

THE REDEMPTIVE SIMILE: PARIS AND HEKTOR AND THE HORSE SIMILES OF *ILIAD* 6 AND 15

Patricia Fagan

Introduction

The similes are one of the most uniquely “Homeric” elements of the Homeric poems. Of extant archaic Greek poetry, only the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* use similes with any frequency. When one looks to later Greek poetry, it is only in the *Argonautica*, the work of the Homeric imitator and scholar Apollonios of Rhodes, that one sees similes used with something approaching the variety, frequency, and virtuosity of the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*. When one speaks of similes in the Homeric poems the kind of simile one evokes is the “Homeric” simile, the long image that develops in a way that seems independent of the narrative to form a mini-narrative of its own. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* will explicitly compare moments within their main narrative to events outside of the narrative, introducing these comparisons with phrases that, roughly, mean, “It was like this ...” The arguments that I make here, concerning one particular Homeric simile, articulate a method for studying and understanding similes that will be applicable not just to the Homeric poems, put to traditional narrative poetry in general; the fundamental ground for my arguments is that we, as interpreters and scholars, must look first to the poem itself to guide and inform us about how to study it. In the case of the similes, then, I am going to take seriously the fact that the *Iliad*, at Book 6.506 ff. and Book 15.263 ff. tells us that the heroes Paris and Hektor are like horses breaking free of their stalls. What we will see is that these similes, and, indeed, any simile, any moment of explicit comparison, serves to direct our interpretation down a particular path. The poem will not, at these moments, allow us simply to follow our own understanding, but intervenes to point us to an interpretation of events that the narrative itself may not immediately offer to us. The poem, I will argue, uses similes to *redirect* our interpretations of Paris and Hektor to ensure that we understand what the poem needs us to understand about these heroes and their stories.

Scholars have long found the repeated horse simile for Paris and Hektor at *Iliad* 6.506 ff. and 15.263 ff. problematic. What has troubled interpreters is that the simile does not seem to be appropriate and relevant when applied both to the easy-going and questionably heroic Paris and to the responsible and manifestly heroic Hektor.¹ In this paper I will argue that this simile is equally appropriate and relevant to both Paris and Hektor because it serves to redeem each of them as warriors at times when their status as such is questionable. I will argue, first, that this simile is a part of a general narrative pattern common to both contexts. Here I will show that this repeated long simile is used as part of a narrative pattern and can be seen to serve a similar function in each manifestation. The horse simile will reveal itself as a simile describing a return to one's proper place. In the second section of this paper, I will argue that the proper place to which both Paris and Hektor are returning is the battlefield; both Paris and Hektor, as warriors, are returning from a withdrawal from the battlefield that has taken them from this proper place. The third section will discuss the efforts made by Paris and Hektor to define themselves as warriors in the face of others' attempts to keep them inside the city, safe from battle, but tied to the restrictions of city life. I will argue that, in the *Iliad*, the only place for a warrior is on the battlefield and that warriors tied to the city cannot live up to the *Iliad's* ideas of what a warrior properly is. Paris and Hektor will be seen to be redeemed from their unheroic ties to the city through this simile. In the fourth and final section I will discuss how this redemption works. Here we will see that the Homeric simile is, in essence, a direction to a particular interpretation of the narrative and that the *Iliad* can use these directions as a means of self-correction or, in the present case, redemption of failure.

I. The Long Repeated Simile and Narrative Pattern

Similes are a frequent and noticeable feature of the Homeric poems. Short similes, such as, "like a lion" or "like a god" occur often. Long similes that develop over several lines are frequent as well. *Repeated* long similes, however, occur rarely: of the hundreds of similes in both poems, there are only eight examples of repeated similes two or more lines in length.² Of this small group, only two repeated similes, those at *Iliad* 6.506-511=15.263-268 and 11.548-557≈17.657-666, extend over more than five lines. Scholars have demonstrated that the narratives of the Homeric poems tend to unfold through repetition and through patterning. We have discovered, further, that repeated elements are consistently associated with repeated themes.³

In this first section, I will demonstrate that, consistent with this tendency, the repeated horse simile at *Iliad* 6.506-511=15.263-268 is indicative of a larger narrative pattern to be found as the context for the simile.⁴ In subsequent sections I will argue that this narrative pattern consistently evokes specific *Iliadic* heroic themes. Similarity does exist.

In *Iliad* 6, Paris is returning to battle from his withdrawal in Book 3, where Aphrodite snatches him away to safety inside Troy from the impending defeat in a duel with Menelaos (3.373-382). In Book 6, Hektor comes into the city to ask the women to pray to Athene to protect the Trojans from Diomedes (6.111-116). Hektor also decides to ask Paris to return to battle (6.279-281). When Hektor finds Paris in his bed chamber, he reproaches him and tells him he should come back to the fighting (6.325-331). Paris accepts Hektor's reproaches and says that he will arm and go back to the plain with Hektor (6.333-341). He then arms and runs through the city to meet Hektor, at which point he receives the simile comparing him to a horse running across a plain to a river (6.503-516). Paris and Hektor return to battle, bringing relief to the Trojans (7.1-7). Paris immediately kills Menesthios (7.8-10).

In *Iliad* 14, Hera seduces Zeus and ensures that he will fall asleep, so that he is no longer able to guarantee success for the Trojans (14.292-353). Poseidon leads the Achaians into battle (14.361-377), where Hektor and Telamonian Aias meet and fight. Aias knocks Hektor unconscious with a large stone; the Achaians run up to drag Hektor away (14.402-423). The great Trojan warriors rush to protect Hektor while his companions pick him up, place him on his chariot, and carry him back towards the city (14.424-432). They carry Hektor as far as the river Xanthos, where they take him from the chariot and revive him (14.433-439). Zeus wakes up and sends Apollo to restore Hektor's strength (15.221-235). Apollo goes to Hektor, exhorts him to return to battle, and breathes μένος (strength) into him (15.239-262). Hektor, restored, receives the horse simile, and runs back to the battlefield (15.263-270), causing panic among the Achaians (15.277-280).

In these episodes, we see a pattern emerge. The warrior is threatened with defeat and death in single combat, Paris at the hands of Menelaos, Hektor at the hands of Aias. He is rescued from defeat and carried to a place of safety away from the battle. Aphrodite rescues Paris and carries him into the city to his bed chamber; his companions rescue Hektor and carry him to the river. After time spent in the safe place, another character intervenes with

the warrior and urges him to return to battle. Hektor urges Paris to return; Apollo urges Hektor to return and fills him with μένος. The warrior returns to battle, receiving the horse simile in the process. Having returned, the warrior immediately demonstrates his prowess or might. Paris, along with Hektor, relieves the Trojans and kills Menesthios; Hektor causes panic among the Achaians.⁵

We can enumerate the elements of this pattern as follows:

- 1) Threatened defeat and death in combat;
- 2) Rescue and transport to safe place;
- 3) Exhortation;
- 4) Return to battle, marked by a horse simile;
- 5) Demonstration of heroic success.

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

Here we see element 1) Threatened defeat and death in combat, as Agenor is about to be killed by Achilles, element 2) Rescue and transport to a safe place, when Apollo covers Agenor in mist and sends him away from Achilles, element 3) Exhortation, for Achilles, in the form of Apollo's taunts,⁶ element 4) Return to battle, marked by a horse simile, for Achilles, and element 5) demonstration of heroic success, in Priam's reaction to the sight of Achilles. The difference between this case and those of Paris and Hektor earlier is that in Books 21 and 22, the one who is exhorted and receives the horse simile is not the same figure as the one who is threatened and rescued. In the first two episodes, Paris and Hektor

are both threatened with defeat, rescued, exhorted, return with a horse simile, and have heroic success. Here Agenor is threatened with defeat and rescued, at which point Achilles is exhorted, returns with a horse simile, and demonstrates his heroic excellence. The pattern as outlined above is complete; the elements are shared by two characters.⁷

The instantiation of this five-part narrative pattern for Paris, Hektor, and Achilles ties the three figures together: each takes part in the same pattern and each, as we will see, will be linked by the thematic associations of this pattern. The pattern itself can also be seen to be an expansion of the very basic and common pattern of withdrawal and return. In the instantiations of this pattern for Paris and Hektor, it is possible to see the two narratives as versions of the withdrawal-devastation-return pattern. This pattern itself, of course, forms the basic narrative structure of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.⁸ Paris' disappearance from battle results in the breaking of the truce and Diomedes' *aristeia* in *Iliad* 5 and 6;⁹ Hektor's removal from battle results in a rout of the Trojan forces in *Iliad* 14 and 15. This similarity to the larger structure of the *Iliad* will reveal itself to be relevant to issues of theme as well: we will see that this narrative pattern, and the simile it contains, is working out a consistent set of themes relevant to the portrayals of Paris and Hektor that tie those portrayals to larger themes of the *Iliad* as a whole.

II. 'Proper Place' in the *Iliad*

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

ὡς δ' ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος, ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτῃ,
 δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θεῖη πεδίοιο κροαίνων,
 εἰωθὼς λουεσθαι εὐρρείος ποταμοῖο,
 κυδιῶν· ὑψοῦ δὲ κάρη ἔχει, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται
 ὤμοις ἀΐσσονται· ὁ δ' ἀγλαΐῃφι πεποιθὼς,
 ῥίμφα ἐ γοῦνα φέρει μετὰ τ' ἦθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων.
 (6.506-511=15.263-268)

As when some stalled horse, who has been corn-fed at the manger
 breaking free of his rope gallops over the plain in thunder
 to his accustomed bathing place in a sweet-running river
 and in the pride of his strength holds high his head, and the mane floats
 over his shoulders; sure of his glorious strength, the quick knees
 carry him to the loved places and the pasture of horses.¹⁰

The simile tells us first that the horse has been in a stall and has been eating grain from a manger; it is a domestic animal, male, that is well-fed and well-housed. The horse has broken free of his bond (δεσμὸς) and is running across the plain. He has been in his stall and has chosen to be somewhere else: out running across the plain. The horse runs to the river to bathe and exults with his head high; the verb here is κυδιάω, a frequentative verb from κῦδος, which means something like, “to bear oneself proudly or triumphantly”. The horse as he bathes displays a sense of his own well-being and superiority. The horse trusts in his ἀγλαΐη, his splendour. He relies on his splendour as warriors rely on their ἀλκή, their battle strength.¹¹ ‘Αγλαΐη does not mean simply splendour of appearance; it encompasses all the things that make someone ἀγλαός: beauty, strength, joy, glory, and the like.¹² The horse is confident of himself and his ability to do what a horse does. The simile, then, presents the horse’s physical well-being and his pride.

The simile closes by stressing the horse’s speed and ease of movement. His knees carry him swiftly where he wants to go. The word for “swiftly” here, ῥίμφα, comes from ῥίπτω,¹³ so we have a sense that the horse moves, not just swiftly, but headlong, “hurlingly;” that is, there is an idea of strong force behind the speed, perhaps a sense of compulsion. The horse rushes towards the ἦθεα, the haunts, of horses; he is not doing something idiosyncratic, but something expressive of his horsiness, rushing towards the place *horses* frequent, the ἦθεα and the νομός (pasture) of horses.¹⁴ These two words stress that the horse moves towards the place that he, as a horse, belongs.¹⁵ He does not belong alone in the stall, but out on the plain running free with the other horses. The horse must break free of its pampering stall and run across the plain to its proper place, among

others of its own kind. The simile leaves us, then, with the idea that the horse is going swiftly to its proper place.

This simile ties into Paris' situation as follows. Paris is a prince of Troy, and so must be, like the horse, accustomed to good quarters and good food. Further, he is returning to battle refreshed after an absence. Paris rushes on swift feet (σεύατ' ... ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι 6.505) through the city, while the horse rushes across the plain. Paris meets no resistance in his run through the city, but can be said to have broken a bond in that he is returning to battle having broken free of the will of Aphrodite, which brought him back to Troy in Book 3, and, as we will see below, from the constraints of family and city life. The horse has left its stall and is running on the plain towards the place of horses, just as Paris is heading for the plain and the battlefield, the places of warriors. Just as the horse is running, glorying, with his knees carrying him swiftly, so Paris runs, carried by his swift feet, shining in his armour (6.513-514). Hektor tells him when they meet that no one would find fault with his action in battle, since he is mighty (6.521-522). They both then run together out of the gates and onto the field, eager to do battle and to fight (7.1-3).¹⁶

The simile works in a similar way for Hektor.¹⁷ Hektor, like Paris, is a royal prince who is normally well-fed and well-housed. He has been stopped and restrained like the horse in that he has been wounded and carried away. His breaking the bond is coming to consciousness and running away from his companions back into battle. Like the horse, Hektor glories as he runs in that Apollo has filled him with μένος; he has speed and strength in him and so can be said to be glorying and confident. Just as the horse is carried easily by his knees (ρίμφα ἐ γούνα φέρει, 15.268) so Hektor runs plying his limbs and knees swiftly (λαυνηρὰ πόδας καὶ γούνατ' ἐνώμα, 15.269). Just as the horse runs lightly towards his haunts, so Hektor runs lightly across the plain to the battlefield. The glorying of the horse and its swift movement show Hektor's own glorying and happiness in his return to battle with Apollo behind him. The simile takes Hektor from the safety of the river and back to the battlefield.

As I have noted, the simile closes with the notion that the horse, in running towards the river, is returning to its proper place. Since Paris and Hektor both receive this simile at points at which they are returning to battle, it seems that the simile is indicating that Paris and Hektor, like the horse, are also returning to their proper place. In what follows, I will explore in more detail how the *Iliad* portrays the battlefield as the proper place, not just for Paris and Hektor at the moments they receive the simile, but for warrior heroes in general.¹⁸

I noted in my discussion of the five-part narrative pattern that contains our repeated horse simile that the pattern is one of withdrawal and return. This basic pattern, of course, appears as the narrative structure of both Homeric epics as withdrawal-devastation-return. Each of the poems has its own account of the place to which its hero returns: for the *Odyssey*, return is νόστος, return home; for the *Iliad*, return is return to battle. In the *Iliad*, the place to which the heroic ideal, Achilles, must return to realize his epic potential is the battlefield. Within the context of the *Iliad*, then, the proper place for the warrior appears to be the battlefield. Paris and Hektor, consequently, as warriors in the *Iliad*, are also returning to their proper place in returning to battle.

Another way in which it seems that the horse, Paris and Hektor are returning to their proper places is the ease with which they make this return. Running towards the pasture or towards the battlefield is easy and swift. All three of these figures move with confidence and pleasure as they pursue their returns. Natural place is the place in which one wishes to stay and towards which one most easily moves.¹⁹ The horse, Paris, and Hektor move easily, swiftly, and gladly back to the places they want to be and where they should be. Like the horse, then, Paris and Hektor, as warriors, in returning to battle are returning to their proper Iliadic place.²⁰

The other feature of the horse that is significant here is its status as a luxury animal. In the larger cultural context of the ancient Mediterranean we see that the horse is the aristocratic animal *par excellence*; its role as a prestige animal is attested not only in Greece in the Bronze Age and later, but in third and second millennia Near Eastern cultures as well. The horse, unlike the ass or the ox, had no value as a work animal until well into the Middle Ages, when a yoke was developed that allowed draught animals to pull loads without choking themselves. Further, horses require more water and better pasturage than sheep and goats, which decreases their efficiency as meat and milk producers. In Greece and the Aegean, moreover, all available arable land was used for agriculture. Consequently, only those who could afford the upkeep for animals that did no work and produced no goods were able to keep horses; that is, only the wealthy, with land and resources to spare, kept horses.²¹ The horse thereby became, in the world of the audience of the Homeric poems, a sign of wealth that refused to acknowledge the limits of utility.

The *Iliad* itself shares this understanding of the horse. The horse is a prize worth waging war for, worth risking one's life for, as we see in Dolon's insistence at *Iliad* 10.303-323 that he receive Achilles'

horses and chariot for spying on the Achaian camp. We learn also that Herakles' attack on Troy during the reign of Laomedon was because of a dispute over horses (5.640-651). Heroes recognize horses as prizes worthy of their greatest efforts and of the risk of their lives. Heroes also recognize horses as precious possessions that deserve special care and tendance. Pandaros leaves his horses and chariots at home in Zeleia with his father because he fears that there will not be enough for them to eat at Troy (5.201-202). Hektor's wife, Andromache, does not leave the care of Hektor's horses entirely to a servant, but tends them herself every day (8.185-190). Even Priam, king of Troy, feeds his own horses (24.279-280). The horse is not just another domestic animal to be kept in a barn and cared for by slaves; rather, it is prized and tended as valuable by the heroes themselves. The *Iliad* itself, then, regards the horse as a sign of heroic excellence that heroes themselves acknowledge as such.²² Our simile itself mentions the tendence the horse has received in its stall (6.506 = 15.263), alluding to the special care afforded these beings of luxury. Let us now consider the specific nature of war in the *Iliad* in order to see how this aspect of the simile—luxury and non-utility—is appropriate to Paris and Hektor as warriors.

We should note first that the Trojan War is not a war undertaken for any claims of utility: this is no war of conquest, no war for profit through sacking and pillage; rather, the Achaians come to Troy by the thousands in order to win back one man's wife. It is a war entered when one kingly household, the house of Priam, refuses to make good the dishonour it has done to another, the house of Menelaos. The entire resources of two peoples, the Achaians and the Trojans, are spent for the sake of this war. There is no profit motive expressed to explain the hundreds of independent kings' having come to Troy: they come, abandoning their own homes and kingdoms, for the sake of participating in war and for the glory that is uniquely won in that domain.²³

Homeric battle narrative describes individual duels between individual aristocratic champions, for the most part. The troops, the commoners, are invisible, except in scenes of muster and rout. There is no strategy, no aligning of warriors in ways designed to cause the enemy's defeat. Battle takes place at random, according to the wills of the individual heroes whose encounters are described.²⁴ Here again, the way in which battle unfolds in the *Iliad* shows that the war is not a war of utility. The champions are not held to any plan and are not subject to the rule and guidance of any single strategist or commander; they fight as they will and they flee as they will. With no

unifying goal or plan, the only reason left for fighting is the desire of the fighters. Just as with the motive for the entire war, so with the enacting of the war, the Achaians fight because they *choose* to fight and in the *way* that they choose to fight;²⁵ they are, in battle, free and unrestricted.

The chief goal of the warrior hero in the *Iliad* is to win κλέος.²⁶ The ancient epic tradition as a whole provides us with a variety of ways in which a hero can win κλέος, but for the *Iliad*, κλέος is best won in only one way: on the battlefield. The winning of κλέος thus is always, for the *Iliad*, linked to a place: the plain before Troy. Indeed, in the *Iliad*, overwhelmingly the idea of winning κλέος is tied to excellence in battle at Troy;²⁷ when Troy is not the precise site of battle, the battlefield remains the place where, as far as the *Iliad* is concerned, κλέος is won.²⁸ If winning κλέος is the goal that most drives the warrior hero, and if κλέος is won on the battlefield, then the place where the warrior hero belongs, where he is most perfectly a hero, is on the battlefield.

The horse simile, then, using as it does a symbol of prestige and non-utility as a figure for Paris and Hektor, indicates of Paris and Hektor that they are proper Iliadic luxurious warriors. The simile says that, as these two warriors return to battle, they return as proper warriors. In the case of Paris, the horse simile serves to show that Paris' proper place is on the battlefield, not inside the walls of Troy in his bed chamber. The same can be said for Hektor, who, as the chief Trojan warrior, must be present on the battlefield. The place of the warrior is on the battlefield being engaged in battle; his place is not in the city, being protected, living with his family and his fellow citizens. Doing battle means killing other warriors; at its utmost, it means being the berserker that Achilles becomes after Patroklos' death. A warrior does not belong in the city because he does not find his true purpose and identity in the city, but on the battlefield.²⁹ Just as the horse in the simile seeks out the haunts of horses, so the warrior must seek the haunts of warriors, the battlefield. He must exult in the prospect of battle, as the horse exults in his run across the plain.³⁰ The movement away from the safety and constrictions of the city is a move towards the danger and freedom of battle. Paris and Hektor both seek that danger and freedom. For Paris the promise of battle is realised and the claim of the simile vindicated upon his return, as he brings relief to the Trojans and is the first to kill an enemy warrior. Hektor, on his return, comes back to a full-blown battle in the course of which the Trojans bring fire to the Achaian ships and Hektor kills Patroklos after a day of glory in which

he becomes the enraged warrior we see later in Achilleus.

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

III. Proper Place and Improper Place for Paris and Hektor

Homeric poetry is poetry about heroes. The ideal hero, as worked out by the Iliadic tradition, fights and dies at Troy and receives κλέος because of these activities. The ideal Odyssean hero fights, survives, gets home, and achieves κλέος.³¹ The great hero of the *Iliad* is of course Achilleus, who fights, who will soon die, and who chooses death and the unwithering glory he will receive because of that death. There is no other acceptable model of the hero in the *Iliad*. The hero is not a city man, he is not a dancer, or a lover, or a speaker—he is a warrior who will risk all for κλέος.³²

In this light, Paris and Hektor do not always come off well as heroes. The situations in which we see them in the contexts of the two horse similes cast an especially unheroic light on them. Without the mitigation of the simile, which portrays Paris and Hektor as eager warriors rushing to their natural heroic place, the audience would have to decide, on the basis of the model of the traditional Iliadic hero, that Paris and Hektor in these contexts are not real heroes at all. The simile is present in both cases to redeem Paris and Hektor, to reveal the truth of their relations to the warrior ideal, to prove that they are warriors rather than city men. In this section, I will discuss how both Paris and Hektor are cast in an unheroic light prior to their receiving their horse similes and explain in more detail for each how the simile redeems these two warriors.

The five-part narrative pattern for Paris begins in Book 3. He first appears striding across the field in his leopard skin, brandishing his weapons and challenging the Achaians to fight (3.15-20). This

initially heroic challenge soon disintegrates as Menelaos comes forward to accept it and Paris withdraws into the crowd (3.21-37). Paris' first attempt to establish himself as a warrior in the *Iliad* fails because of his own inability to stand before Menelaos. After Paris withdraws, Hektor rebukes him, focussing on Paris' associations with Aphrodite and soft living. He calls Paris, "best in appearance, woman-mad, a deceiver" (3.39), and tells him that his lyre, the gifts of Aphrodite, his hair, and his beauty are of no value in battle (3.54-55). Hektor places Paris firmly within the sphere of the city, the place where one is safe to be beautiful, to deal with women, to play the lyre.³³ Paris in this speech is the pampered horse, who is kept soft and at leisure by his ties to Aphrodite and the safety of the city.

This portrayal of Paris dominates Book 3. Paris himself acknowledges that Hektor is right to object to his having fled from Menelaos (3.59). He reminds Hektor, however, that he has not chosen to be associated with Aphrodite but the gifts of the gods cannot be rejected (3.64-66). Paris insists that, despite Aphrodite's gifts, he can and will fight, and then offers to fight in single combat with Menelaos for Helen and her possessions (3.67-75). Paris tries to uphold his own status as a warrior; he denies that his association with Aphrodite can fundamentally undermine this status. His offer of a duel with Menelaos is an insistence on his own desire to fight and to risk everything in battle. The war will be settled by this combat, Paris says: the victor will take Helen and all her possessions, while the Trojans and Achaians will make peace, and the Achaians will go home. Paris demands that he enter battle, not just as one combatant among many, but as the sole heroic champion of his people.

Paris' insistence on his own right to heroic status here is supported in the narrative by his receiving an arming scene prior to the duel (3.330-338). Arming scenes in the *Iliad* mark the entrance of a superlative hero into battle. That Paris receives an arming scene suggests that he does in fact participate in the heroic ideal, that he is a fighter worthy of warrior status.³⁴

Paris' claim to be a warrior, not a creature of Aphrodite, and the narrative's support of this claim with the arming scene are soon undermined in the duel. Paris cannot pierce Menelaos' shield with his spear, is almost struck himself by Menelaos' spear, and is then caught and dragged by the crest of his helmet, about to be killed (3.346-372). Aphrodite then disregards Paris' right to die as a warrior, killed at Menelaos' hands; she will not allow Menelaos to kill Paris, but snaps the strap of Paris' helmet and carries him off in a mist to his bed chamber (3.373-382). Paris' second attempt to

stand forth as a hero is foiled here, not so much by his own failure as by Aphrodite's refusal to allow him to work out his role as a warrior. In battle, some warriors die and some warriors kill; this situation is what produces heroic κλέος. By denying Paris the opportunity to die as a warrior, in combat, Aphrodite denies Paris his status as a hero, a status he has been trying to uphold in the face of Hektor's treating him as a city man and a man of Aphrodite.

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

Paris acquiesces to this change in status. He does not try to return to battle, but happily stays with Helen and insists that she go to bed with him to have sex (3.441-446).³⁵ Paris easily makes this transition from warrior to lover, indicating that his attempts to establish himself as a warrior will come to nothing after all. He has yielded entirely to Aphrodite's influence. Book 3 ends by turning from Paris' bed chamber, where he and Helen are making love, to the battlefield, where Menelaos is seeking him, and where the Trojans would gladly give Paris up to death (3.448-455). The poem stresses Paris' absence from battle, along with his new and confirmed place inside the city, safe inside his bed chamber.³⁶

Paris next appears in Book 6. Here Hektor, having come into the city to tell his mother and the other women to pray to Athene for protection from Diomedes, decides to ask Paris to return to battle (6.280-281). Hektor finds Paris in his bed chamber, handling his weapons and armour (6.321-322), preparing to make another transition, from lover to warrior, from the world of Aphrodite to the world of battle. Hektor asks Paris to come back to fight and Paris agrees to arm and meet Hektor at the gates (3.326-341). Again, Paris easily acquiesces to another's attempt to recast him: he easily goes along with Hektor's request that he put himself once more into the sphere of the warrior. It is at this point that Paris prepares for battle

and runs through the city, receiving his horse simile (6.503-514). The horse simile marks Paris' movement out of the city and back to his proper place as a warrior.

Book 3, then, shows us a Paris who is a shirker from battle. He is beloved of Aphrodite, who has no place in battle, as is made explicit in Book 5 when Diomedes wounds her and she goes crying back to Olympus and her mother's arms (5.334-380). Aphrodite tries to make Paris into a soft city man, a dancer. Paris accepts this recasting by going to bed with Helen and by not attempting to return immediately to battle.³⁷ In Book 6, Hektor finds Paris already in the process of returning to warrior status, handling his arms in his bed chamber; Paris has brought the battlefield into Aphrodite's world and must leave that world to pursue his role as warrior. The horse simile, given him as he is making the move from inside the bed chamber and the city walls to the battlefield outside the walls, shows Paris taking on his proper identity. Immediately after receiving the horse simile, Paris receives another short simile, comparing his shining in his armour to the shining of the sun (6.513). Images of shining heavenly bodies occur in the poem to describe victorious warriors, so the sun simile confirms Paris' return to warrior status.³⁸ Paris here, like the horse, breaks bonds of safety and pampering. He breaks free from Aphrodite and Helen. Paris will never again be seen inside the city in the *Iliad*. From the end of Book 6 on, he appears only as a warrior. He moves now only in his proper place, the battlefield.

Hektor, like Paris, must establish himself as a warrior outside of the safety and demands of the city. His relationship to the city is different from Paris' in that Hektor is responsible to, and for, many different people inside the city. The precise nature of Hektor's ties to the city is articulated in Book 6. Here, through his encounters with Hekabe, Helen, and Andromache, we see that the city, for Hektor, is a place inhabited by women who want to keep him away from battle, away from the realization of his role as warrior hero. Each of these women offers Hektor a different aspect of the pampering restrictions of the city, each of which Hektor must reject.³⁹

Arriving in Troy, Hektor finds his mother and asks her to go pray to Athene. Hekabe asks Hektor to wait so that she can give him wine to drink and with which to pour a libation to Zeus (6.258-260). Hektor rejects the wine on two grounds: first, that it will weaken his μένος, his strength, and make him forget his ἀλκή, his battle courage, and second, because he should not pray to Zeus with his hands covered in blood and gore (6.267-268). The offer of wine to Hektor here is an offer of the normal, safe, and secure aspects of

life that are at odds with Hektor's activities as a warrior. The warrior, while he is being warrior (bloody and fighting), cannot move into the peaceful activity of drinking wine and pouring a libation without a diminution in his battle fury and battle might.⁴⁰ Further, Hektor has just come into the city from battle; he is covered in blood and the traces of his fighting. Prayer and libation to the gods inside the city can only be undertaken if one is clean. Hektor is not clean and cannot make himself clean if he is going to go back to fight. Hektor thus, in rejecting his mother's offer of enervating wine, is rejecting the world of the city.

After Hektor sees Paris at his house and urges him to return to battle, Helen offers Hektor a chair on which to rest (6.354). Hektor rejects this chair, too: his spirit is urging him on to defend the Trojans (6.361-362). Moreover, rest is not possible for Hektor right now because, within the city, there are others he must see before returning to battle. Going back to fight is uppermost in Hektor's mind, but he still feels compelled to seek out his wife and child (6.365-366). Warrior though he is, Hektor must satisfy his desires as husband and father. When Hektor meets Andromache, they have a long conversation, in the course of which Andromache reminds Hektor of her complete dependence on him and asks him to fight from the walls, and not out on the plain, where he is in danger (6.429-437). Hektor refuses this style of fighting because, he says, he would be ashamed before the Trojans to behave that way, because his spirit will not let him, as he has learned to be a good fighter and to stand among the front row of Trojan fighters, and because on the plain he can win κλέος for himself and his father (6.442-446). To fight from the walls is to fight *inside* the walls. κλέος cannot be earned from inside the walls, only shame. Further, to be a good warrior is to fight in the front line, not at the back, and certainly not from the wall. Hektor, as a warrior, cannot agree to be a fighter in any way except the way that his spirit, longing for glory, tells him to fight. His wife does not understand that a warrior cannot be a warrior inside the city, even if he is *fighting* inside the city. The warrior's place is out on the field among other warriors, risking his life for κλέος. To fight from the city walls is to fight from safety and this fight is no fight at all.⁴¹ Hektor then leaves to meet Paris and to return to the field.⁴² Like Paris, Hektor is never seen inside the city again in the *Iliad*. The city remains marked for Hektor as the site of restrictive responsibility and safety. His place from now on will be on the battlefield.

When Hektor takes part in his version of the five-part narrative pattern, he and the Trojans have been successful in driving the

Achaians back to their ships. While Zeus sleeps, Telamonian Aias hits Hektor in the chest with a boulder. Hektor is felled, unconscious (14.409-420). He has, then, been unsuccessful as a warrior champion. Hektor's companions compound his failure when they rush to protect him; they carry him to his chariot, which carries him back across the plain towards the city (14.428-432). Hektor, in his injured state, cannot move or act for himself. His companions decide to protect him from death by carrying him, not just behind the lines where his chariot is, but back towards the city, the location of the safety that Hektor has, the last time we see him in it, rejected. Flight on the field is one thing; flight back towards the city is flight back to the world of safety and responsibility. Hektor is, through no decision of his own, being carried back towards the city world of safety and its bonds.

When Zeus wakes up, he sends Apollo to revive Hektor and to marshal the Trojans (15.220-235). Apollo restores Hektor, breathing μένος into him. Hektor then returns to battle, receiving his horse simile. Immediately after Hektor receives this simile, he is given another, comparing him to a lion driving hunters and their dogs away from their prey (15.271-276). While the horse simile illustrates Hektor's speed and his return to his proper heroic place, the lion simile illustrates his μένος.⁴³ The lion simile thus confirms that Hektor has regained his full capacity as a destructive warrior. Hektor's reappearance causes the Achaians to lose heart and turn back to the ships (15.279-300). When Apollo shakes the aegis at the Achaian champions who are trying to stand firm, they also flee, driven by Hektor (15.320-327). This flight begins the rout that culminates in the attack on Protesilaos' ship, which Hektor leads (15.704-746). Thus, the warrior status implicit in the two similes is made real in Hektor's successful performance in battle.

The μένος Apollo restores to Hektor here is the μένος that Hektor feared he would lose in Book 6 if he drank his mother's wine. Hektor after his revival is removed from his feebleness and his trouble, and restored to μένος and speed, two features necessary to the warrior.⁴⁴ Hektor is redeemed from shame and weakness and has become again a terrifying and glorious warrior. His rescue and withdrawal back towards the city are now outweighed by his new vigour and fearsomeness. Hektor has successfully put himself back into his proper heroic place, away from his home and his city.⁴⁵

The five-part narrative pattern, threatened defeat and death in battle, rescue and transport to a place of safety, exhortation, return to battle marked by a horse simile, and demonstration of heroic

success, has revealed itself to be a story of the warrior's return to his proper place. In the *Iliad*, the warrior's proper place is the battlefield, a place removed from the concerns of daily life within the city and from the safety offered by the city walls. When Paris and Hektor take part in their versions of the pattern, the simile serves to mark their returns, not just to battle, but to full warrior-hero status.

The horse simile used for Paris and Hektor in each case marks their redemption as heroes. By "redemption," I mean their return to an heroic status from which they have earlier departed or which they have failed to achieve. This heroic status is one which the *Iliad* itself defines and assumes as the norm for men like Paris and Hektor, aristocrats at war. The warrior hero of the *Iliad* is a figure who exists to fight, kill, and, perhaps, die in battle. He is exemplified most fully, of course, by Achilles, who fights and kills more successfully than any other warrior hero in the poem and whose imminent death is the dominant undercurrent of its final books. I speak of "redemption" for Paris and Hektor, because, in terms of the *Iliad's* ethics, these two heroes have, prior to their returns to battle, failed as heroes. Paris has betrayed the ethics of the warrior hero, while Hektor has been unable to live up to the warrior ideal. As Paris returns to battle in Books 6 and 7, as Hektor returns to battle in Book 15, each is marked as returning with full warrior status. Each re-appears as a complete and successful hero. Paris and Hektor thus *redeem* themselves within the scope of Iliadic warrior hero ethics.

Conclusion: Redemption by Simile

The redemption that I have argued is taking place for Paris and Hektor depends on one crucial aspect of the similes: their role as directors of audience interpretation. At certain junctures, the poem, rather than allowing us to hold our own views about the narrative, intervenes directly in our interpretation to tell us, with a simile, "it was like this . . ." The poem thereby demands that we hold to its directions in our understanding of the narrative.⁴⁶ The simile, as a comparison, asks us to take a view of the narrative that the narrative itself does not transparently lead us to take. In the case of the repeated horse simile for Paris and Hektor, the simile's direction to our interpretation is more a *redirection*: the narrative has set us up to regard Paris and Hektor as failed heroes and needs, at the points where the horse simile appears, to have us think differently of the two heroes. At these points the similes appear and tell us that, contrary to the narrative's information, Paris and Hektor are real

Iliadic heroes.⁴⁷ The repeated horse simile introduces us to an image, the horse breaking free of its stall and running across the plain, that reorients our interpretative expectations without ever expressly announcing that this redirection is taking place. The redirection is, consequently, properly poetic and self-concealing.

To some extent, then, the simile allows the narrative to correct itself; in the events leading up to their returns Paris and Hektor have both been unsuccessful and unheroic. Before the poem sends them off to battle, before Paris brings salvation to the Trojans in Book 7 and before Hektor begins his day of glory in Book 15, the poem must remind its audience that these two heroes are capable and worthy of the exploits that will be attributed to them. The device the poem uses to achieve this reminder is the simile of the horse breaking free of its stall and running across the plain. This vignette carries with it precisely the two features that need, at the times the simile appears, to be emphasized. The poem needs, in order to recast Paris and Hektor as proper heroes, to show that they belong, not to the city, but to the battlefield, and that, like all warriors, they are prepared to give up all concerns for responsibility and utility when they are in battle. These goals are accomplished through the mechanism of the simile. Having set itself and the audience up to take one stance towards Paris and Hektor, the poem, through the simile, redirects our interpretation of these characters, redeems them, and allows us to see them as the proper heroes that they are.

The single factor that most contributes to readers' current inability to understand or see the point of various Homeric similes is that our world is not the world that produced the Homeric poems. We are not the audience for whom, or with whom, these poems were composed; we have not been brought up within this tradition. Consequently, much that would be immediately and implicitly clear to an Homeric audience is opaque to us. Our job, then, as students of these poems, is to reconstruct as much as we are able of that tradition. This reconstruction must include not only meaning or symbol, but method as well. These poems do not always convey meaning in a *way* that we can easily recognize and understand. My argument in this paper has been that the horse simile for Paris and Hektor is not merely ornament or illustration, but that it is, in fact, a sign-post or *direction* for understanding. In these similes the poem is telling us to interpret Paris and Hektor at the moments they receive the simile in light of the meanings immanent in the simile. My point, further, is that essential to this interpretation are notions that are themselves immanent traditional notions: warrior ethics and the

horse as a sign of luxury. To make sense of this simile as it appears for Paris and Hektor, then, we must, as the poem does, recognize and interpret Paris and Hektor in the terms brought forward by the simile. Only once we have done that can we begin to unpack the traditional meanings immanent in these passages.

Notes

1. Scholars who consider the simile to be inappropriate for Hektor are influenced by the fact that a *reader* of the *Iliad* sees the simile first used for Paris. Scholarly biases regarding Paris then come into play. Schnapp-Gourbeillon (1981) states (p. 80) that the image of the horse is not warrior-like, because the stallion here thinks of nothing but females and is very vain (notice here the influence of Virgil's re-working of this simile for Turnus at *Aeneid* 11.492-497, where line 494 reads "*in pastus armentaque tendit equarum*"). Edwards (1987) gives evidence (pp. 154, 212) of this Virgilian influence also. Bowra (1968) argues (p.118) that the simile is less appropriate when used for Hektor, but functions (92) to contrast the frivolous Paris and the tried warrior Hektor. Kirk (1990) states (*ad* 6.506-511) that the simile is equally effective, in different ways, in both of its appearances. Janko (1992) remarks (*ad* 15.263-268) that, if we did not have Book 6, no one would find fault with the use of this simile for Hektor. Moulton (1977) notes (p. 94) that the contexts for the two appearances are significantly different, in that Book 6 gives a domestic context, while Book 15 gives a battle context.
2. *Iliad* 5.782-83=7.256-257; 5.859-861=14.148-150; 6.506-511=15.263-268; 9.14-15=16.3-4; 11.548-557=17.657-666; 13.389-393=16.482-486; *Odyssey* 4.335-340=17.126-131; 6.232-235=23.159-162.
3. See, for example, Edwards (1987:11-23); Fenik (1968, 1974); Foley (1990, pp.240-387), where he examines thematic structure and story pattern in the *Odyssey*, *Beowulf*, and Serbo-Croatian return songs; Krischer (1971).
4. Scott (1974) has shown (p.53) that similes with the same subject are used consistently in the same kinds of situations, such as entrance of the hero into battle, attack of a single warrior by a group, and so on; he notes (1974: 86) that horse similes are used generally at points where a hero re-enters battle. Further, passages in which the same situation is described *verbatim*, such as feast scenes, arming scenes, and the like, are not just describing a typical action in typical words; they are also parts of broader narrative patterns. See Fenik (1968, p.78 f.) and Krischer (1971, p.23) on the role of arming scenes as a preliminary element in heroic *aristeiai*. See also Foley (1990: 248-257, 1991:174-189; and 1997:169).
5. The pattern I outline here begins for Paris in Book 3 (where we find elements 1 and 2) and resumes in Book 6 (where we see elements 3, 4, and 5) when the narrative returns to Paris in Troy. So also for Hektor the pattern begins in Book 14 (elements 1 and 2) and resumes in Book 15 (elements 3, 4, and 5), when the narrative returns to Hektor. In each case the pattern is interrupted by a change of scene and a change of focus. See Fenik (1974), who argues (p.138) that large scale patterning can be found in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.
6. See Fenik (1968: 26; 49-50) for the relationship between and interchangeability of "rebuke patterns" and "consultation patterns". These different patterns

- share elements, just as here the exhortation and rebuke play the same role in the larger pattern I have identified.
7. Transferral of elements in patterns and motifs occurs elsewhere. On the transfer of elements in the “woman attended by maidservants” motif, see Nagler (1974, p.68ff.); on transfer of elements in the “wrath, withdrawal, return” motif, see Nickel (2003: 72-78); on transfer of elements in the “wrath, withdrawal, return” motif, see Sowa (1984: 104). Lord (1960) also notes (p.98) that singers will substitute something similar to the traditional pattern when they cannot use one of the pattern’s elements in its usual form. Note also that, in the case of each of the three horse similes discussed here, another simile for the one receiving the horse simile follows almost immediately upon each horse simile (6.513 compares Paris to the sun, 15.271-276 compare Hektor to a lion, and 22.26-31 compare Achilleus to the Dog Star).
 8. See, for example, Lord (1960: 158-197) for this pattern in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and M. L. Lord (1967) on the pattern in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter.
 9. An *aristeia* is a formalized narrative of heroic success that contains standard repeated elements.
 10. Lattimore (1951), translator.
 11. The horse is described as ἀγλαΐφι πεποιθώς. Compare *Iliad* 5.297-302 (Aineias, ἀλκί πεποιθώς, rushes to protect Pandaros’ corpse) and 18.158-160 (Hektor, ἀλκί πεποιθώς, presses his attack on Patroklos’ corpse).
 12. Cunliffe 1924 *s.v.* “ἀγλαΐη”, “ἀγλαός”. Cf. Stanford 1959 *ad Odyssey* 2.109. See *Iliad* 2.506, 7.203, 19.385.
 13. Cunliffe 1924 *s.v.* “ρίμφα”; Ebeling 1963 *s.v.* “ρίμφα”.
 14. Compare *Iliad* 18.575, where the herd of oxen on the shield rush to their pasture (ἐπεσσεύοντο νομόνδε).
 15. See Kirk (1985: *ad* 3.156) on νέμω and its derivatives conveying the notion of proper place and Benveniste (1973: 68) on νομός and agreed portion and (pp. 270-271) on ἔθος and social bond.
 16. Scott (1974) notes (p.104) that warriors arming for battle or about to enter the field often receive “peaceful” similes in order to make their transition into battle more striking. So here the violence of battle in the narrative of Book 7 is strongly marked off from the quiet and absence of strife in the horse simile. Scott’s notion of similes playing a role in creating mood seems to me quite reasonable, although my own concerns here are different from his.
 17. Fränkel (1921) argues (p.77) that when this simile is used for Hektor, the aspect of breaking free from restraint is more important, while for Paris the idea of splendour is at the fore.
 18. The notion that place is a constituent component of identity is an idea present throughout early Greek thought. For example, in the *Theogony*, the first *places*, Chaos, Gaia and Tartaros, are beings, capable of producing more beings. Gaia herself is the πάντων ἕδος, the seat of all things, the place to which all things belong. Gaia bears Ouranos so that he may be the seat of the gods. Place in the *Theogony*, as in the *Iliad*, is inherently oriented. Compare Casey (1997: 3-23), but especially, see pp. 5-7.
 19. Cf. Aristotle *Physics* IV 5.212b29-34.
 20. Dumezil (1969) discusses (p.125) the ten forms of Verethragna, god of offensive victory; among these forms are a stallion and a warrior. Schnapp-Gourbeillon (1981) notes (p.170) that war is the common business of the horse and the warrior, as one sees attested in the presence of a catalogue of horses at *Iliad*

- 2.760-779. Schnapp-Gourbeillon adds that the horse in the *Iliad* reproduces the hero's condition in that horses can be offspring of gods, have divine ancestors, and be raised by gods, just as heroes can (p.176).
21. On the horse in Mediterranean and Near Eastern cultures, see Drews (1988: 83-84, 92); Richter (1968: 70-71, 76). On the invention of the yoke, see Anderson (1961: 3). On the use of arable land, see Anderson (1961: 4); Crowel (1995: 309-311); Donlan (1989:136, 144). On horses as reserved for the wealthy, see Donlan (1989: 143-144). Similar issues, I believe, pertain to chariots. Greenhalgh (1973: 14) and van Wees (1997: 690) understand the use of the chariot for heroic transportation in the *Iliad* to be wasteful and ineffective as a means of war; I propose that what is commonly taken to be a misunderstanding of the tactical value of chariots or a dim mis-remembering of Mycenaean use of chariots in battle can better be seen as a pointed portrayal of heroic luxury and excess.
 22. Cf. Woronoff (1983), where Woronoff argues (p.489, p.492) that Anchises' "theft" of the divine seed of Laomedon's horses is part of the complex of the rivalry between the two lines of Dardanids; Anchises must acquire the divine horses so that Laomedon's descendants do not alone control the divine stock and its associations with heroic and military excellence.
 23. Achilles in *Iliad* 1 reminds Agamemnon that he and the other Achaians followed Agamemnon and Menelaos to Troy to please Agamemnon and to win τιμή for Agamemnon and Menelaos and that he himself has no quarrel with the Trojans (1.152-160). Whenever discussions as to Achaian motives for being at or remaining at Troy arise, the prospect of booty or profit is not mentioned; rather, such discussions focus on retrieving Helen and on questions of honour. So, in Book 2, when Athene and Odysseus are trying to prevent the Achaian flight to the ships, spoil does not come up as a reason to remain; instead honour or loss of honour (2.160-161 ≈176-177 εὐχολή), cowardice (2.190), obedience (2.192, 200), and vengeance (2.354-356) are the motives. Cf. van Wees (1992) who argues (pp.183-189) that booty is an extra good that comes in addition to the primary and sufficient goal: glory and honour and that the goal for both Achaians and Trojans is the total destruction of the enemy, including the destruction of wealth that could be taken as spoil (p.178, p.183). So Ready (2007), who notes (p.13) that prizes and spoil, desirable in themselves, are most important to warriors for the κλέος and τιμή that come with them.
 24. Finley (1965) observes (p.122) that discussions containing a "sustained consideration" of circumstances and possible strategies do not occur in the *Iliad*. So also Mueller (1984), who adds (p.76) that warfare depends upon the strength and spirit of individuals. van Wees (1997) argues (pp.669-672) that Homeric battle scenes demonstrate consistently that the warriors fight as and where they please, not according to any plan or strategy. Singor (1995) argues that there is organized mass fighting in the *Iliad*; he marshals evidence that does support the idea that troops go into battle in some kind of order (p.185). While this evidence may be helpful for dating certain passages of the poem, it nonetheless remains the case that the narrative focus is overwhelmingly on the duels. Raaflaub (2008) argues that there are signs of a proto-phalanx in the *Iliad's* descriptions of massed battle, but notes that Iliadic battles are moved by individual heroes.
 25. Notice, too, that they can choose to have no battle at all on particular days. The *Iliad* opens with battle suspended, allowing time for Agamemnon to insult

- Chryses, for Apollo to send the plague, and so on.
26. See Hektor's speech to Andromache 6.446; Sarpedon's speech to Glaukos 12.310 ff., for example. See Ready (2007), who argues (pp.21-22) that the individual hero's receiving κλέος in exchange for dying in battle is key for the maintenance of the heroic social and economic order.
 27. See 4.197=4.207; 5.3, 172, 273, 532=15.564; 7.91; 9.413, 415; 10.212; 11.227; 13.364; 17.16, 131, 232; 18.121; 22.304.
 28. See 2.325; 6.446; 11.21; 17.143.
 29. Schein (1984) notes (p.71) that, in the *Iliad*, to be fully himself, a warrior can only live to kill or be killed in battle.
 30. Edwards (1987: 154) sees Hektor looking forward to battle with pleasure in Book 15, comparing Menelaos rejoicing like a lion upon seeing Paris at *Iliad* 3.21-28, and Patroklos' overweening eagerness at 16.684-687 and 784-786.
 31. See Nagy (1999; especially pp.26-41) for an account of the existence and nature of these two separate heroic traditions. Moulton (1977) treats the similes of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* separately because of the narrative and structural differences between the two poems (p. 11).
 32. Achilles' exemplary status as hero in the *Iliad* very much centres on his being a lover of battle, and a bloodthirsty one at that. This role is one that he plays both for the reader of the poem and for the other characters within the poem, as we see at 1.117, where Agamemnon reproaches Achilles for being a lover of ἔρις, πόλεμοι, and μάχαι; Zeus uses this same line to reproach Ares at 5.891. Cf. Nagy (1999), who also notes this parallel in a discussion of Achilles as a bloodthirsty hero (p.131 n.4). Later in the poem we learn that after Patroklos' death Achilles is not pleased in his heart until he has returned to battle (19.312-313), and later that he wishes his θύμος would drive him to eat Hektor raw (22.346-347). Achilles' spirit takes pleasure in battle and drives him almost to the point of savage cannibalism. Cf. Nagy (1999) who notes (pp.157-158) the parallels between Achilles and the Hesiodic Bronze Race at *Erga* 143-155; one implicit feature of the Bronze Race may be cannibalism. See also Pratt (2007) who links Achilles' warrior-hero status to his "childlike" self-absorption; Pratt notes also that Hektor, as his death approaches, becomes more childlike and self-concerned, more like the ideal warrior hero (pp.36-40).
 33. On the disjunction of warrior and Aphrodite, see Monsacré (1984, pp.41-50).
 34. See Fenik (1968: 78f.), Krischer (1971: 23), and Nickel (2002) on this topic. Collins (1988) argues (p.35) that Paris' attempts to establish himself as a warrior are part of his role as the questionable warrior who helps to define the true warrior.
 35. Schein (1984) notes (p.22) that Paris' lack of concern about the duel here shows his lack of concern both for heroic values and for the values of the responsible city man, Hektor.
 36. Muellner (1990) argues (p.89) that Paris' attempt to be a warrior in Book 3 fails, not because Paris is inherently a poor fighter, but because Aphrodite and the "subjugating nature" of the sexuality she represents cause him to fail. Monsacré (1984) notes that Paris in the bed chamber is in the wrong place for a man, particularly during a battle and during the day (pp.46-7). Hektor's view of Paris as a creature of Aphrodite makes its way into the views of scholars as well. For example, Edwards (1987) notes (p.107) that the simile at 6.506 ff. illustrates Paris' beauty more than his speed. Edwards does not make a similar claim about Hektor when he discusses the passage in Book 15 where Hektor receives

- the same simile; instead he notes that the simile illustrates how Hektor's spirits rise as he returns to battle (p.154) and that it is "odd" that Hektor receives the same simile as Paris (p.212).
37. Cf. Meltzer (1989-1990), who notes that the poem, by not mentioning Paris between Books 3 and 6, gives the impression that he has stayed in his bedroom all this time (p.244).
 38. See Scott (1974: 86). Moulton (1977) argues that this simile, like the preceding horse simile, stresses Paris' good looks (p.94). In general, comparisons to heavenly bodies do seem, in part, to illustrate beauty. However, Achilles receives similes comparing him to the sun at 19.398 and 22.135; these images draw upon the beauty of fire as well as its destructive capabilities. Consequently, this use of a sun simile for Paris should also stress his destructive aspect. Scott (1974) argues that fire and fiery heavenly body similes can be interchangeable (p.67). See Whitman (1958: 128-153; especially see p.139, pp.142-144) on fire imagery in the *Iliad*.
 39. See Clay (2011: 38-41) on the "emotional geography" of Troy, defined by "male and female, by closeness and distance, a space not physical, but psychological." Cf. Van Nortwick (2001), who argues that Book 6 opposes Hektor's masculine drive for status to the feminine need for intimate interpersonal connection; the warrior must be alienated from those for whom he cares (p.224, p.230).
 40. Eating and drinking for the warrior are a matter of appropriate context. At *Iliad* 19.155-183, Odysseus reminds Achilles that the other Achaians should not go back to battle from their rest until they have had an opportunity to eat and drink.
 41. Van Nortwick (2001) notes (p.227) that Hektor's rejection of Andromache's advice is based, not in strategy, but in his desire to be someone who fights always in the front ranks. Compare the scorn with which Diomedes greets Paris' striking him with an arrow (*Iliad* 11.369-395). The archer fights from behind a wall of shield, as Teukros does from behind Aias' shield (*Iliad* 8.266-334). In the view of the *Iliad*, the archer is not a real warrior.
 42. Meltzer (1989-1990) argues (p.277) that Hektor's conversation with Andromache here is parallel to Paris' long delay with Helen. Both warriors, then, are lingering inside the city with their women, but this lingering is characterized in a different way for each. Cf. Moulton (1977) who sees irony in Paris' receiving two splendid similes and being ready for battle while Hektor lingers talking with Andromache (p.96). Monsacré (1984) notes (p.46) that, aside from Paris, Hektor meets only women on his trip into Troy; speaking only to women here marks Hektor as not participating in the warrior's proper role, as warriors speak only with other men, be they allies or foes.
 43. See Leinieks (1986) for a demonstration that particular kinds of images in similes have particular traditional associations. The lion is one of the traditional figures for μένος. Moulton (1977) argues that the lion simile balances the horse simile; the two of them together show Hektor's assault and the panic of the Achaians (p.69).
 44. Compare the Aiantes' discussion of the physical symptoms of their own μένος at *Iliad* 13.73-80: battle spirit shows itself in the eagerness of hands and feet to fight and kill. For a fuller account of μένος and its physical manifestation, see Monsacré (1984: 56-57).
 45. Monsacré (1984) argues (p.49) that the *Iliad*, in order to cast Hektor as a real warrior, must isolate Hektor progressively more and more from his family and

his city. Van Nortwick (2001) notes (p.234) that Hektor is more defined by relations with women than any other character in the *Iliad*; this association with the female makes his being strongly marked as masculine warrior hero all the more necessary.

The poem marks Hektor's assumption of full warrior status through similes. Up to the moment of his redemption in Book 15, Hektor receives only two similes comparing him to a predatory animal (at 7.256-257 and 12.41-48, where Hektor is compared to a lion). After his redemption Hektor receives eight more similes comparing him to predatory animals (lion: 15.271-276, 15.630-636, 16.756-759, 16.823-827, 18.161-164; eagle: 15.690-692, 22.308-311; hawk: 17.755-759).

46. See de Jong (1987, pp.93-94; pp.124-136) for a narratological account of the similes as interpretive of the narrative. Compare Nagy (1983, p.36), discussing the recognition and interpretation of σήματα in Homer. Nagy argues that any recognition of a σῆμα implies an act of interpretation.
47. See Fränkel (1921: 107) on similes achieving what is not possible in the narrative. Compare Riezler (1936), who argues (p.254) that the similes can function as a parallel narrative, which is a peculiarity of the Homeric simile. See also Ready (2008), for a discussion of how the poems are aware of and exploit the variety of functions that figures of speech like similes can fulfil (especially see pp. 470-496).

References

- Aristotle. *Physics*. David Ross, ed. 1950. Oxford.
- Homer. *Opera*. 5 vols. David B. Monro and Thomas W. Allen, eds. 1912-1920. Oxford.
- Anderson, John K. 1961. *Ancient Greek Horsemanship*. Berkeley.
- Benveniste, Emile. 1969. *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. Paris
- Bowra, Cedric M. 1968. *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*. Oxford.
- Casey, Edward S. 1997. *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Clay, Jenny Strauss. 2011. *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision, and Memory in the Iliad*. Cambridge.
- Collins, Leslie. 1988. *Studies in Characterization in the Iliad*. Athenäums Monographien: Altertumswissenschaft 189. Frankfurt am Main.
- Crouwel, Joost H. 1995. "Chariots in Early Iron Age Greece and in Homer," in Jan P. Crielaard, ed., *Homeric Questions*. 309-312.
- Cunliffe, Richard J. 1924. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*. London and Glasgow.
- de Jong, Irene J. F. 1987. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam.
- Donlan, Walter. 1989. "Homeric τέμενος and the Land Economy of the Dark Age," *M.H.* 46: 129-145.
- Drews, Richard. 1988. *The Coming of the Greeks. Indo-European Conquests in the Aegean and the Near East*. Princeton.
- Dumezil, Georges. 1969. *Heur et malheur du guerrier*. Paris.

- Ebeling, Heinrich, ed. 1963. *Lexicon Homericum*. Hildesheim.
- Edwards, Mark W. 1987. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore.
- Fenik, Bernard. 1968. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad*. *Hermes Einzelschriften* 21. Wiesbaden.
- _____. 1974. *Studies in the Odyssey*. *Hermes Einzelschriften* 30. Wiesbaden.
- Finley, Moses I. 1965. *The World of Odysseus*. New York.
- Foley, John M. 1990. *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford.
- _____. 1991. *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*. Bloomington and Indianapolis.
- _____. 1997. "Oral Tradition and its Implications," in I. Morris and B. Powell, eds., *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden, New York, and Köln. 146-173.
- Fränkel, Hermann. 1921. *Die homerischen Gleichnisse*. Göttingen.
- Greenhalgh, P. A. L. 1973. *Early Greek Warfare*. Cambridge.
- Janko, Richard. 1992. *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 4. Cambridge.
- Kirk, Geoffrey S. 1968. *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 1. Cambridge.
- _____. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 1. Cambridge.
- _____. 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 2. Cambridge.
- Krischer, Tilman. 1971. *Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epik*. *Zetemata* 56. Munich.
- Lattimore, Richmond, trans. 1951. *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago.
- Leinieks, Valdis. 1986. "The Similes of *Iliad* Two," *C.M.* 37: 5-20.
- Lord, Albert B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA.
- Lord, Mary L. 1967. "Withdrawal and Return: An Epic Story Pattern in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter and in the Homeric Poems," *C.J.* 62: 241-248.
- Meltzer, Gary S. 1989-1990. "The Role of Comic Perspectives in Shaping Homer's Tragic Vision," *C.W.* 83: 265-280.
- Monsacré, Héléne. 1984. *Les l'armes d' Achille. Le héros, la femme et la souffrance dans la poésie d'Homère*. Paris.
- Moulton, Carroll. 1977. *Similes in the Homeric Poems*. Göttingen.
- Mueller, Martin. 1984. *The Iliad*. London.
- Muellner, Leonard. 1990. "The Simile of the Cranes and Pygmies: A Study of Homeric Metaphor," *H.S.C.P.* 93: 59-101.
- Nagler, Michael N. 1974. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Nagy, Gregory. 1983. "Sema and Noesis: Some Illustrations," *Arethusa* 16: 35-55.
- _____. 1999. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Revised Edition. Baltimore and London.
- Nickel, Roberto. 2002. "Euphorbus and the Death of Achilles," *Phoenix* 56: 215-233.
- _____. 2003. "The Wrath of Demeter: Story Patterns in the Hymn to Demeter," *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* N.S. 73: 59-82.
- Pratt, Louise. 2007. "The Parental Ethos of the *Iliad*," In *Constructions of Childhood in Ancient Greece and Italy (Hesperia Supplements 41)*, Ada

- Cohen and Jeremy B. Rutter, eds. (Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens) 25-40.
- Raaflaub, Kurt. A. 2008. "Homeric Warriors and Battles: Trying to Resolve Old Problems," *Classical World* 101: 469-483.
- Ready, Jonathan L. 2007. "Toil and Trouble: The Acquisition of Spoils in the *Iliad*," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 137: 3-43.
- _____. 2008. "The Comparative Spectrum in Homer," *American Journal of Philology* 129: 453-496.
- Richter, W. 1968. *Die Landwirtschaft im homerischen Zeitalter*, vol. 2, part H in F. Matz and H.-G. Buchholz, eds. *Archaeologia Homerica*. Göttingen.
- Riezler, K. 1936. "Das homerische Gleichnis und der Anfang der Philosophie," *Die Antike* 12:253-271.
- Schein, Seth L. 1984. *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Schnapp-Gourbeillon, Annie. 1981. *Lions, héros, masques: Les représentations de l'animale chez Homère*. Paris.
- Scott, William C. 1974. *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile*. Leiden.
- Singer, Henk W. 1995. "Eni Prōtoisi Machesthai: Some Remarks on the Iliadic Image of the Battlefield," in J. P. Crielaard, ed. *Homeric Questions*. Amsterdam. 183-200.
- Sowa, Cora A. 1984. *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns*. Chicago.
- Stanford, William B., ed. 1959. *The Odyssey of Homer*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. London and New York.
- Van Nortwick, Thomas. 2001. "Like a Woman: Hector and the Boundaries of Masculinity." *Arethusa* 34: 221-235.
- van Wees, Hans. 1992. *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History*. Amsterdam.
- _____. 1997. "Homeric Warfare," in I. Morris and B. Powell, eds. *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden, New York, and Köln. 668-693.
- Whitman, Cedric. H. 1958. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge, MA.
- Woronoff, M. 1983. "Les chevaux de Troie," in *Mélanges Edouard Delebeque*. Aix-en-Provence. 487-496.