

## HOMERIC PATHOS AND OBJECTIVITY\*

'There is no subjectivity in Homer' — Coleridge.<sup>1</sup>

'A more general characteristic of the Homeric style, the restrained objectivity and aristocratic withdrawnness' — H. Fränkel.<sup>2</sup>

'[There is in Homer] never a gap, never a glimpse of unplumbed depths. And this procession of phenomena takes place in the foreground — that is, in a local and temporal present which is absolute' — E. Auerbach.<sup>3</sup>

One of the most striking differences between ancient and modern writings on Homer is the prominence in the former, and the rarity in the latter, of discussions of pathos. The word barely appears in the most characteristic books of our time on the subject. Thus the inquirer will find in Wace and Stubbings's *Companion to Homer* (1962) an index hospitable enough to include 'Babylonian cuneiform', and 'Kum-Tepe, neolithic site at', and 'Pig-keeping, in Homer'; but for 'pathos' he will look in vain. *The Songs of Homer* (1962) by G.S. Kirk, intended to interest 'amateurs of literature and oral poetry who may know no Greek' (p. xiii), has forty-nine references under 'Yugoslavia, oral epic of', and under 'Dialect' no less than sixty, concluding 'and passim'; but again 'pathos' does not appear. The *Bibliography of Homeric Scholarship, 1930-1970*, produced by D.W. Packard and T. Meyers (Malibu, 1974), has accumulated seventeen items to list under the rubric 'Poetics: Comic', but has no comparable entry for the pathetic mode. And yet — is comedy really so much more important in Homer than tragedy? Is the dialect of the poems really so many times more interesting than their pathos? In what follows, an attempt will be made to distinguish and discuss some particular forms of pathos, particularly in the *Iliad*; this will be combined with a discussion of the 'objectivity' of the Homeric style, sometimes perhaps rather too rashly thought to be universal. Ancient scholarship will be called in to redress the balance of the new; Wilamowitz remarked of it, 'Ancient literary theory, as always showing infinitely more comprehension for its own literature than does that of the moderns.'<sup>4</sup>

For the ancient commentators, ἔλεος, οἶκτος, and πάθος are among the commonest of terms. An idea of their frequency can be got from the work of J. Baar,<sup>5</sup> under the entries: ἐλεεινός, ἔλεος, οἶκτος, οἰκτρός, περιπαθής, περιπαθῶς, συμπαθής, συμπαθῶς, συμπάσχω. These entries, like others in the book, are not exhaustive,<sup>6</sup> and some lemmata have been omitted which should have been included (e.g. γοερός, xix. 282: οἰκτίζομαι i. 505, xv. 56, xvii. 300, xxiv. 500): but there are certainly well over 100 passages where

\* I am indebted for help and encouragement to Professor Hugh Lloyd-Jones.

<sup>1</sup> *Table Talk* for 12 May 1830.

<sup>2</sup> *Dichtung und Philosophie*<sup>2</sup> (1962), p. 41: 'Einem weiteren Kennzeichen des homerischen Stils, der verhaltenen Sachlichkeit und vornehmen Distanz.'

<sup>3</sup> *Mimesis* (Eng. trans. by W. Trask),

p. 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Homerische Untersuchungen* (1884), p. 123: 'Die antike Ästhetik, wie immer für die eigene Litteratur unendlich verständiger als die neuere. . .'

<sup>5</sup> *Index zu den Ilias-Scholien* (1962).

<sup>6</sup> See the review by W. Bühler in *Byz. Zeitschrift* 55 (1962), 79.

surviving ancient scholarship found pathos a feature calling for comment. This will sometimes be useful as a confirmation of the validity of our remarks on this slippery subject. For it is of course a risk, in handling it, that we may slip into a maudlin or baseless subjectivity of judgement. I hope to avoid it by taking a set of passages which can be extracted and arranged with some clarity. There are a number of Homeric devices which one might choose. One is apostrophe, of which the late Adam Parry<sup>7</sup> made some use, in discussing Homer's treatment of Menelaus and Patroclus. More references on it, and on its recognition by the ancient commentators as a vehicle of pathos, can be found in the dissertation of M.-L. von Franz.<sup>8</sup> Another is the type of passage, often a prediction of the future, which the ancients thought to be 'uttered by Homer himself', ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου προσώπου or ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, such as the comments introduced by νήπιος, or the weighty judgement on Patroclus' being called out by Achilles at xi. 604, κακοῦ δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλεν ἀρχή.<sup>9</sup> Similes are another emotional device, and we shall find that some of the motifs to be discussed here can recur as similes. That fact has its implications, and a complete treatment of Homeric pathos would involve discussion of all this; but here we shall be concerned with Homer's 'obituaries', the short notices which heroes are given at their death. They are an important class of passages for the whole ethos of the poem, and they can be sufficiently clearly defined for treatment. We shall see that motifs important for the production of pathos meet us also as expressive, in other places, of other emotions, but that they play their central role in conveying the central fact of the *Iliad*, the significance of death.

Of the practice in general, the ancient scholars say (ΣΒΤ in xiii. 171): χαρίεν τὸ ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἐπισήμων τὴν διήγησιν κατὰ τὰς ἀναιρέσεις ἐκφέρειν · τὸ μὲν γὰρ προεκθέσθαι περὶ ἐκάστου μακρόν, τὸ δὲ ἐν τοῖς συμπτώμασι παρεπιτηγήσασθαι πῦθάνον, 'it would be tedious to narrate the story of each of the heroes in advance, but we are convinced of its truth by its being incidentally narrated along with what happens to them'. Let us proceed from examples which seem dispassionate in manner to those which are more frankly emotional.

(1) xi. 262, Agamemnon has killed two sons of Aenor.<sup>10</sup> The episode has been a highly pathetic one; it is summarized:

ἔνθ' Ἀντήνορος υἱες ὑπ' Ἀτρείδῃ βασιλῆϊ  
πότημον ἀναπλήσαντες ἔδυν δάμον' Ἀἶδος εἶσω.

Such a passage, free from emotional words, is easily underrated. The ΣΤ observes, περιπαθῶς ἀπήγγειλεν: the modern reader wonders whether there is 'really' any such colouring to the passage. Are we not in danger of reading into the text emotions not 'really' there?<sup>11</sup> For, like Presocratic philosophers, we are looking always, in Homer, for the origin of things: what qualities can be compa-

<sup>7</sup> In *HSPb.* 76 (1972), 9 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *Die ästhetischen Anschauungen der Iliasscholien*, Diss. Zürich 1943, pp. 34 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. G.E. Duckworth, *AJP* 52 (1931), 320 ff.

<sup>10</sup> Some historical reflections on the motif and its origins: C.A. Trypanis, 'Brothers fighting together in the *Iliad*,'

*Rb. Mus.* 106 (1963), 289 ff. He does not consider the increase in pathos produced by having two brothers slain at once, as so often happens.

<sup>11</sup> "[The 'obituaries' in the *Iliad*] werden nie gefühlvoll im Ausdruck, aber ihre Wirkung tun sie doch": H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*, p. 41.

tible with all things being made of formulae?<sup>12</sup> I hope to meet this objection by showing that an unbroken chain connects such a passage with unambiguously emotional ones.

(2) v. 559, twin sons of Diocles: their parentage; growing up, they sailed to Troy; there Aeneas slew them, as men slay a pair of lions:

τοίω τῷ χείρεσσιν ὑπ' Αἰνείαο δαμέντε  
καππεσέτην, ἐλάττησιν ἐουκότες ὑψηλῆσι.

Again, no word of explicit pathos; but the ΣΒ observes: *πειπαθῶς τὸ 'ἐλάττησιν ὑψηλῆσιν', διὰ τε τὸ κάλλος καὶ τὴν ἥβην*. The simile has, implicitly, brought out the pathos a little more (once fallen, they lie low), as did the treatment of their childhood and growing up.

(3) xi. 99, Agamemnon kills Bianor and Oileus:

καὶ τοὺς μὲν λίπεν αὐθι ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων  
στήθεσι παμφαίνοντας, ἐπεὶ περίδυσε χιτώνας.

The unusual phrase *στήθεσι παμφαίνοντας* means (see Leaf ad loc.) that their bared chests gleamed in the sun; in antiquity Nicanor said (*ap. ΣΤ*) that the words 'showed their youth'. Here then another phrase, apparently unemotional, gives a colouring to the whole.

(4) We come closer to explicitness with xvi. 775, one of the most unforgettable passages in Homer. Over the body of Cebriones the battle raged:

ὁ δ' ἐν στροφάλιγγι κονίης  
κεῖτο μέγας μεγαλωστί, λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων.

The ΣΤ say: *καὶ ἡδέως ἐπεφώνησε καὶ περιπαθῶς*, and some modern scholars have found the lines too splendid to have been invented for so minor a character as Cebriones.<sup>13</sup> Again, no single word is explicitly emotional. But the contrast (see below pp. 182 f.) is effective, and it would be an imperfect reader of the poem who detected no *πάθος* here.

(5) iv. 536, a leader from each side is killed:

ὥς τῷ γ' ἐν κονίῃσι παρ' ἀλλήλοισι τετάσθην,  
ἦτοι οἱ μὲν Θρηκῶν, ὁ δ' Ἑπειῶν χαλκοχιτώνων  
ἡγεμόνες · πολλοὶ δὲ περὶ κτείνοντο καὶ ἄλλοι.

G. Strasburger<sup>14</sup> suggests that here the heroic death of the two leaders represents the general *mêlée*, which could not be well depicted in epic. There is, I think, truth in this; but the particular way in which their deaths are summed up seems also to be meant to bring out the tragic fact that both fought and died far from home. Enemies, they lie side by side in death, and the audience 'sees' them in the perspective in which the gods see them, as equal in vulnerability, in mortality, in death.

<sup>12</sup> The provenance of material is the subject of C.R. Beye, 'Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues', *HSPb.* 68 (1964), 345 ff.

<sup>13</sup> Thus even a purely aesthetic perception becomes at once an implement of enquiry into Origins; see Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer* (1920), p.142; W. Fried-

rich, *Verwundung und Tod in der Ilias* (1956), p.106; *contra*, cf. A. Dihle, *Homeric Probleme* (1970), p.23.

<sup>14</sup> G. Strasburger, *Die kleinen Kämpfer der Ilias*, Diss. Frankfurt/Main 1954, p. 45; cf. W. Marg, *die Antike* 18 (1942), 168.

The motif 'far from home', here implicit only, is developed in a series of passages. First, its use as a reproach, xvi. 538, Glaucus to Hector:

- (6) Ἑκτορ, νῦν δὴ πάγχυ λελασμένος εἰς ἐπικούρων  
οἷ σέθεν εἵνεκα τῆλε φίλων καὶ πατρίδος αἴης  
θυμὸν ἀποφθνύουσι.

As a taunt, different in character, at i. 29, Agamemnon to Chryses:

- (7) I will not give you back your daughter:

πρὶν μὲν καὶ γῆρας ἔπεισω  
ἡμετέρῳ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ, ἐν Ἄργεϊ, τηλόθι πάτρης,  
ιστὸν ἐποικομένην καὶ ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντιώσασαι.

On this Σ say shrewdly: κατ' ὀλίγον αὖξων τὰ τῆς διστάσεως λυπεῖ τὸν γέροντα,<sup>15</sup> (sc. in line 30): the separation from home emphasized to cause the father the greatest possible pain. We do not forget here that Chryses is a highly pathetic character: what immediately follows brings this out with great subtlety:

- 33 ὥς ἔφατ', ἔδεισεν δ' ὁ γέρον καὶ ἐπειθετο μύθῳ·  
βῆ δ' ἀκέων παρὰ θῖνα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης.<sup>16</sup>

(8) Another way of using the motif to cause pain is seen at xx. 389, Achilles exulting over the corpse of Iphition, son of Otryntes:

κείσαι, Ὀτρυντιάδη, πάντων ἐκπαγλότατ' ἀνδρῶν·  
ἐνθάδε τοι θάνατος, γενεὴ δέ τοί ἐστ' ἐπὶ λίμνῃ  
Γυγαίῃ, ὅθι τοι τέμενος πατρῴϊόν ἐστω.

Achilles says this εὐχόμενος: it is of course not simply a geographical or biographical excursus, but brings out the bitterness of death far away from home, which is worse than mere death itself.

(9) It is easy to reverse this and convert an insult into a lament. xi. 814, Patroclus is moved to pity by seeing the Achaean leaders wounded:

τὸν δὲ ἰδὼν ᾤκτειρε Μενoitίου ἄλκιμος υἱός,  
καὶ ῥ' ὀλοφυρόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·  
ὦ δειλοί, Δαναῶν ἡγήτορες ἡδὲ μέδοντες,  
ὥς ἄρ' ἐμέλλετε τῆλε φίλων καὶ πατρίδος αἴης  
ἄσσειν ἐν Τροίῃ ταχέας κύνας ἀργέτι δημῷ.

Here the emotion is made quite explicit, and the same motif ('far from home') is used to bring out the pathos felt by the speaker as in the superficially 'dispassionate' passages, nos. (5), (10), (12). In the light of (9), there can be no great doubt as to the tone of the following passage:

- (10) xvii. 300, Hippothous killed by Ajax over Patroclus' body:

ὁ δ' ἄγχ' αὐτοῖο πέσε πρηνῆς ἐπὶ νεκρῷ,  
τῆλ' ἀπὸ Λαρίσης ἐρβώλακος,

for the poet goes on to add

<sup>15</sup> Well discussed by J. Th. Kakridis, *Homer Revisited* (1971), p.131.

<sup>16</sup> ΣΤ in i.33: οἰκείως δὲ τὸν

ἠτμασμένον καὶ φοβούμενον ἑγέροντα  
καλεῖ καὶ οὐχ ἱερέα, πλέον οἰκτιζόμενος.

— οὐδὲ τοκεῦσι  
 θρέπτρα φίλους ἀπέδωκε, μυννθάδιος δέ οἱ αἰὼν  
 ἔπλεθ' ὑπ' Αἴαντος μεγαθύμου δουρὶ δαμέντι.

Here the poet has added two more of his most pathetic motifs: 'short life' and 'bereaved parents'. These two, in their fully expanded form, dominate the architecture of the whole poem, from the Achilles and Chryses scenes in *Iliad* i to the encounter of Achilles and Priam in xxiv. On (10) the ΣΤ say, *ὠκτίσατο περὶ τὴν διήγησιν ἱκανῶς*, but it is not by means of explicitly emotional words that this effect is achieved.<sup>17</sup>

Two more examples. One is in direct speech, one in a narration by the poet. (11) v. 684, Sarpedon, wounded, begs Hector to rescue his body:

Πριαμίδη, μὴ δὴ με ἔλωρ Δαναοῖσιν ἐάσῃς  
 κεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπάμυνον · ἔπειτά με καὶ λίποι αἰὼν  
 ἐν πόλει ὑμετέρῃ, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλον ἔγωγε  
 νοστήσας οἰκόνδε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν  
 εὐφρανέειν ἄλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νήπιον υἱόν.

On this moving appeal Eustathius, 594.13, makes the obvious comment: *οἶκτον δὲ πολλὸν ἔχει ὁ λόγος, ὀρφανίαν φράζων παιδὸς καὶ τάφον ἐπ' ἀλλοδαπῆς*.<sup>18</sup> It is unreal, I think, not to accept that the same sort of pathos is present in such a passage as the second, xv. 705:

(12) Hector sets fire to the ship of Protesilaus,

ἢ Πρωτεσίλαον ἔνεικεν  
 ἐς Τροίην, οὐδ' αὖτις ἀπήγαγε πατρίδα γαίαν.

On this, Σ says *περιπαθὴς ἢ προαναφώνησις*. The poet need not have added the little expansion upon the doom of Protesilaus, which had been developed in a highly emotional way at ii. 700 ff. (= (63) below); the motive for its appearance here must be pathos, and that, again, in a 'factual' style. Its dispassionate air is parallel, for example, to (48) below.

It is of course not possible to separate neatly the different motifs. Already passages have been mentioned which combine several. But before passing on to others, we can observe some special developments of the motif "far away".

(13) At xxii. 445 Andromache has made her usual household preparations for Hector's return, and heated water for his bath:

νηπίη, οὐδ' ἐνόησεν ὃ μιν μάλα τῆλε λοετρῶν  
 χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος δάμασε γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη.

On this the ΣΤ (in 443) say: *αἴξει τὸ πάθος · τοσοῦτον γὰρ ἀπέχει τοῦ ἐννοεῖν τι τῶν συμβεβηκότων, ὥς καὶ λουτρὰ παρασκευάζει, μονονουχὶ ὀρώσα αὐτόν · διὸ καὶ ἐπεφώνησεν ὁ ποιητὴς συμπαθῶς τὸ 'νηπίη, οὐδ' ἐνόησεν,' ὥσπερ ἔλεων τὴν ἄγνωσαν αὐτῆς*. Here the poet has with great skill made use of the motif of 'far away from home' for Hector, who was killed in his own homeland: he is

<sup>17</sup> Reflection on this may suggest doubts about a highly lexicographical approach to the study of ancient (or modern) poetry and ideas. It is not only, perhaps it is not chiefly, by use of the

'most important terms of value' that emotions and judgements are conveyed. Cf. the Appendix below on dying for one's country.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. (37) below.

'far' from the comforts prepared by his loving wife.<sup>19</sup> As the Σ point out, the ἐπιφώνησις by the poet of the word νηπιή and what follows gives here a more explicitly pathetic tone. Such passages may be seen as standing between the expressive manner of the reported speeches, and the dispassionate manner of the narration.<sup>20</sup> The quality of Homer's treatment can be felt when one compares it with a celebrated passage in Thackeray, presumably derivative from it,<sup>21</sup> directly or indirectly. At the end of the 32nd chapter of *Vanity Fair*, the heroine waits for her husband to come back from the field of Waterloo: 'Darkness came down on the field and city: and Amelia was praying for her George, who was lying on his face, dead, with a bullet through his heart.' A reader of Homer may feel, perhaps, that this effect seems by contrast rather crude; partly because of the abrupt rhythm, and partly because it is introduced as a surprise, unprepared.<sup>22</sup> Both features are un-epic.

Two particular developments in the *Odyssey*, where so much continued emphasis is laid upon Odysseus' remoteness:

(14) first, i. 57:

αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς  
ιέμενος καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρῶσκοντα νοῆσαι  
ῆς γαίης, θανέειν ἱμείρεται (cf. *Od.* vii. 224),

a wish, touching because so modest, to glimpse his own country, even at the price of death.

(15) Second, xvii. 312, Eumaeus speaks of the dog Argus: καὶ λίην ἀνδρός γε κύων ὅδε τῇλε θανόντος. This passage combines irony (it is to Odysseus himself that Eumaeus says this) with a certain sentimentality. The suffering of devoted dogs is beneath the notice of the *Iliad*. These two passages, chosen not quite at random from the lesser epic, seem to me to stand in the same relation to those from the *Iliad* as the one poem itself stands to the other. On the one hand, a simple pathos of heroic life and death; on the other, greater complexity and a nearer approach to sentimentality.<sup>23</sup>

In the *Iliad* another special development of the motif produces a striking and

<sup>19</sup> Schadewaldt, in discussing this scene, *Von Homers Welt und Werk*<sup>4</sup> (1965), p. 328, speaks of Homer's 'great and simple art of contrasts'.

<sup>20</sup> On the distinction of the two see H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*<sup>2</sup> p. 43.

<sup>21</sup> The motif of innocent preparations is parodied by Juvenal, 3.264, of a man squashed in a road accident—surprisingly, neither Friedländer nor Mayor records the point. Thackeray records (*The Letters and Private Papers of W.M. Thackeray*, ed. G.N. Ray (1945), i.207) that on 10 June 1832 he made 'a vow to read some Homer every day'.

<sup>22</sup> The motif of 'ignorance of friend's fate' is used again to great effect at xvii. 401, Achilles does not know of the death of Patroclus: ΣΤ ad loc. says, εἰωθε συμπάθειαν ἐγείρειν διὰ τούτων, ἐπὰν οἱ τὰ μέγιστα δυστυχοῦντες ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ τῶν κακῶν ὥσι καὶ ἐπὶ φιλανθρωποτέρων

ἐλπίδων φέρωνται, ὡς Ἀνδρομάχη (at xxii.437). Nothing of this in Leaf; the analysts tended to reject the passage in xvii, Ameis-Hentze pointing out that 'its content is purely negative.' Not without provocation did Adolph Roemer refer to 'das kleine Geschlecht der grossen Analytiker' (*Hom. Aufsätze* (1914), p.66).

<sup>23</sup> On the different ethos of the two poems, see F. Jacoby, 'Die geistige Physiognomie der Odyssee', *die Antike* 9 (1933), 159-94 = *Kleine philologische Schriften* (1961), i. 107-39; W. Burkert, 'Das Lied von Ares und Aphrodite: Zum Verhältnis von Odyssee und Ilias', *Rh. Mus.* 103 (1960), 130-44; W. Marg, 'Zur Eigenart der Odyssee', *Antike und Abendland* 18 (1973), 1-14. The Tränenseligkeit of the *Odyssey* is brought out, e.g., by G. Beck, 'Beobachtungen zur Kirke-Episode', *Philol.* 109 (1965), 1-30.

memorable passage at iii. 243. Here Helen tells Priam that she cannot see the Dioscuri, her brothers, among the Achaean leaders; perhaps they keep out of sight because of the disgrace she has brought upon them;

- (16) ὥς φάτο, τοὺς δ' ἤδη κάτεχεν φουίζοος αἶα  
ἐν Λακεδαιμόνι αὐθι, φίλῃ ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ.

The lamented Adam Parry<sup>24</sup> has given this passage one of the best evaluations in the modern literature of the subject. I add only that from our present point of view we have here a case where again 'dead far away' is used of those who are dead in their own country (compare, and contrast, (13) above). The combination of this with the motif of 'ignorance of friends' suffering' places Helen in an especially touching light.

Another sort of reversal is also possible. It is terrible to die and lie buried in a foreign land;<sup>25</sup> it is also terrible to see one's own country ravaged, and to be slain amidst its friendly scenes. The poem does not fail to include this motif.

(17) In xxii the Trojans must watch from their wall the pursuit and death of Hector — as Zeus says, xxii. 172:

- νῦν αὐτὲ ἐδῖος Ἀχιλλεύς  
ἀστυ περὶ Πριάμοιο ποσὶν ταχέεσσι διώκει,

a passage whose effectiveness comes from the close juxtaposition of 'the city of Priam' with Achilles' pursuit of Priam's son.

(18) As Hector runs, xxii. 153, he passes the *πλυνοί*, the washing-places, where the Trojan women used to wash clothes, τὸ πρὶν ἐπ' εἰρήνης, πρὶν ἐλθεῖν νῆας Ἀχαιῶν. It is hard to imagine this detail being preserved in an heroic tradition, except for emotional use in just this way: doubtless S.E. Bassett<sup>26</sup> was right to see in it an invention 'for tragic contrast'. The juxtaposition of women at their household work (we think of the opening of *Odyssey* vi), and the Trojan hero hunted to death, is another supreme example of Homeric use of contrasts with emotional significance.<sup>27</sup> We shall have to say something (on 37 below) of 'intrinsically symbolic' figures; this contrast, too, might claim to be one.

From the motif 'far from home' we have come to that of 'near to home', and it is a natural step to that of 'near to friends'. A series of Homeric warriors are slain close to friends, who cannot help them. This of course is on a 'rational' level a natural result of the way in which fighting is presented in the *Iliad*, as duels amid a general mêlée, but it is turned to great effect for pathos.

(19) First, a light and 'dispassionate' example: iv. 522 = xiii. 548, a warrior falls:

- ὁ δ' ὕπτιος ἐν κονίῃσι  
κάππεσεν, ἀμφὼ χεῖρε φίλοις ἐτάροισι πετάσας.

(20) The motif is developed with similes: thus xiii. 653, Harpalion is brought down by a spear through the pelvis:

<sup>24</sup> YCS 20 (1966), 197 ff.

<sup>25</sup> ἐχθρὰ δ' ἔχοντας ἐκρυψεν, Aesch. Ag. 454.

<sup>26</sup> 'The Pursuit of Hector', TAPA 61

(1930), 138.

<sup>27</sup> In the *Odyssey* the analogy, characteristically less tragic and more ironic, is the abuse of Odysseus 'in his own house'.

ἐξόμενος δὲ κατ' αὐθι φίλων ἐν χερσὶν ἑταίρων  
θυμὸν ἀποπνεύων, ὥς τε σκώληξ ἐπὶ γαίῃ  
κείτο ταθείς · they remove his body, ἀχνύμενοι ·

his father goes with them (658),

δάκρυα λείβων,  
ποῦν δ' οὐ τις παιδὸς ἐγίγνετο τεθνηῶτος.

Friends are powerless to help Harpalion, and also to avenge him. The treatment of the whole passage, especially the figure of the father, is an accumulation of devices of pathos, made explicit in the 'grief' of the comrades and the 'tears' of the father. The ancient commentators make no comment on all this, because unfortunately the father here is the notorious Pylaemenes, who was dead in v and is alive in xiii; as usual in Homeric scholarship, a ζήτημα of fact, however insignificant, at once banishes any aesthetic comment.

In the light of this, I think it would be wrong to read as really impassive the less explicit (19) above, or indeed xi. 120:<sup>28</sup>

(21) here Agamemnon kills two sons of Priam<sup>29</sup> and strips them of their armour (line 110), γλώσσκων: story, how he knew them; simile, lion killing fawns:

ὥς ἄρα τοῖς οὐ τις δύνατο χραισμῆσαι ἄλκον  
Τρώων, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπ' Ἀργείοισι φέβοντο.

The detail of Agamemnon 'recognizing' them<sup>30</sup> is adapted no doubt from the Lycaon-episode of xxi.<sup>31</sup> As that is one of the most pathetic episodes in the whole poem, the intention here, too, is surely to produce pathos; and the simile, of a lion crunching up the νήπια τέκνα of a deer, has the same tendency; finally, they die in the sight of their terrified and helpless companions.

(22) So too xv. 650, Hector kills Periphetes:

φίλων δέ μιν ἐγγὺς ἑταίρων  
κτεῖν' · οἱ δ' οὐκ ἐδύναντο καὶ ἀχνύμενοί περ ἑταῖρον  
χραισμεῖν · αὐτοὶ γὰρ μάλα δεΐδισαν Ἐκτορα δῖον.

Here the word ἀχνύμενοι brings out the implicit pathos.

(23) The motif can appear as a taunt. xvi. 837, Hector to dying Patroclus, with ironical sympathy:

ἂ δελ', οὐδέ τοι ἐσθλὸς ἐὼν χραίσμησεν Ἀχιλλεύς.

<sup>28</sup> The scene is discussed by Schade-waldt, *Iliasstudien* (1938), pp. 47 ff.

<sup>29</sup> Scholars have often been struck by the number of kinsmen of Priam who are killed in the course of the *Iliad*. Many have said simply that Trojans whose death at the hands of Achaean heroes is to be worth recording must be in some way significant, and the easiest way to confer significance upon the insignificant is to make them sons of Priam. G. Strasburger, *Die kleinen Kämpfer*, p. 24, suggests that, in contrast to the Achaeans, the Trojans are presented as forming a unity, embodied in the house-

hold of Priam. Aesthetically, I think the principal point is that Priam is *the* old man and father whom we see suffer in the poem (apart from the death of Hector, cf. also xxii. 44 ff., Priam on the deaths of his sons), and the accumulation of disasters upon him can be made visible and tangible in terms of pathos. We *know* Priam: other pathetic fathers are, by contrast, bloodless. And the *Iliad* is greatly interested in bereaved fathers (cf. p. 174).

<sup>30</sup> 'An extremely prosy addition,' Platt: quoted with approval by Leaf.

<sup>31</sup> So Schade-waldt.



(24) It can be applied to a patron deity. v. 49:<sup>32</sup>

Σκαμάνδριον, αἶμονα θήρης,  
 Ἀτρεΐδης Μενέλαος ἔλ' ἔγχεϊ ὀξυόεντι,  
 ἐσθλὸν θηρητῆρα· δίδαξε γάρ Ἀρτεμις αὐτῇ. . .  
 ἀλλ' οὐ οἱ τότε γε χραΐσμ' Ἀρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα,  
 οὐδὲ ἐκηβολαίη, ἦσιν τὸ πρῶν γ' ἐκέκαστο. 32

(25) It can be used to deride a fool, as at ii. 872, of the Trojan Amphimachus:

ὃς καὶ χρυσὸν ἔχων πόλεμόνδ' ἔιν ἤντε κούρη,  
 νῆπιος, οὐδέ τί οἱ τό γ' ἐπήρκεσε λυγρόν ὄλεθρον,  
 ἀλλ' ἐδάμη ὑπὸ χερσὶ ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο.

*κωμωδεῖται*, says ΣΒ correctly. The 'gold' motif can however also be used pathetically, see (68) below.

The inability of friends to help leads to the motif 'lack of care (after death)'.<sup>33</sup> Like all of those considered here, it can appear with very different emotional colourings.

(26) First, as a warning: so xviii. 270, Polydamas warns the Trojans not to spend the night out of the city and be caught by Achilles; otherwise:

ἀσπασίως γὰρ ἀφίξεται Ἴλιον ἱρήν  
 ὃς κε φύγη, πολλοὺς δὲ κύνες καὶ γῦπες ἔδονται  
 Τρώων.

The scholia comment: ἐκφοβεῖ, ἵνα δέξωνται τὴν συμβουλήν.

(27) More usually, it is a threat; either to slackers on one's own side, as at ii. 393, Agamemnon: any Achaean who shirks battle:

οὐ οἱ ἔπειτα  
 ἄρκιον ἐσσεῖται φυγέειω κύνας ἡδ' οἰωνούς.

So too Hector, xv. 348.

(28) It can be a threat to the enemy; thus, Hector to Ajax, xiii. 831:

Τρώων κορέεις κύνας ἡδ' οἰωνούς  
 δημῷ καὶ σάρκεσσι, πεσὼν ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιοῶν.

(29) The threat can be expanded by the contrast with the better treatment in store for one's own dead; so Achilles to Hector, xxii. 335: You thought you would get away with killing Patroclus, but I was there to avenge him:

σὲ μὲν κύνες ἡδ' οἰωνοὶ  
 ἐλκήσουσ' αἰκῶς, τὸν δὲ κτεριούσω Ἀχαιοί.

A further development, and one which uses to great effect a device of pathos, is (36) below.

<sup>32</sup> The contrast with the *Cycle* is great. In the *Iliad* not only divine favourites like Scamandrius and Hector, but even a son of Zeus like Sarpedon can be killed; in the *Cycle*, *ἀθανασία* was distributed with lavish hand. Thus Artemis gave immortality to Iphigeneia, Eos and Thetis to their sons Memnon and Achilles, and Zeus to the Dioscuri; while Circe made all the survivors

immortal, it seems, in the *Telephony* (Proclus). The *Odyssey* does not stoop to this, but flinches from the austerity of the Iliadic conception (*Od.* iv. 561, Menelaus to be immortal).

<sup>33</sup> The material is collected by C. Segal, 'The Theme of Mutilation of the Corpse', *Mnemosyne*, Suppl. 17 (1971).

The motif can appear in the expression of real pathos by a speaker, as in (9) above:

ἃ δειλοὶ Δαναῶν ἡγήτορες ἡδὲ μέδοντες,  
ὥς ἄρ' ἐμέλλετε τῇλε φίλων καὶ πατρίδος αἴης  
ἄσσειν ἐν Τροίῃ ταχέας κύνας ἀργέτι δημῶ.

It can be combined with ironical pathos to form a bitter taunt, as in (23) above:

σὲ δέ τ' ἐνθάδε γυῖπες ἔδονται.  
ἃ δεῖλ', οὐδέ τοι ἐσθλὸς ἐὼν χραίσμησεν Ἀχιλλεύς.

(30) It can also be combined with real pathos into a passionate warning; so xxii. 86, Hecuba to Hector:

εἴ περ γάρ σε κατακτάνῃ, οὐ σ' ἔτ' ἐγωγε  
κλαύσομαι ἐν λεχέεσσι, φίλον θάλλος, ὃν τέκον αὐτή . . .  
(but)  
'Αργείων παρὰ νηυσὶ κύνες ταχέες κατέδονται.

(31) The bitter taunt of (23) above can be further developed, as in the words of Achilles to Lycaon's corpse, as he throws it into the river, xxi. 122:

ἐνταυθοὶ νῦν κείσο μετ' ἰχθύσιν, οἳ σ' ὠτειλήν  
αἶμ' ἀπολιχμήσονται ἀκηδέες· οὐδέ σε μήτηρ  
ἐνθεμένη λεχέεσσι γοήσεται,

but fishes will feed on the shining fat of Lycaon. Here the special circumstances of the *παραποτάμιος μάχη* have led to the introduction of the fishes instead of the more usual dogs and birds, and the poet has succeeded in making Achilles' taunt at least as horrific, and as memorable, as the normal form. Eustathius 1227.17 observes: ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς σκώπτει μετὰ βαρύτητος.

(32) Later in the same book, the death of Asteropaeus is followed by the same motif in the 'dispassionate' style of narrative, xxi. 201:

τὸν δὲ κατ' αὐτόθι λείπεν, ἐπεὶ φίλον ἦτορ ἀπηύρα,  
κείμενον ἐν ψαμάθοισι, δίαψε δέ μιν μέλαν ὕδωρ.  
τὸν μὲν ἄρ' ἐγκέλυές τε καὶ ἰχθύες ἀμφέπενοντο,  
δημὸν ἐρεπτόμενοι ἐπιφριδίων κείροντες . . .

P. Von der Mühl<sup>34</sup> attributes this scene to his poet B and finds it unsatisfactory; in a note he points out that eels don't really behave like this. But from our point of view the 'eels and fishes' form a counterpart to the 'dogs and birds', and the passage takes its place as a member, almost as an expected member, of a long series.

(33) Another powerful passage is the passionate outburst of Priam to Hector, reminding him of all the horrors which will accompany the sack of Troy, xxii. 66:

αὐτὸν δ' ἄν πύματόν με κύνες πρῶτησι θύρῃσιν  
ὠμησταὶ ἐρύουσιν . . .  
οὓς τρέφον ἐν μεγάροισι τραπέζης θυραωρούς,

<sup>34</sup> *Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias* (1952), p.317: 'Noch hässlicher ist, was folgt. . . nach Otto Körner, *Die homerische Tierwelt* (1930), 80, geht dies, was die Aale betrifft, gegen die Naturgeschichte.'

Cf. Kakridis, *Homer Revisited*, p.96. Some of the ancients, too, thought Homer was infallible on every art and science; see, e.g., F. Buffière, *Les Mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque* (1956) pp. 10 ff.

οἱ κ' ἐμὸν αἶμα πίνοντες ἀλύσσαντες περὶ θυμῷ  
 κείσονται ἐν προθύροισι . . .

The T scholia say: καὶ τὸ 'πύματον' οἰκτρόν, οἷον ἐπιδόντα τὰ τῆς πορθήσεως δεινά; and go on, οἰκτροτάτη ἢ μετὰ θάνατον αἰκία. Ever since Payne Knight the passage has been suspect (see Von der Mühl ad loc). It seems clear that the lines which follow are related to Tyrtaeus 10 West, and that the epic is dependent on the elegist, not the reverse; but the motif of the dogs defiling the body does not come from Tyrtaeus, who is urging his men to fight, not to refrain from fighting, and who therefore could not use this idea without absurdity. The nightmare vision of Priam is a development, like so many others, of our familiar epic motif, with the variant that the 'dogs' this time are no longer unspecified pariahs, but Priam's own. Of course, those who dislike it can say it is late; Homeric scholars share with the poet himself the idea that earlier poets, like earlier men, were 'better' than later.<sup>35</sup>

(34) These passages have mostly been in direct speech. A very important one which is not is i. 1-5:

μῆνυν αἶεθε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος  
 οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρὶ Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε,  
 πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν  
 ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν  
 οἰωνοῖσι τε δαῖτα.<sup>36</sup>

What is the tone of this prologue? The question seems to have had little interest for recent workers;<sup>37</sup> and yet it must be important for the whole poem. The A and T scholia say that the poet 'has devised a tragic prologue for his tragedies', τραγωδίας τραγικὸν ἐξεύρε προοίμιον, and the BT scholia say, on the word οὐλομένην: ὡς ἐπὶ ἰδίοις δὲ ἀλγῶν βλασφημεῖ αὐτήν (sc. τὴν μῆνυν), and of line 3: κύνεσσιν οὐ τὴν τυχεύσαν ἔχει τὸ προοίμιον, εἰ μέλλει διηγείσθαι θανάτους πολλῶν ἰφθίμων ἡρώων, which seems to mean, 'The proem has extraordinary emotional effect,<sup>38</sup> as it shows that the poem is to narrate the deaths of many mighty heroes'. Here it seems to me that the ancients are vindicated, and the silence of the moderns is to be condemned. The μῆνις is οὐλομένη, accursed: its result was that mighty heroes became food for scavenging dogs and birds. We have looked at the way in which Homer has used this motif, and we have found that it is used in a whole range of emotional utterances. Can it be dispassionately used?

In the prologue to Book i, the poet is attracting the attention of his audience, and showing them what the poem will be about, what it will be like. Its subject is a disastrous μῆνις, which leads to great Achaeon losses and nearly to an Achaeon defeat. It is not, and can never have been, a theme for the mere φιλοθεάμων, who 'likes to be amused' — though such a taste might have enjoyed the *Odyssey*. The audience must have accepted it, those who did accept

<sup>35</sup> 'Here too B has attached an unseemly passage,' von der Mühl, p. 333. 'The gratuitous exaggeration of horror combines with other considerations. . . to stamp these lines too as not original,' Leaf, p. 428, who at once adds that 'all these suspicions rest on somewhat general grounds', and that 'the additions. . . are skilfully made.'

<sup>36</sup> δαῖτα Zenodotus: πᾶσι codd. Cf. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* i (1968), 111.

<sup>37</sup> It is not discussed in M.M. Willcock, *A Commentary on Homer's Iliad, I-VI* (1970), nor by B.A. van Groningen, *The proems of the Iliad and Odyssey, Meded. der kon. Ned. Ak.* 9.8 (1946), nor W. Kullmann, 'Ein vorhomerisches Motiv im Iliasproömium', *Philol.* 99 (1955) 167-192.

<sup>38</sup> For such a sense of κύνεσσιν (not in LSJ) cf. ΣBT in i.446 . . . ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοσαύτην κύνεσσιν ἔχει τὰ ἡδέα λεγόμενα δόσσην τὰ λυπηρά.

it, as a tragic work. And the prologue announces it as such: an accursed, a hateful *μήνις*, and great warriors lying unburied; *that* was the will of Zeus. It does not present the subject as 'ding-dong battles, hair-breadth 'scapes in th' imminent deadly breach, and a culminating victory over Hector, after which Troy is doomed'. The audience reacts to the mention of the unburied dead with emotion; there are things which cannot be said without that, as we shall see again in connection with (37) below. In conclusion, then: an example of emotional writing in the dispassionate style.<sup>39</sup>

(35) Another instance of some interest, again easy to overlook, comes from xxiv. 520. Here Achilles says to Priam, 'How could you bring yourself to come to the Achaean ships alone:

*ἀνδρὸς ἐς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὅς τοι πολέας τε καὶ ἐσθλοὺς  
υἱέας ἐξεκάρξα; σιδήρεών νύ τοι ἦτορ.*

It is not easy in English to express 'many brave sons of yours' without slipping out of the high style altogether. Most English translators resort to saying 'so many': thus Chapman ('How durst thy person thus alone / venture in his sight that hath slain so many a worthy son, / And so dear to thee?'), Rieu ('How could you dare to come by yourself to the Achaean ships into the presence of a man who has killed so many of your gallant sons?') and Lattimore ('I am one who has killed in such numbers / such brave sons of yours'). The introduction of 'so' makes the passage more evidently emotional ('I am *so* sorry!'), and the slight change helps to bring out the quality of the original: an apparently unemotional word, which succeeds in conveying emotional force. And fortunately in this place such a judgement on the tone cannot be dismissed as subjective, as the poet has at the beginning of Achilles' utterance made his purpose explicit, saying that Achilles stood up (516) *οἰκτίρων*, and began his speech *ᾶ δειλέ*. . .

Another pair of passages shows us the double motif 'unburied, far from loved ones' developed in each of the two styles.

(36) At xi. 391 Diomedes boasts, taunting Paris: Your arrows have no force to wound, but as for the man whom *I* hit:

*τοῦ δὲ γυναικὸς μὲν τ' ἀμφίδρυφοὶ εἰσι παρειαί,  
παῖδες δ' ὀρφανικοί· ὁ δέ θ' αἵματι γαῖαν ἐρεῦθων  
πύθεται, οἶωνοὶ δὲ περὶ πλέες ἡὲ γυναικες.*

(37) Here a horrific piece of gloating, it reappears in narrative at xi. 159, where Agamemnon is pursuing the routed Trojans, constantly slaying, like a destructive forest fire:

*πολλοὶ δ' ἐριαύχενες ἵπποι  
κεῖν' ὄχρα κροτάλιζον ἀνὰ πολέμοιο γεφύρας,  
ἡνιόχους ποθέοντες ἀμύμονας.<sup>40</sup> οἱ δ' ἐπὶ γαίῃ  
κείατο, γύπεσσω πολὺ φίλτεροι ἢ ἀλόχοισιν.*

Why this allusion to the wives of the dead warriors? The figure of the widowed wife is used in a simile for the most uncontrollable grief at *Od.* viii. 523 (Odysseus

<sup>39</sup> In a modern literature one might compare (but there are so many examples), Thomas Nashe:

Brightness falls from the air;  
Queens have died young and fair;  
Dust hath closed Helen's eye . . .

The affective juxtaposition of 'Helen's eye' and 'dust' is the same effect as 'mighty heroes' . . . the prey of dogs and birds'.

<sup>40</sup> For a development of this idea as fuller and more explicit pathos, see (64) below.

weeps, like a widow over the body of her husband, slain defending his city and his children:<sup>41</sup> the simile is given a long development); in the *Iliad* it is embodied in Andromache. It is common in highly emotional contexts (e.g. (38)–(43) below); and I think it is an idea which, even when expressed without elaborate pathos, cannot help but be emotive. Schadewaldt<sup>42</sup> applies the expression 'unwillkürliche Symbole' to certain things in the *Iliad*, such as the head-dress which falls from Andromache's head as she sees Hector dead (xxii. 468), 'which golden Aphrodite had given her on the day when she was married from her father's house to Hector of the bright helmet'. One might perhaps translate this as 'intrinsically symbolic'; such a passage, like that in which Andromache says she will burn Hector's clothes (xxii. 510), enables us to see directly into the significance of what has happened; the meaning of Hector's death is brought out in Andromache's loss of her wedding head-dress, and in the destruction of the clothes, the embodiment of her wifely care of him, now over and useless.

The figure of the bereaved wife of the warrior is in an analogous way 'intrinsically emotional'; it needs only to be named to produce an emotional response. One can reflect that there are many other statements of fact which, even in their simplest form, cannot be uttered without such an effect; for example, 'Mrs X has been left a widow with a young child', or 'My brother died as an undergraduate', or 'There is a dead body outside in the road'.<sup>43</sup> It was a regular effect of new plays in the 1960s to have such utterances received by the other characters on the stage in an inappropriately calm or flippant or irrelevant manner; that this produced a *frisson* in the audience was because of the breach of normal expectations. As far as poetry goes, it appears to be the case that simplicity and brevity in such expressions heighten their effect, conveying a sort of understatement, a noble restraint which allows the event to speak for itself.<sup>44</sup> And also we see why the material of these motifs so lends itself to treatment in different emotional modes; it is because it is itself so highly charged with potential emotion. The one way in which it is not possible to use it is in a really dispassionate utterance.

(38) The idea of the 'widowed wife and orphaned child' ((36) above) forms a passionate plea to the warrior not to risk his life — vi. 431, Andromache to Hector:

ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἐλέαυρε καὶ αὐτοῦ μίμν' ἐπὶ πύργῳ,  
μὴ παῖδ' ὀρφανικὸν θήης χήρην τε γυναῖκα.

(11) above used it for a different sort of plea, equally pathetic: 'since I can't go home to my wife and child, at least. . .' But it can also be used to reinforce the opposite plea from (38):

(39) xv. 495, Hector to the Trojans, 'Fight bravely; if a man is to die today, let him die — but his wife and children will be safe':

<sup>41</sup> See the Appendix for a discussion of this line and the idea of heroic death.

<sup>42</sup> *Von Homers Welt und Werk*, p.331.

<sup>43</sup> Saint-Simon, *Mémoires* ii.48 (Bibl. de la Pléiade): 'Il est des vérités dont la simplicité sous art jette un éclat qui efface tout le travail d'une éloquence qui grossit ou qui pallie. . .'

<sup>44</sup> Two more examples:

She's gone for ever.  
I know when one is dead and when one lives;  
She's dead as earth. (Shakespeare, *King Lear* V.3)

Half-owre, half-owre to Aberdour,  
'Tis fifty fathoms deep;  
And there lies gude Sir Patrick Spens  
Wi' the Scots lords at his feet.  
(*Ballad of Sir Patrick Spens*)

τεθνάτω· οὐ οἱ ἀεκέες ἀμνομένω περὶ πάτρης  
τεθνάμεν· ἀλλ' ἄλοχός τε σὴ καὶ παῖδες ὀπίσω.<sup>45</sup>

(40) Conversely, the attackers are encouraged with the hope of making widows and orphans; iv. 237, Agamemnon to his men:

τῶν [sc. τῶν Τρώων] ἦτοι αὐτῶν τέρενα χροὰ γῦπες ἔδονται,  
ἡμεῖς αὐτ' ἄλόχους τε φίλας καὶ νήπια τέκνα  
ἄξομεν ἐν νήεσσιν, ἐπὴν πτολίεθρον ἔλωμεν.

The laments of Andromache in xxii and xxiv develop the material at length, from the point of view of pathos; and the bereaved wife is the subject of a gloating outburst of passionate hate from Achilles, xviii. 121:

(41) νῦν δὲ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀροίμην,  
καὶ τινα Τρωϊάδων καὶ Δαρδανίδων βαθυκόλπων  
ἀμφοτέρησιν χερσὶ παρειάων ἀπαλάων  
δάκρυ' ὁμορξαμένην ἄδιδόν στοναχῆσαι ἐφείην.

The BT Scholia comment: ἤδη ὑπ' ὅψιν λαμβάνει τὰ ἀκολουθήσονται τοῖς πολεμίοις δεινὰ, ὥσπερ ἐμπιπλάμενος τῆς τῶν πολεμίων τιμωρίας διὰ τῆς ἐλπίδος.

An even more frequent motif than the orphaned children of the slain warrior is that of his bereaved parents;<sup>46</sup> it is as if the warrior were thought of, at his death, as being younger than we seem to find him elsewhere<sup>47</sup> (or than ten years of campaign at Troy would realistically have made him). The bereaved father is a dominant figure in the plot, from Chryses to Priam, who appeals to Achilles in the name of another tragic father, Peleus; it seems natural to compare Achilles' grief for Patroclus (xxiii. 222) with that of a father mourning for his son.

(42) The motif of 'bereaved parents' appears in the taunt of a killer, xiv. 501, Peneleos over the body of Ilioneus:

εἰπέμεναί μοι, Τρώες, ἀγανοῦ Ἴλιονῆος  
πατρὶ φίλῳ καὶ μητρὶ γοήμεναι ἐν μεγάροισιν . . .

(43) We find it assuming two different colours on the lips of two opposing heroes. xvii. 24 ff., Menelaus to Euphorbus, is a taunt: I have killed your brother Hyperenor;

οὐδέ ἔφημι πόδεσσί γε οἷσι κίωντα  
εὐφρῆναι ἄλοχόν τε φίλην κεδνούς τε τοκῆας.  
ὥς θην καὶ σὸν ἐγὼ λύσω μένος. . .

(44) In Euphorbus' reply, a threat arises from the pathos of loss, xvii. 34:

νῦν μὲν δῆ, Μενέλαε διοτρεφές, ἧ μάλα τείσεις  
γνωτὸν ἐμόν, τὸν ἔπεφνες, ἐπευχόμενος δ' ἀγορεύεις,  
χῆρωςας δὲ γυναῖκα μυχῶ θαλάμοιο νέοιο,  
ἀρητὸν δὲ τοκεῦσι γόον καὶ πένθος ἔθηκας.

<sup>45</sup> See the Appendix on this passage.

<sup>46</sup> A very exaggerated statement of this in C.R. Beye, *The Iliad, the Odyssey, and the Epic Tradition* (1968), p.94: 'Only the very old (and Andromache) seem to have any concern for children . . .'

<sup>47</sup> Cf. p. 185 below for the same fact in

early epigrams. Croesus is made by Herodotus to say to Cyrus (1.87.4): 'Nobody is mad enough to choose war rather than peace; for in peace sons bury their fathers, but in war fathers bury their sons.' There is a proverbial ring to this γνώμη.

I shall console them if I slay you.' Eustathius, 1093.34, comments: *περιπαθὲς καὶ οἴκτον ἔχον*. We observe that the wife is in her 'new' house: that is, she is a young bride, for the obvious reason that her bereavement is thus more touching.

(45) In (10) above we had an example of an 'obituary' in the dispassionate style, which followed the motif of 'death far from home' with that of 'short life and bereaved parents'. The combination is developed more fully and pathetically at v. 152 ff., the two sons of Phaenops slain by Diomedes:

βῆ δὲ μετὰ ξάνθον τε Θόωνά τε, Φαίνοπος υἱε,  
ἄμφω τηλυγέτω· ὁ δὲ τείρετο γήραι λυγρῷ,  
υἱὸν δ' οὐ τέκετ' ἄλλον ἐπὶ κτεάτεσσι λιπέσθαι·  
ἔθ' ὃ γε τοὺς ἐνάριζε, φίλον δ' ἐξαίνυτο θυμὸν  
ἄμφοτέρω· πατέρι δὲ γόνον καὶ κήδεα λυγρὰ  
λείπει, ἐπεὶ οὐ ζῶοντε μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντε<sup>49</sup>  
δέξατο· χηρωσται δὲ διὰ κτήσιν δατέοντο.

Eustathius 533.28: καὶ ἔστι περιπαθὲς ὁ λόγος. We observe here that the sons barely exist at all, and that the epithets applied to them (*Φαίνοπος υἱε, ἄμφω τηλυγέτω*<sup>49</sup>) relate entirely to their relationship with their father. His feelings (*γόνος καὶ κήδεα λυγρὰ*) are the real subject of interest, and every device is used to increase their bitterness. As with Harpalion's father, (20) above –

μετὰ δὲ σφι πατὴρ κίε δάκρυα λείβων,  
πουνή δ' οὐ τις παιδὸς ἐγίγνετο τεθνηῶτος –

pathos is the explanation of the development.

(46) If a father can be bereaved, then we wonder how he tried to take care of his son. He can be prophetic, and foresee their doom; xi. 328, Diomedes and Odysseus slay the two sons of Merops:

ἔθ' ἐλέτην . . .  
υἱὲ δὴ Μέροπος Περκυσίου, ὃς περὶ πάντων  
ἤδεε μαντοσύνας, οὐδὲ οὖς παῖδας ἔασκε  
στείχεω ἐς πόλεμον φθισήνορα· τῷ δὲ οἱ οὐ τι  
πειθέσθην· κῆρες γὰρ ἄγον μέλανος θανάτω.

Here the force of the motif is that his foresight was vain, destiny doomed his sons; again the focus of interest is upon the absent and suffering father.

(47) Or a father may doom his son through his own reckless wrongdoing,

v.59: Μηριόνης δὲ Φέρεκλον ἐνήρατο, τέκτονος υἱὸν  
'Αρμονίδεω, ὃς χερσὶν ἐπίστατο δαίδαλα πάντα  
τεύχεω . . .  
ὃς καὶ 'Αλεξάνδρῳ τεκτῆνατο νῆας εἵσας  
ἀρχεκάκους, αἱ πᾶσι κακὸν Τρώεσσι γέγοντο  
οἳ τ' αὐτῷ, ἐπεὶ οὐ τι θεῶν ἐκ θέσφατα ἦδη.

<sup>48</sup> *μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντα* is used four times; revealingly, always of *failure* to return from battle. All the other three passages refer to Hector (xvii.207; xxii.444; xxiv.705).

<sup>49</sup> This use of *τηλυγέτος* of more than one son is peculiar; 'perhaps twins', says LSJ, as if the poet had in mind a real family

saga, beyond what he says in this passage, which could be reconstructed by us by conjecture. I suppose the usage has arisen from the desire to combine two pathetic motifs: 'the only child' and 'two sons lost at one blow'. The poet is not innocent of exaggeration. Cf. (59) below.

Again the father predominates; again the impression is of human folly and helplessness in the face of destiny.

(48) A father may fail to be prophetic when he should be; v.149, the two sons of Eurymachos the interpreter of dreams are slain by Diomedes:

νείας Εὐρυδάμαντος, δνειροπόλοιο γέροντος·  
τοῖς οὐκ ἐρχομένοις ὁ γέρων ἐκρίνατ' ὄνειρους,  
ἀλλὰ σφεας κρατερός Διομήδης ἐξενάριξε.

Again, we learn nothing of these men but the pathetic ignorance of their father, who should have known their fate.

(49) A father may be careful of his son, but of course in vain; xx. 408, Achilles kills Polydorus, Priam's son:

τὸν δ' οὐ τι πατὴρ εἶασκε μάχεσθαι,  
οὐνεκά οἱ μετὰ παισὶ νεώτατος ἔσκε γόνουιο,  
καὶ οἱ φίλτατος ἔσκε πόδεσσι δὲ πάντας ἐνίκα·  
δὴ τότε νηπιέησι ποδῶν ἀρετὴν ἀναφαίνων  
θῦνε διὰ προμάχων, ἦος φίλον ὤλεσε θυμόν.

The rare noun *νηπιέη* replaces the commoner *νήπιος* ὅς, always said by the poet with emotion, whether of pity or derision; Priam is an important character, whose function is to lose his sons and lament over them (xxiv. 255,

ὦμοι ἐγὼ πανάποτμος, ἐπεὶ τέκον νῆας ἀρίστους  
Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ, τῶν δ' οὐ τινα φημι λελεῖσθαι.)

Polydorus exists only for this effect of his death on Priam and on Hector.

(50) Less obvious is the allusion at xvii. 194. Hector puts on the armour of Achilles:

ἃ οἱ θεοὶ οὐρανίωνες  
πατρὶ φίλω ἔπορον· ὁ δ' ἄρα ὧ παιδὶ ἦπασσε  
γηράς· ἀλλ' οὐχ υἱὸς ἐν ἔντεσι πατρὸς ἐγήρα.

Of this passage, the ancient scholars say (ΣΑΤ), ἡδὺ καὶ περιπαθὲς τὸ εὐρίσκεισθαι δυστυχέστερον τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν υἱόν. Von der Mühl, <sup>50</sup> on the other hand, finds it 'sentimental and in poor taste,' and supposes that 'the poet imitates the tragic tone of Homer'. Tastes vary, and I find this passage a touching and effective one. As for 'sentimentality', (12) above seems to me exactly comparable (the ship which brought Protesilaus, but did not take him home) on which Von der Mühl says (p. 236) 'dies wird hier alt sein'.

The more sentimental manner of the *Odyssey*, which likes to look back with a nostalgic tenderness on the heroic sufferings of the past, is well exemplified by Nestor's words at iii. 108, of Troy:

ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτα κατέκταθεν ὅσοι ἀριστοί·  
ἔνθα μὲν Αἴας κείται ἀρήιος, ἔνθα δ' Ἀχιλλεύς,  
ἔνθα δὲ Πάτροκλος, θεόφω μῆστωρ ἀτάλαντος,  
ἔνθα δ' ἐμὸς φίλος υἱὸς . . .

The lapidary style of the *Iliad* is softened: 'all the best of us' were killed there (cf. the lament of Menelaus, *Od.* iv. 95 ff), and the speaker dwells lovingly on their names, ending with 'my dear son'. *περιπαθῶς λίαν*, observe the Scholia — a different pathos from that of the greater epic.

<sup>50</sup> *Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias*, p. 258.



So much for the bereaved fathers in the background of the poem; the *Iliad* is composed of small units which have the same nature as the large ones, it seems, when we reflect on the unhappy father in the foreground of the plot. That is confirmed by the use of another motif, not capable of being sharply distinguished from the last: that of 'short life'. Sometimes the emphasis is rather on the short life of the hero than on the grief of his family; above all, with Achilles. His early doom is, of course, another subject which cannot be mentioned without emotion.

(52) Thus at its first appearance, i. 352, Achilles, weeping and alone, gazing out over the sea, calls:

μητέρα, ἐπεὶ μ' ἔτεκές γε μυννθάδιόν περ ἔοντα . . .

(53) and his mother replies, i. 413:

κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσα ·  
ὦ μοι τέκνον ἐμόν, τί νύ σ' ἔτρεφον αἰνὰ τεκοῦσα;  
αἶθ' ὄφελες παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀδάκρυτας καὶ ἀπῆμυν  
ῆσθαι, ἐπεὶ νύ τοι αἶσα μίννυθά περ, οὐ τι μάλα δὴν ·  
νῦν δ' ἅμα τ' ὠκύμορος καὶ οἴζυρός περὶ πάντων  
ἔπλεο.

And it is important for the last Book, too, that Achilles is near his death; xxiv. 540, Peleus, too, is unlucky:

(54) ἓνα παῖδα τέκεν παναώριον . . .

There is no need to expand on the destiny of Achilles, but others too are presented in the same light.

(55) At xv. 610 Zeus aids Hector:

αὐτὸς γάρ οἱ ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἦεν ἀμύντωρ  
Ζεὺς, ὃς μιν πλεόνεσσι μετ' ἀνδράσι μῶνον ἔοντα  
τίμα καὶ κύδαινε. μυννθάδιος γάρ ἐμελλεν  
ἔσσεσθ' ἥδη γάρ οἱ ἐπόρνευε μόρσιμον ἡμαρ  
Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη ὑπὸ Πηλεΐδαο βίηφιν.<sup>51</sup>

This is a statement of fact: Zeus is helping Hector, and his death is near. But the effect is to make us see Hector as a doomed man, to see him as he appears in the perspective of Zeus. The BT scholia say part of this: ἡ πρόληψις δὲ σχῆμα ποιητικόν. προσεκτικόν τε ταῦτα τὸν ἀκροατὴν καὶ περιπαθέστερον ἀπεργάζονται. We feel the pathos of Hector's delusive triumphs, as we feel that of Achilles' early death; and Schadewaldt<sup>52</sup> is right to emphasize that Zeus 'loves' Hector *because* his death is near.

(56) From our present point of view it is interesting that Zeus himself expresses the very thought here cast in the narrative form; xvii. 200, seeing Hector put on the armour of Achilles, Zeus:

κωήσας ῥα κάρη προτὶ δὴν μυθήσατο θυμόν ·  
ἄδειλ', οὐδέ τί τοι θάνατος καταθύμιός ἐστιν,

<sup>51</sup> Most editors have followed the Alexandrians in rejecting these lines (see Leaf ad loc.). As with (33) above, there are real difficulties, but the *emotional* effect is, I think, in accord with the others discussed here.

<sup>52</sup> *Iliasstudien*, pp. 107 ff. The reason for giving concrete honour to his corpse is his sacrifices (xxiv.67 ff), but the account of his death shows him lifted up and divinely favoured to contrast most tellingly with his end.

ὅς δὴ τοι σχεδὸν εἶσι · σὺ δ' ἄμβροτα τεύχεα δύνεις  
 ἀνδρὸς ἀριστῆος, τὸν τε τρομέουσι καὶ ἄλλοι ·  
 τοῦ δὴ εὔαιρον ἔπεφνες ἐνηέα τε κρατερόν τε,  
 τεύχεα δ' οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἀπὸ κρατὸς τε καὶ ὤμων  
 εἶλεν · ἀτάρ τοι νῦν γε μέγα κράτος ἐγγυαλίξω,  
 τῶν πωυῆν ὃ τοι οὐ τι μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι  
 δέξεται Ἀνδρομάχη κλυτὰ τεύχεα Πηλεΐωνος'.<sup>53</sup>

This impressive speech (it, too, is for von der Mühl 'sentimental and in poor taste'), 'makes even a pro-Achaean audience pity Hector', say the Σ; it combines the motifs of 'short life', 'pathetic ignorance', and 'no return home'. It represents in fact what might be called the austere pathos of heaven; in contrast, the passionate pathos of earth is exemplified by Andromache's lament over Hector's body, xxiv. 723:<sup>54</sup>

(57) τῇσιν δ' Ἀνδρομάχη λευκώλενος ἦρχε γόοιο  
 'Ἐκτορος ἀνδροφόνου κάρη μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχουσα ·  
 'ἄνερ, ἀπ' αἰῶνος νέος ὦλεο, κἀδ δέ με χήρην  
 λείπεις ἐν μεγάροισι · παῖς δ' ἔτι νήπιος αὐτῶς  
 ὄν τέκομεν σὺ τ' ἐγὼ τε δυσάμμοροι . . .

These three passages, (55–7), form an ascending scale of pathos. First, the objective manner in which the poet in his own narration conveys his sense of tragedy, then the perspective of Zeus, in which human suffering is touching but not shattering, and finally the view of the human victim whose life is destroyed.

There are other important passages in which the divine perspective is conveyed in a 'dispassionate' tone, and they are important for the poem.

(58) At xv. 361 Apollo clears the way for the triumphant Trojans into the Achaean camp, kicking down for them the wall erected so laboriously in Book viii:

ἔρειπε δὲ τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν  
 ρεία μάλ', ὥς ὅτε τις ψάμαθον παῖς ἄγχι θαλάσσης,  
 ὅς τ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ποιήσῃ ἀθύρματα νηπιέσῃ  
 ἅψ αὐτὶς συνέχευε ποσὶν καὶ χερσὶν ἀθύρων,  
 ὥς ῥα σὺ, ἦϊε Φοῖβε, πολὺν κάματον καὶ οἰζὺν  
 σύγχεας Ἀργείων, αὐτοῖσι δὲ φύζαν ἐνῶρσας.

The ancient commentators did not miss the moving quality of the passage; ΣΒΤ, ἔστι διὲ περιπαθῆς ἡ ἀναφώνησις καὶ ἐμφαντικὴ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ. I point particularly to the phrase πολὺν κάματον καὶ οἰζὺν Ἀργείων: much toil and sweat of the Argives, destroyed by Apollo easily, as a child destroys a sandcastle. The juxtaposition is an eloquent one, and conveys the poet's sense of

<sup>53</sup> B. Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad* = *Hermes Einzelschriften* 21 (1968), 170, comments that 'the sympathetic, pondering tone is special to Books xvi and xvii,' comparing xvi.431, 644, and xvii.441. Comparison with (54) above, showing that the two passages form a pair like a number of other pairs, may suggest the distinction is less than complete; see

also Zeus' speech about Hector, xxii. 168–73. It is in xvi and xvii that Sarpedon and Patroclus are killed, and that Hector seals his doom; that is no doubt largely why such passages are commonest in those two books.

<sup>54</sup> Well discussed by K. Deichgräber, *Das letzte Gesang der Ilias*, SB Mainz 1972, pp. 118 ff.

the pathos of vain human effort, and also the divine scale, on which nothing achieved or endured by men can be really serious.<sup>55</sup>

(59) A second similar passage is the opening of xiii. At the end of xii, Hector has smashed his way into the Achaean camp, his eyes flashing fire,

ῥμαδος δ' ἀλίαςτος ἐτύχθη·  
 Ζεὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν Τρῳάς τε καὶ Ἑκτορα νηυσὶ πέλασσε,  
 τοὺς μὲν ἔα παρὰ τῇσι πόνον τ' ἐχέμεν καὶ οἰζὺν  
 νωμελέως, αὐτὸς δὲ πάλιν τρέπεν ὅσσε φαεινῶ,  
 νόσφιν ἐφ' ἵπποπόλων Θρηκῶν καθορώμενος αἶαν. . .  
 ἐς Τροίην δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἐτι τρέπεν ὅσσε φαεινῶ.

Here again the same contrast: the unperturbed superiority of the gods 'who live at ease', in contrast with the suffering of earth. Zeus 'turns away his shining eyes', and leaves the men to their unending labour and pain.<sup>56</sup> And the phrase πόνον τ' ἐχέμεν καὶ οἰζὺν νωμελέως admirably exemplifies the emotive use of factual words.

The ascending scale of pathos can be found again with the motif 'the young husband slain'. We have observed that the Homeric warrior is characteristically seen as young, and that the widowed wife is a natural figure of Homeric pathos. A pathos still more intense is produced by combining the two ideas (cf. (44), (57) above).

(60) First, the idea of 'bridegroom' used as a bitter taunt, xiii. 381. Othryoneus had offered to drive the Achaeans from Troy, in exchange for the hand of a daughter of Priam free of bride-price. He is slain by Idomeneus, who exults over his body:

ἀλλ' ἔπε', ὄφρ' ἐρὶ νηυσὶ συνώμεθα ποντοπόροισιν  
 ἀμφὶ γάμῳ (dragging away his corpse).

(61) Next a passage whose pathos is implicit only; xiii. 428, the slaying of Alcahous:

γαμβρὸς δ' ἦν Ἀγχίσαιο,  
 πρεσβυτάτην δ' ὥπνιε θυγατρῶν, Ἴπποδάμειαν,  
 τὴν περὶ κῆρι φίλησε πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ.

The addition of the last line (she was the *favourite* daughter) brings out the grief which will be felt at her husband's death; just as in (45) above both sons were τηλυγέτω, to increase the father's suffering.

(62) A little more explicit is xiii. 171, the death of Imbrius:

ναῖε δὲ Πήδαϊον πρὶν ἐλθεῖν νῆας Ἀχαιῶν,  
 κούρην δὲ Πριάμοιο νόθην ἔχε Μηδεοκιάστην·  
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Δαναῶν νέες ἤλυθον ἀμφιέλισσαι,  
 ἄψ' εἰς Ἴλιον ἤλθε, μετέπρεπε δὲ Τρῳέεσσι,  
 ναῖε δὲ παρ Πριάμῳ· ὁ δὲ μιν τίεν ἴσα τέκεσσι.

<sup>55</sup> See H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*<sup>2</sup>, p.60; W.F. Otto, *The Homeric Gods* (English translation), pp. 241 ff.

<sup>56</sup> Those scholars who notice the passage are not much impressed by it. C. Michel, *Erläuterungen zum N der Ilias* (1971), p.30, is content to quote with

approval the 'recognition by earlier scholars' that it is 'an all too transparently invented device,' with no other point than to leave freedom of manoeuvre to Poseidon. Ameis-Hentze (*Anhang*, p.10) go so far as to say that 'the poet's lack of skill could not betray itself more clearly than in this inept invention. . . .'

Slain by Ajax, he falls like an ash tree, felled upon a mountain, which

χαλκῷ ταμνομένη τέρενα χθονὶ φύλλα πελάσσει.

Eustathius 926.54, quoting lost older writers, says: *περιπαθὼς δὲ ἡ παραβολὴ ἔχει, καὶ οἷον συναχθόμενος φράζει ὁ ποιητὴς κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς*. The whole account of Imbrius' death is so constructed as to place the emphasis first on his family relationships (almost a son to Priam), and secondly on his fall, like a tree whose 'tender leaves' are brought to the ground.<sup>57</sup>

(63) The next stage is represented by the mention of Protesilaus in the Catalogue, ii. 698 ff.; as for the men from Phylace:

τῶν αὖ Πρωτεσίλαος ἀρήϊος ἡγεμόνευε  
 700 ζῶος ἑὼν· τότε δ' ἤδη ἔχεν κάτα γαῖα μέλαυα.  
 τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἀμφιδρυφῆς ἄλσχος Φυλάκη ἐλέλειπτο  
 καὶ δόμος ἡμιτελής· τὸν δ' ἔκτανε Δάρδανος ἀνὴρ  
 νηὸς ἀποθρῶσκοντα πολὺ πρῶτιστον Ἀχαιῶν·  
 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' οἱ ἀναρχοὶ ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν . . .  
 708 . . . οὐδέ τι λαοὶ  
 δεύονθ' ἡγεμόνος, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἐσθλὸν ἑόντα.

His house was unfinished, therefore he was newly married; he was the first to leap ashore, therefore a true hero. His wife tore her cheeks in mourning for him, and his men missed him, under the command of another. This last point is repeated. For the ancient commentators this was beautiful and pathetic (ΣΒ: *τῇ δὲ ἐπαναλήψει οἰκτρότερον τὸ πάθος ἐποίησεν*: Eustathius 327.27, *οἶκτον κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς πολὺν δίδεισιν*); for the analysts it is a blemish ('nichts anderes als ein Notbehelf,' Jachmann;<sup>58</sup> '708-9 look like a gloss. . . filled up from previous lines so as to make two hexameters,' Leaf) and suggests un-Homeric authorship. The neatness with which the passage fits in with our others is striking,<sup>59</sup> and some will continue to find it moving, *more antiquo*. Especially noteworthy is the prevalence, in so fully amplified a passage, of implicit over explicit pathos.

(64) The series is concluded by Iphidamas. At xi. 221 ff. we are given an account of his upbringing and marriage; at xi. 241 he is slain by Agamemnon:

ὥς ὁ μὲν αὖθι πεσὼν κοιμήσατο χάλκεον ὕπνον  
 οἰκτρός, ἀπὸ μνηστῆς ἀλόχου, ἀστοῖσιν ἀρήγων,  
 κουριδίης, τῆς οὐ τι χάρις ἶδε, πολλὰ δ' ἔδωκε. . .

The particular interest of this passage is the explicit epithet *οἰκτρός* (*συμπαθῶς φησιν*, ΣΤ in 243); the poet himself gives utterance to the pity he feels for the unlucky young husband.

As we look back over the last series, (61-4), can we find a point where dispassionate objectivity gives place to the expression of sympathy and pathos? Does it not rather appear that even in the first of them, the account of Alcaethous' death, is so presented as to have a pathetic colouring?

(65) Perhaps this is confirmed by xxiii. 222; Achilles at the funeral of

<sup>57</sup> Cf. M.-L. von Franz, *Die aesthetischen Anschauungen der Iliasscholien*, p.34.

<sup>58</sup> G. Jachmann, *Der homerische Schiffskatalog und die Ilias* (1958), pp. 118 ff. He will not allow that the passage is the work of 'a poet' at all.

<sup>59</sup> The phrase *Δάρδανος ἀνὴρ* for the slayer of Protesilaus is certainly odd; heroes are not normally slain by nameless persons. Perhaps it was the peculiar bitterness of Protesilaus' fate, foretold by an oracle, to be killed by an unknown hand?

Patroclus:

ὥς δὲ πατὴρ οὐ παιδὸς ὀδύρεται ὅστέα καίων,  
 νυμφίου ὅς τε θανῶν δειλοὺς ἀκάχησε τοκῆας,  
 ὥς Ἀχιλεὺς ἐτάροιο ὀδύρετο ὅστέα καίων.

This simile, which exists to convey the emotion of passionate grief, singles out the newly married son as the most heart-breaking of all deaths; to present the slaying of warriors in that light is to present it in its most pitiful aspect.

A last series completes this argument. It is a little more complex but of the same character. The motif is 'beauty brought low'.<sup>60</sup>

(66) First, an example in the 'dispassionate' manner; xiii. 578, Helenus slays Deipyrus, whose helmet rolls in the dust:

ἡ μὲν ἀποπλαγχθεῖσα χαμαὶ πέσε, καί τις Ἀχαιῶν  
 μαρναμένων μετὰ ποσσὶ κυλῳδομένην ἐκόμισσε·  
 τὸν δὲ κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἐρεβεννὴ νύξ ἐκάλυψεν.

This is not far removed from grim passages where a head (xiii. 202) or a limbless trunk (xi. 145) is sent rolling through the battle, and though it is perceptibly 'emotional' it is not so clear what the emotion is.

(67) This is clearer with xv. 537, where Meges lops off the plume from the helmet of Dolops:

ῥῆξε δ' ἄρ' ἵππειον λόφον αὐτοῦ· πᾶς δὲ χαμάζε  
 κάππεσεν ἐν κονίησι νέον φοῖνικι φαεινός.  
 ἦος ὁ τῷ πολέμιζε μένων, ἔτι δ' ἔλπετο νίκην

(but Menelaus slew him from behind). That the detail of the plume, resplendent with new colour and fallen to the earth, is indeed pathetic, is strongly suggested by the next lines; 'he still fought hopefully on,' but at once was slain. The pathos is, however, coloured with irony at Dolops' expense.

(68) More emphatic is xvii. 51, the death of Euphorbus:

αἵματι οἱ δεύοντο κόμαι Χαρίτεσσιν ὁμοῖαι  
 πλοχμοὶ θ', οἱ χρυσῷ τε καὶ ἀργύρῳ ἐσφῆκωντο.

As a cherished olive plant, protected and in flower, is uprooted by a storm and lies stretched on the ground: so did Euphorbus fall and lie. The simile is a developed and pathetic one, related to that which Thetis applies to her own cherished son (xviii. 56); the flowers on the sapling recall Euphorbus' hair, and the care lavished on the plant reminds the reader of what he had been told (xvii. 36 ff. = (44) above) of Euphorbus' mourning parents. Eustathius rightly observes, 1094. 38: οἰκτεῖρει χαμαὶ κείμενον, for the whole account of the death is strongly pathetic in colour.

(69) Related is the description of Achilles' horses mourning the death of Patroclus; xvii. 437;<sup>61</sup> they stood motionless, like images on a grave:

οὔδεις ἐνοισκίμψαντε καρῆατα· δάκρυα δὲ σφι  
 θερμὰ κατὰ βλεφάρων χαμάδις ῥέει μυρομένοισιν  
 ἡνιόχοιο πόθῳ·<sup>61</sup> θαλερὴ δ' ἐμαίνετο χαίτη  
 ζεύγλης ἐξεριπούσα παρά ξυγὸν ἀμφοτέρωθεν.  
 μυρομένῳ δ' ἄρα τῷ γε ἰδὼν ἐλέησε Κρονίων,

<sup>60</sup> It is of course to this motif that (4) above owes part of its force, and so too do

(36) and (37).

<sup>61</sup> Cf. (37) above.

κωήσας δὲ κάρη προτὶ ὄν μυθήσατο θυμόν·  
'ἄ δειλῶ . . .'

The grief of the immortal horses, which moves the pity of Zeus, finds expression in the soiling of their manes. The lines which follow the motif have been quoted because they make explicit the pathos which is to be felt in the passage as a whole.

(70) That fine passage is excelled by the next, xvi. 793. Apollo strikes Patroclus with the flat of his hand,<sup>62</sup> and his armour falls from him:

τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ μὲν κρατὸς κυνέην βάλε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων·  
795 ἢ δὲ κυλινδομένη καναχὴν ἔχε ποσσὶν ὕφ' ἵππων  
αὐλώπις τρυφάλεια, μάνθησαν δὲ ἔθειραι  
αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσι· πάρος γε μὲν οὐ θέμις ἦεν  
ἵπποκομον πήληκα μαινεσθαι κονίῃσιν,  
ἀλλ' ἄνδρὸς θεῖοιο κάρη χαρίεν τε μέτωπον  
800 ῥύετ' Ἀχιλλῆος· τότε δὲ Ζεὺς Ἑκτορι δῶκεν  
ἣ κεφαλῇ φορέεω· σχεδόθεν δέ οἱ ἦεν ἄλεθρος.

This is great poetry, and it combines a number of our motifs. The fall of the helmet in the dust is made almost more moving than Patroclus' death itself; the T Scholia on 796 says, ἐμπαθῶς τῷ θείῳ ὄπλῳ συνάχθεται. The contrast of *now* and *then*, the helmet on the head of the splendid hero and its degradation in the dirt, is completed by the statement that Hector, too, did he but know it, is also doomed. In his human ignorance of destiny he embraces his doom.<sup>63</sup>

This series will be completed by xxii. 401 (73) below; but first two other passages call for comment, which present the motif in the developed form, 'unrecognizable in death and mutilation'.

(71) At xvi. 638 battle rages over the body of Sarpedon:

οὐδ' ἂν ἔτι φράδμων περ ἀνὴρ Σαρπήδωνα δῖον  
ἔγνω, ἐπεὶ βελέεσσι καὶ αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσιν  
ἐκ κεφαλῆς εἵλυτο διαμπερές ἐς πόδας ἄκρους.

We feel the horror of this description, especially of so attractive a character as Sarpedon: if we need re-assurance of the correctness of our perception, it is provided by the importance given to the preservation of Hector's corpse in xxiv.

(72) In vii. 421 ff., the dead are collected and burned.<sup>64</sup> In the early morning both sides set about the grim task:

οἱ δ' ἦν τεον ἀλλήλοισιν.  
ἔνθα διαγνῶναι χαλεπῶς ἦν ἄνδρα ἕκαστον·  
ἀλλ' ὕδατι νύχοντες ἀπο βρότον αἱματόεντα,  
δάκρυα θερμὰ χέοντες ἁμαξάων ἐπάειραν,  
οὐδ' εἴα κλαίειω Πρίαμος μέγας . . .

This is another passage which fared better at the hands of ancient than modern criticism: Eustathius says, 688. 65: περιπαθὲς τὸ δρᾶμα. The pathos is that of

<sup>62</sup> Cf. (57) above for the contrast of the effortless action of the god and the catastrophe it produces for man.

<sup>63</sup> Analysis can find no better words for the passage than 'Überdichtung,' and

'ein Zusatz von B' (von der Mühl ad loc.).

<sup>64</sup> A 'late insertion,' according, e.g., to Wilamowitz, *Glaube der Hellenen*<sup>2</sup> i.299.

the lesser warriors, of those whose bodies are not rescued by heroic companions but allowed to lie all night disregarded (viii.491 = x.199), driven over by chariot wheels (xi.537; xx.502), and eaten by scavengers (i.*init.* = (34) above).

These last two examples bring out the truth of the dictum of W. Marg,<sup>65</sup> that the *Iliad* is a poem of death rather than of fighting. The subject of the poem is life and death, contrasted with the greatest possible sharpness. Alive, a hero: dead, a mindless ghost and a corpse not even recognizable, unless the gods will miraculously intervene.

(73) This scale of pathos is concluded by xxii. 401. Hector's body is dragged behind Achilles' chariot:

τοῦ δ' ἦν ἐλκομένοιο κονίσσαλος, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαίται  
κυάναει πίτναντο, κάρη δ' ἅπαν ἐν κονίησι  
κεῖτο πάρος χαρίεν· τότε δὲ Ζεὺς δυσμενέεσσι  
δῶκεν ἀεικίσσασθαι ἐῆ ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ.

Homeric pathos can go no further than this. Zeus, who 'loved' Hector and glorified him in his triumphs, has now brought him down as far as man can fall. The motif 'beauty brought low' is combined with that of 'suffering in one's own country' (cf. (16) and (17) above). The bitterness of the ill treatment of Hector's head, 'which before was comely,' is increased by his enemy having power to inflict it in his own fatherland, before the eyes of his own people. It is a triumph of the Homeric style and its control that all this weight of feeling can be contained in four lines; and lines which still admit, at one level, of being described as 'objective'.

The investigation has, I hope, shown that the ancient scholars were right to regard pathos as one of the most important elements in the *Iliad*. It opens with Chryses, and ends with a book devoted to lamentation; ἐπὶ πλείστῳ δὲ ἐλέῳ καταστρέφει τὴν Ἰλιάδα, says ΣΤ on xxiv. 746. The tragedy of human life is brought out by the treatment of every age-group. Heroes are killed; women and children are made widows and orphans; old men weep helplessly, with no other consolation than to be told that the gods allot suffering to every man, αὐτοὶ δέ τ' ἀκηδέες εἰσίν.<sup>66</sup> The 'obituaries' serve to show us parents, wives, and children who could otherwise not be brought on to the battle-field and shown to us in their suffering and pain.

Some accounts given of these passages and their purpose seem, in this light, inadequate. Bowra says,<sup>67</sup>

The poet holds his audience by the reality and solidity of his narrative, and to maintain this he resorts to a constant, lively invention, especially of small touches which do not much affect the main story. . . Their task is to enliven a tale so crowded with persons that they may easily become faint or tedious. This is especially the case in the battle scenes, where many are killed or wounded and must be given momentary attention. This is secured by some small touch of information. . .

The defect of this account, which resembles that in some passages in the scholia singling out 'variation'<sup>68</sup> or 'credibility' as the point, is that it takes no serious

<sup>65</sup> *Antike und Abendland* 18 (1973),

10. <sup>66</sup> xxiv.525 ff., Achilles to Priam,

<sup>67</sup> *Homer* (1972), p.56.

<sup>68</sup> e.g. ΣΒΤ in xi.104: ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ οὖν ἡ γένος ἢ σχῆμα πτώματος δηλῶν ποικίλλει

τὸ ὑποκείμενον; and ΣΒΤ in xvii.575: ἐπισημαίνεται πάντα, πόλιν ὄνομα γένος φίλιαν, ὡς ἀνιχνεύσας τὴν ἀληθείαν. See R. Griesinger, *Die ästhetischen Anschauungen der alten Homererklärer*, Diss. Tübingen 1967, p.33.

account of the content and the tone of the passages. They are thus reduced to mere ornaments, empty of emotional significance, as if we could just as well have been told the deceased's size in shoes, or his favourite colour, or his taste in tooth-paste. But in fact they include some of the most striking lines in the poem, and cumulatively they 'affect the main story' very much, for they are one of the devices which make us interpret it in a certain way and not in other ways.

Schadewaldt<sup>69</sup> says: 'When a man falls in battle, Homer lingers for a moment on his person and his fate, and so brings out the significance of the death; and this gives a warm, human ring (einen warmen, menschlichen Klang).' With this we come closer to the point, but 'a warm, human ring' seems less than adequate as a description of the effect of these accounts of death, and of human lives seen as interesting only in the immediate shadow of death. Kirk<sup>70</sup> writes that one of the two 'main devices that bring reality and life to the scenes of warfare. . . used with almost unlimited richness and variety. . . is the lapidary sketch of the minor victims — for it was a difficulty that most of the victims *had* to be insignificant figures, almost unknown to the rest of the poem. . . Hundreds of otherwise obscure Trojan and Achaean warriors are brilliantly illuminated at the moment of their death.' Again the vital thing seems to be omitted: the way in which these deaths affect our perception of the nature of heroism and of the world in which the hero struggles and dies. They are 'illuminated' with a very particular light; and nothing is less in the Homeric manner than to dilate upon τὰ βιωτικά for their own sake.<sup>71</sup> The austere Muse of the *Iliad* has no interest in them except to illustrate the actions, the thoughts, and the death of the hero.<sup>72</sup>

Reinhardt<sup>73</sup> remarks of (8) above (= *Il.* xx.391) that it is 'almost reminiscent of the form of the later epigrams for the tomb'; the same comparison is perhaps implicit in Kirk's epithet 'lapidary', and a similar perception is occasionally expressed in the Scholia.<sup>74</sup> For we do find in some archaic epigrams the same reticent power which has proved so striking in these Homeric passages. Thus in Peek no.862,<sup>75</sup> a sixth-century epigram from Eretria:

Πλειστίας.  
Σπάρτα μὲν πατρίς ἐστίν, ἐν εὐρυχόροις δὲ Ἀθάναις  
ἐθράφθε, θανάτο δὲ ἐνθάδε μοῖρ' ἔχισε.

This poem exploits the motif of 'far from home', and feels no need to make explicit the pathos of Pleistias' distant death. Equally reticent is no.73 Peek, sixth century, from Corcyra:

οἶμα τόδε Ἀρνιάδα· χαροπὸς τόνδ' ὤλεσεν Ἄρες  
βαρνώμενον παρὰ ναυσὶν ἐπ' Ἀράθθοιο ροφαῖσι,  
πολλὸν ἀριστεύοντα κατὰ στονόεσσαν Ἀφύτάν.

<sup>69</sup> *Von Homers Welt und Werk*<sup>4</sup>, p.326.

<sup>70</sup> *The Songs of Homer*, p.342.

<sup>71</sup> e.g. ΣΤ in i.366: μεγαλοφυῶς δὲ συντέμνει τὰ περισσὰ τῶν λόγων καὶ τῶν ιστοριῶν.

<sup>72</sup> M.P. Nilsson, *die Antike* 14 (1938), 31, points out that mythological 'digressions,' too, are never included merely for their own sake (he excepts *Il.* xvi.173-92, *Od.* xv.223-56), but always are transformed

by being given a psychological point.

<sup>73</sup> *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* (1961), p.430: 'erinnernd fast an eine Form des späteren Grabepigramms'.

<sup>74</sup> ΣΒΤ on vi.460: ἐπιγραμματικὸν ἔχει τύπον. Eustathius 461.35 on iv.178: τοῦτο δὲ οἶον ἐπιγραμματὶ ποιεῖ τῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τάφῳ περιπαθῶς.

<sup>75</sup> *Griechische Vers-Inschriften I: Grabepigramme*, ed. W. Peek (1955).



Richard Heinze pointed out in 1915 that 'in the overwhelming majority of cases, where the erector of a metrical inscription of the early period is identifiable, it is a father who pays this tender honour to a dead son'.<sup>76</sup> That observation chimes with a striking aspect of the pathos of the *Iliad* (above, p. 174); and moreover, as Heinze saw, the epitaphs must really be created to satisfy a deep emotion of loss and disappointment. The austere form in which this emotion clothes itself (influenced of course by the epic) thus confirms the view that the similar style in Homer is also the vehicle of deep pathos.

A last epigram: the famous epitaph of Phrasiclea (68 Peek), Attic, sixth century:

σῆμα Φρασικλείας· κόρῃ κεκλέσσομαι αἰεὶ,  
ἀντὶ γάμο παρὰ θεὸν τοῦτο λαχὼς ὄνομα.

No words of lamentation were felt necessary in this simple and perfect statement. The death of an unmarried girl is one of the 'intrinsically emotional' things. It has often been pointed out that the epic avoids the violent gestures and wild cries of passionate woe which are admitted in Attic tragedy: the *δοτοδοτοδοτοῖ* and *αἰαὶ αἰαὶ* of Aeschylus appear in Homer only as *ὥς ἔφατο κλαίουσα*, ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες. No doubt in the real world such shrieks were to be heard at funerals<sup>77</sup> but banished from the epigrams, as the frightful powers of the malignant dead were banished, the necromancers<sup>78</sup> and the Erinyes.<sup>79</sup> The effort of stylization can be seen to be closely related in the two genres.

But though the grave epigram was not effusive, it is clear that it was expected to produce an emotion in the wayside reader, and that the emotion was pity. In Peek nos. 1223 and following, are collected those epigrams which make this explicit. *σῆθι καὶ οἴκτιρον* is a repeated phrase. No. 1223 (Attic, c. 550 B.C.):

παῖδός ἀποφθιμένοιο Κλεοῖτο τῷ Μενεσαίχμῳ  
μνῆμ' ἐσορόν οἴκτιρ', ὃς καλὸς ὢν ἔθανε.

*οἴκτιρ'*, ὥς καλὸς ὢν ἔθανε: the words seem made to apply to passages such as (2) or (4) above. Here again a further comparison suggests itself with the epic. H. Fränkel<sup>80</sup> has well shown that within the epics, narrators of stories say they relate 'sufferings,' *κῆδεα*, *ἄλγεα*. We have observed that the *Iliad* has as its subject suffering and death, and must have been listened to from an interest in that subject. Suffering is what produces song, says Helen;<sup>81</sup> if the song of Athene's anger and the suffering of the Achaeans is bitter to hear, says Telemachus to Penelope, *Od.* i.353,

σοὶ δ' ἐπιτολμάτω κραδίη καὶ θυμὸς ἀκούειν

— others, too, have suffered. That is to say: by listening to tragic song and reflecting on it, understand what the world is like, and what is the position of man within it.<sup>82</sup>

<sup>76</sup> Von altgriechischen Kriegergräbern, *NJbb.* 18 (1915), 8 = *Das Epigramm*, ed. G. Pfohl (1969), p.47.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* i<sup>2</sup>. 714, for the funerals of the archaic period and the attempts of legislators to curb them.

<sup>78</sup> W. Burkert in *Rb. Mus.* 105 (1962),

p.36.

<sup>79</sup> H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus* (1971), p.75.

<sup>80</sup> *Dichtung und Philosophie*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 15 ff.

<sup>81</sup> *Iliad* vi.357.

<sup>82</sup> Strikingly argued by W. Marg, *Homer über die Dichtung* (1957), p.14.

This tragic and consistent view of human life is what makes the epic so great. The 'obituaries' and the other passages of austere pathos are vitally important for it. The *Iliad* is a poem of death; as G. Strasburger points out,<sup>83</sup> actual duels in it are short, and the greater hero shows his greater ἀρετή by killing his opponent, who for his part is usually killed with ease, sometimes without resistance. A contrast with the duels, for instance, in Malory's *Morte Darthur*, where knights hew and hack at each other for hours with periods of rest, brings this out clearly. Fate, not fighting technique, is what interests the *Iliad*; the hero, splendid and vital, going down into death. A long poem consisting of such encounters could easily become gruesome, or boring, or unbearable; what prevents this is the light in which the warriors are seen. The device, like the conception it serves, is not an obvious or universal one. Neither the *Nibelungenlied* nor the *Song of Roland*, for example, is concerned so to illuminate minor characters who exist only to die; there the contrast is rather that of the great hero on the one hand, and countless insignificant dead on the other, who exist merely to make a mighty number for the hero to slay. But in the *Iliad* the lesser heroes are shown in all the pathos of their death, the change from the brightness of life to a dark and meaningless existence, the grief of their friends and families; but the style preserves the poem from sentimentality on the one hand and sadism on the other. Stripped of the sort of passages here discussed, it would lose not merely an ornament, but a vital part of its nature.

#### APPENDIX: ON DYING FOR ONE'S COUNTRY

It is argued by Professor Adkins<sup>84</sup> that dying for one's country, 'where even if one's army succeeds one had oneself failed, posed a problem for traditional Greek ἀρετή at all times . . . [in Homer] it is not yet καλόν to die for one's country; that had to wait for Tyrtaeus.' This assertion seems vulnerable from several points of view.

(i) Some parts of the Homeric text we have are later than Tyrtaeus. This seems certainly true of *Iliad* xxii. 71 ff. ('Nirgends ist der Einfluss der Elegie auf den jüngeren Homer so deutlich wie hier,' von der Mühlh); and so most scholars.

(ii) The *Iliad* makes it clear in other ways than the use of the words καλόν and αἰσχρόν<sup>85</sup> that death in such a battle was admired. e.g. (a) Hector, challenging an Achaean champion, offers to allow the return of his body for burial and the building of a monument, vii. 87:

<sup>83</sup> *Die kleinen Kämpfer*, p.50.

<sup>84</sup> Homeric Values and Homeric Society,' *JHS* 91 (1971), 7, n.37, in opposition to A.A. Long, 'Morals and Values in Homer', *JHS* 90 (1970), 130, n.53, who had called Hector's death 'glorious'. Cf. also Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility*, p.66, n.13.

<sup>85</sup> Adkins, p.9: 'αἰσχρόν is the only word powerful enough. . .'. In fact, αἰσχρόν is a rare word in Homer, being used of courses of action only three times (*Il.*

ii.119, 298; xxi.437). This fact alone suggests that there were other means of conveying praise and blame. Professor Dover remarks on the moral and evaluative use of 'Do you call that a hat?' and similar utterances (*Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (1975), pp. 46 ff.). We cannot expect that a poet will say 'and that was καλόν,' to resolve our doubts by the lexicographical method. Cf. note 17 above, and H. Lloyd-Jones, *Justice of Zeus*, pp. 2 ff.

καί ποτέ τις εἴπησι καὶ ὀψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων,  
 νηὶ πολυκληΐδι πλέων ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον·  
 ἄνδρὸς μὲν τόδε σῆμα πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος,  
 ὃν ποτ' ἀριστεύοντα κατέκτανε φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ'.

The chief glory is to be Hector's but (since he is here offering an inducement) some must attach to the man slain ἀριστεύων; and this word is used in just the same way as in Peek no. 73 (p. 184 above). Is it credible that it has 'become καλόν' between the two?

- (b) *Od.* viii. 523, a simile: as a woman weeps over the body of her husband,  
 ὃς τε ἐῆς πρόσθεν πόλιος λαῶν τε πέσῃσιν,  
 ἄστυ καὶ τεκέεσσιν ἀμύνων νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. . .

This can have only one implication: that such a death was laudable.

- (c) So indeed does *Il.* xxiv. 500, Priam to Achilles:

ὃς δέ μοι οἶος ἔην, εἶρυν το δὲ ἄστυ καὶ αὐτοὺς,  
 τὸν σὺ πρῶτον κτεῖνας ἀμυνόμενον περὶ πάτρης,  
 Ἴκτορα. . .

In cases (b) and (c) the question is: why *else* is this detail mentioned?

- (d) And still more clearly, *Il.* xv. 494:

ἀλλὰ μάχεσθ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν ἀολλέες· ὃς δέ κεν ὑμέων  
 βλήμενος ἡὲ τυπείσθαι θάνατον καὶ πότμον ἐπίσπῃ,  
 τεθνάτω· οὐδ' οἱ ἀεικὲς ἀμυνομένω περὶ πάτρης  
 τεθνάμεν· ἀλλ' ἄλοχός τε σὴ καὶ παῖδες ὀπίσσω.

This passage contains the answer to the idea that Greek morals were so orientated to individual success that any 'failure' was necessarily a disgrace. Even death can be a success, for the community. That brings us shamefacedly to

(iii) the argument from common sense. First, could a society have survived if its men had to fight, but to be killed in its defence was a shameful failure? And second, could an epic whose central characters were Achilles and Hector be heroic, if their deaths were 'not yet καλόν'?