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

THE MANY AND THE ONE: FATHERS AND SONS IN HOMERIC EPIC (WITH AN EPILOGUE ON TOLSTOY'S *WAR AND PEACE*)

Naomi Jennifer Rood

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY

OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE

BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

November 1999

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I thank the Departments of Comparative Literature, of Classics and of Slavic at Princeton University. Within these departments, I first thank the readers of my dissertation: Richard Martin, who exemplifies for me both the paragon of a reader of Greek poetry and a gentleman; Froma Zeitlin, who has always comprehended my train of thinking compassionately and critically; and Caryl Emerson, whose inspiration and committment still make me regret not becoming a Slavicist. I also thank two pillars of the Department of Comparative Literature: Robert Fagles, who transmitted his love of Homer in eloquent words and his deep care for his graduate students in eloquent silence; and Robert Hollander, who gives me faith in the triumph of fairness, honesty and integrity. Finally, I thank Carol Szymanski, who keeps the department running and without whose knowledge, good spirits, and candy dish I could not have navigated the labyrinth of graduate school.

I also thank Piero Pucci, who visited Princeton and inspired me with his seriousness of thought which informs his whole way of being; and my teachers before Princeton: at Berkeley, Leslie Kurke took me under her wing and nurtured me with support and direction; as an undergraduate, Richard Garner first taught me to read Greek grammatically and passionately; Ralph Hexter encouraged me with his balance of knowledge and irreverence; and Robert L. Jackson embodied the idea that one could become wise from being a "student of Dostoevsky."

Lastly, I thank friends and family: Rachel Friedman, who I could ask the questions I was embarrassed to ask anyone else; Katy Gibney for always giving me a vote of confidence; Sherman Lawrence, who in many ways has been "like a father" to me; all of my sisters and brothers-in-law for their patience and support; Poppy for his obliviousness to all things literary and Greek; Emory Creel for being my very best friend; and above all, my mother, who has carried the torch with courage, wisdom and unparalleled humor.

Abstract

This thesis examines fathers and sons in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* with an epilogue on Tolstoy's *War and Peace*. All of these works are framed by a father and son. But each work, while foregrounding father and son, presents sharply distinct pictures of them.

From an introductory study of father similes in both epics, I distinguish the *Iliad* as a poem of simile and the *Odyssey* one of symbol. That is, the *Iliad* values filial relationships based on analogy, while the *Odyssey* rejects father substitutes and aims for the actual father himself. Thus the *Iliad* portrays the growing involvement of the divine *patêr*, who becomes like a father to the mortal sons separated from their genitors by war and death. This community of sons under father Zeus comprises another aspect of the epic's interest in Panhellenization. The *Odyssey* shows an unchanging impersonal divine *patêr*, and the sons' reunion with their genitors. And yet, with *mêtis* characteristic of the house of Odysseus, the relationship of these fathers and sons are marked by an indeterminacy more profound than that of fathers and sons by analogy. The consistent opposition between the two epics' representations of fathers and sons adds further evidence to the idea that early Greek poetry was composed under agonistic conditions.

Tolstoy's *War and Peace* contrasts two heroes of different generic roots: Pierre, from the conventional feminine novel of manners; and Prince Andrei from epic. While Tolstoy transforms Pierre into the hero of his newly masculinized novel through his rebirth from maternal men, Prince Andrei resists such rebirth and disintegrates into the Father God — a parody of the epic hero who attains permanent individuality in his death. What is Homeric about Tolstoy is his masculinization of the previously female domain of the home and marriage, similar to the Homeric masculinization of death. Homeric epic and *War and Peace* thus share the accomplishment of bringing what had been the terrible or trivial world of women into the realm of men and thereby transform their own genres of epic and novel into new and inimitable forms.

Foreword

Images of the father loom large in literary and religious imagination: Zeus, Yahweh, God; King Hamlet, King Lear, Pere Goriot, Fyodor Karamazov, Leopold Bloom, Thomas Sutpen — to name a few.[1] Ancient Greek literature contains its share of memorable fathers and sons: Ouranos and Kronos, Kronos and Zeus, Agamemnon and Orestes, Laius and Oedipus, Oedipus and Polyneices, Nestor and Antilochos, Priam and Hector, Odysseus and Telemachus, Kreon and Haimon, Theseus and Hippolytus, among others. Several genres of the Greek corpus obviously foreground father stories. For example, Hesiod's *Theogony* accounts for the establishment of Zeus's sovereignty in contest with that of his fathers. And the prominence of fathers in tragedy has recently been recognized in more plays than Aeschylus's *Oresteia* or Euripides's *Hippolytus*.[2] The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* also tell their stories within the frame of father-son tales. The *Iliad* begins with "Achilles son of Peleus" and ends with his extraordinary meeting with the fatherly Priam. The *Odyssey* starts with the recollection of Aigisthos's paternal vengeance and Telemachus's daydream of his father; and ends with the three generations of fathers and sons allied against the vengeful fathers of the slain suitors. Though the idea of father and son is one among several which organizes and informs the Homeric epics, no one has yet systematically considered this prominence.[3] This dissertation articulates these father stories of the two poems and thus places them in the Greek — and larger literary — tradition of tales of fathers and sons.

Though one of the most valuable findings of this study is the ongoing dialogue between the two epics, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, this project first began as a question about the *Iliad* alone. Like many readers of the *Iliad*, I was intrigued by its complex

---

[1]For an overview see Davis 1988, 547-559.
[2]See Wohl 1998; and Griffith 1999.
[3]For partial treatments, see: Redfield 1975, 110-12; Finlay 1980, 267-73; MacCary 1982; Lynn-George 1988, 241-50; Martin 1993, 222-39; Crotty 1994, 24-42.

representation of mortality.[4] Emily Vermeule, approaching the topic circumspectly, has restricted the broad claim that the *Iliad* is about death: "In a way it is wrong to regard the *Iliad* as a poem of death, even in some partial aspect, although death is so powerful a theme. It might be truer to regard it as a poem of mortality and mortal accidents, and of the kinds of behavior only mortals need have to confront these."[5] The poem certainly represents many aspects of mortality and mortal behavior — dread of death, physical dying, grief and lament, funerary ritual, the lot of the survivors, and more. And yet Vermeule's description, which already modifies the broad claim of others, is itself still too broad. The *Iliad* presents a very specific arena of mortality: the battlefield. Here youthful men meet in the zero-sum contest of warfare. The *Iliad* thus represents the mortality of only a very limited part of all humanity. A precise description of the *Iliad* would thus say that it is a poem about the mortality and mortal accidents of vigorous men and the responsive behavior of gods, parents, brothers, wives, comrades and enemies to those deaths. It is possible to be even more precise about the vigorous men whose mortality the poem reflects. They are named in death with their patronymic; they die with the final pathetic thought of leaving an aggrieved father or mother behind at home; they attempt to avoid death with a last supplication by the goods stored up in their father's house; they are called collectively "the sons of the Achaeans," and "the sons of Priam." That is, then, the men who die in the *Iliad* are predominantly identified as sons. From this observation arose the question which first set this dissertation in motion: why does the *Iliad* present mortality as an issue of sons? In order to answer that question, one needs first to know what a son signifies and implies in the epic imagination. In the patriarchal economy of the *oikos*, the son forms part of an interdependent unit with the father.[6] A study of why the *Iliad* is a poem of the mortality of specifically — and exclusively — sons thus demanded a

---

[4]A select bibliography includes Reinhardt 1960, 5-15; Griffin 1980; Marg 1942, 167-79; Schein 1984; Nagy 1979; Vermeule 1979; Vernant 1991, 50-75; Pucci 1998, 49-69, 179-231. For further bibliography, see Edwards, M.W. 1987, 142.

[5]Vermeule 1979, 97.

[6]Cf. Redfield 1975, 110-113.

prerequisite analysis of epic fathers and sons overall; whence the subject of this dissertation. Because of both the volume of the epics' representations of fathers and sons and the interest of this topic by itself, I do not give an exhaustive answer to the question of why the *Iliad* portrays their mortality particularity. Nevertheless, that question remains an important subtext to my investigation of fathers and sons in the *Iliad.*

This observed relationship between sons and mortality leads to the first of three preliminary ideas fundamental to my readings of fathers and sons in the *Iliad.* First is the idea of the poem's masculinization of death. Shiela Murnaghan has discussed a Greek cultural connection between mothers and mortality: "mothers transmit the knowledge of mortality to their children in a recapitualtion of their original transmission of the mortal condition itself" (1992, 243). That is, because mothers bring people into the world by birth, they are linked to their passing out of it as well. But, I argue, Murnaghan provides only one half of the picture of death in Homeric epic. For as Vernant has demonstrated, epic death has two faces: terrifying death from the point of view of the dead; and glorious death from the point of view of the living.[7] These two faces are readily gendered. Terrifying death corresponds to the mother, to the feminine in general. The horrific agents of death are all female: Keres, Gorgons, Harpies, Sphinxes, Sirens. Glorious death is the domain of the male. Its divine agents are pacific and benign: Hades is "a king of remembered images"; and Thanatos "a negative, a cessation, an inversion of life, but not a physical enemy."[8] In epic, glorious death, under the aegis of the male, is ideally wrested from the feminine cyclicality of endless birth and death. Indeed a goal of heroic epic is this masculinization of death: by socializing death as it turns it into "an ideal type of life," epic poetry tames the feminine aspect of death, subordinating it to the masculine aspect.

A major way epic accomplishes this masculinization of death is by detaching it from the mother and attaching it to the father. This move can be seen as one from nature to culture. Women, as Murnaghan has shown, typically imply the cyclicality of birth and

---

[7]Vernant 1981, 285.
[8]Vermeule 1979, 37

death. Contrary to the mother's joint relationship to birth and death, the father's relationship to birth, not as obviously certain as that of the mother, is symbolic from the outset.[9] Thus when the father is associated with death, it comes without its natural complement, birth. There is then no sense of death as the natural down-slide in a circle which will regenerate into new life. Instead, death becomes an endpoint, a stoppage of cyclicality, a culmination. Like the social construction of fatherhood, like the *poêma* itself, death becomes a thing made, an occasion for symbolic discourse. Death transmuted from the reign of the female to the male makes it like a piece of living wood crafted into the royal scepter (*Iliad* 1.233-37) — a thing of nature that has been transformed into a thing of culture, which is then *aphthiton aiei* (2.46, 186), "imperishable forever."[10] Epic song upholds this anti-cyclical form of immortality by attaching death to the divine father, Zeus.[11] Indeed to large degree, death ordained by the father is the *Iliad's* divine story.[12] Its plot, Zeus's *boulê* begun in Book 1, is Zeus's agreement to honor Thetis's most short-lived son, Achilles. To do so, Zeus must oversee the sacrifice of many Achaean heroes (1.409-410, 509);[13] and he must approve of the death of his own son, Sarpedon — from which follows the deaths of Patroklos and Hector. The pattern of the poem, starting with Zeus's initial nod to Thetis, is Zeus's sanction of the death of hero-sons. By associating Father Zeus with mortality, heroic death is removed from the realm of nature and brought under the aegis of culture where it becomes an object of undying glory.

The second concept basic to my interpretation of fathers in epic has already been suggested in the discussion above about epic's masculinization of death; it is the primacy of the social construction of the father over the biological connection. As already mentioned

---

[9]"The father belongs to a reality that is sacred in itself, more spiritual than any other, since ultimately nothing in lived reality strictly speaking points to his function, his presence, his dominance" (Lacan 1993, 215).

[10]See Nagy 1979, 179-180.

[11]Using literature, archaeology and cult practice, O'Brien 1991 presents an intriguing if somewhat speculative argument of the transfer of the dominion over death from Hera to Zeus.

[12]In the earlier Herakles epics against which the *Iliad* positions itself (see Martin 1989, 228-30), Hera would have been the antagonistic divinity who stood over heroic death. Cf. O'Brien 1993, 117 and 203ff.

[13]Note the emphatic enjambement of the Achaeans' dying in Achilles' prayer: τοὺς δὲ κατὰ πρύμνας τε καὶ ἀμφ' ἅλα ἕλσαι Ἀχαιοὺς / κτεινομένους (1.409-410).

above, the father's relationship to birth is symbolic: *patêr* and genitor are two distinct ideas. I follow Emile Benveniste who explicates how the word *patêr* was originally a classificatory term:

> ... does **pater* designate properly and exclusively physical paternity? The term **pater* has a pregnant use in mythology. It is a permanent qualification of the supreme God of the Indo-Europeans. It figures in the vocative in the god name *Jupiter*: the Latin term *Jupiter* is taken from a formula of invocation: **dyeu pater* 'father Heaven', which corresponds exactly with the Greek vocative *Zeû pater* (Ζεῦ πάτερ). Besides *Jupiter*, the nominative *Diespiter* has also been preserved, which corresponds in Vedic to *dyauh pita*. To the testimony of Latin, Greek and Vedic we must add that of Umbrian *Iupater* and, finally, a form less well-known, but interesting, *Deipaturos* (Δειπάτυρος), glossed in Hesychius: θεὸς παρὰ Στυμφαίοις 'God of the Stymphians', the inhabitants of Stymphaea, a town in Epirus. In this region occupied by an ancient Illyrian population some part of the Illyrian heritage has survived in the Dorian dialect: the form *Deipaturos* may be a vocative of Illyrian origin. The area of this divine invocation is so vast that we may be right in assigning it to the common Indo-European period as a mythological use of the name for 'father'. Now, in this original usage, the relationship of physical parentage is excluded. We are outside kinship in the strict sense, and **pater* cannot designate 'father' in the personal sense. The passage from one sphere to the other is no easy matter. These are two separate ideas, and in some languages they can be mutually exclusive. (1969, 170)

In discussing immortal and mortal fathers in both epics, I use Benveniste's findings to distinguish between *patêr* — an impersonal conceptual 'father'; and genitor — the biological one. My analysis will show that on the divine level, the *Iliad* develops impersonal father Zeus into a kind of foster father, what Benveniste calls the *atta*, "the 'foster father' who brings up the child" (1969, 171). On the mortal level also, the *Iliad* values substitute father figures — especially evident in the poem's closing meeting of Priam and Achilles. The *Odyssey*, on the contrary, keeps Zeus the fixed divine *patêr*. And among mortal fathers, the *Odyssey* moves away from the *atta* toward the genitor: the goal of Odysseus's return after all is his reunion with his own son, wife and father. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* thus oppose one another in their representations of fathers and sons.

This opposition between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* comprises my third idea central to the discussion in the chapters which follow. From passages in the *Iliad* (2.594-600) and Hesiod's *Works and Days* (654-59), and from the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, scholars over the last two decades have argued "that early Greek poetry was composed

under agonistic conditions."[14] Just as Telemachus in the *Odyssey* says that men always like the newest song (1.351-52), so poets competed against earlier songs. Richard Martin shows how the *Iliad's* poem of Achilles assumes an agonistic superiority to prior Herakles epics (1989, 230). Anthony Edwards argues that the *Odyssey* assumes a competitive stance towards the *Iliad* (1985, 11ff.). Without assuming any specific chronological development between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* — but rather an oral coexistence — I also discuss the two poems as agonistically oriented to each other. While I agree with the arguments of the scholars about poetry's competitive performance context, I did not start from an assumption of contest between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Instead, the accumulated evidence of fathers and sons itself generated a picture of the two poems in opposition to one another. I thus consider my study of epic fathers and sons another contribution to the idea of song competition.

The following chapters are divided between the two epics, the first on the *Iliad*, the second on the *Odyssey*. Each chapter is sub-divided into two sections: one on immortal fathers and immortal / semi-divine sons; the other on mortal fathers and mortal sons. I begin with a prologue on fathers in simile. My dissertation ends with an epilogue which examines fathers and sons in a novel which has often been considered epic, Tolstoy's *War and Peace*. Here I show how Tolstoy's generically epic hero, Prince Andrei, cannot be fully integrated into his revision of the novel as a genre, as opposed to his generically novelistic hero, Pierre.

[14]Martin 1989, 229. See also Edwards, A. 1985, 11-13; Griffith 1990; Jensen 1980, 59-60; 147-49; Peabody 1975, 268-72; cf. Meier 1893, 839-40.

Prologue: Fathers in Simile

Introduction

The best place to begin a study of the epics' presentation of fathers and sons is from its own terms; what meanings and contexts do the poems associate with the word *patêr*? The poems offer such a starting point in their uses of fathers in simile. For if the subject of a simile's vehicle can be a father ("just as a father..."), a father was a recognizable entity, endowed with a particular set of qualities and expected behaviors. If lions are associated with preeminent warriors in the thick of battle or ready to fight; fire with gleaming objects, warriors in battle, or anger; deer with frightened, dazed, and cringing groups of men; *stelai* with immobility; divers with men falling; insects with groups of lesser warriors; rivers with rushing, swelling, violent energy, what was a father, according to the essentializing vehicle of Homeric simile?[15]

Together the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* contain eleven similes of the ὡς πατήρ ("just as a father") sort. Nine of the eleven occur in mimesis, that is, in the direct speech of a character. This sub-group may in turn be divided into two: five of the nine are spoken about a surrogate father who was just like a father; the other four employ the traditional blending of the father-king. Taken on their own, there is nothing particularly remarkable about these images. They portray a father as one who loves his son with enormous affection — conveyed by the son described as the father's single heir (*Iliad* 9.481) or as one who returns from afar after many years (*Odyssey* 16.17-19; *Odyssey* 17.112-13).[16] They depict a father as one who gives good advice to his son (*Od.* 1.306-308; *Od.* 17.397-99); and who is always kind and gentle, *êpios* (*Il.* 24.770). This *êpios* quality further characterizes the good father-king (*Od.* 2.46-47, 233-34; *Od.* 5.11-12; *Od.* 15.151-53). As has been observed: "Kings are like fathers and share with them certain qualities — namely

[15]These associations are the conclusions from Scott 1974, 58-77.
[16]Cf. Redfield 1975, 111.

wisdom, justice, the ability to give good advice, the desire to promote cohesion among their dependents, and often, old age."[17] It seems that our idea of a traditional father was in part formed from these images. Do we learn anything new from these similes beyond the familiar type of wise old kingly men?

The substantive readings of these similes lie outside of their immediate content; they are found instead in their contexts, distribution and clustering in the poems. Discussion of the father similes within their contexts will form the body of this chapter. Their distribution and clustering in each epic provides this analysis's guiding idea. A glance at the distribution of father similes between the two epics makes it clear that they comprise the first evidence of competition between the two poems, as explained in the introduction. For overall, the *Iliad* contains more similes than the *Odyssey* — roughly two hundred (of the long sort) compared to about forty in the *Odyssey.* But in the case of father similes, the *Iliad* contains far fewer than the *Odyssey*— three as opposed to eight. Furthermore, the *Iliad's* father similes cluster near the end of the poem. Since a simile by definition juxtaposes two things on the basis of likeness, the *Iliad's* postponed placement of its father similes suggests a development toward relationship based on likeness.[18] A remarkable shift in clustering occurs in the *Odyssey*: not only do all its father similes occur near the beginning of the poem, but once Odysseus — the actual father — returns to his house in Ithaca, the similes disappear. In other words, the appearance of the father himself puts a decisive end to the *Odysseys's* consideration of a father by analogy. In addition, the *Odyssey* also entertains an extensive discussion of likeness as a factor in the relationship between father and son. Athena (1.206-209), Nestor (3.121-25), Helen (4.141-44) and Menelaos (4.148-150) all comment on Telemachus's likeness to Odysseus, while Telemachus himself cannot say for sure who his father is. The *Odyssey's* many and early father similes, combined with its explicit consideration of likeness between son and father,

[17]Edmunds 1990, 24.

[18]A simile is a figure of speech conservatively defined as a non-literal comparison between two unlike things and introduced by "like" or "as." *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* pp.1149-1150; see also Darian 1973, 48; Ortony 1979, 186-202.

suggests that it struggles with an anxiety about the relationship of likeness absent from the *Iliad*. Thus a central opposition between the two poems becomes apparent: the *Iliad* builds toward a meeting of one like a father and one like a son as its conclusion; the *Odyssey* moves away from such relationships of likeness toward a reunion of the actual father and son themselves.

Another way to phrase this basic difference between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is in the terms of a modern literary theorist, Wyatt Prunty, as the difference between simile and symbol. A simile is a flexible kind of speech without one fixed meaning, but ever moving in the continual play of likeness and difference. Symbol, in contrast to simile, implies correct interpretation. "In contrast, insofar as symbol and allegory appeal to the tradition for their significance, they initiate a kind of genetic philology because the original meaning of a thing is an arche."[19] What then is a Homeric father? A creature of simile or symbol? A relative thing of seeming or a related one of being?[20] I wish to argue that based on the evidence of these similes and the passages relevant to them, a father in the *Iliad* is a creature of simile, moved in the *Odyssey* to one of symbol. This movement from simile to symbol divides the two epics.

Father Similes in the *Iliad*

The *Iliad's* father similes focus on Peleus and Achilles, Priam and Hector: Phoinix recalls how Peleus loved him like a father (9.481-83); Achilles mourns Patroklos like a father does his son (23.222-25); Hermes likens Priam to his father (24.370-71); and finally Helen remembers how Hector was as gentle to her as a father (24.767-75). Clustering near the end of the poem, the similes' inherent idea of likeness builds toward the final meeting of Priam and Achilles — a meeting like a simile acted out on a grand scale as it brings together an old man like a father to Achilles and a young man like a son to Priam.

---

[19]Ibid., 19.

[20]Cf. Darian, who qualifies "seemingly" and "seem to" as indicators of simile, using the following examples: "He stood there, seemingly trapped in the pool of light." "...they seemed to breathe, live in a bowl of molten lead" (Faulkner). (Darian 1973, 53).

Phoinix and Peleus

The first father simile in the *Iliad* introduces the motif of Achilles's association with substitute fathers. Hoping to persuade Achilles, Phoinix recounts his adoption into the house of Peleus:

> καί με φίλησ' ὡς εἴ τε πατὴρ ὃν παῖδα φιλήσῃ
> μοῦνον τηλύγετον πολλοῖσιν ἐπὶ κτεάτεσσι.
> καί μ' ἀφνειὸν ἔθηκε. πολὺν δέ μοι ὤπασε λαόν.
> (9.481-83)
>
> And he [Peleus] loved me just as a father loves his son
> his only son, begotten late in life, heir to many possessions,
> and he made me rich, and gave to me many people.

Having quarrelled with his father, Phoinix left home and arrived at a new parentage: Phthia, "mother of flocks" (μητέρα μήλων 9.479) and Peleus, who loved him "as a father" (ὡς εἴ τε πατὴρ 9.481). One bond of ancestry is extinguished and another one forged.[21]

Phoinix's persuasion of Achilles demonstrates how a stranger can become so incorporated into a new house so as to seem at times more like a father than one's own father. Phoinix repeats regarding Achilles what he reported Peleus did for him. He recalls — in the same metrical position — that Peleus made him, Phoinix, rich (καί μ' ἀφνειὸν ἔθηκε 483); and so he, Phoinix, made Achilles "what sort you are" (καί σε τοσοῦτον ἔθηκα 485). This repetition is emphasized since its expression forms both a chiasmus and part of a hysteron proteron.[22] Phoinix says that Peleus loved him (481) and gave to him (483); whereas he gave to Achilles (485) and loved him (ἐκ θυμοῦ φιλέων [loving from my heart] 486). Phoinix's inversion of the order into first giving and then loving comprises an important part of his persuasive technique. First of all, in the lines about himself, he redefines the verb of giving, ἔθηκε. Peleus made Phoinix rich, but Phoinix made Achilles what he is, by loving him from his heart. Phoinix implies that for Peleus love was inseparable from economy, leading inexorably to it. But for Phoinix to Achilles,

---

[21]Phoinix is saying that he is part of Achilles's house alone. Note the similarity to Andromache's speech to Hektor (6.413-430). On Phoinix's speech, see Rosner 1976.

[22]For a discussion of hysteron proteron, see Thalmann 1984, 6-8.

the economy of material wealth is absent. And it is this absolute omission of the material aspect that is crucial to Phoinix's position presently: Achilles should listen to him not only as a son should listen to his father, but because his fathering came solely out of love, having nothing to do with material economy.

In this present context in Book 9, Phoinix's overshadowing of material wealth contrasts the rejected fathering that Agamemnon has been offering to Achilles:[23]

> εἰ δέ κεν Ἄργος ἱκοίμεθ' Ἀχαιικόν, οὔθαρ ἀρούρης.
> γαμβρός κέν μοι ἔοι· τίσω δέ μιν ἶσον Ὀρέστῃ.
> ὅς μοι τηλύγετος τρέφεται θαλίῃ ἔνι πολλῇ.
> (9.141-43 = 283-85)
>
> If we should reach Achaean Argos, with rich lands,
> he will be my son-in-law; I will honor him equal to Orestes,
> who born late to me is nurtured in much abundance.

Agamemnon's offer to honor Achilles equally with his own son, Orestes, comes amid a catalogue of countless gifts and wealth. By separating his concern for Achilles as one based on love and not wealth, Phoinix distinguishes himself not primarily from Peleus but more importantly from Agamemnon, the *persona non grata* whose capacity to give wealth has lost its power in Achilles's eyes. Thus, Phoinix communicates, be persuaded by me who loves you as a father disinterested in material possessions, and interested solely in love. The reciprocity in Phoinix's relation to Achilles is one of care: I nursed you when you were young (9.486-92), so you would protect me when I am old (9.494-95). Such an essential contract between father and son arises between Achilles and one now his own, Phoinix.

Phoinix's father simile functions on several levels simultaneously. In its immediate context, Phoinix uses his paternal relationship toward Achilles to strengthen his argument. On a larger scale, the simile brings into focus the abundance of father figures associated with the house of Peleus: not only was Peleus like a father to Phoinix, but father substitutes surround Achilles — Phoinix and Agamemnon. Most specifically, this first father simile in

---

[23]For a thorough discussion of Agamemnon as Achilles's "third father" — after Peleus and Phoinix — see Avery 1998. On Achilles's refusal of Agamemnon as a father-in-law, see Redfield 1975, 16; Finlay 1980, 270.

the poem — of Peleus's reception of the metanastic Phoinix, will find its ultimate resonance at the dramatic end of the poem when Achilles receives the rhetorically metanastic Priam (24.480-83). Phoinix's simile thus introduces a central motif of the *Iliad*, the welcome of fathers based on likeness.

Achilles and Patroklos

A cluster of parent-child similes gather around Patroklos and Achilles — three concern Achilles alone (9.323; 18.56-57 = 437-38); three concern Patroklos (17.4, 133, 755); and three involve both heroes (16.7; 18.318; 23.222).[24] Only the last of these parent-child similes liken Achilles and Patroklos to a father and son specifically. The simile in Book 16, when Patroklos persuades Achilles to lend him his armor and send him into battle, Patroklos's silence and tears provoke Achilles to compare him with a tearful little *girl* (κούρη νηπίη 7-8). Only after his death, Achilles mourns Patroklos like a father for his son: the heroic Patroklos begins and ends as a child in relation to its parent — with a notable shift in gender.[25]

---

[24]Moulton 1977, 101. Moulton notes that mention of parent and offspring is not exclusively confined to Achilles and Patroklos in the *Iliad*. Six such similes occur between Books 4-16, all in scenes of battle (or impending battle): 4.130ff; 5.555; 8.271-72; 12.167-70, 433-36; 16.259-265. Four of the six (4.130; 5.555; 8.271) refer explicitly to mothers (once called simply γυνή, but still with reference to her children (12.433-35)); of the remaining two, one concerns both male and female -- wasps and bees (12.167), and the other only wasps (16.259). Thus it is fair to say that these similes predominantly portray images of the mother, and never explicitly the father. The action of the majority of these similes is described by the verb: ἀμύνω, three times explicitly (4.130; 12.170; 16.265) and once implied (8.272). The other two actions are related: in one the mother ἐτραφέτην her lion cubs (5.555); in the other she labors to earn a petty wage for the sake of her children (12.436). These activities all concern the care and protection of the young, primarily enacted by mothers. The Patroklos parent-young similes of this type also portray the relationship of mother and child.

[25]Not only does Patroklos shift from girl to boy, but his "parent" changes from mother to father. The bT-scholia on Achilles's simile interprets his words as purposefully brusque and his "feminization" of Patroklos as derogatory (an expression of womanishness); later scholars continue this line of thought: for example, Willcock calls Achilles's speech "a delicate combination of friendship and irony" (cited in Janko 1992, 316). Contrary to these readings, I do not think his words need to be ironized. First, Achilles cannot be blaming Patroklos for womanishness since he makes himself into a woman — the mother — in the simile, too. But more importantly, the poem prefaces the simile by stating that Achilles felt pity (ὤκτειρε) on seeing Patroklos, and Achilles indeed proceeds to speak to Patroklos with the same gentle words his mother used to him when he came to her in tears (16.19 = 1.363). Achilles's repetition of his own mother's words is important. Although it has been argued otherwise, Thetis is Achilles's more powerful and less vulnerable parent: she is immortal and Zeus is bound to her from of old. (Cf. 18.86-87. See Murnaghan 1992, 251-52; and Slatkin 1991.) When she spoke to Achilles in the words he repeats to Patroklos, Achilles had sought her out in prayer to help him in a situation beyond his reach: she was the

After Patroklos is killed, three animal similes describe the relationship of a hero to his corpse. These three similes, which finally culminate in the father-son simile of Achilles burning Patroklos, describe the process of transforming the corpse from something visible to invisible: Menelaos stands over the dead body like a mother over her calf (17.4-5); Ajax covers it like a lion standing over her young (17.132-37); and Achilles groans over the body like a lion who returns to find her whelps snatched away (18.316-323). When Achilles lights the pyre of Patroklos — the context of his father-son simile — he actualizes this process of making the corpse unseen. That is, he completes ("perfects") the death process, transforming Patroklos from, as Vermeule puts it, one who died (τὸν θανόντα) to one who is dead (τεθνειῶτα).[26]

While the other parent-young similes considered different aspects of the corpse's presence, the final simile of father and son focuses entirely on the process of creating absence — of making the corpse "away from the eyes" (ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν). Achilles states this making invisible as the task of the first part of Book 23:[27]

> ἠῶθεν δ' ὄτρυνον, ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγάμεμνον,
> ὕλην τ ἀξέμεναι παρά τε σχεῖν ὅσσ' ἐπιεικὲς
> νεκρὸν ἔχοντα νέεσθαι ὑπὸ ζόφον ἠερόεντα,
> ὄφρ' ἦ τοι τοῦτον μὲν ἐπιφλέγῃ ἀκάματον πῦρ
> θᾶσσον ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν, λαοὶ δ' ἐπὶ ἔργα τράπωνται.
> (23.49-53)
>
> In the morning rouse up, lord of men Agamemnon,
> to bring wood and prepare as much as is seemly
> for a dead man to have when he goes beneath the murky gloom,
> in order that untiring fire might burn him
> quickly from sight, and the people turn to their tasks.

---

parent capable of giving aid and protection. In the continuation of Achilles's speech after the simile, he notably asks Patroklos if he is crying because of some news of the deaths of their *fathers* : the father, in general and for Achilles in particular, is the vulnerable parent. Thus, when Achilles likens himself to a mother at the start of Book 16, he shows himself as feeling strong and capable of granting aid or protection to his "child." This is made all the more clear by the different situation in Book 23 when Achilles grieves over Patroklos like a father: there he has failed in his powerful protecting role and has become, like the dead man before him, full of mortality and vulnerability. With his failure to protect and his mortality in full view, he changes from mother to father. But at the start of Book 16 Patroklos is alive and Achilles full of a sense of his power. Thus he begins like his mother, confident that he can care for his child. For issues of men, tears, and womanish traits, see Monsacré 1984.

[26]Vermeule 1979, 12.

[27]The first part of Book 23 extends up until line 257, when Achilles gathers the host for the funeral games.

Patroklos's pyre must be gathered and burned in order to remove him from sight.[28] Patroklos's shade reiterates this need to be made unseen when he pleads with Achilles: "bury me as quickly as possible, that I will cross the gates of Hades" (θάπτε με ὅττι τάχιστα. πύλας Ἀΐδαο περήσω 71). With the wood cut and gathered into a pyre, with the men having cut their hair over the corpse, with dedications of honey and oil and sacrifices of animals and men complete, Achilles prays to the winds to ignite the reluctant fire. The winds blow upon the flame all night long, during which long time Achilles pours libations and calls upon Patroklos. The father-son simile figures the night's heavy mourning:

> ὡς δὲ πατὴρ οὗ παιδὸς ὀδύρεται ὀστέα καίων,
> νυμφίου, ὅς τε θανὼν δειλοὺς ἀκάχησε τοκῆας,
> ὡς Ἀχιλεὺς ἑτάροιο ὀδύρετο ὀστέα καίων,
> ἑρπύζων παρὰ πυρκαιήν, ἀδινὰ στεναχίζων.
> (23.222-25)
>
> Just as a father laments burning the bones of his son,
> newly married, who dying brought grief to his wretched parents,
> so Achilles laments burning the bones of his companion,
> walking heavily around the pyre, groaning incessantly.

This simile is remarkable in its apparent lack of obliquity. Unlike so many similes that more or less obscure the relation of similitude between tenor and vehicle, this simile inclines toward transparent equivalence in its repetition of diction and meter. Every word unit of line 222 is replaced by a corresponding one in line 224: δὲ πατὴρ [father] = Ἀχιλεὺς [Achilles]; οὗ παιδὸς [of his son] = ἑτάροιο [of his companion]; ὀδύρεται = ὀδύρετο; ὀστέα καίων = ὀστέα καίων. Achilles is the father engaged in the identical activity of grieving and burning the bones of his companion, the son. The simile is made complex not by its variation of subject types (e.g. man to animal or force of nature) or activities (e.g. warriors gathering for battle to wolves gorged on a killed stag), but by the very closeness of tenor and vehicle. Indeed the close bond between ἀκάχησε (223) and

[28]Cf. lines 135, 189 (where the ease with which Apollo hides Hektor contrasts with Achilles's difficulty in lighting the pyre), 244, 254.

Ἀχιλεὺς (224) connects tenor and vehicle further.[29] One is thus compelled not to ask who is who and what is what, but why so emphatically a father and son.

The father of the simile mourns for a *numphios* son. Basing his definition on *Odyssey* 7.65 (ἄκουρον νυμφίον ἐν μεγάρῳ. μίαν οἴην παῖδα λιπόντα [a bridegroom without a son in the hall, leaving behind only one daughter]), Leaf defines *numphios*:

> We may conclude from this that a man was called νύμφιος. *bridegroom*, after his marriage until he had a son; until he had thus provided for the continuance of his house he retained the name which indicated that his marriage had not yet attained its fulness. That a father should thus be deprived of male descendants at the moment when he might reasonably expect them would naturally add to the poignancy of his grief.

Drawing on Leaf's conclusion, an emphasis of the simile thus concerns the loss of continuance. The death of a *numphios* son implies the end of the line; it incorporates the "death" of the father also, who now has no hope of immortality through progeny. A father mourning his son who has died childless fits the pattern of conversion to the unseen. It includes a general sense of eradication, appropriate to Achilles's knowledge that the death of Patroklos (his "son") will now lead to his own death (the "father"). Although both Thetis (18.95-96) and Patroklos's shade (23.80-81) have prophesied Achilles's imminent death to him, his loss of continuity resulting from the death of Patroklos seems to include a further implication beyond the linked deaths of Patroklos — Hector — Achilles. So the following passage of Achilles's earlier grieving over Patroklos shows:

> Remembering Patroklos he sighed much for him, and spoke aloud:
> 'There was a time, ill fated, o dearest of all my companions,
> when you yourself would set the desirable dinner before me
> quickly and expertly, at the time the Achaeans were urgent
> to carry sorrowful war on the Trojans, breakers of horses.
> But now you lie here torn before me, and my heart goes starved
> for meat and drink, though they are here beside me, by reason
> of longing for you. There is nothing worse than this I could suffer,
> not even if I were to hear of the death of my father
> who now, I think, in Phthia somewhere lets fall a soft tear
> for bereavement of such a son, for me, who now in a strange land
> make war upon the Trojans for the sake of accursed Helen;
> or the death of my dear son, who is raised for my sake in Skyros
> now, if godlike Neoptolemos is still one of the living.
> Before now the spirit inside my breast was hopeful
> that I alone should die far away from horse-pasturing Argos
> here in Troy; I hoped you would win back again to Phthia

[29]Richard Martin has pointed this out to me. For the larger connection between the name Achilles and *achos*, see Nagy 1979, 69-71, 83, 177.

so that in a fast black ship you could take my son back
from Skyros to Phthia, and show him all my possessions,
my property, my serving men, my great high-roofed house.
For by this time I think that Peleus must altogether
have perished, or still keeps a little scant life in sorrow
for the hatefulness of old age and because he waits ever from me
the evil message, for the day he hears I have been killed.'
(19.314-37)[30]

Achilles's hope of continuity lay in the return of Patroklos to Phthia where he would take over the role of bringing Neoptolemos into the house of Achilles. The loss of Patroklos thus implies to Achilles the loss of his own son; who else will escort him back from Skyros to Phthia, knowing that Peleus is either no longer alive or too old to do so? It seems then that Achilles mourns Patroklos like a father does his *numphios* son because Achilles saw in Patroklos his only hope of continuity. The death of his father would not be worse since he was finished procreating; nor would the death of his son be worse since the son could only play his part if brought home into the ways and things of his father. Only Patroklos could fulfill this function for Neoptolemos in the place of Achilles. The simile seems to suggest that the relationship between Achilles and Patroklos was not that of father and son in structure, but rather in expectation and dependence. In the death of Patroklos, Achilles sees both his own personal death and that metaphoric death comprised of the loss of futurity.

Helen and Hector

Just as the poet used a father-simile to convey Achilles's grief not for his father but for his companion, so Helen speaks a father simile in her lament for her agemate, Hector. She begins by praising Hector among all her husband's relatives and reproaching herself.[31] She continues:

ἀλλ' οὔ πω σεῦ ἄκουσα κακὸν ἔπος οὐδ' ἀσύφηλον·
ἀλλ' εἴ τίς με καὶ ἄλλος ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἐνίπτοι
δαέρων ἢ γαλόων ἢ εἰνατέρων εὐπέπλων,

[30]Lattimore's translation.

[31]So Hekabe in her lament praised Hektor among all her sons; cf. 24.762 and 748. Helen is the only female to speak a father simile; perhaps this refers to her characteristic transgression of boundaries, though she does speak her simile in the female genre of lament.

ἦ ἑκυρή — ἑκυρὸς δὲ πατὴρ ὡς ἤπιος αἰεί —
ἀλλὰ σὺ τόν γ' ἐπέεσσι παραιφάμενος κατέρυκες
σῇ τ' ἀγανοφροσύνῃ καὶ σοῖς ἀγανοῖς ἐπέεσσι.
τῶ σέ θ' ἅμα κλαίω καὶ ἔμ' ἄμμορον ἀχνυμένη κῆρ·
οὐ γάρ τίς μοι ἔτ' ἄλλος ἐνὶ Τροίῃ εὐρείῃ
ἤπιος οὐδὲ φίλος. πάντες δέ με πεφρίκασιν.
(24.767-75)

Not yet have I heard from you an evil or degrading word;
but if some other one in the halls should reproach me
one of the brothers-in-law or sisters-in-law or one of the well-robed wives of my husband's brothers, or my mother-in-law — for my father-in-law was always as gentle as a father — but you restrained them with persuasive words
and with your mildness and your mild words.
I weep for both you and for me ill-fated, sorrowing at heart;
for there is not any other in wide Troy
gentle and kind, but all shudder at me.

According to the conclusions of Susan Edmunds, who studied the word *êpios* in Homer, Hesiod and the Homeric hymns, *êpios* means something like "connecting," in an integrative sense. For example, in the *Odyssey* a good king is *êpios*, similar to Nereus in Hesiod's *Theogony*, who is called "old man" because he is νημερτής τε καὶ ἤπιος (235) and not forgetful of what is *themis*, but knows just and *êpios* councils (236). The good king, like the wise Nereus, ensures community among his subjects. *Êpios* is further a kind of like-mindedness which moves toward reconciliation. For example, when Agamemnon retracts some provocative words to Odysseus, he says: οἶδα γὰρ ὡς τοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν/ ἤπια δήνεα οἶδε· τὰ γὰρ φρονέεις ἃ τ' ἐγω περ (4.360-61). The idea of like-mindedness applies to the use of *êpios* between men and their wives or lovers, for example when Agamemnon in the underworld tells Odysseus not be *êpios* even with your wife (11.441), since you cannot depend on her loyalty. *Êpios* is associated with heads of households (Laertes and Odysseus to Eumaeus) and particularly with fathers, or fatherly behavior. Kings are like fathers and share certain qualities: wisdom, justice, good advice, the promotion of community, and old age (often). Thus *êpios* means, broadly, "connecting."[32] In the passage cited above in which Helen laments the death of Hector, she gives a full enumeration of all her "connections" to the Trojans through her husband (763):

[32]Edmunds 1990; she also suggests that there is semantic evidence for *êpios* being derived from the root **âp-* found in Latin *apiscor* and Sanskrit *âpnóti* (1990, 10-24).

brothers-in-law, sisters-in-law, wives of brothers-in-law, mother-in-law and father-in-law. Of all these, and there were many brothers- and sisters-in-law, only Priam and Hector were *êpios* — true "connections" to her.

The poem itself presents a scene of Priam, Helen's father-in-law, behaving in this fatherly way to her. During the Teichoskopia, after the old men on the wall have just acknowledged, but ultimately reproached her (3.156-60), Priam speaks gently to Helen:

> δεῦρο πάροιθ' ἐλθοῦσα, φίλον τέκος, ἵζευ ἐμεῖο,
> ὄφρα ἴδῃς πρότερόν τε πόσιν πηούς τε φίλους τε —
> οὔ τί μοι αἰτίη ἐσσί, θεοί νύ μοι αἴτιοί εἰσιν,
> οἵ μοι ἐφώρμησαν πόλεμον πολύδακρυν Ἀχαιῶν —
> (3.162-65)
>
> Come here, dear child, sit before me,
> in order that you may see your former husband and own kinsmen by marriage —
> to me, you are not at all to blame, to me the gods are to blame,
> who roused up against me the much tearful war of the Achaeans —

Unlike the elders, Priam sees beyond the immediate, accepted cause of the war to the divine movers behind it. He knows better than attribute such a tearful war to one mortal's actions, even a war destructive of his own house and kingdom. His *êpios* acceptance of Helen in Book 3 prefigures his novel gesture of kissing the hand of Achilles in Book 24. Indeed, already in the Teichoskopia, Priam looks with admiration at the enemy heroes.

To return to Helen's lament, the question arises why her father simile occurs in this speech act. *Goos* is a genre addressed to the dead which expresses a shift in relationship. It contrasts the past with the present, the "you" with the "I," the dead with the living.[33] Helen's lament contrasts the past when only her father-in-law (who was like a father) and Hector were *êpios* to her, with the present, when there is no one *êpios* to her. Through her repetition of *êpios* (770; 775), Helen makes an implicit comparison between Hector and his (or a) father. Helen's simile fits a type common in lament, which grieves for the loss of support: the mourner complains to the dead man about the hope and comfort of which his death has deprived her. This loss of support is often expressed by identifying the dead man with an object of support or defense.[34] Helen identifies Hector with the

[33]Alexiou 1974, 171.
[34]Ibid., 193.

image of a supportive father. But the part played by Priam seems to have died with Hector: no one *êpios* is left. Helen both creates the father (πατὴρ ὡς ἤπιος [as gentle as a father]) and destroys the father (οὐ γάρ τίς μοι ἔτ' ἄλλος ἐνὶ Τροίῃ εὐρείῃ/ ἤπιος [for there is not any other gentle one in wide Troy] in one speech. We saw in Achilles's grief for Patroklos — like a father for his son — the metaphorical death of the father in the loss of his son. Helen's lament for Hector presents this idea again in her suggestion of the death of Priam implicit in the death of Hector.

Priam and Zeus

The final instance in the *Iliad* of something like a father is more a proto-simile than a full fledged one. Its very incompleteness lends a clearer insight into the mechanics of simile in the *Iliad.* In Book 24, Zeus sends Hermes to escort Priam secretly to Achilles. Priam and his old herald, driving through the dark on this dangerous mission, become terrified at the sight of the god disguised as a strong young man. But Hermes approaches and reassures Priam:

> ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐδέν σε ῥέξω κακά. καὶ δέ κεν ἄλλον
> σεῦ ἀπαλεξήσαιμι· φίλῳ δέ σε πατρὶ ἐίσκω.
> (24.370-71)
> But I will do nothing harmful against you, and I will
> ward off another from you; I liken you to my own father.

Hermes explains his benign attitude to the old man: I liken you to / compare you with my own father. In other words, Hermes articulates the mental process implicit in simile. For simile by definition juxtaposes two things on the basis of likeness.[35] Hermes's words to Priam, which expose the process of making things like, comprise the perfect introduction to the scene into which Hermes escorts Priam, wherein Priam and Achilles relate to each other according to their respective likenesses to father and son. And its late placement in the poem — between Achilles's mourning for Patroklos like a father for his son and Helen's lament for Hector who was as gentle as a father — suggests that this relationship

[35]See footnote 18.

of likeness comprises the destination of the poem. The *Iliad* builds toward this explicit statement of likeness; the *Odyssey*, I will now show below, starts from this point and then distances itself from it.

Father—Son Likeness in the *Odyssey*

The *Odyssey* at first considers relationship to the father as one based on likeness. Such association of father and son based on likeness occurs three times — but only while the living father is absent.

Athena first introduces likeness as the promise of father-son relationship. When she comes to inspire Telemachus at the opening of the *Odyssey*, she asks him if he is the son of Odysseus himself. She surmises such a relationship between Telemachus and Odysseus based on physical likeness:

> ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπὲ καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον.
> εἰ δὴ ἐξ αὐτοῖο τόσος πάις εἰς Ὀδυσῆος.
> αἰνῶς μὲν κεφαλήν τε καὶ ὄμματα καλὰ ἔοικας
> κείνῳ (1.206-209)
> But come, tell me and recount it exactly,
> if, being of such a size, you are the son of Odysseus himself.
> You are wondrously like to that one in respect to your head and beautiful eyes.

Athena's words do not express a paternity "proved" by superficial physical resemblance, but are rather part of a deeper traditional concept of order and rightness. Hesiod makes this clear in a statement about the loss of resemblance between father and son. He explains that the Iron Age contains a mixture of good and evils, but Zeus will destroy this generation when it becomes wholly bad. A series of inversions will characterize that time of disorder and pure evil: children will grow gray hair as they are born, there will not be friendship between guest and host nor between brother and brother, as it was before (*W&D* 180-84). Also among this list is the disorder in the relationship between father and son: "the father is not like to his sons nor are the sons [like to their fathers]" (οὐδὲ πατὴρ παίδεσσιν ὁμοίιος οὐδέ τι παῖδες *W&D* 182). The lack of likeness between father and son is one of the signs that will mark the irretrievable decline of this age. Conversely, as long as fathers

and sons are alike, there is still good in the Iron Age. Thus resemblance between father and son contains a moral and cosmic implication; on such basis Athena observes Telemachus's likeness to Odysseus. It is a vote of confidence: Telemachus should put stock in his mother's words that he is the son of Odysseus; and on a larger scale, she implies that the world order is intact and it is only a matter of time before the present disorder is righted.

Like Athena, Nestor also notices Telemachus's likeness to his father. Telemachus, having asked Nestor for news of his father (3.83-84), has explicitly revealed his identity to Nestor. Like Athena, Nestor states his observation of father-son likeness after hesitating about the truth of Telemachus's sonship. Their asseverance of resemblance, following the moment of questioning, seems a way to controvert their own uncertainty; that is, if likeness is seen, the probability of relationship becomes hard to deny. Nestor says:

> ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλὸν ἐνίκα δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
> παντοίοισι δόλοισι, πατὴρ τεός, εἰ ἐτεόν γε
> κείνου ἔκγονός ἐσσι· σέβας μ' ἔχει εἰσορόωντα.
> ἦ τοι γὰρ μῦθοί γε ἐοικότες, οὐδέ κε φαίης
> ἄνδρα νεώτερον ὧδε ἐοικότα μυθήσασθαι.
> (3.121-25)
>
> ...since noble Odysseus greatly excelled
> in all wiles, your father, if truly
> you are the offspring of this one; awe holds me beholding you.
> For your speeches are alike, and you would not think
> such a young man to speak seemly things.

Nestor's pun on ἐοικότες - ἐοικότα, playing on meaning as he shifts it from likeness to seemliness, incorporates the idea implicit in Hesiod that resemblance is seemly, that is, a sign of orderliness. Unlike Athena who noted Telemachus's head and eyes, Nestor remarks on his speech.[36] After the lines cited above Nestor continues to focus on speech, recalling how he and Odysseus never spoke at variance in council but always said how things might be best. A weak old man during the war, Nestor was valued for his words alone. His highest praise for Odysseus is to match his speaking with his own. So

[36]Benardete also notes Nestor's pun. He relates it primarily to a similarity of speaking: "Nestor puts side by side two different meanings of *eoike* : the semblance of Telemachus' speeches to Odysseus's (*muthoi ge eoikotes*) and the sensibleness of his speaking (*eoikota muthêsasthai*). To be like Odysseus in speech is to speak the likely" (1997, 18).

when he says that Telemachus speaks like his father, Nestor remarks on the quality he values most. And he does so in a way that affirms his own talent for speech: he says wittily that resemblance between father and son is itself seemliness.

Finally Helen and Menelaos reiterate Telemachus's likeness to his father. Menelaos has already noted Telemachus's tears in response to Menelaos's words about Odysseus, but refrains from asking him about his father. Helen speaks of it first to Menelaos:

> οὐ γάρ πώ τινά φημι ἐοικότα ὧδε ἰδέσθαι
> οὔτ' ἄνδρ' οὔτε γυναῖκα, σέβας μ' ἔχει εἰσορόωσαν,
> ὡς ὅδ' Ὀδυσσῆος μεγαλήτορος υἷι ἔοικε,
> Τηλεμάχῳ, τὸν ἔλειπε νέον γεγαῶτ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ
> (4.141-44)
>
> For not yet do I claim to have seen anyone thus alike
> neither a man nor a woman, awe holds me beholding,
> as this one is like to the son of great hearted Odysseus,
> to Telemachus, whom he left behind in his house a newborn

Menelaos responds:

> οὕτω νῦν καὶ ἐγὼ νοέω, γύναι, ὡς σὺ ἐίσκεις·
> κείνου γὰρ τοιοίδε πόδες τοιαίδε τε χεῖρες
> ὀφθαλμῶν τε βολαὶ κεφαλή τ' ἐφύπερθέ τε χαῖται.
> (4.148-50)
>
> So now also I observe, wife, as you make the likeness;
> His feet and hands were of such a sort
> and the glances of his eyes and his head and hair above.

Helen's words differ somewhat from those of Athena and Nestor earlier. While still perceiving likeness, she likens Telemachus not to his father, but to the little son that was left behind when Odysseus went to Troy. Menelaos responds to Helen's prodding: once she makes the likeness, he sees it too. We see that relationship between father and son in the *Odyssey* is iteratively and explicitly based on likeness. And yet when likeness is extended to other father figures through simile, we see this basis of relationship challenged. It thus seems that likeness only applies in the *Odyssey* between actual father and son, and will not extend into metaphor.

Father Similes in the *Odyssey*

As Hamlet's mother says of her representation on stage — "the lady doth protest too much" (III.ii.222) — the *Odyssey's* proliferation of father similes up until Book 17, when

Odysseus sets foot in his house, suggests an anxiety about the designation of the father and the relationship to him. Father similes liken four characters to a father to Telemachus: Athena (1.307-308), Eumaeus (16.11-26), Nestor (17.110-114) and Antinoos (17.397-400). Similar to Telemachus as many fathered, since Odysseus was a king as gentle as a father (2.46-47; 2.230-34; 5.11-12), he accumulates many sons. But this multiplicity is challenged: below I will show how in each comparison of another to Telemachus's father, there is a sense of irony; and how Athena directs the idea of Odysseus as a gentle king specifically at her one father, Zeus.

Athena-Mentes and Telemachus

Telemachus's first embrace of another as a father figure is essentially straightforward. Well advised by Athena, he thanks her for her guidance:

> ξεῖν', ἦ τοι μὲν ταῦτα φίλα φρονέων ἀγορεύεις.
> ὡς τε πατὴρ ᾧ παιδί. καὶ οὔ ποτε λήσομαι αὐτῶν.
> (1.307-308)
> Stranger, indeed you speak these things having good intentions in mind,
> just as father to his son, and I will not ever forget them.

Telemachus unproblematically welcomes the fatherly Athena, but the circumstances for Telemachus as a son are problematic. If Odysseus left for Troy when Telemachus was still *nêpios*, as is frequently recalled, how does he know how a father speaks to his son, as he claims in the case of Mentes? Furthermore, having just spoken kindly words to incite Telemachus to action, Athena normatively aligns the father with the speaker of words and the son with the doer of deeds. But Telemachus's situation inverts the paradigm: Athena soon departs, while he is the one left at home occupied with thought (ὀσσόμενος πατέρ ἐσθλὸν ἐνὶ φρεσίν [seeing his noble father in his thoughts] 1.115); moreover, his actual father is out and active in the world. A father for him is not just the speaker of words, but wholly a creature of words.[37] Thus the father he names in his response to Athena above

[37]Cf. 1.214-16.

suggests the father as yet wholly an idea and an ideal. Telemachus, like the audience, has yet to refer this image of the father to an experience of a real father himself.

Nestor and Telemachus

The *Odyssey's* next father simile occurs soon after Telemachus returns home from his journey to Pylos and Sparta. Penelope asks him (for a second time) what he heard about his father (17.44; 104-106). Telemachus tells her briefly of his trip to Nestor in Pylos:

> δεξάμενος δέ με κεῖνος ἐν ὑψηλοῖσι δόμοισιν
> ἐνδυκέως ἐφίλει. ὡς εἴ τε πατὴρ ἑὸν υἱὸν
> ἐλθόντα χρόνιον νέον ἄλλοθεν· ὡς ἐμὲ κεῖνος
> ἐνδυκέως ἐκόμιζε σὺν υἱάσι κυδαλίμοισιν.
> (17.110-114)
> he [Nestor], having received me into his high-roofed house,
> loved me kindly, just as a father his son
> coming lately from afar after a long time; so he tended me
> kindly together with his glorious sons.

Telemachus's speech does not quite accord with the past events.[38] A son who has long been away would evoke anxiety and longing in a parent; his return would become doubly welcome with relief added to joy. Having indeed just returned from his first journey to distant lands, Telemachus has received three such welcomes — by Eumaeus, Eurykleia, and Penelope. The poem thus precedes Telemachus's simile with a triple enactment of what he reports about his reception by Nestor. Of Eurykleia's greeting, the poem says:

> τὸν δὲ πολὺ πρώτη εἶδε τροφὸς Εὐρύκλεια.
> κώεα καστορνῦσα θρόνοις ἔνι δαιδαλέοισι.
> δακρύσασα δ' ἔπειτ' ἰθὺς κίεν· ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ἄλλαι
> δμῳαὶ Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος ἠγερέθοντο.
> καὶ κύνεον ἀγαπαζόμεναι κεφαλήν τε καὶ ὤμους. (17.31-35)
> The nurse Eurykleia saw him first by far
> as she was spreading fleeces on the intricately wrought chairs,
> shedding tears she went straight to him; the other house servants
> of steadfast Odysseus gathered around them,
> and welcoming him they kissed his head and shoulders.

---

[38]It is rather stylized. The composition of this simile recalls that of Phoinix about Peleus discussed above. Like the *Iliad* example, this simile aims to express how one was loved by another: cf. καί με φίλησ' ὡς... (9.481); ἐνδυκέως ἐφίλει. ὡς... (17.111). The father's primary action is again loving (here unexpressed) his son, with an emphasis on relationship (πατὴρ ἑὸν υἱὸν); and again the son is qualified in some way so as to enhance his dearness. In the former example he was an only son, the single heir, grown big and so implying the father's advanced age and decreased hope in having another son, as well as his greater dependence on that son. In this latter example the son is one having just come from afar after much time.

Penelope, too, reacts with such a display of emotion:

> ἀμφὶ δὲ παιδὶ φίλῳ βάλε πήχεε δακρύσασα.
> κύσσε δέ μιν κεφαλήν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλά
> καί ῥ' ὀλοφυρομένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
> (17.38-40)
>
> around her dear son she threw her arms, crying,
> she kissed his head and both beautiful eyes
> and sobbing she addressed him with winged words;

Lastly, Eumaeus greeted Telemachus with an ardor equivalent to that of his nurse and mother (16.11-22).We have witnessed Nestor's reception of Telemachus in Book 3 and thus know that it was hospitable, but hardly emotional. Nestor displayed no such love, affection, and attachment for a son returned home after a journey as the poem explicitly depicts three times, significantly just before Telemachus's simile. We thus observe the gap between how Telemachus is greeted at home and at Pylos; from this difference, we then note the difference between what Telemachus says in simile and what he actually experienced. Nestor did not receive him as a loving and anxious father with tears and embraces. Telemachus's simile of Nestor's reception of him thus has an edge of irony.

Nestor and Menelaos

Like Telemachus, Menelaos also invokes Nestor as a father figure. His use of a father simile adds further irony both to the idea of Nestor as father and to the *Odyssey's* father similes in general. Menelaos speaks of Nestor when Peisistratos and Telemachus are leaving Sparta:

> χαίρετον, ὦ κούρω, καὶ Νέστορι ποιμένι λαῶν
> εἰπεῖν· ἦ γὰρ ἐμοί γε πατὴρ ὡς ἤπιος ἦεν.
> ἧος ἐνὶ Τροίῃ πολεμίζομεν υἷες Ἀχαιῶν.
> (15.151-53)
>
> Farewell, young men, and speak a word to Nestor, the shepherd of the people;
> for to me he was as gentle as a father
> when we sons of the Achaeans made war in Troy.[39]

[39]These are Menelaos's last words in the poem. Their finality is stressed by Peisistratos's subsequent bid to Menelaos to speak (φράζεο δή, Μενέλαε διοτρεφές, ὄρχαμε λαῶν [Consider / tell, Menelaos] 15.167), which Helen preempts (ὑποφθαμένη 171). Helen manages to anticipate Menelaos in speech since he pauses to deliberate about the meaning of a bird sign. While he ponders how to interpret rightly, Helen precedes him, declaring αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μαντεύσομαι [but I will prophesy] (172). While Menelaos has already once previously suffered Helen's preemptive speech because of his wont to contemplate

In the *Odyssey*, Menelaos says that Nestor was like a father to him when we were making war in Troy. But the extant epic record of that period, the *Iliad*, contains not one scene, let alone any particular affection, between Menelaos and Nestor specifically. They simply had no need to engage with one another in the *Iliad*. In that epic, it was rather Menelaos's brother, Agamemnon, the other Atreides, who received much of Nestor's care and support. It is only in the *Odyssey* that we first hear, indeed from Nestor himself, of some special encounter between Menelaos and Nestor. Nestor's account of his shift in loyalty from Agamemnon to Menelaos seems perfectly tailored to this epic. He recalls to Telemachus how strife arose between Agamemnon and Menelaos, already suggestive of a reevaluation of the two brothers: Menelaos encouraged the men to be mindful of return, while Agamemnon urged a delay to offer hecatombs to Athena. Nestor brands Agamemnon with a narrator's more knowing comment: νήπιος. οὐδὲ τὸ ᾔδη... [fool, he did not know...] (3.146); and he then sides with Menelaos. This is a marked shift from the *Iliad* — one which brings to mind Monro's Law, the observation that the two epics do not overlap or repeat each other. Nestor's account of the Achaean departure from Troy strongly suggests a tale directed toward this epic, in which Menelaos is now the single living hero of the pair of Atreidai. The *Iliad*, a story about the host of the Achaeans led by King Agamemnon, naturally privileges him as the more powerful and threatening of the two heroes (Achilles has rivalry with Agamemnon, not Menelaos). But in this epic, with Agamemnon dead, and Menelaos the remaining and representative hero, Menelaos must be the heroic son of Atreus worthy of Nestor's special support and affection. So Nestor makes Menelaos, adapting past event to present circumstance. And then Menelaos completes this revision when he says that Nestor was like a father to him for the duration of their fighting at Troy, not just at the time of the dispersion of the troops (this latter time safely out of the *Iliad's*

(μερμήριξε 4.117; 15.169), this final instance of their way of interacting draws a marked closing portrait of each of them: Helen is quick to assume the role of the prophet and look into the future, whereas Menelaos's hesitation makes his last words ones wholly directed to the past.

scope). Nestor as a fatherly figure to both Telemachus and Menelaos raises questions about the validity of this comparison.

Eumaeus and Telemachus; Antinoos and Telemachus

After invoking Athena and Nestor as fatherlike to Telemachus, the poem next brings together Telemachus and Eumaeus in a father-son embrace (16.11-22). As I discuss at length in Chapter 2, this simile is the first of several devices which displace the reunion of true father and son. The father and son in simile, Eumaeus and Telemachus, thus participate in the irony of the bigger picture. Finally, in the presence of Odysseus returned to his own house, Telemachus mocks his rhetorical plurality of fathers when he calls the suitor, Antinoos, a father to him (17.397-400)— in outright irony of course.

The king as father

In addition to the similes I have discussed above which liken a character to a father, the *Odyssey* also contains three similes which liken a king to a father. All three describe Odysseus as a king who was as gentle as a father. It would seem that just as the former type of father similes presented Telemachus with a plurality of fathers — Athena-Mentes, Nestor, Eumaeus, and Antinoos — so Odysseus's fatherly kingship would make him a father of many sons. But we saw that all of the father similes which referred to Telemachus were qualified by an undertone of irony, thereby subverting the idea of a multiplicity of fathers. And since the presence of the one father, Odysseus, puts an end to these several father similes, the irony in them indeed points toward a rejection of multiple fathers by analogy in the *Odyssey*. A similar phenomenon characterizes the similes which liken Odysseus to a king as gentle as a father. While this description implies a father-king of many sons, all of these similes describe Odysseus as he was in the past. Accordingly, rather than opening the way to an image of Odysseus as a *patêr* of many sons, these similes actually show him as the one father of one son.

First, in response to Aegyptius's opening question of who called the assembly and why, Telemachus foregrounds the distinction between public and private: "neither do I propose nor speak of any public matter, but of my own need, the evil that fell on my house" (οὔτε τι δήμιον ἄλλο πιφαύσκομαι οὐδ' ἀγορεύω./ ἀλλ' ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος. ὅ μοι κακὰ ἔμπεσεν οἴκῳ 44-45). At this point Telemachus refers to the father in simile:

> τὸ μὲν πατέρ' ἐσθλὸν ἀπώλεσα. ὅς ποτ' ἐν ὑμῖν
> τοίσδεσσιν βασίλευε. πατὴρ δ' ὡς ἤπιος ἦεν·
> (2.46-47)
> I lost my noble father, who once was king among you here,
> and was as gentle as a father;

Telemachus's lines move from the individual private to the inclusive private. His stratagem is to personalize the *dêmos* and thus compel them into empathy: I have lost my father, just as you have lost yours. Telemachus would create all of Ithaca in his own image — sons at a loss in the absence of the father. And technically he is right: the suitors are men of a generation after Odysseus, young enough to be his sons.[40] But when Mentor repeats the idea of the father-king, he annuls Telemachus's attempt to bind the *dêmos* into a community of sons.

Mentor says the people have forgotten Odysseus and so they are not like sons:

> μή τις ἔτι πρόφρων ἀγανὸς καὶ ἤπιος ἔστω
> σκηπτοῦχος βασιλεύς. μηδὲ φρεσὶν αἴσιμα εἰδώς.
> ἀλλ' αἰεὶ χαλεπός τ' εἴη καὶ αἴσυλα ῥέζοι·
> ὡς οὔ τις μέμνηται Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο
> λαῶν οἷσιν ἄνασσε. πατὴρ δ' ὡς ἤπιος ἦεν.
> (2.230-34)
> Do not let any scepter-bearing king henceforth be mild and gentle
> nor know the measure of things in his thoughts,
> but let him be always harsh and do what is unjust;
> since no one remembers godlike Odysseus
> no one of the people over whom he ruled, and he was gentle as a father.

The assembly speeches follow the three-part form of proposition, rejection, and response: Telemachus begins (2.40-79), Antinoos retorts (85-128), and Telemachus answers back in turn (130-145); an omen appears which Halitherses interprets (161-76), Eurymachus reacts against (178-207), and Telemachus answers for (209-223). The third set of speeches

[40]So he calls the suitors "the own sons of these men who are the best here" (τῶν ἀνδρῶν φίλοι υἷες. οἳ ἐνθάδε γ' εἰσὶν ἄριστοι 2.51).

breaks from this pattern abruptly: Mentor rebukes the negligence of the *dêmos* (229-41) and Leokritos rejects his words and scatters the people (243-56). The third component seems to be missing; the poem articulates the breach of form: "thus Leokritos spoke, and released the quick assembly" (ὣς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν [Λειώκριτος]. λῦσεν δ' ἀγορὴν αἰψηρήν 257). Instead of Telemachus's public answer to reinforce Mentor's words, as in the two previous cases, with the assembly dispersed he instead withdraws apart to the sea and prays to Athena; and she answers him in the form and voice of *Mentor*. Thus for the internal audience of the assembly, Leokritos gets the last word and preempts Telemachus from responding, thereby diminishing his stature and dismissing the speech of Mentor. But for the audience of the poem, Telemachus does get to speak in answer. He no longer addresses the assembly, but his speech occurs in exactly the same time sequence it would have ordinarily: Leokritos finishes speaking at line 256, and five lines later we hear the expected voice of Telemachus, beginning with the formal invocation: κλῦθί μευ (262; cf. 25, 161, 229). To our ears, Mentor gets the last word. Telemachus's private response to him affirms the sense of Mentor's words: the others have forgotten their father-king. What might have been a plurality of figurative sons is now just Telemachus alone.

Just as Mentor makes the son only one, so Athena makes the father god singular when she repeats Mentor's words from the assembly in the divine assembly. Athena repeats Mentor's father simile verbatim, but in a different context. Mentor spoke in a vacuum — in a kingdom devoid of its king. His words resound as though he is cursing his actual state. Athena, on the other hand, speaks to a council of the gods in the marked presence of Zeus in all his power: "and the gods sat down to counsel, among them Zeus who thunders on high, whose power is greatest" (οἱ δὲ θεοὶ θῶκόνδε καθίζανον. ἐν δ' ἄρα τοῖσι/ Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης. οὗ τε κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον 5.3-4). And she addresses the assembly: "Father Zeus and other blessed gods who are forever" (Ζεῦ πάτερ ἠδ' ἄλλοι μάκαρες θεοὶ αἰὲν ἐόντες 7).[41] Zeus is thus introduced as the recognized king and

[41]While this line is formulaic, the denomination of Zeus as father is often in significant contexts. That this is so in Athena's address to the council of the gods is clear from both Zeus's corresponding naming

father. Whereas Mentor's rhetoric is addressed primarily to the people of Ithaca, rendering the absent good king and gentle father a figure of the forgotten past, Athena directs her words to the very present Father Zeus.

Athena calls upon Father Zeus her father and presents him with two kinds of kings: the gentle and just king versus the harsh and unjust one. Forgotten Odysseus was of the former kind — he was gentle as a father. This comes as an implicit challenge: which kind of king, father, are you? With the mention of the *êpios* father, Athena circumscribes his choice. In view of the abstract idea, and ideal, of what a father is, she leaves him little choice — could Zeus now be anything but *êpios* to her as father (as he always has been) and not to everyone else as king? For Athena then, a king as gentle as a father is an imperative of how one in such a position ought to act. Her use of the father simile thus departs from its usual concern with likeness and relationship and concerns imposition and bindingness. For her the father is one and only one, Zeus. Or, to use the terms introduced at the beginning of this discussion of father similes in both epics, the loosening inherent in simile here moves to the singularity of symbol.

As I have already observed, the *Odyssey's* several father similes come to a halt in Book 17 when the father himself is back home with his son. A clear aim of the poem is for the thing itself bared of disguise, lies, similitude. The manyness achieved by likeness is overcome by the oneness of identity. And yet, as the discussion of Odysseus's reunion with Laertes in Chapter 2 will show, this epic of *mêtis* has one last trick to play. In another poem, the realization of singularity suggested in the last third of the poem might be accepted as its sole desired destination. But it is harder to accept this linear reading of the *Odyssey* not just because it is not a wholly linear narrative, but moreover, because

---

of Athena as τέκνον ἐμόν (22), and their similarly familial tone of exchange in the first, rather parallel, council of the gods in Book 1 (26-95). There Zeus is referred to as father three times and when Athena addresses the assembly she calls on ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη. ὔπατε κρειόντων (46 = 81) alone, not mentioning the other gods at all. Again Zeus calls Athena "my child" (1.64 = 5.22); and in his answer to her he insists, careful of family politics, that he could never forget about Odysseus (65) and Poseidon is to blame.

Odysseus cannot be his one self without being many — *polutropos*.[42] The realization of the one father at the end of the poem thus remains a question, now at a whole other level.

The epic poems' father similes can be looked at from one further angle. Each poem contains one diegetic father simile. When we juxtapose them, the different themes of the poems in relation to fathers and sons appear in all their simplicity. The *Iliad's* diegetic father simile is one of bereavement: Achilles mourns Patroklos like a father for his son. The *Odyssey's* is one of restoration: Eumaeus welcomes Telemachus like a father greeting a son arrived home after a long journey to faraway lands. From these two similes alone we see that in broad terms, the *Iliad* tells the story of loss and separation, of the inverted order of the deaths of sons; the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, portrays the opposite — the return of the son to the father, the overcoming of danger and death. The father similes, with all their nuance and complexity, also tell the simple stories of the two poems. Within the poet's own code of simile, the topic of fathers and sons is a central point upon which the two epics intersect and diverge in more ways than one.

[42]Cf. Pucci 1982, 51: "Odysseus confronts all situations repeatedly with the same wily, disguised mind, but his devices sometimes vary. As a result, the character, Odysseus, inasmuch as he is fully contained and distinct in his manyness, emerges in the accumulating and in the exploitation of having accumulated the same and the different from the same. Such a structure implies that Odysseus, while repeating himself, is also constantly on the track of otherness. This condition is the cause and/or effect that makes Odysseus resourceful, devious and wily. For his manyness as repetition means that he is always removed in advance from himself, always split: he is always himself and other than himself."

Chapter I.1: Immortal Fathers and Immortal / Semi-Divine Sons in the *Iliad*

Introduction

The *Iliad* contains only one immortal father of immortal sons: Zeus. The poem sings of Zeus "the father of men and gods," but evidently his story as the father cannot be told without reference to him as the son. For his number of father epithets vies with his son ones for frequency. Out of all his sixty-one epithets, those for father and son recur most frequently, but the ones for "father" (πατήρ) appear ninety times, a close second to the ninety-eight occurrences of his epithets for "son" — Κρονίδης (36 times), Κρονίων (49 times), Κρόνου πάις (12 times) or Κρόνου υἱε (1 time).[43]

The recollections of Zeus as son through his epithet, "son of Kronos," may remind one of Zeus's violent overthrow of his father.[44] Their frequency may keep one in mind of those past struggles over divine supremacy. But such reminders of Zeus's history of generational conflict exhaust the topic: that is the subject of a different kind of poem. Instead of moving through the theogonic time of generations, the *Iliad* describes only a terminus: Zeus is fixed in an essentially stable reign, the men are the final, culminating generation of heroes.[45] Threats to Zeus's dominion do occur in the poem, but not from his

---

[43]His other epithets in the *Iliad* are far less frequent — the next most common is 49 forms of "aegis-bearing," then 28 of "cloud-gathering," after which the frequency of epithets drops down into the teens, with some occurring just a few times. Two other gods appear with the epithet πατήρ: Poseidon (1 time) and Nereus (4 times). But neither are immortal fathers of immortal sons: Poseidon is referred to as the father of the two mortal Moliones (11.751); and Nereus is of course the father of the goddess Thetis (1.358, 396; 18.36, 141). In the *Odyssey*, Zeus is also equally, though less frequently, father and son: πατήρ 32 times and son 32 times. See Dee 1994.

[44]On allusions in epic see Slatkin 1991, xiii-xvi. On this allusion to Zeus's overthrow of Kronos in particular, see 14.203-204, discussed below.

[45]On the relationship of heroic epic to theogonic poetry, see Thalmann 1984, xii-xiv; and Clay 1989, 10-12. Scholars like Louise Cowan and Bruce King have recently articulated how epic is positioned at the transition just before the end of one way of life and the beginning of another. "This is to say that epic displays on a panoramic scale an entire way of life — caught, it is true, at a moment of radical change and yet, viewed from an omni-dimensional standpoint, in that very act transfigured and preserved. ... The poet sees his society as standing between two worlds; ... Hence, in this work of recovering a past which, though worthy of reverence, is almost certain to be (or has already been) overturned, the epic imagination

sons specifically. They are instead from a variety of relations and in a variety of degree: from his wife Hera, and his brother Poseidon; and less seriously from his daughter Athena, and only from one son, Ares. Rather than a poem of conflict between divine father and son, the *Iliad* tells of the growing closeness of the divine father to his sons — sons immortal and mortal. It shows Zeus move from an impersonal to a personal "father of men and gods."

The following analysis of the immortal father, Zeus, and his immortal sons, Apollo, Ares, Hephaistos, and Hermes, falls into three major sections. I begin with a preliminary view of Zeus as son. Once he is shifted into the role of divine father, I discuss Zeus's relationships with Ares and Apollo. Here I will consider how the poem solves the old theogonic issue of the divine son's overthrow of his father. Finally I consider Zeus's relationships with Hephaistos and Hermes, relationships which frame the poem. I will show how they enact the movement of Zeus from a distant, objectified father to one drawn close to sons, immortal and mortal. I end the chapter with a discussion of Zeus's paternal care for a mortal son like a god, Hector; and by extension, for mortal sons in general.

Zeus as son

Beyond patronymic epithets, the poem refers to Zeus as a son only in Book 14, a book of challenges to his supremacy. Of all the gods, only Hera recalls Zeus as a son enthralled to his father, a recollection appropriate to her current aim of seducing Zeus in order to bind him in sleep. Keeping her true intent secret, she goes to Aphrodite and tells her that she is going to the limits of the earth where she might reconcile Okeanos and Tethys:

> δεξάμενοι Ῥείας, ὅτε τε Κρόνον εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
> γαίης νέρθε καθεῖσε καὶ ἀτρυγέτοιο θαλάσσης.
> (14.203-204)
> they received me from Rhea, when loud-sounding Zeus
> thrust Kronos down beneath the earth and unresting sea.

---

is pulled two ways, toward death and birth, and engaged in a double mode of vision, both elegiac and prophetic" (Cowan 1992, 3-5). Cf. King 1997.

The idea of the *Iliad* as the end of the heroic age is rather standard; for a good account of this idea, see Edwards, A.T. 1985.

Aphrodite interprets this recollection of Zeus's triumph over his father as testimony of Zeus's power; she acquiesces to Hera as to one not to be denied since she "sleeps in the arms of Zeus" (14.213). Having procured the charms of Aphrodite, Hera goes to Zeus and also tells him her false plans to go to Okeanos and Tethys. Flattering as her recollection of Zeus's triumph over his father would be to Zeus, Hera omits these lines when she repeats the lie to him. As will soon become clear, she leaves out Zeus's past feat so as not to put him in mind of the very goal which is lurking behind her seductiveness: the son's overthrow, with some help from his mother, of the reigning father. For the poem goes on to show that Hera attempts to bind Zeus not just temporarily in sleep, but permanently in the locking chamber which her son, Hephaistos, made for her.

Hera reveals her design when she feigns modesty and invites Zeus to make love not out in the open but inside the enclosed bedroom which Hephaistos built:

> ἔστιν τοι θάλαμος, τόν τοι φίλος υἱὸς ἔτευξεν
> Ἥφαιστος, πυκιναὶ δὲ θύρας σταθμοῖσιν ἐπῆρσεν·
> (14.338-39)
> There is your bed-chamber which your own son fashioned,
> Hephaistos, and fitted strong doors upon the door-posts.

Earlier, in her private thoughts, the poem described this bedroom as one Hephaistos fashioned for her, his mother, fitted not only with sturdy doors, but — as she leaves out from her persuasion of Zeus — with a secret bolt only she might open (14.166-68). Hera aims to lure Zeus into the chamber Hephaistos made for her and there lock him up as her prisoner. Through the agency of their son, Hera — like Rhea before her — endeavors to bring about the change of generations by trapping the father in some inescapable confinement. She would have Zeus locked away by Hephaistos just as Kronos was by Zeus.

The poem brings together that past time of the rule of Kronos and the present of Zeus in its comparison of Zeus's desire for Hera now and then. When Zeus sees Hera made irresistible by the help of Aphrodite, eros dazzles him like it did the first time:

> οἷον ὅτε πρῶτόν περ ἐμισγέσθην φιλότητι,
> εἰς εὐνὴν φοιτῶντε, φίλους λήθοντε τοκῆας. (14.295-96)

such as when first they mingled in love,
going together to bed and escaping the notice of their parents.

Zeus's desire for Hera goes back to a time before he thrust Kronos beneath the land and sea, returning to a kind of original time, of firsts — ὅτε πρῶτον. Just as Hera feigns to go to Okeanos, the "genesis" of the gods (14.302), so Zeus returns to an origin. The origin to which Zeus returns was marked by an act of deception — the couple evading the notice of their parents. Hera's pretense to return to a place of origin is also an act of deception. The difference is one of the parties involved. In the earlier time, the children, Zeus and Hera, deceived their parents, Kronos and Rhea, so that they could make love illicitly. In the narrative present, the wife, Hera, deceives her husband, Zeus. The former relationship, of children and parents, naturally includes the concept of replacement: a child will one day grow up to take the place of the parents who pass away, or for gods, are overthrown. A child's act of disobedience contains the seeds of ultimate replacement, as the poem's two allusions to Zeus's relationship to Kronos demonstrate: Zeus mingled with Hera without the notice of their parents (14.295-96) and later thrust Kronos beneath land and sea (14.203-204). But the relationship between wife and husband is not structurally one of replacement and thus Hera's deception of Zeus cannot pose that kind of threat to him. To effect such an end, the wife must go through the child, as did Rhea with Zeus to defeat Kronos. And so Hera must try to defeat Zeus through the help of her son, Hephaistos.

Hephaistos is a likely candidate for the son who takes the part of his mother against his father. In Book 1, he recounted how he had once suffered for trying to save his mother, contrary to his father's pleasure (1.590ff.).[46] But despite Hera's affinity with Hephaistos, he is also too much associated with his father to expel him, as we will discuss below. Try as she will, Hera cannot effect a repetition of Rhea's triumph over her husband through the agency of their son.[47] Zeus was once the son better than his father and Hera

[46]Outside of Homer, Hera conceived and bore Hephaistos on her own as a counterpart to Zeus's birth of Athena (Hesiod, *Th.* 925ff.). See further Janko 1992, 199.

[47]She makes a later attempt with Ares (15.111-12), as we will see below.

seeks to repeat such pattern. But, as stated above, the theogonic story of the violent succession of divine generations is not the plot of the *Iliad*, which tells instead of the father's growing closeness to his sons. How the *Iliad* has solved the problem of generational succession appears in the poem's presentation of Zeus's relationships with two of his sons, Ares and Apollo.

Apollo and Ares

Apollo and Ares are opposed in the poem as two kinds of sons: Apollo, of like mind with Zeus, enjoys a harmonious relationship with him; Ares, baneful to all including his father, struggles against him in an imperfect peace between father and son.[48] The difference between these two divine sons centers in part around their contrasting reactions to the heroic deaths of two semi-divine sons: Ares rebels against his father when he learns of the death of his son, Askalaphos; Apollo, on the other hand, assists Zeus in the process of Sarpedon's death. Apollo — aligned with the beneficent aspects of death, Hupnos and Thanatos (16.676-683) — moves with his father into the masculine control over heroic death. Ares — a figure of the blood and terror of the battlefield — resists the transformation of death into a benign and glorious cultural object.

In Book 13, Deiphobus kills Ares's son, Askalaphos (13.518-19). Unlike other semi-divine children or divine favorites, such as Aeneas or Paris, who are protected by a watchful god in battle, Ares is long ignorant of his son's death (13.521-22). Not until Book 15, the aftermath of Hera's rebellion against Zeus, does Hera provocatively inform Ares of his loss. Her seemingly casual news of Askalaphos's death is really an invitation to incite Ares to rebel. Zeus, she says, thinks that he among all the gods is best in might and strength (φησὶν γὰρ ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι / κάρτει τε σθένει 15.107-108). Thus, she continues, everyone must accept whatever evil he sends to them. Ares then provides

[48]On Apollo as Zeus's "right hand man," see Muellner 102-104; I also discuss this further below.

Hera's case in point: she concludes her speech with the example that now it is Ares who suffers since his most beloved son has fallen in battle:

> υἱὸς γάρ οἱ ὄλωλε μάχῃ ἔνι, φίλτατος ἀνδρῶν,
> Ἀσκάλαφος, τόν φησιν ὃν ἔμμεναι ὄβριμος Ἄρης.
> (15.111-112)
>
> For his son perished in battle, the most beloved of men,
> Askalaphos, whom mighty Ares claims to be his own.

Hera puts forth two claims: Zeus's idea (φήσιν 107) that he is mightiest among the gods and Ares's belief (φησιν 112) that he is the father of Askalaphos. Both are challenges to Ares. The first infringes upon his *timê* as the god of sheer physical force; the latter questions his paternity of his cherished son. Having failed to defy Zeus with her son Hephaistos, she now incites their other son, Ares, to rebel against the father. Her speech ends with a rousing call to Ares by name: ὄβριμος Ἄρης (112). And her persuasion produces the desired effect. Ares swears vengeance for the death of his son even if it means getting as close to death as an immortal can — "even if it be my fate to be smitten with the lightning bolt of Zeus and to lie low in blood and dust amid the dead" (εἴ πέρ μοι καὶ μοῖρα Διὸς πληγέντι κεραυνῷ/ κεῖσθαι ὁμοῦ νεκύεσσι μεθ' αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσιν 15.117-18).[49]

Ares and death

Well before this episode, the poem has represented Ares as a god who has much to do with death, even beyond his obvious role as the god of war and violence. Dione lists him first among the three gods — Ares, Hera, and Hades — who have before been wounded by men. Unlike Hera and Hades, Ares was not wounded with an arrow, but confined in

[49]On Ares's gesture here of smiting his thighs which usually indicates imminent harm (15.113-14), see Lowenstam 1981. In preparation for taking vengeance, Ares calls on his immortal sons, Terror and Rout, to harness his horses. These sons of Ares comprise a pair of immortal father -- immortal sons. The most that can be said about them from the context, however, is that they seem to do Ares's bidding without hesitation (no obedience problems here). This satellite quality is even more pronounced in the other appearance of Phobos as the son of Ares where he follows (ἕσπετο) Ares into battle. Although Hesiod tells of Terror and Rout as the sons of Ares by Aphrodite (*Th.* 934), in Homer they are little more than attributes of their father. This latter idea is in and of itself significant: it seems reflective of a fantasy that the child be the embodiment of one paternal characteristic. For a god, no more than that would be ideal.

bonds, a traditional means of permanently subduing — approximately killing — a god.[50] Dione gives a rather abbreviated account of how Ares endured this affront by men: Otos and Ephialtes, sons of Aloeos, bound him in a bronze jar for thirteen months. Had the step-mother of these two men, Eeriboia, not told Hermes, who then stole him out of the jar, Ares would have perished.[51] Remarkable about this passage is its suggestion that the god could actually die: Ares was already wasting away (ἤδη τειρόμενον 5.391) and would have perished (ἀπόλοιτο 5.388).

By the end of Book 5, Dione's narrative of Ares's past suffering at the hands of men has been repeated in the present action. With Athena behind him, Diomedes has wounded Ares in the nethermost hollow under the ribs (νείατον ἐς κενεῶνα 5.857), a wound which we know is fatal to a mortal man since Patroklos dies from this (16.821). When Ares explains his wounded condition to his father, he emphasizes the potentiality of his demise. Diomedes, Ares complains, rushed upon, but he hastened away in time:

> αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' αὐτῷ μοι ἐπέσσυτο δαίμονι ἶσος·
> ἀλλά μ' ὑπήνεικαν ταχέες πόδες· ἦ τέ κε δηρὸν
> αὐτοῦ πήματ' ἔπασχον ἐν αἰνῇσιν νεκάδεσσιν.
> ἤ κε ζὼς ἀμενηνὸς ἔα χαλκοῖο τυπῇσι.
>
> (5.884-87)
>
> And then he [Diomedes], equal to a god, rushed upon me;
> but my swift feet carried me out of danger; otherwise for a long time
> I would have suffered woes among the heaps of the dead,
> or I would have been living without vitality because of the blows of the bronze.

Mortal and immortal are confused in this passage. Diomedes is equal to a god (δαίμονι ἶσος), and Ares imagines himself among the dead. The god places himself into death in two ways: either by suffering among the heaps of corpses, or alive but strengthless, ἀμενηνὸς being a key word to describe the "stupid" dead.[52] As Richard Martin has suggested to me, it seems that only Ares has this distinction of coming so close to death since he is the god who makes others die.

---

[50]Cf., for example, 1.401. On binding the gods, see Detienne and Vernant 1978, *passim*.

[51]On the binding of Ares by Otos and Ephialtes, see Detienne and Vernant 1978, 78.

[52]The formulaic description is repeated four times in the *Odyssey*: νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα (10.521, 536; 11.29, 49). This adjective also describes a dream at *Od.* 19.562. On the "stupid dead," see Vermeule 1979, 1-42.

Ares and Zeus

As a result of Diomedes's spear thrust to his "nethermost belly," Ares quickly goes to Zeus on Olympus, shows him the blood flowing from his wound and laments to his father:

> Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὐ νεμεσίζῃ ὁρῶν τάδε καρτερὰ ἔργα:
> αἰεί τοι ῥίγιστα θεοὶ τετληότες εἰμὲν
> ἀλλήλων ἰότητι, χάριν δ' ἄνδρεσσι φέροντες.
> σοὶ πάντες μαχόμεσθα· σὺ γὰρ τέκες ἄφρονα κούρην,
> οὐλομένην, ἣ τ' αἰὲν ἀήσυλα ἔργα μέμηλεν.
> ἄλλοι μὲν γὰρ πάντες, ὅσοι θεοί εἰσ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ,
> σοί τ' ἐπιπείθονται καὶ δεδμήμεσθα ἕκαστος·
> ταύτην δ' οὔτ' ἔπει προτιβάλλεαι οὔτε τι ἔργῳ,
> ἀλλ' ἀνιεῖς, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς ἐγείναο παῖδ' ἀίδηλον·
>
> (5.872-80)
>
> Father Zeus, are you not angry seeing these violent deeds?
> Always we gods suffer most cruelly
> by the will of one another when we show favor to men.
> We all do battle with you; for you bore that senseless and baneful girl,
> who is ever eager for lawless deeds.
> For all the other gods as many are in Olympus,
> are obedient and subject to you, each one of us;
> but you pay no heed to her either in word or deed,
> but you urge her on, since you yourself gave birth to this baneful child.

From Ares's point of view, the pantheon is divided into three parts: all the gods (as many as there are on Olympus), Zeus (against whom they all fight), because of Athena (to whom evil deeds are always a concern). In the poem's only repetition of οὐλομένην, ἣ... Ares effectively speaks a new proem, rearranging causes and reassigning parts. In his present filial perspective, right and wrong is a matter of obedience and submission to the father (878): only Athena is exempt from the rules, he complains, "because you yourself (*autos*) bore that destructive child" (880) and thus grant her special allowances.[53] The problem among the Olympians, as Ares sees it, is Athena's wicked nature and Zeus's paternal indulgence of it.[54]

---

[53]Leaf notes that Scholium B glosses *autos* as *monos*, i.e. without a mother. But, Leaf proposes, it need not mean more than 'you yourself' since the legend of the birth of Athena from Zeus's head is not found in Homer (Leaf 1960, 253). However, it could well be alluded to here.

[54]Katerina Synodinou (1986, 155-64) takes this speech of Ares as a starting point for an investigation of the relationship between Zeus and Athena in the poem. Although she pays lip service to its specificity in context (157), she nevertheless continues to use it for the sake of her argument as a claim to argue for and against. That is, she posits a very weak "straw man" in Ares's words here. Of course this speech is determined by Ares's present point of view.

Zeus reproaches Ares by turning Ares's words around back onto him. For indeed, Ares has imposed onto Athena the character most frequently associated with *his* bellicose and bloody nature.[55] Zeus is quick to reorder the stock personalities and relationships, and reassign the blame where it is due. *Ares*, Zeus says, is the one who is contentious and hateful; and it is only because I am your father, Zeus continues, that *Ares* is cared for at all. Zeus removes Ares's castigations from Athena and places them back onto Ares himself:

> μή τί μοι, ἀλλοπρόσαλλε, παρεζόμενος μινύριζε.
> ἔχθιστος δέ μοί ἐσσι θεῶν οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν·
> αἰεὶ γάρ τοι ἔρις τε φίλη πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε.
> μητρός τοι μένος ἐστὶν ἀάσχετον, οὐκ ἐπιεικτόν,
> Ἥρης. τὴν μὲν ἐγὼ σπουδῇ δάμνημ' ἐπέεσσι·
> τῷ σ' οἴῳ κείνης τάδε πάσχειν ἐννεσίῃσιν.
> ἀλλ' οὐ μάν σ' ἔτι δηρὸν ἀνέξομαι ἄλγε' ἔχοντα·
> ἐκ γὰρ ἐμεῦ γένος ἐσσί, ἐμοὶ δέ σε γείνατο μήτηρ·
> εἰ δέ τευ ἐξ ἄλλου γε θεῶν γένευ ὧδ' ἀίδηλος,
> καί κεν δὴ πάλαι ἦσθα ἐνέρτερος Οὐρανιώνων.
> (5.889-98)
>
> Do not, double-faced, sit beside me whimpering.
> Of all the gods who hold Olympus you are most hateful to me;
> for always strife and wars and battle are dear to you.
> You have the ungovernable, unyielding spirit of your mother,
> Hera. Her I barely subdue with words.
> I think that you suffer these things from her promptings.
> But no longer will I endure you having pain.
> For you are my offspring, your mother bore you to me;
> if you were born from any other god and were thus baneful,
> long ago you would have been lower than the sons of Ouranos.

By the end of Zeus's rebuke, Ares is the baneful, ἀίδηλος (897), child rather than Athena, as Ares had complained (880). Zeus blames Ares's mother, Hera, for his unyielding nature. In the Homeric poems, only Ares and Hephaistos are the Olympian offspring of Zeus and Hera. The combination of the hateful, unbearable Ares and the lame, comic Hephaistos produces the sense that even with Zeus, Hera can only produce children of some monstrosity.[56] In this exchange between immortal father and immortal son, Zeus defends his paternal order by aligning the undesirable elements with the maternal side. But

---

[55]A kind of "sibling transference" as it were induced by guilt; and it is interesting that Ares begins both this speech to his father as well as the one in Book 15 to all the gods with words anticipating anger and blame, as though he is continually feeling guilty or at least susceptible to blame: cf. "Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὐ νεμεσίζῃ...;" (5.872) and "μὴ νῦν μοι νεμεσήσετ', Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες" (15.115).

[56]Cf. her monstrous offspring in Hesiod's *Theogony* 925ff.

he does not disclaim his paternity: regardless of his hate for his son, the tie between them is binding. And Zeus honors that bond forthwith, his harsh words notwithstanding.

In his first words to his son, Zeus commanded that he not sit beside him whimpering (889). By the end of the scene, Ares, healed, bathed, and beautifully dressed (905), once again sits at the side of his father: πὰρ δὲ Διὶ Κρονίωνι καθέζετο κύδει γαίων (906). Book 5 ends with a restoration of order; Ares by the side of Zeus appears as a necessary evil which has an integral place high up — as opposed to Zeus's threat to make him lower — in the divine system. Despite all the angry words, there is an ultimate acceptance, a kind of mutual acknowledgement, between father and son. Athena and Ares, in their opposition, show themselves in a dialectic relationship: they are two sides of one whole, of the *mêtis* and *biê* which makes up war.[57] Zeus's great affection for Athena, who is ultimately linked with Ares, must to some extent recognize Ares, too. For in order to have masculine heroic death, one still needs the bloody battle which is Ares.

Apollo

Contrary to Ares, Zeus never struggles with Apollo since they are much alike in spirit. Unlike Ares who is very much his mother's son, Apollo is his father's. In their first interaction, Zeus speaks to Apollo as to a reflection of himself: in one line he refers to his own hands (χεῖρας ἐμάς 15.229), and in the next line to Apollo's (ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ἐν χείρεσσι 15.230).[58] And it is indeed an emblem of himself that Zeus puts into Apollo's hands — his tasselled aegis.[59]

---

[57]Cf. Vian 1985, 58.

[58]For another instance of hands creating likeness, cf. 24.477-78: "Great Priam stood by him [Achilles] close;/ His [Priam's] hands took Achilles's knees; he kissed his [Achilles's] hands." Redfield comments: "This likeness [between Priam and Achilles] is perhaps already there in line 478, which begins with one pair of hands and ends with the other" (1975, 215).

[59]"...it [the aegis] symbolizes his [Zeus's] power, although Homer no longer knew exactly why" (Janko 1992, 261). Janko notes further that in one version, Zeus used the aegis to defeat the Titans — significant to the order of this speech wherein he has just referred to their defeat (15.225). Earlier, Agamemnon said that the day will come when sacred Troy will fall and Zeus himself will shake the aegis (Ζεὺς δέ σφι Κρονίδης ὑψίζυγος. αἰθέρι ναίων./ αὐτὸς ἐπισσείῃσιν ἐρεμνὴν αἰγίδα πᾶσι 4.166-67). (1992, 250-51; 261).

The poem shows Apollo fulfilling the behest of his father as he leads Hector and the Trojans and carries the paternal aegis —the symbol of Zeus's power— in his hands (15.307-311). The relationship between Zeus and Apollo in Book 15 thus portrays an ideal trust and fluidity between father and son. In the recuperation of his power after awakening from Hera's deception, Zeus vacillates between the imperfect obedience of Hera, Ares, and Poseidon and the more absolute obedience of Athena, Iris and Apollo. Unlike all the others (except the structurally neutral messenger, Iris), only Apollo does not act out of fear of Zeus's might, but from like-mindedness. Thus the questions put to Zeus's supremacy by Poseidon's independent disobedience starting in Book 13, and Hera's deception of Zeus in Book 14, and Ares's rising to Hera's provocation to disobey in 15, are answered in this final scene of Apollo's perfect obedience.

In Book 16, Apollo again acts in accord with Zeus. In this critical episode of the poem, Zeus reluctantly sanctions his son Sarpedon's death.[60] When Zeus considers the possibility of saving his son from death, Hera cushions its necessity with the suggestion that once Sarpedon has been killed, Zeus can send Death and Sleep to carry his body out of the battle and back to Lycia where it will be duly honored (453-57). Zeus agrees to Hera's compensation and entrusts to Apollo the care of Sarpedon's body and its transference to Sleep and Death (666-75). Apollo readily concurs with his father's instructions to remove Sarpedon's body from out of the battle, to bathe, anoint, and dress it in immortal clothes, and to give it over to Sleep and Death (16.676 = 15.236).

The death of Sarpedon

Before acquiescing in Sarpedon's death, Zeus has already twice saved him in battle (5.662; 12.402-403). By the beginning of Book 15, the death of Sarpedon is no longer open to

[60]In this book, an important pattern which structures the poem begins to become evident. Thalmann observes: "The later books of the *Iliad* progress by a rhythm of significant deaths that are related to one another by a complex of shared motifs" (1984, 45). The poem makes this death memorable by its dreadful foreshadowing in 5.662, by Zeus's reluctance to give in to its fulfillment (16.431-38), by the shower of bloody raindrops Zeus sends to honor his son (16.459-61), and the unusual (in Homer) caretakers of the dead, Sleep and Death (16.454; 672; 682).

question: when Zeus awakens from the sleep Hera imposed on him, he announces his design up to the fall of Troy. He classifies the death of Sarpedon among those of the other warriors Patroklos will kill (15.66-67). Albeit indirectly, the loss of Sarpedon can be shown to be part of Zeus's promise to Thetis to honor her son Achilles: Sarpedon's death is a kind of sacrifice for the glory of Patroklos, which in turn reflects on Achilles. We know that Zeus is thinking along this line of reasoning since he closes this prophetic speech on that topic of his promise to Thetis (15.74-77). The honor of one son requires the loss of another, many others. Zeus has chosen to honor the son of Thetis over all others, even his own. In this poem which rests on the giving of honor to a semi-divine son, Zeus gives the greatest honor by sacrificing his own semi-divine son for the sake of that other one. Through the episode of Sarpedon's death, Zeus progresses from an impersonal supreme *patêr* to a divine genitor concerned with the death of his biological son — just like Ares — and again to the divine *patêr*, but one who now looks with pity over the deaths of all sons. Let us look more closely at this critical death.

The episode of Sarpedon's death begins with his entry into the battle and ends with the removal of his body from out of it, occupying over 264 lines at the center of Book 16. Whitman, in his analysis of the geometric structure of individual books of the *Iliad* and the poem as a whole, has shown the ring-structure of Book 16. Starting from the beginning and so comprising the largest frame, balanced scenes depict Patroklos's despatch and death; these scenes frame two battles, by the ships and by the wall of Troy; these battles finally frame the book's central episode, the duel with Sarpedon and its aftermath.[61] This central episode has a ring-form of its own. The outermost frame contains Sarpedon's entry into the action (419-30) balanced by the removal of his body from the action (666-83); this frame surrounds the smaller frame of Zeus on Olympus considering saving his son (431-61) and later pondering the death of his son (644-65); finally Sarpedon's death (462-507) and the battle for Sarpedon's body (563-644) enclose the center of Glaukos's intervention

[61]Whitman 1958, 282-83; Janko 1992, 311.

(508-62).[62] Zeus plays an active part three times in the representation of his son's death. The death itself is surrounded by two scenes of Zeus on Olympus; and during the struggle over Sarpedon's body, Zeus lends some small support. The ring structure of this episode thus reveals the death of the mortal son schematically embraced as it were by the divine father.

Unlike the previous episode of Sarpedon in battle wherein Zeus's activity also comprised a frame by sending his son into battle and taking him out of it (12.292-93; 402-403), Zeus takes part at different stages of this latter action. In Book 16, Sarpedon is motivated on his own to confront the destructive Patroklos; the sight of his comrades falling in the battle takes the place of Zeus's encouragement in Book 12. Thus the father does not send his son to his death in battle. He comes into the action only once the duel between Sarpedon and Patroklos is already begun. He comes in at a distance, from the perspective of the height of Olympus. That distance, symbolic of Zeus's supremacy in general and the ultimate difference between this immortal father and mortal son in particular, fixes Zeus in his divinity and Sarpedon in his mortality.

The simile describing the meeting of Sarpedon and Patroklos in battle contributes to this particular (and ambivalent) consideration of height. The two heroes clash like birds of prey fighting stridently on a high rock (πέτρῃ ἐφ' ὑψηλῇ 429). The simile is disturbing in two ways. First, in regard to the warriors, it suggests that the way men can approach greater height (of divinity) is their intimacy with death — as birds who feed off the dead and battle each other potentially to the death. Moreover, the simile associates Kronidês Zeus with these predatory birds in their similar epithets:

> οἱ δ' ὥς τ' αἰγυπιοὶ γαμψώνυχες ἀγκυλοχεῖλαι
> πέτρῃ ἐφ' ὑψηλῇ μεγάλα κλάζοντε μάχωνται,
> ὡς οἱ κεκλήγοντες ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ὄρουσαν.
> τοὺς δὲ ἰδὼν ἐλέησε Κρόνου πάις ἀγκυλομήτεω,
> Ἥρην δὲ προσέειπε κασιγνήτην ἄλοχον τε·
>
> (16.428-32)
>
> Just as birds of prey with hooked talons and hooked beaks
> do battle upon a high rock screeching greatly,

[62]Clark and Coulson 1978, 65ff. (cited in Janko 1992, 371).

so they with such cries rushed upon one another.
And the son of crooked-counselling Kronos seeing them felt pity,
and addressed Hera, his sister and wife;

Zeus's nomination here, Κρόνου πάις ἀγκυλομήτεω, surely reflects the description of the birds as ἀγκυλοχεῖλαι.[63] Both adjectives occupy the same metrical position and are emphatically placed at line end. Janko points out that this description of Zeus (Κρόνου πάις ἀγκυλομήτεω) occurs only eight times in the poem compared to its metrically equivalent formula, πατὴρ (δ') ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, which occurs much more often, thirty-six times.[64] Thus the poet could have used a different, more usual epithet — and one appropriately explicit of the "father theme"— for Zeus in this line, but chose one resonant with the simile instead.[65] The turn from the simile to the description of Zeus thus produces an image of Zeus up on Olympus like a bird of prey on high, full of violence and and an eagerness for death.[66] But this figural bird of prey is also one who is said to feel pity. "Crooked-counselling" describes Kronos, not Zeus. At this critical moment when Zeus takes on the role of the father standing over the death of his son, the poem remembers Zeus's father who pitilessly desired the deaths of all his children. There seems to be an anxiety that Zeus will simply become another killer of sons like his father before him. But while his epithet yokes the divine father and son, Zeus's pity distinguishes him and his relationship to the death of his son from that of his father with his thoughtless killing of his sons. In this one line, Zeus moves away from his father and toward his mortal son.

---

[63]On Kronos's *mêtis* versus Zeus's, see Detienne and Vernant 1978, 88-90.

[64]Janko 1992, 375. These are statistics for both epics. The former formula occurs only in the *Iliad*.

[65]Richard Martin points out to me the suitability of the usual "father of men and gods" epithet in this passage where Zeus is doubly father — *patêr* and genitor.

[66]Cf. 7.58-61 where Athena and Apollo sit like vultures (αἰγυπιοῖσι) to watch Hektor in single combat. These lines also repeat the idea of height, with the gods now specifically on high (ὑψηλῇ):

κὰδ' δ' ἄρ' Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων
ἑζέσθην ὄρνισιν ἐοικότες αἰγυπιοῖσι
φηγῷ ἐφ'ὑψηλῇ πατρὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.
ἀνδράσι τερπόμενοι. (7.58-61)

Then Athena and Apollo of the silver bow sat down like birds, vultures, upon the high oak of father Zeus the aegis-bearer, taking pleasure in the men.

For other references to gods as birds in both Homeric epics, see Carter 1995, 287-89 (I use Carter's translation here).

Part of Zeus's difference from his father in their ways of overseeing the deaths of their sons is the mindfulness with which they do so. In Zeus's deliberation over whether to snatch Sarpedon living from out of the battle or to let him die, he considers the latter option in the first person, assuming responsibility for it: ἦ ἤδη ὑπὸ χερσὶ Μενοιτιάδαο δαμάσσω (Or whether I shall subdue him now under the hands of the son of Menoitios 16.436-38). Although it is standard practice for this verb to occur when a man is killed by a god through the hands of a mortal man, its use in the first person is unique. Even in this same scene, when Hera repeats this verb she depersonalizes it: 'allow him to be killed' (ἔασον ... / ... δαμῆναι 16.451-52). The diction suggests that Zeus knowingly assumes the responsibility of the death of his son.[67]

Zeus does not kill his son but allows him to be killed (cf. 16.521-22). Before and after the expiration of Sarpedon's life, Zeus sends down divine signs. First he honors his son's imminent death with a shower of bloody drops (16.459-460). Then, when Sarpedon lies dead and the battle is fought over him, he stretches baneful night over the battle, making the struggle over the body all the more baneful.[68] Blood and night respectively symbolize, among other things, the essence of mortality and the permanence of death. They stand for something mortal and dimming, but their existence as symbols inherently transforms what is transient into something everlasting. Indeed, to send down night is to imitate death while at the same time covering over death itself, much like the poet who recounts the deaths of heroes in similar symbolic language which simultaneously describes and memorializes their dying. Zeus's divine signs thus surround Sarpedon's biological end with acculturated images of death, heroizing it before and after, counteracting the disintegration of bodily death.

---

[67]Cf. the deliberation over the death of Hektor where Zeus speaks of this killing by all the gods, δαμάσσομεν (22.176). (And cf. also the usual word for saving him from death: σαώσομεν 175).

[68]That Zeus does not participate in the moment of Sarpedon's biological death is made clear in the diction around the night he sends down. While night is a common image of metaphorical death, its adjective and verb here unmistakably distinguish it from the dark death that covers a hero when he biologically dies. When five heroes thus die, night is *erebenne* (5.659; 13.580; 22.466), *kelaine* (5.310), or *melaina* (14.438), and it always acts by covering (ἐκάλυψε(ν)). It is never, as here, 'baneful' (ὀλοὴν), nor is it ever stretched over (τάνυσε).

Yet the description of the actual physical death of Sarpedon, which Zeus "straddles," realizes these abstracted images of death on the human level — the horrible disintegration of the human body as it loses its individuality, transformed beyond recognition:

> οὐδ' ἂν ἔτι φράδμων περ ἀνὴρ Σαρπηδόνα δῖον
> ἔγνω. ἐπεὶ βελέεσσι καὶ αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσιν
> ἐκ κεφαλῆς εἴλυτο διαμπερὲς ἐς πόδας ἄκρους.
> οἱ δ' αἰεὶ περὶ νεκρὸν ὁμίλεον. ὡς ὅτε μυῖαι
> σταθμῷ ἔνι βρομέωσι περιγλαγέας κατὰ πέλλας
> ὥρῃ ἐν εἰαρινῇ. ὅτε τε γλάγος ἄγγεα δεύει·
> ὣς ἄρα τοὶ περὶ νεκρὸν ὁμίλεον. οὐδέ ποτε Ζεὺς
> τρέψεν ἀπὸ κρατερῆς ὑσμίνης ὄσσε φαεινώ.
> ἀλλὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς αἰὲν ὅρα ...
>
> (16.638-46)
>
> Not even a clever man would have recognized glorious Sarpedon,
> since with missiles and with blood and with dust
> he was wrapped from his head to the tips of his toes.
> For continuously they were fighting over the corpse, just as when flies
> in the farmstead buzz about pails full of milk
> in the season of spring, when the milk wets the vessels;
> thus they were fighting over the corpse, nor did Zeus ever
> turn his shining eyes from the fierce battle,
> but always looked down upon them ...

Sarpedon's body is full of death: missiles *or* blood *or* dust would sufficiently convey his deadness, but he is covered by all three. The repeated effects of death which hide him, wrapped around him, reiterate the end of death which killed Sarpedon by covering him (τέλος θανάτοιο κάλυψεν 16.502). The image of the flies thronging about the milk, black blotting out white, furthers the sense of a covering over with darkness; the swarming warriors themselves become such a cover, befouling the purity of Sarpedon. Moreover, the pastoral simile, with its milk in the spring season of abundance, reminds us of Patroklos's early death in his youthful "springtime." Zeus does not once look away from this awful sight. In contrast to the darkness all around Sarpedon — the wrap of missiles and blood and dust — Zeus's eyes shine brilliantly (ὄσσε φαεινώ). Seeing and light, two traditional images of life, watch over Sarpedon's death. While physical dying is full of the loss of the body's integrity, Zeus's shining presence over that death guarantees its transformation into something bright and immortal like himself. True to the masculine sense of heroic death,

Zeus's presence — his divine signs, his brilliant eyes — surround the bodily process of death with immortal glory.

Zeus's transformation of human death into a beautiful form of deathlessness becomes explicit in his instructions to Apollo to care for Sarpedon's body. Apollo must take away all the signs of mortality and replace them with those of immortality instead:

> εἰ δ' ἄγε νῦν, φίλε Φοῖβε, κελαινεφὲς αἷμα κάθηρον
> ἐλθὼν ἐκ βελέων Σαρπηδόνα, καί μιν ἔπειτα
> πολλὸν ἀποπρὸ φέρων λοῦσον ποταμοῖο ῥοῇσι
> χρῖσόν τ' ἀμβροσίῃ, περὶ δ' ἄμβροτα εἵματα ἕσσον·
> (16.667-70)
> Come now, dear Phoebus, cleanse Sarpedon of the dark blood
> taking him out from the missiles, and then
> having carried him to a great distance wash him with streams from the river
> and anoint him with ambrosia, and clothe about him ambrosial garments.

Zeus bids Apollo to purify Sarpedon of the mortal effects he accumulated above: the darkness (κελαινεφὲς), the blood (αἷμα), the missiles (ἐκ βελέων). Sarpedon's mortality is to be replaced with ambrosia. Likewise, his "covering" (περὶ ... ἕσσον), in contrast to the end of death, and the stretched night, and the wrapping of blood, dust and missiles, becomes ambrosial clothes.[69]

Apollo performs Zeus's bidding to take the body of Sarpedon out of the battle, to cleanse and anoint him and clothe him in immortal raiment. Zeus instructs him further to give him to Sleep and Death to bear to Lycia where Sarpedon's relatives may give him the rites due the dead:[70]

> πέμπε δέ μιν πομποῖσιν ἅμα κραιπνοῖσι φέρεσθαι,
> Ὕπνῳ καὶ Θανάτῳ διδυμάοσιν, οἵ ῥά μιν ὦκα
> θήσουσ' ἐν Λυκίης εὐρείης πίονι δήμῳ.
> ἔνθα έ ταρχύσουσι κασίγνητοί τε ἕταί τε
> τύμβῳ τε στήλῃ τε· τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων. (16.671-75)

---

[69]To be touched or infused with ambrosia does not indicate an ascent to the immortality of the gods. Other dead heroes after Sarpedon will also enjoy this privilege: the bodies of both Patroklos (19.38-39) and Hektor (23.185-87) are preserved through a divine application of ambrosia. And Achilles, while living, is given nectar and ambrosia to stave off his hunger (19.347-48; 353-54). But Achilles is thus divinely satiated so he might continue fighting in a battle he knows will end in his own death. The ambrosia allowed to mortals is associated with their deaths. Rather than an allotment of divine immortality, it signifies the immortality of heroization, a status which rests on the experience of death. Zeus will not go against fate and allow his son to be heroized without having gone through death. Instead, his divine presence throughout the death of Sarpedon — before during and after — promises the shift from mortality to a kind of immortality.

[70]On the death of Sarpedon and the cultic associations with the verb ταρχύω, see Nagy 1990, 122-142, esp. 131 ff.

> Send him to be borne together with the swift escorts,
> with the twins Sleep and Death, who swiftly will
> place him in the rich land of wide Lycia,
> where his brothers and cousins will honor him
> with tomb and stele; for these are the honors of the dead.

This passage, starting in the lines preceding those above, contains persistent doubling initially apparent in the repeated etymological wordplay: ἀμβροσίῃ...ἄμβροτα. εἵματα ἔσσον. πέμπε...πομποῖσιν.[71] Doubleness then occurs in the repetition of 'swiftness' (κραιπνοῖσι ... ὦκα) and is made explicit in the *twins* of Sleeps and Death; it continues in the brothers and cousins, the tomb and stele. Apollo, we recall, is Sarpedon's half-brother, both from the same father, Zeus. It seems that in a passage full of doubling, the implicit relationship between Apollo and Sarpedon forms one last, unstated but nonetheless vivid, doubled pair. Apollo performs the first of the three phases of care for the dead, the washing and preparation of the body. The other two, the *prothesis* (the vigil over the body) and *ekphora* (the procession to the cemetery), are, presumably, left for his mortal brothers, *kasignêtoi*, back in Lycia. In this final moment of the death of the mortal son of the immortal father Zeus, the poem leaves us with an image rather than words. At the very end, after the mutilation of the corpse and the stripping of its armor, Zeus sends his divine son to care for his mortal son in an intimate, womanly-maternal way. There is the image of Zeus above his two sons, twinned in their different immortal and mortal states. By the end of the passage, Apollo has given Sarpedon to Sleep and Death. Sarpedon and Apollo are gone from the scene, but perhaps the sense of their unspoken fraternity lingers. It seems that it is left unspoken because it is not quite explicable; like with all twins, the connections are obvious and elusive simultaneously.[72]

The death of Sarpedon comprises a multiform of the death of Memnon who is also killed under the caring eye of the divine, his mother Eos, and then given over by her to Sleep and Death. Neo-analysts have considered the Sarpedon story an inferior copy of the death of Memnon rather than a parallel, in part because Zeus plays the role of Eos, the

---

[71]Janko 1992, 396.
[72]Perhaps Apollo and Sarpedon share a likeness similar to that between Sleep and Death, respectively.

hero's mother, confronting the Moirai; and Apollo takes on her role as the divinity who removes the body, washes and anoints it.[73] Nagy has persuasively countered the neo-analytic arguments for influence rather than parallel development:[74] suffice it for us to say that in objecting to the divine actors in the Iliadic account of Sarpedon's death — Zeus and Apollo instead of Eos — the neo-analysts have called attention to the shift in the divine care for heroic death from the maternal to the paternal. From our argument of the *Iliad's* masculinization of death, the change from the hero's mother to his father and father's son in the roles around death traditionally held by women does not appear problematic but rather thematic.

Ares and Apollo: conclusion

Having considered the deaths of the semi-divine sons, Askalaphos and Sarpedon, we see that a primary difference between Ares and Apollo is their response to the heroic deaths of mortal sons. Whereas Ares rebelled against his father over the death of his mortal son, Askalaphos, Apollo assists his father in rounding off the episode of the death of his father's mortal son, Sarpedon. Ares embodies the violent death of battle, wherefore all warriors die as "peer of Ares";[75] Apollo, on the other hand, signifies the immortalization which awaits such a death. These divergent relationships to the heroic deaths of sons imply two types of divinity: the former "regressive" and the latter "progressive" insofar as the god is willing to oversee a heroic death. The account of the death of Sarpedon ruled over by the glorifying Zeus and Apollo significantly comes after the death of Askalaphos ruled over by the death-filled Ares: their juxtaposition heightens Zeus's different response to the death of a mortal son.

These two deaths — of Askalaphos and Sarpedon — reveal the structure of Olympus as well. Apollo, as we have seen, falls into line with Zeus as like minded,

---

[73]Clark and Coulson 1978, 66-75.
[74]Nagy 1990, 122-143.
[75]Nagy 1979, 293-95.

"progressive" gods of two generations. On the other hand, traditionally Ares's older counterpart is Poseidon. The *Iliad* alludes to this tradition in Book 15 wherein Zeus suppresses a revolt first by Ares then by Poseidon. Francis Vian has documented the frequent association of Ares and Poseidon: sometimes they seem interchangeable, other times they appear rather as rivals or complements. For instance, their interchangeability emerges in cult: Ares is the husband of the Erinys Tilphossa in Boeotia, while other traditions associate Poseidon and the Erinys Demeter with Telphoussa in Boeotia or with Thelpousa in Arcadia. Their relation by rivalry is evident in the myth that Ares killed Halirrhothios, the son of Poseidon, who had violated Ares's daughter Alkippê; or by the story of the Aloades, twins descended from Poseidon, who locked up Ares in a jar for three months. Rivalry is also complementarity: at Orchomenos, Ares and Poseidon each loved two sisters with essentially the same names — Chrysê and Chrysogonê; each sister gave birth to a son of antithetic functions — the warrior Phlegyas and the rich Minyas.[76] A functional opposition between the two gods becomes evident through their various joint myths: the god of war is the natural rival of the master of chthonic forces and fecundity.[77] Replacement, rival, or complement, Ares and Poseidon have a history together in mythology.

The generational resonances between Zeus and Apollo, and Poseidon and Ares bring to mind Hesiod's myth of the ages which, as Vernant has shown, vacillate between periods characterized by *dikê* and then in turn by *hubris*. According to Vernant's structural analysis of the myth of the races, the four ages break down first into two parts — Gold and Silver, Bronze and Heroes. Within each group, one age is the inverse of the other, the positive age marked by *dikê* and the negative by *hubris*. Hesiod's time, the Iron Age, contains both *dikê* and *hubris*. Schematically, according to their character marked by *dikê*

---

[76]Detienne and Vernant (1978, 78) note another connection between Ares and Poseidon: the expression of Ares's confinement by Otos and Ephialtes, *chalepos hê desmos edamna*, is connected with the jar, "also hooped with bronze, whose mouth Poseidon closed with bronze doors, namely Tartarus" (Theogony 726-735).

[77]Vian 1985, 55.

or *hubris*, the Golden Age is to the Silver Age as the Age of Heroes is to the Bronze Age. Vernant recapitulates:

> Thus, so far as the relationships between the first four races are concerned, the text presents the following structure: a distinction is made between two different groups with gold and silver in the one, and bronze and the heroes in the other. Each group is divided into two antithetical aspects, one of which is positive and the other negative, and each thus comprises two associated races, each of which is positive and the other negative, and each of which is the necessary counterpart to the other and stands in contrast to it as *dike* does to *hubris*. (1983, 7)

The four gods in question fall easily into line with the Hesiodic four ages — Zeus (gold) is to Poseidon (silver) as Apollo (heroes) is to Ares (bronze). Zeus as the supreme Olympian clearly merits the greatest metal, gold. Poseidon's association with the Silver Age requires further explanation. His *hubris*, characteristic of the Silver Age, is embodied in his destructive, angry character and in his relation with the race who, as Hesiod describes, would not serve the immortals nor make sacrifices to the gods.[78] In the episode of the Achaean wall, Poseidon is angry because the Achaeans have accomplished a great deed without offering hecatombs to the gods (οὐδὲ θεοῖσι δόσαν κλειτὰς ἑκατόμβας 7.450 = 12.6); Poseidon fears that men will no longer have any regard for the gods and the fame of the wall which he built at Troy will be forgotten (7.446-53). Thus Poseidon in the *Iliad* can be seen to epitomize the god offended by the dishonor of men. In reaction, out of fear for his own glory, he becomes the destroyer god.

In addition to Poseidon as the god who destroys the race of impious men, he fits into the Hesiodic schema in terms of relation:

> Silver does not possess a specific symbolic meaning of its own. It is defined in terms of gold, being like gold a precious metal, but inferior to it. Similarly, the race of silver which is inferior to the race that preceded it exists and is defined only in relation to it. It is on the same plane as the race of gold, and is its exact counterpart and opposite. (Vernant 1983, 7)

Vernant's explication here brings to mind Poseidon's claims to being of equal portion to Zeus and of the same parents, while he simultaneously admits his inferiority (e.g. 8.211;

---

[78]οὐδ' ἀθανάτους θεραπεύειν/ ἤθελον οὐδ' ἔρδειν μακάρων ἱεροῖς ἐπὶ βωμοῖς "nor would they worship the gods/ nor make sacrifice on the sacred altrars of the blessed ones" (*W&D* 135-36); Cf. Ζεὺς Κρονίδης ἔκρυψε χολούμενος. οὕνεκα τιμὰς/ οὐκ ἔδιδον μακάρεσσι θεοῖς "Zeus son of Kronos in anger engulfed them, for they paid no due honors/ to the blessed gods who live on Olympos" (138-39).

13.345-60). Moreover, the idea of relation reminds us of the poet's striking diction in Book 21 where Poseidon is denoted as "the brother of the father," πατροκασιγνήτοιο (469). This word clearly emphasizes relationship, one determined according to the superior status of the father, analogous to the way silver is defined in terms of gold.

Turning to Ares, several scholars have pointed out the association between him and Hesiod's Bronze Age — an association that Hesiod makes explicit: "to them the woeful deeds of Ares were a concern and violence" (οἷσιν Ἄρηος/ ἔργ' ἔμελεν στονόεντα καὶ ὕβριες *W&D* 145-46). The metal bronze appears regularly as an epithet of Ares.[79] *Pankhalkeos* also appears as a substantive for Ares according to Muellner's interpretation of *Iliad* 20.102.[80] Vian, as already mentioned, sees Ares and Athena as representing two different conceptions of war: Ares is interested only in battle and incarnates the elementary form of martial activity as an end in itself; Athena on the other hand represents a more evolved level of thought where military action aims at the goal of protecting a prince or a people.[81] Vernant characterizes the Bronze Age further. It stands in contrast to the Gold and Silver Ages, concerned with law and religion, as a time occupied exclusively by military matters. "We have moved from the juridical and religious plane to that of manifestations of brute force (μεγάλη βίη), physical energy (χεῖρες ἄαπτοι ... ἐπὶ στιβαροῖσι μέλεσσι), and the terror (δεινόν ἄπλαστοι) which the warrior inspires."[82] This is the Ares Vian sees as pure symbol in Homeric epic — of battle in its savagery, brutality and uncertainty.[83]

Finally, Apollo in the poem is deeply concerned with the heroes and war. For example, he goes to strengthen and encourage Hector so that he will return to the battle with renewed force (15.307-311). And he often participates directly in the battle,

---

[79]Vernant 1983, 13.
[80]Muellner 1976, 82.
[81]Vian 1985, 58.
[82]Vernant 1983, 12.
[83]Vian explains that the myths about Ares take place in a time previous to the Trojan War, in stories about Thessaly and Boeotia, Thebes and Orchomenos. By the time of Homeric epic, he has been reduced to a convention (1985, 56-57).

memorably protecting Aeneas, carrying off Sarpedon, and killing Patroklos. In general, Apollo is traditionally imagined as the ideal, youthful warrior (*kouros*).[84] As Achilles's divine model (his ritual antagonist), this *kouros* image of Apollo is clearly implied in the *Iliad*.[85]

Beyond these correspondences, the myth of the races provides an analogy for viewing structure and time.[86] Vernant emphasizes that the notion of time in the four ages is not linear but cyclical:

> The ages succeed one another to form a complete cycle, which, once completed, starts all over again, either in the same order, or more probably, as in the Platonic myth in the 'Politicus', in reverse order, so that cosmic time is unfolded alternately, first in one direction and then in the other. (1983, 6)

The alternating structure of the myth of the races, we saw, parallels the different spirits of the ages of Zeus — Poseidon — Apollo — Ares. Such structure, wherein "time does not unfold according to a chronological sequence, but according to the dialectical relationship of a system of antinomies," provides the poem's solution to the old problem of intergenerational conflict.[87] The relationship of correspondence between Zeus and Apollo — a kind of *dikê* in one age and the next — and the coexistence of the correspondence between Poseidon and Ares — *hubris* in one age and the next — marks a different kind of divine father-son relationship than that violent and disruptive one among Ouranos-Kronos-Zeus. With a concept of cyclic rather than linear time, the need for intergenerational strife disappears — as we have seen in Zeus's relationships with his sons.[88]

---

[84]Richard Martin's suggestion to me.

[85]On this relationship between Achilles and Apollo, see Rabel 1990; and Muellner 1996, 102-104.

[86]Hesiod affords a more or less synchronic text in relation to the epics. So Nagy uses the Hesiodic myth of the ages for a different kind of interpretation of Homeric epic, its tradition of *biê* based on the Hesiodic opposition of *dikê* and *hubris* (1979, 319).

[87]Vernant 1983, 9.

[88]Thus Apollo refuses to fight with the brother of his father, πατροκασιγνήτοιο, Poseidon. During the Theomachia, Poseidon invites Apollo to do battle against him. Apollo however refrains out of deference:

> Ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας πάλιν ἐτράπετ'· αἰδέτο γάρ ῥα
> πατροκασιγνήτοιο μιγήμεναι ἐν παλάμῃσι.
>
> (21.468-69)
>
> So saying he turned him back; for he had shame
> to deal in blows with his father's brother.

Why won't Apollo obey his uncle and mingle with his uncle in battle? He and Poseidon each mark different generations, different "ages" which oppose each other not only chronologically (between the time of the father and the time of the son), but also in temper: Apollo is a god of *dikê* in contrast to Poseidon

Hephaistos and Hermes

Like Ares and Apollo, Hephaistos and Hermes comprise a pair of divine sons in the poem, but they are joined by narrative structure rather than a cosmic one.[89] Hephaistos figures in the opening of the poem as the divine son associated with Zeus; Hermes as the divine son closes the poem.[90] Together they describe the trajectory of Zeus's relationship to gods and men, which develops over the course of the poem from distance to proximity.

Hephaistos

The poem starts with Hephaistos since he, positioned behind his father as we will see, gives form to an otherwise unknowable because unrepresented father.[91] Just as Hesiod showed that the Muses were necessary to the promulgation of Zeus's ordinances without which his divine ordering would have remained unheard (*Th.* 65-74), so Hephaistos is necessary for making Zeus's intangible power manifest. It follows suit that the *Iliad*, conscious of itself as a poem in its embedded songs and singers, starts with a divine son who embodies the prototype of the craftsman. Like the blind singer, the mythical "artist" has "a marked physical or personality flaw, which alienates him from heroic society."[92] Hephaistos's physical imperfections — his limping, panting (1.600), and sweating (18.371ff.) — correspond to his often comic position among the gods. But diametrically opposed to the artist's misshapen form is the other profound side of his character which enacts the transformation of chaos into order, makes non-being into being, just like the

---

as one of *hubris*. Such gods must by necessity remain apart because they are complements of a cycle. They occupy different times and moods. (Notice their opposite responses to Laomedon's injustice: Poseidon ever bears his grudge (21.446-60) while Apollo is the staunchest Trojan ally.) Were they to mingle (μιγήμεναι) and one defeat the other, the balance would be lost. Among these gods, the implications would be cosmological.

[89]They are also both gods associated with *mêtis*.

[90]This does not mean that other divine sons are absent from the first and iast books of the poem. Rather, insofar as these sons' actions are involved with the father, Hephaistos and Hermes are predominant.

[91]Apollo is the first son of Zeus to appear in the poem, but his actions have little to do with Zeus explicitly. Though on the displacement of Zeus's *mênis* onto Apollo, see Muellner 1996, 102.

[92]Himmelmann 1998, 58-60.

Hesiodic co-origination of Zeus's order and the Muses' song. Nikolas Himmelmann says of the ancient craftsman:

> The maker of ἀγάλματα ["showpieces"] and δαίδαλα [intricate handiwork] in the Homeric period clearly possessed artistic traits in the later sense of the word. This is shown by his self-consciousness expressed in mythical terms, his understanding of material and technique, his ability to call into being κάλλος [beauty] and χάρις [grace], and above all lifelikeness and naturalness.[93]

Hephaistos is a magician.[94] He calls into being the extraordinary "golden handmaids" who are like living creatures since they possess reason and voices (18.417). He brings to life out of metal the furrowed fields and dancers and adjudicating parties on Achilles's shield (18.482ff.). He makes houses for the gods (1.608), the special locking bedroom for his mother (14.166ff.), and armor for Diomedes and Achilles (8.195; 18). But the objects he crafts for his father are the most transformative of spirit into matter: the royal scepter (2.101); the aegis of Zeus (15.310); and the polished portico of Zeus's house where all the gods assemble (20.10-12). He stands at the start of the *Iliad* for, like the poem itself, he materializes Zeus's intangible power.

Hephaistos's anteriority to Zeus as the maker of his symbolic objects, like a magician calling that power into being, is evident in the descriptions of Zeus's scepter and aegis:

> ἀνὰ δὲ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
> ἔστη σκῆπτρον ἔχων. τὸ μὲν Ἥφαιστος κάμε τεύχων.
> Ἥφαιστος μὲν δῶκε Διὶ Κρονίωνι ἄνακτι,
> αὐτὰρ ἄρα Ζεὺς δῶκε διακτόρῳ ἀργειφόντῃ·
> Ἑρμείας δὲ ἄναξ δῶκεν Πέλοπι πληξίππῳ,
> αὐτὰρ ὁ αὖτε Πέλοψ δῶκ' Ἀτρέι, ποιμένι λαῶν·
> (2.100-105)
>
> Up Lord Agamemnon
> stood holding the scepter which Hephaistos made with craft.
> Hephaistos gave it to lord Kronian Zeus,
> in turn Zeus gave it to the messenger Argeiphontes;
> Lord Hermes gave it to horse-driving Pelops,
> in turn Pelops gave it to Atreus, shepherd of men;

Hephaistos stands at the head of a string of δῶκε's, before Zeus. He makes palpable that Zeus is the ultimate king and that earthly kings come from Zeus (*Th.* 96) Hephaistos

[93]Himmelmann 1998, 60. Cf. Detienne and Vernant 1978, 57-107.
[94]See Delcourt 1957.

occupies this same anteriority with regard to Zeus's aegis, another symbol of his power:[95] Ἥφαιστος Διὶ δῶκε φορήμεναι ἐς φόβον ἀνδρῶν· ("Hephaistos gave it to Zeus to bear for the putting to rout of men" 15.310). In both these passages, Hephaistos gives an object to Zeus which Zeus then passes along to another, different, son: the scepter to Hermes (who transfers it to mortal men), the aegis to his son Apollo. Hephaistos enables a line of communication, materializing Zeus's inherent capacities so that they may be recognizable and transferable.

In addition to Zeus's scepter and aegis, Hephaistos also crafts the house of Zeus where all the gods — the entire pantheon — congregate at the beginning of Book 20:

> ἐλθόντες δ' ἐς δῶμα Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο
> ξεστῇς αἰθούσῃσιν ἐνίζανον, ἃς Διὶ πατρὶ
> Ἥφαιστος ποίησεν ἰδυίῃσι πραπίδεσσιν.
> (20.10-12)
>
> Having come into the house of cloud-gathering Zeus
> they sat down within the polished colonnades which for father Zeus
> Hephaistos made with cunning skill.

The houses of the gods, all of which Hephaistos built (1.608), symbolize the gods' permanence in heaven. Hephaistos's own house is bronxe χάλκεον (18.371), a quality characteristic of heaven itself (cf. 18.425 χάλκεον οὐρανὸν).[96] The description of Zeus's house idealizes the royal abode present among men in Priam's impressive palace. Both houses are equipped with polished colonnades, ξεστῇς αἰθούσῃσι (cf.6.243), but where the sleeping together of husbands and wives is emphasized in the excursus on the house of Priam (6.245-50), the sitting down in the portico built by Hephaistos is the principal activity in the house of Zeus. The sitting, ἐνίζανον. of all the gods signifies their steadfastness, an image we will soon see again in the poem's opening portrait of Zeus. To match the enduring stoniness of their houses, mortal men need to reproduce sexually, whereas the divine — by definition, everlasting — simply are, represented in their stable

---

[95]"...it [the aegis] symbolizes his [Zeus's] power, although Homer no longer knew exactly why" (Janko 1992, 261).

[96]Cf. Pindar N.6.3-4: ὁ δὲ χάλκεος ἀσφαλὲς αἰὲν ἕδος/ μένει οὐρανός.

sitting.[97] Thus also in the house of Zeus, Hephaistos materialized the divine power of his father.

We now understand Hephaistos's artistic role in the poem. What does his relationship with his father tell us about Zeus's position toward his immortal son at the beginning of the poem? Hephaistos appears as the son who stands between the conflict of his mother and father, Hera and Zeus. At the start of the poem, Hera, eager to know Zeus's secret plotting with Thetis, receives a stern rebuke from her husband (1.561-67). Zeus's scolding of Hera agitates (ὄχθησαν) all the gods. Hephaistos is the first to break the silence. In his speech, he cares equally for his mother and father. He speaks to his mother in way well-disposed to her:

μητρὶ φίλῃ ἐπὶ ἦρα φέρων (1.572)

And he encourages her to be likewise well-disposed to father Zeus:

πατρὶ φίλῳ ἐπὶ ἦρα φέρειν Διί (1.578).

The repeated diction, with the echo of mother and father (μητρὶ. πατρὶ) at line beginning, places Hephaistos directly between his two parents. As a median point between them, he has been the target of both of their displeasures: Zeus threw him from heaven when he tried to save Hera (1.590-94); and Hera also threw him out when she sought to hide him because of his lameness (18.395-97).[98] The first book of the poem thus presents him as the misshapen god rejected by both father and mother, suggestive of the artist's position of alienation outside the community — wherefore he is here the comic relief of the gathered gods. But in his two-sided artistic character, misshapen and magical, in this opening book, Hephaistos exemplifies both his alienation from his parents and his capacity to effect a reconciled closeness between them. The book closes with an image of husband and wife sleeping side by side in the house Hephaistos built for them (1.609-611). Hephaistos

[97]Pindar N.6.3-4 also shows divine stability: ὁ δὲ χάλκεος ἀσφαλὲς αἰὲν ἕδος μένει οὐρανός: note also that heaven itself is imagined as a seat.

[98]Hera's punishment of Hephaistos may have also expressed anger and resentment at Zeus if it was caused by dissatisfaction with the son she produced in competition with Zeus's birth of Athena, as according to some traditions.

benefits his father — here he keeps the peace and breaks the tension by making all the gods laugh — in both his outsideness and in his material creations. But this father and son never move beyond this distance and these crafted objects: Hephaistos and Zeus never come face to face to actually speak and interact with each other in the poem.[99] Hephaistos is only called into relation with his father in the histories of the objects he made, objects symbolic of Zeus's powers. A certain paradox of penetration and distance thus characterizes the relationship between this inital pair of father and son. And this distant image of the father god extends beyond them to indeed characterize the opening nature of Zeus.

Father Zeus at the beginning of the *Iliad*

Long before we ever see Zeus, we hear much of him. Up to the point of his first appearance we have heard of Zeus's will (1.5, 128-29, 239, 353-54), Zeus's son (9, 21), that dreams are from Zeus (63), that Achilles is dear to Zeus (74), as is Apollo (86), of Agamemnon's kingly connection to Zeus (175, 279), the daughter of Zeus (202), the house of Zeus (222), that heralds are messengers of Zeus (334), of Achilles's sending Thetis to Zeus (394-95) and how she helped him in the past (396-406), that Zeus is with the Aethiopians but that Thetis will go to him when he returns (419-27), and finally that Zeus led the gods back to Olympus (495). Indeed, like the thunder he wields, we hear Zeus before we see him.

His sitting apart is our first sight of him. Two of the times the poem calls Zeus 'father' involve scenes of the gods as a collective body gathered around him. The first is in Book 1 when Thetis goes to seek Zeus on Olympus. She finds him sitting on the highest peak, apart (ἄτερ) from the other gods (1.498). Our first sight of Zeus thus casts him at a distance from the rest of the gods, as separate. Kirk glosses Zeus's apartness as a sign of his independence and superiority (1985, 106) — indeed he is sitting on the *highest* peak.[100] Additionally, his apartness culminates a theme introduced in the opening book in

[99]As he does several (important) times with Hera (e.g. 21.328 ff.).
[100]Cf. Redfield 1975, 214.

the withdrawals of Chryses and Achilles. Offended by Agamemnon, Chryses went in silence to the shore of the loud sea and there, having gone apart, the old man prayed to Apollo (πολλὰ δ' ἔπειτ' ἀπάνευθε κιὼν ἡρᾶθ' ὁ γεραιὸς 1.35). Achilles, likewise insulted by Agamemnon, sat down apart from his companions, and in tears prayed to his mother (αὐτὰρ 'Αχιλλεὺς/ δακρύσας ἑτάρων ἄφαρ ἕζετο νόσφι λιασθείς 1.349). Zeus's separateness forms the climax of this tripartite motif of apartness.

Unlike the two men, Zeus has no impetus to go apart. Chryses and Achilles, on the other hand, withdraw for specific reasons. Outraged by Agamemnon, they retreat to the shore of the sea, apart from others, to pray for compensation. Their movement is precipitated by a quarrel, another — mutual — form of setting apart or standing apart (διαστήτην 1.6). Zeus's sitting apart is not preceded by cause. Rather, as Kirk suggests, Zeus's separation is one of his attributes. Zeus is *statically* apart, whereas the two men must *go* apart. What does it mean to be apart? The apartness of the three — Chryses, Achilles and Zeus — is expressed differently: ἀπάνευθε (35); νόσφι λιασθείς (350); ἄτερ (498). The first word choice, ἀπάνευθε, is built on ἄνευ (ἀπ-άνευ-θε). Like the last one, ἄτερ, these words have the sense of being 'without,' particularly "without the need of." Zeus's epithets in his first appearance designate qualities of his that are, without having to be manifest. Among the gathered gods, his only communal connection is conceptual: he is *Kronidês*, the son of Kronos, but otherwise alone. He is "loud-sounding," εὐρύοπα, but at this initial moment, silent — Thetis twice initiates the talk in her prayer since Zeus sat in silence (τὴν δ' οὔ τι προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς./ ἀλλ' ἀκέων δὴν ἧστο· 511-12).[101] By contrast, the mortals Chryses and Achilles speak first and then are silenced.[102] Zeus's apartness is thus a sign of his completeness unto himself

[101]Kirk notes that εὐρύοπα means 'loud-sounding' (from ὀψ = voice) not 'far-seeing' (cf. ὄψις, ὄπωπα) (1985, 106).

[102]For Chryses, the noise of the sea resounds instead of words (βῆ δ' ἀκέων παρὰ θῖνα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης· 34). Cf. Lynn-George: Epic, "narrative drama," deals in words: "If the opening of narrative marks a break from a silence without, the epic reflects, in this solitary speechless figure cast out along the beach [Chryses], on the silence within. The prolonged journey along the strand bordered by the loud-sounding sea is the site of a significant struggle in an epic which sustains and overcomes silence." (Lynn-George 1988, 52)

as he is a god turned inward and backward while simultaneously present and turned, by Thetis's prompting, forward. He is, at first sight in the poem, the supreme *patêr*.

Zeus's apartness indeed characterizes the initial nature of his divine paternity. Though separate, when he returns to the others, he appears as a reverenced guest among them. The repetition of his "facing" presence renders it unusual, something emphatically noted:

> θεοὶ δ' ἅμα πάντες ἀνέσταν
> ἐξ ἑδέων σφοῦ πατρὸς ἐναντίον· οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
> μεῖναι ἐπερχόμενον, ἀλλ' ἀντίοι ἔσταν ἅπαντες.
> (1.533-35)
>
> All the gods together rose up
> from their seats before the face of their father; not one dared
> to remain seated at his coming, but all stood before him.

Zeus exists as a father even apart from his children — illustrating Benveniste's observation that the father is first a conceptual category — e.g. Father Heaven — before becoming a biological relationship.[103] At the beginning of the *Iliad*, Zeus perfectly fulfills the abstract and inherently complete concept of the *patêr*, who is father in and of himself apart from his children.[104]

---

[103]Benveniste 1978, 169.

[104]In another book, of the divine conflict of the Theomachia, Zeus again appears as the father surrounded by the other gods, his children. This book also demonstrates Zeus's apartness even as he forms the center of the divine community. But here, as opposed to the fear he inspires in his divine "children" in Book 1, the gods are drawn to his side. At this later point in the poem, Zeus's apartness is balanced by a complementary closeness. At the beginning of Book 20, he bids the gods fight against each other:

> μέλουσί μοι ὀλλύμενοί περ.
> ἀλλ' ἤ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ μενέω πτυχὶ Οὐλύμποιο
> ἥμενος, ἔνθ' ὁρόων φρένα τέρψομαι· οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι
> ἔρχεσθ' ὅφρ' ἂν ἵκησθε μετὰ Τρῶας καὶ Ἀχαιούς,
> ἀμφοτέροισι δ' ἀρήγεθ', ὅπῃ νόος ἐστὶν ἑκάστου.
> (20.21-25)
>
> They [mortals] are a concern to me even though they die.
> But I will remain in a fold of Olympus
> sitting, from where seeing I will delight my heart; but for the others
> go until you come among the Trojans and Achaeans,
> help both sides, in which way each of you is minded.

Except for Apollo who goes to Troy to assure that the Danaans not destroy the city wall beyond what is fated, the gods come back in contrasting moods:

> οἱ δ' ἄλλοι πρὸς Ὄλυμπον ἴσαν θεοὶ αἰὲν ἐόντες,
> οἱ μὲν χωόμενοι, οἱ δὲ μέγα κυδιόωντες.
> κὰδ' δ' ἵζον παρὰ πατρὶ κελαινεφεῖ·
> (21.518-20)
>
> The other gods who are forever came to Olympus
> some angry, some exulting greatly.
> They sat down beside their cloud-dark father.

Hermes

As several of his interactions with some of his Olympian children show, Zeus does not remain apart throughout the poem.[105] While the reasons for his different affinities to his different children vary according to their particular circumstances, the closing father-son frame of the poem provides the greater picture in balance with the opening of Zeus's apartness. At the end of the poem, in contrast to the first instance of utter absence of interaction between Zeus and Hephaistos, Zeus deferentially approaches his son Hermes.

Narratively speaking, Hermes comes last in the poem's representations of immortal sons of Zeus. Naturally, each of the immortal father-immortal son relationships varies according to the combination of personalities involved. Apollo, we have seen, exhibits a kind of filial *homosophrune* with Zeus, frequently thinking in tandem and working in parallel with him; their exchange of words is brief and to the point. Ares, in contrast, is the rebellious son whom Zeus hates and scolds, but nevertheless accepts as his own. Hephaistos is the son who stands behind the physical manifestations of Zeus's power, but never face to face with his father. In all three of these relationships, Zeus maintains a position of dominance. Only his exchange with Hermes is marked by a curious courtesy:

> Ἑρμεία, σοὶ γάρ τε μάλιστά γε φίλτατόν ἐστιν
> ἀνδρὶ ἑταιρίσσαι, καί τ' ἔκλυες ᾧ κ' ἐθέλῃσθα
> (24.334-35)
> Hermes, since to you especially it is most dear
> to be a companion to a man, and you listen to whom you wish

Zeus's two prefatorial lines justifying his calling on Hermes sound like a formal invocation of a prayer from, if not man to god, at least from a less powerful (or more compromised) divinity to an older and more powerful one.[106] Richardson notes that "Zeus treats Hermes

---

The different gods in different spirits return to Olympus and congregate around Zeus, παρὰ πατρί. By this late point in the poem, the god who sits apart from the others is also the god around whom the others sit — the extremity and the center. Zeus's opening impersonal connection with his son, Hephaistos, is no longer the whole picture.

[105]In fact, in his tendance of Artemis in Book 21 (505-510), he is positively affectionate (cf. Dione's care for Aphrodite 5.374-75).

[106]On the naming of the god in the invocation of hymns, see Bremer 1987, 194-95.

with more elaborate courtesy than either Dream or Iris" (1993, 308), or Apollo, for that matter.[107] Why does Zeus so formally and courteously address his son Hermes?

In Hesiod's *Theogony*, the poet describes another god with a prerogative like that of Hermes to listen to whom he wishes, ᾧ κ' ἐθέλῃσθα (24.335): Hecate is the goddess whose capacities are repeatedly qualified according to her will — ᾧ δ' ἐθέλῃ (429), ὅν κ' ἐθέλῃσιν (430), οἷς κ' ἐθέλῃσι (432 and 439), ἐθέλουσά γε θυμῷ (443), θυμῷ γ' ἐθέλουσα (446). Her other repeated quality is her manifest presence beside a man: παραγίνεται ἡδ' ὀνίνῃσι (429 and 436), παραγίνεται (432), παρεστάμεν (439). In these two reiterated traits, Hecate doubles Hermes, at least insofar as Zeus addressed him as the god who is a companion to men (ἑταιρίσσαι is equivalent to παραγίνεται) and gives ear when he will (ἐθέλ- words). Reminiscent of his politeness to Hermes, Zeus honored Hecate above all: ἣ δ' ὑποκυσαμένη Ἑκάτην τέκε. τὴν περὶ πάντων/ Ζεὺς Κρονίδης τίμησε· (*Theogony* 411-12).[108] Thus Hermes and Hecate share a closeness to men and a correlative independence from the world of gods.[109] Zeus assumes some deference in his attitude toward them since they share a special affinity with men which excludes him and the other Olympians.

Zeus calls on Hermes to resolve the divine quarrel over the dead Hector. Apollo is angry at Achilles's maltreatment of the dead body: a man can lose one dearer — a brother or a son — rather than a friend, and still make an end to grieving (24.46-48). But Hera scornfully takes up Apollo's objections: Apollo could be right only if all the gods would really treat the son of a goddess and the son of a mortal woman equally (58-60). She recalls that she nursed Thetis at her own breast and casts blame at all the gods, and Apollo in particular. Zeus ends the quarrel by assuring Hera that the two men, one born of a

---

[107]Zeus simply commands Apollo with no opening niceties: ἔρχεο νῦν... (15.221).

[108]Hesiod's poem marks this honor with the embedded hymn it sings to her, complete with laudatory phrases. See West on lines 410, 413-14 (1966, 281-82). Hermes is actually named in this "hymn to Hecate"; the only other god mentioned is Poseidon. The "hymn" links Hermes to Hecate in their capacity to increase the flocks in the stables: ἐσθλὴ δ' ἐν σταθμοῖσι σὺν Ἑρμῇ ληίδ' ἀέξειν· (*Theogony* 444). For their coupling in cult and their shared chthonic associations, see Burkert 1985, 200.

[109]Cf. West 1966, 281-82.

goddess and the other of a woman, will not have the same honor (66); he plans only to let the father receive back the body of his son. In order to execute the return of the dead son to the old father, Zeus turns to Hermes for his familiarity with men. And as we have seen, Zeus approaches Hermes politely and formally, as he would Hecate, but not one of his sons. The death of a mortal son thus impels Zeus to shift his relationship with his own sons — from no interaction at all with Hephaistos, to a rebuke of Ares, to a plain command to Apollo, and finally to a polite request to Hermes. If this does not seem like such a profound change of attitude, Hermes's play with fathers in response — Hector's and his own — reveals the extent to which Zeus is no longer apart, but now the highest version of the father affected by the death of his sons.[110]

Zeus sends Hermes to Priam. Hermes first addresses Priam familiarly as *patêr*: πῆ. πάτερ... (24.362); in ring composition he ends this first speech by making this generic *patêr* as one like his own father: φίλῳ δέ σε πατρὶ ἐίσκω ("I liken you to my own father" 24.371).[111] Hermes, disguised as a young prince, has not yet identified himself to Priam as Hermes, son of Zeus. But he has told him that he will not harm him and will come to his defense (24.370-71), an allusion to Iris's previous message to Priam that Hermes will be his escort who will lead him safely to the house of Achilles (24.181-83). Thus Priam has a good idea who the young stranger is.

Indirectly, consciously or not, Priam reveals some recognition of the disguised god. He slips into Hermes's indefinite signification, answering the stranger's name for him, "father," by addressing him in turn as "dear child," φίλον τέκος (24.373). And,

---

[110]According to Hera, and approved by Zeus, in the eyes of the gods a man's value in the end comes down to his pedigree. (In this reckoning, it is a matter of the maternal line, but perhaps only for the simple reason that Achilles was born from a divine mother, rather than divine father.) This is not the first time superiority has been claimed on the grounds of divine lineage (cf. 5.635-42; 20.104ff.; 21.184-99). In one instance, Apollo encourages Aeneas to fight against Achilles by reminding him of his descent from Aphrodite, a goddess greater than Thetis because of her greater father, Zeus (20.105-107). Be it the mother or father, the estimation of a man's honor refers back to the fact of a divine parent. Hera's complaint to Apollo and all the other gods asserts the final importance of divine lineage — the one thing Hector lacks in his recent ancestry. It is this sanctity of divine lineage that Hermes violates in his capricious play on divine fatherhood in his exchange with Priam.

[111]Richardson notes the ring composition of this speech (1993, 311).

without directly citing Iris's word to him that Argeiphontes himself would be his guide, Priam approaches it:

> ἀλλ' ἔτι τις καὶ ἐμεῖο θεῶν ὑπερέσχεθε χεῖρα,
> ὅς μοι τοιόνδ' ἧκεν ὁδοιπόρον ἀντιβολῆσαι,
> αἴσιον, οἷος δὴ σὺ δέμας καὶ εἶδος ἀγητός,
> πέπνυσαί τε νόῳ, μακάρων δ' ἐξ ἐσσι τοκήων.
> (24.374-77)
> Someone of the gods must have held his hand over me,
> who sent such a wayfarer to meet me,
> a gentle one, you remarkable in body and form,
> wise in mind, you are from blessed parents.

Priam not only acknowledges that a god's hand is involved in the appearance of the stranger, but practically names him outright: the wayfarer, ὁδοιπόρον, describes Hermes in his general capacity of traveller always on the move, and particularly his function as a landmark along paths and tracks (Hermes ὅδιος, ἐνόδιος).[112] Priam's qualification of the stranger's parents as blessed, μακάρων, signifies doubly: as an adjective, it calls the parents happy; as a substantive, it recognizes them as gods. But Priam would be presumptuous to recognize a disguised god too boldly. Thus he insinuates rather than declares; and thus he asks outright the stranger's name and parents. In response, the disguised Hermes tells Priam that he is a Myrmidon, son of Poluktor, a rich man and old like Priam (Μυρμιδόνων δ' ἔξ εἰμι, πατὴρ δέ μοί ἐστι Πολύκτωρ./ ἀφνειὸς μὲν ὅ γ' ἐστί, γέρων δὲ δὴ ὡς σύ περ ὧδε 397-98). Who then is the signified of Hermes's "father," of his first statement — that he would protect the old king who is "like to my own father" (24.371)? Hermes's feigned father, Poluktor? his real father, Zeus? or some combination of the two, since lying tales often paraphrase the truth?

Richardson comments that Poluktor is a name suitable for a rich man since the ending, -κτωρ, is probably related to the word for goods, κτέρας (1993, 314). The juxtaposition of Poluktor with the adjective "wealthy," ἀφνειὸς, which starts the next line, reaffirms the generic sense of Hermes's invented father's name. Poluktor could also suggest not just a rich father, but a beneficent god. For the descriptive name (almost an

---

[112]Vernant 1983, 5. Cf. Burkert 1985, 156.

adjective or epithet) 'Poluktor' characterizes gods who are "givers of good things."[113] When Hermes finally reveals his identity to Priam, he follows his name with the comment, "my father sent me to you as an escort": σοὶ γάρ με πατὴρ ἅμα πομπὸν ὄπασσεν (461). In the end, Hermes's father is Zeus; and Poluktor could well be correlative with Zeus as the giver of good things. Thus in likening Priam to his father, he sees a reflection of Zeus in Priam.[114]

Why does Hermes see this mortal man full of death (his son's accomplished death and his own imminent one) as a likeness of his own father, Poluktor-Zeus? Hermes's alias for his father, Poluktor, has one further signification beyond a rich man or a generous god: it also suggests the stored up wealth of the god of the underworld who receives all but lets none go. When Hermes renames his father as Poluktor while fulfilling his father's bidding to escort old Priam on an underworldlike journey to receive the dead body of his son, he implicitly associates Zeus with chthonic power.[115]

The *Iliad* contains one reference to Zeus as a god of the underworld. In the embassy to Achilles, Phoinix reminds Achilles of his devotion to him as to his own son since his father cursed him to never have children. Phoinix incurred his father's wrath when, upon his mother's request, he slept with the mistress of his father. In anger his father cursed him by the Erinyes. "And the gods fulfilled his curse, even chthonic Zeus and dread Persephone" (Ζεύς τε καταχθόνιος καὶ ἐπαινὴ Περσεφόνεια 9.457). Old Phoinix, recounting an event from his childhood, conjures a seemingly archaic image of an infernal Zeus otherwise absent from the poem.[116] Phoinix's image of Zeus does not correspond to the poem's representation of him as a god who shrinks from overseeing the death of his son (Book 16, *passim*) or who appeases *Poseidon's* wrath by encouraging

---

[113]Richardson 1993, 314.

[114]Perhaps significantly the epithet "godlike," θεοειδής, occurs in the line just after Hermes likens him to his father (372).

[115]On the underworld imagery of Book 24, see Whitman 1958, 217 ff.; Redfield 1975, 214. On chthonic Zeus generally, see Burkert 1985, 200-203.

[116]There is one mention of chthonic Zeus in Hesiod *W&D* 465; there associated with Demeter, the nomination appears literal, i.e. agricultural. The image of chthonic Zeus is developed later in tragedy; e.g. Aeschylus pairs Zeus with other chthonic gods in *Agamemnon* 355 and *Choephoroi* 394-99.

him to destroy the Achaean wall (7.455-463) or who marvels at Hera's terrible wish to eat Priam and his sons raw (24.212) or who takes pity on aged Priam (24.323). Unlike Poseidon and Hera, Zeus is not portrayed as a vengeful and violent god. Yet there is one correspondence between Phoinix's chthonic Zeus and the Olympian Zeus of the rest of the poem. Both are on the side of the father and allow the son to be hurt. However, Phoinix's chthonic Zeus is aligned with feminine figures of vengeance and death — the Erinyes and Persephone. When the *Iliad* subdues these feminine figures of death by upholding the masculine ones, Zeus loses his connection to such infernal females and his vengeful aspect as well. At the end of the poem, he is chthonic Zeus of a civilized sort; he is Poluktor — the giver of good things, the beneficent god of death.

Unlike unplacable Hades, ἀμείλιχος (9.158), Zeus is a paternal god of death softened by pity.[117] The gods pity Hector's body, Zeus pities old Priam: ἰδὼν δ' ἐλέησε γέροντα ("Seeing the old man he felt pity" 24.332-33). This pity for the aggrieved father and the dead son brings Zeus close to men; and close to his son Hermes. As we have seen, in the *Iliad*, there is no conflict of generations between immortal father and immortal sons. The immortal sons stand rather between the divine father and the mortal sons — as messengers, whether, like Apollo, of Zeus's will or, like Hephaistos, of his very being, or like Ares, of the need for men to die in battle, or like Hermes, of his pity for those affected by death. The immortal sons contribute to, enable, the deaths of the mortal sons: Apollo finally leaves Hector (24.213), Ares gets the better of them all when they are killed in battle, Hephaistos makes the shield which cannot protect Achilles, and Hermes helps recover Hector's dead body. The relationship between the divine generations is no longer one of conflict but of closeness and cooperation. So Hermes stands as the final immortal son in exchange with Zeus, as the god closest to men and mortality, who can see in Priam, the father who redeems his dead son, a reminder of Father Zeus-Poluktor, the benign god of heroic death.

---

[117]On the worship of chthonic Zeus Meilichios, see Burkert 1985, 201. I will discuss Zeus and pity further below.

Afterword: Hector

By the end of the *Iliad*, Zeus has drawn close not only to his divine son, Hermes, but also to the fully mortal Hector as he cares for his body and funeral. With his care for Hector, Zeus returns to his postion as divine *patêr* but now with personal concern for one not only unrelated but also wholly mortal. By the end of the poem, father and son are widened poetic categories: so to Hermes, the mortal father Priam is like to the divine father Zeus; similarly, the mortal son Hector is like to the son of a god.

Beyond praising the hero with the epithet "godlike," the poem aligns Hector in a hypothetical relationship as a son of Zeus three times. The first two references underscore the impossibility of relation between immortal father and mortal son. But the third time, near the end of the poem after Hector's death, the great gulf which separated divine father and mortal son closes as Zeus himself takes on the care of Hector.[118] By the end of the poem, represented in the most mortal hero who emphatically lacks a divine lineage, we see Father Zeus taking care for the deaths of heroic sons.

We first see the poem's emphasis on Hector's non-relation to Zeus. There is no question that Hector is the conspicuously mortal son of a mortal father. Agamemnon underscores Hector's mortal lineage:

> οὐ γάρ πω ἰδόμην οὐδ' ἔκλυον αὐδήσαντος
> ἄνδρ' ἕνα τοσσάδε μέρμερ' ἐπ' ἤματι μητίσασθαι,
> ὅσσ' Ἕκτωρ ἔρρεξε διίφιλος υἷας Ἀχαιῶν.
> αὖτως. οὔτε θεᾶς υἱὸς φίλος οὔτε θεοῖο.
>
> (10.47-50)
>
> Not yet have I seen or heard by word of mouth
> that one man devised such sorts of painful deeds in a day's space,
> of what sort Hector, dear to Zeus, did to the sons of the Achaeans,
> just as he is without extraneous aid, who is neither the son of a goddess nor a god.

The son neither of a goddess nor a god, Hector's full mortality is unmistakable. In Book 13, Poseidon exhorts the two Aiantes by referring to the destruction Hector leaves in his wake. He calls the frenzied Hector one who "claims (εὔχετ') to be the son of mighty Zeus" (13.54). Poseidon's words, intended to provoke the two Achaean warriors, are not

[118]Here, as in the rest of the poem, the ambivalent idea that through death the hero approaches the divine emerges explicitly (compare the bird simile in the battle between Sarpedon and Patroklos; and Zeus's pity evoked by a hero's dying).

meant literally. Rather, as Leaf explains, Poseidon speaks hyperbolically, accusing Hector of presumption *as though he would* behave in such a way (1960, 54). Within the same book, as if in response to Poseidon's accusation, Hector himself demonstrates the falsity of such a charge. Answering the taunt of Telamonian Aias, Hector imagines himself as the son of Zeus and Hera in the contruction of an *impossible* wish:

> εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼν οὕτω γε Διὸς πάις αἰγιόχοιο
> εἴην ἤματα πάντα. τέκοι δέ με πότνια Ἥρη.
> τιοίμην δ' ὡς τίετ' Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἀπόλλων.
> ὡς νῦν ἡμέρη ἥδε κακὸν φέρει Ἀργείοισι/ πᾶσι μάλ'·
> (13.825-29)
>
> I wish I were as surely the son of aegis-bearing Zeus
> for all days, and that reverend Hera bore me,
> would that I were honored as Athena and Apollo are honored,
> as this day will bring evil to all the Argives;

Janko blames Hector here for presumption, contending that in this boast he confirms Poseidon's words that Hector would claim to be the son of Zeus (1992, 146-47). But Hector does not merit such aspersion. Hector does *not* make the claim that he is the son of Zeus and Hera or even honored like a god. Rather he uses the impossiblity of this wish to emphasize the possibility of the opposed event, namely the day of evil for the Argives. So Leaf has explained this εἰ γὰρ ... ὡς νῦν construction: in this form of wish, a thing is vividly depicted as certain by opposing it to an imaginary event which is obviously impossible, or vice versa (1960, 368). In Hector's wish in Book 13, the event depicted as certain is the day of evil for the Argives; the imaginary event in opposition is his birth from divine parents. Rather than exhibiting presumption, Hector's words express his full acknowledgement of his absolutely mortal status.[119] Indeed, the point of the poem's references to Hector as the hypothetical son of Zeus seems to be to underscore their impossibility, their untruth. For, as we have noted, the difference in honor awarded to Achilles and Hector comes down to the difference in their divine and mortal parentage: the gods will give more honor to Achilles since he was born from a goddess whom Hera herself suckled, whereas Hector was born from a mortal woman and nursed by her (24.56-66). Thus the poem, through Poseidon's consciously false accusation and Hector's

[119]Cf. 8.537-40 where Hektor uses similar rhetoric to the same effect.

impossible wish, raise the idea of Hector's divine parentage in order to all the more fully dismiss it.

But then Hector's own father, Priam, plays with Hector's divine parentage at the end of the poem, after the divine speech concerning Achilles's preferential treatment because of his goddess mother. With Hector now dead, Priam scolds his few remaining sons:

> Ἕκτορα θ'. ὃς θεὸς ἔσκε μετ' ἀνδράσιν. οὐδὲ ἐώκει
> ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ πάις ἔμμεναι. ἀλλὰ θεοῖο.
> (24.258-59)
>
> And Hector, who was a god among men, did not seem
> to be the son of a mortal man, but of a god.

Priam angrily rebukes his sons who have survived battle while the great defensive warrior, Hector, has fallen. In his grief, Priam adulates his lost son and blames the remaining ones. In so doing, he effaces himself, that "mortal man," for the sake of Hector's divine paternity.[120] In grief for his dead son, Priam obliterates his own self — a sign of profound mourning as the survivor "follows" the dead into the state of invisibility. He is also praising Hector by foregoing his own paternity of the most heroic son and ascribing it to a god instead. The poem does not need to "correct" Priam's words, as it does with Poseidon's in Book 13.[121] For in his eulogy, Priam does what the epic poem does. Through reflecting on heroic death, he recasts the paternity of mortal sons away from their own fathers to Zeus instead and transforms their passing mortality into permanent godlikeness.

Conclusion

Let us begin to sum up by stepping back to see the *Iliad* in greater perspective. As discussed by scholars like Jenny Strauss Clay and William Thalmann, Homeric epic fits into a larger project of hexameter poetry including theogonic and hymnic poetry. Clay and Thalmann argue for different nuances in this body of linked hexameter poetry; for my

[120]Cf. 22.394 and 434-5 where Priam and Hecuba respectively praise Hektor as godlike.

[121]The poem does not correct Priam, but complicates his words further when Hermes soon after plays with Priam's mortal status when he says he "likens him to his own father" (24.371), as discussed earlier.

purpose, I isolate one common denominator of these collective poems: praise of Zeus.[122] This praise is obvious in Hesiod's *Theogony*. It is more subtle though still explicit in the hymns. For example, while the *Hymn to Hermes* narrates the birth and cunning of the infant Hermes, it ends with all of Hermes's wiles already in the mind of Zeus (535); likewise while the *Hymn to Aphrodite* shows the irresistible power of Aphrodite as she succumbs to her own force, it gives Zeus precedence since it was he who cast the sweet longing into Aphrodite's heart (45). The *Iliad* too, I suggest, comprises a praise of Zeus as it develops him into a compassionate father who pities the mortality of his sons, in particular Sarpedon, Hector and Achilles.

Zeus's solidarity with his mortal sons extends into his relationship with his own immortal ones. Apollo, Ares, Hephaistos, and Hermes, as we have seen, all participate in his drawing nearer to mortal men. As a result, the *Iliad* has no concern with intergenerational strife and succession issues among the gods. Thus while the *Iliad* and the *Theogony* are alike in praising Zeus, they part company in their different pictures of intergenerational relationships. Unlike the threat son poses to father in the *Theogony*, we have seen that in the *Iliad*, only gods of the same generation as Zeus seriously challenge his supremacy — Hera and, to lesser extent, Poseidon. Without the theogonic movement through generations, time in the *Iliad* loses its linearity and becomes almost static in an equipoise of simultaneity. So we saw in Zeus's relationships to Apollo and Ares the cycle of Hesiod's Four Ages existing at once in the balance of Zeus and Apollo, Poseidon and Ares. Movement of time in the *Iliad* is evident not in dramatic divine upheavals, but in Zeus's more subtle development from distance to closeness, exemplified in the shift from

---

[122]Most important to Thalmann about the continuum of hexameter poetry is its single world view. This poetry was a means of coming to know and explain the world and man's place in it. It concerns history and the arrangement of the physical world; the course of divine and human history; the conditions that govern men's relations with the gods and each other; the significance and value of human civilization and social institutions (1984, xii-xiv). Clay discusses the interplay of theogonic, hymnic and epic poetry under the rubric of Panhellenism and its task of Olympian systematization. The Hesiodic poems outline the prehistory of the gods and men. The hymns are concerned with the acquisition or redistribution of *timai* within the Olympian cosmos. Homer presents the "stabilized Olympian pantheon with each god exercising his timai under the supreme authority of Zeus, who is both king and father of them all" (1989, 10-12).

his unconnected relationship first with Hephaistos and his connected one later with Hermes.

The poem ends not just with Zeus's nearness to his own divine sons, but also with his pity for two mortal ones, Hector and Achilles (19.340ff.). When we recall Zeus at the start of the poem described as the supreme god set apart from the others (ἄτερ 1.498), such pity for men at the end must be one of the poem's great theological achievements. There is much subtlety in the shift of Zeus's position from beginning to end because on the surface there appears to be little change: at the start Zeus is a true *patêr*, a conceptual idea of a father not connected to biological sons; and at the end he is again such a *patêr,* who cares for sons by analogy, such as Hector. But there is a change in the quality of his emotional involvement apparent in his development of pity, which Kevin Crotty shows "has a merging effect."[123] The *Iliad,* I have suggested, creates Zeus into a feeling *patêr* through the pivotal episode of the death of Sarpedon wherein his roles as *patêr* and genitor coincide. Zeus's reluctant acceptance of the death of Sarpedon comprises the crucial moment in his turn from detachment to attachment. Having experienced the pity of the genitor for the loss of his own son, Zeus becomes a *patêr* who can feel pity for the deaths of all sons.

A previous instance of Zeus feeling pity must be accounted for: before Zeus feels pity for his own son, Sarpedon, he already pities the wounded Hector (15.12). This prior instance provides an intriguing counterpoint to, and rehearsal for, Zeus's pity for Sarpedon. In ways Zeus's pity for Hector is very much like that for Sarpedon. Both occur in company with Hera and in some kind of paternal capacity — Zeus is Sarpedon's genitor, and called the "father of men and gods" when he pities Hector (15.12). A main difference, however, distinguishes the nature of this paternity. In the case of Sarpedon, Zeus agonizes

[123]Crotty 1994, 48. Pity has this effect "because it rests on the warrior's perception that another's well-being is deeply implicated in his own" (ibid.). So for example, Hector's grief for Andromache is inseparable from his grief at the prospect of his own death, just as Achilles's mourning for Patroklos's death includes mourning for his own. Divine pity for the deaths of sons cannot of course entail such a merging over the pain of one's own death. Merging is instead approximated by a drawing near.

about whether to save his son or kill him by the hands of Patroklos (16.435-39). That is, he engages personally and emotionally in his son's death. In the case of Hector by contrast, the issue of Zeus's complete supremacy plays into his pity: Zeus has just awoken from the sleep Hera had cast on him to find that the battle below has gotten out of his control and is running contrary to his plan. When Zeus pities the wounded Hector, he proceeds to intimidate Hera in a lecture about his invincible supremacy (15.14-33), rather than focus on Hector: his sovereignty is the primary issue, Hector a piece of that concern. Thus the paternal title "father of men and gods" in this first instance of Zeus's pity yet signifies his position as supreme *patêr* more than a personal one. And this idea of Zeus as an impersonal divinity in the episode of Hector's wounding is underscored by the simile which describes it: "And just as when beneath the blast of father Zeus an oak falls uprooted, and a dread reek of brimstone arises from it, then indeed courage no longer possesses one who looks on and stands nearby, for harsh is the bolt of great Zeus; even so fell mighty Hector swiftly to the ground in the dust" (14.414-418). This simile presents an exemplary picture of the impersonal "father Zeus" (14.414), who sends down elemental violence from afar.[124] Thus this first instance of Zeus's pity, before his pity for Sarpedon, comprises a foil to the one soon to follow wherein Zeus pities his son as a personal father and father god.

We must also note that divine pity is not exclusive to Zeus. Once Hera feels pity for the Achaeans when they are hard pressed in battle (8.350). And Apollo also feels pity for the mistreated body of Hector (24.19).[125] How does Zeus's pity differ from Hera's

---

[124]On Zeus as weather god reflective of "normative" divinity, not epic conventionalized divinity, see Redfield 1975, 75-78. I do not agree, however, with Redfield's division between gods of actual practice and epic "literary" gods.

[125]Nicholas Richardson argues that Apollo's concern for respect and pity (*aidos* and *eleos*) frames the poem: in Book 1.8-52, Apollo responds to Agamemnon's disregard for his priest's supplication by sending a plague upon the Achaeans; in 24.19, Apollo instigates the divine care for Hector's body by pitying him (Richardson 1993, 5-7; 280). A problem with Richardson's claim is that while Apollo's response surely involves respect and pity in a general sense, the diction of the passage never specifically refers to either. Instead it emphasizes Apollo's anger (χολωθεὶς 1.9; χωομένος 1.44), in accord with the opening theme of *mênis*. Despite this objection to Richardson's argument, he does call attention to an important aspect of Apollo's role in the poem I have not yet touched on. Curiously, the *Iliad* begins as father centered, from the divine point of view, with its proemial mention of the will of Zeus. But very

toward the Achaeans (8.350) or Apollo's toward Hector's body (24.19)? In a discussion of pity, Crotty discerns a "close association between *eleos* and family connections in the *Iliad*" (1994, 47). To this point he evidences Andromache, Priam and Hecuba asking Hector for pity; and Odysseus and Phoinix asking Achilles for pity with reference to Achilles's father or, in the case of Phoinix, Phoinix's fatherliness.[126] Pity can obtain between husband and wife or parent and child. To an extent self-reflective — I can pity someone because I can imagine how I would feel in their shoes — pity readily extends to intimate family members who are not quite others.[127] Zeus's pity, I suggest, differs from that of Hera and Apollo in its familial associations. Hera's pity is partisan: a staunch Achaean ally, she flinches to see her favorites being too harshly thrashed. Apollo's pity is rational and rhetorically balanced between praise and blame, the former for Hector, the latter for Achilles. Apollo's pity for Hector arouses an argument with Hera in her disregard for him (24.25-63), suggesting a kind of partisanship applicable to both these gods who pity men; Hera pities the Greeks while Apollo pities the Trojan. Zeus, by contrast, pities both Greek and Trojan, indeed caring for both sides in the pair of enemies, Hector and Achilles. And Zeus's pity, the death of Sarpedon shows, is paternal in nature. In pitying Sarpedon, Hector, and Achilles, Zeus cares for them as a father would his son.

---

quickly it shifts to the action of the son: "Who then of the gods was it that brought these two together to contend? The son of Leto and Zeus" (1.8-9). As Rabel has discussed and Muellner expanded more recently, Apollo is Achilles's divine model and antagonist. Apollo's anger at the beginning of the poem mirrors Achilles's wrath; his pity at the end previews the pity of Achilles. According to Muellner, the *mênis* of Zeus is displaced onto Apollo since divine intervention in the human domain does not suit Zeus's style since he acts only through intermediaries. In assuming his father's wrath, Apollo again shows his closeness to Zeus. To add to this, the fact that Apollo is Achilles's ritual antagonist implies that, by analogy, he ultimately shares with Apollo a similar relationship to Zeus: Achilles also acts in profound harmony with the divine father, from before the start of the poem in being born his mortal son (as Laura Slatkin has discussed), to returning the body of Hector at the end of the poem. Muellner points toward the complex bond between father and son in the idea that Zeus takes on the *mênis* of Achilles when he nods to Thetis's request. Thus Zeus places his rage onto Apollo, and Achilles moves his onto Zeus. The foregrounding of Apollo at the start of the poem holds out, I think, a paradigm against which to understand Achilles as a son closely connected to Zeus and deeply involved in the nexus of his order.

[126]Crotty 1994, 47-66. Crotty explains battlefield supplication between warriors, as mentioned above, as that which causes one to merge with the other; the warrior is made to reflect on his own vulnerability to death. On Phoinix in the embassy to Achilles, see Muellner 1996, 147-49; on the embassy and father figures, see Wilson forthcoming.

[127]For a summary of the scholarship on *eleos* and the variant definitions ascribed to it, see Crotty 1994, 44-46.

One example serves to tie up these considerations of Zeus as a *patêr* who moves closer to men through pity — and to complicate them. A formulaic line of Zeus's pity appears in Book 2 and recurs in Book 24. In each case Zeus has sent Iris with a message: Διὸς δέ τοι ἄγγελός εἰμι./ ὃς σεῦ ἄνευθεν ἐὼν μέγα κήδεται ἠδ' ἐλεαίρει (I am a messenger from Zeus, who even being far away cares for you greatly and pities you 2.26-27=2.63-64=24.173-74). The lines in Books 2 and 24 may be identical, but their contexts reveal their great difference. For in Book 2, Iris reports Zeus's care to Agamemnon in the Lying Dream, which Zeus purposely designed to deceive him. The idea of Zeus's pity even from afar is utterly ironic as these words in context mean the exact opposite of what they say. But by Book 24 when this line of Zeus's pity recurs and Iris is preparing Priam for his embassy to Achilles, the report of Zeus's pity is now true. Thus, true to our observation of Zeus's growing closeness to men and gods in the poem, Zeus's expression of pity is ironic at the beginning of the poem and only true at the end. A interesting twist arises, however: the poem's final statement of Zeus's pity is significantly directed at not a son, but a father. Harold Isaacs has discovered a curiosity about father-son literature in its preponderant point of view of the son rather than the father:

> There came a time in my middle forties when I first began to notice that almost all writing about fathers and sons was done by sons. Our shelves are filled with what I came to call son novels in which writers across the generations have tried to deal with the experience of wrenching free from their fathers or have written sad or tender memoirs about what their fathers were like as they finally came to remember them.[128]

Interestingly, the *Iliad* appears to defy Isaacs's categorization of a father or a son work. For it seems to me to be both: on the divine level a father work, but with the importance of Apollo as early as 1.8, also a son one; on the mortal level a son epic but with the closing images of Priam, also a father one. Returning to Zeus's pity, Zeus pities the deaths of sons in a close, paternal way. But he also pities the exemplary father, Priam, in a peerlike

[128]In Isaacs's short list of father writing, he includes: "the Old Testament, that great father book, the Greeks and their gory generational myths, Turgenev's *Fathers and Sons* (which is essentially a son book that is kinder to fathers than it is to sons), Lear" (1978, 189).

way.[129] Zeus's pity thus fulfills both of Crotty's quantifications of it: it is familial and nearly merging.

In conclusion, let us now approach a response to our overarching question of why the *Iliad* depicts mortality through the deaths of sons. In complement to the *Theogony* and the Homeric hymns, the *Iliad* concerns the sovereignty of Zeus. A main objective of the poem is to praise Zeus by presenting him as no longer engaged in intergenerational strife and succession issues, but as the established father of gods and men. The poem, I think we have shown, creates this praise by developing Zeus's paternal character from an abstract *patêr* to an involved one. But why accomplish Zeus's fatherliness through his involvement with the deaths of sons? Why not show him coming down from heaven to protect heroes, like Apollo? or even in some other context than war? One response may involve the following line of thought. Just as the *patêr* is a primary image for the head of the cosmic order, so is mortality the defining feature of men.[130] With an essence of Zeus his fatherliness and an essence of men their mortality, the poem brings these two basic qualities together to praise Zeus while giving meaning to mortals' deaths. In the best of possible worlds, how would one die? Watched over, cared for, mourned and remembered. A divine *father*, who would oversee his son's death in both an emotional and heroic way — apart from the destructive feminine associations with the horrible death we saw in the likes of Kêres of the Erinyes — would best care for his son's death in this way. When death is conceived of as cosmically familial, as under the aegis of such a divine father who feels pity when his mortal sons die, death becomes profound. On the other hand, to praise Zeus through man's most serious, irrevocable act, is to offer him the highest praise. Again the *Iliad* seems to stymie Isaacs's question of a father poem or a son one — an idea in and of itself suggestive. This blurring of polarities will recur in the final analysis of the topic to which I now turn, the *Iliad's* mortal fathers and mortal sons.

---

[129]Hermes's words to Priam — "I liken you to my father" (24.371) — now take on even greater suggestiveness. For in his pity for Priam, Zeus likens himself to him.

[130]Recall Benveniste 1973, 170: "The term **pater* has a pregnant use in mythology. It is a permanent qualification of the supreme God of the Indo-Europeans."

Chapter I.2: Mortal Fathers and Mortal Sons in the *Iliad*

Introduction

The Iliadic portrait of mortal fathers and sons necessarily inverts that of the immortal father and sons. We saw that the divine father moves closer to his sons; in order for Zeus to become a close father, the mortal fathers must become more distant. Indeed the poem's many vignettes of mortal fathers and sons tell of their separation. But while the stories are joined by this shared theme, they are at the same time divided according to the categories of Trojan and Greek — those at home and those away from home.[131] The Trojan tale is one of utter desolation: all the brothers who are killed together in battle — depriving the father of not one son but two — are Trojans sacrificed to Achaean *aristeiai;*[132] all the warriors who supplicate for their lives on the battlefield are Trojan warriors whose begging ends in death. The Achaeans, on the contrary, are sons who have received great goods from their fathers — encouraging martial advice, armor and horses, divine allegiances. But while the gifts of the Achaean fathers are beneficent, as opposed to the picture of loss among the Trojans, the sons are not beholden to their fathers by them. For the paternal legacies are subverted by gaps and fallibilities. The paternal advice is benign but rhetorical; his armor glorious but ineffective; his relationship to a divinity close but marred, incomplete. The best of the Achaeans are sons better than their fathers.

While the Trojans fight at and for home, both the superficial and the underlying Achaean story is a movement of the sons away from home. Not only have they sailed to Troy in ships bearing the Kêres of death (2.302-303), but scattered through the poem are the stories of Achaean heroes who have separated from their fathers and left home —

---

[131]Mackie 1996, 127-135 provides a thorough discussion of the Trojan association with the *oikos* and the Achaeans with the polis, with annotated bibliography.

[132]There is one exception to this rule: Aeneas kills two Achaean brothers (5.541ff.). Though this certainly comprises an exception, it is perhaps mitigated by the fact that Aeneas is a Trojan at odds with Priam (13.460 ff.), who will leave home ultimately.

Meges, Phoinix, Tlepolemos, Medon and Patroklos.[133] These brief vignettes prefigure and culminate in the meeting of two men who together realize that they have left home irremediably — Achilles and Priam. In Book 24, an unprecedented meeting of Trojan and Greek occurs. Achilles sees in Priam the father he will not return to; and Priam not only physically leaves Troy for the first — and symbolically fatal time — in the poem, but he comes to Achilles figured in simile as a man who has had to leave home, forced into exile for slaying another:[134]

> Tall Priam came in unseen by the other men and stood close beside him
> and caught the knees of Achilles in his arms, and kissed the hands
> that were dangerous and manslaughtering and had killed so many
> of his sons. As when dense disaster closes on one who has murdered
> a man in his own land, and he comes to the country of others,
> to a man of substance, and wonder seizes on those who behold him,
> so Achilles wondered as he looked on Priam, a godlike
> man, and the rest of them wondered also, and looked at each other.
>
> (24.477-484; tr. Lattimore)

Narrative and simile make Achilles and Priam overlap and exchange roles.[135] Priam has just kissed Achilles's man-slaying hands, but he is figured as the murderer who has fled into exile. And they exchange parts in that the Trojan Priam is the one to leave home, while the Achaean Achilles is pictured as the one at home. According to the simile, whom could Priam have metaphorically slain? In this poem where fathers live and sons die, who could Priam have "killed" but his own son Hector? Just as Patroklos was killed physically by Hector but also by Apollo, so Hector was killed physically by Achilles but also, in an underlying way, by Priam. This extraordinary father-son meeting thus condenses the whole father-son ethos of the poem: the role of the mortal father in the poem is to oversee the son's departure from home out to war with its promise of glory. As the son becomes an individuated hero, he separates from his father and his lineage, replacing his particular biological father with Zeus, the conceptual father of the generation of heroic sons. For the divine father, the separation of the son from home allows their enhanced closeness; for the mortal father, it means a mixture of pride and loss. Thus, as we have seen, Priam mourns

[133]Patroklos left home but evidently brought his father with him.
[134]I will return to this simile in the discussion at the end of this chapter.
[135]See Redfield 1975, 215; Richardson 1993, 323.

and praises his beloved son Hector as a god among men, who "did not seem to be the son of a mortal man, but of a god" (24.258-59). Distinct for Trojan and Greek throughout the poem, in this final outstanding moment, both sides participate in this glorifying dynamic.

The course of the poem effectively distances fathers and sons. By the end irremediably apart, such an otherworldly meeting between them, as between Priam and Achilles, is the only kind and last one possible. In that meeting, father and son both come away from home in recognition of their mutual parts in the death of the son and the creation of a hero. And behind this meeting stands the supreme, Panhellenic father, Father Zeus.

Trojan Loss: Deaths of Brothers in Battle

With the Achaean attack on Troy led by brothers, Agamemnon and Menelaos, against brothers, Paris and Hector (and their many other brothers), it is not surprising that of all the Greek and Trojan warriors at Troy, we find over forty pairs of brothers.[136] They are spread evenly among the warring sides. There are, for example, the Greek Ajax and Teucer, Podaleirius and Machaon, Antilokhos and Thrasymedes; on the Trojan side, many of the most famous warriors are brothers of Hector — Paris, Polydamas, Deiphobos.[137] But despite the abundance of brothers on both sides of the battle, only Trojan brothers are represented pathetically dying, giving double grief to their parents at home.[138] Precisely because of the doubled loss to the house — or a complete loss when there are only two sons — the death of brothers conveys the utter desolation the war brings to the Trojans.[139]

---

[136]The approximate count of forty includes mortal brothers only. Excluded are past mythical brothers (Otos and Ephialtes 5.385f.); demigods (Castor and Pollux 3.237f.); rivers (Scamander and Simois 21.308f.); and gods (Zeus and Poseidon; Hephaistos and Ares). For a long but not quite complete list of mortal brothers in the *Iliad*, see Trypanis 1963, 19n1.

[137]Curiously, several prominent heroes who survive are not part of a pair of brothers — Odysseus, Diomedes, Aeneas. It has been argued that Achilles has a brother-like relationship with Patroklos (Trypanis 1963, 295-97).

[138]See footnote 131.

[139]Latte, followed by Trypanis, have argued that the army made up of *hetaireiai* is a later development of the "ancient power of the *genos*" to "retrieve" the blood of a kinsman and give him honorable burial. So this law of the *genos* is stated by a Trojan, Akamas. While fighting protectively over his slain brother, he kills the Greek warrior, Promachos: "Think how Promachos sleeps among you, beaten down under my spear, so that the blood-price (ποινή) for my brother may not go long unpaid. Therefore a man prays he will leave behind in his house a kinsman (γνωτόν) to be his protector from harm [of being unavenged]" (14.482-85; tr. Lattimore adapted). (As in this passage, the word for kinsman other times designates a

Just as the deaths of brothers is a double *penthos* for their family and companions, so it is double *kleos* for the warrior who kills them. Such twofold deaths thus appear either in the *aristeiai* of Greek heroes, or in briefer scenes of intense praise wherein they provide a hieroglyph as it were of the victor's great prowess.

Diomedes, in his *aristeia*, kills three sets of brothers. At its beginning, he comes first upon two brothers. They are the two sons of Dares, a priest of Hephaistos (5.9-10). One son, Phegeus, aims at Diomedes and misses; Diomedes returns the thrust and kills him. Idaios, Phegeus's brother, does not dare to stand over his brother and runs away. The scene ends with some consolation for the father:

> οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς ὑπέκφυγε κῆρα μέλαιναν.
> ἀλλ' Ἥφαιστος ἔρυτο. σάωσε δὲ νυκτὶ καλύψας.
> ὡς δή οἱ μὴ πάγχυ γέρων ἀκαχήμενος εἴη.
>
> (5.20-24)
>
> and he [Idaios] himself would not have escaped dark fate,
> had not Hephaistos kept him from harm, and saved him covering him in night,
> so that the old man would not be grieving completely.

In his first encounter with brothers, Diomedes does not kill both of them. Nonetheless, there is something terrible about the victory which commences his *aristeia,* for the death of these two sons demoralizes the Trojans and begins a period of great Trojan defeat. The sight of one son killed and the other fleeing arouses panic in the hearts —θυμός (29) — of all the Trojans who are great-hearted —Τρῶες ... μεγάθυμοι (27). Furthermore, it causes Athena to invite Ares to refrain from interfering in the battle, as though mortals can inflict enough harm on themselves without the assistance of the gods. Athena's withdrawal from her favorite recalls her response to Diomedes's father, Tydeus, when he savagely ate the brains of his conquered foe at Thebes.[140] There is also something unholy and transgressive in Diomedes's act of killing the son of a priest. So in the poem's opening, Agamemnon's disrespect for Chryses, the priest of Apollo, and his refusal to return his daughter,

---

brother specifically (17.35; 22.234). On the translation of 14.485, see Janko 1992, 220-21.) Such an historical argument would lend support to my idea of the *Iliad's* destruction of the familial bond in preference of the political one, but I cannot confidently cite it as actual history. For the argument see Latte 1931, 32-33; followed by Trypanis 1963, 296.

[140]Kirk 1985, 370.

Chryseis, brings down a plague. Clearly, one should not tangle with the priests of the gods. But Diomedes's whole *aristeia* is one long episode of doing precisely that, of transgressing the boundary between what is of the gods and what of men. So Aphrodite, wounded by Diomedes, laments that "the Danaans would now even do battle with the immortals" (5.380). And Ares, wounded likewise, complains that Athena incited Diomedes "to rage like a madman (μαργαίνειν) upon the immortal gods" (5.882). Accordingly, the transgressive *aristeia* of Diomedes begins with his transgressive slaughter of one of two brothers, the son of Dares, the priest of Hephaistos.[141]

After Diomedes is wounded and healed by Athena in his *aristeia*, he kills two sets of brothers: these two pairs together form one unit. The first are two sons of Eurudamas, an old dream interpreter:

> ὁ δ' Ἄβαντα μετώχετο καὶ Πολύιδον,
> υἱέας Εὐρυδάμαντος, ὀνειροπόλοιο γέροντος·
> τοῖς οὐκ ἐρχομένοις ὁ γέρων ἐκρίνατ' ὀνείρους,
> ἀλλά σφεας κρατερὸς Διομήδης ἐξενάριξε·
> (5.148-51)
>
> He [Diomedes] went in pursuit of Abas and Poluidos,
> sons of Eurudamas, an old man interpreter of dreams:
> the old man did not interpret any dreams for them when they were coming [to Troy],[142]
> but mighty Diomedes slew them.

In the second of the two, Diomedes kills Xanthos and Thoon, the two sons of Phainops:

> βῆ δὲ μετὰ Ξάνθον τε Θόωνά τε, Φαίνοπος υἷε,
> ἄμφω τηλυγέτω· ὁ δὲ τείρετο γήραι λυγρῷ.
> υἱὸν δ' οὐ τέκετ' ἄλλον ἐπὶ κτεάτεσσι λιπέσθαι.
> ἔνθ' ὅ γε τοὺς ἐνάριζε, φίλον δ' ἐξαίνυτο θυμὸν
> ἀμφοτέρω, πατέρι δὲ γόον καὶ κήδεα λυγρὰ

---

[141]The poem's first mention of brothers and their father, in the Catalogue of Ships, is similar to that of the sons of Dares insofar as the father is also one closely connected to the gods — a prophet: "They were led by Adrestos and Amphios with a corselet of linen / the two sons of Merops of Perkote, who beyond all men / knew prophesying, nor did he allow his sons / to go into man-destroying war. But the two did not / obey him; for the fates of dark death led them" (2.830-34). The prophetic father foresees his sons' deaths in battle and tries to stop them from going, but cannot oppose the lure of dark death. These lines contain an interesting hierarchy of control, which unravels rather into the lack thereof. For they begin formulaically with the names of the Trojan captains who lead (ἦρχ') troops from Adrestia, Apaisos, Pitueia and Tereia. The mention of their father who can foresee the future brings in two forces beyond the young leaders: their father and fate itself. The sons dismiss the power of the father; by the end of the vignette, in contrast with its first line, the fates of death are disclosed to be the true leaders (ἄγον). The father is thus presented as a middle element between his sons and fate itself. While the sons disregard him, the father's alignment with fate restores him to his proper position of power. For it is the leadership of the sons that is dismantled in these lines: they who think they are leading others are themselves being led by death.

[142]See Leaf 1960, 205 for the translation of this line.

λεῖπ'. ἐπεὶ οὐ ζώοντε μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντε
δέξατο· χηρωσταὶ δὲ διὰ κτῆσιν δατέοντο.
(5.152-58)

He [Diomedes] went after Xanthos and Thoon, the two sons of Phainops,
both late-begotten; but he [the father] was wasted away with wretched old age,
and had not begotten another son to be left behind in charge of his possessions.
There he [Diomedes] slew them, and deprived both of them of their lives,
and to the father he left lamentation and wretched cares
since he would not receive them returning from battle alive;
but next-of-kin divided up his possessions.

Before looking at these two vignettes together, let us first note some observations on this latter instance. The deaths of the two sons, Xanthoos and Thoon, is appropriately reported pleonastically, doubly: he killed them and deprived them of their lives, both of them. The passage ends with an important conceptual word which reinforces that full sense of their deaths: the inheritors δατέοντο, divide, or devour—what Achilles would do to Hector's body (22.354; 23.21). As we saw with Achilles's loss of Patroklos when he burns and mourns him like a father for his newly married son who has not yet fathered an heir, this passage conveys a sense of total loss. The father loses his only two sons — and so his heirs and his possessions. He is left with only his grief. With the death of the inheriting sons, the father also disappears.

These two scenes can now be read together. The fathers of these two vignettes, Phainops and Eurudamas, share advanced old age. It thus follows that Eurudamas is vulnerable in the same way as Phainops, vulnerable to utter obliteration. In his briefer story, the poem expresses that vulnerability in an abbreviated form not made explicit until the next vignette of Phainops. If we look back at the two lines describing Eurudamas and his failure to interpret dreams for his arriving sons (149-50), we see that the components of line 149 are redistributed in 150:

υἱέας Εὐρυδάμαντος, ὀνειροπόλοιο γέροντος·
τοῖς οὐκ ἐρχομένοις ὁ γέρων ἐκρίνατ' ὀνείρους (5.149-150)

We now observe that ὀνειροπόλοιο γέροντος becomes ὁ γέρων ἐκρίνατ' ὀνείρους (the two halves of the lines after the caesura), except in the second line preceded by οὐκ. That is, the second line recasts the old man (a noun phrase in the first and noun-verb one in the

second), but negates him in the process. When we read the two passages together, we see that the old man loses his defining quality of reading dreams when his sons leave, as though his identity goes with them, just as the other old father's loss of his possessions signifies the negation of the his whole life, all his efforts to accumulate and renew his house's store of goods and glory. The *oikos* ends with the death of the inheriting sons, wiping out the past and the future. Such is the devastation the Trojans suffer.

Agamemnon's *aristeia* is organized by four events of paired killings, the last three of which are brothers. After the first three pairs of deaths, his *aristeia* is interrupted by Zeus sending Iris to Hector to tell him that he should refrain from fighting until Agamemnon is wounded and removed from battle. Clearly, Agamemnon's *aristeia* will soon be cut short. Nevertheless, despite its imminent end, an invocation to the Muses asks for help remembering the many men Agamemnon is about to encounter — all of two: "Tell me now, Muses, who first came before Agamemnon, either of the Trojans themselves or of their renowned allies" (11.218-20). This appeal to the Muses would seem to presage a feat of memory (as at 2.484 and 14.508), but instead marks the wounding of Agamemnon.[143] The brevity of Agamemnon's *aristeia* is compensated for by the density of a triple sequence of slaying brothers.

Like Agamemnon, Odysseus ends his brief *aristeia* by killing two brothers, the second of whom, Sokos, first succeeds in wounding him severely enough to send him out of the battle. Challenging Odysseus, Sokos knows what is at stake: "on this day you will boast over two sons of Hippasos or I will deprive you of your life" (11.431-33). Athena wards off the fatality of Sokos's blow and Odysseus strikes the fleeing Trojan in the back. He then says over the corpse:

> Poor wretch, your father and honored mother
> will not close your eyes for you in death, but birds
> who eat raw flesh will tear you, quickly beating their wings.
> But as for me, if I die, the illustrious Achaeans will honor me with funeral rites.
> (11.452-55)

[143]Hainsworth 1993, 247.

Odysseus's words show that the parents are the polar opposite of birds of prey. To kill brothers — away from the caring hands of their parents — is sufficient compensation for one's own potential end. The loss of two sons is a great loss. The deaths which close the *aristeiai* of both Agamemnon and Odysseus must be terrible enough to compensate for the wounding and withdrawal of such great Achaean heroes. So their *aristeiai* culminate in the deaths of two brothers.

The poem's final scene of the deaths of brothers occurs in what might be considered Menelaos's *aristeia*— his defense of the body of Patroklos. In the battle over the body, Euphorbos, the Trojan archer who first struck Patroklos, threatens Menelaos, claiming the *kleos* for Patroklos's death and the right to his arms. Menelaos retorts by recalling how he killed Euphorbos's brother, Huperenor, who did not come home "on his feet" to gladden his wife and parents (17.24-28). Euphorbos picks up Menelaos's jeer over Huperenor's wife and parents:

> Now indeed, god-nurtured Menelaos, you will certainly make recompense for (τίσεις)
> my brother, whom you killed, and boastingly you speak of,
> having made his wife a widow in the inner chamber of the new bed chamber,
> and you gave unspeakable lamentation and longing to his parents.
> I would stop the grief of those unhappy ones,
> if I, bearing your head and armor,
> thrust it to Panthoos and noble Phrontis, into their hands. (17.34-40)

The one first to strike Patroklos is now the first one to be struck. Menelaos kills the haughty Euphorbos with extreme violence, pressing his spear through the throat and out through the back of the neck. This final scene of the death of the brother is the first tribute to dead Patroklos, doubling the lamentation and longing of the Trojan parents rather than stilling it. This first bloody tribute is a precursor to the volumes of Trojan blood Achilles will violently offer to Patroklos both on his funeral pyre and in furious battle, which ends in the death of another Trojan brother, Hector.

Trojan Loss: Failed Supplication

There are many kinds of supplications in the *Iliad*: goddess to god; priest to war leader; war leader to hero; friend to friend; parents to sons; sons to mothers. Most scenes of supplication are intra-Trojan or intra-Greek. One variety of supplication involves a father-son motif. When a warrior sees that he is to be conquered, he asks the vanquisher to spare his life in exchange for great wealth from his father's goods stored up in the house. All the warriors supplicating for their lives are Trojan, all the warriors supplicated are Greek. All of the supplications are rejected. Each supplicating Trojan is killed, accompanied by the thought that this one death is only a token of the utter obliteration being wrought upon all the other Trojans past, present and yet to be born. Like the deaths of brothers in battle, the several vignettes of warriors supplicating in battle form a picture of not just Trojan defeat but desolation.[144]

Supplication is in part an economic system. Between father and son, the life of a son is worth the price of an abundance of wealth to the father, partially because a son in turn owes his parents recompense for their nurture (4.477-79; 13.465-66; 17.301-303). The latter would entail care for the aged parents and a renewal of the father's glory by means of the son's own attainment of glory. Between victor and vanquished, the winner gains the glory of material wealth connected to a story of triumph. The *Iliad* on the whole reevaluates the worth of material wealth, most evident in Achilles's questioning of the system of gifts in exchange for his life. Supplication on the battlefield also undergoes a shift from an economy of material goods to one of ideological worth. An abundance of the father's riches is not a stay against the momentum of the Trojans toward utter obliteration.

---

[144]Supplication has been the subject of considerable scholarly inquiry. It is the focus of two books, Thornton 1984; and Crotty 1994; as well as of several articles: Servais 1960; Gould 1973; Pedrick 1982; Macleod 1992. See also Griffin 1980, 53-56; Lynn-George 1988, 200-209; Goldhill 1991, 73-75. None of these studies address the phenomenon of exclusively Trojan supplication and death on the battlefield. Gould and Pedrick consider the ritual of supplication in general; Thornton analyzes the Achaean supplication of Achilles; Crotty looks at the poetics of supplication and devotes close attention only to Thetis's supplication of Zeus in Book 1 and Priam's supplication of Achilles in Book 24; Macleod's essay addresses this final book of the *Iliad* alone. I am here considering only the supplication on the battlefield because it alone features a relationship of father and son. I discuss Book 24 below.

The worth of a Trojan death is greater than any amount of a father's gold and gifts. The rejection of supplication thus enacts a symbolic separation between father and son, but one which moves toward the effacement of the Trojan warrior rather than his creation as an individual hero. However, the poem's final scene of battlefield supplication, Lykaon to Achilles, shows the frailty of the distinction between moving away from the father toward either undifferentiation in death on the one hand, or undying glory, on the other.

In each of the following scenes, the Trojan warrior supplicates by the wealth of his father. I cite such speech in the first instance, but omit it in the subsequent analyses. Since the general thrust of the following discussion is the utter desolation of the Trojans presented in their scenes of fathers and sons, let us remember that at the start of the sons' supplications is the image of the father in his wealth.

Adrestos

The poem's first instance of battlefield supplication, wherein a Trojan warrior supplicates an Achaean one, establishes the tenor of all such supplication to follow. The Trojan at a disadvantage begs for his life in exchange for great wealth from his father's treasury. The Achaean warrior recognizes the gesture of supplication but refuses it. The one desperate Trojan is viewed as a representative of the crimes of others; not just this one Trojan, but all must be destroyed. In the first scene of supplication, this pattern of response to the one supplicating is divided between two brothers, Menelaos and Agamemnon. The Trojan warrior, Adrestos, supplicates Menelaos who, about to accept, is interrupted by the greater fury of his brother. Menelaos's near acceptance might have informed a wholly different poem. Agamemnon instead defines the poem's spirit toward supplicants. First we hear Adrestos's prayer to Menelaos:

> Take me alive, son of Atreus, and you will receive a worthy ransom;
> many treasures lie in the house of my rich father,
> bronze and gold and elaborately wrought iron,
> my father would conciliate you with boundless ransom of these,
> if he should learn that I am alive by the ships of the Achaeans.
> (6.46-50)

Agamemnon intervenes. Recalling the extreme treachery of Paris's deceit, he forbids any mercy to any Trojan from here on in:

> τῶν μή τις ὑπεκφύγοι αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον
> χεῖρας θ' ἡμετέρας. μηδ' ὅν τινα γαστέρι μήτηρ
> κοῦρον ἐόντα φέροι. μηδ' ὃς φύγοι. ἀλλ' ἅμα πάντες
> Ἰλίου ἐξαπολοίατ' ἀκήδεστοι καὶ ἄφαντοι.
>
> (6.57-60)
>
> Let not one escape utter destruction
> and our hands, not the male child whom a mother is carrying
> in her womb, let him not escape, but let all together
> disappear from Ilios, unmourned and unmarked.

Full of rage and insult, Agamemnon utters an imprecation which aims toward the absolute obliteration of a people. Just as a mortal approximates divine speech through the utterance of a curse, so Agamemnon here approaches the divine vision of total desolation glimpsed in the lines which refer to the time when Poseidon and Apollo will wash away all trace of the Achaean wall (12.13-33). But unlike the gods who seek to erase the achievements of human construction, Agamemnon strives against the people of the city, all its men — those now and those still becoming in their mothers' wombs. According to Agamemnon, all the Trojans bear the guilt of Paris; all must be slaughtered. Agamemnon here appears as his characteristically stubborn and rash self, but surprisingly, his decree is not idiosyncratic. The poet approves, saying that Agamemnon spoke justly, αἴσιμα παρειπών (61-62). The war against the Trojans no longer allows for the ransoming of the son in exchange for treasures from the father's stored up wealth;[145] its aim rather is sheer and total destruction (αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον) of the Trojans.

Dolon

With the rejection of suppliants established as the *modus operandi* of this catastrophic war where all must persish, the other suppliants follow suit and go the way of Adrestos. In Book 10, Dolon repeats parts of Adrestos's plea in his supplication (cf. 10.378-81 and 6.46-50). Like Adrestos, he also emphasizes life (ζώγρει(τ')...ἐμὲ ζωὸν) in exchange for boundless ransom (ἄξια δέξαι ἄποινα ... ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα) from the father. And as in

[145]Cf. 11.104-106; 21.100-102)

Adrestos's supplication, the response to Dolon is divided between two Achaeans. Odysseus answers Dolon's first plea with the deceitful reassurance that he should "not let death be upon his heart" (θάρσει. μηδέ τί τοι θάνατος καταθύμιος ἔστω 10.383). For since the spying Achaeans cannot get information from a corpse, they cannot kill their suppliant until they question him. But once they have heard a thorough account of the Trojan camp and counsels, Diomedes rejects Dolon's second plea (10.442-45) by turning Odysseus's prior pacification into a death sentence. Rather than reassuring Dolon not to have thoughts of death upon his heart (καταθύμιος), Diomedes warns him not to put thoughts of escape from death in his heart (μὴ δή μοι φύξιν γε. Δόλων. ἐμβάλλεο θυμῷ 10.447). For, Diomedes explains, a living Trojan is an enemy Trojan and will come back to oppose them again. Rather than allow for any future Trojan hostility, Trojans must be killed. The thirteen sleeping men Diomedes kills as he withdraws from the Trojan encampment underscores the blanket distrust of Trojans, the enemy even in their unprotected sleep. Indeed, Odysseus's infiltration into the Trojan camp, his use of deceit, and Diomedes's slaughter of the vulnerable sleeping men prefigures the final and utter destruction that will be wrought upon the Trojans.

Isos and Antiphos / Peisandros and Hippolokhos

Soon after Diomedes kills the suppliant Dolon so he will not be a bane to the Achaeans again, Agamemnon in his *aristeia* encounters two sons of Priam, Isos and Antiphos, both of whom Achilles had previously captured and set free for a ransom. This second time around, Agamemnon puts an end to the possibility of such Trojan futurity. He kills them readily and despoils their glorious armor (11.101-121).[146]

Just after Agamemnon kills Isos and Antiphos, the poem tells of another failed supplication of brothers, Peisandros and Hippolokhos (11.122-147). Whereas

[146]The poem hints that Agamemnon had his eye on the armor when Achilles first captured them (110-12); like the desire of Odysseus and Diomedes for Rhesos's goods. There is some implicit discussion of the desire for material wealth at work in the backdrop of these stories and certainly an economic aspect is central to these scenes of supplication.

Agamemnon's slaying of the former pair kills the potential for Trojan futurity, his slaughter of the latter destroys its past. These two paired killings thus together describe a kind of total destruction, of present, future, and past. Peisandros and Hippolokhos are two sons of Antimakhos, a Trojan who advised the murder of Menelaos when he came as an envoy to Troy. Agamemnon kills the two Trojan brothers in retribution for their father's crime. But though the sons die as recompense for their father's unseemly insult (νῦν μὲν δὴ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀεικέα τίσετε λώβην 11.142), the sons are themselves not exonerated of baseness. At the opening of the vignette, the poem says that these two sons above all others did not want the return of Helen because they hoped for splendid gifts and gold from Paris (11.123-24). Just as the poem earlier approved Agamemnon's genocidal decree to kill all the Trojan men and the male children in the womb, so it here suggests that these mercenary sons *deserve* to die for a treacherous father. Father and sons both tainted with guilt, Agamemnon's destruction of Trojans past, present and future cannot be so easily dismissed. Agamemnon's violence becomes both more and less palatable: more, because it may well be driven by more than just personal savagery; less, because then we must entertain the rightness of the destruction of an entire people and city.[147]

Lykaon

Lykaon's supplication of Achilles is the most extended scene of supplication on the battlefield in the *Iliad* (21.34-135).[148] Like all the other killing of suppliants, with also his own additional reasons, Achilles kills Lykaon because he is Trojan and all Trojans must die:

> Die, until we come to the city of sacred Ilios,
> you fleeing, and I cutting you down from behind.
>
> You will die by an evil fate, until all of you
> will have paid for the death of Patroklos and the destruction of the Achaeans
> (21.129-30; 133-34)

[147]On the city as holy but doomed, see Scully 1990, 16-40.
[148]Griffin calls it "the climax of the set of supplications in battle" (1980, 56n12).

But beyond the other scenes of the killing of suppliants as part of the obliteration of the Trojans, Achilles phrases his killing of Lykaon as an epistemological inquiry into that process of death and effacement. Having once before captured Lykaon, Achilles confronts him again:

> Can this be? Here is a strange thing that my eyes look on.
> Now the great-hearted Trojans, even those I have killed already,
> will stand and rise up again out of the gloom and the darkness
> as this man has come back and escaped the day without pity
> though he was sold into sacred Lemnos; but the main of the grey sea
> could not hold him, though it holds back many who are unwilling.
> But come now, he must be given a taste of our spearhead
> so that I may know inside my heart and make certain
> whether he will come back even from there, or the prospering
> earth will hold him, she who holds back even the strong man.
> (21.54-63; tr. Lynn-George)

How make someone disappear? Does death forever contain a man if Lykaon can return from slavery across the sea? Achilles declares that he is killing Lykaon to learn about the power of death, "so that I may know inside my heart and make certain whether he will come back even from there." Of all the heroes, Achilles knows about the permanence of death. Particular to him now is the knowledge that in order to send something away so that it will never return, the only way to do so is to kill it. Death is more than binding one to a master, futher away than across the vast ocean. Like Lear's five nevers, death is the impossiblity of return.

Achilles's slaying of Lykaon is the last and greatest scene of a supplicating Trojan son killed by an Achaean hero. After the other supplication scenes' visions of complete obliteration, Achilles returns to the most basic level of what it means to disappear. His speeches encompass the wide perspective of the destruction of a whole people and city (21.129-34); he conjures the vastness of the grey, containing sea. But in the end, obliteration is refigured on the micro-level as a matter between father and son. Lykaon reminds Achilles of how Achilles found him in his father's orchard and "took him away from my father and friends" (καί με πέρασσας ἄνευθεν ἄγων πατρός τε φίλων τε 21.78; cf. 21.36). To leave home, to separate from one's father, and to never return is the same path toward obliteration as toward undying *kleos*. While the poem signposts the fork

in the path by marking the path of obliteration as Trojan and that of undying glory as Greek, Achilles's recognition of his shared mortality with Lykaon (21.106-113) reveals the artificiality and fragility of that division. The utter obliteration of Troy and the Trojans is not just a contrast to the story of the permanent glorification of the Achaean heroes, but a figure of the path they also must personally travel to attain cultural immortality.[149]

Afterword: Supplication from father to son

In the scenes discussed above, Trojan sons supplicate Achaean heroes to spare them in exchange for the goods stored up in their fathers' houses. The complement to the supplication of Trojan sons is that of a Trojan father, Priam who begs Hector to remain within the walls and protect the city. But just as Trojan sons fall in battle despite their fathers' wealth, so the father's supplication of the son, though full of pathos, is ineffective.

Priam is an embodiment of a just old king. When Menelaos agrees to Hector's proposal for a single combat to decide the conflict in Book 3, he gives instructions that Priam be called to seal the pledges (3.105-106). Menelaos chooses circumspect Priam because he looks "before him and behind him" (ἅμα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω/ λεύσσει 109-110). Once Priam has overseen the cutting of the oaths, he turns to go back to Troy before the battle begins:

> ἦ τοι ἐγὼν εἶμι προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν
> ἄψ, ἐπεὶ οὔ πω τλήσομ' ἐν οφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρᾶσθαι
> μαρνάμενον φίλον υἱὸν ἀρηιφίλῳ Μενελάῳ·
> Ζεὺς μέν που τό γε οἶδε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι,
> ὁπποτέρῳ θανάτοιο τέλος πεπρωμένον ἐστίν.
> (3.305-309)
>
> I go back to windy Troy
> since I have not yet reached the point of enduring to see in my eyes
> my own son battling with Menelaos dear to Ares;
> Zeus I suppose knows and the other immortal gods
> to which of the two the end of death is fated.

As Menelaos said, Priam is able to look both forwards and backwards; based on experience of the past, he can thereby anticipate an event's completion. In this situation of single battle between his son Paris and Menelaos, the end of death is clear to Priam's envisioning and as

[149]Cf. Vernant 1981.

something already divinely decided. Priam has great experience in the death of his sons; the accumulation of these filial deaths has created in him a mixture of resignation and sensitivity. He does nothing to prevent this single battle in which Paris's life is at stake. On the one hand, he willingly places a finality onto this battle by sealing the oaths. But on the other hand, he walks away from its performance, averting his eyes (ἐν οφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρᾶσθαι). This last phrase doubles the act of sight: "to see in my eyes." It occurs only here in Homeric epic, further increasing what is already a peculiarity in its doubleness. Through this phrase, the poem foregrounds Priam's seeing, what he can do forward and backward (λεύσσει), but will not do here. Despite his stated incapacity to see his son in single combat with the end of death awaiting one of the two warriors, Priam will see the death of Hector. The difference there is that unlike in this monomachia between Paris and Menelaos wherein Priam seals the pledges and so facilitates the battle, Priam will beseech Hector not to enter into the fight.

In the overarching ring composition of the poem, Priam's entreaty to Hector on the wall in Book 22 indeed balances his cutting the oaths and returning to Troy in Book 3 (from where he has not left since and will leave only in Book 24 to fetch Hector's body).[150] His words in Book 3 must then be read in conjunction with his later ones in Book 22. There is again an initial focus on Priam's seeing expressed in a similar doubled emphasis: "the old man Priam first saw him [Achilles] with his eyes" (τὸν δ' ὁ γέρων Πρίαμος πρῶτος ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι 22.25), spoken of Achilles sweeping across the plain like the baneful Dog Star. Priam's wish to not see in Book 3 is immediately counteracted in Book 22 by his act of being the first to see. The appearance of the Dog Star is a sign of evil (κακὸν δέ τε σῆμα 22.30) and sickness to come. Prophetic of imminent disaster, Priam in his speech to Hector spells out in words what he sees in his vision of Achilles like that star; his speech is a weaving out in words of what he has seen.[151]

---

[150]For similiar patterns of ring composition, see Stanley 1993.
[151]De Jong 1989, 126-27.

Like Priam's vision, his speech begins wordlessly, with the gesture of the suppliant which could also be construed as a motion of lament. He moans in an emphatic repetition (ὤμωξεν δ' ὁ γέρων ... μέγα δ' οἰμώξας 22.33-34) and beats his head, imparting the sense that he speaks to one already dead— as he will not long after within the same book. At the end of his speech in ring composition he again performs gestures of lamentation, now tearing the gray hair from his head (22.77-78). When Priam soon after responds to Hector's actual death, his mourning is much more subdued and abbreviated. There he groans piteously once (22.408) and is then immediately moved toward action. Priam thus laments his son prematurely, before his actual death. We have seen Thetis act likewise for Achilles, but in her case, the poem will provide no further opportunity for her lament. Whereas for Hector, his proper funeral is still to come so that poetically it cannot be that Priam must mourn him now. It seems rather that this moment before death is poignant in a different way than the actuality of it. In the anticipation of death there is still the possibility of a different outcome, a not having-to-be one way only.

Priam opens his entreaty to Hector to stay within the walls with the command that he not fight the stronger man since that might entail Hector's death. Seven lines into his speech, Priam turns to his sad story of the loss of his many sons. He singles out two — Lykaon and Polydorus — wondering pathetically over their fate, as Helen did for her brothers, Castor and Pollux. But among the deaths of his many sons, his grief for Hector will be greatest: for the Trojans, for the glory it would give to Achilles, and to Hector himself. The rest of Priam's speech is a plea that Hector have pity on him who "has looked upon many evil things" (κακὰ πόλλ' ἐπιδόντα 22.61). Priam again spells out his vision as it were of his sons killed and daughters dragged away into captivity and his own horrid death as though it has already happened, again looking forward according to the past. He describes his own pitiful fate last and longest, making explicit what is implicit in all father's laments for their sons: their own deaths and the loss of the *oikos*. Without his son to protect him, the father will die most pathetically. But despite all of Priam's evocations, he

cannot move Hector; his *thumos* is not persuaded (οὐδ' Ἕκτορι θυμὸν ἔπειθον 91). Priam's failure to keep his son from battle implies his own death and the destruction of his house, people, and city. Trojan supplication, whether from son by the father's goods, or from father to son, consistently fails, a marker of the irresistible Trojan obliteration.[152]

Greek goods

We have seen that Trojan fathers and sons in the *Iliad* are characterized by weakness and loss. Exclusively, Trojan fathers lose not just one son, but two, when brothers are killed together in battle. Furthermore, the power of the Trojan father, symbolized in his stored up wealth, is dismissed when the sons' supplications by their fathers' riches are refused. Together, the motifs of the death of brothers in battle and the failure of supplication by the father's treasure create an image of the destruction of the Trojan *oikos*— the sons of the house are dead, the father of the house rendered impotent. In a poem intent on creating a generation of Panhellenic heroes, the Trojans — too centered in their local *oikoi* — are utterly vanquished. Father and son, the most basic unit of the ancestral house, bear the brunt of the Trojan devastation.

The picture of Achaean fathers and sons distinctly differs from that of the Trojans. Achaean fathers also suffer, losing sons in the war and left vulnerable in their old age. But there is no Achaean equivalent of Trojan Priam, the man of sorrows whose function has been described as enduring the loss of sons.[153] Instead, Achaean fathers are shown as the givers of good things to their sons — advice, armor, horses. But as I will discuss below, the legacies of Achaean fathers are inherently limited and the sons who inherit them

---

[152]Mark Griffith (1999) discusses the "eye of the father" in the context of Attic tragedy as something to be avoided: "Yet 'fathers' do loom very large in Greek tragedy — mainly *in absentia*, i.e. in the imaginations and conversations of the characters; and it is especially the prospect of encountering the father's gaze, face-to-face, that provides the strongest source of anxiety. ... In either case, living or dead, the father's ever-vigilant eye and overshadowing, often jealous, presence pose a constant challenge to his ambitious son, even as he also presides as the ultimate source of authority and arbiter of success, and (in some sense) as a safety-net and protector in the event of failure."

[153]"Priam is an important character, whose function is to lose his sons and lament over them" (Griffin 1980, 126). In fact, the closest Achaean counterpart to Priam is Nestor, who inverts rather than mirrors him.

progress beyond what they have been given, surpassing their ancestral lineage. The Achaean fathers are not presented as devastated, effaced figures. Though they are, in their limitations, left behind, certainly with regret and sorrow, it is without the sense of total loss characteristic of the Trojans. For the Achaean fathers are compensated for the loss of their sons who, though no longer a localized source of continued glory for their house, become divinely nurtured Panhellenic heroes.

Below I discuss the intangible and tangible goods Achaean fathers pass on to their sons: heroic advice, divine allegiances, armor and horses. All such beneficences pass between Achaean kin exclusively. In several instances, as though there to highlight the different fortunes of Trojan and Greek, Trojan fathers give the same kinds of gifts to their sons but with opposite, ominous effect. So, for example, whereas Achilles receives glorious armor from his father, Hector passes to Astyanax the life of an outcast orphan. Likewise, the Achaean sons are a joy to their fathers, but the Trojan son a bane.

Paternal advice: Peleus via Odysseus to Achilles

In the embassy to Achilles in Book 9, Odysseus endeavors to persuade Achilles to return to battle and save the Achaeans. On the day when Peleus first sent Achilles to Troy, it was Odysseus who came as Agamemnon's representative, just as he does now for the same reason. Exploiting his position of one who was before structurally on a par with Achilles's father, Odysseus now uses the genre of a father's parting words in an attempt to bring himself and Agamemnon into the father's sphere of power over the son:[154]

ὦ πέπον, ἦ μὲν σοί γε πατὴρ ἐπετέλλετο Πηλεὺς
ἤματι τῷ ὅτε σ' ἐκ Φθίης Ἀγαμέμνονι πέμπε·
'τέκνον ἐμόν, κάρτος μὲν Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη
δώσουσ', αἴ κ' ἐθέλωσι, σὺ δὲ μεγαλήτορα θυμὸν
ἴσχειν ἐν στήθεσσι· φιλοφροσύνη γὰρ ἀμείνων·
λῃγέμεναι δ' ἔριδος κακομηχάνου, ὄφρα σε μᾶλλον
τίωσ' Ἀργείων ἠμὲν νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες.'
ὣς ἐπέτελλ' ὁ γέρων, σὺ δὲ λήθεαι. ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν
παύε', ἔα δὲ χόλον θυμαλγέα· σοὶ δ' Ἀγαμέμνων

[154]Cf. Avery 1998. For a different view of Odysseus's, Phoinix's, and Agamemnon's attempts to replace Achilles's father, see Mackie 1996, 146f.

ἄξια δῶρα δίδωσι μεταλλήξαντι χόλοιο. (9.252-61)
Good friend, indeed your father Peleus enjoined upon you
on that day when he sent you from Phthia to Agamemnon:
'My child, Athena and Hera will give you might,
if they wish, but you keep in check your great-hearted spirit
in your breast; kind-mindedness is better;
Cease from evil-contriving strife, in order that
the young and old of the Argives will honor you more.'
Thus the old man enjoined, but you forget. But still even now
stop, and put aside your heart-distressing anger; and Agamemnon
will give to you, ceasing from anger, worthy gifts.

Odysseus's invocation of Peleus serves a calculated rhetorical purpose which capitalizes upon the father's authority and the son's expected obedience.[155] His recollection of Peleus's words serves his own ends as an enhancement of his own status and an argument in favor of accepting Agamemnon's gifts. Emptied of their content — of their relation to any actual paternal utterance, Odysseus uses only the form of paternal speech. The father in the fatherly words Odysseus "remembers" is nothing more than a construction of rhetoric.[156]

Menoitios via Nestor to Patroklos

A few books later, Nestor, who had accompanied Odysseus into Phthia to gather men for the Achaean army, repeats Odysseus's rhetorical use of paternal advice. He also undertakes to persuade a withdrawn hero, this time Achilles's loyal friend Patroklos, to go into battle by means of recollecting the fatherly speech spoken to him on that same day when they left for Troy. Intent on affecting Patroklos, Nestor quickly passes over the exchange between Peleus and Achilles.[157] He condenses that paternal speech into the apparently formulaic code for what a father tells his son: "Peleus enjoined upon Achilles, the old man to his son, always to be the best and to be preeminent among others" (11.784 = 6.208, Hippolokhos's injunction to Glaukos). The discrepancy between Odysseus's and

[155]Hainsworth has well understood Odysseus's turn to the words of Peleus as a polite screen for his not so polite message: 'restrain your anger' (1993, 97).

[156]Cf. Muellner 1996, 136-155; Wilson forthcoming. Willcock describes Phoinix's paternal advice to Achilles as an "ad hoc invention for the purpose of the present situation" (1976, 101). Cf. Brenk 1986, 81.

[157] As Hainsworth notes, "the pressure is on Patroklos and the important words are not those of Peleus" (1993, 307).

Nestor's reports of Peleus's parting words to Achilles confirms not the truth or falsity of them, but their careful selection according to the effect desired. Indeed, it seems that a father's advice to his son is such a standard topos, that it is almost expected or understood that they will be varied according to context, as need be (cf. 7.124-28).[158]

The problem with Odysseus's adaptation of Peleus's speech has been diagnosed as being a speech adjusted to the situation, but not the listener; "the proud man does not appreciate another's injunctions."[159] When we now consider Nestor's rendition of another paternal speech — Menoitios's parting words to his son Patroklos — we see that Nestor tends too far in the other direction: he adapts his words predominantly to his listener, much less than to even a permissably recreated reality. Odysseus's report of Peleus's words — that Achilles should restrain his *thumos*— retains some plausibility; we can imagine an old father discouraging excess and promoting moderation. But Nestor's recollection of Menoitios's last injunction to Patroklos — to be the older and wiser advisor to Achilles — completely contrasts with everything else the poem tells or shows about the relationship between the two friends. Rather than the poem's standard representation of the superior Achilles with Patroklos as his *therapôn*— both actual servant and substitute — Nestor gives Patroklos the advantage over Achilles in counsel:

> σοὶ δ' αὖθ' ὧδ' ἐπέτελλε Μενοίτιος. Ἄκτορος υἱός·
> 'τέκνον ἐμόν, γενεῇ μὲν ὑπέρτερός ἐστιν Ἀχιλλεύς,
> πρεσβύτερος δὲ σύ ἐσσι· βίῃ δ' ὅ γε πολλὸν ἀμείνων.
> ἀλλ' εὖ οἱ φάσθαι πυκινὸν ἔπος ἠδ' ὑποθέσθαι
> καί οἱ σημαίνειν· ὁ δὲ πείσεται εἰς ἀγαθόν περ.'
> ὣς ἐπέτελλ' ὁ γέρων, σὺ δὲ λήθεαι· ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν
> ταῦτ' εἴποις Ἀχιλῆι δαίφρονι, αἴ κε πίθηται.
>
> (11.785-91)
>
> But Menoitios, the son of Aktor, thus enjoined upon you:
> 'My child, Achilles is the superior in lineage / race,
> but you are older; he is much better in might.
> Thus speak a wise word to him well and give him advice
> and act as counsellor to him; and he will obey beneficially.'
> Thus the old man enjoined, but you forget; but still even now
> you might say these things to wise-hearted Achilles, if he should listen.

---

[158]Cf. Martin 1989, 85: "Here the rhetoric of recollection comes full circle. A commander's persuasive power, as we saw, depends on an ability to construct memories; so does a warrior's attack on the enemy. The 'truth' value of such memories is not an issue; epic 'deconstructs,' if you like, the very act of memory by showing us its pragmatic underpinnings in such situations."

[159]Minchin 1991, 284n27.

But from the very foundation of their relationship, Patroklos occupies a deferential position to Achilles: he came as a *metanastês* to his house (23.84-90) and Peleus named him Achilles's *therapôn* (καὶ σὸν θεράποντ' ὀνόμηνεν 23.90). Accordingly, Patroklos consistently appears in the poem in this subordinate relationship to Achilles. Thus in silence he obeys Achilles's bidding to bring forth Briseis and lead her away (1.337-47). Later, when the Achaean embassy comes to Achilles, they find Achilles delighting in singing to the lyre, with Patroklos as his silent audience, waiting for when Achilles would leave off from the song (9.190-91). Achilles offers the ambassador men hospitality, but makes Patroklos do the work: "set down a large bowl, son of Menoitios, mix a strong drink, give a cup to each" (9.202-203). Again Patroklos obeys (9.205 = 1.345). He makes the fire, salts the meat, roasts it and lays it on platters. When it comes time to serving, however, Patroklos distributes the bread, whereas Achilles significantly shares out the meat; it is for Achilles to apportion the honor.[160] At the end of this episode, Achilles signals Patroklos to prepare a bed for Phoinix (9.620-21). When Patroklos fulfills this command, he delegates it to some other unnamed comrades and the handmaids (Πάτροκλος δ' ἑτάροισιν ἰδὲ δμῳῇσι κέλευσε 9.658), as though the task appointed to him is for the likes of a servant.

Finally, the way that Patroklos finds himself an audience to Nestor is also derived from an injunction of Achilles. Achilles calls him forth from his hut and sends him to Nestor to ask who it was that he brought out from the battle (11.602-612). Once again, Patroklos obeys (11.616 = 9.205 = 1.345). He arrives at Nestor's hut full of the awesome presence of his friend. The poem articulates Patroklos's reverence of Achilles, bordering on fear, for which reason he declines Nestor's invitation to come inside and sit down:

> οὐχ ἕδος ἐστί, γεραιὲ διοτρεφές, οὐδέ με πείσεις.
> αἰδοῖος νεμεσητὸς ὅ με προέηκε πυθέσθαι
> ὅν τινα τοῦτον ἄγεις βεβλημένον. ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς

[160]On feasting as apportionment, see Nagy 1979, 127-28. The two lines are significantly enclosed by the names of the two heroes, beginning with Patroklos, but ending emphatically with the name Achilles: Πάτροκλος μὲν σῖτον ἐλὼν ἐπένειμε τραπέζῃ/ καλοῖς ἐν κανέοισιν. ἀτὰρ κρέα νεῖμεν Ἀχιλλεύς (9.220-21).

γιγνώσκω. ὁρόω δὲ Μαχάονα. ποιμένα λαῶν.
νῦν δὲ ἔπος ἐρέων πάλιν ἄγγελος εἶμ' Ἀχιλῆι.
εὖ δὲ σὺ οἶσθα. γεραιὲ διοτρεφές. οἷος ἐκεῖνος
δεινὸς ἀνήρ· τάχα κεν καὶ ἀναίτιον αἰτιόῳτο.
(11.648-54)

I will not sit, divinely nurtured old man, nor will you persuade me.
Reverend and easily roused to anger is he who sent me forth to learn
who is this one you lead wounded. But even I myself
recognize him, I see Makhaon, the shepherd of the people.
Now to speak this word, I go as a messenger back to Achilles.
And you know well, divinely nurtured old man, what sort he is
a terrible man; readily would he blame even one not worthy of blame.

There is no reason to doubt Patroklos's characterization of Achilles. He invokes a reason for haste — Achilles's temper — that must ring true to Nestor. The scene at Nestor's tent suggestively begins with these opening words of Patroklos's reverence of Achilles, emphasizing the shift that takes place over the course of his encounter therein. For it is only after Patroklos's engagement with Nestor that his role changes from the obedient *therapôn* to the advisor full of initiative and suggestions, exactly what Nestor would have him be. Only after Patroklos emerges from Nestor's tent does he even further prolong his absence from Achilles by helping Eurupylos; and then, for the first time, he counsels Achilles and tells him what to do — in Nestor's very words, as though Nestor has cast some spell over Patroklos.[161]

Nestor has detained and persuaded Patroklos by telling him a long story of his past glory and then "recalling" Menoitios's parting words to him. Rather than a bewitching *pharmakon* sprinkled into his *kukeôn* (11.624) — his mixed drink — as in the house of Circe, Nestor bewitches Patroklos with his song of his own past glory.[162] At the end just before Patroklos leaves, Nestor recounts Menoitios's paternal exhortation that Patroklos

[161]Although, as Lechter (1994, 23) has pointed out, Patroklos returns to his subordinate — particularly filial — relationship to Achilles when Achilles sends Patroklos off to battle in a paternal manner by giving him cautionary advice (16.83-100), asking him to win him honor and glory (16.84), and giving him his armor (16.130-154).

[162]On Nestor as Sirenlike, see Dickson 1995, 37-38. I suggest that he does this by insinuating the possibility of a song of *kleos* achieved without the requisite death of the hero. (The recitation of one's *aristeia* by nature differs from the self-praise implicit in telling one's genealogy, "an exercise in heroic self-affirmation that amounts to the ultimate praise of the hero by the hero" (Nagy 1979, 274; he cites Muellner 1976, 74-77).) In his self-singing, Nestor presents the potential for a hero to hear the song of his own *kleos* within his own lifetime, much as the dangerous Sirens offer. Nestor's story thus makes Patroklos forgetful not only of his return to Achilles, but of his return to life, that is, of his death.

should be an advisor to Achilles. He emphatically describes this role with a threefold repetition: "speak a circumspect word and advise him and direct him" (φάσθαι πυκινὸν ἔπος ἠδ' ὑποθέσθαι/ καί οἱ σημαίνειν 11.788-89). Having scolded Patroklos for forgetting his father's advice (11.790), he uses the suggested lacuna of the father's parting words of advice in order to himself give the advice that Patroklos should give advice. At the final turn of this pivotal, "pregnant" scene, Nestor evokes the paternal tradition of advising, drawing Patroklos into the line of fatherly advisors.[163] But he imposes this on a hero who does not fit this position, as all the previous and subsequent images of Patroklos show. Through a play of memory and forgetting, Nestor transforms Patroklos, under the image of his father, into the image of the father-figure. At this pivotal turn in the poem, the words of the father are invoked and recreated; in a sense, they lie at the bottom of Patroklos's and Achilles's deaths. Both Odysseus and Nestor exploit their rhetorical force. Perhaps, when used thus rhetorically, they may be best considered a kind of *pharmakon* indeed — a substance capable of good or evil, salvation or demise, inherently neither one or the other but dependent on how they are dispensed.

Achaean versus Trojan paternal speech

In addition to Odysseus's and Nestor's recollections of paternal advice discussed above, the *Iliad* contains two paired episodes of other genres of paternal speech directed at sons— prayer, exhortation, and blame. Most striking about these sets of speeches is their linked contrast of Greek and then Trojan paternal speech.

Hippolokhos and Glaukos / Hector and Astyanax

The first pair of Achaean and Trojan paternal speeches is set together one within the other, like a nest egg. In Book 6, Hector temporarily leaves the field of battle in order to instruct the Trojan women to dedicate a robe to Athena. In the time it takes him to go from the

[163]"Patroclus ... has a long conversation with Nestor -- the most pregnant moment in the poem -- and starts back" (Arieti 1983, 128).

battlefield to Troy, Glaukos and Diomedes meet and exchange arms in a sign of paternal guest-friendship from of old. These latter glorious warriors remind each other of their illustrious grandfathers, discounting their own fathers in the process. An image of sons clearly better than their fathers thus emerges from the meeting of Glaukos and Diomedes. When Hector soon after prays to Zeus for the future of his son, he asks for him to become "far better than his father" (6.479), a wish pathetic for its certain impossibility of fulfillment. The paired speeches thus juxtapose the Achaean, and in this case also Lykian, achievement of a blessing violently denied to the Trojan hero.[164]

Hippolokhos and Glaukos

The meeting between Diomedes and Glaukos takes place first. Encountering Glaukos just after his battle against two gods, Ares and Aphrodite, Diomedes wisely asks the identity of his latest opponent (6.123). In a lengthy response of sixty-six lines, Glaukos traces his ancestry back four generations. But about his father, Glaukos has little to say:

> Hippolokhos begot me, and I claim to be from him;
> and he sent me to Troy, and strongly enjoined upon me,
> always to be the best and to be preeminent among others,
> not to bring shame upon the race of my fathers, who were the supremely best
> in Ephure and in wide Lycia.
> I claim to be from this stock and blood. (6.206-211)

In a long speech, Glaukos evidently finds the minimum of his father's deeds worth relating: he begot me, sent me to Troy, and laid a strong injunction upon me. His report of his father's advice is formulaic; it recalls Nestor whom we saw in Book 11, who eager to turn his attention to Patroklos, quickly summed up Peleus's advice to Achilles in the same words (6.208 = 11.784). Glaukos's report of his father's words subtly reveal his father's desire that his son should be like his fathers: the repetition ἀριστεύειν ... ἄριστοι [be the best ... who were the best] expresses what Glaukos should be and what his forefathers were. But in his long speech of his lineage, Glaukos describes only how his grandfather was *aristos*, passing over his father with the standard, almost perfunctory, report of his

[164]Glaukos, it is true, fights on the Trojan side; but he is an ally from afar, not a Trojan struggling against the very obliteration of his home city.

father's words and deeds. To be the best, Glaukos must imitate his grandfather, not his father.

Indeed, the emphasis of the meeting between Diomedes and Glaukos is not the story of their fathers, but the shared history of their grandfathers who met and exchanged gifts (6.215ff.). Glaukos elaborately recalls his grandfather, Bellerophon — for forty-seven lines, but mentions his other progenitors in five lines or less. He belongs to a line in which greatness occurs every other generation — wherefore his association with his grandfather rather than his father. Sisyphos, the founder of his line, is one of the renowned transgressors in Hades (*Odyssey* 11.593ff.), but his son Glaukos is of small repute. Likewise, the elder Glaukos's son, Bellerophon, is legendary in contrast to his rather anonymous sons. In this vein, the younger Glaukos recounts that of Bellerophon's two sons, one, Isander, was killed while fighting against the glorious Solumi, the same enemy whom Bellerophon overcame (cf. 184-85 and 203-204). Of Bellerophon's other son, Hippolokhos, Glaukos's father, nothing (beyond his advice to Glaukos) is said. Presumably, like his brother, Isander, Hippolokhos is not a great hero — also a son worse than his father. Finally, Glaukos himself is a highly admirable and sympathetic hero in the *Iliad*; he embodies the heroic ideal, shows absolute loyalty to his friend and cousin, Sarpedon, and speaks like a poet.[165] He is also a son greater than his father and so looks back to his grandfather for his model. The poem itself links Glaukos to his grandfather a generation earlier, skipping over his father: when Glaukos and Diomedes exchange arms, Glaukos foolishly gives gold for bronze because "Zeus took away his wits" (Γλαύκῳ Κρονίδης φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεύς 234), just as Bellerophon once became hated by all the gods (200) and so was "inflicted with madness" (θυμὸν κατέδων literally: 'devouring his thumos' 202).[166] Both grandfather and grandson temporarily lose their minds and suffer because of the divine — a mark of this every-other-generation ambitious greatness.

---

[165]Moulton 1981, 1-8.

[166]Leaf comments: "Madness has always been considered a direct infliction of heaven; so in ι 411, when the Kyklopes think that Polyphemos is mad, they say νοῦσόν γ' οὔ πως ἔστι Διὸς μεγάλου ἀλέασθαι [there is no way to escape the sickness from great Zeus]" (1960, 273).

Tydeus and Diomedes

The son better than his father is also an important motif in the story of Diomedes here and through the poem. Let us briefly digress to review the poem's presentation of this pair of father and son. Allusively, the poem has already drawn attention to Diomedes's tension with his father and shown that he is the better hero by virtue of the simple fact that his father transgressed the will of the divine and so ultimately lost Athena's favor, whereas Diomedes vigilantly observes Athena's behests and retains her care. Agamemnon first introduced the competition between the last generation of heroes and the present one, the Epigoni, when he rousingly chastised Diomedes for being a son worse than his father.[167] While Diomedes kept silent in the face of Agamemnon's rebuke, his friend, Sthenelos, rebutted: their fathers, he argued, should not be given as much honor as the sons since they perished because of their own arrogance, while the sons triumphed because they obeyed the signs of the gods (4.405-410). Sthenelos alludes to the *hubris* which brought destruction down upon the invaders against Thebes, killing six of the seven warriors. His own father, Capaneus, was destroyed by a thunderbolt as he scaled the walls of Thebes and boasted that not even Zeus could stop him (Aesch. *Septem* 427). And Tydeus, Diomedes's father, savagely gnawed the head of his opponent, Melanippos, and so lost the immortality Athena had intended for him (Apollodorus 3.75-76). It was for the more virtuous Epigoni — the sons — to capture Thebes instead.

Athena plays with Diomedes's heritage of a father both valiant and transgressive. On the one hand, she favors him as she did his father. Wounded by Pandaros in his *aristeia*, Diomedes prays to Athena that he may kill him in return. His prayer follows the traditional form, opening with an invocation to the goddess which names her with several attributes, and then claiming the god's present attention according to some past assistance.

[167]There is a potential dictional repetition linking that scene in Book 4 with the one in Book 6. In the earlier of the two, Diomedes's friend and charioteer, Sthenelos, responded that Agamemnon should not equate the two generations, since the latter is indeed better than the former: their fathers perished at Thebes because of their impiety. They, on the other hand, though fewer in number, took Thebes by trusting in the signs of the gods (πειθόμενοι τεράεσσι θεῶν 4.408). In the same pious way, Bellerophon overcame the Chimaira (θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας 6.183).

But instead of recalling what Athena has done for him before, Diomedes recollects instead what she has done for his father: "If ever before you stood with good intention beside my father in hostile war, now in turn be my friend too, Athena" (εἴ ποτέ μοι καὶ πατρὶ φίλα φρονέουσα παρέστης/ δηίῳ ἐν πολέμῳ. νῦν αὖτ' ἐμὲ φῖλαι. Ἀθήνη· 5.116-17). Athena readily answers his prayer, supporting him in deed and word. After relieving the heaviness of his wound, she stands near him; her present proximity, ἀγχοῦ δ' ἱσταμένη (123), corresponds to how she used to stand beside Tydeus, παρέστης (116), showing her repeated care for father and son. Her exhortation to Diomedes follows his own prayer; he asked her to aid him like she did his father and she reassures him that she has filled him with 'paternal might': "for I infused paternal spirit into your breast, dauntless spirit, the kind which the horseman Tydeus, wielder of the shield, had" (ἐν γάρ τοι στήθεσσι μένος πατρώιον ἧκα/ ἄτρομον. οἷον ἔχεσκε σακέσπαλος ἱππότα Τυδεύς 5.125-26). It seems that Diomedes could call upon Athena's previous care for his father as grounds for her present help to him since she has endowed him with the same spirit as his father, making them essentially alike.

But there is also a difference between father and son. Whereas Tydeus transgressed the boundaries of the virtuous hero and so died forsaken by Athena, Diomedes remains mindful of Athena and so attended by her. She returns to him when Zeus has approved her wish to drive Ares from the battle. She finds Diomedes, who will serve as her mortal accomplice through whom to assail Ares, withdrawn from the fighting due to a wound. Ironically, she rebukes him, saying that he is a son little like his father (800) since Tydeus, even when she bade him not do battle, could not refrain from fighting — alluding to Tydeus's lack of restraint in his savagery toward Melanippos. She jokingly continues that Diomedes, in contrast, although she stands beside him and protects him, does not fight even when she bids him to; thus he is no offspring of Tydeus (802-813). In response, Diomedes stands up to Athena's unwarranted mock abuse. He reminds her of his faithfulness to her divine command — he succeds precisely where Tydeus fatally failed.

Athena ordered him, Diomedes reminds her, not to do battle with any of the gods except Aphrodite and he is thus refraining from battle since Ares is now holding sway over the battlefield (5.816-24). Diomedes's defense faithfully reproduces Athena's behest to him. He repeats to her her own words of command (5.819-21 = 5.130-32). It is Athena who has changed her plans meanwhile without amending her instructions to Diomedes. The difference then between father and son is that Tydeus, regardless of Athena's command, would provoke battle, even contrary to her word. But Diomedes upholds her bidding religiously: "but I am still mindful of your injunctions, which you laid upon me" (ἀλλ' ἔτι σέων μέμνημαι ἐφετμέων, ἃς ἐπέτειλας· 5.818). As a result, Athena leaves off from her affectionate teasing of Diomedes, no longer speaking in reproach but with encouragement. She now informs him that he may fight against Ares and other immortals since she is such a supporter to him, just as she was before to Tydeus (cf. τοίη τοι ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθός εἰμι (828)/ τοίη οἱ ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθός ἦα 5.808). Diomedes has all the favor of Athena which she earlier bestowed on his father without the taint of his unforgiveable *hubris* and savagery.

In the present episode when Diomedes meets Glaukos, he rather boldly dismisses his father: "I do not remember Tydeus, since he left me behind when I was small, when the host of the Achaeans perished in Thebes" (6.222-23). Diomedes here claims to not remember his father, but he does remember his father's death in Thebes — that is, his ghastly deed and deserved mortality. Because of the guest-friendship of his grandfather with Glaukos's, like Glaukos, Diomedes skips over his father and remembers his grandfather, Oineos, instead (6.215ff.). But this thematic connection between the heroes' grandfathers symbolizes their "forgetting" of their fathers — for they are two sons better than their fathers.[168]

---

[168]The poem mentions Diomedes and Tydeus several more times, each of which prefers the son to the father, while still greatly valuing the father. In the Doloneia, both Odysseus and Diomedes pray to Athena; Diomedes asks her to protect him as she did his father 10.291). In the action in the Trojan camp, Odysseus takes the part of the speaker of words whereas Diomedes is the doer of deeds — the roles appropriate to their older man - younger man relationship, even a kind of father-son relationship. In response to Diomedes's prayer to Athena, "Athena infused might into the son of Tydeus, in order that not

Hector and Astyanax

While Glaukos and Diomedes are having their exchange of words and arms, Hector reaches Troy to fulfill the bidding of Helenos to instruct the Trojan women to dedicate a robe to Athena. Once Hector is within the walls of the city, the poem builds up anticipation of his meeting his small family, repeatedly referring to them while postponing their reunion (6.365, 366, 372, 389). When Hector finally finds Andromache and then turns to address his son — only after listening to Andromakhe, responding to her, and then playing with his son — he speaks not to Astyanax, but prays to Zeus and the other gods. His audience is in effect quadruple: we the audience of the poem hear him, as do Zeus, Andromakhe, and lastly — to whatever degree his young son understands — Astyanax. Zeus is his primary addressee:

> Ζεῦ ἄλλοι τε θεοί, δότε δὴ καὶ τόνδε γενέσθαι
> παῖδ' ἐμόν, ὡς καὶ ἐγώ περ, ἀριπρεπέα Τρώεσσιν,
> ὧδε βίην τ' ἀγαθόν, καὶ Ἰλίου ἶφι ἀνάσσειν·
> καί ποτέ τις εἴποι 'πατρός γ' ὅδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων'
> ἐκ πολέμου ἀνιόντα· φέροι δ' ἔναρα βροτόεντα
> κτείνας δήιον ἄνδρα, χαρείη δὲ φρένα μήτηρ.
> (6.476-81)

---

some other of the bronze-chitoned Achaeans might claim that he was the first to strike and he [Diomedes] come in second" (10.366-68). There are only two Achaeans present: the only "other of the bronze-chitoned Achaeans" is Odysseus. Athena strengthens Diomedes so that he will anticipate Odysseus and take first place — an implicit triumph of the "son" over the "father."

Furthermore, across ten books the poem develops the question of the young, the son, in comparison with the old, the father, using the figure of Diomedes. First in Book 4, Agamemnon reproached Diomedes for not living up to his father in terms of battle courage. In Book 9, Agamemnon lost heart and proposed the Achaean withdrawal and retreat from Troy. Diomedes, referring to Agamemnon's earlier rebuke to him, reproached Agamemnon for his lack of courage. Nestor spoke in response to Diomedes, criticizing the incompleteness of his speech on the grounds of Diomedes's young age. Nestor gave the final advice which was accepted and carried out. In Book 14, the Achaeans are again faced with dire circumstances. Diomedes suggests the plan that is followed. He overrides Nestor's advice of keeping the wounded out of battle; and he reverses Agamemnon's inclination to set sail and leave Troy. Diomedes thus fulfills Agamemnon's wish for someone, whether young or old, to offer a plan better than his: νῦν δ' εἴη ὅς τῆσδέ γ' ἀμείνονα μῆτιν ἐνίσποι./ ἠ νέος ἠὲ παλαιός· (14.107-108). It is the young Diomedes who proposes the better *mêtis*, better than that suggested by old Nestor, the master of *mêtis* himself. The final judgement on the question of father vs. son comes down on the side of the young son. Yet, as we have seen, not without the father. Diomedes, whose *aristeia* the poem celebrates, draws on his father's achievements as he accomplishes his own. The father helps the son win glory and the son wins glory for his father. The young triumphs within the resolution of mutuality (cf. 6.444-46).

The references to Tydeus in the speeches to Diomedes are the poem's primary allusions to the epic tradition of the *Thebaid* (see e.g. Vermeule 1987, 138ff.). It thus seems likely that the poem's treatment of Diomedes also concerns its relationship to an earlier epic tradition, which mirrors the father-son relationship. The poem then also finds its resolution with its poetic "father."

> Zeus and other gods, grant even this one here
> my son to be just as I, preeminent among the Trojans,
> good in strength, and to rule mightily over Ilios;
> and at sometime may someone say 'this one is far better than his father'
> as he comes back from war; may he bear the bloody spoils
> having killed an enemy, may his mother rejoice in her heart.

This is Hector's wish for his son: "may someone say 'this one is far better than his father.'" Such wish directly contrasts with Zeus's fear of this in the case of Achilles. Evidently, Hector makes a wholly mortal wish — that of continuity through replacement. His prayer is a wish for the future, yet hard to see separately from his other comments on what he knows the future will bring: the fall of Troy and Priam (6.448-49), which implies, also his own (cf.487). For Hector, a standard paternal wish becomes an impossible one.

There are gaps in the direction of Hector's address. He asks Zeus for a way of life Astyanax is too young to understand; and Andromakhe responds to these words instead of Zeus. The poem mentions nothing of Zeus's audience to the prayer, not even that he declined to accept it. He prays to Zeus when Zeus has already decided to abandon Troy, and at a moment when the tide of battle has moved against them. Finally, Hector closes his speech with a turn to insuperable fate (6.487-89). As Richard Martin has commented on Hector's use of claiming authority over military matters in this scene (488 ff.), "we hear not an assertion of actual authority but once more a more desperate attempt to wrest some power from position, *precisely when* the speaker knows he does not have the authority."[169] Hector's speech is less a prayer and more a plea for a future he knows his son will not have.

The combined speeches of paternal advice and prayer in Book 6 thus form a picture of contrasts: the Trojan father prays in vain for what the Achaean and Lykian sons have achieved — to be a son better than the fathers. I will return to Hector and Astyanax below who again comprise a contrast to the Achaeans in the legacies handed down from father to son.

---

[169]Martin 1993, 237.

Nestor and Antilokhos / Priam and his surviving sons

A final set of paired paternal speeches are spoken by like speakers but of contrasting genres. On the one hand, Achaean Nestor, an old father of many sons, exhorts and praises his son, Antilokhos; on the other hand, the Trojan Priam, also an old father of many sons, casts blame at his remaining sons. The two speeches occur near the very end of the poem making them both retrospective and representative, as though praise and blame ultimately comprehend the capacities of, respectively, Achaean and Trojan paternal speech.

Nestor and Antilokhos

Nestor directs Antilokhos before the chariot race in the role of instructor and praiser. Richard Martin has discussed "Nestor's consistent praise function in the poem." By continually "memorializing" his audience, Nestor gives commands, rebukes and advice in the genre of praise.[170] His speech to his son begins with praise. The father, says the poet, speaks to one who understands (μυθεῖτ' εἰς ἀγαθὰ φρονέων νοέοντι καὶ αὐτῷ 23.305); who has already been taught horsemanship by Zeus and Poseidon (307-308); and knows more cunning than all the others (311-12).

Just as Nestor speaks to his son as one already initiated, the relationship between them is harmonious and complementary. Roisman has shown that Antilokhos does not win the race by following his father's advice literally, but rather by picking up the more general spirit of cunning. And Richardson makes the fine observation that the structure of Nestor's speech "neatly mirrors that of the race, 309-25 portraying the physical and psychological situation before the turn, 334-48 that after it, with the speech pivoting around 326-33, the central description of the turn" (1993, 208). Nestor replicates in speech what he can no longer perform in deed, complementing in word what his son will soon enact in deed. There is a perfect balance between father and son which fits the shape of the racecourse which turns around the post and ends where it began.

---

[170]Martin 1989, 108-109. See also Detienne and Vernant 1974, 11-27.

Nestor addresses his son in Book 23, which begins with the funeral of Patroklos and quickly makes a transition to the games held in his honor.[171] This is a book of reconciliation: the process of death moves from personal anguish to socialized integration and celebration.[172] And at this late point in the poem, poetry itself is reflected as central to the transformation of *penthos* into *kleos*, shown particularly in the poet-figure of Nestor.[173] Nestor structures the first and most developed athletic event in the funeral games, the chariot race.[174] In ring composition, he frames the chariot race by his first speech to his son, Antilokhos (23.306-49), and then in his closing speech, in which he accepts a prize from Achilles (23.626-50). From a greater perspective, Nestor's chariot race speeches create also a larger frame extending back over several books. Just as he gave a speech of paternal advice at the outset of Patroklos's death —the beginning of his *pêma* — so he speaks again at its conclusion. Together, the two paternal speeches describe the trajectory of heroization. First the warrior must go into battle, into death — as Nestor encourages Patroklos in Book 11. His speech to Antilokhos, which marks the social recognition of Patroklos's death, stands on the other side of death: it is a speech about immortalization through *mêtis* and poetry. In his instructions to Antilokhos, Nestor concentrates on the turning post, the possible *sêma* of a man who died long ago. On the one hand, he tells Antilokhos how to use cunning to get around the dangerous turning post where many fall; these detailed instructions show his son how, like him, to escape death

[171]The transition to the games is made mid-verse in line 257, which shows the integral connection between the two subjects of the book — funeral and games. They are complementary.

[172]On the social mechanism of funeral games, see Redfield 1975, 204-210. Eight games are narrated in a decrescendo of detail and suspense since they function in part to diffuse the intensity of the passion accumulated in the preceding struggles, gradually restoring a sense of the normal (Richardson 1993, 164-65). Book 23 is also about the reconciliation of Achilles with Agamemnon: here Achilles symbolically makes his peace with Agamemnon, recognizing his position of honor by awarding him a first place gift without challenging him in contest (23.890-93). Cf. Richardson 1993, 166.

[173]Cf. Martin 1989, 108: Nestor speaks "in a manner akin to the poet's." See also Dickson 1995.

[174]Following Richardson's idea of the decrescendo of the narration of the eight funeral games (1993, 164-65), the chariot race, the first game, is primary. Its account occupies more than half the lines devoted to the telling of all eight games. As a balance to what has come before, the chariot race matches, in chiastic proximity, the burning of Patroklos's pyre and the conclusion of Achilles's formal lament for him.

through *mêtis*.[175] But the *sêma*, the place of monumentalizing, is crucial for Nestor also in his poetic function as a storehouse of memory and a speaker of praise for those already dead. In the aftermath of the chariot race, Achilles awards Nestor the final prize "to be a memorial of the funeral of Patroklos" (Πατρόκλοιο τάφου μνῆμ' ἔμμεναι· 619).[176] Achilles continues: "for not again will you see him among the Argives" (οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' αὐτὸν/ ὄψῃ ἐν Ἀργείοισι· 619-620). The funeral prize replaces Patroklos; or more precisely, the memory Nestor attaches to it, a memorial to be recounted, takes the place of the missing hero. Nestor, who sent Patroklos to his death, will serve this poeticizing function for him. In ways akin to the voice and view of the poet, Nestor embodies the ideal of an Achaean father who stands over the whole process of a son's heroization: he sends him into death and brings him out of it on the other end into immortality through the memorializing song of praise.

Priam and some of his surviving sons

After Nestor's praise of his living son, Antilokhos, and his promise of praise for the dead Achaean sons, Patroklos and others, the poem's last paternal speech presents a sharp contrast — a speech of blame to worthless sons. Priam, the bereft Trojan father, reproaches his surviving sons, contrasting them with the "best" sons (υἷας ἀρίστους 24.255) who no longer live:

> σπεύσατέ μοι, κακὰ τέκνα, κατηφόνες· αἴθ' ἅμα πάντες
> Ἕκτορος ὠφέλετ' ἀντὶ θοῆς ἐπὶ νηυσὶ πεφάσθαι.
> ὤ μοι ἐγὼ πανάποτμος, ἐπεὶ τέκον υἷας ἀρίστους
> Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ, τῶν δ' οὔ τινά φημι λελεῖφθαι,
> Μήστορά τ'ἀντίθεον καὶ Τρωίλον ἱππιοχάρμην
> Ἕκτορά θ', ὃς θεὸς ἔσκε μετ' ἀνδράσιν, οὐδὲ ἐώκει
> ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ πάις ἔμμεναι, ἀλλὰ θεοῖο·
> τοὺς μὲν ἀπώλεσ' Ἄρης, τὰ δ' ἐλέγχεα πάντα λέλειπται,

[175]The poet sums up Nestor's speech suggestively: ᾧ παιδὶ ἑκάστου πείρατ' ἔειπε [he told to his son the limits/ essence of each thing] (350). The semantic range of the word *peirar* designates "that which forms the limit of the outward extension of anything" (Bergren 1975, 41). One of its meanings is the boundary "between the world of life and contests (ἀέθλων) and the world of death" (ibid.). Nestor's speech can be seen to aim at keeping his son on the life-and-contest side of the boundary separating it from the world of death.

[176]This might be seen as a further sign of the complementarity between father and son in this scene.

ψεῦσταί τ' ὀρχησταί τε, χοροιτυπίῃσιν ἄριστοι.
ἀρνῶν ἠδ' ἐρίφων ἐπιδήμιοι ἁρπακτῆρες.

(24.253-62)

Hurry, base children, downcasts; would that all of you together
instead of Hector had been slain by the swift ship.
Woe is me who has ill fortune to the full, since I fathered the best sons
in wide Troy, not one of whom I say remains,
not godlike Mestor nor the charioteer Troilus
not Hector, who seemed a god among men, nor did he seem
to be the son of a mortal man, but of a god;
Ares destroyed them, yet all these disgraces are left behind,
liars and dancers, best in beating the dance floor,
robbers of your own people's lambs and kids.

Priam in his advanced age provides a mirror image for Nestor. Like Nestor, Priam is also a kind of poet, but one of blame rather than praise. He blames his living sons in his mourning for his dead ones; he is also a singer of lament. So Achilles likens the grieving Priam to Niobe (24.604ff.), a monument of unceasing grief. Unlike the Achaean resolution of death in heroizing poetry, Priam finds his immortalizing song for his sons in perpetual lament.

Nestor's speech of praise took place during the poem's concluding Achaean resolution of death: the funeral games for Patroklos, the ritual which completes the transformation of the dead warrior into a remembered, socialized hero. Priam's speech of blame precedes the poem's turn to the final Trojan ritual of death: the funeral of Hector, which ends significantly with the burning and burial of Hector — without the poem telling of the complementary, normalizing and celebratory funeral games. Thus it is for the poem's closing, representative Achaean father, Nestor, to sing an undying song of praise; whereas the other representative Trojan father, Priam, speaks blame and grief in his Niobelike perpetual song of lament.

The son as *kharma / pêma* to his father

The *Iliad* reiterates the idea of the Achaean father's praise of sons and the Trojan father's blame, through its uses of the traditional ideology to "be a joy to one's friends and a bane to one's enemies." Based on this rule, three Achaean heroes are praised as a "light" to one's father (8.282-85) or a bane to one's enemy and his father (13.453-54; 22.420-23).

But when this ethos is applied to a Trojan hero, it becomes inverted so that the Trojan son is — contrary to nature — a bane to his own father (6.282-83; cf. 3.50-51). So for example, the Achaean Teucer is encouraged to fight courageously and so "be a light to the Danaans and to your father Telamon" (8.282-83). But Paris, on the other hand, is twice blamed by Hector for either bringing a great bane (*mega pêma*) — Helen — "to your father and city and all the people, on the one hand a joy to your enemies, but a disgrace to yourself" (3.50-51); or blamed for himself having been nurtured a great bane (*mega pêma*) "to the Trojans and great-hearted Priam and his sons" (6.282-83). The destruction of Troy is in part warranted by the guilt of some of its inhabitants, Paris among them. Hector's blame of Paris suggests that Priam's blame of his sons is more than just a poetic effect, more than just the result of a war which devastates a whole city, but perhaps an articulation of a latent truth.

Legacies passed down from father to son

In addition to the paternal words spoken from father to son, Achaean fathers also pass down material goods. A poem of wartime, the *Iliad* features heirloom arms and horses. These goods intended to protect the son and take him swiftly out of harm's way only partially realize their aim. More often than not, the paternal armor is vulnerable or lost, and the swift horses made still. No armor is impregnable, not even that which is divinely forged. These vulnerable defenses against death perfectly summarize the overall beneficence of the Achaean father constrained by gaps and incompleteness. Though the Achaean father gives to his son with the best intentions, Achilles shows us that the Achaean son moves beyond his father's imperfect goods to become a hero outside of generation. In the one instance when a Trojan father hands down a legacy to his son, it is by contrast a promise of doom and destruction, in part for the very reason of the continuing bonds of generation.

The breastplate of Phuleus's son

Sometimes the armor a father bestows on his son succeeds in protecting him. Book 15 tells of the safety of the son of Phuleus thanks to the breastplate of the father:

> ὃς τότε Φυλείδαο μέσον σάκος οὔτασε δουρὶ
> ἐγγύθεν ὁρμηθείς· πυκινὸς δέ οἱ ἤρκεσε θώρηξ,
> τόν ῥ' ἐφόρει γυάλοισιν ἀρηρότα· τόν ποτε Φυλεὺς
> ἤγαγεν ἐξ Ἐφύρης, ποταμοῦ ἄπο Σελλήεντος.
> ξεῖνος γάρ οἱ ἔδωκεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Εὐφήτης
> ἐς πόλεμον φορέειν, δηίων ἀνδρῶν ἀλεωρήν·
> ὃς οἱ καὶ τότε παιδὸς ἀπὸ χροὸς ἤρκεσ' ὄλεθρον.
> (15.528-34)
>
> He [Dolops] then threw his spear at the middle of the shield of Phuleus's son
> attacking from closeby; but the well-made breastplate protected him,
> which he wore, fitted with plates; this once Phuleus
> brought out from Ephure, from the river Selleis.
> For his guest-friend, the lord of men Euphetes, gave it to him
> to wear in war, a defense against enemies;
> this even now warded off death from the body of his son.

As the ring composition — ἤρκεσε θώρηξ...ἤρκεσ' ὄλεθρον — makes clear, the emphasis of this vignette is the protection of the son by the father's breastplate. The fact that the protected warrior is not even given a name beyond 'Phuleus's son' gives all the credit to the father and his capacity to ward off death from his son with heirloom armor. But this happy outcome is also a prelude to less successful stories of sons in their fathers' arms, thereby providing a point of contrast that heightens the limitations of the other scenes.

Meriones's helmet

In Book 10, Meriones lends his helmet to Odysseus for his nighttime expedition into the Trojan camp with Diomedes. The helmet's "genealogy" is recounted: Autolukos stole it out of the house of Amuntor and gave it to Amphidamas; Amphidamas gave it to Molos as a guest-gift; finally Molos gave it to his son, Meriones. Now Meriones lends it to Odysseus.

The description of the helmet emphasizes its close construction (θαμέες) of boar's teeth on the outside (10.263-65). When Meriones puts the helmet on Odysseus, its dense protection is reiterated in a verb synonymous of "thick," θαμέες: "now, placing it, he covered (concealed) the head of Odysseus" (δὴ τότ' Ὀδυσσῆος πύκασεν κάρη

ἀμφιτεθεῖσα 10.271). This finite verb, πύκασεν, corresponds to the description of Amuntor's house four lines above. In the same metrical position after the caesura, his house is called πυκινὸν. "closely constructed, affording good shelter, protection or security" (267).[177] This description of the house as well-fitted, without breaks or interstices, quickly becomes ironic in light of the fact that Autolukos obtained the helmet by breaking in (ἀντιτορήσας 267) to it. While the feat of breaking into a secure house attests to Autolukos's consummate skill of thievery (*Od.* 19.395-96), the house is, nonetheless, not impregnable. For just one book earlier, Phoinix recalled his quarrel with Amuntor, his father. Phoinix was so angry with his father and upset by his father's anger that he could not continue living in his house any longer. While watchman stood gurard for nine nights around Phoinix's room lest he try to run away, Phoinix nevertheless, going in the opposite direction from Autolukos, broke *out* of Amuntor's house: "and then I, breaking down the closely fitted doors of the bedroom, came out" (καὶ τότ' ἐγὼ θαλάμοιο θύρας πυκινῶς ἀραρυίας/ ῥήξας ἐξῆλθον 9.475-76). Again, the careful construction of Amuntor's house is emphasized, described in diction similar to that in Book 10 (πυκινῶς). Amuntor's house, able to be broken into and out of, is a vulnerable protection.

The dictional similarities between house and helmet cited above — the house is πυκινὸν; the helmet θαμέες and πύκασεν — associate these two constructions closely built for security and protection. The helmet, like the house, must be vulnerable. Meriones's father gave him a well-crafted helmet to wear. With its several layers and intricate construction, it seems a sound protection. But it is also a vulnerable and penetrable one, indicative that there is a limit to how much a father can protect his son. The strong power of the father, no matter how much it would be without interstices, is breakable.

Meriones lends Odysseus a helmet which practically belongs to Odysseus already: back near the beginning of its genealogy, we recall that Odysseus's maternal grandfather, Autolukos, stole it from Amuntor's house. Reminiscent of his grandfather — "who

---

[177]Cunliffe 1963, 352.

excelled all men in thievery and oaths" (*Od.* 19.395-96) — Odysseus borrows the helmet also to perform a feat of cunning, his nighttime spying mission among the Trojans. Thus while Merione's helmet may be for him vulnerable protection from his father, for Odysseus on the other hand, the helmet skips over his father to illustrate the continuity between him and his grandfather — a phenomenon we have already seen in the lineages of Diomedes and Glaukos, and will see again for Odysseus in the *Odyssey*.

Achilles's armor and horses

Achilles's father, Peleus, though himself mortal, passed on to his son two gifts he received from the gods: splendid armor (18.83-84) and immortal horses (16.381, 867). Though legacies divine and magnificent, Achilles gradually leaves behind his paternal gifts as he surpasses his mortal lineage and becomes a hero outside of generation. Thus the story of his inheritance tells first of his separation from his father's armor, replaced by a superior set of divine armor newly forged for him alone. Relatedly, the poem tells of the immobilizing of his wind-footed immortal horses, figures once of swiftness become images of stillness instead.

The first description of Achilles's inherited armor emphasizes the separation of the son from the gift of his father. Hector, having won Achilles's arms from Patroklos, girds himself in it:

> ὁ δ' ἄμβροτα τεύχεα δῦνε
> Πηλείδεω Ἀχιλῆος, ἃ οἱ θεοὶ Οὐρανίωνες
> πατρὶ φίλῳ ἔπορον· ὁ δ' ἄρα ᾧ παιδὶ ὄπασσε
> γηράς· ἀλλ' οὐχ υἱὸς ἐν ἔντεσι πατρὸς ἐγήρα.
> (17.192-97)
>
> and he put on the immortal armor
> of Achilles son of Peleus, those which the heavenly gods
> gave to his father; and he gave them to his son
> when he was an old man; but the son, in the arms of his father, did not grow old .

The first view of Achilles's inherited armor is one of displacement and separation. We never see Achilles don his own armor. First Patroklos appeared in it and now Hector,

whose arming scene iconically demonstrates that the armor separates Achilles from his father rather than drawing father and son into the same shared "space" within it.[178]

In Book 18, 'The Shield of Achilles,' Thetis reenacts the bestowing of divinely made armor for her son now bereft of armor. Achilles's mention of the paternal armor to his mother brings time back to that day when the gods gave Peleus an immortal wife, a time of origin:

> I have lost him [Patroklos], and the armor
> Hector, killing him, stripped off; the armor enormous, a wonder to behold,
> beautiful; these the gods gave to Peleus, splendid gifts
> on that day when they placed you into the bed of a mortal man. (18.82-85)

The armor is a transition from present grief to a reflection on the past. It brings Achilles back to that original time of a "day when."[179] When Thetis gives Achilles a new set of divine arms, it repeats that day, comprising the fulfillment of a cycle of time as original time now recurs. Achilles thereby becomes separated from that first time, and, concomitantly, from the legacy of Peleus. So he returns to battle in a new set or armor which has come to him directly from the gods, bypassing his father. In effect, he is given an "original" mortality: he becomes less typically mortal as he becomes more separate from generation. Even his death is all his own, broken away from generational succession. Peleus's armor, borrowed by Patroklos and despoiled by Hector, is finally replaced by Hephaistos. The father's armor is surpassed; Achilles returns to battle not as the son of his father, but in direct descent from the gods as it were, a hero made immune from father-son generation. In

---

[178]After five wholly dactylic lines and the one before it almost so, the last line in the passage dramatically slows down the rhythm with five intial long syllables, forcing one to take note. The runover γηράς at the beginning of the line is matched by ἐγήρα at the end. But the pause after the enjambed γηράς also separates it from the rest of the line. The son is separated from his old father by his negation of growing old: γηράς· ἀλλ' οὐχ υἱὸς; in the rest of the line, he is separated from his father by the armor: ἀλλ' οὐχ υἱὸς ἐν ἔντεσι πατρὸς ἐγήρα.

[179]The epithet ἄμβροτος, applied to Achilles's armor and horses, is also applied in the *Iliad* to the winding-clothes of Sarpedon, but to no other artifact. But in the *Odyssey*, told after the death of Achilles, it now describes the winding-clothes of Achilles (24.59). This shared diction underscores the connection between the wedding of Peleus and Thetis and the "funeral" for Achilles.

the recreation of original time, linear time shifts and Achilles's moves into the realm of the timeless.[180]

The poem's repetition of divinely made armor bestowed on father and son encodes the dynamic between them. Hephaistos fashions for Achilles armor so wondrous, such as a man has never yet borne on his shoulders (οἷ' οὔ πώ τις ἀνὴρ ὤμοισι φόρησεν 19.11). The gods give Achilles a set of armor superior to what they gave to Peleus (which accords with their respective constitutions: semi-divine and fully mortal). Like the theme embedded in the telling of the exchange of arms between Glaukos and Diomedes, or indeed Sthenelos's outright statement in Book 2, Hephaistos's second gift of unsurpassed divine armor now to the *son* of Peleus gives an account of a son better than his father. It is not only a matter of semi-divine versus mortal blood. For this secondary set of armor appears to be a Homeric invention by which the poet recasts the relationship between father and son, making his story particularly in praise of the Achaean son.[181]

Achilles's horses

In addition to armor, Achilles received his father's divinely bestowed immortal horses (16.381, 867).[182] Children of the wind Zephyros and the Harpy Podarge (16.150), these horses can run "swift as the blast of Zephyros, which is said to be the swiftest" (19.415-16). But contrary to their nature, the poem shows these fleet, divine horses only in postures of stillness and scenes of death, as though their divinity has been translated into a frozen monument of grief. First, they are likened to a funeral stele that marks the tomb of a dead man or woman (17.434ff.). Then, in his introduction of the prizes for the chariot

[180]Shannon discusses the ash spear's persistent mythic connections with the origin of man. This may contribute further to Achilles's return to an original time. (Shannon 1975, 44-53). See also Scully 1990, 124-27.

[181]Edwards 1991, 156-57 discusses the story as invented by Homer.

[182]Achilles's speech to his horses is introduced with a line-end emphasis on their belonging to his father: "loudly he called to the horses of his father" (σμερδαλέον δ' ἵπποισιν ἐκέκλετο πατρὸς ἑοῖο 19.399).Cf. Edwards (1991, 282): "... the concluding πατρὸς ἑοῖο has more impact than when used in the similar verse (23.402) by Antilokhos of Nestor's horses."

race, Achilles says that were he to compete with his immortal horses, he would doubtlessly win.[183] But, he continues, as it is, I and my horses will remain:

> ἀλλ' ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ μενέω καὶ μώνυχες ἵπποι·
> τὸν τώ γ' ἑσταότες πενθείετον, οὔδει δέ σφι
> χαῖται ἐρηρέδαται, τὼ δ' ἕστατον ἄχνυμένω κῆρ.
> (23.279; 283-84)
>
> But I will remain and my single-footed horses;
> They stand and long for him [Patroklos], and on the ground their
> manes trail, they stand grieving at heart.

In a doubled line, Achilles says that his horses stand (ἑσταότες) grieving, the two stand (ἕστατον) grieving at heart.[184] This image of the once swift immortal horses now paralyzed by undying grief is their final image in the poem. Achilles's immortal horses, his other inheritance from his father, though divine become limited in the poem. They will not bear Achilles safely out of death. On the contrary, they prophesy that they will carry him into battle and death (19.416-17), where, dying heroically and becoming an acculturated hero, he will find his ultimate separation not just from his father's gifts, but from his father himself. Together with the armor, Peleus hands down to his son two unsustainable gifts: protection from death through (the lost) armor, and salvation from death by swift horses.

Trojan legacies

The *Iliad* presents two instances of a Trojan father passing on his legacy to his son. The first follows the pattern that only Achaean fathers pass down beneficial goods, so that when Trojan fathers operate within these benign categories, the good becomes negative, tainted by its "Trojanness." So, for example, we saw Nestor's praise of his sons inverted into Priam's blame of his. Similarly, in terms of paternal legacies, the poem shows that what Hector has to pass down to his son is the wretched lot of an orphan.

Of greater complexity is the poem's other instance of a Trojan paternal legacy. For rather than remaining within the terms of an Achaean good become a Trojan evil, this final

---

[183]Nestor's slowest horses, driven by Antilokhos, win the chariot race instead — clearly now a contest of *mêtis* rather than *biê*, perhaps indicative of a general turn toward *mêtis* as the poem draws to a close.
[184]Cf. Fränkel, *Gleichnisse* 56, on the immobility of death (cited in Edwards 1991, 106).

occurrence reflects on those terms by removing them out of this simple binary relationship of Achaean good-Trojan evil and juxtaposing the Achaean good with an empowered, revitalized Trojan viewpoint instead. Specifically, when Achilles encounters Aeneas in battle, implicit in the meeting of the two men is that of two epic traditions, two epic ideologies. Whereas the *Iliad* is a reflective poem of endings — of the heroic age, of the marriage of Peleus and Thetis in the death of Achilles — the Aeneid tradition appears to offer the futurity of a recommencement beyond this catastrophic vision of doom and glory. Aeneas looks at time and the future with an openness and hopefulness wholly alien to Achilles. He offers to begin the cycle all over again, whereas Achilles and the *Iliad* remain on the side of the end. To be at the beginning of a line means to give way to those who come after you, it means being repeated in the cycle of generations. Achilles and the *Iliad*, like Zeus, prefer the end of the line, where one is ultimate and unrepeatable.

Hector and Astyanax

We have seen that Hector wished for his son to become just like him: a preeminent warrior, valiant in might and king among the Trojans (6.476-481). Andromache however imagines a different future for their son. She fears the time when Hector is killed and a terrible fate awaits the fatherless Astyanax:

> σὺ δ' αὖ, τέκος, ἢ ἐμοὶ αὐτῇ
> ἕψεαι, ἔνθα κεν ἔργα ἀεικέα ἐργάζοιο,
> ἀθλεύων πρὸ ἄνακτος ἀμειλίχου, ἤ τις Ἀχαιῶν
> ῥίψει χειρὸς ἑλὼν ἀπὸ πύργου, λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον,
> χωόμενος, ὥ δή που ἀδελφεὸν ἔκτανεν Ἕκτωρ
> ἢ πατέρ', ἠὲ καὶ υἱόν, ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν
> Ἕκτορος ἐν παλάμῃσιν ὀδὰξ ἕλον ἄσπετον οὖδας.
> οὐ γὰρ μείλιχος ἔσκε πατὴρ τεὸς ἐν δαὶ λυγρῇ·
>
> (24.732-39)

> But you, child, either will follow with me
> to a place where you will work at unseemly tasks,
> toiling on behalf of a relentless mater, or someone of the Achaeans
> taking you by the arm will throw you from the tower, a wretched death,
> because he is angry that Hector killed his brother
> or father or son, since very many of the Achaeans
> by the hands of Hector bit the vast earth with their teeth.
> For your father was not gentle in baleful war;

Andromakhe foresees that the deeds of the father will continue to be played out in the life of his son. The son of Hector who was not gentle (οὐ γὰρ μείλιχος) in disastrous war (ἐν δαὶ λυγρῇ), will either have an ungentle master (ἄνακτος ἀμειλίχου) or a disastrous death (λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον). This is the negative side of what a father hands down to his son. In addition to helpful advice or armor and horses, a father can also pass on the effects of his acts on to his son.[185] In her first lament for her recently killed husband, Andromakhe painted a detailed picture of the miserable lot of the orphan awaiting their little son, Astyanax. Robbed of his property (22.489), the son literally and figuratively loses his place in society. Shunned by his former friends, he is reduced to begging where before he was feasted and coddled in the utmost luxury (490-505). The early death of the father creates a reversal of fortune, turning the child's world upside down: "now he will suffer many things, since he has lost his own father" (22.505).

Achilles and Aeneas

In Book 20, Achilles encounters Aeneas in battle. He presents himself, as he will soon after with Lykaon, as skeptical about repetition: he reminds Aeneas that Zeus once before saved him from death at his hands, but now he will not again (194-95). Aeneas, on the other hand, takes the opposite position, affirmative of repetition. In response to Achilles's taunt of his desire to be king of the Trojans which is the portion of Priam (20.179-183), Aeneas recounts his genealogy, significant of his belief in the relevance of past to present, his forefathers' stories to his own (20.215ff.).

Aeneas defends his legitimacy to rule by tracing his ancestry in the ruling family of the Trojans; both he and King Priam share descent from Tros, who, Aeneas says ruled over the Trojans (Τρῶα δ' Ἐριχθόνιος τέκετο Τρώεσσιν ἄνακτα 20.230). Less than a

[185]So in Book 11 Agamemnon rejects the supplication of Isos and Antiphos because of the outrage their father perpetrated when he sought to kill Menelaos: "Now you will pay for the unseemly insult of your father" (νῦν μὲν δὴ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀεικεά τίσετε λώβην 11.142).

hundred lines later, Poseidon makes this same claim for Aeneas, but now in the future tense:

> ἤδη γὰρ Πριάμου γενεὴν ἤχθηρε Κρονίων·
> νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει
> καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται.
> (20.306-308)
>
> Already the son of Kronos hates the race of Priam;
> and now the might of Aeneas will rule over the Trojans
> and the sons of his sons, those who will be born later.

Poseidon's prophecy helps reveal the meaning implicit in Aeneas's account of his lineage. When Achilles first encountered Aeneas, he mocked him for hoping to be king among the Trojans, Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξειν (20.180). These three recurrences of this phrase in Book 20 comprise its only appearances, forming a unit. Aeneas goes back to his lineage to answer Achilles's charge and shows that he comes from the family fit to rule Troy. Poseidon's prophecy confirms this for the future. Perhaps it is in part his attitude of belief in repetition — in futurity — that makes Aeneas the right foundational hero for the next ruling dynasty. For in order to attain "immortality" through the continuity of sons, one must believe that sons will have sons, repeating perpetually. Achilles, in contrast, rejects this cycle, choosing instead to be the end of a line, the one and only and so unrepeatable.

Nagy has pointed out some parallels between the two heroes, Achilles and Aeneas. Both withdraw from the conflict because of a *mênis* aroused by the king's dishonoring them. Like Achilles against Agamemnon, Aeneas has *mênis* against Priam since he did not honor him according to his worth (13.459-61). Aeneas is the only other hero besides Achilles who has *mênis*, the first word and primary theme of the *Iliad*. From these similarities between the two heroes, Nagy develops the idea that Aeneas was the central hero of another epic tradition, an Aeneid tradition.[186] This other poetic tradition obviously tells a very different story than that of the *Iliad*, for it is foundational, a beginning rather than the culmination of the marriage of Thetis to a mortal and the end of Peleus's good fortune embodied in the death of Achilles. It follows from what we know of the Aeneid

[186]Cf. Martin 1989, 86.

tradition that it very likely would have celebrated the perpetuity of the line of the Aeneadae; so it would have sung of the continuity through sons rather than the deaths of sons.[187]

The meeting between Aeneas and Achilles brings into contact two divergent philosophies, summed up in the heroes' different roles as the culmination of a tradition versus the foundation of one. Unlike Aeneas, Achilles is not the father-hero who will recommence a line of kings, "the sons of his sons, those who will be born later" (παίδων παῖδες. τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται). Instead Achilles's epic is about a different kind of immortality. And, in a sense, its scope of time is narrower, more in line with Achilles's more circumscribed way of seeing. Different from an Aeneid poem which would tell of an origin for the present and so be a future-oriented song, the *Iliad* looks to the future only insofar as it will remember this past. Its few glimpses toward the future foresee a rather bleak picture. Glaukos images time as a faceless cycle of birth and death (6.146-49). And the poem's most explicit look forward envisions the erasure of human achievement and a return to the unmarked expanse of natural and divine time (12.10-35).[188] The darkness of the future after the *Iliad* may seem to mark a limitation. But it is the Aeneid tradition's very solution to mortality — a repeatable heroic cycle — which the *Iliad* works against.

---

[187]Nagy 1979, 265-66. The meeting of these two poetic traditions in Book 20 concentrates itself around the issue of kingship. Achilles can see no other result to conflict with the king but the preservation of the status quo; from Achilles's point of view, regardless of one's intrinsic merit and desire to rule, kingship is a family right, which the father passes down into the hands of his sons. When a king has sons, they will inherit that post, not someone outside the family, like Aeneas or Achilles himself. This is one of the first lessons of the *Iliad*, its line of reconciliation in the problem of the central hero's conflict with the king. So Nestor seeks to keep the peace after Achilles rebuked Agamemnon and angrily threw the scepter to the ground by reason of the special divine right of kings (1.277-81). Near the end of the poem, when Achilles outright awards Agamemnon the first prize in the javelin contest (23.890-95), the lesson of the secure right of kings is completed. Through the conflicts of the poem, Achilles comes finally to accept Nestor's initial words of unquestioning support of the king. The poem presents a clear trajectory: it opens with a conflict between the central hero and the king, wherein not only Nestor but the mass of the Achaeans continue to support Agamemnon, and resolves it by the end with a reconciliation and reaffirmation of kingship despite Agamemnon's many conspicuous shortcomings. This conservative path comprises the *Iliad's* solution to the problem of anger against the king. The Aeneid tradition would start from the same point of conflict between the main hero and the king, Aeneas withdrawn in his *mênis* because of Priam. We can surmise that this poetic tradition would reconcile the conflict in a completely different way. Rather than upholding the person of the king right or wrong, the Aeneid poem would present the moment — its solution — of a shift in the ruling house, a change in the paternal line of kingship.

[188]Cf. Ford 1992, 148-152.

The *Iliad's* idea of an end of the world coincident with its end describes instead its unique and insurmountable greatness.

Leaving Home

We have seen that the story of mortal fathers and mortal sons in the *Iliad* is an account of their separation. For Trojan sons fighting a war at home, distance from the father typically entails the separation of death, often without the recompense of an acculturated rebirth as a hero of undying fame. Achaean heroes, fighting a war away from home, separate from their fathers in a much less violent way. First, they naturally leave home; and when they do die in battle, their distance from the father is rewarded as the prerequisite for their transformation into a national, cultural hero.

This characteristic of the Achaeans as those who leave home is shown to be more than just a result of circumstance: the poem contains seven heroes who left home as one of their salient features because of a conflict with their relatives, not just in order to fight at Troy. For example, Phoinix left home because of a quarrel with his father and resettled in the house of Peleus (9.447ff.). To leave behind one's house and homeland amounts to a permanent shift in one's identity, one's place of origin and one's father. The heroes who leave home demonstrate a capacity to rebel against and separate from the cycle of generation and recreate themselves as their own origin — a process the *Iliad* praises as it upholds those who leave home and its context of generation to become the son of a national brotherhood, symbolically fathered by Zeus. All these seven heroes who left home are Achaean. The Achaeans, evident in these seven heroes, already have a history of separating from home, as though it is more innate to them than to the Trojans.

Leaving home: Phuleus, Phoinix, Tlepolemos, Medon, Lykophron, Epeigeus, Patroklos

Of the seven heroes who leave home, two go because of a quarrel with their father; the remaining five depart because they killed a kinsman. All of these affronts to the *oikos*

imply a capacity to stand apart from one's lineage and conceive of oneself as an individual. The self-motivated Achaean rebellion against their own *oikoi* prefigures the general tendency of the mass of Achaean warriors.

Anger at one's father — a transparent rejection of lineage — comprises one reason a son leaves his *oikos* to dwell elsewhere. Meges, the leader of the contingent from Doulikhion and Ehinai, is the son of a *metanastes*, Phuleus. Originally Epean, Phuleus "enraged with his father, once settled Doulikhion" (ὅς ποτε Δουλίχιόνδ' ἀπενάσσατο πατρὶ χολωθείς 2.629). Just as Phuleus left home because of strife with his father and resettled in a new place, so also Phoinix, in a much more developed story, left home because of anger between father and son. In the embassy to Achilles, Phoinix recounts to Achilles his strife with his father over a concubine. Encouraged by his mother to sleep with the mistress of his father and so lure her away from the older man, Phoinix's father Amuntor, cursed him, invoking the infernal gods to prevent his son from ever having a child of his own. Phoinix contemplated killing his father, but some god stopped his anger (παῦσεν χόλον 9.459). Nevertheless, he could not bear to stay in the halls of his angry father (πατρὸς χωομένοιο 463). With anger on both sides, Phoinix left his homeland of Hellas and came to the house of Peleus in Phthia, changing lands, homes and fathers.

Besides father-son strife, there is another reason recounted for leaving home: the killing of a kinsman or compatriot. The Catalogue of Ships introduces this motif in the story of Tlepolemos. Herakles's son Tlepolemos killed the maternal uncle of his father and left home because of the threats of Herakles's other sons and grandsons. He wandered until he settled in Rhodes with his companions and Zeus gave them wealth. In the Catalogue Tlepolemos is thus justifiably the leader of the Rhodians (2.661-70).

Medon is another metanastic hero. One of the leaders of the Phthians, he was a bastard son of Oileus, but he lived far from his native land since he killed a kinsman of his stepmother (13.692-97). When Aeneas kills him two books later, this fact of his change of homeland is repeated (15.332-33=13.696-97). Likewise, Lykophron's metanastic past is

recalled upon his death. He became one of the house of Ajax, "honored equally to his parents," after he left home in Kythera where he had killed a man (15.431-32). Next Epeigeus — the first of the Myrmidons killed in the battle over the body of Sarpedon — like Medon, became absorbed into the house of Achilles. His biography relates that he had been king in Boudeia, but having killed a kinsman, he went to Peleus and Thetis as a suppliant (16.571-76). His death is narrated as having befallen "far from the worst" of the Myrmidons — an appellation that may, as Janko wonders, be temporarily mistaken for the fall of Patroklos (1992, 387). For Patroklos shares a biography similar to that of Epeigeius. Unintentionally, Patroklos killed Amphidamos's son over a game of dice; as a result, Menoitios took him to Peleus who received him into his house (23.83ff.).

Achilles and Priam

The metanastic stories of Phoinix, Medon, Epeigeus and Patroklos cluster around Peleus and Achilles. All of these heroes left home and resettled in the house of Peleus. Furthermore, Peleus sent Achilles to Troy surrounded by heroes who, exiled from their own lands, became integrated into his house instead: he sent Phoinix with Achilles to Troy to teach him about battle and assembly (9.438-43), sent Epeigeius to follow Achilles to Ilios and the battle against the Trojans (16.575-76), and named Patroklos Achilles's *therapôn* (23.90).[189] The fact of their change of homeland becomes increasingly noted toward the end of the poem, Books 15-23; and Patroklos's resettlement, not mentioned until after his death in Book 23 is underscored by its doubling in his mirror image, Epeigeus. Evidently, leaving home is important to the Achaeans in general and Achilles in particular, who comes from a house with a tradition of receiving suppliant exiles. Priam's embassy to Achilles near the end of the poem focuses the expansive quality of the house of Peleus. It is a small stretch for Achilles to see in Priam his own father; and accordingly,

[189]Harry Avery has persuasively added Agamemnon to the short list of Achilles's fathers — Peleus and Phoinix — making Agamemnon his "third father" (1998, 389-397). But he fits into this longer list, too, as Avery argues that Peleus, sending Achilles "to Agamemnon" (9.253), entrusted Achilles to Agamemnon as to a father.

Priam — the paradigmatic genitor — takes on this expansiveness in the presence of Achilles, moving from genitor to *patêr*.

We have seen in this chapter the strong division of the stories of mortal fathers and sons according to the partisan lines of Trojan versus Greek. Because of the poem's Panhellenic ideology of upholding a generation of heroes bound by a national sense of kinship under father Zeus, the Trojans fighting at home for their local *oikoi* are doomed to obliteration. Thus Trojan fathers and sons suffer desolating losses: only Trojan brothers are killed in battle; only Trojan sons futilely supplicate for their lives in exchange for their father's wealth. Achaean sons on the other hand, receive the limited but beneficent paternal goods of heroic advice, armor and divine relationships. Nonetheless, just as these paternal legacies cannot fully care for the sons, these Achaean sons surpass their fathers as they become the last and best generation of heroes under Zeus. But as the poem draws to its close, these profound dichotomies of Trojan versus Greek and father versus son become challenged. So we saw at the end of the last section that Hector, despite being Trojan, received the care of the gods, and became like a son to Zeus. It is surprising that the end of the *Iliad* upholds *Hector* as the greatest embodiment of the son who ultimately chooses to leave home — in his refusal to withdraw within the walls — and subsequently becomes like a son of Zeus. The binary rule of Trojan versus Greek, already questioned in Achilles's words to Lykaon, is thus problematized in the death and funeral of Hector.

A similar questioning of binaries occurs in Priam's embassy to Achilles. In this case, the Trojan Priam breaks the rule of the poem's favoring of ideological fathers rather than biological ones — the *patêr* over the genitor. The conquering Greeks who take on the metaphorical relationship of sons of Zeus illustrate the rule; Priam, on the other hand, with his fifty sons many of whom fight at Troy, exemplifies the genitor. Yet, just as Hector became a metaphorical son of Zeus at the end of the poem, so Priam also becomes a *patêr* in his closing exchange with Achilles as Achilles recognizes his own father in Priam. Thus the end of the poem reconsiders the strict binary lines that have been drawn up to this point.

The father and son, Priam and Hector, challenge what has been heretofore a Greek achievement of Panhellenizing fathers and sons.

But perhaps even more remarkable than the unexpected development of Priam into Achilles's final father figure at the end of the poem is not their father-son relationship, but their identification with one another. Before Priam and Achilles exchange any words, a simile describes Priam's entry into Achilles's tent. This simile culminates the tradition of the house of Peleus of receiving exiles; but it also surprisingly conflates guest and host, father and son. The simile likens Priam to a man who has left home because he has blood on his hands:

> τοὺς δ' ἔλαθ' εἰσελθὼν Πρίαμος μέγας, ἄγχι δ' ἄρα στὰς
> χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος λάβε γούνατα καὶ κύσε χεῖρας
> δεινὰς ἀνδροφόνους, αἵ οἱ πολέας κτάνον υἱας.
> ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἄνδρ' ἄτη πυκινὴ λάβῃ, ὅς τ' ἐνὶ πάτρῃ
> φῶτα κατακτείνας ἄλλων ἐξίκετο δῆμον,
> ἀνδρὸς ἐς ἀφνειοῦ, θάμβος δ' ἔχει εἰσορόωντας,
> ὣς Ἀχιλεὺς θάμβησεν ἰδὼν Πρίαμον θεοειδέα·
>
> (24.477-83)
>
> Escaping their notice great Priam came in, and stood close by him
> With his hands he took the knees of Achilles and kissed the hands
> dread, man-slaying, which killed his many sons.
> Just as when dense folly takes a man, who in his homeland
> having killed a man went to the country of others,
> into the house of a rich man, and wonder holds those beholding him,
> so Achilles marvelled seeing godlike Priam;

Just after this simile, Priam speaks his opening words to Achilles: "Remember your father ..." (486). One of the things Achilles must remember about Peleus is his consistent reception of exiled suppliants. Achilles becomes like his father as he receives this impure suppliant — Priam. And Priam becomes like the sons whom Peleus treated as though he were their very father. Not only does Achilles thus become like a father and Priam like a son, but the simile further confounds their differences. First of all, when Achilles was feeling dishonored by Agamemnon, he called himself a *metanastes* (ἀτίμητον μετανάστην 9.648).[190] Gazing at the noble man outcast in his own community, Achilles

[190]See Mackie 1996, 145ff.

sees a reflection so often characteristic of himself in the poem. Redfield observes a further identification between the two men:

> By the simile Priam is turned into the slayer and Achilles the rich king — as if, in the eye of the poet, they take on each other's roles for a moment. This likeness is perhaps already there in line 478, which begins with one pair of hands and ends with the other. (1975, 215)

At the end of the last section, I raised the issue of the poem's indeterminate point of view between father or son. This scene between Achilles and Priam confounds the separation of father and son even further as the two men, one young and one old, become for a moment interchangeable. What could it mean to obscure the difference of father and son? For it is one thing to make Priam like a *patêr* and thus uphold its value over the genitor even in the most unlikely case. But why toy with the erasure of the roles of father and son altogether which have so centrally informed the poem up to this point? It seems that in this moment of transcending opposition — of Trojan meeting Greek, of the father of the one killed kissing the hands of the killer — the whole system of binary oppositions must fall away. An extraordinary closeness between two men here arises, men who are for the moment neither Trojan nor Greek, father nor son, slayer nor victim. Priam's embassy to Achilles reenacts and enhances the poem's goal of a personal *patêr*. Priam really is like to Hermes's father here as he crosses the great gulf of Trojan versus Greek to come close (ἄγχι) to an Achaean son. But this mortal meeting goes beyond that to show just how culturally constructed these differences are. The question whether the *Iliad* counts as a father or a son poem becomes moot as the poem — after all it has shown of fathers and sons — presents at its end the questions: what is a father? and what a son? In this way the *Iliad* is as much a poem about the construction of kinship as about mortality. Our guiding question of why the poem considers mortality as a father-son issue should perhaps be turned around to see that the poem wonders about the construction of fathers and sons in relation to mortality. In the meeting of Priam and Achilles, the *Iliad* goes beyond

Panhellenization, beyond creating a generation of cultural sons of the father Zeus, to consider its most basic metaphors of culture itself.[191]

[191]Here the poem's use of the image of the *metanastes* may be poetically significant: Richard Martin has explained how the wisdom poet, particularly Hesiod, assumed the position of the *metanastes* in order to speak from the margin of the community with greater freedom and clarity about the center. The metanastic associations with Achilles and Priam, which culminate at the end of the poem, may thus signify a reference to the poetic voice itself. Cf. Mackie 1996, 145ff. and 160ff., who connects Achilles with a speaker of distorted wisdom poetry.

Chapter II.1: Immortal Fathers and Immortal / Semi-Divine Sons in the *Odyssey*

Introduction

Much like Monro's law that whatever happens in the *Iliad* is not mentioned in the *Odyssey*, the divine stories of the two poems are mutually exclusive. In the last chapter I discussed the divine story of the *Iliad* as one about the movement of father Zeus from an impersonal to a personal *patêr*. In the *Odyssey*, by contrast, Zeus maintains a steadfast distance, involved in the action strictly from afar. Further unlike the *Iliad*, stories of the divine father and his sons do not preoccupy the *Odyssey*. One minimal interaction between Zeus and Hermes comprises the extent of the *Odyssey's* representation of Zeus's relationships to his sons. The primary divine actor in the poem is, of course, Athena, who, I think, reflects not so much on Zeus but on Odysseus. Indeed, the father-son interest of the poem seems to focus on the mortal fathers and son as the *Odyssey* foregrounds Telemachus's quest for his father and Odysseus's reintegration into his house. But despite this shift away from Zeus and his sons, the *Odyssey* does address the issue of the divine father in an oblique way in its representations of Poseidon. For in the poem, Poseidon is presented at greater length than Zeus as the divine father of divine sons in his portrayal in the song of Demodokos and in his relationship to Polyphemus. This substitution of stories of Poseidon instead of Zeus comprises the *Odyssey's* consideration of the divine *patêr*. I will look first at Zeus and Hermes; and then at Poseidon's paternal role in the poem.

Zeus and Hermes

In Zeus's single meeting of the poem with a divine son, he bids Hermes go to Ogygia and tell Calypso of the Olympian plan for Odysseus's return (5.28-42). Zeus's simple imperative to his son — "tell" (εἰπεῖν 5.30) — recalls his Iliadic instructions to Apollo

rather than his elaborate courtesy to Hermes (*Iliad* 24.335).[192] Accordingly, Hermes in the *Odyssey* appears — like Apollo in the *Iliad* — more like-minded with Zeus. As opposed to Zeus's Iliadic deference to Hermes — "you listen to whom you will (ὧ κ' ἐθέλῃσθα)" (24.335) — in the *Odyssey*, Hermes tells Calypso that his free will is now subordinate to Zeus: "Zeus bid me, unwilling, to come here" (Ζεὺς ἐμέ γ' ἠνώγει δεῦρ' ἐλθέμεν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα· 5.99). Hermes's different relationship with Zeus in the *Odyssey*, one lacking any play, perhaps suggests Zeus's more fixed remoteness.

The single episode of Hermes fulfilling his father's behest establishes once and for all for the poem that Zeus is the divine father of gods and men. A trickster god who excels in elusiveness, can not elude Zeus:

> ἀλλὰ μάλ' οὔ πως ἔστι Διὸς νόον αἰγιόχοιο
> οὔτε παρεξελθεῖν ἄλλον θεὸν οὔθ' ἁλιῶσαι.
> (5.103-104)
> But in no way is it possible for any god
> either to slip past or to frustrate the mind of aegis-bearing Zeus.

---

[192]Unlike his active part in the events of the *Iliad*, Apollo has no direct action in the *Odyssey*. He certainly appears in the poem, but in the prayers of men (4.341; 7.311; 17.132; 18.235; 24.376) and in their recollection of past events (3.279; 7.64). Similar to the common observation that Ares in the *Iliad* is often less a divine personality than a designation for the furor of war, Apollo in the *Odyssey* appears as the remote idea of his functions: as patron deity of prophecy (6.162; 8.79; 15.245, 252, 526), poetry (8.488), and archery (8.277; 21.338; 22.7). He is frequently evoked as a death dealing god, who kills gently (7.64; 15.410) or vengefully (17.251, 494; 21.364). (Note also that in all of the prayers cited except for that at 7.311, the invocation of Apollo is coupled with a wish for violent deaths; 17.132 reports 4.341). Apollo is evident in the poem as an object of cult worship: Odysseus mentions a young palm tree beside his altar at Delos (6.162); and he recounts the source of his Cyclops-defying wine as a gift from Maros, the priest of Apollo who dwelt in a grove of Apollo (9.198-201). (Apollo has signs of cult worship also in the *Iliad* (e.g. his priest Khruses), but in that poem he is more directly involved with men; for example, he effectively kills Patroklos and at times helps the Trojans rout the Achaeans.Apollo has signs of cult worship also in the *Iliad* (e.g. his priest Khruses), but in that poem he is more directly involved with men; for example, he effectively kills Patroklos and at times helps the Trojans rout the Achaeans.) Toward the end of the poem, the suitors postpone the proposed contest of the bow and retire to an Ithakan grove of Apollo to pour libations to the god in celebration of a feast of Apollo (21.267ff.). Indeed, the poem's culminating turn to archery (and by the poet's own association, poetry (21.406-409)) coincides with this seasonal festival of Apollo, which a scholiast explained as the feast of Apollo Noumenios, Apollo of the New Moon (cited in Austin 1975, 245). Austin has further deciphered that the climactic events of the contest of the bow and the slaughter of the suitors fall not only on the day of the monthly new moon, but that day which marks the end of the old year and the ushering in of the new one -- the beginning of spring (1975, 239-53). The worship of Apollo, whom Austin calls the "god of both timing and marksmanship" (1975, 251), is abstracted into a pattern of time. Apollo is thus immanent in the poem but in that utterly divine, incorporeal way. He is active exclusively from afar: through his oracles, arrows, and poetry itself. In the *Odyssey*, Hermes is the divine son who assumes Apollo's Iliadic involvement.

Hermes states a traditional sentiment, about the ineluctablity of Zeus's will, in striking diction which emphasizes Zeus's frustration of even the greatest of tricksters: in its few other contexts, his first verb, παρεξελθεῖν, always describes an action that is murky and mysterious. In the *Iliad*, it appears once — significantly in a speech of Odysseus — during the secret nighttime ambush of the Doloneia. When Dolon sets forth toward the Achaean camp, Odysseus espies him and recommends to Diomedes that they allow him to "pass by" (παρεξελθεῖν) them at first for a little bit, and then to rush forth and grab him (*Iliad* 10.344-45). In the *Odyssey*, when Odysseus again uses this verb, he now describes the impossibility of a mortal man observing a goddess, Circe, as she "easily passed by" (παρεξελθοῦσα); for who could see a god, against his divine will, going to and fro? (10.571-74). Circe, like the context of dark uncertainty of the nighttime Doloneia, is a mysterious goddess endowed with magical powers. Evidently, from its use in these two marked situations, the verb is not neutral, but describes a stealthy, mysterious and numinous passing by.[193] Thus when Hermes uses the verb in his speech to Calypso (5.103-104), he conveys the comprehensiveness of Zeus's grasp: neither he the trickster nor she the goddess of darkness and hiding can escape the mind of Zeus.

Zeus's interaction with Hermes thus attests in several ways to his powerful dominion. With his sovereignty so deeply established, Zeus may now disappear from the poem, but with the understanding that all that occurs in it takes place within the framework of Zeus. Indeed, critical actions of Zeus frame the poem (1.26ff.; 24.477-486). After Zeus's single interaction with a son conveys his inescapable authority, he subsequently withdraws and in his place Poseidon twice appears as the divine father — but in an oblique way. In the first case, he acts the paternal part in Demodokos's comic song of Ares and Aphrodite. In the other instance, he appears as the father of his semi-divine son, the monstrous Polyphemus.

---

[193]Perhaps it is significant that the word is twice spoken by Odysseus, another trickster figure.

Poseidon: Poseidon in Demodokos's song

Demodokos is the bard of the Phaeacians, a sea people directly descended from Poseidon. Accordingly, in his song, Demodokos represents Poseidon as Olympus's just arbitrator and father god. When Hephaistos in Demodokos's tale calls on his father Zeus in his quarrel with Ares, Zeus is nowhere to be seen. Rather Poseidon alone represents the older generation of gods, and he alone resolves the quarrel among the younger gods by placating Hephaistos's anger (just as Zeus will do for him, ironically, when he is enraged at the Phaeacians 13.128ff.). Demodokos, appropriate to his heritage, thus sings of Poseidon as a wise and just Old Man of the Sea type — a master of truth.[194] Demodokos's Phaeacian image of Poseidon, however, contrasts with the vengeful Poseidon of the greater poem. Ironically, Poseidon's destructive aspect emerges most clearly in his destruction of the Phaeacians themselves.

Poseidon and Polyphemus

Like Demodokos, Odysseus also tells a story about Poseidon among the Phaeacians. Appropriate to the Phaeacians' descent from Poseidon, his story refers to Poseidon's loyalty to his son — the Phaeacians' relative — Polyphemus.[195] While in the *Iliad*, several gods and goddesses watch over their divine children and interfere in mortal affairs because of their loyalty to them — Thetis and Achilles, Ares and Askalaphos, Zeus and Sarpedon, Aphrodite and Aeneas — in the *Odyssey*, Poseidon alone is the father of a semi-divine son, notably the Cyclops Polyphemus. In the *Odyssey*, Zeus and Poseidon present alternate models of divine fathers: Zeus, withdrawn from the action, is the impersonal *patêr*; Poseidon, closely involved with his son, is a personal one. As Zeus frames the poem by casting crucial judgements at either end (1.26ff.; 24.477-486), the *Odyssey*, unlike the

[194]Richard Martin suggests this idea to me. On Poseidon's affinity to the Old Man of the Sea, see Detienne 1996, 55 and 161n18, with bibliography.

[195]See Ahl and Roisman (1996, 92-121) for a detailed discussion of this story as fitted to its audience; and also for the bibliography on the Cyclops episode (see also my bibliography with specific references).

Iliad, clearly comes down on the side of the remote *patêr*. Why Zeus's impersonal justice is preferred becomes evident in the poem's underworld representation of semi-divine sons.

Semi-divine sons in the underworld

Beside Polyphemus, the poem's other semi-divine sons are dead (significantly, as we shall see), glimpsed only in the shadowy underworld realm. These underworld sons can be seen to reflect on Polyphemus, providing as it were a commentary for "reading" him.

The catalogue of semi-divine sons named in the underworld begins and ends — in ring composition — with sons of Poseidon. Tyro, who bore two sons to Poseidon — Pelias and Neleus — is the first heroine to appear (11.241-257). Iphimedeia, mother of two sons of Poseidon, Otos and Ephialtes, is the last to bear semi-divine sons. Her story is recounted among those of women of later generations.[196] She is thus not only the last woman to have produced semi-divine sons, but is also shown to have done so belatedly. Her children are gigantic and irreverent sons, bordering on the monstrous. In mythic measurements suggested by the repetition of the number nine, at nine years old they were nine cubits in breadth and nine fathoms in height. And they were monstrous not only in size but in character. Impious sons, they threatened war against Olympus and so died an early death from Apollo (11.305-320).

Part of the monstrousness of Otos and Ephialtes seems to be their lateness of conception. Evident in the chronology of the catalogue of heroines, by this time, sons of the gods had become a thing of the past; thus when Poseidon forced himself on Iphimedeia, they naturally produced offspring of outsized proportions and outrageous character. It is as though the insertion of such a relic into the present engenders an

[196]Odysseus sees Tyro, who consorted with Poseidon, and then sees Antiope and Alcmene, who consorted with Zeus. After Alcmene, Odysseus sees four women who of a later generation since they married a later generation of men, those produced after the unions of gods and women: Megara (the wife of Amphitryon's son; Amphitryon is the husband of Alcmene); Epicaste (queen of Thebes, wife of Laius and Oedipus, both later than Zethus, named founder of Thebes 11.262); Chloris (wife of Neleus, son of Tyro and Poseidon); Leda (wife of Tyndareus; their children are contemporaries of Odysseus). See also Segal 1994, 204.

asynchronism, a discordancy of kind with time.[197] Otos and Ephialtes, Poseidon's late-born gigantic and irreverent sons suggestively mirror Polyphemus, who is also huge and claims to disregard the Olympians — and is a late-born contemporary of Odysseus. Through this juxtaposition, Polyphemus's monstrousness also appears to symbolize the discordancy of a vestige of the old inserted into the new.[198] At the end of his sojourn in Hades, Odysseus articulates the temporal distance of the heroes he met there:

> αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν αὐτοῦ μένον ἔμπεδον. εἴ τις ἔτ' ἔλθοι
> ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων. οἳ δὴ τὸ πρόσθεν ὄλοντο.
> καί νύ κ' ἔτι προτέρους ἴδον ἀνέρας. οὓς ἔθελόν περ.
> Θησέα Πειρίθοόν τε. θεῶν ἐρικυδέα τέκνα·
>
> (11.628-630)
>
> But I remained there steadfastly, in the hope that some other
> of the heroic men might come forth, those men who died in days of old.
> And I should have seen yet others of the men of former times, whom I was eager to see,
> Theseus and Peirithous, glorious children of the gods;

According to Odysseus's definition, children of the gods (θεῶν ἐρικυδέα τέκνα) are men of old (προτέρους ... ἀνέρας), earlier men. So Poseidon's sons, Pelias and Neleus, born among the early generations, fit smoothly into the time scheme of divine offspring and are counted among the heroes rather than the monsters. Poseidon's later born sons, Otos, Ephialtes and Polyphemus, however, violate Odysseus's observation that the glorious children of the gods come from earlier days.

Herakles, the last shade Odysseus encounters, completes the underworld's reflection on Polyphemus in its presentation of other semi-divine sons. When Herakles, more than a generation older than Odysseus, sees Odysseus, he immediately recognizes him in the exact same way that the shade of Agamemnon, his contemporary, did (11.615=11.390). In this poem wherein recognition is thematic, Herakles's knowledge of Odysseus's identity (and epithet), suggests a like-mindedness between the two heroes. Herakles develops this association of the younger hero with himself, the elder one: he asks him if "you also" (καὶ σὺ 618) endure an evil destiny "of the sort I endured" (ὅν περ

---

[197]Perhaps it is in this same spirit of representing a present world without semi-divine sons that the city of the Phaeacians, men close to (ἐγγύθεν) the gods as are the Cyclopes and Giants (7.205-206), must be hidden away out of sight.

[198]Cf. Vidal-Naquet 1986, 15-38; Segal 1994, 202-204.

ἐγὼν ὀχέεσκον 619). Through this visual and verbal "recognition" of Odysseus, the younger hero can be seen to emerge from Hades a hero equal to Herakles. And so his meeting with Herakles comes strategically last in his account of the underworld.

But there is furthermore the suggestion that Odysseus not only matches Herakles, but surpasses him. Odysseus's last verbal encounter took place with Ajax. After that, he only sees the last five heroes but does not speak with them. When Odysseus addressed Ajax, the still embittered hero made no reply and left Odysseus in an apparently awkward silence (11.563-67). Odysseus's encounter with Herakles reverses that situation. Herakles approaches Odysseus and speaks rather passionately to him (617-626). Odysseus allows him to leave while maintaining a kind of steadfast silence (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν αὐτοῦ μένον ἔμπεδον 628). Odysseus's lack of response recalls Ajax's silence — most likely also a disdainful one based on Odysseus's past knowledge of Herakles. For Herakles appears once elsewhere in the poem in a memory which furnishes a likely reason for Odysseus's silence: "Odysseus's silence seems to be due to his recalling his friend Iphitus, who gave him the bow with which he kills the suitors, and whom Heracles slew in his own home when Iphitus was a guest-friend (21.11-14)."[199] Odysseus and Iphitus exchanged guest-gifts when they met in the house of Ortilochus. Like Odysseus who later uses the bow to reclaim his own house, both had come on recovery missions: Odysseus to collect a debt for three hundred sheep and their shepherds owed the Ithacans, Iphitus for twelve lost brood mares and their nursing mules. Iphitus later came as a guest to the house of Herakles, but Herakles there killed him:

> ὅς μιν ξεῖνον ἐόντα κατέκτανεν ᾧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ,
> σχέτλιος, οὐδὲ θεῶν ὄπιν ᾐδέσατ' οὐδὲ τράπεζαν
> (21.27-28)
> Herakles slew him, his guest though he was, in his own house,
> pitiless, for he did not respect the watch of the gods nor the table

How not think of the Cyclopes, who "are not concerned with Zeus or the other blessed gods" (9.275-76); and Polyphemus who desecrates the sanctity of the table by killing (and

[199]Benardete 1997, 98.

eating) guests in his own home? The *Odyssey* thus likens Herakles to Polyphemus: both are semi-divine monsters to be superseded. Creatures of *biê*, they naturally contrast Odysseus's *mêtis*.[200] No longer the slayer of monsters, Odysseus's Herakles, like Polyphemus, is now the "monster" to be overcome.

The semi-divine sons in the underworld reveal that blood relation to a divine father is essentially — and ought to be — a thing of the past. Correspondingly, the divine father loses his bond of blood vengeance to sons, favoring instead a more remote, impersonal justice — that of Olympian Zeus. One might see the *Odyssey's* preference for the impersonal *patêr*, Zeus, over the personal one, Poseidon, as its agonistic stance toward the *Iliad*. For while we saw how the *Iliad* moves toward developing the impersonal divine father into a close one who cares for his sons, the *Odyssey* turns this around to work in precisely the opposite direction as it presents Poseidon's close relationship to his son as anachronistic.[201] But on the other hand, the *Odyssey* does not differ from the *Iliad* in its Panhellenic outlook: with its rejection of kin loyalty, the *Odyssey*, like the *Iliad*, also promotes the political over the personal. It does so, however, not by the significant utter destruction of a people who fight at and for home, but by its elevation of a purely "political" father god.

---

[200]They are creatures of βίη: Κύκλωπός τε βίης μεγαλήτορος. ἀνδροφάγοιο ([they remembered] the might of the great-hearted Cyclops, the man eater 10.200; cf. 6.6); τὸν δὲ μετ' εἰσενόησα βίην Ἡρακληείην (And after him I became aware of the mighty Herakles 11.601). In their mercilessness, these semi-divine sons — Polyphemus and Herakles — embody what Nagy has called the "negative aspect" of βίη. Note also Nagy's observation of how βίη plus the genitive name is almost exclusive to Herakles (1979, 318-321).

[201]I am thus persuaded by Segal (1994, 195-227), who entertains the possibility that the justice of Poseidon reflects an older stratum of belief about the gods, but sees the poem as synchronically incorporating such material meaningfully into itself. The realm of Poseidon, Segal emphasizes, is carefully bracketed off from that of Zeus: isolated from the other gods, Poseidon is cast into the role of the "other." The divine program of the *Odyssey*, in Segal's understanding, is to bring the polycentric and polytheistic world order under the unified morality of Zeus. I also find the related arguments of Cook (1995) persuasive.

Chapter II.2: Mortal Fathers and Mortal Sons in the *Odyssey*

Introduction

In the previous discussions of immortal fathers and immortal and semi-divine sons in both epics, we saw concerns shared by both epics drawn to opposite conclusions in each: the *Iliad* depicted a growing closeness of the divine *patêr*; the *Odyssey* contested the close *patêr* in its contrast of involved Poseidon and remote Zeus. A similar phenomenon occurs in the *Odyssey's* representation of mortal fathers and mortal sons. The *Iliad*, we saw, tells of the depersonalizing of the kinship bond. Accordingly, it builds to a crescendo of father substitutes as Achilles — accompanied by several father figures in his going to Troy — meets with the greatest, but for him most inconceivable father figure of all, Priam. The *Odyssey*, on the other hand, moves from a multiplicity of father images to its decrescendo. For the poem in praise of Odysseus is a process of selecting him out of all the others. So Douglas Frame describes the Odyssean hero: "Helios takes away from the companions their day of return because they are the 'amorphous mass of common men' from whom the hero must be separated. The hero, on the other hand, is one of the 'elect,' and may thus gain 'salvation'" (1978, 22-23). As a result of this process of election, the *Odyssey's* story of multiple mortal fathers and sons is one of attrition. Just as we saw in the *Odyssey's* father similes, its heroes aim toward the actual father himself: Telemachus travels with the goal of news of his father; Odysseus seeks his *oikos*— wife, son, and father. The picture of mortal fathers and sons in the *Odyssey* is thus something like a gauntlet of father-son paradigms, which both Telemachus and Odysseus must endure until they reach the goal of the "actual" father and son. Along the way to this narrow goal, these pairs of mortal fathers and sons provide various models against which the central fathers and sons of the poem — Telemachus, Odysseus and Laertes — are differentiated and over which they are

gradually selected. As the men of the house of Odysseus pass through a gauntlet of father-son pairs, they are upheld as the superlative model.

One further point, however, must be included to complete these observations about the general trend of mortal fathers and sons in the *Odyssey*. While it is certainly the case that the poem presents a kind of closing down of fathers into the singular one, the centrality of *mêtis* in the house of Odysseus exerts a counter force. For *mêtis* tends away from the hard-and-fast, the actual and singular. *Mêtis* is after all, as well described in one of Odysseus's epithets, polytropic. As a result, it adds to the *Odyssey's* narrowing presentation of mortal fathers and sons a simultaneous play of displacement within these singular relationships. Just because the poem moves toward the thin line of Laertes—Odysseus—Telemachus, it should not be assumed that the reunited generations share a perfect intimacy. For Odysseus is a trickster hero, who, as we will see below, passes on his *mêtis* to Telemachus. Such trickster heroes continually refashion themselves rather than being fashioned by father figures. Thus only Odysseus and his wife — a peer relationship which has no effect on Odysseus's "self-authoring" — enjoy perfect like-mindedness. On close scrutiny, the heroic line of Laertes—Odysseus—Telemachus is pitted with gaps and inconsistencies. As I will discuss below, Telemachus never quite fulfills his desire for his father; and, one of the oldest problems of the poem, the reunion between Odysseus and Laertes is likewise unsatisfactory.

Below I will first discuss Telemachus's 'gauntlet' of rejected father-son exempla — Nestor and Peisistratos, Agamemnon and Orestes, Menelaos and Megapenthes, Polypheides and Theoklymenos — and end with an analysis of his reunion with Odysseus as a scene of displacement. I will then likewise consider Odysseus's 'gauntlet' of fathers and sons — Alkinoos and sons, Agamemnon and Orestes, Achilles and Neoptolemos — and conclude with a look at his reunion with Laertes as also a scene of displacement. I begin, however, with an introductory view of the poem's overarching paradigm of father and son — Agamemnon and Orestes.

Agamemnon and Orestes

The *Odyssey* introduces the Agamemnon-Orestes paradigm within its first fifty lines. In the poem's first speech, Zeus muses on the folly of men and takes Aigisthos is his example. Heard before the poem turns to Odysseus, the Oresteia story predisposes our hearing of the *Odyssey* story. Like all paradigms, it presents a desired and rejected model, one to be emulated and surpassed.[202]

Zeus's recollects the Oresteia story as a *fait accompli*:

> Just as now Aigisthos, beyond that which was ordained, took to himself the wedded wife of the son of Atreus, and slew him on his return, though well he knew of the sheer destruction, seeing that we told him before, sending Hermes, the keen-sighted Argeiphontes, that he should neither slay the man nor woo his wife; for from Orestes will be vengeance for the son of Atreus (ἐκ γὰρ Ὀρέσταο τίσις ἔσσεται Ἀτρεΐδαο), when he has attained his youthful prime and longs for his land. So Hermes spoke, but for all his good intent he did not prevail upon the heart of Aigisthos; and now he has paid the full price for it all (νῦν δ' ἀθρόα πάντ' ἀπέτισεν). (1.35-43)

From "vengeance will be" (τίσις ἔσσεται) to "he has paid the penalty" (ἀπέτισεν), Zeus's present tense is only a self-justifying reflection on the past. He renders the Oresteia paradigm into a brief tale of vengeance forewarned and vengeance fulfilled — a theodicy. His Oresteia story portrays a move from the disorder of Aigisthos's behavior "beyond fate" (ὑπὲρ μόρον) to the order of the dishonored father posthumously avenged by the returned son.

The completedness of the Oresteia paradigm provides a foil against which the Odyssey story develops and defines itself both within the poem and intertextually. For the early inclusion of the paradigm casts the Odyssey song to come as a superior rival in time and kind to the Oresteia song already sung. In regard to time, the Odyssey song is new, a story just beginning. It reopens the Oresteia's basic father-son storyline, but now in the uncertain subjunctive mood: in contrast to Zeus's closed image of vengeance, when Telemachus addresses the assembly in Book 2, he wishes that the Ithakans had eaten up his

---

[202]Its function in the *Odyssey* has been well considered. See Combellack 1982, 361-372; D'Arms and Hulley 1946, 207-13; Düring 1943, 95; Edwards 1985, 27-28; Garvie 1986, ix-xii; Hommel 1955, 237-45; Hölscher 1967, 1-16; 1989, 94-102, 297-310; Lesky 1967, 5-21; Miller 1977, 259-68; Olson 1990, 57-71; Snider 1895, 16; Woodhouse 1930, 140-41, 246-47.

property so that "some time soon there might be recompense" (τάχ' ἄν ποτε καὶ τίσις εἴη· 2.76). For Telemachus, requital remains a hypothetical condition.[203] Thus the Odyssey poem is not of the finished past time, as Zeus views the Oresteia one, but is the "newest" song, the kind which men praise most (1.351-52).

In its content also, the *Odyssey* poet presents a different challenge than his paradigm. The *Odyssey* is also a tale of vengeance, but here the new father is absent, but not dead, and the new son maturing, but not yet fully come into the measure of his youth. The *Odyssey* is not a poem of a simple future tense fulfilled by a simple past tense, but one in the present. The revenge is not for the father alone, but as the Telemachy makes clear, comprises Telemachus's struggle as well. The initial occurrence of the Oresteia paradigm introduces a new father-son story with more complex questions: what shall be the relationship between father and son when both are living? when both are invested in the house and in glory? The Agamemnon-Orestes paradigm recurs next during Telemachus's trip to Pylos, where he begins to explore answers to these questions.

Telemachus's Father Figures: Nestor and Sons

On his journey for news of his father, Telemachus never discovers his father's fate. Instead he sees and hears about other fathers and sons, exempla which show him what he and his father are not. His initially wide open uncertainty about his father thus becomes an uncertainty more circumscribed.

When Telemachus ventures out of Ithaca for word of his father, he comes first to Pylos, the city of Nestor and his many sons. Pylos occupies this primary position for many reasons. First, according to Nestor's account that he and Odysseus never disagreed in council since they were "of one mind" (3.126-29), we gather that of all the Trojan heroes, Nestor is most like Odysseus — a cunning speaker of words, one who survives and eludes death, one who returns home. Specifically for our interests, Pylos also comes first for the

[203]His sense of requital is uncertain even as to who owes whom: εἰ μή ... /.../ τῶν μ' ἀποτινύμενοι (2.71-73).

reason that Nestor's patriarchy differentiates the father-son pair of Odysseus and Telemachus from not only his own relationship to his sons, but also from a dominant father-son paradigm of the *Iliad*. Through his words, Nestor ultimately turns away from the story of Agamemnon and Orestes; through his deeds, he opposes the Iliadic model of Priam among his sons. Telemachus's visit to Pylos thus leaves the world of the *Iliad* behind and ushers in its different vision of mortal fathers and sons. I will first consider Nestor and his sons as a contrast to Priam's *oikos* outside the poem. Then, staying within the poem, I will discuss the two father-son paradigms he presents to Telemachus: Agamemnon and Orestes; and his own relationship to his sons.

Nestor and Priam

The image of the old patriarch, Nestor, surrounded by his sons closely parallels the final scenes in Priam's palace in Book 24 of the *Iliad*. From the start, the *Odyssey* quite differently incarnates the reverend father: Nestor's happy home on Pylos with the old father contentedly surrounded by his many sons presents a paradigm of the blessed old man contrary to that offered by the *Iliad*.

In *Iliad* 24, Iris comes to Priam in his palace to convey Zeus's message that he go to Achilles to ransom Hector. There she finds a scene of wailing and lament:

> ἶξεν δ' ἐς Πριάμοιο, κίχεν δ' ἐνοπήν τε γόον τε.
> παῖδες μὲν πατέρ' ἀμφὶ καθήμενοι ἔνδοθεν αὐλῆς
> δάκρυσιν εἵματ' ἔφυρον, ὁ δ' ἐν μέσσοισι γεραιὸς
> ἐντυπὰς ἐν χλαίνῃ κεκαλυμμένος· ἀμφὶ δὲ πολλὴ
> κόπρος ἔην κεφαλῇ τε καὶ αὐχένι τοῖο γέροντος.
> τήν ῥα κυλινδόμενος καταμήσατο χερσὶν ἑῇσι·
> (24.160-65)
>
> She came into the house of Priam, and found wailing and lament.
> His sons were sitting about their father within the court
> staining their clothes with tears, and at the center was the old man
> closely wrapped in his cloak; and there was much filth
> around the head and neck of the old man,
> which he had gathered up in his hands while rolling on the ground.

Like old Nestor surrounded by his sons (3.39; 412-15), the poem presents Priam in his house surrounded by his. Yet how different the two scenes, the one on Pylos of

thanksgiving sacrifices, feasting and telling stories, the other in Troy of the most anguished lament. Nestor, comparable to Priam in age and sons, is not so in fate.

The resonance between these two patriarchs in these two scenes extends further. Both poems show the old kings commanding their sons to ready a vehicle; but for Priam this becomes a scene of reproach:

οἱ δ' υἱάσιν οἷσιν ὁμόκλα.
νεικείων Ἕλενόν τε Πάριν τ' Ἀγάθωνά τε δῖον
Πάμμονά τ' Ἀντίφονόν τε βοὴν ἀγαθόν τε Πολίτην
Δηίφοβόν τε καὶ Ἵππόθοον καὶ Δῖον ἀγαυόν·
ἐννέα τοῖς ὁ γεραιὸς ὁμοκλήσας ἐκέλευε·
"σπεύσατέ μοι, κακὰ τέκνα, κατηφόνες· αἴθ' ἅμα πάντες
Ἕκτορος ὠφέλετ' ἀντὶ θοῆς ἐπὶ νηυσὶ πεφάσθαι.
ὤ μοι ἐγὼ πανάποτμος, ἐπεὶ τέκον υἷας ἀρίστους
Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ, τῶν δ'οὔ τινά φημι λελεῖφθαι,
Μήστορά τ' ἀντίθεον καὶ Τρωίλον ἱππιοχάρμην
Ἕκτορά θ', ὃς θεὸς ἔσκε μετ' ἀνδράσιν, οὐδὲ ἐώκει
ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ πάις ἔμμεναι, ἀλλὰ θεοῖο·
τοὺς μὲν ἀπώλεσ' Ἄρης, τὰ δ' ἐλέγχεα πάντα λέλειπται,
ψεῦσταί τ' ὀρχησταί τε, χοροιτυπίῃσιν ἄριστοι,
ἀρνῶν ἠδ' ἐρίφων ἐπιδήμιοι ἁρπακτῆρες.
οὐκ ἄν δή μοι ἅμαξαν ἐφοπλίσσαιτε τάχιστα,
ταῦτά τε πάντ' ἐπιθεῖτε, ἵνα πρήσσωμεν ὁδοῖο;"
(24.248-64)

He was rebuking his sons,
reproaching Helenos and Paris and noble Agathon
Pammon and Antiphonos, Polites of the great war cry,
Deiphobos and Hippothoos and proud Dios.
Rebuking these nine, the old man gave them command:
"Hasten for my sake, base children, disgraces; would that all of you together
had been killed beside beside the swift ship instead of Hector.
Ah me, ill fated, since I fathered the best sons
in wide Troy, of whom not one, I say, is left behind,
Mestor like a god and Troilos who delighted in horses
and Hector, who was a god among men, who did not seem
to be the son of a mortal man, but of a god;
Ares destroyed them, and all those remaining are disgraces,
liars and dancers, excellent at the dance,
robbers of your own peoples' lambs and kids.
Will you not ready my wagon as quickly as possible,
and place all these things upon it, so that I may get on with my journey?"

Priam's catalogue of sons (249-251), in the context of a reproach to their excellence, is clearly spoken ironically since catalogues conventionally express martial heroism.[204] In

[204]Catalogue is a sub-genre usually reserved in the *Iliad* for contingents of warriors. When a catalogue of children does occur, it names the fifty *divine* daughters of the Old Man of the Sea; there is thus still a majesty expressed by it. The blame context of the catalogue of Priam's sons is emphasized by the ring lines around it: οἱ δ' υἱάσιν οἷσιν ὁμόκλα (248) and ἐννέα τοῖς ὁ γεραιὸς ὁμοκλήσας ἐκέλευε· (252). On catalogue, see Davies 1992.

contrast, the first "heroic" catalogue in the *Odyssey* occurs on Pylos when Nestor's sons gather around him:

> περὶ δ' υἷες ἀολλέες ἠγερέθοντο
> ἐκ θαλάμων ἐλθόντες. Ἐχέφρων τε Στρατίος τε
> Περσεύς τ' Ἄρητός τε καὶ ἀντίθεος Θρασυμήδης.
> τοῖσι δ' ἔπειθ' ἕκτος Πεισίστρατος ἦλυθεν ἥρως
> (3.412-15)
>
> His sons gathered around in a throng
> coming from their bed-chambers, Echepron and Stratios
> and Perseus and Aretos and godlike Thrasymedes.
> to these then came as sixth the hero Peisistratos

Nestor's sons emerge from their private bedrooms — and anonymity — naturally and of their own volition, not as the result of a rebuke from their father. The praise implicit in the naming of heroes does not then come into a tension with the circumstances of their gathering, as occurs in the context of Priam's reproach. Nestor's sons, named and gathered, are soon instructed by him to fulfill tasks for the purpose of making a thanksgiving sacrifice to Athena. As each son carries out an appointed duty, he does so again by name (3.439-454). Like the amicable nature of their gathering, the sacrificial tasks alloted to the sons accord with the celebratory tone of catalogues. In contrast, Priam's sons are named for the more mundane service of yoking a wagon. Nestor's sons will soon do likewise (3.477-78). But when they do so, they are then grouped collectively rather than by individual name. Indeed, the *Odyssey* replaces the *Iliad's* long description of the sons' yoking (24.266-280) with a long scene of their sacrificing (3.430-463). In an almost pointed contrast, the *Odyssey* accomplishes its yoking in one line, with an emphasis on the swiftness of the action: καρπαλίμως δ' ἔζευξαν ὑφ' ἅρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους (3.478). Nestor's sons have more majestic things to do than extensively yoke a chariot.

After the catalogue of Priam's nine sons, he begins his angry command to them:

> σπεύσατέ μοι, κακὰ τέκνα, κατηφόνες· (24.253)
> Hasten for me, wicked children, disgraces;

Nestor's command to his sons, although similar in content, stands in direct contrast in tone:

> καρπαλίμως μοι, τέκνα φίλα, κρηήνατ' ἐέλδωρ (3.418)
> Quickly for me, dear children, fulfill my desire

Nestor's praise of his sons — τέκνα φίλα — contrasts with Priam's blame — κακὰ τέκνα. Together, these two moments encapsulate each poem's distinct attitude to mortal father and son relationships. Strictly on the level of storyline, the *Odyssey* continues the events of the *Iliad.* Seen in this way, the pleasant scene at Pylos, near the beginning of the *Odyssey*, puts to rest for the duration of the poem the tense one at Troy, near the end of the *Iliad.*

Priam's next nine lines comprise his reproach to his sons. Needless to say, such blame speech is absent from the comparable scene on Pylos: Nestor is specifically not an angry, bereaved and disappointed father. Yet even without a speech exactly parallel to Priam's rebuke, Nestor has spoken some comparable lines. In his anger, Priam laments the loss of his best sons and the baseness of those left behind: τῶν δ'οὔ τινά φημι λελεῖφθαι (256); τοὺς μὲν ἀπώλεσ' Ἄρης, τὰ δ' ἐλέγχεα πάντα λέλειπται (260). Priam's bitterness over his remaining sons contrasts with Nestor's joyous appreciation of the idea of remaining sons: ὡς ἀγαθὸν καὶ παῖδα καταφθιμένοιο λιπέσθαι/ ἀνδρός, ἐπεὶ καὶ κεῖνος ἐτίσατο πατροφονῆα (3.196-97). Whereas Priam regrets those sons left behind him, Nestor cherishes the idea, showing a faith in sons which is no longer held by Priam. In a further sense, perhaps related to their faith or lack thereof, Priam is a father who loses his sons, whereas Nestor is a father who always has more.

Finally, Priam's speech shares with Nestor's the command to yoke a vehicle:

> οὐκ ἄν δή μοι ἅμαξαν ἐφοπλίσσαιτε τάχιστα,
> ταῦτά τε πάντ' ἐπιθεῖτε, ἵνα πρήσσωμεν ὁδοῖο:
> (*Iliad* 24.263-64)
> Will you not ready my wagon as quickly as possible,
> and place all these things upon it, so that I may get on with my journey?
> παῖδες ἐμοί, ἄγε Τηλεμάχῳ καλλίτριχας ἵππους
> ζεύξαθ' ὑφ' ἅρματ' ἄγοντες, ἵνα πρήσσῃσιν ὁδοῖο.
> (*Od.* 3.475-76)
> My sons, come now, yoke for Telemachus horses with beautiful mane
> beneath the chariot, so that he may get on with his journey.

The conspicuous difference between these scenes of yoking, beyond that of angry versus amicable tone, is the person for whose sake the vehicle is readied. In Troy, old Priam is preparing to leave his kingdom and go out on a journey. In Pylos, old Nestor is sending

forth the young Telemachus. Just as Troy proleptically and synecdochically falls when Hector does, so too can we see the disintegration of the whole city when Priam issues forth from its gates.[205] For even more explicitly than Nestor (3.32), Priam is the center of his realm: ὁ δ' ἐν μέσσοισι γεραιὸς (24.162). In contrast to the uneasily mobile Priam, Nestor does not move but remains at the center. Pylos is a gathering point to which others come:

> ὣς ἔφαθ'. οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐποίπνυον. ἦλθε μὲν ἄρ βοῦς
> ἐκ πεδίου. ἦλθον δὲ θοῆς παρὰ νηὸς ἑίσης
> Τηλεμάχου ἕταροι μεγαλήτορος. ἦλθε δὲ χαλκεὺς
> ὅπλ' ἐν χερσὶν ἔχων χαλκήια. πείρατα τέχνης.
> ἄκμονά τε χρυσὸν εἰργάζετο· ἦλθε δ' Ἀθήνη
>
> (3.430-35)
>
> So he spoke, and they all set busily to work. The heifer came
> from the plain, from the swift shapely ship
> the comrades of great-hearted Telemachus came, the smith came
> bearing in his hands his tools of bronze, implements of his craft,
> anvil which he wrought with gold; and Athena came

Just as Telemachus travels to Pylos, so here condensed in the scene of sacrifice is represented the centripetal nature of Nestor's realm. At Troy, as seen in the exit of the old patriarch-king, the center does not hold. At Pylos it does. The *Odyssey* thus revitalizes the image of the ancient patriarch, presenting as the first of its adventures the kingdom of the legendary Nestor, who has ruled for three generations and with no known death in the tradition, presumably continues to do so indefinitely. With his endless supply of sons around him, Nestor on Pylos comprises the exemplar of the perpetual patriarch, a contrast to the fallen icon before him — Priam and his sons. The *Odyssey's* first view of a father distinctly sets his image apart from that in the Iliadic story: it makes perfectly evident that this is no Iliadic tale of bereft old fathers.

Agamemnon and Orestes at Pylos

The story of Agamemnon and Orestes occupies much of Nestor's response to Telemachus's request for news of his father. Upon arriving in Pylos, Telemachus said that except for Odysseus, it was known where each hero perished in bitter destruction (λυγρῷ

[205]Cf. Griffin 1980, 1.

ὀλέθρῳ 3.87); he then asked to be told of the bitter destruction (λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον) of his father (3.93). Nestor catalogues the *nostoi* of several of the greatest heroes and concludes with the bitter destruction (λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον) of Agamemnon (3.194), thereby returning indirectly to Telemachus's question.

Both Athena as Mentor (1.298-302) and later Nestor invoke the Agamemnon-Orestes paradigm in their advice to Telmachus, but with one significant difference between their speeches. Whereas Mentor focused on the *kleos* Orestes won for his loyalty to his father (1.298), Nestor emphasizes vengeance:

> ἀλλ' ἦ τοι κεῖνος μὲν ἐπισμυγερῶς ἀπέτισεν·
> ὡς ἀγαθὸν καὶ παῖδα καταφθιμένοιο λιπέσθαι
> ἀνδρός. ἐπεὶ καὶ κεῖνος ἐτίσατο πατροφονῆα
> (3.195-97)
>
> But he [Aigisthos] paid the price grievously;
> how good it is that a son be left behind a man at his death
> since he [Orestes] avenged the father-slayer

With his focus on the vengeance of Orestes's deed, Nestor's account resembles Zeus's:

> ἐκ γὰρ Ὀρέσταο τίσις ἔσσεται Ἀτρεΐδαο
> ὁππότ' ἂν ἡβήσῃ τε καὶ ἧς ἱμείρεται αἴης.
> ὣς ἔφαθ' Ἑρμείας. ἀλλ' οὐ φρένας Αἰγίσθοιο
> πεῖθ' ἀγαθὰ φρονέων· νῦν δ' ἀθρόα πάντ' ἀπέτισεν.
> (1.40-43)
>
> for from Orestes shall come vengeance for the son of Atreus
> when once he has come to manhood and longs for his own land.
> So Hermes spoke, but he did not prevail upon the heart of Aigisthos
> although he intended well; now he [Aigisthos] has paid the price in full.

Neither Nestor nor Zeus are particularly vengeful figures in the poem. And so their sentiments are not about vengeance plain and simple. Rather, they bespeak a certain orderliness of being. Zeus muses on the audaciousness of man, ever ready to blame the gods for sorrows they came upon through their own folly, beyond those appointed by fate (1.34). So one man, even when warned by divine speech, nevertheless committed deeds beyond fate (1.35). The repetition of ὑπὲρ μόρον in the same metrical position in two consecutive lines suggests that Zeus's dismay centers around man's transgression of what is fated, not the acts themselves. Hermes's promise of vengeance and its subsequent fulfillment correct the disorder inherent in going beyond fate; it is a return to divine foreknowledge and control. The shift from the futurity of Hermes's promise (τίσις

ἔσσεται) to the aorist of its completion (ἀπέτισεν) suggests Zeus's satisfaction in divine speech made deed — the way things should be when man does not act beyond fate. Thus Zeus is concerned with vengeance as a vehicle of cosmic and social order.

Nestor shares Zeus's emphasis on vengeance in the story of Orestes as well as its greater signification. For him too, the enactment of vengeance assures that order is intact and observed. What binds his two mentions of vengeance, the one suffered by Aigisthos and the other enacted by Orestes, is praise for the familial structure thanks to which a father is not forsaken even after his death. For Nestor, a father who evidently accepts the role of sons as in service to the father — as he did in the death of Antilochos, discussed below — the knowledge that a son remains to stand up for the dead father demonstrates the continuity of right order. With his many sons around him at home, Nestor needn't question the truth of this assurance.

Soon after recounting Orestes's vengeance, Nestor bids Telemachus also to be valiant. In response Telemachus praises that kind of force and vengeance, but concludes that his fate is otherwise: ἀλλ' οὔ μοι τοιοῦτον ἐπέκλωσαν θεοὶ ὄλβον. / πατρί τ' ἐμῷ καὶ ἐμοί· νῦν δὲ χρὴ τετλάμεν ἔμπης ("but the gods have spun no such happiness for me, for my father and for me; now as it is it is necessary to endure" 3.208-209). Telemachus's dictional invocation of the fates (following his naming of the crime of the suitors as ὑπερβασίης. 206) recalls Zeus's complaints about men going beyond fate. Telemachus speaks respectfully, even piously — nothing for Zeus to complain about. He simply articulates a different, Odyssean means of returning to order: endurance. This latter conclusion recalls Athena's two previous options open to Telemachus, each taking off in a different direction dependent on whether or not he finds Odysseus to still be alive: "If you hear that your father is alive and coming home, then surely, though you are much afflicted, you could endure for another year" [εἰ μέν κεν πατρὸς βίοτον καὶ νόστον ἀκούσῃς. / ἦ τ' ἂν τρυχόμενός περ ἔτι τλαίης ἐνιαυτόν 1.287-88]. Endurance would be the response appropriate to news of a still living Odysseus. Perhaps Telemachus now

remembers Athena's words: he has not heard from Nestor that his father is dead. As a result, it is right for him to yet endure. Telemachus embraces the Agamemnon-Orestes paradigm only to set himself and his father apart from it. He and Odysseus are bound as closely as Agamemnon and Orestes (cf. the fate common to πατρί τ' ἐμῷ καὶ ἐμοί·); yet theirs is presently a necessity to wait. Telemachus and Odysseus, still bound in a state of suspension unlike the finished story of Agamemnon and Orestes, must follow their own path.

Nestor and sons

Nestor's discussion of Agamemnon revealed his father-oriented philosophy. His remark about how good it is for a father to leave behind a son to avenge him (3.196-97) considers sons strictly from the point of view of the father and the father's benefit. Priam is indeed a father who benefitted from the loyalty of his son: traditionally, his son Antilochos died while saving him. In Pythian 6, a source for the account of Antilochos's death, Pindar upholds Antilochos as an ancient heroic paradigm and praises him for his death on behalf of his father (ὃς ὑπερέφθιτο πατρός 30).[206] Nestor remembers the loss of his son Antilochos, but with no apparent allusion to the sacrifice his son made for him. His eulogy is standard:

> ἔνθα δ' ἐμὸς φίλος υἱός, ἅμα κρατερὸς καὶ ἀμύμων,
> Ἀντίλοχος, πέρι μὲν θείειν ταχὺς ἠδὲ μαχητής·
> (3.111-12)
>
> There my own son, both strong and blameless,
> Antilochos, preeminent in speed of foot and as a warrior.

Nestor subtly praises Antilochos by placing him last in the select catalogue of fallen heroes and dwelling on him for the greatest number of lines. Beyond this formal praise, he remembers his virtues in a conventional way — strong and noble, an athlete and warrior. His failure to comment on his son's death for the sake of his own life, stated in the context of the overall contented and idyllic patriarchal Pylos, suggests Nestor's comfort with the

---

[206]See Pindar Pythian 6.28-42. For the orthodoxy of Pindar's version of Antilochos's death, see Willcock 1983, 482-83; for complementary references in other sources, see pp.484-85n7. See also HWH 167.

loss of his son. This filial death is acceptable according to Nestor's view that sons exist for the sake of the father. And moreover, it does not cause Nestor overbearing grief because of a sensibility predominant in the scenes on Pylos that Nestor's sons are so numerous, that they thus become expendable. On Pylos, Telemachus sees his first model of fathers and sons, wherein sons are many and so essentially replaceable.

The scene on Pylos shows that Nestor's young son, Antilochos, has been doubly replaced: first by his brother Thrasymedes, who was often his heroic partner at Troy; and then by his brother Peisistratos, who is the new Odyssean youngest son. Both Thrasymedes and Peisistratos are met in Telemachus's first approach to Pylos. Peisistratos leads the way to greet the arriving strangers (3.36).[207] He assists their transition from outside to inside; on the shore of Pylos, the "inside" consists of the center of the group where "Nestor sat with his sons, and around them the companions" (3.32). The poet mentions that Thrasymedes in particular sat beside his father (3.39). The center of the group — a seat beside the king, soft fleeces to sit on, sacrificed animal innards, wine in a golden cup (3.38-41; HWH 162) — is certainly a place of honor. Here is where Antilochos, a hero of the Trojan War, would presumably have sat. But with Antilochos dead, his brother Thrasymedes occupies the center.

Of Nestor's six named sons in the poem — Echephron, Stratios, Perseus, Aretus, Thrasymedes and Peisistratos (3.413-14; cf.439-454), only Thrasymedes fought at Troy. His six appearances in the *Iliad* in sufficiently memorable actions suggest that he was a recognizable hero of considerable status.[208] In the *Iliad*, he twice fights beside Antilochos: once against two Lykian brothers angered over Sarpedon's death and protects Antilochos from a threatening blow by killing the one about to strike (16.319-323); he again fights

---

[207]Peisistratos's forthright approach to the strangers, soon after Telemachos's hesitation to draw near (3.22-24), comprises a contrast to it (cf. Telemachus going behind, μετ' ἴχνια (3.30) and Peisistratos's primacy, πρῶτος (3.36)).

[208]Thrasymedes appears as a captain of a group of a hundred sentinels (9.80-86); he arms Diomedes for his nighttime spying mission, giving him sword, shield, and "skull-cap" helmet (in the Doloneia, 10.255-59); Nestor takes Thrasymedes's shield — since Thrasymedes had Nestor's — when he leaves his hut to see the turn of battle (14.10-11);

beside Antilochos in a place apart from the rest of the Achaeans, as commanded by Nestor, and is thus unaware of Patroklos's death (17.377-83. In this last scene, Thrasymedes's accompaniment of Antilochos turns into replacement. For when Menelaos sent Antilochos out of battle to bear the news of Patroklos's death to Achilles, in order not to leave the Pylian contingent without their leader, he puts Thrasymedes in charge (17.702-705). The *Iliad* thus also contains this image of Antilochos replaced by his brother, Thrasymedes. But whereas in the *Iliad* the replacement is only temporary in a situation of duress, the scene on Pylos in the *Odyssey* suggests that one man can permanently sit in for another who has died.

Finally, Peisistratos, a new Odyssean son never mentioned in the *Iliad*, strengthens this sense of Nestor's ever elastic line of sons. In his speech to the strangers, he reveals that he and Telemachus are the same age (ὁμηλικίη δ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῷ 3.49). He must then be Nestor's youngest son, most likely born after he left for Troy (4.200ff.). In the *Iliad*, Antilochos was apparently Nestor's youngest son. The idea of a new son at home in Nestor's house, born while Nestor is far away, deepens the impression of his great fecundity and lineage.[209] It is as though Nestor's own apparent deathlessness is transferred to — or manifest in — his endless supply of sons. In contrast to Nestor's abundance of replaceable sons, Telemachus is from a line of single sons. Having come upon this watershed difference between Pylos and Ithaca, Telemachus —the single son of a single son — leaves Pylos behind.

---

[209]At night, the sons go off to their own houses, the unwed Peisistratos sleeps in the portico of the palace beside Telemachus, and Nestor himself sleeps in the inmost chamber of the lofty house beside his wife. Nestor is at the culmination of this rhetorical crescendo. Correspondingly, he resides in the very wellspring of the house — the μυχός. And this innermost chamber retains all its erotic and fecund associations. It is located within a high-roofed house, suggestive of male virility (cf. Sappho 111.1: ἴψοι δὴ τὸ μέλαθρον). Moreover, the description of Eurydike emphasizes her function of sexualized bedmate: τῷ δ' ἄλοχος δέσποινα λέχος πόρσυνε καὶ εὐνήν ["beside him his reverend wife prepared the bed and bedding," bed and bedding words often used euphemistically for sexual intercourse, reiterated by the repetition of ἄλοχος and λέχος 3.403]. Nestor is old and has many married children, but is nevertheless the productive center of his house.

Menelaos and Megapenthes

Telemachus leaves the double sacrifices on Pylos and arrives at a double wedding on Sparta. Just as Nestor is found making sacrifice together with his sons, so is Menelaos met in a ritual involving his children. But whereas Nestor sat surrounded by his many sons, Menelaos and Helen are marrying off their only son and daughter in a scene outside the vision of the poem. The poem reminds us of the difference in the abundance of children between Pylos and Sparta: it recounts that Menelaos's son was born to him by a slave woman since "to Helen the gods vouchsafed no more issue after she had at the first borne her lovely child, Hermione" (4.13-15).[210] Telmachos thus comes to a place different from Pylos in two important ways: first, his host has only one son rather than many; and although he is celebrating the wedding of his children, he is never seen among them, unlike Nestor who sat at the center of his sons.

Further unlike Nestor, Menelaos is a man of constant sorrow (4.101-103) who apparently gets little joy from his children. His son's name, Megapenthes, underscores his sadness. Indeed, of the four youths getting married in Menelaos's house — his daughter and son and their groom and bride — only Megapenthes is named (4.11).[211] The marriage celebration is first and foremost a feast: ὡς οἱ μὲν δαίνυντο (4.15), a reiteration of line 3, δαινύντα γάμον. And this feast is an occasion of delighting, τερπόμενοι (4.17). With the great revelry of the wedding — food, song, dance (4.15-19) — it seems like a most attractive event. Yet not long after the arrival of Telemachus and Peisistratos, Helen replaces the marriage feast (δαινύντα γάμον 4.3) with the feasting and pleasure of

---

[210]Megapenthes is marrying the daughter of Alektor; the audience could have construed his name as derived from *a- lektron* (α- λέκτρον) — alpha privative preceding the neuter noun for marriage bed. Such implication seems relevant to the statement of Helen's limited productivity; together they intimate that one might expect a thin lineage from this union. Richard Martin suggests an alternate association with ἀλέξω, "ward off."

[211]In the description of the daughter's marriage, she is not named: she is the direct object of Menelaos's action. And of greater interest than the daughter is her groom, the son of Achilles. But while he occupies a place of interest, he also is not called by name. Rather the history of their betrothal is amplified, a story about an earlier agreement between the two fathers, Menelaos and Achilles. Clearly the goal of this described marriage are not the bride and groom themselves, but the fulfillment of a promise between the two men.

drugged storytelling (ἦ τοι νῦν δαῖνυσθε καθήμενοι ἐν μεγάροισι/ καὶ μύθοις τέρπεσθε "now sitting in the halls, feast and delight in stories" 4.238-39). In perfect opposition to the named son, Megapenthes (Great-sorrow), Helen produces this alternative festivity with the drugs, *nêpenthes* (No-sorrow) (4.221). The feast of the double wedding, usually a joyous occasion of futurity, has overtones of sorrow and limited productivity. Rather than enjoy that banquet, Menelaos and Helen turn to the backward looking stories of their past, now emptied of their sorrow and made an occasion of delight.

Telemachus, we saw, left Sparta because the gathering there of Nestor's abundant sons did not accord with his experience as the single son of a single son. Like Telemachus's line, Menelaos has only one son. But the sorrow implicit Megapenthes and explicit in Menelaos sets them apart from the father-son pair for which the poem aims. At Sparta, we never actually see father and son together, despite the fact that Megapenthes is nearby celebrating the important day of his marriage. Telemachus leaves Sparta behind, where the son is out of the picture and the "non-sorrow" of drugs, *nêpenthes*, is preferred over the son, "Great-Sorrow," Megapenthes.

Polypheides and Theoklymenos

So far on his travels, Telemachus has met two father figures — men of his father's generation or older who recognize him as the son of Odysseus. He has taken Nestor's young son, Peisistratos, along with him in his visit to Sparta; but as he is making his way back to Ithaca, for the first time he meets an independent son like himself, Theoklymenos. Theoklymenos is an unusual character in the *Odyssey*, indeed one suggestively Iliadic. For example, he is the only (living) hero in the *Odyssey* introduced with his full genealogy.[212] And reminiscent of the heroes around Achilles who fled to the house of Peleus, Theoklymenos's dynasty has been full of strife — and the changes of homeland which occur as its result. Theoklymenos's line began with Melampus, the "flawless seer"

[212]No other character outside the underworld is awarded this honor.

(11.291). Melampus was originally a rich man in Pylos but fled to a country of strangers because of conflict with Neleus (15.228-29); he later dwelled in Argos (238-40). Melampus had two sons, Antiphates and Mantius; the latter was Theoklymenos's grandfather. Mantius had a son, Polypheides, who left home and settled in Hyperesia because he was angry at his father (15.255). Finally, Theoklymenos, the son of Polypheides, killed a man of his own kin and so approaches Telemachus for help in his flight (15.224; 272, 275-77). The conflict from generation to generation is remarkable, perhaps calling attention to the metanastic motif so important to the *Iliad.*

Telemachus's meeting with Theoklymenos comprises his final encounter with a father-son paradigm in his "gauntlet" of fathers. He accompanies Telemachus in his transition from his journey away from home to his return to Ithaca. Placed in this critical juncture, Theoklymenos — like Nestor at the start of his journey — fulfills a double function. First, he completes Telemachus's process of rejecting alternative father-son paradigms. And additionally, in complement to Telemachus's visit to Nestor, he completes a ring composition around his journey which distinguishes his version of fathers and sons from the Iliadic one. I will consider Theoklymenos's two functions respectively.

When Theoklymenos meets another young man away from home, he makes the connection between his situation and Telemachus's explanation of why he is at sea: "so also I am apart from my homeland" (οὕτω τοι καὶ ἐγὼν ἐκ πατρίδος 15.272); "I flee, since it seems that it is my lot to wander among men" (φεύγω, ἐπεί νύ μοι αἶσα κατ' ἀνθρώπους ἀλάλησθαι 276). It is not clear, however, if Theoklymenos identifies himself with Telemachus who is away from home, or with Odysseus, who, Telemachus said, has long been gone (δὴν οἰχομένοιο 270). But in both cases, the comparison is clear — as well as the contrast. Theoklymenos and his fathers epitomize the metanastic wandering life: his fleeing home coincides with Telemachus's and Odysseus's returning home. Theoklymenos has run away from home for slaying one of his own kin. But for Telemachus, the slaughter of men in his own house will become the means for

reappropriating home and land, rather than the cause for fleeing it.[213] Thus in the context of meeting Telemachus at the moment of his returning back to Ithaca, Theoklymenos provides a pointed contrast of killing one's own and so wandering away from home, rather than travelling back to home and killing others for the sake of it. And in the context of Telemachus's imminent reunion with his father, Theoklymenos provides a contrast as one with a history of father-son separation — he has left his father behind, just as his father left his grandfather out of anger.

Telemachus's meeting with Theoklymenos also suggests important thematic contrasts with the *Iliad*. At first there seems to be a likeness. Owen Lee has observed that in the same hour that Telemachos receives the suppliant Theoklymenos onto his ship, Odysseus hears from Eumaeus how his father, Laertes, once performed a similar act. Thus Telemachus's reception of the stranger akin to his grandfather's similar act recalls such grandfather-grandson connections as those expressed by Diomedes and Glaukos. But Lee only accounts for half the picture. For upon reaching Ithaca, Telemachus does not directly receive the suppliant into his house, but entrusts his friend to Peiraeus to take him into his house instead (15.539-543). Telemachus's ultimate disinclination to forthwith integrate the stranger — though he does entertain him later (17.151ff.; 20.350ff.) — reveals that instead of becoming akin to his grandfather who took in Eumaeus, he rather grows unlike and distant from him. This distance between grandfather and grandson can be seen as characteristic of the displacement I will address below among fathers and sons in the house of Odysseus.

Lee also rightly sees Telemachus's reception of Theoklymenos as related to the Iliadic motif of the necessity of receiving the suppliant, specifically Achilles's delayed reception of Priam in Book 24.[214] In our discussion of this scene, we saw how this marked

---

[213]Nagler 1990, 345: "The complexity and allusiveness of references between proem and narrative, domestic and exotic, surely means the poet is dealing with something he cannot or does not want to confront directly, which is obviously that Odysseus (the 'savior of the *oikos*,' 2.59=17.538) has to kill his own retainers."

[214]Lee 1979, 133.

a culmination in the *Iliad's* development of relationship based not on blood kinship but on constructions of likeness. But the *Odyssey*, we have seen, moves in the opposite direction away from relationships based on likeness and toward the actuality of only the father himself. Telemachus does not receive the stranger into his house because his house is not one based on metaphorical kinship; once Odysseus comes home, we have seen, no one is *like* a father but there is only the father himself. Achilles, on the other hand, receives Priam and so becomes like his father, fitting into the tradition in his house of metaphorical kinship. The fact that Theoklymenos accompanies Telemachus in his transition from travel to home, wherein he is received on the one end but not on the other, cannot be coincidental. For this metanastic, Iliadic figure marks Telemachus's transition from an Iliadic heroic adventure to an Odyssean domestic tale. Theoklymenos thus concludes Telemachus's journey, just as Nestor began it, by differentiating his story of father and son from the Iliadic one.

Odysseus and Telemachus

Like the other fathers and sons discussed so far, except for Nestor and his sons, Telemachus also begins at a distance from his father. Fathers and sons are separated for various reasons: Orestes because his father is dead; Megapenthes because his father has guests; Theoklymenos because he has left home in exile; Telemachus because his father is lost. But in this last case of Telemachus, Book 1 develops his separation from his father from one of simple distance from and desire for the absent father into a signifying device. That is, by the end of Book 1, Telemachus has learned from Athena how to use his father's uncertain fate as a trick for his own ends: he has been divinely assured that his father is still living, but he withholds this knowledge from the suitors in order to deceive them. Beyond Book 1, *mêtis* continues to keep father and son at a metaphysical distance, as I will discuss below. Since both father and son are figures of *mêtis*, the relationship between them also

becomes infused with it. Indeed, *mêtis* sets off the relationship of Odysseus and Telemachus from the other fathers and sons in the poem.[215]

Telemachus's orientation to his father in Book 1 begins in desire and ends with cunning. Some combination of desire and *mêtis*, both creators of distance, henceforth through the poem describe their relationship. Telemachus first appears thinking of his father, "should he perchance come from somewhere and make a scattering of the suitors in the palace" (1.115-116). This initial desire for his father's return shifts between belief and disbelief in its possibility. We meet him imagining his father coming home (115), but he then speaks to the stranger of his father's return in an impossible condition: "were they to see him returned..." (1.163). He continues assuredly that his father "has perished by an evil doom" (1.166) and "gone is his day of returning" (1.168). Mentes corrects him: "not yet has noble Odysseus perished on the earth, but still he lives" (1196-97). Subsequently, Telemachus modifies his description of his father's state and describes it more accurately as uncertain: "the Harpies have swept him away and left no tidings (ἀκλειῶς): he is gone out of sight (ἄιστος), out of hearing (ἄπυστος). Athena has "stirred up" (1.89) Telemachus by bringing Odysseus back to life in his mind. He now knows from divine assurance (οἴσατο γὰρ θεὸν εἶναι 1.323) that his father yet lives (1.196).

Yet, after Athena's departure, Telemachus again — three times — asserts the certainty of his father's death. First he rebukes his mother for lamenting Phemius's bitter song of the return of the Achaeans (326-27; 337 ff.): "For not Odysseus alone lost his day of return in Troy, but many other men perished" (354-55). He states his father's absence as permanent. Soon after, he speaks harshly also to the suitors. In response to Antinoos's wish that Telemachus never become king of Ithaca, Telemachus says that there are many men on the island who may hold that honor "since Odysseus is dead (θάνε)" (396). Finally, in answer to the suitor Eurymachus's questions about the stranger and what news he brought of Odysseus, Telemachus says: "surely the return of my father is lost; no longer

[215]Cf. Nestor and Antilochos in the *Iliad*.

do I trust in tidings, from wherever they may come" (413-14). After Telemachus repeats to Eurymachus Athena's fictional name and patronymic, the poet conspires with the audience with the reminder that Telemachus knew she was a goddess (420). How explain Telemachus's assertions of his father's death after Athena has infused him with knowledge of his father's survival (1.196; 320-24)?

At the end of Book 1, Telemachus is thrice returned to the occupation in which we first met him, contemplating something in his mind, ἐνὶ φρεσίν (115). He knows in his mind, φρεσὶ (420), that Mentes was Athena; he goes up to bed revolving many things in his mind, φρεσὶ (427). Finally, the book ends with his all-night meditative vigil: "he pondered in his mind the journey which Athena had shown him" (βούλευε φρεσὶν ἦσιν ὁδὸν τὴν πέφραδ' Ἀθήνη 444). The ὁδὸν which Telemachus contemplates is a broad and metaphorical enough word to suggest not just the literal and logistical course of travel, but the many branches of Athena's "if... then" advice to him. Beyond news of his father, Athena has certainly given Telemachus something to think about: in deed and word — her disguise and her lying tale — she has demonstrated the art of seeming. So in his three post-Mentes asseverations of Odysseus's death enumerated above, Telemachus appears to be trying out his newly learned skill; like Athena, Telemachus was dissembling. By the end of the first book of the poem the ambivalent death of the father has become a ruse — just as it is for the tricky fox who plays dead to catch birds.[216] We saw in Achilles's encounter with Lykaon in the *Iliad* Achilles's stark understanding of death as that from which one can never return. The *Odyssey* takes this defining moment of the *Iliad* and in its first book reverses it. The trickster hero "cheats" death; he may play dead, but he comes back to

---

[216]Detienne and Vernant cite Oppian's (*Halieutica* II, 107-118) description of the cunning fox: 'The scheming fox (*agkulomêtis kerdô*) devises a similar trick; as soon as it spots a flock of wild birds it lies down on its side, stretches out its agile limbs, closes its eyelids and shuts its mouth. To see it you would think that it was enjoying a deep sleep or even that it was really dead, so well does it hold its breath as it lies stretched out there, all the while turning over treacherous plots (*aiola bouleuousa*) in its mind. No sooner do the birds notice it than they swoop down on it in a flock and, as if in mockery, tear at its coat with their claws, but as soon as they are within reach of its teeth the fox reveals its cunning (*dolos*) and seizes them unexpectedly'. The fox is a trap; when the right moment comes the dead creature becomes more alive than the living" (1974, 35). False death, Scheintod, is also a trick for later poets of other genres like Euripides in *Helen* and for the Greek novelists.

life.[217] By the end of the first book, Telemachus has learned this trick. The knowledge of his father's aliveness is granted as a secret to the son alone. By divinely informing Telemachus of his father's life and future homecoming, Athena has given him more father than he has ever yet had. Cunningly, he finds the surest way to protect his still fragile facsimile of a father is to keep others away from it by keeping him dead in word.

Telemachus soon has occasion to call on his divine mentor of *mêtis*, Athena. With the last word in the abruptly ended assembly in Book 2 taken away from him, Telemachus prays to Athena instead. In the form of Mentor, she announces Telemachus's relation to his father within a general statement on fathers and sons:

> Τηλέμαχ', οὐδ' ὄπιθεν κακὸς ἔσσεαι οὐδ' ἀνοήμων.
> εἰ δή τοι σοῦ πατρὸς ἐνέστακται μένος ἠύ.
> οἷος κεῖνος ἔην τελέσαι ἔργον τε ἔπος τε·
> οὔ τοι ἔπειθ' ἁλίη ὁδὸς ἔσσεται οὐδ' ἀτέλεστος.
> εἰ δ' οὐ κείνου γ' ἐσσὶ γόνος καὶ Πηνελοπείης.
> οὐ σέ γ' ἔπειτα ἔολπα τελευτήσειν, ἃ μενοινᾷς.
> παῦροι γάρ τοι παῖδες ὁμοῖοι πατρὶ πέλονται,
> οἱ πλέονες κακίους, παῦροι δέ τε πατρὸς ἀρείους.
> ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ὄπιθεν κακὸς ἔσσεαι οὐδ' ἀνοήμων,
> οὐδέ σε πάγχυ γε μῆτις Ὀδυσσῆος προλέλοιπεν,
> ἐλπωρή τοι ἔπειτα τελευτῆσαι τάδε ἔργα.
>
> (2.270-280)
>
> Telemachus, you will be neither base nor lacking understanding in the future,
> if indeed the serviceable spirit of your father has been instilled in you,
> considering what kind of man he was in fulfilling both deed and word:
> your journey will not be fruitless nor unfulfilled.[218]
> But if you are not the child of him and Penelope,
> then I do not expect that you will fulfill the things you desire.
> For few sons are like their fathers,
> more are worse, and few are better than their fathers.
> But since you will be neither base nor lacking understanding in the future,
> nor has the *mêtis* of Odysseus completely forsaken you,[219]
> there is then hope that you will fulfill these deeds.

Athena's speech divides into three parts of 4 lines (270-73), 4 lines (274-77), 3 lines (278-280). The first four and the last three say essentially the same thing; their repetition of idea is marked by the repetition of a line (cf. 270 and 278). Both state that Telemachus will not

---

[217]Pucci 1987, 148-57.

[218]HWH makes the sensible suggestion of alternate punctuation for the first four lines. Full stop at the end of 270, comma at end of 272; the conditional clause of 271-72 then goes with 273, not with 270 (HWH 148). This does lend the lines a certain intelligibility, although it removes the potentiality of Telemachos's future state. But if we translate ἐπεὶ in 278 causally, Athena does seem to assert this futurity unhesitantly.

[219]HWH prefers to translate οὐδέ ... πάγχυ as 'not at all' rather than 'not altogether' (HWH 148).

be base nor stupid; and depending/ dependent on his inheritance of his father's *menos/ mêtis*, his journey will be fulfilled. As in Book 1, Athena's declaration upon Telemachus as a worthy son of his father moves from *menos* to *mêtis*, words etymologically related, but with different emphases.[220] Grammatically, there is a shift of tone: the last three lines make declarative what in the first four were only conditional. The questionable instillment of *menos* in line 271 becomes the indicative statement of inherited *mêtis* in line 279. Just as in Book 1, the endpoint is *mêtis*. In a sense, Athena's speech above distills the movement of Book 1 into ten lines: Telemachus is like his father, having inherited his father's *menos*; but it is not until he acquires his *mêtis* that his heroic success is assured.

Not forsaken by his father's *mêtis*, Telemachus is ready to set sail on his journey in search of news of his father. His discoveries, however, would seem to be constrained by his skepticism about ever knowing one's father. Athena asked him if he is the son of Odysseus, and Telemachus answers that no one ever surely knows his father:

> μήτηρ μέν τέ μέ φησι τοῦ ἔμμεναι. αὐτὰρ ἐγώ γε
> οὐκ οἶδ'· οὐ γάρ πώ τις ἑὸν γόνον αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω.
> (1.215-16)
>
> My mother says I am his. I for my part
> do not know; for not yet does someone himself know his father.

According to Telemachus, the child himself (αὐτὸς 216) is the last one to be able to speak with authority on his own conception and parentage.[221] Rather, it is the other, the one who saw in the past, from outside the self, who can witness another's origin.[222] The stranger told Telemachus that he often mingled with Odysseus before Odysseus left for Troy. In

---

[220]Nagy 1974, 265-278.

[221]There are other readings of these lines. For an interpretation of diffidence, see HWH 1988, 102; for convention, HWH 1988, 102; Stanford 1947, 225.

[222]Cf. Bakhtin: "In the life I live and experience from within myself, my own birth and death are events which I am in principle incapable of experiencing; birth and death as *mine* are incapable of becoming events of my own life. Just as in the case of outward appearance, the point here is not merely the impossibility of experiencing these events in fact; the point is first of all that I lack any essential axiological approach to them. ... In my own life, people are born, pass by, and die, and their life/death is often the most important event of my own life — an event that determines the content of my life (cf. the essential constituents that determine the stories or plots of world literature). The terminal points of my own life cannot have this plot-determining significance; my own life is that which temporally encompasses the existence of others. ... I am in myself the condition of possibility for my own life, but I am not its valuable hero. I am not capable of experiencing the emotionally consolidated time that encompasses me, just as I am not capable of experiencing the space that encompasses me. My time and my space are the time and space of an author, and not those of a hero" *Author and Hero,* 104-106.

response to her question of his identity, Telemachus's answer in effect says, why are you asking me? You were here, you saw with your own eyes — you are the one in the position to know, not me, who, like all men, requires an outside other to see his origin. Telemachus's journey affords the opportunity for him to be seen by others who, having known his father, can furnish Telemachus with their greater vision invisible to all — the mystery of one's birth, one's beginning. In the diction of Bakhtin, these others will "author" the "hero" Telemachus. Starting with the authoring vision of Athena-Mentes, the journey presents two further scenes of others' authoring — Nestor and Menelaos and Helen. At the end of her meeting with Telemachus, Athena sends him out on a quest for word of his father; this quest, Telemachus's words above make clear, is as much about the recognition of Telemachus as learning news of Odysseus (cf.1.94-95). That is, his whole journey — a passing through a series of father substitutes — comprises the solution to his response to Athena that no one himself knows his father.

The Reunion of Odysseus and Telemachus

The first appearance in the poem of Telemachus — who is occupied by imagining his returning father — introduced the motif of Telemachus's desire for his father. The scenes following developed his acquisition of *mêtis* within the framework of this desire — his search for word of his father. At the end of Book 4, the poem turns from the son to the father. When Telemachus returns into the action to be reunited with his father, the theme of his desire for his father ironically returns with him, but now redefined and permanent. Rather than a simple wish capable of fulfillment, the reunion of Odysseus and Telemachus instead shows Telemachus's seemingly straightforward desire for his father to be an impossible wish incapable of fulfillment. By triply displacing the meeting of father and son, their reunion portrays not so much their long-awaited coming together, but rather the inherent impossibility of such satisfaction. More than a seemingly simple desire for his father, Telemachus's desire is revealed as infinitely complex, metaphysical rather than

physical. His initial desire for his father was constrained by his doubt of the ultimate knowability of one's father: "My mother says that I am his, but I do not know; for never yet has anyone himself known his own parentage" (1.215-16). Telemachus's desired reunion with his father does not fulfill his longing for his father but rather his original doubt. Odysseus's initial state as uncertain, as lost at sea, now becomes a significant metaphor: one's birth, one's father is essentially uncertain and unknowable. Telemachus's desire for his physical father is fulfilled, only to be replaced by a greater metaphysical desire incapable of fulfillment. The father is always lost in a way.

Three factors circumscribe the long anticipated reunion between Odysseus and Telemachus: the proleptic, substitute reunion between Telemachus and Eumaeus; the son's interruption of his father's embrace due to his disbelief in his father's mortality; and finally, once united, the bird simile which describes their wailing. The presentation of this highly anticipated moment keeps it elusive and ultimately beyond reach: through the three techniques enumerated above, it is continuously displaced.

Telemachus's response of wonder and fear to his seemingly divine father has been well analyzed as a classic response to a divine epiphany made for the purpose of testing a mortal and initiating a cult.[223] But while "fear is a natural reaction to a divine epiphany," in the literary examples, each mortal manifests his or her fear in slightly different ways and in reaction to slightly different epiphanies.[224] Telemachus's response to his father shares contextual and dictional similarities with one other such scene in particular: Anchises's reaction to Aphrodite's epiphany in the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite*.[225]

In the hymn to Aphrodite, overcome by Aphrodite's persuasive words and his own desire, Anchises has already, unknowingly, lain beside the goddess. After this dangerous liason, Aphrodite wakens him to reveal herself. She tells him to wake up and tell her if she looks the same as she did before:

---

[223]Kearns 1982.
[224]Ibid., 5.
[225]In using the hymn as a comparandum, I am assuming only that they share a set of associations, not that one precedes or influences another.

καὶ φράσαι, εἴ τοι ὁμοίη ἐγὼν ἰνδάλλομαι εἶναι.
οἵην δή με τὸ πρῶτον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι νόησας:
(h.Aph. 178-89)

And consider if I appear to be the same,
the sort I was when at first you perceived me with your eyes.

Anchises obeys her and upon seeing her in changed form, becomes afraid:

ὡς δὲ ἴδεν δειρήν τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ' Ἀφροδίτης,
τάρβησέν τε καὶ ὄσσε παρακλιδὸν ἔτραπεν ἄλλῃ·
(h.Aph. 181-82)

But when he saw the neck and beautiful eyes of Aphrodite,
he became afraid and he turned his eyes, bending them to the other side.

Anchises shares with Telemachus the recognition of a "divinity" based on a change in their appearance. Just as Aphrodite reappeared to Anchises in all her divine beauty, so for Telemachus, the stranger changes from an old beggar to a strong and youthful man (16.172-76). And his response to this shared context is markedly similar to Anchises's:

θάμβησε δέ μιν φίλος υἱός.
ταρβήσας δ' ἐτέρωσε βάλ' ὄμματα, μὴ θεὸς εἴη
(16.178-79)

His own son wondered at him,
and being afraid he cast his eyes to the other side, lest he was a god

In all the other literary representations of a mortal in the moment of recognizing an epiphany, only Anchises shares with Telemachus this verb of fearing and this act of turning aside his eyes.[226] Richardson explains the emphasis on the visual as implicit in the ritual of initiation into the Mysteries. Therein the initiate ascends to the level of seeing. But in these epiphanic scenes, vision is negated; these young men, according to this explanation, work against the direction of initiation. But there is another association with turning aside one's eyes which the hymn itself provides. Before Aphrodite consummates her relationship with Anchises, she presents herself to him as virginal, "unbroken and untried in love" (ἀδμήτην μ' ἀγαγὼν καὶ ἀπειρήτην φιλότητος 133). At the moment when she ascends the couch to make love with Anchises, she turns her eyes away:

φιλομμειδὴς δ' Ἀφροδίτη
ἔρπε μεταστρεφθεῖσα κατ' ὄμματα καλὰ βαλοῦσα
(h.Aph. 155-56)

Laughter-loving Aphrodite
went turning aside, casting down her beautiful eyes

[226]For a list of reactions to epiphanies, see Richardson 1974, 208. Sowa makes the comparison of these Odyssean and Hymn to Aphrodite passages (1984, 252)

Eyes and vision, particularly not letting one's eyes be seen, are not necessarily primarily epiphanic, but in certain contexts, highly erotic motifs. "Eyelids are important. From the eyelids may issue an erotic emotion that sets the interval between two people vibrating."[227] When Telemachus turns his eyes aside from the apparently divine stranger, his gesture suggests a reaction to an epiphany, but an epiphany of a particularly erotic sort.

The ambiguity of this relationship — both man to god and lover to beloved — misplaced onto father and son is reiterated in the simile which describes their embrace:

> κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως. ἀδινώτερον ἢ τ' οἰωνοί,
> φῆναι ἢ αἰγυπιοὶ γαμψώνυχες. οἵσι τε τέκνα
> ἀγρόται ἐξείλοντο πάρος πετεηνὰ γενέσθαι·
> (16.216-18)
>
> And they wailed shrilly, more vehemently than birds,
> sea eagles or vultures with hooked talons, whose young
> hunters took away before they became fledged.

The plural dative, οἵσι, states that these afflicted birds are imagined in the plural. Their offspring are either their own singly, which puts both Odysseus and Telemachus into the role of a parent, or, more simply, their offspring are shared between them, rendering Odysseus and Telemachus a mating pair.

The point of elucidating the erotic undertones of Odysseus's and Telemachus's reunion is NOT to suggest some latent homoerotic, incestuous desire between the two men. It is, rather, that by characterizing the reunion of father and son in terms of that between man and god, and lover and beloved, the poet willfully displaces the actual moment of this filial consummation. By turning to the imagery of lovers, the poet distances and empties out the embrace of father and son. Thus displaced into terms other than its own, that latter reunion is left unrepresented. It never fully happens.

One might wonder what a representation of the reunion of father and son could be like. Even so, the poet has just earlier represented precisely such a reunion. The poet's failure to depict the reunion between father and son thus does not derive from a lack of ability or of such a cultural category:

---

[227]Carson 1986, 20. She discusses the lyric uses of eyes — especially the glance withheld— further (pp.20-21).

> In amazement up sprang the swineherd, and from his hands the vessels fell with which he was busied as he mixed the sparkling wine. And he went to meet his lord, and kissed his head and both his beautiful eyes and his two hands, and a big tear fell from him. And as a loving father greets his own son, who comes in the tenth year from a distant land — his only son and well-beloved, for whose sake he has borne much sorrow — even so did the noble swineherd then clasp in his arms godlike Telemachus, and kiss him all over as one escaped from death; and sobbing he addressed him with winged words. (16.12-22)

Just as the embrace between father and son was displaced onto that between lover and beloved, so the singular explicit description of a reunion between father and son is displaced onto slave and master. The scene of filial reunion is *purposefully* introduced with an instance of its imperfect consummation — the words of father and son, but not the content. The poetic grandeur of a father and son coming together after so many years of separation is immediately and prodigally thrown away in the first few lines of Telemachus's return. It is a magnificent and dashing misplacement. Before Telemachus ever sets eyes on the stranger, his father who is finally there and waiting for him, the poet has played his trump card. In doing so, he communicates that the reunion of father and son is not what it seems. The moment of reunion symbolizes the greater impossibility that the two parties can ever fully embrace: they will somehow miss each other, whether because they are not actually father and son, or worse, because there simply is no such satisfaction.

The simile of the shrieking birds finally explains the reason for the first two displacements of the reunion between father and son (onto slave and master, and lover and beloved). For the simile not only suggests the oddity of the relationship between father and son reflected in that of parents, but more markedly recasts the *joyous* reunion of father and son into parents' *grievous loss* of their young.[228] While for the Greeks grief and joy are not so dramatically different, the simile describes a particular moment of grief: the moment of the discovery of loss.[229] The long awaited embrace between father and son, as already

[228] To "cry shrilly" (κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως) is an expression of acute grief: so Achilles mourns over the body of Patroklos (*Iliad* 19.5); so Odysseus's crew recall their past ordeals and losses at sea (10.201); so Agamemnon approaches Odysseus in Hades (11.391). Achilles's lamentation over Patroklos is most interesting since he is soon said to grieve over him as a father for his newly wedded son. The displacement of relationship in the expression of Achilles's loss suggests that it partakes of the same dynamic of expressing *pothos*, as will be developed below. On the loss in this similie, cf. Crotty 1994, 179.

[229] Another simile from the *Iliad* more expansively portrays this inchoate horror:

suggested by the two other devices of displacement, is not a consummate fulfillment but rather a surprising discovery of absence. The bird simile's representation of Odysseus's and Telemachus's reunion as an occasion of stunning loss and absence describes its essential nature. It is not, as commentators have understood it, "inept" or primarily proleptic of their killing of the suitors to come six books later.[230] Instead, its depiction of revealed absence goes to the heart of their embrace. For the simile addresses the fundamental nature of desire: "Not all [poems] look triangular in action, yet they share a common concern: to represent eros as deferred, defied, obstructed, hungry, organized around a radiant absence — to represent eros as lack."[231] The great revelation of this scene of desire formally fulfilled —father and son are in each other's arms — is the poet's refusal to offer full satisfaction.[232] Instead, the most long awaited and ardently imagined moment of reunion only opens up the unfillable space, the vast vista of desire. While Telemachus longed for the return of his father, fulfillment seemed simple and attainable. With that return revealed as incomplete, as only one mask of longing, its fulfillment signals the beginning of discovering metaphysical absence. His longing is redefined from an

---

> And among them the son of Peleus began the vehement lamentation (ἀδινοῦ ... γόοιο)
> laying his man-slaying hands upon the breast of his comrade,
> groaning utterly incessantly just as a well-bearded lion,
> whose whelps a deer hunter has snatched away
> from out of the thick wood; and the lion coming back later grieves
> (*Iliad* 18.316-20)

The simile continues to describe the anger and vengeful seeking of the lion after the man (18.321-22). These emotions may be relevant to the simile of Odysseus's reunion with Telemachus.

[230]Stanford 271; Ahl and Roisman 1996, 195-96.

[231]Carson 1986, 18. She continues: "Pursuit and flight are a *topos* of Greek erotic poetry and iconography from the archaic period onward. It is noteworthy that, within such conventional scenes, the moment of ideal desire on which vase-painters as well as poets are inclined to focus is not the moment of the *coup de foudre*, not the moment when the beloved's arms open to the lover, not the moment when the two unite in happiness. What is pictured is the moment when the beloved turns and runs" (19-20). The Homeric poet, by inserting the bird simile of loss into the "moment when the two unite in happiness," accomplishes the simultaneous portrayal of unfulfillment within fulfillment.

[232]Cf. Pucci 1980, 97. Also see Lord 1978, 180: Lord shows the displacement of this scene on the level of form. Telemachus's recognition of his father, due to the poem's desire to place it first, displaces the otherwise prepared scenes of recognition between Odysseus and Eumaeus (end of Book 14 and 15.495) and Odysseus and Laertes (15.38 and 495).

attainable wish to a condition of being: a permanent longing for something ineffable and unknowable.[233] Whence, perhaps, his reluctance to believe his father less than a god.

The structure of the scene of Odysseus's and Telemachus's reunion now becomes sensible. The false starts and interruptions do not heighten the final fulfillment, but rather represent its unattainability. The series of deferrals enacts the nature of their postponed embrace, which itself gives way to a feeling of dismay and sorrow. The return of the father is less than magical. Just as Odysseus must persuade Telemachus that he is indeed only human, the recognition is itself a deflation, literally a "coming down to earth." Accordingly the pathos of the scene is abruptly cut short (αἶψα 16.221): practical thoughts of ships and allies readily interfere with what had previously been imagined to be the grand fulfillment of all of Telemachus's desires. The depleted moment of recognition is no longer sustainable: the return of the father is a profound disappointment.[234]

Telemachus's disappointment in his father's return, however, is not all for naught. For while it may leave him wanting, it simultaneously ensures a constructive distance between them — the distance which allows for the continued individuality of the father and son within the framework of the house. Father and son become co-workers. The reunion ends with a significant revision of Telemachus's gaze. Rather than turning his eyes away from his father, he looks knowingly at him, excluding the "outsider," Eumaeus, newly returned from the palace:

---

[233]Cf. the analysis of Primo Levi on the nature of discontent: "For human nature is such that grief and pain — even simultaneously suffered — do not add up as a whole in our consciousness, but hide, the lesser behind the greater, according to a definite law of perspective. It is providential and is our means of surviving in the camp. And this is the reason why so often in free life one hears it said that man is never content. In fact it is not a question of a human incapacity for a state of absolute happiness, but of an ever-insufficient knowledge of the complex nature of the state of unhappiness; so that the single name of the major cause is given to all its causes, which are composite and set out in an order of urgency. And if the most immediate cause of stress comes to an end, you are grivously amazed to see that another one lies behind; and in reality a whole series of others" (Primo Levi, *Survival in Auschwitz*. Trans. Stuart Woolf. Simon & Schuster. 1993. p. 73.) The return of Odysseus is only when Telemachus's "most immediate cause of stress comes to an end."

[234]But useful nonetheless. It does not stop the plot and end the story: we are after all only mid-poem. Yet the profundity of the poem's demonstration of the essential nature of unfulfillment suggests that the cause for Telemachus's disappointment is not for the sake of continuing the poem. The poem ends with another father-son reunion wherein we will see whether there is such a thing as fulfillment. It seems at this point unlikely. Fulfillment in the poem comes in the form of prophecies fulfilled — all of a destructive sort.

ὣς φάτο. μείδησεν δ' ἱερὴ ἴς Τηλεμάχοιο
ἐς πατέρ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδών. ἀλέεινε δ' ὑφορβόν.
(16.476-77)
Thus he spoke, and the divine might of Telemachus smiled
looking with his eyes at his father, but he avoided the swineherd.

Telemachus's reunion with his father has come full circle. Earlier, when first witnessing the "epiphany" of Odysseus, Telemachus turned away his eyes in fear and wonder (16.179). Now, after having talked and made a sacrifice (σὺν ἱερεύσαντες 16.454) — from man to god — with his father, Telemachus purposefully catches his father's eye. No longer the eye of some alleged divinity that Telemachus avoids in dread reverence, he simply avoids the eye of the swineherd who is extraneous to the covenant between father and son.[235]

Odysseus and Telemachus at Home

The duration of the poem shows father and son working together toward their shared goal of reclaiming what's theirs. Telemachus fights alongside his father but not in a struggle exclusively his father's. Odysseus fights his own battle; but as the Telemachy has made clear that this is as much the son's battle as well, Telemachus fights his own battle, too. Telemachus's questioning of his father during the typical structure of recognition — doubt, proof, embrace — becomes a paradigm for their immediately subsequent interactions.[236] For example, as they begin to work together, toward their own and shared goal, there is a mutuality between them akin to that of the companions at Troy. So on the one hand, Odysseus asks Telemachus for an account of the suitors to determine if they two will be sufficient opposition against them (16.235-39); Telemachus politely expresses dismay at his father's presumption (240-57); Odysseus corrects him (259-61); Telemachus approves his father's wisdom (263-65). But on the other hand, the poem juxtaposes a more open-ended dynamic between the father and son: Odysseus prescribes to Telemachus the actions and words he must perform on the following day (270-307); Telemachus affirms the

[235]There is, of course, an ordinary plot-furthering device operative here, too.
[236]For this structure, see Murnaghan 1987, 22.

command to test the female slaves but suggests postponing the trying of the male ones (309-320). At this point the poet intervenes, depriving Odysseus of his expected response and ending the pattern now with the son's voice and correction.

Soon after, father and son work together as a pair bathed in Athena's divine light: "Then the two leapt up, Odysseus and his glorious son, and carried in the helmets and embossed shields" (τὼ δ' ἄρ' ἀναίξαντ' Οδυσεὺς καὶ φαίδιμος υἱὸς/ ἐσφόρεον κόρυθάς τε καὶ ἀσπίδας ὁμφαλοέσσας 19.31-32). Not long after, Odysseus, disguised, makes a statement of their equality:

> εἰ δ' ὁ μὲν ὣς ἀπόλωλε καὶ οὐκέτι νόστιμός ἐστίν.
> ἀλλ' ἤδη παῖς τοῖος Ἀπόλλωνός γε ἔκηται./ Τηλέμαχος·
> (19.85-87)
> But if as it seems he [Odysseus] is dead and is no longer expected to return,
> but already his son, by the will of Apollo, is such a sort, Telemachus;

Odysseus acknowledges his son's commensurability to himself: he indicates that if he is not available to punish the unfaithful slaves, Telemachus will do so instead. Odysseus's words furthermore make clear the importance of timing. For he completes this speech: ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι τηλίκος ἐστίν ["since he [Telemachus] is no longer such an age" 19.88]. This phrase is in perfect responsion with Odysseus's οὐκέτι νόστιμός ἐστίν (85). Telemachus's τηλίκος would replace Odysseus's νόστιμός should the latter be denied.

The timing of these books as coincident with Telemachus's having come of age is evident in one other pair of comments. In Book 18, Penelope recalls Odysseus's instructions to her to marry another man and leave the house when Telemachus is bearded should he not return from Troy (267-70). She recounts these words since they have now come to fulfillment: τὰ δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται (18.271). In Book 19, the poet tells the story of Odysseus's scar, received during a boar hunt among the men of the house of his maternal grandfather — a rite of passage indicative of his coming of age. The superimposition of Telemachus's recent entry into manhood over the recollection of Odysseus's past one bring the two men together into a palimpsest of manliness. In such overlaying there both is time and is not. Telemachus displays the past youth of his father

but both are presently sung, and paratactically, with his father's entry into manhood curiously placed second. The story of the scar augments the importance of Telemachus's story of coming of age as it suggests that at least one of a person's defining features derives from just that period. For a moment, it allows both father and son to coexist, equally valuing both times of man.

Telemachus commits several acts heroic enough to maintain his equal alliance with his father. First he kills Amphinomos who was aiming at Odysseus and thereby saves his father's life (22.91). Then, when Odysseus divides up the tasks among the four allies — Odysseus, Telemachus, the swineherd Eumaeus, and the cowherd Philoetius, he assigns the work of keeping the suitors in the hall to himself and his son, and commands the two slaves to punish the disloyal goatherd, Melanthios (22.171ff.). The bond between father and son is also evident in the words of others. For example, the suitor Agelaos urges on the rest, calling for the death of "father and son" (πατέρ' ἠδὲ καὶ υἱόν 22.216). Soon after Athena is said to give only partial assistance to her favorite since she is still testing Odysseus and his son ('Οδυσσῆος ἠδ' υἱοῦ κυδαλίμοιο 22.238). Finally, during the slaughter of the suitors, Odysseus is twice supplicated, first by the seer, Leiodes, whom he kills (310ff.); and then by the singer, Phemios (337ff.). Telemachus intervenes on behalf of Phemios and also asks for the life of the herald who raised him, Medon (362-70). Odysseus listens to Telemachus's persuasion and so father and son, separately and together, both rightful heroes within one house, claim what is theirs.

The sparing of Phemios and Medon, which ends the slaughter of suitors, forms a suggestive inversion of the supplication motif in the *Iliad* on several counts. In our discussion of battlefield supplication in the *Iliad*, we observed how Trojan sons in vain entreat for their lives in exchange for the wealth stored up in their fathers' house. The supplication of Phemios and Medon first inverts this Iliadic motif since they ask for mercy because they had no part in *destroying* the father's wealth (22.351-53; 368-370). Next, this play on the usual swearing by a father's wealth is furthered when Telemachus

intervenes on behalf of the singer and herald; that is, the son intervenes for the sake of non-kin.[237] Telemachus's concern for those close to him by analogy but not kinship surely brings to mind the end of the *Iliad*, which brings into greater focus Achilles's coterie of metanastic followers. In his plea to spare the herald, Medon, Telemachus speaks in a way reminiscent of the relationship between Phoinix and Achilles. Telemachus beseeches his father: "Let us save the herald, Medon, who used to care for me in our house, when I was a child — unless perchance Philoetius has already killed him, or the swineherd, or he met you as you were raging through the house" (22.357-360). Indeed, there may even be a echo in the name, 'Medon,' since in the *Iliad* we saw that Medon was a *metanastês*, who had left home for slaying a relative of his stepmother (*Il.* 13.694-97). This late mention of a Phoinix-like father figure of Telemachus seems to allude to the *Iliad's* gradual development of Achilles's father substitutes which culminate in his meeting with Priam in the final book. But this mention of Medon in the *Odyssey*, however, brings the Iliadic motif to mind only to distinguish itself from it. Medon has been a minimal character throughout the *Odyssey*, and accordingly, Telemachus's care for him comes as an afterthought; he thinks to spare Medon if he hasn't yet been killed by chance. Medon has escaped death by draping himself in the skin of a newly flayed ox and hiding under a chair — a tactic which may comprise a comic play on cunning and disguise. Indeed, having spared the supplicating Medon, Odysseus sends him out of the house, a symbol that in this house, there is room for only one father and that father is Odysseus alone.

Most importantly, Odysseus accepts the supplication of Phemios and Medon, backed by Telemachus, reversing the Iliadic trend of refusing all battlefield suppliants. His speech to the suppliants recasts some Iliadic motifs:

> θάρσει, ἐπεὶ δή σ' οὗτος ἐρύσσατο καὶ ἐσάωσεν,
> ὄφρα γνῷς κατὰ θυμόν, ἀτὰρ εἴπῃσθα καὶ ἄλλῳ,
> ὡς κακοεργίης εὐεργεσίη ηέγ' ἀμείνων. (22.372-74)
> Be of good cheer, for he has delivered you and saved you,
> that you may know in your heart and tell also to another,
> how far better is the doing of good deeds than of evil.

[237]Richard Martin's suggestion to me.

In Odysseus's benign speech, we first hear an echo of his deceitful words to Dolon who also once begged Odysseus for his life: θάρσει, μηδέ τί μοι θάνατος καταθύμιος ἔστω ("Be of good cheer and do not let death be in your heart" *Il.* 10.383). Both Odysseus's encouragement, θάρσει, and his mention of the suppliants' heart — κατὰ θυμόν: καταθύμιος — resonate in these passages. But in the *Iliad*, Odysseus spoke to Dolon falsely, fully intending to kill him (followed by the slaughter of many sleeping enemies); in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus's awful slaughter of the suitors ends on a note of a truthful and beneficent Odysseus. Finally, along with this reversal in the epic's presentation of its hero, we see also a reversal of the larger Iliadic presentation of a battle without mercy but death for all (cf. *Il.* 6.57-60). Telemachus and Odysseus will be praised, Odysseus suggests, not for their terribleness in battle, but for their compassion. By accepting the supplication of Phemios and Medon, Odysseus undoes the absoluteness of the slaughter of the suitors, transcending as well as the *Iliad's* ethic of absolute slaughter of the Trojans.

Odysseus as father and son

Like Telemachus, Odysseus also encounters a number of father and son pairs before returning to his own family. His sea adventures contain no stories of mortal fathers and sons. Only when he reaches Scheria, his last stop and a transitional civilization both blessed and threatening, does he return to the world of mortal men. So accounts of mortal fathers and sons begin here. Telemachus's experience with the gauntlet of fathers, we recall, distinguished his sought after relationship with his father from them. Odysseus also passes through several other fathers and sons in a manner similar to Telemachus, as well as akin to many of his encounters — destructively, leaving disappointment in one's charms or magic, or a wound or a sealed off city, behind him. Likewise, Odysseus disrupts and brings out the worst in the fathers and sons he meets. Through the poem, Odysseus harms others while he survives; his response to fathers and sons is no less hostile. Just as his

whole journey is a process of paring down to one as he loses his entire crew, his desire regarding fathers and sons appears to be likewise unwelcoming.

As the first of Odysseus's meetings with a father and son during his journey toward Ithaca, his encounter with Alkinoos and his sons parallels that of Telemachus with Nestor. Like Nestor with his six named sons, Alkinoos is another prolific father with five sons living at home with him (6.62).[238] And in a similar fashion to Telemachus's arrival on Pylos, Odysseus is escorted to the center of the gathering, and seated beside the king. There are however subtle differences between the two receptions. On Pylos, Nestor's son, Peisistratos, approached the strangers and led them to the king (3.36-39). On Scheria, the king himself takes Odysseus by the hand and gives him a seat (7.167-169).[239] On Pylos, the king is seated beside his heroic son, Thrasymedes. Peisitratos leads the strangers to soft seats beside both the prince and the king (πάρ τε κασιγνήτῳ Θρασυμήδει καὶ πατέρι ᾧ· 3.39). On Scheria, the king displaces his most beloved son, who sits next to him, for the stranger: "he [Alkinoos] took by the hand Odysseus, the wise and crafty-minded, and raised him from the hearth, and set him upon a bright chair from which he bade his son, the kindly Laodamas, to rise" (7.170-71). These differences suggest a greater danger of the incorporation of the stranger on Scheria than on Pylos. Such danger is borne out by the desire of both daughter and father to bring Odysseus into the *oikos* through marriage. Odysseus could thus take the place of a favored son beside the king and so not return to his own wife and house. And Laodamas, the beloved son himself, reacts to the potential threat of being usurped when he challenges Odysseus in contest (8.130-57). On Pylos, such a danger of the stranger replacing the favorite son through marriage is not foreshadowed; and so Telemachus is ultimately paired with the companion, Peisistratos,

---

[238]Three sons is conventional (*Iliad* 11.59; 14.115; 20.231); more suggests a truly θαλερὸν γάμον (4.66). HWH 297.

[239]Perhaps some of the difference in the treatment of Odysseus arises from his more advanced age, wherefore he is shown greater honor. Toward this idea are the several (albeit ironic) appellations of Odysseus as ξεῖνε πάτερ (8.145, 408).

rather than a nubile daughter. Odysseus thus presents a subtle threat to the father-son harmony on Scheria.

Odysseus in the underworld

Odysseus tells the Phaeacians about his past adventures, including his trip to the underworld. Thus he recounts how in the underworld, before encountering any of the heroic dead, he first met his newly dead crew member, Elpenor. Deprived of burial and lamentation, Elpenor asks Odysseus to make up for this lack. He beseeches him by those who are "not present" — his wife and father and son left behind (11.66-68) (νῦν δέ σε τῶν ὄπιθεν γουνάζομαι, οὐ παρεόντων 11.66).

Ordinarily, with stories told by the living from the point of view of the living, the dead are the consummately absent. The completion of death — whether by inhumation or cremation — is a process of making the body invisible.[240] From the point of view of the dead, however, those not present are the living. Odysseus, alive among the dead, becomes both present and not present; as one of the latter, he is a link to the living. Both Agamemnon and Achilles ask him about their absent ones, their sons, and for Achilles, also his father. In response, Odysseus has little to tell or tells only little of what he knows about their absent sons and fathers (11.463ff.; 505).[241] In effect, then, he keeps those absent absent. As a result, as in the poem as a whole, only Odysseus obtains presence: because the dead are the ultimately absent and Odysseus is reticent about the absent living, there is present only his own voice as narrator.

Thus completely in control of his self-presentation in the underworld, Odysseus describes two encounters involving fathers and sons: Agamemnon and Orestes, Achilles and Neoptolemos. In both these instances, Odysseus manages to praise himself as a father

---

[240]"Any form of burial marks the family or community action which transfers the body to a new state of belonging, and the absent element of individuality called the *psyche* always is absent, and so 'elsewhere.' ... There must be a processional escort to the burial place, a permanent separation of the group from the visible body, which is concealed or dispersed, and replaced, in a sense, by a tombstone or mound" (Vermeule 1979, 2-3).

[241]Cf. Ahl and Roisman 1996,141-152.

in response to the other heroes' questions about their sons. In the first encounter, Agamemnon tells Odysseus all about the sad ending of his terrible death. In this speech, he contrasts his fate with Odysseus's, since Odysseus will return home to greet his son: "Behold him [Telemachus] his dear father will, when he comes, and he will embrace his father, as is right and good. But my wife did not let me sate my eyes even with the sight of my son. Before that it was I myself whom she slew" (11.450-53). At the end of this speech, Agamemnon asks for news of the whereabouts of his son, Orestes, who might avenge his father's sad demise. Agamemnon knows that Orestes is still living since he has not seen him in the underworld. Yet Odysseus offers little in response to this question so important to Agamemnon: "Son of Atreus, why do you question me of this? I know not at all whether he is alive or dead; and it is bad to speak idly" (463-64). The meeting between Agamemnon and Odysseus thus ends with a reported exchange of lamentation (465-66). The good news of father and son remains Agamemnon's prophecy of Odysseus's happy return to his son.

After Agamemnon, Odysseus next meets Achilles. Like Agamemnon, Achilles naturally also asks for news of his son. And in this encounter, too, Odysseus makes himself come out on top, this time as the patron of Neoptolemos. First he tells Achilles that he himself brought Neoptolemos to Troy. And then he slyly praises Neoptolemos as always being the first to speak and surpassed only by himself and Nestor; and in battle, Odysseus continues, Neoptolemos always fought in the front ranks. Anthony Edwards has carefully described Odysseus's cunning in his report to Achilles, from which analysis I quote only one section:

> Neoptolemos serves two masters in this account. By "defending the Argives" as their πρόμος ἀνήρ, he lives up to his father's memory. Yet, throughout the narrative he is otherwise the apprentice of Odysseus. For it is Odysseus who fetches him from Scyros and introduces him into the world of heroism, Neoptolemus submits to the ascendency of Nestor and Odysseus in the ἀγορή, and he participates in the final victory over Troy in strict obedience to Odysseus, its strategist. ... through this strategem [λόχος] Odysseus not only initiates the last assault upon Troy, but also enlists the αἰχμητής, Neoptolemos, in a λόχος, and finally appropriates for himself Achilles' role as the father. Moreover,

wrapped in this praise of Neoptolemos, Odysseus advances his claim to be the hero who sacked Troy, and asserts the ultimate triumph of wit over force.[242]

Odysseus's stories of Agamemnon and Achilles in the underworld can thus be seen as praise of himself as hero and father.

Odysseus and Eumaeus

After the Phaeacians leave Odysseus in Ithaca, the first mortal he meets is his loyal swineherd, Eumaeus. The two men pass the time talking about themselves. Their different desires toward their past and parents form the last father-son foil against which Odysseus stands apart: Odysseus is not a slave who can switch from loyalty to one father to a new master.

Having heard from Eumaeus of his past loss of home and transfer to a new home where he was cared for by Odysseus's own parents, Odysseus responds:

> ὦ πόποι, ὡς ἄρα τυτθὸς ἐών, Εὔμαιε συβῶτα,
> πολλὸν ἀπεπλάγχθης σῆς πατρίδος ἠδὲ τοκήων.
> (15.381-82)
> Incredible, how young you must have been, swineherd Eumaeus,
> when you were carried away so far from your country and parents.

Odysseus's exclamation has the tone of genuine dismay and compassion.[243] His term to describe Eumaeus's wandering — ἀπεπλάγχθης — suits his own fate (cf. 1.2).[244] It sounds like, for the first time, Odysseus has been struck by the magnitude of Eumaeus's loss: for the first time, he "recognizes" him. Could it be that here in the swineherd's hut, the heroic master dressed in the rags and wrinkles of an old beggar comes to appreciate his own likeness to this slave? That he, too, has been long separated so far from his country and parents?

There is a long tradition of reading Homeric epic as a treatise on what it means to be human.[245] The *Odyssey* in particular lends itself to being understood as the emergence from

---

[242]Edwards 1985, 65. For Edwards's complete argument about Odysseus and Neoptolemos, see 59-69. He persuasively reads this scene as part of the *Odyssey's* general competition with the *Iliad* and its hero.
[243]Cf. Athena to Telemachus about Odysseus (ὦ πόποι, ἦ δὴ πολλὸν ἀποιχομένου Ὀδυσῆος 1.253).
[244]Richard Martin's observation.
[245]See Stanford 1963.

the possibility of immortality into the insistence on mortality. While true enough, Odysseus is a far cry from an Everyman making his way back, at long last, to the simplicity of hearth and home. More than a poem on what it means to be human, it portrays, as I have been arguing, what it means to be a hero — one separate and marked off from the mass of mankind. Odysseus's heartful exchange with the swineherd is not a moment of recognizing the shared humanity between all men. Rather, the conversation between Odysseus and Eumaeus effects a greater separation between them. For Odysseus comes to understand what it means to be a slave: it is not just a matter of being taken away from home for whatever reason — war or pirates (15.384-88), the former comprising a matter which kept Odysseus himself away from home for twenty years.[246] But rather it is the voluntary relinquishment of the desire for home which makes one a slave. At the beginning of their conversation, Eumaeus showed his loyalty to the long absent Odysseus: "For never again shall I find a master so kind, however far I go, not though I come again to the house of my father and mother, where at the first I was born, and they reared me themselves" (14.138-141). The meeting between Eumaeus and Odysseus is one which establishes differences, between the ordinary man and hero, here in the more marked terms of the difference between slave and master. The slave is one who not only leaves home, but of his own will relinquishes his desire for his own house and parents. The master, on the other hand, is the one who returns finally to his house, never having forgotten home and parents. Before going to meet his father, in Eumaeus's hut Odysseus first distinguishes his relationship to his father from Eumaeus's relationship to his.

Odysseus and Laertes

Lest Laertes be left out of the pattern of the line of Odysseus basking in the light of other father-son pairs, we also find a foil for Laertes's relationship with his son in the poem, as early as Book 2. Old Aegyptius begins the assembly in Book 2. He is the very old father

[246]Nor would the exile resultant from the murder of one's own kin, as in the case of Theoklymenos, turn him into a slave.

of several sons, one lost among Odysseus's crew, one a suitor in Odysseus's house, and two at home. As a result of the prolonged absence — and so presumed death— of his son, Aegyptius is a man of constant sorrow: he weeps even as he addresses the assembly (2.23-24). This figure of an old man weighed down by an unrelenting grief for his son lost on his return from Troy describes also Laertes, whose grief has drawn him away from public life. Both Laertes and Aegyptius fulfill the Iliadic image of the mourning father, who perpetually grieves for his dead son. Such a father sustains an inconsolable loss: so Aegyptius, even with three other sons living near him on Ithaca, cannot forget the one lost and gone (2.21-22), just as Laertes has withdrawn into a reclusive life on his farm.

But, unlike Aegyptius, Laertes will not be weighed down forever by grief; and unlike Aegyptius's son, Antiphos, whom the Cyclops devoured, Odysseus will come home from the Cyclops's cave (as well as other threatening confines). Just as Odysseus is the one elected to survive out of a large crew and fleet, demonstrating his heroic status, so Aegyptius is the chaff which shows Laertes to be the wheat. Aegyptius, like his son Antiphos was to Odysseus, is one of Laertes's "crew."

But as much as Aegyptius provides a foil to Laertes which shows Odysseus's father in all his strength, at the same time he also calls attention to Laertes's weaknesses. The presence of the sorrowful old man in the assembly emphasizes the absence of that other old man, Laertes. Why hasn't Laertes come to the rescue this whole time? Moreover, the orderliness of an elder opening the assembly simultaneously belies the disorderliness not just of Laertes's current absence, but his whole premature retirement from kingship. Why was Odysseus already king twenty years earlier, before he left for Troy, when his father was still a relatively young man? Why was Odysseus so soon king? Back in the days before Troy, Odysseus's premature ascension to kingship reveals a problematic relationship between father and son.

Other factors corroborate this sense of estrangement between father and son. First is the history of Odysseus's naming. Different from Alkinoos's statement of the norm of

naming, that there is no one of all mankind who is nameless since "parents bestow names on all when they give birth" (8.554), Odysseus was named by his maternal grandfather, Autolykos (19.403ff.), to whom Hermes had given the skill to "exceed all men in thievery and oaths" (19.395-96). The story of Autolykos's naming of his grandson in place of his son-in-law, Laertes, suggests an allusion to the myth that while Sisyphus was visiting his house, Autolykos sent him a guest gift of his daughter, Anticleia, for the night.[247] Anticleia, though engaged to marry Laertes, became pregnant with Sisyphus's son. As a result, she raised Odysseus in the house of Laertes as the son of Laertes. Beyond this one allusion, the poem is silent about this story of Odysseus's alternative father; and yet Odysseus's tricky nature supports his lineage from Hermes and Sisyphus. Odysseus's possible descent from Sisyphus rather than Laertes raises the question whether Laertes is indeed Odysseus's father. One wonders if Odysseus's gauntlet of fathers has yet ended even upon arriving home.

The inconsistencies in Odysseus's past relationship with Laertes — his unexplained assumption of authority while Laertes was still fit to be king, his naming by his grandfather who was reputed to have welcomed Sisyphus with the gift of his daughter — find present fulfillment in Odysseus's tense reunion with Laertes. The long-standing question of Odysseus's inexplicably cruel treatment of Laertes loses its problematic stature in light of the precedents enumerated above of the peculiar relationship between Odysseus and Laertes. Odysseus, the man of *mêtis*, has never stood especially close to his father, and so it is again now upon Odysseus's return. Like Odysseus and Telemachus, Odysseus returns to his father not in an engulfing embrace, one which merges one into the other, but in such a way that maintains a distance between them characteristic for a hero of cunning.

Odysseus's meeting with his father in Book 24 reiterates this idea of a proliferation of fathers. Odysseus returns to his father to find a regress of origins. Behind the *sêma* of the trees is that of the scar: behind his father is his maternal grandfather who gave him his

[247]This myth is preserved first in a fragment of Aeschylus's lost *Hoplön Krisis* (fr 175 R). See Gantz 1993, 175-76 for further discussion of the myth.

name (24.331-35; cf. 19.403-412).[248] Once recognized, father and son interact minimally. They exchange rather generic speeches (373-82); such things, the poet concludes, they said to one another (383). In place of a more developed reunion between father and son, a final recognition of Odysseus occurs. A father and his sons, the slave Dolios and his six sons, recognize Odysseus on sight. Why this further recognition, an afterthought to the reunion of Odysseus and Laertes which has long been considered itself an afterthought?[249]

In the introduction to Odysseus's reunion with his father, the poem includes a mention of the old Sicilian woman who cares for Laertes (24.211-12). She is the wife of Dolios. Out there at the farm, she becomes in a sense, also a substitute wife for Laertes (cf. the slave Eurykleia from whose bed he abstained only out of respect for his wife). Dolios and his sons who sit in order beside him (ἐξείης δ' ἕζοντο παραὶ Δολίον. πατέρα σφόν 411) reflect the royal father and son who share the table with them. Conspicuously striking in this picture is the name of that other father, Dolios, "Tricky," a characterization of Odysseus himself and also reminiscent of Odysseus's mythic relation to Sisyphus and divine connection to Hermes. Odysseus's reunion with his father is cut short by the immediate recognition of him by another father, Dolios. As in his reunion with Telemachus, there is a sense of displacement. Odysseus painfully reunites with his father only to be quickly and painlessly recognized by another father, Dolios. The image of the father multiplied throughout the poem and multiplied once again finds finally a fitting name: Dolios — "Tricky." Odyssean fathers and sons — creatures of *mêtis* — come together only to remain elusively, and so individually, apart. Our study of mortal fathers and mortal sons thus shows a combination of passing through a series of alternate father figures to arrive at the actual father himself, mixed — because of characteristic *mêtis* — with a sense of displacement in meeting that actual father. In the final case of Odysseus and Laertes, the combination of father figure and displacement may coincide as it remains a subtle question

[248]On the name of Odysseus, see Peradotto 1980.

[249]On the Scholia, see Bertman 1967, 115n1. For arguments in favor of the integrity of Book 24, see Bassett 1917-18, 521-26, Lord 1960, 176-185; Stanford 1965, 5-20; Bertman 1967, 115-23; Moulton 1974, 153-169; Wender 1978.

whether Laertes is his actual father at all. The poem's conclusion with a challenge to the certainty about the actual father in a sense returns us to Telemachus's opening observation that no one yet knows himself who his father is. Having brought its audience so far in the quest for the actual father and ending with a question of it, the poem shows itself to be a work of *mêtis*.

Conclusion

In the epic style of ring composition, I return to my discussion in the prologue for the guiding terms of my conclusion. I began this study of fathers and sons in Homeric epic with an analysis of the father similes in both poems; my aim was to discover the meanings and associations of the word *'patêr'* on epic's own terms. In this analysis, I found a striking divergence between the two epics. On the one hand, the *Iliad's* father similes clustered around Achilles near the end of the poem in accord with the poem's development toward the meeting between Priam and Achilles. I saw this meeting akin to a simile on a grand scale, since therein Priam becomes like Achilles's father and Achilles like Priam's son. Recall Prunty's definition of simile: "a flexible kind of speech without one fixed meaning, but ever moving in the continual play of likeness and difference" (1990, 18-19). Following this definition, I claim that in its presentation of fathers and sons, the *Iliad* is a poem fluid with simile. It uses the form of simile as it builds toward the idea implicit in it that filial relationships are created on the basis of analogy. Roughly phrased then, I call the *Iliad* a poem of simile.

The *Odyssey*, on the other hand, begins with a cluster of father similes centered around Telemachus. The poem's father similes conspicuously disappear from the epic once Odysseus, the father himself, steps foot into his house. The goal of the *Odyssey*, in opposition to the *Iliad's* widening terms of father and son, is the return and reintegration of the single father into his own house. And so, the *Odyssey* stands in contrast to the indeterminacy of simile. Recall Prunty's definition of symbol, a literary figure in opposition to simile: "In contrast, insofar as symbol and allegory appeal to the tradition for their significance, they initiate a kind of genetic philology because the original meaning of a thing is an arche" (1990, 19). A symbol, Prunty continues, implies "correct interpretation." So in a sense does polytropic Odysseus, a man of many disguises. The *Odyssey*, I

observed in the prologue, has far fewer similes overall than *Iliad*; and yet it has twice as many father similes. It is a poem less fluid with simile than the *Iliad* as it moves away from relationship based on analogy toward a reunion with the single father. Its many father similes, I argued, indeed display its very anxiety over the widening of filial relationship through likeness. Broadly phrased, I call the *Odyssey* a poem of symbol.

These two broad descriptive terms — simile and symbol — for the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* respectively, provide the guiding ideas for a concluding review of fathers and sons in the poems. The *Iliad* values filial relationships based on analogy in regard to both the immortal father and the mortal ones. The path of the divine father, we saw based on the definitions of Benveniste, was his movement from an impersonal *patêr*, through his pity as genitor of Sarpedon, toward a personal *patêr* of all sons. More than the abstraction 'father Heaven,' the *Iliad* develops Zeus into a god like a father, who cares for the deaths of men. Benveniste comments further on the mythological concept of paternity:

> Now, in this original usage [of **pater*], the relationship of physical parentage is excluded. We are outside of kinship in the strict sense, and **pater* cannot designate 'father' in a personal sense. The passage from one sphere to the other is no easy matter. These are two separate ideas .... (1969, 170)

In the words of Benveniste, the *Iliad's* achievement of developing Zeus into a personal *patêr* "is no easy matter."

Just as Zeus becomes a caring substitute father, so the *Iliad* portrays the Achaean heroes as sons who left behind their particular homes and genitors. The majority of the Achaeans left home to fight at Troy; several, mostly affiliated with Achilles, left home for private reasons, such as killing a man of their own kin or arguing with their father. The Trojan sons of Priam, on the other hand, fight in defense of home. I thus interpreted the battle between the Achaeans and the Trojans as in part expressive of a division between those who leave home and those who fight at and for home, respectively. The utter defeat of the Trojans then also represents a defeat of those who remain at home. This figurative battle has political implications: to leave home and genitor and become like sons of Zeus is to transcend the local and the particular, that is, to become Panhellenic. I thus see the

Iliad's affirmation of simile as instrumental in its contribution to Panhellenization, wherein relationship extends beyond kinship and is based instead on a constructed likeness of ideology.

The *Odyssey's* "symbolic" nature comprises a basic aspect of its difference from the *Iliad.* Like the *Iliad* and simile, symbol well describes the *Odyssey's* representation of the divine father and mortal ones. Zeus in the *Odyssey*, we saw, remains consistently fixed as 'father Heaven,' the divine *patêr* who stands behind events and decisions but does not personally involve himself in them. Furthermore, we saw that the *Odyssey* depicted Poseidon as the type of personal *patêr* developed in the *Iliad* — but ironically, another instance of the *Odyssey's* difference from the *Iliad.* Unlike the *Iliad*, the "symbolic" *Odyssey* takes no part in a divine *patêr* like a father: it represents Zeus as purely a symbolic father — the distant and abstract concept of *patêr.*

Mortal fathers in the *Odyssey*, like the divine one, aim for the thing itself rather than any extension by analogy. Thus we saw the *Odyssey's* gradual rejection of substitute father figures in its movement toward the recognition of the genitor himself. Telemachus and Odysseus encountered a series of father figures, only to endure until meeting the real one. Odysseus's words to his son well describe the single focus of the poem: "you may be sure no other Odysseus will ever come here" (16.204). So just as the *Iliad* opens up the idea of relationship between father and son, so the *Odyssey* closes it down into the single thin thread: Laertes—Odysseus—Telemachus. And yet the discussions of the actual reunions between father and son in the *Odyssey* revealed a qualification to what I am calling its "symbolic" nature. While it is certainly the case that the poem presents a kind of closing down of fathers into the singular one, the centrality of *mêtis* in the house of Odysseus, we saw, exerts a counter force. *Mêtis*, which runs contrary to the actual and singular, adds to the *Odyssey's* narrowing presentation of mortal fathers and sons a simultaneous play of displacement within these singular relationships. So while the poem moves toward the thin line of Laertes—Odysseus—Telemachus, *mêtis* introduces its own

kind of indeterminacy into these otherwise "symbolic" relationships. We saw that in the case of Odysseus and Laertes, there arises the indeterminacy whether Laertes is Odysseus's actual father at all. This concluding challenge to certainty about the actual father, I argued, shows the poem subtly questioning its whole "symbolic" representation of the father. In this way, its indeterminacy is more profound than that of the *Iliad* — fitting to a poem of *mêtis*.

My division between the epics — of the *Iliad* as a poem of simile and the *Odyssey* one of symbol — highlights, finally, the consistent relationship of competition between them. Thus in brief, the poems tell two contrasting stories of fathers and sons. The *Iliad* portrays the growing involvement of the divine *patêr*; and the separation of mortals sons from their genitors. The *Odyssey* shows an unchanging impersonal divine *patêr*; and the sons' reunion with their genitors. Moreover, the *Iliad* portrays the mortality of sons; the *Odyssey*, in its thin line of heroes, depicts their survival. The consistent competition between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* reveals their vitality — two contestants in an ongoing dialogue, an endless "process ever subject to revision, addition, retraction."[250] Just as within each poem there are many and varied fathers and sons, so in the end there is no one, grand statement on Homeric fathers and sons. Instead, consistent with the nature of Greek contest, the "truth" lies in the poems' joint picture of diverse fathers and sons ultimately irreducible in all their complexity.[251]

---

[250]Griffith 1990, 200.

[251]Cf. Griffith's list of Greek contests of "tainted verdicts, bribed or biased judges, indeterminate outcomes, and peculiar and tactful solutions to awkward confrontations" (1990, 190). See also the conclusions of Emily Vermeule, who acknowledges at the outset the ultimate variety of representations of Greek death. She begins by explaining what her book consists of: "What remains is a derivative and arbitrary selection of aspects of Greek death in terms of artistic documents and familar passages which could be combined (and could likely be recombined in a more orderly way by others). ... After four years of reading I still do not know what the Greeks thought about death, or what Americans think either, or what I think myself. ... It is nearly impossible to recreate any general 'Greek view of death'...." (1979, x-2).

Epilogue: Fathers and Sons in Tolstoy's *War and Peace*

Introduction

Tolstoy's *War and Peace* begins with a father thinking about his son and ends with a son thinking about his father. In the beginning of the novel at Anna Pavlovna's soirée, Prince Vasily hopes to obtain a post — or a rich wife— for his younger son, Anatol; at the end, the domestic epilogue closes with Nikolenka's dream of his father: "Oh Father, Father! Yes, I will do something that even he would be satisfied with..." (Epilogue I.xv; 1411).[252] The long, digressive novel is thus securely framed by the traditional patrilineal plot — a tradition at least as old as the Homeric poems with which the novel shares such father-son endpoints. Fathers and sons are clearly as important to Tolstoy's novel as we have already seen in Homeric epic. How does Tolstoy introduce this featured topic in the novel's beginning?

It took Tolstoy a year of work and fourteen rejected drafts before he settled upon the opening scene of the novel.[253] His protracted effort derived from his dual concern for conventionality — of language, images and style — on the one hand, in conflict with his unconventional, "un-novelistic" desire to comment on the political and social issues he was raising, on the other.[254] Ultimately, novelistic conventions prevailed; wherefore we approach the opening conventionally, as one which sets out the major interests of the work to follow. So what is introduced? First, *not* introduced are the two aims which kept Tolstoy so long at work on the novel's beginning: the introduction of a major hero and of serious political controversy. Instead, the beginning of the novel achieves a different goal:

---

[252]Such enumeration refers, respectively, to the book, part and page of *War and Peace*; when followed by an Arabic numeral, this refers to the page from the Signet edition translated by Ann Dunnigan.
[253]He waivered among variant openings: a fictional one, *in medias res*; a brief historical setting; an extended historical introduction; a preface. See Feuer 1996, 88-109; especially 99-100.
[254]Feuer 1996, 69.

it characterizes the social milieu of one of the novel's places, St. Petersburg.[255] For the novel is one of place, carefully set in three locations: the court life of St. Petersburg; the autonomous country estate, specifically, Bald Hills; and irregular, "organic" Moscow.[256] Of all these equally important places, why does the novel begin in St. Petersburg?

Conventional as it is, the opening in St. Petersburg allows Tolstoy to conspicuously and instructively dramatize convention. For it illustrates a particularly conventionalized milieu — polite society, with its highly developed rules of speaking. Here the obtrusiveness of the ungainly, uncontained Pierre is the exception which proves the rules of this group: not to leave a lady before she has finished speaking, but also not to detain one who is trying to get away; and more importantly, to speak cleverly as a means to an end — whether it be the advancement of one's son (Prince Vasily, Princess Drubetskaya) or the entertainment of the group (the Abbé Morio, Ippolit) — but not earnestly out of sheer curiosity and conviction (Pierre). The conventional opening of the novel thus begins with an oblique glance at convention significant for the reader: words fulfill different functions dependent on their contexts. The reader must proceed circumspectly, sensitive not to the words alone, but to their settings — where, by whom and how they are spoken and received. The simile of Anna Pavlovna working her drawing room like the foreman of a spinning mill makes clear that words must be moderated to fit a greater whole. Not the words themselves, but just the right flow of words is the assurance of a smoothly running machine. *Caveat lector.*

In this context of polite society talk occurs the novel's most explicit discussion of paternity. Anna Pavlovna raises the topic of Prince Vasily's *famille* as a way to enjoy a flirtatious intimacy with him. She involves herself in his family affairs for sport and pleasure in the *rôle* fitting to her: "They say old maids have a mania for matchmaking" (I.i.i; 33).

---

[255]Here "courtly formality (Annette) and worldly ambition (Prince Vasily) are tinged with corruption (Anatol)." (Feuer 1996, 96.)

[256]To these three peacetime settings correspond three varieties of military life: the center of power, the High Command; one's own Guards regiment; and the carefree hussars. (Feuer 1996, 101).

Within their "intimate" repartee, while Anna plays her role of the spinster who favors children,[257] Prince Vasily acts the part of the inept, helpless father.[258] His sons are what they are:

> Что ж мне делать? ... Вы знаете, я сделал для их воспитания все, что может отец и оба вышли des imbéciles. Ипполит по крайней мере покойный дурак, а Анатол — беспокойный. Вот одно различие.... (I.i.i)
> What can I do? ... You know, I did for their upbringing everything a father can and both turned out imbeciles. Ippolit at least is a calm fool, but Anatol — a restless one. That's the only difference...

Prince Vasily's two fools call to mind the character *Ivanushka durachok* (Jonny the Fool) — a stock comic figure of traditional Russian folktales. These "simpleton" tales illustrate grotesque and hyperbolic examples of Ivanushka's folly, generally leading to his injury or death. Sometimes *Ivan durak* also plays a heroic role where his folly is mere simplicity or the fraudulent characterization of his envious brothers.[259] Prince Vasily assigns roles to his two sons with the result that all have their parts to play: the matchmaking spinster, the comic Papa *durak* with his two *duraki* sons. With the actors in character, the stage is set. Indeed, the salon is itself a stage and the guests readily assume their parts so that the ongoing play may continue smoothly.

Why does *War and Peace* begin with a drawing room discussion of paternity? As a conventional opening, its privileged placement suggests accurately that fathers and sons will comprise a theme in the work to follow. But with this serious theme placed in the highly conventional salon milieu, the traditional patrilineal plot is introduced with some irony and skepticism. For the salon contains many kinds of falsity which the novel will work to expose: of speaking prepared lines; of conceiving of oneself as a pre-made story;

---

[257]"I often think how sometimes the favors of life are distributed unfairly. Why did fate give you such glorious children ... such charming children? And you, truly, appreciate them less than everyone and therefore you are not worthy of them" (I.i.i; 32).

[258]"Que voulez-vous? Lafater aurait dit que je n'ai pas la bosse de la paternité" (I.i.i). The joke of Prince Vasily's response, of course, is his mixing of the literal and idiomatic meanings of the French. Lafater was a Swiss physiognomist then popular in Russia, who connected a person's capabilities with the shape of his head. Preceded by the speaker Lafater, the French idiom "to be good at" becomes equal with "having the bump of."

[259]Harkins 1985, 148.

of seeking to control the future with plans. By placing the talk about paternity in a setting of rule-bound talk, the opening makes clear that paternity, like the conventional speech appropriate for a soirée, is also a convention dependent on its setting. Prince Vasily, like his speech and manners perfect for society, is not bad, but simply the consummate St. Petersburg father. Just as the opening scene of conventional speech warned the reader to understand words as such, so the novel's beginning with Prince Vasily and his discussion of paternity shows the reader that fathers and sons can also be seen as creatures of convention determined by place. Only with this in mind can a reader rightly approach the novel's subsequent threefold examination of paternity: the families of Prince Vasily, Pierre, and Prince Andrei.

To return to Prince Vasily, Anna Pavlovna's solution for his expensive, troublesome son is to engage him to a rich heiress, the novel's subplot which takes this father and son from St. Petersburg to the country estate at Bald Hills (to seek the hand of Prince Marya), and later to Moscow (to marry Julie Karagina). Prince Vasily and his son thus traverse all the significant places of the novel — St. Petersburg, country, Moscow.[260] They comprise the novel's link between its various places, as it examines paternity in the two cities and in the country. While Prince Vasily and his two *duraki* are the St. Petersburg father and sons; the dying Count Bezukhov and his illegitimate son, Pierre, are the Moscow father and son;[261] and finally severe, old Prince Nikolai Bolkonsky and his son, Prince Andrei, are the country father and son. What are the stories of these three pairs of fathers and sons? How do they reflect on one another? And what do they have to tell us about paternity and the novel; that is, why is paternity a primary theme of *War and Peace* ?

---

[260]And for Anatol alone, also the military; we last see him horribly wounded in the field hospital after the Battle of Borodino.

[261]Count Rostov and his son, Nikolai, are also Moscow father and son, but Nikolai is more a son of his mother (and brother to his sister). However, we will refer to him as is relevant.

Pierre

Pierre, having just returned from his ten years of education abroad, is, like the reader, new to the Russia of the early 1800's. His first appearance in the novel coincides with his first experience of a soirée in Russia (I.i.ii; 37). But rather than seeing the various members of polite society through his eyes, we see him through theirs. Introduced through the viewpoint of high society, he is met like any stranger there — from the outside, with uncertainty as to who he is, what he's like and how he'll be received. Thus on his entrance into the salon, he is first described physically and then provided with some background history (I.i.ii; 35). His novice performance presents him unapologetically: he is awkward — inexperienced, naive, and much too overeager. He does not fit in.

This introduction of Pierre through the eyes of Anna Pavlovna and her guests foregrounds one of his essential characteristics:

> Anna Pavlovna greeted him with the nod she accorded the very lowest rank in the hierarchy of her salon. But despite this minimal greeting, when she saw Pierre enter the room a look of uneasiness and fear came over her face, as at the sight of something monstrous and alien to the place (при виде чего-нибудь слишком огромного и несвойственного месту). (I.i.ii; 36)

In this novel of place and places, Pierre is out of place; and what is more, he is essentially placeless. For not only has he just returned to Russia after the ten formative years of his education abroad, but he is an *illegitimate* son of a *dying* Moscow father, and is now living in St. Petersburg, at the house of Prince Vasily, who, as he himself said, lacks the "bump of paternity." Pierre lacks father, home, and native city.

Pierre's stay with Prince Vasily provides his first experience of a father substitute in the novel. While residing with him, Pierre becomes like one of his "foolish" sons, participating with abandon in their dissolute entertainments. (The narrator even discerns something "somewhat stupid" (глуповатое) in Pierre's smile, I.i.i; 31). Like Anatol who lacks ambition, Pierre, sent to Petersburg by his father to settle on a career, does

nothing about it and seems to not want to even think about it. As a character of no place, Pierre lets himself be molded to the place he is in.

Pierre's own father is not so different than the quasi-paternal Prince Vasily who does what he can for his sons, giving them a fine education, recommendations to powerful men, and financial support — without too much strain on his part and not too much result on theirs. So Count Bezukhov quite similarly launches his son toward a career in St. Petersburg (I.i.v; 52). The primary difference between the St. Petersburg father and the Moscow one is the fact that Pierre is illegitimate, a difference commensurate with their respective cities.

Pierre's illegitimacy leaves him utterly free.[262] It has given him a critical distance from authority — the father's and, by extension, that of law in general. Tolstoy plays off of the political idea of the not-lawful latent in the Russian word for illegitimate, незаконный. For the novel, which spans the years 1805 to 1820, takes place in the heyday of Napoleon, the illegitimate emperor who captured not only political power, but also the imagination of Europe, and gave rise to a deep cultural myth of the usurper. Just as Napoleon was a force of destabilization politically, so was he in literature. His self-made rise to power thwarted the conventional novel plot of the foundling who is later discovered to be of aristocratic blood. Already Stendahl mocked the traditional novel plot with a hero, Julian Sorel, who is overtly made noble by a kind of nominal adoption but nevertheless begins to believe that he may really be of aristocratic origin. At the start of *The Red and the Black*, Julian adores Napoleon; but as he mingles with the aristocracy, he must hide his

---

[262]To large extent, the subtext of Pierre's plot is a meditation on the meaning of freedom. Near the end of the novel he wishes to tell Princess Marya and Natasha of the freedom he he has gained since his captivity and experience with Karatayev, as well as the death of his wife, Hélène (IV.iv.xvii; 1334). But by the time of the epilogue, Pierre is no longer free in these same ways. His marriage to Natasha is described in terms of bondage: Pierre is "under the shoe of" his wife (Пьер был под башмаком своей жены); every moment of his life belongs to (принадлежит) her; his relationship to her is one of submission (подвластность). On the other hand, Natasha is his "slave" (рабы мужа) (Epilogue I.x). Thus the novel begins with Pierre ostensibly completely free: he has no name, no fortune, no estate, no wife or family; and it ends with him completely enslaved, unfree: with name, fortune, estates, wife and family. "Freedom" is redefined from beginning to end, first it is "free from" and gradually becomes "free to."

affection and alter his expressed political loyalties. Tolstoy, who admired Stendahl, was heir to not only a political myth, but also a literary motif of Napoleon.[263]

In this vein, in the opening soirée of *War and Peace*, the illegitimate son Pierre takes the part of the illegitimate ruler, Napoleon. Afraid of letting Pierre get carried away in conversation, Anna Pavlovna breaks in with a response to the Viscount about the French people and Napoleon: "And I think there is no doubt that once delivered from the usurper the entire nation will throw itself into the arms of its legitimate king (законного короля)" (I.i.iv; 45). Like Anna Pavlovna, the Viscount also argues for a return to the old regime. He ironically agrees with Pierre that he would call Napoleon a great man "if, when he had seized power, he had restored it to the lawful king (законному королю)" (47/ 30). The fashionable opinion in St. Petersburg at the moment apparently favors the royal family and opposes the "usurper," Napoleon.[264] Pierre on the other hand, the illegitimate, unlawful son (незаконный сын I.i.ii), does not praise the "lawful king" (законный король), but the "usurper" instead. Unlike the residents of the city of the High Court, St. Petersburg, Pierre — the illegitimate son from a more natural city — is free from notions of tradition and lineage. To an opposite extreme, he is the espouser of the new man, the "usurper" Napoleon. His unlawfulness is freeing to the extent that he advocates murder (in the case of the Duke of Enghein). Pierre's opening association with Napoleon may set him apart from Petersburg society, but it sets him in line with certain novelistic conventions.[265]

Once out of the superficially political salon, Pierre refers to his illegitimacy in personal terms. At Prince Andrei's house, when his friend turns the conversation to him, Pierre has little to say for himself:

> "What's there to say about me?" Pierre said, his lips parting in a carefree, merry smile. "I am a bastard! (Je suis un bâtard!)." And he suddenly blushed crimson: it had obviously

---

[263]In Russia, Pushkin exhibits a fascination with Napoleon, especially in his Napoleon ode, and select prose works, especially *The Queen of Spades* and *Count Nulin*. Cf. Raskolnikov's thoughts of Napoleon and the "new man" in Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*.

[264]The Viscount has already called Napoleon thus once before (I.i.iv; 45).

[265]Also at play is the subplot of *King Lear*, the conflict between the seemingly loyal bastard son, Edmund, and the defamed legitimate son, Edgar. The story of the illegitimate son has other European non-novelistic antecedents.

> required a great effort for him to say this. "Without name or fortune. And it really is— —" But he did not say what it really was. "For the present I am free, and I'm all right. Only I have no idea what to take up." (I.i.vi; 58)

Before his proficient friend, Pierre is ashamed of his own lack of will power. He sums up his idle state — indeed his whole self ("What's there to say about me?") — in the one thought: "Je suis un bâtard!" While he may have first intended this remark as a light-hearted dismissal of his friend's question, his crimson blush reveals it to be anything but jocular. Pierre's illegitimacy appears to be something that penetrates to the core of his self image and encloses it unto itself; it conditions who and how he is. He is free (свободен), but to the point of indeterminacy; and, insofar as making decisions, to the point of immobility — the kind of freedom that requires captivity to become truly liberating.

In the novel, Pierre does not stay a bastard for long. But this lack — незаконность — is his defining origin. His arbitrary process of being made legitimate incurs the death of his father. Indeed, Pierre is introduced in the novel under the aegis of his dying father (I.i.ii; 35), and much of Book I.1 is devoted to the scenes of his father's dying and death. Why?

The death of Count Bezukhov is the first of three protracted deathbed scenes in the novel (followed by those of Prince Bolkonsky and Prince Andrei).[266] The scene of a person's final days and moments held a particular fascination for Tolstoy, already evident in his earlier works *Childhood* (1852) and "Three Deaths" (1859), and later developed in *Anna Karenina* (1877), *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* (1886) and "Master and Man" (1895). The deathbed scene attracted Tolstoy for at least two reasons. First, in his own life, death remained an irreconcilable problem for him, a fear which he could not master. And next, literarily, it provided a privileged place for language and experience. For here, as Gary Saul Morson has shown, was a site for authorless and thus fully authoritative speech; such

[266]In his favoring of analogy, *War and Peace* also contains a version of "three deaths." There are, of course, other significant deaths in the novel — Lise, Platon Karatayev, Petya Rostov, Count Rostov; but only those of the three men are represented so exhaustively.

speech has the rhetorical privilege of unanswerability and must be taken seriously.[267] Moreover, the deathbed held a potential for a final revelation of meaning and truth, which, even had one fallen short of it in life, could nevertheless be instructive (though probably not redemptive) if glimpsed at all.

War and Peace features its first deathbed scene early on and ironically. In contrast to the two such subsequent scenes, the death of Count Bezukhov defies signification; it is a scene of only the forms of a sacred experience with its content either unknowable ("When Pierre approached, the Count looked directly at him, but with a gaze the intent and significance of which no man could have fathomed" I.i.xx; 118) or not sought to be known. It is a scene told strictly from the outside, with no help into the inside of the dying Count — his stillness and his mute impassivity symptoms of his utter inaccessibility. As the novel's three deaths progress, they are told with greater faith in both the significance and the communicability of the dying man's interior: Princess Marya is able to decipher her father's confessional syllables «Гага -- бои... бои...» (III.ii.viii) into the meaningful words «Душа, душа болит»; and finally Prince Andrei's death is told in the opposite way as Count Bezukhov's, primarily from the inside out, a different view of why death is so hard to communicate (III.iii.xxxii). But its initial death scene, not unlike the novel's opening in the salon, presents an ironic view of an often sentimentalized and romantic moment.[268]

The mute immobility of the dying man has turned his house into something like a ship without a helmsman. Several volunteers for the position quickly arise: Prince Vasily and Anna Mikhailovna Drubetskaya are the main contestants, with their supporting crew of Princess Mamontova and Pierre, respectively. In addition to the obvious efforts of the Prince and Anna Mikhailovna to direct the scene — and thus the inheritance, the doctors and the church also play out their conventional, meaningless parts. The handsome, foreign

---

[267]Morson 1987, 26-32.

[268]Cf. Anna Karenina's romantic hope to fulfill her dream of death in childbirth and the unglamorous scene of her near death which does not realize her wish (and so neatly end her predicament and the novel).

Dr. Lorrain prescribes a glass of water with a pinch of cream of tartar ("he indicated with his delicate fingers what he meant by a pinch" I.i.xviii; 106) for the dying man after his third stroke. The dying man is oblivious to the celebration of his last rites observed so obsequiously around him. Indeed, the only genuine witness of the Count's death is the merry, youngest princess, who even during the solemn service around the Count's deathbed cannot look at Pierre without laughing but also cannot stop looking at him and so hides behind a column to avoid temptation (I.i.xx; 116).

Pierre's experience of his father's death is mainly dispassionate. He happens to be in his father's house because he was "exiled" to Moscow for his misbehavior in Petersburg, not because of his father's dying. And, having not yet been summoned by his father, he spends all his time there in his rooms, apparently not thinking about his father; for when Boris goes to see him, he catches Pierre acting out a fantasy that he is Napoleon crossing the English Channel. Pierre confesses to Boris that he has not been to see "the Count" once and continues: "I am sorry for him as a man (как человека) — but what can I do?" (I.i.xiii; 87). The door to his father's bedroom feels closed to him, and Pierre — the favorite son (67) and so as rightful a player as Prince Vasily or the princesses or certainly Anna Mikhailovna — makes no attempt to approach it.[269] Even once escorted through that door to witness his father's last rites, his view of his father becomes blocked because "the sick man was so surrounded by doctors, servants, and the Princesses" (I.i.xx; 117). Brought to his father's bedside by his self-appointed (and self-interested) guardian, Anna Mikhailovna, he perfunctorily follows her instructions, mechanically kissing his father's unresponsive hand and then sitting in the chair at his side. There is an impenetrable, obscuring distance between the silently expiring, still handsome and majestic, father and his awkward, illegitimate son.

---

[269]Anna Mikhailovna informs the guests in the Rostov's drawing room that although Count Bezukhov may have lost count of his illegitimate children, "this Pierre was his favorite," for whose benefit the Count took great pains (I.i.vii; 67).

But oddly enough, there is at the same time a curious resemblance in the parts father and son play in this scene of death. Just as in the novel's opening in the salon, Pierre is once again in a conventional setting in which he does not know how to behave. There, Pierre's friend, Prince Andrei, arose to his support (I.i.iv; 48). Now it is Pierre's father who is his closest ally. Not only has he approved of Pierre by naming him his heir in his (revised) will, but he aids him wordlessly — by means of his body and his very silence, he mirrors Pierre in a dignifying light. When Pierre first sees him, his father is lying in a Voltaire chair directly under the icons with a servant supporting a candle between the fingers of his right hand. Attention is drawn to the largeness of his hands (I.i.xx; 116, 118), and the overall undiminished greatness of his body and sculpted handsome face:

> ... the young man caught a momentary glimpse over their heads and backs of the dying man's great, stout, uncovered chest, the fleshy shoulders, which were pushed up by those who held him under the armpits, and the gray, curly, leonine head. This head, with its singularly high forehead and cheekbones, its handsome, sensual mouth, and cold, august gaze, had not been disfigured by the approach of death. It was just as Pierre remembered it from three months before, when the Count had sent him to Petersburg, but now it dangled, helplessly swaying with the uneven steps of the bearers, and the cold, impassive gaze did not focus on anything (I.i.xx; 118).

Pierre's father, in his very dying, is larger than life. From the outside, he has not declined at all, but only become an inanimate version of his former self. Still and lifeless, with a cold, impassive gaze, he has become like a colossal statue, more appropriate to a pagan temple than the churchlike setting under the icons. Kept on the outside of the Count's dying, we do not know if he has experienced any insight into the truth of the universe. But from his fossilization into a massive, handsome, sensual icon it seems unlikely. Rather, he appears as a monument of virility and male beauty. The Count may not be enlightened in his dying, but he at least possesses the virtue of consistency — he does not seem to be anything other than what he has always been.

Pierre, helpless in this strange ritual of dying, surrenders himself wholly to the will of Anna Mikhailovna:

> He took the glove from the adjutant without a word, sat down in the lady's chair, laid his big hands on his symmetrically placed knees in the naive attitude of an Egyptian statue, and made up his mind that all this was just as it should be, and

> that on this night, to avoid losing his head and doing something stupid, he must not act according to his own ideas, but must surrender himself entirely to the will of those who were guiding him. (I.i.xix; 114)

Pierre manifests his inner silence by becoming physically still — like an Egyptian statue. He assumes this pose again when he sits beside his paralyzed father (I.i.xx; 118). On the outside, father and son are alike in their statuesque silence and impassivity. Just as the Count appears like a Classical Greek (or Renaissance Neo-Classical?) colussus of Hercules, Pierre takes on the attitude of an alien ancient culture: father and son are alike in their incommunicability, their separateness from their surrounding context. Around them, the prince and princesses and Anna Mikhailovna and adjutants and clergy and doctors minister to the dying man with a concern mixed with self-interest. What appears as devotion is not empty of pretense. The Count and his son Pierre, on the other hand, are separate from this obsequious activity in their shared immobility, which marks, more deeply, a closed distance from on-going signs. Set apart from the actors around them, Pierre and his father resonate indirectly, in the mode of parallel, though not contiguous, images.[270] As a result, despite the Count's inscrutable impassivity, Pierre's shutting off his own ideas, and the warring desires of those blocking his access to his father, Pierre experiences an unexpected moment of real, living feeling connected to his father. It might be a moment of contiguity:

> While the Count was being turned over, one arm lay inert behind him and he made a vain attempt to pull it forward. Whether he had noticed the look of horror with which Pierre regarded that lifeless arm, or whether some other thought had flashed through his expiring brain at that moment, he looked at the intractable arm, at Pierre's horrified expression, and again at the arm, and there appeared on his face a feeble, piteous smile, which was incongruous with his features and seemed to deride his impotence. At the sight of this smile Pierre felt an unexpected quivering in his breast and a tickling in his nose, and tears dimmed his vision. The sick man was turned on his side with his face to the wall. (I.i.xx; 119)

Pierre's impassivity is broken in the awkward transition between poses — while his father is being turned from his back to his side. Not something conventional or staged (as Anna Mikhailovna would have it) — a father's parting word or a son's loving touch — moves

---

[270]Cf. Rancour-Laferriere 1993, 34.

Pierre to tears, but the pitiful sight of his father's weak smile, proceeded by a feeling of horror. There is no certainty about the cause of his father's smile, no certainty that it concerns anyone outside of the Count's own mind. Nevertheless, Pierre is unexpectedly "infected" with emotion between poses, his father's and his own, at the turning when lifelessness becomes horrifying. There is greater significance to this surprising moment.

On the way to see his father, Pierre is asleep in the carriage (I.i.xix; 111) and after his father dies, he is fast asleep in the drawing room (I.i.xxi; 123).[271] While sleep in *War and Peace* can mean different things, here it seems to be in its ancient form of the brother of Death, something akin to his father's deathbed lifelessness. Between coming and going in sleep, Pierre experiences a moment of connection to his father before his own vision grows dim and his father's face is turned to the wall, permanently. Much later in the novel, when death is told from the inside out, Prince Andrei dreams his own death and then wakes up. Upon awakening, he says: "Yes, that was death. I died — and I awoke (Я умер — я проснулся). Yes, death is an awakening (пробуждение)!" (IV.i.xvi; 1176) The narrator confirms the idea of death as an awakening when he reports Prince Andrei's end, "There was nothing terrible or violent in this relatively slow awakening (пробуждение)" (IV.i.xvi; 1176). It seems that for Pierre, who sleeps coming and going, the "unexpected quivering in his breast and a tickling in his nose" is a moment of a comparable kind of awakening, from his own deathlike state.

There is a parallel dying and awakening for father and son in Count Bezukhov's death: the former dies out of life to awaken in death, the latter dies out of lifelessness to awaken into life. Pierre is a character who alternates between periods of enervating depression and reinvigorating optimism born out of newly found "truths." Those truths often prove to be too systematic and doctrinaire, and so false. Only when Pierre meets Platon Karatayev does he learn the unsystematic truth of faith in the present in all its

[271]Both times with Anna Mikhailovna and awakened by her; is there something more genuine about his world of sleeping than hers of waking?

movement and change — a truth which is itself open to change.[272] When Pierre shifts from the despair about unaccountable evil in the face of near execution to the return to life beside Karatayev, he experiences finally a true rebirth.[273] When Pierre momentarily "awakens" out of his lifelessness beside his dying father, he undergoes a preliminary rebirth, the first of several such renewals, culminating in his rebirth beside the peasant Platon Karatayev. In the case of Karatayev, however, Pierre is significantly reborn from the presence of a *maternal* figure; at the death of Count Bezukhov, Pierre's rebirth is exclusively male, the son reborn out of his father. Why this initial rebirth? and why so early on in the hero's career?

Count Bezukhov's death significantly occurs between two other, quite different, stories of fathers. The novel self-consciously juxtaposes them: "While in the Rostov's ballroom the sixth *anglaise* was being danced to music that the weary musicians were no longer able to play without false notes, and tired cooks and footmen were preparing supper, Count Bezukhov had his sixth stroke" (I.i.xviii; 104). More particularly, at the Rostov's party, Count Rostov has just finished energetically dancing a rousing "Daniel Cooper," much to everyone's delight (I.i.xvii; 103-104). Likewise, just after Count Bezukhov dies and Anna Mikhailovna reports back about it to the Rostovs, the novel immediately turns to the industrious patriarch, Prince Bolkonsky. Framed by the vitality of two of the novel's other fathers, the death of Pierre's father is all the more arresting. Its significant position insists on the importance of Pierre's orphaning. But why? Why must Pierre so soon become, and why must we unfailingly and extensively see him become fatherless?

Pierre's loss of his father placed in between the portraits of the lively Count Rostov and Prince Bolkonsky is significant of Pierre's characteristic position of liminality. He is indeed transitional between the sons Nikolai Rostov and Prince Andrei Bolkonsky in a generic way. For as we will later discuss further, Nikolai is a fully realized hero of the

---

[272]Cf. Morson 1987, 230-253.
[273]Cf. Jackson 1978, 535-542.

conventional novel — rather ordinary, unself-conscious, and contentedly domestic; and Prince Andrei is deeply an epic one — the product of a reverend genealogy, raised for glory, a highly father-identified single son who fathers a single son. Pierre, by contrast, is a hero in the process of becoming — a hero of Tolstoy's revision of the novel. He is the one who reveals, like a view into the creator's crucible, how such heroes are made. In a sense, Tolstoy does not need his admired Laurence Sterne's outrageous extra-fictional devices to show how fiction is made because he has Pierre instead.

Pierre's plot — the illegitimate son who may or may not be made legitimate, may or may not receive his father's fortune, but finally gets both in the end (plus the girl, but that comes later) — is the standard story of the conventional novel, drawn out over its length by means of obstacles and subplots. But in Pierre's case, this standard story is opened and closed in twenty pages (I.i.xviii-xxi; 104-24), and at an early point in the novel when it has barely begun. As the hero in-the-making of Tolstoy's remaking of the novel, Pierre begins where other novel heroes leave off. He lives out the old plot in part for the sake of signposting genre; but it soon becomes evident that Pierre will progress far beyond the genre's customary boundaries. In so doing, the inadequacies of the old plot and its boundaries are made glaringly absurd.[274]

Pierre becomes legitimate through a letter from his father sent posthumously to the Emperor. Why posthumous? Tolstoy's fascination with incontestable posthumous speech, mentioned above, provides one reason. So Prince Vasily suggests that the words of the now deceased aristocrat will be irresistible to their addressee, the Emperor.[275]

---

[274]In a different light, Tolstoy's use of the old novel plot can be seen as meta-fictional. Widening the definition of father and son to suggest literary tradition and new text, respectively, Pierre's plot displays the stance of the revised novelistic hero to other generic heroes who have come before. Having come into being unlawfully, Pierre is outside the canon of accepted norms. Accordingly, Tolstoy wanted his work to be outside the accepted idea of the novel (and the confusion of contemporary critics shows he achieved this goal). But just as Pierre can be made legitimate, by a letter from his father to the emperor, so the new novel might be similarly incorporated. This strange process of suddenly becoming legitimate by means of a piece of writing exposes the idea of legitimacy as artificial and arbitrary, rather than something with roots which fathom the depths of time and place. Words and the relationships of those who exchange them have the power to bestow identity above custom and law. A parallel occurs for the late genre of the novel, also something of an illegitimate son belatedly deemed legitimate.

[275]"... as soon as all is over... and the Count's papers are opened, the will, along with this letter, will be delivered to the Emperor, and the petition will certainly be granted. Pierre, as his legitimate son, will get

Furthermore, that Pierre becomes his father's lawful son only after his father's death imparts the sense that father and son occupy the same, limited structural space; i.e. that there is room for only one at a time and that the son cannot become fully himself until the father is no longer alive. This sensibility is evident again for two of the novel's other sons, Nikolai Rostov and Prince Andrei. Pierre, the liminal hero, is released from his father — whom he hardly knew — quite early in the novel so he can freely pursue his task of becoming.[276] He is made legitimate, but to a father and a past that no longer exist. Instead, his legacy is his father's immense fortune, which includes his Moscow estate. In a very concrete way, Pierre occupies the same structure as his father — his father's now uninhabited house. Thus we see him drawn to his father's rooms; and subsequently we find him in the deserted house of his deceased father figure, the Freemason Iosif Bazdayev. Pierre still has before him the task of leaving behind these unihabited and uninhabitable paternal structures to become truly free.

The death of Count Bezukhov leaves Pierre a wealthy bachelor and the disinherited Prince Vasily in need of money. Naturally, then, Prince Vasily begins to patronize Pierre; the extraordinary beauty of his daughter, Hélène is the perfect match for Pierre's extraordinary fortune. And so, rather quickly and even inexplicably to himself, Pierre finds himself married. At this point the conventional novel would certainly end: Pierre has name, fortune, and wife — what more is there to do or desire? But in Tolstoy's novel, with his marriage to Hélène, Pierre's troubles are only beginning.

When Pierre is left alone with Hélène so that he might propose to her, he cannot make up his mind to take the final step. He feels shame and the sense of occupying someone else's place. An inner voice says: "This happiness is for those who do not have within them what you have" (I.iii.ii; 264). But Pierre cannot resist and the marriage takes

---

everything" (I.i.xviii; 108). Apparently this irresistible posthumous word to the Emperor was a fantasy of Tolstoy's (cf. Tolstoy's deathbed letter to Nicholas II cited in Morson 1987, 27).

276"...(everyone considered it a duty to assure Pierre at every opportunity that he was greatly afflicted by the death of the father he had hardly known)..." (I.iii.i; 255).

place. It haunts him for long after, until near the end of the novel. What is Pierre's trouble with Hélène?

Hélène's enthrallingly beauty is only the first reason she is eponomously named for Helen of Troy. Beyond physical glamour, they share a story line. Helen's story took place in the Homeric economy of gift exchange. In the bride-contest for her, many suitors competed in offerings of wealth. Nothing other than riches mattered: not lineage, power, athletic prowess, fine speaking, or even physical beauty. As Helen was wooed, her father grew rich. Finally the richest man became her husband — Menelaus. This marriage to the man "greatest in wealth" (Hesiod fr.198.6) was unsustainable from the outset. None of Menelaus's other qualities were at as high a level as his fortune. He was mediocre as a warrior and worse at guarding his own house. So when Paris, the handsome son of King Priam, was a guest in Menelaus's house, he desired the wife and wealth of the house and made off to Troy with both. Menelaus, the cuckolded husband, now had to fight a war to regain his wife, goods, and honor. So far the story is the same for Pierre: Pierre becomes the husband of the great beauty for the sole reason of his money to enrich the father's house; he is not an able guardian of his house; Dolokhov lives in his house and takes freely of Pierre's wife and wealth. The cuckolded husband again must go to "war," now in the stripped down version of a duel, over the disloyal wife. In both stories Helen is a figure of disruption and destruction. But only in Homer is this disruption coupled with great compensation.

In the epic, Helen is one of the causes of the Trojan War, but she is simultaneously a figure of the poet. She weaves a web which depicts the struggles of the war (*Iliad* 3.125-28); in the last book of the poem, she sings the final lament over Hector. In general she understands that the present suffering and death will provide the material for a glorious song to come. Thus her position of *casus belli* is not really different from her stance as poet. For in causing the war, she creates the possibility for men to compete and win the

glory of eternal fame. She is irresistible both for her present charms and the future ones she promises.

But Tolstoy's Hélène is one-sidedly destructive and becomes more so as the novel progresses. She cannot balance her destructiveness with the epic construction of glory for the reason that Tolstoy's novel explicitly rejects the concept of epic heroism. What Helen of Troy imagines celebrated in epic song, Tolstoy mocks as false heroism. The novel's incorporation of Helen of Troy thus engenders the increasingly sinister Hélène Kuragina. Her only part to play in the novel is that of captivating men without simultaneously endowing them with a version of immortality. Helen of Troy knows death — she is at Troy and sees what happens there; she mourns Hector whom she loved. But she herself, the biological daughter of Zeus will not die. And in virtue of her status, neither will Menelaus, her first and last husband. She will take him on her coattails to the paradisiacal Isle of the Blessed where they live together in eternal matrimonial harmony. In contrast, what Hélène has to offer Pierre is purely physical without the corresponding transformation of that body into any form of immortality — poetic, spiritual, mythical or even through the most ordinary path of birthing children. So Tolstoy's Hélène, unlike Homer's, dies.

At first, Hélène's body is an ambivalent but irresistible pleasure to Pierre. Irresistible not just because of its obvious asthetic allure, but more deeply so because in Hélène, Pierre finds a reflection of his own most base and shameful qualities.[277] She is unabashedly lascivious and promiscuous; and in her own ways she is, like Pierre, "unlawful": she breaks the incest taboo with her brother, breaks the marriage bond by both practicing adultery and using contraception, and devalues sexuality by freely giving herself in a mercenary marriage and later, like a Madam, facilitating the seduction of another, Natasha.[278] While at first Pierre, like a moth to the light, cannot turn away from his fascination with the image of what he despises in himself, after a short time, when he can

---

[277]Cf. Rancour-Laferriere 1993, 54-72.

[278]Rancour-Laferriere notes that both Pierre and Hélène have foreign names, suggestive of their alienness in Russia (1993, 64).

no longer deny his wife's infidelity, his sense of disgust and shame prevails over that of desire.[279]

While Pierre is married to Hélène, he keeps a house both in Moscow and St. Petersburg. She, a woman of St. Petersburg, assures that Pierre remains placeless, living in neither one or the other of the two cities, but back and forth between them. This geographical placelessness corresponds to a Pierre's condition of childlessness with Hélène. She does not enable him to become rooted in either space or time. Hélène carries on her intrigue with Dolokhov in Moscow and it is there that Pierre wounds him in a duel, another ritual performed perfunctorily in a way reminiscent of his attitude at his father's death. The duel marks Pierre's final estrangement from his wife: his challenge confirms his suspicion of her unfaithfulness and its aftermath compels him to admit to himself that he never loved her since she is abhorrently depraved.

Pierre's contemplation of his wife's true nature occurs in his father's apartments: "The night following the duel he did not go to his bedroom, but remained, as he often did, in his father's huge study, the very room, in fact, where old Count Bezukhov died" (I.iii.xv; 337-38). Pierre may have spent much time in his father's study, but this is the first time the novel tells us that. What transpires there is a return from insincerity to sincerity. Lying in his father's study, he recalls a particularly vivid and shameful memory "of how one day shortly after his marriage he had come out of the bedroom into his study a little before noon in a silk dressing gown, and found his head steward there; the man bowed respectfully and looked into his face and at his dressing gown with a slight smile, as if expressing his respectful understanding of his employer's happiness" (II.i.vi; 388). This recollection divides the two studies into two realms: his own, the site of reprehensible carnal lust; and his father's, the place of honest inward reflection. When Hélène, the embodiment of all that is no longer tolerable to Pierre — falseness, vanity, corruption — enters the other, purer realm of his father's study, Pierre is seized by the urge to destroy

[279]Shame even at his own hurt ego that Hélène failed to love him and remained indifferent about his fidelity (Rancour-Laferriere 1993, 76).

her. He brandishes a marble table top at her and she springs away in horror. "His father's nature showed itself in Pierre. He was carried away by a transport of frenzied rage. He flung down the slab of marble, broke it, and lunged at Ellen with outstretched hands" (II.i.vi; 391). In his father's study, Pierre manifests his father's nature, particularly a characteristic fit of rage.

In this second scene in Count Bezukhov's study — in the first one the Count died, the room again provides the setting for another moment of rebirth for Pierre. Here again he emerges from a state of living death — this time his dishonest, artificial and childless life with the corrupt Hélène— to reawaken into life. Once again the novel mentions Pierre awakening from sleep (II.i.vi; 390). Within a week, Pierre separates from his wife and leaves behind his house in Moscow. His father's study, the place of awakening death, has once again freed Pierre from a binding constraint, but only partially. He leaves his father's house behind, but he is still in search of a father — both literally in the sense of a substitute father figure, and metaphorically, in the sense of a philosophy to dogmatically explain existence and prescribe all the rules for how to behave within it. He thus soon meets his next father figure on the road to St. Petersburg.

In the inn between Moscow and St. Petersburg, Iosif Bazdayev picks up where Pierre's father (symbolized by his father's study) left off. For Bazdayev begins talking to Pierre about his recent "misfortune" in Moscow, that is, not only his separation from but more so his whole marriage to Hélène. Bazdayev's approach to Pierre is benignly paternal: "You are unhappy, my dear sir... You are young, I am old. I should like to help you, as far as it lies in my power" (II.ii.ii; 426). After such paternal beginning, the novel makes this Bazdayev's role explicitly. Bazdayev "suddenly smiled in an unexpectedly tender and paternal (отечески) way" (II.ii.ii; 427).[280] And soon again, "the Mason smiled his gentle, fatherly (отеческой) smile" (II.ii.ii; 429).[281]

---

[280]When Pierre is moved by his father's weak smile, his feeling is unexpected (неожиданно); so when Bazdayev smiles at him paternally, it is an unexpected (неожиданной) smile. Paternal connection seems to take Pierre by surprise.

[281]Cf. Rancour-Laferriere 1993, 102-103.

Bazdayev's spiritual conversation with Pierre involves males exclusively. He speaks of the patriarchal, Biblical God, "a Being omnipotent, eternal, and infinite in all His attributes" (II.ii.ii; 428). What we know of Him has been passed down "from our first forefather Adam to our own day" (II.ii.ii; 428). Bazdayev is a Freemason, a member of the all-male brotherhood.[282] His presence has transformed Pierre into a child. First Bazdayev compares him to a child playing with a watch; then Pierre responds in part to Bazdayev's rationality, but is also persuaded, "as children are," by his tone of sincerity and authority (II.ii.ii; 429). Finally, when Bazdayev is about to leave, Pierre speaks in a "childlike, hesitating voice" (II.ii.ii; 430). With Bazdayev, Pierre has become a child again, listening to the authoritative tones of a fatherly figure. He is transfixed not by Bazdayev's discussion of God, but by his voice and body: "...by tone of sincerity and authority in the vibrant voice which almost broke at times, or by those brilliant eyes grown old in that conviction, or by the calm firmness and certainty of purpose radiating from his whole being" (429). The thought of God is too distant and immaterial for Pierre who can only refer to embodied people and so reacts to a bodied father figure. While hearing and seeing Bazdayev, Pierre "experienced a joyous feeling of solace, regeneration, and return to life (чувство успокоения, обновления и возвращения к жизни)." (II.ii.ii; 429) Again Pierre is reborn from a father.

Just as his own father allowed Pierre to free himself of Hélène, so his next father figure, Bazdayev, allows him to rid himself once and for all of her father (and an earlier father substitute), Prince Vasily. Alone and settled in St. Petersburg, Pierre reenacts a scene very similar to that with Hélène in his father's study in Moscow. There his father's rage possessed him to banish Hélène, sending her away from him with a terrifying "Get out!" (II.i.vi; 391). In Petersburg, Prince Vasily comes to Pierre to try to reconcile him with his estranged wife. When Prince Vasily approaches him, Pierre must struggle against him: "He was so used to submitting to Prince Vasily's manner of nonchalant self-

[282]Cf. Rancour-Laferriere 1993, 104.

assurance that he now felt powerless to resist it, but he also felt that his whole future depended on what he said now: it would decide whether he would continue along the same old path or take the new road that had been made so attractive to him by the Masons, and on which he firmly believed he would be reborn to a new life (возрождение к новой жизни)" (II.ii.v; 442). Bazdayev is the new road that strengthens Pierre to dismiss the old path — Prince Vasily. And once again, the rage of his own father enables Pierre to do so: "But before Prince Vasily had finished his pleasantry, Pierre, not looking at him, but with an enraged expression on his face that recalled his father, mumbled in a voice that was almost a whisper: ...Go!" (II.ii.v; 443). Pierre, guided by two fathers, finds the power to resist his father-in-law to pursue the "rebirth to a new life."

Pierre's father and the father figure, Bazdayev, empower Pierre to free himself of the Kuragins, father and daughter. Yet the liberation is not complete. Pierre continues to struggle with what the Kuragins embody — an unquestioning habit of depravity born of amorality[283]. So Pierre remains deeply upset by any interaction with his wife. Just as he was seen earlier in his deceased father's study, he later takes refuge "in the empty house of his deceased benefactor, Iosif Bazdayev" (III.iii.xviii; 1041). At home in Moscow, Pierre is beseiged by a roomful of people waiting to see him and ask things of him. Among them is a courier with a letter from his wife and a messenger from Bazdayev's widow asking him to take charge of her husband's books since she is leaving for the country. Pierre feels that sorting Bazdayev's books and papers is most urgent and so simply walks out the back door of his house and disappears to go to "the Patriarchs' Pond, where the widow Bazdayeva's house was located" (III.iii.xviii; 1042). Bazdayev's house could not have a more fitting location.

Just as in his father's study, Pierre takes up residence in Bazdayev's. But the father's study is not finally the place of liberation for Pierre — it is too limited. As

---

[283]Cf. Pierre's tendency to lapse into relativism to the point of lazy amorality; e.g. "But while you're alive — live: tomorrow you die, as I might have died an hour ago. And is it worth tormenting oneself when one has only a moment to live in comparison with eternity?" (II.i.vi; 389). Cf. Morson 1987, 237-240.

Rancour-Laferriere has observed, Pierre's "father-icons" die (1993, 106). Pierre's singular interaction with his father in the novel occurs at his father's dying. And when Pierre first meets Bazdayev, the old man is marked by signs of death: Pierre is contemplating death when Bazdayev walks into the inn (II.ii.i; 424); Bazdayev is wearing a death's-head ring on a finger of one of his shriveled old hands (II.ii.i-ii; 425; 427); and when Bazdayev finishes his long discourse about God and life, Pierre looked at the "stern, impassive, almost dead face of the old man (строгое, неподвижное, старческое, почти мертвое лицо)" (II.ii.ii; 430). Not long after, Bazdayev is indeed dead and Pierre comes to the study of another dead father. The deaths of Pierre's fathers exemplify their ultimate inadequacy; they can help relieve Pierre from paralysis temporarily, but they cannot turn him away from death ultimately. Thus the studies of the dead fathers are only a refuge, a place out of which Pierre can make a turn from one life to the next. They are places that must ultimately be left. What makes them unacceptable, incomplete?

Pierre's fathers offer him two tools: rage and mystical formulas which promise the comprehension of the universe. Not surprisingly, the fathers' methods correspond to two of the novel's favorite kinds of masculine "rationality" which are gradually exposed as futile: war and plans, respectively. What is rage? For one thing, it is the first word of the *Iliad*, the defining characteristic of the hero, Achilles: *mênis*, divine anger. Achilles's rage drives him to transgress the boundaries of the human and become a divine elemental force like fire.[284] When Achilles finally puts on his new, divine armor and returns to battle after the death of his friend, Patroklos, he radiates a divine light and becomes an irresistible force of destruction. His battle with the river Skamander is nothing other than a cosmic battle between fire and water. Hera must intervene to put an end to Achilles's holocaust. Again, when Achilles abuses the corpse of Hector, still not drained of his rage, the gods convene to decide how to manage Achilles's anger. *Mênis*, a noun used, other than in regard to Achilles, only in association with the gods, is a manifestation of Achilles's birth

[284]See Whitman 1958.

from a goddess. Tolstoy, just as he rejected the epic glory Helen offerred, rejects epic rage. Rather than a force that aligns one with the divine, for Tolstoy it lowers one to the level of the bestial. Tolstoy's word, бешенство (II.i.vi; II.ii.v-vi), is the opposite of *mênis* : rather than divine anger, it signifies rabies — animal madness. After Pierre refuses to be reconciled with his wife, society places all the blame on him as one afflicted with "his father's fits of bloodthirsty rage" (II.ii.vi; 443). "Bloodthirsty" suggests an animal on the hunt, akin to the animal imagery associated with father and son Bezukhov — lion and bear.[285] A raw emotion, it returns one to a pre-human state. Rage may have served Pierre well in dismissing Hélène and her father, but the hero must develop beyond such a violent, bestial state.

The problem with Bazdayev's patronage is its mystical promise of a key to the universe; that with a magic, occult formula the profoundest mystery can be cracked and the secret of life understood. Pierre seeks absolute systems which prescribe truth comprehensively, an object necessarily planted with the seeds of its own destruction. For there can be no such total knowledge for men, only the experience of moments of the present. In Bazdayev's house, Pierre is mirrored by Bazdayev's crazy alcoholic brother, Makar Alekseyevich. Pierre has stayed in Moscow to prove to himself that he will not shirk his decision to shoot Napoleon; when a rather foppish, loquacious, and effeminate (that is, harmless) Frenchman comes to lodge at the house, Makar Alekseyevich appears with his pistol and takes aim. As the novel has just reported, Pierre himself was "in a state of nervous irritability bordering on insanity" (III.iii.xx; 1079). The result of Bazdayev's house seems to be these two crazy men. After a long and unexpectedly confessional talk with this Frenchman, Ramballe, Pierre walks into the street with him and then keeps going, without taking leave of his new friend. He leaves Bazdayev's house just as unceremoniously as he had left his own.

---

[285]For this animal imagery, see Rancour-Laferriere 1993, 30-46.

Pierre's fathers, Count Bezukhov, Iosif Bazdayev, and perhaps Prince Vasily, are all necessarily left behind. For while each one allows him moments of rebirth, in their incompleteness they amount more to a series of false starts and kinds of insanity than to a vision of a truthful way of being which Pierre so deeply desires. Pierre leaves Prince Vasily's house for his father's; his father's house for his own in St. Petersburg; his own house for Bazdayev's; and Bazdayev's for soon no house at all. True to this as symbol is Pierre's gradual abandonment of all paternal structures. For he finally realizes, at least for the moment, his long sought understanding when he is homeless in captivity. And it is there, under the *maternal* presence of Platon Karatayev, that Pierre is truly reborn.[286] For his father's violent rage and Bazdayev's patriarchal God are too wholly masculine, in the worst senses of masculinity. Pierre must return to a more primordial state.

As Jackson has shown, Pierre's rebirth after his spiritual death on Devichii Fields is characterized by a mother-child metaphor descriptive of the relationship between him and Platon Karatayev. Pierre returns to life like an infant being born: through his sense of smell and sight, then the sound of Platon's motherly, sing-song voice, and finally the food Platon gives him. Platon is associated with roundness: his movement of unwinding the cords around his legs is repeatedly "circular," his figure, his head, the way he held his arms, his eyes. Alluding to Eliade's discussion of the *prima materia*, Jackson concludes: "In psychic terms his [Pierre's] meeting with Platon takes on the character of a 'return to the mother,' to a primordial situation or 'first state' whence new creation becomes possible. ... Platon emerges here as the source and symbol of renewal: as earth-mother, mother Russia, the people — the indestructibility of the matrix" (1978, 541). After his series of incomplete rebirths from fathers, Pierre finally achieves this complete renewal from the mother wherein he learns the unsystematic truth that: "Life is everything. Life is God. Everything changes and moves, and that movement is God" (IV.iii.xv; 1272).

---

[286]Cf. Rancour-Laferriere 1993, 107 and passim.

On the mythopoetic level, the return to the mother offers complete renewal, a rebeginning not just from one's own birth but from the original creation. On the narrative level, Platon's alignment with the mother expresses a simple domesticity. He questions Pierre: "And do you have an ancestral estate, sir? And a house of your own? Your cup must be full! And a wife in the house? And old parents living? ... Well, and are there little ones?" (IV.i.xii; 1158-59). With his emphasis on the feminine ("A wife for counsel, a mother-in-law for a warm welcome, but there's none so dear as a man's own mother" IV.i.xii; 1159), Platon describes the basic contents and plot of conventional novels for women about marriage from the woman's point of view. Platon's maternal rebirthing of Pierre allows him to return to life not only spiritually, but also literarily. In the role of feminizing mother, Platon "gives birth" to Pierre as finally a novelistic hero, one who can soon take on the conventional wife, mother-in-law and children of the domestic novel plot. While not diminishing Platon's unquestionable maternity and Pierre's liminality, the birth of the novelistic hero yet occurs man to man: Platon is an old soldier and Pierre a political prisoner. Clearly character is not a matter of biological gender. We recall Hélène who was more typically masculine than feminine, a woman who was determinedly not a mother. By postponing true rebirth until Pierre encounters the maternal Platon, and by gradually rejecting the traditional masculinity of Pierre's rebirths from his father and Bazdayev, Tolstoy redefines masculinity. Having done so, through Pierre's true rebirth from a maternal man, Tolstoy masculinizes the conventions of the feminized 19th-century novel of manners which he knew so well and so admired. Marriage and family are elevated from the woman's private realm to a prototype for nationhood. And nationhood requires fatherhood. Thus by the novel's end, Pierre could answer Platon's questions in the affirmative— he does have an ancestral home, a wife, a mother-in-law and "little ones." For reasons important both to genre and politics, at the end of the novel, Pierre is a father indeed.[287]

---

[287]Rancour-Laferriere notices that Pierre becomes a pseudo-father during the burning of Moscow when he

In his marriage, Pierre is a devoted husband, loving father, and master of his house. He is tied to his wife's apron strings so that "every moment of his life belonged to her [his wife] and to the family" (Epilogue I.x; 1384), and he adores his children — three daughters and an infant son — immediately from their infancy. In exchange for his absolute loyalty and dedication, the house is arranged according to his will. Natasha is "a slave to her husband" (Epilogue I.x; 1384), fulfilling his every wish and reverencing his intellectual pursuits, the primary one of which is political. Despite what he learned from Karatayev, Pierre at the end of the novel is not so different from the naively optimistic young man in Anna Pavlovna's drawing room who too ardently discussed a plan for a permanent peace. In the epilogue, Pierre fulfills Tolstoy's idea of a novel about the formation of a Decembrist and so we see him go to St. Petersburg to discuss the "important questions" of a society he helped found there. Still the novel is divided into places: Moscow the place of the home and family, St. Petersburg of political intrigue. Pierre's closing portrait spans both, not quite giving preference to one over the other. The novel leaves him at home, preoccupied with the return to his family: "But it was obvious that in spite of the many interesting things they had to discuss, the baby, with his little wobbling head under his cap absorbed Pierre's attention" (Epilogue I.xi; 1388).[288] On the other hand, we subsequently hear Pierre and his male friends and relatives engaged in political discussion, significantly from within the interior of the home. Politics and domesticity merge finally with a hero fully committed to both equally. In Pierre, *War and Peace* ends with a vision of the interdependence of the home and the nation, of male and female. Consistent with Tolstoy's conviction that only women do real work, marriage is not romance and pleasure, but the natural and whole occupation of life. In his gradual liberation from the paternal stuctures — the rage of his father, the prescriptive mysticism of

---

rescues the little girl and claims to the French that he is her father (1993, 184-188). This would be interesting to consider further.

[288]Why is it, as Rancour-Laferriere (1993, 234) correctly observes, the case that we see Pierre only with his one male child? Is it because he happens to be the infant and Pierre, unlike Nikolai Rostov, likes children from their infancy? Or is there some father-son significance?

Bazdayev — to his renewal from the maternal Karatayev, Pierre is the transitional hero who we see integrate the domestic plot into his masculine beginnings. As Pierre becomes a novelistic hero, he brings the novel — with its wives, mothers, mother-in-law, and children— centrally into the world of men.

Prince Andrei

Pierre, we have seen, is a character with generic roots in the feminine novel whom Tolstoy transforms into the hero of his masculinized novel. Prince Andrei also grows out of pre-existent generic roots, but unlike his friend, develops from heroic epic.[289] It makes sense that Tolstoy engaged with a partially epic character in his own work in light of his lifelong relationship with Homer. From childhood Tolstoy was raised "in love and respect for the highest standards of elegance, expressed ... in Homer, Bach and Raphael" (13.239).[290] Between the ages of 14 to 20, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in Russian translation made a "great" (большое) impression on him; from 35 to 50, now read in Greek, they made a "very great" (очень большое) impression (66.68). Tolstoy comments on his daily reading of the *Iliad* in his diary from 1857 (47.152-54), but as late as 1890 he notes that he spends his days walking, writing, and reading the *Iliad* to himself and aloud (84.68). These and other mentions of Homer in various articles and letters (e.g. 8.89, 342; 14.60; 25.369; 34.525; 35.252; 62.22) are marked by consistent admiration.

Tolstoy developed Prince Andrei with an epic-romantic prototype in mind: "In the Battle of Austerlitz which is yet to be described, but with which I began the novel, I needed a brilliant (*blestyashchy*) young man to die." This preconception of Prince Andrei distills his epic associations into two salient points: the "brilliant" young man is the "shining one," akin to the idea of the illustrious epic hero (epitomized in the divine fire that Athena makes radiate from Achilles when he first enters battle without armor at *Iliad* 18.203-214);[291] and

---

[289]Much has been said on the novel itself as modally epic; see Silbajoris 1995, 108-111 for an overview of the critical perspectives — specifically of Christian, Terras, Eikhenbaum, Opul'skaya and Steiner — on *War and Peace* as generically epic. Gary Saul Morson has equated the novel's epic connection specifically to the character of Prince Andrei: "...Prince Andrei, who is really a character from another genre (the epic), and Pierre, who embodies the traditional qualities of a novelistic hero" (1987, 245). Here Morson cites Stephanie Sandler's paper, "*War and Peace*: Studies in Narrative and Sexual Identity," which neither he nor she were able to locate for reference. Though a somewhat reductive treatment, see also Laura Jepsen's monograph on Prince Andrei *From Achilles to Christ.*

[290]Such Arabic numerals refer to first the volume and then the page number from the Полное собрание of Tolstoy's works.

[291]Patricia Carden makes this connection between *blestyashchy* and the "shining one" (1988, 117).

again like the epic hero who aims for immortal glory through his death, Tolstoy's character is consecrated to death. Prince Andrei's epic character, as well as his relationships with his father and his son, can be explored further according to these two categories of brilliance and death.

In ancient epic, brilliance is primarily a divine quality. It, in part, enables men to recognize a divinity in epiphany (e.g. in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter; Aphrodite). Zeus, the sovereign of the gods, is particularly associated with light; the oblique cases of his name — Dios, etc.— are often etymologized as related to his realm of the sky and light. Accordingly, the commendatory adjective, *dios*, when applied to men, bears these connections to divine radiance and so can be translated as "illustrious" or simply "divine." The mortal hero, Achilles, with his cosmic anger, his associations with fire, his shining armor, and a tomb which is "bright from afar" (*Odyssey* 24.83) partakes of especial brilliance — a marker of his closeness to the divine (as well as to his proximity to death).[292]

The dense ritual and cultural matrix of ancient epic is of course far distant from any character in the 19th century novelistic world. So what might brilliance, *blestyashchy*, connote for Prince Andrei? He describes his fantasy of glory — his wish to be a hero — in his private thoughts:

> ...но ежели хочу этого, хочу славы, хочу быть известным людям, хочу быть любимым ими, то ведь я не виноват, что я хочу этого, что одного этого я хочу, для одного этого я живу. Да, для одного этого! Я никогда никому не скажу этого, но, боже мой! что же мне делать, ежели я ничего не люблю, как только славу, любов людскую. Смерть, раны, потеря семьи, ничто мне не страшно. И как дороги, ни милы мне многие люди -- отец, сестра, жена, -- самые дорогие мне люди, -- но, как ни страшно и ни неестественно это кажется, я всех их отдам сейчас за минуту славы, торжества над людьми, за любовь к себе людей, которых я не знаю и не буду знать (I.iii.xii)

> ...but if that is what I want — glory, to be celebrated by men and loved by them, I cannot be blamed for wanting that, for wanting nothing but that, and living for that alone. Yes, for that alone! I shall never tell anyone, but, my God, what can I do if I care for nothing but glory and men's love? Death, wounds, the loss of my family — nothing holds any terror for me. And dear and precious as many persons are to me — father, sister, wife, those who are most dear, I would sacrifice them all, dreadful and unnatural as it may seem, for a moment of glory, of triumph over men, for the love of men I do not know and shall never know... (pp. 324-25)[293]

---

[292]On Achilles's armor, tomb and association with fire, see Nagy 1979, 336-341. See also Whitman 1958. On his cosmic anger and Achilles as the ritual substitute of Apollo, see Muellner 1996.

[293]Translations are from Ann Dunnigan's Signet translation (sometimes adapted).

While the idea of love is not absent from Andrei's fantasy, he thinks about love exclusively as the object of his desire: хочу быть любимым ими ... я ничего не люблю, как только славу, любовь людскую ... за любовь к себе людей ... за любовь вот этих людей; the one time he describes his own activity of loving it is a negated act — я ничего не люблю. Thus Andrei reaches out only toward being the beloved, as opposed to an active lover. Love, furthermore, is linked here with the faceless "people," in opposition to those close and dear to him — his father, sister, and wife. In his preference for the love of strangers — functionally equivalent to the love of posterity — over that of his family, Andrei makes a characteristically epic choice.

Prince Andrei fantasizes that this desired love and glory awaits him almost physically somewhere up in the mist: дорожу этой таинственной силой и славой, которая вот тут надо мной носится в этом тумане ("I value only this mysterious power and glory that is hovering over me in the mist" I.iii.xii). Tolstoy does not soon let go of the fog into which Andrei peers. It structures events of the following chapters. The next chapter begins on that same night; Nikolai Rostov sees behind him the fires of regiment unclearly glowing in the fog (неясно горевших в тумане) and before him misty darkness (туманная темнота). He looks into the misty distance (в эту туманную даль) but cannot see anything (I.iii.xiii). In the next chapter, now at dawn, the increasing fog (усиливающегося тумана) inhibits the movement of the Russian troops. This fog has grown so strong (туман стал так силен), that even though it is growing light (рассветало), the men cannot see ten steps before them. Thus far, the mist prohibits vision; it is akin to darkness and so opposed to light. And through the rest of the chapters until Andrei's wounding and celestial revelation, the fog continues to imply obscurity and the blindness of human actions as the Russians "tardily and listlessly" exchange fire with the enemy they cannot see through the thick fog (в густом тумане не видя ничего I.iii.xiv). According to the epic association of radiance and divinity (and subsequent conventional images of light as truth), one expects Prince Andrei's

contemplation of the heavens to contain the light that the confusion of earthly life and human desires has obscured. But Tolstoy does not fulfill this conventional expectation; Prince Andrei does not look up into the heavens to suddenly see the great transcendent radiance. Instead, like the unclear glowing of the campfires which Rostov saw through the fog (неясно горевших в тумане), Andrei sees a sky also unclear and streaked with gray clouds: Над ним не было ничего уже, кроме неба, -- высокого неба, не ясного, но все-таки неизмеримо высокого, с тихо ползущими по нем серыми облаками ("Above him there was nothing but the sky, the lofty heavens, not clear, yet immeasurably lofty, with gray clouds slowly drifting across them" I.iii.xvi). There is no lightness, no perfect clarity in this cloudy sky. Its distinguishing characteristics are height and boundlessness. If not in the profundity of the heavens, where is the light in these chapters full of fog wherein Andrei enacts his wish for glory? Ironically, brilliance remains below on the level of the "running, shouting, fighting" (I.iii.xvi) men. It characterizes the false heroes of both armies: first Napoleon and then the Russian Emperor. Napoleon is described in an island of light:

> Nine o'clock came. The fog (туман) like an unbroken sea spread out below, but in the village of Schlapanitz, where Napoleon stood on an eminence surrounded by his marshals, it was quite light (светло). Above him was a clear blue sky (ясное голубое небо), and the sun's huge orb quivered like a hollow, crimson buoy on the surface of that milky sea of mist. (I.iii.xiv)

Napoleon's clear sky differs from the mist everywhere else around him. And significantly, it differs from Prince Andrei's vision of the unclear, cloudy sky. Tolstoy portrays Napoleon as the "brilliant" young man with the correlative attribute of actual radiance and pretensions of divinity. He gets another "Toulon" such as Prince Andrei dreamed about, and significantly, it takes place in dazzling light:

> That day was for him [Napoleon] a day of triumph — it was the anniversary of his coronation. ... When the sun had completely emerged from the fog (из тумана) and the fields and the mist were bathed in its dazzling light (as though he had only been waiting for this to begin), he drew the glove from his shapely white hand, made a sign with it to the marshals, and gave the order for the action to begin. (I.iii.xiv)

Evidently, the shining hero is an ironic idea, the light like a stage effect to heighten the histrionic pretensions of grandeur. Brilliance — a sign of traditional heroism — we come

to see, is itself an illusion. The presentation of the young Emperor Aleksandr further illustrates the inversion of light imagery and preference for the "reality" of the fog. When the Emperor, followed by his suite rides up majestically — and oblivious to the absurdity of battle in the perennial mist — Kutuzov assumes a sarcastic respectfulness, which makes a bad impression:

> Kutuzov, affecting the manner of an old soldier at the front, gave the command "Attention!" and rode up to the Emperor saluting. His whole figure and manner were instantaneously transformed. He had the air of a subordinate who obeys without reasoning. With ostentatious respect, which clearly made a bad impression on Emperor Aleksandr, he rode up and saluted. This disagreeable impression, like a wisp of fog in a clear sky (только как остатки тумана на ясном небе), floated across the youthful, happy face of the Emperor and vanished. (I.iii.xv)

The clear sky, like that above Napoleon, signifies the Emperor's usual aspect. Kutuzov's reminder of the Emperor's ostentation is the wisp of fog. Prince Andrei, hoping to realize his glory on this day and become the brilliant, shining hero, instead achieves an understanding of the emptiness and illusion of this dream (все пустое, все обман, кроме этого бесконечного неба). Through this false epic death, which I will return to below, Tolstoy carries Andrei safely through and beyond his epic prototype of the brilliant young man, the shining hero. Loftiness, infinity and eternity replace brilliance. What remains to link Andrei to his epic roots is his continuing connection to death, the ancient hero's means of immortality.

In Andrei's second scene of dying, the light imagery returns in ways complementary to the first. The light begins prosaically: at Mytishchy there is first the small light of the mushroom candle with its red halo. Next, while still attached to the prosaic circumstance of the burning candle (and the buzzing fly), and still in potential, light takes on the suggestion of greater profundity: the ethereal structure which rises and falls before Andrei's face is made up of splinters of wood (*luchina*) used for light like a candle.[294] This structure emanating from Andrei but influenced by the candle and fly outside him is transitional, a kind of potential divine light both from without and within. Its

---

[294]So Carden defines *luchina* (1988, 119).

fullness is not realized until Andrei's awakening from his dream of death when the light next reappears, now significantly exclusively from within:

> «Да, это была смерть. Я умер -- я проснулся. Да, смерть -- пробуждение!» -- вдруг просветлело в его душе, и завеса, скрывавая до сих пор неведомое, была приподнята перед его душевным взором. (IV.i.xvi)
> "Yes, that was death. I died — and I awoke. Yes, death is an awakening!" And his soul was suddenly suffused with light, and the veil concealing the unknown was lifted from before his soul's vision. (1176)

The revelation that there is no death illuminates Andrei's soul, the divine part of him. His radiance, like his death, is not for the eyes of admiring mortals, but between himself and God. It is a joyous, benign, and interior light in contrast to the fierce, far-seen shining of the epic hero. The image of the "brilliant" young man thus traces Andrei's journey out from externalized epic into the interior experience of novelized death.

Before I consider Andrei's death and dying in more detail, his confession about his wish for glory merits further attention. While not yet disabused of his epic dream, Andrei admitted his preference for the love of strangers over the value of his own father, sister and wife. In our discussion of Pierre, we saw that Pierre's transformation into the hero of a masculinized novel occurred through his rebirth from a maternal man, Platon Karataev. Andrei's relationship to his father, father substitutes and women also tells us something about his path toward rebirth, though for him through death rather than into continued life as we know it.

Recall Andrei's confession about his willingness to lose his family if necessary for the sake of glory:

> Death, wounds, the loss of my family — nothing holds any terror for me. And dear and precious as many persons are to me — father, sister, wife, those who are most dear, I would sacrifice them all, dreadful and unnatural as it may seem, for a moment of glory, of triumph over men, for the love of men I do not know and shall never know. (I.iii.12; 324-25)

Andrei's readiness to sacrifice the persons most dear to him — his father, sister and wife — directly addresses his committment to heroism more than his feelings about his family. Nevertheless, his thought does recall the tension Andrei displayed with his life at home, both in St. Petersburg and Bald Hills at the start of the novel — his impatience with his

wife (e.g. I.i.vi), his ironic tolerance of his sister, his affectionate criticism of his father (I.i.xxv). And through the novel Andrei struggles in his relationships with women, with his father and potential father figures.

Unlike Pierre, Andrei enters the novel woven into the web of family. He already has much of what Pierre works so hard to attain — a domestic life of home and family. Yet Andrei feels confined by the "enchanted circle" of married life (I.i.vi). His disregard for one of the novel's greatest values perhaps shows that these goals are not simple acquisitions but the endpoint of deep searching, which must be invested from within. His disdain for his pregnant wife perhaps also signals the opposite direction of Andrei's journey from Pierre's. Andrei, in view of his own path, is not mistaken when he discusses his marriage in terms of constraint: Но свяжи себя с женщиной -- и, как скованный колодник, теряешь всякую свободу ("But tie yourself to a woman and you're bound hand and foot — all freedom gone" I.i.vi). For contrary to Pierre's, his path seems to be one of gradually disconnecting from the mesh of human relationships; opposite Pierre's quest for "freedom to," Andrei indeed desires "freedom from" the personal and the earthly which interferes with his drive for the absolute.

Recall Karataev's formulation to Pierre of life's value: "A wife for counsel, a mother-in-law for a warm welcome, but there's none so dear as a man's own mother" (IV.i.xii). Like Pierre, Prince Andrei also has no mother; but unlike his friend, he has no receptivity for one. Pierre harbors a weakness for women, which first leads him into his painful marriage with Hélène. Nevertheless, Pierre's desire for women may ultimately help him receive the motherliness of Karataev and so become reborn from this feminine man. But Prince Andrei seems to have assimilated his father's misogyny into his own already strained relationships with all others, not just women. He tells Pierre how he agrees with his father's condescension to women: "If only you knew what all those *femmes distinguées*, what women in general, are! My father is right. Selfish, vain, obtuse, and petty in everything — that's what women are when they show themselves in their true

colors" (I.i.vi). Later, when Andrei is taking leave of his father at Bald Hills, he shares a moment of uneasy solidarity with his father over the "bad business" of his wife (I.i.xxv). Indeed this rejection of women, both Lise and Marya, helps forge the tense bond between father and son. And this paternal relationship at the expense of women recurs when Andrei's father makes him choose between him and Natasha; trying to choose father and wife, he loses both. Clearly, women are threatening to the sharply drawn boundaries and the idea of freedom of the Bolkonsky men.

The potential danger associated with women is nowhere more clear than in one of Andrei's deathbed images. At Mytishchy, Andrei sees the edifice of needles rising before him, the candle with its red halo, and "something else of importance — something white by the door — the statue of a sphinx — which also weighed on him" (III.iii.xxxii; 1102). This "shirt-sphinx" is soon doubled: "a new white sphinx appeared, standing upright in front of the door. And that sphinx had the pale face and shining eyes of the very Natasha of whom he had just been thinking" (1103). John Weeks has noted the aptness of the sphinx image "for the puzzle Andrei is trying to solve within himself" (1989, 74).[295] But left unnoticed is the sphinx's transference to Natasha. She is also part of the puzzle Andrei has been trying to solve; he has just been thinking of her. But her first appearance to him is ambiguous. On the one hand, her whiteness is sometimes associated with the "light" of Andrei's death.[296] But her image as sphinxlike also suggests the still latent dangerous power of women to him. The sphinx is the only feminine image in Andrei's dying.[297] And the sphinx is an image of a monstrous, sexual female who will outwit men and then devour them. As in the story of Oedipus, the sphinx is something to be overcome. It is one of those primordial monsters which heroes must rid the land of in order for men to be safe.

---

[295]It might also be suggestive that at the time of Pierre's father's death, Pierre twice assumes the "naive attitude of an Egyptian statue" (I.i.xix, xx; 114, 118). I wonder if there is some connection between these ancient Egyptian statues and death.

[296]So Silbajoris 1995, 118.

[297]Cf. Silbajoris 1995, 117: "Their [Andrei's and Natasha's] love fulfills itself only when Andrey lies dying. Curiously, that love then seems less personal and more symbolic. By that time the physically distant Natasha can no longer be his lover, and therefore she spiritually begins to resemble a mother, or at least the only mother figure Andrey has in the entire book."

The image of the sphinx seems to perfectly contain the Bolkonsky attitude toward women: alluring, deceitful, primitive, and devouring. When the sphinx seems to the dying Andrei to turn into Natasha, this tremulous vision externalizes Andrei's inner struggle about love and forgiveness. He does forgive Natasha, but this means to love her with that impersonal divine love. But the struggle between human love — of someone dear to you that may turn into hatred— and divine love — of your enemy and of everyone (1104), continues through the course of Andrei's illness:

> During the hours of solitude, suffering, and partial delirium that he spent after he was wounded, the more deeply he reflected on the principle of eternal love that had been newly revealed to him, the more he unconsciously renounced earthly life. To love everyone and everything, always to sacrifice oneself for love, meant not to love any one person, and not to live this earthly life. And the more imbued he became with this principle of love, the more he renounced life and the more completely he destroyed that dreadful barrier which, in the absence of love, stands between life and death. ... But after the night at Mytishchy when, half delirious, he had seen her for whom he had longed appear before him, and had shed quiet tears of joy and pressed her hand to his lips, love for a particular woman again crept imperceptibly into his heart, binding (привязала) him again to life. (IV.i.xvi)

A woman is again a bond, again that which ties one to the earthly, and again is in distinction to the masculine realm, now of divine love and death surrounding the Father and his Son. Again Andrei must choose between the Father and Natasha, and again the Father overwhelms him. Andrei's ultimate choice is for the purely masculine Father God. He arrives at this choice through a path of other father figures before this absolute one.

Pierre, we saw, progressed through a series of father figures: for a short time he stayed with Prince Vasily Kuragin, then he experienced his biological father's death and went to live in his father's house, next he met Bazdeev, who identified with the patriarchal God, and spent some time in his house, and finally encountered the maternal Karataev while in the no man's land of captivity. Through the influence of the maternal father figure Karataev — both a mother and a man, Pierre was reborn as the hero of the masculinized novel. Prince Andrei also struggles with several father figures: his biological father, Prince Bolkonsky; the more feminine General Kutuzov; and finally the divine Father God. Each of these relationships are marked by significant tension.

Andrei's difficult relationship with his father builds towards a break and an uneasy peace with him. When Andrei first comes home to Bald Hills near the beginning of the novel, he displays a mixture of adoration and irony toward his father. Unlike his sister who lives there, Prince Andrei, who has been married in St. Petersburg and is off to war, can afford to see his father with some critical distance. He laughs at his father's latest addition to the house, a genealogical tree of the Princes Bolkonsky and a portrait of an alleged descendant of Rurik who founded the Bolkonsky family. Andrei's tempermental loyalty to his father (cf. II.ii.xi) may have more to do with this genealogical tree than meets the eye. Genealogy is a fundamental ancient genre. Along the lines of inheritance, Gregory Nagy has recently considered a well known passage from (the Homeric-thinking) Pindar:

> The pleasure that mortals get waxes in a short space of time.
> And, just as quickly, it falls to the ground, shaken by adverse opinion.
> Creatures of a day. What is a someone, what is a no one? Man is the dream of a shade.
> (Pythian 8, Nagy's translation)

Nagy explains these lines as evidence of a mindset wherein the present generations are possessed by the past ones. He thus glosses the lines: we the living are the dreams of our ancestors; our lives are the dreams of the dead. I don't think this attitude is confined to an archaic Greek way of thinking, but rather characterizes a more widespread, and later aristocratic, conception of the integrity of the ancestral house.[298] For Prince Andrei, having grown up with his imposing *paterfamilias* father, is part of a proud ancestral house which does not easily relinquish its lineage. In this way he, like Pindar's man, is in the grip of the past, or as another poet with ancient connections puts it, is "the planet of his [father's] longings."[299] His complex relationship with his father — part adoration, part competition, part anger and part pity — is thus the first in a series of relationships that, for him, onerously bind.

---

[298]Cf. Tolstoy in his apology for the exclusively aristocratic characters of *War and Peace*: Я аристократ потому, что вспоминать предков -- отцов, дедов, прадедов моих, мне только не совестно, но особенно радостно. (13.239)

[299]Yehuda Amichai, "My Father in a White Space Suit."

When Prince Andrei's father sends him off to war, he recommends him to General Kutuzov — a father figure completely opposite from Prince Bolkonsky. Kutuzov is, as Gary Saul Morson recognized, the "Karataev of war":

> Kutuzov, who embodies wisdom in 'war' as Karataev does in 'peace,' places no faith in principles. ... When he listens to officers' reports during a battle, he pays attention not to factual content but to the state of mind of the officer, and, like Karataev, responds to that immediate situation, to the person before him. (1987, 226-27)

While Kutuzov's disregard of principles and facts contrasts with old Bolkonsky, his likeness to Karataev can be extended further. Karataev contains an essential femininty, which may also be seen in Kutuzov. Though Kutuzov's girth and "round shoulders" may not qualify as the "roundness" which aligned Karataev with the feminine, Tolstoy provides a different indication of his association with the mother.[300] Just before the Battle of Borodino, Kutuzov makes his way to the icon of the Smolensk Mother of God:

> When the service was over, Kutuzov went up to the icon, sank heavily to his knees, and bowed to the ground; for a long time he tried in vain to rise, but was hindered by his weakness and weight. His gray head twitched with the effort. At last he rose, put out his lips in a naive, childlike way and kissed the icon, and again bowed down and touched the ground with his hand. (III.ii.xxi; 919)

Kutuzov's association here with the Mother of God and even with the earth reflects his understanding "that there is something stronger and more significant than his will" in a specifically feminine way. Prince Andrei gradually recognizes in Kutuzov the "absence of everything personal" (III.ii.xvi).[301] When Kutuzov hears of Prince Bolkonsky's death and exhorts Prince Andrei to consider him a second father (III.ii.xvi; 894), Prince Andrei is presented with the perfect opportunity to be reborn, like Pierre from Karataev, from a feminine father. But Andrei, regardless of his respect for Kutuzov, resists him and chooses to serve apart from him. His failure to be reborn from Kutuzov in some ways marks the crossroads in his distinction from Pierre's path. Prince Andrei cannot be reborn under the aegis of an earthly father. His moments of rebirth are conspicuously unparented moments when Andrei is free from his ties to another. They are solitary and silent

---

[300]Cf. Jackson 1978.

[301]Cf. Gustafson 1986, 230-33, who recognizes the centrality of the image of Kutuzov with the icon of the Mother of God, as well as Andrei's response to Kutuzov.

moments: the silence of the sky at Austerlitz, the water lapping at the ferry with Pierre.[302] Nevertheless, Kutuzov with his "absence of everything personal" does provide the bridge to Andrei's ultimate embrace of the divine Father. Andrei's experience of this final father figure can best be seen through a consideration of that other potentially epic part of his character, his consecration to death.

The epic hero achieves immortality through dying. "Death is overcome when it is made welcome instead of merely being experienced; ... the death that has given his [the hero's] biography its conclusion has also given it permanence."[303] While epic death, like heroic "brilliance," can never be replicated outside the complex of structures of archaic Greece, this idea of it as a kind of goal resonates with Tolstoy's prototype for Prince Andrei — a young man needed to die. Tolstoy's plan for the Andrei character to die extends into his presentation of him in the novel: of all the "main" characters who die — the three fathers of the older generation (Bezukhov, Bolkonsky, Rostov), the three father figures (Bazdeev, Karataev, Kutuzov), Prince Andrei and Petya — only Prince Andrei experiences such an extensive rehearsal as it were for his ultimate death. His fall at Austerlitz, left inconclusive but made to seem very likely fatal, introduces the reader to the idea of Prince Andrei's death. And with his sublime experience of the lofty sky — one of his finest moments — Andrei's dying takes on the tone of profundity and revelation. When it happens again it is already familiar; it is something fitting to this character.[304]

An important aspect of epic death is its occurrence on the battlefield where the beauty of the dead man is visible to admirers. So in the *Iliad*, Priam contrasts the shame of death in old age to the wonder of a warrior cut down in his prime: "For a young man all is decorous when he is cut down in battle and torn with the sharp bronze, and lies there dead, and though dead still all that shows about him is beautiful" (*Iliad* 22.71-73).[305] Tolstoy

---

[302]Cf. Morson 1987, 255-56 who explains these "finest moments" as those free from the artificial structures of performances, games and language.

[303]Vernant 1991, 57.

[304]As opposed to Pierre, for example, who, though he contemplates the end of his existence as does Andrei, appears impervious to bullets and fire

[305]I use the translation in Vernant 1991, 63-64.

ironically gives Andrei this kind of admired death in his first "dying" at Austerlitz. There, under the eyes of Kutuzov he falls with the standard. There, Napoleon, once Andrei's hero, admires the fallen Russian soldiers collectively: "De beaux hommes!" (393); and Prince Andrei singly achieves the epic goal of beautiful death as Napoleon pronounces above him: "Voilà une belle mort" (394). But similar to Anna Karenina who must live through her fantasy of romantic death, Prince Andrei cannot finish his story with his epic wish for glory fulfilled. He comes to see Napoleon there on the battlefield as a false idol in comparison with the profundity of the sky (357) and this proximity to death becomes a "return to life" (возвратили бы его к жизни).[306] This first death is thus an exorcism of epic death as it were.[307] His second, actual dying continues to subtly invert — but still engage with — the values of epic death.

Wholeness, which plays an important part in Andrei's dying, is conferred by epic death:

> In Homer the word *sôma* means precisely a body from which life has fled, the husk or shell of a once-living being. So long as the body is alive, it is seen as a system of organs and limbs animated by their individual impuses; it is a locus for the meeting, and occasional conflict, of impulses or competing forces. At death, when the body is deserted by these, it acquires its formal unity. After being the subject of and medium for various actions, more or less spontaneous, it has become wholly an object for others. Above all, it is an object of contemplation, a visual spectacle, and therefore a focus for care, mourning, and funeral rites. During the course of a battle, a warrior may have seemed to become a menace, a terror, or comfort, occasioning panic or flight, or inspiring courage and attack. Lying on the battlefield, however, he is exposed as a simple figure with identifiable attributes: this is truly Patroklos, and this Hector....[308]

Epic death integrates the warrior into an indelible individual. The hero loses all threats of dissolution and becomes permanently and identifiably himself. Prince Andrei's death is also about wholeness, but in the opposite direction. In the divine Father, Andrei finds the "unconstrained" that does not abide on earth. His struggle between human love and divine love is between the personal and the impersonal. For Andrei, death is acceptance of eternal love: "to love everyone and everything, always to sacrifice oneself for love, meant not to love any one person" (IV.i.xvi; 1173). His death is a relinquishing of the particular — not

---

[306]Cf. Morson 1987, 261-62.
[307]Compare the pathetic death of Petya which also debunks romantic heroism.
[308]Vernant 1991, 62-63.

just of his particular love for Natasha, but also of his individuated self: "All is connected by love alone. Love is God, and to die means that I, a particle of love, shall return to the universal and eternal source" (1175). Contrary to the epic hero, Andrei renounces himself and achieves wholeness by disintegrating into the eternal.

So why, after struggling with his own father and with his first father substitute, Kutuzov, does Andrei finally accept God as his divine Father? For, concerning the latter, Kutuzov has already lived out for Andrei the absence of everything personal. If Andrei can awaken into life in the divine Father, why couldn't he be reborn from Kutuzov? A main difference between the two father figures seems to be their gender identification. Kutuzov, we recall, bowing down to the Mother of God, was rather feminine, like his peacetime counterpart, Karataev. Andrei's divine Father is concerned with the masculine line: on his deathbed, Andrei contemplates God as the Father to his Son, wondering why the Son had to be sacrificed:

> "Yes, a new happiness was revealed to me — a happiness which is man's inalienable right," he said to himself as he lay in the semidarkness of the quiet hut, gazing before him with feverishly staring eyes. A happiness that lay beyond material forces, outside the material, external influences on man — a happiness of the soul alone, the happiness of loving! To feel it is within the power of every man, but only God can conceive and ordain it. But how did God ordain this law? And why was the Son ... (III.iii.xxxii; 1101; Tolstoy's ellipsis)

With this return to the dynamic of the male line as he embraces God's eternal, impersonal love, Andrei, it seems, finds in God a perfect combination of the salient qualities of his own father and of Kutuzov. Prince Andrei accepts this divine father substitute as he dies a beatific, but still masculine death.

Andrei's death, we see, thus turns away from epic in its content; it does so also in its form. For epic death is not interior. The hero does not linger, but dies quickly; and as already noted, it is seen from the outside and geared toward the praise of others:

> Greek culture is one in which everyone lives in terms of others, under the eyes and in the esteem of others, where the basis of a personality is confirmed by the extent to which its reputation is known; in such a context, real death lies in amnesia, silence, demeaning obscurity, the absence of fame. By contrast, real existence — for the living or the dead — comes from being recognized, valued, and honored. Above all, it comes from being glorified as the central figure in a song of praise, a story that endlessly tells and retells a destiny admired by all. In this sense, the hero, by the fame he has acquired in pledging

> his life to battle, inscribes his reality as an individual subject on the collective memory of the group....[309]

Recall that Andrei's "finest moments" are those which occur in solitude and silence — the moments when he is free from his burdensome bond to others. His dying comprises his final finest moment: it is a process of gradually turning completely inwards toward perfect solitude and silence.[310] Contrary to the other-centered view of epic, Andrei's death is expressed in a genre as distant from epic as possible — confession: through his process of dying, we hear Andrei's internal thoughts directed at himself and indirectly to God. And it is furthermore an ideal confession, a deathbed speech without the speech. His death is wholly from the inside, in solitude and silence.

But as far as Andrei has come from epic, after his death he is not forgotten in the novel. In fact, he achieves to some extent the epic goal cited above of inscribing "his reality as an individual subject on the collective memory of the group." Just as Tolstoy does not allow Andrei to end with an epic death, neither does he allow him to exist only in the divine realm, but portrays his part in the memories of those on earth.

The first epilogue accounts for the novel's major characters: Natasha and Pierre, and Nikolai and Marya are settled into married family life and even Denisov comes as a welcome visitor. Having taken care of them, the novel comes to rest finally with Nikolenka and his dream of his father. This stopping point of Nikolenka's dream brings into focus the absence which in a sense unites the major characters — Prince Andrei. For each protoganist harbors an intimate connection to Andrei: Natasha's love (Epilogue I.ix; 1381), Pierre's friend, Marya's brother; and even Nikolai, who respected but never quite liked Andrei, replicates that unease and dislike with Andrei's son, Nikolenka (Epilogue I.xv; 1404). The novel thus ends with a subtext about how the now silent, completed past — Andrei's life — becomes narrated and incorporated into their present. Here too, as Tolstoy has shown throughout in the way men necessarily but artificially order and narrate events

---

[309]Ibid., 57.
[310]Cf. Morson 1987, 255-56.

after the fact, memory is subjective.[311] For each character who lived through his or her experience of Andrei remembers him differently and in relation to the present. Pierre recalls Andrei with emotion; and Natasha with "thoughtful, reverent tenderness" (Epilogue I.xii; 1390). She also regains her former vivaciousness when she speaks of Andrei to Marya alone, since "she never spoke of him to her husband, imagining that he was jealous of Prince Andrei's memory" (Epilogue I.ix; 1381-82). Just as Tolstoy is an author who purposefully refrains from presenting past or present in its unknowable totality, so in the first epilogue the remembered Prince Andrei varies according to authorship. Even if one lives through an event, it shifts not only in its telling, but in its meaning as it becomes integrated into the new circumstances of the present. Andrei's contemporaries — Natasha, Pierre, and Marya — "author" him naturally and unself-consciously in fragments which shift in time and context.

Unlike Andrei's contemporaries, Andrei's son Nikolenka does not remember his father. The novel calls attention to Nikolenka's lack of direct experience of his father by repeating his absence of memory of him twice within two paragraphs (отец ... которого не помнил Николенька/ мальчик "Nikolenka did not remember his father" Epilogue I.xvi). With no direct knowledge of his father, Nikolenka gathers ideas about him from overheard, fragmentary remarks, from the tones of voice used when others talk about him (Epilogue I.xii), and by asking questions (Epilogue I.xiv). Nikolenka evidently adores the image of his father, yet he curiously fashions not his father but "Uncle Pierre" into his hero:

> ... Uncle Pierre, as he called him, was the object of his [Nikolenka's] passionate (страстной) love and admiration. No one had tried to instill in him this love for Pierre, and he rarely saw him. ... In Pierre's presence his face was always radiant with happiness, and he blushed and was almost breathless when Pierre spoke to him. He never missed anything Pierre said, and afterward, with Dessalles or by himself, would recall and ponder the meaning of his every word. Pierre'e past life and his unhappiness before 1812 (of which Nikolenka had formed a vague, romantic picture from things he had overheard), his adventures in Moscow, his captivity, Platon Karatayev (whom he knew about from Pierre), his love for Natasha (of whom the boy himself was particularly fond), and, above all, Pierre's friendship with the father Nikolenka did not remember, all made Pierre a hero and a saint in his eyes (все это делало для него из Пьера героя и святыню).
> (Epilogue I.xii;1390)

[311]Cf. for example, I.ii.xxii.

Nikolenka's love for Pierre, which makes him a hero and a saint, is both very much of this world and ecstatic; Pierre furnishes him with a living and present model. If Pierre becomes a hero and a sacred object (святыню) in Nikolenka's eyes, his father becomes a god (божеством Epilogue I.xvi). Andrei is an intangible idea to Nikolenka. He cannot imagine his father (нельзя было себе вообразить Epilogue I.xvi). Adding emphasis to the immateriality of Andrei to his son, the narrator repeats the idea: "Though there were two portraits of him in the house, Nikolenka had never visualized Prince Andrei in human form" (Epilogue I.xvi; 1410). Nikolenka's yearning for his deified father only partially ironizes that of his father for God. For both father and son share the same urge for the absolute and transcendent (a Bolkonsky urge shared also by Marya whose "spirit was ever aspiring to the infinite, the eternal, the absolute" Epilogue I.xv; 1406).[312] In his yearning for his divinized father Nikolenka displays his father's pre-Borodino striving for the absolute, the kernel of an ultimate longing directed at the divine. Just as with Andrei, this unseasoned striving for the absolute other becomes confused with the quest for glory. Inspired by his reading of Plutarch, Nikolenka fantasizes himself as a great martial hero:

> I ask God for only one thing: that something will happen to me such as happened to the men in Plutarch, and I will do as they did. I will do better. Everyone shall know of me, and they shall all love and admire me. (Epilogue I.xvi; 1410)

Nikolenka's fantasy of glory makes him begin to cry. The epilogue ends with his fantasy transformed into a dream and his fervent cry upon his awakening: "And my father? Father! Father! Yes, I will do something that even *he* would be satisfied with ..." (Epilogue I.xvi; 1411). His daydream and nighttime dreams, like those of many other characters in the novel, are effected by his external circumstances. In Nikolenka's case, his reading of Plutarch influences his dreams.

The repeated reference to Plutarch must bear significance in this highly marked place of the end of the domestic epilogue. Nikolenka's reading of Plutarch is particularly relevant to his youth in the post-Napoleonic era, as a recent commentator explains:

---

[312]Cf. Carden 1988, 116ff.

> In France, where he had long been established as a classic by Amyot, Plutarch received new honor from Napoleon, and in the series of sculptured panels around the emperor's tomb in the Invalides the one representing Education gives him pride of place. Once more, general and scholarly interest went together. This was the era of several notable editions, by the German Johann Jakob Reiske, the Greek patriot Adamantios Koraïs (printed at Paris), and the Swiss Daniel Wyttenbach, who did more for Plutarch than anyone since Estienne and who was decorated by Napoleon.[313]

At the time a household name, Plutarch was a moralizing historian for whom greatness was a key concept. Greatness was of two kinds: heroes must be involved in great actions and possess greatness of soul. The self-declared purpose of his biographical writing was contemplation (*theoria*) and imitation (*mimesis*). Following Aristotle's moral theory, he believed that to see what is good and beautiful (*kalos*) is to be drawn to it. As a result, Plutarch edited the lives of the great men of history, leaving out or apologizing for their misdeeds in order to render them into models and thus into patterns of behavior, instructive for modern readers.[314]

In important ways, one can see Plutarch as antithetical to Tolstoy's historical understanding and aims. Contrary to Plutarch's vision, for Tolstoy there are no blueprint biographies for how to lead one's life, there are no great men heroes. Plutarch exemplifies many of Tolstoy's complaints about the historiographical tradition. His writing is filled with the trademarks of traditional histories — set speeches, battle scenes, topographical descriptions and digressions. And yet, Plutarch was not primarily a historian. One does better to call him a historical moralist rather than a moralizing historian. "I am not writing history [an exact account of the details of events], but lives" wrote Plutarch in his introduction to the life of Alexander (1). Plutarch abbreviated formal history in order to get at character: for him, history was above all literature and not document; he converted history into biography.[315] How different is this from Tolstoy's appropriation of historical figures for the sake of demonstration? how different from his idea of history as not document but literature? And while Tolstoy would argue with Plutarch's great men, he

---

[313]Jones 1982, 982.
[314]Ibid., 965-970.
[315]Ibid.

was nevertheless drawn to the morally-templated life. So Tolstoy's notations for "Weekly Reading" are — somewhat ironically — dotted with excerpts from Plutarch on the virtues of vegetarianism, excerpts which uphold Plutarch as a model of a moral life.

While there is at best an ambivalent relationship between Plutarch and Tolstoy regarding history, there is a different transparent overlap between them. Beyond Plutarch's presence in the closing pages of Tolstoy's novel as a representative of the potential dangers of conventional age-old historians, is a positive and powerful reminder of one of Tolstoy's critical methods of writing. A writer perhaps as prolific as Tolstoy, Plutarch was best known and most admired for his series of twenty-three pairs of "Parallel Lives" — juxtapositions of a Greek and Roman great man, both possessed of the same qualities and in roughly similar circumstances, placed side by side to understand more exactly what those qualities are.[316] The Russian calls this work of Plutarch "Comparative Biographies" — «Сравнительные жизнеописания».[317] Comparative lives is precisely what Tolstoy's long novel presents — moments laid side by side without any authorial connectives, but with an inner logic gradually discernable. At the end of the novel, the inclusion of Nikolenka's reading of Plutarch signals the reader to think comparatively. This closing suggestion applies to the whole of the novel now visible from this endpoint, and invites also a more specific comparison. The ending with Nikolenka is very easy to explain away as the marker that what has completed a cycle in the first generation of characters who began in early adolescence and ended in married adulthood is now beginning for the next one; that is, what happened for them must be experienced in every

---

[316]Ibid., 971.

[317]Tolstoy ranked Plutarch at the second level in his hierarchy of wisdom literature, after Brahmin, Chinese, and Buddhist wisdom, Stoicism, Socrates and Christian wisdom; and together with Seneca, Cicero, and Marcus Aurelius (55.286). Plutarch appears as a repeated source for Tolstoy's espousal of vegetarianism (40.371; 41.421; 42.74-75, 446; 43.317; 45.110). And he notes that he was reading Plutarch as late as 1907 (56.3). In his record book for 1907 is an enigmatic scribble: Писать: по Плутарху, по Руссо (56.257). Although Tolstoy lists Plutarch in a list of translations (86.11), I am unable to locate the translation Tolstoy had. In a letter to V.A. Alexeev from 1890, he agrees to read Alexeev's adaptions of Plutarch. The published edition of Alexeev's translation, («Плутарх. Сравнительные жизнеописания. С греческого перевел В. Алелсеев. С введением и примечаниями. Том первый. Выпуск первый. Тезей и Ромул» изд А. С. Суворина, СПЬ 1891, с надписью В. А. Алексеева от 8 июня 1891 г.) from 1891, was kept in the library from Yasnaya Polyana — of course a rather late date in Tolstoy's career.

generation. While essentially true, Tolstoy closes the novel in a way which conjures a much more specific parallel scene.

In the epilogue, after settling Pierre and Natasha, Nikolai and Marya into their respective bedrooms, the scene switches to Nikolenka's room downstairs. The details of the setting are given: a little lamp was burning as usual, Dessalles is sleeping nearby, emitting the rhythmic sounds of snoring. Nikolenka is awakend by a terrible dream filled with fragments of his deeply experienced day: his reading of Plutarch, his joy at Pierre's return, his breaking of Nikolai's pens and sealing wax, his thoughts of his father, his dread of Nikolai. Finally, while Nikolenka is experiencing a tremendous spiritual awakening, Dessalles mistakes his weeping for a physical pain. These details of the closing scene of the novel most closely parallel another critical scene of the novel — Prince Andrei's dying and awakening at Mytishchy. All of the elements enumerated above present in Nikolenka's bedroom appear in Prince Andrei's hut. There also was the stillness of the night with everyone around Prince Andrei asleep. There also is the little light of the mushroom shaped candle, there the sounds of cricketsong and shouting and singing in the street, of cockroaches rustling and an autumn fly plopping against the pillow. There also Prince Andrei has a vision effected by the circumstances around him — the rhythm of the noises, the contingencies of where the fly fell against his face. And finally, Prince Andrei's earlier request for a book of the Gospels was also misinterpreted by his companions as a wish for a bolster against a physical and not a spiritual struggle.[318] These details of the two scenes make them unmistakably parallel — the death and awakening of the father with the "death" of his son's childhood and his awakening into incipient maturity.

Yet perhaps the most important parallel is the content of the two characters' — father and son's — dream-visions. First Prince Andrei:

> And to the sound of the whispering music Prince Andrei felt that over his face, from the very center of it, a strange, ethereal structure of delicate needles or splinters was being erected (какое-то странное воздушное здание из тонких иголок или лучинок). He felt that he must carefully maintain his balance (though this was exceedingly difficult)

[318]I follow for Nikolenka's scene points made about Andrei's by Weeks 1989.

> so that the rising edifice should not collapse; nevertheless it kept falling to pieces and slowly rising again to the sound of the rhythmical, whispered music. "It is growing, extending! It keeps expanding and spreading out!" said Prince Andrei to himself. (1101)

Then Nikolenka:

> He had dreamed that he and Uncle Pierre, wearing helmets such as those depicted in his Plutarch, were marching at the head of a vast army. The army was made up of slanting white threads that filled the air like the cobwebs that float about in autumn (Войско это было составлено из белых косых линий, наполнявших воздух подобно тем паутинам, которые летают осенью), which Dessalles called *le fil de la vièrge*. Before them was glory, which was exactly like those threads, only somewhat more dense. (1410)

Both father and son have visions of ethereal structures made up of luminous lines. Airiness is relevant to both (воздушное / воздух); autumn appears in both, for Andrei as the autumn fly (осенняя толстая муха), for Nikolenka as webs that fly in autumn (паутинам, которые летают осенью). Andrei's structure has been understood as a "pulsating structure of truth."[319] Nikolenka's cobwebby structures, the dream narrator tells us, is both the army and glory. At first he and Pierre buoyantly near their goal, but when the hostile Nikolai appears, the threads slacken and get entangled and the former lightness changes to heaviness. Unlike his father's needles or splinters, Nikolenka's threads are soft — wherefore their comparison to cobwebs and the tutor's name for them, "the threads of the Virgin." This religious name recalls Andrei's interrupted thought just prior to his vision: "And why was the Son..." (1101), a reference to Christ's sacrifice on the Cross.[320] Thus while Andrei contended with his own dying under the aegis of the divine Father, Nikolenka experiences the buoyancy of the divine Mother; in the French name *le fil de la vièrge* may even be heard a pun *le fils de la vièrge*— the son of the Virgin rather than the threads. For in his dream, Nikolenka experiences the bliss of invisible, divine, maternal care, though significantly through the presence of his father:

> Nikolenka turned to Pierre, but Pierre was no longer there. In his place was his father — Prince Andrei — and his father had neither shape nor form, but he existed, and when Nikolenka perceived him he grew faint with love: he felt himself powerless, without bones or substance. His father caressed him and pitied him (Отец ласкал и жалел его). (1410)

---

[319]Carden 1988, 119. She continues that the structure is "the Platonic idea itself, as yet undifferentiated into its verbal axioms by the process of analysis" (1988, 120).
[320]Cf. Weeks 1989, 74.

Both father and son experience the divine in their nighttime visions of ethereal structures. But whereas Andrei questions the sacrifice of the Son in relation to the divine Father, Nikolenka ecstatically dissolves under the caress of divine feminine love associated with the Virgin. Like Pierre who developed into the novelistic hero by being reborn from the motherly male Platon Karatayev, so Nikolenka here experiences a turning point out from his newly "motherly" father, Prince Andrei. Nikolenka's dream is not purely blissful. There is the terror which Nikolai presents and the march towards false epic glory. There is the waning reference of autumn, the time of his father's death and the marker of one of his own "deaths" within life. Yet the dream portends the fullness of what eventually awaits him — the experience of regenerative motherly divine love from a maternal father. Such rebirth evokes the transformation of Pierre — and not the epic Prince Andrei — into the hero of a masculinized novel. So for Nikolenka this novelizing process has begun.

Conclusion

Through different families in different places, Tolstoy incorporates a conglomerate of generic heritages into what amounts to his remaking of the novel. The Kuragins in St. Petersburg — Prince Vasily and his children, Anatol, Hélène, and Ippolit — open *War and Peace* with an ironic reference to the conventional feminine novel concerned primarily with manners and marriage. Pierre, born in Moscow, raised abroad and newly arrived in St. Petersburg where he's staying with the Kuragins, comprises a protagonist in transition from the conventional novelistic hero to a reconstruction of his Moscow birthright; Pierre's self-fashioning into a new kind of novelistic hero parallels Tolstoy's remaking of the feminine novel. Prince Andrei, in his striving for the love of strangers and his premature death, reflects the epic roots of the novel as a genre, and presents, albeit as a transitory and highly mortal option, this alternative to biological flourishing on the earthly plane only. While he moves away from his externalized epic mode to die a wholly interior death, he nevertheless retains his attachment to wholes and absolutes. His son, Nikolenka, however, promises a transition from his own epic aspirations to glory to the novelistic love of home and family. The novel's gradual trajectory from Prince Vasily to Nikolenka in a sense describes its movement away from the typical hero of the conventional novel toward a *sui generis* hero of hybrid roots in epic and novel.

In the discussion of Prince Andrei, we have seen that many readers of *War and Peace* have found connections between it and epic. In this study, I find a conclusion about the relationship between Homeric epic and Tolstoy's novel different from those concerned with theme and style. We saw in the chapters on the *Iliad* that one of the poem's primary objectives was the masculinization of death; the Iliadic representation of death removed it from the realm of gruesome feminine death — Erinyes, Harpies and Kêres — and glorified it under the benign care of Thanatos, Hades and Zeus. In this way, the *Iliad* took the most

basic concern of mortality out of the realm of the feminine and nature and brought it into the world of culture and men. *War and Peace* accomplishes a similar process of masculinizing a basic life concern as it elevates the home, marriage and parenthood from romance and pleasure to a great goal and a complete occupation for men. By recreating men into those who strive to gain the goods prescribed by Karataev — a mother, a wife, and little ones — Tolstoy reforms the conventional feminine novel into a newly masculinized one. I thus suggest that in addition to — and above and beyond — Tolstoy's use of epic similes, epithets and digressions, Homeric epic and *War and Peace* share the accomplishment of bringing what had been the terrible or trivial world of women into the realm of men and thereby transform their own genres of epic and novel into new and inimitable forms.

Bibliography

Ahl, F. and Roisman, H. M. 1996. *The Odyssey Re-Formed.* Ithaca.

Alden, M.J. 1987. "The Role of Telemachus in the 'Odyssey'." *Hermes* 115:129-137.

Alexiou, M. 1974. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tragedy.* Cambridge.

Andersen, W.J. 1957-58. "Notes on the simile in Homer and his Successors, I & II." *CJ* 53:81-87;-127-33.

Anderson, J.K. "The Geometric Catalogue of Ships." In *The Ages of Homer.* Eds. Jane B. Carter and Sarah P. Morris. Austin. 181-93.

Apthorp, M.J. 1980. "The Obstacles to Telemachus' Return." *CQ* 30:1-23.

Arieti, J. A. 1983. "Achilles's Inquiry about Machaon: The Critical Moment in the *Iliad*," *CJ* 79:125-30.

Armstrong, T. 1958. "The Arming Motif in the *Iliad*." *AJP* 79.

Arthur, M. B. 1981. "The divided world of *Iliad* VI," in *Reflections of Women in Antiquity.* Ed. Helene P. Foley. Gordon and Breach.

Austin, N. 1975. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon.* Berkeley.

Avery, H.C. 1998. "Achilles' Third Father." *Hermes* 126:389-397.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. "Epic and Novel," in *The Dialogic Imagination.* Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin.
———— 1984. *Rabelais and His World.* Tr. Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington.
———— 1990. "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity," in *Art and Answerability.* Eds. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov. Trans. Vadim Liapunov. Austin. 4-257.

Bassett, S.E. 1917-18. "The Second Necyia." *CJ* 13:521-27

Bayley, J. 1988. "Not a Novel...': *War and Peace*," in Bloom 1988, 7-41.

Beizer, J. L. 1986. *Family Plots, Balzac's Narrative Generations*. New Haven.

Belmont, D. E. 1967. "Telemachus and Nausicaa: A Study of Youth." *CJ* 63:1-10.

Benardete, S. 1997. *The Bow and the Lyre. A Platonic Reading of the Odyssey*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Benveniste, E. 1969. *Indo-European Language and Society*. Tr. Elizabeth Palmer. London: Faber and Faber.

Bergren, A.L.T. 1975. *The Etymology and Usage of ΠΕΙΡΑΡ in Early Greek Poetry*. Atlanta.
———— 1981. "Helen's 'Good Drug': *Odyssey IV 1-305*," in *Contemporary Literary Hermeneutics and Interpretation of Classical Texts*. Ed. Stephanus Kresic. Ottawa. 201-214.
———— 1983. "Odyssean Temporality: Many (Re)Turns," in *Approaches to Homer*. Eds. Carl A. Rubino and Cynthia W. Shelmerdine. Austin, TX. 38-73.

Bertman, S. 1966. "The *Telemachy* and Structural Symmetry." *TAPA* 97:15-28.
————"Structural Symmetry at the End of the *Odyssey*."
———— 1976. *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner.

Billigmeier, J-C. 1985. "Studies on Family in the Aegean Bronze Age and in Homer." *Trends in History* 3:9-18.

Bliss, F. R. 1968. "Homer and the Critics: The Structural Unity of *Odyssey* Eight." *Bucknell Review* 16:53-74.

Bloch, R. H. 1983. *Etymologies and Genealogies*. Chicago.

Bloom, H. ed. 1988. *Leo Tolstoy's War and Peace*. Chelsea House Publishers.

Braswell, B. K. 1982. "The Song of Ares and Aphrodite: Theme and Relevance to *Odyssey* 8." *Hermes* 110:129-37.

Bremer, J.M. 1981. "Greek Hymns," in *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World.* Ed. H.S. Versnel. Studies in Greek and Roman Religion. Leiden. 193-215.
———— 1985. "Four Similes in *Iliad* 22." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar,* 5:367-72.

Brenk, F.E. 1986. "Dear Child: The Speech of Phoinix and the Tragedy of Achilleus in the Ninth Book of the *Iliad.*" Eranos 84:77-86.

Brooks, P. 1984. *Reading for the Plot.* Alfred A. Knopf.

Brown, C. S. 1966. "Odysseus and Polyphemus: The Name and the Curse." *Comparative Literature* 18:193-202.

Burguière, A., Klapishch-Zuber, C., Segalen, M., and Zonabend, F. eds. 1996. *A History of the Family. Volume I: Distant Worlds, Ancient Worlds.* Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press.

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion.* Tr. John Raffan. Cambridge, Mass.

Bynum, D. E. 1968. "Themes of the Young Hero in Serbocroatian Oral Epic Tradition." *PMLA* 83:1296-1304.

Cairns, D. L. 1993. *Aidôs.* Oxford.

Carden, P. 1988. "The Recuperative Powers of Memory: Tolstoy's *War and Peace,*" in Bloom 1988, 103-123.

Carson, A. 1986. *Eros, The Bittersweet.* Princeton.

Carter, J. 1995. "Ancestor Cult and the Occasion of Homeric Performance." In *The Ages of Homer.* Eds. Jane B. Carter and Sarah P. Morris. Austin. 285-315.

Chittenden, J. 1947. "The Master of Animals." *Hesperia* 16:89-114.

Christian, R.F. 1968. *Tolstoy's 'War and Peace.'* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Clark, M.E. and Coulson, W.D.E. 1978. "Memnon and Sarpedon." *MH* 35:65-73.

Clarke, H. W. 1963. "Telemachus and the *Telemacheia*." *AJP* 84: 129-46.
———————— 1967. *The Art of the Odyssey.* Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Clay, J.S. 1989. *The Politics of Olympus.* Princeton.

Coffey, M. 1957. "The function of the Homeric simile." *AJP* 78:113-32.

Combellack, F.M. 1982. "Two Blameless Homeric Characters." *AJP* 103:361-372.

Cook, A. 1984. "Visual Aspects of the Homeric Simile in Indo-European Context." *QUCC* 17:39-59.

Cook, E. F. 1995. *The Odyssey in Athens.* Ithaca.

Cowan, L. 1992. "Introduction: The Epic as Cosmopoesis," in *The Epic Cosmos.* Ed. Larry Allums. Dallas: The Dallas Institute of Humanities and Culture.

Cramer, O. C. 1976. "Speech and Silence in the *Iliad*," *CJ* 71:300-304.

Crotty, C. 1994. *The Poetics of Supplication. Homer's Iliad and Odyssey.* Ithaca.

Cunliffe, R. J. 1963. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Darian, S.G. 1973. "Similes and the Creative Process." *Language and Style* 6:48-58.

D'Arms, E.F. and Hulley, K.K. 1946. "The Oresteia-Story in the *Odyssey*." *TAPA* 77:207-213.

Davidson, O.M. 1980. "Indo-European Dimensions of Herakles in *Iliad* 19.95-133." *Arethusa* 13:197-202.

Davies, D.R. 1992. *Genealogy and Catalogue: Thematic Relevance and Narrative Elaboration in Homer and Hesiod.* Dissertation: University of Michigan.

Davis, R.C. 1988. "Great Father," in *Dictionary of Literary Themes and Motifs A-J.* Ed. Jean-Charles Seigneuret. Greenwood Press.

Dee, J.H. 1994. The Epithetic Phrases for the Homeric Gods. Garland Publishing.

De Jong, I.J.F. 1989. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad.* Amsterdam.

Delcourt, M. 1957. *Héphaistos ou la légende du magicien.* Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 146. Paris.

Delebecque, E. 1958. *Télémacque et la structure de l'Odyssée. Publication des annales de la Faculté des Lettres.* Aix-en-Provence: Editors Ophyrs. N.S. 21.

Detienne, M. 1996. *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece.* Tr. Janet Lloyd. New York: Zone Books.

Detienne, M. and Sissa, G. 1989. *La Vie Quotidienne des Dieux Grecs.* Hachette.

Detienne, M. and Vernant, J-P. 1978. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society.* Tr. Janet Lloyd. Sussex and New Jersey.

Dickson, K. 1995. *Nestor. Poetic Memory in Greek Epic.* Garland Publishing, Inc.

Dietrich, B.C. 1964. "Xanthus' Prediction," *Acta Classica* 7:9-24.

Donlan, W. 1989. "The Unequal Exchange between Glaucus and Diomedes in Light of the Homeric Gift-Economy," *Phoinix* 43:1-15.

Düring, I. 1943. "Klutaimestra — νηλὴς γυνά. A Study of the Development of a Literary Motif." Eranos 41:91-123.

Eckert, C. W. 1963. "Initiatory Motifs in the Story of Telemachus." *CJ* 59:49-58.

Edinger, H. G. 1980. "The Lay of Demodocus in Context." *Humanities Association Review* 31:45-51.

Edmunds, S. 1990. *Homeric Nêpios.* Garland.

Edwards, A.T. 1985. *Achilles in the Odyssey. Ideologies of Heroism in the Homeric Epic.* Königstein/Ts.: Hain.

Edwards, M.W. 1987. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad.* Baltimore.
———— 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Volume V. Cambridge.

Ellmann, M. 1982. "Polytropic Man: Paternity, Identity and Naming in *The Odyssey* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man,*" in *James Joyce: New Perspectives.* Ed. Colin MacCabe. Bloomington. 73-105.

Farnell, L.R. 1896-1909. *The Cults of the Greek States* I-V. Oxford.

Faulkner, T.M. 1995. *The Poetics of Old Age in Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy.* Norman, Oklahoma.

Fenik, B. 1974. *Studies in the Odyssey.* Hermes Einzelschrift 30. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Feuer, K.B. 1996. *Tolstoy and the Genesis of War and Peace.* Ithaca.

Finlay, R. 1980. "Patroklos, Achilleus, and Peleus: Fathers and Sons in the *Iliad.*" *CW* 73:267-273.

Finley, J. H. Jr., 1978. *Homer's Odyssey.* Cambridge, Mass.

Finley, M.I. 1954. *The World of Odysseus.* Penguin.

Foley, H. 1978. "'Reverse Similes' and Sex Roles in the *Odyssey.*" *Arethusa* 11.1,2:7-26.

Foley, J. M. 1995. "Sixteen Moments of Silence in Homer," *QUCC* 50:7-26.

Ford, Andrew. 1992. *Homer, The Poetry of the Past.* Ithaca.

Frame, D. 1978. *The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic.* New Haven.

Freccero, C. 1991. *Father Figures, Genealogy and Narrative Structure in Rabelais.* Ithaca.

Freud, S. 1913. *Totem and Taboo.* New York.
———— 1939. *Moses and Monotheism.* New York.

Gagarin, M. 1983. "Antilochus' Strategy: The Chariot Race in *Iliad* 23," *CP* 78:35-39.

Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth.* Baltimore.

Garland, R. 1981. "The Causation of Death in the *Iliad* : A Theological and Biological Investigation." *BICS* 28:43-60.

Garvie, A.F. 1986. *Aeschylus Choephori.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gates, H.P. 1971. *The Kinship Terminology of Homeric Greek.* Supplement to the International Journal of American Linguistics 37.4.2. Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics, Memoir 27.

Glenn, J. 1971. "The Polyphemus Folktale and Homer's *Kyklôpeia.*" *TAPA* 102:133-81.
————1972. "Homer's 'God-Trusting' Cyclopes." *CW* 65:218-220.

Goldhill, S. 1988. "Reading Differences: The *Odyssey* and Juxtaposition." *Ramus* 17:1-31.
————1991. *The Poet's Voice. Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature.* Cambridge.

Gould, J. 1973. "Hiketeia." *JHS* 93:74-103.

Griffin, J. 1980. *Homer on Life and Death.* Oxford.

Griffith, M. 1990. "Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry," in *Cabinet of the Muses.* Eds. M. Griffith and D.J. Mastronarde. Scholars Press. 185-207.
————1999. "The King and Eye: The Rule of the Father in Greek Tragedy." *HSCP* 99.

Haft, A. J. 1984. "Odysseus, Idomeneus and Meriones: The Cretan Lies of *Odyssey* 13-19." *CJ* 79:289-306.

Hainsworth, B. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Volume III. Cambridge.

Halverson, J. 1986. "The Succession Issue in the *Odyssey*." *G&R* 33:119-128.

Hansen, W.F. 1972. *The Conference Sequence. Patterned Narration and Narrative Inconsistency in the Odyssey*. Berkeley.

Harkins, W.E. 1985. "Folktale" entry in the *Handbook of Russian Literature*. Ed. Victor Terras. New Haven.

Hart, W. M. 1943. "High Comedy in the *Odyssey*." *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 13:263-78.

Held, G.F. 1987. "Phoinix, Agamemnon and Achilleus: Parables and Paradeigmata." *CQ* 37:245-261.

Heubeck, A. and Hoekstra, A.. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Volume II. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Heubeck, A. and West, S. and Hainsworth, J.B. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Himmelmann, N. 1998. "The Plastic Arts in Homeric Society," in *Reading Greek Art. Selected Essays by Nikolaus Himmelmann*. Ed. and tr. W.A.P. Childs. Princeton. 25-66.

Holbrook, D. 1997. *Tolstoy, Woman, and Death*. New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

Hölscher, U. 1967. "Die Atridensage in der Odyssee," in *Festschrift für Richard Alewyn*. Cologne. 1-16.
———— 1989. *Die Odyssee. Epos zwischen Maerchen und Roman*. Munich.

Hommel, H. 1955. "Aigisthus und die Freier." *Studium Generale* 8:237-245.

Householder, F.W. and Nagy, G. 1972. "Greek." *Current Trends in Linguistics* IX, ed. T.A. Sebeok, 735-816. The Hague.

Hubbard, T.K. 1981. "Antithetical Simile Pairs in Homer." *Grazer Beitrage* 10:59-67.

Humphreys, S.C. 1993. *The Family, Women, and Death.* 2nd. edition. Michigan.

Hyde, L. 1998. *Trickster Makes This World.* Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Isaacs, H.R. 1978. "Bringing up the Father Question." In *Daedalus* 107:189-203.

Jackson, R. L. 1978. "The Second Birth of Pierre Bezukhov." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 12.4 (535-542).

Janko, R. 1992. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Volume IV. Cambridge.

Jepsen, L. 1978. *From Achilles to Christ. The Myth of the Hero in Tolstoy's* War and Peace.

Jensen, M.S. 1980. *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory.* Opuscula Graecolatina 20. Copenhagen.

Jones, C.P. 1982. "Plutarch," in *Ancient Writers Greece and Rome II.* Ed. T. James Luce. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons: 961-983.

Kakridis, J. 1949. *Homeric Researches.* Lund.

Katz, M. 1991. *Penelope's Renown.* Princeton.

Kearns, E. 1982. "The Return of Odysseus: A Homeric Theoxeny." *CQ* 32:2-8.

Kerenyi, C. 1975. *Zeus and Hera. Archetypal Image of Father, Husband, and Wife.* Princeton: Bollingen Series LXV.5.

King, B. M. 1997. "The End of Adventure: On the Future of the Iliadic Hero." Dissertation: University of Chicago.

Kirk, G.S. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Volume I. Cambridge.
———— 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Volume II. Cambridge.

Kullman, W. 1956. *Das Wirken der Gotter in der Ilias.* Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.

Lacan, J. 1993. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book III. The Psychoses 1955-1956.* Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Tr. Russell Grigg. W.W. Norton & Co.

Lacey, W.K. 1968. *The Family in Classical Greece.* London: Thames and Hudson.

Lateiner, D. 1995. *Sardonic Smile.* Ann Arbor.

Latte, K. 1931. Beiträge zum griechischen Strafrecht I.II. *Hermes* 66:129-158.

Lattimore, R. 1951. *The Iliad of Homer.* Chicago.

Leaf, W. 1960. *The Iliad.* 2 vols. Amsterdam.

Lechter, S.L. 1994. *The Portrayal of the Family in Early Greek Hexameter Poetry.* MA thesis: University of Victoria.

Lee, M. O. 1979. *Fathers and Sons in Virgil's Aeneid.* Albany.

Lesky, A. 1967. "Die Schuld der Klytaimestra." *WS* 53:5-21.

Levine, D. B. 1983. "Theoklymenos and the Apocalypse." *CJ* 79:1-8.

Littleton, C.S. 1970. "The 'Kingship in Heaven' Theme," in *Myth and Law among the Indo-Europeans.* Berkeley.

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1971. *The Justice of Zeus.* Berkeley.

Lord, A. 1960. *The Singer of Tales.* Cambridge, Mass.

Lowenstam, S. 1981. *The Death of Patroklos.* Verlag Anton Haig.

Lynn-George, M. 1988. *Epos: Word, Narrative and the Iliad.* New Jersey: Humanities Press International, Inc.

MacCary, W.T. 1982. *Childlike Achilles. Ontogeny and Phylogeny in the Iliad.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Mackie, H. 1996. *Talking Trojan. Speech and Community in the Iliad.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Macleod, C.W. 1982. *Homer: Iliad, Book XXIV.* Cambridge.

Marg, W. 1942. "Kampf und Tod in der Ilias," *Die Antike* 18:167-79; revised and expanded in *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, n.s., 2 (1976) 7-19.

Martin, R. P. 1983. *Healing, Sacrifice and Battle.* Innsbruck.
———— 1984. "Hesiod, Odysseus, and the Instruction of Princes." *TAPA* 114:29-48.
———— 1989. *The Language of Heroes. Speech and Performance in the Iliad.* Ithaca.
———— 1992. "Hesiod's Metanastic Poetics," *Ramus* 21.1:11-33.
———— 1993. "Telemachus and the Last Hero Song," *Colby Quarterly* 29:222-41.

Masset, C. 1996. "Prehistory of the Family," in Burguière 1996, 71-91.

McCall, M.H. 1969. *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison.* Cambridge, Mass.

Meier, P.J. 1893. "Agones," *RE* 1:836-67.

Millar, C.M.H. and Carmichael, J.W.S. 1954. "The Growth of Telemachus." *G&R* 1:58-64.

Miller, D.A. 1977. "A Note on Aegisthus as 'Hero'." *Arethusa* 10:259-268.

Miller, M. 1953. "Greek Kinship Terminology." *JHS* 73:46-52.

Minchin, E. 1991. "Speaker and Listener, Text and Context: Some Notes on the Encounter of Nestor and Patroklos in *Iliad* 11," *CW* 84:273-85.

Mondi, R. 1983. "The Homeric Cyclopes: Folktale, Tradition, and Theme." *TAPA* 113:17-38.

Monsacré, H. 1984. *Les larmes d'Achille. Le héros, la femme et la souffrance dans la poésie d'Homère.* Paris: Albin Michel.

Morson, G.S. 1987. *Hidden in Plain View: Narrative and Creative Potentials in 'War and Peace.'* Stanford.

Moulton, C. 1974. "The End of the *Odyssey*." *GRBS* 153-69.
———— 1977. *Similes in the Homeric Poems.* Hypomnemata 49. Göttingen.
———— 1981. "The Speech of Glaukos in Iliad 17." *Hermes* 109:1-9.

Muellner, L. C. 1976. *The Meaning of Homeric EYXOMAI through its Formulas.* Innsbruck.
———— 1996. *The Anger of Achilles. Mênis in Greek Epic.* Ithaca.

Murnaghan, S. 1987. *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey.* Princeton.
———— 1992. "Maternity and Mortality in Homeric Poetry." *CA* 11:242-264.

Nagler, M.N. 1990. "Odysseus: The Proem and the Problem." *CA* 9:335-356.

Nagy, G. 1974. *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter.* Cambridge, Mass.
————1979. *The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry.* Baltimore.
————1982. "Hesiod," in *Ancient Writers.* Ed. T.J. Luce. New York.
————1990. "The Death of Sarpedon and the Question of Homeric Uniqueness," in *Greek Mythology and Poetics.* Ithaca. 122-42.

Newton, R. M. 1984. "The Rebirth of Odysseus." *GRBS* 25:5-21.

Niles, J. D. 1978. "Patterning in the Wanderings of Odysseus." *Ramus* 7:46-60.

Nimis, S.A. 1987. *Narrative Semiotics in the Epic Tradition: The Simile.* Bloomington.

O'Brien, J.V. 1993. *The Transformation of Hera.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Olson, S.D. 1990. "The Stories of Agamemnon in Homer's *Odyssey*." *TAPA* 120:57-71.
————1995. *Blood and Iron.* Mnemosyne Supplement.

Ortony, A. 1979. "The Role of Similarity in Similes and Metaphors," in *Metaphor and Thought.* Ed. Andrew Ortony. Cambridge. 186-202.

Orwin, D.T. 1993. *Tolstoy's Art and Thought, 1847-1880.* Princeton.

Otto, W. F. 1954. *The Homeric Gods.* Thames and Hudson.

Padel, R. 1990. "Making Space Speak," in *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama and Its Social Context.* Eds. J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin. Princeton. 336-65.

Page, D. 1955. *The Homeric Odyssey.* Oxford.

Parry, M. 1933. "The traditional metaphor in Homer." *CP* 28:30-42.

Paton, W.R. 1912. "The Armour of Achilles," *CR* 26:1-4.

Peabody, B. 1975. *The Winged Word.* Albany.

Pedrick, V. 1982. "Supplication in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*." *TAPA* 112:125-140.
———— 1983. The Paradigmatic Nature of Nestor's Speech in *Iliad* 11," *TAPA* 113:55-68.

Peradotto, J. 1980. *Man in the Middle Voice. Name and Narration in the Odyssey.* Princeton.

Perry, B.E. 1937. "The Early Greek Capacity for Seeing Things Separately." *TAPA* 68:403-427.

Podlecki, A.J. 1961. "Guest-Gifts and Nobodies in *Odyssey* 9." *Phoinix* 15:125-33.
———— 1967. "Omens in the *Odyssey*." *G&R* 14:12-21.

Porter, D.H. 1972. "Violent Juxtaposition in the Similes of the *Iliad*." *CJ* 68:11-21.

Powell, B. B. 1977. *Composition by Theme in the Odyssey.* Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie. Verlag Anton Hain. Heft 81.

Pratt, L. 1993. *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar.* Ann Arbor.

Price, M. 1988. "Forms of Life and Death: *War and Peace*," in Bloom 1988, 123-131.

Prunty, W. 1990. *"Fallen from the Symboled World."* Oxford.

Pucci, P. 1982. "The Proem of the *Odyssey*." *Arethusa* 15:39-62.
————1987. *Odysseus Polutropos*. Ithaca.
————1992. *Oedipus and the Fabrication of the Father*. Baltimore.
————1998. *The Song of the Sirens. Essays on Homer*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Rabel, R.J. 1990. "Apollo as a Model for Achilles in the *Iliad*." *AJP* 111:429-440.

Quinby, L. 1995. *Genealogy and Literature*. Minneapolis.

Quint, D. 1983. *Origin and Originality in Renaissance Literature*. New Haven.

Race, W. H. 1993. "First Appearances in the *Odyssey*." *TAPA* 123:79-107.

Rancour-Laferriere, D. 1993. *Tolstoy's Pierre Bezukhov: A Psychoanalytic Study*. Bristol Classical Press.

Rauber, D.F. 1969-70. "Some metaphysical aspects of the Homeric simile." *CJ* 65:97-103.

Redfield, J. M. 1975. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad*. Chicago.
———— 1979. "Foreword" to Nagy 1979.

Reinhardt, K. 1960. "Tradition und Geist im homerischen Epos," in *Tradition und Geist: Gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung*. Göttingen.

Richardson, N.J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford.
———— 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Volume VI. Cambridge.

Rohde, E. 1898. *Psyche*. 2nd. edition. Freiburg.

Roisman, H. 1988. "Nestor's Advice and Antilochus' Tactics," *Phoinix* 42:114-20.
———— 1994. "Like Father Like Son: Telemachus's *kerdea*." *RhM* 137:1-22.

Romm, J.S. 1992. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*. Princeton.

Rose, G. P. 1967. "The Quest of Telemachus." *TAPA* 98:391-99.

Rosner, J.A. 1976. "The Speech of Phoinix: *Iliad* 9.434-605." *Phoinix* 30:314-327.

Russo, J. and Fernandez-Galiano, M. and Heubeck, A. 1992. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Volume III. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sankovitch, N. 1998. *Creating and Recovering Experience. Repetition in Tolstoy*. Stanford.

Schadewaldt, W. 1965. *Von Homers Welt und Werk*. 4th ed. Stuttgart.

Schein, S.L. 1970. "Odysseus and Polyphemus in the *Odyssey*." *GRBS* 11:73-83.
———— 1984. *The Mortal Hero*. Berkeley.
————ed. 1996. *Reading the Odyssey. Selected Interpretive Essays*. Princeton.

Schmiel, R. 1972. "Telemachus in Sparta." *TAPA* 103:463-472.

Scodel, R. 1977. "Apollo's Perfidy: *Iliad* Ω 59-63," *HSCP* 81:55-57.
———— 1982. "The Achaean Wall and the Myth of Destruction," *HSCP* 86:33-50.

Scott, J. A. 1917-18. "The Journey Made by Telemachus and its Influence on the Action of the *Odyssey*." *CJ* 13:420-29.

Scott, W.C. 1974. *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile*. Mnemosyne Supplement.

Scully, S. 1990. *Homer and the Sacred City*. Ithaca.

Segal, C. 1994. *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey*. Ithaca.

Servais, J. 1960. "Les suppliants dans la 'Loi sacré' de Cyrène." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 84:112-147.

Shannon, R. S. 1975. *The Arms of Achilles and Homeric Compositional Technique*. Mnemosyne Supplement.

Shewan, A. 1926. "Telemachus at Sparta." *CJ* 22:31-38.

Silbajoris, R. 1995. *War and Peace. Tolstoy's Mirror of the World.* Twayne Publishers.

Simon, B. 1974. "The Hero as an Only Child: An Unconscious Fantasy Structuring Homer's *Odyssey.*" *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 55:555-565.

Sinos, D.S. 1980. *Achilles, Patroklos and the Meaning of Philos.* Innsbruck.

Sissa, G. 1996. "The Family in Ancient Athens (Fifth-Fourth Century BC)," in Burguière 1996, 194-227.

Slater, P.E. 1968. *The Glory of Hera. Greek Mythology and the Greek Family.* Princeton.

Slatkin, L.M. 1986. "Genre and Generation in the *Odyssey.*" *Metis* 1:259-268.
———1991. *The Power of Thetis. Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad.* Berkeley.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1971. *The Dark Age of Greece: An Archaeological Survey of the Eleventh to the Eighth Centuries.* Edinburgh.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1995. *Reading Greek Death.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sowa, C.A. 1984. *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns.* Bochazy-Carducci Publishers.

Stanford, W.B. 1947. *The Odyssey of Homer.* Macmillan.
——— 1963. *The Ulysses Theme. A Study of the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
——— 1972. *Greek Metaphor.* London.

Stanley, K. 1993. *The Shield of Homer. Narrative Structure in the Iliad.* Princeton.

Starr, C.G. 1968. "Ideas of Truth in Early Greece." *La parola del passato* 23:348-59.

Stevenson, T.R. 1992. "The Ideal Benefactor and the Father Analogy in Greek and Roman Thought." *CQ* 42:421-436.

Strauss, B. S. 1993. *Fathers and Sons in Athens.* Princeton.

Sutton, D. 1984. *The Lost Sophocles.* Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.

Synodinou, K. 1986. "The Relationship between Zeus and Athena in the *Iliad*," *Dodonê* 15:155-64.

Thalmann, W.G. 1984. *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry.* Baltimore.

Thornton, A. 1984. *Homer's Iliad: its Composition and the Motif of Supplication.* Göttingen: Hypomnemata.

Tolstoy, L.N. 1980. *War and Peace.* Tr. Ann Dunnigan. Signet.

Толстой, Л.Н. 1953. Полное собрание сочинений. Государственное издательство художественной литературы. Москва.

Trahmann, C. 1952. "Odysseus' Lies (*Odyssey*, Books 13-19)." *Phoinix* 6:31-43.

Trypanis, C.A. 1963. "Brothers Fighting Together in the Iliad," *RhM* 106:289-97.

Verdenius, W.J. 1985. *A Commentary on Hesiod Works and Days, vv. 1-382.* Mnemosyne Supplement. Leiden.

Vermeule, E. 1979. *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry.* Berkeley.

Vernant, J-P. 1981. "Death with Two Faces," in *Mortality and Immortality: the Anthropology and Archaeology of Death.* Ed. S.C. Humphreys and Helen King. Academic Press.
————————1983. *Myth and Thought among the Greeks.* Routledge & Kegan Paul.
————————1991. *Mortals and Immortals.* Ed. Froma I. Zeitlin. Princeton.
————————1996. "Death with Two Faces." In Schein 1996, 55-62.

Vian, F. 1985. "La fonction guerrière dans la Mythologie Grecque," in *Problèmes de la Guerre en Grèce ancienne.* Ed. J-P. Vernant. Paris.

Vidal-Naquet, P. 1986. *The Black Hunter. Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World.* Tr. Andrew Szegedy-Maszak. Baltimore.

Vivante, P. 1970. *The Homeric Imagination.* Bloomington.

Weeks, J. 1989. "Love, Death, and Cricketsong. Prince Andrei at Mytishchi," in *In the Shade of the Giant. Essays on Tolstoy.* Ed. Hugh McLean. Berkeley: 61-83.

Wender, D. 1978. *The Last Scenes of the Odyssey. Mnemosyne*, suppl. 52. Leiden.

West, M.L. 1966. *Hesiod's Theogony.* Oxford.

West, S. 1989. "Laertes Revisited." *PCPhS* 35:113-43.

Whitman, C. H. 1958. *Homer and the Homeric Tradition.* Cambridge, Mass.

Willcock, M. M. 1973. "The Funeral Games of Patroclus," *BICS* 20:1-9.
———— 1976. *A Companion to the Iliad.* Chicago.
———— 1983. "Antilochos in the *Iliad*," in *Melanges Edouard Delebecque.* Universite de Provence. 479-85.

Willis, W. H. 1941. "Athletic Contests in the Epic," *TAPA* 72:392-417.

Wilson, D.F. forthcoming. "Symbolic Violence in *Iliad* Book 9."

Wilson, J. R. 1974. "The Wedding Gifts of Peleus," *Phoinix* 28:385-89.

Wohl, V. 1998. *Intimate Commerce. Exchange, Gender, and Subjectivity in Greek Tragedy.* Austin.

Woodhouse, W.J. 1930. *The Composition of Homer's* Odyssey. Oxford.

Zeitlin, F. I. 1996. "Figuring Fidelity in Homer's *Odyssey*," in *Playing the Other. Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature.* Chicago. 19-42.

Zonabend, F. 1996. "An Anthropological Perspective on Kinship and the Family," in Burguière 1996, 8-70.