, 1994.

Fuqua, Charles. "Studies in the Use of Myth in Sophocles' 'Philoctetes' and the 'Orestes' of Euripides." *Traditio* 32 (1976): 29-95.

Gantz, Timothy. *Early Greek Myth: a Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993.

Ghali-Kahil, Lilly B. *Les Enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène dans les textes et les documents*. 2 vols. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1955.

Gill, Christopher. "Bow, Oracle, and Epiphany in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*." *Greek Tragedy*. Ed. Ian McAuslan and Peter Walcot. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993. 95-103.

____. "The Character-Personality Distinction." In Pelling, *Characterization*. 1-31.

Greenhalgh, P.A.L. *Early Greek Warfare: Horsemen and Chariots in the Homeric and Archaic Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1973.

Griffin, Jasper. "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer." *JHS* 97 (1977): 39-53.

____. *Homer*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980.

____. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980.

Grüppe, O. *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*. 2 vols. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1906.

Güterbrock, Hans G. "Troy in Hittite Texts? Wilusa, Ahhiyawa, and Hittite History." Mellink, *Troy and the Trojan War.* 33-44.

Hainsworth, Bryan. *The* Iliad*: A Commentary.* Ed. G.S. Kirk. Vol. III: books 9-12. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Hainsworth, J.B. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

Halperin, David. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* . New York: Routledge, 1990.

____. "The Criticism of an Oral Homer." *JHS* 90 (1970): 90-98.

Hampe, Roland. "Das Parisurteil auf dem Elfenbeinkamm aus Sparta." *Neue Beiträge zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft: Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag Bernhard Schweitzer.* Ed. Reinhardt Lullies. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1954. 77-86.

Hampe, Roland and Ingrid Krauskopf. "Alexandros." *LIMC.* Vol. 1. 494-529.

Harrison, E.L. "Homeric Wonder Horses." *Hermes* 119 (1991): 252-254.

Heath, John. "The Legacy of Peleus: Death and Divine Gifts in the *Iliad.*" *Hermes* 120 (1992): 387-400.

Heitsch, Ernst. "Der Zorn des Paris." *Festschrift für Joseph Klein zum 70. Geburtstag.* Ed. Erich Fries. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1967. 216-247.

Held, George F. "Phoenix, Agamemnon, and Achilles: Parable and Paradeigmata." *CQ* 37 (1987): 245-261.

Henry, R.M. "On the Original Conclusion of the Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Μενελάου Μονομαχία." *CR* 17 (1903): 96-98.

Heubeck, Alfred, Stephanie West, and J.B. Hainsworth. *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey. Vol.1: Introduction and Books I-VIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.

Heubeck, Alfred. "Homeric Studies Today: Results and Prospects." *Homer: Tradition and Invention.* Ed. Bernard C. Fenik. *Cincinnati Classical Studies,* 2. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978.

____. "Die homerische Göttersprache." *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, 4 (1949/50): 197-218.

____. "KE-RA-SO: Untersuchungen zu einem Mykenischen Personennamen." *Kadmos* 4 (1965): 138-145.

____. "Das Meleagros-Paradeigma in der Ilias (I.529-599)." *Neue Jahrbücher* 118 (1943): 13-20.

____. *Praegraeca: Sprachliche Untersuchungen zum vorgriechischen Substrat. Erlanger Forschungen*, 12. Erlangen: Universitätsbund Erlangen, 1961.

Heyne, C.G., ed. *Homeri Ilias*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1834.

Higbie, Carolyn. *Heroes' Names, Homeric Identities. Albert Bates Lord Studies in Oral Tradition*, 10. New York: Garland, 1995.

Hijmans, B.L. "Alexandros and his Grief." *Gräzer Beiträge* 3 (1975): 177-189.

Hinds, A.E. "The Prophecy of Helenus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*." *CQ* 17 (1967): 169-180.

Hoekstra, A. *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes: Studies in the development of Greek epic diction*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1965.

Hohendahl-Zoetelief, I.M. *Manners in the Homeric Epic. Mnemosyne* Suppl. 63. Leiden: Brill, 1980.

Holoka, James. "'Looking Darkly' (ΥΠΟΔΡΑ ΙΔΩΝ): Reflections on Status and Decorum in Homer." *TAPA* 113 (1983): 1-16.

Hooker, James. "Homer, Patroclus, Achilles." *Symbolae Osloenses* 64 (1989): 30-35.

Howald, Ernst. *Der Mythos als Dichtung*. Zurich: Max Niehans, [1937].

Huxley, George L. *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1969.

____. "A Problem in the *Kypria*." *GRBS* 8 (1967): 25-27.

Irving, Edward. "What to Do with Old Kings." In Foley, *Comparative Research*. 259-268.

Jachmann, Gunther. *Homerische Einzellieder. Symbola Coloniensia Iosepho Kroll Sexagenario* . Cologne: In aedibus Balduini Pick Bibliopolae Universitatis, 1949.

Janko, Richard. *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.

____. *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*. Ed. G.S. Kirk. Vol. IV: books 13-16. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

____. "The *Iliad* and its Editors: Dictation and Redaction." *CA* 9 (1990): 326-334.

Jouan, François. "Le Cycle épique: état des questions." *Association Guillaume Budé: Actes du Xième Congrès*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1980. 83-104.

____. *Euripide et les chants cypriens: des origines de la guerre de Troie à l'Iliade*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1966.

Kahil, Lily. "Oinone." *LIMC*. Vol. VII. 23-26.

Kakridis, Johannes. *Homeric Researches*. Lund: G.W.K. Gleerup, 1949.

____. *Homer Revisited* . Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1971.

Kakridis, Phanis J. "Achilleus' Rüstung." *Hermes* 89 (1961): 288-297.

Kammer, Eduard. *Zur homerischen Frage*. Vol. 1. Königsberg i. Pr.: Hübner und Matz, 1870.

Kennedy, J., ed. *Homeri Ilias*. Dublin: R. Milliken, 1827.

King, Katherine Callen. *Achilles: Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to the Middle Ages*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1987.

Kirk, G.S. "Homer." *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol.1 (*Greek Literature*). Ed. P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.

____. *Homer and the Oral Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1976.

____. *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*. Ed. G.S. Kirk. Vol. I: books 1-4. Cambridge: Cambridge UP,1985.

____. *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*. Ed. G.S. Kirk. Vol. II: books 5-8. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

____. *The Nature of Greek Myths*. London: Penguin, 1974.

____. "Orality and Structure in the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*." In Brillante, Cantilena, and Pavese. 163-182.

____. *The Songs of Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1962.

Kirk, G.S., J.E. Raven and M. Schofield. *The Presocratic Philosophers*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.

Kossatz-Deissmann, Anneliese. "Achilleus." *LIMC* . Vol. 1. 37-200.

____. "Paridis Iudicium." *LIMC*. Vol. 7. 176-188.

Kretschmer, Paul. "Alaksandus, König von Vilusa." *Glotta* 13 (1924): 205-213.

Krischam, Joseph. "Oinone." *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classichen Altertumswissenschaft*. Rev. ed. Georg Wissowa. Vol. 17.2 Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller, 1937. 2251-2253.

Krischer, Tilman. *Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epik*. *Zetemata*, 56. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1971.

____. "UnHomeric Scene Patterns in Vergil." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* II (1979): 143-154.

Kullmann, Wolfgang. "Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung zu Homer (Neoanalyse)." In Latacz, *Zweihundert Jahre*. 425-455.

____. "Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research." *GRBS* 25 (1984): 307-323.

____. *Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis)*. *Hermes* Einzelschriften, 14. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1960.

____. "Vergangenheit und Zukunft in der Ilias." *Poetica* 2 (1968): 15-37.

____. *Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias: Untersuchungen zur Frage der Entstehung des homerischen 'Götterapparats'*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956.

____. "Zur Methode der Neoanalyse in der Homerforschung." *WS* 94 (1981): 5-42.

Lamberton, Robert. *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.

Lang, Mabel L. "Reverberation and Mythology in the *Iliad.*" *Approaches to Homer.* Ed. Carl A. Rubino and Cynthia W. Shelmerdine. Austin: U of Texas P, 1983. 140-164.

____. "War Story into Wrath Story." *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule.* Ed. Jane B. Carter and Sarah P. Morris. Austin: U of Texas P, 1995. 149-158.

Latacz, Joachim, ed. *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung: Rückblick und Ausblick. Colloquium Rauricum,* 2. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1991.

Lattimore, Richmond, trans. *The Iliad of Homer.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1951.

Laurens, Annie-France. "Hekabe." *LIMC.* Vol. IV. 473-481.

Leaf, Walter. *The* Iliad. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1900-1902, rpt. 1960.

Lendle, Otto. "Paris, Helena und Aphrodite: Zur Interpretation des 3. Gesanges der *Ilias.*" *Antike und Abendland* 14 (1968): 63-71.

Lesky, Albin. *A History of Greek Literature.* Tr. James Willis and Cornelis de Heer. London: Methuen, 1966.

Lexicon icongraphicum mythologiae classicae (LIMC). 7 vols. Zurich: Artemis, 1981-1994.

Lloyd, Michael. "Paris/Alexandros in Homer and Euripides." *Mnemosyne* 42 (1989): 76-79.

Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. *The Justice of Zeus.* 2nd ed. Berkeley: U of California P, 1983.

Loraux, Nicole. *Les Expériences de Tirésias: la féminin et l'homme grec.* Paris: Gallimard, 1989.

Lord, Albert Bates. "Avdo Mededovic, Guslar." *Journal of American Folklore* 69 (1956): 320-330.

____. "Composition by Theme in Homer and Southslavic Epos." *TAPA* 82 (1951): 71-80.

____. *Epic Singers and Oral Tradition.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991.

____. "Homer and Huso II: Narrative Inconsistencies in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song." *TAPA* 69 (1938): 439-445.

____. "Homer as Oral Poet." *HSCP* 72 (1967): 1-46.

____. "Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts." *TAPA* 84 (1953): 124-134.

____. "Perspectives on Recent Work on Oral Literature." *Oral Literature: Seven Essays.* Ed. Joseph J. Duggan. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1975. 1-24.

____. *The Singer of Tales.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1960.

____. *The Singer Resumes the Tale.* Ed. Mary Louise Lord. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.

____. "The Theme of the Withdrawn Hero in Serbo-Croatian Oral Epic." *Prilozi za knjizevnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor* 35 (1969): 18-30.

Lord, Mary Louise. "Withdrawal and Return: an Epic Story Pattern in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* and in the Homeric Poems." *CJ* 62 (1967): 241-248.

Lorimer, H.L. *Homer and the Monuments.* London: Macmillan, 1950.

Lowenstam, Steven. *The Death of Patroclus: A Study in Typology. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie,* 133. Königstein/Ts.: Hain, 1981.

____. *The Scepter and the Spear: Studies on Forms of Repetition in the Homeric Poems.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1993.

Luce, J.V. *Homer and the Heroic Age.* London: Thames & Hudson, 1975.

MacLeod, C.W., ed. *Homer.* Iliad, *Book XXIV.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.

March, Jennifer. *The Creative Poet: Studies on the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry* . London: U of London P, 1987.

Mellink, M.J., ed. *Troy and the Trojan War: A Symposium held at Bryn Mawr College, October 1984.* Bryn Mawr: Bryn Mawr College, 1986.

Meltzer, Gary S. "The Role of Comic Perspectives in Shaping Homer's Tragic Vision." *CW* 83 (1989-90): 265-280.

Michel, Christoph. *Erläuterungen zum N der Ilias.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1971.

Miller, Andrew. *From Delos to Delphi: A Literary Study of the Homeric* Hymn to Apollo. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985.

Monro, D.B., ed. *Homer.* Iliad. 2 vols. 5th ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1899.

Monsacré, Hélène. *Les Larmes d'Achille: le héros, la femme et la souffrance dans la poésie d'Homère.* Paris: Albin Michel, 1984.

Morrison, James. "Alternatives to the Epic Tradition: Homer's Challenges in the *Iliad.*" *TAPA* 122 (1992): 61-71.

____. *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the* Iliad. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1992.

Most, G.W. "Sappho fr. 16. 6-7 L-P." *CQ* 31 (1981): 11-17.

Moulton, Carroll. *Similes in the Homeric Poems. Hypomnemata,* 49. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

Mueller, Martin. *The* Iliad. London: Allen & Unwin, 1984.

Muellner, Leonard Charles. *The Anger of Achilles: Mênis in Greek Epic.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996.

____. *The Meaning of Homeric εὔχομαι: Through its Formulas. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft,* 13. Innsbruck: Universität Innsbruck, 1976.

____. "The Simile of the Cranes and the Pygmies: A Study of Homeric Metaphor." *TAPA* 93 (1990): 59-101.

Mühlestein, Hugo. "Euphorbos und der Tod des Patroklos." *Homerische Namenstudien. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie,* 183. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1987. 78-89 [orig. publ. in *SMEA* 15 (1972)].

Naber, Samuel Adriaan. *Quaestiones Homericae. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen,* 11. Amsterdam: van der Post, 1877.

Nagler, Michael N. "Ethical Anxiety and Artistic Inconsistency: the Case of Oral Epic." *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer.* Ed. M. Griffith and D. Mastronarde. Atlanta: Scholars P, 1990. 225-239.

____. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A study in the Oral Art of Homer.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1974.

____. "Towards a Generative View of the Oral Formula." *TAPA* 98 (1967): 269-311.

Nagy, Gregory. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1979.

Neumann, Günter. "Die homerischen Personennamen: ihre Position im Rahmen der Entwicklung des griechischen Namenschatzes." Latacz, *Zweihundert Jahre.* 311-328.

Nicole, Jules. *Les Scolies genevoises de l'Iliade.* 2 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1966.

Niese, Benedictus. *Die Entwicklung der homerischen Poesie.* Berlin: Weidmann, 1882.

Nilsson, Martin P. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion.* Vol. 1. 3rd rev. ed. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1967.

____. *Homer and Mycenae.* London: Methuen, 1933.

____. *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1932.

O'Brien, Joan V. "Homer's Savage Hera." *CJ* 86 (1991): 105-125.

____. *The Transformation of Hera: A Study of Ritual, Hero, and the Goddess in the* Iliad. Lanham, Maryland: Rowan & Littlefield, 1993.

Owen, E.T. *The Story of the* Iliad*: as told in the* Iliad. Toronto: Clarke, Unwin, & Co., 1946.

Page, Denys L. *History and the Homeric* Iliad. *Sather Classical Lectures,* 31. Berkeley: U of California P, 1959.

Paley, F.A., ed. *The* Iliad *of Homer.* 2 vols. London: Whittaker, 1866.

Parker, Robert. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in early Greek Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.

Parry, Adam M. "Language and Characterization in Homer." *HSCP* 76 (1972): 1-22 (repr. in *The Language of Achilles and Other Papers*).

____. "The Language of Achilles." *TAPA* 87 (1956): 1-7 (repr. in *The Language of Achilles and Other Papers*).

____. *The Language of Achilles and Other Papers*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.

Parry, Anne Amory. *Blameless Aegisthus: A Study of AMYMΩN and other Homeric Epithets*. *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 26. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973.

Parry, Milman. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. Adam Parry. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

Patzer, Harald. *Dichterische Kunst und poetisches Handwerk im homerischen Epos*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1972.

Pelling, Christopher, ed. *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

Pestalozzi, Heinrich. *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias*. Zurich: Eugen Rentsh, 1945.

Perron, Alexis, ed. *L'Iliade d'Homère*. 2 vols. Paris: Hachette, 1869.

Pipili, Maria. "Philoktetes." *LIMC*. Vol. 7. 376-385.

Potscher, W. *Hera: Eine Strukturanalyse im Vergleich mit Athena*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1987.

Preller, Ludwig. *Griechische Mythologie*. Vol. 1. 4th rev. ed. Carl Robert. Berlin: Weidmann, 1894.

Rabel, Robert J. "Chryses and the Opening of the *Iliad*." *AJP* 109 (1988): 473-481.

Reckford, Kenneth J. "Helen in the *Iliad*." *GRBS* 5 (1964): 5-20.

Redfield, James M. *Nature and Culture in the* Iliad*: the Tragedy of Hector*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1975.

Reece, Steve. *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1993.

Reinhardt, Karl. "Das Parisurteil." *Tradition und Geist: Gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960 (orig. publ. in *Wissenschaft und Gegenwart*, 11 [1938]). 16-36.

____. *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.

Richardson, N.J. *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*. Ed. G.S. Kirk. Vol. VI: books 21-24. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

____, ed. *The Homeric* Hymn to Demeter. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.

____. "Homeric Professors in the Age of the Sophists." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 201 (1975): 65-81.

____. "Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia to the *Iliad*." *CQ* 30 (1980): 265-287.

Robbins, Emmet. "Achilles to Thetis: *Iliad* 1.365-412." *EMC* 9 (1990): 1-15.

Robert, Carl. *Die griechische Heldensage*. (Vol. 2. of L. Preller, *Griechische Mythologie*.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1921.

____. *Studien zur Ilias*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1901.

Robertson, Martin. *The Art of Vase Painting in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

____. *A History of Greek Art*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1975.

Roemer, Adolf. *Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homerkritik (Wirkliche und Angebliche): eine kritische Untersuchung*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.

Roscher, W.H., ed. "Paris." *Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*. Vol. 3, pt. 1. Lepzig: Teubner, 1897-1902. 1580-1638.

Rose, H.J. "De loco Homerico male intellecto." *Humanitas* 3 (1950/51): 281-285.

Rosner, Judith. "The Speech of Achilles: *Iliad* 9. 434-605." *Phoenix* 30 (1976): 314-327.

Rothe, Carl. *Die Ilias als Dichtung*. Paderborn: Schoningh, 1910.

Roussel, Monique. *La Biographie légendaire d'Achille*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1991.

Russo, Joseph A. "Homer Against his Tradition." *Arion* 7 (1968): 275-295.

Sacks, Richard. *The Traditional Phrase in Homer: Two Studies in Form, Meaning and Interpretation*. *Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition*, 14. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987.

Sadurska, Anna. *Les Tables iliaques*. Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964.

Sale, William Merritt. "Achilles and Heroic Values." *Arion* 2 (1963): 86-100.

____. "The Formularity of the Place Phrases of the *Iliad*." *TAPA* 117 (1987): 21-50.

____. "Homeric Olympus and its Formulae." *AJP* 105 (1984): 1-28.

Scaife, Ross. "The *Kypria* and its Early Reception." *CA* 14 (1995): 164-197.

Schadewaldt, Wolfgang. "Das Bild des griechischen Menschen." *Hellas und Hesperien: Gesammelte Schriften zur Antike und zur neueren Literatur in zwei Bänden*. Vol. 1. Zurich: Artemis, 1970. 657-669.

____. "Homerische Szenen I." *Die Antike* 11 (1935): 149-170.

____. *Iliasstudien*. *Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Klasse der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 43 (1938). Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1938.

____. *Von Homers Werk und Welt*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: K.F. Koehler, 1965.

Schefold, Karl. *Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art*. Tr. Audrey Hicks. London: Thames & Hudson, 1966.

Scheibner, Gerhard. *Der Aufbau des 20. und 21. Buches der Ilias*. Leipzig: Robert Noske, 1939.

Schein, Seth L. *The Mortal Hero*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984.

Scherer, Anton. "Nichtgriechische-Personennamen der Ilias." *Studien zum Antiken Epos*. Herwig Görgemanns and Ernst A. Schmidt, eds. *Beitrage zur klassichen Philologie*, 72. Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1976. 32-45.

Schnebele, Andreas. *Die epischen Quellen des sophokleischen Philoktet: die Postiliaca im frühgriechischen Epos.* Karlsruhe: Heinrich Scheider, 1987.

Schoeck, Georg. *Ilias und Aethiopis: Kyklische Motive in homerischer Brechung.* Zürich: Atlantis Verlag, 1961.

Schömann, Georg Friedrich. *Opuscula Academica.* Vol. 3. Berlin: Weidmann, 1858.

Scodel, Ruth. *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides. Hypomnemata,* 60. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

____. "The Word of Achilles." *CJ* 84 (1989): 91-99.

Scott, John A. "The Choice of Paris in Homer." *CJ* 14 (1919): 326-330.

____. "Paris and Hector in Tradition and in Homer." *CP* 8 (1913): 160-171.

____. *The Unity of Homer. Sather Classical Lectures,* 1. Berkeley: U of California P, 1921.

Scott, William C. *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile. Mnemosyne* Suppl., 28. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974.

Segal, Charles. "Orality, Repetition and Formulaic Artistry in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter.* In Brillante, Cantilena, and Pavese. 107-162.

Sergent, Bernard. *Homosexuality in Greek Myth.* Tr. Arthur Goldhammer. Boston: Beacon Press, 1986.

Severyns, Albert. *Homère.* Vol. 3 (*L' Artiste*). Bruxelles: Office de Publicité, 1948.

____. *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus.* Vol. 3 (*La Vita Homeri et les sommaires du Cycle*). Vol. 4 (*Texte et traduction*) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1953, 1963.

Seymour, Thomas D, ed. *Homer's* Iliad*: Books IV-VI.* Boston: Ginn, 1891.

Shannon, Richard Stoll, III. *The Arms of Achilles and Homeric Compositional Technique. Mnemonsyne* Suppl., 36. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

Sinos, Dale S. *Achilles, Patroklos and the Meaning of* Philos. *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 29. Innsbruck: H. Kowatsch, 1980.

Slatkin, Laura M. *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the* Iliad. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991.

Snodgrass, Anthony M. *Arms and Armour of the Greeks.* London: Thames & Hudson, 1967.

____. *Eary Greek Armour and Weapons: from the end of the Bronze Age to 600 B.C.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1964.

Sowa, Cora Angier. *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns.* Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1984.

Stanley, Keith. *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the* Iliad. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993.

Stinton, T.C.W. "Euripides and the Judgement of Paris." *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1990 (orig. publ. *JHS* Suppl. 11 [1965]).

Strasburger, Gisela *Die kleinen Kämpfer der Ilias.* Frankfurt am Main, 1954.

Stubbings, Frank H. "Arms and Armour." In Wace and Stubbings, *Companion.*

Suter, Ann. "Aphrodite/Paris/Helen: A Vedic Myth in the *Iliad.*" *TAPA*: 117 (1987): 51-58.

____. "Δύσπαρι. εἶδος ἄριστε ... " *QUCC* 68 (1991): 7-30.

____. "Language of Gods and Language of Men: the Case of Paris/Alexandros." *Lexis* 7/8 (1991): 13-25.

____. *Paris/Alexandros: A Study in Homeric Techniques of Characterization.* Diss. Princeton, 1984.

Taplin, Oliver. "Agamemnon's Role in the *Iliad.*" In Pelling, *Characterization.* 60-82.

____. *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the* Iliad. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.

Thalmann, William. *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry* . Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1984.

____. "Thersites: Comedy, Scapegoats, and Heroic Ideology in the *Iliad*." *TAPA* 118 (1988): 1-28.

Thornton, Agathe. *Homer's* Iliad*: Its Composition and the Motif of Supplication. Hypomnemata,* 81. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Trollope, William, ed. *The* Iliad *of Homer*. 6th ed. London: Rivington, 1866.

Tsagarakis, Odysseus. *Form and Content in Homer. Hermes* Einzelschriften, 46. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1982.

____. "Oral Composition, Type-Scene and Narrative Inconsistencies in Homer." *Grazer Beiträge* 8 (1979): 23-48.

van der Mije, S.K. "Achilles' God-Given Strength: *Iliad* A 178 and Gifts from the Gods in Homer." *Mnemosyne* 40 (1987): 241-267.

van der Valk, M.H.A.L.H. "Ajax and Diomede in the *Iliad*." *Mnemosyne* Ser. 4, no. 5 (1952): 269-286.

____. "Homer's Nationalistic Attitude." *Antiquité Classique* 22 (1953): 5-26.

____. *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the* Iliad. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963-1964.

van Leeuwen, J. and M.B. Mendes da Costa, ed. *Homeri Iliadis Carmina*. Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1845.

van Thiel, Helmut. *Iliaden und Ilias*. Basel: Schwabe, 1982.

Vian, Francis. *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne. Études et Commentaires,* 30. Paris: Klincksieck, 1959.

Vivante, Paolo. *The Epithets in Homer: A Study in Poetic Values*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1982.

____. *Homer*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1985.

____. *The Homeric Imagination: a Study of Homer's Poetic Perception of Reality*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1970.

von der Mühll, Peter. *Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias. Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft,* 4. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1952.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich. "Die griechische Heldensage." *Kleine Schriften*. Vol. 5, pt. 2. Berlin: Weidmann, 1935 (orig. publ. 1925). 54-126.

____. *Die Ilias und Homer*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1916.

____. "Lesefrüchte." *Hermes* 65 (1930): 241-258.

Wace, Alan J.B. and Frank H. Stubbings. *A Companion to Homer*. London: Macmillan, 1962.

Walcot, P. "The Judgement of Paris." *G & R* 24 (1977): 31-39.

Wathelet, Paul. *Dictionnaire des Troyens de l'Iliade*. 2 vols. Liège: Université de Liège, 1988.

____. *Les Troyens de l'Iliade: mythe et histoire. Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège*, 252. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1988.

Watkins, Calvert. "À propos de μῆνις." *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 72 (1977): 187-209.

____. "The Language of the Trojans." Mellink, *Troy and the Trojan War*. 45-62.

Welcker, F.G. *Der epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Bonn: Eduard Weber, 1865, 1882.

Weniger, Ludwig. "Das Urteil des Paris." *Sokrates* 7 (1919): 1-18.

West, M.L. *The Hesiodic Cataloque of Women: Its Nature, Structure and Origins*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.

____. "The Rise of the Greek Epic." *JHS* 108 (1988): 151-172.

Whallon, William. *Formula, Character, and Context: Studies in Homeric, Old English, and Old Testament Poetry*. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 1969.

____. "The Homeric Epithets." *YCS* 17 (1961): 97-142.

____. "Is Hector *androphonos?*" *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies presented to Bernard M.W. Knox*. Ed. Glen W. Bowersock, Walter Burkert, and Michael C.J. Putnam. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1979. 19-24.

Whitman, Cedric H. "Hera's Anvils." *HSCP* 74 (1970): 37-42.

____. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1958.

Willcock, M.M. "Ad Hoc Invention in the *Iliad.*" *HSCP* 81 (1977): 41-53.

____. "B356, Z326 and A404." *PCPS* 184 (1956/57): 22-26.

____. *A Commentary on Homer's* Iliad: *Books I-VI.* London: Macmillan, 1970.

____. "Homer, the Individual Poet." *LCM* 3 (1978): 11-18.

____. "Mythological Paradeigmata in the *Iliad.*" CQ 14-15 (1964-65): 141-154.

____. "The Search for the Poet Homer." *G&R* 37 (1990): 1-13.

Wilson, John R. "The Wedding Gifts of Peleus." *Phoenix* 28 (1974): 385-389.

Wüst, Ernst. "Paris." *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Vol. 18, pt. 4. Rev. ed. Georg Wissowa. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller, 1949. 1484-1538.

Zeitlin, Froma I. *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.