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Abstract

From Aristotle onwards, the Homeric narrator has been praised for the restrained way in which he provides commentary to his audience. But there are occasions when the poet-narrator intrudes overtly as when he makes a direct address to—or apostrophe of—one of the characters in the epic. Scholars have advanced various hypotheses to explain the function and effect of narratorial apostrophe in Homer.

This study aims to determine whether one evaluation is valid for all narratorial apostrophes of character in the Iliad. I test the current evaluations of these apostrophes in three case studies. According to the character-based evaluation, the Homeric narrator uses apostrophe to model sympathy and pity for a character to elicit a similar emotional response in the audience. According to the structure-based evaluation, apostrophes mark critical turning points in the story. Most scholarship has focussed on the recipients of multiple apostrophes, Menelaos and Patroklos, but I pay equal attention to a third group of apparently miscellaneous apostrophes. My approach relies on a close reading of each apostrophe in its event-sequence, and I draw on elements of structural narratology and Labov and Waletzky’s model of the components of narrative. I also examine the synergy between apostrophes and other forms of narratorial intrusion.

Although the contribution of the character-based approach to our understanding of Homeric apostrophe in the Iliad is well-recognized, I propose that it is limited in scope. I demonstrate the new insights that are offered by a structure-based
interpretation in which the apostrophes of character are examined against Labov and Waletzky's model. What emerges are the different yet complementary insights afforded by a close reading of the apostrophic event-sequences, and an appreciation of the rewarding synergy that can be observed in the poet-narrator's character-based and structure-based strategies.
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Chapter 1—Homeric Narrative and Apostrophe of Character

Introduction

In this study, my focus is on the moments at which the Homeric narrator's restraint—so praised by Aristotle—is relaxed, and he intrudes overtly into his telling of the Iliad in the form of direct addresses to characters, known as apostrophes. In its broadest terms, an apostrophe is a rhetorical device in which the speaker speaks to—rather than about—a real person, imaginary character or object as if he/she or it were a real person and in the presence of the speaker. For the purpose of this study, a narratorial apostrophe of character may be defined as the moment at which the Homeric narrator suspends his account of the action to enter the distant past of the Trojan War and turn it into the present through the act of making a direct address to a character in the epic.

A small number of characters have each been addressed in this way several times by the Homeric narrator. Typically, most of the scholarship on Homeric apostrophe has concentrated on these multiple apostrophes of character. The aim of this study is to determine whether it is possible to extrapolate any one overarching theory that

---

1 Aristotle, Poetics, translated by Stephen Halliwell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995), 1460a 7–8. All translations quoted are from this edition, unless stated otherwise. I follow the tradition of referring to the creator of the Iliad as Homer. In this study, I use the term “poet-narrator”. I avoid “author” and “poet” because virtually nothing is known about Homer as a person. See Joachim Latacz, Homer: His Art and His World, translated by James Holoka (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1998), 23 ff. When I use “Homer”, I refer to the poet-narrator, unless stated otherwise.
is valid for all narratorial apostrophes of character in the Iliad. I shall, therefore, examine all such apostrophes in the epic.

I shall look at narratorial apostrophes of character from a range of perspectives: for example, their contribution to the portrayal of character; the effect they have on the relationship between the narrator, his audience and the addressee; their thematic and structural significance; and the role of apostrophe in the performance of the epic.

In this chapter I shall discuss Homeric narrative and the Homeric narrator, starting with Aristotle’s comments on Homer. After making some observations on direct speech by characters and narrative-text in Homeric epic, on the Homeric narrator and on audience engagement, I shall discuss narratorial intrusion. This will provide a framework in which to discuss apostrophe. In the second half of this chapter, I shall discuss definitions of apostrophe in the context of Homer, using an article by Elizabeth Block as a point of departure. I shall present a summary of the main current evaluations of the purposes of Homeric apostrophe of character. These include: meeting the needs of metrical imperatives; modelling sympathy and pity for the addressees in order to elicit the same response in the audience; marking “turning points” in the story; and contributing to the vividness which characterizes Homeric epic. I shall introduce a new dimension to the structure-based approach to narratorial apostrophes through an examination of their distribution across the structure of the narrative.

In Chapter 2 I shall set out my approach and methodology. With regard to the former, I shall explain the concepts and terms which have shaped my approach from a number of sources, including narratology, variational linguistics, and Homeric scholarship. I also set out my position on the question of Homeric objectivity. The methodology I shall describe is based on a close reading of all apostrophes of character in their context against a number of criteria. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 will report my findings and observations from three test cases: the narratorial apostrophes of Menelaos, Patroklos, and a third category comprising the remaining apostrophes of character in the Iliad. I shall summarize my conclusions in Chapter 6.

**Homeric narrative**

Aristotle considers that tragedy and epic are closely connected. As we shall see in the quotations below, he praises Homer as the epic poet who most closely bridges the two genres. Irene de Jong notes that Aristotle raises two points of commonality between tragedy and epic. The first is historical because Aristotle views Homer as the first tragedian:

...δὲ καὶ τὰ σπουδαῖα μάλιστα ποιητῆς Ὅμηρος ἦν μόνος γὰρ οὐχ οὖν ὑπὸ ἄλλα καὶ μιμήσεις δραματικὰς ἐποίησεν...

Homer was the supreme poet of elevated subjects (for he was preeminent not only in quality but also in composing dramatic mimesis)...  

*Fo. 1448b 34–36*

---

The second point is the structural similarity. For example, as in tragedy, Homer restricts the plot of the *Iliad* to cover a limited period of the war:

...τῷ μηδὲ τὸν πόλεμον καίτερ ἔχοντα ἀρχήν καὶ τέλος ἐπιχειρήσαι ποιεῖν ὅλον: λίαν γάρ ἂν μέγας καὶ οὐκ εὐσύνοπτος ἐμελλέν ἔσεσθαι ὁ μῦθος...

...though the war had beginning and end, he [Homer] did not try to treat it in its entirety, for the plot was bound to be too large and incoherent...

Po. 1459a 31–34

...τοιγαροῦν ἐκ μὲν Ἡλίαδος καὶ Ὀδυσσείας μία τραγῳδία ποιεῖται ἐκατέρας ἢ δύο μόναι...

Accordingly, with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* a single tragedy, or at most two, can be made from each...

Po. 1459b 1–3

Homer provides context and variety to the action of the *Iliad* by references to the past (analepsis), such as the Catalogue of Ships (2.494–760), and forecasts of what is to come (prolepsis), such as Zeus’ revelation of the fate of Patroklos and of Hektor (15.64–66).4

A third, critical link between Homeric epic and tragedy arises from the extent to which Homer allows his characters to speak for themselves.5 The percentage of direct speech-text in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* combined is approximately 55 per cent of the total text.6 Aristotle lauds Homer for knowing his place:

---

4 Unless stated otherwise, all Homeric references are to the *Iliad*, and all translations of the *Iliad* are from Richmond Lattimore, *The Iliad of Homer* (Chicago, Illinois; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1951).

5 Arist., *Poetics*, 1460a 1–12.

6 The *Iliad* has 15,690 lines, of which 7,018 (approximately 45 per cent) are direct speech according to Jasper Griffin’s use of the figures determined by W. Schmid and O. Stählin.
The others participate in their own voice throughout, and engage in *mimesis* only briefly and occasionally, whereas Homer, after a brief introduction, at once “brings onto stage” a man, woman, or other figure (all of them rich in character).

Po. 1460a 7–11

Rene Nünlist observes that in the Ancient Greek *scholia* the terms µιμητικών (that which is represented or imitated) can refer to speeches and διηγηματικών (that which is described, set out) can refer to narrator-text.7 Tragedy is entirely composed of direct speech to achieve µίμησις (representation).8 We see and hear actors representing the characters on stage. With Homer’s epics, the ancient audience did not see a representation of the characters by various performers; they heard a poet-narrator who switched between his narrative-text and the representation of the direct speech of characters:

...διὰ τὸ µή ὅραν εἰς τὸν πρᾶττοντα...

...because we do not actually see the agent...

Po. 1460a 14


8 It may have narrative elements, however, such as messenger reports.

9 Although it remains speculative, we cannot exclude the possibility that the poet-narrator changed his voice and used gestures and expressions when narrating the direct speech of characters.
Homer's reticence in minimising occasions when he speaks "in his own voice" is the basis for Aristotle's famous praise:

"Όμηρος δὲ ἄλλα τε πολλά ἄξιος ἐπαινεῖσθαι και δὴ καὶ ὑπὶ μόνος τῶν ποιητῶν οὐκ ἀγνοεῖ δὲ ποιεῖν αὐτόν. αὐτόν γὰρ δὲ τὸν ποιητὴν ἑλάχιστα λέγειν ..."

Homer deserves praise for many other qualities, but especially for realising, alone among epic poets, the place of the poet's voice. For the poet should say as little as possible in his own voice...

Po. 1460a 7–8

De Jong argues that αὐτόν...λέγειν in this context refers to the non-mimetic Homer speaking personally in the first person—that is, the poet or author speaking in his own right. She points to the proems of the Iliad (1.1–7) and Odyssey (1.1–10) as examples of this. Thus, in her view, Aristotle is the first among epic poets to differentiate between the author (a real person) and the narrator (a literary construct). The narrative-text of the Iliad, which accounts for 55 per cent of its total, thus supports de Jong's view: by any reasonable definition, the narrative-text cannot be described as ἑλάχιστα λέγειν (saying as little as possible). Unlike Plato, then, Aristotle considers the mimetic function to comprise both poet speaking as narrator—to whom I refer as the poet-narrator—and poet speaking as a character who is participating in the events of the poem: Achilleus or Andromache, for example.

---

10 This paragraph is based on de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 7–8.

11 On de Jong's interpretation of Plato's definitions of mimesis as character-speech and of diegesis haple or narration as the poet speaking as himself: de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 5.
Instances of the poet-narrator speaking in his own right are the invocations to the Muses, including the invocation preceding the Catalogue of Ships (2.485–493). This invocation contains a unique number of first-person pronouns, and it is therefore worth quoting in full:

Tell me now, you Muses who have your homes on Olympos. For you, who are goddesses, are there, and you know all things, and we have heard only the rumour of it and know nothing. Who then of those were the chief men and the lords of the Danaans? I could not tell over the multitude of them nor name them, not if I had ten tongues and ten mouths, not if I had a voice never to be broken and a heart of bronze within me, not unless the Muses of Olympia, daughters of Zeus of the aegis, remembered all those who came beneath Ilion. I will tell the lords of the ships and the ships numbers.

2.484–493

In this invocation Homer alludes to the contrasting and complementary roles and responsibilities of the poet-narrator and the Muses. The first seven lines emphasize the Muses’ omniscience (484–490) and acknowledge the limits of all mortals, including the poet-narrator. Having invoked the Muses’ help in enabling him to give a true and authentic account, Homer then continues with his song.

The Homeric narrator or the poet-narrator

De Jong argues that Aristotle’s praise of Homer as the most dramatic—and therefore the best—of epic poets, has led him to ignore the “more personal” passages in the narrative-text, such as the invocation quoted above. Aristotle’s praise is thus the genesis of the view that Homeric narrative is “impersonal” and “objective”.

I shall discuss Homeric “objectivity” in Chapter Two below. The use of the term “personal” is not free from ambiguity because, as de Jong points out, the Homeric narrator is a function, not a real person. The term the “construct of a narrating self” might be more appropriate. In this context, the narrator might mimic or model certain—even if limited—attributes such as reliability and emotions or attitudes such as compassion and approval in order to engage the audience’s interest or elicit a certain response to a situation or to the actions of a character.

The Homeric narrator has not been sufficiently developed to warrant consideration as a character in the same sense as the characters participating in the events of the epic world. Porter Abbott defines characters as “any entities involved in the action that have agency”, and he points out that this includes flat or minor and round or significant characters. Abbott notes that the terms “agent” or “actor/actant” are also used for character. In other words, the Homeric narrator is not dramatized in his

13 Based on de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 8.
14 De Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 32.
own right because he does not appear to have the same degree of characterization as do both significant and minor characters.\(^{17}\)

In some works of fiction, the narrator can be a character who is involved in the events that take place within the work. Such a narrator is known as an internal or homodiegetic narrator. In the novel *Le Grand Meaulnes*, for example, the narrator Seurel is one of the main characters, and we end up knowing him as a character better than we do the main character, Meaulnes.\(^{18}\) In the *Iliad*, however, we do not know any biographical details about the poet-narrator. De Jong, however, argues that this external or extradiegetic narrator is not without “personality”.\(^{19}\) But, as Scott Richardson, notes, the Homeric narrator is “not even a clearly defined personality”.\(^{20}\) In the Homeric narrator we have no rounded portrayal of the totality of attributes, attitudes, interests, behavioural patterns, experience and beliefs that is known as personality. Instead, we gain information about a limited number of attributes, beliefs, and emotional responses, all of which are related to the function or purpose of narration. These can be discerned through the choices the poet-narrator makes about what is noteworthy enough to include in his poems, the order in which the events will be presented, and how much significance will be attached

---


\(^{19}\) De Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 45. To support her point, de Jong refers to the Homeric narrator’s role as interpreter of events before Troy and his relationships with those to whom he makes direct addresses: the Muses, his audience, and characters in the epic.

to the events, and the characters and the objects which play a role in them. The action of selecting, ordering, and interpreting is described as “focalization”, a narratological concept which I shall discuss in more detail in Chapter 2 below.\textsuperscript{21} For example, the poet-narrator is not bound to relate the events of his story in the order in which they take place. He can offer an evaluative comment on, an explanation for, or a response to what he is narrating. Such instances of focalization can be either subtle or obvious in nature.

**Features of direct speech in an oral performance**

Allowing characters to speak for themselves is sound practice from a performative point of view: it is much more entertaining and engaging for the audience than if the poet-narrator were to take centre stage and use indirect speech to report on what the characters have said.\textsuperscript{22} A greater use of indirect speech would create a barrier between the character in question and the audience: even if the historical present were used, the audience would still rely on the narrator as an obvious intermediary. Direct speech, also known as character-speech, enables the audience to experience characters as they speak.\textsuperscript{23} Importantly, it also allows the characters to speak to and about each other. This interaction provides different points of view,  


\textsuperscript{22} In narratives of personal experience, storytellers engage their audiences by slipping into a *mimesis* of noteworthy speech exchanges of different characters, rather than by using indirect speech.

\textsuperscript{23} On the vividness and pervasiveness of direct speech in Homeric epic: Deborah Beck, *Speech Presentation in Homeric Epic* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas, 2012), 23–27.
with the result that the audience is invited—compelled, even—to participate more actively in the unfolding of the story by having to react to the different perspectives of characters.

Book 10 of the *Iliad*, for example, opens with Agamemnon and Menelaos discussing the worsening Achaian situation at night. They go off separately to summon the Achaians to an assembly. Agamemnon goes to Nestor and asks him to accompany him. Nestor assumes the reason why Menelaos is not with Agamemnon, and he addresses the king:

```
άλλα φίλον περ ἐόντα καὶ αἴδοιον Μενέλαον νεικέω, εἰ πέρο μοι νεμεσθέσαι, οὐδ’ ἐπικεύσω ὡς εἴδει, σοὶ δ’ οίω ἐπέτρεψεν πονέσθαι. νῦν ὅφελεν κατὰ πάντας ἀριστῆς πονέσθαι λισσόμενος: χρείω γὰρ ικάνεται οὐκέτ’ ἀνεκτός.’
τὸν δ’ αὐτὴ προσέειπεν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων: ἀ’ γέρον ἀλλοτε μὲν οἱ καὶ αἰτίασθαι ἀνωγα: πολλάκις γὰρ μεθεὶ τε καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλει πονέσθαι οὔτ’ ὁκνῶ εἰκὼν οὔτ’ ἀφραδίστῃ νόοιο, ἀλλ’ ἐμὲ τ’ εἰσοφόρων καὶ ἐμὴν ποτιδέγμενος ὀρμήν. νῦν δ’ ἐμέο πρότερος μάλ’ ἐπέγρατο καὶ μοι ἐπέστη: τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ προσήκα καλῆμεναι οὖς σὺ μεταλλάς.
```

But beloved as he is and respected, I will still blame Menelaos, even though you be angry, and I will not hide it, for the way he sleeps and has given to you alone all the hard work. For now he ought to be hard at work going to all the great men in supplication. This need that has come is no more endurable.’

Then in turn the lord of men Agamemnon spoke to him: ‘Aged sir, other times I also would tell you to blame him, since often he hangs back and is not willing to work hard, not that he shrinks from it and gives way, nor in the mind’s dullness, but because he looks to me, and waits till I make a beginning. But this time he woke far before me, and came to rouse me, and I sent him on to call those you ask after...

10.114–125
Nestor enjoys a special position. He speaks plainly to the hot-tempered Agamemnon. But Nestor is shrewd: he sweetens his criticism of the king’s brother by presenting it as concern for Agamemnon. Nestor’s words reveal his belief that Agamemnon mollycoddles Menelaos. Agamemnon immediately defends Menelaos, revealing his protective attitude towards him. But Agamemnon does not lose his temper with Nestor. He explains Menelaos’ occasional hesitancy in self-flattering terms. Is Nestor’s criticism justified? Is he jealous of Menelaos? Is Agamemnon easily flattered? Does he need to be so protective of Menelaos? We can interpret this conversation a number of ways.

Through direct speech the audience is more effectively drawn into the epic world. We experience characters in a more immediate sense, apparently without any filter or intermediary. In reality, the poet-narrator decides what direct speech to represent, and this is, in itself, a filter. Further, direct speech is generally reserved for important moments and scenes which the audience is allowed to experience in real time. On the critical first day of battle in the Iliad, for instance, many and varied speech exchanges take place in different locations. Such speech-exchanges take place during the duel between Paris and Menelaos (3.20 ff), Pandaros’ wounding of Menelaos (4.105 ff), Athene’s encouragement of Diomedes (5.124 ff) and Hektor’s poignant reunion with his wife and young son (6.390 ff).

---

24 The first day of battle (Day 22 of the Iliad’s time span of 51 days) begins at 2.48 and concludes at 7.380. In contrast, the poet-narrator allocates just one line to the first nine days of the plague (1.53).
Audience engagement

Speech-exchanges in a performance create the impression in an audience member of being an eye-witness to the events. Speech-exchange is an important factor in arousing our interest and creating emotional engagement. W. Wyatt explains that, in the context of story-telling, engagement can be defined as moving through a series of states or conditions to reach a state of emotional investment in what happens to a particular character. From having their attention and curiosity whetted, audience members become interested in what is presented, and then, as a result, they care about the outcome and whom it affects. There are a number of ways in which the poet-narrator can evoke this series of reactions in the narrative-text. He can share information with the audience to which the character concerned is not privy, and he can present significant interactions between the character and another character. Through the use of leitmotifs the poet-narrator can associate a character with a particular theme and cluster of emotions. He can reveal a character’s fate through prolepsis or make an evaluative comment about a character in a particular situation. The poet-narrator can also evoke interest and concern for a character by modelling an apparently spontaneous emotional response in a direct address to the character, known as a narratorial apostrophe of character.

As a speech-act, apostrophe exercises a similar effect to that of character-speech in that both reinforce the impression that what we are experiencing as members of the

---

audience is real and is taking place before us. Direct speech demands our full attention: we have no time to reflect. At one level—the rational or intellectual—we may be quite aware that what is being presented is not real. But enjoyment is partly created by escaping the restrictions of reality. Through our emotional response, we are no longer detached observers but engaged participants in the performance.

We empathize, for example, with Agamemnon in his spontaneous and concerned response to seeing his brother wounded (4.155–182). By being made privy to a more appealing side to the king, we care about where his grief and anger will lead him. Agamemnon finishes his speech in a crescendo of pathos, which seals our engagement, with an imagined taunt by a Trojan, presented as vividly as possible in the form of embedded direct speech:

"αἰθ’ οὕτως ἐπὶ πᾶσι χόλον γελέωτε: Ἁγαμέμνων, ώς καὶ νῦν ἄλιου στρατόν ἡγαγεν ἐνθάδε Ἀχαίων, καὶ δὴ ἔβη οἶκον δὲ φίλην ὡς πατρίδα γαίαν σὺν κεινήσιν νηροῖ, λιπὼν ἡγαθὸν Μενέλαον." ὡς ποτὲ τις ἐφέει τότε μοι χάνοι εὐφεία χθών."

"Might Agamemnon accomplish his anger thus against all his enemies, as now he led here in vain a host of Achaians and has gone home again to the beloved land of his fathers with ships empty, and leaving behind him brave Menelaos."
Thus shall a man speak: then let the wide earth open to take me."

4.178–182

Both the variety of speech uttered by the same character—depending on the addressee and the context—and the comparison of different speakers' speeches in the same situation provide interest and increase the audience's engagement. A

26 From now on “apostrophe” refers to narratorial apostrophe of character, unless stated otherwise.
comparison of Agamemnon's speech to his wounded brother, discussed above, with his cruel response to the priest Chryses' supplication for the return of his daughter (1.26–32) illustrates this point.

Direct speech is, I suggest, one of the most important, if not the single most important, ways in which character is revealed. Drama is founded on this principle. During the _Teikhoskopia_ (Viewing from the Walls), the Trojan counsellor Antenor describes the dramatic change in the Trojans' perception of Odysseus once they heard him speak (3.216–224). Through its form and content, speech offers insights into the speakers: for example, their values, motivations, loyalties, hatreds, and, significantly, their interpretation of the actions of others.

Further, speech-exchange reveals the dynamics of a relationship: for example, who exploits passive aggression as a power ploy, who holds power, and who has the confidence to express himself or herself in a forthright manner. Achilleus' antagonistic speech to Agamemnon during their quarrel reveals his clear contempt and lack of respect for the Achaian co-leader (1.149–151, 158–160). It points to a grievance of some standing. Yet his reassuring speech to Agamemnon's heralds reveals his innate courtesy (1.334–339).

---

27 Other speech-acts, such as "free indirect speech" embedded in the narrative-text, also play an important role: Beck, _Speech Presentation_, 8–9, 79–106.

28 "Man... makes known the uniqueness of his individuality best by his _ipsissima verba_": Samuel Eliot Bassett, _The Poetry of Homer_, edited with an introduction by Bruce Heiden, 2nd edn. (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2003), 57. Bassett's work was first published as part of the Sather Classical Lectures, vol. 15, 1938.
Importance of manner or style as well as content in communication

There is a clear parallel between the features of direct speech and the act of storytelling, and indeed with any act of communication: the manner in which, or how, something is expressed is as important as the content, or what, is said in engaging and sustaining the audience's interest. Any contradiction between the two can create dramatic tension, as in the example of "the smiler with the knife" which has become an expression in everyday English.29

Direct speech offers opportunities for interpretation to the audience, both the internal audience (in the fictional world of the epic or the "storyworld") and the external audience (a realm of interaction between those listening to the oral performance of the epic and the poet-narrator, known as the "storyrealm").30

Multiple perspectives on the same character, event, or dilemma offered by different speakers involve listeners in making judgements or choices about whom to believe. The level of the persuasive power of the speaker and how reliable his listeners deem him to be are major determining factors in the audience's reception of what he has to say. Nestor illustrates this point: his biographical tales from his days of glory model the behaviour he then urges his listener to emulate. Nestor's polished and


30 Katherine Galloway Young defines "taleworld" (or "storyworld") as a domain inhabited by characters "acting in their own space and time" which has been conjured up by the "storyrealm", a "realm of discourse spoken by people who dwell in another space and time": Katherine Galloway Young, Taleworlds and Storyrealms: The Phenomenology of Narrative (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1987), viii. Despite Ed O’Reilly’s criticism that Young has merely created “surrogates” for story and discourse, storyworld and storyrealm are useful terms in examining Homeric narrative: Ed O’Reilly, Review of Taleworlds and Storyrealms: The Phenomenology of Narrative by Katherine Galloway Young, The Journal of American Folklore, 102.406 (1989), 497–500, at 497.
convincing expression and the respect in which he is held nearly always secure the desired effect.\textsuperscript{31}

\textit{Immediate response of audience in an oral performance}

Readers of a text can exercise their personal preference as to how much they read at a given time, whether they react immediately to what they read or whether they try to suspend judgement until a certain point. Oliver Taplin points out that external interferences can interrupt and shape the reading of a text.\textsuperscript{32} But people listening to an oral performance cannot take time out to reflect or debate a point, nor can they manipulate the performance temporally, by repeating their reception of an important scene or moving forwards and backwards in the epic, as can readers of a written text or viewers of a recorded performance. Nor can they stop the performance to discuss an aspect with another member of the audience. At most, they can exchange occasional quick comments. Thus, quickly securing an emotional response from a first-time audience during an oral performance is paramount.

In their seminal study of 1966 on story-telling drawn from the narrator's own experience, which they termed personal experience narrative, William Labov and Joshua Waletzky defined “evaluation” as the aspect of a narrative or story which reveals the narrator’s attitude to it “by emphasizing the relative importance of some narrative units as compared to others”.\textsuperscript{33} Evaluation gives a narrative meaning and

\textsuperscript{31} On Nestor’s rhetorical ability: 1.247–249. Significantly, neither Agamemnon nor Achilleus accept his advice during their quarrel (1.286 ff). This reveals their intransigence.


orientation. Epic poets incorporated and developed the skills used in everyday personal storytelling, such as evaluation, in composing and performing their songs.\textsuperscript{34} Hence, Labov and Waletzky's model of the components of personal experience narrative are relevant to this study. I shall discuss how I have incorporated their model into the approach to my study in more detail in Chapter 2 below.

The Homeric poet-narrator alone is responsible for the successful reception of his narration. Although, as discussed above, the direct speech of characters plays a critical role in engaging the audience, it is the poet-narrator who decides—through the act of focalization—what direct speech to incorporate into his narration. Further, through the evaluative information that he shares, he communicates what is noteworthy about his story, including a particular speech by a character. Hence, de Jong uses the term "primary narrator-focalizer" to emphasize the complementary "collaboration" between the functions of narrating and focalizing. She notes that a character acts as a secondary narrator-focalizer when, through the act of speech, he or she performs the same activities of narrating and focalizing. But the poet-narrator, as the primary narrator-focalizer, exercises the ultimate power by choosing which direct speech to attribute to a particular character.


\textsuperscript{34} Minchin, \textit{Resources of Memory}, 7, 17–23.
Narrative-text in Homer

As preparation for my discussion of narratorial intrusion and narratorial apostrophes of character, I shall summarize a few key points about the nature of narrative-text, or narrative passages, in Homer.

Let us return to Aristotle for his summary of how μίμησις or representation of human activity is realized:

καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ μιμεῖοθαι ἔστιν ὅτε μὲν ἀπαγγέλλοντα, ἢ ἄλλον τι γνωσμένον ὅσπερ Ὅμηρος ποιεῖ ἢ ὡς τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ μεταβάλλοντα, ἢ πάντας ὡς πράττοντας καὶ ἐνεργοῦντας τοὺς μιμομένους...

For in the same medium one can represent the same objects by combining narrative with direct personification, as Homer does; or by in an invariable narrative voice or by direct enactment of all roles...

Po. 1448a 19–24

Narrative passages or narrator-text contribute to character portrayal and audience engagement through the presentation of events—including their causes, effects and results. Narrative passages create the framework for the unfolding of the plot; they provide salient aspects of the setting of important episodes; and they relate

---

35 Aristotle, Poetics, with an introduction, commentary and appendices by D.W. Lucas (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 66–67. Lucas notes that 1448a 19–24 is one of the most difficult passages in Poetics, although its general meaning is not. There are two interpretations. In the first, mimesis is tripartite (mixed narrative and direct speeches by characters, pure narrative, or representation of characters through direct speech). In the second interpretation, there are two categories: the first has two sub-sets (either the poet narrating, at times representing characters through their direct speech, or remaining purely as narrator); and, the second category comprises the representation of characters through their direct speech. What is relevant to this study is common to both interpretations: Homer alternates between the narrative passages or narrator-text and mimesis of characters through characters’ direct speech or character-text. See also de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 6.
interactions between the characters. The poet-narrator can also choose to introduce and comment on events, interactions, characters, and important objects.

In Homer's epics, narrative passages provide balance and relief from the complex and more demanding experience of following and reacting to exchanges of direct speech. Because direct speech is reserved for revealing and drawing out details of moments of drama and significance, the challenge for narrative text is to relate events and provide the necessary context while still engaging the audience.

The Homeric poet-narrator's abilities

Importantly, a narrative passage or narrator-text is not subject to the constraints and demands of real time which direct speech imposes. Narrative-text allows the poet-narrator to compress or summarize events and interactions between characters and descriptions which are less important or interesting but still relevant to the story. The poet-narrator can simply omit what he deems irrelevant. He can vary the pace of his narration and its tone. He has privileged knowledge of what is to come. He can even relate simultaneous events, and collapse the temporal and spatial barriers between the epic storyworld and that of his audience.

The poet-narrator can defy other dimensions of reality—for example, spatially, by rapidly moving between locations. He can move temporally, between the past, present and future, through analepsis and prolepsis. He can narrow his focus from the macro to the micro, and back again. For instance, after walking along the shore,

---

36 Nünlist discusses the references to these concepts in the Greek scholia. He notes that modern use of these terms increased after Genette's use of them (1972): Nünlist, "Narratological Concepts in Greek Scholia", 65–66.
the Achaian embassy of five under Phoinix's leadership arrives at the Myrmidons' camp. They find Achilleus playing his lyre. Through the narrowing of focus our eyes come to rest on a detail of his lyre—its finely-wrought silver bridge:

Μυρμιδόνων δ' ἐπὶ τε κλώιας καὶ νῆας ἱκέσθην, τὸν δ' εὔσον φρένα τεσπόμενον φόρμιγγι λιγείη, καλῇ δαίδαλῇ, ἐπὶ δ' ἀργύρους ζυγὸν ἣν...

Now they came beside the shelters and ships of the Myrmidons and they found Achilleus delighting his heart in a lyre, clear-sounding, splendid and carefully wrought, with a bridge of silver upon it...

9.185–187

This compressed and dramatic narrowing of focus serves to emphasize Achilleus' self-imposed isolation. The poet-narrator then widens his focus slightly to present the figure of Patroklos, sitting very close to Achilleus (9.190–191).

The list of the Homeric narrator's abilities above is by no means comprehensive. Omniscient and with greater powers than his audience or his mortal storyworld characters, he is truly endowed with what Scott Richardson calls “extraordinary abilities”.

The poet-narrator's reliability

The narrator-text in Homeric epic is the "voice" of the poet-narrator. He provides a point of continuity and a reliable reference point for the storyrealm audience. As Block explains, the narrator of an oral epic is expected to be reliable because his audience must understand what is happening so that they can respond "fully and

---

37 Scott Richardson, Homeric Narrator, 109 ff.
immediately to the constantly flowing action”. In other words, the Homeric narrator is not competing with his characters’ direct speech for our attention in deciding whether he can be relied upon or to what extent we can trust his evaluation of events and characters. Because the poet-narrator enjoys the inspiration and support of the Muses, which he has secured by his invocations of them, his audience can be assured that his narration will be authentic and accurate. Thus, the poet-narrator is all-knowing and authoritative. He is also a bridge between his audience and storyworld of the epic. In other words, the poet-narrator is the link or mediator between the two realms.

The poet-narrator’s intrusion

The poet-narrator can intrude into his narration in a subtle or covert way: for example, by making a pause in the action of the story to provide the audience with information about a character. The poet-narrator can also intrude or comment in a more overt way: for example, through evaluative statements such as explanations.

An instance of this is the poet-narrator’s explanation for the Achaian embassy’s response to Achilleus’ refusal to the request that they have presented on behalf of Agamemnon:

---


39 On the complementary roles of the Muses and the Homeric narrator: Minchin, Resources of Memory, 163–180. I discuss the influence of Minchin’s theory concerning invocations in shaping part of my approach in Chapter 2 below.

Another more overt form of intrusion is the poet-narrator’s comparison of something in the epic storyworld with something in the present:

...ο δε χειρισματων λαβε χειφι
Τυδείδης μεγα έργουν ου δυο γ' άνδρε φέροιεν,
οιοι νυν βροτοι εισ' ο δε μην ήξα πάλλε και οίος.

...But Tydeus’ son in his hand caught up a stone, a huge thing which no two men could carry such as men are now, but by himself he lightly hefted it.

Scott Richardson has developed a useful taxonomy of what he terms “narratorial presence“, which ranges from the most covert to the most overt forms. Examples not mentioned above include summary, indirect speech, paralipsis or omissions filled in after the fact, interpretation, and judgement.41

As with many terms used in narratology, “narratorial intrusion“ is subject to debate. A narrow definition is provided by Gerald Prince: the narrator breaks or intrudes into his or her own presentation of the story to communicate, or rather

41 Scott Richardson, Homeric Narrator, 9 ff, 71 ff, 99 ff, 148 ff, 158 ff.
interpret, “more or less explicitly...as a narrating self” (my italics). Prince argues that some narratologists would consider “the slightest ‘evaluative’ adjective or adverb or the most discreet logical connection between events to be intrusions”. He contends that intrusion requires evaluation to be the result of “the narrator’s interpretation, the consequence of his special knowledge, the mere product of his subjectivity rather than the well-established facts in the world of the narrated”.

To enter into this debate is beyond the scope of this study. I therefore offer the following brief comments. Prince’s short definition provides a useful starting point, although his use of the adverb “explicitly” is open to interpretation. There is not likely to be a conveniently clear point of differentiation along the spectrum of narratorial intrusion or presence, as Prince might wish. A case-by-case examination against a set of criteria may be the best approach. There is no doubt, however, that narratorial apostrophe is one of the most overt or self-conscious forms of narratorial intrusion. For the purpose of this study, I define narratorial intrusion as an act of communication by the poet-narrator to his audience which

---


45 See also Booth’s list of “signs of the author”: Booth, *Rhetoric of Fiction*, 18–19.

46 Prince concedes that “intrusions may have different degrees of obviousness”. But he argues that “whereas a self-conscious narrator is always intrusive, the reverse is not true”: Prince, *Narratology*, 11–12. Prince may well have the highly mannered, self-conscious narrator of 18th century fiction in mind: for example, the narrator of Denis Diderot’s *Jacques le Fataliste*. But Scott Richardson appears to equate overt intrusion or presence—to use his term—with self-conscious intrusion: Scott Richardson, *Homerica Narrator*, 4–5.
expresses his evaluation about what is unfolding in the epic storyworld as presented in his narration.

**Speechframes**

Narrator-text also includes the speechframes or speech-formulas which introduce and close direct speech. They act as cue for the transition between the narrative and characters' direct speech. An important guide or prompt for listeners at an oral performance, speechframes also enable the audience to identify both speaker and addressee. Speechframes are considered a form of attributive discourse, and thus contribute to how the story is told.\(^{47}\) Mark Edwards notes that speechframes can be used with "considerable emotional effect".\(^{48}\) For instance, the description in the following speechframe has an evaluative force:

\[
egin{quote}
\text{\text{
\begin{align*}
\text{\‘ως τὴν μὲν προμνήν πῦρ διμφεπεν: αὐτὰρ Αχιλλεὺς μηδὲν πληξάμενος Πατροκλῆς προσέειπεν: \’όροσ οἰδογενὲς Πατρόκλεες ἵπποκέλευθε...}
\end{align*}
\end{quote}}
\]

So the fire was at work on the ship’s stern; but Achilleus struck his hands against both his thighs, and called to Patroklos: 'Rise up, illustrious Patroklos, rider of horses...

16.124–126

The brief but effective description of body language, which jolts Achilleus into action, conveys his emotional response to the sight of Trojan fire on an Achaian ship.


One of the ways in which the poet-narrator can intrude into speechframes to provide evaluation is through an apostrophe of the character who is about to speak.49 Therefore, I shall make a note of any apostrophic speechframes of interest in the context of this study.

**Homerica**

**Definitions of apostrophe**

Block’s 1982 study contrasting the use of narratorial apostrophe by Homer and by Virgil acted as a catalyst for my study.50 This summary of the definitions of apostrophe is based on her work. For my own definition, see above.

Apostrophe is a term in ancient rhetoric to describe, literally, the “turning away” from one stance to another, whether “from objective to subjective narration or from one audience to another”.51 E. A. Mackay stresses the performative aspect of Homeric epic in the context of narratorial apostrophe. Although it is impossible to know for certain, it is likely that the singer may have, as Mackay envisages,

---

49 Examples are at 16.20, 16.744, 16.843. For ease of reference, all line references to apostrophes of character will be bolded; all apostrophes in the Greek text will be underlined, and the translations of them will be in italics.

50 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 7–22.

51 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 8. Apostrophe is described by Edward Corbett and Robert Connors as a figure of speech that is closely linked to personification in that it is a trope which is designed to arouse emotion: Edward Corbett and Robert Connors, *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*, 4th edn. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 402. Their definition is restricted to addressing an absent person or a personified abstraction. For example, “Death, be not proud though some have called thee / mighty and dreadful, for thou art not so”: John Donne, “Holy Sonnets: 3”, in *The New Oxford Book of English Verse*, edited by Helen Gardner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972) 197.
emphasized “his departure from the norm with gesture, turning aside from his audience to address an invisible presence ‘off-stage’”.52

Nünlist notes that Ancient Greek scholia on various Greek poets contain commentary on the transition from “third-person narrative to second-person narrative and back”, and that second-person narrative found expression in “standard terminology” as προσαγορευτικός λόγος (apostrophic or addressing speech).53

Block refers to Quintilian’s two definitions of aversus (apostrophe):

...sermonem a persona iudicis aversum...

...the diversion of our words to address some person other than the judge…

Quint. Inst. 4.1.63

and

...a proposita quaestione abducit audientem...quod fit et multis et variis figuris...

...serves to distract the hearer from the question at issue...But this effect can be achieved by many different Figures...

Quint. Inst. 9.2.39

The exclamatory figure is relevant to Homeric apostrophe.56 Block contends that rhetorical theory, both ancient and modern, has failed to distinguish between


“narrative apostrophe” that is spoken by the narrator’s own persona and apostrophe in a character’s speech.\(^5^7\) To illustrate this point, she cites Macrobius’ use of the apostrophe or direct address in Antenor’s direct speech, φαίης κε (you would say, 3.220), as an example of apostrophe.\(^5^8\) Yet Macrobius defines apostrophe as:

...inter narrandum velut ad aliquem dirigit orationem...

...in the course of his narrative Homer speaks as though to some individual listener...

Mac. Sat.5.14.9\(^5^9\)

Block concludes that this conflation has led to a lack of appreciation of the development of the narrator as a separate entity.\(^6^0\) Jonathan Culler describes the vocative of the apostrophe as positing an “I-thou”, that is, intimate relationship between speaker and addressee.\(^6^1\) Culler observes that apostrophe is “a communicative voice” between these two parties which, in poetry, acts as an “intensifier”.\(^6^2\) The Homeric apostrophe of character, however, involves a third party, the audience of the poet-narrator.

The transition from the main narrative- or narrator-text to narratorial apostrophe is without any cue: speechframes bracketing a narratorial apostrophe would be an

\(^{56}\) Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 8, n. 3.

\(^{57}\) Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 8, n. 4.

\(^{58}\) Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 12–13.


\(^{60}\) Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 8, n. 4.


\(^{62}\) Culler, *Pursuit of Signs*, 135, 139.
absurdity because they would remove the necessary element of surprise from this
category of apostrophe.

As we shall see, apostrophe plays an all-important role in influencing the audience’s
response to the addressee. Apostrophe, as I shall show, is an act of overt and direct
communication which reveals a moment of deeper level of engagement by the poet-
narrator with his own narration or discourse. Its external manifestation is a
seemingly spontaneous outburst in which the poet-narrator models an emotional
response.

**Survey of literature on Homeric apostrophe of character**

Most scholars writing on Homeric apostrophe give some kind of summary of other
scholarship on this phenomenon. De Jong provides the most recent summary. She
identifies three approaches to the purpose of apostrophe: an evaluation which
favours metrical expediency (exemplified by Campbell Bonner, V. J. Matthews and,
with a variation, by Naoko Yamagata); a character-based approach whereby the
poet-narrator expresses his sympathy for vulnerable yet loyal characters (the Greek
scholia, Adam Parry, Block, Richard Martin, and Ahuvia Kahane); and a call for
attention to a turning point in the narrative (principally Mackay, but others such as
Bonner and Block also cite points of crisis). De Jong’s own contribution is that

---

63 Scott Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 170–171; Ahuvia Kahane, *The Interpretation of Order*
Literature”, in *Trends in Classics: Narratology and Interpretation*, edited by Grethlein and
Rengakos, 87–115, at 94–95. I refer to commentaries of the *Iliad* when I discuss individual
apostrophes.
apostrophes add *enargeia* or vividness and, thus, make the events in the storyworld come alive and seem real.64

Metrical expediency

For Bonner (1906) metrical convenience cannot be ignored as the most important consideration in using the “lively, sympathetic effect” of apostrophe.65 But he concedes that in some cases it is “probably significant” that apostrophe is used at critical points of danger faced by the addressee.66 Matthews’ examination (1980) of apostrophe deliberately omits all but a few literary or artistic considerations in its aim to strengthen the case for a metrical evaluation.67 He conducts a detailed analysis of instances of apostrophe based on the suitability of certain case endings of proper-nouns and their position in lines. His argument rests on the choice of a proper-noun vocative as suitable for reasons of colometry and metre. Yamagata (1989) contends that the most likely reason apostrophes were used is “because they were available” rather than because the poet-narrator was eager to address his characters.68 She acknowledges the objection that metrical convenience is not a bar to the poet-narrator expressing an emotional response. But she sees narratorial reserve in the lack of the interjection ὦ (o) or patronymic-name combinations.

64 De Jong, “Metalepsis”, 95.


Yamagata has strong reservations, therefore, about narratorial modelling of emotion and the poet-narrator treating characters as if they were real beings in his presence.

Evaluation of metrical expediency

Although it is beyond the scope of this study to enter into a detailed rebuttal of this largely technical issue, I offer some brief comments on why I reject the view that gives primacy to metrical expediency. Parry has argued convincingly against this approach.69 Kahane rightly observes that rejecting a rigid metrical approach does not imply a complete rejection of the role of metrics. The very act of deciding to use a proper noun in a narratorial apostrophe, Kahane contends, is in essence a semantic or poetic choice.70 Homeric narratorial intrusion, in general, is rightly characterized as being subtle, or covert. The rare use of such an overt and powerful trope as apostrophe cannot be arbitrary, regardless of whether one argues that the use of apostrophe is based on considerations of character or structure, or both. The serendipity of the metrical convenience of the vocative proper names of the two recipients of multiple apostrophes is no argument for metrical expediency's primacy of purpose. The recipients, Menelaos and Patroklos, are significant characters who help define Achilleus not only with their attributes but through the role which they play in the plot. Scholars may contend that certain apostrophes have a more obvious significance or work better than others. For example, the significance of the apostrophe of Menelaos as he is about kill Peisandros (13.603) may appear debatable but, as we shall see, there is an argument in its favour. I shall


70 Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 154.
not revisit the approach of metrical expediency in the case studies, although I shall comment on some limited aspects of metre.

**Sympathy for loyal yet vulnerable characters**

From Parry’s influential article on Homeric characterization (1972), support has grown for the theory that the aim of Homeric apostrophe is to engender sympathy for the character-addressees who are compassionate, loyal and somehow vulnerable.\(^\text{71}\) This view has its roots in the *scholia* to Homer which comment on the sympathy Homer has for the addressees of narratorial apostrophe.

The scholiasts generally see apostrophe as a poetic figure which is used to maintain interest by providing variation and to draw attention to a particular person.\(^\text{72}\) But Homeric apostrophe, in the view of Greek scholiasts (in, for example, \(\Sigma bT\), \(\Sigma T\) and \(bT\)), can be summed up as a narratorial expression of an emotional response of empathy or sympathy and pity to the situation in which the addressee finds himself. The Greek scholiasts describe the Homeric narrator’s response with verbs such as \(\pi\rho\omicron\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\\dot{a}\omicron\chi\omicron\omega\) (literally, to experience in addition, to suffer as well).\(^\text{73}\) For example, \(\Sigma bT\) comments on the apostrophe of Menelaos (4.127) as the goddess Athene deflects Pandaros’ arrow from the Spartan king:

\[\text{71 Adam Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 9–22.}\]

\[\text{72 Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 9; Scott Richardson, Homeric Narrator, 171, 238 (n. 11).}\]

...προσπέπνυθε δὲ Μενελάω ὁ ποιητής...

...and the poet has suffered along with Menelaos...

(my translation)

Parry (1972) makes the case that calling attention to a particular character and providing variation is too limited and too simplistic a view of the purpose of apostrophe. Apostrophe can also mark points of escalation in the plot and bring into alignment the pace and emotional tone. Parry’s main contribution is, first, the way in which he compares the recipients of multiple apostrophes and, second, his explanation of the role of apostrophes in portraying character and in eliciting an emotional response from the audience to such characters. He observes certain similar traits in the characters so addressed—loyalty, unusual sensitivity and compassion—all of which render these characters deserving of sympathy. He contends that the characterization of Menelaos and Patroklos sets them apart from the standard epic hero-warrior in their lack of concern for self-assertion. Patroklos is the “sweetest” character in the poem, and the Achaians—and the gods—feel a special concern for Menelaos.

Block’s point of departure is that apostrophe is an acknowledgement of some kind of relationship between a narrator and his audience (my emphasis). The aim of apostrophe, Block contends, is to move and teach by example, achieving this by

---

76 Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 16.
77 Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 10, 11, 16.
shifting the audience’s attention to create a “diversion through which the speaker
[or narrator] guides the response of the listener”\textsuperscript{78}. This diversion is most effectively
applied at emotional high points. In drawing out her argument that the purpose of
narratorial apostrophe is to elicit sympathy for the addressees, Block draws on
Parry’s observations, noted above, about the traits that the recipients of multiple
apostrophes share. Block contends that these attributes imbue the characters with “a
vague but poetically essential weakness”\textsuperscript{79}.

Mark Edwards (1987) concludes that, although apostrophe was “probably [first]
developed for primarily metrical convenience”, the narrator uses it to indicate his
special sympathy for Menelaos and Patroklos and to increase the audience’s
engagement.\textsuperscript{80} Richard Martin (1989) refers to narratorial apostrophes as a long-
standing problem. He notes the development to ascribe the motivation for its use
less as a means of characterization and more for the creation of emotional effect. For
example, apostrophes increase the poignancy of Patroklos’ death and highlight the
“themes of protection and responsibility for which they are the focus”.\textsuperscript{81}

While Richardson (1990) acknowledges that the effect of apostrophe is some kind of
bond between audience and character, his view is that the narrator engenders

\textsuperscript{78} Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 8–9.

\textsuperscript{79} Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 16.

\textsuperscript{80} Mark W. Edwards, \textit{Homer: Poet of the Iliad} (Baltimore, Maryland, and London: The Johns

\textsuperscript{81} Richard P. Martin, \textit{The Language of Heroes} (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press,
1989), 235. See also Block who identifies Menelaos and Patroklos as “the focus of the themes
of protection and responsibility”: Elizabeth Block, “Narrative Judgment and Audience
sympathy “without showing any sympathy of his own”.82 Richardson reasons that
the explanation for the audience’s definite sympathetic response to recipients of
multiple apostrophes lies in the effect of apostrophe of character as a form of
metalepsis.83 Metalepsis can be described as the conflation of the spatial and
temporal barriers between storyworld and storyrealm.84 The intimacy created by the
act of metalepsis forms a “close alliance” between addressee and the audience as the
“narrator’s companion”.85

Kahane favours a literary approach (1994) in his examination of narratorial
apostrophes of character in the context of patterns of vocatives of proper names: for
example, the implication of their position within the hexameter.86 He ascribes the
“verse-internal” positioning of vocative proper names in apostrophes as a sign of
the poet-narrator’s special attention or attitude towards the addressee. Kahane
equates this to a tone of sympathy.87 He concludes that narratorial apostrophe may
require still further explanation, but “it is quite certain that it is at least in part a
device for expressing sympathy”.88

---

82 Scott Richardson, Homeric Narrator, 171.
83 Scott Richardson, Homeric Narrator, 172.
84 I discuss metalepsis in the context of de Jong’s evaluation of narratorial apostrophe below,
and in greater detail in Chapter 2 below.
85 Scott Richardson, Homeric Narrator, 174.
86 Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 104–113.
87 Kahane contends that the vocative at the beginning of an apostrophe is the “default” or
neutral position, and that the end indicates the “protagonist” or heroic position: Kahane,
Interpretation of Order, 107.
88 Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 112.
Turning point in the narrative

A number of scholars observe that apostrophes of characters occur at high or emotional points of drama. For example, in his 1905 study, R. M. Henry places an important crisis for the addressee or another character as the first in his categories of narratorial apostrophe. Block notes apostrophes occur at crucial points of change or acceleration of the action.

The most cogent and thorough evaluation of apostrophe as a marker of a “turning point” is put forward by Mackay (2001). In her view, Homer uses apostrophes of character at moments of high emotional tension to reflect his own emotional engagement with his characters. In addition to eliciting a similar emotional response in the audience, the aim of apostrophe is to deepen the audience’s perception at that point in the narrative. Mackay notes that the turning point may be “fundamental or incidental”. The effect of apostrophe is that:

...for a brief moment we (who can also be addressed by the narrator as ‘you’) see the situation through that character’s eyes)...

---


90 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 17–18.

91 This paragraph is drawn from Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 10–12, 16–17, 31.

92 Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 11.

93 Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 18.
Apostrophe is a device for structuring narrative. No single contextual motive can be found for its use, nor is it worthwhile to seek one. Apostrophe is similar to other elements of oral composition, such as verbal forms and type-scenes, in that it can be used for a number of purposes. The reason for its use at any given juncture may therefore vary. But “within the traditional context”, according to Mackay, the way in which meaning is constructed should be the same.94

Increasing enargeia

De Jong (2004) approaches apostrophe in the context of metalepsis.95 She concludes that the “sum effect of the apostrophe is to increase enargeia”, which she describes as “that vital characteristic of Homeric epic”. Apostrophe may be used to draw attention to emotional or crucial events. Through apostrophe, the poet-narrator presents events in such a way that they seem to take place before the eyes of the audience. De Jong observes that narratorial apostrophe is as “energetic” as characters’ direct speech. She concludes that the “metaleptic apostrophe” enhances the Homeric poet-narrator’s authority and his story: because he can address his characters, they are real. In other words, narratorial apostrophe adds to the authenticity of the story.

---

94 This paragraph is based on Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 16–17, 17, n.9.

95 This paragraph is based on de Jong, “Metalepsis”, 95–97. In the first edition (1987) of Narrators and Focalizers de Jong did not discuss apostrophes of character because they “have already been discussed satisfactorily by other scholars”: de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 45, 45 n. 3. De Jong does not re-visit this view in the second edition of this work (2004).
Elizabeth Block on Homeric apostrophe

Block’s primary aim is to compare the use of narratorial apostrophe by Homer and by Vergil. She notes that the narrator of each “intrudes in a varying degree of subtlety to provide the audience with a running commentary”. She singles out the Homeric poet-narrator’s intrusion in general for its subtlety or covert nature.

The nature and effect of narratorial intrusion changed, Block contends, when it was adapted from a “predominantly oral [performance] to a predominantly written literature”. The Homeric narrator, “in identifying himself with characters and audience, fosters an apparently objective stance that ensures a communal response” (my emphasis). Vergil’s narrator, on the other hand, becomes subjectively involved in his epic and he is separate from his audience. The reader does not share the emotions of Vergil’s narrator but must “synthesize, criticize and incorporate” them. While the Homeric poet-narrator is reliable, Vergil’s narrator offers another point of view that the reader must interpret.

Although I shall concentrate on apostrophes of character, on occasion I refer to other forms of Homeric apostrophe, which Block divides into four categories. The

---

96 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 7.

97 See also de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 53.

98 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 8.

99 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 10, n. 12.

100 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 10.

101 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 10–11. Although I agree with Block’s four categories of Homeric apostrophe, in the context of this study I use “apostrophe” to mean apostrophe of character, unless stated otherwise.
first is the invocation, which Block defines as an appeal that often includes a rhetorical question to the Muses. The second category is the “faded invocation”, which Block describes as a rhetorical question which is not included in an invocation, such as the “who was the first/last” question before a list of slain warriors. In theory, a faded invocation can be addressed to characters in the storyworld or to the audience in the storyrealm. The third category of narratorial apostrophe is the direct address to the audience which is present with the poet-narrator in the storyrealm. The fourth category, the largest, comprises the 19 direct addresses to characters in the storyworld of the Iliad.

Block observes that invocations appear to direct the attention of the audience towards the significance of what is about to happen, and to ask for help in describing momentous events. Block argues that invocations deserve greater attention than their somewhat formulaic expression might indicate. They nearly always “express and demand a strong response”. She offers little comment on faded invocations except to say that they might represent “truncated invocations”.

---

102 Examples of faded invocations: 5.703 ff, 8.273 ff. See Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 12. On the term faded invocation: Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 49–50; Minchin, Resources of Memory, 142–144.

103 See Appendix A for a list of the four categories of narratorial apostrophe in the Iliad which is based on Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 12, n.2. The frequency is: invocations (6), faded invitations (4), direct addresses to the audience (6), and apostrophes of character (19).

104 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 7. On invitations, see also Minchin, Resources of Memory, 161–180.

105 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 12, n. 21.
Block notes that the use of second person subjunctive such as φαίνετε κε (you would say/think) in the direct addresses to the audience reveals that the poet-narrator is making an assumption about the listener's reaction. The correct or desired interpretation is established by contrast to the articulated response.\textsuperscript{106}

**Key topics for my study**

Block refers to Parry's account of the characteristics shared by Menelaos and Patroklos to make her case that the purpose of apostrophe is to elicit sympathy and pity for the addresseees. She argues that the shared traits of loyalty and vulnerability act as a catalyst to arouse the protective qualities in the main characters whom Menelaos and Patroklos complement—Agamemnon and Achilleus respectively.\textsuperscript{107} Block, however, focuses only on Patroklos, because of his relationship with Achilleus. She argues that the purpose of arousing sympathy for Patroklos through apostrophes is to characterize Achilleus:

\ldots more finely than direct narration, for in sharing rather than judging it [the sympathy for Patroklos] the audience shares in Achilles' choice, and tragedy...\textsuperscript{108}

Patroklos “physical and emotional vulnerability” defines Achilleus’ weakness, which Block describes as “his self-absorption”.\textsuperscript{109} Although she lists the apostrophes of Menelaos as well, Block briefly refers to only one apostrophe and only in the

\textsuperscript{106} Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 13–14. An example of a direct address to the audience is when the poet-narrator uses the formula οὐκ ἂν γνωίης (you could not have told) to comment that audience members would not have been able to tell on which side Diomedes was fighting as he charged through the ranks (5.85).

\textsuperscript{107} Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 16.

\textsuperscript{108} Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 16–17.

\textsuperscript{109} Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 16.
context of Agamemnon’s response to Menelaos when he is wounded. She notes that, because of their relationship, Agamemnon presents to Menelaos an aspect of his character which is fundamental but which he does not present to any other character. ¹¹⁰

Without denying the importance of apostrophe in contributing to Menelaos and Patroklos’ function as touchstone characters, I aim to determine if the apostrophes of the two hero-warriors afford insights into their characters in their own right. I aim to test the notion of an “essential weakness” in both characters and tease out other traits in common. Importantly, I shall investigate whether narratorial apostrophes reveal any differences between Menelaos and Patroklos and, if so, how such differences are created and why. The differences will not be restricted to personal attributes: they could include the thematic significance of each character, and their role in the unfolding of the plot.

Block builds on Parry’s work in demonstrating the contribution of narratorial apostrophe to characterization and audience engagement through the evocation of an emotional response described as sympathetic or compassionate. The aim of my study is not so much to question this approach as a whole but to conduct a close examination of the prevalent assumption about the very restricted nature of the emotions modelled by the narrator. I therefore shall attempt to clarify the emotions modelled by the poet-narrator in all his apostrophes of Menelaos and Patroklos.

¹¹⁰ Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 16, n. 28.
Block reasons that two aspects of Homer's use of apostrophe reveal his awareness of its power: the very restricted occurrence of apostrophe and the patterns of its use. \textsuperscript{111} As noted, she contends that apostrophe by its very nature acknowledges some kind of relationship (my emphasis) between the poet-narrator and his audience. \textsuperscript{112} In overtly making his own response known through the act of apostrophe, the narrator asks the storyrealm audience to modify:

...even if slightly, its perception of the action, by aligning or comparing its responses to his own or those it has been led to expect... \textsuperscript{113}

In the context of the reliability of the narrator of oral epic (guaranteed by the Muses), Block notes that the narrator of an oral performance can present a situation which is open to interpretation, as long as unreliable information is not presented. \textsuperscript{114} Implied in this is the assumption that the Homeric narrator and his audience share the same values and the same Weltanschauung. Thus, the relationship between Homeric narrator and audience is one of trust—and goodwill: the narrator's response is shared, not questioned, and the audience is "primarily a feeling, not a judging participant". \textsuperscript{115} I shall examine the effect of apostrophe on the relationship between the poet-narrator, the audience and the character in the storyworld

\textsuperscript{111} Block, "Narrator Speaks", 7.

\textsuperscript{112} Block, "Narrator Speaks", 8. Cf Culler, Pursuit of Signs, 141.

\textsuperscript{113} Block, "Narrator Speaks", 8.

\textsuperscript{114} Block, "Narrator Speaks", 9.

\textsuperscript{115} Block, "Narrator Speaks", 10.
Block observes that Patroklos' role is the most concentrated of all major roles in terms of the action of the Iliad, and, similarly, that Menelaos' role is "concentrated in segments". Block notes that apostrophes are most effective at emotional high points in the narrative. Mackay usefully emphasizes the role of apostrophes at significant turning points. This study will go one step further by looking at the distribution of apostrophes across the narrative structure according to Labov and Waletzky's model. I aim to determine whether there is any pattern in, or relationship between, apostrophes of the same character. Attention will be paid to the linkages between apostrophes of character and other types of narratorial apostrophe, notably direct addresses to the audience, and other forms narratorial intrusion such as simile and prolepsis.

Although Menelaos and Patroklos inevitably dominate any treatment of apostrophes, the same questions will be asked about every instance of narratorial apostrophe of character in the Iliad. Basic but important examples of questions include "to whom?", "when?", "where?" and "how?" does the narrator make a direct address. I shall also ask what the effect is on the audience and what the consequences are for driving the plot forward.

---

116 Block, "Narrator Speaks", 16.
117 Block, "Narrator Speaks", 8, 14.
118 Labov and Waletzky, "Narrative Analysis", 12–44.
Conclusion

In this chapter I discussed some of the main features of, and distinctions between, narrator-text and characters’ direct speech in Homeric narrative. I discussed the role of the Homeric narrator, his abilities, and his reliability. The importance of the oral nature of epic as an act of communication and the nature of audience engagement were stressed. The concept of narratorial intrusion provided a framework in which to introduce a definition of apostrophe. I concluded with an outline of the scholarship on Homeric apostrophe and discussed Block’s importance as a catalyst to this study.

I also outlined some of the key aspects on which I shall focus with regard to narratorial apostrophes of character. These aspects fall into four broad areas: the portrayal of character; the relationship between the poet-narrator, his addressee, and the storyrealm audience; the unfolding of the plot; and structural considerations. I shall determine distinctive and unique features of the addressee’s character; the poet-narrator’s emotional response; and possible patterns in, or the relationship between, apostrophes of the same character. I shall also determine distinctive features of a major character, with whom the addressee has a significant relationship, which the apostrophic circumstances bring to light. I shall also examine how the poet-narrator uses apostrophe of character to engage his audience, the effect of metalepsis through apostrophe, and the effect of apostrophe on presentation of the story. I shall evaluate the role of apostrophes at significant points in the narrative, and take this further by investigating the distribution of apostrophes across the narrative structure. In examining these aspects, I shall pay
attention to linkages between apostrophes of character, other types of narratorial apostrophe (according to Block’s definition), and other forms of narratorial intrusion. I shall also test current evaluations of narratorial apostrophe of character.

Even if a single theory for all apostrophes proves elusive, the overall purpose of my study is to have a set of observations about apostrophe of character which are “sufficiently formal” in terms of theoretical underpinning, and can be considered valid and useful.119

In Chapter 2 I shall outline my approach and methodology. I shall present the theoretical aspects that underpin my study and some of the accompanying terminology I have drawn on from the disciplines of Homeric studies, narratology, variational linguistics, and literary theory to inform the development of my evaluative framework. I shall then set out the methodology for my study of narratorial apostrophes of character in the Iliad.

119 I borrow the term “sufficiently formal” from Jonas Grethlein and Antonios Rengakos who use it to argue that models of structuralist narratology offer useful tools for interpretation. I explain this further in Chapter 2 below: Jonas Grethlein and Antonios Rengakos, “Introduction”, in Trends in Classics: Narratology and Interpretation, edited by Grethlein and Rengakos, 1–11, at 3.
Chapter 2: Approach and Methodology—Constructing an Evaluative Framework

Introduction

This chapter comprises two broad sections: in the first I set out the approach which I shall adopt, and in the second section I outline the methodology which I shall employ.

My aim is not so much to construct a neat theoretical model than to assemble a set of useful terms and tools in order to conduct a close reading and investigation of narratorial apostrophe of characters in the *Iliad*.

As Slatkin has pointed out in the context of the *Odyssey*—although her observation is just as valid for the *Iliad*—since the 1970s new approaches have enriched Homeric studies. These include structuralism, narratology, feminism, cognitive studies, and orality. I shall draw on Labov and Waletzky’s model of the elements of personal experience narrative. I shall draw on the work of narratologists such as Prince and O’Neill, and literary theorists such as Booth and Culler. In the field of Homeric studies, I have already referred to the influential narratological approach of de Jong, as well as other scholars who have written on Homeric apostrophe, especially Parry, Block, Scott Richardson, Kahane, and Mackay. I shall also draw on

---

other Homeric scholars who have examined a variety of aspects which are relevant
to this study. A few examples will serve to illustrate the diversity of topic and
approach to scholarship on the *Iliad*: Maureen Alden on para-narrative; Bernard
Fenik on battle scenes; Jasper Griffin on Homeric objectivity and the themes of life
and death; Dean Hammer on the enactment of politics; Richard Janko for his
outstanding commentary on Books 13–16; Elizabeth Minchin on the application of
cognitive studies and her approach to the invocations to the Muses; James Morrison
on misdirection; and Jenny Strauss Clay on the theatre of war; and Anna Stelow on
the importance of Menelaos.

Regarding narratology, I have been guided by the sagacity of Grethlein and
Rengakos who argue that, despite the variety of "narratologies" which have come
into being since the late 1980s, it is still useful to draw on the "clear profile" of
structuralist models developed in the 1960s and 1970s as:

...a heuristic tool for interpretation. Narratology thus defined will not deliver fully
developed interpretations, but rather present observations which, though without
claim to objectivity, are sufficiently formal to enrich various readings...\[121\]

A further advantage of the model of structuralist narratology developed by Genette
and refined by others offers, notably Mieke Bal, is that its terminology obviates the
need for periphrastic and/or potentially ambiguous definitions and terms. As de

---

\[121\] Grethlein and Rengakos, "Introduction", in *Trends in Classics: Narratology and
Interpretation*, edited by Grethlein and Rengakos, 1–11, at 3.
Jong observes, valid comparisons and "points of contact" are possible only when a common set of terms is used.\footnote{122 On the value of narratological terminology: de Jong. "Metalepsis", 87.}

In short, the overall approach adopted in this study combines the rigour of a theoretical underpinning with some of its attendant terminology and a sound methodology with the pleasures of exploration and discovery, afforded by a close reading of the text.

**Approach**

**Overall aim**

A close reading and analysis of each apostrophe of character will be conducted within the context of the scene or episode in which it occurs. I shall report my findings and observations against the key aspects I outlined in Chapter 1 above. As stated at the beginning of this study, my aim will be to determine whether it is possible to extrapolate any one overarching theory that is valid for all narratorial apostrophes of character in the *Iliad*. I shall also test, and indicate my position on, aspects of current evaluations of Homeric apostrophe. In Chapter 1 above, I indicated reasons why I do not support the approach in which primacy of purpose is given to metrical expediency, although I noted that metrical considerations cannot be dismissed. I shall therefore not explore this approach further.
**Narratology**

First, I shall place the key narratological concept of focalization, which I introduced in Chapter 1 above, in the broader context which has guided my approach.

"Discourse analysis"—like so many terms in socio-linguistics—has a plethora of definitions. But Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi Hamilton distil this abundance into three main categories, which they summarize as:

...(1) anything beyond the sentence, (2) language use, and (3) a broader range of social practice that includes nonlinguistic and nonspecific instances of language.123

Narratology is sub-set of discourse analysis. While Prince defines narratology as "the study of the form and functioning of narrative", O'Neill defines it as "that branch of contemporary narrative theory focusing specifically on the analysis of narrative structure".124 Although "narrative" and "narration" are sometimes used interchangeably, it can be useful to observe the distinction between them.125

Narration describes the act or function of narrating or telling. Narrative is the result of the narrator's activity, the sum of his or her "telling".

Discourse analyst Barbara Johnstone asserts that "one of the major themes in humanistic and social scientific thought since the mid-twentieth century" has been

---


124 Prince, Narratology, 4; Patrick O'Neill, Fictions of Discourse: Reading Narrative Theory (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 3.

125 See de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 31–32.
narrative. She sees this as a reflection of an increasing trend to make sense of the world in the modern era by replacing rationality with storytelling. Telling and listening to stories meets a universal need in people to find meaning in their existence, as well as to entertain and be entertained. Hence, narrative was one of the first discourse genres to be examined in linguistics. The impetus to tell, listen to (or read), and respond to any story arises from the conviction that the story is worth relating and worth receiving. The continuing appeal of Homeric epic lies in the skilful rendition of a series of related and significant events about life and death, involving larger-than-life heroes who inhabit a remote, past world that is similar to that of both the narrator and audience but more splendid and wondrous. It is a world in which mortals are capable of almost superhuman physical feats, the gods interfere in the affairs of mortals, and where even objects such as armour and weapons are fabulous creations of inestimable wealth.

**Labov and Waletzky: elements of narrative; the variational approach to narrative**

The element of noteworthiness is an essential criterion of a story, which Johnstone describes as a narrative with a point. I gave a brief definition of the concept of

---


127 Johnstone, “Discourse Analysis and Narrative”, 640. This tendency is still seen in the custom of recounting stories about a person’s achievements at important life stages such as coming-of-age, and, especially, death: for example, eulogies delivered at funerals.


evaluation in Labov and Waletzky’s model of personal experience narrative in Chapter 1 above.\textsuperscript{131} Evaluation facilitates an emotional connection between audience and narrator. A fictional narrative such as epic does not so much imitate life as connect with the audience at a deep level through what is already familiar: for example, the complex relationship between parent and offspring or between siblings. This familiarity triggers our interest. Even an imagined epic world must ring true at a basic experiential level in order to engage its audience.

Labov and Waletzky’s model of the components of personal experience narrative will provide a general framework for analysing the narrative structure of the \textit{Iliad} in the context of apostrophe of character. This model prompted the inclusion of the distribution of apostrophes as an important topic of my study.

Labov and Waletzky determined these narrative components according to their “originating functions” as abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, result or resolution, and coda.\textsuperscript{132} The elements can be seen as the answer to a series of questions.\textsuperscript{133} The abstract, comprising one or two phrases, answers, “What was this about?” The opening invocation in the \textit{Iliad}, for example, points to the abstract of the poem:

\begin{quote}

\[\textit{Labov, Language in the Inner City, }370.\]
\end{quote}
μήνιν ἀείδε θεά Πηληϊάδεω Αχιλῆος
ουλομένην...

Sing, goddess, the anger of Peleus’ son Achilleus
and its devastation...

1.1–2

The orientation answers the questions “who?”, “when?”, “what?” and “where?”

The remainder of the proem can be said to provide some of this information:

...ἡ μυρι’ Αχαιος ἀλγε’ ἔθηκε,
polláz δ’ ἱθύμους ψυχάς Αἰδι προϊαψεν
ηρώων, αὔτους δὲ ἐλώρησα τεύχε κύνεσσιν
οἰωνοῖσι τε πάσι, Δίως δ΄ ἐτελείετο βουλή,
εξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρώτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε
Ατρείδης τε ἄναξ, ἀνδρῶν καὶ δίος Ἀχιλλεύς.

...which put pains thousandfold upon the Achaians,
hurled in their multitudes to the house of Hades strong souls
of heroes, but gave their bodies to be the delicate feasting
of dogs, of all birds, and the will of Zeus was accomplished
since that time when first there stood in division of conflict
Atreus’ son the lord of men and brilliant Achilleus.

1.2–7

Labov notes that it is theoretically possible for all free orientation clauses to be
placed at the narrative’s beginning, but in practice such material may be placed at
strategic points later on.334 The complicating action comprises a sequence of events,
informing the audience or narratee about what happens next. It creates tension
which is released at the resolution of this action. The first wave of complicating
action of the Iliad is triggered by Agamemnon’s impious refusal to Chryses’
supplication. Its immediate result is the plague sent by Apollo (1.8–53). The plague
is the reason why Achilleus calls the assembly where he and Agamemnon quarrel.

And so the complicating action of the tale rolls on. The resolution to the quarrel

334 Labov, Language in the Inner City, 365.
comes with Achilleus’ reconciliation with Agamemnon in Book 19 (56–75). A coda signals that there is no further complicating action; the narrative has ended. It can also be aimed at preventing any further questions. It may include a bridging comment that will return the audience to the present.

Labov and Waletzky demonstrate how verbal skills are used to evaluate experience. They observe that myths, legends, epics, and sagas seem to result from combining and developing simpler elements or basic oral narrative structures of personal experiences. Labov and Waletzky, “Narrative Analysis”, 12. See also Labov, “Some Further Steps in Narrative Analysis”, 1; Minchin, Resources of Memory, 7.

Evaluation, however, is not governed by the same linear progression as the other narrative elements. Although the resolution must follow complicating action (even if there are many instances of complicating action-resolution within the narrative), and the coda is always last, evaluation may permeate the other elements, or structures, of the narrative.

Labov asserts that evaluation is “perhaps the most important element in addition to the basic narrative clause” because it is “the means by which the narrator indicates the point of the narrative...why it was told and what the narrator is getting at”. Labov and Waletzky, “Narrative Analysis”, 37.

Looking at the use of narratorial apostrophe as an evaluative device will help develop reasonable hypotheses of intent by determining the effect on, and the

135 Labov and Waletzky, “Narrative Analysis”, 12. See also Labov, “Some Further Steps in Narrative Analysis”, 1; Minchin, Resources of Memory, 7.


137 Labov and Waletzky, “Narrative Analysis”, 37.
audience’s response to, a number of critical aspects. These include: the portrayal of character, the presentation of themes, the relationship between poet-narrator and audience, and the unfolding of the plot.138

In the sense that many of the manifestations of evaluation suspend the action of the narrative and provide commentary on why a story is important or newsworthy, they intersect with narratorial presence or intrusion. Such manifestations include, for example, occasions on which the poet-narrator stops the action, turns to his listeners and explains its significance to them or makes an overt comment on what is happening.139

The external evaluation in the following example takes the form of overt intrusion with a direct address by the poet-narrator to the audience:

Τυδείδην δ’ ούκ ἂν γνοίης ποτέοιοι μετείη
ηὲ μετὰ Τῶιεσσιν ὀμιλεῖ η ἡ μετ’ Αχαιοῖς.

...but you could not have told on which side Tydeus’ son was fighting, whether he were one with the Trojans or with the Achaians...

5.85–86

The poet-narrator catches our attention with his direct address to us. He then sustains it with an extended simile likening the unstoppable, destructive action of the hero-warrior to that of a river in flood (5.87–92). This prepares us for the significant event that is to come, the aristeia of Diomedes. One of the aspects which I

---

138 I define “plot” as the series of casually-linked events of the story: see Prince, Narratology, 66; Paul Cobley, Narrative (London; New York: Routledge, 2001), 5.

139 Labov, Language in the Inner City, 370–375 (categories of evaluation), at 371. Labov notes that most categories of evaluation involve the suspension of the narrative’s action although the emotions expressed may have been simultaneous with the action. This calls the listener’s attention to that part of the narrative.
aim to explore the extent to which narratorial apostrophes of character drive the plot forward.

**Ring composition**

Ring composition may be defined as a deliberate arrangement of elements in a unit of discourse, such as a digression within a story, which relate to each other.¹⁴⁰ For example, the same element or idea might appear at the beginning of a story which forms a sequence such as A, B, C. It is then reversed and repeated as C, B, A at the end of the story. This makes an identifiable pattern.¹⁴¹ Two common interpretations of such patterning are the stylistic, in that it enhances the aesthetic effect, and the mnemonic, in that it facilitates recall, which is an important consideration in an oral presentation.

Minchin draws on the work of Labov and Waletzky and Livia Polanyi to point to the way in which we shape the stories we tell in everyday discourse. As storytellers, we naturally engage in a certain amount of repetition at the beginning and end of a

---


¹⁴¹ Two examples of ring composition which Whitman identifies are located in Books 8 and 9 (the Embassy): Whitman, *Heroic Tradition*, 277, 281, respectively. He observes that Book 8 starts with dawn, a council and lightening and ends with lightening, a council and dawn. With regard to Book 9, Whitman proposes the following pattern: Diomedes’ speech (A), Nestor and Agamemnon’s speeches (B), Achilles’ reception of the embassy (C), and Odysseus’ appeal to Achilles (D) which is reversed and repeated with Aias’ appeal to Achilles (D), Achilles’ response to Aias (C) speeches by Agamemnon and Odysseus (B), and a speech by Diomedes(A).
story. An abstract can introduce a narrative by giving a brief summary or evaluation of the story. Thus, the storyteller primes the listener and prepares him or her for what is to come. This summary or evaluation may be repeated in the coda as part of rounding the story off and returning to the present. It is through the habits of oral storytellers, who shape their stories with their audiences in mind, that such patterns are created. I shall not, therefore, refer to the term “ring composition” to describe those patterns which Minchin convincingly argues arise in natural discourse and are therefore not premeditated.

Invocations

The application of cognitive studies and Labov and Waletzky’s model are also relevant to Minchin’s examination of how Homer works with the schema for the presentation of successful stories.

The poet-narrator calls upon the Muses in the here-and-now of the storyrealm to help him accurately realize the past in the performative present. Although the Muses are present at the performance as a “knowing audience”, in my view, they inhabit a divine realm which is parallel to the mortal storyrealm. The effect of the invocations of the Muses on the first-time or unknowing audience is metanarrational: the poet-narrator interrupts his story, but not his performance, to signal

---

142 Minchin, Resources of Memory, 185–187.

143 Minchin, Resources of Memory, 163–180.

144 Minchin, Resources of Memory, 165–166. C. Goodwin defines a “knowing recipient” as someone or an entity which has either participated in or witnessed the events being narrated, and an “unknowing recipient” as the first-time member of the audience. Minchin uses these terms: Minchin, Resources of Memory, 165, n.11.
that something important is about to happen and that this is a moment when the audience should pay close attention.\textsuperscript{145} For example, an invocation heralds the Catalogue of Ships (2.484–493), a performative \textit{tour de force}, which provides important background information to the Trojan War (2.494–760). A second invocation immediately follows:

\begin{quote}
τίς τὰς τῶν ὀχ' ἄριστος ἦν σὺ μοι ἐννεπε Μοῦσα
αὐτῶν ἣδ' ἵππων, οἱ ἄμ' Ἀτρείδησιν ἔποντο.
\end{quote}

Tell me then, Muse, who of them all was the best and the bravest, of the men, and the men’s horses, who went with the sons of Atreus.

2.761–762

This introduces some qualitative information about the Achaians and acts as a transition to the narratorial present, in which the reality of Achilleus’ withdrawal from the campaign is stressed as the rest of the Achaians march to the battlefield (2.769–785). In other words, invocations act as narratorial cues in a performance: they herald critical points.

Minchin observes that invocations no longer appear after a certain point in the narrative is reached.\textsuperscript{146} The final invocation of the Muses in the \textit{Iliad} underscores the importance of the firing of the Achaian ships (16.112–113), a turning-point of the poem. This is the catalyst that signals the final series of events in the complicating action. Minchin concludes that the invocations help maintain the audience’s engagement through the various delays in reaching the poem’s turning point.

\textsuperscript{145} Minchin, \textit{Resources of Memory}, 167, 168 (n. 22), 169.

\textsuperscript{146} Minchin, \textit{Resources of Memory}, 170-172.
Invocations reinforce the message that the audience’s patience will be rewarded with a story worth the telling.

Mackay’s evaluation of narratorial apostrophe of character is useful in stressing its importance in marking critical junctures, but her hypothesis does not extend to the related issues of frequency and distribution.¹⁴⁷

Both Minchin and Mackay’s observations raised for me the question of what other messages narratorial apostrophes of character might be communicating to the audience, apart from those arising from an emotional response to a character facing a particular situation. Is the significance of such apostrophes limited to their content or is it extended to the performance of the poem? What, if any, significance might be attached to the distribution of apostrophes of character at critical points across the narrative structure? And why are there so few after a certain point?

**Terminology**

Structuralist approaches to analysing literary narrative, according to Johnstone, are varied; but they share two assumptions.¹⁴⁸ One is that common abstract levels can exist beneath quite different structures and meanings. The other is that “narrative can be separated from the events it is about”.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁷ Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 5-16, 31.


¹⁴⁹ Johnstone argues that this distinction is useful in overcoming what she describes as “recurrent confusion” about the term “narrative” arising from Labov’s definition (a sequence of past events) and a general one (talk aimed at catching and maintaining the attention of an audience in the re-telling of past events): Johnstone, “Discourse Analysis and Narrative”, 639.
Here it is useful to refer briefly to some terms for the relationship between what is told and how it is told. Although narratologists employ a confusing and competing array of different terms to describe the parties to this relationship—and some terms overlap—the actual terms are less important in the context of this study than an understanding of the underlying relationship which they seek to describe.\textsuperscript{150}

This relationship is both interdependent and dynamic. At its most basic level, a "story" is what is told and "discourse" is how it is told. The activity involved in telling or communicating the story is the narration, and the voice of the narration is the narrator.\textsuperscript{151} As O'Neill notes:

...a narrative necessarily involves a story being told. Moreover, it is told by somebody and for somebody, since all stories are told to be received by some addressees, even if the teller is only talking to himself.\textsuperscript{152}

De Jong's approach, from which I have selectively borrowed, follows that of Bal in using a three-layered model equating to what is being told—the "text", "story", and "fabula". The text is what the audience receives, the result of the narrator's activity (the narration). The object of the narration, what the narrator tells, is the story which comprises the fabula viewed from a specific angle or perspective (known as

\textsuperscript{150} See, for example, the table of 12 terms and terminologies, including those of Aristotle, the Russian Formalists of the 1920s, Genette, Bal, Prince, and Toolan, in O'Neill, \textit{Fictions of Discourse}, Figure 1.1, 21. As O'Neill points out, each model offers advantages and disadvantages. All, however, "have no independent existence...The terms denoting them likewise derive their meaning from their relationship with the other terms of the system of which they form a part". See also Gérard Genette, \textit{Narrative Discourse Revisited}, translated by Jane E. Lewin (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1988), 13–15, and Scott Richardson, \textit{Homeric Narrator}, 2.

\textsuperscript{151} See Scott Richardson, \textit{Homeric Narrator}, 2–3.

\textsuperscript{152} O'Neill, \textit{Fictions of Discourse}, 14.
focalization). The *fabula* itself is a logical, chronological related chain or series of events, arising from the activities of characters in a fictional realm.\(^{153}\)

Genette first split the activity of narration into “speaking” (narrating) and “seeing” (focalizing).\(^{154}\) Bal observes that terms such as “point of view” or “narrative perspective” do not make a sufficiently explicit differentiation between “those who see and those who speak” (her emphasis).\(^{155}\) For Bal and de Jong, focalization is more than “seeing”: focalization incorporates:

\[\ldots\text{the function consisting of the perceptional, emotional and intellectual presentation of the fabula}\ldots\]\(^{156}\)

This definition points to the co-operation between focalization and evaluation in the presentation of the narrative or story.

In this study, I shall use the word “story” in its general sense—the sum of what is being told.\(^ {157}\) I shall also use “narrative” in a similar sense but in the context of structural considerations. On occasion, where the context permits, I shall also use


\(^{155}\) Bal, “Focalization”, 154. Although Bal concedes that “perspective” covers both the physical and psychological points of perception, it has come to refer to both the narrator and what she calls the “vision”. Hence the need, she argues, for a technical term like focalization which is derived from photography and film (154).

\(^{156}\) De Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, Glossary (no page number used).

\(^{157}\) Cobley defines “story” simply as “all the events”: Cobley, *Narrative*, 6.
"narrative" to stand for narrative passages or narrator-text. I use the term *fabula* rarely, but in the sense used by Bal and de Jong.

For how the story is told I shall use the term *narration*. But when I focus on the activity of the poet-narrator, given the original status of the *Iliad* as an oral poem, I shall also use the word "presentation" to emphasize the performative aspect. I would add that the channel of communication is critical to how the resulting story is presented and received. In oral epic, the performative aspects cannot be dismissed, even by an audience which receives the epic through the act of reading it in a written form. I shall use the term "poet-narrator" for the Homeric narrator to cover both the functions of narration and focalization, unless I wish to make a distinction between the two. In the context of examining Homeric apostrophe—and other forms of intrusion in passing where relevant—it will sometimes be useful to draw this distinction.

Bal's semiotic approach to the narrative "text", or the result of the activity of narration, can be described as:

...a form of communication between an author sending a message and a hearer/reader receiving that message...158

Communication is not just a question of the passive *reception* of a message; communication involves a *response*, regardless of its form, or whether it is shared with a third person (such as another member of the audience) or directed to the sender of the message (the poet-narrator). Each member of the audience responds to

and complements the narrator's focalization with his or her unique "focalization of reception" and response. This process of communication relates to the concept that Homeric apostrophe is predicated upon there being some kind of relationship between the poet-narrator and his audience, as discussed in Chapter 1 above. It also raises the question of to whom the apostrophe is directed—addressee or audience, or both. My approach includes a consideration of "meta-apostrophic" elements which nevertheless form part of, or support, the apostrophe as an act of communication. Such elements may include aspects of context, distribution, or the interplay with other forms of narratorial intrusion.

**Homeric objectivity**

As an obvious form of narratorial intrusion, apostrophes raise the inevitable question of Homeric "objectivity". As I noted above, Block contends that by identifying himself with his characters and audience, the Homeric narrator cultivates an "apparently objective stance" (my emphasis) to elicit a communal response from his audience. The degree to which the poet-narrator allows his characters to speak for themselves, the generally subtle nature of his intrusion and the influence of Aristotle are, I believe, the three most significant factors that have contributed to the view that the Homeric narrator is impersonal and objective. In Chapter 1 above, I referred to de Jong's view that Aristotle's emphasis on the

---

159 Block, "Narrator Speaks", 8.

160 Block, "Narrator Speaks", 10 ff, n.12.
dramatic quality of Homeric epic begat the long tradition of enlisting Aristotelian authority to support the interpretation of Homer as impersonal and objective.\textsuperscript{161}

De Jong provides an historical overview of Homeric reception in this context.\textsuperscript{162} I shall draw on limited elements of this and supplement them with direct reference to the work of scholars such as the literary theorists Käthe Friedemann and Booth, and Homeric scholars Bassett and Jasper Griffin.\textsuperscript{163}

First, I call attention to the list of 10 categories of “subjective elements” assembled by de Jong from eight scholars who have dealt with the issue of Homeric objectivity.\textsuperscript{164} The first three categories are relevant to Homeric intrusion in the form of apostrophe: invocations to the Muses and requests for information; direct appeals by the poet-narrator to the audience using second person singular optatives and rhetorical questions, and passages where the poet-narrator models an emotional response.\textsuperscript{165}

In the 19th and early 20th centuries this imbalance was compounded by several factors, which include: the argument between the Analysts and Unitarians; literary theory in which objectivity was argued to be a general characteristic of heroic or

\textsuperscript{161} De Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 16.

\textsuperscript{162} De Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 14–26.

\textsuperscript{163} Käthe Friedemann, Die Rolle des Erzählers in der Epik (Berlin: H. Haessel [W. R. Sorgenfrey], 1910; reprinted Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965); Bassett, The Poetry of Homer; Booth, Rhetoric of Fiction; Griffin, “Homeric Pathos and Objectivity”;

\textsuperscript{164} De Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 18–20.

\textsuperscript{165} This third category also includes the “mini-obituaries” for dying heroes, passages containing pathos and those introduced by emotional particles such as ἦτοι, μὴν and μάν.
De Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 18.
epic poetry; and, finally, the fundamental problem with the terms “objectivity” and “subjectivity”. For example, “subjectivity” can be interpreted to mean the momentary abandonment of the poet-narrator’s objectivity or the unique attributes of Homer the person-author. In the context of this discussion, “objectivity” may be defined as the lack of intrusion by the poet-narrator to provide his interpretation, personal commentary, and guidance. Clearly, Homer is not consistently “objective” in the narrative passages. I turn now to highlight the contribution of four modern scholars on Homeric objectivity: Friedemann, Bassett, Booth and Griffin.

In 1910 Friedemann argued for a shifting of perspective, to draw attention to the narrator as the key difference between drama and epic, rather than continuing to see epic defined by its similarity to tragedy. As she noted:

...ist also die Tatsache, dass uns im Epos im Gegensatz zum Drama die vergangenen Ereignisse durch ein gegenwärtiges Medium vermittelt werden...

...there is also the fact, that in epic, as opposed to drama, events in the past are conveyed to us through an intermediary in the present...

(my translation)

166 De Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 27–28; Bassett, Poetry of Homer, 81–82.

167 See also Friedemann, Die Rolle des Erzählers, 20.

168 On Friedemann, Bassett and Booth, see de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 17, 21–22, 24. De Jong notes that Friedemann’s work has never exercised the influence which it merits, except on Bassett, who likewise did not receive the recognition which he deserved at the time he wrote. On Bassett, see also Scott Richardson, Homeric Narrator, 5. On Booth: Abbott, Cambridge Introduction to Narrative, 73.


170 Friedemann, Die Rolle des Erzählers, 21–22.
In a description that is compatible with later narratological terminology,

Friedemann describes the narrator as “der Bewertende, der Fühlende, der Schauende”
(the one who assesses/evaluates, the one who feels, and the one who views, my
translation and emphasis). I contend that this description points the way to the
Homerian narrator as one who communicates an emotional or “subjective” response
to his audience.

In a similar vein, Bassett’s view, expressed in the 1930s, is that the continuing
influence of Aristotle’s close approximation of epic and drama has led to a lack of
appreciation of the potential and role of narrative-text in providing commentary.

Bassett argues that “epic poets must often personally interpose” because:

[The epic poet’s] wider compass of time and place, and his larger cast of characters,
make it impossible to put all the exposition, description, motivation and explanation
of various kinds into the words of the characters, as drama must do... 171

In the 1960s Booth continues this argument, writing that, despite Aristotle’s praise
that Homer composed less in his own voice than did other poets:

...even Homer writes [sic] scarcely a page without some kind of direct clarification of
motives, of expectations, and of the relative importance of events... 172

Booth questions criticism of what he calls “signs of the author’s presence” which
“an astonishing number of authors and critics since Flaubert” have made. 173 Booth
concludes:

171 Bassett, Poetry of Homer, 83.

172 Booth, Rhetoric of Fiction, 4.
...the author cannot choose to avoid rhetoric; he can choose only the kind of rhetoric he will employ. He cannot choose whether or not to affect his readers' evaluations by this choice of narrative manner; he can only choose whether to do it well or poorly...  

Although Booth concedes that Homer is impersonal and objective in that we cannot find out about Homer the person or his life from his work, the lack of biographical information should not lead to an assumption of impersonality and objectivity in Homer's epics. Scott Richardson argues that Homer fails each of Booth's three tests for narratorial objectivity. Although Scott Richardson agrees that Homeric objectivity is "falsely stressed", he contends that the poet-narrator's personal feelings are only rarely expressed in overt commentary and that even then, the "judgment or emotional element is not salient".

Griffin notes narratorial devices to evoke pathos, including apostrophe, simile, and various leitmotifs. Such devices express emotion, even if the words themselves are seemingly devoid of overt emotion. Examples of important leitmotifs are "far from home" (4.174–175, 13.645, 16.461), and the "father's grief" over his warrior-son's death (13.658–659, 16.459–460, 24.493–494). Griffin puts the objectivity of Homer to the test by raising the question:


176 Scott Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 165. The tests are: neutrality to values, impartiality to characters, and an "unimpassioned" attitude towards characters and events in his story.

177 Griffin, "Pathos and Objectivity", 61–62.

178 Griffin, "Pathos and Objectivity", 64.
...whether it is wrong in principle, to read into the bare words of the text of Homer anything more than what they explicitly contain...179

Griffin argues that it is not wrong to do this, and he gives numerous examples to support his view, such as:

ἔνθ’ Αἰσυήταο διοτρεφέος φίλον ιῷν
ήω’ Ἀλκάθοοον, γαμβρός δ’ ἦν Αγχίσαο,
πρεσβυτάτην δ’ ὀψιε θυγατρῶν Ἰπποδάμειαν
tὴν τερί κῆρι φίλησε πατήρ καὶ πότνια μῆτηρ...

There was a man, loved son of illustrious Aisyetes, the hero Alkathoos, who was son-in-law of Anchises, and had married the eldest of his daughters, Hippodameia, dear to the hearts of her father and the lady her mother...

13.427–430180

Alkathoos’ death results in a complete family tragedy, a complete reversal of fortune for the “ideal family” that is evoked by the leitmotifs of loving father and a wife who is her parents’ favourite daughter. The hero is defined in terms of his family relationships rather than by a simple patronymic. By the simple evocation of a series of universally-understood emotional connections, the poet-narrator elicits our emotional response.

Griffin concludes that the audience’s instinctive response to such “bare words” is evidence of “emotional weight, not explicitly spelt out but still present”, and that the distinction between “objective” and “subjective” is “less clear than is often

179 Griffin, Life and Death, 139. The rest of this paragraph is based on this. For examples, see 121–132.

180 Griffin, Life and Death, 132, where he uses 13.428–430 as an example.
suggested". He observes that passages can have the same emotional effect whether expressed apparently objectively in the narrative by the poet-narrator, or subjectively in the direct speech by a character.

The question that arises from the discussion of Homeric objectivity in the context of this study is whether narratorial intrusion is "objective". The degree to which the Homeric narrator makes his commentary subtle or overt might differentiate him from more self-conscious and obviously subjective narrators. While a fabula itself may be considered an objective abstraction, the act of focalization involves using a particular mix of perception, feeling, and intellectual activity (notably evaluation) as a prism through which the poet-narrator narrates his story. The result cannot be considered objective, even if the manner of presentation may give this general impression.

Metalepsis

As well as providing a useful approach to dealing with the Homeric narrator's "objectivity" by using the concept of focalization, narratology also provides the concept of metalepsis, which I briefly referred to in Chapter 1 above. Metalepsis is one of a group of useful terms introduced or, rather, re-introduced from the Greek scholia into narratology by Genette. Meaning "sharing", metalepsis describes the

---

181 Griffin, Life and Death, 139.

182 Block, "Narrator Speaks", 9. Whether it is reliable is a separate issue; and I have discussed the reliability of the Homeric narrator in Chapter 1 above.

183 Genette, Narrative Discourse, translated by Lewin with a foreword by Culler, 234-236; de Jong, "Metalepsis", 87.
phenomenon by which the temporal and spatial boundaries which separate narrative levels have been conflated. De Jong defines metalepsis as:

...transgression of the boundaries between narrative universes or the subversion of the hierarchy of narrative levels...\[184\]

Her general conclusion about metalepsis in ancient narrative is that it is serious in intent: it is designed to increase the authority of the narrator and the realism of his narrative. The use of apostrophe in ancient narrative therefore differs from the modern use of apostrophe, which is “ludic or anti-illusionist”, as in the work of 18th Century writers such as Diderot and Goldsmith.\[185\] Apostrophe is, according to de Jong, a “relatively straightforward example” of metalepsis.\[186\]

De Jong agrees with Mackay that metalepsis associated with apostrophe creates “pragmatically marked moments” which are generally vital and/or emotional in nature.\[187\] Thus, the concept of metalepsis will be an important consideration as we examine the relationship between the poet-narrator, his audience and the storyworld characters who are the recipients of his apostrophes.\[188\]

\[184\] De Jong, “Metalepsis”, 115. De Jong discusses four types of metalepsis in ancient literature: apostrophe of character, characters announce the text in the text, blending of narrative voices, the merging of storyworld and storyrealm at the end of the narrative (93–113).

\[185\] De Jong, “Metalepsis”, 91–92, 97, 115.

\[186\] De Jong, Metalepsis, 93.


\[188\] On the enunciative effect of apostrophes in epic performance to create the performative present, see Jenny Strauss Clay, Homer’s Trojan Theatre: Space, Vision and Memory in the Iliad (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 20–21, 20, n.16. Strauss Clay contends that
I have reserved the definition of other terms which are relevant to this study, such as misdirection, until they occur in the context of examples from the text.

Methodology

Introduction

In any discussion of the narratorial apostrophes of characters, two of the immediate questions which arise concern the identity of the addressees and the frequency with which they are addressed. Of the 19 narratorial apostrophes of character in the *Iliad*, seven direct addresses are made to Menelaos (4.127–129, 4.146; 7.104; 13.603; 17.679, 17.702, 23.600) and eight to Patroklos (16.20, 16.584–585, 16.692–693, 16.744, 16.754, 16.787–788, 16.812, 16.843). In addition, there are two narratorial apostrophes of Apollo (15.365–366, 20.152), and a single apostrophe of both the Trojan Melanippos (15.582) and of Achilleus (20.2).

The apostrophes provide the material for three test cases: the apostrophes of Menelaos; those of Patroklos; and the apostrophes of the remaining three addressees—Apollo, Melanippos, and Achilleus. It is necessary that all the apostrophes of Menelaos and Patroklos be examined, rather than concentrating on more straightforward examples or those which support one evaluation over another. In other words, to exclude some instances may skew findings. Similarly, I consider it necessary to include the apostrophes of Apollo, Melanippos, and Achilleus because I start my study with the premise that no narratorial apostrophe of character is arbitrary.

Both invocations to the Muses (except for the first one) and faded invocations are ways in which the poet-narrator reinforces the audience’s distance to the epic past (22, 22, n.19).
The methodology I have developed takes as its point of departure the need to examine each narratorial apostrophe of character in its context. Thus, the first step in each case study will be to determine what I call the “apostrophic event-sequence”.\(^{189}\) The second step will comprise a close reading and analysis of each apostrophic event-sequence. The third step will be to determine an interpretation and evaluation of the results of the analysis against the specific aspects which I outlined at the end of Chapter 1 above, such as the emotion modelled by the poet-narrator, whether is any pattern or progression in apostrophes of the same character, and the relationship of the apostrophe to the unfolding of the plot and the structure of the narrative. Finally, I shall compare my observations and findings on the three test cases in an attempt to determine whether we can identify one theory about Homeric apostrophe of character that is valid for all instances.

**Apostrophic event-sequence**

When I use the term “apostrophic event-sequence”, I refer to a linked series of interactions or events which provides the context for a narratorial apostrophe of character.\(^{190}\) For example, the event-sequence for the first apostrophe of Menelaos covers the wounding of the Spartan king by Pandaros. The event-sequence begins just after Pandaros has decided to kill Menelaos (4.105) and ends with Agamemnon’s response to Menelaos’ reassurance that the wound will not be fatal (4.191). This event-sequence contains two apostrophes (4.127–129, 146). Some comments to place the apostrophic event-sequence in context will be made.

---

189 For further discussion on the apostrophic event-sequence, see below.

190 See Appendix B for a list of apostrophic event-sequences. Henceforth, when I use the term “event-sequence”, I refer to an “apostrophic event-sequence”.
Given the focus and constraints of this study, I shall restrict my analysis to those parts of the event-sequence which are of most relevance to the apostrophe. While the emphasis will be on the narrative-text, certain aspects of the direct speech of characters will be included in the analysis. An example of this is the first apostrophe of Patroklos (16.20) which is contained in the speechframe that introduces his critical speech to Achilleus. Achilleus' response results in approval for Patroklos to enter the battlefield where he meets his death.

At times the event-sequence might make up an episode in its own right; at others, it is a significant scene within an episode. For example, the event-sequence containing the first apostrophe of Apollo (15.365–366) takes place during the fight by the Achaian ships. The god is addressed by the narrator as he forges a path through the Achaian defences for the Trojans, thus giving them a critical strategic advantage. This eventually results in the firing of the Achaian ships (16.112 ff).

**Analysis**

Each event-sequence will be analysed according to a common set of indicators. As a starting point, I shall seek answers to the following basic questions that might be asked of any noteworthy event— who is present, who is participating, what is happening, where does it take place, when does it take place, and why? This will help determine any points of commonality between apostrophes.

Aspects of language which I shall consider include vocabulary, epithets, enjambment, deictics, and other signals of the poet-narrator speaking in what
Egbert Bakker terms the “immediate present”. Bakker has examined the grammatical aspect of Homeric vividness or enargeia. He cites the rare but significant use of the deictic oúτος (this man [here]) in narrative-text to transform a distant reality into an immediate present which both poet and audience share. I shall refer to this immediate present as the “performative present”.

Other signals that the poet-narrator is speaking in the immediate present include νήτιος (fool, innocent one) and the evidential particle ἀσα. Bakker remarks that deictic elements in the narrative discourse are taken from character-speech, where they are more frequent. If these signs stand in close proximity to an apostrophe, the resulting effect of vividness will be compounded.

Special attention will be paid to other signs of the poet-narrator’s presence or intrusion in the event-sequences. These will include evaluative commentary and explanations, gnomic statements, narratorial misdirection, prolepsis, and simile. As for the apostrophes themselves, I shall consider any distinctive features, for example, the incorporation of an apostrophe into a speechframe, enjambment and the use of epithets or second person pronouns. The evocation of leitmotifs and other thematic concerns and their effect will also be noted.

191 Egbert J. Bakker, *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics* (Cambridge, Massachusetts; London: Harvard University Press, 2005) 71–84. Bakker contends that oúτος is not only deictic but also “dialogic”, that is, a deictic of the second person, “you there” (78).


Interpretation and evaluation

The reports on each case study will not follow exactly the same format, although certain essential aspects will be common to all. For example, one case study may contain observations on the function and effect of simile in apostrophic event-sequences, and the linkage between simile and apostrophe. Another case study may lend itself to comment on the apostrophes in the order in which they appear.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have outlined the various theoretical concepts and the key attendant terminology which I shall employ in the evaluative framework for this study. If variational linguistics has contributed the concept of evaluation and insights into the components of narrative to my approach, structural narratology has been the primary influence on my approach to Homeric apostrophe of character. This will enable a consideration of current evaluations of apostrophe, as well as the testing of a new evaluation, the distribution of apostrophe. The methodology provides a blueprint for a purposeful close reading and analysis which will enable a valid comparison across the three test cases which comprise the body of the thesis. In the next chapter I report on the findings and observations of the first test case, the narratorial apostrophes of the Spartan king Menelaos.
Chapter 3: First Case Study—Menelaos

Introduction

Menelaos is often viewed as the more agreeable yet somehow vulnerable or weaker brother of Agamemnon who, as the wronged husband of Helen, provides the impetus for the Achaian campaign. Some argue that the primary purpose of the narratorial apostrophes of him is to model sympathy and to arouse this emotion in the audience.194 Parry offers a more qualified view: although he notes a fundamental sympathy for Menelaos, he concludes that the apostrophes of him do not have the same increasing tenor of pathos as those of Patroklos.195

“Sympathy” can be ambiguous in that it can mean either the ability to share another’s feelings or, especially if coupled with pity, sorrow arising from the pain of another. Hence, I prefer to use empathy or sympathy and goodwill, depending on the context, rather than sympathy.196 Malcolm Willcock notes, Homer displays sympathy (or, as I prefer to call it, empathy) for his characters in general in the


196 Mackay also refers to empathy in the context of the audience’s response: Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 18.
I shall examine what additional emotions, arising from the specific circumstances in question, might be present in the apostrophes of Menelaos, as well as some kind of general—even heightened—goodwill or "sympathy".

Another reason for a careful re-examination of the apostrophic response to Menelaos lies in the apparent assumption that, fundamentally, he is the recipient of the same emotional response as Patroklos because they share certain attributes.

This assessment eclipses a true appreciation of the apostrophes of Menelaos. For example, Block uses Patroklos to illustrate the nature and function of Homeric apostrophe of character. She mentions Menelaos only three times and always in respect of points that he and Patroklos have in common. I contend that it is worthwhile to examine all the apostrophes of Menelaos in their own right.

The eliciting of the audience's sympathy and pity is a somewhat limited evaluation: it does not adequately explain why Homer singles out Menelaos as one of only two characters in the Iliad who receives multiple narratorial apostrophes. Menelaos is one of the leading Achaian heroes—along with Agamemnon, Diomedes, the Aiantes, Odysseus, Idomeneus, Meriones, and Nestor—whose actions the poet-

---


200 Block, "Narrator Speaks", 11, 16, 16 (n.28), 17. For a more even-handed approach: Parry, "Language and Characterization", 11, 14–21.
narrator presents in portraying the battle scenes during Achilleus' withdrawal from the campaign.201

I shall examine what it is about Menelaos that warrants the distinction of receiving seven narratorial apostrophes. Is it his character, his role in the unfolding of the plot, his significance in terms of the narrative structure, or a combination of these factors?

As foreshadowed in Chapters 1 and 2 above, in attempting to determine whether one overarching theory about narratorial apostrophes of character in the Iliad is valid for all instances of apostrophes, I shall test certain evaluations of apostrophe. As well as eliciting sympathy and/or pity for Menelaos, evaluations include marking a turning-point or critical juncture and increasing vividness through metalepsis. Because the apostrophes of Menelaos are distributed across five books (4, 7, 13, 17, and 23), their distribution over the elements of narrative and how this might relate to Menelaos' role as the Achaians' moral figurehead will be key considerations. In determining the common factors of the apostrophes of Menelaos, I shall compare some of the apostrophic event-sequences with the more significant of his other appearances. First, however, a brief sketch of this complex, interesting character is warranted.

201 This period lasts from Day 11 until Day 26 of the action (1.306–19.54–75). The three battle days are covered in the epic between 2.48 and 18.242. The focalization of the poet-narrator neatly illustrates the asynchrony between erzählte Zeit (the narrated time) and Erzählzeit (the time of narrating), as first defined by G. Mueller in 1947: de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 42. Examples of various Achaians' achievements: Diomedes' aristeia (Book 5), Agamemnon's aristeia (Book 11), Idomeneus' aristeia (Book 13), Odysseus (Books 5, 10, 11), Antilochos (Books 5, 13), Telamonian Aias (Books 7, 12, 15), Nestor (Books 6, 7, 9, 11). Nestor fulfils an important role through his exhortations and strategic advice.
Menelaos’ character

We find many engaging touches in Homer’s portrayal of Menelaos. Willcock contends that evidence can be found of, possibly, an earlier treatment of him, which emphasizes his warlike nature: for example, epithets such as ἀρηφίλος Μενέλαος (Menelaos dear to Ares, 3.21) and βοην ἀγαθός Μενέλαος (Menelaos good at the battle-cry, 3.96). Homer, however, portrays a character who perhaps represents a more forward-looking type than the typical Bronze Age hero.

Menelaos’ defining attribute in the Iliad is his sense of justice, which can override his innate circumspection and drive him to volunteer for combat challenges beyond his capability or to place himself at increased risk. For example, his sense of justice and honour impel him to accept Hektor’s challenge (7.94–105). Here we see

---

202 See Willcock, “Menelaos in the Iliad”, 224. Willcock argues that Homer introduced many original touches to these three characters. Lattimore notes that although the “what” might be fixed in tradition, the “how” and “why”, including aspects of characterization, allowed Homer some latitude: Lattimore, Iliad of Homer, 45.

203 Whether epithets are more than convenient metrical formulas is critical to a consideration of them as a form of narratorial commentary: see Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 1–9. My view is that, overall, epithets do contribute to character portrayal. Some carry greater meaning and can therefore be a stronger form of commentary.


evidence of the family impulsiveness which is more pronounced and self-directed in Agamemnon.206

Menelaos displays a certain gravitas and personal conviction regarding the value of decorum and θέμις (justice, law according to custom, not statute), as his quarrel with Antilochos reveals (23.532–613).207 His leadership style is more open to collaboration than that of Agamemnon, as illustrated in the endeavours to rescue Patroklos’ corpse (Book 17).

Menelaos shares with Patroklos an endearing capacity for compassion and concern for individual comrades and the Achaians as a whole.208 As the holder of greater status, his concern is perhaps more remarkable. His name reveals his thematic significance: Μνέαλαος, he who stands fast with the host.209 Both Menelaos and Patroklos provide an antithesis to Achilleus’ extreme pre-occupation with his personal, individual concerns. Menelaos enjoys the attribute—as do Achilleus and

206 Examples of Agamemnon’s impulsiveness are the quarrel with Achilleus (Book 1), the decision to test the Achaians (Book 2), and proposals to abandon the campaign (Books 9, 14).

207 Menelaos’ slight pompousness in viewing young men as fickle is illustrated by his reference to φοφενές ἐκεδοκονταί (their minds turn with every wind, LSJ translation, 3.108) compared to prudent older men—thinly-veiled references to Paris and himself. On his rather “stuffy” side: Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 18.

208 Parry points to Menelaos’ affinity with Patroklos through compassion: Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 11, 16.

Patroklos—of being able to elicit affection and loyalty. In short, he is the likeable son of Atreus.

**Distribution**

The distribution of the apostrophic event-sequences featuring Menelaos across the elements of narrative structure, as defined by Labov and Waletzky, has received scant, if any, attention.

Menelaos appears on at least 19 occasions in the epic. The poet-narrator apostrophizes him seven times in five event-sequences. Menelaos' non-apostrophic appearances range from a small cluster, which contributes to the portrayal of his character, to a second group, in which he is included in lists of Achaian heroes and their achievements in battle.

---

210 For example, Antilochos stands by Menelaos to take on Aineias in the rescue of two brothers' corpses (5.541–570); Nestor's reference to Menelaos' popularity (10.114); and the Achaian leaders' spontaneous response to Menelaos' offer to fight Hektor (7.104–106).

211 As Willcock points out, Menelaos is *simpatico*: Willcock, "Menelaos in the Iliad", 224. This term is not easily translated into English.

212 Labov and Waletzky, "Narrative Analysis", 12–44. See also Chapter 2 above. In my survey of secondary literature I have not found the distribution of apostrophes in the Iliad examined from this particular viewpoint.

213 I refer to these as appearances, although some are references rather than scenes or episodes in which Menelaos undertakes action: for example, his inclusion in the Catalogue of Ships (2.581–590). I have not included such cursory references as Jason's provision of wine to Agamemnon and Menelaos (7.470–471).

214 The apostrophic event-sequences: 4.105–191 (apostrophes at 4.127–129, 4.146); 7.54–122 (apostrophe at 7.104); 13.576–642 (apostrophe at 13.603); 17.651–761 (apostrophes at 17.679, 17.702); and 23.532–613 (apostrophe at 23.600). See also Appendix B.

215 Examples of the first group: the attempt to avenge brothers Orsilochos and Krethon (5.561–575); the Adrestos episode (6.37–65). An example Menelaos' inclusion in a list is at 16.311–312.
panorama of battle action and provide a contrasting background to the interaction between two or three characters.

The first six narratorial apostrophes of Menelaos (4.127–129, 4.146, 7.104, 13.603, 17.679, and 17.702) are located in the complicating action of the story which presents the deteriorating Achaian situation.216

One of the effects of highlighting Menelaos’ role as the rallying point for the Achaians in a series of apostrophic event-sequences is to provide a unifying thread during Achilleus’ self-imposed withdrawal from the campaign (1.306–19.56).217 This striking absence of the leading protagonist is a bold narratorial move, especially given the Iliad’s opening lines:

μὴνιν ἀεὶδε, θεά, Πηληνίάδεω Αχιλής
οὐλομένην, ἣ μνηίτ' Ἀχαιὼς ἀλγε' ἑθηκε...

Sing, goddess, the destructive wrath of Achilleus,
the son of Peleus, which sent countless troubles to the Achaians...

1.1–2 (my translation)

The first invocation of the Muses raises audience expectations that Achilleus will be physically present for much, if not most, of the action, but he makes only four

---

216 This extends to the immediate aftermath of Patroklos’ death (Book 17), which acts as a transition to the resolution of the narrative. (Achilleus’ quarrel with Agamemnon, the cause of his initial wrath, is resolved in Book 19, but is superseded by another wave of complicating action leading to the “greater wrath” caused by Patroklos’ death. This is resolved with Hektor’s death in Book 22.) I do agree with Rabel that the wounding of Menelaos (Book 7) is very significant to the plot: Rabel, Plot and Point of View, 79, 87.

appearances during his period of withdrawal. Nevertheless, Achilleus continues to be a commanding presence. His withdrawal from the Achaian campaign generates the momentum of cause and effect which dominates the events in the poem. The poet-narrator sustains our interest during Achilleus’ absence by presenting a mosaic of episodes and scenes that switch between various locations. Some of these episodes are what Alden terms “para-narratives”, that is, episodes which are subsidiary to the main narrative: for example, Hera’s seduction of Zeus (Book 14).

Distribution of apostrophic event-sequences in the complicating action

Robert Rabel goes so far as to call the focus on the deteriorating Achaian situation in Books 2 to 8 a sub-plot. I refrain from doing so, principally because of the difficulty in separating out its thematic concerns from the story’s main theme. Rabel argues that there is a change in focus from the Achaian deterioration with Helen as “an object of contention” to a focus, after Book 8, on heroes seeking individual glory. But the focus on the communal concern—highlighted by the apostrophes of

---

218 The appearances: the Embassy (Book 9), charging Patroklos with confirming that Machaon has been wounded (Book 11), the conversation with Patroklos after his return (Book 16), and saving Patroklos’ corpse by bellowing from off the battlefield (18.165–233).

219 On Homer’s use of elements beyond the restrictions of time and location which govern events on the battlefield: Lateiner, “An Unpredictable Classic”, 12–13.


221 Rabel, Plot and Point of View, 59–90.

222 Rabel, Plot and Point of View, 87. Taplin, however, argues that Helen as the object of contention fades after the duel between Menelaos and Paris in Book 3: Taplin, Homeric Soundings, 27. I am inclined to agree with Taplin, but I add that only during the overnight truce in Book 7 does Paris finally refuse to give up Helen (7.363–365).
Menelaos—takes us to Patroklos’ death (Book 16) and its immediate aftermath (Book 17). An individual hero’s striving for glory can be accommodated in a communal effort, as the various aristeiai illustrate. Stolen women and the quest for κλέος (glory) are rather leitmotifs that permeate the story. The critical shift is from a focus on charting the communal Achaian fortunes to a focus through which Achilleus’ fixation to avenge Patroklos completely dominates the action.

The first three apostrophes of Menelaos are distributed in that section of the epic which covers the Achaians’ performance on the first day of fighting into the second day (Books 3–8).\(^\text{223}\) The first two apostrophes (4.127–129, 4.146) occur in the first apostrophic event-sequence, in which Pandaros wounds Menelaos (4.105-191). The third apostrophe (7.104) occurs in the second apostrophic event-sequence, in which Menelaos accepts Hektor’s challenge to a duel (7.54–122).

Books 9 and 10 provide variation and respite—an “intermission” between the first and second half of the complicating action of the story and its battle scenes. In Book 9 Achilleus’ negative response to the embassy reminds us of his intractability (9.308–429). Book 10 entertains us with a para-narrative of welcome Achaian success, the night raid known as the Doloneia.

The second half of the complicating action (Books 11–17) all takes place on the third day of combat. Zeus’ promise of success to Hektor until the sun sets (11.186–194)

\(^{223}\) The first day of combat starts at 2.48, and the second day starts at 8.01. There is one day between the two (7.381–7.482). See Appendix C for the distribution of all categories of apostrophe in the Iliad, as defined by Block.
holds this together as a narrative unit.\textsuperscript{224} The fourth apostrophe (13.603) occurs in the third apostrophic event-sequence (13.576-642), in which Menelaos wounds Helenos and kills Peisandros. Apostrophes five and six (17.679, 702) occur in the fourth apostrophic event-sequence, in which Menelaos leads the attempt to save Patroklos' corpse (17.651–761).\textsuperscript{225}

The seventh apostrophe takes place during the quarrel between Menelaos and Antilochos in Book 23 (23.600). Briefly, the para-narrative in which it is located acts as a coda at the communal level. In some respects, this apostrophe is different from the other six although it is linked thematically to Menelaos' status and concern for communal order and wellbeing.

\textit{Distribution of the non-apostrophic episodes featuring Menelaos}

Three non-apostrophic episodes featuring Menelaos are located in the first half of the complicating action: the inconclusive duel with Paris (3.21–450), the rescue of the corpses of Orsilochos and Krethon (5.541–575), and the Adrestos para-narrative (6.37–65). A fourth takes place at the start of the Doloneia (10.25–70, 228–253).\textsuperscript{226} In the fifth episode, Menelaos rescues the wounded Odysseus (11.461–488).

\textsuperscript{224} Taplin can see no major division across the "huge central day" lasting from Book 11 to Book 18: Taplin, Homeric Soundings, 18.

\textsuperscript{225} I note that Rabel describes Books 9–16 as a conflict between Achilleus' desires and the Achaians' needs: Rabel, Plot and Point of View, 135. I agree, in that the consequences become more serious, but I argue that the conflict starts as soon as the Achaians go to battle without Achilleus (Book 4).

\textsuperscript{226} The inclusion of the Doloneia has always been debated. On its sources, see Bryan Hainsworth, The Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 3: books 9–12 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 151. Whether it was part of Homer's original plan for the \textit{i}liad\ is not germane to this study. Its placement and function in the narrative structure work well. The introductory
These episodes provide insights into Menelaos' character, with more of an emphasis on his actions as an individual rather than as a leader and figurehead. In the duel with Paris, for example, he is the vengeful, cuckolded husband (3.21–450). His pity for Orsilochos and Krethon makes him fearless (5.561–564) and he takes on their killer, Aineias. Pity also motivates his rescue of the wounded Odysseus (11.459–484). In the Adrestos para-narrative he acts pragmatically, preferring a great ransom to killing (6.37–65). In the Doloneia he appears to defer to Agamemnon (10.61–63), who treats him as the protected brother (10.120–125; 234–240). We also see his capacity for collaboration when he rescues Odysseus (11.459–488).

The poet-narrator apparently sees no need for further scenes of this kind, because Menelaos' character has been well delineated by Book 11. From now on, Menelaos features in apostrophic event-sequences which increasingly stress his public persona as the Achaians' moral figurehead. Menelaos meets Michael Gagarin's definition of moral behaviour in Homer because he displays a sense of consideration for others which is not closely linked to rational self-interest.

---

227 Antilochos goes to help Menelaos, and Aineias retreats from the corpses. The poet-narrator makes it clear that Antilochos' motivation here is partly based on the importance of Menelaos to the campaign (5.567).

228 This foreshadows the collaborative effort to save Patroklos' corpse in Book 17.

229 See Michael Gagarin, “Morality in Homer”, Classical Philology, 82.4 (1987), 285–306, at 228. Gagarin asks whether a sense of right or wrong independent of τιμή (honour) exists in Homer. Although he concedes that a fully-developed system of morality in the modern sense does not exist, he argues that “the beginning of a moral sense” (285) does. Self-interest and morality are the two ends of a spectrum in this. Concern for others may be restricted to just a few to progressively larger groups. I contend that no character in the Iliad is concerned for all other humans as humans, but that Menelaos exemplifies a highly developed concern...
Further points of commonality in apostrophic event-sequences

Apart from the thematic unity of presenting Menelaos in his public persona as the Achaian co-leader and rallying point, what other points of commonality can be identified in the apostrophic event-sequences featuring Menelaos?

The first four apostrophic event-sequences take place on the battlefield (Books 4, 7, 13, 17), the plain between the Achaians' camp and Troy. The audience immediately recognizes the symbolic significance of the topography. The battlefield is a public theatre for the enactment of war, with the promise of treasure and glory for the victors, and the threat of ignominy and death for the defeated. As a contested space, the battlefield is the point of access to the booty in the Achaian camp and in the splendid trophy city of Troy. To the gods, the battlefield is a theatre providing entertainment for divine spectators.\(^{230}\) The last apostrophic event-sequence (23.532–613) takes place near Patroklos' funeral mound.\(^{231}\) We are told:

\[
\ldots\alphaυτά\ Αχιλλεύς
\alphaυτού\ λαὸν \ζηκένεν \ ήυφύν \ άγώνα\ldots
\]

\[\ldots\text{But Achilleus held the people there [at Patroklos' funeral mound], and made them sit down in a wide assembly...}\]

\[23.257–258\]

for his people, the Achaian host. See also Hammer, Iliad as Politics, Chapter 7, “Toward a Political Ethic, 171–193.

\(^{230}\) See Strauss Clay, Homer's Trojan Theatre, 2. Her study plays on three meanings of "theatre": the theatre of war that offers a comprehensive view of a military campaign; theatre as a space where an audience can view a performance or spectacle; and the “classical mnemonic system of loci”.

Although not specified exactly, the location would have a close spatial relationship—and probably visual—from the Achaian camp, the sea and the battlefield.

In three apostrophic event-sequences (Books 4, 7, 17), Menelaos interacts exclusively with male Achaian and Trojan warriors. In the third event-sequence (Book 13), he interacts only with Trojan warriors, which emphasizes a moment of martial prowess undertaken by him alone. In the fifth event-sequence (Book 23), he interacts with Antilochos before the other Achaians. Menelaos does not interact with any non-warriors, whether men, women or children; nor are any present. Nor does he interact with any gods in the apostrophic event-sequences. But Athene participates, unperceived, in the first apostrophic event-sequence (Book 4) to prevent an arrow from killing him. At the start of second apostrophic event-sequence, Athene and Apollo take their places in a tree, disguised as vultures, to watch Hektor’s challenge (7.58–61).

232 Agamemnon (Book 4); Agamemnon and Achaian leaders (Book 7); the Aiantes, Antilochos, Meriones and other unnamed Achaians (Book 17).

233 The Trojans are: Pandaros (Book 4), Hektor (Book 7), Helenos and Peisandros (Book 13), Hektor, Aineias and other Trojans (Book 17).

234 Sometimes a god is involved in the lead-up to an event-sequence. For example, in the lead-up to the fourth apostrophic event-sequence (17. 543–573), Athene, in the likeness of Phoinix, exhorts the Achaians to save Patroklos, starting with Menelaos. Pleased with his response, she increases his resolve and strength.
First apostrophic event-sequence: Menelaos is wounded (4.105–191)

The first apostrophic event-sequence (4.105–191) will illustrate how such event-sequences can serve as an especially important catalyst in driving the plot forward.235

Book 4 comprises four main parts. In the first part, Zeus agrees to Hera’s call for a Trojan violation of the truce to cause further fighting. Athene, disguised as the Trojan Laodokos, persuades Pandaros to try to kill Menelaos (1–104). The second part sees Pandaros wound Menelaos (105–191). The third part comprises the long para-narrative, the Epipolesis (Tour of Inspection), in which Agamemnon re-asserts himself as the military commander to organise revenge (223–421). In the fourth part, the Achaians march to battle and fighting breaks out (422–544).

In addition to two apostrophes (4.127–129, 146) which bracket two similes (130–131, 141–145), the first event-sequence contains a wealth of descriptive detail.236 The poet-narrator also uses repetition to great effect, as we shall see.

Lengthy narratorial description distorts and stretches time. After Pandaros unwraps his bow (4.105), the poet-narrator describes its history (105–111). The description evokes a splendid, bygone heroic era and conveys the message that the bow will be used in an important act. The poet-narrator then describes in detail the sequence of Pandaros’ actions: he strings the bow, places it into position, removes a new arrow


236 Rabel describes lines 127–147 as a chiastic arrangement (simile, description of arrow’s flight, simile) bracketed by two apostrophes, Plot and Point of View, 81.
from his quiver, makes a vow to Apollo, draws the bow, and releases the arrow (112–126). This sequence would take but a few seconds in real time, but the detail—including the narratorial explanation as to why Pandaros’ companions shield him (113–115)—slows the pace to increase suspense. We wait on tenterhooks. Before describing the arrow’s flight, the poet-narrator suspends the action of his story to address Menelaos:

οὐδὲ σεθεν, Μενέλαε, θεοὶ μὰκαρες λελάθουντο ἀθάνατοι, περὶτη δὲ διὸς θυγάτῃ ἀγελείη, ἡ τοι πρὸσθε στάσα βέλος ἐχεπευκές ἄμυνεν.

Still the blessed gods immortal did not forget you,
Menelaos, and first among them Zeus’ daughter, the spoiler,
who standing in front of you fended aside the tearing arrow.

4.127–129237

The apostrophe reminds us of the gods’ special regard for Menelaos.238 It is one of two instances in which the proponent of metrical primacy, Bonner, acknowledges that metre and rhetoric “co-operate”.239 Although the wording of the apostrophe indicates that Menelaos will not die at this moment, the result of the arrow’s flight is

237 Parry points out that if τοι is intended (some manuscripts have οί), the apostrophe continues into the third line: Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 15. This would make this the longest apostrophe in the poem. In view of the apostrophic event-sequence’s role as the cause for hostilities breaking out, I support the interpretation of τοι.

238 It is probable that Homer’s audience would have known that, according to tradition, Menelaos would be re-united with Helen and return to Sparta. See also Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 15.

239 Bonner, “Use of Apostrophe”, 386. The other example he gives is the third apostrophe of Menelaos at 7.104.
unknown, and so the suspense is not dissipated. This instance of narratorial prolepsis also strengthens our confidence in the poet-narrator’s omniscience.240

**Combination of apostrophe and similes in the first apostrophic event-sequence**

The poet-narrator continues his temporal manipulation with a simile (4.130–131) that delays the return to the action:

ή δὲ τόσον μὲν ἐφαγεν ἀπὸ χρόος, ὡς ὅτε μήτηρ παιδὸς ἐφη μύιαν, ὅθεν ἴδει λέεται ὕπνῳ...

She brushed it [the arrow] away from his skin as lightly as when a mother brushes a fly away from her child who is lying in sweet sleep.

4.130–131

Showing the mother’s *action* in the simile is more effective in conveying the goddess’ concern for Menelaos than telling us about it.241 The action is stressed through the *polyptoton* of ἔφη (to shut out/keep away) in the tenor (Athene) and in the vehicle portion of the simile (the caring mother).242

The retardation of time continues: the arrow’s progress and the moment of impact are related in detail (4.132–140).243 Thus, even a flesh wound is evaluated as a


242 See Jonathan L. Ready, Character, Narrator, and Simile in the Iliad (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 4, 11–21. Ready employs the terminology developed by I. A. Richards. He argues that the simile comprises both vehicle and tenor. Thus, in referring to the vehicle, he qualifies it with “portion” (4. n.10). I use Ready’s qualification to stress this point.

243 The description of Menelaos’ armour and protective clothing emphasizes the skill with which they have been fashioned: for example, the repetition of πολυδαιδαλος (highly or
momentous result with grave consequences because it is Menelaos who has been injured.\footnote{Diomedes later avenges Menelaos by killing Pandaros (5.286–296).}

The second simile in the event-sequence also provides a compelling contrast between actions undertaken in an orderly domestic world and those in chaotic warfare. Again it is the \textit{act} of staining that is central: the white ivory is stained with dark purplish-red dye to make it more precious:

\begin{quote}
\begin{alltt}
ώς δὲ ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοίνικι μήνη
Μηνοίς ἥ Κάειρα, παρήσον ἐμμεναι ἵππων:
κεῖται δ' ἐν θαλάμῳ, πολέες τέ μιν ἠρήσαντο
ἵππης φορέειν: βασιλῆι δὲ κεῖται ἄγαλμα,
ἀμφότεροι κόσμος θ' ἵππω ἑλατήρι τε κόδος:
tοῖοι τοι, Μενέλαος, μιᾶνθην αὐματὶ μηροὶ
eὐψυκές κυνῆμα τε ἰδὲ σφυρὰ κᾶλ' ὑπένεσθε.
\end{alltt}
\end{quote}

As when some Maionian woman or Karian with purple colours ivory, to make it a cheek piece for horses; it lies away in an inner room, and many a rider longs to have it, but it is laid up to be a king’s treasure, two things, to be the beauty of the horse, the pride of the horseman: so, \textit{Menelaos, your shapely thighs were stained with the colour of blood}, and your legs also and the ankles beneath them. 4.141–147

The vehicle portion of this simile—the precious cheek-piece for a horse—would make a valuable war-trophy, as would Menelaos’ corpse. Robert Edgeworth notes that the colour purple is an epithet of death, but that not every reference to the colour is associated with death. Thus, the references to the purple dye and blood richly wrought, 4.135–136). This complements the description of Pandaros’ bow with its golden string-hooks (4.111) in evoking the epic past and the event’s importance.
convey a cluster of associations: of precious value, life, and death.\textsuperscript{245} The background of white (ivory and Menelaos' skin) heightens the effect of the dark colour. The simile is notable for its beauty and its original tenor.

By immediately following the vehicle of the simile with an apostrophe containing its tenor (Menelaos), the poet takes us abruptly from the familiar world of the simile into the epic storyworld. Again, polyptoton intensifies the effect of the simile and apostrophe—\textit{μυήνη} (stains, colours, 4.141) and \textit{μώάνθην} ([thighs] were stained, 146).

The proximity of this word-play heightens the dramatic vividness of the scene and ensures that we appreciate the gravity of the situation.

As Minchin observes, the detail of Homeric similes evokes intimacy, through the audience members' recognition of something familiar in their own world. Intimacy is a pre-condition for engagement.\textsuperscript{246} This bridge to intimacy turns suddenly to concern with the poet-narrator's apostrophe of response to the image of Menelaos' blood staining his thighs down to his ankles. The order in which Menelaos' body parts are named subtly conveys the downward flow of blood (4.146–147).

\textit{Emotion modelled by the poet-narrator in first apostrophic event-sequence}

Through the modelling of an apparently spontaneous emotional response, the poet-narrator conflates the spatial and temporal barriers between storyrealm and storyworld. He takes us with him as silent but engaged witnesses. I suggest that the

\textsuperscript{245} Robert Edgeworth, \textit{The Uses of Color Terms in the Aeneid} (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1974), 64, 261. Edgeworth uses the fight over Patroklos' body as another example (17.361).

\textsuperscript{246} Minchin, \textit{Resources of Memory}, 144–145.
emotion he is modelling is not simple sympathy or pity. Although this is a dramatic and serious moment, its pathos is limited. With the first apostrophe (4.127–129), we already know that tradition will be upheld: Menelaos will not die. The emotions modelled are a blend of concern, awe and relief, which are added to the general narratorial empathy and goodwill for Menelaos. Agamemnon’s reaction has much more pathos because—unlike the poet-narrator, the audience and Menelaos—he is unaware that the wound is not fatal and responds as if it were. The emotional response in the second apostrophe (146) is a mixture of compassion, concern and awe: we are mindful of Menelaos’ importance to the Achaians.

The presentation of the brothers’ emotional response reveals aspects of their characters and their relationship:

\[\text{QLYTJCJEV}\]

Then the lord of men Agamemnon the lord of men shuddered as he saw how the dark blood was flowing down from the wound, and Menelaos the warlike himself also shuddered.

4.148–150 (my translation)

The same verb—\text{QLYTJCJEV} (he shuddered)—conveys each brother’s reaction at the beginning of lines 148 and 150, stressing both the nature of the response and the bond between the brothers. There the similarity ends. The poet-narrator uses two lines (152–153) to express Menelaos’ realization that he is not seriously injured. In contrast, an extended speechframe introduces Agamemnon’s 28-line spontaneous speech:
And groaning heavily powerful Agamemnon spoke to them, holding Menelaos by the hand, and his companions groaned in reply.

4.153–154 (my translation)

The communal groans which echo Agamemnon’s reflect the general distress which is based on genuine affection for Menelaos and on his importance to the campaign.

This is the fourth instance of verbal play in the event-sequence. Agamemnon’s body language conveys his special concern (154).247

Homer allows the audience to experience Agamemnon’s response through the immediacy of direct speech (4.155–182), the first in the event-sequence.

Agamemnon’s speech is a mixture of an older sibling’s affection, concern, sense of responsibility and guilt. It contains a claim to moral superiority over the enemy and a personal belief—hope, perhaps—that Zeus will ultimately destroy the Trojans.

Agamemnon’s pessimistic streak then surfaces: he imagines Achaian failure and departure, leaving Menelaos’ bones behind to rot far from home.248

In the first apostrophic event-sequence we see a more likeable side of Agamemnon through the prism of his relationship with Menelaos. Interestingly, Menelaos is calmer than Agamemnon. It is the wounded Menelaos who offers reassurance to his “strong” brother. Any vulnerability in Menelaos here does not arise from a personal

247 Taking someone by the hand or stroking them conveys care and concern: for example, Thetis comforting Achilleus (1.360–361).

248 Another example of Agamemnon’s tendency to depression and pessimism: 9.9–28.
weakness: it lies in his public persona as a high-profile target whose death will greatly increase his killer’s κύδος (renown).

A common reaction following the safe resolution of a dangerous crisis is relief, then anger. Physiologically, action is an outlet for the surge of adrenalin produced by a crisis. Anger frequently seeks the solace of being channelled into decisive action. Thus, the role of Agamemnon’s anger as the driver of the para-narrative often described as the Epipolesis (4.223–421) is psychologically sound.

Narratorial direct addresses to the audience in Book 4

The Epipolesis and the battle march (4.222–445) create a new wave of anticipation and suspense by delaying the Achaians’ revenge.249 Both contain a narratorial apostrophe of the audience—the first two in the poem (223, 429). Block argues that apostrophes of character are more powerful than invocations, faded invocations, and direct addresses to the audience.250 But these other forms of apostrophe are also important as infrequent overt intrusions. The direct addresses in Book 4 assist in indicating the book’s significance in providing the cause and break-out of fighting in the poem.251

In the first direct address to the audience (4.223), the omniscient poet-narrator plays on assumptions which we might have about Agamemnon, and he corrects them:

---


250 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 11.

251 The other narratorial direct addresses to the audience are at 5.85, 15.697, and 17.366: Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 11, n. 22. See also Appendices A and C.
Then you would not have seen brilliant Agamemnon asleep nor skulking aside, nor in any way a reluctant fighter, but driving eagerly toward the fighting where men win glory.

4.223–225

The poet-narrator uses this moment of intimacy with the audience to counter Achilleus’ view of Agamemnon as a coward (1.225 ff). The direct address is not combined with similes but embedded in simple narrative-text, as befits Agamemnon’s decisive action. The angry energy of a hero-warrior in avenging a wounded or slain comrade is a strong motivational leitmotif in the poem.

The second narratorial direct address to the audience uses the οὐδὲ κε φαίης (you would not say) formula:

...οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι ἄκην ἰσαν, οὐδὲ κε φαίης τόσον λαὸν ἐπεσθαί ἔχοντ’ ἐν στήθεσιν αὐθήν, σηγὴ δειδίατες σημάντορας: ἄμφι δὲ πάσι τεῦχεα ποικίλ’ ἐλαμπτε, τὰ εἴμενοι ἐστιχόντο.

...and these went silently, you would not think all these people with voices kept in their chests were marching; silently, in fear of their commanders; and upon all glittered as they marched the shining armour they carried.

4.429–432

The poet-narrator first assures us that the silence of the Achaians marching to battle as one glittering body is unnatural and extraordinary. Their silence contrasts with the cacophony of languages arising from the undisciplined Trojans and their allies

252 Familial affection aside, Menelaos’ strategic importance would be well appreciated by Agamemnon.

Two similes bracket the direct address, and amplify the contrast. The first simile likens the ocean pounding onto the shore to the Achaians’ marching (422–426). The second likens the Trojans to ewes bleating for their lambs (433–435). Both similes work on our aural “imagination” as well as our visual. The result is highly-charged anticipation, spiked by various gods driving both sides on (439–440). The clash of battle finally erupts (446).

**Second apostrophic event-sequence: Menelaos’ initial acceptance of Hektor’s challenge (7.54–122)**

A comparison of the two challenges to a duel which Menelaos accepts (Books 3 and 7) will illustrate the pre-conditions for narratorial apostrophe of the Spartan king.

Paris is the first challenger (3.15–20); Hektor is the second (7.38–91).

The duel between Menelaos and Paris in Book 3 (85–380 with the intervening *Teikhoskopia*, the viewing from the Trojan walls, 121–244) focuses on the more personal side of Menelaos. The duel is the first attempt to resolve the conflict by one-to-one combat. Paris’ participation reminds us of the cause of the war.

The motivation for Menelaos’ acceptance to fight Paris is made clear:

...φάτο γαρ τίσεοθαι ἄλειπτην...

...thinking to avenge himself on the transgressor...

3.28 (my translation)

At the sight of Menelaos Paris tries to withdraw, but Hektor shames him into fighting (3.38–75). The poet-narrator here presents Paris and Menelaos to us as individuals—the charismatic lover and the betrayed husband—competing for the
prized Helen (86–94). From the perspective of the warriors on both sides, however, this is almost certainly not the case.

After a vow by Menelaos, which reveals his outrage at the behaviour of Paris, an erstwhile guest who has abused the laws of hospitality (3.351–354), the duel begins. Just as Menelaos appears to secure a comparatively easy victory, Aphrodite intervenes to whisk her favourite away to his bedchamber (373–425). The focus shifts to Paris and Helen who make love in Paris’ bed (423–448). Meanwhile, Menelaos ranges around on the battlefield like a beast which has been denied its prey (448–450). Although Agamemnon claims victory for Menelaos (455–461), there is no clear resolution.254

The poet-narrator has not used a narratorial apostrophe of character here. We need not be concerned for Menelaos who is clearly the better warrior. The emphasis on Menelaos as an individual is heightened by the concluding portrayal of the eternal triangle, with Menelaos as the excluded party. The duel’s purpose is to begin a sequence of episodes that offer, and then deny, the possibility of a truce. The duel contains an element of near-farce. It is more a false start than a critical point. The relatively low level of tension provides a benchmark against which a series of increases can be discerned as the complicating action develops.

254 On the humour in this situation, see Taplin, Homeric Soundings, 103.
The second apostrophic event-sequence (7.54–122)

The second apostrophic event-sequence (7.54–122) begins with Hektor’s challenge in a further attempt to resolve the conflict by one-to-one combat (67–91). This is no longer a question of cuckolded husband and adequate warrior fighting wife-stealer and lesser warrior. Leader of the Trojans, Hektor is a formidable warrior. Because the truce has already been violated by Pandaros (Book 4), the stakes are much higher. Menelaos expects one of the Achaian champions to step forward. None does. Aggrieved by the communal loss of face and, no doubt, piqued by the lack of enthusiasm to fight on his behalf, Menelaos volunteers. His reluctance is expressed by the phrase ὢψε δὲ δὴ (but now at long last, 94).255

Leaf contrasts the harsh language of Menelaos’ rebuke (7.96–102) with what he describes as Menelaos’ usual “tone of courteous regret” towards the Achaians.256 In cursing the Achaians, Menelaos compares their collective cowardice with his moral courage:

ἀλλ’ ὑμεῖς μὲν πάντες ὕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένοιοσθε, ἡμενοὶ αὐθὶ ἐκαστοι ἀκήρου, ἀκλεές αὐτῶς:
τόδε δ’ ἐγών αὐτός θωρηξόμαι: αὐτάρ ὑπερθε νίκης πείρατ’ ἔχονται ἐν ἀθανάτοις θεῶσιν.

No, may all of you turn to water and earth, all of you who sit by yourselves with no life in you, utterly dishonoured. I myself will arm against this man. While above us the threads of victory are held in the hands of the immortals.

7.99–102


At this emotional flashpoint, the poet-narrator addresses Menelaos:

Ἐνθὰ κέ τοι, Μενέλαε, φάνη βιότοιο τελευτή
Ἔκτορος ἐν παλάμησιν, ἔπει πολὺ φέρτερος ἦν,
εἰ μὴ αναϊζαντες ἐλον βασιλῆς Ἀχαίων,
ἀυτὸς τ’ Ἀτρείδης εὐφῦ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
δεξιτερής ἐλε χειρὸς ἐπος τ’ ἑφατ’ ἐκ τ’ ὀνόμαζεν...

And there, o Menelaos, would have shown forth the end of your life
under the hands of Hektor, since he was far stronger than you were,
and the son of Atreus himself, powerful Agamemnon,
called you by the right hand, and called you by name, and spoke to you...

7.104–108

The emotions modelled here, I suggest, combine excited dread about what might
have happened and relief because it did not. Although the emotional response is
similar to that of the first two narratorial apostrophes when Menelaos is wounded
(4.127–129, 4.146), it is more intense because Hektor presents a greater hypothetical
threat than does Pandaros. As with all the apostrophes of Menelaos, the response
also models the poet-narrator’s underlying goodwill and concern for him,
something noted by the scholiast ᾿ΣΤ:

Φιλοστόργως δὲ πρός αὐτὸν ποιεῖται τὸν λόγον ὁ ποιητής, καὶ συμπαθῶς
προανεφώνησεν αὐτοῦ κίνδυνον.

And the poet makes his speech towards Menelaos tender, and he has proclaimed
Menelaos’ danger sympathetically.

(my translation)

The poet-narrator sustains his overt intrusion with an explanation of his concern
(7.105).257 The poet-narrator’s response validates the Achaians’ consternation, which
is expressed by their involuntary physical reaction (106). This is matched by

257 Scott Richardson contends that such commentary allows the poet-narrator to posit a
hypothetical “other” unfolding of plot, although tradition is respected. The effect of such a
strategy is essentially to raise tension: Scott Richardson, Homeric Narrator, 188–190.
Agamemnon’s body language (107) and his speech (109–119). Agamemnon echoes the poet-narrator in stressing that Hektor is a better warrior (111). The expression of communal and individual concern for Menelaos echoes and intensifies that of the first apostrophic event-sequence (4.153–154). The combined response reinforces Menelaos’ unique significance to the Achaians, to Agamemnon and—through the apostrophe—to the poet-narrator and his audience.

Menelaos is persuaded by his brother’s argument and his own prudence. An appeal by Nestor for volunteers carries the plot forward: nine warriors offer to fight Hektor. A dramatic but inconclusive duel between Aias and Hektor leads to another delay, an overnight truce to allow for the dead on both sides to be buried. This provides an opportunity for Paris to announce a final refusal to return Helen. The Achaians construct defences around their ships (438–482). Thus, the chain of actions arising from the apostrophic event-sequence helps shape the circumstances for the battle by the ships and its all-important consequences for the plot.

**Digression: non-apostrophic event-sequences**

I shall now comment on aspects of some non-apostrophic episodes featuring Menelaos to explore further, through contrast, the pre-conditions for the poet-narrator’s apostrophes of the Spartan king.

**The para-narrative concerning Adrestos (6.37–65)**

The Adrestos para-narrative (6.37–65) contributes to the portrayal of Menelaos’ character. He responds as an individual to Adrestos’ ransom plea and, as Taplin
points out, as a man who does not love violence for its own sake.\textsuperscript{258} To increase his honour by acquiring great treasure through ransom rather than win limited κύδος (renew) by killing a Trojan of no great significance appears reasonable to Menelaos.\textsuperscript{259} The poet-narrator then allows us to savour the irony of the somewhat greedy Agamemnon scolding his brother and taking the high moral ground:

\[ ω \ πέπον, \ ω \ Μενέλαι, \ τί \ ἡ \ δὲ \ σὺ \ κήδεα \ οὕτως \ ἀνδρῶν; \ ἦ \ σοι \ ἁριστα \ πεποίηται \ κατὰ \ οὐκον \ πρὸς \ Τρώων; \ τῶν \ μὴ \ τις \ ύπεκφύγοι \ αἰτίων \ οἷον \ χείρας \ θ᾽ \ ἡμετέρας...\]

Dear brother, o Menelaos, are you concerned so tenderly with these people? Did you in your house get the best of treatment from the Trojans? No, let not one of them go free of sudden death and our hands...

6.55–58

This is essentially a private interaction between the brothers. As an enemy warrior—the “other”—Adrestos is not considered a real participant by the brothers. Typically, Menelaos responds to reason and a call for justice, and the poet-narrator notes this (6.62). But it is Agamemnon who kills Adrestos. In short, this episode does not represent a critical point in the complicating action of the tale: Menelaos is not at any increased risk, nor does he perform an act of heroism. The para-narrative does not generate any sequence of important events. Nor is any strong emotional response to Menelaos elicited.

\textsuperscript{258} Taplin, Homeric Soundings, 192.

\textsuperscript{259} On Menelaos’ tendency to be persuaded by reason: Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 16.
Rescue of the wounded Odysseus (11.459–488)

When Menelaos rescues the wounded Odysseus (11.459–488), he acts as a decent comrade-at-arms. His status is not relevant. We also see his capacity for collaboration: he draws Aias in to help him (465–471). Importantly, as in the duel with Paris in Book 3, the poet-narrator immediately switches his focus away from Menelaos. He describes Aias’ carnage (489–497), a greater achievement, and then switches to the left flank where Paris wounds Machaon (505–507). It is the consequences of this act which drive the plot forward in a great bound. Thus, this cameo of Menelaos reinforces the portrayal of his compassionate nature but does not mark a critical point in the plot.

Third apostrophic event-sequence: Menelaos the warrior (13.576–642)

If apostrophes signal a critical juncture in the narrative, as argued by Mackay, the significance of the third event-sequence (13.576–642) depends to some degree on the identity of one of Menelaos’ victims, Peisandros.

According to one view, the Peisandros whom Menelaos slays in Book 13 was originally Antimachos’ son but was later stripped of his identity to be killed in Book 11 by Agamemnon (11.122–147). Another view is that the reference to Peisandros

---

260 This foreshadows the attempt to rescue Patroklos’ corpse in Book 17.

261 Achilles sends Patroklos to confirm that Machaon has been wounded (11.595–616).

262 Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 10–11.

263 Antimachos had advocated killing Menelaos during his pre-war embassy to Troy. Parry speculates that Homer originally had Antimachos’ son slain by Menelaos, then had Agamemnon kill him. This created the “strange combination of insignificant Trojan and
in Book 11 is an inconsistency. There is a third possibility: Agamemnon may have wounded Peisandros in Book 11, but not killed him. I offer the following points to support this view, but acknowledge that there is no definitive answer. The elaborate nature of the duel between Peisandros and Menelaos (Book 13) is consistent with a highly significant act. The slaughter of Antimachos’ son would provide an appropriate setting for Menelaos to articulate the Trojans’ transgressions and express his moral superiority in a vaunt (13.620–639). There is also a tempting symmetry about the two sons of Atreus killing the two sons of Antimachos. This allows Menelaos to avenge his honour independently of the domineering Agamemnon.

The apostrophic event-sequence begins shortly after Menelaos has taken over from a tiring Idomeneus in the defence of the left flank in the battle by the ships.

Priam’s son Helenos, a respected augur and adviser of Hektor, has slaughtered detailed duel preceded by apostrophe and the particular content of the long speech after it”: Parry, “Language and Characterization,” 19–20. See also “Peisandros”, in The Homer Encyclopedia, vol. 2, edited by Finkelberg, 635.

K.B. Saunders notes that Homer uses both unambiguous words or phrases for killing and death and less definite ones that literally indicate being wounded or falling to the ground: K. B. Saunders, Appendix, 131–167, in Wolf-Hartmut Friedrich, Wounding and Death in the Iliad, translated by Gabriele Wright and Peter Jones, preface by Peter Jones (London: Duckworth, 2003), 132–134. Thus, Peisandros may have only been wounded in Book 11 (143–144).

Without agreeing with Strauss Clay that Idomeneus’ aristeia in Book 13 is followed by one of Menelaos, the view that Menelaos kills Antimachos’ son adds to his achievement: Strauss Clay, Homer’s Trojan Theatre, 73.

Deipyros. Menelaos’ sorrow over the death is expressed with simple dignity in one line bracketed by a double epithet. He then assumes the typical stance of a hero-warrior about to engage in combat:

\[ \text{Ἀπεξεῖθεν δ’ ἄχος εἰλε βοήν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον:} \]
\[ \text{βῆ δ’ ἑπατειλής οἷς Ἐλένη ἤστα ἀνακτή ὀξὺ δόρυ κραδᾶσσ.} \]

And the son of Atreus, sorrow caught him, Menelaos of the great war-cry, and he came to Helenos, the hero and fighter, menacing him, shaking his sharp spear...

13.581–583 (my translation)

Helenos then aims at Menelaos. His arrow ricochets off Menelaos’ cuirass. The poet-narrator suspends the action to convey the arrow’s movement in a delightful agricultural simile:

\[ \text{ὡς δ’ ὃτ’ ἀπὸ πλατέος πτυχόφιν μεγάλην κατ’ ἄλοην} \]
\[ \text{θρόσκωσιν κύμαι μελανόχρωες ἦ ἔρεβινθοι} \]
\[ \text{πνοῆ ὑπὸ λιγυρῆ καὶ λυκμητήρος ἐρωῇ...} \]

As along a great threshing floor from the broad blade of a shovel the black-skinned beans and the chickpeas bounce high under the whistling blast and the sweep of the winnowing fan...

13.588–590

Taken from a peaceful setting, the almost cheerful activity of the pulses contrasts sharply with the bellicose tenor, an arrow. The repetition of the phrase ἐπτατο πικρὸς οἰωτός (the bitter arrow bounced back, 587 and 592) brackets the departure from, and return to, the storyworld.

Menelaos wounds Helenos, causing his retreat. Peisandros comes forward to avenge Helenos. The poet-narrator confluates the barriers between what Mackay

267 On Helenos’ importance: 6.75 ff, 7.44 ff.
describes as “narrated context and narrating context” with his fourth apostrophe of Menelaos:

Πείσανδρος δέ ίδυς Μενελάου κυδαλίμοιο ἤμε: τὸν δ’ ἄγε μοῖρα κακῆ θανάτου τέλος δὲ σοι, Μενέλαε, δαμήναι ἐν αἰεὶ δηύτητι.

Peisandros now came on straight against Menelaos the glorious, but an evil destiny led him toward death’s end, to be beaten down by you, Menelaos, in the stark encounter. 13.601–603

The poet-narrator is modelling empathy and warm approval for Menelaos’ warrior-like behaviour. There is a small crescendo in these lines. Simple narrative is followed by foreshadowing, and the high point is reached in the apostrophe with its emphatic, triumphant start of σοι, Μενέλαε (by you, Menelaos!). 269 The poet-narrator pays tribute to Menelaos with an epithet whereas Peisandros’ name is merely stated (601). 270 The combination of prolepsis and apostrophe also creates relief which allows us to enjoy the dramatic fight. It even has a touch of grim humour. By commenting on Peisandros’ optimism, despite his shattered sword, the poet-narrator makes an ironic aside:

268 The description of the treatment of Helenos’ wound stresses his status and Menelaos’ achievement in wounding him (596–600).

269 Edwards’ contention that the apostrophes of Menelaos always occur when he evokes our sympathy or shows some “amiable emotion” does not apply here: Edwards, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 5, 128. Edwards comments that Menelaos is apostrophized when he is about to make an important speech. But that it is not strictly so: the poet-narrator addresses Menelaos as Peisandros comes forward to fight him.

270 Another example: 605–606. As the pace quickens, simple proper names are used for both. The description of Peisandros’ splendid axe also contrasts with any lack of epithet for its owner (611–613). This could be a subtle narratorial comment on his inherited shame rather than an attempt to differentiate this Peisandros from Antimachos’ son. On epithets as commentary: Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 2–9.
...ο δὲ φρεσίν ἦσι χάρη καὶ ἐξέπτευτο νίκην.
...yet he was light-hearted and hopeful of victory.

No other Achaian hero is mentioned: the spotlight is entirely on Menelaos’ achievement in battle. This moment of triumph acts as a trigger for Menelaos’ long vaunt (620–639) which puts the war into a moral perspective. He expresses his grievance and the justification for the campaign against Troy, stressing the Trojans’ collective and unnatural hunger for war (621–625, 634–635, 639). He further strengthens his position as a “character-bridge” by listing the universal pleasures of life such as sleep and making love (636–639). Janko rightly points out that Menelaos’ vaunt goes far beyond his immediate triumph. It is significant that his triumph and vaunt take place at a moment in the part of the complicating action which marks the start of the final and most desperate stage for the Achaians, the battle by the ships. There is a touch of poignant irony in its timing.

---


273 Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 122–123; Taplin, Homeric Soundings, 169–170, especially 170, n. 28. I agree with Taplin and Janko’s argument that Menelaos’ speech has been generally misjudged. For example, Willcock assesses the vaunt assessed as “a kind of weak resentment that the Trojans are fighting so well in spite of their guilt against him personally”: Willcock, “Menelaos in the Iliad”, 221.

274 Book 14 opens with Nestor leaving the wounded Machaon to search for Agamemnon. He encounters Diomedes, Odysseus, and Agamemnon—all wounded (14.27–40).
Digression: further examples of other forms of narratorial intrusion

The first three apostrophic event-sequences have demonstrated that other forms of narratorial intrusion—both covert and overt—support narratorial apostrophe and enliven the event-sequence in which it is placed.\textsuperscript{275} I shall make some further observations on the use of simile in apostrophic event-sequences, and also discuss two other forms of narratorial apostrophe, faded invocation and direct address to the audience. By way of an introduction to the fourth apostrophic event-sequence (17.651–761), I shall use examples from Book 17.

**Simile**

It is acknowledged that poet-narrator employs strings of similes elsewhere in the poem, for example in Book 2. But the combination of simile and narratorial apostrophe has a particular emphatic synergy.\textsuperscript{276} Through simile the poet-narrator steps out of the epic storyworld to please audience members with the recognition of something familiar in an unspecified location in their world.\textsuperscript{277} Simile sustains and enhances the relationship between the poet-narrator and his audience. The poet-narrator then takes us back to the storyworld to forge a link between vehicle and tenor, thus strengthening our appreciation of, and connection to, what is taking

\textsuperscript{275} Pandaros’ wounding of Menelaos, 4.105–191; Menelaos’ acceptance of Hektor’s challenge, 7.54–122; Menelaos wounds Helenos and kills Peisandros, 13.576–642.

\textsuperscript{276} The largest category of apostrophes which Henry identifies is the “emphatic sequence” of simile followed by apostrophe. Three of the six instances he cites relate to Menelaos: 4.146, 17.679, 23.600: Henry “Use and Origin of Apostrophe in Homer”, 7. See also Scott Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 238, n. 10, n. 14. Richardson counts eight instances.

place. Homer then suspends the action to defy temporal and spatial restrictions to make us his witnesses to his apostrophe of one of the characters in the epic storyworld.

Perhaps the most striking example of the powerful effect of combining similes with apostrophes of Menelaos is the placement of seven similes and two apostrophes in the fourth event-sequence, the rescue of Patroklos’ corpse (17.651–761).278 Three extended similes refer to Menelaos (657 ff, 674 ff, 742 ff). The overall result is that the narrated time is slowed down, and the bridge between the audience’s world and that of the epic storyworld is strengthened. This helps to communicate and celebrate Menelaos’ greatest act in the poem. Similes also provide small pockets of relief within the long scenes on the battlefield, allowing the audience to process momentous events.

Menelaos is first likened to a thwarted but unbowed lion in a long simile (17.657 ff) and then compared with a sharp-eyed, ruthless eagle (674 ff). Both similes turn the spotlight on Menelaos’ courage, skill, and determination. The vehicle of the second simile leads into the poet-narrator’s apostrophe, in which he celebrates Menelaos’ behaviour with warm approval:

\[
\text{πάντοσε παπταίνων ὡς τ’ αιετός, ὃν ὅ ἐὰν τὰ φασίν}
\text{όξυτατον δέρκεσθαι ὑπομανῶν πετεινών,}
\text{ὅν τε καὶ ύψοθ’ ἕοντα πόδας ταχύς οὐκ ἐλαθεῖ πτώξ}
\text{ὡς ἄρα φανήσας ἀπέβη ξανθός Μενέλαος,}
\text{θαμνῷ ύπ’ ἀμφικόμω κατακείμενος, ἀλλὰ τ’ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ}
\text{ἔσουσι, καὶ τέ μιν ὄκα λαβὼν ἐξειλέτο θυμόν.}
\]

278 See Appendix D for the distribution of similes and apostrophes in the fourth event- sequence (17.651–761).
Similes three and four follow this passage. They convey the Trojans’ frenzied attack of the Trojans and the fighting over the body (725 ff and 737 ff). In the third simile featuring Menelaos, the poet-narrator likens him and Meriones to a team of mules as they carry Patroklos’ body to safety (742–745). Although it may seem unusual to compare the hero-warriors’ action with the behaviour of mules, the poet-narrator is drawing a comparison with the well-known tenacity and sure-footed performance of these animals in treacherous conditions. Further, as Ready observes, the dissimilarity of vehicle and tenor secures our attention. Two final similes follow, in which the poet-narrator likens the escorting Aiantes to a rocky ridge holding

---

279 The first likens the Trojans to hounds attacking a boar (Patroklos’ corpse), and the second, typically, likens the destructive energy and movement of battle to that of fire.

280 Focusing on the action expressed in a simile is a more useful approach than ascribing meaning to the subject of the vehicle, as does William Scott. Likening the daring with which Athene imbues Menelaos to a persistent mosquito/fly (17.570 ff) illustrates this point. According to Scott the simile is “strangely unwarlike” and an “unpromising beginning” to Menelaos’ most noble deed: William C. Scott, *The Artistry of the Homeric Simile* (Hanover, New Hampshire, London: University Press of New England, 2009), 151. Using Ready and Minchin’s approach, however, the insect’s persistent action may be viewed as an original and appropriate comment on Menelaos’ determination.

back strong currents of water (747 ff) and the younger Achaian warriors’ flight from the Trojans to that of little birds before a raptor (755 ff).

The concentration of similes and apostrophes in this event-sequence with the frequent switches between storyworld and storyrealm provides an emphatic rhythm in the narrative which matches the dramatic and desperate action, especially that in the sequence of the last three similes at the end of the book (742 ff, 747 ff, 755 ff).

Through simile the poet-narrator evokes a moving image, similar to a short film clip, of something familiar doing what it always does. As with characters’ direct speech, we need to participate in this act of communication by decoding and appreciating its meaning. This deepens our engagement.

**Faded invocation**

All four instances of faded invocation fall within the complicating action of the *Iliad*. The example in Book 17 (260 ff) is the only faded invocation which occurs in proximity to a narratorial apostrophe of character.

Menelaos has exhorted the Achaian leaders to protect Patroklos (17.248–255). After naming four volunteers, the poet-narrator breaks off to ask:

\[ \text{τῶν δ’ ἄλλων τίς κεν ἃπι φρεσίν οὐνόματ' εἶποι,} \\
\text{ὅσοι δὴ μετόπισθε μάχην ἔγειραν Ἀχαιῶν;} \]

---

282 Ready, "Comparative Perspectives", 74–75; Minchin, *Resources of Memory*, 150.

283 They occur at 5.703–504, 8.273, 11.299–300, and 17.260: Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 12, n. 21. (There are no apostrophes of character in Books 5, 8, and 11.) See Appendices A and C.
But what man could tell forth from his heart the names of the others, all who after these waked the war strength of the Achaians?

17.260–261

The faded invocation draws attention to Menelaos’ ability to inspire the Achaians to make a co-operative effort. This is relevant to Menelaos’ role in the rescue attempt (651–761). The poet-narrator’s choice of faded invocation also indicates that he is keen to maintain the fast narrative momentum at this critical point rather than create a digression by invoking the Muses to help him complete a long list.

Direct address to the audience

The poet-narrator makes five direct addresses to the audience across the complicating action of the narrative and the start of the transition to the resolution (Books 4, 5 15, 17).²⁸⁴ Although the poet-narrator does not make a direct address to the audience about Menelaos, three direct addresses (4.223, 4.429, 17.366) are relevant to two apostrophic event-sequences featuring him (4.105–191, 17.651761).²⁸⁵

I shall now discuss the third direct address which occurs during the initial fighting over Patroklos’ corpse (17.366).

The narratorial address to the audience starts with a very short simile likening the bloody struggle for Patroklos’ corpse to fire. The formula οὐδὲ κε φαίης (you would not say) leads to an enjambment which highlights the reasonable assumption,

²⁸⁴ They occur at 4.223, 4.429, 5.85, 15.697, 17.366. See also Appendices A and C. For a broader definition which includes third-person potential optatives as a device to transform listeners into spectators, see Strauss Clay, Homer’s Trojan Theatre, 23–25, 23 (n.25).

²⁸⁵ The remaining two direct addresses occur during Diomedes’ aristeia (5.85) and the pitched battle by the ships (15.697). In Chapter 5 I shall discuss the direct address at 15.967 in the context of the narratorial apostrophe of Apollo (15.365) and that of Melanippos (15.582).
which any unknowing audience might make, that Zeus through his mist has created
total chaos. The apparent absence of both sun and moon is used as synecdoche for
the entire cosmos being out of kilter, such is the magnitude of the effect and
consequences of Patroklos’ death:

ως οἱ μὲν μάραναντο δέμας πυρός, οὐδὲ κε φαίης
οὔτε ποτ’ ἥλιον σῶν ἐμεναι οὔτε σελήνην:
ἵνα γὰρ κατέχοντο μάχης ἐπὶ θ’ ὄσον ἄριστοι
ἐστασαν ἄμφι Μενοιτίδῃ κατατεθηνὼτι.

So they fought on in the likeness of fire, nor would you have thought
the sun as still secure in his place in the sky, nor the moon, since
the mist was closed over all that part of the fight where the bravest
stood about Patroklos, the fallen son of Menoitos.

17.366-369

The chaos foreshadows Achilleus’ complete inner turmoil when he learns of
Patroklos’ death. The effect of this direct address is manifold. It draws our attention
to a critical point. The effect reinforces the I-Thou relationship of the poet-narrator
and his audience. Although it draws the audience in as a witness to the scene—as
does apostrophe of character—the direct address also reinforces the “otherness” of
what happens in the epic storyworld. The poet-narrator asserts his position as an
all-knowing and dependable guide to interpret for us what is taking place.
Fourth apostrophic event-sequence: Menelaos’ finest hour (17.651–761)

Book 17 is, therefore, notable—by Homeric standards—for its range of narratorial intrusion. Leaf criticizes the delays in Book 17, asserting that “the weakness of the narrative as a whole is patent” with its “four successive ‘false starts’”. He does not appear to appreciate Homer’s use of delay with regard to how something will be achieved as an effective device to heighten drama and suspense. The degree of divine intervention in the action facilitates delays by contributing to cause and effect, and by creating additional suspense through the gods’ sometimes unpredictable behaviour.

Structural and thematic significance

The grand scale of the Iliad and the complex tapestry of narrative strands preclude any fast or simple transition. I interpret the significance of the fourth apostrophic para-narrative as the first intimation of the shift from complicating action to resolution. Two apostrophes celebrate Menelaos’ single-minded heroism in leading the attempt to rescue Patroklos’ corpse (679, 702), although Achilleus is needed for

Note the poet-narrator’s comment on the ultimate futility of mortal ambition in battle through his use of ψυχοι (fools, 17.236, 496). This adds to the effect of the performative present.


Zeus shrouds Ida with a mist and sends thunder and lightning to give victory to the Trojans (593 ff). Then he responds with pity to a prayer by Telamonian Aias and restores daylight (648 ff). Other examples of divine intervention: Zeus (198 ff, 441 ff), Apollo (322 ff, 582 ff), and Athene (544 ff).
its completion (18.228 ff). Thus, in the rescue of Patroklos’ corpse, we see the transfer of focus from Menelaos to Achilleus.

Anna Stelow makes the perceptive observation that Menelaos and Achilleus’ concerns—the former’s with the Trojans and the latter’s with his personal wrath—are aligned through the substitution of Menelaos for Achilleus in being the first to express grief over Patroklos’ death and to try to save his corpse.\(^{290}\) I contend that the significance of this alignment can be seen in the poet-narrator’s transition from a series of episodes which feature Menelaos as the embodiment of the communal Achaian cause to a restored focus on Achilleus as an individual. I agree with Stelow that Menelaos’ pivotal role in Book 17 has not fully been recognized. Stelow points out that the scholiasts gave this book the title of the aristeia of Menelaos.\(^{291}\) Whether Menelaos’ performance in Book 17 warrants this evaluation can be questioned, but Menelaos is presented at his finest moment.\(^{292}\)

The poet-narrator indicates Menelaos’ dominance and significance in Book 17 by devoting most of the book’s opening line to his name, using a double epithet:


\(^{292}\) Willcock finds the traditional title “a little surprising”, arguing that Menelaos’ actions are not “remotely comparable” to the aristeiai of Diomedes (Book 5), Agamemnon (Book 11), and Achilleus (Books 20–21): Willcock, “Menelaos in the *Iliad*”, 221. Although Willcock concedes Menelaos’ presence throughout Book 17 and frequent highlighting in the narrative, he argues that Menelaos does not dominate the battlefield. Louden, who is unusually generous in his list of aristeiai, does not accord Menelaos one: Louden, *Iliad, Structure, Myth and Meaning*, 19, 85, 89, 95, and 101.
Menelaos' deep sorrow about Patroklos' death is expressed in the poignant simile of a cow lowing for its calf (4–5), an interesting version of the grieving parent leitmotif. Menelaos is the first to avenge Patroklos by slaying one of his killers, Euphorbos (45 ff), thus leaving Hektor for Achilleus to deal with. Automedon calls to Menelaos and the Aiantes to protect Patroklos (507 ff). Menelaos is no random or accidental lynchpin here. Although Edwards suggests that his prominence may be partly due to the lack of able-bodied Achaian leaders, this does not fully acknowledge Homer's genius in exploiting cause and effect. Nor does it take into account Menelaos' thematic significance.

**Fifth apostrophe of Menelaos (17.679)**

The fifth apostrophe of Menelaos follows the eagle simile (674-678) and celebrates the hero's complete concentration on the task at hand:

---

293 The sensitive and compassionate side of Patroklos and Menelaos is alluded to in the choice of two similes in which they are likened to females (16. 7–9 by Achilleus, 17.4–5 by the poet-narrator). But the female of the species, too, can fight fiercely to protect her young. Ready offers a different interpretation of the cow simile: the calf may not be dead, and the cow lows a warning and her preparedness to fight for her calf: Ready, *Character, Narrator, and Simile*, 198–199.

Some might criticize Menelaos for being prompted by Aias to seek out Antilochos, but the preceding lion and eagle similes do not support such criticism (109 ff, 657 ff, 674 ff). Further, the pattern of a leader receiving counsel—sought or not—and deciding on its implementation is accepted political activity in the Iliad. Aias here performs a similar role to that of Nestor in advising Agamemnon. Some might argue, as Rabel does, that this action is linked to the vulnerability or "weakness" of Menelaos: the idea being that such attributes dispose a character to seek the protection of, or defence in, the co-operative effort of a group. Despite Menelaos' realistic self-assessment, his sense of justice and moral conviction impel him to take risks, sometimes beyond his physical ability. To behave in this way arguably

---

295 I cannot agree with Wilcock’s argument that Menelaos acts as Aias’ “subordinate” in the rescue attempt: Wilcock “Menelaos in the Iliad”, 227. Aias may be physically superior, but it is Menelaos as the leader who starts the exchange about saving Patroklos’ body (102–105). The criticism is also inconsistent with Menelaos’ earlier speech which is so effective in garnering the Achaian’s communal effort that the poet-narrator marks it with a direct address to the audience (260–261), as discussed above. The device of having one character call upon another to perform an act provides a neat causal link. All these factors create a more vivid and engaging effect than a mere narration of sequential actions or a too-frequent reliance on soliloquy.


297 Rabel, Plot and Point of View, 81, n. 24.
requires a greater degree of courage. He also shows true leadership in making difficult but necessary decisions: for example, realizing that Hektor has divine assistance, he cedes Achilles' armour and leaves Patroklos' corpse to find assistance. He describes this as κακών δὲ κε φέρτατον (the best of evils, 105).

Further, the poet-narrator can explore the dynamics of various relationships through such interactions. For example: in accepting and acting on the stalwart Aias' prompt, Menelaos shows good leadership. Although reluctant to leave Patroklos for a second time to find the swift-footed Antilochos, he wisely allows the others to guard his corpse after delivering a brief, poignant eulogy (669–712).

Sixth apostrophe of Menelaos (17.702)

As soon as Menelaos commissions Antilochos, the poet-narrator addresses the Spartan king:

οὐδ’ ἄρα σοι, Μενέλαε διορθεῖς, ἡθελε θυμὸς
teiroménoi étáροισιν ἀμυνέμεν, ἐνθὲν ἀπῆλθεν
Ἀντιλοχος, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Πυλίοισιν ἐτύχθη...

...so now, Menelaos, the spirit in you, illustrious,
wished not to defend his stricken companions, after Antilochos was gone from them, and his loss wrought greatly upon the Pylians...

17.702–703


The response of the poet-narrator is emphatically approving. Note the use of ἀς and σοι to create emphatic immediacy. He marvels at Menelaos’ ability to suppress his natural compassion to give priority to the urgent task of informing Achilleus and, hopefully, engage his assistance. The poet-narrator then notes, surely with implicit approval, that Menelaos does not abandon Antilochos’ companions. Menelaos sends Thrasymedes to help them before he calls on the Aiantes to develop a plan of action with him (705–714).

Book 17 closes with a joint heroic struggle: the Aiantes fight off the Trojans as Menelaos and Meriones carry the corpse. Interestingly, in contrast to the Aiantes, from the moment at which Menelaos and Meriones pick up Patroklos’ corpse (722–723), neither is named during the remaining 41 lines of the book. Perhaps this indicates the point at which the poet-narrator starts to move his focus away from Menelaos. He is no longer needed in the transition to the resolution of the story.

Fifth apostrophic event-sequence: the quarrel between Menelaos and Antilochos (23.532–613)

In the fifth and last apostrophic event-sequence (23.532–613) the poet-narrator apostrophizes Menelaos for the seventh time (23.600). As noted earlier, this event-sequence functions as the highlight of a coda at the communal level. With Hektor’s death (22.306–363), the apparent resolution of Achilleus’ wrath over Patroklos’ death has been achieved. The funeral of Patroklos can proceed (23.110–257). The

following funeral games (257–897) complete the ritual of publicly honouring and
farewelling Patroklos.

According to Labov, the coda of a narrative is one of the ways in which a narrator
signals that the narrative is finished, and that the sequences of complicating actions
and their resolutions are complete.\(^\text{301}\) Labov notes that a good coda is one that leaves
the audience with a satisfied feeling that matters have been resolved.\(^\text{302}\) Seth Schein
observes that the games provide a satisfying conclusion on many levels, which help
us, as well as the Achaians, to come to terms with the “pain and loss entailed in
being mortal”.\(^\text{303}\) For Achilleus himself the killing of Hektor is a personal act of
revenge, which does nothing to resolve his wrath and grief, but, at the communal
level, the death of the Trojans’ military commander and killer of Patroklos is a
major victory.

As a rare respite from war, the funeral games release the tension of the sombre
grandeur of Patroklos’ funeral. The poet-narrator presents all the surviving Achaian
heroes in a formal ceremonial setting that also acts as a farewell to them. Achilleus
presides as the chief mourner and gracious donor of generous prizes, which honour
both Patroklos and himself. As Redfield observes, funeral games are midway
between games and ritual. Although the funeral games do result in a distinction
between the winners and losers, they create unity among the contestants, between

\(^\text{301}\) Labov, *Language in the Inner City*, 365.


\(^\text{303}\) Seth Schein, *The Mortal Hero* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of
the contestants and the Achaian audience, and between the heroes and their dead companion.\textsuperscript{304}

In the broader structural and thematic context, Nicholas Richardson has compared Book 23 with Book 2.\textsuperscript{305} Each book comprises two halves which emphasize the public or communal. The threatened unity of the Achaian assembly of Book 2 (50–483) is balanced by the restoration of morale and order in Patroklos' funeral in Book 23 (110–257). The catalogue of ships (2.494–759) is balanced by the funeral games (23.257–897).

By devoting more than half of Book 23 (262–650) to the chariot-race and its aftermath, Homer stresses their significance.\textsuperscript{306} Communal harmony is a delicate equilibrium, and the games are subject to their own swell of tension in the form of the quarrel between Menelaos and Antilochos.\textsuperscript{307} As an example of the enactment of politics, the quarrel is a matter of public concern.\textsuperscript{308} The outcome will determine whether the newly-restored harmony can withstand the robust transactions of the


\textsuperscript{305} This paragraph is based on Nicholas Richardson, \textit{Iliad: A Commentary}, vol. 5, 164–165.

\textsuperscript{306} The subsequent seven contests are portrayed in ever-decreasing detail (23.651–897).

\textsuperscript{307} Another example: Achilleus intervenes during the chariot race to prevent an escalation in the disagreement between Idomeneus and Aias (473–498).

\textsuperscript{308} See Hammer, \textit{Iliad as Politics}, 140–141.
heroic code and its “economy of honour” or whether a new sequence of complicating action will begin.309

Diomedes wins the chariot race. Nestor’s son, Antilochos, comes second, and Menelaos a close third (526–527). Pitying the best horseman Eumelos (534) who comes last, Achilleus proposes awarding him the second prize, a mare. All the Achaian leaders approve, except for Antilochos who hotly objects (539–554). Achilleus famously smiles at Antilochos and awards Eumelos a different prize (555–565). Menelaos angrily accuses Antilochos of playing foul in the race. He calls on the leaders to adjudicate (573–578). In a move that reveals his conviction about his rights and responsibilities as a king and his moral rectitude, Menelaos changes his mind:

ει δ’ ἄγ’ ἐγὼν αὐτὸς δικάσω, καὶ μ’ οὖ τινὰ φημι ἄλλον ἐπιπλήξειν Δαναῶν: ιθεία γὰρ ἐσται. Ἀντιλόχ’ εὶ δ’ ἄγε δεύο διοπρεφές, ἢ θέμις ἐστί.

...Or rather
...come, I myself will give the judgment, and I think no other man of the Danaans can call it in question, for it will be right. Antilochos, beloved of Zeus, come here. This is justice. 23.579–581

Note the repetition on the theme of justice at the end of lines 580 and 581, perhaps indicating Menelaos’ pleasure in his new tactic. He asks Antilochos to swear an oath that he raced fairly (582–585). Antilochos backs down immediately (586–595), and Menelaos’ anger melts (597–600). He gives Antilochos the mare and a warning (601–611).

Funeral games are an imitation of war. Like war, they offer an opportunity to win κόσμος (renown), but the context is different. Redfield points to some fundamental differences. Unlike war, funeral games are governed by rules. The competition in the funeral games is not "zero sum": while the winner gains honour, it is not at the cost of the loser’s dishonour.\(^{310}\) For Menelaos, however, Antilochos’ underhand tactics have flouted the rules. In this respect, the chariot race has moved closer to real combat. Menelaos feels publicly dishonoured by Antilochos.

The quarrel as political activity

Hammer argues that because of its location and context, and the distribution of prizes as its primary cause, the quarrel is very much in the public realm.\(^{311}\) It touches on Menelaos’ sense of identity and the value he holds most dear, justice. Menelaos also has a strong awareness of occasion. When the herald hands him the staff and calls for silence, Menelaos steps forth ἵστατος ἄνδρα (a man like a god, 568). He is about to compete with a younger warrior of lesser status in a display of rhetorical skill, and his honour is at stake.

Portrayal of complex human interaction

The event-sequence is noteworthy for its realistic portrayal of complex human interaction. Even Leaf, whose introduction to Book 23 concentrates on possible interpolations, describes the quarrel as among the “most lifelike and delightful” in the Iliad.\(^{312}\) Other factors contribute to its complexity. For example, by his

---


\(^{311}\) Hammer, Iliad as Politics, 140–141.

\(^{312}\) Leaf, Iliad, vol. 2, 468.
favouritism towards Antilochos, Achilleus has arguably played an unwitting public role in increasing Antilochos’ wrongdoing in Menelaos’ eyes. Despite Menelaos’ apparent predisposition to believe in the foolishness of younger warriors, friendship—or at the very least a cordial and co-operative relationship—between Menelaos and Antilochos is alluded to on several occasions in the poem. These factors all aggravate Menelaos’ loss of face.

Antilochos’ immediate capitulation starts with a public acknowledgement of Menelaos’ higher status. The capitulation is not designed to withdraw any threat to Menelaos’ honour but to enhance it without losing face himself (587–595). Proving that he is a worthy son of Nestor, he persuasively requests Menelaos’ indulgence because:

{oioθ' oiai neou andros uperbasai telledousi:}
kraupnotepos men gar te vos, lepti de te mitys...

You know how greedy transgressions flower in a young man, seeing that his mind is the more active but his judgment is lightweight...

23.589–590

**Seventh apostrophe (23.600)**

Antilochos’ diplomatic reaction frees Menelaos from any anxiety that his honour is threatened and, thus, his inherent amiability can come to the fore and allow Antilochos to save face. Homer uses the effective combination of simile followed by

---

313 For example, his comment about the instability of young men compared to the prudence of older men (3.108–110). That a younger warrior has stolen his wife may have entrenched Menelaos’ belief about the unreliability of younger warriors. On Menelaos and Antilochos’ friendship: 5.541–575, 15.568–577, 23.570.

314 Antilochos says he will give the mare *he has won* to Menelaos (my emphasis, 591–592).
The two are again closely linked by the repetition of ἰανθή (melted or softened) in both the vehicle of the simile and its apostrophic tenor (598–599, 600).

Menelaos' reaction is presented in one of the most pleasing similes of the poem:

He [Antilochos] spoke, the son of Nestor the great-hearted, and leading the mare up gave her to Menelaos' hands. But his [Menelaos] anger was softened, as with dew the ears of corn are softened in the standing corn growth of a shuddering field. For you also the heart, o Menelaos, was thus softened within you.

23.596–600

Taplin describes the characterization of Menelaos and Antilochos as affectionate. The apostrophe expresses the poet-narrator's delighted relief and pleasure in Menelaos' reaction and invites us to share in his response.

The combination of the evidential ἡ ὡς followed by the personal pronoun σοι conveys a heightened impression that events are taking place in the immediate present. The apostrophe provides a clear evaluation of Menelaos' emotional intelligence and maturity. It inevitably invites a comparison between Agamemnon and Menelaos, and Achilleus and Antilochos. Menelaos and Antilochos' generosity towards each other stands in marked contrast with the intransigence of Agamemnon and Achilleus.

---

315 Taplin, Homeric Soundings, 256.
The closing speechframe (612) to Menelaos’ speech of reconciliation (602–6011) is the simplest formula, ἃ ὰ (he spoke). It reinforces Menelaos’ authority and dignity. The king has spoken: the matter is closed. Menelaos hands over the mare to Antilochos’ companion, and picks up the third prize (612–613). In a satisfying postscript, Achilleus complements Menelaos’ generosity by awarding the remaining prize to Antilochos’ father, Nestor (615–623).

**Menelaos the politician**

Menelaos is capable of shrewd Realpolitik as it applies to the epic world. We might have expected Menelaos to issue a stern rebuke to Antilochos, but he satisfies himself with using the protest form, albeit thrice (426–428, 439–441, and 570–585).316 This is a further difference between Menelaos and Agamemnon. Agamemnon’s powerful standing manifests itself as the licence to satisfy his personal greed, indulge his hot temper, and issue rebukes.317

Menelaos refrains from directly contesting Antilochos’ claim that the mare is his. Instead he states that he will award Antilochos his mare (my emphasis) in recognition of the service that Antilochos and his family (my emphasis) have rendered him (607–609). Thus, he cleverly plays on the young warrior’s responsibility to his family not to make trouble. He is also perhaps prudently not antagonising the influential family head, Nestor, who may not be his most ardent

---

316 Elizabeth Minchin, Homeric Voices: Discourse, Memory, Gender (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 149, 156. Her criteria for protest are: a negative reaction, a correction of the misapprehension or elaboration of consequences, and a proposal for action which is not necessarily to be undertaken by the addressee. A rebuke is more serious and generally delivered by a more powerful party.

317 Agamemnon issues the most rebukes of any character: Minchin, Homeric Voices, 151.
For his part, Antilochos has cleverly moved the issue from what Redfield describes as a “contest of competition to a contest of hospitality and gift-giving”.

Menelaos thus embeds a separate public message in his speech to Antilochos that he generously rewards those who work hard for his sake. This is the act of a shrewd leader who takes advantage of an unexpected opportunity. It also demonstrates that Menelaos embodies an important concept of heroism, which Redfield describes as the reciprocity between hero and his community.

The resolution of the quarrel increases the honour of both Menelaos and Antilochos. Achilleus outwardly fulfils his role as the host, but he remains inwardly isolated from the community. The resolution of his grief and wrath is the business of Book 24. But in the metalepsis resulting from the final apostrophe of Menelaos, the poet-narrator and both audiences—storyrealm and epic storyworld—can savour the triumph of goodwill and increased honour all round.

---

318 See Nestor’s criticism of Menelaos: 10.114–130. Alden’s interpretation of Nestor’s subsequent speech (23.626–650) about his past victories at games is that, by his lack of reaction to a race, in which he suffered unfair disadvantage, he is hinting to Menelaos that his reaction was inappropriate: Alden, Homer Beside Himself; 32–33. But Nestor’s behaviour in tales about himself is always paradigmatic. If he is hinting to Menelaos, it is not the dominant theme of his speech.


320 Scodel, Epic Facework, 44–47. Scodel suggests that Menelaos’ motivation in giving Antilochos the horse-prize is to impress the Achaians. In other words, it is a political act.

321 Redfield, Nature and Culture, 103.
Evaluation of the apostrophes of Menelaos

The apostrophes of Menelaos call for a re-appraisal of his character through their progressive revelation of his stronger and more heroic attributes. Menelaos is admittedly not in the first rank of the Achaian warriors, but Edwards rightly defends him as a "strong warrior".\footnote{Mark W. Edwards, "Homer's Iliad", in A Companion to Ancient Epic, edited by John Miles Foley (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 302–314, at 306. On Menelaos' bravery: Kahare, Interpretation of Order, 107. A further point is that Menelaos has the strength and skill to do well in the demanding chariot-race, even discounting divine interference of the best entrant (23.391 ff).} He acquits himself satisfactorily, as shown by his inclusion in lists of heroes' achievements and, significantly, by his achievements on the battlefield to which apostrophes draw our attention (13.603, 17.679, 17.702).\footnote{Examples of lists of Achaian heroes and their achievements, which include Menelaos: 5.49 ff, 8.261 ff, 14.515 ff, 16.311 ff. See also Willcock, "Menelaos in the Iliad", 222. One interpretation of the simile of the olive tree to describe Menelaos' slaying of Euphorbos (17.52–58) is that it is a small achievement. But it could express the ease with which Menelaos kills him, and so it honours Menelaos. Euphorbos is previously described as an impressive warrior (16.808–811).} His self-awareness, ability to think strategically, courage, and emotional intelligence compensate for not equalling Odysseus and Nestor in words and wiles. He leads through collaboration and chooses the right warrior for the right task (17.656–761). The way in which he resolves his quarrel with Antilochos (23.602–611) and incorporates into his speech an important political message to the assembly are also evidence of his leadership ability.

Menelaos thus occupies the difficult ground of satisfying the two qualities that a hero-warrior should display without excelling at either, but he has occasional moments of great achievement. He has no easy brilliance like Achilleus. But, importantly, he is able to hold onto his kingship in a world of strong warriors, raids,
and takeovers. Menelaos stands out in his practical commitment to justice, order, and the moral values of his time, such as honouring guest friendship.

In the context of apostrophe, scholars have generally yielded to the temptation to view Menelaos together with Patroklos and not to sufficiently differentiate between them. This has led to an emphasis on Menelaos as vulnerable at the expense of acknowledging his strengths. It is reasonable to ask whether he is more vulnerable than the other Achaians, except for Patroklos, because of a weak or softer strain in his character. Or is he more at risk because of his public persona and status? Is he vulnerable intrinsically or extrinsically? The answer lies in a complex blend. He is a greater target because his killer will gain great glory, as the event-sequence involving Pandaros illustrates (4.104–191). Where justice and honour are at stake, Menelaos can place himself at risk, as when he accepts Hektor’s challenge (7.54–122). But this requires great courage. Willcock argues that Menelaos’ sense of personal responsibility arouses his comrades’ protectiveness. Their attitude also arises from personal affection for him and recognition of his strategic importance.

The first three apostrophes (4.127–129, 4.146, 7.104) stress that both the poet-

---

324 On the ever-present provisional nature of authority in Homeric epic: Osborne, “Homer’s Society”, 213.

325 All epic heroes are vulnerable in that they are expected to place themselves at risk and face death in seeking glory. Mortals are vulnerable; the gods are not.

326 Agamemnon, too, is at greater risk but he acquits himself better in battle. What Agamemnon lacks in providing an edifying and unifying moral leadership, Menelaos offers. Thus, the two brothers compensate for each other.

327 On Menelaos’ “chivalry” impelling him to take dangerous risks: Willcock, “Menelaos in the Iliad”, 222–223. But all hero-warriors must do this to win honour. Perhaps the difference is that Menelaos’ motivation has a greater communal aspect.
narrator and the Achaians evaluate Menelaos as worth saving as an individual and leader-king.

The story and its narration do not require Menelaos to be an Aias or Diomedes. Homer has accorded him a different, quite unique role, which is brought to the fore in the apostrophes of him. Through the antithesis of public—private Menelaos provides a continuing point of comparison with Achilleus.

Menelaos' reasonableness, affability, compassion, and even his foibles such as slight pomposity endear him to us because they create a character less removed from our world than the other epic heroes. He therefore provides an ideal character-bridge between storyworld and storyrealm. The poet-narrator's modelling of empathy, goodwill and understanding towards Menelaos is convincing. It elicits a similar response from the audience. Our response and appreciation of Menelaos are enriched through the immediacy afforded by the metaleptic apostrophe. We are there to share Menelaos' relief when he does not have to face Hektor (Book 7); we celebrate his despatch of Peisandros (Book 13); and we admire his determination to rescue Patroklos' corpse (Book 17). And, as Taplin notes, we can sense—and share—the poet-narrator's smile of pleasure when Menelaos' anger against Antilochos softens (23.597–600).328

The event-sequences in which the apostrophes of Menelaos are embedded mark significant milestones in the unfolding of the plot. The intensity and nature of the narratorial response varies, as noted above. The first four apostrophic event-

328 Taplin, *Homeric Soundings*, 256.
sequences (Books 4, 7, 13, 17) provide signposts for us in the complex narrative
topography of the complicating action. The consequences of these junctures exercise
a significant causal effect on the plot, but not all are uniform in importance. From a
structural perspective, the first (the wounding of Menelaos, Book 4) and the last
apostrophic event-sequence (the rescue of Patroklos' corpse, Book 17) in the
complicating action are the most important. This is why both these event-sequences

Conclusion

Parry rightly identifies Menelaos as the character who represents the moral basis of
the Iliad. The theme of Menelaos' strategic value as the rallying point for the
Achaian is increasingly important in the apostrophic event-sequences in the
complicating action of the narrative. As the Achaian fortunes deteriorate, the poet-
narrator provides the balance of Menelaos' progression from potential victim to
increasing acts of heroism through the apostrophic event-sequences.

The apostrophic event-sequences set on the battlefield which are focussed on
Menelaos reflect the experiences of an epic hero in combat, and Menelaos' speech-
acts complement these experiences. In the first apostrophic event-sequence
Menelaos is wounded (4.134–147), and he reassures Agamemnon (4.187). In the
second, Menelaos risks death by accepting a challenge (7.101), and he rebukes the
Achaian for dishonouring their cause (7.96–103). In the third, he wounds one

329 Parry, "Language and Characterization", 15. Despite this, he argues the fundamental
issues are political. See also Osborne, "Homer's society", 219.
opponent, kills another, and, striping his armour, vaunts over him (13.593–630).

And in the fourth event-sequence, he protects a comrade’s corpse (17.722–746). In related speeches he shows leadership (17.685–693, 17.708–714), and he delivers a eulogy (17.669–672).

In his actions and speech in the apostrophic event-sequences, we can detect Menelaos’ development from potential victim (Books 4 and 7), to increasing acts of heroism in battle (Books 13 to 17). Once Achilleus hears of Patroklos’ death (Book 18) and returns to play a continuing role in the plot, there is no longer a place for Menelaos. In the fifth apostrophic event-sequence (23.596–613), Menelaos’ political acumen and εὐβουλία (good counsel) protect communal order and justify his kingly status. The apostrophic response of the poet-narrator complements Menelaos’ progression. Added to a basis of empathy and goodwill, the response moves from concern and relief (Books 4 and 7), to approval (Books 13 and 17), and approving delight (Book 23).

Although we sense the poet-narrator’s heightened goodwill and empathy for Menelaos, “sympathy” and/or “pity” do not adequately account for the poet-narrator’s emotional engagement with his character.

What is unique to all the apostrophes of Menelaos, however, is their exposition of the important theme of his communal significance which acts as a foil to Achilleus.

He also defines the more likeable and complex side of Agamemnon, thereby

rounding out his character. Yet the significance of the apostrophes of Menelaos goes beyond their contribution to character portrayal or to their content. All are notable for their structural significance in terms of distribution. Six of the apostrophes are all located in one element of the narrative structure, the complicating action, with one notable exception, the communal coda. This limited distribution supports the theory that one of the primary functions—if not the most significant—of these apostrophes is to provide a thematic and structural strand which helps bind the complex complicating action. The last apostrophe celebrates Menelaos' contribution to maintaining communal order and thereby creates a satisfying highlight to the communal coda. The limited distribution of the apostrophes of Menelaos offers us a new insight into the poet-narrator's concept of his story's structure. The first three event-sequences (Books 4, 7, 13) mark flashpoints in the gradual tightening of tension that reaches its climax in the Patrokleia (Book 16). The apostrophes of Patroklos are the subject of the next case study.
Chapter 4: Second Case Study—Patroklos

Introduction

Patroklōs’ significance to the protagonist of the Iliad, Achilleus, means that we approach the gentle hero through the prism of their relationship and largely from Achilleus’ perspective. It is often pointed out that, in presenting their unique relationship, aspects of Achilleus’ character are revealed which otherwise would remain hidden or not sufficiently stressed. Focussing on the narratorial apostrophes of Patroklōs allows us to appreciate this hero without losing sight of his thematic significance and role in the unfolding of the plot.

As with the narratorial apostrophes of Menelaos examined in Chapter Three, I shall explore the significance of the distribution of the apostrophes of Patroklōs in the context of the presentation of the narrative and its structure. I shall examine each apostrophe in the context of the event-sequences in which it appears to establish whether any pattern or progression of modelled emotions exists and how this might relate to the structure of the narrative. This study also includes some discussion of the effect that the narratorial apostrophes of Patroklōs have on the audience, how the apostrophes shape our response to his death, and how this response might influence our attitude to Achilleus, as aspects of his revenge challenge our goodwill towards him.
There is no need, as was the case with Menelaos, to establish the significance of the appealing and engaging Patroklos in the story in order to explain in part the narrator’s overt intrusion in apostrophizing him.\(^{331}\) It is still necessary, however, to explore why the poet-narrator has singled him out as one of only two recipients of multiple apostrophes in the \textit{Iliad}. Hence, I also explore how apostrophe contributes to portraying Patroklos’ character and his thematic significance in the poem.

Patroklos is a character who scholars such as Willcock, Schein, and Margaretha Kramer-Hajos argue has been given many original touches.\(^{332}\) Kramer-Hajos argues that, given his importance for plot development, it is likely that Patroklos is predominantly a literary figure. Although Homer did not entirely invent his character, he re-modelled and fleshed it out to meet the requirements of plot.\(^{333}\) Like Hektor, Patroklos is motivated by concern for friends and “dedicates his life to the service of others”.\(^{334}\) Unlike the other warrior who comes from Lokris, Oilean Aias, Patroklos is modest, a rounder character with appealing feelings and emotions.\(^{335}\)

\(^{331}\) On Patroklos as “the sweetest and most compassionate of the Homeric warriors”, uniquely gentle, and lacking the typical “heroic self-assertion”: Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 10–11.


\(^{333}\) Kramer-Hajos, “Heroes of Lokris”, 97 (n. 63), 100, 102. She notes the view that the “one dimensionality” of his character and his dependence on Achilleus have suggested to some that he is an invention of Homer and modelled on either Antilochos or Achilleus.

\(^{334}\) Kramer-Hajos, “Heroes of Lokris”, 98.

\(^{335}\) Drawn from Kramer-Hajos, “Heroes of Lokris”, 98–99. She also notes the large range of epithets (14) used for Patroklos, some of which are flattering and others are an appeal to our emotions. Oilean Aias, she contends, is a “stock character”, and his limited epithets reflect this (99).
All eight narratorial apostrophes of Patroklos are located in Book 16. All eight narratorial apostrophes of Patroklos are located in Book 16.336

Complementing and augmenting this unique concentration of overt narratorial intrusion are the final invocation of the Muses (112–113), cases of prolepsis (46 ff, 250 ff, 460 ff, 800), and narratorial “musing” (688–691).337 Less overt narratorial commentary in the apostrophic event-sequences featuring Patroklos is provided by comments, explanations, similes, and epithets.338

Because Patroklos is essential to the story of the Iliad and because of Achilleus’ emotional attachment to him, scholars have tended to give priority to Patroklos when they consider Homeric apostrophes of character. For example, in her article of 1982, Block discusses two examples of apostrophes of Patroklos in detail, but none of Menelaos. The longer discussion deals with the direct address to the audience about the fighting over Patroklos’ corpse (366 ff). The other discussion covers the first apostrophe of Patroklos after he returns to Achilleus (20).339 Much scholarship, too, has focussed on the pathos that the apostrophes of Patroklos arouse through the poet-narrator’s modelling of sympathy (or empathy) and pity to the exclusion of exploring whether other emotions are modelled and what their significance might be.

336 Apostrophes of Patroklos: 20, 584–585, 692–693, 744, 754, 787–788, 812, 843. All line references in this chapter are to Book 16 unless in block quotations or needed for clarity.

337 By narratorial musing, I refer to moments at which the poet-narrator pauses to reflect on a general truth.

338 Examples: comments (382, 530 ff); explanations (119 ff, 549 ff, 686 ff); similes (156 ff, 428 ff, 582 ff, 765); and epithets (120, 626, 717, 760, 854).

339 In fairness to Block, she could not do otherwise, given the length of her article and its scope: Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 13. Block’s detailed and helpful discussion of Patroklos’ character in relation to apostrophe is relevant (16–17). Other scholars who give a more equal weighting in their selection of examples include Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 9–22; and Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 5–16, 31.
be. Parry also rightly argues that the context of each apostrophe needs to be taken into account. For example, the context is plays a critical role in imbuing the three apostrophic speechframes with their full meaning (20, 744, 843).

Without denying the all-important "pervasive and emphatic sympathy" the poet-narrator garners for Patroklos, there is merit in ascertaining the specific emotions which he models in each apostrophe. As with my case study of Menelaos, I argue that such an approach can result in a greater appreciation of the addressee and the thematic and structural contribution of the apostrophes to the presentation of the poem. Without being inconsistent with a fundamental narratorial attitude of empathy and goodwill towards Patroklos—terms that, as I argue in Chapter 3 above, are more accurate than "sympathy", which too often leads to an assumption of, or association with, pity—it may be advantageous to the presentation of the story for the poet-narrator to model a broader, more complex range of emotion in his apostrophes.

340 Parry, "Language and Characterization", 10. He deals with six apostrophes of Patroklos but does not comment on the apostrophe during the fight over Kebriones' corpse (754) or that during Euphorbos' wounding of Patroklos (812).


342 Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 317, where he refers to the "especial application" of narratorial apostrophe to the "unusually sympathetic" figures of Menelaos and Patroklos.

343 While the context may be different, I note Wolf-Hartmut Friedrich's warning about "unjustifiable generalisation of individual observations which are actually correct" in his introduction to Wounding and Death in the Iliad, 4.

344 On the clear and consistent narratorial concern for Patroklos "shared by the audience without hesitation": Block, "Narrator Speaks", 17.
In the apostrophes where pity is not the dominant emotion modelled, pathos can still arise through either the context in which the apostrophe takes place or through some other means: for example, the disconnection between the epic character’s expectations and limited knowledge and the poet-narrator’s privileged knowledge to which he has made the storyworld audience privy. Thus, the emotions modelled in an apostrophe can be a complex blend, even contradictory.\(^{345}\)

**Background**

Four characters are essential to what Lattimore terms the “irreducible” plot of the *Iliad*—Agamemnon, Achilleus, Patroklos, and Hektor.\(^{346}\) Yet, as Beck points out, Patroklos’ role is mainly peripheral for most of the first half of the *Iliad*.\(^{347}\) When the events of the complicating action reach a crisis point, Patroklos, as Achilleus’ substitute, leads the Myrmidons into battle. His appearance in Achilleus’ armour makes it clear that he is no mere delegate. From Hektor’s point of view, when he kills Patroklos he is rehearsing killing Achilleus. Patroklos’ death then reduces Achilleus to a monomania of revenge. Although the resolution to his wrath over the quarrel with Agamemnon is resolved in Book 19 (56 ff), as noted above, Patroklos’ death has caused a second wave of complicating action and an all-consuming

\(^{345}\) A complex response to a significant event is realistic, and something to which the audience can relate. For example, it is not uncommon to laugh and cry at a funeral.


wrath. The apparent resolution—the slaying of Hektor (22.326 ff)—proves superficial: Achilleus’ grief and wrath continue.348

I shall restrict references to Patroklos’ appearances in other books of the Iliad to those which are relevant to the apostrophic event-sequences featuring him. I shall draw on Patroklos’ appearances in Books 11 and 15 because they are essential to an understanding of what motivates his actions in the Patrokleia. The references to Patroklos after his death receive less attention because, apart from his ghostly interaction with Achilles in Book 23, Patroklos becomes a point of focus whose sole function is to keep alive Achilleus’ wrath. The poet-narrator draws attention to this by referring to Patroklos (by his proper name, patronymic or anaphora) in every subsequent book after his death (Books 17–24), whereas he is referred to in only five books when he is alive (1, 9, 11, 15, 16). Thus, the poet-narrator maintains the focus on the significance of Patroklos to Achilles.

In Books 1 and 9 Patroklos’ unique closeness to Achilles is established. In Books 11 and 15 he becomes essential to the plot. He is convinced that only he is capable of persuading Achilles to help the Achaians.349

We first meet Patroklos in Book 1 after the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles. The poet-narrator simply states that Achilles withdraws to his shelter with Patroklos and his companions (306–307). It is Patroklos whom Achilles asks

---


to fetch Briseis for Agamemnon’s heralds (337–338). Thus, the poet-narrator shows rather than tells or explains Patroklos’ standing as Achilleus’ closest companion.

We next encounter Patroklos in the Embassy (Book 9), in which we learn more about his relationship with Achilleus. Achilleus’ rejection of Agamemnon’s offer plays an essential part of the plot. The delegation encounters Achilleus playing his lyre and singing about κλέος, glory (185–188). Only Patroklos is with him, watching him in silence (190–191). The poet-narrator comments on their close physical proximity. When Achilleus stands to greet the visitors, so does Patroklos (193–195). This scene encapsulates the dynamics of their relationship. It prepares us for the intimate context of their conversation at the beginning of Book 16, in which the first narratorial apostrophe of Patroklos is located (16.20). As well as being the premier Achaian warrior, Achilleus is the courteous and hospitable head of the Myrmidons (9.196–204). The Myrmidon camp functions at one level as a kind of oίκος (household). Patroklos fulfils the supportive role, making arrangements for hospitality (9.205–220, 658–661). As in the quarrel, he plays no role in the discussion or decision-making. But he is always at Achilleus’ side.

---

350 Schein points out that Achilleus’ action determines the consequences of three critical points in the Iliad: the quarrel with Agamemnon (Book 1), the Embassy (Book 9), and the reaction to Patroklos’ death (Book 18): Schein, Mortal Hero, 35.

351 Such is their understanding that Achilleus need only silently nod a request to Patroklos (9.620–621).

352 The poet-narrator also defines their relationship in the description of their sleeping arrangements: each takes a corner inside the shelter with a woman captured by Achilleus (9.663–668).
W. M. Clarke notes that many in antiquity thought the two were lovers and that modern scholars have debated this issue. Whether their love for each other had a sexual dimension is largely irrelevant. The intense emotional attachment between the two is what defines their relationship. It also reflects the difference in status and power between the two heroes. Achilleus is more heroic or warlike and a leader. Patroklos is the older, yet lower in status. Clarke notes that Patroklos' deferential attitude towards Achilleus reflects a deep intimacy and dependency. Although this may reflect Patroklos' basic attitude to Achilleus, other aspects of his character emerge in the *Patrokleia*. For example, his concern for the Achaians triggers a more assertive side in the hero, whom Menelaos eulogises as ἐνηείης (gentle, 17.670) and μείλιχος (kindly, 17.671). Achilleus' equal dependency on Patroklos is critical to the plot. Mutual "enmeshment" is perhaps a more accurate description of the relationship. Separation from Patroklos through death and guilt at his role in bringing about Patroklos' death make life unbearable for Achilleus. The poet-narrator enables the audience to experience Patroklos' reciprocal feelings for

---

353 W. M. Clarke, "Achilles and Patroclus in Love", *Hermes*, 106.3 (1978), 281-396. Clarke sums up various views about this issue from antiquity onwards. He observes that the only indication which might imply a sexual relationship is open to debate because it is based on a determinative interpretation of περί (24.130-131). Clarke points out that the 5th Century BCE idealisation of the relationship between older man and a youth is irrelevant to the epic world of heroes (338-339), Janko's term "heroic friendship" does not adequately describe the intensity of the relationship: Janko, *Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 4, 328.


355 In his brief eulogy Menelaos stresses Patroklos' defining attributes. These attributes also appeal to Menelaos' own concept of self. Parry observes that the poet-narrator refers to Patroklos as ἐνηείης (gentle) four times in the poem: Parry, "Language and Characterization", 11.

Achilleus through his phantom’s direct speech: his phantom asks that their bones be buried together and that their ashes be placed in the precious urn which Thetis gave to her son (23.69–92).

Like Menelaos, Patroklos is notable for his concern for the common good of the Achaian host (11.803–820). Like Menelaos, he expresses this instinctively in his behaviour. For example, Patroklos delays his return to Achilleus to tend to Eurypylus’ wounds (11.827–847). Just as Menelaos acts as a foil to Agamemnon, so Patroklos’ concern for the Achaian host and his ability to see the bigger picture act as a foil to the individual and often egocentric Weltanschauung of Achilleus. Like Achilleus, Patroklos is innately courteous, as illustrated by the manner in which he declines Nestor’s invitation (11.647–653) and by Briseis’ eulogy for him, with its emphasis on his comforting kindness at its start and end (19.287–300). Patroklos’ speech to Nestor in Book 11 contains an affectionate but clear-eyed assessment of Achilleus (652–653). Such touches prevent the presentation of his devotion from being unrealistic or overly sentimental.


358 Kahane suggests that Menelaos and Patroklos are the “more sympathetic antitheses” of Agamemnon and Achilleus because the latter are “in their own way intransigent and larger than life and poor candidates” for apostrophe: Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 112. See also Edwards, Homer's Iliad, 306. Schein reminds us that, under normal circumstances, Achilleus is also concerned for the Achaians’ welfare. This concern motivated his call for an assembly in Book 1 (45 ff): Schein, Mortal Hero, 117.
Analysis of apostrophic event-sequences

Distribution

Seven of the eight apostrophes are located within the last third of the *Patrokleia* and, of these, six within the last fifth. The first apostrophe at line 20 is contained in a speechframe in the conversation between Patroklos and Achilleus (6–100). The poet-narrator waits some 564 lines before apostrophizing Patroklos again.

The eight apostrophes of Patroklos are located in five event-sequences: the decisive conversation between Achilleus and Patroklos which opens Book 16 (1–100, apostrophe at line 20); Patroklos' killing of Sthenelaos (569–592, apostrophe at lines 584–585); his slaughter of nine warriors followed by his attempt to enter Troy (684–711, apostrophe at lines 692–693); his vaunt over Kebriones' corpse and attempt to take his armour (731–764, apostrophes at lines 744 and 754); and the killing of Patroklos and his final speech (783–857, apostrophes at lines 787–788, 812, and 843).359

Thus, the increasing tension as Patroklos hurls himself, unaware, towards his fate is reflected in the increasing concentration of apostrophes within the event-sequences themselves: the first three event-sequences contain one apostrophe, the fourth has two, and the final one has three.360

---

359 See Appendix B for a list of event-sequences and Appendix C for a chart of the distribution of all the four categories of apostrophe: apostrophes of character, direct addresses to the audience, invocations of the Muses and faded invocations.

Overview of non-apostrophic event-sequences in Book 16

Before turning to the common aspects that I have identified in the apostrophes of Patroklos, let us consider on some of the scenes and episodes that fall between the apostrophic event-sequences. Not surprisingly, two-thirds of these scenes are concentrated between the first and second apostrophic event-sequences, that is, between lines 101–568.

Book 15 concludes with Telamonian Aias on an Achaian ship, fighting off the Trojans (674–746). The poet-narrator breaks off his account to focus on Patroklos and Achilleus’ conversation at the beginning of Book 16. He then returns to Aias (101–111). Making his final invocation of the Muses in the song, the poet-narrator draws attention to the decisive moment:

\[ \text{Tell me now, you Muses who have your homes on Olympos, how fire was first thrown upon the ships of the Achaians.} \]

This switch in scene links Patroklos’ first-hand experience of the disturbing consequences of the battle (11.805 ff, 15.395 ff) with his return to Achilleus (Book 16). It also comes very close to meeting the conditions for Achilleus to end his isolation—when Hektor brings fire to the Myrmidon ships (9.649–655)—and thus increases our anticipation.

---

361 I shall refer to “scenes” from here on in this section rather than “scenes and episodes”.

362 As explained in Chapter 2 above, Minchin explains the function of invocations as a bid to re-engage the audience’s attention before certain special turning points. They also acknowledge the Muses’ support: Minchin, Resources of Memory, 170–172.
When Homer switches back to Achilleus and Patroklos, we see them as public figures. Achilleus stands up and slaps his thighs, signalling he will respond actively to the emergency. He orders Patroklos to arm, and assembles the Myrmidons (124–129).

The Myrmidons’ battle preparations fall into two scenes: the first is a detailed arming scene (130–154) where the poet-narrator deliberately plays on audience expectations raised by typical arming scenes which precede a critical phase of the poem. Patroklos does not take up Achilleus’ spear, which is somewhat similar to the Excalibur, in that only its owner can wield it (140–144). This exception to the usual arming scene sounds a warning that Patroklos will not be able to match Achilleus’ prowess as a warrior. The mortal trace-horse brought out for Achilleus’ immortal horses can also be seen as a symbol of Patroklos’ fate (152–154). Homer then presents the second scene, the Myrmidons’ muster and the ritual pre-battle prayers (155 ff). The mini-catalogue format heralds their military re-engagement in

363 Homer uses the same body language to express Patroklos’ dismay at the Achaians’ situation in battle (15.397–398).

364 Achilleus is not yet ready to go back into battle but he cannot hide his concern. He exhorts the Myrmidons (200–209), and makes the ritual pre-battle libation and prayers (220 ff). Only when the Myrmidons are marching to war, does Patroklos assume leadership (268 ff).

365 See “Arming-Scenes”, in The Homer Encyclopedia, vol. 1, edited by Margalit Finkelberg (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 97. Practical considerations dictate the order: the warrior puts on greaves and cuirass; he slings his sword over his shoulders; dons his helmet; and picks up his spear.

366 In Achilleus’ case, no quasi-magical element is involved: the poet-narrator explains that nobody has the strength to use Achilleus’ spear except its owner.

367 Griffin, Life and Death, 36.
a ceremonial manner (168 ff). Achilleus exhorts the Myrmidons (200 ff) and supplicates Zeus that Patroklos may drive back the Trojans and return safely (220–248). We learn of Zeus’ response immediately:

\[\text{τῷ δ’ ἔτερον μὲν ἐδώκε πατήρ, ἔτερον δ’ ἀνένευσε:}
\[\text{νηὼν μὲν οἱ ἀπώσασθαι πόλεμον τε μάχην τε}
\[\text{δώκε, σῶν δ’ ἀνένευσε μάχης ἔξαπονέσθαι.}

The father granted him one prayer, and denied him the other. That Patroklos should beat back the fighting on the vessels he allowed, but refused to let him come back safe out of the fighting.

16.250–252

The double schema of tantalising announcement (250) followed by clarification and elaboration strengthens the tension-raising effect of this instance of prolepsis.

Patroklos exhorts the Myrmidons in his new role as their military commander (269–274). A series of battle scenes follows, which culminates in Patroklos killing Sarpedon.

A series of revenge-killings follows, in which the poet-narrator addresses Patroklos direct for the second time (584–585). The Sarpedon-episodes, including his death, 368 The Myrmidons are keen to go to war and have been complaining about Achilleus’ intransigence, as he acknowledges through the embedded direct speech (203–206) within his exhortation (199–208). Embedded direct speech provides insights into the character and concerns of the speaker. See de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 37–39.

Patroklos focuses on earning honour for Achilleus so that Agamemnon recognizes his ἀτύχη (reckless transgression, 274) in dishonouring Achilleus. Patroklos does not refer to saving comrades-in-arms. I believe that his evaluation signals the emergence of his bellicose side. Schein observes that when Patroklos dons Achilleus’ armour, he effectively loses his own identity and characteristic gentleness: Schein, Mortal Hero, 34–35.

A central panel featuring Sarpedon’s death and the fight for his armour takes up approximately one-third of Book 16 (394–683). On the causal linkages between the deaths of the three warriors, see Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 311–312.
are part of the extended build-up to Patroklos' death. Patroklos' recklessness and confidence increase with his success in battle and—as time runs out for him.

Apostrophic event-sequences now alternate with non-apostrophic sequences as the pace quickens. Apostrophized for the third time (692–693) as he slaughters nine warriors, Patroklos forgets Achilleus' earlier injunctions and attempts to take Troy (698–711). The poet-narrator apostrophizes him for the fourth time (744) before his vaunt over his next victim Kebriones. The fifth apostrophe (754) marks his attempt to take the Trojan's armour. Both sides become involved and the Achaians finally seize Kebriones' armour (766–782). The drawn-out climax, the killing of Patroklos, then takes place.

As with the apostrophes of Menelaos, all but the first of the apostrophes of Patroklos take place on the battlefield and during fighting with other hero-warriors.371

First apostrophic event-sequence: Patroklos and Achilleus (1–100)

When Patroklos returns from the public theatre of war to Achilleus, the poet-narrator laconically informs his audience that:

---

371 Although the location of first apostrophe of Patroklos (the Myrmidon camp) and the last of Menelaos (the funeral games) do not take place on the battlefield, I include them as part of the broader setting of war. I discuss the location of the two other apostrophes which do not occur on the battlefield itself (the apostrophe of Achilleus, 20.2, and the second of Apollo, 20.152) in Chapter 5.
Meanwhile Patroklos came to the shepherd of the people, Achilleus, and stood by him...

It is left to the audience to visualize where this takes place. It could be inside Achilleus' shelter, or at a place where he is sitting apart from his Myrmidons, perhaps on the seashore, where he tends to go when troubled. The Myrmidon camp is characterized by frustrated inactivity compared to the frenetic activity on the nearby battlefield. Homer does not specify the exact physical location where the conversation takes place because it does not matter: Patroklos and Achilleus are communicating in a private, self-contained psychological domain. They alone are in sharp focus. This reflects both the intimacy of their relationship and the critical importance of the consequences of their discussion for the plot. Unlike the storyrealm audience, no storyworld characters are privy to their conversation.

The first apostrophic event-sequence (1–100) is notable for its very small proportion of narrative text: the exchange of three speeches between Patroklos and Achilleus takes up 90 lines. This is their longest conversation in the poem. The narrative text comprises 10 lines, three of which are speechframes. One is apostrophic and therefore can be considered as a speech-act by the poet-narrator (20).

372 Thetis finds Achilleus weeping alone on the strand after Briseis has been taken from him (1.348–350). After the funeral games, as others eat then sleep, he paces by the sea mourning Patroklos (24.11–12).

373 Achilleus himself alludes to this (207–209). As well as being isolated from the Achaians, he is increasingly isolated from his men.

includes the simile about Patroklos’ tears (3–4) and the prolepsis concerning his death (46–47). The real time of direct speech allows us to appreciate the dynamics of the relationship, and it portrays the speakers’ characters as defined by their unique interaction. The conversation also satisfies the demands of cause.

Using a prominently-placed simile, the poet-narrator draws our attention to Patroklos’ compassion and concern for the Achaians:

δάκων θεομάχε πέτρα, ὡς τε κρήνη μελάνυδρος, ἢ τε κατ’ αἰγύλιπος πέτρος δυναφόν χέει ὕδωρ.

[Patroklos]...wept warm tears, like a spring dark-running That down the face of a rock impassable drips its dim water. 16.3–4

Achilleus takes pity on Patroklos and affectionately teases him with the delightful simile of the tearful girl-child (6–11). Clarke describes this as “unparalleled in Homer, and virtually in ancient literature”. Achilleus then poses two questions to Patroklos which have a note of disingenuousness. The third, however, is quite pointed, and ends on a note of sarcasm which, I suggest, is directed at Agamemnon, not Patroklos (12–19):

---

376 Gentle teasing is not inconsistent with affection and intimacy. See Elizabeth Minchin, “From Gentle Teasing to Heavy Sarcasm: Instances of Rhetorical Irony in Homer’s Iliad”, Hermes, 138.4 (2010), 387–402. She argues the “affectionate and easy” tone of Achilleus’ speech reassures Patroklos and gives him the courage to speak up (396). Janko, however, describes Achilleus’ subsequent questioning as “brusque and ironic”, aimed at hiding his pity: Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 309, 314. My interpretation is that what starts as gentle teasing progresses to a jibe in Achilleus’ third question (discussed above). This provokes Patroklos’ spirited response.

In the opening speechframe of Patroklos’ reply the poet-narrator employs his first apostrophe:

τὸν δὲ βαρὺ στενάχων προσέφης Πατρόκλεως ἵππευ...

*Then groaning heavily, Patroklos the rider, you answered...*

16.20

The use of βαρὺ στενάχων (heavily groaning) in the apostrophic speechframe reveals that the poet-narrator wants us to appreciate that Achilleus’ affectionate banter has the opposite effect to that intended. It does not comfort Patroklos but adds to his distress. It is important to remember that Patroklos has recently been primed by Nestor’s persuasion (11. 655–802); he has received an update on the battle from the wounded Eurypyllos (11.821–835); and, from Eurypyllos’ shelter, he has seen the Trojans swarming towards the Achaian ships (15.395–396). Karl

378 Janko notes that asking questions when the answers are not true is typical of epic and oral tradition: Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 316. When Achilleus refers to the dying Achaians in his third question, which he knows is the real reason for Patroklos’ distress, he deals with his guilt by shifting the blame.

379 The poet-narrator also links βαρὺ στενάχων (groaning heavily) in an opening speechframe after a similar water simile which emphasizes Agamemnon’s cespair (9.16).

Reinhardt rightly points out that Patroklos has undergone an inner transformation at the end of Book 11.381

Patroklos' response is a protest, which includes a forthright assessment of Achilleus' hardness, pride and that temper (29–35). Only Patroklos could get away with such frankness.382 Although his close relationship with Achilleus permits him to make a private protest, the fundamental power imbalance in the relationship would make a rebuke inappropriate.383 In his agitated state Patroklos relies on Nestor's words but he presents them as if they were his own. He proposes that he lead the Myrmidons into battle in Achilleus' armour (36–45).384 Using Nestor's words might also indicate a degree of nervousness about his ability to overcome Achilleus' obduracy.385

381 This change is due to Patroklos' compassion and his own ambition and Nestor's persuasion. Er [Patroklos] geht als ein Verwandelter (he sets off a changed man, my translation): Karl Reinhardt, Die Ilias und ihr Dichter (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1961), 264.

382 On Homeric protest, as distinct from rebuke, see Minchin, Homeric Voices, 147–160. Minchin points out that, despite the power imbalance, Patroklos has touched Achilleus' affection for the wounded Achaian leaders.

383 According to Minchin's analysis, it is only Patroklos' phantom which can rebuke Achilleus (23.69–92). See Minchin, Homeric Voices, 150–155. A rebuke generally includes criticism of the addressee's behaviour and a directive: 157. See also Schein, Mortal Hero, 117.

384 This is a common ploy in making requests from a more powerful or difficult person. Compare these lines with 11.793–802. In an example of different focalization by characters, Nestor refers to the splendid quality of Achilleus' armour (11.797), whereas Patroklos subtly stresses its purpose (16.40). See also Rabel, Plot and Point of View, 157.

385 Schein, Mortal Hero, 118. Patroklos has seen how the members of the embassy—Odysseus and even Phoinix, for whom Achilleus has such affection—have failed to change Achilleus' mind (9.225–317, 421–619).
In the closing speechframe to Patroklos’ speech the poet-narrator models an emotional response to the speech that expresses greater pity than the apostrophe in the opening speechframe (20):

\[\text{ος φατο λοσόμενος μέγα νήπιος: ἦ γὰρ ἐμελλέν \}\]
\[\text{οι αὐτῷ θάνατον τε κακὸν καὶ κῆρα λιτέσθαι.}\]

So he spoke supplicating in his great innocence; this was his own death and evil destruction he was entreating.

16.46–47

The effect of prolepsis is unlike that of apostrophe in that the poet-narrator does not conflate the barriers between storyrealm and storyworld. He evaluates Patroklos’ speech with a comment that draws attention to the tragic irony of Patroklos’ supplication by using the polyptoton of λίσομαι (supplicate) in lines 46 and 47. The polyptoton links the illocutionary element of the speechframe with the explanatory prolepsis which echoes that of Zeus (15.64–67).\(^{386}\) The poet-narrator models explicit pity with μέγα νήπιος (greatly innocent, 46, my emphasis). Griffin cites νήπιος (innocent, foolish) as an example of a comment that stands between the “expressive quality” of direct speech and the “dispassionate” narratorial manner.

The dominant narratorial response is one of compassionate empathy and understanding of the cause of Patroklos’ distress. An element of pity is also present.\(^{387}\) Through his choice of οἰκτείω (to pity, 5), the poet-narrator allows

\(^{386}\) On Levinson’s definitions of various speech-acts: de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 200–208. Boasting, supplicating and rebuking are examples of illocutionary speech acts (201). De Jong notes that most Homeric speech acts in speechframes are locutionary or neutral (202).

\(^{387}\) For a discussion of my use of the term empathy, see Chapter 3 above.
Achilleus’ response to Patroklos to dominate the opening scene.\textsuperscript{388} We warm, as we are meant to, to Achilleus’ reaction. The simile in his speech reflects greater pity, even if it is cloaked in affectionate teasing (6–11).\textsuperscript{389}

The proposition that the prolepsis models greater narratorial pity than the apostrophe can be defended on two counts. The first is that it is not appropriate for the poet-narrator to model greater pity than does Achilleus at this point. Patroklos is not facing any danger at this point in the poem. His tears persuade us, the audience, of his great capacity for compassion and concern for the Achaian host. The tears evoke great pity in Achilleus. Second, the low to moderate level of pity modelled in the apostrophe allows for a gradual increase of narratorial pity in the subsequent apostrophes, which is expressed as Patroklos moves closer to death—especially the last three apostrophes during the event-sequence of his wounding and death (787–788, 812, and 843).

Janko and Ruth Scodel remark on the complexity of Achilleus’ response to Patroklos (49–100). Janko observes that Achilleus vacillates between his concern for his honour and his “unstated wish” to save the Achaians.\textsuperscript{390} It is a strangely

\textsuperscript{388} Aristarchus’ emendation of θάμμησεν (he was astounded) for ὠκτειμένον (he pitied), noted by Did.T is not supported. Aristarchus’ reasoning is that Achilleus would not have teased Patroklos if he had felt pity for him. But, as noted, gentle teasing is not inconsistent with affection and compassion.

\textsuperscript{389} On Achilleus’ use of the simile of a tearful girl, which unconsciously reveals his attitude to Patroklos as that of a protective parent: Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 316. There are parallels with Agamemnon’s attitude towards Menelaos. Older siblings can model parental traits. Griffin contends that it is natural to compare Achilleus’ grief for Patroklos with that of a father: Griffin, \textit{Life and Death}, 123.

endearing and complex blend of resentment against Agamemnon, concern about the Trojan advance, affectionate concern for Patroklos, and ambition. Achilleus sees it as his prerogative to lead an assault on Troy with Patroklos by his side. He tries to secure Patroklos' safe return by repeating his order for Patroklos to return once he has driven the Trojans away from the ships (87, 95). The privileged knowledge of the audience (8.473–488, 15.64–77) renders Achilleus' precautionary orders tragic.391

The first apostrophic event-sequence thus reinforces Patroklos' compassion as the primary motivation for his supplication to Achilleus. No simile precedes or follows the first narratorial apostrophe. The dominance of direct speech is deliberate: we are allowed to experience this crucial interaction without any intermediary. The narrative text is stripped back to a minimum, and the narratorial intrusion is deft and sparing. The intensely private nature of the discussion abruptly shifts to public or communal concerns when Patroklos and Achilleus discuss battle preparations in the following scene.

**Intervening scenes between first and second apostrophic event-sequence**

The length, detail and focus of the Myrmidon preparations (101–256 or 18 per cent of the *Patrokleia*) form a solemn overture to the battle scenes, the first of which (394–568 or 20 per cent of the *Patrokleia*) establishes Patroklos' credentials as a warrior. For example, he is the first to kill (284–292). The presentation of blood, dust, broken chariots, trapped warriors and fast movement in these scenes is vivid: our

---

391 On the audience's ironic perspective which renders tragic Achilleus' orders to Patroklos and his prayer to Zeus to save Patroklos: Schein, *Mortal Hero*, 120.
imagination is stimulated by appealing to three senses—auditory, visual and olfactory.

Because the second apostrophic event-sequence (569–592) falls within the important Sarpedon panel of the Patrokleia (394–683), it is fitting to make some observations on the lead-up to the event-sequence. A scene on Mt. Olympos (431–461) is central to the evaluation of the death of Sarpedon because it stresses Zeus' great attachment to his son. Zeus weeps tears of blood over Sarpedon's impending death (459–461).392 His reaction evokes two continuing poignant leitmotifs throughout the poem: the grieving father—even Zeus cannot save his son—and death far from home, which are relevant to the fate of both Patroklos and Achilleus. The scene also provides relief from the battlefield. It reminds us that there is another audience, the knowing one of the gods within the storyworld.

When Sarpedon dies, he calls for his companions to protect his corpse (492–501).393 Patroklos pulls out his spear with Sarpedon’s midriff attached to it (503–505).394 The scholiast asks why the gentle Patroklos would be brutal enough to perform such an action. This ignores the fact that Patroklos in war is just the same as any other

392 On the special nature of Zeus' tears honouring Sarpedon: Griffin, Life and Death, 190. Zeus considers saving his son’s life, but Hera reminds him that the other gods will not tolerate any attempt to change fate (440–457).

393 The leitmotif of removing a fallen warrior’s armour is continued with the fight between Patroklos and Hektor for Kebriones’ armour (751–782).

394 In the fourth apostrophic event-sequence featuring Menelaos, he steadies his foot on Peisandros’ corpse to remove his victim’s armour (13.618–619). It is possible that this casual treatment of a warrior’s corpse may have been a particular insult. Agamemnon also sets his heel on the dead Adrestos to remove his spear (6.63–65).
warrior.\textsuperscript{395} In killing Sarpedon, whom the poet-narrator describes as the \textit{\varepsilon\omega\mu\alpha} (stay, protector) of Troy (549), Patroklos wins great \kappa\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma (renown). But his action illustrates Karl Reinhardt's point that a chance event with major consequences is an important element in the poem. Glaukos urges the Trojans to defend Sarpedon's corpse (538–547), and Patroklos exhorts the Achaians to take his armour (556–561). Zeus turns day to night. The howling armies clash (563–568). Slaying Sarpedon marks a critical turning point because it makes Zeus focus on settling his plan for Patroklos (644–655).\textsuperscript{396}

**Second apostrophic event-sequence: Patroklos the victorious warrior (569–592)**

A series of four revenge killings take place (569–631). The first and most important triggers the second apostrophic event-sequence (569–592). Hektor avenges Sarpedon by killing the Myrmidon Epeigeus (569–580).\textsuperscript{397} Patroklos reacts with \digamma\chi\omicron\omicron\varsigma (anguish), and he seeks revenge.

The vehicle portion of the simile likens Patroklos' movement through the enemy ranks to a hawk, a suitably predatory creature. The tenor contains the second apostrophe (584–585):

\textsuperscript{395} On the theme of defiling a corpse as revenge: Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 386.

\textsuperscript{396} Reinhardt, \textit{Die Ilias und ihr Dichter}, 338; Bernard Fenik, \textit{Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad} (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1968), 201–204.

\textsuperscript{397} Like Patroklos, Epeigeus sought asylum with Peleus because he had committed manslaughter. Although Patroklos' background is mentioned only in his phantom's speech (23.84–90), it is possible that Homer's audience would have known about it. For an argument that Epeigeus' death does not prefigure that of Patroklos: Fenik, \textit{Typical Battle Scenes}, 206–207. For a summary of views: Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 387.
And he pressed on straight through the front ranks like a swift hawk, who puts to flight both jackdaws and starlings:

So, straight for the Lykians, o lord of horses, Patroklos, you swept, and for the Trojans, heart angered for your companion.

This continues the raptor motif that described the start of Patroklos and Sarpedon’s duel (428–429). It also prefigures that used to convey the Achaians scattering before Hektor and Aineias (17.755–757).

Both the vehicle and apostrophized tenor of the simile start with words emphasizing Patroklos’ swift retaliation: ἵθυσεν (he made straight for, 582); ὁκέι (swift, 583); ἕθυς (straight, 584); and ἐσού (you rushed, 585). We note the pattern of ABAC through the use of polyptoton (ἵθυσεν and ἕθυς). The enjambment in the extended apostrophe of lines 584 into 585 conveys the dramatic action, as does the cadence created at the caesurae in these lines (Ἀυκίων, Lykians, 584; Τρώων, Trojans, 585). Block’s interpretation of the switch from second to third person pronoun within the hexameter is that it calls attention to the special nature of the poet-narrator’s response—his “emphatic sympathy and involvement”. She notes that oral delivery would emphasize the switch in pronouns. The apostrophe ends with an explanation of Patroklos’ motivation—κεχόλωσο δὲ κήρ ἐτάφοιο (he was...

---

396 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 17. The next apostrophe (692–693) is another example. The pathos is much stronger, and its effect stresses compassion as Patroklos’ initial or true motivation before he becomes intoxicated with success in battle.
angered in his heart for his companion, 585). Observe the progression of his emotions from sorrow, just a few lines earlier:

Πατρόκλω δ’ ἄρ’ ἄχος γένετο φθιμένου ἔταρχοι.

And a fury took hold of Patroklos for his fallen companion. 16.581 (my translation)399

We see a different side of Patroklos. His compassion and grief have been transformed into a vehement drive for revenge. In the apostrophe (584–585) the poet-narrator models understanding and approval of Patroklos’ motivation and action.400 The poet-narrator prolongs the effect of metalepsis to stress this important inner transformation.

**Context for the third apostrophic event-sequence**

The poet-narrator reflects the tradition’s anthropomorphic view of the gods in his presentation of the contrasting aspects of Zeus.401 We see Zeus, as a grieving father, give an order to Apollo to take Sarpedon’s corpse to his homeland for burial (667–683). Although he may appear as the puppet-master who actualizes fate, Zeus himself is also subject to fate. He decides to bring about Patroklos’ destruction by

---

399 In yet another example of foreshadowing in the *Patrokleia*, Patroklos’ fury over a companion’s death presages Achilleus’ extreme wrath. Foreshadowing functions as a marker of a key point or theme.

400 This approving apostrophe is similar in tone to that of the apostrophe of Menelaos when he is about to kill Peisandros (13.603). Janko argues that this extended apostrophe maintains our goodwill towards Patroklos despite the increasing ferocity of both sides: Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 388.

401 Griffin stresses the importance of viewing the gods as gods—immortal, all-pervasive and omnipotent. He criticizes approaches that reduce the gods’ divinity to merely that of a higher authority or seek to explain motivation in a purely sociological manner: Griffin, *Life and Death*, 144–178. Although he concedes that gods can be frivolous, Griffin argues that Homeric epics must be seen against “the background of the gods and the dead” (162).
granting him more honour which will cause Hektor’s retreat to Troy (652–655). Thus, Patroklos will be tempted to over-reach himself by following Hektor to the city.

**Third apostrophic event-sequence: the gods summon the victorious Patroklos to his death (684–711)**

The third apostrophic event-sequence (684–711) functions as the liminal moment between Patroklos as victor and Patroklos as victim. He pursues the retreating Trojans μέγ’ ἄσθη (in a great frenzy, 685). This phrase conveys Patroklos’ exact moment of error in judgement that will lead implacably to his destruction.402

A tone of regret—and perhaps frustration—marks the enjambment of νήπιος (innocent fool), which starts the following line (686).403 The poet-narrator digresses to offer a tantalizing but unrealistic alternative to the traditional outcome for Patroklos:

...εἰ δὲ ἔπος Πηληθάδαο φύλαξεν,
ἡ τ’ ἀν ὑπέκφυγε κῆρα κακὴν μέλανος θανάτωιο.

... if he had kept the command of the son of Peleus
he might have escaped the evil doom of black death.

16.686–687 (my translation)

402 Lattimore translates this as “in a huge blind fury” which emphasizes both intensity and ignorance: Iliad of Homer, 348. See also Naoko Yamagata, Homeric Morality (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 50–55: Yamagata notes that ἄτη, of which the cognate verb is αἴω, describes a temporary state of mind in which errors are made which lead to misfortune, regardless of whether it is god-sent or not.

403 The poet-narrator uses νήπιος comments to presage doom. See Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 397.
Homer plays on audience expectations by positing the tantalising possibility of evading death. Note the unequivocal evaluation of death conveyed by the juxtaposition of the two adjectives bracketed by doom or fate and death: κῆρα κακῆν μέλανος θανάτων (the evil doom of black death).404

Richardson argues that when the poet-narrator describes a hypothetical other outcome this is like taking us behind the “scenes of plot construction” and serves primarily as mechanism to raise tension.405 The use of an unfulfilled conditional in the past makes it clear that escaping his fate was never a viable alternative for Patroklos. The act of articulating what might have been has a melancholic effect and causes an anticipatory spike of pathos.

Zeus continues to shape the fulfilment of his plan: he imbues Hektor with the desire to retreat (656–658). Homer uses a gnomic construction to engage in a rare narratorial musing on the power of Zeus to make a mortal behave as he sees fit (688–690).406 Now Zeus imbues Patroklos with θυμος or passion (691). The

404 For a discussion of κῆρας (Κήη: the goddess of death, so fate or doom): Griffin, *Life and Death*, 43. According to LSJ the noun is especially used to describe a violent death. Fenik notes that lines 864–688 have been “widely held” to be an interpolation. He argues, however, that they “clearly” belong to a category of summary scenes where the poet-narrator interrupts his narration to restate main points or offer commentary: Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes*, 211.

405 See Richardson, *Homeric Narrator*, 187–195. Richardson argues that, in offering a different outcome, the poet-narrator tacitly asking us to compare it with the better choice he has made—that is, “according to the tradition, according to the divine plan” (189). There is, however, some scope for originality. Richardson cites, as examples, delaying Achilles’ return to battle for as long as possible and developing a minor character. He offers Patroklos as a possible illustration of the latter (188–189).

406 See Block, “Narrative Judgment and Audience Reception”, 165. Narratorial comment on the power of the gods is rare and it appears more often in characters’ direct speech: Janko, Iliad: *A Commentary*, vol. 4, 397–398. I agree with van der Valk’s defence of line 689, discussed by Janko: the emphasis on Zeus’ omnipotence makes Patroklos’ fate more tragic.
narratorial musing establishes an appropriately solemn tone before the third apostrophe (692–693). Block notes that the Homeric poet-narrator uses aphoristic commentary rarely because more frequent use would encourage the audience to reflect on “a world beyond the scope of the poem”. 407

The combination of unusual narratorial reflection and extended apostrophe of character draws our attention to the importance of what is about to happen.

> ἐνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ ’ οἴσασιν ἐξενάριζας,  
> Πατρόκλεις, ὅτε δὴ ὑπὲ θεοὶ θάνατος δὲ καλέσαν;  
> Then who was it you slaughtered first, who was the last one,  
> Patroklos, as the gods called you to your death?  
> 16.692–693

The third apostrophe is a hybrid: the first half takes the form of a formulaic introduction to a faded invocation—otherwise addressed to the audience—with its “who was the first and who the last?” formula. This formula elsewhere precedes a list of slain warriors, and so it has a connection with death. 408 A first-time audience would expect such a list. But the second-person form of the verb reveals that the poet-narrator is addressing Patroklos. 409 Kahane notes that this is the only apostrophe of Patroklos where his name begins a line. But because it comes in the middle of the apostrophe, Kahane argues that it has the same force as “verse-  


408 Three faded invocations introduce catalogues of slain heroes with the form “who was the first?” form (5.703 ff, 8.274, and 11.299 ff): Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 12, n.21.

409 This is a very short but effective case of causing false anticipation in a first-time audience, but it is not an instance of what Morrison terms misdirection because it is not a prediction: James Morrison, False Predictions in the Iliad (Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1992), 14, 20.
“internal” apostrophes: it signifies the poet-narrator’s special interest and sympathy.\textsuperscript{410}

As Mackay observes, one of the aims of Homeric apostrophe is to increase our awareness of a critical juncture in the story.\textsuperscript{411} The run-over to line 693 of the vocative \textit{Πατρόκλεις (o Patroklos)} creates a micro pause of anticipation within the apostrophe itself that invites us to appreciate Patroklos’ victory on the battlefield to this point.

The tone of the first hexameter of this apostrophe (692) then arguably expresses admiration, even wonder, at the achievement of the larger-than-life epic warrior.\textsuperscript{412} In the next hexameter (693) the poet-narrator switches a tone of compassion and pity. The emphatic δὴ (surely, indeed) precedes the ominous reminder that the gods, as agents of fate, are calling Patroklos to his death. The effect is fourfold: it reminds us that mortal triumphs are transitory; it creates a prickle of suspense; it increases our compassion for Patroklos; and it draws our attention to the critical juncture in the narrative. Patroklos has gone beyond the point of return. The force of the accusative pronoun σε (you, 693) expresses Patroklos’ impending fate as a

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{410} Kahane’s theory is discussed in Chapter 2 above: Kahane, \textit{Interpretation of Order}, 106–107, 110. When Achilleus addresses Patroklos, the vocative of the proper name is always verse-internal (110) or sympathetic.

\textsuperscript{411} Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 31.

\textsuperscript{412} On narratorial apostrophe of character revealing admiration for “semi-divine” heroes: de Jong, “Metalepsis”, 97.
mortal "object". Yet Bonner argues that it "perhaps" exemplifies those apostrophes about which:

...it can be confidently maintained that the needs of the metre had great weight, and rhetorical considerations none at all, in prompting their use...

414

His qualification does little to lessen the surprise that this is the only apostrophe he cites to illustrate such a concession.

This does not exonerate Patroklos from being partly responsible for bringing about his own death. Nestor, Achilleus, Zeus, Apollo, Euphorbos and Hektor all contribute to what Albin Lesky describes as "das Zusammenwirken von Mensch und Gott" (the joint action of mortal and god, my translation). Janko cites Patroklos' death as an example of Lesky's concept of "doppelle Motivation" ("double motivation") in Homer, in which gods and mortals are jointly responsible for actions. Janko contends that because of the tragic overtones in the Iliad, responsibility cannot be as neatly ascribed as in the Odyssey. Patroklos' intoxication with battle has a similar duality: it is both externally imposed by Zeus (691) and internally generated.

---

413 On the theme of the gods calling or leading men to death and its application to both Patroklos and Hektor (22.297): Griffin, Life and Death, 42–43.

414 Bonner, "Use of Apostrophe", 386.


416 Albin Lesky, Gottliche und menschliche Motivation im homerischen Epos (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1961), 27.

A list of the names of Patroklos' next nine victims (694–696), followed by the forceful dactyl τοῖς ἔλεν (these he took, 697), which re-focuses our attention on Patroklos the warrior. The Trojan reaction is stressed by the word order in the rest of the line:

... οἱ δ´ ἄλλοι φύγαδε μνώντο ἐκαστος...

... and the others were intent on fleeing, each one...

16.697

In a conditional sentence, the poet-narrator calls attention to the consequences of divine partisanship, against which even the most impressive human striving cannot prevail:

ἐνθά κεν ψίπτουλον Τρῳήν ἔλον νίες Αχαιῶν
Πατρόκλου ὑπὸ χειρόι, περὶ πρὸ γὰρ ἔχει θύεν,
εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος ἐιδήμητον ἐπὶ πύργου
ἐστὶ τῷ ὀλοᾷ φρουέων, Τρῴεσσι δ´ ἀρήγας.

There the sons of the Achaians might have taken gate-towering Ilion under the hands of Patroklos, who raged with the spear far before them, had not Phoibos Apollo taken his stand on the strong-built tower, with thoughts of death for him, but help for the Trojans.

16.698–701

As he did only 10 lines previously (686–687), the poet-narrator indicates that his narration might have taken a different direction but he again remains true to tradition. The effect is a further increase in suspense. The reference to Patroklos hurtling towards death (699) creates pathos.\(^{418}\) He is too intoxicated (ἀάσθη) with his successes to recall, let alone obey, Achilleus' order not to exult in war and provoke Apollo by going to Troy (91–96).

\(^{418}\) Compare line 699 with lines 46–47.
By introducing the “three-four” motif, the poet-narrator makes us anticipate that something important, probably disastrous, is about to happen (702 ff). Three times Apollo nudges Patroklos away from Troy’s walls. When Patroklos makes a fourth attempt, we prepare ourselves for the worst. But this is a case of narratorial misdirection: Apollo merely commands Patroklos to retreat, and informs him that fate will grant neither him nor the superior warrior Achilleus the κύδος (renown) of taking Troy (702–709). The third apostrophic event-sequence ends with the slackening of tension as Patroklos withdraws:

... Πάτροκλος δ᾿ ἀνεχάξετο πολλὸν ὀπίσω μὴνιν ἀλευμένος ἐκατηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνς.

... and Patroklos gave ground before him a great way, avoiding the anger of him who strikes from afar, Apollo. 16.710–711

The poet-narrator turns to Hektor inside Troy. Disguised as Hektor’s uncle, Apollo encourages him to return to battle with the prospect of killing Patroklos (715–725). The engine of suspense is switched back on.

Although Leaf criticizes Patroklos’ attempt to take Troy as a “serious stumbling block” which was athetized “probably rightly by Payne Knight and others”, its role

---


420 Morrison, False Predictions, 14, 20. Morrison defines misdirection as foreshadowing that upsets expectations of an implied first-time audience unaware of the tradition by being false or misleading. He uses three categories: false anticipation where the fulfilment is delayed; thematic misdirection when predictions are false; and incomplete predictions where vital information is withheld from the audience.
emphasizes the extent of Patroklos’ fixation.\(^{421}\) In the best tradition of storytelling, the audience has a brief glimpse of the unattainable. By the end of the third apostrophic event-sequence we have a sharpened perception of Patroklos’ reckless optimism. It has made him take a wrong turn, and it brings his fate ever closer.

**Fourth apostrophic event-sequence: Patroklos vaunts over Kebriones’ corpse (731–764)**

The fourth event-sequence (731–764) revisits the leitmotif of fighting for the armour of a slain warrior.\(^{422}\) Hektor orders his driver Kebriones, an illegitimate son of Priam, to drive straight towards Patroklos (731–732). Patroklos is presented at this point as the embodiment of an epic warrior in his prime:

\[\text{Πάτροκλος δ’ ἐτέρωθεν ἄφ’ ἑπτών ἀλτὸ χαμάζε σκαίη ἐγχος ἐχων: ἐτέρησι δὲ λάζετο πέτρον μάρμαρον ὀκριόντα, τὸν οἶ περὶ χεῖρ ἐκάλυψεν,}\]

On the other side Patroklos sprang to the ground from his chariot holding his spear in his left hand. In the other he caught up a stone, jagged and shining, in the hold of his hand.

16.733–735

Patroklos kills Kebriones with a rock (739 ff), as he did with Sthenelaos (586–587)—a typical heroic feat. Kebriones’ eyes pop out and roll on the dust. His body back flips onto the ground head-first in a movement which Homer likens that of a diver (741–743).

\(^{421}\) Leaf, Iliad, vol. 2, 155, 204. For a defence of this example of “siege-poetry”: Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 399.

\(^{422}\) The fight over Sarpedon’s armour (552–668).
As with the first narratorial apostrophe of Patroklos (20), the fourth (744) is part of an opening speechframe:

τὸν δ’ ἐπικεφαλεῖς, Πατρόκλεις ἵππει: ὠ τόποι, ἤ μᾶλ’ ἐλαφρῶς ἀνήρ, ὡς ἐμα κυβιστά. εἰ δὴ ποι καὶ πόντω ἐν ἰχθυόντι γένοιτο, τολμοῦσ’ ἄν κορέσειεν ἀνήρ ὡς τῇθεα διφῶν νηρὸς ἀποθρόσικοιν, εἰ καὶ δυσπέμφελος εἰη, ὡς νῦν ἐν πεδίῳ ἐξ ἐπιτων ἑλια κυβιστά. ἤ ὡς καὶ ἐν Τρώσσοι κυβιστηθήρες ἐσαιν.

...Now

you spoke in bitter mockery over him, rider Patroklos:

‘See now, what a light man this is, how agile an acrobat.
If only he were somewhere on the sea, where the fish swarm, he could fill the hunger of many men, by diving for oysters; he could go overboard from a boat even in rough weather the way he somersaults so light to the ground from his chariot now. So, to be sure, in Troy also they have their acrobats.

16.744–750

The link between the diver vehicle of the narratorial simile and Patroklos’ reference to a diver in his vaunt allows the scene the relief of a certain grim humour.423

Although the emotion modelled by the poet-narrator is not readily apparent from the apostrophe itself, a certain wonder—perhaps tinged with sadness or regret—at Patroklos’ confidence and high spirits would not be out of place. These emotions check the humorous effect.

This apostrophe also highlights the need to take into account as many factors as possible when evaluating an apostrophe. In this case we should consider the choice of verb in a speechframe. De Jong notes that this is a way in which the focalizer—here the poet-narrator or primary narrator-focalizer—can seek to influence the...

423 Janko explains that the diver image is traditional, hence the content of Patroklos’ vaunt is not as unusual as it may seem to a modern audience: Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 404.
Thus, supplementing the neutral locutionary verb προσέφης (you said) with the illocutionary participle, ἐπικεφτομέων (mocking), the poet-narrator draws attention to Patroklos’ act of making a vaunt. The key to the meaning of the apostrophe lies in the play between Patroklos’ intent to mock his victim Kebriones, who is beyond any perception of this, and Patroklos as the unknowing object of a mocking fate.

Taking Mackay’s approach that apostrophes mark junctures or turning points and that addressees share some of the responsibility for the unfolding of the plot, it is useful to consider what the poet-narrator wishes us to appreciate at this precise point in the narrative. I suggest that it is the pathos that arises from a disconnection between the poet-narrator’s evaluation of Patroklos as greatly innocent (μεγανίψιος, 686) and Patroklos’ perception that he is enacting what is expected of the successful warrior.

Because of the contrast between the apostrophic speechframe and its context, we focus on the ironic futility of Patroklos’ triumph rather than the traditional cruelty of his vaunt. Had we heard Patroklos’ direct speech without the poet-narrator’s apostrophe, the effect would not have been the same. We experience first-hand how Patroklos’ battle success has transformed him further. He does not justify his moral superiority as Menelaos did in his vaunt over Peisandros (13.620–639). He does not refer to the Achaians or Achilleus. His wit reveals his high spirits (745–750); he

---

424 Most Homeric verbs in speechframes are neutral, that is, locutionary. On the use of Levinson’s speech act theory in her examination of Homeric speechframes: de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 200–208.
revels "in the moment". Despite this—or perhaps because of it—his first words are more applicable to him than to Kebriones, and without the sarcastic effect: ὁ πόποι (oh, for shame, 745).

The poet-narrator makes a pause after the real-time of direct speech, and through a simile of a marauding lion—frequently deployed in battle scenes—he reinforces the point that Patroklos is victim to his own nature. The lion’s courage causes his downfall:

ως εἰπὼν ἐπὶ Κεβριόνη ἰρωϊ βεβήκει
οὕμα λέοντος ἔχων, ὡς τε σταθμοὺς κεραίζων
ἐβλητο πρὸς στήθος, ἐτ' τέ μιν ὠλεσεν ἀλκή...

He spoke so, and strode against the hero Kebriones with the spring of a lion, who as he ravages the pastures has been hit in the chest, and his own courage destroys him.

16.751–753

The vehicle of the simile ends in what amounts to a forecast of Patroklos’ death.

Combined with the tenor, the second apostrophe of the event-sequence (754) causes a prickling of anticipatory tension:

ως ἐπὶ Κεβριόνη Πατρόκλες ἄλσο μεμαχός.

So you leapt against Kebriones, Patroklos, in your frenzy.

16.754

The use of μεμαχός (eagerly desiring) underscores Patroklos’ state of mind and is a critical part of the apostrophe. Such words can act as a cipher to gain access to the

powerful and sometimes complex associations of a leitmotif.\textsuperscript{426} Again, the apostrophe gains its force—and pathos—from a key word linked to the immediate context. Emotion need not be explicitly described. Rather, its effect can arise from the contrast between unaware addressee and informed audience. The poet-narrator’s tone is agitated and rueful, perhaps even frustrated, because he cannot compromise the integrity of the traditional material.

Just one line of narrative, in which Hektor jumps off his chariot to defend Kebriones’ corpse and armour (755), separates the second lion simile (756–758) in the event-sequence from the apostrophe (754). When Hektor and Patroklos begin fighting, they are likened to two hungry lions fighting over a dead deer. Homer conveys their equal prowess with a line of balanced epithets:

\[
\text{Πάτροκλός τε Μενοιτιάδης καὶ φαίδιμος Ἐκτωρ ἵεντ’ ἀλλήλων ταμέειν χρόα νηλεὶ χαλκῷ.}
\]

Patroklos, son of Menoitios, and glorious Hektor were straining with the pitiless bronze to tear at each other.

16.760–761

The personification of their bronze spears as pitiless (761) and the impasse in their hold of each other convey the two warriors’ desperate striving:

\[
\text{Ἔκτωρ μὲν κεφαλήφιν ἐπεὶ λάβεν οὐχὶ μεθεῖ: Πάτροκλος δ’ ἐτέρωθεν ἔχεν ποδός...}
\]

...since Hektor had caught him by the head, and would not let go of him, and Patroklos had his foot on the other side...

16.762–763

\textsuperscript{426} Griffin, \textit{Life and Death}, 104–110.
This is a case of false anticipation. Instead of the resolution of the duel, the poet-narrator broadens his focus to present the two sides joining in to create a panorama of two great armies clashing over a corpse. To do this, Homer uses a majestic five-line simile likening the fighting to that between the east and south winds which results in a cacophony of breaking branches (765–769). The random yet dynamic physicality of battle is presented: spears are thrown, feathered arrows leap from bows, and boulders thud against shields (770–774). The poet-narrator then narrows his focus to rest on the pitiful sight of the dead Kebriones, covered by swirling dust, whom he describes with the unusual polyptoton of μεγαλωστί (mightily in his might, 776).

Thus, within the fourth apostrophic event-sequence, a concentrated sequence of narratorial intrusion is developed. It comprises: a narratorial simile (Kebriones likened to a diver, 742), a narratorial apostrophe of Patroklos (744), Patroklos' direct speech (with a return to the diver image, 745–750), a second narratorial simile (Patroklos as the wounded lion, 752–753, and a second narratorial apostrophe of Patroklos, 754), and a third narratorial simile (with a return to the lion vehicle with Patroklos and Hektor likened to two lions, 756–758). The level and concentration of narratorial intrusion—and Patroklos' vaunt—act as an extended overture or

427 Morrison, False Predictions, 20.

428 By specifying the tree in these similes, the poet-narrator comments on the splendid beauty of the epic hero-warrior.

429 Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 407–408. His main point here is that the fighting does not become general hand-to-hand combat until 17.262.
narratorial drum-roll before the anticipated main event—the final and decisive confrontation between Patroklos and Hektor.

Fifth apostrophic event-sequence: the wounding and death of Patroklos (783–857)

The poet-narrator has set the stage for the climax of the complicating action, the three-phased wounding and death of Patroklos. The audience is prime. The final, fifth apostrophic event-sequence (783–857) of the Patrokleia begins after the Achaians have taken Kebriones’ corpse in an effort that the poet-narrator honours as ὑπὲρ αἰσιαν (beyond their fate, 780). The event-sequence occurs in the last moments of Book 16 (783–857). It begins with a repetition of the “three-four” motif which was last used in Patroklos’ attempt to scale Troy’s walls (702–704). In the first part of this two-step schema the poet-narrator emphasizes Patroklos’ god-like action with θοῶ αὐτάλαντος Ἄρη (like swift Ares, 784). In the second part he uses δαιμονί ισος (like a divine being, 786). The repetition of τρὶς (three) adds to dynamic energy of the first part: Patroklos slays 27 men in three bursts, the highest point in his aristeia:

τρὶς μὲν ἐπειτ᾿ ἐπόρουσε θοῶ αὐτάλαντος Ἄρη
σμερδαλέα ἱάχων, τρὶς δ᾿ ἐννέα φῶτας ἐπεφνεν.

Then three times he sprang like swift Ares and, screaming fearfully, three times he struck down nine men. 16.784–785 (my translation)431

430 Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 410. He notes that the single use of this hyperbole in the Iliad is the “ultimate accolade” for Patroklos and the Achaians. This illustrates the poet-narrator’s deliberate honouring of Patroklos as a hero-warrior, a suitable companion for Achilleus.

431 In likening Patroklos to the god of war in the vehicle of the simile, the poet-narrator is paying tribute to Patroklos’ achievements in his aristeia.
This time the anticipation of disaster is fulfilled. The momentous implication is
marked by the sixth apostrophe of Patroklos:

\[
\text{άλλ` ὅτε δὴ τὸ τέταρτον ἐπέσυντο δαίμονι ἱσος,}
\text{ἐνθ' ἄρα τῷ, Πάτροκλε, φάνη βιότοιο τελευτή:}
\text{ἡντετο γάρ τοι Φόιβος ἐνι κρατεὶν ὑσμίνῃ}
\text{δείνος...}
\]

But then for the fourth time he charged in like a divine being,
then in truth, Patroklos, the end of your life was shown forth:
for dread Phoibos came against you in the fierce combat ...

16.786–789(my translation)

The length of this vivid apostrophe allows the audience to understand that the
complicating action has reached its climax. The sinister omnipotence of Phoibos
Apollo is stressed in the enjambment of δείνος (terrible or dread, 789).

The first line of the apostrophe (787) invites a comparison with the apostrophe of
Menelaos when he accepts Hektor’s challenge:

\[
\text{ἐνθ’ κέ τοι Μενέλαε φάνη βιότοιο τελευτὴ}
\text{εἰ μὴ...}
\]

And there, ο Menelaos, would have shown forth the end of your life
had not...

7.104–105432

The pity for Patroklos modelled by the poet-narrator in the apostrophe (787–788) so
deply affected the scholiast βΤ that he famously responded with his own
apostrophe of the hero. He went on to list six affecting characteristics or actions of

---

432 The apostrophe of Menelaos in Book 7 is part of the apodosis of an unfulfilled conditional
sentence expressing relief. It contrasts with the apostrophe of Patroklos (787–788) in which
the emphatic particle ἄρα stresses that Patroklos’ time is up. Parry observes that the
apostrophe of Menelaos points to the “larger dimensions” of the story: Parry, “Language
and Characterization of Homer”, 16.
Patroklos, starting with his love for Achilleus. Others include Patroklos' care of the wounded Eurypylus, his tears over the Achaians' misfortune and the sacrifice of his life for them. The scholiast concludes:

...ταῦτα πάντα ἔνεστιν ἐπαναφέροντας ἐπὶ τὴν ἀποστροφήν ὀρῶν τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ περιπαθὲς...

...by relating all these things to the apostrophe its deeply moving quality can be seen...

(my translation)

All these reasons are valid, and together heighten the pathos of the juncture in the narrative. Just as compelling a contribution to the moving quality of the sixth apostrophe is Patroklos’ deluded belief that he alone is capable of taking Troy despite Achilleus’ orders (684–686).

The action is riveting and dreadful. Unperceived by Patroklos, the mist-shrouded Apollo strikes him on the back (788–792). Patroklos’ eyes spin (792) evoking the death of Kebriones (741–742). But Patroklos’ death is not so merciful in its speed. Achilleus’ helmet falls onto the ground, defiled with blood and dust for the first time (793–799). This can be taken as a third narratorial comment on Patroklos’

---

433 His lack of perception is complete: it now extends to the physical environment.

limitation as a warrior compared to Achilleus and as a symbol of his fate. Even the sullied helmet is part of Zeus' plan:

\[\ldots \tau \acute{o} \tau e \; d \acute{e} \; Z \acute{e}u s \; ' \acute{E}ktori \; d \acute{w} \acute{k}e n \\
\; \acute{h} \; k \acute{e} \phi \alpha \lambda \acute{i} \; \phi o r \acute{e} \acute{e} i n, \; \sigma \chi e d \acute{o} \acute{th}e n \; d \acute{e} \; o i \; \acute{h} \acute{e} n \; \acute{A}l \acute{e} \acute{t}h\acute{r}o s.\]

...but now Zeus gave it over to Hektor
to wear on his head, Hektor whose own death was close to him.

799–800

Thus, the helmet links the fates of Patroklos and Hektor. Like Patroklos, Hektor will overestimate his chances of ultimate victory and will pay with his life. Despite its sturdiness, Patroklos' spear shatters. Achilleus' splendid fringed shield—reminiscent of hair—drops to the ground (801–803). Then the final step in the dis-arming scene which symbolizes the unravelling of Patroklos' fate:

\[\lambda \acute{u} \acute{s}e \; d \acute{e} \; o i \; \theta \acute{w} \acute{r}o \acute{h} \acute{e} k a \; \acute{a} \acute{n}a \acute{x} \; \Delta i \acute{w} \zeta \; v \acute{i} \acute{o} s \; \acute{A}p \acute{o} \acute{l} \acute{l} \acute{a} w o n.\]

The lord Apollo, son of Zeus, broke the corselet upon him.

16.804

435 The other two comments were in regard to Patroklos' inability to lift Achilleus' sword (140–144) and the mortal trace-horse for Achilleus' immortal horses (148–154).

436 Schein argues that because Patroklos (and Hektor) die wearing Achilleus' armor, Achilleus is made to die symbolically. Further, through the death and funeral of Patroklos, Achilleus' own death is foreshadowed although it does not take place within the Iliad: Schein, Mortal Hero, 129.

437 Fenik, Typical Battle Scenes, 212–213. A comparison between Patroklos and Hektor is instructive. For example, Briseis and Helen both praise the courtesy and kindness of Patroklos and Hektor respectively (19.282–300, 24.761–775); the funeral of each is narrated in detail (23.108–228, 24.777–804).

438 Fenik, Typical Battle Scenes, 216. He notes that the rapid succession of motifs—such as the intervention of Apollo, the time (midday), and the triple charge—mark Patroklos' final combat as part of the larger-than-life epic world, granting the scene an eerie grandeur.
Patroklos is unprotected and disoriented as the second phase in the event-sequence begins (805–817). Unperceived, a warrior comes from behind to thrust a javelin into his back (806–807). His biography reveals Euphorbos' high status as a warrior (808–811). Even so, he only dares attack Patroklos in a stealthy move.439

The poet-narrator models an outburst of pity and compassion for Patroklos in the seventh apostrophe:

ος τοι πρωτος ἐφήκε βέλος Πατρόκλες ίσπευ
οὐδὲ δάμασσ’...

He was the first [mortal] to throw a spear at you, Patroklos the rider
but he did not destroy you...

16.812–813 (my translation)

There is also a touch of wonder and pride. One of the immortals has clouted Patroklos in the back; now a warrior has struck him in the back with a sharp javelin;

but Patroklos is still alive. Homer continues to honour him while increasing the pathos. Euphorbos does not dare press his advantage:

...ο μέν αὐτίς ἀνέδραμε, μίκτο δ’ ὀμίλῳ,
ἐκ χροὸς ἀρπαξάς ὄρος μείλινον, οὐδ’ ὑπέμεινεν
Πάτροκλον γυμνὸν περ ἐόντ’ ἐν δημιοτητί.

... He ran back again after pulling out his ash spear from [your] body and merged into the crowd, and he did he dare face Patroklos in combat, although he was defenceless.

16.813–815 (my translation)440

439 The fact that Euphorbos is named only at line 808 adds to the covert nature of his attack. On giving Euphorbos an impressive battle record to honour Patroklos, see Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 414.

The third and final phase of the fifth apostrophic event-sequence starts on a strong note of pathos and suffering, the result of the poet-narrator's summation of the situation. This allows the audience a moment to take in the great change in Patroklos:

Πάτροκλος δὲ θεοῦ πληγή καὶ δουρὶ δαμασθεὶς ἀψ ἐτάφων εἰς ἐθνὸς ἔχαζετο κῆρ' ἀλεεῖνων.

Now Patroklos, broken by the god's blow and the spear, was trying to retreat back into the band of his companions, fearing for his death. 16.816–817 (my translation)⁴⁴¹

The last two elements of the summary are repeated in reversed order to convey Hektor's focalization (818–820):

'Εκτωρ δ᾽ ἠδεν Πάτροκληα μεγάθυμον ἀψ ἀναχαξόμενον, βεβλημένον ὀξεὶ χαλκῷ...

But Hektor, when he saw high-hearted Patroklos trying to get away, saw how he was wounded with the sharp javelin...

16.818–819

Patroklos' desperation is now transparent. The tension is almost unbearable. Hektor seizes his opportunity. He comes forward to stab Patroklos right through his lower flank (820–821). The description of Patroklos falling with a heavy thud increases our pity and dismay. It is made more vivid by the appeal to our auditory imagination as well as our visual one (822).⁴⁴² In the same line the poet-narrator reminds us of the

⁴⁴¹ On the conative sense of the imperfect tense stressing Patroklos' attempt to escape: Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 414. Conversely, the aorist of ἀνατιθέμενος (he ran back, 814) conveys Euphorbos' successful retreat.

⁴⁴² The fall is also an allusion to similes that liken strong warriors falling in battle to trees being felled: Fenik, Typical Battle Scenes, 58, 58 (n.48), 126. Other examples: the simile of fighting winds which create a cacophony of falling branches (765 ff) and Sarpedon's death (482–484).
suffering of the Achaian audience in the storyworld: μέγα δ’ ἡκαχε λαον Αχαϊων
(and the host of the Achaians grieved greatly). Their grief reminds us of Patroklos’
endearing nature and also foreshadows Achilleus’ grief.443

No apostrophe is needed here to guide our emotions. A simile, the vehicle of which
draws upon magnificent and powerful animals, pays tribute to Patroklos in a way
that allows him dignity in his losing struggle:

\[ \omega \delta' \doteq \sigma\nu \alpha\kappa\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\tau\alpha \lambda\epsilon\omega\nu \epsilon\beta\iota\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\tau\alpha \chi\acute{a}\mu\eta, \]
\[ \omega \tau' \doteq \alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma\circ \kappa\omega\nu\phi\iota\varsigma\mu\iota\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha \phi\rho\nu\epsilon\omicron\nu\tau\eta \mu\acute{a}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\omega\nu \]
\[ \pi\delta\acute{a}k\acute{o}c \acute{a}μ\acute{f} \acute{o} \acute{o}l\acute{y}n\acute{h}s; \epsilon\theta\epsilon\ell\acute{o}u\varsigma \delta\epsilon \tau\iota\acute{e}μ\epsilon\nu\ \acute{a}μ\acute{f}\omega; \]
\[ \pi\omega\lambda\acute{a} \delta\epsilon \tau' \acute{a}o\theta\acute{m}a\acute{i}ν\omicron\nu\tau\alpha \lambda\epsilon\omega\nu \acute{e}d\acute{a}m\acute{a}s\acute{s}e \beta\ieta\acute{f}i\nuin... \]

As a lion overpowers a wearless boar in wild combat
as the two fight in their pride on the high places of a mountain
over a little spring of water, both wanting to drink there,
and the lion beats him down by force as he fights for his breath...

16.823–826

The poet-narrator’s message is that Patroklos is unbowed in spirit.444 Hektor does
not enjoy an easy victory. The pastoral setting contrasts sharply with the life-and-
death struggle of the beasts and warriors; and άο\theta\mu\alpha\acute{i}ν\omicron\nu\tau\a (struggling for breath, 826) corrects any false anticipation of Patroklos’ death.


444 Leaf and Janko comment that άκαμας (untiring) used to describe the boar (823) is an
epithet reserved for Spercheios and the sun and that its use here honours Patroklos: Leaf, Iliad, vol. 2, 212; Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 416. Both commentators note the use of the
boar-lion combat in folklore, archaic art and literature and that it would not be an
unfamiliar concept to Homer’s audience. The use of the lion invites a comparison with the
previous lion-simile where the same characters, Patroklos and Hektor, fight over Kebriones’
body (756–758). The small spring used in this simile could be interpreted as life.
A solemn couplet marks the return to the narrative—replete with epithets:

ως πολέας πεφυνότα Μενοιτίου ἀλκιμον υίόν

Τεκτω Πριαμίδης σχέδον ἐγχεί θυμόν ἀπήσα...

...so

Hektor, Priam’s son, with a close spear-stroke stripped the life
from the fighting son of Menoitios, who had killed so many...

16.827–828

Homer honours Patroklos with a patronymic epithet describing him as valiant
(ἀλκιμος). He calls Patroklos the slayer of many (πολέας πεφυνόντα). This is
arguably an epithet, newly awarded because of Patroklos’ aristea. Its evaluative
force is clear.445 Through the repetition of the critical action, the poet-narrator allows
us a moment to appreciate the momentous import of what has just taken place.446
Hektor and his successful spear-stroke are then mentioned.

Hektor delivers his vaunt (830–842) in an almost conversational manner that
increases its cruelty.447 Janko argues that the use of the enclitic ποὺ three times
conveys a certain false hesitancy.448 It appears as ἦ ποὺ (or perhaps, 830), ὃς ποὺ (he
somehow, 838) and ὡς ποὺ (somehow thus, 842). I believe the deliberately leisurely

445 On Homeric use of epithets to communicate evaluative responses to the action: Block,
“Narrative Judgment and Audience Response”, 156.

446 The summary also marks a coda of sorts which returns us to the performative present so
that the action may continue.

447 For a very perceptive commentary on Hektor’s vaunt: Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4,
417–418.

448 Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 418. We see the ploy of casual disingenuousness often
displayed by villains in film and on stage. Inevitably they pay for it. Achilles also uses the
enclitic ποὺ, but in a positive sense, to begin his vaunt over Hektor (22.331): Τεκτω ὁτάγ
ποὺ ἔθης (But, Hektor, surely you thought...). The technique is the same. To assert their
power, victors affect to know what their victims and/or close associates were thinking or
saying in their absence.
pace is calculated. The play on illusion (and Hektor’s self-delusion) and reality is noted.\textsuperscript{449} The embedded imagined direct speech of Achilleus (839–841) is a clever rhetorical device, reflecting Hektor’s delight at his triumph and determination to humiliate his victim. He taunts the dying Patroklos with his imagined representation of Achilleus’ direct speech (16.839–841).\textsuperscript{450} Hektor follows this “quotation” with his evaluation of what it really means (16.841–842). Hektor’s overweening self-confidence and arrogance are evident, as he praises himself in the third person (834–835). His final point is the jibe that Achilleus has cynically manipulated his credulous and foolish companion by persuading Patroklos’ witless wits (φοενες ἄφονες, 842), an emphatic combination of oxymoron and polyptoton.

Hektor’s allegation does not crush Patroklos’ spirit. It elicits a courageous response (844–854).\textsuperscript{451} With an apostrophe the poet-narrator draws our attention to its noteworthiness:

\begin{quote}
\textit{τὸν δ’ ὀλιγοδοανέων προσέφης, Πατρόκλες ἵππεύ:}
\end{quote}

And, powerless, you spoke to him, o Patroklos the rider...

\textbf{16.843} (my translation)

\textsuperscript{449} Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 417.

\textsuperscript{450} Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 110. He notes that, of the three instances of the proper-noun vocative in Hektor’s addresses to Patroklos, the proper-noun vocative is twice in the neutral position, that is, it begins the hexameter. It is in the “sympathetic” verse-internal position here because Hektor is mimicking Achilleus. To use de Jong’s term, Hektor is acting as a “tertiary character-focalizer”: de Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 41.

\textsuperscript{451} Compare this to Hektor’s response to Achilleus’ vaunt: he entreats him to allow his family to ransom his corpse (22.338–343).
The only non-formulaic word in the apostrophic speechframe—\(\text{ὀλιγοδοφανέων}\) (powerless)—emphasizes Patroklos’ feeble physical state. Combined with the act of apostrophe, it reflects the poet-narrator’s pity and sorrow, but the context also makes clear that he is also expressing his admiration.\(^{452}\) The contrast between the strength of Patroklos’ spirit and his mental acuity on the one hand and his physical helplessness on the other is deeply moving. The poet-narrator thus rounds out the presentation of Patroklos as an ideal epic hero: his skill with words complements his skill as a warrior. Patroklos’ battle “fever” has lifted, and we see a return to his true self. His speech ensures that there is no hint of bathos in this death scene.

By ascribing his downfall to divine intervention and Euphorbos Patroklos belittles Hektor as a warrior (844–850). He forecasts Hektor’s imminent death, confident that Achilleus will avenge him:

\[
\text{où ῥην οὖν αὐτὸς δηρὸν βεη, ἀλλὰ τοι ἕδη}
\]
\[
\text{ἄγχι παρέστηκεν θάνατος καὶ μοίρα κραταίη, χερσὶ δαμέντ Ἀχιλῆς ἀμύμονος Αἰακίδαο.}
\]

You yourself are not one who shall live long, but now already death and powerful destiny are standing beside you, to go down under the hands of Aiakos’ great son Achilleus.

16.852–854\(^{453}\)

His last words, the alliterative epithet \(\text{Ἀχιλῆς ἀμύμονος Αἰακίδαο}\) (of Achilleus the noble son of Aiakos, 854), affirm his bond with Achilleus.

---

\(^{452}\) The opening speechframe to the dying Hektor’s speech is much the same as the apostrophe of Patroklos except for one significant change, the use of the third person. Added to the different context, the emotional effect is much less intense, and any pathos is implicit.

\(^{453}\) On the belief that foreknowledge was granted to the dying: Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 420. The forecast of an enemy’s imminent downfall is typical: for example, the dying Hektor forecasts that Apollo and Paris will kill Achilleus at the Skaian gates (22.359–360).
In the return to narrative, the poet-narrator uses embedded focalization in a mournful formulaic couplet (856–857) to give the death of Patroklos, a warrior in his prime, a delicate poignancy. In mourning for Patroklos, his soul foreshadows the grief of Achilleus:

\[ \omegaς \alphaς \muν \epsilonιπόντα \tauέλος \thetaανάτωιο \κάλυψε: \\
\vphχι \delta' \ek \reθε\vphν \πταμέ\vphν \\Acιδς \de \beβήκει \\
oν \πότμον \γο\vphωσα \lπ\vphον' \άν\vphδοτή\vphτα \kαι \νήβην. \]

He spoke, and as he spoke the end of death closed in upon him and the soul fluttering free of his limbs went down into Death’s house mourning her destiny, leaving youth and manhood behind her.

16.855–857

Hektor addresses the now-abandoned shell. Its status is emphasized by the anonymous τε\vphνη\vphωτα (the dead man, 858). The theme of futile mortal optimism continues as Hektor scorns Patroklos’ prescience and wonders if Achilleus might be his next victim (859–861). The poet-narrator complements Hektor’s speech with a motif of careless disrespect: Hektor steadies himself by putting his heel on the corpse to pull out his spear. Rather than stripping off Achilleus’ armour, Hektor pursues Achilleus’ famed horses. Thus, a lull is created before the build-up to the next narratorial high point: the defence of Patroklos’ corpse in Book 17. This will mark the transition from the poem’s complicating action to its resolution, which is fulfilled when in Achilleus slays Hektor (Book 22).

454 On the blend of archaisms and post-Mycenaean elements in these lines: Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 420. The same lines mark the moment of Hektor’s death (22.361–363).

455 As discussed above, this gesture accompanies two other significant vaunts, those of Patroklos (502–505) and Menelaos (13.618–619).
Conclusion

In Book 16 Patroklos is presented both as a heroic warrior who achieves an outstanding aristêia, and as the victim of his own misplaced buoyancy, Achilleus' personal obsession, and Zeus' plan. The portrayal of the public dimension of Patroklos is critical: he is a respected member of the Achaian community of warriors. Like Menelaos, Patroklos symbolizes concern for the community of warriors and communal wellbeing, and in this they both contrast markedly with Achilleus' tragic individualism. The first apostrophic event-sequence establishes compassion as his primary motivation. It also provides a further twist on the antithesis of public and private by revealing the very special intimacy of Patroklos' relationship with Achilleus before external events interrupt their conversation and demand a public response. This brings the Myrmidon army's isolation to a close. Their real leader, Achilleus, occupies an uneasy position of re-engagement through Patroklos as his proxy. Through the carefully-placed progression of the next seven apostrophes the poet-narrator presents Patroklos' triumphs, growing intoxication with battle, and his tragic death.

Even though the division of the Iliad into books is something that came with the written text, what we know as Book 16 has a strong internal unity through its exclusive concern with the Patrokleia. The poet-narrator's unparalleled overt intrusion into the narrative charts the inexorable journey to the climax of the complicating action, the death of Patroklos.
The primary significance of Patroklos in the plot rests on his importance to Achilleus, and we focus, as we are intended to, on Patroklos as Achilleus’ companion, Achilleus’ voice of conscience, Achilleus’ battlefield substitute, and, through his death, as the cause of Achilleus’ desire for revenge. Nevertheless, a close reading of the apostrophic event-sequences affords us a glimpse of Patroklos in his own right. All but the first of these apostrophes take place on the battlefield and where the scenes are not dominated by Achilleus’ physical presence. They therefore allow a more finely nuanced and complex character to emerge.\footnote{456 For a defence of the complexity of Homeric psychology: Griffin, \textit{Life and Death}, 70–73.} Parry’s summary of the key attributes of the recipients of multiple apostrophes is most suited to Patroklos: “altruistic, loyal, sensitive, vulnerable”.\footnote{457 Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 21.} We also see Patroklos’ weaknesses, but they are more complex than the “vague but essentially poetic weakness,” that Block finds in Parry’s description of Patroklos.\footnote{458 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 16.} In enriching our appreciation of Patroklos, the poet-narrator validates his importance to Achilleus.

The apostrophes of Patroklos call attention to high points in the \textit{Patrokleia}, and they create an intense vividness. Block notes that they mark narratorial concern at crucial points of change or acceleration in the action.\footnote{459 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 17. See also Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 14, 31.} But they do not cover all the high points because some of the high points are not suitable: for example, Sarpedon’s death. Perhaps the poet-narrator is aware that he should not use apostrophe too often. It is important to draw attention to Zeus’ grief at Sarpedon’s death rather
than to Patroklos’ achievement in this case. The poet-narrator creates pathos through the leitmotif of grieving parent. Zeus’ grief impels him to decide how and when Patroklos should die. The apostrophes elicit a deep emotional response in us which sustains our engagement. They reveal the progressive transformation of Patroklos and its tragic consequences. Parry is correct in his observation that the apostrophes mark a carefully controlled “crescendo” of pathos. The increasing frequency of apostrophes in the five event-sequences which I have identified reflects this controlled acceleration. But this does not mean that the level of pathos created by each narratorial apostrophe is the same.

The effect of the distribution of the seven apostrophes and their increasing frequency does more than create pathos. The apostrophes of Patroklos are all clustered within the complicating action—and just at that point where the climax is nigh. It can therefore be argued that this distribution could reflect the poet-narrator’s intent.

The first narratorial apostrophe of Patroklos stresses compassion as his main motivation (20). Structurally, it marks the start of the final countdown to his death. The long scenes preparing for battle create a sense of ceremony and scale: the final invocation of the Muses in this section is a final call for us to pay close attention to what is about to take place. The second apostrophe (584–585), some two thirds into the Patrokleia, shows us that, on the battlefield, Patroklos’ innate compassion is now

---

460 Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 20. Parry considers that the repetition of the three-four motif is also part of the overall crescendo of pathos in the Patrokleia.

461 One apostrophe in the first three event-sequences; two apostrophes in the fourth event-sequence, and three apostrophes in the fifth event-sequence.
secondary to anger and the desire for revenge. His battle achievements elicit a narratorial apostrophe of admiration in the third apostrophe (692-693). But the apostrophe also marks a critical turning point, when the poet-narrator “tells” Patroklos that the gods are calling him to his death. This apostrophe thus encapsulates the pathos that arises from the contrast between the supreme confidence of the successful warrior and his unwitting impotence before fate as a mortal about to die. The narratorial apostrophes marking Patroklos’ vaunt over Kebriones’ corpse (744) and the frenzied zeal with which Patroklos engages in the fight over Kebriones’ armour (754) continue the theme of mortal victor as next victim. The apostrophes do not necessarily model pity specifically. Homer is the master of subtlety. The act of making apostrophes at these points of lesser pathos—such as the vaunt over Kebriones—invites us to appreciate fully the tragic irony in Patroklos’ position without jeopardising our empathy and sympathy for him. In modelling the poet-narrator’s admiration as well as sorrow and pity, the final three apostrophes (787–788, 812, 843) concede to the great pathos of Patroklos’ prolonged death scene the small but important comfort that the hero-warrior recovers his dignity.

462 Culler makes the important observation that apostrophe is different from other tropes in that it makes its point not on “troping on the meaning of the word but on the ... situation of communication: Culler, Pursuit of Signs, 135.
Chapter 5: Third Case Study—Apollo, Melanippos, and Achilleus. Strange Bedfellows?

Introduction

In this chapter I present my findings and observations on the four remaining apostrophes in the *Iliad*. Two of the four apostrophes occur in Book 15 and two in Book 20. In Book 15 the poet-narrator addresses Apollo when he knocks down the Achaian defences to create a pathway for the Trojans (**15.365–366**). He later addresses the fallen Trojan Melanippos (**15.582**). Book 20 starts with an apostrophe of Achilleus as he is about to enter the battlefield for the first time in the *Iliad* (**20.2**). Still in the preliminaries before Achilleus fights, Apollo is apostrophized for the second time as he joins the divine audience which is assembling to watch the spectacle (**20.152**).463

While it may appear that a god, a minor Trojan character, and the best Achaian warrior and central protagonist have little in common, I shall use as much as possible of the same approach and methodology as with the multiple apostrophes of character to determine points of commonality—and differences—in these apostrophes. There are aspects which are obviously irrelevant to a consideration of

---

463 The event-sequences are as follows: 15.346–366 (apostrophe of Apollo, **365–366**); 15.539–591 (apostrophe of Melanippos, **582**); 20.1–3 (apostrophe of Achilleus, **2**); and 20.112–155 (second apostrophe of Apollo, **152**). See Appendices B for a summary and C for their distribution.
these apostrophes, such as charting any progression and identifying any linkages between multiple apostrophes of the same addressee. An additional consideration will be to establish whether there is any difference in a narratorial apostrophe of a god compared to that of a mortal.

Menelaos and Patroklos are described by Kahane as the “main apostrophized characters”. My preference is to designate them as the recipients of multiple apostrophes. There exists, however, no neat terminology that covers the remaining four apostrophes. Melanippos alone can be described as a minor character. But I do not wish to pre-empt any findings by describing the apostrophes themselves as minor. My approach in this case study is to begin with how this odd assortment of apostrophes has been assessed by Homeric scholars.

Scholarship on these four apostrophes

The scholars whose evaluation I summarize here in chronological order are the Block, Richardson, Kahane, Mackay, and de Jong. If any single evaluation of narratorial apostrophe of character in the Iliad is valid, it will have to accommodate these four apparently disparate instances. This is no easy task, as the summary of evaluation will indicate.

464 Kahane’s description of Menelaos, Patroklos, and Eumaios: Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 112.

465 Parry did not include these apostrophes in his landmark 1972 article, “Language and Characterization”. This is probably a sign that they are difficult to accommodate in a character-based approach.
In comparison with the evaluation of multiple apostrophes of character, it appears that there is more divergence and more qualification in the assessment of the apostrophes of Apollo, Melanippos, and Achilleus.

Block

The only comment on the apostrophes of Melanippos and Achilleus Block offers is that these characters are exceptional in that they do not display the common traits of Homeric characters identified by Parry—loyalty, sensitivity and vulnerability.466 Block’s sole reference to the apostrophes of Apollo is to refute P. T. Eden’s claim that addressing a god with anything but an invocation does not occur in Homer.467 In this regard, she notes that the apostrophes of Apollo are unique in that they alone address a god as a participant in the epic storyworld.

Richardson

Richardson argues that the apostrophe of Achilleus is consistent with his view that apostrophe creates sympathy for a character through intimacy, rather than through the emotion modelled.468 The apostrophe of Melanippos, whose name is metrically the same as Menelaos’, might, according to Richardson, be considered as a

...reflex at the conclusion of a simile, a relatively common frequent location for these apostrophes...469

---

466 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 16; Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 9, 16.


469 See Henry, “Use and Origin of Apostrophe”, 7; Scott Richardson, Homeric Narrator, 238, n. 10. As noted in Chapter 3 above, I agree with Ready that the simile comprises both vehicle
Richardson concludes that sympathy is clearly irrelevant as a consideration in the apostrophes of Apollo. He notes Matthews’ comment on the likelihood of them being modelled on an address used in ritual hymn, but does not express a view on this.\footnote{Matthews: “Metrical Reasons”, 98. See also de Jong, “Metalepsis”, 95.}

Kahane

With regard to these apostrophes, Kahane’s comments are mainly technical. For example, he notes the difficulty of establishing any pattern for vocatives of proper names that appear twice.\footnote{Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 92.} He grapples with the single apostrophe of Achilleus, and suggests that at this particular point he is portrayed as a tragic figure who is a victim of his own character. Thus, Kahane argues that the apostrophe is used to express the poet-narrator’s “sympathetic gesture as he [Achilleus] heads off into the decisive battle”.\footnote{Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 112. On Achilleus as a tragic hero, see Redfield, Nature and Culture, 106–109. Redfield argues that, in its suffering and insight, Achilleus’ story is tragic. His “tragedy”, however, is not as a result of a tragic action in the Aristotelian sense but a tragedy of reaction (106–108).}

Mackay

Mackay’s view that apostrophes mark turning points is qualified by the caveat that such junctures may be either potential or realized, and be of greater or lesser importance to the story.\footnote{Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 11.} She contends that the apostrophe of Apollo in Book 15 supports structural demands, in that it heralds what will be the worst point for the

\textit{and its tenor: Ready, Character, Narrator, and Simile, 4, n. 10. Strictly speaking, the vehicle portion of the simile in this case is followed by the tenor which contains the apostrophe.}
Achaians, the breaching of their defences and the subsequent firing of their ships.\textsuperscript{474} 

The apostrophe of Melanippos in Book 15 is not so much a turning point as a dramatic spurt of tension as both sides are caught in a deadlock.\textsuperscript{475} She contends that the apostrophe of Achilleus clearly marks a major turning point in the story.\textsuperscript{476} Mackay’s assessment of the second apostrophe of Apollo is more complicated. Basically, she concludes that it signals that the turning point for the Trojans has come.\textsuperscript{477}

De Jong

De Jong notes three explanations for the function of the Homeric poet-narrator’s apostrophe of character: metrical expediency; the poet-narrator’s expression of sympathy for loyal, vulnerable characters; and a drum-roll for a turning point in the narrative.\textsuperscript{478} In discussing the apostrophes of Melanippos, Apollo and Achilleus, she rejects metrical expediency.\textsuperscript{479} As for the second category, she finds that this explanation is less convincing in the apostrophes of Apollo and Achilleus. And, as for the third, she is equally divided, deeming as turning points the first apostrophe of Apollo when he destroys the Achaian defences (15.365–366) and the apostrophe of Achilleus (20.2). But she rejects the second apostrophe of Apollo (20.152) and the

\textsuperscript{474} Mackay, "Frontal Face", 12.

\textsuperscript{475} Mackay, "Frontal Face", 13.

\textsuperscript{476} Mackay, "Frontal Face", 14–15.

\textsuperscript{477} Mackay, "Frontal Face", 15–16. I shall go into more detail about Mackay’s assessment of this apostrophe later in this chapter.

\textsuperscript{478} De Jong, "Metalepsis", 94–95, including nn. 17–19.

\textsuperscript{479} De Jong, "Metalepsis", 94–95, 94 n. 19. The footnote covers the points in the rest of the paragraph.
apostrophe of Melanippos (15.582) as turning points. Concerning her own view that through metalepsis apostrophes add to the enargeia of the narrative-text, De Jong makes no comments on the four apostrophes.

**Distribution a major evaluative aspect**

In my case studies of Menelaos and Patroklos, a common thread of interest and relevance has been the distribution of all the apostrophes in accordance with Labov and Waletzky's framework of the elements of narrative. We saw that the distribution of the apostrophes plays a significant role in marking critical and highly significant points in the development of the complicating action. Further, the last apostrophe of Menelaos (23.600) marks the moment at which the threat to the Achaians' recently restored order is removed; when Menelaos and Antilochos have the good grace to resolve their quarrel without either losing face. This created a satisfying highlight to the coda at the communal level. Thus, in this case study, the distribution of the apostrophes of Apollo, Melanippos, and Achilleus across the narrative structure will come under particular scrutiny. My account, therefore, will be structured in two main parts—apostrophes in Book 15 and those in Book 20. But observations relevant to both apostrophes of Apollo (15.356–366, 20.152) will be dealt with together.

**Location, participants, and context of the apostrophes**

In common with the majority of other narratorial apostrophes of character, the first apostrophe of Apollo (15.365–366) and the apostrophes of Melanippos (15.582) and Achilleus (20.2) take place on the battlefield. The second apostrophe of Apollo
occurs within what can be described as the larger structure of the theatre of war, literally in the "gods" section of the audience within the storyworld (20.149–152).

Only Melanippos is engaged in mortal-to-mortal conflict. He has been given a fatal wound by Antilochos and is dying. He has unique status as the only Trojan to be addressed by the poet-narrator. As noted, Apollo is unique because he is the only god within the storyworld who is addressed by the poet-narrator. In the first apostrophe (15.365–366) he is intervening in mortal affairs to re-arrange the "props" of war by forging a pathway through the Achaian defences to give the Trojans an advantage in their offensive. But he is neither perceived by any mortal, nor is he assaulting one, as in Book 16 when he strikes Patroklos (16.789–792). He occupies a parallel dimension in the storyworld, reserved for gods, whence he can intervene in the affairs of mortals. In the second apostrophe, Apollo and the other gods (with the exception of Zeus), have come down from Olympos to occupy two high observation points (152). To continue with the metaphor of war as theatre, the apostrophe of Achilleus (20.2) takes place when the hero is waiting in the wings, as the two rival forces put the finishing touches to donning their war costumes by arming themselves (20.1, 20.3)—the Achaians around Achilleus, and the Trojans in the distance.

**Apostrophes in Book 15**

Book 15 reveals an increasing amount of narratorial intrusion in the build-up to the climactic events of the complicating action of Book 16. Book 15 provides the final trigger for Patroklos' re-entry into battle by chronicling the successful Trojan
offensive, which takes the fighting to the Achaian ships. It is worth dwelling on the importance of Book 15 and its function in the unrolling of the plot. In what I described in Chapter 3 as the second half of the complicating action and its immediate aftermath (Books 11–17), all the action takes place on the third day of battle. Hence, Homer describes sequentially what is happening at the same time in different locations: for example, Nestor’s persuasion of Patroklos, Hera’s seduction of Zeus, and the battle action, from various perspectives. As Patroklos delays his return to Achilleus to tend the wounded Eurypylus (11.840–12.2), the fighting portrayed in Books 12, 13, 14 and approximately half of Book 15 takes place. It is only after the Trojans climb over the Achaian rampart and make for the ships that the poet-narrator returns us to Patroklos in what seems by comparison a peaceful, almost domestic scene, as he tends Eurypylus’ wound:

τόθρ’ ὁ γ’ ἐνὶ κλισὶ ἀγαπήνονος Εὐρυπύλου
ἠστὸ τε καὶ τὸν ἐτερπεῖ λόγοις, ἔπι δ’ ἔλκει λυγρῷ
φάρμακ’ ἀκέσματ’ ἐπασσε μελαινάων ὀδυνάων.

...[he] had sat all this time in the shelter of courtly Eurypylus and had been entertaining him with words and applying medicines that would mitigate the black pains to the sore wound.

15.392–394

The sight of the Trojan offensive jolts Patroklos. He starts to run back to Achilleus, intent on persuading him to fight for the Achaians (395–404). He repeats Nestor’s words to boost his confidence (11.792):

---

480 As noted in Chapter 3 above, Taplin’s view that the “huge central day” lasting from Book 11 to Book 18 is a narrative unit: Taplin, Homeric Soundings, 18.
The apostrophe of Apollo (15.365–366) marks the first breaching of the Achaian defence and calls our attention to it as a critical turning point. The effect on Patroklos confirms importance of this development. The poet-narrator then resumes his account of this next most critical phase of the complicating action, in which the apostrophe of Melanippos (582) takes place.

As well as two apostrophes of two new addressees, an instance of another category of apostrophe, a direct address to the audience (697), adds to the narratorial intrusion marking the significance of these events (in what we know as Book 15) in the plot. And, as noted in Chapter Four, Book 15 also contains the most important and comprehensive example of prolepsis in the Iliad: Zeus reveals the fates of Sarpedon, Patroklos, Hektor, and even Troy itself (15.65–71). This provides a point of reference for a series of related narratorial prolepses in the Patrokleia which sustain and augment the tension and the theme of impending doom for Patroklos, and a short-lived victory for Hektor. Although primarily a tension-raising device, narratorial prolepsis also reinforces the status of the poet-narrator as a trustworthy and reliable presenter of events. This is important, as the complicating action of the narrative picks up pace and the final sequence to its climax begins. I shall return

481 His response impels the plot forward: he hurries back to Achilleus and pleads with him to be allowed to help the Achaians. (16.21 ff).

482 Morrison’s definition of misdirection was given in Chapter 4 above: Morrison, False Predictions, 14, 20.
to intrusion in more detail in my discussion of the apostrophes. But before I turn to
the apostrophes themselves, I shall first comment on the special factors in making a
narratorial apostrophe of a god.

Narratorial apostrophe of a god

In the *Iliad*, the act of apostrophizing a god in circumstances other than an
invocation is remarkable.\(^{483}\) The gods occupy a special and privileged dimension in
the storyworld. They are all-seeing, all-knowing. They can defy spatial boundaries
and temporal restrictions. They never suffer, and never die. It is legitimate to ask
whether they are characters in the same sense as their mortal counterparts. In the
context of apostrophes, I consider Apollo to be a character within the epic
storyworld. As divine observers, gods do function as an audience—but *within* the
epic storyworld. They can intervene in the action within the storyworld. And when
they intervene they are generally removed or veiled from mortal perception.\(^{484}\) In
their dealings with mortals they are presented more as a force and as an instrument
of Zeus' will in realizing what fate has decreed. They reveal their more personal
attributes, and therefore their character, in their interactions with each other. At an
individual level, Apollo reveals fewer personal attributes than most of the other
gods who play a role in the poem (especially those attributes which liken the gods

---

\(^{483}\) Matthews takes the opposite view. He contends that an apostrophe of a god by Homer is
more understandable than that of mortals, and it is surprising that there is only one example
of the former: Matthews, "Metrical Reasons", 98. He is clearly not referring to invocations of
the Muses.

\(^{484}\) Examples of exceptions are Thetis and Iris. As the loving mother of Achilleas, Thetis is
unique in her direct interactions with her mortal son (1.357–427; 18.65–137). Iris identifies
herself as a messenger from Zeus when she tells Priam to ransom Hektor (24.159–188).
to mortals such as Hera’s wiles, her nagging and her jealousy). Apollo’s most significant attributes are his focussed swiftness and his anger—ones he shares with Achilles. But he is a significant participant in the events of the storyworld. Kahane contends that like Achilleus—and Athene—Apollo may be viewed as an “epic or heroic ‘core’ character”.

Bonner dismisses anything beyond metrical convenience with regard to the apostrophes of Apollo, Melanippos and Achilleus as just as unlikely as Henry’s view that the apostrophes of Patroklos were influenced by dirges for fallen heroes. As we have seen, Matthews contends that the apostrophes of Apollo are “probably” modelled on a ritual hymnal address as in h. Hom. 3 (Apollo) 120:

\[\varepsilonνθα σέ, ἡμε Φοίβε, θεαὶ λόον ὑδατὶ καλῳ\]

then the goddesses washed you, Lord Phoibos [Apollo] with clear water

\[h. Hom. 3.120 (my translation)\]

---

485 For example: 1.536–569, 14.153–360. An important exception in the context of Apollo is his pity for the defilement corpse of Hektor (24.33–54).

486 Rabel argues that Apollo’s anger acts as an important paradigm in relation to the wrath of Achilleus: Rabel, Plot and Point of View, 41–42, 200. He draws on Reinhardt, De Ilias und ihr Dichter, 43–44, where Reinhardt points out that Apollo is Agamemnon’s first opponent; Achilleus is his second (44).

487 Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 117. He draws this conclusion from an examination of the vocatives of Apollo’s proper name which are dominantly “verse-terminal”. (Kahane’s examination of Athene covers her role in the Iliad and the Odyssey.) The two narratorial apostrophes of Apollo, however, do not contain the vocative of his proper noun. A variation on Kahane’s interpretation is that these gods take the initiative and have as core attributes strength and purposeful energy.


489 Matthews, “Metrical Reasons”, 98.

Yamagata describes the apostrophes of Apollo as “ready-made expression[s] borrowed from ritual/hymnial tradition”. De Jong suggests that the two apostrophes of Apollo closely resemble the Du-Stil (thou-style) characteristic of hymns. She notes that the Du-Stil is natural in hymns which, like prayers, address a god. She also argues that the poet-narrator may have borrowed them from this context. Although I do not reject this explanation as a factor, I consider it important to determine points of commonality with the other apostrophes.

First apostrophe of Apollo (15.365–366)

Book 15 presents the nadir of the Achaians’ fortunes after their temporary revival under Poseidon while Hera beguiles Zeus. On waking, Zeus is angry with Hera but she manages to deflect his anger by blaming Poseidon for helping out the Achaians of his own volition (15.4–47). Zeus moves to assert his authority over all the gods, including Poseidon (49–53). He reveals his overall plan for the deaths of Patroklos, Sarpedon and Hektor and for the defeat of Troy (54–71). Iris is sent to order Poseidon back to his home (55–58), and Apollo is sent to heal and strengthen the wounded Hektor (58–62). Zeus orders that no god may help the Achaians until the promise he made to Thetis is fulfilled (1.505–510). Thus, Zeus has set the framework for the rest of the story and also for the events beyond the scope of the Iliad.

Most unusually, when Apollo encounters Hektor, he speaks to him ἅντις (face-to-face, openly, 247)—another sign of the momentous events to come. Hektor’s

---

491 Yamagata, “Apostrophe of Homer”, 103.

492 De Jong also uses h. Hom. 3.120 as an example, and compares it to the apostrophe at 15.365–366: de Jong, “Metalepsis”, 95.
confidence returns with his new strength—likened to a powerful stallion breaking free from his stall (263–268)—and with the news that Zeus himself has ordered Apollo to protect him.\footnote{The Achaians’ sudden switch from bravery to fear is likened in a somewhat convoluted simile to hunters who, deprived of their quarry by a fearsome lion, take flight (271–276).} Hektor leads his troops towards the Achaian defences. The Achaians panic and retreat (306–327). Mini-lists of victims from both sides convey the intense fighting (328–342). The Trojans press forward φαλαγγηδόν (in phalanxes, 360) through the Achaians on a pathway created by Apollo who stands by, holding the aegis:

\[
\ldots \textit{έρειπε δὲ τεῖχος Αχαίων}
\]

\[
\textit{φέαία μάλι, ὡς ὅτε τις ψάμαθον παῖς ἀγχι θαλάσσης,}
\]

\[
\textit{ὅς τ᾽ ἐπει σῶν ποιήσῃ ἀθύρματα νηπιαῖσιν}
\]

\[
\textit{ἄψ αὐτοῖς συνέχειε ποσίν καὶ χερσίν ἀθύρμαν.}
\]

\[
\textit{ἁς ὅα σὺ, ἥμε Φοῖβε, πολύν κάματον καὶ οἶζόν}
\]

\[
\textit{σύγχεας Ἀργεῖον, αὐτοῖσι δὲ φύλαν ἐνώςας.}
\]

... and [Apollo] wrecked the bastions of the Achaians easily, as when a little boy piles sand by the sea-shore when in his innocent play he makes sand towers to amuse him and then, still playing, with hands and feet ruins them and wrecks them.

So you, lord Apollo, piled in confusion much hard work and painful done by the Argives and drove terror among them

15.361–366

The simile of the sand-boy—both creative and innocently destructive in his play— is delightful and familiar, even to audiences of today. But the point is that, for a god, the effort expended in destroying mortal fortifications, however strong, is child’s play, or achieved φείδα μάλι (with great ease). Apollo’s baleful motivation contrasts sharply with the sand-boy’s ingenuous, and perhaps literally thoughtless, play.

Janko notes that similes often describe gods’ wondrous deeds. He also notes that this simile follows one that likens the width of the path Apollo has created to the
cast of a spear in competition. Both similes increase the contrast between the ease of a god’s action and the toil of mortals.\textsuperscript{494} Pathos arises from the emphasis on the Achaians’ effort in building the defences as πολὺν κάματον καὶ οἶῳν (much toil and hardship). Griffin reminds us that nothing created or suffered by mortals is serious to the gods.\textsuperscript{495}

The emotion modelled here is of awe and wonder at the power of the god. Thus, the theory that accounts for apostrophes as mechanisms to evoke sympathy or pity for the addressee does not apply here. And to describe the poet-narrator’s attitude as empathy is equally inappropriate. The poet-narrator does not address the god Apollo as he would any other character in the storyworld. Homer is inviting us, a mortal audience, to join him, a fellow mortal, in contemplating this casual manifestation of Apollo’s destructive power with equal awe, tempered by an awareness of, and compassion for, the consequences for the mortal Achaians. In support of this view, I point to Janko’s comment that the “emotive address to Apollo expresses his power” and that the mysterious ἐν “is restricted to such apostrophes”. But others, such as Edwards, argue that the use is likely to be restricted to metrical expediency. Edwards concedes only a “slight emphasis” on Apollo in both apostrophes.\textsuperscript{496} I shall question this narrow assessment.

\textsuperscript{494} Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 267.

\textsuperscript{495} Griffin, Life and Death, 130.

\textsuperscript{496} Janko, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 267; Edwards, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 5, 308. Edwards also notes that the expression takes place at the god’s birth in h. H. 3.20 and “must reflect the ritual cry ἐν”. Leaf does not comment on either apostrophe of Apollo except to say that all explanations of ἐν are “mere guesses”: Leaf, Iliad, vol. 2, 128, 359. The definition of
The importance of this apostrophe of Apollo is stressed in two ways. The first is that this is one of eight instances where the apostrophe is preceded by a simile. The link between simile and apostrophe is strengthened by the fact that the apostrophe contains the tenor of the simile. The poet-narrator heightens the immediate quality of the apostrophe by starting it with the emphatic ὅποια οὗ (so you surely), which includes a second person pronoun and the evidential particle ὅ. This dramatic start lets the audience know that what is to follow is of momentous import. Here the particle has the force of “mark you!” rather than a sequential “then”. As Bakker points out, the evidential ὅ (or its Epic form ὅ) indicates the immediate present and heightens the enargeia of a scene.

Kahane observes that the patronymic in the apostrophe of Achilleus (20.2) and “possibly” the two instances of ἦιε Φοῖβος (15. 356–366, 20.2) are the only exceptions to the use of proper-names in Homeric apostrophes. Whether ἦιε Φοῖβος (usually translated as Phoibos Apollo) is an exception depends on whether Φοῖβος (Phoibos) is considered an epithet or proper name.

More effective than any further overt narratorial intrusion at this point are two actions. First, Nestor invokes Zeus’ pity with a prayer which the god answers with a huge peal of thunder (15.370–378). This reminds us that any Trojan triumph will

---

i] that the LSJ provides is that it is an “exclamation of joy or enthusiasm, especially used in the cult of Apollo”.

497 Henry, “Use and Origin of Apostrophe in Homer”, 7; Scott Richardson, 238, n. 10.

498 Bakker, Pointing at the Past, 97–98.

499 Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 82, 82. n. 6.
ultimately not be final. Second, as I noted above when setting Book 15 into context, Patroklos’ reaction (390) to the Trojans penetration of the Achaian defences causes the next acceleration in the plot. There is a direct causal link between Apollo’s action, marked by apostrophe, and the critical turning-point of the complicating action, when Achilleus and Patroklos see the firing of an Achaian ship (16.112–113), its announcement contained in the last invocation to the Muses. The link is strengthened by the poet-narrator’s foreshadowing of Achilleus’ physical reaction (16.124–125) through that of Patroklos:

\[\text{Patroklos groaned aloud then and struck himself on both thighs with the flats of his hands and spoke a word of lamentation...} \]

The poet-narrator then describes the fighting, various deaths, near escapes, and Apollo’s intervention to save Poulydamas (406–568). Of particular note is the stalemate between Hektor and Aias (415–419), and Hektor’s subsequent exhortation (485–499) complemented by that of Aias (502–513). The fighting continues with renewed vigour and takes a heavy toll (515 ff). This scene provides the background for the second apostrophe of Book 15, that of Melanippos.

\[\text{Minchin, Resources of Memory, 171.} \]

\[\text{The difference in reaction is expressed through the two verbs } \dot{\phi} \text{μωξέν (he groaned, 15.397) and } \\sigma\lambdaοφυφόμενος (lamenting, 15.398), which stress Patroklos’ distress at what he sees. Achilleus, by comparison, jumps into action (16.125 ff).} \]

\[\text{The same closing speechframe is used for Hektor and Aias (500 = 514), the only difference being in lack of augment in 514 (.fromString(} \dot{o} \text{τωυε he stirred up), which could be taken as a conative imperfect.} \]
Apostrophe of the Trojan Melanippos (15.582)

After Menelaos kills Dolops, Hektor calls to his brothers and rebukes Melanippos, who is Dolops' cousin (545–558). The poet-narrator provides a brief biography of the son of Hiketaon:

...δ' ὀφρα μὲν εἰλίποδας βοῦς
βόσκει ἐν Περκότῃ δημῶν ἀπὸ νόσφιν ἑόντων:
αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ Δαναών νέες ἠλυθον ἀμφιέλισσαι,
ἄψ εἰς Ἱλιὸν ἠλθε, μετέπεπε δὲ Τρώεσσι,
ναῖε δὲ πάρ Πριάμῳ, δὲ μιν τιν ἴσα τέκεσσι...

...He in Perkote had tended his lumbering cattle, in the days before when the enemy was still far off; but when the oarswept ships of the Danaans came, then he returned to Ilion, and was a great man among the Trojans, and lived with Priam, who honoured him as he honoured his children. 15.547–551

Aias exhorts the Achaians again (561–564). Zeus rouses the Trojans (567). Now Menelaos exhorts Antilochos, a neat reinforcement of their special relationship (discussed in Chapter 3 above), with a reference to his youth and superior speed (568–571). Antilochos steps forward, glaring, javelin at the ready. The Trojans retreat, but Antilochos does not miss Melanippos, who is referred to at the moment of his death with both a patronymic and an epithet as Ἰκετάνονος υἱὸς ὑπέρθυμος Μελάνιππος (the son of Hiketaon, Melanippos the high-hearted, 576):

Ἀντίλοχος δ' ἐπόρουσε κύων ὡς, δό τ' ἐπὶ νεβρῷ
βλημένῳ ἄξιον, τόν τ' ἐκ εὐνήφη θυρόντα
θηρητήρι ἐτύχησε βαλὼν, ὑπέλυσε δὲ γυῖα:
ὡς ἐπὶ σοί, Μελάνιππε, θῷ Ἀντίλοχος μενεχάμμης
τεῦχεα συλῆσων: ἀλλ' οὐ λάθεν Ἐκτορά δίον,
δό όρα οἱ ἀντίος ἠλθε θέων ἀνὰ δηιστήτα.
Antilochos sprang forward against him, as a hound rushes against a stricken fawn that as he broke from his covert a hunter has shot at, and hit, and broken his limbs' strength. So Antilochos stubborn in battle sprang, Melanippus, at you, to strip your armour but did not escape brilliant Hektor's notice, who came on the run through the fighting against him.

15.579–584

The vehicle of the simile focuses on Antilochos' speed and predatory intent. The strong Melanippus is reduced to a vulnerable object of prey. In the apostrophe, however, the focus switches to Melanippus, the fallen Trojan, as the second person pronoun makes clear. The position of the proper-noun vocative is described by Kahane as "verse-internal". As we saw in Chapter 4, Kahane contends this position indicates the poet-narrator's "sympathy" for addressees of multiple apostrophes.503 Regarding Melanippus, Kahane concludes that the apostrophe of Melanippus is a Homeric ἐπιτάφιος λόγος (a funeral oration, typically on a warrior fallen in battle) on a minor character and that it indicates "a small measure of special attention".504 Although he does not specify what emotion is involved in this "special attention", it is reasonable to assume that it equates to a measure of empathy and compassion. The biographical details of Melanippus, introduced earlier, strengthen the effect. Priam honours Melanippus as he honours his own children (551). Melanippus is referred to a second time with his patronymic at the moment of his death (576). The patronymics and Priam's feeling for Melanippus can be linked to the leitmotif of the grieving father.505 As we have seen in Chapter 2 above, Griffin argues that, although such phrases are not overtly emotional in tone in themselves, they have the force to


504 Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 92–93.

505 On the grieving father leitmotif: Griffin, Life and Death, 123–127.
evoke a strong emotional response. Further, the reference to Melanippos’ home in Perkote evokes a second poignant leitmotif, discussed by Griffin, the death of a hero far from home. Strictly speaking, the apostrophe of Melanippos does not mark the moment of his death. Instead, the apostrophe raises the spectre of being stripped of one’s armour after death, an indignity which every hero dreads as worse than death itself, especially when linked to the fear of dying far from home. This equates to losing one’s all-important identity as a hero-warrior, the son of an arguably distinguished father, and to becoming carrion for vultures and dogs instead of being buried with honour. It is one thing to be a slain hero, but it is quite another to be a naked, dishonoured corpse.

This is a further relatively common example of a simile paving the way for an apostrophe. But here a second simile brackets the apostrophe (586–588). It is curious. Antilochos flees like θηρί κακὸν ὀξεῖαντι (a wild beast after committing a bad deed, 15.586). Two examples of bad deeds are given. One is the murder of an ox-herd. Was Homer implicitly expressing a view that there was a shameful aspect to stripping armour off a dead warrior? The apostrophic event-sequence finishes as

506 Griffin, Life and Death, 139.

507 Other examples: Agamemnon’s grief imagining Menelaos buried in Troy, far from his home (4.169–182); Zeus sheds tears of blood when he thinks of the imminent death of his son Sarpedon far from home (16.459–461).

508 On “the bitterness of death far away from home, which is worse than mere death itself”: Griffin Life and Death, 108.

509 Griffin, Life and Death, 44–47.
Hektor and the Trojans pursue Antilochos ἱχνὶ θεοπεσίη (with an unearthly sound, 590) in vain.

Why would the poet-narrator apostrophize a Trojan and what emotions could he be modelling? I suggest that here Homer is saluting the “everyman” warrior. It is precisely because Melanippos is a minor character who appears in the narrative only to die that he can be accorded this honour without offending the sensibilities of Homer’s audience.510 We are not told about any Achaians he might have killed. Griffin has pointed out, in a different context, that Homer deals even-handedly with both Trojans and Achaians when they gather up their dead in silent grief (7.42–431).511 It is consistent with this that he acknowledge the pathos of the fallen hero-warrior on the “other” side and his dependency on his comrades to protect his armour and his corpse.512 Generally, Homer expresses empathy for non-combatant Trojans such as Andromache, Hekabe and Priam. And his empathy and compassion is implicit in descriptions of body language and the choice of speeches by such characters, which express fear, affection, anxiety, and grief—often within the context of close family relationships. The apostrophe of Melanippos is a rare overt expression.

Woven into both the Iliad are many mini-biographies of minor warriors, who, like Melanippos, are introduced during an encounter which ends in their death. These

510 On the introduction of characters who “exist in order to be killed”: Griffin, Life and Death, 103.

511 Griffin, Death and Life, 48.

mini-biographies play a role in sustaining our interest and engagement because they bring war to a personal level. They also help portray the depths of loss and suffering to which the proem alludes (1.2–5). The result is that the audience empathizes with the plight of a series of minor characters and understands the human cost of war (1.2–5).

De Jong notes that this apostrophe does not mark a vital point in the narrative. But a case can be made for its position in the narrative structure as part of the deliberate mosaic of important points in the penultimate stage of the complicating action at which everything is set in place for the Patrokleia. The apostrophe occurs at the lowest point for the Achaians. Viewed in this light, this apostrophe is not only well-placed, it is consistent with other overt narratorial commentary, such as prolepsis, on the futility of mortal triumph. For example, soon afterwards the poet-narrator explains why Zeus is honouring Hektor to such an extent. Hektor’s triumph will play its role in realizing fate:

"Εκείνοi γάρ οἱ θυμός ἐβούλετο κύδος ὁρέξαι Πρωμίδη, ἵνα νησί κορωνίς θεσπίδας πύρ ἐμβάλοι ἄκαμπτον, Θέτιδος δ’ ἐξαίσιον ἁρήν τάσαιν ἐπικρηνεὶε...

Zeus’ desire was to give glory to the son of Priam, Hektor, that he might throw on the curved ships the inhuman weariless strength of fire, and so make completely accomplished the prayer of Thetis.

15.596–599


514 Hence, the importance of achieving κλέος (glory). Being celebrated in song is the only way for mortal heroes to live beyond their death.
We are told that Zeus is honouring Hektor because his life will be short: his death is already being brought on by Athene ὑπὸ Πηλείδαο βήψαν (through the force of the son of Peleus, 15.614). And, given that the function of Book 15 is to prepare for the *Patrokleia* by presenting the final impetus to Patroklos to act, the brief but intense attempt to strip Melanippos’ of his arms presages the crucial battles over the armour of the slain Sarpedon (16.633–665), Kebriones (16.755–782) and Patroklos (Book 17).

**Direct narratorial address to the audience (15.657)**

Despite rallying sporadically, the Achaians’ overall situation worsens. The cause is clear: Zeus himself is involved. He has promised Hektor victory until the sun sets (11.187–194). Many of the senior Achaian leaders are wounded and Achilleus is still in self-imposed isolation in his camp. The third narratorial apostrophe in Book 15, the only book in the *Iliad* to have three different recipients of narratorial addresses, is a direct address to the audience:

...φαίης κ’ ἀκμήτας καὶ ἀτειφέας ἀλλήλωιν ἄντεσθ’ ἐν πολέμῳ, ὡς ἐσπαρέας ἐμάχοντο. τοῖς δὲ μαραναμένοισιν δὲ ἦν νός: ἦτοι Ἀχαιοὶ οὐκ ἔφασαν φεύξεσθαι ὑπ’ ἐκ πολέμου, ἀλλ’ ὀλέσθαι, Τρωσίν δ’ ἐλπιτεὶ θυμὸς ἐνι στήθεσιν ἐκάστου νῆς ἐνιπτήσειν κτενεῖν Θ’ ἥρωσας Ἀχαιοὺς.

...you would say that they faced each other unbruised, unwearied in the fighting, from the speed in which they went for each other. This was the thought in each as they struggled on: the Achaians thought they could not get clear of the evil, but must perish, while the heart inside each one of the Trojans was hopeful to set fire to the ships and kill the fighting men of Achaia.

15.697–702
This marks the final impasse before the Trojans set fire to an Achaian ship. It corrects the reasonable assumption of the audience that both sides would be exhausted by now. Such is their passion and motivation, that they still seem equally matched. Hektor, however, provides the incentive for his men to break the impasse and to take fire to the Achaian ships:

νῦν ἡμῖν πάντων Ζεὺς ἄξιον ἦμαρ ἔδωκε νῆας ἐλεῖν...

Now Zeus has given us a day worth all the rest of them: the ships' capture...

15.719–720

Apostrophes in Book 20

Books 17–18 are concerned with the immediate aftermath of Patroklos' death (Book 17), the rescue of his corpse (Books 17–18), Achilles' response to Patroklos' death (Book 18), Hektor's refusal to return to Troy when the sun sets on the third day of fighting (18.284 ff), and the fashioning of Achilles' new armour by Hephaistos (Book 18). The completion of the rescue of Patroklos' corpse by Achilles ends the transition from the complicating action of the main narrative to its resolution phase (18.203–238). The blaze of fire rising from a golden cloud placed about Achilles' head by Athene is not just a sign of the goddess' favour and support of the hero. It may be taken as a symbol of the raw energy of his wrath which provides the impetus for his impatient reconciliation with Agamemnon in the next book (19.40–144). His impatience is based on the fact that this reconciliation is merely the means to an end: his existence has been reduced to securing Hektor's death. As Redfield ...
observes, Achilleus’ “absolute obligation” to avenge Patroklos relieves him from the need to make any choices or decisions.\textsuperscript{515}

Book 19 starts with the dawn of the first day following Hektor’s loss of Zeus’ protection. The golden light of energy leitmotif continues and marks a new phase:

\begin{quote}
'Ἡώς μὲν κροκόπτεπλος ἀπ’ Ὀκεανοίο όφανων ὀρνυθ', ἵν' ἀθανάτοιοι φώος φέροι ἦδὲ βροτοίσιν...
\end{quote}

Now Dawn the yellow-robed arose from the river of Ocean to carry her light to men and to immortals...

19.1–2

Thetis returns with Achilleus’ new armour. The armour’s terrible glitter eclipses the gentle light of the new day and frightens the Myrmidons:\textsuperscript{516}

\begin{quote}
...αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεύς ὡς εἰδ’, ὡς μιν μᾶλλον ἐδυ χόλος, ἐν δὲ οἱ ὁσσε δεινόν ὑπὸ βλεφάροις ὡς ἐι σέλας ἐξεφάνθεν: τέφτετο δ’ ἐν χειρεσσιν ἐχων θεοῦ ἀγλαὰ δώρα...
\end{quote}

...Only Achilleus looked, and as he looked the anger came harder upon him and his eyes glittered terribly under his lids, like sunflare. He was glad, holding in his hands the shining gifts of Hephaistos...

19.15–18

It is as if the force of Achilleus’ inner anger is seeking an external outlet.\textsuperscript{517} He is the closest he has ever been to being god-like, in that he has lost touch with his essential

\textsuperscript{515} Redfield, \textit{Nature and Culture}, 18–19.

\textsuperscript{516} The new armour and its frightening effect are linked to the leitmotif of shining energy and glittering metal associated with Achilles: for example, the blaze above Achilles’ head, caused by Athene, had struck terror into the Trojans in Book 18.

\textsuperscript{517} On Achilles’ continuing, almost unnatural, energy after he dons his new armour: Schein, \textit{Mortal Hero}, 35. Schein draws attention to a simile which expresses the alignment of the armour with Achilles’ destructive force as he moves across the plain in search of Hektor.
humanity. A mortal’s life is given meaning by the certainty and fear of death. And yet, Achilleus at this moment is not concerned as to whether he lives or dies. Redfield translates χόλος as “rage” because this word “is a whole-body reaction, the adrenal surge which drives men to violent speech and actions”. Even Achilleus’ pleasure in Hephaistos’ gifts is linked to its utility in enabling his revenge. He refuses to eat or drink until the day’s fighting is over (305–308). Book 19 concludes with three delaying sequences which intensify our anticipation and stress the momentous nature of the event that is to come. Zeus is moved to pity by Achilleus’ words of lamentation (315–340). At Zeus’ behest, Athene strengthens Achilleus with divine ambrosia and nectar (352–354). The detailed ceremonial donning of Achilleus’ new armour is replete with words that reflect its magnificence and brilliance, including many references to light and fire (365–391). The Achaians’ helmets, which are brought out as they start to arm themselves for battle, add to the general effect of light and brilliance with Achilleus at its epicentre (359–364). Indeed, the poet-narrator likens Achilleus in his armour to the sun-god Hyperion (398). Book 19 ends with the intimate and affecting conversation between Achilleus and his horse Xanthos (400–424). Everything is now in place for the confrontation between Achilleus and Hektor.

He likens him to the evil star Orion’s dog, Sirius (22.25–32). The fact that the poet-narrator presents this moving image through the focalization of Priam makes it more powerful.

518 Redfield, Nature and Culture, 14.

519 To avoid any hint of the magical, the poet-narrator attributes Xanthos’ ability to speak to an act by Hera (407).
Apostrophe of Achilleus (20.2)

Book 20 begins when the poet-narrator turns away from his audience to enter into the epic storyworld to address Achilleus direct:

\[ \omega \varsigma \delta \iota \mu \varepsilon \nu \pi \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \nu \iota \ kορο\nu\iota \iota \ \theta ω\rho\iota \gamma\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\circ \alpha \mu \phi \ i \sigma \epsilon \, \Pi\iota\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma,\ \nu\iota \ \mu\acute{a} \chi\varsigma \ \acute{\alpha} \kappa\omicron\rho\eta\gamma\theta\iota\omicron \ \Lambda\chi\alpha\iota\omicron\iota,\ \ \Theta\rho\omicron\varsigma \ \delta \ \alpha\theta \ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\omicron\omega\theta\epsilon\nu \ \epsilon\pi \ \\theta\rho\omega\omicron\varsigma\mu\omega \ \pi\epsilon\delta\iota\omicron \omicron \ldots \]

So these now, the Achaians, beside the curved ships were arming around you, son of Peleus, insatiate of battle, while on the other side at the break of the plain the Trojans armed...

20.1–3

We do not need any preamble, nor is there any need for explanatory or supporting simile or other narratorial comment. After the grand and lengthy preparations of Book 19, Achilleus is presented in readiness at the eye of a gathering storm of arming Achaians and Trojans.

Kahane observes that characters apostrophized are usually addressed by their proper name.\textsuperscript{520} As noted above, Kahane has identified the apostrophe of Achilleus, Πηλέος νιέ (son of Peleus, 20.2) as the only exception, and the two instances of ἰἶε Φοῖβε as possible exceptions. Kahane also notes that vocative elements, such as patronymics and epithets, are frequently omitted in apostrophes.\textsuperscript{521} The use of the second person pronoun in this apostrophe emphatic: it stresses that “you, son of

\textsuperscript{520} Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 82.

\textsuperscript{521} Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 82, 82, n.6. Kahane also asserts that the second person pronoun is frequently omitted. But he is referring to all 34 instances of narratorial apostrophe of character in the Iliad and the Odyssey, and his conclusion in this regard is skewed. This conclusion does not apply to the Iliad: a form of the second person pronoun is included 16 times in 14 of the 19 apostrophes. (The three speechframes which contain apostrophes in the Iliad (16.20, 744, 844) do not contain any second person pronouns.)
Peleus” are at the forefront of both sides’ thoughts, arousing the opposite emotions of hope and dread (42–46). The emphasis on the battle-ready Achilleus, standing on his chariot behind his driver and surrounded by Achaians busily arming themselves, indicates his domination of the plot. The rich image also stresses his inner isolation from his community, and hence from his own humanity.522 Everything needed for the resolution phase is in place, except the presence of Hektor. From now on the plot will, as it were, roll out under its own momentum.

Kahane observes that Achilleus and Agamemnon’s intransigence and larger-than-life quality make them “rather poor candidates for a personal address by the poet”, but he also describes Achilleus as a “tragic figure and, in a sense, a victim of his own character”.523 Kahane accords Achilleus temporary status as a character who deserves a “sympathetic gesture” as he is about to enter a decisive battle. I contend that the atypical patronymic is used here to convey a note of pathos. Griffin makes a compelling argument about the effect of the grieving father leitmotif which forms a strong thematic thread through the poem.524 He notes:

The Iliad is composed of small units which have the same nature as the large ones, it seems, when we reflect on the unhappy father in the foreground of the plot...525

522 See Schein, Mortal Hero, 139. Schein cites Achilleus’ refusal to eat (in the preparatory Book 19) as a sign of his dual status. Godlike in the extent of his wrath, he does not need to eat and “to this degree is no longer a mortal”. He is isolated from his fellow mortal hero-warriors “for whom a meal is a shared ritual”.

523 Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 112.

524 Griffin, “Homeric Pathos and Objectivity”, 174–177, and Life and Death, 113, 123–127. See also discussion on Homeric “objectivity” in Chapter 2 above. Kahane raises the semantic functions of the atypical patronymic and he notes that it may be significant if the leitmotif of grieving father is considered valid as a device for presenting pathos: Kahane, interpretation of Order, 112 n. 100.

525 Griffin, Life and Death, 127.
Achilleus is here presented as the son of Peleus (my emphasis). We are reminded that Peleus will soon become another parent whose son dies before his time (1.352, 18.95–96). Achilleus’ reconciliation with Agamemnon was a necessary step in returning to battle to avenge Patroklos. He is not concerned with the usual business of hero-warriors, striving for glory. He is reconciled to dying because he feels responsible for Patroklos’ death (18.98–100). His acceptance of his role in Patroklos’ death and the knowledge—which we share with him—that he soon will die ensure that we are not alienated by his transformation. As Redfield observes, in a sense Achilleus has died with Patroklos; what is left is an isolated force of raw energy, a destroyer rather than a leader of men.

The patronymic also lends a certain sense of occasion and ceremony to the situation. The emotion modelled here is not easy to pinpoint. Taking into account the context and content, as well as the use an apostrophe, the emotions modelled by the poet-narrator in the apostrophe of Achilleus are compassion and awe. A note of pathos arises from the gulf between him in his splendid yet alienating armour, standing in his chariot and the public or open panorama of the armies massing on both edges of the plain. Although Achilleus now appears to champion the communal cause, there is within him no inner reconciliation or reintegration. He is more isolated and alone.

526 On the leitmotif of a short life: Griffin, Life and Death, 127–130. Achilleus’ moving speech, in which he refers to Peleus and Neoptolemos, reminds us that the death of warriors will affect sons as well as fathers (19.322–337).

in the excess of his destructive fury and grief than at any time during his self-imposed isolation when he still had Patroklos' company.

Patroklos is not named in this book either by proper name or patronymic, and there are two possible reasons for this. When both Zeus and Achilleus refer to him, it is as the honoured companion of Achilleus. For example, when Achilleus catches sight of Hektor, he says:

\[\text{ἐγγὺς ἄνηφ ὦς ἐμὼν γε μάλιστ' ἐσεμάσσατο θυμόν, ὦς μοι ἐτάιρον ἐπεφην τετμένον}...\]

Close is the man who cut my heart to pieces, who slayed my honoured companion...

The second reason is the poet-narrator's unwavering focus on Achilleus in Book 20, to the extent that no other Achaian is named.

Bonner argues that the apostrophe of Achilleus is a case where "the figure is of no rhetorical value" and metrical convenience may have prompted its use although it did not force it.\(^{528}\) Mackay's spirited defence takes the opposite view. She describes this point of the narrative as climactic because Achilleus has "absented himself" since Book 1 and now, at last, the Achaians are about to follow him onto the battlefield. The apostrophe thus marks "the turning point to which everything has been leading".\(^{529}\) De Jong agrees with Mackay's assessment.\(^{530}\) My evaluation of the apostrophe is that it indeed marks a critical point, marking the expected acceleration

\(^{528}\) Bonner, "Apostrophe in Homer", 386.

\(^{529}\) Mackay, "Frontal Face", 14–15.

\(^{530}\) De Jong, "Metalepsis", 94–95, n. 19.
of the resolution of the second and greater wave of complicating action caused by Patroklos’ death. To recapitulate briefly, after the transitional Books of 17 and part of 18, the rest of Book 18 and Book 19 chart the necessary conditions and preparations being put in place for Achilleus to take to the battlefield for the first time. Our patience is about to be rewarded, or so we think. In what is an addendum of contrasting understatement to the lavish and detailed arming set-piece at the end of Book 19, the poet-narrator allows Achilleus, his audience, and himself to take a breath before the suspense gives way to battle. The apostrophe is also a powerful repetition of the motif, introduced in the detailed arming scene, that Achilleus is the focal point of the Achaians (19.363–264). There is, I argue, a deft touch of emotional modelling in the patronymic which also sets a serious and ceremonial tone. We are fleetingly reminded of a father’s grief before the poet-narrator moves on with the action. This “event-sequence” has been more of a tableau than a sequence of events.

Immediately after the apostrophe, the poet-narrator switches his focus to Olympos to present the immortal preparations which complement those of the mortal warriors. This is, in part, a delaying tactic, but it also forms a necessary part of the build-up to the final confrontation between Achilleus and Hektor. Zeus summons the gods to an assembly. In a change of policy, he announces that they may take part in the battle. Achilleus needs to be thwarted from defying fate by taking Troy (4–30). Zeus announces that he will watch the spectacle from Olympos, using the phrase φαένα τέρψομαι (I shall pleasure my heart, 23). This jarring note is a
reminder of the fundamental gulf between mortals and the gods. Mortals' existence is shaped and given meaning by the certainty of death, while ultimately nothing matters for the gods because they "fear no consequences" and the future is limitless.

Second apostrophe of Apollo (20.152)

Until the gods become involved, the Achaians under Achilleus are triumphant:

Τρώας δὲ τρόμος αἰνός ύπῆλυθε γυνιά ἐκαστον δειδιότας...

But the Trojans were taken every man in the knees with trembling and terror...

The gods drive their favourite sides on and start to quarrel among themselves. The clamour and bellowing is so loud that:

ἐδεισεν δ' ὑπένερθεν ἀναξ, ἐνέρων Αἰδωνεύς,
δεισας δ' ἐκ θρόνου ἀλτο καὶ ίαξε...

Aidoneus, lord of the dead below, was in terror and sprang from his throne and screamed aloud...

Edwards argues against such an interpretation. It is from the gods, he contends, that Zeus expects to derive "justifiably" his amusement: Edwards, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 5, 289. This attempt to defend Zeus is not convincing. We cannot explain all the gods' behaviour in human terms. Zeus will take his pleasure from both mortals and gods.

Griffin, Life and Death, 169.
The poet-narrator uses the same fast-paced language to describe how the gods pair off against each other as he does to describe fighting between mortals (67–74).533 There is a certain ludic quality about the gods facing up to each other. Soon the poet-narrator moves back to the mortals. Achilleus is thwarted from finding Hektor because Apollo fires up Aineias to fight the Myrmidon leader (81–109). Hera urges Poseidon and Athene to take action, but Poseidon proposes they move away to watch the battle and intervene only if Ares or Apollo fights or restrains Achilleus (133–143).

Poseidon leads the pro-Achaian faction of gods to Herakles’ stronghold on high:

\[\text{ἐνθά Ποσειδάων κατ’ ἄρ’ ἔζετο καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι,} \\
\text{ἀμφὶ δ’ ἄρ’ ἀρρηκτον νεφέλην ὄμοισιν ἔσαντο:} \\
\text{οἱ δ’ ἐτέρωσε καθίζον ἐπ’ ὀφρύσι Καλλικολώνης} \\
\text{ἀμφὶ σὲ, ἔνε Φοίβε, καὶ Ἀρη πτολίπτορθον.}\]

There Poseidon and the gods who were with him sat down and gathered a breakless wall of cloud to darken their shoulders; while they of the other side sat down on the brows of the sweet bluffs around you, lord Apollo, and Ares sacker of cities.

20.149–152

This apostrophe draws attention to two significant junctures. By following Poseidon’s lead and taking his seat as a divine spectator, Apollo has tacitly decided that he will neither provoke a full battle between the gods nor intervene further in the mortals’ fight at this stage. He does, of course, intervene later but only after Poseidon has set a precedent (see below). Because he has already incited Aineias to fight Achilleus, Apollo has set the next phase in motion: the duel between the two

533 Edwards notes that no actual duels are described until Book 21 (385 ff) and that a roll-call of combatants is unknown in Homer. The closest equivalent is competitors for games: Edwards, Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 5, 296.
warriors (158–340). This is the next major event of the resolution of the tale. The audience’s expectations of a duel between Achilleus and Hektor have been thwarted, a case of narratorial misdirection. Achilleus does not come face to face with Hektor until line 419 and, even then, Apollo protects him with a mist (441–454). The decisive encounter takes place in Book 22.

Mackay suggests that the poet-narrator wishes “to single Apollo out” as the only god who has taken the initiative and secured something positive for his side, the Trojans, before the gods decide to cease fighting and become spectators. She argues that this is also a turning point: a battle between the gods could have broken out. Her definition of turning points is quite accommodating: it includes ones which are actual or potential, “fundamental or incidental”. But I would argue that they must be significant to the structure of the narrative in order to warrant the overt relaxation of the poet-narrator’s restraint through apostrophe. De Jong claims that this apostrophe does not mark a turning point. Mark Edwards grants very little significance to either apostrophe of Apollo (15.365–366, 20.152). After conceding that in both apostrophic event-sequences there is a “slight emphasis” on

---

534 Morrison, *False Predictions*, 12–19. One of Morrison’s categories of misdirection, we recall, is the upset of the expectations of an implied first-time audience by false anticipation. See also Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 10. She comments that it can seem as if the poet-narrator is almost “teasing his listeners with a premature conclusion to his song”, something that meets Morrison’s definition of misdirection.

535 Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 15.

536 Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 15–16. A serious battle between the gods at this stage of the story would detract from the focus on Achilleus’ first battle scene in the epic.

537 Mackay, “Frontal Face”, 11.

the god, he concludes that it is more likely that the vocative was used for metrical reasons.539

As for any emotion modelled by the poet-narrator in this second apostrophe of Apollo, I contend there is less emotion here (20.152) than in the first (365–366). In the first apostrophe, Apollo is addressed as he is performing a dramatic act, the destruction of the Achaian defences. If dramatic quality were the only criterion, the moment at which Apollo incites Aineias might be a suitable point (103). But that would prevent the apostrophe from marking two turning-points, as discussed above. The emotion, however, is similar to that expressed in the first in that it expresses awe. In this regard, Yamagata observes that when Zeus addresses Apollo he uses φιλε Φοιβε (dear Phoibos, 15.221, 16.667). By using the "conventional, probably ritual" ἡτε the poet-narrator might be expressing veneration towards the god when he is also addressing him as a character in the narrative.540 Perhaps a measure of relief is present as well. The cosmic disturbance of the gods' initial clash is frightening enough to terrify the king of the underworld, Aidoneus (61–66).

Yamagata also draws attention to the similarities between Apollo's role and that of the Muses, in that the poet-narrator has the privilege to make direct addresses to "music deities". Apollo, Yamagata, reasons, is somehow ever-present "listening to and supervising" the poet-narrator's performance.541 Such a view does not take into account Apollo's participation in, and significance for, the events of the story. Nor


541 Yamagata, "Apostrophe in Homer", 97.
does it take into account the fundamental difference between the invocations of the Muses and the apostrophes of Apollo which have nothing to do with his role as the god of music and poetry.

The aim of both apostrophes of Apollo is to articulate a psychological and/or emotional attitude about a critical state of affairs, rather than to create a moment of intimacy through metalepsis. I doubt whether the poet-narrator intends to make us intimes, or intimates, to use Richardson’s term, of Apollo by modelling a similar familiarity himself. Rather, he is inviting us to share in awe and wonder at a situation, where Apollo plays a leading role, by taking us with him into the storyworld to experience it. The metalepsis here is related more to de Jong’s concept of heightened vividness arising from the transformation of remote past to the present. But, importantly, we remain at an emotional distance from the god.

Although the poet-narrator has the remarkable ability to conflate the narrative levels to present the divine dimension in the storyworld to us as part of the performative present, I doubt whether it is intended that either poet-narrator or storyworld audience enter the realm of the divine audience on the same level as the gods. Perhaps we have a privileged view of this divine dimension from within the storyrealm. It is only the gods who can conflate the barriers between mortal and immortal.

Although Apollo occupies a parallel dimension in which he is veiled from direct encounters with mortals in his own guise, he is the first of the gods to intervene in

---

542 Richardson, Homeric Narrator, 174.
the events in the mortal domain by bringing a pestilence upon the Achaians in response to Chryses’ supplication (1.43–52). It is appropriate that the poet-narrator returns to stress Apollo’s role in Books 15 and 20. The second apostrophe of Apollo sets the seal on the final preparations, divine and mortal, so that the poet-narrator gives the impression that the plot is driven by the energy accrued during the winding up of the complicating action.

Conclusion

The four “other” apostrophes all illustrate aspects of the different evaluations of Homeric apostrophe of character. In the context of apostrophe, we can grant Apollo a qualified inclusion as a character. As for modelling an emotional response there is a clear distinction between apostrophes of the two mortals, Melanippos (15.582) and Achilleus (20.2), and those of Apollo (15.365–366, 20.152). It is one thing to respond to a character who is a fellow-mortal—albeit an epic hero—facing a particular crisis, critical situation or challenge. It is another thing to respond to a significant situation or state of affairs in which a god is a causal participant. While the result may be a crisis or danger, it is not so for the divine addressee. Both the apostrophe of Melanippos and the second apostrophe of Apollo have been criticized for failing to satisfy the main criteria of the two dominant current hypotheses about apostrophe, that is, for failing to evoke an emotional response based on character, and for failing to mark a critical juncture. In terms of character portrayal and of sympathy modelled in the narratorial response, the apostrophes of Apollo have minimal relevance. The apostrophes of Melanippos and of Achilleus have greater
significance, albeit in different ways. Although Melanippos' fate is touching, it illustrates one shared by countless hero-warriors, each with his sad story. The song's main theme, however, is concerned with Achilleus, the individual, and the consequences of his behaviour.

I have argued that these apostrophes do meet the criterion of marking significant stages in the elements of narrative according to the framework of Labov and Waletzky. The apostrophes in Book 15 each mark a significant point in the last phase of the complicating action. The direct address to the audience performs a similar function.

The two apostrophes in Book 20, as well as the last apostrophe of Menelaos (23.600), form the exception in terms of distribution across the narrative structure. Like the invocations to the Muses, the apostrophe of Achilleus at the beginning of Book 20 (2) tells us that we must pay close attention because something momentous is about to happen. But, more than that, it tells us that the moment at which Achilleus will enter onto the battlefield is finally about to be realized. This jump-starts the final series of events leading to the climax of the resolution, Hektor's death. With the second apostrophe of Apollo (20.152), therefore, the poet-narrator is drawing our attention to a point in the resolution which is so momentous that the gods, except for Zeus, leave Olympos en masse to take up opposing sides. Divine war, which would create cosmic chaos, briefly becomes a possibility. But it is averted, and the gods take their places again as a special storyworld audience. Both the gods and we, the mortal storyrealm audience, are on tenterhooks as we await the confrontation between Achilleus and Hektor.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

Introduction

My aim in this study has been to test current hypotheses about Homeric apostrophe of character in the content of the Iliad in order to determine whether any one evaluation may account for all instances of apostrophe. I therefore report on my observations and findings about narratorial apostrophe of character in four broad areas: the portrayal of character, the relationship between the Homeric narrator, his addressee, and the audience; the unfolding of the plot; and structural considerations.

The commonality of certain basic aspects in all but two or three cases allows us to propose a set of criteria for the use of narratorial apostrophe of character. The criteria relate to location, participants involved, and action of the event-sequence. The setting is either the battlefield or a setting close-by which has a strong connection to the battlefield: for example, the lofty vantage points to which the gods congregate to view Achilleus in battle (Book 20). Addressees of apostrophe are male hero-warriors, with the unique exception of Apollo. It follows therefore that the action of the apostrophic event-sequences relates to acts associated with the battlefield and fighting. As discussed in Chapter 3 above, the quarrel between Menelaos and Antilochos (Book 23) is akin to battle because Antilochos’ dubious tactics have elevated the chariot race from a funeral-game competition to a situation of conflict.
The poet-narrator saves all but three of the 19 instances of apostrophe of character for Achaian characters. This bias reflects the theme of the epic and its focus on Achilleus and the consequences of his behaviour for the Achaians. It may well also reflect the fact that Homer composed the epic for a Greek audience. The poet-narrator’s generosity with his empathy for the “other” acts as a counterweight to this bias. Apart from his apostrophe of Melanippos, the poet-narrator employs non-apostrophic means to present the pathos of the “other”. I shall present my observations about such non-apostrophic means below.

Portrayal of character; “sympathy” and pity

Two factors are relevant to the contribution of narratorial apostrophe to character: one is the portrayal of character and the second is the narratorial response modelled in the apostrophe of a character. Scholars including Parry, Block, Edwards, Scott Richardson and Kahane propose the hypothesis that the aim of Homeric apostrophe of character in the Iliad is to engender “sympathy” and pity for the character-addressees who share certain traits in common. Such an evaluation is generally based on an analysis of the apostrophes of Menelaos and Patroklos, with an

543 The Catalogue of Ships (2.494 ff) would please the local pride of many in the audience, no matter where the epic was performed. On an approach to Homer’s audience, see Latacz, Homer, 35 ff.

544 Melanippos is the only Trojan to receive a narratorial apostrophe. But, as discussed in Chapter 5 above, he only appears in the epic to die. He is not portrayed killing Achaians.

545 The argument that apostrophes elicit sympathy for altruistic, loyal and somewhat vulnerable characters is used as a convenient shorthand to describe Homeric apostrophe of character in both the Iliad and the Odyssey: for example: Parry, “Language and Characterization”, 9; Block “Narrator Speaks”, 15–17; Janko. Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 4, 317; Kahane, Interpretation of Order, 112.
emphasis on those of Patroklos. Although narratorial apostrophes of character bring to the fore aspects of the addressees' characters and those with whom they interact in the event-sequence, the character-based evaluation of the purpose of apostrophe does not account for all the instances of apostrophe. And, as I have shown, there is even less reason to conclude that Homer's purpose is to evoke sympathy and pity in all the narratorial apostrophes, even those of Menelaos and Patroklos. The findings of my three case studies above indicate a more finely nuanced differentiation in the apostrophic responses modelled by the poet-narrator.

The poet-narrator's heightened goodwill—affection, even—for the two recipients of multiple apostrophes, Menelaos and Patroklos, is clear. But the emotional response modelled by the poet-narrator to these characters in apostrophes has a greater range than sympathy and pity. The narratorial apostrophes of Menelaos chart his progress from potential victim to his finest hour as a hero-warrior and, finally, as an adept in political activity. Added to empathy and goodwill, the emotional response modelled in these apostrophes includes, concern, relief, sympathy, wonder, approbation, and delight. In contrast, the apostrophes of Patroklos can be described as modelling an overall sympathy and pity. Nevertheless, not every apostrophe of Patroklos expresses these emotions: for example, the poet-narrator models approbation in the fourth apostrophe when Patroklos' grief for the slain Epeigeus is transformed into vengeful anger (16.584-585). The apostrophe is used here to establish Patroklos' credentials as a hero-warrior capable of an aristeia to give full effect to his sudden metamorphosis from victor to victim.

The view that the purpose of the narratorial response is to elicit our sympathy and pity does not apply to the two apostrophes of Apollo (15.365–366, 20.152). The pathos in the death-scene of Melanippos is arguably created to a greater extent by the short biography and the evocation of a series of leitmotifs, including that of death far from home, than by the apostrophe itself. Although the poet-narrator salutes the everyman-warrior through the act of apostrophe, its content in this instance (15.582) highlights the threat of Melanippos’ armour being taken by Antilochos which Hektor immediately defuses (583). Hektor’s action thus tempers the pathos. Finally, although the unique use of the patronymic in the apostrophe of Achilleus (20.2) may be said to evoke the leitmotif of the grieving father, or rather the father who will soon grieve, the primary effect of this apostrophe is to mark a critical point in the epic.

**Non-apostrophic means of conveying pathos**

If we were to accept that the primary purpose of apostrophe is to evoke sympathy and pity, the question arises as to why the poet-narrator does not at certain moments use apostrophes of characters for whom we are clearly meant feel compassion: for example, Hektor, Andromache and their baby son in the intimate family scene before Hektor’s return to the battlefield (6.369–493).

The poet-narrator employs other mechanisms to present emotionally-charged and significant moments away from the battlefield when the participating characters include women, non-combatant males, children and the gods. For example, extended exchanges of character speech-acts create immediacy and secure our
engagement and sympathetic response. Mechanisms also include: description of body language and significant objects, evaluative explanation, prolepsis, overt narratorial commentary, and the evocation of relevant leitmotifs, particularly those which encapsulate a complex cluster of images and emotions concerning death.547

Just as one character’s direct speech can be embedded within another character’s direct speech, so the focalization of a character can be embedded within the narrative-text of the poet-narrator.548 The following example illustrates the switch from the poet-narrator’s focalization to that of characters:

\[
\text{αἱ μὲν ἔτι ζωὸν γόνω Ἐκτορα ὅ ἐνι οἰκὼν:}
\text{οὐ γὰρ μιν ἔτι ἔφαντο υπότροπον ἐκ πολέμου}
\text{ἧξεσθαι, προφυγόντα μένος καὶ χείρας Ἀχαιῶν.}
\]

So they mourned in his house over Hektor while he was living still, for they thought he would never again come back from the fighting alive, escaping the Achaian hands and their violence.

6.500–502

After Andromache unsuccessfully tries to dissuade Hektor from returning to the war, she and her handmaidens mourn for the living hero. By way of offering an explanation for this extraordinary behaviour, the poet-narrator presents the women’s embedded focalization. The words γὰρ ἔφαντο (for they thought) cue the

547 Examples of such speech-exchanges: Ares’ reaction to his son’s death and Athene’s efforts to calm him down (15.113–142); Priam and Hekabe’s efforts to prevent Hektor leaving the city to fight Achilleus (22.33–98); and Priam’s return to Troy with Hektor’s body and the funeral of Hektor (24.697–804). On the role of leitmotifs in eliciting an emotional response, see Griffin, Life and Death, 104–139. On devices to enhance the vividness and immediacy in the narrative-text of such scenes, see Bakker, Pointing at the Past, 71–79, 87–91, 97–98.

548 De Jong, Narrators and Focalizers, 257, n. 1. De Jong estimates that about 5 per cent of the Iliad is the embedded focalization of a character which she terms “complex narrator-text”.
switch in focalization. The effect is that of added poignancy. We experience more directly the emotional response of the character concerned than through “straightforward” narrative because embedded focalization lies between narrative passages or narrator-text and characters’ direct speech. We feel things from Andromache’s point of view. Thus, the poet-narrator increases our empathy for Hektor’s wife and elicits our sympathy for her in this situation. A similar effect is achieved by certain forms of commentary such as the poet-narrator’s explicit explanation of a character’s ignorance of information to which the storyrealm audience has been made privy. For example: while Hekabe leads the Trojan women in a dirge for Hektor, the poet-narrator stresses to us that Andromache does not yet know that he is dead (22.437–439). Thus, her everyday domestic activities become a source of delicate pathos: as she continues weaving, she calls out to her handmaidens to prepare hot water for Hektor’s bath (22.440–444).

The poet-narrator’s portrayal such moments of pathos involving family members of the “other” also allows him to present the universal reactions of concerned and grieving family members and to maintain the Achaians’ distance from home, an important leitmotif. Although we are allowed to witness Achilleus with his mother, Thetis, whose divine status enables her to go to her son, he is still far from his home, his father and his son.

---

549 De Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 147. She notes that it gives a vividness and motivation to events presented in the narrative, especially in providing reasons or clues to the actions of characters.

550 Other examples: the description of Priam and Hekabe’s grief when Hektor is killed and Achilleus defiles his corpse (22.405 ff); the continuing grief of Priam and his sors (24.160 ff). See also Griffin, *Life and Death*, 110.
Consistent with his empathy and goodwill for his characters in general, the poet-narrator also honours Hektor as a hero-warrior with a form of direct address: two of the four faded invocations in the epic introduce lists of victims of Hektor (5.703–704, 11.299–300). But faded invocations, as Block observes, do not have such a dramatic effect as apostrophe of character. The poet-narrator does not model any other particular emotion in the faded invocations.

**Relationship between poet-narrator, addressee, and audience**

In his re-enactment of the events of the distance past in the performative present, the poet-narrator persuades his audience of his reliability and accuracy through the Muses' inspiration and support. The invocations of the Muses assure us of the superior quality of the poet-narrator’s account. De Jong observes that the “metaleptic apostrophe” also enhances the poet-narrator’s authority because he can address his characters, they are real, and his story is authentic.

The very act of apostrophe is critical to its success as a powerful device to reinforce and deepen the engagement of the audience. Apostrophe signals the heightened engagement of the poet-narrator himself with what is befalling one of his characters at a particular point in the story. Apostrophe is a type of natural and spontaneous

---

551 One faded invocation introduces a list of Trojans killed by Teukros (8.273) and one introduces a foreshortened list of Achaians who respond to Menelaos’ call to protect Patroklos’ corpse (17.260), as discussed in Chapter 3 above.

552 Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 11.

553 De Jong, “Metalepsis”, 95.
spoken response with which the audience is already familiar. In other words, apostrophe builds on the skills of natural rhetoric which people use, and thus it rings true.\textsuperscript{554}

Trust is a hallmark of the audience’s relationship with the poet-narrator. The Homeric narrator shares the same values as his audience. Block rightly stresses the importance of reliability in the narrator of an oral epic.\textsuperscript{555} Through the act of apostrophe the poet-narrator invites his audience to align its emotional response to the response he has modelled. Although de Jong’s observation that apostrophes of character create heightened enargeia through metalepsis is true, this is but one effect and it is not unique to apostrophe.\textsuperscript{556} It does not satisfactorily differentiate apostrophes of character from other means the poet-narrator uses to create vividness: for example, direct speech, simile, and other forms of overt intrusion such as νήπιος (innocent, fool) comments followed by evaluative explanation.

Through metalepsis the poet-narrator conflates the temporal and spatial boundaries which separate storyrealm from storyworld. The audience becomes a participant in the poet-narrator’s demonstration of his special ability: he takes us with him to the epic storyworld. The irony of apostrophe is that, although the poet-narrator speaks

\textsuperscript{554} A contemporary example is that of the sports commentator who spontaneously suspends his or her live report of a tennis match to make a direct address to the player to praise him or her for a brilliant shot. But narratorial apostrophe of either a character or the reader in contemporary literature, which is composed in writing, has a somewhat mannered effect.

\textsuperscript{555} Block, “Narrator Speaks”, 9–10.

\textsuperscript{556} De Jong, “Metalepsis”, 95.
to a character, the addressee cannot hear. Nor can he respond. This can raise tension most effectively. The audience is witness to the speech-act, and it is the audience with whom the poet-narrator wishes to communicate and influence. The result is that our response to, and appreciation of, the addressee is enriched. With multiple recipients of addresses in particular, we can speak of the relationship between addressee-character and the audience—at least, from the audience’s perspective. For example, we take delight in the way in which Menelaos’ anger melts in response to Antilochos’ speech (23.600), and we feel sadness at Patroklos’ death (16.843).

Thus, I appreciate but do not agree with Scott Richardson that our reaction to apostrophized characters arises (my emphasis) from the intimacy created by metalepsis and not from the emotions modelled by the poet-narrator. His argument that the apostrophes do not express explicitly (my emphasis) the poet-narrator’s emotion overlooks the importance of taking into account context and the emotional effect which words can elicit although they may not be explicitly emotional in themselves—as Griffin has so ably demonstrates. The intimacy of metalepsis, together with the audience’s trust in the reliability of the poet-narrator, enables the full effect of the narratorial response to take place.

557 A contemporary example is when people watch a horror film or a thriller they sometimes cannot stop themselves calling out to warn the character.

558 Cf Anna Bonifazi’s discussion of Kacandes’ theory that apostrophes in modern literature are messages with two intended addressees—the addressee ("thou") and the receiver of the text (the audience): Anna Bonifazi, Homer’s Versicolored Fabric: The Evocative Power of Ancient Greek Epic Word-Making, Center for Hellenic Studies (Cambridge, Massachusetts; London: Harvard University Press, 2012), 106, n. 127.

Plot considerations

The appreciable difference between the emotions modelled in the apostrophes of Menelaos and those of Patroklos is aligned to the differences that the poet-narrator creates in their characters. This difference is directly linked to their role in the epic. For true Bronze Age heroes, such as Nestor and Agamemnon, Menelaos may have a weak streak, but the poet-narrator guides us to a more finely nuanced and positive view of him through the “discourse” of the apostrophes. Menelaos’ main purpose in the plot is to embody the communal cause of the Achaians and provide an antithesis to Achilleus’ preoccupation with his concerns as an individual. The narratorial apostrophes of Menelaos reflect his purpose. Patroklos has far less personal power and status. His role in the plot is to help define Achilleus’ character and to die and, thereby, cause the second wave of Achilleus’ wrath. The poet-narrator prevents Patroklos’ sacrifice from descending into bathos by providing a counterweight, through his apostrophic approval of Patroklos’ conduct in battle (16.583–585, 754) and his riposte to Hektor in his dying speech (16.843).

Agamemnon’s impiety caused Apollo’s anger at the beginning of the epic. As Zeus’ “right-hand god”, he has been the most instrumental god in the actualization of fate in the epic according to Zeus’ plan. For example, Apollo strikes the first blow in the death scene of Patroklos, a critical moment marked by the sixth apostrophe (16.787–788). His role as a destructive force is stressed by apostrophe when he casually destroys the Achaian defences (15.365–366). The apostrophe of Apollo, as he seats

---

580 Griffin, Life and Death, 121, 139.
himself to view Achilleus on the battlefield, draws attention to the engagement of the divine audience in general. The apostrophe also draws attention to Apollo as one of the most significant characters whose actions impel the plot forwards.

Whereas Melanippos' role in the plot is negligible, Achilleus is the main protagonist. In the context of apostrophe, however, the poet-narrator addresses Achilleus just once to mark a critical point of the plot when we see a great disconnection between him as the formidable warrior-champion and Peleus' son, whose life will be cut short.

**Distribution of apostrophes**

The case studies set out in Chapters 3–5 above have revealed that all narratorial apostrophes of character in Homer's *Iliad* occur at critical points or junctures. This view is proposed by Mackay who convincingly argues that apostrophe is a "structuring device". But the hypothesis that these apostrophes mark critical junctures does not go far enough. Labov and Waletzky's model of the structure of narrative has provided further insights and an additional dimension to a structure-based approach to apostrophes. In addition, their model can account for the distribution of all the narratorial apostrophes of character and can explain why the poet-narrator has not used apostrophe at other critical points of the narrative, some of which are, arguably more critical—such as Patroklos' reaction to Nestor's speech (11.803–804) and the moment at which Achilleus kills Hektor (22.325 ff).

---

561 Mackay, "Frontal Face", 11–12, 16.
Sixteen of the 19 narratorial apostrophes of character are located within what Labov and Waletzky have called the complicating action of the story, as the poet-narrator develops the consequences of Achilleus' withdrawal from the campaign. Six apostrophes of Menelaos (Books 4, 7, 13, 17) provide a thread of unity to the battlefield scenes in Achilleus' absence. As the Achaians' situation deteriorates, the apostrophes chart Menelaos' progression to his finest moment. The apostrophes of Apollo and Melanippos in Book 15 (365–366, 582) contribute to marking significant and thematically appropriate milestones in the last phase of the story's complicating action before the Patrokleia. Apollo's intervention gives the decisive advantage to the Trojans. The apostrophe of Melanippos marks the final gridlock in the fighting shortly before the Patrokleia begins. Antilochos may have killed Melanippos, but Hektor saves his armour. The distribution of the apostrophes of Patroklos is highly concentrated, especially those towards the end of the Patrokleia. This befits what Parry describes as a "closely controlled crescendo of pathos" as the climax is reached with the death of Patroklos.562

Two apostrophes mark the initial acceleration of action in the resolution phase of the story. The first heralds the long-awaited moment when Achilleus is poised to enter battle (20.2). His withdrawal from combat has generated the series of events within the complication action of the story, and the apostrophe marks his domination of its resolution. As noted above, it is appropriate that, of all the gods, Apollo is addressed by the poet-narrator in the lull that follows the false start of the

gods' fight, as the gods take their seats according to which mortal side they favour. There is a rounding-off here, consistent with natural storytelling, in the poet-narrator's second apostrophic call for attention to Apollo's role in the events of the epic, a role that is far from finished. The final apostrophe of Menelaos marks a satisfying coda to celebrate the triumph of good sense and restraint in preventing the escalation of a quarrel into a force for division and strife in the Achaian community.

Apart from three exceptions, the poet-narrator does not choose to use apostrophe after the transition from complicating action to resolution in the dramatic rescue of Patroklos' corpse. The general absence of apostrophe of character is linked to the fact that both Menelaos and Patroklos have completed their primary roles in the plot. Also relevant to structural consideration is the absence of all other three forms of narratorial apostrophe after Book 17—direct addresses to the audience, invocations of the Muses, and faded invocations. The famed restraint of Homer, the poet, may account for the general absence of apostrophes after this point. Too-frequent use of a dramatic device can jeopardise the intended effect. The natural location for Homeric apostrophe, as defined by Block, is therefore the complicating

---

563 Other examples of Apollo's continuing role in the unfolding of the plot: he rescues Hektor from an untimely death at Achilleus' hands (20.441 ff); he prevents the Achaians from taking Troy (21.544 ff); and he takes Agenor's likeness to lure Achilleus into Troy (21.599 ff). It is Apollo's pity for Hektor which triggers Zeus' decision to have Achilleus accept ransom in exchange for Hektor's corpse (24.32 ff).

564 Patroklos' phantom reappears in a poignant scene to speak to Achilleus. This leads into his funeral (23.65–107), and Menelaos appears in the apostrophic event-sequence of the quarrel with Antilochos (23.532–613) which acts as a communal coda.

565 See Appendix D for the distribution table.
action of the story. From this point on, the impression is that the rest of the story is released under its own momentum, as it were, independent of the poet-narrator and the Muses.

Summary

In summary, the character-based assessment of the narratorial apostrophes of character in the *Iliad*—especially that of Parry and Block—offers a wealth of insight into the function and role of apostrophes in the portrayal of Menelaos and Patroklos, as well as aspects of their complementary characters, Agamemnon and Achilleus. But this assessment does not account for *all* apostrophes of character or for the range emotions modelled by the poet-narrator. A more precise differentiation between Menelaos and Patroklos and the attempt to pinpoint the emotional response modelled by the poet-narrator in each apostrophe have resulted in an appreciation of the addressees as complex and engaging characters in their own right. The advantage of the structure-based approach, on the other hand, especially of that formulated by Mackay, is that it can accommodate the apostrophes of Apollo, Melanippos and Achilleus. This approach, as I have shown, rightly restores the value of these apostrophes as important overt intrusions by the poet-narrator. As such, they form part of the important communication from the poet-narrator to his audience about the events he is relating. Furthermore, by using Labov and Waletzky’s model, I have revealed a pattern of distribution which is consistent with a placement of narratorial apostrophes of character according to the
functions of the elements of narrative. What emerges are the different yet complementary insights afforded by a close reading of the apostrophic event-sequences, and an appreciation of the rewarding synergy that can be observed in the poet-narrator's character-based and structure-based strategies.
Narratorial apostrophes in the *Iliad*

This list is based on Block’s four categories of narratorial apostrophe.566

1. **Apostrophe of character**

**Menelaos**
- 4.127–129: Athene deflects Pandaros’ arrow
- 4.146: Menelaos’ legs stained by blood
- 7.104: Initial acceptance of Hektor’s challenge to a duel
- 13.603: Wounds Helenos, kills Peisandros, and vaunts over his corpse
- 17.679: Looks for Antilochos during attempt to rescue Patroklos’ corpse
- 17.702: Gives priority to rescue attempt, not to Antilochos’ companions
- 23.600: Anger melts and resolves quarrel with Antilochos

**Apollo**
- 15.365–366: Forges path through the Achaian defences
- 20.152: Takes seat on high to watch Achilles in battle

**Melanippos**
- 15.582: Antilochos is about to strip Melanippos’ armour

**Patroklos**
- 16.20: Pleads with Achilles
- 16.584–585: Avenges Epeigeus by killing Sthenelaos
- 16.692–693: Gods summon Patroklos to his death
- 16.744: Vaunts over Kebriones’ corpse
- 16.754: Fights with Hektor for Kebriones’ armour
- 16.787–788: Apollo strikes Patroklos
- 16.812: Speared by Euphorbos
- 16.843: Responds to Hektor’s vaunt

**Achilleus**
- 20.2: About to enter battlefield, surrounded by Achaians

2. **Direct addresses to audience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.223–225</td>
<td>Agamemnon, the determined military leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.429–431</td>
<td>Eerie silence of Achaians marching to battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.85–586</td>
<td>Diomedes' extraordinary power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.697–698</td>
<td>Pitched battle by the ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.366–369</td>
<td>Fight over Patroklos' corpse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Invocations of the Muses (an appeal, a form of apostrophe that often includes a rhetorical question)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1–7</td>
<td>Proem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.484–487</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.761–762</td>
<td>Best and bravest of Achaians and their horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.218–220</td>
<td>The first Trojan to stand against Agamemnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.508–510</td>
<td>The first of the Achaians to kill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.112–613</td>
<td>How fire was thrown onto Achaian ships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Faded invocations (rhetorical questions not included in invocations)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.703–704</td>
<td>Achaians killed by Hektor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.273</td>
<td>Trojans killed by Teukros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.299–300</td>
<td>Achaians killed by Hektor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.260–261</td>
<td>Achaians respond to Menelaos' call to protect Patroklos' corpse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Apostrophic event-sequences in the *Iliad*

#### Menelaos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Line ref.</th>
<th>Description of event-sequence</th>
<th>Apos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.105–191</td>
<td>Is wounded by Pandaros but saved from death by Athene’s intervention</td>
<td>4.127–129, 4.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.54–122</td>
<td>Initially accepts Hektor's challenge to a duel</td>
<td>7.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.576–642</td>
<td>Wounds Helenos, kills Peisandros, and vaunts over his corpse</td>
<td>13.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.651–761</td>
<td>Leads rescue attempt of Patroklos’ corpse</td>
<td>17.679, 17.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.532–613</td>
<td>Quarrels with Antilochos</td>
<td>23.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Patroklos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Line ref.</th>
<th>Description of event-sequence</th>
<th>Apos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.1–100</td>
<td>Pleads with Achilleus</td>
<td>16.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.569–592</td>
<td>Kills Sthenelaos to avenge Epeigeus</td>
<td>16.584–585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.684–711</td>
<td>Kills nine Trojans as the gods summon him to death</td>
<td>16.692–693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.731–764</td>
<td>Vaunts over Kebriones; fights for his armour with Hektor</td>
<td>16.744, 16.754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Apollo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Line ref.</th>
<th>Description of event-sequence</th>
<th>Apos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.346–366</td>
<td>Forges path through Achaian defences to their ships</td>
<td>15.365–366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.112–155</td>
<td>Takes a seat on high to watch Achilleus in battle</td>
<td>20.152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Melanippos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Line ref.</th>
<th>Description of event-sequence</th>
<th>Apos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.539–591</td>
<td>Antilochos attempts to strip armour from Melanippos</td>
<td>15.582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Achilleus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Line ref.</th>
<th>Description of event-sequence</th>
<th>Apos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.1–3</td>
<td>Waits, battle-ready to enter the battlefield</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Apostrophes of characters

| Book | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Menelaos | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Patroklos | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Apollo | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Melanippos | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Achilleus | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

### Direct addresses to storyrealm audience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Menelaos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patroklos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanippos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilleus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Invocations of the Muses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Menelaos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patroklos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanippos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilleus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faded invocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Menelaos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patroklos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanippos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilleus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Books in which Achilleus is not physically present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: the number in the shaded box reflects the number of apostrophe/s in the book.
### Apostrophes and similes in the fourth apostrophic event-sequence featuring Menelaos: the rescue of Patroklos’ corpse (17.651–761)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Simile</th>
<th>Apostrophe</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>657-664</td>
<td>Simile 1</td>
<td>Menelaos</td>
<td>Menelaos like lion that retreats, thwarted but unbowed, from closely-guarded livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674-678</td>
<td>Simile 2</td>
<td>Menelaos</td>
<td>Menelaos seeks out Antilochos like sharp-eyed eagle searching for prey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>Simile 5th of Menelaos</td>
<td>Menelaos, cherished by Zeus, your shining eyes turn in all directions in search of Antilochos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Simile 6th of Menelaos</td>
<td>Menelaos, cherished by Zeus, your spirit does not wish to defend Antilochos’ stricken companions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725-729</td>
<td>Simile 3</td>
<td>Trojans attack Achaians defending Patroklos’ corpse like a hound attacking a wounded boar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737-739</td>
<td>Simile 4</td>
<td>The fighting between the Trojans and the Achaians is like fire setting a city ablaze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742-745</td>
<td>Simile 5</td>
<td>Menelaos and Meriones shoulder Patroklos like mules straining under a heavy load</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747-751</td>
<td>Simile 6</td>
<td>The Aiantes hold off the Trojans like a rocky ridge holding back strong currents of water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755–757</td>
<td>Simile 7</td>
<td>The young Achaians scatter before Trojans like small birds fleeing a hawk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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