

## ARMS AND THE MAN: EUPHORBUS, HECTOR, AND THE DEATH OF PATROCLUS

This article has two chief (and interconnected) aims: the first is to show in detail how the narrative of the death of Patroclus, the turning point in the *Iliad*, prepares for the subsequent conduct and fate of Hector; the second is to investigate a number of wider issues in early Greek epic, using the Patroclus scene as a test case. These include the question of the *Iliad* poet's capacity for invention, the use of traditional and transferable narrative patterns within oral poetry (and how far this practice can be taken to point to direct borrowing from particular fixed versions or texts), the validity of the etymology of characters' names as an explanation of their origins and fates, and finally, and more specifically, the relationship of the *Iliad* to the cyclic *Aethiopis*.

### I

The narrative of the death of Patroclus in *Iliad* 16 has been found puzzling in a number of ways.<sup>1</sup> Yet perhaps the most problematic aspect of the episode has proved to be the significance of Euphorbus' role in Patroclus' death. Indeed, by far the most influential reading of the scene in recent years focuses on the figure of Euphorbus, interpreting him as a doublet of Paris, and so assimilating Patroclus to Achilles (killed by Paris and Apollo).<sup>2</sup> Rather than taking Euphorbus from previous tradition,<sup>3</sup> the *Iliad* poet has, it is argued, invented him on the model of Paris so as to underline the similarities between the deaths of Patroclus and Achilles. Before considering the alleged affinities between Euphorbus and Paris, let us recall what the poet tells us about the former:

ὅπιθεν δὲ μετάφρενον ὀξείῃ δουρί  
ὦμων μεσσηγὺς σχεδόθεν βάλε Δάρδανος ἀνὴρ,  
Πανθοίδης Εὐφορβος, ὃς ἡλικίην ἐκέκαστο  
ἔγχεϊ θ' ἵπποσύνῃ τε πόδεσσί τε καρπαλίμοισιν

All references are to the *Iliad*, unless stated otherwise. The text of the *Iliad* is cited from the edition of M. L. West, *Homerus: Ilias*, 2 vols (Stuttgart, Leipzig, and Munich, 1998–2000). I should like to thank Adrian Kelly and *CQ*'s anonymous referee for much helpful discussion and advice.

<sup>1</sup> For a review of the main questions (why does Apollo first daze and disarm Patroclus? why is the armour of Achilles still said to be on the body of Patroclus? etc.), see R. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, 4. Books 13–16 (Cambridge, 1992), 408–9, on *Il.* 16.777–867.

<sup>2</sup> H. Mühlestein, 'Euphorbos und der Tod des Patroklos', *Studi micenei ed egeo anatolici* 15 (1972), 79–90 (= *Homerische Namenstudien* [Frankfurt, 1987], 78–89; I refer throughout to the earlier publication, which remains unchanged in the reprint); endorsed by e.g. H. van Thiel, *Iliaden und Ilias* (Basel, 1982), 416; M. W. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, 5. Books 17–20 (Cambridge, 1991), 18; Janko (n. 1), 410, 414; K. Dowden, 'Homer's sense of text', *JHS* 116 (1996), 47–61, at 54, n. 38, 56; R. Scodel, *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative, and Audience* (Ann Arbor, 2002), 96; M. L. West, 'Iliad and Aethiopis', *CQ* 53 (2003), 1–14, at 5, n. 22. Although few Homerists now follow Mühlestein's strong Neanalytical approach in all details, the wide acceptance of his interpretation of Euphorbus compels a critical discussion of his arguments.

<sup>3</sup> So U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin, 1916), 143; P. von der Mühl, *Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias* (Basel, 1952), 255.

καὶ γὰρ δὴ ποτὲ φῶτας ἑίκοσι βῆσεν ἀφ' ἵππων,  
 πρῶτ' ἐλθὼν σὺν ὄχεσφι, διδασκόμενος πολέμοιο·  
 ὅς τοι πρῶτος ἐφῆκε βέλος, Πατρόκλεις ἱππεύ,  
 οὐδ' ἐδάμασσε. ὁ μὲν αὖτις ἀνέδραμε, μίκτο δ' ὀμίλῳ,  
 ἐκ χροὸς ἀρπάξας δόρυ μελλινόν, οὐδ' ὑπέμεινεν  
 Πάτροκλον γυμνὸν περ ἔδοντ' ἐν δηϊότητι. (Il. 16.806 15)

Then a Dardanian man came up from behind and struck him [Patroclus, now dazed by Apollo's blows] at close range with his sharp spear in the back, between the shoulders. This was Panthous' son, Euphorbus, who surpassed his age-mates in throwing the spear and horsemanship and the speed of his legs; for he knocked twenty men from their horses when he first came [to battle] in his chariot, learning the art of war. He it was who first cast his spear at you, horseman Patroclus, but he did not kill you: he ran back again and mixed with the crowd after drawing the ash spear from the flesh, nor would he face Patroclus in the fray, unarmed though he was.

And then, as Euphorbus is killed by Menelaus:

δοῦπησεν δὲ πεσών, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ.  
 αἵματί οἱ δεύοντο κόμαι Χαρίτεσσιν ὁμοίαι  
 πλοχμοὶ θ', οἱ χρυσῷ τε καὶ ἀργύρῳ ἐσφῆκωντο. (Il. 17.50 2)

He fell with a thud, and his armour clanged around him. Blood soaked his hair, which was such as the Graces have, and his locks that were bound tightly with gold and silver.

According to Mühlestein and others, Euphorbus matches Paris in a variety of ways:<sup>4</sup> both are handsome and athletic Trojan nobles, and both are connected to shepherds, Paris through his upbringing on Mount Ida (cf., for example, Eur. *Andr.* 293–5), Euphorbus through his name ('rich in pasture').<sup>5</sup> The tenuousness of these links has been illustrated recently by Nickel, who points out that Euphorbus' excellence in spear-throwing, horsemanship, and running does not link him to Paris (who is an archer).<sup>6</sup>

Following in the wake of Neoanalysis, Mühlestein also claims that the reason Homer has inserted a second Paris (that is, Euphorbus) alongside Hector as the killer of Patroclus is that the scene is derived from the *Aethiopsis*.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, the truth of this is said to emerge via etymology: Homer has called his hero Patroclus, son of Menoetius, because he is based on Antilochus, who πατρός ἔκλυε (that is, hearkened to his father Nestor's cry for help) and thus οἶτον ἔμενε ('awaited death').<sup>8</sup> At this point one might ask whether there is any validity in the etymologizing approach to characters' names. The Greeks were undoubtedly capable of thinking in this way (e.g. Aesch. *Sept.* 829–30 [πολυνεκεῖς, used of the warring brothers], Soph. *Aj.*

<sup>4</sup> Mühlestein (n. 2), 81–3; supported by e.g. Janko (n. 1), 414, on 16.808–11.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. H. von Kamptz, *Homerische Personennamen* (Göttingen, 1982), 89; not simply 'shepherd' (so Mühlestein [n. 2], 80–1).

<sup>6</sup> R. Nickel, 'Euphorbus and the death of Achilles', *Phoenix* 56 (2002), 215–33, at 220, who also argues that 'In the absence of any evidence that Homer or the epic tradition knew of the story of Paris' exposure, his youth as a shepherd, and his eventual reunion with his family on the occasion of his funeral games, the claim that Euphorbus is modelled on Paris has no force.' Homer does allude to the Judgement of Paris, which took place 'when they [the goddesses] came to his farmstead' (ὅτε οἱ μέσσαυλον ἵκοντο, Il. 24.29), but this need not presuppose Paris' (early) life as a shepherd, merely that he was tending to his herds when the goddesses arrived (as was Aeneas when Achilles chased him from the hills of Mount Ida: 20.188–90).

<sup>7</sup> Mühlestein (n. 2), 84. The *Iliad*'s dependence on the *Aethiopsis* is disputed in § III below.

<sup>8</sup> Mühlestein (n. 2), 84–5. For an alternative etymology of Patroclus' name in terms of ancestral glory, see G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore, 1979), 111–15; von Kamptz (n. 5), 215.

430–3, [*Aἴας ~ αἰαῖ*], Eur. *Tro.* 989–90 [*Ἀφροδίτη ~ ἀφροσύνη*]), and the Homeric poems abound in etymologizing explanations for epithets and names, including those of sons whose names reflect characteristics or experiences of their fathers (e.g. Astyanax [6.403], Megapenthes [*Od.* 4.11]).<sup>9</sup> Yet it is precisely the obviousness and (in narrative terms) unimportance of etymologizing in the epics that leads one to doubt whether Homer set much store by this with regard to the names of prominent heroes, unless one is prepared to argue that he is being extremely subtle about it.

Moreover, the mechanical ‘speaking names’ approach practised by Mühlestein<sup>10</sup> leads to wholly imaginary problems: the Patroclus scene is said to be ‘complicated’ and ‘overloaded’ because, it is claimed, Patroclus’ ‘two deaths’ (at the hands of Euphorbus and Hector) derive from the meeting of the two paradigms—the killing of Antilochus (Patroclus) by Memnon (Hector) and the killing of Achilles by Paris (Euphorbus) and Apollo.<sup>11</sup> However, as Nickel well observes, ‘Mühlestein does not consider why, if Patroclus can simultaneously stand in for Antilochus and Achilles, Hector cannot also fulfil both the roles of Memnon and Paris. Hector, after all, could easily double for his brother in such a scene, thereby rendering Euphorbus superfluous.’<sup>12</sup> In other words, we are still no closer to understanding the significance of the poet’s introduction of Euphorbus.

Interestingly, Nickel has recently advanced a new reading of the episode whereby Euphorbus functions as a doublet of Achilles himself.<sup>13</sup> Thus, it is argued, the fact that Patroclus is wearing Achilles’ armour, making him a surrogate Achilles too, means that behind the scene lies the image of Achilles killing himself.<sup>14</sup> This in turn is related to Achilles’ knowledge (gained later from his mother Thetis: 18.95–6) that Hector’s death will ensure his own soon after: ‘By modelling Euphorbus on Achilles and then having him wound Patroclus, who also functions as a doublet of Achilles, we are presented with a picture of Achilles’ self-willed death.’<sup>15</sup> The argument is certainly neat, but it seems to me that the parallels between Euphorbus and Achilles are exaggerated and that the persistent interpretation of the scene in terms of doublets obscures the agency and motivation of the characters involved.

Euphorbus is said to be pre-eminent among his peers at throwing the spear, horsemanship, and running (cf. 16.808–9). He wounds Patroclus with an ash-wood spear (16.814). In all these traits he is said to resemble Achilles,<sup>16</sup> despite the fact that

<sup>9</sup> Cf. A. Heubeck, S. West, and J. B. Hainsworth (edd.), *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey*, 1. *Introduction and Books I–VIII* (Oxford, 1988), 91–2 (S. West on *Od.* 1.113 [Telemachus]). For the study of etymologies as a serious (philosophical) project, leading us to the ‘true’ meaning of words, see D. L. Gera, *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language, and Civilization* (Oxford, 2003), 25–6.

<sup>10</sup> Throughout the articles published together as *Homerische Namenstudien* (n. 2). For ancient and modern attempts to etymologize the name of Homer himself, see B. Graziosi, *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge, 2002), 52–4, 79–82.

<sup>11</sup> Mühlestein (n. 2), 86.

<sup>12</sup> Nickel (n. 6), 217, n. 7. Cf. J. S. Burgess, ‘Beyond Neo-analysis: problems with the vengeance theory’, *AJP* 118 (1997), 1–19, at 16: ‘Patroclus does not need to reflect both Antilochus and Achilles at the same time when he is slain.’

<sup>13</sup> Nickel (n. 6), 228–31.

<sup>14</sup> One might compare the doublets often traced in the final killing of the *Aeneid*: Aeneas (the avenger of Pallas, and so an Achilles figure) kills Turnus (called *alius Achilles*: 6.89), while ‘Pallas’ (*Pallas te hoc vulnere, Pallas immolat*, says Aeneas: 12.948–9) also faces ‘Pallas’ (Turnus is wearing his baldric); cf. P. R. Hardie, *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* (Cambridge, 1993), 10–11, 23–6, 33–4.

<sup>15</sup> Nickel (n. 6), 221.

<sup>16</sup> Nickel (n. 6), 228–9.

numerous warriors besides Achilles are noted for their swiftness, their spearmanship, and their handling of horses, while six heroes besides Achilles and Euphorbus are said to wield ash-wood spears.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, Euphorbus is in no way a major hero like Achilles, despite his promising start (cf. 16.810–11), a detail which is there to magnify Patroclus rather than to mirror Achilles, for despite his early show of courage, Euphorbus does not dare to face Patroclus, though the latter is wounded and unarmed (cf. 16.813–15).<sup>18</sup> Most importantly, by seeing Euphorbus and Patroclus as doublets of Achilles we risk neglecting their particular identities, which the poet has taken care to create (on a larger scale in the case of Patroclus). Finally, to argue that Achilles (in the form of Euphorbus) kills himself (in the form of Patroclus) is to overlook Patroclus' own share of responsibility for his death, which is stated emphatically:

Πάτροκλος δ' ἵπποισι καὶ Αὐτομέδοντι κελεύσας  
 Τρώας καὶ Λυκίους μετεκίαθε, καὶ μέγ' ἀάσθη,  
 νήπιος· εἰ δὲ ἔπος Πηληϊάδαο φύλαξεν,  
 ἦ τ' ἂν ὑπέκφυγε κῆρα κακὴν μέλανος θανάτοιο. (Il. 16.684–7)

But Patroclus gave orders to his horses and to Automedon and went in pursuit of the Trojans and Lycians, and he was greatly mistaken, poor fool! For if he had observed the instruction of the son of Peleus, he would surely have escaped the evil doom of black death.

Patroclus' overconfidence is punished by *ἄτη* ('destruction'): 'After three further rushes on the enemy (Il. 16.784) Apollo strikes Patroclus (Il. 16.791), *ἄτη* seizes him (Il. 16.805), and he becomes an easy prey for Euphorbus and Hector.'<sup>19</sup>

## II

What, then, is the significance of Euphorbus' role in the death of Patroclus? The most influential treatment of the scene concludes, 'Gewiss, das Ende der Patroklie, mit der kläglichsten Rolle Hektors, ist künstlerisch unbefriedigend.'<sup>20</sup> On the contrary, I shall argue, the death of Patroclus is crafted in such a way that Euphorbus' intervention has a meaningful impact on the audience's perception of Hector's character and fate in the

<sup>17</sup> The latter point is acknowledged by Nickel himself: (n. 6), 229, n. 49. Moreover, as K. B. Saunders has shown ('Frölich's table of Homeric wounds', *CQ* 54 [2004], 1–17, at 12–13, 16–17), Achilles' ashen spear is unique, not only in being identified as Pelian (*Πηλιάς*) and by a specific word for ashen (*μελίη*), but also in being used as both a thrusting and a throwing weapon.

<sup>18</sup> Similarly, after Euphorbus' death, Apollo, disguised as Mentès, tells Hector that Menelaus has killed 'the best of the Trojans' (17.80), a rhetorical exaggeration that is intended as a rebuke to Hector so that he will rouse himself and prevent Menelaus from winning Euphorbus' armour: cf. 17.70–1 *ἔνθα κε ρεία φέροι κλυτὰ τεύχεα Πανθοίδαο/Ἀτρείδης, εἰ μὴ οἱ ἀγάσσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων*. (For a similarly rhetorical description, compare Apollo/Phaenops' denigration of Menelaus as a *μαλθακὸς αἰχμητής* [17.588], also addressed to Hector; cf. I. J. F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* [Amsterdam, 1987], 250, n. 41, though correcting 'Poseidon' to 'Apollo'). Apollo's intervention here is crucial since it leads to Hector gaining the arms of Achilles and so marks his doom: *τότε δὲ Ζεὺς Ἴκτορι δῶκεν/ἦ κεφαλῇ φορέειν· σχεδόνθεν δὲ οἱ ἦεν ὄλεθρος* (16.799–800); cf. H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im homerischen Epos* (Berlin, 1986), 174.

<sup>19</sup> M. J. Alden, *Homer beside Himself: Para Narratives in the Iliad* (Oxford, 2000), 257; cf. also 16.46–7 *ὡς φάτο λισσόμενος, μέγα νήπιος ἦ γὰρ ἐμελλεν/οἱ αὐτῷ θανάτῳ τε κακὸν καὶ κῆρα λιτέσθαι*. Contrast Hector's contemptuous version of events (16.839–41), which falsely blames Achilles for ordering Patroclus not to return from battle until he has killed Hector.

<sup>20</sup> Mühlestein (n. 2), 90.

rest of the poem.<sup>21</sup> Far from being 'artistically unsatisfying', it is precisely in Hector's tarnished victory that the full significance of the scene emerges. Although Euphorbus is first to wound Patroclus after he has been dazed and disarmed by Apollo, Hector is the major hero on the Trojan side and it is he who kills Patroclus and strips him of his armour. Euphorbus' role can therefore only be properly interpreted in the context of Hector's victory and his despoiling of Patroclus' corpse. The larger structure of Book 16 shows the importance of this event (the stripping of Patroclus' armour), as the struggles over the corpses and armour of Sarpedon (16.530–683) and Cebriones (16.751–82) build up to the greatly extended (and most important) battle over Patroclus and the armour of Achilles (Book 17; cf. esp. 17.91–3).

Rather than construct Euphorbus as a doublet of Paris or Achilles, the poet has given him a coherent and significant Trojan identity: he is the son of Panthous (16.808), one of the old Trojan leaders who serve as Priam's counsellors (3.146–53). Moreover, Euphorbus is the brother of Hyperenor and Polydamas. Since Menelaus had killed Hyperenor (14.516–19), this gives his encounter with Euphorbus an added tension, as Euphorbus tries to avenge his brother's death (a typical, yet powerful, motif: cf. 11.248–63, 17.34–40), while Menelaus seeks to protect the armour and corpse of Patroclus (17.12–17, 29–32).<sup>22</sup> More importantly, Euphorbus is the brother of Polydamas, who is the only Trojan to oppose Hector's tactics (18.254–83), and whose rejected advice proves to have been right, as Hector acknowledges (22.99–103). Euphorbus, I shall argue, functions like his brother Polydamas in questioning Hector's wisdom on the battlefield.

As Fenik has shown, the description of Patroclus' death is built from a number of typical elements: a warrior's disabling by a god, the withdrawal of a fighter into his own ranks after he has dealt a wound, the wounded hero killed as he tries to withdraw, and so on.<sup>23</sup> Yet for all its typical features, the scene does present a *unique extension* of the pattern whereby a god and a mortal combine to attack a mutual enemy.<sup>24</sup> The shape of the battle narrative leads us to expect a decisive duel between Patroclus and Hector (cf. 16.380–3, 724–5, 731–2, 754–6), ending in Patroclus' death (cf. Zeus' prophecies at 8.473–6 and 15.65–8 [Hector will kill Patroclus, but will himself fall to the avenging Achilles]; also 11.603–4, 16.46–7, 646–50, 685–91). And although Apollo's hostility to Patroclus is well prepared (16.700–1, 724–5), Euphorbus' intervention is not. As we shall see, the poet has brought together these elements (each of

<sup>21</sup> In addition, viewing the narrative retrospectively, one can see the audience being prepared far in advance to expect that Patroclus' *aristeia* will end in his death: cf. 8.476 (Zeus speaking), 11.604 (narrator), 15.65–7 (Zeus), 16.46–7 (narrator), 16.249–52 (narrator), 16.644–55 (Zeus' thoughts reported by the narrator), 16.684–7 (narrator). The predictions become more frequent and explicit, and the (authoritative) perspective of the narrator more insistent, as Patroclus' death draws nearer.

<sup>22</sup> Menelaus recalls how Hyperenor insulted him, calling him 'the most contemptible fighter among the Danaans' (17.25–7). These details are not in 14.516–19, but there is no reason to suggest, as B. Fenik does, that 'The discrepancy is considerable. There were perhaps two poets at work here' (*Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description*, *Hermes Einzelschriften* 21 [Wiesbaden, 1968], 162). Fenik's second proposal is more accurate: 'It is also possible that the poet invented the story on the spur of the moment in order to re-enforce Menelaos' complaint against the sons of Panthoös.' The *Iliad* poet is of course free to elaborate such details as they suit the needs of the scene.

<sup>23</sup> See Fenik (n. 22), 216–17.

<sup>24</sup> The enemy may even be a god: cf. 5.792–897, where Athena combines with Diomedes to wound Ares; [Hesiod], *Shield of Heracles*, 424–66 (Athena combines with Heracles to similar effect).

them attested elsewhere, and so ‘typical’, but never before so combined) in order to emphasize the hollowness of Hector’s triumph over Patroclus.<sup>25</sup>

From the moment of Patroclus’ death until Hector himself is killed we are reminded repeatedly not only that Hector’s boasting of victory (cf. 16.829) is unjustified and deluded, but also that his exulting in Achilles’ divine armour is unwarranted. Patroclus’ final speech links these two ideas emphatically:

τὸν δ’ ὀλιγοδρανέων προσέφη, Πατρόκλεις ἱππεύῃ  
 “ἦδη νῦν, Ἴκτορ, μεγάλ’ εὐχεοῖ· σοὶ γάρ ἔδωκεν  
 νίκην Ζεὺς Κρονίδης καὶ Ἀπόλλων, οἳ μ’ ἐδάμασσαν  
 ῥήϊδι· αὐτοὶ γάρ ἀπ’ ὤμων τεύχε’ ἔλοντο.” (Il. 16.843 6)

Then you addressed him, horseman Patroclus, as your strength ebbed away:<sup>26</sup> ‘Yes, for now, Hector, make your great boasts. To you have Zeus the son of Cronos and Apollo granted victory, they who overwhelmed me with ease: for they themselves took the armour from my shoulders.’

It was the gods, Patroclus insists, not Hector, who stripped him of his armour, and the diminution of Hector’s glory continues:

“ἀλλά με Μοῖρ’ ὀλοή καὶ Λητοῦς ἔκτανεν υἱός,  
 ἀνδρῶν δ’ Εὐφωρβος σὺ δέ με τρίτος ἐξεναρίζεις.” (Il. 16.849 50)

‘No, it was destructive Fate and Leto’s son who killed me, and of men Euphorbus: you are the third in my slaying.’

This is a striking description of a unique combination of events. Hector is demoted to third in the list of Patroclus’ killers. And while the gods and Euphorbus are said to have ‘killed’ Patroclus (ἐκτανεν, 16.849), Hector’s role is described using a word whose root meaning is ‘to despoil’ rather than ‘to kill’ (ἐξεναρίζεις, 16.850), as if to imply that he has merely reaped the rewards of other people’s efforts.<sup>27</sup>

This idea is reinforced (during Hector’s absence: cf. n. 25 above) in the confrontation between Euphorbus and Menelaus. Euphorbus says:

“Ἀτρεΐδῃ Μενέλαε διωτρεφές, ὄρχαμε λαῶν,  
 χάζεο, λείπε δὲ νεκρόν, ἔα δ’ ἔναρα βροτόεντα.  
 οὐ γάρ τις πρότερος Τρώων κλειτῶν τ’ ἐπικούρων  
 Πάτροκλον βάλε δουρὶ κατὰ κρατερὴν ὕσμινῃ·  
 τῷ με ἔα κλέος ἔσθλόν ἐνὶ Τρώεσσιν ἀρέσθαι,  
 μή σε βάλῳ, ἀπὸ δὲ μελιγδέα θυμὸν ἔλωμαι.” (Il. 17.12 17)

<sup>25</sup> In contrast to his unexpected appearance, Euphorbus’ death follows the pattern of battle narrative whereby those minor Trojan heroes who wound the major Achaean leaders are immediately killed (e.g. Pandarus at 5.290 6; Coön and Socus, who wound Agamemnon and Odysseus, in Book 11). Hector is removed from the scene to chase vainly after Achilles’ horses (cf. 17.75 8), so that Menelaus can face Euphorbus alone. Hector’s return means that Menelaus must call for Ajax’s help (17.120 3; cf. T. Krischer, *Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epik* [Munich, 1971], 84).

<sup>26</sup> For the emotional effect of such second-person addresses, cf. R. P. Martin, *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Ithaca, NY, 1989), 235.

<sup>27</sup> Strictly speaking, Apollo removes Patroclus’ armour before he is struck by Euphorbus’ spear and thus before Patroclus retreats into the Achaean ranks, where Hector kills him (cf. 16.791 822). Yet the poet continues to speak of Patroclus’ corpse as if the armour remained on his body (17.13, 125, 205). To speak here of ‘inconsistency’, however, would be worse than pedantic, for such thinking would make no sense to an experienced audience of epic, whose knowledge of battle narrative will have accustomed them to expect a struggle for both the body and the armour of the fallen hero (the Achaeans have already managed to win Sarpedon’s armour [16.663 5] and both the armour and corpse of Cebriones [16.781 2]).

‘Menelaus, son of Atreus, nurtured by Zeus, leader of your people, give ground, leave the corpse, let be the blood-stained armour. For before me no-one of the Trojans and their famous allies struck Patroclus with the spear in fierce combat. Allow me then to win noble glory among the Trojans, or I shall cast my spear at you and rob you of honey-sweet life.’

By proclaiming his prerogatives as the first man to wound Patroclus, Euphorbus draws attention to the fact that Hector did not defeat Patroclus and win the spoils by himself. Yet it is unthinkable that such a minor warrior should gain Achilles’ armour, and Menelaus’ swift killing of Euphorbus<sup>28</sup> leaves the field open for Hector to make his own attempt to strip Patroclus’ corpse.<sup>29</sup> As he puts on Achilles’ armour, Hector proclaims himself the slayer of Patroclus (17.186–7). Zeus reacts, however, by shaking his head and announces the folly of Hector’s actions:

“ἄ δαίλι, οὐδέ τί τοι θάνατος καταθύμιός ἐστιν,  
ὅς δὴ τοι σχεδὸν εἶσι· σὺ δ’ ἄμβροτα τεύχεα δύνεις  
ἄνδρὸς ἀριστήος, τὸν τε τρομέουσι καὶ ἄλλοι.  
τοῦ δὴ ἑταῖρον ἔπεφνες ἐνθάδε τε κρατερὸν τε,  
τεύχεα δ’ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἀπὸ κρατός τε καὶ ὤμων  
εἴλε· ἀτὰρ τοι νῦν γε μέγα κράτος ἐγγυαλίξω,  
τῶν ποιήην, ὃ τοι οὐ τι μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι  
δέξεται Ἀνδρομάχη κλυτὰ τεύχεα Πηλεΐωνος.” (Il. 17.201–8)

‘Poor wretch, death is not at all in your thoughts, though it surely draws near you. But you are putting on the immortal armour of a man who excels in valour, and before whom all others tremble. And you have killed his companion, kind and mighty, and have taken the armour from his head and shoulders, in no way rightly. But for now I shall grant you great strength, in recompense for the fact that you will never return from the fighting, for Andromache to receive from you the famous armour of the son of Peleus.’

As before (cf. 16.799–800, n. 18 above), Hector’s donning of Achilles’ armour is associated with his imminent death. Notably, Zeus describes Hector’s despoiling of Patroclus’ corpse as οὐ κατὰ κόσμον (17.205). Hector’s actions are ‘not according

<sup>28</sup> Menelaus is an appropriate avenger of Patroclus, and protector of his corpse, since he is painfully conscious of his own responsibility for his death: ὅς κεῖται ἐμῆς ἔνεκ’ ἐνθάδε τιμῆς ([Patroclus] who lies here dead for the sake of avenging my honour’, 17.92).

<sup>29</sup> The near confrontation between Hector and Menelaus over the armour of Euphorbus, which Apollo begrudges Menelaus (17.59–60, 70–1, 84–6), prefigures the real struggle over the body and armour of Patroclus. (Thus Edwards [n. 2], 72, on 17.90–3, is wrong to say that ‘Homer never makes it clear whether Menelaos managed to retain them [Euphorbus’ armour] or not’; on the contrary, Apollo’s refusal of this honour is clear from the text: cf. n. 18 above.) When Hector, encouraged by Apollo/Mentes, goes to prevent Menelaus from stripping Euphorbus (17.87–9), Menelaus deliberates and—uniquely, following such deliberation—refuses to face his opponent (for Menelaus’ ability here to construct an alternative account of his retreat which frees him from blame, see D. L. Cairns, ‘Ethics, ethnology, terminology: Iliadic anger and the cross-cultural study of emotion’, *YCS* 32 [2003], 11–49, at 34, n. 103). The focus now turns to rescuing the body and armour of Patroclus (of course the more important and elaborated). On 17.580–1, the moment where Menelaus succeeds in rescuing Patroclus’ body from the Trojans, see M. Willcock, ‘Menelaos in the *Iliad*’, in M. Reichel and A. Rengakos (edd.), *EPEA PTEROENTA: Beiträge zur Homerforschung. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 2002), 221–9, who argues that this achievement underlies the traditional title of Book 17 as ΜΕΝΕΛΑΟΥ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΑ.

to order', and therefore dangerous to himself, because he is (for two major reasons explained below) categorically unworthy of Achilles' armour.<sup>30</sup>

According to Reinhardt, Zeus describes Hector's triumph as *οὐ κατὰ κόσμον* because it was Apollo, not Hector, who killed Patroclus.<sup>31</sup> Yet both the conventions of epic narrative and Greek views of divine-human interaction mean that as a rule one should not interpret divine involvement as excluding human participation, so that even if Apollo's disabling and disarming of Patroclus is an extreme case, the glory of his human killers is not annulled.<sup>32</sup> No less significant, however, is the way Reinhardt ignores the role of Euphorbus, for while a divine helper magnifies a warrior's success, a human interloper does not. A more plausible explanation of Zeus' criticism, I would suggest, is that Hector's actions are *οὐ κατὰ κόσμον* because the person whose corpse he has stripped is not the rightful owner of the armour.

The ownership of fine armour, and its passage through the generations from father to son, are important features of the epic world, since such lines of inheritance are a mark of social rank and heroic descent. Just before Zeus' speech, as Hector removes his own armour and prepares to don the spoils, the narrator draws attention to Achilles' peculiarly prestigious inheritance:

ὁ δ' ἄμβροτα τεύχεα δύνει  
Πηλείδew Ἀχιλῆος, ἃ οἱ θεοὶ οὐρανίωνες  
πατρὶ φίλῳ ἔπορον, ὁ δ' ἄρα ὦι παιδὶ ὅπασσεν  
γηράς... (Il. 17.194–7)

<sup>30</sup> The phrase *οὐ κατὰ κόσμον* is used to describe a variety of 'disorderly' situations: Thersites' abuse of the Achaean leaders (2.214), Ares' destruction of the Achaean army (as seen from Hera's perspective: 5.759), the punishment of the gods by Zeus if they disobey him and assist either side (8.12). (For the phrase's use in the *Odyssey* to describe unruly speech, see A. Ford, *Homer: The Poetry of the Past* [Ithaca, NY, 1992], 122 3.) Significantly, the state of affairs so described is put in 'good order' immediately or soon after: Thersites is rebuked and beaten, Zeus allows Hera to send Athena against Ares, the gods refrain from battle. The pattern continues in the present scenario (17.205), as Hector's recklessness leads to his own destruction and the armour's return to Achilles.

<sup>31</sup> K. Reinhardt, *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*, ed. U. Hölscher (Göttingen, 1961), 337. Thetis tells Hephaestus that it was Apollo who 'killed the son of Menoetius among the foremost fighters and gave glory to Hector' (18.455–6), while Xanthus says the same to Achilles (19.413–14). Although it is natural for the gods to foreground the actions of other gods (since they consider themselves more important than humans), there is added point in the speakers' emphasis on the role of Apollo. Thetis' rhetorical purpose helps to explain her version of events (cf. n. 18 above): she seeks to make Achilles' situation appear as grim as possible (he has lost his companion and his armour), and she therefore foregrounds the role of her son's chief divine opponent, the god on whom Achilles will wish he could avenge himself (22.20), and the god whom Hera attacks as *κακῶν ἑταρῶν, αἰὲν ἄπιστε* ('friend of the base, always faithless', 24.63) for his hostility to Thetis' son. Thetis makes no mention of Euphorbus since his role is irrelevant to her goal. Similarly, Xanthus seeks to absolve himself and Balios of any blame for the death of Patroclus: it was after all Apollo, 'the best of gods' (19.413), who killed him. In addition, Xanthus' speech reveals that Achilles will die at the hands of a mortal *and a god* (19.410, 416 17; cf. 22.359).

<sup>32</sup> Similarly, the only other passage that involves a god disabling a warrior to such effect (13.434–44, where Poseidon stupefies Alcaethous, who is then killed by Idomeneus) does not diminish the victor's glory, but enhances it (the kill is also marked by a spectacular wound, as Alcaethous' heart, pierced by Idomeneus' spear, 'made the spear quiver right to its butt' cf. K. B. Saunders, 'The wounds in *Iliad* 13 16', *CQ* 49 [1999], 345–63, at 349: 'Rarely seen, but once seen, never forgotten'). This is immediately recognized by Deiphobus, who reacts to Idomeneus' taunting speech (13.446–54) by withdrawing and seeking out Aeneas' support (455–9).



... and he [Hector] put on the immortal armour of Achilles son of Peleus, which the heavenly gods had given to his dear father, and which he had given to his son when he grew old.

Strikingly, then, Zeus' disapproval of Hector's actions is not connected to the intervention of Euphorbus. Indeed, Zeus states quite plainly that Hector has killed Patroclus (17.204), but his criticism concentrates instead on Achilles' armour as a false symbol of victory over the owner himself.

Furthermore, the latter idea is underlined by repeated emphasis on the armour's divine origins (17.194–7, 202–3, 18.82–5). Here it may be helpful to compare other passages in the poem where weapons or armour are said to have been made by the gods and/or given to humans by them.<sup>33</sup> Pandarus received his bow from Apollo (*Πάνδαρος, ὦν καὶ τόξον Ἀπόλλων αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν*, 2.827),<sup>34</sup> but the bow itself is of human manufacture: just before Pandarus fires the arrow which breaks the truce we learn how he made the bow from the horns of a wild goat which he had killed himself (4.105–11).<sup>35</sup> Areïthous' armour was given to him by Ares (7.146), Hector received his helmet from Apollo (11.353), and Achilles' spear of Pelian ash was given to his father by Cheiron (16.143), yet none of these is said to have been made by the gods themselves. Indeed, the single Iliadic parallel to Achilles' divinely wrought armour is the breastplate of Diomedes, which Hector hopes to strip from him, and which is said to have been made by Hephaestus (8.194–5). But although these are the only examples in the poem, the brief and perfunctory manner in which the poet relates this detail about Diomedes' breastplate suggests that he is used to singing (or hearing others sing) of armour made by the gods, which is indeed a well-attested epic motif (cf., for example, [Hesiod], *Shield of Heracles* 122–320).<sup>36</sup> In any case, the nature of Hector's victory (he has not defeated the real Achilles and has therefore not earned the spoils) is, I would argue, more significant than the origins of the armour, even if Hector's appropriation of Achilles' divinely bestowed inheritance may have struck the audience as a sign of dangerous overconfidence. The Myrmidons' reaction to the sight of Achilles' new panoply expresses the awesome and fearful power of such superhuman objects: *Μυρμιδόνας δ' ἄρα πάντας ἔλε τρόμος, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη / ἄντην εἰσιδέειν, ἀλλ' ἔτρεσαν* ('Trembling took hold of the Myrmidons, and no-one dared to look upon the armour, but they shrank back', 19.14–15; cf. 16.278–83).<sup>37</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Such weapons and armour are an epic subset, as it were, of a wider class of divinely wrought items (e.g. Agamemnon's sceptre, made by Hephaestus: 2.101–8) and divinely granted powers (Calchas receives the gift of prophecy from Apollo: 1.72).

<sup>34</sup> So too Teucer (15.440–1) and Heracles ([Hesiod], *Ehoiai* fr. 33.29 MW).

<sup>35</sup> When Diomedes kills Pandarus, there is no mention of his corpse being stripped, though the conventions of epic narrative suggest the audience will assume that Diomedes has won the spoils, with Athena's support (5.290–6). However, it is implied in the exchange between Pandarus and Aeneas before their attack on Diomedes that Pandarus has abandoned his bow in favour of fighting with the spear (5.215–16, 238), so the audience cannot assume that Diomedes has won the divinely granted bow. There is therefore no parallel here to Hector's despoiling of Achilles' divine armour, though it remains the case that Diomedes kills the spoils' rightful owner, whereas Hector does not.

<sup>36</sup> Diomedes' breastplate is a clear counter-example to the claim 'Probably only sons of divinities like Akhilleus and Memnon, and perhaps marriage-connexions like Peleus, may properly wear armour made by Hephaistos' (Edwards [n. 2], 81, on 17.194–209).

<sup>37</sup> Note how Apollo/Mentes rebukes Hector for pursuing the immortal horses of Achilles: no mortal, but only the semi-divine Achilles, can control them properly (17.75–8). Patroclus, of course, is no more divine than Hector, but he does wear Achilles' armour with his permission and is meant to be his temporary replacement. Behind the supernatural disarming of Patroclus may lie the folk-tale motif of armour which makes the wearer invincible and must therefore be removed if he is to be defeated. Yet even if the precise nature of the attack is unparalleled,

Zeus grants Hector great strength (17.206), but it is already clear that his success must soon end. And as his death approaches, the poet draws a connection between Hector's reckless overconfidence and his exulting in Achilles' divine armour. Zeus comforts Achilles' horses as they mourn Patroclus' death:

“ἀλλ’ οὐ μὰν ὑμῖν γε καὶ ἄρμασι δαιδαλέοισιν  
Ἑκτωρ Πριαμίδης ἐποχῆσεται· οὐ γὰρ ἑάσω.  
ἦ οὐχ ἄλῃς, ὥς καὶ τεύχε’ ἔχει καὶ ἐπέύχεται αὐτως;” (Il. 17.448–50)

‘But assuredly Hector son of Priam will not mount you and your elaborate chariot: I shall not allow it. Is it not enough that he has the armour and boasts about it in vain?’

To underline Hector's folly, he is immediately presented urging on Aeneas to help him capture Achilles' horses, which Zeus has just vowed to protect (17.483–90; cf. 17.451–3).<sup>38</sup> Achilles himself, when he learns of Patroclus' death, vows to kill Hector so that ‘he pays for the despoiling of Patroclus, son of Menoetius’ (18.93), while Thetis reassures her son that Hector's boasting will soon come to an end:

“ἀλλὰ τοι ἔντεα καλὰ μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ἔχονται  
χάλκεα μαρμαίροντα. τὰ μὲν κορυθαίολος Ἑκτωρ  
αὐτὸς ἔχων ὤμοισιν ἀγάλλεται· οὐδέ ἔφημι  
δῆρὸν ἐπαγλαῖεσθαι, ἐπεὶ φόνος ἐγγύθεν αὐτῶι.” (Il. 18.130–3)

‘But your beautiful armour of gleaming bronze is in the possession of the Trojans. Hector of the flashing helmet wears it on his own shoulders and glories in it. But I do not think he will exult in it for long, since his own death is close upon him.’

When, shortly after, Hector rejects the advice of Polydamas (whose wise counsel the narrator forcefully emphasizes: 18.249–53, 313),<sup>39</sup> the audience clearly grasps the fatal implications of Hector's overconfidence, an outcome promptly affirmed by divine intervention: Athena takes away the Trojans' wits so that they support Hector's proposal to remain camped outside the city (18.310–11).<sup>40</sup>

The theme of Hector's misguided boasting receives its final confirmation, appropriately, in face-to-face combat with Achilles. Having been ‘third’ to strip the divine armour from Patroclus (16.850), a surrogate (and inferior) Achilles (cf. 16.140–4), Hector must now confront its actual owner. Interestingly, their duel is so constructed that no damage is done to either set of Achilles' armour: the opening spear cast flies over Hector's head, while his spear bounces straight off Achilles' shield (22.273–6, 289–91). Although these features are found in other duels, their combination here may underline the exceptional value of each man's armour. Most importantly, the

Apollo's actions are thoroughly typical both as part of a combined divine and human advance (cf. Athena and Diomedes in Book 5) and as an instance of an individual deity's attention being directed specifically towards a mortal (as when, for example, Zeus hurls a lightning bolt before Diomedes' chariot at 8.133–4).

<sup>38</sup> Chromius and Aretus, the minor Trojan warriors who join Hector and Aeneas in the attempt to capture the horses, are called ‘fools’ by the narrator (17.497) and Aretus is promptly killed by Automedon, who strips him of his armour (17.516–24, 536–42).

<sup>39</sup> Polydamas' four speeches of advice alternate between success and failure: 12.61–79 (Polydamas persuades), 12.211–29 (fails), 13.726–47 (persuades), 18.254–83 (fails). The second rejection is decisive and Hector eventually realizes the magnitude of his mistake (22.99–104). Thus, as his brother Euphorbus diminishes Hector's claims over Patroclus, so Polydamas makes clear his recklessness in the latter stages of the battle.

<sup>40</sup> Hector's tactical failure is foreshadowed by ominous signs at the final Trojan ἀγορή: they meet standing up, not seated, and do so without taking a meal, panicked as they are by Achilles' appearance at the trench (18.243–8).

poet has structured Achilles' second (and fatal) strike in a novel and significant way. Achilles is presented *εἰσορόων χροά καλόν, ὅππῃ εἴξειε μάλιστα* ('looking over his fine flesh to find where it might best yield [to a strike]', 22.321) until he locates a suitable place:

τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἄλλο τόσον μὲν ἔχε χροά χάλκεα τεύχεα  
καλά, τὰ Πατρόκλοιο βίην ἐνάριξε κατακτάς,  
φαίνεται δ', ἥ κληῖδες ἀπ' ὤμων αὐχέν' ἔχουσιν,  
λαυκανίης, ἵνα τε ψυχῆς ὤκιστος ὄλεθρος.  
τῇ ῥ' ἐπὶ οἱ μεμαῶτ' ἔλασ' ἐγχεῖ διὸς Ἀχιλλεύς,  
ἀντικρὺ δ' ἀπαλοῖο δι' αὐχένος ἤλυθ' ἀκωκῆ. (Il. 22.322–7)

All the rest of his body was covered by the bronze armour, the fine armour which he had stripped from mighty Patroclus when he killed him. But there was an opening where the collar-bones join the neck and shoulders, at the throat, where the destruction of a man's life is quickest. There, as Hector charged upon him, godlike Achilles drove with his spear, and the point went straight through his soft neck.

Such descriptions of an enemy's body and its most vulnerable parts are generally used *after* a weapon has been cast or the blow struck (cf. 8.325–6: Hector strikes Teucer with a stone *παρ' ὤμων, ὅθι κληῖς ἀποέργει/αὐχένα τε σπῆθος τε, μάλιστα δὲ καίριον ἐστίν* ['beside the shoulder, where the collar-bone parts neck and chest, an especially dangerous spot']; or 5.305–10, where Diomedes disables Aeneas with a wound to the hip).<sup>41</sup> Here, by contrast, the poet has set the description before the assault and used it to describe Achilles' deliberate scanning of Hector's body. As the action pauses, the narrative presents Hector as if from Achilles' perspective: the enemy is perceived as an armoured target, but one that Achilles knows well (since it is his own armour) so that he can quickly locate its weakest point. Hector's boasts of winning Achilles' armour are not allowed to pass with impunity, and like the vaunting Euphorbus, he is stabbed in the throat (cf. 17.19, 47–9).<sup>42</sup>

### III

Let us now turn to the important general questions prompted by our analysis of Patroclus' death and its place in the *Iliad*. As we saw, previous interpretations of the scene have tended to present Patroclus, Euphorbus, and Hector as doublets of other figures. Thus, according to one influential Neoanalytical interpretation, the *Iliad* poet is working under the influence of the *Aethiopis*, where Achilles allegedly kills Memnon to avenge the death of Antilochus.<sup>43</sup> On this model, Patroclus is

<sup>41</sup> The pattern is not confined to human victims: cf. 8.83–4, where Nestor's horse is struck by an arrow on the crown of the head.

<sup>42</sup> Achilles' stripping of Hector's corpse, and the recovery of his own panoply, is alluded to in a single typical phrase: *ὃ δ' ἀπ' ὤμων τεύχε' ἐσύλα/αἵματόεντ'* ('and he began stripping the blood-stained armour from the shoulders', 22.368–9). Given that this is the poem's most important combat scene, such brevity is striking. Yet now that Hector is dead and has paid for the despoiling of Patroclus, to dwell on the armour might recall too much Hector's earlier victory, while an attempt at further description of divine armour (following Book 18) would be to risk bathos. Moreover, unlike the deaths of Sarpedon and Patroclus, the death of Hector is followed by no major *Leichenkampf*. Instead Hector's corpse (along with his armour) passes straight into the (vengeful and mutilating) hands of Achilles, in preparation for the poem's final movement, Priam's supplication of Achilles for the return of his son's body.

<sup>43</sup> However, there is reason not only to doubt this reconstruction of the *Aethiopis*, but also to be cautious concerning the basic assumptions of Neoanalysis (see below, esp. nn. 53, 61–2). For the surviving fragments of the *Aethiopis* and Proclus' summary, see M. L. West, *Greek Epic Fragments* (Cambridge, MA, 2003), 108–17.

viewed as a calque on Antilochus, and Hector as a calque on Memnon.<sup>44</sup> As a consequence of this approach, the figure of Euphorbus (who is unattested in the putative source, the *Aethiopis*) is seen as an invention of the *Iliad* poet,<sup>45</sup> and some have argued that Patroclus and Hector are inventions of the *Iliad* poet as well.<sup>46</sup> Since our focus is the death of Patroclus, we must consider in more detail whether it is likely that Homer invented Patroclus, and also ask whether it matters if he did.

As is often noted, Patroclus is introduced as 'the son of Menoetius' (1.307), and the bare patronymic strongly suggests that he was already familiar to the audience from other heroic songs. Furthermore, Patroclus is thoroughly integrated into the story and matches a common pattern whereby a prominent warrior is attended by a less prominent one. It seems likely that both Menoetius and Patroclus were fairly well-known characters before the *Iliad*, though not necessarily linked with Peleus and Achilles. (The Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* [fr. 212a MW] makes Menoetius a brother of Peleus, perhaps partly to explain the presence of Menoetius at Peleus' court [11.765–89].) This of course does not mean that it was Homer who first connected Patroclus to the story of Achilles, any more than he was necessarily the first to relocate Achilles from the Iolcus cycle to the Trojan one.<sup>47</sup> In short, the evidence that Patroclus did belong to pre-Homeric tradition is impressive enough to make it probable. However, even if we could be certain that Patroclus was invented by Homer, this would have no real importance for our interpretation of his character and role in the *Iliad*. For regardless of his pre-Homeric relationship (if any) to Achilles and Hector, what matters is the way the *Iliad* poet constructs Patroclus as a surrogate Achilles and links his *aristeia* to Achilles' anger and death.

Achilles' death at the hands of Paris and Apollo is predicted in the *Iliad* (22.359–60) and narrated in the *Aethiopis*, while Patroclus is killed by Apollo and the mortals Euphorbus and Hector. As we saw, this has led some to argue that Euphorbus is a doublet of Paris,<sup>48</sup> or even that Euphorbus is a doublet of Achilles himself.<sup>49</sup> By contrast, it has been argued here that the search for 'sources' of the Iliadic narrative of Patroclus' death, and the tracing of doublets for the figures concerned, have obscured the significance and purpose of the scene itself, particularly with regard to the presentation of Hector.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. e.g. W. Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk* (Stuttgart, 1965<sup>4</sup>), 176. By contrast, West (n. 2), 5–7 has argued that the *Iliad* poet did not know of the Memnon episode as related in the *Aethiopis*. We shall consider West's view of the relationship between the two poems in more detail below.

<sup>45</sup> As we saw (n. 2 above), others reach the same conclusion by a different route (thinking Euphorbus to be modelled on Paris, the killer of Achilles).

<sup>46</sup> For example, R. von Scheliha, *Patroklos: Gedanken über Homers Dichtung und Gestalten* (Basel, 1943), 236–51; Schadewaldt (n. 44), 177.

<sup>47</sup> Evidence from other oral traditions suggests that moving characters around from one saga to another is likely to have been fairly common in the pre-textual period of Greek epic, so that even if we accepted that Homer was the first to link Patroclus to the story of Achilles, this would be another indication of the *Iliad* poet's traditionality.

<sup>48</sup> In turn, Euphorbus is often interpreted as providing an object of immediate revenge for Patroclus' slaying: cf. H. Pestalozzi, *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias* (Zurich, 1945), 45; W. Kullmann, *Die Quellen der Ilias, Hermes Einzelschriften* 14 (Wiesbaden, 1960), 315–16; G. Schoeck, *Ilias und Aithiopis: Kyklische Motive in homerischer Brechung* (Zurich, 1961), 121.

<sup>49</sup> Nickel (n. 6).

It is not my intention to criticize the approach of the Neoanalysts *tout court*, since their insistence on parallels (or, as some would have it, 'sources')<sup>50</sup> has had the laudable effect of underlining the similarities between Patroclus' *aristeia* and death and those of Achilles.<sup>51</sup> Nevertheless, for all the parallels between the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopis*,<sup>52</sup> it is far from clear whether, in the case of the death of Patroclus, these are the result of direct influence from the *Aethiopis*, or rather part of the *Iliad*'s own strategy of connecting the three major deaths narrated in the poem (those of Sarpedon, Patroclus, and Hector) in such a way that they foreshadow that of Achilles himself, the central hero of the *Iliad* poet's song. Indeed, the general approach of Neoanalysis is itself open to one fundamental objection: since our knowledge of the specific content of the poems of the Epic Cycle is severely limited, being based on extremely lapidary summaries and fragments which are themselves post-Homeric, we can never be at all sure how much the *Iliad* poet owed to them and how much he created himself.<sup>53</sup>

What, then, is the relationship of the *Iliad* to the cyclic *Aethiopis*? If we imagine that Homer knew of, and may indeed have sung himself, stories which were later promulgated under the title *Aethiopis*, there is no difficulty in the idea that he may be encouraging an audience to think of those future events. For our purpose the crux of the question is whether there existed, as the Neoanalysts claim, a (more or less) fixed version of these stories (including Achilles' killing of Memnon to avenge Antilochus) which could have influenced the composition of the *Iliad*.<sup>54</sup> West has recently argued that the *Iliad* poet had no knowledge of the Memnon episode as narrated in the *Aethiopis*, but that it was rather the author of the '*Memnonis*' who copied the *Iliad*'s story of Achilles taking revenge upon the man (Hector/Memnon) who killed his friend (Patroclus/Antilochus).<sup>55</sup> West may be right about Homer's

<sup>50</sup> For a largely sympathetic view of Neoanalysis and its precursors, see most recently M. Willcock, 'Neoanalysis', in I. Morris and B. Powell (edd.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden, 1997), 174–89; West (n. 2), 2–5, 12.

<sup>51</sup> Recognized long ago (from an analytic perspective) by D. Müller, *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen* (Berlin, 1910), 180–6. However, one can acknowledge that Patroclus' *aristeia* and death are 'based on' those of Achilles (so Janko [n. 1], 312) without accepting the further Neoanalytical claim that Achilles' slaying by Paris and Apollo at the Scaean gate is a borrowing from the *Aethiopis*, or that Patroclus is killed by a figure based on Paris. We need make no appeal to external sources: the *Iliad* poet has 'based' the *aristeia* and death of Patroclus on those of Achilles because he aims to present Patroclus as a failed Achilles, a surrogate who cannot replace the poem's greatest hero and whose death leads to Achilles' own.

<sup>52</sup> For an excellent summary, see Edwards (n. 2), 18; cf. Kullmann (n. 48), 303–35; Reinhardt (n. 31), 349–90.

<sup>53</sup> This basic problem was pointed out long ago by D. L. Page, 'The sources of the *Iliad*' (review of Kullmann [n. 48]), *CR* 11 (1961), 205–9 at 207, and Fenik (n. 22), 237–40, yet many Neoanalytical interpretations since then have ignored it; cf. Burgess (n. 12), 6: 'To reconstruct a pre-Homeric story on the basis of the *Iliad* and then to claim that the reconstructed story influenced the *Iliad* is not sound methodology.' Moreover, it is perfectly possible that Homer may have influenced the form of the later myth: cf. A. Kelly, 'Neoanalysis and the *Nestorbedrängnis*: a test case', (forthcoming), on the relationship between the *Nestorbedrängnis* of *Iliad* 8, the *Aethiopis*, and Pind. *Pyth.* 6.28–42.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Dowden (n. 2), 47: 'There is some telling, e.g. of the *Aithiopis*, which is sufficiently fixed for Homer to allude to it specifically, to inform his work by it, and for his audience to recognise this interaction.' West (n. 2), 14, supports the existence of written texts, and sees the *Iliad* as the earliest example (around the middle of the seventh century), which proved 'the catalytic achievement that precipitated and conditioned the formation of a corpus of written epic in the following decades'.

<sup>55</sup> West (n. 2), 5–7, 10.

knowledge or lack of it,<sup>56</sup> and he is undoubtedly right to abandon the prejudice that views all cyclic material *per se* as secondary and derivative,<sup>57</sup> but his insistence on fixed (written) texts and their influence seems extreme.<sup>58</sup> Similarly, the poems of the Epic Cycle may well preserve pre-Homeric traditions, but this is a long way from showing that there existed fixed versions of the poems which were available to Homer. It is more plausible to think of a shared epic technique based upon a 'grammar' of typical motifs and situations,<sup>59</sup> since the pursuit of specific dependence or influence (from Homer to the cyclic poems, or vice versa) is, in the pre-textual stage of early Greek epic, a misleading methodology.<sup>60</sup>

Thus the relationship between the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopis* cannot be captured in terms of direct influence, and even if we can trace certain broad similarities in their core story-patterns, characters, and themes, this shows their evolution from a shared epic tradition (an important point, of course, but not enough to justify *Quellenforschung*). Moreover, the very claim that the *Iliad* poet has modelled the death of Patroclus on that of Antilochus in the *Aethiopis* has been shown to be flawed.<sup>61</sup> As a result, it is likely to be more productive if we analyse the death of Patroclus with regard to its function within the *Iliad*, rather than as an adaptation (however skilful) of a now unrecoverable 'original'.<sup>62</sup>

Nevertheless, our discussion of the relationship between the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopis* has helped answer an important general question: whether the appearance of similar

<sup>56</sup> West (n. 2), 6–8, presents two main arguments for his claim that Homer cannot have known of Memnon: firstly, his Ethiopians are utterly unlike the warriors of the *Aethiopis*; and secondly, Thetis' prediction that Achilles will die 'straight after Hector' (αὐτίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα μεθ' Ἑκτορα πότμος ἑτοῖμος, 18.96) presupposes a far briefer series of events than that found in the rest of the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopis*. However, neither argument is fully convincing: (i) if, as West thinks, the *Iliad* poet was influenced by an earlier version of the *Aethiopis* story (that is, he modelled Patroclus' death on that of Achilles), it would be quite possible that he knew of warriors from Ethiopia, since they are one of the most striking features of the *Aethiopis*, but chose to present the Ethiopians otherwise; (ii) the phrase αὐτίκα ... ἔπειτα cannot bear the weight West wants it to, since it does not necessarily mean 'then, right at that moment', but may instead be taken to refer to some time 'thereafter' – in other words, the *Iliad* poet is doing what he does throughout the work, telescoping time and thereby bringing the fall of Troy and the death of Achilles within the wider compass of his narrative.

<sup>57</sup> For the Epic Cycle as sub-Homeric, see e.g. D. B. Monro, 'Homer and the cyclic poets', in *Homer's Odyssey, Books XIII–XXIV* (Oxford, 1901), 340–84, esp. 355–62 on the *Aethiopis*.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. West (n. 2), 11 (on oral theory): 'It was good for us to go through that phase'; *ibid.* 14: 'Once we shake the oralists off our backs and recognize the status of written texts in this period and the use made of them...'.  
<sup>59</sup> For the dexterity of Homeric epic in manipulating one kind of type-scene and its motifs, see the careful analysis by P. Gainsford, 'Formal analysis of recognition scenes in the *Odyssey*', *JHS* 123 (2003), 41–59.

<sup>60</sup> J. S. Burgess, *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore, 2001), 135, makes a strong case for the cyclic epics being 'independent in content and form from the Homeric poems'.

<sup>61</sup> See Burgess (n. 12), esp. 10–13, for weaknesses in the 'vengeance theory' applied to the reconstruction of the *Aethiopis*. Also, the idea that Homer hints at Antilochus' (future and greater) role in the story of Memnon is not supported by the text of the *Iliad*: see West (n. 2), 10–11. Antilochus' death at the hands of Memnon is alluded to in the *Odyssey* (3.111–12, 4.187–8), but this tells us nothing substantial about the relationship between either Homeric poem and the *Aethiopis*. In such matters one does well to recall the dictum attributed to Aristarchus: 'Ὀμήρου ἐξ Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν.'

<sup>62</sup> In other words, it is possible that the *Iliad* poet was influenced by previous accounts of Achilles' death (perhaps even sung by him) in constructing his Patroclus narrative, especially in the involvement of Paris and Apollo, the battle over the corpse, and the warrior's funeral, but there is no need to see the cyclic *Aethiopis* as a direct source or model.

situations in different stories is to be explained in terms of narrative patterns being transferred and reused within a shared oral poetic tradition or rather seen as direct borrowing from a particular version. Comparative evidence indicates that such transferability decreases as individual poems become known as the authoritative version, and that both of these processes (the decrease in transferability and the increasing authority of particular poems) are compounded by the spread of texts and the advance of literacy. The question then becomes how early we place the *Iliad* along the epic timeline—late enough to see Homer drawing on specific versions of events as related in other stories? Yet the absence of fixed or written texts means that such similarities are *prima facie* more likely to be transferable narrative patterns which are not linked with one story more than any other.

It may be helpful here to apply the categories of 'traditional' and 'specific' referentiality, developed by Foley.<sup>63</sup> Traditional referentiality covers generic features shared by a body of works, while specific referentiality points to the individual works themselves. In Foley's terms, 'a traditional work depends primarily on elements and strategies that were in place long before the execution of the present version or text, long before the present nominal author learned the inherited craft'.<sup>64</sup> Thus when Homer depicts Achilles enraged and refusing to fight, he is applying a traditional pattern (wrath and withdrawal) to a specific hero. Traditional referentiality is characteristic of oral traditions and part of the narrative dynamics of early archaic Greek poetry. Of course, we also find specific referentiality, as when the *Iliad* poet alludes to Heracles' previous sack of Troy (5.638–51, 14.250–1, 20.144–8), making another story part of the background to his tale. But at the core of the *Iliad* poet's narrative technique we find certain more general themes (for example, a warrior seeking vengeance for his fallen companion) becoming associated with specific individuals (Achilles, Patroclus, and Hector). The idea that Homer could copy or allude to someone else's version is not, on this model, impossible, but it is unlikely.<sup>65</sup> Moreover, it is not needed to understand the character and function of Patroclus, Euphorbus, or Hector.

#### IV

In conclusion, our discussion has sought to explore the scene of Patroclus' death, and especially the roles taken in it by Euphorbus and Hector, within the larger action of the poem. It has tried to illustrate how Euphorbus' intervention questions Hector's triumph over Patroclus' corpse, and, in addition, how these doubts are confirmed when Hector dons Achilles' armour, despite the fact that he has not defeated Achilles himself. It has also argued that the tendency to interpret the episode as a series of doublets, or to stress alleged non-Homeric sources for its configuration, risks obscuring the characters' own identities and their significance for the development of the poem itself. Thus, depending on one's view of the 'original' model, one

<sup>63</sup> J. M. Foley, *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington, IN, 1991), 2 37; cf. also id., 'Oral tradition and its implications', in Morris and Powell (n. 50), 146–73, at 165–7.

<sup>64</sup> Foley, *Immanent Art* (n. 63), 8.

<sup>65</sup> Willcock (n. 50), 187–8, has challenged the 'all-inclusiveness of allusion and reference' found in some recent Neoanalytical scholarship, and rightly argues that similar situations are best seen 'not as some kind of imitation of a particular pre-existing poem, whether written or oral, but as the result of conditioning of the mind of the poet by the material with which he was familiar'.

could make a case for each of Patroclus' killers (Apollo, Euphorbus, and Hector) being an added figure,<sup>66</sup> which in itself strongly suggests that we should avoid thinking of doublets, sources, or 'intruders', and focus instead on trying to make sense of the characters and their actions on their own terms. Finally, our discussion has aimed to relate the scene to important general questions of early Greek epic such as the relationship between the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopis*, and the issues of Homeric invention, borrowing, and textual fixity.

The poet has constructed a powerful and uncanny end for Patroclus, and has done so using a unique combination of typical elements.<sup>67</sup> By tracing the impact of these elements (without recourse to extraneous non-Iliadic 'parallels') we can better perceive the episode's purpose and effectiveness. The scene indicates the consequences of Hector's deluded victory and links all the major deaths (of Sarpedon, Patroclus, and Hector), with their shared concern for the fate of the warrior's armour and the burial of his corpse, so as to foreshadow in various ways the death of the poem's most important hero himself (cf., for example, 16.431–8 ~ 22.168–76, 16.663–6 ~ 17.160–3, 16.851–4 ~ 22.358–60). Although Achilles prayed to Zeus that his companion would return from battle unharmed and with all his armour (16.246–8), Patroclus' death resulted from his own recklessness (16.87–96, 698–712, 784–7). As we have seen, the manner of that death and the fate of Achilles' armour points in turn to the recklessness of Patroclus' killer. Viewed in this way, the scene of Patroclus' death, far from being puzzling or 'overloaded', reveals most forcefully the skill and success of the *Iliad* poet's design.

*University College, Oxford*

WILLIAM ALLAN  
william.allan@univ.ox.ac.uk

<sup>66</sup> If one sees Euphorbus as 'Paris', Hector is additional; if one sees Patroclus as 'Antilochus' (killed by Hector/'Memnon'), it is Euphorbus who appears extraneous; finally, one might even say that Apollo is added on, if one focuses on the pattern of a two-pronged human attack: cf. 15.539–45, where Dolops, as he is fighting against Meges, is slain by an unseen Menelaus, who kills him with a spear cast from behind (a parallel to Euphorbus' attack on Patroclus as he faces Hector).

<sup>67</sup> For the range of Homer's creative traditionality, see J. M. Foley, *Homer's Traditional Art* (University Park, PA, 1999), esp. 13–34.