Boston University

OpenBU | http://open.bu.edu

Boston University Theses & Dissertations | Boston University Theses & Dissertations

2016

Grief, longing, and anger: a study of emotions in the Iliad

https://hdl.handle.net/2144/17060

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Dissertation

GRIEF, LONGING, AND ANGER:
A STUDY OF EMOTIONS IN THE *ILIAD*

by

EMILY P. AUSTIN

B.A., University of Dallas, 2006

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

2016

© Copyright by
EMILY P. AUSTIN
2016

Approved by

First Reader ______________________________

Stephen Scully, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Classical Studies

Second Reader ______________________________

Stephanie Nelson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Classical Studies

Third Reader ______________________________

Jeffrey Henderson, Ph.D.
William Goodwin Aurelio Professor of Greek Language and Literature

To my sweet mother
who, together with my father,
taught me to read
and to love

In paradisum deducant te angeli

Acknowledgments

As I have come to the end of this long writing process, I have felt ever more keenly that a dissertation – rather like a cathedral – is built not by one person, but by a whole city of people. In my city of helpers, I foremost must thank my father, who has been a constant, intelligent, and wise counselor. He knows me better than I know myself, and unfailingly found the right words to guide me through difficult moments, both intellectual and personal. Profound thanks go also to Moira Walsh, whose prudent and affectionate advice carried me through the final stretch. The two of them have taught me patience and optimism, and I hope to have the opportunity to help others as much as they have helped me. In the department, Rachel and Laurie have offered me the joys of friendship intertwined with a shared love for Homer. They not only have been bastions of support, but our thoughtful conversations about the *Iliad* have greatly enriched the final product.

Stephen Scully has been an exemplary mentor. His love for the text is second to none, making him one of the most thoughtful readers of the *Iliad* I have ever known. I am deeply indebted to him for his confidence, as he pushed me to find my own voice regarding a much-discussed poem. I will miss our conversations about Homer greatly. Stephanie Nelson too exhorted me to take my argument further, going as deep into the truth of the *Iliad* as I was able to go. She matched this challenge with unwavering generosity and managed to make every meeting enjoyable as well as productive. I am also grateful to Jeffrey Henderson and David Konstan, whose wide knowledge of antiquity brought fresh insights to my reading of the *Iliad*. Patricia Johnson, Ann Vasaly, Jay Samons, Stephen Esposito, Wolfgang Haase, Zsuzsanna Varhelyi, and James Uden have been outstanding teachers and

mentors during my time at Boston University, and I am grateful for every class and conversation. I must also thank my other colleagues in the department, who have been sounding boards for my work and generous companions through graduate school, particularly my officemates Dustin Dixon and Michael Wheeler, as well as the marvelous cohort who preceded me and showed me that graduate studies are compatible with a sense of humor and spirit of camaraderie: Tyler Travillian, Julia Demetriou, Sophie Klein, Seth Holm, and Miska Vincze.

Last but certainly not least I must thank my Bayridge and Pittsburgh family. It is impossible to name all the women who have kept me cheerful and motivated (and fed and watered) in this past near decade. Irene Dorgan, Sara Ribeirinho Machado, Angie Reckart, Aileen Chang, Shareen Rador, Sarah Byers, Allannah Karas, Kathleen Carroll, Eileen Maher, Sonsoles de Lacalle, Lisa Coyne, Leonor Zubillaga, Thomas and Meghan Marré, Christine Turcotte, Celia Merullo, and Danielle Pahud are just a few of the dozens who have enriched my life in these years. For them and for all the many others who have supported me with their prayers and friendship, I give thanks.

GRIEF, LONGING, AND ANGER: A STUDY OF EMOTIONS IN THE *ILIAD*

EMILY P. AUSTIN

Boston University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, 2016

Major Professor: Stephen Scully, Associate Professor of Classical Studies

ABSTRACT

Readers of Homer's *Iliad* immediately confront the anger of Achilles; the first word of the poem, μῆνις, forefronts the hero's godlike wrath. Yet little attention has been paid to the important relationship that exists between Achilles' anger and his grief. In this dissertation I identify language in the poem unique to Achilles, linking his grief for Patroklos with a longing, ποθή. The most important interpretive consequence of this link between ποθή and grief, I argue, is the proper understanding of the insatiable roots of his subsequent anger. Achilles experiences the death of Patroklos as a rending of the fabric of his life. In this state of restless volatility, we see that Achilles' anger is one more response to an underlying experience of rupture and thus is both aimless and fruitless. Although Achilles succeeds in ensuring the future sack of Troy by killing Hektor, his behavior remains insatiate, since his deeds of anger are motivated by a desire for what cannot be achieved, life shared with Patroklos. The persistence of his attempted vengeance beyond the slaying of Hektor reveals the futility of his underlying longing, such that, according to the poem, the only end he can make of his grief-driven anger, finally, is to let it go.

The Trojans' grief for Hektor is never described with the language of longing, and this surprising exclusion underscores the contrast between Achilles and Hektor. Where Achilles has a uniquely independent status, Hektor is continuously tied to the city as a whole and part of a rich network of close relations. Rather than exploring the rupture of a single, highly personal relationship, perhaps typical of a warrior far from home many years, with Hektor's death the poem depicts the impending destruction of an entire civilization. Thus every expression of grief for this warrior refers not only to personal loss but to the multiple relationships that will be impacted by his death. The Trojans' grief for their defender cannot linger on the sense of rupture in the present, but rather their grief is shaped by a forward-looking sense of doom.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments v

Abstract vii

Table of Contents ix

Introduction 1

Plan of Chapters 15

Chapter One: ποθή in the Iliad 18

Grief rooted in ποθή 25

The Relationship of Achilles and Patroklos 36

Chapter Two: Longing and Anger 58

Things Going Nowhere 76

Aimless Anger 86

Chapter Three: Narrative Consequences of ποθή-driven Anger 93

Insatiate Anger and the Sack of Troy 93

Achilles' story: From Endlessness to Letting Go 110

Release, Take 1 119

Release, Take 2 128

Chapter Four: Grief for Hektor 135

Hektor and the People of Troy 137

Andromache in Book 6 – Particular and Civic Grief 142

Communion and Isolation – A Parenthesis 145

Particular and Civic Grief for Hektor after his Death 149

In Conclusion – The Passive Quality of Trojan Grief 166

Conclusion 170

Appendix A: ποθή, ποθέω, and πόθος in the *Iliad*: Some Subdivisions 177

Appendix B: ποθή, ποθέω, and πόθος in the *Odyssey*: Some Subdivisions 182

Bibliography 187

Curriculum Vitae 197

"The *Iliad* is not, ultimately, a story about the warrior code,

or the search for 'unperishable renown,' but rather a story of griefs…."

Kevin Crotty, *The Poetics of Supplication*, 59

Introduction

This dissertation is in large part about the futility of vengeance. It follows a single narrative thread in the *Iliad*, the poem's presentation of the grief of Achilles for Patroklos and the anger that it spawns. Although I am wary of attempts to capture the epic's narrative in just a few words, Kevin Crotty's claim that the *Iliad* is a story not about the search for renown, but about grief and emotions, provokes a fruitful line of thought.[1] The study of Achilles' grief in particular reveals a rich framework for understanding several key elements in the *Iliad*'s narrative. In this dissertation I argue that the poem roots Achilles' grief, after the death of Patroklos, in the rupture of shared life, from which also stems his subsequent anger, with its particular qualities of relentlessness, aimlessness, and futility. Such grief is delineated in the poem with the language of ποθή, or longing. This understanding of Achilles' grief and anger illuminates several narrative threads: how Achilles becomes the daimonic force that effectively sacks the city of Troy; why such anger fails to redress the grief that drives it; and the moderating force of human attachment which qualifies the hero's immortal dimension and ultimately enables him to release his enemy's body. The poem's presentation of Achilles' grief also sheds light, by way of contrast, on the grief of the Trojans for Hektor, which is dominated by a civic awareness of future doom.

[1] Crotty (1994), 59.

The story of Achilles' anger is well known. After hearing of Patroklos' death in Book 18, the distraught warrior reenters battle in order to kill Hektor, launching himself into an unparalleled killing spree against the Trojans. He slays Hektor and buries his friend; yet still in the grip of anger, he turns to a cycle of repeated vengeance on Hektor's corpse, broken only by the intervention of the gods and his own decision to let go. Scholars have focused separately on the anger, killing, and grief of Achilles, but they have neglected to explore the relationship between that grief and anger, both insatiable emotions for Achilles at this stage of the poem. I wish to look at this particular combination of emotions, uniquely linked in the case of Achilles in the *Iliad*, and, surprisingly, largely absent from the grief of Hektor's loved ones. Thus I ask why Achilles' grief results in such vast fury, when the Trojans' grief for Hektor does not. Drawing on the language of the *Iliad* itself, I shall argue that Achilles' anger and grief are linked through the dynamic of longing.

Only the grief of Achilles for Patroklos is associated with the term ποθή, a force of longing, as in the phrases σῆι ποθῆι (19.321) and Πατρόκλου ποθέων (followed by a series of objects, 24.6ff). It is a peculiarity of the poem that this quality of longing is restricted to the grief of Achilles, an observation not yet discussed in scholarly literature. One might expect to find the same collocation of grief and longing in the Trojans' great need for Hektor, whose death provokes more narrated γόοι than any other character in the poem, and whose funeral closes the poem, yet ποθή never describes any expression of grief for this hero. The unique constellation of terms in grief for Patroklos points us to a particular way of understanding the nature of Achilles' grief, and it is to this peculiarity that I wish to direct this dissertation. This small linguistic point has large interpretive consequences. By

distinguishing Achilles' grief from that of the other major grievers in the poem, the poem draws our attention to the particular qualities in his grief that propel Achilles into deeds of relentless anger. If we better understand the emotional dynamics driving Achilles in the last fourth of the poem, we better understand both Achilles in his human and divine aspects, so central to his character, and the narrative arc of the poem, the story of how one warrior becomes a force whose anger is vast enough to sack a city.[2]

In this dissertation I am attentive to nuances in the language of particular lines, yet I have found that the three Iliadic words for longing, ποθή, ποθέω, and πόθος, largely overlap in their context and significance. Thus I do not differentiate between the verb and noun forms, since they collectively point to a unified concept, whose significance I shall argue for below. For convenience's sake, I shall refer to this concept with the noun ποθή or the English translation "longing/yearning." For a complete catalogue of the verb and noun forms as they are distributed throughout different contexts, see Appendix A.

When we draw together all the uses of ποθή and its related forms in the poem, in both grief and non-grief contexts, we can establish four common elements in the term's Iliadic significance. First, ποθή is the response to an absence. Second, insofar as the absence ruptures a former wholeness, ποθή bears in it an intrinsic desire for the absence to be filled. Third, ποθή tends to be particular, not generic, i.e., one longs for a specific person, not for a

[2] The sack, of course, is not narrated in the poem directly, but poetically occurs with the death of Hektor in Book 22. For a reading of the *Iliad* as the story of the sack of Troy, with one narrative thread telling how Achilles became the force that could sack the city, and the other telling how the city fell through the death of Hektor, see Scully (1990), 114-128. King (1987) likewise frames the *Iliad* thus, as the story of "the effective conquering of a city by wreaking personal vengeance on that city's champion," 1. This reading will be discussed further in Chapters Three and Four.

generally "equivalent" person to fill up the absence.[3] And lastly, ποθή can refer to something that is deeply a part of the person; in other words, the wholeness that is ruptured has an intimate subjective dimension. The first chapter will analyze the appearances of ποθή in the poem, beginning with its most common context, the ten times a group of warriors is said to long for their leader. When Achilles longs for the slain Patroklos in the last fourth of the poem, these later passages resonate with the battlefield context already well established, but they are embellished by a greater discourse on grief itself. Once we have drawn out the essential elements of the word's meaning in these grief and non-grief contexts, we shall turn in subsequent chapters to the narrative consequences of a grief so shaped by this longing. I shall argue that we best understand the vast anger of Achilles when we see it as deriving from ποθή, the insatiate desire for a wholeness that has been lost.

A useful comparandum for this discussion can be found in Plato's *Cratylus* where Socrates distinguishes the terms ἵμερος and πόθος. Socrates designates ἵμερος as the desire for what is present, and πόθος as the same feeling as it is felt when the object of desire is absent.[4] This distinction gives an outside parallel to what we see in Homer. Since ποθή*,* a yearning for what is absent, is at the heart of Achilles' grief, all of his grief-driven activities can only achieve more weeping and other activities of attempted presence, but can never fill the absence of ποθή. When we understand this dimension of grief, we see that Achilles' grief is intrinsically volatile and unable to be assuaged.

---

[3] ποθή never describes longing for things in the *Iliad* and only once describes longing for an activity, when Achilles longs for warfare in 1.492. This is one of the main ways in which ποθή in the *Iliad* differs from the *Odyssey*, on which see below.
[4] *Cra.* 419e-420a.

It is worthwhile noting that ποθή never describes sexual desire in the *Iliad*. In fact, the word never describes even the grief of one spouse for the other, with the exception of one such imagined grief when Dione threatens Diomedes (5.414). In its predominant application of ποθή to battlefield contexts and to grief for a single warrior, the *Iliad* differs both from the *Odyssey* and from much of archaic literature. In the *Odyssey,* ποθή words are used in a wide range of contexts, often quite utilitarian. Almost half of the appearances of ποθή describe missing/desiring an external object. As in the *Iliad,* ποθή in the *Odyssey* is never explicitly sexual, although Penelope does describe her longing for her absent husband with this language on three occasions (1.343, 18.204, 19.136), a description shared by Odysseus' mother and the swineherd, Eumaios.[5] A complete catalogue of the forms and contexts of ποθή words in the *Odyssey* can be found in Appendix B.

In archaic literature the preferred noun is πόθος, which often denotes sexual desire in this period. Thus Hesiod in the *Works and Days*, for example, describes Pandora as endowed with πόθον ἀργαλέον ("troublesome yearning," *WD* 66);[6] Sappho,[7] Theognis,[8]

---

[5] Odysseus' father, mother, and the swineherd long for Odysseus in his absence (11.196, 11.202, and 14.144); cf. Telemachos' fear that his absence will make his mother long for him (2.375, 4.748). Circe advises Odysseus that it is better to long for six dead companions than for the entire company (12.110), the closest parallel to the Iliadic ποθή of the battlefield. All other appearances of ποθή in the *Odyssey* refer to the missing of an external object. For a complete catalogue of forms and contexts, see Appendix B.

[6] πόθος denoting sexual desire also appears in the pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles* 41.

[7] Sappho (fr. 22.11, 48.2, 102.2 Voigt). Three other Sappho fragments could be using πόθος words to denote sexual yearning, although in these fragments either the word is not fully formed or the context is not clear: fr. 15.11, 36.1, and 94.23 V. Cf. the fragmentary references in Archilochus, fr. 193.1 and 196 West.

[8] *Theognidea* 1339 West. The participle ποθῶν also describes sexual desire at Thgn. 1251 W.

and other archaic poets[9] likewise use the term in erotic contexts. But we also see πόθος in this period describing the grief of bereavement and absence. Callinus describes the longing of a people for a slain warrior thus: λαῶι γὰρ σύμπαντι πόθος κρατερόφρονος ἀνδρὸς/ θνήσκοντος, ζώων δ' ἄξιος ἡμιθέων· ("For when a man of strong mind dies, his entire people long for him, and he has the worth of the living demigods," fr. 1.18 West).[10] Tyrtaeus similarly describes the entire city as grieved by ἀργαλέωι […] πόθωι at the fall of a warrior (fr. 12.28 W). The identification of πόθος with absence is particularly keen in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, when Persephone has been abducted by Hades, and first mother and then daughter feel a grieved longing for the other (*HH Dem* 201, 304, and 344).[11] Elsewhere in archaic literature πόθος denotes longing for deeds of valor (Pindar, *Pyth.* 4.184).[12] This spectrum of contexts for πόθος in the archaic poets does not affect our interpretation of the *Iliad*; but here we can perhaps see a small cross-section of a larger pattern of overlapping

---

9 E.g., Simonides *Anth. Pal.* 7.25.8 Campbell (although Gow-Page date this epigram to the later Hellenistic period; cf. *ad* IV G.-P. (1965), 518-9); Bacchylides 26 Maehler.

10 In the same Callinus fragment, two lines earlier, the warrior who returns home and dies of old age is neither φίλος nor ποθεινός (fr. 1.16 W). In Pindar too, variant forms of πόθος describe absence/bereavement: *Ol.* 6.16, Ποθέω στρατιᾶς ὀφθαλμὸν ἐμᾶς, "I long for the eye of my army," (describing the death of a seer); cf. *Ol.* 10.87, an absent child is ποθεινός to his father.

11 These examples bear great similarity to Achilles' grief-longing for Patroklos, as will be noted in Chapter Two. Cf. the paternal longing predicted by a dying son in Simonides *Pal. Anth.* 7.513.4 Campbell: ἀρετὴν ποθέων […] σαοφροσύνην (note the participial form; Page (1981) dates this epigram to the 2nd century B.C., *ad* LXXIV, 294).

12 Similarly, perhaps, in Ibycus S227 *PMGF* (=P.Oxy. 2637 fr. 7). Variant forms also describe longing for valor in Pindar: participle, *Ol.* 13.64 (Bellerophon longing to yoke Pegasos); adjective, (ποθεινοτάταν δόξαν, *Ol.* 8.64; ποθεινόν/ κλέος, *Isth.* 5.7). In 'Anacreon' III Page (= *Anth. Pal.* 7.263), πόθος denotes longing for one's home country; Page (1981) dates this epigram to the Hellenistic period, 135.

imagery in poetic descriptions of grief and love, particularly when the beloved is not attained.[13]

The *Iliad*, of course, is a work of literature, not philosophy, and as such it never spells out the exact nature of the relationship between ποθή and grief. Conceptually, the two are distinct: longing is a force of attraction, grief the pain of loss. But as we shall see, longing for what has been lost fundamentally shapes Achilles' grief. In my analysis I stay away from strictly causal language – "he grieves because he longs" – because such language suggests discrete episodes; whereas, when the Iliad depicts Achilles' grief with ποθή language, such longing seems to be the persisting shape of his grief, the characteristic feature that makes it insatiable and volatile. Thus the poem portrays Achilles' grief as more than simply pain, although his loss is certainly painful; rather it includes a kind of restless dynamism, which we will explore in the next several chapters.[14] I shall occasionally abbreviate this particular species of grief in the hyphenated term "grief-longing" or "ποθή-grief," especially when contrasting it with the Trojans' grief for Hektor.

Part of my contribution is to distinguish this grief and anger from other griefs and angers in the poem. In Achilles and Patroklos the poem offers us a unique story, a friendship of unparalleled closeness, and it depicts the grief caused by the rupture of that friendship with unique language, ποθή, and uniquely prolonged and insatiate effects. But despite the singularity of this story, the poem invites us to see Achilles' grief and anger as paradigmatic.

---

[13] Even though, of course, there are major differences between death and unrequited or temporarily absent love.

[14] Konstan (2006) argues lucidly for the likeness of grief to physical pain, as opposed to other emotions, insofar as loss impacts the bereaved without regard to anyone's intentions and without provoking the disposition to respond, 244-258, esp. 246-8. Thus, he notes, the most common word for grief in ancient Greek literature is λύπη, 245; but note that no form of λύπη appears in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*.

He has a particularly intense temperament and, moreover, is associated with the gods in ways which distinguish him from the other mortals in the poem, as we shall discuss in Chapters One through Three. Yet throughout the poem we see glimmers of likeness in other characters' experience of grief and anger. Many other warriors in battle feel grief at the death of a companion and respond by trying to kill the killer.[15] One notable example is the grief of Hektor when his younger brother Polydoros is killed:

> Ἕκτωρ δ' ὡς ἐνόησε κασίγνητον Πολύδωρον
> ἔντερα χερσὶν ἔχοντα, λιαζόμενον ποτὶ γαίηι,
> κάρ ῥά οἱ ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλύς· οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτ' ἔτλη
> δηρὸν ἑκὰς στρωφᾶσθ', ἀλλ' ἀντίος ἦλθ' Ἀχιλῆος
> […]. (20.419-422)[16]
>
> But when Hektor saw his brother Polydoros
> holding his innards in his hands, sinking down to the earth,
> darkness poured over his eyes too; and no longer did he endure
> to turn there far from battle, but he came face-to-face with Achilles
> […].[17]

---

[15] E.g., 8.316-322, αἰνὸν ἄχος pierces Hektor for his dead charioteer, and he tries to kill the slayer Teucer; 11.248-253, κρατερόν […] πένθος covers Koön's eyes and he attacks Agamemnon for slaying his brother; 13.402-403, Deïphobos, Ἀσίου ἀχνύμενος, attacks Idomeneus; 13.581-583, ἄχος takes Menelaos at the death of Deipyros and he approaches Helenos, brandishing his spear; 14.458-461, the Argives feel ἄχος at the slaying of Prothoënor, and Ajax is stirred to killed Archelochos; 14.475-477, ἄχος takes Trojans at the slaying of Archelochos, and his brother Akamas bestrides the body to fight; 14.486-487, the Argives feel ἄχος at the slaying of Promachos, and Penelaos is stirred to kill Akamas; 16.508-547, Glaukos feels αἰνὸν ἄχος at the death speech of Sarpedon and he prays for healing so that he can return to battle; 16.548-553, πένθος/ ἄσχετον takes the Trojans at the news of Sarpedon's death, and in anger Hektor leads them to battle; 17.591-592, Hektor learns of the slaying of his beloved companion Podes (cf. 17.575-577), and a black cloud of grief covers him, and he strides to the front of the fighting (τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα,/ βῆ δὲ διὰ προμάχων κεκορυθμένος αἴθοπι χαλκῶι); etc. For passages where grief is not specified, cf., 13.203, Oilean Ajax angered because of the death of Amphimachos (κεχολωμένος Ἀμφιμάχοιο); 13.660-662, Paris angered for the death of guest-friend (ἀποκταμένοιο χολώθη·/ […]/ τοῦ ὅ γε χωόμενος); etc. See Fenik (1968) on the typical nature of these chain reaction fights, 10. Bassett (1933) argues that the poem views these vengeful actions as required of the survivor, 52-54.

[16] All Greek quotations of the *Iliad* come from West's Teubner edition (1998-2000).

Grief for his brother impels Hektor to battle with his slayer. This pattern of grief in battle begetting vengeance is not explored extensively for most of these warriors, but in the pattern we see the potential likeness between these griefs and angers and the grief-driven anger of Achilles. The depth to which the *Iliad* probes the yearning of Achilles is atypical, yet the poem invites us to see his response to Patroklos' death as a paradigmatic story, the *kind* of story that could apply to anyone.

Yet in this potentially paradigmatic story, the poem challenges one element in the pattern of vengeance in battle, the occasional claim that killing the enemy eases the pain of grief. This notion emerges in the vaunts of certain characters that vengeance accomplishes "deeds of equal worth," as if the slaying of a companion required in turn slaying of the enemy, or more, to balance the scale. The violence of Hekabe's desire to devour the enemy raw is but one example of this concept of ἄντιτα ἔργα:

> […] τοῦ ἐγὼ μέσον ἧπαρ ἔχοιμι
> ἐσθέμεναι προσφῦσα· τότ' <u>ἄντιτα ἔργα</u> γένοιτο
> παιδὸς ἐμοῦ, ἐπεὶ οὔ ἑ κακιζόμενόν γε κατέκτα,
> ἀλλὰ πρὸ Τρώων καὶ Τρωϊάδων βαθυκόλπων
> ἑσταότ', οὔτε φόβου μεμνημένον οὔτ' ἀλεωρῆς. (24.212-216)

> And I wish I could hold the middle of his liver
> and attaching myself devour it; those would be <u>deeds of fair requital</u>
> for my son, since not cowardly was he when [Achilles] killed him
> but on behalf of the Trojan men and Trojan women with their low-hanging garments
> he stood, thinking neither of flight nor avoidance.

[17] Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are the author's own.

Although Hekabe speaks with unusual gruesomeness,[18] her hope for ἄντιτα ἔργα echoes a thought common to others in the poem, what Bernard Fenik calls the "'fair exchange' of slayings."[19] Such passages contribute to a general impression that deeds of vengeance somehow ease the pain of grief. Priam claims something similar about lament, when he declares that Achilles can kill him, once he has held Hektor's body in his arms and assuaged his desire for weeping: αὐτίκα γάρ με κατακτείνειεν Ἀχιλλεύς/ ἀγκὰς ἑλόντ' ἐμὸν υἱόν, ἐπὴν γόου ἐξ ἔρον εἵην (24.226-227). This variant of the formula for having one's fill of a meal suggests a likeness between the longing of grief and the satiable desires of the body. In the narrative of Achilles, however, we shall see that grief-longing is distinguished by its insatiety, and through this story the poem will refute the notion that vengeance can be ἄντιτα, of equal value, to what has been lost. We shall return to these questions of the motivation and efficacy of vengeance in Chapters Two and Three.

In Chapter Four, I shall turn to the major counter-example in the poem, the grief for Hektor, which is never described in terms of ποθή. I shall suggest that perhaps the narrative of grief-longing turning to anger was not told for Hektor because he is predominantly a man

---

[18] The only parallels are Achilles' rejection of Hektor in Book 22, αἲ γάρ πως αὐτόν με μένος καὶ θυμὸς ἀνείη/ ὤμ' ἀποταμνόμενον κρέα ἔδμεναι, οἷά μ' ἔοργας ("If only somehow my fury and spirit would urge me myself to cut off your flesh and eat it raw, such deeds have you done," 22.346-347), and Zeus' characterization of Hera's wrath against the Trojans as only to be sated by devouring them raw (ὠμὸν βεβρώθοις, 4.35); he asks her, have they done such evils to you? (τόσσα κακὰ ῥέζουσιν;, 4.32).

[19] Fenik (1968), 135. See, e.g., 13.446, when Idomeneus boasts to Deiphobus, Δηΐφοβ', ἦ ἄρα δή τι ἐΐσκομεν ἄξιον εἶναι,/ τρεῖς ἑνὸς ἀντὶ πεφάσθαι; […] ("Deiphobos, so then shall we say this was a deed of equal worth, to slay three men in exchange for one?," 13.446-447); also 14.471-472, when Ajax boasts to Polydamas, φράζεο, Πουλυδάμα, καί μοι νημερτὲς ἐνίσπες·/ ἦ ῥ' οὐχ οὗτος ἀνὴρ Προθοήνορος ἀντὶ πεφάσθαι/ ἄξιος; οὐ μέν μοι κακὸς εἴδεται οὐδὲ κακῶν ἔξ,/ ἀλλὰ κασίγνητος Ἀντήνορος ἱπποδάμοιο/ ἢ πάϊς· […] ("Think, Polydamas, and tell me truthfully; is not this a man worthy to die in exchange for Prothoënor? He does not seem to me to be a base man, nor born of base men, but a brother of Antenor the horse-tamer, or a son; […]" 14.470-474).

of the city, and his story is dominated by his specific role and innumerable ties to his community. Conversely, we can plausibly argue that Achilles' freedom from the ties of city, emphasized by the particularity of his exclusive friendship with Patroklos (see Chapter One), makes Achilles and Patroklos a particularly good paradigm for the story of grief's personal effects.[20]

The scholarship on grief in the *Iliad* tends to bypass a thorough study of its dynamics, focusing more on the distinctive functions of lament for the different sexes. So in her seminal *Les larmes d'Achille*, Helene Monsacré observes the active, virile modes of grief which make up the suffering of the masculine hero in Homer, so different from the slow wasting away of female tears;[21] or in *Dangerous Voices*, Gail Holst-Warhaft explores the distinctive power women have in Homeric society through their status as formal lamenters;[22] in *Leaving Words to Remember*, the first chapter of which is devoted to Iliadic personal laments, Katharine Derderian argues that the poem privileges male, active forms of mourning over ephemeral female mourning at funeral rituals.[23] Derderian's work also contributes to a related area of scholarship which studies the generic differences between epic and lament,

---

[20] Cf. Bassett (1933), who compares Patroklos' relationship with Achilles to the entirety of Troy's various family relationships with Hektor, 55-56. E.g., "The love and devotion which Hector gave to the many members of his family Achilles gave to Patroclus," 55.

[21] Monsacré (1984); on this point see esp. 199-201. In her work she argues that the male hero is as much defined by his suffering as he is by his prowess in war, and his weeping is in no way a lack of manliness. Many scholars agree with her on this point; cf., e.g., van Wees (1998) who, with a similar focus on gender, looks at tears in Homer in the context of restraint, concluding that there is little, if any, expectation of restraint from men when it comes to weeping; the one exception is ritual laments, in which women are expected to be the primary mourners and to do so more intensely than men, 10-53.

[22] Holst-Warhaft (1992), esp. 98-114. For a more general study of female lament, see Alexiou (2002; orig. 1974), who places Greek ritual lament in a historical context, comparing it in ancient literary, epigraphic, Byzantine, and contemporary folk sources.

[23] Derderian (2001), 10-15. Her interest is in how permanency shapes the evolution of different genres of mourning in ancient Greece; so she analyzes male and female mourning in the Iliad in terms of commemorative value and durability.

arguing that the presence of lament in a war epic brings out intratextual commentary on the values and ethos of the epic itself;[24] noteworthy in this field is Sheila Murnaghan, who argues that lament both aids epic in its project of conferring *kleos* on heroes and at the same time subverts it, through the regret and grief that coexist with praise of the dead hero.[25] But nowhere have I found an exploration of Iliadic grief in light of ποθή, nor has anyone observed the linguistic relationship between grief and longing in the Achilles-Patroklos story. Without this observation, few scholars have explored the impact that longing in grief has on the other emotions and actions of Achilles in the poem, particularly with regard to his anger.[26]

In the *Iliad* a wide lexical range is used to describe grief in relation to longing. In this dissertation I have not classified these grief terms into separate categories, since the significance of ποθή in these scenes does not depend upon any individual formulaic expression for grief, but emerges from the context. In the five passages where ποθή is directly linked with grief, the griever is responding (or is imagined as responding) to a death. The descriptions of their grief range through the following vocabulary: Diomedes' wife is imagined as lamenting (γοόωσα, 5.413) in yearning for her deceased spouse;[27] Achilles'

---

[24] Cf. Derderian (2001), 15-62.
[25] Murnaghan (1999), 202-220. Cf. also Perkell (2008).
[26] Specific laments have been studied in depth in innumerable studies – among them we can mention Laura Slatkin's *The Power of Thetis* (1991) and Casey Dué's *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis* (2002), which look at outside traditions to better understand the characters of Thetis and Briseis in the *Iliad*. But no scholar has explored the specific characteristics of grief-longing as portrayed in the poem, which have important consequences for our understanding of grief's relationship with anger and of the narrative as a whole.
[27] The ποθή of 5.414 is a hypothetical longing which Dione threatens will come to Diomedes if he does not desist from attacking gods; this single example of a grief-longing for someone *other* than Patroklos, even though only imagined, supports our claim that such characteristics of grief are at least

horses weep (κλαῖον, 17.427), shed warm tears (δάκρυα […]/ θερμὰ κατὰ βλεφάρων χαμάδις ῥέε, 17.437-438), and mourn (μυρομένοισιν/μυρομένω, 17.438/441) in their longing for Patroklos; in Book 19, Achilles speaks of his longing for Patroklos in the midst of groaning (στοναχίζων, 19.304), "terrible grief" (ἄχος αἰνόν, 19.307),[28] weeping (κλαίων, 19.338) and mourning (μυρομένους, 19.340);[29] Achilles and the Myrmidons cry out (ᾤιμωξαν, 23.12), mourn (μυρόμενοι, 23.14), feel the desire to lament (γόου ἵμερον, 23.14), and soak the earth with tears (δάκρυσι, 23.16) as they long for their great warrior-companion; and finally in Book 24, Achilles' sleepless yearning for Patroklos is accompanied by weeping (κλαῖε, 24.4) and tears (θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυον εἶβεν, 24.9). Derderian has classified these and other Homeric terms for grief and mourning in her study of how laments subvert *kleos*.[30] But she has not observed the particular coupling of grief and mourning with longing in these five instances of the poem. In my contextual study of this vocabulary, I shall note any instances where particularities of the language have interpretive consequences for our understanding of ποθή.

Christos Tsagalis has studied the personal laments (γόοι) of the *Iliad* in detail, examining the elements of their formal structure and their recurring themes, but the only meaning he makes of these themes focuses on the "intratextuality" of the laments, that is, the way the personal laments of the *Iliad* foreshadow, allude, and correlate to one another

---

potentially paradigmatic, although given unique narrative focus in the poem. See note 48 on this passage in Chapter One.

28 Achilles' own words; see discussion of this term in Chapter Two.

29 This last plural includes the elders who join Achilles in his lamentation, a feature typical of ritual lament; cf., Alexiou (2002, orig. 1974), 132-5; Tsagalis (2004a), 64-68; etc.

30 Derderian (2001), 16-52.

and, through these references, encompass in miniature the whole story of the poem.[31] Tsagalis' work is useful for his systematic presentation of the elements common to all of these γόοι, but he never turns his attention to the uniqueness of Achilles as a griever nor to the relationship between Achilles' grief and his anger. Some of Tsagalis' themes do point to grief's roots in longing for what has been lost, particularly the motif of separation in these laments,[32] yet Tsagalis rarely considers the impact of grief in its immediate context.[33] Tsagalis denies any theme of separation *in the present* between the mourner and the dead in these laments, arguing rather that the laments unite the deceased and the survivor.[34] I, by contrast, will argue that the laments portray union between the mourner and the deceased only to draw attention to the fact that that union has been sundered. My focus will be on the specific language for Achilles' grief that draws attention to such lost union and thus illuminates the narrative consequences of his grief.

The correlation of grief to longing has appeared in studies of later classical authors. David Konstan has observed the likeness between grief and longing in Lucretius and Lucian, although he has not applied his concepts to Homer. In a study of grief in Lucretius, he compares the naturalness of human grief with the instinctive sorrow of animals at the loss of

---

31 Tsagalis (2004a); see, e.g., 25-26, 168-169.
32 *Ibid.*, 82-83. One example of the separation motif is the antithesis between *then* and *now*, seen for example in Briseis' lament over the corpse of Patroklos in 19.288-289, ζωὸν μέν σε ἔλειπον ἐγὼ κλισίηθεν ἰοῦσα,/ νῦν δέ σε τεθνηῶτα κιχάνομαι, ὄρχαμε λαῶν,/ ἂψ ἀνιοῦσ'· ("I left you alive when I went away from the shelter,/ but *now* I find you dead, leader of the people, as I return back here.") The core of Briseis' lament is the contrast of her empty present with the lost promise of a happy life, married to Achilles back in Phthia.
33 Any such considerations are made only in passing, as when he attributes the separation motif to the "binary oppositions" typical of Greek thought in general, 75-76 (cf. Lloyd (1966), 41-48, 86-94); or when he briefly concludes that these antitheses contribute to the larger tension of the poem, created by the Homeric heroes' dilemma of *nostos* versus *kleos*, 168.
34 This claim forms part of Tsagalis' argument about the "common fate" motif that highlights the common sphere of suffering shared by the mourner and the deceased, 29n106 and 39-41.

those to whom they are attached by nature, a *desiderium* for the deceased.[35] In a nuanced reading of Lucian's satire *On Mourning* (περὶ πένθους), Konstan develops this concept of *desiderium* (although without using the term here), arguing that people who love one another form a "larger self", since the projects that they share in common make them live, in that sense, a single life.[36] Thus the loss of a loved one is a kind of "amputation."[37] The death of the loved one causes the survivor to lose a portion of his very self, dissolving his joint identity with his beloved, and the survivor "mourns the extinction of a common existence." Konstan encapsulates this concept of grief with the lovely summation, grief is "what it is to be without a person who is half of one's soul."[38]

Plan of Chapters

Although Konstan only looks at texts much later than Homer's,[39] his insights describe precisely the poignant characteristics of ποθή that we see in the *Iliad*. Konstan's language of amputation and shared life matches perfectly with the restricted use of the term in this poem. In the *Iliad*, ποθή most often refers specifically to the longing that a group of fighting men feel for a great warrior, often their leader, when he has left them or been lost.

---

[35] According to Konstan (2013b), humans experience this animal-like "brute sense of loss" together with a cognitive judgment about the sadness of what has occurred, 208. Such "brute sense of loss" aligns very much with how I see Homer using ποθή – physical perception of absence.

[36] Konstan here modifies Aristotle's definition of a friend as "another self" (*NE* IX.4, 1166a31-2) to someone who is "one and the same self," (2013a), 143-4. For a similar understanding of friendship, see Oele (2010) on Arist. *NE* IX.9, 1169b5-7 and 1170b5-7; here the friend *completes* one's self, 53.

[37] Konstan (2013a), 143.

[38] *Ibid*, 149.

[39] For example, Quintilian in *Institutio Oratoria* Bk. 6, who mourns the absence of his son who shared his deep interest in language and literature. According to Konstan, Quintilian's pain results from the unfulfilled hopes (*spes inanes*) that he had for his son, in and through whom he expected to live (*Inst.* 6 *praef.* 12). Cf. *Inst.* 6 *praef.* 3, where he calls his son his *viscera*, suggesting that in bereavement one has lost part of oneself. Konstan (2013a), 144 and 150.

In the first chapter we shall look at these appearances of ποθή and its variants to better understand the nature of longing in this poem – longing as the experience of a void, a missing presence, and the desire for the wholeness that has been lost. When we return to grief in the poem, themes of absence and lost wholeness will illuminate those scenes where grief is described in terms of ποθή. This frame of lost wholeness will also provide language to describe the poem's portrayal of the relationship between Achilles and Patroklos. In Chapter Two we shall explore the intrinsic insatiety in Achilles' grief, tracing its transitions to anger. His anger shares with all of his responses to grief this common grounding in ποθή, and thus his anger manifests an underlying aimlessness and ultimate futility. In Chapter Three we shall apply these insights to major portions of the narrative. The godlike vastness of Achilles' anger after Patroklos' death is best understood as a manifestation of this insatiate longing. Yet, although Achilles succeeds in killing Hektor and thereby destroying Troy's future, his vengeance fails insofar as it is rooted in desire for something unachievable, the healing of the rupture of his life shared with Patroklos. The futility of his vengeance is seen in the persistence of his insatiate behavior beyond the slaying of Hektor, until, as the poem presents it, the only end he can make of his grief-driven anger, finally, is to let it go. The one moderating force within this limitless ποθή is its roots in life shared with a mortal, and I shall end Chapter Three by arguing that this intrinsic limiting factor, a desire for life *qua* life, is a significant factor in Achilles' ability to release the body and put an end to his relentless pursuit of vengeance. In Chapter Four we shall turn to Hektor, who is the object of much grief, yet never explicitly of ποθή. This surprising linguistic reality reflects the position of this hero in the poem's narrative, insofar as he is continuously tied to the city as a whole and

part of a rich network of close relations, making him thus a less apt paradigm for exploring the intensity of personal longing than the single relationship between Achilles and Patroklos. This difference in language corresponds to the different roles of the heroes in the poem: Achilles' story concerns the rise to heights of anger vast enough to effectively sack Troy, whereas grief for Hektor is part of a story about total loss. We shall now turn to the first of these stories.

Chapter One: ποθή in the Iliad

The *Iliad* articulates a special relationship between grief and longing through the death of Patroklos and the particular language used to describe the grief for this warrior. In order to understand the nature of this grief and its impact on the behavior of Achilles, we must first examine how ποθή is used elsewhere in the poem. Four common elements are evident: that ποθή is the response to an absence; that insofar as the absence ruptures a former wholeness, ποθή bears in it an intrinsic desire for the absence to be filled; that ποθή tends to be directed towards a particular person, not some general equivalent; and lastly, that the wholeness yearned for in ποθή has an intimate subjective dimension. By drawing out these essential elements of the word's meaning in both grief and non-grief contexts, we shall be better able to understand the relationship between Patroklos and Achilles and the effects of grief on Achilles' behavior.

In non-grief contexts throughout the poem, ποθή primarily describes the feeling of a group of warriors when their leader is gone from the battlefield.[40] Achilles threatens the Greeks that they will feel such a longing for him when he has withdrawn from battle (ποθὴ ἵξεται, 1.240); later Poseidon exhorts the Greeks to more vigorous action, promising that if they exert themselves, they will not excessively long for Achilles (κείνου δ' οὔ τι λίην ποθὴ ἔσσεται, 14.368). Menelaos fears such a loss and longing for the Danaans if Odysseus be lost, calling it a μεγάλη [...] ποθή (11.471); this can be compared to the longing on the

[40] Substantial portions of the argument in the following two sections first appeared in my article, "Grief as ποθή: Understanding the Anger of Achilles," published in the *New England Classical Journal* 42.3 in 2015.

battlefield for Poseidon and Antilochus when they have to depart (πόθεσαν, 15.219, and μεγάλη […] ποθή, 17.704, respectively). Hektor too projects such longing onto his soldiers when he is absent from them in Book 6, using their physical need for him as a reason to refuse Helen's appeal to sit (μέγ' ἐμεῖο ποθὴν ἀπεόντος ἔχουσιν, "they have great longing for me in my absence," 6.362). Some scholars draw connections between a few of these appearances of ποθή, focusing on the narrative impact of the word's later repetition.[41] Yet their translations of the term vary, from "missing," to "longing," to "feeling his absence,"[42] with no interpretation of this variety.[43] Yet these six appearances of ποθή offer a more precise way to interpret the relationship between "missing" and "longing": in all of these instances, ποθή is capturing a specific physical situation, the warrior or leader's absence from battle,[44] and its psychological consequences: the physical absence of that warrior's valor causes those who remain behind to miss him, to long for what they have lost. This

---

[41] Pucci (1993), for example, notes the irony that Achilles, after Patroklos' death, feels the very longing for Patroklos (19.321) that he had threatened the Greeks would feel for him (1.240), 268-9. He argues that the audience could well have heard an evocation of the earlier threat, across the expanse of the poem, and that they would have felt the pathos of that narrative arc. Zanker (1994) too asserts that Achilles' threat could resonate in later moments of the poem, observing that Poseidon's exhortation to the other Greeks in Book 14 picks up the language of Achilles' defiance in 1.240, 93n32. Muellner (1996), arguing that Achilles is the first victim of his own *menis*, notes that he feels ποθή for the social occupations of the warrior male (1.488-492) long before the Greeks feel the ποθή that he predicts for him here, 138.

[42] E.g., Zanker (1994), 93-97. We could add to this variety Fitzgerald's translation (1974) of σῆι ποθῆι (19.321, original numbering) as "lacking you," 467; cf. *ibid.*, τοῖον γὰρ πόθεον (23.16, orig. num.), "for they missed him bitterly," 530.

[43] Nor do any of these scholars isolate the significance of this term in order to apply the concept to grief, as the poem invites us to do.

[44] Two other examples, both of horses, bring out this dimension of ποθή as the perception of physical absence: Trojan horses miss their slain rein-bearers in 11.161, as they rattle through the battle with empty chariots; cf. a Trojan speaker imagining Aeneas' horses longing for their familiar driver, 5.234.

significance of the word will illuminate our understanding of grief later when we look at those passages where grief is described in terms of longing.

The same significance of ποθή comes through elsewhere in the poem, in contexts where sorrow is present although the grief is not explicitly linked to longing itself. When Menelaus asks Antilochus to bring to Achilles the λυγρὴ ἀγγελίη, the "wretched news" of Patroklos' death, he describes the impact of that death on the army as a μεγάλη […] ποθή (17.685-690). This longing has the same source as the non-grief examples above – the yearning of a group of fighters for a strong warrior whom they have lost – but it also conveys clear notes of sorrow. Menelaus calls Patroklos' death a πῆμα for the Greeks, but victory for the Trojans, and the word evokes the army's sense both of impending doom and of grief: doom, since they have lost a warrior to lead the Myrmidons to their aid, and grief over that loss.[45] Moreover, Menelaus' exhortation causes silent tears to spring to Antilochus' eyes, reinforcing the presence of sorrow in this scene of ποθή for a commander. Thus we not only see further evidence of the physical and psychological situation being described by ποθή, namely, the absence of a missing leader and the ensuing desire for his presence, but also intimations of how this force will be linked with grief.

In the Catalogue of Ships there are two more examples of ποθή for an absent leader in which grief is not emphasized, but can be discerned. These examples not only further

---

[45] Cf. 22.421-426: Priam links πῆμα and ἄλγεα, calling Achilles a πῆμα for the Trojans, but one who has caused suffering (ἄλγεα) for him above all, killing all of his children and now killing Hektor. Achilles is Troy's bane, in that he causes its destruction, and for each individual in Troy, that destruction means personal sorrows for specific dead. The same association between πῆμα and ἄλγεα is made at 3.156-160, where Greeks and Trojans ἄλγεα πάσχειν ("endure sufferings") because of Helen, a πῆμα. For πῆμα linked with ὀϊζύος, cf. 6.282-285, where Hektor calls Paris a πῆμα for Troy, at whose death Hektor would think that he had forgotten sorrow.

complete this picture of longing as the response to a void and point to the relationship of that longing to grief, but they also illuminate the personal nature of ποθή. In the first example, the Greeks from Phylake and Pyrasos long for Protesilaus who, as first to disembark at Troy, was shot immediately (2.695-710). The ποθή of the men follows a brief narrative of grief, felt in the description of what Protesilaus left behind, his wife ἀμφιδρυφὴς ("with both cheeks torn in mourning," 2.700) and his house half-finished (δόμος ἡμιτελής, 2.701). The picture of incompleteness and of mourning gives the entire passage a current of sorrow, including the longing that his men have for their leader (πόθεον, 2.709). In the second passage, sorrow is more subtle, since the missing leader, Philoktetes, has not died, but has been abandoned by the Achaians on Lemnos. Although alive, he has been left in pain: ἄλγεα πάσχων ("suffering pains," 2.721), ἕλκει μοχθίζοντα κακῶι ("vexed by an evil wound," 2.723), ἀχέων ("aggrieved," 2.724). Philoktetes' pain, caused by his wound, seems to be as much psychological as physical – the grief of abandonment – and these same words in other contexts describe grief *per se*.[46] When the narrator, immediately after this description of anguish, tells us that Philoktetes' men long for him, the longing fits into a larger context of pain and sorrow that colors the entire passage. In this context of sorrow, the narrator tells us that their longing is personal. In both sections of the Catalogue, we are explicitly told that these men have new leaders, but long for their former one: Protesilaus' men, οὐδέ τι λαοί/ δεύονθ' ἡγεμόνος, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἐσθλὸν

[46] Cf. 5.399-400, Dione reminding Aphrodite of Hades' wounding by Herakles, where physical pain and interior grief are intertwined: […]/ κῆρ ἀχέων, ὀδύνῃσι πεπαρμένος, αὐτὰρ ὀϊστός/ ὤμωι ἔνι στιβαρῶι ἠλήλατο, κῆδε δὲ θυμόν· ("grieved at heart, pierced by pains, as the arrow had driven into his heavy shoulder, and he was distressed in his spirit"). On the overlap between physical and emotional suffering in archaic and classical Greek thought, see Harris (2001), 340-43; but see also Konstan (2006), 245-6.

ἐόντα ("nor was the army at all without a leader, yet they longed for him since he was good," 2.708-709); and Philoktetes', οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν ("nor were they leaderless at all, yet they longed for their leader," 2.726).[47] This simple detail points to an important nuance in the significance of ποθή: although the felt absence is described in terms of the *role* of the one who is absent – the men missed their strong *leader* – the longing in these examples is clearly for a specific person, not for a role-fulfiller, since the role of leadership is being fulfilled. These men feel the absence of specific persons, not of generic leaders. The detail about Protesilaus, ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα (2.709), suggests that his men long for him *in* his capacity of leadership – he was good at it – but still the lines emphasize the particularity of their longing. The adversative particle γε μὲν (πόθεόν γε μὲν ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα) draws attention to the contrast between their longing for the man they lost and the fact that they do have a new leader. Their ποθή is personal.

ποθή once describes longing for an action rather than a person, in a passage concerning Achilles. In this passage we see a fourth significance of ποθή, longing for something that is intimately part of one. After the narrator describes the return of Chryseis and Apollo's appeasement, he briefly returns to Achilles, who has withdrawn in rage from the army and the battle, and he depicts him sitting by his ship, torn between inaction and desire:

αὐτὰρ ὁ μήνιε νηυσὶ παρήμενος ὠκυπόροισιν

[47] Line 2.726 duplicates 2.703 (οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν); West (2001) contests 2.703, since it gives information that will be repeated in 2.708-709 and does not fit the earlier place, 181-2. For a different reading of πόθεον, cf. Nagy (2013), who sees in this and other ποθή passages an indirect reference to the sacral eroticism built into hero cult, 393-406. Such latent implications would not rule out the plain meaning of the text, argued for in this chapter.

> διογενὴς Πηλῆος υἱός, πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς·
> οὔτέ ποτ' εἰς ἀγορὴν πωλέσκετο κυδιάνειραν
> οὔτέ ποτ' ἐς πόλεμον, ἀλλὰ φθινύθεσκε φίλον κῆρ
> αὖθι μένων· ποθέεσκε δ' ἀϋτήν τε πτόλεμόν τε. (1.488-492)
>
> But this man was full of wrath, as he sat by his swift-going ships,
> the god-born son of Peleus, swift-footed Achilles;
> neither did he ever go into assembly where men strive for honor,
> nor into war, but he was forever wasting away his own heart,
> remaining there; and constantly he yearned for the cry of battle and for war.

Achilles is denying himself the very thing he longs for, ἀϋτή and πόλεμος. This unique use of ποθή with warfare, not a person, as its object, highlights the wholeness whose rupture gives rise to such yearning. Achilles' entire life has centered on his excellence in warfare. The war-cry and battle are a part of him, and his withdrawal from these activities creates a void in himself. His men share his yearning for battle, as we see in Book 2. When the Catalogue of Ships reaches the Myrmidons, the narrator paints a vivid picture of their idleness, which he connects with a longing for their war-loving leader (ἀρχὸν ἀρηΐφιλον ποθέοντες, 2.778). Kirk regards this yearning as inappropriate, since Achilles is not absent but nearby, but his complaint misses the context of the phrase.[48] Just as Achilles yearns for battle, so do his men, but the narrator expresses this longing for the fight as longing for a person to lead them to fight.[49] The small slippage of thought is quite suggestive: Achilles is given the epithet ἀρηΐφιλον, which elsewhere in the poem typically describes Menelaos, and the import of

---

[48] Kirk (1985), *ad loc.*

[49] Later in 16.203-209, Achilles declares that the Myrmidons resented his keeping them from the fight. Their eagerness for battle is evident in the dramatic simile comparing these warriors to wolves, 16.156-166, highlighting not only sheer ferocity, in the graphic descriptions of bloody feasting, but impetus towards battle in the verb ῥώοντ', which ties the simile back to the actions of the Myrmidons, rushing around their battle-leader, Patroklos (16.165-166).

the line, in the context of the men's idleness, is "The Myrmidons longed for the *fighting* Achilles." Thus this passage not only shows that the Myrmidons long for battle as much as Achilles, but it highlights the wholeness that Achilles has sundered through his withdrawal, reinforcing the poignant sketch of 1.492 – Achilles is by nature a war-lover and one who leads men to battle, and his abstention from battle makes him long for it. This special use of ποθή illuminates its rich dimension as the strong desire for something deeply a part of one.

This survey of ποθή, in non-grief contexts and in those passages where grief is not emphasized but can be discerned, establishes four key elements in the term's Iliadic significance. First, the predominant meaning of ποθή is a felt absence, as when a leader leaves the battlefield and his men miss his physical presence. Secondly, this missing has a psychological dimension, that is, a longing for the absence to be filled. Thirdly, ποθή is personal, not generic. And lastly, ποθή can describe the desire for something intimately part of the person, as Achilles longs for warfare during his period of withdrawal. We shall now turn to four scenes in which grief is explicitly described in terms of longing. All of these scenes describe longing for Patroklos, and I argue that the narrator is carefully depicting the grief of Achilles, and, by extension, that of the Myrmidons and Achilles' horses, as a response to a ruptured wholeness, a yearning born of absence.[50]

---

[50] There is a fifth scene where grief is described with ποθή: in Book 5, when Dione threatens Diomedes' life, declaring that he should be careful whom he fights with, lest his wife, γοόωσα ("lamenting," 5.413), be unable to sleep, κουρίδιον ποθέουσα πόσιν, τὸν ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν ("longing for her wedded husband, the best of the Achaians," 5.414). The goddess' threat remains in the world of possibility, but this passing reference to grieved longing suggests that the characteristics which the poem explores extensively in Achilles' grief for Patroklos are potential features of any grief. Later we shall look at why Achilles' story is an apt paradigm for the exploration of grief's relationship with anger.

Grief rooted in ποθή

The *Iliad* uniquely clusters ποθή terms with grief words in scenes of grief for Patroklos. When lamenting Patroklos, 19.315-337, Achilles poignantly explains why he will continue to refuse food and drink:

> ἦ ῥά νύ μοί ποτε καὶ σύ, δυσάμμορε, φίλταθ᾽ ἑταίρων,
> αὐτὸς ἐνὶ κλισίηι λαρὸν παρὰ δεῖπνον ἔθηκας
> αἶψα καὶ ὀτραλέως, ὁπότε σπερχοίατ᾽ Ἀχαιοὶ
> Τρωσὶν ἐφ᾽ ἱπποδάμοισι φέρειν πολύδακρυν ἄρηα.
> νῦν δὲ σὺ μὲν κεῖσαι δεδαϊγμένος, αὐτὰρ ἐμὸν κῆρ
> ἄκμηνον πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος, ἔνδον ἐόντων,
> σῆι ποθῆι. […]. (19.315-321)
>
> "Ah me, once indeed you, ill-fated, dearest of my comrades,
> yourself in our hut prepared the savory dinner,
> quickly and deftly, whenever the Achaians were hastening
> to bring tearful war to the horse-taming Trojans.
> But now you lie here, your flesh torn, and my heart
> will have nothing of drink nor food, though they are here,
> because of my longing for you; […]."

In Achilles' earlier refusal to eat, he says that an ἄχος αἰνόν, a dread grief, has come upon him (19.307). Here he describes that grief as driven by the longing born of Patroklos' absence – the aching void of his comrade no longer at his side, preparing the food, sharing his life as a warrior against Troy. The longing has the same character as that of its non-grief appearances above: it stems from a concrete, felt absence. The contrasting temporal markers emphasize the piece of shared life that now is missing: ἦ ῥά νύ μοί <u>ποτε καὶ σύ</u>, δυσάμμορε, φίλταθ᾽ ἑταίρων,/ αὐτὸς ἐνὶ κλισίηι λαρὸν παρὰ δεῖπνον ἔθηκας/ […]/ <u>νῦν δὲ σὺ</u> μὲν κεῖσαι δεδαϊγμένος […] (19.315-316, 319). The emphatic position of σῆι

ποθῆι heightens the pathos of Achilles' refusal to eat and draws our attention to this connection between grief and longing.[51] We see, moreover, that Achilles' longing for Patroklos is particular, as was the men's longing for a leader in the Catalogue of ships. The Achaian leaders surround him, urging him to eat, yet in longing for his particular friend Patroklos, whose companionship included such meal preparation, Achilles refuses to eat.[52] Achilles' lament then expands upon this sense of grief as the longing for a lost common existence, in a way that echoes Konstan's description of grief as a kind of amputation. The death of Patroklos has not only sundered the unity of life that he shared with Achilles, but has also rendered hollow Achilles' plans for the future, since Achilles, we learn, knowing the certainty of his death, had hoped that Patroklos would raise his son.[53] Patroklos' death thus not only rips from Achilles' life the wholeness of companionship but also the wholeness of his family's future well-being. The tears which he imagines his father shedding for him, and

[51] On the impact of the phrase, cf. Edwards (1991), *ad* 19.319-321, who notes how σῆι ποθῆι is not only emphatic by position (enjambed placement in first position, followed by a pause), but also because of its unexpectedness, and Pucci (1993) who observes its force: "very few expressions in this text have the force and the pathos of σῆι ποθῆι (19.321) which is in no way accented by repetition and metrical fixity," 272; cf. 268. I would say that the phrase makes itself keenly felt not only by emphatic position, but also through its incisive brevity: σῆι ποθῆι encapsulates the whole new reality of Achilles' state of grief.

[52] Crotty (1994) notes how the irreplaceability of Patroklos to Achilles shapes Achilles' grief in this section of the poem, 66. Cf. Edwards (1991): laments in the *Iliad* betray the "intensely lonely and personal nature of grief," insofar as mourners focus on the impact of the death on their own lives (commenting on the lament of Briseis for Patroklos, *ad* 19.287-300). Although Edwards does not refer to the language of ποθή, this term gives linguistic clarity to a phenomenon latent in many experiences of grief.

[53] 19.326ff. On the rupture of hopes in this lament, cf. Pucci (1993), who sees in the nullity of Achilles' hopes the destruction of others' hopes as well: for example, Briseis' hope for marriage is annulled when he says that he hoped he alone would die at Troy, etc.; 272. Cf. Konstan (2013a) on Quintilian's *spes inanes* (note 39 above). I follow Tsagalis (2004a) and van Thiel (1996) in keeping these lines, *contra* West (2001), 12; cf. Tsagalis (2004a), 148-9n408. Although the *Iliad* mentions Achilles' son only one other time, the reference here wholly suits the passage, which compares the loss of Patroklos to his other relationships and potential reasons for grief.

his father's impending death, contribute to this picture of total loss.[54] Achilles has nothing: no future for his father, none for his son, and no present shared life with his companion. He calls the grief shaped by this void a *longing*, and the whole lament depicts that longing as the rupture of a whole.[55]

Achilles' longing for his companion here is linked to a mortal reality, the need for food, upon which Achilles now refuses to act.[56] The nature of this bereaved refusal to act upon his mortal needs comes into focus after his lament speech. Athena, encouraged by Zeus, distills nectar and ambrosia into his breast, ensuring that divine food will prevent human weakness from overwhelming him.[57] Stephen Scully has argued that after the death of his beloved companion, Achilles moves into a realm of godlike indifference to his impending death.[58] He gives particular importance to Achilles' claim that the loss of Patroklos has severed his link both to his father and his son. Now Achilles exists in world without past or future.[59] This reading brings out the depth of loss captured in σῆι ποθῆι; Achilles has lost a companion whom he, and the poem, identifies with his mortal self, with whom he shared

---

[54] 19.323-324, 19.334-337.

[55] Although Schadewaldt (1965) does not consider the language of ποθή, his formulation of Achilles' grief as an "event" rather than an expression ("Ereignis" vs. "Ausdruck," 248), points to a similar understanding of the fundamental rupture that now shapes Achilles' life; cf. *ibid.*, 247-8.

[56] Cf. Schein (1984) on how this refusal to eat is a marker of his divinized state at this point in the poem, 139.

[57] 19.340-356.

[58] Scully (2003b), 38-42. Cf. Schadewaldt (1965) on the purity and decisiveness of Achilles' will, 240-67.

[59] Scully (1990), 123-124. For Scully this point is important since the aggrieved Achilles can act without any restraint, in contrast to Hektor who remains always bound to his city and family. Thus the *Iliad* is a poem about the counterbalance between these two heroes (cf. note 2): the one who becomes the hero who can sack a city, the other the city-defender at whose death the city is sacked; Scully (1990), 114-127. This reading will be discussed further in Chapters Three and Four.

the activities of mortal life.[60] Scully is right to observe the godlike features which accompany his destructive behavior at the last stage of the poem. This explicit connection with the divine that Achilles has through his semi-divine parentage and Zeus' predilection highlights an essential contrast between him and Patroklos. Nevertheless the poem roots Achilles' divine rage in his longing for a quintessentially human relationship. The contrast between the immortal food which now nourishes him and the mortal companion for whom he longs draws our attention to the human quality of that longing, a force driven by the absence of one with whom he shared his life.

In Book 24, that same longing driven by rupture is at the heart of Achilles' wakefulness, when, in tears, he tosses and turns through the night:

> Πατρόκλου ποθέων ἀνδροτῆτά τε καὶ μένος ἠΰ,
> ἠδ' ὁπόσα τολύπευσε σὺν αὐτῶι καὶ πάθεν ἄλγεα,
> ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἀλεγεινά τε κύματα πείρων· (24.6-8)
>
> longing for Patroklos' manhood and good strength,
> and all the deeds he accomplished with him and the griefs he suffered,
> passing through wars of men and difficult waves.[61]

---

[60] Cf., among others, Whitman (1958), 195-203, and Vivante (1970), 55-57. Many textual markers associate Patroklos with mortal humans, in contrast with Achilles, suggesting that he represents Achilles' human side: see, e.g., 16.140-144, when Patroklos arms himself in Achilles' armor, but cannot take up the Pelian ash spear, which Achilles alone can wield (μιν οἶος ἐπίστατο πῆλαι Ἀχιλλεύς, 16.142), the spear which the centaur Cheiron gave to Achilles' father "to be death for heroes" (φόνον ἔμμεναι ἡρώεσσιν, 16.144); or the mortal trace horse yoked next to Achilles' immortal horses in this same arming scene, ὃς καὶ θνητὸς ἐὼν ἕπεθ' ἵπποις ἀθανάτοισιν ("and he, though mortal, attended immortal horses," 16.154), and which is killed in Patroklos' combat with Sarpedon, 16.467-469. On these markers of immortality and mortality, see Armstrong (1958), 346-48, Wilson (1974), 385-9, and Schein (1984), 93. Taplin (1992) thinks these scenes designate Patroklos as the "vulnerable surrogate" of Achilles, a kind of "trace-horse" to Achilles, as Achilles is a kind of "trace-horse" to the gods, 181-2. Janko (1992) reads these scenes more in terms of overall inferiority than contrasting mortality *per se*, although he does see the mortal trace horse as symbolic of Patroklos' mortality; see comments *ad* 16.101-277, 141-44, 130-144, 152-4, and 467-9.

[61] Those who athetize these lines (Aristarchus, Aristophanes, Leaf) on the grounds of their Odyssean language (esp. 24.8, "passing through wars and difficult waves") and their supposed weakening of dramatic effect miss the important link between longing and insatiate restlessness, and the climactic

Macleod claims that, although ποθέων governs ἠδ' ὁπόσα τολύπευσε σὺν αὐτῶι καὶ πάθεν ἄλγεα ("all the deeds he accomplished with him and the griefs he suffered," 24.7), the verb is applied more properly to the life of Patroklos, and in line 7 it refers only to the memory implicit in missing.[62] Such distinction between longing for Patroklos and longing for the deeds accomplished together blurs the profound reality captured by ποθέων, that in remembering their former comradeship, Achilles feels a deep void and yearns for that lost shared life. Marjolein Oele rightly observes that these lines, and the phrase τολύπευσε σὺν αὐτῶι in particular, show a strong union between the friends, linked in their ability to do and to suffer together.[63] Achilles' longing for their shared life manifests itself in restlessness: he cannot sleep in any position, neither on his side, nor his back, nor face-down (24.10-11), and he repeatedly – iterative verbs – gets up in the middle of the night to pace the shore (δινεύεσκ' ἀλύων παρὰ θῖν' ἁλός, 24.12),[64] followed at dawn by repeatedly dragging Hektor's body around Patroklos' burial-mound (Ἕκτορα δ' ἕλκεσθαι δησάσκετο, 24.15).[65] This vignette of restlessness reflects, on the level of action, the intrinsic nature of his grief, specified in the language of the passage: it is a ποθή for Patroklos, for the unity of life – ὁπόσα τολύπευσε σὺν αὐτῶι καὶ πάθεν ἄλγεα – that they once shared.

---

suitability of these lines to this moment in the narrative. For an overview of the debate, cf. Richardson (1993), *ad* 5-11 and Macleod (1982), *ad* 6-9.

62 Macleod (1982), *ad* 24.6-8.

63 Oele (2010), 59. Cf. Konstan (2001), on the σὺν- prefix elsewhere in Greek literature signifying friends' mutual sharing of life, 56-60.

64 Macleod (1982), *ad loc.*, refers to Sappho 96.15 V and Menander, *Misumenos* 7 Arnott, as well as *Il.* 2.778-779, where pacing is a sign of longing.

65 Repeated past action is seen also in the iterative imperfects at 24.13 and 17, and in the iterative optative in temporal clause, 24.14.

ποθή terms describe grief for Patroklos two other times in the *Iliad*, and I would argue that both scenes are extensions of the grief of Achilles himself. The first is the tears of longing shed for Patroklos by Achilles' immortal horses – the very first tears shed for the slain warrior in the poem – which the narrator specifies as arising from longing. Stunned into motionlessness by their grief, these horses stand apart from the battle, weeping:

> ἵπποι δ' Αἰακίδαο μάχης ἀπάνευθεν ἐόντες
> κλαῖον, ἐπεὶ δὴ πρῶτα πυθέσθην ἡνιόχοιο
> ἐν κονίῃσι πεσόντος ὑφ' Ἕκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο.
> […] (17.426-429)
> τὼ δ' οὔτ' ἂψ ἐπὶ νῆας ἐπὶ πλατὺν Ἑλλήσποντον
> ἠθελέτην ἰέναι, οὔτ' ἐς πόλεμον μετ' Ἀχαιούς,
> ἀλλ' ὥς τε στήλη μένει ἔμπεδον, […]
> […] (17.432-434)
> οὔδει ἐνισκίμψαντε καρήατα, δάκρυα δέ σφιν
> θερμὰ κατὰ βλεφάρων χαμάδις ῥέε μυρομένοισιν
> <u>ἡνιόχοιο πόθωι</u>· θαλερὴ δ' ἐμιαίνετο χαίτη
> ζεύγλης ἐξεριποῦσα παρὰ ζυγὸν ἀμφοτέρωθεν. (17.437-440)
>
> But the horses of Aiakides were apart from battle,
> weeping, from the time when first they learned of their rein-bearer
> fallen in the dust at the hands of Hektor, the man-slayer.
> […]
> And the pair was not willing to go up to the ships at the broad Hellespont,
> nor to go into war among the Achaians,
> but they remained fixed in place like steles […],
> […]
> heads bowed down to the earth. And warm tears
> flowed down from their eyes to the ground as they wept
> in longing for their rein-bearer. And their full manes were soiled
> as they swept down from the yoke-pad along both sides of the yoke.

The horses' motionlessness is motivated by πόθος, a longing for their rein-bearer (17.439).[66] Again we see the precise character of this longing: like the ποθή of the men in the battlefield who are suddenly without their leader, the horses' longing for Patroklos arises from a concrete, felt absence. The word order, ἡνιόχοιο πόθωι, and the placement of the phrase in first position put a gentle emphasis on the missing one whose absence causes πόθος.[67] Formerly their rein-bearer guided them through battles and cared for them back in the camp,[68] but now he is dead, no longer able to fulfill that place in their lives.[69] The horses, who have a rein-bearer beating them and beseeching them to go into battle (17.429-431), do not lack someone to perform the role itself, but the particular longing for Patroklos in their grief immobilizes them. Achilles links his horses' grief with their perception of Patroklos' absence in yet more detail in Book 23, when he explains why he will not compete in the chariot race during the funeral games. His horses have lost (ἀπώλεσαν) their gentle rein-bearer, who washed their manes with oil and water, and so they stand with their manes trailing on the ground, grieving (τὸν τώ γ' ἑσταότες πενθείετον, οὔδεϊ δέ σφιν/ χαῖται ἐρηρέδαται, τὼ δ' ἕστατον ἀχνυμένω κῆρ, 23.283-284). In this later scene Achilles clearly transfers his own grief to his horses, since not only they but he misses Patroklos, and thus he

[66] Note here the sole appearance of the variant noun πόθος in the *Iliad.* Given that its context is identical to that of ποθή, and considering the even distribution of varied participle and verb forms throughout such contexts, I think we need not draw a conclusion beyond simply to note the variance. See Appendix A. πόθος shows up three times in the Odyssey, amid a similarly even distribution of variants; see Appendix B.

[67] This enjambment should be compared with the even more incisive σῆι ποθῆι of 19.321, discussed above (cf. note 49).

[68] Cf. 23.280-284.

[69] de Jong (1987) points to this naming of Patroklos via his role, suggesting that the role-naming shows we are learning the *horses'* thoughts, 104. Without disagreeing, I would say in addition that by naming Patroklos according to his role, we are led to contemplate a community of life that death has ruptured.

does not wish to compete.[70] He locates the origin of their grief-driven withdrawal in the rupture of their shared life, here identified with the care that Patroklos gave to the horses. In the scene of motionless weeping in Book 17, the narrator explicitly designates this sense of loss as a force of πόθος. The life shared by the horses and their caregiving rein-bearer has been sundered, and their grief for him derives simultaneously from the pain of his absence and the longing for his presence.

By claiming an aspect of irreplaceability in these ποθή scenes, I am not claiming that the bereaved will never again forge new bonds with the one who takes over the function performed by the deceased. Over time the shared activities of fighting together, preparing for battle off the field, and other activities of companionship will create new ties between the bereaved and the new leader, or rein-bearer, or companion in battle, and the two could experience the wholeness of shared life to a degree comparable to the shared life that has been lost. However the new shared life will not be the same as the old, since the actual shared experiences can never be replicated, and those are the shared experiences which create the particular void and the particular longing in these scenes. Such irreplaceability will be of special importance when we consider the effects that ποθή in grief has on Achilles' behavior.

Achilles and his horses are not only linked by the grief-driven withdrawal from the funeral games in Book 23; a further link can be traced in the verb μιαίνω, befoul, which describes both the manes of the stricken horses, defiled in the dust, and Achilles' helmet in

---

[70] Cf. Macleod (1982), 29n1.

Book 16, when Apollo overcomes Patroklos in battle and his comrade's helmet spins off of his head:

> τοῦ δ᾽ ἀπὸ μὲν κρατὸς κυνέην βάλε φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων·
> ἣ δὲ κυλιδομένη καναχὴν ἔχε ποσσὶν ὕφ᾽ ἵππων
> αὐλῶπις τρυφάλεια, μιάνθησαν δὲ ἔθειραι
> αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσι. πάρος γε μὲν οὐ θέμις ἦεν
> ἱππόκομον πήληκα μιαίνεσθαι κονίῃσιν,
> ἀλλ᾽ ἀνδρὸς θείοιο κάρη χαρίεν τε μέτωπον
> ῥύετ᾽ Ἀχιλλῆος· (16.793-799)
>
> Then from his head Phoibos Apollo knocked the helmet;
> and spinning it crashed beneath the feet of the horses,
> the four-plumed helmet with its eye-holes, and the horsehair crest was befouled
> with blood and dust. Formerly indeed it was not permitted that
> the helmet with its horsehair crest be befouled with dust,
> but it guarded the head and lovely face
> of that god-like man, Achilles; […].

The defilement of Achilles' helmet has been much discussed as prefiguring the death of Achilles himself, which will follow his revenge on Hektor for killing Patroklos in this moment.[71] But here I wish to bring attention to the verbal parallel of befoulment, uniting Achilles' grief with that of his horses.[72] The dragging in the dust of what was formerly part of life – the horses going into battle, the helmet guarding the beautiful face of Achilles – signals how profoundly Patroklos' death rends the fabric of existence for Achilles and others

[71] Cf. Schein (1984), 130; Van Nortwick (1996), 60-1. On the foreshadowing of Achilles' death in general, see Kakridis (1949), 65-95; Schadewaldt (1965), 166-8; Silk (2004), 37; Burgess (2009), esp. 43-55, 72-97, among others.
[72] The verb is relatively rare in the *Iliad*, appearing 6 times. While it is a standard motif in battle scenes to describe human hair or horsehair crests mingling with the dust, as Janko (1992) observes *ad* 16.794-800, half of Janko's examples do not include a verb of defiling. Cf. Fenik (1968), 163.

in Achilles' world.[73] These scenes also highlight the tension in Achilles' life between his immortal and mortal sides: though both the armor and the horses are a gift from the gods, they too are subject to the effects of death.[74]

The broadening of Achilles' grief also encompasses the Myrmidons, who too are specifically said to feel ποθή in their grief for Patroklos. At the beginning of Book 23, when the Greeks have reached the camp with Patroklos' body and dispersed, Achilles prevents his men from scattering, asking them to give Patroklos his γέρας θανόντων, a lament (23.4-9). They drive their horses and chariots around Patroklos' corpse three times, wetting the sand and their armor with their tears: δεύοντο ψάμαθοι, δεύοντο δὲ τεύχεα φωτῶν/ δάκρυσι· <u>τοῖον γὰρ πόθεον μήστωρα φόβοιο</u> ("Soaked was the sand, and soaked the arms of the men, with their tears; <u>for they were longing for so great a deviser of rout</u>," 23.15-16). The narrator portrays the abundant tears of these fighters as rising from the felt absence of their strong companion-in-arms, their μήστωρα φόβοιο, and the resulting desire for his presence. This scene of ποθή in grief clearly describes not only the men but Achilles, who leads their lament (οἳ δ' ᾤμωξαν ἀολλέες, ἦρχε δ' Ἀχιλλεύς, 23.12). The impact of the loss of

---

[73] *N.b.*, just as here the helmet is said to have formerly protected the χαρίεν […] μέτωπον of Achilles, Hektor's head, after being dragged in the dust, is described as πάρος χαρίεν, (22.403); and, as in the Book 16 episode Zeus gives the helmet to be worn by Hektor, in Book 22 Zeus gives Hektor to be defiled by his enemies. These correspondences draw us up into the divine vantage point, from which we see these lives intertwined with a certain inevitability; yet on the human level they reinforce the reality of death's contrast with life. Segal (1971a) argues that the parallel befoulment points to the price Hektor has paid for his earlier success, 41-43; cf. Taplin (1992), on how the wearing of Achilles' immortal armor marks Patroklos and Hektor out for death, 185-188; Rutherford (1982) on how the parallels between Patroklos' and Hektor's death scenes emphasize the inevitability of the slayer's own death, 152ff.

[74] Cf. Edwards (1987), 115-16. This tension will figure in our discussion of the narrative effects of this grief in Chapter Three. Taplin (1992) connects the horses' grief with Thetis', the grief of immortals caught, by unusual fate, between the divine and human worlds, 189-190.

Patroklos on the Myrmidon warriors broadens our understanding of what Achilles longs for – not only a fellow companion who prepared his food and to whom he would have entrusted the upbringing of his son, but a warrior who could lead his men to victory in battle.

These four uses of ποθή words resonate against the larger backdrop of ποθή throughout the poem. The same key elements appear: physical absence; its psychological consequence, the desire to fill that absence; particularity; and the intimacy of a wholeness that has been ruptured. Thus the language of the poem offers us tools to understand Achilles' grief more deeply. When we see it as rooted in longing, we see that the death of Patroklos has something akin to a physical effect on him, like the physical absence of a deeply needed leader in the middle of a fight. The physicality of this absence takes on richer content in his own explanations of his grief, as he describes his experience of the rupture of a life formerly shared. The psychological impact of such a loss – his unwillingness to eat, his disconnect from his mortal self, his restlessness – accords well with the psychological feeling of longing described in those other ποθή passages in the poem, especially the personal longing for specific leaders whose absence is described in the Catalogue of Ships. And the same intimacy that we see in Achilles' longing for warfare pervades these later scenes of longing for the person of Patroklos whose life was part of a common existence.

These resonances in the ποθή-grief of these scenes have important consequences for our understanding of the poem. They not only illuminate deeper dimensions of Achilles' grief, they help explain the effects of this grief on Achilles' actions, particularly his deeds of anger, and thus they offer insight into the narrative arc of the poem. Before we turn to these

consequences, however, I would like briefly to explore how these linguistic observations offer us language with which to describe the relationship between Achilles and Patroklos. In subsequent chapters we shall then turn to the relationship between grief and anger and the poem's unfolding of its narrative in light of this linguistic link between grief and ποθή.

The Relationship of Achilles and Patroklos

The intensity of the relationship between Achilles and Patroklos in Homer's *Iliad* has proven to be something of an interpretive conundrum. In what follows I shall argue that their relationship can best be understood with a specific interpretive key, namely by attending to the poem's use of ποθή to describe the impact of Patroklos' death on Achilles. I shall be arguing that the poem's characterization of Achilles' grief for Patroklos as shaped by ποθή, longing for a ruptured whole, gives us linguistic grounds to understand them as having a particular form of friendship, one rooted in a deep and pervasively shared life.[75] Such shared life is evident throughout the passages describing Achilles and Patroklos. I offer this interpretation as an alternative – although in some cases as a complementary alternative – to three other ways in which the relationship has been presented by scholars: as erotic, as father to son, or as an instance of alter-ego or second self.

Some have speculated that these two men were lovers. In many texts from later antiquity they are unambiguously so portrayed, yet Homer himself makes no mention of any erotic element to their interactions. In the *Myrmidons* Aeschylus depicts an explicit erotic

---

[75] Although Konstan (2013a) is not describing Achilles and Patroklos, his description of grief as a kind of amputation is an apt image for understanding their rich relationship, 143-9. Cf. Shay (1994), observing the effects of war on veterans from Vietnam, wherein he claims that the particularity of love for a special comrade makes him an irreplaceable part of one's life, 44.

component to their relationship, launching a debate among later authors over how to fit this relationship into a pederastic model.[76] In Plato's *Symposium* Phaedrus takes Aeschylus to task for claiming that Achilles was the lover of Patroklos, claiming that since he was very much younger and more beautiful, he must have been the beloved.[77] This debate over the proper application of the roles of ἐραστής and ἐρώμενος[78] was amplified by a disagreement over whether the bond was sexual at all, and if so, in what way. In his *Symposium* Xenophanes has Socrates argue against a homosexual interpretation, placing Achilles and Patroklos instead in parallel with other mythical heroes whose companionship was non-erotic.[79] We should note that Xenophon's Socrates argues against the Aeschylean pederastic model, Achilles as lover and Patroklos as beloved. His argument is part of a larger distinction between physical and spiritual love. Aeschines takes a different tack in his oration against Timarchus, distinguishing not spiritual and physical love but rather temperate pederasty, which he himself engages in, and the intemperate homosexual activity of which he accuses Timarchus.[80] To legitimize this distinction, Aeschines appeals to the poets, beginning with the oldest and wisest of them, Homer, who implicitly presented Achilles and Patroklos as ἐρῶντας (lovers), but also σώφρονας (restrained).[81] These debates, I think, present to us an overly narrow reading of their relationship, given the richness of the *Iliad*. Pantelis

---

[76] Aesch. *Myrm.* fr. 135 and 136 Sommerstein.
[77] Plato *Symp.* 180a. *N.b.*, in claiming that Achilles was *much* younger than Patroklos (ἔπειτα νεώτερος <u>πολύ</u>), Phaedrus overstates his case. Cf. Seneca's letter to Lucilius (88.6), in which he refers to the relative ages of Achilles and Patroklos as a popular (and pointless) subject for inquiry.
[78] Dué rightly observes the manifold interpretations of Achilles' and Patroklos' respective ages and age-roles and the impossibility of assigning a single ἐραστής/ἐρώμενος reading to their relationship in the *Iliad* or in later antiquity, 75-76n27.
[79] Xen. *Symp.* 8, esp. 8.31.
[80] Aeschin. *Tim.* 132-150, esp. 142.
[81] Aeschin. *Tim.* 142.

Michelakis has argued that as a mythological figure Achilles offered a great diversity of roles to playwrights, philosophers, artists, etc., who were able to adjust their representation of him according to the needs of their society or their personal interests.[82] It does seem that the diversity of interpretations among ancient authors reflects the malleability of this relationship to various literary needs.[83] But these debates also illuminate the danger of a reading which seeks to apply the later institution of pederasty back into this Homeric relationship. Rather than becoming enmeshed in a reductive debate on which of the two is the ἐραστής or whether the relationship is the emulable kind of pederasty, I think we should let the relationship stand as the poet has presented it: a rich, complex, intimate companionship between fellow warriors who were raised and educated together.[84]

A case can certainly be made for likeness between the relationship of Achilles and Patroklos and certain elements of the pederastic relationship. Achilles was a teacher of Patroklos, as we will see below, and Patroklos an advisor of Achilles, two roles which echo the educative aspect of pederasty.[85] But we can likewise draw parallels between this

---

[82] Michelakis (2002). Cf. Barrett (1981), who comments that Martial's crass description of Achilles' sexual practices at *Ep.* XI.43.9-10 "says much about Martial and nothing about Homer," 88-89; and Percy (1996), who claims that the classical interpretation of pederasty in this relationship goes against plain meaning of the Homeric text, but indicates for us the importance of that institution for classical Greek culture, 37-40.

[83] For Michelakis' particular arguments regarding the strategic representations of homosexuality in each of these authors, see *ibid.*, 40-53.

[84] For an overview of the debate, cf. Clarke (1978), 381, and Dover (1989), 196-199. Fantuzzi (2012) argues lucidly against "forcing Homer's Achilles and Patroclus to wear the straightjacket of the classical idea of pederastic love," 190-91; for his full consideration of their relationship in its narrative function and subsequent reception, see 187-265.

[85] This co-dependence of educative roles seems to differ from the typical notion that the ἐραστής passed on knowledge and virtue to the ἐρώμενος, on which see, e.g., Dover (1989), 202. But even within an institution typically characterized by asymmetrical roles, we see an idealization of mutuality, as when for example Pausanias in Plato's *Symposium* praises those lovers who only fall in love with boys old enough to think for themselves, saying they are the most likely to be companions for life (τὸν βίον ἅπαντα συνεσόμενοι καὶ κοινῆι συμβιωσόμενοι, *Symp.* 181d); cf. also Plato's *Phaedrus*

friendship and other types of male-male relationships. David Halperin, with others, assesses the "heroic comradeship" of Achilles and Patroklos not as the early beginnings of the pederastic narrative, but as part of an earlier narrative tradition which includes the intense heroic friendships of Gilgamesh and Enkidu in the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, and of King David and Jonathan in the Old Testament.[86] In all three of these relationships, Halperin argues, a mixture of kinship and conjugal terms are used, only to be displaced, as if the bonds of blood and conjugality are mere images of friendship.[87] Jonathan Shay in turn likens their relationship to the intense bonds experienced by men in the Vietnam War.[88] For an outside comparison we could consider this comment of John Keegan, writing about the First World War:

> Men whom the trenches cast into intimacy entered into bonds of mutual dependency and sacrifice of self stronger than any of the friendships made in peace and better times. That is the ultimate mystery of the First World War. If we could understand its loves, as well as its hates, we would be nearer understanding the mystery of human life.[89]

Such is the breadth of interpretation which this rich friendship quite legitimately offers to its reader. This wide range of interpretation, combined with the absence of explicit erotic

---

239a-240a, where Socrates criticizes pederastic relationships for their tendency to maintain the inferiority of the beloved; instead he praises relationships which are μὴ ἐρῶντι καὶ νοῦν ἔχοντι (*Phdr.* 241c). Later in the dialogue he regrets condemning love altogether and instead praises generous love (ἐλεύθερον ἔρωτα, *Phdr.* 243c), although the import of the story of the charioteer and the two horses is less about mutuality and more about reverence and modesty in the lover's pursuit of the beloved (*Phdr.* 253c-256d).

[86] Halperin (1990), 75-87; cf. Wilson (1986), esp. 28-31, and West (1997), 336-347.

[87] Halperin (1990), 85.

[88] Shay (1994). Verweij (2007) conceptualizes their relationship in a similar way, 282-4; she contrasts the intense exclusivity of such comradeship with friendship as Aristotle defines it (*NE* VIII, 1155a – IX, 1172a15), 280-292.

[89] Keegan (1999), 427.

language, should make us cautious of embracing a homosexual interpretation.[90] W. M. Clarke admits this absence of explicit erotic relations between them, but he claims that the intensity and intimacy of their relationship, unparalleled in other friendships in the poem, therefore implies that their relationship was erotic.[91] In fact, all that Clarke succeeds in proving is that their friendship surpasses that of "shared interests and mutual advantage"[92] and is characterized by a deep affection and unique closeness.[93] Uniqueness does not require an erotic interpretation, but in fact can here be best understood in the larger narrative pattern of the poem, which explores the depth of this relationship in order to understand the intensity of Achilles' response when it is ruptured. Instead of basing my argument on hidden meanings, therefore, my strategy will be to turn to the clear language of the poem.

Other interpreters have seen the relationship of Achilles and Patroklos as a father-son relationship, aided by the beautiful simile in 23.222-225, where Achilles weeps over Patroklos' body, as he carries him in funeral procession, like a father mourning for his recently married son. Dué cites four passages that present Achilles' grief for Patroklos as the

---

[90] Cf. Pavlock (1990): "Although difficult to define precisely, Achilles' bond with Patroclus does not seem to be primarily erotic but rather to be symbolic of the hero's ideal image of himself," 14. In this interpretation she follows MacCary (1982), 127-129.

[91] Clarke (1978).

[92] Clarke (1978), 391n26.

[93] Again we see parallels in the *Iliad* that suggest their uniqueness is one of degree, not kind, and thus that such special friendship could potentially be experienced by other warrior pairs. See, for example, the description of Sthenelos' friendship with Deipylos: δῶκε δὲ Δηϊπύλωι, ἑτάρωι φίλωι, ὃν περὶ πάσης/ τῖεν ὁμηλικίης, ὅτι οἱ φρεσὶν ἄρτια εἴδη, ("and he gave the horses to Deipylos, his beloved companion, whom he honored beyond all his peers, because he understood thoughts closely joined to his," 5.325-326); Hektor's friendship with Podes: ἔσκε δ' ἐνὶ Τρώεσσι Ποδῆς, υἱὸς Ἠετίωνος,/ ἀφνειός τ' ἀγαθός τε, μάλιστα δέ μιν τίεν Ἕκτωρ/ δήμου, ἐπεί οἱ ἑταῖρος ἔην φίλος εἰλαπιναστής· ("There was among the Trojans a man Podes, son of Eetion, a man both rich and noble, and Hektor honored him above all his people, since he was his beloved companion who shared his table," 17.575-577); note that line 17.591, the "black cloud of grief" which covers Hektor at the death of Podes (τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα, 17.591), also describes Achilles' grief for Patroklos at 18.22. For more on honor in friendship, see Chapter Two.

grief of a father for his child or vice versa: this simile in 23; the lion simile in 18.314-323, where Achilles' grief is compared to a lioness' anguish at the loss of her cubs; Achilles' lament at 19.315-337, where he contrasts the loss of Patroklos with the potential loss of both father and son; and his weeping for both Patroklos and his father during the reconciliation scene at 24.507-512.[94] The similes suggest likeness, perhaps, though they need not prove a father-son relationship; but the latter two examples seem to me in fact to distinguish Achilles' relationship with Patroklos from such a parent-child relation, as I will argue further below.[95] Dué observes that the ἐραστής/ἐρώμενος relationship can be cast as father-son (cf. Plato's *Laws* 838a-b, *Republic* 403b5). However, in both of the Plato passages she refers to, once Socrates turns to kinship relations he explicitly removes any erotic element.

I think the poem offers us a relationship that is best characterized neither as erotic nor as father-son, but instead as a remarkable instance of the mutually protective friendship that can blossom between two comrades in the course of a war.[96] My argument, then, complements that of those scholars who see Patroklos as an "alter-ego" of Achilles.[97] These scholars, led by Nagy, focus on the original meaning of θεράπων as "ritual substitute,"[98]

---

[94] Dué (2002), 75n27. We can add to this list a fifth passage describing the two men with parent-child imagery, the scene when Patroklos stands weeping before Achilles and Achilles compares him to a tearful young girl, holding onto the skirts of her mother, 16.7-11. On the protection motif in these parent-child similes, see Moulton (1977), 101-106.

[95] Cf. Van Nortwick (1996) on the limitations of a single parent-child reading, despite these similes (to which he adds 16.7-11), 51. On the preponderance of scenes where Achilles is depicted in a "protective parental role," see Janko (1992) *ad* 16.7-10. For a reading of Patroklos as father figure to Achilles, cf. Finlay (1980), 267-273, discussed further below.

[96] Cf. Shay (1994), 41-44.

[97] Cf., *inter alios*, Silk (2004), 38; Konstan (1997), 41-42; Muellner (1996), 135-6; Arieti (1984), 129, and (1985), 199-202; Devereux (1978-9), 3-15. For a psychoanalytic (and Hegelian) model, cf. MacCary (1982), who proposes that Patroklos is related to Achilles as ego ideal, cf. 63-65, 127-129, 184, 191ff., etc.

[98] Nagy (1999), 292. He follows Van Brock (1959), 119, who argues that the word θεράπων had meant "ritual substitute" in Hittite at the time Greek borrowed it into its language, and who notes the

and note that the concept of "ritual substitute" suits the passages where Patroklos, so described, goes into battle in Achilles' place and is killed wearing Achilles' armor.[99] Whitman, with many others, reads their relationship in a similar light, calling Patroklos the "epic surrogate" of Achilles, and focuses particularly on Patroklos as human alter-ego, the one who "played his mortality for him."[100] My reading of Achilles and Patroklos differs from that of Nagy, Whitman, and others, however, in that I think this language of an alter-ego captures much, but not all, of the richness in this remarkable relationship. The two men are not merely stand-ins for one another, but they instantiate the powerful bonds forged through comradeship and shared experience. Scholars rightly note how Achilles' special relationship with the divine is unshared by Patroklos, a disparity which grows after Patroklos' death.[101] But it is remarkable how often the poem depicts them, in practical terms, as near equals, developing a rich relationship composed of manifold bonds. Even as Patroklos' death drives Achilles to a divinized state, it simultaneously emphasizes the hero's mortal dimension, in that his grief is rooted in longing for this human relationship.[102]

In what follows, we shall look closely at several passages from the poem in order to demonstrate the rich complexity of the relationship between Achilles and Patroklos. The two men are related as brothers, teachers and pupils, counselors, and fellow comrades, and in the

---

applicability of such a concept to Patroklos when he enters battle in the place and guise of Achilles. Cf. also Sinos (1980), 29-37.

[99] Cf. 16.165, 244, 653 and 17.164, 271, 388.

[100] Whitman (1958), 202; see 195-203. Cf. Scully (2003b), 38-9, 42; Van Nortwick (1996), 57-58; Schein (1984), 129-32; Vivante (1970), 56-57, among others. Sinos (1980) argues for a slightly different paradigm of Patroklos as other self: in his paradigm, Patroklos is the non-martial component of Achilles' heroic identity; see esp. 55-56.

[101] See note 58 on the Pelian ash spear (16.140-144; cf. Schein, 1984, 93) and mortal trace horse (16.152-154, 467-469). Note too how Patroklos' loss of Achilles' armor prepares the way for the gift of divine armor, which lifts Achilles like wings (19.386), a divinizing movement which parallels his divine nourishment earlier in the same book (19.349-354; for discussion, see Scully, 2003b, 38-40).

[102] Cf. Schein (1984), arguing that Achilles' immortal side is always qualified by his mortal side, 93-95.

midst of this complexity we see the manifold bonds that forged their close union in life, such that after Patroklos dies, Achilles' grief is shaped by yearning for a lost whole.

This complexity emerges gradually in the poem's narrative. The first appearances of Patroklos are rather unremarkable, but taken together they offer a consistent depiction of strong union and near peership between Achilles and Patroklos. When Achilles leaves the assembly in disgust after his quarrel with Agamemnon in Book 1, Patroklos is at his side, singled out by name among the other companions;[103] and he is again present when the heralds come to take Briseis to Agamemnon, and he is the one whom Achilles asks to deliver Briseis to them.[104] We again see prominent companionship in the Embassy scene of Book 9. When the Embassy first arrives, Patroklos sits silently facing Achilles, waiting for him to leave off singing the κλέα ἀνδρῶν, the glories of men.[105] Although the poem tells us little about Achilles' interior state during this scene,[106] Achilles seems to ponder the implications of his withdrawal from the fight, and in this unique moment of reflection through art, Patroklos again is singled out, this time by the adjective οἱ οἶος (9.190): Patroklos sits as sole audience and companion to Achilles in his withdrawn musings.[107] When the embassy appears, Patroklos mirrors Achilles' amazed rising (ὣς δ' αὔτως Πάτροκλος, ἐπεὶ ἴδε

---

[103] Πηλείδης μὲν ἐπὶ κλισίας καὶ νῆας ἐΐσας/ ἤϊε σύν τε Μενοιτιάδηι καὶ οἷς ἑτάροισιν· (1.306-307).

[104] 1.337-338; then executing the command, 1.345-347: ὣς φάτο, Πάτροκλος δὲ φίλωι ἐπεπείθεθ' ἑταίρωι,/ […] (1.345).

[105] 9.189-191.

[106] Such understatement is typical of Homer.

[107] Whitman (1958) thinks it likely that Achilles ponders the nature of heroic life in this scene, 193-4 and 345n37. Cf., e.g., Arieti (1986), 1; King (1987), 11. On Achilles' isolation in this scene, see, e.g., Silk (2004), who sees the lonely playing of the "convivial lyre" as symptomatic of Achilles' status as an outsider throughout the poem, 79. Cf. also Austin (1975), who argues that once Achilles withdraws from the army, he can do nothing but uselessly sing about ancient heroes, 146. The connection between isolation and inaction will be discussed later in this dissertation.

φῶτας, ἀνέστη (9.195), thus reminding us of his constant presence and intimating the closeness between the two friends. As in Book 1, he here again performs the role of special "servant": Achilles asks Patroklos to prepare more wine and a larger drinking bowl for them and their new guests, and in the description of further preparation, Patroklos performs most of the actions.[108]

Noteworthy also is their ability to communicate without speaking, made explicit in this scene: ἦ, καὶ Πατρόκλωι ὅ γ' ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε σιωπῆι/ Φοίνικι στορέσαι πυκινὸν λέχος, ὄφρα τάχιστα/ ἐκ κλισίης νόστοιο μεδοίατο ("He spoke, and to Patroklos he nodded silently with his brows for him to draw up a sturdy bed for Phoinix, so that they might very quickly think about returning from his shelter," 9.620-622). *Pace* Arieti, who sees this silent command as indicative of Patroklos' subservience to Achilles,[109] I would argue that the quickness of Patroklos' response even to silent commands suggests a closeness between these two men that is born of many years of shared life.[110] In a poem where speech is prominent,[111] the instances between Achilles and Patroklos where speech is not needed are striking.

With the exception of the lyre scene, Patroklos' actions in these scenes are relatively unremarkable, but taken together they show us a person who constantly accompanied

---

[108] 9.201-221. Patroklos is the subject of lines 206-208; 211-214; 215-217; and in 219-220 he, designated by the narrator as Achilles' companion, is the one Achilles bids to sacrifice to the gods: θεοῖσι δὲ θῦσαι ἀνώγει/ Πάτροκλον, ὃν ἑταῖρον. Beck (2012), observing how Patroklos gives orders to the other servants on Achilles' behalf (9.658-659), concludes that Patroklos' role is one of special prominence, 169.

[109] Arieti (1986), 18.

[110] The scene is more often discussed according to its effect on the embassy, who immediately begin to take their leave; e.g., Hainsworth (1993) reads this silent communication as a move of courtesy on Achilles' part, to have Patroklos hint through actions rather than overtly ordering; see *ad loc.*

[111] Cf. Kirk (1990), 28; Beck (2005), 1-2.

Achilles and has special prominence. By singling out Patroklos in these episodes, the poem gradually builds a feeling of "we two together" between him and Achilles.[112] The lyre scene in particular elevates Patroklos to a unique level of companionship, since he accompanies Achilles in a moment unparalleled in the poem, and since the narrator is careful to note that Patroklos accompanies him alone. Patroklos' special status in Achilles' social world is further emphasized in the scene which follows the embassy's departure, when Achilles lies in the corner of his shelter, with a woman of Lesbos at his side, and Patroklos too lies on the opposite wall, also with a woman at his side.[113] This scene of domestic tranquility contrasts strikingly with the disastrous slaughter that Achilles has just wished upon the Achaians, and to have Patroklos share equally with Achilles the moment of respite and the enjoyment of a beautiful war-prize adds a note of intimacy to their close association evoked in the other scenes. Patroklos seems fully part of Achilles' world, a world that is at odds with the rest of the army.[114]

---

112 Cf. Schadewaldt's description (1965) of Patroklos as the "Nur-Freund" of Achilles, 178-181.

113 αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς ηὗδε μυχῶι κλισίης εὐπήκτου,/ τῶι δ᾽ ἄρα παρκατέλεκτο γυνή, τὴν Λεσβόθεν ἦγεν,/ φόρβαντος θυγάτηρ, Διομήδη καλλιπάρηος·/ Πάτροκλος δ᾽ ἑτέρωθεν ἐλέξατο, πὰρ δ᾽ ἄρα καὶ τῶι/ Ἶφις ἐΰζωνος, τήν οἱ πόρε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς/ Σκῦρον ἑλὼν αἰπεῖαν, Ἐνυῆος πτολίεθρον. (But Achilles slept in the corner of his well-built shelter, and beside him lay a woman, whom he brought from Lesbos, the daughter of Phorbas, Diomede of the lovely cheeks; and Patroklos bedded down against the opposite wall, and beside him too was well-girdled Iphis, whom godlike Achilles gave to him when he took steep Skyros, the city of Enueis, 9.663-668).

114 Cf. Fantuzzi (2012), on how this scene creates a sense of equilibrium in the microcosm of their life, but also the impression that if either of the two men were harmed, this equilibrium would be shattered, 197-98. *N.b.*, Phoinix also lies down to sleep just before Achilles and Patroklos (9.658-662), but the place of his bed is not specified, whereas Achilles and Patroklos are clearly paired in their opposing corners and parallel war γέρατα. Phoinix's presence can serve as a reminder that while Achilles is at odds with the army, he does not fully reject them; we are right to pay attention to the warmth of his welcome for his comrades and the partial concessions that their appeals move him to make. Cf. Arieti (1986), 4 and (1985), 185. But for a study of his relationship with Patroklos, we must see how in Book 9 Patroklos moves within Achilles' world, both as it welcomes guests and tosses them out. Konstan (1997) sees an element of anti-socialness embedded in Achilles' intense

As the poem continues to depict Achilles and Patroklos as a pair, the substance of that shared life for which Achilles will long emerges with greater clarity. First, the two men are a pair of fighters. It is a peculiar beauty of the poem that we never see Achilles and Patroklos fighting together, yet we are constantly shown that such was their normal state. Thus when Patroklos goes out to fight without Achilles, we feel the absence of what should be there.[115] What follows are just a few examples of other characters pairing the two as fighters. When Nestor relates the story of gathering Achilles and Patroklos to go to Troy, he clearly had assumed that the two men would join the fighting together. Nestor found Achilles and Patroklos side-by-side (11.772), and when he invites the young men to join them, he relates, in the dual, that the two of them were very willing, σφὼ δὲ μάλ' ἠθέλετον (11.782). Although no personal history emerges of the two of them as a pair of fighters, the scene suggests that they function as a unit. As the poem continues, Achilles' own words verify that he and Patroklos normally fought side by side. For instance, in Bk. 16 Achilles admonishes Patroklos not to fight the Trojans without him: μὴ σύ γ' ἄνευθεν ἐμεῖο λιλαίεσθαι πολεμίζειν/ Τρωσὶ φιλοπτολέμοισιν· ("Do not strive without me to do battle with the war-loving Trojans," 16.89-90). Although the passage reveals Achilles' persisting zeal for honor, as well as his concern for Patroklos' life were he to fight without Achilles at his side,[116] in addition to both of these clear motives, the admonition, μὴ <u>σύ γ' ἄνευθεν</u>

---

affection for Patroklos, which plays itself out when Achilles returns to battle for private reasons after Patroklos' death, 42.

[115] According to Sinos (1975), Patroklos is a warrior of equal stature to Achilles only when Patroklos fights at Achilles' side, 46-52.

[116] μή τις ἀπ' Οὐλύμποιο θεῶν αἰειγενετάων/ ἐμβήηι – μάλα τούς γε φιλεῖ ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων ("lest someone of the everlasting Olympian gods enter the battle – for truly the far-worker Apollo loves them greatly," 16.93-94).

ἐμεῖο λιλαίεσθαι πολεμίζειν, draws the two men together into a single unit.[117] This basic assumption that the two men fight together becomes a crystal clear reality in his fantastic wish at the end of this speech. In a climactic state of contradictory interior motives, as he both sends Patroklos into battle to fight in his stead and thus save the Achaians from utter disaster, and yet refuses to renounce his wish for the Achaians to feel his absence and long for him in the battle, Achilles prays:

> αἲ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἄπολλον,
> μήτέ τις οὖν Τρώων θάνατον φύγοι, ὅσσοι ἔασιν,
> μήτέ τις Ἀργείων, νῶϊν δ' ἐκδυῖμεν ὄλεθρον,
> ὄφρ' οἶοι Τροίης ἱερὰ κρήδεμνα λύωμεν. (16.97-100)
>
> If only, father Zeus and Athena and Apollo,
> not one of the Trojans might escape death, as many as live,
> nor any of the Argives, but we two might emerge from the destruction,
> so that alone we might destroy the sacred walls of Troy.

Achilles' extreme cruelty, and the exclusivity of his love for Patroklos to the point of wishing no other might survive this battle, has drawn extensive comment,[118] but here I wish merely

---

117 Nagy, discussing Sinos (see note 113), draws attention to this "without me" at 16.89; Nagy (1999), 292-3. Although I do not follow him in all of his conclusions, MacCary (1982) rightly draws attention to the predominance of men fighting in pairs in the *Iliad*, 129-133.

118 Clarke (1978), 385, argues that we should pay heed to the scholiasts who found the exclusivity of these lines suggestive of a pederastic relationship (and thus agreed with their athetesis by Aristarchus and Zenodotus); cf. ΣA and ΣT *ad* 16.97-100. But again, exclusivity does not require a pederastic interpretation, and these lines suit the context and temperament of Achilles. Schein (1984) argues against a sexual reading of these lines, 127n43. Kullmann (2001, orig. 1968) finds these lines indicative of Achilles' divided feelings and tragic blindness to Patroklos' impending death, 402-3; cf. Whitman (1958), for whom this wish shows the paradox of Achilles' will, as he endeavors both to achieve absolute heroism – honor exclusively from Zeus, not men – and to include Patroklos, the incarnation of his humane side, in this transcendence of everything human, 197-203, esp. 199. MacCary (1982) sees in these lines "an almost complete identification between [Achilles] and Patroklos," which he calls their "mutual apotheosis in battle," 219. For erotic language throughout descriptions of warfare in the *Iliad*, see *(inter alios)* Scully (2003a), 189-197; for Scully, the interlocking images of eroticism and war focus around the impending sack of Troy, likened to the rape of a fertile woman.

to observe that yet again we see how closely the two warriors are paired. The fierceness with which Achilles utters this wish speaks to the intense closeness forged by such shared activity.[119] The relationship between these two men, which in Achilles' grief becomes linguistically delineated in terms of a shared life, can be seen to have arisen in part from the joint sacrifices and efforts made together on the battlefield.

The two men are not only comrades in battle, however. Their many-layered relationship includes Patroklos' role as a counselor to the younger Achilles. Nestor appeals to Patroklos' advising role in Book 11, reminding him of his older years, because of which his father enjoined him to advise Achilles, even though Achilles is nobler and stronger. Nestor reminds Patroklos,

> σοὶ δ' αὖθ' ὧδ' ἐπέτελλε Μενοίτιος Ἄκτορος υἱός·
> 'τέκνον ἐμόν, γενεῇι μὲν ὑπέρτερός ἐστιν 'Αχιλλεύς,
> πρεσβύτερος δὲ σύ ἐσσι· βίηι δ' ὅ γε πολλὸν ἀμείνων·
> ἀλλ' εὖ οἱ φάσθαι πυκινὸν ἔπος ἠδ' ὑποθέσθαι
> καί οἱ σημαίνειν· ὃ δὲ πείσεται εἰς ἀγαθόν περ.' (11.785-789)
>
> But to you Menoitios, son of Aktor, gave this command in turn:
> "My child, in birth Achilles is superior to you,
> yet you are older; while in strength he is much greater;
> but speak well to him with wise speech and give him counsel
> and guidance; and he will be persuaded for the good indeed."

Nestor's words delineate a complementary relationship. To Achilles' superior birth and greater strength are matched Patroklos' older years and ability to be a guide, a counselor, someone who will show Achilles the way to act. Nestor adds at the end of the speech, ἀγαθὴ δὲ παραίφασίς ἐστιν ἑταίρου ("and the persuasion of a *hetairos* is strong," 11.793).

---

119 Cf. Shay (1994) on the closeness of a special comrade, 40-48.

These words respond to Patroklos' own caution when he first enters Nestor's tent and refuses to sit, not wanting to anger Achilles whom he describes as αἰδοῖος νεμεσητός (11.648), and δεινὸς ἀνήρ (11.654). Nestor in turn appeals to the mutuality in their relationship, reminding Patroklos that this strange and terrible man, so quick to anger, is also his ἑταῖρος, his close comrade, and within such a relationship words of appeal would move Achilles, despite his anger. Nestor claims a degree of peership between them. The two men are on equal footing, because of their complementary strengths, such that in a sense each one needs the other. We saw in the first scenes of the poem how Patroklos serves Achilles in a special way, yet is more than special servant: in the scene of mutual domestic tranquility we see not only unity but a kind of equality. Such equality is not a condition for grief to have the characteristics of longing for a shared life – one could well imagine a parent longing for a dead child with ποθή language, for example,[120] and we see soldiers long for leaders in the poem – but within a complementary relationship there is a greater possibility for variety in what has been shared, and thus a potential for a particularly rich bond. In this way, although we know Achilles is superior to Patroklos in his semi-divine birth and unmatchable battle-prowess, when the poem draws attention to an alternation of superior roles in their relationship, it sets us up for a multiplicity of ways they relate to one another, and thus a multiplication of bonds that unite them and will define Achilles' loss.

At the end of Book 11 we learn of a different dimension to Achilles and Patroklos' relationship, that of teacher to student. In this scene Eurypylos, wounded in battle, appeals to Patroklos to tend his wound, as Patroklos has learned healing arts from Achilles (11.828-

---

[120] Cf. Konstan (2013a) on Quintilian (*Inst.* 6 *praef.* 12), whose grief for his dead son was shaped by the empty hopes he had for their future as writers, 144.

832).[121] This reversal of Nestor's model of counselor to counseled points us again to the mutuality and multiplicity of roles between the two men. Each can assume the role of elder or of younger.[122] Whereas Nestor just painted Achilles as an excellent, noble-born fighter who nevertheless needs guidance from the older Patroklos, now Eurypylos alludes to Achilles' role as a teacher of Patroklos. The subject of this instruction adds a new facet to our picture of Achilles: this warrior has been instructed in the arts of medicine, and has taught Patroklos those same good arts (ἤπια φάρμακα […] ἐσθλά, 11.830-831). This scene develops further the richness of Achilles and Patroklos' relationship by broadening the content of their bond. Patroklos is not only a special servant, but he shared with Achilles a life before the war at Troy, not only fighting with him, but learning with him the arts of healing. Again we see a degree of equality: although Achilles is superior to Patroklos as the one who first learned these healing arts, directly from the centaur Cheiron (11.832), Patroklos nevertheless is now in a position to step into his teacher's role, to heal in his stead. His ability to act in Achilles' place and with Achilles' skill underscores a degree of peership between them, based on this common knowledge and skill. Such peership is limited; for

[121] ἀλλ' ἐμὲ μὲν σὺ σάωσον ἄγων ἐπὶ νῆα μέλαιναν,/ μηροῦ δ' ἔκταμ' ὀϊστόν, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ δ' αἷμα κελαινόν/ νίζ' ὕδατι λιαρῶι, ἐπὶ δ' ἤπια φάρμακα πάσσε/ ἐσθλά, τά σε προτί φασιν Ἀχιλλῆος δεδάασθαι,/ ὃν Χείρων ἐδίδαξε, δικαιότατος Κενταύρων ("But save me at least, leading me to the black ship, and cut this arrow from my thigh, and wash the black blood from it with warm water, and set on it kindly medicines, good ones, which they say you have learned from Achilles, whom Cheiron taught, Cheiron, the most just of the centaurs," 11.828-832).

[122] Finlay (1980) subsumes this multiplicity into the single paradigm of Patroklos as father-figure to the younger Achilles. Although I agree with Finlay's argument that Peleus is of great importance in Achilles' story, his monolithic claim that "Patroklos surely reflects the patriarchal and communal values of his society rather than any aspect of [Achilles]" (272) is not supported by the hero's rich and varied portrait in the poem.

example, Patroklos will be unable to wield Achilles' spear, also a gift from Cheiron.[123] But the mutuality evident here gives us further evidence of the shared life that Achilles longs for when he grieves for his friend.

In addition to these various descriptions of Patroklos as both pupil and mentor of Achilles, the poem also depicts them as brothers who were raised together. When the shade of Patroklos appears to Achilles in Book 23 and begs Achilles to bury him quickly, he reminisces about what they have lost because of his death. As in Book 9, we here again get the image of these two men together, apart from the others: οὐ μὲν γὰρ ζωοί γε φίλων ἀπάνευθεν ἑταίρων/ βουλὰς ἑζόμενοι βουλεύσομεν, ἀλλ' ἐμὲ μὲν κὴρ/ ἀμφέχανε στυγερή, ἥ περ λάχε γεινόμενόν περ ("For not alive, sitting apart from our dear companions, will we take counsel together, but death has swallowed me, the hateful death that was allotted to me at my birth," 23.77-79). This picture of the two of them making plans together, separated from the rest of their companions, recalls the special closeness we saw in earlier scenes in the poem, and Patroklos then narrates the personal history of this intimacy.[124] We learn for the first time that Menoitios brought Patroklos to the home of Achilles' father when Patroklos was small, because Patroklos had killed a man in a rash outburst over a game of dice, and Peleus then raised him in his home: ἔνθά με δεξάμενος ἐν δώμασιν ἱππότα Πηλεύς/ ἔτρεφέ τ' ἐνδυκέως καὶ σὸν θεράποντ' ὀνόμηνεν ("and

[123] Thus mutuality is balanced against disparity: Patroklos was able to learn from Achilles the art of healing but not that of killing. Cf. 16.140-144.

[124] It is noteworthy that Patroklos' interactions with Achilles rely more and more on speech throughout the poem, from silent communication in Book 9 (9.620-622), to a briefly uttered question in 11, "what need have you of me?" (11.606), to a long speech of condemnation and appeal in Book 16 when he begs Achilles to return to battle, quoting the appeal of Nestor (16.21-45), and then at last to this speech from beyond the dead, of comparable length (23.69-92). Separated first by the disparity of understanding about how to respond to the Greeks' need, and now by the great gulf of death, Patroklos must turn ever more to speech.

there the horseman Peleus received me in his home, and he *raised me with care* and named me your companion in battle," 23.89-90). We have seen Patroklos acting as Achilles' θεράπων, serving Achilles and attending to his needs off the field, and we know that he was Achilles' right hand man in battle. We know too that he was a pupil of Achilles in the arts of healing. Here we see the origin of their relationship in their common upbringing by a common father.[125] In response to this speech, Achilles calls Patroklos "ἠθείη κεφαλή" (23.94), a respectful term for an elder that seems to be used especially when referring to a brother.[126] In the rich complexity of this relationship, we see that the concept both of lovers and of father-son are too reductive to capture the fullness of what these men are to one another. These men are brothers, peers, companions at all times, alternatingly mentor and pupil one to the other, and for this richness, the poem offers us an encompassing image, shared life, delineated linguistically when the poem describes Achilles' grief.[127]

---

[125] Halperin (1990) writes about the way this rich friendship borrows from imagery of both kinship and conjugality in an attempt to define itself (cf. above, p. 39). The reciprocity of it, with both men alternatingly superior to the other in different areas, points to the equality of their relationship, despite its fundamental asymmetry; here in this speech Halperin sees their equality in death reinforced by Patroklos' appeal that their bones be buried together, as they were raised together (μὴ ἐμὰ σῶν ἀπάνευθε τιθήμεναι ὀστέ', Ἀχιλλεῦ,/ ἀλλ' <u>ὁμοῦ, ὡς τράφομέν περ ἐν ὑμετέροισι δόμοισιν</u>, 23.83-84); Halperin (1990), 83-85. On the significance of Achilles' and Patroklos' shared σῆμα for what he calls the "ultimate thematic matching of the pair," see Sinos (1980), 59. On their relationship's basis in affection, illuminated by such kinship contexts, see Zanker (1994), 14-16.
[126] Cf. Richardson (1993), *ad* 22.229-31 and Friedrich (1977): "Achilles grew up with Patroclus, and addressed him with a quasi-kinship term for respected, older persons (etheios) – indeed, Achilles acts toward Patroclus as though the latter were a sort of structural elder brother," 283. Bettini (1988) emphasizes the close affection, shared upbringing, and ready devotion to the other's bidding signified by this term of address, 154-166.
[127] Shay (1994) observes a similar multiplicity within the relationships between special comrades at Vietnam: these men were both brothers *and* mothers to one another, and the loss of a special comrade felt to the survivor like both becoming an orphan and losing a child, 49. Mother-child imagery forms part of Achilles' characterization of his relationship with Patroklos at 16.7-11; Gaca (2008) claims that this and other mother-child similes in the *Iliad* portray a warrior's defense of his vulnerable comrade at any cost, 162-7. She compares the simile to real situations of invasion where a fleeing mother risks rape by slowing down for her child, 148-154. For common characteristics

The poem only once describes Achilles' relationship with Patroklos in terms of father to son, during Patroklos' funeral, when Achilles weeps for Patroklos like a father mourning his newly wedded son. The narrator uses this simile as Patroklos' corpse burns on the funeral pyre, tended by Achilles through the night, as he calls on the soul of Patroklos:

> ὡς δὲ πατὴρ οὗ παιδὸς ὀδύρεται ὀστέα καίων
> νυμφίου, ὅς τε θανὼν δειλοὺς ἀκάχησε τοκῆας,
> ὣς Ἀχιλεὺς ἑτάροιο ὀδύρετο ὀστέα καίων,
> ἑρπύζων παρὰ πυρκαϊὴν, ἁδινὰ στοναχίζων. (23.222-225)
>
> As a father mourns, burning the bones of his son
> just married, who in dying grieves his wretched parents,
> so Achilles mourned, burning the bones of his companion,
> dragging himself around the pyre, groaning thickly.

This poignant image captures a special dimension in Achilles' loss, that of a spoiled promise. The son in the simile had been recently married, so his death not only bereaves the father of his son, but of his son precisely in his potentiality for joy, for new life. In the context of the whole poem, we need not extrapolate from this simile a universal father-son characterization of Achilles' and Patroklos' relationship, since we have seen how that relationship is manifold and complex;[128] and the funeral has already clearly articulated Achilles' relationship with the deceased as that of companionship: ὄπιθεν δὲ κάρη ἔχε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,/ ἀχνύμενος, ἕταρον γὰρ ἀμύμονα πέμπ' Ἄϊδόσδε ("and from behind godlike Achilles was holding the head, and grieving, for the one whom they were conveying to Hades was his blameless

---

between mother-child relations and those of friends, cf. Aristotle *NE* IX.4, 1166a4-9, where he notes that both friends and mothers desire the existence and preservation of the other and share in the other's sorrows and joys.

[128] *Pace* Moulton (1977), noted above, who traces the parent-child similes which surround the pair in terms of the single motif of protection in their friendship, 101-106; protectiveness is certainly part, but not all, of the poem's characterization of their relationship. On the bereaved parent motif in general, cf. Griffin (1980), 123ff.

companion," 23.136-137).[129] The simile, rather, fits the framework of longing that shapes Achilles' particular grief for his ἕταρον. Though this simile does not focus on the rupture of formerly shared life, it gives substance to the feeling of present rupture, which evokes thoughts of a lost future, through the poignancy of the enjambed adjective νυμφίου, "wedded" (23.223). In losing Patroklos, Achilles loses the friend through whom he hoped to live.

Such an interpretation of the simile exactly accords with Achilles' lament for Patroklos in Book 19. If Achilles had considered Patroklos as a son to him, this lament, in which Achilles feels the vanity of his hope that Patroklos would survive the war and be the one to raise his son (19.315-337), would have been a suitable moment for making that relationship clear. After pinpointing the heart of his refusal to eat in longing for Patroklos who used to prepare his food, Achilles then weighs this loss against other possible losses of loved ones:

> […]. οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακώτερον ἄλλο πάθοιμι,
> οὐδ᾽ εἴ κεν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀποφθιμένοιο πυθοίμην
> […] ἠὲ τόν, ὃς Σκύρωι μοι ἐνιτρέφεται φίλος υἱός,
> εἴ που ἔτι ζώει γε Νεοπτόλεμος θεοειδής. (19.321-322, 326-327)
>
> For no worse thing could I suffer,
> not though I were to learn that my father had died,
> […] nor my dear son, who is being raised for me in Skyros,
> if indeed godlike Neoptolemus still lives.

[129] For an outside parallel of parental imagery within a clearly non-parental relationship, cf. Gilgamesh's grief for Enkidu in the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, where Gilgamesh is compared to a mother lioness, deprived of her cubs, who keeps pacing back and forth; *Gilgamesh* Tablet VIII.49-50. Enkidu is repeatedly called "friend" and "brother" in the epic. (All Gilgamesh references are to Kovacs' translation, 1989).

Achilles judges his loss of Patroklos to be worse than the death of both father and son. This rupture of shared life strikes him more deeply than the rupture of the closest kin relationships. By characterizing his current grief as something worse, τι κακώτερον, than the loss of son or father, he thereby characterizes that relationship as something other.[130] Immediately after Achilles distinguishes his loss of his companion from the possible loss of father or son, he reflects further on the consequence of Patroklos' death: this death has dissolved his hope that Patroklos could act as father to his son in his stead:

> πρὶν μὲν γάρ μοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἐώλπει
> οἶον ἐμὲ φθείσεσθαι ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἱπποβότοιο
> αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ Τροίηι, σὲ δέ τε Φθίηνδε νέεσθαι,
> ὡς ἄν μοι τὸν παῖδα θοῆι σὺν νηῒ μελαίνηι
> Σκυρόθεν ἐξαγάγοις καί οἱ δείξειας ἕκαστα,
> κτῆσιν ἐμὴν δμῶας τε καὶ ὑψερεφὲς μέγα δῶμα. (19.328-333)
>
> Indeed formerly the spirit in my breast had hoped
> that I alone would perish far from Argos, land good for the horses' grazing,
> here in Troy, while you would return to Phthia,
> so that you could convey my son from Skyros on a black ship
> and could show him everything,
> my possessions and my servants and my great high-roofed home.

Rather than lamenting the loss of one who was like a son to him, Achilles laments the loss of one who could be a second father to his son. In other words, Achilles sees Patroklos as the one who is most like him, a peer who can act in his stead, a fellow friend who is closer and dearer to him than both father and son.[131]

---

130 Zanker (1994) reads this passage with a similar distinction between family ties and the relationship between Achilles and Patroklos, 56.

131 Finlay (1980) wrongly interprets Achilles' lament as equating Patroklos and Peleus, 270-271. When Achilles contrasts the loss of Patroklos with the potential death of Peleus (19.321-322) he does not thereby equate the two men; rather he weighs the differences in the two relationships. Nor does

In the rest of the dissertation we shall turn to the specific dynamism in Achilles' ποθή-driven grief for Patroklos that makes it particularly prone to insatiable anger. This dynamism is rooted in the loss of a closely shared life, well summarized in Shay's description of these two men as "special comrades": "Foster brother, closest friend, comrade-in-arms, second in command, emotional stabilizer – all together these constituted the relationship of Patroklos to Achilles, and together they represent what Achilles lost when Patroklos died."[132] The manifold aspects to their relationship – that they were alternatively mentor and pupil to one another, grew up together, fought side by side, communicated without words, and lived as constant companions – are summed up when the poem uniquely characterizes Achilles' grief as shaped by ποθή. Muellner, writing about the anger of Achilles, argues that his response to Patroklos' death is the physical response of one who is the "literally surviving half of a symbolic whole."[133] We have seen that the poem explicitly delineates *longing* in grief precisely for those characters who most completely shared a common life, Achilles and Patroklos. Their deep bond of friendship forges between them a single identity. As we saw above, this shared existence extends to a broader world of Achilles' horses and Achilles' men, whose grief for Patroklos is also called a ποθή. The horses and the Myrmidons are a kind of extension of Achilles himself, and the repeated scenes of weeping *in longing* for

---

Achilles' hope that Patroklos could have taken his own place in raising his son put Patroklos on the same plane as *Peleus*, but rather it aligns Patroklos with Achilles as potential father-figure to Neoptolemus.

132 Shay (1994), 42.

133 Muellner (1996), 161. Cf. *ibid.*, 133-136, 157-161 on the literal identification of Achilles with Patroklos; he calls it an "enactment of Aristotle's definition of friendship" (160); see also Whitman (1958), quoted earlier (cf. note 98): Patroklos "was so far a part of [Achilles] that he played his mortality for him," 202.

Patroklos reinforce the sense that Patroklos' death has ruptured an entire world – the shared life that existed between Achilles and his closest comrade.

Chapter Two: Longing and Anger

In Chapter One, we identified a linguistic feature of the poem: variants of ποθή uniquely characterize portraits of grief for Patroklos, whereas grief for Hektor is never explicitly so described. In the next two chapters we shall argue that the unique use of ποθή to describe grief for Patroklos is part of a larger story of uniqueness, the unparalleled relentlessness that characterizes Achilles' responses to his grief. The frame of ποθή shows us that Achilles' anger against Hektor and the Trojans is one element in a spectrum of grief-driven behavior, wherein rupture drives both insatiability and an underlying fruitlessness. In this chapter I shall explore the various, almost paradoxical ways in which longing results in insatiety, from isolation to communion, inactivity to activity, and above all deeds of anger, arguing that all of these responses to grief share a common grounding in that unquenchable desire for the life that has been lost. Such diverse responses to grief can be discerned throughout the poem, yet in Achilles they manifest a particular insatiety, captured by the unique language of ποθή. I shall argue that this linguistic peculiarity informs our understanding of Achilles' anger after Patroklos' death, which, rooted as it is in the longing for something unattainable, shares with all grief-driven activities a fundamental aimlessness, and thus fails to redress the grief that drives it.

Many have observed that Achilles' grief gives rise to anger in the last six books of the poem, but these scholars assume the logic of such association without exploring it.[134]

---

[134] To note just a few such assumptions: Schein (1984) observes that Achilles' love for Patroklos both opens Achilles up to the needs of the army and, paradoxically, releases this vast fury, 128ff. Merely observing the contrast, however, does not explain the relationship between these emotions. King (1987) likewise asserts that Achilles' killing rampage is impelled by grief, seen in the language of human passion used to describe his fire, 15. But "passion" is a broader concept than grief and the

Konstan's work on *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks* (2006), however, rightly distinguishes Achilles' initial anger over Agamemnon's wrongdoing from the grieved fury that besets Achilles after Patroklos' death. Achilles' anger with Agamemnon is a response to an affront, while his rage against Hektor and the other Trojans is a response to great harm, but not to insult.[135] Konstan attributes the vastness of Achilles' latter fury to the pain of loss.[136] Without downplaying the role of pain in Achilles' transition from grief to anger, I argue such pain is just one manifestation of the more fundamental dynamic of longing driven by rupture. Only the insatiableness of this dimension of grief can properly account for the heights of daimonic fury to which this hero ascends.

First let us draw out the element of relentlessness created by the rupture of a shared life. In our earlier tracing of ποθή through the *Iliad* we saw how longing for Patroklos immobilizes the horses of Achilles during the struggle over Patroklos' corpse. This description of motionlessness extends for a full fifteen lines, beginning with the contrast between their weeping and the surrounding battle:

---

precise relationship between such grief and killing remains to be worked out. Zanker (1994), in a brief discussion of the simile where the grieving Achilles is compared to a bereaved lioness (18.316-323), explains the relationship between grief and anger in that passage in terms of "emotional compensation." He notes the presence of affection and ties, but not the dynamic of longing, saying simply, "The emotion of wrath is developed," 99. Cf. Beck (2005), who persuasively argues that this simile focuses our attention on Achilles' grief, through the contrast between strength and bereavement and the delaying effect of interjecting the simile before the lament; but she mentions the anger in the simile only in passing, 262.

[135] Achilles' initial anger with Agamemnon is accompanied by a kind of grief, tears, but the tears are of indignation, and his anger seeks to correct a wrongful dishonor (cf. 1.348ff). Thus Achilles summarizes his first anger as his response to a slight, being wronged by an equal (16.52-55). Compare Poseidon's sentiments about the way Zeus has treated him, 15.208-210. (*sic* Janko (1992) *ad* 16.52-55).

[136] Konstan (2006), 41-55. Konstan bases his argument on Aristotle's presentation of anger, and of emotions generally, in the *Rhetoric*; see, e.g., *Rh.* 1378a-b. Cf. Lossau (1979), who examines of Achilles' anger in light of Aristotle, 120-129; although Lossau recognizes a difference of scale between Achilles' first and second anger, he presents both as attempts to rectify a slight, 124-5.

ἵπποι δ᾽ Αἰακίδαο μάχης ἀπάνευθεν ἐόντες
κλαῖον, ἐπεὶ δὴ πρῶτα πυθέσθην ἡνιόχοιο
ἐν κονίῃσι πεσόντος ὑφ᾽ Ἕκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο. (17.426-428)

But the horses of Aiakides were apart from battle,
weeping, from the time when first they learned of their rein-bearer
fallen in the dust at the hands of Hektor, the man-slayer.

This weeping isolates the horses from the activity of fighting, setting them apart. The detail about time, weeping ἐπεὶ δὴ πρῶτα, from the time when first they learned of Patroklos' death, adds to the scene a sense of lengthiness. The horses' prolonged inactivity is then further emphasized by the narrator's enumeration of their driver's vain efforts to get them to move:

ἦ μὰν Αὐτομέδων, Διώρεος ἄλκιμος υἱός,
πολλὰ μὲν ἂρ μάστιγι θοῇ ἐπεμαίετο θείνων,
πολλὰ δὲ μειλιχίοισι προσηύδα, πολλὰ δ᾽ ἀρειῇ·
τὼ δ᾽ οὔτ᾽ ἂψ ἐπὶ νῆας ἐπὶ πλατὺν Ἑλλήσποντον
ἠθελέτην ἰέναι, οὔτ᾽ ἐς πόλεμον μετ᾽ Ἀχαιούς (17.429-433)

And Automedon, the courageous son of Diores,
many times kept striking them, hitting with his swift whip,
and many times he spoke to them with kindly words, and many times with a threat;
but the pair was not willing to go up to the ships at the broad Hellespont,
nor to go into war among the Achaians […].

The horses' imperviousness to their driver's blows, pleas, and threats shows the depth of their disorientation. They have withdrawn from both time and place, able neither to go forward into battle nor back to their ships. This temporal dislocation is then amplified with a striking simile, comparing their immobility to the fixity of a burial monument:

ἀλλ᾽ ὥς τε στήλη μένει ἔμπεδον, ἥ τ᾽ ἐπὶ τύμβωι
ἀνέρος ἑστήκηι τεθνηότος ἠὲ γυναικός,

> ὣς μένον ἀσφαλέως περικαλλέα δίφρον ἔχοντες,
> οὔδει ἐνισκίμψαντε καρήατα· (17.434-437)
>
> but as a stele remains fixed in place, which stands upon the burial mound
> of a man or woman who has died,
> so they remained immovable, holding the very beautiful chariot,
> heads bowed down to the earth;

Mark Edwards rightly observes the simile's association with death, but makes too little of the stillness that is the point of comparison: living horses as inanimate, unmoving stone.[137] The death of Patroklos has utterly sapped the horses of any living impulse to move, fight, or return home. As we saw in the previous chapter, this motionless grief is rooted in longing:

> δάκρυα δέ σφι
> θερμὰ κατὰ βλεφάρων χαμάδις ῥέε μυρομένοισιν
> <u>ἡνιόχοιο πόθωι</u>· θαλερὴ δ' ἐμιαίνετο χαίτη
> ζεύγλης ἐξεριποῦσα παρὰ ζυγὸν ἀμφοτέρωθεν. (17.437-440)
>
> And warm tears flowed down from their eyes to the ground as they wept
> <u>in longing for their rein-bearer</u>. And their full manes were soiled
> as they swept down from the yoke-pad along both sides of the yoke.

As the extended portrait of motionlessness ends with the horses' heads bowed in non-motion, the narrator carefully pinpoints the origins of such immobility in ruptured wholeness. The particular impossibility of shared activity can lead quite naturally to general

---

[137] Edwards (1991), *ad loc.* The only other comparison of a living being to a grave-stone in the *Iliad* occurs in 13.437, when Alkathoos, bewitched by Poseidon, stands before the onslaught of Idomeneus, fixed to the spot like a grave-stone or tree. The simile in Book 17 denotes a more complete motionlessness, since it offers no alternative comparison to a tree and expands the simile into a second line, making us dwell on the immobility of the image.

motionlessness, as here the horses, longing for their former rein-bearer, pay no heed to the current rein-bearer who is prodding them to move.[138]

We see a similar inactivity born of longing in Book 19, when Achilles refuses to eat σῇι ποθῇι, because of longing for Patroklos (19.321). Just as the horses' longing for the common life with Patroklos drains them of any desire to engage in war, so Achilles' longing for the days when Patroklos prepared his food drains him of any desire to eat whatsoever: αὐτὰρ ἐμὸν κῆρ/ ἄκμηνον πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος, ἔνδον ἐόντων, /σῇι ποθῇι· […] ("my heart will have nothing of drink nor food, though they are here, because of my longing for you," 19.319-321). Pietro Pucci argues that in refusing to eat Achilles seeks communion with death itself.[139] His interpretation accords well with Achilles' total embrace of death after Patroklos dies, seen in his forswearing of life until he wreaks vengeance on Hektor, οὐδ' ἐμὲ θυμὸς ἄνωγεν/ ζώειν οὐδ' ἄνδρεσσι μετέμμεναι, αἴ κε μὴ Ἕκτωρ/ πρῶτος ἐμῶι ὑπὸ δουρὶ τυπεὶς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσηι,/ Πατρόκλοιο δ' ἕλωρα Μενοιτιάδεω ἀποτείσηι ("my spirit does not bid me to live nor to remain among men, unless first Hektor beaten down beneath my spear loses his life and repays the despoiling of Patroklos, son of Menoitios," 18.90-93), and in his reply to his mother's prediction that his death will follow Hektor's, αὐτίκα τεθναίην ("straightaway let me die," 18.98).[140] Achilles' refusal to eat, however, not

138 Austin (1975) links isolation and inaction, arguing that only within the community can decisions be made and actions taken, 146.

139 Pucci (1993), 265-266. Van Nortwick (1996), by contrast, sees in this refusal of food not the movement towards death, but rather the denial of death's reality, since Achilles here withdraws from the natural rhythms of life, 70. I think the complexities in Achilles' behavior are understood most coherently as various manifestations of longing for shared life as outlined in these chapters.

140 This embrace of death continues through the end of the poem; cf., e.g., 22.365-366, Achilles' response to Hektor's dying threat. Scholarship on Achilles' unique knowledge and embracing of

only imitates the fasting of death, but quite explicitly arises from longing for the living Patroklos who used to prepare their shared meals. Thus Pucci is too limited when he claims that "longing for you" in 19.321 means "longing for death," since this explanation leaves unexplored the ways in which Achilles physically yearns for Patroklos' living presence. Tsagalis rightly sees that Achilles here makes food and drink symbolic of his shared life with Patroklos, and his abstention from those activities demonstrates the paralyzing effect of losing that shared life.[141] The gaping void in Achilles' life disables him, and the poem pinpoints the origins of this inactivity in the language of ποθή.

Both of these scenes of inactivity show signs of lengthiness and isolation. The horses' paralysis in Book 17 has been prolonged for some time (κλαῖον, ἐπεὶ δὴ πρῶτα πυθέσθην […], 17.427) and persists until the intervention of Zeus, 17.441ff.; Achilles forswears eating with a promise to endure his fast throughout the day, δύντα δ' ἐς ἠέλιον μενέω καὶ τλήσομαι ἔμπης (19.308), and he is only prevented from carrying out his promise by a second intervention by Zeus, 19.340ff.[142] Such prolongation points to the insatiety that attends longing in grief. Moreover, the isolation of the bereaved in both of these scenes points to this quality of insatiety. Achilles' horses in Book 17 refuse to respond to another driver and stand apart, persisting in their longing for the person of Patroklos. In Book 19, Achilles, having dissolved the assembly and sent away the other leaders, refuses the

---

death abounds. Of particular note are Schadewaldt (1965), 251-267; Scully (1990), 121-125; Whitman (1958), 203-214; cf. also Schein (1984), 89ff., 131f., 155f.; Zanker (1994), 96-100.

141 Tsagalis (2004a), 149.

142 The parallel is wonderfully underscored by the parallel lines, μυρομένω δ' ἄρα τώ γε ἰδὼν ἐλέησε Κρονίων (17.441), μυρομένους δ' ἄρα τούς γε ἰδὼν ἐλέησε Κρονίων (19.340), the latter plural referring to the Achaian leaders who weep in response to Achilles' lament for Patroklos, 19.338-339. The significance of these divine interventions will be discussed in Chapter Three.

pleas of his remaining companions for him to eat.[143] In both of these scenes, longing for a specific person shuts the griever into an isolated world, and the motionlessness born of their grief reinforces their singularity.[144]

The poem's attentiveness to the insatiate quality of this immobile grief illumines the common root of Achilles' grief and anger. The refusal to eat in Book 19 first appears in an earlier oath of vengeance, as Achilles contrasts Hektor's mangled victims with Agamemnon and Odysseus urging food upon the army (19.203-205). He then declares his own wish for all of the Greeks to fast until vengeance is achieved:

> ἦ τ᾽ ἂν ἐγώ γε
> νῦν μὲν ἀνώγοιμι πτολεμίζειν υἷας Ἀχαιῶν
> νήστιας ἀκμήνους, ἅμα δ᾽ ἠελίωι καταδύντι
> τεύξεσθαι μέγα δόρπον, ἐπὴν τεισαίμεθα λώβην.
> πρὶν δ᾽ οὔ πως ἂν ἐμοί γε φίλον κατὰ λαιμὸν ἰείη
> οὐ πόσις οὐδὲ βρῶσις, ἑταίρου τεθνηῶτος,
> ὅς μοι ἐνὶ κλισίηι δεδαϊγμένος ὀξέϊ χαλκῶι
> κεῖται ἀνὰ πρόθυρον τετραμμένος, ἀμφὶ δ᾽ ἑταῖροι
> μύρονται· τό μοι οὔ τι μετὰ φρεσὶ ταῦτα μέμηλεν,
> ἀλλὰ φόνος τε καὶ αἷμα καὶ ἀργαλέος στόνος ἀνδρῶν. (19.205-214)

Truly I would bid the sons of the Achaians to go to war now,

---

143 19.276, λῦσεν δ᾽ ἀγορὴν αἰψηρήν ("and he quickly dissolved the assembly"); 19.309, ἄλλους μὲν ἀπεσκέδασεν βασιλῆας ("he scattered the other kings"); cf. the contrast Zeus makes between the other Greeks who go to their dinner, and Achilles who sits grieving for his dear companion (κεῖνος ὅ γε προπάροιθε νεῶν ὀρθοκραιράων/ ἧσται ὀδυρόμενος ἕταρον φίλον· οἳ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι/ οἴχονται μετὰ δεῖπνον, ὃ δ᾽ ἄκμηνος καὶ ἄπαστος, 19.344-346).

144 In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, similar markers of isolation and inactivity are linked with the absence-driven grief of πόθος: Demeter's refusal to eat (ἀλλ᾽ ἀγέλαστος ἄπαστος ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος/ ἧστο πόθῳ μινύθουσα βαθυζώνοιο θυγατρός, 200-201), her sitting apart from the gods (ἔνθα καθεζομένη μακάρων ἀπὸ νόσφιν ἁπάντων/ μίμνε πόθῳ μινύθουσα βαθυζώνοιο θυγατρός, 303-304), and her daughter's unwillingness to share Hades' bed (ἥμενον ἐν λεχέεσσι σὺν αἰδοίῃ παρακοίτι/ πόλλ᾽ ἀεκαζομένη μητρὸς πόθῳ· […], 343-344). On parallels between the withdrawals of Demeter and Achilles, without reference to πόθος, cf. Muellner (1996), 23-25. Lynn-George (1996) sees isolation and inactivity as typical of grief in the *Iliad*, 5.

> fasting and without food, and as the sun goes down
> to prepare a great supper, when we have avenged the outrage.
> But before this, there shall go down my throat
> neither drink nor food, since my companion is dead,
> who lies turned at the doorway of my shelter, torn by sharp bronze, and our
> companions mourn about him; so in my breast I care nothing for these things,
> but only for slaughter and blood and the grievous moaning of men.

Avenging the outrage must come before eating. When Achilles later pinpoints his refusal to eat in the experience of absence that drives his grief (19.315ff.), we see that his anger arises from the same source. Although in some ways Achilles is becoming like a dead man, he also pursues vengeance precisely out of longing for a shared life that has been lost. Simone Weil discerns in such scenes both the movement towards death and the anger against the killer, calling it a "double need for death": the bereaved heroes desire to die, in emulation of their beloved companions, but they also pursue the death of the enemy, as if killing the enemy will cure them of their loss.[145] I take her observation one step further, that this desire to "cure one's loss," which manifests itself in angered killing, is in fact rooted in longing for the shared life with a living companion. A paradox lies at the root of this anger: it expresses a longing for something one knows cannot be achieved. We see here too the polarity between Achilles' isolation, refusing his peers' encouragement to eat, and his desire for communion, wanting all to share his fast.[146] Such variety points to a core volatility generated by the rupture of death. When the bereaved persists in his isolation, the narrator emphasizes the

---

[145] Weil (1957), 42-43.

[146] Achilles refers to the many victims of Hektor, a kind of extrapolation of his personal loss to the many similar losses that his fellow Achaians have suffered at Hektor's hands: νῦν δ' οἳ μὲν κέαται δεδαϊγμένοι, οὓς ἐδάμασσεν/ Ἕκτωρ Πριαμίδης, ὅτε οἱ Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκεν,/ ὑμεῖς δ' ἐς βρωτὺν ὀτρύνετον ("But now these men lie slain, whom Hektor son of Priam defeated, when Zeus gave glory to him, yet you urge us to eat," 19.203-205). The note of condemnation in that last statement of Achilles, ὑμεῖς δ' ἐς βρωτὺν ὀτρύνετον, points to his desire for his fellow leaders to share the intensity of his grief.

dimension of grief in which the bereaved longs for a particular person, who can never be so honored in common ritual or shared mourning as to fill the void in the bereaved's life. Yet when the bereaved reaches out for communion in his grief, we see come to the fore a general yearning for shared life, which is one dimension of that particular longing. Thus Achilles attempts to share his life with the surviving Achaians in a manner similar to the sharing that has been lost.[147]

As we turn now to various grief-driven activities, some of which are pursued alone, some with the community, we shall see this same relentlessness pervading Achilles' repeated deeds of vengefulness, weeping, and social mourning rituals. By framing Achilles' grief in terms of the longing that drives it, the poem shows us that both activity and inactivity in grief share a similar insatiety and pointlessness. No actions, deeds of anger included, are able to redress the grief that drives them.

This insatiety is evident at the beginning of Book 23, when Achilles asks the Myrmidons to remain by Patroklos' corpse and honor it with a lament. Their tears of longing for their μήστωρα φόβοιο ("deviser of rout," 23.16) are abundant, as we see in the parallel structure of line 15, with its repeated verb "soaked": δεύοντο ψάμαθοι, δεύοντο δὲ τεύχεα φωτῶν/ δάκρυσι· ("Soaked was the sand, and soaked the arms of the men, with their tears," 23.15-16). The abundance of the tears gives the scene a tone of intense activity, as does their triple circuit around the corpse. These details create the sense that the

---

147 In the isolation of these weeping scenes we could see a likeness to death, in which one no longer participates in society in a functioning way; cf. Pucci (1993), noted above, who sees Achilles' refusal of food as a rejection of life, 265-266; and Edwards (1991), who identifies funereal connotations in the comparison of horses to grave-stones, *ad* 17.434-436 (see pp. 61-63 for discussion). But this death-like separation from society is rooted in ποθή, and thus paradoxically is rooted in the desire for shared life and communion.

Myrmidons are totally given over to their grief. In the context of Achilles' characterization of their lament as something they must do before they turn to the evening's repast (23.10-11), this intensity reminds us of the persistence in Achilles' refusal to eat in Book 19.

As with the refusal to eat in 19, the Myrmidons' lamentation for Patroklos in 23 does not end with mere abundance of weeping but transitions to anger. After linking the Myrmidons' tears with their longing for Patroklos (τοῖον γὰρ πόθεον μήστωρα φόβοιο, 23.16), the narrator focuses on Achilles at their center, whose thoughts are fixed on vengeance:

> τοῖσι δὲ Πηλεΐδης ἁδινοῦ ἐξῆρχε γόοιο,
> χεῖρας ἐπ' ἀνδροφόνους θέμενος στήθεσσιν ἑταίρου·
> "χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ Πάτροκλε, καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισιν·
> πάντα γὰρ ἤδη τοι τελέω τὰ πάροιθεν ὑπέστην,
> Ἕκτορα δεῦρ' ἐρύσας δώσειν κυσὶν ὠμὰ δάσασθαι,
> δώδεκα δὲ προπάροιθε πυρῆς ἀποδειροτομήσειν
> Τρώων ἀγλαὰ τέκνα, σέθεν κταμένοιο χολωθείς." (23.17-23)
>
> And in their midst the son of Peleus led their sobbing lamentation,
> placing his man-slaughtering hands upon the breast of his companion:
> "Rejoice, I tell you, Patroklos, even in the house of Hades;
> for I am now accomplishing for you everything that earlier I promised,
> that having dragged Hektor here I would give him raw to the dogs to tear to pieces,
> and before your pyre would cut the throats
> of twelve shining Trojan youths, in anger over your slaying."

Achilles' entire γόος , rather than following the typical form,[148] consists of his reiteration of an earlier oath to defile Hektor and sacrifice twelve Trojan youths before Patroklos' funeral

---

[148] Tsagalis (2004a), who defines γόοι not only by textual markers but also a typical pattern and content of motifs (such as the praising address, antithesis between mourner and deceased, death wish, and so on), does not consider 23.19-23 to be a true γόος, because its content and structure are different; *ibid.* 8n36, 27n101, 173n446. He argues that the introductory formula, τοῖσι δὲ Πηλεΐδης

pyre. These actions arise from anger at Patroklos' slaying (23.23). He then acts on his anger, the narrator tells us, devising shameful deeds for godlike Hektor by stretching him face-first next to the bier of Patroklos, in the dust ([…] Ἕκτορα δῖον ἀεικέα μήδετο ἔργα,/ πρηνέα πὰρ λεχέεσσι Μενοιτιάδαο τανύσσας/ ἐν κονίῃς, 23.24-26). We again see that, in a grief scene where relentless actions are driven by ποθή, those actions also express anger.

The relation between grief, longing, and anger is pellucid at the beginning Book 24. Unsatisfied by his elaborate funeral for Patroklos, Achilles continues to mourn, night after night, and these nights of sleepless weeping are followed by endless cycles of mutilating Hektor's corpse (24.10-18). Earlier we discussed how the poem explicitly locates the origin of Achilles' restlessness in his longing for shared life with Patroklos: Πατρόκλου ποθέων ἀνδροτῆτά τε καὶ μένος ἠΰ,/ ἠδ' ὁπόσα τολύπευσε σὺν αὐτῶι καὶ πάθεν ἄλγεα,/ ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἀλεγεινά τε κύματα πείρων· ("longing for Patroklos' manhood and good strength, and all the deeds he accomplished with him and the griefs he suffered, passing through wars of men and difficult waves," 24.6-8). The longing for this lost union here leads to endless activity, much like the repeated circuit of weeping at the beginning of 23. The language of the vignette conveys the insatiability of Achilles' longing, first with the triple ἄλλοτε to describe his sleeplessness – ἄλλοτ' ἐπὶ πλευρὰς κατακείμενος, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε/ ὕπτιος, ἄλλοτε δὲ πρηνής (lying now on his side, and now again on his back, and now face-down, 24.10-11) – and then with the iterative verbs to describe his nightly pacing

ἁδινοῦ ἐξῆρχε γόοιο, stems from the overall funereal context of Book 23. I would argue rather that the substitution of vengeful promise for typical γόος themes reveals the grounding of Achilles' anger in grief-longing.

the shore (δινεύεσκ’ ἀλύων παρὰ θῖν’ ἁλός, 24.12), and repeated dragging of Hektor’s body at dawn:

> οὐδέ μιν Ἠώς
> φαινομένη λήθεσκεν ὑπεὶρ ἅλα τ’ ἠϊόνας τε·
> ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἐπεὶ ζεύξειεν[149] ὑφ’ ἅρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους,
> Ἕκτορα δ’ ἕλκεσθαι δησάσκετο δίφρου ὄπισθεν·
> τρὶς δ’ ἐρύσας περὶ σῆμα Μενοιτιάδαο θανόντος
> αὖτις ἐνὶ κλισίηι παυέσκετο, τὸν δέ τ’ ἔασκεν
> ἐν κόνι ἐκτανύσας προπρηνέα. (24.12-18)
>
> Nor did Dawn in her appearing ever fail to see him along the sea and the shore;
> but he kept yoking his swift horses to his chariot
> and kept binding Hektor to drag him behind the chariot;
> and when three times he had dragged him around the tomb of Menoitios’ dead son,
> again he would stop at his shelter, and he kept letting him
> lie stretched out face-first in the dust.

The Hellenistic commentators athetized lines 24.6-9, claiming that they weaken the dramatic effect of the passage, a claim supported by Richardson, who says that while we need not consider these lines spurious, they do not add much to the portrait of Achilles’ grief.[150] But far from weakening the dramatic effect of Achilles’ grief, the portrait of shared life, followed by these reiterative actions, underscores the link between Achilles’ insatiable anger and grief, in a way consistent with the poem’s intense interest in that point. His repetition of this daily ritual of dragging, until the gods intervene on the twelfth day, drives home the quality of insatiety that pervades Achilles’ grief and anger. We should note too the alternation in Achilles’ lonely weeping here, and his seeking communal lament in Book 23, a range seen

---

149 Iterative optative in temporal clause (cf. S 2414). Cf. Macleod (1982), *ad* 24.14.
150 Richardson (1993), *ad* 24.5-11.

elsewhere in his responses to the death of Patroklos.[151] Both the expansive impulse and the persisting loneliness indicate a volatile restlessness which particularly defines Achilles' grief, driving him sometimes to impel others to participate in his intense grief, at other times to wallow in the absolute loneliness of his particular experience of loss.[152]

These nights of repeated mutilation echo many such attempts of Achilles to defile Hektor's corpse. Here in Book 24 Achilles drags Hektor ἐν κόνι ἐκτανύσας προπρηνέα (24.18); when he first slew Hektor, he likewise dragged his head in the dust: τοῦ δ' ἦν ἑλκομένοιο κονίσαλος, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται/ κυάνεαι πίτναντο, κάρη δ' ἅπαν ἐν κονίῃσιν/ κεῖτο πάρος χαρίεν ("And as he was dragged a cloud of dust was raised, and his dark hair splayed about him, and his entire head lay in the dust, formerly lovely […]," 22.401-403).[153] We already saw a variation of this dragging after his lament-threat in Book 23, when Achilles stretches Hektor face-first in the dust before the bier of Patroklos (23.24-26); and these "unseemly deeds," as the narrator calls them,[154] are again alluded to during the

---

151 For lonely weeping on the shore, see also 23.59-61, which, in spite of the presence of other Myrmidons, evokes a sense of isolation because of the contrast between the army's return to their shelters and Achilles' groan-filled lying on the shore. For insistence on large public ritual shared by Myrmidons and the rest of the Achaians, see the funeral itself, particularly Achilles' instructions to Agamemnon at 23.49-53, 23.158-160, and 23.236-248, in which he distributes the funeral tasks among all of the Achaians, and the funeral procession at 23.128-139, in which the grieved Achilles is surrounded, at his own bidding, by the host of fully armed Myrmidons. Cf. also the funeral games, 23.257-897, which Achilles begins by holding back the entire army from returning to their shelters and seating them in full assembly (αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεύς/ αὐτοῦ λαὸν ἔρυκε καὶ ἵζανεν εὐρὺν ἀγῶνα, 23.257-258).

152 Gilgamesh offers us an outside parallel of such variety when he grieves for Enkidu, in the presence of the elders, but with an entirely particular experience of grief, and yet also seeks to have that grief shared by the world, especially as it relates to Enkidu and his life, Tablet VIII.1-44.

153 Derderian (2001) groups together these markers of the excessive nature of Achilles' grief – his disfigurement of Hektor's corpse, his human sacrifice at the funeral of Patroklos, and his placement of Hektor head down in the dust – calling them "ruptures in the form of the death ritual," 55.

154 "ἀεικέα […] ἔργα," at 22.395 and 23.24.

funeral itself as if they were an ongoing reality.[155] The slight variations in his disfigurement of Hektor's face and head match the variety in his verbal threats of mutilation. When he first addresses Patroklos in lament over his corpse, he promises to decapitate Hektor, a threat never repeated;[156] he later threatens to give the corpse to the dogs, threatened most violently in his duel with Hektor when he wishes *he* were angry enough to eat Hektor's raw flesh, since no one will ward off the dogs from his head,[157] and then repeated twice over Hektor's corpse, in language progressively less violent.[158] In such variety of threats and disfigurement we see the volatility at the core of Achilles' anger: shaped by this grief-longing, Achilles' anger drives him not to specified actions, but to manifold expressions of that grief.

The role of longing in the transition from grief to anger emerges with particular clarity in Achilles' first lament for his comrade-in-arms in Book 18. Although no ποθή term describes the grief in that scene, the same dynamics of grief and longing permeate his lament and the simile that precedes it. In this simile, Achilles' grief is compared to that of a lioness who ceaselessly tracks the hunter who stole her cubs, driven to pursuit by a piercing anger (δριμὺς χόλος, 18.322). The movement from grief to anger emerges also in Achilles' lament

155 Aphrodite protects Hektor from dogs and anoints him "so that [Achilles] would not shred his skin as he dragged him" (ἵνα μή μιν ἀποδρύφοι ἑλκυστάζων, 23.187). For a thorough argument that ἀεικέα […] ἔργα is a morally neutral description, see Bassett (1933), who argues that Achilles' behavior is well within the expected norms of war in the *Iliad*; for the opposite view, see, e.g., Segal (1971a), 12-17, esp. 13. For an overview, see de Jong (2012), *ad* 22.395.

156 οὔ σε πρὶν κτερίω, πρὶν Ἕκτορος ἐνθάδ' ἐνεῖκαι/ τεύχεα καὶ κεφαλήν, μεγαθύμου σεῖο φονῆος· (18.334-335).

157 αἲ γάρ πως αὐτόν με μένος καὶ θυμὸς ἀνείη/ ὤμ' ἀποταμνόμενον κρέα ἔδμεναι, οἷά μ' ἔοργας,/ ὡς οὐκ ἔσθ' ὃς σῆς γε κύνας κεφαλῆς ἀπαλάλκοι […] (22.346-348).

158 In Book 23 he first threatens to give Hektor's corpse to the dogs to divide raw (Ἕκτορα δεῦρ' ἐρύσας δώσειν κυσὶν ὠμὰ δάσασθαι, 23.21), and then, in less violent language, to give it not to the fire to devour, but to the dogs (Ἕκτορα δ' οὔ τι/ δώσω Πριαμίδην πυρὶ δαπτέμεν, ἀλλὰ κύνεσσιν (23.182-183). Cf. Segal (1971a), esp. 28, 38, and 54.

following the simile, and in parallel form, and the poem grounds both emotions in the volatile dynamic of longing driven by absence.

The passage merits looking at in detail.[159] First let us see how the insatiate force of ποθή pervades the lioness simile:

> […] ὥς τε λὶς ἠϋγένειος,
> ὧι ῥά θ′ ὑπὸ σκύμνους ἐλαφηβόλος ἁρπάσηι ἀνὴρ
> ὕλης ἐκ πυκινῆς, ὃ δέ τ′ ἄχνυται ὕστερος ἐλθών,
> πολλὰ δέ τ′ ἄγκε′ ἐπῆλθε μετ′ ἀνέρος ἴχνι′ ἐρευνῶν,
> εἴ ποθεν ἐξεύροι· μάλα γὰρ δριμὺς χόλος αἱρεῖ· (18.318-322)

> […] like a lioness, bearded,
> whose cubs a hunter has snatched
> from the dense woods, and she returning after is grieved,
> and she comes to many valleys as she pursues that man's tracks,
> in hopes that she might find; for bitter anger takes complete hold of her;[160]

Grief leads to pursuit, extended through many valleys, with a growing sense of urgency and longing, culminating in bitter anger. The underlying continuity in this seamless transition from grief to anger seems to be an insatiety similar to that which the *Iliad* depicts elsewhere, in scenes where longing is linguistically explicit. The point of the simile does not seem to be simply vengeance, because it is unclear what the lioness hopes to achieve by pursuing the hunter. The object of the verb *find* (18.322) is unspecified. Does she hope that her cubs are alive? Does she wish to kill the hunter, whether her cubs are alive or dead? What is clear in

---

[159] A version of this argument about the lion simile appeared in my article, "Grief as ποθή: Understanding the Anger of Achilles," published by the *New England Classical Journal* 42.3 in 2015.
[160] Chapman captures both the physicality of the loss and the immediacy of the pursuit in his translation, which takes ὕστερος ἐλθών (18.320) as the lions' active response to the discovery of her empty den: "[…] That in his absence being robd by hunters of his whelps,/ Returnes to his so desolate den, and (for his wanted helps)/ Beholding his unlookt-for wants, flies roring backe againe/ hunts the slie hunter, many a vale resounding his disdaine," (18.319-322; in Chapman's numbering, 18.282-285). All quotations of Chapman come from the 1984 edition, Princeton University Press.

the simile is that the lioness responds to the absence of her cubs with immediate pursuit. The hunter has literally stolen part of the lioness's life, her offspring, and her lengthy hope-driven quest to *find* bespeaks both the absence and the almost physical response to that absence – longing for it to be filled. This ambiguity about her aim – whether or not it includes a desire for vengeance – enhances our understanding of the role of longing in grief's transition to anger: such anger is not necessarily the hope of redressing a wrong, but a response to the inability to redress that wrong, a kind of translation of the inner longing for what is lost into outward action.[161]

This inner dynamic is all the more apparent in the words of Achilles' lament after the simile. In the midst of prolonged weeping, with the Achaians groaning their lament for Patroklos all night long,[162] Achilles voices his particular grief for Patroklos. Longing can be discerned throughout this lament in his regret over unfulfilled future plans:

> ὢ πόποι, ἦ ῥ' ἅλιον ἔπος ἔκβαλον ἤματι κείνωι
> θαρσύνων ἥρωα Μενοίτιον ἐν μεγάροισιν·
> φῆν δέ οἱ εἰς Ὀπόεντα περικλυτὸν υἱὸν ἀπάξειν
> Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντα λαχόντά τε ληΐδος αἶσαν.
> ἀλλ' οὐ Ζεὺς ἄνδρεσσι νοήματα πάντα τελευτᾶι· (18.324-328)

> Oh, for shame, truly I uttered an empty promise on that day
> when I was encouraging the hero Menoitios in his home;
> and I said that I would bring his illustrious son back to Opoeis
> when he had sacked Troy and won a share of the spoil.
> But Zeus does not accomplish all the plans of men.

---

161 Tsagalis (2004a) understands the role of the γόος in similar terms: through lament, the bereaved can release some of his pent-up grief by verbalizing it, 176. As we shall see later in the dissertation, I argue that the poem questions the ultimate efficacy of such "translation," be it into lament or deeds of vengeance.

162 18.314-315.

Achilles laments his empty promise to Patroklos' father that he would bring Patroklos safely home after Troy's sack. This notion of unfulfilled promises conveys the note of longing for a lost future. Achilles' further conclusion, ἀλλ' οὐ Ζεὺς ἄνδρεσσι νοήματα πάντα τελευταῖ ("But Zeus does not accomplish all the plans of men," 18.328), continues this feeling of rupture. Achilles had a goal that encompassed him and Patroklos: that when Troy had been sacked and the spoil won, they would return home.[163] Now he sees the vanity of his hopes for such shared life; instead, their true fate is for both to die at Troy. Achilles faces his death with clarity, a death that will follow soon after Patroklos'. Some scholars see this link between Patroklos' death and Achilles' as the heart of the lament, since Achilles here reveals how deeply he embraced his death after the death of his comrade; they even use language of "reunion" in death.[164] Yet Achilles speaks not of reunion but simply shared death. I would argue that although Achilles faces his death unflinchingly, his lament betrays the restlessness of a present marked by separation. He continues with a cry that brings home all the longing that shapes his grief: <u>νῦν</u> δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν, Πάτροκλε, σέ' <u>ὕστερος</u> εἶμ' ὑπὸ

---

[163] Although the narrator tells us that Achilles' mother often told him the plans of Zeus (17.408-409), we see throughout the poem his conflicting expectations of what is in store for him; e.g., at 18.9-11 Achilles voices for the first time another prediction of his mother, that Patroklos would die at Troy while Achilles was still alive. His hope for their safe return here at 18.326 differs too from the hope expressed at 19.328-333, that he alone would die at Troy and Patroklos would bring his son home and raise him. These latter two hopes, though at variance, both convey Achilles' interunion with Patroklos' life and thus capture the reality of ποθή when he is gone. We should see these conflicting ideas of the future as part of the poetic representation of that tension in Achilles' life between his immortal and mortal dimensions; although his mother knows much of what is fated for him, Achilles remains in the mortal world and only comes to understand his fate in the course of the narrative. In such a context he could well have competing understandings of how the war would end, different hopes for the future and Patroklos' role in it. For discussions of Achilles' understanding of his fate, see Rutherford (1982) 156n54; Scully (1990), 118; Taplin (1992), 198; Kullmann (2001, orig. 1968), 402-5.

[164] Cf. Tsagalis (2004a), who interprets Achilles' declaration, "for we two are fated to redden the same earth" (18.329) as a future reunion in death, 79-81.

γαῖαν, ("But *now*, Patroklos, since indeed I shall go beneath the earth *after* you […],"
18.333). Achilles has not yet followed Patroklos beneath the earth. The antithesis between the ruptured now and the later death captures the yearning marked out at the beginning of the lament when he voiced his bitter understanding that his plans for a shared future with Patroklos were void.[165] The role Achilles had planned to play in his companion's life was nothing more than an empty promise, and now his present is shaped by the absence of his friend and the dissolution of his plans.

Framed by such longing, Achilles' grief erupts in an oath of anger:[166]

> νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν, Πάτροκλε, σέ' ὕστερος εἶμ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν,
> οὔ σε πρὶν κτερίω, πρὶν Ἕκτορος ἐνθάδ' ἐνεῖκαι
> τεύχεα καὶ κεφαλήν, μεγαθύμου σεῖο φονῆος·
> δώδεκα δὲ προπάροιθε πυρῆς ἀποδειροτομήσω
> Τρώων ἀγλαὰ τέκνα, σέθεν κταμένοιο χολωθείς. (18.333-337)
>
> But now, Patroklos, since indeed I shall go beneath the earth after you,
> I shall not give you your burial rites before I carry here
> the arms and the head of Hektor, your great-hearted slayer;
> and before your funeral pyre I shall cut the throats
> of twelve shining youths of Troy, in anger over your slaying.

Achilles' move from grief to anger reminds us of the lioness's ἄχος[167] and χόλος in the preceding simile (18.320, 322). For both the lioness and Achilles, the grief of the scene is

---

165 Tsagalis (2004a) claims that Achilles' conflation of "now" and "then" allows the future reality of Achilles' death to "intrude" into the present of his performance, 81. In light of Achilles' initial lament of the vanity of his plans to achieve Patroklos and his own homecoming, I think we can rightly see not intrusion but contrast: Achilles' present is shaped by this new future, the loss of the shared life that he had hoped for and promised. For Achilles as future-oriented after the death of Patroklos, see Kullmann (2001, orig. 1968), 403-5; Kullmann does not observe how Achilles' acceptance of death is part of a new present, with immediate consequences on the warrior's behavior.

166 This is the oath he reiterates in slightly varied form in the Book 23 "γόος," after the Myrmidons soak the beach with their tears, 23.17-23. See discussion pp. 67-68.

shot through with notes of longing, and the resulting actions are explicitly attributed to anger: "μάλα γὰρ δριμὺς χόλος αἱρεῖ" for the lioness (18.322), and "σέθεν κταμένοιο χολωθείς" for Achilles (18.337). The specific point of comparison in the simile is grief – Achilles leads the lament *groaning like a lioness* […] – but within both the simile and the lament, we see the same sense of restlessness, and the same specific mention of anger as causing these deeds.[168] Thus, the poem highlights the insatiety of Achilles' grief and roots in such insatiety the promised deeds of anger: slaying Patroklos' murderer, bringing that murderer's head and weapons to Patroklos, and then cutting the throats of twelve Trojan youths before Patroklos' funeral pyre. Agony and ferocity are linked in Achilles' grief through the underlying dimension of longing born of loss.

Things Going Nowhere

The simile of the mother lioness pursuing the hunter and the parallel lament of empty promises, ending with oaths of vengeance, allow us to see, in depth and clarity, the underlying continuity in Achilles' transition from grief to anger, namely, the insatiety of ποθή. In tracing the link, however, a question naturally emerges. Why does a ποθή-shaped grief turn to anger? We see the common element of insatiety, but do these actions born of

---

[167] Neither Achilles nor the narrator refers to his ἄχος; the point of comparison in the simile is the quality of his groaning: ἀνεστενάχοντο γοῶντες (18.315), ἐξῆρχε γόοιο (18.316), πυκνὰ μάλα στενάχω (18.318) … ὣς ὃ βαρὺ στενάχων (18.323). The lioness's grief is given in verbal form, ἄχνυται (18.320); according to Derderian (2001), ἄχνυσθαι generally represents "personally motivated grief of individual men within the network of ἑταῖροι or kin" that motivates the hero to action and revenge, 19.

[168] Cf. the restlessness in Gilgamesh who grieves like a lioness pacing *to and fro* when deprived of her cubs, Tablet VIII.49-50. Fränkel (1921) claims that, from the lion simile on, Achilles' groans "nicht nur Trauer, sondern auch wilder Rachedurst zu uns sprechen soll" (should speak to us not only of his sorrow but also of his wild thirst for vengeance), 93.

grief have ends that correspond to the nature of that grief? Intertwined with this question of aim is the question of efficacy: do these grief-driven deeds of anger accomplish anything to address the longing that drives them? One answer posited by characters in the poem is that killing eases the pain of grief. Automedon boasts thus when he kills Aretos in Book 17, claiming, "I have eased my heart somewhat of its grief for the slain Patroklos through the killing of even a lesser man," (ἦ δὴ μὰν ὀλίγον γε Μενοιτιάδαο θανόντος/ κῆρ ἄχεος μεθέηκα χερείονά περ καταπεφνών, 17.538-539).[169] Euphorbos utters a similar sentiment when he claims, after Menelaos kills his brother, that if he brings Menelaos' head and armor to his grieving family, he might become for his family "a respite from weeping" (ἦ κέ σφιν δειλοῖσι γόου κατάπαυμα γενοίμην, 17.38). Priam speaks similarly in Book 22, when he declares that if the gods hated Achilles as much as he, then "swiftly would dogs and vultures eat him as he lay there; and truly then would a dread grief depart from my chest" (τάχα κέν ἑ κύνες καὶ γῦπες ἔδοιεν/ κείμενον· ἦ κέ μοι αἰνὸν ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἄχος ἔλθοι, 22.42-43). Yet the reality evinced by Achilles' story is that such deeds of vengeance do not, in fact, assuage grief because these deeds are driven by a force that is ultimately aimless.

In her final lament over the funeral bier of Hektor, Hekabe captures the fruitless desire in vengeance, namely, the restoration to life of the beloved deceased. Addressing her son, she incisively condemns Achilles' treatment of his corpse: πολλὰ ῥυστάζεσκεν ἑοῦ περὶ σῆμ' ἑτάροιο/ Πατρόκλου, τὸν ἔπεφνες – ἀνέστησεν δέ μιν οὐδ' ὧς/ […] ("he

[169] Shay (1994) cites this phrase, κῆρ ἄχεος μεθέηκα (17.539), to argue for the concept that killing eases the pain of grief, both in Homer and in the life of the Vietnam veterans with whom he worked, 54. For what seems to me to be the transferal of a similar concept, see 13.414-416 with 13.402-403: Deïphobos, grieved at the death of Asios (Ἀσίου ἀχνύμενος, 13.403), slays a Greek warrior, a deed of vengeance which he thinks will gladden Asios in his heart (γηθήσειν κατὰ θυμόν, 13.416) since he now has an escort for his trip to Hades.

kept dragging you, many times, around the tomb of his companion, Patroklos, whom you killed – <u>but not even thus did he raise him up</u> […]," 24.755-756). Hekabe perceptively sees that longing for the life of his companion is at the root of Achilles' insatiate mutilation of Hektor's corpse. Despite Achilles' repeated dragging of the body – πολλὰ ῥυστάζεσκεν – this action did nothing to fill the void caused by Patroklos' death. Although such behavior is irrational, the poem shows the inherent potency in grief-longing to generate insatiate activity, including actions of anger.[170]

This question of purpose is two-fold. Insofar as Achilles' anger is rooted in ποθή-grief, we should not only ask whether his deeds of anger effectively ease that grief, but if they are the kind of deeds whose ends correspond to what is longed for by that motivating emotion. In order to understand better this relationship between the aim of anger and the underlying ποθή-grief, we need to look broadly at the function or purpose of all the activities that are spawned by grief's insatiety. We have seen that the void created by death leaves the bereaved in a state both volatile and insatiable, as he longs for what he can never have. Thus both the inactivity and the activity that arise from grief share a similar restless aimlessness.[171] For example, in scenes of abundant weeping and other mourning rituals, we see attempts to approximate the deceased's presence, but the underlying reality of ποθή also reminds us of the inherent limits in these approximations. This failure of abundant

---

[170] Cf. Segal (1971a), who thinks Apollo's condemnation of Achilles' behavior in Book 24, κωφὴν γὰρ δὴ γαῖαν ἀεικίζει μενεαίνων ("for he savages the dumb earth in his raging," 24.54), passes judgment on the "irrational savagery of Achilles' attempt to vent his passion on a corpse," 59.

[171] Thus the simple dichotomy between grief as a passive state and anger as an active one (suggested, for example, in Slatkin (1991), 91-93) can blur the likeness between deeds of anger and more passive responses to grief, such as motionless weeping: both are motivated by a desire for what cannot be achieved, and both reflect that impossibility in their outcome.

mourning to address the longing that drives it not only reveals its inefficacy, but also a degree of underlying aimlessness, since the griever knows these substitute activities will not in fact accomplish what he really wants. In the same way, the anger of longing is driven not by the rational pursuit of some end, but by the insatiety of absence, and it too fails to assuage the grief. Just as the horses' longing for the dead Patroklos so disoriented them that they were literally going nowhere, the various actions born of grief lack any true orientation and thus are potentially endless.[172]

Further examples of Achilles' varied responses to grief will reinforce this picture of underlying aimlessness. One such example can be seen at the end of Achilles' lament after the lion simile. Having moved from grief and longing to his first vengeful threats against the life of Hektor and the twelve Trojan youths, Achilles then makes a further promise:

> τόφρα δέ μοι παρὰ νηυσὶ κορωνίσι κείσεαι αὔτως,
> ἀμφὶ δέ σε Τρωιαὶ καὶ Δαρδανίδες βαθύκολποι
> κλαύσονται νύκτας τε καὶ ἤματα δάκρυ χέουσαι,
> τὰς αὐτοὶ καμόμεσθα βίηφί τε δουρί τε μακρῶι
> πιείρας πέρθοντε πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων. (18.338-342)

> But I declare, so long as you lie thus by the curved ships,

172 One suggestive example of this underlying aimlessness can be seen in the range of passive to active verbs within the single image of befoulment linked to Patroklos' death. We saw earlier that at the moment of Patroklos' death, Achilles' helmet is stained in the dust (16.794-799); one book later, this same death causes Patroklos' horses to let their manes be stained (17.439) and then, in Book 18, Achilles to befoul himself: τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα./ ἀμφοτέρῃσι δὲ χερσὶν ἑλὼν κόνιν αἰθαλόεσσαν/ χεύατο κὰκ κεφαλῆς, χαρίεν δ' ἤισχυνε πρόσωπον·/ νεκταρέωι δὲ χιτῶνι μέλαιν' ἀμφίζανε τέφρη ("But a black cloud of grief enveloped him. And grabbing smoky dust with both hands he poured it over his head, and he disfigured his lovely face; and black ashes settled around his fragrant tunic," 18.22-24). This movement from passive to middle to active verbs in a single image – the armor being defiled, the horses letting their manes be defiled, Achilles defiling himself – points to a range in grief's manifestations, from a defiling that is endured to one that is sought. In the lens of ποθή this range makes perfect sense: if an unfillable void directs one's behavior, one could easily alternate between living out that void in inactivity and aimlessly acting as if to fill it.

> around you also will weep Trojan and Dardanian women, whose robes fall in deep folds over their chest, and they will weep for you day and night, shedding tears, those women whom we two toiled hard to capture by force and the long spear when we were sacking the rich cities of mortal men.

Here we have a new type of grief-driven action: not personal weeping, not vengeance, but enforcing that Patroklos will be wept for, day and night, by women whom they captured together. Achilles' description of these women makes them almost symbolic of the shared life he has lost: they are the ones who are the fruit of Achilles' and Patroklos' common effort, the mutuality which he emphasizes by the dual verb καμόμεσθα (18.341) and dual participle πέρθοντε (18.342).[173] Together with this attempt to approximate the lost shared life by having its representatives lament it, we see familiar markers of relentlessness, here in the ceaselessness of weeping "day and night" (18.340), as well as that expansive impulse to have others partake in his mourning for Patroklos. This promise, riding on the tail end of his threat of vengeance in a speech full of longing, puts his anger in a larger context. All of his varied responses to grief are motivated by the underlying longing for Patroklos, and all will fail to satisfy that longing. This range points to the volatility of grief, his inner world of aimless restlessness.

A further indicator of pointlessness can be seen in the desire to mourn (ἵμερος γόοιο), a phrase used exclusively to describe lament for Patroklos. The significance of this concept, desiring lament, emerges when we look at the reasons mourners give for their

[173] The lament of Gilgamesh for Enkidu shows a similar desire for representatives of that formerly shared life to perpetuate his own cry of grief: he calls on the roads to the Cedar Forest and the trees of that forest, where they defeated Huwawa, to lament Enkidu; the men of the city who saw them defeat the Bull of Heaven; the rivers on whose banks the two men used to walk; and so on; Tablet VIII.7-28. This combination of expansiveness, calling on the whole world to grieve, and yet repeated focus on the rupture caused by death again points us to the insatiable longing that makes grief volatile.

lamentation. When Achilles bids his men to delay their dinner in order to weep for Patroklos, at the beginning of Book 23, he calls such lament the γέρας θανόντων, the gift of honor for the dead, and claims that the Myrmidons will find delight in performing this "destructive lament," ὀλοοῖο τεταρπώμεσθα γόοιο (23.9-10). Achilles repeats this claim when Patroklos' shade appears to him that night, begging the shade to draw close so that, embracing one another, "ὀλοοῖο τεταρπώμεσθα γόοιο" (23.98). The concepts of pleasure, τέρψις, and lament could seem to be at odds with one another;[174] yet we see that in honoring the dead, Achilles seeks a likeness of what was shared in life, mutual honor. Achilles characterizes his friendship with Patroklos thus in his first words after learning of Patroklos' death: φίλος ὤλεθ' ἑταῖρος,/ Πάτροκλος, τὸν ἐγὼ περὶ πάντων τῖον ἑταίρων/ ἶσον ἐμῆι κεφαλῆι[·] τὸν ἀπώλεσα ("my dear companion has died, Patroklos, whom I honored beyond all my companions, equal to my own life; him I have lost," 18.80-82). Patroklos reciprocates Achilles' affection through honor as well, as we see when he stirs the Myrmidons to battle, ὡς ἂν Πηλεΐδην τιμήσομεν ("so we may honor the son of Peleus," 16.271).[175] Such is the mutual honor Achilles seeks to replicate in offering Patroklos

[174] Cf. Tsagalis (2004a), 174-177. Latacz (1966) distinguishes the positive satisfaction denoted by a-stems of the verb τέρπομαι and the mere satiety denoted by the verbs κορέσσασθαι and ἄσαι, 174-219.

[175] Muellner (1996), 134, uses this speech, 16.269-274, to argue for identity and solidarity between Achilles, Patroklos, and the *philoi* whom they lead; cf. Muellner on the interdependence of friendship (*philotes*) and honor in epic society, 149. For other references to honor in friendships, see, e.g., Sthenelos giving a pair of horses to Deipylos: δῶκε δὲ Δηϊπύλωι, ἑτάρωι φίλωι, ὃν περὶ πάσης/ τῖεν ὁμηλικίης, ὅτι οἱ φρεσὶν ἄρτια εἴδη,/ ("and he gave them to Deipylos, his beloved companion, whom he honored beyond all his peers, because he understood thoughts closely joined to his," 5.325-326); and Hektor's grief for Podes (τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα, 17.591) whom the narrator introduces as a special friend: ἔσκε δ' ἐνὶ Τρώεσσι Ποδῆς, υἱὸς Ἠετίωνος,/ ἀφνειός τ' ἀγαθός τε, μάλιστα δέ μιν τίεν Ἕκτωρ/ δήμου, ἐπεί οἱ ἑταῖρος ἔην φίλος εἰλαπιναστής· ("There was among the Trojans a man Podes, son of Eetion, a man both rich and noble, and Hektor

his γέρας θανόντων. By extension, too, when the Myrmidons honor Patroklos with a triple circuit of abundant tears, they affirm his value to them as warriors and thus maintain a shadow of the life they shared as fighters under Achilles.[176]

Moreover, the promise for satisfaction or even delight in lamenting the deceased Patroklos suggests that mourning itself somehow approximates the presence of the deceased, since his absence creates the pain of grief. This approximation is suggested in this paradoxical reality that mourners can desire to grieve, captured by the five appearances of ἵμερος γόοιο, in varied form, to describe Achilles and his fellow Achaians' response to Patroklos' death. As with ποθή, this linguistic confinement of ἵμερος γόοιο to Achilles and his fellow companions underscores the poem's attentiveness to the dynamics of Achilles' grief.[177] The first three appearances of this phrase serve to illustrate the insatiety that drives this weeping as much as the deeds of anger.[178] When Achilles urges his men to take their delight in the destructive lament for Patroklos, at the beginning of Book 23, Thetis stirs up

---

honored him above all his people, since he was his beloved companion who shared his table," 17.575-577). For references to special friendship on the battlefield, see Fenik (1968), 184.

[176] Cf. Holst-Warhaft (1992), 103, on lament linked with burial as a necessary part of the *geras thanonton* in Homer. In Book 4 of the *Odyssey*, Peisistratos links ἵμερος γόοιο and γέρας for the dead, when Menelaos' memories of Odysseus stir up in him, Helen, Telemachos, and Peisistratos a desire for weeping (τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ὑφ' ἵμερον ὦρσε γόοιο, *Od.* 4.183). Peisistratos begs for an end of weeping during supper, which he declares unpleasant (οὐ γὰρ ἐγώ γε/ τέρπομ' ὀδυρόμενος μεταδόρπιος, 4.193-194), although he judges no man wrong for such weeping, since this alone is the γέρας for wretched mortals, to cut a lock of hair and cast down a tear from our cheeks (τοῦτό νυ καὶ γέρας οἶον ὀϊζυροῖσι βροτοῖσι,/ κείρασθαί τε κόμην βαλέειν τ' ἀπὸ δάκρυ παρειῶν, 4.197-198).

[177] Andromache stirs up in her maids a γόος itself, without reference to the *desire*: τῇσιν δὲ γόον πάσῃσιν ἐνῶρσεν (6.499); likewise Hekabe's funeral lament for Hektor stirs up everlasting lament: γόον δ' ἀλίαστον ὄρινεν (24.760). In an example much closer to the Greek ἵμερος γόοιο, Priam imagines dying with his son's body in his arms, ἐπὴν γόου ἐξ ἔρον εἵην (24.227), a variant of the formula for having one's fill of a meal. Priam's echo of the concept points to the potential for any grief to have the characteristics of ποθή, despite the poem's focus on Achilles.

[178] The other two appearances of this phrase, at 24.507 and 24.513-514, will be discussed in Chapter Three in the context of Achilles' release of Hektor's body.

in the Myrmidons a desire for weeping (μετὰ δέ σφι Θέτις γόου ἵμερον ὦρσεν, 23.14). Early the next morning Achilles' narration of his encounter with Patroklos' shade stirs up in the Myrmidons the same desire (τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ὑφ' ἵμερον ὦρσε γόοιο, 23.108), as does his later speech to Spercheios declaring that his father's prayer for his safe homecoming was void, followed by giving Patroklos the lock of his hair formerly dedicated to that river:[179] ὣς εἰπὼν ἐν χερσὶ κόμην ἑτάροιο φίλοιο/ θῆκεν, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ὑφ' ἵμερον ὦρσε γόοιο (23.152-153). The desire for weeping is matched by the abundance of tears in these three weeping scenes. Just as in the first scene the Myrmidons' tears were so plentiful that the sand and armor were soaked (23.15-16), in the latter scenes, the crying goes on so long that, first, the sun rises on their weeping (23.109), and then mid-funeral the sun would have set on their weeping had Achilles not intervened to let the funeral continue (23.154-155). How can potentially interminable γόος, the lamentation born of loss, be something desired in this context?

Gail Holst-Warhaft offers one explanation of why weeping might be desirable when she observes that γόοι in the *Iliad* focus on the desire of the survivor to communicate with the deceased through praise or blame.[180] Death has ruptured a social fabric, and by speaking to the deceased that intercourse is partially restored. Holst-Warhaft identifies the

---

179 Locks of hair, wine, oil, and food are traditional offerings made to the dead; cf. Alexiou (2002, orig. 1974), 7-8; Holst-Warhaft (1992), 104. In Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers* 6-7, Orestes offers two locks of hair to the river-god, Inachus, before the tomb of his father, as θρεπτήριον (requital for care) and as πενθητήριον (token of grief). Nagy (2013) sees Achilles' hair-cutting as signaling the move from pre-adult to adult status, into which Achilles enters prematurely after the death of his friend, 403. On the anomalous nature of some of Achilles' actions during the funeral (e.g., his choice of sacrificial victims – humans, dogs, horses), see Derderian (2001), 54, Garland (1982), 72, and Schnapp-Gourbeillon (1982), 80-83.

180 Holst-Warhaft (1992), 124.

perpetuation of memory as essential to this restorative function of lament.[181] Tsagalis notes that with both the Myrmidons and Patroklos' shade, Achilles' invitation to take delight in wretched lament (ὀλοοῖο τεταρπώμεσθα γόοιο, 23.10, 98) is preceded by an exhortation to draw closer (ἆσσον ἰόντες at 23.8, ἆσσον στῆθι at 23.97), which Tsagalis suggests indicates the closeness of the two friends and the function of lament as a substitution for their living bond. Thus such lament can be a source of delight since it mimics the closeness between the two men.[182] Pucci too notes a kind of imitation of life in these laments. Although they convey a sense of rupture, insofar as they address the deceased as if to engage in a dialogue, which is now impossible,[183] nevertheless, by so addressing the deceased, the laments give a kind of "immortal continuity" to the living presence of the deceased. Thus through the fiction of conversation and the memories of life, the lament partially restores the shared present that is no longer possible.[184] This partial restoration through fictive dialogue and memory can shed light on why Achilles and his men might desire to weep and hope to find satisfaction in lament.

Aristotle gives importance to the role of memory in his discussion of this Homeric phrase. He argues in *Rhetoric* 1370a-b that we can only desire what is pleasant. Whatever pleases us also gives pleasure when we remember it or hope for it, since through memory and hope a likeness of the thing is present. Thus, Aristotle argues, those who grieve find some pleasure in mourning, because the act of mourning brings with it memories of the deceased, and those memories are pleasant insofar as they approximate the deceased's

---

181 *Ibid.*, 35.
182 Tsagalis (2004a), 175.
183 But note the increased speech between Achilles and Patroklos *after* Patroklos' death, discussed in Chapter Three, p. 113.
184 Pucci (1993), 260 and 263.

presence. Aristotle likens the experience of the bereaved to separated lovers. Lovers, he observes, enjoy doing things that have to do with the loved one, such as talking or writing about him; despite the pain of the loved one's absence, there is pleasure in making him present, as it were, through memory and hope. In an analogous way, for the bereaved, mourning can be desirable, since in spite of the pain caused by the beloved's absence, there is pleasure in making him present through memory. For this reason, Aristotle says, Homer spoke rightly, "So he spoke, and stirred up in all of them the desire for weeping."[185]

Aristotle's interpretation of this phrase accords with the dynamics of ποθή as we have traced them throughout the poem. In grief, one longs for a missing presence, and in weeping, one achieves a shadow of that presence. It seems no accident that grief and love are likened in Aristotle when he examines the meaning of desire to mourn. In Achilles' companionship with Patroklos, as we saw in Chapter 1, the two men shared their life extensively, as brothers, mutual advisors and teachers, and comrades-in-arms, such that when Patroklos dies, Achilles laments the one whom he honored equal to himself (18.82, cf. above). The attempt to honor Patroklos in death allows Achilles to regain some measure of his presence. Yet the pleasure in such activity is limited. Memory clearly does not achieve the full presence that is longed for. Nor does the deceased truly receive the honor proffered by the survivor. Pucci's observation of the paradox built into the γόος's apostrophe to the dead highlights these limitations: the speaker addresses the dead man as if to engage in true dialogue, which would be to deny the reality of death, and at the same time he speaks of the

---

[185] Muellner (1996) makes a somewhat similar comparison when he likens love and lament, noting that the phrase ἵμερος γόοιο parallels the expression of sexual desire (ἵμερος) for φιλότης (3.129, 14.198), 164n60. He argues that both love and lament are social realities which bind people together: "in the Homeric world, no one grieves alone," 164.

painful irreversibility of death.[186] Such fictive dialogue fails to achieve the restoration that it seeks and knows it must fail. Thus the approximation itself reiterates the reality of grief, a gaping void that cannot be filled, within which longing must be potentially endless.[187]

Aimless Anger

This ultimate failure of prolonged weeping to address the longing that drives it helps us to understand the nature of the anger that arises from that same longing. Although on one narrative level Achilles' anger is highly focused on Hektor and Troy and succeeds in destroying both, the poem simultaneously tells a story of futility. Just as the consuming desire to weep does not assuage the ποθή that drives it, the various deeds of anger and vengeance fail to restore the loved one's presence. This failure is rooted in, so to speak, a displacement of ends: what Achilles longs for, life shared with Patroklos, is not what he aims at in his weeping or his killing. Thus Schein is wrong to suggest that Achilles' relentless killing is "personally productive" for Achilles, despite the fact that, objectively, it brings only destruction.[188] Achilles' grief-driven deeds achieve nothing to ease his personal pain, and the

---

[186] Pucci (1993), 260 and 263. The speech between the shade of Patroklos and Achilles in Book 23 breaks this norm of fiction, but still highlights the separation and rupture caused by death, since in life they were able to communicate without dialogue. See discussion, p. 113.

[187] Cf. 24.227, noted above, where Priam claims that weeping over Hektor's body will assuage his desire for weeping, which he expresses with a variant of the formula for having one's fill of a meal, ἐπὴν γόου ἐξ ἔρον εἵην. Although Priam's grief is never explicitly described as rooted in longing, we shall see that his is the most parallel to Achilles', with random outbursts of anger and signs of insatiety.

[188] Schein (1984), 146. In this section Schein is observing the twofold significance of the metaphor applied to Achilles' slaughter, 20.495-503, that of threshing barley underfoot: threshing is an activity essential for life, but applied to Achilles' relentless killing it evokes destruction, 145-147. Cf. also Nagler (1974), 147; King (1987), 24. Harris (2001) argues against a cathartic function of anger, 414; his work concerns anger itself, without reference to grief.

Iliad as a whole explores the volatile origins of such an attempt and its uselessness.[189] The fruitlessness of vengeance born of grief distinguishes such anger from anger in the strict Aristotelian sense, in which one responds to an undeserved slight and seeks to reverse the wrong.[190] Thus Konstan rightly modifies Oliver Taplin's claim that Achilles' anger in the last seven books of the *Iliad* remains unchanged in substance but is merely transferred to a new object; rather, as Konstan argues, Achilles' new grief-filled wrath is a much broader emotion than the first anger which responded to a wrong Achilles could hope to undo.[191] Perpetuated by an unsatisfiable desire for the loved one's presence, the vengeance of Achilles has a displaced end, as do all of the actions shaped by his grief.[192]

---

[189] One is reminded of Odysseus' suggestive metaphor in which he seems to say that fighting itself is profitless: αἶψά τε φυλόπιδος πέλεται κόρος ἀνθρώποισιν/ ἧς τε πλείστην μὲν καλάμην χθονὶ χαλκὸς ἔχευεν,/ ἀμητὸς δ' ὀλίγιστος ("Immediately men are sated with war, the husks of which bronze pours out plentifully on the ground, but there is very little harvest," 19.221-223). For a discussion of the metaphor, see Edwards (1991), *ad loc.*

[190] Aristotle *Rh.* 1378a-b (cited above). See, for example, his claim, οὐδεὶς δὲ τῶν φαινομένων ἀδυνάτων ἐφίεται αὑτῷ, ὁ δ᾽ ὀργιζόμενος ἐφίεται δυνατῶν αὑτῷ ("And no one aims at things that are manifestly impossible for himself, but the angered man aims at things he can accomplish," 1378b3-5).

[191] Konstan (2006), 42-55; *contra* Taplin (1992), 20, 193-202. Harris (2001), like Taplin, suggests that the fury against Hektor is the same as his initial anger, only with a new object, 133; cf. Bowra (1930), 17-22, esp. 20; Kullmann (2001, orig. 1968), 386; and Schadewaldt (1966), 156, and (1965), 187 and 340-8, esp. 343; in 181-5, he notes the distinct motives, honor and grief, in these two angers without fully distinguishing them. Frazer (1993) too, although purporting to distinguish between the two angers (which he calls the "wrath" and the "vengeance"), in fact only distinguishes between their objects, and not their actual substance or type, 29; cf. 13 and 259. In contrast, see ΣbT *ad* 18.112-13 and ΣA *ad* 18.113 (where Achilles declares that he will let his anger with Agamemnon be, though he is grieved, subduing his dear heart in his breast because of necessity), who say that of the two emotions here besetting Achilles', ὀργή and λύπη, the λύπη for Patroklos wins out; bT specify that such λύπη entails vengeance. Cf. bT's attribution of λύπη at 24.3-4.

[192] Cf. Van Nortwick (1996), who notes that in contemporary psychology, anger is a secondary emotion, generated by some other emotion that is not expressed, 65. For Van Nortwick, Achilles' anger is a response to his self-imposed alienation from the humane part of himself, represented by Patroklos, 66. Cf. Schein (1984), 128-163. Doubtless some truth lies in this reading of the *Iliad*, but I think the poem explores the even simpler (and more powerful) emotional dynamic that we have been following, the displaced energy of grief-longing and its consequences.

Some scholars suggest that action allows men to achieve something in the midst of their grief, a move impossible for women.[193] Katharine Derderian proposes two such ends that Achilles can achieve through vengeance: he can continue the action of the deceased Patroklos through his own action, and he can also achieve personal *kleos*.[194] This possibility of turning grief into action places Achilles' grief within the general frame of male ἄχος, which Derderian notes is the term used by the poem, together with its participial form ἀχνύμενος, to designate such action-oriented grief.[195] Thus at 13.403, Deiphobus, ἀχνύμενος for Asios, approaches his slayer to strike him down; at 13.581, ἄχος takes Menelaos at the death of Deipyros and he approaches Helenos, threatening and brandishing his sharp spear; at 16.581-585 Patroklos experiences ἄχος for his deceased companion, and in a counterattack explicitly associated with anger – ὣς ἰθὺς Λυκίων, Πατρόκλεις ἱπποκέλευθε,/ ἔσσυο καὶ Τρώων, κεχόλωσο δὲ κῆρ ἑτάροιο (16.584-585) – he is compared to a pursuing hawk which puts lesser birds to flight; and in the lion simile, discussed above, the grief which turns to pursuit is designated with the finite verb form,

---

193 Derderian (2001), 52-62; Tsagalis (2004b), 13; Monsacré (1984), 201. Murnaghan (1999), 221, argues that Achilles' status as a male warrior requires him to turn his grief into action. I would argue that such scholarship, when it focuses on the disparity between male and female grief, bypasses an intrinsic truth about grief and anger which the poem explores, namely, that anger fails to redress the grief that drives it.

194 Derderian (2001): Achilles "incorporates a singular assertion of male activity into the female genre by performing a lament that functions as a threat and thus forms a bridge between the end of Patroclus' action and Achilles' own attainment of κλέος in returning to battle to avenge him," 60-61.

195 The only mortal women in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* whose grief is described with a form of ἄχος are Helen (*Il.* 24.773, ἀχνυμένη κῆρ) and Penelope (four times: *Od.* 4.716, 18.256, 18.274, and 19.129), which Derderian (2001) attributes to their greater association with male agency as cause of the war and head of the household, respectively, 18n6. Hera also feels ἄχος at the wounding of Achaian warriors by Ares, *Il.* 5.759.

ἄχνυται (18.320), and likewise ends in χόλος (18.322).[196] These action-oriented ἄχος scenes again point us to the phenomenon of grief turning to anger, although these scenes lack any explicit description of what such anger hopes to achieve; yet, when Derderian frames such ἄχος-deeds as means of "resolving" grief,[197] she fails to see disparity in the larger narrative between the ends achieved by such killing and the ποθή quality discernible in Achilles' ἄχος. Achilles' turn to vengeance is certainly motivated both by a personal sense of honor and by his desire properly to honor his friend: we can see this motivation, for example, when he declares his intent to fight until he has killed Hektor and focuses on the despoiled armor: "I have no desire to live," he says, αἴ κε μὴ Ἕκτωρ/ πρῶτος ἐμῶι ὑπὸ δουρὶ τυπεὶς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσηι/ Πατρόκλοιο δ' ἕλωρα Μενοιτιάδεω ἀποτείσηι ("unless first Hektor, beaten beneath my spear, loses his life and repays the despoiling of Patroklos, son of Menoitios," 18.91-93). This focus on recovering the armor as a form of recompense (ἀποτείσηι) channels Achilles' anger to an achievable end, as does his later declaration that, even though it brings his death, he goes now to win noble glory (νῦν δὲ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀροίμην, 18.121).[198] But these achievable ends do not map onto the yearning for his shared life with Patroklos, and this longing is what drives him. The insatiety in Achilles' anger,

---

196 For Derderian's discussion of ἄχνυσθαι, see (2001), 17-22.; cf. *ibid.*, 40-41 on the acceptable male lament, which, having been either overcome or interrupted, is then "translated" into revenge or further fighting.

197 *Ibid.*, 19.

198 In the earlier part of Achilles' speech he carefully narrates first the excellence of the armor – huge, a wonder to behold – and then the history of it being given to his father as a wedding gift from the gods (18.83-85). Although this reminiscence leads to an outburst against his mortal nature, it also serves to tie the armor to Achilles as well as Patroklos, and frames the despoiling as an indignity even more. Silk (2004), with others, notes that his re-entry marks his decision to die at Troy, as both Thetis (18.95-96) and Achilles (18.98, 115-16, 120-121) interpret it, 81; cf. Bassett (1933), 58; Vivante (1970), 57-59; etc.

which persists well beyond his duel with Hektor, illuminates a narrative fact of the poem: killing Hektor does not ease Achilles' grief. The killing is a manifestation of the insatiety of grief-longing, not its cure.

Holst-Warhaft sees anger as a way to move from pain to action, and thereby to give structure to the pain. She sees in lament an attempt to achieve order and control, not only through the ritual action of the lament, but also in the assignment of blame for a death. Once blame has been assigned, pain can shift to anger and often to action.[199] Thus the bereaved do not seek vengeance as if to reverse the death of the beloved, but in order to find some stability in pain. This explanation of the turn to vengeance makes sense in theory, but it does not conform to the patterns that we see in the *Iliad*. As we saw above, in Achilles' insatiate anger there is no single object. He resorts to a range of vengeful activities, from the indiscriminate slaughter of Trojans in the river[200] to the slaughter of twelve Trojan youths on Patroklos' funeral pyre,[201] and despite his fury against Hektor he seems also to blame himself for the death of his friend.[202] We see a parallel example of such displaced anger when Priam, grieved by the death of his son Hektor, lashes out at his surviving sons, as if angry with them

---

[199] Holst-Warhaft (1992), 73. Cf. Van Nortwick (1996) who, looking at the *Iliad* through the lens of contemporary psychology, calls anger a "tool for self-motivation," which gets us past interior hindrances to action, 65.
[200] 21.7-26; cf. also his "die all" oath over the corpse of Lycaon, 21.122-135, where he promises, in quite bloody terms, that all will pay for the death of Patroklos and the slaughter of the Achaians.
[201] Their capture, 21.27-32; their slaughter, 23.175-177.
[202] Cf. his strong self-deprecation after he learns of Patroklos' death: οὐδέ τι Πατρόκλωι γενόμην φάος οὐδ' ἑτάροισιν/ τοῖς ἄλλοις […],/ ἀλλ' ἧμαι παρὰ νηυσὶν ἐτώσιον ἄχθος ἀρούρης ("Neither was I any light at all for Patroklos nor for my other companions […], but I sit by the ships, a useless burden on the earth," 18.102-104). Gaca (2008) argues that his anger displaces regret for ignoring the need he recognized in Book 16, when Patroklos came crying to him; thus although he directs his rage against Hektor, his grief is implacable because it is rooted in knowledge of his fault, 163-4.

for not being Hektor.[203] Such anger has no single blame object, but rather is rooted in the volatility of grief-longing. One could also see Achilles' aimlessness as a form of avoiding the underlying pain.[204] The persisting frame of ποθή, however, grounds a theory of avoidance in the more comprehensive reality that drives such anger, the yearning for an irrecoverable wholeness that is both painful and potentially endless.

In the next chapter we shall turn to two narrative consequences of this anger, which map onto Achilles' tension between his mortal and immortal sides. First is the symbolic sack of Troy. The potentially endless yearning for Patroklos drives Achilles' anger to a heightened scale, on which, unbeknownst to him, he operates as an accomplice of Zeus for the ultimate fall of the city. Although killing Hektor does not assuage his grief for Patroklos, in this section of the poem, in which Achilles is elevated to a quasi-divine status, the warrior acts with relentless focus. Yet after the death of Hektor and the symbolic sack of Troy, although he descends from these daimonic heights, his relentlessness persists in cyclic futility. We shall see that in the narrative of the poem, ultimately all Achilles can do with his grief-anger is to

---

203 σπεύσατέ μοι, κακὰ τέκνα, κατηφόνες. αἴθ' ἅμα πάντες/ Ἕκτορος ὠφέλετ' ἀντὶ θοῇς ἐπὶ νηυσὶ πεφάσθαι./ ὤι μοι ἐγὼ πανάποτμος, ἐπεὶ τέκον υἷας ἀρίστους/[…]./ τοὺς μὲν ἀπώλεσ' ἄρης, τὰ δ' ἐλέγχεα πάντα λέλειπται […] ("Hurry up, evil children, my disgraces. If only all of you had perished together in place of Hektor, by the swift ships. Ah me, I am entirely ill-fated, since I gave birth to the best sons […], and these war killed, and all that are left for me are these disgraces […]," 24.253-255, 260). This scene follows one in which Priam sits covered in dung, surrounded by his family, all weeping for Hektor (24.160-168), and this immobile grief gives way to anger with the Trojans, whom he drives off with a stick, and with his nine sons, whom he curses (24.237-264). We perhaps see a shadow of such displacement in Fenik's observation (1968) that when a companion is slain in battle, often the bereaved warrior randomly slays other enemies, instead of the enemy who killed his friend, 57, 71, and 177.

204 Chapman's translation at 24.12 perhaps points to this psychological phenomenon: "Rage varied his distraction […]" (Chapman's numbering). On anger and pain, cf. Konstan (2006), 41-55 (discussed above, pp. 58-59), and ΣbT *ad* 18.112-13, who say that having left behind μῆνις Achilles must act on λύπη, the stronger emotion because it concerns Patroklos; and λύπη entails τιμωρήσασθαι τοὺς πολεμίους.

let it go. This conclusion to the narrative of Achilles' grief and anger will point us to an essential limiting condition on his elevation to divine status during this period of battle fury: at its core, the unquenchable desire to recover what he lost with Patroklos' death is itself a moderating force, a desire for life shared with a fellow mortal. This desire for shared human goods at the root of his relentless anger is an essential condition for his release of the body, and with it, his insatiety.

Chapter Three: Narrative Consequences of ποθή-driven Anger

In Chapter Two we established that Achilles' anger is rooted in the endless and restless response to a ruptured shared life, and thus shares with all of his responses to grief the same insatiety and aimlessness. Now we shall turn to the narrative consequences of his anger. We best account for the magnitude, volatility, and persistence of Achilles' anger, as well as the manner of its ultimate release, when we read these narrative threads in light of their roots in ποθή.

Insatiate Anger and the Sack of Troy

Scully has persuasively argued that the *Iliad* tells two complementary stories. The story of Achilles tells of how a single man becomes the force that can sack a city, while the story of Hektor tells of how the fall of a city comes about through the death of one man.[205] Both are stories of grief, on some level, and in complementary ways. Hektor's death causes great grief, whereas Achilles' rise to daimonic fury is generated by grief. Yet only in Achilles' story does Homer explore in depth the effects of the volatility and insatiety that are potential in other grief stories. The correct understanding of Achilles' grief-driven anger is crucial to

[205] Scully (1990), 114-127. Cf. ΣT *ad* 12.9-12, who sees the interweaving of Hektor and Achilles around the life of the city as a pithy summary of the *Iliad*, as well as a foreshadowing of what will come: ἐν βραχεῖ τὸ κεφάλαιον τῆς συγγραφῆς ἐξέθετο. ἅμα δὲ δείκνυσιν ὅτι δύο πρόσωπά ἐστι τὰ συνέχοντα τὴν Ἰλιάδα, καὶ παρεδήλωσέ τι τῶν ὕστερον ὅτι μετὰ τὴν Ἀχιλλέως μῆνιν οὔτε Ἕκτωρ ἐβίω, εὐθέως δὲ καὶ ἡ Ἴλιος ἐλήφθη ("In brief he lays out the summary of the narrative. And at the same time he shows that two persons hold the *Iliad* together, and he intimates what will come after these things, that after the anger of Achilles Hektor will not live, and immediately too Troy will be taken"). Along the same lines, see Redfield (1975): "In some sense the story of the Iliad is the story of the relation between these two heroes," 27.

our understanding of the register on which he operates from Books 18-22 and of his final release of his anger in Book 24.

One might posit several reasons why Achilles' anger in the last fourth of the poem is so vast. One argument could be driven by character. Achilles is an intensely tempestuous hero, who was willing to pray for his fellow Achaians to perish so that the army would realize how much they need him;[206] and one might argue that this tendency to extremes accounts for the magnitude of Achilles' anger in Books 18-24.[207] Certainly Achilles is prone to extremes and this capacity contributes to the scale on which he responds to Patroklos' death, but the narrative invites us to see a qualitative difference between this second anger and his initial anger with Agamemnon. After Patroklos dies, Achilles is newly indifferent to the original causes of the quarrel.[208] In this stage of the poem, Achilles' new anger coincides with a cosmic shift in his mortal and immortal dimensions, in which he becomes repeatedly associated with the divine in ways unparalleled in the earlier part of the poem, as I will show. Moreover, as we have seen, this grief-driven anger is far more aimless than the initial anger against the Achaian commander, betokening a pervasive restlessness that can only properly be understood in light of the ποθή that drives it. In other words, the vastness of Achilles'

---

[206] Cf. 1.239-244 (Achilles' original threat that ποθή for Achilles will come to the sons of the Achaians); 1.408-412 (his instructions to Thetis that she ask this of Zeus); 15.74-77 (Zeus referring to Achilles' prayer); 16.236-237 (Achilles' reference to his own prayer); 18.74-77 (Thetis reminding Achilles that he prayed for this to happen). On the intensity of Achilles' character, see, e.g., Vivante (1970), 53ff.
[207] Cf. Segal (1971a), on the potential of Achilles' "passionate nature" to take the destructiveness of war to its furthest extreme, 16; cf. 39, "his violence and hatred should be commensurate with his *arete*." See too Schadewaldt (1965) on Achilles as the Homeric figure "schmerzensreichste (richest in pain)" throughout the poem, 336.
[208] This indifference is notable throughout the reconciliation with Agamemnon in Book 19, but particularly in Achilles' utter indifference to Briseis or gifts of honor (cf. 19.56-60, 19.146-148, 19.243-303); in this last passage, when Briseis is returned to Achilles together with gifts of honor, Achilles neither speaks to her nor acknowledges her presence in any way.

second anger, evident in his semi-divine associations, is not reducible to his character alone, but also depends on the nature of his grief.[209] A second possible reason for the grand scale of this new stage of anger could be found in the intervention of the gods, primarily seen in the gift of new, fully divine armor, to replace the armor given to his mortal father, Peleus, at his marriage to the Thetis;[210] and in Zeus sending Athena to nourish him with nectar and ambrosia (19.340-356). The gods certainly play a central role in Achilles' transition from mortal hero to the semi-divine sacker of Troy, yet their intervention gives cosmic scope to a human reality, which they themselves do not provoke: Achilles' anger is rooted in the restless, insatiate longing stirred up by the irreparable rupture of his former life.[211]

Several episodes of Book 19 illuminate the new register on which Achilles operates after Patroklos dies, a register marked by close ties to the divine, frequent indicators of new intensity and magnitude, and that omnipresent degree of indeterminacy that qualifies his anger and reminds us of its roots in grief. One detail that points to this shift in register is the different language describing his call to assembly in Books 1 and 19. In Book 1, after nine days of plague and Achaian deaths, Achilles summons an assembly: τῆι δεκάτηι δ' ἀγορήνδε καλέσσατο λαὸν Ἀχιλλεύς· ("and on the tenth day, Achilles summoned the

---

209 Van der Valk (1966) approaches this argument when he attributes the extremity of Achilles' emotions to the intensity of his friendship with Patroklos, 7-8; cf. Schadewaldt's claim (1965) that Achilles' deeds of vengeance convey not the implacability of vengeance but rather the immeasurability ("Unermesslichkeit") of his grief for his friend, 180.

210 Achilles describes the lost Pelian armor at 18.82-85; Thetis insists on bringing him new armor from Hephaistos before he returns to battle, 18.130-137; she begs the god for this armor, which he gladly makes, 18.457-614; when Achilles arms himself in the divine armor (θεοῦ […] δῶρα, at 19.3, 19.18, cf. 19.368), the armor lifts him like wings (τῶι δ' εὖτε πτερὰ γίνετ', ἄειρε δὲ ποιμένα λαῶν, 19.386).

211 Schein (1984) attributes the large scale of action in this section of the poem to Achilles' alienation from his human self, manifest both in his symbolic death and ties to the divine, 128-163. Such attribution describes what happens to Achilles without accounting for why: his loss of his mortal self in Patroklos' death has specific insatiate qualities that stem from the nature of his grief.

army to an assembly," 1.54); and the assembly gathers: οἳ δ᾽ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ᾽ ἐγένοντο,/ τοῖσι δ᾽ ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς· ("and when they assembled and were all gathered together, standing up in their midst swift-footed Achilles addressed them," 1.57-58). We can contrast the straightforward language of this gathering with the fiery yelling that characterizes Achilles' second summoning of the Achaians in Book 19. In the throes of grief and anger and newly endowed with divine armor, Achilles heeds his mother's advice to call an assembly: αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ παρὰ θῖνα θαλάσσης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς/ σμερδαλέα ἰάχων, ὦρσεν δ᾽ ἥρωας Ἀχαιούς ("So godlike Achilles strode along the shore of the sea, shouting terribly, and he bestirred the Achaian heroes," 19.40-41). The language of calling to assembly, ἀγορήνδε καλέσσατο (1.54),[212] is gone, replaced with an awe-inspiring yelling that stirs the Achaian heroes.[213] We sense the raw emotion that grips Achilles, we feel his urgency for battle, and yet too we see the indeterminacy that underpins Achilles' current state of anger. Certainly he wishes to summon the Greek heroes, yet the absence of any specific language of assembly points us once again to the greater grief-anger motivating Achilles' behavior, which, because of its grounding in longing for what is irretrievable, is somewhat unspecified in its aims. The scale of the moment, in contrast to the

---

[212] Or, as his mother urged him, εἰς ἀγορὴν καλέσας (19.34).

[213] Cf. Agamemnon bellowing at the beginning of Book 11 as he stirs the Achaians to arm themselves: Ἀτρεΐδης δ᾽ ἐβόησεν ἰδὲ ζώνυσθαι ἄνωγεν/ Ἀργείους· (11.15-16). Achilles' call to assembly in Book 19 is much more like a summons to battle than to taking counsel. Indeterminate yelling indicates readiness to fight also at 17.88, when Hektor sees that Menelaos has slain Euphorbos over Patroklos' body and he gives a piercing cry (ὀξέα κεκληγώς). Hektor's grief is specified – Ἕκτορα δ᾽ αἰνὸν ἄχος πύκασε φρένας ἀμφὶ μελαίνας (17.83) – followed by his striding to the front of battle, with a piercing cry, gleaming like Hephaestean fire (βῆ δέ διὰ προμάχων κεκορυθμένος αἴθοπι χαλκῶι,/ ὀξέα κεκληγώς, φλογὶ εἴκελος Ἡφαίστοιο/ ἀσβέτωι, 17.87-89). See also 8.316-322, where Hektor, gripped by αἰνὸν ἄχος over his slain rein-bearer (8.316-317), tries to kill Teucer, shouting terribly (σμερδαλέα ἰάχων, 8.321); cf. 5.302, 8.92, 16.785, 20.285, 20.382, and 20.443.

Book 1 assembly, is magnified by those who attend: not only the warriors, but also the rowers and steersmen and stewards, who normally do not come to assembly, come to see Achilles who has appeared after such a long withdrawal from battle (19.42-46).[214] Their unusual presence highlights the new register on which this last fourth of the poem operates. Understanding the roots of Achilles' anger in a potentially interminable grief helps us better understand this heightened scale – a register that is vast not just because Achilles is very angry or very sad about the death of his friend, but because the dynamics of such grief and anger are insatiable.

But together with this indeterminacy, Achilles' all-encompassing focus on engaging in battle pervades this book, and in this focus too we see his new level of insatiety. He briefly unsays his anger in the presence of Agamemnon and the other Achaians,[215] and then immediately he moves to the war that awaits them: ἀλλ' ἄγε θᾶσσον/ ὄτρυνον πόλεμόνδε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιούς ("But come, quickly drive the flowing-haired Achaians to war," 19.68-69). When Agamemnon starts speaking of gifts, Achilles repeats his desire for them all to fight, which he locates as an immediate need:

> […] νῦν δὲ μνησώμεθα χάρμης
> αἶψα μάλ' – οὐ γὰρ χρὴ κλοτοπεύειν ἐνθάδ' ἐόντας
> οὐδὲ διατρίβειν, ἔτι γὰρ μέγα ἔργον ἄρεκτον –
> ὥς κέ τις αὖτ' Ἀχιλῆα μετὰ πρώτοισιν ἴδηται
> ἔγκεϊ χαλκείωι Τρώων ὀλέκοντα φάλαγγας·
> ὧς δέ τις ὑμείων μεμνημένος ἀνδρὶ μαχέσθω. (19.148-153)

But now let us remember our battle spirit

---

214 καὶ μὰν οἳ τότε γ' εἰς ἀγορὴν ἴσαν, οὕνεκ' Ἀχιλλεύς/ ἐξεφάνη· δηρὸν δὲ μάχης ἐπέπαυτ' ἀλεγεινῆς (19.45-46). Cf. 18.247-248, 20.42-43.

215 νῦν δ' ἤτοι μὲν ἐγὼ παύω χόλον· οὐδέ τί με χρή/ ἀσκελέως αἰεὶ μενεαινέμεν. ("But now truly I cease from my anger; for it is not at all fitting that I rage always, unrelentingly," 19.67-68).

> *now*, right away – for it is not fitting that we be here, chattering,
> nor that we linger, for still a great deed is undone –
> so that someone again may see Achilles among the foremost fighters
> killing troops of Trojans with his bronze spear;
> and thus remembering might one of you do battle with his man.

Many have discussed Achilles' lack of interest in the formalities of gifts in this exchange, his near obsession with immediate battle, to the point that he does not even want the other Achaians to eat before fighting (19.205-208).[216] Edwards comments on the bloodthirstiness with which Achilles ends this exhortation to fight: τό μοι οὔ τι μετὰ φρεσὶ ταῦτα μέμηλεν,/ ἀλλὰ φόνος τε καὶ αἷμα καὶ ἀργαλέος στόνος ἀνδρῶν ("Therefore I have no care for things in my breast at all, but only for slaughter and blood and the grievous groaning of men," 19.213-214). No other character speaks with such an accumulation of gruesome terms, Edwards notes, and Achilles speaks like this only in his present frame of mind.[217] The above study of the ποθή that underlies Achilles' anger gives us a clear set of parameters for understanding this new register on which Achilles acts, the νῦν δὲ of his ruptured present.[218]

---

[216] Cf., e.g., Taplin (1992), on the unsociability of Achilles' refusal of food, 210-212; Schein (1984), 139-140. Odysseus challenges Achilles' proposal specifically on the grounds of lengthiness, which we have seen to be characteristic of ποθή-grief: οὐ γὰρ ἀνὴρ <u>πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα</u>/ ἄκμηνος σίτοιο δυνήσεται ἄντα μάχεσθαι ("For not <u>throughout the whole day until the sun sets</u> will a man be able to fight without food face-to-face," 19.162-163). Achilles specifically counters this claim with his promise 19.308, δύντα δ' ἐς ἠέλιον μενέω καὶ τλήσομαι ἔμπης.

[217] Any other accumulation of gruesome terms is always confined to the narrator's voice. See Edwards (1991), *ad* 212-214. Cf. Segal (1971a), who describes Achilles' rejection of food as part of his surrender to the destructiveness of war which has pervaded his own soul, 49. On Achilles as "brutality incarnate" throughout his *aristeia*, see King (1987), 13-28. Although King acknowledges Achilles' ties to the divine in this section of the poem, she gives more importance to the bestial cruelty of his actions, reinforced by his several lion similes, from 18.318 on; King (1987), 19-28.

[218] Friedrich and Redfield (1978) observe that "νῦν δὲ" appears far more often in the speech of Achilles than in that of others conversing with him. This characteristic of his language, they claim, is consistent with Achilles' character, a combination of imagination and abrupt returns to realism; (1978), 283; cf. their discussion of Achilles' imagination and realism, 273-275. Their insights are valuable, yet I would add that the "νῦν δὲ" statements after Patroklos' death point to Achilles' new

The insatiety of ποθή drives both his bloodthirsty focus on battle and his restlessness that ranges beyond such specifics.

We find the same strange mixture of aimlessness and focus, both contributing to the sense of vastness, when Achilles first sees the new armor made for him by Hephaistos at the beginning of this book. The sight of these arms, particularly the shield,[219] causes him delight, emphasized by the repeated verb τέρπω as Achilles holds and gazes at Hephaistos' gift.[220] Yet Achilles' first emotion upon seeing these arms is anger: αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς/ ὡς εἶδ', ὥς μιν μᾶλλον ἔδυ χόλος ("But for Achilles, the more he looked, the more anger entered into him," 19.15-16). Edwards says that Achilles' anger here "of course" is directed against Hektor,[221] and doubtless given the overall narrative context of Achilles' quest for vengeance, this is, broadly speaking, the right frame in which to see his anger. But there is nothing "of course" about the object of his anger in this particular passage, which has no reference to the Trojans nor clues to Hektor's wrongdoing being depicted on the shield. Scully, interpreting the reactions of different characters to this shield, connects this episode to the later scene in Book 19 when Achilles, arming himself in this new armor, is filled with grief and anger. Athena has just intervened in Achilles' fast, instilling nectar and ambrosia into his chest, and the narrator describes with vigorous imagery the warrior arming in the midst of the Achaians as they prepare for war:

---

reality, the ruptured present that drives his behavior. Cf. Bassett (1933) on the constant refrain of "νῦν δὲ" after Patroklos' death (15 times), which indicates the destruction of his hopes and his fixedness on revenge, 58-59.

219 Scully (2003b) makes a compelling argument that Achilles' response to the armor is foremost a response to the shield, which has been described most fully and is most conspicuous, 34n15.

220 τέρπετο δ' ἐν χείρεσσιν ἔχων θεοῦ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα./ αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ φρεσὶν ᾗσι τετάρπετο δαίδαλα λεύσσων […] (19.18-19).

221 Edwards (1991), *ad loc.*

τοῦ καὶ ὀδόντων μὲν καναχὴ πέλε, τὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε
λαμπέσθην ὡς εἴ τε πυρὸς σέλας, ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ
δῦν' ἄχος ἄτλητον· ὃ δ' ἄρα Τρωσὶν μενεαίνων
δύσετο δῶρα θεοῦ, τά οἱ Ἥφαιστος κάμε τεύχων. (19.365-368)

and clashing came from his teeth, and his two eyes
flashed as if a blaze of fire, and into his heart
entered unendurable grief; and raging against the Trojans
he put on the gifts of the god, which Hephaistos toiled at in making them.

Scully argues that the narrator here links Achilles' anger against the Trojans with his grief for Patroklos, ἄχος ἄτλητον (19.367), and thus in this later scene we see more clearly that the χόλος of 19.16 is anger against the Trojans, linked to Achilles' human grief for Patroklos.[222] Scully is clearly right that Achilles' grief for Patroklos drives him to desire battle with the Trojans, but coexisting with this focus is also a core restlessness and insatiety. In his grief-stricken state, Achilles is precisely prone to an inexplicable χόλος that fills him more and more, ὡς εἶδ', ὥς μιν μάλλον ἔδυ χόλος, with no stated target, propelling him into a new realm of action. Clothed in divine armor, which "lifts him like wings" when he firsts puts it on (τῶι δ' εὖτε πτερὰ γίνετ', ἄειρε δὲ ποιμένα λαῶν, 19.386), Achilles has become a force furious enough to sack the city of Troy.

---

[222] Scully (2003b), 38; cf. Schadewaldt (1966) on the link between the anger in 19.365ff, 19.15ff, and the earlier lion simile, 156n2. Scully (*ibid.*) notes the repeated verb δύνω, 19.16, 367, and 368: the anger and grief "clothe themselves," so to speak, in Achilles, as Achilles clothes himself in his new armor; cf. Kim (2000), 126. Scully's larger argument is that Achilles' reaction to his shield shows us his newly divinized state, driven by the loss of his human side in Patroklos; he now gazes on divine objects without the fear that others in the poem show, sharing in a god-like, detached view of human life. Cf. Van Nortwick (1996), who links Achilles' fiery anger at the sight of the shield with the divine element in him, 67. For the rich interweaving of fire imagery with Achilles after the death of Patroklos, see Whitman (1958), 137-145; e.g., "Throughout the arming scene, the single symbol of fire connotes directly all the anguish, semidivine glory, and utter isolation of Achilles," 139. See also Armstrong (1958), 351-52. For fire as the typical image used to describe the shining of a warrior's armor, see Fenik (1968), 10-11.

The root of this enormous anger in grief for Patroklos is kept in the listener's mind throughout this arming scene and entry into war. We discussed earlier the longing for Patroklos which shapes Achilles' lament refusing food. The pitying intervention of Zeus reminds us again that the refusal to eat is based on grief for Patroklos: he chides Athena, do you not care for Achilles?, ἧσται ὀδυρόμενος ἕταρον φίλον· ("he sits grieving for his beloved companion," 19.345). We are reminded again of Patroklos' presence at the close of the scene, when Achilles rebukes his horses, urging them not to leave him dead on the field as they left Patroklos (μηδ' ὡς Πάτροκλον λίπετ' αὐτόθι τεθνηῶτα, "and do not leave us dead there, as you left Patroklos," 19.403). Edwards rightly observes that this rebuke of his horses allows Achilles once again to evoke the reality of Patroklos' death as he sets off to take vengeance.[223] These references to Patroklos before, during, and after this climactic arming scene keep the underlying context clear. Achilles' vast eagerness for war is rooted in his longing-filled experience of grief.[224] His final words to his horses highlight this overarching theme of insatiety: ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔμπης/ οὐ λήξω, πρὶν Τρῶας <u>ἅδην ἐλάσαι</u> πολέμοιο. ("But even so I shall not leave off until the Trojans <u>are sated</u> with war," 19.422-423). The relentlessness in Achilles' promise is matched by the narrator's summary of the arming scene, when he calls the Achaians μάχης ἀκόρητοι ("insatiate of war," 20.2), a kind of expansion of the insatiety of Achilles in their midst: ὣς οἳ μὲν παρὰ νηυσὶ κορωνίσι θωρήσσοντο/ ἀμφὶ σέ, Πηλέος υἱέ, μάχης ἀκόρητοι Ἀχαιοί ("So they armed beside the

---

[223] Cf. Edwards (1991), *ad* 19.399-403

[224] Cf. Armstrong (1958), 350-354; "Paris arms for shame, Agamemnon for security, Patroclus for loyalty and friendship, but Achilles arms in anger and grief […]," 350.

curved ships/ about you, son of Peleus, the Achaians, insatiate of war," 20.1-2).[225] The reality of ποθή has propelled Achilles, and with him the poem's narrative, into a new register of raging insatiety.[226]

Taplin argues against those who depict Achilles as an aimless bringer of destruction, a "force of sheer destructive energy," as Schein puts it.[227] Rather than enacting aimless devastation, Taplin argues that Achilles' ruthless deeds in Books 20-22 are ruled by a grim logic, that of universal and imminent death.[228] We see this logic clearly in Achilles' rejection of Lykaon's supplication: before the death of Patroklos, he used to spare Trojans; but now not one will escape death, if the god gives him into his hands; indeed, not even he will escape death, despite his greatness.[229] While I agree that this "logic of imminent death"

---

225 Variants of κόρος describe satiety/insatiety for battle seven times in the *Iliad*: 7.117, 12.335, 13.621, 13.635, 13.639, 19.221, 20.2. Of the other twelve appearances, four refer to dogs have their fill of human flesh (8.379, 13.831, 17.241, 22.509); the others vary between having one's fill of a meal, of work, of making threats, and of weeping. Among the other expressions for satiety – variants of ἅδην/ἄδην and ἀδέω, ἄω, and ἆτος (29 total) – a similarly high proportion refer to satiety/insatiety in battle contexts: eight refer to battle itself (5.388, 5.863, 6.203, 13.315, 13.746, 19.402, 19.423, 22.218), three to glutting Ares with blood (5.289, 20.78, 22.267), six to satiety of flesh (spears: 11.574, 15.317, 21.70, 21.168; dogs: 11.818, 24.211). Thus again we see that Achilles' unique story emerges against a backdrop in which he can also be seen as paradigmatic. The theme of satiety and its resolution in the poem will be discussed at the end of this chapter, pp. 121-8.

226 Taplin (1992) notes the difference between Achilles' rejection of Agamemnon's material compensation in Book 9, which was conditional – I shall not give way *until* he has repaid the entire, heart-grieving outrage (πρίν γ' ἀπὸ πᾶσαν ἐμοὶ δόμεναι θυμαλγέα λώβην, 9.387) – and the unconditional rejection of Hektor's appeal that his body be returned to his parents, should he die (22.345-354). This later unconditional response points to Achilles' "extreme state of mind" in this latter part of the poem, as he deals with a situation he finds irreparable; Taplin (1992), 244-5.

227 Schein (1984), 145.

228 Taplin (1992), 218-224.

229 *Il.* 21.99-113. The contrast between before and after Patroklos' death is best seen in these lines: πρὶν μὲν γὰρ Πάτροκλον ἐπισπεῖν αἴσιμον ἦμαρ,/ τόφρα τί μοι πεφιδέσθαι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φίλτερον ἦεν/ Τρώων, καὶ πολλοὺς ζωοὺς ἕλον ἠδ' ἐπέρασσα·/ νῦν δ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς τις θάνατον φύγοι, ὅν κε θεός γε/ Ἰλίοο προπάροιθεν ἐμῇς ἐν χερσὶ βάλησιν/ καὶ πάντων Τρώων, πέρι δ' αὖ Πριάμοιό γε παίδων. ("For before Patroklos met his fateful day, then it was somewhat dearer to me in my breast to spare Trojans, and I took many alive and sold them; but now there is no one who

figures prominently in Achilles' speeches in this last fourth of the poem,[230] it seems less to give genuine purpose to Achilles' destructive behavior than to uncover the alogical structure of his actions: his bringing of ruin is driven by his experience of rupture, the loss of Patroklos, without accomplishing anything restorative of that rupture.[231] It seems perfectly compatible to say that Achilles is in the grip of a new, alogical logic, and to say that in such a state he becomes a force of pure destruction. Again, the focus on Patroklos and his present reality without him, brought out by the contrast πρὶν μὲν … νῦν δ′ (21.100, 103), keeps this rupture ever present to the listener and frames our understanding of his prolonged and ruthless fury.

Two crucial divine interventions have occurred as Achilles transitions from immobile grief to angry readiness to kill Trojans, one the feeding with nectar and ambrosia which nourishes his human strength, and the other the procuring of divine armor to replace the armor lost when Patroklos died. Both of these moments are key in Achilles turning to action: when his mother brings him the armor made by Hephaistos, she finds him lying around Patroklos' body, weeping shrilly (ηὗρε δὲ Πατρόκλωι περικείμενον ὃν φίλον υἱόν/ κλαίοντα λιγέως, 19.4-5); but once Achilles sees the divine armor, he is up, full of

---

will escape death, if the god should place him in my hands before Troy, not one of all the Trojans, but above all of the sons of Priam," 21.100-105).

[230] Cf. his exchange with his mother when he first learns of Patroklos' death, esp. 18.88-91, 18.98, and 18.115-121; his further references to his nearing death, 18.330-332, 19.328-330, 19.421-422, 21.110-113, 21.277-278, 22.365-366, 23.150; his speech after he slays Lykaon in which he includes all the Trojans in a universal death wish, 21.122-135.

[231] McCoy (2013) aligns herself with arguments of futility, but from the angle of Achilles' search for meaning in the face of mortality, 27-30; for example, on this Lykaon passage, she writes: "Achilles is not angry specifically at Lykaon, so much as determined to 'resolve' the conflict between finding life meaningful and accepting human death, by participating as much as possible in the futile, angry violence, as if by embracing its futility more fully and more passionately, he might somehow defeat its power. He understands meaning to be found in brute power […]," 29.

the fiery energy described above. Likewise, Athena's intervention prevents λιμὸς ἀτερπὴς ("joyless hunger," 19.354) from overtaking Achilles' limbs, and immediately the narrator tells in grand scale of the general preparations of the Achaians and Achilles arming in their midst. Although these divine interventions are crucial in facilitating Achilles' transition from motionless withdrawal to vengeful action, I would argue that they do not motivate the anger itself and its potential to be limitless. In each case, Achilles is already in the grips of that unquenchable longing which drives his anger, and the gods' intervention takes an already present relentlessness and draws it up to a cosmic scale. In fact, Thetis' gift of the divine armor is in part a check on that very relentlessness: she has to remind him that he cannot fight without armor and promises to return at dawn bringing him new armor from Hephaistos (18.128-137).[232] Likewise, the feeding with nectar and ambrosia is a check on the insatiety of Achilles' rejection of food: the narrator observes that although the Achaian leaders stay with Achilles, trying to comfort him (τέρποντες) as he was thoroughly grieved (πυκινῶς ἀκαχήμενον), there was no pleasure in his heart (οὐδέ τι θυμῶι/ τέρπετο), until he should enter the mouth of bloody war (πρὶν πολέμου στόμα δύμεναι αἱματόεντος, 19.312-313). This pleasure in war alone contrasts with what is truly supportable by human nature, as the narrator observes when he describes Athena as preventing pleasureless hunger, λιμὸς ἀτερπὴς, from overtaking Achilles (19.354).[233] Achilles' behavior is insatiate even by

---

[232] Her speech responds to Achilles' defiant "μηδέ μ' ἔρυκε μάχης φιλέουσά περ· οὐδέ με πείσεις," ("Do not keep me back from battle, though you love me; you will not persuade me," 18.126).

[233] Cf. Taplin (1992), who claims that the gods' feeding Achilles "undercut[s] his lack of human realism," 210. Paradoxically Taplin notes that the only other human who receives nectar and ambrosia is the dead Patroklos, so this divine gift could also be seen as a marker of Achilles'

divine standards, which accords with the poem's presentation of its grounding in an unfillable absence.[234]

This period of Achilles' acute perception of loss and concomitant insatiety corresponds to a period of the poem in which the references to the destruction of Troy are far more frequent. Scully, who observes this preponderance, notes that not only are the references to Troy's destruction more frequent, but that a greater number of them occur in the narrator's own voice.[235] The narrative of the poem is driving towards a climactic peak in Book 22, when Achilles kills Hektor, the "sole defender" of Troy (as the poem suggests in multiple ways), and the response of the city is exactly what would have happened, the narrator says, had all of Troy been burning (τῶι δὲ μάλιστ' ἄρ' ἔην ἐναλίγκιον, ὡς εἰ ἅπασα/ Ἴλιος ὀφρυόεσσα πυρὶ σμύχοιτο κατ' ἄκρης, 22.410-411).[236] In the final chapter we shall discuss more the implications of this close narrative tie between Hektor and the city, but equally significant is the indication that Achilles has effectively burned Troy to the ground.[237] This heightened scale of action is prepared throughout Achilles' *aristeia*. In Book 21 the river, Skamandros, marks the behavior of Achilles as supra-human, when, tired of the

---

approaching death; *ibid*., n12. See also McCoy (2013) on Achilles' "resistance of forward movement" in his refusal to eat, which is part of his rejection of human vulnerability, 28.

234 Thus Page (1959) misses the point when he remarks, "More than 180 lines have now passed since luncheon stole the limelight, and nothing has been achieved," 314. The prolongation of the battle preparations in this book develops the nature and scope of Achilles' anger by constantly reminding us of its roots in grief.

235 See Scully (1990), 77-8.

236 Cf. Taplin (1992), 20, on the relentless progression of the narrative to Hektor's death in Book 22. He notes the emphasis in the language μάλιστ' ἄρ' […] ἐναλίγκιον, arguing that the poet "could hardly be more explicit" in presenting the death of Hektor as an effective sack of Troy, 249-250. On the climactic nature of Book 22, reflected in its imagery, see also Moulton (1977), 76-78.

237 Patroklos assault on the wall prefigures the impending danger for Troy (16.698-705); cf. Fenik (1968) on Patroklos' *aristeia* as here entering "the realm of the gigantic and supernatural," 216. Line 16.698, ἔνθά κεν ὑψίπολον Τροίην ἕλον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν, recurs at 21.544, as Achilles's threat to the city grows (see below).

corpses clogging his waters, he complains, "ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ, περὶ μὲν κρατέεις, περὶ δ' αἴσυλα ῥέζεις/ ἀνδρῶν·" ("O Achilles, you are surpassingly strong, and you do deeds surpassing what is just for men," 21.214-215).[238] The scope of Achilles' battle-fury is so vast that this scene ends in an elemental battle between the fire of Achilles, aided by Hephaistos, and the water of Skamandros. Taplin sees this scene, in which the river, essential for the life of the city, is burned by divine fire (21.356), as a prevision of the sack of Troy, which the vanquished river promises not to prevent (21.373-376).[239] The dramatic clash of elemental forces, Fire versus Water, is unparalleled in any prior battle scene in this poem and further indicates that the supernatural moments surrounding the grieved and angered Achilles are oriented towards his newly vast capacity for slaughter and destruction.[240]

Such extraordinary markers of Achilles' daimonic ability, in this stage of grief-anger, to destroy the city of Troy are matched by another detail of language, Achilles' fourfold reception of the epithet πτολίπορθος, "city-sacker," twice as often as Odysseus and four times as often as any other character in the poem.[241] These moments where Achilles is named "sacker of cities" form part of the narrative arc of the city's figurative sack in Hektor's death. Hera is first to apply the epithet to Achilles, in 8.372, where she complains of Zeus granting Thetis' prayer to honor him, sacker-of-cities (λισσομένη τιμῆσαι Ἀχιλλῆα πτολίπορθον). Shortly after this speech Zeus reveals to his wife that Patroklos'

---

[238] Cf. Scully (1990), 53.
[239] Taplin (1992), 228-9; cf. Whitman (1958), 139-41, 206-7.
[240] On this cosmic striving with the elements, cf. Schadewaldt (1965), 289-93; Nagler (1974), 148-51; Nagy (1999) discusses all of Achilles' cosmic and elemental associations, 321-347.
[241] Achilles is so named 4 times (8.372, 15.77, 21.550, 24.108), Odysseus twice (2.278, 10.363), four other characters once each (Oileus, 2.728; Enyo, 5.333; Ares, 20.152; Otrynteus, 20.384), for a total of ten appearances of this epithet in the poem.

death will stir Achilles to return to the fight ([...] ὄρθαι παρὰ ναῦφι ποδώκεα Πηλείωνα/ ἤματι τῶι, ὅτ' ἂν οἳ μὲν ἐπὶ πρύμνῃσι μάχωνται/ στείνει ἐν αἰνοτάτωι περὶ Πατρόκλοιο θανόντος, 8.474-476). In Book 15, Zeus repeats this summary of how Achilles' prayer will unfold with more detail, applying πτολίπορθος to Achilles a second time: the death of Patroklos will anger Achilles, Achilles will kill Hektor, and the Achaians will take Troy (τοῦ δὲ χολωσάμενος κτενεῖ Ἕκτορα δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς./ […] εἰς ὅ κ' Ἀχαιοί/ Ἴλιον αἰπὺ ἕλοιεν […], 15.68, 70-71), and thus Zeus will grant the prayer of Thetis, that he honor Achilles, sacker-of-cities (λισσομένη τιμῆσαι Ἀχιλλῆα πτολίπορθον, 15.77).[242] We see how Achilles' grief-driven anger, for all its aimlessness, fulfils a plan of Zeus for Troy's fall. This recapitulation of the story's end directs our attention beyond the return of Achilles to the doom of the city, which is linked to his return in the sequence of the projected narrative, and then reinforced by this closing epithet, "sacker of cities."[243]

πτολίπορθος describes Achilles a third time at a charged moment towards the end of Book 21, as the threat to Troy's survival becomes imminent. Apollo has entered the city, "lest the Danaans sack it on that day, beyond fate," (μὴ Δαναοὶ πέρσειαν ὑπὲρ μόρον

[242] West (2001) athetized 15.64-71, because of some lexical peculiarities and because there is "no reason why" Zeus would look so far ahead at this point, 230-1. But in fact it is highly suitable for Zeus to link Achilles' return to battle with its origin in the death of Patroklos, and Hektor's agency in that death is directly linked, throughout the poem, to his death and the fall of his city. Janko (1992) defends the passage extensively, *ad* 15.56-77; among other points, he notes that increasingly developed forecasts are typical of the poem.

[243] The narrative break in Book 12 captures this projected narrative in miniature, when the narrator, speaking from a detached perspective of the fate in store for the Achaian wall, says that the wall lasted ὄφρα μὲν Ἕκτωρ ζωὸς ἔην καὶ μήνι' Ἀχιλλεὺς/ καὶ Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος ἀπόρθητος πόλις ἔπλεν ("as long as Hektor was alive and Achilles was full of rage and the city of Lord Priam was unsacked," 12.10-11). Cf. ΣT *ad* 12.9-12, above n202.

ἤματι κείνωι, 21.517), and the divinely-inspired Achilles, turning towards the city itself as he slays Trojans, is compared to an affliction caused by gods who are angry with a city:

> ὡς δ᾽ ὅτε καπνὸς ἰὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἵκάνει
> ἄστεος αἰθομένοιο, θεῶν δέ ἑ μῆνις ἀνῆκην,
> πᾶσι δ᾽ ἔθηκε πόνον, πολλοῖσι δὲ κήδε᾽ ἐφῆκεν,
> ὣς Ἀχιλεὺς Τρώεσσι πόνον καὶ κήδε᾽ ἔθηκεν. (21.522-525)
>
> And as when smoke rising reaches broad heaven
> from a burning city, and the wrath of the gods sends it up,
> and lays down toil for all, and sends griefs for many,
> so Achilles laid down for the Trojans toil and griefs.

The image of the burning city reinforces our understanding that the life of Troy is threatened by Achilles, as does Priam's fearful speech that Achilles might leap onto the wall, δείδια γάρ, μὴ οὖλος ἀνὴρ ἐς τεῖχος ἅληται (21.536),[244] and the narrator's conclusion that had Apollo not then intervened, the Achaians would have taken Troy: ἔνθά κεν ὑψίπυλον Τροίην ἕλον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν (21.544).[245] In this context the narrator calls Achilles πτολίπορθος as the Trojans stream into the city before Achilles, and Agenor alone turns to face him: αὐτὰρ ὅ γ᾽ ὡς ἐνόησεν Ἀχιλλῆα πτολίπορθον,/ ἔστη […] ("But when he perceived Achilles, sacker of cities, he stood […]," 21.550-551). The epithet is charged as the narrative climaxes to the impending doom of the city. After the doom of Troy is sealed with

---

244 Scully (1990) notes that the application of οὖλος to Achilles, an epithet normally given to Ares, marks out the inhumanity of Achilles at this stage of the poem as he moves towards the sack of Troy, 53.

245 At 20.29, Zeus reminds us that this threat to the city of Troy "beyond fate" is rooted in Achilles' terrible anger at the death of Patroklos: "νῦν δ᾽, ὅτε δὴ καὶ <u>θυμὸν ἑταίρου χώεται αἰνῶς</u>,/ δείδω μὴ καὶ τεῖχος ὑπὲρ μόρον ἐξαλαπάξηι." ("But now, when indeed he is <u>terribly enraged in his heart for his companion</u>, I fear lest he even sack the wall, beyond fate," 20.29-30). On the resonance of this "νῦν δ᾽" with Achilles' habitual speech pattern, see Edwards (1991), *ad loc.*; for my argument that this speech pattern particularly captures Achilles' experience of rupture after the death of Patroklos, see above, pp. 98-99.

the death of Hektor, Achilles is named πτολίπορθος one final time, when Zeus summarizes the divine stasis provoked by Achilles' treatment of the dead city-defender's body: ἐννῆμαρ δὴ νεῖκος ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ὄρωρεν/ Ἕκτορος ἀμφὶ νέκυι καὶ Ἀχιλλῆϊ πτολιπόρθωι ("For nine days strife has arisen among the immortals about the corpse of Hektor and about Achilles, sacker of cities," 24.107-108). This pairing of Achilles, the city-sacker, and the dead body of Hektor subtly reinforces the symbolic sack that occurred when Achilles killed Hektor, two books before, and the narrator compared the city's response to what would happen were the city being thoroughly destroyed by fire (22.410-411). These references to Achilles as city-sacker correspond to the growing intensity of the narrative as the sack of Troy is virtually enacted through the slaying of Hektor and then felt with a sense of abiding finality as the poem ends with the burial of the city's defender.

Here we have outlined a few key markers of the daimonic scale of Achilles' anger, particularly the narrative attention to his unusual relationship with divine power, the threat to the whole city of Troy, and that omnipresent sense of indeterminacy which points to his anger's roots in insatiable grief. Although Achilles accomplishes the will of Zeus for Troy in this period of semi-divine wrath, the relentlessness of his anger persists beyond this achievement. Thus we now turn to the second narrative consequence of Achilles' ποθή-driven anger, namely, its ultimately cyclical nature, driven by its failure to assuage the loss that drives it. This cycle of desire and failure ends only with Achilles' release of Hektor's body, and with it, his own insatiety.

Achilles' story: From Endlessness to Letting Go

We have already traced indicators of insatiety in the various responses of Achilles to the death of Patroklos, and we have argued that such variety points to the core aimlessness in his grief. To these instances we shall add three scenes in Book 23 that indicate the persistence of insatiate longing beyond the slaying of Hektor, setting up the question of how such longing will finally be released. The first such scene is Achilles' refusal to bathe before Patroklos is buried. Although he has killed Hektor and brought the corpse back to the Achaian camp, his language of refusal points to unassuaged grief: οὐ θέμις ἐστὶ λοετρὰ καρήατος ἆσσον ἱκέσθαι,/ πρίν γ' ἐνὶ Πάτροκλον θέμεναι πυρὶ σῆμά τε χεῦαι/ κείρασθαί τε κόμην, <u>ἐπεὶ οὔ μ' ἔτι δεύτερον ὧδε/ ἵξετ' ἄχος κραδίην, ὄφρα ζωοῖσι μετείω</u>. ("It is not lawful for baths to come close to my head, before I place Patroklos on the pyre and pour the burial mound over him and cut my hair, <u>for never again in such a way will grief come to my heart while I am among the living</u>," 23.44-47). With this statement, Achilles combines his clear intent to bury Patroklos with his larger insistence on the uniqueness of his loss, here expressed by a persisting bloodiness born of grief, since no such grief (ἄχος) will come to him again so long as he lives. This motivation – refusing to perform certain actions because he has suffered something uniquely painful – refocuses us on his insatiate state, one which he claims will persist beyond the burial of his friend. We are reminded of the lengthiness of his sworn refusal to eat in Book 19, and we see again that insatiety tends to be unsocial: Achilles' refusal to wash separates him from the group, even though he initiates a common meal and the common project of beginning the burial preparations.

The scale of Patroklos' burial too points us to that underlying state of insatiety, which Richardson calls that "aspect of excess."[246] In the burial we again see that variety which points to volatility: the many kinds of sacrificial victims – horses, dogs, and humans (23.171-176), some of which belonged to Patroklos and thereby represent his life (the dogs who were at his table 23.173-174), others who are sacrificed as part of the promised vengeance (the twelve Trojan youths, 23.175-176); the covering of Patroklos' body with hair cuttings (23.135ff); the pouring of libations during cremation (23.218-221). Achilles' behavior is anomalous for a funeral,[247] and aligns with the larger variety in his threats, promises, and refusals. We see that rather than pure desire to kill Hektor or Trojans, Achilles' deepest motivation is a personal experience of grief that reaches out almost randomly, without a true single aim.[248]

The third indicator of Achilles' persisting insatiety in Book 23 is the theme of the delay of burial. This theme requires some elaboration. Achilles initiated the delay of Patroklos' burial in his first lament over the body, when he promised that he would not bury Patroklos until he brought back the head of Hektor and slew twelve Trojan youths before Patroklos' funeral pyre (18.334-337). As we argued in Chapter Two, Achilles' closing promise that the women whom he and Patroklos had won together should lament Patroklos day and night until the burial (18.338-342) reveals the underlying insatiety motivating this

---

[246] Richardson (1993), 165. Cf. Whitman (1958), "The funeral scene […] bulges with the enormity of Achilles' grief," 214.
[247] Derderian (2001), 54; cf. Garland (1982), 72, and Schnapp-Gourbeillon (1982), 77-88, esp. 80-83. Derderian, following Schnapp-Gourbeillon, notes how Achilles' excessive honor to Patroklos parallels his excessive dishonor of Hektor, *ibid.* But West (2007) looks at the consistency of the basic details (hero, often in armor, cremated on pyre, animals slaughtered, funeral ritual lasting for days, remains buried in a mound) across literature of different cultures from different ages, 496-8.
[248] Cf. Garland (1982), who argues that Achilles' behavior at the funeral is motivated largely by personal sorrow, to the exclusion of any other aim, 73.

delay, as if somehow he can achieve a kind of indefinite perpetuation of their shared life. The delay of burial is linked to his grief-driven anger again in Book 19 when Achilles fears that the dead body of his friend is in danger of decay (19.23-27). The context for this concern is his display of aimless χόλος when he sees his new armor (19.16) and his declared intent to arm (19.23). This juxtaposition of fear of decay with indeterminate χόλος again reminds us that the delay of burial is rooted in Achilles' potentially limitless anger.[249]

The theme culminates at the beginning of Book 23 with the curious claim of Patroklos' shade that in delaying burial Achilles has forgotten him (23.69-70). This exchange contributes to our understanding that Achilles' turn to anger has been personally fruitless. Patroklos' criticism of Achilles echoes Achilles' own realization in 22, after he kills Hektor and contemplates sacking Troy in that very moment, that his battle-lust is a kind of forgetfulness of Patroklos:

> ἐπεὶ δὴ τόνδ' ἄνδρα θεοὶ δαμάσασθαι ἔδωκαν,
> ὃς κακὰ πόλλ' ἔρρεξεν, ὅσ' οὐ σύμπαντες οἱ ἄλλοι,
> εἰ δ' ἄγετ' ἀμφὶ πόλιν σὺν τεύχεσι πειρηθέωμεν, (22.379-381)
> […].
> ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός;
> κεῖται πὰρ νήεσσι νέκυς ἄκλαυτος ἄθαπτος
> Πάτροκλος· τοῦ δ' οὐκ ἐπιλήσομαι, […] (22.385-387)
>
> Since the gods have given this man to be defeated,
> who did so many evil deeds, more than all the other men together,
> come! let us make trial of the city surrounding it with our arms,
> […].
> But why does my dead spirit think on these things?
> For there lies by the ships a corpse, unwept, unburied,
> Patroklos; him I shall not forget […].

---

[249] Cf. Frazer (1993), who notes that Thetis' protection of the body of Patroklos while Achilles seeks vengeance keeps us aware of the grief that "motivates and sustains the vengeance," 202.

The self-reproach is curious, because we have seen how the loss of Patroklos is what drove Achilles to such extremes, and the many evils wrought by Hektor (22.380) are what spur him to attack the city in this moment. Yet the rupture that drives this fighting lust points us to the displacement of ends, wherein killing Hektor does not correspond to the underlying longing for a life shared with Patroklos. In light of such displacement, Achilles could well feel a kind of inner disunity as he contemplates sacking Troy, as if somehow his height of anger was careless of his companion, since in truth it does not accomplish what it seeks.[250] This self-reproach contributes to the larger narrative thread of futility in Achilles' seeking to redress grief through vengeance.

Although Achilles' focus turns to the burial of Patroklos once he has slain Hektor, his mood of general insatiety remains as he refuses to bathe, seen above. Such is the frame of persisting grief when the shade of Patroklos visits Achilles in his sleep and chides him for his failure yet to have buried him. For a pair who were able to communicate without speech in life, the need for speech at this moment highlights the new divide between them.[251] Richardson, commenting on these lines, notes that such language is a trope in dream apparitions, since many such apparitions chide the sleeper for sleeping.[252] He reconciles the

---

[250] Zanker (1994) claims that in turning to the burial of Patroklos here, Achilles is "addressing the loss of Patroklos more directly again," 108.

[251] See discussion of Book 9 episode in Chapter One, p. 44. In Book 16, this silent communication has already been replaced by extensive speech, more than 90 lines, betokening their disunity on the question of helping the Achaians and pointing towards the impending rupture of death. After the death of Patroklos, the pair exchanges 66 lines of speech, 37 of which Achilles addresses to the dead Patroklos, 29 of which belong to this exchange between shade and living man. Considering that these lines of speech occur in less than one fourth of the poem, the number is disproportionately high.

[252] Cf. 2.23-24: εὕδεις, Ἀτρέος υἱὲ δαΐφρονος ἱπποδάμοιο·/ οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὕδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα,/ […] ("You sleep, son of Atreus the skillful horse-tamer; it is not fitting for a man who brings counsel to sleep all night long, […]").

apparent contradiction of Patroklos chiding Achilles for failing to do the very thing that Achilles is intent on doing in terms of "Homeric psychology," calling this doubling of Patroklos' exhortation and Achilles' own desire an instance of the typical double motivation of a single action in both the human and divine realm.[253]

When we examine the content of Patroklos' criticism, however, we see that Patroklos does not simply double Achilles' own wish to complete the burial. In his opening words Patroklos contrasts Achilles' living relationship with him and the relationship they have now that Patroklos is dead: εὕδεις, αὐτὰρ ἐμεῖο λελασμένος ἔπλε', 'Αχιλλεῦ·/ οὐ μέν μεο ζώοντος ἀκήδεις, ἀλλὰ θανόντος ("You sleep, and have forgotten me, Achilles; not when I lived were you so uncaring for me, but in death," 23.69-70). The contrast between Achilles' care for Patroklos in life and in death forces us to think of the motivation of this delay in burial, namely, Achilles' desire to seek vengeance. It is true that Patroklos does not refer to Achilles' pursuit of Hektor, nor to the capture of the twelve Trojan youths, focusing instead on his own inability to enter Hades before burial, prevented from passing through the gates by the other shades (23.71-74). But he does contrast this present state of unrest in death with an explicit depiction of their former shared life: οὐ μὲν γὰρ ζωοί γε φίλων ἀπάνευθεν ἑταίρων/ βουλὰς ἑζόμενοι βουλεύσομεν, ἀλλ' ἐμὲ μὲν κήρ/ ἀμφέχανε στυγερή, ἥ περ λάχε γεινόμενόν περ ("For not alive, sitting apart from our dear companions, will we take counsel together, but death has swallowed me, the hateful death that was allotted to me at my birth," 23.77-79). He clearly depicts how death has ended their shared life, that former reality of *we two* together, apart from the others. Although we

---

[253] Richardson (1993), *ad loc*. On "double motivation" in Homer, see, for example, Whitman (1958), 221-48; Edwards (1987), 135; et al.

have seen Achilles describe the rupture of death with the same concepts, his declarations have not brought about closure, burial, and acceptance, but prolonged vengeance-seeking. Patroklos seems to be offering a counter response to death's rupture. Where Achilles insisted on honoring Patroklos by acting on his anger, translating the loss of shared life and the inherent volatility of such a state into deeds of relentless anger and prolonged lamentation, Patroklos refers to their former shared life as motivation for Achilles to bury him as quickly as possible, and, once he has died himself, to have their mortal remains joined in a single urn, united in death as they were in life (23.84-91). Such contrast gives context for Patroklos' criticism of the carelessness of Achilles. Although Achilles has been focused on the loss of Patroklos for five books, and all of his actions have been various responses to this state, he has been careless of Patroklos insofar as he has delayed the burial in order to seek special vengeance. Patroklos, on the other hand, sees that the only effect their formerly shared life can have on a present ruptured by death is for Achilles to commit himself to uniting their remains after death.[254] Without directly criticizing the deeds of restless longing, Patroklos nevertheless seems to chide Achilles for "mis-translating" the formerly shared life into the present through deeds of vengeance.

We can support this reading of Patroklos' criticism with a small detail preceding the speech that recalls Achilles' reason for delaying the burial. When Achilles leaves Agamemnon, after refusing to bathe, we are led to think that Achilles will be sleepless, since

---

[254] Thus Whitman (1958) claims that Achilles' actions, after Patroclus' death, "are appropriate to himself, but not to Patroclus." Cf. Sinos (1980), who sees Patroclus's criticism as evidence that he did not find the vengeance-seeking necessary, 59-60. Sinos makes this point as part of a larger argument of the separate identities of the two heroes and their path to understanding this separateness. Cf. also Macleod (1982), who dismisses the criticism, since "there is no doubt that Achilles will bury his friend;" for Macleod, the narrative function of the episode is to separate the two men, 28-29.

the other Achaians go to their shelters, and he stays on the seashore, lying there in the midst of his Myrmidons, groaning heavily (23.58-61). But sleep overtakes him, μάλα γὰρ κάμε φαίδιμα γυῖα/ Ἕκτορ' ἐπαΐσσων προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν ("for he was very tired in his shining limbs from chasing Hektor around windy Ilion," 23.63-64). This detail about tiredness puts us again in Achilles' mindset, his need to kill Hektor which so clearly arises from his own grief.[255] Achilles seems to feel all the burden of thus honoring Patroklos on his own.[256] Patroklos as a shade does not mention Hektor at all. Rather he focuses on the loss of their former shared life and his desire that they be buried together, as they were raised together – a shadow in death of their union in life. Achilles' response, without contradicting Patroklos, shows his fixation on the longing-filled rupture of his present:

> τίπτε μοι, ἠθείη κεφαλή, δεῦρ' εἰλήλουθας
> καί μοι ταῦτα ἕκαστ' ἐπιτέλλεαι; αὐτὰρ ἐγώ τοι
> πάντα μάλ' ἐκτελέω καὶ πείσομαι, ὡς σὺ κελεύεις.
> ἀλλά μοι ἆσσον στῆθι, μίνυνθά περ ἀμφιβαλόντε
> ἀλλήλους ὀλοοῖο τεταρπώμεσθα γόοιο. (23.94-98)
>
> Why have you come to me here, honored head of my brother,
> and why do you narrate each of these things to me? Indeed, for you I shall
> heartily accomplish every one of these things, and I shall be persuaded as you bid.
> But stand closer to me, and may we two, even for a short time embracing
> one another, take our delight in destructive lament.

---

[255] For a different reading of this setting, see Segal (1971a), 50-51. Segal argues that the seashore is a peaceful setting, signaling the diminishing of Achilles' passion throughout this Book and setting up his release of Hektor's corpse in Book 24. I would argue rather that the seashore betokens Achilles' loneliness, despite the other Myrmidon companions, since it is presented in contrast to the sleep of the others in their shelters, and his sleep serves merely to remind us of the gigantic killing effort he recently unleashed on the city of Troy.

[256] Cf. his own appeal to Patroklos, 24.592-595, that his friend not be angry with him for ransoming the body, since the gifts Priam brought were noble, and he promises to share these gifts with him. Although it is typical in the poem to seek vengeance for beloved slain, as we observed in the Introduction, Patroklos' silence regarding Hektor points to Achilles' comparative fixation.

Achilles promises to bury Patroklos, but his real desire bursts forth in the last two lines, that he may be reunited with his friend, embrace him, and take part together in that shadowy likeness of shared life, lament. We know that the attempt to embrace the shade fails (ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας ὠρέξατο χερσὶ φίλῃσιν,/ οὐδ᾽ ἔλαβε· ψυχὴ δὲ κατὰ χθονὸς ἠΰτε καπνός/ ᾤχετο τετριγυῖα. "Thus speaking he reached out with his own hands, but did not grasp; and the shade went beneath the earth like smoke, shrieking," 23.99-101); and Achilles is left only with lament, which he stirs up in his fellow Myrmidons precisely by narrating the insubstantiality of the shade that appeared to him, and yet its likeness to Patroklos:

> "ὢ πόποι, ἦ ῥά τίς ἐστι καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισιν
> ψυχὴ καὶ εἴδωλον, ἀτὰρ φρένες οὐκ ἔνι πάμπαν·
> παννυχίη γάρ μοι Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο
> ψυχὴ ἐφεστήκει γοόωσά τε μυρομένη τε,
> καί μοι ἕκαστ᾽ ἐπέτελλεν· ἔϊκτο δὲ θέσκελον αὐτῶι."
> ὣς φάτο· τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ὑφ᾽ ἵμερον ὦρσε γόοιο. (23.103-108)
>
> "Oh for shame, truly then in the house of Hades too there is some
> shade and likeness, but in it there is no substance whatsoever;
> for all night long by me stood wretched Patroklos'
> shade, lamenting and mourning,
> and it told me each thing I should do; and wondrously was it like to him."
> So he spoke, and in all of them he stirred up the desire for weeping.

This cry points us precisely to the reality of the loss itself, the desire for the return of the beloved and the irrecoverability of what has been lost. The reprise of ἵμερος γόοιο in light of this irrecoverability reminds us yet again that Achilles is in the grip of a desire that none of his actions can fulfill. The ending of the scene with the sun rising on their weeping (μυρομένοισι δὲ τοῖσι φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς, 23.109) gives that sense of intrinsic endlessness that we saw in earlier ποθή scenes, such as Achilles' prolonged desire for

fasting.[257] The exchange with Patroklos' shade illuminates the persisting insatiety of his grief, unsatisfied by any amount of weeping or deed of vengeance.[258]

Thus although the insatiate longing in Achilles' grief drives an anger vast enough to accomplish the symbolic sack of Troy, such an end is displaced from the force that drives it, and his relentlessness persists beyond Book 22. What remains for us now is to look at Achilles' final release of his insatiety at the end of the poem. Scholars have already offered sensitive and thorough considerations of Achilles' reconciliation with Priam, and with this study I seek only to refine certain points. First, there is a tendency in scholarship to suggest that the weariness in Achilles' grief-driven anger motivates his release; whereas I argue that the cyclicity of his grief-anger does not *in itself* motivate the giving up of that anger, but rather points to a simple narrative fact: the only answer to an internally unending cycle is to let go. In a second account of Achilles' release of the corpse, however, we shall consider one dimension of release that is internal to the structure of longing itself. We have seen throughout this dissertation that Achilles' friendship with Patroklos built up a common life between them, and thus the longing for that shared life, even as it drives Achilles to godlike levels of destructiveness, is rooted in Achilles' mortal self. The experience of shared mortality with Priam, so frequently commented on in scholarship, seems to me to explain

[257] Such a feeling is even more pronounced later, after Achilles' cuts his hair over Patroklos' corpse, when the narrator says that the sun *would have* set on their weeping, had not Achilles moved the funeral along, 23.154-155. Achilles speaks of satiety of weeping (Ἀτρείδη […], γόοιο μέν ἐστι καὶ ἄσαι, 23.156-157), but clearly does not experience it himself.

[258] *Pace* Segal (1971a), who rightly argues that the scene with Patroklos' shade has made Achilles' aware of the reality of death's total separation, but then distinguishes this awareness from intensely personal, individual grief, 51-54; this latter distinction seems to me to be groundless, given the sense of prolongation and yearning in ἵμερος γόοιο; rather the awareness seems precisely to fuel the intensity of Achilles' personal grief.

the release of the body satisfactorily only when we see that Achilles' own interminable longing was for his mortal self, for life shared with a fellow human.

Release, Take 1

The first account of Achilles' release of the corpse traces the culmination of his insatiate actions in repeating cycles. Segal gives a version of this narrative in his examination of the theme of the mutilation of the corpse, reading three stages in the development of that theme. In the first stage, Books 17-22, mutilation, either carried out or threatened, comes to a climax; in the second stage, Book 23, the intensity of violence begins to lessen, as Achilles gets weary; and in the third and final stage, in Book 24, order is restored by the gods' action, which gives scope to Achilles' generosity and pity and makes for a fitting end to the poem.[259] This final restoration of Achilles' generous self, according to Segal, comes from Achilles' sense of weariness and futility, so palpable in the scene of repeated mutilations which opens Book 24, with its multiple iteratives and that final phrase "though he was dead indeed" (καὶ τεθνηότα περ, 24.20), which ends this vignette.[260] Segal's lucid account of Achilles' growing weariness, however, must be refined. Achilles does not merely tire of the growing futility of prolonged vengeance. Rather the futility of his repeated mutilations of Hektor's corpse reveals with clarity the purposelessness underlying all of his responses to his grief. The opening scene of Book 24 draws together active anger and inert isolation into one repeated cycle of action, a cycle which includes a literal circle, the repeated circuit of dragging Hektor's corpse around Patroklos' tomb. By drawing together in a repeating circuit these

[259] Segal (1971a).
[260] *Ibid.*, 57-59. Cf. Taplin (1992) on the "exhaustion of Achilleus' vengeance," 20 and 252-3.

seemingly contrary impulses, action and inertia, the narrator highlights their essential likeness. The nightly repetitions of sleepless weeping, pacing, and mutilation are futile in precisely the same way Achilles' earlier deeds were futile. Active anger that kills Hektor is, at its root, the same type of deed as inert isolation: that is to say, it is rooted in the same depth of aimless insatiety and accomplishes no end that satisfies the longing that drives it.[261] Thus it does not seem sufficient to say that Achilles' restoration comes from the weariness that pervades these lines. The weary cycle points to the underlying reality of unsatisfiable longing. Activity and inertia coincide in Book 24 in a way that illuminates the paradoxical dynamic that grips Achilles: the nature of death's rupture is such that one will attempt to repair it, but such attempt is intrinsically impossible.[262]

Taplin similarly attributes Achilles' movement towards reintegration to his growing exhaustion. Taplin claims that we see a greater "sociability" in Achilles' deeds as early as the slaughter of the Trojan youths at the funeral of Patroklos (23.175-176), which are presented dispassionately by the narrator, unlike the passion of Achilles' earlier threats, indicating Achilles' growing weariness of his own anger. This growing sociability blossoms into fullness during the funeral games, and although it withers to persisting isolation at the beginning of

---

[261] Macleod (1982) notes the parallel τρὶς in these nightly draggings of Hektor's corpse (τρὶς δ' ἐρύσας περὶ σῆμα Μενοιτιάδαο θανόντος, 24.16) and the triple circuit of lament around Patroklos' corpse at the beginning of Book 23 (οἳ δὲ τρὶς περὶ νεκρὸν ἐΰτριχας ἤλασαν ἵππους, 23.13); he claims that the parallel reveals the meaning of this dragging, Achilles' tribute to Patroklos out of continued longing for him, *ad* 24.16.

[262] Cf. the terms Nagler (1974) uses to describe the mood of this scene, "aporia" and "stagnation," 167. Such concepts entail not imminent end, but potentially endless continuation. Segal (1971a) distinguishes between Achilles' weeping and his deeds of vengeance; the weeping in Book 23, for Segal, is part of a diminishing of the fire of Achilles' passion, 51-54. Although certainly weeping and killing are different responses to grief, I do not see grounds for claiming that Achilles' weeping is any less insatiate or personal throughout Book 23; moreover, the variety in Achilles' responses to his grief has included weeping, isolation and motionlessness since he learned of Patroklos' death in Book 18.

Book 24, Taplin accounts for this relapse by separating the public reintegration of Book 23 from Achilles' private, internal lack of peace.[263] Such an account describes the polarities we see in these two books without explaining them. Why would exhaustion help one to give up public manifestations of relentlessness, but not private ones? Does not it seem rather that exhaustion emerges from, and thus points to, the underlying dynamic of insatiable longing? Achilles is in the grip of a volatile desire, and although he conducts the funeral games with wisdom and warmth, the weary repetitions that open Book 24 point to the persisting character of longing that governs his deeds, without allowing neat systems or categories.

The unsociability in Achilles' behavior, persisting beyond the burial of Patroklos, can further be seen in the contrasting objects of delight between him and the other Achaians. Book 23 opened with Achilles' claim that his men could find delight in "destructive lament," (ὀλοοῖο τεταρπώμεσθα γόοιο, 23.10), a move which set him apart from the other Achaians' returning to their tent; here at the beginning of Book 24, despite the intervening period of sociability during the funeral games, Achilles again is separate from the Achaians, whose return to their ships is specifically marked by their enjoyment of food and sleep:

> λῦτο δ' ἀγών, λαοὶ δὲ θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας ἕκαστοι
> ἐσκίδναντ' ἰέναι. τοὶ μὲν δόρποιο μέδοντο
> ὕπνου τε γλυκεροῦ ταρπήμεναι· αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεύς
> κλαῖε […]. (24.1-4)
>
> And the assembly was dissolved, and the army scattered,
> each man going to his swift ship. And they turned their thoughts
> to enjoying supper and sweet sleep; but Achilles

---

263 This lack of peace is evident in the imperfects, 24.12ff.; Taplin (1992), 252-3. Cf. King (1987), 37, on Achilles' separate social reintegration in Book 23 and spiritual reintegration in Book 24; see also Macleod (1982), 29; Whitman (1958) on Achilles' lack of peace, despite the partial exhaustion of his fire during the funeral (he references the actual blaze of the funeral pyre, lit at 23.215, quenched at 23.250).

wept […].

These contrasting objects of τέρπομαι, destructive lament *versus* supper and bed, resonate with the many such contrasts throughout the poem. Menelaos, in what has been called his "homily on κόρος"[264] (13.620-639), accuses the Trojans of being insatiable for war, when normal men have their fill even of pleasant things:

> […] οὐδὲ δύνανται
> φυλόπιδος κορέσασθαι ὁμοιΐου πτολέμοιο.
> πάντων μὲν κόρος ἐστί, καὶ ὕπνου καὶ φιλότητος
> μολπῆς τε γλυκερῆς καὶ ἀμύμονος ὀρχηθμοῖο·
> τῶν πέρ τις καὶ μάλλον ἐέλδεται ἐξ ἔρον εἶναι
> ἢ πολέμου· Τρῶες δὲ μάχης ἀκόρητοι ἔασιν. (13.634-639)
>
> […] Nor are they able
> to sate themselves of the battle in difficult war.
> Truly there is satiety of everything, both sleep and lovemaking
> and sweet song and flawless dance;
> of these someone hopes to have his fill,
> more than of war. But the Trojans are insatiate of battle.

This contrast between battle and other, pleasant activities like lovemaking, sleep, song, and dance, becomes emblematic of the intensity of Achilles' anger, as we saw in the earlier discussion of scale, when Odysseus has to chide Achilles for his precipitousness, reminding him that men can fight their enemies once they have their fill of food (ὃς δέ κ' ἀνὴρ <u>οἴνοιο κορεσσάμενος καὶ ἐδωδῆς</u>/ ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσι πανημέριος πολεμίζηι, 19.167-168),

[264] Taplin (1992), 169-170. Taplin notes commentators' distaste for the speech on the grounds of incoherence, but he claims that it is characteristic of Menelaos: the Trojans first acted villainously by abducting Helen, now by attacking the ships that bring retribution. Taplin claims that the audience would have agreed with the viewpoint that war is a necessary evil, to which the delights of peace are preferable. For the view that the speech is incoherent in its context, see Fenik (1968), 146-147; he calls it "a particularly unsuccessful example of the 'expansion technique,'" that is, the composition method in which the speaker "allows one thought to lead him on to the next," *ibid.*, 147.

but they quickly have enough of the fighting (αἶψά τε <u>φυλόπιδος</u> πέλεται <u>κόρος</u> ἀνθρώποισιν, 19.221). Achilles' behavior proves exactly the contrary, where he is concerned: as we have seen, there is no sense of fullness or completion in any of his battlefield exploits.[265] The contrast in delight at the beginning of Book 24 complements that theme of contrasting satiety and indicates that, funeral games notwithstanding, Achilles is no closer to satisfying his ποθή-driven restlessness than he was before the burial of Patroklos.

To this problem of satiety the poem offers an answer embedded in its language, that of release. The only remedy for this desire for what is irretrievably lost is the letting go of such attempts. Achilles' release of his insatiety is a narrative fact. When Priam stirs up in Achilles a desire for weeping, the weeping scene ends with Achilles being released of such desire: αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα γόοιο τετάρπετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,/ καί οἱ ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἦλθ' ἵμερος ἠδ' ἀπὸ γυίων,/ αὐτίκ' ἀπὸ θρόνου ὦρτο [...] ("But when godlike Achilles had taken his pleasure of weeping, and the desire left his heart and limbs, straightaway he rose from the throne [...]," 24.513-515). These last two appearances of ἵμερος γόοιο recall those earlier moments in Book 23, where the phrase pointed both to Achilles' desire for the presence of Patroklos and the varied and ineffectual attempts to achieve that presence. This linguistic marker of Achilles' potentially limitless desire is here reframed at the moment of its release: the phrase is split, Achilles taking his pleasure in lament (γόοιο τετάρπετο, 24.513), and the ἵμερος, without a stated object, leaving his heart and body (24.514). Although we understand clearly that the narrator is describing Achilles' desire for weeping, the generality

---

[265] Cf. Taplin (1992), 73: Achilles, who at 19.208 says that the Achaians should not eat ἐπὴν τεισαίμεθα λώβην, clearly does not feel, as he maltreats Hektor's corpse in Book 24, that the λώβη has been paid off.

of this last appearance captures that larger state of insatiety which has been so volatile and encompassed such diverse deeds, none of which brought satisfaction to Achilles; and the totality of this release is betokened in the specification ἀπὸ πραπίδων […] ἠδ' ἀπὸ γυίων, a release not only from his spirit but also his very body.[266]

This arc in the language of the poem, from insatiety to release, is reinforced by the preponderance of forms of λύω in the final book. Of the 106 appearances of λύω words in the *Iliad*, twenty of them occur in Book 24 – nearly one fifth.[267] Seventeen of these occurrences refer to the release of Hektor's body for ransom. The refrain, which varies from the active ἀπό θ' Ἕκτορα λύσηι ("that Achilles might release Hektor for ransom," 24.76, 116, cf. 115, 136, 137) to the middle λύσασθαι φίλον υἱὸν ("that Priam might ransom his dear son," 24.118, 146, 195, 237, cf. 175), and other forms,[268] forefronts the idea of release, imitating on the level of language the thematic answer to Achilles' unbreakable cycle of grief and vengeance. When Achilles has wept with Priam and makes a speech of consolation and

---

[266] According to Nagler (1974), 189, if anything is the climax of the *Iliad*, it is this release of pent-up emotion at 24.513-514. Although it is difficult to argue for a single climax – the Trojan response to the death of Hektor in 22 is certainly a climax of the narrative arc of Achilles' *aristeia* and its consequences – I would agree that this moment of release is climactic in the sub-narrative of Achilles' grief-driven insatiety.

[267] The second highest preponderance of this word is in Book 16, where it appears 10 times, of which 7 refer to death. The second highest preponderance of λύω-words used to denote ransom is in Book 1 (5 times); cf. Macleod (1982), on the verbal echoes between the supplication of Book 24 and that of Book 1, 33-34. Lynn-George (1996) notes the prominence of λύω together with ἐάω ("let it be") in Book 24, 4.

[268] 24.502, λυσόμενος παρὰ σεῖο (Priam to Achilles, "I have come to ransom Hektor from you"); 24.554-555, ἀλλὰ τάχιστα/ λῦσον (Priam bidding Achilles, "But release him as quickly as possible"); 24.560-561, νοέω […]/ Ἕκτορά τοι λῦσαι (Achilles' reply, "I intend to release Hektor to you"); 24.593, Ἕκτορα δῖον ἔλυσα (Achilles to Patroklos, "[don't be angry if you learn that] I released Hektor"); 24.599, υἱὸς μὲν δή τοι λέλυται (Achilles to Priam, "your son has been released to you"); 24.655, ἀνάβλησις λύσιος νεκροῖο γένοιτο (Achilles to Priam, "[sleep outside, lest an Achaian see you] and there be a delay of the ransoming of the corpse"); 24.685, φίλον υἱὸν ἐλύσαο (Hermes to Priam, "you have ransomed your son").

reconciliation, we see his understanding of the futility of those deeds he was pursuing cyclically: οὐ γάρ τις πρῆξις πέλεται κρυεροῖο γόοιο ("for nothing is accomplished by chilling lament," 24.524). At the close of his speech he repeats such a sentiment, expounding on the fruitlessness of sorrow: ἄνσχεο, μηδ' ἀλίαστον ὀδύρεο σὸν κατὰ θυμόν·/ οὐ γάρ τι πρήξεις ἀκαχήμενος υἷος ἑῆος,/ <u>οὐδέ μιν ἀνστήσεις</u> […] ("Bear up, and do not mourn without ceasing in your heart; for you will accomplish nothing by grieving for your son, <u>nor will you raise him up</u> […]," 24.549-551). This phrase reverberates with Hekabe's later condemnation of Achilles' vengeance-seeking, discussed above: ἀνέστησεν δέ μιν οὐδ' ὧς ("but not even thus did he raise him up," 24.756). Achilles' understanding of the futility of lament to restore the dead to life points precisely to the cycle in which he has been enmeshed. He emerges from ποθή-driven insatiety not because that insatiety has been satisfied, but because he has let it go.

The gods, of course, play a role in Achilles' release of Hektor's body. Zeus is the first to apply the verb λύω to Achilles' release of the corpse (24.76), and his intervention is comparable to those earlier scenes where he mitigated the effects of grief's insatiety, both the horses' immobility in Book 17 and Achilles' fasting in Book 19. Taplin rightly argues, however, that the gods' intervention in Book 24 does not *cause* the release of the corpse. Many details indicate that the conclusion is not foregone: Zeus' conditional language, αἴ κέν πως ("if he fears me and releases Hektor," 24.116); the many indications that Achilles' obedience to the commands of Zeus requires personal restraint (cf. 24.560ff); and Thetis' omission of the detail that Priam will be the one who seeks Hektor's ransoming (24.137), which, Taplin argues, leaves undetermined, on the human level, *how* these events will be

accomplished.[269] Achilles' release remains a personal reality, an internal letting go, and thus it surpasses, on the human level, the effectiveness of earlier divine interventions, which mitigated the effects of insatiety without truly causing release.[270]

The poem underscores the totality of this release by giving remarkable closure to the theme of delight. In a reconciliation scene justly famous, Achilles and Priam eat together, and then gaze at one another in mutual admiration. The scene is framed with markers of satisfaction:

> αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο
> ἤτοι Δαρδανίδης Πρίαμος θαύμαζ' Ἀχιλῆα,
> ὅσσος ἔην οἷός τε· θεοῖσι γὰρ ἄντα ἐῴκει·
> αὐτὰρ ὃ Δαρδανίδην Πρίαμον θαύμαζεν Ἀχιλλεύς
> εἰσορόων ὄψιν τ' ἀγαθὴν καὶ μῦθον ἀκούων.
> αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐς ἀλλήλους ὁρόωντες […]. (24.628-633)
>
> But when they had put away their desire for drink and food,
> truly Dardanian Priam gazed with wonder at Achilles,
> how great he was, of what quality; for he was like the gods in appearance;
> and Achilles gazed with wonder at Dardanian Priam,
> looking upon his noble appearance and listening to his speech.
> But when they had taken their delight in looking at one another […].

This moment where the two men delight (τάρπησαν) in looking at one another reaffirms our awareness that Achilles is newly released from insatiety. Whereas before Achilles was insatiate both of battle and weeping, he now not only has his fill of food (ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο,

---

[269] See Taplin (1992), 263-274.

[270] Thus Whitman (1958) argues that Achilles' quick yielding to his mother in Book 24 reveals that "the gods can teach a man nothing which he has not already learned and willed," 216-7. Schadewaldt (1965) describes the release as a human deed, but not to the exclusion of the gods, 348. See also Macleod (1982), *ad* 24.119, on how Zeus expects Achilles to be pleased with the gifts and respect his command, but does not predict the "fellow-feeling" that will unite Achilles and Priam. Richardson (1993) suggests, *ad* 24.139-140, that Achilles' terse acquiescence to his mother could indicate reluctance to think about the matter; such reluctance would show that his internal release is still to come.

24.628), but enjoys gazing upon his enemy. This is not the first time Achilles has eaten since Patroklos death,[271] yet the significance of the scene remains: these marked moments of satisfaction and delight establish clearly Achilles' newfound ability to rest.[272] The sense of closure in this moment is reinforced by Priam's share in its fullness. The king had earlier claimed that weeping could bring satiety, using a variant of the formula for completing a meal: αὐτίκα γάρ με κατακτείνειεν Ἀχιλλεύς/ ἀγκὰς ἑλόντ᾽ ἐμὸν υἱόν, ἐπὴν γόου ἐξ ἔρον εἵην ("For then might Achilles have killed me holding my son in my arms, when I had had my fill of weeping," 24.226-227). Thus Priam too, whose response to grief has manifested the greatest likeness to Achilles', now satisfies his desire for food rather than weeping, enhancing the sense of fullness in this scene. Redfield says about the end of the *Iliad* that "the opposite of *menos* is *koros*, satiety;" and indeed this moment of mutual delight offers closure to the persisting relentlessness that has characterized Achilles since Patroklos' death. The insatiety has been released.[273]

---

[271] It is unclear whether he eats with the other Achaians before Patroklos' funeral, 23.55-57, although the insatiate quality of his grief is seen in his refusal to bathe. When Priam enters Achilles' tent in Book 24, Achilles has just finished a meal (24.475-476); yet Patroklos' absence is felt here in the description of Automedon and Alkimos as Achilles' attendants; cf. Taplin (1992), 78-81.

[272] See Nagler (1974) on placement of this mutual admiration between the themes of food and sleep, to which it is linked by the theme of satiety, 197.

[273] Redfield (1975), 201. Cf. Griffin (1980): the poem develops the *feeling* that nothing will end the extremity of Achilles' grief, which feeling is resolved when he eats with Priam, 16-17. On Achilles' return to normal activity, see, among others, Muellner (1996), 168-175; Monsacré (1984), 183. Kakridis (1949) frames this scene in terms of the contrast between "grieving soul and hungry body," traced from Odysseus' prudent exhortation to eat in Book 19, through Patroklos' chiding Achilles for his sleep in Book 23, to this final scene of the body's needs winning out over the soul; Kakridis (1949), 103-5. Such interpretation aligns him with Segal (1971a) and Taplin (1992), when they claim the reconciliation is born of weariness (cf. n253, above). Although Kakridis et al. are right to point to the role of time and human tiredness, such arguments bypass the point of delight. Achilles' and Priam's mutual delight in eating and gazing at one another suggests that insatiety has been released, where eating out of necessity would prove merely human weakness.

When we follow the growing cyclicity in Achilles' vengeance, we see the poem's simple answer to such cycles of vengeance, evident in the language – the only way to end insatiety is to let it go. Achilles' exhortation on the futility of seeking life through grieving shows his understanding of the cycle he was in, and the recapitulation of the theme of delight, applied not merely to the delights of peace that Menelaos speaks of in Book 13, but to looking upon Priam, and being looked upon by him, establishes the fact of release firmly for the audience.

Release, Take 2

The second point about Achilles' reconciliation with Priam that I wish to refine concerns the epic's depiction of his psychological motivations at the end of the work. Some speak of Achilles' alienation from his mortal self during the grief-anger period, and his restoration to the human community in Book 24, as if the conclusion of the poem proceeded from a kind of narrative inevitability. Thus narrative observations are made, tracing archetypal narrative patterns of withdrawal, devastation, and return, for example,[274] or markers of Achilles' daimonic scale and return to human activity,[275] without exploring the coherence of Achilles' inner motivation. When scholars do consider Achilles' inner motivation, they emphasize the coexistence of his violent and generous sides, without

---

274 Nagler (1974); cf. M. Lord (1967), 241-248, esp. 247-248. For terms, see A. Lord (2000), 186-197.
275 King (1987), 13-45, esp. such statements as, "The divine and the bestial in Achilles will become once again integrated into the human as Books Twenty-Three and Twenty-Four bring the *Iliad* to a quiet, civilized and sorrowful close," 28 (although she does make a case for his universalized understanding of grief in Book 24, 42). Cf. Owen (1946), 232-48; Segal (1971a), whose account of these polarities is particularly lucid; Schein (1984), 128-163. Vivante (1970), by contrast, claims that grief for Patroklos restores Achilles fully to the human world as early as Book 18; thus the reconciliation with Priam is merely a further step in Achilles' embrace of mortal realities, 57-59.

accounting for the transition between them;[276] or, as we saw above, they argue for the inevitability of Achilles' return to social normalcy given the sense of futility at the beginning of Book 24. But as we have seen, such a sense of futility points to a problem, rather than a solution, and moreover it fails to explain what inspired Achilles to show the father of his best friend's slayer such gracious hospitality and the offer of friendship.[277] It seems to me that the poem offers us more than the closure externally necessary for our satisfaction with the poem. The poem carefully roots Achilles' loss of mortal limits and alienation from human community in an entirely human phenomenon, his ποθή for his deceased friend. Thus the restoration is rooted in the same reality that motivated the alienation. Therefore I find Nagler slightly misleading in his otherwise lucid and useful study, when he claims that Achilles had to learn "heroic detachment" from Patroklos in order to achieve true spiritual communion with his deceased friend.[278] The poem does not offer us a lesson against "constricting emotional attachment,"[279] but rather unpacks the twofold potential of such human attachment, to enable communion and to lead to isolation.[280] If there are any lessons

---

[276] Cf. Segal (1971a), 25f., 49f., 65-67; Schein (1984), 98f., 153-163 (although he briefly refers to Achilles' deepened understanding of the tragic human condition, 162). Crotty (1994), *pace* Segal, acknowledges that Achilles has both violent and gentle aspects, but he argues that such an observation takes us no closer to understanding how Book 24 relates to the preceding narrative, 5. Slightly different, but equally unsatisfying as explanations, are statements about Achilles returning to his "true self" in Book 24; thus, e.g., Bowra (1930), "His anger has passed away, and he is himself again," 22; cf. *ibid.* 199; Schadewaldt (1965), 345; *et al.*

[277] On this point, see Crotty (1994), 5. On the limitations and applicability of the term "friendship" for this exchange, see Oele (2010), 61-63.

[278] Nagler (1974), 189; cf. 180-189. Segal (1971a) similarly speaks of Achilles learning to release his "self-centered, desperate clinging to the dead," 66. Cf. Whitman (1958), 218. Whitman's argument, however, is nuanced to include the integration of Achilles' divine and humane sides through his courageous self-mastery in this scene; thus Achilles gives up his excessive vengeance without negating his fiercely intense nature, 218; on these two sides to Achilles, cf. 199-220.

[279] Nagler (1974), 180.

[280] We have already traced markers of Achilles' loneliness, in tension with his attempted communion. To these we shall add the end of Book 19, where the arming of the other Achaians gives way entirely

to be learned from the narrative of Achilles' grief and anger, it is the deeper understanding of the nature of grief, its roots in the desire for shared life, and the fruitlessness of anger to assuage it.

Thus I would also argue against explanations of the release of Hektor's corpse based entirely on Achilles' new understanding of the universal experience of suffering. Such explanations are supported by the parallelism in the weeping scene, in which Priam's evocation of Achilles' father spurs Achilles to weep for Peleus and thereby opens him up to Priam's grief for his dead son Hektor. In these arguments, scholars observe that after the men weep side by side, Achilles' words to Priam describe suffering as a universal human experience, since Zeus bestows on every mortal either unmixed evils or evils mixed with good (24.525-533). So, for example, Segal, taking the father simile in Book 23 as his starting point, argues that the similarity between Achilles' grief and that of Hektor's survivors creates in this scene a universal experience of suffering, in which is felt the "omnipresence of loss, separation, and the grief of distant parents."[281] Likewise Katherine King argues that Achilles

---

to the description of Achilles' personal arming (19.351-391), and this grandiose depiction introduces an *aristeia* in which one could easily have the impression that he is the sole Achaian on the field (e.g., his encounter with Aeneas at 20.158-292; the prolonged series of slayings, in which he is the only Achaian named, 20.381-21.210; the fight with the river, 21.211-382; Priam beholding Achilles' onslaught, 21.520-543), to the point that we are surprised by reminders of the other Achaians' presence (e.g., Achilles falling back into the ranks of Achaians after Aeneas disappears, 20.351-364; his shaking his head at the other Achaians, so that they would not intervene as he chases Hektor around the city, 22.205-207). We can note too small details in Book 23 that suggest his separateness, first in the contrast between him, as he lays Hektor face-first in the dust, and the other Myrmidons, who are unyoking their horses and preparing the meal (23.24-34); and second, when even after he arguably shares a feast with the Achaians (which he calls a "στυγερῆι […] δαιτί," 23.48), he lies down on the seashore, while the others go to their shelters (23.58-61, cf. note 149).

[281] Segal (1971a), 45. For Achilles' lamenting the sorrows bestowed on his father, far from his son at Troy, see 24.538-542. Rutherford (1982) likewise claims that Patroklos is to Achilles as Hektor is to Priam and all the Trojans, and he argues that the *Iliad*'s end shows how suffering brings understanding when one looks beyond individual sorrow to the condition of the human race, 159-

should be seen as a father figure to Patroklos, and thus in this scene he weeps both as child of Peleus and as parent of Patroklos, a more comprehensive grief which transcends his previous personal responses to Patroklos' death.[282] These considerations of the universalized experience of suffering deserve attention, certainly. Despite the limitations on full communion in this scene, intimated in Achilles' gentle pushing away of Priam's hand and the unique objects of each one's grief,[283] the structure of the lines evokes parallels in their suffering, and the dual participle, "they were remembering" draws them together, a union clinched by the singular verb which ends the vignette, "and their groaning rose through the house:"

> ὣς φάτο· τῶι δ' ἄρα πατρὸς ὑφ' ἵμερον ὦρσε γόοιο,
> ἁψάμενος δ' ἄρα χειρὸς ἀπώσατο ἦκα γέροντα.
> τὼ δὲ μνησαμένω, ὃ μὲν Ἕκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο
> κλαῖ' ἁδινὰ προπάροιθε ποδῶν Ἀχιλῆος ἐλυσθείς,
> αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς κλαῖεν ἑὸν πατέρ', ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
> Πάτροκλον· τῶν δὲ στοναχὴ κατὰ δώματ' ὀρώρει. (24.507-512)
>
> So he spoke; and in him he stirred up a desire to weep for his father,
> and taking him by the hand he pushed the old man away, gently.
> And the two men were remembering, the one for Hektor the man-slayer
> was weeping thickly, curled up before the feet of Achilles,
> but Achilles was weeping for his own father, and again in turn for
> Patroklos; and their groaning rose up throughout the house.

160; cf. Kim (2000): "This simile equates, as it were, the emotional state of Achilles with that of Priam," 149; and Silk (2004), 82-84.

[282] King (1987), 42; cf. Kim (2000), 149-150.

[283] Lynn-George (1988) maintains reservations about the degree of sharing in this scene, which he describes as ambivalently "poised between reconciliation and repudiation, […] suspended in the separation of shared grief," 243-244. His point is true to a degree. Nevertheless, weeping together does create community between these two men to a remarkable degree, consonant with, but unprecedented in, the backdrop of previous weeping in the poem. On this paradox, cf. Oele (2010), 60.

The word order is marvelous: after drawing the two men together with the dual participle, τὼ δὲ μνησαμένω, the narrator draws a thread from object Ἕκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο, set at the end of line 509, followed by its enjambed governing verb, κλαῖ', through two central lines positioning Priam at Achilles' feet, and Achilles weeping for his own father, to the second marked enjambment, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε/ Πάτροκλον, which closes this grammatical period, forcing us to compare Hektor and Patroklos and thus relate the two grievers' griefs to each other. We need not read a parental relationship between Achilles and Patroklos in order to appreciate the poem's presentation of these two men's griefs as having a certain likeness.[284] Moreover, it is clearly significant that Achilles weeps for two persons, his father and Patroklos, and such an experience certainly contributes to the broadened understanding that we see in his later speech to Priam.

Such partial symmetry in this scene, however, should not then give rise to explanations of the reconciliation that are based solely on a kind of intellectual conversion on Achilles' part. Kevin Crotty, for example, attributes the reconciliation scene to Achilles achieving insight, through pity, into the same sorrow and anger that have driven him throughout the *Iliad*. According to Crotty, the final scenes of compassion arise from the very same source, namely, sorrow and anger, as the violence that precedes them; but this sorrow and anger are now transformed by Achilles' new understanding that suffering is the *sort of*

---

[284] Thus Macleod (1982) rightly reads not a straight parental likeness in their griefs, but rather a likeness born of surpassing dearness: "[…] Patroclus is to [Achilles] what Hector is to Priam, closest to his heart and uppermost in his mind," 26. On external signs of their grief's likeness, e.g., their parallel sleeplessness, self-defilement, and refusal to eat, cf. Macleod (1982), *ad* 24.160, 162-164, and 637-642. Simon (1978) too goes beyond a straight father-son interpretation, arguing that the two men are related in multiple ways, 75-77; he attributes to this multiplicity the efficacy of Achilles' "working through grief and need for revenge" in this scene, insofar as Priam and Achilles realize that each contains "within him parts of all others," 75-76.

thing that happens, and that he is the *sort of being* susceptible to harm.[285] Crotty is right to observe this intellectual dimension to the emotional unity that ties this scene with the earlier scenes of fury and insatiety. But while pity certainly plays an important role in transforming Achilles' grief and anger, we must see too that the original longing which shaped both of those emotions bears an intrinsic desire for shared life as such. Thus the enjambed Πάτροκλον in line 512 not only signifies a partial symmetry in this scene, but it reminds us that Achilles still weeps for Patroklos, that the same loss moves him in this moment, in the midst of the broadening influences of Priam's appeal and his memory of his own father.[286]

Thus I would say that although Achilles is special for his ability to channel that impulse towards shared life to a new object – all the more special because of how well we understand the isolation brought on by longing[287] – we also must realize that this dynamism towards life inheres in Achilles' experience of loss. The very grief that detached Achilles from the human world contains an element of unrelenting attachment to that world.[288] This attachment to mortal life is very limited, as we have already noted – the loss of Patroklos,

---

[285] *Ibid*, 10-14, 71-84; cf. 92, 102. Cf. Kim (2000), 151-166; Zanker (1994), 121-125, 130. For pity as insight into the human condition of universal suffering, see also Macleod (1982), 27.

[286] Zanker (1994) reads this double object of weeping as a sign that Achilles "regards his relationship with Peleus in a sense as dead as that with his friend," and thus indicative of Achilles' new degree of resignation to his death, 122. Such awareness of his death's implications for his father is certainly integral to the scene, yet the emphasis on Patroklos also points to continuity in Achilles' grief, reminding us that his separation from the human world was driven by longing for a particular aspect of that world, the life shared with his friend.

[287] On Achilles' empathy, cf. Kim (2000), 148-9; for the unique degree of magnanimity in Achilles' reconciliation with Priam, defined as disinterested fellow-feeling, see Zanker (1994), 127-154, esp. 137-8. MacCary (1982), in contrast with these scholars, argues that Achilles is "unable to project himself outside himself," 15; cf. 93-96, 235.

[288] Cf. Muellner (1996): "Grief for Patroklos is what made Achilles' return to the human community absolute and irrevocable," 174. Bespaloff (1947) phrases a similar idea in terms of hatred of death: Achilles' "passion for destruction grow[s] out of a hatred for the destructibility of all things," 105. Yet this hatred of death is the obverse of his desire for life, which is essential for understanding this final scene with Priam.

and the certainty of his future death, has cut Achilles off from both past and future, represented by his father and son back in Phthia.[289] But in Achilles' grief-stricken desire for life shared with Patroklos and in the shared meal with Priam we see a certain continuity. Thus I would argue Achilles does not merely possess two dimensions, his immortal side and his mortal side, nor two registers of acting, suprahuman slaughter and human compassion, to which duality we should attribute this scene of reconciliation. Rather, the final enjambed "Patroklos" of line 24.512 reminds us that his ties with immortality and his period of daimonic grief have been rooted, in the poem's presentation, in the mortal phenomenon of human love. Although scholars are right to note the broadened perspective in Achilles' pronouncements on mortality and universal suffering, to such understandings we must also add this more complete picture of what drove the period of insatiety in the first place: the desire for shared life. This human reality grounds Achilles enough to enable him to release the body, and to share magnanimously in human activities with his fellow enemy.

In this chapter we have traced several narrative threads which are shaped by the character of Achilles' grief-longing: the daimonic scale of his deeds of anger; the tension between his intense focus on Hektor's death, whereby the poem symbolically portrays the sack of Troy, and his core aimlessness; the persisting relentlessness of his grief beyond vengeance and burial; the theme of release; and the moderating force of his underlying desire for shared life. In the final chapter we shall turn to the Trojans' grief for Hektor. Although grief for this warrior shares with Achilles' grief some features of ποθή, the language is absent. To this phenomenon we now turn.

---

[289] Cf. 19.324-325, 19.334-337. Thus argues Scully (1990), 123-124, and (2003b), 38-42; cf. Whitman (1958), 202-6. For discussion of Achilles' detachment, see Chapter One, pp. 27-28.

Chapter Four: Grief for Hektor

One can never definitively say why a poet included or excluded something from a work, but in this last chapter I shall try to understand why the dynamics of longing in grief are linguistically emphasized in Achilles' story and not in the story of Hektor, despite their potential and occasionally emerging presence. The exclusion of ποθή and ἵμερος γόοιο language from grief for Hektor is surprising, since Hektor is the focus of tremendous grief and receives more narrated γόοι than any other character in the poem. But I shall argue for three points that make sense of this omission. The first two considerations are intimately related. First, Hektor's inescapable role as defender of the city permeates every expression of grief for this great warrior. In such a story of real civic need, the story of a communion of persons, so wonderfully captured by ποθή, is subsumed to a larger story of civic survival. Similarly, Hektor is defined by a network of relations, with his wife, father, mother, sister-in-law, and people as a whole, and this network spreads out the experience of shared life among many people.[290] By contrast, Achilles' entire experience of shared life rests on Patroklos. Their highly personal relationship lends itself to an exploration of the effects of longing in grief. All expressions of grief for Hektor, however, even where they include personal dimensions, are fundamentally tied to the larger story of Troy's fall and are in concert with other persons' experiences of loss. The effect of this diffusing is such that we never see these expressions of grief erupt in anger or manifest insatiety to the same degree as

---

[290] Redfield (1975) articulates the complex position of Hektor *vis-à-vis* his community throughout his work, defining his story as one "shaped by a delicate structure of diverse relations," 109. Cf. Beck (2005) contrasting Achilles as chief mourner for Patroklos with the multiple relatives lamenting Hektor, 263. Her distinction stops there, however, and her analysis lumps the laments of Achilles and the Trojans together insofar as both communicate the costs of war, 268-70.

we see in Achilles' grief; the focus is not on what grief for Hektor leads individual Trojans to do, but on what the absence of Hektor means for the entire city.[291]

The third consideration involves time. When Achilles grieves for Patroklos, he mourns a ruptured present, and he responds to that state of present loss with various futile attempts to change it, somehow to fill it up. In grief for Hektor, the different Trojan mourners are constantly looking forward to a sack that has not yet happened. Their grief for this man is, to be sure, driven by an experience of present loss, which makes that future sack inevitable; but, still, the Trojans' grief is colored by a prevailing dread about the future. Thus perhaps the narrator avoided using the present-centered concept of ποθή in describing grief for Hektor because their mourning is not only longing for what is already gone, as is that of Achilles, but dread of the doom that impends now with all inevitability.[292] Thus when Katherine King, for example, sums up the *Iliad* as "the effective conquering of a city by wreaking personal vengeance on that city's champion,"[293] we must give due importance to the word "effective." Though at the end of the *Iliad* we know the sack of Troy is certain, the prevailing mood is doomed finality, not actual destruction. Thus the language of Trojan grief looks to the future in a way absent from Achilles' grief for Patroklos. In these two intertwined stories of grief, Achilles' grief for Patroklos and the Trojans' grief for Hektor, we see two different narrative interests – the one an interest in how the insatiety of a ruptured

---

[291] One interesting consequence of this diffusion in grief is the fact that a shade of Hektor never speaks to Andromache, Hekabe, Priam, or another member of the Trojan community, in contrast to Patroklos' shade speaking to Achilles. The scene between Patroklos' shade and Achilles brings out the tensions of personal longing in a way unexplored in the Trojans' story.
[292] See Kullmann (2001, orig. 1968) on the *Iliad*'s presentation of the entire war through its characters' comments on past and future, 385-408; Andromache in particular focuses on the grimness of the future, 399-402.
[293] King (1987), 1; quoted in Intro (cf. note 2).

present drives an anger vast enough virtually to sack a city, the other an interest in how a city will fall through the death of one man – and these two narrative interests lead to different linguistic focuses. In what follows I shall trace the ways throughout the poem in which Hektor is tied to the future sack of the city, noting where the poem could have pursued a dynamic of longing-driven insatiety in the Trojans' grief, but subordinates such potential to a larger perspective. After his death, Hektor's wife, parents, and the people of Troy persistently link his death to the impending fall of the entire city. Thus the grief for Hektor is not primarily shaped by longing for a shared life that can never be recovered. His story speaks not of how grief can erupt in an anger massive enough to destroy a civilization; rather, the death of Hektor entails the imminent fall of Troy, and the grief of his people for him highlights this broader story of impending loss.[294]

Hektor and the People of Troy

The Trojans in the *Iliad* exist in relation to Troy. Scully observes this link in the poem's many references to Troy as Πριάμοιο πόλις, the city of Priam.[295] The life of the city

---

[294] For a glimpse of the story *not* here told, the active response to grief for a fallen city defender, compare the Trojan response to the death of Sarpedon, called the ἕρμα πόληος at the moment of their grief: ὣς ἔφατο, Τρῶας δὲ κατὰ κρῆθεν λάβε πένθος/ ἄσχετον, οὐκ ἐπιεικτόν, ἐπεί σφισιν ἕρμα πόληος/ ἔσκε καὶ ἀλλοδαπός περ ἐών· πολέες γὰρ ἅμ' αὐτῶι/ λαοὶ ἕποντ', ἐν δ' αὐτὸς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι./ βὰν δ' ἰθὺς Δαναῶν λελιημένοι· ἦρχε δ' ἄρά σφιν/ Ἕκτωρ, χωόμενος Σαρπηδόνος. ("So he spoke, and sorrow took the Trojans from head to foot,/ a sorrow unrestrained, not to be endured, since for them he was the city's stay/ always, foreigner though he was; for many were the peoples who with him/ came, but among them he excelled in battle./ And straight for the Danaans they aimed, straining; and their leader was Hektor, angered over Sarpedon," 16.548-553.) Although Hektor too could easily be described as "the city's stay," his death provokes not the turn to battle, but the depiction of certain and widespread doom.

[295] Scully (1990), 54-68; cf. Kullman (2001, orig. 1968), 405-6. One poignant example of this periphrasis is in 22.165, as the narrator sums up the length and course and speed of Achilles' pursuit of Hektor around Troy: ὣς τὼ τρὶς Πριάμοιο πόλιν πέρι δινηθήτην/ καρπαλίμοισι πόδεσσι· ("Thus the two men flew in chase three times around the city of Priam on their swift feet."); here in

centers, in the language of the poem, on the king's family. Thus we find many collocations of Priam, his family, and the Trojans at large, as when Hektor declares to Hekabe that Paris is a πῆμα/ Τρωσί τε καὶ Πριάμωι μεγαλήτορι τοῖό τε παισίν ("cause of misery for the Trojans and for great-hearted Priam and for his children," 6.282-283), or when Nestor chides Achilles and Agamemnon for their quarrel which gladdens Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες,/ ἄλλοί τε Τρῶες ("Priam and the children of Priam and the other Trojans," 1.255-256).[296] Scully observes that through such union of these two spheres, οἶκος and πόλις, the destruction of a city is clearly shown to entail the destruction of vulnerable lives within it. One poignant example of such inter-referencing between the city and its families is the arming scene in Book 8, where the narrator describes straightforwardly the Achaians eating and arming,[297] while on the other side the Trojans arm before their city, the significance of which location the narrator then drives home: Τρῶες δ' αὖθ' ἑτέρωθεν ἀνὰ πτόλιν ὡπλίζοντο,/ παυρότεροι, μέμασαν δὲ καὶ ὧς ὑσμῖνι μάχεσθαι,/ χρειοῖ ἀναγκαίηι, πρό τε παίδων καὶ πρὸ γυναικῶν ("But on the other side the Trojans were arming before the city, fewer, but they were eager to fight thus in battle, because of compelling necessity, on

---

this climactic moment we are reminded of the pursued's tie to his city, a city made up of people and relationships. Cf. 8.551-552, where the gods ignore the sweet savor of their sacrifices because they hate Ἴλιος ἱρή,/ καὶ Πρίαμος καὶ λαὸς ἐϋμμελίω Πριάμοιο ("sacred Troy, and Priam, and the people of Priam of the good ash spear"); and 24.27-28, where the ἄτη of Alexander makes Ἴλιος ἱρή,/ καὶ Πρίαμος καὶ λαὸς ("sacred Ilion, and Priam, and his people") hateful to Athena and Hera. Regarding the power of this antithesis between one man's folly and the fate of a whole city, see Macleod (1982), *ad loc.*

[296] Cf. Scully (1990), 57. Scully cites also 2.304, 4.35-36, 21.105, 24.35-37. Similar is Hektor's criticism of Paris for bringing Helen to Troy, πατρί τε σῶι μέγα πῆμα πόληΐ τε παντί τε δήμωι ("a great grief for your father and city and entire people," 3.50). Cf. Graziosi and Haubold (2010) *ad* 6.282-283, who comment that the Trojans and Priam's family tend to merge into a single identity.

[297] οἳ δ' ἄρα δεῖπνον ἕλοντο κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοι/ ῥίμφα κατὰ κλισίας, ἀπὸ δ' αὐτοῦ θωρήσσοντο· (8.53-54).

behalf of their children and their wives," 8.55-57).[298] Such interweaving between the city, the people within it, and the men who fight for them keeps us ever aware of the network of relationships that defines Troy and each Trojan.

Hektor is the focal point of this link between people and city. He is repeatedly depicted as city-defender and acknowledges this link himself, as we see in his response to his wife's entreaty to fight from within the walls in Book 6,[299] or his boast over Patroklos:

> Πάτροκλ', ἦ που ἔφησθα πόλιν κεραϊξέμεν ἁμήν,
> Τρωϊάδας δὲ γυναῖκας ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούρας
> ἄξειν ἐν νήεσσι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
> νήπιε· τάων δὲ πρόσθ' Ἕκτορος ὠκέες ἵπποι
> ποσσὶν ὀρωρέχαται πολεμιζέμεν, ἔγχεϊ δ' αὐτός
> Τρωσὶ φιλοπτολέμοισι μεταπρέπω, ὅ σφιν ἀμύνω
> ἦμαρ ἀναγκαῖον· (16.830-836)
>
> Patroklos, truly you thought that you would sack our city,
> and robbing the Trojan women of their day of freedom
> would convey them on ships to your own land of your fathers,
> fool; since in front of them Hektor's swift horses
> with full strides are stretched out to do battle, and I myself with my spear
> stand out among the war-loving Trojans, and I ward off for them
> the day of slavery;

Hektor links the survival of the city to ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ, the day of freedom of the city's women, protected by his own fighting on their behalf.[300] This focus on Hektor as the

---

[298] Cf. too 6.94-95, where Helenos tells Hektor to propitiate Athena, αἴ κ' ἐλεήσῃ/ ἄστύ τε καὶ Τρώων ἀλόχους καὶ νήπια τέκνα ("if only she might pity the city and the Trojan wives and small children"). Taplin (1992) notes how the narrator refers to the Trojan women at 6.237-241 in terms of their network of relationships with husbands and kin, 117.

[299] "I am dreadfully ashamed before the Trojan men and women with their long robes, if like a coward I were to avoid battle, off by myself […]," 6.441-443; Scully (1990) rightly notes that in this speech Hektor puts grief for his wife over all other griefs which will come with Troy's destruction; thus the implication is that Hektor fights for Andromache. Here again we see the intertwining realities of πόλις and οἶκος; Scully (1990), 60-61.

personification of the city's very survival intensifies as the poem depicts his death and the Trojan response to it. Particularly striking is the simile that accompanies his death in Book 22, when the entire city responds with lamentation like that which will accompany the sack of Troy: τῶι δὲ μάλιστ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἔην ἐναλίγκιον, ὡς εἰ ἅπασα/ Ἴλιος ὀφρυόεσσα πυρὶ σμύχοιτο κατ᾽ ἄκρης ("and it was most like this, as if all of beetling Troy were being consumed by fire, from its pinnacle to its foundations," 22.410-411).[301] This wailing of the city arises in the midst of the particular grief of Hektor's parents. The narrator first depicts Hekabe, tearing at her hair, ripping off her headdress, and wailing as she looks at her son, whose corpse is being dragged in the dust by Achilles (22.405-407);[302] then his father, groaning pitifully (22.408); and third, the people of Troy, who surround the king and queen, held by wailing and lamentation throughout the city (ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοί/ κωκυτῶι τ᾽ εἴχοντο καὶ οἰμωγῆι κατὰ ἄστυ, 22.408-409). This crescendo, from mother, father, and people, ending with the startling comparison of Hektor's death to the sack of the city, points to the reality reflected in that simile. Just as Hektor's survival is entwined with the fate of his city, the grief of Hektor's family is enmeshed in the larger needs of the polis, the λαοί of whom Priam and Hekabe are a part. Thus we see again that network of relationships which weaves Hektor into the larger entity of Troy itself.

---

[300] Cf. Scully (1990), 58-61, 116-118; Taplin (1992) on Hektor as the maintainer of these women's relationships and lives, 117.

[301] On the death of Hektor and the sack of Troy, see among others, Schadewaldt (1966), 156-7; Schein (1984), 24-25; Segal (1971a), 42-47; Taplin (1992), 248.

[302] Hekabe's ἀπὸ δὲ λιπαρὴν ἔρριψε καλύπτρην/ τηλόσε ("she cast off her shining veil far from her," 22.406) reminds us of the symbolism of rape embedded in Andromache's similar gesture, when her κρήδεμνον falls far from her head (22.468-470), the head covering which symbolizes her marriage to Hektor and which same word, in the plural, refers to the walls of the city. Cf. Gottschall (2008), 75; Schein (1984), 176; Monsacré (1984), 68f.; Nagler (1967), 298-307, esp. 304; Redfield (1975), "A woman's purity is her chastity; the city walls, so long as they are unbreached, secure a kind of purity to social life," 161. For the symbolism of κρήδεμνα in general, see Scully (1990), 65.

The name of Hektor's son reflects this warrior's relationship with Troy. When Hektor encounters his wife and son at the gates of the city in Book 6, the narrator gives a brief etymology of the young child's name: τόν ῥ' Ἕκτωρ καλέεσκε Σκαμάνδριον, αὐτὰρ οἱ ἄλλοι/ 'Αστυάνακτ'· οἶος γὰρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἕκτωρ ("This one Hektor always called Skamandrios, but the others called him "Astyanax," Lord of the City; for Hektor alone protected Ilion," 6.402-403).[303] The very place of this meeting bespeaks Hektor's symbolic union with the life of the city, and more broadly the Trojans' relationship with those walls. Hektor, not finding his wife at home, rushes back to the battlefield, when he encounters his wife running towards him, just as he is about to pass through the gates of the city: εὖτε πύλας ἵκανε διερχόμενος μέγα ἄστυ/ Σκαιάς, τῆι ἄρ' ἔμελλε διεξίμεναι πεδίονδε ("when he reached the gates, having gone through the great city, those Skaian gates, where he was about to pass through and go towards the plain," 6.392-393). The emphasis on these gates as a place of transition from city to plain highlights Hektor's role as defender of the city, and physically embodies the dilemma of his existence. In fighting to defend the city and live up to his essential role as its protector, Hektor risks death, the city's sack, and his wife's enslavement. The location of their dialogue brings his aporia into relief.[304]

Given this inescapable civic context, we can understand why the poem avoids characterizing the Trojans' grief for Hektor in terms of ποθή. Hektor is a man enmeshed in

---

303 Andromache repeats this etymology in her lament for Hektor in Book 22, thus again drawing our attention to this fundamental link: Ἀστυάναξ, ὃν Τρῶες ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν,/ οἶος γάρ σφιν ἔρυσο πύλας καὶ τείχεα μακρά ("Astyanax, which name the Trojans call him, for you alone protected for them the gates and long walls," 22.506-507).

304 On the need for Hektor to stay alive for his community and yet risk death fighting for their survival, see Redfield (1975), esp. 123-127; e.g., "His death is not a private matter," 124. See also Scully (1990), 65-66; Lynn-George (1988), 218-219. Taplin (1992) calls the Skaian gate the "great symbol of defense and vulnerability" for the entire people of Troy – men and women, young and old – who make their home in the city, 95.

a web of relationships, all of which bind his character to the survival of the city. The poem does not explore the individual effects of grief for Hektor on each of his loved ones, because in the larger story of Troy the poem looks not at what the death of Hektor drives the Trojans to do, but at the devastation which that death will wreak on their city and survival.[305] This forward-looking, broad sense of loss can be traced in each lament for Hektor, overwhelming the latent notes of ποθή discernible in much of his loved ones' grief with a prevailing tenor of impending civic doom.[306]

Andromache in Book 6 – Particular and Civic Grief

As we turn to Andromache's grief for Hektor, we should note that the language of the poem does not preclude delineating the grief of wife for husband with ποθή terms. In Book 5, when the goddess Dione threatens Diomedes' life, she declares that he should be careful with whom he fights, lest his wife γοόωσα ("lamenting"), be unable to sleep, κουρίδιον ποθέουσα πόσιν, τὸν ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν ("longing for her wedded husband, the best of the Achaians," 5.413-414). This threatened ποθή shows the possibility of a wife's grief for her husband being depicted with such specific language of longing. Nor is Andromache's Book 6 lament in anticipation of Hektor's death devoid of ποθή-like elements. As Andromache narrates the sack of her previous home and subsequent death of

---

305 Thus I think Slatkin (1991) overstates her case when she says, "Grief is never static, never passive, in the *Iliad*," 86; her characterization applies to Achilles and to many individual warriors, but not to the Trojans as a whole.

306 On the forward-looking tenor of the poem in general, anticipating both Achilles' death and Troy's fall, cf. Mackie (2008), who accounts for this gap between present and future in terms of the poem's sense of change in the conduct of heroism from past generations to the future in which Troy will be utterly destroyed, 1-5, 153-171, 190-91, etc.

her father, brothers, and mother, her climactic plea betrays an intense desire not to lose yet again the wholeness of life shared with family: Ἕκτορ, ἀτὰρ σύ μοί ἐσσι πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ/ ἠδὲ κασίγνητος, σὺ δέ μοι θαλερὸς παρακοίτης. ("Hektor, indeed, you are my father and my honored mother and my brother, and you are my strong husband," 6.429-430). Her words depict the fullness of their life together, and thus intimate how his death would rupture that existence and create a deep void. Hektor too understands the particular longing that she will feel for her husband, when he sensitively observes that whenever she hears him praised, it will only reinforce her grief: ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει· σοὶ δ' αὖ νέον ἔσσεται ἄλγος/ χήτει τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον ἦμαρ ("Thus at some point will someone say; but for you it will be a fresh grief, widowed of such a man to ward off the day of slavery," 6.462-463).[307]

But this potential longing, thus depicted, remains in the background. The larger focus in the scene is the conflict between Hektor's need to fight for his city, his family, and especially for his wife, and his inability to ensure his survival for those very people if he does so fight. His usefulness to Troy colors his role also as Andromache's husband: she needs him alive both as husband and as city defender, lest her life be destroyed by yet another sack of her city and subsequent destruction of her family.[308] Thus Taplin aptly sums up this

---

[307] *Pace* scholars who find Hektor selfishly boastful, imagining Andromache's future slavery only in terms of his own future renown, e.g., Clarke (1978), 39n37; Beck (2012), 166-7. Although I agree that Hektor is preoccupied with his reputation after death, I nonetheless find his concern for Andromache sincere, given that he has just described her future slavery as his greatest source of grief, and ends his imagining of future renown with an understanding of the grievous effect such reminders will have on his widowed wife. On Andromache's importance to Hektor, seen especially in 6.450-454, cf. Tsagalis (2004a), 121-122. Cf. also Schein (1984), 174; Edwards (1987), 208-212; Lohmann (1988), 39-42.

[308] Cf. Kirk (1990), *ad* 440-465, on the recurrent collision in this scene of the heroic with the personal, the martial with this compassionate, seen in the alternation within both Andromache and

speech when he characterizes Andromache's appeal as a plea for her husband "not to turn Troy into another Thebe."[309] In her narrative of past loss and her plea for Hektor to remain within the walls we see that constant union of home and city that characterizes Troy. Hektor's understanding response, even as it shows his sensitivity to the absence she will feel, ties her longing for a husband to her loss of a protector: ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον ἦμαρ ("a husband *to ward off the day of slavery*," 6.463). The world of marriage is tied to the world of the polis that Hektor must defend. We see the merged roles of husband and protector too in the startling fact that Hektor is helmeted throughout this exchange, removing the helmet only after it terrifies Astyanax (6.466-470). The identification of the home and city spheres is reinforced by Andromache's martial suggestion, at the close of her appeal: immediately following her poignant characterization of her husband as father, mother, and brother to her, she pleads with him to remain inside the city and fight from the wall: ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἐλέαιρε καὶ αὐτοῦ μίμν' ἐπὶ πύργωι,/ μὴ παῖδ' ὀρφανικὸν θήηις χήρην τε γυναῖκα ("But come now, have pity and stay here on the wall, lest you make your child an orphan and your wife a widow," 6.431-432). This emphasis on the wall directs our attention yet again to the larger story of impending loss, of which Andromache's personal loss is but a part.[310] Thus we can understand perhaps why the narrative would not explore the effects of longing

---

Hektor's speeches between both themes (Hektor pitying his wife even as he must return to battle, Andromache begging Hektor to be a family man even as she gives him martial advice) and in the narrative background (Astyanax's fear of his father's helmet, 6.467-470). See also Schein (1984), 174-5.

[309] Taplin (1992), 126.

[310] Cf. Muich (2010), who sees in Andromache and her son a type of the general fate of all the women and children of Troy, 41-50, 91f; see also Schein (1984), who describes Hektor and Andromache as exemplars of Trojan life in general, a world of peace ruptured by war, 75-76, 190. Edwards (1987) goes further: Hektor and Andromache not only reveal the meaning of Troy's fall for all Trojan families, but their parting scene represents all such parting moments between warriors and their wives, 209-213.

for a shared life within the paradigm of this grief. Hektor's death represents not only the loss of a person, but also the loss of a role-fulfiller, the one person who could be Andromache's family and, thematically linked, the city's protector.

Communion and Isolation – A Parenthesis

In addition to latent notes of longing, this scene between Andromache and Hektor shares with other grief scenes in the *Iliad* a tension between communion and isolation. We have seen how ποθή in grief drives the mourner variously either to persist in the particularity of his grief, seen for example in Achilles' repeated nights of lonely weeping on the shore, or to seek to have his grief shared by the community, as Achilles invites the other Greek leaders to share his fast in Book 19 and requires certain social mourning rituals, which he calls the γέρας of the dead, in Book 23. The intensity with which Achilles persists in unsocial mourning resonates with the underlying reality of a particular, unfillable void that drives his grief; and likewise, when he turns to communal rituals, as if thereby to multiply his grief by having it instantiated on a large scale, or thereby to approximate those activities of shared living whose absence paralyzes him in these cycles of grief and anger, we see a variability that coheres in a story about the fruitlessness of anger and other actions to resolve the grief that drives them. In the Hektor story, by contrast, communion and isolation have less to do with longing for a shared life than with the larger conflict of the Hektor story, his dual identity as city-protector and family man. As with the hints of ποθή, the partial communion and persisting isolation in his encounter with his wife serve the larger story of

Troy's fall, rather than illuminating the nature of grief *per se* and its emotional and behavioral consequences.

The markers of communion in the scene in Book 6 are physical. Andromache rushes up to Hektor and initiates the conversation by taking hold of him: Ἀνδρομάχη δέ οἱ ἄγχι παρίστατο δάκρυ χέουσα/ ἔν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρὶ ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν·/ "δαιμόνιε [...]" ("and Andromache stood near him, shedding tears, and she clung to him with her hand, and spoke a word, and called him by name: 'Strange one, [...]'," 6.405-406). By the end of their exchange, Hektor is returning the physical gesture. When Andromache receives Astyanax, after Hektor's final prayer, laughing and crying at the same time (6.484), Hektor pities her, strokes her with his hand, calls her by name, and says to her, "Strange woman, do not grieve so much for me [...]," (πόσις δ' ἐλέησε νοήσας,/ χειρί τέ μιν κατέρεξεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν·/ 'δαιμονίη, μή μοί τι λίην ἀκαχίζεο θυμῶι [...],' 6.484-486). The physical symmetry of the opening and closing of their exchange is emphasized by the recurrence of δαιμονίε/η as the first word of each spouse's plea. Their sorrows have been shared, Hektor acknowledges that her impending slavery grieves him more than any other doom that may come to the city (6.450-455),[311] and with helmet removed (6.472-473) Hektor reaches out to her as πόσις (6.484), a gentler title than the martial epithets attached to his name throughout the rest of the scene.[312] The unhelmeted

---

[311] On Hektor's "ascending scale of affection," matching Andromache's in her earlier plea, see Kakridis (1949), 18-27 and 49-53.

[312] Ἕκτορι χαλκοκορυστῆι, "Hektor the brazen commander," when Andromache first appears and is given her brief biography (6.398); μέγας κορυθαιόλος Ἕκτωρ, "great Hektor whose helmet gleams," when Hektor first replies to her appeal (6.440); φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ, "shining Hektor," when

Hektor's reciprocation of the clinging of his wife demonstrates that some communion has occurred in this scene of grief. The progression of pity also shows the genuineness of his response to his wife's sorrow: at 6.407-408 she declares that he pities neither son nor her, at 6.431 she asks him to pity her, and then in 6.484 the narrator tells us that perceiving her sorrow, Hektor pities her: πόσις δ' ἐλέησε νοήσας.[313] Yet the union is partial: Hektor cannot heed her plea, and he sends her home to the distaff and himself to the battlefield.[314] The final physical postures in this scene indicate both the partial communion and persisting isolation engendered by their exchange. Andromache leaves the gates, weeping and ἐντροπαλιζομένη, continually turning back to her husband (6.496). Her pivoting shows how reluctant she is to leave her husband and accept the separation, likely to be permanent.[315] Hektor too remains facing his wife, not completing his turn to the battlefield until Paris finds him lingering at the gates: Ἕκτορα δῖον ἔτετμεν ἀδελφεόν, εὖτ' ἄρ' ἔμελλεν/ στρέψεσθ' ἐκ χώρης ὅθι ἧι ὀάριζε γυναικί ("He came upon godlike Hektor, his brother, when he was going to turn from the place where he conversed intimately with his

---

he reaches for his baby, removes his helmet, and takes his helmet up again at the close of their meeting (6.466, 472, 494).

[313] Schadewaldt (1965) notes that the couple does not truly come together ("Vereinigung") until this moment where Hektor has removed his helmet, and, handing the child to his wife, "haltlos zwischen Lachen und Tränen (adrift between laughter and tears)," 223, he pities her, *ibid.*, 221-4.

[314] ἀλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα τὰ σ' αὐτῆς ἔργα κόμιζε,/ ἱστόν τ' ἠλακάτην τε, καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι κέλευε/ ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι· πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεσσε μελήσει/ πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοί, τοὶ Ἰλίωι ἐγγεγάασιν ("But go home and take up your work, the loom and the distaff, and bid your maids to engage in their work; but war will be a care for men, all the men who live in Troy, and for me most of all," 6.490-493).

[315] The finality of this separation is emphasized in 6.499-502, when Andromache and her maids lament for Hektor as though he were already dead: τῇισιν δὲ γόον πάσῃισιν ἐνῶρσεν./ αἱ μὲν ἔτι ζωὸν γόον Ἕκτορα ὧι ἐνὶ οἴκωι·/ οὐ γάρ μιν ἔτ' ἔφαντο ὑπότροπον ἐκ πολέμοιο/ ἵξεσθαι προφυγόντα μένος καὶ χεῖρας Ἀχαιῶν ("and she stirred up in all of them a lamentation. And they were lamenting Hektor while he was still alive, lamenting him in his own house; for they did not think that he would any more come returning from war, having escaped the battle strength and hands of the Achaians," 6.499-502).

wife," 6.515-516).[316] As with Andromache's turning back, Hektor's lingering manifests that a real communion occurred in this scene; and yet we are keenly reminded of his role as city-defender by the place where he lingers, at those gates that mark the barrier between the interior life of the city and the salvation of that city being sought on the battlefield.[317] The necessity for Hektor to fill this ever-present role prevents any communion with his wife from being total.[318]

Hektor's exchange with his wife in Book 6 immerses us in the reality that overshadows all potential contours of ποθή and insatiety in the grief for this warrior. Hektor is intrinsically the warrior who keeps the city safe, and this civic identity impels him to risk death in its defense.[319] Although Hektor has not yet died, Andromache's appeal to her

---

316 Cf. Edwards (1987), who thinks these lines suggest that Hektor is watching his wife depart, 212.
317 Cf. Scully (1990), who argues that the meeting of husband and wife by the city gate reinforces the public dimension of their family intimacy; the collective well-being of the city constantly overshadows the personal fates of the Trojans. The narrator draws attention to the wall by first imagining their meeting taking place at home; compare the parallel movement from home to wall in Book 22; Scully (1990), 42-43. Taplin (1992) too notes how the location of this meeting, at the border between home and battlefield, resonates with the tension of the scene, which he sums up as a meeting between "opposing forces: optimism and pessimism, fear and bravery, union and separation, laughter and tears," 120.
318 The narrator reinforces our understanding that the shared intimacy of this domestic scene cannot remain, that battle forces them apart, in line 6.495, by juxtaposing *helmet* to *wife* (ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας κόρυθ' εἵλετο φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ/ ἵππουριν· ἄλοχος δὲ φίλη οἶκόνδε βεβήκει, 6.494-495). This juxtaposition of words representing the two spheres is emblematic of Hektor's life and his conflicted situation; cf. Lynn-George (1988), 219. Separation is also marked in the enjambment in the phrase χήρη/ σεῖ' ("a widow without you," 6.408-409), which separates the widow, Andromache, from the husband whom she will lose. Beck (2005) reads Andromache's failure to persuade Hektor in this scene as part of the poem's larger pattern of using conversation to show the "isolation of its characters and the primacy of conflict in human interaction," 144-5; cf. 128-9. I would align myself more with Lohmann (1988), who argues not for the "primacy of conflict," but rather the ambivalence of Hektor's multiple roles, which makes this scene one of both encounter and separation, 40-47.
319 One might argue that Hektor could have heeded Andromache's advice to fight a defensive battle from the safety of the Trojan wall (cf. 6.433-434); cf. Muich (2010-2011), 9-11. On Hektor's diverse motivations in his defense of the city, including his personal quest for honor, see Zanker (1994), 140-143; cf. Redfield (1975), 109-27. Within such complexity, however, Hektor's civic identity remains ever present. For a lucid account of the conflict embodied in Hektor between family and warfare, see

husband in this scene is more than half a funeral lament,[320] but this lament is not shaped primarily by lost wholeness, but by the conflict built into their marriage by his larger commitment to the safety of Troy and the Trojans' dual identity as people of the home and people of the city.

The subordination of personal grief-longing to the need of a city is evident when we consider the single reference to ποθή for Hektor. Although Hektor predicts his own death at the end of the speech, in which he refuses Helen's appeal to sit and declares his intent to see his wife and child (6.360-368), he does not apply ποθή language to the grief that will follow his predicted death; he rather confines the term to his men's physical need for him in battle: μή με κάθιζ', Ἑλένη, φιλέουσά περ· οὐδέ με πείσεις./ ἤδη γάρ μοι θυμὸς ἐπέσσυται ὄφρ' ἐπαμύνω/ Τρώεσσ', οἳ μέγ' ἐμεῖο ποθὴν ἀπεόντος ἔχουσιν ("Don't sit me down, Helen, though you love me; you will not persuade me. For already my spirit urges me to come to the aid of the Trojans, since my men greatly long for me in my absence," 6.360-362). Although the death of Hektor hangs over his story, the language of the poem invites us not to look at the dynamics of grief engendered by that death, but rather to the civic impact of his death on his city and family.

Particular and Civic Grief for Hektor after his Death

After Hektor's death, those grief elements that came into such sharp focus in the grief for Patroklos – longing for shared life, movement towards communion and yet

---

Lohmann (1988), esp. 41-43, where he argues that Andromache's concentration of father, mother, brother in her husband (6.429-430) intensifies our awareness of his ambivalent role as both preserver and destroyer, insofar as his death will entail the destruction of her entire second family; see also Muich (2010-2011), 6-9.

[320] Cf. Graziosi and Haubold (2010), 46; Tsagalis (2004a), 6; Muich (2010), 51-55; among others.

isolation, and above all a restless aimlessness – continue to be present in a shadowy way, but never with the linguistic clarity and narrative focus that we saw in Achilles and his fellow Myrmidons. Like the potential contours of longing in Andromache's anticipatory lament in Book 6, such dimensions of grief are subordinated to the narrative focus on the conflict engendered by the city's relationship with its families. One such shade of ποθή emerges in Andromache's lament for her husband in Book 22. The interplay of personal pronouns at the opening of this speech emphasizes their union in life (22.477-484),[321] as does her declaration that they were born to a single fate: ἰῇι ἄρα γεινόμεθ' αἴσηι/ ἀμφότεροι ("we were born to a single fate, we both," 22.477-478).[322] Such an opening could potentially introduce a cry of lost wholeness, and certainly one feels the rupture of what was shared, particularly in the enjambment of "widow" right after the verb "to leave:" αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ στυγερῶι ἐνὶ πένθεϊ <u>λείπεις/ χήρην</u> ἐν μεγάροισι ("But me in hateful grief you leave/ a widow in our home," 22.483-484). Andromache applies this word to herself five times in the poem, on each occasion emphasizing her bereavement, the absence that characterizes her present.[323] She repeats the word towards the end of the speech, in the context of the

---

[321] Ἕκτορ, ἐγὼ δύστηνος [...]· σύ μὲν [...], αὐτὰρ ἐγώ [...], ὅ μ' [...]. νῦν δὲ σὺ [...], αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ [...] (22.477-483). Cf. Muich (2010) on Andromache's use of these pronouns to build unity, 61-62. Andromache likewise intertwined personal pronouns at the beginning of her appeal in 6.407-413; cf. Graziosi and Haubold (2010) *ad* 6.407-413, on how these personal pronouns in both passages "present[...] her fate as interwoven with Hector's."

[322] Tsagalis (2004a) reads "we were born to a single fate" as part of the larger "common fate" motif, in which the mourner and the deceased share a common sphere of suffering, 41. Graziosi and Haubold (2010) compare this passage, in which Andromache equates Hektor's death to her grief, to 6.241 when Hektor tells the Trojan women to pray for their male kinsmen, πολλῇισι δὲ κήδε' ἐφῆπτο; see *ad* 6.241. Such equivalence between male death and female grief modifies Tsagalis' "common fate" motif to the more precise reality in Troy, that grief for one's deceased husband signals, at the same time, awareness of one's own impending devastation.

[323] Cf. 6.408, 6.432, 22.499, and 24.725. Of these five uses, three are poignantly enjambed: this one at 22.484; 6.408 (discussed above, note 315); and 24.725, which echoes the enjambment of 22.484, in

suffering in store for Astyanax, who will be shunned from the company of his father's peers, δακρυόεις δέ τ' ἄνεισι πάϊς ἐς μητέρα χήρην,/ Ἀστυάναξ, ("and in tears the child goes to his mother, a widow, the child Astyanax," 22.499-500). The absence evoked by "widow" is embedded in this story of their child, whose life too will be impacted by the loss of Hektor, and we feel the double rupture of their shared life through the ruined life of their child.[324] This second rupture is particularly keen in the iteratives that follow this second appearance of χήρην:

> Ἀστυάναξ, ὃς πρὶν μὲν ἑοῦ ἐπὶ γούνασι πατρός
> μυελὸν οἶον ἔδεσκε καὶ οἰῶν πίονα δημόν,
> αὐτὰρ ὅθ' ὕπνος ἕλοι παύσαιτό τε νηπιαχεύων,
> εὕδεσκ' ἐν λέκτροισιν [...]. (22.500-504)
>
> Astyanax, who before, on the knees of his own father,
> was always eating only the marrow and the rich fat of sheep,
> and whenever sleep would take hold of him and he would cease from his infant play,
> he was always sleeping in his bed [...].

---

reverse order: με χήρην/ λείπεις ἐν μεγάροισι (24.725-726). The word appears one other time in the *Iliad*, in the plural, when Odysseus upbraids the Achaians for behaving like children and widows, 2.289. Cf. Muich (2010) on Andromache as the "consummate [...] widow," 49.

324 For Astyanax as a representation of the shared life of Andromache and Hektor, cf. ΣbT *ad* 6.404*b*, where Hektor and Andromache laugh together at their son's frightened reaction to Hektor: σύνδεσμος γὰρ ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν ἡ παιδοποιΐα ("for making a child binds together men and women"); thus Lohmann (1988) comments on this scene in Book 6, "Das Kind verkörpert einmal das Motiv der Begegnung," ("the child at one point embodies the motif of encounter"), 47. Cf. Whitman (1958) on Astyanax and the tear-filled laughter of Andromache as images of the "mysteriously unified" worlds of men and women, 208. See too how Andromache extends to Astyanax the same intertwining of pronouns which replicated her union with Hektor: πάϊς δ' ἔτι νήπιος αὔτως,/ ὃν τέκομεν σύ τ' ἐγώ τε δυσάμμοροι· οὔτε σὺ τούτωι/ ἔσσεαι, Ἕκτορ, ὄνειαρ, ἐπεὶ θάνες, οὔτε σοὶ οὗτος ("But the child, still thus a baby, whom we begat, you and I, ill-fated; neither will you for him be a help, Hektor, since you are dead, nor he for you," 22.484-486); Edwards (1987) notes the unusual complexity of this sentence structure, 57-58.

By so depicting her child's former happiness, living with the safety of one whose father is alive, Andromache evokes the same feeling of present yearning that we saw captured by Achilles' ποθή.

Yet these notes of personal rupture constantly yield to the larger implications of Hektor's death. Foremost is Andromache's concern for Astyanax. As a mother Andromache cannot afford to dwell only on the personal loss of her husband, but she must think of the welfare of her son.[325] In this concern we see yet another contrast between the rupture of a friendship, which does not necessarily impact others outside the friendship, and the loss of one whose identity is bound up in multiple roles. Andromache's urgency in looking to Astyanax's future is paradigmatic for the situation of all the mothers of Troy, now that Hektor has died, and such civic awareness pervades her lament. When Andromache imagines her son's bleak future, even if he should survive the war, bereft of the status, comfort, and protection that a father would provide (22.484-505), she describes this orphaned state in generic terms, as if giving voice to the fate that awaits all the children of Troy: ἦμαρ δ' ὀρφανικὸν παναφήλικα παῖδα τίθησιν […] ("but the day of becoming an orphan bereaves a child of friends his own age […]," 22.490).[326] This generic narrative of the suffering in store for any orphan continues for ten lines, and when she returns to her own particular story with the emphatic "Ἀστυάναξ" at the beginning of line 500, we are already thinking not just of this wife and child, but of the broader fate of the Trojan people without

---

[325] On the turn to Astyanax in Andromache's lament, see Muich (2010-2011), 12-17, and Willcock (1976), *ad* 22.484-507, who defends these "considerations which might well occur to a wife and mother at such a time" against critics who found them out of place. For an overview, see Richardson (1993), *ad* 22.477-514.

[326] Cf. Richardson (1993) on the "proverbial" tone of these lines, *ad loc.*; he calls Andromache and her son the "archetypes of all widows and orphans," *ad* 487-499. See also Taplin (1992), 125-6; Muich (2010); etc.

Hektor's defending presence.[327] When the iterative verbs in the next four lines create that sense of the fullness of the deceased's former presence, this potential context for describing such a loss with ποθή is again subordinated to the larger story of the fall of Troy: Andromache concludes her memory of Hektor's care for their son with the etymology of his name, which the people of Troy gave to him because of his father's role in preserving the survival of the city: νῦν δ' ἂν πολλὰ πάθησι, φίλου ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἁμαρτών,/ Ἀστυάναξ, ὃν Τρῶες ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν·/ οἶος γάρ σφιν ἔρυσο πύλας καὶ τείχεα μακρά ("But now he suffers much, deprived of his beloved father, Astyanax, whom the Trojans call by that name; for you alone guarded their gates and long walls," 22.505-507). She expands her family unit to the entire city of Trojans, who so depend on her husband for their survival that they name his son, "Lord of the City." Tsagalis notes the special narrative thread woven around this family unit, who, in non-battle contexts, are always mentioned together, such that the three become a compositional unit.[328] To this observation we must add the larger reality of what the poem achieves: the small family unit reflects at a local level what happens to all of Troy, a city composed of many such families. Hektor, through continuous connection to his family, is thereby connected to Troy, the city of families, and Andromache's lament at the moment of his death reflects both her urgent concern for her son's future and, by extension, the civic dimension of her husband's life as protector of the

[327] de Jong (2012) connects the πρίν in line 22.500 to line 22.156, noting the frequent nostalgic references in the poem to the time before the Greeks came, when there was peace in Troy and Priam had many living sons; she places Andromache's recollection of Astyanax's protected childhood in this context of nostalgia for a time now irretrievably past. Cf. other moments of nostalgia: Troy at peace and rich, 9.401-403, 18.288-289, 24.543-546; Priam still had many sons, 24.495-497, 546; etc.; de Jong (2012) *ad* 22.500-504.

[328] Tsagalis (2004a), 40-41. Cf. Tsagalis on Andromache's summary of Hektor's importance to her in Book 6, when she clusters first and second person pronouns at the end of her speech, 97-98.

city.[329] Again we see the difference in focus, the utility that pervades Hektor's life and shapes the various expressions of grief for him. Although his wife grieves for him at a deeply personal level, her grief makes constant reference to the destruction of lives and civic life that will follow Hektor's death, and this broader civic consequence diffuses the personal focus that would have been captured by ποθή.

Andromache's lament also differs from the ποθή-grief of Achilles insofar as her grief is forward looking. She ends this lament declaring that she will burn the garments of Hektor, since he will never be buried in them, a gesture which Segal interprets as symbolic of the burning of Troy and with it the destruction of civilization.[330] Where Achilles' loss of Patroklos ruptures his present definitively, Andromache's loss of Hektor has future implications that have not yet played out. This shift in tense, so to speak, is particularized in the figure of Astyanax, who represents for Andromache and all of Troy the future doom of the city. We could say that Astyanax displaces ποθή; where Achilles' grief is driven by the present reality of absence, Andromache's grief trembles before the anticipated reality of future destruction.

We see this localization of the doom of Troy in Astyanax more vividly in Book 24. This final lament of Andromache, at Hektor's funeral, in some ways evokes the depth of her personal anguish at Hektor's death more explicitly than her anticipatory lament in Book 6 or her initial cry of anguish at Hektor's death in Book 22. The fate in store for Astyanax is

---

[329] Muich (2010-2011) downplays the civic significance of Andromache's lament in Book 22, claiming that Andromache here focuses solely on her family unit, in contrast to the broader civic dimensions of her Book 24 lament, 17-22. Although Muich is right to observe the greater civic emphasis in Book 24, she fails to acknowledge the civic impact of telling Astyanax's story impersonally and concluding with a repetition of his name's etymology, which ties his fate to his father's civic role.

[330] Segal (1971a), 47.

grimmer, either slavery or murder, which she imagines not in gnomic terms, but with a direct prediction:

> […] σὺ δ' αὖ, τέκος, ἤ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῆι
> ἕψεαι, ἔνθά κεν ἔργα ἀεικέα ἐργάζοιο
> ἀθλεύων πρὸ ἄνακτος ἀμειλίχου, ἤ τις Ἀχαιῶν
> ῥίψει χειρὸς ἑλὼν ἀπὸ πύργου, λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον […]. (24.732-735)
>
> But you on the other hand, child, either with me myself
> will follow, where you may carry out shameful deeds,
> toiling for a harsh master, or some one of the Achaians
> will cast you from the ramparts, taking you by the hand, a wretched death […].

We are forced again to contemplate the double rupture entailed by this staggering loss of her husband, which not only rends their life together but also will destroy the life of their child. Andromache ends her lament with a crescendo of pain, placing herself as the one most grieved by Hektor's death: τὼ καί μιν λαοὶ μὲν ὀδύρονται κατὰ ἄστυ,/ ἀρητὸν δὲ τοκεῦσι γόον καὶ πένθος ἔθηκας,/ Ἕκτορ. ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα λελείψεται ἄλγεα λυγρά·/ […] ("and therefore the people mourn for him throughout the city, and accursed lamentation and sorrow have you laid on your parents, Hektor. But for me most of all will wretched griefs have been left; […]," 24.740-742). The personal dimension of her grief could not be more apparent, and we again feel the ghost of ποθή, the felt absence which pervades Andromache's grief.[331]

But in other ways this funeral lament connects her grief to the larger fate of Troy with even more clarity than her earlier laments. As soon as she refers to their ruptured family unit, at the opening of her lament, her thoughts turn to the loss for the entire city:

---

[331] Such felt absence gives us a far better account for the "then-now" elements and sense of helplessness in these laments than Tsagalis's characterization (2004a) of such motifs as typical of the "binary oppositions" present in Greek thought, 75-76.

> ἆνερ, ἀπ᾽ αἰῶνος νέος ὤλεο, κὰδ δέ με χήρην
> λείπεις ἐν μεγάροισι· πάϊς δ᾽ ἔτι νήπιος αὔτως,
> ὃν τέκομεν σύ τ᾽ ἐγώ τε δυσάμμοροι, οὐδέ μιν οἴω
> ἥβην ἵξεσθαι· πρὶν γὰρ πόλις ἥδε κατ᾽ ἄκρης
> πέρσεται·   (24.725-729)

> Husband, you have died young in your time of life, and me, a widow
> you have left in our home; and our child is still just a child,
> whom we gave birth to, you and I, ill-fated ones, nor do I think that he
> will reach adulthood; for sooner this city from its pinnacle to the foundations
> will be utterly sacked;

The fate of Astyanax, death in childhood, hinges on the sack of the city, and Andromache, as soon as she verbalizes "sack," explicitly names the other sufferers whose lives will be destroyed without their protector, Hektor: […]/ πέρσεται· ἦ γὰρ ὄλωλας ἐπίσκοπος, ὅς τέ μιν αὐτήν/ ῥύσκε᾽, ἔχες δ᾽ ἀλόχους κεδνὰς καὶ νήπια τέκνα ("[…]/ sacked; for truly you have perished who were the guardian, who were always guarding this city, and you held in safety the loving wives and young children," 24.729-730.) Richardson notes the chiasmus in lines 24.728, which moves from Astyanax, fated to die, through Hektor's former protection of the city to the νήπια τέκνα, also fated to die. But we must emphasize that within this chiasmus we do not return to Astyanax alone but to the fate of all the families of Troy. This naming of wives and children in the plural is Andromache's most explicit expansion of her family to the larger civic community. She vividly describes how those women will now be carried off in the Achaians' ships, herself among them (αἳ δ᾽ ἤτοι τάχα νηυσὶν ὀχήσονται γλαφυρῇσιν/ καὶ μὲν ἐγὼ μετὰ τῇσι, 24.731-732), capturing the mood of total sack and impending enslavement that has colored the poem's description of

Troy since the moment Hektor died (22.410-411).[332] This larger role of Hektor again emerges as Andromache reflects on the slavery in store for Astyanax, or, as is more likely, his death at the hands of some vengeful Achaian (24.732-736). The manner of his death, ῥίψει […] ἀπὸ πύργου ("cast from the ramparts," 24.735), again focuses our attention on the walls of the city, tying the individual life of Astyanax to the fate of the entire society. Andromache's prediction of the Achaian anger that will motivate this infant killing (χωόμενος, 24.736) prompts her then to dwell on Hektor's role as protector of the city, here in terms of his constant valor in battle: ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν/ Ἕκτορος ἐν παλάμῃσιν ὀδὰξ ἕλον ἄσπετον οὖδας./ οὐ γὰρ μείλιχος ἔσκε πατὴρ τεὸς ἐν δαῒ λυγρῇ, ("since very many of the Achaians bit the vast earth with their teeth at the hands of Hektor. For your father was never gentle in woeful battle," 24.737-739). The iterative ἔσκε mirrors the iterative ῥύσκε' of line 730, "you were always guarding the city," and this evocation of Hektor's constant defense of Troy highlights the civic impact that will follow this loss. Andromache's awareness of the civic dimension of Hektor's death does not lessen the intensity of her personal grief. As soon as she recalls the fullness of his former protection, she moves through the scale of those affected, placing herself in last position as the one most grieved by his death. Yet the absence of ποθή language to describe this keen

---

332 In Phoenix's story of the besieged Kalydon (9.529-599), Kleopatra likewise describes the fate of a sacked city in generic terms, as she pleads with Meleagros to rise and fight: λίσσετ' ὀδυρομένη, καί οἱ κατέλεξεν ἅπαντα,/ κήδε' ὅσ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλει τῶν ἄστυ ἁλώῃ·/ ἄνδρας μὲν κτείνουσι, πόλιν δέ πῦρ ἀμαθύνει,/ τέκνα δέ τ' ἄλλοι ἄγουσι βαθυζώνους τε γυναῖκας ("she beseeched him, grieving, and narrated for him all the evils that men suffer when their city is taken: they kill the men, and fire turns the city to dust, and other men lead off the children and the deep-girdled wives," 9.591-594). Kakridis (1949) notes resonances of the Meleagar story with that of Hektor, Andromache, and Troy, 49-64; cf. Nagy (1999), 110-11.

grief of Andromache and her city moves our focus away from the potential actions that could erupt from this personal grief onto the larger story of total, irremediable loss for an entire people. This loss is again localized in future terms, the future death of Astyanax, the future slavery of the other Trojan women, the future destruction of Troy's great web of civil society.[333]

Andromache of course is not the only voice of grief for Hektor. When we turn to the grief of Hektor's parents, we see even more strongly the ties to the city that shape their grief. Hekabe's lament is shot through with the lost presence of Hektor, but always on the civic level:

> τέκνον, ἐγὼ δειλή· τί νυ βείομαι αἰνὰ παθοῦσα
> σεῖ' ἀποτεθνηῶτος; ὅ μοι νύκτας τε καὶ ἦμαρ
> εὐχωλὴ κατὰ ἄστυ πελέσκεο, πᾶσί τ' ὄνειαρ
> Τρωσί τε καὶ Τρωιῇσι κατὰ πτόλιν, οἵ σε θεὸν ὥς
> δειδέχατ'· ἦ γὰρ καί σφι μάλα μέγα κῦδος ἔησθα
> ζωὸς ἐών· νῦν αὖ θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κιχάνει.[334] (22.431-436)
>
> Child, I am wretched; why now do I live, suffering terrors,
> since you have died? who day and night
> made me exult, always, throughout the city, and who aided all
> the Trojan men and women throughout the city, who as a god
> greeted you; for in truth you brought to them very great honor
> when you were alive; but now death and fate have overtaken you.

The markers of lost shared life in this speech all serve the larger story of loss. Hekabe's "now" is certainly marked by the felt absence of Hektor, poignantly captured in the opening

---

333 Cf. Kullmann (2001, orig. 1968), who sees Andromache's speech in Book 24 as more explicit than any previous about the link between Hektor's death and the sack of Troy; thus she sees her family's fate against the backdrop of that of the city, 400-402.

334 West (2001) contests 22.436, finding it "weak and pointless" here, 264; de Jong (2012) argues that it can stand, since (1) it is present in all the MSS, and (2) laments regularly make this type of contrast between the present and the past.

two lines, in which she calls herself wretched, suffering terribly, and then emphatically gives the reason with the enjambed σεῖ' ἀποτεθνηῶτος ("with you dead," 22.432). But the description of lost presence has an overriding civic dimension. Although she paints a picture of fullness with the length of time, νύκτας τε καὶ ἦμαρ, and the iterative verb πελέσκεο, these markers of longing for the wholeness of a shared life are tied to Troy. Hekabe's wretched present is a present without the one who gave her reason to exult throughout the city (ὅ μοι νύκτας τε καὶ ἦμαρ/ εὐχωλὴ κατὰ ἄστυ πελέσκεο, 22.432-433) and her boast is not merely personal pride, but rather is tied to Hektor's essential role as defender of the city (πᾶσί τ' ὄνειαρ/ Τρωσί τε καὶ Τρωιῇσι κατὰ πτόλιν, 22.433-434). The specification of both Trojan men and Trojan women (Τρωσί τε καὶ Τρωιῇσι), and the repetition of "throughout the city" in two successive lines (κατὰ ἄστυ and κατὰ πτόλιν, 22.433, 434), reinforces the reality that permeates all grief for Hektor: his death is a loss for the city of Troy and all of the people in it.

Not every lament speech, nor every depiction of Trojan grief, carries in it explicit mention of the future destruction that will attend the death of Hektor. Hekabe's funeral lament (24.748-759), for example, is largely an exclamation of praise, in which she calls Hektor the dearest of all her children without giving a reason for that special love.[335] She alludes nowhere to his importance to the city at large, so prominent in her initial Book 22

[335] Hekabe's pride in the beauty of her son and the care evident in the gods' protection of his corpse from disfigurement does offer her scope to condemn the fruitlessness of Achilles' attempts to "raise up Patroklos" by dragging Hektor (24.755-756), discussed earlier in this dissertation; but here she does not speak about her loss, in either personal or civic terms.

lament, nor, indeed, to her personal loss.[336] Such reference to the fate of the city is likewise absent from Priam's anguished appeal to the other Trojans, when he sees his son slain and being dragged in the dusty battlefield before Troy. This scene, in fact, is one which shares a great similarity to Achilles' grief. Priam's immediate attempt to run outside of the walls, scarcely restrained by his people, bespeaks a volatility, the restless longing that drives the bereaved to action, any action, as if thereby to assuage the grief.[337] One might argue that Priam does have a clear purpose driving his desire to go out to Achilles: he wants to recover the body for burial. But even though he doubtless does intend to beg for Hektor's corpse, given the context of Achilles defiling the body in the dust and Priam's final wish that Hektor had died in his arms (22.426), still Priam does not articulate his hope in so many words. Rather his behavior and somewhat fragmented logic suggest he is in a state of near madness, similar to the unspecified restlessness in ποθή-driven grief.[338] His anguish is particularly intense, beseeching the people to let him go as he rolls about in the dung (πάντας δ' ἐλλιτάνευε κυλινδόμενος κατὰ κόπρον, 22.414); and although there is a kind of theoretical logic in the notion that Achilles, who also has a father, might pity the old age of Priam (22.419-421), as in fact we see occur in Book 24,[339] the wish is rash in the current

[336] On the fittingness of ending the *Iliad* with laments that also function as encomia, see Richardson (1993), *ad* 718-776; on Hekabe's triumphant pride in this speech, Richardson (1993), *ad* 748-759.
[337] λαοὶ μέν ῥα γέροντα μόγις ἔχον ἀσχαλόωντα,/ ἐξελθεῖν μεμαῶτα πυλάων Δαρδανιάων ("And the people of the city were holding back the old man with difficulty as he chafed, yearning to go out through the Dardanian gates," 22.412-413).
[338] The term "madness" makes one think too of Andromache rushing "like a maenad" to the wall (22.460), although there is nothing unspecified in her aim: she must fly to the wall to learn the fate of her husband. Cf. Segal (1971b) on the emotional impact of this phrase, together with its Book 6 precursor, μαινομένηι ἐϊκυῖα (6.389), 47-8. For an overview of the debate on whether these two phrases refer to Dionysian cult, see Muich (2010), 105-110 and 125-6.
[339] Macleod (1982) traces the ways in which this speech of initial desperation (22.416-428) prepares for the successful supplication in Book Twenty-Four, 21-22.

situation, where Achilles is ruthlessly humiliating the dead Hektor, showing with deeds the meaning in his earlier rejection of any agreement, […] οὐκ ἔστι λέουσι καὶ ἀνδράσιν ὅρκια πιστά,/ οὐδὲ λύκοι τε καὶ ἄρνες ὁμόφρονα θυμὸν ἔχουσιν ("[…] there are no trusty oaths between lions and men, nor do wolves and lambs have a spirit of concord," 22.262-263). Priam, in yearning to face Achilles in this state, seems driven more by the restlessness of grief than a true hope to accomplish something thereby.

But although Priam's highly personal grief in this scene shows a reckless insatiety reminiscent of ποθή, and while he makes no clear statement of the civic implications of Hektor's death, he, like Hekabe in her Book 24 funeral lament, does declare that his grief for Hektor is greater than that for any other of his sons:

> τόσσους γάρ μοι παῖδας ἀπέκτανε τηλεθάοντας.
> τῶν πάντων οὐ τόσσον ὀδύρομαι ἀχνύμενός περ
> ὡς ἑνός, οὗ μ' ἄχος ὀξὺ κατοίσεται Ἄϊδος εἴσω,
> Ἕκτορος. (22.423-426)
>
> For he (Achilles) has killed so many of my sons in their flourishing.
> But not for any of these do I do mourn so much, though I am grieved indeed,
> as I mourn for one, grief for whom will swiftly send me down to Hades,
> for Hektor.

Such language about the surpassing grief for this one son, Hektor, recalls Priam's earlier plea to Hektor, to come inside the wall and not die in single combat against Achilles. In this plea, Priam compares his and Hekabe's grief for two of their other children with the Trojans' grief for Hektor, should Hektor die:

> εἰ δ' ἤδη τεθνᾶσι καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισιν,
> ἄλγος ἐμῶι θυμῶι καὶ μητέρι, τοὶ τεκόμεσθα,
> λαοῖσιν δ' ἄλλοισι μινυνθαδιώτερον ἄλγος

ἔσσεται, ἢν μὴ καὶ σὺ θάνῃς Ἀχιλῆϊ δαμασθείς.
ἀλλ' εἰσέρχεο τεῖχος, ἐμὸν τέκος, ὄφρα σαώσῃς
Τρῶας καὶ Τρῳάς [...]. (22.52-57)

But if they have already died and are in the house of Hades,
it will be a grief for me in my heart and for their mother, we who begat them,
but for the other people of the city the grief will be less,
so long as you do not die too, overpowered by Achilles.
But come inside the wall, my child, so that you may save
the men and women of Troy [...].

Priam here states clearly the relationship between Hektor and his city. Grief for Hektor does not reside in the realm of personal grief only, wherein we find the grief of parents for children; but grief for Hektor is tied to the salvation of those men and women of Troy. Priam then makes that civic survival a condition for his own happiness, as in the end of his appeal he describes in detail the evils in store for him when he sees the city sacked and himself ravaged by his own dogs (22.61-76).[340] Priam's description of the relative griefs for his different sons conditions the way we understand his later declaration that he grieves more for Hektor's death than that of any other of his many sons who have died. That degree of grief is greater by virtue of the total loss it represents, not only the loss of a son, but through that loss the loss of a city, a civilization, and the hope for a dignified death.[341]

Priam's vivid description of the sack in this Book 22 appeal again ties οἶκος and πόλις, as Priam names the future sufferers by their familial relationships:

υἷας τ' ὀλλυμένους ἑλκηθείσας τε θύγατρας
καὶ θαλάμους κεραϊζομένους, καὶ νήπια τέκνα

[340] Segal (1971a) characterizes Priam's plea in civic terms: we see a king supplicating his son in terms of social and moral standards, 64.
[341] Likewise Hekabe's declaration in her funeral lament of Hektor's surpassing dearness (24.748), unaccounted for in the words of that lament, are colored by her earlier lament in 22, where she explains that his defense of Troy made him her constant boast (22.432-434).

βαλλόμενα προτὶ γαίῃ ἐν αἰνῇ δηϊοτῆτι,
ἑλκομένας τε νυοὺς ὀλοῇς ὑπὸ χερσὶν Ἀχαιῶν. (22.62-65)

sons destroyed and daughters dragged off
and bedchambers laid waste, and young children
thrown to the earth in terrible strife,
and daughters-in-law dragged off at the destructive hands of the Achaians.

Having described the sack of Troy in terms of its impact on sons, daughters, bedrooms, children, and daughters-in-law, Priam's prediction climaxes to a relentlessly personal note, as he ends with the awful image of his own dogs tearing him raw, lapping his blood and befouling his genitals:

αὐτὸν δ' ἂν πύματόν με κύνες πρώτῃσι θύρῃσιν
ὠμησταὶ ἐρύουσιν […] (22.66-67)
οἵ κ' ἐμὸν αἷμα πιόντες ἀλύσσοντες περὶ θυμῷ
κείσοντ' ἐν προθύροισι. […] (22.70-71)
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πολιόν τε κάρη πολιόν τε γένειον
αἰδῶ τ' αἰσχύνωσι κύνες κταμένοιο γέροντος,
τοῦτο δὴ οἴκτιστον πέλεται δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν. (22.74-76)

and me myself, last of all, the dogs before my doors
will tear at, eating flesh […]
who lapping at my blood, maddened in spirit,
will lie in my forecourts. […]
But when dogs defile the grey head and grey beard
and the private parts of a slain old man,
this is the most pitiful thing for mortal men.[342]

Jonathan Gottschall sees in Priam's final words a reference to the whole cultural and biological life of Troy, symbolized in Priam's αἰδῶ.[343] His interpretation is very plausible,

[342] Cf. Segal (1971a), who argues that this threatened mutilation of Priam by his own dogs "illustrates […] the destruction of civilized values, of civilization itself, by the savagery" of war, 33. The liminal status of Priam's dogs, capable of living in the human community and of reverting to such savagery, intensifies our sense of Troy's impending doom in this scene.

given the overall poetic tie between Priam with his large family and the people of Troy. As Taplin puts it, this appeal to Hektor to come inside the wall almost prophetically ties the fall of Troy to the death of Priam's son.[344] Thus here too, although Priam uses personal and familial realities to try to persuade Hektor, the imagined impact of Hektor's death is a broad loss that affects an entire people, sundering many lives and not one particular relationship.

In Book 24, Priam's grief for Hektor again displays ποθή-like qualities when he bursts forth in flashes of anger that seem somewhat misdirected, even aimless. Iris comes to the king as he sits covered in dung, surrounded by grieving sons and daughters and yet alone (24.159-168); and after he receives her message and decides to ransom his son from Achilles, he energetically drives the Trojans from his portico with a stick (24.238, 247), upbraiding them:

> ἔρρετε, λωβητῆρες, ἐλεγχέες· οὔ νυ καὶ ὑμῖν
> οἴκοι ἔνεστι γόος, ὅτι μ' ἤλθετε κηδήσοντες;
> ἦ οὔνεσθ', ὅτι μοι Κρονίδης Ζεὺς ἄλγε' ἔδωκεν,
> παῖδ' ὀλέσαι τὸν ἄριστον;   (24.239-242)
>
> Be gone, good-for-nothings, disgraces; do not you also
> have lament in your homes, that you come to me full of sorrows?
> Or is it not enough that Zeus, son of Kronos, has given griefs to me,
> destroying my best son?

Priam is not angry with the Trojans for any real wrongdoing but rather for reminding him of his own grief. With this opening reprimand, Priam laments what he has lost, his best son; but again we see that looking back to the loss of Hektor forces Priam to look forward to the

---

[343] Gottschall (2008), 145.
[344] Taplin (1992), 249.

impending sack, a reality that makes the loss of Hektor every bit as personal for each Trojan as it is for the king:

> ἀτὰρ γνώσεσθε καὶ ὔμμες·
> ῥηΐτεροι γὰρ μᾶλλον Ἀχαιοῖσιν δὴ ἔσεσθε
> κείνου τεθνηῶτος ἐναιρέμεν. αὐτὰρ ἐγώ γε,
> πρὶν ἀλαπαζομένην τε πόλιν κεραϊζομένην τε
> οφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδεῖν, βαίην δόμον Ἄϊδος εἴσω. (24.242-246)

> But you know this also yourselves;
> for you will be much easier for the Achaians to kill
> now that he is dead. But I, truly,
> before I see the city destroyed and laid waste
> with my own eyes, would rather go down to the house of Hades.

Even here, where Priam's responses to Hektor's death share a degree of volatility and aimless anger reminiscent of the grief of Achilles, the grief is manifestly shared by many, with consequences that have not yet played out.[345] This larger, forward-looking, civic plane colors Priam's grief, as it does the grief of each Trojan, despite intimately personal ties with Hektor. In the Trojan story, the narrator depicts not a grief that leads through ποθή to action, but one that attends an irremediable loss that has not yet fully occurred.[346]

---

[345] Kullmann (2001, orig. 1968) finds Priam, in his awareness of his city's coming destruction, to be perhaps the most future-oriented of all the characters in the *Iliad*, 405-6.

[346] Helen's funeral lament for Hektor conspicuously lacks any sense of grief for his larger role as defender of the city; she focuses on her personal loss of the one Trojan, aside from Priam, who spoke gently to her and protected her from abusive comments (24.762-775). Since she is Greek, not Trojan, we can perhaps see this absence of a civic perspective on his loss as representative of her Greekness; certainly, although her future happiness is precarious at best, the sack of Troy would not entail for her a total loss in this same way it does for the other women in Troy.

In Conclusion – The Passive Quality of Trojan Grief

Throughout this chapter we have observed the overriding civic dimension in grief for Hektor, the constant reference to his defense of the city which pervades all expressions of grief for him, whether of his wife, mother, or father. This constant reference to the death of Hektor in terms of the loss of a protector makes the Trojans' grief as much dread for the future as yearning for a lost past. As we conclude this chapter, let us turn to one other moment of communal grieving for Hektor that shares a marker of insatiety similar to the insatiate grief for Patroklos. When Priam finally returns to Troy with the body of his son, the city rushes out to meet him at the gates, and the narrator declares that the sun would have set on their weeping if Priam had not prevented them: καί νύ κε δὴ πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα/ Ἕκτορα δάκρυ χέοντες ὀδύροντο πρὸ πυλάων,/ εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ἐκ δίφροιο γέρων λαοῖσι μετηύδα· ("and now truly through the entire day to the setting of the sun/ would they have mourned Hektor, shedding tears before the gates,/ if the old man had not addressed the people from his cart: […]," 24.713-715). This moment of potentially endless weeping reminds us of the prolongation characteristic of Achilles' ποθή-grief, and the description of time, πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα, recalls in particular two ἵμερος γόοιο scenes in the Greek camp. The first is 23.109-110, where Achilles tells the Myrmidons of his visit from Patroklos' shade, stirring up in them a desire for weeping (τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ὑφ' ἵμερον ὦρσε γόοιο, 23.108); and, the narrator tells, μυρομένοισι δὲ τοῖσι φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς/ ἀμφὶ νέκυν ἐλεεινόν ("and as they wept around the piteous corpse rosy-fingered Dawn appeared," 23.109-110). Here the narrator conveys the

relentlessness of sorrow by suggesting lengthiness, dawn coming upon them as they weep. In the second scene, Achilles stirs up in the Achaians the desire for weeping by his address to Spercheios, when he cuts his hair and puts a lock of it in the hand of his companion; and, the narrator says, "the sun would have set on their weeping, if Achilles had not addressed Agamemnon," (καί νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδυ φάος ἠελίοιο,/ εἰ μὴ Ἀχιλλεὺς αἶψ' Ἀγαμέμνονα εἶπε, 23.154-155). This more hypothetical prolongation suggests an insatiate degree of sorrow quite similar to the scene around Hektor's corpse at the gate of Troy; and although this Trojan weeping lacks the language of ἵμερος γόοιο, we feel the same possibility of endlessness. This weeping could have lasted an entire day or more, and the only thing that prevents such endless expression of sorrow for their fallen warrior is the king's intervention.

This potentially endless grief, however, remains different from Achilles' grief for Patroklos. As with the persisting civic dimension in the individual laments for Hektor, this entire scene is about Troy as an entity, made up of individuals, but with a collective fate. The civic impact of Hektor's death is felt keenly as the whole people of Troy pour out to meet the body at the gates:

> […]· οὐδέ τις αὐτόθ' ἐνὶ πτόλεϊ λίπετ' ἀνήρ
> οὐδὲ γυνή· πάντας γὰρ ἀάσχετον ἵκετο πένθος·
> ἀγχοῦ δὲ ξύμβληντο πυλάων νεκρὸν ἄγοντι. (24.707-709)
>
> […]; nor did any man remain there in the city,
> nor any wife; for uncontrollable grief came to all of them;
> and close to the gates they gathered around the one bringing in the corpse.

The opening of this section, "Nor did one man remain within the city, nor a wife," captures that poignant perspective of the poem on this city, a city of families, of husbands and wives.

The place of this great encounter of the whole people of Troy with their slain defender reinforces once again the impact of Hektor's death on the survival of the city – the men and women of Troy meet Priam at the gates (πυλάων, 24.709), that transition place between battle without and the civilization within. The narrator then singles out the grief of Hekabe and Andromache, only to tie them again to the people of whom they are a part:

> πρῶται τόν γ' ἄλοχός τε φίλη καὶ πότνια μήτηρ
> τιλλέσθην, ἐπ' ἄμαξαν ἐΰτροχον ἀΐξασαι,
> ἁπτόμεναι κεφαλῆς· κλαίων δ' ἀμφίσταθ' ὅμιλος. (24.710-712)
>
> First about him his beloved wife and queenly mother
> tore their hair, as they darted towards the well-made chariot,
> touching his head; and the crowd stood around them weeping.

We are reminded of the wailing in Book 22, when the entire city (except for Andromache) sees the death of Hektor from the wall, and his family's grief becomes part of the lamentation of the whole people.[347] The intensity of the group's grief is then described in great color with the three lines quoted above, where the narrator suggests that this spontaneous lamentation of the entire city had no intrinsic reason to stop. Unlike such moments of boundlessness in the grief of Achilles, however, this moment of endless weeping encapsulates the total hopelessness of the Trojan situation and the multiple personal relationships which are devastated by Hektor's fall.

In sum, this Trojan response to Hektor's death shares with the other Trojan laments the perspective of despair and hopelessness. There is no turn to action as we see in Achilles' grief. Nor do we see the vacillation between motionlessness and frenzied activity that

---

[347] Segal (1971a) speaks of the Trojans' great desire to mourn Hektor on a bier, seen both communally here when they bring the body inside (24.719-720), and personally in Andromache's lament, 24.743-745, 68.

characterized his responses to the loss of Patroklos. Rather, their grief is more uniform, the product of a city mourning for its beloved defender and dreading the impending loss of their home.[348] The poem reinforces the civic dimension of loss by ending with ritual mourning: the three voiced laments at Hektor's funeral, followed by the quiet description of his funeral rites.[349] The mourning of the city of Troy betokens the passivity of their fate, in a sense. Every description of what has been lost to the mourner with the loss of Hektor makes reference to his defense of the people of Troy. It seems that the narrator's desire to tell this story, the story of a city-defender whose death will result in the destruction of his people, could well have motivated his omission of any explicit ποθή language in these descriptions of grief. The language of ποθή allows one to focus on the volatile actions, though they be senseless, that can erupt from grief, including the vast anger that kills Hektor and prefigures the destruction of sacred Troy. In the laments and grief scenes for Hektor, such aimless insatiety is subordinated to an overriding civic story, this man's inescapable role as the savior of Troy and the concomitant themes of irremediable loss and certain destruction which dominate this story line in the poem. Thus the intertwining of these two stories, of Achilles and of Hektor, is illuminated by the narrator's use of ποθή, and the absence of this word from Trojan grief complements the narrative's depiction of this people as left with nothing at the end of the *Iliad* but an overbearing sense of doom.

---

[348] Cf. Lynn-George (1988) on the poem's indefinite, indirect relation of the ultimate fall of Troy as "the prolonged tolling of Troy's death knell," 226.

[349] Cf. Segal (1971b) on the solemn effect of these ritualized, stylized laments, which bring at least a minimal sense of closure to the poem, 37.

Conclusion

In this dissertation I have argued that a proper understanding of grief in the *Iliad* offers insights into large swathes of the narrative. Although the pattern of heroic warfare and the boasts of characters in the poem might suggest that deeds of anger ease the grief that drives them, I have argued that the poem as a whole demonstrates otherwise. Achilles experiences the death of Patroklos as a rending of the fabric of his life. We have seen how the particular language which both he and the narrator use to describe his grief, that of ποθή, captures this almost physical reality of felt absence. To describe grief thus is more than to underline the basic reality of grief as pain, although such rupture is certainly painful. The *Iliad*'s portrayal of Achilles' grief as grounded in ποθή underscores its restlessness, its outward-seeking dynamism which is inherently fruitless, since the wholeness which is missed has been permanently ruptured.

The poem's unique linking of ποθή and grief in the Achilles-Patroklos story has opened up for us major inroads into the larger narrative. We have traced Achilles' responses to grief, seeing how the various movements towards isolation, communion, inactivity, and relentless activity cohere in light of their common origin, the experience of ruptured wholeness. We have seen how each description of ποθή in Achilles' grief has included a turn to anger. The most important interpretive consequence of this link between ποθή and grief, I have argued, is the proper understanding of such anger as one more response to his experience of rupture, and thus, as both aimless and fruitless. Although Achilles succeeds in ensuring the future sack of Troy by killing Hektor, his behavior remains insatiate. We have

seen that the anger which arises from grief cannot achieve what it seeks, which is to assuage the void that drives it.

The aimless futility of Achilles' anger offers us two larger realities to ponder. One is the narrative fact that the *Iliad* presents the destruction of an entire civilization as, so to speak, collateral damage from a personal loss. This is only half of the story, of course, because the will of Zeus is relentlessly focused on this future sack of Troy, and Achilles' grief-driven actions are accomplices in Zeus' execution of his will. The fact remains, however, that on the human level, the destruction of Troy is not something that Achilles strictly speaking intends. For all his heights of fury, the inner relentlessness that drives Achilles to slay Trojans is no different from that same relentlessness as it prevents him from eating, or sleeping, or as it drives him to persistent weeping. The sack of Troy is portrayed as inevitable, due to Achilles' killing of Hektor, which Achilles sought through four books of the poem, yet the heart of his pursuit is a desire for something quite different. Such facts invite us to ponder the meaning of the destruction of Troy, a loss whose pointlessness, from a human perspective, is perhaps rarified by its origin in Achilles' fruitless attempt to find consolation in vengeance.

The second reality we are invited to ponder is the narrative fact that the poem never directly portrays the sack of Troy, despite all of the clear foreshadowing and even poetic equating of Hektor's death with that city's fall. I think this gap between the literal fall and its Iliadic foreshadowing has a twofold effect, both illuminated by our investigation of ποθή in grief. One, the postponement of the sack of Troy until after the end of the poem draws our attention to the underlying insatiety driving Achilles' anger. By delaying the total fulfillment of Zeus' will until after the poem's end, we are forced to consider more fully Achilles'

human motivations and their inner futility, prolonged through Books 23 and 24 through his persisting restlessness and unmitigated by an actual portrayal, in the present of the poem, of the event which is their cosmic purpose. The second implication of this gap is the insight it gives us into the nature of cities. As we have shown, grief for Hektor is never depicted with the language of ποθή, and although some of the Trojans demonstrate similar elements of insatiety, volatility, and even aimless anger in their grief, particularly Priam, in every case these characteristics are subordinated to a city-centered story of families, focused on the widespread consequences of a single death on those who surround him in a web of relationships. The gap between the death of Hektor and the impending fall of Troy allows us to understand the meaning of that death for his bereaved wife, son, mother, father, and people, and the portraits of their grief keep our attention constantly on the relationship between individual and family, family and city, city and individual, and so on. In a city, the *Iliad* suggests, all life is intertwined and death can have civic consequence.

The contrast between Hektor and Achilles in this regard is striking. Achilles' entire experience of shared life was located in a single friend, an experience that can be seen as typical of a warrior abroad, separated from home and family for many years.[350] To this typical phenomenon the poem adds Achilles' atypical relationship with the gods, with whom he shares a kind of divine impassivity, latent until Patroklos dies and he is cut off from his mortal self.[351] More than any other mortal in the poem, Achilles is self-sufficient, without ties

---

[350] Cf. note 125 on Shay (1994), who observed among Vietnam veterans the spectrum of bonds located in a single special comrade relationship, such that the men were both brothers and mothers to one another, and the loss of one felt to the other both like becoming an orphan and like losing a child, 49. Cf. also Macleod (1982), *ad* 24.495-497, who claims that Achilles represents "all the unfamilied warriors of the poem."

[351] Cf. Scully (2003b), 39-47.

that bind him after Patroklos has died. Unlike Andromache, who cannot turn her back on the world or focus on her personal grief, as she has a son to raise and protect, the warrior Achilles has a uniquely independent status, making his story apt for the poem's portrayal of the consequences of ποθή-grief and the boundless anger it can engender. Yet, as I have argued, while Achilles' grief and longing are unique, he remains essentially paradigmatic, not unique, since to his divine impassivity is matched a mortal susceptibility, his love for Patroklos and, we learn, for his father Peleus; and since in this mortal susceptibility can be seen those patterns of desire which motivate other warriors to seek vengeance (ἄντιτα ἔργα) and other loved ones to desire lament. I have argued that a correct understanding of Achilles' release of Hektor's body requires our attentiveness to this particular limiting condition on Achilles' immortal side, which is constantly shown to be moderated by his desire for life shared with a fellow mortal. The fact that this desire had a single object, Patroklos, makes Achilles an apt subject for a story about relentless insatiety when that object is lost; but the human element of this desire allows us to see Achilles' grief and turn to anger as paradigmatic, wherein no deeds can be ἄντιτα with respect to death and ultimately all one can do with such insatiate longing is to let it go.

In this dissertation I have traced all the scenes where Achilles' grief is shown to be insatiate, rooted in longing and persistently turning to a range of vengeful deeds, which indicate volatility rather than the pursuit of a single aim. Balanced against such a grief model, which is shaped by relentlessness and the impossibility of remedy, we can consider the model of grief that Achilles offers to Priam in Book 24, that of Niobe. This exemplum will give us a focal point on which to end this dissertation.

Achilles tells the story of Niobe as part of his advice to Priam not to grieve excessively, but rather to turn to a meal. The warrior, having bid his serving women to wash and anoint the body, places Hektor's corpse on a bier with his own hands (24.582-590). With this momentous release accomplished, he then exhorts the old king to eat:

> υἱὸς μὲν δή τοι λέλυται, γέρον, ὡς ἐκέλευες,
> κεῖται δ' ἐν λεχέεσσ'· ἅμα δ' ἠοῖ φαινομένηφιν
> ὄψεαι αὐτὸς ἄγων. νῦν δὲ μνησώμεθα δόρπου.
> καὶ γάρ τ' ἠΰκομος Νιόβη ἐμνήσατο σίτου
> τῆι περ δώδεκα παῖδες ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ὄλοντο, […]. (24.599-603)
>
> Your son is released to you, old man, as you bid,
> and he lies on a bier; and together with the dawn in her appearing
> you will see him yourself, conveying him away. But now let us be mindful of supper.
> For even fair-haired Niobe was mindful of food
> whose twelve children perished in her great hall […].

Achilles then retells the story of Niobe's boast that her twelve children made her superior to the goddess, Leto, who only had two children, but which two, Apollo and Artemis, slew all twelve of Niobe's. This sorrowful tale is something of a strange exemplum in a speech advising moderation in grief. To be sure, Achilles reinforces his encouragement to eat, mid-story: τοὺς δ' ἄρα τῆι δεκάτηι θάψαν θεοὶ οὐρανίωνες,/ ἣ δ' ἄρα σίτου μνήσατ', ἐπεὶ κάμε δάκρυ χέουσα ("But then on the tenth day the gods of the heavens buried them, and then she was mindful of food, when she was worn out from shedding tears," 24.612-613). But Niobe's meal does not bring joy or a return to normal life. Achilles follows her story to its end, somewhere in the mountains, where she, now a stone, forever broods over her sorrows (ἔνθα λίθος περ ἐοῦσα θεῶν ἒκ κήδεα πέσσει, 24.617). We see in Achilles' exhortation two complementary realities: his new ability to see grief as something which can

be extricated from insatiety, at least after a period of initial weeping – in Niobe's case, nine days – and yet his understanding that grief persists, even if it is not insatiate.[352] This story of a bereaved mother, grieving forever for her children as a stone, suggests to me an alternate response to the irremediable loss of grief, that of endurance. Grief is still grief, a rupture which persists forever and thereby an unhealable wound. Yet the insatiety itself is something that can be released and replaced with endurance.

The "endurance model" of grief is perhaps a helpful way to look at the grief characteristic of the Trojans. Without options and with certain doom, all that this people can do is endure their sorrows. After eating with Achilles, Priam picks up Achilles' description of Niobe's grief, κήδεα πέσσειν, to brood on her sorrows, and applies it to his behavior after Hektor's death: ἀλλ' αἰεὶ στενάχω καὶ κήδεα μυρία πέσσω,/ αὐλῆς ἐν χόρτοισι κυλινδόμενος κατὰ κόρπον ("But always I have been groaning and nursing myriad sorrows, in the enclosures of my courts rolling through the dung," 24.639-640). What strikes us first in Priam's depiction is again his likeness to Achilles, the extremity of grief that kept him awake, grieving, and defiling himself. But we see too the difference, as he seeks nothing more than to mourn his son on a bier. As the poem comes to its close with Hektor's funeral (24.788-804), the difference is rarified: perhaps aided by Achilles' advice, Priam remains part of a whole people, whose grief has a civic dimension, expressed in ritual form at the funeral,

---

352 Lynn-George (1996) similarly argues that lines 24.614-617 show Achilles' thoughtfulness in both encouraging food but acknowledging that grief will extend beyond eating; so too Van der Valk (1964), against the athetesis of these lines by Aristarchus, 385-6. For an overview, see Richardson (1993), *ad loc.*

which is unremarkable in its contents, though poignant in its quietness.[353] This model of Niobe grieving *in perpetuum* as a stone echoes the Trojan's response to suffering, that of passive endurance, painful though their grief be, rather than volatile, insatiate attempts to fill up what can never be repaired. That Achilles so encourages Priam indicates once again that he has released his own insatiety.

The *Iliad* rewards many angles of inquiry, but the lens of grief offers to us particularly rich insights. Through the lens of grief we see the particular nature of Achilles' experience of the loss of Patroklos, that yearning for a lost wholeness. Through grief we understand the origin of his anger and the futility at its core. Through grief we see the contrasting nature of the Trojans' relationship with Hektor, and we understand more fully the forward-looking sense of doom which pervades the poem's end. And, perhaps of most importance, through the lens of grief we see that fundamental desire for companionship which makes Achilles, for all his other-worldly features, a paradigmatically human figure, capable of speaking to diverse audiences at the core of who we are.

---

[353] Cf. McCoy (2013), on the purpose of ritual mourning as allowing forward movement, through the bonding between mourners that occurs as they memorialize and honor the dead, 28. Cf. also Muellner (1996) on desire for public lament as the desire for binding, 163-4, esp. n60.

Appendix A: ποθή, ποθέω, and πόθος in the *Iliad*: Some Subdivisions

I. All Iliadic Forms, In order of Appearance *(19 Total)*

1.240 ἦ ποτ᾽ Ἀχιλλῆος ποθὴ ἵξεται υἷας Ἀχαιῶν
1.492 αὖθι μένων· ποθέεσκε δ᾽ ἀϋτὴν τε πτόλεμόν τε.
2.703 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ᾽ οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν.
2.709 δεύονθ᾽ ἡγεμόνος, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα
2.726 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ᾽ οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν·
2.778 ἐν κλισίῃς. οἳ δ᾽ ἀρχὸν ἀρηΐφιλον ποθέοντες
5.234 ἐκφερέμεν πολέμοιο, τεὸν φθόγγον ποθέοντε
5.414 κουρίδιον ποθέουσα πόσιν, τὸν ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν
6.362 Τρώεσσ᾽, οἳ μέγ᾽ ἐμεῖο ποθὴν ἀπεόντος ἔχουσιν
11.161 ἡνιόχους ποθέοντες ἀμύμονας· οἳ δ᾽ ἐπὶ γαίηι/ κείατο,
11.471 ἐσθλὸς ἐών, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖσι γένηται.
14.368 κείνου δ᾽ οὔ τι λίην ποθὴ ἔσσεται, εἴ κεν οἱ ἄλλοι/ ἡμεῖς […]
15.219 δῦνε δὲ πόντον ἰών· πόθεσαν δ᾽ ἥρωες Ἀχαιοί.
17.439 ἡνιόχοιο πόθωι· θαλερὴ δ᾽ ἐμιαίνετο χαίτη
17.690 Πάτροκλος, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖσι τέτυκται.
17.704 Ἀντίλοχος – μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Πυλίοισιν ἐτύχθη –
19.321 σῆι ποθῆι. οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακώτερον ἄλλο πάθοιμι,
23.16 δάκρυσι· τοῖον γὰρ πόθεον μήστωρα φόβοιο.
24.6 Πατρόκλου ποθέων ἀνδροτῆτά τε καὶ μένος ἠύ

II. Divided By Parts of Speech

Nouns *(8 out of 19)*

ποθή *(7 out of 8)*

1.240 ἦ ποτ᾽ Ἀχιλλῆος ποθὴ ἵξεται υἷας Ἀχαιῶν
6.362 Τρώεσσ᾽, οἳ μέγ᾽ ἐμεῖο ποθὴν ἀπεόντος ἔχουσιν
11.471 ἐσθλὸς ἐών, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖσι γένηται.
14.368 κείνου δ᾽ οὔ τι λίην ποθὴ ἔσσεται, εἴ κεν οἱ ἄλλοι/ ἡμεῖς […]
17.690 Πάτροκλος, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖσι τέτυκται.
17.704 Ἀντίλοχος – μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Πυλίοισιν ἐτύχθη –
19.321 σῆι ποθῆι. οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακώτερον ἄλλο πάθοιμι,

πόθος *(1 out of 8)*

17.439 ἡνιόχοιο πόθωι· θαλερὴ δ᾽ ἐμιαίνετο χαίτη

Finite Verbs *(6 out of 19)*

1.492 αὖθι μένων· ποθέεσκε δ᾽ ἀϋτήν τε πτόλεμόν τε.
2.703 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ᾽ οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν.
2.709 δεύονθ᾽ ἡγεμόνος, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα
2.726 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ᾽ οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν·
15.219 δῦνε δὲ πόντον ἰών· πόθεσαν δ᾽ ἥρωες Ἀχαιοί.
23.16 δάκρυσι· τοῖον γὰρ πόθεον μήστωρα φόβοιο.

Participles *(5 out of 19)*

2.778 ἐν κλισίῃς. οἳ δ᾽ ἀρχὸν ἀρηΐφιλον ποθέοντες
5.234 ἐκφερέμεν πολέμοιο, τεὸν φθόγγον ποθέοντε
5.414 κουρίδιον ποθέουσα πόσιν, τὸν ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν
11.161 ἡνιόχους ποθέοντες ἀμύμονας· οἳ δ᾽ ἐπὶ γαίῃ/ κείατο,
24.6 Πατρόκλου ποθέων ἀνδροτῆτά τε καὶ μένος ἠύ

III. Divided By Non-grief/Grief Context; Subdivided by Object Longed For (*see discussion in Chapter 1*)

A. Grief Context (*5 out of 19*)

1. Diomedes' Wife for Husband (Imagined)

   Participle

   5.414 κουρίδιον ποθέουσα πόσιν, τὸν ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν

2. Horses, Myrmidons, and Achilles for Patroklos

   Nouns

   17.439 ἡνιόχοιο πόθωι· θαλερὴ δ᾽ ἐμιαίνετο χαίτη[354]
   19.321 σῆι ποθῆι. οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακώτερον ἄλλο πάθοιμι,

   Verb

   23.16 δάκρυσι· τοῖον γὰρ πόθεον μήστωρα φόβοιο.

---

[354] Note unique appearance of πόθος.

Participle

24.6 Πατρόκλου ποθέων ἀνδροτῆτά τε καὶ μένος ἠύ

B. Non- or Secondary Grief Context (*14 out of 19*)

(**marks passages where sorrow is present, but not explicitly linked to longing*)

1. Group of Warriors for *Leader/Strong Warrior*

Nouns

1.240 ἦ ποτ᾽ Ἀχιλλῆος ποθὴ ἵξεται υἷας Ἀχαιῶν

6.362 Τρώεσσ᾽, οἳ μέγ᾽ ἐμεῖο ποθὴν ἀπεόντος ἔχουσιν

11.471 ἐσθλὸς ἐών, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖσι γένηται.

14.368 κείνου δ᾽ οὔ τι λίην ποθὴ ἔσσεται, εἴ κεν οἱ ἄλλοι/ ἡμεῖς […]

*17.690 Πάτροκλος, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖσι τέτυκται.

17.704 Ἀντίλοχος – μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Πυλίοισιν ἐτύχθη –

Verbs

*2.703 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ᾽ οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν.

*2.709 δεύονθ᾽ ἡγεμόνος, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα

*2.726 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ᾽ οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν·

15.219 δῦνε δὲ πόντον ἰών· πόθεσαν δ᾽ ἥρωες Ἀχαιοί.

2. Individual or Group for *Battle*

Verb

1.492 αὖθι μένων· ποθέεσκε δ᾽ ἀϋτὴν τε πτόλεμόν τε.

Participle

2.778 ἐν κλισίῃς. οἳ δ᾽ ἀρχὸν ἀρηΐφιλον ποθέοντες[355]

3. Horses for Rein-Bearer

Participle

5.234 ἐκφερέμεν πολέμοιο, τεὸν φθόγγον ποθέοντε

11.161 ἡνιόχους ποθέοντες ἀμύμονας· οἳ δ᾽ ἐπὶ γαίῃ/ κείατο,

---

355 See Chapter One, pp. 23f., for argument that this longing for the *fighting* Achilles signifies the Myrmidons' longing for battle.

IV. In Narrative vs. Speech

A. Narrator *(11 out of 19)*

Noun

17.439 ἡνιόχοιο πόθωι· θαλερὴ δ᾽ ἐμιαίνετο χαίτη

17.704 Ἀντίλοχος – μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Πυλίοισιν ἐτύχθη –

Verbs

1.492 αὖθι μένων· ποθέεσκε δ᾽ ἀϋτὴν τε πτόλεμόν τε.

2.703 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ᾽ οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν.

2.709 δεύονθ᾽ ἡγεμόνος, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα

2.726 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ᾽ οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν·

15.219 δῦνε δὲ πόντον ἰών· πόθεσαν δ᾽ ἥρωες Ἀχαιοί.

23.16 δάκρυσι· τοῖον γὰρ πόθεον μήστωρα φόβοιο.

Participles

2.778 ἐν κλισίῃς. οἳ δ᾽ ἀρχὸν ἀρηΐφιλον ποθέοντες

11.161 ἡνιόχους ποθέοντες ἀμύμονας· οἳ δ᾽ ἐπὶ γαίηι/ κείατο,

24.6 Πατρόκλου ποθέων ἀνδροτῆτά τε καὶ μένος ἠύ

B. In Speech *(8 out of 19)*

Achilles:

Nouns

1.240 ἦ ποτ᾽ Ἀχιλλῆος ποθὴ ἵξεται υἷας Ἀχαιῶν

19.321 σῆι ποθῆι. οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακώτερον ἄλλο πάθοιμι,

Pandaros:

Participle

5.234 ἐκφερέμεν πολέμοιο, τεὸν φθόγγον ποθέοντε

Dione:

Participle

5.414 κουρίδιον ποθέουσα πόσιν, τὸν ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν

Hektor:

Noun

6.362 Τρώεσσ᾽, οἳ μέγ᾽ ἐμεῖο ποθὴν ἀπεόντος ἔχουσιν

Menelaos:

Noun

11.471 ἐσθλὸς ἐών, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖσι γένηται.

Poseidon:

Noun

14.368 κείνου δ′ οὔ τι λίην ποθὴ ἔσσεται, εἴ κεν οἱ ἄλλοι/ ἡμεῖς […]

Menelaos:

Noun

17.690 Πάτροκλος, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖσι τέτυκται.

Appendix B: ποθή, ποθέω, and πόθος in the *Odyssey*: Some Subdivisions

I. All Odyssean Forms, In order of Appearance *(20 Total)*

1.343 τοίην γὰρ κεφαλὴν ποθέω μεμνημένη αἰεὶ/ ἀνδρός […]
2.126 ποιεῖτ', αὐτὰρ σοί γε ποθὴν πολέος βιότοιο
2.375 ἢ αὐτὴν ποθέσαι καὶ ἀφορμηθέντος ἀκοῦσαι
4.596 ἥμενος, οὐδέ με οἴκου ἕλοι πόθος οὐδὲ τοκήων·
4.748 ἤ σ' αὐτὴν ποθέσαι καὶ ἀφορμηθέντος ἀκοῦσαι
8.414 μηδέ τί τοι ξίφεός γε ποθὴ μετόπισθε γένοιτο
9.453 ὀφθαλμὸν ποθέεις, τὸν ἀνὴρ κακὸς ἐξαλάωσε
10.505 μή τί τοι ἡγεμόνος γε ποθὴ παρὰ νηῒ μελέσθω·
11.196 σὸν νόστον ποθέων· χαλεπὸν δ' ἐπὶ γῆρας ἱκάνει.
11.202 ἀλλά με σός τε πόθος σά τε μήδεα, φαίδιμ' Ὀδυσσεῦ,
12.110 ἓξ ἑτάρους ἐν νηῒ ποθήμεναι ἢ ἅμα πάντας.
13.219 τῶν μὲν ἄρ' οὔ τι πόθει· ὁ δ' ὀδύρετο πατρίδα γαῖαν
14.144 ἀλλά μ' Ὀδυσσῆος πόθος αἴνυται οἰχομένοιο.
15.514 ἔρχεσθ'· οὐ γάρ τι ξενίων ποθή· ἀλλὰ σοὶ αὐτῷ
15.546 τόνδε τ' ἐγὼ κομιῶ, ξενίων δέ οἱ οὐ ποθὴ ἔσται.
16.287 παρφάσθαι, ὅτε κέν σε μεταλλῶσιν ποθέοντες·
18.204 αἰῶνα φθινύθω, πόσιος ποθέουσα φίλοιο
19.6 παρφάσθαι, ὅτε κέν σε μεταλλῶσιν ποθέοντες·
19.136 ἀλλ' Ὀδυσῆ ποθέουσα φίλον κατατήκομαι ἦτορ.
22.387 κύμαθ' ἁλὸς ποθέοντες ἐπὶ ψαμάθοισι κέχυνται·

II. Divided By Parts of Speech

Nouns *(8 out of 20)*

ποθή *(5 out of 8)*

2.126 ποιεῖτ', αὐτὰρ σοί γε ποθὴν πολέος βιότοιο
8.414 μηδέ τί τοι ξίφεός γε ποθὴ μετόπισθε γένοιτο
10.505 μή τί τοι ἡγεμόνος γε ποθὴ παρὰ νηῒ μελέσθω·
15.514 ἔρχεσθ'· οὐ γάρ τι ξενίων ποθή· ἀλλὰ σοὶ αὐτῷ
15.546 τόνδε τ' ἐγὼ κομιῶ, ξενίων δέ οἱ οὐ ποθὴ ἔσται.

πόθος *(3 out of 8)*

4.596 ἥμενος, οὐδέ με οἴκου ἕλοι πόθος οὐδὲ τοκήων·

11.202 ἀλλά με σός τε πόθος σά τε μήδεα, φαίδιμ’ Ὀδυσσεῦ,

14.144 ἀλλά μ’ Ὀδυσσῆος πόθος αἴνυται οἰχομένοιο.

Verbs *(6 out of 20)*

1.343 τοίην γὰρ κεφαλὴν ποθέω μεμνημένη αἰεὶ/ ἀνδρός […]

2.375 ἢ αὐτὴν ποθέσαι καὶ ἀφορμηθέντος ἀκοῦσαι

4.748 ἤ σ’ αὐτὴν ποθέσαι καὶ ἀφορμηθέντος ἀκοῦσαι

9.453 ὀφθαλμὸν ποθέεις, τὸν ἀνὴρ κακὸς ἐξαλάωσε

12.110 ἓξ ἑτάρους ἐν νηῒ ποθήμεναι ἢ ἅμα πάντας.

13.219 τῶν μὲν ἄρ’ οὔ τι πόθει· ὁ δ’ ὀδύρετο πατρίδα γαῖαν

Participles *(6 out of 20)*

11.196 σὸν νόστον ποθέων· χαλεπὸν δ’ ἐπὶ γῆρας ἱκάνει.

16.287 παρφάσθαι, ὅτε κέν σε μεταλλῶσιν ποθέοντες·

18.204 αἰῶνα φθινύθω, πόσιος ποθέουσα φίλοιο

19.6 παρφάσθαι, ὅτε κέν σε μεταλλῶσιν ποθέοντες·

19.136 ἀλλ’ Ὀδυσῆ ποθέουσα φίλον κατατήκομαι ἦτορ.

22.387 κύμαθ’ ἁλὸς ποθέοντες ἐπὶ ψαμάθοισι κέχυνται·

III. Divided By Grief/Non-grief Context (*for sake of comparison with the* Iliad)
Subdivided by Object Longed For

A. Grief Context *(9 out of 20)*

1a. Penelope for Odysseus

Verb 1.343 τοίην γὰρ κεφαλὴν ποθέω μεμνημένη αἰεὶ/ ἀνδρός […]

Participle 18.204 αἰῶνα φθινύθω, πόσιος ποθέουσα φίλοιο

19.136 ἀλλ’ Ὀδυσῆ ποθέουσα φίλον κατατήκομαι ἦτορ.

1b. Laertes, Antikleia, Eumaios for Odysseus (in that order):

Participle 11.196 σὸν νόστον ποθέων· χαλεπὸν δ’ ἐπὶ γῆρας ἱκάνει.

Noun 11.202 ἀλλά με σός τε πόθος σά τε μήδεα, φαίδιμ’ Ὀδυσσεῦ

14.144 ἀλλά μ’ Ὀδυσσῆος πόθος αἴνυται οἰχομένοιο.

2. Penelope for Telemachus

Verb

2.375 ἢ αὐτὴν ποθέσαι καὶ ἀφορμηθέντος ἀκοῦσαι

4.748 ἤ σ᾽ αὐτὴν ποθέσαι καὶ ἀφορμηθέντος ἀκοῦσαι

3. For Companions

Verb

12.110 ἓξ ἑτάρους ἐν νηῒ ποθήμεναι ἢ ἅμα πάντας.[356]

B. Non- or Secondary Grief Context *(11 out of 20)*

(**marks passages where sorrow is present, but not explicitly linked to longing*)

1. For External, Inanimate Objects

Nouns

2.126 ποιεῖτ᾽, αὐτὰρ σοί γε ποθὴν πολέος βιότοιο

8.414 μηδέ τί τοι ξίφεός γε ποθὴ μετόπισθε γένοιτο

15.514 ἔρχεσθ᾽· οὐ γάρ τι ξενίων ποθή· ἀλλὰ σοὶ αὐτῷ

15.546 τόνδε τ᾽ ἐγὼ κομιῶ, ξενίων δέ οἱ οὐ ποθὴ ἔσται.

Verb

13.219 τῶν[357] μὲν ἄρ᾽ οὔ τι πόθει· ὁ δ᾽ ὀδύρετο πατρίδα γαῖαν

Participles

16.287 παρφάσθαι, ὅτε κέν σε μεταλλῶσιν ποθέοντες·[358]

19.6 παρφάσθαι, ὅτε κέν σε μεταλλῶσιν ποθέοντες·

2. For Home and Parents, Guide, Eye, and Sea[359]

Nouns

4.596 ἥμενος, οὐδέ με οἴκου ἕλοι πόθος οὐδὲ τοκήων·

10.505 μή τί τοι ἡγεμόνος γε ποθὴ παρὰ νηῒ μελέσθω·

---

[356] This use of ποθέω is the most Iliadic, capturing the feeling of loss when a group loses their comrade; the context is Circe's advice to Odysseus to brave Scylla, not Charybdis, since it is better to long for six of your companions than all of them together.

[357] τῶν refers to the gifts of the Phaiakians that Odysseus brings home.

[358] The reference here and at 19.6 is to the suitors missing the weapons after they are removed from the hall.

[359] These latter two I distinguish from external, inanimate objects, because the eye is integral to the Cyclops, and the sea necessary for the life of the fish, to whom the dead suitors are compared.

Verb

*9.453 ὀφθαλμὸν ποθέεις, τὸν ἀνὴρ κακὸς ἐξαλάωσε[360]

Participle

*22.387 κύμαθ’ ἁλὸς ποθέοντες ἐπὶ ψαμάθοισι κέχυνται·[361]

IV. In Narrative vs. Speech

A. Narrator (*2 out of 20*)

Verb

13.219 τῶν μὲν ἄρ’ οὔ τι πόθει· ὁ δ’ ὀδύρετο πατρίδα γαῖαν

Participle

22.387 κύμαθ’ ἁλὸς ποθέοντες ἐπὶ ψαμάθοισι κέχυνται·

B. In Speech (*18 out of 20*)

Penelope:

Verb 1.343 τοίην γὰρ κεφαλὴν ποθέω μεμνημένη αἰεὶ/ ἀνδρός […]

Participle 18.204 αἰῶνα φθινύθω, πόσιος ποθέουσα φίλοιο

19.136 ἀλλ’ Ὀδυσῆ ποθέουσα φίλον κατατήκομαι ἦτορ.

Telemachos:

Verb 2.375 ἢ αὐτὴν ποθέσαι καὶ ἀφορμηθέντος ἀκοῦσαι

Noun 4.596 ἥμενος, οὐδέ με οἴκου ἕλοι πόθος οὐδὲ τοκήων·

15.514 ἔρχεσθ’· οὐ γάρ τι ξενίων ποθή· ἀλλὰ σοὶ αὐτῷ

Odysseus:

Noun 8.414 μηδέ τί τοι ξίφεός γε ποθὴ μετόπισθε γένοιτο

Participle 16.287 παρφάσθαι, ὅτε κέν σε μεταλλῶσιν ποθέοντες·

19.6 παρφάσθαι, ὅτε κέν σε μεταλλῶσιν ποθέοντες·

Antinoös:

Noun 2.126 ποιεῖτ’, αὐτὰρ σοί γε ποθὴν πολέος βιότοιο

Eurykleia:

Verb 4.748 ἤ σ’ αὐτὴν ποθέσαι καὶ ἀφορμηθέντος ἀκοῦσαι

---

[360] The Cyclops transfers his own longing for his eye to his ram.

[361] The context is a simile, comparing the heaps of dead suitors to piles of fish on the shore, longing for the sea as they die.

Polyphemos:

Verb 9.453 ὀφθαλμὸν ποθέεις, τὸν ἀνὴρ κακὸς ἐξαλάωσε

Circe:

Noun 10.505 μή τί τοι ἡγεμόνος γε ποθὴ παρὰ νηῒ μελέσθω·

Verb 12.110 ἓξ ἑτάρους ἐν νηῒ ποθήμεναι ἢ ἅμα πάντας.

Laertes:

Participle 11.196 σὸν νόστον ποθέων· χαλεπὸν δ᾽ ἐπὶ γῆρας ἱκάνει.

Antikleia:

Noun 11.202 ἀλλά με σός τε πόθος σά τε μήδεα, φαίδιμ᾽ Ὀδυσσεῦ

Eumaios:

Noun 14.144 ἀλλά μ᾽ Ὀδυσσῆος πόθος αἴνυται οἰχομένοιο.

Peiraeus:

Noun 15.546 τόνδε τ᾽ ἐγὼ κομιῶ, ξενίων δέ οἱ οὐ ποθὴ ἔσται.

Bibliography

Editions of Ancient Texts

Aeschines Orationes, ed. M. Dilts. 1997. Stuttgart-Leipzig: Bibliotheca Teubneriana.

Aeschyli Tragoediae, ed. D. Page. 1972. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aeschylus: Fragments, ed. A. Sommerstein. 2008. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Loeb Classical Library 505.

Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica, ed. R. Kassel. 1976. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea, ed. I. Bywater. 1894. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Epic of Gilgamesh, The, transl. M. Kovacs. 1989. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Further Greek Epigrams, ed. D. Page. 1981. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Greek Anthology, The: Hellenistic Epigrams, eds. A. Gow and D. Page. Vols. 1-2. 1965. Cambridge University Press.

Greek Lyric, Vol. III: Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides, and Others, ed. D.A. Campbell. 1991. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Loeb Classical Library 476.

Hesiodi Opera, ed. F. Solmsen, R. Merkelbach, M. L. West. 3rd. ed. 1990. New York: Oxford University Press.

Homeri Ilias, ed. H. van Thiel. 1996. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag AG.

Homeri Opera: Odysseae, ed. T. W. Allen. 1917. New York: Oxford University Press.

Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer, ed. M. L. West. 2003. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Loeb Classical Library 496.

Homerus Ilias, ed. M. L. West. Vols. 1-2. 1998-2000. Stuttgart-Leipzig: Bibliotheca Teubneriana.

Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati, ed. M.L. West. Vols. 1-2. 1989-92, orig. 1971-2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lieder des Bakchylides, Die. Zweiter Teil: Die Dithyramben und Fragmente, ed. H. Maehler. 1997. Leiden: Brill.

Menander, ed. W. Arnott. Vol. 2. 1997. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Loeb Classical Library 459.

Pindarus, ed. Snell. Vol. 1. 1964. DGR: Bibliotheca Teubneriana.

Platonis Opera Vol. 1: Euthyphro, Apologia Socratis, Crito, Phaedo, Cratylus, Sophista, Politicus, Theaetetus, ed. E. A. Duke, et al. 1995. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Platonis Opera Vol. 2: Parmenides, Philebus, Symposium, Phaedrus, Alcibiades I and II, Hipparchus, Amatores, ed. J. Burnet. 1922, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Platonis Opera Vol. 5: Minos, Leges, Epinomis, Epistulae, Definitiones et Spuria, ed. J. Burnet. 1907. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Platonis Respublica, ed. S. R. Slings. 2003. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, ed. M. Davies. Vol. 1. 1991. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sappho et Alcaeus Fragmenta, ed. Eva-Maria Voigt. 1971. Amsterdam: Athenaeum – Polak & Van Gennep.

Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem, ed. H. Erbse. Vols. 1-7. 1969-88. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Senecae ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales, ed. L. Reynolds. Vol. 1.1965. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Xenophontis Opera Omnia, ed. E. C. Marchant. Vol. 2. 1921, 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Commentaries and Translations

Chapman's Homer: the Iliad, ed. Allardyce Nicoll. 1984. Princeton University Press; orig. Bollingen Foundation, Inc., 1956.

de Jong, I. 2012. *Homer: Iliad. Book XXII. Cambridge Greek and Latin classics.* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Edwards, M. 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. V: Books 17-20*, gen. ed. G.S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fitzgerald, R., transl. 1974. *The Iliad* by Homer. New York: Doubleday.

Graziosi, B. and J. Haubold. 2010. *Homer: Iliad, Book VI*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hainsworth, J.B. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. III: Books 9-12*, gen. ed. G.S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Janko, Richard. 1992. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. IV: Books 13-16*, gen. ed. G.S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirk, G. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. I: Books 1-4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

____. 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. II: Books 5-8*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macleod, C. W. 1982. *Homer, The* Iliad*, Book XXIV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richardson, N. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. VI: Books 21-24*, gen. ed. G.S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willcock, M.M. 1976. *A Companion to the* Iliad. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Works Cited and other Selected Bibliography

Alexiou, M. 2002, orig. 1974. *The Ritual Lament in the Greek Tradition*, 2nd ed. Revised by Dimitrios Yatromanolakis and Panagiotis Roilos. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Arieti, J. 1984. "Achilles' Inquiry about Machaon: The Critical Moment in the *Iliad*." *Classical Journal* 79.2: 125-130.

____. 1985. "Achilles' Guilt." *Classical Journal* 80.3: 193-203.

____. 1986. "Achilles' Alienation in *Iliad* 9." *Classical Journal* 82.1: 1-27.

Armstrong, J. 1958. "The Arming Motif in the *Iliad*." *American Journal of Philology* 79.4: 337-54.

Austin, E. 2015. "Grief as ποθή: Understanding the Anger of Achilles." *New England Classical Journal* 42.3: 147-163.

Austin, N. 1975. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's Odyssey.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Barrett, D.S. 1981. "The Friendship of Achilles and Patroclus." *Classical Bulletin* 57: 87-93.

Bassett, S.E. 1933. "Achilles' Treatment of Hector's Body." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 64: 41-65.

Beck, D. 2005. *Homeric Conversation*. Center for Hellenic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University, Washington, D.C.: Harvard University Press.

____. 2012. *Speech Presentation in Homeric Epic.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bespaloff, R. 1947. *On the* Iliad. Washington, D.C.: Pantheon Books.

Bettini, M. 1988. "Ἠθεῖος." *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 116: 154-66.

Bowra, C. M. 1930. *Tradition and Design in the* Iliad. London: Oxford University Press.

Braund, S.M. and G.W. Most, eds. 2003. *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burgess, J. 2009. *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Clarke, W.M. 1978. "Achilles and Patroclus in Love." *Hermes* 106 (3): 381-396.

Crotty, K. 1994. *The Poetics of Supplication: Homer's Iliad and Odyssey*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

de Jong, I. 1987. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the* Iliad. Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner Publishing Co.

Derderian, K. 2001. *Leaving Words to Remember: Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy.* Leiden: Brill.

Devereux, G. 1978-9. "Achilles' 'Suicide' in the *Iliad*." *Helios* 6: 3-15.

Dover, K. 1989. *Greek Homosexuality.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dué, C. 2002. *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Edwards, M. 1987. *Homer: Poet of the* Iliad. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fantuzzi, M. 2012. *Achilles in Love: Intertextual Studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fenik, B. 1968. *Typical Battle Scenes in the* Iliad. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH.

Finlay, R. 1980. "Patroklos, Achilleus, and Peleus: Fathers and Sons in the 'Iliad.'" *The Classical World* 73.5: 267-273.

Frazer, R. M. 1993. *A Reading of the* Iliad. Lanham: University Press of America.

Fränkel, H. 1921. *Die homerische Gleichnisse.* Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Friedrich, P. 1977. "Sanity and the Myth of Honor." *Ethos* 5.3: 281-305.

Friedrich, P. and J. Redfield. 1978. "Speech as a Personality Symbol: The Case of Achilles," *Language* 54.2: 263-288.

Gaca, K. 2008. "Reinterpreting the Homeric Simile of *Iliad* 16.7-11: The Girl and Her Mother in Ancient Greek Warfare." *The American Journal of Philology* 129:2: 145-171.

Garland, R. 1982. "*Geras thanonton*: An Investigation into the Claims of the Homeric Dead." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 29.1: 69-80.

Gottschall, J. 2008. *The Rape of Troy: Evolution, Violence, and the World of Homer*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Griffin, J. 1980. *Homer on Life and Death.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Halperin, D. 1990. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality*. New York: Routledge.

Harris, W. 2001. *Restraining Rage: the Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Holst-Warhaft, G. 1992. *Dangerous Voices: Women's Lament and Greek Literature.* New York: Routledge Press.

Hubbard, T. 2003. *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kakridis, J. 1949. *Homeric Researches*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup.

Keegan, J. 1999. *The First World War*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Kim, J. 2000. *The Pity of Achilles: Oral Style and the Unity of the Iliad*. Cambridge, MA: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

King, K. 1987. *Achilles: Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to the Middle Ages*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Konstan, D. 1997. *Friendship in the Classical World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

____. 2001. *Pity Transformed*. London: Duckworth.

____. 2006. *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

____. 2013a. "The Grieving Self: Reflections on Lucian's On Mourning and the Consolatory Tradition." In *Greek and Roman Consolations: Eight Studies of a Tradition and its Afterlife*, ed. H. Baltussen. 139-152. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

____. 2013b. "Lucretius and the Epicurean Attitude towards Grief." In *Lucretius: Poetry, Philosophy, and Science*, ed. Daryn Lehoux, A.D. Morrison, Alison Sharrock. 193-210. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kullmann, W. 2001, orig. 1968. "Past and Future in the *Iliad*." In *Oxford Readings in Homer's* Iliad, ed. D. Cairns, transl. L. Holford-Strevens. 385-408. New York: Oxford University Press.

Latacz, J. 1966. *Zum Wortfeld "Freude" in der Sprache Homers.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Lloyd, G. E. R. 1966. *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumentation in Greek Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lohmann, D. 1988. *Die Andromache-Szenen der Ilias: Ansätze und Methoden der Homer-Interpretation*. Zürich and New York: Georg Olms Verlag Hildesheim.

Lord, A. 2000, orig. 1960. *The singer of tales*, 2nd ed, eds. S. Mitchell and G. Nagy. Cambridge,

MA: Harvard University Press.

Lord, M. L. 1967. "Withdrawal and Return." *Classical Journal* 62.6: 241-248.

Lossau, M. 1979. "Achills Rache und aristotelische Ethik." *Antike und Abendland* 35: 120-129.

Lynn-George, M. 1988. *Epos: Word, Narrative, and the* Iliad. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International.

____. 1996. "Structures of Care in the *Iliad*." *Classical Quarterly* 46.1: 1-26.

MacCary, W. T. 1982. *Childlike Achilles: Ontogeny and Phylogeny in the Iliad.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Mackie, C. J. 2008. *Rivers of Fire: Mythic Themes in Homer's* Iliad. Washington, D.C.: New Academia Publishing.

McCoy, M. 2013. *Wounded Heroes: Vulnerability as a Virtue in Ancient Greek Literature and Philosophy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Michelakis, P. 2002. *Achilles in Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Monsacré, H. 1984. *Les larmes d'Achille. Le héros, la femme et la souffrance dans la poésie d'Homère.* Paris: Albin Michel.

Moulton, C. 1977. *Similes in the Homeric Poems.* Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Muellner, L. 1996. *The Anger of Achilles:* Menis *in Greek Epic.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Muich, R. 2010. "Pouring Out Tears: Andromache in Homer and Euripides." PhD dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

____. 2010-2011. "Focalization and Embedded Speech in Andromache's Iliadic Laments," *Illinois Classical Studies* 35-36: 1-24.

Murnaghan, S. 1999. "The Poetics of Loss in Greek Epic." In *Epic Tradition in Contemporary World. The Poetics of Community*, J. Beissing, J. Tylus, S. Wofford, eds. 202-220. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nagler, M. 1967. "Towards a Generative View of the Oral Formula." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 98: 269-311.

____. 1974. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study of the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nagy, G. 1999, orig. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

____. 2013. *The Ancient Greek Hero in 24 Hours*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Oele, M. 2010. "Suffering, Pity and Friendship: An Aristotelian Reading of Book 24 of Homer's Iliad." *Electronic Antiquity* 14.1: 51-65.

Owen, E. T. 1946. *The Story of the* Iliad. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, and Company.

Page, D. L. 1959. *History and the Homeric "Iliad."* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pavlock, B. 1990. *Eros, Imitation, and the Epic Tradition*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Percy, W. 1996. *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Perkell, C. 2008. "Reading the Laments of Iliad 24." In *Lament: Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond*, ed. A. Suter. 93-117. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pucci, P. 1993. "Antiphonal Lament between Achilles and Briseis." *Colby Quarterly* 29.3: 253-72.

Redfield, J. 1975. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hektor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rutherford, R. B. 1982. "Tragic Form and Feeling in the *Iliad*." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 102: 145-60.

Schadewaldt, W. 1966. *Iliasstudien.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

____. 1965. *Von Homers Welt und Werk: Autsaetze und Auslegungen zur homerischen Frage,* 4th ed. Stuttgart: K. F. Koehler Verlag.

Schein, S. 1984. *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's* Iliad. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schnapp-Gourbeillon, A. 1982. "Les funerailles de Patrocle." In *La mort, les morts dans les*

sociétés anciennes, ed. G. Gnoli and J-P. Vernant. 77-88. London: Cambridge University Press.

Scully, S. 1990. *Homer and the Sacred City*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

____. 2003a. "Eros and Warfare in Virgil's *Aeneid* and Homer's *Iliad*." In *Being There Together: Essays in Honor of Michael C.J. Putnam on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, ed. P. Thibodeau and H. Haskell. 181-197. Afton Historical Society Press.

____. 2003b. "Reading the Shield of Achilles: Anger, Terror, and Delight." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 101: 29-47.

Segal, C. 1971a. *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the* Iliad, Mnemosyne. Leiden: Brill.

____. 1971b. "Andromache's *anagnorisis*: formulaic artistry in *Iliad* 22.437-476." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 75: 33-57.

Shay, J. 1994. *Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character.* New York: Maxwell Macmillan International.

Silk, M. 2004, orig. 1987. *Homer: The Iliad*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simon, B. 1978. *Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece: The Classical Roots of Modern Psychiatry.* Ithaca and London: *Cornell University Press.*

Sinos, D.S. 1975. "The Entry of Achilles into Greek Epic." Ph.D. dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University.

____. 1980. *Achilles, Patroklos, and the Meaning of Philos*. Innsbrucker Beitraege zur Sprachwissenschaft 29. Innsbruck.

Slatkin, L. 1991. *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the* Iliad. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Taplin, O. 1992. *Homeric Soundings: the Shaping of the* Iliad. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Tsagalis, C. 2004a. *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's* Iliad. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

____. 2004b. "The Poetics of Sorrow: Thetis' Lament in *Iliad* 18.52-64." *Quaderni Urbinati di*

Cultura Classica 76.1: 9-32.

Van Brock, N. 1959. "Substitution rituelle." *Revue Hittite et Asianique* 65: 117-146.

Van der Valk, M. 1964. *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the* Iliad*: Part Two*. Leiden: Brill.

____. 1966. "The Formulaic Character of Homeric Poetry and the Relation between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*." *L'Antiquité Classique* 35: 5-70.

Van Nortwick, T. 1996. *Somewhere I Have Never Travelled: The Hero's Journey*. New York: Oxford University Press.

van Wees, H. 1998. "A Brief History of Tears." In *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity,* eds. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, 10-53. London and New York: Routledge.

Verweij, D. 2007. "Comrades or Friends? On Friendship in the Armed Forces." *Journal of Military Ethics* 6.4: 280-291.

Vivante, P. 1970. *The Homeric Imagination: A Study of Homer's Poetic Perception of Reality*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Weil, S. 2003. *The* Iliad *or The Poem of Force: A Critical Edition*, ed. and trans. James P. Holoka. New York: Peter Lang.

West, M. L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

____. 2001. *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the* Iliad. Munich-Leipzig: K. G. Saur.

____. 2007. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, J.R. 1974. "The Wedding Gifts of Peleus." *Phoenix* 28.4: 385-389.

____. 1986. "The *Gilgamesh* Epic and the *Iliad*." *Echos du monde classique = Classical Views* 30: 25-41.

Whitman, C. 1958. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zanker, G. 1994. *The Heart of Achilles: Characterization and Personal Ethics in the* Iliad. University of Michigan Press.

Curriculum Vitae

EMILY P. AUSTIN

PhD Candidate • Department of Classical Studies, Boston University
1363 Shady Ave • Pittsburgh, PA 15217 • emilyparkeraustin@gmail.com • 617-777-9047

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Classical Studies, Boston University, MA — Forthcoming May 2016

- Dissertation: "Grief, Longing, and Anger: A Study of Emotions in the *Iliad*"

Teaching Writing Certificate, Boston University, MA — 2014

B.A., *summa cum laude,* Classical Studies, University of Dallas, TX — 2006

- Major: Classical Studies – Greek
- Thesis: "Meaning Amidst Formula: A Study of the Epithets of Odysseus in the *Odyssey*"

RESEARCH and TEACHING INTERESTS

Homer, especially characterization and emotions in the *Iliad*
Greek literature
Emotions in the Ancient World
Greek and Latin grammar
Ancient Philosophy
Livy as a Narrative Historian
Classical Tradition

PUBLICATIONS

"Grief as ποθή: Understanding the Anger of Achilles," *New England Classical Journal* 42.3 (2015): 147-163

CONFERENCE PAPERS and OUTREACH

"Grief as *Pothos*: Understanding the Anger of Achilles"
  Paper presented to the Classical Association of New England — March 8, 2014

"Who is a Hero? Ancient and Modern Ideals"
  Seminar for the Massachusetts Junior Classical League — December 6, 2013
  Guest Speaker for students at Montrose School, Medfield, MA — January 29, 2014

"Pericles, Persuasion, and Power"
  Seminar for the Massachusetts Junior Classical League — January 15, 2009

FELLOWSHIPS

Graduate Writing Fellow, Boston University	2012-2013
Teaching Fellow, Department of Classical Studies, Boston University	2007-2010
Presidential University Grant Fellow, Department of Classical Studies, Boston University	2006-2007

AWARDS and GRANTS

Rosemoor Continuing Scholars' Grant	2014-2016
Boston University Center for the Humanities, The Edwin S. and Ruth M. White Prize, and The Angela J. and James J. Rallis Memorial Award	2014
Summer Research Grant, Fund for Hellenic Studies, Boston University	2013
Outstanding Teaching Fellow Award, Department of Classical Studies, Boston University	2009-2010
Fr. Placid Award for exceptional achievement in Classics, University of Dallas	2006
Phi Beta Kappa, Eta Chapter of Texas	2005
National Merit Scholar Scholarship	2002-2006

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Boston University

- Instructor (courses self-designed):
  - Writing and Research Seminar: Concepts of Heroism in Ancient Epic — Spring 2013
  - Freshman Writing Seminar: Concepts of Heroism in Ancient Epic — Fall 2012
  - Beginning Latin 2 — Summer 2011
  - Beginning Latin 2 — Spring 2010
  - Beginning Latin 2 — Summer 2007
- Teaching Assistant, with discussion sections:
  - Classical Civilization: The World of Rome — Fall 2009
  - Classical Civilization: The Glory of Greece — Fall 2008
  - Classical Civilization: The Glory of Greece — Spring 2008
- Teaching Assistant:
  - Roman History — Spring 2009
  - Greek History — Fall 2007

Brooklyn College, The City University of New York

- Discussant (responsible for half of students' grade)
  - Classical Cultures — Spring 2011
  - Classical Cultures — Fall 2010

University of Dallas

- Tutor, *Latin in Rome Program* (for American high school students) — Summer 2006
  ~ daily instructor of a small group of five to six students and lecturer on-site in locations in and around Rome, Italy

LANGUAGES

Greek and Latin; Reading knowledge of German, French, and Spanish (with some spoken German)

SERVICE

Assistant Director, Bayridge Residence and Cultural Center — July 2013-Aug 2014

~ Independent Residence for college women in the Back Bay, with the mission of providing a studious, formative environment where the students may grow personally and professionally

Director, CollegePrep — Summer 2009-2012

~ High School Leadership Program, run by Bayridge Residence and Cultural Center, for junior and senior girls, seeking to develop the character and skills necessary to flourish in college

Director, Service in the City — Summer 2008-2010

~ High School Service Program, run by Bayridge Residence and Cultural Center, for sophomore girls, who go out into the Boston community to serve those with needs and, at the same time, seek ways to bring service into daily life