

die bloße Rachehandlung ihm keine Befriedigung schaffen kann. Ihm fehlt die Erkenntnis der Beschaffenheit des Menschlichen, die größere Dauer und höheren Wert besitzt, als die bloße Rachehandlung. Es ist bezeichnend, daß Achilleus diese Wende nicht selbst durchführen kann, sondern daß sein Entschluß wieder als Ausfluß des göttlichen Willens dargeboten wird, wodurch der Weg zu einer echten Versöhnung geöffnet wird. Achilleus erfährt jetzt, was es heißt, hilfreich und edel zu handeln, nicht aber den Stolz auf die rein körperliche Gewalt als letztes Ziel ritterlichen Daseins anzusehen. Es kann kein Zufall sein, daß die *Ilias* mit der feierlichen Beisetzung Hektors schließt, genau mit dem Akt, den Achilleus selbst vor dem Zweikampf höhnisch abgewiesen hatte. Es gibt also auch für das heroische Dasein eine Art der Auseinandersetzung, die das gemeinsame höhere Recht in Geltung läßt. Wollte Homer darauf hinweisen, daß er diese Art des Rittertums für die richtige hält?

Bonn

Hartmut Erbse

WARRIOR VAUNTS IN THE *ILIAD*

Warrior vaunts, the short speeches of triumph delivered over a vanquished dead or dying opponent, are peculiar to the *Iliad* and very rare in extant literature after Homer.¹ These speeches have

1) In Od. 22 only the cowherd Philoetius vaunts over the suitor Ctesippus (287–91), ‘admonishing’ him not to boast in the future but to let the gods be the arbiters of his claims. A more conventional vaunt but over an unconventional enemy is found in the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* (362–70), on which see the detailed discussion of A.M. Miller, *From Delos to Delphi* (Leiden 1986) 88–91. In Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* (1394; cf. 1262) Clytaemestra herself states that she gloats over the husband she has just slain. There are also a few rather short vaunts in Vergil’s *Aeneid* (9.634–35; 10.557–60 and 737; 11.686–89, 12.296 and 359–61; cf. 10.825–30, the apostrophe of Aeneas to the dead Lausus). See the discussion of A.L. Keith, *The Taunt in Homer and Vergil*, *CJ* 19 (1923–24) 558–60, G. Strasburger, *Die kleinen Kämpfer der Ilias* (Frankfurt 1954) 135–37 and G. Highet, *The Speeches in Vergil’s Aeneid* (Princeton 1972) 116–17.

received little scholarly attention² probably because of their relative paucity in the epic. They lack formulaic language or structure³ although they naturally share a number of elements: they occur in man-to-man combat, when the formations of the initial clash have broken down or major leaders perform their ἀριστεῖαι; they do not usually occur at the beginning of books, as the military situation they presuppose needs some time to build up; all but one (20.425–27) are delivered after the vanquishing of the opponent, they often include abusive/scornful remarks addressed to the vanquished and/or his party as well as an emphasis on the victor's credentials. Vaunting is mentioned by the poet before any vaunt is reported in the epic. In book 4, after the truce is broken, the Achaean and Trojan armies clash in full force (422 ff.). The narrator graphically comments on the mighty clang of shields (448–49) and specifies that the earth was soaked with the free-flowing blood which was running like a river (451 ff.). Men were killing and being killed and the air was full of their groans (οἴμωγή) and victory vaunts (εὐχολή) (450). This reference in the context of a narratorial statement allows nothing of the diversity of individual vaunts that are scattered throughout the poem to shine through. But, although otherwise inconclusive for a detailed study of Homeric vaunts, it has a very noteworthy aspect: the narrator indicates the importance of vaunting by making it part of the essence of Iliadic warfare.⁴

2) Keith (above, n. 1) 556–58 makes some passing remarks on a number of vaunts (which he considers a kind of taunt); cf. M. Edwards, *Homer, the Poet of the Iliad* (Baltimore 1987) 93–94. A. Fingerle, *Typik der homerischen Reden* (München 1940) 150–61, provides a list and a brief overview. D. Lohmann, *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias* (Berlin 1970), does not discuss vaunts separately. Useful discussion in N. Bezantakos, *Η ρητορική της Ομηρικής μάχης* (Athens 1996) 141–50.

3) Generally, as B. Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad* (Wiesbaden 1968) 101, notes, no fixed pattern for the verbal exchanges of warriors seems to have existed.

4) T. Krischer, *Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epik* (Munich 1971) 134, has included this passage (446 ff.) in his discussion of the Homeric practice of presenting first a general picture and then supplying particulars because at 456, after the reference to the din of battle and the river of blood, Antilochus is said to be the first to kill an opponent; cf. E.J. Bakker, *Poetry in Speech* (Ithaca 1997) 86–87. The two-line formula (4.450–51) also occurs at 8.64–65. If this is not an interpolation, it may be accounted for by the fact that 8 is a new beginning of sorts. After two inconclusive duels and a broken truce the fighting resumes with vigor; at the end of the day the Achaeans will have to supplicate Achilles (without success) and the next day will be one of the most difficult of the war. Thus the formula at the beginning of the book may not be out of place.

It is indeed a reasonable expectation that vaunts would be invested with particular significance because they are uttered almost simultaneously with the vanquishing and killing of enemies in battle, i.e. with the performance of the quintessential warrior task. They are actually the first registering of a man's most glorious achievements, their first inscribing into collective memory, an embryonic epic song of sorts. But this prominence of vaunts seems to clash with the ambivalent attitude of the characters of the epic, especially the *πρόμαχοι*, towards the exchange of taunts and talking in general, at least on the battlefield. The heroes repeatedly express their disdain for lengthy verbal exchanges on the grounds that talking is unworthy and womanish since words can be manipulated by virtually everybody while the work of Ares can be handled only by a few accomplished warriors.⁵ Given that challenges and taunts are frowned upon, one would expect that vaunts would also be censured since they are often less effective and/or justified than taunts and border on hubris and impiety.⁶ Rather paradoxically, vaunts per se are never directly censured in the epic, although the character of the warriors who utter them and of their party occasionally come under attack.

The ambiguities surrounding vaunts are put into relief with the first vaunts of the poem, which predictably occur rather late, since the first fullscale battle in the dramatic time of the *Iliad* begins late in book 4. The same warrior, Pandarus, the person responsible for the breach of the truce in 4 (104 ff.), vaunts twice (5.102–105 and 284–85) in encounters with Diomedes; both times his vaunt-

5) Aeneas' speech before his duel with Achilles (20.200–258) is the longest and most detailed (if not verbose) utterance in the poem about the exchange of taunts on the battlefield. The irony of stressing at such great length the necessity for succinctness and deed over word has escaped few readers. A subtler irony involves the fact that Aeneas' diatribe is a lengthier version of Patroclus' rebuke of Meriones in 16 (627–31): there it was the same Aeneas who initiated the exchange that prompted Patroclus' rebuke (617–18). Cf. Hector's reply to the challenge of Ajax at 7.234–43; cf. also 13.292–94; 20.366–72 and 431–37; 22.122–30 and 279–85.

6) See the discussion of Achilles' vaunts below. The *Iliad* does not censure gloating over dead people but already the *Odyssey* does: Odysseus urges Eurycleia not to gloat over the bodies of the suitors (22.411–12); for the difference from the attitude in the *Iliad* see e.g. C.M. Bowra, *Tradition and Design in the Iliad* (Oxford 1930) 21, K. Latte, *Kleine Schriften* (Munich 1968) 7 and R.M. Merkelbach, *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee* (Munich 21969) 128–29. Disapproval of gloating over dead people is also voiced by Archilochus fr. 134 W, Cratinus fr. 102 K-A and Euripides, *El.* 900–902.

ing is premature and empty and he quickly meets his death by Diomedes' hand. The confrontation of Diomedes and Pandarus has some similarities with subsequent, more portentous encounters in the poem, especially those of Hector and Achilles.⁷ These parallels primarily shed light on Homer's presentation of Diomedes who is consistently associated with Achilles.⁸ Pandarus, too, though, is elevated to a status higher than his description as rash and petulant in 4 and 5 indicates.⁹ Still, the parameters that define his vaunting remain elusive. The main question is whether Pandarus' empty vaunt casts a long shadow on all subsequent vaunts in the poem and especially on those of Hector and Achilles. Are all vaunts, whether by a major leader or a lesser warrior, essentially empty and do they draw divine displeasure on the vaunter, especially when hubris is involved?

In what follows I will discuss how subsequent vaunts bring out or modify the negative implications of the first two. I will argue that, despite their paucity and brevity, vaunts, varied in form and flexible, are an important poetic device. They are not distributed randomly and they often work on more than one level simultaneously. Besides their obvious function of enlivening the narrative, vaunts serve as indicators of the pace of battle in long battle narratives. Their presence (and, occasionally, their absence) focuses attention on individual fighters, their character, personal history and relationships as well as on the fortunes and concerns of the enemy camps as a whole.

7) Pandarus' address to Diomedes before he throws his spear (5.279) ends the same way, with *αἶ κε τύχωμι* (which also occurs at Od. 22.7), as Hector's gallant speech to Ajax before their duel (7.243). The subsequent formula, *ἦ ῥα καὶ ἀμπεπαλὼν προίει δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος*, for the actual throw of the spear (5.280) occurs six more times in the *Iliad*, all in the context of important duels (3.355; 7.244; 11.349; 17.516; 22.273 and 289). Half of Diomedes' reply (5.288–89) forms part of Achilles' response to Hector (22.267–68). Cf. also 5.289 = 22.267 = 20.78, for Achilles' urgent desire to slay Hector (the only three instances in the epic).

8) See for instance 11.362–67 where Diomedes hurls the same abusive taunt at Hector as Achilles at 20.449–54. Cf. also 6.143 = 20.429.

9) His importance is suggested by the fact that Aeneas energetically defends his body (5.297–302). The description of the defense has similarities with Menelaus' defense of Patroclus' body; cf. in particular 5.301 = 17.8 but also 5.299 and 17.4. Ø. Andersen, *Die Diomedesgestalt in der Ilias* (Oslo 1978) 53–54, discusses why the figure of Pandarus is important to the development of the book.

The heaviest concentration of vaunts in the epic is found in books 13 and 14 despite the fact that neither the most difficult nor the most decisive battles are fought in these books. Since no god or major champion storms the enemy lines, the fighters feel that their efforts are frustrated. The harsh situation leads the men to increasingly harsher vaunting in an attempt to bolster their own and their comrades' morale and intimidate a resilient enemy. In 13 both Achaeans and Trojans hold their own, fighting with determination and self-assurance. Losses are heavy, especially on the Trojan side, but no routing or major success ensues. The vaunts highlight the difficulties of the fighters and two of them, Idomeneus' (13.374–82) and Menelaus' (13.620–39), contribute to the characterization of these leaders.¹⁰ The vaunt of Menelaus also addresses the ques-

10) The first significant contribution of vaunts to the characterization of individual leaders is made in 11, Agamemnon's ἀπιστεία. Despite the general lack of restraint he shows in battle, Agamemnon does not vaunt in 11. Taking into account the largely negative figure the leader cuts in the epic one may plausibly interpret his reticence as an indirect indication of lesser warrior status. Agamemnon is certainly the only major Achaean leader who has absolutely nothing to do with vaunting in the epic. (Diomedes and Menelaus do not formally vaunt either but both answer the misplaced provocative speeches of their adversaries [5.287–89 and 17.19–32] and Menelaus also recalls a past success [17.24–28], labelled as 'vaunting' by his opponent [17.35]. I do not consider Diomedes' speech after he wounds Aphrodite [5.348–51] a vaunt, as e.g. Fingerle [above, n. 2] 151 and Edwards [above, n. 2] 93 do, because the wounded will not die and Diomedes does not really gloat over his success. The highlights of Diomedes' ἀπιστεία are the wounding of Aphrodite and Ares and vaunting would be particularly inappropriate in such a context; cf. Fenik [above, n. 3] 40–41, who associates the scene not with vaunts but with insults). If that had been some kind of distinction, it is unlikely that the poet would have reserved it exclusively for Agamemnon. On the other hand, the poet does not present vaunting as a straightforwardly positive practice, as will appear below, and its absence may not necessarily contribute to the negative portrait of Agamemnon. It is definitely a sign of diminished rhetorical ability or difficulty with words, which also becomes apparent from the two short, colorless speeches (11.138–42 and 276–79) Agamemnon delivers during his ἀπιστεία; for Agamemnon's rhetorical shortcomings see e.g. R. Martin, *The Language of Heroes* (Ithaca 1989) 117–18. The only Achaean leader who emerges relatively blameless from 11 and the only one who is given a vaunt in the book is Odysseus; for the presentation of Odysseus (and Diomedes) in 11 see the excellent discussion of B. Fenik, *Homer and the Nibelungenlied* (Cambridge, Mass. 1986) 13–19. For Odysseus in the *Iliad* see also M. Reichel, *Fernbeziehungen in der Ilias* (Tübingen 1994) 213 with further bibliography. Odysseus' vaunt over Socus (450–55) is the first proper one in the epic and it is quite exceptional because of its realistic tone, lack of animosity and avoidance of elation. The encounter with Socus actually encapsulates the most prominent characteristics of the Iliadic Odysseus: he is fond of speech (he also addresses Socus before he hits

tion of the moral principles of the participants in the long and complicated war, especially the moral deficiency of the Trojans. It is characteristic that vaunts addressed to the entire enemy party appear only in 13 and 14: not only individual enemies and their actions but the cause of the enemies and their behavior as a group come under attack by the exasperated opponents.

In 13 Idomeneus inaugurates his ἀριστεία by killing the young Othryoneus, who had recently come to Troy as an ally (363–64), and vaunting over him (374–82). The poet provides a very original piece of information concerning the young man's motives: he had made the extravagant vow to Priam that he would drive the Achaeans away from Troy single-handedly in exchange for Cassandra's hand. Priam was interested and promised to keep his end of the deal if the young man kept his (364–69). The bridegroom-to-be set out energetically to win his bride but his plans were tragically upset by Idomeneus. Othryoneus has been considered a totally negative figure, a foolish braggart who promptly receives his dues.¹¹ This is definitely Idomeneus' view: the vaunt of the aged warrior is one of the most sarcastic, almost coarse, speeches addressed to an enemy in the epic. He mocks his victim's vow assuming a stance of gawking admiration before the supposed abilities of the young man (374–76). He then sarcastically proposes a reversal of Othryoneus' plan, based on the youth's presumed insatiable appetite for princely brides: if Othryoneus agrees to change sides and collaborate with the Achaeans in the capture of Troy, his new allies will give him the fairest of Agamemnon's daughters in marriage (377–80); he should now follow Idomeneus to the ships to have the match arranged and see for himself that the Achaeans are great betrothers (381–82). Idomeneus then starts dragging the body by the foot toward the ships as if to initiate in this insulting way the proposed meeting (383–84). Despite the insults he puts in Idomeneus' mouth the narrator does not seem to share his negative view of Othryoneus' motives and behavior without qualifications: Othryoneus is of course an over-confident young man (the narrator characterizes his vow as μέγα ἔργον at 366), naive and almost

him, 441–45) and realistic about the hardships of warrior life (cf. 2.291–97; 19.155–72 and 221–37); he is not the best fighter but he is no coward or even weak and he is a favorite of Athena's who minimizes the impact of Socus' spear (437–38).

11) See e.g. Fenik (above, n. 10) 35 and R. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Vol. IV, Books 13–16 (Cambridge 1992) 93.

ludicrous in his cockiness, but the pathos of his story is unmistakable.¹² Inflamed by love for a difficult bride and having just assured a promise Othryoneus brings destruction upon himself. This scenario is hardly to be taken lightly in an epic which deals with a great war triggered by the promise of a fair bride to an eager youth to his (and his people's) detriment. The beginning of the war will be mentioned again in Menelaus' vaunt (13.620–39) but the thrust and parry of sarcasm will continue to dominate the two vaunts before Menelaus' and most of the vaunts in 14.

Idomeneus' second victim is Asius (387–93) whose death was foretold in 12 (108–17). No vaunting occurs here since in the *Iliad* the privilege to vaunt twice in a row is only granted to Achilles in 21.¹³ Despite his foolishness Asius is a prominent leader and Idomeneus' success is reinforced by Antilochus' killing of the victim's panic-stricken charioteer and capturing of his coveted horses (394–401). This is answered by Deiphobus' accidental killing of Hypsenor (the spear was aimed at Idomeneus, 402–12). The Trojan's boasting (414–16) is neither long nor very elaborate. The narrator, though, introduces it with the formula ἔκπαγλον ἐπεύξατο, μακρὸν ἄσας (413), which, perhaps not accidentally, occurs only in this (445) and in the following book (14.453 and 478) in the *Iliad*. Just one third of Idomeneus' first (and second, over Alcahous at 13.446–54) and a mere one seventh of Menelaus' subsequent vaunt (13.620–39), it is nevertheless memorable for the wry remark which crowns the usual pride in killing an opponent and avenging a fallen comrade. The dead Asius is said to rejoice as he embarks on his unpleasant journey to Hades (εἰς Ἀΐδός περ ἰόντα, 13.415) because his ordeal will be facilitated by the recent victim who will act as his guide. The remark is probably the reason for the violent reaction of the Achaeans "who resented his boast" (417). This narratorial comment, to the effect that the distress of comrades arises from the enemy's vaunt (as opposed to the killing itself), will appear again in 14. With his fighting spirits still very high, Idomeneus is eager to turn the tables on the enemy and espe-

12) Very significantly, it was not lost on Vergil who adapted the story in even more pathetic tones (Aen. 2.341–46 and 403–26). For bridegrooms slain in the *Iliad* see the discussion of J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford 1980) 131–34.

13) Cf. also W.-H. Friedrich, *Verwundung und Tod in der Ilias* (Göttingen 1956) 22, who observes that the failure to vaunt over Asius creates a ring-composition, from the death of Othryoneus to that of Alcahous.

cially Deiphobus. Aggressively (and impressively) soldiering on he even scores his greatest success yet: he kills Alcahous (427–44), “the best of the Trojans” (433), Aeneas’ brother-in-law. The killing was facilitated by Poseidon who charmed the victim motionless (434–40).¹⁴ Idomeneus’ vaunt, addressed to Deiphobus, ostentatiously caps the latter’s boast by stressing the Achaean superiority which becomes obvious from the unpleasant 3 to 1 score (446–47): Idomeneus thus effectively denies the Trojan side the right to vaunt. He also issues a challenge to Deiphobus proudly recounting his genealogy (448–54). This almost gratuitous coda to the vaunt is characteristic of Idomeneus who is presented as rather loquacious in the epic.¹⁵

After Idomeneus’ retreat the Achaeans have a slight edge and Menelaus performs very well, wounding Helenus (581–95) and killing the ax-wielding Peisander (601–18). The victim is otherwise unknown¹⁶ but his manner of death is particularly graphic: Menelaus smashes his forehead with the sword and Peisander’s eyes pop out and fall in front of his feet (a similarity with the gruesome killing of Ilioneus at 14.493–99 and Kebriones at 16.740–42). Menelaus strips the body (618–19) and vaunts (620–39). This long speech, the only one in a considerable stretch of battle narrative, differs from all other vaunts in the *Iliad* and has been much discussed. Menelaus omits all references to the victim’s personal circumstances or the fate of the body and launches a moral invective against all Trojans whom he accuses of lack of measure and concomitant excessive lust for outrages and battle: the Trojans, he con-

14) This motif appears again in the account of the death of Patroclus (16.788–806): in both cases it accentuates the credentials of the afflicted leaders and reinforces the pathos of their death. For the typology of these scenes cf. S. Lowenstam, *The Death of Patroklos* (Königstein 1981) 82–83. R. Renehan, *The Heldentod in Homer: One Heroic Ideal*, CP 82 (1987) 109, suggests that Patroclus does not exactly die an heroic death because he was fleeing when he received the fatal wound. This is formally correct but the retreat of the wounded Patroclus is due to the stupefaction Apollo’s intervention caused him (16.788–806). No foe, not even Hector, can subdue Patroclus and Euphorbus does not dare face him even when Apollo has disarmed him (806–15).

15) See C. Michel, *Erläuterungen zum N der Ilias* (Heidelberg 1971) 69. Cf. below n. 45.

16) See, though, the discussion of Janko, (above, n. 11) 120, who cites A. Parry, *Language and Characterization in Homer*, HSPH 76 (1972) 19–20: another Peisander, a son of Antimachus, was killed by Agamemnon at 11.143–44 and the two namesakes were probably the same person.

tends, will be punished with the sack of their city for shamelessly trampling underfoot all moral standards and especially the *ξενία* code, protected by Zeus. The role of Zeus is controversial, though. Although Menelaus is confident that Zeus Xenios will punish the transgressors, he is also exasperated by what he perceives as clearly contradictory signs from the god: for the time being Zeus seems to endorse and thus forward the Trojans' hubristic behavior. Menelaus was wronged by the Trojans and is understandably eager to take revenge. Since Paris and all Trojans fighting for his sake committed a crime against Zeus Xenios the wronged party naturally expects the god to eventually, after ten long years of harsh fighting, mete out some punishment to all the transgressors, according to the most basic, universal rule of divine retribution.

Earlier scholars thought that the speech of Menelaus was an interpolation.¹⁷ More recently, Fenik (above, n. 10, 41–43) has accused the speech of turgidity and superficiality but his argument is rather loosely based on the supposed implications of the subsequent deaths of Harpalion and Euchenor (660–72). According to Fenik, Harpalion, who is killed by Meriones (650–55), is a sympathetic and innocent young man who dies hideously. It is clear that Harpalion and his grieving father Pylaimenes (658–59) are one of the many pathetic father-son pairs in the epic but there is no denying either that Harpalion is one of the least distinguished fighters who dies in panicky retreat from a humiliating wound (648–55). No justification can be found for the claim that “there is a disharmony between Menelaos' sanctimonious moralizing and the killings perpetrated by himself and others on the Greek side, between the riddle of Zeus' workings he tries to ponder and the ludicrous inadequacy of his efforts” (Fenik [above, n. 10] 42). First of all, Menelaus nowhere claims or implies that he and his side do not perpetrate brutal killings. As far as Euchenor is concerned, his similarities with Achilles are indeed apparent.¹⁸ But it is inaccurate

17) See W. Leaf, *The Iliad* (London 21900–2, repr. Amsterdam 1971) ad loc. and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin 1920) 225. The structure of the speech has been vindicated convincingly by Michel (above, n. 15) 111–12. Less convincing is the suggestion of the same scholar (113) that the speech serves to create an impression of Trojan invincibility while in reality the Trojans suffer quite heavy losses. For the structure of Menelaus' speech from the point of view of hubris see N.R.G. Fisher, *Hybris* (Warminster 1992) 154–55.

18) There are, though, clear differences between the fate of the two men; see H. Erbse, *Betrachtungen über das 5. Buch der Ilias*, *RhM* 104 (1961) 174–75.

to suggest that Euchenor or Achilles died as a consequence of the enmity of Paris and Menelaus. Both men die because they consciously chose the glory of death in battle over an inglorious death at home. Of the two fatalities that follow Menelaus' vaunt only the death of Harpalion may be attributed to the enmity of Menelaus and Paris because Harpalion was Paris' guest-friend.¹⁹ The juxtaposition of Paris the violator of guest-friendship, as portrayed in Menelaus' speech, and Paris the defender of the same code, who kills Euchenor in order to avenge the death of his own guest-friend Harpalion, does provide a necessary background to Menelaus' invective but it does not reflect negatively on Menelaus, as Fenik suggests. It is paradoxical that in the same paragraph Fenik both accuses Menelaus of failing to discern the deeper issues at hand and claims that the design of Zeus is inscrutable and "the god provides no tidy balance sheet of crime and punishment of the sort the man yearns for" (43). The most that can be safely said of the speech is that it provides yet another illustration of human limitations, memorably outlined in the introduction of book 12 (9–35).²⁰ Menelaus is indeed quite prone to moralize²¹ but his invective against the Trojans is not unique in the epic.

Significantly, it is Achilles who makes pronouncements similar to Menelaus' in 21: in the vaunt over Lycaon Achilles expresses the wish to avenge Patroclus' death not only on Hector but on all Trojans whom he essentially accuses of willfully killing his friend and other comrades in the battle at the ships (128–35), as if battle were premeditated murder. Achilles of course speaks from the point of view of a victor and an invincible warrior for whom the

19) Janko, (above, n.11) 127, makes a good point here, that the criticism of Paris' behavior as the cause of Harpalion's death is not explicit but that it is present and very effective.

20) Ignorance and knowledge or delusion and 'recognition' of the truth is one of the major thematic axes of the epic. All characters, even gods, are to a degree subject to miscalculations, deception and frustration. The movement from delusion to knowledge is most clearly depicted in the career of Hector and Achilles and especially the latter. Unlike others who become wise only at the moment of death Achilles attains knowledge well before his death; see W. Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk* (Stuttgart 1965) 255–60, W. Kullmann, *Vergangenheit und Zukunft in der Ilias*, *Poetica* 2 (1968) 32–34 and C. Macleod, *Homer Iliad Book XXIV* (Cambridge 1982) 10. Cf. below n. 22.

21) He calls all his enemies *ὑπερφίαλοι* (cf. also 3.106 and 17.20–23) and at 23.611 declares that he himself is not *ὑπερφίαλος*. Cf. also his addresses to Zeus in the duel with Paris (3.351–54 and 365–66).

bodies of his victims pave the way to certain triumph and memorable revenge. Menelaus expresses the frustration of a lesser fighter who sees a victory he considers rightfully his slip away yet again. Nevertheless, Achilles' pronouncements too are vitiated by his obsessive lust for revenge because he adopts a stance that echoes Agamemnon's advice to Menelaus to exterminate absolutely all Trojans (6.57–60). Achilles knows that he is fated to die young²² and he himself states to Lycaon shortly before he kills him and vaunts that he will soon die in his turn (21.110–13). But this knowledge has no sobering effect on him: he kills his suppliant and commits hubris against the river-god who protects Troy inviting his wrath upon himself with almost fatal consequences. Both Menelaus and Achilles air their grievances²³ and hopes and present a picture of events that they at the moment believe to be accurate. The fact that their rhetoric does not fully represent reality does not make them ludicrous but self-absorbed and not thoughtful enough.²⁴

More interesting is the fact that the poet chose vaunting as the framework of these utterances. Vaunts are not a mere registration of objective facts. As will appear more clearly below, the vaunters often deal with the emotions the killing awakens, especially in connection with previous losses, rather than with their success per se. This crucial characteristic of the vaunts will continue to be manifested until the end of the epic. It takes its most personal twist when the families of the fighters are involved, a variation first exemplified in 14 whose vaunts are very effective rhetorically and echo closely,

22) For a collection of passages concerning Achilles' fate and his knowledge of it through the prophesies of Thetis see M. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. V, Books 17–20 (Cambridge 1991) 101–102.

23) It is characteristic that Achilles too calls the Trojans ὑπερφίαλοι in his reply to Scamander's plea for moderation (21.224). W. M. Sale, *The Trojans, Statistics and Milman Parry*, GRBS 30 (1989) 344–45, argues that the proportion of abusive terms for Trojans is high in the *Iliad*.

24) The Trojan side commits similar mistakes. In 14 (479–85) Acamas vaunts over the killer of his brother, whom he proudly boasts of having avenged soon, accusing all Achaeans of being insatiable boasters. His speech is reminiscent of Menelaus' but it becomes immediately clear that Acamas has bitten off much more than he could possibly chew: no sooner he finishes his vaunt than he flees before the very mediocre warrior Peneus (488–89). Though Menelaus' accusations against the Trojans and Achilles' contemptuous dismissal of the power of the river were exaggerated, the Achaean leaders had a much better case than Acamas.

even point by point, the vaunts in 13.²⁵ The grim balance of retribution and an emphasis on the impact of the death on the victims' dependents are the main themes of the vaunts in 14. The last motif, which will become more prominent in the following books in connection with the death of Hector, reflects here the ferocity of the battle, especially since the last vaunt of 14 follows an exceptionally brutal killing. The first vaunter is Polydamas who avenges his comrade Satnius by killing the Boeotian leader Prothoenor (449–52). The vaunt is short but full of sarcastic wit (454–57). It is also a remake of Deiphobus' at 13.414–16: both are introduced with the same formula and mention the dead man's trip to Hades which is facilitated in 13 by a 'guide' (Asius, whom Deiphobus avenged by killing Hypsenor) and in 14 by a 'staff' (the killer's spear). The vaunt of Ajax (470–74), who aims at Polydamas but hits Archelochus instead (459–68), is addressed to Polydamas and recalls Idomeneus' second boast in 13 (446–47): both are addressed not to the dead man but to a prominent opponent who boasted before and they begin with a similarly phrased question about the *lex talionis* and the advantage of the party which struck the last blow. Both also dwell on genealogy, Idomeneus his own (13.449–54) and Ajax his victim's, ironically feigning that he did not know his ancestry but assuming from his appearance that he was probably a son of Antenor.

The longest vaunt of the book is given to the Trojan Acamas who avenges his brother Archelochus (479–85). The first part, an invective against the Achaeans as a whole (479–81), is of course reminiscent of Menelaus' attack on Trojan mores: Acamas insults the Achaeans as stupid and insatiable boasters but his invective is less protracted and bitter than Menelaus'. It also answers the vaunt of Ajax very effectively from a rhetorical point of view: φράζεσθε (482) for φράζω (470), the proclamation of the victim's name (482) in contrast with Ajax' feigned conjecture (472–74), and the praise of the killer's family, not merely noble, as Ajax claimed for the Antenoridae, but also very good at taking immediate care of the important retribution business (483–85).²⁶ The mention of the

25) I. Espermann, Antenor, Theano, Antenoriden (Meisenheim 1980) 59–60, lists the similarities between the two sets of vaunts. The relative brevity of the vaunts in 14 is an indication that the pace of fighting now accelerates; cf. below n. 27.

26) Cf. 13.658–59 where the Paphlagonian Pylaimenes is heavily distressed at the unavenged death of his son. ἄτιτος, on which see Espermann (above, n. 25) 62 n. 21, is also found in Deiphobus' vaunt (13.414).

families is the only element that links the last vaunt, Peneleus', to its predecessors. As indicated above (n.24), Acamas retreated before Peneleus who missed him but hit the young Ilioneus, the only son of Phorbias, a protégé of Hermes. The young man dies horribly: the spear pokes out his eye and pierces his brain; as he sits down opening both arms in vain supplication, Peneleus lops off his head with the spear still stuck in the eye-socket. The killer then raises and brandishes the spear with the head impaled on it addressing his vaunt to all Trojans (489–500). The vaunt (501–5) remains isolated in both the savagery of the execution that prompts it and the terror it inspires to the enemies. The death of Ilioneus remains unavenged like the death of Othryoneus in 13. Together the vaunts over these two victims, whose circumstances were meant to arouse pity in the audience, form a loose framework that encompasses all the vaunts of 13 and 14. Viewed as a whole the closely interrelated vaunts in 13 and 14 remain ineffectual despite their stinging wit, inventive rhetoric and immediate effect of intimidating or rousing opponents. They answer each other without delay in word or deed or both but the scales remain balanced. Even Peneleus' vaunt, which has the most impressive success, will soon be answered by the defeat of the Achaeans and their near destruction in 15 before Patroclus intervenes.

Vaunting is used sparingly in 16 with long stretches of battle narrative unfolding without it, similarly to 15.²⁷ As a matter of fact,

27) 15 depicts fierce fighting under crucial circumstances and man-to-man combat in Homer's best style is abundant but not a single instance of vaunting occurs in it. This makes it unique among the battle books of the epic. (12 also lacks vaunts and it shares many other features with 15 as they both deal with the breach of the rampart. But 12 is much shorter and has limited fighting at close quarters. Nevertheless, it is significant that a chance for vaunting is explicitly recorded to be lost because of a victim's resourcefulness. Glaucus is wounded by Teucer's arrow but he retreats quietly in order to forestall a triumphant vaunt on the part of the enemy [390–91], a specification that proves beyond doubt the impact of vaunting on the morale of both armies. This is the only time in the epic that a warrior manages to retreat in this manner and especially the only time vaunting is explicitly said to be deliberately thwarted.) It is a fair guess that Homer, a great virtuoso of *variatio*, having made full use of the motif of vaunting in the previous two books, on purpose refrained from piling vaunts upon vaunts. The poet, though, probably had more than *variatio* in mind when he excluded vaunting from 15 while he gave it a place of honor, as it were, in 14. The absence of vaunting indicates that the fighting has now taken a turn for the inevitable which is actively fostered by divine intervention. Facing the worst crisis of the war the Achaeans might not be desperate yet

16 has only two vaunts, Patroclus' over Kebriones (745–50) and Hector's over Patroclus (830–42). This sparseness underscores in a very special way the double nature of the book, an account of Patroclus' ἀριστεία and death. While in 13 and 14 no great leaders were consistently in the spotlight, from now on the best of the Trojans and the Achaeans will hold center-stage until the end. References to Patroclus and his fate will dominate heroic discourse in general and vaunts in particular. Vaunts will now increasingly highlight the loss of restraint and the hubris of the major leaders as well as the impact of their confrontations on lesser fighters.

Beginning from the end of 16, Hector's vaunt is fairly long and elaborate. Never one to mince words, especially to 'inferiors' like Paris (3.39–57 and 13.769–73) and now his vanquished opponent, Hector is sarcastic and visibly inflated. He stresses his own role as defender of Troy, the warrior who can virtually single-handedly protect his city from destruction and her women from enslavement. As has been observed, Hector reaches the pinnacle of his delusion when he imagines and reports in direct speech Achilles' supposed instructions to Patroclus before the latter enters the battle (839–42).²⁸ In his reply (844–54) Patroclus²⁹ easily de-

but their situation is critical and they themselves recognize that the gods, especially Zeus, are on the Trojan side (286–93). With constant prodding from Ajax, the πρόμυχοι are still standing their (limited) ground but they can hardly boast over any (incidental) success of theirs which cannot be viewed as anything more than exactly that, incidental and unlikely to reverse the Trojan advance. On the other hand, the Trojans and especially Hector do not wish to waste any time with boasting. They have their eyes fixed on the ships and take full advantage of the divine assistance that has now so generously come their way. Clearly indicative of this attitude and telling for the absence of vaunting are Hector's harsh threats to his own men who would lag behind to strip Achaean fatalities: he threatens to personally execute the laggards and see to it that their corpses be left prey to dogs outside the walls of their own city (347–51); cf. 6.67–71. Stripping is not identical with, and is much more time-consuming than, vaunting but the two activities are often combined and prohibiting one also presumably hampers the other. In 15 the critical situation the Achaeans have been fearing and the Trojans expecting since Achilles' withdrawal obviously materializes: nothing is allowed to interfere with the relentless Trojan advance toward the ships. Vaunts are also absent from the battle at the beginning of book 6 (1–72) in order to stress the impact of the Achaean advance and the magnitude of the Trojan losses.

28) For a good analysis of the speech (and its similarities with 22.331–36, Achilles' vaunt over Hector) see Lohmann (above, n. 2) 115–17 and 159–61. Cf. also J.M. Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad* (Chicago 1975) 149.

29) Of all the warriors that are vaunted over and die only Patroclus (and later Hector, 22.338–43) is given the opportunity to answer his vanquisher.

flates the victor's exaggerated claims as the dying man gains insights and prescience the living lack, not to mention a fair degree of composure and sober self-awareness that he lacked a moment ago (see below). He reveals the role of the gods in his defeat and reminds Hector of Achilles' imminent revenge – a vain warning, as it turns out, because Hector will gain insight only on the verge of his own death in 22 (297–305). Nevertheless, Hector's vaunt, which emphasizes the superiority of the victor and his side and contains threats about the miserable fate awaiting the victim's body, falls within the broad boundaries of conventional victory-shout and is typical of the hero's behavior at this stage.

The same can hardly be claimed for Patroclus' only vaunt in 16 (and in the entire epic), his sarcastic remarks over Kebriones' body shortly before his own death (745–50). The fight over the body of Kebriones, Hector's charioteer and half-brother, swiftly leads to the fall of Patroclus. Kebriones was killed when Patroclus hurled a rock at him and smashed his forehead. The man fell from the chariot somersaulting backwards (734–43). This spectacular 'leap' inspired Patroclus' mockery – it is indicative that Homer does not label it 'vaunting' but 'teasing, speaking in jest' (ἐπικερτομέων, 744), which is also used for Achilles' teasing remarks to Priam (24.649). Interestingly, Patroclus assumes here the persona of an observer marveling at or noting something that strikes him or suddenly becomes clear to him: the introductory exclamation (ὦ πόποι) also introduces the comments of Thoas (15.286) and Achilles (20.344), when they realize that Hector and Aeneas enjoy divine assistance and are saved, and Achilles' amazement when he ponders the possibility that Lycaon may have risen from the dead (21.54; cf. 23.103). In 16 Patroclus claims that Kebriones' acrobatic agility should have been put to some practical use: he should have dived for seafood even in stormy weather and fed people. "Trojans, too, have tumblers", he concludes. As has been observed,³⁰ this is a reply to Aeneas' earlier jibe at Meriones. After the fall of Sarpedon and as the fight over his body intensifies with serious fatalities on both sides, Aeneas casts his spear at Meriones. The target avoids injury or worse by ducking (608–15). Miffed at his failure Aeneas calls Meriones a 'dancer' and vouches that his spear would have put an end to Meriones' pirouettes had it only gotten him (617–18). Meriones caps the insult by

30) See Janko (above, n. 11) 404.

reminding Aeneas of his all too obvious limitations and wishes to strike him so that he can bring him down and win glory (620–25). Patroclus then immediately scolds Meriones for answering Aeneas and engaging in idle (in his view) exchange of taunts (627–31). Janko (above, n. 11, 391) remarks that Patroclus' scold is "comical ... especially since he hurls such a jibe himself at 745 ff." But much more than comedy seems to be at work here.

It is true that Patroclus' rebuke of Meriones seems holier-than-thou in view of his own subsequent behavior and even when he pronounces it since Meriones merely replies in kind to Aeneas' taunt. Nevertheless, Patroclus' gentle and humane disposition is his trademark characteristic.³¹ Related to that is his apparent dislike for, or at any rate avoidance of, prolonged verbal exchanges and quarrelsome talk.³² Such a disposition would naturally make Patroclus loath to boasting. One, then, is easily led to the conclusion that Patroclus' rebuke is totally in character for him and that it is his vaunt over Kebriones which is exceptional and least like him. This suggestion might be considered subject to the strictures of *e silentio* argumentation, especially in an epic where Patroclus is not one of the leading characters, he does not participate in battles until his ἀριστεία and may have been Homer's own invention.³³ But even if these factors are taken into account, Patroclus' failure to vaunt during his long and remarkable ἀριστεία is absolutely unique and should give one pause. Though he kills scores of enemies he is nowhere reported to gloat or dwell on his success until the very end. Only then, when the gods "invited him to his death" (693), does he appear to undergo a radical change. Blinded by his success and prompted by Zeus, Patroclus disregards Achilles' admonition to return to the ships as soon as he repels the enemy

31) The narrator (23.252) and several characters comment on his gentleness: Achilles (23.280–81), Zeus (17.204), Menelaus (17.670–72), Briseis (19.287–300), Lycaon (21.96). He treats the wounded Eurypylus despite his urgency to return to Achilles (11.806–48 and 15.390–405) and laments the fate of the army (11.814–21 and 16.2–45).

32) For Patroclus' 'silence' see recently A. Kahane, *The Interpretation of Order: A Study in the Poetics of Homeric Repetition* (Oxford 1994) 139–41.

33) It has been suggested that the figure of Patroclus was patterned on that of Antilochus in older epic or that it is a composition of the figures of Antilochus, an older Patroclus and Achilles; see R. von Scheliha, *Patroklos* (Basel 1943) 391–2, H. Pestalozzi, *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias* (Zurich 1945) 45, Schadewaldt (above, n. 20) 178–81 and H. Erbse, *Ilias und Patroklië, Hermes* 111 (1983) 1–15.

from them (80–96) and pushes on to the wall of Troy (684–91). In this state of mind he kills Kebriones and mocks his fall.

This behavior is distinctly different from Patroclus' reaction to the fall of Sarpedon, his most illustrious victim. A great warrior and an interesting character, Zeus' son is the third most prominent casualty in the *Iliad* and the first chronologically. Homer must indeed have had very strong reasons to let him fall in silence.³⁴ Patroclus demonstrates an exceptional degree of restraint that, given the standards of warrior behavior, borders almost on modesty about his great success. Not only does he refrain completely from vaunting, he also urges the Aiantes to fight suggesting that this is an opportunity for all the Achaean leaders to make a mark for themselves and take their revenge for the breaking of the rampart in 12 since the man who first broke in now lies dead (556–61). Patroclus refrains from mentioning explicitly that he himself killed the Lycian leader and secured this opportunity for his comrades. Although this cannot have escaped the attention of his addressees, the glossing over is remarkable in a speech that occupies the place of a vaunt. The death of Sarpedon is announced thrice in less than forty lines: by Glaucus in his prayer to Apollo (16.521–22) where he asks for speedy recovery from the wound he had suffered earlier (12.387–89) so that he can fight for Sarpedon's body; by Glaucus again in his paraenesis to Hector and the other Trojan leaders to defend the body (541–43) and by Patroclus himself in his paraenesis to the Aiantes (558–59). Only the second time is the name of the killer mentioned (543). The poet may have striven for variation but the means he employs to achieve it are hardly random: mortal addressees may be deemed more in need of information than a god; a leader may omit a reference to his own name but need not present his achievement as common to all. Besides, Patroclus' paraenesis answers Glaucus' point per point (see Lohmann [above, n. 2] 124–25) except for the killer's identity.³⁵ Patroclus retains the

34) In silence, of course, only as far as vaunting is concerned because the dying man delivers a fine emotive speech to his comrade Glaucus (492–501). This speech together with Sarpedon's speech to Glaucus in 12 (310–28) and his rebuke of Hector in 5 (472–92) finely encapsulate epic notions of heroic loyalty and prowess. Significantly, Sarpedon does not vaunt in the epic but he effectively answers the taunt of Tlepolemus (5.648–54).

35) Usually when κείτῳι or ὄλωλε is used for a recent death, as in the references to Sarpedon's death, the killer's identity is included in the speech (18.20–21,

same reserved down-to-earth attitude throughout the fight over Sarpedon's body during which he, as mentioned above, rebukes Meriones for answering Aeneas' taunt (627–31).

Restraint and the lack of it also figure prominently in 17 which sensitively presents the aftermath of a great success and crisis with its emotional and physical pressures. The comrades of the deceased have to deal with the heavy loss as best they can. The difficulties they face are considerable because Hector, elated by his success, still enjoys divine support and thus Menelaus is understandably reluctant to confront him (94–101). But relinquishing Patroclus' body to the enemy is simply unacceptable on several accounts: first and foremost, Menelaus feels obliged to defend the body because Patroclus fell fighting for his honor (92; cf. 556–58); on the other hand, the loss of the body of a leader would damage the collective honor of his comrades (415–19); on a more personal level, Patroclus was very kind to all (670–72) and his loss caused the comrades considerable grief (459, 564, 694–700), which must have enhanced their wish to save the body from the disgrace of stripping or worse. At any rate, the only 'classic' instance of vaunting in the book brings out the problems of the Achaean leaders, their distress at the loss of their brave and kind comrade and their desire for revenge.

This unique case of vaunting occurs in the last third of the book when the battle over the body is entering its last stage. Automedon, the charioteer of Patroclus, very briefly vaunts over his victim (538–39) and his victory-shout is unique in the entire epic in that it acknowledges the magnitude of the previous loss instead of stressing the importance of the present success. Modest and immersed in his grief Automedon points out that his success,

cf. 5.103–105; 17.689–93). The only exceptions are passages involving gods: at 5.467–69 a disguised Ares uses Aeneas' alleged death in his paraenesis to the sons of Priam, and at 15.111–12 Hera tries to foment revolt against Zeus among the gods by announcing the death of Ares' son Ascalaphus (13.518–20). In both cases, especially the first, the identity of the killer is of no consequence at all. Glaucus' prayer to Apollo is exceptional in the epic because it states that the gods can hear a man in need from anywhere. Although this by no means implies that the god has omniscience, the failure to mention Sarpedon's killer becomes less striking in this context: a god who has the power to hear from afar can easily know who killed a mortal half-brother of his. On occasion Homeric gods appear to know things they should logically have no knowledge of: Ares is unaware of his son's death but Hera knows about it, although she was not present when her grandson died.

though minor because the victim is an inferior warrior, gives him a slight comfort. The vaunt also elegantly reminds us that Patroclus lies unavenged and thus looks forward to the appropriate revenge the right avenger will exact from the right victim.

Automedon's success is also unique in that a lesser warrior manages, even with the help of others, to repel an enemy leader. The retreat indicates that the Trojan prospects are not very bright, especially given the fact that immediately following the retreat Zeus dispatches Athena to rouse the Achaeans (544–46). The problems of the Trojans become evident from the very beginning of the book with Euphorbus' failure to kill Menelaus in order to strip Patroclus (since Euphorbus was the first to wound Patroclus, he feels entitled to the glory). The exchange of taunts between the two warriors quickly reveals that they had an older enmity because Menelaus had killed Euphorbus' brother Hyperenor who had accused him of cowardice (24–27). Now Menelaus accuses the sons of Panthus of excessive confidence (19–23). Stung by this speech, Euphorbus condemns the boasting of his opponent (*ἐπευχόμενος δ' ἀγορεύεις*, 35) and vows to kill Menelaus in order to avenge his brother (38–40). The extensive Menelaus-Euphorbus episode and in particular the speeches of the two opponents set the tone for the entire book as they look back to 13 and 14 and forward to Achilles' *ἀριστεία* with the main theme of avenging an important casualty. The taunts also touch on the issue of excessive confidence in one's prowess which borders on hubris, the risk Hector runs now, as he tries to round off his success by winning the staunchly defended body of Patroclus and capturing the divine horses of Achilles. At the peak of his success, Hector has problems similar to those of his adversaries³⁶ but most important is the hero's inability to observe his limits. The fine line that separates vaunts from hubristic boasts becomes evident from the fact that Zeus himself uses the verb

36) He manages to strip Patroclus' body but he fails to win it or the coveted horses. His difficulties become apparent from his (and Aeneas') retreat before the Aiantes (533–36) and the promise of half of the spoils to the man who will help him win Patroclus' body (229–32). Hector cannot enjoy his moment of supreme glory to the full: the disguised Apollo rebukes him (75–81) and Glaucus attacks him in a lengthy speech (142–68) which shows Hector's problems as commander-in-chief of an allied army; cf. 5.472–92; 16.538–47; 17.220–28; 18.288–92. For Glaucus' speech see C. Moulton, *The Speech of Glaukos in Iliad 17*, *Hermes* 109 (1981) 1–8.

ἐπεύχομαι for the hero's dangerous attitude (450),³⁷ although Hector nowhere boasts in the book. This is the only time in the poem the verb occurs not in immediate connection with a killing or a shot. This problematic of hubristic behavior, in word or deed or both, will be taken up more prominently in Achilles' ἄριστεία.

Book 20 foreshadows 21 and to a lesser degree 22 but it is cast in a more leisurely mold as a vivid and protracted introduction to a long and lethal battle³⁸ since Achilles' ἄριστεία proper begins after the lengthy thwarted duel with Aeneas (158–352). The first and only 'regular' vaunt highlights the cool detachment of the supreme hero but the poet includes another intriguing reference to vaunting in the book. The first victim of Achilles is an ally of the Trojans, Iphition the son of Otryntus (382–87). Except for the information about the man's country and parentage, which the poet provides on the occasion of his death (382–85), nothing else is said about him. It has been obvious to readers since at least the ancient commentators that these biographical details are an ad hoc invention in order to increase the pathos of the death and the importance of the victim. The victor vaunts briefly but very characteristically (389–92). He does not

37) Actually the supreme god comments twice on Hector's presumptuous gloating, in his compassionate reflections occasioned by the sight of Hector donning Achilles' armor (201–8) and of Achilles' divine horses weeping for Patroclus (443–55). After Glaucus' stinging rebuke Hector urges the Trojans and allies to fight bravely and proclaims that he killed the brave Patroclus and won Achilles' arms (186–87). This contrasts with the restrained attitude of Patroclus when he scored his greatest success by killing Sarpedon (cf. the discussion above), and it indeed appears to be characteristic of Hector: after the retreat of Agamemnon Hector urged his men to fight vigorously and led the counterattack declaring that Zeus gave him great εὖχος (11.288). The speech is introduced with the same two-line formula as Hector's paraenesis to the men in 17 (184–85) and both precede an attack. The claim in 11 is not justified: Iris had announced to Hector the plan of Zeus to let Hector reach the ships after the retreat of Agamemnon (202–9) but with his claim Hector seems to imply that the retreat was somehow to his credit: "Zeus gave me reason to boast" is a very loose and misleading account of the situation. Zeus opened the way for him to win glory and to boast but Hector had nothing to do with the retreat. For the meaning of εὖχος see below n. 48.

38) The battle mood is suggested by the frequency of ἀντίος for human and divine adversaries, especially for Achilles and warriors facing him. It occurs seven times in the book (175, 197, 352, 371, 373, 422, 463; cf. 75, 76, 80, 85, 88, 97, 113, 118, 130, 164, 333), much more often than in the rest of the poem. The last occurrence (463) is especially pathetic and subtle because the word is used for young Tros who approaches Achilles not in order to fight him but in order to supplicate him for his life (464–69).

deride or belittle the victim or even utter a word of actual boasting: he is calm and almost distant, probably absorbed in his mission but far from exuberant or agitated. The fact that he attributes to Iphition a characterization often used for himself in the poem bespeaks a sort of all-encompassing self-centeredness (ἐκπαγλότητα, 389). Achilles also dwells on the geographical landmarks of the victim's distant country, a reference which reinforces the impression of lack of urgency and calm, almost chilling distance.³⁹ The narratorial comment that concludes the account of Iphition's death rounds off the picture along similar lines: the victim succumbed and his body was lacerated by enemy chariot wheels (394–95),⁴⁰ as Achilles proceeded to slay other enemies. A few lines below, when Hector and Achilles face off for the first (and last) time before their duel in 22, the narrator will comment on Achilles' attitude in a more dramatic way.

The predictable outcome of the encounter in 20, Hector's death, is only thwarted by the intervention of Apollo who swiftly whisks Hector away to safety (443–44) where the hero remains until 22. Apollo had already warned Hector to steer clear from Achilles (376–78) and the Trojan leader duly complied for a while. But when Achilles disemboweled his youngest half-brother Polydorus (407–18), Lycaon's full brother, Hector became heavily distressed and turned to face Achilles, abandoning his caution (421–23). The narrator then specifies that Achilles "noticed him immediately and bounded forward uttering a vaunt" (καὶ εὐχόμενος ἔπος ἤῤῥδα, 424).⁴¹ This is clearly the only time in the epic that an utterance is labelled as a vaunt before a confrontation. Even more extraordinary is the fact that in this case there will not even be a killing or a wound: Achilles will challenge his opponent (429) and Hector will respond with a speech (431–37) very similar to Aeneas'

39) Cf. Griffin (above, n. 12) 54.

40) This stark image is developed at the end of the book (498–502); see the comments of Strasburger (above, n. 1) 127–28 in the conclusion of her book: she notes that the corpses of lesser warriors usually remain exposed to be lacerated by enemy chariots or wild beasts in order for the poet to juxtapose the glory won by the few with the suffering of the many.

41) This formula is used to introduce the vaunts of Menelaus (13.619), Peneleus (14.500), Automedon (17.537) and Achilles over Asteropaeus (21.183). It is also used at 11.379 where it introduces Paris' outburst of joy at his great success and not a formal vaunt. The formula probably suggested the attitude of the speaker rather than the content of the speech.

(200–258)⁴² but Apollo will rescue his protégé transporting him out of the range of Achilles' weapons. Achilles' brief utterance is not a vaunt and is not even addressed to Hector. But, as Zeus called Hector's attitude in 17 'vaunting', the choice of the introductory formula here conveys the essence of Achilles' attitude, his determination to kill Hector and the certainty that the confrontation will swiftly lead to the annihilation of the opponent. In Achilles' mind Hector is already dead. The formula does not provide information on the nature of the utterance but offers a glimpse of the state of mind that drives Achilles. For him the duel is not an issue and the outcome is precluded: everything he says is a preliminary victory-shout. But the parallel with Hector in 17 has ominous connotations. In 21 Achilles will find himself in a very difficult situation, largely brought about by his own arrogance.

21 is the *par excellence* fighting book of the *Iliad*, comparable only to 5 perhaps, not because Achilles kills scores of Trojans – fierce fighting also occurs in other books – but especially because the gods fight among themselves. Achilles' stature is stressed throughout the book, as everything revolves around him and the gods fight essentially for his sake. Vaunting precipitates the river's attack on Achilles and indirectly the battle of the gods.⁴³ The hero vaunts twice in 21, over his first eponymous victims in the book. As the panic-stricken Trojans flee towards the city with Achilles in hot pursuit, they eventually split up and half of them fall into the river. Achilles jumps in too and slaughters them in droves until he captures the twelve youths he will eventually sacrifice at Patroclus' tomb (1–33). Immediately thereafter he meets Lycaon, an illegitimate son of Priam and the brother of the young Polydorus he slew in 20 (407–18). Despite Lycaon's extensive and moving supplication (74–96) Achilles slays the armless and powerless youth without pity. Achilles' vaunt over the body of the victim, though, adds insult to injury: not only does the victor dwell harrowingly on the

42) This is perhaps an indication that the encounter will not be fatal to Hector. For the similarity of the two speeches see Martin (above, n. 10) 136 who also points out the differences and suggests that Hector's ability to manipulate words diminishes as he approaches his death.

43) Vaunting also occurs there, although naturally no deaths. As F. Letoublon, *Défi et combat dans l'Iliade*, REG 96 (1983) 33, observes, the divine confrontations, including the speeches exchanged, parallel the human duels. Cf. also W. Parks, *Verbal Dueling in Heroic Narrative* (Princeton 1990) 67.

details of the fate of his victim's body in the river (122–27), where he drags the body (120), he also points out that the river, to whom the Trojans offered sacrifices, will not be able to save Lycaon or the other Trojans from him (130–35). This is Achilles' first defiance of the power of the river god for which he will soon be punished.

The hero's vaunt over his second victim, Asteropaeus (184–99), moves along the same lines, although Asteropaeus is very different from Lycaon. He is a formidable warrior, ambidexterous at that (162–63), and he is the only one in the epic who manages to wound Achilles, however lightly (166–67). The only element he shares with Lycaon is the pathetic specification of the number of days, 12 for Lycaon (45–47) and 11 for Asteropaeus (155–56), since they arrived at Troy. On the other hand, the narratorial comment on the fate of Asteropaeus' body in the river, with fish biting on his kidney fat (203–204), echoes Achilles' vaunt over Lycaon's body. Achilles' threat graphically materializes here and of course applies to the fate of all his victims in the river.⁴⁴ The victor's vaunt over Asteropaeus also includes a provocative insult against the river. This highly rhetorical speech is couched mainly as a capping answer to Asteropaeus' genealogy which the hero recounted in response to Achilles' initial inquiry (150–51).⁴⁵ Achilles now stresses almost to the point of tedium the superiority of the descendants of Zeus like himself over descendants of rivers like his victim. The vaunt over Asteropaeus, coupled with the hero's incessant slaughter of enemies within the river who pleads with him in vain (214–21), provokes the wrath of Scamander: he taunts Apollo for his inertia (229–32) and undertakes to drown the demonic warrior himself (234–323). This attempt, frustrated by Hera's rousing of Hephaestus (331–82), brings about an all-out battle of the gods (385–513) announced in 20 (23–74). Achilles is saved from the

44) It is characteristic that of all the threats of animal scavenging on bodies in the epic only this materializes. Cf. C. Segal, *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad* (Leiden 1971) 31.

45) The fact that the narrator also provides the same genealogy in more detail (141–43) indicates the warrior's importance. Warriors who recount their genealogies face serious problems soon afterward: Idomeneus retreats (13.449–54 and 512–15), Aeneas is almost killed (20.215–41 and 290–91), Asteropaeus perishes, and Achilles is attacked by the river (21.234 ff.). Even Glaucus leaves the battlefield at a disadvantage, having exchanged his golden armor for Diomedes' bronze one (6.145–211 and 234–36).

river's wrath but he has clearly overstepped a boundary. He is lucky to escape with his life unlike Patroclus and Hector.

The vaunt of Achilles over the dying Hector in 22 (331–36), the last one in the epic, is fairly short and not particularly dramatic or elaborate per se. The vaunter stresses the fact that he has exacted the appropriate revenge for his slain comrade. He echoes Hector's vaunt over Patroclus (16.830–42), especially the reference to the foolishness of the victim, and introduces the major themes of the abuse of the body and the funeral honors to Patroclus. But the death and stripping of Hector is followed by two other intriguing speeches which are very close to vaunts. The first is a short anonymous $\tau\iota\varsigma$ -speech by the Achaean army who stab Hector's body (22.373–74) and the second a longer one by Achilles himself to the comrades (22.378–94). The speech of the soldiers, who mock the victim and rejoice in the tragic reversal of his circumstances, is actually a sarcastic vaunt except that the 'vaunters' did not kill Hector themselves. The men, having suffered greatly from the latest Trojan onslaught, are obviously relieved that Hector will not be able to repeat his attack on the ships. The horror the act inspired to the men is indicated by both their coward, ignoble abuse of the body and the recollection of the fire in their speech. It is not accidental that the loss of Patroclus is not mentioned in this speech. In contrast to Achilles, they did not experience this loss as the most horrifying event of the war, especially now that the body of Patroclus has been saved from the hands of the enemy and his killer is dead. They view Hector's death as their revenge for the worst outrage he perpetrated against them, the attempt to burn the ships.

Markedly different from this utterance but also from Achilles' own vaunt is his address to the men. Pious and chivalrous, it acknowledges the gods' role in the demise of Hector and suggests a victory paean to accompany the transportation of the body to the Achaean camp. The glory won is commensurate with the prowess of the vanquished and thus a gallant, and probably the most important, tribute is paid to Hector because his arch-enemy duly recognizes his god-like status among his people. Achilles also refrains from stating explicitly that he was the vanquisher of Hector: the man is said to have been subdued by the agency of the gods, to have fallen, to be no more and the glory won is magnanimously presented as the property of the entire Achaean camp. First person plurals appear throughout the speech except for the middle portion

where Achilles vows to remember Patroclus even in Hades. The speech touches on major tenets of heroic morality: the status of the leader, the role of and attitude to the divine, loyalty to comrades and especially the acquisition of martial glory. Judging from this speech one could hardly imagine the savage treatment of Hector's body that immediately follows (395–404). More significant from the point of view of the vaunts is the fact that judging from Achilles' vaunt over Hector (not to mention the 'vaunt' of the Achaeans) one could never imagine the subsequent speech of Achilles. The victim is abused in word and deed and there is no mention of the gods, the worth of the enemy or even the glory won. This great difference brings sharply into focus features that are shared by virtually all vaunts in the epic and put them in a category of their own among warrior speeches.

One of the most important aspects of the vaunts is their connection to the past of the warriors, mainly the very recent but also the more remote one. The vaunts constantly echo the past, previous losses, successes and performance. The latest success provides an opportunity to 'rework' the past, to change the established status quo and settle old scores. The vaunt is the hero's public registration of this reworking and the new situation it establishes, even very briefly, if not momentarily. Ultimately all vaunts may be pronounced 'empty', as was indicated by the first vaunts in the epic, not so much in the sense that they include inaccurate claims, which some in fact do, but rather in the sense that they have very little impact on the battle situation and the overall image of the vaunting warrior. It is almost always with contempt that vaunts are mentioned by others, which is rare, and never outside the battlefield. No warrior is ever credited with having vaunted over slain enemies while both the number of enemies killed and the spoils captured are a palpable, esteemed and often mentioned sign of a warrior's honor and worth (e.g. 4.387–97; 5.273; 7.136–55; 11.671–81 and 738–61; 13.260–68; 17.130–31; 20.191–94; cf. 6.479–81, Hector's prayer that his son return one day victorious from battle carrying the spoils of the enemy he killed, causing joy to his mother and admiration to his people). The constant tension between lengthy, abusive verbalizations on the battlefield and the actual work of Ares keeps the vaunts relatively short and few. On the other hand, the warriors do not deem the danger of appearing undignified or foolish boasters serious enough to

counterbalance the appeal of vaunting. The two main well-springs that nourish vaunts are elation and self-congratulation, often combined. Amidst the carnage of battle, the loss of friends and relatives, divine assistance to the enemies and the ever-present danger of defeat, disgrace and death, vaunting appears to be one of the few means available to the hard-pressed men to boost their morale and shame their enemies.⁴⁶

Particularly worth noting is that the acquisition of glory, which might have been expected to appear prominently in the claims made in vaunts, is not mentioned and is not an issue: to stand firm in front of one's enemies, especially formidable ones, defending one's party and avenging one's dead or taking revenge for other 'wrongs' committed by the enemy are the main issues that come up repeatedly, directly or indirectly, almost in all vaunts. To be a competent fighter naturally and of itself confers glory on the warrior in question but this advantage is simply not what the vaunters seek to stress. This is all the more unexpected since not only are Homeric warriors constantly preoccupied with glory but they are also quite vocal about their martial achievements and their prospects of winning eternal fame.⁴⁷ Κῦδος and εὖχος are the most coveted objects of desire. Although εὖχος is etymologically related to εὐχεσθαι, it appears in only one vaunt, significantly Pandarus' after his second attempt at Diomedes (5.285).⁴⁸ Especially

46) Cf. Parks (above, n. 43) 106 and Bezantakos (above, n. 2) 148.

47) A prominent example is Hector: not only is he consistently preoccupied with glory, he also often 'performs' like an epic poet in his speeches; see Martin (above, n. 10) 134–38.

48) This is one of the main passages that led A.W.H. Adkins, εὐχομαι, εὐχολή and εὖχος in Homer, CQ 19 (1969) 20–33, (who strangely confuses Pandarus with Sarpedon throughout the article), to take exception to the interpretation 'object of prayer' in LSJ; see also H. Reynen, εὐχεσθαι und seine Derivative bei Homer (Bonn 1983) 155–56. Adkins correctly claims that no prayer is involved in the passages where the word appears and thus "(occasion for) victory-shout" is a more appropriate translation. Ultimately, though, the difference between the two interpretations may be less radical than it appears. Diomedes and Achilles claim that Hector prays to Apollo before he enters battle (11.364; 20.451), and other warriors are reported to pray to gods for healing or assistance before they attack their enemies (Menelaus 3.350 and 17.46, Pandarus 4.119–21, Diomedes 5.115–20 and 10.284–94, Odysseus 10.278–82, Glaucus 16.514–26 and Automedon 17.498–99; cf. 4.101–103; 7.194 and 200–205; 16.230–48; 20.104–105). The answer to these prayers ultimately results in the acquisition of glory by the victorious warrior/party and glory may more generally be viewed as the answer to relevant prayers, whether they are reported or not. Cf. LfrE s.v. εὖχος.

indicative of the failure to mention glory is the vaunt of Achilles at the end of 22. Glory is mentioned by Achilles in his speech to his mother after Patroclus' death (18.121) and in his speech to the Achaeans (22.393–94) but also by Athena before she deceives Hector (22.216–18).⁴⁹ In the vaunt over Hector, though, only the avenging of Patroclus' death and the abuse of the victim's body appear. The fact that the victorious party won glory was a standard belief and an accepted fact of life in the *Iliad* and it seems not to have aroused particular resentment in the opposite camp, especially if the body of their comrade did not suffer abuse. Chief purpose of the vaunts is to hurt the enemy: the vaunter vents his pent-up anger by portraying the victim as inferior, from a moral and/or moral/intellectual point of view.⁵⁰ This is where a crucial line may be crossed. Humility or modesty was not a Greek virtue but self-aggrandizement and victorious gloating place the victor in a precarious position because they may easily distort his view of his own capabilities or the situation he is faced with. It takes a relatively small step to cross from triumphant victory-shout to excessive exultation and hubristic self-promotion, especially when vaunts are uttered in the wake of very important successes and when gods are directly involved. Later poetry, mainly tragedy, dealt extensively with most of the themes that appear in epic vaunts: the importance of the past, revenge, delusion, hubris, the fair treatment of the dead and the appropriate attitude to one's own success. In the context of vaunts later poets found successful heroes making arrogant public statements with an eye on their past and inviting upon themselves the resentment of men and gods.⁵¹ The tragedians chose to con-

49) A very similar case is Odysseus' reply to Socus' challenge and the vaunt over the victim. The former ends with a reference to the glory of the victor (11.445) while the latter concentrates on the miserable fate of the body (11.453–55). Before duels and after their success the warriors think of and often elaborate on their glory. The list also comprises Diomedes (5.273) on the Achaean side and Hector (7.91; 18.294; 22.304–5; cf. 17.130–31) and Sarpedon (5.654; 12.328) on the Trojan.

50) The desire for verbal abuse is suggested graphically at 22.328–29 where Achilles' spear is said not to have severed Hector's windpipe so that he could answer Achilles. If the text is sound, then the weapon may be thought to 'express' the intent of its owner, not its victim. It is Achilles and not the dying Hector who wishes to speak to a still conscious victim, although Hector does use the opportunity to supplicate Achilles (in vain) for a fair treatment of the body (337–43).

51) Arrogance induced by success, although not directly in connection with relevant statements, is also one of the main motifs of epinician poetry.

centrate much more on delusion and hubris and to caution more openly against arrogant declarations of success and gloating, especially over dead people, than Homer did in the *Iliad*. Nevertheless, the poetic prototypes of gloating, hubristic or impious tragic heroes may in part be traced back to the vaunting warriors of the *Iliad*.

Komotini

Poulheria Kyriakou