

HOMER  
ILIAD

BOOK VI

EDITED BY  
BARBARA GRAZIOSI

*Professor of Classics,  
Durham University*

JOHANNES HAUBOLD

*Leverhulme Senior Lecturer in Greek Literature,  
Durham University*



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Ex Libris  
Paul Schubert

## CONTENTS

---

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| <i>Acknowledgements</i>   | page ix |
| <i>List of abbreviations</i>                                      | x       |
| Introduction  | i       |
| 1 <i>The poet and the Muses</i>                                   | i       |
| 2 <i>The composition of Homeric epic</i>                          | 8       |
| 2.1 <i>The hexameter</i>  | 10      |
| 2.2 <i>Formulae and their meaning</i>                             | 13      |
| 2.3 <i>Traditional narrative patterns</i>                         | 16      |
| 2.4 <i>Language</i>   | 18      |
| 2.5 <i>Grammar</i>  | 21      |
| 2.6 <i>Vividness</i>  | 23      |
| 3 <i>Book 6 in the structure of the Iliad</i>                     | 24      |
| 3.1 <i>The gods</i>   | 26      |
| 3.2 <i>Men and women</i>  | 29      |
| 3.3 <i>The city of Troy</i>                                       | 32      |
| 4 <i>Difficult encounters</i>                                     | 34      |
| 4.1 <i>Glaukos and Diomedes</i>                                   | 36      |
| 4.2 <i>Hector and Hecuba</i>                                      | 40      |
| 4.3 <i>Hector, Paris and Helen</i>                                | 41      |
| 4.4 <i>Hector and Andromache</i>                                  | 44      |
| 5 <i>The encounter between Hector and Andromache through time</i> | 47      |
| 6 <i>The text</i>   | 56      |
| ΙΛΙΑΔΟΣ Ζ   | 59      |
| Commentary  | 76      |
| <i>Bibliography</i>   | 235     |
| <i>Indices</i>  | 263     |

## ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations mainly follow those used in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* with the following variations and additions:

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <i>LfgvE</i>     | <i>Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos</i> , ed. B. Snell, U. Fleischer and H.-J. Mette <i>et al.</i> , Göttingen 1955– |
| <i>New Pauly</i> | <i>Brill's New Pauly: encyclopaedia of the ancient world</i> , ed. H. Cancik and H. Schneider, Leiden 2007            |

## INTRODUCTION

### 1. THE POET AND THE MUSES

In his *Collection of useful knowledge* Proclus observes that Homer said nothing about his own origins and lineage, and that ‘because his poetry gives no express indication on these questions, each writer has indulged his inclinations with great freedom’.<sup>1</sup> This is a perceptive comment: from antiquity to the present there has been much debate about the origin, date and authorship of Homeric epic – a debate fuelled, in part, by a lack of reliable information. And yet the *Iliad* does say something important about its poet, and in order to offer an introduction to Homeric poetry, it seems reasonable to start with the image of the poet presented in the *Iliad* itself, before broaching the many, and difficult, issues on which the poem offers no explicit guidance.

The poem starts with an order: ‘Sing, goddess, the wrath of Achilles.’ Like all second-person addresses, this opening invocation establishes a specific relationship between speaker and addressee. The poet asks the goddess to sing and she evidently complies with his request: what follows, after the proem, is indeed a song about the wrath of Achilles. Song, *ᾠοιδή*, is a word the poet uses for his own performance: the Muse sings, and the poet sings too, about the same topic. After the proem their voices blend, until the poet faces particularly difficult challenges. Before launching into the massive Catalogue of Ships in book 2, for example, the poet suddenly puts some distance between himself and the Muse, re-establishes his own individual voice with the pronoun *μοι*, and asks, again, for divine support (2.484–93):

ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι –  
ὕμεις γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστε τε ἴστε τε πάντα,  
ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν –  
οἳ τινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν.  
πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὄνομήνω,  
οὐδ' εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλώσσοι, δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἴεν,  
φωνὴ δ' ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δὲ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη,  
εἴ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι, Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο  
θυγατέρες, μνησαίαθ' ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον.  
ἀρχοὺς αὖ νηῶν ἐρέω νῆάς τε προπάσας.

Tell me now, you Muses who have your homes on Olympus –  
for you are goddesses, are present and know all things,  
but we hear only the *kleos* and know nothing –  
who were the leaders and commanders of the Danaans.  
I could not tell the masses nor name them,

<sup>1</sup> Proclus, *Chrestomathy* I, trans. M. L. West 2003: 419.

not even if I had ten tongues and ten mouths,  
 a voice that cannot break, and a heart of bronze inside me,  
 unless the Muses of Olympus, daughters of aegis-bearing  
 Zeus, remembered all of those who came to Ilios;  
 but now I will tell the leaders of the ships, and all the ships there were.

The Muses alone 'are present and know all things'. Without their help, the poet is in exactly the same position as his audience: 'we have only heard the κλέος, and know nothing'. κλέος is, literally, 'what is heard': the word sometimes describes the subject matter of epic poetry (e.g. *Od.* 3.204, 8.73; *Hes. Theog.* 99–101; *Hom. Hymn* 32.18–20; cf. *Il.* 9.189). The Muse 'sings', and the audience 'hear': in between, mediating in that complex transaction, stands the poet. At 2.487 the poet asks the Muses to tell him who the leaders of the Danaans were; he then declares he needs their help in order to relate to the audience this information; and finally, at 493, he launches into the grandest and most impressive catalogue in the whole poem. The Muses and the poet sing in unison again for a while; but the invocation establishes the terms of their relationship.<sup>2</sup> The goddesses guarantee the accuracy of the poet's performance (they 'know everything'); while the poet's performance, in turn, guarantees their presence (he states he could not accomplish his poetic feat without their help). Through this interaction, the ability to perform and the accuracy of the performance are tightly woven together.

We may wonder about the meaning of πάρεστε, at 2.485: are the Muses 'present', in the sense that they are in the company of the poet and his audience; or are they 'present' in Troy, at the time of the Trojan expedition? This question admits of no straightforward answer. Clearly, the Muses and the poet enjoy an intimate relationship, and the result of that relationship is the performance itself, in front of an audience. But the 'presence' of the Muses, in our passage, does not just concern their impact on the poet and his audience: it is closely linked to the Muses' own knowledge of the Trojan expedition, and to their divine powers more generally: ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστε τε ἴστε τε πάντα, 'you are goddesses, are present, and know all things'. Hesiod tells us that the Muses please the mind of Zeus by 'telling what is, what will be, and what was before' (εἰρεῦσαι τὰ τ' ἔοντα τὰ τ' ἔσομένα πρό τ' ἔοντα; *Theog.* 38). Their knowledge has a temporal dimension in the *Iliad* too: they bridge the gap between the great events at Troy, and the world of Homeric audiences. The poet never describes his audience in any detail, but he does imply that his performance takes place long after the age of the heroes: he repeatedly compares the feats of his heroic characters with the meagre achievements of 'people as they are nowadays' (5.302–4, 12.378–83, 445–9 and 20.285–7).

<sup>2</sup> Later the poet asks the Muse to identify the best of the Achaeans (2.761–2). At 11.218–20 and 14.508–10, two important moments in the narrative, he asks the Muses to establish the correct order of events. At 16.112–13 he demands to know how the ships of the Achaeans caught fire. In every case, the poet goes on to provide the information he requested of the goddesses.

The question about the 'presence' of the Muses also applies to the position of the epic singer, as a passage in the *Odyssey* makes clear. When Odysseus arrives at the land of the Phaeacians, he has lost everything: his ship, his comrades, his possessions, even his clothes. The Phaeacians cannot, therefore, establish his identity on the basis of any external evidence; they can only rely on what he says himself – and that, of course, is a risk because travellers often lie. Fortunately, there is one character, in the land of the Phaeacians, who already knows about Odysseus and is thus in a position to corroborate his story. In the course of celebrations in honour of the shipwrecked stranger, the singer Demodocus entertains his audience with three songs: the first is about a quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles (8.73–82); the second is set on Olympus and describes an adulterous love affair between Ares and Aphrodite (8.266–366); the third celebrates the fall of Troy, and Odysseus' stratagem of the Trojan horse (8.499–520). Demodocus is blind: he does not know that Odysseus, a major character in his own songs, is right there, among his audience. It is Odysseus who recognises himself in Demodocus' first song: he pulls up his cloak, covers his head, and cries (8.83–92). Later, before Demodocus' third song, he praises the singer (8.487–91):

“Δημόδοκ', ἔξοχα δὴ σε βροτῶν αἰνίζομ' ἀπάντων  
 ἢ σέ γε Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε, Διὸς παῖς, ἢ σέ γ' Ἀπόλλων.  
 λίην γὰρ κατὰ κόσμον Ἀχαιῶν οἶτον αἰεῖδεις,  
 ὅσσ' ἔρξαν τ' ἔπαθόν τε καὶ ὅσσ' ἐμόγησαν Ἀχαιοί,  
 ὧς τέ που ἢ αὐτὸς παρεῶν ἢ ἄλλου ἀκούσας.”

'Demodocus, greatly I praise you, above all mortals;  
 either the Muse, daughter of Zeus, taught you, or Apollo.  
 You sing the fate of the Achaeans precisely, according to order;  
 what they did and endured and all they suffered,  
 as if you had been there yourself, or heard from someone who had.'

There is a striking correspondence between the suffering of the Achaeans and Odysseus' own pain, as he listens and remembers his past. It is through tears, and poetry, that Odysseus first begins to reveal himself to his hosts. After paying his compliment to Demodocus, Odysseus asks the bard to sing about the fall of Troy, and the stratagem of the Trojan horse. It is after that performance that he finally reveals his identity: in books 9–12 Odysseus takes over from Demodocus' story and tells what happened after the fall of Troy. The Phaeacians believe Odysseus because he sounds like a singer (11.363–9):

“ὦ Ὀδυσσεῦ, τὸ μὲν οὐ τί σ' εἴσκομεν εἰσορόωντες  
 ἠπεροπῆά τ' ἔμεν καὶ ἐπὶ κλοπῶν, οἳά τε πολλοῦς  
 βόσκει γαῖα μέλαινα πολυσπερέας ἀνθρώπους  
 ψεύδεά τ' ἀρτύνοντας, ὅθεν κέ τις οὐδὲ ἴδοιτο·  
 σοὶ δ' ἔπι μὲν μορφή ἑπέων, ἐνὶ δὲ φρένες ἐσθλαί,  
 μῦθον δ' ὡς ὅτ' αἰοῖδός ἐπισταμένως κατέλεξας,  
 πάντων Ἀργείων σέο δ' αὐτοῦ κήδεα λυγρά.”

'Odysseus, looking at you, we do not liken you to a fraud or a cheat, the sort that the black earth breeds in great numbers, widespread people, who craft their lies – from what sources one does not see. Your words have beauty, and there is sense in you, and expertly, as a singer would do, you have set out the story, of all the Argives' terrible sorrows, and your own.'

Again, a complex exchange links truth to epic performance. Odysseus compliments Demodocus because he describes the fall of Troy as accurately as if he had been there; while the Phaeacians believe Odysseus' own account because he performs like a singer: his words have 'beauty', or 'shape' (μορφή).

There are of course differences between Odysseus and Demodocus: the most obvious is that the singer will never be an eyewitness: he is blind. It is because of his relationship with the Muse, rather than any first-hand experience, that he knows what happened at Troy. By himself, he is not even able to recognise Odysseus, who is sitting right beside him. Blindness separates Demodocus from his audience; but also marks a different, divine, kind of vision (8.63–4):

τὸν περὶ Μοῦσ' ἐφίλησε, δίδου δ' ἀγαθὸν τε κακὸν τε  
ὀφθαλμῶν μὲν ἄμερσε, δίδου δ' ἠδεῖαν ἀοιδίην.

The Muse loved him greatly, and gave him both good and evil:  
she took his eyesight but gave him sweet song.

Ancient readers thought that this description of Demodocus was autobiographical: an image of Homer himself. Modern scholars have often doubted the ancient report that Homer was blind and have sometimes noted that his poetry is especially vivid and visual. But this is to miss the point of the ancient legend: Homer's blindness, just like Demodocus', was thought to compensate for his poetry.<sup>3</sup> And, as a poet, he could see what went on in Troy: like Demodocus, and the Muses, he could overcome the barriers of time and space and 'be present'. At the same time, Homer's blindness symbolised his distance and impartiality vis-à-vis his human audiences.

The poet of the *Iliad* does not address his audience directly, in order to ask for attention, flatter or make demands. Never does he name specific addressees or describe the context of his performance. By contrast, he addresses not only the Muses, but also some characters in his own story.<sup>4</sup> These direct apostrophes are so startling that some ancient and modern readers have argued that they betray a special concern

<sup>3</sup> The idea would have seemed less strange to ancient readers than it might seem to us. Compare what Socrates has to say about true insight at Plato, *Symp.* 219a: 'The inner eye of thought (ἡ τῆς διανοίας ὄψις) begins to see clearly when our real eyes start losing their sharpness of vision.'

<sup>4</sup> The passages are collected and discussed in A. Parry 1972, Block 1982 and Yamagata 1989.

for the characters addressed.<sup>5</sup> But in one case, at least, there seems to be no reason to suppose an enduring affection or interest on the part of the poet: the direct address seems motivated by the immediate situation at hand, rather than by a long-lasting commitment to certain characters. At 15.582–4 Antilochos has just killed Melanippos and is about to take his spoils, when the poet suddenly addresses the dead Melanippos in the vocative and points out that Hector defended his corpse. The narrative gains in immediacy: what the poet describes is not a routine battlefield occurrence, but something that would have mattered greatly to Melanippos and now matters to the poet, and hence to all those who listen to him. The poet thus engages his audience not by addressing them directly, but by addressing his characters, and thus taking part in the story he tells.

The poet's presence at Troy may help to explain another puzzling feature of Homeric poetry. In an influential study of 1899–1901, Theodor Zielinski argued that Homeric narrative always moves forward: as a result, the poet represents simultaneous actions as sequential. Early responses to 'Zielinski's law' took it as evidence for the primitive state of the Homeric mind, which was supposedly unable to grasp the complexities of time and simultaneity.<sup>6</sup> Such perceptions of Homeric poetry have by now been dispelled: the poems do, in fact, represent simultaneous action by several different means.<sup>7</sup> For example, while Hector leaves the battlefield, Glaukos and Diomedes meet and exchange gifts: in terms of narrative structure, the encounter between the two warriors counterbalances Hector's mission in Troy (see below, Introduction 4.1). What remains true, however, is that the poet often fails to draw attention to simultaneity. As Scodel points out in her judicious appraisal of Zielinski's law, 'there is no single solution for all passages where the Homeric narrator's treatment of time is difficult, because time stands in a complex relationship with his other narrative concerns'.<sup>8</sup> One such concern does, however, help to explain Zielinski's observation. The poet describes events as if he were there. Overt references to simultaneity would dispel that sense of presence: in order to say that an event was taking place while something else was happening elsewhere, the poet would need to stand back from both events, however briefly. That, by and large, he does not do: he often abandons one strand of the story and picks up another without offering explicit guidance to the audience about the transition. He simply, suddenly, looks elsewhere, or changes locale – just like Zeus, who, at the beginning of book 13, momentarily stops looking down at the war raging on the Trojan plain and turns his eyes to the land of the Thracians.

The perspective of the poet is indeed that of the gods. He can offer a god's-eye view of the whole battlefield at 1–4n. and then zoom in to show how the tip of a spear penetrates through a forehead and 'breaks into the bone': 10n. He can observe at close quarters how Adrestos' horses trip over a tamarisk branch, break the chariot's pole and run away – and then zoom out in order to show how the horses

<sup>5</sup> S. D. Richardson 1990: 170–4 discusses ancient and modern views.

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, Fränkel 1955. <sup>7</sup> De Jong 2007: 30–1. <sup>8</sup> Scodel 2008b: 109.

are just two of many that are stampeding across the plain towards the city (38–41n.). Contemporary readers describe Homeric poetry as cinematic,<sup>9</sup> but in antiquity there were no helicopters from which to take aerial shots, and no cameras zooming in or out. The poet's powers were truly divine: only the gods could view things from above, or descend and observe the fighting at close quarters, without fear of death. The poet makes that point explicitly at 4.539–42, when he describes an especially fierce battle:

ἔνθα κεν οὐκέτι ἔργον ἀνὴρ ὀνόσαιτο μετελθών,  
ὅς τις ἔτ' ἀβλητος καὶ ἀνούτατος ὄξει χαλκῶι  
δινεύοι κατὰ μέσσον, ἄγοι δέ εἰ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη  
χειρὸς ἔλοῦσ', αὐτὰρ βελέων ἀπερύκοι ἐρωήν.

Then no longer could a man have faulted their war work, on arrival – someone who, as yet unhurt and unstabbed by the piercing bronze, moved about in their midst, as Pallas Athena led him taking his hand, and holding off the oncoming spears.<sup>10</sup>

Divine inspiration, then, is not just a matter of conventional invocations to the Muses. It shapes the poet's relationship to space, and his treatment of time. More importantly still, it informs his moral outlook. The poet can always tell whether the gods are present or absent (1n.) and knows what they plan. At the very beginning of the *Iliad* he asks the Muse to sing the wrath of Achilles and tell how 'the will of Zeus was accomplished' (1.5). The characters inside the poem have only a limited understanding of their own circumstances and have no sure knowledge of the future. The poet, by contrast, knows everything: his song follows the plan of Zeus and describes in painful detail what it entails for mortals. There is, then, a wide gap between the poet (and his audience), who know the future and the will of the gods; and the characters inside the narrative, who struggle, in their ignorance, with their hopes and fears (see, for example, 237–41n.). There is just one character, in *Iliad* 6, who does share the perceptions of the poet, at least to an extent. At 357–8n. Helen presents herself, Paris and, indirectly, Hector as future subjects of song – and sees a link between her human suffering, the fate decreed by Zeus and the delight of future epic audiences.

Helen's clear-sightedness is unusual and derives, in part, from her unique position in the poem. As the war rages over her, she – standing in the eye of the storm – sees herself from the perspective of future audiences. Helen thus momentarily comes close to sharing the poet's own vantage point and, like him, draws a connection between Zeus's plans, human suffering, and poetry. And yet her vision does not stem from an objective knowledge of what was, is and shall be – for all that she is the daughter of Zeus (just like the Muses themselves). In the *Iliad* Helen's divinity is played down, and she shapes her vision of the future not like a goddess or a singer,

<sup>9</sup> Winkler 2007.

<sup>10</sup> On the complex relationship between the imagined observer, the poet and the audience in this passage, see Mirto 1997: 925.

but like a woman with immediate and pressing concerns. She wants Hector to stay with her: she needs him to focus on her plight and wants him to feel special because of his connection with her. In Helen's handling, future poetry becomes a weapon of seduction (343–58n., 357–8n.). Her words are not an impartial statement of fact, but an attempt to manipulate the situation so as to flatter Hector and persuade him to stay. Helen cannot ultimately escape the pain and uncertainty of her own human condition. At 3.234–42, for example, she looks for her brothers among the Achaean troops and wonders why they are not there: at that point, the poet informs us that they are already dead (3.243–4).

There is a great difference between what we know with utter certainty (because the poet, the Muses and Zeus himself guarantee it), and what the characters themselves think, feel and fear. This gap in knowledge is crucial to the *Iliad* as a whole but is especially important in book 6. We know that Troy must fall; and so, when Hector enters the city, we are confronted with a place and a people that are, from our perspective, already doomed. This is not just a general impression: it is reinforced by many details in the narrative. The women of Troy, for example, pray that Diomedes die in front of the Scaean Gates – but we know that he will survive the war: we thus realise that their prayer is futile (306–7n.), even before the poet describes Athena's response to it (311n.). The poet's narrative is in tune with the plans and actions of the gods, but also with what we already know, as competent epic audiences. It is of course difficult to establish, in every case, what kind of knowledge the poet assumed of his listeners. In some cases, allusions seem clear. When Hector picks up his baby son and tosses him about in his arms, we recognise a familiar gesture, which usually makes babies squeal with fear and elation – but we also remember Astyanax's individual fate: the next time a soldier picks him up, he will throw him off the walls (466–81n.). Other allusions are harder to assess: according to Euripides' *Alexander*, Paris was meant to be killed in infancy, but he survived and returned to Troy as a grown man. Hecuba tried to kill him on his return but then recognized him as her child and welcomed him back into the city. At 280–5n. Hector says to Hecuba, of all people, that he wishes her own son Paris was dead: that is a hard thing for any mother to hear, but to those audiences who knew the legend staged in the *Alexander*, Hector's comment will have seemed particularly harsh – a pointed allusion to Hecuba's own role in saving Paris' life. Early audiences did not have complete mastery of every aspect of the epic tradition: they did not instantly recognise all verbal echoes with the facility of a computer search engine. The point, rather, is that what the poet told his audiences resonated with what they already knew about his characters; and that, conversely, further stories, legends and poems developed around the *Iliad*: as a result of that process, the *Iliad* itself became richer, and more allusive, in the course of time (e.g. 434n.).

The main effect of our knowledge, and of the characters' lack of it, is a sense of tragic irony – a realisation that mortals have no sure understanding of the gods, or even of themselves. The *Iliad* enables us to see the limitations of humankind from the perspective of divine knowledge; but the spectacle is not simply entertaining, because the pain, suffering and uncertainty of Homer's characters are ultimately our own.

Sometimes, characters do have moments of insight: at 447–9n., for example, Hector declares that he knows Troy will fall. And yet he cannot hold on to that realisation: only moments later, with his baby son in his arms, he hopes for a better future (475–81n.). Later still, Hector declares that he does not know what awaits him: he tells himself and his wife that all they can do is behave dutifully, as their destiny unfolds (485–93n.); but even that sense of clarity, and resignation, gives way to wild hope at the very end of the book. As Hector leaves the city and prepares to face the enemy, he depicts an unlikely image of future happiness: one day, after the Achaeans have been defeated, he will raise a toast to freedom together with his brother Paris, and the other Trojan men (520–9n., 526–9n.). This last wish clashes violently with what we know will happen to the Trojans and their city. The prophetic knowledge of the poet, together with the human frailty and uncertainty of his characters, provokes in the audience a mixture of pleasure and pain. As Macleod points out, in Homer we find ‘an awareness of the paradox that pain, as recorded in art, can give pleasure – and not only of this aesthetic paradox, but also of the fact it rests on, namely the difference between art and life, tragedy and suffering’.<sup>11</sup> In Homer’s *Iliad* we do indeed recognise the seeds of Greek tragedy; but more importantly still, we recognise ourselves.<sup>12</sup> Homeric audiences, and readers, need no special knowledge in order to understand, for example, Hector’s sudden surge of hope, as he holds his baby son in his arms; or imagine Hecuba’s pain, as she hears one of her sons wish death on another. The Muses guarantee the truthfulness of the poet’s song: they are goddesses, are present and can describe with utter precision what happened at Troy. But the poem is true also because it connects with what audiences know, from their own experience, about human life.

## 2. THE COMPOSITION OF HOMERIC EPIC

The poet never specifies his intended audience, or the context of his performance. This has led to great speculation about the circumstances under which the *Iliad* was composed; but there are, in fact, good reasons for the poet’s silence. The poem aspires to be a tale of universal interest, and the poet, as Griffith points out, avoids establishing a privileged relationship with a particular addressee, or audience.<sup>13</sup> Scodel argues that he tells his story in a manner which does not divide audiences over controversial issues: he does not draw attention to mythological innovations, for example.<sup>14</sup> That he shows little interest in local legends and cults has long been recognised.<sup>15</sup> Because of the poet’s reticence, and the scarcity of external evidence, it is difficult to establish how and when the *Iliad* was composed, so it seems best to start with two points on which there is general consensus. The poem clearly belongs to a rich and ancient tradition of epic poetry. Its language and compositional techniques were honed over a long

<sup>11</sup> Macleod 1982: 7.   <sup>12</sup> See Zajko 2006.   <sup>13</sup> Griffith 1983: 46.   <sup>14</sup> Scodel 2002a.

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, Rohde 1925: 25–6 (German edn 1898).

period of time: they developed for the purpose of singing the deeds of gods and men to a particular rhythm, what we call the hexameter ‘line’.

The second point on which there is broad agreement is that, by the second half of the sixth century BCE, the *Iliad* was well known. The material record preserves many late archaic images inspired by the *Iliad*; and the earliest explicit quotation from the poem also dates to this period. Simonides singles out a line from book 6, and calls it ‘the finest thing the Chian man said’: 146n. Some doubt the authenticity of Simonides’ fragment 19 West, but his treatment of Homer fits a late sixth-century or early fifth-century context: we know that at that time artists were selecting and reworking their favourite Iliadic episodes.<sup>16</sup> We also know that Theagenes was writing about Homer in the late sixth century: as Cassio argues, the fact that there were written disquisitions about Homeric epic suggests that there were also written copies of his poems by 530–520 BCE.<sup>17</sup> It thus seems that the *Iliad* was widely known in the late sixth century BCE, and that written copies were available. When precisely the poem came into being is much more difficult to establish: current suggestions range from c. 800 BCE to as late as the sixth century itself.<sup>18</sup> Those who champion an early date of composition tend to argue that Homer himself wrote down or dictated a master copy of the *Iliad*.<sup>19</sup> Those who support a sixth-century date often emphasise the importance of an Athenian ‘recension’.<sup>20</sup> According to some sources, the tyrant Pisistratus or one of his sons decreed that only Homer had to be recited, in the correct order, at the most important city festival: the Great Panathenaea.<sup>21</sup> Those reports do not speak of a state-owned text; they refer to a situation in which the state monitored the performance of Homeric poetry. The debate over the date of composition of the *Iliad* reflects, in part, a difference in emphasis: some scholars focus on the original contribution by an early poet, others on the earliest known historical context for Homeric recitation. Beyond these differences, all Homerists agree that a sixth-century ‘recension’ must have captured something older; it is also clear that even if texts of the *Iliad* existed in the seventh century, they did not much affect the reception of the poem: they were scores or scripts, rather than works of literature. Most people appreciated the *Iliad* through listening, not reading.

<sup>16</sup> The visual evidence for Iliadic scenes is collected and discussed in Burgess 2001: 53–94.

<sup>17</sup> Cassio 2002: 118–19.

<sup>18</sup> Powell 1991 suggests that the Greek alphabet was adapted from West Semitic prototypes specifically so as to write down Homeric epic at around 800 BCE. Janko 1982: 231 dates the *Iliad* to c. 755/750–725 BCE. Burkert 1976 and M. L. West 1995 detect allusions in the *Iliad* to later events, and on that basis suggest a date of composition in the seventh century BCE. Jensen 1980 argues that the poems were written down in Athens, in the sixth century BCE.

<sup>19</sup> E.g. Janko 1982: 191; Lord 2000: chs. 6–7; Powell 1991: 232–3.

<sup>20</sup> E.g. Wolf 1985 [1795]; Heitsch 1968; Jensen 1980; Seaford 1994: 152–4; for the view that the poems were transmitted orally, but with only minor variations, between the eighth and sixth centuries BCE, see Kirk 1962, esp. pp. 98–101. Kirk’s idea of the ‘life cycle’ of an oral tradition (Kirk 1962: 95–8) is developed in G. Nagy 1996a.

<sup>21</sup> See esp. [Plato], *Hipparchus* 228b and Lycurgus, *In Leocratem* 102. Related sources are collected and discussed in Merkelbach 1952; Jensen 1980: chs. 9–10; Kotsidu 1991: 41–4; and G. Nagy 1996a, esp. ch. 3.

Our own love of reading, and appreciation of writing, may lead in fact to wrong assumptions: in the *Iliad* writing (or something close to it) is depicted as an especially nasty and devious business. At 168–70n. Proitos asks Bellerophon to deliver a folded tablet to the king of Lycia, on which he has inscribed the order to kill the bearer of the message.<sup>22</sup> Bellerophon thus goes into exile carrying with him his own death warrant. There is no hint, in the Homeric poems, that writing may be used to record great deeds, or help singers compose their songs. This may simply be because Homeric epic is set in a distant, heroic past, where writing did not yet exist or was just being invented by resourceful crooks like Proitos. The actual context of composition of the *Iliad* may have been quite different from the situation depicted inside the poem.<sup>23</sup> What remains true, however, is that the poet of the *Iliad* describes his own work in terms of singing (ᾄδῆ) and listening (κλέος): he therefore invites his audience, and indeed his readers, to consider his poem as a live performance. The hexameter rhythm is an integral part of that performance, and shapes the language, grammar, and narrative structures of the *Iliad*.

### 2.1 The hexameter

|       |       |       |       |       |     |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6   |
| – ̄ ̄ | – ̄ ̄ | – ̄ ̄ | – ̄ ̄ | – ̄ ̄ | – – |

The rhythm of Homeric poetry is the dactylic hexameter.<sup>24</sup> It consists of five dactylic feet or metra (– ̄ ̄), and a sixth foot that scans – –. The last syllable in the line can be short or long, but is always measured long, because there is a pause in recitation at the end of the verse. Dactyls can be replaced with spondees (– –), though this is rare in the fifth foot (about 5 per cent of lines in the whole of early Greek epic; e.g. 232–3n.). Homeric lines may consist exclusively of dactyls (e.g. 6.13) or, exceptionally, spondees (e.g. 2.544); but most lines are a mixture of the two.

For the purposes of scansion, each verse is divided into syllables, without regard for word division; that is, word divisions can fall within syllables: it is only at the end of the line that there is always a break (for other breaks see below). A syllable is long if it is ‘closed’ (i.e. ends with a consonant), or if it has a long vowel or diphthong; otherwise it is short. The letters η and ω represent long vowels; ε and ο represent short ones. α, ι, υ may be either long or short.

Syllables begin with the consonant that precedes a vowel, if there is one; otherwise they begin with the vowel itself. When two consonants occur in succession (other than

<sup>22</sup> On Proitos’ trick and what, if anything, it reveals about the role of writing in the composition of Homeric epic, see Heubeck 1979: 126–46; Powell 1991: 198–200; Ford 1992: 131–8; Brillante 1996; Bassi 1997: 325–9; and J. M. Foley 1999: 1–3.

<sup>23</sup> The extremely regular layout of the inscription on the eighth-century Ischia cup (‘Nestor’s cup’) may reflect the influence of epic texts written on papyrus or leather – though such texts may not have been Homer’s poems as we have them; see Cassio 1999: 79.

<sup>24</sup> For Homeric prosody and metre see W. S. Allen 1973, M. L. West 1982 and 1997b, Sicking 1993, Nünlist 2000.

at the beginning of the line), the second consonant starts the following syllable, while the first (normally) belongs to the preceding one, which is therefore closed. This is also true of the consonant clusters which, in the Greek alphabet, are represented by a single letter (ζ, ξ and ψ = *zd*, *ks* and *ps*). The sound *w*, represented by digamma (Ϝ), was lost early in the Ionic dialect but continued to affect the rhythm of Homeric epic – even if not consistently.<sup>25</sup> Epic performers knew, for example, that the word (Ϝ)ᾄστου behaved as if it began with a consonant; but, in some rare cases, they ignored that and treated it as a normal word starting with α (e.g. 18.274). Similarly, the digamma before the 3rd pers. sing. pronoun (Ϝ)ξ, (Ϝ)ξθεν, (Ϝ)οἶ, etc. was generally felt (e.g. 16–17n., ἀλλά οἱ), but not always; some editors try to restore it in all cases, but there is no reason to suppose there was total consistency on the matter: cf. 9n. (ὄς οἱ δοκέει). At the beginning of a word, the sounds represented by μ, ν, ρ, λ and σ are sometimes drawn out to close a preceding syllable, even when no other consonant follows; in some papyri and manuscripts this is marked by a double consonant, see e.g. 91n. (ἐνὶ μεγάρωι).<sup>26</sup> Conversely, plosive consonants (π, β, φ, τ, δ, θ, κ, γ, χ) sometimes start a syllable although they are followed by a second, nasal or liquid consonant (μ, ν, λ, ρ). In those cases, the previous syllable may therefore be open (e.g. 6.163: βασιλιῆα προσηύδα, *ba-si-lē-a-pro-sēu-dā*, scanned ̄ | – ̄ ̄ | – –).

When followed by another vowel, a short vowel is elided (e.g. 6.1: δ’ οἰώθη); and a long vowel is often shortened (this is called correption, e.g. 6.69: μῦνέτω ὤς, scanned – ̄ ̄ | –). Diphthongs too may be shortened when followed by a vowel. In such cases, the second element (ι or υ) was perhaps pronounced like a consonant (like English *y* and *w*), making the syllable open (e.g. 6.1: καὶ Ἀχαιῶν).<sup>27</sup> When two vowels are juxtaposed and there is no elision or correption, they may come together to form a single syllable (so-called ‘crasis’, ‘mixing’, cf. 260n.: καῦτός) or each retain their natural length (‘hiatus’, cf. 6.388: ἐπειγομένη ἄφικάνει).

Greek poetry usually avoids hiatus (lit. the ‘gap’ or ‘opening’ in sound, when a word ending in a vowel is followed by a word beginning with one). In Homeric poetry, however, hiatus is much more frequent than in later epic.<sup>28</sup> It arises, for example, when traditional expressions are adapted to new contexts (e.g. δεκάτη ἐφάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως, 175n.). In many cases the loss of initial digamma at an early stage in the epic tradition resulted in a hiatus that is merely apparent; see, e.g., 16–17n.: ἀλλά (Ϝ)οἶ; 6.56: κατὰ (Ϝ)οἶκον; 6.75: Ἔκτορι (Ϝ)εἶπε; 6.148: φύει (Ϝ)ἄρος; 6.256: περι (Ϝ)ᾄστου; 6.258: μελιθεῖα (Ϝ)οἶνον; 6.451: Πριάμοιο (Ϝ)ἄνακτος. But there are also several cases of true hiatus: because the tradition allowed hiatus where there had once been a digamma, other cases may have sounded acceptable too. Hiatus is particularly common where the rhythm of the hexameter is interrupted by a word break (caesura); cf. 6.8: υἱὸν Ἐϋσώρου | | Ἀκάμαντ’ ἦϋν τε μέγαυ τε.

<sup>25</sup> For a brief overview see Wachter 2000: 72–3.

<sup>26</sup> At the end of a word, the sounds ν, ρ, σ may have the same effect.

<sup>27</sup> W. S. Allen 1973: 224; M. L. West 1982: 12; Nünlist 2000: 110. Wachter 2000: 74 is sceptical.

<sup>28</sup> The same freedom in the treatment of hiatus is evident in the text inscribed on the Ischia cup (n. 23); see Chadwick 1990: 174–5; and Garvie 1994: 32.



The whole hexameter line is hard to pronounce in one breath; word breaks occur at specific places and tend not to occur at others.<sup>29</sup> A word division must occur around the middle of the line, where the break is clearly useful for the performing bard: it takes place either after the first short syllable of the third foot (the so-called 'feminine' caesura, which is the most common), or after the first long syllable of that foot (the 'masculine' caesura) or, less often, after the first long syllable of the fourth foot (the hephthemimeral).<sup>30</sup> Word division is also common between the fourth and the fifth foot (bucolic diairesis): this produces a separate unit | - ∪ | -- at the end of the hexameter verse, which often leads on to a runover line. There is usually no word division between the first and the second short syllable of the fourth foot: at that point the rhythm runs smoothly on towards the end of the line. This phenomenon is called 'Hermann's bridge'.<sup>31</sup> Like many other aspects of Homeric rhythm, it too is a strong tendency rather than a hard-and-fast rule.

Oral performance is greatly facilitated by lines that are self-contained units of thought. The performer makes a brief pause at the end of the line, before gathering his thoughts and launching into the next line: when lines express self-sufficient units of thought, the break at the end of each line does not disrupt the performer's train of thought or impair the audience's ability to follow his performance. Most Homeric lines are grammatically complete;<sup>32</sup> though lines often start in enjambment: they elaborate (e.g. 154n.), qualify (e.g. 126n. and 260n.), or modify (e.g. 37–8n.) what has just been said.<sup>33</sup> There are two different kinds of enjambment: most often, a line is grammatically complete and could stand on its own, but an additional phrase extends it, in what we call 'progressive' enjambment.<sup>34</sup> Less frequently, in order to make grammatical sense, a line requires an addition in 'necessary' enjambment (see, e.g. πεφνέμεν, 180n.).<sup>35</sup> In antiquity Homer was considered a master of enjambment: in the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, his rival Hesiod challenges him to complete lines that cannot stand on their own without correction or qualification; and Homer always overcomes the challenge, with miraculous resourcefulness.<sup>36</sup> In the *Iliad* there are many cases of striking enjambment, which must have been even more striking in performance: see, e.g., 130–1n. with 139–40n., 341n., 413n. and 496n.

<sup>29</sup> Groups of words that were pronounced together may have been marked in early written texts of Homer, as they are on the Ischia cup (n. 23); see Alpers 1969; Heubeck 1979: 115; and Wachter 2000: 66–7.

<sup>30</sup> M. L. West 1997b: 222–3 gives the relative frequencies of the main Homeric caesurae.

<sup>31</sup> Enclitic words are not considered exceptions to Hermann's bridge because they lean heavily on the previous word (i.e. there is no real word break there). There are also words that lean forward and belong to what follows: for example, καὶ - ∪ | -- is frequent at the end of the line and is not thought to disregard Hermann's bridge. See further van Leeuwen 1890: 265–76; and M. L. West 1982: 37–8.

<sup>32</sup> Higbie 1990: 66 gives the percentage of Homeric lines that can stand on their own as just over 75 per cent.

<sup>33</sup> This happens in just over 60 per cent of cases, according to Higbie 1990: 66.

<sup>34</sup> For the term, see Kirk 1985: 30–7.

<sup>35</sup> The term is Parry's; for his discussion of enjambment, see M. Parry 1971: 251–65.

<sup>36</sup> See Graziosi 2001 and D. B. Collins 2004: 185–91.

Enjambment is clearly used to expressive effect: the progressive type, for example, suits the weighty register of epic catalogues.<sup>37</sup> Necessary runovers, by contrast, often convey the urgency and animation of Iliadic speeches (see, e.g., 477n.). This is particularly evident at the beginning of Andromache's speech, when she first addresses Hector: as Bakker points out, Andromache's speech creates 'a rhythmical profile that runs increasingly against the basic rhythm of the hexameter'.<sup>38</sup> In Andromache's speech, units of rhythm, and of thought, often start after the bucolic diairesis, rather than at the beginning of the line: this alternative rhythm seems to reflect her emotional strain and characterises fraught speeches also elsewhere in the poem.<sup>39</sup>

Though rhythm is not generally used to expressive effect in Homer,<sup>40</sup> there are, then, exceptions. At 506–11n., for example, the overlapping runovers match the swift movement of the horse; and the effect is reinforced by the 'galloping' dactyls of 511n., as Kirk points out.<sup>41</sup> At 157n. Glaukos' exceptionally ugly and impressive κῶκ' ἐμήσατο θυμῶι, at the end of the line, is made even uglier by the fact that he disregards Hermann's bridge – that is to say, he inserts a word break, where the line usually runs smoothly on. At 164n. Anteia's brutal rhetoric matches the disjointed rhythm of her speech. Elision too can have a powerful impact, especially at the beginning of the line: 165n., 413n. Even hiatus can sometimes be expressive: at 306n. it lends urgency to Theano's prayer. Whether or not the poet of the *Iliad* made use of writing, all this shows that he understood the power of rhythm in performance.

## 2.2 *Formulae and their meaning*

Rhythm shapes the language of epic. In composing his song, the poet of the *Iliad* draws on a large and well-established stock of phrases, which fit the rhythm of the hexameter line. Comparative studies show that repeated phrases, or formulae, help bards to compose poetry in real time, as they perform in front of an audience. In the 1930s Milman Parry and Albert Lord recorded the performances of illiterate Bosnian *guslari* and showed that they were able to recite very long poems – not by remembering a script, but by combining formulaic expressions, and by arranging them into well-established narrative patterns, or 'themes'. Formulae and themes were, to a large extent, inherited: they had developed over generations, in order to enable singers to compose, or re-compose, their poems in the course of live performances. The *guslar* had at his disposal a stock of different formulae that described the same character, situation, thing or action, each of which had a specific metrical shape. He could choose the appropriate formula depending on how many beats he needed in order to reach the end of the line.

Parry showed that in Homeric epic there is usually just one formula describing a particular character or action in any given metrical unit: this formulaic economy, or 'thrift', enabled bards to get to the end of the line without having to take too long thinking about different options for describing an action or character. The language

<sup>37</sup> See Higbie 1990: 67. <sup>38</sup> Bakker 2005: 55. <sup>39</sup> For discussion, Bakker 2005: 52–5.

<sup>40</sup> M. L. West 1982: 39 and 1997b: 232–3. <sup>41</sup> Kirk 1990: 226.

of Homeric epic is thus characterised by formulaic economy. This characteristic emerges clearly, for example, when we consider some of the more common noun-epithet formulae used to describe Hector, in the nominative, at the end of the line.<sup>42</sup> He is called μέγας κορυθαίολος 'Ἐκτωρ after the feminine caesura (e.g. 263n.):

– ∪ | – ∪ | – ∪ μέγας κορυθαίολος 'Ἐκτωρ

A briefer formula is used after the hephthemimeral caesura (116 etc.):

– ∪ | – ∪ | – ∪ | – κορυθαίολος 'Ἐκτωρ

After the bucolic diairesis, when only two feet are left, Hector is called φαίδιμος 'Ἐκτωρ (466n., 472, 494, etc.), or ὄβριμος 'Ἐκτωρ, in contexts where φαίδιμος 'Ἐκτωρ is metrically impossible (8.473, 10.200, 11.347, 14.44):

– ∪ | – ∪ | – ∪ | – ∪ | φαίδιμος 'Ἐκτωρ/ὄβριμος 'Ἐκτωρ

This kind of analysis helps to explain when these formulae are used; what remains to be seen is how they affect the audience. Milman Parry, in an influential study entitled 'The meaning of the epithet in epic poetry', reached rather discouraging conclusions about the significance of noun-epithet formulae: he argued that many epithets had no special meaning in relation to the context in which they were used, that audiences felt indifferent towards them, and that they were perhaps best left untranslated.<sup>43</sup> This sort of approach does not seem entirely satisfactory: traditional epithets, and other formulaic expressions, are not equivalent to an instrumental interlude, or a bit of humming, or some other wordless rhythmical 'filling'. They are words, and affect audiences through their meaning, as well as through their rhythmical qualities.

Modern readers often find the traditional formulations of Homeric poetry repetitive and burdensome: in his reworking of the *Iliad* the poet Christopher Logue, for example, decided '(mostly) to omit Homer's descriptive epithets'.<sup>44</sup> In antiquity too, the formularity of Homer became increasingly obsolete: in keeping with their literary sensibilities, Hellenistic scholars often championed a less formulaic text of Homer than that found in the mainstream tradition.<sup>45</sup> In order to assess the effect of formulae on early audiences, it is perhaps best to start with the reactions to epic performances described in the Homeric poems themselves.

The Phaeacians trust Odysseus because he sounds like a singer, there is a 'shape of words' to his performance (*Od.* 11.367, quoted above). This is an apt description of traditional epic language: formulae have a specific shape, and they do inspire trust. The poet does not describe actions and characters simply as the fancy takes him; there is a rhythm and an order to his words. Although the formulaic system is used with remarkable flexibility and inventiveness in the *Iliad*, rhetorically, it conveys an impression of stability. Traditional epithets, for example, link specific characters to their aptest attributes. Hector is κορυθαίολος, 'of the gleaming helmet', throughout the *Iliad*. Most of the time the epithet remains in the background: it reminds the

<sup>42</sup> For a full analysis of Hector's epithets see Di Benedetto 1998: 122–39.

<sup>43</sup> M. Parry 1971: 118–72, esp. 171–2. <sup>44</sup> Logue 2001: vii. <sup>45</sup> Fantuzzi 2001: 174–7.

audience, unobtrusively, that Hector is an impressive-looking warrior. In book 6, however, the poet reflects on Hector's warlike appearance and brings his epithet into focus. At 467–70n. baby Astyanax suddenly realises that his father is indeed κορυθαίολος and lets out a mighty scream. The scene makes us smile (471n.), not only because the baby's reaction is described in such vivid and realistic detail, but also because the poet adapts standard battlefield formulations in order to describe a most unwarlike episode (468n., 469–70n.).

There is often a dynamic, expressive tension between the traditional formulations used by the poet and the specific situations he describes. The use of patronymics is a case in point. Sons bear their fathers' names and should live up to their memory: patronymics are precisely a means of remembering the father when describing the son. And yet the narrative shows how the relationship between fathers and sons is seldom straightforward. At 119n. the poet formally introduces 'Glaukos, son of Hippolochos' and Diomedes 'son of Tydeus', as they drive forward ready to fight one another. In the ensuing encounter between the two, Glaukos tries hard to live up to the expectations of his father (206–11n.) and fails; Diomedes, by contrast, claims that he cannot even remember his own father (222–3n.) and proposes an exchange of gifts in honour of a friendship between grandfathers: 215–21n. The use of the patronymic at 401n. is even more devastating: the poet calls Astyanax Ἐκτορίδην, 'son of Hector'. The word is traditional in meaning and formation; but it is, in fact, unique: a *hapax legomenon* – something the poet says only once. There are obvious reasons for this: Astyanax will never grow up to be Hector's heir. The poet makes up a patronymic for him only shortly before the baby dies. And Astyanax will die precisely because he is 'the son of Hector', as Andromache points out: 24.734–8.

Traditional formulations describe the world as it should be: they encapsulate, for example, the orderly succession from father to son. But in fact, the poet often draws attention to the distance between his traditional, inherited 'beauty of words' and the painful tale he sings: Hector 'of the gleaming helmet' frightens his son; and later, when Achilles kills him and drags him from his chariot, the poet describes how 'the dust rose around him, as he was dragged away, and his black hair spread out, and his whole head was in the dust, which had been beautiful before' (22.401–3). That image shows Hector without his shining helmet.

Not all epithets are thrown into relief in quite this way; some remain in the background, but they too add to the texture of the poem: many words, for example, convey a sense of brilliance (cf., e.g., 26–7n.: φαίδιμα γυῖα; and 31n.: δῖος). They also, unobtrusively, express some fundamental values: war is dreadful (11n.); death is terrible (16–17n.). Homer's traditional formulations constitute a powerful language, then; they are not simply a toolkit of metrically convenient expressions, or empty fillers.<sup>46</sup> Like many other aspects of Homeric poetry – ranging from metre, to diction, to grammar – formulae are far from rigidly mechanical. There are some stable

<sup>46</sup> Edwards 1986 and 1988 gives an excellent account of scholarship on Homeric formulae. For more recent contributions see the articles assembled in Morris and Powell 1997, Bakker and Kahane 1997, and Létoublon 1997; also Visser 1987, J. M. Foley 1991 and 1999, Bakker 1997a and 2005, Graziosi and Haubold 2005.

patterns; and, even more often, there are recognisable tendencies: some epithets, for example, gravitate towards certain nouns but are not exclusive to them (12n: βοῆν ἄγαθός). Some phrases or lines are repeated just twice: they are not standard formulae or type scenes, therefore, but they are also not unique: 9–11n., 447–9n., 506–11n.<sup>47</sup> It does not seem possible to draw sharp distinctions between inherited, traditional formulations and original contributions on the part of the poet. In fact, any sharp distinction between tradition and innovation seems unhelpful: the poet, inspired by the Muse, sings what happened at Troy ‘as if he had been there himself’ (*Od.* 8.491). Traditional formulae help him in this task; but in order to describe unique, and often startling, events – such as the conversation between Glaukos and Diomedes, the encounter between Hector and his son Astyanax, or the defilement of Hector’s body – the poet adapts and reworks the language of epic, in order to convey what happened precisely, and in vivid detail.

### 2.3 *Traditional narrative patterns*

As well as shorter formulae, the poet also makes use of larger narrative patterns and structures, which help give shape and significance to the story. Catalogues, as has already emerged, are a distinctive feature of Homeric poetry: they enable the poet to express and organise his impressive knowledge of the heroic past.<sup>48</sup> Well-established structures are also employed in the description of common actions or events: Homeric characters arm themselves, bathe, eat, fight, die and lament the dead according to recognisable routines, or ‘type scenes’.<sup>49</sup> Speeches also follow standard templates and can be divided into several different categories, depending on their purpose and their formal characteristics: there are, for example, clearly defined martial exhortations, prayers, supplications, laments for the dead and verbal assaults (‘flyting’: 123–43n.). Formalised lines mark the beginning and end of speeches, and they express something important about their tone, significance and effect (45n., 51n.). Other traditional devices are standardly used to structure the poems: at the end of a speech or episode, for example, the poet often echoes its beginning, in ‘ring composition’ (e.g. 123–43n., 253–62n. and see below p. 18).<sup>50</sup>

These traditional patterns were doubtless technically helpful, and we can imagine how experienced singers must have taught beginners how to do a supplication speech, or round off a killing. We know that, in the South Slavic tradition, the *guslari* learnt from

<sup>47</sup> On significant lines repeated twice, see Rutherford 1992: 56–7.

<sup>48</sup> Catalogues impressed ancient audiences and readers: Alcinoos compliments Odysseus on his ability to ‘set out’ or ‘catalogue’ his story like a bard (καταλέξει: *Od.* 11.368); see also the comments of ancient readers in the scholia *ad Il.* 2.484–93. Gaertner 2001, Perceau 2002 and Sammons 2010 discuss Homeric catalogues.

<sup>49</sup> Discussed by Arend 1933 and, from the perspective of oral poetry, Lord 2000 (first published in 1960). For more recent approaches, see Edwards 1992 and Clark 2004: 134–7.

<sup>50</sup> Ring composition was first described by van Otterlo 1948. For an up-to-date anthropological perspective see Douglas 2007. Minchin 1995 and Nimis 1999 focus on Homer; for ring composition in Homeric speeches: Lohmann 1970.

one another how to ‘ornament’ a horse or a hero (as they put it); they knew, in other words, how to describe the arming of a hero, or the appearance of his beautiful horse, according to standard templates, which facilitated (re-)composition in performance.<sup>51</sup> But the point, for readers of Homer, is not so much to learn traditional techniques of composition, but to appreciate their effect, and the different uses to which they are put in the *Iliad*. Like formulae, traditional narrative patterns contribute to an impression of ‘shape and beauty’ (μορφή: *Od.* 11.368). They suggest that there is a proper way of doing things: the actions of epic characters often have a formalised quality to them. When Hecuba enters her store room and selects her favourite garment, for example, her actions resemble those of Priam at 24.191–237, when he enters the store room, and those of Helen at *Odyssey* 15.99–108, when she selects a garment for Telemachus. The verbal similarities between these different passages are not uniquely significant (they are not as pointed and deliberate as the rare repeated lines in Virgil, for example); and yet they lend to the passage a distinctive shape (288–95n.).

Sometimes, traditional narrative patterns are put to more specific and pointed use. It is rewarding to pay attention to divergences and adaptations, because the poet often harnesses the expectations of competent listeners to great dramatic effect. At 110–18n., for example, Hector delivers a speech of martial exhortation. He starts in conventional fashion but then makes a radical departure from the norm. Just at the point when exhortations usually feature an appeal for unity and solidarity among men on the battlefield (113n.), Hector declares that he alone will go back into the city and meet up with the wives of his soldiers – while they stay out and fight. This is a shocking statement, not just for Hector’s troops, but also for Homeric audiences familiar with the rhetoric of martial exhortation. Even catalogues, which may be thought intrinsically static in form, can actually have dramatic impact, and considerable narrative momentum. The catalogue of killings at the beginning of book 6, for example, is arranged in a steady *crescendo*: in the first entry, Ajax kills one opponent; in the next, Diomedes kills two; Euryalos then kills four men in quick succession; and the catalogue then adds seven deaths in an even shorter compass: 5–36n. By line 36 it is clear that the Achaeans are about to defeat the Trojans, even before the poet says so explicitly.

Traditional patterns, then, should not be regarded as the unwieldy legacy of an oral tradition, but rather as versatile poetic resources. The poet commands a very rich and diverse tradition, from which he draws together and combines many different elements. Glaukos’ speech, for example, is cast as a genealogy and invites listeners to reflect on an issue that is more generally relevant to genealogical accounts: in every family history there are rises and falls; there are generations that stand out for their achievements, and others that contribute to a family decline. Glaukos tries hard to present himself as the culmination of his family’s hopes and aspirations (206–11n.), but in fact it is his grandfather Bellerophon who dominates his family history.

<sup>51</sup> For a fascinating description of how the *guslari* learnt and used traditional themes, see Lord 2000: ch. 4, esp. 88.

Often, the poet combines different traditional elements to striking effect: when Andromache addresses Hector as he is about to leave for the battlefield, she opens and closes her speech in a manner that recalls battlefield rebukes – but with a difference. Instead of urging Hector to go forward and fight in the first line of battle, as in ordinary rebukes, she tells him to put the troops forward and to direct operations from inside the walls (431–9). This suggestion shocked ancient readers, but the main part of her speech explains her perspective – in the most direct and harrowing way. Between her opening reproach and her closing suggestion, Andromache performs something close to a funeral lament, in front of her living husband. She thus enacts, for him, the consequences of his actions. The poet later comments explicitly on Andromache's performance: he says that, on returning home, she instilled in all the women a need to mourn, and that 'they lamented Hector in his own home, while he was still living' (500n.). This is one of many lines that mark the end of the book through ring composition: see also 482–3n., 494n., 495n., 497n., 499n., 501–2n., 515–16n. and 520–9n. All these circles close off the last encounter between husband and wife – and foreshadow the end of everything that mattered to them: the death of Hector, the enslavement of Andromache, the murder of Astyanax, the fall of the city.

#### 2.4 Language

Almost half the *Iliad* consists of direct speech; book 6 exceeds even that proportion: speeches take up more than 60 per cent of the overall number of lines. Homeric characters use language in an impressive and memorable way: they pun (e.g. 130–1n., 139–40n., 143n., 201n., 284n., 328–9n. with 331n.), quote proverbs and maxims (146n., 261n., 339n., 492–3n.), subvert or parody traditional language (255n., 260n., 336n.) and often use flamboyant turns of phrase (143n., 344n., 413n.). Characters have a recognisable, individual style: Hector tends to be formal and restrained, except for one sudden, frustrated outburst when he talks to his mother (280–5n.). Paris sounds self-indulgent, petulant and insecure (332–41n., 517–19n.); Hecuba uses dramatic gestures and vigorous language (255n.); Helen's words are as inviting as her appearance (343–58n.).

In comparison with the language of his characters, the poet is more even: some words occur only in character speech, because they are too colourful, or imply too strong a value judgement.<sup>52</sup> And yet the language of the poet is far from rigid or monotonous: he too puns on words (500n.) and uses memorable phrases (e.g. 496n.). Objects and situations affect his language: the description of Priam's palace, for example, is solid and painstaking (242–52n.); while the scene where Paris runs towards Hector requires a more free-flowing approach (503–5). The language of

<sup>52</sup> Griffin 1986. Restrictions can cut both ways: Homeric characters, who lack the poet's understanding of divine affairs, do not call Helen the 'daughter of Zeus'; the one exception is Penelope at *Od.* 23.218.

the similes is often more varied and idiosyncratic than that of the main narrative: when the poet makes a comparison, he moves away from the battlefield, and this is reflected in the greater variety of his vocabulary and style.<sup>53</sup> The famous simile at 506–14n. is a good example: the poet describes the mood and movement of the horse in a style that recalls the more idiosyncratic language and syntax of character speech.

The language of the poet is often influenced by the concerns and perspectives of his characters: narratologists call the phenomenon 'embedded focalisation'.<sup>54</sup> When Hector looks at Astyanax in silence, for example, the poet uses the language of doting parents, and he piles on words of endearment for the little boy: Ἐκτοριδῆν ἀγαπητόν, ἀλίγκιον ἄστέρϊ καλῶϊ, 'son of Hector, beloved, beautiful like a shining star' (401n., cf. 400–3n.). Later, the poet describes how Astyanax perceives his father, as he looks up to his terrifying helmet: 470n. This is a striking case of focalisation, where the poet describes things from the perspective of a baby who is too young to talk. Sometimes, it is the characters who adopt the tone and register of the poet. At 414–28n., for example, Andromache gives an account of her family history, thus completing the information provided by the poet shortly before (395–8n.). This kind of juxtaposition between main narrative and character speech is typical of Homeric epic and was of interest to ancient readers;<sup>55</sup> sometimes, it involves a drastic change of tone, but not in this case: Andromache sounds almost as distanced and objective as the poet. Her tone reveals, with devastating clarity, that her dependence on Hector is a matter of fact, not just an emotion: if Hector dies, nobody will be able to look after her, because her father, her brothers and her mother are already dead.

Homeric language is, at times, difficult to translate – not because it is particularly erudite or recherché, but because it contains many traditional words and expressions that were not entirely transparent even to the earliest audiences of the *Iliad*. Comparative studies show that traditional texts (whether oral or written) tend to retain archaic words beyond the point when they are easily comprehensible: the liturgical formula 'the quick and the dead', for example, retains a use of 'quick' (= 'living') which is almost extinct in standard, contemporary English. The diction of Homeric epic is likewise characterised by inherited expressions, and the poet sometimes glosses within the text itself: at the very beginning of book 6, for example, φύλοπις is followed by the common noun μάχη. While the exact meaning of φύλοπις was debated in antiquity, the word was powerful and expressive: it sounded warlike, and later Greek poets used it precisely in order to evoke the heroic battles described in early hexameter poetry (1n.). There are, then, some obvious continuities between the glosses contained in the poem itself, the explanations given by ancient scholars and lexicographers, and the definitions offered in standard modern dictionaries. For example, Homer suggests two popular etymologies for the traditional epithet δαΐφρων, indicating that it may mean 'warlike' (cf. δαΐ = 'battle') or 'wise' (cf. δαήμων = 'knowledgeable, understanding'):

<sup>53</sup> Edwards 1991: 37–8, with further bibliographical guidance.

<sup>54</sup> De Jong 2004: ch. 4.

<sup>55</sup> Plato famously discusses the phenomenon at *Rep.* 392c.

162n. The same alternative meanings are preserved also in the Homeric scholia; and the LSJ proposes the following translations: 'warlike', 'fiery', 'wise', 'prudent'.

Sometimes, the point of particular words and expressions is not to convey a straightforward meaning in the clearest possible way, but to mirror the most mysterious and difficult aspects of human life and behaviour. It is not entirely clear, for example, what exactly is meant by the description of sacrificial cattle as ἦνις ἠκέστας (93–4n.), but the epithets sound ancient and precise and suggest ritual propriety. Death is shrouded in mysterious expressions (143n., 241n.); and the Chimaira is as impossible as the adjective that characterises her: ἀμυμακέτην, 179n. Many words try to capture the unfathomable characteristics of the gods (e.g. 269n.: δγελείης), and the poet occasionally even offers items of vocabulary in the language of the gods: 4n. (Ξάνθοιο), 1.403, 14.290–1 and 20.74. Items of divine vocabulary suggest, in the most direct way, that the poet's linguistic competence derives from his special relationship with the Muse, but there are also less direct ways in which he tries to explain to ordinary mortals the nature of the gods. He reflects, for example, on the etymologies of divine names and epithets: 419–20n. (κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο). Etymologising passages are frequent also in Hesiod's *Theogony* (e.g. 195–8) and the *Homeric Hymns* (311n.: Παλλάς; 428n.: Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα); and that is no coincidence, because those texts too have divine authority: according to Herodotus, 'it was Hesiod and Homer . . . who first established a theogony for the Greeks, gave epithets to the gods, defined their due honours and spheres of influence and described their appearance'.<sup>56</sup>

Particles are also difficult to translate, not because they are obscure, but because there are no straightforward equivalents in the English language. They structure and organise Homeric discourse: their effect is sometimes captured by our use of punctuation, and sometimes by conjunctions and adverbs. Particles fit the hexameter rhythm, and different clusters suit different metrical contexts; but this does not entail their being meaningless padding: they enhance and organise the narrative, and establish a connection with the audience. Bakker has shown in detail, for example, how the particle ἄρ(α) or ῥα directs the attention of the audience to a specific aspect of the story and brings it to life before their eyes.<sup>57</sup> When the poet uses the particle at the beginning of the book, 2n., he invites audiences to visualise how the fighting intensified everywhere across the plain. The poet Christopher Logue captures this aspect of Homeric poetry not by using particles, but by challenging his readers directly: 'See if you can imagine how it looked.'<sup>58</sup> At 9n. Homer uses the particle ῥα to draw attention to a specific event – τὸν ῥ' ἔβαλε, Ajax 'hit him' – and then invites the audience to follow the tip of Ajax's spear, as it penetrates into the forehead of the enemy: πέρησε δ' ἄρ' ὀστέον εἴσω | αἶχμη χαλκείη (10n.). Other particles are more discreet, but they too ensure that the audience stays with the poet. The frequent δέ, for example, unobtrusively reminds the audience that the poet is guiding them

<sup>56</sup> Herodotus 2.53.2.    <sup>57</sup> Bakker 1993: 16–23.    <sup>58</sup> Logue 2001: 153.

through the story, in proper order.<sup>59</sup> Together with the rarer μέν, which anticipates important developments, δέ can at times be rather pointed (e.g. 40n. with 42–3n., 167n. and 168n., 212–31n., 279n. and 280n.).

Characters use particles in a more obviously rhetorical way than the poet. Diomedes, for example, employs γε three times in quick succession: the particles express his aggressiveness mixed with uncertainty (125n., 128–9n.). Glaukos uses ἄρα to reveal the details of the plot against Bellerophon (158n.). Hecuba second-guesses Hector with ἦ μάλα δῆ (255n.; cf. Paris at 518n.). Helen waves away the issue of her guilt with a casual γε (349n.) and then uses ἄρ(α) twice in one line, in order to establish a special relationship with Hector, at the expense of her husband Paris (352n.). Hector responds by mentioning his own wife, excusing himself and trying hard to sound reasonable: three γάρ-clauses in a row (359–68n.).

### 2.5 Grammar

Like every aspect of Homeric language, grammar is fundamentally shaped by the hexameter rhythm. Different grammatical forms coexist, and make Homeric language more versatile and suited to different metrical combinations. For example, the poet can choose between linguistically older, typically uncontracted forms, and more recent, contracted ones. The early singular genitive ending in -οιο coexists with the contracted -ου; there are genitive plurals in -άων and in -ῶν; earlier and later forms of the same verb are often attested: for example, φοβέοντο (early) and φοβεύμενος (late). Contracted forms may be artificially extended so as to fit the hexameter: the phenomenon is called diectasis; cf. φώς (6n.) and τηλεθώσσα (148n.). Some extended forms were never contracted in the first place, thus we find the dative plural ἐπέεσι(ν) alongside the expected ἔπε(σ)σι(ν); these alternative forms suit different metrical contexts: 325n. Homeric language fits itself exactly to the hexameter and as a result develops some artificial forms (e.g. εὐχετάσθαι: 268n.).<sup>60</sup> Genuine archaisms are preserved if they are metrically convenient or sound especially grand and impressive. Ancient forms in -φι, for example, are metrically useful alternatives to genitive and dative case endings: 510n.

As well as mixing older and more recent forms, Homeric Greek draws from several different dialects. It was never spoken by any real-life community but rather developed for the specific purpose of singing the deeds of gods and men to the six-foot rhythm.<sup>61</sup> The predominant colouring is Ionic (note, for example, the Ionic ending -η, replacing an older -ᾱ), and this fits with ancient traditions that linked Homer to

<sup>59</sup> Bakker 1997a: 74–80.

<sup>60</sup> For a detailed discussion of words designed to fit the hexameter, see Chantraine 1948–53: vol. 1, 94–112.

<sup>61</sup> For Homeric language as a *Kunstsprache*, 'artificial language', see Meister 1921. For more recent discussions, Chantraine 1948–53, Hainsworth 1988, Horrocks 1997, Wachter 2000 and Hackstein 2002.

various birthplaces on the coast of Asia Minor, especially Chios.<sup>62</sup> There is also a strong Aeolic component (one of Homer's putative birthplaces was Aeolian Cyme), and there may be remnants of Mycenaean Greek.<sup>63</sup> Scholars have also argued for Euboean and Boeotian influences and pointed to several Attic elements, though some of these have turned out not to be exclusive to the Attic dialect, and many seem to concern matters of spelling.<sup>64</sup> There were other literary languages in the ancient world: in seventh-century Mesopotamia, for example, the deeds of gods and heroes were recorded in Standard Babylonian, an equally composite and artificial language.<sup>65</sup> What distinguishes Homeric Greek from other literary languages is the formative influence of the hexameter: different dialect forms were selected so as to provide metrically useful alternatives for saying the same thing. Infinitives, for example, take many different endings: -ειν, -ναι (Ionic), and -μεν, -μεναι (Aeolic); the Ionic pronouns ἡμεῖς/ὕμεῖς coexist with Aeolic ἄμμες/ὕμμες; both the Ionic particle ἄν and the Aeolic alternative κε(ν) are attested and suit different metrical situations.

Ancient readers claimed that Homer knew *all* the Greek dialects.<sup>66</sup> This is an exaggeration that reflects, in part, his status as a poet of Panhellenic appeal; but it is also true that Homeric epic displays a dazzling number of different words and forms. Homer can say 'to be' in five different ways: εἶναι, ἔμεν, ἔμμεν, ἔμεναι, ἔμμεναι; there are also five forms of 'he was': ἔην, ἦεν, ἦην, ἦν, ἔσκε; and the nearly synonymous verbs γίνομαι, πέλομαι and τέτυγμαι add to this already exuberant number of forms. Most of these alternative words are metrically useful, and many are commonplace, but there is also a sense that the poet commands an unfathomably rich language.

In contrast to morphology, Homeric syntax is relatively simple. Complex sub-clauses are rarer than in other genres, though they do feature, especially in character speech (for example: 476–8n.). Sometimes, characters bend the rules of Homeric grammar, as they struggle to express difficult emotions. A good example is 280–5n.: when Hector wishes death on his own brother, even his morphology and syntax become harsh and twisted. In comparison with his characters, the style of the poet is simpler: he often strings together sequences of main clauses, in what is called 'parataxis'. Oral poets from other traditions typically use parataxis, rather than complex subordinate structures: they track the flow of ideas rather than aim at rhetorical condensation.<sup>67</sup> In an important study Bakker argues that parataxis reflects the

<sup>62</sup> See Graziosi 2002: ch. 2 for a discussion of early Greek traditions relating to Homer's birth.

<sup>63</sup> See Janko 1994: 15–19 (Aeolic) and 11–12 (Mycenaean).

<sup>64</sup> On Attic: Wackernagel 1916; Chantraine 1948–53: vol. 1, 15–16; Cassio 2002: 117 with n. 55. On possible Euboean and Boeotian influences, see the cautious appraisal by Cassio 2002: 108, 111 and 116.

<sup>65</sup> For the character and use of Standard Babylonian see Huehnergard 2005: 595–8.

<sup>66</sup> Hillgruber 1994–9: vol. 1, 102–4.

<sup>67</sup> One of the first scholars to investigate the connections between parataxis and orality is Notopoulos 1949, who compares ancient Greek and Kirghiz narrative traditions. An influential discussion of parataxis as a feature of orality is Ong 1988, esp. 37–8.

structures of spontaneous human thought and speech.<sup>68</sup> Given that the *Iliad* stems from a tradition of composition in performance, it makes sense that it should rely on the structures of improvised speech. But parataxis is not just a natural or convenient arrangement for oral performers: it defines the Homeric style. By using parataxis, the poet describes the story as it unfolds, without drawing attention to himself. At 9–11, for example, he offers a series of main clauses marked by the particle ἄρα, as we have already discussed: Ajax attacks an opponent, thrusts his spear into the man's forehead, and the tip breaks through the bone. The attack, the impact and its result are conveyed by successive sentences which, like camera shots, track the movement of the spear. Straightforward sequences of main clauses, like this one, enhance the impression of objectiveness – and make the narrative exceptionally vivid.

### 2.6 Vividness

There have been many different responses to Homeric epic in the course of its long history, but listeners and readers of different ages have been impressed by its vividness. In *The Contest of Homer and Hesiod* 13 West, for example, the audience react with amazement (θαυμάσαντες) at a recital of *Iliad* 13.126–33 and 339–44 (a blindingly vivid passage).<sup>69</sup> This is the kind of response that the *Iliad* invites: the poet sometimes uses explicit formulae of amazement in order to underline particularly impressive aspects of his story: θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι, 'a wonder to behold'; cf. ἦ μέγα θαῦμα τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶμαι, 'that is a great wonder for my eyes to see'.<sup>70</sup> In a famous essay entitled *Laocoön: on the limits of painting and poetry*, the eighteenth-century critic Gotthold Ephraim Lessing singles out Homer for the exceptional vividness of his narrative, pointing out that he does not just paint an image but shows how it evolves and develops over time: 'when Homer wants to show us how Agamemnon was dressed, he has the king put on his garments, one by one, before our eyes'; 'he places a single object in a series of stages, in each of which it has a different appearance'.<sup>71</sup> Lessing praises Homer above any painter because, he argues, he tracks the transformation of an image over time. As we have seen, modern readers find his poetry cinematic.

Many factors contribute to the exceptional vividness of Homeric poetry, some of which have already been discussed. There are the many bright words that describe the heroic world: the scholia D ad 2.522 even gloss δῖος as θαυμοστός, thus making a connection between this standard epic epithet and the overall effect of Homeric poetry. There are the many particles which keep the audience engaged and draw attention to salient details in the narrative. And then there are grand panoramic vistas, and detailed observations at close quarters. The poet's language is precise

<sup>68</sup> Bakker 1997a.

<sup>69</sup> Note especially 13.340–1: . . . ὄσσε δ' ἄμερδεν | αὐγὴ χαλκείη κορύθων ἄπο λαμπομενάων: ' . . . their eyes were dazzled by the bronze light reflecting off the shining helmets'.

<sup>70</sup> 13.99 etc. Slatkin 2007 explores the connections between seeing, marvelling, and epic fame in the *Iliad*.

<sup>71</sup> Lessing 1962: 80; originally 1766.

and memorable, his syntax transparent; and speeches reveal the character of those who utter them. But, above all, there is the poet's ability to connect with our own perceptions, even across a gulf of almost three millennia. It is not difficult to visualise, for example, Astyanax as he recoils, screaming, into his nurse's arms – because we have all seen little children behave like that. An ancient commentator praises lines 467–9 as follows (ΣβT *ad* 6.467):

ταῦτα δὲ τὰ ἔπη οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐναργείας μεστὰ, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἀκούεται τὰ πράγματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁρᾶται. λαβῶν δὲ τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ βίου ὁ ποιητὴς ἄκρως περιεγένετο τῆι μιμῆσει.

These lines are so full of vividness because we do not just hear about the events but see them too.<sup>72</sup> Taking this scene from real life, the poet achieves the highest degree of imitation.

The scholiast mentions *μίμησις*, 'imitation', a key concept in ancient literary criticism. According to Plato, poetry imitates life, drama is the most mimetic kind of literature, and Homer is 'the path-finder of tragedy'.<sup>73</sup> There are, indeed, many theatrical aspects to Homer's poetry. We get a clear sense of how characters look and behave: in some cases the text comes close to providing implicit 'stage directions'. At 496n., for example, the poet describes Andromache, as she walks home in tears and 'turns back again and again' to look at Hector. The implication must be that Hector is looking at her and is still standing by the Scaean Gates (the poet later confirms this: 515–16n.). At 340–1n. we can likewise infer Hector's behaviour from the way others react to him. Paris asks Hector to wait while he gets ready for battle and then suddenly changes his mind: Hector should go right ahead. We can easily imagine Hector's look at the mere suggestion that he should stay around, while his soldiers die (for the sake of Paris) on the battlefield.

Classical Greek tragedy, modern painting, contemporary film: the *Iliad* has repeatedly been compared to the most vivid and visual means of expression. These comparisons are, of course, anachronistic: in the end, it is important to return, in ring composition, to our opening remarks. To the poet of the *Iliad*, and his early audiences, vividness was a sign of divine presence, a gift of the Muse. Homeric poetry was, as Ford has argued, a kind of epiphany.<sup>74</sup>

### 3. BOOK 6 IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE *ILIAD*

It is difficult to establish when the *Iliad* was divided into twenty-four books, each represented by one letter of the alphabet.<sup>75</sup> The division was clearly in place in

<sup>72</sup> Or perhaps: '... so that we do not just hear ...', reading ὥστε for ὅτι with Wilamowitz.

<sup>73</sup> Plato, *Rep.* 598d, with Macleod 1982: 1–8. On Homer's 'stagecraft', see esp. Clay 2007.

<sup>74</sup> Ford 1992: 54–5.

<sup>75</sup> [Plutarch] *On Homer* II ch. 4 claims that Aristarchus, or more generally his school, was the first to divide the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* into books, but this cannot be right: see S. West 1967: 18–25.

Hellenistic times but, as with many other aspects of the Homeric text, we know far less about the situation in the archaic and classical period. At 2.116 Herodotus discusses *Iliad* 6.289–92 and says that the lines are found 'in the exploit of Diomedes' (ἐν Διομήδεος ἀριστείῃ), a title that was later reserved for book 5 alone. It follows that even if our book divisions are early, as Jensen and others have argued, there were other ways of dividing up the text in classical Greece.<sup>76</sup> The issue of origins should not, however, distract us from a more important point: the divisions at the beginning and end of book 6 stem from an intelligent ancient articulation of the poem. Book 6 is characterised by the gods' absence: they abandon the battlefield at 6.1 and only enter again at 7.17. The central episode of the book is Hector's visit to Troy: lines 1–71 describe the crisis that leads to his mission; lines 72–118 reveal Helenos' plan to send Hector back and describe him as he runs towards the city; an intervening episode concludes the narrative of Diomedes' exploits (119–236); and finally the poet describes in detail Hector's visit: 237–529. The book ends as Hector and Paris are on the point of leaving the city through the Scaean Gates, and at 7.1 they run out into the battlefield.

The first books of the *Iliad* introduce the main characters and evoke the cause and beginning of the Trojan war: the poem opens with the clash between Achilles and Agamemnon; the Catalogue of Ships in book 2 acts as a reminder of the expedition; book 3 introduces Helen and her two husbands; book 4 dramatises how a private quarrel over a woman can become a war; in book 5 the fighting escalates; and in book 6 – as soon as the gods leave the battlefield – the Achaeans break through the lines and demonstrate their military superiority. The narrative now looks forward to the time when the Achaeans will defeat the Trojans: it anticipates the end of the poem (particularly books 22 and 24) and foreshadows the fall of the city. It is book 6, more than any other, that makes the *Iliad* 'a poem about Troy'.

In comparison with other books, the plot hardly advances in *Iliad* 6: the confrontation between Glaukos and Diomedes results in an exchange of gifts rather than a duel; and Hector's mission fails in its purpose (311n.). The tension in the book does not stem from momentous developments in the narrative, but from a stark contrast between what the audience know will happen to the city and what the characters inside it fear and hope. The issue is introduced as soon as Hector enters the city at 237–41n., and the poet constantly reminds the audience about the future of Troy: the second half of the book focuses on the Trojan women in a manner that recalls early accounts of the fall of Troy.<sup>77</sup> The foreshadowing is, at times,

For further discussion see especially Jensen 1999; Taplin 1992: 285–93; Heiden 1998; and Edwards 2002: 39–47.

<sup>76</sup> One ancient commentator actually encourages his readers to ignore the division between *Iliad* 2 and 3 because, he claims, it is not original; cf. Nünlist 2006.

<sup>77</sup> E.g. *Iliou Persis* (Proclus, *Chrestomathy*, pp. 144–6 West); Stesichorus, *Sack of Troy* frs. 197–8, 201 and 204–5 Davies. The women of Troy occupy a prominent place also on Polygnotus' painting of the aftermath of the Trojan War as described by Pausanias (10.25–27, esp. 25.9ff.); and in Euripides' play *Trojan Women*.

uncomfortably vivid: Hector's behaviour, in particular, mirrors the actions of future conquerors. At 318–20n. he enters into Helen's bedroom fully armed, and covered in blood – just like the Achaean soldiers who will soon break into the homes and bedrooms of the Trojans, in order to loot, rape and murder.<sup>78</sup> The poet thus relies not only on the audience's familiarity with the epic tradition, but also on their visual memory: he superimposes iconic images of the fall of Troy onto his narrative of Hector's visit.

Whereas the audience know, in graphic detail, that Troy will fall, the characters inside the story can only imagine what might happen. There is a great sense of foreboding in their words, but there are also occasional glimmers of hope, and self-delusion. The speeches in book 6 convey an extraordinary range of emotions. Fear of the future is obvious in all characters in Troy, with the possible exception of Helen. Andromache cannot keep to her daily tasks, the strain is too great: 381–9n., 485–93n. and 494–502n. Hector himself is far from stable: his speeches vary widely in tone and express many contradictory views about the future in close succession. His vitriolic and frustrated outburst against Paris (280–5n.) is quickly followed by a surprisingly restrained speech to him (325–31n.). Hector is studiously reasonable in his reply to Helen (359–68n.); whereas his first speech to Andromache ends in open despair (440–65n., 464–5n.). He imagines Astyanax in his prime, and victorious over the enemy (475–81n.), and then refuses to contemplate the future at all, insisting instead on the importance of duty and the inscrutability of fate (485–93n.). And then there are his sudden and unlikely hopes at the end of the book, which help him make up with Paris and face the enemy (520–9n.).

Book 6 inspires an overwhelming sense of pity, on the part of the audience, for the characters in the story. Pity also colours the characters' own words and feelings: Andromache asks Hector to take pity on her (407n., 431n.) and, when he sees her smiling tearfully at their baby, he does indeed feel pity for his wife (484n.) but goes on to remind her about fate, and duty and honour. The clash of feelings and values, the irreconcilable difference between social expectations and individual needs, the ignorance of the characters and the psychological complexity of their speeches, the threat of madness (389n.), the aloofness of the gods and the audience's sure knowledge of what will happen – all these aspects of book 6 make it remarkably close to classical Greek tragedy.

### 3.1 *The gods*

Book 6 is marked by the temporary absence of the gods – but the characters do not know that the gods have left, and we see them ask themselves whether they are present. When Hector rallies the troops, and the Trojans suddenly make a stand, the Achaeans think that a god in disguise 'descended from starry heaven': 107–9n.

<sup>78</sup> Later accounts of the sack of Troy emphasise the violent intrusion of soldiers into bedrooms: see e.g. Eur. *Andr.* 109–12, *Hec.* 914–51; and Virg. *Aen.* 2.479–505, esp. 503–5.

The supposition makes sense, especially as a reaction to the events in the previous book. At 5.334–40 Diomedes wounds Aphrodite, who is rescuing her son Aeneas; he then charges against Apollo, who reminds him of the difference between mortals and gods: 5.436–44. Ares enters the fray at 5.461–2, and his intervention draws Athena to the battlefield: she leaps onto Diomedes' chariot (which creaks under her weight) and drives it against Ares: 5.835–41. Diomedes wounds the god: 5.855–63. It is only at the end of the book that Zeus establishes some order, and the gods settle down on Olympus, while mortals continue fighting. In book 6 we see Diomedes reflect on what has just happened, mindful of the warning issued by Apollo. When Glaukos challenges him, his reaction is a strange mixture of uncertainty and aggression: if Glaukos is a god, then Diomedes will not fight him; but if he is mortal, he should consider himself already dead (123–43n.). His speech includes the cautionary tale of Lycurgus, who dared attack Dionysos and was punished as a result; but it is only in the following speech, delivered by Glaukos, that the inscrutability of the gods and the vulnerability of human beings truly find expression: 144–211. Diomedes still behaves as if he can simply establish where he stands vis-à-vis the gods; whereas in Glaukos' speech, and especially in his tale about Bellerophon (155–205n.), the gods remain in the background – powerful and incomprehensible. His outlook sets the tone for what follows.

Faced with the imminent fall of their city, the Trojans seek the protection of Athena – but do not see that she rejects their entreaties: that knowledge is reserved for the audience alone. The seer Helenos tells Hector that the women of Troy should pray to Athena, offer her a robe, promise a sacrifice and ask her 'to take pity on the wives of the Trojans, and their little children' (94–5n.). Hector repeats those instructions to Hecuba (269–78n.), and the women put them into practice – in their own way (286–311n.). And then the poet reveals, in a single line, that the ritual fails: no explanation is offered; the goddess simply lifts her head in denial (311n.). The line fits the portrayal of the gods in the rest of the poem. The Iliadic gods show little concern for human communities; they do not take pity on women or little children. In fact, they seem mostly concerned with individual men. Thetis cares only about her son Achilles: she wants the other Achaeans to perish, so that he may receive his due honours. Hera is determined to destroy the entire city of Troy (presumably because Paris offended her by judging Aphrodite more beautiful).<sup>79</sup> Hera is in fact so keen to see Troy fall that she casually tells Zeus he is welcome to destroy her own favourite cities – Argos, Sparta and Mycenae – whenever he likes: 'let us grant these things to each other, I to you, and you to me, and the other gods will follow' (4.62–3). The other gods do indeed share Hera's careless attitude towards human cities: the Trojans worship Athena, they call her 'protector of cities' (ἑρυσίπτολαί: 305n.), they have a temple dedicated to her on their acropolis and, at the end of the war, famously

<sup>79</sup> Hera and Athena are hostile to Troy throughout the *Iliad*, and indeed until the city falls: 20.313–17. The poet hardly refers to the judgement of Paris, though at 24.27–30 he does say that it offended the goddesses; see further Scully 1990: 38–40.



drag the Trojan horse into the city, as an offering to her.<sup>80</sup> And yet Athena does not care for Troy: Paris offended her too, and so she hates the entire city. She changes her attitude only after the fall of Troy, when Ajax desecrates her statue and rapes Cassandra. After that, she exacts her revenge on the Achaeans, because a single man offended her. Many poems in the Trojan cycle explored Athena's complex attitude towards Trojans and Achaeans.<sup>81</sup> The failed ritual in *Iliad* 6, as so many other aspects of the book, invited early audiences to reflect on the poems, legends and images that depicted the fall of Troy.

The relationship between Athena and Troy remained a prominent issue in the classical period: according to Herodotus, Xerxes presented himself to the Greeks as the avenger of Priam and the champion of Trojan Athena.<sup>82</sup> The failure of the ritual in book 6 must have seemed particularly interesting, and alarming, to audiences at the Panathenaea. We have already seen that recitations of the Homeric poems featured prominently at that festival. The most important event, however, was a ritual procession, which culminated in the offering of a garment to the goddess Athena. The parallels between the Panathenaea and the ritual in *Iliad* 6 are so striking that Lorimer considered the entire episode an Athenian interpolation.<sup>83</sup> It is ultimately impossible to establish the origins of our text; but it remains important to ask how the Athenians experienced the similarities between their own ritual and that depicted in *Iliad* 6. It must have been striking to hear about Athena's rejection of the Trojan robe, at a festival where the Athenians themselves presented the goddess with one. There were, however, some crucial differences between the Trojan and the Athenian offering. In the *Iliad* Helenos asks Hecuba to select 'the most graceful and largest robe, the one dearest to her' (90n., 91n.). Her choice is disastrous: she picks a garment woven by Sidonian women who were abducted by Paris on his way home, after he had already taken Helen (288–95n.). In early epic the history of an object generally determines its significance,<sup>84</sup> and the history of this particular garment was unlikely to please Athena: it evoked the rape of Helen, and hence the judgement of Paris. The history of an object was also important in actual cultic practice: the Athenians closely monitored the design and production of the robe they offered to Athena. Rather than leaving such matters to individual choice, they publicly appointed weavers and helpers.<sup>85</sup> A comparison with Panathenaic practices suggests that Troy, in contrast to Athens, is at the mercy of individual whims, preferences and allegiances. We have already seen that the Iliadic gods care more about individual men than about cities

<sup>80</sup> *Iliou Persis* in Proclus, *Chrestomathy*, p. 144 West. No individual god is mentioned at *Od.* 8.509.

<sup>81</sup> See especially the *Little Iliad* (Proclus, *Chrestomathy*, pp. 120–2 West); the *Iliou Persis* (*Chrest.* pp. 144–6 West); the *Nostoi* (*Chrest.* p. 154 West); and cf. *Od.* 1.326–7, 3.130–6 and 143–7, 4.502, 5.105–11, 13.312–51, with Clay 1983. For a later exploration of Athena's attitude to Troy, cf. Eur. *Tro.* 1–97.

<sup>82</sup> See esp. Herodotus 7.43, with Haubold 2007.

<sup>83</sup> Lorimer 1950: 442–9, who builds on earlier work by Bethe 1929: 314–24; for further discussion, see Kirk 1990: 167–8.

<sup>84</sup> See Crielaard 2003 and Grethlein 2008. <sup>85</sup> See Neils 1992: 112–17.

and communities – but the problem is not limited to the gods. Hecuba's choice of garment reveals that she is too close to Paris: she cherishes his gifts and is therefore implicated in his actions. Even when she tries to act on behalf of the city, she remains first and foremost Paris' mother.

### 3.2 *Men and women*

As the Achaeans break through the lines, and the Trojans flee in disarray, the narrative shifts from the battlefield to the city, and to the women who live in it. Agamemnon reminds his brother of what happened in his home when Paris raped Helen and urges him to fight on relentlessly, until he exacts his revenge: all the Trojans must die, even babies still in their mothers' wombs (55–60n.). The speech is an extreme version of a thought that Nestor has already expressed: at 2.354–6 he told the Achaeans that nobody should set sail for home 'until he has lain in bed with the wife of a Trojan, to avenge Helen . . .' (cf. also 3.301, where rape is again considered an aspect of war). It is quite clear what the fall of the city entails for the women of Troy and, at 73–4n., the Achaeans are poised for victory. It is at this point that Helenos tells Hector and Aeneas to rally the troops 'before they fall into the hands of the women and become a source of joy for the enemy' (81–2n.). The Achaeans are eager to enter, rape and murder – and, precisely for that reason, the Trojans must not withdraw into the arms of their own wives. Helenos insists that, in this moment of extreme danger, the men and women of Troy must keep to their separate tasks: the men must continue fighting, while the women should pray and make an offering to Athena. The problem is that Helenos needs to communicate his plan to the women: for this difficult task he chooses Hector, who alone must enter the city and talk to the women – without falling into their hands.

At the Scaean Gates he is surrounded by the wives and daughters of the Trojans, who anxiously ask him about their relatives. Family concerns threaten to take over, but Hector does not linger on individual circumstances and delivers the same message to each woman: they should all pray (237–241n.). Here, as elsewhere, Hector tries to reinforce cohesiveness and a sense of community, refusing to yield to individual concerns. The poet, however, emphasises the different personal circumstances of the women: he reveals that many are already bereaved, even though they are unaware of it: 241n. There are good reasons why Hector fails to give specific information about those who have fallen in battle: he may not know all the details, and in any case the news would be divisive – some women would feel relieved, while others would abandon themselves to despair and mourning. And yet Hector will eventually have to face the individual concerns of his own womenfolk: his mother, his sister-in-law and his wife will all confront him with their needs.

Under the strain of war it is difficult and dangerous for men and women to meet: despite Hector's encounters, *Iliad* 6 largely depicts 'a divided world'.<sup>86</sup> The poet

<sup>86</sup> The description is taken from Arthur Katz 1981.

conveys the impression that the women move and meet inside the city according to their plans and routines, and that Hector's arrival interrupts and startles them. He meets Hecuba in front of the palace, as she returns from some errand together with her daughter Laodike; like Hector, we do not know where she has been.<sup>87</sup> There is a clear sense, in *Iliad* 6, that the women's plans remain largely unknown to the men. Helenos, for example, says that Hecuba should gather the old women of Troy, unlock the temple of Athena, choose a robe for her and utter a prayer on behalf of the community (86–98n.). In the event, however, the women of Troy divide these tasks among themselves: Hecuba tells her maids to gather the old women (286–7), while she selects the garment (288–95n.); it is then Theano, in her official capacity as priestess of Athena, who opens the temple (297–311n.), places the robe on Athena's knees and utters the prayer (304–10). These discrepancies do not mean that Hecuba disobeys her son's instructions; they simply show that Helenos and Hector have no direct access to the world of the women: they tell their mother what needs to be done, and she delegates as appropriate.

This sense of distance and separation between men and women reaches a new intensity when Hector meets Andromache. He first looks for her at home but does not find her. The housekeeper then tells him that she ran out to the rampart 'like a madwoman', together with the nurse and the baby (381–9n.). When Hector finally meets Andromache, she is extremely distressed, but she is not deranged: the housekeeper must have seen Andromache's grief at its rawest and most uncontrolled. When Andromache returns home after talking to Hector, she again shows the extremity of her pain to her maids: rather than supervising their work, as Hector had told her to do, she rouses them to a full funeral lament (494–502n.). All this suggests that Andromache gives full expression to her pain only in front of other women. Eventually, Andromache will follow Hector's advice and return to her normal household duties – weaving, spinning, and supervising her maids (491–2n.). At 22.437–46, when she next appears, she is weaving a robe and giving an order to her maids – that they should prepare a warm bath for Hector. It is at that point that the poet calls her *νηπιη*, 'poor innocent' (22.445), because then Hector is already dead. Andromache's tempo does not match Hector's: there is a disjunction between her emotional responses and his death. The poet's comment, *νηπιη*, suggests that Andromache is out of touch with Hector's situation; but it also exposes the limitations of Hector's earlier advice to her.<sup>88</sup> To continue at home, as normal, while men see to the fighting, proves impossible because war destroys everybody; it is ultimately not just 'the concern of men' (492).

It is above all through the perspectives of women that the poet exposes the brutality of war. Never do women in the *Iliad* celebrate war.<sup>89</sup> Andromache makes no moral distinction between killing and being killed – and accuses Hector of being

<sup>87</sup> Aristarchus was so puzzled by Hecuba's movements that he offered an unlikely interpretation in order to account for them: 252n.

<sup>88</sup> On 22.445, see further Grethlein 2006a: 245–53.

<sup>89</sup> On women's attitude to war in the *Iliad*, see further Murnaghan 1999: 207–17.

about to make her a widow: 432n. The one exception is Helen, who ultimately commemorates her own powers in a woven robe depicting the wars that Achaeans and Trojans underwent 'for her sake' (3.128).<sup>90</sup> She is also the only woman who taunts her husband, Paris, and tells him to go back to the battlefield, if he dares (3.428–36; cf. 349–53n.). Her behaviour emphasises, by contrast, the attitudes of other women. Andromache desperately tries to keep Hector safe, and close to her, inside the city: she fights against Hector's determination to prove himself in the first line of battle: 'Your own strength will kill you', are her first words to him (407n.), and in her final appeal she tells him not to make her a widow, or her son an orphan: those are the acts of an enemy (432n.). Her attitude is similar to that of other women in the *Iliad*: in general, they focus their attention on the man they love and try to influence his thoughts and ideas; how his behaviour may be determined by other men is not something they consider in any great detail. Hecuba, for example, assumes that Hector retreated into the city on an impulse, in order to pray (256n.); but, in fact, we know that he is carrying out Helenos' instructions, has rallied the troops before leaving and has informed the army of his mission (110–18n.). He is not simply acting on a whim, as Hecuba suggests. The physical separation between men and women affects the knowledge and outlook of Homeric characters: men do not know exactly how women move and organise themselves in the city; while women can only imagine, and try to affect, how their own men behave.

That the feelings, values and priorities of men and women are different is dramatised most eloquently in the encounter between Hector and Andromache. Hector is torn between the competing demands of the other men, who need him on the battlefield, and Andromache, who wants him to stay inside. This kind of entanglement seems typically Trojan: Diomedes too has a wife, as Dione reveals when she comforts Aphrodite (at 5.410–15), but he never mentions her – and this is not just because she is far away, since the Trojan ally Sarpedon does think about his wife and baby son back in Lycia (5.479–81 and 684–8). The point, rather, is that women compromise a man's valour and impair his ability to fight (81–2n.). Hector finds it hard to resist Andromache's appeal for pity. It is only at the end of the *Iliad* that the quest for glory, social responsibility, love and pity are reconciled – but then the drama is played out entirely in the male domain, and Achilles is the protagonist. As Arthur Katz points out, 'Achilles' love for Patroclus brings him back to the battlefield, and ensures victory for the Greeks [...] And Achilles' pity for Priam, who reminds him of his own father, induces him to accept Priam's supplication and so to acknowledge the common bond of humanity which unites all men.'<sup>91</sup> Women, however, are left crying at the end of the poem.<sup>92</sup> Hector does imagine a future of perfect harmony between men and women, when he utters a prayer on behalf of his son (475–81n.): he

<sup>90</sup> See further Arthur Katz 1981: 26.   <sup>91</sup> Arthur Katz 1981: 38.

<sup>92</sup> The prevailing notion that the *Iliad* ends with the touching encounter between Achilles and Priam is not quite accurate: the poem finishes with the women's laments for Hector, and with his burial.

imagines that, one day, Astyanax will return from the battlefield carrying the spoils of the enemy, and that his mother will 'rejoice in her heart' (481n.). The whole vision is unlikely, doomed even. It implies that Hector and Andromache share the same values, but Andromache never celebrates Hector as a warrior – to her, he is 'father, mother, brother and tender husband' (429–30n.). Even in her final funeral lament, at 24.739–45, she makes a distinction between her own perspective and that of the wider community: the people mourn Hector because he was the strongest warrior, 'but for me above all there will be sharp pain, Hector, because you did not die in your own bed, stretching out your hands to me, and telling me a wise word, that I could cherish always . . .' That was her preferred vision for the future.

### 3.3 *The city of Troy*

The plight of the Trojans is set against the backdrop of their city. Book 6, more than any other, gives a vivid impression of the landmarks, buildings and streets of Troy. Rather than offering a static image of the city, the poet describes it by following Hector's progress through it. The overall impression is of swift movement: images of the city pass quickly before Hector's eyes, and our own. He enters through the Scaean Gates, near the oak tree (237n.); then he presses on to the palace of Priam – an imposing building, all made of polished stone (242–52n.); at the entrance to the palace he meets Hecuba – and the narrative then follows her, as she enters into the innermost chamber of the palace (288n.) and picks her favourite robe (295n.). She then leads the women to the temple of Athena, on the acropolis; Theano unlocks its doors and places Hecuba's robe on the knees of a seated statue of Athena (297n.; 298n. with 88–9n.; and 303 with 92n.). Also on the acropolis, in ominous proximity to the temple, is the palace of Paris: built by the best workmen in Troy, it is beautiful and houses the most beautiful couple (312–17n.). After visiting Paris and Helen in their own bedroom, Hector hurries home, looking for Andromache (369–91n.). The poet says very little about Hector's palace, a case of secondary focalisation: to Hector, it is home, and therefore unremarkable. We see him looking for Andromache inside, then stopping at the threshold, asking after her. He then runs back to the Scaean Gates, retracing his steps through the 'built-up streets' (391n.), of 'the great city' (392n.). Hector's overall trajectory is configured as a linear journey in, and then out of the city. The innermost point in that journey is Hector's own home.

Greek audiences of all times thought they knew where Troy was: Homer gives it a precise location on the plain beneath Mount Ida, close to the rivers Scamander and Simoeis, not far from the Hellespont and the islands of Samothrace, Tenedos and Imbros. Heinrich Schliemann excavated an impressive Bronze Age citadel precisely in this area, at Hisarlik in modern Turkey.<sup>93</sup> The relationship between the ongoing

<sup>93</sup> For Schliemann's work see Schliemann 1880, Calder and Traill 1986, Calder and Cobet 1990, Cobet and Patzek 1992, Traill 1993 and 1995, Boedeker 1997, Cobet 1997 and Easton 2002.

excavations at Hisarlik and Homer's Troy is complex and much debated.<sup>94</sup> One thing, however, seems clear: imposing Bronze Age fortifications were still visible in the early first millennium BCE. The site at Hisarlik continued to be inhabited, and Athena was worshipped there in historical times.<sup>95</sup> It seems, then, that the Trojan saga found confirmation in the grand ruins of an early citadel; and that the ruins, in turn, inspired stories and explanations. For those communities who lived near the ruins or in any case had seen them, the fall of Troy was a material reality. But for all audiences, the *Iliad* supplied a concrete image of the city. Within the text, a sense of doom is palpable in the mention of specific landmarks. Hector and Andromache meet at the Scaean Gates, and the *Iliad* later reveals that Hector confronted Achilles outside the Gates (22.5–6), and that Andromache stood near them, watching Achilles disfigure her husband's corpse (22.462–4). Specific places contribute to the sense of doom also by reference to a wider net of legends and stories. At 6.433–4, for example, Andromache mentions one part of the wall, 'near the fig tree', which seems particularly vulnerable: according to a myth attested in Pindar, one portion of the wall was built by human hands, rather than the gods, and was therefore vulnerable to attack: 434n. Andromache's fear thus finds confirmation in Pindar's poetry.

The very solidity of the city in *Iliad* 6 emphasises, by contrast, the vulnerability of those who live in it. The palace of Priam boasts fifty bedrooms for his sons and their wives, and twelve bedrooms for his daughters and their husbands (242–52n., 244n., 248–50n.). It is a powerful image of dynastic continuity, but in fact those couples will never live there together again. In *Iliad* 6 the city is configured as a female space. We know that there must be old men inside too, because they featured at 3.146–60, and because Hector mentions them in his initial speech to the troops (see 113n.). After that, however, they remain out of sight. By focusing on the women, the poet not only emphasises the trials of Hector – a man surrounded by women who want to delay him – but also powerfully foreshadows the fall of Troy. The city has fragrant storerooms, bedrooms and lovely women with scented breasts (288n.: κηῶντες; cf. 482–3n.: κηῶδες): it is a treasure, a prize for conquerors. Because the city is so starkly female, Hector's final wish, at the end of book 6, seems especially unrealistic. He imagines that one day the Achaeans will sail home, defeated – and that the Trojan men will finally celebrate together, resolve all tensions between them and set up a mixing bowl for freedom 'in the halls' (526–9n.) – thus reclaiming civic space as their own.

The fall of Troy is evoked by the buildings, the landmarks and the people in it. What remains unclear is exactly why Troy must fall. The poet and his characters offer many explanations: the gods came to dislike Laomedon (21.441–60); Paris presumed to judge on divine beauty (24.25–30) and abused his position as Menelaos' guest

<sup>94</sup> See, for example, the debate about the excavations of the late Manfred Korfmann: Latacz *et al.* 2001, Cobet and Gehrke 2002, Haubold 2002, Ulf 2003 and Latacz 2004.

<sup>95</sup> Hertel 2003: 24–86 (the walls of Troy) and 94–122 (the temple of Athena); see also the remarks in Hertel 2008: 86–9.

(3.351-4, 328-9n., 356n.); Helen behaved badly (3.126-8, 164-5 and 173-5; 344-8n.); Pandaros broke the truce (4.155-68, 7.348-53); the Trojans failed to disown Paris and return Helen (7.345-79); Hector failed his people (22.99-110). But there were also larger, more general causes at work in the background: the *Iliad* suggests that the heroes were destined to die.<sup>96</sup> They were much stronger than 'people nowadays', but their social institutions were weaker. The fate of Troy could not be disentangled from the affairs of the ruling family; similarly, the Achaeans perished as a result of Achilles' anger, and Agamemnon's greed (1.1-7). The fall of Troy thus symbolises the death of the heroes, and the end of an entire age (12.22-3 and 14.83-7). And perhaps, it symbolises even more than that: for Achilles, the Trojan War illustrates the general truth that human happiness cannot last (24.543-51).

#### 4. DIFFICULT ENCOUNTERS

With the gods largely withdrawn from the action, the poet explores in detail how human beings interact with one another – on the battlefield, and in the city. Most of book 6 represents their difficult encounters, at a time of extreme tension. When Hector sets off for Troy, the narrative initially remains focused on the battlefield: Glaukos and Diomedes drive forward between the two armies, determined to fight to the death. Their encounter offers a searching exploration of conflicting loyalties on the battlefield. It is memorable and surprising: an exchange of insults between enemies becomes a hospitality scene; while an exchange of gifts between friends turns out to be a source of humiliation for one of them. The placing of the episode, between Hector's departure (117-18n.) and his arrival at Troy (237), offers a starting-point for its interpretation: although some ancient critics placed it elsewhere,<sup>97</sup> it is best understood as a description of what happens on the battlefield while Hector is away.<sup>98</sup> The episode is sufficiently long and elaborate to counterbalance the description of Hector's actions in the second half of the book, and to suggest that nothing momentous takes place while he is away. At the same time, it shows that Glaukos is no substitute for Hector (cf. 119n.), and that Diomedes remains dangerous: the Trojans need Athena to 'break his spear' more than ever (306n.).

In comparison with the long and uneventful encounter between Glaukos and Diomedes, Hector's mission in Troy is swift and to the point. Hector's aims are set out clearly at the beginning of the book: his brother Helenos instructs him to go into the city and tell Hecuba to organise an offering for Athena (86-98n.). In the course of his visit Hector meets not only his mother, but also Helen and Paris, and his wife and child. Each encounter is carefully introduced, so as to show that Hector acts as a responsible soldier, even while away from the battlefield. In the course of

his conversation with Hecuba, he announces his intention to go and retrieve Paris from his palace and bring him back to the battlefield. His decision is not part of Helenos' original plan but can hardly be faulted: it is – as Hector himself points out – demoralising for the troops to fight on behalf of somebody who absents himself from the battlefield (325-31n.). Later, in response to Helen's seductive speech (343-58n.), Hector suddenly declares that he wants to go and see his own wife (359-68n.). This is the only decision that he cannot justify in military terms. And yet, again, it is hard to fault him for it: Hector needs to wait for Paris, in order to ensure that he does indeed return to the battlefield and, rather than spend time with Helen, he decides to go and see his own wife and son – because, he adds in an alarming moment of insight, this may be the last time they see him alive (367-8n.).

Throughout his mission in Troy, Hector is conscious that the men desperately need him to return to the battlefield as soon as possible. He runs towards Troy, with his shield slung behind him, 'battering his neck and shins' (117-18n.). He quickly dismisses the women of Troy, telling them all to pray (237-41n.); he then reaches the palace of Priam and refuses Hecuba's offer of wine because, he claims, it would sap his strength (265n.). Hecuba tries to delay him (ἀλλὰ μὲν': 258n.), but he moves swiftly on. He enters Paris' bedroom and finds his brother sitting idle (318-24n.). When Paris asks him to wait or go ahead without him, he is left speechless (340-1n., 342n.). When Helen invites him to 'sit down' next to her (354-6n.), he says that the Trojan men on the battlefield are 'longing' for him (362n.) – and then, while he waits for Paris, he goes swiftly home to see his own wife (370n.: αἴψα δ' ἔπειτα). When he realises Andromache is not there, he rushes back to the Gates (ἀπέσσυτο: 390n.), where she intercepts him (393n.). There is only one moment, in the whole of book 6, when Hector loses momentum. After his conversation with Andromache, she leaves crying – 'turning back again and again' to look at him (496n.). It is precisely at this moment that Paris appears in full armour, galloping like a stallion towards the battlefield. As soon as he sees Hector, he takes the opportunity to draw attention to his own speed – and this precisely at the one moment when Hector is standing still, with his back to the battlefield 'in the place where he had his sweet talk with his wife' (515-16n.). Despite Paris' provoking words, Hector refuses to get drawn into an argument: any differences, he claims, will be resolved after the war (520-9n.).

Hector's mission in Troy is configured as a set of three trials. First, he must resist Hecuba's offer of wine; then there is the trial of seduction; and finally he is confronted with Andromache's emotional appeal. The tension increases steadily: each trial is harder and more drawn out. Some scholars speak of a 'scale of affection' in the order of Hector's encounters, corresponding to Andromache's description of her relationship with Hector: 'you are to me father, mother, brother and tender husband'.<sup>99</sup> There is, however, no reason to think that Hector loves Paris or Helen more than Hecuba; just as, in Andromache's speech, there is no indication that her brothers are more important to her than her father or mother. The point of

<sup>96</sup> Graziosi and Haubold 2005: 103-5, 125-34. <sup>97</sup> ΣΑ ad 6.119a.

<sup>98</sup> Σβ1' ad 6.237a; Schadewaldt 1943: 77; Homer inserts an episode of similar length and nature while Trojan heralds are sent from the battlefield to the city in book 3: between their departure (3.116-17) and their arrival (245), the poet offers an extended description of the battlefield (3.121-244).

<sup>99</sup> The idea goes back to Kakridis 1949: ch. 1, esp. 49-53.

this arrangement, rather, is that it traces the natural course of a human life: as his visit unfolds, Hector is cast as a son, brother, husband and father. And it is that last challenge – of being a good husband and father – that proves most painful. Hector's different relationships offer precious insights into the dynamics of ancient families. Ancient commentators observe, for example, that Hecuba behaves like a typical mother,<sup>100</sup> that Astyanax's reactions are true to life<sup>101</sup> and that Andromache is torn between her desire to obey Hector and her love for him.<sup>102</sup> When reading the difficult encounters of *Iliad* 6, it is useful to follow the cues of ancient scholiasts and ask to what extent we still recognise Homer's characters in our own experience. Homeric poetry suggests that some aspects of human life, particularly family life, are remarkably stable. A simile at 15.362–4, for example, reveals that children have been busy making and destroying sandcastles at the beach for almost three millennia. But even when the activities, values and situations of Homer's characters are radically different from our own, the careful way in which they are drawn brings them truly to life.

#### 4.1 *Glaukos and Diomedes*

In terms of narrative structure, the episode needs to be substantial in length and inconclusive in outcome: it suggests that nothing momentous happens on the battlefield while Hector is away. The poet takes this as an opportunity to explore, quizzically and unpredictably, some important themes in *Iliad* 6, such as loyalty in marriage and in war, divine inscrutability and human self-deception. He uses a wide range of different narrative forms: exchanges of insults on the battlefield, hymns to the gods, sayings, children's stories, genealogies, hospitality scenes. These different elements combine to unexpected effect: the encounter between Glaukos and Diomedes has puzzled ancient and modern readers alike, and it has attracted comments and explanations through the ages – starting within the text itself. The poet's own comment at the end of the episode casts an entirely new light on it (232–6n.), and the exchange of gifts between Ajax and Hector at 7.277–312 works as an internal elaboration on the episode.

Diomedes, who has been on a rampage since book 5, is the first to speak. His words are an example of battlefield 'flyting' (verbal assault): he intimidates his opponent and boasts about his own prowess: 123–43n. To these standard elements of flyting, he adds an altogether different observation: if Glaukos is a god, he will not challenge him. The dangers of fighting with the gods are illustrated by the story of Lycurgus, which takes the shape of an inverted hymn: 130–40n. Diomedes seems to have learnt from his own experiences in book 5 and now wants to draw a sharp line between gods and mortals. He remains convinced, however, that he can simply establish whether

Glaukos is a man – and then proceed to kill him if he is. Glaukos' answer suggests that human affairs are not as straightforward as Diomedes assumes: the gods are inscrutable.

In answer to Diomedes, Glaukos delivers one of the longest speeches in the whole *Iliad*. Given the context, length is in itself a sign of weakness: the closest parallel to Glaukos' speech is Aeneas' excessively long answer to Achilles' verbal attack at 20.199–258: that speech is followed by his humiliating defeat.<sup>103</sup> Flyting boasts are usually short preambles to actual violence, but Glaukos' speech does not open as a boast at all.<sup>104</sup> He starts with an image of arresting beauty: his identity is unimportant, he suggests, because men constantly die and are born, like leaves on a tree: 146–9n.; after that, he launches into a very long account of his family and identity: 150–211n. Taken as a whole, his speech is best seen as an answer, however strange, to Diomedes' opening challenge.<sup>105</sup> Diomedes claimed he would kill any human opponent (142–3); now Glaukos admits that he is mortal and suggests that this is all that matters, since all mortals must die (146–9n.). Diomedes told the story of Lycurgus, who offended the gods and was punished for it (130–40n.); now Glaukos tells the story of his grandfather Bellerophon, who was rewarded by the gods after many trials, only to meet with their displeasure in the end. Glaukos does not explain why Bellerophon became hateful to the gods: either he does not know it or does not care to mention it (200–21n.), but the story of how Bellerophon tried to ascend to heaven must have been known to many ancient audiences. Glaukos is similarly silent about crimes of his ancestor Sisyphos, who challenged the gods by trying to overcome death (153n.). These omissions contribute to the impression that Glaukos is young and inexperienced: he seems to be repeating the stories he has been told by his elders (see also 185n. and 190n.). His account of his grandfather's life contains many elements familiar from children's stories: Bellerophon was persecuted by a wicked queen, went into exile, overcame three impossible trials set by the king of a distant land and finally married a princess and inherited half the kingdom. These are the stories Glaukos understands and relates at length; on the causes of his grandfather's downfall he says nothing at all: 155–205n.

Glaukos' genealogical history reaches a high point with Bellerophon's exploits and the birth of Sarpedon (191n., 198–9n.); after that, the family experiences a sharp decline. Glaukos is acutely aware that his unremarkable father expects great things of him (206–11n.) but he will ultimately fail to make him proud: the poet suggests that this encounter ends in humiliation (232–6n.). Later in the *Iliad* Glaukos again appears eager, but unable, to prove himself to his own satisfaction and that of others. At 12.310–28 Sarpedon addresses him with a famous speech about valour in the face of death. Glaukos dutifully helps to lead the ensuing attack, but already at 12.387–91 he is wounded by an arrow and hides away, afraid that the Achaeans might taunt him

<sup>100</sup> ΣbT *ad* 6.260c, discussed below: Introduction 4.2.

<sup>101</sup> ΣbT *ad* 6.467, discussed above: Introduction 2.6.

<sup>102</sup> ΣbT *ad* 6.495–6, discussed at 494–502n.

<sup>103</sup> See Willcock 1992: 68–72.

<sup>104</sup> For a standard flyting reply, see, for example 5.647–54.

<sup>105</sup> Stoevesandt 2008: 57–8 discusses alternative interpretations.

and gloat. At 16.490–501 Sarpedon, who is about to die, calls on Glaukos to rescue his armour and threatens him with eternal shame should he fail to do so. Still wounded by Teucer's arrow, Glaukos is unable to help (16.508–12) and, even after Apollo heals him, cannot prevent Sarpedon from being stripped of his armour (16.663–5). It seems clear that Glaukos cannot measure up to Diomedes; but his speech offers a perspective on human life that early audiences of the *Iliad* are likely to have recognised as close to their own: the past seems more glamorous than the present; the gods are inscrutable; and human fortunes unpredictable.<sup>106</sup>

In his reply Diomedes considers none of these general truths: he is inexplicably delighted with Glaukos' speech. He soon explains that their families share an ancient bond of hospitality and proposes that they should avoid one another in battle (224–9n.) and exchange armour (230–1n.). Though energetic and apparently straightforward, Diomedes' speech makes a controversial suggestion and offers a genealogical account that is as selective as Glaukos' own account of his family. Diomedes claims he cannot remember his father, a comment that the scholia criticise as inappropriate, 'out of place' (222–3n.). Whether or not Diomedes has any direct memory of his father,<sup>107</sup> other characters in the *Iliad* keep reminding him about Tydeus and telling him to be like him (see especially Athena's words at 5.800–13) – and the audience know what that means: in the *Iliad* Tydeus is remembered as a savage warrior. He marched against Thebes disregarding the will of the gods and thus played a leading role in one of the greatest disasters described in the poem: 4.370–400, and 4.404–10. Diomedes wavers between emulating his father when he is on the attack (5.115–17, 10.283–94; cf. 5.252–6), and rejecting him as a model when he chooses to be less extreme, as here.

At the end of Diomedes' speech the two enemies leap off their chariots, shake hands and make pledges – and then the poet remarks that 'Zeus must have robbed Glaukos of his wits', because he exchanged his golden armour for one of bronze: 232–6n. This is a shocking comment, which exposes as naïve not only Glaukos' actions, but also our own interpretation of the encounter up to this moment. What seemed to be a touching example of friendship across battle lines is now presented as an unequal exchange. In an important essay of 1795–6, Schiller argued that the conclusion of the episode was characteristically Homeric: he praised the 'matter-of-fact truthfulness' (*trockene Wahrhaftigkeit*) of Homer and contrasted it with the sentimentality of Ariosto.<sup>108</sup> Homer's final comment struck ancient audiences too: 'bronze for gold' became proverbial in ancient Greece (Pl. *Symp.* 219a), and the passage gave rise to many different interpretations. Surviving ancient responses can be divided into three groups. Some focus on the unequal outcome of the exchange: the scholia T ad 6.234b<sup>1</sup>, for example, suggest that Homer was trying to please a Greek audience.

<sup>106</sup> See further Graziosi and Haubold 2005: 139–47.

<sup>107</sup> Pratt 2009 suggests that he does not.

<sup>108</sup> *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung*. The essay is printed in Janz *et al.* 1992: 706–810. For an English translation see Hinderer and Dahlstrom 1993: 179–260. Schiller discusses the passage from *Iliad* 6 at Janz *et al.* 1992: 730–2; cf. Hinderer and Dahlstrom 1993: 198–9 (*trockene Wahrhaftigkeit*; Janz *et al.* 1992: 731).

Others attempt to justify Glaukos' behaviour: ΣbT ad 6.234a claim that he was trying to emulate Bellerophon's generosity; cf. Eustathius IV, p. 83: 14–17 and IV, p. 182: 24–6 van der Valk. Aristotle rejects that view and argues that Glaukos should not be blamed because he gave away something too valuable, but because he gave away something he needed: warriors should not relinquish their armour.<sup>109</sup> A third group of comments focuses on Diomedes' actions: ΣbT ad 6.230 insist that he was not greedy; ΣbT ad 6.235a<sup>2</sup> question the wisdom of stripping and contemplate the possibility that Diomedes was as foolish as Glaukos (πῶς οὐ Διομήδης φρένων λείπεται).<sup>110</sup>

Modern readers echo the concerns of ancient ones.<sup>111</sup> Some insist that Glaukos is the loser; Martin 1989: 127–30 argues that Diomedes intimidates Glaukos and manipulates him into a humiliating defeat. Others try to justify his actions: Donlan 1989b draws on the anthropology of gift exchange to suggest that Glaukos tries – but fails – to compensate for a perceived status imbalance. Others still suggest that Diomedes is the real fool of the situation: Scodel 1992b argues that he is misguided about the human condition and the role of the gods, and that he will be taught a lesson at 8.130–71. The conclusion of the episode allows no doubt on one point: Glaukos suffers a symbolic defeat, cf. 230–1n. Beyond this, the poet leaves us with many difficult questions as we return to Troy and follow Hector's purposeful and swift journey into the city. Some of those questions are then taken up in book 7.

At 7.273–82 the Trojan and the Achaean herald interrupt a particularly fierce single combat between Ajax and Hector, because night is falling and it is time to stop fighting. Ajax declares that he is willing to postpone the duel, if Hector is too – and Hector readily settles for a temporary truce: 'You will make all the Achaeans rejoice by the ships, and especially your friends and relatives; and I will please the Trojan men, and the Trojan women of the trailing robes, in the great city of king Priam': 7.294–7. As ever, Hector thinks first of the benefits of the arrangement for his own community. He then proposes an exchange of gifts: 'So that an Achaean or a Trojan may say about us: "They fought in the soul-devouring battle but then joined together in friendship, before they separated"': 7.300–2. Hector offers a sword and scabbard, and he receives a purple belt: the exchange does not involve stripping.<sup>112</sup> This episode throws into relief the more problematic aspects of the encounter between Glaukos and Diomedes.<sup>113</sup> Those two warriors do not interrupt their confrontation at the request of others: they simply decide to avoid each other in battle, in the name of a private bond of hospitality. Indeed, Diomedes goes as far as observing that

<sup>109</sup> Aristotle, fr. 155 Rose = 379 Gigon.

<sup>110</sup> For ancient interpretations of the episode, see further Maftei 1976: 52–4.

<sup>111</sup> For overviews of the modern debate: Calder 1984; Alden 1996; and Stoevesandt 2008: 85–6.

<sup>112</sup> Even that exchange was perceived as problematic in antiquity, see Soph. *Ajax* 661–5 and 1026–39.

<sup>113</sup> The *Little Iliad* described another wartime encounter between guest-friends: see fr. 22 West, where Odysseus spares Helicaon because they share an ancient bond of hospitality. That episode must also have cast an interesting light on the encounter between Glaukos and Diomedes.

there are plenty of other Trojans he can kill and declares that Glaukos is welcome to kill other Achaeans too, if he can: the two thus trade off the lives of their own comrades in a perverse form of gift exchange between guest-friends: 224–9n. As elsewhere in the *Iliad*, personal bonds and interests are pitted against loyalty to one's own wider community – and, as often, personal considerations prove to be stronger.

#### 4.2 *Hector and Hecuba*

When Hector enters the city, he is confronted with the interests and priorities of the women closest to him. Their needs are pitted against his wider responsibilities: he needs to defend the city and hence return to the battlefield as soon as possible. Hecuba is the first woman who tries to hold him back. She meets him in front of the royal palace, a building that, as we have seen, provides a poignant backdrop for their encounter: it speaks of generational continuity, lasting protection and ordered family life – but it also reminds us that Troy will fall, and sons will die before their mothers: 242–52n. She arrives at the palace together with her prettiest daughter, Laodike, and is startled to see Hector: her first words express her surprise, as she tries to work out what he might be doing there. She guesses, correctly, that he is reacting to an emergency, but she wrongly assumes that he left the battlefield on an impulse (θυμός: 256n.), because he wanted to pray. Without waiting for an explanation from him, she goes on to make plans: he should wait while she goes inside the palace to get some wine for a libation – and then he should drink himself, because wine restores the strength of a tired man. The scholia bT *ad* 6.260c observe that she behaves like a typical mother: 'because mothers always expect children to eat and drink'. There are other aspects of her speech that contribute to her characterisation: she uses emotive and sometimes strong language (254n.: τέκνον; 255n.: δυσώνυμοι... Ἀχαιῶν), and concludes her speech with a proverb: 261n. She makes assumptions about Hector; worries about him and wants to keep him close to her. Unlike Andromache, she does not admit to her own needs and fears. Most of her speech is taken up by second-guessing her son: although, as we have seen, she fails to comprehend the discipline and organisation required of men on the battlefield, her views are in other ways very perceptive. Hector is not planning to pray to Zeus, but Hecuba ultimately turns out to be right: when confronted with the uncertain future of his own son, Hector will indeed stop and pray (475–81n.).

Hector is firm, but polite, in refusing his mother's offer: wine, he claims, would only weaken him, and a libation is inappropriate, because his hands are stained with blood (264–8n.). Here, and indeed repeatedly in the course of book 6, we are reminded that Hector looks wrong against the peaceful backdrop of the city. After his polite refusal, Hector goes on to relate Helenos' instructions precisely (269–78n.). And then, all of a sudden, he bursts out in a vitriolic and frustrated complaint about Paris – wishing death on his own brother (280–5n.). This is the only time in the entire *Iliad* when we witness Hector's exasperation and pent-up suffering, as well as his sheer

exhaustion. As Edwards remarks, it can be no coincidence that he discloses those feelings to his mother.<sup>114</sup> And yet Hecuba cannot take his side entirely: Paris is her son too. For those audiences who knew the myth staged in Euripides' *Alexander*, Hector's outburst will have seemed especially pointed.<sup>115</sup> But whether or not early audiences knew the myth is perhaps not the point, since it ultimately expresses a more general truth: that mothers love their children regardless of what they do, and that Hecuba cannot therefore forsake Paris.<sup>116</sup> Indeed, Hector is equally unable to distance himself entirely from his brother – as his next encounter amply demonstrates.

#### 4.3 *Hector, Paris and Helen*

The narrative now picks up a thread abandoned in book 3: Paris has been in his bedroom ever since Aphrodite saved him from sure death on the battlefield, wrapped him up in mist and deposited him there at 3.382. The goddess then forced Helen to join him, and she sat down opposite him, averting her eyes, and venting her frustration in a mocking speech against her Trojan husband (3.428–36). Paris minimised the significance of his defeat: 'This time Menelaos won with Athena, another time I will defeat him – there are gods on our side too' (3.439–40). But the divine powers that support him are no good on the battlefield. The influence of Aphrodite is evident in what he next says to Helen: 'Never has desire so engulfed my senses, not when I first took you from lovely Lakedaimon, and sailed off in seafaring ships and lay with you in love-making on the island of Kranaë, not even then did I love you as I do now, or sweet desire seize me' (3.442–6). After that, they make love – while the war rages outside.

When Hector enters their bedroom, the poet draws attention to his spear and describes how he finds Paris handling his own weapons: the shield, armour and curved bow. Helen is nearby, supervising the weaving of famously beautiful robes (318–24n.).<sup>117</sup> There is an obvious contrast between Hector's menacing spear and Paris' own weapons – which are beautiful, but idle. The weapons comment on the virility of the two brothers, particularly in the charged context of their meeting in a bedroom, in front of Helen. Paris damaged his spear in his encounter with Menelaos (3.346–9), and now he is handling a bow, which becomes his weapon of choice in the rest of the *Iliad* – despite its negative connotations: 321–2n. This is the only time, in book 6, when we see Hector enter a θάλαμος, the most private room in the house: when he looks for Andromache, the poet uses the more neutral expression ἐν μεγάροισιν (371n.). His martial appearance is in sharp contrast with his surroundings and, as we have seen, foreshadows the future violation of Trojan homes. Hector's

<sup>114</sup> Edwards 1987: 207. <sup>115</sup> See above p. 7.

<sup>116</sup> Priam too loves his son Paris: at 3.304–9 he claims he cannot bear to watch him fight with Menelaos.

<sup>117</sup> This is the second of four conversations between Hector and Paris in the *Iliad*; cf. 3.38–76, 6.517–29 and 13.765–88. It is the only direct encounter between Hector and Helen, though she comments on their relationship at the very end of the poem: 24.761–75.

menacing entrance is, however, followed by a surprisingly restrained speech. Some ancient readers speculated that Hector did not want to humiliate Paris in front of Helen: ΣbT *ad* 6.326b.<sup>118</sup> More generally, it seems that Hector is afraid he may not manage to get Paris back to the battlefield if he exerts too much pressure.<sup>119</sup> When they were still on the battlefield, Hector was capable of much harsher words (cf. 3.39–57), and it is clear that he feels equally strongly now (cf. 280–5n.); but the situation has become so anomalous that it requires a more delicate approach. Hector starts by suggesting that Paris might have left the battlefield out of anger; it is not at all clear why Paris should feel any anger, but it is the only acceptable reason for a hero not to fight: 326n. Hector goes on to suggest that Paris surely agrees with him and would say the same things to any remiss soldier: this is another conciliatory move, which casts Paris in the role of a fighter (328–9n. and 330n.). Finally, Hector points out the real danger they are all facing: if Troy falls, everything will burn – one implication being that even Paris' bedroom, which now seems so sheltered and inviting, is in fact vulnerable to attack: 331n. (πυρὸς δηΐοιο).

Paris' reply is an embarrassment: 332–41n. He starts by judging Hector's reproach appropriate, rather than excessive (333n.), and continues by correcting Hector: he did not withdraw from the battlefield out of anger, but because he abandoned himself to grief: 335n., 336n. This explanation does not tally with what we already know: Aphrodite removed him from the battlefield, and he was overcome by desire for Helen. And yet, Paris' own account is psychologically convincing: although he slept with Helen (indeed, perhaps because of it), he is now feeling despondent. The situation demands that he fight in the first line of battle, not that he withdraw into the bedroom – and he knows that. Much has been made of 'double motivation' in the *Iliad*: there are human explanations for actions, and divine causes.<sup>120</sup> There is what Paris says about himself, and what the poet reveals about Aphrodite. Rather than dismissing double motivation as an archaic pattern of thought, it is important to bear in mind how difficult it is – at times – to account for human actions. Alternative explanations, then as now, are a sign that situations are complicated, and hard to understand. Paris' behaviour is so bad that it attracts different explanations: Hector tactfully suggests anger, Paris himself speaks of grief, and the poet reveals that Aphrodite was involved. Paris does not linger on the most embarrassing details of his situation, but he does reveal some humiliating information – not just about his state of mind, but more specifically about his marriage. He claims that Helen was encouraging him to return to the battlefield 'with soft words' (337n.). We know that her words at 3.428–36 were far from soft, and she goes on to criticise Paris in the harshest possible way, in front of Hector: 352n., 353n. But even leaving aside her tone, it is bad enough that Helen is trying to persuade Paris to return to the battlefield: her

<sup>118</sup> See also Minchin 2007: 33.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. 13.116–22, where Poseidon claims there is no point in upbraiding weaklings.

<sup>120</sup> Lesky 1961 is a classic account of this phenomenon. For an abridged version in English see Lesky 2001. For more recent discussion and bibliography, see Cairns 2001: 14–20.

attitude is in sharp contrast with that of Andromache – who is desperate with anxiety that Hector might be killed and wants to keep him in the city at all costs.<sup>121</sup>

Paris' speech leaves Hector at a loss for words: 342n.<sup>122</sup> And it is at this point that Helen intervenes, filling one of the heaviest silences in the whole poem. Her speech is a lesson in the arts of seduction.<sup>123</sup> She starts by blaming herself and drawing attention to her own terrible plight, then she flatters Hector at the expense of her own husband and finally she imagines a future for herself, Paris and – implicitly – Hector, as subjects of poetry. The context of her speech is particularly charged, because of the dynamics of ancient families: Hesiod's discussion of adultery includes a specific warning against sleeping with the wife of a brother (*Op.* 327–9), and this makes sense, since men would have had more intimate contact with their sisters-in-law than with most other women, excepting slaves and blood relatives. We have already seen that some ancient readers thought that Hector was inhibited by Helen's presence in the room. Helen now weaves her speech around a central request that Hector come and sit next to her (354–6n.): she is the only woman in book 6 who stays at a distance and expects Hector to approach her; all the other women he encounters run or walk towards him.<sup>124</sup> This is, in itself, a seductive ploy. Helen starts by wishing she had died in infancy (344–8n.) then suddenly strikes a realistic note: since the gods decreed that she had to be abducted, she just wishes she had a better husband in Troy – somebody with a sense of shame and proper behaviour (349–53n.).<sup>125</sup> She then criticises Paris in the harshest terms and predicts that he will have his comeuppance. Echoing Hector's own view that Paris was solely responsible for the war (328–9n.), she now casts herself in the role of the victim. This is not how ancient audiences saw her, of course: although Gorgias argued for Helen's innocence (in a deliberately provocative speech), she was generally held to be at least partly responsible for the war.<sup>126</sup> And it has to be said that her behaviour in *Iliad* 6 gives some support to ancient perceptions: her seductive stance towards Hector undermines her protestations of innocence. She is the only woman in early Greek epic who explicitly wishes for a better husband, and she has already had two. By the end of her speech, Helen has effectively set up a new triangle: she, Paris and Hector are inextricably bound together: she and Paris will be the subject of future song, but that is also a promise held out to Hector (cf. 358n.:

<sup>121</sup> Eust. II, p. 353: 12–15 van der Valk.

<sup>122</sup> Here as elsewhere, Paris has a powerful hold on his family and people; cf. 7.345–79, 11.122–5.

<sup>123</sup> Helen's ability to seduce depends on her words as well as her beauty: at *Od.* 4.277–9, for example, we are told that she *tried to lure* the Achaeans out of the wooden horse by *imitating the voices of their wives*; on Helen, beauty and persuasion, see further Gorgias, *Encomium of Helen*, together with Bergren 1983: 82–6; Worman 1997 and 2001. For a different reading of the speech, see Stoevesandt 2008: 115.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. 238n. (the Trojan women), 251n. (Hecuba) and 394n. (Andromache).

<sup>125</sup> Arthur Katz 1981: 29 rightly points out that Helen's description of a good husband fits Hector.

<sup>126</sup> Gorgias, *Hel.* ch. 7: ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἔδρασε δεινά, ἡ δὲ ἔπαθε ('he did dreadful deeds, she suffered them'). On ancient attitudes towards Helen, see Austin 1994.



πελώμεθ' ἄσιδοιμοι). Helen shares, to an extent, the poet's perspective here, and the poet's own portrayal of Helen in the *Iliad* is not unsympathetic. Yet he does show, in only fifteen lines of poetry, how Helen cannot help but be seductive, and he offers us a glimpse of how things might have gone when she first welcomed Paris to come in and sit down near her, in Sparta. Hector is polite but firm in declining her offer: 'Do not make me sit down, Helen, loving as you are' (φιλέουσά περ: 360n.). He 'is careful not to offend her', as the ancient commentators, ΣβΤ *ad* 6.360a, point out. It is in response to Helen's invitation that Hector first mentions his intention to go and see his own wife, Andromache: 367–8n.

#### 4.4 *Hector and Andromache*

When Hector reaches his house, he does not find his wife there: 369–91n. This detail casts Hector, for the first time, in the role of the pursuer – and delays the encounter between husband and wife. The poet introduces Andromache not by describing her directly, but by dramatising how others perceive her. Hector can think of two explanations for her absence: that she is visiting her sisters-in-law, or that she joined the women who are praying at the temple (374–80n.). As the scholia bT *ad* 6.378b point out, 'he gives reasons for which modest women (τὰς σώφρονας) may leave the house' – but we know that he is wrong in his assumptions, because the poet already said that Andromache went to the rampart (372–3n.). Now the housekeeper has the difficult task of telling Hector that his wife ran out to the city wall in a frenzy (381–9n.). The role of the housekeeper is important, in this scene. She looks after Andromache and depends on her: her perspective, both sympathetic and alarmed, adds to the narrative tension and prepares for the later exploration of Andromache's own feelings of dependence, fear and love.<sup>127</sup> There is a stark contrast between Hector's wishful thinking and Andromache's desperate plight, as witnessed by her servant. This contrast reinforces the impression that men and women inhabit separate spheres, and it adds to the sense of foreboding which pervades the book: the war, Hector is now forced to realise, is already disrupting domestic life.

Hector is about to leave the city through the Scaean Gates when Andromache sees him (393n.). As she runs towards him, the poet introduces her formally, through a short 'catalogue' entry outlining her origins, family and marriage (395–8n.); this background information further delays the moment of encounter – the audience can imagine Andromache running down from the rampart, as they hear about her origins and realise that she and Hector had a wedding, share a past and were once unremarkable in their happiness.<sup>128</sup> And then, suddenly, she is in front of him: ἦντισ' (399n.). This is not an easy confrontation: it happens at the last possible moment,<sup>129</sup>

and in a transitional place, at the Scaean Gates, halfway between home and the battlefield.<sup>130</sup> Neither partner speaks immediately: Hector is taken by the presence of his baby son and smiles at him in silence: 404n. Andromache takes her cue from Hector's smile (his only one in the poem), and she starts her appeal by telling him that he has no pity for his son, or for her. She then describes his death with prophetic clarity (410n.) and wishes she could die when he does. There will be no warmth or comfort for her when he is gone (θαλπωρή: 412n.), but only pain: ἀλλ' ἄχε' at 413n. is as close as Homeric diction ever gets to an anguished scream. Andromache then explains that Achilles killed her father, destroyed her city, slaughtered her seven brothers and enslaved her mother. And then she adds an interesting detail: Achilles released her mother for ransom, and she died in the palace of her own father: 425–8n. It is the fate of Andromache's mother that highlights, by contrast, Andromache's total dependence on Hector: she has no family that could come to her rescue or pay for her release. When she claims that Hector is a father, mother, brother and tender husband to her, this is not a sentimental line of poetry (as in Catullus 72.3–4), or a piece of aggrandising rhetoric (as in several Near Eastern texts, cf. 429–30n.): it is the truth.

In the final part of her speech Andromache suddenly strikes a pragmatic note: Hector should place the troops in front of the wall, near the fig tree, where it is most vulnerable (433–9). She justifies her suggestion with an empirical observation: the Achaeans have already tried to scale the wall in that place three times (435n.) and may be acting on the advice of a seer (438–9n.). Ancient and modern readers have found Andromache's suggestions extraordinary, and many have objected to them. ΣΑ *ad* 6.433–9 report that the lines were athetised in antiquity, on the grounds that Andromache gives alternative military advice to Hector (ἀντιστρατηγεί... τῶι Ἐκτορι), and that the lines contain a 'lie', since the battle is not that close to the walls (though cf. 73–4n.). Some modern scholars likewise find lines 433–9 suspect: Lohmann 1988: 37–8 argues that they upset the carefully balanced structure of the speech and introduce an unseemly topic, since, in his view, Andromache's address ought to focus on family matters alone. It is true that her final suggestion is, from a military point of view, problematic (433n.), and that it upsets the balanced structure of her speech, but the extremity of her situation has – according to her housekeeper – unbalanced Andromache (389n.), so there is no reason to expect a measured ending to her appeal. As an ancient commentator remarks, the end of her speech defies conventional expectations about the behaviour of women but 'fits Andromache'.<sup>131</sup>

<sup>129</sup> Felson and Slatkin 2004: 99, n. 24. <sup>130</sup> Arthur Katz 1981: 19–20 and 31.

<sup>131</sup> ΣβΤ *ad* 6.433: 'Even if it is not fitting for a woman, it is fitting for Andromache, since looking after horses is also not for a woman, but Andromache gives wheat to Hector's horses and mixes wine for them, because loving her husband she also looks after the horses who carry him.' The scholiast is referring to 8.186–90, where Hector remarks good-naturedly to his horses that Andromache feeds them before taking care of her own dear husband. As the scholiast points out, such unconventional details in no way cast doubt on Andromache's love for Hector but make her marriage to him vivid and credible. For modern appreciations of lines 433–9, see Arthur Katz 1981: 32–3; Kirk 1990: 217–18; Schadewaldt 1997: 134; and Van Nortwick 2001: 226–7.

<sup>127</sup> For an excellent discussion of the housekeeper, see Di Benedetto 1998: 60–1.

<sup>128</sup> The poet employs a similar technique at 369–91n.: while Hector looks for Andromache inside the house, he tells the audience where she actually is. The time of story and that of the performance match: Hector looks, while the poet tells. Andromache runs, while the poet remembers her past.

She wants to keep Hector close to her, tries to capture his attention and delay his departure by discussing strategy – a topic that should interest him. As Pope observed in the notes to his translation, ‘we shall not think that she talks like a soldier, but like a woman, who naturally enough makes use of any incident that offers, to persuade her lover to what she desires’.<sup>132</sup>

Hector refuses to be drawn into a detailed discussion of military matters, or to view the battlefield from the rampart. He opens his speech with some statements of principle, which summarise what has often been called ‘the heroic code’:<sup>133</sup> he would feel shame before the men and women of Troy if he stayed away from the battlefield; he has learnt always to fight in the first line of battle; and he wants to win κλέος for his father and for himself: 441–6n. This last thought leads Hector to face the future with unflinching clarity: he knows in his heart that Troy will fall, and Priam and his people perish – it is precisely for this reason that he must fight in the first line of battle, rather than look for alternative courses of action as Andromache suggests (447–9n.). In book 22, moments before dying, he will again reflect on the need to give his best, not for the people of Troy, but for all those who will hear of his deeds in the future: 22.300–5. For now, however, his speech focuses – more painfully – on the future of his immediate family: in the third, longest, and most anguished part of his speech (450–65), he considers the fate of his parents, his brothers, and that of Andromache, the person he loves above all others. Hector imagines her as a slave, carrying water, and weaving. The one task he does not mention explicitly is forced sex with the enemy. Instead, he quotes the words of a passer-by, who will one day recognise Andromache as the former wife of Hector, best warrior among the Trojans: 454–63n. That, he knows, will only be the source of fresh suffering for her: 462n., 463n. And this is when Hector finally breaks down: he would rather be dead, he says, than hear Andromache scream as she is dragged away into slavery (464–5n.). These final lines confirm Andromache’s view that Hector is on a death mission (407n.); but they also resonate with her own death wish at 410–11n., and more generally with the tone of her speech, which was close to that of a funeral lament (405–39n.).

Andromache performed a lament in front of her living husband, and now Hector says he had rather be dead than witness her suffering. In many respects, Hector’s reply corresponds to Andromache’s appeal: both partners have lost, or are about to lose, their closest family; both love and care for each other, above all other people; and both contemplate the imminent fall of Troy, Hector’s death and Andromache’s terrible future. Husband and wife are ‘born to the same fate’, as Andromache claims at 22.477–80. And yet their speeches also highlight contrasting perspectives and priorities: Andromache starts with a desperate plea but ends with practical suggestions aimed at protecting Hector and the city walls. Hector, by contrast, starts with a measured statement of principle, but, in the end, sees death as his escape route. His final words

<sup>132</sup> Mack 1967: 354.

<sup>133</sup> For discussions of the heroic code, see, e.g., Dodds 1951: chs. 1–2, Atkins 1960: chs. 2–4; Long 1970; Rowe 1983; Redfield 1994: 99–127; Cairns 1993: ch. 1; and Scodel 2008a, esp. ch. 1.

are, ultimately, an admission of defeat. Hector can hardly face Andromache at this point, and he turns his attention to baby Astyanax, as he had done at the beginning of their encounter (466–81n.). It is the baby’s frightened reaction at the sight of his helmet that finally brings Hector and Andromache together: they both laugh out loud (471n.). As Σb *ad* 6.471 point out, in times of hardship even the smallest incident can cause laughter.<sup>134</sup> And it is again the scholia who observe, about the role of Astyanax: ‘Making babies binds men and women together’ (ΣbT *ad* 6.404b: σύνδεσμος γὰρ ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν ἢ παιδοποιΐα).

Hector seizes this moment of harmony, lifts up his baby and utters a prayer on his behalf. As we have seen, he hopes for a future of shared values: Astyanax will, one day, bring home the spoils of the enemy, and Andromache will rejoice at the sight. This is an impossible vision, not just because Troy will fall and Astyanax will be killed in infancy – but because we never see Andromache take pleasure in war. When, at the end of his prayer, Hector entrusts Astyanax into her arms, ‘she laughs in tears’, and Hector feels pity for her (484n.). When he tells her to go home, while he sees to the war, her response is equally ambiguous: she obeys, but she turns back again and again to look at him (496n.). Once home, she mourns him as if he was already dead. Hector’s speech clearly failed to reassure her, and his words about shame, duty and glory had no impact on her own views: when he dies, she repeats her initial judgement – that he was killed by his own strength (22.455–9). Hector himself remains committed to his own position: when confronted with Achilles, he reminds himself that he must not chat to him like a girl to a boy (22.127–8).<sup>135</sup> There is no resolution, no common perspective. At the end of this most loving encounter, there is simply a parting.<sup>136</sup>

## 5. THE ENCOUNTER BETWEEN HECTOR AND ANDROMACHE THROUGH TIME

One of the most rewarding aspects of reading the *Iliad* is that one joins a vast community of other committed readers. For more than 2,500 years, people have studied this poem, tried to explain it and brought to bear on its interpretation all their intelligence, knowledge, experience and creativity. The comments of ancient scholars, which survive in much abbreviated form in the margins of medieval manuscripts

<sup>134</sup> The comment reads: ἀπὸ τῆς πολλῆς αὐτῶν λύπης ἡ μικρὰ τοῦ παιδὸς αἰτία φυσικὸν τινα κινεῖ καὶ μέτριον γέλωτα; ‘out of their great distress, the child’s slight cause (sc. for distress) moves them to a natural and fitting laughter’. As often, the b scholia creatively reinterpret a source more faithfully represented by the T scholia: ἀπὸ τῆς πολλῆς λύπης ἐκ μικρῆς αἰτίας γέλωτα κινεῖ: ‘[Astyanax] makes them laugh because of his great distress from a slight cause.’ The intent of b is clearly that of explaining how Andromache and Hector can laugh although they are in such a terrible situation. On the b scholia, see van der Valk 1963–4: vol. 1, ch. 5; and cf. 21n. (Αἴσηπον καὶ Πῆδασον).

<sup>135</sup> See further Van Nortwick 2001.

<sup>136</sup> Although Hector briefly returns to Troy at 7.307–10, the poet makes little of it and says nothing about Andromache. This is, in effect, their final parting, as Edwards 1987: 212 rightly argues.

(scholia), have already featured prominently; but they are not the only useful resources for commentators and readers of *Iliad* 6.<sup>137</sup> It is not possible, in the short compass of this commentary, to examine the immensely rich and varied responses which the *Iliad* inspired, and yet it is useful to have some awareness of its reception history – for a simple reason. By considering how other readers approached *Iliad* 6, we can begin to explore some important continuities and changes in the history of its interpretation – and, more importantly still, we can position ourselves, as readers, in relation to those who read the poem in radically different historical and cultural circumstances. In what follows we outline some important stages in the reception of the encounter between Hector and Andromache. We focus on this episode because it seems to be the most memorable and important in *Iliad* 6. This judgement does not just reflect modern sensibilities: we know, for example, that Stephanos the Grammarian (who must have been active in the late antique or early Byzantine period) shared that view. He wrote a poem, preserved in the *Palatine Anthology* and in many Homeric manuscripts, which summarised the contents of the *Iliad* book by book. About *Iliad* 6 he stated:

Ζῆτα δ' ἄρ' Ἀνδρομάχης καὶ Ἑκτορός ἐστ' ὀριστύς.

Book 6 is the love talk between Andromache and Hector.<sup>138</sup>

For Stephanos, as for modern readers, the encounter between Hector and Andromache is the most important episode in book 6 – even if the word he uses to describe it, ὀριστύς, is, in some ways, surprising. Hector and Andromache are not just engaged in 'love talk': they speak about their deepest needs, fears and convictions. And yet Stephanos is not wrong or casual in his summary: he is actually paraphrasing the poet's own description of the encounter at the end of the book, when Hector and Paris are about to return to the battlefield (ὄριζε: 516–17n.). There are at least three lessons to be learnt here. First, the reception of the episode starts within the *Iliad* itself: there is no neutral terrain 'before reception' that we may ever hope to recover. Secondly, reception is contested from the beginning. Finally, a confrontation with Stephanos helps to shed light on a simple truth about the episode, and about the *Iliad* more generally: from the perspective of men engaged in killing one another on the battlefield, any conversation with a loving wife – however difficult – is a sweet alternative.

<sup>137</sup> For a useful introduction to the Homeric scholia see Schmidt 2002. The *Iliad* scholia have been edited by Erbse 1969–88; those to the *Odyssey* are currently being re-edited by Pontani, who has so far covered books 1–2 (Pontani 2007). For the other books, it is still necessary to consult Dindorf 1855. The important *Iliad* commentary of Eustathius has been edited in van der Valk 1971–87; the so-called D-Scholia to the *Iliad* are available in a preliminary edition by van Thiel 2000b; see also van Thiel 2000a; Schmidt 1976 studies the bT scholia. On ancient scholarship, see further van der Valk 1963–4, Pfeiffer 1968, Montanari 1979–95, Reynolds and Wilson 1991, and Dickey 2007.

<sup>138</sup> *Anthologia Graeca* 9, epigram 385.6. For critical edition and discussion see Ludwich 1887: 1–9; and Stadtmueller 1906: 364–8. There was a competing version of the poem which emphasised the offering to Athena.

Surviving evidence suggests that the encounter between Hector and Andromache made little impact on archaic and classical art and literature, with one exception: Athenian drama. Vases do not display much interest in the episode,<sup>139</sup> and, although Sappho does celebrate the wedding of Hector and Andromache in fr. 44 Voigt, the relationship between her poem and *Iliad* 6 is hard to characterise – as is, more generally, the relationship between early lyric and Homeric epic.<sup>140</sup> Sappho depicts the joyful first encounter between Hector and Andromache, and that is appropriate to her genre: as Griffith points out, 'lyric in general often seems to relish those very moments and feelings that epic is least capable of including, or at least, of sustaining and approving: romance, courtship, seduction and marriage'.<sup>141</sup> Sappho describes in detail the happy couple, the gifts, the songs and dances: her vision is in some ways antithetical to the sense of loss, the laments and the sheer anguish of *Iliad* 6. But there is no close engagement with our text of the *Iliad*.

The first clear allusions to the Iliadic encounter between Hector and Andromache survive in Athenian drama. Sophocles modelled the meeting between Ajax, Tecmessa and their son Eurysaces (*Ajax* 430–692) on the Homeric episode: ancient and modern commentators have pointed out the close parallels between the two texts.<sup>142</sup> The differences, however, are also important: Tecmessa is a slave rather than a wife and, according to classical Athenian law, her son is therefore illegitimate. As Helene Foley has argued, Sophocles' allusion to Homer fosters a serious and emotionally committed consideration of an issue – the status of illegitimate children – that was controversial in classical Athens.<sup>143</sup> Euripides' *Andromache* investigates similar concerns by recasting the Iliadic Andromache as a slave and mother, after the fall of Troy.<sup>144</sup> *Iliad* 6 also features in comedy: Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* claims that her husband quotes Hector at her, 'war will be the concern of men', in order to make her shut up – and then declares that from now on 'war will be the concern of women'.<sup>145</sup> At *Achaeans* 580–90, Dicaeopolis behaves just like baby Astyanax: he is terrified by the mighty plume on top of Lamachus' helmet!<sup>146</sup> It seems that the helmet scene also

<sup>139</sup> Herter 1973: 160; see also LIMC s.v. 'Andromache', vol. 1.1, p. 773. The few vase paintings that undoubtedly represent the parting scene are listed at LIMC s.v. 'Andromache' 3.4–6 (vol. 1.1, p. 768). Images 14–21 (vol. 1.1, p. 769) are of doubtful relevance: even if some of the disputed vases were meant to represent Hector and Andromache, the very fact that we can no longer be sure seems significant.

<sup>140</sup> On the relationship between epic and lyric, see further Fowler 1987: 3–52; Hunter 2004: 238–40; and Graziosi and Haubold 2009, with further literature.

<sup>141</sup> Griffith 2009: 82.

<sup>142</sup> See the Sophoclean scholia ad 499, 501b, 514, 545a, 550 Christodoulou. See further Easterling 1984; Zanker 1992: 22–3; Farmer 1998; Ormand 1999: 110–19; Zimmermann 2002: 244–5; and Maronitis 2004: 89–97.

<sup>143</sup> H. P. Foley 2001: 90–2.

<sup>144</sup> Note, for example, the parallels between Euripides *Andr.* 164–9 and *Il.* 6.456–8. The image of Andromache carrying water seems to become popular in later literature; cf. ΣΑ ad 6.457a.

<sup>145</sup> Aristoph. *Lys.* 520 and 538. For other citations of, and allusions to, Hector's words, see Aesch. *Sept.* 200–1 with Ieranò 2002: 75–6, and the passages collected in West's *apparatus*.

<sup>146</sup> See Hunter 2004: 242; Zimmermann 2006: 75.

made an impact on tragedy: a fragment from Astydamos' *Hector* suggests that, in one scene, Hector removes his helmet, so as not to frighten his child.<sup>147</sup> These tragic and comic allusions are quite specific but should not come as a surprise: the audience in the theatre of Dionysos were well placed to appreciate them. There was a dynamic relationship between different festivals and performances in classical Athens: at the Great Dionysia, drama offered ever new and challenging perspectives on the epic tradition, whereas at the Great Panathenaea the *Iliad* kept being performed, festival after festival. There was a sense that the *Iliad* was well known and authoritative: at *Trojan Women* 647–58, for example, Euripides portrays Andromache as a rather self-satisfied wife, who knows she is famous for being good. His Andromache claims that she did not deserve her fate, because she always behaved well towards her husband and never yielded to her longing to be outdoors: it is hard not to see in this a rather pointed reference to her behaviour in *Iliad* 6.<sup>148</sup>

The behaviour of Andromache in the *Iliad* remained a source of debate, inspiration and anxiety in later Greek literature too. In popular philosophy and rhetorical education her character became that of the loving wife (φίλανδρος).<sup>149</sup> And yet some concern was expressed, for example, when discussing the etymology of her name: ἄνδρο – μάχη (man-fighter).<sup>150</sup> In the Second Sophistic, Hector and Andromache were held up as a model couple<sup>151</sup> but also used in order to articulate cultural changes and developments. In his *Advice to bride and groom*, a treatise cast in the form of a wedding address to Pollianus and his bride Eurydice, Plutarch urges the young couple to emulate Hector and Andromache in a way that is appropriate to their different circumstances: the husband will become 'father and honoured mother, and brother' to his wife, but he should also be 'a guide, philosopher and teacher' to her.<sup>152</sup> In the *Brutus* Plutarch again discusses Hector and Andromache as a model for a married couple. He reports that Porcia recognised her own situation in a painting of Andromache, and that the painting made her reveal her pain at the departure of her husband Brutus:

<sup>147</sup> Astydamos *TiGF* 1 60 F 2; Carrara 1997 discusses the content and context of this difficult fragment. For a reconstruction of the play on the basis of an Apulian volute-crater in Berlin, see Taplin 2009.

<sup>148</sup> Esp. *Tro.* 650; see also *Tro.* 645–6, where she claims that she always behaved modestly (σώφρων) in the house of Hector: Iliadic readers know that she was not always there; for further discussion of the *Troades* and Homer, see Davidson 2001.

<sup>149</sup> E.g. ΣΤ *ad* 6.394b<sup>1</sup>; ΣΤ *ad* 6.411a<sup>1</sup>; ΣβΤ *ad* 6.433; ΣβΤ *ad* 17.207–8b; Maximus of Tyre, *Dissertationes* 40.3; Eust. II, p. 372: 20–1 van der Valk.

<sup>150</sup> See, e.g., Eur. *Tro.* 731–4; *TiGF* v.2 F 1094; Varro, *De Lingua Latina* 7.82 (Ennius takes up the Euripidean etymology); and *Anthologia Graeca* 11, epigram 378.5 (about a dreaded wife who is truly ἀνδρομάχη). The motif of a combative Andromache is attested in vase painting (Capetini 2007: 218–20) and found its way also into ancient Homeric scholarship (see Eust. II, p. 331: 9–11 van der Valk).

<sup>151</sup> See, e.g., Maximus of Tyre, *Dissertationes* 18.8.

<sup>152</sup> Plutarch, *Coniugalia praecepta* 145B6–c2.

παντάπασιν ἀπογνοὺς τῶν πραγμάτων ἔγνω καταλιπεῖν Ἰταλίαν, καὶ πεζῆι διὰ Λευκανίας εἰς Ἑλέαν ἐπὶ θάλασσαν ἦκεν. ὅθεν ἡ Πορκία μέλλουσα πάλιν εἰς Ῥώμην ἀποτραπέσθαι, λανθάνει μὲν ἐπειρᾶτο περιπαθῶς ἔχουσα, γραφὴ δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς προὔδωκε, τᾶλλα γενναίαν οὔσαν. ἦν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν διάθεσις, προπεμπόμενος Ἐκτωρ ὑπὲρ Ἀνδρομάχης, κομιζομένης παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ παιδίον, ἐκείνῳ δὲ προσβλεπούσης. ταῦτα θεωμένην τὴν Πορκίαν ἢ τοῦ πάθους εἰκῶν ἐξέτηξεν εἰς δάκρυα, καὶ πολλάκις φοιτῶσα τῆς ἡμέρας ἔκλαιεν.

Altogether despairing of the situation, Brutus decided to leave Italy and came by land through Lucania to Elea by the sea. As Porcia was about to return from there to Rome, she tried to conceal her distress, but a painting betrayed her, although she had otherwise been very brave. Its subject was Greek: Andromache's farewell to Hector; she was taking from his arms their little son, while her eyes were fixed upon her husband. That image of suffering made Porcia burst into tears when she looked at it – and she would return to it many times a day and weep before it.<sup>153</sup>

Clearly, Porcia is looking at a painting that depicts the precise moment when Hector entrusts Astyanax to Andromache: 482–93n. We know from other sources that the scene was popular in Roman art,<sup>154</sup> but Plutarch uniquely describes an individual reaction to it. Porcia identifies herself with Andromache to the point of tears. She is not supposed to display her grief, and indeed she does not want to (unlike Andromache) – but she cannot help it. Indeed, she submits to the power of the painting 'many times'. Plutarch uses this story to frame a second response to Hector and Andromache which, this time, focuses on Brutus, the husband:

Ἀκίλιου δὲ τίνος τῶν Βρούτου φίλων τὰ πρὸς Ἐκτορα τῆς Ἀνδρομάχης ἔπη διελθόντος·

Ἐκτορ, ἀτὰρ σύ μοι ἔσσι πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ  
ἠδὲ κασίγνητος, σύ δέ μοι θαλερὸς παρακοίτης,

μειδιάσας ὁ Βρούτος “ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐμοὶ γ’” εἶπε “πρὸς Πορκίαν ἔπεισι φάναι τὰ τοῦ Ἐκτορος·

ἰστόν τ’ ἠλακᾶτην τε καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι κέλευε·

σώματος γὰρ ἀπολείπεται φύσει τῶν ἴσων ἀνδραγαθημάτων, γνώμη δ’ ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς ἀριστεύσει.” ταῦτα μὲν ὁ τῆς Πορκίας υἱὸς ἰστόρηκε Βύβλος.<sup>155</sup>

<sup>153</sup> Plutarch, *Brutus* 994D–E.

<sup>154</sup> See *LIMC* s.v. Andromache 3.8–9 for two other extant examples of Roman wall painting, one from a house in Pompeii, the other from Nero's *Domus Aurea*.

<sup>155</sup> Plut. *Brut.* 994E–F.

When Acilius, one of Brutus' friends, recited the verses containing Andromache's words to Hector,

'But Hector, you are a father and honoured mother to me,  
and a brother, and a tender husband'

Brutus smiled and said: 'But I, for one, do not intend to speak to Porcia in Hector's words:

"Ply the loom and the distaff, and give orders to your maids"

for though her body is not strong enough to perform such heroic feats as men do, still, in spirit she valiantly defends her country just as we do.' Bibulus, Porcia's son, tells this story.

By juxtaposing this scene with Porcia's response to the painting, Plutarch sets up a series of contrasts: between men and women, art and poetry, and between Greek and Roman attitudes to marriage and war. Porcia responds to the painted Andromache by submitting to the emotional power of art. Brutus by contrast refuses to play Hector to her Andromache: he quotes the *Iliad* – a text, not an image – and distances himself from it with a knowing smile. His act of resistance is manly, and yet it concerns a woman: Brutus declares that Porcia is just as valiant in spirit, and committed to war, as he is himself. This attempt at rewriting *Iliad* 6 is full of ironies. Although Brutus claims that Porcia is like a man in spirit, she has just shown herself to be very unlike Brutus, and very much like the Homeric Andromache – even though she had initially tried to resist a display of grief.

On the whole, the Roman reception of *Iliad* 6 focuses on Andromache's life after the fall of Troy and is often mediated through tragedy; Hector is less important, partly because he has no future beyond the Trojan War. Naevius may have followed Astydama in his *Hector proficiscens*,<sup>156</sup> but Ennius' influential *Andromacha* put the emphasis squarely on the post-Iliadic Andromache. Virgil extensively reworked the encounter between Hector and Andromache in *Aeneid* 2: his emphasis is also on Andromache, because Hector recedes into the past.<sup>157</sup> Seneca's *Troades* portrays Andromache as a widow and – alongside Virgil's description of her in exile (*Aeneid* 3.294–505) – defines her persona for much of the Middle Ages and the early modern period.<sup>158</sup> In Racine's *Andromaque* she is – as often in earlier literature – a widow, rather than the anguished wife of *Iliad* 6. It is only towards the end of the seventeenth century that we begin to see a renewed interest in the Iliadic encounter between Hector and Andromache.

<sup>156</sup> Marmorale 1950: 149–50 and 190. Too little is left of the play to allow firm conclusions as to its contents.

<sup>157</sup> On Virgil's allusions to *Iliad* 6 in *Aeneid* 2, see esp. Hughes 1997. Elegy, unsurprisingly, does show an interest in Hector and Andromache as a couple, but the focus is more on their sex life than on their final parting: Propertius 2.22 B, 31–4 Heyworth; Ovid, *Amores* 1.9.35–6; cf. *Ars amatoria* 2.709–10, 3.107–10. For Hector as a paradigmatic husband and lover, see *Heroides* 5.107 (*felix Andromache, certo bene nupta marito*), and *Ars am.* 2.645–6. The *Ilias Latina* has Andromache initiate the encounter: 564–74.

<sup>158</sup> For the reception of Seneca's *Troades* see Keulen 2001: 30–5.

Dryden translated it for his *Examen poeticum* of 1693,<sup>159</sup> and Pellegrini painted his *Hector and Andromache* for the first Duke of Manchester c. 1708–10.<sup>160</sup> Shortly after, Pope wrote the following note on *Iliad* 6:

Homer undoubtedly shines most upon the great Subjects, in raising our Admiration or Terror: Pity, and the softer Passions, are not so much of the Nature of his Poem, which is formed upon Anger and the Violence of Ambition. But we have cause to think his Genius was no less capable of touching the Heart with Tenderness, than of firing it with Glory, from the few Sketches he has left us of his Excellency in that way too. In the present Episode of the Parting of *Hector* and *Andromache*, he has assembled all that Love, Grief, and Compassion could inspire.<sup>161</sup>

As Clingham notes, the episode was fast becoming 'a touchstone for pathos and a natural style',<sup>162</sup> and not just in poetry: in his *Tableaux tirés de l'Iliade de l'Odyssee et de l'Enéide* of 1757, the comte de Caylus devoted to the encounter three separate tableaux: 'Andromache and the nurse', 'the farewell of Hector' and 'Andromache laments with her maids'.<sup>163</sup> In Britain the Swiss-born Angelica Kauffmann painted *Hector taking leave of Andromache* (c. 1768/9) for the inaugural exhibition at the Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture; she turns Hector into a 'wistful juvenile who wears his helmet uneasily'.<sup>164</sup> Kauffmann's painting inspired Friedrich Schiller's poem *Hektors Abschied*, which is formally a dialogue between the two partners but concentrates almost entirely on Hector.<sup>165</sup> Schiller returned to and reworked his poem for a period of over twenty years and considered it 'one of his best'.<sup>166</sup> Goethe's newspaper *Propyläen* held a painting competition in 1800: artists could choose whether to depict the Iliadic encounter between Hector and Andromache, or the death of Rhesos in *Iliad* 10. The subjects were designed to showcase different skills: one required 'tender sentiment

<sup>159</sup> For discussion see Clingham 2000.

<sup>160</sup> Oil on canvas, Temple Newsam House, Leeds Museums and Galleries. For a reproduction see Lomax 2000: 26.

<sup>161</sup> Mack 1967: 349. Pope himself acknowledged his debt to Dryden in the same context: 'I must not forget, that Mr. Dryden has formerly translated this admirable Episode, and with so much Success, as to leave me at least no hopes of improving or equalling it. The utmost I can pretend is to have avoided a few modern Phrases and Deviations from the Original, which have escaped that great Man.'

<sup>162</sup> Clingham 2000: 54.

<sup>163</sup> Caylus 1757: 50–2, plates 6–8. Note especially his comments on plate 7: he believes that the farewell of Hector 'will always deserve the attention of painters'.

<sup>164</sup> Boime 1987: 112–13; cf. Mellor 1995: 132. The painting is now kept in Saltram House, Plymouth. For a reproduction see Birmingham and Brewer 1995, plate 8.2.

<sup>165</sup> Schiller appears to have known Kauffmann's painting indirectly, through a description of Helfrich Peter Sturz; cf. Ballof 1914: 298 and Thalheim 1980: 834. For discussion of his poem see Borchmeyer 1972.

<sup>166</sup> Letter to Christian Gottfried Körner of 27 May 1793, printed in Nahler and Nahler 1992: 243. The poem had already appeared as an inset song in Schiller's play *Die Räuber* (1781) but was only published as a free-standing work in 1800 (*Gedichte* I/1 pp. 301–2). Schubert set it to music in 1815, published in 1826.

and inner feeling', the other 'artistic effect'.<sup>167</sup> Dönike has argued that the two subjects reflected a tension between German classicism, with its emphasis on inner feelings (Hector and Andromache) and the more dramatic French manner, as represented especially by Jacques-Louis David.<sup>168</sup> In his appraisal of the submissions to the painting competition, Schiller explicitly connected the popularity of Hector and Andromache as a subject with German sentimentality:

Hector's farewell is a moving subject in and of itself, even without any input on the part of the artist. It could make a telling image without testing the imagination, through simple truth alone. But here one had to reckon with the sentimental tendencies of our nation and our times, which have taken hold to such an extent that they are truly threatening to ruin all art, including that of painting, as it is threatening to ruin poetry.<sup>169</sup>

Schiller praised Homer for his ability to depict sentiments without sentimentality; his judgement proved influential. Schadewaldt's reading of the *Iliad* is deeply influenced by Schiller,<sup>170</sup> and through Schadewaldt's own work, Schiller's views have entered mainstream Homeric scholarship. But Hector and Andromache also had a lasting impact on the visual arts. Giorgio de Chirico painted Hector and Andromache as mannequins and hence deprived them of all inner feeling.<sup>171</sup> His enigmatic *Hector and Andromache* became an icon of the metaphysical movement and was later reconfigured by the post-modern artists Andy Warhol and Mike Bidlo.<sup>172</sup> It seems, then, that from Plutarch to Schiller to de Chirico and beyond, the encounter between Hector and Andromache inspired an extended meditation on poetry, art and human emotion.<sup>173</sup>

<sup>167</sup> Meyer 1800; for discussion of the competition and reproductions of some of the submissions see Scheidig 1958: 65–124 and plates 4–10; Lange *et al.* 1988: 422–31 and 1088–96; and Dönike 2005: 236–78.

<sup>168</sup> Dönike 2005: 269–70 and 273–4. David's dramatic *Andromache mourning Hector* (painted after Racine) gained him election to the Académie Royale in 1784; for the much later drawing of *Hector's departure* (1812), see Schnapper 1982: 260.

<sup>169</sup> Schiller in Janz *et al.* 1992: 847. Goethe expressed his agreement with Schiller's remarks in a letter of 30 September 1800: 'You cannot imagine how beautiful, good and appropriate I find [your essay]' (Dörr and Oellers 1999: 79).

<sup>170</sup> Schadewaldt himself praises Schiller's 'deep understanding' of the Homeric scene at Schadewaldt 1959: 232.

<sup>171</sup> De Chirico painted several versions of *Hector and Andromache* between 1917 and 1970. For a reproduction of the 1917 version (Mattioli collection, Milan) see Hirsh 2004: 416; for the 1924 version (Galerie Cazeau-Béraudère, Paris) see Baldacci and Roos 2007: 119. The visual template for the series was de Chirico's own earlier work *Le duo (Les mannequins de la tour rose)* of 1915. On the mannequin motif see Bohn 1975. For a very different Hector and Andromache by de Chirico, see Quasimodo 1982: 45.

<sup>172</sup> A. Warhol, *Hector and Andromache*, 1982; M. Bidlo, *Not de Chirico (Hector and Andromache, 1918)*, 1989. For reproductions and discussion see Hirsh 2004: 415–31.

<sup>173</sup> Zajko 2006 chooses precisely the Iliadic encounter between Hector and Andromache in order to develop and test her Freudian model for reader identification. The reception history of the episode suggests that readers have indeed found it easy to commit emotionally to Hector and Andromache.

This brief discussion is not intended as a normative guide to the most influential reworkings of the episode, but rather as an open-ended invitation to read *Iliad* 6 together with other readers, as well as scholars, writers and artists. Some modern reworkings can help to capture the overall mood of the episode. Cavafy's *Trojans*, for example, though primarily inspired by *Iliad* 22, recreates the effect of Andromache's ominous lamenting for Hector, while he is still alive:

Our efforts are those of men prone to disaster;  
our efforts are like those of the Trojans.  
...  
and we scurry around the walls  
trying to save ourselves by running away.  
Yet we're sure to fail. Up there,  
high on the wall, the dirge has already begun.<sup>174</sup>

Mandelstam recalls the encounter in *Iliad* 6 from the perspective of Andromache:

Why did I tear myself away from you before it was time?<sup>175</sup>

Sometimes, poets contribute to our understanding of details. Carol Ann Duffy, for example, expands Homer's compressed line 391, offering a full picture of the built-up city, and Hector's movement through it:

These words, like shadows, followed Hector's stride  
All through the town, along the avenues, ducking down  
Cool alleyways, his helmet's sudden flash,  
His cape's dark swish, disappearing round the corner  
Of walled lanes, until he reached the Skaian Gates.<sup>176</sup>

Amy Clampitt describes a Greek tutorial in a 'ninth-floor classroom, its windows grimy... the noise of traffic, πολυφλοισβοιο-θαλάσσης-like', and then suddenly identifies with Astyanax:

We have seen . . .  
. . . Hector's baby, shadowed by the plumes of war  
As we are, pull back from his own father with a shriek.<sup>177</sup>

Michael Longley, in 'The Parting', condenses the whole encounter into two lines of poetry.<sup>178</sup>

He: 'Leave it to the big boys, Andromache.'  
'Hector, my darling husband, och, och,' she.

Through his vernacular idiom, Longley sets the encounter in a modern Irish context, against the backdrop of the Troubles. In another poem, 'The Helmet', he reflects on

<sup>174</sup> Cavafy 1992: 22. <sup>175</sup> In Kossman 2001: 226. <sup>176</sup> Duffy and Graziosi 2005: 7.

<sup>177</sup> Clampitt 1997: 202. <sup>178</sup> Longley 2006: 226.

the same episode, but focuses on Hector's prayer for Astyanax. Here he implicitly casts Homer as his own literary father – and questions his influence on contemporary literary and moral values.<sup>179</sup>

When shiny Hector reached out for his son, the wean  
Squirmed and buried his head between his nurse's breasts  
And howled, terrorised by his father, by flashing bronze  
And the nightmarish nodding of the horse-hair crest.

His daddy laughed, his mammy laughed, and his daddy  
Took off the helmet and laid it on the ground to gleam,  
Then kissed the babbie and dandled him in his arms and  
Prayed that his son might grow up bloodier than him.

## 6. THE TEXT

Editors of Homer are guided in their choices by what they think about two fundamental, and much disputed, issues: how the *Iliad* came into being, and what happened to it in Alexandria.

Those who believe that Homer dictated or wrote down a master copy of the *Iliad* in the eighth or seventh century BCE privilege readings that look old, find it easier to justify interventions that aim at consistency and tend to emend passages or features that seem recent relative to other aspects of the text.<sup>180</sup> Those who believe that the *Iliad* stems from a more drawn-out process of textual fixation are prepared to allow for a less consistent and early-sounding text.<sup>181</sup> In formulating our own views, we have tried to hold on to one basic point. The origins of the *Iliad* remain obscure: as Cassio points out in a helpful discussion, the poem is 'likely to be the result of extremely complicated processes involving both orality and writing, which we can no longer reconstruct'.<sup>182</sup> Given the limitations of our knowledge, caution seems appropriate.<sup>183</sup> The *Iliad* may be early, but then – as we have seen – there is little evidence that suggests it made much impact before the sixth century. Performances at the Panathenaea were clearly an important factor in the survival and transmission of Homeric epic, but the *Iliad* is not an Athenian poem.<sup>184</sup> The language of epic combines older with more recent elements and shows influences from different dialects; attempts to weed out

<sup>179</sup> Longley 2006: 226; for a discussion of the poem, see Hardwick 2007: 58–9.

<sup>180</sup> E.g. the edition by M. L. West 1998–2000, cf. West 2001a; for specific discussions of West's text: 61n., 90n., 237n., 266n., 280n., 285n., 291n., 298n., 344n., 459n., 465n. and 493–4n.

<sup>181</sup> G. Nagy 1996a, 1996b and 2004. <sup>182</sup> Cassio 2002: 114.

<sup>183</sup> Van Thiel 1996 is exemplary in this respect.

<sup>184</sup> Jensen 1980 argues that 'the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were dictated and written at the court of Pisistratus' (p. 159). The Athenians themselves, however, thought that the Homeric poems originated in Ionia, i.e. the coast of Asia Minor, and had been brought to Athens by the Homeridae: for ancient discussions of the origins of the poems, see Graziosi 2002: 201–34. The earliest authors known to have discussed the Homeric poems are Theagenes of Rhegium, Xenophanes of Colophon and Heraclitus of Ephesus, not one of them Athenian.

supposedly un-Homeric forms quickly run into difficulties: even seemingly clear-cut examples of innovative spelling are not always easy to date absolutely and therefore cannot be disregarded as post-Homeric.<sup>185</sup> In view of the gaps in our knowledge, the present edition adopts a pragmatic approach: we have noted instances of *prima facie* archaic forms (e.g. regard for initial digamma) and apparently later usage (e.g. disregard of digamma), but we have not attempted to date these, or to impose consistency on the transmitted text.

The second issue concerns the impact of Alexandrian scholarship on the text of the *Iliad*. It is generally agreed that the vulgate can be traced back to the Hellenistic period. To what extent it is a reliable guide to the pre-Hellenistic text of Homer is a more difficult question. Early papyri show a certain amount of variation, especially in the number of lines.<sup>186</sup> These divergences, however, are small-scale, and do not detract from the general impression of textual unity: the classical text of the *Iliad* must have been close to the medieval vulgate. Early citations by and large confirm this impression.<sup>187</sup> When Herodotus, for example, quotes and discusses *Iliad* 6.289–92, he uses a text that is recognisably the same as our own: we cannot of course exclude the possibility that Herodotus' text was brought in line with the Homeric vulgate at some point in the history of transmission, but it is clear from Herodotus' paraphrase that he must have known essentially the same *Iliad* as we have today: 289–92n. Some variants may have originated in rhapsodic performance, though ancient commentaries do not usually credit rhapsodes with variant readings.<sup>188</sup> A particular problem arises from variants recommended by ancient scholars, but unattested – or only weakly attested – in the textual tradition. There is considerable dispute over the value and origins of such variants.<sup>189</sup> We have tried to approach them with an open mind, assessing each case on its own merits. The result has been that – as far as *Iliad* 6 is concerned – the readings of ancient scholars often seem motivated by a desire to clarify or correct the transmitted text (e.g. 4n., 21n., 31n., 71n., 76n., 148n., 226n., 237n., 241n., 252n., 266n., 285n., 321–2n., 415n., 511n.). Scholarly readings make the Homeric text more context-specific (e.g. 112n.), more idiomatic (e.g. 475n.) or more decorous (e.g. 135n., 160n.) by the standards of Hellenistic readers. Our findings thus confirm Fantuzzi's argument that Hellenistic scholars tended to adjust Homeric poetry to the sensibilities

<sup>185</sup> For a striking instance of the Homeric narrator using a late form even when an earlier one can be restored, see 344n. (κακομηχάνου, ὄκρυσσος).

<sup>186</sup> S. West 1967.

<sup>187</sup> Although there are differences between early citations and the Homeric vulgate (as emphasised, for example, by Haslam 1997, Dué 2001a and 2001b), they do not seem to us to testify to the existence of radically divergent *Iliads*. The *Iliad* may be called a multiform text in the archaic and classical period, but it is important to emphasise that variations seem to be small scale.

<sup>188</sup> Cassio 2002: 124. The rhapsodes prided themselves on accurate performance (Graziosi 2004), but we do not know against what standards they judged their own faithfulness to Homer's text.

<sup>189</sup> E.g. M. L. West 2001a; Rengakos 2002; Janko 2002: 658–62; G. Nagy 2003; M. L. West 2004. Zenodotus' readings are especially controversial.

of their age.<sup>190</sup> This does not exclude the possibility that some of the readings favoured by the Alexandrians represent genuine early variants,<sup>191</sup> but if that is what they are, they survived because they suited Hellenistic tastes.

The text is our own, though it does not differ significantly from standard editions. Our apparatus adopts the simplified system of reference introduced by Macleod 1982: the letters **a**, **b** and **c** indicate variant readings, including those found in the papyri and scholia. Readings only found in one or more papyri are noted under **p**; in the commentary papyri are sometimes identified by quoting their number in M. L. West 2001a. Suggestions of ancient scholars are cited by their name, when it is known; the following abbreviations are used: Ar. = Aristarchus; Arph. = Aristophanes of Byzantium; Zen. = Zenodotus. The apparatus makes no claim to completeness. Variants are selected either because they are significant in themselves or because they are instructive for readers of *Iliad* 6. Those interested in the details of textual transmission should consult the editions by van Thiel and West.<sup>192</sup>

<sup>190</sup> Fantuzzi 2001: 174–7.

<sup>191</sup> As argued by Rengakos 1993.

<sup>192</sup> The papyri are listed in M. L. West 2001a: 88–138. The fullest list of manuscripts can be found in Allen 1931, though his work has been criticised for containing numerous inaccuracies; see van Thiel 1996: vii–viii. For a more sympathetic view of Allen's contribution, see Haslam 1997.