A more drastic instance of intervention by a third warrior occurs when Menelaos kills Dolops from behind as he is facing an attack by Meges. All of caution. On two occasions in Book 13 a Trojan warrior unsuccessfully attacks an Achaean only to be caught unawares by Meriones on his retreat. Such surprise is not very common. In the fourth book, Elephenor bends over a slain warrior to strip him. As he does so, his ribs are exposed and The question of fairness arises wherever a warrior is taken by surprise. Leaving aside the few bow-shots and the spear-casts that hit someone else, the trickery of the gods is a special case. The one part of the Warfare in the Iliad depends entirely on the strength and courage of the individual fighter. There is no room for strategy or cunning. There is not even much interest in skill. It is assumed that the warrior knows how to throw a spear or wield a sword, but special dexterity in the use or avoidance of a weapon is not a significant feature of the narrative. This attitude is Iliadic rather than Homeric or heroic. Cunning is highly regarded in the Odyssey, and in the Iliad there are occasional references to it. The shield of Achilles shows men gathered in an ambush and increasing their strength through cunning. Idomeneus praises the sang-froid Meriones would display in an ambush. Nestor likes to give orders and advice of a strategic kind; he also tells Antilochos how a good charioteer can use intelligence (metis) to compensate for inferior horses, and the dutiful son remembers the advice so well that he seeks to improve his position in the race by reckless cheating. On another occasion Nestor tells how in the old days Lykurgos killed Areithoös 'by guile rather than force.' But, while the Iliad is clearly familiar with a world in which the outcome of contests turns on the unscrupulous use of intelligence and the ruthless exploitation of the opponent's weakness, the poem banishes both from its arena and presents a spectacle of war at once brutal and innocent: no ambush, no stratagem, no diversionary or dilatory tactic qualifies the encounter of enemies in the field of battle. The bow is a marginal weapon in this world and does not become a major warrior. It is used by Pandaros, Paris and Teukros, but Odysseus, who gives a taste of his cunning in the wrestling match with Aias, left his bow at home when he sailed for Troy and like other major warriors fights with spear and sword. Only accident is allowed to qualify open force: some dozen warriors in the Iliad lose their lives because they stand in the path of a spear aimed at someone else. The trickery of the gods is a special case. The one part of the Iliad in which deception plays a major role, the Doloneia (Book 10), has been firmly established as a later addition to the epic.

The ethos of fighting is perfectly embodied in the words that precede Hektor's attack on Aias in their duel in Book 7:

Yet great as you are I would not strike you by stealth, watching
for my chance, but openly, so, if perhaps I might hit you.
(7.242-3)

Fighting in this spirit not only despoils guile and cowardice; it is also constrained by an implicit notion of fairness. The actual fighting in the Iliad does not always live up fully to that ideal; indeed, it is Hektor himself who runs away from Achilles and takes ruthless advantage of Patroklos' injury. How typical are these striking violations of the code?

The question of fairness arises wherever a warrior is taken by surprise. Leaving aside the few bow-shots and the spear-casts that hit someone else, such surprise is not very common. In the fourth book, Elephenor bends over a slain warrior to strip him. As he does so, his ribs are exposed and Agenor hits him. Similarly, Koön takes Agammenon by surprise as he removes the armour of Iphidamas. These incidents reflect on the victim's lack of caution. On two occasions in Book 13 a Trojan warrior unsuccessfully attacks an Achaean only to be caught unawares by Meriones on his retreat. A more drastic instance of intervention by a third warrior occurs when Menelaos kills Dolops from behind as he is facing an attack by Meges. All three cases seem less than heroic and occur in a stretch of fighting distinguished by savagery of other kinds. None of these incidents, however,
matches the ruthlessness of Hektor's killing of Patroklos. On three occasions a warrior kills an enemy whom he has previously disabled. But there is no other case of a warrior killing an enemy whom someone else has disabled.

If the death of Patroklos is the most serious violation of fairness, the duel of Hektor and Achilles provides the most glaring example of loss of courage. The Homeric warrior aims at inspiring in his opponent the uncontrollable fear that leads to flight (phobos). Instances of such panic are numerous, but they are typically a collective phenomenon. Individual flight is a much rarer and more qualified phenomenon. When Zeus turns the scales of battle in favour of the Trojans and the Achaeans run away, Diomedes is the only warrior to come to the help of the stranded Nestor. He calls on Odysseus as he runs past, but Odysseus does not hear him or does not listen (the text is ambiguous, 8.97). Odysseus, however, makes the fullest statement of the code of courage when, surrounded by Trojans, he refuses to yield in the face of overwhelming odds. Between these extremes, there are intermediate positions. Diomedes is afraid to yield lest Hektor accuse him of cowardice. It takes the advice of Nestor and three thunderbolts from Zeus to persuade him that retreat on this occasion is inevitable and not shameful. The hand of the god is generally a valid excuse for yielding. So Diomedes in Book 5 organises a retreat because Hektor is aided by a god. Zeus inspires Aias with fear, but even so his retreat is slow and reluctant. A warrior may without serious loss of face retreat from an enemy who is clearly superior. Thus Menelaos persuades himself that he may abandon the body of Patroklos when Hektor approaches, and Aeneas yields to Menelaos and Antilochos, but Diomedes scornfully rejects the advice to retreat before the joint attack of Aeneas and Pandaros, and events prove him right.

There are limits to Hektor's courage even before the encounter with Achilles. At the order of Zeus he avoids Agamemnon just as at the order of Apollo he avoids Achilles, although he breaks that command when he witnesses the death of his brother Polydoros. He also avoids Aias on his own initiative. When Patroklos routs the Trojans, Hektor at first resists the attacks of Aias by his skill at evasive action—the only time in the Iliad this skill is made much of—but then he, too, joins the rout. He teams up with Aeneas against Automedon in the hope of conquering the horses of Achilles, but he retreats in fear when the Aiantes come to the aid of Automedon. But neither his previous behaviour nor the other scenes of more or less honourable retreat are any precedent for his extraordinary loss of courage at the approach of Achilles. A warrior may persuade himself to stay (Odysseus) or to retreat (Menelaos), but only Hektor persuades himself to stay and fails to live up to his resolution. It is important to remember, however, that the poet sees Hektor's flight less as a failure of Hektor's courage than as a symptom of the overwhelming terror emanating from Achilles.

The unit of fighting is the individual encounter. The most salient feature of this unit is its brevity. In other forms of heroic poetry warriors demonstrate their prowess in protracted struggles with one or more opponents. Hours or days and many lines may pass before the decisive stroke, and the victor may suffer as many wounds as the vanquished. Not so in the Iliad, where the first blow disables the opponent, occasionally through injury, but mostly through death, which is always instantaneous.

Except for two occasions, the injured warrior has no power to strike back. Agamemnon and Odysseus withdraw from battle after killing the men who injure them. The other injured warriors do not return to battle until a god heals or strengthens them as happens to Diomedes, Aeneas, Glaukos and Hektor. The wounding of Menelaos by Pandaros does not occur in battle. Sometimes injuries are forgotten or trivial and healed by the surgeon. Sarpedon, who suffers a serious thigh-wound on the first day, fights on the third day as if nothing had happened to him. Similarly, Teukros suffers what appears to be a disabling shoulder injury on the second day of fighting, but is all there again on the following day. It is hard to tell whether these cases are due to heroic resilience or to a lapse of memory, but the three Achaean leaders wounded in Book 11 hobble to the assembly on the following day.

Out of some 140 specified encounters only twenty involve more than one blow, and except for the duel of Hektor and Aias no encounter goes beyond a second exchange of blows. On three occasions, the victim is only disabled by the first blow, and it requires a second blow to kill him. The death of Patroklos at the hands of Apollo, Euphorbos and Hektor is an elaboration of these cases.

On two occasions, the warriors let go of their missiles simultaneously. On seven occasions, the aggressor misses the enemy or does not pierce his armour fatally and is killed or disabled in return. The victim is always a Trojan. We find this pattern with Pandaros and Diomedes, Ares and Diomedes/Athene, Euphorbos and Menelaos, Hektor and Aias. A slight variation occurs in the duel of Meges and Dolops. Meges is hit by Dolops, whose spear does not pierce. Meges, who has used his spear to kill another Trojan, hits Dolops with his sword. This stroke, however, is not fatal, and Dolops is killed by Menelaos, who comes up from behind and pierces his chest with his spear. Finally, in two closely related scenes, the Trojan aggressor inflicts an Achaean who retains enough strength to avenge himself on his aggressor but is then forced to leave the battle. This pattern is found in the wounding of Agamemnon and Odysseus in Book 11 by Koön and Sokos. Agamemnon is injured less seriously than Odysseus but, while he continues to fight for a while after Koön's death, the poet does not attribute any named slayings to him.

Only eight encounters go beyond a first exchange of blows—a telling indication of the narrator's preoccupation with the decisive moment. The first exchange always involves spears and has a variety of outcomes. Peneleos and Lykon miss one another. So do Sarpedon and Patroklos, but each of them hits another victim, the latter the charioteer of Sarpedon, the former the tracehorse of Patroklos. The outcome of the first exchange reflects the relative strengths of the combatants in the duels of Paris and Menelaos and Achilles and Aeneas. On both occasions, the Trojan fails to pierce the Achaean's shield. The Achaean does pierce the armour of his opponent, who somehow 'ducks' the spear. On four occasions it is the victor who misses on the first throw. Thus Agamemnon misses Iphidamas, Menelaos Peisandros, Achilles Asteropaios and Achilles Hektor. In each case the opponent hits but fails to pierce; the ambidextrous Asteropaios discharges two spears at once, one of which sticks in Achilles' shield whereas the other grazes his hand.

There is no standard procedure for the second exchange, although it usually involves a change from spear to sword. Menelaos attacks Paris with a sword, which breaks. He then pulls Paris by the strap of his helmet, but Aphrodite snaps the helmet strap. Agamemnon hits Iphidamas with his sword.
The duels of Peisandros and Menelaos and Lykon and Peneleos are alike in that both involve a simultaneous exchange of blows in which the Trojan's blow fails. But Peisandros wields a battle-axe instead of a sword, the only warrior in the *Iliad* to do so. Sarpedon and Patoeklos exchange spears in the second round. The former misses, the latter hits. Asteropaios, the man with two spears, has no sword. As he vainly tries to pull the spear of Achilles out of the ground, Achilles dispatches him with his sword. Achilles rushes at Aeneas with his sword, and Aeneas stands ready to throw a rock, but Poseidon puts an end to the encounter before the second exchange can take place. The most famous victim of Achilles can only be a victim of his spear: Hektor rushes at Achilles with his sword, but Achilles kills him with the spear that Athene returned to him after he missed on his first throw.

The longest fight in the *Iliad*, curiously enough, is the not entirely serious encounter of Hektor and Aias in Book 7. Their duel does not involve the characteristic change from spear to sword, but is based on the triple repetition of a throwing contest in which Aias comes out slightly ahead each time. When the warriors turn to their swords the heralds put an end to the fighting by pointing to the onset of night.

Battle narrative in the *Iliad* is dominated to the point of obsession by the decisive and disabling blow. Some 170 Trojan and fifty Achaean named warriors lose their lives in the *Iliad*; another dozen, evenly divided between the two sides, are injured. About eighty of these die in lists, two, three or four to a line, such as the following victims of Patoeklos:

```
Adrestos
first, and after him Autonoös and Echeklos,
Perimos, son of Megas, and Epistor, and Melanippus,
and after these Elasos, and Moulios, and Pylartes.
(16.694-6)
```

The remaining 140, only two dozen of them Achaenans, attract more of the poet's attention at the point of their death. The degree of attention varies enormously and observes a delicately graded hierarchy: Hektor, Patoeklos and Sarpedon, but also Euphorbos, Iphidamas and Sokos, stand out against the many warriors about whom the poet tells us no more than their name, patronymic, and the nature of their invariably fatal injury. What unites the greatest and the least warriors is the experience of sudden and violent death.

The poet goes out of his way to introduce variety into his grim litany. Take the narrative stretch that describes a rout of the Trojans and shows six Achaean leaders each killing an opponent. Hodios falls off his chariot hit by Agamennon's spear between the shoulders. Idomeneus hits Pheiostos on the right shoulder as he mounts his chariot. Menelaos, like his brother, hits the fleeing Skamandrios between the shoulders. Meriones' spear pierces the right buttock and bladder of Phereklos. Meges hits Pedaios in the back of the head, cutting through his teeth and tongue. Eurypylus rushes at Hyspenor with a sword and cuts off his arm. A similar stretch in the Patoeklia features wounds in the thigh, chest, hip, flank, shoulder, neck, shoulder, mouth, as well as a cut-off head.

Here are the victims of Achilles, the final list of slayings in the *Iliad*. Iphition is hit in the middle of the head, Demoleon on the temple. His helmet does not hold: the spear crashes through the bone and brain splatters on the inside of the helmet. Hippodamas is hit in the back, Polydoros in the navel: he falls holding his guts in his hands. The spear of Achilles hits Dryops in the neck and Demouchos in the knee. Lagonos and Dardanos are dispatched with spear and sword respectively, but their injuries are not specified. Tros vainly seeks to supplicate Achilles: a sword-stroke makes his liver slip out. The spear drives in at one ear of Moulios and out at the other. The sword plunges deep into the neck of Echeklos and is heated by his blood. Deukalion is hit in the elbow; unable to move, his head is cut off and flung away with the helmet. Marrow jets out of his spine. Rhigmos is hit in the abdomen, Areithoös in the back.

This survey of some two dozen injuries from four killing scenes provides a fairly representative sample of injury and death in the *Iliad*. The upper body and the head are the most common targets for the spear, the neck and head for the sword. In any sequence of killings the poet will vary the injuries and the degree of detail. He may state the mere fact of death, or he may dwell in great detail on the circumstances of a particular slaying, but most commonly he will use a phrase that is specific without being very descriptive, such as 'on the right shoulder', 'through the chest', 'below the ear'. Against the background of ordinary killings some scenes stand out for their special precision, atrocity or extravagance. In our sample, the victims of Meriones and Meges in Book 5 as well as several of Achilles' victims fall in this category.

These special injuries require separate attention because they have an effect quite disproportionate to their scarcity. Mention the *Iliad* in a conversation, and someone is likely to point to some particularly grisly injury as a typical instance of Homeric narrative. But such injuries are not nearly so pervasive as casual readers assume. Out of 140 specified injuries only thirty are remarkable in one way or another, and their description takes up a bare hundred lines. Far from being instances of epic battle-lust, these descriptions are associated with particular characters or situations, and they owe their prominence as much to strategic placement as to vividness of detail.

First a brief survey of the grisly scenes. A few injuries are remarkable less for their cruelty than for their attention to real or imagined anatomical detail. Thus Amphiklos is hit 'at the base of the leg where the muscle/of a man grows thickest so that on the spear head the sinew/was torn apart.' Ancient scholiasts wondered about this injury because it does not appear to be particularly lethal. Antilochos rushes at Thoön and 'shore away the entire vein/which runs all the way up the back till it reaches the neck.' For all its precision, the description defies human anatomy. The third example of what Friedrich has called fake realism occurs in Book 14 where Archelochos is hit 'at the joining place of head and neck, at the last/vertebra, and cut through both of the tendons.

Much more important to the tone of the poem are scenes in which a head is either severed or smashed in a particularly brutal way. Three times, and in
words that echo each other, the helmet shatters under the blow of a spear and is besplattered on the inside with brain. Idomeneus drives a spear through the mouth and into the brain of Erymas. The skull splits, teeth fall out, and the eye sockets fill with blood, which also wells up through nose and mouth. The helmet of Hippothoós cannot withstand the force of Aias' blow, 'and the brain ran from the wound along the spear by the eyehole, bleeding.' The spear of Diomedes drives through eye, nose and teeth of Pandaros before cutting off his tongue at the base. A whole line is given over to Pandaros' tongue, perhaps because he had been such a braggart in his life, but Pediaios and Koíranos suffer a similar fate. The realm of the probable is clearly left behind in two scenes where the violence of the blow forces the eyes out of their sockets so that they fall on the ground, the fate of Peisandros and Kebriones.

Decapitation occurs half a dozen times, sometimes as a form of mutilation. Aias Oileus cuts off the head of the dead Imbrios and throws it before Hektor's feet. Agamemnon chops off Koón's head over the body of his brother Iphidamas. When he hews off the arms and head of Hippolochos, killing and mutilation are both present. The same is true of one of the most grotesque scenes in the *Iliad*. Ilioneus is speared in the eye; as he falls backward, Peneleos cuts off his head and triumphantly lifts his spear, with the head stuck on it 'like a poppy.' The same Peneleos later severs the head of Lykon so that it dangles from the body by a mere piece of skin.

Abdominal injuries are not uncommon, but are usually not specified beyond such phrases as *kata laparen* ('in the flank'), *mesen kata gastera* or *neairrei en gastri* ('in the middle or lower belly'). Where the wound is elaborated, the poet dwells on the image of guts spilling out of the body. This happens to Peiros, and to three victims of Achilles. The gruesomest image, however, occurs in Book 17. On two occasions a spear misses and continues to quiver after it hits the ground. This image is varied in the death of Aretos, whom Automedon, the charioteer of Patroklos, kills in revenge for his fallen comrade: the spear quivers in the entrails of the hapless victim.

Groin injuries occur four times. One of them is passed over in a phrase, the other three are remarkable for being the work of Meriones, a ruthless and somewhat sneaky warrior. The first injury is suffered by Phereklos, son of the man who built the ships for Paris' fateful voyage. An ancient scholiast interpreted the wound as poetic justice for the whoring of Paris. The other two occur in adjacent and similar passages in the aristeia of Idomeneus: a Trojan fails to pierce the armour of an Achaeans; as he retreats, Meriones hits him in the groin 'where beyond all places/death in battle comes painfully to pitiful mortals.' The death spasms of the victims are compared to a twitching bull and a wriggling worm--unique images that make it clear that a sense of revulsion is intended and not the result of a more refined sensibility.

There remain three unique and bizarre scenes of death in the *Iliad*. Two of them involve charioteers. A straightforward version of a charioteer's death occurs after the death of Asios. His unnamed charioteer loses his wits, is hit in the stomach by Antilochos and falls off his chariot. In Book 5, Menelaos kills Pylaímenus, and once more it is Antilochos who kills the charioteer, but the motif of the fallen warrior is varied: his head is stuck in the deep sand, and the body remains standing for a while--an image that gains force from the contrast with typical closing phrases like 'he fell thunderously and his armour clattered about him'. In the other version, the motif of the charioteer's paralysis is varied. Patroklos kills the terrified Théstor by stabbing him in the jaw and then

hooked and dragged him with the spear over the rail, as a fisherman who sits out on the jut of a rock with line and glittering bronze hook drags a fish, who is thus doomed, out of the water. So he hauled him, mouth open to the bright spear, out of the chariot, and shoved him over on his face, and as he fell the life left him.

(16.406-10)

Finally, perhaps the most bizarre death of all, a second variation on the theme of the spear quivering in the ground. Paralysed by Poseidon, Alkathoös stands immobile as Idomeneus pierces his armour and drives the spear through his heart:

He cried out then, a great cry, broken in him, and fell, thunderously, and the spear in his heart was stuck fast but the heart was panting still and beating to shake the butt end of the spear. Then and there Ares the huge took his life away from him.

(13.441-4)

With the exception of Koíranos, the victims of gruesome injuries are always Trojans, a reflection of the bias of the poet's narrative sources. Some interesting conclusions emerge from looking at the distribution of these injuries and at the identity of the killers. Twenty-eight of thirty injuries occur in Books 5, 13-14, and in the aristeias of Achilles, Agamemnon and Patroklos (including the fight over his body). The killers are either minor warriors or major warriors in extreme situations. The reasons for this distribution are not hard to find. Minor warriors are both distinguished and placed by their association with fanciful and cruel injuries. Meriones is the specialist in groin injuries; Peneleos acquires similar notoriety through the brutality of head wounds he inflicts. The cluster of unusual injuries in Books 13 and 14 has two reasons. We may distinguish in the *Iliad* between fights that sharply focus on a concrete object (the wall in Book 12, the ships in Book 15, the body of Patroklos in Book 17) and diffuse fighting scenes in which the general sense of battle yields to the individual encounter. Grotesque injuries are almost completely absent from the fighting scenes of the former type (except for the fighting over Patroklos), and they are clustered in the scenes of the latter type. The desire to make individual encounters more colourful and inevitably more brutal accounts for the frequency of unusual injuries in Book 5 and in Books 13 and 14, but it does not explain the much greater brutality of Books 13 and 14. Again the reason is not hard to find. The cruelty of Books 13 and 14 measures the changing nature of the war. The reminder of increasing brutality comes just before Patroklos re-enters the fighting. Patroklos, we recall, is singled out in the
**Iliad** for his gentleness, and the brutality of his fate is a major theme of the poem. But, if Patroklos becomes a victim of war, he is also transformed by its rage: the fighting he leads is exceptionally bloody, and of the five unusual injuries it causes he himself is responsible for two.

It is hardly necessary to point out why cruel injuries are frequent in the aristeia of Achilles: his violence is a response to and further intensification of the brutality that has claimed Patroklos, but as with Patroklos it is at odds with his ‘character’: 'Achilles' unyielding harshness to both living and dead enemies is less the function of his nature than of his fate' (Friedrich).

Agamemnon is a different case. His cruelty manifests itself in the first scene of the **Iliad** when he rebuffs Chryses, and his bloody aristeia seems quite in character. On the other hand, Agamemnon as the leader of the expedition has the strongest sense of the wrong done by the Trojans. His killing of the suppliants Adrestos and Hippolochos is motivated by his sense of outrage. Thus even the Iliadic Agamemnon may not be cruel by nature, but we discover in his portrayal the theme of the brutalising force of a moral mission, which Aeschylus was to develop with magnificent thoroughness.

The preoccupation with the individual encounter and the decisive stroke of death appears in another Iliadic convention, the phrase, ranging in length from a half-line to three lines, by which the poet confirms the death of the victim. These poetic death certificates appear roughly a hundred times and exhibit considerable variety.

Death appears as the loosener of limbs in a set of phrases of which *luse de gaia* (X 6) is the commonest. Another set of phrases equates death with the literal fall of the warrior. *Doupesen de pesōn,*

'he fell with a thud' (X 12), occurs most frequently, its very sound echoing the fall of the warrior on the ground. Less onomatopoeic is a set of phrases that are derived from the verb *ereipein,* 'to fall', and specify the direction or origin of the fall, such as 'from the chariot', 'over his feet', or 'in the dust'. The phrases *keito taneisthes* (X 2) and *keito tateis* (X 2), 'he lay stretched out', dwell on the result of the fall. After the death of Kebriones there is fighting over his body, and the poet returns to the body on the ground: *ho d'en strophalingi konies/keito megaros megalostis telasmesos hipposunaon* ('he lay in the whirling dust mightily in his might, his horsemanship all forgotten').

The falling phrases may stand by themselves but more commonly they are combined with others. The most famous of these combinations contrasts the thudding sound of the body with the clatter of its armour, imitating the contrast in its own phonetic structure: *doupesen te pesōn, aravde se teuchē ep' autōi,* 'he fell with a thud and his armour clattered about him' (X 6). Another phrase for the accompanying noise of the armour is *amphi de ho brache teuchea pokila chalkoi,* 'his glittering armour clattered about him' (X 3), and a unique variant focuses on the noise of the helmet: *amphi de pelex smerdalon konabese peri krotaphosi pesontos,* 'the helmet crashed fearfully about the temples of the falling man'.

The sound can also be the death shout of the falling warrior, as in *gnux d' erip' omōxas,* 'he fell backwards in the dust with a shout', and in the phrase that closes the falls of Asios and Sarpedon:

*hōs ho prosth' hippōn kai diphrou keito taneisthes*

*bebruchōs, konios de dragemenos haimatoeess*

So he lay there felled in front of his horses and chariot, roaring, and clawed with his hands at the bloody dust.

(13.392-3 = 16.485-6)

A similar gesture of futility appears in the line *ho d'en koniesi pesōn hele gaian agastos,* 'falling in the dust he clutched the earth with his hand' (X 5). Even more pathetic is the vision of the dying warrior stretching out his hands towards his comrades: *ho d' huptios en koniesi kappesen amphon cheire philos hetaroisi petassas,* 'he fell backward in the dust stretching out his hands towards his companions' (X 2).

The contrast of death and fertility occurs in a line that closes catalogue killings: *pantos epassuterous pelase chthoni pouluboteirei,* 'all these he felled to the bountiful earth in rapid succession' (X 3). Perhaps a similar association informs the line *keito tateis, ek d'haima melan rhee, deue de gaian* ('he lay at length, and the black blood flowed, and the ground was soaked with it').

The most impressive of these closing phrases transform the absence of life into a dark and threatening presence. *Ton de skotos osse kalupse,* 'darkness covered his eyes' (X 11), is the commonest version of a theme on which the poet likes to play sombre variations: *thanatos de min amphi kalupse,* 'death covered him all around'; *nephele de min amphi kalupse kuane,* 'a dark cloud covered him all around'; *stugeros d' ara min skotos heilen,* 'hateful darkness took him' (X 3); *ton de kat' osse/ellabe porphureos thanatos kai moira kratei,* 'the red death and destiny the powerful took hold of both his eyes'; *amphi de min thanatos chuto thumariostes,* 'life rending death was poured about him'; *ton de kat' ophthalmōn erebenne nux ekalupse,* 'baleful night covered him from the eyes down'.

In a few cases, this possession appears as a grim exchange: *ōka de thumos o' chet' apo meleōn, stugeros d' ara min skotos heilen,* 'swiftly the spirit fled from the limbs but hateful darkness took him' (X 2); and *psuche de kat' outamenei ôteilen essut' epiongoose,* *ton de skotos osse ekalupse,* 'life rushed from the wound, urged on, but darkness covered his eyes'.

The collective impact of these phrases is very powerful and shapes the representation of death as a sudden and violent disaster. The frequency and elaboration of such phrases in different parts of the narrative is random. In this they differ from the unusual injuries, which are highly context-bound. It is clear, however, that the poet avoids the use of the same phrase in successive scenes. Such repetition occurs twice with relatively colourless phrases, and the arresting line *ho d'en koniesi pesōn hele gaian agastos,* 'falling in the dust he clutched the earth with his hands', occurs twice within
the space of thirteen lines, possibly to underscore the tit-for-tat of slaying and counter-slaying. But a survey of scenes in which warriors are killed in quick succession shows the poet at pains to achieve variation. This is most apparent in the fifty-line stretch in Book 5, where six Trojans die, each with a different closing statement:

He fell, thunderously, and his armour clattered upon him

(5.42)

He dropped from the chariot, and the hateful darkness took hold of him.

(5.47)

He dropped forward on his face and his armour clattered upon him.

(5.58)

He dropped, screaming, to his knees, and death was a mist about him.

(5.68)

and he dropped in the dust gripping in his teeth the cold bronze.

(5.75)

and the red death and destiny the powerful took hold of both eyes.

(5.82-3)

The deaths of Patroklos and Hektor are so central to the poem that the poet invents a special elaborate death formula and stresses the interrelation of the two events through its use on those two occasions only:

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.

(16.855-7, 22.361-3)

Of the victims in the *Iliad* only Sarpedon, Patroklos and Hektor, and to a lesser degree Asios, Pandaros and Euphorbos, play any role prior to their death. The rest appear and disappear at the moment of their death and occupy the poet's attention for the space of a few lines only. Most of these victims might as well be nameless, but in some thirty cases the poet gives a sketch of the warrior's background and history. These little necrologues, consisting typically of three or four lines, are, like the similes, a master-stroke of Iliadic art. Through them the poet not only introduces variety into his narrative, but also the collective effect of these miniatures is to create a powerful image of the suffering of war and to extend the narrator's sympathy to Trojans and Achaeans alike.

Evidently the narrative has a strong Achaean bias. Achaeans are killed rarely; even in scenes of Trojan victory, the Achaeans win most of the individual fights, and Achaeans are spared cruel and undignified injuries. Despite the premiss that without Achilles the Achaeans are at the mercy of Hektor, no Achaean fighter of rank is defeated by Hektor, who in fact loses both to Aias and to Diomedes, does not confront Agamemnon, and is even denied the glory of killing Patroklos in open combat. It would have been possible for the poet to motivate this superiority of the Achaeans in moral terms and to attribute the defeat of the Trojans to a moral failing. Herodotus, who thought of his history as in some sense a continuation of the *Iliad*, interpreted the war of the Greeks and Persians as an east-west conflict, in which voluntary submission to law triumphs over the despotism of an oriental ruler. There are traces of such a conception in the *Iliad*. When the armies first clash, the order and silence of the Achaeans are contrasted with the noisy confusion of the Trojans and their allies. Such lack of control is easily related to great wealth and to the foolish passion of Paris that caused the war. Occasionally a Trojan death is seen as the consequence and punishment of wickedness. Thus Menelaos in a speech over the fallen Peisandros sees his victory as just retribution for Trojan licence. In two other cases the sketch of the victim's background sounds a similar theme. We hear of Phereklos that he was the son of Harmonides, who built the ships for Paris' fateful expedition. Peisandros and Hippolochos are the sons of Antimachos, who took bribes from Paris and prevented the return of Helen. Agamemnon, on listening to their supplication, remembers that their father proposed to kill Menelaos and Odysseus when they were on a diplomatic mission to Troy, and he proceeds to avenge the father's disgraceful deeds on the children.

Such moralising, however, is exceptional in the *Iliad*. The necrologue characteristically ignores the division of Achaean and Trojan and deals with the death of the warrior as a human event. Thus the pro-Achaean narrative bias of the poem generates its own counterpoint: the greater the successes of the Achaeans on the battlefield, the more the Trojan victims evoke the poet's sympathy. The poem's narrative bias leads to an unequal division of the poet's impartial sympathy: only seven victims with stories are Achaeans.

The narrator's impartial pity is established early and firmly. At the end of Book 4, the Aetolian Dioreus, an Achaean ally, and the Thracian Peiros, a Trojan ally, have both been killed. The poet takes leave of this part of the battle by dwelling on the common fate that unites them in death:
So in the dust these two lay sprawled beside one another, lords, the one of the Thracians, the other of the bronze-armoured Epeians; and many others beside were killed all about them.

(4.536-8)

The simplest necrologues add to the name of the father that of the mother and dwell on the circumstances of birth or conception. One is tempted to call the effect pastoral because it turns on the nostalgic evocation of a natural habitat from an unnatural perspective. On three occasions the mother is a numphe neis, a water nymph whom the father encountered while tending his flocks or herds. Here is the story of Aisepos and Pedasos and their father Boukolion (the name means 'cowherd'):

Aisepos and Pedasos, those whom the naiad nymph Abarbare had borne to blameless Boukolion.
Boukolion himself was the son of haughty Laomedon, eldest born, but his mother conceived him in darkness and secrecy.
While shepherding his flocks he lay with the nymph and loved her, and she conceiving bore him twin boys. But now Mekistios' son unstrung the strength of these and the limbs in their glory.

(6.21-8)

Similar stories are told about Satnios and Iphition. The mother of Simoeisios was human, but not unlike a water nymph she gave birth to her son on the banks of Simoeis, while following the flocks of her parents. On other occasions the poet simply states the beauty of the mother or the wealth and status of the father.

Some of the biographical detail is anecdotal in character. Skamandrios, killed by Menelaos, was a favourite of Artemis, who taught him skill in hunting,

Yet Artemis of the showering arrows could not now help him, no, nor the long spearcasts in which he had been pre-eminent.

(5.53-4)

Pedaios was the bastard son of Antenor, whose wife treated him like one of her own children to please her husband. The three Achaean victims Medon, Lykophron and Epeigeus are exiles who left their home after killing a man. This is of course the fate of Patroklos as well, and it may not be random that the three vignettes occur shortly before or during the Patroklea. Periphetes, a victim of Hektor, is described as a better man than his father Kopreus (Dung), whom Eurystheus sent on errands to Herakles. This is one of two occasions when a necrologue refers to the body of legend outside the poem. The other and rather obscure passage refers to the father of Atymnios and Maris as the man who reared the amaimakete chimaira, a monster of uncertain nature. In another case, the necrologue refers to an earlier event in the Trojan war: when Agamemnon slays Isos and Antiphos we learn that on a previous occasion Achilles captured them alive and freed them for ransom.

A motif that occurs three times in Book 13 and nowhere else involves a Trojan ally who is married to or a suitor of a Trojan princess. Imbrios married a bastard daughter of Priam and returned to Priam's house when war broke out. Othryoneus wooed Kassandra, the most beautiful of Priam's daughters, and boasted that he would drive off the Achaeans in return for her hand. Alkathoös was the 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 in the great house, since she surpassed all the girls of her own age for beauty and accomplishments and wit; for which reason the man married her who was the best in the wide Troad.

(13.429-33)

It is quite common in the Iliad for brothers to suffer death at the hands of one warrior, and three passages in which the poet looks at brothers united in death are particularly affecting. But the most memorable of the necrologues dwell on the grief of the survivors, the parents--more specifically the father--and the wife. They echo and universalise the suffering of Andromache, Priam and Peleus, and in so doing they establish a powerful thematic link between the major and minor characters of the Iliad. Simoeisios, the first warrior to be singled out for a necrologue, 'did not return his parents' care for him'. If in this instance the grief of the survivors is only implicit, it is very explicit in the story of the father of Xanthos and Thoön:

but Phainops was stricken in sorrowful old age
nor could breed another son to leave among his possessions.
There he killed these two and took away the dear life from them both, leaving to their father lamentation and sorrowful affliction, since he was not to welcome them home from the fighting alive still; and remoter kinsmen shared his possessions.

(5.153-8)
Harpalion followed his father to war 'and did not come home again to the land of his fathers'; indeed, the grieving father walks behind the Paphlagonians who rescue the son's body. Ilioneus, we learn, is the only son of his wealthy father; Polydoros the youngest and favourite son of Priam, who vainly tried to keep him out of battle. Ilioneus is the only son of his wealthy father; Polydoros the youngest and favourite son of Priam, who vainly tried to keep him out of battle. In the case of Sokos, the figure of the grieving parents appears in Odysseus' speech of exultation. The motif also appears in the exchange of speeches between Euphorbos and Menelaos and is confirmed in the elaborate tree simile in which the dead Euphorbos is compared to a young tree, tended carefully by a man in a lonely place and suddenly torn up by a gust of wind.

Sometimes the father is a prophet. The soothsayer Merops vainly tried to prevent his sons from joining the war. Eurydamas, on the other hand, refused (or neglected) to interpret the dreams of his sons Abas and Polyides. Euchenor faces a dilemma not unlike that of Achilles: his father tells him that he must choose between a lingering sickness at home or death in battle. He chooses the latter and, curiously enough, dies at the hands of Paris, as Achilles later will.

The grieving wife appears in the story of Protesilaos, the first Achaean warrior to die at Troy, while his wife 'cheeks torn for grief, was left behind in Phylake / and a marriage half completed'. The theme is implicit in the finest and most elaborate of all necrologues, the story of Iphidamas. Brought up by his maternal grandfather, he married his daughter and went from his wedding straight to the war, where he was killed by Agamemnon:

So Iphidamas fell there and went into the brazen slumber, unhappy, who came to help his own people, and left his young wife a bride, and had known no delight from her yet, and given much for her. First he had given a hundred oxen, then promised a thousand head of goats and sheep, which were herded for him in abundance.

(11.241-5)

The impartial sympathy that the poet shows for the fallen warrior sharply contrasts with the savage partisanship the victors display on such occasions. But the gloating speeches are similar in function to the necrologues in that they keep the fallen warrior a little longer in the limelight. The distribution of gloating speeches relates them closely to grisly injuries. Of the sixteen instances, eight are found in Books 13 and 14, three in the Patrokleia, and four in the aristeia of Achilles. Only one such speech is found outside this complex of scenes. On two other occasions, Pandaros and Paris exult prematurely at the prospect of triumph over Diomedes. But Pandaros misses his target and Paris does not inflict a fatal wound.

The gloating speeches share with the necrologues the motif of the grieving survivor, but they vary it to reflect the hostile perspective of the speaker. The triumphant warrior dedicates the corpse to animals and imagines the survivors' mourning deepened by the lack of the body to care for. The motif occurs in Achilles' speeches to Lykaon and Hektor; Odysseus' words to the body of Sokos form an unusually sombre and restrained instance of the genre:

Sokos, son of wise Hippasos the breaker of horses, death was too quick for you and ran you down, you could not avoid it. Wretch, since now your father and your honoured mother will not be able to close your eyes in death, but the tearing birds will get you, with their wings close-beating about you. If I die, the brilliant Achaians will bury me in honour.

(11.450-5)

The motif of burial is absent from the speech over the body of Ilioneus in which Peneleos contrasts two sets of survivors. The whole scene is worth quoting because it shows a single slaying elaborated by a grisly wound, a necrologue, a simile (short but striking) and a gloating speech, with the different components carefully interrelated. The death of Ilioneus brings to a close the string of brutal slayings in Books 13 and 14; its elaboration is in accordance with the climactic position it occupies:

He then stabbed with the spear Ilioneus the son of Phorbas the rich in sheepflocks, whom beyond all men of the Trojans Hermes loved, and gave him possessions. Ilioneus was the only child his mother had borne him. This man Peneleos caught underneath the brow, at the bases of the eye, and pushed the eyeball out, and the spear went clean through the eye-socket and tendon of the neck, so that he went down backward, reaching out both hands, but Peneleos drawing his sharp sword hewed at the neck in the middle, and so dahsed downward the head, with helm upon it, and still the spear point stuck in the eye socket. He lifted the head high like a poppy, displayed it to the Trojans, and spoke vaunting over it: 'Trojans, tell haughty Ilioneus' beloved father
and mother, from me, that they can weep for him in their halls, since
neither shall the wife of Promachos, Alegenor's
son, take pride of delight in her dear lord's coming, on that day
when we sons of the Achaians come home from Troy in our vessels.'
(14.489-505)

On four prominent occasions the gloating speeches display coarse and savage irony. Thus Idomeneus addresses the body of Othryoneus, the boastful
suitor of Kassandra, and offers him one of Agamemnon's daughters if he would join the Achaians. After Idomeneus has killed Asios, Deïphobos kills
Hypsenor in return and boasts that he has provided him with an escort on the way to Hades. Poulydamas goes one better on this conceit and boasts
that his spear will serve his victim as a walking-stick. It is significant that the gentle Patroklos at the height of his triumph is tempted into such
language. Here he is commenting on the fall of Kebriones from his chariot:

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.
(16.745-50)

Twice the gloating speech turns into genealogical display. More important to the structure of the poem is the preoccupation of several speeches with
the theme of revenge. This theme links the speeches of Books 13 and 14 so that in each book they form a tight cluster. Thus, in Book 13, Deïphobos
thinks of his killing of Hypsenor as revenge for the death of Asios, but Idomeneus retaliates by killing Alkathoös, and referring to his victories over
Othryoneus, Asios and Alkathoös he replies: 'Deïphobos, are we then to call this a worthy bargain/three men killed for one?' In Book 14, Aias kills
Archechos in return for the slaying of Prothoenor by Poulydamas, whose boast he answers thus: 'Think over this Poulydamas, and answer me
truly./Is not this man's death against Prothoenor's a worthwhile/exchange?' The Trojan Akamas thereupon kills Promachos and boasts that the Trojans
are not alone in suffering pain and misery. This prompts Peneleos to kill Ilioneus and to compare the sufferings of his parents with those of
Promachos' wife in the passage quoted above. The chain of retribution that is thematised in these exchanges clearly points forward to the major
version of the revenge triangle in the story of Patroklos, Hektor and Achilles. The theme recurs in the speech of Automedon over the body of Aretos,
whose death he sees as retribution, however inadequate, for the death of Patroklos. For the last time, it appears in Achilles' words to the dying Hektor:

Hektor, surely you thought as you killed Patroklos you would be
safe, and since I was far away you thought nothing of me,
o fool, for an avenger was left, far greater than he was,
behind him and away by the hollow ships.
(22.331-4)

Speeches of exultation form an important part of the aristeia of Achilles and culminate in the words just quoted. The first addressee is Iphition, for no
other reason than that he is his first victim. The victim's fate is briefly summarised, but then Achilles lingers over the description of his home in a
manner that recalls the rhetoric of the unreal with which he envisaged the life in Phthia to which he, likewise, will not return:

Lie there, Otrynteus' son, most terrifying of all men.
Here is your death, but your generation was by the lake waters
of Gyge, where is the allotted land of your fathers
by fish-swarming Hyllos and the whirling waters of Hermos.
(20.389-92)

The other speeches occur in the encounters with Lykaon, Asteropaios and Hektor, Of these only the Asteropaios scene stays within the convention of
minor encounters. In both the Lykaon and Hektor scenes the speech of exultation is part of a more complex pattern.
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