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In this project I have selected a body of similes with a unified subject, the horse, for study. The method and presuppositions of my study have been drawn from recent oral poetic theory, working largely from the notion of traditional referentiality. Chapter 1 lays out the state of the question in Homeric scholarship and provides an account of the method of this project. Chapter 2, in keeping with the notion of traditional referentiality, investigates the economic and semantic function of the horse in Archaic Greek culture. Chapters 3 to 5 examine the four appearances of horse similes in the Iliad; each draws upon a different feature of the horse's traditional meaning and demonstrates that the four similes serve the purpose of redirecting our interpretation of the narrative into paths that the narrative does not explicitly demand that we take. Chapter 3 examines the similes for Achilleus and then Achilleus and Hektor at Iliad 22.21 ff. and 22.162 ff.; it argues that these similes use the horse's traditional associations with funerals to transform Achilleus' pursuit of Hektor around Troy's walls into a race at funeral games, thereby enacting the funeral games for Patroklos. Chapter 4 discusses the similes for Paris and Hector at Iliad 6.506 ff. and 15.263 ff. to show that the horse's traditional value as a luxury animal redeems Paris and Hector as proper Iliadic heroes at moments when their heroic status has been undermined. Chapter 5 examines the simile at 15.679 ff. comparing Aias to a man driving horses across the plain to show that this simile recharacterizes Aias, traditionally a great static defensive warrior, as a marshaller of men through the idea of control of the great heroic animal, the horse.
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The similes are one of the most uniquely "Homeric" elements of the Homeric poems. Of extant archaic Greek poetry, only the Iliad and the Odyssey use similes with any frequency. When one looks to later Greek poetry, it is only in the Homeric imitator and scholar Apollonios of Rhodes that one sees similes used with something approaching the variety, frequency, and virtuosity of the Iliad or the Odyssey. When one speaks of similes in the Homeric poems the kind of simile one evokes is, of course, the "Homeric" simile, the long image that develops in a way that seems independent of the narrative to form a mini-narrative of its own. Despite the richness and strata of meaning that the similes contribute to the poems, scholars of the Iliad and the Odyssey have for a long time been suspicious of the long Homeric simile. Since the publication of Milman Parry's brilliant and seminal work on the Homeric poems as oral traditional poetry, scholars who have found individual long similes suspicious on grounds of their "inappropriateness" to their narrative contexts have found in Parry's work a justification for rejecting or excising these suspicious similes. Similes whose meaning and function have not been immediately and transparently clear to individual scholars have been branded not just "inappropriate," but "late interpolations" and
“inorganic.” Parry’s work, which has been so fruitful for the development of our understanding of these poems in this century, has also become a tool for avoiding the attempt at understanding.

While other aspects of the poems that had suffered at the hands of dogmatic and rigid followers of Parry, such as the traditional epithet, have been explored and interpreted with care and subtlety by more recent scholars of oral traditional poetics, the similes have not yet received a thorough-going re-examination in light of more recent developments in oral traditional poetic theory. The project I am undertaking here is intended as a contribution to this kind of study. My goal here is to develop an interpretation of a specific set of similes in the Homeric poems, namely the horse similes of the Iliad. My method will be grounded primarily in oral traditional poetic theory, most particularly in the notion of traditional referentiality. To understand a simile, any simile, I will argue that we must begin by understanding what the figures involved in the simile, be they lions, shepherds, geese, or, as in my study, horses, mean within the poetic tradition that produced those images.

1See, for example, Bowra 1972:61-66, who argues that long similes are a device to relieve monotony in oral performance and cannot be regarded as particularly meaningful in their contexts; Bowra 1968:116-119 argues that inappposite long similes are likely taken over whole cloth from the poetic tradition and so are not meaningful in context. Lee 1964:13, 26-28, 31-32 argues, following Shipp, that the similes of the Iliad are later than the narrative and mark themselves as consistently inappropriate to their contexts (I discuss Lee’s work in detail in Chapter 1). A. Parry 1989:1-2 argues that the generic nature of traditional formulaic language does not allow or encourage the poet to adapt similes to their narrative contexts in a meaningful way (in a discussion of the simile comparing the Trojan campfires on the plain to the night sky at Iliad 8.555-559). Shipp 1972:212-215 argues that the long simile developed later in the tradition than the narrative and that the majority of the long similes can be excised or reduced to short forms (I discuss Shipp’s work at greater length in Chapter 1.)

2See, for example, Bakker 1995; Foley 1991; A.A. Parry 1973; Sacks 1987.
Having reconstructed the traditional complex that informs each image, we can then examine that complex in its instantiation in a particular context within the poems.

I have chosen the complex of the horse as a case study for three main reasons. First, all of the similes comparing figures to horses are long similes; they range in length from two to seven lines and therefore offer a fairly elaborate account of the horse and its associations for the Homeric poems. Second, the horse is not as frequent a figure in the similes as the lion or the eagle; it is, consequently, possible to offer a detailed account of each of the five horse similes and to attempt thereby a comprehensive examination of the Homeric horse simile. Finally, horse similes appear only in the Iliad; this confinement to a single poem will allow my analysis to focus on the horse similes within the structures and poetics of the Iliad alone and not demand any mediation between the poetics of the Iliad and poetics of the Odyssey, which scholars are coming to recognize more and more as distinct although complementary aspects of the Homeric tradition.³

My analysis of the horse simile in the Iliad will fall into five parts: first a survey of twentieth century scholarship on the Homeric simile and an articulation of the place of the present work within that tradition, second, an examination of the horse in archaic Greek culture, third, an analysis of the horse similes for Achilleus and Hektor in Iliad 22, fourth, an analysis of the repeated similes for Paris and Hektor in Iliad 6 and 15, and finally, an analysis of the horse simile for Telamonian Aias in Iliad 15.

In Chapter one, I will offer an account of how I have found similes must be

---

³Cf. A.A. Parry 1973:8, who notes that the Iliad and the Odyssey do not always use the same words in the same ways.
interpreted and studied. I will argue here that the strong impulse many scholars continue to have to treat similes as essentially decorative and hence unnecessary to the development of the narrative and its themes must result ultimately in a failure to do the poems justice and a failure to understand the poems completely. I will show, in my survey of twentieth century scholarship, how scholars since Fränkel have come more and more to recognize the similes’ organic and traditional place within the poems. I will then go on to discuss how research in other areas of Homeric scholarship can and must play a role in how we interpret the similes.

In Chapter two, because the similes under examination here are all similes containing horses, and because the cornerstone of my account here is traditional referentiality, I will provide a brief investigation of the cultural significance of the horse in archaic Greece. This examination of the horse will consider the horse’s economic value and its role in iconography. The aspects of the horse within archaic Greek culture that will be of particular importance for my analysis of the Iliad’s horse similes will be the horse’s associations with funerary imagery (for Chapter three) and its status as a luxury or prestige animal (for Chapter four).

These first two chapters, then, will be primarily introductory and methodological. In the final three chapters I will offer detailed studies of the five horse similes of the Iliad.

Chapter three contains a study of the similes at Iliad 22.21 f. and 22.151 ff. that compare first Achilleus and then Achilleus and Hektor together to prize-winning horses. I will examine the meaning of the phrase ἀεθλοφόροι ἵπποι in its other appearances within the poems to see just what an audience could have taken that phrase to mean. I will
demonstrate that prize-winning horses in the Homeric poems must be horses racing at funeral games. I will argue, further, that the horse similes of *Iliad* 22 function in a *transformative* capacity in that they allow a particular narrative pattern to be realized and thereby endow Achilleus and Hektor with aspects that would otherwise be impossible. I will show specifically that the comparison of Achilleus and Hektor to horses racing at funeral games transforms this final encounter between the two heroes into a reenactment of a very ancient death ritual.

In Chapter four I will offer a close reading of the repeated similes for Paris and Hektor at *Iliad* 6.506 ff. and 15.263 ff. that compare each of the two to a horse racing across a plain. Here I will argue that the simile serves in a *redemptive* capacity that allows Paris and Hektor at the moments they receive their horse similes to be recognized as having a status that would otherwise be challenged or undermined by other aspects of the poem. I will show that the horse's cultural status as a luxury animal ties it to the ethos of the warrior hero and that the horse similes for Paris and Hektor mark Paris and Hektor as participating fully in the values and status of the Iliadic warrior hero at points where each of them has been unsuccessful as a warrior.

Chapter five will examine the simile at *Iliad* 15.679 ff. that compares Aias to a man riding four horses across a plain and jumping from one horse's back to another's. I will argue here that the simile *recharacterizes* Aias and allows him to perform in a role that the rest of the *Iliad*'s narrative would consider uncharacteristic. Through a close reading of this final simile I will demonstrate that this image of the simile is one of leadership and of the marshaling of forces. In this passage, Aias, traditionally and characteristically the great
defensive warrior, the ἔρυχος Ἀχιλῆς, must function, uncharacteristically, as a leader of men, or, in the simile's terms, a rider of horses.

My analysis of these five similes will let us see that similes are not merely decorative, but are essential to the Iliad. This study of how similes can be essential to the development of the Iliad's themes, characterization, and narrative will also let us understand something of what the Iliad understands by "horse." This project, then, offers three basic things: a new articulation of the nature and function of the Homeric simile, a close reading of five similes that will offer a model for further studies of the similes, and an account of what, traditionally, a horse is.
In this first chapter I will lay out the goals and assumptions of my project. Because these goals and assumptions have been influenced by and have developed from not just the reading of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but the reading and examining of the work of other scholars, I want to put into context the development of my own approach to this topic by reference to the history of scholarly debate on the interpretation of the Homeric simile. This chapter will fall into four sections. First, I will offer an account of a particular way of interpreting the similes that has had much influence in Homeric studies, but which has, I maintain, derived from unfruitful presuppositions about the similes and has resulted in inadequate interpretations of the similes. This approach has begun from the view that similes are separable from the rest of the poems. I will maintain that the efforts to defend this claim that the similes can be removed from the rest of the poems without affecting the poems' meaning have been unconvincing. Second, I will discuss four scholars who have interpreted the similes as organic to the poems. It is these scholars who have established the context for recognizing the essentiality of the similes to the meaning of the poems; I intend my own work to be a contribution to this tradition of interpretation. Third, I will discuss more recent
accounts of oral traditional poetic theory and explain the importance of this theory to the interpretation of the Homeric similes. Finally, having laid the theoretical foundation in my discussion of other scholars, I will explain my own method and assumptions.

§ I. The Problem of the Homeric Simile

I will begin by explaining what I mean when I refer to a "simile," and then proceed to discuss the longstanding and broadly held view that similes are separable from their contexts because they are late additions to the poems or because they do not contribute to the meaning of the poems (these two views are often held at the same time, but can also be held independent of each other). I will examine two significant articulations of these views, those of G. P. Shipp in his *Studies in the Language of Homer* and D. J. N. Lee in *The Similes of the Iliad and the Odyssey Compared*,¹ as well as some challenges to these views.

I define simile very broadly. In my analysis, a simile is any expression that explicitly compares the narrative to something else. A simile sets one thing beside another and holds the two up as like each other. In order for an expression to qualify as a simile, then, it must contain some words that state that the narrative, or a character, event, or object within the narrative is like something else. Similes can be introduced by a fairly broad range of words and phrases meaning, "like, as, as when," and so on. The Greek for these phrases most often begins with ὡς (as), as in ὡς ὑπὲρ (as when). I include here also phrases that begin ἀναλαlambda

¹Shipp 1972; Lee 1964.
The similes have not fared well in the work of many scholars. The analysts began early to argue that the similes, structurally discrete as they are, support the notion that they are really not part of the poems at all, but were added to the "original" Iliad by rhapsodes and lesser oral poets. Scholars who wished to argue for the separability of the similes appealed often to the idea of many similes (such as the comparison of the Trojan watch fires on the plain at 8.555-559 to a shepherd's view of the night sky, or the comparison of Hektor to a horse at 15.263-268) being "inappropriate" to the narrative context. This notion of "inappropriateness," far from being an innocent factual label, is manifestly a value judgement and is rooted in various, often unacknowledged, methodological presuppositions. I myself will be arguing from the opposite position: that it is methodologically essential to presume that all similes are "appropriate." The idea of the inappropriate simile rests most obviously on the assumption that the scholar using this designation has a better understanding of the aesthetic principles of Homeric poetry than the poems themselves do. Often such scholars reveal a lack of understanding regarding the differences between themselves and their own cultural values, traditions, and habits of thought, on the one hand, and the values, traditions,

---

2 See, for example, Bolling's 1950 edition of the Iliad, which excises 8.557-558 and 15.265-268. Fick 1886 separates the Iliad into layers, the earliest of which is the original Wrath of Achilleus (1-91); in his text of the expansion of the Wrath, built of material from Iliad 11-19, 22-24, Fick includes material from 15.1-414, but excludes the horse simile for Hektor at 15.263 ff. (159). Fick also (372) rejects the simile at 4.141-147 comparing Menelaos’ wound to a horse’s cheek-piece as a later insertion. Cf. Leaf 1886 ad 8.557-558, 15.263-268. Robert 1901:535 argues that in the similes of the "Urilia" wild animals predominate; the hands of later poets can be detected through their use of human life, celestial bodies, birds, and so on in their similes. Wilamowicz-Moellendorf 1916:244 argues that the similes presently found in Iliad 12-15 do not belong to the original version of these books. In his view the simile for Hektor at 15.263 ff. is borrowed from Book 6.
and habits of thought that produced the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* on the other. Only inferior poets, in these accounts, could have produced and inserted images that jarred and shocked the reader so much. Thus, as these similes were so obviously not part of the original poem, they could be removed and critically ignored without damaging the integrity and meaning of the poems.

Arguments for the similes as interpolations were supported by the work of G. P. Shipp, who demonstrated in his 1953 work, *Studies in the Language of Homer*,\(^3\) that the similes contain a higher proportion of *hapax legomena* and linguistically late forms than the rest of the poems. Scholars no longer had to appeal to the highly subjective idea of the inappropriate, but could point instead to the seemingly concrete fact of the linguistic differences between the similes and the rest of the poems. Shipp's findings convinced many scholars, but were not universally accepted as proving the lateness or non-organic character of the similes. For example, Ruijgh, while accepting the "fact" of linguistic lateness, argues that the concentration of late linguistic features in the similes is more plausibly explained as a kind of genre-conditioning; the similes are formally recognizable and contain subject matter that is very often unlike that of the rest of the poems, particularly the *Iliad*. Taking the purpose of the similes to be the clarification of the narrative, Ruijgh argues that in the similes the poet would most frequently have reason to appeal to the experience of his own lived world and would then, for the sake of vividness, express this experience in language more like the spoken language of his own lived world. Thus, the linguistic lateness is for Ruijgh a

\(^3\)This book was revised and published in a second edition in 1972. All citations to this work will be to the second edition.
feature of the very composition of the similes along with the rest of the poems and reflects the historically spoken language of the period of composition.4

Although the language of the similes is not a focus of his discussion, Hoekstra has shown another way in which Shipp's arguments do not demonstrate that the similes are interpolated. Hoekstra's concern is the modification of formulaic prototypes in Homer. He demonstrates how rapidly the formulaic language can develop and change in his examinations of the incorporation of moveable-\textit{nu} and neglect of \textit{digamma} into formulaic diction. Hoekstra argues that the poems as we have them are very late in the tradition because of the systematic and organic use of these late forms. Further, Hoekstra argues that the use of an Aeolic or archaic form does not in itself attest to the antiquity of the line in which it appears; rather, we can often speak of Aeolizing or archaizing on the part of the poet in the choice of word forms. The technology of Homeric oral composition developed very quickly and rapidly assimilated any devices that could increase its facility of expression.5

Thus, appeals to the chronological linguistic differences between the similes and the rest of the poems do not necessarily prove that the similes are later in their composition than the rest of the poems. The poems themselves are late parts of their tradition

\footnote{Ruijgh 1957:22-24. See also Martin 1997, who argues in more detail that similes draw upon material and diction from genres of poetry other than epic, such as lyric and elegiac poetry. Chantraine, upon whose work Shipp bases most of his findings about the similes (the first two chapters of his discussion of similes refer explicitly to Chantraine's 1942 \textit{Grammaire Homérique}), did not find Shipp's work convincing. He argues in a review of the first edition of \textit{Studies in the Language of Homer} that late forms are not necessarily post-Homeric forms and that the long similes (the focus of Shipp's analysis) manifest a highly traditional character. Chantraine also finds some of Shipp's analyses of particular words obscure or based on careless reading of the texts (Chantraine 1955).}

\footnote{Hoekstra 1965.}
and incorporate whatever new devices of language are available to express themselves. Ruijgh’s idea of genre-conditioning also gives us good reason to accept that linguistic differences need not be determined by differences in the dates of composition of the similes and the rest of the poems but by differences in subject matter.6

In his 1964 monograph, The Similes of the Iliad and the Odyssey Compared, D. J. N. Lee uses Shipp’s findings to show that the Iliad’s similes were often composed later than the rest of the poem, while those of the Odyssey are contemporary with the composition of the Odyssey itself. He presumes that Shipp has proven that the similes are late parts of the poems and that the long similes of the Iliad are further marked as late by being, very often, inappropriate to their narrative contexts. Lee also assumes that the long simile as such could not have existed at earlier stages of the poems’ development. Given Lee’s reliance on Shipp’s arguments, and given the problems with Shipp’s analysis I have outlined above, many of Lee’s arguments cannot succeed. Nonetheless, there is a variety of technical aspects to Lee’s analysis of the similes that seem to me to be rather important.

The grounds on which Lee makes his comparison of the similes of the Iliad and the Odyssey are quantity and quality. The first comparison, as to quantity, begins with an account of what Lee considers a simile to be (pp. 3-4); the necessary feature is some expression of likeness, such as ὡς. Lee begins by compiling a list of all the similes in the

6On subject determining linguistic form, Hoekstra notes the far greater frequency of imperatives and infinitives in the Theogony and the Works and Days. We can compare here also the work of Ingalls 1979 comparing the formular density of the similes and a test sample of the Iliad’s narrative; Ingalls demonstrates that the similes use verbatim and analogous formulaic language with almost exactly the same frequency as the narrative, which indicates that they are just as oral as the rest of the poem if one takes formularity as a litmus test for orality.
*Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and the numbers of feet or verses they cover. Lee distinguishes the similes as simple and full (short and long), and provides a count of simple and full similes in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. This count shows that the *Iliad* has a much higher proportion of full to simple similes (c. 5:3) than the *Odyssey* (c. 3:5), a higher number of similes, and more lines taken up by similes. Lee rightly attempts to account for these differences. In his view the *Iliad* has more, and more elaborate, similes than the *Odyssey* because of the nature of the two narratives; because the *Iliad* has so much space given over to fighting, the poets found it necessary to relieve the tedium of battle scenes with relieving figures like similes. The poets who added these relieving similes were no longer in touch with the robust values of the original narrative and so they added similes that are artificial and inappropriate. Consequently, on the basis of quantity, Lee argues, we can already see that the similes of the *Iliad* must be late.

Lee's attempts to *define* the phenomenon he is examining encourage one to be more clear as to what one means by a "simile" in the Homeric poems. Lee refuses to include as similes certain types of expressions (namely those beginning *άτάλαντος*, *έπισάμενος/-η*, and some *ὡς τε θεός* expressions), on the grounds that they are not similes, but fossilized epithets or statements of fact. This distinction between similes and what looks like simile but is not does demand that one be more explicit about what precisely one takes a "simile" to be; however, while these differences in the expression of likeness may be important, I do not accept Lee's division since it is not evident from his arguments or from the poems that the

---

7Lee follows a fairly standard explanation of the greater frequency of similes in the *Iliad*. See, for example, Bassett 1921:132, 136-138; Bowra 1968:123.
different expressions always mark a fundamental difference in the narrative functions of the comparisons.\(^8\) This aspect of Lee’s analysis, however, his provision of a kind of grammar of simile introductions, seems to be a fruitful area for further analysis. By offering an account of all the ways the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* say “like,” and by discovering which ways of saying “like” each poem favours, Lee offers an avenue into the exploration of the two poems’ different poetics of likeness.

The view of the similes as separable to the degree that they are not original parts of the poems, espoused by Lee and Shipp, rests on a more general view of the similes as separable in that their function as poetic devices is ultimately not essential. Again, I will oppose this view that similes are separable to such a degree that we can remove them from the text and not lose any meaning. The similes in this view are ornamental, used to stress important narrative moments, to relieve tension, to relieve monotony in battle scenes, or illustrative, used to clarify narrative elements that might not be immediately clear to the audience, but they contribute nothing to the development of the poems’ themes or narrative.\(^9\) Such accounts of the similes do not attend to a special quality of poetic language: its working through implicititude, through prevarication, rather than through explicit discursive expression. Rather than looking for a reason for expression through simile that regards simile as a way to poetic meaning, these interpreters focus on the plot of the poems as the place in which meaning is contained. When one regards the story or the plot as the meaning of the poem (a

\(^8\) An exception to this statement would have to be expressions using ἐοικός and its variants to describe gods, dreams, and so forth in disguise, as, for example, at *Iliad* 2.20-21, the dream that comes to Agamemnon in the shape of Nestor, Ἡλητίῳ ὑπὶ ἐοικός.

\(^9\) See Bassett 1921, especially 136, 146, for a clear and sensitive articulation of this view.
stance that ignores to some degree the fact that story and plot themselves are not transparent carriers of meaning, it becomes possible to relegate elements of the poems that are not plot or story to the category of the unimportant or separable. These views of the simile as separable, then, are united in that they do not regard simile as a way of expressing meaning.

One of the fundamental assumptions of my account of the Iliad's horse similes will be that similes are organic and essential elements of the poem. Our task in interpreting similes must be to attempt to understand what any simile can mean and why that meaning is expressed in the form of a comparison. There exist important scholarly precedents for such an approach.

§ 2. Contemporary Developments in the Analysis of the Simile

Much substantial work has, of course, already been done on Homeric similes. My hope is to contribute to that study in an innovative way. I will now discuss what I take to be the four most significant works that define contemporary study of the complex semiotic functioning of similes in the Homeric poems. While I will not always fully agree with the conclusions these scholars have drawn, it remains the case that each of these four works has offered something that can help us now to refine and develop the way we read the Homeric similes. I will give a brief overview of each of these four works and conclude each overview with an account of what I have taken from the work into my own analysis of the similes.

I begin with Hermann Fränkel's work, Die homerischen Gleichnisse,\footnote{Fränkel 1921.} which remains broadly one of the most helpful monographs on this topic because of Fränkel's
sensitivity to issues of reading similes as organic elements of the narrative and his arguments for the importance of interpreting the similes in light of the Homeric poetic tradition as a whole. I move then to William C. Scott's *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile*,\(^\text{11}\) which is the first work to take up and expand Fränkel's arguments about the traditional nature of the similes; Scott's work is invaluable for its laying out the systematic and logical deployment of simile material in the Homeric poems. Next, I move to Carroll Moulton's work, *Similes in the Homeric Poems*,\(^\text{12}\) which takes up Scott's work and refines many of his conclusions to offer a more sophisticated account of how similes can function and be integrated in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. I conclude with a brief discussion of Irene J. F. de Jong's *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*,\(^\text{13}\) which offers an account of point of view in the Homeric similes that has significant implications for my own work. Having completed this survey, I will then discuss the work of John Miles Foley and Albert Bates Lord on oral traditional poetics and its relevance to the study of Homeric similes in light of the contributions of Fränkel, Scott, Moulton, and de Jong.

*a) Fränkel*

Hermann Fränkel's 1921 monograph, *Die homerischen Gleichnisse*, lays the foundation for much twentieth century scholarship on similes in the Homeric poems. The work contains analyses of many individual similes, divided according to the type of subject

\(^{11}\)Scott 1974.

\(^{12}\)Moulton 1977.

\(^{13}\)de Jong 1987.
(e.g. hunting, weather, technical), and a general account of the nature of the similes. The general account is where Fränkel lays out explicitly his method and theory for the interpretation of the similes. Fränkel takes the presence of all of the similes as uncontroversially organic, and then sets out to explain how each simile can achieve something within the poem. His concern is with the effect of similes as integral parts of the Iliad and the Odyssey. Consequently, Fränkel treats the similes much as he would treat any other aspect of the poems: he examines their language, their variations, their manners of portraying the material they contain.

Fränkel begins with the recognition that the similes cannot all have a single unified goal (p. 98). He takes particular issue with what he regards as the then predominant view of the "goal" of the similes: that the similes seek to make something unknown or unclear in the narrative clear through a comparison or juxtaposition with something known or clear in the simile (p. 98). Fränkel argues that, if the similes are present simply as elucidations of unclear moments in the narrative, it should be the case that they choose their subject matter from well-known, familiar areas. Many of the similes, however, precisely appeal to unfamiliar subjects, such as the lion hunt. Thus the notion that similes attempt to explain the unknown through the known cannot be tenable. Fränkel’s own view is that similes do not have goals, but effects. That is, Fränkel does not attempt to understand or explain the intention of the similes, but rather explains how the similes work, what results they have in different kinds of cases. Some similes serve to strengthen the effect of narrative passages by lingering on particular themes, some make things that are intangible, like wonder, tangible through a concrete comparison. Fränkel maintains that there are too many
different ways that the similes can work, too many goals that they can have, to produce a unified theory of the "goal" of the simile. For Fränkel, the similes were ready to hand for epic singers, to be used in any way that occurred to the particular singer (p. 99).

Fränkel also addresses the question of the historic Location of the material portrayed in the similes. He begins this discussion by noting that the major effect of the similes arises from the fact that the similes carry the audience of the poems into a world different from that of the narrative. Some similes, he argues, give evidence of portraying the Ionian world of the time of the poems' composition, while others seem to have more to do with the Mycenaean world that predates the poems' composition (p. 100). Fränkel argues that the similes and mainland Bronze Age art both portray humans as located in and affected by the natural world, a view that is not held by the narrative (p. 101). Similes and mainland Bronze Age art also share a synoptic style of presentation that subordinates many individual elements under one unified treatment. Fränkel concludes from his comparison of the similes to mainland Bronze Age art that the world of the similes preserves memories of this earlier culture. His general conclusion about the world of the similes is that, given that the similes include elements from both the Ionian world of the poems' composition and from the Mycenaean world, the similes will gladly accept material from any time and period; they avoid only material that comes from the world of epic narrative itself.

In his discussion of the connection of the similes to the narrative, Fränkel insists that similes are never independent of the narrative, but are always a part of it and always serve it (p. 105). The connection between the similes and the narrative is not always straightforward, however, because the similes have their own momentum. Consequently, a
tension always exists between developed similes and the narrative; this tension must be evaluated in each individual case (p. 104). Fränkel enumerates some ways in which similes can be connected to the narrative in which they appear. As with his account of the goals of the similes, Fränkel's account of the connection of similes to the narrative ends up being an account of the effect the similes have in the narrative. He notes first off that similes illustrate events or themes by *transcribing* them. Often these transcriptions will agree with and even complete the narrative (p. 105). Similes can also disagree with the narrative when the events of the simile cease to run parallel to those of the narrative; in such cases, Fränkel argues, similes can serve to foreshadow future events or to achieve something that is prevented in the narrative (p. 107).

Fränkel outlines what he takes to be the development of similes from their origins prior to the emergence of Homeric epic to the expanded long similes characteristic of this epic. He locates the original impulse to compare human life to animals and the natural world in the logic that, he says, led early peoples to see the whole world as reflective of and connected to their own lives. Similes thus, for Fränkel, arise in the same way that the idea of omens arises: a bird's flight is a sign for something in the human world in the same way that fire is a real expression of heroism (p. 110). The earliest singers, then, believed themselves to be uncovering real connections between the figures in their songs and the natural world when they created their first similes; they were not merely using "images" to "illustrate" their narratives.

This original function is evidence for Fränkel of the great age of many of the similes. Those similes that reveal themselves to be the most ancient are those for which the
poems show the greatest range of development, that is, those similes that can appear as short comparisons, such as, "he strides like a lion," as well as in fully developed long similes with a narrative progression of their own. Such similes also show a high degree of organization into what Fränkel calls "family trees." Consequently, newer similes reveal themselves by not appearing in the full range of forms possible for similes, and by not belonging to the same kind of broad system (p. 113).

Similes can also reveal their age from their material, Fränkel argues. The oldest similes compare the narrative to material from hunting, herding, and the weather, while newer similes compare the narrative to material from technology, sea travel, and agriculture (pp. 111, 113). Fränkel ends this section with the suggestion that, given that the oldest similes contain material which he has shown to be foreign to the experience of the audience, the people who first developed the similes were city-dwellers who turned to the unfamiliar worlds of the hunt and herding when they wanted to portray something lofty and significant.

The three aspects of Fränkel's approach to the similes that are of most relevance for my own are his arguments for the similes being organic parts of the poem, his arguments against the idea of a single "goal" for similes as such, and his discussion of how similes can achieve things not possible in the narrative. Like Fränkel, I begin from the assumption that similes are traditional elements of the poems and that our task is to explain each simile in its own terms to see how it functions or what effect it has; I will offer here no universal claim about how similes work. I will, however, find that the Iliad's horse similes have a consistent function that is at least suggestive for reading other similes: namely, to
recharacterize for the sake of redirecting narrative expectations. This recharacterizing, I will argue, is one potential narrative effect of similes. Further, this recharacterizing will on occasion run contrary to narrative expectations, thereby demonstrating how horse similes can, as Fränkel argues for similes in general, achieve what is not possible in the narrative.

Also of importance for this project are Fränkel’s arguments about the world of the similes, in particular his notion that many similes preserve memories of Bronze Age culture prior to the time of the poems’ production. My study will operate with that view as well; I will be examining the question of how the meaningfulness of the horse similes, at least sometimes, is accomplished through or relies upon memories of an earlier time. Further, Fränkel’s discussion of how the original impulse to compare the figures and events in heroic poetry to elements in the natural world arose out of a belief in a real connection between the hero and this world will also be relevant to my study. In this part of his discussion, Fränkel stresses that the similes are expressions of real and significant truths for the poems. Consequently, as I will argue, similes are capable of doing a great deal of poetic work and of carrying a great deal of poetic meaning.

b) Scott

William C. Scott’s 1974 work, The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile, was the first work systematically to examine similes as part of oral poetic composition. In response to the arguments Shipp makes in Studies in the Language of Homer regarding the late linguistic features found with greater frequency in the similes, Scott argues that as a mode of expression similes are very ancient and that a simile with a particular subject at a
particular narrative juncture can be ancient and traditional without affecting the formulation of the simile we have at that juncture as it stands. Scott's arguments address very cogently what has long been taken as the most compelling evidence for the lateness of the similes compared to the rest of the poems: the linguistic differences compiled by Shipp. Scott demonstrates that the occurrence of late linguistic features in any simile in no way undermines the traditional nature of the simile as such.

Scott's positive arguments for the traditional simile focus upon the placement of similes, the subjects of similes, how short similes are extended and whether these methods of extension adhere to oral compositional technique, and the relation of the similes to "imagistic" Mycenaean art to see if they share any features. In examining the placement of similes in the Iliad and the Odyssey, Scott discovers that there are particular types of narrative situations in which similes are consistently used. He argues (pp. 51ff.) that these placements of similes within the narrative must be part of the traditional inherited technique of oral composition. Similes are typically found "joined" to particular themes, such as journeys of gods, measurement, specific emotions, general scenes of armies, and so on. In some cases, such as journeys of gods (pp. 15-20), the deployment of a simile is merely one among a variety of alternative methods of singing the passage. Scott also shows (pp. 42-50) that similes are part of a broader poetic technique for placing emphasis upon important scenes or episodes, for joining scenes together, and for stressing motifs that are continued

---

14 Scott thus addresses, on the whole, issues very similar to those Fränkel discusses in Die homerischen Gleichnisse.
throughout the narrative of the poems as a whole.\textsuperscript{15}

In light of the possibility of the poets' choosing simile deployment from among a variety of alternatives, Scott argues that similes are used with particular thematic issues in mind. He discovers that the similes compare the narrative to sixteen different types of things. Scott discovers a consistency of application of simile subjects that, he argues, must be a part of oral traditional compositional technique. For example, lion similes are used to set off individual warriors in battle (pp. 58-62), while tree similes are used for warriors about to die or who stand steadfast in battle (pp. 70-71). Scott does not distinguish between short and long similes in his analysis of simile subject. A lion simile is used in a particular kind of narrative situation; the extension of a short simile into a long one will depend upon the concerns of individual poets at different moments in their compositions.

Scott takes his discoveries about the deployment of similes as evidence for the similes' being ancient parts of the Greek oral poetic tradition. He sees further evidence for the oral composition of the similes in the use of repeated similes (pp. 128 ff.) and in the paratactic methods used to expand short similes into long ones (pp. 140 ff.). Both these features prove for Scott that the Homeric simile is part of the oral poetic tradition.

Scott's final chapter is devoted to placing the simile within the oral tradition, first by examining early Greek and Mycenaean art to see if any similarities can be found between graphic and plastic art and the similes, and second by discussing the relationship between the poetry and its contemporary traditional audience. Scott discovers that the

\textsuperscript{15}Moulton 1977 develops this last aspect at greater length. See my discussion of Moulton below.
subjects of many Homeric similes are found also in Mycenaean and early Greek art. His discussion of the audience focuses on the idea of a "traditional" audience, parallel to the traditional poet. The poet sings, Scott argues, to and from traditions shared with the audience. The examination of graphic and plastic art goes some way to establishing the existence of these traditions outside of the poetic tradition.

Specific discussions in my study will be guided by Scott's findings about the placement of similes, about the deployment of simile subjects, and about the ways in which similes "assist" the narrative. I will conclude that the similes I examine are using a particular simile subject, the horse, consistently in situations where the narrative needs the help of a simile to portray a figure in a way that is out of character or out of keeping with the situation the narrative has set up. Furthermore, I will here be following up on Scott's arguments in his final chapter that study of the similes must be done in a context of study of oral traditional poetry with regards to both form and content. I will in large part be relying on Scott's findings as the ground for my own assumptions about the similes as traditional and organic parts of the Iliad.

16 Compare the survey of Vermeule 1964, who notes the presence of hunting scenes on grave stelai from the shaft graves at Mycenae and in frescoes at Mycenae and Pylos (Vermeule 1964:91-92; 194-195); hunts appear in similes at, for example, Iliad 5.554-558; 11.292-293; 11.414-420. Vermeule 1964:92-93 discusses a portrayal of lions attacking a bull on a grave stele; a lion attacks a bull in a simile at Iliad 16.487-490, while bulls appear in similes at Iliad 2.480-483 and 19.403-406. Vermeule 1964:203 lists goats, fish, and birds as subjects of Mycenaean vase painting; in similes we see goats at, for example, Iliad 13.198-202, 15.271-276, and 16.352-356; fish at Iliad 16.406-410, 21.22-26, and 23.692-695; birds at, for example, Iliad 3.2-7 and 9.323-327. Vermeule also notes the presence of deer, fawns, and lions in Mycenaean ivory carvings (Vermeule 1964:219); in similes we see deer at, for example, Iliad 10.360-364, 13.101-106, and 15.271-276; fawns appear in similes at Iliad 4.243-245, 11.113-121, 15.271-276, and 21.29; lions appear in similes very often, as, for example, at Iliad 3.21-28, 5.136-143, and 5.161-164.
c) Moulton

Carroll Moulton, in his 1977 monograph, *Similes in the Homeric Poems*, sets out to demonstrate that patterns can be discerned in the deployment of similes in the two poems that relate intimately to and support narrative structure, characterization, and the development of themes in the poems. Moulton’s basic assumptions in this work are that each poem is a sophisticated unity produced through a traditional oral compositional technique, that the similes are integral parts of the poems, and that similes achieve their effects, not through a mathematical correspondence in a point or points of comparison, but through a deeper power of suggestion and association.¹⁷

Moulton's analyses of the similes in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* aim to establish one fundamental point: the similes are not detachable from the narrative, but are an integral part of the compositional technique of the poem and so cannot be removed without damage to the narrative, its themes, and their development. Moulton establishes this point first by examining the organization of similes according to what he calls an "associative technique." Moulton demonstrates that simile subjects are deployed, not just in typical kinds of ways on the large scale, as Scott demonstrates, but in patterns and motifs within individual episodes or books of the poems. The use of repeated images and key motifs binds similes in sequence together to illuminate and intensify narrative events and themes.

Moulton examines similes within battle narrative to show how similes play a key role in what he argues is a major structural principle in battle narrative: dynamic symmetry. Dynamic symmetry for Moulton is the balancing and coordinating of episodes, 

¹⁷Moulton follows Fränkel 1921 in this assumption.
scenes, and events in the narrative in a way that avoids precise symmetry, but which allows elements to contrast, expand, and change. Similes are one device used to achieve this dynamic symmetry; as such, they are an integral element of narrative composition and can be discounted as a feature of Homeric poetry no more than traditional epithets or type scenes.¹⁸ They are necessary aspects of the poems' expression and development.

Moulton's goal overall in his book, as I have said, is to establish the similes as an integral part of the *narrative technique* of the Homeric poems. Consequently, his focus is upon the placement and interaction of similes in broad narrative units, not upon the detailed unpacking of individual similes in context. My own exegesis will be of the second kind, eschewed here by Moulton. Nonetheless, Moulton's analysis is of great relevance for my own work. Having established, in a more subtle way than Scott, the integrity of simile and narrative, Moulton has effectively done away with one of the primary problems scholars have had in analyzing individual similes: the question of whether the simile is original with its context. Moulton gives us the means to say that similes are integrated, and subtly integrated, not only with the precise context in which they occur, but with broader narrative and thematic issues and progressions. This degree of integration indicates that the similes in these contexts are indeed organic.

Further, although he does not himself develop this aspect of his work here, Moulton, in developing an account of an "associative technique" of composition, gives us a basis from which to support a reading of the Homeric poems that insists upon the existence

¹⁸Moulton's arguments here are related to Fränkel's discussion of the effects of the simile (Fränkel 1921:104-107) and to Scott's account of the deployment of similes (Scott 1974:42-50, 95 ff.).
of long-term implicit traditional associations at play in every aspect of the poems. That is, thematic progression by association of repeated images and motifs does not work through an explicit direction to the audience that we should remember, for example, that Achilleus has been compared to the Dog Star at the beginning of Iliad 22 when he is compared to the Evening Star at the end of Iliad 22. Instead, this thematic progression works through the implicit assumption that this connection is present for us to make if we can. So the possibility of thematic progression through repeated imagery allows us to look for other aspects of implicit association that will involve deeper levels of interaction than the ones Moulton chooses to examine here. Moulton’s analysis of the similes as part of Homeric narrative technique, then, lends itself to an analysis of the similes in light of oral traditional poetics in that he argues for an audience that knows and understands the expressive conventions of the poems.

d) de Jong

In her 1987 book, Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad, Irene J. F. de Jong uses the systems and terms of narratology to explain how the story of the Iliad actually gets told: how the reader gets the content of the poem through the activities of the narrators and focalizers in the poem. de Jong’s concern, then, is not for what she terms “genetic” questions regarding the origin and development of the Iliad into its received shape or regarding the nature of the oral tradition that produced the Iliad. Rather, she is concerned to give an account of the Iliad as it stands: to read and interpret the text of the Iliad as a unified consistent whole independent of its historical and cultural context.
In her account of the similes, de Jong argues that most Homeric similes deal with information that belongs to the category of "shared extra-textual knowledge." The primary narrator-focalizer (abbreviated NF₁) inserts similes to help the primary narratee-focalizee (abbreviated NeFe₁) to "visualize" what is being told, and thus draws upon and activates this shared knowledge with the insertion of similes (pp. 93-94). Further, de Jong argues, the fact that similes are familiar to the NeFe₁ gives them the status of "permanent fact," marked syntactically by ἀν and the use of present indicatives, gnomic aorists, or iterative subjonctives. The similes, therefore, are without a specific temporal reference, because the shared world of the NF₁ and the NeFe₁ is also not clearly fixed in time, except insofar as it is fixed as later than the world of the characters and their experiences. That the narrator can insert these atemporal references without further explanation shows that the narrator takes the stance of one who assumes that the audience knows and understands the same sphere of the world as the narrator.

The NF₁ thus invites the NeFe₁ to share an interpretation of the narrative with himself. de Jong argues that all comparisons and similes in the Iliad are interpretations of the events narrated (p. 136); these interpretations, as they are based upon the shared extra-textual knowledge of the NF₁ and the NeFe₁, must then be shared interpretations. The NF₁ invites or directs the NeFe₁ to take the same point of view on a particular scene or character that he takes himself. de Jong's discussion of the similes does not touch upon the relationship

---

19Scott 1974, in his arguments for a traditional audience, deals with similar issues.

20Fränkel 1921:100-101 comes to much the same conclusion in his analysis of the "world" of the similes.
between these moments of explicit interpretation and the implicit interpretation in the narrator-text and the NeFei's reception of that text. There are implications of this point that are, nonetheless, relevant to what I will be undertaking in my own analysis; I will discuss these implications below.

This idea of the poem's pointing out a particular interpretative path for us fits in with the generally held view, to which de Jong herself broadly subscribes, that similes are meant to illustrate - to shed light upon - the narration of events. de Jong argues that the primary function of similes is to illustrate "visual, auditory, or psychological aspects of the story" (p. 124). Consequently, each simile can be demonstrated to have a particular concrete relation to its immediate context, and most can be shown to have further, more subtle, relations to their broader context. de Jong, thus, to some extent does appeal to a more universalist approach to the function of the similes than do Fränkel, Scott, and Moulton, but in a more subtle and convincing way than many of the scholars these three oppose.

While de Jong addresses only a small part of her discussion to similes, her analysis is of great importance to my own account. Of particular significance for my purposes are her discussion of the similes as drawing attention to the interpretative aspect of receiving or producing a narrative and her notion of the similes as relying upon the shared extra-textual knowledge of the NF1 and the NeFei. de Jong's point about similes as interpretative supports my own arguments that similes are moments in which the narrator of the Iliad demands that we not follow other possible interpretations that we might make of the events or characters receiving the similes. I will argue that the horse similes challenge a way of interpreting the events or characters that we were anticipating by easing us into a new
vision of these characters or events. This notion of the similes as directions towards paths of interpretation shows that the poem acknowledges itself as an interpretative force and as an interpretative authority.

Further, de Jong’s notion of the similes’ primary function as illustrative also supports the notion of the poem’s consciousness of its own authority. For the narrator to take the stance of being the one who can illustrate for the audience, he must take the stance of one who knows or understands the material of the poem and its meaning better than the audience does. The audience is present to receive that narration in the expectation that they will be told, not only the information of the story, but how to interpret and understand this story. In adopting the premise that the narration of a story involves the passage of information from the NF₁ to the NeFe₁, de Jong implicitly adopts the premise that the NF₁ is in a position of authority with respect to the NeFe₁ and the material he is narrating. This authority, moreover, pertains not only to the "facts" of the story, but to the meaning/interpretation of the story as well. The similes’ drawing attention to the authoritative interpretative power of the narrator is crucial to my analysis of the horse similes in that these similes all insist on one particular interpretative approach in situations that might otherwise suggest different interpretations. These similes introduce us to a set of images that reorients our interpretative expectations without ever expressly announcing that this redirection is taking place.

This assumption of the authoritative stance taken by the NF₁ of the Iliad is relevant for the second of my stated interests in de Jong and her work: the usefulness of an ahistorical analysis of the Iliad for an oral traditional reading. Relevant here also are de Jong’s arguments concerning the atemporal nature of the NF₁ and the NeFe₁.
While de Jong herself states strongly that she is not concerned with the *Iliad* as an oral traditional poem, the analysis of the *Iliad* she develops is in keeping with oral traditional analysis. When we have come to understand the *Iliad* and the view of the world it expresses not as the products of an individual poet living in a particular time, but as the products of a tradition of poetry developing for centuries in a particular geographic and linguistic sphere, we must also come to regard the *Iliad* as, in some ways, expressing an ahistoric, atemporal view of the world. de Jong's observations about the atemporal character of the similes, the moments of explicit interpretation in the poem, therefore support a reading of the similes which sees them as interpreting from the point of view of the tradition, not of a particular poet in a particular place.

The assumption of an authoritative stance by de Jong's *NF* also supports an oral traditional reading of the *Iliad* in that it fits in with oral traditional Greek views on the status of the poet as one with access to something approaching the divine standpoint. The poet speaks about the culture to particular audiences as the voice of the tradition itself.

---

21 See, for example, Kirk 1985:7-8. Cf. Lord 1960:99 who argues that the ideal for poets is the preservation of the tradition through the constant re-creation of tradition. Morris 1986 argues for an eighth century background for the poems in terms of the assumptions through which the poet would portray the heroic world. He stresses throughout this article that the institutions described in the poems must have derived from the world of the poems' taking their final form in the eighth century (82, 86, 91, 120). Sherrat 1999:91-9, on the other hand, argues that the heroic ideals expressed in the poems can be linked to any one of three of what he identifies as the crucial periods for the development of this poetic tradition: the pre- and early palatial Mycenaean, the post-palatial Mycenaean, and the late eighth century. Sherrat also argues (96) that the poems' performance by travelling bards at panhellenic festivals makes the origin and home of Homer an immaterial question. Snodgrass 1974 argues that the Homeric poems present a cohesive portrait of a society that derives its features from a number of historical periods and sources.

22 See, for example, Bakker 1997, Foley 1997a and 1997b, and Martin 1989, especially 231-239.
which is not concerned with particular issues of place and time, but with the propagation of its own general stance - the stance, in many ways, of the gods.

Finally, de Jong's arguments about the atemporal NF and NeFe and their shared extra-textual knowledge demonstrate the necessity for scholars now to strive to rebuild the shared extra-textual knowledge that the traditional narrator and the traditional audience bring to their experience of the Iliad. Although I would myself argue that every aspect of the Iliad and the Odyssey relies upon this shared extra-textual knowledge, not just the similes, de Jong's claim here does support my views on the necessity of reconstructing the traditional associations of the horse. She acknowledges that there can be material at play in the poems that is not part of the text of the poems, that interpreting the poems can demand that we know things that the poems do not explicitly tell us. Consequently, we see again that some excavation of the traditional context of the horse similes is necessary.

We see that each of the four scholars I have discussed, despite their coming to the study of the Iliad from very different backgrounds and traditions, points us towards the importance of studying similes in light of oral traditional poetic theory. Fränkel, Scott, and de Jong all point in different ways to a study of the traditional context of the similes. Scott and Moulton demonstrate that interpreting the similes demands not only that we know and understand the traditional content of the similes, but that we know and understand the traditional forms of expression as well. It remains, then, for me to discuss those aspects of oral traditional poetic theory that are most significant for my study of the similes.
§ 3. **Oral Traditional Poetics and Similes**

One of the most important points that Parry established in "The Traditional Epithet in Homer" was the economy of oral formulaic diction.\(^{23}\) His examination of the personal name-epithet formulae for the major figures of the Homeric poems showed that the poems for the most part have only one name-epithet formula for each metrical and syntactical need. Hainsworth expanded these arguments somewhat by showing that the poems have set noun-epithet formulae only for the most frequently needed cases; thus there are not formulae to answer to every possible need, but there are traditional methods available through which poets can develop new formulae to fit new or infrequent needs.\(^{24}\)

Subsequent work on traditional diction showed also that along with traditional diction there go traditional themes.\(^{25}\) That is, just as there are formulae to answer to the major metrical and syntactical needs of oral composition, so traditional themes economically tend to express themselves through the same kinds of traditional diction. So Nagy has shown that the traditional noun-epithet formula κλέος ἄφθων is always used self-referentially of the power of traditional oral epic poetry to confer glory.\(^{26}\)

The traditional themes, meanings, or structures of oral poetry do not always explicitly flag themselves. In part, this occurs because the traditional audience and the

\(^{23}\) Parry 1971.

\(^{24}\) Hainsworth 1968.

\(^{25}\) I do not use "theme" here in Lord's sense (as motif or generic plot).

\(^{26}\) Nagy 1974:229-261. Cf. Lord 1960:31, who calls the formula the "offspring of the marriage of thought and sung verse."
traditional poets do not need to have their attention drawn to the traditional meanings. These meanings and structures are present automatically and implicitly not only in the poetry but in many other aspects of the religious and cultural lives of the peoples who produce this traditional poetry. Just as I do not need to have someone who utters the phrase, "the prodigal son," tell me, "I am referring to the story from the New Testament," because I know this story and grew up with it as a part of the broad cultural package that came with growing up in Canada in the late twentieth century, so the archaic Greek audience did not need to be told outright that the phrase κλέος ἀφθιτον means the power of epic poetry to bestow fame.

Because these traditional meanings need only be implicit for the traditional audience they are not always clear to interpreters as far removed from archaic Greece as the scholars of the last two hundred years have been. This cultural difference is the source of many of the accounts of the simile that view particular similes as inappropriate. They may well be inappropriate to the habits and sensibilities of a twentieth century scholar; that they were inappropriate to the archaic traditional audience is unlikely.

One of the greatest tools that oral poetic theory offers us in our efforts to reconstruct this cultural background is the connection between traditional theme and traditional diction. The same ideas express themselves the same way over and over again. Thus we can look at various occurrences of particular words or phrases and use the contexts of all the occurrences as the background for each individual occurrence.

Another tool that oral theory has given us is the ability to see how traditional

27 See Hainsworth 1992:72-74 on how the Iliad and the Odyssey assume on the part of their audiences, not just a knowledge of the stories of the Trojan War, but a knowledge of how poems in their tradition construct their stories and associate theme and structure.
oral poetry draws not only upon a cultural context that is known and explicit to its traditional audience but upon associations and structures that are present to its traditional audience and to itself in an implicit and mythic way. Oral poetry, like ritual, is conservative and retains structures of thought which may in its own lived cultural context no longer be openly at play. These structures still nonetheless inform the development of themes and structures in the poetry. This point is one that scholars have demonstrated in a different way in examinations of Homeric descriptions of artifacts. Lorimer has shown that very often the Homeric poems will refer to kinds of weaponry that were used in the Mycenaean period but not in later periods in ways that do not understand what the object is to which they are referring.\textsuperscript{28} Here we see how the diction of the poems has a drive of its own: to maintain the use of traditional expressions even when these expressions are no longer clear in their meanings. The same holds true of different features of the poems; the poems can maintain the use of particular features that seem traditionally to mean one thing, but which in their Homeric context are something else. Thus, for example, Paris, a figure of low heroic status in the \textit{Iliad}, receives a typical arming scene, which is otherwise reserved for heroes about to embark upon \textit{aristeiai}.\textsuperscript{29}

In a different way, we see that a traditional ancient logic which may no longer be active in archaic Greece or which may not be explicitly active in the poems is nonetheless at play implicitly. Sergent has argued that the story of the Kalydonian Boar Hunt in \textit{Iliad} 9 is

\textsuperscript{28}For example, Lorimer 1950:182-183, 239-241.

\textsuperscript{29}See Nickel 1997:202-230.
implicitly an aetiological account of paederastic initiation rituals. Here we see that the logic of paederastic initiation, while not explicitly given a place in the *Iliad*, nonetheless plays a role in the mythic account Phoinix gives Achilleus of his relations to Patroklos, Agamemnon, and to the adult male project of war. Oral traditional poetic theory, then, has pointed scholars towards avenues of research that have opened up new and enriched ways of understanding the Homeric poems. I will discuss only two of the scholars who have worked on the Homeric poems in light of oral traditional poetic theory, Albert Bates Lord and John Miles Foley. My discussion of Lord will be brief because for the purposes of this study it is Foley and his work on traditional referentiality that have been of the greatest significance.

*a) Lord*

Albert Bates Lord’s work has been devoted mainly to the development of a theory of oral poetic tradition, focusing on the notion of composition in performance, based on his work on Homeric, old English, and Serbo-Croatian poetry. Lord has been crucial to the general development of oral traditional poetic theory for a number of reasons: for his demonstration that oral traditional composition in performance does not involve the thoughtless and mechanical combination of formulae, for his notion that oral traditional poetry works much as a language works, for his bringing to light the notion of the traditional audience that goes along with the traditional poet, and for the development of the idea of the

---

traditional “theme” or motif or story pattern.\(^{31}\)

In his discussions of oral traditional composition in performance, Lord has demonstrated, in particular through his interviews with traditional singers, that the traditional performer is a creative performer who has learned the skill of traditional composition in performance over a period of years, during which he has absorbed the traditional rhythms, metre, language, formulae, story patterns, characters, and so on; Lord stresses that this learning develops in the same way one learns one’s first language, through exposure and habituation, not through memorization (1960:5, 31-36, 86, 99; 1986; 1991:73-76.) The skilled poet can adapt the form of any particular performance to the character and demands of his audience and can perform a variety of songs on a variety of topics using the same resources and techniques in each case (1960:16, 24, 94-98, 99; 1991:76-78). Oral traditional poets, then, use their technique and their medium as a means of immediate communication with an audience that is present and attentive; this communicative status necessarily demands flexibility and responsiveness from the performers, not mechanical generation of lines of verse and narrative.\(^{32}\)

Essential to this notion of oral traditional poetry as communicative is Lord’s discussion of how oral traditional poetic composition is learned like and generates songs like a natural language (1960:35-36, 141 ff.). This notion of oral traditional poetry as a kind of language leads to two important consequences: first, the possibility of great sophistication in

---

\(^{31}\)I have brought these four aspects of Lord’s work to the fore because they are the ones that have been of the most significance in the development of my own project.

\(^{32}\)Cf. Hainsworth 1992:67, who discusses how a poet can adapt his performance to his own and his audience’s needs and concerns.
the composition of the poetry, and, second, sophistication in its reception (Lord 1960:65, 141; 1986; 1991:73-76). Within an oral tradition, as in a language, poems will be produced that are as subtle or as banal as the individuals producing them (1960:86). Both performers and audience will share an understanding of the “grammar” of the poetic tradition (1960:65, 108-109; 1991:73).

Lord’s account of the audience and the poets sharing a knowledge and understanding of the poetic tradition opens up the notion of traditional referentiality (compare 1960:148, 158; 1991:83-85). For Lord, the notion of the oral traditional song does not include just a single particular performance of a song, but every performance of the song, including any present performance (1960:100; 1991:78, 96-97); such a tradition derives unity from the fact that each performer learns from other performers (1991:78). Lord’s notion of each performance implicating every other performance means that each element of the performance, the narrative structure, the diction, and so on, has a meaning beyond the particular context. The traditional poets and audiences are privy to these meanings; those of us from outside of the tradition must learn to recognize and understand these meanings (1960:65); to understand the Homeric tradition, Lord suggest looking, not just at the Iliad and the Odyssey, but at the Hesiodic poems, the epic cycle, ancient drama, and even at Near Eastern mythic material (1960:158).

In addition to his work on the theory of oral traditional composition in performance, Lord has also made significant contributions to the study of oral traditional story patterns and motifs, called by Lord, “themes.” Lord has argued that oral traditional poetry relies, not just on formulaic language, but on conventional groupings of ideas in the
generation of narrative (1960:68-69). Each song is composed by adapting motifs and story patterns, such as the motif of equipping, sailing over the sea, landing, being met by someone, being entertained and reviled (found in Odysseus’ arrival in Ithaka in the *Odyssey*), to the needs of particular songs about particular heroes (1960:94, 99, 160-163; 1991:136). The impulse to use these motifs and patterns in the same way repeatedly is very strong; so strong that poets will alter details of their narratives in order to respect the patterns (1960:98, 163).

Lord’s work is relevant to my study in the following ways. His demonstration that composition in performance is not mechanical, but artful and sophisticated, and his discussion of the traditionally educated audience underlie my own assumption that a simile always does something important and meaningful. Further, I will be assuming throughout this project that the *Iliad* is a poem of great sophistication and subtlety in its manner of expression and in the messages that it conveys through that expression. Lord’s discussions of oral traditional poetry as a kind of language and of the necessity for interpreters of this poetry to come to know the tradition as well as possible are relevant for my attempts to reconstruct the traditional associations of the horse and then to interpret the *Iliad*’s horse similes through that reconstruction. Note here that, although Lord’s own work did for the most part focus on internal questions of narrative structure and composition, he does lay the groundwork for the notion of traditional referentiality in his discussions of the meaning of “song” and his suggestions regarding how we today could go about reconstructing the tradition of the Homeric poems by looking at other kinds of poetry. My own attention to the historical and cultural context and not just to the poetic context is, I believe, a logical expansion of Lord’s ideas. Finally, Lord’s work on motifs and story patterns provides the background for the
work I do on the repeated horse simile for Paris and Hektor in Chapter 4. I will argue there that each time the simile appears it is part of a larger narrative pattern that always includes a horse simile.

b) Foley

John Miles Foley has been a major contributor to the field of Homeric studies on the topic of traditional referentiality. His 1991 monograph, *Immanent Art*, lays out the groundwork for this concept and its application to oral traditional poetry. In this book, Foley sets out to answer the question of how the conventions of oral traditional poetry convey meaning (pp. xi-xii). He begins from the presupposition that the traditional structures, such as noun-epithet formulae or type scenes, mean something and that this meaning is inherent in the structures and not conferred upon them by any particular context in which they appear; their meaning is, thus, immanent. For Foley, conventional structures must have conventional meaning as well (pp. xiv-v, 6). The key to understanding oral traditional poetry, which expresses itself through conventional and recurrent structures, is, then, the recognition that meaning is conveyed in this poetry in the same conventional, traditional way every time that meaning is conveyed.

Traditional structures, in Foley’s view, are not simply useful tools for composition in performance, but are expressive elements that refer not simply to the particular point in any poem in which they appear, but refer instead to the entire tradition of which they are a part. Traditional expressive structures, such as those we have written down
as the texts of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, have an extra-textual dimension (p. 7). Oral traditional poetry, then, conveys meaning in a metonymic way: each particular instance of a traditional expressive structure stands for its entire tradition (pp. 7-8). Consequently, our first task when interpreting oral traditional poetry must be to "recontextualize" the particular part of the tradition under study by reconstructing as far as possible its inherent traditional meaning (p. 9).

This reconstruction of the context on the part of scholars is, for Foley, part of a necessary recognition that an oral poetic tradition implies an oral traditional audience. Foley describes his interpretative approach as a fundamentally receptive theory (pp. 45-47). To convey meaning in a conventional immanent way demands a conventional audience that can recognize and respond to the signals that the traditional performance or text provides (p. 45). Without an oral traditional audience oral traditional poetry cannot function as a purveyor of meaning, or can function only partially. The realization of the expressive goals of oral traditional poetry relies upon an audience capable of understanding this poetry and capable of doing the work required of it to make the implicit meaning of the poetry explicit to themselves. The audiences's ability to participate in the generation of meaning requires that it, just as much as the poets and performers in the tradition, know and understand the tradition (pp. 47-48). Scholars of oral traditional poetry, then, in their effort to reconstruct

---

33 See also my account of de Jong, who draws upon the idea of shared extra-textual knowledge in her narratological analysis of the *Iliad*.

34 Cf. Bakker 1995:102, who argues that metonymy is part of wider strategies to locate poetic performances in human experience, the poetic tradition, and myth; Bakker includes similes as an example of the manifestation of these metonymic strategies.
the tradition implied by oral traditional poetry, are reconstructing themselves as the implied traditional audience.

The major consequence of oral traditional poetry's metonymic way of generating and expressing meaning, for Foley, is that, given an oral traditional audience, this poetry will imply and express far more than it actually utters (p. 53). So, for example, the noun-epithet formula πόδας ὄκος Ἀχίλλευς does not refer only to Achilleus as he functions in any one particular context in the Iliad in which he receives this epithet; instead the phrase stands metonymically for the complete Achilleus as he exists throughout the Iliad and its tradition. In focussing on one particular aspect of Achilleus, his swiftness, the noun-epithet phrase embodies his whole traditional character. The noun-epithet formula serves to call up a kind of epiphany of Achilleus whenever it appears (pp. 19, 25). As Foley demonstrates in his analysis of Iliad 24 in Immanent Art, this particular epiphanic noun-epithet formula serves to call up Achilleus' entire character at moments where this character seems to have receded. When πόδας ὄκος Ἀχίλλευς responds with anger to Priam's refusal to accept a chair, the audience is reminded that Achilleus is not just the courteous host of Iliad 24, but that he is also the enraged killer of Iliad 19 to 22. Achilleus' anger at this precise moment is therefore easier to understand and is also more resonant (pp. 136-138).

For an audience that knows and responds to the signal contained in the phrase πόδας ὄκος Ἀχίλλευς, a moment in the narrative of Iliad 24 that has caused interpretative problems for generations of readers of the Iliad is no problem at all; instead it is a rich and resonant

35This notion of epiphanic noun-epithet formulae will be relevant in my discussion of Aias in Chapter 5.
reminder of just who this Achilleus giving his foe’s corpse up for burial really and completely is.

The example of Foley’s method I have just given goes some way to showing the value of Foley’s approach. For the purposes of my study, Foley’s notion of traditional referentiality forms the cornerstone of my attempts to reconstruct the traditional meaning inherent in the idea of the horse and in particular elements of the traditional diction contained in the horse similes. Just as the similes do not exist in isolation from the context of the Homeric poems, so the poems do not exist in isolation from the culture and traditions that produced them. Consequently, to interpret the horse similes of the *Iliad*, I will be looking not just at the *Iliad* but at the broader context of archaic Greece. This examination of the horse in archaic Greece is an expansion of the field through which Foley does his analysis of the *Iliad* in *Immanent Art*; instead of focussing just on the *Iliad* as Foley does, I will examine the horse in its iconographic and economic roles in archaic Greece. In so doing, I will, I believe, be taking the next logical step in a traditional referential analysis.

My examination of the broader cultural context of the image of the horse will be particularly relevant in Chapters three and four where I will draw on, in Chapter three, the funerary associations of the horse, and, in chapter four, the horse’s social and economic role as a luxury or prestige animal.

I will be following Foley’s example more directly in chapters three and five, where I will examine the phrases ἀφθονόφοροι ἵπποι and Τελαμώνιος Αἴας. In these cases my goal will be to uncover the meaning inherent in each of these phrases and then to use this meaning to interpret the horse similes of *Iliad* 22 and 15. In each case we will see that, as
Foley has argued, more is implicit in each of these phrases than is explicitly said and that a knowledge of these meanings adds to our understanding of the particular similes under examination and of the narrative contexts in which they appear.

§ 4. The Method of this Study

I have devoted much time here to discussion of the work of other scholars for two reasons: to locate my own approach to the horse similes within the various traditions of Homeric scholarship and to explain how and why I have come to approach these similes in the way I do. My own method is both grounded in and a response to other scholars; I have learned from other scholars by scrutinizing their approaches and assumptions and by assessing whether these approaches and assumptions lead to a productive and accurate explication of the Homeric simile. That said, I must now go on to lay out my own approach and assumptions in more detail.

Most basically, what I offer in this project is a close reading of the five long horse similes in the Iliad. These close readings are intended to serve as a case study for the Iliadic simile at least. In my introduction I have already explained the reasons for my focus on the horse simile: all of the horse similes are long and so offer much simile material for study, and they are confined to the Iliad and so allow for an examination of the simile within the poetics of only one of the Homeric poems. Further, I have discovered in the course of my research that the horse similes offer a fertile ground for the exploration of such issues as the nature and function of type scenes and narrative patterns, the degree to which implicit meaning is at work in the Iliad, and the role of similes in characterization and in the
development of the narrative. This case study, then, beginning from a close reading of approximately twenty-five lines of poetry, allows us to explore and examine some of the fundamental questions involved, not just in the study of the Homeric simile, but in the study of the Homeric poems as a whole.

I begin my close reading in each case with the presumption that each simile I examine is doing something in its context; my own view is that the similes must be approached with a belief that they are organic and essential parts of the poem and that our task as interpreters of similes is to discern what each simile is doing in its place. I assume, further, not just that the similes are doing something, but that they are doing something important; I will demonstrate that we ignore or excise similes at the risk of losing an important aspect of the poem's expression and meaning. Moreover, I assume that there is a reason for the poem expressing itself at particular points in the form of a simile rather than in some other way. My basic assumption, then, is that similes are, in form and in content, appropriate, distinctive, and effective.

What I will do in my close reading of the Iliad's horse similes can be generally situated, I believe, within the framework of studies of the Homeric poems as oral traditional poetry. I will be following here in the path laid out by scholars like Parry, Lord, Nagy, and Foley. One principle of this scholarly approach, as I have mentioned in my discussion of Foley earlier in this chapter, is that oral traditional poetry always means much more than it explicitly says. What this poetry always means can be fully understood by reading it in light of its tradition.

The notion of key importance for my analysis of the horse similes, then, will
be that of metonymic traditional referentiality. The great difficulties that we face as scholars of the Homeric tradition are that we are not ourselves a living part of that tradition and that much of that tradition has been lost over time. Our own experience of this tradition comes from a small part of that larger whole and we are not educated throughout our lives in receiving and understanding that traditional material. Consequently, in order to understand the parts of the tradition that we do have, we must reconstruct as much as possible the context that was ready to hand for the archaic poets and audiences or for the tradition. There is, of course, much that we do know about this tradition already, but often the full resonance of the Iliad or the Odyssey can go unnoticed because we have not done the archeological excavation of the poems and their tradition that will allow us fully to appreciate the sense of what we are reading. I will be contributing to the excavation of the Iliad here by trying to reconstruct the traditional associations of a set of similes that attach to the horse.\(^{36}\)

Consequently, my reading is especially geared to see what else in the universe of the poem (its text, its tradition, its historical and cultural context) is being brought into play in each horse simile. I will then work from these larger associations back to the individual similes to establish the meaning of the initial simile through the meanings of the associations it calls up. These associations will be different in each case; other textual material, other aspects of poetic technique, broader cultural associations, will come up in the three chapters of analysis. In some overall sense, then, my method looks much like bricolage

---

\(^{36}\)Cf. Lord 1960:148, who argues that we can share in the tradition only by steeping ourselves in the tradition. See also Muellner 1990:66; Nimis 1987:12 ff.
in that what I do in each case will be determined by the material that faces me.  

Beyond saying that I assume similes to be appropriate and meaningful in form and content and beyond saying that my method is to pursue the associations and background invoked by each simile to clarify the simile’s meaning, I cannot lay out a single overarching approach here. In each case the demands of method will be shaped by what each simile calls up as far as I can see it. What I will be performing in each case is a reading—not a deduction nor, ultimately, a solution.

The general conclusion that I will reach as a result of my study of the Iliad’s horse similes is that the simile structure here functions to express what the narrative will not allow as possible. Having investigated the cultural significance of the horse in archaic Greece and having worked through the specific ways that horse similes refer to and draw upon other aspects of the poem we will see that horse similes transfer attributes to a character or event that he should not otherwise have by associating him in more or less complex fashions with someone or something else. The horse simile of the Iliad will reveal itself as always solving a problem through implicit redefinition.

\[37\text{See Lévi-Strauss 1966:16-36.}\]
Chapter 2
The Semantics of the Horse in Archaic Greece

In what follows I will attempt to reconstruct at least the most basic and broadest associations of the horse for the *Iliad* and for archaic Greek culture. I will begin with an examination of the horse in the *Iliad*. Here we will see that the horse in the similes consistently serves as an image of rapid easy movement. We will see, further, that, in the *Iliad*, the horse appears almost universally as a draught animal pulling an heroic chariot. This almost exclusive association of the horse with the chariot will lead us to another Iliadic association of the horse: funerary ritual. I will then go on to examine the horse’s status in archaic Greek culture. Here I will discuss the horse’s status as a luxury or prestige animal and then go on to link that status to a persistent presence of the horse in Greek funerary iconography. We will see that the image of the horse in ancient Greek culture consistently calls to mind notions of heroic excellence, heroic luxury, and heroic death.

In the *Iliad*, the horse most simply and clearly represents speed and ease of movement.¹ Speed lies at the heart of all four of the horse similes under consideration here.

¹In the *Iliad*, speed is the most prominent feature in horses’ epithets: they are ὠκὺς (thirty times), ὠκύπος (twelve times), ποδώκης (four times), ταχὺς (four times), ὕκυπέτης (twice). Fränkel 1921:9, 77 argues that all comparisons to horses originated in recognition of the horse’s speed.
At 6.506 ff., Paris "rushed through the city, trusting in his fast feet," like a horse breaking free from his bonds and running across the plain so quickly that his mane leaps over his shoulders. Paris' speed, in his rushing (σεύωτ' 6. 505) and his fast feet (ποσὶ κρατπνοῖσι 6. 505) is picked up in the horse's running (Θείη 6. 507) and the leaping of his mane (ἀίσονται 6. 510). The same simile is repeated for Hektor at 15.263 ff., when Hektor returns to battle after being wounded by Aias and restored by Apollo. Hektor's speed is not explicit in the narrative surrounding the simile to the same degree as Paris's; we see it nonetheless in the line concluding the simile, "thus Hektor swiftly (λατψηρὰ) plied his feet and knees" (15.269). Speed is again the primary subject of the horse-racing similes in Iliad 22. At 22.21 ff., Achilleus runs back to Troy from the plain, "rushing like a prize-winning horse with its chariot, who runs easily accomplishing the plain." Here, Achilleus' rushing (σευάμενος 22.22) is picked up by the easy running (φεία Θῆισι 22.23) of the horse. The simile concludes (22.24) with a line identical to that with which the simile for Hektor at 15.263 ff. concludes, except for the personal name: "thus Achilleus swiftly plied his feet and knees." Again, speed is the focus of the simile at 22.162 ff. Here Achilleus pursues Hektor swiftly (καρπαλίμως 22.159) around the walls of Troy, as when prize-winning horses run easily around the posts. The simile concludes, "thus they whirled (δίνηθῆτην 22.165) three times around the city of Priam with their swift (καρπαλίμοισι 22.166) feet." Achilleus' and Hektor's speed (note the concurrence of adverbial καρπαλίμως 22.159 and adjective καρπαλίμοισι 22.166) is picked up in the running (τρωχώσι 22.163) of the horses in the

---

2I will discuss this simile in detail in Chapter 4 "The Redemptive Simile."

3These two similes in Book 22 are the subject of Chapter 3 "The Transformative Simile."
simile. Speed is not the focus of Aias’ horse simile at *Iliad* 15.679-684; nonetheless, the horses in this simile again manifest the association of horses and speed.⁴ The man driving the horses in this simile is described as σεύδας (15.681), the same verb used to describe Paris and Achilleus at 6.505 and 22.22. The horses here are also said to fly (πετονται 15.684), a description that again implies speed.⁵

Delebecque has noted that the most significant parts of a horse’s body in the *Iliad* are its extremities: its feet, hooves, and limbs; the swiftness of the horse precisely resides in those parts of its body through which it runs.⁶ The horse’s status as an emblem of speed appears also in the story of the mares of Erichthonios at *Iliad* 22.221-229; here the wind, Boreas, mounts Erichthonios’s mares in the form of a stallion, impregnates them, and thereby sires a race of swift immortal Trojan horses.⁷ We see the horse’s speed again in the names given to heroes’ horses; for example, Hektor’s horses are named Xanthos, Podarge, Aithon, and Lampos (*Iliad* 8.185). Podarge seems to mean “swift-footed,” while the last two names have some overt connotation of flashing, which can be said to describe the speed of the horse’s movement.⁸

---

⁴I will examine this simile in Chapter 5 “The Recharacterizing Simile.”

⁵In the similes in *Iliad* 22, which involve ἄεθολοφοτοί ἵπποι in particular, we can see also that the idea of swiftness is implicit in the idea of the prize-winning horse. Competitions involving horses are competitions of speed; those horses that win prizes must of necessity be fast horses.

⁶Delebecque 1951:56-57.

⁷Cf. *Iliad* 16.148-151, where we learn that Achilleus’ horses are the offspring of the harpy Podarge and the wind Zephuros. See also Delebecque 1951:242; Woronoff 1983:491.

The horse also exemplifies ease of movement. Its speed comes without effort or exertion, as we see in the simile at 6.506 ff. = 15.263 ff. Here the horse runs and his knees carry him easily (ρίμφα 6.511 = 15.268). At 6.506 ff., we see Paris immediately (αἴψα 6.514) overtaking Hektor in his running; Paris' comfortable speed allows him to move through the city rapidly enough to catch Hektor. At 15.263 ff., Apollo breathes μένως (15.262) into Hektor that allows Hektor to run through the Trojan ranks, urging on the fighters. At 22.21 ff., the horse in the simile runs easily (ῥεῖς 22.23). So Achilleus, who has been fruitlessly pursuing Apollo across the plain (21.599-611), can turn and run swiftly back towards the city as easily as a horse. Although this notion of ease of movement does not seem to be at play in the simile at 22.162 ff., it is present in Aias’s simile at 15.679 ff. In this case, the idea of ease is connected with the skill of the man driving the horses. This man is described as ἐὖ εὐδῶς (15.679); his movements as he jumps from one horse to another are said to be ἐμπεδῶν ἀσφαλές αἰεί (15.683). The driver’s skill allows for confident and rapid movement, which we see in the narrative as Aias moves back and forth with his big strides (μακρὰ βιβάζων 15.676, μακρὰ βιβάς 15.686). The horse, then, in all its appearances in the Iliad’s horse similes, represents swift and easy movement.

This ease of movement is again a feature of the Iliad’s horse outside of the similes. For example, at Iliad 5.221 Aineias invites Pandaros, who has left his own precious

with fire and light (see Whitman 1958:128-153); the hero achieves his victory with the assistance of his swift horses.

The name Xanthos may also contain the idea of flashing, being perhaps derived from the root *skandh-, gleam or shine (Prellwitz 1905 s.v. “ξανθός;” cf. Ebeling 1963 s.v. “ξανθός.” Frisk 1970 s.v. “ξανθός” does not make this connection; he finds the word etymologically obscure and suggests a relationship with words for “white” or “gold.”
horses at home (5.202-203), to ride in his own chariot. Aineias continues this invitation by boasting to Pandaros of his horses’ skill in battle; these horses know how to run back and forth on the field, in pursuit and in flight (5.221-223). Aineias’ horses, then, are skilful horses who can negotiate the demands of the battlefield quickly and easily.\(^9\) Both narrative and horse simile, then, set the horse up as fast and fluid in its movement.

Throughout the *Iliad*’s narrative the horse appears always in connection with or attached to a chariot. The horse as a riding animal is absent here, although it appears in this function in a simile at *Odyssey* 5.371, where Odysseus clutching the mast of his broken ship is compared to a man riding on a horse’s back. The horse as riding animal appears also in Aias’s simile at 15.679ff, where the man in the simile is said to be knowledgeable about κελπτιζεν, about riding on horses. We also see Odysseus and Diomedes riding the horses of Rhesos at *Iliad* 10.512-514 and 526-531 (these horses belong with a chariot, as we see Diomedes pondering whether to carry off the chariot that goes along with the horses at 10.503-506). Aside from these three references, the Homeric horse is an animal that pulls heroes’ chariots.\(^10\)

In the *Iliad*, the horses and chariots serve primarily to carry great warriors on and off the battlefield or to carry them from one point on the field to another; their use in the poem is thus primarily aristocratic and military (a use that we will see again when we look at the horse’s status outside of the Homeric poems). This aristocratic military use of horses in

\(^9\)Woronoff 1983:489 refers to Aineias’ “vanité naïve” in this passage. One could equally speak of proud recognition of the serviceability of an heroic tool or even colleague.

\(^10\)Cf. Delebeque 1951:47, who attributes the appearance of riding in the two similes to Homer’s using an image of contemporary life to make his narrative of the ancient past more easily understood.
the *Iliad* corresponds to the horse's status within the poem as a prestige animal. The horse is a prize worth waging war for, worth risking one’s life for, as we see in Dolon's insistence at *Iliad* 10.303-323 that the reward he receive for spying on the Achaian camp be, not merely a horse and chariot, as Hektor promises at 10.303-312, but Achilleus’ horses. We learn also that Herakles' attack on Troy during the reign of Laomedon was because of a dispute over horses (*Iliad* 5.640-651). Likewise, Nestor, in his account of the war between the Pylians and the Epeians, tells of how Neleus receives a greater share of the spoils because Augeias had stolen four of Neleus’ horses (11.696-704). Heroes recognize horses as prizes worthy of their greatest efforts.

Heroes also recognize horses as precious possessions that deserve special care and tendance. Pandaros, as noted above, leaves his horses and chariots at home in Zeleia with his father because he fears that there will not be enough for them to eat at Troy (5.201-202); instead, the horses remain in his palace next to their chariots with their food (5.195-196). Hektor’s wife, Andromache, does not leave the care of Hektor’s horses entirely to a servant, but tends them herself every day, even before she gives Hektor himself his meal (8.185-190). Even Priam, king of Troy, feeds his own horses (24.279-280). The horse is not just another domestic animal to be kept in a barn and cared for by slaves; rather, it is prized and tended as valuable by the heroes themselves. The *Iliad* itself, then, regards the horse not just as a symbol for swiftness and fluid movement, but as a sign of heroic excellence that heroes themselves acknowledge as such.11

11 Cf. Woronoff 1983:489 and 492, where Woronoff argues that Anchises’ “theft” of the divine seed of Laomedon’s horses is part of the complex of the rivalry between the two lines of Dardanids; Anchises must acquire the divine horses so that Laomedon’s descendants do not alone control the
Horses and chariots appear in one other significant context: in races at funeral games. As I will show in my analysis in Chapter 3, the only competitions in which horses are explicitly said to win prizes in the Homeric poems are competitions at funerals. Consequently, we can conclude that the horses in both of these similes are winning prizes at funeral games, as indeed the horses in the simile at 22.162 ff. are said to be. The *Iliad* gives us a long and detailed account of funeral games in Book 23, where the funeral games for Patroklos occur. Book 23 of course provides the most complete and elaborate extant account of an heroic burial. Of the many competitions held at these games, the chariot race receives the longest account (23.262-650), and is clearly marked as the most prestigious competition by having the most valuable and the greatest number of prizes awarded to its participants (a woman and a tripod, a pregnant mare, a cauldron, two talents of gold, and a phiale 23.262-270). Patroklos is not the only hero for whom funeral games were held; the tradition also tells us that Pelias receives funeral games, as do Amarynkeus, Amphidamas, Oedipus, and Achilleus himself.

Horses' presence in funerary ritual in the *Iliad* is not limited to their running in chariot races. We see horses and funerary ritual associated in other ways as well. Achilleus

divine stock and its associations with heroic and military excellence.

12Note the presence of a horse among these prizes. Compare the prizes for boxing (a mule and a cup, 654-656), wrestling (a tripod and a woman, 702-705), the foot race (a krater, an ox, and a half talent of gold, 740-751), the armed duel (the sword of Asteropaios and the arms of Sarpedon, 799-809), the iron-hurling (the lump of iron, 826-827), archery (ten double axes and ten single axes, 850-855), and the spear-throwing (a cauldron and a spear, 884-886).

makes the tomb of someone long dead the τέρμα for the horse race (23.331-333). Prior to the burial ritual, Achilleus and the Myrmidons drive their horses and chariots around Patroklos’ corpse three times and lament while doing so (23.12-16). Among the sacrificial offerings at Patroklos’ funeral are four horses (23.171-172), whose bones lie at the edge of Patroklos’ enormous pyre, mixed with those of the Trojan victims (23.241-242). Further, Hades, god of the dead, is regularly referred to as 'Αἰδης κλυτόπολος, Hades glorious for horses;¹⁴ this designation again associates horses and death ritual.

The associations of the horse in the Iliad, then, occur in four different arenas: the horse is, as an image, a figure for swiftness and for ease of movement. Second, the horse is a sign of heroic noble prestige. The horse, further, is always associated with the heroic chariot. Finally, the horse has strong intimate connections with funerary imagery and ritual. When we turn to look at the larger cultural context for the horse, we will see that these two latter associations – the horse and the heroic chariot and the horse and funerals – are also at play in archaic Greek culture as a whole. The Iliad, then, will reveal itself to be working within a system of reference that is not peculiar to itself but which it shares as a part of the historical and cultural context of archaic Greece.

In that larger context we see, first and most clearly, that the horse is the aristocratic animal par excellence; its role as a prestige animal is attested not only in Greece in the Bronze Age and later, but in third and second millennia Near Eastern cultures as well.¹⁵

The horse, unlike its equipod relative the ass or bovines such as the ox, had no value as a

¹⁴Iliad 5.654; 15.415; 16.625.
work animal until well into the Middle Ages, when a yoke was developed that allowed draught animals to pull loads without choking themselves. Further, horses require more water and better pasturage than sheep and goats, which decreases their efficiency as meat and milk producers. In Greece and the Aegean, moreover, all available arable land was used for agriculture. Consequently, only those who could afford the upkeep for animals that did no work and produced no goods were able to keep horses; that is, only the wealthy, with land and resources to spare, kept horses. The horse thereby became a sign of the wealth of its possessor.

With the development of the light chariot and the light spoked wheel in the second millennium, it became possible for teams of horses to be used to pull these chariots. These chariots were themselves luxury items that required sophisticated expert carpentry to be built and properly balanced. Here again, even though a use for the horse as a means of rapid transport was made possible through the development of a light two-wheeled chariot, this utility was immediately undermined by the great expense involved in the manufacture of the chariot. Again, chariots and teams of horses of necessity could be possessed only by the very wealthy.

These light chariots and teams of horses did find a use other than display and

---

16 Anderson 1961:3.


18 Donlan 1989:143-144.


20 Drews 1988:86.
occasional rapid transport: they came to be used more and more during the second millennium as instruments of war.\textsuperscript{21} Linear B tablets from Knossos and Pylos attest to the presence of hundreds of chariots, along with wheels, among the palaces' possessions.\textsuperscript{22} Here the aristocratic overlords who had conquered the Minoans and pre-Greek inhabitants maintained large armouries that contained chariots, as well as bows and arrows and spears.

Although abundant clear evidence regarding the chariot in Greece and the Aegean after the dissolution of the Mycenaean palace system is lacking, scholars are agreed that the use of the chariot did indeed survive into the Greek Dark Age.\textsuperscript{23} We have the evidence of the tenth century "Heroon" at Lefkandi, where a warrior is interred along with a woman and four horses, two of which have the remains of iron bits in their mouths, indicating that they were chariot animals.\textsuperscript{24} Whether the horse and chariot continued to have any military applications from the tenth to the eighth centuries, and what precisely those applications could have been, are matters of dispute.\textsuperscript{25} It does seem to be the case, however, that the horse retained its status as a prestige animal, the exclusive possession of wealthy aristocrats, and that its use into the archaic period was primarily for display and for aristocratic competition at chariot races.\textsuperscript{26} The horse, then, even outside of the \textit{Iliad},
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persistently calls to mind the idea of noble military life. Just as, in the Iliad, the horse exists to carry the hero king around the battlefield, so in the lived world, the horse existed as a symbol of its owner’s wealth, leisure, and military prowess.

Aside from these inherent aristocratic and military associations, the horse also has immediate funerary associations that are closely connected to the aristocratic associations.²⁷ Horse imagery is an important part of funerary iconography in the Mycenaean period. Once the Mycenaean acquired horses and chariots from the east, they began occasionally to inter horses and chariots along with human remains and to include images of horses and chariots on grave offerings and grave markers.²⁸ The use of such images seems to have resulted from the aristocratic associations of the horse and may also indicate some Mycenaean knowledge of ancient Near Eastern royal funerary practice.²⁹

The Bronze Age practices of marking graves with horse images and of interring horse images continue in Greece and the Aegean into the archaic period. For the most part, the inclusion of the horse in funerary contexts is as an image. For the ninth century in Attic burials the only figures found on grave vessels are horses.³⁰ During the eighth century in Athens, the interment and disposal of kraters and amphorae with chariot

²⁷I will examine these associations in some detail in Chapter 3, where I will also consider questions of the interpretation of the iconographic material. Consequently, I will provide only a brief overview of this material here.


scenes at graves became customary.\(^{31}\) We see horses associated with funerary rituals also in 
archaic Lakonia, which produced cups for grave offerings that regularly portrayed some kind 
of heroized horseman.\(^{32}\) Likewise in eighth century Argos the predominant grave offering is 
a large krater with images of horsemen.\(^{33}\) There is also evidence of the continuing or 
renewing of the practice of horse burial on Cyprus in the eighth and seventh centuries. 
Again, the inclusion of horses and horse images in graves is interpreted as a signal of the 
aristocratic status of the person interred.\(^{34}\)

Consistently these horse images do not appear to be portraying the experiences 
of the dead. Rather, they are images of the living as they honour the deceased. The honorific 
function of horse burial and of horse imagery around graves make sense given the expense 
involved in owning and maintaining horse and chariots in Greece during these periods. One 
further function of the horse imagery seems to have been not merely to honour a dead 
aristocrat but to raise that dead aristocrat's status from aristocratic to heroic.\(^{35}\)

Again we see that the connection that the *Iliad* consistently makes between 
horses and funerals is a connection that it shares with its historical and cultural context.


\(^{32}\)Homann-Wedeking 1966:106.

\(^{33}\)Whitley 1991:190-191; Whitley connects these horse images to the political system of Argos 
at the time, which, he argues, was likely run by a military elite.

\(^{34}\)Hurwitt 1993:15, 33, 36; Langdon 1993a:51-52, 66. Sherrat 1999:90-91 links these horse 
images to jostling for power among the elite in the newly emerging *poleis*.

\(^{35}\)Boardman 1977; Hurwit 1993:35-36; Langdon 1993b:85, 99-100; Snodgrass 1980:74; Whitley 
These associations for the Greeks go back to the Bronze Age, as we have evidence of the horse as part of funerary iconography for Mycenaean civilization. The associations continue in Greece up into the archaic period, which is the more immediate context for the *Iliad*. The poem and its audience, thus, can immediately and unhesitatingly feel or hear that “horse” does not just mean “horse;” instead horse carries with it a rich and complex system of images, meanings and associations, all of which will turn out to be at play in the appearances of the horse in the *Iliad*’s similes.

In sum, we have seen here how the horse in the *Iliad* has many associations upon which the poem can draw when it uses horse images in its similes. The poem itself sets the horse up as the image for speed and ease of movement, as we see in the horse similes and in the broader narrative. The poem also treats the horse as a prestige animal, as we have seen in heroic attempts to acquire horses and in heroic care for horses. The poem associates horses with funerary contexts, as we see in *Iliad* 23 in the account of Patroklos’ funeral games. More broadly, ancient Greek culture associates the horse and the chariot with wealth and warrior status, as we have learned from consideration of the introduction of the horse and chariot into the Aegean. Further, we have seen that the horse and chariot have funerary associations in Greek art and in the archaeological evidence. These funerary associations themselves draw upon the horse’s traditional aristocratic connotations and can in fact be seen to have specific heroic associations even outside the *Iliad*. 
The similes have long been a problem area in Homeric scholarship. As we have seen, when trying to interpret particular similes, which generally involves explaining the connections between the simile and its narrative context, some scholars, when unable to make these explanations, have accused similes of being "inappropriate" to their narrative contexts. I have claimed that this apparent inappropriateness often reflects only the scholar's own inability to understand how a simile could be appropriate or explicable. Such inability is not surprising when one remembers that the traditions and meanings that inform Homeric poetry, including the similes, are not the traditions and meanings that inform contemporary scholars' interpretations. These traditions were simply ready-to-hand for the oral poets and their audiences; evocations that would have been automatic to them are not so often present for us. Consequently, to understand this poetry, we must work to reconstruct explicitly the conventions that were familiar and implicit to the tradition and its purveyors.

The *Iliad* itself, and not just the arguments of scholars of the poem, justifies the reading of the similes in light of traditional referentiality in that the poem itself directs us to think of it as a part of a tradition and to pay close attention to *how* it tells its story. The
Iliad, as a poem, is very much concerned with what a poem does. One of the major tasks of a poem is to keep memory alive. This notion of keeping memories alive is central to the "Choice of Achilleus" in Book 9. There Achilleus tells Agamemnon's embassy that he must choose between early death, which will bring with it κλέος ἄφθατον, and long life, which will bring obscurity (9.410-416). When the Homeric poems talk of κλέος, they are talking of epic poetic tradition that keeps κλέος alive.1 Achilleus' choice is thus a choice between having epic poetry sung about him or not having epic poetry sung about him. To die young in battle is to have done something worthy of song, and so the Iliad shows itself here very much aware of its own role in a tradition that poetically preserves its culture's memory of its own traditions and views about what it values. Through this notion of κλέος ἄφθατον the Iliad stresses both the importance of tradition and the fact that it is part of a tradition.2 This insistence on the part of the Iliad gives rise to the notion that one must study the poem through considering tradition and traditional referentiality.

The Iliad also tells us that the preservation of memory is not merely a matter of presenting a story that can be immediately and transparently understood.3 The poem itself tells us that how a story gets told matters for what the story is going to mean. This issue of the form of story-telling crystallizes in the Iliad around notions of praise and blame. The Iliad itself, as a story of the κλέα ἄνδρῶν, allies itself with the traditions of praise poetry, in

---

1See, for example, Nagy 1974 and 1979, especially pp. 211-276.

2Cf. Martin 1989:47, 77-88 on how the Iliad gives the performance of memory first place in its hierarchy of categories of speech.

3Cf. Hainsworth 1992:69, who notes that, "traditional stories are not a neutral means of expression."
part by setting itself against traditions of blame poetry embodied by the speech of Thersites in Book 2.225-242 and by the flying exchange between Achilleus and Aineias in Book 20.176-258. In Thersites' speech especially (with which we can compare Achilleus' long speech to Thetis in Book 1.365-392) we see how the blaming stance can change the way material is portrayed and how, then, this material demands that its audience take it up. Or, rather, we see that the blaming stance tells a story that is materially different from that told by the praising stance, while claiming, in the case of Thersites, to be representing the same situation. We see here, then, that the poem tells us that meaning is not separate from the explicit utterance, that there is no difference between form and content. That is, we learn from examining praise and blame as ways of telling a story that we must pay close attention to how the Iliad tells its story; we must pay attention to formal features, such as the fact that some part of the story is told as a simile. We cannot simply interpret the content, but must interpret the form of expression that provides the content in order to understand the story of the Iliad. In its recognition of itself as a traditional poem and in its recognition of the principle that form and content are inseparable, then, the Iliad itself invites an interpretation that invokes the logic of traditional referentiality and that attempts to explain why it is fitting that the poem expresses itself where it does with a simile.

In what follows, then, I will be attempting a reconstruction of one semantic element of the Iliadic tradition: the horse. In attempting such a reconstruction of the Iliad, we must keep in mind the organic connection between traditional themes and traditional diction

---

4See Nagy 1979:253-264 for a thorough analysis of the relationship between Thersites' speech and blame poetry such as Archilochos' iambics. See also Martin 1989:65-77 for an account of competitive abusive speech in the Iliad.
that has been the theme in recent work in traditional referentiality and oral traditional poetics, namely, that the same ideas tend to be expressed in the same way in the same words. Consequently, there develops an interplay between theme and diction; just as occurrences of the same theme will evoke the same diction, so occurrences of the same diction will evoke the same theme.\(^5\) Traditional oral poetry, handed down, performed, developed over long periods of time through countless manifestations, expresses its meaning in ways that rely not only upon the explicit and obvious meanings of words and themes, but upon the very familiarity of those words and themes. This familiarity is at play both for the poet and for the audience, and so serves as a principle both for composition and for interpretation.\(^6\) In short, particular sets of traditional language will rely upon and contain implicitly particular structures of meaning and particular themes. To understand any passage in the *Iliad* - and the similes are no exception - we must try to reconstruct for ourselves the traditional meaning that is condensed in that passage. We must examine other occurrences of the lines, the formulae, the vocabulary, similar narrative moments, and the like. From this kind of preliminary examination we can come to see the structures of meaning implicit in our passage and we can begin to develop an interpretation of the passage that will more adequately take into account what that passage and its context will or will not allow interpreters to say of them. We will have undertaken to understand our passage in its own terms.

\(^5\)See, for example, Foley 1990:7-9; Muellner 1990:83n42; Nagy 1979:2-3.

\(^6\)There is no need here to open up issues of logical or causal priority of theme and diction, although such issues may well be relevant in other contexts.
In this chapter I will attempt to unpack the implicit traditional meaning of only two words that occur in two similes in *Iliad* 22, ἵππος ἀεθλοφόρος. We will discover that these two words alone open up and rely on a large set of themes and structures that can inform our understanding of the particular contexts in which these two words occur. Further, we will take account of the precise kind of situation in which these words occur - in similes. When faced with a simile, we must ask what task it fulfills, what meaning it contains, in light of a larger account of epic poetics. We must ask why the poem or the poetic tradition found that it could express itself at this point only through a structure that says, "it was like this...". 

§1. *The Transformative Simile* 

To answer the question of why the poem uses a horse simile, I will discuss what I call the *transformative* function of some of the similes. I will argue in what follows that in some cases the simile can serve to take the narrative moment to which it is being compared and turn that moment into itself in a way that extends beyond the immediate context in which the simile occurs. That is, the likeness posited in the simile becomes an identification within the narrative in that the narrative will be seen to assume that the image of the simile is now being enacted in the narrative through the transference of the image out of the simile and into the narrative. This transformation can extend more or less broadly through specific narrative passages. Some of the similes in the *Iliad* thus will be seen to

---

7 Compare here Nagy 1983:36, discussing the recognition and interpretation of σῆματα in Homer. Nagy argues that any recognition of a σῆμα implies an act of interpretation. Cf. de Jong 1987:136 who argues that similes are interpretations of narrative. The simile, as a comparison, *invites* interpretation by asking us to take a view of the narrative that the narrative itself does not transparently lead us to take.
demand not only that we recognize and adhere to the demands the simile puts on us to interpret given narrative moments in light of a particular structure of meaning but that we see this structure actively at play as an essential feature in the narrative proper in the sense that to remove the simile would undermine the narrative.8 Two examples of such a transformative simile will make the account more clear.

At 13.528-529 we see a brief simile for Meriones. Here Meriones, as he rushes at Deiphobos to drive him from the corpse of Ascalaphos, is likened to swift Ares, Μηριόνης δὲ θοὸ ἀτάλαντος Ἀρηvements βραχίονα τύψεν ἐπάλμενος. The comparison of a warrior to Ares is common in the Iliad, occurring twenty times, four of which are for Meriones.9 In general, similes in which a character is compared to a god in the Homeric poems appear at points in which we see a warrior entering battle, especially in cases in which a single warrior's attack is being described, or at points where we see characters entering or re-entering the narrative.10 In this case we see Meriones alone attack Deiphobos in a scene that forms part of the book in which Meriones is most actively present in the Iliad. The comparison to swift Ares here stresses Meriones' martial valour and the speed with which he moves against Deiphobos.

There is more going on in this brief image than the illustration of conventional battle virtues in a conventional way, however. When we look at the broader narrative context

---

8Compare here Riezler 1936:254, who argues that the similes can function as a parallel narrative, which is a peculiarity of the Homeric simile. Cf. also Hampe 1952.

92.477-479, 627; 5.576; 7.208-211; 8.215; 11.295, etc. For Meriones 13.295, 298, 328, and Meriones = Enualios 2.651.

we discover that Askalaphos is a son of Ares (2.511-512, 9.82, and in our passage, 13.519).

Further, Ares here is unable to see or learn of or prevent his son's death because he is held on Olympos by the commands of Zeus, who has covered Olympos with golden clouds that apparently prevent the other gods from seeing what is taking place on the battlefield (13.521-525). So Ares, although a god, is unable to help his son at this moment of peril, even though in similar situations other gods are able to see and help their own sons or favourites. The poem has set up a narrative situation in which the very thing that one would expect to happen when the son of a god is threatened on the battlefield - that the god will at least notice, if not aid or protect the son - cannot happen, because Zeus has made it so that Ares cannot see what has happened and consequently can do nothing about it. Meriones here, in preventing Deiphobos from stripping Askalaphos' corpse, is acting as Ares would in this situation if he could. The son of the god is thus still protected by his father, but here in the person of Meriones. Meriones here is not merely like Ares, he is Ares to Askalaphos, and to the audience, insofar as they are able to see him acting towards Askalaphos as his father would.

So we see here the simile not merely illustrating the swift moves of an attacking warrior, but transforming that warrior into the very subject of the comparison, and thereby crystallizing a common narrative moment, the protection of a god's son by his parent. We cannot have the death of a god's son go unremarked by the god in the Iliad, and so, when the demands of the narrative have made it impossible for Ares to in fact be aware of Askalaphos' death, the poem uses another strategy to make Ares see this death and act on it in

---

the appropriate way. For the moment in which he is defending Askalaphos' corpse from Deiphobos, Meriones serves as Ares for the narrative.

We see this structure again in the simile for Patroklos contained in Achilleus' speech at the beginning of Book 16. Achilleus asks Patroklos why he has come crying to Achilleus ἡδε κοῦρη/νηπίη (16.7-8). As Roberto Nickel has shown, Achilleus here, in speaking of Patroklos as a female, is allowing Patroklos to take on the role of the person who turns the angry one from her or his wrath in the typical wrath-withdrawal-return motif, as this figure is always a female figure.\(^\text{12}\) That is, Achilleus' wrath at Agamemnon, his withdrawal from fighting, and his eventual return to battle after Patroklos' death together form a common traditional narrative motif: the motif of wrath-withdrawal-return. This motif is found fully articulated for Meleagros at Iliad 9.529-599, for Demeter in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, and less articulated for Hera in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo (305-355). In the fully articulated versions of this motif, a mediating figure who turns the angry figure away from her or his wrath and back to the sphere from which she or he has withdrawn is always present. This figure is always female: Kleopatra for Meleagros and Persephone for Demeter.

This simile at the beginning of Iliad 16, then, in likening Patroklos to a girl, allows Patroklos, whose death at Hektor's hands sends Achilleus back into battle after his refusal to fight, to be the traditionally necessary female figure. The Iliad's narrative is not set up in such a way as to allow a manifest female figure to persuade Achilleus back to the fighting; further, it demands that the death of Patroklos be the motivation for Achilleus' refusal to fight.

\(^\text{12}\)Nickel 1997:257, 281-282. Kakridis 1949:22-33 examines in some detail the similarities between Patroklos and Kleopatra in the story of Meleagros' wrath in Iliad 9, although he does not draw any conclusions about those similarities in light of the simile in Book 16.
Consequently, in order for the poem to articulate the traditional motif that structures the entire narrative, a means must be found to have a female figure turn Achilleus back to battle. Only through the mediation of the simile can this motif be enacted; the simile of the little girl allows Patroklos to be the girl who turns Achilleus from his wrath and returns him to battle. So, here again we see the simile transforming the explicit narrative moment into something else that would otherwise be absent from it.

Similes, then, can be transformative in the narrative. Similes, that is, can set up interpretative frames through which the audience is compelled to see and understand the characters and events beyond the narrow purview of the simile itself. When the simile itself, the words, here θοὺ ἀτάλαντος Ἀρηί η ὄτε κοῦρη νηπίη, have finished being uttered, it is the case that Meriones remains Ares for a little while and Patroklos becomes the necessary mediating female figure in the turning aside of Achilleus' wrath; Meriones is transformed into Ares and Patroklos into a girl crying for her mother for these episodes in the narrative.

Note also that for the simile to function transformatively, the surrounding narrative must support and even demand the transformation. There must be present in the surrounding context elements that can interact with the elements present in the simile in such a way as to allow for the identification of the simile and the narrative; these elements must allow for the simile to function as an essential route for the continuation of the narrative.13

We have seen this interaction and necessity in the cases we have examined above, where we

---

13Cf. Nagler 1967:307, who argues that poetic signification is always inherent in the traditional *Gestalt*, but that it must be brought "into obvious resonance" with the poetic context in order to be active.
have seen that only through the similes are a common narrative moment (the assistance of a
god's son or favourite by the god at a moment of peril) and a traditional motif (the turning
aside from wrath by a female figure in the wrath-withdrawal-return motif) enacted.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsection 2. \textit{Iliad} 22.21-24, 162-166

Now that we have seen in outline how the transformative simile works, we
will turn our attention to another section of the \textit{Iliad}, in which the transformative simile plays
a larger and thematically more significant role. The similes in Book 22 depict the final
combat between Hektor and Achilleus, watched by all of the characters in the poem, the
Trojans from the walls of the city, the Achaians from the edges of the field, and the gods
from Olympos. We will see in our discussion of Book 22 that the similes at 21 ff., where
Achilleus is compared to a prize-winning racehorse, and at 162 ff., where both Achilleus and
Hektor are compared to prize-winning racehorses, function transformatively for the rest of
the encounter between Achilleus and Hektor. Specifically, these similes set up an
interpretative direction for the rest of this episode that demands that Achilleus’ pursuit of
Hektor around the walls of Troy be understood as a race at a funeral competition.

\textsuperscript{14}Cf. Riezler 1936:255, who argues that the similes can often express what the narrative cannot,
and, further, that the similes can sometimes show how the narrative could or should have developed,
but did not develop.

We can compare here the question of whether the comparisons of gods to birds, as at 7.58,
14.290-291, 15.237-238, etc., are similes asserting a likeness or accounts of actual metamorphoses
by the gods. See Scott 1974:77, who notes that bird similes for gods hark back to divine epiphanies.
Also Moulton 1977:138, who notes it is not always easy to tell if we are dealing with similes or
a) ἵππος ἀεθλοφόρος in Iliad 22

The first section of Book 22 is notable for the concentration of similes; fourteen similes occur within the first two hundred lines, a number that is unparalleled elsewhere in the poem. The first of the similes that will be relevant for us here occurs at 22.21-24. Here Achilleus, once Apollo reveals that Achilleus has been pursuing him and not Agenor across the field, heads back towards the city,

οὗ εἰπὼν προτὶ ἀστυ μέγα φρονέων ἐβεβήκει,
σενάμενος οὗ θ' ἵππος ἀεθλοφόρος σύν ὄχεων,
δὲ ρὰ τε ρεία θέσιν τιταινόμενος πεδίοιο.
οὗ Ἀχιλεὺς λαιψηρὰ πόδας καὶ γούνατ' ἐνώμα.

He spoke, and stalked away against the city, with high thoughts in mind, and in tearing speed, like a racehorse with his chariot who runs lightly as he pulls the chariot over the flat land. Such was the action of Achilleus in feet and quick knees.

The simile here serves to illustrate the speed with which Achilleus runs back towards the city: he runs as swiftly as a racehorse, and, like the horse, he runs across a plain. The aspect of this simile that we will consider in order to see its transformative character is the reference in line 22 to the ἀεθλοφόρος ἵππος. The other simile with which we will be concerned here is that for Hektor and Achilleus as they run around the walls of the city. Here again the

---

15 Although compare Book 2, for the lead-up to the catalogue of ships, where we have seven similes in twenty-eight lines, and Book 1, where we see thirteen similes within two hundred lines leading up to the aristeia of Agamemnon.

16 All translations here will come from R. Lattimore's 1951 translation of the Iliad.

17 Dunkle 1996-1997:228-229 notes that this simile stressing Achilleus' speed in running also reminds us that Achilleus has the fastest horses; his speed, then, takes the form of swiftness of foot and swiftness of horses. Dunkle also notes (229) that the prize-winning horse comparisons look forward to the funeral contests of Book 23.
comparison is to racehorses,

\[\text{όως δε δτ' ἀεθλοφόροι περὶ τέρματα μόνες ἵπποι ῥήμας μᾶλα τρωχώσι: τὸ δὲ μέγα κεῖται ἄεθλον, ἣ τρίτος ἡ γυνὴ, ἀνδρὸς κατατεθνηώτος· ὦς τῷ τρῖς Πριάμου πόλιν πέρι δινηθήτην καρπαλίμωσι πόδεσοι.} \text{(22.162-166)}\]

As when about the turnposts racing single-foot horses
run at full speed, when a great prize is laid up for their winning,
a tripod or a woman, in games for a man's funeral,
so these two swept whirling about the city of Priam
in the speed of their feet.

As with the simile at 22.21 for Achilleus, this simile serves most simply to illustrate the
speed with which Hektor and Achilleus run around Troy's walls. This simile describes an
actual competition, and thereby captures the struggle between Achilleus and Hektor for
Hektor's life, which corresponds to the prize for which the horses in this simile are racing.
These horses are running around a course, just as Hektor and Achilleus run a circuit around
Troy. Here again our first concern will be the designation of Hektor and Achilleus as
ἀεθλοφόροι ἵπποι.

The connection between horse-racing and funeral games is of course explicit
in the second simile at 162 ff. Here the horses are racing for a prize for a man who has died.
This connection is not, however, explicit in our first simile, and part of my goal in what
follows is to demonstrate how the very words ἀεθλοφόρος ἵππος carry with them the notion
of competition at funeral games. Towards this goal I will pursue two different but
complementary lines of inquiry. The first concern will be to establish what the implicit
traditional meaning of this phrase is by examining other occurrences of these two words in
the Iliad. My aim here will be to show just what it would have been possible for a
contemporary audience to understand when they heard the phrase. The tools for performing this task will come largely from recent oral theory, which has done much to develop notions of maximal interpretative weight for oral poetry. In essence, we will be trying to discover as much of the traditional context of this phrase, ἀεθλοφόρος ἵππος, as we can from poetic diction. Our second concern will be to consider more general ancient Greek accounts of the origin and nature of athletic competitions. This consideration will reveal that there is a strong tradition that places the origins of all the major athletic competitions, like the Olympic and Nemean Games, in funeral games for dead heroes. Finally, we will examine the broader issue of the origins of funeral games. Here we will see that such games developed out of a general human desire for revenge for the death of a loved one much like Achilleus' desire for revenge for the death of Patroklos. This examination will establish that for the archaic Greeks, and for the Homeric poems, to speak at all of prize-winning or of athletic competition is to speak of funeral games. In this context, it will be possible to see how these two similes can transform the pursuit of Hektor around the walls of the city into a race at the funeral games for Patroklos.

The phrase ἀεθλοφόρος ἵππος (or its plural) occurs only twice in the Iliad, five times when we include the contracted ἀθλοφόρος ἵππος. The two occurrences of the uncontracted form are in our similes from book 22. The other, contracted, occurrences are at 9.123-124 = 9.265-266, and 11.698. The occurrences in Book 9 are, first, in the speech of Agamemnon listing the prizes Agamemnon will give to Achilleus if Achilleus will return to battle, the second in Odysseus' speech to Achilleus, in which he repeats almost verbatim the list given originally by Agamemnon. In Book 11 the phrase occurs in Nestor's speech to
Patroklos, in which Nestor tells the story of the battle between the people of Pylos and the Epeians.

First of all we must note that the idea of prize-winning horses in Homer does not explicitly attach itself to any kind of athletic competition besides funeral games. We see horses racing for prizes at the games for Patroklos in Book 23 and we see the horses racing at funeral games in the simile at 22.161 ff. In the other occurrences, the precise nature of the competition at which the horses win or have won prizes is not expressed. Nonetheless the simile and the race in Iliad 23 do establish an Iliadic association between prize-winning horses and competitions at funeral games.

If we turn our attention away from the particular competition of the horse race we discover first that in the Homeric poems, the only kinds of athletic competitions at which prizes are said explicitly to be won are funeral games. The prize-winning horses of the simile at 22.161-164 are running for the ἀσθλον ... ἀνδρὸς κατατεθνήτος, we see the prizes being set up for Patroklos' games in 23, and we have Agamemnon's description of the funeral games of Achilles at Odyssey 24.85-96, in which Thetis sets up the prizes for the competitions. Instances in the Iliad in which prizes are said to be won or competed for, but in which the occasion of the competition is not stated, are as follows: 9.124, where Agamemnon offers Achilles prize-winning horses that have won him much wealth, 9.266-269, in which Odysseus repeats Agamemnon's offer of prize-winning horses to Achilles, 11.699, where Nestor speaks of how Augeias stole a four-horse chariot that was going after a prize from Neleus, and 16.590, a simile that likens the distance the Trojans yield before the
Achaians to the distance a man throws a javelin in a contest or in war. In all of these instances, except perhaps for that at 11.699, there is not enough information given in the context to tell what sort of competition is being called to mind by ἀεθλον. From the explicit references to funeral games at 22.161 ff. and in Book 23, and from the fact that at the only other athletic competition that we see in the Homeric poems, the contests at the banquet Alkinoos holds for Odysseus in Book 8, there is no mention of prizes for the competitions, scholars have concluded that the only type of competition at which prizes are offered, as far as the Iliad and the Odyssey are concerned, is a funeral game.

b) Horses, Competitions, and Funerals in Material Remains and Larger Greek Culture

It appears that the Iliad and the Odyssey regard prizes as being won only at funeral games and that associations between horses and funerals underlie other portions of the Iliad besides the horse-racing similes of Book 22. Let us turn now to an examination of the general views that archaic Greek culture held upon the relation between horses and funerals. We will look first, briefly, at the evidence offered by graphic art, which we will see maintains the association between horses and funerals.

---

18 We also have 3.126, 8.363, 15.639, and 19.133, in which ἀεθλον means more generally "struggle" or "labour," most often the struggle or labour of Herakles for Eurystheus. And we can compare uses of the verb ἀεθλεύω, which means "to struggle or labour" at 7.453, 15.30, 24.274, and "to compete" at 4.389.

19 See Appendix 1, where I argue that the traditional themes and associations of Nestor and his family do support the idea that the competition here is in fact a competition at funeral games.

funerals we see in graphic art will also clarify for us one aspect of the relationship between horses and funerals: we will see that graphic art consistently places horse and chariots in the world of the living, as part of how those left alive commemorate and respond to death.  

A connection between horses and funerals outside of the text of the Iliad is found in the funeral practices and in the graphic art of the Mycenaean world. With the introduction of the horse to the Mycenaean world, there was a change in the funeral practices of these people; horses began to be buried and images of horses, particularly of horses and chariots, whether they be figurines or paintings upon kraters or lamakes, are found in tombs. Further, the Mycenaen inscribed images of chariot races upon grave stelai; these images have most frequently been interpreted as depictions of chariot races at funer al games. Lorimer and Benson suggest that the use of these images of horses and chariots calls upon the aristocratic associations of the horse and horse-related practices, such as hunting and war, in their relations with the deceased and serve to ennoble the deceased by associating him with these recognized signs of aristocratic pursuits. Benson further suggests that the presence of this kind of image could be an indication of a general knowledge in the Aegean and the Near East of a more ancient Near Eastern practice of  

---

21 What follows here necessarily involves an expanded recapitulation of some of the material discussed in Chapter 2.


interring chariots and teams of draught animals in the tombs of kings or nobles.\textsuperscript{25} Moreover, Benson argues that the practice of burying horses and chariots seen, for example, on Cyprus in the eighth and seventh centuries is not simply an imitation of Homeric practice, as this behaviour is found also in Iron Age Italy and France.\textsuperscript{26} Archaeology thus supports the idea that the association of horses, chariots, and funerals is a cultural idea that underlies what we see in the Homeric poems.

Further, we see in graphic art that the association between horses, chariots, and funerals carries no discernible cultic references. That is, the horse and chariot are never used to carry the deceased to the land of the dead. Rather, they are present to serve the ennobling function of the funeral procession. The image of the horse serves to elevate the deceased to the status of a king or hero.\textsuperscript{27} The horse in Greek myth likewise never serves to carry the dead to the afterlife. So here we are dealing with representations of the behaviour of the living at a funeral, not of the behaviour of the dead.

Like the Homeric similes, which require an educated interpreter to unpack the denseness of cultural significance they carry, ancient graphic art can also be simultaneously

\textsuperscript{25}Benson 1970:30.

\textsuperscript{26}Benson 1970:30.

\textsuperscript{27}Cf. Morris 1987:94-96, who argues that the burial record for Greece to which we have access is, for the most part, that of the upper classes. The burials of the lower classes are invisible to us because of the absence of material remains. Thus, burials marked by horse images are likely already the burials of the upper classes, which strive to continue to differentiate themselves from the lower classes even in death.

Compare Boardman 1977, who argues that the 192 figures in, on, and around the horses and chariots on the Parthenon Frieze are the 192 Athenian dead from the battle of Marathon. The horse imagery on the frieze, Boardman argues, is geared to ennoble these dead by heroizing them.
very sparse and very dense. Geometric painting in particular is notable for the sparseness and simplicity of its images. Nonetheless, it is recognized that, despite this apparent simplicity (once regarded as primitive), these images contain a great deal of information that is condensed or abbreviated in them. This abbreviation can be fairly straightforward, as in a representation of horses and chariot on a fifteenth century gem from Knossos, which does not include explicitly a representation of the yoke binding the two horses, but which positions the collar of the front horse in such a way as to indicate clearly where the yoke should be. Lorimer remarks of this representation that the spectator is expected to supply the image of the yoke her or himself.\(^28\)

We see this kind of abbreviation at work in a more complex way in representations of single horses in graphic art. Benson argues that the association of horses and chariots in Greece until the seventh century was so strong that any representation of a single horse can be understood as an abbreviation for a representation of horses and a chariot. This association holds, Benson argues, because, for the Greeks, the horse was primarily an animal that pulled the carriage until the seventh century, not a riding animal. Thus, an isolated horse stands for a chariot and team and, Benson argues further, for the more particular idea of the funeral procession.\(^29\)

Notice here that, according to Benson's analysis, this idea of abbreviation holds not merely for the sketching in of physical detail, as with Lorimer's remark about the absent yoke, but for the supplying of whole structures of ritual and belief, as with the

\(^{28}\)Lorimer 1950:312.

\(^{29}\)Benson 1970:23.
association of the single horse with not only a chariot and team but with a funeral procession. Here we see that the individual horse calls to mind a traditional ritual and pattern of behaviour. This association between the horse and the funeral procession is not one that those of us who are not members of archaic Greek culture are in a position to make without considerable study and research, but is nonetheless one which the Greeks could make because this association was ready to hand for them. Both the graphic tradition and the poetic tradition rely upon the same broad set of cultural patterns and behaviours here; both can rely upon their condensed images' being understood by their audiences to mean not only what they explicitly say, but what they implicitly say as well. We should thus expect that the hearers of the Iliad could similarly recognize the funerary context of representations of prize-winning horses within the poem.

Let us now consider Greek views on athletic competition in general. There are traditions that place the origins of all of the major panhellenic games, the Olympic, Pythian, Isthmian, and Nemean, in funeral games. From the hypotheses to the Isthmian and Nemean odes of Pindar, we learn that the Olympic games were instituted as funeral games for Pelops, the Pythian for the python slain by Apollo, the Isthmian for Sinis or for Melikertes, son of Ino and Athamas, and the Nemean for Archemoros, son of Lykourgos. The Isthmian and Nemean games were, later, rededicated to Olympian gods; the Isthmian for Poseidon (by the people of Corinth) and the Nemean for Zeus (by Herakles). For the Greeks themselves, then, the very idea of athletic competition, of ἀθλοι or ἀθλα, is inseparable from the idea of

30Isthmian: Drachmann II.192-195.4; Nemean: Drachmann II.1-5.20. Cf. Pindar Olympia 2.3, Herakles established the Olympic games with spoils of war, and O. 3.13-15, Herakles made the olive the μήμα of the games in Olympia.
funeral games. I have referred to these accounts of the origins of the panhellenic games, even though we locate the origins of these games for the most part after the crystallization of the Homeric poems, because they attest to a more general Greek view of the nature of athletic competition. Indeed, if this view is entirely shaped by the Homeric view, it precisely attests to the correlating of competitions and funerals in the Homeric poems. This identification of athletics and death practise in the origin of Greek athletic competitions is supported in modern anthropology in the work of Karl Meuli, who further traces these origins to a ritual duel to the death (a version of which, I shall go on to argue, is found in the final confrontation of Achilleus and Hektor.)

In his article, "Der Ursprung der Olympischen Spiele," Meuli argues that the fully developed form of the athletic festival that we see in the Olympic games originates ultimately in a general human desire for revenge upon the death of an intimate. Meuli's account relies upon comparative ethnology; he finds examples of what he describes as the various stages of the development of this kind of death practise, relying most heavily upon groups who belong to the same cultural circle and type as the early Greeks (nomadic herders), and then shows how we can see the logic underlying these practises consistently worked out in the high culture of the Greeks. An important point for Meuli (and ultimately for my own arguments here) is the absence of self-understanding in ritual behaviour. Meuli reminds us that the custom he is discussing here is no longer understood, but just practised, and that,

---

31Meuli 1975.

over time, new meanings have been given to the inherited forms of ritual.\textsuperscript{33}

In brief, Meuli argues that a very common feature of human cultures is a view of human death as unnatural; death comes into the world after the world has already come into being, often as a result of human sin or stupidity. All deaths, then, must be caused by an agent, often a sorcerer. As some individual person is always responsible for any death, all deaths thus become murders. As such, all deaths demand vengeance.

When someone dies, those left behind try to find the individual responsible for the death; for this task, they use various means, including dissection and divination. When the investigation points to a potentially guilty person, the family of the dead person challenges the alleged killer to engage in a ritual combat with advocates from the family; Meuli refers to this combat as the \textit{Gottesurteil}.\textsuperscript{34} If the alleged killer dies in the fight, guilt is proven, if not, then the search must begin again. This combat, which most often occurs as a duel, serves as trial, judgement, and penalty all in one act.

From this basic ritual duel to the death, over time, come the kind of athletic competitions we see in the ancient Greek festivals. The first step in this development is the move from combat to the death to combat in which blood must be shed.\textsuperscript{35} Over time this ritual combat is restricted to death practise for noble individuals, and moves further from its

\textsuperscript{33}Meuli 1975:883, 893. Cf. 886, where Meuli says that the Greeks understood the nature of their athletic competitions as well as most people from European cultures understand why mourners wear black clothes.

\textsuperscript{34}Meuli 1975:891.

\textsuperscript{35}Cf. Malten 1925:1861 who likewise links the armed duel to the origins of funerary competition, although he places the origin of these competitions in human sacrifice at funerals.
original life or death result. We see bloody duels as part of annual celebrations for dead family members, which over time themselves take on a more and more festive character. Meuli argues that at this stage this form of death practic entered Greece. Celebrations for dead family members evolve into celebrations for ancestor heroes, which ultimately are taken up into the structure of Olympian worship.36

From Meuli's account of the origins of the Olympic games, I take two points in particular: the organic connection between athletic competition in general and funeral games, and the logic of the armed duel to the death as trial, judgement, and penalty. I will return to the second point in my discussion of Iliad 22 as funeral games. For now, I point out with respect to the connection Meuli makes between athletics and death practic that Meuli's remarks about ritual behaviour in general will hold true in a similar way for oral poetic language: structures can be preserved over time for which new meanings develop, but in which the essential logic remains implicit.37 We return now to Achilleus' pursuit of Hektor in Iliad 22 as a race at funeral games.

36 Meuli discounts the story of the early history of the Olympic games in Hippias of Elis, which states that the games originally consisted only of foot races for young men, on the grounds that Hippias' account in general is concerned to justify later Elian domination of the area around Olympia with evidence of early Elian dominance. Meuli points to the evidence of Plutarch (Quaest. conviv. 5.2 675C) that the most ancient Olympic games contained a duel with weapons, a μονομαχίας ἀγών that may lead to the death of the loser. On this topic in general compare Burkert 1985:106-107, 190-194, who adopts Meuli's account of the origins of funeral games. Burkert adds, 193, that the Bronze Age war chariot stayed in use "virtually only for such agones."

37 See my discussion of the noun epithet phrase Τελαμώνιος Ἀιας in Chapter 5, which deals with related issues.
c) The Similes of Book 22 in Light of the Expanded Semantics of the Horse

One of the major themes of the *Iliad* is the death of Achilleus, which does not occur explicitly within the narrative of this poem. It does occur implicitly through the deaths of Patroklos and Hektor and is present as an event that will take place in the very near future once Patroklos has died and Achilleus decides to return to battle. At 18.95-96, Thetis warns Achilleus not to return to battle to kill Hektor, because his death must necessarily follow shortly upon Hektor's. Then at 22.358-360, as Hektor dies, he warns Achilleus of his imminent death at the hands of Paris and Apollo. Thus Achilleus' death is in its way as much a part of the *Iliad* as the deaths of Patroklos or Hektor. Achilleus dies through the persons of Patroklos and Hektor.38

Another major concern of the *Iliad* is the burial of dead heroes. This concern manifests itself most clearly in the denial of burial to the corpses of foes, which is the victor's way of proclaiming his final and greatest control over his enemy: to throw a body to the dogs is to show most clearly that one's enemy is not a human being to whom one owes the same kind of care and respect that one owes to one's own people.39 And yet Achilleus' first concern upon receiving Patroklos' corpse at 18.233-238 is not to arrange Patroklos' funeral, but to wreak vengeance on Hektor and the Trojans; Patroklos must wait until Achilleus kills Hektor and captures twelve Trojan youths for sacrifice at Patroklos' pyre (18.333-340). Once Achilleus has killed Hektor and captured his Trojan victims, the burial is still delayed; Patroklos himself must come to Achilleus to demand that he be buried as quickly as possible.

because without burial he cannot join the company of the dead (23.65-74). Why does the poem add this final delay to Patroklos' burial? In part the answer lies in our being able to say that Patroklos does indeed receive his funeral games before the games that take place in Book 23. In the pursuit of Hektor around the walls of the city in Book 22, which is likened to the running of horses at funeral games for a dead man, we see the ritual celebration for Patroklos' death. Thus the transformative similes of the ἀθηλοφόροι ἵπποι allow us to see taking place events that the poem itself cannot allow to occur explicitly and actually.

We see that the final confrontation between Achilles and Hektor is very much like the Gottesurteil as Meuli describes it. Achilles is enraged at the death of Patroklos; Hektor killed Patroklos, and so, in Achilles' view, Achilles must avenge this killing by killing Hektor; Achilles regards Hektor, not just as the man who has slain Patroklos in battle, but as his murderer, his φονεύς (18.335). The view of Patroklos' death Achilles takes in the Iliad is in some ways out of keeping with the situation in which the death occurs, as Patroklos is killed in battle, a fate that warriors expect. This idea is expressed most clearly in the well-known speech of Sarpedon to Glaukos in Iliad 12, where Sarpedon concludes,

νῦν δ' ἐμπειρός γὰρ κῆρες ἐφεστάσιν θανάτοιο
μυρίαι, ἐς οὐκ ἐστι φυγεῖν βροτόν οὐδ' ὑπαλῦξαι,

40The word φονεύς is rare in the Homeric poems, appearing only here at 18.335, at 9.632, where Aias remarks that a man accepts a price from his brother's φονεύς, and at Odyssey 24.434, where Eupeithes, the father of the suitor, Antinoos, urges his companions to take vengeance on the murderers of their sons and brothers. This unusual word should be taken at its full value in Achilles' mouth.

41Moreover, Hektor is not solely responsible for Patroklos' death; Apollo (16.791-793) and Euphorbos (16.806) both strike him before Hektor at last kills him (16.820-821).
But now, seeing that the spirits of death stand close about us in their thousands, no man can turn aside nor escape them, let us go on and win glory for ourselves, or yield it to others.

Death for a warrior in battle should not incur blame for the killer. In treating Patroklos' death as something which incurs blame for Hektor, Achilleus is treating it as, in essence, a murder. Only in this light does his wrath become explicable. Murder, unlike death in battle, is something that demands vengeance or payment in kind, which Achilleus has determined to wreak from Hektor and all the Trojans. We see this desire for vengeance stated clearly in Achilles' speech to Lukaon in Book 21,

άλλα καὶ ὃς ὀλέσθε κακὸν μόρον, εἰς ὁ κε πάντες
teίσετε Πατρόκλου φόνον καὶ λοιγὸν Ἀχαιῶν,
oi̇c épi νηυίθιο φήσιν ἐπέφευτε νόσοιν ἐμείο. (21.133-135)

And yet even so, die all an evil death, till all of you pay for the death of Patroklos and the slaughter of the Achaians whom you killed beside the running ships, when I was not with them.

Patroklos' death must be paid for with Trojan lives.42

Already we can see here parallels to the Gottesurteil. Any death is viewed as a murder perpetrated by a responsible human agent; so Achilleus views Patroklos' death as a murder at Hektor's hands. The responsible individual must be found and the murder avenged; so Achilleus seeks out Hektor in order to kill him to avenge Patroklos.

When Achilleus and Hektor at last meet on the battlefield there is still room for doubt as to the outcome of their combat. Thetis has indeed warned Achilleus that his

---

42 Cf. 19.90-93; 21.26-28; 22.345-354. Cf. also 9.632-633, where Aias remarks of Achilleus' anger that even someone whose child or brother has been murdered accepts a ransom.
death will come quickly after Hektor’s death (18.96); however, she does not mention a specific time or a specific encounter for Hektor’s death.\(^\text{43}\) Some of Achilleus’ most recent encounters with Trojans in single combat have ended with the Trojans’ rescue by a god (Aineias 20.320-329; Agenor 21.596-598). So, for the characters involved in the narrative, if not for the tradition and the audience, Hektor’s death in this precise encounter with Achilleus is not a certainty.\(^\text{44}\) Hektor himself says that the question of which of Hektor and Achilleus will die is in Zeus’ hands (22.130). This view is to some degree borne out when Zeus debates whether to save Hektor from death (22.168-176); Zeus then goes on to tell Athene to do what she likes to assist Achilleus (22.183-185) and to weigh the κῆρς of Achilleus and Hektor in his scales (22.209-212). Hektor’s fate is the heavier and so it is determined that he, and not Achilleus, will die (22.208-213).\(^\text{45}\)

Again we see parallels to the Gottesurteil. The outcome of the ritual combat is viewed as a reflection of the gods’ judgement as to whether the accused is guilty or innocent. For the accused to die is a sign that the gods find this person guilty; survival is a sign of the gods’ viewing the accused as innocent of the murder. So here Zeus’ decision that

\(^\text{43}\)When Patroklos tells Hektor that Achilleus will soon kill him (16.852-854), he does not state when or how. Likewise Zeus, when he foretells Hektor’s death at 17.201-208, says nothing more specific than that Hektor will not return home from battle.

\(^\text{44}\)Cf. Bakker 1997:30-36, who argues that the hero’s understanding of his own situation is limited and must be distinguished from the understanding of the narrator and the audience who look back on the hero’s experience knowing what is going to happen to him.

\(^\text{45}\)Hektor’s death is, of course, settled before the weighing of the κῆρς. As Richardson 1993 ad 22.208-213 notes, the weighing is the “symbolic representation of the crucial moment at which the decision becomes irrevocable.” That moment is also marked by Apollo’s abandoning Hektor (22.213).
Hektor must die is in a way a divine endorsement of Achilleus' view that Hektor is guilty of murdering Patroklos. In the *Gottesurteil* the judgement of the gods is made manifest in the outcome of a duel to the death; so here, Zeus' judgement is made manifest for Achilleus, Hektor, and the other human characters in the *Iliad* in the outcome of the duel between Achilleus and Hektor. For the audience Zeus’ judgement is explicitly *enacted* in his weighing of Hektor’s and Achilleus’ κηρες at 22.208-213; we do not simply assume that the gods have made a decision, we see and know that they have.

Thus we see that the similes of the ἄεθλοφόροι ἵπποι, carrying with them the implicit structure of funeral games, lead us back to the very logic of the origins of funeral games in the ritual duel to the death, which is itself played out in Book 22 in Achilleus and Hektor's own combat. This combat enacts the same logic as the *Gottesurteil* not merely by being a duel to the death, but by being a duel to the death caused by Achilleus' desire for revenge for Patroklos' "murder" at Hektor's hands, and by having its outcome explicitly decided by the gods. The gods' decision, further, supports Achilleus' view of Hektor as a murderer in that the decision is that Hektor must die in the duel. So we see here trial, in that the fates of Hektor and Achilleus are weighed out by Zeus, judgement, in that Hektor is chosen to die, and penalty, in that Achilleus kills Hektor for the murder of Patroklos. Thus there are elements present in the narrative that correspond to the three moments of the *Gottesurteil*, and that support and interact with the implicit structure of the funeral games and their origins.

I am not arguing here that the logic of the *Gottesurteil* is still explicitly understood by the poems. Rather, my point is that this logic underlies the story we have and
that we, by unpacking as much of the textual, mythical, and religious context of this story as we can, are able to recognize this logic still at play in the story of the *Iliad*. In the story of Achilleus' wrath towards Hektor we see an example of a very ancient practice that has developed into a new kind of practice with new meanings, but which is still nonetheless present and discernible in its new form. We see, further, that the working out of this ancient logic, activated by the similes of the prize-winning horses, allows for the enactment of Patroklos' funeral when the narrative itself cannot yet allow that funeral to take place.

§ 3. Conclusion: Transformation by Simile

I return now to my account of the transformative simile. We have seen that the simile for Meriones as Ares at 13.528, the simile for Patroklos as a girl at 16.7-8, and the similes for Achilleus and Hektor as prize-winning horses at 22.21 f. and 161 ff. all serve to transform the figures or events compared into the subjects of the similes, thereby allowing them to work out traditional themes or motifs which would not otherwise be possible. In *Iliad* 22, the similes comparing Achilleus and Hektor to prize-winning horses, through their inherent funerary associations, transform the pursuit around Troy's walls into a race at funeral games, thereby accomplishing a necessary element of Patroklos' funeral. This funeral is not possible in Book 22 because of Achilleus' insistence on vengeance before all other concerns. In his rage over Patroklos' death Achilleus rejects all forms of peaceful unifying ritual: he will not feast with his fellow Achaians and only reluctantly agrees to let them,

hungry, feast themselves (19.199-214, 270-275);47 he rejects the ritual supplication of Lukaon and instead kills the boy and throws him in the river (21.64-135). This rejection of ritual culminates in Achilleus' refusal to ritually honour the very one whose death has caused such rage and isolation for Achilleus. Only through the similes and the ritual complex inherent in them can Patroklos' funeral take place as the similes transform Hektor's last flight around the city into a race at a funerary competition.

These similes are, in other words, mimetic, in the sense that in them, Meriones performs Ares, Patroklos performs the female who turns the angry one from wrath, and Achilleus and Hektor perform a race at funeral games and the Gottesurteil. Each of these performances is a re-performance in that we are only able to recognize the degree to which, for example, Meriones is being Ares because we already know that in a situation in which a god's child is threatened on the battlefield, the god will try to intervene to assist that child. In order for the simile to function transformatively/mimetically here, we must already be familiar with the narrative structure the simile calls into play and reperforms. Simile shares this element of reperformance with ritual in that all rituals are mimetic re-enactments of previous enactments of a particular form of behaviour.48

47The rejection of the feast here is also the rejection of reconciliation with Agamemnon, who wants to present Achilleus with all his promised gifts in the context of a feast (19.185-197). Cf. Nagy 1979:128-131 on the relationship of the Aitakids and the feast.

48For the Greeks, at least, every ritual has its mythic aition, a first performance of the ritual behaviour which serves as the model for all subsequent reperformances of the ritual. On mimesis as ritual re-enactment, see Nagy 1990:44-45. Cf. Calame 1977 on the origins of rituals for Artemis at Ephesus and at Brauron in Athens, who notes (1.1.81) that the act of devotion becomes an act which repeats itself, and thus a proper ritual act. On Brauron, and the maidens who imitate bears, Calame notes that the girls call to mind, through their mimesis, the original ritual act (1.187).
Transformative similes and ritual also share another important characteristic: through them activity becomes possible that is not otherwise allowed. Thus, in the ritual bloody duel that forms the base of the Gottesurteil, it is possible and necessary to kill or wound another human being. The rules of everyday behaviour are put aside so that the rules of ritual may take over. In the transformative simile also the strictures of the narrative context are put aside so that another set of rules - in the cases we have examined, the rules of traditional themes and moments - can take over. These similes allow the working out of deep implicit traditional narrative desires that the narrative at these moments will not admit. They thus transform the narrative into what it really wants to be; they recognize and realize the driving logic of the poems when the narrative itself cannot.

---

49 Again, see Riezler 1936:259. On ritual, see Burkert 1985:54-58, 247-248, where Burkert argues that ritual necessarily suspends the laws of normal life and activity and demands certain kinds of transgressive acts.
The repeated horse simile for Paris and Hektor at *Iliad* 6.506 ff. and 15.263 ff. has attracted much attention from Homeric scholars. A large part of scholarly discussion has devoted itself to trying to see how this simile can be appropriate to both Paris and Hektor in these two contexts. In what follows I will argue that the simile functions in precisely the same way in each of its appearances: for both Paris and Hektor it serves to redeem them as warriors at times when their status as such is questionable. I will argue, first, that this simile is a part of a general narrative pattern common to both contexts. Here I will compare another repeated simile, in which Telamonian Aias and Menelaos are compared to lions withdrawing from a farmyard, to show that repeated long similes can be used as parts of narrative patterns and can be seen to serve similar functions within these patterns. The horse simile will reveal itself as a simile describing a return to one's proper place. In the second section of this paper, I will discuss what the proper place is to which both Paris and Hektor are returning. This proper place will be the battlefield; both Paris and Hektor, as warriors, are returning from a withdrawal from the battlefield that has taken them from this proper place. The third and final section will discuss the efforts both Paris and Hektor make to define themselves as
warriors in the face of others' attempts to keep them inside the city, safe from battle, but tied to the demands of city life. I will argue that, in the *Iliad*, the only place for a warrior is on the battlefield and that warriors tied to the city cannot live up to the *Iliad*'s ideas of what a warrior properly is. Paris and Hektor will be seen to be redeemed from their unheroic ties to the city through this simile. I will conclude that the horse simile is appropriate and understandable for both of these figures as it serves to link them, through the narrative pattern in which it is embedded, to the great hero of the *Iliad*, Achilles.

§ 1. *The Long Repeated Simile and Narrative Patterns*

My continuing goal is to show that similes are not "detachable" from the narrative, that they are not mere ornament added after the composition of the narrative, but that they are necessary and integral parts of the poems. As I indicated in Chapter one, W.C. Scott's work, *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Similes*, goes some way towards demonstrating that similes are a systematic part of oral poetic composition. Scott shows how similes in general are regularly deployed in certain kinds of situations, and how particular types of simile subjects are used in the same kinds of narrative contexts, without considerable overlap in usage between different simile subjects. So, for example, lion similes are generally used for single warriors fighting a group, while wolf similes are consistently used for groups of warriors in battle fury.¹ Scott limits his examination of narrative context to the immediate

situation of the simile, looking at such broad contexts as death of a warrior, flight, attack, and so on. Taking my departure from this idea of similes of the same subject matter being deployed consistently in the same kinds of narrative contexts, I will examine the narrative contexts for two of the long repeated similes of the *Iliad*, those comparing Telamonian Ajax and Menelaos to lions at 11.548 ff. and 17.657 ff. and the long repeated horse simile at 6.506 ff. and 15.263 ff. Given that similes with the same subject matter are used in the same kinds of contexts, it should be the case that similes repeated *verbatim* will point to even more similarities in the narrative contexts. We will see that these two repeated long similes both belong to broad-ranging narrative structures that are at play in each of their appearances. We will be able to conclude at the end of this examination that these long similes, at least, are not simply ornamental additions to a given narrative context, but appear to be parts of traditional narrative patterns.

Similes are a frequent and noticeable feature of the Homeric poems. Short similes, such as, "like a lion" or "like a god" occur often. Long similes that develop over several lines are more frequent. Repeated long similes, however, occur rarely: of the hundreds of similes in both poems, there are only eight examples of repeated similes that are two or more lines in length. Of this small group, only two repeated similes, those at *Iliad* 6.506-511=15.263-268 and 11.548-557=17.657-666, extend over more than five lines.

---

Given the tendency Homeric poetry has to unfold through patterning and repetition, it seems likely that the appearance of a long simile using identical diction in two passages should indicate that there is a similarity between the narrative contexts for these two passages. As Scott has shown, similes with the same subject are used consistently in the same kinds of situations; thus, horse similes are used generally at points where a hero re-enters battle.

Further, passages in which the same situation is described verbatim, such as feast scenes, arming scenes, and the like, are not just describing a typical action in typical words; they are also parts of broader narrative patterns. In what follows I will demonstrate that in the case of repeated long similes, such as the simile repeated for Paris and Hektor in Books 6 and 15, the repetition of the simile can indicate that there is a larger narrative pattern to be found as the context for the simile. I will first examine the contexts for the simile repeated at Iliad 11.548-557 and 17.657-666 to show that such a narrative similarity does exist. Having established the existence of this similarity, I will turn to the simile at Iliad 6.506-511=15.263-268 to show that, again, we see a narrative pattern common to both contexts.

At Iliad 11.548 ff. Telamonic Aias is compared to a lion being driven slowly

---


4Scott 1974:53 notes that repeated similes are always used in the same broad context group, such as entrance of the hero into battle, attack of a single warrior by a group, and so on.

5Scott 1974:86.

away from a farmyard by dogs and men.

As when the men who live in the wild and their dogs have driven a tawny lion away from the mid-fenced ground of their oxen, and will not let him tear out the fat of the oxen, watching nightlong against him, and he in his hunger for meat closes in but can get nothing of what he wants, for the raining javelins thrown from the daring hands of the men beat ever against him, and the flaming torches, and these he balks at for all of his fury and with the daylight goes away disappointed of desire; so Aias, disappointed at heart, drew back from the Trojans much unwilling, but feared for the ships of the Achaeans.

Agamemnon, Diomedes, Odysseus, and Machaon have all recently been wounded and have withdrawn from battle, accompanied by Menelaos and Nestor. Aias is thus the last of the great Achaian warriors left on the field. Hektor and Kebriones decide to attack Aias to keep him from driving the Trojans back (11.521-520). As they move in, Zeus drives fear on Aias (11.544), who begins to draw back slowly and reluctantly under the Trojan attack, like a lion driven out of a farmyard. The simile here illustrates both Aias' strength in the face of the Trojan onslaught and of the fear Zeus has sent and Aias' inability to resist these attacks. He fights back, and then runs, and fights back and then runs, just like the lion (11.565-568).

---

7Agamemnon withdraws 11.282-283; Diomedes 11.396-400; Odysseus 11.487-488, led by Menelaos; Machaon 11.516-520, driven by Nestor.
At *Iliad* 17.657-666, Menelaos is compared to a lion driven away from a farmyard by dogs and men.

As from a mid-fenced ground some lion who has been harrying dogs and men, but his strength is worn out; they will not let him tear out the fat of the oxen, watching nightlong against him, and he in his hunger for meat closes in but can get nothing of what he wants, for the raining javelins thrown from the daring hands of the men beat ever against him, and the flaming torches, and these he balks at for all of his fury and with the daylight goes away disappointed of desire; so Menelaos of the great war cry went from Patroklos much unwilling, and was afraid for him, lest the Achaians under pressure of fear might leave him as spoil for the enemy.  

Here Menelaos, the two Aiantes, and Meriones are standing alone, defending Patroklos' corpse from the Trojans. Zeus shakes the aegis to terrify the Achaians and give victory to the Trojans (17.593-596). Peneleos, Leitos, and Idomeneus all begin to flee back to the ships (17.597-623). Telamonian Aias tells Menelaos to leave Patroklos and to go seek Antilochus, so that Antilochus can run to tell Achilles that Patroklos is dead (17.652-655). Menelaos goes to leave, like the lion, unwilling to abandon Patroklos' corpse. Here again, the simile

---

While there are differences in the opening lines of these two similes which would play a role in the effect each simile has in its context, my concern here is with the broader picture and not with a detailed analysis of these similes.
illustrates Menelaos' strength and unwillingness to abandon his place in battle.

In both of these cases, we see warriors unwilling to withdraw from their place in battle. We see also that in each case, the warrior is being left behind by his fellows, who are, in the case of the simile for Aias in Book 11, wounded and withdrawing, and in the case of Menelaos, fleeing from the Trojans. Again, in each case we see that the warrior does not himself choose to withdraw from his place, but is compelled to do so: Aias is compelled by the fear Zeus sends on him, Menelaos by Aias' request that he go find Antilochus. The simile illustrates, therefore, not just a reluctant withdrawal, but a compelled withdrawal. Note also, that in the transition from each simile back to its narrative context, the warrior receiving the simile is described in a line beginning, ἦν τὸλλ᾽ ἀέκων· περὶ γὰρ δίε ... (11.557, 17.666). The simile is part of a complex involving not only similar narrative actions, but similar narrative diction as well.

We can summarize this narrative pattern in the following way:

1) Hero being left behind on battlefield;

2) Hero compelled to withdraw;

3) Withdrawal marked by a lion simile;

4) Unwillingness to withdraw and fear of the consequences of withdrawal.

We see element 1) Hero being left behind on the battlefield, for Aias, when the Achaian heroes are wounded and leave the field; for Menelaos, when the Achaians begin to flee because of Zeus and Hektor. Element 2) Hero compelled to withdraw, appears for Aias when Zeus fills him with fear and the Trojans attack him; for Menelaos when Aias tells him to go find Antilochus. Element 3) Withdrawal marked by a lion simile, occurs for Aias as he
begins to back across the field; for Menelaos as he goes off on his search. Element 4)

Unwillingness to withdraw and fear of the consequences of withdrawal, occurs immediately after the close of each simile; for Aias, explaining that he is unwilling to withdraw because he fears for the Achaian ships and for Menelaos, explaining that he is unwilling to withdraw because he fears his companions will abandon Patroklos' corpse under pressure from the Trojans.⁹

Given the presence of this narrative pattern for the long repeated simile at 11.548 ff. and 17.657 ff., I will go on now to demonstrate the existence of a similar narrative pattern for the long repeated simile at 6.506 ff. and 15.263 ff. This pattern, which again includes the use of a simile, reveals itself not only in the two contexts surrounding the repeated simile, but, with some variation, in the narrative surrounding the simile describing Achilleus as a prize-winning racehorse in Iliad 22.

In Iliad 6, Paris is returning to battle from his withdrawal in Book 3, where Aphrodite had snatched him away to safety inside the city from impending defeat at the hands of Menelaos in their duel (3.373-382). In Book 6, Hektor comes into Troy to ask the women to pray to Athene to protect the Trojans from Diomedes (6.111-116). Hektor also decides to ask Paris to return to battle (6.279-281). When Hektor finds Paris in his bed chamber, he reproaches him and tells him he should come back to the fighting (6.325-331). Paris accepts Hektor's reproaches, tells him that Helen, too, has been urging him to return to battle, and

⁹Fenik 1968:110 has already noted the general similarity between these two similes and their contexts; he argues that the lion simile in both of the cases discussed above describes essentially the same action and is equally appropriate in each appearance. My claim here is that the similarities are more numerous and more precise than what Fenik sees.
says that he will arm and go back to the plain with Hektor (6.333-341). Paris then arms and runs through the city to meet Hektor, at which point he receives the simile comparing him to a horse running across a plain to a river (6.503-516).

As when some stalled horse, who has been corn-fed at the manger breaking free of his rope gallops over the plain in thunder to his accustomed bathing place in a sweet-running river and in the pride of his strength holds high his head, and the mane floats over his shoulders; sure of his glorious strength, the quick knees carry him to the loved places and the pasture of horses.

Paris and Hektor return to battle, bringing relief to the Trojans (7.1-7). Paris immediately kills Menesthios (7.8-10).

In *Iliad* 14, Hera has seduced Zeus and ensured that he will fall asleep, so that he is no longer able to guarantee that the Trojans will have their day of victory (14.292-353). Poseidon leads the Achaians into battle (14.361-377), where Hektor and Telamonian Aias have the first encounter of the new fight. Aias strikes Hektor with a large stone that stuns Hektor and throws him to the ground; the Achaians run up to drag Hektor away (14.402-423). The great Trojan warriors rush to protect Hektor while his companions pick him up, place him on his chariot, and carry him back towards the city (14.424-432). They carry Hektor as far as the river Xanthos, where they take him from the chariot and revive him with water (14.433-439). Zeus wakes from his sleep and sends Apollo to restore Hektor’s strength (15.221-235). Apollo goes to Hektor, exhorts him to return to battle, and breathes μένως into
him (15.239-262). Hektor, restored, receives the horse simile, and runs back to the battlefield (15.263-270), causing panic among the Achaians (15.277-280).

In both of these episodes, we see a basic pattern emerge. The warrior is threatened with defeat and death in single combat, Paris at the hands of Menelaos, Hektor at the hands of Aias. He is rescued from defeat by another and carried to a place of safety away from the battle. Paris is rescued by Aphrodite and carried into the city to his bed chamber; Hektor is rescued by his companions and carried to the river. After time spent in the safe place, another character intervenes with the warrior and urges him to return to battle. Hektor urges Paris to return; Apollo urges Hektor to return and fills him with μένος. The warrior returns to battle, receiving the horse simile in the process. Having returned, the warrior immediately demonstrates his prowess or might; Paris, along with Hektor, relieves the Trojans and kills Menesthios, Hektor causes panic among the Achaians.10

We can enumerate the elements of this pattern as follows:

1) Threatened defeat and death in a context of battle;

2) Rescue and transport to safe place;

3) Exhortation;

4) Return to battle, marked by a horse simile;

10The pattern I outline here begins for Paris in Book 3 (where we find elements 1 and 2) and resumes in Book 6 (where we see elements 3, 4, and 5) when the narrative returns to Paris in Troy. So also for Hektor the pattern begins in Book 14 (elements 1 and 2) and resumes in Book 15 (elements 3, 4, and 5), when the narrative returns to Hektor. In each case the pattern is interrupted by a change of scene and a change of focus. See Fenik 1974:138, who argues that large scale patterning can be found in both the Iliad and the Odyssey. Beye 1984:10-11 has also noted that there is a pattern related to return to battle here; he connects this pattern to the stressing of important events: Paris' refusal to return Helen to Menelaos at 7.357-364 and Hektor's bringing fire to the ships at 16.122-123.
5) Demonstration of heroic success.\footnote{My thanks to Roberto Nickel for pointing out this final element in the pattern.}

Having established the existence of this pattern for Paris in Books 3 and 6 and for Hektor in Books 14 and 15, we can see it at play for Achilleus and Agenor in Books 21 and 22 as well. All five of the elements are present, although they do not work themselves out in the same way. In Book 21, Achilleus is slaughtering the Trojans, who flee in terror before him. Priam orders the guards to open the gates so that the Trojan warriors may come to safety inside the city (21.531-536). Apollo sends Agenor to stand against the Achaians (21.543-546). Agenor stands to meet Achilleus and throws his spear at him (21.590-594). Apollo saves Agenor from death at Achilleus' hands by covering him in a mist and sending him away out of the battle (21.596-598). Apollo then takes Agenor's appearance and runs away from the city to the river Skamandros so that, by luring Achilleus away, he may allow the Trojans to get safely inside the walls of the city (21.599-607). When all of the Trojan warriors are safely inside the walls, Apollo reveals himself to Achilleus, who, angered even more than he has been, returns to the city, receiving the simile comparing him to a prize-
winning horse (22.1-24). Priam sees Achilleus and is terrified for Hektor (22.25-36).12

Here we see element 1) Threatened defeat and death in a context of battle, as Agenor is about to be killed by Achilleus, element 2) Rescue and transport to a safe place, when Apollo covers Agenor in mist and sends him away from Achilleus, element 3) Exhortation, for Achilleus, in the form of Apollo's taunts,13 element 4) Return to battle, marked by a horse simile, for Achilleus, and element 5) demonstration of heroic success, in Priam's reaction to the sight of Achilleus.14 The difference between this case and those of Paris and Hektor earlier is that in Book 22, the one who is exhorted and receives the horse simile is not the same figure as the one who is threatened and rescued. In the first two episodes, Paris and Hektor are both threatened with defeat, rescued, exhorted, and return with a horse simile. Here Agenor is threatened with defeat and rescued, at which point Achilleus is exhorted, returns to battle with a horse simile, and demonstrates his heroic excellence. The pattern as outlined above is complete; some of the elements have simply been transferred to another character.15


13See Fenik 1968:26, 49-50 for the relationship between and interchangeability of "rebuke patterns" and "consultation patterns." These different patterns share elements, just as here the exhortation and rebuke play the same role in the larger pattern I have identified.

14In the general context of Iliad 22, of course, Achilleus' success manifests itself as his killing Hektor. More immediately, however, Priam recounts in his speech at 22.38-76 all of the reasons he has to fear Achilleus and his prowess.

15Transferral of elements in patterns and motifs occurs elsewhere. See Nagler 1974:68 ff. (on the transfer of elements in the "woman attended by maidservants" motif), Nickel 1997:257, 300, 304 (on transfer of elements in the "wrath, withdrawal, return" motif), and Sowa 1984:104 (on transfer of
§ 2. Proper Place in the Iliad

Now that we have seen that this narrative pattern exists and is at play for both Paris and Hektor in their respective contexts, I will analyze what the image of the horse in particular tells us about these two situations; that is, I will examine the correlation of image and structure. This correlation will depend upon two features of the horse in the simile: its return to its proper place, the haunts and pastures of horses, and its status as prestige or luxury animal. I will then show how these features of the horse are at play for both Paris and Hektor, first, by discussing how each of these characters, in returning to battle, is returning to his proper place as warrior, and then by demonstrating how the portrayal of the horse as a luxury animal, outside of the sphere of utility, is an appropriate image for both Paris and Hektor qua warriors. I will conclude that the warrior, like the horse, belongs to a sphere outside utility and outside of the demands and strictures of daily life within a city and family.

I quote the simile again:

\[ \text{ἐὼς δ’ ὁτε τις στατὸς ἵππος, ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτνη, δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θείῃ πεδίῳ κροατίων, \vphantom{\text{external}}\text{εἰσθάνως λούσαθαι ἐὕρρειος ποταμόι, κυδιόνων ὑψοῦ δὲ κάρη ἔχει, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται ὁμοίως ἀἴσσονται: ὁ δ’ ἀγαλαίηφι πεποιθώς, ρίμφα ἐ γοῦνα φέρει μετὰ τ’ ἥθελα καὶ νομίν ἵππων} \]

elements in the "wrath, withdrawal, return" motif). Lord 1960:98 also notes that singers will substitute something similar to the traditional pattern when they cannot use one of the pattern's elements in its usual form.

Note also that, in the case of each of the three horse similes discussed here, another simile for the one receiving the horse simile follows almost immediately upon each horse simile (6.513 compares Paris to the sun, 15.271-276 compare Hektor to a lion, and 22.26-31 compare Achilleus to the Dog Star).
As when some stalled horse, who has been corn-fed at the manger breaking free of his rope gallops over the plain in thunder to his accustomed bathing place in a sweet-running river and in the pride of his strength holds high his head, and the mane floats over his shoulders; sure of his glorious strength, the quick knees carry him to the loved places and the pasture of horses.  

(Iliad 6.506-511=15.263-268)

We learn first that the horse has been in a stall and has been eating grain from a manger; it is a domestic animal, male (masculine adjectives and participles throughout),\(^\text{16}\) that is well-fed and well-housed.\(^\text{17}\) The horse has broken free of his bond (δεσμός) and is running across the plain. He has been in his stall and has chosen to be somewhere else: out running across the plain. The horse runs to the river to bathe and exults with his head high.\(^\text{18}\) The verb describing the horse as he holds his head high is κυδιάω, a frequentative verb from κύδος, which means something like, "to bear oneself proudly or triumphantly."\(^\text{19}\) The horse as he bathes displays a sense of his own well-being and superiority. This reference to κύδος also shows a way in which a horse is like a hero in that both of them are motivated by κύδος in some way.\(^\text{20}\) The horse's mane flows (ἀξόσονται) around its shoulders (ὁμος); the verb

\(^{16}\)For example, ἀκοστήσας, 6.506 = 15.263, ἀπορρήξας, 6.507 = 15.264.

\(^{17}\)Ameis-Hentze 1913 ad 6.506-511 note that the horse is richly fed, and consequently in high spirits.

\(^{18}\)Fränkel 1921:74 notes that an animal's trip to water is a common motif in the poems, citing Iliad 13.492-493 (flocks following a ram to drink), 16.824-826 (a boar and a lion fighting over a spring out of which each wants to drink), and Odyssey 10.158-163 (Odysseus kills a deer as it comes to drink at the river) as parallels.

\(^{19}\)Cunliffe 1924 s.v. "κυδιάω;" Ebeling 1963 s.v. "κυδιάω."

\(^{20}\)For κύδος as an heroic motivator, see, for example, Iliad 4.94-96 (Athene tells Pandaros he will win χάρις and κύδος from all the Trojans if he hits Menelaos with an arrow), 9.303-306 (Odysseus
\(\text{\`a}\text{\`i}\text{\`o}\text{\`o}\) carries the sense of swift easy movement, so that the horse's mane moves in the same fashion he does. The horse trusts in his \(\text{\`a}\gamma\lambda\alpha\text{\`i}\), his splendour. He relies on his splendour as warriors rely on their \(\text{\`a}\lambda\kappa\iota\).\(^{21}\) \(\text{\`a}\gamma\lambda\alpha\text{\`i}\) does not mean simply splendour of appearance: rather, it encompasses all the things that make someone \(\text{\`a}\gamma\lambda\alpha\delta\zeta\): beauty, lustre, joy, glory, and the like.\(^{22}\) The horse's trusting in his \(\text{\`a}\gamma\lambda\alpha\text{\`i}\) here must depend on his speed and his consciousness of his speed; he is confident of himself and his ability to do what a horse does.

The simile closes by stressing the horse's speed and ease of movement.\(^{23}\) His knees carry him swiftly where he wants to go.\(^{24}\) The word for "swiftly" here, \(\rho\iota\mu\phi\alpha\), comes tells Achilleus he will win \(\kappa\delta\delta\zeta\) if he returns to battle), and 22.216-217 (Athene tells Achilleus he will win \(\kappa\delta\delta\zeta\) for killing Hektor). Ameis-Hentze 1913 ad 6.509 note that the use of \(\kappa\nu\delta\iota\delta\omicron\nu\) here marks a shift in the portrayal of the horse, who is now described in terms of his high spirits and his power.

\(^{21}\)The horse is described as \(\text{\`a}\gamma\lambda\alpha\text{\`i}\varphi\iota\tau\omicron\theta\omicron\varsigma\). Compare Iliad 5.297-302 (Aineias, \(\text{\`a}\lambda\kappa\iota\ \tau\omicron\theta\omicron\theta\omicron\varsigma\), rushes to protect Pandaros' corpse) and 18.158-160 (Hektor, \(\text{\`a}\lambda\kappa\iota\ \tau\omicron\theta\omicron\theta\omicron\varsigma\), presses his attack on Patroklos' corpse).

\(^{22}\)Cunliffe 1924 s.v. "\text{\`a}\gamma\lambda\alpha\text{\`i}," "\text{\`a}\gamma\lambda\alpha\delta\zeta." Cf. A. A. Parry 1973:51 n. 3; Stanford 1959 ad Odyssey 2.109. See Iliad 2.506, 7.203, 19.385.

\(^{23}\)Fränkel 1921:9, 77 argues that all horse similes in the Homeric poems originate in comparisons stressing speed.

\(^{24}\)Lee 1964:26 condemns this simile as a late interpolation on the grounds that line 511 (\(\rho\iota\mu\phi\alpha\ \epsilon\ \gamma\omicron\omicron\nu\alpha\ \phi\epsilon\epsilon\omicron\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\iota\ \theta\omicron\epsilon\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\ \iota\pi\omicron\nu\)) uses the pronoun \(\epsilon\) to refer to the horse, rather than \(\tau\omicron\nu\). Lee points out that a number of similes use \(\epsilon\), \(\omicron\nu\), \(\omicron\iota\) for animals instead of \(\tau\omicron\nu\), etc. This use of the pronoun is "wrong" or "new" for Lee. Its wrongness for Lee consists in the use of a "human" pronoun for an animal. However, one could argue that the animals in the similes Lee cites, like the stallion here, are the actors in the similes, and are consequently treated like humans in the pronouns used for them.

Lee cites other examples of \(\epsilon\), \(\omicron\nu\), \(\omicron\iota\) for animals and objects in similes, and notes that the only other uses of this pronoun for animals or objects in the Iliad outside similes are 1.236-237 (Agamemnon's staff), 9.419 (Troy), 11.29-40 (Agamemnon's sword, shield, and the serpent on the shield), 21.586 (Troy), and 24.452 (Achilleus' hut). Leaving aside the complicated role of the city of Troy in the Iliad (on which topic see Scully 1990), we see that in each of the other cases, the
from ῥίπτω,25 so we have a sense that the horse moves, not just swiftly, but headlong, "hurlingly;" that is, there is an idea of strong force behind the speed, perhaps a sense of compulsion.26 The ηθεα here are the habitual places of horses; the horse goes to these places from habit.27 The habit is not just his own habit, but the habit of other horses as well, since he is moving towards the place horses frequent, the ηθεα and the νομὸς of horses.28 The horse is moving towards the place that he, as a horse, belongs. He does not belong alone in the stall, but out on the plain running free with the other horses. The horse must break free of its pampering stall and run across the plain to its proper place, among others of its own kind.

This simile ties into Paris' situation as follows. Paris is a prince of Troy, and so must be, like the horse, accustomed to good quarters and good food. Further, he is returning to battle refreshed after a long absence.29 Paris is rushing on swift feet (σεῦατ' ...
ποσι κραιπνοίσι 6.505) through the city, while the horse rushes across the plain. Paris meets no resistance in his run through the city, but can be said to have broken a bond in that he is returning to battle having broken free of the will of Aphrodite, which brought him back to Troy in Book 3, and, as we will see below, from the constraints of family and city life.30

The horse has left its stall and is running on the plain, just as Paris is heading for the plain, since that is where the armies are fighting. Just as the horse is running glorying across the plain with his knees carrying him swiftly, so Paris runs, carried by his swift feet and shining in his armour like the sun (6.513-514).31 As the horse runs easily towards his proper place, so Paris is running towards his proper place in running back to the battle. Hektor tells him when they meet that no one would find fault with his action in battle, since he is mighty (6.521-522). Hektor and Paris then run together out of the gates and onto the field, both eager to do battle and to fight (7.1-3). This eagerness again shows that Paris, like the horse, is returning to his proper place as he runs to go back into battle.32

The simile works in much the same way for Hektor.33 Hektor, like Paris, is a

30Schol. bT ad 6.507 notes that Paris' δεσιμός here is Helen.

31Kirk 1990 ad 6.506-511 notes that feet and knees are often associated with rapid movement in the Iliad. Monsacré 1984:54 sees the hero as marked by his legs in that he walks with long strides, as Aias at 7.212-213 and Hektor at 15.306-307, and in that he can run quickly.

32Scott 1974:104 notes that warriors arming for battle or about to enter the field often receive "peaceful" similes in order to make their transition into battle more striking. So here the violence of battle in the narrative of Book 7 is strongly marked off from the quiet and absence of strife in the horse simile. Scott’s notion of similes playing a role in creating mood seems to me quite reasonable, although my own concerns here are different from Scott’s.

33Fränkel 1921:77 argues that when this simile is used for Hektor, the aspect of breaking free from restraint is more important, while for Paris the idea of splendour is at the fore.

Scholars are divided on the issue of whether or not this simile is "appropriately" applied to
royal prince who is normally well-fed and well-housed. He has been stopped and restrained like the horse in that he has been wounded and carried away. His breaking the bond is coming to consciousness and running away from his companions back into battle. Like the horse, Hektor glories as he runs in that Apollo has filled him with μένη; he has speed and strength in him and so can be said to be glorying and confident. Just as the horse is carried easily by his knees (φίμφα ε γοῦνα φέρει, 15.268) so Hektor runs plying his limbs and knees swiftly (λαυψηρὰ πόδας καὶ γούνατ ἐνώμα, 15.269). Hektor's lightness and ease of movement at this point are a strong contrast to his heaviness and panting shortly after

both Paris and Hektor. Those who feel that the simile is inappropriate for Hektor are influenced by the fact that a reader of the Iliad would see the simile used first for Paris. Scholarly biases regarding Paris then come into play. Schnapp-Gourbeillon 1981:80 states that the image of the horse is not warrior-like, because the stallion here thinks of nothing but females and is very vain (notice here the influence of Virgil's re-working of this simile for Turnus at Aeneid 11.492-497, where line 494 reads "in pastus armentaque tendit equamr"). Edwards 1987:154, 212 gives evidence of this Virgilian influence also. Eustathios 1015.11 on 15.263 ff. states that the simile is more natural for Paris. Bowra 1968:118 argues that the simile is less appropriate when used for Hektor, but functions (92) to contrast the frivolous Paris and the tried warrior Hektor. Kirk 1990 ad 6.506-511 states that the simile is equally effective, in different ways, in both of its appearances. Janko 1992 ad 15.263-268 remarks that, if we did not have Book 6, no one would find fault with the use of this simile for Hektor. Moulton 1977:94 notes that the contexts for the two appearances are significantly different, in that Book 6 gives a domestic context, while Book 15 gives a battle context. My point here is, of course, that this stallion is precisely warrior-like in whatever context he appears, particularly now that we have seen that the context for the simile includes not simply the specific narrative detail of each appearance, but a narrative pattern as well.

Tsagarakis 1982:142-143 argues that Hektor's inactivity has been no less invigorating than Paris' in Book 6; further, the description of the horse as well-fed corresponds for Tsagarakis to Apollo's having filled Hektor with μένη.

Duchemin 1960:408 sees the detail of the horse's confinement as irrelevant to both Paris and Hektor; rather, the important detail is the horse's pride, which mirrors both Paris' and Hektor's pride. Lonsdale 1990:66 sees this simile as marking Hektor's physical restoration and his sudden sense of freedom.
being wounded. Just as the horse runs lightly towards his haunts, so Hektor runs lightly across the plain to the place where warriors ought to be: the battlefield. The glorying of the horse and its swift movement show Hektor's own glorying and happiness in his return to battle with Apollo behind him. The simile takes Hektor from the safety of the river, back to the place he is accustomed to be.

Now that we have seen how this horse simile suggests that Paris and Hektor, in returning to battle, are returning to their proper place as warriors, I will explain in more detail how the battlefield is the warrior's proper place. The primary aspect of the warrior's relationship to battle in the *Iliad* that I will stress here is the battlefield as a place of luxury and non-utility. We will see that the warrior of the *Iliad* functions most perfectly as warrior when he fights for nothing more that the joy of fighting. The horse will emerge as the emblem of this luxurious side of battle through its own broad associations with wealth and excess.

First, and most obvious, the Trojan War is not a war undertaken for any claims of utility: the Achaians come to Troy by the thousands in order to win back one man's wife. This is no war of conquest, no war for profit through sacking and pillage (to which we see reference in the mentions of Achilleus' sacking of Thebe, where he kills Andromache's father and wins Briseis\textsuperscript{37}). It is a war entered when one kingly household, the house of Priam,

\textsuperscript{36}Monsacré 1984:55 demonstrates that states like spirit or fatigue are characterized by the distinction between suppleness and lightness on the one hand and stiffness and heaviness on the other.

\textsuperscript{37}*Iliad* 1.366-369, 2.688-693, 6.414-428, etc.
refuses to make good the dishonour it has done to another, the house of Menelaos. The entire resources of two peoples, the Achaians and the Trojans and their allies, are spent for the sake of this war. The Achaians, as the aggressors, simply by virtue of participating in the expedition against Troy, define themselves as not bound by concerns of profit or preservation of wealth. We see in the Achaian expedition to Troy a war undertaken essentially for its own sake. Helen is a pretext for the war, but a pretext is nonetheless necessary. Notice that the Iliad makes no mention of the oath of Helen's suitors to uphold the honour of her marriage (attested in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women). There is no reason expressed ever for the hundreds of independent kings' having come to Troy. They come because they want and choose to come to participate in battle for its own sake. And for the sake, of course, of

\[\text{\textsuperscript{38}}\] I will talk in terms of the Achaians here because the Trojans are not the ones who declared the war and are fighting to defend their homeland from the invading Achaians. One could, of course, argue that the Trojans could have ended the war at any time by forcing Paris to give Helen back to Menelaos. In a sense that claim is true; however, the right of the prince to his honour is important enough in the poems that forcing Paris to relinquish Helen is never an option at all. When Antenor suggests at the Trojan assembly in Book 7 that they send Helen and her possessions back to the Achaians, Paris' mere refusal to give Helen back is sufficient to put that discussion to rest (7.345-378).

Note also that the Achaians are, as an army, not a complete society in the way that Troy is. Lonsdale 1990:11 contends that most of the similes that convey pathos occur for the Achaians, to balance the full domestic life possible in Troy.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{39}}\] Agamemnon's anxiety over Menelaos' wound at Iliad 44.148 ff. is in large part a result of his fear that, if Menelaos dies, the Achaians will have to return home, leaving glory to Paris and the Trojans and having accomplished nothing (4.169-175). Similarly, in Iliad 7 Agamemnon will not allow Menelaos to enter the duel with Hektor for fear that Hektor will kill him (7.109-119).

\[\text{\textsuperscript{40}}\] Fr. 204.78-84 Merkelbach-West.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{41}}\] Achilleus in Iliad 1 reminds Agamemnon that he and the other Achaians followed Agamemnon and Menelaos to Troy to please Agamemnon and to win τιμή for Agamemnon and Menelaos and that he himself has no quarrel with the Trojans (1.152-160). In Book 9 Achilleus also mentions that the retrieving of Helen is the reason Agamemnon and Menelaos have come to Troy (9.337-339).
the glory that they win by participating in this war. Moreover, the Achaians do not just participate in the war, they cause it, precipitate it. The Trojan War itself is already outside of the world of utility because it is not a war for conquest or profit, but a war for the sake of being at war, entered into on the claim of avenging Paris' dishonour to Menelaos.⁴²

When we turn to the individual warrior in the Iliad in terms of refusal to be limited by the demands of utility, we see that Homeric battle narrative describes individual duels between individual aristocratic champions, for the most part.⁴³ The troops, the

⁴²Whenever discussions as to Achaian motives for being at or remaining at Troy arise, the prospect of booty or profit is not mentioned; rather, such discussions focus on retrieving Helen and on questions of honour. So, in Book 2, when Athene and Odysseus are trying to prevent the Achaian flight to the ships, spoil does not come up as a reason to remain; instead honour or loss of honour (2.160-161 = 176-177 ἐν ὁμαρχήν), cowardice (2.190), obedience (2.192, 200), and vengeance (2.354-356) are the motives. Cf. van Wees 1992:183-189 who argues that booty is an extra good that comes in addition to the primary and sufficient goal: glory and honour. See also Thalmann 1988:5-6 who argues that, in the heroic ideology of the Iliad, heroes do not enter battle in order to gain material rewards, but for “intangible values.” In light of the tensions within the Achaian hierarchy in Books 1 and 2, Thalmann argues (15, 19), there are no good reasons for the Achaians as a whole to stay fighting at Troy.

Gaining honour and glory is not the same as gaining profit and territory; honour, unlike profit and territory, lies outside the realm of utility. Honour and property are, of course, connected in the Iliad. Achilleus' wrath begins in Book 1 because he is stripped of a prize of honour, Briseis. This wrath focusses on Briseis as a sign of his status more than as valuable in herself; Achilleus is outraged at being mistreated and undervalued and, significantly, at the fact that all the Achaians endorse Agamemmon's abuse by remaining silent (1.225-244). Note also, as Claus 1975:23 argues, that gifts and prizes are necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for fighting; Achilleus, to preserve his honour, rejects the numerous gifts Agamemnon offers him in Book 9. Compare also the Achaians' response to Paris' suggestion (7.362-364) that he return all of Helen's possessions to Menelaos, but not Helen herself; Diomedes rejects the return of the possessions and of Helen and all the Achaians approve (7.399-404). Simple material benefit is not the issue here. Cf. van Wees 1992:178, 183, who argues that the goal for both Achaians and Trojans is the total destruction of the enemy, including the destruction of wealth that could be taken as spoil.

⁴³Edwards 1987:154 notes that the battlefield is the place where individual warriors struggle for honour. Compare Singor 1995:189, and van Wees 1997:678. Luce 1975:119 states that the isolation of heroes on the battlefield increases the "heroic aura."
commoners, are invisible, except in scenes of muster and rout. There is no strategy, no aligning of warriors in ways designed to cause the enemy’s defeat. Battle takes place at random, according to the wills of the individual heroes whose encounters are being described.\textsuperscript{44} Here again, the way in which battle unfolds in the \textit{Iliad} shows that the war is not a war of utility. The champions (\textit{πρῶμακοι}) are not held to any plan and are not subject to the rule and guidance of any single strategist or commander; they fight as they will and they flee as they will. For battle to belong to the wills of the individual champions it must not have a point as a battle of one people against another; with no unifying goal or plan, the only reason left for fighting is the desire of the fighters. Just as with the motive for the entire war, so with the enacting of the war, the Achaians fight because they choose to fight and in the way that they choose to fight.\textsuperscript{45}

Given that the general context of the Trojan War and the way it gets fought in

\textsuperscript{44}Finley 1965:122 observes that discussions containing a “sustained consideration” of circumstances and possible strategies do not occur in the \textit{Iliad}. So also Mueller 1984:76, who adds that warfare depends upon the strength and spirit of individuals. van Wees 1997:669-672 argues that Homeric battle scenes demonstrate consistently that the warriors fight as and where they please, not according to any plan or strategy. Singor 1995 argues that there is organized mass fighting in the \textit{Iliad}; he marshals evidence that does support the idea that troops go into battle in some kind of order (185). While this evidence may be helpful for dating certain passages of the poem, it nonetheless remains the case that the narrative focus is overwhelmingly on the duels.

\textsuperscript{45}Notice, too, that they can choose to have no battle at all on particular days. The \textit{Iliad} opens with battle suspended, allowing time for Agamemnon to insult Chryses, for Apollo to send the plague, and so on. The poem does not explicitly state that no battle is taking place at this time, but it is not. The Trojans do not attack the Achaians at this time, which they should do if this is a war of utility.

Greenhalgh 1973:14 argues that the use of the chariot for heroic transportation in the \textit{Iliad} is wasteful and ineffective as a means of war. van Wees 1997:690 holds the same view. This characterization accords with my own interpretation; what is commonly taken to be a misunderstanding of the tactical value of chariots or a dim mis-remembering of Mycenaean use of chariots in battle can be seen to be a pointed portrayal of heroic luxury and excess.
the *Iliad* is a context of willed war not for utility, but for the experience of war itself, why is this point being made so forcibly in the horse similes for Paris and Hektor? In the case of Paris, as I have already argued, the horse simile serves to show that Paris' proper place is on the battlefield, not inside the walls of Troy in his bed chamber. The same can be said for Hektor, who, as the chief Trojan warrior, must be present on the battlefield. The place of the warrior is on the battlefield being engaged in battle; his place is not in the city, being protected, living with his family and his fellow citizens. Doing battle means killing other warriors; at its utmost, it means being the berserker Achilleus becomes after Patroklos' death. A warrior does not belong in the city because he does not find his true purpose and identity in the city, but on the battlefield. Just as the horse in the simile seeks out the haunts of horses, so the warrior must seek the haunts of warriors, the battlefield. He must exult in the prospect of battle, as the horse exults in his run across the plain. The movement away from the safety and constrictions of the city is a move towards the danger and freedom of battle (remembering here that warriors fight as they please). Paris and Hektor both seek that danger and freedom. For Paris the promise of battle is realised upon his return, as he brings relief to the Trojans and is the first to kill an enemy warrior. Hektor, on his return, comes back to a full-blown battle in the course of which the Trojans will bring fire to the Achaian ships and Hektor will kill Patroklos after a day of glory in which he becomes the enraged warrior we

---

46Schein 1984:71 notes that, in the *Iliad*, to be fully himself, a warrior can only live to kill or be killed in battle.

Another way in which it is clear that the horse and the heroes are returning to their proper places is the ease with which they make this return. Running towards the pasture or towards the battlefield is easy and swift. All three of these figures move with confidence and pleasure as they pursue their returns. Contrast the slow and reluctant movement of Aias and Menelaos away from their places on the battlefield marked by the repeated lion similes in Books 11 and 17. Natural place is the place in which one wishes to stay and towards which one most easily moves. Aias and Menelaos are being forced away from where they belong, while the horse, Paris, and Hektor move easily, swiftly, and gladly back to the places they want to be and where they should be. The horse, Paris, and Hektor have broken the bond that keeps them tied up in the place they do not belong and where they do not want to be. Their movement is swift and easy because they are now unfettered. For the warrior, it is not safety inside the city walls that is easy, but the battlefield. The warrior, like the horse, leaves behind the world of security and utility and returns to the luxurious freedom of battle.

---

48 At 15.605-610, we see Hektor raging like Ares or destructive fire, with frothing mouth, burning eyes, and his helmet shaking terribly around his head.

49 Cf. Aristotle Physics IV 5.212b29-34.

50 Fränkel 1921:77 speaks of how the hero dances in exultation back to the battlefield.

51 Dumezil 1969:125 discusses the ten forms of Verethragna, god of offensive victory; among these forms are a stallion and a warrior. Schnapp-Gourbeillon 1981:170 notes that war is the common business of the horse and the warrior, as one sees attested in the presence of a catalogue of horses at Iliad 2.760-779. Schnapp-Gourbeillon adds that the horse in the Iliad reproduces the hero's condition in that horses can be offspring of gods, have divine ancestors, and be raised by gods, just as heroes can (176; cf. Lonsdale 1990:74).

Cf. Vian 1968:67, who argues that the warrior of epic exists on the margins of his society and is only ever integrated in that society provisionally.
The luxury of the battlefield for the warrior is linked in the simile with the horse's status as a luxury animal. As we have seen in the earlier examination of the horse in ancient Greek society, the horse is the aristocratic animal *par excellence* because of the enormous expense involved in its maintenance and its lack of a general useful function. Just as the horse does not answer to the demands of utility, so the warrior is also outside these demands. Neither Paris nor Hektor leaves the battlefield by choice: each is removed, Paris by a god, Hektor by his comrades. Neither chooses safety over death in battle; the fact of safety is forced on both of them. Safety for Paris and Hektor means being taken back into or towards the city of Troy. Troy for Trojan princes represents family and responsibility. These ties are expressed most fully for Hektor in Book 6, where we see him meeting a succession of people who make demands on him to stay inside the walls with them. His mother, his sister-in-law, and his wife all try to detain him, to compel him to recognize their claims on him. Hektor must reject these claims in order to go back to battle. He rejects his own safety, his own ability to live up to these responsibilities, and goes back to battle, where he is free to live up to his role as warrior, where only the free play of fighting prevails.

---

52 Kirk 1990 *ad 6.506-511* remarks that the language of the simile as a whole is "sumptuous;" the luxurious character of the language thus captures the character of the animal it portrays and the warrior it describes.

53 To some extent the hero's love of battle and its risks in the *Iliad* can be compared to the practice in many historical societies of destroying wealth. Practices such as competitive gift-giving, potlatch, and the interring of precious objects in graves all serve as means to increase the status of the giver within the community (Bradley 1982:117-120). This increase in status essentially works through a claim not to be bound by the demands of utility and the concerns of everyday life. So in the *Iliad* the hero, by risking his precious life in battle, claims the right to heroic status by proclaiming his freedom from the everyday demands of responsibility to community, family, spouse, and economy. See also Bataille 1988:19-41, 63-77.
For a warrior, responsibility resides in the city, not on the battlefield. War and returning to war are easy things in which the warrior takes pleasure and where he finds his only hope for glory (κλέος). Thus, just as the horse glories (κυδιών) in running across the plain, so Paris and Hektor glory in their role as warriors. The warrior is willing to die for κλέος; his life, his responsibilities, and his chances for a future are nothing beside his glory. War is not a matter of utility, of living up to responsibility, of conquest and profit, but is about fighting and dying, giving up all ties to family and city, for the sake of luxurious κλέος that will never perish. The warrior is a horse in that he breaks away from the safe limits of the city in order to return happily and easily to the plain, the arena of battle, where he will fulfil his non-utilitarian nature by fighting and achieving κλέος in the luxurious and useless Trojan War.

Through this unfolding of the horse simile repeated for Paris and Hektor in Books 6 and 15, we have seen that both the warrior and the horse are returning to their proper places. The place for the warrior is on the battlefield, away from the city. We have seen, further, that this image of the horse, with its implications of luxury and non-utility, is an appropriate image for the warrior because it reveals the warrior's status as a figure outside of the world of utility and inside the world of free striving for glory. I will turn now to a discussion of why it is necessary for the poem to make these points about Paris and Hektor when it does.

---

54 Compare Claus 1975:20 ff., who argues that the Homeric hero desires to establish his actions as gratuitous, free from concern for material gain or for the obligations of his position within his society.
§ 3. Proper Place and Improper Place for Paris and Hektor

Traditional Greek epic poetry is poetry about heroes. The ideal hero, as worked out by the Iliadic tradition, fights and dies, and receives κλέος because of these activities. The ideal Odyssean hero fights, survives, gets home, and achieves κλέος.55 The great hero of the Iliad is of course Achilleus, who fights, who will soon die, and who chooses death and the unwithering glory he will receive because of that death. There is no other acceptable model of the hero in the Iliad. The hero is not a city man, he is not a dancer, or a lover, or a speaker -- he is a warrior who will risk all for κλέος.56

In this light, Paris and Hektor do not always come off well as heroes. The situations in which we see them in the contexts of the two horse similes cast an especially unheroic light on them. Without the mitigation of the simile, which portrays Paris and Hektor as eager warriors rushing to their natural heroic place, the audience would have to decide, on the basis of the model of the traditional Iliadic hero, that Paris and Hektor are not real heroes at all. The simile is present in both cases to redeem Paris and Hektor, to reveal

55See Nagy 1979, especially 26-41, for an account of the existence and nature of these two separate heroic traditions. Moulton 1977 treats the similes of the Iliad and Odyssey separately because of the narrative and structural differences between the two poems (p. 11).

56Achilleus’ exemplary status as hero in the Iliad very much centres on his being a lover of battle, and a bloodthirsty one at that. This role is one that he plays both for the reader of the poem and for the other characters within the poem, as we see at 1.117, where Agamemnon reproaches Achilleus for being a lover of ἔρις, πόλεμος, and μάχαι; Zeus uses this same line to reproach Ares at 5.891. Cf. Nagy 1979:131, who also notes this parallel in a discussion of Achilleus as a bloodthirsty hero. Later in the poem we learn that after Patroklos’ death Achilleus is not pleased in his heart until he has returned to battle (19.312-313), and later that he wishes his θόμος would drive him to eat Hektor raw (22.346-347). Achilleus’ spirit takes pleasure in battle and drives him almost to the point of savage cannibalism. Cf. Nagy 1979:157-158, who notes the parallels between ACHILLEUS and the Hesiodic Bronze Race at Erga 143-155; one implicit feature of the Bronze Race may be cannibalism.
the truth of their relations to the warrior ideal, to prove that they are warriors rather than city men. In this section, I will discuss how both Paris and Hektor are cast in an unheroic light in the contexts prior to their receiving their horse similes and explain in more detail for each how the simile redeems these two warriors.

The five-part narrative pattern for Paris begins in Book 3. Paris first appears striding across the field, resplendent in his leopard skin, brandishing his weapons and challenging the Achaians to come forth to fight (3.15-20). This initially heroic challenge soon disintegrates, as Menelaos comes forward to meet the challenge and Paris withdraws into the crowd (3.21-37). Paris' first attempt to establish himself as a warrior in the Iliad fails because of his own inability to stand before Menelaos. After Paris withdraws into the crowd of fighters, Hektor rebukes him, so that Paris then offers to fight Menelaos in a duel to settle the whole matter of the war once and for all (3.38-75). In his rebuke, Hektor focuses on Paris' associations with Aphrodite and soft living; he calls him, "best in appearance, woman-mad, a deceiver" (3.39), and tells him that his lyre, the gifts of Aphrodite, his hair, and his beauty are of no value in battle (3.54-55). Hektor places Paris firmly within the sphere of the city, the place where one is safe to be beautiful, to deal with women, to play the lyre.58

---

57 Whitman 1958:223 argues that Paris' "natural sphere" is the world of women. He justifies this statement with an inaccurate reference to Paris' being compared "regularly" to women, citing this passage (in which Paris is called γυναικαντῆς, not compared to a woman) and 11.384-395, Diomedes' speech of abuse after Paris wounds him with an arrow (which does indeed contain a simile comparing Diomedes' wound to one inflicted by a woman or a child at line 389 - the only comparison of Paris to a woman in the Iliad). Neither of these examples unambiguously supports Whitman's claims.

58 Hektor's chastising Paris for his beauty here is at odds with the general Greek tendency to regard beauty and excellence as going hand in hand. The Iliad does recognize that these two can sometimes be at odds, as when it states that Nireus is the most beautiful man to come to Troy after Achilleus,
Paris in this speech is the pampered horse, who is kept soft and at leisure by his associations with Aphrodite and the safety of the city.

This portrayal of Paris dominates Book 3. Paris himself acknowledges that Hektor is right to object to his having fled from Menelaos (3.59). He reminds Hektor, however, that he has not chosen to be associated with Aphrodite: the gifts of the gods cannot be rejected by those to whom they are given, although no one would willingly opt for them (3.64-66). Paris insists that, despite the gifts of Aphrodite, he can and will fight, and then offers to fight in single combat with Menelaos for Helen and her possessions (3.67-75). Paris tries to uphold his own status as a warrior here; he denies that his association with Aphrodite can fundamentally undermine this status. His insistence on a duel with Menelaos is an insistence on his own desire to fight and to risk everything in battle. The war will be settled by this combat, Paris says: the victor will take Helen and all her possessions, while the Trojans and Achaians will reach peace, and the Achaians will go home. Paris demands that he be allowed to enter battle, not just as one combatant among many, but as the sole heroic champion of his people.

but is ἀλαταδινός, weak (2.671-675). These same lines also equate beauty and excellence by noting that Achilleus, the best warrior, is the most beautiful of all.

On the disjunction of warrior and Aphrodite, see Monsacré 1984:41-50.

Kirk 1978:26 states that Book 3 takes a consistent stance towards Paris' "wrongdoing and volatile character."

Moulton 1977:91 discusses the simile in Paris' reply to Hektor that compares Hektor's heart to an axe for cutting trees to be ships' timber. The fallen tree is also an image of a fallen warrior; Paris thus is comparing Hektor to a killing machine. Moulton argues further that Paris does not accurately assess Hektor's character, as we see Hektor in Troy in Book 6 being anything but a killing machine. I would add to Moulton's remarks that Paris' characterization of Hektor is the opposite of Hektor's characterization of him.
Paris' insistence on his own right to heroic status here is supported in the narrative by his receiving an arming scene prior to the duel (3.330-338). Arming scenes in the *Iliad* mark the entrance of a superlative hero into battle. They are a sign of real heroic status and of the coming of an heroic *aristeia*. That Paris is described with an arming scene shows that he does in fact participate in the heroic ideal, that he is a fighter worthy of warrior status.61

Paris' claim to be a warrior and not a creature of Aphrodite and the narrative's support of this claim in the arming scene are soon undermined in the duel. Paris cannot pierce Menelaos' shield with his spear, is almost struck himself by Menelaos' spear, and is then caught and dragged by the crest of his helmet, about to be killed (3.346-372). Paris' right to die as a warrior, killed at Menelaos' hands, is then overturned by Aphrodite's intervention; she will not allow Menelaos to kill Paris, but snaps the strap of Paris' helmet and carries him off in a mist to his bed chamber (3.373-382). Paris' second attempt to stand forth as a hero is foiled here, not so much by his own failure to kill Menelaos, but by Aphrodite's refusal to allow him to work out his own role as a warrior. In battle, some warriors die and some warriors kill; this situation is what produces heroic *κλέος*. By denying Paris the opportunity to die as a warrior, in combat, Aphrodite denies Paris his status as a hero, a status he has been trying to uphold in the face of Hektor's treating him as a city man and a man of Aphrodite.

Aphrodite's denial of Paris' warrior status is explicit in her speech to Helen.

Here Aphrodite tells Helen that Paris awaits her in the bed chamber, shining in his beauty and his clothes; Paris does not look like one who has just come from battle, but like someone going to a dance or resting from dancing (3.390-394). Aphrodite recasts Paris entirely here. He is not a warrior, but a dancer. Because she is a god, Aphrodite is capable of making this portrayal in words true in fact. She has taken him from the battlefield, on which he was fulfilling his warrior's role, and placed him in her domain, the bed chamber, safe inside the city walls. She has, further, stated plainly that she has transformed Paris from a warrior to a shining lovely dancer. Paris no longer belongs to the world of warriors, outside the walls on the battlefield, but to the world of the city and love and beauty.62

Paris himself acquiesces to this change in status. He does not try immediately to return to battle, but happily stays where he is, with Helen, and insists that she go to bed with him to have sex, because he desires her (3.441-446).63 Paris easily makes this transition from warrior to lover, leaving the impression that his attempts to establish himself as a warrior will come to nothing after all. He has yielded entirely to Aphrodite's influence. Book 3 ends by turning immediately from Paris' bed chamber, where he and Helen are making love, to the battlefield, where Menelaos is seeking him, like a wild beast, and where the Trojans

62 Compare Iliad 24.260-262, where Priam reproaches his sons by calling them ὀρχεσταῖ, contrasting them with the dead Hektor. Fenik 1968:168 notes that to call a man beautiful or a dancer is in effect to call him a coward. See Monsacré 1984:66 f. for a discussion of the associations of dancing in the Iliad and Muellner 1990:80-95 on Paris as a dancer and the relation of Iliad 3 to traditions regarding Aphrodite, rape, and dancing. Monsacré argues that dancing as such belongs to the sphere of Aphrodite. Collins 1988:37 n. 25 notices that the love of a god seems to endow the beloved with some feature of that god; so Paris, beloved of Aphrodite, takes on her characteristics.

63 Schein 1984:22 notes that Paris' lack of concern about the duel here shows his lack of concern both for heroic values and for the values of the responsible city man, Hektor.
would gladly give Paris up to death (3.448-455). Paris' absence from battle is stressed here, along with his new and confirmed place inside the city, safe inside his bed chamber.64

Paris next appears in Book 6. Here Hektor, having come into the city to tell his mother and the other Trojan women to pray to Athene for protection from Diomedes, decides to go ask Paris to come back to battle, if Paris will listen to him (6.280-281). Hektor finds Paris inside his bed chamber, handling his weapons and armour (6.321-322). Paris is here already preparing to make another transition, from lover to warrior, from the world of Aphrodite to the world of battle. Hektor asks Paris to come back to fight and Paris agrees to arm himself and meet Hektor at the gates (3.326-341). Again, Paris easily acquiesces to someone else's attempt to recast him. He easily goes along with Hektor's request that he put himself once again into the sphere of the warrior. Paris prepares for battle, and runs through the city, at which point he receives his horse simile (6.503-514). The horse simile marks Paris' movement out of the city and back to his proper place as a warrior.

Book 3, then, shows us a Paris who is a shirker from battle. He is beloved of Aphrodite, who has no place in battle, as is made explicit in Book 5 when Diomedes wounds her and she goes crying back to Olympos and her mother's arms (5.334-380). Aphrodite tries

---

64Muellner 1990:89 argues that Paris' attempt to be a warrior in Book 3 fails, not because Paris is inherently a poor fighter, but because Aphrodite and the "subjugating nature" of the sexuality she represents cause him to fail. Monsacré 1984:46-7 notes that Paris in the bed chamber is in the wrong place for a man, particularly during a battle and during the day.

Hektor's view of Paris as a creature of Aphrodite makes its way into the views of scholars as well. For example, Edwards 1987:107 notes that the simile at 6.506 ff. illustrates Paris' beauty more than his speed. Edwards does not make a similar claim about Hektor when he discusses the passage in Book 15 where Hektor receives the same simile; instead he notes that the simile illustrates how Hektor's spirits rise as he returns to battle (154) and that it is "odd" that Hektor receives the same simile as Paris (212).
to make and succeeds for a time at making Paris into a soft city man, into a dancer with shining clothes. By locating Paris with Helen, Aphrodite keeps Paris for herself and opens up for him the possibility of non-heroic behaviour. Paris responds to this possibility by wanting to have sex with Helen and by not attempting to return to battle straightaway. Hektor in Book 6 finds Paris already in the process of returning to warrior status. Paris is handling his arms in his bed chamber; he has brought the battlefield into Aphrodite's world and must leave that world to pursue his role as warrior. The horse simile, given him as he is physically making the move from inside the bed chamber and the city walls to the battlefield outside the walls, shows Paris taking on his proper identity. Further, immediately after receiving the horse simile, Paris receives another short simile, comparing him shining in his armour to the shining of the sun, ηλέκτωρ (6.513). Images of shining heavenly bodies occur in the poem to describe victorious warriors; the comparison to ηλέκτωρ, however, Paris shares only with Achilleus, who receives it at 19.398 as he drives his horses back into battle. The sun simile confirms Paris' return to warrior status. So Paris here, like the horse, breaks bonds of safety and pampering. He breaks free from Aphrodite and Helen. Paris will never again be seen

---

65Cf. Meltzer 1989-1990:244, who notes that the poem, by not mentioning Paris between Books 3 and 6, gives the impression that he has stayed in his bedroom all this time. See also Duchemin 1960:408, who argues that the horse simile, with its detail of the horse's long confinement, does not fit either Paris or Hektor in that regard. I would argue that Paris' apparent confinement in the bedchamber noted by Meltzer corresponds to the horse's confinement.

66See Scott 1974:86. Moulton 1977:94 argues that this simile, like the preceding horse simile, stresses Paris' good looks. In general, comparisons to heavenly bodies do seem, in part, to illustrate beauty. However, Achilleus receives similes comparing him to the sun at 19.398 and 22.135; these images draw upon the beauty of fire as well as its destructive capabilities. Consequently, this use of a sun simile for Paris should also stress his destructive aspect as well. Scott 1974:67 argues that fire and fiery heavenly body similes can be interchangeable. See Whitman 1958:128-153, especially 139, 142-144 on fire imagery in the Iliad.
inside the city walls in the *Iliad*. From the end of Book 6 on, Paris exists in the narrative only as a warrior. He lives now only in his proper place, the battlefield.\(^{67}\)

Hektor, like Paris, must establish himself as a warrior outside of the safety and demands of the city. His relationship to the city is different from Paris' in that Hektor is responsible to and for many different people inside the city. Book 6 articulates Hektor's ties to the city. Here Hektor meets and rejects three people who seek to keep him inside the city and away from the battle: his mother, Hekabe, his sister-in-law, Helen, and his wife, Andromache. Hektor finds his mother and asks her to go pray to Athene. Hekabe asks Hektor to wait so that she can give him wine to drink and with which to pour a libation to Zeus (6.258-260). Hektor rejects the wine on two grounds: first, that it will weaken his μενος, his strength, and make him forget his ἀλκή, his battle courage, and second, because he should not pray to Zeus with his hands covered in blood and gore (6.267-268). The offer of wine to Hektor here is an offer of life inside the city. It is an offer of the normal, safe, and secure aspects of life that are at odds with Hektor's activities as a warrior. The warrior, while he is being warrior (bloody and fighting), cannot move into the peaceful activity of drinking wine and pouring a libation without a diminution in his battle fury and battle might.\(^{68}\)

Further, Hektor has just come into the city from battle; he is covered in blood and the traces

\(^{67}\)Cf. Meltzer 1989-1990:277, who notes that the horse simile at 6.506 ff. shows Paris breaking free both from Hektor's rebukes concerning his unwarriorlike behaviour and from Helen's "enervating influence." Eustathius 659.26 notes that the reference to Paris as τευχεστι παμφαινων at 6.513 shows that Paris is coming to fight as a ὀπλίτης, a proper warrior, rather than as a τοξοτης.

\(^{68}\)Eating and drinking for the warrior are a matter of appropriate context. At 19.155-183, Odysseus reminds Achilleus that the other Achaians should not go back to battle from their rest until they have had an opportunity to eat and drink. See Scully 1990:66-68 on Troy as a place of nurture, dominated by women, that subverts the warrior's virility.
of his fighting. Prayer and libation to the gods inside the city can only be undertaken if one is clean. Hektor is not clean and cannot make himself clean if he is going to go back to fight. Hektor thus, in rejecting his mother's offer of wine, is rejecting the world of the city.

When Hektor has left his mother and has arrived at Paris' house, Helen offers Hektor a chair on which to sit (6.354). Hektor rejects this chair, too. He cannot rest, although he is tired, because, as he says, his spirit is urging him on to defend the Trojans (6.361-362). Moreover, rest is not possible for Hektor right now because, within the city, there are others he must see before returning to battle. Going back to fight is uppermost in Hektor's mind, but he still feels compelled to seek out his wife and child (6.365-366). Warrior though he is, Hektor needs to satisfy the demands of his role as husband and father.

When Hektor meets Andromache, they have a long conversation, in the course of which Andromache asks Hektor to fight from the walls, and not out on the plain, where he is in danger (6.431-437). Hektor refuses this style of fighting because, he says, he would be ashamed before the Trojans to behave that way, because his spirit will not let him, as he has learned to be a good fighter and to stand among the front row of Trojan fighters, and because on the plain he can win κλέος for himself and his father (6.442-446). To fight from the walls is to fight inside the walls. Κλέος cannot be earned from inside the walls, only shame.

Further, to be a good warrior is to fight in the front line, not at the back, and certainly not from the wall. Hektor, as a warrior, cannot agree to be a fighter in any way except the way that his spirit, longing for glory, tells him to fight. Andromache does not understand that a warrior cannot be a warrior inside the city, even if he is fighting inside the city. The warrior's place is out on the field among other warriors, risking his life for κλέος. To fight from the
city walls is to fight from safety and this fight is no fight at all. Hektor then leaves to meet Paris and to return to the field. Like Paris, Hektor is never seen inside the city again in the Iliad. His place from now on will be on the battlefield.

When Hektor takes part in his version of the five-part narrative pattern, he and the Trojans have been meeting victory as they drive the Achaians back to their ships. Hera seduces Zeus, making it possible for Poseidon to assist the Achaians to drive the Trojans away from the camp. During the fighting, Telamonian Aias hits Hektor in the chest with a boulder. Hektor is felled, unconscious (14.409-420). Hektor's companions rush to protect him from further Achaian attacks; they carry him to his horses, who are standing behind the battle line, and the horses carry him back across the plain towards the city (14.428-432).

Hektor, in his injured state, cannot move or act for himself. His companions decide to protect him from death by carrying him, not just behind the lines where his horses are, but back towards the city, the location of the safety that Hektor has earlier rejected. Flight on the

69 Compare here the scorn with which Diomedes greets Paris' striking him with an arrow (Iliad 11.369-395). The archer fights from behind a wall of shield, as Teukros does from behind Aias' shield (Iliad 8.266-334). In the view of the Iliad, the archer is not a real warrior.

70 Meltzer 1989-1990:277 argues that Hektor's conversation with Andromache here is parallel to Paris' long delay with Helen. Both warriors, then, are lingering inside the city with their women, but this lingering is characterized in a different way for each. Cf. Moulton 1977:96, who sees irony in Paris' receiving two splendid similes and being ready for battle while Hektor lingers talking with Andromache.

71 Monsacré 1984:46 notes that, aside from Paris, Hektor meets only women on his trip into Troy; speaking only to women here marks Hektor as not participating in the warrior's proper role, as warriors speak only with other men, be they allies or foes.

72 See Bakker 1995:110-111, especially 111 n. 37, where he notes that Aias is formally staged with his noun-epithet formula Τελαμώνιος Αίας as performing something remarkable or characteristic in his stopping Hektor. See my discussion of Aias the defender in Chapter 5.
field is one thing; flight back towards the city is flight back to the world of the city and its safety and responsibility. Hektor is being carried back towards the city world of safety and its bonds.

When Zeus awakens from sleep, he sees Hektor lying wounded on the ground and the Trojans driven away from the ships. Zeus sends Apollo to revive Hektor and to marshal the Trojans for a day of victory (15.220-235). When Apollo finds Hektor, he asks him why he is sitting feebly apart from the others and wonders if some trouble has come to him (15.244-245). Apollo then revives Hektor, breathing μένως into him. Hektor then returns to battle, receiving his horse simile. Immediately after Hektor receives this simile, he is given another, comparing him to a lion driving hunters and their dogs away from their prey (15.271-276). While the horse simile illustrates Hektor's speed and his return to his proper heroic place, the lion simile illustrates his μένως. The lion simile thus confirms that Hektor has regained his full status as a destructive warrior. Hektor's reappearance causes

73 The word for trouble here is κῆδος, which often has a sense of trouble concerning a family member. Apollo here could be suggesting that Hektor is back in the city in his mind, worrying about his family responsibilities.

74 Edwards 1987:154 notes that the simile marks how Hektor exults as he returns to battle.

75 See Leinieks 1986 for a demonstration that particular kinds of images in similes have particular traditional associations. The lion is one of the traditional figures for μένως. Moulton 1977:69 argues that the lion simile balances the horse simile; the two of them together show Hektor's assault and the panic of the Achaians.

76 De Jong 1987:127 argues that this simile focalizes the view the Achaians have of Hektor as he returns to battle. Cf. Lonsdale 1990:44, 66; Moulton 1977:95. Mueller 1984:115 holds that lion images in the Iliad, besides illustrating heroic might and spirit, show also that the hero has moved outside of human society and abandoned its laws. Mueller's view fits well with my argument regarding the warrior properly existing outside of the civilization and constraints of the city.
the Achaians to lose heart and turn back to the ships (15.279-300). When Apollo shakes the aegis at the Achaian champions who are trying to stand firm, they also flee, driven by Hektor (15.320-327). This flight begins the rout that culminates in the attack on Protesilaos' ship, which Hektor leads (15.704-746). Thus, the warrior status implicit in the two similes is made real in Hektor's performance in battle.

The μένος Apollo restores to Hektor here is the μένος that Hektor feared he would lose in Book 6 if he drank his mother's wine. Μένος is a necessary feature of those who fight.77 Hektor revived is removed from his feebleness and his trouble, and restored to μένος and speed, two features necessary to the warrior.78 Hektor is redeemed from shame and weakness and has become again a terrifying and glorious warrior. His rescue and withdrawal back towards the city are now outweighed by his new vigour and fearsomeness. Hektor has successfully put himself back into his proper heroic place, away from his home and his city.79

77See, for example, Iliad 5.1-3 (Athene gives Diomedes μένος and θάρσος so that he can win κλέος), 8.335-336 (Zeus stirs up μένος in the Trojans, who then drive the Achaians back to their trench), and 15.60-62 (Zeus gives directions to Apollo to breathe μένος into Hektor so that Hektor may turn the Achaians away).

78Compare the Aiantes' discussion of the physical symptoms of their own μένος at Iliad 13.73-80: battle spirit shows itself in the eagerness of hands and feet to fight and kill. For a fuller account of μένος and its physical manifestation, see Monsacré 1984:56-57.

79Monsacré 1984:49 argues that the Iliad, in order to cast Hektor as a real warrior, must isolate Hektor progressively more and more from his family and his city. The poem marks Hektor's assumption of full warrior status through its similes. Up to the moment of his redemption in Book 15, Hektor receives only two similes comparing him to a predatory animal (at 7.256-257 and 12.41-48, where Hektor is compared to a lion). After his redemption Hektor receives eight more similes comparing him to predatory animals (lion: 15.271-276, 15.630-636, 16.756-759, 16.823-827, 18.161-164; eagle: 15.690-692, 22.308-311; hawk: 17.755-759). Schein 1984:180 claims, erroneously, that Hektor, unlike the outstanding warrior
The five-part narrative pattern, threatened defeat and death in battle, rescue and transport to a place of safety, exhortation, return to battle marked by a horse simile, and demonstration of heroic success, has revealed itself to be a story of the warrior’s return to his proper place. In the *Iliad*, the warrior’s proper place is the battlefield, a place removed from the concerns of daily life within the city and from the safety offered by the city walls. This pattern, further, bears a strong resemblance to the general story pattern that Lord has identified as the pattern of the main narrative of both the *Iliad* and of the *Odyssey*: withdrawal, devastation, and return.\(^8^0\)

Paris’ withdrawal from battle in *Iliad* 3 culminates in the devastation of the Trojan forces that prompts Hektor to demand Paris’ return to battle, which saves the Trojans. Hektor’s withdrawal in *Iliad* 14 is part of a general rout of the Trojans that ends with his revival and return in Book 15. Return in the *Odyssey* is of course, νόστος, return home; home is the proper place for Odysseus in his epic. In the *Iliad* the return to the proper place is a return to battle. Paris, Hektor, and Achilleus (who is the protagonist of the larger story pattern in the *Iliad*) all return to battle, their proper location.

§ 4. *Conclusion: Redemption by Simile*

The horse similes for Paris and Hektor, then, are marking them as warriors in the same way that Achilleus is a warrior; like Achilleus, they reject safety and long life and

\(^8^0\)See, for example, Lord 1960:158-197 for this pattern in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and M. L. Lord 1967 on the Homeric Hymn to Demeter.
the responsibilities of their own futures in favour of the freedom and excess of battle. The image of the horse and its implicit connotations of wealth and luxury link Paris and Hektor with the excessive and irresponsible warrior ideal, Achilleus. Both Paris and Hektor receive their heroizing horse similes at moments where they are attempting to re-establish themselves as heroes, having been undermined in that role by other characters, Paris by Aphrodite, Hektor by Aias and his own companions. This repeated simile, then, is redemptive in that it renders Paris and Hektor properly heroic when the explicit narrative has shown them to be shameful or failures as heroes.
The simile for Telamonian Aias at 15.679-684 is not, strictly speaking, a horse simile in the way that the similes discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 are horse similes. In this simile Aias is compared to a rider of horses rather than to a horse. Here Aias is likened to a man who jumps from the back of one horse to another as the horses rush across a plain; the man is watched with amazement by many people. The context for this image is the last ditch defense of the Achaian ships before Hektor and the Trojans manage to set fire to one of the ships. In this passage Aias jumps from the deck of one ship to another as he tries to keep Hektor away. I include this simile in my examination of the horse similes for two reasons: first, because this simile seems to me to serve a recasting function comparable to that of the earlier horse similes of Iliad 6, 15, and 22 and second, because this image, comparing Aias to a man who can control the heroic beast, the horse, contributes to the general semantics of the horse in the Iliad.

In this chapter, I will follow much the same path as in my discussion of the repeated simile at Iliad 6.506 ff. and 15.263 ff. I will sort out the terms the simile itself uses, noting especially the spectacular nature of the rider’s behaviour, while considering how the
terms of the simile apply to the circumstances of the narrative context. This consideration will lead us to the simile’s function in portraying Aias a leader in the defense of the ships. We will see that Aias, like the rider in the simile, is behaving in a spectacular way. Then I will discuss in detail the Iliad’s dominant portrayal of Aias; Aias is the great defensive warrior marked by immobility and an inability to take initiative and make decisions on behalf of others. This portrayal will become clear through an examination of the narrative and also through an interpretation of Aias’ most frequent epithet, Τελαμώνιος, arguing that this epithet refers to Aias as Pillarlike, rather than as the son of Telamon. We will see, finally, how the simile at 15.679-684 assists the poem in recharacterizing Aias: in the middle books of the Iliad Aias is compelled by circumstance to step out of the defensive shadows to lead the defense, to set an example for the rest of the Achaians to follow, to make a spectacle of himself, and thereby to act as a leader; at the moment that Aias steps out of his traditional role, the simile serves to enable Aias, briefly, to become a new kind of warrior through associating him with the horse-rider.

§ 1. Horses and Spectacle in Iliad 15.679 ff.

Hektor is approaching the ships, ready to set fire to them (15.593 ff.). Aias jumps from ship to ship, exhorting the Achaians to repel the attack (15.674-678). He is, at this point, compared to a horse-rider:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ως δ' ὡτ' ἀνήρ ἰπποισι κελητίζειν ἐν εἰδώς,} \\
\text{ὁς τ' ἐπεῖ ἐκ πολέων πίσυρας συναείρεται ἰπποὺς,} \\
\text{σειὰς ἐκ πεδίοιο μέγα προτὶ ἀστυ δὴνται} \\
\text{λαοφόρον καθ' ὁδον· πολέες τὲ ἐθησαντο} \\
\text{ἀνέρες ἤδε γυναικες· ὁ δ' ἐμπεδον ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ}
\end{align*}
\]
And as a man who is an expert rider of horses who when he has chosen and coupled four horses out of many makes his way over the plain galloping towards a great city along the travelled road, and many turn to admire him, men and women, while he steadily and never slipping jumps and shifts his stance from one to another as they gallop. (15.679-684)

Let us begin by considering the terms of the simile point by point. The simile begins by referring to a man, who is skilful (ἐὖ εἰδὼς) at riding horses (κεληττείων).

κεληττείων designates specifically riding on a horse. It occurs only once in the poems, and is related to κελῆς, a riding-horse. The man's skill does not lie in being a charioteer, which is the only kind of horse-riding we see elsewhere in the Iliad, with one exception: Odysseus and Diomedes ride horses in Iliad 10 (512-514, 526-530). At Odyssey 5.370-372 Odysseus rides a ship's timber as though riding a κελῆς. Riding on a horse's back is thus rare in the Homeric poems, which suggests that the event being compared to this horse-riding is itself something unusual.¹

¹Janko 1992 ad loc. tells us that Aristarchus says that Homer knew of riding but avoids it, like trumpets, boiled meat, fish, and quadrigas. Notice that trumpets and quadrigas occur in similes. Fish occur in the episode in Od. 12 on Thrinacia, as well as in similes at Iliad 16.406-410, 21.22-26, and 23.692-695. Aside from boiled meat, then, all of these features of "ordinary" life that the poems avoid show up in similes. This finding fits in with Fränkel's demonstration that the world of the similes is not the world of the poems. We could see here support for the view that in the similes the poets draw on the world of their own experience for their images. Compare Greenhalgh 1973:53 on this passage, who argues that although in similes the poet thinks of his own time, he keeps the narrative "strictly archaized," by having warriors use chariots. Greenhalgh notes that Aristarchus athetized Iliad 8.185, where Hektor drives a quadriga, while he kept Odyssey 13.81-83, a simile containing a quadriga.
the particular weapon he plies.\textsuperscript{2} Warriors are described as \textit{εὐ εἴδως} of bows or arrows (2.718, 720; 4.196, 206; 5.245; 12.350, 363) of battle in general (2.823; 4.310; 5.11, 549; 12.100), of \textit{άλκη} (15.527), and of the spear (15.525). The predominance of the martial associations for this phrase resonates strongly with the context.\textsuperscript{3}

Just as the horseman in the simile is \textit{εὐ εἴδως}, well-knowing, so is Aias skilful. At \textit{Iliad} 7.197-199, Aias, about to enter his duel with Hektor, says that no one will beat him back by \textit{βίς}, force, nor by \textit{ιδρείς}, knowledge, since he is not \textit{νητός}, ignorant, of fighting. Here we see Aias, in a context where he is about to fight with Hektor in particular, claim his own status as a skilled warrior. Now, in Book 15, Aias as defender of the ships is pitted against Hektor as leader of the Trojan attack. Hektor’s presence is noted immediately after Aias’ simile, as the poem describes him rushing upon a ship (15.688-694). Moreover, Aias’ moving about from deck to deck of the ships implies that he is a warrior skilled not only at land fighting, but at sea-fighting as well. The weapon he uses to defend the ships is not his regular battle spear, but a \textit{ξυστῶν ναύμαχον}, a pike for sea-fighting (15.677). Aias is thus a consummate warrior demonstrating here his expertise in \textit{all} areas of battle.

In the simile the man has chosen four horses out of a herd of \textit{many} horses just as Aias is moving among the \textit{many} ships of the Achaians. The poem refers to the ships consistently in the plural in this passage; Aias walks upon the decks of the ships 15.676 (\textit{νηών ἱκρι ἐπώχετο}), and he wanders upon the many decks of the swift ships 15.685-686

\textsuperscript{2}Exceptions are \textit{Iliad} 1.185, 385, 515; 6.150 = 20.213, 438; 9.345; 21.487.

\textsuperscript{3}Wiesner 1968:110 and Fränkel 1921:79 suggest that the man with the horses here is a servant who is retrieving the horses for his master, which, if true, could suggest a non-aristocratic association in this simile.
(ἐπὶ πολλὰ θοῶν ἱκρα νηῶν φοίτα). As there are many (πολέων) horses at 15.680, so there are many (πολλὰ) ships and decks of ships.  

The simile next refers to the horseman as, σεῦως ἐκ πεδίων μέγα προτι ἀστυ διήται (15.681). Swift movement is suggested in σεῦως, urging, which often has the sense of pursuit or of driving something.  

There is a strong sense of external compulsion in σεῦως. Further, the man is driving the horses (διήται), which again implies swiftness. δίηματι, like σεῦω, is often used to describe pursuit, which again suggests external compulsion in the movement of the horses.

Σεῦω also occurs in the context for the horse similes used for Paris and Hektor. At 6.505, Paris σεῦετ’, rushes, through the city. At 15.272, in the simile for Hektor that immediately follows his horse simile, dogs and hunters ἔσευωνυμο, drive, a deer or wild goat. It also occurs in the context for Achilleus’ horse simile at 22.22, where Achilleus goes back to the city σεῦεμενος, rushing. This horse simile in Book 15, then, draws upon

---

4The word for four at 15.680 is πίσυρας, which is an Aeolic form; the regular Ionic form would be τέσσαρας. The metrical shape of πίσυρας is ~ ~ (here long by position), that of τέσσαρας is ~ ~; the πίσυρας thus fits the line, whereas the Ionic form would not. Janko 1992 ad loc. says that this is not an Aeolic form, but an Aeolism. The poem uses Aeolisms, generally, not for metrical convenience, but to archaize. At this point, the simile may be trying to make its contents look ancient as a way of compensating the anachronism of the rider on horseback in the simile, if Greenhalgh 1973:53 is right (see note 1 above).

5Cunliffe 1924 s.v. “σεῦως;” Ebeling 1963 s.v. “σεῦω.” Compare 3.25-26 (dogs and hunters drive a hungry lion off from a deer or a goat) and 15.271-272 (dogs and men pursue a deer or a goat).

6Compare the discussion of this verb at 6.505 in Chapter 4.

7Compare 7.197-199 (no one will drive Aias away by might or skill), 12.275-276 (the Aiantes urge the Achaians to move forward in case Zeus allows them to drive the Trojans towards the city), and 22.189-190 (a dog pursues a fawn in the mountains).
vocabulary for describing swift movement that the other horse similes or their contexts share.

Notice that, even though the horses are the ones doing the running, the simile focuses on the man - his urging and driving are what the movement really consists in. His initiative and control are at the fore. All of this is appropriate to the initial statement that he is well-knowing how to ride. It explains that knowing how to ride means being able to make horses move. The horseman, moreover, is driving the horses from the plain towards the big city. We might suppose that the ships are the city of the Achaians; their camp and their ships are the only society that exists for them at Troy. The ships are surrounded with a wall, just like a city. The poem, elsewhere in Book 15, stresses the identity of ships and walls: at 15.381-383, the Trojans and their chariots coming over the walls of the Achaians are compared to a great wave washing over the walls of a ship. Again, at 15.624-629, Hektor charging the Achaians is compared to a wave in a storm falling on a ship. In both cases, just as the ships in the narrative are under attack, so the ships in these two similes are attacked by waves. The Trojans on their chariots are the waves that overwhelm the ships.

The path here is λαοφόρος, people-carrying. λαός generally has the sense of

---

8The man is driving the horses across the plain, which is where one has the greatest freedom of movement with horses, towards a big city. Recall that the horse in the simile at 6.506 ff. = 15.263 ff. is also rushing across a plain. Speed for horses needs the wide open space of a plain, or a racetrack, as in the similes for Achilles and Hektor in Iliad 22. Compare 5.221-223, where Aineias tells Pandaros to see how his horses know how to pursue here and there swiftly across the plain and how to flee. There the horses are ἐπιστάμενοι (compare the rider here, who is ἐν οἰκών); their skill consists in running across the plain. Horses running belong on the plain. The plain is linked to a city here explicitly. He drives from the plain to the big city. As with the simile for Paris and Hektor, given the remarks of Aineias, we can see that the horses belong on the plain.
a unified people, such as an army or a city.9 So the λαοφόρος ὀδός here carries people who belong together. This phrase also makes clear the fact that the roads are the haunts of people. Ships are also in fact people-carrying objects, although they have no epithet indicating that function. The sea, however, on which ships travel as these horses and their rider travel on the road, is described as having paths on it.10

So far, then, the simile has pointed to Aias as a consummate warrior and has identified the ships with a fortress city. It is in the next features of the simile, however, that its essential work is accomplished.

The horseman is driving his horses along a well-used road, and many people are watching him: they θηῆσαντο (15.682). In general, θηῆσαμαι has the sense of watching, and of marvelling at.11 The man here is doing something worth staring at. The gods on Olympos also watch Achilleus and Hektor race around Troy in Book 22; there the verb is ὀρῶντο (22.166). These spectators suggest that watching is integral to the semiotics of the horse. The simile in Book 15 implies the attitude of the people watching by the use of θηῆσαμαι -- they watch with amazement (the verb is cognate with θαῦμα, which, every time it is used in the Iliad, is something that is seen).12 The rider’s activity, then, is spectacular,
unusual, worth watching. The presence of this wonder in the simile implies that what Aias is doing in the narrative in making a trip from one ship to another is also unusual, worthy of amazement. The many watching in the simile are matched in the narrative by the Danaans, whom Aias through his action is urging to defend the ships (15.687-688).

The simile has one individual, the rider, set off from a unified group. So here one individual, Aias, is set off from a unified group, the Achaians. At 15.674-676 we see that Aias does not want to stay where the rest of the Achaians are standing apart. Again, at 15.687-688, Aias alone is urging the Danaans, as a group, to defend the ships. Both the simile and the narrative are marking off one individual who stands out from a large united group. Aias’ separation from the rest of the Achaians, like the separation of the rider from the community of bystanders, is achieved in part by his being the one individual whom the others watch. This focus on the single individual is, I believe, the first crucial aspect of the simile. The second is the action the rider is performing.

The actions of the man in the simile are described as being performed ἐμπεδοῦν ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ (15.683). The poem stresses his calm control of the horses. ἐμπεδοῦν means steadily; literally, on the feet. ἀσφαλὲς means unshakenly, literally. As

8.17, πολλοὶ δ’ ἀρα θησαυροῦ, where the Phaiakians gather at Alkinoos’ palace to see the stranger, Odysseus, and Erga 482, πεῦροι δὲ σε θησαυροῦνται, where the farmer who ploughs at the solstice reaps a poor crop and few will wonder at him; in his commentary on this line of Erga, West notes the similarity between this phrase and Iliad 15.682, under discussion here.

13ἀνέρες ἡ δὲ γυναῖκες at 15.683 is formular, Janko 1992 ad loc.; it appears three times in the poems: here, Iliad 7.139, and Odyssey 15.163. The presence of the women who are watching depends on the presence of a city in the context of the Iliad and further, coupled with ἀνέρες, indicates that the group of watchers represents the entire community.

one who is κελητίζειν ἐν ἐιδώς, the rider here is marked by his absolute security in this
dangerous activity of jumping from one horse to another. ἄλλοτ' ὑπ' ἄλλοιν ἀμείβεται
(15.684) implies fairly frequent and regular jumping back and forth. So the man seems to be
travelling this way. That is, he is not actually riding the horses at all, but leaping from horse
to horse as the horses run.\(^\text{15}\) Fränkel suggests that the man is a servant getting horses from a
farm, who jumps from horse to horse as the horses travel so as not to tire out any individual
animal.\(^\text{16}\) In other words, the jumping serves a purpose internal to the activity, and is not a
demonstration of “trick” riding.\(^\text{17}\)

\(^{15}\)Janko 1992 \textit{ad} 15.679-684 suggests that the rider here could be compared to the
ἀναβάτης or κάλπη competition at the Olympics. In this race, riders would ride a single mare
around the \textit{dromos} and then for the final lap, would jump off the horse and run alongside
(Pausanias 5.9.1-2, Schneider 1919:1760-1761). There is no indication in the simile that the
horseman is jumping off the horses or running beside them; rather he is jumping from one horse
to another. Moreover, the κάλπη was part of Olympic competition only from 496-444; those
dates are too late for the simile to be a reference to any contemporary practice. Consequently, I
see no reason to compare the horseman here to an ἀναβάτης. I wonder, however, if we see here
a reminiscence of Minoan acrobatics. We might compare the rider’s activity to bull-jumping (an
who also connects the activity of the man in the simile to acrobatics and to bull-jumping.
(Compare also the presence of the tumblers among the dancers on Achilleus’ shield (18.604-605)
and the ball dance performed at Alkinoos’ court at \textit{Odyssey} 8.370-389, which seems rather
acrobatic.) The presence of the many spectators is then explained by the fact that this rider is not
merely a chance comer-by, but a performer. In both cases, that of the ἀναβάτης and that of the
Minoan acrobats, we have a context of spectatorship implied in the activity itself, which is here
made explicit in the presence of the people marvelling at the horseman.

If I am right about the Minoan reminiscence, then we have another archaizing element in
the simile (besides the AEolism πίσυρας). Indeed, the whole simile becomes an archaism, rather
than an anachronistic insertion of contemporary horse-riding, as Greenhalgh 1973:53 argues.

\(^{16}\)Fränkel 1929:79.

\(^{17}\)Wiesner 1968:110 agrees with Fränkel that the horseman here is someone driving
horses and jumping from back to back.

I have gone into this consideration of the precise nature of the activity of the man in the
simile because it seems to me, ultimately, rather mysterious.
The man on the horses is marked as steady and unshaken in his riding. This steadiness is a mark of his skill. So Aias here, the skilful warrior, is steady and constant in his activity. But what exactly is his activity? The rider in the simile is moving from one horse to another while the horses rush along the road just as Aias is moving from one ship to another (15.685-686). In leaping from ship to ship he is *exhorting* the other warriors and binding them together through his example into a community, a strong wall. Aias yokes together the Danaans through his spectacular behaviour of leaping from ship to ship. This is very uncharacteristic behaviour for Aias, as we can see by looking at his portrayal in the *Iliad* as a whole.

---

18 Aias’ constancy is suggested at line 687 by the use of *αἰεῖ* to describe his exhortation. Hubbard 1981:64-66 argues that one function of this simile for Aias is to stress his “rational, methodical” defense of the ships by drawing on the world of culture. Culture, Hubbard argues, is opposed to nature in the simile at 15.690-692 comparing Hektor to an eagle; this opposition captures the difference between the wildness of the attacking Hektor and the domestication of the defending Aias. In light of Hubbard’s articulation I would suggest that the domestication of Aias captures his commitment to the defense of the ships while Hektor’s wildness captures the absence of ties of responsibility between attacker and attacked. Cf. Lynn-George 1996:1 who argues that violence in the *Iliad* is generally defined as the absence of any form of care.

19 The ships here, unlike the horses, are not moving. Nonetheless, the ships do receive one of their characteristic modifiers, *θοάων*, swift (15.685). *θοάων νηόν* is of course formulaic and one must be cautious in placing a great deal of weight on generic formulaic epithets. Sacks 1987:108-150, in his examination of the generic formulaic epithet *φαίδιμος* gives us some reason to attach meaning to generic epithets. So here, in part, the simile may be transforming the stationary ships of the narrative into the moving ships of a naval battle and Aias here with his long pike may be the warrior defending his ships at sea. Janko 1992 *ad* 15.679-684 argues that the poet calls the ships “swift” here to remind us that, although in this instance the ships are not moving, their “true nature” is to be swift, which makes the image of the simile more apt.
§ 2. Aias the Defender

In the battle for the ships in *Iliad* 15, Aias must serve as a leader for the Achaians; all of the major Achaian warriors have been wounded and have left the field, so that Aias is the last warrior of any status left standing. Consequently, the responsibility for marshalling the defense falls on him. The role of leader is not one that Aias usually takes; so, in Book 15, Aias is acting uncharacteristically. The simile at 15.679 ff. assists the narrative in its transformation of Aias; it stresses his skill and points to his now being, like the man in the simile, a spectacle and a yoker and driver of men.

In what follows, I will examine first the nature of leadership in the *Iliad*; it will become clear that leadership depends on the ability to take initiative and on the ability to speak in public. Aias is typically not marked by either of these abilities. Next, I will examine Aias’ typical function in the *Iliad*, that of defensive warrior. We will see here that defensive excellence in some ways excludes the possibility of excellence as a leader. That Aias is typically a defensive warrior reveals the need for a transformation in Book 15: the great defender, marked by silence and stolidity, must become more like the aggressive and self-motivating leader. The horse-riding simile for Aias, then, will reveal itself as serving a transformative or recasting function comparable to that of the horse similes for Paris, Hektor, and Achilleus.

a) Aias’ Characterization in the Narrative of the Iliad

All of the leaders of men among the Achaians are marked, as Aias himself is, by their general heroic excellence: they are all noble, all leaders within their own
communities at home, all superb warriors capable of exciting fear in battle, all renowned for their heroic status. Such leaders are marked by the striving that Hektor speaks of at *Iliad* 6.208-209, always to be the best and to excel among others. Leaders must also be able to speak persuasively, to convince others to follow their suggestions and commands. This ability to speak well is most relevant in the *Iliad* in council scenes. In these scenes we see that there is among the Achaians a hierarchical system of speaking. The two great speakers in council are Agamemnon and Nestor. Agamemnon always speaks first (as at 2.53-85, 4.256-272, and 9.8-103) and his words are always heeded. For example, in Book 2, the Achaian elders agree to follow his suggestion to test the forces, who later, when Agamemnon tells them of his conviction that they should return home, act on that stated conviction (2.73-86, 139-154). In Book 9, Agamemnon’s desire to return home elicits the suggestion Nestor makes that they send an embassy to Achilleus (9.26-28, 111-113, 163-172). Nestor’s effectiveness as a speaker is marked by his suggestions always being heeded. Nestor is the one who suggests the construction of the walls and the trench around the Achaian ships (7.337-343), which are built at 7.435-441. Nestor likewise suggest sending men among the Trojans to kill some of them and to listen for news (10.204-217); Diomedes volunteers to go (10.220-226). Nestor is the one who suggests that the embassy go to Achilleus. Nestor is the one who urges Patroklos to ask Achilleus to let him return to battle in Achilleus’ armour

---


21Letoublon 1983:42-43 argues that being the best means excelling in aggressive combat by killing large numbers of the enemy and by killing an especially good opponent in single combat. Aias’ preeminence as a defensive warrior, in that case, cannot ever qualify him as the best of those fighting at Troy because the arena of his excellence is the wrong arena.
(11.796-801); Patroklos makes his request at 16.38-45, using Nestor’s own words and arguments. Effective speech and the ability to make speeches on which others can act are the hallmarks of the leader.

Agamemnon acts most like a leader of the Achaian forces in Book 4 during the Epipoleis; this episode also brings to the fore some of the key issues involved in the Iliad’s account of martial leadership. Here Agamemnon visits each of the major Achaian chiefs as they prepare their troops for battle, praising some and abusing others as they act like leaders (4.231-249). Agamemnon praises Idomeneus here, after he finds Idomeneus himself among his front-fighters and Meriones urging on the Cretan φάλλαγγες (4.251-264). He next praises the two Aiantes when he finds them equipping themselves and their foot soldiers following them (4.273-291). Agamemnon also praises Nestor, who is arranging his fighters and urging them to fight (4.293-316). He then proceeds to rebuke and abuse, first Menestheus and Odysseus (4.338-348), and then Diomedes (4.370-400). Menestheus, Odysseus, and Diomedes all seem to incur Agamemnon’s insults by their not appearing to be doing anything to prepare their forces; all three are described as standing with or beside their men (Menestheus is ἐσταότ’ at 4.328; Odysseus ἑστήκει at 4.329; Diomedes is ἑσταότ’ at 4.336). The first three speeches of praise are made to leaders who are actually doing something to prepare for battle.


23 Cf. Kirk 1985 ad 4.333-335, who notes that any doubt that the frequent references to standing mean “standing around” is cleared up by Agamemnon’s speech.
Note here that, in the cases of Idomeneus and Meriones and of Nestor, the preparation for battle involves speech of some kind. Nestor makes a speech of exhortation and direction at 4.303-309. Idomeneus himself is not explicitly described as speaking to his front-fighters, but Meriones is described as rousing the ranks in the rear (πῦματας ὀτρυνε φάλλαγγας, 4.254). The verb that describes Meriones' action here, ὀτρύνω, does not necessarily indicate rousing or urging through speech. It does, however, consistently occur in contexts where social superiors urge or command their social inferiors to perform certain actions through speech. Consequently, speech from Meriones does seem implicit in this passage.

The two Aiantes, on the other hand, make no speeches to their troops; the narrative, further, gives no indication that they have been speaking. The poem tells us, τῶ δὲ κορυσσεόθην, ἄμα δὲ νέφος εἰπετο πεζῶν (4.274). The appearance of the troops is then likened to the appearance of a storm cloud bringing a whirlwind to a shepherd, who shudders when he sees the cloud and drives his flocks into a cave (4.275-279). The poem then goes on to describe the troops as dense, dark, and bristling with shields and spears (4.281-282). The impression one receives of the troops from this description and from the preceding simile is that of a more or less undifferentiated mass with the fluidity and indefiniteness of a cloud. One does not see here an organized column going into battle.

---

24 For example, 4.294 (Nestor is arranging his companions and urging them to fight; his speech at 4.303-309), 15.59 (Zeus says that Apollo should rouse Hektor to fight, which Apollo does in a speech at 15.244-245), and 24.143 (Zeus urges Iris to go down to Troy; his speech at 24.144-158).

Contrast the descriptions of the Cretan contingent and Nestor's troops. The Cretans are at least marked out as being divided into front-fighters (προμάχοις 4.253) and the ranks in the rear (πύματας φάλλαγγας 4.254). Nestor's troops are divided into contingents behind their different leaders (4.295-296), the chariots are placed in the front, the foot soldiers in the rear (4.297-298), and the cowards in the middle (4.299). Nestor next gives a speech of advice to his charioteers (4.303-309). At the end of the speech, the poem calls Nestor ὁ γέρων πάλαι πολέμων εὖ εἰδὼς (4.310), marking his long-standing expertise in warfare. Nestor's expertise manifests itself here in his careful division and arrangement of his troops and in his use of speech to direct them. Idomeneus and Meriones likewise divide and arrange their troops and appear to use speech to direct them; they also manifest, to a lesser degree, Nestor's expertise in warfare. In a context where leadership is an issue, Aias is marked as a silent leader, set off from the other chiefs, who divide their troops and lead with words.²⁶

Aias' inability to speak in such a way as to initiate others' action is in keeping with his defensive role.²⁷ The Iliad marks Aias as the great defensive warrior and as one who always follows other's leads, who is generally not the first to kill a man in battle, who is never the first one that any character thinks to mention for any particular activity, but who nonetheless always performs bravely and well. Aias stands in the shadows cast by the other Achaian heroes. The poem's characterization of Aias as best of the Achaians after Achilleus

²⁶Notice also that Idomeneus and Nestor both respond to Agamemnon's praise with speeches (4.265-271, 318-325), while the Aiantes are silent.

(2.768-769), while it notes his excellence, also condemns him. In a situation where the aggressive warrior hero is the model, the defensive warrior will always be inadequate.\textsuperscript{28}

Aias' role as the great defensive warrior is marked most obviously by his characteristic armour; unlike the rest of the Achaians, unlike any other warrior at Troy, Aias carries the great σάκος ἑύτε πύργον, the shield like a tower (7.219, 11.485, 17.128). The comparison of Aias' shield to a tower does not just express the shield's unusual size; it also stresses its defensive function.\textsuperscript{29} In the \textit{Iliad}, a tower is not a place from which attacks are launched; it is a place of defense.\textsuperscript{30} Aias is also called the bulwark of the Achaians, the ἔρκος Ἀχαίων (3.229, 6.5, 7.211). As the bulwark of the Achaians, Aias is again marked as a defender, not as an aggressor. No other hero receives this title, and this, I suggest, is because no other hero is so consistently and uniquely a defensive warrior.\textsuperscript{31} Given that Aias is already marked as a defensive warrior, we must examine his performance in battle to see just what other features are typical of the defensive warrior in the \textit{Iliad}.

First, one notes that Aias is consistently portrayed as coming or acting

\textsuperscript{28}Compare my discussion of Paris, Hektor, and warrior ideals in Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{29}Kirk 1968:113 connects Aias' shield to his status as the great \textit{static} defender. I will discuss Aias' immobility below.

\textsuperscript{30}See, for example, 4.461-462 (Echepolos falls like a tower in battle; presumably here a tower under attack), 7.337-338 (Nestor suggest building πύργους ὑψηλοὺς to be a protection for the ships and for the Achaians), and 15.737-738 (Aias reminds the Achaians that there is no city with towers nearby in which they can protect themselves).

\textsuperscript{31}A possible exception to this statement would be Hektor, the holder of Troy, who is characterized in part as a great "wall warrior." Cf. Scully 1990:59.
second. As I have mentioned above, Aias is second best of the Achaians (after Achilleus). That status is difficult to interpret, but in part seems to reflect the characterization of Aias as a follower. When open battle begins in *Iliad* 4, we learn that Antilochos was the first Achaian to kill a man, Echepolos (4.457-471), followed by Aias (4.473-489). In Book 7, Aias fights in single combat with Hektor, but only after Menelaos volunteers and is rejected (7.94-119) and Nestor rebukes all of the rest of the Achaians for their cowardice (7.124-160). In Book 8, Diomedes drives his chariot onto the plain and kills a man (8.253-257), followed by the rest of the Achaian chiefs, first Agamemnon and Menelaos and then Aias (8.261-262). During the embassy to Achilleus in Book 9, Aias speaks last of the three ambassadors (9.622-642). When the embassy returns without Phoinix, Agamemnon implicitly acknowledges Odysseus as the leader of the embassy by asking Odysseus for news of their success and not Aias (9.673-675). In Book 10, when Nestor suggests sending spies to the Trojan camp, Diomedes volunteers first, asking for a companion (10.220-226); the Aiantes, Meriones, Antilochos, Menelaos, and Odysseus all want to follow him (10.227-232). When Odysseus is wounded in Book 11, Menelaos hears his cries and suggests to Aias that they go assist Odysseus; Aias follows Menelaos’ suggestion and the two go to help Odysseus, Menelaos leading and Aias following (11.451-472). In Book 12, Menestheus sends the herald Thoas to summon Aias to help him defend his position on the wall (12.342-350); Aias heeds this request (12.364.). In Book 17, during the fight over Patroklos’ corpse, Menelaos summons Aias to help him defend the corpse, and Aias once again responds (17.113-125). Aias is the

---

32 Aias’ coming second is, of course, notable outside the *Iliad* in his coming second to Odysseus in the competition for Achilleus’ arms (*Odyssey* 11.543-551; cf. Pindar *Nemean* 7.24-27, 8.26-27.)
always willing, always effective, follower. He is not, like Diomedes, one to stand up first to volunteer, but must always wait and respond to the initiative of others. Defense as such, in the person of the defensive warrior, is not proactive, but reactive; defense means responding to others’ actions, others’ words, not being the first one to act or the first one to speak.33

In some ways, being the defender means being taken for granted.34 Aias is someone whose presence is always assumed. He is always ready to go to another’s aid, always prepared to leave his own immediate situation in order to do what someone else wants. Others want him only in situations where they are threatened with defeat or death; Menestheus wants Aias to help him defend his tower, Menelaos wants him to help him defend Patroklos. In situations where the Achaians are succeeding in their attack on Troy, Aias is not the warrior that other warriors think to summon. Only when defense is needed is the bulwark of the Achaians recognized and his presence demanded.35 In general, Aias does little to draw himself to others’ attention; he is not a speaker at assemblies, he is not someone who demands to be heard and heeded (with the exception of his role in the embassy in Book 9, a role given to him, not one that he seeks); instead Aias is marked always by a willingness to assist others and respond to their needs. Aias, then, is not simply the great defensive

33Cf. O’Higgins 1989:45, who notes that Aias’ designation as the ἔρκος Ἀχιλών and as the best after Achilleus both confers honour and sets limits on Aias.

34Kirk 1985 ad 2.448 suggests that Aias’ brief treatment in the Catalogue of Ships and Helen’s dismissal of Aias in the Teichoskopia may be bits of “psychological subtlety.” I suggest that the poem asks its audience to take the same attitude towards Aias that his fellow Achaians do.

35Kirk 1990 ad 5.519-521 notes that Aias is always prominent where things are not going well for the Achaians.
warrior, but is also the warrior of  αἰδώς, of respect for others.36

Defensiveness as manifested by Aias is not simply an inability to take initiatives, but is also a willingness to recognize the needs of the community. Aias is always marked by this willingness. When summoned in battle, he always responds; when told to join the embassy to Achilleus, he goes without hesitation. Aias is the warrior who always thinks of others. This feature is made explicit in two passages: in his speech to Achilleus in Book 9 and in his speech of exhortation to the Achaians at 15.561-564, shortly before he receives his horse simile at 15.560 ff. In each of these passages, Aias asks others to act upon the principles that motivate himself, upon friendship and concern for the community.

At Iliad 9.624-642, Aias gives his speech after Odysseus and Phoinix have both failed to convince Achilleus to return to battle. His speech is considerably shorter than

36See Benveniste 1969:340, who argues that  αἰδώς designates feelings of respect and obligation to members of one’s own group, noting in particular that a feeling of  αἰδώς compels one member of a group to defend another. Cairns 1993:49 also argues that  αἰδώς is motivated by concern for others, although he stresses that in the Iliad that concern shows itself primarily in concern for others’ opinion of oneself and less significantly as concern for the well-being of one’s group. Collins 1988:23 links  αἰδώς to individualism, arguing that, in the Iliad, individual κλέος is dependent upon the welfare of the group. Hooker 1987:122-124 argues that the primary meaning of  αἰδώς in the Iliad is respect for others. Sinos 1980:40-41 argues that  αἰδώς in the Iliad designates a sense of social obligation. van Wees 1992:68-76 argues that  αἰδώς in the Iliad deals primarily with “norms of deference.” Whitman 1958:171-172 remarks that Aias’ commitment to  αἰδώς, expressed in his speech to Achilleus in Book 9, manifests itself in his taking most of the burden consequent upon Achilleus’ continued refusal to fight. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1959:349-350 argues that  αἰδώς means respect, as in respect for others and in self-respect; in general, he says,  αἰδώς subdues the individual will. Zanker 1990:216 argues that  αἰδώς carries with it notions both of shame and of respect, while acknowledging that loyalty in the Iliad often includes a sense of care. By 1992 Zanker seems to have revised his views somewhat, arguing that  αἰδώς means “reverence for obligation” (Zanker 1992:20).

Hainsworth 1993 ad 9.620-668 notes that Aias is characterized throughout the Iliad as calm, reliable, and silent.
Odysseus' and Phoinix' speeches. Aias appeals three times in his eighteen-line speech to the idea of bonds that tie men together. He notes that Achilleus, in his refusal to fight, is forgetting that his actions are having bad consequences for his friends, that Achilleus is not respecting (αἰδεσσαί 9.640) the members of the embassy as his guests, and reminds Achilleus that those who have come to him are the φίλαττοι of the Achaians to him (9.642). Aias is reminding Achilleus that the war at Troy is not simply about the quest for prizes and glory (the two things to which Odysseus and Phoinix appeal in their attempts to persuade Achilleus to return to battle), but that there are responsibilities attendant upon being a member of this expedition. Achilleus is one of the Achaians and his belonging to that group means that he must, in Aias' view, think more about what is good for the community as a whole, more in terms of being responsible and respectful, than about his personal desires and profit.38

In Book 15 Aias appeals to the Achaians as a whole with the same principle of αἰδώς that he uses in his speech to Achilleus. In a speech of four lines at 15.560-563, Aias

37Benveniste 1969:340-341 argues that the notion of the φίλος is closely related to αἰδώς; those who are φίλοι must recognize the demands of αἰδώς amongst themselves. By calling himself φίλος to Achilleus, a designation Achilleus does not dispute, Aias is insisting that Achilleus see himself as obliged to his φίλοι. Hainsworth 1993 ad 9.206-221 notes that Aias is reminding Achilleus that his obligations to the embassy are all the stronger because he has just shared a meal with them.

38Higbie 1990:120 notes that Aias' speech here contains the longest sequence of what she calls "skewed sentences" in the poem (a skewed sentence is one where neither the beginning nor the end of the sentence coincides with the beginning or ending of a line (Higbie 1990:77)). In this speech Higbie sees seven skewed sentences, notes that almost every line of the speech is enjambed, and argues that this constant crossing of the bounds of the hexameter captures Aias' anger here very well. This anger over Achilleus' refusal to acknowledge the demands of αἰδώς points up Aias' own commitment to it.
uses forms of αἴδως or αἴδεομαι three times (15.561, 562, 563). In defense, warriors must not think of themselves and their own personal desires or motives, they must not fight as they would fight in an aggressive context, each forging a path across the field; instead, they must be mindful of each other and of the effects that each man's actions will have on his companions. The goal of defensive warfare is not the same as the goal of aggressive warfare; to defend successfully, warriors must stand by each other and present a united front, a wall, to their attackers. As the defensive warrior of αἴδως, Aias understands and acts on this principle more than any other warrior at Troy, Trojans and Achaians included.39

b) Aias' Epithet Τελαμώνιος

The narrative of the Iliad establishes Aias as the defensive warrior of αἴδως. In what follows, I will attempt to demonstrate that this characterization corresponds to a traditional characterization of Aias as the immobile defensive warrior, as is revealed through his traditional epithet, Τελαμώνιος. I will do this by exploring the implications of Paul Girard's suggestion that Τελαμώνιος Αἰας does not mean Aias the son of Telamon, but Aias the Pillarlike. This exploration will entail examining passages in the Iliad where Aias is called Τελαμώνιος to see if the poem retains any memory of an original sense of Τελαμώνιος as pillarlike. Through this examination it will emerge that in almost all of the contexts in which he is designated Τελαμώνιος, Aias consistently retains his characteristic immobility, defensive excellence, and inability to take initiative.

39O'Higgins 1989:53n.15 notes that Aias typically does not fight as a champion in single combat but as the rallier of a "necessarily cooperative defense."
Aias is, of course, the ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν, the bulwark of the Achaians, a title not shared by any other Achaian. Already in that epithet the notions of defense and immobility are linked: a bulwark is a wall that stands between attackers and their prey. This epithet, which serves so well to express Aias’ role within the Iliad, is one that Aias receives only three times, at 3.229, 6.5, and 7.211, so it is not from this phrase that we can definitively take Aias’ defensive immobility as his dominant traditional characteristic.

Aias’ most frequent epithet is Τελαμώνιος, which he receives thirty-six times in the Iliad in four cases and in name-epithet formulae that expand the basic formula Τελαμώνιος Αίας (2.528, 768; 4.473; 5.610, etc.). In its frequency and flexibility Τελαμώνιος Αίας is marked as a very old and developed part of traditional epic diction. Aias has other features that also mark him as a very ancient figure in the tradition. His name, Aias, is attested on Mycenaean tablets as ai-wa. The σάκος ἥπε τύργον, the shield like a tower (7.219, 11.485, 17.128), which belongs only to Aias, is Mycenaean in origin, as is the line in which it is embedded. Three times Aias’ name in the dative, Αἰαντι, is given the metrical value rather than (from Aiwántei in Mycenaean). Aias’ epithet ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν, and the phrase ἐπιείμενοι ἄλκην, used to describe Aias and Lokrian Aias at Iliad 7.164, 8.262, and 18.157, have parallels in other Indo-European epic traditions, which

---

40 Janko 1992 ad 13.46 remarks that Aias comes from early Mycenaean epic.


marks them as very ancient. Further, Aias' not wearing body armour, his use of the tower shield in general, and, in particular, his covering Teukros with this shield while Teukros shoots from behind it with his bow at *Iliad* 8.266-272, are all very ancient kinds of battle practice. Aias is one of the most ancient elements of the Iliadic tradition.

Like other very ancient elements of the epic tradition, aspects of Aias have been retained by the tradition without understanding. Just as the poem has continued to use phrases devised to describe Mycenaean body shields to describe the archaic round shield or the word λίς without knowing any longer what these words mean, so the tradition can be understood to have continued to use Aias' most frequent epithet, Τελαμωνιος, without understanding what it means. For the *Iliad*, Τελαμωνιος is a patronymic and describes

---

44 Kirk 1990 *ad* 7.164; West 1988:154, 158-159.


46 Bethe 1927:121 suggests that Aias' lack of a father (I discuss this issue in more detail below) is a sign of his antiquity. Kirk 1985 *ad* 2.406 notes the retention of an early use of the dual in the phrase Αἰαντε δύω (cf. Page 1959:236).

47 Lee 1964:26; Lorimer 1951:134-146. Compare Lord 1960:65-66, who argues that a noun-epithet formula may have been retained after its peculiar meaning was lost because the “fragrance of its past importance” still clung to it.

48 Τελαμωνιος is Aias' distinctive epithet; he receives it more than any other epithet and shares it only with Teukros and only three times (8.281, 13.170, 15.462). Generally, distinctive epithets express some significant aspect of the hero's traditional epic role. A patronymic meaning for Τελαμωνιος expresses nothing about Aias' role in the *Iliad* and so is already suspicious on that ground. Higbie 1995:43, 46-48, sums up the functions of the patronymic as follows: it can provide emotional content, convey genealogical information that is important in a warrior society, provide general identifying information, and can be useful for the construction of verses.

Aias as the son of Telamon, distinguishing him from Aias son of Oileus of Lokris. Scholars have long agreed that the Homeric tradition has constructed the figure of Telamon, Aias’ father, in order to explain the meaning and existence of the epithet Τελαμώνιος; that is, Aias was Τελαμώνιος before that tradition had ever heard of a character named Τελαμών. The tradition has, in essence, misidentified the ancient modifier Τελαμώνιος as a patronymic formed like a possessive adjective based on the father’s name, like Νηληίος or Ποιάντιος.

The tradition has also come up with a proper Ionic patronymic, Τελαμωνιάδης, and the phrase υίὸς Τελαμώνος. Each of these is likely to be later in origin than Τελαμώνιος. Aιας, which, as a verse end formula beginning at the heptameter caesura, again marks itself as very ancient.

———

49 Note that later tradition makes Telamon a son of Aiakos, and brother of Peleus. Aias and Achilleus are thus cousins. The Iliad shows no knowledge of this relationship. Achilleus is regularly called Αιακίδης (for example, 2.860, 9.184, 10.402), but Aias never is. Aias has a father but no ancestors. Cf. Hainsworth 1993 ad 9.168-169; Roscher 1884-1886 v. 1:215-216. Kirk 1985 ad 2.558 suggests that Aias’ membership in the family of Aiakos may not have been securely established at this phase of the tradition; consequently the poem suppresses references to Aias’ family history.


51 Nilsson 1972:257. Higbie 1995:48-49 notes that the -ιος form of patronymic is the rarest form in the poems, occurring only as Καπανήιον (Iliad 5.108), Νηληίος (Iliad 23.349, for example), Τελαμώνιος, and Ποιάντιος (Iliad 3.190). The most frequent of these patronymics is, of course, Τελαμώνιος for Aias.

52 Hainsworth 1993 ad 9.622-623 notes that the patronymic form Τελαμωνιάδης is a sign, not only of modification of the ancient word Τελαμώνιος, but of interpretation of it as well; it shows that Τελαμώνιος is being taken by the poem as a patronymic. Janko 1992 ad 14.460 argues that the patronymic Τελαμωνιάδης is a post-Mycenaean “remodelling” of Τελαμώνιος.

Having recognized this misidentification the task has then been to discover what Τελαιομόνιος could have meant when it first entered the tradition. The first and most obvious answer to this question was that Τελαιομόνιος comes from τελαμών, strap, and refers to Aias as the carrier of the shield like a tower, which hangs from Aias' shoulders by a τελαμών, a strap (14.404-405). Some scholars have had difficulty accepting the designation of a hero by a word used for an insignificant part of his characteristic armour: Strappy Aias seems an unsatisfying and odd combination.  

Paul Girard, in his article, "Ajax fils de Télamon," offers another solution to the question of the meaning of Τελαιομόνιος. Girard's suggestion is one that explains why this epithet persisted in the tradition and that fits with and supports the general characterization of Aias within the Iliad. Rather than being derived from τελαμών = strap, Girard argues, Τελαιομόνιος comes from τελαμών = pillar. In both cases we are dealing with words derived from the root ταλ-, τελ- meaning hold or endure. In Τελαιομόνιος Αίας, then, we may well be dealing, not with Aias son of Telamon or Aias the Straplike, but Aias

---

54 Girard 1905:3-4; Whallon 1966:28.

55 Girard 1905.

56 Girard 1905:15-16 cites inscriptions from north and west of the Black Sea and Vitruvius de Architectura 6.7.6, where Vitruvius notes that Romans call male statues supporting brackets or cornices telamones, while the Greeks call them ἀτλαντες. This point had already been made by Puchstein 1896:2107.

Bethe 1927:120 suggests that τελαιομόνιος means something like “supporting” or “protecting,” much as Aias’ other epithet, ἔρκος Ἀχαιόων, does. Note that in each case, if we accept the meaning of τελαιομόνιος as pillar, we are dealing with epithets that characterize Aias as an immovable structure.
the Pillarlike.\footnote{Girard 1905:14-16. Bakker 1995:102 argues that noun-epithet formula are primary means of evoking a god or hero’s traditional themes. The theme of “pillar” for Aias seems more related to his particular themes and character than his being the son of the obscure Telamon or his having a strap on his shield.}

If we accept that \( \text{Τελαμώνιος Αἴας} \) originally meant Aias the Pillarlike, it remains the case that in the \textit{Iliad} we are dealing with a poem that \textit{claims} that \( \text{Τελαμώνιος Αἴας} \) is Aias the son of Telamon. Our task then becomes that of discovering whether the poem preserves signs of the earlier meaning while still speaking of Aias as the son of Telamon. Does the \textit{Iliad} still \textit{behave} as though \( \text{Τελαμώνιος Αἴας} \) is Aias the Pillarlike? The issues involved in this question are similar to those at play in the discussion of the \textit{Gottesurteil} in Chapter 3. There we saw that even though the poem betrays no explicit knowledge of this ancient ritual and its logic, it nonetheless shows us the \textit{Gottesurteil} in action in Achilleus and Hektor’s final encounter. In that case the \textit{Iliad} behaves very much as though it knows and understands the \textit{Gottesurteil} even when it does not or cannot acknowledge this knowledge and understanding. So in the case of Aias the Pillarlike we must look for indications that the poem continues to treat Aias as pillarlike even though the tradition no longer takes \( \text{Τελαμώνιος} \) to mean pillarlike. What follows is an attempt to show that the \textit{Iliad} does indeed still behave as though it believes that \( \text{Τελαμώνιος Αἴας} \) is Pillarlike Aias.\footnote{The method I have followed in attempting to discover the contextual meaning of \( \text{Τελαμώνιος} \) is much the same as that of A. A. Parry 1973 in her examination of \( \text{άμύμων} \) (see pp. 5-7 for Parry’s arguments for this method) and Sacks 1987 in his examination of \( \text{φατίδιμος} \). To examine every use of the epithet in order to get a sense of how the poem uses the word, not just a sense of what the lexicon says the word means. I provide below a précis of my findings. The complete discussion of \( \text{Τελαμώνιος} \) appears in Appendix 2.}
Broadly, we can divide the passages in which Aias is referred to as Τελαμώνιος into two categories: passages in which the epithet is used in an identifying and "epiphantic" sense,⁵⁹ and passages in which the epithet, taken as meaning "pillar-like," resonates strongly with its immediate context.⁶⁰ The first category is in essence one in which we can say that Aias' characteristic epithet is not specifically appropriate to the narrative context, but serves more to remind us precisely who Aias is. The second category, that of resonant application, contains far more uses of the epithet and will be the main focus of the discussion that follows.

Before turning to the passages in which the phrase Τελαμώνιος Αιας is interacting with its specific context, I will discuss the other passages briefly. They are six: two in Iliad 2, at 2.528 and 768, one at Iliad 11.526, and three in Iliad 23, at 23.708, 811, and 842.⁶¹ The first two appearances occur in or around the catalogue of ships, the first one in a passage where Lokrian Aias is being described (2.527-530). An element of his description is that he is much smaller than Τελαμώνιος Αιας. The second appearance in Book 2 occurs as the poem answers the question of who are the best Achaian warriors and horses at Troy; Τελαμώνιος Αιας is much the best of men as long as Achilleus is angry (2.768-769). In each case Aias is identified only through the epithet Τελαμώνιος; no further account of him


⁶⁰Cf. Cosset 1990 who argues that characteristic epithets can consistently have a semantic function that is determined by their relationship to their narrative contexts.

⁶¹I do not insist on these instances not interacting with their contexts. With the possible exception of 23.708, I have not found such interaction. I would suggest that the prime function of the epithet in these passages is epiphantic.
is given. Aias’ characteristic epithet fully explains who he is and nothing more need be said to explain him or his particular relevance in the context. As the largest of the Achaians and given his close association with Lokrian Aias, he is the right figure for a comparison of size, as in the Lokrian Aias passage. As the great defensive warrior, largest of the Achaians and most beautiful after Achilleus,⁶² he is the right figure to be best of the men after Achilleus. The simple identification of Τελαμώνιος Αἴας reminds us of all we need to know about him in these two passages.

At 11.526 the poem refers to Τελαμώνιος Αἴας immediately after Paris wounds Machaon and forces Machaon’s withdrawal with Nestor (11.504-520). After Machaon’s departure all the Achaian forces begin to flee except Aias (11.504-506).

Kebriones remarks to Hektor that Τελαμώνιος Αἴας is throwing the Trojans into turmoil (11.525-526) and that he recognizes Aias by his broad shield (11.526-527).⁶¹ The noun epithet phrase Τελαμώνιος Αἴας here serves primarily to identify Aias: Kebriones tells Hektor which particular Achaian is throwing the Trojans into a panic. Kebriones expands the sufficiently identifying Τελαμώνιος Αἴας to refer also to Aias’ unique and identifying shield.

Much the same situation pertains in the three passages from Iliad 23. Each of these lines marks Aias as he participates in various contests at Patroklos’ funeral games. At


⁶¹Hainsworth 1993 ad 11.526-527 argues that the use of the phrase σάκος εὕρη here has no special reference to Aias since it is used to describe other heroes’ shields at 13.553, 13.608, and Odyssey 22.184.
23.708 he stands to compete in wrestling, at 811 to compete in the armed duel, and at 842 he makes his cast in the iron-throwing competition. As with the *Iliad* 2 passages, Aias receives no further identification in any of these three; the simple identification of Τελαμώνιος Αίας gives us all the information we need. The knowledge that it is *this* Aias who is competing and not the other Aias tells us that this Aias will be a formidable opponent.

Notice that the poem, in all of these cases, when it is necessary to unequivocally identify Aias, chooses to call him Τελαμώνιος. This choice, along with the numerical predominance of the epithet Τελαμώνιος in the *Iliad*, suggests that Τελαμώνιος is Aias' predominant characteristic epithet. This epithet, then, should express his traditional role and character in a meaningful way. We will now go on to see whether pillar-like immobility is associated with Aias in the other contexts where he is designated Τελαμώνιος.

The remaining thirty uses of the epithet Τελαμώνιος can be divided into three categories, according to the contexts in which they appear. First, we see passages in which Aias receives the epithet in a context where he is explicitly engaged in defensive activity (the occurrences of Τελαμώνιος in Books 11, 12, 15, 16, and 17 fall into this category). Second, we see the epithet appear in contexts where Aias is taking part in aggressive combat, but where, nonetheless, his traditional role as defensive warrior is still at play (the occurrences in Books 4, 7 and 14 belong to this group). Finally, we have a much smaller group in which the poem calls Aias Τελαμώνιος in contexts where he is not involved in warfare, but where the associations of his defensive role in battle are relevant to the context (here we see occurrences in Books 9 and 23). We will see that in almost every passage where he is called Τελαμώνιος Aias functions as the great defensive warrior. Further, we will see that this
defensive excellence depends in large part upon Aias’ immobility in battle.

An examination of Aias as a defensive warrior reveals much about the *Iliad*’s views on the nature of defensive warfare (as opposed to aggressive warfare). Defense in the *Iliad* involves four elements: the ability to stand in battle, the inability to take certain kinds of initiative, the use of defensive arms, specifically the shield, and a stance of αἰδώς towards one’s fellows. Rather than explicate each occurrence of ἔλεγχος Αἰας in detail here, I will instead examine only the defensive category of usage for ἔλεγχος Αἰας and discuss the four elements of defense as they are worked out in this category. I will discuss examples of standing, inability to take initiative, use of the shield, and the stance of αἰδώς to show how these features adhere to ἔλεγχος Αἰας throughout the *Iliad* regardless of the context in which he appears.

Aias’ first appearance as ἔλεγχος in a context of defense occurs at 11.465. Here Menelaos calls on Aias to help him defend the wounded Odysseus (11.465-471). Menelaos’ speech to Aias begins, Ἄιαν διογενὲς ἔλεγχος ἔλεγχος, κοιρανε λαὸν, and continues to remark that ἀλεξέμεναι ἄμεινον (11.469). Menelaos then sets out towards Odysseus and Aias follows: ὅς εἰπὼν ὦ μὲν ἠρχ’, ὦ δ’ ἄμεινον ἔσσετο ἵσθεος φῶς (11.472). Aias and Menelaos find Odysseus surrounded by Trojans. Next, Αἰας δ’ ἐγγύθεν ἠλθεὶ φέρων σάκος ἦτε πύργον, στῇ δὲ παρέξ (11.485-486); while the Trojans scatter at Aias’ appearance, Menelaos leads Odysseus out of the broil (11.486-488). This passage exemplifies Aias’ *standing* to defend by portraying Aias as he stands (11.486) before Odysseus while all those around him move (the Trojans flee 486, Menelaos leads Odysseus

---

64I have already discussed the stance of αἰδώς above.
487, the attendant whips the horses 488). Defense in this case, as Aias does it, means serving as a point of immobility around and behind which others must move. It means becoming, in effect, a wall.65

This association of defense with standing and immobility shows itself in thirteen more uses of Τελαμώνιος Αίας in a defensive context, in four of the occurrences of the phrase in aggressive contexts, and in one occurrence of the epithet in a non-warfare context.66 It dominates the defensive uses of Τελαμώνιος Αίας, making standing the predominant feature of Aias' defense. An appearance of this phrase at 11.563 is noteworthy here, since it shows how the standing warrior withdraws from battle. In this passage, Zeus stirs up fear or flight in Aias so that Aias will withdraw (11.544). Aias receives three similes that describe his reluctance to withdraw and follow his movements as he ultimately makes only a partial withdrawal (11.546, 548-555, 558-562).67 Aias' first impulse after Zeus rouses

65This passage also exemplifies Aias' defensive inability to take initiative, in that Menelaos is the one who suggests that they assist Odysseus, and Aias' carrying the defensive shield like a tower. Hainsworth 1993 ad 11.489 notes that in this passage Aias is receiving features that normally precede an aggressive aristeia: he kills three Trojans, receives a simile, is avoided by Hektor. Aias' more characteristic defensive role, he says, takes over again at 11.544. Whitman 1958:166 remarks that one must often think of Aias as "im movably fixed to the earth;" for Whitman Aias embodies rest and endurance, while Diomedes embodies motion and action.


67See Chapter 4 for a discussion of 11.548-555 as a repeated simile. Hainsworth 1993 ad 11.548-547 argues that the lion simile (548-555) and the donkey simile (558-562) illustrate two different sides of Aias' style of defense, but have in common the insistence on Aias' tenacious refusal to move when attacked. He links the donkey simile to the reference to Aias' excellence in αὐτοστάσιν at 13.321-325 (Hainsworth 1993 ad 11.558-562). Lorimer 1950:183 suggests that Aias' slow withdrawal here is possible only if he is carrying his big shield like a tower. In that case, Aias' association with this shield is at play in this passage.
φόβος in him is not, in fact, to run away, but to stand; at 11.545 we see στῇ δὲ ταφῶν.68 Ultimately Aias stops his withdrawal before he reaches the mass of the Achaeans and so stands between the Trojan and Achaian forces (11.566-571). Even when flight is in him, Aias is still the immobile standing warrior.

After the ability to stand in battle, the inability to take initiative is the most prominent feature of Ῥελαμόνιος Αίας in defensive activity. This reactive side to defense is most apparent in Iliad 12 when the Achaeans are defending their new wall from the Trojan onslaught. At 12.330 ff. Menestheus is defending his tower against Sarpedon, Glaukos, and the Lykians. He looks around for an Achaian leader to help him in his defense and sees the two Aiantes and Teukros standing nearby (12.336-337). Menestheus sends the herald, Thoas, to summon the Aiantes or at least to bring Ῥελαμόνιος Αίας and Teukros (12.343-350). Thoas goes to the Aiantes and Teukros and reports Menestheus’ desires more or less verbatim, concluding his speech with the specific request for Ῥελαμόνιος Αίας (12.354-363). Aias immediately agrees to Menestheus’ request and sets off for the tower (12.364-370). In this passage, we see that Aias’ defensive activity comes about through someone else’s initiative, not his own. When Menestheus sees the two Aiantes and Teukros they are just standing nearby, not engaged in any particular activity. Aias acts here because someone else prompts him to act; he reacts, responds, to another’s request for help, but does not

68 See Aubriot 1989:252-254, who argues that the aorist participle ταφῶν is consistently used to describe terror, whose manifestations include suspended reasoning, trembling, buckled knees, and standing. Aias here stands (545), trembles (546), is compared to an animal, (which Aubriot links to suspended reasoning) (546), and shifts his weight from one knee to another (547). Aias’ standing here thus participates in another set of associations, those of ταφῶν, as well as those of his own characteristic defensive standing.
initiate his defensive activity himself.

Aias' inability to take initiative is at play in seven other occurrences of the phrase Τελαμώνιος Αίας in a defensive context, and in four of the occurrences in aggressive contexts. It manifests itself in forms other than as a response to a request for help; Aias is also someone who follows other warriors' leads, as we see in an episode at Iliad 13.43-80. Here Poseidon comes to the two Aiastes, exhorts them, fills them with μένος, and departs (11.43-62). Lokrian Aias first realizes that a god has been talking to them (τοῖν δ' ἔγνω πρόσθεν 13.66), and remarks on the change in his attitude to fighting because of the god’s appearance (13.68-75). Τελαμώνιος Αίας responds and agrees to Lokrian Aias’ account of the situation (13.76-80). This passage marks Aias’ understanding as slower than Lokrian Aias’ by insisting that Lokrian Aias first recognizes the god and first gives an account of the god’s effect on him. Aias follows Lokrian Aias’ lead here by agreeing to his characterization of the situation and by being slower than Lokrian Aias to recognize what has been happening.

The third element of defense that attaches itself to Τελαμώνιος Αίας is his use of the great defensive shield. Aias himself carries his unique shield like a tower, which is an emblem of his defensive excellence. The poem stresses a general necessity for shields in

---


70Longo 1996 argues that, in the Iliad, the hero’s body and his armour are not really distinguishable. In that case, Aias, through his carrying the great defensive shield like a tower, is the embodiment of defense. This tie between heroic arms and the heroic body supports my larger arguments here about Aias and the character of the defensive warrior. Mühlestein 1987 notes (19) that Aias is his shield. Earlier, he argues (14) that Aias’ name in Mycenaean, ai-wa, is a variant of ai-wo-ro, which appears in Greek as αἰωλος. Twice, Aias’ shield is described as αἰωλον (7.222; 16.107); so Aias and his shield in a sense share the same name (Mühlestein 1987:20). This shared “name” makes the identification of Aias and his shield all the stronger.
defensive warfare in Book 15 after Hektor's return to battle. Hektor is leading his successful attack on the Achaian wall and ships when Teukros attempts to strike him with an arrow but fails because Zeus breaks his bowstring (15.459-470). Τελαμωνις Aις advises Teukros to put aside his bow and arrows and to take up a spear and shield instead (15.472-475). When Teukros follows Aias' advice, the poem tells us, he gets a shield, a helmet, and a spear (15.479-482). Conspicuously absent here is a breastplate, not normally worn by archers. The breastplate is also not worn by Aias.71 Teukros here, in following Aias' advice, prepares to fight as Aias fights. He is fighting as a shield warrior. The great defender Aias recognizes that if defense is to succeed, if, in this case, the Trojans are to be driven from the ships, the defenders must wear defensive armour, in particular, shields.

Τελαμωνις Aις is explicitly linked with shields in defensive contexts in four other passages, never in aggressive contexts, nor in non-warfare contexts.72 The occurrence of Τελαμωνις Aις at 14.409 is the only passage in the Iliad that makes any meaningful connection between Aias and τελαμωνις, straps, as the straps of Aias' shield and sword protect him from Hektor's spearpoint (14.402-406). This passage stresses Aias' association with and reliance upon his shield because it makes clear the fact that Aias wears no breastplate; his chest is vulnerable, not covered by metal armour. Aias goes to battle with his body protected only by his emblematic shield.

The final element of the defensive Τελαμωνις Aις is his attitude of αιδως.

---

71 14.402-406, where Aias' life is saved, not by his breastplate, but by the crossing of his shield and sword straps.

72 11.465; 13.708; 14.409; 17.115.
The poem explicitly points to this feature of Aias’ character in Book 15, as Aias tries to rouse the Achaians to defend the ships. At 15.560-564, Τελαμὸνιος Αίας makes a speech of exhortation in which, as I have noted earlier, he appeals to αἰδώς three times in four lines (αἰδὼ 561, αἰδεῖσθε 562, αἰδομένων 563). The poem marks the end of Aias’ speech with ὡς ἐφατ', οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀλέξασθαι μενέανον (15.565). Aias tells the Achaians that defense does not just involve a set of actions, like standing and fighting, but that a specific attitude must inform the posture of defense: αἰδώς. Warriors must respect their comrades and must stand in battle out of a desire to defend each other. Defensive battle must be a battle undertaken by warriors as a community, rather than as the individual champions of aggressive warfare.73

This attitude of αἰδώς is openly at work in only one more passage where Τελαμὸνιος Αίας appears in a defensive context, at 11.563. It occurs in one passage where Τελαμὸνιος Αίας occurs in a non-warfare context, at 9.644, during the embassy to Achilleus. At 11.563 we see that Aias, moved by Zeus to flight (11.544), cannot withdraw fully from the fighting because he fears for the Achaian ships (11.557). Aias is not concerned about missing an opportunity to attack Troy or to kill Trojans, but about keeping the Trojans away from the ships. Aias is worried about the rest of the Achaians more than he is about himself; this concern is another example of the αἰδώς Aias advocates in Book 15.

In the passages in which he is called Τελαμὸνιος, then, the majority of which occur in contexts where Aias is serving in a defensive capacity, Aias always functions as Aias the defensive warrior. The use of this epithet consistently points to some part of Aias’

73 Again, see Chapter 4 for a discussion of the aggressive warrior.
character as the defender: his ability to stand still in battle, his lack of initiative, his \( \alpha \iota \delta \omega \varsigma \) for his fellow Achaians. Given this consistency, and, in particular, given the regular association of defense and immobility, we are on much safer grounds in agreeing with Paul Girard that \( \tau \epsilon \lambda \alpha \mu \omega \nu \iota \varsigma \ \Lambda \iota \alpha \varsigma \) is not just Aias the son of Telamon in the \( \textit{Iliad} \), but Aias the Pillarlike as well.

We have seen, then, that, of the thirty-six appearances of \( \tau \epsilon \lambda \alpha \mu \omega \nu \iota \varsigma \ \Lambda \iota \alpha \varsigma \) in the \( \textit{Iliad} \), the majority occur in contexts in which Aias’ portrayal as the defensive warrior is actively at play, even in situations in which he is not expressly involved in defensive warfare. We have seen, further, that Aias the defender is not just a warrior who defends successfully; rather, there is a set of characteristics that goes along with this role. The defensive warrior is a warrior who stands unmovable in battle. He is characterized by defensive armour, by a willingness to follow where others lead, by a sense of responsibility to his warrior community. Aias the Pillarlike is the figure who most completely and consistently manifests these qualities.\(^{74}\)

Given this consistent characterization of Aias as the immobile warrior who cannot take initiative and cannot lead other warriors, we see that in Book 15, as he marshals the Achaian defense, Aias is behaving in an uncharacteristic way. In this scene Aias functions, in contrast to all other situations, as an aggressive, proactive, exhortative leader. Aias the defender, the follower of others’ leads, the warrior of \( \alpha \iota \delta \omega \varsigma \), then, needs to be recast

\(^{74}\) Aias’ defensive immobility, like his inability to take initiative, his armour, and his stance of \( \alpha \iota \delta \omega \varsigma \), marks him as unlike the great aggressive warrior, Achilles, who is consistently described as \( \pi \delta \alpha \varsigma \ \omega \kappa \upsilon \varsigma \). See Dunkle 1996-1997 for a discussion of this aspect of Achilles in the \( \textit{Iliad} \).
if he is to serve effectively, plausibly, as a leader, even in a defensive context. This recasting is made an even more pressing need by the strength of Aias’ portrayal as the immobile defender. This portrayal relies not only upon the particularities of the Iliad’s account of Aias, but upon ancient traditional associations between Aias and immobile defense. The Iliad must contend, then, not just with its own version of Aias, but with the dominant traditional portrayal of Aias as well.\footnote{Collins 1988:13-22 sets up her study of characterization in the Iliad by discussing how a traditional poem could have narrative needs or perspectives that could be foreign to or at odds with the tradition as a whole. Nickel 1997 deals with issues of Iliadic characterization as opposed to traditional characterization as they pertain to Paris. Sacks 1987:108-150 deals with a similar issue in his examination of the epithet φαίδιμος in the Iliad; there he finds that the epithet’s surface meaning (shining) is always opposed to its contextual meaning (defeat).} The poem needs to recast Aias, to transform him into a leader rather than a follower. His simile at 15.679-684 plays a large role in this recharacterization.

§ 3. Conclusion: Recharacterization by Simile

As I have argued in Chapter 4, the warrior model for the Iliad is the aggressive warrior, Achilleus. Such a warrior is characterized by a desire and ability to fight full-out in pursuit of his own pleasure in battle, unfettered by concerns about his ties and responsibilities. For this reason, the image of the luxurious horse is an appropriate image for the hero. Aias is precisely not such an aggressive warrior. As we have seen, Aias is characterized always by his inability to forge ahead in the absence of another’s lead and by his constant recognition and acceptance of the responsibilities that he has to his people and to his community. In his simile at 15.679 ff., then, Aias cannot possibly be characteristically and coherently compared to a horse because he does not embody the values that the horse

\footnote{Collins 1988:13-22 sets up her study of characterization in the Iliad by discussing how a traditional poem could have narrative needs or perspectives that could be foreign to or at odds with the tradition as a whole. Nickel 1997 deals with issues of Iliadic characterization as opposed to traditional characterization as they pertain to Paris. Sacks 1987:108-150 deals with a similar issue in his examination of the epithet φαίδιμος in the Iliad; there he finds that the epithet’s surface meaning (shining) is always opposed to its contextual meaning (defeat).}
exemplifies for the *Iliad*. Instead, he is compared to a driver and controller and yoker of horses.\(^\text{76}\) To marshal the Achaian defense, Aias must take a group of aggressive warriors whose exemplar is the luxurious self-absorbed Achilleus and turn them into a united “altruistic” body of defenders, into a team. In order to effect this transformation on the Achaians, Aias must himself be transformed from a silent and self-effacing defensive warrior into an aggressive leader. Aias, in order to organize the Achaians as defenders, sets an example for them to follow. He becomes a spectacle, and through his exemplary initiative they can be “yoked” together into a united defensive wall.\(^\text{77}\)

The simile explains Aias’ new role as leader in two ways: it recharacterizes him as a leader of men and a yoker of horses and it shows through what medium his leadership will manifest itself. In its insistence on the spectacular character of the horse-rider’s actions, the simile tells us that Aias will also lead by being spectacular; he will not just tell the Achaians what to do, he will show them, as he does when he jumps from one ship to the next, holding his ναύμαχον, fending off the Trojans and their torches.

In transforming Aias from the immobile defensive warrior into the mobile leader, moreover, the *Iliad* does not have to address merely its own portrayal of Aias. As we have seen above, the characterization of Aias as immobile, defensive, unable to take

---

\(^\text{76}\) Now, as the defender of the city, Aias must be a yoker of horses. Aias has thus been transformed into a *match* for Hektor ἵπποδαμος. Throughout the second half of Book 15 Aias and Hektor are the main figures in the narrative and are portrayed as involved in corresponding and opposing actions. See Janko 1992 *ad* 15.405-591.

\(^\text{77}\) Cf. Janko 1992 *ad* 15.485-514 who notes that the usual purpose of speeches of exhortation in battle is to urge the fighters to form into a tight line and to fight at close quarters. Compare also 15.565-567, where the Achaians, in response to Aias’ ἀίδως speech at 15.561-564, ἄραξαντο δὲ νῆας ἔρκει χαλκεῖον. They create a wall of weapons around the ships.
initiative, is one that is deeply rooted in the traditional material. His characteristic Mycenaean shield and his very ancient epithet, Τελαυώνιος, both attest to how firmly Aias the defender is embedded in the tradition. We have seen also that Aias the defender is not just a warrior who is good at warding off the enemy; the defender has other particular features that make him good at defending: he can stand, he feels responsible for his comrades, he does what others ask him to do, he reacts rather than taking initiative. The character, the personality, that the Iliad gives to Aias, thus, is one that is in keeping with the idea of defense; a warrior like Achilleus or Agamemnon could not be the great defender. The defender is one who does not speak up, who does not lead others into battle; Aias and the Iliad itself must overcome Aias’ role as defensive warrior in order for him to function as a defensive leader at the end of Book 15.

The simile for Aias at 15.679 ff., then, serves a transformative function comparable to that of the other horse similes. Through it, not only Aias, as the yoker of horses, but the Achaians, as the yoked horses, are taken out of the roles typical for them in the Iliad. The Achaians as a group are aggressive warriors, at Troy to attack, take, and plunder Troy for the treasure she holds within her walls. Aias is a defensive warrior who lacks the initiative and forwardness necessary for him to function effectively in most contexts as a leader. In Book 15, the Achaian attackers must become defenders of their own walls, and the silent reactionary Aias must become a bold self-motivating leader. The simile effects this recharacterization and allows the narrative to proceed in a situation where all those involved are behaving as they never have before.
This examination of the *Iliad*'s horse similes has had three goals: to demonstrate that an oral traditional poetic reading of the similes can produce a fruitful reading of the similes, to explore the nature of the horse as an image for the warrior in the *Iliad*, and to explain how similes can be necessary to the purveying of poetic meaning in the *Iliad*. Throughout this study I have tried to be attentive to the implications of traditional referentiality as I have explored the horse similes and their application to Achilleus, Hektor, Paris, and Aias in situations where the demands of the poem have set up conflicts that could be resolved only through the use of these similes.

In Chapter 1, my discussion of my methods and assumptions, I explained how and why scholarship on the Homeric poems during the twentieth century has come more and more to recognize the value of interpreting these poems in light of their traditions. Chapter 2, in keeping with this recognition, has provided a basic account of the role and function of the horse in the Homeric poems and in the cultural context of archaic Greece. Further, in my discussions of the horse similes of *Iliad* 6, 15, and 22, I have shown how attention to traditional modes of expression, such as the use of traditional diction, epithets, and narrative patterns, has been relevant to interpreting and understanding these similes. In Chapter 3, I
have shown how the use of the traditional phrase, ἀεθλοφόροι ἱπποί, allows us to see Achilleus’ pursuit of Hektor around the walls of Troy as a race at funeral games. In Chapter 4, I have shown how the horse similes for Paris and Hektor are an element of a traditional narrative pattern, describing the warrior’s removal from and successful return to battle, that allows us to see the returning warriors as unmarked by their withdrawal. In Chapter 5, I have shown how Aias’ traditional characterization as the immobile and reactionary warrior demands his recharacterization as a leader for the Achaian defense of the ships through a simile that empowers the narrative to effect this change of status.

A key aspect of my attempt to provide an analysis of the traditional referentiality of the horse in the *Iliad* has been to explore the horse’s traditional cultural status as a sign of aristocratic wealth. I have shown in Chapter 2 that the horse in the *Iliad* is not merely a figure to illustrate speed, but is also an image of heroic nobility. In Chapter 3, I have shown how the traditional aristocratic associations of the horse have played a role in the horse’s further association with funerary ritual and imagery; here, Achilleus and Hektor’s being likened to horses has been seen to transform them into participants in a race at funeral games. In Chapter 4, the horse’s latent associations with wealth revealed themselves in the horse’s status as a luxury animal; this status showed itself in the similes for Paris and Hektor in the horse’s being an image for a kind of ideal heroic abandon. Chapter 5, and its discussion of Aias, showed how the image of the swift, luxurious horse could be used in an image of leadership as Aias became in his simile, not a horse, but a yoker and driver of horses.

Finally, I showed throughout how the horse similes revealed themselves as
necessary to the conveying of meaning within their contexts as I demonstrated that these similes play a similar role in their contexts. In each case, I have argued that the narrative has set up a situation that cannot be worked out given the parameters the narrative on its own has defined; the similes are necessary in each instance for the working out of the narrative demands. This working out in each case has taken the form of redefining, recasting, recharacterizing, the characters and actions in the narrative. In Chapter 3, I have shown how Achilleus and Hektor’s transformation into participants at funeral games allows the funeral of Patroklos to take place at a time when Achilleus himself is refusing to participate explicitly in any form of peaceful ritual. In Chapter 4, I have shown how the image of the horse serves to redeem Paris and Hektor as aggressive warriors at times when their status as warriors has been undermined by events in the narrative. In Chapter 5, I have shown how Aias’ traditional portrayal as the great defensive warrior makes him a poor candidate for leadership and how the simile comparing him to a man yoking and riding horses recharacterizes him as someone capable of exemplary leadership.

My hope is that this study will provide some insight, not just into the *Iliad’s* horse similes, but into the study of the Homeric simile as such. It should be the case now that we can see the value of reading the similes with the care and attention that we bring to other aspects of the poems. Traditional referentiality has proved itself a valuable tool for interpreting the potential richness of these images; without attention to traditional themes, associations, and structures, these comparisons can seem merely decorative or illustrative. I have shown in each case that a more probing reading of the horse similes brings to light the relationship of these similes to the *Iliad’s* explorations of such themes as the nature of the
hero, the nature of responsibility to one’s community, and the nature of ritual. Further work of this kind on other similes will surely bear similar fruit.

Further, I have insisted throughout this study on approaching the similes as though they are meaningful in form and in content. I have tried to show how the message that each horse simile conveys is essential to the development of the narrative and its themes. I have also tried to show why the poem has used similes to convey its meaning and not some other form of expression. Further attention to the similes as necessary and significant both in what they say and in how they say it can only produce a richer and more subtle account of the similes and of the Homeric poems as a whole.
The occurrence at 11.699 of prize-winning horses that run for a prize is part of Nestor's long account of his own role in the battle between the Pylians and the Epeians over the cattle of the Epeians. In this line Nestor is explaining why Neleus in particular had a right to a great share of the spoil of the raid Nestor led on the Epeian herds and flocks.

For indeed a great debt was owing to him in shining Elis. It was four horses, race-competitors with their own chariot, who were on their way to a race and were to run for a tripod, but Augeias the lord of men took these, and kept them and sent away their driver who was vexed for the sake of the horses. Now aged Neleus, angry over things said and things done, took a vast amount for himself.

Augeias stole four prize-winning horses from Neleus as these horses were on their way to compete in Elis. I want to consider this situation in more detail. Later in the poem, while accepting Achilleus' gift of the unclaimed fifth prize for the chariot race, Nestor speaks of his
own performance in the funeral games of Amarynkeus (23.629-643). My goal is to establish a clear connection between the competition Nestor mentions in Book 11 and funeral games in general by establishing a correlation between Nestor and funerals in general.¹

Scholarly consensus seems to be that the story Nestor tells in Book 11 is based on archaic epic traditions of Pylian exploits.² I want now to consider whether this account of Pylian heroic deeds in Iliad 11 can allow us to know if the horses of Neleus were stolen on their way to funeral games. Establishing such a connection would lend further plausibility to the claim that all athletic competition for prizes in the Homeric poems is competition at funeral games.

Though scholars on the whole agree that this long story told by Nestor about the actions of the Pylians against the Epeians is an Homeric retelling of a Pylian heroic tradition, this tradition is mostly lost to us, although some scholars have worked to reconstruct the story.³ Both Cantieni and Bölte agree that lines 11.698 ff. are later explanatory insertions into a previously existing narrative, designed to account for Neleus'...

¹I do not insist on these games being the games for Amarynkeus, which Hainsworth 1993 ad 11.699-700 says are not the same games as those mentioned in our passage. Hainsworth argues that these games cannot be the funeral games of Amarynkeus, as Nestor himself took part in these games, while Nestor does not take part in the games mentioned Book 11. Note that the sons of Aktor appear in both these stories (11.750 ff. and 23.638 ff.). The sons of Aktor are siamese twins and have been identified with the siamese twin figures on early grave kraters; Ahlberg-Cornell 1992:181 ff.; Fittschen 1969:68 ff. (although Fittschen disputes the identification of all of these figures on the vases with the sons of Aktor); Hampe 1981:472.

²Bölte 1934:346; Hainsworth 1993 ad 11.699-700. Cf. Delebeque 1951:22-25, who argues that the technical equestrian language in this passage differs from the usage of the rest of the Iliad, and concludes from this difference that a poem independent of the Iliad has been incorporated here.

³E.g. Bölte 1934, Cantieni 1942, Mühlestein 1965.
larger share of the booty from the cattle-raid by alleging Augeias' theft of Neleus' own horses; consequently, they go to no real lengths to discover what could be behind them.⁴ Cantieni does note, however, that the story of the theft of Neleus' horses by Augeias has independent attestation in a fragment of Pherekydes. Pherekydes tells how Neleus sent horses to compete at games being celebrated at Elis by Augeias.⁵ When Neleus' horses were victorious, Augeias became envious and stole them. Nestor later recovered these horses, along with a great deal of booty.⁶ This further attestation may suggest that there was a tradition of Augeias stealing Neleus' horses, although there remains the possibility that Pherekydes tells this story as an expansion of the lines in Iliad 11.

However, although there is little to be learned about the nature of this competition in 11.699 from other sources, we can make some suggestions about this issue by

---

⁴Cantieni 1942:64 ff. argues that 11.703 τῶν ὁ γέρων ἐπέων κεχολωμένος ἰδὲ καὶ ἐργῶν makes no sense following upon line 702 because, referring as it does to the singular Augeias, it contains no plural antecedent for τῶν. Further, there is nothing in the lines about Augeias to explain the presence in 703 of ἐπέων, unless we take the phrase ἐπέων καὶ ἐργῶν as a mere figure of speech. If, he argues, we remove 698-702, we find satisfactory solutions to both of these problems: we can refer the plural τῶν back to the Epeians, and we can understand ἐπέων as part of the general behaviour of the Epeians mentioned in 695 (Cantieni postulates that we could see here an implicit reference to a Pylian embassy rejected by the Epeians, although there is no evidence to support this suggestion.) These lines 698-702 were added, Cantieni says, to explain why Neleus had a right to a greater share of the Epeian booty than the rest of the Pylians. Bölte 1934:346 says only that 698 ff., along with 690 ff., 694 ff., and 739 ff., is an explanatory interruption inserted after the whole story had taken its present form.

⁵Hainsworth 1992 ad 11.699-700 notes that μετ’ ἄθαλα at 699 seems to indicate some precursor to the Olympic games, but adds that for epic prizes are awarded only at funeral games. Schol. bT ad 11.700 says that Homer did not know the Olympics, but that the horses must have been departing for some χρηματικόν contest; that is, the horses were departing for a contest at which valuable or cash prizes were awarded, as the Olympics awarded only crowns.

⁶Pherekydes F.Gr.Hist. 3,118.
examining Nestor's Homeric and traditional roles in more detail. We will see that throughout the Homeric poems and throughout the more general Greek tradition there are strong and deep-rooted connections between Nestor and the dead.

Let us begin with the meaning of Nestor's name. Nestor and his father, Neleus, have names containing the stem *nes-*, which is semantically related to the theme of returning home. Neleus' name can be broken into the constituent elements, *nes-* and laos, so that his name can be seen to mean, "he who brings the fighting folk home." Nestor's name is an agent noun meaning, "he who brings home." It seems also that Nestor's name is a kind of shortened form of his father's name, so that Nestor, too, may be "the one who brings the fighting folk home."7 We see this name actualized in the stories surrounding Nestor, particularly the story of the war at Troy. Nestor tells the story of how he successfully wages war against the Elians, and brings the fighting folk home from that war (having brought back, in an earlier expedition, the Elian flocks and herds) in Iliad 11. Further, Nestor is one of the few Achaian leaders who achieves a successful homecoming for himself and his people after the war ends. Within the myths of Trojan war Nestor is the one who brings home and who gets home. In the Iliad, homecoming is contrasted with death in battle, as we see in Achilleus' speech in Book 9 (412-413), so insofar as Nestor is the one who gets home, he is

7Frame 1978:82-83; Kretschmer 1913:308; Mühlestein 1965:157-159 Cf. Meringer 1926:116, who also accepts the derivation of Nestor from *nes-*, but suggests that the name means rather, "the one who comes home." See also von Kamptz 1982:172, 252, who opts for Nestor from the root *ned-*, "to sound, roar, be noisy," an option not mentioned by any of the other scholars whose work I have examined.

Nestor's name being an abbreviated form of his father's name is in keeping with the mythic naming of sons as attributes of their fathers, as with Odysseus' son, Telemachos (Far-fighter), Aias' son Eurusaches (Broad-shield), and Achilleus' son Neoptolemos (Young at War).
the one who avoids death. Nestor, thus, is mythically related to death.

If we look more generally at Pylos and the stories and figures associated with Pylos, we see again a connection with death. Some scholars have argued that Nestor's father, Neleus, was in his origins a god of the underworld. Further, we see that the Iliad itself supports the association of Pylos and the underworld in its account of how Herakles wounded the god Hades, ἐν Πύλαι ἐν νεκροσοι (5.397). In this passage we see in a pointed way the idea of Pylos as πῦλα, the gates of Hades. Pausanias in fact tells us of a cave in the city of Pylos in which Nestor is said to have kept his cattle. Caves are very often considered to be entrances to the underworld, so this cave in Pylos could also be conceived in this way. Nestor has strong connections not merely with the dead, but with the land of the dead itself, and indeed, in the interpretation of Neleus as a god of the underworld, perhaps with the king of the dead.

Let us now consider Nestor's function as one who avoids and is opposed to death. In the Homeric tradition, the death of a warrior is not only opposed to his safe return home, but is also correlated to his leaving behind his glory, his κλέος. A warrior will die, but wishes to die in such a way that people will remember him after his death. One of the

---

8Mühlestein 1965:164n49. Cf. Kretschmer 1913:309. This view has been supported by the fact that many of the names around Pylos and Neleus express underworld associations: Klumenos, Klumene, Periklumenos, Chloris, Anax, Pulartes, Echelos (Frame 1978:92).

9Frame 1978:92. Kirk 1990 ad 5.396-397 notes that Aristarchus took these lines to be a reference to the underworld.

10Pausanias 4.36.2-5.

11Cf. the cave at Cape Tanairos which was said to be an entrance to the underworld, Pindar Pythia 4.44. Frame 1978:92; Mühlestein 1965:164n49.
ways that people remember dead heroes is through epic poetry. Another way for heroes to achieve κλέος is through their funerals. Homeric burial involves both the erection of a burial mound, which remains behind as a visible sign of the hero's glory (σήμα and τύμβος both serve to designate this mound in Homer), and the holding of athletic competitions for prizes, which serves to glorify both the dead hero and those who participate in the games. We will see that Nestor plays a role in helping others achieve κλέος both as a teller of κλέος and as one who makes funerals happen.

The Nestor of the Homeric poems is characterized most obviously by his talking. Nestor talks a lot and talks very often about himself and the heroic exploits in which he engaged as a youth. Many of these exploits are stories that in themselves clearly belong to other heroic traditions, involving as they do figures like Theseus and Peirithoos in Nestor's story at Iliad 1.260-273. Nestor tells stories, then, that are part of the recognized repertoire of heroic poetry, which designates itself as the κλέα ἄνδρων τε θεών τε. In telling of the heroic exploits he took part in as a younger man Nestor is thus a teller of his own κλέος, as well as of the κλέος of others. Nestor has known and associated with some great heroes, and he perpetuates their fame along with his own each time he tells a story of his youth involving these other heroes.

When we consider Nestor as the one who tells κλέος and as the one who will get home and bring others home, we can discern a further reason for Achilleus' giving Nestor a prize for the chariot race at the funeral games of Patroklos in Iliad 23. Achilleus gives Nestor the fifth prize, a φιάλη that remains unclaimed after the redistribution brought about by Achilleus' unwillingness to let Eumelos take fifth prize (23.536 ff.), so that this prize can
be a μνήμα, a reminder, of the burial of Patroklos: τῇ νῦν, καὶ σοὶ τούτο, γέρον, κειμηλιον ἔστω, Πατρόκλοιο τάφου μνήμ' ἐμεναι (23.618-619). Achilleus thus hands over to Nestor the memory of Patroklos' funeral and the responsibility of keeping that memory alive. Further, Achilleus tells Nestor that the φιάλη shall be a κειμηλιον, something to be stored up and kept safe, not lost or frittered away. The μνήμα of Patroklos' funeral, in Achilleus' view, is also something to be stored up and treasured, and preserved. In giving Nestor the φιάλη, which is to be a κειμηλιον, which shall be a μνήμα, Achilleus is giving Nestor part of the responsibility of taking the word, the story, the κλέος of Patroklos' funeral with him. Achilleus is justified in placing this responsibility in Nestor's hands because Nestor is one who carries on κλέος. In order for the κλέος of Patroklos' funeral to live on in words and not just in the tomb, the sign, the memory must be given to someone who will carry it away from the war at Troy and home, which is the place where κλέος in song is properly manifested. Nestor, as the one who gets home, and as the one who tells his own κλέος, and along with it, the κλέος of those involved with him, is the right one to get the μνήμα because he will be the one to get home and turn the memory of the funeral and the

---


13Note here that Achilleus, as someone who can himself sing the κλέα ἄνδρῶν, recognizes in Nestor the one who will get home. We see Achilleus as a singer of κλέος at Iliad 9.186-192; as such he possesses the same skill and understanding of the tradition and how it works as the Iliad itself does. One of the things the tradition knows is that characters' names mean important things about the functions they will serve, the roles they will play, the kinds of stories they will work out. Achilleus and the Iliad can both recognize Nestor as the one who will get home and bring his people home. Cf. Martin 1989:101-113, who calls Nestor the Iliad's "ideal speaker" as a speaker of κλέος.
tomb into verbal κλέος for others.⁴

Nestor serves not only to bring the word of κλέος home for his fellow warriors at Troy; we see also that he brings home heroes and accomplishes burial for them. Pausanias 3.26.8-10 tells that at Enope (now called Gerenia) there is a tomb for Machaon at which Machaon receives hero-cult worship. Machaon died at Troy, but his bones were brought home and his cult established by Nestor. The memory of the hero in cult centers on the hero's tomb, the existence of which depends in its turn on the presence of the hero's bones in the tomb. Without Nestor's mediation, then, the cult of Machaon, the memory of Machaon's burial, could never have been established.⁵ Nestor, then, is the one who brings home the κλέος of Machaon from Troy and allows Machaon to be remembered in ritual and worship, just as he brings home the μνήμα of Patroklos' funeral and allows that memory to be told of in verbal κλέος.⁶

Nestor, then, is a figure with broad-reaching and deep connections to the dead

---

⁴κλέος properly must be uttered in words, as we know from the derivation of κλέος from the Indo-European root *kleu-, hear (Nagy 1979:16n3, Watkins 1985 s.v. kleu-).

⁵Compare the fate of Nestor's own father, Neleus, the location of whose grave was to be kept a secret from all, including Nestor (Pausanias 2.2.2).

⁶Homeric poetry values itself as the medium of κλέος more highly than it values burial and funeral games; while seeing itself as belonging to the same "genre" of κλέος, it nonetheless sees itself as being the best species of this genre. This hierarchy of valuation also helps to explain the necessity of another μνήμα for the funeral of Patroklos besides the tomb itself. The tomb is silent and inactive and therefore needs to be interpreted and made explicit in words in order to give glory to those it encloses. The sign that is the burial mound needs to be interpreted and given meaning by human words, which can travel and make themselves explicable long after the tomb itself can say whom it contains. The tomb thus contains the possibility of becoming not a sign for a particular hero, but for any hero. Glory must be particular, and so must be enshrined in particular words and particular poems. Cf. Nagy 1983:46 on the tomb as the physical manifestation of the hero's κλέος.
and to funerals in particular. In a context, then, where the figure who will get home and bring home the memories and the bones of other heroes speaks of prize-winning horses going after prizes, it does seem reasonable to say that these prize-winning horses are competing at funeral games, that these themes are being paired in the poems. The situation, in other words, is that the only prizes that are identified are for funeral games. In this situation, where the source of the prizes is not identified, there is strong peripheral evidence to suggest a general context of funerary themes. There is thus a strong correlation of prize-winning horses and funerals in the *Iliad.*

---

17 Cf. Delebeque 1951:240-241, discussing Hades' epithet, κλυτόπωλος. Delebeque suggests that Hades as king of the dead may receive this epithet because of horse-sacrifices performed for kings, like the horse sacrifice Achilleus performs for Patroklos 23.171-172. While I do not agree with Delebeque's precise suggestion, I support his idea of a thematic connection between the king of the dead and horses.
In what follows I present the results of my examinations of those appearances of Τελαμώνιος Αίας that I do not discuss in Chapter 5. As I have already noted in that chapter, I have divided the uses of this phrase according to their contexts: defensive warfare, aggressive warfare, and non-warfare. It will become clear at the end of the following discussion of Aias’ dominant epithet that the aspects of defense I have outlined in Chapter 5 (immobility, the defensive shield, the inability to take initiative, and the stance of αιδώς) are consistently at play in all of the resonant occurrences of the phrase, Τελαμώνιος Αίας.

§ 1. Defensive Contexts

As Aias stands between the Trojans and Achaians during his forced withdrawal in Book 11, Eurypulos runs to assist him (11.575-577). Paris wounds Eurypulos as he tries to strip the slain Apisaon (11.580-584). Eurypulos withdraws and as he withdraws calls on the rest of the Achaians to assist Aias. Eurypulos tells them that, despite the fact that Aias is being overwhelmed by missiles,

... οὐδὲ ἐς φήμι
φεῦξεσθ’ ἐκ πολέμου ὀυσιχέος, ἀλλὰ μάλ’ ἀντὴν
ίστασθ’ ἄμφ’ Αἰαντα μέγαν, Τελαμώνιον υἱόν. (11.589-591)

Aias, it seems, is not going to withdraw or flee any further. To protect Aias, the Achaians
must venture out to the place where Aias stands on the field. The Achaians do go out in large numbers to stand beside Aias; once they are near him, Aias comes to them and, having taken his place as part of the crowd of Achaians, turns about and stands once again (11.592-595).

In this passage we see Aias serving as a point of orientation for the Achaians. The place where he stands is twice, once for Eurypulos and once for the rest of the Achaians, the point from which the Achaians launch a new phase of response to the Trojan attack. As the marker of that place, Aias does indeed serve as a pillar. Further, we see that although Aias himself is the marker of the Achaian place and the focus of the new Achaian attack, he is in this role only because of another warrior's leadership and initiative. Eurypulos thinks to go assist Aias and Eurypulos again thinks to tell the Achaians to stand beside Aias to help him. Aias throughout this episode is mute and his will shows itself only in a stubborn refusal to move. Once again, we see Aias functioning as the warrior like a pillar.

In Book 12 we see the entire Achaian army in defense as the various leaders take their places along the defensive wall constructed in Book 8. Aias next appears as Τελαμώνιος within this general context. Any appearance of Τελαμώνιος Αίας in Book 12, then, can be taken as belonging to the defensive complex that, I am arguing, surrounds that name-epithet combination. I will do another detailed examination of the remaining appearances of Τελαμώνιος Αίας in Iliad 12 to see if the particular contexts belong to this complex and to see what further light they can shed on the Iliad's account of defensive warfare.

——

1Cf. Scott 1974:70-71, who notes that similes that compare warriors to stelai portray steadfastness in battle.
In Book 12, after Menestheus has sent the herald to summon the two Aiantes to help him defend his tower, we see the herald Thoas make a speech to the two warriors (12.354-363). At the conclusion of Thoas' speech we see, ὡς ἑφατ', οὐδ' ἀπίθησε μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἰας (12.364). Aias goes on to tell Lokrian Aias to stay where he is while he goes to Menestheus. Aias concludes, αἰσχρό δ' ἐλεύσομαι αὐτίς, ἐπὴν εὖ τοίς ἐπαμύνω (12.369). In a situation in which he is being called on explicitly to function in his defensive capacity, Aias is again pointedly Τελαμώνιος Αἰας. Aias, further, recognizes his own defensive function here as he promises to return to Lokrian Aias once he has sufficiently warded off the enemy from Menestheus' position.

Aias is Τελαμώνιος again in the line that follows his speech: ὡς ἄρα φωνήσας ἀπέβη Τελαμώνιος Αἴας (12.370). He and Teukros come to Menestheus' tower, where they find the Lykians climbing the buttresses (12.373-376). In the next stage of the battle we see Αἴας δὲ πρῶτος Τελαμώνιος ἄνδρα κατέκτα (12.378). When his defensive activity begins, Aias defends the tower as Τελαμώνιος Αἴας. 12.378 is Aias' last appearance as Τελαμώνιος in Book 12. Aias last appears in Book 12 at 12.404 ff. as he drives Sarpedon off from one of the tower's buttresses.

This episode in Book 12, in which Aias is called Τελαμώνιος five times within thirty lines, gives us an Aias who does nothing but defend. His defensive activity takes place inside a wall and from a tower; Aias is fighting from a single position and not struggling to move forward on a battlefield. Defense in this passage, then, is immobile fighting. As with the two earlier passages in which we saw Aias defending, we see here that Aias' defensive activity comes about through someone else's initiative. When Menestheus
sees the two Aiantes and Teukros they are doing nothing in particular, just standing. Menestheus’ initiative in calling Aias to help defend his position is what prompts Aias’ participation, nothing else. Once again we see that Τελαμώνιος Αίας is an immobile defender who follows other warriors’ leads.

Early in book 13 the poem calls Aias Τελαμώνιος twice within ten lines at 13.67 and 13.76. The general context here is the Achaian flight to the ships, so Aias as a fighter here is primarily defensive. Here Poseidon comes to the two Aiantes disguised as Kalchas and exhorts them to save the Achaians (σαώσετε 13.47), to not remember flight (13.48), to stand strong against Hektor (ἐστάμεναι κρατερώς 13.56), and to drive Hektor back from the ships (ἐρωθήσατ’ 13.57). Poseidon exhorts them to defend the Achaians and their ships. Poseidon then fills the two with μένος and flies away (13.59-62). Lokrian Aias first realizes what has happened (τοίν δ’ ἕγνω πρόσθεν 13.66), and remarks to Aias, Τελαμώνιον υἱόν (13.67), that the figure who spoke to them must have been a god and that he is now eager to fight (13.68-75). The line that introduces Aias’ response is τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη Τελαμώνιος Αίας (13.76).

First and most straightforwardly, Aias’ designation as Τελαμώνιος or as Τελαμώνιος υἱός in this passage serves to distinguish him from Lokrian Aias. These two occurrences of Aias as Τελαμώνιος frame Lokrian Aias’ speech running from 13.68-75, with one at 13.67 and the next at 13.76. Simply for the sake of clarity they are not both necessary. Moreover, Lokrian Aias is clearly identified at 13.66 as Ὄιλῆς ταχύς Αίας, so the strong identification of Salaminian Aias in the following lines is not itself entirely needed. Line 76 is, of course, the familiar and frequent speech introduction that requires a
two and a half foot name-epithet formula for its conclusion. Aias himself receives this line only one other time, at 7.283 (to be discussed below), so what is essentially familiar and capable of passing without notice is in fact not quite so familiar and bland for Aias. The poem does seem in this passage to be insisting on Aias as Τελαμώνιος.

Elements within the context do support the notion that Aias as Τελαμώνιος is a defensive warrior. As I have noted above, Poseidon’s exhortation is an exhortation to defense: he tells the Aiantes to save the Achaians, not to flee, to stand against Hektor, and to drive Hektor back from the ships. Poseidon’s speech, further, links defense and standing by telling them to *stand* against Hektor. The passage also reinforces the typical characterization of Aias as defender in its marking his understanding as slower than Loikrian Aias’. Lokrian Aias is the one who first recognizes that they have been touched by a god; Aias follows Lokrian Aias’ lead here by agreeing to his description of the god’s effect on them (13.77-80). Aias is plausibly pillar-like here in his ability to stand and defend and in his following another’s lead.

We next see Aias as Τελαμώνιος in a defensive context at 13.321. Here Meriones and Idomeneus are discussing where on the field they are most needed for the Achaian defense. Idomeneus argues that the ships in the middle are adequately defended by the Aiantes and Teukros, so they should go fight on the right (13.312-327). Idomeneus explains at some length why these three are sufficient for defense. Teukros is the best archer and he is good at standing battle (13.313-314). Lokrian Aias receives no further mention in Idomeneus’ speech, but Aias is discussed at length. First, Idomeneus says, ἀνδρὶ δὲ κ᾿ οὐκ εἴξειε μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας (13.321); Aias, in fact, would not give way to Achilleus
himself in a standing fight (αὐτοσταδίη) (13.324-325). Further, no one can compete with Aias in feet (13.325). The poem here stresses Aias’ ability to stand, which is a major part of his defensive excellence. Idomeneus’ speech here is also overturning a common Iliadic topos. Feet are usually the emblem of a warrior’s swiftness; to be peerless in feet means to be the fastest mover. Here feet are brought up for their immobility; Aias is best in feet because he can stand and not be moved from his place. This passage, then, supports the notion that Τελαμώνιος Αίας is pillarlike as it stresses the importance of standing for Aias’ defensive excellence.\(^2\)

Aias is Τελαμώνιος in a defensive context again at 13.702. The surrounding passage describes the Achaian defense of their wall where it is lowest. The Boiotians, Ionians, Lokrians, et al. are involved in this defense (13.685-689). As part of this general scene of defense Lokrian Aias οὐκέτι . . . ἵστατ’ ἀπ’ Αἰαντος Τελαμώνιον οὐδ’ ἔβαιν (13.701-702). The united standing of the Aiantes is compared to two oxen yoked together and ploughing a field (13.703-707). The simile closes by again pointing to the Aiantes’ standing together, ὡς τῷ παρβεβαιῶτε μᾶλ’ ἔστασαν ἀλλήλοιν (13.708). Next the poem tells how many of Aias’ companions follow him to take his shield when he needs to rest (13.709-712). The Lokrians do not follow their Aias, however, because they cannot fight in a standing battle (σταδίη ύσιν 13.713), since they do not carry helmets, shields, and spears into battle, but bows and slings (13.712-718). The Aiantes, supported by missiles from behind them, begin to turn the Trojans back (13.719-720).

\(^2\)This passage also gives us another excellence for feet: feet are not just for running, but for standing as well.
This passage supports the association of Τελαμώνιος and defense by occurring in a general context of defense and by stressing the association of Aias and defense with standing. Aias’ defensive armour, his shield, also plays a prominent role here.\(^3\) Moreover, the necessity of defensive armour to standing defense is made clear as the poem explains that the Lokrians cannot fight out behind Lokrian Aias because they lack, among other things, shields. Aias is successful as a defensive warrior here as the Trojans begin to turn in confusion. Again, the notion of pillar-like Aias reveals itself in a passage that stresses that Aias’ excellence as a defender rests in part on his standing.

The next appearance of Τελαμώνιος Αίας in a defense context is at 14.409. Here the Achaians and Trojans are fighting fiercely at the wall. Hektor casts his spear at Aias, hits him, but does not wound him because the straps (τελαμώνε) of his shield and of his sword, crossing on Aias’ chest, drive back the spear (14.402-406). Hektor withdraws into the crowd of his companions, but μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αίας (14.409) hits Hektor with a boulder and knocks him unconscious (14.406-413). The poem tells us that the boulder was one of the ἔχματα νηών that appears to have come dislodged and rolled into the fighting (14.410-411). Once Hektor is down, the Achaians rush at him but his companions carry him out of battle and back towards the city (14.419-432).

This passage describes Aias as a successful defensive warrior; in it he manages to remove the leader of the Trojan army from the fighting, which results in a Trojan rout. This passage is openly playing on the association of Τελαμώνιος with τελαμών as

\(^3\)The shield is not explicitly called a shield like a tower here, but that idea is at play whenever the poem mentions Aias’ shield and pointedly here where the size of the shield must explain the need for Aias to hand it over to rest.
strap. This is the only place in the poem that makes any meaningful connection between Aias and straps. Here the straps of his shield and his sword save his life, so that Aias is accurately strappy at this point. Beyond the pun, the notion of Τέλαμωνιος as Strappy bears no weight here. Aside from the use of the epithet Τέλαμωνιος in a general context of defense and the insistence on Aias’ connection to his shield, there does not appear to be any other defensive association at play here.  

In his two appearances as Τέλαμωνιος Αἰας in Book 15 (the appearance at 15.560 ff. is discussed in Chapter 5), Aias adds two elements to our understanding of defensive warfare in the Iliad: we learn that defensive warfare requires defensive weaponry and that it demands of its participants a commitment to each other and to their community. Aias the pillar warrior is Book 15 is not so much the immobile warrior as the expert in defense.

Despite his mastery of defensive warfare, Aias fails in his attempt to keep fire from the ships. At 16.112-113, the poet asks the Muses to tell how fire fell on the Achaian ships. Hektor cuts the head off Aias’ spear with his sword (16.115-116), with the result that Τέλαμωνιος Αἰας is plying a headless spear (16.116-117). Aias recognizes the work of the gods and the plan of Zeus and so, at last, withdraws from the fighting (16.119-121). At this point the Trojans set fire to a ship (16.121-122). Aias is Τέλαμωνιος at the moment he

---

4 A possible punning resonance at play here could appear at 13.410 in the phrase ἔχωντα νηών. ἔχω, prop or stay, is what holds a ship in its place, and so it is characteristically a means for causing immobility. The word is derived from the verb ἔχω, to hold, and has a synonym in its meaning as prop in ἔρμα. The use of ἔχω rather than ἔρμα here could be playing on the notion of holding, which is often associated with notions of protecting or defending, as we see in Hektor the holder of Troy. Here Aias the defender is using a holder, a keeper in place, to drive Hektor off from the ships.
abandons his role as defender. Recognizing the futility of defense he withdraws and allows the attackers to succeed in their plan to burn a ship. The epithet at this point reminds us of all that Aias is as a defender and thereby makes this moment of failure more reverberant.

The first appearance of Aias as Τελαμώνιος in Book 17 is strongly reminiscent of the Τελαμώνιος Αἳς of Book 12. In this case Menelaos is protecting Patroklos’ corpse when he sees Hektor and the Trojans approaching (17.82-89). Menelaos decides that, rather than stay by Patroklos and die, he will go find Aias so that together they can rescue the corpse (17.91-96). So Menelaos withdraws into the body of the Achaian army, seeking Αἴαντα μέγαν, Τελαμώνιον υἱόν (17.115). When Menalaos find Aias, he tells him what he wants, and the two of them set off together (17.116-124). When they arrive at Patroklos’ corpse, Hektor is stripping Achilleus’ arms from the body (17.125-126). When Aias approaches with his shield like a tower, Hektor withdraws, unable to drag off Patroklos’ corpse (17.127-129). Having driven Hektor away, Aias stands over Patroklos’ corpse and covers it with his shield (17.132-133). Here, as in Book 12, when someone wants defensive aid, Aias is the warrior he thinks to seek. As in Book 12, Aias responds without hesitation to the request for help. Notice again that the motivation for Aias’ defensive action comes from another character and not from Aias himself. Again, defense involves the idea of standing by what one defends and creating a barrier between it and the attacker.

As Book 17 draws to a close, Hektor is rampaging through the Achaian ranks. More and more Achaians withdraw from the field. Aias and Menelaos continue to protect Patroklos’ corpse. In the face of the beginnings of a general Achaian withdrawal, μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἳς (17.628) suggests to Menelaos that they need to come up with a plan for
rescuing the corpse (17.634-635). He suggests that Menelaos find someone to take a message to Achilleus about Patroklos’ death (17.640-641); he goes on to suggest Antilochos as a possible messenger (17.652-655). Menelaos then sets out reluctantly to find Antilochos (17.656 ff.). As with earlier occurrences of Τελαμώνιος Αἴας we see a context of defense in which Aias is the one who is immobile in a context of movement. The other Achaians are withdrawing, the Trojans are attacking, while Aias stands over Patroklos. Here, as elsewhere, Aias the defender is characterized by his immobility.

The last appearance of Τελαμώνιος Αἴας in an explicitly defensive context is at 17.715. Menelaos returns to Aias, having dispatched Antilochos to Achilleus (17.702-707). He now suggests that they devise a way to rescue Patroklos’ corpse (17.708-714). Then μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας suggests that Meriones and Menelaos carry the corpse out while he and Lokrian Aias come behind to fight the Trojans (17.715-721). Menelaos and Meriones lift up the corpse and the Trojans attack en masse (17.722-731), only to be stopped by the Aiantes who stand (σταίησαν) against them (17.732-734). Again we see Aias’ immobility in defense at play as he remains where Menelaos has left him earlier and as he stands, with Lokrian Aias, against the Trojans. Aias the pillar warrior is once again in evidence.

Τελαμώνιος as “pillar-like” makes considerable sense for Aias in the defensive contexts examined above. The defensive warrior is characterized by his standing still while others attack or flee around him. Lack of initiative is also characteristic of the defensive warrior (with some reservations, to be discussed below). The defensive warrior

5 See Chapter 4 on the simile for Menelaos at 17.657 ff.
must possess defensive arms, most specifically a shield and a spear. Finally, the defensive warrior is motivated by αἰδώς for his fellows rather than by a desire to forge out as a champion to win prizes. We will now go on to consider whether these characteristics of defense also manifest themselves at points where Τελαμώνιος Αἴας is not explicitly involved in defensive activity, but rather in aggressive warfare. If we discover that they do, we are on safer ground in our claim that Τελαμώνιος Αἴας is "pillar-like" Aias.

§ 2. Aggressive Contexts

Aside from its appearances in Iliad 2 the first instance of Τελαμώνιος Αἴας is at 4.473: ἔνθε βαλέν Ανθεμίωνος υἱὸν Τελαμώνιος Αἴας. The context is the first engagement of the two armies in the poem. Antilochos is the first of the Achaians to kill a Trojan (4.457). The next kill is Aias' at 4.473. Typical of Aias' defensive behaviour, we see here that Aias is not the first of the Achaians to kill, but that he follows Antilochos' lead and kills second. Τελαμώνιος Aias' behaviour is in keeping with what we have seen of him in his defensive appearances insofar as the narrative here has him not acting as the aggressive leader or initiator of killing.

We see Τελαμώνιος Αἴας again at 6.5. Here Αἴας δὲ πρῶτος Τελαμώνιος, ἔρκος Αχαιῶν breaks the Trojan ranks. This line comes after we learn that all of the gods have left the battlefield. Diomedes' aristeia is still in process, so that Aias' act of breaking the Trojan ranks here is an aggressive act. The Achaians are not in a situation of defense. Indeed, later in Book 6, Hektor will go into Troy to ask for Athene's protection against Diomedes and the Achaians (6.102-115). Nonetheless, Aias is described here in defensive
terms. The line ends with his explicitly defensive epithet, ἔρκος Αχαῖων, while the sentence goes on to describe his breaking the Trojan line as φῶς δ' ἐτάρκησιν ἔθηκεν—he brought salvation to his companions by killing Akamas (6.6). In these two lines, then, we see Aias' characteristic defensive nature controlling the way the poem describes a successful aggressive act. Even when Aias is functioning as an aggressive warrior, the poem describes him in defensive terms. The use of the two formulae in line 5, Αἴας δὲ πρῶτος Τελαμώνιος and ἔρκος Αχαῖων, could be explained as simply formular and epiphanic. However, that the poem then goes on to say that Aias brought salvation to his companions indicates that his actions are being recast here and that the formulaic line should be taken as fully meaningful.

Aias is Τελαμώνιος in an aggressive context in two lines in quick succession in Iliad 5, at 5.610 and 5.615. Here Hektor kills Menestheus and Anchialos (5.608-609). Τελαμώνιος Aias, in pity for the two dead men, stands near them (στὴ δὲ μάλ' ἕγγυς ἰὼν 5.610-611) and kills Amphios with a cast of his spear (5.611-613). Τελαμώνιος Αἴας strikes him beneath his belt (5.615-616). Aias then runs up (ἐπέδραμε) to strip the corpse (the only time that Aias engages in this typical warrior behaviour in the Iliad), at which point he is called φατίδιος Αἴας (5.617-618). The Trojans drive Aias off before he can do anything but pull his spear from Amphios' corpse (5.618-622). Here Aias' aggressive act (killing Amphios) is a reaction to Hektor's killing Menestheus and Anchialos, not a killing undertaken simply on his own initiative. As the poem describes Aias responding to Hektor's aggression, it calls him Τελαμώνιος. When Aias then engages, of his own will, in the
aggressive acts of running up to strip the corpse, he becomes φαίδιμος Αίας. Swift aggressive action belongs to Aias, not as Τελαμώνιος, but as φαίδιμος. Aias is unsuccessful in this one attempt at typical heroic stripping of the fallen foe and is forced to withdraw.

Aias' next appearance as Τελαμώνιος in an aggressive context is in Book 7, during his duel with Hektor. Hektor, prompted by Helenos, challenges an Achaian champion to single combat (7.67-91). Menelaos stands to accept the challenge (7.94-95), but Agamemnon dissuades him (7.109-119). Nestor then reproaches the Achaians for their reluctance to fight (7.124-160). In response to Nestor's chastisement, nine Achaians stand to accept the challenge: first Agamemnon, then Diomedes, then the Aiantes, then Idomeneus and Meriones, and finally Eurypulos, Thoas, and Odysseus (7.161-168). The nine cast lots in a helmet and Aias' comes out (7.181-183). When φαίδιμος Aias recognizes his lot, he rejoices (7.186-189). Aias and Hektor prepare for battle; Aias arms, receives a simile comparing him to Ares, and goes out to fight with his shield like a tower, whose construction the poem describes (7.206-223). With these preliminaries finished Τελαμώνιος Αίας (7.224) stands near Hektor and threatens him (7.226-232); Aias ends his threats with, ἀλλ' ἄρχε μάχης ἰδὲ πτολέμοιο (7.232). Hektor responds to Aias' threats (7.234-243), addressing him as Αίας διογενῆς Τελαμώνιε, κοίρανε λαών (7.234), and then casts his spear at Aias (7.244).

---

6See above on 11.489-490.

7The poem insists on the warriors standing up one after the other with πρῶτος 162, τῷ δ' ἐπὶ 163, τοῖς δ' ἐπ' 164, τοῖς δ' ἐπ' 165, and τοῖς δ' ἐπ' 167.
Aias’ behaviour here is also in keeping with his defensive behaviour. The duel itself is an Achaian response to Hektor’s challenge, itself prompted by Athene and Apollo (7.37-45). Aias is not the first to accept the challenge, but is preceded by Menelaos. Agamemnon’s rejection of Menelaos still does not prompt Aias to fight. Nestor must stand up and abuse all of the Achaians before Aias responds. Even in this response Aias follows both Agamemnon and Diomedes. Once again, Aias shows himself to be incapable of initiative (a quality, granted, that he shares here with all of the Achaians). Aias insists on his own not taking the lead at 7.232, between the two appearances of his epithet, when he tells Hektor that Hektor must start the fighting.

Each of the instances of Τελαμόνιος Αίας here can be taken as epiphanic uses of the epithet. The first of them appears at the end of what appears to be a version of the traditional preparation for an aristeia: arming scene, simile, focus on a particular piece of armour, description of the effects of the warrior on those who see him. When Aias appears at the end of this scene, carrying his shield, he is appearing as the complete warrior Aias, identified by his characteristic epithet, the one that most accurately describes his traditional role. So also with the use of Αίαν Τελαμόνιε in Hektor’s speech. Hektor is not simply responding to Aias at this particular moment, but to Aias in his role as champion of the Achaians, as a kind of figurehead devoid of particular content but rich with associations. And yet the poem reminds us that Τελαμόνιος Αίας is the warrior who stands when it tells us, immediately after calling him Τελαμόνιος Αίας, that he stands (στῆ) near Hektor at 7.225. The poem further reminds us of Aias’ characteristic inability to take initiative by

---

8Compare the arming scenes for Paris, Agamemnon, and Patroklos.
insisting on this inability in its account of the selection of an Achaian champion and in its having Aias insist even now on Hektor making the first move. Notice also that Aias, at the moment where he manifests typical aggressive features, when he recognizes his own lot and rejoices, is φαιδιμός, an epithet for a successful aggressive warrior.

Aias is Τελαμώνιος again at 7.283, when, as night falls, the herald Idaios suggests that they end the fight because neither Aias nor Hektor is winning and it is getting dark (7.279-282). In response to Idaios' suggestion Aias says, let Hektor decide, since this fight was his idea (7.284-286). Here we see Aias being typically Τελαμώνιος in his refusal to make a decision and in his inability to succeed unequivocally in an aggressive situation. Although it is clear that Aias is a better fighter than Hektor, the defensive warrior, evoked by Τελαμώνιος Αίας, cannot best the aggressive warrior.

Aias is next called Τελαμώνιος in an aggressive context at 14.511. Here Aias and the Achaians, under the leadership of Poseidon, have routed the Trojans and are pursuing them back across the plain. The poet calls on the Muses to tell which of the Achaians made the first kill after Poseidon turned the battle (14.508-510). We learn that Αίας ὁ πρῶτος Τελαμώνιος ἔχριτον οὔτα (14.511) and that Antilochos killed Phalke and Mermeros (14.512). Here, even though the poem gives Aias first place, he is not the first one to make a kill; rather, Antilochos kills, while Aias only wounds. Once again, Aias the defensive warrior takes second place to an aggressive warrior.

14.511 is the last of the instances in which Aias is called Τελαμώνιος in an

---

9There is no casting of lots to see who will cast his spear first, as in Paris' duel with Menelaos at 3.324-325. The first move here belongs to the one who makes it.
aggressive context. In each of these cases we have seen that Τελαμώνιος Αίας does not
function completely or successfully as an aggressive warrior. Instead, whenever he is
designated Τελαμώνιος, features or characteristics of Τελαμώνιος Αίας the defensive
warrior are at play. He is incapable of taking initiative, he is not a swift mover. Lack of
initiative and slowness of movement are significant features of Aias in aggressive warfare,
where they do not serve as well as they do in defensive contexts.

§ 3. Non-warfare Contexts

It remains to examine the two instances in which Τελαμώνιος Αίας occurs
outside of battle. The first of these is at 9.644, where Aias takes part in the embassy to
Achilleus. The second is at 23.722 during the funeral games for Patroklos. We will see that,
even in these cases, Aias’ character as defensive warrior is at play.

At 9.644, Achilleus addresses Aias as Αίαν διογενὲς Τελαμώνιε, κοίρανε
λαόν, as he replies to Aias’ speech. In replying to Aias with this typical vocative formula,
Achilleus is pointing to Aias as the defensive warrior in response to what Aias has just said to
him. Aias’ speech focuses on what Achilleus owes to Aias, Odysseus, and Phoinix as their
host and their φίλας: οδ’ Ίλαιν ἐνθεο θυμόν, αἰδεσσαί δὲ μέλαθρον (9.639-640). He
asks also that Achilleus respect his ties with the rest of the Achaians, rather than keep an
ἀγριον θυμόν and not μετατρέπεται φιλότητος ἐταίρων (9.629-630). Aias asks
Achilleus to consider the effects his behaviour is having on everyone else. In short, Aias is
asking that Achilleus be a warrior of αἰδώς, just as, we have seen, he asks the Achaians to
remember αἰδώς at 15.561-564. To be a warrior of αἰδώς is to fight thinking of your
companions and of your membership in a warrior community. Although Aias does not here explicitly ask that Achilleus be a warrior of αἰδώς, the message is the same. Aias the defensive warrior attempts to persuade Achilleus, not in terms of honour and prizes, as Odysseus and Phoinix have done, but in terms of respect and care for his fellows. This respect and care are what mark Aias as the defensive warrior and Achilleus acknowledges Aias' defensive character when he addresses him as Διαν Τελαμώνιε.

Finally, at 23.722, Aias is called Τελαμώνιος in the course of his wrestling match with Odysseus. Strictly speaking, this match is a combat; however, it is not a combat in a context of war, but in the context of the peaceful ritual of Patroklos' funeral. Odysseus and Aias stand to compete (23.708-709). They go to the middle of the assembly to fight, but neither is able to throw the other (23.710-720). Aias at last addresses Odysseus, telling him that either Odysseus should lift him or he will lift Odysseus (23.722-724). As he speaks, Aias is called μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αίας (23.722). Having spoken, Aias lifts Odysseus, but Odysseus, relying on δόλος rather than strength, hits Aias behind the knee so that Aias falls (23.725-727). Aias is Τελαμώνιος in the sense of pillar-like in this passage first because it is not possible for Odysseus to throw or lift him; Aias remains standing upright. He is pillar-like again in his inability to withstand Odysseus' trickery. The pillar-like warrior is a straightforward fighter who does not use cunning, but only strength and prowess.
§ 1. Primary Sources


§ 2. Secondary Sources


